UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 109—PART 6

APRIL 25, 1963, TO MAY 13, 1963
(PAGES 7059 TO 8390)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1963

J
11
.R
V149
pt. 6

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 25, 1963

(Legislative day of Wednesday, April 24, 1963)

The Senate met in executive session at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of our salvation, for a sense of whose presence our restless spirits ever yearn, for these moments we would hush our busy thoughts to silence as we seek to discern Thy will.

> 'Mid all the traffic of the ways,
> Turmoils without, within,
> Make in our hearts a quiet place
> And come and dwell therein.

For void of Thee, all is vanity and life itself is barren, joyless, robbed of its wonder, its dignity, and its beauty.

Even as draining duties, tied to the Nation's welfare, demand the utmost in time and energy of Thy servants here, in the fellowship of the world unseen more real than the tangible things about us, may there come to our questing spirits light out of darkness, peace out of discord, strength out of struggle, forgiveness out of guilt, and faith out of fear.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance:

Alfred C. Dumouchel, of Rhode Island, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 5, with headquarters at Providence, R.I.

By Mr. McNAMARA, from the Committee on Public Works:

Frank E. Smith, of Mississippi, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

NOMINATIONS—NEW REPORTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the new reports on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will proceed to state the new reports on the Executive Calendar.

CIVIL SERVICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of L. J. Andolsek, of Minnesota, to be a Civil Service Commissioner for the term of 6 years expiring March 1, 1969.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Charles B. Fulton, of Florida, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of Florida.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the postmaster nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the postmaster nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am delighted that the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas has shown such an active and personal interest in the postmaster nominations which have been considered and confirmed unanimously by the Senate.

TRANSACTION OF LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following legislative business was transacted:

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 24, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2440) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1964 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. VINSON, Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina, Mr. PHILBIN, Mr. HÉBERT, Mr. ARENDS, Mr. GAVIN, and Mr. NORBLAD were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 12. An act to increase the opportunities for training of physicians, dentists, and professional public health personnel, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 5338. An act to enact the Uniform Commercial Code for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 12. An act to increase the opportunities for training of physicians, dentists, and professional public health personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H.R. 5338. An act to enact the Uniform Commercial Code for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SESSION OF THE SENATE

On request of Mr. PASTORE and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences and the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Subcommittee of the Commerce Committee was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I wish to state that I understand that the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] intends to make, at the conclusion of morning business, a point of order dealing with the constitutionality of the nominations of incorporators of the Communications Satellite Corp. It is the intention of the leadership at that time to suggest the absence of a quorum.

On behalf of the distinguished minority leader and myself, I wish to serve notice to the attachés of the Senate that it will be a live quorum. We hope all Senators will be on the floor at the conclusion of the quorum call, because at that time an announcement will be made in regard to the business which will be pending at that time.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The **VICE PRESIDENT** laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report on Transfer of Research and Development Funds, National Aeronautics and Space Administration

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the transfer of fiscal year 1962 research and development funds to the fiscal year 1962 construction of facilities appropriation for the revised construction of the liquid hydrogen facility at the Marshall Space Flight Center; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Report on Officers Assigned to Permanent Duty in the Executive Element of the Air Force at the Seat of Government

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, reporting, pursuant to law, that as of March 31, 1963, 2,196 officers were assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive element of the Air Force at the seat of government; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Reimbursement of the Treasury by the Panama Canal Company

A letter from the president, Panama Canal Company, Balboa Heights, C.Z., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for reimbursement of the Treasury by the Panama Canal Company for the annuity paid to the Republic of Panama (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Audit Report on Washington National Airport

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Washington National Airport, Federal Aviation Agency, fiscal years 1959–61 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Amendment of Authorization To Appropriate Money for Maintenance and Operation of Experimental Stations of Department of the Interior

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the authorization to appropriate money for the maintenance and operation of three experimental stations of the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Amendment of Section 1871, Title 28, United States Code, To Increase Certain Allowances of Grand and Petit Jurors

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1871 of title 28, U.S. Code, to increase the per diem and subsistence, and limit mileage allowances of grand and petit jurors (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report of National Institute of Arts and Letters

A letter from the Assistant Secretary, the National Institute of Arts and Letters, New York, N.Y., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Institute, for the year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the **VICE PRESIDENT**:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Joint Memorial 9

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, concerning taxation

"Whereas during the past 30 years the proportion of each dollar of taxes paid by residents of the State of Colorado has changed from a ratio of 77 percent for State and local government purposes and 23 percent for Federal Government purposes to a ratio of 73 percent for Federal Government purposes and 27 percent for State and local government purposes; and

"Whereas in many instances the tax structures of the Federal and State governments result in dual taxation upon the same class of transaction, especially in the field of transfer of property by gift or by devise; and

"Whereas the Federal tax structure is complicated by the allowance of numerous exemptions, exclusions, exceptions, and credits, which are available to some taxpayers but unavailable to others, whereby the burden of Federal taxation is not equitably borne by all taxpayers, even in cases where their gross income is precisely equal: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the 44th General Assembly of the State of Colorado* (*the House of Representatives concurring herein*), That we the members of the General Assembly of the State of Colorado respectfully make application to the Congress of the United States of America, under article V of the Constitution of the United States, to call a constitutional convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment limiting the amount of tax that may be levied and collected by the United States of America on the net income of any person, except in time of grave national emergency so declared by the Congress, and to permit a fair and more scientific approach to the levying of taxes and the division thereof between the Federal and local governments, and to prohibit income tax avoidance now and in the future, and to prohibit the Federal Government from levying any tax, duty, or excise, upon the transfer of property upon or in contemplation of death or by way of gift; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a duly attested copy of this memorial be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

"Robert L. Knous,
"*President of the Senate.*
"Mildred H. Cresswell,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*
"John D. Vanderhoof,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*
"Donald H. Henderson,
"*Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.*"

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Resolution 3

"Resolution requesting the U.S. Congress to aid the State of Hawaii in the development of Waikiki Beach

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has passed legislative measures granting aid to the States for the improvement of the beach resources of the Nation; and

"Whereas the State of Hawaii, being an island State, has a large share of the beach resources of the Nation; and

"Whereas the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has made studies and plans concerning the most efficient development of Waikiki Beach in the State of Hawaii, which beach is subject to continual erosion of sand especially during the winter months; and

"Whereas the State of Hawaii, recognizing the importance of the project, desires to proceed without delay with the improvement of Waikiki Beach: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the Second Legislature of the State of Hawaii, regular session of 1963*, That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby respectfully requested to appropriate $2 million, or so much as may be necessary, for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to aid the State in improving Waikiki Beach in accordance with the plans developed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States be and is requested to authorize the State of Hawaii to proceed, prior to project authorization, with the improvement of Waikiki Beach in accordance with the plans approved by the Corps of Engineers and that the amount expended by the State shall be credited to its ultimate contribution toward the project; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That duly certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress, the Hawaii delegation in the U.S. Congress, and the Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. **HILL**, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; without amendment:

H.R. 4549. An act to amend section 4103 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the appointment of the Chief Medical Director of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration (Rept. No. 156).

By Mr. **BYRD** of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

H.R. 199. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans having the service-connected disability of deafness of both ears (Rept. No. 157);

H.R. 211. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide increases in rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to children and parents of deceased veterans (Rept. No. 158); and

H.R. 214. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans suffering the loss or loss of use of both vocal cords, with resulting complete aphonia (Rept. No. 159).

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance, with amendments:

H.R. 2053. An act to provide for the temporary suspension of the duty on corkboard insulation and on cork stoppers; (Rept. No. 160).

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Appropriations, without amendment:

S. Res. 128. Resolution to provide additional funds for the Committee on Appropriations; referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REPORT ENTITLED "OPERATIONS OF SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT COMPANIES"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 161)

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, from the Select Committee on Small Business, I submit a report entitled "Operations of Small Business Investment Companies." I ask that the report be printed, together with the individual views of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Alabama.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 1361. A bill relating to eligibility requirements for enrolling in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps and the Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota (for himself, Mr. Mundt, Mr. McGovern, and Mr. Burdick):

S. 1362. A bill to provide that certain lands shall be held in trust for the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe in North Dakota and South Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. METCALF:

S. 1363. A bill to increase the participation by counties in revenues from the National Wildlife Refuge System by amending the act of June 15, 1935, relating to such participation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. METCALF (for himself and Mr. Mansfield):

S. 1364. A bill to remove for and on behalf of the State of Montana a cloud on the title of a certain island in the Yellowstone River; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Metcalf when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. Javits):

S. 1365. A bill to establish the Fire Island National Seashore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Keating when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON:

S. 1366. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis Leontaritis;

S. 1367. A bill to provide for improved administrative practices and procedures in the U.S. courts, and for other purposes; and

S. 1368. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional judge for any of the U.S. courts of appeals, district courts, Court of Claims, Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, or Customs Court upon the attainment of age 70 by any judge hereafter appointed to such court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Johnston when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON (by request):

S. 1369. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 so as to authorize certain teachers employed by the Board of Education of the District of Columbia to participate in a health benefits plan established pursuant to such act and to amend the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 so as to extend insurance coverage to such teachers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSTON (for himself and Mr. Brewster) (by request):

S. 1370. A bill to amend title 39 of the United States Code to increase the area within which the Postmaster General may establish stations, substations, or branches of post offices, from 10 to 20 miles; and

S. 1371. A bill to amend the automatic separation provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 1372. A bill to correct a technical omission in the enactment of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Dirksen when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 1373. A bill to promote the orderly transfer of the Executive power in connection with the expiration of the term of office of a President and the inauguration of a new President; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Jackson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr. Gruening):

S. 1374. A bill to amend the act providing for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union with respect to the selection of public lands for the development and expansion of communities; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Bartlett when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE:

S. 1375. A bill for the relief of Manuel Brandao Guimaraes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION

REPORTS ON CERTAIN TRAVEL EXPENSES BY SENATE COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 129); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That (a) the chairman of each standing or select committee of the Senate or joint committee the expenses of which are disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate, any of the members or employees of which travel on official business of such committee outside the fifty States (including the District of Columbia), shall file with the Secretary of the Senate an itemized report showing all amounts expended from appropriated funds or other moneys (including foreign currencies) of the United States for lodging, meals, transportation, entertainment, tips, and other purposes in connection with such travel.

(b) Each member or employee of a standing or select committee of the Senate, or of a joint committee the expenses of which are disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate, who travels on official business of such committee outside the fifty States (including the District of Columbia) shall file with the Secretary of the Senate an itemized report showing all amounts expended by him or in his behalf from appropriated funds or other moneys (including foreign currencies) of the United States for lodging, meals, transportation, entertainment, tips, and other purposes.

(c) A report required by this resolution shall be filed within thirty days following the completion of the travel covered by the report, and shall be in addition to any reports required by section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended. Any failure by a committee or member or employee thereof to file a report required by this resolution, which comes to the attention of the Secretary of the Senate shall be reported by him to the Committee on Rules and Administration for such action as it deems appropriate.

(d) Reports filed under this resolution shall be made available by the Secretary of the Senate for inspection at reasonable times by any interested person.

REMOVAL OF CLOUD IN TITLE TO A CERTAIN ISLAND IN YELLOWSTONE RIVER

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield], and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to remove, for and on behalf of the State of Montana, a cloud on the title of a certain island in the Yellowstone River.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and letters from Montana's attorney general, Forrest H. Anderson, and from Solicitor Frank J. Barry, of the Department of the Interior, be printed at this point in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letters will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1364) to remove for and on behalf of the State of Montana a cloud on the title of a certain island in the Yellowstone River, introduced by Mr. Metcalf (for himself and Mr. Mansfield), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to remove a cloud on the title of a certain island situated in the Yellowstone River, in section 17, township 14 north, range 55 east, Montana Principal Meridian, containing 36.30 acres more or less, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to quitclaim to the State of Montana, without

consideration, any right, title, and interest of the United States in and to such island.

The letters presented by Mr. METCALF are as follows:

STATE OF MONTANA,
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Helena, Mont., January 11, 1963.
Hon. LEE METCALF,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR LEE: I am writing to ask your assistance in clearing Montana's title to a certain island located in the Yellowstone River in section 17, township 14 north, range 55 east, Montana principal meridian and containing about 205.02 acres.

The State of Montana has exercised dominion over this island since June 3, 1952, when it granted an oil and gas lease covering the island to Edward M. Catron of Casper, Wyo.

Montana claims title to this island on the basis that it was formed after the date of our admission into the Union.

In 1953, the Department of the Interior claimed Federal ownership of this island. The Northern Pacific Railway Co. protested this claim, contending that the island was given to the Northern Pacific under the land grant to that railroad. The Department held administrative hearings to determine ownership of this island and decided in favor of the Federal Government's claim to the island. Because of a lack of funds available at that time, Montana was unable to participate in the administrative appeal to the Secretary of the Interior. Only the Northern Pacific took that appeal and their position in the proceeding was necessarily that the island in question was formed before 1889, the year of Montana's admission to the Union.

Consequently, the basis of Montana's claim to this island, viz, that it was formed after November 8, 1889, was never considered by the Secretary. Since 1957, we have made repeated attempts to have this matter reopened by the Interior Department but to no avail. The Federal Government's immunity from suit leaves us with no forum in which to fully try Montana's right to this island.

In view of these facts, I am asking you and the other members of our congressional delegation to introduce legislation to recognize Montana as the rightful owner of this island. I will be happy to fully explain the factual and legal basis of this claim to you at any time.

Because of its presence in a proven oil field, this island is extremely valuable to the people of Montana. I believe our claim is just and factually correct. Your assistance in securing title to this island for Montana will be a tremendous service to Montana.

Thanking you for your consideration of this matter, I remain

Very truly yours,
FORREST H. ANDERSON,
Attorney General.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR,
Washington, D.C., April 10, 1963.
Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: This is in further reference to your inquiry of January 15, 1963, regarding ownership of an island in the Yellowstone River in section 17, township 14 north, range 55 east, Montana principal meridian.

Mr. Forrest H. Anderson, the attorney general of the State of Montana, wrote you on January 11, 1963, concerning title to this island and requested you to introduce legislation which would recognize Montana as its rightful owner. After careful review of our records we are of the opinion that, in the circumstances here present, it would be necessary for the Congress, in order to establish the ownership in the State, to make a grant of the island by specific legislation.

This Department has already decided that the island in question is a part of the public domain (*Northern Pacific Railway Company, Ralph L. Bassett*, 62 I.D. 401 (1955)). It is presently subject to Petroleum Reserve No. 43. The State of Montana was a protestant in the case, at least so far as its appeal to the Director, Bureau of Land Management; but the State did not pursue an appeal to the Secretary.

As the above cited decision notes in footnote 1 at page 402: "The State of Montana has also filed a protest against the lease after it had been issued, which was dismissed by the manager. The State appealed this action to the Director, who affirmed it. The State has not appealed to the Secretary and thus must be deemed to have acquiesced in the Director's decision."

Moreover, on April 8, 1958, Deputy Solicitor Frity wrote to Mr. Anderson: "I have considered carefully the documents entitled 'Notice of Appeal' and 'Appellant's Brief' filed by you in connection with oil and gas lease Montana 011522, the validity of which was upheld by the Department in *Northern Pacific Railway Company, Ralph L. Bassett*, 62 I.D. 401 (1955).

"As an appeal from the Acting Director's decision of September 28, 1954, which affirmed the dismissal of the State's protest against the lease, it has been filed far too late to be considered.

"However, the documents, in effect, also seek to have the Department reconsider its decision of October 20, 1955 (supra). In this light I have reviewed the points raised in the brief and have concluded that they do not warrant any change in the Department's decision.

"Therefore, the decision of October 20, 1955, will remain the Department's final determination in this matter."

The basis for the Department's decision was that the evidence supported the conclusion that the island was in existence at the time Montana was admitted to the Union; that it was, therefore, public land; and that it did not pass to the railway as grant lands under its 1896 patent to section 17 because it was unsurveyed at that time. Further, it was concluded that the railway's inchoate claim to the island was released in 1941 under the terms of the Transportation Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 954, as amended).

Under the circumstances, we can reach no different conclusion.

Sincerely yours,
FRANK J. BARRY,
Solicitor.

FIRE ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE BILL

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on behalf of my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a national seashore at Fire Island, N.Y.

Only 50 miles from New York City, and within hours of approximately 20 percent of the population of this country, there is a long sand reef protecting the shores of Long Island. This beach—Fire Island—has been enjoyed by generations of Americans who appreciate the isolated quiet of its dunes and the peace of its natural beauty.

In other parts of the country—in Massachusetts, California, and Texas—the Federal Government has acted in the interest of all Americans to preserve seashores in their natural state. There are, at the present time, three such national seashores, and we believe Fire Island should be designated as the fourth. In the opinion of the National Park Service, the Fire Island area is "of extreme importance because of its natural features and its close proximity to large centers of population. It is one of a constantly narrowing group of exceptionally important, relatively undeveloped seashore areas on the Atlantic coast that rates high priority for acquisition and conservation by a public agency. It should be preserved as a substantially natural area because of its special qualities and character."

The Department of the Interior has expressed its concern that Fire Island not become a part of "our vanishing shoreline," and recommended that its beaches be set aside for public use and enjoyment. The creation of a national seashore has also been urged by the residents of the island themselves, by the Suffolk County Board of Supervisors and by the two local governments directly concerned—Brookhaven and Islip. Conservationists, sportsmen, and scores of citizens concerned over the disappearance of unspoiled recreation areas on the east coast have written to me concerning the need for this legislation.

In the 87th Congress, our distinguished colleague in the other body, Representative JOHN LINDSAY, of New York, took the initiative in proposing this legislation. Although there has been unanimous agreement on the need for creating a national seashore in this area, it cannot be denied that there are divergent views concerning the exact boundaries which the preserve should encompass. We have chosen to incorporate in our bill, the areas specified by Representative LINDSAY—that is, the land between the Fire Island Lighthouse and Moriches Inlet—in the interest of getting an early start on this legislation. It is expected, however, that interested parties, particularly the Department of the Interior, will submit suggestions for the exact demarcation of this area which we, the sponsors, will gratefully receive and carefully consider.

America has been criticized for spoiling its God-given scenic beauty with commercial enterprise, soiling its landscape with billboards and neon signs. For the people of New York—in fact for all the residents of the great megalopolis which stretches from Boston to Richmond—Fire Island offers respite from the demands of the city and repose near the calming sea, which might be very welcome to some Members of this body in their more tense moments. Before this, too, is spoiled, let us act to preserve this haven for our fellow citizens, and for the generations yet unborn.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1365) to establish the Fire Island National Seashore, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Keating (for himself and Mr. JAVITS), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purpose of preserving certain unspoiled shoreline areas for the enjoyment and inspiration of the people of the United States, the Secretary of Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized, in accordance with this Act, to establish the Fire Island National Seashore on the Great South Beach in the towns of Islip and Brookhaven, Suffolk County, New York, in the area between the westerly boundary of the Federal Reservation at Fire Island Lighthouse and Moriches Inlet.

SEC. 2. The Fire Island National Seashore shall consist of not more than seven thousand five hundred acres of land designated by the Secretary in the area described in the first section, including the shore front and such adjoining waters and submerged lands as the Secretary shall deem necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary is authorized to acquire real property and any interest therein in the area described in the first section by gift, purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, in order to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(b) Any property of the United States not within the jurisdiction of the Secretary shall be transferred to the Secretary for the purposes of this Act by the head of the department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States having jurisdiction of such property upon request of the Secretary.

SEC. 4. (a) Whenever the Secretary has acquired five hundred acres of the real property referred to in this Act, he shall declare the establishment of the Fire Island National Seashore by publishing in the Federal Register notice of such establishment. Establishment of such national seashore by such publication shall not be deemed to prevent the Secretary from acquiring other property for inclusion within such national seashore, subject, however, to the acreage limitation provided in section 2 of this Act.

(b) Access to such national seashore shall be provided at such points as the Secretary may direct.

SEC. 5. In order that the seashore shall be permanently preserved in its present state, no development or plan for the convenience of visitors shall be undertaken therein which would be incompatible with the preservation of the unique flora and fauna or the physiographic conditions now prevailing: *Provided,* That the Secretary may provide for the public enjoyment and understanding of the unique natural, historic, and scientific features of Fire Island within the seashore by establishing such trails, observation points, and exhibits and providing such services as he may deem desirable for such public enjoyment and understanding: *Provided further,* That the Secretary may develop for appropriate public uses, such portions of the seashore as he deems especially adaptable for camping, swimming, boating, sailing, fishing, and other activities of a similar nature.

SEC. 6. The Secretary shall administer, develop, and protect the Fire Island National Seashore in accordance with and subject to the Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Park System, and for other purposes", approved August 25, 1916, as amended and supplemented (16 U.S.C., section 1 and others).

SEC. 7. The sum of $50,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is authorized to be appropriated for such surveys and studies as the Secretary may deem necessary to determine the area suitable for inclusion in the Fire Island National Seashore.

SEC. 8. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the acquisition of real property to carry out the purposes of this Act, and such further sums as may be necessary for improvement and administration.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, with respect to the bill to create a national seashore at Fire Island, I am honored to join with my colleague from New York. I have actually lived on Fire Island, in successive summers, for 4 years, and know it well personally.

When the matter first arose as an issue as to what should be done with it, whether a road should be built on it, as contemplated by plans by Mr. Moses, then chairman of the New York State Park Commission, or whether it should be left in its present condition, where there are some 18 cottage communities, I gave the matter considerable thought and consulted with many who lived there, and gave the place my personal inspection again, though I knew it well.

In the course of the whole inquiry I came to the conclusion that the establishment there of a national seashore was the most logical one. I therefore joined with my colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING] in the sponsorship of this bill with great personal conviction.

Fire Island is a 31-mile sandbar off the south shore of Long Island—an area of mostly unspoiled natural beauty just 50 miles from New York City. It is only about 2,000 feet wide at its widest point and in many places is less than 500 feet wide. Yet it is one of the most magnificent and most famous strips of oceanfront in the world.

Fire Island is one of the last unspoiled stretches of natural beach left on the east coast, and unspoiled beach is becoming one of the greatest rarities in the United States. The growth of income and population has speeded up commercial development and increased real estate values to the point where time is running out on opportunities to preserve such areas for the enjoyment of all the people of the United States.

If action is not taken soon, this priceless piece of real estate will disappear forever under the encroaching forces of development.

That is the reason I have joined with Senator KEATING today in sponsoring this legislation to establish a Fire Island National Seashore.

The total acreage involved in our bill is 7,500 acres of shorefront, vegetation, submerged and wetlands which are not developed, extending from the Federal reservation at Fire Island Lighthouse to Moriches Inlet. In my view, this is the soundest approach, for it would preserve as much of Fire Island as possible. But I recognize that there are varying views as to the area on Fire Island which should be included in a national seashore park. I am confident, however, that a consensus will be arrived at, on the basis of the recommendations of the Interior Department, as well as the testimony of the various experts in the field before the appropriate congressional committees.

The 7,500 acres involved is not a large area when you consider the 36,000 acres in the newly formed Cape Cod National Seashore. But because Fire Island is so narrow and long, there is as much ocean shoreline on Fire Island as there is on Cape Cod and even more, if the Great South Bay is included. This area—the Great South Bay, between Fire Island and the south shore of Long Island—is not only a mecca for boating, fishing, and sheltered swimming, but is a major migratory bird center and contains several areas, including the unique Sunken Forest, with some of the most ancient holly on the continent.

Most proposals for national seashores have stirred major controversies in the past. Happily, except for details, this is not true in the case of Fire Island.

Under this and several preceding administrations, the National Park Service has consistently singled out Fire Island as part of "our vanishing shoreline" worthy of preservation. In 1955, during the Eisenhower administration, the National Park Service conducted a survey of 3,700 miles of gulf and Atlantic shoreline and recommended taking Fire Island into the national park system.

Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall has indicated his strong support for creation of the Fire Island National Seashore and has said he would prefer that the island be kept as much as possible in its natural state while protecting the area for maximum public use.

The residents, themselves, of the 18 summer cottage communities on the island are also in favor of the national seashore as well as the Suffolk County Board of Supervisors and the administrations of the two townships most directly affected, Islip and Brookhaven.

The local chambers of commerce, leagues of women voters, sportsmen and conservationist groups, and the leading newspapers in New York are also behind this movement.

With such support, we should be able to move rapidly toward establishment of the Fire Island National Seashore.

The Federal Government has already made a major investment in this property. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is now embarked upon an 83-mile Federal-State beach erosion control and hurricane protection project which will involve, according to present plans, substantial work on Fire Island. By 1965, more than $11 million of Federal, State, and local funds will be spent on Fire Island in order to protect hundreds of millions of dollars worth of property on the mainland for which the island serves as a barrier beach against the onslaughts of the Atlantic Ocean. This is another reason why the entire dune and oceanfront should be preserved for the public instead of having these public funds benefit commercial developers.

Secretary Udall has said that "we need diversity of recreational opportunity. And in particular, we need to provide for the preservation of natural open spaces free of automobile traffic, parking lots and hot dog stands." Fire Island is one of the last remaining opportunities to provide diversified recreational facilities easily accessible to almost 20 percent of the population of the United States. It is within a few hours' traveling distance of the entire metropolitan complex extending from Boston to Washington.

The cost per acre of Fire Island is probably higher than the costs of other national parks, but the actual cost in terms of potential use is considerably lower. Preservation now of this natural treasure for all the people is one of the greatest economic bargains available to us. In a few years, at the present rate of development, we no longer will have the chance. The farsighted planners who acquired Central Park and Jones Beach for the public are vindicated today. Robert Moses has estimated that Jones Beach land today would be worth $10,000 an acre and will probably be three to five times that amount in another generation.

As one who has had the pleasure of spending several summers on Fire Island with my family, I can personally testify that this represents a rare opportunity for our Nation to preserve a stretch of oceanfront which our grandchildren and succeeding generations will be able to see and enjoy as God created it.

With time so short, I fervently hope this administration, the Interior Department and Congress will act promptly to preserve a natural asset which is slipping away and can never return once lost.

APPOINTMENT OF AN ADDITIONAL JUDGE FOR CERTAIN COURTS UNDER CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the appointment of an additional judge for certain courts under certain circumstances.

This is a matter which has concerned the members of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate for some time. In my opinion it requires careful consideration, primarily by the Judicial Conference of the United States.

The purpose of this bill is to provide for the appointment of an additional judge for any of the U.S. courts of appeals, district courts, Court of Claims, Court of Custom and Patent Appeals, or Customs Court upon the attainment of age 70 by any judge hereafter appointed to such court.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table showing the retirement periods of 293 district judges on active duty in the U.S. district courts according to age and length of service, as of December 31, 1962.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the table will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1368) to provide for the appointment of an additional judge for any of the U.S. courts of appeals, district courts, Court of Claims, Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, or Customs Court upon the attainment of age 70 by any judge hereafter appointed to such court, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The table presented by Mr. JOHNSTON is as follows:

Retirement periods of 293 district judges on active duty in the U.S. district courts according to age and length of service as of Dec. 31, 1962

	Number of judgeships	Vacancies	Active judges	Age					Length of service in years						Eligible to retire—				
				Under 55	55 to 59	60 to 64	65 to 69	70 and over	0 to 4	5 to 9	10 to 14	15 to 19	20 to 24	25 and over	As of Jan. 1, 1963	In 1963	1964 through 1967	1968 through 1972	After 1972
Total 89 districts	304	11	293	93	74	58	30	38	137	65	39	23	12	17	44	3	30	90	126
1st circuit, 5 districts	11	2	9	2	1	2	3	1	2	2	1	1	2	1	3	-------	1	3	2
2d circuit, 6 districts	41	1	40	12	11	8	6	3	17	10	8	2	1	2	5	1	5	14	15
3d circuit, 5 districts	33	2	31	8	14	6	1	2	15	10	3	2	1	-------	2	-------	2	11	16
4th circuit, 10 districts	22	2	20	9	2	6	1	2	13	4	1	-------	-------	2	2	1	-------	7	10
5th circuit, 17 districts	44	1	43	20	7	5	3	8	21	8	5	6	1	2	8	-------	3	11	21
6th circuit, 9 districts	31	-------	31	12	3	8	2	6	15	5	3	2	1	5	7	-------	5	5	14
7th circuit, 7 districts	23	-------	23	6	7	3	4	3	10	6	4	-------	2	1	3	-------	3	8	9
8th circuit, 10 districts	24	1	23	11	5	1	2	4	12	6	-------	3	1	1	4	-------	1	6	12
9th circuit, 11 districts	43	1	42	9	13	13	4	3	21	7	8	3	1	2	4	-------	4	17	17
10th circuit, 8 districts	17	-------	17	4	5	5	-------	3	8	5	2	1	-------	1	2	-------	3	5	7
District of Columbia	15	1	14	-------	6	1	4	3	3	2	4	3	2	-------	4	1	3	3	3

NOTE.—Territorial courts for Guam, Virgin Islands, and Canal Zone are not included.

DEDUCTIONS ALLOWED IN COMPUTING TAXABLE INCOME OF CERTAIN INSURANCE COMPANIES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to correct an apparent omission in the Internal Revenue Code with respect to deductions which affect qualified pension, profit-sharing, and annuity plans of insurance companies.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1372) to correct a technical omission in the enactment of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

THE PRESIDENTIAL TRANSITION ACT OF 1963

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill entitled "The Presidential Transition Act of 1963." The purpose of the bill is to promote the orderly transfer of the Executive power in connection with the expiration of the term of office of a President and the inauguration of a new President.

This bill will carry out a recommendation made to the Congress by President Kennedy on May 29, 1962, as one of a group of proposals dealing with the financing of presidential election campaigns. Those bills were initially introduced as a group by Senator HOWARD CANNON by request last session. At this session, the relevant bills are being introduced individually, by a number of different Senators. Those bills, including the one I am introducing today, are based on a report, "Financing Presidential Campaigns" prepared by the President's Commission on Campaign Costs. The bipartisan Commission was asked by the President to make "recommendations with respect to improved ways of financing expenditures required of nominees for the office of President and Vice President." It consisted of nine members with varied and extensive experience in political finance, including Alexander Heard—chairman, V. O. Key, Dan A. Kimball, Malcolm Moos, Paul A. Porter, Neil Staebler, Walter N. Thayer, John M. Vorys, and James C. Worthy.

Traditionally the political parties have had to pay the costs of a President-elect and Vice President-elect during the transition period. I know, because I was chairman of the Democratic National Committee during the transition of 1960–61. The cost to the national committee on behalf of President-elect Kennedy and Vice President-elect Johnson from election day 1960 until Inauguration Day 1961 was at least $360,000. In 1952–53, the cost to a special Republican committee of the transition period exceeded $200,000. In both cases these funds were used largely to pay for office space, comunication, staff salaries, and transportation but in neither case did these funds take care of some expenses that rightfully should not have to be covered from private funds: the cost of an individual who is called to Washington to discuss potential appointments or policies with the President-elect; the costs of Cabinet and other appointees who need to live in Washington for a number of weeks while assembling their staffs and preparing to take office following the inauguration; the costs of preparing position and policy papers for the President-elect.

In the 1960–61 period, I know of the personal sacrifice involved for many individuals of limited means who were called to Washington by President-elect Kennedy, who paid their own transportation and other expenses, who maintained two residences while seeking permanent housing in Washington and who worked without pay until taking office. I know of special studies requested by the President-elect where the participants not only drew no pay but paid out of their own pockets the clerical and administrative costs involved.

This situation clearly demands remedy. The American public has an enormous stake in the orderly transfer of Executive power and there are important reasons, aside from cost, to institutionalize the changeover from one administration to another. With the many pressing international and domestic problems facing the country it is imperative that there be continuity in the execution of the laws and the conduct of the Government. In order to avoid any disruption, it is manifestly in the public interest to provide Federal funds to facilitate the orderly conveyance of political power and help an incoming President in his preparations to assume that power on January 20. The work of a President-elect begins as soon as the ballots are counted and he must have the means to prepare himself for the possibility of the gravest crisis once he assumes office. The size and complexity of the Federal Government make it essential that the transfer of power be effected smoothly and efficiently in ways that do not interfere with the conduct of essential governmental functions.

It is a tribute to both Presidents Truman and Eisenhower that they gave cooperation to their successors, but it is now fitting and proper that we establish a formal process supported by law.

This is a matter of the national interest and it is not a partisan matter. Too much is at stake to risk continued reliance upon party or private funds for this purpose. Too much is involved to permit continuance of a system requiring that party solicitors seek out private contributions to support the necessary activities of a President-elect of the United States.

The bill I am introducing would accomplish the following:

Section 1 of the bill gives the title: "The Presidential Transition Act of 1963."

Section 2 declares its purpose to promote the orderly transfer of Executive power during the several months of transition from one administration to the other.

Section 3 authorizes certain services to be provided by the General Services Administration to Presidents-elect and Vice Presidents-elect, such as office space, compensation for staff personnel and experts, travel expenses, communications, postage, and so forth. The Administrator of General Services is to ascertain the apparent successful candidates following the general elections.

Section 4 authorizes necessary services, office space, and so forth, to outgoing Presidents and Vice Presidents for a period of 6 months in order to wind up their affairs.

Section 5 authorizes the Congress to appropriate such funds as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the act.

Mr. President, I want to conclude by noting that the recommendations of the Commission on Campaign Costs, upon which this bill is based, received the endorsement of President Kennedy and former Presidents Truman and Eisenhower and of former Presidential candidates Thomas E. Dewey, Adlai E. Stevenson and Richard M. Nixon. In addition, the chairmen of the two major political parties, John M. Bailey and Congressman William E. Miller, have endorsed the proposals.

Mr. President, in these times of challenge I think it is our responsibility to ease and facilitate the taking of office by a new President by providing the means, as this bill does, to insure that there be no disruption or interference in the orderly conduct of the Federal Government.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1373) to promote the orderly transfer of the Executive power in connection with the expiration of the term of office of a President and the inauguration of a new President, introduced by Mr. Jackson, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

AMENDMENT OF ALASKA STATEHOOD ACT

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the act providing for the admission of Alaska into the Union.

Under the act, State officials are authorized to select some 103 million acres of land from national forest lands and other public lands of the United States in Alaska. Subsection 6(a) grants 400,000 acres of national forest lands and 400,000 acres of other public lands, "for the purposes of furthering the development and expansion of communities." Subsection 6(b) provides for general selections of 102,550,000 acres from public lands in Alaska.

According to subsection 6(g), the selections must be made in accordance with the laws of the State and the procedures for selection regulated by the Secretary of the Interior. In addition, subsection 6(g) requires:

> All selections shall be made in reasonably compact tracts, taking into account the situation and potential uses of the lands involved, and each tract selected shall contain at least five thousand seven hundred and sixty acres unless isolated from other tracts open to selection.

The State contends that the Congress did not anticipate the application of this minimum acreage requirement to community grants. It has been pointed out to me that if applied to the 800,000 acres granted for community expansion, the creation of new communities, and recreational areas, not nearly enough selections can be made to satisfy existing needs. Moreover, such large selections are impractical and wasteful. To select 9 square miles of land for the expansion of a small community or creation of campsite area does not seem reasonable. As a result the State has hesitated to make further selections under their community development program and at present this program is at a standstill.

The Interior Department held in a decision handed down October 30, 1962, rejecting a State selection of less than the 5,760-acre minimum under the community purposes grant:

> While it is possible to question the desirability of applying the minimum acreage rule to community purposes selections, the language of the statute and the committee report leave no doubt that this must be done.

In that same decision it was stated:

> The difficulties envisioned by the State are real and serious in their import.

Mr. President, though the Department of the Interior recognizes the problems faced by the State, relief apparently is not possible under the present language contained in subsection 6(g) of the Statehood Act. The bill my colleague and I present to the Senate today, we feel, would make the necessary changes and allow Alaska to get on with her community development program which is such an important part of the growth and progress of Alaska.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1374) to amend the act providing for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union with respect to the selection of public lands for the development and expansion of communities, introduced by Mr. Bartlett (for himself and Mr. Gruening), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL—AMENDMENTS

Mr. PROXMIRE submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 5517) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate of April 11, 1963, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills:

S. 1316. A bill to provide for the establishment of a National Council on the Arts and a National Arts Foundation to assist in the growth and development of the arts in the United States: Mr. Cooper, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Randolph, and Mr. Scott.

S. 1318. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921: Mr. Allott, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Bible, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. Carlson, Mr. Clark, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Engle, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Keating, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Lausche, Mr. Moss, Mr. Ribicoff, Mr. Symington, Mr. Thurmond, and Mr. Yarborough.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. DODD:

Address delivered by him on April 17, 1963, at opening of New College Theater on campus of University of Connecticut, Storrs, Conn.

COMMITTEE STAFF MEMBERS FOR REPUBLICAN SENATORS

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I desire to state that earlier this year I submitted Senate Resolution 81, which would guarantee Republican Senators more staff members on Senate committees and subcommittees.

Presently, the minority labors under a serious handicap in the Senate because of a staffing situation. Republican Senators at the present time constitute approximately one-third of the Senate; yet they have at their command only a small percentage of the total number of committee and subcommittee staff members.

In preparing for hearings, in studying bills, and in developing new concepts and new policies, Republican Senators thus labor under a great disadvantage.

This whole problem was brought sharply to focus by the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] in an article published in Advance magazine. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DEMOCRATS' LOADED DICE

(How the majority mistreats the minority. Why the minority needs more staff workers. The threat to two-party government.)

(By Senator HUGH SCOTT)

A most important problem faces the Congress if it is to meet its obligation to provide adequate research and staff assistance on a fair and equitable basis to Members of both parties. As one who has served as a Member of both the House of Representatives and the Senate, I know that this situation has too long suffered from neglect and indifference.

According to the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, committee staffs were to be nonpartisan, selected and prompted solely on the basis of merit. The report accompanying the act, recommended that committee staff personnel "should be appointed without regard to political affiliation * * * and should not be dismissed for political reasons." The intention was to establish a type of legislative civil service headed by a director of congressional personnel. Later the act was amended to empower each committee of the Senate and House to choose its staff by majority vote. The ideal of the professional nonpartisan staff remained as the basis for the selection of both committee staffs and the Legislative Reference Service and Legislative Counsel.

Certainly, there has been a failure to live up to the spirit of the Legislative Reorganization Act, but was the nonpartisan staff concept adequate in the first place? Our system of committee government within the Congress is based on a differentation of majority and minority roles. We cannot expect committee staffs to function in an isolated nonpartisan world. Rather, it is my firm belief that we must broaden our concept of congressional staffing to recognize the two-party basis of the committee system, and the necessity for equitable control of staff resources between majority and minority. I am in no way suggesting that we move away from a professional competent staff, but, that we insure a fair distribution of such staff resources as exists and work to increase the number of qualified staffs across the board. Such a move will improve, not impair, the effectiveness of congressional government.

UNHEALTHY IMBALANCE

However, an unhealthy imbalance between majority and minority staff has replaced the original, though inadequate, goal of nonpartisan staffs. This situation has an important bearing on the future of the two-party system in this country. For the first time since 1952, the Republican Party finds itself without control of either the executive or legislative branch. It has had to learn anew the role of the loyal opposition. In this experience it has been gravely handicapped by its lack of staff resources.

There are some who deny that the problem even exists. Chairmen of several committees have challenged assertions that the nonpartisan staff concept has broken down. They have also challenged tabulations of majority and minority staffs compiled in the House by Representative FRED SCHWENGEL, and in the Senate by Senator CARL T. CURTIS of Nebraska, and further researched by Roscoe Drummond, Congressional Quarterly, North American Newspaper Alliance, and Advance.

If the problem does not exist, why are so many of my Republican colleagues so exercised about it? In the past few months there have been speeches on the floors of the House and Senate by numerous Members. Representative FRED SCHWENGEL of Iowa has received letters supporting his stand for more equitable minority staff from ranking Members the Congress and outstanding Republicans across the country. These are indications of a real discontent, not an imagined inequity.

THE NEED

The problem is real. One could point out a number of instances in the various Senate committees where more staffing is needed. A few examples will illustrate where the lack of staffing has limited the effectiveness of the Senate and Congress. The Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee is moving into new, virtually unexplored policy areas, yet it reviewed the $3.9 billion NASA budget in less than a week of cursory hearings. Observers have commented on the lack of critical discussion of major policy problems before various committees.

The Appropriations Committee has assumed a new importance with the increasingly frequent requests on the part of the Executive for greater authority and discretionary power. The minority needs adequate resources if it is to find out what the administration is doing and planning. Without sufficient minority staff, the majority will have unchecked control of the power of the purse.

The Armed Services Committee, with a defense budget of almost $48.5 billion, with the rapidly changing technology of weapons and weapon systems, with the recent charge of President Eisenhower to adopt a more critical attitude to defense spending, has perhaps the most demanding requirements for staff.

The committees with major responsibilities for domestic and foreign economic policy; Banking and Currency, Finance, Public Works, and Joint Economic, may be called upon in the next 6 to 12 months to face the first recession of this administration. Will they have sufficient staff, both the majority and minority, to assess the adequacy of the administration policies? Will the minority, which has already made a major contribution toward the solution of the unemployment problem through a House Republican task force, have the resources to develop new approaches to the vexing long-term problems of our economy? The minority has at present only one professional economist on the Joint Economic Committee.

One could go on at length, but these illustrations should give us a sufficient indication of the magnitude of the problems we face.

One hears too often that the Republican Party has few ideas, few alternatives, and little vision, or that it is merely the party of blind opposition and obstruction. This is a myth spread by our opponents, but it can also be a self-fulfilling prophecy when the party in power denies the minority adequate staff to develop distinctive constructive policies.

IMPORTANCE OF STAFF

The most severe limitation to the effectiveness of a Representative or Senator is time. Faced with a busy schedule of committee work, speaking, correspondence, and legislative duties, he must have staff assistance if he is to develop and express sound positions on the major issues of the day. Staff is essential for the research, preparation, and presentation of major policy speeches. Staff is required for a coordinated effort among colleagues within the Congress and for the effective use of radio and TV time.

The limitation of time is doubly acute for the Republican minority in the Senate. As a distinct minority, we Republicans have an extra burden in adequately covering our committee assignments. If we find it difficult for an individual Senator to do his homework in comparison to a Congressman, how much more difficult is it for a Republican Senator to do his job properly, covering more area per man, with less staff, than his Democratic colleagues. Deprived of competent, adequate professional staff, and in such a statistical minority, we cannot begin to match the resources of the bureaucracy downtown, or of a much better staffed Democratic majority on the Hill.

The minority in the Senate is also faced by a geographical imbalance. We have lost key seats in the North and West and we are just beginning to see the emergence of a genuine two-party system in the South. Many of these States have Republican Governors and/or Congressmen. If we, the Republican Party in the Senate, are to give adequate representation to Republicans in these areas, we need more staff. If we are to study such crucial problems as conservation, water resources, and reclamation we need staff authorized to make field trips and carry out investigations to fill in the broad gaps of our knowledge. The ideal of good government requires that we be a national party with a national vision serving the national interest, not a regional party hamstrung by a glaringly deficient number of minority staff assistants.

We of the minority are greatly concerned because the means of offering constructive alternatives, through adequate help in researching policy problems, is presently unavailable to us. Many of us have supported Republican initiative on a number of fronts, including for example, the fields of employment, worker retraining, and civil rights. But, without adequate staff, good ideas die for lack of public airing. In our system of government, we cannot rely on one party, the majority party, to produce all the ideas. By the very nature of politics, there are areas of public policy where the party in power cannot or will not act. The minority party must prod the majority party into action. It must nurse the neglected orphans of majority politics.

The most glaring example of majority party paralysis is civil rights, but on every issue there will be some facets the majority will ignore or deemphasize in terms of its own party interests. This is simply politics, and this is the reason the minority must be in a position to think out and develop its own position on every major public issue. It must have the resources to provide a real competition of ideas in the political marketplace. It should have a staff to read and study the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the latest books and magazines, professional journals, and learned papers; to monitor news broadcasts and analyses, to channel ideas to appropriate party spokesmen; to think out what should be the role of the minority in each particular area of policy.

Where possible, minority staffs should be available to all the members of the minority, not just to the actual membership of a particular committee. Where a member has a particular interest, say in foreign policy, agriculture, public works, or economic policy, he should be able to tap the expertise of minority staff familiar with that area. When staffing is kept to a bare minimum, this kind of cooperation in pooled resources among the minority is not possible.

Apart from proposing new programs or alternatives to the administration's proposals, much of the hard work of legislation and oversight rests in the sifting, evaluation, and reassessment of old programs.

NEEDED: OVERALL ANALYSIS

Too often in our budgeting and program development, we start with last year's base and merely weigh the proposed additions. We should be examining the historical basis of proposals as well, including support, where warranted, of existing programs which are serving their purpose, or the elimination or pruning of existing programs no longer useful as presently operated. Government is, or should be, a dynamic business, responsive to the genuine needs of the citizenry. Yet without the prodding and questioning of the Republican minority, who have no vested interest in the growth of the bureaucracy, these new empires of agency personnel may become frozen into the structure of government. Obviously, effective oversight and investigation of the administration's programs require adequate minority staffing.

An ambitious and attractive President can exploit the national media far more effectively than a numerical minority of individuals in Congress. If the minority is to cope effectively with its responsibility as to programs presented by the President and the majority, it must have resources to document its arguments. The real results of minority effort either in the form of constructive alternatives or sound criticism of administration policies, come in the committee reports, the speeches prepared by minority spokesmen, the amendments offered on the floor, and in other similar forms.

It is doubly important that the minority have these resources, for the editors and newsmen who control the news media of our country will tend to judge the minority and its actions by what it reads of their reactions on the wire services and receives from its own services. Mailings of minority views by the Republicans on the Joint Economic Committee, including my former colleague, Senator Prescott Bush, Representative CURTIS, of Missouri, and others, have been well received. The House Republican policy committee's release of the report of its task force on Operation Employment last year is an excellent example of what needs to be done much more often. The response of the press to this sort of thing has been encouraging, but it needs to be done on a regular, systematic basis. It is disturbing to me that many minority reports are never written, filed, or distributed for one basic reason: lack of adequate staffs.

The minority member needs information from sources other than the administrative departments and the majority controlled staffs. While it may be going too far to suggest that these sources are captive, it is not unreasonable to expect some will not go out of their way to volunteer information inimical or embarrassing to the policy objectives of the President and the majority party.

This need for independent information is particularly crucial in the field of foreign policy. There are policies concerning trouble spots in the world that need searching review and responsible constructive criticism from the minority. The strong pro-Arab bias in our Near East policy, and the troika experiment in Laos are two problems of deep personal interest to me. Yet, without the inclusion of minority staff members in connection with foreign policy surveys in Washington and abroad, the minority must depend on secondary and not always explicit sources for these policy reviews.

These arguments have all dealt with the more general problem of increasing the effectiveness of the minority in congressional government. They are set forth within the context of a need for greater congressional staffing regardless of majority and minority roles. We may disagree as to the exact form staffing arrangements should take, but we should all agree that good government suffers when the minority is deprived of the means to (1) develop constructive alternatives, (2) offer sound critcism and evaluation, (3) document and communicate its views, and (4) check information supplied by the majority against impartial sources. The fact that these minimal minority rights have not been achieved is by itself the most serious and disturbing aspect of the entire problem. It has serious implications for the future of our two-party system.

Our system of government was founded on the unwritten understanding that the party in power will not attempt to exterminate the party in opposition; that the ins and outs can exchange roles periodically; that the majority may press its advantage, but still will respect the integrity of the minority.

The majority is not playing by the rules of the game, and if the American people knew the full facts of the story, their sense of justice and fairplay would cry out against the shame of a loaded legislative procedure. Would they endorse a ratio of 14 or 12 to 1 between majority and minority staffs? Would they approve a system that places virtually complete control of congressional committee staffs under the majority chairmen? The chairman empowered to hire and fire, set salaries, and determine tenure? Would they condone the limitations placed upon the minority in terms of office space, travel, telephone calls, secretarial services, and other essentials to the mechanics of adequate staffing? Would they affirm the policy of some committee chairmen not permitting minority staff to question witnesses? Would they justify the power of a majority chairman to select witnesses to arrive at prearranged conclusions? Would they applaud the inaction of some of the minority who would rather keep the personal perquisites they have than risk losing them by rocking the majority boat too hard? I hardly think so. This is not a partisan issue. This is not a division between liberals and conservatives. It is a contest between those who are dedicated to achieving effective congressional government, and those who are complacently content with the inequities that breed inefficient committee work and detract from the power and prestige of the Congress. It is a cause that includes in its ranks representatives of business and labor, civic action groups, the individual voter—all those who are dedicated to good government above petty political gain.

Why then have we not corrected the wrongs? Why are the loaded dice still in play? No one can be against good government—or can they?

THE CUBAN QUARANTINE

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I wish to make a statement in regard to the Cuban quarantine.

The question may be asked, What is the ultimate purpose of the Organization of American States?

What are its responsibilities? To what extent has it thus far been fulfilling them?

These are important questions which require from the members of the Organization positive answers insuring a course of conduct which will prevent a communization of nations in Central and South America and a continuation of the Castro Communist government in Cuba.

I am in complete agreement with the statements, made by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], calling for a hemispheric quarantine of Cuba by the United States and other members of the Organization of American States.

This Organization has not been sponsored and approved by the citizens of the United States solely for the purpose of drawing upon their financial and moral support, without expectation that the members will follow a course of conduct which will insure Western Hemisphere solidarity opposed to communism and supporting governments pledged to democracy. Short of invasion, the least the Organization of American States can do is emphatically support the position it took, 6 months ago, for a complete quarantine against Cuba by the members of OAS.

Moreover, I am in agreement with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that the economic sanctions which the nations of the Western Hemisphere imposed upon the Dominican Republic in 1960, when Dictator Rafael Trujillo was in power, constitute a positive precedent and justification for the imposition of similar sanctions against Castro.

The position of Communist Castro in Cuba is weak. Poverty, squalor, disease, lack of medicine, lack of food, and lack of spiritual and intellectual liberty hang heavily over the people and have caused them to pray for emancipation and weep over the state of their native Cuba. Yet, there are in the Western hemispheric nations leaders of government knowing that what is happening in Cuba is vicious and wrong, but because of political expediency do not dare to proclaim to the world their condemnation of the injustices—political, economic, and social—that now prevail in Cuba.

The people of the United States are prepared to give economic aid to our neighbors in Central and South America providing there is a purpose on the part of the governments of these nations to genuinely participate in combating communism unequivocally and fully wherever it exists.

The people of the United States, on the basis of self-respect and the preservation of their system of government, will not and should not be giving aid to either Central or South American nations which are unwilling to assume in the fullest degree their responsibilities for the elimination of Communists and the preservation of democratic governments throughout the world.

Since last October 22, the position of Castro has been markedly strengthened. With the advances made by Communist Castro, the position of our associates in the Organization of American States and the position of the United States has been weakened. The least that we can do at present, if the Organization of American States means anything at all, is to impose upon Communist Cuba a relentless and unyielding quarantine similar to the one which the Organization of American States imposed upon the government of Rafael Trujillo in the Dominican Republic. The request that this be done cannot be escaped by the members of the Organization of American States except by adopting arguments that cannot be supported by principle and truth.

OUR AFFLUENT UNCLE SAM

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I desire to state that a few days ago there came to my office a letter the contents of which struck me with great force. I am sure that the letter, which comes from W. E. Munn of Toledo, Ohio, will be interesting to those who will hear me read it. He writes as follows:

THE RANSOM & RANDOLPH CO.,
Toledo, Ohio, April 12, 1963.

Hon. FRANK LAUSCHE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR LAUSCHE: I hate to tell you my troubles, but I have tried everything else I know. I feel that only you can help me now.

I have a dependent relative staying with me who has very little fiscal responsibility. He is very good natured and means well, but he keeps buying presents for my wife and me, and our three children. He charges these presents to my account. When he sees something that he thinks we need he buys it for us. Many of these things are not needed by us and in very few cases are they what we would have bought if we had bought these things ourselves. Because he doesn't work for a living, money doesn't mean too much to him and he tends to buy the first thing he sees and he doesn't shop around like I would do if I were purchasing items. He is also quite generous to the poor and needy, but often gives to those he doesn't know who feed him a soft line.

I just received a bill for his last spending spree and it gives me a sick, hopeless feeling. I keep thinking how much better off I would be if I could just spend that money for the things I want and could give to the people and charities I think are needy. Honestly, he does so much of my spending that I tend to give less money to charity.

He won't listen to me, but he will listen to you because he respects you. Please use your influence to cut the spending habits of my Uncle Sam.

Sincerely,

W. E. MUNN.

I sent an answer to Mr. Munn, which I should like to read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may have an additional 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I replied as follows to Mr. Munn:

APRIL 24, 1963.

Mr. W. E. MUNN,
President, the Ransom & Randolph Co.,
Toledo, Ohio

DEAR MR. MUNN: I am pleased to receive your letter of April 12 describing your deep concern over some of the actions of your dear "Uncle," who seems to have a mania for spending more and more; buying things that are unnecessary at this time, resulting in plunging you further and further into debt.

I deeply share your concern over the ultimate outcome of his thriftless ways unless they are curtailed and brought into balance commensurate with his income. I have talked to him upon many occasions about his overspending and have warned that he should mend his ways. He has always been courteous to me and listened, but I fear that he is being influenced by a few "nephews" who urge him to spend more and buy items and services that could well be delayed until his bank account is in better shape.

I know that "Uncle" likes to bestow gifts upon his "nephews and nieces," and I commend him for his spirit of generosity; but, in my opinion, he is overdoing it. I told him that he ought not to build the $10 million aquarium here in Washington now and also that he has no business sticking his nose into the multi-billion-dollar mass transportation problem.

I know that "Uncle" has been, upon occasion, rather liberal in the use of his credit cards. He ought to realize that while these cards have a gold backing, when he opens so many new charge accounts, he runs the risks that there may not be enough gold to guarantee his existing debts which could easily ruin his credit rating.

It appears that "Uncle" has forgotten the days when he, too, was young and had to be thrifty. What he needs right now is not a spring tonic or pep pills, but some old-fashioned discipline and a liberal dose of puritanical prudence.

I will continue to do my best to impress upon our "Uncle Sam" that he should live within his means.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK J. LAUSCHE.

COPYRIGHT PROTECTION—TRIBUTE TO GEORGE MIDDLETON

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I hold in my hand an article which is a reprint from the Bulletin of the Copyright Society of the United States entitled "Rights and Royalties of Foreign Authors and Composers in Wartime," written by a distinguished American, George Middleton.

This article details, for the first time, the overall record of a unique and little publicized copyright program, which the Government set up when the recent war broke. It initially took over and administered the copyright interests and royalties of all enemy authors and composers who then had existing contracts with American publishers. In addition, similar prewar agreements with the French and nationals of occupied countries were also vested under technical "protective custody." Their royalties were thus carefully safeguarded, and all moneys as and when due, were thus kept from falling even indirectly into enemy hands in Europe. These have now nearly all been returned to their original owners, with their values enhanced. But sums received from enemy properties have been credited to the war claims fund, to compensate for American losses at enemy hands. Enemy properties, not under prewar contracts, were vested and licensed profitably to both Government and American nationals who desired to exploit the material. In all, over $6 million was collected.

As I said, the author of this article is a distinguished American whom I have known for many years. In fact, when I was really still a boy I became acquainted with this great American. He happens to be the husband of Fola LaFollette. He is one of the distinguished men of Wisconsin. He has been an adviser of mine on many matters, as we have fought for the great causes for which the elder Bob LaFollette fought.

Before I conclude I shall ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

Mr. President, George Middleton has been the author or coauthor of 30 plays professionally produced in this country, in Paris, and in London, where his "Polly With a Past," as well as "Adam and Eva," were also presented. Among the distinguished stars appearing in his plays were Julia Marlowe—who did his first play in New York soon after he was graduated from Columbia—E. H. Sothern, Margaret Anglin, Eva Le Gallienne, Alla Nazimova, Fay Bainter, Marjorie Rambeau, Robert Edeson, and Peggy Wood. Other distinguished actors who had roles in his plays during their early stage and screen careers, were Noel Coward, Dame Edith Evans, Katherine Hepburn, Claude Rains, Thomas Mitchell, and Henry Hull. During 3 years in Hollywood as a writer and executive, Mr. Middleton was associated in film productions with Will Rogers, Mrs. Pat Campbell, Humphrey Bogart, and Paul Muni. Among his adaptations from the French were plays by Sacha Guitry, Bourdet, and Brieux. David Belasco produced two of these plays in New York. Four volumes of his collected one-act plays have been published and widely performed here and abroad. An autobiography, "These Things Are Mine," covering his professional career, was also published by Macmillan.

A member of both the British and French Authors Societies, he was one of the original organizers and an early president of the Dramatists' Guild of the Authors' League of America. He officially represented it in 1928 at Berlin, as honorary vice president at the Confederation Internationale des Sociétés d'Auteurs et Compositeurs, which discussed all problems affecting professional creators of copyright material. Based on this background and knowledge of trade customs, as a professional writer himself, he offered his services in 1942, to the Office of Alien Property, later taken over by the Department of Justice, to map out a copyright program. He remained for 16 years, as technical specialist in copyrights. For his many contributions and innovations, the Department of Justice awarded him a sustained superior performance award, previous to his recent mandatory retirement.

Mr. President, I consider it a great personal privilege and a distinct honor and pleasure to ask the Senate for unanimous consent to print in the Congressional Record this article, "Rights and Royalties of Foreign Authors and Composers in Wartime." It is with some feeling of sentiment and emotion that I make the request, because this is an article which sets out, I think, for anyone who will read it, a pretty clear example of what dedicated public service can do. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

RIGHTS AND ROYALTIES OF FOREIGN AUTHORS AND COMPOSERS IN WARTIME

(By George Middleton) [1]

The President has approved legislation to amend the War Claims Act of World War II, largely divesting to former owners, subject to claims, certain enemy properties which had been taken over (vested) when war broke, by the Office of Alien Property (OAP) now in the Department of Justice.[2]

Since the United States obtained no reparations under the treaty of peace, the net proceeds, to the extent of nearly $230 million, derived from the administration of these properties during the Government's ownership, have been transferred to the War Claims Fund. This fund has been used generally to satisfy claims of American prisoners of war, civilian internees, and others who had suffered from their enemy captors. Further sums will also be transferred to this fund to pay for additional claims against Germany.

Among the various categories of vested assets were copyrights. The story may now be revealed of the Government's unique and little publicized program—with its picturesque overtones of famous works and personalities—to administer the copyright interests and royalties of enemy authors and composers, who had prewar contracts with American publishers. In addition, the similar prewar interests of French and nationals of other occupied countries were also vested under technical "protective custody." Such properties were carefully safeguarded, and all royalties due on them were thus kept from falling, even indirectly, into enemy hands in Europe. These copyrights were all eligible for return under an existing claims procedure and many already have been returned with their values substantially increased. The return of enemy property, however, was prohibited by the Trading With the Enemy Act.[3] Under the new legislation, which goes into effect in 90 days from October 23, 1962, all copyrights will simply be divested; but royalties collected up to that date will be retained by the Government. Complicated problems of extensive renewals and ultimate ownership will thus be avoided.

The necessary administrative problems were formidable. Initially, to some 1,800 American publishers or organizations known to have foreign literary or musical connections under copyrights, demands were sent for all current contracts. By vesting the foreign interest in these contracts the Government had stepped into the shoes of the former owner, proceeded to collect all royalties and took complete control though protecting the continuing contractual American interest.

Since the potential financial value of any copyright can never be predetermined (in the face of additional royalty-bearing rights coming into existence) OAP never sold a single copyright—as was unfortunately done in World War I. Instead, a licensing apparatus was devised, for a limited period only, following customary trade practices. Many other enemy properties, not under prewar contracts, were also vested and licensed profitably, both to the Government and the American nationals who desired to exploit the material.

LICENSES

When war broke, the need to obtain current results of foreign research was urgent. The OAP "assumed the responsibility of reproducing enemy-originating scientific publications." Operating under President Roosevelt's authority, an advisory committee of distinguished scientists and librarians obtained, through ultrasecret channels, 125 German journals, which were offered by subscription to 8,000 American firms. By 1945, 3,200 issues had been republished. As the printing costs were less than the gross subscription of $311,293, the main objective of helping in the war effort was thus accomplished at no expense to the Government.

But this subscription effort did not include foreign copyrighted scientific books; 1,100 licenses were granted to republish those works which were vital to Army and Navy technicians engaged in war activities. Surreptitiously obtained by the Office of Strategic Services, these included sets and compilations, of which 759 were reproduced by photo-offset. On the usual trade royalties $376,210 has been paid, in spite of numerous royalty-free copies allowed to offset manufacturing costs. All books were sold at less than the original German price. Beilstein's "Handbuch der Organischen Chemie," a German classic in 57 volumes, was originally imported at $2,000 a set. This had put it beyond the reach of many American laboratories. The republication price was at first $400 a set and the royalties to date have been $193,200.

In all, 1,800 licenses were granted on films, books, sheet music publication and other types of vested properties, yielding over $1,300,000. Of this, $500,230 has come from items found in 25 million feet of captured enemy films, which contain 4,500 individual titles. Among those which presented copyright problems of ownership or remake rights, were "M," "The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari," "The Last Laugh," and "The Blue Angel," that made Marlene Dietrich a star. Hundreds of German and Italian films were also licensed to exhibitors for showings at neighborhood theaters in their original language. On these, OAP retained 50 percent of the rental fees. Stock shots on such serials as "Victory at Sea," "Crusade in the Pacific," "20th Century," and the Churchill series, newsreels and shorts have been in constant and now increasing demand by commercial companies, colleges and study groups. On these the standard fee was $2.50 a foot. As most film licenses have provided income from enemy property, further substantial revenue was credited to the War Claims Fund. Under the new legislation all film prints will be transferred to the Library of Congress, to be retained or disposed of at its discretion. Thus any film of historical or other value will be preserved.

PREWAR CONTRACTS

Some 634 prewar contracts were reported and copyright interests vested. The accounting habits of each firm were not disturbed and their office forms were accepted. Royalty payments were scrupulously checked and followed up. Any exclusivity granted in a contract was recognized and no raiding of any rights by a business competitor was tolerated. In addition, no deviation from the contractual terms was allowed, except to enhance the Government's financial interest or the interest of those nationals sheltered under protective custody. In the loose program followed by the custodian in World War I, only 3,166 copyright interests were taken over and about $250,000 collected. In World War II—so extended in duration and territory, plus a great expansion of new rights in music and films—several hundred thousand copyrights were vested. Nearly $5,963,010 was received through September 30, 1962, from licenses and prewar contracts.

Of the 300 books vested, only a few samples will indicate the scope and variety of the program. Oswald Spengler's famous classic, "The Decline of the West," originally published by Knopf in 1924, had been active before and since vesting in 1943, and $17,725 royalties were reported. OAP cooperated, also, in making possible a recent condensed edition. "Count Ciano's Diaries," which brought $36,332 royalties, had been artfully smuggled out of Italy into Switzerland by his widow, the daughter of Mussolini, who put the script under her garment, as she escaped into Switzerland. "Babar the Elephant," a children's classic, earned $26,402, while the late Isak Dinesen's celebrated African tales added up to the unusual $33,558. There were also books by Gide, Bergson, Malraux, Romain Rolland, and plays by Giraudoux and Werfel, among others. Small sums only were often involved; but each account was carefully kept and fitted into the administrative pattern. Some idea of the continuing interest in Marcel Proust is evidenced in the royalties on "The Remembrance of Things Past." Of the $33,000 paid for Gallimard, the French publisher, on his entire catalog, $13,000 was credited to Proust.

MUSIC

The sturdiest return of all, however, came from music and with it the most administrative copyright problems. From its various sources over $4 million was paid OAP; the composer's share is now a far cry from days when he lived on the crumbs of a patron's table. He then generally sold his composition outright to a publisher; but the ethical standards were low because neither could be supervised by the other. Both plagiarism and duplicate outright sales took place. Even as late as 1859, Charles Gounod, of "Faust" fame, had turned over the French and foreign rights to his celebrated "Ave Maria," based on Bach's "Prelude," for 500 francs, as a photostat in OAP's files attests. But within this half-century the entire financial status of composers changed, beginning with the advent of "player piano" rolls. Until 1909, when the revised copyright law came into effect, no composer was paid for the uses of his composition. Due to the march of mechanical inventions, however, a single composition began to proliferate into specific separate fee-earning rights: sound films,[4] perfected disks, radio broadcasting, and television, plus performance and concert rights, each springing from an initial copyrighted sheet music publication. Even here the contractual relations between publisher and composer are now formalized.

---

[1] The author of this interesting firsthand account is the distinguished writer of many well-loved American plays, the translator of Brieux's "Accused," and similar works, and one of the founders and a past president of the Dramatists' Guild of the Authors' League of America. The author offered his services at the start of World War II to the Office of Alien Property, where, though not a lawyer, he acted for the next 16 years as a "technical specialist" in the administration of vested copyrights. For his many contributions and innovations, the Department of Justice awarded him a "Sustained Superior Performance Award." The facts and figures employed in this article have all been taken, with permission from official files.

[2] Public Law 87-861, 87th Cong., Oct. 23, 1962, 76 Stat. 1139.

[3] 62 Stat. 1246, 50 U.S.C. App., sec 39.

[4] As an instance, in another field, of how the income from stage production, beyond the usual royalties, has been increased by the invention of talking pictures, the powerful Dramatists Guild reported that on 600 picture sales (1926–56) nearly $43 million was collected for distribution.

Generally speaking, the complexities in monitoring the fees from each of these separate rights had best been handled through large groups or associations, often international in scope. To funnel the Government's share from such varied sources of musical income, which represented only the vested foreign national's interest, OAP did not disturb the workable structure of such commercial exploitation laboriously evolved over the years. One of the most effective of these was ASCAP, which has paid the Government $1,150,832, mainly from broadcasting.

In 1914, when Victor Herbert strolled into Shanley's Broadway restaurant, he heard its orchestra playing the waltz hit from his own opera, "Sweethearts." As this competed with the play itself at a nearby theater, he brought an infringement suit. In using Herbert's music, without permission or fee, Shanley was following a well-established pilfering custom. It claimed this was not a performance for profit, within the meaning of the 1909 Copyright Act, since no admission was charged. In 1917, Justice Holmes wrote an opinion momentous to both native and foreign composers:

"If music did not pay it would be given up. If it pays it pays out of the public's pocket. Whether it pays or not the purpose of employing it is profit and that is enough."[5]

Before this copyright decision, no American composer had received a penny for the use of his music in any theater, dancehall, cafe, circus tent, night club, or cabaret. With radio's later arrival in 1922, every legal device was again employed to avoid paying for music. In 1941, Justice Brandeis handed down another epochal copyright decision: that broadcasting music through a radio, which distributed it in a hotel, was also a public performance for profit and constituted an infringement.[6] This was climaxed by a series of similar decisons that any use of copyrighted music in films, on records or other mediums must be paid for.

In 1917, as a result of Holmes' decision, the nonprofit Association of American Composers, Authors, and Publishers, was formed. They assigned to the organization, ASCAP, their nondramatic public performance rights, and it ultimately leased its entire repertoire for fees to be divided among its members. Blanket licenses have since been periodically negotiated with radio broadcasting chains, individual stations, orchestras, theaters, wire services, etc. Millions have literally been snatched from the air.

This was of special concern to OAP because it had immediately vested 12 prewar reciprocal agreements, which ASCAP had made with similar European societies in enemy and enemy-occupied countries. It had thus previously protected the revenue of its own American members abroad and, in return, reciprocally monitored and collected fees for the use of foreign compositions in the United States. On OAP's demand, ASCAP turned over all such sums due the foreign nationals with its usual certified breakdowns of each work and its original composer; $629,266 alone was credited to the account of the French société des Auteurs, Compositeurs et Editeurs de Musique (SACEM), the granddaddy of all such protective groups.

INDIVIDUAL COMPOSITIONS

Since war conditions prevented contact with enemy-occupied France, its enormous musical repertoire, largely published under contract with American firms, had, like SACEM, been similarly vested. Among those world-famous individual compositions were Debussy's "Clair de Lune," and "Bolero," written for the ballerina Ida Rubenstein, by Ravel. The contracts between their publishers and Elkan-Vogel, the American agent, in each case, required executive determination and will best illustrate the efficiency of OAP's protective custody policy. Jobert had only granted the rights to exploit the sheet music sale of Debussy's masterpiece; all other rights had to be submitted to Paris for approval. As war no longer made this possible, when Paramount offered $5,000 for its use as "background music" in the film, "Frenchman's Creek," OAP itself immediately granted permission. The sheet music sales were thus greatly increased, resulting, from all extended rights, to over $160,000 when it was returned. The popular "Bolero" was included in the Durand et Cie. catalog, but its contract had expired just before America entered the war. Knowing this, numerous competitors sought nonexclusive licenses from OAP to exploit it. As Durand, however, had renewed the original contract several times, OAP decided to continue Elkan-Vogel's exclusivity. The catalog earned over $100,000, after the deduction of the American agent's legitimate commission, the protection of which had likewise been within OAP's policy.

Among those composers who had become naturalized American citizens, Stravinsky, Schoenberg and Hindemith demanded and recovered their royalties which OAP had collected. Their early compositions had been included among the vested catalog of leading European publishers. Some of these composers had been for years under contract with Associated Music Publishers, Inc. (AMP). As this important firm, owned by Broadcast Music, Inc. (BMI), controlled all exploitation rights, including radio, OAP obtained, during nearly 20 years, over $820,000 on its German items alone.

Richard Strauss and Sibelius were still alive when the United States entered the war. Both wrote personal letters for the return of their accumulating royalties. Sibelius himself sent a long list of his works, "trusting it may be of use in making your decision." But Sibelius was a Finn. During early days his country was part of Russia, which afforded no copyright protection. Some of his compositions, however, had been published by a German firm which had owned the copyrights OAP vested. A very human problem rose as to how these works could legally be returned to the great composer.

This and similar cases led to OAP's most dynamic administrative decision. It had already been forced to consider the tragic lot of many destitute refugees who had escaped to this country. To meet the obvious injustice of retaining their needed royalties, as well as those of naturalized Americans, OAP relied on the equitable servitude doctrine. This implicitly recognized that the author or composer had a continuing title interest in the seized property, even though the legal copyright had previously been held by a German firm. Only with such title interest could one be eligible, under the then existing regulations, to file a claim for its return. Many thousands of royalties, augmented by OAP's administration, were thus ultimately given back to war victims. To Sibelius personally went a net of $9,500, shortly before his death.

RICHARD STRAUSS AND OPERAS

An unpublished letter[7] of biographical value, written by Richard Strauss 2 years before he died, will best present the complicated personal and copyright problems of nationality which the OAP faced:

LAUSANNE, LE,
February 2, 1949.

CUSTODIAN OF ENEMY PROPERTY,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I trust you will forgive this direct approach in a matter of vital importance to me which may receive your sympathetic consideration in view of the somewhat unusual circumstances.

My name is certainly well known to you. And you may know that I am 85 years of age. The American rights in my works are vested in you and all my income from the numerous performances, mechanical reproductions and broadcasts is being seized by your office. All this is right and I recognize without complaint the justification. If I was able to earn my livelihood by other means such as conducting, I would do so and raise no questions about any income from my works. But I cannot conduct any more being too old and too ill. Therefore the income from my works is all that is left to me after having lost all my funds. And the major proportion of this income is seized by various custodians in various countries. What I still can draw is not sufficient to keep my wife and myself and to meet the doctors' bills.

The British custodian very kindly released my income from Great Britain as from the February 1, 1948. Would it not be possible for you to entertain the idea of releasing my American income as from some appropriate date?

You may want to be satisfied that my attitude to the National Socialist regime in Germany was not such as to justify a personally punitive quality of the seizure of my income. I beg you to spare an old man to go through the formalities of questionnaires which are not altogether applicable. I know that there is a certain amount of misrepresentation which ignores the fact that I was so prominent that what would have led to a prison or a concentration camp with others led only to a boycott with me. My family connections, the dedication of my works, my friendship with so many people all over the world should dispel any suspicion about my own attitude and convictions. I went, as you may know, through the formal denazification procedure and was cleared without a hearing. I helped many people in Germany to save their lives and property and never took part in any party matters In fact, I am one of the very few who never belonged to the Nazi Party in any form whatsoever.

I do hope you will accept these assurances. In all modesty I may say that my works have given and are giving many happy hours to many American listeners. Could you consider then to allow me a modest participation by releasing the income from the American performances and so let me have what happiness a man of my age can still have? I would be most grateful if you could give this matter your kind attention and if you would grant under unusual circumstances this unusual request.

I am,
Yours very truly,
DR. RICHARD STRAUSS.

In spite of this moving appeal, the chain of title of his famous works led back to his German publishers, all rights in which had been automatically vested. Under existing law, which differs from British regulations, his property could not then be returned until his non-German citizenship—at time of vesting—could be established. In the meantime, though Strauss had originally sold outright all publication rights in "Der Rosenkavalier," "Salome," and "Elektra," their performing and other rights plus his tone poems and songs have earned $90,550.

---

[5] *Herbert* v. *Shanley Co.*, 242 U.S. 591, 595 (1917).

[6] *Buck* v. *Jewell-La Salle Realty Co.*, 283 U.S. 191 (1931).

[7] The manuscript letters from Strauss and Sibelius, among others, as well as photostats of numerous other documents, including many opera contracts, are deposited for study in the Music Division, Library of Congress.

Opera agreements in Europe, as with Strauss, were generally made between composer and music publisher, who in turn leased them separately to each opera house, at fees depending on its status. For this reason, OAP had obtained photostats of all vested opera contracts, since they indicated the division of the respective share due on U.S. performances, when handled by American agents. These were paid to OAP. SACEM's terms and conditions, generally controlling French operas, facilitated the administration of performances of "Thais, Mignon," "Louise," and "Pelléas et Mélisande," written and composed by Maeterlinck and Debussy, among others.

OAP's copies of David Belasco's contracts, however, indicate that he sold the "opera rights" in his plays, "Madame Butterfly" and "The Girl of the Golden West," for $1,250 each. But when Puccini wrote "Tosca," founded on the Sardou play, "La Tosca," Sarah Bernhardt's greatest success, the French author's estate obtained, through OAP, a share of performance fees, plus a percentage from both rental of scores and libretto sales, amounting to $10,000. Until all the Italian property was returned, under treaty, the Ricordi catalog, largely on Puccini royalties from "La Boheme," "Tosca," and "Madam Butterfly," had paid OAP $320,000. This included fees even on arias (such as "Un Bel Di" and "Vissi d'Arte"), concert performances and films each of which OAP had licensed and on which it had collected a fee.

Though much pleasure, on a different level, has been given American audiences from the strains of European operettas, their administration faced a tangle of copyright ownerships, assignments, shifting royalty percentages on stage performances, with every possible accounting headache which such international works are heir to. However, they were all encouraged by OAP to sing out their famous melodies to considerable profit. "Blossom Time," a hardy perennial back to World War I, paid on its annual tours over $50,000; "The Merry Widow," "The Waltz Dream," and "Die Fledermaus" "Rosalinda") added lesser amounts. "The Chocolate Soldier," by Oskar Straus (based on Shaw's "Arms and the Man"), with its celebrated "My Hero Waltz," brought nearly $100,000.

As a foonote to popular songs, $150,000 was also gathered from the sentimentally titled "I Kiss Your Hand, Madame"; "Speak To Me of Love"; "You Can't Be True, Dear," and "Jealousy." To which is added the most famous German woman the war produced, "Lili Marlene," on which some 60 licenses had been granted. Starting as the sentimental yearning of Hitler's soldiers for the girl friend he left behind, its torrid tempo was turned by its publisher, Paul Lincke, the noted composer of "Glow Worm," into a popular soldiers' marching song.

HITLER AND GOEBBELS

Shortly after Hitler's marching troops had failed to conquer Europe, there was found, in a rubbish heap, a carbon copy, on elegant paper, of "Goebbels' Diary." Following a series of fantastic happenings, including extensive oversea investigations—much of which is still restricted—OAP claimed the common law copyright. After wide newspaper serialization, it became a book-of-the-month selection. With the consent of the Government, Louis Lochner's English translation and commentary was published by Doubleday. The script as found, which had not been vested, now rests in the Hoover War Library, the gift of former President Hoover. Dr. Paul Joseph Goebbels, so linked in the Hitler venture, was a witness with Martin Bormann to Hitler's last private will, written in the besieged Berlin bunker, and signed at 4 a.m., April 29, 1945. In this authenticated will, a copy of which OAP obtained from the official court records in Munich, Hitler had dictated:

"Since in the years of my struggle I did not feel justified in assuming the responsibility of marriage, I have only now, before termination of my earthly career, decided to marry the girl who after long years of faithful friendship voluntarily came into this almost besieged city to share the same fate as myself. At my desire she will die with me as my wife. In death we shall find what my work in the service of my people robbed us of."

Like his master, Goebbels killed himself, two spectacular endings to the Nazi saga which concerned OAP, since royalties from each work will continue to be paid, already on the Diary $81,796 and on "Mein Kampf" $43,945.

In 1942, the English translation of Hitler's "Mein Kampf" was almost the first to be vested. Published by Houghton Mifflin 10 years previously, the abridged version had rough legal going. Challenged by another publisher, who brought out and sold extensively a complete unauthorized version, it was claimed the basic copyright was invalidated since Hitler was a stateless person. A protracted lawsuit followed until the second circuit finally sustained Houghton Mifflin's legal contention that copyright protected even a stateless citizen.[8] The court's decision greatly helped OAP's administration of the property of refugees to this country, who themselves were later to be made stateless by Hitler.

The new 1962 law specifically forbids "Mein Kampf" to be divested, as well as the "Diary of Goebbels," the "Memoirs of Alfred Rosenberg, Otto Skorzeny, and other Nazi leaders. Also to be retained are the 123,000 items in the extensive photographic history of the Nazi Party by Heinrich Hoffmann, its official photographer.

Among the great variety of contrasting documents OAP received may be added Paderewski's last will. The great musician and former Premier of Poland died in 1941. He was buried, by President Roosevelt's direction, in Arlington National Cemetery—the second foreigner to be so honored. His amazing will of 20 pages, written in his own hand, was not found until 3 years later. Its photostat became part of OAP's records since some of his copyright interests had been vested.[9] In its final few sentences he voiced his indignation at what was then happening to his beloved Poland:

"For the wrongs which I have suffered, and I have suffered many, I forgive in a Christian spirit. I cannot forgive those haughty and vile persons who, thinking only of their personal advantage and their own aggrandizement, led and are leading the fatherland to perdition and the nation to degradation. God himself will not forgive them."

TRAGEDY IN ALABAMA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, William L. Moore's tragic death during his pilgrimage for civil rights has shocked the Nation.

There have been and will be many martyrs in the fight for civil rights. William Moore's murder puts to shame those who have insisted that civil rights is solely a Negro cause. Civil rights obviously is not a Negro or a white man's cause, but an American cause, in which every citizen concerned about enforcing the Constitution should be joined. Every resource, not only of the State of Alabama in which this crime occurred, but also of the Federal Government, should be enlisted in making certain that those responsible for this terrible crime are punished. If the Federal Government has no jurisdiction in cases such as this, as the President suggested at his news conference yesterday, then there may be a need for new legislation.

I have no doubt whatever that the decent people in Alabama are as outraged by this case as are Americans in other parts of the Nation. It must be said, at the same time, that the pattern of unpunished lawlessness, intimidation, and reprisals prevalent in some areas of our country is bound to breed exactly this kind of violence. Massive resistance is not merely a theory, but a practice which encourages contempt for and defiance of the law. So long as the rights of Americans under the Constitution can be flouted and disregarded with official connivance, we must all share in the responsibility for this terrible incident.

Mr. President, our hearts go out to the wife and children of William L. Moore in Binghamton, N.Y., in their hour of grief. He died courageously, and let us pray that he has not died in vain.

NEW YORK'S NEW CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am pleased to call the Senate's attention to the signing on April 22 by the Governor of New York, Nelson A. Rockefeller, of two measures maintaining New York's place in the forefront of the States in the field of civil rights. One broadens the New York law against discrimination in housing, which previously covered the sale or rental of housing accommodations in multiple dwellings and in developments of 10 or more houses on contiguous land. It also barred discrimination by real estate brokers with respect to housing covered by the law. The new measure prohibits discrimination in the sale or rental of any housing accommodation, except rentals in an owner-occupied one- or two-family home, and it also extends to all housing the provision relating to real estate brokers.

A second bill signed by the Governor makes it an unlawful discriminatory practice to retaliate against any person because he has opposed any discriminatory practice or because he has filed a complaint, testified, or assisted in any proceeding before the State commission for human rights. The first law against discrimination in New York in 1945 made such retaliation unlawful in all cases involving discrimination in employment. This measure brings the rule against retaliation into step with the many other constructive advances made in the State since that time toward eliminating racial discrimination in issues cognizable under the State constitution. It should also be noted that the city of New York is this month celebrating the fifth anniversary of the enactment of its fair housing practices law.

---

[8] *Houghton Mifflin Co.* v. *Stackpole Sons, Inc.*, 104 F. 2d 306 (2d Cir.), cert. denied, 308 U.S. 597 (1939).

[9] Royalties amounting to $4,172, on Paderewski's vested copyright interest in his "Memoires" and famous "Minuet," are being returned to the University of Cracow, Poland.

These are indeed auspicious steps in the continual effort being made in New York State and in many other States to achieve the goals which we proclaim in the Constitution of the United States for all our citizens and hold out to the world in the hope of emulation of our way of life. What is needed is a comparable effort at the Federal level to obtain meaningful civil rights legislation in the Congress.

I am proud to say that New York State practices what it preaches through its two Senators, and that it remains in the forefront of those who wish to guarantee equal rights to every citizen in all areas in which civil rights are concerned, without regard to race, color, or creed.

RATIFICATION BY IOWA OF ANTI-POLL-TAX AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am very glad to report to the Senate that the State of Iowa has ratified the anti-poll-tax amendment to the Constitution, which eliminates the requirement for the payment of a poll tax or any other tax for voting in Federal elections. Iowa thus becomes the 32d State to ratify this important amendment.

I wish to express my profound appreciation to both distinguished Senators from Iowa, the senior Senator [Mr. Hickenlooper] and his colleague [Mr. Miller], both of whom not only strongly supported passage of my resolution proposing this amendment in the 87th Congress, but have since worked diligently to obtain ratification by the legislature of their great State, the most gratifying results of which I am so happy to announce today.

I was informed a few minutes ago that the Iowa House this morning, by a vote of 92 to 4, approved the resolution ratifying the amendment. This completed action by the Iowa Legislature, the Iowa Senate having approved ratification of the amendment on March 28, 1963, by a vote of 48 to 0. This action again demonstrates the completely bipartisan nature of the support which this amendment is receiving.

I am indeed hopeful, Mr. President, that we shall soon have good news from several of the seven other States whose legislatures have not acted on ratification of the amendment but which are presently in session. As Senators are aware, ratification by 38 States is required before the amendment will become valid.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Let me say that it is little enough for my distinguished colleague [Mr. Hickenlooper] and myself to have joined with the distinguished Senator from Florida in furthering the passage or ratification of the constitutional amendment in our State legislature. Having formerly served in our State legislature, both of us recognize that there is an area in which sometimes Members of the National Congress should not intrude when it comes to State legislation, but the members of our legislature also know that they are very much concerned about the improvement of our human relations in this country, and they recognize that, while there is a basic right, which is very precious, of States to determine the qualifications of their voters, that right should not be abused. There has been a recognition of the fact down through the years that the poll tax had served as a vehicle for abuses in some cases.

So this action is a recognition by the legislature of my great State that we can always improve, and that in the field of human relations, this is a landmark. So I say it was a pleasure for us to have joined with the Senator from Florida. We trust a few additional States will join with Iowa and the other 31 States in having the constitutional amendment ratified.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I not only thank my distinguished colleague for his most generous statement, but I would like for the Record to show the fact that Florida and Iowa are moving together in this matter. Florida approved the amendment a few days ago as the 31st State, and Iowa has done so today as the 32d State. Those two States came into the Union together under the same resolution, Iowa at that time as a free State, and Florida at that time as a slave State, under the Missouri Compromise. We in Florida have felt particularly close to Iowa through the years. We are glad to be moving together now toward a goal which we both believe to be worthwhile.

Mr. MILLER. I thank my colleague. Let me add that what he has just said is shared by us in our attitude toward his great State. One reason why Florida is such a fine tourist attraction in the wintertime is that so many of our Iowa residents go there to visit and to stay.

So the sentiments he has expressed are shared by us, and we appreciate the opportunity of again joining him on this great occasion.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank my friend from Iowa.

TRIBUTE TO Y. FRANK FREEMAN, GREAT AMERICAN

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, more than 1,200 leading citizens of Hollywood and California will gather together this weekend to honor Y. Frank Freeman, one of the outstanding architects of my State's most famous industry, and a dedicated and devoted American patriot.

Mr. Freeman, often called Mr. Motion Picture Industry, is chairman of the board of the Association of Motion Picture Producers and vice president of Paramount Pictures.

Frank Freeman has been more than just a titan in the motion-picture business He has rendered distinguished service to his community, State, and Nation. He has never failed to respond to a worthy cause for his country or for people.

He has given generously of his time, effort and resources over the years to the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, the Community Chest, the Red Cross, and the World Affairs Council. He has been active in the campaigns of the Motion Pictures Permanent Charities and has served on the board of trustees of the Motion Picture Relief Fund. And he is a trustee of my alma mater, the University of Southern California.

These are just a few of the reasons why his friends in both the industry and community of Hollywood are holding a Y. Frank Freeman testimonial dinner.

I shall not be able to attend, but from a distance of 3,000 miles I shall be there in spirit to pay a just need of praise to an outstanding fellow citizen.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point in my remarks the text of a concurrent resolution adopted by the California Legislature.

There being no objection, the text of the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Assembly Concurrent Resolution 52

Concurrent resolution commending Y. Frank Freeman

Whereas Y. Frank Freeman, board chairman of the Association of Motion Picture Producers and vice president of Paramount Pictures, is being honored on April 28 for his long and distinguished service to the Hollywood motion picture industry; and

Whereas for nearly 25 years Mr. Freeman as a respected and beloved leader of the Hollywood community has been one of the State's leading citizens; and

Whereas for all of this time he has devoted himself to innumerable civic, charitable and worthwhile endeavors for the betterment of his industry, community, State, and country; and

Whereas for 16 years as chairman of the Association of Motion Picture Producers, he has helped make Hollywood, Calif., synonymous with the best in entertainment for millions of people throughout the world; and

Whereas his devotion to the highest principles of Americanism have been an example and inspiration to his fellowmen; and

Whereas his industry and his community have chosen to honor him for all of these and many more of his magnificent contributions during the past quarter century: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, (the senate thereof concurring), That the members of the legislature join with his thousands of friends throughout the State and Nation in paying tribute to Y. Frank Freeman as one of Hollywood's foremost citizens and statesmen; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit a suitably prepared copy of this resolution to Y. Frank Freeman.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish to add a few words to the statement of the distinguished minority whip, the senior Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel], with respect to the honor being shown in Hollywood this weekend to a distinguished native of my State, who now is a citizen of California—Hon. Y. Frank Freeman.

It has been my privilege to know Mr. Freeman practically all my life, and to enjoy my friendship with him and also with a number of the members of his family.

He is an outstanding American who not only has made outstanding contributions to public entertainment of the highest and cleanest sort in this country, but also has made outstanding contributions to good government. He has interested himself in government at every level, from the local community and the city to the Government in the Nation's Capital. No man is more deserving of being honored at the capital of the motion-picture world than is Y. Frank Freeman.

CUBA

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, in response to a question at his press conference yesterday, President Kennedy said this:

> I know there is a good deal of concern in the United States because Castro is still there. I think it is unfortunate that he was permitted to assume control in the 1950's and perhaps it would have been easier to take an action then than it is now. But those who were in position of responsibility did not make that judgment.

Whatever may have been Mr. Kennedy's intentions, his statement yesterday has distinct political overtones. Perhaps the record should be set straight.

During the 1950's there were few, if any, Republican voices raised in support of Castro and there were few, if any, Democratic voices raised in condemnation of Castro. This record is clear.

Let us not forget that Castro, the revolutionary, was admired by many in this country and throughout the hemisphere. This undoubtedly was the case because of the unpopularity of the Batista administration and the corruption and ruthlessness which characterized that administration.

President Kennedy while a U.S. Senator recognized that. I quote from "The Strategy of Peace," by John F. Kennedy, dated January 1, 1960:

> The wild, angry passionate course of the revolution in Cuba demonstrates that the shores of the American Hemisphere and the Caribbean islands are not immune to the ideas and forces causing similar storms on other continents. Just as we recall our own revolutionary past in order to understand the spirit and the significance of the anticolonial uprisings in Asia and Africa, we should now reread the life of Simon Bolivar, the great liberator and sometime dictator of South America, in order to comprehend the new contagion for liberty and reform now spreading south of our borders. On an earlier trip throughout Latin America, I became familiar with the hopes and burdens which characterize this tide of Latin nationalism.
>
> Fidel Castro is part of the legacy of Bolivar, who led his men over the Andes Mountains, vowing war to the death against Spanish rule, saying, "Where a goat can pass, so can an army." Castro is also part of the frustration of that earlier revolution which won its war against Spain but left largely untouched the indigenous feudal order. "To serve a revolution is to plow the sea," Bolivar said in despair as he lived to see the failure of his efforts at social reform.
>
> Whether Castro would have taken a more rational course after his victory had the U.S. Government not backed the dictator Batista so long and so uncritically, and had it given the fiery young rebel a warmer welcome in his hour of triumph, especially on his trip to this country, we cannot be sure.

Let me also quote from a program on May 14, 1960, on WRC-TV in Washington sponsored by the District of Columbia Kennedy-for-President Committee:

> Question: Should the United States try to retaliate against the Cuban Government?
>
> Kennedy: Well, the situation in Cuba, of course, continues to deteriorate but for the present I think the administration's policy is the right one. * * * For the time being, I would conduct our policy on the basis that it is being conducted. The situation could change at any time. * * * For the present, I support the administration policy.

Two quotations from former President Harry S. Truman might be of interest to my colleagues:

> Harry S. Truman (New York Times, Apr. 29, 1959): I think the boy (Castro) means to do right. Let's wait and see.
>
> Harry S. Truman (North American Newspaper Alliance, July 31, 1959 in New York Times): I think that Fidel Castro is a good young man, who has made mistakes, but who seems to want to do the right thing for the Cuban people, and we ought to extend our sympathy and help him to do what is right for them.

Again let me quote President Kennedy during the closing weeks of his campaign in 1960. On October 15 he said:

> We must end the harassment, which this Government has carried on, of liberty-loving anti-Castro forces in Cuba and in other lands. While we cannot violate international law, we must recognize that these exiles and rebels represent the real voice of Cuba, and should not be constantly handicapped by our Immigration and Justice Department authorities.

On October 20 he said:

> We must attempt to strengthen the non-Batista democratic anti-Castro forces in exile and in Cuba itself who offer eventual hope of overthrowing Castro.

How strange these words strike us in view of recent actions taken by this administration in connection with the group of brave and patriotic Cubans in Florida today.

The facts are that those who were in position of responsibility did make a judgment and did take action. In March of 1960 under the Eisenhower administration steps were begun to train and equip an expeditionary force of Cuban exiles to invade the island. For various reasons, among them the difficulty of finding the proper leadership, that invasion could not be implemented during the remaining months of the Eisenhower administration. It was attempted in April of 1961 under the Kennedy administration. It failed. Most people agree that its failure was caused by Castro's air superiority. The Attorney General says that the invaders were never promised air cover. Yet the evidence is clear that the invaders were assured that there would be no air opposition. It is also generally accepted that militarily Castro's forces are 10 or 15 times as effective today as they were in April 1961.

When the President finally took his firm stand against the Russian missile installations in Cuba, I supported him to the hilt as did most Republicans. Some Republicans and some very important Democrats asked for even stronger measures. In any event, the United States was hailed throughout South and Central America and, indeed, throughout most of the free world for seizing the initiative. Unfortunately, in conforming our Cuban policy to expediency, we have seen the edge of our blade dulled. The bold initiative of last fall has become a wishy-washy policy of backing and stalling this spring.

I repeat, the statement made by President Kennedy yesterday cannot go unchallenged.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1963

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I submit an amendment reducing the amount of the supplemental appropriation bill, H.R. 5517, which is expected to be taken up by the Senate tomorrow. The amendment would reduce the amount of the bill as reported to the Senate by approximately $52 million and would reduce the bill as passed by the House by approximately $3.5 million.

With obviously necessary exceptions, the Senate committee increases in the bill as passed by the House have been eliminated, and Senate decreases in House-approved amounts have been retained. All increases in estimated budget amounts have been eliminated save for such necessary Senate and House expenses as payments to relatives of deceased Members, including the relatives of the late Senators Dworshak, Chavez, and Kerr.

Other Senate additions which have not been cut in my amendment are items which the Senate traditionally adds to the bill for housekeeping purposes and salaries of employees.

An increase in claims and judgment funds of $3.5 million over the House bill has been retained in the amendment because it covers enforceable judgments against the United States.

Mr. President, I submit the amendment and ask that it be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

THIRTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, this month marks the 30th anniversary of the Tennessee Valley Authority, the greatest approach to integrated development of the resources of an entire region that the world has ever known.

I note with great pleasure that the distinguished Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, is in my State today inspecting TVA's Beech River watershed development project. According to an article in the April 9 issue of the Memphis Commercial Appeal, Secretary Freeman is making this trip in order to "study the means by which the Agriculture Department's rural areas development program can be utilized within the framework of TVA's regional development program."

All too few people outside the Tennessee Valley realize that TVA is much more than the Nation's biggest producer of electricity. Indeed, if there was one thing that spurred the creation of TVA, it was that the Tennessee River once was a wild, unpredictable destroyer of life and property whose onslaughts could not be tolerated by a modern nation.

For years now the Tennessee has been tamed, thanks to the TVA. On March 20, 1963, there appeared in the Chattanooga News-Free Press an Associated Press article about TVA's success in preventing floods over the area drained by the Tennessee and its tributaries. It is a remarkable story of the science of flood control and of the millions of dollars saved because of this vast operation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article and an excerpt on the same subject from the TVA Weekly News Letter of March 27, 1963, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article and excerpt were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Chattanooga News-Free Press, Mar. 20, 1963]

TVA EXPERTS JUGGLE RIVER WATER TO PREVENT FLOODS OVER WIDE AREA

KNOXVILLE.—When floods threaten, the Tennessee Valley Authority's river control branch makes decisions on measures to be taken to meet the danger.

These decisions involve hours of tedious paperwork, split-second figuring by man and computer, perhaps hurried messages by microwave radio during the night, and juggling of waters behind more than two dozen dams.

One of the big decisionmakers is Alfred Cooper, chief of TVA's river control branch, who sums up his job thusly:

"We fight time."

If conditions call for it, white haired, bespectacled Cooper can figuratively twist the technical faucets that can turn off the Tennessee where it enters the Ohio at Paducah, Ky.

The Tennessee was stopped dead in its tracks in 1958, 1960, and 1961 to control flooding on the lower Ohio and down the Mississippi. By its own figures, TVA has averted about $31.5 million damages along those areas by regulating the Tennessee's flow.

AT CHATTANOOGA

But at Chattanooga alone TVA also estimates it has prevented $148 million losses from 31 potentially damaging floods.

Cooper generally is responsible in the operation, and, as a TVA spokesman put it: "He's the only man in the world with a river job like that."

If Cooper had any simple formula for controlling a runaway river, it would be this:

Clear the mainstream of as much water as possible ahead of an expected flood crest, and hold back waters from the tributaries until the flood crest passes.

The hitch is deciding which of TVA's nine mainstream dams to open and which of its five major tributary dams to close, how much and for how long.

The answers are determined at TVA's 25-man flood control office beginning about 7:30 a.m. when the faxwriter—a reproduction machine—begins reeling out sheets filled with data on rainfall, reservoir elevations and discharges at each dam.

Minutes later, a teletype begins spelling out forecasts from the Weather Bureau, where TVA pays the salaries of three meteorologists. TVA receives two special forecasts daily, with additional advisories with significant weather changes.

STREAM OF REPORTS

About 8:05 a.m., a steady stream of information begins pouring in from 10 area offices where field engineers have received reports from 200 rainfall stations and 43 stream gages throughout the valley.

With other data, the rainfall measurements are fed into a computer—rented for $1,500 a month—which spits forth averages and such technical information as runoff indexes.

Armed with an array of computations, three or four men huddle in the seventh floor of a TVA building in Knoxville to discuss where the critical flood points are. There's Cooper; perhaps Reed Elliott, the water control planning engineer (and, technically, Cooper's boss); and Alfred Blickensterfer, head of the forecasting section; plus an aide.

After brief discussion, they decide to begin preliminary discharges. An office in Chattanooga is alerted:

"Increase discharges 20,000 cubic feet per second at Watts Bar, Chicamauga, 20,000; Guntersville and Wheeler, 25,000; and Pickwick, 40,000."

The order is relayed to the dams via a hot line on TVA's transmission lines, by microwave or by commercial telephone.

At one dam—within half an hour of the decision—the push of a button starts a motor that lifts the gate that spills the water * * * at another, a man jumps into a crane, wheels along the top of the dam and wields a big mechanical hand to lift the gate.

That's the beginning of what may be repeated in the next day or so: empty the mainstream for storage capacity, hold back the tributaries.

In the case of a new flood crest coming down the Ohio, TVA Tuesday curtailed the Tennessee flow from 350,000 cubic feet per second—or 160 million gallons a minute—to 250,000 cubic feet per second. It may be cut to 200,000 cubic feet per second.

The whole idea is to slice the Tennessee flow to a minimum when the Ohio flood crest passes Paducah—about Thursday—and then allow the Tennessee's pent-up waters to flow in behind.

With such a vast flood control operation, why then does Tennessee have floods. The answer is simply that the flooding occurs largely along creeks and streams where there are no dams.

[From the TVA Weekly News Letter, Mar. 27, 1963]

Total benefits from TVA flood control now exceed total flood control costs by about 60 percent, just 27 years after its first multiple-use dam was closed, TVA said today.

The agency's flood control facilities represent an investment of $184 million, most of it flood control's share of the overall cost for multiple-use dams and reservoirs. Accumulated operating and enginering costs over the years, plus an allowance for interest on the investment, bring total present flood control costs to $285 million.

On the benefit side of the ledger, total estimated benefits now stand at about $456 million including those resulting from this month's flood control operation, TVA said. These benefits are of two types—damages prevented during floods and increases in land values resulting from flood protection.

TVA has made a preliminary estimate of more than $100 million in damage saved at Chattanooga during the early March flood regulation. This pushes the total damages which have been prevented in the Tennessee Valley to about $275 million.

Outside the Tennessee Valley, flood losses along the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers (outside the levees) have been reduced $31 million by the effects of TVA regulation, not counting additional benefits this month that cannot be estimated accurately until the flood recedes.

These prevented losses add up to $306 million in the two areas. In addition, greater security provided by TVA regulation to 6 million acres behind Mississippi and Ohio River levees has increased the value of those lands by an estimated $150 million.

When flood crests come down the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers, as they did last week, TVA uses the vast storage in 184-mile-long Kentucky Reservoir to hold back part or all of the Tennessee River's flow and keep it off the Ohio crest. Last week discharges at Kentucky Dam were reduced from 350,000 to 200,000 cubic feet per second during the Ohio crest. Kentucky Reservoir rose about 10 feet as waters pouring down the Tennessee River were stored there.

TVA said this month's flood and the one in 1957, while not the largest in Tennessee River history, were potentially the most destructive because of the urban development and economic growth that has taken place. Without regulation, a single flood today like the one in 1957 would cause damage in Metropolitan Chattanooga greater than the entire $184 million investment in TVA flood control facilities.

TVA pointed out that the investment figures for its reservoir system include the value of the land which was purchased for the permanent reservoirs.

Prevented damages in the Tennessee Valley have averaged over $10 million a year since Norris Dam was closed in 1936, and prevented losses along the Ohio and Mississippi have averaged another $1.5 million a year since Kentucky Dam was closed in 1944 (aside from land enhancement benefits). In contrast, the cost of TVA flood control operations—including depreciation on the original investment—is currently running about $3½ million a year.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that an article published in th Knoxville Journal of April 6, 1963, concerning TVA's plans to replace Hales Bar Dam because of a worsening leakage problem, be printed at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TVA TO REPLACE HALES BAR DAM

Directors of Tennessee Valley Authority yesterday announced their decision to build a new dam and navigation lock on the Tennessee River to replace the 50-year-old Hales Bar Dam west of Chattanooga, at which a leakage problem is gradually getting worse.

Preliminary plans are to build the new dam downstream from the existing one between Hales Bar and the mouth of the Sequatchie River. TVA said details of design and cost were not yet available.

"The decision to replace Hales Bar with a new dam was reached after a detailed review of efforts which have been carried on over the past several years to reduce leakage under the old dam," the TVA board said. "Recent engineering studies reveal that improvements required at Hales Bar would be more extensive than previously indicated and their success in completely sealing and stabilizing the dam could not be assured."

The agency said there is no current danger of a failure of Hales Bar Dam, which it purchased from Tennessee Electric Power Co. in 1939, but that there are indications of "a continued worsening of the leakage. It explained that a dam in that vicinity is necessary to maintain a continuous navigation channel.

The old dam "has been plagued with foundation problems since construction began in 1905," TVA said, asserting that preliminary study indicates a favorable site with good foundation condition can be found downstream.

ANNUAL REPORTS BY SUBCOMMITTEES OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I wish to express my attitude toward "Annual Reports" of Senate Judiciary Subcommittees as required by identical provisions in all authorization resolutions.

These are necessarily filed as reports of the Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, "made by its subcommittees" pursuant to the particular resolutions authorizing investigations and studies in the preceding year. Perhaps we are all in general agreement that these are annual reports of the subcommittees, nothing more, even though they must technically be filed from the full Judiciary Committee. But misunderstanding can arise from time to time, by the nature of the subject matter or the tone of the presentation.

As a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, I feel that these annual subcommittee reports—as distinguished from reports on specific bills or resolutions—should be filed as approved by a majority of the subcommittee members. If there are to be dissents, or minority or separate views, these should normally be made by other members of the subcommittee involved, rather than by members of the full committee who are not on the subcommittee. This is not to abdicate responsibility by members of the full committee; this is a method of assuring that the Senate will receive the language chosen by the subcommittee in each instance to describe its own work of the past year. In some situations, of course, members of the full committee may suggest revisions to the subcommittee, but I do not favor this as a standard practice.

Therefore, it should be understood that the fact that I do not submit dissenting or separate views with regard to any annual report does not mean that I am in agreement with the report; as I obviously do not agree with the exposition nor the conclusions reached in all of the annual reports that have been or will be submitted by the 14 standing and special subcommittees.

JOINT AUTHORITY OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO ORIGINATE APPROPRIATION

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, it was my pleasure and privilege to appear this past Sunday on what has become a widely acclaimed television program—the weekly telecast of Senator KENNETH KEATING. On that program Senator KEATING asked me if there was any action Congress could take to shorten its lengthy sessions. My answer was that if it permitted the Senate to originate half of the appropriation bills the session could be shortened significantly.

There are two schools of thought in opposition to the proposal of dividing the initiation of appropriations bills between the House and Senate. One school of thought advocates the abolition of the House Appropriations Committee and the abolition of the Senate Appropriations Committee—and their replacement with a Joint Committee on Appropriations.

I do not agree with this suggestion. It may appear to have much logic on its face—but when you probe beneath the surface it has potentialities that could lead to far reaching changes that perhaps even its proponents would not like.

It is true that we have joint committees between the House and Senate, but with the exception of those on Atomic Energy, Defense Production, Immigration and Nationality Policy, and Internal Revenue Taxation, and the Joint Economic Committee, the activity of joint committees is limited and rarely do they hold hearings.

Of these exceptions, only the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has any legislative jurisdiction. The others may hold hearings and make studies, but proposed legislation is never referred to them for action. And even the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is limited to being an authorization committee, and has no jurisdiction over appropriations for atomic energy. That jurisdiction is retained by the Appropriations Committee.

There are two basic legislative functions: the first is to authorize; the second is to appropriate. In recent years, a third function has emerged—to investigate. But for practical purposes, the backbone of legislation is authorization and appropriation—and not investigation.

In short, roughly half of the work of the House—and half of the work of the Senate—half of the work of the Congress—is appropriations. To appropriate through a joint committee and follow the precedent of the relatively young Joint Committee on Atomic Energy would, in effect, to a great extent make Congress a unicameral legislature instead of the bicameral character given it by our Constitution.

Thus, the spirit—if not, the letter—of the Constitution would be amended by indirection in the creation of a Joint Committee on Appropriations—rather than by the direct method of amending the Constitution by a constitutional amendment requiring not only two-thirds approval of both the House and Senate but also three-fourths of the States. Frankly, I think this would be an unacceptable shortcut.

Furthermore, if the function of appropriating—which accounts for half of the work of Congress—is to be vested in a joint committee, then what valid answer is there to the logic of "what is good enough for appropriating is good enough for authorizing, for legislating" and in all consistency make all the authorizing or legislating committees of the House and Senate joint committees.

For if the logic for a Joint Committee on Appropriations is valid and acceptable, surely it is just as acceptable and valid for the creation of Joint Committees on Agriculture and Forestry, on Armed Services, on Banking and Commerce, on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, on Commerce, on Revenue and Finance, on Foreign Relations, on Government Operations, on the Judiciary, and so forth.

Yes, if you start with appropriations, where can you logically draw the line? And then where do you end up—with neither the House nor the Senate having its separate committees—with all committee work being done on a unicameral basis. And if you have all committee work done on a unicameral basis, then why not have the actual debate and voting on a unicameral basis? Why not just have one legislative body instead of two?

But if you do this, then several complex and difficult questions arise. First, the Constitution will have to be amended. Second, the concept of balances and checks within the legislative branch of our Government will have been abolished. Third, the balance between direct representation of the people by population in the House and the representation of the States, without reference to population, in the Senate, will have been eliminated.

If representation of the States—the balance against representation of the population—is eliminated, then what kind of compromise can be effected? Unless representation by States is to be abolished completely and arbitrarily, what workable compromise is there?

I do not think the American people want a unicameral Congress—but that is exactly the direction of the proposal of abolition of the House Appropriations Committee and the Senate Appropriations Committee and replacement of them with a Joint Committee on Appropriations.

If such an attempt is to be made, then I propose that it be done the direct and straightforward way through a constitutional amendment in which the States can have their say, rather than the back door, indirect and shortcut way of Congress taking such action by resolution to the exclusion of a direct voice of the people through their States.

The other school of thought that opposes equal division of the initiation of appropriation bills by the House and Senate—of giving the Senate the right to start half of the appropriation bills instead of the House retaining that privilege exclusively—bases such opposition on the contention that the Constitution reserves such an exclusive right to the House.

An analysis of this contention has been made by one of the most learned men to ever serve on the staff of Congress—Dr. Eli E. Nobleman, a member of the professional staff of the Senate Committee on Government Operations for more than 15 years. It is incorporated in a memorandum dated April 3, 1963.

Dr. Nobleman, who holds an earned doctorate in public law, has prepared a number of studies of this type for the committee, dealing with various aspects of constitutional law and public law. It was my privilege to serve on the Committee on Government Operations for several years and to have the opportunity to witness the excellent work of Dr. Nobleman.

He is undoubtedly one of the foremost authorities in our country on the subject of Federal-State-local relations and has performed tremendously valuable service to the committee, the Senate, and the country in this very important field.

And while I am making reference to Dr. Nobleman, I also want to pay tribute to the staff director and the professional staff members of the full Senate Government Operations Committee, for in my opinion they constituted one of the most outstanding staffs in the entire history of

Congress—at least in the 23 years that it has been my privilege to serve in Congress.

Dr. Nobleman's learned study is most impressive. But it is more than that. It is readable and understandable rather than being couched in complex legalistic terms. I invite the attention of every Member of this body to it. While it was printed in the hearings on S. 537, to create a Joint Committee on the Budget, as an appendix to the record, I ask unanimous consent that it be placed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

I also ask unanimous consent that the April 16, 1963, column of distinguished columnist Arthur Krock, of the New York Times, be placed in the RECORD immediately following the study of Dr. Nobleman. Columnist Krock takes appropriate notice of the importance of the Nobleman study.

There being no objection, the study and column were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE COMMITTEE ON
GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS,
April 3, 1963.

Staff Memorandum No. 88-1-27.

Subject: Authority of the Senate to originate appropriation bills.

During the hearings on S. 537, to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States, held on March 20, 1963, reference was made to the position of some Members of the House of Representatives that this bill, which would establish a Joint Committee on the Budget, might in some manner, infringe on alleged constitutional prerogatives of the House of Representatives to originate appropriation bills. Taking note of this issue, the chairman directed the staff to prepare a summary and analysis of the debates and actions of the Constitutional Convention of 1787, with particular reference to the authority of the Senate to originate appropriation measures.

Since the birth of the Republic, a controversy has existed as to whether article I, section 7, clause 1, on the Constitution of the United States vested in the House of Representatives the exclusive authority to originate appropriation measures.

Article I, section 7, clause 1 provides: "All bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with Amendments as on other Bills."

Although no mention is made of appropriations in this clause, the House of Representatives has, during the entire course of the history of the Nation, frequently asserted the position that this clause conferred upon it the exclusive authority to originate appropriation measures. The Senate has, from time to time, contested this position, contending that it has equal authority to originate such bills. However, for the most part, the Senate has acquiesced in the position of the House and, as a matter of practice and procedure, all appropriation measures do originate in the House of Representatives. This, however, is a matter of practice and not of constitutional right.

At this point, it may be stated unequivocally that there is nothing either in the language of the Constitution or in the debates of the delegates to the Constitutional Convention of 1787 which, in any way, lends support to the position of the House. On the contrary, the evidence is abundantly clear that various attempts in the Constitutional Convention to vest in the House of Representatives the exclusive authority to originate appropriation bills were defeated on several occasions, following extensive debate and discussion.

This position is supported conclusively by a statement of George Mason, delegate from Virginia, author of the Virginia Declaration of Rights, member of the Continental Congress, and one of the three men who refused to sign the completed Constitution. Mason, who participated actively in the debates, having spoken 136 times, was unalterably opposed to vesting any authority over either revenue or appropriation measures in the Senate. In assigning his reasons for refusing to sign the Constitution, he said, "The Senate have the power of altering all money-bills, and of originating appropriations of money * * * although they are not representatives of the people or amenable to them."[1]

Supporting data will be found in the debates and actions of the Constitutional Convention, as reported by James Madison and reprinted in (1) Elliott, "Debates on the Adoption of the Federal Constitution" (rev. ed., Philadelphia, 1861), vol. 5; (2) Farrand, "The Records of the Federal Convention of 1787" (New Haven, 1911), vols. I, II and III; (3) "Documents Illustrative of the Formation of the American States," House Document No. 398, 69th Congress (1927); and the following materials, all of which have been carefully analyzed: A report of the House Committee on the Judiciary entitled "Power of the Senate To Originate Appropriation Bills" (H. Rept. 147, 46th Cong., 3d. sess., 1881); a comprehensive article, entitled, "History of the Formation of the Constitution," by John A. Kasson, President of the Constitutional Centennial Commission, contained in the "History of the Celebration of the 100th Anniversary of the Promulgation of the Constitution of the United States" (Philadelphia, 1889), volume I; W. W. Willoughby, "The Constitutional Law of the United States" (2d ed., 1929), volume II; a memorandum submitted by Representative Robert McClory, based upon Charles Warren's "The Making of the Constitution" (Boston, 1937); a monograph, entitled, "Creation of the Senate," published as Senate Document No. 45, 75th Congress; and the testimony of Mr. Lucius Wilmerding, authority on the Federal spending power. See also Selko, "The Federal Financial System" (Brookings Institution, 1940). The report of the House committee was published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 108, part 10, pages 12904–12911, and was also inserted in the appendix to the record of the hearings on S. 537 as exhibit 1. The pertinent portion of the publication of the Constitutional Centennial Commission is attached hereto as exhibit 2. The materials submitted by Representative McClory and Mr. Wilmerding are found in the hearings on S. 537.

The balance of this memorandum will be devoted to a discussion of the arguments of the House of Representatives and evidence refuting these arguments, as contained in the Madison Journal and the other materials referred to above.

POSITION OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES [2]

The position of the House of Representatives appears to be based upon (1) the practice of the English Parliament at the time of the adoption of the Constitution, under which the lower House, the House of Commons, exercised full and complete control over all money bills, both appropriation and revenue-raising or tax bills; (2) the terminology of the period, under which the terms "money bills" and "bills for raising revenue" allegedly referred to and included appropriation bills; and (3) the alleged intention of the Constitutional Convention to retain authority over all financial matters in the House closest to the people.

DEBATES AND ACTIONS OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION OF 1787

Analysis of the debates of the Constitutional Convention clearly refutes the position of the House of Representatives. An authoritative account and analysis of these debates, with special reference to the right of the Senate to originate appropriations, is found in an article, entitled, "History of the Formation of the Constitution," published in a two-volume work, entitled, "History of the Celebration of the 100th Anniversary of the Promulgation of the Constitution of the United States," under the direction and authority of the Constitutional Centennial Commission in 1889, and referred to above.

The article in question was written by former Representative John A. Kasson, president of the Constitutional Centennial Commission, and a distinguished lawyer and scholar, who served six terms as a Member of the House of Representatives from Iowa. In addition, Mr. Kasson served as First Assistant Postmaster General in President Lincoln's Cabinet, as United States minister to Austria-Hungary and Germany, and as U.S. member and representative at numerous international conferences and commission negotiations.

In a section of his article entitled "The Legislative Right to Originate Money Bills" (pp. 101–105), reprinted in full as exhibit 2 of this memorandum, Mr. Kasson reviewed the debates, discussions and votes of the delegates to the Convention, and demonstrated conclusively (1) that the delegates considered and rejected the practice of the English Parliament; (2) that they were fully aware of the distinction between revenue bills and appropriation bills; (3) that they refused to extend the exclusive power of the House of Representatives beyond bills to raise revenue; and (4) that they deliberately and expressly voted to vest in the Senate equal authority with the House over appropriation measures.

In the scheme of government, as originally approved in the Committee of the Whole, equal power to originate legislation was given to the two Houses of Congress by unanimous consent. On June 13, during consideration of the Virginia Resolutions, Gerry moved to insert the words, "except money bills," which shall originate in the first branch of the national legislature." Butler saw no reason for such discrimination: "We were always following the British Constitution, when the reason for it did not apply. There was no analogy between the House of Lords and the body (Senate) proposed to be established. If the Senate should be degraded by any such discriminations, the best men would be apt to decline serving in it in favor of the other branch." Madison observed "that the commentators on the British Constitution had not yet agreed on the reason of the restriction on the House of Lords in money bills. Certain it was there could be no similar reason in the case before us. The Senate would be the representatives of the people as well as the first branch. If they should have any dangerous influence over it, they would easily prevail on some Members of the latter to originate the bill they wished to be passed. As the Senate would be generally a more capable set of men, it would be wrong to disable them from any preparation of the business, especially of that which was most important, and in our Republic, worse prepared than any other." He concluded that if the proposal was to be advocated at all, it must be extended to amending as well as originating money bills. Sherman stated, "We establish two branches in order to get more wisdom, which is particularly needed in the finance business. The Senate bear their share of the taxes, and are also the representatives of the people." Pinckney said, "This distinction prevails in South Carolina, and has been a source of pernicious disputes between the two branches." The motion was then defeated by a vote of 7 to 3, and both Houses retained equal rights in all legislation.

---

[1] Elliott, "Debates on the Federal Constitution" (2d ed., Philadelphia, 1861), vol. I, p. 494; Ford, ed., "Pamphlets on the Constitution of the United States," New York, 1888, p. 329.

[2] See, Williams, "The Supply Bills," S. Doc. No. 872, 62d Cong., 1st sess., 1912; report of the House Committee on the Judiciary, "Minority Views," H. Rept. No. 147, 46th Cong., 3d sess., 1881, "Luce, Legislative Problems," Boston, 1935, pp. 391, ff.

Subsequently, during the debate on equality of State representation in the two Houses, it was urged by delegates from the larger States that questions of revenue ought to be determined by a proportional representation, otherwise, a minority of population, represented by a majority of States, might impose burdens on the majority of both wealth and population. This led to an offer by the small States that "all bills for raising or appropriating money * * * shall originate in the first branch of the legislature, and shall not be altered or amended by the second branch; and that no money shall be drawn from the Public Treasury but in pursuance of appropriations to be originated in the first branch." This offer was conditioned upon the acceptance of an equal vote in the Senate; and a committee, of which Gerry was chairman, so reported the plan on July 5. This plan was opposed by Madison, Gouverneur Morris, and Wilson, but the clause was adopted on July 6, by a vote of 5 to 3, with the understanding that it was still an open question. On July 16, following debate on the compromise as a whole, which included other matters, the plan was carried by a vote of 5 to 4, with the understanding that it was still an open question, and it went to the Committee of Detail, still unsupported by a majority of the States.

In its report on August 6, the Committee of Detail provided that "All bills for raising or appropriating money, and for fixing the salaries of the officers of Government, shall originate in the House of Representatives, and shall not be altered or amended by the Senate. No money shall be drawn from the Public Treasury, but in pursuance of appropriations that shall originate in the House of Representatives." In another section of the report, it was provided that "Each House shall possess the right of originating bills, except in the cases aforementioned."

When the Convention took this section up for debate, on August 8, Pinckney moved to strike it out, on the ground that it gave no advantage to the House of Representatives, and "if the Senate can be trusted with the many great powers proposed, it surely may be trusted with that of originating money bills." Gouverneur Morris said, "It is particularly proper that the Senate shall have the right of originating money bills. They will sit constantly, will consist of a smaller number, and will be able to prepare such bills with due correctness; and so as to prevent delay of business in the other House." Mason opposed Pinckney's motion to strike out the section stating that the purse strings should never be put into the hands of the Senate. Mercer thought that without this power the equality of votes in the Senate was rendered of no consequence. Madison also favored the motion, thinking the power to be of no consequence to the House and likely to involve the two branches in "injurious altercations." Mason, Butler, and Ellsworth opposed the motion, on the ground that it would add to the already too great powers of a Senate and promote an aristocracy. Thereafter, the Convention proceeded to vote to strike out the clause which vested exclusive power over revenue and appropriations in the House by a vote of 7 to 4.

On August 9, Randolph gave notice that he would move to reconsider this vote, stating that he thought it was not only "extremely objectionable", but also "as endangering the success of the plan." The plan he referred to was a part of the so-called Great Compromise of July 16, under which the right of the House to originate all revenue bills had been given as a concession to the large States in return for equality of representation in the Senate for the small States.

Williamson said that his State of North Carolina "had agreed to equality in the Senate, merely in consideration that money bills should be confined to the other House, and he was surprised to see the smaller States forsaking the condition on which they had received their equality." Mason said that unless this power should be restored to the House, "he should, not from obstinacy, but from duty and conscience, oppose throughout the equality of representation in the Senate." Gouverneur Morris, on the other hand, considered the section relating to money bills as "intrinsically bad"; and Wilson said that the two large States of Pennsylvania and Virginia had uniformly voted against it.

On August 11, on a motion to reconsider the vote striking out the money bill clause, Randolph made an elaborate speech in support of vesting the power over money bills in the House. It will make the plan "more acceptable to the people because they will consider the Senate as the more aristocratic body and will expect the usual guards against its influence be provided according to the example in Great Britain." He thought also that the restraint of the Senate from amending was of particular importance and he proposed to limit the exclusive power to "bills for the purpose of revenue", to obviate objection to the term "raising money", which might happen incidentally, not allowing the Senate by amendment to either increase or diminish the same. Reconsideration was agreed to by a vote of 9 to 1.

On reconsideration, Randolph's motion, made on August 13, was in the following words: "Bills for raising money for the purpose of revenue, or for appropriating the same, shall originate in the House of Representatives; and shall not be so amended or altered by the Senate as to increase or diminish the sum to be raised, or change the mode of levying it, or the objects of its appropriation."

This motion led to a heated debate. Mason supported Randolph fully. It was opposed, however, by Wilson, who said, "it would be a source of perpetual contentions where there was no mediator to decide them. The President here could not, like the executive in England, interpose by a prorogation or dissolution. This restriction had been found pregnant with altercation in every State where the Constitution (State) had established it. The House of Representatives will insert other things in money bills, and by making them conditions of each other, destroy the deliberate liberty of the Senate. * * * With regard to the purse strings (referred to by Mason), it was to be observed that the purse was to have two strings, one of which was in the hands of the House of Representatives, the other in those of the Senate. Both Houses must concur in untying, and of what importance could it be which untied first, which last. He could not conceive it to be any objection to the Senate's preparing the bills, that they would have leisure for that purpose and would be in the habits of business (referring again to Mason's remarks). War, Commerce, and Revenue were the great objects of the General Government. All of them are connected with money. The restriction in favor of the House of Representatives would exclude the Senate from originating any important bills whatever."

Gerry stated that "taxation and representation are strongly associated in the minds of the people, and they will not agree that any but their immediate representatives shall meddle with their purses. In short the acceptance of the plan will inevitably fail, if the Senate be not restrained from originating money bills." Madison thought that if Randolph's substitute is to be adopted "it would be proper to allow the Senate at least so to amend as to diminish the sum to be raised. Why should they be restrained from checking the extravagance of the other House. One of the greatest evils incident to republican government was the spirit of contention and faction. The proposed substitute, which in some respects lessened the objections against the section, had a contrary effect with respect to this particular. It laid a foundation for new difficulties and disputes between the two Houses. The word 'revenue' was ambiguous. In many acts, particularly in the regulation of trade, the object would be twofold. The raising of revenue would be one of them. How could it be determined which was the primary or predominant one; or whether it was necessary that revenue should be the sole object, in exclusion of other incidental effects." Madison then went on to show that it is difficult to determine whether a bill which was sent to the House by the Senate was or was not an amendment or alteration of a House revenue bill. He noted further the difficulties in determining what was an amendment or alteration, and what was the meaning of the words "increase or diminish." Continuing, he stated, "If the right to originate be vested exclusively in the House of Representatives, either the Senate must yield against its judgment to that of the House, in which case the utility of the check will be lost—or the Senate will be inflexible and the House of Representatives must adapt its money bill to the views of the Senate, in which case, the exclusive right will be of no avail."

After Dickinson and Randolph had defended further Randolph's motion, Rutledge stated that "he would prefer giving the exclusive right to the Senate, if it was to be given exclusively at all. The Senate being more conversant in business, and having more leisure, will digest the bills much better, and as they are to have no effect until examined and approved by the House of Representatives, there can be no possible danger. * * * The experiment in South Carolina, where the Senate cannot originate or amend money bills, has shown that it answers no good purpose; and produces the very bad one of continually dividing and heating the two Houses. Sometimes, indeed, if the matter of the amendment of the Senate is passing to the other House they wink at the encroachment; if it be displeasing, then the Constitution is appealed to. Every session is distracted by altercations on this subject. The practice now becoming frequent is for the Senate not to make formal amendments; but to send down a schedule of the alterations which will procure the bill their assent." Carroll said, "the most ingenious men in Maryland are puzzled to define the case of money bills, or explain the Constitution on that point; though it seemed to be worded with all possible plainness and precision. It is a source of continual difficulty and squabble between the two Houses."

At the close of this debate, three votes were taken. First, on the exclusive right in the first House to originate money bills; defeated, 4 to 7; second, on originating by the first House and amending by the Senate; defeated, 4 to 7; and third, on the clause, "No money shall be drawn from the Public Treasury, but in pursuance of appropriations that shall originate in the House of Representatives"; defeated, 10 to 1.

Warren, in commenting on the action taken by the Convention on August 13, notes that "the Convention adhered to its vote of August 8; and thus a victory was again scored by the supporters of the power of the Senate."[3] Kasson observes that "here, for the first time, appears a very strong conviction of the Convention that a distinction should be made between bills for raising revenue and bills for appropriating money."[4]

On August 14, Williamson referred to the money bill section as dead, but "its ghost he was afraid would notwithstanding haunt us. It had been a matter of conscience with him, to insist upon it as long as there was hope of retaining it. He had swallowed the vote of rejection with reluctance. He could not digest it. All that was said on the other side was that the restriction was not convenient. We have now got a House of Lords which is to originate money bills."

On August 15, Strong proposed the following amendment: "Each House shall possess the right of originating all bills, except bills for raising money for the purposes of revenue, or for appropriating the same and for fixing the salaries of the officers of the Government which shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with amendments as in other cases." Mason seconded Strong's motion, stating that "He was extremely earnest to take this power from the Senate, who he said could already sell the whole country by means of Treaties." Gorham said the amendment was of great importance. "The Senate will first acquire the habit of preparing money bills, and then the practice will grow into an exclusive right of preparing them." Gouverneur Morris opposed it as unnecessary and inconvenient. Williamson said, "Some think this restriction on the Senate essential to liberty, others think it of no importance. Why should not the former be indulged? He was for efficient and stable Government but many would not strengthen the Senate if not restricted in the case of money bills. The friends of the Senate would therefore lose more than they would gain by refusing to gratify the other side." He thereupon moved to postpone the subject until the powers of the Senate had been reviewed, and further action was then postponed.

On September 5, the Committee of Eleven, to which had been referred certain portions of the proposed Constitution upon which action had been postponed, filed a report recommending, among other things, that "All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives, and shall be subject to alterations and amendments by the Senate; no money shall be drawn from the treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law."

Gouverneur Morris moved to postpone consideration, noting that "it had been agreed to in the committee on the ground of compromise, and he should feel himself at liberty to dissent to it, if on the whole he should not be satisfied with certain other parts (of the report) to be settled." Sherman "was for giving immediate ease to those who looked on this clause as of great moment, and for trusting to their concurrence in other proper measures." Morris' motion carried by a vote of 9 to 2 and the matter was postponed.

It should be noted, at this point, that here, for the first time, we have an official recommendation from a special committee, directed to report with respect to matters which had been postponed, which retains in the House exclusive authority to originate measures for raising revenue, while authorizing the Senate to alter or amend such measures, but which eliminates the exclusive power in the House to originate appropriations. It is perfectly clear, from the previous debate, that the elimination of the exclusive power in the House to originate appropriation bills was not accidental, inadvertant, or due to any lack of understanding on the part of the delegates as to the difference between bills to raise revenue and bills to appropriate funds. In fact, the vote on August 13, previously described, makes it quite clear that the distinction between revenue and appropriation measures was well understood. What is reflected in the proposal of the special committee is an attempt to reach a compromise which would placate those who wanted to see more power vested in the Senate and who had opposed the origination of revenue measures in the House exclusively.

Commenting on this proposal of the special committee, Warren states that "this new compromise satisfied some of the delegates from the smaller States and some from the larger States, who had hitherto opposed the origination of revenue bills in the House; * * *."[5]

On September 8, the postponed proposed section was again considered. After adopting an amendment to the first clause which incorporated the language of the Massachusetts constitution, the section was adopted by a vote of 9 to 2. As amended and adopted, it reads as follows: "All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives, but the Senate may propose or concur with amendments, as in other bills. No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law."

On the same day, a committee of five was appointed "to revise the style of and arrange the articles which had been agreed to * * *", referred to as the Committee on Style and Arrangement.

On September 12, the Committee on Style and Arrangement made its report on a final and revised draft of the Constitution. Section 7 of this final draft contained the provision: "All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives, but the Senate may propose or concur with amendments as on other bills." The last clause of the version adopted on September 8, forbidding money to be drawn from the Treasury except in consequence of appropriations made by law, had been removed from section 7 and appeared as clause 6 of section 9.

SUMMARY OF DEBATES IN THE CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

Summarizing the debates, it appears (1) that originally each House was to have full and equal authority to originate all bills; (2) an attempt to except money bills and require them to originate in the House of Representatives was rejected; (3) as a result of a compromise between delegates from the small and large States, all States were given an equal vote in the Senate, in return for vesting in the House of Representatives exclusive power to originate both revenue and appropriation measures, and this was tentatively approved on two occasions; (4) subsequently, a provision to vest exclusive authority in the House over both revenue and appropriation bills was proposed by the Committee on Detail and rejected on two occasions; (5) this rejection was in three parts; one rejected the exclusive authority in the House to originate money bills; the second rejected the exclusive authority in the House to originate, with amendment by the Senate; and the third rejected exclusive origination of appropriation measures in the House of Representatives; (6) subsequently, a special committee, in an attempt at conciliation, recommended that the House have exclusive authority to originate revenue measures, with amendment by the Senate, and exclusive authority to originate appropriation measures was dropped; and (7) finally, the Convention adopted the language now contained in the Constitution, except that the clause requiring appropriations made by law prior to drawing money from the Treasury was moved to another section of the Constitution, probably in order to avoid the confusion and misunderstanding generated by the earlier language, and as a matter of style.

Kasson, commenting on the final product, says, "It thus appears by express votes the Convention refused to extend the exclusive power of the House beyond bills for raising revenue, and by express vote decided to leave in the Senate an equal power to originate bills making appropriations of public money * * *."[6]

REPORT OF HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, 46TH CONGRESS (1880)

Further substantiation for this view is found in the report of the House Committee on the Judiciary, made in 1881, referred to above (H. Rept. 147, 46th Cong., 3d sess.). It appears that a Senate bill, authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase certain land, and further authorizing the appropriating of funds therefor, had passed the Senate and was referred to the appropriate House committee which reported it favorably. Having determined that the matter involved the making of an appropriation, it was referred to the House Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to inquire into the right of the Senate under the Constitution to originate appropriation bills. This committee made a searching examination of the entire question and concluded that the Senate had such authority and that the power to originate appropriation bills is not exclusive in the House of Representatives.

After reviewing the British Parliamentary practice at the time of Constitutional Convention, the House committee observed, "* * * if they (the Founding Fathers) had intended to secure to the House the sole right to originate appropriation bills * * * it is but reasonable to suppose that they would have done so in perfectly plain and unequivocal terms."

Following an examination of a portion of the debates in the Constitutional Convention, the House committee stated:

"From this brief summary it will be seen that the proposition was more than once presented to the Convention to vest in the House of Representatives the exclusive privilege of originating 'all money bills' co nomine, which was so often rejected. It would seem obvious, therefore, that the framers of the Constitution did not intend that the expression 'bills for raising revenue', as employed by them, should be taken as the equivalent of that term as it was understood in English parliamentary practice; for, if they had so intended, they would surely have used that term itself, which had already received a fixed and definite signification from long and familiar usage, instead of the one they chose to employ."

Thereafter, the House committee observed that it could not be said that the framers of the Constitution acted under any misapprehension or want of proper deliberation. Not only did they specifically reject language which would have vested in the House of Representatives the exclusive privilege of originating appropriation bills, but

"No provision in the entire Constitution was more elaborately discussed or more carefully considered. The policy of investing the House of Representatives with the exclusive privileges exercised by the English House of Commons in relation to 'money bills' was persistently and ably urged by such distinguished and patriotic statesmen as George Mason, Elbridge Gerry, and Benjamin Franklin; and the impropriety of making any discrimination whatever between the two Houses as to their power to originate any bills was forcibly presented by Madison, Gouverneur Morris, Oliver Ellsworth, James Wilson, and Roger Sherman."

---

[3] Warren, "The Making of the Constitution" (Boston, 1937), p. 435.

[4] Kasson, "History of the Formation of the Constitution," in "History of the Celebration of the One Hundredth Anniversary of the Promulgation of the Constitution of the United States" (Phila., 1889), p. 104.

[5] Warren, "The Making of the Constitution," op. cit., p. 670.

[6] Kassan, "History of the Formation of the Constitution, op. cit., supra, p. 105.

Continuing, the House committee states:

"To say that the illustrious men who composed the Federal Convention were incapable of declaring in clear and unmistakable language that the House of Representatives should have the sole right to originate appropriation bills, if such had been their intention, would be an insult to their intelligence, which, in view of the precise and perspicuous terms used in the resolution reported by Mr. Gerry, the substitute offered by Mr. Randolph, and the amendment proposed by Mr. Strong, could only stultify the person who might hazard such an insinuation; and it would be no less an imputation upon their integrity and candor, as well as a gross abuse of construction, to suppose that they intended to be understood as meaning precisely what they repeatedly refused to say in plain words, especially when such a meaning cannot be inferred by any possibility from the language they actually employed, if that language is taken according to its natural and ordinary import."

The House committee came to the conclusion that it was never the intention of the framers of the Constitution to withhold the power of originating appropriation bills from the Senate, and that this was clearly shown from the language used in the instrument and the circumstances under which that language was employed.

Concerning the argument that usage and customs should govern, the committee said:

"* * * if the Senate was ever invested with that power by the Constitution, it cannot be said to have lost it by nonuser. Fortunately for us, that is not the way in which our constitutional provisions are changed, nor can they be altered by mere parliamentary practice. They must remain in the plain words in which they are written until amended by the concurrent votes of two-thirds of each branch of Congress and the legislatures of three-fourths of all the States in the Union, and while they remain they must be construed according to the simple and well settled rules of interpretation applicable to all other written language.

"If the mere practice of the two Houses or of either of them can be said to affect in any way a clear constitutional principle, instances in which the House has passed, without objection, appropriation bills which have originated in the Senate, might be adduced in sufficient numbers to fill a volume."

In concluding its report, the committee stated:

"With the policy of such a provision your committee has nothing to do. That was a matter to be considered and determined by the convention which framed the Constitution and the States which ratified it. And whether they acted wisely or unwisely in that regard cannot alter the fact that there is nothing in the language of the Constitution to indicate an intention on their part to withhold from the Senate the power to originate bills for the appropriation of money or that they repeatedly rejected a proposition to confine that privilege to the House of Representatives, although presented in the most emphatic and unequivocal terms. Believing, therefore, from the plain letter of the Constitution, as well as from all the circumstances surrounding the adoption of the provision in question, that the Senate had the clear right to originate the bill, they report it back to the House, with the recommendation that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and that the following resolution be adopted:

"*Resolved,* That the Senate had the constitutional power to originate the bill referred, and that the power to originate bills appropriating money from the Treasury of the United States is not exclusive in the House of Representatives."

This report, which was accompanied by minority views, was recommitted. The minority views contained the usual arguments advanced in support of the contention that the House of Representatives has exclusive power to originate appropriation bills.

VIEWS OF COMMENTATORS AND THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

The precise question of the right of the Senate to originate appropriation bills has never been passed upon directly by the courts. However, it has been the subject of comment by several commentators and has been treated indirectly in several decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court.

Mr. Justice Story, writing in 1833, in his famous "Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States," stated: [7]

"* * * What bills are properly 'bills for raising revenue,' in the sense of the Constitution, has been a matter of some discussion. A learned commentator supposes that every bill which indirectly or consequent may raise revenue is, within the sense of the Constitution, a revenue bill. He therefore thinks that the bills for establishing the post office and the mint, and regulating the value of foreign coin belong to this class, and ought not to have originated (as in fact they did) in the Senate. But the practical construction of the Constitution has been against his opinion. And, indeed, the history of the origin of the power already suggested abundantly proves that it has been confined to bills to levy taxes in the strict sense of the words, and has not been understood to extend to bills for other purposes, which may incidentally create revenue. * * *"

More recently, an equally eminent authority on the Constitution, W. W. Willoughby, in his definitive work, "The Constitutional Law of the United States" stated: [8]

"The Constitution provides that 'all bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with amendments as on other bills.'

"This provision has given rise to frequent controversies between the two Houses of Congress, but has but seldom been passed up by the courts. No formal definition of a revenue measure has been given by the Supreme Court, but in *Twin City National Bank* v. *Nebeker,* the Court, in effect, held that a bill, the primary purpose of which is not the raising of revenue, is not a measure that must originate in the House, even though, incidentally, a revenue will be derived by the United States from its operation."

Concerning appropriations acts, Mr. Willoughby stated: [9]

"It would seem that the Senate has full power to originate measures appropriating money from the Federal Treasury.

"This right has at times been denied by certain Members of the House, but the House has not itself formally adopted this negative view."

In *Twin City Bank* v. *Nebeker,*[10] the Supreme Court of the United States upheld the validity of a statute providing a national currency secured by a pledge of bonds of the United States and imposing a tax on the notes in circulation of the banking associations organized under the statute, in furtherance of that object and to meet the expenses attending the execution of the act. It was contended that since the act imposed a tax, it was a revenue raising measure; and that since the amendment which imposed the tax originated in the Senate, it was void. The Court held that this was not a revenue bill "which the Constitution declares must originate in the House of Representatives."

In disposing of this contention, Mr. Justice Harlan (202-3) stated:

"Mr. Justice Story has well said that the practical construction of the Constitution and the history and origin of the constitutional provision in question proves that revenue bills are those that levy taxes in the strict sense of the word, and are not bills for other purposes which may incidentally create revenue. * * *"

BASES FOR THE POSITION OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The position of some Members of the House of Representatives, that the Constitution vests in that House exclusive authority to originate appropriation bills, appears to have received its principal support from Asher Hinds and Representative CLARENCE CANNON, both former House Parliamentarians, and a considerable amount of material on the subject is found in "Hinds' and Cannon's Precedents." Additional material is found in Luce's "Legislative Problems," and in the minority views attached to the report of the House Committee on the Judiciary (H. Rept. No. 147, 46th Cong.), referred to above. However, the major work purporting to support this position is found in an article by former Senator John Sharp Williams, written in 1912 and published as Senate Document No. 872 (62d Cong., 1912).

In this article, Mr. Williams, after reviewing briefly the debates in the convention, arrives at the events of September 8, 1787. Noting the adoption by a vote of 9 to 2 of the language "All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives, but the Senate may propose or concur with amendments, as in other bills. No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law," he says, "no discussion. Evidently nobody thought that it made a difference from previous drafts. Why? Because the phrase 'raising revenue' was equivalent to the phrase 'raising money and appropriating the same'."

In coming to this conclusion, Mr. Williams ignored completely the fact that on two occasions a provision by the Committee on Detail to vest exclusive authority over both revenue and appropriation bills was rejected. Furthermore, at the time of the second rejection, a vote was taken on the following language: "No money shall be drawn from the Public Treasury, but in pursuance of appropriations which shall originate in the House of Representatives"; and it was defeated by a vote of 10 to 1.

How Mr. Williams was able to conclude after that action and the debate surrounding it that the phrase " 'raising revenue' was equivalent to the phrase 'raising money and appropriating the same' " is not readily apparent and is merely based upon his own personal views and interpretations, rather than on historical facts and events.

Mr. Williams also made much of the fact that the final draft, which omitted any reference to "appropriations," was the work of the "Committee of Revision of Style," concluding that it "seems still evident that to 'raise revenue' meant to raise money and appropriate it." He made no reference to the fact that this committee moved the last clause of the version adopted on September 8, dealing with appropriations, from section 7 of the final draft to section 9 of the final draft. It is certainly just as valid to assume that the committee took this action in order to separate, once and for all, the appropriation provision from the revenue provision, in order to avoid the conflict and misunderstanding which existed throughout a considerable portion of the debate. Mr. Williams' implication, that the omission of any reference to "appropriations" was purely one of style and arrangement, certainly finds no justification in the facts reviewed, and must be treated as mere conjecture on his part.

---

[7] Vol. 2, pp. 342-343.

[8] (2d ed., 1929), vol. II, p. 656.

[9] Ibid., p. 657.

[10] 167 U.S. 196 (1897).

Mr. Williams proceeded to review the debates in some of the State conventions on the ratification of the Constitution. His references to the language used, however, are inconclusive, since all or most of them are to "money bills," a term which, although used in the debate by the framers, was later discarded in favor of the more precise term—"bills to raise revenue," and "appropriations." By tortured interpretations of the terms, "money bills," "revenue bills," and "supply bills," he attempts to show without any noticeable basis, that they really mean "appropriation bills."

Mr. Williams states further that "if you will read the proceedings of the Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia very carefully, you will find that the whole argument there was whether the Senate should or should not have the right to amend. There never was one moment spent in discussion as to whether the House should or should not have the right to originate."

It is apparent that Mr. Williams did not read the debates with the care he requested of others. As early as June 13, 1787, when Gerry moved to change the equal right in both Houses to originate all legislation, so as to except money bills "which shall originate in the House of Representatives," Butler, Madison, Sherman, and Pinckney took issue with him. Madison specifically observed that "the Senate would be the representatives of the people as well as the first branch," and "as the Senate would be generally a more capable set of men, it would be wrong to exclude them from any preparation of the business, especially of that which was important, * * *." Sherman said, "We establish two branches in order to get more wisdom, which is particularly needed in the finance business. The Senate bear their share of the taxes and are also representatives of the people." Pinckney noted that this distinction in South Carolina has been a source of "pernicious disputes between the two branches." After the debate, Gerry's motion was defeated by a vote of 7 to 2.

Subsequently, on August 6, the Committee on Detail, in its report, provided for the origination in the House of Representatives of "all bills for raising or appropriating money * * *." In the debate on this provision on August 8, Gouverneur Morris said, "it is particularly proper that the Senate shall have the right of originating money bills. They will sit constantly, will consist of a smaller number, and will be able to prepare such bills with the due correctness; and so as to prevent delay in the other House." Following further debate, the provision was rejected by a vote of 7 to 4. In further debate, several days later, Wilson said that "the purse was to have two strings, one of which was in the hands of the House of Representatives, the other in the Senate. Both Houses must concur in untying, and of what importance would it be which untied first, which last." He could not conceive "it to be any objection to the Senate's preparing the bills," and "the restriction in favor of the House of Representatives would exclude the Senate from originating any important bills whatever."

In the light of the foregoing, it certainly cannot be said with any degree of accuracy, that "there never was one moment spent in discussion as to whether the House should or should not have the right to originate."

Finally, we have the clear statement of George Mason, a delegate from Virginia, who gave, as one of his reasons for refusing to sign the Constitution, the fact that "the Senate shall have the power of altering all money bills, and of originating appropriations of money." [11]

CONCLUSIONS

As stated at the outset of this study, an examination of the debates of the framers of the Constitution and of the principal commentators and authorities on the subject reveals, beyond any doubt, that the Senate has constitutional authority to originate appropriation bills. This conclusion is based upon the following findings:

1. The language of the Constitution itself makes it perfectly plain that the exclusive authority of the House of Representatives refers only to "bills for raising revenue" which term means "levying taxes." If the delegates to the Convention had desired to vest sole authority over appropriations in the House of Representatives, it may be assumed, in the light of their intellectual capacities and stature, that they would have done so in plain and unequivocal terms, particularly in view of the fact that attempts to confine that authority to the House were rejected repeatedly. This position is further supported by the refusal of Delegate George Mason to sign the Constitution because it gave the Senate power to originate appropriations, quoted in the preceding paragraph.

2. The practice of the English Parliament, at the time of the Constitutional Convention, under which the House of Commons controlled both revenue-raising and appropriation bills, was well known and understood by the delegates. The question of vesting the same powers in the House of Representatives was thoroughly debated and was ultimately rejected as inapplicable to the situation at hand, since the Senate bore no resemblance whatever to the hereditary House of Lords.

3. The framers of the Constitution deliberately discarded the term "money bills", used in English parliamentary practice, because of the confusion generated by this term. Furthermore, they understood fully the distinction between revenue-raising measures and appropriation measures, and, at no time was it intended that the term "bills for raising revenue" was to include bills for appropriating money.

4. Originally, each House was given equal authority to originate all bills, and an attempt to except money bills and require them to originate in the House of Representatives was rejected.

5. As the result of a compromise between the small and large States, all States were given an equal vote in the Senate in return for vesting in the House of Representatives exclusive power to originate both revenue and appropriation measures, and this was tentatively approved on two occasions.

6. Subsequently, a provision to vest exclusive authority in the House over both revenue and appropriation measures was proposed and rejected on two occasions. This rejection was in three parts: one vote rejected the exclusive authority in the House to originate money bills; the second rejected the exclusive authority in the House to originate, with amendment by the Senate; and the third rejected exclusive origination of appropriation measures in the House of Representatives.

7. Having reached an impasse on this question, a special committee, in an attempt at conciliation, recommended that the House have exclusive authority to originate revenue measures, with amendment by the Senate, and exclusive authority to originate appropriation measures was dropped, in order to placate those delegates who resented the attempt to exclude the Senate from a matter of such importance as appropriations.

8. The Convention finally adopted the language now contained in the Constitution, except that the clause requiring appropriation made by law prior to drawing money from the Treasury was moved to another section by the Committee on Style and Arrangement. It is obvious that this action could not have been inadvertent, since the committee in question had no authority to make substantive changes. Therefore, their action in dropping any reference to appropriation measures from article 1, section 7, clause 1, was done deliberately in order to carry out the desires of a majority of the delegates, and to eliminate any possible confusion which had been generated by the earlier language. Had this action been taken, merely as a matter of style, it would have exceeded the authority of the committee, and the Constitution would never have been ratified in that form.

9. Since the power to originate appropriation measures was clearly vested in the Senate by the Constitution, the fact that the Senate, as a matter of practice and procedure, has permitted the House of Representatives to originate general appropriation bills over a long period of time, cannot operate to divest the Senate of this important constitutional power. If this is desirable, it must be done by an amendment to the Constitution as prescribed by that document.

Approved:

ELI E. NOBLEMAN,
Professional Staff Member.
WALTER L. REYNOLDS,
Staff Director.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 16, 1963]

IN THE NATION—SOFT FOOTFALLS OF CHANGE IN NOISY TIMES

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, April 15.—Considering the clamor of the disputes over domestic and foreign policy between the administration and its critics, and those among the free world nations over collective defense and economic programs, it is not surprising that, of two very important moves in the direction of fundamental change in our governing system, one has just come to national notice, and the other is advancing toward its goal without arousing the goal tenders.

APPORTIONMENT POWER

The first basic change, which 10 State legislatures have now invoked their constitutional right and privilege to set in motion, would be the return to all 50 States of the final power to apportion their legislative seats, denying all Federal court jurisdiction in this political area by an amendment to the Constitution. The second would be the assertion by the U.S. Senate of equal right with the House to originate appropriation bills, a fundamental broadening of procedure with great but unforeseeable effects on the future fiscal condition of the Government. This claim of Senate power, which the House has rejected ever since the beginning of the Government, has just been certified as constitutional in a staff study for the Committee on Government Operations headed by Senator MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas.

Since the courts have never decided this issue, and the Senate has acquiesced to the insistence of the House that it alone may constitutionally originate appropriations, the House has paid very little attention to previous Senate complaints. But if this study, prepared for Senator MCCLELLAN by Eli E. Nobleman of the committee staff, persuades the Senator to urge a showdown on the issue, and the Senate goes along with him, the House's long-prevailing treatment of it as a harmless exercise in constitutional research will end in a stalemate of appropriating that the Federal courts will be obliged to try to break.

ORIGINATING MONEY BILLS

This issue between the two branches has moved to the active from the inactive status with the new determination revealed by the Senate to establish a joint committee on the budget. That legislation, designed to provide overall congressional management of expenditure versus revenue, has passed the Senate five times, only to be killed in the House on the claim that it is a mechanism by which the Senate can originate appropriations and thereby elude the constitutional restriction of this function to the House. But now the bill, drawn in rejection of this claim on the basis of the Nobleman study, has 76 sponsors, more than three-fourths of the Senate.

---

[11] See, supra, note 1.

Obviously, the preparation of a staff study is the quietest of all the originating phases of legislation. This sufficiently explains, though the product may be a bomb, as in this instance, the quiet of its target, the House, during the production stage. But it does not account for the fact that no national attention was drawn to the mounting procession of State legislatures, toward regaining from the Federal courts the power of the electorate of the States to fix their own formula of legislative representation, until the number of marchers had reached 10.

CURIOUS LACK OF NOTICE

This lack of national notice is the more curious because the legislatures of States such as Missouri, with urban populations able in combination to control their politics, had joined the procession, and its objective had also been approved by one branch of the legislatures of other States in the same category—New Jersey and Illinois among them. Hence it may be that the rapid action in 19 States to conform to the Supreme Court's new assumption of authority over legislative apportionment had so convinced the zealous and highly articulate supporters the rule was established that they quit listening for the tread of State reaction in the increasing noise of the larger national and international policy battles.

In the alarm of their awakening, however, this group seems to be overlooking at least two aspects of the situation. (1) The 10 legislatures exercised their specific rights as stated in the Constitution. (2) There is no evidence as yet of an overall design to prevent an equitable register of urban and rural votes by referendums on State reapportionments if and when recovered from the jurisdiction of the Federal courts.

SHIPS TRADING WITH CUBA

Mr. **GOLDWATER**. Mr. President, Lloyd's Shipping Index gives a daily appraisal of shipping on the oceans of the world. I became interested in this available information, and I feel certain that my colleagues in the Congress will be interested in what a study of the index of of March 14 reveals.

It is interesting in an intriguing way to notice the number of British ships plying trade with Cuba, when they have been asked to assist our Navy in intercepting the small groups of Cubans trying to retake their own country. In fact, the whole study indicates that there is anything but a diminution of shipping to the Communist-dominated country immediately to our south.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the index in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the index was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ships trading with Cuba

OTHER THAN RUSSIAN

[Partial list positions based on Lloyd's Shipping Index of Mar. 14, 1963]

Vessel	Flag registry	Year built	Gross tonnage	Net tonnage	From—	For—	Latest report
Angelos	Greek	1943	7,314	4,325	Cienfuegos	Osaka	Arrived Mar. 1.
Apollon	do	1957	9,744	5,628	Novorossisk	Havana	Arrived Feb. 5.
Ardmore [1]	British	1939	4,664	2,682	Niigata	do	In 22:30 N. 37 W. Mar. 8.
Arlington Court	do	1962	9,662	5,551	Havana Mar. 2	Vancouver	Passed Panama Canal Mar. 8.
Baltyk	Polish	1942	6,984	5,105	Havana Feb. 10	Sagua	
Banda	Dutch	1956	8,785	5,038	Calcutta	Havana	Arrived Kobe Mar. 13.
Bar	Yugoslav	1943	7,233	4,403	Havana Feb. 22	Antilla	
Batjian	Dutch	1956	8,789	5,045	Calcutta	Havana	Arrived Callao Mar. 8.
Bialystok	Polish	1942	7,173	4,287	Havana Mar. 2	Cardenas	
Birgit	Swedish	1928	5,907	3,350	Havana Jan. 12	Gothenburg	Arrived Jan. 31.
Bytom	Polish	1942	5,967	3,981	Hango Feb. 9	Havana	Arrived Mar. 11.
Ernst Moritz Arndt	East German	194	6,996	4,264		do	Arrived Feb. 24.
Glynafon	British	1953	7,021	4,131	Matanzas	Japan	In 8.56 N. 96.2 W. Mar. 6.
Himmerland	Danish	1956	8,774	5,130	Whampoa	Cienfuegos	Arrived Mar. 7.
J. G. Fichte	East German	1949	11,883	5,088	Havana Oct. 27	Nuevitas	
Karl Marx Stadt	do	1960	9,632	5,758	Cienfuegos Feb. 25	Rostock	
Kladno	Czechoslovak	1959	8,837	5,466	Havana Mar. 2	Nicaro	
Kongsgaard	Norwegian	1961	19,999	12,709	Tuapse	Cuba	Sailed Augusta Mar. 11.
Linda Giovanna	Italian	1940	9,985	6,064	Cienfuegos Feb. 25	Liverpool	Anchored Mersey Bar Mar. 13.
Linkmoor [1]	British	1961	8,236	4,583	London Feb. 28	Havana	Passed Deal Feb. 28.
London Confidence	do	1962	21,699	12,976	Havana Feb. 18	Novorossisk	Arrived Mar. 7.
London Pride	do	1950	10,776	6,277	Santiago Mar. 3	Black Sea	In 29:10 N, 41:20 W. Mar. 10.
Lord Gladstone [1]	do	1959	11,299	6,574	Novorissisk Mar. 10	Cuba	Passed Istanbul Mar. 11.
Maria Santa	Greek	1943	7,217	4,467	Piraeus Feb. 15	Havana	Sailed Freeport (Bahamas) Mar. 12.
Mastro-Stelios II	do	1943	7,282	4,674	Novorossisk	do	Arrived Feb. 11.
North Express	do	1957	10,904	6,294	Odessa	Cuba	Off Gibraltar, Mar. 2.
Ole Bratt	Norwegian	1945	5,252	2,948	Hsinkang	Havana	Arrived Feb. 11.
Overseas Explorer	British	1955	16,267	9.480	Santiago Feb. 20	Odessa	Arrived Mar. 10.
Pamit	Greek	1945	3,929	2,296	Rotterdam	Havana	Sailed Antwerp Feb. 20.
Polyclipper	Norwegian	1954	11,737	6,766	Havana Mar. 6	Black Sea	
Priamos	German	1959	3,027	1,609	Arrived New Orleans Mar. 7 from Cuba.		
Shienfoon	British	1944	7,127	4,343	Havana Mar. 10	Caribarien	
Spree	East German	1952	2,736	1,355	Havana Feb. 20	Nicaro	
Stylianos N. Vassopulos	Greek	1943	7,244	4,396	Odessa Feb. 1	Havana	Arrived Mar. 2.
Sirius [1]	do	1955	16,241	9,562	Novorissisk Feb. 28	do	Sailed Augusta Mar. 4.
Thomas Muntzer	East German	1937	5,345	2,961	Hamburg Mar. 1	Cuba	
Tulse Hill	British	1943	7,120	4,249	Novorossisk	Matanzas	Arrived Feb. 1.
Tine [1]	Norwegian	1930	4,750	2,702	Shanghai	Havana	Passed Gibraltar Mar. 7.

[1] Added to blacklist of Maritime Commission on Apr. 10.

RUSSIAN VESSELS

Vessel	Year built	Gross tons	Net tons	From—	For—	Latest report
Admiral Nachimov	1925	15,286	8,988	Odessa	Havana	Arrived Mar. 8.
Alapajevsk	1960	5,411	2,912		do	Arrived Mar. 9.
Almetjevsk	1959	5,411	2,951		do	Arrived Mar. 2.
Angarges	1957	5,494	2,856	Amsterdam Dec. 18	Cuba	Sailed Rotterdam Dec. 22.
Aragvi	1960	4,084	2,133	Havana Mar. 3		
Atkarsk	1960	5,411	2,916	Leningrad	Havana	Arrived Mar. 6.
Baikal	1962	4,800		Havana Feb. 21		
Baku	1943	7,176	4,380	Havana Mar. 9	Puerto Padre	
Baltika	1940	7,494	3,452	Havana Feb. 13	Riga	
Bolshevik Suchanov	1959	6,660	3,666	Odessa	Santiago	Arrived Mar. 9.
Bratsk	1957	5,518	2,952	Havana Mar. 2	do	Arrived Mar. 10.
Bucharest		21,255	11,676	Havana Feb. 28	Black Sea	
Cherniakhovsk	1961	5,382	2,889	Turku	Havana	Arrived Mar. 6.
Chernovski	1955	8,229	3,942	Havana Feb. 16	Antilla	
Dekabrist	1943	7,175	4,380	Guantanamo Bay Feb. 1		

Ships trading with Cuba—Continued

RUSSIAN VESSELS—Continued

[Partial list positions based on Lloyd's Shipping Index of Mar. 14, 1963]

Vessel	Year built	Gross tons	Net tons	From—	For—	Latest report
Deputat Lutski	1959	9,935	5,420	Cienfuegos Feb. 5	Odessa	Passed Istanbul Mar. 6.
Dobrolubov	1955	3,046	1,294	Havana Feb. 5		
Druzhba	1960	25,719	16,568	Havana Mar. 10	Black Sea	
Gogol	1955	3,050	1,289	Havana Jan. 10		
Ivanovo	1956	8,229	3,942	Havana Mar. 6	Black Sea	
Izhevsk	1958	5,513	2,951	Havana Feb. 11	Antilla	
Karachajevo Cherkessija				Santiago Mar. 4	Matanzas	
Kasimov	1962	9,250	5,500	Tunas de Zaza	Cienfuegos	Arrived Mar. 1.
Kimovsk	1962	9,250	5,500	Cuba	Rotterdam	Arrived Mar. 8.
Kirovsk	1957	5,518	2,952		Santiago	Arrived Mar. 8.
Kislovovsk	1959	5,419	2,946	Havana Mar. 10	Antilla	
Komiles	1960	4,639	2,349	Santiago Feb. 16	Manzanillo	
Kovrov	1962	9,250	5,163	Santiago Feb. 14	Cienfuegos	Arrived Feb. 16.
Krasnograd	1961	9,000	5,156	Havana Dec. 3		Passed Elsinore Dec. 19.
Labinsk	1960	9,820	5,261	Odessa	Havana	Sailed Gibraltar Jan. 10.
Lebedin	1962	22,226	15,360	Black Sea	do	Sailed Gibraltar Mar. 7.
Leninsky Komsomol	1959	12,016	6,718	Havana Feb. 2	Nuevitas	
Lenkoran	1962	23,159	14,575	Havana Feb. 18	Odessa	Arrived, Mar. 6.
Ljgov	1961	5,382	2,889		Havana	Arrived Feb. 20.
Maria Ulyanova	1960	4,720	2,061		do	Arrived Mar. 11.
Mikkail Kalinin	1958	4,722	2,061	Havana Mar. 3	Riga	
Nemirovich Danchenko	1957	3,385	1,577		Havana	Arrived Feb. 28.
Nikolaevsk	1962	4,870	2,060	Havana Nov. 5		Passed Elsinore Nov. 18.
Okkotsk	1962	11,106	6,337	Novorossisk	Cienfuegos	Arrived Feb. 5.
Praga	1961	21,255	11,676	Havana Feb. 28	Black Sea	
Pskov	1943	7,176	4,235	Novorossisk	Havana	Arrived Feb. 7.
Rionges	1957	5,494	2,856	Havana Feb. 13	Antilla	
Slavsk	1962	9,344	4,945	Rotterdam Feb. 18	Cuba	
Slutsk	1963	3,170	1,225	Santiago Feb. 20	Santiago	
Sovetsk	1962	9,344	4.945	Havana Feb. 16	Puerto Padre	
Sretensk	1959	5,419	2,946	Rostock	Havana	Arrived Feb. 20.
Stanislovsky	1956	3,385	2,577	Leningrad	do	Feb. 27.
Stepan Razin	1943	7,176	4,235	Havana Mar. 3	Carderas	
Sverdlovsk				Havana Nov. 24		
Tsimly Anskges	1957	5,494	2,856	Havana Jan. 15	Puerto Padre	
Tukum	1962	3,128	1.553	Halifax Mar. 10	Havana	
Urjupinsk	1959	5,628	2,744	Odessa	do	Arrived Mar. 6.
Vilnus	1939	4,956	2,601	Leningrad	Santiago	Arrived Feb. 16.
Vladimir		8,229	3,942	Matanzas	Odessa	
Volgograd	1944	7,216	4,382	Havana Jan. 12	Vladivostok	

COMMUNIST DOMINATION OF ESTONIA, LATVIA, AND LITHUANIA

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, Americans who contemplate the present status of the once proud nations of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, cannot avoid a deep sense of regret and of sympathy for the injustices suffered by the citizens of these nations who must now live under Communist domination.

I rise today to pay my respects to the determination of these great peoples, and of their relatives here in the United States, in their efforts to regain the freedom and independence of their native lands.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD, at this point, a noble resolution, recently framed by the sons and daughters of these countries who now make significant contributions to American society in Maryland, but are not unmindful of the needs of their relatives back home.

My concern, and the concern of all Americans for these people, has led me to forward copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and our permanent Ambassador to the United Nations.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the greatness of the United States is in large part attributable to its having been able, through democratic process, to achieve a national unity and freedom of its people, even though they stem from the most diverse of racial, religious, and ethnic backgrounds; and

Whereas this national unification of the free society has led the people of the United States to possess a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of peoples everywhere; and

Whereas so many countries under colonial domination have been or are being given the opportunity to establish their own independent states, the Baltic Nations having a great historical past and having enjoyed the blessings of freedom for centuries are now subjugated to the most brutal colonial oppression; and

Whereas the Communist regime did not come to power in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by legal or democratic process; and

Whereas the Soviet Union took over Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by force of arms; and

Whereas Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians desire, fight, and die for national independence and freedom; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America maintains diplomatic relations with the Governments of the Baltic Nations of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia and consistently has refused to recognize their seizure and forced incorporation into the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics; and

Whereas no just peace and security can be achieved in the world while these and other nations remain enslaved: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America request the President of the United States to bring up the Baltic States question before the United Nations and ask that the United Nations request the Soviets (a) to withdraw all Soviet troops, agents, and controls from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; (b) to return all Baltic deportees from Siberia, prisons and and slave camps in the Soviet Union; and be it further

Resolved, That the United Nations conduct free elections in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia under its supervision.

BUSINESS EDUCATION NEEDS THE GI BILL NOW

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee, I was deeply impressed by testimony recently presented before this committee in favor of the cold war GI bill, by Robert W. Sneden, of Grand Rapids, Mich.

Mr. Sneden is president of the Davenport Institute, a junior college of business, and is president-elect of the United Business Schools Association.

In this dual capacity, Mr. Sneden is very much aware of the importance of setting up a GI bill for education aid to veterans.

His testimony is a strong defense of educational programs for veterans, and also emphasizes the role business schools and colleges of the Nation would perform if this cold war GI bill were enacted.

Many times in arguing for passage of this GI bill, which I have introduced and reintroduced in three successive sessions of Congress, I have pointed out that veterans will more than repay the Government for their educational aid through increased earnings and payment of higher income taxes.

But this matter of self-financing is not by any means the major point in favor of enactment of a GI bill. In presenting his thoughtful and well-documented testimony, Mr. Sneden also discusses the inequity of present educational opportunities for veterans, the need for raising the level of education and skills of our work force, the advantage of making military enlistment more attractive, the need to relieve labor markets of non-training and semitrained applicants, and the importance of giving these veterans an opportunity to become more valuable to the society in which they live. I urge every Senator to read the answering arguments to opponents of the bill which is summarized in fine, irrefutable arguments. The 10-point conclusion should reach the seat of knowledge of every American.

I ask unanimous consent that this fine statement from one of the Nation's leading authorities on education be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ON S. 5 BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS OF THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE, U.S. SENATE, BY ROBERT W. SNEDEN, PRESIDENT, DAVENPORT INSTITUTE, GRAND RAPIDS, MICH.

My name is Robert W. Sneden. I am president of the Davenport Institute, a junior college of business in Grand Rapids, Mich., which is accredited by the Accrediting Commission for Business Schools.

I appear before you as president-elect of the United Business Schools Association. United Business Schools Association, which I have the honor to represent, is the one educational association speaking for some 500 of the top independent business schools and colleges of the Nation which adhere to its standards and regulations. Its roots go back to 1912, and the present name is the result of the merger in May of 1962 of the National Association and Council of Business Schools, of which I am a past president, and the American Association of Business Schools. Its companion organization, The Accrediting Commission for Business Schools, has been recognized by the U.S. Office of Education as a "nationally recognized accrediting agency" under the Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952.

I have been associated for the past 17 years with the field of business education and have served on the board of directors of the National Business Teachers Association.

For the most part the schools which I represent are well established educational institutions which were founded from 25 to more than 50 years ago. Today there are more than 100,000 teachers employed in the various independent business schools and colleges, which have assets running well over a billion dollars. The independent business schools and colleges, in some cases being operated as private enterprises and in other cases as nonprofit institutions, currently enroll more than 500,000 students.

We feel that our schools are making a distinct contribution by serving the youth of America and providing trained personnel for commerce, industry, government, and national defense. The participation of our schools in the management counseling program of the Small Business Administration was commented upon in Report No. 2270 of the 87th Congress, 2d session, wherein the Senate Select Committee on Small Business noted that "* * * privately operated, non-tax-supported colleges and schools of business have a place within the federally sponsored management counseling program."

STATEMENT OF POSITION

It is a pleasure to appear before you today and express our support for the continuation of a program of veterans education along the lines of the successful Korean GI bill. The position of the United Business Schools Association is the result of association committee analysis, consideration by our board of directors and discussion at past conventions. This, of course, refers not only to S. 5 but also to S. 349 of the 87th Congress and similar measures introduced in the 86th Congress.

IMPORTANT GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

In the development of the position of the United Business Schools Association on S. 5, we believe that the following general considerations are entitled to great weight as they are considered by your committee:

1. Conditions today are such that thousands of young men are required by the compulsory draft law to serve on active duty in the Armed Forces for a specific period of time. If there should be any question in the mind as to safety and lack of risk in the military service today, we need only to mention Vietnam, Berlin, Congo, Formosa, Korea, Greenland, and numerous satellite areas and other hot spots in the world. These serve as reminders that we must maintain a constant state of preparedness and must continue to expose our servicemen to the hazards of potentially explosive military incidents. Following this active duty, these young people are further compelled to perform additional services in the Active Reserve and, later, the Standby Reserve. Their total obligation, once entered upon active duty, generally extends for 6 years.

If these cold war conditions were not present, the majority of these men would not be entering military service but would be pursuing their own individual goals in civilian life. At the present time our Federal Government does not offer these young people any help in coping with the problems created for them by the cold war and their compulsory military service. They need the help of this legislation to catch up with those contemporaries who were not asked to serve in the Armed Forces.

2. Educational assistance to these young people is only fair based upon the student deferment policy. Many students were deferred due to the Government's recognition of the importance of education and it is inconsistent to deny educational benefits to those who have already served. If education is considered important enough to warrant deferment, by the same token, it is of comparable importance to justify postservice educational assistance.

It is also true that the student deferment policy placed college education in a highly preferred status. Persons who wish to pursue trade or other postsecondary education are not generally eligible for student deferment under Selective Service regulations. Students attending our private business schools or colleges are not eligible for deferment, as a general rule, under these regulations. Our goals as a nation require that our young people obtain as much advance training as possible, college or otherwise, and therefore educational assistance is desirable.

3. The relatively low educational attainment of veterans affected by this bill shows clearly the need for this legislation. A Veterans' Administration survey dated May 29, 1959, states:

"At the time of their separation from the Armed Forces, 6 percent had not completed elementary school; 10 percent had completed elementary school but had had no further schooling; 29 percent had had some high school education but had not graduated; 35 percent had graduated from high school but had had no college training; 8 percent had completed 1, 2, or 3 years of college work; and 12 percent had completed 4 or more years of college."

The final report of the Bradley Commission concluded that the interruption of education of post-Korean veterans would be their main handicap. They stated:

"The Commission recognized that the main handicap which may be incurred by the peacetime ex-serviceman, other than service-connected disabilities elsewhere discussed is the effect that a period of 2 year's mandatory service at an early age may have upon education. At the age of entrance into military service, schooling is the occupation of many, and military service will delay some young men from advancing their formal education and will perhaps cause some to drop their plans forever because marriage and other pursuits may interfere with their return to school or college."

4. An educational assistance bill will provide America with professional, technical and vocational skills that otherwise might be irreplacably lost. Our present critical shortages in certain essential occupations would be even more catastrophic except for the passage of the previous GI bills.

5. We have already recognized GI bills in the past; namely, in the World War II GI bill and the Korean GI bill, and the need to furnish our servicemen with opportunities to overcome in part the years lost from civilian life and to establish themselves in productive and useful occupations. In a press release issued on June 22, 1954, the 10th anniversary of the World War II bill, the Veterans' Administration stated:

"Through the GI bill, the World War II veterans have become the best educated group of people in the history of the United States.

"Because of their training they have raised their income level to the point where they now are paying an extra billion dollars a year in income taxes to Uncle Sam. At this rate, GI bill trained veterans alone will pay off the entire $15 billion cost of the GI education and training program within the next 15 years."

This means that the educational assistance given to the young servicemen will be self-liquidating. The Federal Government will be paid back the cost of the education through increased taxes on higher earnings resulting from the students' education. Therefore, ultimately the investment the Government makes in educational assistance will be completely repaid.

6. Actual hostilities in Korea ceased on July 27, 1953. The Korean conflict, for the purposes of educational assistance, was officially terminated by Presidential declaration of January 31, 1955. This arbitrary date cut off many men who are entitled to these educational benefits equally with those who were in service prior to January 31, 1955. It would not be fair to exclude these men from educational benefits as a result of this arbitrary cutoff date.

This is only a brief summary of some of the major considerations which we feel are important to your committee. There are undoubtedly many other considerations which we have overlooked but it is apparent that there is a need for this legislation now.

ANSWER TO ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION TO EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS FOR COLD WAR GI'S

Opposition to proposals for restablishing educational benefits seems to fall within seven major categories:

First, there are those who oppose this legislation because of cost. This group, not yet having fully analyzed the statistics published by the Veterans' Administration, look at the estimated $500 million annual cost of these benefits. And yet, data from the Veterans' Administration shows conclusively that veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict, as a result of educational benefits, have increased their income levels so that they now pay, in additional income taxes, over a billion dollars annually into the Treasury. At this rate the entire cost of GI benefits will be paid, by those who receive them, within the next few years. Thus, the initial cost, over a few short years, will be more than repaid into the Treasury.

In this connection we must note that in its first 4 years of operation, the Korean GI bill was instrumental in attracting approximately 155,000 veterans into scientific and engineering careers, which in terms of our national manpower needs alone would make the program worthwhile.

A second group of individuals opposes this legislation because of the small number who are actually subjected to induction. This group fails to recognize that many individuals, facing induction, voluntarily enlist. Others, offered choice assignments, volunteer for service. For this reason the actual number entering military service because of the draft is unknown. This group fails to consider the entire problem. They refuse to face up to our national obligation—an obligation to every individual—not merely an obligation to groups large enough to exert political pressure.

A third group of individuals opposes this legislation because they feel that the compulsory draft law does not disrupt the education plans of many of our young men. This group fails to realize that military service, or the possibility of military service, affect the lives of many young men below the age of 22. The mere existence of the compulsory draft law becomes an important part of each individual's qualifications for employment as he comes to draft age. Employers are unwilling to invest time and money to train men who might have to serve in the Armed Forces. Besides the effect on a young man's employment potential, the draft raises numerous uncertainties which make it impossible to plan ahead. As a result many students are frequently discouraged from immediately entering into advance educational training.

It is not surprising that young men from 17 to 18½ years of age constitute about one-half of all first-time enlistments each year. It can only be assumed that many of these enlisted in the service as a result of the draft law, in order that they may select the service of their choice and serve at a time most convenient for them. Therefore, it is clear that the compulsory draft law does disrupt the educational plans of many of our young men.

A fourth group opposes this legislation on the basis that such benefits will induce trained personnel, personnel who have been in the service for the required 2-year period, to leave the service and accept benefits offered by this legislation. It is true that some individuals fail to reenlist so that they could avail themselves of GI benefits. It was also true that such individuals provided, and still provide, a pool of trained manpower, better trained in some cases because of the higher educational level attained as a result of educational benefits. These individuals are available, if needed, for the security of our country. They may be lost to the military services but only temporarily; such loss may cause concern to the services, they may not be available on a full-time basis; but they are available for the security of this Nation and they can, and will, provide trained manpower if and when needed even though they may be beyond military age.

In this connection we would like to quote from a letter to Senator PAT MCNAMARA, my own Senator of Michigan, from Dr. John A. Hannah, president of Michigan State University, dated April 23, 1959. Dr. Hannah, you will recall, was formerly Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower.

"One of the objections to the GI bill—one which I encountered throughout my service with the Defense Department—was that the GI bill created too great an incentive for those in military service to return to civilian life. I believe that there is some truth in that charge, but I believe that those who make it do not face the facts realistically. The truth is that a great majority of those who enter the military service are not attracted by the military as a career but are simply discharging their duty to our country because it is their duty.

"I can endorse with enthusiasm a program making it possible for our bright young men to finance their higher education in exchange for a contribution to our security through a period of service in our military organization. The Nation would be doubly benefited. We would be assured of a constant flow of ambitious and able young people into the military, and we would be guaranteed a continuing flow of these people back into our colleges and universities."

We accept Dr. Hannah's comments based on his experience with his problem. We believe that this bill would tend to increase voluntary enlistments in the military service. Many bright young men in lower economic brackets would enter the military service if they were shown that the Government intended to help them later on in getting an education. We know from past experience that incentives aid enlistments, and this bill would be a truly appealing incentive.

A fifth group opposes the legislation because it provides benefits not heretofore provided for the peacetime soldier who faces none of the hazards of war. This group points out that such benefits have in the past been reserved for those who served during periods of war. This group maintains that the peacetime inductee can anticipate the draft and plan accordingly. They say such planning was not possible by the wartime GI.

It is true that peacetime draftees do not face the hazards of war. It is also true that of the millions of men who were called into the service during World War II and the Korean conflict only a small number were actually involved in combat. Yet the GI bill did not distinguish between those who served in actual combat and those who also served. The cold war has not yet ended; the tension in many areas of the world is such that fighting could break out again at any time. Men are still being inducted into service and men are still serving in extreme hardship posts under heavy tension. They too serve and deserve the benefits provided by the bills under consideration by this committee.

A sixth group argues that inservice educational programs are already successfully in operation and meet the needs for educating and training personnel. It is true that inservice educational programs today offer a valuable supplement to other avenues of securing education. However, the fields of study are limited and because of the spare time nature of the study, few men actually can secure a substantial amount of academic credit in this way. For example, Air Force testimony indicates that only 800 men per year have obtained college degrees under their program. In any case, full-time civilian education opportunities in practice, as well as in principle, are superior to part-time military educational programs.

Finally, a number of individuals object to this legislation because there is no clear showing of need that educational benefits should be provided for all individuals who have the capability and desire to continue their education. The United Business Schools Association agree and will continue to support any measure which is designed to increase the educational level of our Nation. Such legislation is a must.

But the Congress has not yet enacted legislation broad enough to provide sufficient opportunities for the educational advancement of all our younger citizens. The National Defense Education Act of 1958 was a step in the right direction. We are sure that it will provide opportunities for many of our youth to obtain a higher education but this act does not provide for any persons who wish to pursue business courses, trades, or other postsecondary education.

It is our hope that the National Defense Education Act will be broadened and expanded to include the training of students in every form of education to the very limits of their capabilities. We, therefore feel that the legislation here proposed will not conflict with the objectives of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 but will supplement the provisions of that law. It will encourage individuals to volunteer for service so that they can pay for their education by serving their country. This legislation will clearly and unmistakably serve as a notice to all our youth that their obligation to serve their country is not a one-way proposition—that the Federal Government acknowledges a special obligation for those who serve in the Armed Forces over and above any obligation we might have to those who never perform any duty for their country.

There are many other arguments against this legislation and I am sure you gentlemen have already heard many of them. I will not take any more of your time to point out the invalidity of them. I am sure in your consideration of this bill you will clearly see that its objectives are founded on a careful analysis of the benefits derived by the Nation from the GI bill of rights.

IMPORTANCE OF KEY PROVISIONS OF GI BILL

We wish to comment on certain key provisions of the bill.

1. The educational benefits are particularly valuable since they permit a wide range of choice by the individual veteran among the various educational opportunities that are most likely to be of value to him. These opportunities range from advanced professional and technical study to on-the-job training in applied skills. It is essential that we continue to allow the veteran to make his own choice of vocation.

2. The proposed legislation, in the judgment of nearly all of us in higher education, should provide for the payment of benefits directly to the individual veteran. The veteran then attends the school or college of his choice. The experienced educators across the country are so uniformly in favor of this procedure that I want to endorse strongly a provision for direct payment to the veteran.

We suggest that any bill passed by this committee should include the above-outlined principles.

CONCLUSION

In summary, Mr. Chairman, we see the following benefits in the approval of an educational assistance program to post-Korean veterans:

1. Inequity of educational opportunities for veterans will be corrected

2. The Nation will be able to repay those who sacrificed the most in a way which will be beneficial to both the individual and society.

3. Educational opportunities will result in additional scientists, engineers, technicians, and other professional people thus raising the skilled and technical levels in America, thereby strengthening the defense of our Nation.

4. Opportunities for individuals to make their own choices in education assure an educational balance with the total needs of our society.

5. Those who will benefit under this program will not only aid their society by their increased educational training, but will naturally aid the coffers of the Treasury.

6. Enlistments in the military service will increase too, with greater purpose and planning on the part of volunteers.

7. Skills and ability which otherwise may be lost or not used will be developed at every level of education.

8. Production increases can be expected through increased enrollments in programs of vocational education.

9. Labor markets will be relieved of nontrained and semitrained applicants.

10. In addition to raising the standard of living, preparing our young people for automation by developing their technical, scien-

tific, and educational skills, and reducing the number of unskilled, we are providing for an enlightened and educated citizenry.

Before closing my testimony, I would like to say on behalf of the private business schools of America, that we will rededicate ourselves to do an even better job than we have done in the past in turning out trained personnel who will meet the needs of commerce, industry, Government and national defense.

We also wish to express the appreciation of our group for the privilege of appearing before this committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE CORP.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nominations of incorporators of the Communications Satellite Corp.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nominations, en bloc, of the incorporators of the Communications Satellite Corp.?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is the Senate in executive session?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am about to propound a unanimous-consent request. It has been cleared with the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen], with the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], and the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson], who favor the confirmation of the nominations; and with the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver], the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], and other Senators who oppose the confirmation of the nominations. I believe that at this time we have perhaps touched all bases.

I ask unanimous consent that on the point of order to be made by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], and following the conclusion of a forthcoming quorum call, 40 minutes be allocated to the consideration of the point of order, 20 minutes to be controlled by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], and 20 minutes to be controlled by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse].

The limitation of debate will not become effective until after the conclusion of a live quorum call, at which time the Senator from Oregon will obtain the floor and make his point of order. At that time the limitation of debate will start.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Chair correctly understand that the Senator from Oregon anticipates raising a constitutional question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, may we know the request?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have just made the request that the Senate agree to a limitation of debate following the conclusion of a live quorum call. The Senator from Oregon will then make his point of order, and at that time the limitation of debate will begin.

Mr. JAVITS. There would be a limitation of 40 minutes?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Did the Chair correctly understand the Senator from Montana to say that the Senator from Oregon intends to raise a question as to whether the Senate has the authority under the Constitution to confirm the nominations?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is a constitutional question.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I accept the correction. The Record is now clear.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask that the attachés notify Senators that it will be a live quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 62 Ex.]

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bennett
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Edmondson
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Goldwater
Gore
Gruening
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kefauver
Kennedy
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Mechem
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Bible], the Senator from California [Mr. Engle], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Symington], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before I raise the point of order, in behalf of myself and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson], which I know every Senator expects me to make, I ask for the yeas and nays on the point of order.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, speaking now under the unanimous-consent agreement, I rise to make the point of order that the Senate is without constitutional authority to advise and consent to the nominations of private incorporators of a private business enterprise, since the nominees whose nominations are before the Senate are private incorporators of a private business enterprise. Their nominations are not properly or constitutionally before the Senate at this time, nor can they be at any other time because, in the opinion of the Senator from Oregon, article II, section 2, of the Constitution is not applicable to the present situation.

Senators will find on their desks mimeographed copies of the main speech that I made last night. All of it is in the Congressional Record, and also in the Record are the ad libbed remarks I made in addition. I thought it would be helpful if I place copies of my manuscript speech before Senators today.

Senators will also find on their desks a summary of my position on the constitutional argument in a blue-backed memorandum. That argument reads as follows:

ARGUMENT

1. The Communications Satellite Corp. is a private business enterprise and its incorporators and directors are not officials of the U.S. Government within the meaning of article II, section 2 of the Constitution.

2. The Senate does not have the authority under the Constitution to confirm the appointment, election, hiring, or other selection of incorporators or directors of a private business enterprise.

A. Only those powers enumerated in the Constitution are conferred on the Legislature.

B. For the Senate to advise and consent to the nomination of an incorporator of a private business is not necessary and proper within the meaning of the Constitution.

C. Under established principles of statutory construction, the Constitution is presumed to have been intended to exclude that which it does not include.

D. Constitutional history makes clear the Constitution's intent to limit advising and consenting by the Senate to treaties and nominations of officers of the United States.

3. It follows that the confirmation by the Senate of the incorporators and directors of the Communications Satellite Corp. is either an unconstitutional enlargement of the constitutionally prescribed powers of the Senate or a superfluous act which does not in any way affect the right of the incorporators to take office.

4. By well-established rules of statutory construction, an act of Congress will not be construed to be without effect.

5. Conclusion: It follows that the confirmation by the Senate is not without effect; that under the Communications Satellite Act the incorporators cannot take office without the advice and consent of the Senate; and, therefore, this section of the Communications Satellite Act extends the authority of the Senate beyond its constitutionally enumerated limits and is unconstitutional.

Mr. President, I say to my colleagues that what we are being asked to do today is unconstitutional. The Constitution calls upon the Senate to confirm nominations of officers of the United

States; but there is not one shred of evidence that these 14 incorporators of the Space Communications Corp. are to be, or were intended to be, officers of the United States. The testimony of the incorporators and the opinions of the Justice Department are entirely to the contrary. The incorporators are responsible only to the corporation.

The chief argument advanced in support of Senate confirmation has been the precedent of the National Bank Charter of 1816. We are being told that because certain directors of that infamous institution were also confirmed by the Senate, we should confirm the incorporators of the satellite corporation.

The national bank precedent is no precedent for wise, sound, or foresighted Federal policy. The operation and fate of that institution were all bad. It was a raid upon the American public for private profit, just as I believe this corporation to be. To have the Senate confirm directors having no responsibility whatever to the public was, in my opinion, unconstitutional then, and is unconstitutional now. I do not say that either the bank or this corporation is unconstitutional; but I do say that the present procedure is, unless and until the 1962 act is amended to give these incorporators public responsibilities and to make them accountable to the President and the Senate.

Last night I read into the Record the famous historic veto message of the incomparable President Jackson when he vetoed an attempt on the part of the Congress to renew the charter of the National Bank. I would be perfectly willing to rest my case on Jackson's veto. What was dealt with then was an act so infamous that it split the Senate for years and almost caused a political revolution in our country.

Finally, President Jackson vetoed a proposal to renew the charter.

In my judgment, when the issue which we are now discussing reaches the U.S. Supreme Court—and I shall do all I can within my ability to bring it eventually to the U.S. Supreme Court—there is no question in my mind as to what the decision of that Court will be; namely, that under article II, section 2, of the Constitution, the Senate cannot constitutionally confirm the nominations.

Therefore I do not believe the Senate should be asked to participate in an empty gesture. The record of the Senate should be clean in regard to abiding by the limits of article II, section 2.

The nominees are not officers of the United States. Therefore, in my judgment, the action of the Senate in confirming the nominations in effect would be unconstitutional.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to ask the status of the time. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania, but I believe that the opposition ought to consume a little time now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon had 20 minutes. He has consumed 6 minutes. Therefore he has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield to me so that I may have a procedural discussion?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I desire that the time I have used be taken from the time available under the unanimous-consent agreement. I wish to make that clear. But I have raised a point of order. I believe there should be a ruling on the point of order, unless some Senator asks the Chair to withhold his ruling until Senators can discuss the question. Senators could proceed with the discussion, with the understanding that the time I have already used be taken from the time available under the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. PASTORE. That is satisfactory to the Senator from Rhode Island.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon has raised a constitutional question.

Mr. MORSE. On behalf of myself and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson].

The VICE PRESIDENT. A constitutional question has been explicitly raised. A constitutional question having been raised, uniform Senate precedents require that the Presiding Officer submit the question to the Senate for decision. Therefore, the question is as follows: Is consideration of the nominations by the Senate in accordance with the Constitution?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New York.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Rhode Island yields 3 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I have reviewed the arguments of the distinguished Senator from Oregon, who is well known as an able lawyer. The first point of his argument, copies of which he has been kind enough to supply us, is that the Communications Satellite Corp. is a private business enterprise, and that therefore the incorporators are not officials of the U.S. Government.

With that point I agree. They are not.

The second point of the argument of the Senator from Oregon is that the Senate does not have the authority under the Constitution to confirm the appointment of directors of a private business enterprise.

The Senate would not have had that authority had it not been provided in the legislation which was enacted.

In the third point of his argument the Senator from Oregon states that confirmation by the Senate of the nominations of the incorporators and directors of the Communications Satellite Corp.——

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. KEATING. I shall be glad to yield if I may have sufficient time to do so. I have been given 3 minutes. I have been asked to make the constitutional argument.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield a minute to the Senator from Tennessee so that he may ask a question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the Senator from Oregon yielding 1 minute to the Senator from Tennessee for the purpose of his making an inquiry? The Chair hears none. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, if the junior Senator from Tennessee correctly understood the junior Senator from New York to say that the Senate would not have the authority to confirm the pending nominations unless a statute had been passed, the junior Senator from Tennessee would inquire of the distinguished Senator, "How does an act of Congress change section 2 of article II of the Constitution?"

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, an act of Congress obviously cannot change the Constitution. However, those of us who seek confirmation of the nominations have been charged with doing an unconstitutional act. It is said that this is an unconstitutional process. In my judgment, it is nothing of the kind. It is a nonconstitutional process.

Confirmation of the nominations by the Senate was provided for in the statute which was enacted. The time to raise the point being raised was when the proposed statute was under consideration. The Congress has passed the statute. It is a law. The bill was signed by the President. There is no constitutional infirmity or impediment with respect to the confirmation by the Senate of the nominations of persons to serve as incorporators, in the way we are providing.

The argument made by the distinguished Senator from Oregon, it is respectfully submitted, is a nonsequitur. The mere fact that these men are not officials of the Government and that we are not proceeding under the terms of the Constitution but are proceeding under the terms of a law which Congress has enacted, would not, in my judgment, interfere with the process which we are undertaking.

We cannot do something which is unconstitutional; and we are not doing anything unconstitutional. There is no alternative which I can see to acting upon the qualifications of the nominees, as has been provided in the statute, unless we are to say, "We are going to ignore the statute. We have enacted a law, but we are going to pay no attention to it." I feel that we should not do that.

Mr. President, it should be clear by now that I share in the well-considered opinion of the Attorney General that the Presidentially nominated incorporators of this organization are not "officers of the United States" within the meaning of article II, section 2, clause 2, of the Constitution. However one may wish to characterize the new Communications Satellite Corp.—whether you want to call it public or private, quasi-public, semi-public, or some other hyphenated or hybrid kind of animal—the fact remains that under section 301 of the Communications Satellite Act, the organic act of the corporation, the source of its very existence, the new enterprise has been declared by the Congress to be a "corporation for profit which will not be an agency or establishment of the U.S. Government." In other words, it is a nongovernmental agency established, however, by act of Congress.

Whatever possible alternative form of agency might have been devised by the Congress to meet the purposes for which the Satellite Act was passed, the fact remains that the statute provides that the incorporators and the directors shall be confirmed by this body. In creating this corporation the Congress was acting pursuant to its constitutional mandate to regulate interstate and foreign commerce and communications. Without doubt the Congress had the power to direct the manner of appointment of incorporators and directors. The time to object to the chosen method and offer alternatives was at the time of the passage of the authorizing legislation, not now when we are engaged in implementing that law.

It appears to me that those opposed to confirmation are drawing a negative inference from the language of article II that in my judgment is wholly unwarranted. Just because with respect to certain classes of governmental officers article II sets out a specific method of appointment, this does not to my mind rule out the same method of appointment for persons or classes of persons not mentioned in article II.

Here we have a group of incorporators who do not fall within the category of "officers of the United States" within the meaning of article II, as the Attorney General holds, and I agree with him. Nevertheless, the Congress, in the very act creating the corporation, in its wisdom chose a method of appointment and confirmation for this group which follows the method provided in article II for other situations.

Perhaps, the words "advise and consent," which evoke the rubric of the constitutional provisions, were not wisely chosen; perhaps some other semantic formula could have been struck. Be that as it may, the Satellite Communications Act, which clearly lay within the constitutional domain of the Congress to enact, with all "necessary and proper" means available to the Congress to achieve its desired ends, set up a process of senatorial confirmation for these incorporators. This is not an unconstitutional process. It is a nonconstitutional process. It is wholly statutory. And nothing in article II or elsewhere in the Constitution has convinced me that the statutory plan hit upon by the Satellite Communications Act is prohibited to us.

Mr. President, we cannot sit here debating the constitutionality of an act of Congress passed last year, signed by the President, and now set into actual motion. If constitutional doubts existed as to any of the act's provisions, last year was the time for those who entertained such doubts to come forward and seek to persuade us to reject the measure. This was in fact done, but without success.

Now we are passing on the sole question whether to advise and consent to the nominations we expressly provided for in last year's act. We are following our own prescription contained in the act. Whether the prescription be wise or unwise—and let the people of the United States decide that for themselves—it is water over the dam.

Mr. President, I see no alternative except to act on the qualifications of the nominees before us as required by the Communications Satellite Act. Let us not drift into what is now, it seems to me, a superfluous matter which should have been, and in my judgement, was, settled once and for all when the Congress passed the act in the first place.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. MORSE. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, yesterday I engaged in a colloquy with the very able senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore] about the constitutionality of the section under consideration requiring Senate confirmation of these nominations. I stated my view, and my reasons for thinking that the provision was unconstitutional.

My friend from Rhode Island stated that there was an opinion of the Attorney General to the effect that this section of the act was constitutional, and that he had put it in the Record. The Senator from Rhode Island placed in the Record a "Memorandum Re Constitutionality of Senate Confirmation of Persons Nominated by the President as Incorporators and Directors of the Communications Satellite Corp." It appears beginning at page 6977. My colloquy with the Senator from Rhode Island appears at page 7002.

I have been furnished by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver] with a copy of the communication from the Department of Justice, from which it appears that this was not an opinion of the Attorney General at all, but a memorandum forwarded to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver] by Norbert A. Schlei, Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legal Counsel. He states in his covering letter that in the opinion of the Office of Legal Counsel the constitutional objection raised by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore] is without substance. To my mind, the memorandum which he encloses is completely unconvincing, and I think it would be unconvincing to any constitutional lawyer who made an earnest effort to determine whether this is a sound brief or not.

I make this point only in order that the Record may be clear. I adhere to my view expressed on the floor yesterday that this section of the Communications Satellite Act is unconstitutional and void.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, yesterday when I rose to say a word in favor of the nominees who are to be the incorporators of the Communications Satellite Corp., I was challenged on legal grounds. Overnight I have taken considerable pains to check my own views with respect to the legal questions involved.

I have come to the conclusion that the Senate has an absolute right to do what it is about to do, that is, to confirm these nominations. I shall vote "yea." If I did not vote "yea," I would have to favor going back to the very early days of the Constitution and agree that what is being argued for might very well involve us in setting back for decades the constitutional interpretations upon which we proceed in many directions.

These nominees are not officers of the United States. A straw man is being erected by that line of argument only for the purpose of knocking him down. The Attorney General says that the nominees are not officers of the United States. The law makes it clear that they are not officers of the United States. This is to be a private corporation organized for profit.

Ever since the case of McCulloch against Maryland, the Congress has been organizing corporations, some of them private in character. The appendix of a report of the Committee on the Judiciary, issued as long ago as 1947, in the 80th Congress, 1st session, pursuant to Senate Resolution 30, stated that there were up to that time 288 such charter statutes that Congress had enacted. Often, the report stated, incorporators were listed in the congressional charters, so that both Houses, in effect, advised and consented to their nominations.

These cases represent the utilization by the Congress of the "necessary and proper" clause of the Constitution in order to implement the interstate and foreign commerce power of the Congress.

So I do not base my argument at all upon the contention that these men are officers of the United States. Of course, they are not, and the Constitution does not say that only officers of the United States may be confirmed by the Senate; hence the Senate may so act if the authorizing legislation is otherwise constitutional.

I base my argument on the fact that Congress has a right to provide in a statute that the Senate shall confirm nominations, on the ground that Congress may make reasonable provisions in any statute which it passes to charter a private corporation giving itself residual control over that corporation.

I see no difference whatever between what we have done in this instance and numerous acts which have been passed in recent years. One was the Reorganization Act, in which the Congress reserved to itself a veto power over a Presidential reorganization plan.

Another example could be cited from any one of the surplus property disposal statutes in which we have asked Government agencies to report back to us the disposition of a piece of property. If we do not like what the Government agency is doing about that particular piece of property, we can ask the Congress to try to stop it.

Another example is the Trade Adjustment Act, which Congress passed, in which we reserved to ourselves certain authority—in that case over tariff schedules. We said we did not need the concurrence of the Executive, if we wished to undo what he did.

Every one of us has not only voted for but also has advocated the power of the Congress, by concurrent resolution, to terminate certain sections of law, like the Foreign Aid Acts, as an example, without a Presidential signature.

The question we must ask ourselves is whether it violates the Constitution for the Congress to reserve to the Senate this authority.

We must remember, Mr. President, that we are not exercising an authority to confirm officers of the United States, an authority specifically derived from article II of the Constitution. We are exercising an authority derived from a law, passed by the Congress under its interstate and foreign commerce power, reserving this particular confirmation power to the Senate. The question is not whether that particular power is violative of article II of the Constitution, but whether the Congress had the right under its general legislative authority under the Constitution to reserve that particular authority to one of its bodies, to wit, the Senate of the United States. In my judgment, it had that power, and I believe that we have followed such a practice and many other permutations of it right along.

Secondly, it seems to me that there are highly relevant precedents. I think the Union Pacific charter precedent is somewhat relevant. I think the precedent of the Second United States Bank is extremely relevant. Though it is a very old precedent, it is nonetheless very relevant. To me the most relevant of any of the precedents are the reservations of power which we have kept to ourselves without necessitating the concurrence of the Executive, time and again, in statutes which all of us have advocated.

For me, I would consider it very dangerous to challenge, give away, or question such authority on our part. I think it is an extremely valuable way in which we can deal with certain subjects without violating the Constitution and at the same time conform the constitutional authority to the needs of our time.

So I have come to the conclusion that this is not an issue of questioning the authority of the Senate, under the Constitution, to advise and consent to the appointment of officers of the United States. It is, rather, the exercise by one of the bodies of the Congress, by way of authority given to this body by the whole Congress in a statute which is justified by the interstate and foreign commerce clause and by the "necessary and proper" clause.

I have cited the precedents and rationale which I believe justify the position which the Senate should take.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I desire to yield myself 2 minutes to reply to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, does the Senator wish me to yield him time?

Mr. MORSE. No. I wish to reply to what the Senator has said.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from Oregon, on his own time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to say most respectfully that the Senator from New York has completely and totally missed the issue before the Senate. The "necessary and proper" clause of the Constitution is not before the Senate at all. All of us agree with what the Senator has said with respect to the "necessary and proper" clause. Under the Constitution the Senate has power to do a great many things, but under article II, section 2, it can confirm, by advice and consent, only those nominations of the President who are named to be public officers. It cannot by statute enacted under the necessary and proper clause create new powers for itself nor alter its existing ones. That is the constitutional issue involved.

The Senator from New York spoke about the Union Pacific Case. In that case, the members of the board of directors who were appointed by the President were public officers. They were appointed by the President to perform public functions but no Senate confirmation of them was provided for in the law. The officers in the Satellite Corporation clearly are not public officers in any respect but the law does call for Senate confirmation. It is this requirement of the law which I contend is clearly unconstitutional.

With regard to the bank case, if Senators will read the debate of that time, the Senate thought they were to be public officers. It was Nicholas Biddle, the most powerful political boss of the time, who wrote the letter I put in the RECORD yesterday, saying they did not have public functions but their status was purely private. The issue of confirmation was never raised at any time in the Senate debate in the second bank case controversy.

The fact that it was unconstitutional then does not make this act of confirmation we are asked to perform today constitutional. It is the old story that two wrongs cannot make a right. In my judgment, someone should have raised the constitutional question in the debates on the Second Bank Act.

Because the operative facts are so different there is no question that the Union Pacific case has no relevancy to the case before us.

My good friend from New York is talking really about the "proper and necessary" clause, and not about article II, section 2.

There is a very narrow but important constitutional question that I am raising, along with the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON]. I am joined in this question by the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and other Senators. The question is, Are we being asked to confirm the nominations in this case under article II, section 2 of the Constitution? I say we are. Such an act of confirmation would be an unconstitutional act by the Senate because these nominees are to fill private, not public, offices.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am very pleased that the Senator from Oregon took the time to explain his position. I can understand why the Senator from Oregon would wish us to join issue with him upon that article and section of the Constitution on which he is absolutely right and on which there is no contention that he is wrong. But we cannot and should not do it, because those of us who are going to vote for the nominations rely upon a part of the Constitution which sustains our point of view.

So I refuse to accept the issue which the Senator from Oregon has set out here as the challenge. It is not the issue. If this action can be justified under another section of the Constitution, then it deserves such action. We press that point and say we are fully justified under another section of the Constitution, and the Senate is only doing its duty if it advises and consents to the nominations.

I yield back my time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I spoke at length on this subject yesterday and my remarks are in the RECORD. I think the Senator from Oregon has stated our position correctly. These men are not officers of the United States; they are directors of a purely private corporation—nothing more, nothing less. I pointed out that fact in the debates last August. At that time we tried to do something that would make the directors officers of the United States, but the Senate voted us down.

The question here is, shall the Senate be used to give governmental stature to officers of a purely private corporation, and shall we be called upon to abuse the authority we have been given? The drafters of the Constitution very specifically set forth the persons who should be appointed with the advice and consent of the Senate. They are ambassadors, ministers, consuls, judges of the Supreme Court, and other officers.

If the drafters of the Constitution had intended that the Senate have authority to advise and consent on the appointment of directors of General Motors or A.T. & T.—which is similar to what we are doing here—they would not have specifically enumerated the persons on whom the Senate can give its advice and consent. So we are doing something improper. This is a constitutional nullity. We are setting a precedent that is going to haunt us in years to come.

The implications of what we do here should be considered. The public is going to consider that these are quasi-public officers. When stock is issued, they are going to assume the Senate gave approval. When the directors are dealing with other countries, those countries are going to assume that they are quasi-public officials, because we approve their appointment. When the directors get into other kinds of business, as they have said they may, they are going to be in a position that will give them an advantage over officers and directors of other corporations.

The **VICE PRESIDENT**. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. **KEFAUVER**. I ask for 1 more minute.

Mr. **MORSE**. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. **KEFAUVER**. I have no objection to any of the persons who have been named. The ones I know personally are very fine men. But this action by the Senate will put them in a bad position. What is going to happen when they would like to reduce rates in order to get service to an underdeveloped country, but when such action would not be in the pecuniary interest of the corporation? They will have to act in the interest of the corporation. This is true for the presidentially appointed directors as well as the privately selected directors. I say the Senate should not be called upon to do something for which it has no authority under the Constitution. The Senate has a duty, under the Constitution, not to confirm these incorporators and directors.

Mr. **MORSE**. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON].

The **VICE PRESIDENT**. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. **NELSON**. Mr. President, I joined with the senior Senator from Oregon in raising the constitutional question. I think the constitutional question is soundly based. It has been stated well by the Senator from Oregon, and I shall not repeat his argument here.

I wish to raise another question which was raised briefly yesterday. It is a question which, to my knowledge, has not been answered yet on this floor. We have argued the question of whether or not the Senate has power to confirm. We have argued the question of whether the Senate has the constitutional right to confirm. But I have heard no argument on whether it is the Senate's proper business to concern itself with this question.

I raise this question, which is not a legal question at all. When I go back to my State of Wisconsin, and my people see that we have confirmed this board of directors, they will assume that this involves public business. They know that we do not confirm the board of directors of the A.T. & T. or any other public utility—and that is what this is.

This corporation will be selling stock to the public.

The people will expect, based upon our actions here, participation of the Federal Government, and, in anticipation of millions of dollars being given to it by the Federal Government, they will conclude that this is a good investment and will put in some of their own dollars.

It ought to be made clear that there is no participation by the Federal Government. Or is there participation by the Government of the United States? It has not been made clear on the floor what part, if any, of the $51 million that will go to NASA is going to be given to this corporation for purposes of research, or what part of the research will go for the benefit of the corporation. There has been no line drawn as to where the Federal Government's research starts and stops and where the private corporation's research starts and stops. Perhaps such a line cannot be drawn. There is bound to be some duplication.

By our act here we are saying to our constituents in every State of the Union that there is some cloak of public responsibility imposed upon the incorporators of this private corporation. Our people back home will naturally assume that there is some Federal financial backing to this private corporation. Relying upon that assumption, they may well be induced to invest in this corporation.

My thought is that we should not proceed in this way at all. The fact is I do not believe that anyone wanted Senate participation in this matter. I do not believe the administration wanted it in the first place. It is my understanding that the administration wanted the President to make the appointments, period. I understand that it was some Members of the Senate who insisted upon the confirmation process.

The remedy at this time is to refer these nominations back to the committee, and then we should amend the act by providing that the President of the United States shall make appointments, and leave out confirmation by the Senate.

I do not want it to appear to my constituents that by my vote I have somehow implied there is any more public responsibility imposed on this corporation than on any other public utility.

Mr. **PASTORE**. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The **VICE PRESIDENT**. The Senator from Rhode Island has 9 minutes remaining. The Senator from Oregon has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. **PASTORE**. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

I believe this afternoon we are arguing ourselves into a paper bag. First, this corporation would never have existed if Congress had not enacted the law which was signed by the President last August.

On October 15, 1962, the President, on the recommendation of Senator Kerr of Oklahoma, and myself, made interim appointments. These men assumed the obligations of their office and they began to comply with their responsibilities.

On January 30 of this year the President of the United States sent the names of the incorporators to the Senate, with the recommendation that they be considered with the advice and consent of the Senate.

When the legislation was originally suggested and recommended by the administration, the administration did not recommend at that time that the incorporators should be subject to the advice and consent of the Senate. Because the Senate itself thought—I repeat—because the Senate itself thought that we should be a partner in this responsibility, we went a step further than the administration had suggested, and we said to the President, "Not only will you appoint the incorporators, but we ask you to send their names here, so that they may be considered with our advice and consent."

We placed that clause in the law. We did that after considerable debate. It is in the law today because we put it in there.

The President of the United States signed that law. It is the supreme law of the land today. No matter what we decided here this afternoon, we cannot repudiate the law. We cannot vitiate the law. We cannot render the law a nullity. We can only say that we think it is unconstitutional. However, where are we after we have said it? Is the law repealed? Do we tell the House of Representatives that they must abide by our position that the law no longer exists, because we have said it is unconstitutional?

Do we say to the President of the United States, "The law does not exist any more because we said it is unconstitutional?" Even a law student knows that every law remains the law of the land until the Supreme Court says it is unconstitutional.

Therefore, even if we repudiate these incorporators today, the President of the United States will have no alternative but to send up other names, because the law will exist as the law of the land until such time as the Supreme Court says it is not the law of the land.

A big moment was made of the fact that the Attorney General himself did not write the opinion that was used here.

When it was mentioned to the Senator from Rhode Island that the question of the constitutionality might be raised, I wrote to the Attorney General. The answer came to me from his Assistant Attorney General, who said in his letter:

> This is in reply to your letter of March 26 to Attorney General Kennedy requesting the Department's views on the questions raised by Senator GORE.

These are the views of the Attorney General. I have had them inserted in the RECORD. The Attorney General has stated, not that this is constitutional, but that in his opinion it is constitutional. Even he cannot declare a law either constitutional or unconstitutional. Only the Supreme Court of the United States can do that.

I say to my brethren until such time that the law is challenged in the courts, until such time that the law is declared unconstitutional, we must abide by it as the law of the land. That is precisely what we are asking the Senate to do. That is precisely what we are doing. That is precisely what I hope the Senate will do.

Mr. **MORSE**. I yield myself 1 minute.

My reply to the Senator from Rhode Island is simply this: Last year the Senate passed a law which in my opinion had an unconstitutional provision in it. The Senator from Rhode Island is suggesting that we perpetuate that law, that we compound a mistake that we have already made. The time has come when this section of the law should be taken out. It should be amended by striking it from the law. We should not be asked to use Article II, Section 2 of the Constitution to commit what amounts to an unconstitutional act of procedure this afternoon.

As the Senator from Wisconsin has said, we ought to have this matter go to the Judiciary Committee for review with regard to the legal points that are involved. The Act ought to be amended. The matter ought to be taken up with the President. We should make it perfectly clear that we are not going to commit an unconstitutional procedural act under Article II, Section 2 of the Constitution. We should make it clear that these men are not public officers of the United States Government and because they are not public officers the Senate does not have the constitutional power or right to confirm them under Article II, Section 2 of the Constitution.

The Senator from Rhode Island now says that we should wait for the Supreme Court to rule on the question. He and I both took the same oath to uphold the Constitution. When we believe that a proposal is unconstitutional, we have a duty not to commit an unconstitutional act by approving it. That is the position of the senior Senator from Oregon. Now is the time to correct our mistake.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I submit that we made no mistake at all.

My concluding remark this afternoon is that 10 Members of this branch of Congress agreed with WAYNE MORSE last year; 65 agreed with JOHN PASTORE last year.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this is the first time I have heard on the floor of the Senate that the might of voting power makes right in the Senate.

Mr. PASTORE. I know; but we cannot all be out of step because one Senator may say we are.

Mr. MORSE. One is not necessarily in step when his majority squad is wrong.

The VICE PRESIDENT. All time has been yielded back. The question is, Is the consideration of these nominations by the Senate in accordance with the Constitution? Senators who believe that it is in accordance with the Constitution will vote "yea"; Senators who believe that it is not in accordance with the Constitution will vote "nay."

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to suggest the absence of a quorum, the time for the quorum call not to exceed 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll for a quorum.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time for the quorum call has expired.

The question is, Is the consideration of these nominations by the Senate in accordance with the Constitution? Senators who believe that it is in accordance with the Constitution will vote "yea"; Senators who believe that it is not in accordance with the Constitution will vote "nay." The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 75, nays 15, as follows:

[No. 63 Ex.]

YEAS—75

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bayh
Beall
Bennett
Boggs
Brewster
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Eastland
Edmondson
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Goldwater
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kennedy
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Mechem
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Morton
Mundt
Muskie
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—15

Bartlett
Burdick
Church
Clark
Douglas
Gore
Gruening
Kefauver
Long, La.
McNamara
Morse
Moss
Nelson
Neuberger
Yarborough

NOT VOTING—10

Bible
Engle
Hart
Hayden
Humphrey
Magnuson
Randolph
Smathers
Symington
Williams, N.J.

So the question, Is the consideration of these nominations by the Senate in accordance with the Constitution? was decided in the affirmative.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I move that the nominations of the incorporators of the Communications Satellite Corp. be referred to the Judiciary Committee with instructions that hearings be held and that the committee report to the Senate at the end of 1 month with respect to the constitutionality of the Senate's advising and consenting to the nominations of private persons as officials of a private, profit-seeking business enterprise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alaska.

The motion was rejected.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate give its advice and consent to these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nominations, being considered en bloc, of the incorporators of the Communications Satellite Corp.? [Putting the question.]

The nominations were confirmed.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of legislative business.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the minority leader and I have an announcement which may be of interest to all Senators.

First, let me state, for the information of the Senate, that it is anicipated that the supplemental appropriation bill will not be brought up until tomorrow. No votes will be taken on the bill tomorrow. It is the intention to have the Senate go over, following the session tomorrow, until Tuesday morning, at 11 a.m.

No further votes will be taken today. No votes will be taken tomorrow. Votes will be taken on Tuesday.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL NOON TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its session this afternoon, it adjourn until noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT FROM TOMORROW UNTIL TUESDAY AT 11 O'CLOCK A.M.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the

Senate adjourns tomorrow, it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a.m. on Tuesday next.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, the only business to be undertaken during the remainder of the day will be consideration of items on the calendar to which there is no objection. For those Senators who may wish to listen, there may be a few speeches.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the calendar be called, starting with Calendar No. 128, to and including Calendar No. 135, and that at the appropriate points in the RECORD reports relating to the bills under discussion may be printed.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

MRS. MARIA NOWAKOWSKI CHANDLER

The bill (S. 1196) for the relief of Mrs. Maria Nowakowski Chandler was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a)(23) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Maria Nowakowski Chandler may be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of Justice or the Department of State has knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 143), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to waive the excluding provisions of existing law relating to a conviction of possession of narcotics in behalf of the wife of a U.S. citizen member of our Armed Forces.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The beneficiary of the bill is a 36-year-old native and citizen of Germany, who is the wife of a U.S. citizen member of our Armed Forces whom she married in Austria on April 7, 1956. The beneficiary's husband has been a member of the Armed Forces since 1943. He returned to the United States on September 5, 1962, when he was reassigned to Fort Riley, Kans. The beneficiary and her husband have two children who are U.S. citizens, and a third adopted child. The beneficiary has been denied a visa because of two minor convictions for theft and embezzlement and a conviction for possession of narcotics. As the wife of a U.S. citizen, the convictions for theft and embezzlement may be administratively waived. Although the narcotics offense appears to have been minor in nature, without the waiver provided for in the bill, the beneficiary will be unable to join her husband in the United States.

A letter, with attached memorandum, dated September 11, 1962, to the chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary from the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization with reference to S. 3502, which was a similar bill for the relief of the same beneficiary that passed the Senate during the 87th Congress, reads as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
IMMIGRATION AND
NATURALIZATION SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., September 11, 1962.

Hon. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: In response to your request for a report relative to the bill (S. 3502) for the relief of Mrs. Maria Nowakowski Chandler, there is attached a memorandum of information concerning the beneficiary. This memorandum has been prepared from the Immigration and Naturalization Service files relating to the beneficiary by the Kansas City, Mo., office of this Service, which has custody of those files.

The bill would waive the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act which exclude from admission into the United States any alien who has been convicted of violating, or conspiring to violate, a narcotic law or regulation, or any alien who is, or has been, an illicit trafficker in narcotic drugs. It would authorize the issuance of a visa and the beneficiary's admission into the United States for permanent residence, if she is found to be otherwise admissible. The bill limits the exemption granted the beneficiary to a ground for exclusion known to the Department of State or the Department of Justice prior to its enactment.

Sincerely,

RAYMOND F. FARRELL,
Commissioner.

REEXAMINATION OF ATTORNEY FEES PAID IN BANKRUPTCY PROCEEDINGS

The bill (H.R. 2833) to amend subdivision (d) of section 60 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 96d) so as to give the court authority on its own motion to reexamine attorney fees paid or to be paid in a bankruptcy proceeding was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 144), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to strengthen the provisions of the Bankruptcy Act governing the review of attorneys' fees by the bankruptcy court.

STATEMENT

The proposed legislation has been requested by the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts.

A similar bill, H.R. 8708, was approved by the House of Representatives in the 86th Congress but was not acted upon by the Senate.

A similar bill, H.R. 5149, was approved by the House of Representatives in the 87th Congress but was not acted upon by the Senate.

The proposed legislation does not have the support of the National Bankruptcy Conference.

In its favorable report on H.R. 2833 the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives wrote:

"Section 60d of the Bankruptcy Act now provides that the bankruptcy court shall, upon petition of the trustee or any creditor, examine the reasonableness of fees paid by the debtor in contemplation of bankruptcy for legal services to be rendered. Amounts determined to be in excess of a reasonable fee may then be recovered by the trustee for the benefit of the estate.

"Experience has shown that this language is inadequate to protect both the creditors and the bankrupt from excessive attorneys' fees. In bankruptcy, the motivations which normally prevent overcharge are often absent. It matters very little to a bankrupt whether his attorney's fee is large or small since it will be paid out of assets which in any event will normally be completely consumed in distribution. It is the claimant with a lesser priority and the general creditors who, in effect, pay excessive fees through a reduction in the value of assets available to them.

"Although the act now provides that the trustee or creditors may cause the court to examine into the reasonableness of a fee, lawyers are frequently reluctant to challenge the fairness of the fees charged by their colleagues. In view of the wording of existing law referees have, in the absence of such a challenge, been hesitant about examining fees on their own.

"An additional but related problem is presented in no asset or nominal asset cases. Since the allowable fee in these cases would be rather small, attorneys have sometimes required debtors to sign notes for excessive fees after the filing of the petition.

"These and similar abuses were brought to the attention of the Bankruptcy Committee of the Judicial Conference which requested the introduction of legislation substantially the same as H.R. 2833.

"This bill strengthens the power of the court to review the reasonableness of attorneys' fees in the bankruptcy cases. It gives the bankruptcy court additional authority so that it may examine on its own motion payments made in contemplation of bankruptcy for legal services rendered or to be rendered. The bill also adds a new paragraph to section 60d providing that if an agreement is made either before or after filing to pay legal fees after filing, the court may on its own motion or shall upon petition of the bankrupt made prior to discharge examine into the reasonableness of those fees. The fees are to be held valid only to the extent of a reasonable, fair charge for the services. Obligations above this amount are to be canceled and if payment has already been made, the excess is to be returned to the bankrupt.

"In amending section 60d, the anachronistic terms 'solicitor in equity' and 'proctor in admiralty' were deleted and the simple term 'attorney at law' was inserted instead. The word 'examine' has been inserted in place of 'reexamine.' The review under section 60d is in most cases the initial review and, therefore, 'examine' rather than 'reexamine' is considered to be the more appropriate term. 'Examine' is also the broader term and encompasses 'reexamine.'

"The committee is of the view that this bill is necessary to correct certain abuses which have developed in bankruptcy practice and commends it to the House for its favorable consideration."

The committee believes the bill, which has been three times approved by the House of Representatives, is meritorious and recommends it favorably.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL REGISTER ACT

The bill (H.R. 2837) to amend further section 11 of the Federal Register Act (44 U.S.C. 311) was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 145), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to authorize the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register to adopt improved publication techniques whereby the Code of Federal Regulations may be produced more quickly, more economically, and in a more usable form. This would be accomplished by striking out the outmoded requirements for pocket supplements (which involve slow and costly hand operations) and substituting the discretion of the Administrative Committee as to techniques whereby books of the code are updated.

STATEMENT

The facts and justification in support of this legislation are contained in House Report 72 on H.R. 2837 and are as follows:

The proposed legislation is part of the legislative program of the General Services Administration. It originated with and is recommended by the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register, a statutory committee consisting of the Archivist of the United States, the Public Printer, and an officer of the Department of Justice designated by the Attorney General (44 U.S.C. 306).

The bill would further amend section 11 of the Federal Register Act, as amended (67 Stat. 388; 44 U.S.C. 311). Section 11 in subsection (a) authorizes the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register, with the approval of the President, to require publication in special or supplemental editions of the Federal Register of complete codifications of agency documents which have general applicability and effect.

Subsection (b) provides that any such codification shall be printed and bound in permanent form, and that as far as possible each codification shall constitute a separate book. It further requires that each such book shall include an index and a pocket for cumulative supplements. The principal thrust of the present bill is to eliminate the necessity for pocket supplements.

The Administrator of General Services advises that since the enactment of the present law in 1953 the Code of Federal Regulations has grown from 34,000 to 45,000 pages and that the volume of material has doubled since the 1949 edition. In the meantime, there has been an increased demand for compact and timely code books. Reporting that the Public Printer finds that "the amendments included in this proposed bill should reduce the production time as well as the cost for publishing the code," the Administrator states that enactment of the bill will enable the Administrative Committee to take advantage of improvements in publication techniques, and to realize important savings in costs.

In addition to eliminating the necessity for pocket supplements, the bill makes certain formal changes to improve draftsmanship, but without changing existing practices or procedures.

SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1(a) of the bill amends subsections (b), (c), and (d) of section 11.

Section 11(b), as amended, removes the requirement for pocket supplements and gives a statutory basis for the name "Code of Federal Regulations."

Section 11(c), as amended, gives the Committee authority to regulate supplementation and the collation and republication of the printed codifications, with the proviso that each book shall be either supplemented or collated and republished at least once in each calendar year.

Section 11(d), as amended, authorizes the Office of the Federal Register to prepare and publish the codifications, collations, and indexes authorized by this section.

Section 1(b) of the bill substitutes a new subsection (g) in section 11 making clear that nothing in section 11 shall be construed to require codification of Presidential documents published in title 3 of the Code.

Section 2 of the bill does not amend any existing provision of law. Together with the elimination of old subsection (g) of section 11, it makes clear that the section applies as well to the past as to the future Code of Federal Regulations.

The Committee, after a study of the foregoing, concurs in the action of the House of Representatives and recommends that the bill H.R. 2837 be considered favorably.

Attached hereto and made part hereof is a letter from the Administrator of General Services transmitting a draft of the bill and urging its enactment.

AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES CODE REGARDING TRIAL OF ALL OFFENSES BEGUN OR COMMITTED UPON THE HIGH SEAS OR OUTSIDE THE JURISDICTION OF ANY PARTICULAR STATE OR DISTRICT

The bill (H.R. 2842) to amend section 3238 of title 28, United States Code was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 146), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to (1) permit the indictment and trial of an offender or joint offenders who commit abroad offenses against the United States, in the district where any of the offenders is arrested or first brought; (2) to prevent the statute of limitations from tolling in cases where an offender or any of the joint offenders remain beyond the bounds of the United States by permitting the filing of information or indictment in the last known residence of any of the offenders. The bill also permits the filing of indictment or information in the District of Columbia in the event that the residence of any of the offenders in the United States is not known.

STATEMENT

An identical bill, H.R. 7037, passed the House in the 87th Congress but no action was taken upon it by the Senate.

The instant legislation is designed to cure two important defects in the present venue statutes. Its importance is underlined by the fact that with the spread of U.S. interests overseas, Federal crimes committed outside the United States have increased proportionately. Such crimes committed abroad may include treason, fraud against the Government, theft or embezzlement of Government property, bribery, etc., as well as conspiracy to commit such offenses.

Under existing law, where joint offenders commit abroad any offense, they must be tried separately if they are found in more than one judicial district. The term "found" in most cases means "arrested." For example, if three persons jointly steal Government property in Europe and by the time the investigation is completed, the three individuals have returned to the United States and are located in Boston, New Orleans, and San Francisco, respectively, under the present wording of section 3238, title 18, United States Code, these three individuals can only be indicted and tried where they are found; to wit, in three separate districts. Prosecution must be undertaken at the place where they are first found or where they are brought into the United States, and if they come into different districts the grand jury proceedings and the trials must occur in different districts. This is true whether the three joint offenders are indicted for the substantive crime or for conspiracy to commit the substantive crime.

The Department of Justice stresses the fact that to try these three separate cares arising from a joint crime would place a substantial burden on the Government, and would be unnecessarily expensive. Moreover, since in this type of case it would be necessary to bring witnesses from overseas to establish the commission of a crime and the guilt of the accused, it will require transporting the witnesses to several districts and, in the event that the trials are widely separated in area and in time, it might involve several trips to the United States for these witnesses.

The second purpose of this legislation is designed to clear up a serious question arising under the decisions of appellate courts as to whether an offender who commits an offense beyond the bounds of the United States and continues to remain outside of the United States is a "person fleeing from justice" within the terms of title 18, United States Code, section 3290.

It has been submitted to the committee by the Department of Justice that in these cases it would be required to prove that the individual is in actual flight or has left the jurisdiction before he could be considered a fugitive. On the other hand, if the offender is not a fugitive, the statute of limitations will continue to run. It has been so held in several appellate decisions, e.g., *Donnell* v. *United States* (229 F. 2d 560 (C.A. 5, 1956)); *United States* v. *Hewecker* (79 Fed. 59 (C.C.S. D.N.Y., 1896)); *United States* v. *Brown* (Fed. Cas. 14,665 D. Mass., 1873)).

Illustrative of the situation which the second purpose of this legislation is designed to reach is the case of an American citizen who stole Government property abroad and remains abroad so as to make it impossible to undertake criminal prosecution because venue is not established under any statute until he is either brought to the United States or found in the United States. In the meantime, unless the prosecution can demonstrate that he is a fugitive, the statute of limitations may run before criminal proceedings against him could be instituted. The instant legislation would correct this situation by making it possible to file an indictment or information in the case of such an offender in the district of his last known residence or in the District of Columbia if such residence is not known.

THE BOWMAN DECISION

The committee is satisfied that the enactment of this legislation will sustain and implement a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in *United States* v. *Bowman* (260 U.S. 94). In this decision, delivered by Chief Justice Taft, the Supreme Court of the United States held that citizens of the United States, while outside the United States, are subject to penal laws passed by the United States to protect itself and its property, and such infractions are trialable in the district where they are first brought. The committee believes that the following excerpts from Chief Justice Taft's opinion should be cited at this point:

"The necessary locus, when not specially defined, depends upon the purpose of Congress as evinced by the description and nature of the crime and upon the territorial limitations upon the power and jurisdiction of a government to punish crime under the law of nations. Crimes against private individuals or their property, like assaults, murder, burglary, larceny, robbery, arson, embezzlement, and frauds of all kinds, which affect the peace and good order of the community, must of course be committed within the territorial jurisdiction of the Government where it may properly exercise it. If punishment of them is to be extended to include those committed outside of the strict territorial jurisdiction, it is natural for Congress to say so in the statute, and failure to do so will negative the purpose of Congress in this regard. * * *

"But the same rule of interpretation should not be applied to criminal statutes which are, as a class, not logically dependent on their locality for the Government's jurisdiction, but are enacted because of the right of the Government to defend itself against obstruction, or fraud wherever perpetrated, especially if committed by its own citizens, officers, or agents. Some such offenses can only be committed within the territorial jurisdiction of the Government because of the local acts required to constitute them. Others are such that to limit their locus to the strictly territorial jurisdiction would be greatly to curtail the scope and usefulness of the statute and leave open a large immunity for frauds as easily committed by citizens on the high seas and in foreign countries as at home."

The committee is of the opinion that this legislation is meritorious and accordingly recommends favorable consideration of H.R. 2842 without amendment.

Attached hereto and made a part hereof are letters from the Attorney General of the United States, the Judicial Conference of the United States, and a letter from the Deputy Attorney General of the United States, to the chairman of this committee.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 47 OF BANKRUPTCY ACT

The bill (H.R. 2849) to amend section 47 of the Bankruptcy Act was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report, No. 147, explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to facilitate the deposit of the funds of bankrupts' estates in interest-bearing accounts, under proper safeguards.

STATEMENT

The proposed legislation has been requested by the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts.

A similar bill, H.R. 10204 of the 87th Congress, was approved by the House of Representatives but was not acted upon by the Senate.

The bill does not have the support of the National Bankruptcy Conference.

In its favorable report on the bill the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives wrote:

"Section 47a(2) of the Bankruptcy Act requires a trustee in bankruptcy to deposit all money received by him in 'designated depositories.' Section 61 of the act provides that the courts of bankruptcy 'shall designate, by order, banking institutions as depositories for the money of estates.'"

"As a result of two early cases these provisions have been interpreted to require the trustee to deposit the money of a bankrupt's estate in demand deposit accounts. By this view he may not make deposits in interest-bearing accounts unless the creditors consent. See *Huttig Mfg. Co.* v. *Edwards*, 160 Fed. 619 (8th Cir. 1908) and *In re Dayton Coal & Iron Co.*, 239 Fed. 737 (E.D. Tenn. 1916).

"It has been brought to the attention of the committee that in cases where a substantial period of time elapses before the closing of the estate, large sums of money may be held by the trustee for long periods of time without the realization of any interest on those funds.

"The committee believes that sound fiscal management requires that the funds of a bankrupt's estate shall not lie idle for long periods of time but should earn interest under proper safeguards. To this end, the bill provides that the court may authorize the trustee to deposit the money of a bankrupt's estate in interest-bearing accounts in 'designated depositories.' The security of such deposits is assured by section 61 of the Bankruptcy Act.

"Section 61 requires that the designated depositories provide adequate security to assure the repayment of deposits. Where deposits are covered by deposit insurance under 12 U.S.C. 1821, no security is required."

The committee believes that the proposed legislation is meritorious and recommends it favorably.

Attached and made a part of this report are: (1) A letter, dated February 1, 1962, from the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts; and (2) a letter, dated January 14, 1963, from the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts.

ZOFIA MIECIELICA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 787) for the relief of Zofia Miecielica which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Zofia Miecielica may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of that Act, and a petition may be filed in behalf of the said Zofia Miecielica by Mr. and Mrs. John Miecielica, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 205(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report, No. 148, explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to facilitate the entry into the United States in a nonquota status of an alien child adopted by U.S. citizens. The bill has been amended to bring the case within the procedures applicable to the admission of adopted alien orphans under the general law.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The beneficiary of the bill is a 14-year-old native and citizen of Poland, who resides in that country with her widowed mother and a brother. She was adopted in Poland on April 27, 1961, by Mr. and Mrs. John Miecielica, who are U.S. citizens. The beneficiary is Mr. Miecielica's niece. The beneficiary's adoptive parents state that they will provide the beneficiary with a good home, and that she will be cared for as though she were a natural child.

A letter, with attached memorandum, dated April 3, 1963, to the chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary from the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization with reference to the case, reads as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., April 3, 1963.

Hon. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: In response to your request for a report relative to the bill (S. 787) for the relief of Zofia Miecielica, there is attached a memorandum of information concerning the beneficiary. This memorandum has been prepared from the Immigration and Naturalization Service file relating to the beneficiary by the Providence, R.I., office of this Service which has custody of that file.

The bill would confer nonquota status upon the 14-year-old adopted daughter of U.S. citizens. The bill further provides that the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act. As a quota immigrant, the beneficiary would be chargeable to the quota for Poland.

Sincerely,

RAYMOND F. FARRELL,
Commissioner.

MEMORANDUM OF INFORMATION FROM IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE FILE RE S. 787

Information concerning the case was obtained from Mr. and Mrs. John Miecielica, the benficiary's adoptive parents.

The beneficiary is a native of Poland, born on May 15, 1948. She resides in Poland with her widowed mother and her brother, age 18. She also has an adult half brother and three adult half sisters who reside in Poland, and who are the issue of her farther's first marriage. Mr. and Mrs. Miecielica adopted the beneficiary by proxy on April 27, 1961, in Poland. She is in the eighth grade of school. She has no income or assets, but Mr. and Mrs. Miecielica send clothing and money for her regularly.

John Miecielica was born in Poland on March 16, 1916. His wife, whom he married in Poland on August 10, 1948, was also born in Poland on October 8, 1925. They have no children. They entered the United States on October 5, 1949, and became citizens of this country by naturalization on January 24, 1955. They reside in Pascoag, R.I., and are employed in a shoe factory in Webster, Mass. Mr. Miecielica earns about $100 a week and Mrs. Miecielica earns about $56 a week. This is their only income. Their assets consist of savings amounting to $4,000, a 1956 automobile, and their household furnishings. They rent a four-room cottage, which will provide a good home for the beneficiary. Mr. and Mrs. Miecielica have stated that they will give the beneficiary proper care and education as though she were their natural child. Private bill H.R. 13031, 87th

Congress, introduced in the beneficiary's behalf, was not enacted, and private bill H.R. 3748 has been introduced in her behalf in the 88th Congress.

EVANTHIA HAJI-CHRISTOU

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 495) for the relief of Evanthia Haji-Christou which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, in line 4, after the word "Act", to strike out "Evanthia Haji Christou" and insert "Evanthia Christou", and in line 8, after the name "Evanthia", to strike out "Haji Christou" and insert "Christou"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Evanthia Christou may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F), and a petition may be filed by Mr. and Mrs. Vincent G. Kouspos, citizens of the United States, in behalf of the said Evanthia Christou, pursuant to section 205(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Evanthia Christou."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 149), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to facilitate the entry into the United States in a nonquota status of an alien child to be adopted by citizens of the United States. The bill has been amended to correct the beneficiary's name.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The beneficiary of the bill is a 19-year-old native and citizen of Cyprus, who presently resides there with her widowed mother and four brothers and a sister. Her uncle and his wife, both U.S. citizens, desire to adopt her and information is to the effect that they are financially able to care for the beneficiary.

A letter, with attached memorandum, dated January 2, 1963, from the chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary from the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization with reference to S. 3728, which was a bill introduced in the 87th Congress for the relief of the same alien, reads as follows:

Department of Justice,
Immigration and
Naturalization Service,
Washington, D.C., January 2, 1963.

A–12848366.
Hon. James O. Eastland,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: In response to your request for a report relative to the bill (S. 3728) for the relief of Evanthia Haji-Christou, there is attached a memorandum of information concerning the beneficiary. This memorandum has been prepared from the Immigration and Naturalization Service files relating to the beneficiary by the Hartford, Conn., office of this Service, which has custody of those files.

The bill provides that the 18-year-old child, who is to be adopted by U.S. citizens, may be classified as an eligible orphan and granted nonquota immigrant status subject to the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act relating to adoption requirements.

As a quota immigrant the beneficiary would be chargeable to the quota for Cyprus.

Sincerely,
Raymond F. Farrell,
Commissioner.

ANTONIO ZORICH, AMABILE MIOTTO ZORICH, AND FIORELLA ZORICH

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 732) for the relief of Antonio Zorich, Amabile Miotto Zorich, and Fiorella Zorich which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 1, line 4, after the name "Zorich," to strike out "Amabile Miotto Zorich" and insert "Rosetta Amabile Zorich"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Antonio Zorich, Rosetta Amabile Zorich, and Fiorella Zorich shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct three numbers from the appropriate quotas for the first year that such quotas are available.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Antonio Zorich, Rosetta Amabile Zorich, and Fiorella Zorich."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 150), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Antonio Zorich, Rosetta Amabile Zorich, and Fiorella Zorich. The bill provides for appropriate quota deductions and for the payment of the required visa fees. The bill has been amended to correct the name of one of the beneficiaries.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The beneficiaries of the bill are a 36-year-old husband, his 38-year-old wife, and their 5-year-old daughter, all citizens of Italy, who entered the United States on August 26, 1960, as visitors. The father was born in that part of Italy which is now in Yugoslavia. The male beneficiary's parents entered the United States in 1956 as refugees, having resided in refugee camps in Italy; the father died in November 1961. The beneficiaries presently reside in the rectory of All Saints Catholic Church in Portland, Oreg., where the male beneficiary is employed as a janitor and the female beneficiary as a housekeeper. The male beneficiary is also employed part time as a metal cleaner and polisher. The couple also have a 2-year-old daughter and an infant son who are native-born U.S. citizens. Information is to the effect that the male beneficiary is the sole support of his aged mother.

A letter, with attached memorandum, dated November 27, 1961, to the chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary from the then Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization with reference to S. 2485, which was a bill introduced in the 87th Congress for the relief of the same aliens, reads as follows:

Department of Justice,
Immigration and Naturalization
Service,
Washington, D.C., November 27, 1961.

A–12468543.
A–12468542.
A–12469592.
Hon. James O. Eastland,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: In response to your request for a report relative to the bill (S. 2485) for the relief of Antonio Zorich, Amabile Miotto Zorich, and Fiorella Zorich, there is attached a memorandum of information concerning the beneficiaries. This memorandum has been prepared from the Immigration and Naturalization Service files relating to the beneficiaries by the Portland, Oreg., office of this Service, which has custody of those files. According to the records of this Service, the correct name of the beneficiary, Amabile Miotto Zorich, is Rosetta Amabile Zorich.

The bill would grant the beneficiaries permanent residence in the United States as of the date of its enactment upon payment of the required visa fees. It would also direct that three numbers be deducted from the appropriate immigration quotas.

The beneficiaries are chargeable to the quota for Italy.

Sincerely,
J. M. Swing,
Commissioner.

COMMENDATION OF SENATOR KENNEDY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy] for the able way in which he has conducted himself in the Senate's consideration of the nominations which have been confirmed today, and also the bills on the calender which have been considered and passed.

CONFERENCES IN EUROPE ON COMMON MARKET ANTITRUST DEVELOPMENTS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, last week the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly held a series of conferences in Brussels, Paris, and London, as part of its study of antitrust developments in Europe and their significance for American business and public policy. We were accompanied by Mr. Paul Rand Dixon, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission. Mr. Dixon had previously met many European antitrust experts at prior conferences and he made a very valuable contribution to our efforts. The Europeans with whom we met were especially glad to talk with him in order to obtain the benefit of the FTC experience on many problems which they are now facing for the first time.

Our schedule was very full. On Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, we met in Brussels with the antitrust officials of the Common Market and with numerous American and European businessmen, lawyers, professors, and other experts. On Friday and Saturday, in Paris, we met with French and German national antitrust officials, and with American and French lawyers and professors. Then, this past Monday in London, we met with representatives of the Conservative and Labor Parties to discuss merger policy. These conversations followed an intensive staff study of some 4 weeks in which some 75 antitrust experts were interviewed.

Although we are still in the process of analyzing the information and materials we have obtained, on which we shall issue a full report, certain things are clear:

These European antitrust laws, and the competitive philosophy which underlies them, are at the heart of the Rome Treaty, and this is now recognized by all. In earlier days, many Europeans were quick to proclaim that competition was inherently bad, ruinous, and wasteful. Today, almost no one will attack the competitive philosophy as such. Obviously, different people interpret the concept differently, and the degree of actual attachment to competition varies. But the very fact that no one will attack the competitive philosophy indicates a fundamental and basic change in economic climate and attitude. It is most encouraging that our European friends are getting away from the old ideas of doing business by cartels.

This change is reflected in the numerous national and supranational antitrust laws recently enacted or pending. Although these laws vary substantially, I was struck with the strength of some of these laws, and the powers granted antitrust officials with respect to investigations and penalties. This is particularly true of articles 85 and 86 of the Rome Treaty itself. Much, of course, depends on how these laws are to be administered.

We found overwhelming support for these laws among American lawyers and businessmen. As one lawyer put it—and he was unanimously supported by the half dozen other American lawyers present—Americans are the newcomers; it is we who must break into these markets to improve our balance of payments and trade position. If these laws do, in fact, weaken cartelistic arrangements, it will be that much easier for our companies to establish themselves. This is especially true for our small and medium-sized businesses, which would be in an especially weak position to obtain entry into cartelized markets. Moreover, as another American pointed out, our companies are used to operating under antitrust laws and they have probably had to do less to comply with these laws than their European counterparts.

It is still too early to say what impact these laws have had or will have. Much is still influx. For example, the English are seriously concerned about the increasing number of mergers, and some very far-reaching proposals to prevent and control such mergers have been made. The French seem to be tightening up on exclusives; the Germans are also reviewing their laws.

With respect to the Rome Treaty, itself, some 800 horizontal agreements and some 36,000 vertical agreements were filed with Brussels last November and February to obtain exemption from the prohibition of article 85(1). Many other agreements were modified or rescinded to avoid registration. It is suspected that some which should have been filed were not registered at all. How the EEC Commission handles this massive volume of registrations, and the arrangements not registered, may well determine the initial operation of the Rome Treaty in this area. One thing is clear: Many hours of conversation with EEC Commissioner Hans von der Groeben and with some dozen members of his staff convinced us that they are realistic and determined. These men will do their utmost to make the antitrust sections of the Rome Treaty into one of its most significant and vital aspects. They are absolutely determined that the international tariffs and quotas soon to be abolished should not be replaced by cartels and other private restrictions.

There are many other aspects to these antitrust laws and their significance for our public and private interests. These include the relationship of European planning and programing to competition and to American investments. Concentration is another problem as are export cartels, penal provisions, and investigatory powers. Our report will deal fully with these. I should like to add but one thing more:

Everyone assured us that the Common Market will go forward. This means that competition—the heart of the Rome Treaty—will also be promoted. Obviously, the job is hard. Attitudes, habits, laws, and customs; all will have to undergo changes, but signs of such changes are already visible. Price conscious consumer movements are beginning to develop; many European businessmen, especially the younger ones, are beginning to realize that competition can be profitable. The ultimate fate of this great experiment is obviously not possible to foresee, but a very promising start has clearly been made.

Our subcommittee plans to continue its study. America and Europe are rapidly becoming more and more intertwined, and it is incumbent upon Members of the Senate to keep fully abreast and to respond appropriately to these developments.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an appendix to my remarks, showing the itinerary of the subcommittee while in Europe.

There being no objection, the appendix was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPENDIX

BRUSSELS, BELGIUM

April 15, 1963:

A.m.—Briefing by U.S. Embassy staff and John W. Tuthill, Ambassador to the U.S. Mission to the European Communities, and Mission staff, on economic and antitrust developments in Europe.

P.m.—Reception and dinner conference with American businessmen in Brussels, including: ITT Europe, Inc., Brussels, Belgium; Charles G. Sherwood, executive vice president; David Barker, area director, public relations; R. G Bateson, area general counsel; W. H. Bulte, production line manager components; H. P. Willard, area director, planning and organization; Clark Equipment Company, Martin E. Graham, general manager; INCOM, Colonel Ralph J. Nunziato; Management Center Europe, Nelson L. Rusk, managing director; Arthur Anderson & Company, George R. Stevens, general manager; First National City Bank, Arthur L. Worthington, manager; and Robin International, Ltd., London, England, Anthony Z. Landi.

April 16, 1963:

A.m.—Briefing by Ambassador Douglas MacArthur II, on relevant political and economic factors in Europe and Belgium.

P.m.—Luncheon and conference with Dr. Hans von der Groeben, Commissioner of European Economic Community, and antitrust experts on his staff as follows: P. VerLoren van Themaat, K. Gleichmann, R. Jaume, N. Koch, G. Linssen, P. Nasini, Willie Schlieder, H. Schumacher, Ivo Schwartz, J. Thiesing, and E. Wirsing.

April 17, 1963:

A.m.—Individual conferences with American lawyers in Brussels: Klaus Newes, attorney at law, Baker, McKenzie & Hightower; Frank Boas, consulting attorney.

Noon—Luncheon conference with American lawyers, and others, given by Ambassador John H. Tuthill. Guests included: Homer Angelo, attorney at law; Sydney Cone III, attorney at law, Cleary, Gottlieb & Steen; and R. Peter Dreyer, the Journal of Commerce.

P.m.—Conference with Prof. Michel Waelbroeck, Institute of Comparative Law. Reception given by American and European business and legal community in Brussels. Guests included: Count Charles d'Ursel, vice president and general manager, Morgan Guaranty Trust Co. of New York; Edgerton Grant North, vice president, Morgan Guaranty Trust Co. of New York, and consultant on EEC; Thomas L. Coleman, attorney at law, Baker, McKenzie & Hightower; Paul Eeckman, area counsel, western European area, Coca Cola Export Corp.; Rene Lamy, assistant to the management, Societe Generale de Belgique; Baron Charley del Marmol, professor, Liege University; Andrew W. G. Newburg, attorney at law, Cleary, Gottlieb & Steen; Robert Niemants, counsellor, Federation of Belgian Industries; Raymond Pulinckx, director and general manager, Federation of Belgian Industries; and Pierre van der Rest, president, Steel Industry Association; Arnold van Zeeland, Brufina.

April 18, 1963:

A.m.—Individual conferences with: Prof. Eric Stein, Law School, University of Michigan, and Prof. Ernst J. Mestmaecker, adviser to EEC Commission, and University of Münster.

P.m.—Press Conference at U.S. Mission to the European Communities.

PARIS, FRANCE

April 19, 1963:

A.m.—Briefing by U.S. Ambassador Charles E. Bohlen at U.S. Embassy. Conferences with French antitrust authorities, including: Phillippe Hüet, Director-General, Office of Price and Economic Investigations, French Ministry of France, and Robert Clement, Director of Economic Investigations, French Ministry of Finance.

Noon—Luncheon with American lawyers, including: Loftus Becker, Cahill, Gordon, Reindel & Ohl; Prof. Lazar Focsaneanu, Coudert Brothers; A. Jack Kevorkian, Coudert Brothers; George Martin, Donovan, Leisure, Newton & Irvine; Richard Moore, Cleary, Gottlieb and Steen; and Charles Torem, Coudert Brothers.

P.m.—Conferences with French experts, including: Prof. Jacques Lassier, and Prof. Robert Plaisant.

April 20, 1963:

A.m. — Conference with Dr. Gerhard Rauschenbach, vice president, German Cartel Authority.

LONDON, ENGLAND

April 22, 1963:

A.m.—Briefing by U.S. Ambassador David K. E. Bruce at U.S. Embassy. Conference with Lord Poole, chairman of the Conservative Party Committee on Mergers and Monopolies, who was accompanied by his assistant, Mr. James Douglas.

Noon—Reception and luncheon at U.S. Embassy by Ambassador Bruce. Included were: Lord Poole, and Austen Albu, Member of Parliament (Labor).

P.m.—Conference with Mr. Austen Albu, above, on Labor Party views on antitrust and monopoly problems.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I should like, in closing, to express our deepest gratitude for the help and cooperation we received from everyone. We were especially gratified by the warm welcome given us by the American business and legal communities. We hope our study will prove helpful to them.

(At this point Mr. McIntyre took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

ANALYSIS OF LEGISLATION RELATED TO COTTON FARMERS AND THE COTTON TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on January 31 I introduced S. 608, legislation which I feel is needed for our cotton farmers and our cotton textile industry. I ask unanimous consent to place in the Record at this point an analysis of my bill and a statement concerning the need for the legislation.

There being no objection, the analysis and statement were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Analysis of S. 608, 88th Congress, 1st Session, Introduced on January 31, 1963

The bill would amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to make cotton available to domestic users at prices more competitive with prices foreign users pay for cotton and to authorize the Secretary to permit cottongrowers to plant additional acreage for the 1963 and succeeding crops of upland cotton.

Paragraph (1) of section 1 of the bill would add the following new sections to the act:

Section 348: This section would authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to make payments to persons other than producers on upland cotton produced in the United States at a rate which the Secretary determines will eliminate inequities sustained by domestic users of cotton as a result of differences in domestic and foreign costs of cotton, taking into account differences in transportation costs and other relevant factors. Payments would be made through issuance of payment-in-kind (PIK) certificates subject to terms and conditions, including redemption for cash if suitable stocks of CCC cotton are not available, as the Secretary may prescribe.

Section 349: This section would authorize the Secretary to permit increased plantings of upland cotton for the 1963 crop and for each succeeding crop up to 30 percent of the farm allotment established under present provisions of law (including revisions due to release and reapportionment of allotment for the farm). The increased acreage which is referred to as "export market acreage" would not count as history acreage in establishing future State, county, and farm allotments. For purposes of determining compliance with the farm allotment, the sum of the farm allotment and the maximum export market acreage authorized for the farm would be used for farms on which export market acreage is planted. In other words, no farm marketing excess and marketing quota penalty will result unless the plantings of cotton on a farm exceed the above total authorized acreage for the farm. Beginning with the 1964 crop of cotton, estimated production of cotton on export market acreage must be deducted from the national marketing quota but in any event the national acreage allotment shall not be less than 16 million acres. This section shall not apply to extra-long-staple cotton.

Section 350(a): This subsection would exempt producers on a farm on which there is export market acreage from payment of the export marketing fee if they furnish a bond or other security satisfactory to the Secretary conditioned upon the exportation without benefit of any Government export subsidy of a quantity of cotton equal to the estimated production of the export market acreage on the farm. The period of time for completion of such exportation would be prescribed by the Secretary. As set forth in section 350(b), the producers furnishing a bond or other security shall be liable for an export marketing fee (1) on the number of pounds of cotton by which the actual production of the export market acreage exceeds the estimated production specified in the bond or other security, and (2) on the number of pounds of cotton covered by the bond or other security which are not exported in compliance with the conditions thereof.

Section 350(b): This subsection would make producers on a farm on which there is export market acreage jointly and severally liable for payment to the Secretary of an export marketing fee on the production of the export market acreage unless exempt by reason of furnishing a bond or other security pursuant to subsection (a) of section 350. The Secretary shall determine the amount per pound of cotton which shall be the export marketing fee for any crop not later than the beginning of the marketing year for the crop and such amount shall approximate the difference between the price of cotton marketed by producers in the United States during such marketing year and the price at which such cotton can be marketed competitively for export during such marketing year.

The export marketing fee, unless prepaid, shall be payable at a converted rate on all cotton produced on the farm and the rate is determined by multiplying the export market acreage on the farm by the export marketing fee per pound of cotton and dividing the result by the acreage planted to cotton on the farm. The fee at the converted rate shall be collected by the first buyer from the producer at the time of marketing. Pledging of the cotton to CCC by a producer and, as provided by regulations of the Secretary, delivering, pledging or mortgaging of cotton by a producer to any person shall be deemed a marketing of cotton. If cotton is not marketed during the marketing year, the fee at the converted rate is due and payable at the end of the marketing year. The person liable for payment or collection of the fee is also liable for interest at 6 percent per annum from the due date until payment is made. The Secretary may provide by regulation for prepayment of the fee on the basis of estimated production subject to adjustment on the basis of actual production and may require prepayment of fees which are so small that collection at the converted rate is impracticable. The Secretary may establish actual production by appraisal upon failure of the producer to furnish satisfactory proof of production. The Secretary shall remit to CCC all export marketing fees received which CCC shall use to defray costs of promoting export sales of cotton under section 203 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, as amended.

Section 369: This section provides that determinations of export market acreage shall be subject to review by a review committee and court review under sections 363 to 368 of the act. It also requires mailing to the farm operator of notices of maximum export market acreage and determinations of actual export market acreage.

Paragraph (2) of section 1 of the bill would amend section 372 of the act by adding a new subsection (e) at the end thereof. This subsection (e) would provide that collecting of export marketing fees and remitting of such fees to the Secretary shall be subject to existing provisions of law in subsections (b) through (d) of section 372 of the act which govern collection of marketing quota penalties, claims for refunds and exemptions for cotton grown for experimental purposes, except that export marketing fees shall be paid by the Secretary to CCC.

Paragraph (3) of section 1 of the bill would amend section 376 of the act by adding a sentence at the end thereof which would grant court jurisdiction to enforce the collection of export marketing fees.

Paragraph (4) of section 1 of the bill would amend section 385 of the act by adding a sentence at the end thereof which would make final and conclusive any payments under section 348 of the act.

Statement With Respect to the Need for Cotton Legislation Proposed in S. 608, 88th Congress, 1st Session, Introduced January 31, 1963

The bill would make cotton available to domestic users at prices more competitive with prices foreign users pay for cotton and would authorize the Secretary to permit cotton growers to plant additional acreage for the 1963 and succeeding crops of upland cotton.

This legislation is needed in order to: (1) overcome the disadvantage which the present two-price system for cotton imposes on the U.S. textile industry; (2) provide more flexibility in giving individual cotton farmers room for choice in selecting price—acreage combinations best suited to their individual situations; and (3) promote sustained and expanding markets for U.S. cotton.

The need for new legislation has been made much more acute by recent events.

First, there has been a sharp increase in imports of cotton textiles. For the first 11 months of calendar year 1962, cotton textile imports were up 71 percent above the comparable 1961 period. Total imports of cotton textiles on a raw fiber equivalent basis were 596,000 bales in the first 11 months of the year, which was a record level.

Second, there has been mounting evidence of the loss of cotton markets to competing manmade fibers. There are more and more cases where rayon and other synthetic fibers are being substituted for cotton. The production of manmade fibers for the first three quarters of 1962 was 25 percent above a year earlier. While cotton consumption was also up moderately during the first 9 months of 1962, the daily rate of mill consumption in October had dropped to 31,000 bales compared with 34,000 bales in 1961. Synthetic staple fiber consumption, on the other hand, continued 22 percent above October of 1961.

The third event which has added great urgency to the need for cotton legislation is the adverse finding of the Tariff Commission with respect to the recommendation by the Department of Agriculture for an import equalization fee on imported cotton textiles to offset the 8½-cent-per-pound export payment on raw cotton. The difference in the cost of raw cotton to American textile mills compared with the cost to foreign mills not only placed an unfair burden upon the American textile industry, but, in the opinion of the Department of Agriculture, also interfered with operation of the cotton price support program. However, the Tariff Commission found to the contrary, and so this avenue of relief was closed.

The adverse consequences of these recent events are pointed up by the fact that although the national acreage allotment for 1962 was reduced nearly 400,000 acres below the 1961 allotment, the carryover is expected to increase by about 2 million bales. In short, it has been made plain that changes in the cotton program are needed.

The 1963 national acreage allotment and national reserve has been established at 16,250,000 acres and the price support level has been announced at 32.47 cents per pound for middling 1-inch cotton at average location. The price support level is the same as for 1962. Thus, while adequate price protection is available, many thousands of producers across the Belt have sustained at least a 10-percent allotment reduction.

The proposed legislation would give relief to those producers who want to grow more cotton at about the world price. The payment-in-kind program would increase mill consumption and, therefore, aid the entire cotton industry.

LITERACY TEST REQUIREMENT FOR VOTING

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on April 9, the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] introduced a civil rights bill embodying several recommendations of the administration.

One of the sections of this bill is almost identical in its provisions and even in its language to S. 666, a bill which our able colleague the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and I introduced on February 4, 1963, with 26 other cosponsors.

This section of the administration bill provides, as does S. 666, that literacy tests must be in writing and that copies of the tests shall be available to the applicant and to the Department of Justice, so that they can be used as evidence in any case where a voter applicant is discriminated against in violation of the 14th and 15th amendments to the Constitution.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and I introduced this provision in the conviction that it provided a way to make solid progress in the field of voting rights without raising any valid constitutional issue and without interfering with the right of the separate States to set voter qualifications.

I am greatly encouraged that the administration and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] and others found sufficient merit in this proposal to incorporate it as part of their own civil rights package.

The administration bill links this proposal with another provision which provides that a sixth grade education shall constitute proof of literacy so far as voter applicants are concerned. This latter provision, of course, raises all of the constitutional and States rights issues which S. 666 sought to avoid in the interest of bringing forward a proposal that could pass the Congress and become law.

The bill introduced by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] has many meritorious provisions and I shall do all that I can in the Judiciary Committee to bring this bill to the floor of the Senate for action. Past experience teaches us that any civil rights package as ambitious as the administration bill runs grave danger of foundering on the same rocks and shoals that have sunk all similar proposals in the past. Therefore, I shall do all that I can to see to it that the original Cooper-Dodd proposal will have full opportunity for separate consideration on its merits. I have discussed this matter with the gracious chairman of the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], and he has assured me that S. 666 will be placed on the agenda of his subcommittee and given a full hearing.

COMMEMORATION OF THE WARSAW GHETTO UPRISING

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on April 22 a significant ceremony took place at the Adas Israel Congregation Synagogue in Washington. It was the 20th commemoration of the Warsaw ghetto uprising.

Speakers on the occasion were Rabbi Stanley Rabinowitz, Supreme Court Justice Arthur Goldberg, and my son, Thomas, who read a statement in my behalf.

I have been unable to obtain a transcript of Justice Goldberg's eloquent statement, since he spoke without a prepared text, but I do have the other statements and I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the introductory and dedicatory remarks of Rabbi Rabinowitz and my own statement.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEDICATION

(By Rabbi Stanley Rabinowitz; music by Cantor Raphael Edgar)

Every adult in this sanctuary tonight is involved one way or another in the events we commemorate tonight. For we are part of mankind. And every person over 35 in the world today can be assigned to one of three groupings—those who committed; those who suffered; and those who failed to prevent these desecrations.

How does one react to a nightmare so horrible that fact is understatement?

One way is to cry. But tears achieve nothing save the luxury of a catharsis, and soon the spring of tears is dry and even the wake of salt upon the cheek is brushed away to nothingness.

Others who could no longer cry expressed their reaction in poetry and song. Perhaps long after all else is forgotten, the poetry, the literature, and the music will remain as evidence of man's triumph over the beast.

That which we offer is only the fleeting echo of a refrain from the musical memorial which the victims themselves composed.

Much of the music is on a note of utter despair. In the nightmare of those days there were no blacks or whites * * * there was only dark black and light black. One poet tells us that the planet is sinking into a vast, black cloud. The sun no longer shines. The flowers wither from lack of nourishment. The wire fence blots out the daylight. For us it is always night.

(Cantor sings "Bei Unz Iz Shtendik Finster.")

On the earth there is silence. Even the song of the lullaby is perverted. For there is no reason to recite a lullaby of gentler days—only to twist them. A mother parodies the familiar lullabies of her own childhood. Yesterday they sang of raisins and almonds.

"Today there are neither raisins nor almonds. Father has gone away—maybe to the ends of the earth. May God help him and protect him. But perhaps it is a land where he has but to open his eyes in the morning, and behold, there will be raisins and almonds in abundance."

There is hope in this song—perhaps father has escaped.

(Cantor sings "Nicht Kein Rozinkes, Nicht Kein Mandlen.")

There is still another way to react to tragedy—laugh in its face.

But let's consider a child whose name is Yisroelik, a waif of the ghetto, who knows only one law. It is the law of survival at any cost. "Life is cheap," he says, "A life for a grosh or two." At least, so the ghetto merchant has told him. Yet something of human perception remains in his consciousness and this only heightens the tragedy, for Yisroelik has not lost his sense of humor.

Yisroelik looks at himself, wearing a coat without a collar, underclothing stolen from many different sources, overshoes that fall to his ankles. "If any person is laughing around here," he comments, "It's me they're laughing at." Self-contemptuous as he is, Yisroelik is still able to laugh. He even is able to whistle, to hum a tune, and this is the tune that he hums.

(Cantor sings "Yisroelik.")

Perhaps the ultimate degradation of the past is the suggestion that the victims cooperated, perhaps connived at their own destruction. Those who speak thus violate the ethical edict not to judge our fellow men until we stand in their place. Those who think thus betray not only gross insensibility to historical and psychological factors, but cast a pall on the memories of the martyrs whose lives we honor.

Of course, in crisis some men will behave like beasts, but others will react as saints. That's not strange. Man has both potentialities within himself. Which one is actualized depends not only upon inner decisions, but upon conditions beyond the self.

After all, man is that being who invented the gas chambers of Auschwitz. However, he is also that being who entered those gas chambers upright with the Shma Yisroel on his lips.

He is also that being who glared contemptuously at his oppressors.

Here is the musical record of one who tells his fellows that they will some day see Haman hanged. He exhorts his fellows to remember their dignity as he tells them, "No work they give us, however onerous, will tire us. We will not fall at their feet from exhaustion. No matter what they do to us, we will not show any weakness. We will respond with strength until they drop, from the exhaustion of excess. They will weaken before we will." This man would not bend the knee. He refused to desecrate the dignity of the Jew.

(Cantor sings "Minuten Fun Bitochen.")

We are not assembled to give way to impotent rage nor to become victims of despair. Our task is not to denounce so much as to affirm. It is not enough simply to remember; we must affirm our faith in the future of our people and in the future of mankind's freedom. We must snatch from the gutted ruins of the past that faith which rose up above the ghetto walls. We must pick up the melody of the credo, "Ani Ma'amin" that was on the lips of the doomed.

(Cantor sings "Ani-Ma'amin.")

Those who lived with the beast could not keep silent. They could not afford the luxury of tears. They were inspired to sing, and the song they sang was one of hope. And out of their aspiration came fulfillment, so that we who live on the sidelines could behold the greatest miracle of all—that of Am Yisrael Chai, the remnant of Israel continues to live. Out of the ashes and the embers of a world gone by, they were able to sing, "Do not say this is my last road, nor that the light of heaven is covered over. The day we have awaited will yet come and we shall march on. This is the new day struggling to be born." We can sing no lesser tune—nor any greater one.

(Cantor sings "The Song of the Partisans.")

DEDICATION OF MEMORIAL, MONDAY, APRIL 22, 1963

(By Rabbi Stanley Rabinowitz)

A few moments ago the curtain was removed from a memorial dedicated to the memory of the martyred victims of Nazi tyranny. This memorial is part of a larger complex designated as "The Hall of Memories." On exhibit is a collection of ceremonial objects on loan from the Jewish Museum of the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York, and an art collection which includes water colors by Mykola Shramchenko and lithographs by Leonard Baskins and Ernest Freed. Our program will conclude with the singing of our national anthem, The Star-Spangled Banner. Upon conclusion, you are invited to visit the adjoining building and to be among the first to derive the inspiration that we believe is to be found therein.

In addition to the pulpit guests mentioned in the dedication program, we are pleased to have on the pulpit the distinguished sculptor, Emanuel Milstein, who executed the Menorah that is part of the Memorial.

And Mr. Mykola Shramchenko, a pious Christian, a gifted artist, and himself a survivor of the very scenes that he has memorialized so movingly in the water colors now on exhibit.

We are grateful to our distinguished guests who are part of this program of dedication. Their stature is such that they require no introduction nor further identification.

Implied in their participation is the realization that there is in man the nobility that enables him to rise above even the evil of which he is capable. Let this be the thought, not only of invocation, but also of benediction.

REMARKS OF SENATOR THOMAS J. DODD

The event which we commemorate tonight evokes in each of us two kinds of directly opposed emotions. For it is at once a story of man at his worst and man at his best. It is a study of man in the bottomless depths of depravity and at the measureless heights of nobility.

I was once compelled to study the Warsaw ghetto uprising in all of its grim detail when I was executive trial counsel at the Nuremburg war crimes trial.

Like all who reflect upon this incident, I asked myself—"How could fellow members of the family of man become so degraded, so brutal, so debased, as to formulate and carry out the extermination of 6 million men, women, and children for no reason other than that of their race?"

But in the sadness forced upon up by these reflections on human perversity, we come upon the other side of man's nature. We see the helpless Jews in the Warsaw ghetto, not cowering before a fate so inevitable, so cruel, so senseless, but rather forming to do battle against impossible odds. We get a glimpse of the loftiness of man. We see that divine quality which refuses to be degraded. We see that eternal spark which refuses to be snuffed out. We see the real meaning of human dignity, of courage, of honor.

As the conduct of the Nazis reveals to us the degradation into which human nature may fall, so the conduct of the victims illumines for us the vast potential of man.

In the story of the Warsaw ghetto uprising we see presented in its most extreme and graphic form a recurring chapter in the history of mankind.

On one side stand all the forces of predatory aggression, organized by perverted science and motivated by hate and greed. On the other side stand the victims, foredoomed by an evil force they could not possibly understand but determined to show that human life was too significant to be silently forfeited and debased without a struggle.

And so for 20 days in April and May of 1943, the Jews of Warsaw fought against the greatest engine of destruction ever devised, fought against it with revolvers, knives, clubs, and stones. The result of that struggle was, of course, inevitable but the making of that struggle reveals something about the human race that will be celebrated when the story of Nazi atrocity is but a dim memory.

For it demonstrates the qualities of man which we hope and believe will survive and become dominant in human conduct; nobility, courage, and above all the passion for justice, which is the noblest of all human traits and the hope of man's future.

The Warsaw ghetto uprising is now part of the dead past, but the larger struggle, of which it was one incident, goes on. Sometimes we become so immersed in the details of the cold war that we forget what it is that we are contending for.

We of the United States have, in part through circumstance, in part through design, become the principal champions of the effort to preserve what is good in man. Commemorations such as this remind us with vivid force that we are struggling for that higher view of man's purpose and man's significance which motivated the Jews of Warsaw 20 years ago.

We pay tribute to them tonight and in so doing we draw strength and inspiration for the continuing struggle which must be carried on until the temple of man's honor and man's freedom is forever secure.

OREGON STATE LEGISLATIVE MEMORIAL ON TUALATIN PROJECT

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Oregon and myself, I submit House Joint Memorial No. 9 adopted at the 52d Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon. The memorial emphasizes the desirability of early action on the proposal for establishing the Tualatin Valley irrigation project in the State of Oregon.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the memorial and the certificate of transmittal from the secretary of state of the State of Oregon be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter of transmittal, the certificate, and the memorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SALEM, OREG., *April 9, 1963.*

Hon. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: As directed by the 52d Legislative Assembly of Oregon, I transmit herewith a certified copy of House Joint Memorial No. 9, relating to the Tualatin Valley irrigation project.

Respectfully,

HOWELL APPLING, Jr.,
Secretary of State.

CERTIFICATE

STATE OF OREGON,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, Howard Appling, Jr., secretary of state of the State of Oregon, and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify that the attached is a true and complete copy of House Joint Memorial 9 adopted by the 52d Legislative Assembly of Oregon, 1963, now in session; said memorial being filed in my office on April 8, 1963.

I further certify that the signatures affixed to the subject memorial are those of the duly elected officers of the senate and house of representatives of this 52d Legislative Assembly of Oregon.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Oregon; done at the capital at Salem, Oreg., this 9th day of April, A.D., 1963.

HOWELL APPLING, Jr.,
[SEAL] *Secretary of State.*

ENROLLED HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 9

(Introduced by Representatives Mosser, Atiyeh, Jones, and Senators Hare, Ireland)

To His Excellency, John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, and to the Honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the 52d Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas the feasibility report for the Tualatin Valley (Scoggins) irrigation project has been completed and published; and

Whereas that report is now in the hands of the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation awaiting approval; and

Whereas voters of Washington County have approved formation of the Tualatin Valley Irrigation District, which district contains more than the 17,000 irrigable acres required for the feasibility of the project; and

Whereas the Tualatin project involves a supply of water for municipal and industrial use, recreation, fish and wildlife and water quality control, all of which uses are vital to the area served; and

Whereas an Oregon Supreme Court decision has decreed a priority of natural stream flow to users outside the Tualatin River drainage area; and

Whereas that court decision deprives the present users of the natural stream flow of the Tualatin River and its tributaries of an adequate supply of water for the irrigation of approximately 26,000 acres and also limits the water supplies for municipal and industrial users; and

Whereas the Tualatin project, as proposed, represents a multipurpose project which fulfills the principles of maximum water resource development; and

Whereas local organizations interested in the water quality control, fish and wildlife and recreation have approved the project; and

Whereas, because of water shortages, the cities of Forest Grove and Hillsboro and the Lake Oswego Corp. are vitally interested in obtaining municipal and industrial water from the project; and

Whereas Scoggins Reservoir, which would be created by the project, rates high in the recreational long-term plans of the metropolitan planning commission as reported to the city council of the city of Portland and the county commissioners of Multnomah, Washington and Clackamas Counties: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:

1. We urge the expeditious processing through the Federal agencies concerned of the review of the Tualatin Valley irrigation project plan required preliminary to its approval by the Secretary of the Interior and the authorization of the project by the Congress of the United States, and we further urge that approval and authorization.

2. The secretary of state shall send a copy of this memorial to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, and to each member of the Oregon congressional delegation.

Adopted by house March 13, 1963.

CECIL L. EDWARDS,
Chief Clerk of House.
CLARENCE BARTON,
Speaker of House.

Adopted by senate April 2, 1963.

BEN MUSA,
President of Senate.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow, pursuant to the order previously entered.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Friday, April 26, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 25 (legislative day of April 24), 1963:

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Glenn T. Seaborg, of California, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for a term of 5 years expiring June 30, 1968. (Reappointment.)

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Arnold Ordman, of Maryland, to be General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board for a term of 4 years, vice Stuart Rothman.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 25 (legislative day of April 24), 1963:

COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE CORP.

The following-named persons to the offices indicated, to which offices they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

To be incorporators of the Communications Satellite Corp.

Edgar M. Kaiser, of California.
David M. Kennedy, of Illinois.
Sidney J. Weinberg, of New York.
Bruce G. Sundlun, of Rhode Island.
A. Byrne Litschgi, of Florida.
Beardsley Graham, of Kentucky.
Leonard Woodcock, of Michigan
Sam Harris, of New York.
George Feldman, of New York.
Leonard Marks, of the District of Columbia.
John T. Connor, of New Jersey.
George L. Killion, of California.
Leo D. Welch, of New York.
Joseph V. Charyk, of California.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

L. J. Andolsek, of Minnesota, to be a Civil Service Commissioner for the term of 6 years expiring March 1, 1969.

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

Charles B. Fulton, of Florida, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of Florida.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Liberty B. Todd, Attalla.
Ersie F. Palmer, Birmingham.
Ida L. Colgrove, Boligee.
Erskine W. Bonds, Docena.
William H. McCarty, Moulton.
Thomas P. Weeks, Moundville.

ALASKA

Marshall C. Higginbotham, Aniak.
J. Raymond Roady, Ketchikan.
Mildred J. Sanford, Tok.

ARKANSAS

Eliot T. Bush, Arkinda.
James G. Ramey, Everton.
Kathryn R. Richards, Gamaliel.
Maxine R. Edmondson, Gentry.
Leslie H. Johnson, Hackett.
Herbert Miller, Jr., Junction City.
Roy L. Sharpe, Little Rock.
Milton M. Hemingway, McGehee.
Alph Herron, Mayflower.
Marvin J. Wilber, Maysville.
Arnold B. Sikes, North Little Rock.
Joe D. Taylor, Plainview.
John A. Graves, Siloam Springs.
James E. Landes, Stamps.
Erwin B. Medart, West Fork.

COLORADO

Harley O. Mullins, Aurora.
William J. Smith, Craig.
Claude T. Cecil, Gill.
Phyllis M. Jenkins, Gilman.
Fredda H. Mizner, Pine.
Vernon L. Morris, Ramah.

CONNECTICUT

Warren A. Holbrook, Amston.
Philip V. Rokosa, Bristol.
Ruth C. Soracchi, Columbia.
Charles N. Doane, Jr., Essex.
Arline M. Fife, Falls Village.
B. Woodruff Clark, Litchfield.
John H. Murphy, New Canaan.
Eugene D. Lynch, New Milford.
Donald T. Hogan, Plymouth.
Stanley L. Zaprzalka, Seymour.
Carl J. Gniadek, Southport.
Merle E. Phelps, Staffordville.
Matthew J. Monahan, Thomaston.
Louis P. Gage, Washington Depot.
John J. Slattery, Waterbury.

GEORGIA

Charles E. Garrett, Alley.
Fred A. Kimler, Damascus.
Clifton H. Conner, Gainesville.
Newt S. Hinton, Poterdale.
C. Wayne Shannon, Preston.
Rothwell A. McCaskill, Sparta.

IDAHO

Don C. Chrystal, Bovill.
Oscar H. Egbert, Heyburn.
Elmer M. Fetzer, Paul.

ILLINOIS

Rudolph E. Beranek, Berwyn.

INDIANA

Andrew E. Street, Crane.
Charles R. Forgey, Freetown.
George R. Bills, Lewisville.

KENTUCKY

Henry M. Fannin, Ezel.
Joseph L. Thomas, Glendale.
Bremer Ehrler, Louisville.
Edward A. Runyan, Marion.
James E. Morris, Neon.
James H. Hicks, New Haven.
Charles M. Crawford, Olive Hill.
James C. Tracy, Smithland.
Mary R. McCormack, Sparta.

MAINE

William E. Comer, Bangor.
Sidney W. Bessey, Buckfield.
Samuel A. Saunders, Calais.
Ervin D. McCluskey, Jr., Freeport.
Erma M. Small, Monson.
Lorraine J. Bragdon, North Vassalboro.
Keith G. Robinson, Pembroke.
Edward E. Scribner, Stratton.
Lloyd E. Beckett, Thomaston.

MARYLAND

Eugene G. Bujac, Bowie.
Richard H. Bates, Branchville.
Ora H. King, Clarksburg.
Joseph E. Kenney, Frostburg.
Virginia M. Goode, Marbury.
Henry J. Mundell, North Beach.
W. Conway Beall, Upper Marlboro.
M. Illene Trotter, Waldorf.

MONTANA

L. Preston Blakeley, Absarokee.
Jean M. Hanson, Simms.
George A. Henderson, West Glacier.
Lois M. Walker, Wolf Creek.

NEBRASKA

Donald F. Carey, Bancroft.
Blaine T. Larsen, Beaver Crossing.
Wilfred L. Kozisek, Bruno.
Norman I. Anderson, Concord.
Carl C. Larson, Edgar.
Elgar R. Dempcy, Eustis.
Mary E. Hartigan, Inman.
Frederick G. King, Lynch.
W. Edward Chamberlain, Rushville.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Ernest F. Rossi, Jr., Milford.
Martin J. Keenan, Jr., Peterborough.

NEW JERSEY

Joseph J. Stahley, East Brunswick.

NEW YORK

Erma B. Tenney, Alexander.
John P. Frey, Atlantic Beach.
John J. Biondolillo, Avon.
Daniel F. Mulvana, Bombay.
Edward K. Sutryk, Bradford.
Michael Pokitko, Burt.
Richard J. Lobdell, Canton.
John M. Edwards, Chester.
Alan R. Mann, Cobleskill.
Henrietta B. VanDerheyden, Coeymans.
Marcella J. Lee, Crown Point.
James A. Mulholland, Delmar.
Thomas J. Dolan, Dover Plains.
John J. Frazer, Earlton.
Christene S. Myers, Eldred.
Marie L. Murray, Ellington.
Mae S. Cohen, Fallsburgh.
Marie M. Olds, Freeville.
George L. Nelson, Glen Head.
Helen S. Victor, Grand Gorge.
John W. Carroll, Jr., Great Neck.
William E. Vaughn, Greenville.
Raymond E. Skinner, Greenwood Lake.
Rodney N. Lockwood, Hinsdale.
Jean T. Klemann, Honeoye.
Clarmarie S. Kenerson, Jacksonville.
Raymond W. Gould, Jamestown.
Lawrence J. Daley, Kanona.
Hugh E. Birdslow, Lacona.
George L. Longyear, La Fayette.
Alton E. Briscoe, Laurens.
Jean V. McQueen, Little Genesee.
John W. McCormick, Maine.
Gerard R. T. O'Grady, Malverne.
Guy E. Hobbs, Jr., Manlius.
Ruby L. Folds, Maple View.
Floyd A. Jones, Marathon.
Joan C. Jendral, Mastic Beach.
Mary V. Quigley, Mottville.
Benjamin N. Ketcham, Mountainville.
Dominic A. Amuso, Mount Kisco.
Donald E. Van Vliet, Niverville.
Arthur C. Jacobia, Old Chatham.
Shirley A. McNally, Olmstedville.
Mary A. Jones, Oyster Bay.
Joseph J. Farrell, Paul Smiths.

Nathan R. Walker, Phelps.
George R. Low, Pine Bush.
Joseph Espinar, Plattekill.
Karl E. Putnam, Prattsburg.
Ella N. DeLaire, Prospect.
Michael L. Odak, Red Hook.
Donald M. Slocum, Richfield Springs.
Raymond R. MacDonald, Rock Tavern.
Walter F. Schiener, Sardinia.
Helen H. Kirker, Seneca Castle.
Victor W. Humel, Shirley.
Margaret B. Belmont, Sidney Center.
Maurie G. Flanigan, Slingerlands.
Frank H. Doyle, Jr., Stuyvesant.
Edna K. Baldassare, Tomkins Cove.
Arthur H. Withall, Ulster Park.
Robert A. Nussbaum, West Hurley.
Michael J. Taylor, Whitney Point.
Irene I. Carson, York.

NORTH DAKOTA

Richard D. Grieve, Buffalo.
Chester C. Cowee, Crosby.
Margaret L. Keenan, Portal.

OKLAHOMA

Earl A. Moore, Boley.
William R. Kilgore, Sr., Idabel.
Youvon W. Martin, McAlester.
Guy E. Warren, Norman.
Paul D. Sockey, Red Oak.
Eura V. Furr, Stringtown.
Buster T. Robb, Sulphur.

PENNSYLVANIA

Donald M. Crouch, Butler.
Carolyn F. Singley, Cashtown.
Robert E. Dibble, Cedars.
Daniel J. Gildea, Coaldale.
Edward P. O'Connell, Eagleville.
Shirley G. Marmer, Frederick.
John H. Reynolds, Grove City.
Oscar W. Laucks, Hummelstown.
A. Thomas Carty, Lafayette Hill.
Michael J. Clark, Lansdowne.
W. Deen Lauver, McAlisterville.
Thomas F. Doyle, Marion Center.
Roy C. Brey, Red Hill.
Russell G. Kratzer, Richfield.
Barbra M. Wissinger, Salix.
Dean A. Risch, Sarver.
Joseph Kosik, Townville.
George W. Nase, Tylersport.
James F. Acker, Venango.
Thomas W. McIntyre, West Chester.

RHODE ISLAND

Pasquale D. Frisella, Wakefield.

TENNESSEE

R. Frank Cunningham, Obion.
John L. Norris, Jr., Tiptonville.

TEXAS

Graham M. Phillips, Cranfills Gap.
Alma J. Littleton, Dryden.
Mary N. Barger, Goree.
Gilma C. Jones, Graford.
James H. Jones, Jarrell.
Junius P. Ray, Llano.
Maurice P. Long, Mount Vernon.
Harold I. Line, O'Donnell.
Charlene Westbrook, Talco.

UTAH

Don A. Mayhew, Duchesne.
Bryce R. Jensen, Roy.

WASHINGTON

Lila E. Cahill, Kittitas.
Jean M. Olson, Manchester.
Dorothy E. Bjornsgaard, Rosburg.
Donald F. McLennan, Sedro Woolley.

WISCONSIN

Clarence G. Buss, Belmont.
John W. Crimi, Brookfield.
Max H. Bergen, Chetek.
Daniel A. Wirkus, Edgar.
Keith E. Anderson, Eleva.
Gordon H. Mollers, Glenwood City.
Raymond A. Austad, Hawkins.
Charles F. Held, Jackson.
Cleo N. DeLaura, Menomonee Falls.
Irene L. Genisot, Montreal.
Charles M. Bruner, Prentice.
Donald C. Tuttle, Suamico.
George P. Grabarec, Union Grove.
Frederick W. Pagel, Watertown.
John F. Graham, Whitewater.
Elmer F. Crowell, Wittenberg.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 25, 1963

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m.

Rev. Jack D. Smith, pastor of the First Methodist Church of Sylvania, Ga., offered the following prayer:

Our great and eternal God, we give Thee thanks for all that Thou has provided for us in this great and abundant America of ours. Above all we thank Thee for consecrated leadership, for the pride and interest and endurance of men and women who give of the best that life has to offer that our country may not just survive but that it may grow in grace, and peace, and wisdom. God give us great consecrated courage and give us convictions to go with that courage that we may put it to practice for the use of all mankind.

We pray in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 980. An act to provide for the holding terms of the United States District Court for the District of Vermont at Montpelier and St. Johnsbury; and

S.J. Res. 39. Joint resolution designating the week of May 20–26, 1963, as National Actors' Equity Week.

LABOR, HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report on the bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare and related agencies for the fiscal year 1964, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD reserved all points of order on the bill.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittees of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 25]

Ashley
Betts
Broomfield
Broyhill, N.C.
Burton
Cameron
Celler
Curtis
Davis, Ga.
Diggs
Fisher
Forrester
Glenn
Goodling
Healey
Hébert
Henderson
Karth
Lennon
Lipscomb
Macdonald
Miller, Calif.
Pepper
Powell
Rains
Reifel
Rich
Rivers, Alaska
Roosevelt
Shelley
Staebler
Tuten
Walter
Watson
White
Widnall
Winstead

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 392 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR AIRCRAFT, MISSILES, AND NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2440) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1964 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to all of the amendments of the Senate and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. VINSON, RIVERS of South Carolina, PHILBIN, HÉBERT, ARENDS, GAVIN, and NORBLAD.

PERMISSION TO COMMITTEES TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on the Panama Canal may be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

FEED GRAIN ACT OF 1963

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 320 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

> *Resolved,* That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4997) to extend the feed grain program. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed three hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of that time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules of this House has had under consideration House Resolution 320. That resolution, if adopted, will make in order the consideration by this House of H.R. 4997, a bill authored by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], which is designed to extend the feed grain bill. The bill, if enacted, will be known as the Feed Grain Act of 1963.

The rule, House Resolution 320, provides that in the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4997), the House may use 3 hours in general debate. The time shall be equally divided and it shall be controlled by the chairman, and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture. After general debate, the bill will be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

I am proud to have the privilege of presenting on behalf of the Committee on Rules the rule on this bill. I was born and raised on a farm, and have myself been engaged in farming, more or less, all my life. My State of Alabama continues to be, by and large, an agricultural State. Its agricultural interests are diverse within the State, ranging from the peanut area of southeast Alabama to the cotton area of Sand Mountain, and to the broiler area which stretches all across north Alabama. The rich lands of the Tennessee Valley continue to give forth a great harvest. The beef farms of Alabama's black belt are now among the finest in the Nation. Our farmers have very greatly improved their ability to grow corn and feed grains in the last 25 years. In dairying, Alabama has very substantial interests.

The average Alabama farmer is a man whose philosophy and expression have been tempered by hard work, an understanding of and appreciation of the laws of nature, and an abiding faith in man's movement toward the ultimate goal of goodness.

As I understand the Alabama farmer, he has his own immediate agricultural interests which have to do with his own economic well-being, but at the same time, he has an understanding and an appreciation for the overall needs of America's agriculture. He realizes that if agriculture is strong in the Southeast that it must be strong in the Midwest. If agriculture is strong on the Atlantic seaboard it must be strong in other parts of our Nation.

Now, the purpose of the bill which the rule before us seeks to make in order for immediate consideration is a bill whose purposes are fourfold. First, those who have studied it believe that it will raise farm income; second, those who have worked on this bill firmly allege and believe that it will lower the surplus stocks of feed grains; third, it is believed that the passage of the bill will save millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money; and fourth, it will give the feed and grain producer more flexibility in the operation and the management of his own farm, which is a goal always to be desired.

Since this feed grain program complements and works alongside and with the wheat program enacted by the Congress last year, prompt action on this feed grain measure is urgently needed in order for wheat producers to be in a position to make the best decision in the 1964 wheat referendum to be held next month, on May 21.

In summary, the bill, H.R. 4997, provides for a voluntary feed grain program for feed grain crops to be produced in 1964 and 1965. In the event that the Secretary of Agriculture finds that the total supply of feed grains is likely to be excessive, he would be required to develop an acreage diversion program.

Price supports for corn, if a feed grain acreage diversion program is in effect, would be between 65 percent and 90 percent of parity to those producers who participate in the acreage diversion program.

Price support for other feed grains would be comparable to that for corn; a portion of the price support would be made in the form of a payment in kind. The amount of the payment in kind would be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to assure that the benefits of the price support and diversion program would benefit all cooperating producers.

If no acreage diversion program is in effect, the price support would be at the level authorized by the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, but might be restricted to those producers who do not exceed the feed grain basis established for the farm.

Land diversion payments-in-kind for 1964 and 1965 are authorized at levels not in excess of 50 percent of the support price, including that portion of the support price-in-kind which is actually paid in kind, and it relates to the normal production of the acreage diverted.

The base acreage used to determine the percentage of land to be diverted would continue to be 1959 and 1960 average adjusted acreage. However, the average acreage of wheat for 1959, 1960, and 1961 produced under the feed wheat exemption, which is under section 335(f) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, in excess of the small farm wheat basis established for the farm would be included in the feed grain base under this bill.

A new feature of the bill is a provision to reserve not to exceed 1 percent of the estimated State feed base for apportionment to farms on which there were no acreages devoted to feed grains during 1959 and 1960, with specific guidelines for apportioning the reserve to such farms. Farms that receive bases under the provision would not be eligible for land payments in the first year. Farms that receive bases under the provision would not be eligible for land diversion payments in the first year.

The adjusted yield used to determine the normal production for price support payments and land diversion payments for the 1964 crop would be based on the 1959–62 average yield, and for the 1965 crop the 1959–63 average yield. For farmers who prove their actual acreage and yields, such proven acreage and yields shall be used in making the determinations.

The acreage to be diverted would be determined as that necessary to achieve the acreage goal, but could not exceed the larger of 50 percent of the base, or 25 acres.

Payment-in-kind involved in the price support and acreage diversion program would be in the form of negotiable certificates with CCC authorized to redeem such certificates for feed grains valued at not less than the current support price less that part of the support price made available through payments-in-kind, plus reasonable carrying charges.

The term "feed grains" under the bill means corn, grain sorghums, and barley. The term "feed grains" also includes oats and rye if the producers on a wheat farm so request, in which case the diversion program shall be applicable to oats and rye and the producers could, if they desired, utilize such acreages for the purpose of having acreage devoted to the production of wheat considered as devoted to the production of feed grains pursuant to section 328 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962. However, permitted acreages of oats and rye under the diversion program may not be planted to corn, grain sorghums, and barley.

While I recognize that there are many critics of the voluntary feed grain programs of the last 3 years, yet the results of those programs speak very eloquently for themselves. In 1961, prior to the impact of the first feed grain program, stocks of all feed grains were at a record 3.2 billion bushels. This year, it is estimated that stocks will be down to about 2.3 billion bushels. And, it is firmly believed that by the end of the 1963-64 marketing year, feed grain stocks will approach the reserve quantities which are deemed necessary to meet possible emergencies.

We all know that farm income in this country was up $1.2 billion in 1962 over 1960. Personally, I do not think that is enough of an increase but certainly it is a marked improvement. In addition, through June 30 this year, the cumulative savings to taxpayers in carrying charges alone on feed grains and wheat from the 1961 level will amount to nearly a quarter of a billion dollars. Eventual savings from the 1961, 1962, and 1963 feed grain programs alone will amount to somewhere in the neighborhood of a billion and a quarter dollars. We all know that throughout this period, consumer costs have remained very stable and in relation to income have actually declined. These reductions in stocks of feed grains and reductions in carrying charges have been accomplished without damage to our free market structure and without depressing prices. Two years ago the market price of corn in Chicago was $1.11 a bushel; today the farmer can sell grain on the Chicago market for $1.20 a bushel.

Mr. Speaker, it is my belief that this rule should be adopted. At the proper time, I will move the previous question on its adoption.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Alabama has so well explained, this rule does make in order under 3 hours of general debate the so-called feed grain bill, H.R. 4997, a bill called the Feed Grain Act of 1963, which would fix a program for the production of feed grains during the calendar year of 1964.

The first question that logically pops into the mind of the average Congressman who reads this measure is "Why all the hurry?" Why rush to get this legislation through to take care of feed grain production on the farms of America, not in this calendar year, but in the calendar year of 1964, when in most instances, in sections of the country, corn and seed for the 1963 crop, to be harvested in September or October or even as late as November, has not yet even been planted? But from here we are being called upon to enact a bill for 1964, a crop year that is still over a year away.

I wonder why the hurry? I wonder why the necessity of moving so quickly? Can it be that someone would like to rush this legislation through before the famous or infamous referendum on the administration's proposed wheat program can be held across the Nation on May 21, so American farmers participating therein will have no opportunity to know something about what wheat production or the wheat program may or may not be before they are asked to pass upon a small feed program such as this?

Perhaps, that is the real reason why we have this measure before us today.

I would like to tell my farmer friends, as one who operates a couple of fairly good farms out in Ohio, so I know something about agriculture from personal experience, and as a Member of Congress of some 25 years' experience, as well as a publisher of rural newspapers, as to the serious effect these various farm programs have had on the farmers of the Nation and on our agriculture generally throughout the years. While the program described in H.R. 4997 will be called a volunteer program, as there is no direct actual compulsion in the bill, there is all through this bill well disguised, well covered, provisions that say to the average farmer, "Well, if you are smart you will sign up and join this program or you will not get the benefits, you will not get the promised 'goodies' we hold out for you, in the provisions of this bill."

Mr. Speaker, I have followed through Congress many of the Agriculture Department bills that have been cleared by this body in the past and some of them have been "doosies" as to the methods used, and some of them have been most peculiar, but in this bill we would give more power, more authority, to the Secretary of Agriculture than in any piece of legislation that has ever been enacted in the past. You give this man, Mr. Freeman, the Secretary of Agriculture, who as far as I know never spent a day of his life on a farm, the power to make all sorts of decisions, and to do all sorts of things not only for, but to, the farmers of the Nation and the Congress as well. We will not only be delegating our authority as Members of Congress, as the legislators for the people of this country, to the Secretary of Agriculture, but we will also be abdicating our own powers, our own responsibilities, our own rights, and our own privileges.

Mr. Speaker, if the Members of this House would just take the time to read this bill, and it is not a long bill, it has just 3 lines over 11 pages, they will find that in almost every sentence, or every paragraph, at least, more and more power, more and more authority, and more and more discretion is placed in the hands or in the mind—whatever you want to call it—of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I have just marked a few places in this bill. On page 2, up in the first line, there is language dealing with parity prices and there are also the words "as the Secretary determines." All through the bill everything is to be "as the Secretary determines" or "in his discretion decides it should be," not as the Congress decides it should be, not as the farmers of the Nation who may join this program decide it should be, or the participants in it, not how anyone else decides, but just one man and his minions that work under him, may decide.

We can go on down the bill, if you please, for I know I have missed several.

It is an interesting experiment just to read this bill over even once. If you do, I believe you will come to the conclusion I am right as to the unusual delegation of power and authority this House is being asked to confer upon the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman.

On page 2, line 13, which has to do with how the producer shall participate in the diversion program, the language reads, "to the extent prescribed by the Secretary."

Maybe you can participate and maybe you cannot. That is up to the Secretary. Take the bill and go through it, line by line. Let us turn over to page 3, line 9, where they talk about acreage diversion, "as the Secretary determines desirable."

Who decides? Not the farmer, not the man who owns the land or tills the soil—oh, no. But as this little "god" that sits down the street here on Independence Avenue, between 12th and 14th Streets, may decide in his innate wisdom is in the best interests of the farmers of this Nation, or that of somebody else—I do not know, for we have no assurance who it may or may not be.

It may be a lack of confidence, but I simply do not believe that there is any individual, even the Secretary of Agriculture, who has within himself, within his own little brain, all the knowledge, all the information and all the wisdom, in America, and that the rest of the population have none; that one man knows more about agriculture and what may affect all the different farm activities in the United States, in different sections of this broad land of ours, because conditions change—knows more than anybody else, and everybody else, combined. And are we so anxious to give him such power over the feed grains crops of 1964 that we will rush through a bill like this here before the 1963 crop has even been planted.

Let us go on for just a minute more. Let us look at lines 21 and 22 on page 3:

> The Secretary may make not to exceed 50 per centum of any payments hereunder to producers.

He "may make," and he may not. It is up to the Secretary. If you are a feed grains producer, how do you know what the Secretary may or may not decide? I would not want to guess.

Here is another one on top of page 4—and I am just hitting the high spots. It says "such feed grains to be valued by the Secretary"—he fixes the value. It is not the market price, not based on supply and demand, nothing else—just on the desires of the Secretary, in his innate wisdom, in his knowledge of all things. He decides. Go down to line 11, if you please, on page 4, which refers to "reasonable costs of storage and other carrying charges"—now, this is after Billy Sol Estes, thank goodness—"reasonable costs of storage and other carrying charges, as determined by the Secretary." Who knows what those charges and costs will be? Any farmer? Any participant in the program, any taxpayer? No, just one person, the Secretary of Agriculture, or some individual he may designate.

Let us go on hurriedly, if we may, because I do not wish to take too much time. Let us look at page 5, line 17. This is one of these "notwithstanding" sections of the bill. It starts off—"Notwithstanding any other provision of law—" certain things can be done, "subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines."

In other words, set aside the laws written by the Congress if the Secretary determines, in his very, very innate wisdom that would be better for the people of the United States, than the laws enacted by the Congress. And it also says "conservation payments in amounts determined by the Secretary to be fair and reasonable."

It is just possible that what Mr. Freeman thinks may be fair and reasonable may not appear to some other person as being fair and reasonable. But others do not have anything to say about it, these hundreds of thousands of tillers of the soil, these men and women who earn their living the hard way. Instead, the decision is made in a plush office down here on Independence Avenue. The determination is made there. The Secretary decides what may be fair and reasonable.

Let us go on to page 6. Let us look at line 9. "Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions," in other words, set it all aside. We have said so and so but we do not mean it.

Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions, the Secretary may permit—and so forth. In other words, if he decides that what Congress has said is not right he can change it and permit something else.

Then line 17, "such crop shall be at a rate determined by the Secretary to be fair and reasonable."

Again, he decides what is fair and reasonable, no one else. Mr. Freeman is a very great man, a very able man, undoubtedly. He must be, because I understand he helped write this bill. It was written down in the Department, so I am told.

Then we go on to page 7, line 20, "shall require the producer to take such measures as the Secretary may deem appropriate."

He decides what measures are appropriate for you to take, the measures you should follow in connection with this program. The Secretary is perhaps an interested party. I do not know. He may have seen this draft, he may have helped to prepare it, if the rumors and reports are correct. He should have known what is in this bill, and I am sure he would not approve of legislation of this type unless he knew it.

Then let us go on to page 8, in which there is talk about crop years "as the Secretary determines necessary." He determines what is necessary, no one else, no committee of farmers, just the Secretary.

Then go down a little further to lines 18 and 19 on page 8:

> The Secretary may make such adjustments in acreage and yields as he determines necessary.

He makes the decision. He is the Supreme Court, he is the law of the land, he, the Secretary is the almighty that you must turn to for recourse.

Then let us look at the top of page 9:

> The Secretary may make not to exceed 50 per centum of any payments to producers in advance of determination of performance.

He decides what he will give you or what he will not give you.

We can go on and on. Just read the bill and you will find that.

On page 10, line 10, it reads, "There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts."

We do not fix any amount. The authorization is not spelled out.

> There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to enable the Secretary to carry out this section.

Of course, he may have to go before the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations. I hope so. Perhaps something could be done there.

Let us go to page 11, about the Commodity Credit Corporation, what it shall and shall not do, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall, in accordance."

Now, mark these words: "in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary."

He tells the Commodity Credit Corporation just what it can and cannot do, this powerful individual, the Secretary. He must indeed be a very, very wise man.

Then let us look at line 9. It deals with reasonable costs of storage and other carrying charges, "as determined by the Secretary." The words are there for you.

Then let us look at line 18. That is in paragraph (6):

> Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may, by mutual agreement with the producer, terminate or modify any agreement previously entered into.

He can make any kind of deal he wants. That is quite a lot of power to have.

But if a man is allwise, if he is a man of omniscience and of infallible judgment, then, perhaps, he will not make an unwise agreement. Perhaps, he will treat everybody exactly alike. Perhaps, he will be fair to everyone.

Go through this bill and you find that in it we are being asked not only to hurry through a program for a crop year that will not get underway for another 12 months, but are also being asked to surrender our own powers, rights, and authorities to one man, an appointed official, a member of the Cabinet, yes—but an appointed official just the same—responsible only to the President, to make all the decisions and all giving him more power, authority, and more discretionary rights to act than any individual has ever exercised in that Office in all history.

There should be a warning sign erected, and the House of Representatives should at least know what sort of legislation it is being called upon to vote for or against when this matter comes up for final decision.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. BASS]. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL].

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I am the only member of the House Agriculture Committee representing a constituency in which practically all farming is by the lot, plot, or flowerpot rather than by the acre.

I am elected by voters who grow grass and flowers and maybe a tree or two for personal pleasure rather than profit. Their battles are not with the boll weevil or corn borer, but with crabgrass and the bug who would do in the rosebud.

Yet the families who send me to Congress have a continuing interest in the food and agriculture policies and programs of our society. One reason is that they consider themselves not just citizens of a geographical area in New York City, but as citizens of the United States. Another reason they have an interest, and a significant stake, in food and farming is their concern with nutrition and health, and with family and Federal budgets.

There are more buyers and consumers of food and fiber in the Eighth Congressional District of New York than there are farmers in the States of Arkansas, Illinois, Kansas, Nebraska, and Florida put together.

There are five times as many buyers and consumers of food and fiber in the cities of New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, and Detroit as there are farmers in all the 50 States.

These statistics constitute a tremendous, and merited, tribute to the approximately 3.5 million American farmers and their families.

Never in all the history of mankind have so few fed so many, so well. One cannot walk into a metropolitan supermarket and see the mountains of meats, vegetables, breads, fruits, and dairy products without knowing gratitude for the bounty of our land and the skill and dedication of our farm people.

However, appreciation is a two-way street. Farmers have made a great contribution to the welfare of consumers. At the same time, in terms of their financial and philosophical and political support of commodity and conservation programs, city consumer-taxpayers have substantially contributed to the welfare of farmers.

The claim that city people do not understand farm problems is quite frequently heard. The record does not support this contention.

I believe city people understand the economic fact that they cannot be assured of plenty of food if farmers must continually produce at a financial loss.

I believe city people understand the necessity for utilizing Federal loans to bring electricity and telephones to farm homes, and I believe they understand these projects create better farm markets for household appliances and services that have city origin.

I believe city people understand the necessity for spending public funds to conserve soil and water so that future generations of Americans may know food and fiber abundance, too.

I believe city people want to preserve the free-enterprise system of family farms.

Perhaps there is more city understanding of the needs and problems and contributions of agriculture than there is rural understanding of the needs and problems and contributions of urban people.

Surely, there must be a parallel between a watershed project and urban renewal, between farm-to-market road development and mass transportation improvements, and between a Department of Agriculture and a Department of Urban Affairs—but if such parallels exist—they have not been noticeably recognized in rural America.

Perhaps those in farm areas who complain about lack of understanding should be reminded of a centuries-old fact—there is a close relationship between understanding gained and understanding given.

Someone once said education is too important for policymaking in that area to be the sole responsibility of educators. By the same token, maybe food and farming policy determinations are too important to be limited to those who are concerned with fields and pastures. This concept need not diminish either producers or consumers—it could easily enrich both. And in that framework, the presence of a distinctly urban-consumer representative on the House Agriculture Committee does not necessarily make the committee a home for a displaced person.

In the areas of food supply management, prices, Federal farm spending, utilization of production, balance of trade and conservation of natural resources—no citizen of our society—regardless of whether he ever sees a field of grain or a live chicken, steer, cow, or pig—can escape either responsibility or privilege.

The denial of man's right to be an island, entire in himself, applies to both producer and consumer of food. Dependent one upon the other, each carries a responsibility for the other's welfare—each benefits from the other's role in the society.

Mr. Speaker, I believe I represent my district and my State in giving attention to the health and welfare of agriculture. I am just as convinced that the health and welfare of my constituents, both physical and financial, should be an integral part of food and farming legislation. I sincerely hope the entire Congress will give such legislation this two-dimensional study.

I do not pretend knowledge of the technical phases of the feed grain program now before us. But it is quite clear that the operation of a similar program over the past 2 years has brought an increase in farm income, a decrease in the Federal expenditures attached to storage of unneeded and unwanted surpluses, and stable prices for consumers.

After all, in urging farmers to expand their productive abilities and facilities in two wars since 1940, all of us gained a measure of responsibility for the growth of surpluses and a measure of blame for failure to adequately attack the problem in the 1950's.

I believe this general responsibility will be terminated, so far as surpluses are concerned, once we have achieved the transition to balance between supplies and current and reserve needs.

There will be, in the coming months, a closer tie between the extent to which farmers use agricultural programs and the extent to which consumer-taxpayers are willing to authorize and finance them.

I am reminded of the story of the two Boy Scouts who approached their leader and asked if they might untie the knots in their kerchiefs, because they had performed their good deed for the day.

What did you do? the leader asked.

We helped a sweet little old lady across the street.

How come it took two of you?

She did not want to go.

I am convinced that the residents of cities and suburbia, who have the most votes, will not continue to help farmers across a street they really do not want to cross.

I am just as convinced that when our farmers want to move toward significant goals, and do it with unity and purpose, they can count upon all the help they need from their fellow citizens.

It is on that basis I shall vote for H.R. 4997.

It is from that viewpoint that I shall consider, and vote for or against, future farm and food legislation.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY].

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, my friends over on the right-hand side of the aisle have raised the question several times lately as to why the majority party and the administration have been charged with management of the news. Some of you fail to understand why that charge has been made.

I might say the bill before us today is a very good example, because you have been told two things. You have been told this is a simple extension of the feed grain program that is now operative and a matter of law, and you have been told, too, that it is a voluntary program. I submit, Mr. Speaker, it is neither. Therefore, I think this is a typical example of why the administration and the majority must bear the responsibility and the label that was attached to you for news management. By whom? By Republicans? No. By the press? Yes.

You might inquire why do I say this is not a voluntary program, and why do I allege there is an element of misrepresentation in here. It is a relatively simple thing to explain.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] spoke to you at some length about the unprecedented delegation of authority to the Secretary of Agriculture under this bill. It really is not unprecedented as far as a proposal is concerned, because the precedent was probably established last year in the compulsory bill that the House rejected.

For those of you who may be having difficulty in making up your minds as to how you should vote on this bill, it is relatively pretty simple, because if you voted against the compulsory feed grain and bushel management bill last year on the floor of the House, you most certainly should vote against this bill today, because it has all the elements of a compulsory feed grain program written in it.

The gentleman from Ohio pointed out in some detail the various examples of delegation of authority. But certainly I would further submit, Mr. Speaker, that if there is any question remaining in the minds of the Members about all of the mechanics being written into this bill that are necessary to make it a compulsory program, I would remind you of two or three simple little provisions appearing in this 1963 feed grain bill. There was a specific stipulation that the subsidy payments would be 18 cents a bushel in the 1963 program. What does it say in this bill? There is no limit at all. As far as I can tell by reading the bill, the subsidy payment can be 25 cents a bushel, it can be 30 cents a bushel. You ask, Is this not good for the farmers? Is this not what you want, a higher farm income? Of course a higher income is desirable. But what I think the Secretary wants to do is to increase the subsidy payments and lower the support price and in that way bring about economic sanctions against the farmer so he must be a cooperator in the program.

And then I might suggest, too, about the diversion payments. Now, they were very clearly stipulated in the bill last year to be 50 percent of the average annual production. What are they this year? Even if there is a program, it is discretionary with the Secretary of Agriculture whether or not there will be any diversion payments. If I may have your attention just for this one point, even though the Secretary might decide there would be no diversion payments for 1964 and 1965, the implication is the farmer can proceed to plant all the corn he chooses. No. It specifically provides that he shall be denied any support price if he exceeds his acreage allotment. So, this is another example of the compulsion of the economic sanctions that are contained in the proposal.

Now, why are we having this bill here in late April when the feed grain crops have not even been planted for 1963? Frankly, I do not know. I think I know why it is here. But, I asked the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] when he was before the Committee on Rules, as the Committee on Agriculture was leaving the room, if he would restate specifically and concisely why it was necessary to have this bill before the House at this season of the year to consider legislation for 1964, and the 1963 crops have not even been planted nor their yield estimated. And, I might say I did not get a very satisfactory answer from the gentleman from Texas. The allegation, of course, is that the wheat farmers, when they vote in their referendum come May 21, should know absolutely whether there is going to be a feed grain program or not for 1964.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that even though this bill might pass the House and might pass the Senate, the wheat farmers of America will still not know whether it is going to be a feed grain program for 1964, because, again, it relates back to the discretion of the Secretary.

There is a further aspect unfavorable to agriculture that could come about by permitting the Secretary to have almost unlimited discretion in fixing the subsidy payment. The minimum price for which the Secretary could dispose of existing Commodity Credit Corporation stocks of feed grain is based upon the prevailing support price during any single year. Therefore, by this arrangement the Secretary can keep the support price at the bare minimum, increase the price to cooperators through the subsidy and then stand poised over all of the other farmers threatening them with very low prices by dumping of stocks on the market if they do not participate in the feed grain program.

This bill should be recommitted.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, in December of 1962 the noted public opinion analyst, Sam Lubell, made a speech in Ames, Iowa, in which he said:

> In recent years many Congressmen have voted for farm legislation which they thought would reduce the total cost of farm subsidies. Only after the accounting was in did they realize that they had actually voted for higher subsidy costs.

He also said:

> The writing of farm legislation has become a conspiracy against public understanding.

The substance of this speech will underscore Mr. Lubell's conclusions.

All of you received today a letter from Secretary Freeman in which he points to the success of the feed grain program in 1961, 1962, and 1963 as a justification for a new 2-year lease on life as embodied in this bill. And, although there are substantial changes in the language before us now from the language under which the first 3 years of the program have operated, still he would have authority, if he so chose, to operate the programs in 1964 and 1965 as he has in 1961, 1962, and 1963. So, I think it is very proper for us to find out just what kind of a success this program really has been.

I invite your attention, first of all, to the fact that the administrative cost has not been a trivial item. If you will add up the expenses of all of the officers of the House of Representatives and their clerks, if you add the salaries of all of the clerks and secretaries of all 435 Members of the House of Representatives together, these people who serve the interests—the intimate multitude of interests of the entire population of this Nation—you will find that the cost for all these services is considerably less than the cost expended each year under the operation of the feed grain program.

The total administrative cost for 3 years of the feed grain programs was over $100 million.

Mr. Speaker, what have we got for the tax dollars we have spent and are spending in direct payments? Has this truly been a success story? In 1961 payments amounted to $782 million, in 1962 they were up to $842 million, and in 1963 they are up over $140 million.

Each year the payments go up and up. One might expect that the results would go up and up. After all, the purpose of this program has been to take feed grain acres out of production as a device to balance supply and demand and reduce our stockpiles. So, let us look at what was achieved. Did we actually get reasonably good results for our money? In 1961 we diverted 25 million acres at a cost of $782 million in direct payments, and here we do not include heavy administrative expenses and realized losses to Commodity Credit Corporation. We spent that amount of money in order to get 25 million acres out of production. Look what is happening in 1963. Direct payments total $983 million—up over $200 million—but diverted acres are still only 25 million.

How long can we afford the savings that Secretary Freeman claims under this feed grain program?

I note that on page 31 of the committee report feed grain farmers were paid $782 million in 1961 and $842 million in 1962 not to grow corn, sorghum, and barley. On page 14 of the committee report, I note that the estimated payments for the 1963 program total some $983 million. Yet, the tables on page 13 show that in 1961 there were 25.2 million acres diverted, in 1962, 28.6 million acres diverted, and in 1963, 25.8 million acres diverted. Assuming these figures supplied by the Department of Agriculture are all accurate, why is it that in 1963 the payments for not growing 25.8 million acres of feed grains are over $200 million more than the payments for not growing 25.2 million acres of these grains in 1961? In fact, the payments are $141 million more in 1963 than they were in 1962, in spite of the fact that there are almost 3 million fewer acres diverted. The reason appears to be that in the 1963 program, payments are made up of both land retirement payments in the amount of $496 million and an additional $487 million in direct price-support payments.

Whatever the legal distinctions may be, it seems readily apparent that this feed grain program which was enacted as a temporary expedient in 1961 is going to cost at least $200 million more in 1963 while achieving fewer results. The bill that is now pending before the House proposes to extend this 1963 program with some changes for 2 more years.

When administrative costs and inventory shuffling expenses are taken into account, we can readily see a billion dollar a year program being proposed for the next 2 years. Perhaps this is why Secretary Freeman said last year during the debate on the mandatory feed grain bill in a memorandum to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on May 21, 1962, as follows:

> 1. The voluntary programs are too costly.
>
> (a) The additional cost to the Government of operating the voluntary feed grain and wheat programs in S. 3225 for the 1963 crops, compared with the long-range programs, would be about $600 million.
>
> (b) If the voluntary programs were extended further, through the 1966 crops, the cumulative additional cost would be about $4 billion. This amount is equal to the average yearly Federal income taxpayments of nearly 5 million taxpayers; would build 27,000 miles of modern highways; would complete 4,000 watershed projects.
>
> 2. The voluntary programs provide no assurance that stocks will be reduced. In the voluntary feed grain program, noncooperators offset much of the acreage reduction made by cooperators. In 1961, noncooperators increased their plantings by 6 to 7 million acres, offsetting about one-fourth of the acreage reduction diverted and paid for on farms of cooperators. In the voluntary wheat program, smaller carryovers depend on acreage diversion beyond the mandatory 10-percent reduction from 1961 allotments. In both programs, farmer participation is uncertain, and is dependent on crop conditions.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the more that this administration says it is going to save, the more the taxpayers end up paying.

It is not easy to find out how much taxpayers have spent under the feed grain programs, and what they got for their money.

One reason is statistical skullduggery on the part of the Kennedy administration. One example was Secretary Freeman's declaration in his February 28 memorandum to Congressmen that the wheat and feed grain programs have cut surplus stockpiles over 1 billion bushels.

USDA reports showed this to be a gross exaggeration. Stockpiles were down only 437 million bushels.

Taking comparable dates, corn holdings were down 371 million bushels, wheat down 48 million bushels, and grain sorghums down 18 million bushels. This adds up to a total cut of 437 million bushels.

Another example was Secretary Freeman's letter dated April 19 to all Members of the House. Here is the text:

> DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
> OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
> *Washington, D.C., April 19, 1963.*
>
> DEAR CONGRESSMAN FINDLEY: I understand the Feed Grain Act of 1963 will come before the House shortly after the Congress returns from its recess. This legislation would extend for 2 years, the highly successful measures enacted in 1961 and 1962 which have—
>
> Contributed to a 10-percent increase in net farm income between 1960 and 1962.
>
> Reduced feed grain stocks from a record 3.2 billion bushels in 1961—prior to the time the new feed grains programs became effective—to an estimated 1.9 million bushels at the close of the current marketing year.
>
> Maintained stable food prices for consumers.
>
> Resulted in savings of $920,000 each day in grain storage and handling charges as compared with this date in 1961.
>
> This is striking progress every citizen understands.
>
> If the House reaffirms its actions of 1961–62 by passing this bill, it means elimination of the unneeded, unwanted feed grains surpluses by 1964. Once the carryover has been reduced to a level adequate for emergency and security reserves, a supply-demand balance can be maintained with less acreage diversion and less cost in the years ahead.
>
> Further, if the House takes favorable action on this legislation, farmers participating in wheat and feed grains price support programs will have greater flexibility in utilization of their land. If the wheat referendum is approved May 21, and there is also a feed grains program, producers will be able to interchange these crops. It is desirable for

farmers to know before voting in the referendum what the wheat-feed grain relationship will be.

I am hopeful the success of the feed grain programs and the importance of action now on feed grains in the light of the upcoming wheat referendum will make possible your favorable support of H.R. 4997.

Sincerely,

ORVILLE J. FREEMAN.

This morning I circulated this response to Members of the House:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 23, 1963.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: You are in for trouble with farmers and other taxpayers if you try to explain your vote on the feed grain bill by quoting Secretary Freeman's April 19 letter to Members of the House. It tells only part of the story.

He calls the 1961-62 programs highly successful and says they helped to boost farm income. Note these facts:

When direct payments to farmers are deducted, net farm income went down—not up—between 1960 and 1962. The direct tax outlay to farmers rose faster ($1.2 billion) than net farm income ($1.1 billion).

The cost-price squeeze for farmers is actually the worst in years. The farm parity ratio (prices related to costs) is 77—down from 81 when Mr. Freeman took over. In Illinois, the parity ratio is now 71—lowest on record since 1934.

Mr. Freeman claims his programs have reduced feed grain stocks 1.3 billion bushels. He uses the word "reduced" at the beginning of the sentence but hid the telltale word "estimated" later on. This 1.3-billion figure is sheer speculation.

Based on USDA reports, I can prove that Government grain holdings are down less than half the amount claimed.

Mr. Freeman says the programs have "resulted in savings of $920,000 each day in grain storage and handling charges." This is not factual. It is guesswork, and it is misleading.

Total cost to taxpayers is actually up sharply. The Wall Street Journal (Apr. 23, 1963) said: "This year's acreage cutting plan, providing for higher price supports on 1963 feed grain crops and lower payments for idling land, will cost taxpayers nearly $1.2 billion, Federal economists estimate. That's $100 million more than probably 1962-63 costs."

Taxpayers are spending more but getting less results. This table shows what's happening (figures from committee report on H.R. 4997).

	Diverted acres	Payments
1961	25,200,000	$782,000,000
1962	28,600,000	842,000,000
1963	25,800,000	983,000.000

NOTE.—Administrative expenses and CCC realized losses not included.

The latest report of the Commodity Credit Corporation shows total Government investment in farm surpluses, $8,445,793,604—up 10 percent from a year ago.

The latest USDA feed situation report clearly shows the 1963 program will get far less results despite increased cost. Taxpayers will shell out $8.78 for each dollar's worth of surplus feed grain disposed of this year.

The Secretary said in a letter last June to Senator ELLENDER, "The voluntary programs are too costly. * * *. If the voluntary programs were extended further, through the 1966 crops, the cumulative additional cost would be about $4 billion. This amount is equal to the average yearly Federal income tax payments of nearly 5 million taxpayers; would build 27,000 miles of modern highways; would complete 4,000 watershed projects."

This bill would extend these costly programs through 1965. I contend they have been a gigantic and costly failure, and are a legislative mistake which should not be compounded.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL FINDLEY,
Representative in Congress.

Mr. Freeman claims taxpayers are saving $920,000 each day because they are not paying storage and handling on a mythical 1,300 million bushels. This is based on a theoretical storage cost of 26 cents per bushel a year—almost twice the average storage cost.

Rate on resealed grain is now 14 cents. The commercial storage rate is 13½ cents. CCC claims much lower cost on grain stored at binsites and in the moth ball fleet. Handling charges might average 2 cents a bushel at the most.

Here again savings on mythical stockpile cuts are computed at mythical rates—about twice too high.

In the committee report, facts and fantasy mixed together. Refer to table 8 on page 14 of committee report, "Estimate of savings." Facts on payments and costs mixed with unadulterated speculation on what may happen if the rabbit does not stop to scratch his left ear.

For phony conclusions, turn to page 5 of committee report. I quote:

> Just 2 years ago the Nation's agriculture, our basic and largest industry, was on the brink of bankruptcy. The farm program which had worked so long and so well—during wartime and in peace in the interest of farmers and the general economy was a shambles.

The facts: Cattle and hog prices are the lowest in several years.

The parity ratio for the Nation was 77 for March of this year—down from 81 when the Kennedy administration took over.

In Illinois the parity ratio hit 71—lowest on record since 1934—the worst cost-price squeeze in 29 years.

The best way I know to measure the value of this program is to stick to facts and forget the hypothetical guesswork. Here are a few facts:

[H. Rept. 16.180, 88th Cong., on H.R. 4997]

	Diverted acres (table 7, p. 13)	Payments (table 8, p. 14)
1961	25,200,000	$782,000,000
1962	28,600,000	842,000,000
1963	25,800,000	983,000,000

Not included are administrative expenses which are CCC realized losses.

Note payments have gone up each year—up $60 million the second year, up an extra $141 million the third year. What will it be in 1964 and 1965 under this bill? Clearly, the trend is up.

Now, note that the total acres diverted are down under the 1963 program but costs are up. Here we see another dramatic application of Professor Parkinson's law—costs continually rise even though services and accomplishments may decline.

Now I hasten to say the 1963 figures are estimates, but they are estimates supplied by the administration and we can safely assume they are on the conservative side.

According to the American Farm Bureau and the table on page 39 of the report shows total reduction in feed grain carryover to be 23.7 million tons under the 1961 and 1962 programs.

If we take just the direct costs of these programs, and if we assume that the programs were responsible for all cutbacks in carryover—this shows a direct cost of $2.04 per bushel corn equivalent. If we take into account increased utilization of feed grains—and we should—then we will find it cost $7.93 for each bushel cutback achieved during the 1961 and 1962 programs. With corn worth about $1 a bushel, this can hardly be regarded as an economical program.

I invite your attention to these factors involved in the reduction of feed grain stocks:

[In millions of tons]

	1961	1962	Total
Reduction in production from 1960 of crops covered by program:			
Corn	7.9	7.4	15.3
Grain sorghum	4.0	3.1	7.1
Barley	--------	0	0
Total	11.9	10.5	22.4
Reduction in production from 1960 of crops not covered by program:			
Barley	.8	--------	.8
Oats	2.3	2.0	4.3
	3.1	2.0	5.1
Increase in utilization from 1960 marketing year	8.1	8.3	16.4
Net effect of reduction in production of crops not covered by program and increase in utilization on carryover	−11.2	−10.3	−21.5
Total reduction in carryover	12.9	10.8	23.7
Reduction in carryover due to feed grain program	1.7	.5	2.2

NOTE.—It may be argued that the carryover would have increased if there had been no feed grain program. The point, however, is that the program has done little except to stop the buildup. The reduction in accumulated stocks is almost entirely due to increased utilization and reduced production of feed crops not covered by the program.

The total direct costs of our 2-year experience with the feed grain program have exceeded $1.7 billion.

Direct costs of the 1961 and 1962 feed grain programs

[In millions of dollars]

Payments to—	1961	1962	Total, 1961 and 1962
Corn producers Sorghum producers	765	854	1,619
Barley producers	--------	42	42
Administrative expenses	42	[1] 42	84
Total	807	938	1,745

[1] Assumed to be the same as for 1961.

Indirect costs resulting from the policy of dumping CCC grain to penalize nonparticipants will add $200 million or more to the total cost of the 1961 and 1962 programs.

Slippage under this program has been shocking. In 1961 taxpayers paid for approximately 4 acres for each 3 acres by which corn and grain sorghum plantings were reduced from the 1959–60 base. In 1962 taxpayers paid for approximately 5 acres for each 3½ acres by which corn, grain sorghums, and barley were reduced from the 1959–60 base. The situation will be even worse in 1963.

What we have before us now is a proposal to spend about a billion dollars in each of the next 2 years to farmers for not growing feed grains.

And finally a novel feature of this bill, one intended to benefit new growers, authorizes the Secretary even to pay new growers for not growing corn they never did grow.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the problems with regard to the feed grains programs are rather complicated. As the gentleman from New York said, it is very difficult to understand all the ramifications of such a bill. It is even more difficult when you get the kind of figures thrown out here that were presented by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY]. And I will tell you why. Under the 1963 program we are going to have the money spent principally in two particular ways: One is for diverted acres, and one is to pay the 18 cents to the farmers that we otherwise would have lost if we had taken the grain into Government storage and then sold it later. Almost all of the cost in that program is covered by the 1963 figure; but, Mr. Speaker, under the 1962 program the program costs that are referred to there are only for the diverted-acres costs. Those figures did not include the loss we have taken or will take from moving the grain into the Government bins and then selling it at a loss. The truth of the matter is that the cost of the 1963 program will be less, because there will be less realized losses on grain taken over by the Government and less handling charges.

Mr. Speaker, the 1963 figure as shown on the chart represents almost the total cost for the crop year which we will have suffered; whereas the 1962 figure only takes into account the part of the cost related to payment for diverted acres. Use of these kinds of figures is the kind of thing that makes it difficult to understand these programs, and I think in order to understand it better, we should also go back one step further to the 1959 and 1960 program which is still being supported by some people who are opposed to this feed grains legislation. Under that program we would raise 600 million bushels more than we consumed. There is no limit under that program to the amount that can be delivered to the Government and whether we take it in at 75 cents a bushel or $1.50 a bushel, there is no place for it to go except into Government bins. If we pay $1 dollar a bushel for it, that is $600 million. Then we would keep it around for several years and spend $1.75 a bushel keeping it around until it would go out of condition enough so that the law would permit putting it into market channels.

Mr. Speaker, that is the most expensive kind of program. It cost us $1.7 billion or $1.8 billion that year to operate that program. The feed grains program has not only raised farm income but also reduced those Government costs while keeping the supplies to the consumer at a stable price and an adequate level.

I submit to you that during the afternoon we should look very carefully at all the figures presented and make sure we are not doing like the fellow who advised his neighbor that he should produce milk with goats rather than cows. He said, "After all, both milk goats and Guernsey cows give milk and it costs less to feed the goat." That rationalization totally fails to consider the fact that the cow would give 10 times as much milk. That is about the kind of comparison one has when comparing the 1962 with 1963 diverted-acres costs without also comparing the cost of realized losses on grain.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time on this side to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to the fact that the question we are presently considering is whether we are going to adopt the rule. The question before us is not whether you think this is a perfect bill. The question is do we have a fair rule presenting a feed grains bill to the House? The rule is an open rule. Anybody may offer amendments to the bill which has been presented by the committee. This is not a gag rule in any respect; it is wide open. The rule provides for adequate, and more than adequate, debate. There is every opportunity for anyone who wants to suggest any change or any other type of program to suggest it. What more can you ask in the way of a rule?

The issue on which you are about to vote is whether we are to bring this bill up for consideration; not whether you think this bill as it now stands is the bill which you want to support. I hope you will support it because I think it is a good bill. I think it is pretty well worked out. But you may disagree with that. If you do, you still should vote for this rule unless you feel that there should be no feed grains program in the United States.

Of course, if you are opposed to any and all programs; if you are opposed to doing anything to try to balance supply and demand; if you are opposed to being of any assistance to that great group of our American citizens who produce our food and fiber, then of course it is perfectly proper and perfectly legitimate for you to oppose this rule or any other rule. But let it not be said that any Member of this House voted against this rule and then suggests that the reason he did so was that even though he wanted to give the farmer a feed grains program, he just did not like the way the rule presented the matter.

Oh, I know that there are those who say, "But we should not take this action now." I know that there are members on our committee who say, "Yes, we should help the farmer; yes, we want to be of help, but we do not want to help him now."

Why do we not want to help now? Because, perchance we think that this would have some influence on the wheat referendum. I do not know that it can have any influence on the wheat referendum one way or the other. But I do think that the people who are growing wheat and who must vote in the coming wheat referendum have a right, and that this Congress has a duty to give them full information when they vote in that referendum, which they will do next month, on the 21st of May. They cannot have that full information unless they know what we are doing about a feed grains bill. Remember this, it is the wheat farmers who are going to be called upon to vote in a referendum, not feed grain farmers.

It is the wheat farmers who need to know what Congress has done, when they vote. They are the ones who are going to vote in May and unless we act to give them all of the information, they cannot properly coordinate the information that they have. There is no such compulsion for prompt information to the feed grain farmer because this bill imposes no program on the feed grains farmer. It is voluntary as to every one of them. There is no compulsion. There is no referendum except as each individual decides for himself whether he thinks it is helpful to him to participate in the program or not. There is no penalty if he does not participate and he will have until planting time next spring to make up his mind as to whether or not he wants to participate.

He will by that time know what the wheat program is.

Certainly there is a relationship between the wheat program and the feed grain program, but the wheat farmers must vote next month, and unless you give them this information today they are going to vote in ignorance. The feed grain farmer is not going to have to make any decision until long after the referendum. So I submit there is no logic to the suggestion that this rule should not be adopted today. I want to give those people who must make a decision all of the information they can have, and then let them make that decision with all of that information.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. KELLY. I am very much interested in the problems of the farmer and I have supported farm bills many times. I should like to refer to page 8 of the committee report, where under the heading of "Utilization" reference is made to the exports of feed grains as being, expressed in million tons, 17.3 in 1961 and 15.6 in 1962. Would that not mean that this program is most helpful as far as the foreign aid program is concerned?

Mr. POAGE. I should think it would be substantially helpful to the foreign aid program.

Mrs. KELLY. Then the foreign aid program is most helpful to the farmer.

Mr. POAGE. Yes.

Mrs. KELLY. I hope, then, Mr. Speaker, that those who support and need this program will do so because it will also be helpful to the foreign aid program. I would like to add the following figures under Public Law 480—which is for sale of agriculture products abroad. Fiscal year 1962 $1,563 million was sold and from 1954–62 about $11 billion was sold.

Mr. POAGE. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House to the fact that we are working against time. The committee gave time to those who now oppose the legislation. They came in and suggested, "We should not make a decision until we know the magnitude of the signup under the 1963 program." That suggestion was made in February. The committee said, "That is a reasonable suggestion, and we will not act until after the signup," which I believe was held on the 20th of March. We waited until after that signup. We waited until everybody got the information which they said they needed. Then we felt we should act, but the same group then said: "Now let us wait another couple of months—don't do anything until after the wheat referendum". The majority felt that that was unreasonable. So we acted.

We think we have been fair with everyone. We believe it is now time to take some action, to make some decision here so that farmers who must vote in May may know the effect of their vote. Today we must make some decisions because time is short. Many of you want to go to a reception tonight and we hope we can finish this bill in time. Let us vote on this bill without further delay.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll. No. 26]

Anderson
Ashley
Ayres
Blatnik
Broomfield
Celler
Colmer
Derwinski
Diggs
Ellsworth
Fisher
Forrester
Glenn
Goodling
Harris
Hawkins
Hays
Healey
Hébert
Hosmer
Jarman
King, Calif.
Leggett
Lennon
Macdonald
Mathias
Pillion
Pirnie
Powell
Rich
Rivers, Alaska
Roosevelt
St Germain
Shelley
Staebler
Walter
Widnall

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 398 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

FEED GRAIN ACT OF 1963

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

FEED GRAIN ACT OF 1963

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4997, to extend the feed grain program.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4997, with Mr. Wright in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Poage] will be recognized for 1½ hours, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Hoeven] will be recognized for 1½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Poage].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Cooley].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Agriculture brings to the House H.R. 4997, a bill to continue for 2 years the entirely voluntary, and highly successful, program for corn and other feed grains.

This legislation represents a dedicated effort by the members of our committee to deal effectively with the production and income problems in a major area. I commend especially Hon. W. R. "Bob" Poage, chairman, and the other members of the Livestock and Feed Grains Subcommittee, for the long hours and hard work they have devoted in public hearings and in the preparation of this legislation. I want to express my appreciation to each member of our Committee on Agriculture who is supporting this effort to hold grain production in reasonable bounds and to assure our grain farmers reasonable prices, in a purely voluntary program.

The purpose of the program in this legislation is fourfold. First, it will raise farm income, by assuring fairer prices for feed grain producers and by providing a basis of stability for livestock prices; second, it will bring down further the surplus stocks of feed grains; third, it will save millions of dollars in costs to taxpayers, in contrast to the Government storage program which would be in effect without this legislation, and fourth, it will give the wheat and feed grains producers new freedom and flexibility in the management and operation of their farms. It will enable them to substitute acre for acre between feed grains and wheat whenever they find that by doing so they will increase the efficiency and effectiveness of their own personal farming operations. Since this feed grains programs is interrelated with the wheat program enacted by Congress last year, prompt action on this feed grains measure is urgently needed so that wheat producers will have all the available information in making their decision in the referendum on the 1964 wheat program on May 21, 1963.

THE NATIONAL GRANGE SPEAKS

Mr. Chairman, in a recent letter to Members of the Congress, concerning this legislation that is now before us, Herschel D. Newsom, master of the National Grange, wrote:

> The Grange has consistently supported programs designed to bring a better balance of supplies with demand and to obtain a reduction in Government stocks of feed grains. We supported the emergency feed programs of 1961 and 1962 as temporary measures to meet an acute problem of increasing costs to the Government and declining income to farmers. It seems clear to us that these emergency programs have, in some part, achieved the results mentioned above.
>
> Present indications are that the 1963 program will show further progress toward these goals which most of us have been seeking. In light of this progress, we believe that it is unthinkable that there should not be further legislation authorizing the continuation of efforts to solve the feed grain problem without depressing farm income. We, therefore, urge your favorable consideration of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, the National Grange and Mr. Newsom are not noted for rash and irresponsible statements. The Grange is a distinctly middle-of-the-road farm organization and while it has never demonstrated fear of controversy, neither has it been identified with efforts to create it.

If the studies made by the National Grange show we are on the right path for improving farm income and reducing Government costs with this legislation, I am convinced we are on pretty solid ground.

Actually, the views of this great farm organization are supported by any candid study of where we were, where we are, and where we can go in achieving balance in our agricultural abundance by making a purposeful program available to our farmers.

H.R. 4997 is built upon the experience gained through the successful operation of the emergency feed grains programs launched in 1961. These programs have contributed to substantial, and essential, increases in farm income while reducing Government costs associated with the handling and storage of grain surpluses and providing reasonable and stable prices for food buyers.

Right now we are in position to break through the long-sought goal of a balance between feed grains demands and a supply level reflecting abundance without waste. And this legislation provides the mechanism for keeping this balance once we have reached it.

THE WHEAT REFERENDUM

What are the critics of H.R. 4997 saying?

Some of them contend the legislation is sound in principle and purpose, but that it is premature—and they recommend the Congress act eventually instead of now. They would kill the bill with a combination of kind words and procrastination.

Their real object is to defeat the wheat program in the May 21 referendum.

There is a vital reason for action by the Congress now, and this is it: The Feed Grain Act of 1963 will round out comprehensive grain legislation the Congress began last year with the adoption of a permanent wheat program. The two programs represent a package for many thousands of our producers, and unless they know the combination they will be handicapped in making sound judgment on May 21.

A key provision in the already adopted wheat legislation is the interchange of wheat and feed grains acres by farmers who wish to use this privilege. This is one of the greatest contributions to efficiency and flexibility in individual farming operations we have had since the beginning of farm programs. It will not increase total supplies. It embraces the greatest freedom of the farmer in managing his cropland ever provided in a production adjustment program for agriculture.

This provision, however, is available to producers only if there is a feed grains diversion program in effect. Consequently, unless the wheat producer knows before May 21 whether or not there will be a feed grains diversion program he will not be equipped with all the information he needs to make the best possible decision on the alternatives offered in the wheat referendum.

We owe it to the wheat farmer, as well as the feed grains farmer, to have the package completed before the middle of May.

Mr. Chairman, since the legislation before us and the impending wheat referendum have been so closely related, I believe it will be in the best interest of sound action here to return to the position of the National Grange. The "Grange Letter" to that organization's members on April 16 said:

> If you look closely enough you can find two points on which both sides agree in the wheat certificate referendum: (1) the result will be important to all wheat growers, and (2) the "no" alternative would result in a substantial loss of income to wheat growers.
>
> So far we have seen no one, nor heard of anyone, who prefers the "no" alternative in the law, to a "yes" vote. There is no third alternative program available.
>
> Yet, opposition to certificates is based entirely on the assumption that if marketing certificates are voted down Congress will pass and the President will sign a better program for 1964.
>
> We challenge that argument on two grounds: First, we believe now, as we have for more than 25 years in which the Grange originated and pioneered in development of the domestic parity, commodity-by-commodity farm program approach, that the certificate plan is the best program yet developed for assuring producers a fair income for their products.
>
> The certificate program is fair to producers, and it is fair to consumers, as well as to taxpayers—including farmers—who have financed a program of burdensome and continuing priced-depressing surpluses.
>
> The wheat certificate program supported by the Grange and all other farm groups responsive to the legitimate and reasonable interest of agriculture and the Nation, as contrasted with self-seeking aims and interests, is in accord with long-established Grange policy and objectives.
>
> Just two paragraphs from the general farm policy declaration unanimously adopted by delegates to the 96th annual session of the National Grange in Fort Wayne last November, illustrate the Grange position:
>
> Farmers must face squarely and forthrightly the necessity of bringing the supplies of their products under control if they are to be assured of incomes comparable to those received by nonfarmers. They have no right to expect Government to spend the taxpayers money to support prices of farm commodities when supplies are far in excess of market demand and when farmers themselves make no concentrated effort to reduce production.
>
> If prices of wheat and feed grains and of livestock and poultry products are to be maintained at fair and equitable levels, while the Government-owned stockpiles of cereals are significantly reduced within a reasonable period, effective supply management programs for those types of wheat in surplus and for feed grains will have to be inaugurated.
>
> The wheat referendum places that challenge squarely before farmers. To pretend, or to mislead farmers into believing, that the problem does not exist, or that if ignored it will disappear, is to misrepresent the facts, and do a serious disservice to agriculture.
>
> The opponent of the certificate program has raised a smokescreen of false and misleading issues in an obvious effort to confuse farmers. As fast as one false issue is knocked down, another is raised.
>
> This is a tactic often effective because it takes time for facts to catch up with such devious misstatements. We, along with all other sincere friends of agriculture, regret that such is the case.
>
> The Grange firmly believes that farmers have a right to the facts on which to base their decision when they vote on May 21. It does not believe scare tactics can be justified under any circumstances.
>
> Let's examine, close up, just a few of the scarecrows and boogeymen, that have been and are being put up in the false hope that farmers are so simple-minded as to believe that they are real:
>
> False: If certificates are voted down Congress will immediately adopt a better program.
>
> True: Congress last year gave careful consideration to many alternate programs and rejected all but the two which will be on the May 21 ballot. President Kennedy, Secretary Freeman, the chairman and members of both congressional agriculture committees have expressed opposition to further action if certificates are voted down.
>
> False: If certificates are voted, farmers * * * will not manage—they will need only to know how to follow orders.
>
> True: Assertion is ridiculous on its face. Farmers will continue to have as much freedom in operating their farms as under programs repeatedly approved by an overwhelming majority of growers not only for wheat, but cotton, tobacco, and other crops.
>
> False: The certificate plan * * * is a foot-in-the-door approach to Government supply management for all of agriculture.
>
> True: Pure hogwash. Before similar type programs could be offered for other commodities, it would first have to be enacted by Congress and, secondly, approved by two-thirds of the producers in a referendum.
>
> You have heard, or will hear, scores of other equally false statements intended to confuse and mislead farmers. If you don't have the facts to refute them on the spot, write us and we will answer them in the next Grange letter * * * or as many of them as space permits.
>
> Referring to vague and unsupported statements that if the wheat referendum is defeated Congress will pass legislation providing for a "better program," Newsom declared "there is no sound basis for this promise.
>
> "Grange contacts with congressional leaders representing both political parties make it perfectly clear that new wheat legislation is neither contemplated nor expected in case the referendum fails," he said.
>
> The declared opposition objective is to delay passage of the feed grains extension bill until after the wheat referendum and then, if the certificate program is defeated, attempt to combine wheat and feed grains legislation.
>
> This, some Washington officials insist, is asking feed grains growers to play legislative Russian roulette. They run the risk, if passage of a feed grains bill is delayed, of virtually no program in 1964 if Congress becomes mired in a wheat-feed grains controversy.

CRITICS ANSWERED

Mr. Chairman, a decision now on this bill will give farmers more time to plan their livestock programs for the next 2 years, and give administrators of the feed grains program at national and State and local levels opportunity to schedule their work in a way that gets maximum performance from personnel and facilities without conducting crash-type informational and administrative efforts to out-race fall and spring planting seasons.

Along with the critics of the legislation favoring delay, we have others claiming it provides too much discretionary authority for the Secretary of Agriculture.

This bill does not represent abandonment of either responsibility or authority by the Congress.

It simply delegates responsibility and authority, under prescribed guidelines, that will give producers maximum flexibility and provide consumers a continued guarantee of abundance.

The proposed 1964–65 feed grains programs differs from similar legislation of prior years in two respects.

First, the minimum percentage of diversion of feed grains acres for each cooperating farm is not spelled out; and, second, the price support loan and payment combination is not fixed.

This discretionary authority is not without precedent, and in the interests of providing for flexibility that will match the program with producer and consumer needs is most desirable.

The legislation puts both a floor and a ceiling on the price-support loan and payment combination, and at the same time permits their most efficient adaptation to the degree of desirable diversion.

We have long been concerned with the fact that too many price-supported commodities move into Government storage instead of normal trade channels. It was with the aim of remedying this situation that the Congress incorporated a direct payment into the price support structure for the current crop year. This feature cannot be of maximum benefit, however, unless the payment and loan levels can be combined in a way that augments desired goals in terms of production, diversion, reduction in grain takeovers by the Government, farm income and retail price levels.

We are dealing with commodities affected by unfavorable weather, crop pests and diseases, and which are, on the other hand, subject to increasing per-acre yields. These same commodities have an impact on the health and nutritional standards and the houeshold budgets of our people.

Inflexibility and rigidity in programs subject to quick changing conditions are not in the national interest. Discretionary authority with a sound background of legislative history and congressional intent is not dangerous; rather, it is indeed desirable.

COSTS AND SAVINGS

Along with those who would countenance delay or confuse discretion with license, we also have those critics who contend continuation of a voluntary feed grains program is undesirable in view of lower government costs associated with a mandatory program.

Some of these critics—those who voted for a mandatory feed grains program when it was before this House last year—have a case. I can sympathize with their philosophy while insisting we have to operate in the realm of the possible.

But I can find little time for those who on the one hand voted against a mandatory feed grains program and are now urging farmers to vote "no" in the May 21 wheat referendum, and at the same time compare the economies of a mandatory program with the expenditures of the voluntary type.

Of course a voluntary program costs more than a mandatory system of supply adjustment.

It is unfortunate, however, that critics of the cost tend to concentrate upon what we put into a successful voluntary supply adjustment program and ignore what we get out of it.

The feed grains programs of 1961 and 1962 cost $1.7 billion and we will invest a little more than $800 million in the 1963 program, on the basis of indicated farmer participation.

Yet, the 1961–62 investments reflected a billion-dollar rise in annual net farm income and avoided surplus production of feed grains that—had been planted and harvested—would have been a burden on taxpayers for the next 7 to 9 years.

Avoidance of the production of the grain and its acquisition by CCC will save millions of taxpayers' dollars. Ultimate savings, after taking into consideration the cost of diversion payments, will amount to $591 million for the 1961 program, $634 million for the 1962 program, and $90 million for the 1963 program—for a total of $1.3 billion.

The net investment, in terms of results, is indeed small.

Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, it is true that the costs are great. But this, the 88th Congress, is not responsible for these costs. We simply are paying for the mistakes of the 1950's when our Government frolicked and gambled with the idea of unlimited production and low prices for agriculture—a "freedom" and "go for broke" philosophy, if you please.

PHANTOM ACRES

Finally, we have the feed grains program critics who periodically search the statistics for "phantom acres."

Here are the facts:

First, it is true that the 1959–60 base for participating farms was adjusted, in line with congressional intent, to iron out individual inequities and eliminate hardships resulting from adverse weather conditions in the base years. However, participating farms planted fewer acres to feed grains than they were permitted after diversion from the base. In 1961, for example, while the base for participating farms was adjusted upward by 4.3 million acres, these same participating farms planted 6.2 million fewer acres than they were entitled to plant after the diversion.

Second, the nonparticipating farmer is responsible for the "slippage" determined by comparing total planted acreage for 1 year with that of another and finding that total planted acreage does not decrease as much as the total acreage diverted. There is nothing which requires a farmer to participate or requires a nonparticipating farmer to hold his feed grain acreage down. This, of course, is one of the reasons a mandatory program was proposed in 1962. For 1961, nonparticipating farms increased their acreage by about 6.7 million acres over the 1959–60 average planted acres.

And, finally, farmers are paid only for actual acres diverted based on determinations made by on-the-farm measurements.

PAINFUL PARTISANSHIP

Mr. Chairman, this legislation was reported by the Committee on Agriculture, and now is presented to the House, over the solid opposition of the Republican members of the committee.

This is exceedingly painful to me, and especially so since such partisan division has become a pattern on farm legislation. Mr. Chairman, there were times, now past, when it was difficult to distinguish a Democrat from a Republican in this House as legislation relating to the well-being of agriculture was debated and voted upon. We in this great body then comprehended that farm people are Democrats and they are Republicans, and that their well-being should have no reference to partisan politics.

These were the times of the triumph of the parity principle that ushered in the golden years of agriculture. For 11 consecutive years prior to 1953 the average prices paid to farmers were at or above 100 percent of parity.

BLESSINGS OF ABUNDANCE

Moreover, these were years that showered blessings upon the consumers of America. Our farmers invested their good earnings in the sciences of the culture of things to eat, they developed the techniques of abundance, and America became the best fed nation on the face of the earth, with our people paying a smaller portion of their income for food than any other people anywhere.

Agriculture wrote America's greatest success story.

Farmers in no other country of the world have lowered food costs, in relation to workers' wages, so dramatically. The farm program has been the dominant factor in bringing about this high-level efficiency.

And it is well at this point, Mr. Chairman, to recall that this farm program, that so abundantly blessed our farmers and our consumers, operated for 20 years prior to 1953 at an actual profit to the Government in its production stabilization and price support activities for the basic crops—corn, wheat, cotton, rice, tobacco, and peanuts. At the end of those 20 years the Government had only moderate investments in farm commodities.

PLANNED PARALYSIS

Then, for reasons I still do not understand, the new administration in 1953 decided to depart from this program, and President Eisenhower subsequently called for the scrapping of the parity principle.

We entered a period of planned paralysis for the farm program.

The consequences—farm depression, record surpluses, great costs.

Two years ago, after 8 long years, the Nation's agriculture, our basic and largest industry, was on the brink of bankruptcy. The farm program, which had worked so long and so well—during wartime and in peace—in the interest of farmers and the general economy—was a shambles.

Farmers' net earnings were at the lowest level, in relation to volume of their sales, for any period since the Department of Agriculture began keeping books. Average farm prices had reached their lowest, in terms of parity, for any year since the 1930's. Per capita annual income of people living on farms was only about one-half that of nonfarm people.

Huge surpluses of food and fiber—$9 billion worth of Government-held warehouse stocks—were being carried at great costs to taxpayers.

In February of 1961, President Kennedy, in his farm message, called upon Congress to remedy this situation, and the Congress responded.

The long downslide in farm income was halted.

Cumulative net earnings of farmers already have been increased by more than $2 billion. The pileup of surplus upon surplus in grains has been stopped.

Taxpayers already have been saved many millions of dollars, on future farm program costs.

In 1962 net farm income of $12.9 was 10 percent greater than in 1960 and the highest since 1953.

Average net income per farm in 1962 was up 18 percent over 1960, from $2,960 to $3,498.

Hourly returns for farmworkers and operators were $1.05 in 1962, compared with 87.5 cents in 1960, up 20 percent. Bank deposits and business activity in 20 major farm States are now 10 percent above 1960, an indication of the importance of farm income to the general economy.

THE GRIM ALTERNATIVE

Mr. Chairman, the Nation's agriculture is on the road back. Our action on the legislation now before us will further bolster this recovery, or it may present our farmers and, indeed, the Nation, with a grim alternative.

If we fail here in this House to enact this legislation, and should the wheat referendum fail, we shall risk chaos in the agricultural economy, and we shall risk the collapse of the Nation's farm program.

Such chaos and such collapse no doubt would set off a severe depression in the general economy.

To end farm price and production adjustment programs would bring on a terrible farm depression. This would be reflected quickly in a downturn for the entire economy. It would mean a drop of about a third in farm commodity prices, and an even sharper drop in net farm income.

Wheat prices, for example, would be cut almost in half—perhaps below a dollar a bushel.

Corn prices no doubt would fall to around 80 cents a bushel. Prices of other feed grains would follow corn prices down. Livestock markets, with unlimited production of cheap feed at depressed prices, would in the long run be demoralized.

Moreover, all the investments by the Government in the last 2 years to bring down grain surpluses would have been wasted.

AN END TO PARTISANSHIP

Now, Mr. Chairman, I must return again to the partisan feeling in the House, in the presence of a farm bill. It is all senseless to me, especially since our Republican friends are opposing this feed grains bill in the thought that they may defeat the wheat program in the impending referendum.

Moreover, it is indeed strange that those on the other side of the aisle want to destroy the wheat program, for it is the program, in all major respects, originally sponsored in the House by the man I deem to be the greatest Republican farm statesman of all time, Cliff Hope, of Kansas, former chairman of our Committee on Agriculture. Not only this, but a bill embracing this program was passed by the House in the Republican 83d Congress.

Mr. Chairman, it is not good for this country we all love, for one party or the other to position itself on public matters and legislation solely out of political considerations.

As for agriculture, I will say that unless farmers and their friends, in both political parties, can get together in the decision-making process, then someone else is going to make the decisions and the policies and the programs for agriculture. I for one am not willing here to contribute to circumstances which may bankrupt agriculture and create such chaos that farmers might lose their freedom to manage their businesses.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I want to let my Republican friends know that I yearn and long and pray for the day when, again, the thought of political advantage will be silent and it will be difficult to distinguish a Republican from a Democrat in this House when legislation relating to the well-being of agriculture, and to the people who produce our food and fiber, is debated and voted upon.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we have probably come to the most important milestone in agricultural legislation that we have reached for some years or that we probably will reach for some years, because we are today dealing with feed grains.

Mr. Chairman, I would of course like to tell the Members of the House that cotton is the great crop of the Nation and my people grow it, it does produce a vast amount of cash income. There are those from other areas who would like to tell you that wheat is the great crop of the Nation because the people depend upon it for their bread, and it is a vital crop. There are others who would tell you that dairying and livestock represent the greatest crops in the United States. But, after all, our livestock industry, our dairying industry, and all of our poultry industry is tied directly to feed grains. Feed grains account for a very large portion of the activities of American agriculture and probably play a much greater influence on all other crops than does any other activity of the American farmer. So, today we are dealing with the very crux of the farm problem when we deal with feed grains.

Historically feed grains have been produced with little or no controls. For a good many years we attempted to support the price of corn without any mandatory reduction in the acreage of corn. It worked for a little time and then producers began to feel that they could have it both ways, both in price and in production. That does not work in any free economy. As you increase production you inevitably decrease price unless there is a corresponding increase in consumption. So when our farmers sought both to increase supply and at the same time increase the price they simply could not do it and the result was that the U.S. Government was making up the difference for a long time, and for a good many years we were putting into Government storage around 300 million bushels of corn every year that the U.S. Government was buying, paying the support price for it, putting it in the warehouse, paying the transportation, and paying the storage.

As the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] so well pointed out, you keep this grain in storage and then you try to get it out of condition so you can sell it at a discount price.

I do not care what figures you have seen, you know and I know that the only way you can reduce your cost is to reduce the surplus in storage. As long as you continue to keep these vast volumes of feed grains in storage and add to them every year, the cost of your program is going to go up. You do not have to be a mathematician to know that. That is just a plain fact. And the cost of the program was getting completely out of hand, as everybody knows.

I want you to know about just what has happened in the last few years, because there are those who have indicated that the present program on feed grains was, oh, not worth its costs. At the peak of the inventories which was in 1961 we held 2,164 million bushels of feed grains and 1,277 million bushels of wheat; 3,451 million bushels of grain that the U.S. Government owned and on which it was paying storage. We have brought that down until our inventories on March 15, 1963—I want you to get that; I am not talking about what we hope to do this year, I am talking about where our inventories stood just a year ago—were 2,158 million, a reduction of 1,293 million bushels of grain.

It was costing us during the fiscal year 1962, 26.99 cents a bushel to carry that corn; 21.23 cents for grain sorghums and 26.21 cents for wheat. Apply that to the 1,293 million bushels on which we are not paying storage as a result of these programs and you find that we have a saving during the year of $336 million, or a saving of $920,000 per day. Talk about a program of economy. Can anybody seriously insist that they are supporting economy in government and vote to abandon this program of control of our feed grains with a saving right now of $920,000 a day, almost $1 million every day that comes around?

That is what we have already saved with the program. With the program in effect this year, it is confidently anticipated that we will bring the supply and demand of feed grain into approximate balance and that there will no longer be a need to continue to reduce the surpluses because we will have brought them down to where they are in fact no longer surpluses but normal carryover.

But you say, "Why don't you just continue the existing program?" You could not continue the existing program if you brought feed grains into balance with demand because we have been bringing this surplus down at the rate that I have pointed out here. We will not need to bring our stocks down further after this law is passed, unless we have a very unusual year. We will need only to maintain the balance between supply and demand. We will not have to take out that 300 million bushels a year piled up in Government surplus for these many years. We will not need to pay the same rates we are now paying to secure all the needed cooperation on the part of landowners. Something considerably less will do it.

You say, "Why didn't you pick some figure; something less?" For the very reason our friends suggested, that you ought to have all the facts before you in writing legislation. We could not say whether 18 or 15 or 13 cents would be the right payment. We do know that it should not take as much money to carry this program in future years as it has taken the last 2 years, when we had to bring down surpluses that had previously been accumulated. So we give to the Secretary the discretion that the gentleman from Ohio discussed this morning.

It is perfectly correct to say that rather than fixing a rate that would result in an unnecessary reduction and unnecessary waste of public money and possibly even a dangerous drawdown we have empowered the Secretary of Agriculture to apply such rates of payment as he feels will suit the occasion of the amount of grain that we have in storage and the amount that we need to reduce. We believe that that of itself will result in a saving of many hundreds of millions of dollars. But remember that you have a saving of approximately $1 million per day already established, and if you do not have this bill next year you will not only lose that $1 million a day but you will go right back to the old situation of accumulating more and more surpluses.

We have been asked wherein this bill differs from the existing law. I think that the answer is clear and that I have already given it to you. It is substantially this, that we do put flexibility into this bill so that there may be a downward adjustment of costs. That is the major difference between this bill and the existing law. The existing law has been working very well, but we need not keep it geared up to the present rate of payments for we can hold down on our expenditures and we should do so.

There is one other item in this bill which I want to call to the attention of my friends who asked that we put it in here, and we put it here. That is the exchangeability between feed grains and wheat.

It was the request of our friends on the Republican side that we provide this exchangeability, and it is in the bill. It is there to give those in the Far West who have gone to planting other feed grains such as oats or barley the opportunity to have them considered as wheat for the purposes of exchangeability of allotments only; but for no other purpose. It means that that farmer in Washington State who may have planted barley instead of wheat will now be able to consider that barley as wheat and, if he wants to, to plant wheat.

Let me make one further fact abundantly clear. This is not a mandatory bill. This bill does not provide for any kind of vote. It does not impose any kind of restrictions on any farmer. It authorizes any farmer to participate in the program, if he wants to. If he wants to retire as much as 20 percent of his historic planting, he may do so and may be paid up to 50 percent of his normal production on those retired acres. He will by complying also become eligible to receive payments and to receive the assurance of support price. There are, I think, decided advantages in becoming a complier. But if any farmer decides he does not want to comply, he does not have to say anything to anybody, he does not have to notify anybody, he does not have to do a thing in the world except to get out his drill and drill in every acre that he owns. There is no restriction on the rights of the individual farmer to carry on his farming just as he wants to carry it on.

We have been told by a great many people—oh, we do not want a bill that regiments the farmer. This bill does not regiment the farmer. Yes, it is going to cost you more money than a bill with mandatory allotments in it. But, this House decided it did not want mandatory allotments, and we are living with that decision. We have met the request of those who are going to oppose this bill. We have sought to perfect this bill. We bring you a good bill, a fair bill, and a voluntary bill—a bill that will get us results and which will save us money.

We are going to be crowded for time, and I am not going to take more time nor am I going to yield all of the time that has been allocated to the majority. We will yield only enough time to present the facts. In this way I hope to return at least three quarters of an hour. I invite the opponents to join me in expediting the consideration of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. NELSEN. It seems that we are going to hurry this bill through and, yet, in the discussion on the rule, we were told that there would be opportunity to be heard and offer amendments. If we are going to do what we have been doing in the last 5 years that I have been here, in other words, close off debate and close off an opportunity to be heard, I fail to see where there will be fair and adequate treatment of this bill. I do hope we have adequate time to discuss this. I have some questions I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] and I hope I will have that opportunity later because this is a very important piece of legislation and adequate time should be provided.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. POAGE. If the gentleman wants to yield me time to answer the questions I will, but I do not have the time. We are not going to use all our time, but if the gentleman wants to use his, all right. If the gentleman wants to yield to me to answer questions I will be glad to.

Mr. HOEVEN. I understand it is contemplated to complete this bill today and I have no objection. I hope the gentleman from Minnesota understands that under the 5-minute rule he will have an opportunity to speak, and I do hope that everyone will have an opportunity to be heard who wants to be heard.

Let me make it clear at the outset that I am not opposed to feed grain legislation as such, and that I am not opposed to a realistic and proper feed grain program for 1964 and 1965 of the right kind and at the right time. I am opposed to the method being used here in trying to ram through this bill today before the wheat referendum is held on May 21 of this year.

Time is not of the essence as far as this legislation is concerned. The Feed Grain Act of 1963 is now on the statute books. It pertains to the crop year 1963. And, therefore, there is ample legislation to take care of the crop year 1963. The Congress can pass a Feed Grain Act for 1964 or 1965 any time before this session of Congress adjourns. The feed grain farmer will not be planning his crop program for 1964 until along in the winter of 1963, and most certainly he should have the right of knowing what the wheat farmer is going to do in the referendum of May 21, 1963. The gentleman from Texas, my good friend, contends that the wheat farmer is entitled to know what the feed grain program is going to be before the referendum is held. That, of course, is simply a political sweetener for the wheat farmer and, in my humble judgment, is a deliberate attempt to influence a favorable vote in the wheat referendum. Passing a feed grain bill now, in effect, would be saying to the wheat farmers throughout the country that they could feel free to vote in favor of the wheat referendum because then we would have on the statute books a feed grain bill. So if the wheat referendum should fail, the wheat farmer could plant sorghums and other feed grains on his wheatland. It is a direct invitation for the wheat farmer to go ahead and vote for the wheat referendum in the knowledge that he had a feed grain bill to fall back on. I challenge anyone to tell the committee why we should pass a feed grain bill at this time, except for the purpose of trying to influence a favorable vote in the referendum on May 21, 1963. There can be no other reason.

If you will read the minority report you will find that we of the minority on the committee vigorously oppose the enactment of H.R. 4997 at this time for two basic reasons: One, because it is premature, and, two, because it lodges entirely too much discretion in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture.

The proponents of this bill feel that its enactment prior to the wheat referendum will improve the chances of the wheat referendum. It is nothing more than a deliberate attempt to influence a "yes" vote. In other words, it is nothing more than a crude "carrot and stick" tactic being executed on the wheat farmers of America in a desperate attempt to force a "yes" vote.

I personally resent those kinds of tactics. I think the wheat farmers of this country are intelligent people, and they have the know-how to vote as they deem best. They do not have to be told how to vote. I am sure that the wheat farmers across the country will resent this attempt to influence their vote.

And may I say to the proponents of this bill right now that this tactic might backfire on May 21, 1963.

Why is the administration so interested in passing this feed grain bill at this time? It has always been my impression that the Secretary of Agriculture in these referendums should be a referee in these referendums. He should see to it as such referee, that the wheat referendum is fairly conducted in accordance with the regulations and the law, instead of trying to bring about the kind of a result that the Secretary of Agriculture wants.

This is a two-way street. If the wheat farmer is entitled to know what the feed grain act is going to be, then the feed grain farmers by the same token are entitled to know what the wheat farmers are going to do in the referendum. This is only fair, just and equitable.

I doubt very much whether we are going to spend a lot of time debating the merits or demerits of this legislation, because the question of whether or not the legislation is premature is paramount. There will be a motion to recommit offered, not for the purpose of killing the bill, as far as I am concerned. It will be offered only for the purpose of postponing the legislation for only 24 legislative days until after the referendum has been had. Is this a reasonable request in view of the fact that time is not of the essence just now? We can pass a feed grain bill any time between now and the time Congress adjourns. We should have the benefit of the referendum results so the Committee on Agriculture can then act intelligently in presenting a realistic feed grain bill to the House, and a new wheat bill also if the referendum fails. Then we can legislate intelligently on the facts and not on the hopes or desires of the Secretary of Agriculture.

I am disturbed about the activities of the Department of Agriculture in trying to influence the wheat referendum, and I want to quote to you part of an article which appeared in the Wall Street Journal this morning, as follows:

> Agriculture Secretary Freeman is mobilizing all his Department's vast field organization to explain the control plan to voters. A series of informational sessions in over 2,000 wheat-raising counties is beginning; perhaps 27,000 full-time and part-time Government employees will be involved. Four million copies of seven different explanatory booklets are being circulated. Last year there were 2 pamphlets and 2.4 million printings.
>
> A special Freeman emissary, former Republican Congressman Phil Weaver of Nebraska, is criss-crossing Wheat Belt States, speaking to chambers of commerce, Rotary Clubs, and other groups in behalf of the control plan. TV films and radio tapes starring Mr. Freeman have been sent to some 300 broadcasters. In part, he hits directly at farmers' pocketbook interests. "With a 'yes' vote," he tells audiences, "the price of wheat will be $2 a bushel; with a 'no' vote, $1 a bushel."

This is propaganda of the first order and we have the right to question the propriety of such open pressure to sway the outcome of the referendum, let alone the legality of such unwarranted actions.

It is interesting to note that in the Feed Grain Act of 1962, which applies to the crop year 1963, it was specifically spelled out that the direct payments would be 18 cents a bushel. This provision is eliminated in the bill before us and there instead is placed in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture wide discretion to fix the loan level as high or as low as he desires thus enabling him to manipulate the market to almost any level he desires. The Secretary of Agriculture, not being able to put over his control program, is now attempting to do indirectly what he has not been able to do directly in imposing new controls. Everyone knows that the proposal presented in the wheat referendum is the most stringent wheat control bill in the history of this country. If the Secretary can only get his wheat control program on the statute books, through a favorable vote in the referendum, I daresay it will then be attempted to pass a new strict feed-grain control bill which means that our feed-grain farmers will be compelled to fall in line with the wheat farmers in a complete control program for midwestern agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. POAGE. I wonder if the gentleman from Iowa would care to yield more time at this juncture, because we are not going to use the hour and 30 minutes at our disposal.

Mr. HOEVEN. Can the Chairman advise me how much time has been consumed?

Mr. POAGE. We will try to use half of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas has consumed 15 minutes and the gentleman from Iowa has consumed 12 minutes.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-three Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 27]

Ashley
Ayres
Betts
Broomfield
Brown, Calif
Cameron
Casey
Celler
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Diggs
Dingell
Fisher
Forrester
Giaimo
Glenn
Goodling
Hawkins
Hays
Healey
Hébert
Hosmer
Kee
Keith
Lankford
Lennon
McMillan
Mathias
Nygaard
Powell
Reifel
Rich
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roosevelt
Schwengel
Shelley
Sibal
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Springer
Staebler
Steed
Teague, Calif.
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Waggonner
Walter
Widnall
Williams
Willis
Wydler

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WRIGHT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill H.R. 4997, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 380 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I shall support a motion to recommit this bill for the purpose of waiting until the wheat referendum is decided by the farmers of the country.

Mr. Chairman, acting on feed grain legislation at this time is premature. It is premature for the feed grain farmers, it is premature for the wheat farmers, it is premature for the Congress.

The reason why this bill is premature for feed grain farmers is that it is based on the premise that the wheat referendum will pass, that a "yes" vote will prevail. On the chance that the wheat referendum does not pass, and there is a very strong chance it will not, from all I hear from over the country, this program will not fit. It will not give the proper protection to the feed grain farmers, and a huge increase in the production of wheat will damage the price of feed grains, also the whole livestock feeding operation will be disrupted because the livestock people will find it necessary to shift to the feeding of wheat rather than corn and grain sorghums and barley. Its effect could be another big buildup in feed grain surpluses again. It is unwise for the Congress at this time to consider a piece of feed grain legislation when we do not know what program the most interrelated crop wheat will be operating under in 1964.

It is premature for the wheat farmer because he is making his decision in this referendum on May 21. He may decide he does not want the certificate plan, a plan which will make Government control more stringent, more mandatory than ever before, bringing Government direction not only to the farmers but to those who merchandise the grain after the farmer sells it to them, all the way up to the person who mills the wheat.

If the wheat farmers turn the referendum down, they ought to have the opportunity of having enacted in this session of Congress legislation which will protect them in 1964.

The alternative for the certificate wheat plan, as has been stated by the Secretary of Agriculture, is something that will bring disaster to them. He plans, he states, to cover all the international wheat commitments from the CCC wheat stocks which would result in new crop wheat being dumped on the market, thereby creating a hardship. I do not think the situation will be as bad as he claims, but in the event it is the Congress ought to be ready to act and act quickly. There has been pressure from the feed grain areas because for 1964 we have now virtually no program. That means 80-cent corn. Pressure will be on the Congress to act after the wheat referendum and before Congress adjourns. There is no urgency to pass this bill at the present time. There is plenty of time after May 21 and before adjournment.

For the benefit of the wheat farmers of this country we should wait on this feed grain legislation and for once pattern a bill treating wheat and feed grain alike. That is what we ought to do. For that reason it is premature for the Congress to act now because we are not acting on a situation as it will be after May 21. We are acting on what some people hope it will be, hoping that the farmers will adopt the referendum. Rather we ought to wait for a month and find out what the situation is in connection with wheat and legislate then as intelligently as we possibly can. At that time we ought to put together a wheat and feed grain program similar to that which we now have before us for feed grains—a voluntary program, the benefit of the program going to those who comply with it, payment in kind for reduced production, thereby getting rid of the surpluses that confront us. This has worked so well in connection with wheat grains, so that at the end of the 1963 market year the surpluses will be down to a normal carryover. The carryover is going to be high, 45 million tons, but that normal carryover has been established by the Department of Agriculture. If the program could be permitted to work for wheat, you would find a reduction in that surplus commodity in a very short time, and that is what ought to be done.

Let us look at the feed grain bill before us. It is unwise for the reason it is giving so much added discretion to the Secretary of Agriculture. He can virtually make this voluntary program into a mandatory program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, this could turn out to be a mandatory program, because now it is based on the philosophy that the person who participates to the least amount will be benefited the greatest. This means he could force everybody into the program and not just use it to reduce the production. The Secretary has not indicated he would do so; however, the law leaves it wide open now so that the price support loan rate could be unreasonably low and the compliers would be benefited by direct payment as much as the Secretary wants to make it, and thereby he could force everybody who raises feed grains, because of this power he has, by complete discretion, to manage it in every way possible. And, I do not believe, judging from the experience with the present Secretary of Agriculture, that we ought to give this discretion to him, because he has harmed enough programs, he has harmed enough commodities in this country like dairy products and cotton to indicate that he would not any more wisely handle the feed grain program.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Short].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I do not know when I have been in this Chamber considering a bill under any more unusual circumstances than we are witnessing here today. I think there are few people on our side of the aisle that are completely opposed to this feed grain bill, but we are opposed to it now, at least I am opposed to it, because I think it is completely unnecessary that this bill be before the House of Representatives at this time. Many of us on this side of the aisle would like to support this legislation. I would like to add right there, however, that I would only support it if it could have some improving amendments. This bill has a lot of possibilities for improvement, as most of the bills that come before Congress have. My concern at this time—and this is a most sincere concern—is that we are going to be in a most unfortunate position if we pass this feed grain bill before we know what the result of the wheat referendum is going to be. I do not think, whether we pass this bill or whether we do not today, it is going to have any material effect on the outcome of the wheat referendum. I think most farmers know—at least, they have good reason to know—that Congress will extend a feed grain program. I think all we need to clear the air is for the leadership on the majority side to take the same position that they have taken in regard to future legislation, if the wheat referendum fails. The majority party have announced that if the wheat referendum fails, there will be no future legislation. I do not know why they take this arbitrary position. I hope that if the wheat referendum does fail, and it could fail, they will remember these words and maybe have to live with them back in their own districts. But, I think if we need something to clear the air about what the farmers are going to have in the way of feed grain legislation if the wheat referendum fails, all we need is a statement from the majority side to the effect that Congress will consider, as I am sure we will, feed grain legislation after May 21.

Let me point out something that is most important. I do not think we should be so concerned about this bill in the event the referendum passes, because it does fit in, as has been pointed out here, with the certificate wheat program. But, where are we if the referendum fails? And, the referendum could fail. There are a lot of farmers that just do not like this certificate wheat program. As I have said many times, and many other people on this floor have said—and this is the truth—there has never been a more restrictive, completely compulsory wheat program offered to the American wheat farmers than this certificate program that they are being asked to vote for, in the wheat referendum.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. When we passed this bill last year, did not the Wheat Growers Association indicate that was the kind of a program they wanted?

Mr. SHORT. Which bill are you talking about?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I am talking about the program that they are going to vote the referendum on.

Mr. SHORT. I supported the feed grain program that we passed a year ago, I will say to the gentleman from Missouri, and I think I made it plain that I will support the bill again. But I do not think this bill should be passed now because if the referendum fails how can we people who represent agricultural areas who have a responsibility come back here to Congress and incorporate into this feed grain bill some protection for the wheat farmer beyond what he is going to have if he in his wisdom turns down this choice he is going to have to make in the wheat referendum? His only choice is to accept the most restrictive program he has ever had to live with or virtually no program and the added burden of the Government having over 1 billion bushels of wheat that would compete with the farmers' production.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to be able to come back here and consider this feed grain program in a little bit more congenial atmosphere and explore the possibility of adding wheat to this feed grain program. I think this feed grain program has some very desirable characteristics. First in my book is the simple one that my friend, the gentleman from Texas, very properly emphasizes, and that is that the farmer if he does not like Federal farm programs can stay out. He can simply not participate. This is the completely voluntary feature of the feed grain program that the administration endorses so ardently. The wheat farmer is deserving of the same consideration and treatment.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. MAY. May I suggest to my distinguished colleague from North Dakota that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Jones] asked a question and I would like to have him have an opportunity to repeat it here. Perhaps the gentleman did not understand it. Am I right in that the question was this: Did not the wheatgrower organizations support this wheat certificate plan that was in the referendum? Am I correct?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. If the gentleman will yield, that is what I asked.

Mrs. MAY. If the gentleman from North Dakota will yield further, I believe the gentleman did not support the wheat certificate plan.

Mr. SHORT. If I left the impression that I ever voted for any bill that incorporated the certificate wheat program it was not my intention, and I want to correct the Record now. I did not support the farm bill last year largely because it included the certificate wheat program. I did support at a later date the extension of the feed grain program. It was somewhat different than the program that we now have under consideration.

Mrs. MAY. If the gentleman will yield further, I thought the gentleman would like to have that clear, and would the gentleman agree that while the National Wheat Growers Association did support the legislation, not all the State groups did?

Mr. SHORT. This is very true and I thank the gentlewoman from Washington for helping me clarify my statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has again expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Jones].

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, we have here the question of which came first, the hen or the egg. In other words, some people want to vote on the wheat referendum and then pass a feed grain bill. There are others of us who feel that the feed grain bill should pass first. There is a difference of opinion and I think it is an honest difference of opinion. But we hear them on the other side say "let us postpone it, let us postpone it." All I have heard from that side during this entire session of Congress is "why do we not do something? Let us get to work. Let us pass some legislation." Then here they come today and say "let us postpone it again." I cannot understand it. I know this, though: that there are a lot of Representatives from the Republican areas who are under strict discipline here today whose farmers want this feed grain program and I know that is the reason they do not want to vote on it today. But I think their feet are going to be held to the fire. They are going to have to take some chances on it. They are going to have to go on the record today.

Mr. Chairman, we have seen used a lot of figures here today. I have always heard that figures will lie and liars will figure. Some Members have used figures to show how costly this program is. I will admit that figures are sometimes complicated and hard to understand. However, there was one figure used here today and bandied around the House a lot, and it just is not true, and that is the sum of $963 million for 1963 is represented as being land diversion payments, when it actually includes $490 million for price supports. If we did not divert those acres, we would have tied up more money in this program than we have now. Under the provisions of this bill which we are considering today it will save money, and it will cut down production and it will bring the supply and demand in balance. It will cut out a lot of this acreage and those people who say they want to save money are going to get the chance to go on record and see if they really want to save some money.

I was amused at one of the speakers during the debate on the rule when he was pointing out what authority we were giving the Secretary of Agriculture. I do not know of any agency in Government where the administrator of any program does not have some authority to issue regulations and to make determinations. That has been true of any program that has ever passed, whether it was an agricultural program or anything else. In this bill we have given the Secretary of Agriculture some leeway in order to adjust. As the gentleman from Minnesota said, we are going to bring down the supply in storage to a reasonable level. He has admitted that on the floor today. I think we have to have authority for the Secretary to make that adjustment because it is possible that this program could be so attractive that we would reduce beyond and not have a reasonable reserve stock.

Someone said, "When is the right time to pass this bill?" I think a lot of people say they would like to be for the bill. The fact is the gentleman from Iowa said that he was against the bill at this time because of the wheat referendum. He says, if it backfires, who will be hurt? I will tell you who will be hurt if that wheat referendum backfires. The wheat farmer is going to be hurt. I think the wheat referendum should be approved. If it is not, the wheat farmer is the one who is going to suffer.

I want to say to the gentleman who is talking about how the administration stands that I do not represent the administration. I represent one person on the House Committee on Agriculture; and if that wheat referendum does not carry I do not intend to vote for any further wheat legislation at this session. If the farmers make their bed, they can lie in it for a year. That is the way I feel about it. I think my good friend from North Dakota has been listening to Mr. Shuman too much. Mr. Shuman has been telling the people all over the country to vote down this referendum and you will get some more legislation. I do not think he knows what he is talking about. I know that anything that Orville Freeman would be for, Mr. Shuman would be against, I do not care what it is. He has emphasized that time and time again.

I think that before we cast our vote today we have a clear issue here and I think, according to the people who have talked on the other side today, they have indicated to you that there was a lot of good in this bill. They have indicated that we need this feed grains bill. They have admitted that it has brought down the surplus and that it has saved money; they have admitted that this new program will continue to save money. For that reason I think it will carry. I think it will be most embarrassing to any Representative coming from a farm area that produces feed grains to vote against this bill. He is going to have a heck of a time explaining that to his people when he gets back home, that he voted against it. That is all I have to say at this time.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred fourteen Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. McINTIRE].

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, on page 35 of the report on this bill I filed some additional minority views pointing out my concern with the action the Secretary of Agriculture had taken in the use of section 22 of the ICC Act as a vehicle to implement reduced rates of freight into the Southeast, and also the sales policy of the Commodity Credit Corporation at 25 cents a bushel above the cash price of corn in Chicago.

My contention has been that these actions were not within the framework of keeping a fair and normal competitive balance between the Southeast users of feed, and feed users in the Northeast.

I grant that the Secretary had full authority, but it has been my contention that the Secretary has an equal responsibility in the administration of the Feed Grain Act to the feed grain users in the Northeast deficit area as to the feed grain users in the Southeast.

Recently the Central Connecticut Farmers Cooperative Association has prepared an analysis of what we in the Northeast consider to be a very inequitable situation. Time will not permit going into a lot of detail, but let me point out a couple of figures.

Normally the differential between New England and the South Atlantic States has been 12.9 cents a bushel, and between New England and the East South Central States 19.5 cents a bushel. In March of 1963, the relationship had moved adversely to New England to 15 cents in relation to the South Atlantic States and from 19.5 cents to 35 cents in February 1963 and 29 cents in March adversely in relation to the East-South Central States. As we know, this disparity has been brought about by the sale policy which the Department promulgated January 9.

Let me put this into other figures as far as dollars and cents go. This report from Connecticut indicates that this has meant about $525,000 annually to the poultry farmers in Connecticut, placing these farmers at a disadvantage relatively to the Southeast of about $350 per farmer per year.

Again, I say the Secretary has the authority, but in this instance I think his authority was used altogether too much in the interest of a regional area and that he overlooked his responsibility using this authority in fairness and equity to two areas that compete with each other in the marketplace. Let me convert this into a total New England area. In New England in 1961, we used approximately 728,000 tons of corn. In my State of Maine, it was 303,000 tons or a little less than half. If I were to take this same basis of figures and convert them into the difference this has made from a competitive relationship, one area with the other, then according to my figures this is adverse to the New England poultry industry by about $1 million a year.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY].

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MAY. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. STAFFORD. I would just like to say, I join in and support the remarks of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. McINTIRE] who just spoke. I completely endorse what he said and entirely support the position he has taken. This legislation is detrimental to the interests of poultrymen and dairy farmers of the Northeast. It is ill timed. It grants the Secretary of Agriculture too much power. I thank my colleague the gentlewoman from Washington for yielding.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, the House today is being presented with some duplication of argument, which is not unusual. I rise at this time to reemphasize some points concerning this legislation that have already been discussed by my colleagues on this side of the aisle. I do, however, present these facts representing a somewhat unique wheat growing area in the United States; namely, the Pacific Northwest.

One of the previous speakers from the majority party said that a great many of us on this side do think this legislation is good legislation and that our farmers want it, and if we vote to delay it today, they are going to be unhappy.

I would like to submit, before I make any further remarks, that actually my district in the State of Washington, which is not a major feed grains producing area, probably it would be far better if I opposed the feed grains bill in toto all the way through. That is, that should probably be my stand if I were representing the feeling and thinking of the majority of the farm population in my area. However, my stand and my work with this bill in committee, and the remarks I make on it today, I make on behalf of the wheatgrowers of my area, and in this respect I have no basic objections to congressional approval this year of a feed grain bill, because I believe the Nation's major feed producing areas need this legislation and I am trying to reflect more than parochial interest.

Mr. Chairman, I think the Congress must approve a feed grains bill because of the obvious need for feed grain legislation in 1964. However, like others, I am opposed to the premature consideration of feed grain legislation at this time. Again for the reasons, that have been pointed out, we do not know whether the wheat farmers of this Nation are going to approve or reject the wheat certificate plan in the referendum on May 21.

I have just returned from my own district where I visited with the wheatgrowers in all of the major wheat-producing counties of my district. It would be very difficult for me to make any sort of prediction at this time, as a result of questioning them and talking with them, what the vote in the State will be on May 21. I do know that if the wheat certificate plan is accepted the wheatgrowers of this White wheat and summer fallow area will very much need the plan presented in the feed grain legislation for substitution of acreage, and inclusion of oats and rye.

On the other hand, I do know that if the wheat certificate plan is voted down by the wheat farmers of this Nation, the situation will be far different and that my wheatgrowers will need remedial wheat legislation which I for one have promised I will try to get for them.

I would say that the question most often asked me by my wheatgrowers when I was home, asked in special meetings called to discuss the referendum with me and with others, the question most often asked was, "In case the wheat certificate plan is turned down in the referendum, will there be a chance to pass remedial legislation in Congress for wheatgrowers?" I gave them as honest an answer as I could. Nobody secondguesses what Congress will do before action takes place. All I could do was list to them certain features that would be involved in this decision and what might be in the minds of each Member on May 22.

In this respect I pointed out that I was extremely interested in noting that on Sunday, April 21, the distinguished chairman of the Wheat Subcommittee indicated on a nationwide radio program that in the event the wheat referendum failed the Congress would consider remedial wheat legislation. I might say, of course, that up until then administration spokesmen on this point have stated emphatically that the farmers could take it or leave it as far as they were concerned, and that if they turned down the certificate plan there would be no other plan available to them.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague from Washington yield?

Mrs. MAY. Yes, I am pleased to yield to my colleague from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. My colleague the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. May] and I have almost identical districts. Our farmers feel they are being coerced a little bit in this matter. At this time there is a feeling of uneasiness among them, as has been pointed out today. The difficulty arises because of summer fallowing practices and the need for substitution acreage. They object to the provision which would allow an element of compulsion, and to the element of mandatory authority which it appears is given in this bill.

Mrs. MAY. I thank my colleague from Washington.

Mr. Chairman, it is significant that the able chairman of the Wheat Subcommittee should make the statement he did in the radio program because it had been inconceivable to me that the administration would sell the wheat farmers short if they voted against the wheat stabilization plan.

If this body sends H.R. 4997 back to the Committee on Agriculture to be held until after May 21, I feel certain there will be no major difficulty in passing a feed grains program then. Then we will know what the situation really is instead of what some people wish it to be, and we will be able to help the farmers in any other area then necessary, particularly if remedial wheat legislation is called for in the event of a no vote in the referendum.

There is plenty of time. There is no need to rush through a program at this time that would not go into effect until next year.

As to the provisions of H.R. 4997, although I do not like all the discretionary authority provided the Secretary of Agriculture, nor do I particularly like the costly compensatory direct payments of the bill, these are not my major objections, as I have stated. My main objection is this bill is entirely premature at this time.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Will the Chair state whether the Chair is counting those Republicans who went back in the cloakroom?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will respond to the inquiry, which is not a parliamentary inquiry, that he is counting Members as they leave the Chamber.

The Chair counts 102 Members present, a quorum.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Purcell].

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman, it is my privilege at this time to serve as chairman of the Wheat Subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture in the House.

Before making any further remarks, I want to comment on the statement made by the gentlewoman from Washington in regard to a nationwide program that ran on last Sunday, April 21. The statement that I made was this, in substance, when asked a question as to what would be the situation in the Congress if the referendum failed:

> Those of us from the farm areas of the country would do all we could to see that the farmers were given the kind of program they wanted to have.

I immediately continued by saying that in my judgment, based upon statements made by people in responsible positions in both parties of this Congress, I thought it very unlikely any legislation could be secured at that time.

Only yesterday I learned that I was being quoted in the State of Washington as saying that further provision would be made. I did not make the statement in that manner. I made it in the manner I have just indicated.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PURCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Anyone who makes a statement about the prospect of legislation in an area of this kind is being completely reckless with the wheat farmers of the United States.

Mr. PURCELL. That is my judgment, and I have tried to make that clear in any public statement I have made.

In regard to the accusations that are made as to why we have to have feed grain legislation at this time, I would like to reflect a few minutes with you as to why we want information on any election that is being presented to us.

Is it proper, is it not the purpose in any election for those who are going to vote to have every bit of knowledge they are capable of getting before they are called upon to vote? The law requires that on May 21 the wheat farmers of this country will be required to vote for or against the wheat program that is now in existence. That is the law, not what we may think the law should be. It is only fair in my judgment that those farmers have all the knowledge that they can have available to them. There is a provision in the wheat law, the law that is to be voted on on May 21, which for some reason has not been mentioned by those I have heard comment on this bill today. I am quoting, or going to quote, from the wheat law that is in existence, which will be passed or defeated on May 21.

Section 328 of that act states:

> SEC. 328. Effective with the 1964 crop, during any year in which an acreage diversion program is in effect for feed grains, the Secretary shall, notwithstanding any other provision of law, permit producers of feed grains to have acreage devoted to the production of feed grains considered as devoted to the production of wheat and producers of wheat to have acreage devoted to the production of wheat considered as devoted to the production of feed grains to such extent and subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines will not impair the effective operation of the program for feed grains or wheat.

Now, if we are responsible and if we want to be fair about what the wheat farmers of America need to know when they go to the polls to vote, surely we must be fair enough to emphasize that they will then, for the first time to my knowledge, have a choice of exchanging feed grain acres for wheat acres and, conversely, they will be allowed to exchange wheat acres for feed grain acres. In my judgment we owe it to the farmers of our country to give them every bit of knowledge that they can have. They will not know what the law provides for them in regard to feed grains when they go to the polls on May 21 unless we pass a law that is being proposed here now. If we are interested in being fair with our farmers, if we are not interested in playing politics with our farmers, it seems to me that it is incumbent upon us now to pass the feed grain bill that is before us.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY].

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, in lieu of presenting to the House some comments I had prepared, an incident happened during the course of the day which caused me to change the tenor of the remarks I had planned to make.

A Member of Congress came to me and said in all seriousness:

> We have been listening to the debates on farm programs on the floor of the House for many years. Most of you are so technical and get so involved in your discussions that those of us who are not acquainted, particularly those of us who are consumer Congressmen, just feel that you do not make it clear to us what the problem is all about.

And, I am going to address myself very briefly to that point; particularly I hope this will be of interest to consumer-type Congressmen.

Most of you know I am a farmer; a grain and livestock farmer on a family farm in Indiana. I have a college degree in agriculture and I majored in animal husbandry. I taught agriculture for 5 years; then went to farming and farmed for 20 years until coming to the Congress. I still have an active interest in our home farm, and our son and family are engaged in farming there today.

Now, one of the very first things that I think most people try to do is to oversimplify the problem. In doing it they try to classify all farmers and all farm commodities in the same category. If there is any one thing we have learned during the years, it is the very fact that each commodity represents a separate problem, and the remedy that might suit the needs of one commodity group and fit into their problem might not suit the livestock producer at all.

In order to get at the proper context also of the grain and livestock problem, I think you have to realize that approximately two-thirds and sometimes a little more or a little less of all agricultural income is derived from livestock and livestock products. So, in dealing with this particular item, you are dealing with the biggest single item so far as agriculture is concerned.

Now, the basic philosophy of the grain and livestock farmer has been entirely different in most instances than that of the producer of other commodities. Time will not permit me telling you or going into detail why this is true, but, please believe me, it is. But, one of the principal tenets that has been obvious from the very beginning of the grain and livestock farmer is that he wants to continue to provide the consumers of this country with the very finest diet in the world, which is a meat diet, and he is willing to take his chances in the free market to produce this commodity. Now, his occupation is not the easiest one in the world or in many instances, the most productive one, either. I can say to you that if there is such a thing as an average grain-livestock farmer today, if his income averages as much as the average hourly wage of an employee in a factory, he is pretty lucky.

Most of them are not making much money today for their work, much less the interest on their investment. In most cases it requires $100,000 to put a man to work on a grain and livestock farm.

Mr. Chairman, we are at the point where the grain and livestock farmer, being intimately associated in his problems with the wheatgrowers and in many instances being all three at the same time, is at the crossroads. This has been building up, this decision that they are facing now has been building up for many years. The day of decision is coming in less than a month.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to dwell when we get into the reading of the bill for amendment at a little greater length on some of the facets of this problem. But I want to say that I hope in considering the problem of the livestock and grain farmers we will think of it in this context and think of it sympathetically. There is no place in the wide world where the consumer is so well fed, with such a high standard of diet, as they are in this great United States of ours.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Freeman's letter to Congressmen referred to earlier today, indicated that farmer net income is up 10 percent as a result of the grain programs. Now an interesting point was brought out by Prof. Theodore Shultz, noted economist, University of Chicago, who was quoted favorably in the Farmers' Union Bulletin just this past week, took note of this fact: Payments to farmers went up $1.2 billion from 1960 to 1962; whereas income of farmers, including those payments, went up even less, $1.1 billion. So, if you make a proper and fair adjustment for the amount of direct payments to farmers under these programs, the income of farmers as a result of all this spending—3 years later and about $3 billion later in spending—the real net income of farmers is actually less than before.

Mr. Chairman, parity ratio tells the story far more meaningfully than price levels. It is the ratio between what farmers have to pay for what they need in their business and what they receive for their commodities. The parity ratio in March this year was 77, down from 81 before these programs started. In my home State of Illinois parity has dropped to 71. The Illinois crop Reporting Service notified me that this was the lowest parity ratio level on record since 1934. So it is a little difficult to see how any fair appraisal could indicate that farm income is better as a result of all this spending.

CHART 1.—*Feed grain program—Farm cost price squeeze*

	Parity ratio
December 1960 (before feed grain programs)	81
March 1963 (after 1961–62 feed grain programs)	77

Source: Agricultural prices, USDA, April 1963.

		Million
Direct payments to farmers (1960–62)	up	$1,200
Net farm income	up	1,100
Adjusted net farm income	down	100

Source Dr. Theodore W. Schultz, professor of economics, university of Chicago, recognized authority in agriculture at Ames, Iowa, December 1962.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSEN. The first 3 months of this year the parity ratio level is the lowest since 1939, and these figures come from the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. FINDLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, earlier I reviewed the tremendous administrative cost, over $100 million just to pass out the payments to the farmers, more than is spent for all of the officers and all of the clerks and all of the secretaries employed by all of the 435 Members of Congress.

CHART 2.—*Feed grain program—Administrative costs*

	Costs (million)
1961	$42
1962	29
1963	30
Total	101

Or $13.1 million more than the total expenditures during the 3-year period (fiscal year 1963–64) for the salaries of all the officers and employees of the House of Representatives and the staffs of its Members.

Source: H. Rept. No. 180, 88th Cong., p. 14 and the budget of the U.S. Government, fiscal year 1964, p. 132.

In 1962, by department reports—and all of my figures come right out of the U.S. Department of Agriculture—the Department reports the reduction of surplus in 1962 was 11 million tons. Our direct payments were $842 million, for a cost per bushel for the reduction in stockpile that year, of $2.14. This is based on the assumption that all of this reduction was due to the program. That I doubt, but even if we make that assumption, the cost is $2.14 per bushel—twice the value of the grain. This does not include administrative expenses; it does not include realized losses to the Commodity Credit Corporation. If these losses were included of course the cost per bushel would be still higher in 1963. I base this on "Feed Situation," the document which reached my office from the Department of Agriculture in the middle of April. The anticipated reduction is a little less, actually, than $2.3 million tons.

This year, with payments at $983 million, the cost to the taxpayer for each bushel cut back in our stockpile is $8.78.

Here again we do not include realized losses, we do not have the administrative costs and if those were included the cost to the taxpayers would be that much higher.

Spend more, get less. That is clearly the story of the feed grain program.

CHART 3.—*Feed grain program*

SPEND MORE—GET LESS

Year	Reduction in surplus (tons)	Government payments	Taxpayer cost per bushel
1962	11,000,000	$842,000,000	$2.14
1963	2,400,000	983,000,000	8.78

Source: Feed Situation No. 198, April 1963, USDA, and H. Rept. No. 180, 88th Cong., p. 14.

I would like to refer to the record of 3 years' spending. I have listed the payments in 1961, 1962, and 1963. Then there is the acreage diverted. You will see that this spending was with 25 million acres diverted in 1961; $842 million with 28.6 million acres diverted which would be reasonable, to get more diversion as a result of more spending. But in 1963, with payments up $141 million we dropped back to 25 million acres diverted.

How are we really making any achievement when we spend more, when payments go up and when results go down? We certainly do not achieve anything more as a result of that procedure.

CHART 4.—*Feed grain program*

PAYMENTS UP, RESULTS DOWN

Year	Payments	Acreage diverted
1961	$782,000,000	25,200,000
1962	842,000,000	28,600,000
1963	983,000,000	25,800,000

Source: H. Rept. No. 180, 88th Cong., on H.R. 4997, pp. 8, 13, and 14.

One of the problems we have faced in considering the feed grains bill is the information that has been presented to us by the Secretary of Agriculture. On February 28 all of you got a memorandum purporting to show that stockpiles were down 1 billion bushels as a result of the operation of these programs. The facts do not bear that out. Yet in a letter that you received just today in support of this bill, the Secretary claimed that stockpiles are down, not 1 billion bushels, but 1.3 billion bushels.

I have a table prepared at my request by the Statistical Branch of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and from that it is clear that the reduction in stockpiles is 437 million bushels, not the 1.3 billion bushels that the Secretary has indicated.

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield.

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I should like to commend my distinguished colleague for presenting a knowledgeable and most enlightening discourse on this very serious subject. He well knows that I represent a district comparable to his. Both of us are particularly interested in the welfare not only of the small farmer but of people who are engaged in the manufacture of farm equipment.

I should like to ask the gentleman two questions. When I was home these questions were asked me. One, do you think that at the present time—and I am speaking of farmers who I am sure want some type of feed grains program—this is the proper time to do it? And second, the bill which is presently before us, does it not have certain defects in it which should be ironed out before we pass any type of feed grain program?

As a Representative of one of the greatest agriculture districts in this great Nation of ours I am vitally interested in any legislation which might have an adverse effect upon the economy and the welfare of the people who sent me to Congress.

Today we are debating H.R. 4997—the feed grain bill—and it is my humble opinion we must move with caution before we enact any legislation which would destroy those we profess to be concerned about.

Not only does a large segment of my constituency comprise small, honest, hardworking farmers, but the primary labor market in the metropolitan areas of the 19th Illinois District is geared to those who are engaged in manufacturing farm equipment.

Much of our Federal farm legislation has been enacted under the pretense and guise of helping the small independent farmer. I seriously question whether we have obtained the desired results, rather I feel our socialized Federal farm programs are actually doing much to destroy the small American farmer who through the years has done much to further the economy of America.

While the motives of the present bill under consideration may be worthwhile I feel there are many deficiencies which make this bill highly costly and quite ineffective.

I ask what is the immediate urgency in the enactment of this bill at this time? I feel it ill timed and premature. Why the haste before the wheat referendum which is scheduled for May 21? Is the administration attempting to scare and pressure wheat farmers into casting a favorable vote so that the outcome of this measure will satisfy the whims of those who are advocating controls?

Likewise, I feel H.R. 4997 gives the Secretary of Agriculture too much power. Is Congress willing to place in his hands the authority to manipulate the market price to almost any desired level? This bill makes farmers dependent on direct payments. Are we going back to the principles of the oft-rejected Brannan plan?

I know in talking with farmers in my area that the cost-price squeeze is actually the worst it has been in 10 years. Not only have we been getting managed news from the White House, but I also question some of the figures released from the Agriculture Department.

In my opinion, taxpayers are paying more and getting less in the operation of our agricultural program. I do not question but what Federal subsidies enrich the operators of big farming syndicates and certain dishonest operators like Billie Sol Estes. Are we really helping the small farmer?

We cannot continue tyrannical controls imposed by the Agriculture Department and at the same time make it possible for small farmers to operate profitably, and to do so as freemen.

Before we buy a pig in the poke, let us move slowly, let us get all the facts before we pass a new feed grain program.

In conclusion, while I am in favor of some type of feed grain program, I do not believe this is the type of legislation which will do the job, and I would hope my colleagues would come up with the type of legislation we all could support.

Mr. FINDLEY. There is certainly no hurry in getting this bill out. I think it should be recommitted so the committee can get the facts straight not only on the 1961 and 1962 programs but on the 1963 program, as to what it is we are accomplishing and what it is costing the taxpayer.

We ought to devise a way to cut back on this excessive cost. Surely there is enough brainpower in the House of Representatives—I know there is—to accomplish this. To me, it is ridiculous for us to pass a program which has gotten so badly out of hand and is costing so much. Instead of giving more authority for more spending to the Secretary we should be curbing that authority.

Now I should like to speak about the production of feed grains this year compared with the so-called base years preceding our feed grain programs. If we take the 1959–60 base years we find that production in those years averaged just 1 million tons more than is expected by Department estimates this year. With only 37 million bushels less production this year, we are spending in direct payments in 1963 a total of $983 million. If you divide the 37 million bushels into all that spending you come up with a per-bushel cost of $27 for each bushel reduction that we have achieved this year in the production of feed grains compared with the 1959–60 base years' average. A bushel of corn such as is displayed out in the corridor is worth only $1 to a farmer in Illinois. Why should the taxpayers spend $27 a bushel, $8 a bushel, or even $2 a bushel to get rid of it?

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, while I am in agreement that the feed grain program of the last 2 years has been helpful in holding the line on production, the record is clear that many of our farmers have been hurt by the way the program has been administered under the 1961 and 1962 provisions. Dumping of Commodity Credit surpluses at bargain prices has contributed to the downward slide of livestock prices and the income of Midwest farmers.

Great and often exaggerated claims are made by the Secretary of Agriculture for his program which last year he said was only a temporary measure which would be ineffective as a permanent program—and in any event, too costly. I suppose it makes some difference which bill is being sold and to whom and for what purpose. At any rate, it would seem to me that the feed grains program has displayed some effectiveness in holding the line on production. Total feed grain production in the 1962 crop year is said to have been 143 million tons—only 3 million over the 5-year average for the years 1956-60 and only 3 million over 1961.

Feed grains: Production, United States—Total corn, oats, barley, and grain sorghum

	1,000 tons
Average, 1956-60	140, 215
1956	119, 308
1957	132, 424
1958	144, 122
1959	149, 605
1960	155, 618
1961	140, 626
1962	143, 093

And this record on 27½ million less acres planted than the 1956-60 average since the ingenious farmer increased the yield per acre by an average of over a quarter ton.

With total production of feed grains at 143 million tons in 1962, an increase of 3 million over 1961, it can hardly be maintained that the feed grain program was the cause for CCC owned stocks to be an estimated 250 million bushels less on January 1, 1963, than they were on January 1, 1962. The answer is not to be found in the workings of the feed grain programs but rather as a result of increased domestic utilization and a high level of exports.

Total feed grains, supply and utilization

[Million tons]

Marketing year beginning	Carryover	Supply			Utilization				
		Production	Imports	Total	Livestock feed	Food and industrial	Seed	Exports	Total
Average, 1956-60	58. 6	140. 2	0. 7	199. 5	108. 7	10. 4	2. 4	11. 1	132. 6
1960	74. 6	155. 6	. 4	230. 6	120. 2	10. 7	2. 3	12. 7	145. 9
1961	84. 7	140. 6	. 5	225. 8	123. 4	11. 1	2. 2	17. 3	154. 0
1962	71. 8	143. 1	. 3	215. 2	125. 4	11. 1	2. 1	15. 6	154. 2
1963 [1]	61. 0								

[1] Preliminary utilization and carryover at the end of the year based on indications in January 1963.

I might point out that roughly two-thirds of the feed grain exports during the 1961-62 marketing year were handled through regular commercial channels with no assistance from Government export programs. It is estimated by the Department that exports will be somewhat less during 1963 due in part to the new import tariffs of the Common Market countries and since it would not be reasonable to expect a repeat of the adverse weather conditions which necessitated European imports last year.

The record domestic utilization of feed grains during the past year resulted from the continued increase in the number of cattle kept for meat on farms in the United States. This total reached a record high of 74.7 million on January 1 of this year. This 6-percent increase over the past year is part of a long-term 26-percent increase beginning in 1958. Coupled with this increase in numbers is the continued emphasis on the use of feed grains and high protein concentrates in cattle feeding.

Production of hogs has also increased—the 1962 fall pig crop was the second highest on record—44.5 million, or 5 percent above the preceding year. This total was surpassed only in 1943.

Now what is the point of all this? Simply that in the face of greatly increased number of hogs and meat cattle the Secretary of Agriculture has dumped feed grains on the market. And this he has done in spite of his having made strong statements in the past to the effect that "cheap feed means cheap livestock." He apparently set out to prove his statement and what an effective job he has done.

Prices of choice slaughter steers at Chicago fell from $30.47 last November down to $22.91 in March of this year. Hog prices also skidded in the first quarter of this year—I quote from the Department's publication "The Current and Prospective Cattle Situation of April 1963":

> Hog prices also dropped sharply during the first quarter of 1963, due largely to the supply situation.

The statement goes on:

> The number of hogs slaughtered in federally inspected plants in February was 7 percent above a year earlier, and the weekly rate of federally inspected slaughter in March was up 8 percent from a year earlier.

The hog-corn ratio has been above the 1952-61 average during the past few years. The ratio average for 1961-62 was 16.5 compared to the 1952-61 average of 13.9. The beef-corn ratio also has been high: During 1962 the average price of beef steers at Chicago was equal in value to 24.7 bushels of corn—substantially above the 1952-61 average of 19.0.

The feed ratios during 1962 were such as to encourage production of hogs and beef—the farmer will feed his grain instead of selling it for cash if it means more money in his pocket. Yes, Mr. Secretary, the result as we see it is indeed that "cheap feed means cheap livestock"—you have proved it. At the farmer's expense, of course.

I have consistently opposed vesting in the Secretary's hands the authority to sell surplus feed grains at prices which will depress the market. The Secretary demanded this clubbing authority in 1961 and in 1962. I objected then, but he was given that authority and he used it. In his zeal to reduce surplus stocks of CCC feed grains, 272 million bushels of corn were sold from CCC stocks outside the feed-grain program in 1961-62 and in all a total of 857 million were dumped on the market during the marketing year ending September 30, 1962.

The price of corn was at 60 percent of parity in March of 1962 or $0.986 per bushel compared to the average 1957-59 price of $1.10. Selling corn out of CCC stocks at $1 when the support price was set at $1.20 had the effect of depressing the market, especially during the first half of last year when CCC sales were particularly heavy. When CCC sales declined at midyear, then commercial stocks came into the market and the result was price depressing during the whole year.

With depressed corn and livestock prices resulting from the administration efforts of the Secretary of Agriculture we find that the American farmer's parity ratio during the first quarter of this year stood at 77 percent—the lowest first quarter parity figures since 1939. Is this the type of administration discretion with which to burden American agriculture?

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEERMANN].

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Chairman, we have listened to some fine speeches on the great accomplishments of the feed grain program. It is not my purpose to disagree with my esteemed colleagues regarding the merits of a feed grain program. I believe that a feed grain program with specific legislative instructions to the Secretary, passed after the wheat referendum, and better yet after the feed grain harvest this fall, will be desirable. I am certain that voting at this time on an overgeneralized feed grain bill with unlimited authority in the hands of this Secretary of Agriculture is premature.

First, I wish to make some serious charges against the Secretary of Agriculture. He consistently gives no consideration to the legislative intent of the Congress. For example:

First. He has flagrantly disregarded the expressed instructions of the Congress with respect to feed grains, as revealed in the statement signed by the members of the majority party in their statement accompanying the conference report. Let me cite the example that I am referring to.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 108, part 15, page 20104, the following statement appears:

> The conference agreed to the House bill with respect to the 1963 feed grain program with the following changes:
>
> (3) A single payment rate of up to 50 percent of the value of normal production would be substituted for the payment rates of 45 and 50 percent provided by the House bill.

What did the Secretary do? He provided for two payment rates, one of which was as low as 20 percent of the value of the normal production. I know that the chairman of the committee signed the report, and I would like to hear his explanation for permitting this violation of the specific instructions of the conferees.

Second. In the presentation of the wheat program to the Congress, the Secretary stated several times that in determining the acreage allotments, an amount of wheat would be subtracted from the total wheat demand in order for the Government to reduce its stocks.

As a matter of fact in a release from the Office of the Secretary in February 1962, page 23 of the proposed Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, the following paragraphs appear:

> HOW PROPOSED WHEAT PROGRAM MIGHT OPERATE
>
> *Examples*
>
> Nationally: Here is how the proposed wheat program might work nationally, using reasonable but assumed price supports and acreage reductions in a hypothetical and preliminary example:
>
> Total wheat demand estimated at, say, 1,250 million bushels.
>
> The Government decides to reduce stocks by, say, 150 million bushels, with two-thirds of it going into exports and one-third to domestic supplies. This leaves a total market to be filled by farmers of 1.1 billion bushels.
>
> At average yields, this produces an acreage allotment for the 1963 crop of 43 to 46 million acres.

Congress acted on this and gave the Secretary exactly what he asked for in this area. Section 332(b) of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 reads as follows:

> If a national marketing quota for wheat has been proclaimed for any marketing year, the Secretary shall determine and proclaim the amount of the national marketing quota for such marketing year not earlier than January 1 or later than April 15 of the calendar year preceding the year in which such marketing year begins. The amount of wheat which the Secretary estimates (i) will be utilized during such marketing year for human consumption in the United States as food, food products, and beverages, composed wholy or partly of wheat, (ii) will be utilized during such marketing year in the United States for seed, (iii) will be exported either in the form of wheat or products thereof, and (iv) as the average amount which was utilized as livestock (including poultry) feed in the marketing years beginning in 1959 and 1960; less (A) an amount of wheat equal to the estimated imports of wheat into the United States during such marketing year and, (B) if the stocks of wheat owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation are determined by the Secretary to be excessive, an amount of wheat determined by the Secretary to be a desirable reduction in such marketing year in such stocks to achieve the policy of the act.

However, when the Secretary in his great anxiety to get a favorable vote for his straitjacket within a straitjacket chose to forget the requirement that in determining the allotment, the Secretary must set aside the quantity which he had been telling us all along he would set aside. He raised the allotment by this maneuver from 43 to 46 million acres to 49.5 million acres. He suddenly discovered that he would pay for this at the rate of $1 a bushel, raising the cost of the program by some $50 million.

I say that the Secretary has disregarded the law and the legislative intent.

Third. In view of the Secretary's past history, I do not believe it desirable to give him the unlimited authority which is provided in this proposed legislation. First, there is no limitation on the expenditures. Second, there is no instruction as to the proportion of the price support to be made up by direct payments.

As a matter of fact, he could make all of the price support up by direct payments through setting the loan at zero. We are not unmindful of the fact that the proposed legislation will provide for the making of very substantial payments during a presidential election year, and that the Secretary might be politically motivated in the determination of the levels of loan rate and cash payments to such an extent that tremendous payments would be made just prior to November 1964.

The authority that is provided here for the Secretary with respect to loan rates payments, acreage reductions, and diversion percentages are just too great. The Congress is handing the Secretary of Agriculture a blank check.

Fourth. In the Secretary's press release dated March 29 he stated that a "no vote" in the wheat referendum will mean about 65 million acres in production and about 1½ billion bushels produced. It is obvious that somebody did not tell the Secretary what he was signing in the Federal Register, and which was also dated March 29. On page 3255 of the Federal Register, the Secretary says that there would be 70 million acres of wheat harvested, and the production would be about 1.6 billion bushels if no wheat marketing program is in effect for 1964. Which figure does the Secretary believe?

It is obvious to me that there is entirely too much irresponsibility with the use of statistics by the present Secretary of Agriculture. I do not want to give him the unlimited authority asked for in this legislation.

In addition, I wish to point out some of the implications to wheat growers if the feed grain bill becomes law at this time. The Secretary of Agriculture seems to think that the provision under which wheat can be substituted for feed grains, which are nothing but a political sweetener, will be of benefit to wheat producers. It should be noted that the wheat that is produced, as provided by law, would be supported at $1.30 per bushel. If feed grain market prices are supported at current levels, or lower, then the additional wheat produced will not go into feed use but will be a substitute for the wheat for which the Government will be paying $1 per bushel to reduce.

In other words, the Secretary has stated in his press release of March 29 that 165 million bushels will be reduced from CCC stocks through a voluntary payment program. It is entirely conceivable that the additional acreage diverted to feed grains from grain sorghums and barley could result in the additional production of at least 165 million bushels. This matter would be decided by the most profitable use of the acreage as far as the individual farmer is concerned. How does this benefit the wheat producer, if the wheat carryover is just as great or greater at the end of the 1964 marketing year as it was at the beginning?

In view of this fact, I think the representatives from the major wheat States should ask themselves, why the rush?

Fifth. The Secretary has stated that if the wheat referendum fails, that wheat prices would drop sharply. I do not believe that in a leap year like 1964 that the smart politicians among the Democrats will fail to propose emergency legislation.

The real issue is not, as Secretary Freeman says, $2 or $1 wheat, unless he plans something other than the law states, such as dumping wheat to keep the price down as was done with feed grains. The real issue is: Shall farmers transfer their right to manage their farms to a government bureaucracy directed from Washington for an experiment of a supply management theory?

In view of this, I suggest we wait. Let us not rush into a complete abdication of congressional authority, not only over the details, but also the purse strings.

Mr. Chairman, now I should like to discuss the Federal Register and a letter I got yesterday from one of my constituents.

On March 1 under "Rules and Regulations" in the Federal Register, page 1979, there appeared this statement with regard to administrative committees of the ASC:

> TERMS OF OFFICE—COUNTY AND COMMUNITY COMMITTEEMEN
>
> The terms of office of county and community committeemen and alternates to such office shall begin on the first day of the month next after their election: *Provided, however,* That before any such county committeeman or alternate county committeeman may take office he shall sign a pledge that he will faithfully, fairly, and honestly perform to the best of his ability all of the duties devolving on him as a committeeman, and that he will support the programs he is called upon to administer. A term of office shall continue for 12 months or until a successor has been elected and qualified.

Then there are other provisions of removal from office or employment and so forth.

Mr. Chairman, these people are elected by us in each county. We elect a committeeman on the ASC board in our county, and we expect them to serve to the best of their ability for the people in our county and not for promoting administrative programs that their people might not want. I agree, if anyone signs up under any farm program, they must follow the law, and as to that I say they must carry out their responsibility. But as to going out and supporting programs and promoting them, I want to read part of this letter illustrating my point.

I quote from the letter:

> I must write and relate to you a recent (Friday) experience indicating the further erosion of fair play in our Government.
>
> I am a precinct ASC committeeman. We were called to town for a meeting. Never before has the county committee called a precinct meeting to review wheat allotments and indexes (1964) so early. After this was completed, we were subjected to the most partisan, unobjective indoctrination on the Freeman wheat program at taxpayers expense. As if this was not enough, time was given to the chairman of the referendum committee asking for active and 100 percent support of the precinct committee. Since the referendum chairman was unable to attend, the county ASC chairman spoke in his behalf. My blood was doing a slow boil all morning and I finally had enough of that. I told the county chairman he was treading on unethical ground selling a political program while on the payroll, outlined my ideas about the wheat program, and walked out.
>
> I have found out that the ASC office was sufficiently shook up to notify the State office. The crowning blow to the whole deal, which you should know about, was that the morning's agenda was planned by either State or National offices—including the opportunity to the referendum committee. This committee remains somewhat of a mystery to me but apparently it is not tax supported—but has obvious connections with the USDA. I can't understand why this activity can be done by the public servants.

I have said before that I do not like the transfer of authority from Congress to the White House. Congress has transfered more than it should. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] spoke earlier about the transfer of authority to the Secretary or to the executive branch of the Government, and this is proof of a flagrant violation of the intent of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, in summing up my discussion, I would like to say as a producer and a user of feed grains in Nebraska, and I wish that there were 400 Members here to hear this, we plant our crop in the spring. We harvest it in the fall. I do not ask you to wait on this feed grain legislation until after the wheat referendum on May 21; I ask you to wait until after the crop has been harvested this fall. Our fine chairman, if I have to say it loud enough to match voices, I hope everyone here in the Congress and throughout the country hears me at this time, because we make our plans for farming our farms after we produce our crop for the year. That is a better time to propose legislation. In 1961 we had emergency feed grain legislation even though Congress had to organize its committees. We will not have to organize committees in 1964 and better feed grain legislation could be passed in January or February in time to plant the spring crop. If you have been all over the Central part of the United States during the Easter recess, you have found out that it is dry. We may need different legislation than we are discussing today because there may be a shortage of crops because of the weather and neither the Secretary nor the President nor anyone else can change this. I ask you to vote this down. Let us consider legislation after our crops are in and we will know what is needed.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OLSON].

Mr. OLSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I wish to point out the success of the feed grains programs by reporting to you the feelings of my constituents.

I have here approximately 100 letters asking me to support this legislation. The most significant thing is, I believe, that I have no letters from my district against this bill.

I also have a report on the signup in the 1963 feed grain program in my district. It shows overwhelming support of the voluntary feed-grain programs. The feed grain area I represent has producer participation as high as 83 percent of the feed grain farmers.

The program is clearly a success and will continue to reduce surpluses and increase farm income.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how the time stands?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa has 34 minutes remaining; the gentleman from Texas has 61 minutes remaining.

Mr. HOEVEN. Will the gentleman from Texas yield some time?

Mr. POAGE. We are not going to use all our time. The gentleman wants me to yield time. I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. HARDING].

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Chairman, I feel deeply the responsibility that is on my shoulders as I take the floor at this time. As most of the Members know, I was the only Member on the majority side to vote against this legislation in committee, and I wrote my additional minority views for the report.

Let us review briefly the history of this legislation. It originated as the Emergency Feed Grain Act of 1961. The bill's purpose was to cut down the surplus and to maintain farmer income until we could arrive at a permanent feed grain program. The committee did arrive at a permanent feed grain program last year and brought it to the floor of the House.

I thought it was a good program. Then, unfortunately, the Members on the minority side said this program was compulsory, it was going to force controls upon the farmers, which it did. It required production controls and provided for price supports, and they said, "Vote down this program and we will come out with an extension of the emergency program," which is exactly what happened.

We extended this program last year. It had support from both sides of the aisle, and I want to point out that that is probably true this year, that many of the people speaking against it now would support this same bill after the wheat referendum.

But I do not find myself in that position. It is a bad bill now, and on May 22 it will still be a bad bill.

I want to say further that the wheat program provided for in the referendum is the best legislation produced in the last Congress. As far as I am concerned, I have encouraged my wheat farmers to vote for it. They have asked for it. The National Wheatgrowers Association, the Idaho Wheatgrowers Association, the National Grange, the Farmers Union have all asked for this wheat bill. If they vote it down now, I believe they should be left to the other alternative that is provided in the referendum.

Getting back to the feed grain program, you have heard how costly it is. That is true. It is very costly compared with the results we are getting. This program will probably cost over a billion dollars. Yet any feed grain farmer can plant all he wants to plant. As long as we spend this kind of money the farmers are going to accept it, and they will not do anything to cut their production back.

When the bill is read for amendments, I shall offer an amendment which I will call a freedom amendment, not that it necessarily gives the farmers freedom, because in my district they have freedom already. The only controlled program which we have is wheat. They can plant all the sugarbeets they want to; they can plant all the beans, alfalfa, and barley they want to; they can produce all the beef cattle, sheep, hogs, and dairy products they desire. But my freedom amendment is going to be freedom for the taxpayers of this country. I come from a farm district, and I think it is important that we do not pass this billion-dollar bill and add that on to our overburdened national debt.

The other morning I heard over the radio that the interest alone on the national debt this year is going to be $10 billion. I do not oppose a feed grain program as long as it is a program that is going to require some farmer responsibility and one which will cut down production without depending on a billion-dollar subsidy.

I sincerely hope that this House in its wisdom will vote down this bill. If the wheat referendum is defeated, we will probably do nothing; then if the wheat farmers and the feed grain farmers of America later decide they want sensible legislation, our committee will help them enact such farm legislation.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA].

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, there are certain features of this bill we are debating today that I agree with. I voted for this proposal once, but I shall not vote for it today. I think the Members should examine the increased power that this bill gives to the Secretary of Agriculture, along with some of the other features relative to cost, before they vote on it.

Today I want to talk to you a little bit about the effort being used to pass this bill ahead of the wheat referendum on May 21 and to discuss very briefly the program that the administration wants the wheat producers of America to agree to on May 21. We can pass this bill after May 21 on its own merits. We should not further confuse the wheat farmer with this legislation now.

On May 21 the wheat producers of this Nation will vote on a new proposal which has been dubbed by many as a two-price system and by the administration as a certificate plan. During the next few minutes I want to very briefly discuss this proposed program with you once again, because I know that all of you and all of the wheat farmers of the Nation are interested in it.

On May 21, our wheat producers will be deciding whether or not they want any part of the administration's supply-management for agriculture as this is all that is left of this New Frontier approach. Should it pass, we can expect it to be resurrected for other commodities. Since this bill was passed by the Congress by a scant five votes, it is not necessary to mention that there is a tremendous division of opinion in the Congress and in the country on this subject. The Department proposes to fix the price support of wheat at $2 per bushel. This will be arrived at by giving cooperators a certificate worth 70 cents a bushel which must be transferred by the farmer with the wheat to the miller. Adding this 70 cents certificate to the $1.30 feed wheat price, we arrive at a price of $2 per bushel. This proposed program will apply to all classes of wheat notwithstanding the fact that soft red winter wheat produced in Ohio is not in great abundance. In fact, the Department of Agriculture estimates that there will be only a 10-million-bushel carryover of this type wheat on June 30, 1963. This is less than a 1 month's supply and represents only a small fraction of the total carryover from other classes of wheat. In fact, the total carryover of all classes of wheat on June 30, 1963, will be 1,225 million bushels.

Should this new certificate plan be approved on May 21, the door would be closed for all practical purposes on all future wheat producers and on all those farmers who, for some reason or other, did not plant wheat during the base years of 1959, 1960, and 1961. Should this program be approved, the 15-acre exemption would be abolished. There have been approximately 152,000 wheat producers in Ohio operating under this 15-acre exemption. Should this proposal be adopted, we would repeal the 30-acre wheat for feed exemption which would preclude farmers from growing wheat outside the program for use on their own farms. It would require farmers to divert such acreage as prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture after 1965 without payment. The farmer producing under the 15-acre exemption would be permitted to plant only the average of his 1959, 1960, and 1961 plantings. For instance, let us assume that a farmer planted 15 acres in 1959, did not plant any in 1960 and again planted his 15 acres in 1961. He would have an average for the 3 years of 10 acres. In order to participate in the program he would have to divert in 1964, 10 percent of his already reduced base. This would mean that legally he could only plant 9 acres. This same farmer—should he elect to stay out of the program—could plant his 10 acres but no more. Now let us take a look as to how this proposal might affect this small farmer's wheat income.

Assuming he planted his 15 acres in 1963 and received an average of $2 per bushel for a 40-bushel-per-acre yield, he would have a total income of $1,200. Should this plan be approved in 1964, his base average would be 10 acres. His remaining 9 acres producing 40 bushels to the acre would yield him 360 bushels. However, under the program, he would not be paid price support on the total yield from these 9 acres. He will get price support on only 80 percent of his production or 288 bushels. At $2 per bushel, these 288 bushels will gross him $576. On the remaining 20 percent of his production, or 72 bushels, he would get $1.30 per bushel for a gross of $93.60. Based on his past production he would receive approximately $24 for the acre diverted. By adding these three figures, he would have a total gross wheat income of $639.60 for 1964 as compared with $1,200 in 1963.

Assuming that he stayed out of the program in 1964, he could plant his 10 acres. This would yield him 400 bushels to be sold at $1.30 per bushel for a total gross wheat income of $520.

This same farmer could choose to divert all of his 10-acre base and receive a 50-percent diversion payment based on his normal yield. Again assuming his normal yield would be 40 bushels to the acre he could receive $400 for diverting all of his base.

It is needless for me to say that in all of these illustrations this farmer could utilize his remaining acreage as he saw fit unless precluded by some other Government program from so doing. Many people are concerned about the length of time this proposed wheat certificate plan would be in effect. This certificate plan is permanent legislation subject to 1-, 2- or 3-year referendums and will be in effect until repealed by the Congress. As I have pointed out earlier, the land diversion portion of this proposal will only extend for 2 years, 1964 and 1965. Thereafter, land directed to be diverted by the Secretary of Agriculture in order to qualify for price supports must be done at the expense of the farmers.

I think it is important to point out at this time that the program to be voted on by the wheat producers on May 21 is a mandatory program. The 15-acre farmer, for example, will not be able to say I am not going to take my reduction from 15 acres to the average of 1959, 1960, and 1961. He must reduce. Many wheat producers are arguing that since the feed grain program is a voluntary program, that the Congress rejected a mandatory program for feed grains in 1960, and also rejected a mandatory program for dairy producers, that the wheat producers should not be subjected to a mandatory program. They are also arguing that should this program be defeated on May 21, that in all likelihood a voluntary program would be passed by the Congress. Yes, we have heard many statements to the effect that the Congress of the United States will not pass any other wheat legislation should this proposal be defeated. In my opinion, this is merely scare talk in an attempt to convince the farmers to vote "yes" in the referendum. Anyone saying that the Congress would not legislate to prevent a drop in wheat prices must be forgetting that the Congress of the United States is representative of the people and history has shown that whenever the people of this great country wanted legislation in a given field, they received it. For example, in 1962 many so-called leaders in the Congress stated they were passing a feed grain bill for 1 year and that in 1964 corn would be supported at approximately 80 cents per bushel. No one took these statements too seriously and the first order of business of our Agriculture Committee this session was to recommend the passage of feed grain legislation for 1964 to prevent the price of corn from going to 80 cents per bushel. So, if the Congress will act for feed grains, no one can convince me that it will so act for wheat.

We have also read statements to the effect that the price of wheat would automatically be $1 per bushel if the referendum fails. This would be an impossibility under section 7, paragraph 1441(b) of the United States Code. Even though no new legislation was passed, this section provides 50 percent price supports for cooperators and with parity being at $2.49 a bushel the price support would be $1.24½ plus carrying charges of approximately 5 cents per bushel. Since under existing law the Commodity Credit Corporation could not release surplus stocks at less than 105 percent of parity, we could add 6 cents a bushel to the price making a total price of $1.35½. We should also take into consideration the fact that the world price of wheat is $1.40 a bushel. I do not believe that anyone familiar with this wheat market could say that the price of American wheat would be less than the world price.

Now coming to the all-important question which is uppermost in the minds of all wheat producers and especially our 15-acre wheat producers: Am I eligible to vote? The answer to this question is "yes." Every wheat producer is entitled to vote in this year's referendum. However, a small producer with a wheat acreage allotment of less than 15 acres must file an election in writing with the county committee at least 7 days prior to the date of the referendum that he will be subject to the wheat marketing quota for his farm providing the wheat certificate plan is approved in the referendum. All small producers failing to make such an election at least 7 days prior to the referendum will be unable to vote and will be unable to participate in the program should it be approved. Since most of our 15-acre producers have long sought the right to vote in wheat referendums, it is expected that a large percentage of them will take advantage of the opportunity to vote in this year's referendum.

Contrary to some of the comments we have heard on this subject, a producer need not vote "yes" in the referendum even though he agrees to be subject to marketing quotas should the program be approved. In other words, a small producer can sign up and vote "no" on May 21. The vote will be taken by secret ballot and no one will know how he votes. Since this program is so important to every wheat-producing family in the Nation, be it a large or a small farm, I would urge all of them to take advantage of their election franchise on May 21.

Another question being asked is whether or not the landlord and his wife—if her name is on the deed—are entitled to vote as well as the tenant and sharecroppers. The answer is "yes." Anyone having a direct pecuniary interest in the crop is entitled to vote in this wheat referendum.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Ninety-three Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 28]

Ashley
Auchincloss
Ayres
Betts
Boland
Broomfield
Celler
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Diggs
Fascell
Fisher
Fogarty
Forrester
Fulton, Pa.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Glenn
Goodling
Harsha
Hays
Healey
Hébert
Herlong
Holifield
Jones, Ala
Lankford
Lennon
Macdonald
O'Neill
Pillion
Powell
Rich
Rivers, Alaska
Roosevelt
Shelley
Staggers
Walter
Widnall
Wilson, Bob

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Wright, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill H.R. 4997, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 390 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Matthews].

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I am humbly grateful for the quorum call. I want to make it clear that I had nothing to do with the quorum call, Mr. Chairman, but I would be less than honest if I did not say how happy I am to have the privilege of being the first speaker after the quorum call.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank our friends from the city for helping us pass the farm legislation, and I want particularly—and I mean this very sincerely, indeed—to plead with them again this afternoon to help these wonderful Congressmen who represent the farmers do what is best for the farmers, even though they do not want to do it themselves—some of them.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to emphasize that our friends on the opposition have not said they are opposed to this bill. It is just the timing of it. It is "let us do not pass it now; let us pass it a little bit later; let us time it a little bit differently."

Mr. Chairman, what I want to say especially to our friends in the city is that this program has saved money. I want to call the attention of my dear friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley], to some statistics that he pointed out a few minutes ago. I may be in error, but I do not think I am. I know that the gentleman to whom I refer is an honorable gentleman and is giving the statistics to the best of his information. But, now, he was trying to point out that the feed grain program as we have had it the last couple of years did not save money. Then, of course, I would say to those Members who come from the cities if it does not save money we have no right to ask you to vote for it. But, believe me, it has saved money according to the best statistics that we have available.

Mr. Chairman, the mistake that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley] made was that he did not include the production that was avoided as a result of the feed grain program. Millions of bushels of production that were avoided and that would have been stored and that would have cost hundreds of millions of dollars if we had not had the feed grain program. Let us take the figures.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I will yield to the gentleman when I get through. I do not have much time. I shall be delighted to yield to the gentleman later, but let me give you the figures as I recall them. If the gentleman will stand there and let me see if this is what the gentleman said: In the year 1961 the gentleman said the payments for acreage diverted amounted to $782 million for 25.2 million acres. Is that correct, sir, as well as you remember? Just yes or no, please, sir.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I think, sir, you said, "yes," but you did not tell about 834 million bushels that would have been produced if we had not had that program.

Now, sir, just one other statement——

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Just 1 minute, and answer "Yes" or "No," please, sir, and then if I have time I will yield.

In 1962 did the gentleman not say that $842 million were paid for diverting 28 6 million acres, but the gentleman did not tell us about the savings on an additional 1 billion bushels that would have been produced if we had not had the program?

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at this time?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is that right, sir?

Mr. FINDLEY. Will the gentleman yield? I have the right to respond to the gentleman. I mentioned the figures for 1961, 1962, and 1963. Can the gentleman inform me just where these bushels are which were not produced? Do they come entirely from the fancy of some prognosticator?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Will the gentleman please excuse me. I do not have much time. Let me say——

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman agree that that is so?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Let me say to my dear friend that these figures came about on the best basis of the best statistical information that honorable men in the Department of Agriculture could devise, and let me say to the gentleman that he knows much about agriculture. Ladies and gentlemen of the House, do not let this gentleman beguile you. He is one of the most learned men in agriculture on our committee, and he knows that if we had not had that feed grain program we would have produced hundreds of millions of bushels more of feed grain.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Let me ask the gentleman this: Did he not say that in 1963——

Mr. FINDLEY. I did not understand what the gentleman said.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Excuse me, sir.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is that correct, sir? In 1963 did not my dear friend say that we paid $983 million for diverting 25.8 million acres? But my dear friend did not point out that in this $983 million there was included $490 million for price supports? And naturally, in 1963 instead of $983 million, only $473 million went into this program?

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Let me say also, sir——

Mr. FINDLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. In just one moment.

Mr. FINDLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I have not concluded my statistical report. Also in 1963 there would have been produced from 750 million to 800 million bushels more grain——

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. MATTHEWS. If we had not had the program.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. What I am trying to do, Mr. Chairman, is just to put the facts on the line so our friends can see this program will save money. It has saved money.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would my dear friend, the gentleman from Texas, yield to me 1 additional minute?

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, it is my sincere belief, based on good statistics that in 1961 we saved $591 million; in 1962, $634 million. There is less and less of this grain going into storage. This year we are saving $90 million, or a total of $1,315 million for 3 years. So I want to say to my friends from the cities, you have helped us get a program that has saved the consumers money; it has been good for the farmer. I plead with you to help us get this same program again this year.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley].

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. Matthews], has very eloquently told us how much money we have saved in this Congress through the farm program. If that is the case why is Secretary Dillon tomorrow going to ask us in the Ways and Means Committee for an increase in the public debt limit?

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, apparently the way for us to eliminate our public debt is to spend more and more money for farm programs. Under the gentleman from Florida's [Mr. Matthews] economic progression, the more money we spend on farm programs the more we save. If we could know what would happen, if the rabbit had not stopped to scratch his left ear, we might be in a better position to know what to do today. But we cannot safely assume that production would have gone on at any certain level in future years. Even so, must we pass a bad bill just because a program out of the past might have been still worse?

The gentleman tried to show a difference between the payment-in-kind provision under the 1963 program and the diversion payments; but the payments-in-kind feature is added to diversion as an incentive to get participation. So logically and properly the payment-in-kind feature should be added to the diversion payments to determine the total payments to the farmers in order to get them to cut back areas. I mentioned this distinction in a speech earlier today.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the record show that repeatedly I sought the floor to respond to allegations made by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Matthews] in which he mentioned my name, disputing my figures; and I was not accorded that traditional courtesy.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield.

Mr. MICHEL. I think since the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Matthews] has said that we all want to give as accurate figures as we possibly can, all of us would have to agree that when the Department comes before our Appropriations Committee they would give us as forthright and honest figures as they know how, and I shall have a few to give the House when I am recognized later in the debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley] has expired.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Belcher].

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, perhaps some of you might be wondering why, when the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Poage] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Matthews] spoke I sat on a front seat. I was just a little bit afraid that I would not be able to hear them if I sat any further back.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to attempt to create any more confusion than we already have here. I do not think I could contribute to it if I wanted to.

I have been a member of the Committee on Agriculture for 13½ years with the gentleman from Texas and ever since the gentleman from Florida came to the House I have been a member of the committee with him. They are two of the most delightful men I have ever known and two of the finest friends that I have. I have never in my life seen anybody who was able to pick as many figures right out of the air as either one of them.

I will say this, that the gentleman from Texas is one of the most enthusiastic supporters of bills that he brings to the floor of any man I have ever seen; and he is one of the most extreme optimists, because in the 13 years we have been bringing bills to this floor there has never been a bill brought to us by the gentleman from Texas that would not do three things: First, it would reduce the surplus. Second, it would cost less money; and third, it would insure the farmer added income.

I have said many times to my good friend that Houdini would have liked in his time to have had a trick by which you can pay a farmer more money for raising less products and do it all with less taxpayer's money. That would be an extremely good trick. But the gentleman from Texas is just optimistic enough to believe that. Do not think for one minute he is trying to mislead, because he is just thinking as an optimist that those things will work.

I do not know anything about these figures that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley] or the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Matthews] quoted. I do not think you do, either. But I do not think they, either one, know where they got them.

I do know this, and I do not think this will be disputed, that we have more money invested in the Commodity Credit Corporation today than we have had since the farm program started. Secondly, we are spending more money on farm programs than we have spent since farm programs started. I do not know what would happen if the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Florida had not been able to get their bills over. They tell you how many billions of dollars it would cost more than what it is costing now. Maybe it would. The only thing I know is, I ask you if it has reduced the surplus, if it has cost less money, if it has increased the farmers' income.

Let us see about this. The farmers' income was increased $1,100 million, according to the Department of Agriculture, but in doing that we spent $1,200 million. The farmer did not get all of the taxpayers' money we paid out. I do not know where the other $100 million went, but I do know we spent $1,200 million in order to increase the farmers' income by $1,100 million.

I heard the plea of the gentleman from Florida to you fine city Congressmen to help him pass a farm bill that will cost the taxpayers more money. I think you are fine people. I think you have been very generous in voting your taxpayers' money away to pay our farmers for products they did not raise, and even this bill provides for paying a farmer for raising corn he never had raised and would not have raised if it had not been for this bill.

I know that you are up against a tough proposition. For 8 years when we had Secretary Benson I was up against a tough proposition. Many, many times my party and the Secretary of Agriculture urged me to support administration programs and, being a loyal Republican, just as you Democrats are loyal Democrats, and I appreciate the fact that you are and I glory in your loyalty, I was up against the proposition of either following the Secretary of Agriculture or following my own constituents back home. That is exactly what you gentlemen that represent nonfarm areas are up against.

If you are loyal enough Democrats to disregard the amount of money it is going to cost your taxpayers, and follow your Secretary of Agriculture and your administration, I want to say you are certainly loyal Democrats and I admire your loyalty. But I do know you are caught in a dilemma. I appreciate that fact because for 8 years I was in the same dilemma. You have the choice today: You can either follow your constituents or you can follow your administration and your Secretary of Agriculture.

When I get put in that sort of position I am kind of a funny sort of fellow. For some unknown reason I just had to string along with the people that sent me down here. I do not know whether you people feel compelled to do that or not. Maybe you do not. Maybe you feel that your loyalty to the Secretary of Agriculture is worth more to you than your loyalty to your constituents. Some of you are in such safe districts that it may not make any difference. I do not happen to be in that proposition. In my district there are three Democrats registered to every two Republicans. In some parts it is 3 to 1. So I cannot refuse to listen to some of those people back home. Some of you may be safe, but when Maine went Democratic in the same year Oklahoma went Republican, there may not be as many safe districts in this United States as many of us might think.

So some of you people in safe Democratic districts may not be any more safe than the Democratic nominee was in Oklahoma or the Republican nominee for Governor was in Maine. So you use your own judgment. I have never told a single person in this House how to vote during all the time I have been here. That is your privilege. It is up to your conscience. You consider the merits of this bill and you follow your constituents or the Secretary of Agriculture, whichever your conscience tells you to do. Certainly, it will be all right and I will be the last man in this House to criticise you.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Dole].

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, I might say, first of all, I was very pleased to hear the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Matthews] talk about doing what was good for farmers even though they did not like it. I remember only about 10 days ago we had a peanut bill before our committee. It was the gentleman from Florida's [Mr. Matthews] bill and it defined boiled peanuts as not being peanuts. This is the truth—it happened. It was to avoid the marketing quota penalties for some of his peanut producers. I am very pleased to hear he can best legislate for farmers in the Midwest and to know his regard for supply management programs.

Frankly, the wheat law was a matter of some discussion last September, October, and November in Kansas. In fact, former President Truman came to Kansas last October on a political trip, and made the statement the American farmer was the most ungrateful person in the world.

I called my chairman and asked what I should do. He answered, "Try to get him to stay 1 more day." Perhaps, this points out what some think of the American farmer. In Kansas, as all over the country now, there are organized pressure groups trying to sell the wheat program. Some of us do not believe we have the right to tell wheat farmers how to vote. Farmers have the intellect, and sharp enough pencils in western Kansas and can use them on May 21 to determine which way to vote.

There is a man in Kansas who in 1959, as shown in the Congressional Record, July 27, 1959, explained why he was voting "no" for the first time in his life in that year's referendum. Indicates he was a typical wheat farmer. His name is Lud Strnad and now, less than 4 years later, Mr. Strnad is telling the Kansas farmers they are facing bankruptcy if they do not vote "yes." It was difficult to understand why this gentleman 4 years ago was advocating a "no" vote but using nearly the same facts this year in advocating a "yes" vote. Of course, the fact he serves on Secretary Freeman's Advisory Council and is paid per diem and other expenses as he travels around the country might possibly influence his thinking. The illustration does point out that sometimes loyalty is good but at times, expediency is better.

This administration is asking you to foreclose, in advance, any further wheat program. Normally, a defendant is entitled to hear the verdict before the hanging, but the New Frontier is using old frontier justice in this program. The wheat farmers are being told before the vote is counted, You are not going to have any other program. You either vote "yes" or down the drain you go.

I agree with the majority leader, Mr. Albert, anyone who made a statement that he could get a wheat bill through Congress, if the referendum fails would be making an irresponsible one. A Member of the Congress however has a right to advise farmers, whether the farmers are for or against the referendum, he will do all possible to enact new wheat legislation if the referendum fails. We have not lost these powers yet to Mr. Freeman, or to Mr. Kennedy, or to anyone in this administration. As long as I am privileged to represent 550,000 people, whose income is primarily attributable to agriculture, I have a very serious obligation to protect their best interests. The wheat referendum is not a partisan matter. No one can choose up sides and say, the Republican farmers are against it and the Democrat farmers are for it, or vice versa.

The rush to enact feed grain legislation is purely and simply referendum politics. Secretary Freeman knows this as do thousands of others in and out of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. For the first time in the history of agricultural referendums the Nation is witnessing unchecked and unrestained power politics, paid for with funds from the U.S. Treasury. It is strange to witness an election contest where the prime mover, Secretary Freeman, also establishes all the rules and regulations of the election and presides over it. Without question the wheat producer is getting special treatment from Secretary Freeman, who will long be remembered for his attempt to dominate and control the American farmer without regard to either the cost of program or the propaganda used to foist it upon the American farmer.

I can understand Agriculture Secretary Freeman's desire to get farm programs of his origination enacted by Congress. But it seems he is overstepping the bounds of propriety and good conduct in office when he resorts to misrepresentations and threats to swing others to his way of thinking. In the past, it always has been the job of the Department of Agriculture to assist and inform the farmers but to let them make their decisions. Today the idea seems to be to tell the farmers what they can and must do, and to threaten them with all sort of dire consequences if they do not do it.

The feed grain bill before us today is premature and everyone knows it. The referendum next month should have been nonpartisan, neither Democratic nor Republican, for the future economic condition of the American farmer is a matter of grave interest but despite the pressures, farmers should realize they have friends in Congress. There are those in Congress who are not going to hang a farmer economically on May 22 just for the way he voted on the 21st.

We have many pilot projects in this administration and many pilots. An example is the USDA sending out letters through ASC offices to every farmer and many businessmen in Kansas. Businessmen are receiving letters, postage paid, with 25 questions and answers on why they should encourage farmers to vote "yes" in the referendum. The administration is pulling all stops in what could be described as the greatest propaganda program in agricultural history; and as evidenced in an article in today's Wall Street Journal, administrative agents are blanketing the country with letters, radio tapes and TV films. The issue is not what is good for the American wheat producer anymore, but to just what extent Freeman must go to retain his shaky hold upon the American farmer. It is encouraging to know that M. W. Thatcher, chairman of the National Wheat Committee and general manager of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, has pledged himself to fight for new wheat legislation if the certificate plan is defeated. His attitude is a responsible one, but unfortunately one not shared by the President, Secretary Freeman, and apparently other leaders in this administration.

Perhaps I know little about agriculture having been here only as long as Freeman has been Secretary of Agriculture, but let me implore you we do have a serious obligation and responsibility to the American farmer to do something if the referendum fails. Freeman says failure will mean $1 wheat instead of $2 wheat. This simply is not true, and he knows it. The American farmer should be entitled to vote in any referendum freely and without fear of executive or legislative reprisal. He should be guaranteed his right to free expression in the basic American concept.

Section 328 has been referred to. It permits the farmer to plant wheat on feed grain acreage and is another "sweetener" to lure the farmer into voting a "yes" in the referendum. The wheat farmers of America will express themselves on May 21 and it seems ridiculous when we visualize the amount of material the Secretary is sending out, in one way or another, propagandizing the farmer and the amount of money being spent.

Wheat is a very basic commodity and we do have an obligation to the wheat farmers before and after May 22. It is safe to prophesy that if the referendum fails on May 21 that on May 22 there will be a stampede in the well of this House of Members dropping in bills. I trust this will be of some assurance to the wheat farmer that he does have supporters in Congress and that regardless of how he votes he is not going to be hit over the head.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, alluding to my earlier remarks I repeat a statement I quoted that the President made on October 14, 1960:

> I have stated that it is my best judgment that our agricultural program will cost a billion and a half, possibly 2 billion less than the present program.

When he made that statement the expenditures by the Department of Agriculture in the current fiscal year were $5.4 billion. In 1961 it was $5.9 billion. In 1962 it was $6.7 billion; and with the end of the fiscal year on June 30 this year the total cost will be $7.4 billion, or an increase of $2 billion in costs for the Department of Agriculture at a time when we have a decline in the number of farms of 369,000 and better than a million people off of the farms than there were at the time he made that statement. I do not think this one can stand. The truth of the matter is that as a matter of fact it has cost $2 billion more in 2½ years.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, there are several matters that should be cleared up here. I find myself in the position of my colleague from Texas who pointed out that he had made a statement about the wheat referendum, then found that he had been quoted as having made an entirely different statement.

A few days ago I appeared before a group which asked whether there would be further legislation if the wheat referendum were defeated. I made the statement that as far as I was concerned, I would continue to try to secure legislation no matter how many times legislation was defeated, but that I had no expectation that this House or this Congress would pass any kind of farm legislation if the wheat referendum were defeated, because I could see no reason why a Representative who comes from a nonfarm district should feel any compulsion to try to bail out farmers after they had passed adversely on a referendum themselves.

I further pointed out that the only experience of that kind in our farm programs in the United States occurred in the case of the tobacco program in 1938 or 1939, at which time the same prophesies were held out to the tobacco growers, that if they would reject the program they would get something better. They got exactly nothing. And it was one year before they had any program. Since that time they have voted for the program every year, and they have done very well. We can only judge the future by the past. None of us can tell what will happen, but we do know that the experience of mankind does not give us any ground to believe there will be further legislation.

So much for the wheat program. I know that it is not the subject matter before the House at this time. There has been more discussion of the wheat program than there has been of this bill today.

Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration is intended to give us a feed grain program. It is intended to give some stability to the feed-grain market; it is intended to provide a program which will eliminate the overproduction of wheat and feed grains, from which we have been suffering for so many years. You in town have been suffering from it just as well as the boys on the farm have been suffering from it.

For 5 or 6 years prior to 1961 there was a surplus of more than 300 million bushels of corn every year. It went into the warehouses, and the U.S. Government paid the storage on it and has been paying the storage down to the present time. There are those who have been pointing out they could juggle some figures and come up with smart answers, and doubtless they can.

But they cannot escape the fact that at the high point of inventories in 1961 there were 5,451 million bushels of grain in Government hands, and the U.S. Government was paying the storage on it. Last year that storage ran at the rate of 27 cents per bushel for corn, 21 cents for sorghums, and 26 cents for wheat.

There has been a reduction in the Government grain in storage. How did it come about? I am not going to contend that I know all of the factors which brought it about, but I know it came about. It came about while we had these programs in effect, and it seems to me it is reasonable to assume the law brought it about. The vital and undeniable fact remains that there has been a reduction of 1,267 million bushels of grain, and that this is a reduction of storage carrying charges of $920,000 every 24 hours that the clock ticks—a saving of approximately $1 million a day.

Now, that is a worthwhile saving. It is a real saving, and there is not any way that you can wish it off. We are making that saving. We may be spending money somewhere else, but we are not spending money to carry that 1.2 billion bushels of grain that we did not produce, because it is not there now. Now, I think it is perfectly clear that the program has given us a very substantial saving.

Now, there may be expenditure somewhere else, but it is not on this grain which is not in the warehouse. I would call your attention to the fact that as we reduce the grain, that reduces the cost, not simply 1 year, but every year, because storage is a recurring cost.

Now, what is going to happen if we do not pass this bill? I think that is what you have got to consider, Members of the House. What is going to happen if we do not pass this bill? Well, we will go back to the existing, basic law. Let me read it to you:

> Notwithstanding the provisions of section 101 of this Act, beginning with the 1964 crop, price supports shall be made available for producers of each crop of corn at such level at not less than 50 percent or more than 90 percent of parity.

In other words, we go to unlimited production of feed grains, and the Secretary has to support every bushel that is produced in the United States at at least 50 percent of parity.

Now, let us admit that he would not have to pay quite so much on each bushel when he took it into the warehouse as he is doing now, but he has to put it into the warehouse and he has to pay 27 cents a bushel to keep it there, with no prospect of getting rid of it, because there would be no limitation on production. Without this bill we will pile up grain at least as fast as we were doing before 1961. You are not going to reduce the rate of production; you are going to be adding $920,000 a day cost by the time you are up to what we had in 1961, and you are very soon going to be above that.

If you are interested in stopping those expenses, I urge you that we pass this bill and pass it today, not some time next month.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

May I inquire as to the time?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. HOEVEN. How much time has the gentleman from Texas remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas has 43 minutes remaining.

Mr. HOEVEN. Will the gentleman from Texas yield to me?

Mr. POAGE. I ran 2 minutes over the time we intended to run. We promised the House we would try to keep this debate down and made an honest effort to do so, and I am going to turn back 43 minutes to this House.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas made reference to the fact or made the argument that this feed grain bill must be passed today. I was going to ask him when he refused to yield, whether or not if the feed grain bill was not passed today, it would still be possible for the House to pass a feed grain bill any time this year before Congress adjourned and still be in ample time to take care of the crop year 1964–65.

Mr. POAGE. I think the gentleman from Iowa knows as well as I do that there is not a chance in the world of passing a feed grain bill unless we pass it now.

Mr. HOEVEN. May I say to the gentleman that I predict right here and now that if the wheat referendum fails on May 21, the members of the majority party, especially the members of the Committee on Agriculture, will be falling all over themselves to pass both feed grain legislation and wheat legislation. It would be politically unwise for them not to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, though I do not favor all the specific provisions contained in H.R. 4997, I do not believe these provisions to be nearly so dangerous to the American farmer as the unseemly haste to pass this bill before the wheat referendum next month. Farmers are being told on the one hand that their votes in the referendum will be welcomed as a guide to Federal policy, but, on the other hand, these same farmers are being cynically warned that if they vote "no" in the referendum, Congress will take no further action on farm legislation this year. The latter, of course, is not true, unless it is the calculated policy of this administration and its leadership in Congress to cause even greater confusion on the farm front. The enactment of feed grain legislation now will certainly lend credibility to the take-it-or-leave-it threat the Agriculture Department is handing down.

Indeed, there is no particular reason to presently consider H.R. 5449, since the bill applies to 1964 crops. The 1963 crop is just being planted and existing law covers it. Action now proves even more unjustified when we recognize that Congress cannot with certainty provide for next year's wheat crop until the outcome of the referendum is known. If the vote is "no" in the referendum, feed grains should then be considered along with further measures on wheat. Action in midsummer would still give farmers ample time to plan next year's crop. If H.R. 5449 is passed now, there appears to be no alternative but to believe that proponents of federally controlled agriculture have won a victory in their continued effort to influence the vote in the wheat referendum and to present the

American farmer with an accomplished fact.

The timing of this bill makes it a difficult one to judge it on its merits. I do believe, however, that we must ask whether the results achieved by this program have justified its cost. Payments for feed grains totaled $1.7 billion for 1961–62 and are estimated at $0.98 billion for 1963 alone. Feed grain production, however, was higher in 1962 than in 1961. Supporters of the bill have pointed to the reduction of Government stocks as one of the program's achievements, but this has been caused by increased utilization and not at all by the feed grain program. The program applies only to production and not in any way to use.

The 1964 bill is basically an extension of the 1963 bill, except for the new proposal to give the Secretary of Agriculture discretion to set the direct payment and the loan at whatever combination he wishes, so long as the support remains between 65 to 90 percent of parity. While this change is not alarming on its surface, it becomes so with the recognition that the direct payment level for nonproduction could be increased to such an extent as to cause the farmer to depend more upon the U.S. Treasury than the marketplace for his income. Such a dependency should be undertaken by the farmer only with full appreciation for the Secretary's oftenstated goal of a mandatory program for feed grains.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, H.R. 4997 is premature and unecessary on its merits. We must judge its merits on the basis of what it seeks to do. There are plenty of warnings available that the Secretary of Agriculture seeks huge powers over American agriculture. Congress has resisted these recommendations up to now. However, despite the "voluntary" character of this legislation, it sets up circumstances whereby huge monitory controls would seem to be the only alternative in the event the program fails. We need to look only at the facts of its operation in the past to see that the admission of failure is virtually all that is required now. It would be an easy switch back to the hard line this administration has already taken in its approach to agriculture. It is not seeking to relax, by a gradual process, the heavy hand of Government from the farmer. It is pushing on toward greater controls and dictation.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I think it is the general wish of most Members of this House that we reduce nonessential expenditures. We are wrestling with a budget request for new obligational authority of some $108 billion. There are many items in this budget that are difficult to reduce. We have one today that should be easy if we are really sincere in our expressions.

The request by the USDA for authority to spend money in fiscal 1964 exceeds $8 billion. Included in this request are plans for the kind of legislation that is under consideration today; namely, the Feed Grain Act of 1963. It is hard to determine specifically how much is involved in this program embodied in H.R. 4997, but I believe my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee will agree that it is in the neighborhood of $1 billion.

I call to the attention of my colleagues table 4 on page 31 of House Report 180 which contains the majority and minority views with regard to this bill. I call attention to the fact that the State of Ohio, which is a great feed producing State, received in 1961 more than $42½ million not to grow feed grain. You know the results. We only slightly decreased the production of feed grain.

The cost of this program when you include administrative cost during the last 2 years amounts to more than $1.7 billion.

We are being asked to extend for 2 years this "money distributing" program.

Farmers are now involved in a decision with regard to the wheat certificate plan. I think this House will be very unwise in passing this legislation at this time. I think it is bad legislation any time of the year, but particularly bad before we know the results of the wheat referendum—yes, before we know how much wheat will be dumped onto the feed grain market.

I challenge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to exercise their privilege today and save $1 billion. I urge that you vote to recommit this bill to the House Agriculture Committee, and let us take a new look at this whole program.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the supporters of this legislation for their concern of American agriculture in general and our farm population in particular. I share your purpose in raising farm income by assuring fairer prices for feed grain producers and by providing a basis of stability for livestock prices. I agree that surplus stocks of feed grains should be reduced and that taxpayer dollars should be saved in our vast storage program. I heartily concur that we should give wheat and feed grain producers new freedom and flexibility in the management and operation of his own farm.

I also agree that failure to act positively upon a sound stabilization program for feed grains, to operate along with a related and effective program for wheat, would present grim alternatives. Indeed, I made a point of mentioning some of these alternatives last year when we passed the Agriculture Act of 1962, such as the possibility of 80-cent corn and demoralized livestock markets.

There are some provisions of this bill which I find distasteful, of course, such as the unwarranted power placed in the Secretary of Agriculture in regulating markets and controlling payments. But generally speaking, I am firmly in favor of feed grain legislation such as this that calls for voluntary participation and would like very much to throw my unqualified support toward the passage of such legislation today. But I find this most difficult at this time. Gentlemen, we are putting the cart in front of the horse. We are premature. We are considerating legislation that should be considered a month from now, but not today.

There is no urgency that forces us to act at this moment. This legislation applies to the 1964 and 1965 crops. Legislation applicable to the current crop is now in effect. I supported that legislation last year. I have always supported feed grain programs and will continue to do so. Plans for the 1963 crop are secure; and enactment of a 1964 feed grain program anytime within the next few months would still give all feed grain farmers ample opportunity to make their plans for next year.

Then, why this urgency today? I suspect there are added motives that go beyond the grand statements about wanting to help our farmers, and I suspect it is all tied into the upcoming wheat referendum. In fact, I believe the measure we have before us today is being considered at this time for just one reason, to sell our wheat farmers on a "yes" vote on May 21. And frankly, it is not the role of Congress to influence a free choice by enacting premature legislation.

The administration has already threatened the wheat farmers by saying there will be no further legislative action on wheat during this session of Congress if wheat farmers vote "wrong" in the referendum. And if we pass feed grain legislation today, we will virtually close the door to any later effort to enact remedial legislation if the referendum fails.

This bill today also represents a political carrot dangling before our wheat farmers in the hope of leading them to the polls to vote "yes" out of fear.

It seems strange that an administration which came to power on a plank of "parity income" would apply such heavyhanded tactics to the wheat farmer, especially at a time when the parity ratio hit its lowest level since 1959 and farm costs are at an alltime high.

We need feed grain legislation, of course. But we do not need it today. In fact, we should at least wait until after May 21 when all will know whether wheat farmers want the certificate plan. Then and only then can we possibly face this legislation intelligently from the standpoint of how the situation really is. What we are doing today is trying to approach the problem from the standpoint of how certain people would like it to be.

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Chairman, in considering this bill, I am utterly amazed at the amount of power which would be vested in the Secretary of Agriculture, if enacted. On nearly every page, and no less than 20 times in all, there is an expression of discretionary power and really no doubt but that autocratic powers are definitely intended in the administration of the feed grain program. This fact, coupled with the mail I have received from my constituents, makes it very easy for me to stand opposed to the measure.

By way of analogy, and in the same general area, I would remind my colleagues of the Congress' action some 30 years ago which gave similar powers to the Secretary of Agriculture in the fluid milk field. Presently, no less than 72 marketing administrators are trying to cope with the problem, and the Department now seeks to end this debacle by going one step closer toward complete socialization of the dairy industry by suggesting a quota system. It is surprising that our agriculture experts have resisted this move as long as they have. Some 4,000 dairy farms have been discontinued in New York alone during the last year, thus adding at least 10,000 workers to New York unemployment rolls. The oppressive burden with which the taxpayer is saddled continues to mount, and it would seem to me that our metropolitan friends who are so eager to lend their support to these bills would resist further approval of bureaucratic management.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, the farm laws and regulations controlling our farmers are a national disgrace. I want to commend the Republican members of the Agriculture Committee for their minority report, also the additional minority views. These views brand this legislation, H.R. 4997, the unnecessary and unfortunate legislation that it is. This bill is more of the socialistic schemes of the Kennedy administration. Private enterprise is being completely eliminated. Control, regulation, regimentation, and dictation are part and parcel of this farm program.

Beyond the immorality of this type legislation, its unconstitutionality, its full blown socialism, is the cost factor. This misuse of the taxpayers' money is a national disgrace.

Soon now the people will rebel on this dictatorial and regulatory legislation. It is my hope that the people will plainly speak out and demand the removal of Government regulations, control, and price support.

The farmer should be free to grow what he chooses. The taxpayers should be relieved of the double cost, in taxes and food prices in the grocery stores.

Most of all, time is running out on capitalism, as socialism-communism engulfs the world. We must disapprove this legislation and all socialistic schemes. It is never too late to start on the long hard road back to fiscal sanity and freedom for our people.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, it has been said that these proposals "are similar in nature to regulations that have been in effect for many years for such crops as tobacco." The inference is that anyone who supports the tobacco program should favor the proposals contained in H.R. 4997 for feed grains.

Most members support the existing tobacco program, but there are many circumstances which differentiate tobacco from feed grains. Tobacco is heavily taxed. It is not a food or a raw material used in the production of other farm products. It is less perishable than most farm commodities and, in fact, must be aged before it is used. It is not yet threatened with serious competition from substitutes and synthetics. The market is dominated by a few large domestic companies and foreign monopolies. The acreage involved is small. Only 1.1 million acres compared to 144.5 million acres in feed grains, 54.9 million acres in wheat, and another 31.2 million acres to soybeans, rye and flaxseed for a total of at least 230 million acres.

The problems involved in attempting to control production on 230 million acres of grain spread all over the United States are vastly different from the problem of controlling production on 1.1 million acres of tobacco located in a few relatively small areas.

Cotton, rice and peanuts all have statutory minimum allotments.

No existing commodity program includes the controls on diverted acres now being proposed for feed grains and wheat.

Serious problems arise under both the cotton and rice programs. They are heavily dependent on expensive export subsidies as is the case with wheat. In the case of cotton the export subsidy has created a serious competitive problem for our best customer—the domestic textile industry. Cotton is also faced with increasingly serious competition from synthetics and foreign growths.

Essential features of the proposed feed grain program are as follows:

First. Acreage allotments and marketing quotas would be established for corn, grain sorghums, oats, and barley as a group. Rye could be included in the program at the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Second. The national allotment could be reduced at the discretion of the Secretary to permit a reduction in CCC stocks.

Third. Discretionary authority would be provided for the establishment of a commercial area for feed grains.

I shall give you a few facts I have learned as chairman of the committee studying the impact of imports and exports on American jobs.

You can hear any kind of figures you care to in this fight for a more liberal trade policy.

I will not try to give you the many facets of this problem in one short evening. However, I will touch lightly on the farm facts. These figures are backed up by the testimony and reports of Government agencies. They may shock a few of you and in some cases may give you occasion to pause and perhaps reconsider your previous notions.

I want you to know that up until a few years ago I was a militant free trader. I guess I still am. The difference is that now I want free trade to be equitable and fair. I propose to vote for free trade just as fast and just as free as this Nation can afford it. Up until we can afford free trade, I intend to give all my support to protecting my people's welfare, their jobs, their industries, their farms, their incomes, and their markets.

The views I express are in the main interests of farmers, farm groups, producers of agricultural products, canning, freezing, and so forth.

We all know that Public Law 480 was made necessary by price support policies which priced American farm products out of world markets and led to the accumulation of surpluses. We always have regarded it as a temporary measure designed to maintain and expand foreign markets until needed changes could be made in domestic price support policies.

The pending legislation would expand the President's authority to donate surplus commodities to foreign countries for famine relief and other assistance by including commodities not owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation. This would permit a dramatic expansion of giveaway operations. It would do little or nothing to build foreign markets, but it could greatly increase the cost of Public Law 480.

The wisdom of authorizing the purchase of privately owned commodities for foreign donations is essentially a question of foreign policy. Certainly, the cost of such a program should not be charged to farmers.

It is proposed to authorize the use of "surplus agricultural commodities produced in the United States in programs of economic development, emergency assistance, and special feeding carried out through the United Nations system or other intergovernmental organizations."

It is, of course, desirable to seek constructive uses for surplus commodities. It is also desirable for the United States to consider the views of exporting countries, and to seek to avoid giving such countries a justifiable cause for resenting our surplus disposal programs. We do not, however, believe it would be wise for this country to turn over the distribution of large quantities of agricultural surpluses to international organizations where we can be outvoted on the terms and conditions under which such surpluses are to be distributed.

During the past 10 years, farm support programs have cost the American taxpayer $26 billion. During the same period, we imported agricultural products valued at $42 billion. While this was going on, we piled up in Government storage 1.1 billion bushels of wheat, 1.4 million bushels of corn, 2.6 million pounds of tobacco, and about 336 million pounds of butter, cheese, and dried milk.

The bulk of the feed grains, other than we have in Government storage today, has been imported. Our disappearance of feed grains over the past 10 years has been greater than our production, yet, we as taxpayers are paying some $20 million a year to store what is termed "surplus" feed grain. It is surplus, to be sure, but not a surplus created by the overproduction of the American farmer. It is created by imports.

The foreign trade balance is right now up for Tariff Commission action. It is estimated by the textile industry that unless a more realistic view is taken, the entire industry may be jeopardized. I have yet to find any witnesses who are opposed to world trade; however, in all instances, I have found a universal demand for equitable world trade.

There are no farm problems, except those created by the trade policies of this Nation through unfair, unequal, and unjust import competition.

This sounds fantastic, but if the American farmer were permitted to raise and market a major part of the food and fiber that is consumed by the American people, we would not have acres enough today to produce it. The problem is that agricultural imports have created an agricultural surplus.

Furthermore, agriculture has been so commingled with foreign aid, foreign trade, foreign relations, Government programs and State Department planners, that a bad image of the farmer has been created. Free enterprise and agriculture markets have virtually been destroyed. We cannot go backwards, but we can look behind once in awhile to see where we have been. At least this might help us to determine where we want to go.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, dated April 18, 1961, states as follows:

> From 1949 to 1959, we imported twice as much barley as our surplus grew during that period. In fact, we imported more during that period than we had on hand as surplus at the end of 1959. In oats, we imported four times as much from 1949 to 1959 as our surplus grew during the same period—imports approximately equaled the surplus on hand at the end of 1959. The situation in rye is even more vivid. From 1949 to 1959, we produced 46.5 million less bushels than the amount of the total of this crop. Yet, during this same period, our surplus increased by 4.5 million bushels, due to the fact that we imported 52.7 million bushels.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps there are some farmers in the United States who feel that the trade policy is not injurious, but the record shows that not only are nonsubsidized farm products in danger, but that all agriculture is suffering from these unsound trade policies.

The figures on beef imports and their relationship to worked and idled acres tell a story that could come out of Hans Christian Andersen's fairy tales:

DISPLACEMENT OF DOMESTIC ACREAGES RESULTING FROM BEEF IMPORTS IN 1961

For 1961 live imports, 910,000 (USDA estimates). Domestic acres displaced, 18,200,000. For 1961 frozen and processed beef imported 527.5 million pounds. Carcass equivalent (USDA estimates), 1,376,775 head. Domestic acres displaced, 27,535,500. Total domestic acres displaced by beef imports in 1961, 45,735,500.

For 1961 live beef exports, 24,012 head. Acres required to produce, 480,240. For 1961 processed meat exported, 29.9 million pounds. Carcass equivalent (USDA estimates), 72,657 head. Acres required to produce 1,453,140. Total acres required to produce beef exported in 1961, 2,932,380.

Total acres displaced by beef imports	45,735,500
Total acres producing beef exports	2,932,380
Net loss of acreage displacement through beef imports	42,303,120

As a step toward solution of the farm problems, we are asked by the Government to purchase 50 million acres of productive land, retiring it from production.

Permitting the American farmer to produce just the beef imported last year would have consumed the production of 42.8 million acres—nearly as many acres as we propose to buy.

Which procedure would, in your opinion, be most beneficial to the American economy?

Seriously, Mr. Chairman, the time comes sooner or later when we must stop, look, and listen.

In closing, let me make it very clear, I believe this Nation has met its obligations over the years to both our friends and our one-time enemies. In doing so, all of us as Americans have contributed our share.

I am sure we will be glad to contribute more as it is required for the defense and economic needs of our allies as well as ourselves. However, let us not lose sight of our own economic structure.

I assure you it is not sufficient reason to tell a fellow citizen, a neighbor that your interest in the welfare of other peoples, other States, or other countries compels you to take his job away.

I will not vote now or at any other time, nor have I ever cast a vote to take one man's bread away so another could eat cake.

We have got to fight together if we want a healthy economy on the farm, in the city, in our Government and above all, in our homes.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce has issued these figures: For every 100 new factory workers; in a community 296 people will be added; 4 new retail establishments will be opened; $360,000 in additional retail sales will be realized; 107 additional automobiles will be in use; 174 more workers will be employed; personal income will be upped $590,000; and bank deposits will show a net of $290,000. We can assume then that the loss of 100 jobs will have the opposite effect.

Mr. Chairman, on May 21 the U.S. Department of Agriculture will conduct a most important referendum among the Nation's wheat farmers. This referendum provides wheat producers with responsibility for making one of the most important decisions ever made by a group of agricultural producers with respect to the future direction of American agriculture.

While one does not think of Pennsylvania as being an important wheat producing State, this referendum has serious implications, not only to wheat people, but to all the farmers in my State and in other areas. The real issue in this referendum is not the phony one of "$2 versus $1" wheat, but rather whether Government-supply management is going to be the future way of life for the American farmer.

Only wheat is directly involved in this particular referendum and only wheat producers can vote, but all farmers, consumers, and taxpayers will be affected by the outcome.

Wheat producers have been voting for Government programs in a more or less routine fashion for several years. Past programs have carried "controls" of a sort, but there were numerous exceptions and limitations. So, wheat producers have not really had to face up to the full implications of going down the supply-management road to a licensed and regimented agriculture. But the situation is different this year.

The multiple-price certificate plan being submitted to producers this year includes the tightest, most binding Government controls ever seriously considered for any farm commodity. In addition to providing much stricter acreage allotments than growers have experienced over recent years and a new type of marketing quota, the administration's plan provides for diverted-acre controls and cross compliance. It also would give the Secretary of Agriculture vast powers to regulate all handlers, processors and distributors of wheat from the farm to the ultimate consumer.

How Pennsylvania farmers vote may decide the referendum in the United States. All wheat farmers with an allotment of 15 acres or more are automatically eligible to vote. In the past there has been an exemption of 15 acres for those who wanted to plant that much and not receive price supports. In addition, a farmer could grow 30 acres providing he used it all for feed on his own farm. Under the 1962 act these exemptions have been eliminated. As a result, for the first time the farmers with less than 15 acres can vote if they agree to participate in the program. In 1961 there were 79,000 Pennsylvania farms with wheat allotments of less than 15 acres. This large potential number of voters could well be the deciding factor in the referendum.

One of my reasons for discussing this question is due to the fact that the 15-acre wheat farmers will have the opportunity to vote for the first time. Under the proposed provisions of the referendum any of these small wheat farmers who want to vote in the referendum must indicate their desire to do so 7 days prior to the referendum date. They must register at the county ASC office before May 14. This means if one of the 15-acre wheat farmers wants to vote "no" in the referendum and therefore preserve his right to grow whatever amount of wheat he chooses, it will be necessary for him to sign up to participate.

I recognize among some wheat farmers the requirement that they sign up to participate in order to vote may cause some of them to be reluctant to vote. However, I hope that all these small wheat growers will sign up to participate and vote in the referendum since every vote will be important.

In recent weeks letters and conversations with farmers from Pennsylvania indicate that the Secretary of Agriculture, who is responsible for conducting the referendum, has thrown the full resources of his Department into a large campaign for a "yes" vote. The Secretary claims that the referendum offers producers a choice between $1 and $2 per bushel for their wheat; that defeat of his control scheme would lead to trade wars and chaos in the international market. These claims are serious exaggerations designed to panic wheat producers rather than an objective analysis of the situation.

Defeat of the wheat certificate plan would not terminate all Government wheat programs. Furthermore, the Congress would still have both the power and the responsibility to deal with any problems that might arise. The Secretary's claim that Congress would not act is nothing more than a scare tactic.

There is no reason to believe that the Congress would abdicate its responsibility. Defeat of the Secretary's control scheme would open the way for the enactment of a sound and constructive solution to the surplus wheat problem.

I have also been very much concerned about the role of the agricultural stabilization committeemen in this referendum. The ASC committeemen, according to the law, have the responsibility to assist in carrying out the administration of any agricultural laws that might be enacted. Their role is essentially one of administering and seeing that the agricultural laws passed by the Congress are carried out and properly understood by farmers. Theirs is not the role of a propaganda or a sales agency. I have been very much distressed by reports that indicate that the ASC committeemen have become propaganda agents for the Secretary of Agriculture in the forthcoming wheat referendum.

I urge that the ASC committeemen return to their historic role as the people who must administer the various farm programs rather than that of being active propaganda salesmen for Secretary Freeman. Unless this is done, they will have lost the confidence of farmers and the general public as to what their real responsibility is in agriculture.

One of my reasons for discussing this wheat referendum is that most of the agricultural producers in my district whether they grow wheat or other commodities have felt rather strongly for some time that the Government should reduce its role in agriculture. The wheat referendum to be held in May provides not only the farmers in my district, but farmers all over the country who produce wheat the opportunity to express their point of view on this important question. I am hopeful that the referendum will be defeated so that we avoid the spreading of supply-management to other agricultural commodities such as dairy, poultry, and livestock.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, the pending bill is not perfect by any means but it appears to be constructively moving in the direction of successfully tackling the vexatious question of huge agricultural food and feed surpluses, which have plagued us for some time past.

It would appear that under the present program, we have made considerable headway in cutting down the amount of surplus grain now in storage and in reducing the cost to the Government some $920,000 each day in the last year.

In addition, the program contributed a 10-percent increase in net farm income between 1960 and 1962.

It reduced feed grain stocks from a record 3.2 billion bushels in 1961, prior to the time the new feed grain program became effective, to an estimated 1.9 billion bushels at the close of the current marketing year.

It also maintained stable food prices for consumers. This would seem to be striking progress as compared to our sorry experiences with some previous programs of this kind.

It is stated that if the pending feed grain bill were passed, it would mean the elimination of the unneeded, unwanted feed grain surpluses by the end of 1963.

Once the carryover has been reduced to a level adequate for emergency and security reserves, a supply-demand balance could be maintained, it is officially asserted, with less acreage diversion and less cost in the years ahead.

Furthermore, if the House takes favorable action on this legislation, it is stated that farmers participating in wheat and feed grain price support programs will have greater flexibility in utilization of their land.

If the wheat referendum is approved May 21, and there is also a feed grains program, producers will be able to interchange these crops. It is desirable for farmers to know before voting in the referendum what the wheat-feed grain relationship will be.

These are some of the considerations regarding this legislation which impress me strongly as offering some real hope for the solution of major farm problems.

I am concerned, of course, about the cost of grain and feed to our own farmers and food grains to our people, and I am interested in keeping these prices down as much as possible, and in sponsoring a program that will effectually reduce the huge surpluses that are hanging like a dark, ominous cloud over our agricultural economy, and costing our afflicted taxpayers millions of dollars per annum for storage of grains—in some instances, actually rotting in their bins.

Since this bill definitely promotes these ends, I am more hopeful than at any previous recent time that this measure holds out a real promise of remedying some of our most perplexing and costly farm problems.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, much has been said today about the feed grain problem and the farm problem, and a great argument has arisen about how to salve over the problem, but little has been said about the cause of the problem or the solution.

When a cancer breaks out, you can salve the sore externally, but unless major surgery is performed and the cancer removed, the patient will die. This feed grain bill, like most of this farm legislation, is salve on the sore; it does not recognize the cause nor does it recognize the solution.

Much has been said about figures and acreage retirement. Those who sponsor this legislation are proud of the fact that in 1961 the Department was able to divert 25.2 million acres at a cost of only $782 million. In 1962 they diverted 28.6 million acres at a cost of only $842 million, and in 1963 they diverted 25.8 million acres at a cost of $983 million. Those who have opposed the legislation contend that this price for diverted acres is exorbitant.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that the price in dollars is not only exorbitant, but the price in agricultural production is 10 times worse. It is foolish, it is asinine, and it is destructive. Let me point out what I mean:

In 1962 there was imported into the United States over 2¾ million head of 1,000-pound beef. This is an increase of one-half million head over 1961.

The Department of Agriculture advises me that on a nationwide basis it requires the production of 28 acres to produce a 1,000-pound beef and put it on the market. For easy figuring and to be safely in line, I have used the figure of 20 acres. On this basis the 2,726,528 head of beef produced in foreign countries and shipped into the United States, which went onto the American market, displaced the production of 54,530,560 American acres. In other words, had we in America, either through quotas or tariffs, reduced beef imports by only 50 percent, there would have been no need for the taxpayers buying 25 or 28 million acres through diversion and hundreds of farmers and ranchers would have been permitted to remain on the farms to raise the beef on these 38 million acres that was otherwise removed from production by beef imports.

Instead of bragging about how the Department of Agriculture was able to take 25 million acres out of production for $983 million, suppose we had permitted the American farmer to raise the beef imported last year. It would have saved the American taxpayer not $983 million, but three times that amount, because the 2¾ million head of beef displaced the production of more than 54 million acres.

This is only one example. During the past 10 years the disappearance of barley, oats, and rye has been greater than the domestic production of barley, oats, and rye, and yet the American taxpayer is called upon to spend some $20 million annually for the storage of barley, oats, and rye. Whose feed grain is being stored? Not the feed grain of the American farmer, but imported feed grain, if you please, while the American farmer is being required to take his acres out of production to make room for barley, oats, and rye imported into this country in direct competition with American production.

Imports of lamb, mutton, and pork jumped several million pounds last year, further displacing thousands of domestic acres. Sugar imports displaced the production of 1.8 million acres, to use only a few examples. This is the cancer, Mr. Chairman; it is the cancer that must be removed instead of sitting here today putting salve on the sore.

The Department of Agriculture tells us today that 10 percent of the beef eaten by Americans last year was imported. In other words, 1 out of 10 farmers are driven from their farm by the imports of beef alone.

Last year when we were considering the farm bill, I pointed out that there were 2¼ million head of beef imported in 1961. Congress took no action, the President took no action, but the State Department was as busy as a beaver. They have been arranging for agricultural imports from almost every country.

For instance, the Argentine press under date of May 9, 1962, carried a big story quoting the U.S. Ambassador, Robert McClintock, to the effect that he was asking the U.S. Government to permit large shipments of cooked beef into the United States. It quoted the Ambassador as saying:

> This afternoon, Dr. Urien asked me to cable Washington saying that Argentina was in agreement, in principle, with the scientific recommendations made to inspect meat in Buenos Aires and in the meat packing houses and to have it marked with seals of our inspectors. Thus, cured meat, after undergoing the corresponding process, may enter the United States.

He also said:

> Personally, I will see what can be done for my country to buy more Argentine cooked meat.

He added that he would send a telegram to Washington to have an answer on a final decision as soon as possible.

The Argentine press story concluded:

> Secretary Urien then announced that a group of U.S. inspectors were coming to Argentina to confirm the excellency of the Argentine meat.

This is only one example of how our Government is deliberately planning to destroy the American farmer by importing the food that goes onto American tables and the fiber that goes onto American backs, requiring the American farmer to year by year reduce his production to make room for these imports.

The American people are propagandized daily about what a wonderful thing the European Common Market is and how the Common Market will take over world trade. This is true because the Common Market countries are protecting their industries and their farmers by tariffs and quotas. Secretary Freeman stated on January 8 that this year we would lose $800 million of agricultural exports to the Common Market countries. Their tariff on poultry alone kept 300 million pounds of poultry raised for export this year from going into the Common Market countries. This 300 million pounds of unexportable poultry was dumped onto the domestic market and had more to do with the slump in beef prices than anything else.

If it is good for the Common Market countries to protect their farmers against ruinous imports, why is it not good to protect the American farmer? Why are agricultural imports invited into this country forcing the American farmer out of business, forcing the American taxpayer to spend billions of dollars to subsidize the farm industry, rather than permitting the American farmer to have his own market and raise the food for the American people?

Oh, yes, I know the manufacturers and American business generally are anxious to sell their product abroad and to arrange for the farmers of these foreign countries to be able to market their agricultural products in America to provide dollars to buy machinery and so forth. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the farmer of the Middle West is a good market. Put him out of business, put him on the rolls of the unemployed, as we have been doing by these so-called farm programs, and industry of the East has lost the best market in the world.

When do we wake up? When do we take a page from the book of the Common Market countries? When do we look back into the pages of American history and see what made this country great?

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That this Act may be cited as the "Feed Grain Act of 1963."
>
> Sec. 2. Section 105 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended—
>
> (1) by changing the period at the end of subsection (a) to a colon and adding the following: "*Provided,* That in the case of any crop for which an acreage diversion program is in effect for feed grains, the level of price support for corn of such crop shall be at such level not less than 65 per centum or more than 90 per centum of the parity price therefor as the Secretary determines necessary to achieve the acreage reduction goal established by him for the crop."
>
> (2) by adding the following new subsection (d):
>
> "(d) The provision of this subsection shall be applicable with respect to any crop of feed grains for which an acreage diversion program is in effect under section 16(h) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended. The Secretary shall require as a condition of eligibility for price support on the crop of any feed grain which is included in the acreage diversion program that the producer shall participate in the diversion program to the extent prescribed by the Secretary, and, if no diversion program is in effect he may require as a condition of eligibility for price support on any crop of feed grains that the producer shall not exceed his feed grain base. Such portion of the support price for any feed grain included in the acreage diversion program as the Secretary determines desirable to assure that the benefits of the price support and diversion programs inure primarily to those producers who cooperate in reducing their acreages of feed grains shall be made available to producers through payments in kind. Such payments in kind shall be made on the number of bushels of such feed grain determined by multiplying the actual acreage of such feed grain planted on the farm for harvest by the adjusted average yield per acre. The base period used in determining such adjusted average yield shall be the same as that used for purposes of the acreage diversion program formulated under section 16(h) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended. The Secretary may make not to exceed 50 per centum of any payments hereunder to producers in advance of determination of performance. Such payments in kind shall be made through the issuance of negotiable certificates which the Commodity Credit Corporation shall redeem for feed grains (such feed grains to be valued by the Secretary at not less than the current support price minus that part of the current support price made available through payments in kind, plus reasonable carrying charges) and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary, assist the producer in the marketing of such certificates. In the case of any certificate not presented for redemption within thirty days of the date of its issuance, reasonable costs of storage and other carrying charges, as determined by the Secretary, for the period beginning thirty days after its issuance and ending with the date of its presentation for redemption shall be deducted from the value of the certificate. The Secretary shall provide for the sharing of such certificates among the producers on the farm on the basis of their respective shares in the crop produced on the farm with respect to which such certificates are issued, or the proceeds therefrom. If the operator of the farm elects to participate in the acreage diversion program, price support for feed grains included in the program shall be made available to the producers on such farm only if such producers divert from the production of such feed grains in accordance with the provisions of such program an acreage on the farm equal to the number of acres which such operator agrees to divert, and the agreement shall so provide."

Mr. POAGE (interrupting reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Page 2, line 6, strike the words "any crop" and insert in lieu thereof "the 1964 crop and 1965 crop".

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion this legislation ought to be passed, and it ought to be passed today.

Mr. Chairman, in the Wheat Act passed by the Congress last year provision was made for the interchange of wheat and feed grain acreage under section 358 of that act in the event that there was a diversion program in feed grain legislation.

Unless this legislation is passed before the referendum on the wheat bill, there will obviously be no diversion program in effect for feed grains.

The principal argument on this bill has been that of postponing the matter until the wheat referendum has been held. The Committee on Agriculture has reported this bill and asked for a rule and has asked to have it programed. A rule has been granted and the bill has been programed. The minority have argued time and again that the responsibility for moving the legislative program belongs to the majority. We have assumed that responsibility and if we do what the minority now wants us to do we will abdicate our responsibility in this regard.

Mr. Chairman, when the wheat farmer goes to the polls on May 21 to vote in the referendum he is entitled to know whether there is going to be an opportunity to interchange wheat and feed grain acreage, as provided in the Wheat Act. Otherwise he is going to be voting in the dark. He is going to vote on a guess as to what the Congress might do at some later date.

What is wrong, I ask you, with the Congress letting the farmer know what the program is going to be before he votes? I submit that that is the issue so far as the question of timing is concerned. I submit further that if this proposition had been brought up a day or two after the wheat referendum it would have passed without the slightest difficulty.

I refer to the feed grains bills of 1961 and 1962 which have been passed by this House. In 1962, last year, on March 22, in the Congressional Record, volume 108, part 6, page 4777, the question was put on the feed grain bill and it was passed by a voice vote, without a record vote being called for, without even a division being demanded.

Mr. Chairman, reference has been made to fictitious figures. I would like to refer to some figures that are not fictitious, figures that are factual. When President Truman left office in January, 1953, CCC stocks were valued at $2.4 billion. When President Eisenhower left office 8 years later CCC stocks were in excess of $9 billion.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the enactment of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], has expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is no secret that many of us, as the majority leader has just said, are interested in moving along the legislative program but that is not to say that taking that position we on this side believe that a measure such as this should be considered at this particular time.

I cannot refrain from stating on this occasion, as I have on others, with reference to President Eisenhower that for the first 2 years his administration was in office we on the Republican side had a bare majority of the membership. As I remember, we had 221. A majority, of course, is 218. Then for 6 years my friends on the other side were in complete control of congressional action as far as legislation was concerned.

It is no secret that time and again President Eisenhower asked for the adoption of legislation in the area of agricultural assistance, assistance to the farmers, finally coming to the point where he said, "If you will enact legislation within these broad guidelines I will approve it." No such action was had from a Democrat-controlled Congress.

I sat here and listened to the debate. I listened to what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] had to say and to his exposition of the figures that are involved here in respect to the cost of this program and what it will accomplish. I was impressed by them. My only regret is that more Members of the House were not here on that occasion, at that time, to hear and to see his presentation, the very graphic figures that in my opinion were not fictitious. They were factual and conclusive.

It is something of an open secret that the great haste that is being exhibited in the consideration of this legislation is very definitely connected with the wheat referendum vote to be held. The majority leader argues that in that forthcoming referendum the wheat farmer is entitled to know what the situation will be as far as this legislation is concerned. My view is that it would be much better to have the referendum on wheat taken and then have the House of Representatives and the Congress enact legislation that would then be deemed to be necessary. In other words, as far as I am concerned, I did not vote for this legislation to begin with because I did not think it would do the job, and I think it has been proven conclusively that it has not done the job.

In the second place, I think the wheat farmers of this country are entitled to vote in that referendum a few days from now, and then, that vote having been taken, let the Congress of the United States enact good legislation.

Some have indicated that if the wheat referendum result is negative there will be no legislation. I have been in that kind of game before. I know if the wheat referendum fails, of approval, the Congress of the United States in good time will enact sound legislation. At least I hope it would. As I say, I have been in that kind of a bind before. I know that the Congress would not dare to go home without action. Despite all the pressures that have been applied, my opinion is that the wheat referendum will not be approved. If that is true, if that comes to pass, then I say there will be plenty of time for us to enact this sort of legislation. So as far as I am concerned, I hope a straight motion to recommit will be offered and I am going to support it. I think it is in the best interest of the country, the best interest of the farmer and of our economy, and in the best interest of the Treasury and the taxpayers. When the time comes, we can enact necessary legislation and we will have plenty of time to get it done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the opinions of the minority leader are very interesting, but I would like to say this. I have been here since 1955 and I voted for this program and I voted for cotton and for wheat and for corn and for tobacco. I want to vote for the feed grain program today. But I tell you this, win or lose today, if this referendum which has benefited wheat farmers under the legislation now existing which has helped them so greatly, fails to secure their approval, I am going to yield to the people in my district who have been criticizing me. And, I am sure, many of my colleagues from the northeast section of the country are going to do likewise. I have voted for the last feed grain support bill I will ever vote for unless this program is approved. Before I get to talk to the wheat farmers themselves and their representatives, I might point out that notwithstanding your very narrow majority in the first 2 years of the Eisenhower administration, this legislation was in your hands—you had the responsibility and you handled it in such a manner that they turned you out, leaving the problem to us. Now we have solved it and we have saved you millions of dollars. You are not going to come back here on the 22d of May and get away with opening up the Benson plan again and making us vote to support every single bushel of wheat that they want to grow. They will take the money they get from taking acreage out of production under a Benson-type plan and do like they did before. They will go out and buy fertilizer and double their production and put enormous surpluses in the granaries.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Yes, briefly.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, I am always very brief. The gentleman referred to the fact that we were turned out.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. That is a matter of history.

Mr. HALLECK. As a matter of fact, that is not——

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I decline to yield further.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I will yield to the gentleman when I have time.

Mr. Chairman, on February 14 I wrote to my constituents. I said that it was my fervent hope that this legislation would come before us and it would pass. In a sense, I apologized to my consumers for some of my farm voting record. But I was able to do so on the ground that this program had saved my consumers money in the cost of bread and in the cost of wheat storage which they are helping to support. I said, therefore, I would look toward the wheat referendum for guidance, and if the wheat farmers do not want a program, I wrote, which has considerable opposition from the people of my district, then neither do I. I am going to be guided by whatever the wheat farmers themselves do, and I am talking only for myself. If they turn this program down, how then can I or any other reasonable person expect to come back here and do anything except possibly for the dairy farmer.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I just want to observe that when you were winning the election, you promised the farmers of this country 90 to 100 percent of parity. The price in the market place is about 77 percent. The low figure you have in this bill is 65 percent.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. That is true.

Mr. HALLECK. May I just make this further observation——

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Just a minute.

Look at the record. I voted for 90-percent parity. Then I got smart and I will not do it any more. I have voted for some basic programs because I sincerely believe that the farm population is as important a segment of our society, no matter what is raised, whether it be peanuts, wheat, corn, cotton, or other products, as are those people who work in the cities. I am always ready to support any sensible farm legislation. But you are not going to sucker me back again on an open end Benson plan.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. BASS. The distinguished majority leader mentioned the fact that after they went this far in the 83d Congress that for 6 years the Democrats had the responsibility of legislating.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. That is right, and in the interim the President vetoed a good bill and they turned the Executive out. Mr. Chairman, following these remarks is my newsletter of February 14, to which I referred earlier.

Mr. BASS. We passed five regular farm bills.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, each year since 1955, when I first came to the Congress, we have voted on farm legislation. Each year I hear from constituents presenting a broad range of opinion relating to farm legislation. At one extreme are many who say the Federal Government should get out of agriculture. At the other end are those who tell me that there is a national interest in preserving the family farmer and the business community which serves him.

Most of the time, I have voted for farm programs—reported out of the House Agriculture Committee in two administrations—for wheat, wool, sugar, and other crops. I have done so because my colleagues representing farming areas have assured me that these programs were necessary to maintain an important segment of our economy. These votes in favor of farm bills have aroused great criticism from many of my constituents and gave my last opponent what he believed to be a major campaign advantage. Fortunately, a considerable majority of the Burlington-Mercer voters believed with me that my votes were in the national interest.

Again this year, we must face up to the farm problem. Some time late this spring, wheat farmers will vote in a national referendum on whether to participate in the Kennedy farm program which has reduced surpluses and thus storage costs to our taxpayers without raising the cost of bread and flour to the people in my district. As a matter of fact surplus storage costs have been reduced by $270 million since the President's program went into effect; a real break for the taxpayer.

I will look to this wheat referendum for guidance. If the wheat farmers do not want a program, which has considerable opposition from the people of my district, neither do I. I am sure that many of my colleagues share my view.

Some people are running around Washington and the wheatgrowing areas saying that if the referendum fails, Congress will pass a better wheat program. Speaking in Champaign, Ill., the other night, President Charles B. Shuman, of the American Farm Bureau, said:

> Regardless of how the referendum goes, Congress will be in session and new legislation will be introduced.

That may be, but if the wheat farmers vote against a wheat program that is cutting the surpluses burgeoning our granaries, so will I.

Mr. Shuman's statement clearly implies that the Congress would substitute some other type of wheat legislation in lieu of the successful Kennedy program. Perhaps he is right, but you can bet your hat that Representatives from nonfarming areas will not vote for another Benson or Benson-type bill. We like to support programs which help the farmers and save money at the same time. Like our constituents, however, we believe that any return to the expensive, pre-Kennedy programs should be resisted. We like the present program and hope that the wheat farmers do, too.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to point out here some of the statements that the majority leader made which were not correct, although I know he had no intention to do so. The vote which was taken without a rollcall on a farm bill in 1962 was the one in which there was no certificate plan for wheat. This was reported by the committee. It came to this House. We voted on it and passed it. Then it went to conference, and it was in conference that the certificate plan for wheat was introduced. At that time the vote was recorded 202 to 197.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I made no such statement. I said the vote was on the feed grain bill. That is what this bill is. If I said wheat, it was the feed grain bill.

Mr. QUIE. Then later the majority leader compared the inventory cost in 1960 with the present cost of our surplus. I call attention to the fact that in 1961 Secretary Freeman changed the accounting method and that meant a manipulation in the inventory costs of the surpluses. So the figures for 1960 are not comparable with those of succeeding years.

If we are to use proper and comparable figures we should use net book value. Using the net book value, in 1960 the surplus amounted to $5.6 billion; in 1961, $5.7 billion; in 1962, $6.3 billion; and in 1963, $7.1 billion.

I make this statement just to set the record straight.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield.

Mr. MICHEL. In that connection, the borrowing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation at present is $14 billion. Several weeks ago we were asked to make a supplemental appropriation of $585 million. That amount of money was necessary in order to give them sufficient leeway to implement these programs. So the whole extent of the borrowing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation is right at the limit now, practically $14 billion.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I happen to be one who believes that the feed grain law that has been on the books for 3 years is basically sound. I think it can be made to work more economically and do the job. I ask you to vote to recommit this bill so that we can consider feed grain legislation to meet the situation that will prevail in this country after the referendum on wheat has been held. Then I think we can devise a sound feed grain bill and a wheat bill which would be less expensive, possibly, and do the job that we wanted, governed by the experience we have had under the past administration and this administration. Then I think we can pass legislation calmly, and not, as the gentleman from Kansas said, based on referendum politics at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Committee amendment: Page 2, line 6, strike the words "for which" and insert in lieu thereof "if".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Committee amendment: Page 2, line 14, strike the comma after the word "effect" and insert "for the 1964 crop of the 1965 crop."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Committee amendment: Page 2, line 15, strike the word "any" and insert in lieu thereof the word "such".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Page 2, line 16, change the period to a colon and add: "*Provided*, That the Secretary may provide that no producer of malting barley shall be required as a condition of eligibility for price support for barley to participate in the acreage diversion program for feed grains if such producer has previously produced a malting variety of barley, plants barley only of an acceptable malting variety for harvest, does not knowingly devote an acreage on the farm to barley in excess of 110 per centum of the average acreage devoted on the farm to barley in 1959 and 1960, does not knowingly devote an acreage on the farm to corn and grain sorghums in excess of the average acreage devoted on the farm to corn and grain sorghums in 1959 and 1960, and does not devote any acreage devoted to the production of oats and rye in 1959 and 1960 to the production of wheat pursuant to the provisions of section 328 of the Food and Agricultural Act of 1962."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. KYL: Page 3, line 7, strike the words "such portion of", strike the rest of page 3 through line 25, strike lines 1 through 18 on page 4 through the word "therefrom", and page 11, line 15, strike the words "minus that part of the current support price made available through payments in kind,".

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to strike from this bill the virtually unlimited authority for the Secretary to make direct payments as part of the price support on corn and other feed grains in 1964 and 1965. This amendment is sound for two reasons: First, it will reduce the cost of the feed grain program, and second, it will eliminate the Brannan plan feature of this bill which is an extremely bad precedent for feed grain and other farm legislation.

The experience that we have had with the voluntary feed grain program in 1961, 1962, and 1963 shows that the direct costs have increased in each of these years even though the acreage in the third year declined. As the committee report points out, in 1961 there were 25.2 million acres diverted at a direct cost of $782 million. In 1962 there were 28.6 million acres diverted at a direct cost of $842 million, and in 1963 there were 25.8 million acres diverted at a direct cost of $983 million. The record shows that even though there are 3 million less acres diverted in 1963 than was the case last year, the direct cost has advanced some $140 million. The reason for this, Mr. Chairman, is the inclusion of the direct payment provision in the 1963 program. The land retirement payments alone under the 1963 program amount to some $496 million. The direct payments account for another $487 million. Thus, if the direct payment authority were deleted under the 1963 program and the diversion rates remained as the Secretary of Agriculture proclaimed them, a direct savings of $487 million could have been achieved. Since H.R. 4997 proposes to extend the 1963 program for 2 more years and contains this direct payment authority, the unnecessary expenditure of approximately $1 billion will be made.

It cannot be argued that the elimination of direct payments will cripple the program because there were no direct payments in 1961 and 1962, and things worked out satisfactorily.

These direct payments, as I said before, establish a very bad precedent because legislation is now pending in our Committee on Agriculture to apply direct cash subsidies to cotton textile mills and cotton farmers and to make direct cash payments to dairy farmers. Some people are even proposing to make direct cash payments to dairy processors in order to lower the price of butter.

All these direct payment plans are, of course, financed through the back door of the Treasury and the Congress, and the Appropriations Committees have absolutely no effective way to control the expenditures that the Department of Agriculture might make—and let me again remind you that these expenditures are of very large proportions. The feed grain payments in 1963 are to be some $487 million, the cotton bill pending in our committee contemplates payments of $382 million, and the dairy proposals are somewhere in the neighborhood of $300 million.

Mr. Chairman, I believe in a feed grain program, and I have since 1960 supported the establishment of a voluntary feed grain program based on land retirement and soil conservation, the use of payments in kind, the limitation of program benefits to participants, and the promotion of a sound market economy. If H.R. 4997 were changed in such a way as to delete these direct payments, I feel that we would have a voluntary feed grain program which meets the basic requirements of a successful program.

In 1961 when the original feed grain bill came before the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] and others pointed out that there were a good many valid features incorporated in this type of legislation, but we vigorously opposed the dumping authority contained in that original proposal. I am happy to say that the Department and the Committee on Agriculture both have recognized the undesirable nature of this authority and have included an antidumping provision in this legislation which would prevent the Secretary from selling grain representing payment-in-kind certificates for less than the support price plus reasonable carrying charges. In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I feel that we should have a voluntary feed grain program but that the program could be operated more economically without establishing this extremely bad precedent if the direct payments were deleted as proposed by the amendment.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, it is noteworthy that every Member who has spoken in favor of this feed grain bill for the crop years of 1964 and 1965 have praised the 1963 program now in effect. Why not? Oh, no; it must be thrown in the ash can, and this bill which provides that the Secretary of Agriculture will at his own discretion at some later date, tell our farmers and the Congress the kind of a feed grain program that he and only he will permit. That, my friends, is more power than any good man would want or any bad man should have.

The feed grain bill which Congress passed last session for the crop years 1963 and 1964 was a pretty good bill for 1963, but bad for 1964, because it was plain to see unless greatly amended for 1964 corn would go down to 80 cents per bushel as I and others predicted, and which was, after the 1962 election, admitted by the President who then asked for an amended bill for the crop year of 1964, but certainly, Mr. Chairman, the bill now before us is not a solution to the feed grain problem facing our farmers in 1964.

It is plain to see that the farmers of the Middle West can expect little from Congress so long as the Democrats are in power. Listen, please, to these facts and figures:

LIVESTOCK PRICES DROP WHEN DEMOCRATS ARE IN CONTROL OF CONGRESS

Prices on most every farm product were driven down when the Democrats rolled back cattle prices 10 percent early in 1951.

HOG PRICES AT THE OMAHA MARKET

In 1940: Low $5.25; high $7.30; Democrat controlled Congress; peace.

In 1941–47: High $27.50; Democrat controlled Congress; war.

In 1947–48: High $32.25; Republican controlled Congress; peace.

In 1949–52 (rollback): High $26.50; Democrat controlled Congress; war.

In 1953–54: High $28.65; Republican controlled Congress; peace.

In 1955–58: High $25.25; Democrat controlled Congress; peace.

In 1959–62: High $20.35; Democrat controlled Congress; peace.

Today's high about $15; Democrat controlled Congress; peace.

LOOK—SOUTHERN DEMOCRATS CONTROL AGRICULTURE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS

Senate Agriculture Committee: Democrat chairman from Southern State; 11 Democrats, 6 from Southern States; 6 Republicans, 5 from Midwest and Northern States.

House Agriculture Committee: Democrat chairman from Southern State; 20 Democrats on committee, 13 from Southern States; 14 Republicans, 13 from Midwestern and Northern States.

Farm products of the Southern States: Mostly cotton, tobacco, rice, and peanuts—prices good.

Farm products of the Midwestern States: Mostly corn, wheat, livestock, poultry, and eggs—prices low.

Congressmen and Senators always look after their own people best. Southerners and midwesterners are no exception.

MIDWEST FARMERS AND MERCHANTS NEED AND DESERVE A REPUBLICAN CONGRESS

Two wars less than 6 years apart, high taxes, low livestock prices, and high cost of all manufactured commodities which our farmers buy have the farmers of the Middle West in a bad price squeeze. Our farmers got fair prices during the wars, but neither they, their wives, nor their children want any more of that kind of business.

Also remember: The Democratic Party was in complete control of the House of Representatives when farm prices went to pot in 1931–32.

Mr. Chairman on Thursday, October 4, 1962, in this House, I said:

> Mr. Speaker, along with a great majority of the Members representing the breadbasket States, I could not support the 1962 farm bill for the many following reasons:
>
> Here are some excerpts from a speech by Congressman HOEVEN, of Iowa, top minority member of the House Agriculture Committee. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 108, part 15, page 20460, he said:
>
> "In 1963 corn and wheat farmers will experience a very liberal and expensive payment program for the voluntary retirement of acreage, but in 1964 the honeymoon is over. After 1 year of payments on producing acres, payments on nonproducing acres and price support loans at $1.02 per bushel, the rug is pulled out from under the corn farmer. He is then faced with no payments whatsoever and price support at 80 cents a bushel. Not only that, but the Government surplus could be dumped on the market at 84 cents a bushel, plus carrying charges, and 175 million bushels of cheap feed wheat would be thrown into artificial competition with corn. During the debate in the House on the conference report there was not one single attempt to dispute the obvious fact that there will be 80-cent corn in 1964. During the debate in the Senate on the bill both before and after it went to conference, the junior Democratic Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], pointed out that under the Senate-adopted formula the 1964 corn support would be extremely low—50 percent of parity.
>
> In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 108, part 16, page 21590, he said:
>
> "Next year our feet will be to the fire. Those of us who want to maintain income for dairy, beef, and hog farmers will be in a far different position than we were this year, because the alternative to doing nothing will

be 50 percent price supports, which means a further cruel income drop for our farmers."

Tobacco is supported under a special formula passed 2 years ago to prevent tobacco supports from going higher (under Public Law 86-389 the 1962 tobacco support is 101 percent of the 1959 support), peanuts are currently supported at 82 percent of parity, rice at 76 percent of parity, and upland cotton at 82 percent of parity.

Along with the sharp increase in the number of employees added to the Department of Agriculture in order to help that agency spend even more tax money, farm debt in America has also risen to an alltime high of $27.7 million. So have farm costs risen to an alltime high of $27.6 billion in the second quarter of 1962.

Whether it is bypassing Congress through a radical delegation of legislative authority, or whether it is penitentiary terms for dairy farmers, or whether it is 80-cent corn for corn farmers, or whether it is by another means, the end is the same—the complete control of our agricultural economy. This is what we have to look forward to next year—more attempts at controlling American agriculture.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would call the attention of the committee to the fact that if you strike these provisions out, you restore supports on unlimited production, supports to the noncooperator as well as cooperator. You make no distinction. You create an utterly intolerable situation.

This is the Quie amendment. This is the amendment which was placed in the bill at the suggestion of the gentleman from Minnesota in the 1963 act, and it had a very sound purpose. The committee accepted it after the gentleman from Minnesota suggested it. We think that it is a pretty sound approach. It eliminates the very provisions which the gentleman objected to, the dumping provisions and the sell-back practices. It makes it possible to distinguish between the cooperator and the noncooperator. If you go back to the old system of giving the man who does not cooperate the same consideration that you give to the man who is a cooperator, you get no results in the way of reducing production. You achieve nothing. Of course, the amendment simply takes the heart out of the bill.

Now, I am not going to use the language that was used yesterday, but it has exactly the effect which was described on the floor of the House yesterday, and everybody knows that effect. Of course, I recognize that there are various ways of killing bills, and obviously this is one of the elite methods of killing bills. There will be a good many people who do not understand it. But, I believe the membership of this House, understands that you must have a distinction between a cooperator and a noncooperator; that you must have a way of making payments to the cooperator that is not going to the noncooperator, and this amendment simply takes out that payment. This amendment places you in a position where you actually have no program at all. The only way you can get a program under this would be to go back to the discredited system that the gentleman has referred to, of sell-backs.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the committee reject this amendment.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make some observations relative to the administration of the present feed grain law as it applies to the family farms of America.

Mr. Chairman, in my judgment one of the most devastating practices that has been used in the administration of this program has been the sale of Commodity Credit Corporation grain which has constantly depressed the market unnecessarily. It is my opinion that under the new bill this provision is being corrected, admitting a mistake under the previous legislation.

Mr. Chairman, records show that production has been below disappearance which normally would have produced a higher price. Commodity Credit stocks have been unwisely dumped. The result has been that feed prices have been depressed. We have often heard from the Secretary that cheap feed means cheap livestock. The result of that is that the population of livestock on the farm has increased materially and the price of livestock has been depressed.

Mr. Chairman, under the bill that we are considering today the thing of which I am afraid is this: That the supports are set in a flexible manner, which used to be a dirty word, at from 65 percent to 90 percent of parity. The compensatory payments are in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture to be used at his discretion. The support levels are subject to his discretion. He has the power to break the feed grain market, which might be all right for a cash crop operator but the family operated livestock farmer who raises his own feed for production of livestock products will find himself confronted with cheap feed in the marketplace and at a price cheaper than a small farmer can raise it. Therefore, the commercial producer is going to be in that market producing in competition with the little farmer who has fixed costs and run him out of business.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe the Secretary should have the authority to set the compensatory payments. It is my opinion that Congress should do it if done at all. I do not believe the Secretary should have the authority to adjust the prices to the extent which he is given that authority in this bill. The Secretary has altogether too much power.

Mr. Chairman, the Congress meets every year. We can set the payment if it must be that way. We should also be in control of some of these things which we now so willingly put in the hands of the Secretary who in my judgment has abused the authority that he already has.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the balance of the bill be considered as read and open for amendment at any point.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARDING: On page 1, strike out all after the enacting clause and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "That section 105 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by striking out subsections (a) and (b), and substituting the following:

" '(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 101 of this Act, beginning with the 1963 crop, no price support shall be made available for any crop of corn, grain sorghums, barley, oats, or rye.'

"SEC. 2. Section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

" 'Beginning January 1, 1963, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall dispose of its stocks of corn, grain sorghums, barley, oats, and rye at market prices at an annual rate equal to one-fifteenth of such stocks on hand on January 1, 1963. *Provided*, That in disposing of such stocks of corn, grain sorghums, barley, oats, and rye, the corporation shall to the maximum extent practicable pursue a domestic sales policy which will: (1) insure the retention of only the highest quality stocks of such feed grains in its inventory, and (2) have a minimum adverse effect on market prices of such feed grains.' "

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Chairman, this is identical to the amendment that I offered last year. This is an amendment that everyone can understand. We presently have no controls on feed grains. All this amendment does is abolish all of the price supports.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard talk earlier today about the 1961 program costing $800 million, the 1962 program costing $900 million, and that the 1963 program is probably going to cost $1 billion for payments to growers and administration. While abolishing the price supports, I would like to point out that my amendment provides for the orderly disposal of the surpluses over the next 15 years. Now, just what is this going to do? Right now at the end of the marketing year in 1962, we have a surplus of 61 million tons of feed grains. If we disposed of it over the next 15 years, that would mean the disposition of 4 million tons per year.

In 1962 we produced 143 million tons of feed grains and we utilized 154 million tons of feed grains. If we added the 4 million tons from Commodity Credit stocks in 1962 we would still have had a market for 7 million tons more than the total produced and the total sold from CCC stocks. Obviously, if you are going to allow for supply and demand and you have a demand for 7 million tons more than there is available, you are going to have a good price and you are not going to break any market.

Last year several people said, "Well, Mr. HARDING, I agree with your amendment, but it will kill the bill and we have got to pass this bill this year." I can tell you right now that if my amendment is not adopted today and this act is extended for 2 years, 2 years from now this same feed grains giveaway will be back before us. I hope I will be here again to offer my amendment and I will probably be told again that it will kill the bill. I think it is time that we vote for freedom and, as I said a little earlier, not only freedom for the farmer but freedom also for the taxpayer. I think the elimination of this $1 billion program would be a good thing. I think it is workable. I think it is in the interest of American agriculture because, as the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] pointed out, the city boys are not going to vote forever for unworkable farm programs that allow price supports and at the same time allow farmers all over America to produce as much as they want to produce if they do not sign up for the program. And that is what we are going to have under this program.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I sympathize fully with the objectives toward which the gentleman would move. I think the Members will recall many occasions when I have spoken out strongly in behalf of getting the Government out of the grain business. There are some weaknesses in this proposal, and I think the fact that he has presented this amendment is a good reason for recommitting the bill so that the full committee may hear testimony and close the loopholes and improve the proposal the gentleman has made. This is one of many alternatives which could and should be considered for feed grains.

One other alternative would be to revise the 1958 program. This was basically a sound program. The reason we had a buildup of stocks under the 1958 program was that the floor on price supports was at an unrealistic level. Had it been lower we would not have had the buildup in stocks.

Another alternative would be the plan I have advocated for several years, that of selling surplus stocks back to the farmers at an attractive price in exchange for a short-term land-retirement agreement.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we had one amendment here that would have taken out all inducements for limitation on production. Now we have an amendment which would take out all supports. Of course, if you take out either you make this a completely unworkable bill.

I think the proponent of this amendment recognizes and admits that he is simply flailing around rather blindly, trying to destroy almost anything that comes in his reach at the present time. So he suggests that instead of holding this grain for 2 years as this bill would provide he would hold it for 15 years and pay storage on it during that time.

I recognize, of course, that if you sell it out in 15 years, that means you move it in an average of 7½ years and at the rate of storage that we paid last year on corn that means that we would have to pay $2.02 a bushel on each bushel we have in storage today.

On every bushel that we have in storage today, and there are something over 2 billion bushels, you are going to pay $2.02 on every bushel, and that is nearly $5 billion that you are going to pay out in storage before you get rid of it over this 15-year period.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. HARDING. I would like to point out to the gentleman the reason I provided for the disposal of it over 15 years is because the storage life of feed grains is 15 years. I wanted it to have the minimum effect on the market price. I think that $5 billion for a feed grain program for the next 15 years is pretty cheap, when we consider it is going to cost us $1 billion this year and if we extend it over 15 years it would cost us $15 billion.

Mr. POAGE. It is merely the storage I am talking about, it is merely the storage of what we now have in the warehouses.

How much we will grow with no restrictions we do not know. Of course we want to protect the livestock market. We would all like to see that done. But when you turn production loose and grow unlimited amounts, then your losses on livestock alone may well be $5 billion per year. But we know we have a $5 billion loss in storage under this method. All of you who want the $5 billion loss, vote for the amendment, but as for me, I am against it.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. Chairman, those of you who were on the floor last year when a similar amendment was offered will remember that on the first vote it was carried and it was only reversed by a narrow margin on a teller vote later on.

It happens that in my own district, although it is quite a diversified district, we do have some growers who grow barley, some who grow corn, some who grow oats. They are taking advantage of this bill, but every time I have talked to them they themselves have expressed a feeling that we would do better to eliminate this whole program.

I issued a questionnaire this year to every family of registered voters in my district as to whether they were in favor of eliminating price supports, and the vote was overwhelming for eliminating them.

This amendment would end the problem of incoming surplus commodities for the Commodity Credit Corporation. The incoming flow of commodities to the Commodity Credit Corporation over the years has been greater and greater. This would bar the incoming flow, so we could see an end to the program, and that is one thing we have not been able to see in any program before the House in recent years.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. One defect I did not mention earlier that I see in this proposal is that it still leaves the going-out-of-condition loophole in the Secretary's authority to dump stocks on an unprotected market. I think this is an additional reason to recommit the bill, so that the loophole can be closed.

Mr. BALDWIN. If the pending amendment is defeated, I will vote for the motion to recommit. I think this is a worthwhile amendment and a desirable amendment.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BEERMANN. I would like to ask that the House turn down this amendment. I am just as much for free enterprise and the market system as the gentleman from Idaho says he is. But the fallacy of this amendment is that we are discussing and legislating on only one segment of the price supported commodities. It is very commendable to reduce the support rate. Price supports should be changed on a gradual basis. We have had controls for 30, 40, or 50 years. We cannot permit such drastic action in 1 year.

This agrees with my philosophy. I would like to say to the gentleman from Idaho, I would like to support it 100 percent, but let us do it under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 and work gradually toward loan rates allowing supply and demand to operate. We can do it on a sensible basis. This bill should be returned to the committee for further study and come back with the right kind of program.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARDING. I would like to point out first to the gentleman from Illinois that there is not a loophole left. The most the Secretary can dispose of is one-fifteenth per year. I would like to point out to the gentleman from Nebraska that all we have before us is a feed grain bill. I will gladly offer the same amendment for any other commodity that enjoys price support without production controls.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken this time because of the attacks that have been made here on price supports generally. May I say to our colleagues that there are many dislocations in the overall agricultural picture. Some of this dislocation comes from the fact that through the years we have been trying to hold controls in line by acreage control, a practice which, in turn, is an incentive to get as much production per acre as possible. That resulted in some of this dislocation. Let us talk about free enterprise and free economy. Something we all believe in. However, when you have a stack of laws 2 feet high, laws that give the right to organized labor to organize and to strike and to bargain; when industry has to add its markup or profits on top of the cost of production—and I am not attacking any of that—but when you are dealing with an economy in which all of this is an established fact, then I say to you, if you do not give some protection to the price of raw materials, and some protection to the rights under law of the other segment of our economy, agriculture, it will run prices of raw material right down into the ground and our food and fiber will then come at the expense of the land in this country, remember we wore out about half our resources that way.

I want to say one other thing. Through the years I have worked in the Committee on Appropriations for agriculture, I have come to know that agriculture is by far the greatest market for the industrial output of this country. I say to you, if you get rid of price supports you will destroy that market. If price supports are gone, the take by the other two major segments will take more and more of the consumer dollar. You will have cheap feeds and you will have cheap meat but you are going to have such low purchasing power by agriculture that you will have another depression just as the other depression that we had which started with low farm income. Not only do I point that out to you, to my friends in the towns and cities, and I am not a farmer, but the worst thing you can do to the American people would be to try to dry up the supplies and production so that scarcity will give the farm good prices in the marketplace. Just imagine what the situation would be in places like Philadelphia, New York, and Washington, D.C., if we had just barely enough of a supply in this country to the point where the shortage would support the price. Then suppose there was a little drought one year or a flood or the plague of locusts and so forth. Just think what would happen. My friends, if you could turn all of it loose, industry, labor, and agriculture, it might work. But, with the right of labor to organize, with minimum wages, with the right to contract and to bargain, which is a part of the American way of life, and the necessity of industry to have its profit on top of cost, I say to you there is no way to keep a proper balance between industry and agriculture and labor which is essential to prosperity without giving each its fair share of the law.

I agree that there are many dislocations in the present farm programs, but my friends when the total cost of all American agriculture, which is the greatest purchasing power that industry has, is about the same as the cost of what we are going to spend each year to try to send a man to the moon, then I say the cost is not out of proportion, though we should hold costs in line to the greatest extent possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. HARDING].

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. HARDING) there were—ayes 93, noes 122.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a consent request to limit debate?

Mr. LANGEN. Not at this time.

Mr. Chairman, this could indeed be a very dark day for American agriculture, and I say that with a great deal of sincerity. That result could come about not because of the content of the legislation before us. After having very diligently followed the discussions here on the floor this afternoon, and I hope I may have followed them with some degree of understanding—because this may be the occasion on which this Congress has become instrumental in influencing the outcome of a vote and a referendum by the American farmers.

After having listened to the discussion here this afternoon one cannot very well dispel the thought that is bound to occur about the principle involved, whether it is in the Congress or in a department, of Government attempting to influence a vote and a decision by the people.

And I should say to you this: One is bound to recollect countries throughout the world in which that kind of oppression is carried out. I say that as if the Congress had not already carried out the influence.

Yes, by threats, if you will, that unless you vote as we have directed, do not look for any kind of sympathy here. If that is not a threat, I do not know what one is.

Mr. Chairman, even aside from that, I think there is further evidence of how come this bill is premature and is before us at a time when sufficient consideration has not been given to the matter.

I have listened this afternoon to all the money that has been saved; and to all the money that has been spent, I have also heard that farm prices are now 77 percent of parity, the lowest since 1939. What a sad and pathetic thing that after 24 years we are going to be back where we started, in spite of all the money that we have spent and in spite of all the money we have saved.

There must be some reason for this. The bill before us should attempt to solve the problems that confront the feed grain farmer. I am wondering if it does. I am wondering too if the haste to get this before us in order to influence a referendum a number of items have been neglected. Has anyone during the course of debate here today made any reference to what has happened to the export of feed grains within this year? It might be worthwhile to say to those who argue how they are going to reduce the supply that the exports of feed grains went down by 1 million tons since January of this year. Consequently, if you are going to accomplish the purpose, the first thing you have got to do is to say to American agriculture, "You are going to have to raise 1 million tons less in order to get back to where you were."

In addition there has been called to our attention the fact that imports of cream have come into being to the extent of almost 2 million pounds. This again must indicate that there will be a reduced market for feed grains and completely upset the cost and accomplishments figures that have been discussed here today.

Without consideration of these facts we can well legislate the feed grain producer less income, less markets, and even more difficult operating conditions.

This House can today, by sending this bill back to the committee for a limited time at least protect the farmers right to make a decision on a referendum without being directed by Congress, even though we continue to reduce his income as we have done for 24 years.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 3. Section 16 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, is amended by adding the following new subsection:

"(h) Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

"(1) For the 1964 crop and the 1965 crop of feed grains, if the Secretary determines that the total supply of feed grains will, in the absence of an acreage diversion program, likely be excessive, taking into account the need for an adequate carryover to maintain reasonable and stable supplies and prices of feed grains and to meet any national emergency, he may formulate and carry out an acreage diversion program for feed grains, without regard to provisions which would be applicable to the regular agricultural conservation program, under which, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines, conservation payments in amounts determined by the Secretary to be fair and reasonable shall be made to producers who divert acreage from the production of feed grains to an approved conservation use and increase their average acreage of cropland devoted in 1959 and 1960 to designated soil-conserving crops or practices including summer fallow and idle land by an equal amount. Payments shall not be made in amounts in excess of 50 per centum of the estimated basic county support rate, including that part of the support price made available through payments in kind, on the normal production of the acreage diverted from the commodity on the farm based on its adjusted average yield per acre. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions, the Secretary may permit such diverted acreage to be devoted to the production of guar, sesame, safflower, sunflower, castor beans, mustard seed, and flax, if he determines that such crops are not in surplus supply and will not be in surplus supply if permitted to be grown on the diverted acreage, subject to the condition that payment with respect to diverted acreage devoted to any such crop shall be at a rate determined by the Secretary to be fair and reasonable, taking into consideration the use of such acreage for the production of such crops, but in no event shall the payment exceed one-half the rate which would otherwise be applicable if such acreage were devoted to conservation uses, and no price support shall be made available for the production of any such crop on such diverted acreage. The base period for the purpose of determining the adjusted average yield in the case of payments with respect to the 1964 crop shall be the four-year period 1959–1962, and in the case of payments with respect to the 1965 crop shall be the five-year period 1959–1963. The term 'feed grains' means corn, grain sorghums, barley, and, if for any crop the producer so requests for purposes of having acreage devoted to the production of wheat considered as devoted to the production of feed grains, pursuant to the provisions of section 328 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, the term 'feed grains' shall include oats and rye: *Provided*, That acreages of corn, grain sorghums, and barley shall not be planted in lieu of acreages of oats and rye: *Provided further*, That the acreage devoted to the production of wheat shall not be considered as an acreage of feed grains for purposes of establishing the feed grain base acreage for the farm for subsequent crops. Such feed grain diversion program shall require the producer to take such measures as the Secretary may deem appropriate to keep such diverted acreage free from erosion, insects, weeds, and rodents. The acreage eligible for participation in the program shall be such acreage (not to exceed 50 per centum of the average acreage on the farm devoted to feed grains in the crop years 1959 and 1960 or twenty-five acres,

whichever is greater) as the Secretary determines necessary to achieve the acreage reduction goal for the crop. Payments shall be made in kind. The average acreage of wheat produced on the farm during the crop years 1959, 1960, and 1961, pursuant to the exemption provided in section 335(f) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, prior to its repeal by the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, in excess of the small farm base acreage for wheat established under section 335 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, shall be considered as an acreage of feed grains produced in the crop years of 1959 and 1960 for purposes of establishing the feed grain base acreage for the farm, and the rate of payment for diverting such wheat shall be an amount determined by the Secretary to be fair and reasonable in relation to the rates of payment for diverting feed grains. The Secretary may make such adjustments in acreage and yields as he determines necessary to correct for abnormal factor affecting production, and to give due consideration to tillable acreage, crop-rotation practices, types of soil, soil and water conservation measures, and topography. To the extent that a producer proves the actual acreages and yields for the farm, such acreages and yields shall be used in making determinations. The Secretary may make not to exceed 50 per centum of any payments to producers in advance of determination of performance. Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection (h)(1), barley shall not be included in the program for a producer of malting barley exempted pursuant to section 105(d) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 who participates only with respect to corn and grain sorghums and does not knowingly devote an acreage on the farm to barley in excess of 110 per centum of the average acreage devoted on the farm to barley in 1959 and 1960.

"(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection, not to exceed 1 per centum of the estimated total feed grain bases for all farms in a State for any year may be reserved from the feed grain bases established for farms in the State for apportionment to farms on which there were no acreages devoted to feed grains in the crop years 1959 and 1960 on the basis of the following factors: Suitability of the land for the production of feed grains, the past experience of the farm operator in the production of feed grains, the extent to which the farm operator is dependent on income from farming for his livelihood, the production of feed grains on other farms owned, operated, or controlled by the farm operator, and such other factors as the Secretary determines should be considered for the purpose of establishing fair and equitable feed grain bases. An acreage equal to the feed grain base so established for each farm shall be deemed to have been devoted to feed grains on the farm in each of the crop years 1959 and 1960 for purposes of this subsection except that producers on such farm shall not be eligible for conservation payments for the first year for which the feed grain base is established.

"(3) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to enable the Secretary to carry out this section 16(h). Obligations may be incurred in advance of appropriations therefor and the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized to advance from its capital funds such sums as may be necessary to pay administrative expenses in connection with such program during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and to pay such costs as may be incurred in carrying out paragraph (4) of this subsection.

"(4) The Secretary shall provide by regulations for the sharing of payments under this subsection among producers on the farm on a fair and equitable basis and in keeping with existing contracts.

"(5) Payments in kind shall be made through the issuance of negotiable certificates which the Commodity Credit Corporation shall redeem for feed grains and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary, assist the producer in the marketing of such certificates. In the case of any certificate not presented for redemption within thirty days of the date of its issuance, reasonable costs of storage and other carrying charges, as determined by the Secretary, for the period beginning thirty days after its issuance and ending with the date of its presentation for redemption shall be deducted from the value of the certificate. Feed grains with which Commodity Credit Corporation redeems certificates pursuant to this paragraph shall be valued at not less than the current support price, minus that part of the current support price made available through payments in kind, plus reasonable carrying charges.

"(6) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may, by mutual agreement with the producer, terminate or modify any agreement previously entered into pursuant to this subsection if he determines such action necessary because of an emergency created by drought or other disaster, or in order to prevent or alleviate a shortage in the supply of feed grains."

Mr. POAGE (interrupting reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that this section be considered as read and open to amendment at any point, and, Mr. Chairman, I also ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, is that to this section or to the bill?

Mr. POAGE. To this section.

Mr. AVERY. Are there other sections?

Mr. POAGE. No.

Mr. AVERY. The essence of the gentleman's request is that all debate on the bill end in 15 minutes?

Mr. POAGE. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. PATTEN and Mr. FINDLEY objected.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. AVERY. I am a little confused on what unanimous consent requests have been agreed to. Was it asked and agreed to that this section be considered read and open to amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state there was one unanimous consent request made which embodied two different requests that was objected to. Therefore, there has been no unanimous consent request granted by the House.

Mr. POAGE (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of this section be dispensed with and that it be open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 7, strike out "beginning with the 1964 crop,".

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the time is late, and I understand there is an affair which many of the Members plan to attend. Could I have the attention of the gentleman from Texas?

The gentleman from Texas alluded several times to the Emergency Feed Grain Act passed in 1961 and, as I recall, he pronounced it a success. I want to say that I voted for the program and I voted for the one that succeeded it, because I thought it was a reasonably good program and the cost was, shall we say, modest. Now, will the gentleman tell me why, if we had this program that seemed to be splendid at a modest cost in 1961, has the committee insisted on encumbering and dissipating its provisions? He pronounced it a good program, one the farmers liked and one we could like. Now we add these encumbrances and continue to delegate more authority to the Secretary of Agriculture. This has made it more objectionable to the farmers of America and to those of us on this side of the aisle. It was his own creature initially, the product of the Committee on Agriculture. What went wrong with it, and why, and when?

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AVERY. I certainly will.

Mr. POAGE. As I attempted to explain to the committee this morning, savings have been made and we could make still further savings. There was a necessity in 1961 and 1962 not only to balance supply and demand of feed grain but to materially reduce the stocks that were then on hand, the surplus carryover. That necessity will probably not exist after this fall. No man can tell just how low the stocks will be, but we know from the experience of the past 2 years that the stocks are going to be down somewhere rather close to the desired balance.

That being true, it seemed entirely unwise to put the provisions in this bill that were in the previous bills requiring the payments up to a certain amount. Consequently we give the Secretary under the terms of this bill the authority to lower those payments. You say, why did we not put a ceiling on there? There is a ceiling on there. He cannot pay more than is found necessary to secure the needed reduction to bring about a balance between supply and demand.

Mr. AVERY. That is a sufficient response at this time.

If I might further have the attention of the gentleman from Texas, did he not hear what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] said, that despite all of these attempted improvements, the cost has gone up every year? So, why do we not go back to the 1961 program?

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman is entirely mistaken. The cost has not gone up each year. He did not show us that this program had increased in cost, nor can he show it. He stated that the full cost to the Department of Agriculture had increased, and that involves a great many factors which are not involved here this afternoon.

Mr. AVERY. I thank the gentleman. I guess you hear what you want to hear and see what you want to see. But, certainly, I understood the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Michel] both to show very persuasively that the cost of this program has gone up year after year. Therefore, I would only suggest to the gentleman that we go back to the 1961 program and I think we can all agree on it and pass it very quickly.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from Texas aware that the Chair is attempting to place before the Committee other committee amendments?

Mr. POAGE. I shall withhold my motion, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the balance of the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 6, line 9, strike the words "any subsequent" and insert in lieu thereof "the 1965".

Page 6, line 10, strike the words "most recent".

Page 6, lines 10, 11, and 12, strike the words "determined by the Secretary to be representative for which statistics are available." and insert in lieu thereof "1959–1963."

Page 8, line 9, after the period add: "Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection (h)(1), barley shall not be included in the program for a producer of malting barley exempted pursuant to section 105(d) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 who participates only with respect to corn and grain sorghums and does not knowingly devote an acreage on the farm to barley in excess of 110 per centum of the average acreage devoted on the farm to barley in 1959 and 1960."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MICHEL. Are we to have all of the committee amendments adopted before any amendments are to be accepted by the Committee?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that that is the usual procedure.

Mr. MICHEL. This does not foreclose our going back to page 9, now, if we move on to pages 10 and 11?

The CHAIRMAN. We are now on page 9.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to page 9.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Michel: Page 9, line 3, after the word "performance" strike the period and insert the following: "*Provided*, That in no event shall the Secretary in the crop years 1964 or 1965 make payments to any producers under this section 16(h) and under section 105(d) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 as amended in excess of 20 per centum of the fair market value of any acre involved."

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, the reason I offer this amendment is first and foremost because I am concerned over any kind of program which pays anyone for doing nothing or pays a farmer for keeping idle his acres. This is repugnant to me.

Mr. Chairman, I am also concerned with the broad discretionary power that is given the Secretary of Agriculture in this bill to raise and lower these payments. We know that there have been instances in the past where land has been purchased just a few years ago for less than $5 an acre for which we are now paying three times that amount in payments for diverted acres.

Mr. Chairman, in my area we pay farmers $50 and $60 an acre to keep their land idle. I say that with this broad discretionary power that the Secretary has it is conceivable that some of these payments could get completely out of hand. Therefore I say let us not provide for a payment in excess of 20 percent in 1 year of the market value of those diverted acres, for if it is in excess of that, shucks, over a period of 5 years we might as well take title to the land in the name of the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is a good limitation which I am proposing here in good faith.

May I say for the purpose of legislative history that this should in no way be considered to be an acceptable standard for payments by the Secretary. It would in my opinion be unconscionable to sanction a payment that even came close to this but I just want to make sure that the Secretary with his broadened powers does not raise these payments to unreasonable levels as he can do.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the broad effect of this amendment is to limit the diversion payments in either year to not more than 20 percent of the fair market value of the diverted acres. If this is the meaning of the proposed amendment, why, we have no objection to the amendment and would be glad to accept it.

Mr. MICHEL. If the gentleman will yield, this is the intended purpose of my amendment.

Mr. POAGE. We will be glad to accept the amendment.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Is not the gentleman fearful that some county committee might get the idea that they are supposed to pay 20 percent of that $800 or $900 an acre land which the gentleman has in his district, and they will be making payments that high?

Mr. MICHEL. No, I do not take that position at all. But I reaffirm my concern that since we are changing this discretionary authority of the Secretary in which he has broadened powers that he will not use this as an avenue for making outlandish payments under this program.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I have seen it happen that each time we try to put a maximum someone will apply it as a minimum, and we get in trouble that way. I think the gentleman is making a mistake.

Mr. MICHEL. I happen to take a view at variance with my friend in this instance.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Smith of Iowa: On page 9, line 1, after the period insert the following:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection (c)(1), the Secretary may, upon unanimous request of the State committee established pursuant to section 8(b) of the said Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act as amended, adjust the feed grain bases for farms within any State or county to the extent he determines such adjustment to be necessary in order to establish fair and equitable feed grain bases for farms within such State or county."

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have one amendment on page 10. Will the gentleman assure me 3 minutes in support of that amendment?

Mr. POAGE. My request was for debate to close in 10 minutes following the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Smith].

Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close at 6 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, under this program the Secretary calculates the number of acres that he deems will be necessary to provide needed consumption for a given year. Then we divide that total production among the various farmers. The determination of the acreage allotment or the base for each individual farm is determined according to what he raised in 1959 and 1960. I submit to you that on many farms in this Nation this is not a fair basis for determining his base acreage. The reason is that perhaps, even by accident, he put all his farm into soybeans one year and none of it into corn, so he ends up with an unfair base. Some producers under these circumstances contribute more for the payments they receive than others because before they can comply with the law they have to give what they should have had above their base acreage as a base. On the other hand, some have such high allotments that they are actually giving little for the money that they get for reducing acreage.

In 1957 under the Acreage Reserve Act adjustments were made. In those States only where the State committee is in unanimous agreement that adjustments need to be made, this amendment would permit adjustments to be made between farmers.

Mr. Chairman, I have talked to the farm leaders on both sides of the aisle and I believe there is not too much opposition to this amendment. I hope it will be accepted.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I talked to the gentleman about this amendment before he offered it. I told him that while I was not too enthusiastic about it we would interpose no objection to it. The committee does not object to it.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I feel that the gentleman's amendment is well taken. It will serve as a good change in the present program. I certainly hope his amendment will prevail.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I thank the gentleman. Of course we know that Iowa producers have been particularly in need of adjustments.

Mr. JENSEN. That is right.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HOEVEN. I have no objection to this amendment.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. For clarification, do I understand correctly that this could not possibly have the result of increasing the base acreages either of the States or the Nation?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. It would not increase the total base acreage. It would not include any authority to change the acreages allotted to any State but would provide authority to adjust acreages between farmers within a county.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. If I understand correctly, this would make possible the adjustment of inequities on the basis of the 1959–60 acreage allotments. It would be in the discretion of the committees to adjust them.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Michel].

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Michel: On page 10, line 12, after the period, strike the balance of line 12 and all of lines 13 through 19.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Battin yielded the time allotted to him to Mr. Michel.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, the lines that I propose to strike out read as follows:

> Obligations may be incurred in advance of appropriations therefor and the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized to advance from its capital funds such sum as may be necessary to pay administrative expenses in connection with such program during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and to pay such costs as may be incurred in carrying out paragraph (4) of this subsection.

The reason for my deleting this subsection is to require the Department to come before the Appropriations Committee in justification of these expenditures. This is just another instance of opening up the back door of the Treasury. If this program is to be effective in the year 1964, there is ample opportunity for the people downtown to come up before our subcommittee and justify these expenditures, particularly in this area of administrative expenses. It has been brought out heretofore in the debate that there is $101 million over a 3-year period in administrative expenses alone in this program. If you want a good accounting, you will get it from your subcommittee chaired by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Whitten], and the rest of us serving on that subcommittee. I say the folks downtown ought to justify these expenditures not only to the Appropriations Committee but to all Members of this House and we shall give a good accounting to the people.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Michel].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie].

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I just want to point out, in closing, the difference between this bill and the 1963 program which is now law. I supported, in the 1963 program, the direct payment because it had the effect of eliminating the authority to the Secretary to buy high and sell low and thereby manipulate the market prices. This proposal, H.R. 4997, gives the Secretary of Agriculture unlimited authority. It was pointed out in the colloquy here between the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Avery] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Poage] that the Secretary would not pay an unduly high direct payment because he only wanted to get a certain amount of grain out of production. The Secretary also has authority, I might point out, that no longer will he have to require a 20-percent reduction in acres in order for a farmer to comply. He can make it 10 percent or 1 percent or no percent at all as a requirement for a farmer to comply with this feed grain program and get a direct payment, and that could be at a tremendous expense to the Federal Government.

I proposed the direct payment last year so the Secretary of Agriculture could not sell low after he bought high. It was not to be used as an incentive to reduce acres. The result under the present administration has been that there is an incentive to reduce acres no more than the required 20 percent of a farmer's acres. This should be changed. With the authority given to the Secretary to set the direct payment at any level which he wishes and the required diversion in order to comply at zero, the Secretary can next year change the good voluntary program of the last 3 years into a mandatory program, if this Congress enacts this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley].

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me be granted to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley].

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, every figure that I have presented here today originated from the statistical warehouse down on Independence Avenue, and did not originate in my own mind. If there is any fiction and if there is any exaggeration, it originated with the statisticians in the Department of Agriculture. Every one of the figures I have cited originates from these two documents, including the figures on this chart which I show you here.

I invite the attention of my colleagues once more to this fact, which I hope you will bear in mind as you think about the next campaign. You are being asked to support a program similar to the one under which in this year the taxpayers are spending over $8 for every dollar's worth of feed grains that is taken out of the stockpiles.

This proposal is to pay farmers for not growing feed grains. This proposal is to provide loans on crops and finally, believe it or not, this proposal contains a provision under which some farmers can be paid for growing corn that they have never grown before. The next year these farmers can be paid not to raise grain that they have never grown before.

My colleague, this is a pointless, perpetual piece of pump priming and ought to be pitched out.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Griffin].

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I sent to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Griffin: On page 10, line 9, after the word "established" and before the period, insert the following: ": *Provided however*, That the authority contained in this section to make payments, for not growing feed grains, to farmers who never grew feed grains, shall only be effective if and when Congress authorizes payments in

like amount to residents of urban areas who are willing not to grow feed grains."

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment may sound funny, but I suggest that it points up a serious situation so far as this bill is concerned.

A number of years ago an irate taxpayer wrote to his Congressman and wanted to know what kind of hogs were best for not raising so that he could select the most profitable breed not to raise. His inquiry created a considerable amount of interest at the time, but soon it was lost in the maze of Federal farm programs with the explanation that the Government had no obligation or intention to pay someone for not doing something that he was not doing anyway. The taxpayer in question was not a hog raiser.

In the bill before the House, however, the Department of Agriculture breaks a new frontier in Federal farm fantasy by proposing now to pay a farmer for not growing feed grains which the farmer never grew anyway.

You will note on page 9, beginning with line 12 of the bill that a part of the estimated total feed grain bases for all farms in a State may be apportioned to farms on which there were no acreage devoted to feed grains in the base crop years of 1959 and 1960.

Under the bill, the acreage base established for each such farm shall be deemed to have been devoted to feed grains on the farm during the crop years 1959 and 1960. The bill then indicates that a producer on such a farm would not be eligible for conservation payments for the first year but that he would be eligible thereafter to receive payments for not growing feed grains.

We are now in the third year of paying feed grain farmers not to grow corn, grain sorghum, and barley. But, until now, we have at least been paying farmers who actually grew corn, grain sorghum, and barley not to grow those grains. To my knowledge, the Government has never before paid farmers for not growing commodities which they did not grow anyway.

Here is how the provision in this bill would work in practice. A farmer who never grew feed grains could be assigned a base from the Department of Agriculture of, let us say, 100 acres. In 1965 he could idle up to one-half of that base or 50 acres, and even though he was not a contributor to the surplus situation, he could then be paid not to grow grain which he never grew anyway.

Mr. Chairman, there are a lot of city people in this country who are willing not to grow feed grains. If the Congress is going to pass ridiculous legislation of this kind, then it seems to me, as my amendment suggests, that perhaps we should be fair and authorize similar payments to city folks as well.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I think it is perfectly obvious that this is simply a facetious amendment. This provision of the bill is intended to provide for new growers of feed grains. A similar provision is in practically every farm program.

The CHAIRMAN. Permit the Chair to state to the gentleman from Texas that he may use his 1 minute at this time, if he chooses to do so, but the Chair has yet to recognize one more Member, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY].

Mr. POAGE. I thank the Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GRIFFIN. When do we vote on my amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. In about a minute.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY].

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, in moving to recommit the feed grain bill—H.R. 4997—I do so with some reluctance for in this piece of legislation is some that is good as well as some that is not. For one thing, I have historically argued that we cannot dispose of our grain surpluses abroad as easily as we do other farm commodities such as cotton or tobacco or wheat. So in recent years, the last 3 in fact, we have begun to treat this commodity as a distinct problem and approach it on about the only basis it can be treated. By this I mean the process of using the surplus as an incentive to producers; in other words, we say to the producers—Please reduce the number of acres you have historically been producing and take a portion of what those acres would have produced instead, from the storage bins the Government has filled in the past.

In this bill also is the voluntary feature which the grain and livestock farmers have insisted they prefer. Whereas the cotton and tobacco growers of the South have historically been amenable to a compulsory type program, the farmers of Indiana and other such States have said most emphatically they want no part of a straitjacket. So in the very beginning, I want, in fairness, to emphasize that this bill does embody some desirable features. I only wish it had not the undesirable ones also which I will enumerate.

As a grain and livestock farmer myself, I would say that the most objectionable feature of this bill is that it is premature. Since it has been my pleasure to serve in the House, I have opposed the so-called certificate plan for dealing with the wheat surplus problem. Despite my opposition this plan will be submitted to farmers within a month. Now the outcome of this referendum will have a very distinct bearing upon grain and livestock farmers. The reason is that the proposed certificate plan will provide for three markets for the wheat we produce. Part will go to make the bread and pastries we use within our own borders, part will go to supply such foreign markets as we can garner. The balance will be sold for livestock feed in competition with our feed grain. It will simply add another depressing load on an already overburdened phase of our economy. Actually it will be simply shifting the burden and problem rather than solving one. This surplus wheat will be sold at whatever it can bring while providing a high price support for the rest. This is not good even for the wheat farmer in the long run although it may look attractive at first glance.

The point I want to make in my argument to the House is that this wheat referendum will be held shortly and we should not move to act on this legislation until we know what the wheat outcome is. The argument will be offered that nothing in this bill will be affected by the wheat referendum but this just is not true.

The second most objectionable feature is that it departs from what is ostensibly an extension of the type of programs we have had during 1961–62. On the surface it has the desirable feature mentioned previously in that it is a voluntary type of program. Actually, however, these outward semblances are cleverly camouflaged to disguise some dangerous provisions. We have historically in the Congress—for better or worse—held that we should draft the provisions of our programs and then expect the Secretary to administer them. In this instance, however, we are delegating to him unwarranted authority. He could at his own pleasure set prices at any figure between 65 and 90 percent of parity. Standing alone the concept of flexible price supports is not an unsound one, but this provision does not stand alone. By giving the Secretary virtually unlimited authority to combine the direct payment and the loan level, the bill gives him practically unlimited authority over not only the market price of feed grain, but also a significant portion of the annual amount of income to be received by 3,700,000 feed grain farmers. The political temptation to use such authority arbitrarily would be too much to grant any Secretary.

In addition this program continues a feature added to the 1963 act which was not in the 1961 or 1962 Feed Grain Act. This is the compensatory or Brannan-type payment to complying farmers. To the uninitiated this may seem an innocuous enough arrangement but therein lies the danger. For while this particular bill has a time limitation of 2 years, there is every evidence that the original provision making it permanent legislation may finally come back in the conference report if this bill is approved. The result of such action will be to force the farmers from now on to come to Washington each and every year to receive a part of their income. As obnoxious as this would be it would also place the farmer in the position of looking to Washington instead of the marketplace for his income. His historic independence would be gone. It is also a form of back-door spending which the Congress is trying to avoid.

Lastly and certainly not least you should evaluate carefully the cost of this legislation. It is not a cheap item in our budget. The program can and should be accomplished in a more economical fashion if it is returned to the committee. For example, payments in 1963 will be $983 million. In 1961 payments were $782 million to accomplish the same purpose for almost the same amount of acres. Important as it is to act on farm matters, this is not a crash-type operation justifying such an expensive plan. It is my hope that the House will approve my motion to recommit and give us an opportunity to come up with a better answer.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] is recognized for approximately 30 seconds.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, the motion to recommit will be the crux of this bill. There is no reason for anyone to feel that he can vote for the motion to recommit and then say that he is in favor of a feed grain bill. If you desire a feed grain bill vote against the motion to recommit.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN].

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. GRIFFIN) there were ayes 124, noes, 151.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. Section 326 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, as amended, is amended by deleting the word "and" immediately preceding "(g)" and inserting immediately after "(g)" the following: "and (h)".

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WRIGHT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4997) to extend the feed grain program, pursuant to House Resolution 320, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4997 to the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordererd.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 196, nays 205, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 29]

YEAS—196

Abele
Adair
Addabbo
Alger
Anderson
Arends
Ashbrook
Avery
Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Barry
Bates
Battin
Becker
Beckworth
Beermann
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bow
Bray
Brock
Bromwell
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Bruce
Burton
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clark
Clausen
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Conte
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Dwyer
Ellsworth
Findley
Fino
Fogarty
Ford
Foreman
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Gavin
Goodell
Goodling
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Harding
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Herlong
Hoeven
Hoffman
Horan
Horton
Hosmer
Hutchinson
Jensen
Johansen
Jonas
Keith
Kilburn
King, N.Y.
Knox
Kornegay
Kunkel
Kyl
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Lloyd
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McIntire
McLoskey
MacGregor
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
May
Meader
Michel
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Minshall
Monagan
Moore
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Murray
Nelsen
Norblad
Nygaard
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Pelly
Pike
Pillion
Pirnie
Poff
Pool
Quie
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Robison
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
St. George
St Germain
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Short
Shriver
Sibal
Siler
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Stinson
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson
Tuck
Tupper
Utt
Van Pelt
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watson
Weltner
Westland
Whalley
Wharton
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Ind.
Wydler
Wyman
Younger

NAYS—205

Abbitt
Abernethy
Albert
Andrews
Ashmore
Aspinall
Barrett
Bass
Bennett, Fla.
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bonner
Brademas
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Buckley
Burke
Burkhalter
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Cameron
Cannon
Carey
Chelf
Cohelan
Cooley
Corman
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Delaney
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Edmondson
Edwards
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Feighan
Finnegan
Flood
Fountain
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gill
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Grant
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Hanna
Hansen
Hardy
Harris
Hawkins
Hechler
Hemphill
Henderson
Holifield
Holland
Huddleston
Hull
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Landrum
Lankford
Leggett
Lesinski
Libonati
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McDowell
McFall
McMillan
Madden
Mahon
Matsunaga
Matthews
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Minish
Montoya
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pilcher
Poage
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Rains
Randall
Reuss
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. Onge
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shipley
Sickles
Sikes
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Staebler
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Toll
Trimble
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vinson
Watts
White
Whitener
Whitten
Wickersham
Wilson, Charles H.
Winstead
Wright
Young
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—32

Ashley
Auchincloss
Ayres
Betts
Broomfield
Celler
Dent
Elliott
Fascell
Fisher
Flynt
Forrester
Fraser
Glenn
Hays
Healey
Hébert
Johnson, Calif.
Lennon
Macdonald
O'Konski
Rich
Rivers, Alaska
Roosevelt
Shelley
Sheppard
Sisk
Staggers
Walter
Weaver
Widnall
Willis

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Broomfield for, with Mr. Walter against.

Mr. Rich for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Auchincloss for, with Mr. Roosevelt against.

Mr. Weaver for, with Mr. Fascell against.

Mr. Glenn for, with Mr. Celler against.

Mr. Betts for, with Mr. Rivers of Alaska against.

Mr. Ayres for, with Mr. Shelley against.

Mr. Widnall for, with Mr. Sheppard against.

Mr. Fisher for, with Mr. Willis against.

Mrs. Staggers for, with Mr. Fraser against.

Mr. Johnson of California for, with Mr. Sisk against.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 208, nays 195, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 30]

YEAS—208

Abbitt
Abernethy
Addabbo
Albert
Andrews
Ashmore
Aspinall
Barrett
Bass
Bennett, Fla.
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bonner
Brademas
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Buckley
Burke
Burkhalter
Byrne, Pa.
Cameron
Cannon
Carey
Chelf
Cohelan
Colmer
Cooley
Corman
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Delaney

Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Edmondson
Edwards
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Finnegan
Flood
Fountain
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gill
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Hanna
Hansen
Hardy
Harris
Hawkins
Hechler
Hemphill
Henderson
Holifield
Holland
Huddleston
Hull
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Landrum
Lankford
Leggett
Lesinski
Libonati
Long, La.
McDowell
McFall
McMillan
Madden
Mahon
Matsunaga
Matthews
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Minish
Montoya
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pilcher
Poage
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Rains
Randall
Reuss
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. Onge
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shipley
Sickles
Sikes
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Staebler
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taylor
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Toll
Trimble
Tuck
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vinson
Watson
Watts
White
Whitener
Whitten
Wickersham
Willis
Wilson,
 Charles H.
Winstead
Wright
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—195

Abele
Adair
Alger
Anderson
Arends
Ashbrook
Avery
Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Barry
Bates
Battin
Becker
Beckworth
Beermann
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Bolton,
 Frances P.
Bolton,
 Oliver P.
Bow
Bray
Brock
Bromwell
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Bruce
Burleson
Burton
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clark
Clausen
Cleveland
Collier
Conte
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Dague
Dent
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Dwyer
Ellsworth
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Fogarty
Ford
Foreman
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Gavin
Goodell
Goodling
Grant
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Harding
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Herlong
Hoeven
Hoffman
Horan
Horton
Hosmer
Hutchinson
Jensen
Johansen
Jonas
Keith
Kilburn
Kilgore
King, N.Y.
Knox
Kunkel
Kyl
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, Md.
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McIntire
McLoskey
MacGregor
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
May
Meader
Michel
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Minshall
Monagan
Moore
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Murray
Nelsen
Norblad
Nygaard
Osmers
Ostertag
Pelly
Pike
Pillion
Pirnie
Poff
Pool
Quie
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
St. George
St Germain
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Short
Shriver
Sibal
Siler
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Stinson
Taft
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson
Tupper
Utt
Van Pelt
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Weltner
Westland
Whalley
Wharton
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Ind.
Wydler
Wyman
Younger

NOT VOTING—30

Ashley
Auchincloss
Ayres
Betts
Broomfield
Celler
Curtis
Elliott
Fascell
Fisher
Flynt
Forrester
Fraser
Glenn
Hays
Healey
Hébert
Johnson, Calif.
Lennon
Macdonald
Rich
Rivers, Alaska
Roosevelt
Shelley
Sheppard
Sisk
Staggers
Walter
Weaver
Widnall

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Walter for, with Mr. Auchincloss against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Weaver against.

Mr. Roosevelt for, with Mr. Glenn against.

Mr. Fascell for, with Mr. Widnall against.

Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Betts against.

Mr. Rivers of Alaska for, with Mr. Ayres against.

Mr. Shelley for, with Mr. Broomfield against.

Mr. Sheppard for, with Mr. Curtis against.

Mr. Sisk for, with Mr. Johnson of California against.

Mr. Fraser for, with Mr. Fisher against.

Mr. Healey for, with Mr. Staggers against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Ashley with Mr. Rich.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke today be permitted to revise and extend their remarks, and that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THE WEEK AND FOR THE WEEK OF MONDAY, APRIL 29

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader as to the program, if any, for the balance of the week and for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished minority leader yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, we are not going to program any further legislative business for this week.

The program for the week of April 29 is as follows:

On Monday, H.R. 4655, reduction of temporary additional Federal unemployment tax and authorization of employment security administrative expenses. Closed rule—2 hours.

H.R. 1762, outdoor recreation, coordinate programs. Open rule—1 hour.

H.R. 3120, simplify administration of Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act. Open rule—1 hour.

On Tuesday, 1964 appropriations bill for the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

For Wednesday and the balance of the week, H.R. 3872, Export-Import Bank Act Extension. Open rule—2 hours.

H.R. 5207, amend Foreign Service Buildings Act. Open rule—3 hours.

This, of course, is made with the customary reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time, and that any further program may be announced later.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in view of my previous announcement, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH THE CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT TO THE AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT—HELPING COMMUNITIES TO HELP THEMSELVES

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Area Redevelopment Act, passed during the 1st session of the 87th Congress, has been successful in helping many economically depressed communities regain lost jobs and lost productivity. This act has withstood the test of practical operation and deserves continued support by the Congress.

I am today introducing an amendment to the Area Redevelopment Act which will improve the operation and administration of section 11 of the act. My amendment gives the ARA the authority to provide funds for general studies of the economic resources of a depressed area and further provides that the ARA can circulate the results of such studies to interested firms who want to expand.

Under present law, the Area Redevelopment Administration can advance a limited amount of planning funds only after a local government has requested them for the use of an interested industry desiring to locate in the community. My amendment will permit the ARA to extend even more beneficial assistance to areas which want to identify their economic assets and shortcomings. It will not only help attract new industries to areas of substantial unemployment, it will help these areas identify the resources they possess to create homegrown jobs and businesses.

STALINISM RETURNS TO THE U.S.S.R.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, a penetrating analysis of the probable return of Stalinism to the Soviet society, as well as perceptive sidelights on the Khrushchev image are contained in an essay just written by E. E. Smith.

Mr. Smith has had more than a little experience in Soviet affairs. His first tour of duty in the American Embassy in Moscow was in the period 1948–50 when he served as assistant military attaché. He served in the same Embassy again as a Foreign Service officer in the period 1954–56. A graduate of the Naval Intelligence School, Mr. Smith has specialized in Soviet affairs for the past 20 years with the exception of duty as a front line infantry officer in the 3d U.S. Army in Europe. His tours of diplomatic duty have included The Hague, Paris, Munich, Berlin and, of course, Washington, among others.

Mr. Smith's essay is as follows:

To Beat or Not To Beat

(By E. E. Smith)

I. TEARS FOR A TYRANT

"When they buried Stalin, there were tears in the eyes of many, including myself. Those were genuine tears. Although we knew even then of several personal defects of Stalin, we trusted him." This disconsolate passage was part of a 15,000-word speech Nikita S. Khrushchev delivered before a group of the Soviet elite in the Kremlin on March 8, 1963. That date was 2 days less than 10 years from Stalin's death in 1953, an event not mentioned in the Soviet press.

The text and tenor of the speech suggested that a meeting of the ruling Kremlin hierarchy had taken place in the recent past. Serious pressures on Khrushchev combined with strong differences of opinion among the confreres had precluded hard and fast decisions. As an interim measure, however, a minimal consensus obliged Khrushchev to issue a somber warning to the Soviet peoples; de-Stalinization must stop.

Khrushchev, aware of Stalin's mass murder as a central issue in Soviet life today, chose the occasion to deliver the most important political pronouncement on internal affairs since his celebrated "secret" speech before the XXth Party Congress in February 1956. Indeed, his March 8 speech was in many ways an extension of the "secret" discourse.

His speech, which was given the widest possible coverage in the U.S.S.R. bore all the earmarks of having been prepared with great care. Not only was the content of the message well thought out but the presentation was a masterpiece in Aesopian semantics. Small wonder that it has been misunderstood widely. If the analysis to follow appears to be overly involved and in some instances far-fetched, the reader should remember that Communist speeches of this type cannot be comprehended unless they are subjected to a sort of exegesis usually applied only to archeology. In particular, the frequent excursions into history are not meant to exhibit erudition but are indispensable for interpretation. Khrushchev himself did not delve into history to prove that he had read a few books and reports but to make points of the greatest importance for the future of the Soviet Union and the world.

II. THE SECRET SPEECH

In the midthirties, when Stalin had embarked upon his horrid purges, the Eighth Extraordinary Congress of the Soviets (1936) took place. Khrushchev spoke about his teacher, Stalin, in servile praise:

"Our party has victoriously led * * * the working class, because at its head stood that genius of mankind, Lenin, because our party is now being led by the brilliant Stalin. * * * During the civil war Stalin appeared in every place where the issue was in doubt, and wherever he appeared victory remained with * * * the revolution * * * Stalin, his genius and his will, are familiar to all of us * * * because there is not a single undertaking directed toward the strengthening of the might of our motherland, toward its Socialist well-being which has not been inspired by * * * Stalin. * * * We know, comrades, to whom belongs the main credit for our victories * * * to our leader * * * Stalin. * * * Wherever this gang of murderers and scoundrels, whose crimes can hardly find precedent in history, were quickly unmasked and destroyed, we are indebted primarily to Comrade Stalin, who sagaciously summoned the party and * * * workers of our country to an intensification of revolutionary class vigilance." [1]

Best evidence suggests that it was pressure of events and political rivalry, and not his free will, which pushed Khrushchev to desecrate Stalin 20 years later, in February of 1956. Most assuredly he was again under heavy pressure in March 1963 when he spoke on the unlikely subject, "high devotion and artistic mastery—the great strength of Soviet literature and art." [2]

Much has happened since Khrushchev, shocking the delegates to the party congress, tore the veil from Stalin and his insane terror.[3] He reported "prolonged tortures * * * insecurity, fear, and despair * * * mass repressions and brutal acts of violation of Socialist legality * * * terror against honest workers" and these were merely "a few manifestations" of Stalin's despotism.

"He practiced brutal violence, not only toward everything which opposed him but also toward that which seemed to his capricious and despotic character contrary to his concepts. * * * Whoever opposed (him) was doomed * * * to moral and physical annihilation."

Khrushchev's present problems began when he partially exposed Stalin's crimes and condemned certain aspects of his former boss' "terror" but failed to cleanse himself of the suspicion of complicity.

If he intended to "de-Stalinize" himself, Khrushchev had much to account and atone for. That he was forever connected with Stalin and his mass homicides was a matter of record. But we now know that he was unsuccessful in trying to disassociate himself from Stalin.

Denunciation of Stalin in 1956 seemed to imply that there would be no repetition of gross injustices, chief among which was murder, and no reimposition of the "terror." The impression created after the "secret speech," whether mistaken or not, was that short of outright treason, the citizens of the Soviet Union henceforth were to enjoy a certain degree of freedom from political persecution, a "reform" to which in the fifth decade of the revolution they were patently entitled. A subsequent ostensible reduction in the arbitrary power of the terroristic and punitive organ, the secret police, tended to reinforce this expectation.

Khrushchev's policy then was to create the impression that past crimes were expurgated genuinely. But the catharsis was phoney. It assumed two distinct forms: some of Stalin's victims were rehabilitated and Soviet writers were allowed to publish toned down stories of Stalin's crimes. The apparent hope was that controlled candor would act as a safety valve; people would tire reading about concentration camps, and soon the whole phenomenon would be forgotten. Not surprisingly, this childish attempt to liquidate communism's—and Soviet Russia's—great crisis of conscience by allowing a thaw in literature failed. No one and no party can talk itself out of murder; hence the present need to embark upon a new course in exculpation: Stalin's victims were innocent, but their murder was somehow justified.

III. BEWARE THE IDES OF MARCH

The malignant tone of Khrushchev's March 8 pronouncement sent chills through the marrow of Soviet citizenry: It semed to mark the birth of neo-Stalinism. In his remarks, Khrushchev left no room for doubt that de-Stalinization in the Soviet Union must stop because, mild though it was, it already had exceeded permissive limits. Khrushchev announced in effect that he does not intend to preside over the liquidation of the Soviet regime, nor does he intend to be deposed. The signal was couched in the innocuous "Aesopian" form of a criticism of contemporary art and literature:

"In the past years," Khrushchev affirmed, "activists of literature and art have * * * concentrated on that period * * * connected with the cult of the personality of Stalin. All this is fully understandable and legal. Works have appeared in which the realities of those years are accurately illuminated * * * for example * * * the novel of A. Solzhenitsyn, 'One Day of Ivan Denisovich,' several poems of E. Yevtushenko, the film * * * 'Clear Sky,' and other works."

To these efforts Khrushchev interposed no a priori objection: "The party fully supports accurate, artistic works of whatever side of life they concern—if they assist the people in its struggle for a new society."

However, a stricture must be kept in mind: "We consider it necessary to direct the attention of all creative workers to * * * mistaken motives and tendencies. * * * These incorrect tendencies consist in the main in that all attention is exclusively concentrated on illegality, arbitrariness, and on the misuse of power."

---

[1] Pravda, Dec. 2, 1963, p. 4.

[2] Pravda, Mar. 10, 1936, pp. 1–4.

[3] Walter Ulbricht, the Stalinist dictator of East Germany, called the speech a "healthy shock."

Khrushchev did not hesitate to confess: "The years of the cult of the personality have had serious consequences. Our party," he added mendaciously, "has spoken truthfully about this to the people."

But, he avered, Communists must "remember that these years were not a period of stagnation in the development of Soviet society * * * as our enemies represent them. Under the leadership of the Communist Party, under the banner * * * of the great Lenin, our people successfully built socialism. The Soviet Union * * * was transformed into a mighty socialist government which withstood the heaviest military experiences" and won "the greatest war in history."

This was the stage setting when Khrushchev proceeded gingerly to explain his own implication in the terror.

"Now, there are frequently questions about why during the life of Stalin illegalities and misuse of power were not uncovered * * * and how should this have happened?"

It develops that this matter was extensively discussed in inner Kremlin circles.

"In party documents our point of view on this question has been more than once fully explained in sufficient clarity. Unfortunately, this has been misunderstood by some people, among whom are workers in art who try to illuminate events in a distorted manner. Therefore, even today, we are again addressing ourselves to the question of Stalin's cult of the personality."

The "sufficient clarity" of undisclosed "party documents" quite obviously was insufficient. The Soviet reader who after 46 years of "Com-Lies" (Communist Lies—the term is Lenin's) has become a great skeptic, probably is very curious about these documents which a decade after Stalin's demise still are kept locked in party safes.

"The cult of the personality"—a euphamism for such crimes as mass murder—has caused, Khrushchev suggested, a vexing problem in literature. Tongue in cheek, he pithily indicated: "They say there has been a spate of writings in magazines and publications about life of people in exile, in prisons, in camps." This is deeply disturbing.

"I repeat still once more that this is a very dangerous theme and difficult material. The less a person has responsibilities for today and the future days of our country and party, the easier it is for him to throw out this material to sensation lovers. If all writers began to write only on this topic, what sort of literature would there be? Who would dash for it? Flies, enormous fat flies. Every sort of bourgeois scum from abroad will crawl toward it."

But the people whom Khrushchev named "fat flies" were precisely the hapless subjects of the Soviet dictatorship, including, presumably, the surviving Communist idealists.

As Khrushchev continued, he sounded more and more like Baron von Munchhauson:

"It is being asked, did the leading cadres of the party * * * know about the arrests at that time? Yes, they knew. But did they know that completely innocent people were being arrested? No. This they did not know. They trusted Stalin and they did not entertain the thought that there could have been * * * repression against honorable people devoted to our cause."

Here Khrushchev's lying became clumsy. It was not that innocent people found themselves arrested. This has happened before and may occur in any free society. Under Stalin (and Khrushchev was then running the Ukraine, with one-quarter of the Soviet population) innocent people were arrested all right, but they went on to interrogation, torture, slave labor, and the "moral and physical annihilation" Khrushchev has earlier described.

The misuse of power and arbitrariness of Stalin had a specific purpose—to terrorize. To be effective, terror must be known, especially to those powerful figures whose opposition is to be deterred. The assertion that the terror escaped Khrushchev is a palpable bit of nonsense resembling an allegation that the Inquisition was intended to be known only to those who perished on the rack.

Lying is difficult and Khrushchev waded into trouble with this particular exercise. He condemned, in the same speech, Ilya Ehrenburg for his theory of silence, a contention that many Russians kept their mouths shut although they were painfully aware of the innocence of Stalin's victims. However, Khrushchev added, Mikhail A. Sholokhov, author of "Quiet Flows the Don," was singularly knowledgeable: He wrote to Stalin concerning the terrible hunger and despair in his native Don country. Stalin, not disputing what had happened, alleged that there was a quiet war being waged by the Soviet peasantry against authority, in fact an Italianka (sabotage) against the army in need of food. He replied to Sholokhov that he was seeing only one side of the problem, but politics demanded that the leader recognize both aspects.

Thus, a curious spectacle emerges from Khrushchev's text: Khrushchev himself, though a most important official of Stalin's regime, had no knowledge of terroristic crimes; Ehrenburg condemned the terror but said nothing until now, thus inviting Khrushchev's sarcasm; Sholokhov sitting in his distant Don country, knew, was better informed than Khrushchev, spoke up, but his protest to Stalin was to no avail.

That the members of the Politburo did not know even about a few of the millions of innocent victims is absurd: many of their closest friends were murdered. But if of all the leading cadres of the party, only Khrushchev (and presumably some of his present colleagues) were not aware of the arrests and extermination of "honorable people devoted to our cause," a proper question is whether such a naive dunce is fit to head the Soviet State.

Khrushchev insisted, with humble unction, that "we only found out about Stalin's misuses of power and the facts of his arbitrariness after his death and the exposure of Beria * * * that enemy of the party and people, the spy and odious provocateur."

This diversion to Beria, weak though it is as an alibi, offers nevertheless a clue to Khrushchev's present objective: He attempts to whitewash Stalin and thereby save himself. It was not Stalin who persecuted innocent people, it was Beria, and only after Beria's exposure in 1953 did the truth come to light.

The Soviet populace now presumably understood that "many, including myself" wept at Stalin's bier. But the murderers and scoundrels whom Khrushchev was castigating in 1936, included those party members whom Khrushchev's government is now rehabilitating—some of them. Yugoslav Communists place the toll of murders during Stalin's reign at 7 million—plus 7 million arrests.[4] Actually, the total is much greater. But whatever it is, Khrushchev was responsible for a portion of this bloody torrent. So far he escaped the penalty, but the ghosts have begun to haunt him and will never leave him in peace again.

IV. THE CASE FOR A REFINED NEO-STALINISM

Ghosts and survivors, prisoners and citizens suffering from slow malnutrition (as a result of Khrushchev's doctrinaire agricultural policies), as well as the skeptical new generation, must comprehend that Khrushchev's absolution was complete because of Stalin's great services to the revolution.

"The party's struggle with enemies of the revolution and socialist construction was headed by Stalin * * * Stalin's contribution to the revolutionary struggle * * * was * * * known to everyone * * * in the later years of socialist construction. Stalin's authority grew particularly in the period of the fight against the anti-Lenin tendencies and opposition groups within the party."

Khrushchev, to put it bluntly, resanctified Stalin's politics of murder. "When plots against the revolution were uncovered, Stalin * * * led the struggle for the cleansing[5] of the country from plotters * * * and enemies of the people." The party allegedly "trusted and supported him in this." And Stalin deserves great credit for "there was not once a case of treachery or treason to the cause of the revolution [like], for example, the provocation of Malinovsky[6]—a member of the Bolshevik faction in the State Duma."

Khrushchev also defended Stalin's fight against such alleged foes of Leninism as the Trotskyites, the Zinovievites, the right opportunists (also referred to as Bukharinites) and the bourgeois nationalists. In this struggle, too, the party and masses trusted him, supported him.

But here, Khrushchev is skating on thin ice and betrays his fundamental allegiance to Stalin and Stalinism.[7] Opponents of Stalin, like Zinoviev and Bukharin may have been wrong[8] but they were not guilty of the crimes for which they were executed. Trotsky was murdered in Mexico many years after he left the Soviet Union. Trotsky, Bukharin, Zinoviev, et. al., were opposed to Stalin for myriad reasons; but, foremost among the criticism of these authentic party members was misuse of power and arbitrariness of Stalin. Khrushchev damned these men despite the fact that their arguments were proved correct—Khrushchev himself was the man who, albeit by implication, disclosed the correctness of the "line" of the executed opposition. The true heroes of communism (like Trotsky and Bukharin) still have to be rehabilitated, and some of the foremost names, like that of Rykov, still have to be mentioned. Hence Khrushchev justified Stalin's main purge, or as he put it, "the Flushing" (ochishchenye).

---

[4] Robert Conquest, The Spectator, "The Great Purge," Nov. 9, 1962, pp. 706–711.

[5] Here Khrushchev used "Ochishcheniye" rather than the usual "chistka" (purge). "Ochishcheniye" is a much stronger term and has no English equivalent. In Russian parlance, this word connotes a complete cleansing out, a flushing, and frequently pertains to a radical expurgation of the body.

[6] Roman Vikentyevich Malinovsky (born in 1878 in Poland) was the principal agent (or double agent) of a remarkable intelligence operation. His connection with the czarist department of police (Okhrana) began during the Russo-Japanese War. He entered into a close relationship with the Okhrana in 1909 after he became prominent in Russian trade union organizing. By directive of the director of police he attended the 1912 Bolshevik Congress at Prague. There he made a great impression on Lenin who saw to it that he was elected a member of the party's central committee. Thereupon, Lenin appointed him to the post of No. 1 Bolshevik inside Russia. Malinovsky was thereafter the principal organizer of Pravda and the leader of the Bolshevik faction in the Fourth Duma. His speeches to the latter were occasionally edited by both Lenin and the czarist police director.

Early in 1914, for reasons still obscure, he resigned his seat in the Duma and went abroad. A German prisoner of war, he performed propaganda work in prisoner-of-war camps during 1915–17. Lenin and Krupskaya sent him parcels and propaganda materials to his camp.

Prior to 1918, Lenin furiously defended Malinovsky, then under suspicion by other socialists. After the Bolshevik seizure of power Malinovsky returned to Soviet Russia, patently certain of Lenin's support. Nonetheless, after a party tribunal, he was shot.

Lenin never forsook Malinovsky. It was Stalin who damned him; here Khrushchev supports the Stalinist (as opposed to the Leninist) interpretation; namely, that Malinovsky was an "odious provocateur" in the pay and service of the Okhrana.

[7] It is interesting in this regard to compare Khrushchev's remarks at a Kremlin banquet honoring a Chinese delegation headed by Chou En-lai (Pravda, Jan. 19, 1957): "Basically and in the main may God grant, as they say, that each Communist knew how to fight, as Stalin fought * * * for the interests of the working class, for socialism * * * and against the enemies of Marxism-Leninism."

Actually, by linking, in one sentence the party opposition with bourgeois nationalists, Khrushchev again read these men out of the party. By equating the party opposition not only to nationalism but to the bourgeoisie, the class enemy, he implicitly echoes Stalin's argument that they were enemies of the party. All Khrushchev is ready to admit is that a few party members were wronged. Thus, in effect, he is upholding Stalin's party purges even today.

In the certain knowledge that millions of innocent persons perished in the Stalin era, it would have been in order, according to Socialist legality, to refer the problem of whether Communists were purged for cause or simply because Stalin wanted them out of the way, to a tribunal of the Nuremberg type. No justice can ever be obtained without judicious consideration by impartial persons.

V. WHO WAS STALIN?

If the purges were justified after all, Stalin, though he may have gone too far, must have been all right.

Sure enough: "Vladimir Ilyich Lenin considered Stalin a Marxist, an outstanding activist of our party, devoted to the revolution." Actually, Lenin never considered Stalin to be a theoretician, hence he hardly regarded him as a genuine Marxist; Lenin, however, did regard Trotsky, Bukharin, and Zinoviev as genuine Marxists. The point would be trivial if it did not denote an attempt to use Lenin, the patron saint, as a character witness for the defendant.

"We are still of the opinion that Stalin was devoted to communism. He was a Marxist. One cannot and should not deny this."

The word "still" and the entire phrasing suggests that doubts about Stalin's dedication to Marxism and the revolution were raised but not sustained.

What is the significance of this remark? For many years the question of whether Stalin served as an Okhrana agent has been debated. Alexander Orlov, whose testimony on other matters was amply borne out by Khrushchev's 1956 speech, stated that evidence of Stalin's Okhrana connection was found in police files. This find was no small factor in Stalin's purge of the NKVD, his own Okhrana during the 1930's. Khrushchev's speech indicated, as clearly as can be, that someone in the party has been digging about in prerevolutionary history of the Bolsheviks.

In other words, Stalin's whole history was investigated. Khrushchev's phrasing suggests that he was given a report on the matter. This report, it can be surmised, raised the question of whether de-Stalinization should be pushed further and the name of communism be cleared by disclosing that Stalin had been a police agent. Such a suggestion was turned down: At this crucial point the brake was put upon de-Stalinization.

But perhaps the question is not yet closed. Khrushchev may still be of the opinion that Stalin was an authentic Communist. Is he therefore still fighting those who evaluate Stalin differently? And if there is such a debate, is it not obvious that some evidence linking Stalin to the police was found, and that the unresolved problem now merely is whether Stalin was a police agent pure and simple, or a double agent who worked with the police for the party? Obviously, explosive material is lying around.

VI. THE MURKY ROAD OF PROVOCATION

Police and subversive operations are plainly on Khrushchev's mind. In more than one passage Khrushchev called attention to the entrapment type of intelligence operations Russians dub "provokatsiya." There has been no such preoccupation with the subject of "provocation" in any speech by Khrushchev since he came to power. Moreover, there has been no significant public pronouncement by any Soviet dictator on the subject of Czarist secret police penetration into Lenin's group for over 40 years. In this speech, three agents were mentioned in connection with pre-1917 events, and one who operated after the Bolshevik coup d'etat. Two and possibly three of these four were Jews.

The Soviet security forces from Vcheka to KGB have their genesis in the Czarist Okhrana.[9] Khrushchev is fully aware of this background and his speech indicates, as already pointed out, that he must recently have studied the history of police provocation with some care. Throughout his discourse were scattered references to the Czarist Okhrana, but also to Soviet security forces, and to various foreign intelligence services which duped Stalin. Odious provocations appear to have exerted considerable influence on revolutionary history.

For example, Khrushchev discussed the arrest, interrogation, and death of General Yakir,[10] "an outstanding bolshevik and military personage." He reported that as the general was about to be shot, Yakir shouted: "Long live Stalin." Khrushchev insisted that throughout the entire interrogation Yakir refused to believe that Stalin had anything to do with his arrest. Someone around Stalin had arranged a provocation to which Yakir had fallen victim. But Yakir was not the only victim to provocation, nor the single case of a Communist who failed to grasp Stalin's true role. Why then make a case out of him? He was a Jew and commanded the military forces in the Ukraine. Skilled dialectician that he is, Khrushchev, in discussing provocation, also wants to score some points in the never-ending national struggle.

VII. THE SUPERIOR LEADERSHIP OF KHRUSHCHEV

The basic tactic of Khrushchev is to prove, not only that he is the best of all contemporary Communists, but also that he is superior to Stalin and even to Lenin. The latter, he implied, was taken in by agent provocateurs. This won't happen to Nikita.

It will be recalled that Khrushchev claimed he had learned about Stalin's arrests of innocent people only after Beria's exposure. But he insisted that Stalin did not permit "one case of treason * * * to * * * the revolution * * * (like) that of Malinovsky." This name has not been mentioned publicly in the Soviet Union since 1918. Malinovsky, close comrade-in-arms of Lenin, was exposed as a police agent but probably acted as a double agent helping the party rather than the police. Khrushchev apparently sides with those who considered Malinovsky to have betrayed the revolution. Since Lenin did not believe in Malinovsky's treachery, the clear implication is that Khrushchev will not be so naive and fallible as Lenin. Khrushchev intimated that Lenin fell repeatedly in police traps, for example, he also was impressed by Zhitomirsky.[11]

At to Stalin, "his guilt consisted in the fact that he made gross mistakes of a theoretical and political character against the Leninist principles of state and party leadership, misused the authority entrusted to him by the party and the people."

Thus he caused serious damage to communism. This fine line between gross mistakes and criminal acts hides an important point. Stalin's criminality is to be argued away. But since criminal acts were committed, was Stalin a criminal by nature? Not at all.

The purges resulted, Khrushchev revealed, from Stalin's beguilement by certain foreign intelligence services. These organizations, "knowing his sick mistrustfulness and suspiciousness," produced cases and documents which seemed accurate and created the belief that "there were groups of military specialists * * * developing criminal plots in our country against Soviet authority * * * and the Soviet state."

Khrushchev's attempt to cast himself in the role of a superior Vozhd, who is immune to provocation, led him, some days after his speech, to release documents of the Nazi Gestapo which—fed to Stalin via Benes, the President of Czechoslovakia—caused the execution of Tukhschevsky and the flower of the Red army.

It remained unexplained, however, why Stalin who, according to Khrushchev, was sick only toward the end of his life, bit on such pap. Nor did Khrushchev care to argue the possibility that Stalin fed fabricated material to the Gestapo in the first place, only to have them passed back to the NKVD. Khrushchev hinted strongly that, unlike Stalin, he would not fall prey to such subterfuge.

By now the scenario was prepared for Khrushchev, the hero. None other than he helped to curb and counter Stalin's sick suspicions. Stalin had more dyela, i.e., purges in mind, but Khrushchev recognized the trouble and saved the Soviet Union from untold grief:

---

[8] Khrushchev's economic policies are patterned after Bukharin's theories. Had Khrushchev wanted to avoid re-Stalinization, he could have easily pulled out arguments of the early 1920's, in which Stalin supported Bukharin's comparatively mild economics, particularly as related to the peasant question. By damning Bukharin, Khrushchev supported Stalin's harsh policies of the 1930's, and recondemned the peasantry to provide the capital to pay for Soviet armament. Had he been looking for reform, he would have found the justification in Bukharin's writings.

[9] The term "Okhrana" (Okhranka) is usually used in references to the czarist department of police in St. Petersburg and its various domestic and foreign offices. It was the first truly modern authoritarian police intelligence system. There was precious little it did not know about the pre-1917 revolutionary operations and personalities in and out of Russia. Professionally competent, yet subject to the pitfall which beset all such organizations, its operational methodology reflected a predilection for subterfuge and the black arts.

[10] Iona Emmanuilovich Yakir was born in 1896 and became a member of the CP in April, 1917. Together with Tukhachevsky, he helped modernize the Red Army. Both were tried (in camera) and executed in 1937.

[11] Iakob Abramovich Zhitomirsky, a physician recruited to intelligence work by the German police while a student in Berlin in 1902, was almost immediately thereafter transferred to the Okhrana as an agent. He, too, occupied an important position in Lenin's organization. Among his specialities was arranging for the despatch of Bolshevik propaganda materials across the Russian frontier from abroad. His operations were conducted in the full knowledge of the Okhrana, which seized most of the propaganda. Last identified as a surgeon with the Franch Army in World War I, Zhitomirsky's fate is unknown.

"Stalin was in the last years of his life * * * deeply ill * * * suffering from suspiciousness and a persecution mania. The party * * * has informed the people about how Stalin created such cases as the Leningrad affair, the doctors' plot, and others. But, comrades, there would have been significantly more * * * if those who worked alongside Stalin * * * had agreed with him about everything. I have spoken about how Stalin had decided on the case concerning the so-called Moscow counterrevolutionary center. But not everyone had become a yes-man and the cadres of the Moscow organization were not subjected to new mass repression."

In any event, if Stalin was only sick in the last years of his life, he must have been healthy during the 1930's and 1940's, when he committed his greatest crimes. The fabrication of cases such as the Leningrad affair and the doctors' plot may have been due to a deep, horrendous disease, but that disease was not identified. At any rate, suspiciousness and persecution mania are symptoms and not a disease.

But again, Stalin was not just sick, he was egged on "by Beria and Kaganovich, afraid that among the creative intelligentsia in the postwar * * * Ukraine, some kind of nationalistic tendencies were ripening. He began to push things in order to dispense with the most outstanding writers and activists of art in the Ukraine. If the Ukrainian Bolsheviki had supported Stalin's feelings the Ukrainian intelligentsia would have suffered huge losses and probably there would have been a case (dyelo) against the Ukrainian nationalists."

Khrushchev was the leading Bolshevik of the Ukraine at that time. Hence it was his own adamant and courageous stand that prevented a postwar purge there, just as he implied that he forestalled the purge of the Moscow party organization at the time when he stood at its head.

Hence we have the following set of assertions:

1. Stalin was a true Communist.
2. In the thirties, he was provoked into the purges by foreign elements. However, he also killed many whose liquidation appears justified even now.
3. Khrushchev did protect the innocents in the Moscow organization who otherwise might have been killed by Stalin at a time when he was not yet sick.
4. Stalin was almost pushed by Beria and Kaganovich into a purge of the Ukraine at an unnamed time but was blocked by Khrushchev.
5. The Leningrad affair and the doctors' plot occurred when Stalin was deeply ill but it might have been worse had not Khrushchev interceded.

Of course, the Leningrad affair did run its full course. If Khrushchev tried to stop it, was he convinced of the victim's innocence? By contrast, the case of the doctors' plot got underway; it was ended abruptly by Stalin's death. For which action, then, is Khrushchev claiming credit? For Stalin's death? The confusion in his alibi building is plain. But it also is clear that Khrushchev is trying desperately to make his leadership claim stick.

Just as Lenin met his beguilers, so Stalin was entrapped by Beria,[12] a spy and enemy of the party and the people, who did not even consider it necessary to conceal his happiness at the grave of Stalin. Were Khrushchev's tears in good taste after all?

What is the sweating dictator trying to say? That both Lenin and Stalin were lacking in Bolshevik vigilance? What is the message? Simply this: After Stalin's death, Beria "tried to assume power and leadership in the party. At the time there actually existed a real danger. From the very first after Stalin's death, Beria began to take steps disorganizing to the work of the party * * * directed to the disruption of our friendly relations * * * with fraternal countries of the Socialist camp. Together with Malenkov, he * * * made a provocative proposition to liquidate the German Democratic Republic as a Socialist government, and * * * the Socialist Unity Party of Germany."

Lo and behold, Khrushchev was smarter than Stalin. He recognized Beria for what he was. It was unnecessary to remind the 1963 audience that Khrushchev purged Beria without benefit of Socialist legality. The liquidation of this vile person, we must infer, was justifiable terrorism. One does not talk about provocations and of means of combating them, unless there is a significant correlation to the present. If Zhitomirsky's, Malinovsky's, and Beria's are lurking about, Nikita Khrushchev is alert. The warning, we may be sure, is coming through loud and clear.[13]

VIII. REEMERGENCE OF TERROR

Khrushchev's arguments are leading back to Stalinism in its rawest form. Citing almost verbatim one of the key teachings of Stalin, Khrushchev maintained we must conduct a ceaseless struggle against the survivals of the past within the country * * * defeat the attack of the organized class enemy in the international arena. We have no right to forget this struggle, even for 1 minute. A few years ago, Stalin was condemned for the theory, then deemed to be incorrect, that the class struggle sharpens after the Communist seizure of power. Now it turns out Stalin must have been right in warning against the apparently immortal survivals of the past.

Stalin also was extolled for his contribution to communism: in defending the revolution, he was fighting "enemies of the people." This very expression "enemies of the people," which Stalin used to label his personal opponents, was strongly criticized after the 1956 speech. Thus, Stalin received credit for the very excesses for which he was being condemned.

The ceaseless struggle justifies endless terror. "Did the revolution have to defend its conquest? Yes, it had to do this, and it did it from the first days—with all decisiveness. In the first months of Soviet authority, by decree of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, there was created a mighty organ of the proletarian dictatorship—against the enemies of the revolution—the Vcheka in the struggle with counterrevolution." [14]

The thrust of this statement is that Lenin is heralded as the originator of the terror organ. Usually, this honor is reserved for Felix Dzerzhinsky who, helpfully, was a Pole. It was Lenin who instituted terror—this precedent would legitimize the resumption of terror by Khrushchev. This is the key message of the speech.

IX. ANTI-SEMITISM IN THE SOVIET UNION

In the past, Khrushchev has demonstrated great sensitivity to the Jewish question. Now it appears that the Jewish issue has again sharpened. No other conclusion may be drawn from the unprecedented length of his discourse on the Jewish problem. With some exceptions, the overwhelming majority of persons mentioned in his speech are Jews: Azev, Zhitomirsky, Beria (Russians insist, probably incorrectly, that he was Jewish), Kaganovich, General Yakir, General Kreiser, Rosa Luxemburg, Ehrenburg, Trotsky, Zinoviev, and others.

His lead into this sticky wicket was by way of a criticism of Evgeny Yevtushenko's now celebrated poem, Babi Yar, describing the Nazi massacre of Jews in a Kiev ravine. Yevtushenko was reprehensible because he did not mention non-Jews who also were killed at Babi Yar.

In an obvious bit of apologia, Khrushchev insisted: "From the very first days of the October revolution * * * Jews were on an equal footing with all other nationalities of the U.S.S.R. * * * The Jewish question did not exist for us and those who suggest it are echoing an alien voice."

There were outstanding Jewish generals in the Soviet past. Even now, Khrushchev disclosed, General Kreiser commands all Soviet troops in the Far East. Was Khrushchev able to find only one Jewish Soviet general? The Jews account for about 3 percent of the Soviet population.

There are different types of Jews, Khrushchev explained. For example, one Jewish officer, Vinokur, telephoned him during the Battle of the Volga (Stalingrad) and said that von Paulus' interpreter Kogan, a former Khrushchev aide from Kiev, was a Jew. "One Jew served as interpreter on von Paulus' staff and another Jew served in our forces that took von Paulus and the interpreter prisoner." This precisely takes off where Stalin left the eternal theme of the "international Jew."

There is little doubt about what happened to the interpreter. Lest the lesson be lost, Khrushchev proceeded with a bit of interesting reasoning. "It is absurd to attribute to the Russian people guilt for the filthy provocations of the Black Hundreds,[15] but it is also absurd to attribute to the whole Jewish people the responsibility for Nationalism and the Zionism of the Bund, for the provocation of Azev and Zhitomirsky ('Otsov'), for the various Jewish organizations connected in their time with the 'Zubatovites' and the Czarist Okhrana (Okhranka)."

Apart from some deliberate falsifications (the Bund was Menshevik and not Zionist), the Soviet dictator recited here an impressive and quite one-sided indictment. The fantastic contributions of Jewish physicists to Soviet nuclear weapons, space exploration and electronics were not mentioned, even though such praise would have alleviated anti-Semitic sentiments. Most interesting are the references to agent provocateurs, to the Okhrana, and the gratuitous reference to Zubatov, an Okhrana official who organized socialist groups to keep the revolutionary movement under control. The policy instituted by Zubatov often has been criticized for having brought about bloody Sunday, a massacre, which was the overture to the revolution of 1905. This revolution fractured the monolithic autocracy of the Czar.

---

[12] Lavrenty Pavlovich Beria, a Georgian, was head of the Soviet secret police from 1938 until his arrest and execution in 1953. He was accused inter alia of having been a British intelligence agent since 1919.

[13] Both the syntax and style of Khrushchev's speech markedly resemble Stalin's later pronouncements. This leads to speculation whether one of Stalin's speechwriters drafted the March discourse.

[14] Established on Dec. 20, 1917, 6 weeks after the Bolshevik advent to power, "Vcheka" stood for the All Russian Extraordinary Committee for Combating Counterrevolution, Speculation, and Delinquency in Office.

[15] The "black hundreds" was a relatively small terror gang organized by the czarist regime for the purpose of arranging pogroms. Khrushchev knows that they were not representative of the Russian peoples. He did not mention his own personalized "pogrom." In an attempt to find scapegoats for the miserable condition of the Soviet economy, Khrushchev's internal security forces have been busily shooting persons charged with fraud, embezzlement, and theft. The overwhelming majority of those executed have Jewish names. That some 3 percent of the population (the Jews) should have committed more than 50 percent of the economic crimes punishable by death, taxes credulity.

Does Khrushchev fear a Zubaton-type entrapment maneuver against him?

X. NO TIME FOR FATHERS

In a candid passage, Khrushchev admitted the visceral craving for freedom emerging from the thaw in his unhappy empire. Most of the current unpleasant problems stem from an abominable hankering for more liberty. "One hears conversations about some kind of absolute freedom . . I do not know what they have in mind here, but I consider that there will never be absolute freedom even under complete communism."

That settled the crucial political problem. The question of "relative freedom" was not discussed and the reins of government will not be loosened. Nor will ideological deviation be permitted.

Yet, unreconstructed bolshevik that he is, Khrushchev has recognized and identified the most serious long-range challenge to the Soviet system. This challenge he described as the so-called father-son relationship. The increasingly sophisticated Russian youth is inquiring why papushka did nothing to halt the Stalin terror. Are Khrushchev's own descendants in a questioning mood? Equally vexing has been the unquenchable youthful desire for explanations from parents, teachers, and ideologues concerning the Stalin era. Soviet youth wants to know how Stalinism could have happened in the Soviet system? Could it recur? What guarantees against its recurrence have been effected?

Khrushchev approached this most serious of problems by way of a criticism of the film, "The Guard of Illych," as yet uncompleted. In this movie, he intoned, the young people "love no one and they respect nothing, they not only refuse to believe their elders but they even hate them. They are dissatisfied with everything. They laugh and spit at it."

What is the true picture of soviet youth? "Our soviet youth are continuing their lives in labor and struggle * * * the heroic tradition of the foregoing generation, proving their great devotion to the ideas of Marxism, Leninism, and to the years of peaceful construction * * * at the fronts of the great fatherland war. Our youth are very well depicted in * * * Fadayev's novel, 'The Young Guard'."

In the bitter winter of 1948–49, the writer saw the première of "The Young Guard" (pt. I) at the main movie theater in Kharkov. If soviet youth was very well depicted in that film, it remains difficult to dismiss the memory of youthful viewers howling with laughter as they watched Nazi troops charging into the Ukraine, occupying beautifully constructed homes—which "our youth" knew very well did not exist in 1949, and do not exist even now.

But Khrushchev, highly exorcized about the so-called father-son problem, launched into a bitter tirade against "The Guard of Illych": "I have previously spoken * * * of the serious question raised by the meeting of the hero of the film with the ghost of his father killed during the war. To the question of the son about how to live, the father's ghost in turn asks the son how old he is. And when the son answers he is 23 years old, the father says, 'but I am 21'. You want us to believe in the accuracy of such an episode? No one will believe it. Can you imagine that a father would not answer the question of his son and not give him advice on how to go on a proper course in life?"

Khrushchev, father of his people, puts all his sons on guard, that he will indeed show them the "proper course."

But what is this proper course? Soviet youth undoubtedly has examined, for example, the statistics of the recent Russian census (the first in three decades). They know that Stalin's terror castrated soviet manhood: more soviet males in their prime perished at the hands of Stalin's executioners than were killed by the Nazis in World War II.[16]

Is the suffering, which soviet adults experienced under Stalin, to return? The fathers knew the agony; the sons know what the terror did to their country.

Khrushchev, contended that "in soviet socialist society there are no contradictions between generations * * * problems of 'father vs. son' do not exist in the old sense." But then he lashed out: "Do you want to set the young against the older generations * * * to bring dissensions into the united soviet family?" This anguished outcry merely proves that after 46 years the revolution has not become a solid accomplishment. Soviet youth is beginning to understand that the sins of communism cannot all be ascribed to Stalin. They sense that Stalin was just a symptom of a deep disease—communism. Khrushchev fears that soviet youth is about to consider him, too, as a symptom of the same disease.

XI. THE CASE OF A FEW MILLION GHOSTS

The plain fact of the matter is that Khrushchev rose to power under Stalin, that he participated in Stalinism, and that he knew all about the excesses of Stalin.

His words show plainly that he is involved in a deep personal and political crisis and that his power position in the Kremlin is under attack. To extricate himself, he is both accusing and exculpating Stalin. Apparently, afraid of provocation (infiltration and entrapment), he is putting the lurking schemers on guard that they would be summarily dealt with. In addition, he is warning the population at large that he may institute what could be called neo-Stalinism—selective terror against his opponents rather than blind mass terror against foe and friend alike.

Beset with problems that threaten to get out of hand, Khrushchev quite obviously feels insecure. It would be so easy to invoke the Castro solution to his domestic problems—"Paredon" ("to the wall"). But despite the bravado of this speech, it is not easy. The years of Stalin's unspeakable brutality still are visible in too many millions of faces.

Khrushchev knows that he is living in a jungle. He is convinced that Lenin was right when he said: "Today you must not stroke the head of anyone—they will bite your hand. It is necessary to beat them over the head, beat without mercy." Stalin, as Khrushchev himself disclosed, ordered his terrorists to beat, beat, and beat once more. To beat or not to beat—that is Khrushchev's burning quandary. But he will be damned if he beats and damned if he doesn't. Khrushchev is now the prisoner of history. The future will tell for how long he succeeded in postponing the inevitable.

KENNEDY FAILS AGAIN TO MEET SOVIET CHALLENGE

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the world press today is carrying another story of the Kennedy administration's failure in maintaining a strong and effective policy in dealing with the Soviet Union.

You cannot do business with Khrushchev and the Communists. Negotiations end in stalemate, appeasement, or the new term accomodation, meaning, we agree to the Communist demands. Yet when we do agree to Communist terms, they up their demands.

Look at the recent test ban talks and agreements as our example. Here is what the President says:

> The Prime Minister and I wrote to Chairman Khrushchev in an effort to see if we could develop some means by which we could bring this matter to a climax and see if we could reach an accord, which we feel to be in the interest of the nuclear powers, the present nuclear powers, to prevent diffusion. But, as I say, I am not sanguine and this represents not a last effort but a very determined effort to see if we can prevent failure from coming upon us this spring.

Here are the facts: Premier Khrushchev has offered only two or three inspections annually, and then only under the most restrictive conditions, actually exempting from inspection any area declared by the Kremlin to be a military area.

When negotiations began in 1958, 20 inspections annually were demanded. The Kennedy administration dropped demands to "10 to 12," then to 7. Although the presently reported concession averages 4¼ inspections annually, the effective number would actually be Khrushchev's demanded 3. This is because inspections could not reasonably be consumed on an annual basis, but must be reserved by at least 25 percent to use if needed during a period of greater suspicion during the last portion of the 7 years. We concede; they demand more.

Worse yet, or most dangerous of all, here is the final blow. Suppose Khrushchev and the Communists make a deal, signed, sealed, and delivered. They make deals only to break them. We honor ours. Only a firm, unbending dedication to protection of U.S. sovereignty can protect us with no deals, no appeasement, no accomodation—and no opportunity for them to break a promise.

REAL DEFINITION OF URBAN RENEWAL HIDDEN BY PROGRESS

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Federal urban renewal program is subject to increasing controversy and many of us feel that a thorough investigation of the operation is long overdue.

An interesting commentary of the urban renewal program appeared in the April 17 issue of the Summit Valley Times. It is an article written by its staff columnist, Lyn Daunoras.

This is a thought-provoking commentary and I place it in the RECORD, feeling that it contributes to the attention given to this subject:

---

[16] Pravda, Feb. 4, 1960.

REAL DEFINITION OF URBAN RENEWAL HIDDEN BY PROGRESS

(By Lyn Daunoras)

Every once in a while we get to wondering how urban renewal will be written up in textbooks.

No doubt, it will be defined as a means of attaining progress by use of Federal funds to tear down slums of which a city could not otherwise rid itself on a local basis because of the tremendous cost involved. This would be a true enough definition on the surface.

But we wonder if anything will be said about the real meaning of urban renewal—the uprooting and dispersal—like they were cattle—of people who have neither the stamina nor the capital to move on to more desirable areas.

We read a story in the Daily News recently about the Harrison-Halsted residents who are hanging on tenaciously to their property and waging a bitter, but futile, battle to retain their homes instead of having them fall to make way for the progressive new University of Illinois.

When we came to the end of it, we felt just a little nauseated at the circumstances that have wrenched away the life earnings and security of these people and compelled them to start over again at an age when they looked forward to some well-deserved rest and peace.

The attitude of the urban renewal officials was unbelievably callous. "If they would only make the move they will find they like it after all," they say. What a lack of understanding of human nature. When a man is offered $7,000 for his paid-up home, however humble, where can he buy another home for the equivalent sum?

Today, $7,000 makes a fair down payment. To have mortgage payments (presuming at that age he can even get a mortgage) to contend with again is more than some folks can bear and it is brutal to thrust such a situation onto them.

To quote a housing official on the Harrison-Halsted matter: "Most of the hundreds of families already relocated are pleased with their new homes and new neighborhoods. Many of the families moved to the vicinity of Austin and north. Some bought new homes—but to do so, some mothers had to go to work. Families doubled up in other instances."

Said with pride. Aren't they the lucky ones—they can now live two families under a roof or with the mother going to work for the first time in order to afford the homes they were forced into buying. So the city exchanges its problem of slums for a potential problem in mental health and juvenile delinquency. That's progress.

As to clearing the slums—the necessity for razing an area has always seemed rather unfounded. For many years we had been anxious to visit New Orleans because we had heard of its romantic atmosphere, its old-world traditions, and its culinary artistry. When we finally got there, we headed right for the famous French Quarter, about which some millions of words have been written and songs composed.

I don't believe I will ever quite forget my first feeling at observing this world-famous section of New Orleans. It was old world, it was "different," all right. Nevertheless, as we stood there gazing about us I couldn't help but comment. "We have a French Quarter back home, too, only we call it the slums."

The charm of European countries lay in its old buildings and the older they are, the more picturesque. Can you imagine these countries—for that matter, New Orleans—clearing away all these old buildings to make way for progress? What would be their tourist highlight? Yet tourists who gasp at the slums here at home will go to these other places and be charmed by the same type of row buildings with outside paint peeling and roofs sinking.

The inconsistencies of man.

STILL ON THE BOOKS

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, now that the Ways and Means Committee has finished its public hearings, it is conducting its necessary, thorough scrutiny of the President's tax message. It is practical to call to the attention of the House the methods of tax reduction which could avoid the controversial pitfalls that face the administration's proposals.

I refer to the repeal of war time excise taxes as the proper approach to tax reduction.

The Lemonter, a community newspaper serving Lemont, Ill., discussed this issue in a concise and logical editorial in its April 18, issue. I place the item in the RECORD hoping that the clarity of expression will draw the attention of House Members:

STILL ON THE BOOKS

A special task force of the American Retail Federation is campaigning for repeal of the wartime excise taxes. It deserves all success.

These taxes, among others, were imposed as an emergency measure during World War II, and it was universally believed that a repeal would come with the war's end. But some 18 years have passed and the taxes are still being levied.

In some areas, at long last, such unfair and discriminatory taxes have been repealed. For instance, the taxes on rail and bus tickets and freight shipments were dropped, and the tax on air fares was halved.

But the retail excise taxes remain. They are applied to a lengthy list of articles—leather goods, cosmetics, certain kinds of office machinery, furs, and jewelry. These articles, for the most part, can hardly be considered needless luxuries in a nation like ours. They are a part of a way of life. They contribute to living standards. And they are almost universally bought and used.

Tax reform is now a principal topic of discussion and debate. One of the best places to start is with a set of emergency excise taxes which are still on the books almost a generation after the emergency's end.

WHAT I CAN DO FOR MY COUNTRY

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in an essay contest conducted by the Argo, Ill., VFW, an outstanding young lady, Michelle Kristie, submitted the winning essay which is certainly meritorious in every respect.

I am proud to submit this article for the RECORD feeling that it reflects the spirit and determination of young Americans everywhere. It is an inspirational work by the type of student that will surely play a major role in the expansion of our Nation.

The article follows:

WHAT I CAN DO FOR MY COUNTRY

(By Michelle Kristie, age 16, 7237 West 62d Street, Argo, Argo High School student; first prize, VFW essay contest winner)

As a student there isn't very much I could do for my country but I can begin by learning as much about my Government as possible.

I could study the Constitution, be active in local youth programs, and follow the rules and codes of a junior citizen by keeping all the laws that the school and the town have set up for people my age.

As an adult the best way to help my country would be to participate in local and national elections. By participating in elections, I do not mean that by casting a vote would be enough. Before I'd cast my ballot I'd read as much as I could about the parties, and the people representing them. By becoming familiar with the various platforms of those running for office, I would be able to cast my ballot with confidence and not use guesswork.

The newspapers are a good source of information and through them I would be able to gather enough facts to choose the man I feel, would help my country most.

However, voting in all elections would not be enough, there are other ways a person can help his country. I could never be a great statesman or a hero in any war, but by being active in local organizations; especially those that are centered around education and children, I could fulfill my duties as a citizen.

The children of today will be the leaders of tomorrow, so they must be coached and taught and finally molded into good citizens.

The PTA, local youth organizations, church clubs, and social work would be a means of reaching our children. Through these organizations, I could help spread a little patriotism. It seems that there is too little of that today. We have all taken our freedom and our democratic way of life for granted. It is time we did some serious thinking about our great country.

We must not stop there. Conservation, keeping our country clean and beautiful, fighting communism, obscenity, and delinquency are of great importance.

We must educate the illiterate, for knowledge is the foundation of a solid government.

We must give help to our senior citizens, because they are the backbone of our country.

If I ever traveled abroad, I would take my manners with me and help erase the image of the ugly American, for American prestige throughout the world is of great value.

We must prove to all Americans and to the world that our country is the greatest of all countries.

I cannot do all of this alone, but with the help of every American, it can be done. It may take a long time, but when all our hopes are fulfilled, it will be a job well done, and the reward will be great.

When this happens, I shall feel that I had a part in this movement by being a good citizen.

I think that President Kennedy summed it up perfectly when he said, "Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country."

A BILL "TO PROVIDE THAT MEMBERSHIP BY NATIONAL BANKS IN THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM SHALL BE VOLUNTARY, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES"

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. St Germain] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, this bill would accord to national banks the option of joining and maintaining or refraining from membership in the Federal Reserve System—a privilege which is now enjoyed only by State-chartered banks and trust companies.

The fourth and fifth sections of the proposed bill would provide that national banks may join the Federal Reserve System, changing from the imperative. Also, the penalty provisions invoked upon failure of a national bank to join the System are eliminated in the sixth section. The eighth section of the bill would permit national banks as well as State banks and trust companies to withdraw from the Federal Reserve System if they desire to do so. The ninth section would provide for reserve requirements for nonmember national banks. The 11th section would provide that the Comptroller of the Currency would regulate interest rates on time and savings accounts for nonmember national banks.

Optional membership for national banks in the Federal Reserve System may be supported, both on grounds of equity, and on grounds of fundamental policy. Considerations of equity arise because all banks do not benefit equally from membership in the System. There are few advantages to be derived from such membership by smaller banks. These banks generally find the check-clearing and borrowing facilities of the System less convenient than those available from their correspondent banks. To procure these correspondent services, they are required to maintain balances with those banks. As a consequence, if they are members of the System they must maintain two sets of idle balances—with the Federal Reserve, and with their correspondent bank. The advantages of optional membership are evident from the fact that the great majority of the smaller State-chartered banks have not chosen to become members of the System. National banks, which do not have this choice, are thus placed at a competitive disadvantage in terms of their operating costs, and hence their capacity to meet the terms of their rival State-chartered banks.

The fundamental policy considerations relate to the need for mandatory membership in the Federal Reserve System as a means of assuring effective monetary controls. It is doubtful that optional membership in the Federal Reserve System would impair monetary control powers significantly. Most of the larger banks of the country would undoubtedly choose to retain their membership in the System, both for reasons of traditions and prestige, and because they are able to utilize the facilities of the System more readily. This is clear from the fact that only a handful of the larger State-chartered banks have failed to seek membership in the System.

There is a possible alternate course for dealing with the problems both of equity and of effective monetary controls. This would be to require mandatory membership in the Federal Reserve System for all commercial banks or at least for all insured commercial banks. This course would not, however, fully meet the problem of equity. Most of the smaller banks would nevertheless find it necessary to maintain their correspondent relationships at the expense of additional idle balances. Moreover, since the reserve requirements imposed under State law are less onerous than those which apply to member banks, mandatory membership would represent a severe added burden to banks which are not now members of the System. For this reason, any proposal to make membership in the Federal Reserve System mandatory for all banks would necessitate a revision of reserve-requirements policy.

While a case may be made either for mandatory or voluntary membership in the Federal Reserve System for all commercial banks, there is no justification for discriminating against national banks in this respect. The original purpose of the provision in the Federal Reserve Act requiring all national banks to become members of the System was to insure a sound starting point for the new Federal Reserve System. If membership had been made optional for all it might have been years before the System became established as banks joined one by one. On the other hand, serious constitutional questions might have arisen in the face of a provision requiring all State banks to become members of a Federal instrumentality. Consequently, all national banks became mandatory members of the new System and State banks were given the option of joining or remaining without the System. The time has come to redress this inequity that was necessary in 1913, the purpose of which has long since become invalid. The Federal Reserve System today is strong and sound so the national banks which are subject to all laws affecting their State competitors should be accorded equal treatment in this important matter. Whatever may have been the need for such discrimination at the time the Federal Reserve System was founded it is no longer required and cannot be supported.

WE MUST NOT LOSE SIGHT OF CUBA

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Rogers] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, although the United States must maintain close watch on the developing situation in southeast Asia, the United States must not be diverted from the No. 1 problem affecting this hemisphere—namely Communist Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, with Under Secretary of State W. Averell Harriman en route to Moscow today to confer with the Kremlin on the southeast Asian situation, I am hopeful that the distinguished Under Secretary will also impress the Soviets with the continued firm determination of the United States to halt the march of communism in this hemisphere.

The renewed Communist activities in Asia signal a change in Sino-Soviet relations with the West. The past has shown us that the Communists cannot be trusted. The future depends on U.S. initiative.

I urge that the United States act to control communism in this hemisphere, and not be deceived into responding to the actions of the Communists in other parts of the globe.

A BILL TO CREATE A FEDERAL BANKING COMMISSION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H.R. 5874, to create a Federal Banking Commission.

This is a revision of H.R. 4253 which was introduced by me on February 26, 1963. The revision was necessary to make technical corrections of statutory citations and to correct grammatical errors. In a bill of this size and complexity, it was too much to hope that a first draft would be without such errors.

The Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee of which I have the honor to be chairman will hold hearings on the Banking Commission bill and on H.R. 729, the proposed Federal Deposit and Savings Insurance Board Act, on May 7, 8, 9, 10 and on May 13, 14, and 15.

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 710, TO AMEND THE BANKRUPTCY ACT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following is my testimony before Subcommittee 4 of the Judiciary Committee in support of my bill H.R. 710:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN ABRAHAM J. MULTER (DEMOCRAT, NEW YORK) BEFORE THE HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 710, APRIL 25, 1963

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before you and make a brief statement in support of H.R. 710 which I introduced on January 9, 1963.

I have introduced several bills over the past 15 years to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to the provision for priority of debts owed by a bankrupt for wages and commissions. The provisions contained in the present law are inadequate and outmoded.

The bill which is now before you does not alter the time limit of 3 months on earnings which are given priority. It proposes primarily to increase the dollar limitation on wages entitled to priority payment from $600 to $1,000.

I have also proposed to insert the word "salaries" after the word "wages." We know that these words are now often used almost interchangeably. When the original bill was enacted into law, in 1898, the term wages was applied more generally to all paid employees. In more recent times the term salary has been given the connotation of those employees paid on a weekly, biweekly, monthly or some other similar basis and the term wages has been applied to those paid on an hourly basis. This portion of the amendment is recommended to update the terminology of the law.

I have further proposed that the term "or became payable" be inserted in clause (2). The original act did not cover salesmen in its provisions for priority payment of wages. However, the act was amended in 1906 to include salesmen having a priority to claims for commissions earned along with other wage earners.

Since that time there has been a great change in the mercantile and selling process. The expansion of credit has given rise to installment buying. This trend increases annually. We generally think of installment buying in the field of consumer goods only, but there exists much of it and in many varied forms among business companies. This increased use of installment selling has changed the role of the salesman.

Many modern salesmen do not receive their commissions at time of sales, rather they are often related to payments for the goods sold. Thus these salesmen become creditors having a claim to a percentage of the receipts of the company even though the sales may have been made a year before. In such a case we might consider that a salesman earns his commission in two stages, one part is the selling of the product and the second part is contingent upon receipt of payment for the product. As the installment payments spread a salesman's commission over a long period, we should consider that any commissions becoming payable in the 3-month interim before bankruptcy action is a valid claim for earnings of that period even though the sale may have been made many months prior thereto.

In the Bankruptcy Act there are several types of debts that have priority and must be paid out of the bankrupt estate before dividends can be paid to the general creditors. All of these debts having priority of payment must be paid in full except one—the claims for wages and commissions which are limited to $600 per claimant. The $600 limitation was established in the 1926 amendment to this act.

I am sure that all of us will agree that one of the prime values of any law rests in its applicability to the current times. Can we consider a limitation of $600 on priority claims for wages of employees established in 1926 to be realistic or equitable in 1963?

The present Bankruptcy Act was established by Congress in 1898 and a limitation of $300 was placed on individual employee claims entitled to priority payment. In 1926 this figure was doubled—there has been no change in the dollar limitation since.

On February 18, 1898, Representative Sulzer speaking in support of the bankruptcy bill on the House floor praised "the provision that gives a preference to and carefully safeguards the wages of employees and the rights of the producers and wage earners of the country. Under the provisions of this bill these worthy people are absolutely protected in every respect and every safeguard is thrown around their rights to protect their wages and earnings."

Here Mr. Sulzer was speaking of the $300 limitation which would adequately cover the earnings of most employees for a 3-month period. Actually this amount would exceed most employees earnings at that time.

The $300 limitation of 1898 would cover the earnings of the average manufacturing employee's wages for 1,470 hours of work; whereas the present $600 limitation would cover only 251 hours of the average manufacturing employee's wages.

Even though Congress doubled the dollar limitation from $300 to $600 in 1926 this was even then inadequate when compared to the 1898 relative position of earnings and cost of living. During this interim the Consumer Price Index increased 138 percent and the hourly wage rate of manufacturing employees increased 217 percent.

For 37 years we have allowed this inequity to grow larger and larger. Let us take a look at some of the changes since 1926. The Consumer Price Index has increased 72 percent and the hourly wages of manufacturing employees have increased 269 percent. Thus starting with an inequity in 1926 we have made no provisions to update the law and provide safeguards for the rights of employees in bankruptcy cases.

I would be among the first to admit that the $1,000 limitation proposed is neither adequate, proper, nor equitable; however, I do feel that this is a step in the right direction and is definitely a great improvement over our present woefully inadequate $600 limitation. To leave this archaic discrimination against employees and salesmen in effect would be injurious to a worthy and honorable element of our society.

We saw a reduction in the number of failures from 17,075 in 1961 to 15,782 in 1962; however, there was a rise in the dollar volume of liabilities. These failures represent many honest employees who were not properly protected. By leaving the present limitation in effect we are encouraging employees to leave their employers if they discern that bankruptcy is probable. The loss of a few key employees at such a time would almost assure bankruptcy. Yet how can anyone expect employees to continue to work when there are inadequate provisions for their protection in case of bankruptcy? Thus, we may through our own inaction increase the number of bankruptcies in the country.

Again I urge that Congress take action to improve the safeguards of employers in bankrupt cases. From 1898 to present our Consumer Price Index has increased by more than four times and the average hourly wages of manufacturing employees have increased almost 12 times. However, we have only doubled the dollar limitation of employees' priority to claims for wages and that was 37 years ago.

The $300 limitation established in the original act would have covered 1,470 hours of work for the average manufacturing employee, today even increasing the limitation to $1,000 we will be covering only approximately 418 hours of work for the average manufacturing employee. Thus we can easily see how outdated this provision of the act is, and how essential it is for the Congress to take action to bring it more in accord with the realities of today.

I urge that H.R. 710 therefore be approved by this committee so that its enactment can be achieved this year.

Thank you for your permitting me to submit my views to you.

WASHINGTON CRIME

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, April 15, more than 12,000 Negroes visited Glen Echo Amusement Park which is situated in Montgomery County, Md., only a few miles from the District line. From all reports, it would appear that the vast majority of these Glen Echo visitors were children of school age from Washington.

I am informed that the Monday following Easter is a school holiday for the Washington public schools. Nearly every year, roaming gangs of Negroes create serious disturbances in Washington or its environs on Easter Monday.

Although a dangerous and explosive situation developed at Glen Echo and several felonies were committed, the Washington Post got around to reporting these felonies on April 24 and referred to them as "minor disturbances."

The Montgomery County Police Department lists the following violations of law which occurred at Glen Echo on April 15:

1. A visiting student from New York State reported the theft of her wallet and cash, and advised she suspected numerous colored people, who were surrounding her while she was waiting to get on a ride.

2. A busdriver for the D.C. Transit Co. reports the loss of $30 while operating his bus on Massachusetts Avenue near Goldsboro Road. This theft is alleged to have been committed by three colored males, who fled the bus when he stopped at a stop sign at the above mentioned location.

3. The Glen Echo Park Co. reports one of their pinball machines, located in Sport Land, was forcibly entered by a large group of colored males.

4. The B. & B. Catering Co., operator of a refreshment stand in the park, reported the larceny, in excess of $100, of funds from the cash register by three to five unknown colored males.

5. A lady's wallet was found discarded in the ladies' lavatory of the Park Co.

6. A teenager reported the theft of his wallet from his rear pants pocket, while standing in a line at the roller coaster. He advised he was surrounded by colored persons at the time this theft occurred. His wallet contained $8.

7. We also have knowledge of the Burns Detective Agency people handling approximately 25 persons for minor acts of disorderliness, consisting of failure to turn in tickets on the rides, jumping railings to avoid giving tickets for the ride, and questioning the authority of the Burns' people. There were also instances where merchandise displayed on outside stands around places such as the gift shops and the popcorn stands, were taken by passing people.

The Washington Evening Star finally printed a related article on April 24 on page E6. That was on the sixth page of the fifth section of the Star.

At least six serious, felonious crimes were committed at Glen Echo that day. The Washington Post described them as minor disturbances and the Star failed to mention them.

This is an example of the type of slanted journalism practiced by Washington newspapers.

Last year, through the efforts of professional agitators, certain Government officials and others who refuse to recognize the existence of racial differences, Glen Echo was compelled to admit Negroes. Prior to that time, only white persons were admitted to the amusement park. Now, the park has become resegregated, inasmuch as most white persons no longer care to patronize this park because of the present intolerable conditions. According to the Montgomery police, 95 to 98 percent of the persons admitted to Glen Echo that day were Negro.

On the morning of April 15, two schoolbus loads of children from a southern State, who were visiting Washington, had to leave the park in the face of impending trouble. They had come to the Nation's Capital to enjoy its historical and cultural advantages but had to abandon their recreational pursuit in the face of the behavior of these young hoodlums, most of whom were Washington schoolchildren.

Because of the violence of Glen Echo and at the Washington Stadium, I would suggest that the management of those two enterprises adopt a strict segregation policy so as to protect white persons who wish to visit them.

I make this suggestion because so far desegregation in the National Capital has resulted in de facto segregation anyway. This means, of course, that white people are now denied the opportunity to attend recreational events in their own National Capital.

OUR POLICY ON CUBA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from new Jersey [Mr. WALLHAUSER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, the United States has been concerned with the problem of Cuba periodically throughout our history. We know that the concern now is greater than it has ever been as the threat of communism hangs heavy over all of our Western Hemisphere.

Because of its location and proximity, Cuba has been recognized as an important element in our strategic national security. The importance of it has increased with the development of military weapons, modes of transportation, and last—but not least—techniques in sabotage, subversion and the infiltration of the minds of the people.

We, as citizens of the United States of America, are concerned not only for our Nation, but also for all nations in the Western Hemisphere, as Cuba is a major threat to the entire hemisphere because of its binding ties with Soviet Russia. Yet, Mr. Speaker, in noting the apparent lack of interest and action by many nations in the hemisphere, I wonder if the nations to the south of us fully comprehend the situation and the threat to them and their people.

The question naturally arises, what have we, as a nation, done through those agencies of government charged with carrying out foreign policy to alert and enlist the Latin American nations in a common cause to eliminate communism from the Western Hemisphere with all of its ugly and slave-encompassing intentions and actions.

I do not question that some attempt has been made to enlist nations of the Western Hemisphere in this effort, but I doubt that we have used every effective means at our command to bring this about. The time for platitudes and pussyfooting has long since passed. It now is the time for presenting of hard facts. It is time for determined action to bring about a cohesive and effective team effort. This action cannot wait.

Under our Constitution, Mr. Speaker, the carrying out of foreign policy is vested in the President. I am sure that whatever action he decides to take in this area will be wholeheartedly supported by the people and the Congress of the United States, for all of us are deeply concerned over what is transpiring today, but before the final decision is made we have a duty to express opinions and give what might be constructive suggestions.

With the advent of a Communist regime in Cuba, it became an ideological challenge; with the advent of Soviet military presence there, it became a military one. We are aware of this and the leaders of the Latin American nations must be exhorted to assist in meeting this challenge.

Americans are united today on three points. First, that the Soviet military presence in Cuba is undesirable; second, that Fidel Castro's government is undesirable, and third, that Cuba must be returned to the Cubans under a democratic, representative, free government. We believe in this and the leaders of the Latin American nations must believe it.

Mr. Speaker, the Cuban situation is a critical challenge to the United States of America. Our future, and the future of the entire Western Hemisphere is at stake. Our prestige throughout the world is at stake. A lack of prestige, as we all know, can have a disastrous effect in our dealings with all nations be they our friends, neutrals or those walking a tightrope on the decision they must ultimately make—alinement with the free world or with the Communist world.

An indecisive United States of America will not present a pretty picture to the world. If we cannot achieve leadership in the Western Hemisphere, how can we, as a Nation, expect to continue our influence as a leader of nations in other parts of the world?

The existence of Cuba as a Communist nation, just 90 miles from our shores, and the presence of Russian military forces in the island is our challenge of today.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, we also have another challenge as relates to Cuba and I believe little or no attention has been paid to it. The decision on this challenge likewise cannot wait. The steps we may take, in conjunction with the Organization of American States, may well determine the future and development of a new Cuba when the Communists are driven from the Pearl of the Antilles.

It, of course, might be termed a long-range challenge. What is done now or not done now will provide the answer as to how we will meet it. If we sit idly by, the result, after the Communists are driven from the island, likely will be a floundering nation wracked by poverty and with no unified national aims. It would be a nation unable to achieve its rightful place as a strong and thriving member of the Western Hemisphere and the free world.

Therefore, it is worthwhile to think through briefly just what our goal is in Cuba, and think about some of the things that can be done now, so that when today's problems are solved, we will not find ourselves facing bewildering new ones tomorrow. Today's problems are how to get rid of the Soviets and Fidel Castro in Cuba. Tomorrow's will be how to deal with, guide and help with the construction of the new Cuba which must eventually emerge.

I think our long-range object, or goal, with regard to Cuba can be stated quite simply. It is the establishment of a successful, representative, honest government there with which we can deal on a mutually honorable basis. The Alliance for Progress distills the essence of what we hope for in our relations with our Latin American neighbors; we are sympathetic with their efforts to improve social and and economic conditions. But the members of the Alliance recognize that self-help and mutual respect are necessary ingredients in that process.

Our problem is that there is no such government in Cuba with which we can deal and that we have taken no positive steps to insure that the post-Castro government will be of such a nature. Put another way, forming and running a representative, democratic government in Cuba, after Castro, is going to be a difficult proposition. Are there steps which we can take now which will help insure the success of such a new Cuban political regime? I believe there are—and I would like to discuss one today. It is the recognition by the United States of a Cuban National Council set up under the authority, protection and advice of the Organization of American States.

When a resolution was introduced in the Senate last September calling for the establishment of a government-in-exile there was a flurry of debate about the idea, certain objections were raised, and it was just beginning to crystallize when the October crisis lessened interest in it. Now, of course, recent outbreaks in the ranks of Cuban exiles living in the United States has revived talk of recognition of a government-in-exile if the various factions involved can find a way to live under one roof and act in a cooperative manner with those who are seeking to help them.

Today, I raise the issue again, but with a new approach. For it to be successful we must call upon the Organization of American States to cooperate with us fully and wholeheartedly. The stakes for the member nations of that organization are great and through leadership we must convince them of that.

It is time for the Organization of American States to take constructive steps to help bring together all factions so that a responsible leadership may be set up to meet the present crisis and the future of Cuba.

It is my belief that arguments raised so far in support of the idea for a government-in-exile fall short of the full potential which the recognition of such a government or a national council possesses. It is my hope that a broadening of the base of these arguments will raise enough discussion, and win over enough adherents to this idea for a national council, so that some action may be taken by the Congress which will be constructive in the light of our long-range goals in Cuba.

Let us leave to the international lawyers the question of whether such a government or council should be recognized as insurgent, belligerent, or as any other limited or conditional category of government. Let us assume that if we decide to take such a step that we can find the most advantageous way to do it in the eyes of the international community. Let us look beyond this to the reasons why we might want to recognize a Cuban national council.

It is my belief that it would accomplish the following:

First. Provide a rallying point for the Cuban refugees in the hemisphere.

Second. Provide a legal and effective instrument through which this and other governments could offer material and financial aid in the fight to regain Cuba's freedom.

Third. Provide a focal point of communication with the freedom-loving resistance fighters still carrying on inside of Cuba.

Fourth. Assure the Cuban people and the world that the United States is not accepting the Castro government as the permanent government of Cuba.

Fifth. Lay the basis of legal domestic support for the activities of the Cuban refugees. At present, our immigration and Coast Guard authorities must enforce strict curtailments on the activities of refugees who are trying in various ways to fight Castro.

Now, those who oppose recognition of a Cuban government-in-exile per se for various reasons have come up with certain arguments against the idea which deserve consideration and answer. In particular, the Department of State has put forward several reasons for not supporting such a move which I would like to examine at this time.

First, the State Department claims that it is their custom to recognize a government-in-exile only when it has direct contact with, or contains members of, the prior government of the territory in question. As, for example, was the case in World War II when many governments, or parts of them, fled their countries in the face of Nazi invasions—then, we could legitimately recognize a government-in-exile. In other words, the State Department claims that a government should constitute a government before being driven from its territory in order for us to recognize that it is in exile.

I suggest that the State Department examine its own files, and do a little homework on the diplomatic history of the United States. During World War I, a Czechoslovak National Council was formed for the purpose of waging a war of independence from the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Czechoslovakia was not even a separate State. The Council was formed right here in the United States, by means of the Cleveland Agreement of 1915 and the Pittsburgh Pact of 1918, which served to unify splintered exile groups. The United States recognized the Czechoslovak National Council as a de facto belligerent government on September 3, 1918, several weeks before the end of the war.

Also, during World War I a Polish National Committee was formed under the leadership of Paderewski, with the cooperation and aid of the Polish movement in Chicago. Poland had been under Russian occupation since 1863, and therefore was not even a free state, let alone self-governed. But on November 1, 1918, the United States recognized the Polish Army, under the Polish National Committee, as a cobelligerent. In neither of these cases did a government as such exist on the territory of the country involved which had any connection with the governments which we recognized.

During World War II a Polish government-in-exile was formed, following the Nazi occupation of Poland. But this was not the pre-Nazi government transplanted, for the Germans caught and detained most of the Polish leaders. This government, which the United States recognized, was composed of other Polish leaders.

The most famous example of a government-in-exile, which the State Department has apparently forgotten, is that of Gen. Charles de Gaulle during World War II. While we did not extend him recognition as "a government of France," we did recognize in August of 1943 that his French Committee of National Liberation was administering certain French oversea territories. Formal diplomatic relations were resumed after he formed a new French Government of National Unity in 1944 in his newly liberated homeland.

Therefore, the arguments of the State Department that there is no precedent for such a recognition seem to me to be rather weak.

The second major argument against recognition of a government-in-exile given by the Department of State is that such a move might cause Castro to react by abrogating the Guantanamo Treaty, or refusing to accept any representation from us through the Swiss Embassy in Havana, so that we would lose contact with his government. This would mean that we could no longer exercise diplomatic means of defending the rights of U.S. citizens still in Cuba, or such Americans as those shipwrecked skindivers recently washed ashore in Cuba.

Now, again, this argument seems weak to me. It is a universally accepted principle of international law that treaties bind States. That is, the State of Cuba is what is bound by the Guantanamo Treaty. The government which happens to be representing that State at the moment is the government of Fidel Castro. We hold his government responsible for the obligations and duties of the Cuban State. Now it is another accepted principle of international law that rupture of diplomatic relations does not constitute withdrawal of recognition of the government concerned. We still recognize Castro as the government responsible for Cuba's international conduct. But the recognition of a Cuban government-in-exile, while it may anger Castro, would not constitute a negation of his responsibilities for the conduct of Cuban affairs. This is because his is already recognized by the whole world as the existing government of Cuba. The recognition of a government-in-exile for limited purposes, which would have to be specified in the recognition proclamation, would in no sense imply that we were holding anyone but Fidel Castro responsible for events in Cuba. Besides, let us be honest about this. It is not a treaty which keeps Castro from marching onto our base at Guantanamo. It is the Armed Forces of the United States.

As far as our representation in Havana is concerned, I think we have already lost contact with Castro, and no effective communication can occur between his government and ours, government-in-exile or no government-in-exile.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of State also gives as a reason for their reluctance to recognize a Cuban revolutionary government-in-exile the fact that the refugees are too splintered to form an effective unity. May I remind you that this was the case with the Czechoslovak exiles that Masaryk formed into a government in 1918; it was true of the Polish exiles that finally rallied around Paderewski during World War I; and it was true of the Free French, who were only unified after the most strenuous exertion of leadership on the part of Gen. Charles de Gaulle. It is precisely the promise of recognition that the Cuban refugees need to draw them together in a serious, responsible effort to be of service to the Republic of Cuba.

Finally, there are concerned observers of the Cuban situation who feel that the recognition of a Cuban government-in-exile would have an adverse reaction on the underground movement which stayed behind to fight Castro. Such recognition, some feel, would make it appear that the United States was favoring a group of refugees over the underground, and might install this exile group in power in Cuba once Castro fell. This is a serious problem, and must be treated forthrightly and with great care. I suggest that many of the problems could be solved in this move by eliminating the title "Government-in-Exile." Remember that in World War I we dealt with what was called the Czechoslovak National Council and the Polish National Committee. These groups were formed not to be imposed as governments in their captive territories, but to obtain the liberation of their homeland. We must not let the Cuban people think that we are going to preempt their right to elect their own government once they are freed of Communist domination.

It seems to me that one way to settle this problem would be to recognize the national council on the condition that they agree that once Castro is overthrown and they return to Cuba, that they will not exercise all the rights of a constitutional government, but rather will agree to serve in an administrative capacity under the supervision of the Organization of American States. At the end of an agreed interim period, free and open elections would be held. This is the kind of approach which I think we should discuss and have clearly understood prior to the recognition of any exile group.

Concerning the long-range benefits of recognition, I think that one of the most important would be that we need to be training people for us to work with in the post-Castro era in Cuba. The new Cuba will definitely be eligible for immediate aid under the Alliance for Progress, since we will certainly be committed to helping the Cubans wipe out the disasterous effects of Castro's economic policies. If we recognize a national council, they could set up a provisional ministry of economics to organize recovery planning for the post-Castro era, train economists and administrators, and perhaps even take part in a program which we could set up to familiarize them with the assistance available from AID, the Inter-American Development Bank, the Export-Import Bank, and so forth. We could do the same thing in public health, education, agriculture, and other fields of public administration. This would mean that in the immediate aftermath of the overthrow of Castro, a trained group of administrators would be available to the Cuban people, to utilize in the initial rebuilding task. In this way, the refugees would show their desire to contribute to the progressive construction of a new and free Cuba. Hopefully, many of these people would retain important government posts following free Cuban elections. The United States would find it convenient and easy to work with them through our foreign aid program, and there would be a high level of mutual understanding and respect.

I would like to close by saying that what I have attempted to do today is to open debate on the recognition of a Cuban national council on a responsible basis. I realize that some of the arguments I have mentioned are debatable, and that is precisely why they have been raised. Because I believe that, if the Congress seriously concerns itself with the pros and cons of this matter, that it will determine in a sound and sober way that there will be considerable advantages to the Cuban people, to the Cuban exiles, and to the United States, in the recognition of such national council. It is in the interest of contributing to such a determination that these thoughts are offered today to the Members of this distinguished body.

SAVE PUBLIC HOUSING

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. public housing program is about to come to a standstill. Within a few months the ceiling on annual contributions to public housing agencies will be reached. The Housing Act of 1937, as amended, imposes a limitation of $336 million per year on Federal contributions to public housing agencies. In addition, no State may receive more than 15 percent of contributions authorized after July 1, 1961.

Today I have introduced legislation embodied in two bills to amend the Housing Act of 1937, as amended, to remove these two restrictions.

This legislation is desperately needed. By June 30 of this year New York State will have reached the 15-percent limitation and exhausted its quota of units available under the act. Unless the 15-percent restriction is removed, there will be no more federally assisted public housing in New York. And unless the $336 million limitation upon annual contributions is removed, the quota of units for the entire country will be exhausted at about the same time.

The Housing Act of 1961 contemplated an additional 100,000 units of public housing. Contracts, reservations, and applications under consideration already exceed that figure.

Mr. Speaker, last September 1 marked the 25th anniversary of the signing of the Housing Act of 1937 by President Franklin D. Roosevelt. Public housing has played a crucial role in the fight against the social and economic evils of slums and has provided decent housing in a healthful environment for millions of our fellow citizens. The program must not be allowed to lapse in the face of unmet national needs.

In New York City the need for further public housing is acute. Mayor Wagner, on February 8, 1963, in a speech before the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officers spelled out this need:

> We still have slums in New York City. In fact, according to the 1960 census more than 500,000 housing units in New York City are deteriorating or in substandard condition. More than 276,000 such units are dilapidated or without essential plumbing facilities. Moreover, according to the 1960 census, and here is a key fact, 79 percent of all families now living in substandard quarters have incomes of less than $5,000 per year * * *. In summary, there are a minimum of 200,000 ill-housed low income families in New York City whose only prospect for improving their housing consists of low rent public housing.

The New York City Housing Authority estimates that New York City needs at a bare minimum 20,000 units a year for the next 10 years in order to meet the desperate shortage of low income housing. The State administration's policy has accentuated the city's shortage. The State does not favor low rent public housing in New York City. Out of $60 million available to the State for public housing New York City received in 1962 approximately $6 million. The State allocated about 10 percent of available State public housing funds to New York City.

Private builders will not construct low-rent housing. According to a recent study published by the Metropolitan Housing and Planning Council of Chicago, private builders are having no success in providing a decent home and a suitable living environment for low-income families. The council states:

> The prices which home builders must charge for their product limits their market to an upper income group which cannot absorb more housing than is now being produced for its use. The purchase prices of new homes, as measured by dwellings insured by the Federal Housing Administration, have increased by 61 percent in the last 11 years, although the cost of living in general has increased by only 29 percent. The continued rise in mortgage interest rates in the last 7 years has increased the monthly payments of potential purchasers and renters, thus further limiting the market for new housing.

It is often said that a State or municipality should do something to help itself. I certainly agree. New York City has an active public housing program. New York City has a total of 138,053 low-rent public housing units. Of that total 50,631 are State aided and 27,702 are city aided. This means that almost 57 percent of the public housing units were built with State and local funds.

New York's housing needs are great. New York State is now trying to house 7 percent of the Nation's Negroes, 10 percent of the Nation's aged, and 22 percent of our foreign born. Some half million Negroes have migrated to New York from the South, more than to any other State, except California. There are now 350 people per square mile in New York as opposed to the national average of 50 per square mile. The States needing little public housing are usually low in density—Wyoming has but 3.4 people per square mile—while those needing public housing are extremely concentrated like New York.

A survey of the 1960 census of housing shows that in New York City the number of sound housing units with all plumbing facilities increased significantly, but there was also a more significant increase in the number of deteriorating, dilapidated, or substandard units. In 1950 less than 15 percent of all units fell in this category. By 1960 more than 20 percent did.

Mr. Speaker, unless the present limitations on annual contributions are removed, we will witness the demise of the public housing program in a very short time. It is ironical that 1962 marked the 25th anniversary of public housing—and 1963, 1 year later, may mark its doom.

During these 25 years the low-rent program has provided housing for approximately 7 million persons. Today about 2 million persons are living in the more than 525,000 homes produced under the program. More than half of them are minors. Nearly half of the presently scheduled homes are to be designed especially for use by elderly persons.

Every State in the Union, with the exception of four, has participated in the public housing program. Among the leading recipients of the benefits are Alabama and Georgia, California and Texas, New Jersey and Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, Massachusetts, Louisiana, and my own State of New York. No section of the country has failed to take part in the program.

The progress report on Federal housing programs, issued by HHFA in August 1962, gave the following comprehensive picture of the status of the public housing program since the Housing Act of 1961 made it possible to commit the full $336 million in annual contributions:

> Since enactment of the 1961 act, 117 new municipal housing authorities have been created and 17 county housing authorities. The municipal authorities are located as follows: 47 in rural places; 44 in communities of under 10,000 inhabitants; 21 in communities with between 10,000 and 49,000; 4 in 50,000 to 99,000 category; and 1 in a city of 126,000.

At the time of the progress report of 1962, 35,000 units had been put under program reservation; that figure has now risen to 58,000. The 1962 report listed 23,199 units under annual contribution contracts; we now have 32,000 in this category. In other words, 90,000 units out of a contemplated 100,000 units have already been committed. Thousands of applications for projects are backlogged at FHA, which will never be granted if the limitations on the public housing program are not removed.

We cannot even be sure that 10,000 more units will result from the uncommitted balance. The estimate that 100,000 units could be built under the Housing Act of 1961 was based on 1960 construction costs which were indexed at 103.9—1957-59=100—for residences and 106.3 for apartments. The latest Commerce Department figures show residences now stand at 106.3 and apartments at 108.8. This represents an all-time high in both categories, and there is every reason to believe that this upward trend in construction costs will continue in 1963. It is clear that public housing may not even reach its hoped for expansion of 100,000 units before the present authorization is exhausted.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that Congress provide the legislation necessary to continue this important program. Otherwise, there will be no more low-income housing forthcoming. Public housing has served about 7 million families and stimulated $6.3 billion in dwelling construction and is now in the process of implementing progressive new programs that will have far-reaching effects. After 25 years of comparative success in meeting some of the most urgent needs of our Nation, it now faces impending oblivion. We cannot allow this program to lapse, particularly not in our largest city which faces our largest housing problems. We cannot allow thousands of families to go unhoused.

We must recognize the emergency and act now.

THE PHILIPPINES CLAIMS AFFAIR

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include certain editorials.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the recent Senate Foreign Relations Committee disclosure of $150,000 in fees to a Philippine sugar and war claims lobbyist for his work in obtaining congressional approval of the $73 million Philippine war claims bill was one of the most shocking cases on record of improper interference with the legislative process. The further disclosure of the political contributions made by this lobbyist during congressional consideration of this legislation adds fury to the fume.

On May 9, 1962, the House voted down the $73 million Philippine claims bill after an extensive public debate. During the course of the discussion on the legislation, it was apparent that some opposition to the bill was generated by some Members of Congress from tobacco growing States who resented an embargo on a shipment of American tobacco to the Philippines.

I was among those Members of this body who opposed the legislation because of instinctive fear that the $73 million payment would end up in the pockets of persons who had purchased the claims or to whom the claims had been assigned for a fraction of original value. The bill simply did not look right. There are many occasions in which the legislator with limited access to facts and under the pressure of business simply opposes legislation which does not seem right.

Immediately after this legislation was rejected, newspapers all over the country bombarded this body for its dereliction of responsibility to our Philippine friends. The following are examples of the editorial barrage to which Congressmen were exposed who dared to question the Philippine payment bill:

[From the San Francisco Examiner, May 16, 1962]

UNFRIENDLY MOVE

Congressional action in disapproving war damage claims by the Philippines just doesn't make sense.

The Philippines are our firm ally in Asia; our bonds are tempered in tradition and battle.

In a surprise move, the House of Representatives has turned down—201 to 171—a bill to pay the Philippines $73 million. The funds would have completed our payments on claims arising from World War II combat between American and Japanese forces.

On the other hand, torrents of dollars are flowing to alleged neutrals and other nations of dubious attitudes toward the United States.

In the Philippines, the reaction is bitter. Vice President Emmanuel Palaez rightly comments that "it seems the United States treats her friends more shabbily than those who are not with her."

President Kennedy has expressed regret over the House action even before President Diosdados Macapagal canceled his visit to the United States next month.

We are happy to note that there is a move afoot in Congress to reintroduce the payment bill at this session. We urge all Representatives and Senators to heal this rift between friends.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, May 15, 1962]

CONGRESS SLAPS A VALUED ALLY

Congress, through stupidity, ignorance, or both, has welched on a promised $73 million war damage payment to the Philippines—alienating a highly valued ally at a time of dangerous crisis in nearby Laos.

Philippine President Diosdado Macapagal, who was elected on a strong pro-American platform, has postponed indefinitely his scheduled June 19 good will trip to Washington, explaining: "Our people would never understand how, under the circumstances, I could go to the United States and dwell on the subject of good will. At this present moment, the word will sound empty."

The war-damage bill, rejected 201 to 171 by the House of Representatives, would have fulfilled a 10-year-old promise to repay 86,000 Filipino claimants for losses suffered in World War II. American as well as Japanese shells and bombs wiped out many a Philippine business and farm. Payment had been pledged by an earlier act of Congress itself.

The rejection was "due to lack of understanding," a cosponsor of the payment bill explained charitably. Some uninformed opponents called it a handout.

President Kennedy, terming the rejection "a gross misunderstanding," promised to fight for quick action to rectify the blunder. The payment—trivial by comparison with U.S. foreign aid to many a less friendly nation—is a moral obligation that must be met, he said.

A second effort to honor this obligation will begin in Congress this week, and a score of Congressmen who opposed the payment are reportedly ready to change their votes. We hope so, from strategic as well as moral considerations.

With Communist offensives taking over more and more of southeast Asia, the Philippines has, until now, been a reassuringly solid foe of that Red expansion. We suggest that Congressmen stop shooting down one of the few allies the United States has left in that hot war area of the uneasy world.

[From the Washington Post, May 14, 1962]

REBUFF TO OUR FRIENDS

The House of Representatives was suffering from the political jitters when it rejected the Philippines war-damage bill. The justice of payments by this country to compensate the Filipino people for damages caused by American military forces in driving the Japanese out of the islands in World War II was fully recognized by Congress in passing the Philippine Rehabilitation Act in 1946. The question at issue in the House was the appropriation of $73 million to complete the payment of these claims. To reject the final payment after the claims have been established comes close to being an act of bad faith.

This is not, of course, the first time that Congress has failed to meet its obligation. Three successive administrations have tried to secure funds to complete these payments to the Philippines. The present performance is especially inexcusable, however, because the House rejected the bill in a rollcall vote after tentatively approving it. And its thoughtless slap at the Philippines comes only 6 weeks before President Diosdado Macapagal is scheduled to visit this country.

President Kennedy has sought to minimize the damage by urging President Macapagal to come in spite of his disappointment. The new chief executive in Manila must know that this action of an economy-minded House does not reflect any unfriendliness on the part of the American people. Nevertheless, it is most unfortunate that the House should turn down the payment of a debt to our good friend and protege in the Pacific merely because an election is in the offing.

The administration should find a way to reverse this decision if it is at all possible.

[From the New York Times, May 18, 1962]

Justice to the Philippines

One of the saddest incidents in the postwar relationships of the United States and the Philippines Republic was the House rejection last week by a vote of 201 to 171 of $73 million worth of Philippines World War II damage claims. To Philippines President Macapagal the vote seemed a slap in the face, and he decided to postpone indefinitely the state visit he had planned to this country. Vice President and Foreign Secretary Emmanuel Palaez made the bitter comment that "the United States treats her friends more shabbily than those who are not with her."

Now the House Foreign Affairs Committee has taken steps to undo last week's action. The bill had evidently not been adequately discussed in committee or on the floor; and certainly some of the blame for the whole mess belongs to the House leadership. Many Representatives must have voted against the bill on the grounds that most of the money would not go to help the Filipinos but would fall into the hands of American-owned corporations which did not need to be rehabilitated.

The administration has now approved two important changes: First, to require recipients of payments to use them only for the economic benefit of the Filipinos; second, to stipulate that all payments be completed within a year. Surely it is possible to see that this money is carefully and honestly spent, and we believe President Macapagal's administration is eager to see this done.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, May 17, 1962]

Discharge the Philippine Debt

After World War II the U.S. Congress enacted the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946. It established a War Damage Commission and authorized $400 million for payment of claims. The object was to make payment in full of losses up to $500 and payments up to 75 percent of awards above that figure.

Representative Walter H. Judd, then a member of the Insular Affairs Committee, recalls that no one then knew what the claims would total. The committee decided to ask for $400 million and come back for $100 million more if needed. As it turned out, this covered 52½ percent of the claims, leaving 22½ percent due under the 75-percent formula.

For several years various administrations have come back to Congress asking $73 million to discharge this implied obligation. Members of the House of Representatives who voted down this bill last week gave persuasive reasons for their opposition to it—but none which would offset the impression, especially among Filipinos, that the United States was failing in a commitment to a most loyal ally.

It is true that American aid to the Philippines since the war has totaled $1,765 million; that only $550 million in reparations was collected from the Japanese, who invaded the islands; and that development projects may at this time be more important to the Philippine economy than war damage restitution.

Yet many of the thousands of corporate and individual claimants already have made investments up to the 75 percent they expected to receive. If the money were given to the Philippine Government, it probably would distribute it to the same claimants. And use of the money by them would surely benefit the economy of a republic which is a free world bastion in these days of Chinese Communist threats to Southeast Asia.

Completion of payment of the Philippine war damage awards would be one of the best proofs the United States could offer that it honors a moral responsibility.

[From the Washington Evening Star, May 14, 1962]

Dishonoring a Just Debt

We share the dismay of Philippine officials over the unjustified repudiation by the House of the $73 million debt still owed the Philippines under terms of a 1946 War Damage Reparations Act. Emmanuel Pelaez, Philippine Vice President and Foreign Secretary, had reason, we think, to describe the House rejection of the claim as "shabby treatment" of a longtime friend and ally.

The appropriation sought by the administration was to have settled remaining claims growing out of damage inflicted on Philippine properties during World War II. Congress, after careful study of the situation a year after close of the war, authorized payment for the damage, but at the time appropriated insufficient money to meet all the awards approved by a United States-Philippines War Damage Commission.

Apparently most of the opposition during debate on the measure centered around awards to large firms, including a brewery and a racetrack corporation. However, all the awards have been held to be justified by the reparations commission and others who have investigated the claims. To default on the entire debt because of dissatisfaction of several Members of Congress with the nature of certain awards is to dishonor a national obligation in a manner that affronts our ally in the Far East. We hope the House will reverse its unwise action of last Thursday and that the Senate will give overwhelming approval of the bill.

[From the Los Angeles Times, May 14, 1962]

The Philippines Feel Short-Changed

The Philippine Republic is bitter over shabby treatment by the United States, and President Diosdado Macapagal hints at canceling his proposed trip to Washington.

The U.S. Congress has just rejected a bill appropriating $73 million in war damage payments to Philippine citizens who lost property in the Japanese invasion.

In view of the billions in U.S. largesse to Tito's Yugoslavia, Nasser's Egypt, and other dubious friends of the United States, the action is hard to understand.

The $73 million is not a handout, but a debt for which the United States is morally responsible. When the Japanese smashed through the islands, the United States was the "protecting power" under international law, as the Philippines were not then an autonomous nation.

The protecting power did not protect. Hence we are liable in justice. We acknowledged the debt by paying war damage claims soon after the war, but funds appropriated then were expended before all claims were settled.

The $73 million appropriation was to cover a deficiency judgment.

President Macapagal made no attempt to conceal Filipino displeasure. Several Filipino senators called for a break in diplomatic relations with the United States.

The breach is widened by ugly reports from Manila that a Philippine commission in Washington to urge passage of the $73 million appropriation was the victim of a shakedown by tobacco-State Senators.

The Filipinos were told that the bill would have a better chance of passage if the Philippines purchased U.S. tobacco.

The Filipinos bought $7 million worth of tobacco, which caused controversy when it landed in Manila. The incident did U.S. prestige no good.

The Philippines have been perhaps the most loyal ally we have had in the world. Her sons by thousands died with U.S. troops in 1941–45. Gen. Carlos Romulo, in the United Nations, stuck his country's neck out a mile in a speech flaying Khrushchev while defending U.S. policy.

And now we repay this devotion with pettiness. The U.S. image in Asia has been damaged.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, May 18, 1962]

Philippines War Damage Bill

Even though the $73 million Philippines war damage claims bill still faces opposition in the House, we are glad that Congress is getting a second chance to see justice done in this matter affecting our long-time friends and allies in Asia.

The revision of the bill during its second voyage through the Foreign Affairs Committee will, we believe, improve both the bill and its chances of passage. An amendment now requires that the funds voted (which are in addition to the $389 million already paid) shall be used for rehabilitation and economic improvement of the Philippines, not merely to repay corporations—largely American—that already have been rehabilitated. A major invitation to corrupt diversion of the money is thus eliminated.

We sympathize with Representative **Hays**, of Ohio, an opponent of the measure, who feels that President Macapagal's cancellation of a planned visit to the United States, in protest of the previous failure of the bill, amounts to "putting a gun at our heads." But, given the intensity of disappointment in the Philippines over this issue, if situations had been reversed, would not **Hays** or any responsible official have acted in the same way?

A principal point for Congress to bear in mind is the paradoxical, if cynical, feeling in odd corners of the world that a nation must have been an enemy of the United States to derive any benefits from it. Our generosity to fallen foes has given rise to this notion, but there is no need to advance it by lack of generosity to proven friends. Britain, France, and other allies are well aware this skepticism is nonsense.

And, after all, we promised, in 1946, to pay the money. So let's pay it.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, May 11, 1962]

We Snub Our Friends

The House of Representatives has given a demonstration of how to alienate our friends. By a vote of 201 to 171, it defeated a bill to pay $73 million in war damage claims to 86,000 claimants in the Philippines. As a result, anti-American feeling is running high in the island republic.

This was no economy move, mind you. The validity of the claims had already been acknowledged. The opposition was spearheaded by congressmen from tobacco-growing States who resented an embargo on a $7 million shipment of American tobacco to the Philippines. This embargo was lifted after the Philippine Supreme Court declared the shipment was legal.

Many members of the Philippine Legislature are now urging President Diosdada Macapagal to cancel his projected visit to the United States. Some are demanding recall of the Philippine Ambassador to the United States and a break in diplomatic relations.

Vice President Emmanuel Pelaez said the action of the U.S. House "would seem to support the view that one has to blackmail the Americans in order to get anything from them."

The House should reconsider its action or adopt the slogan: "Billions for lukewarm and

Communist-leaning neutrals, but not one cent for our proven friends."

Subsequently and because of the insistence of the administration and barrage of editorial clamor by the press this body passed out a modified version of the claims bill on August 1, 1962.

It seems to me, therefore, that the fourth estate must assume a considerable share of responsibility for the finally approved draft of the Philippine claims bill which poured $150,000 into the pockets of a skilled lobbyist who apparently knew how to draft the public press to provide powerful persuasion for his bill.

THE 15TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Rodino] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on Monday the 29th of April we in this body, and freemen throughout the world, will observe the happy anniversary of the founding of the great, progressive State of Israel. I had intended to join with my colleagues at that time in memorializing this happy event. However, I have just been named by the distinguished gentleman from New York who is chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary to attend the meeting in Geneva next week of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration. I shall, therefore, be absent from the House on Monday next. And for this reason, I have asked permission to deliver my tribute to our courageous, loyal ally at this time.

Each year, as the Israelis celebrate the anniversary of the independence of their nation, they are able to look back with pride at the accomplishments which have taken place during the intervening year. Each subsequent year since May 14, 1948, has been more progressive than the previous. For example, this past year saw an increase in industrial production of 13 percent, while citrus exports rose by 50 percent.

During a year, though, setbacks may be encountered. The unexpected death of the beloved President Izhak Ben-Zvi has left a void in the hearts of his fellow citizens and will certainly affect the independence celebrations which are to occur 1 week after his demise. The rise of the new Arab state on the flanks of Israel, which has also caused tension within the Middle Eastern area, may affect international trade and the balance of power. Yet, on the whole, the year has dealt kindly with the Israelis.

The struggle to reach the present economic state has been difficult. Confronted with immigration problems, hunger, unemployment, border skirmishes and underdevelopment, the Government officials have used every means to forward growth in their land. Leaning heavily upon the United States for financial and technical aid, and enforcing a strict austerity program, the Government succeeded in eliminating the basic problems and eventually take the initiative in development planning and operation. The results are self-evident. Wherever one travels today in this land of milk and honey, modern structures confront the viewer.

In Eilat an 11-story building rises majestically on the seacoast, a symbol of the new prosperity of this Red Sea port. In the Negev, three entirely new cities have been constructed to house the workers who labor in the nearby potash plants and marble quarries of the Dead Sea region. Beersheba, once the sleepy frontier town of the Negev, now claims 43,000 residents.

Industries in the major cities of Haifa, Tel-Aviv, and Jerusalem set the pace for economic expansion. Industrial production which in 1948 amounted to but $255 million, totaled $1,200 million in 1962. In all other fields, statistics would show familiar increases which have taken place during the past 15 years. The gross national product rose from $818 million to $2,075 million and exports grew from $29.7 million to $280 million.

The Government, democratic in design and structure, safeguards the rights and privileges of its people. It also assures them the maximum benefits available. Education is compulsory but free, thus attaining for the county a literate status comparable to Western standards. More and more young students are attending higher education facilities made available through the Government's annual budgetary measures. Those desiring vocational training in agriculture or industry are given the opportunity to attend the several excellent vocational institutes which now exist and which continue to grow with the country.

Because of the tremendous rate of immigrants, among whom were carriers of malaria, trachoma, and various sundry diseases, the need became great for medical facilities and doctors to protect those already in residence and curb the diseases in the newcomers. By 1962, there were 5,000 physicians practicing in Israel, with numerous medical institutions ready for training and research. The Hadassah Hebrew University Medical School, originally located on Mount Scopus but forced to rebuild elsewhere when the grounds fell into the hands of Jordanian troops, has already provided for approximately 10 percent of all practicing doctors. The reputation given to these graduates is reflected upon the school and enables it to claim the highest standards of any medical school in the Middle East. Today this rapid development of medicine has brought to even the remotest farm village adequate medical care.

Modern science has been the greatest boon to Israel's development; for without solar energy, irrigation of vast sandy areas would be nonexistent. Water, always in short supply, is now drawn from the sea and, through a cheap desalinization process, used in cultivating the succulent fruits and vegetables for which Israel has become famous. Science has also been responsible for the increases in yields of various agricultural crops, enabling the people to become almost self-sufficient with regard to food. Furthermore, through the use of modern scientific methods, the ancient copper mines of Timna, last mined during the time when Israel was a powerful kingdom between the Babylonian and Egyptian Empires, are again producing sufficient copper ore to sustain industrial production.

Israel is today the most modern and stable nation in the Middle East. An enemy of communism, it is looked upon and respected by the Western Powers as an ally. With the United States, a relationship has developed which has become a lasting friendship. On this, their independence anniversary, I wish to congratulate the people of this progressive nation and extend to them the wish for their continued prosperity and for the continued vitality and growth of their beloved nation.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Martin of California, for April 26, 1963, on account of visit to U.S. Coast Guard Academy, Board of Visitors.

Mr. Mailliard, for Friday, April 26, on account of official business as member of Board of Visitors, U.S. Coast Guard Academy.

Mr. Healey (at the request of Mr. Keogh), for Wednesday, April 24, and Thursday, April 25, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Vanik, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. Patman, for 15 minutes today, and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Madden and include a statement he made on legislation before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on Tuesday of this week.

Mr. Finnegan.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. Langen) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. May.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Albert) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Powell in two instances.

Mr. Gilbert.

Mr. Weltner.

Mr. Sikes in two instances.

SENATE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 980. An act to provide for holding terms of the U.S. District Court for the District of Vermont at Montpelier and St. Johnsbury; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S.J. Res. 39. Joint resolution designating the week of May 20–26, 1963, as National Actors' Equity Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 29, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

740. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled, "A bill to amend section 123 of title 10, United States Code, to apply during emergencies proclaimed by the President"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

741. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on audit of Washington National Airport, Federal Aviation Agency, for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1961, 1960, and 1959, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

742. A letter from the General Services Administration, Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report of the Archivist of the United States on records proposed for disposal in accordance with the provisions of the act approved July 7, 1943 (57 Stat. 380) as amended by the act approved July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 434) and the act approved June 30, 1949 (63 Stat. 377); to the Committee on House Administration.

743. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession contract with Circle Line-Statue of Liberty Ferry, Inc., that will authorize the corporation to provide boat transportation service between New York and the Statue of Liberty National Monument for a period of 20 years from October 1, 1962; submitted pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271), as amended by the act of July 14, 1956 (70 Stat. 543); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

744. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled, "A bill to amend section 1498 of title 28, United States Code, to define the word 'owner' "; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

745. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to amend section 1871 of title 28, United States Code, to increase the per diem and subsistence, and limit mileage allowances of grand and petit jurors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Joint Resolution 245. Joint resolution to provide that Members of Congress shall be limited to per diem allowances and necessary transportation costs in connection with travel outside the United States, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 236). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THORNBERRY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 325. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 3872, a bill to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, to extend the period within which the Export-Import Bank of Washington may exercise its functions, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 237). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TRIMBLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 326. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 4655, a bill to amend title IX of the Social Security Act with respect to the amount authorized to be made available to the States out of the employment security administration account for certain administrative expenses, to reduce the rate of the Federal unemployment tax for the calendar year 1963, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 238). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5175. A bill to authorize the issuance of certificates of citizenship in the Canal Zone; without amendment (Rept. No. 239). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of Missouri: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 6. Concurrent resolution accepting the statue of the late John Burke, of North Dakota, and tendering thanks of Congress therefor; without amendment (Rept. No. 240). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JONES of Missouri: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 7. Concurrent resolution authorizing the temporary placement in the rotunda of the Capitol of a statue of the late John Burke, of North Dakota, and the holding of ceremonies incident thereto; without amendment (Rept. No. 241). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JONES of Missouri: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 8. Concurrent resolution to print the proceedings in connection with the acceptance of the statue of the late John Burke, of North Dakota; without amendment (Rept. No. 242). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JONES of Missouri: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 9. Concurrent resolution for ceremonies in the rotunda in connection with the statue of the late Joseph Ward, of South Dakota; without amendment (Rept. No. 243). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JONES of Missouri: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 10. Concurrent resolution to tender thanks of Congress to South Dakota for the statue of Joseph Ward, to be placed in Statuary Hall; without amendment (Rept. No. 244). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JONES of Missouri: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 11. Concurrent resolution to print as a Senate document the proceedings at the acceptance of the statue of Joseph Ward, to be placed in Statuary Hall; without amendment (Rept. No. 245). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FOGARTY: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 5888. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 246). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 5860. A bill to amend section 407 of the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHORT:

H.R. 5861. A bill to amend section 407 of the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H.R. 5862. A bill to amend section 8 of the Taylor Grazing Act of June 28, 1934 (43 U.S.C., sec. 315g); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 5863. A bill to provide that no Federal financial or other assistance may be furnished in connection with any program or activity in the United States in which individuals are discriminated against on the ground of their race, religion, color, ancestry, or national origin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 5864. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, to eliminate any discrimination against married female employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 5865. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to place a memorial tablet in Woodlawn Memorial Cemetery, Carbondale, Ill., in commemoration of the memorial ceremonies held there on April 29, 1866; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 5866. A bill to extend for 3 years the provisions of the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 5867. A bill to amend section 14 of the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 5868. A bill to provide Federal financial assistance for the construction and expansion of public junior college academic facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LLOYD:

H.R. 5869. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McLOSKEY:

H.R. 5870. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to impose additional duties on cattle, beef, and veal imported each year in excess of annual quotas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 5871. A bill to amend section 11 of the act of April 1, 1942, in order to modify the retirement benefits of the judges of the District of Columbia court of general sessions, the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, and the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 5872. A bill relating to the establishment of concession policies in the areas administered by National Park Service and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 5873. A bill to provide needed facilities and services not otherwise available for the accommodation of visitors in the areas administered by the National Park Service, by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to guarantee loans which are part of concessioner investments in such facilities and services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 5874. A bill to establish a Federal Banking Commission to administer all Federal laws relating to the examination and supervision of banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 5875. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, to provide for payment of salaries covering periods of illegal demotions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RYAN of Michigan:

H.R. 5876. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 5877. A bill to amend the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 to remove the existing 15 percent limit on the amount of assistance which may be provided thereunder for low-rent public housing in any one State; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 5878. A bill to amend the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 to remove the existing limit of $336 million a year on the amount of annual contributions which may be contracted for by the Public Housing Administration to assist low-rent public housing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 5879. A bill to provide that membership by national banks in the Federal Reserve System shall be voluntary and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SIBAL:

H.R. 5880. A bill to amend section 333 of title 38, United States Code, to provide a 3-year presumption of service connection for active tuberculous disease cases in peacetime; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 5881. A bill to promote the cause of criminal justice by providing for the representation of defendants who are financially unable to obtain an adequate defense in criminal cases in the courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 5882. A bill to prohibit the location of chanceries or other business offices of foreign governments in certain residential areas in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 5883. A bill to correct a land description in the act entitled "To provide for an exchange of lands between the United States and the Southern Ute Indian Tribe, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KNOX:

H.R. 5884. A bill to amend section 541 of title 38, United States Code, to increase the rates of pension paid to widows of veterans of World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict, and to liberalize the income limitations applicable thereto; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 5885. A bill relating to the classification for duty purposes of certain wood particleboard imported after July 11, 1957, and before May 25, 1961; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 5886. A bill relating to the establishment of concession policies in the areas administered by National Park Service and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 5887. A bill to provide needed facilities and services not otherwise available for accommodation of visitors in the areas administered by the National Park Service, by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to guarantee loans which are part of concessioner investments in such facilities and services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 5888. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 5889. A bill to provide legal assistance for indigent defendants in criminal cases in U.S. courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5890. A bill to amend the Area Redevelopment Act so as to increase the authorization for technical assistance thereunder and to provide that such assistance may include planning advances for market and feasibility studies; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 5891. A bill to direct the Interstate Commerce Commission not to approve or authorize, until December 31, 1964, the consolidation or merger of carriers by railroad subject to part I of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 5892. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income tax exemption of up to $1,500 for a taxpayer, spouse, or dependent who is a student at an institution of higher learning; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARVEY of Michigan:

H. Con. Res. 142. Concurrent resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to conduct a full and complete study and investigation for the purpose of proposing a code of ethics to govern the conduct of Members of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FINO:

H. Con. Res. 143. Concurrent resolution congratulating the American Veterinary Medical Association on its centennial; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL:

H. Res. 327. Resolution creating in the House of Representatives a Committee on Grievances to study complaints concerning the conduct of Members of the House of Representatives and to make investigations and appropriate recommendations thereon; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to opposing the passage of any law which will eliminate capital gains treatment in connection with the sale and use of timber or discourage the production of the maximum of timber on the forest lands of Florida; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to enactment of legislation providing for continued maximum employment at the Fore River Shipyard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to enactment of legislation extending financial aid to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for purification of the waters of the Merrimack River; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to enactment of legislation repealing the 10-percent excise tax on telephone service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to enactment of legislation providing medical care for the elderly through social security financing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to enacting legislation implementing the programs set forth in the President's special messages on mental illness and mental retardation, youth, and the elderly citizens of our Nation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 5893. A bill for the relief of Abraham Kiali; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 5894. A bill for the relief of Salvador Munoz-Tostado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 5895. A bill for the relief of Stilianos Vauzukakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 5896. A bill for the relief of Irini Vasiliadis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5897. A bill for the relief of Calogero Davi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.R. 5898. A bill for the relief of E. F. Fort, Cora Lee Fort Corbett, and W. R. Fort; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H.R. 5899. A bill for the relief of Gunvor Gronlien Satra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 5900. A bill for the relief of Jacobo Temel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H.R. 5901. A bill for the relief of Mr. Alessandro Ricci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER (by request):

H.R. 5902. A bill for the relief of Eric Voegelin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.R. 5903. A bill for the relief of Dr. James T. Maddux; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

94. By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of Mrs. Augustus West, and other residents of Louisville, Ky., relative to the preservation of the Monroe Doctrine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

95. By the SPEAKER: Petition to the City Council of Royalton, Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting Congress to take immediate steps within their powers as are necessary to

terminate the influx of Communist made goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

96. Also, petition of the City Council of Whitehall, Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their concern of the Communist goods being sold in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Secretary McNamara and the Defense Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I have, of course, been witness to the controversies between Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara and a number of congressional committees. I shall not attempt to pass judgment on these subjects or the controversies. But I do feel that many important steps have been taken by Secretary McNamara for the improvement of the services and that dollars definitely are being saved for the American taxpayer through his leadership. For instance, one of the major steps taken by Secretary McNamara to improve logistics management in the Department of Defense was the establishment of the Defense Supply Agency.

The Agency became operational January 1, 1962 and consolidated logistics functions related to the procurement of common supplies and services at wholesale level.

The action was in line with recommendations of various committees of the Congress. Beginning with the recommendations of the Bonner subcommittee in 1952, the passage of the O'Mahoney amendment to the 1953 defense appropriation bill, and later the McCormack-Curtis amendment to the Reorganization Act of 1958, the Congress had continually prodded the Department of Defense in the direction of unified logistics management.

Commenting upon this problem before the Subcommittee on Defense Procurement of the Joint Economic Committee March 28, 1963, Secretary McNamara said:

> It seemed clear to me, as it had to this committee for many years, that only through the establishment of a separate, single supply support agency could we ever hope to find a lasting solution. The result was the creation of the Defense Supply Agency, which now does the buying, the stocking, and where necessary the surplus disposal of a wide range of commonly used supplies and services. Within its area of responsibility, it will greatly help to ensure that we buy only what we need.

As to the progress achieved by this action, Secretary McNamara listed the following: A reduction of 3,700 personnel by the end of fiscal year 1963; $33 million operations and maintenance saving; $233 million reduction of inventory anticipated in fiscal year 1963 and a further reduction of $112 million in fiscal year 1964; phased reduction over the next 2 years in the number of storage points for DSA-managed supplies from 77 to 11.

A significant factor in the successful transition from integrated commodity and service management within the military departments to unified management by the Defense Supply Agency has been the organizational arrangements approved by Secretary McNamara when he established DSA. To understand what this has meant in better support, more effective management of resources, and accelerated decisionmaking, it is necessary to review the situation which existed prior to DSA.

Within the Department of the Army, for illustration, an integrated commodity agency bought and distributed foodstuffs to all of the military services. This agency reported to the Quartermaster General who, on specified matters, reported to the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics. In turn, the DCSLOG reported to the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Installations and Logistics who next reported to the Secretary of the Army who finally reported to the Secretary of Defense.

Each succeeding level of authority reviewed, evaluated, and passed judgment upon the action proposed by the commodity manager. Much the same situation obtained in the Navy, where the reporting channel ran from the commodity manager through the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts to the Chief of Naval Materiel, the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Navy, and thence to the Secretary of Defense.

Under the improved arrangement, the commodity manager reports directly to the Director of the Defense Supply Agency who reports directly to the Secretary of Defense. Thus, two to three levels of review and supervision were eliminated by establishing DSA as an independent agency of the Defense Department.

This has permitted substantial reductions in decisionmaking time, administrative detail, and paperwork. In the reporting area alone two significant achievements have been realized:

The Secretary of Defense receives a summary management data report monthly within 25 days after the cutoff date. Formerly he received a comparable report on a quarterly basis within 60 days after the cutoff date.

DSA's reporting system requires the field activities to expend a combined total of 100,000 fewer man-hours than had been expended under the former organizational alinements.

Of 537 recurring reports which were required of the field activities by their former headquarters, 253 have thus far been eliminated—a 47 percent reduction.

It may be said, therefore, that improvements have been made in the timeliness of reporting and in reducing the reporting workload.

Other examples of efficiencies derived from eliminating intervening levels of review and supervision include the following:

Substantial reduction in the time required for preaward clearance of significant contract awards, which may range in amounts from $300,000 to several million dollars. DSA completes the clearance in 5.7 days.

Formerly cases arising out of defense contracts which required decision by the Board of Contract Appeals were prepared by the field activity, reviewed in the Army technical service, then by the Judge Advocate General, who finally presented the matter to the Board. Now the field activity presents the case to the Board, subject only to surveillance of the counsel, DSA.

By vesting the director, DSA, with the responsibility and authority necesary to the execution of assigned missions, the Secretary of Defense has made possible the realization of benefits derived from consolidating like activities under unified management, including reductions in overhead costs, reduced staffing, elimination of duplication, faster response, better utilization of inventories, reduced stockage, and faster decisionmaking.

Independence Day of Sierra Leone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on April 27, Sierra Leone will celebrate the second anniversary of her independence. On this memorable occasion, I wish to take this opportunity to extend warm felicitations to His Excellency, the Prime Minister of Sierra Leone, Sir Milton Margai, and His Excellency, the Ambassador of Sierra Leone to the United States, Richard Kelfa-Caulker.

The progress made within the country under the able Prime Minister during the past 2 years, economically and socially is noteworthy. His wise counsel and leadership during frequent consultations on matters of mutual interest between the other independent countries of west Africa has contributed immeasurably to this progress.

Sierra Leone originated in 1787 as a haven for freed Negro slaves. On land purchased from the local natives, the British Government established a colony to receive those liberated from slavers captured on the high seas, and with British support, to reestablish themselves in their native continent.

To the capital city, Freetown, with its beautiful natural harbor, came merchant ships of all flags and, over the years, the colony and the protectorate area adjoining grew in population and village settlement. With this population growth came more wealth and more chance for development of health and educational facilities.

Since independence Sierra Leone has continued its progress in all directions. Diamond mining, heretofore a major industry, is to be supplemented by new iron ore mines. Factory development is being stressed.

The University College at Fourah Bay, in Freetown, under its leader Dr. Davidson Nichol, is becoming a focal point in the joint moves to establish a uniform west African higher education program in both the English and French speaking ex-colonies. This program would raise academic standards generally to a consistent standard, and help in providing the compelling needs of the newly independent west African nations with able and well-educated leadership based on African traditions.

I would like today to salute Sierra Leone on its independence anniversary and wish it continued success in its important position as part of emerging Africa.

The East Atlanta Elementary Band Parents Association—Sponsors of the Best School Band in Dixie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. WELTNER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the existence of a civic enterprise of unusual merit and achievement in my district—the East Atlanta Elementary Band Parents Association, Inc., accurately designated as "sponsors of the best school band in Dixie."

This group, of which Mrs. J. G. Strange, of Atlanta, is currently president, is a chartered, nonprofit organization, operated by the parents of the band members, for the purpose of advancing the musical education of children. These are average families, who, alone, could not give their children an adequate musical education, but by working together, they are able to provide the finest.

This band is made up of children in grades three through seven, from seven Atlanta schools, and a few children from De Kalb County schools. These children begin in C band, progress to intermediate, or B band, then to advanced or A band. Each child progresses according to his own rate, with no set rules governing his progression. The children are taught by the director, during school hours, for 15 or 20 minutes per week. About 5 percent take private lessons. The advanced, or A band is made up of 80 to 90 children, playing a wide variety of band instruments, the more expensive of which are owned by the association. The band's director is Charles I. Bradley, who organized this continuing group in 1947.

National recognitions of their outstanding achievements are numerous, their most recent honor being typical. The executive board of the Mid-West National Band Clinic has unanimously voted to invite the East Atlanta Elementary Band to attend its clinic in Chicago in December 1963. Each year only eight of the Nation's most outstanding bands are accorded this honor, and of the eight, only one is a grade school band. I take understandable pride in this distinction.

Eliminate Guidelines Distribution System in Our Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my statement to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, in which I urged the committee to vote favorably on legislation which would entirely eliminate the work measurement systems in the postal service. My statement follows:

> Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, your committee has under consideration the subject of work measurement standards which now prevail in our postal system. I wish to express my strong disapproval of the guidelines distribution system now in effect and to urge that necessary action be taken to completely eliminate this system.
>
> I am convinced that this multi-million-dollar measurement system represents a total loss of money; it is service disrupting and time wasting; it delays delivery of mail to patrons rather than improves service. You are familiar with the program; I wish to emphasize that the minutes each day that each employee must take to fill out the card reports now required, add up to many thousands of man-hours lost each year.
>
> It is agreed that it is important to keep the Post Office Department operating at a top level of efficiency. At the same time, we must help keep the welfare and just treatment of our postal employees in mind; they are equally important. There is much evidence that the program creates tension which actually results in decreased production; postal employees insist that the program results in innumerable letters of warning, counselings, deprivation of overtime, harassment, intimidation, and termination of jobs, although the Post Office Department would have us believe that no disciplinary action of any kind is supposed to be taken as a result of statistics or data generated by the work measurement system.
>
> It is pointed out that if measurements of mail production are required, they are readily available through other methods; number of bags of mail can be easily counted when they come into the post office; postage canceling machines can also give an accurate relative count of amount of mail handled on a given shift.
>
> From the postal employee's standpoint, the program is based upon the presumption that the worker will not produce, will not render conscientious service, will not work at the required speed or efficiency unless he is watched or his work counted. This is obnoxious to the faithful employee who puts forth his best efforts in his job every day. He feels humiliated and unhappy, and these feelings are not conducive to good morale or high level performance in any field. The occasional laggard or unconscientious employee can be quickly spotted by the supervisor and proper disciplinary action taken against the offender; it is totally unnecessary, and most unfair to subject the entire working force to humiliation and harassment to take care of the few offenders.
>
> I submit that the costly program of guidelines can be eliminated without decreasing postal service one iota; that it is unnecessary, and serves no good purpose whatever. The money saved can be spent to better advantage in a constructive manner to increase the service rendered by the Postal Department.
>
> I urge your committee to vote favorably on legislation before you which would entirely eliminate the work measurement systems in the postal service.

Independence Day of the Republic of Togo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on April 27, the Republic of Togo will celebrate the third anniversary of her independence. On this occasion we wish to extend warm felicitations to the people of this Republic.

On April 27, 1960, a small west African nation gained its independence from French control, the Republic of Togo. We can all remember our shock at the news last January of the brutal assassination of the President of Togo, Sylvanus Olympio. This able leader was cut down by machinegun fire at the very gates of the American Embassy, where he had gone to seek protection.

His death was only the latest happening in the strife-torn history of this area. Togolese territory became a German protectorate in 1894, and its peoples were ruthlessly exploited in the development of German plantations. By the League of Nations mandate in 1922 the country was divided between the French and British, where it remained under divided authority, first as a mandate area, then as a United Nations trusteeship territory, until the fall of 1956 when, by national plebiscite, the area became an autonomous Republic within the French Union.

After independence the country, under President Olympio, made good progress toward political and economic stabilization in spite of continuing border difficulties with the Republic of Ghana. Such progress made even greater the shock of last January's military uprising.

Togo is now under the political control of a council of ministers, headed by Prime Minister Grunitzky. Developments in Togo are being closely observed by neighboring African countries; the President of Dahomey, Hubert Maga, has been appointed by the governments of the other ex-French African colonies to offer guidance to the Togolese Government in its efforts to draw up a new constitution, and to insure the democratic process to the people of Togo.

This joint cooperation to help a fellow country going through a period of instability is but another example of the growing effort among the newly independent nations of Africa to secure for themselves a stable political situation in which to develop.

On this anniversary of Togo independence we should applaud the efforts to maintain the restrained policy being followed and extend to all those involved our sincere hope that such restraint will continue, and that Togo will emerge from this time of trouble a unified and strong nation, dedicated to progress and partnership within the free world.

Address by Hon. Thomas J. Dodd at Opening of Theater on the Campus of the University of Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on April 17, I had the pleasure of participating in ceremonies attending the opening of a splendid new theater on the campus of the University of Connecticut, the New College Theater. This marked the first new theater opening in Connecticut in more than 10 years and it provides an outstanding entertainment facility for the people of the university and the surrounding area.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks which I made on that occasion.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR THOMAS J. DODD AT THE OPENING CEREMONIES OF THE NEW COLLEGE THEATER, UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT, STORRS, CONN., WEDNESDAY, APRIL 17, 1963

I wish to thank the sponsors of these opening ceremonies at Stanley Warner's New College Theater, here on the beautiful campus of the University of Connecticut, for inviting me to take part.

I understand that this is the first new theater to be opened in Connecticut in more than 10 years. So we have here something of a gamble; a demonstration of the new spirit of resurging confidence in an industry which has had its growing pains in recent years.

Up to tonight, this fine edifice has been just a building, a splendid building to be sure, but still mere stone, steel and mortar. Henceforth, however, it will somehow take on a new dimension and become interwoven into the lives and minds and imaginations of its patrons in a way that is difficult to describe or assess.

I try to think of what the local moving picture theater meant to me when I was a boy growing up not far from here in Norwich, and what the theater has meant to me in other places.

I think first of the hours of vicarious adventure, of the fascinating look at distant worlds, of the glimpse of the infinite variety of man's experience which so excited the imagination and stretched the horizons of the mind.

I think of the violent emotions so readily conjured up by the artistry of the screen; joy, sadness, indignation, inspiration, contempt, adulation.

Ofttimes, of course, the objects of these emotions were unworthy; the distance worlds were false worlds.

Ofttimes the appeal was to our ignorance or to our superficiality rather than to our intelligence and genuineness.

But, as there have been poor and even senseless films, so have there been great films, such as the one you are to see tonight.

It is, I think, auspicious, that the management has chosen the picture "To Kill a Mocking Bird" for its premiere presentation, for it presents to us the motion picture in its highest form, as an art, as a medium which helps us to perceive reality, an art form which causes us to grasp the significance and the poignancy of man's existence, which reveals to us our abiding bond with all men, though they may be distant from us in time, place and social climate.

Tonight's film shows us what a moving picture can be and reminds us of what it has been, many, many, times in our experience.

It entitles us to be hopeful about what films will be like in the future.

It causes us to look a little deeper into the human heart; to see injustice, not in the abstract, but in the flesh; to see virtue, not in a rule book, but in the lives of a man and his family; to see, perhaps with a new significance, the weaknesses and the strengths we see in our neighbors and ourselves; to recapture for 2 brief hours something of our childhood, with all its fears and all its limitless horizons; and to feel with a new immediacy and compassion the chords which link us to other men and to other times.

The motion picture is at once a distinct and sophisticated art form, and, as well, the popular art of the American people. As we view the development of this art, we learn something about a free society, something of alarm and something of hope.

In movies, as in all other aspects of a free society, we see the conflict between artificiality and artistry; between the shoddy and the substantial; between the tinsel and the true; between the shallow and the sublime.

For art, like politics, like economics, is another testing ground upon which the free way of life must prove itself.

We believe in the free system. We believe that men and women possess that divine spark which the fuel of free inquiry and free interchange of thought will ignite and cause to burn ever brighter.

We believe in the competition of ideas rather than in the censorship of ideas, and we are willing to accept much that is cheap and shoddy because we hold that over the decades a free people, seeing the contrast between the bad and the good, will not only in large measure reject the bad, to which the would-be censor rightly objects, but will also go far beyond that and will come to insist upon a level of art and of truth higher than that which the mere censor could perceive or attain to.

This is the heart of our national creed and tonight, in a small way, we pay tribute to that creed by celebrating the opening of a new forum of free expression, as well as a center of entertainment for the people in this area.

And so I see this opening of the College Theater at the University of Connecticut as a notable occasion.

I am grateful for the opportunity to be here and I wish each of you the first of many, many, memorable evenings within its walls.

The Important Role of the Republican Minority in the 88th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, our colleague from the State of Washington [Mr. PELLY], during the Easter congressional recess, made an important speech to the chamber of commerce in Kennewick.

Under unanimous consent previously obtained, I ask that this speech pointing up the important role of the Republican minority in the 88th Congress be printed in full at this point:

THE TWO-PARTY SYSTEM AND PARTY UNITY

As a minority Member of Congress, mine is an important responsibility. Like other members of the minority party under the two-party system, it is my responsibility to assure that the American people get as much as possible the facts of both sides of foreign and domestic issues. Under the Constitution, the minority of the legislative branch has an important role. The minority must examine the language and provisions of all administration legislative proposals. In order to strengthen good programs or avoid ill-conceived ones, the minority must suggest alternatives and debate the merits and demerits of all suggested programs. Today, the Republican Party rightly must challenge the policies of the Democratic Party where we find them wrong or ill advised. This is our role.

The press from day to day reports the respective viewpoints of both parties and the issues as the record is written in the daily proceedings of Congress, and thereby an informed public opinion is created. Consequently, the great force of public opinion is stirred and political action consummated.

One very important function of a partisan minority party is frank criticism of the executive branch leadership in the event preelection promises are broken, or power is abused, or mistakes are made. Indeed, a vigorous and vocal minority is absolutely essential, where, as under our Constitution, the sovereign power is vested in the people themselves.

A minority party is the manifestation of government of the people, by the people, and for the people. It is a manifestation of freedom of speech. It is the very safeguard of democracy.

In this spirit, in the role of honest opposition, I appear before you today. I am here as a part of the checks and balances of our Government. As a member of the legislative branch, I must criticize the executive branch where I think it is failing to do the right thing. I criticize freely but never disrespectfully the man or men who hold office, but never the office itself. For example, I have an obligation to not spare President Kennedy; at least, I must not withhold judgment of his actions.

Never has the importance of minority opposition been pointed up so emphatically as with the Cuban situation, or so it seemed to me, because I, myself, was involved. I suddenly discovered that Members of Congress and the press corps were being deliberately misled by our State Department in an effort to tranquilize the American people about the Communist threat in Cuba. This was at the very time the Defense Department had solid intelligence reports as to Soviet missiles and the Communist military offensive threat to the United States in Cuba. I was misinformed by the State Department and told no such threat existed. In briefings, the State Department not only withheld information, but on its own initiative gave false information. At that time, the public was, and still is, extremely concerned over the Cuban situation and it was obvious that an attempt was made to use the press and Members of Congress to calm public agitation, at least until after the November 6 elections.

Under our system of government, as you know, the people must have the true facts. The most serious and dangerous policy that I can conceive of under our constitutional form of government is for an agency of Government to deliberately misinform the public or withhold facts in order to justify its actions or policies.

Whereas 10 years ago there were less than 600 public relations positions in the various agencies of Government, we are safe in assuming that today there are not less than 1,350. These individuals are subject to the policymaking decisions of the administration and can be, and often are, used to sell the people on what a good job the administration is doing.

And the only safeguard against having the people and the Nation being brainwashed by those in power is an alert press and a vigilant minority party.

Right now, the subject of management of the news is being debated. How shocking to have an administration official, as was the case recently, uphold the right of a Government to lie. There is such a thing as national security, and no one asks that vital secrets be released. But in a Republic such as ours, the facts must not be twisted to fool the people. As a newspaper editor testified recently, catch a government lying and the people will never again trust that government.

As a member of the minority party, I am here to warn you that much as all of us might wish differently, our country and our freedom is not having easy going in this troubled world. The Kennedy administration has muffed the ball in its conduct of our foreign affairs.

The way we handled the Skybolt issue has cost us considerable respect in Great Britain. We spoke out of turn and caused a major political crisis in Canada. We have antagonized France and the solidarity of our common European and Atlantic defense is out of balance. In plain language, there is a growing official desire to coexist with our enemy, the Kremlin, and if necessary, to disarm and end nuclear testing without inspection. All the while, we are not getting along with the non-Communist nations. Bluntly speaking, we placate our enemies and insult our friends. We have been giving away our money through foreign aid, but getting no friends. We are in a war now, and American boys are being killed in South Vietnam. I do not suggest that Democrats or this administration want this war. The point is, however, that our foreign affairs are not going well, and do not let any White House press conference or managed news release convince you otherwise.

Like every American, I want the President to succeed. He is my President, too. But in all honesty, I can't go along with an administration which says Cuba is a showcase of Communist failure.

The truth is, Cuba is a Soviet beachhead in the Western Hemisphere. The truth is, the Monroe Doctrine has been violated and it is being violated every single day.

If Cuba is to be what Mr. Kennedy says it already is, an example of Soviet failure, then Castro and communism must be destroyed. That is the way to make it a showcase of Communist failure.

My job as a member of the minority is to keep that fact before the American people.

My job is to not let the alleged withdrawal of ICBM Soviet missiles obscure the sad story of the Bay of Pigs and the humiliation of the United States ransoming the Cuban freedom fighters. Nor should we forget our backing down on promised inspection of the missile withdrawal.

My job, as I see it, is to find out the details about any deals between Premier Khrushchev and President Kennedy, because the public should have the complete details of any nuclear testing ban and any secret disarmament agreements.

Mr. Khrushchev is one of the shrewdest men of all history. He has no integrity nor any regard for his word.

A minority party has an important assignment in debating any decisions or arrangements the administration makes with him or with other nations.

Of course, the President has certain responsibilities in connection with foreign policy. He makes agreements. That's his job, not mine. As a member of the legislative branch, and especially as a U.S. Representative, my job is to see that he does the right thing. But as a Republican, I am not under obligation of silence to refrain from criticism, if criticism is called for.

What is bipartisan foreign policy? As Senator Vandenberg, the originator of bipartisanship in foreign affairs, declared, a minority party has a responsibility to debate foreign affairs. He said we should debate them totally, "down to the water's edge," to quote his own words. I am proud of the restrained way in which the Republicans in Congress have exercised this function.

As to domestic affairs, I make no bones about it, I am here to give you the Republican viewpoint. I am here to recall to you the words of Candidate Kennedy, campaigning for President, when he promised to "get the Nation moving again."

Candidate Kennedy called for a goal of 5 percent annual growth rate and reduction of unemployment to 4 percent. You remember that.

After the election, the President sought to achieve his goal by deficit Federal spending to increase the public purchasing power. He initiated an accelerated public works program and other vast spending measures. The minority party opposed this solution and warned that such fiscal irresponsibility would never create prosperity.

And now Mr. Kennedy has found that the Republicans were right. The growth rate did not improve. Unemployment went up to 6.1 percent with that massive Government spending.

And now it is my responsibility to point up a second mistake and to warn that in the light of this failure what the administration is proposing will aggravate and enlarge the first failure and could have extremely serious consequences. The President's plan, as you know, is to increase deficit spending by reducing taxes, to combine tax reduction with increased Federal spending.

Painful as it is to one who has long called for lowering of the tax rates, I must warn that this second Kennedy solution will never work. Instead, our Republican position is that Federal expenditures must be held to last year's total and not increased, which represents a cut in the Kennedy 1964 budget of at least $7 billion. On the other hand, a combination of curtailed expenditures and a tax cut will do the trick and provide a stimulant to prosperity and more jobs. We Republicans hold that confidence in our dollar will be restored with economy in Government, and will mean an end to the flight of gold; will mean expansion of business; will mean higher employment; will mean better consumer purchasing power; will mean an increase in Government revenue; will mean an end to continual raising of the national debt.

Republicans urge cuts in foreign aid, and President Kennedy now agrees, since the Clay report.

Republicans urge cuts in the cost of the space program.

Republicans say a new Federal Department of Urban Affairs and billions of dollars isn't necessary, with the farmer and everyone else paying the bill, just to provide certain big cities with assistance for mass transportation problems.

Republicans are opposed to increased Federal spending.

We oppose planned Federal deficits.

And my role as a member of the minority party is to raise these issues.

I say an increase in the national debt during comparative prosperity is unsound. Rather, we should be paying it off.

I say Federal aid to education, and ever-growing concentration of power in Washington, D.C., is dangerous.

I believe in keeping government close to the people, where the citizens have a voice in their own affairs.

Republicans oppose Federal regimentation and bureaucracy.

As a strong, vital party, Republicans can play an effective part in support of these principles.

In this respect, it is obviously essential that there be unity among Republicans.

My mission on this trip through the State and in traveling throughout eastern Washington with Bill Walter, the State chairman of the Republican Party, is to seek a GOP victory in 1964 through party unity.

Republicans won't win elections otherwise. Republican philosophy and principles won't prevail.

I emphasize—to win, we must have party unity.

If we hope to elect a Republican to the White House in 1964, there must be unity.

And the same formula is true with regard to winning the governorship in Washington State and to having a Republican legislature in this State.

Those of you who are Democrats will understand the problem of disunity. You have it, too. But the Democratic Party being numerically stronger can afford disunity in its ranks, where the Republicans can't afford it.

I have had letters from my constituents who have said that unless the presidential candidate they favor is nominated, when it comes to a vote they will abstain. Conservatives or liberals, they indulge in splinter-group thinking and put a personality above the overall common heritage of their political party. They overlook the fact that a President, be he liberal, conservative, or middle-of-the-road, under the Constitution must carry out the laws and policy of a duly constituted legislative branch. They overlook that Congress on the national level is where, properly, policy is initiated and programs made. Or, on the State level, it is the State legislature that writes the ticket, not the Governor.

Republicanism is what this country needs. So I am pointing up the weakness of the Kennedy administration, and that it fails to understand the forces underlying growth that instead of accelerated massive Federal spending and planned deficits, the answer to prosperity is incentives and business confidence to modernize and expand industrial production plants and equipment.

This policy will make American industry more competitive and will preserve our own markets and increase foreign sales.

Pump priming and deficit spending create distrust and business uncertainty. They cause our economy to slow down.

True, some Republicans don't vote for economy and some Democrats do.

But, I submit that this is the record. Democrats, when they have control of Congress, have run up 93.4 percent of the national debt. That is the record. Our party philosophy is different from that of the opposition. Democrat congresses have approved deficit spending budgets or deficiency appropriations which resulted in deficits during 20 of the last 27 years. That is the record.

There were Democrats who voted against those spending sprees and Republicans who voted for them.

But, as the record of Congress will show, the majority of Democrats voted for them and the great majority of Republicans voted against them.

I have cited the record of Congress, but with the State legislature it is the same. The majority of Republicans steadfastly advocate under all possible circumstances that the people, not the Government, should manage their own affairs and spend their own money.

The majority of Republicans are opposed to Government providing benefits that the people can as well provide themselves.

The majority of Republicans tend to oppose increased Government intervention and the majority of Democrats tend to support centralized, big government.

That is the issue of the New Frontier, and frankly, I am here to raise that issue. In a nonpartisan meeting, one doesn't tell the audience how to vote. We just point up the issue as between the two parties.

But especially, as a minority Member of Congress, I point out now that in the first 3 years of the New Frontier, the national debt will have gone up $27 billion.

And I emphasize, this huge increase in the deficit is not a matter of the cost of the national defense.

President Kennedy's 1964 budget request proposes, for example, $2 billion more than in 1963 for other than military expenditures.

This is a $9 billion increase over 1961 for other than defense spending.

Under the New Deal and the Fair Deal and the New Frontier, et al., the Government has expanded until it takes more than 30 percent of all money earned by the people and spends it and a lot more besides, for socialistic programs. There are those who favor socialistic programs; well and good, that is what they are getting. But, I ask you, How long can the American worker, the American farmer, and the American merchant bear the burden? How long can our Nation and its Treasury and our finances be sustained under the stress of massive Government spending? I hope we never find out. If we do get to that point, our free enterprise system will have disappeared.

I assert, republicanism is the answer. Under a Goldwater or a Rockefeller, or a Knowland, or a Romney, if the Republican Party is united, I assert the party can win.

My role in raising a minority voice is to speak out for what I believe will leave to the future a strong America and a free America.

The Republican Party calls for wiser and firmer policies in foreign affairs.

The Republican Party calls for wiser and more prudent policies in domestic affairs.

If you disagree, then you have lost nothing but your time in listening to me.

If you agree with me, then I submit you should be active politically for a Republican victory in 1964 through party unity.

Finally, let me thank you for your attention and willingness, in the fine American tradition of freedom, to allow a political discussion in a nonpartisan meeting. No man or party has a complete monopoly on wisdom, but certainly I have logic on my side.

You have been patient; for that and for your friendly attention, I say thank you, and above all else, Republicans and Democrats can agree on one issue: "God bless America."

Quality Stabilization Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee opened hearings this week on the quality stabilization legislation. This legislation was reported favorably by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and the Rules Committee in the last session. On account of the rush pending adjournment, it was impossible to have the bill considered on the floor of the other body last session. It was reported favorably by the Subcommittee of the Senate Commerce and Finance Committees.

Considering the avalanche of support for this legislation over the country and also by Members of both parties in the House and Senate, I do hope that this legislation will be enacted into law as soon as possible.

The following is the statement I made on H.R. 3669 and H.R. 3670 before the committee at the opening of the hearings on Tuesday, April 23.

STATEMENT OF HON. RAY J. MADDEN, OF INDIANA, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMERCE AND FINANCE, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE ON H.R. 3669 AND 3670, THE QUALITY STABILIZATION BILL, APRIL 23, 1963

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, your cooperation in holding these hearings demonstrates that you are much concerned over the devastating methods of merchandising in recent years that is causing great damage to the manufacturers, retailers, and consumers throughout the country.

This bill last year obtained, after lengthy hearings, a favorable report from both the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and from the Rules Committee. It also obtained a favorable report from a special subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee when our Congress adjourned.

Obviously thorough study has been given this measure. I respect the judgment of my colleagues who have given this bill their approval. It is a question of life or death for hundreds of thousands of small businessmen. Let's do our duty to them by moving quickly and effectively to make the quality stabilization bill the law of the land.

Basically, the quality stabilization bill offers a major step in curbing dishonest practices that are misleading the consumer in merchandise values. It spells out bait advertising, deceptive pricing, and published misrepresentations of the product as reasons why a manufacturer may protect the property rights in his brand name or trademark.

The public will be helped by the enactment of the quality stabilization law, since the established price and quality symbolized by the brand name will be a standard from which it may judge the competitive values of products. The consumer will be guarded against the unscrupulous operator who uses the honored brand name or trademark to build store traffic at the expense of his more honest competitors, while recouping his loss at the same time on overpriced, inferior, and blind merchandise.

This legislation will call for no Government bureaucracy or department to supervise or enforce it.

The law will be 100 percent optional with the manufacturer, retailer, wholesaler, and consumer.

It will provide incentives for quality products to be distributed through quality conserving resellers.

In our long and critical struggle against communism, the American system of free enterprise must be our major weapon. Business failures in recent years and the growing lack of protection for consumer purchases demand action by this Congress.

We cannot permit the further degeneration of the brand name system of distribution. We must arrest the growing rate of failure of small business in this country. We must give the incentive to the manufacturer in this country to build toward excellence, and we must protect the consumer from junk merchandise.

The quality stabilization bill covers specific areas in which a manufacturer can control, that is, prevent the unfair use of his own property—his trademark—by the reseller. These areas are:

(1) Intentional misrepresentation as to make, model, size, age, etc.; (2) bait and switch merchandising tactics; or (3) deviation from the established price.

The manufacturer who elects to use the quality stabilization law will publish the retail price or resale price range governing the sale of his product. He is given this right so that he may protect the quality of the product, the goodwill of his brand name, the ethical reseller, and the consumer. Competition will be promoted, not restricted, by the quality stabilization law, and the interaction of competitive forces will insure that the manufacturer's price represents fair value or else that manufacturer will be forced out of business. Any price established under this law will be at the manufacturer's peril. This is the way the free enterprise system should function.

If a retailer knowingly violates the published policy of the manufacturer by engaging in any one or all of the three specific practices named in the bill, then the manufacturer may revoke the right of that offending retailer to make any further use of the manufacturer's name, brand, or trademark.

The quality stabilization bill is not a one-way street. It imposes an obligation on the manufacturer as well. Specific provisions insure that equity be practiced by the manufacturer in his relations with his resellers and in the enforcement of the act.

Under the Quality Stabilization Act, both the reseller and the public will know where each manufacturer stands as to policy and quality consistency. The manufacturer no longer will have the convenient excuse that he cannot protect good resellers against unfair competition.

Essentially, this bill is only a confirmation by Congress of the unanimous decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in *Old Dearborn Distributing Co.* v. *Seagram-Distiller's Corp.*, 299 U.S. 183 (1936) which held that the manufacturer possesses property rights in the goodwill symbolized by his trademark. This bill implements that decision by charting a specific route the manufacturer may use to protect his trademark as it moves along the channels of distribution.

CONSTRUCTIVE COMPETITION INSURED

The Quality Stabilization Act would leave the anti-price-fixing provisions of the Sherman Act intact. Any group of manufacturers or wholesalers or retailers who effect collusive price fixing between themselves would be courting prosecution under the Sherman Act.

To underscore that the quality stabilization bill will promote competition, it must be emphasized repeatedly that the manufacturer alone must make the basic marketing decision—whether to stabilize his price, as a means of restoring and improving quality, or to rely primarily on price alone to attract customers. It is, after all, his brand and his reputation which is at stake. Only he can make the decision. However, before he can use the Quality Stabilization Act, there must be goods usable for the same general purpose available to the public from other sources. The brand name owner's product must be in free and open competition.

Wholesalers and retailers will be free, too, to determine whether they wish to handle products of stabilized quality or a competitive unstabilized one. They may elect to handle top brand lines which are stabilized and others on which they can vary the price. It is their decision. If they elect to handle the quality stabilized brand, they must respect the law and the manufacturer's established policy. This means that the reseller may not abuse the brand name by misrepresentation as to make, model, size, or age, by bait and switch merchandising techniques, or by selling that brand name product at other than the manufacturer's established price.

THE CONSUMER'S INTEREST

This legislation safeguards the consumer. This committee is not unmindful of the situation that results when an unprincipled retailer can take advantage of a product by running a loss-leader ad. For every dollar spent by the misguided customer who is brought in on account of this ad, sacrificing a brand name or a trademark of some producer, that customer spends an estimated $9 for inferior products at the regular or higher price.

It does not take long for that honored product to lose customers. Soon the loss-leader advertiser drops the brand name product and picks up another quality product to pack temporarily his store with unsuspecting customers. It is operations of this kind that the quality stabilization bill will control by protecting the customer, the producer, and the small retail man.

Enactment of the quality stabilization bill will result in availability of products in which the public can have confidence, confidence in their stabilized price and in their quality. Customers can buy that which they seek: quality and price, or price alone. The retailer, by offering both quality stabilized and unstabilized brands, can give the consumer an excellent mix of durable, high-quality products and products of lesser quality whose prices fit his pocketbook or his limited needs.

There will be many brands, made by reputable manufacturers, which will not be stabilized even though some of their brands are stabilized. The quality stabilization bill will affect discount merchants only as to the products the manufacturers place under quality stabilization and then only as to the brand name thereof. On those products the manufacturer will have the legal and equitable right to protect his property. But the discounter is optionally free to handle quality stabilized products along with merchandise that he does not elect to come under quality stabilization.

It is not the purpose of the quality stabilization bill to put anyone out of business. Indeed, it is my conviction that it will reduce the number of small businesses whose owners find it necessary to liquidate.

This bill will help sustain, in a positive way, our brand-name system of distribution that has in the past enabled legitimate retailers and manufacturers to build a successful marketing economy second to none in the world.

Opponents of quality stabilization legislation attack it by smear propaganda, identifying it with fair trade and price fixing. Anyone who reads and studies this bill can easily determine for himself that no provision in the bill identifies it with fair trade or even remotely with price fixing.

The quality stabilization bill contains none of the usual fair trade language. There is no provision for contracts as the bill is wholly predicated on the owner's property rights in his good name; there is no dependence on a nonsigner clause as is the case with fair trade. The essential difference is that fair trade enforcement is to compel a dealer to raise his prices for a product, while under the quality stabilization bill, the action is one akin to trespass—to stop a reseller from abusing a manufacturer's property right in his trademark reputation.

HELP EMPLOYMENT

In urging speedy consideration of this bill by this committee, I direct your attention to the fact that unrestrained price slashing disables labor, industry, resellers, and the public. Unless the quality stabilization bill is enacted, our entire economy will deteriorate at a time when our President is asking for economic growth to strengthen our Nation for survival.

I represent the great industrial Calumet region of Indiana. In recent years consumers and small retailers have been asking me what can be done to reestablish confidence in retail marketing. Unemployment in my area is critical.

Enactment of this quality stabilization legislation will contribute more toward restoring employment than any other legislation before this Congress. When a manufacturer is forced to make 15 men do the work of 20, and is forced to employ cheaper and less skilled labor as well as inferior materials, both American labor and the American consumer are injured where it hurts most. Congressman JOHN DENT will testify as to pressures upon our production economy resulting from the jungle merchandising prevalent today.

In conclusion I call to your attention that almost 70 national trade and professional organizations have endorsed the quality stabilization bill. These include:

National Retail Hardware Association.

National Office Machine Dealers Association.

Independent Garage Owners of America.

National Association of House to House Installment Cos., Inc.

National Sporting Goods Association.

National Association of Retail Clothiers and Furnishers.

National Retail Furniture Association.

Retail Jewelers of America.

Master Photo Dealers and Finishers Association.

National Appliance and Radio-TV Dealers Association.

National Wholesale Jewelers Association.

National Stationery and Office Equipment Association.

Wholesale Stationers' Association.

Toy Wholesalers' Association of America.

Billiard and Bowling Institute of America.

Gift and Decorative Accessories Association of America

Marine Manufacturers Safety Equipment Association.

National Association of Sporting Goods Wholesalers.

American Fishing Tackle Manufacturers Association.

Archery Manufacturers and Dealers Association.

National Wholesale Hardware Association.

Fountain Pen and Mechanical Pencil Manufacturers' Association, Inc.

American Watch Association, Inc.

Watch Material Distributors of America.

Automotive Service Industry Association.

National Association of Bedding Manufacturers.

National Industrial Distributors Association.

Christian Booksellers Association.

National Shoe Manufacturers Association.

Wallcovering Wholesalers Association.

National Small Business Association.

American Research Merchandising Institute.

American Retailers Association.

National Art Materials Trade Association.

National Shoe Retailers Association.

Motor and Equipment Manufacturers Association.

Northamerican Heating and Airconditioning Wholesalers, Inc.,

National Association of Women's & Children's Apparel Salesmen, Inc.

American Watch Manufacturers Association.

National Bicycle Dealers Association, Inc.

National Audio-Visual Association, Inc.

National Office Furniture Association, Inc.

National Outerwear and Sportswear Association.

National Frozen Food Association, Inc.

The Automotive Warehouse Distributors Association, Inc.

National Association of Glove Manufacturers.

National Marine Products Association.

National Association of Retail Druggists.

Paint & Wallpaper Association of America, Inc.

Retail Tobacco Dealers of America.

National Association of Tobacco Distributors.

National Retail Farm Equipment Association.

American Pharmaceutical Association.

National Conference of State Pharmaceutical Association Secretaries.

Metropolitan Cities Drug Association Secretaries.

National Association of Chain Drug Stores.

Toilet Goods Association.

American Booksellers Association.

National Wholesale Druggists Association.

Automotive Electric Association.

Corset & Brassiere Association of America.

Proprietary Association.

The Independent Shoemen.

National Candy Wholesalers Association.

Manufacturing Jewelers & Silversmiths of America.

Laundry & Cleaners Allied Trades Association.

Luggage & Leather Goods Manufacturers Association.

I call further to your attention that this is strictly nonpartisan legislation. Eleven U.S. Senators of both parties have cosponsored the quality stabilization bill, and approximately 25 Members, from both parties, have introduced the identical bill in the House of Representatives.

I remind you again of the approval given this measure last year by your committee, by the Rules Committee, and the special subcommittee of the Senate.

And I urge you to think of the purposes of the bill and its goals not in terms of theory, not in terms of statistics, but as a measure affecting people of flesh and blood with a real problem of survival or failure in a business that is perhaps small, yet still a precious thing to them. It is not coincidental that the thousands upon thousands of members of these 70 national associations view the quality stabilization bill as the one essential piece of legislation before this Congress.

The 15th Anniversary of the State of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD R. FINNEGAN

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, on the 29th of April, Israel will celebrate its 15th anniversary as a state, and I am pleased to join with her friends in honoring this date. It has been my custom on past occasions to direct my colleagues' attention to various aspects of Israel's outstanding achievements on the road to becoming a nation once again. In other years I have spoken of the history of Israel's rebirth in the 20th century, its continuing problems in its surroundings and its internal development and progress.

Today I would like to center my remarks on the program which Israel has initiated in the field of technical assistance to other developing countries. The experiences which have come from the struggle to build a state in Israel are being made available to those who are willing to learn from them. Owing to prevailing psychology in many of the newly created states, Israel represents an ideal source of assistance. The Israeli experience in the face of internal and external difficulties makes an eloquent appeal to countries whose problems are similarly overwhelming.

Modern Israel has developed into a stable, technologically advanced state. The generous assistance which organizations like the United Jewish Appeal have rendered Israel over the past 15 years has had much to do with this progress. However, there is another factor which has had an even more important influence on Israel's remarkable growth. The sense of belonging to a common effort, highly intensified by external dangers and internal needs, has been fruitfully channeled into a wide variety of cooperative enterprises and institutions. This spirit was mobilized to deal with the special problems which Israel faced with its land and population. Over the years this process has produced a body of specialized experience and expertise.

The newly created states of Africa and Asia have found in Israel an example to emulate, and Israel has responded by making available to these nations the great benefits of its experience. And what are the successes to which the new nations are attracted? At its inception Israel entered upon the task of equipping its people with a common language and with the necessary skills to begin building a nation.

The urgency of these needs led to the development of new techniques of civil, general, and vocational education. Many of the problems Israel has had to deal with are similar to those which the underdeveloped nations now face, and the striking success of Israel's efforts and methods are appealing. Israel has been asked to share with other states its experiences and it has responded generously within its limited resources.

In order to deal with the growing volume of requests for cooperation and assistance, Israel created a department of international cooperation within the Ministry for Foreign Affairs. Because of limited financial and manpower resources, Israel's programs of assistance must adhere to certain basic considerations. First, the effectiveness and impact of the assistance on the development of the recipient country must be taken into account. Second, Israel must concentrate its aid in those areas where Israeli experience has produced expertise which is particularly relevant to the problems of the new nations. Third, Israel usually emphasizes tangible projects which can be completed within a relatively short period of time and which require a minimum of resources, but which will lay the foundations for further development plans.

There are now four main categories into which Israeli technical cooperation falls. First, the program provides for manpower training in Israel. Second, experts, advisers, instructors, and survey teams are dispatched on request to interested countries. Third, Israeli teams plan and organize training facilities abroad. Fourth, teams prepare and implement itinerant courses in developing countries using the latest training aids.

In the area of manpower training Israel has provided courses for 1,547 trainees from 77 countries. In view of the paramount impact of agriculture on developing countries, many of the courses deal with the techniques of modern farming, for example scientific feeding and breeding methods with different types of livestock and crop rotation. Agriculture is one of the specific spheres in which Israel has acquired considerable experience in the course of her own development. In addition to the agricultural programs Israel provides training in education, the vocational fields, nursing, cooperative movements, and others. One of the more dramatic examples of Israeli cooperation has been carried out in Burma. While a group of over 100 Burmese ex-servicemen was trained on several agricultural settlements in Israel, a team of Israeli specialists in soil conservation and irrigation surveyed an area in Burma's arid zone and drew up plans for revitalizing the land. The Burmese, on return, worked with the specialists and applied their Israeli training to the production of new crops by mixed farming and irrigation.

Israel has been asked to play a role in several vast, multilateral development schemes. In conjunction with the Government of Upper Volta and the U.N. Special Fund, Israel established an agricultural training center to implement the benefits in the field of agriculture arising from the Upper Volta project.

In its program of international cooperation Israel has organized joint companies with Israeli private firms and local interests or governments of development countries as partners. For example, Zim, Israel's national shipping line ran the Black Star Line together with Khana; the Ghanaian Government holding 60 percent of the share capital. Zim set up a nautical school at Accra to provide marine officers and crews. As Ghanaian seamen became fit to command and sail their ships the Israeli crews returned to the Israel Merchant Navy and the Israeli capital was withdrawn from the Black Star Line for reinvestment elsewhere in developing countries.

In addition to training nurses for medical and public health work, Israel has undertaken several ambitious projects in the field of medicine and Israel now manages and directs several hospitals in Ethiopia and Ghana. Staffs for these institutions and others are training in the Hadassah-Hebrew University Hospital in Jerusalem. An eye clinic was established in Liberia by Israeli surgeons and physicians while a doctor and 10 nurses from Liberia were given specialized instruction at the Hadassah. Within a few years, the Liberians themselves will be fully competent in ophthalmology and able to take over the central clinic.

These then, are some of the programs which Israel has so dynamically undertaken within her limited resources. The moving spirit underlying all of this is, in my opinion, a genuine attempt to spread a gospel of international cooperation and assistance within a framework of hard work or self-help. Young nations, sharing similar problems, have much to gain from sharing their solutions to these problems. The Israeli technical assistance program involves much more than technical assistance. The spirit and dedication which have infused the steady growth of Israel inspires the new nations to get on with the task before them.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me and to many others, that we all can benefit from Israel's experience with her foreign aid program. In many ways it lends itself to more efficiency and accomplishments than does a program launched on a more grandiose scale. No one country or organization, including the United States or the United Nations, is able to undertake by themselves the solving of the myriads of problems facing the emerging underdeveloped nations of the world. If Israel's efforts are copied and used by other nations who have reached this point of maturity there is hope that through the interchange and cooperation of one small country with another, great strides will be made toward eliminating much of the poverty and underprivileged conditions now prevalent in many areas of the world.

To me there is no better way to honor the 15th anniversary of the State of Israel than to pay tribute to her unselfishness in helping others less fortunate, when she is still faced with almost unsurmountable problems of her own.

Veterans' Home Loan Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note the very sound status of the veterans' home loan program in northwest Florida. Through information provided to me by Mr. Rufus Wilson, manager of the Veterans' Administration for Florida, I can state that the veterans of 15 counties including Leon and those west have received 13,375 home loans since the inception of the program approximately 18 years ago. Of this number, as of April 15, 1963, only 48 homes have experienced foreclosure. About this same number are in trouble as far as monthly payments are concerned, but some of these will become current thus avoiding foreclosure.

Of the total number of loans made to west Florida veterans, 1,164 were direct loans and the remainder were made by private lending institutions and guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration.

According to Mr. Wilson, VA along with FHA has given considerable attention to the issuance of speculative commitments. The VA is considering each subdivision on its individual merits and sales records. Through this method the agency has avoided large speculative subdivisions and yet at the same time has not prevented builders from building when they could sell homes.

Escambia County veterans have been approved for 5,152 home loans and 26 of the foreclosures have taken place there. Okaloosa shows a total of 2,780 loans with 8 foreclosures; 2,343 VA loans have been made in Leon County with approximately a dozen foreclosures as of April 15. Bay County veterans have made 1,711 loans with less than one-half dozen foreclosures.

In Florida approximately 163,000 veterans have taken advantage of the VA loan program to provide houses for their families. Foreclosures are spotted being concentrated mostly in four counties of the State. The portfolio of VA loans shows a total of more than $1½ billion. I join Mr. Wilson in complimenting the veterans of west Florida and the entire State for the manner in which they have met their obligations to a Government which has helped them.

While I have quoted Mr. Rufus Wilson, who has done very capable work as manager of the Veterans' Administration in Florida, I wish also to include Mr. Tom David and the entire staff of the VA who participate in housing loans for their sympathetic and cooperative attitude toward assisting veterans of Florida to obtain the housing they need.

SENATE

FRIDAY, APRIL 26, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Reverend R. Trevis Otey, pastor, Glasgow Baptist Church, Glasgow, Ky., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we thank Thee today for Thy love and grace, as revealed to us in Jesus Christ, Thy Son. We rejoice in Thy manifold blessings freely bestowed upon us. We ask for understanding to receive these as gifts from Thy loving hands, and for wisdom to use them for Thy glory.

We thank Thee, Lord, for these Senators, whom Thou hast ordained as Thy servants. We ask Thee to give them strength and courage to fulfill Thy purpose for our land. Give to them peace of heart, clarity of mind, and strength of purpose to the end that this shall truly be "one nation under God."

This, Holy Father, is our prayer, in Jesus' name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 25, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 3662) for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Patterson Bartlett, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 3662) for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Patterson Bartlett was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences and the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly Legislation of the Judiciary Committee were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

CHIEF MEDICAL DIRECTOR, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 140, House bill 4549. I understand it has been cleared with all sides.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 4549) to amend section 4103 of title 38 United States Code with respect to the appointment of the Chief Medical Director of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, this bill was passed unanimously by the House of Representatives, and has been reported by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

This is a minor bill; it merely follows a precedent established by Congress in making possible the appointment of a retired officer of the Army, Navy, or Air Force as Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration, and merely provides that while serving in that position he shall receive the salary fixed by statute for it, and that upon his retirement from that position he may be eligible to receive the retirement pay which he is authorized to receive as a member of the Armed Forces.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an excerpt from the committee report.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 182) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

Chapter 73, title 38, sets forth the functions, activities, and responsibilities of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration.

Section 4103(b) provides for the appointment of the Chief Medical Director by the Administrator with the requirement that he be a "qualified doctor of medicine." The former Chief Medical Director, the distinguished physician, Dr. William S. Middleton, recently retired from this position because of age. At the present time, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is considering several individuals for appointment to this important post. In this connection, he is utilizing the services of the Special Medical Advisory Committee authorized by section 4112 of title 38. This Medical Advisory Committee, the members of which are nominated by the Chief Medical Director, is charged with the duty of advising the Administrator through the Chief Medical Director, questions relating to the care and treatment of disabled veterans and other matters pertinent to the Department of Medicine and Surgery.

In order to provide the widest latitude in the selection of a new Chief Medical Director, this legislation is necessary in order to permit the consideration of doctors retired from the Armed Forces for the position of Chief Medical Director. This legislation would permit the Administrator to have through December 31, 1963, the opportunity of appointing the best qualified individual available to this post, from any source, be it civilian service or service in one of the branches of the Armed Forces.

As indicated in the favorable report from the Veterans' Administration which follows, there would be no additional cost to the Government, nor any duplication of compensation, by the enactment of this legislation since it permits a retired officer to waive his retirement pay while serving as Chief Medical Director and later to resume his retired status with pay after the conclusion of his service as Chief Medical Director.

A similar, although broader, piece of legislation of a temporary nature was enacted for the benefit of a former Chief Medical Director.

The report of the Veterans' Administration follows:

MARCH 21, 1963.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am pleased to furnish the following comments in response to your request for my views on H.R. 4549, 88th Congress.

H.R. 4549 would authorize a very limited exception to the bar against employing retired officers contained in the act of July 31, 1894 (5 U.S.C. 62), so as to permit the appointment of such a retired officer prior to January 1, 1964, to the position of Chief Medical Director in the Veterans' Administration. The bill would not affect the applicability of the dual compensation provisions of the act of July 30, 1932, as amended (5 U.S.C. 59a).

I am now in the process of selecting a new chief medical director. Enactment of this bill would give me increased latitude in selecting the person who will be responsible for the administration of the Department of Medicine and Surgery, and for the furnishing of hospital and medical care to literally millions of disabled veterans. I need not tell you, with your great interest in these programs, of the importance of obtaining the most competent and best qualified individual available, one with a real interest in the needs of veterans.

This bill would not permit any duplication of compensation since—by reason of the provisions of the act of July 30, 1932, as amended—any regular retired officer appointed to the position of Chief Medical Director, which currently carries a salary of $21,500 per annum, would be required to waive the receipt of his retired pay for the period of his service in that position. Of course, his right to retired pay after leaving the employment of the Veterans' Administration would continue unimpaired. For this reason there could be no additional cost to the Government resulting from the enactment of this bill. In fact there would be some slight saving.

Accordingly, I recommend early and favorable consideration of H.R. 4549 by your committee.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection from the standpoint of this administration's program to the presentation of this report to your committee.

Sincerely,

J. S. GLEASON, Jr.,
Administrator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 4549) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 123, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, TO APPLY DURING EMERGENCIES PROCLAIMED BY THE PRESIDENT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 123 of title 10, United States Code, to apply during emergencies proclaimed by the President (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON EXAMINATION OF RENTALS CHARGED FOR EQUIPMENT OWNED AND OPERATED BY MORRISON-KNUDSEN CO., INC., BOISE, IDAHO.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the examination of rentals charged for equipment owned and operated by Morrison-Knudsen Co., Inc., Boise, Idaho, a subcontractor under Department of the Air Force prime contract AF 33(600)-29717 with Western Electric Co., Inc., New York, N.Y., in construction of the White Alice communication system in Alaska, dated April 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROPOSED CONCESSION CONTRACT TO PROVIDE BOAT TRANSPORTATION SERVICE BETWEEN NEW YORK CITY AND THE STATUE OF LIBERTY NATIONAL MONUMENT

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession contract to authorize boat transportation service between New York City and the Statue of Liberty National Monument (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 1498, TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE, TO DEFINE THE WORD "OWNER"

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1498 of title 28, United States Code, to define the word "owner" (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Finance:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 5

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to provide a tax credit not to exceed 30 percent of educational expenses paid to institutions of higher education during a taxable year, or to provide a deduction from gross income for tuition and certain other expenses paid institutions of higher education during a taxable year

"Whereas there are now pending in the Congress of the United States S. 98, by Mr. DOMINICK, and H.R. 3392, by Mr. Bow, which recognize the need for tax relief to certain taxpayers who must pay the expenses of higher education in the United States; and

"Whereas the quality and degree of higher education of the residents and citizens of the United States is an essential component of our national defense; and

"Whereas the costs of higher education increase from year to year, at a rate higher than the increasing costs of living; and

"Whereas there is an increasing economic burden placed upon taxpayers who must pay such increasing costs, without any Federal tax relief; and

"Whereas the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 affords tax relief to those who must further their education if necessary to the retention of employment or to maintain or improve skills required in their business; and

"Whereas the experience of the Federal Government under the GI bill for returning veterans of the armed services has been such that the costs of the GI bill are being returned to the Government through increased earnings of such veterans who obtained higher education therefrom; and

"Whereas said S. 98 provides for a tax credit of not to exceed 30 percent of the educational expenses to public and private institutions of higher education during a taxable year, such tax credit not to exceed $600 with respect to any one individual's expenses of higher education; and H.R. 3392 provides for the deduction from gross income any amount, not to exceed $1,000, paid by a taxpayer to an institution of higher education for education expenses of any individual: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 44th General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the Senate concurring herein)*, That this general assembly hereby petitions the Members of the Congress of the United States to consider both S. 98 and H.R. 3392 and to enact into law either bill to afford tax relief to the parents and students who must bear a great portion of the burden of the costs of higher education; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and Members of Congress from the State of Colorado.

"JOHN D. VANDERHOOF,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*
"DONALD H. HENDERSON,
"*Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.*
"ROBERT L. KNOUS,
"*President of the Senate.*
"MILDRED H. CRESSWELL,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*"

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Finance:

"SENATE MEMORIAL 233

"Memorial to Congress opposing the passage of any law which will eliminate capital gains treatment in connection with the sale and use of timber or discourage the production of the maximum amount of timber on the forest lands of Florida

"Whereas the forest industry, dollarwise is the second largest industry in the State of Florida; and

"Whereas approximately 6 out of every 10 acres of Florida's lands are forest lands, and more than one-half of the areas of 50 counties out of the 67 counties of the State consists of forest lands; and

"Whereas Florida has more than 21 million acres of forest lands and 89 percent of such commercial forest lands are owned by more than 100,000 private owners; and

"Whereas approximately one out of every four employees of the manufacturing establishments of this State is employed by forest industries, and the payrolls of such industries exceed $150 million; the commodities produced by them have a wholesale value in excess of $475 million and remanufacturing of such products increases that figure by $250 million, or a total of $850 million, and a retail value of more than $1 billion; and

"Whereas Florida produces more than one-half of all of the cypress timber produced in the Nation, ranks first in the United States in the production of paperboard, ranks third in the United States in the production of woodpulp, and ranks third in the United States in the production of paper and paperboard; and

"Whereas more than one-fourth of all of the manufacturing plants in the State of Florida rely upon forests for raw materials; and

"Whereas since the year of 1955 the owners of forest lands have planted more than 170 million seedlings each year; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States in order to encourage reforestation and the benefits that flow therefrom including the prevention of soil erosion, the retention and recharge of the underground water supply, the providing of recreational and hunting areas and the restoration of denuded areas to the tax rolls, enacted legislation approximately 20 years ago, according capital gains treatment to the use and sale of growing timber in order to encourage the development of forests and so as to provide a continuing supply of raw materials for manufacturing, defense and other purposes; and

"Whereas approximately 18 years are required to grow timber to pulpwood size and approximately 40 years to reach minimum saw timber size, and during these periods the landowner must pay taxes, provide for forest management, fire protection, and assume the calculated risk against fire, trespass, theft, blight, disease, and insect damage, which annually takes a tremendous toll of growing timber; and

"Whereas the adoption of any laws which will materially reduce any tax benefits presently accorded to the production, use and sale of timber, will adversely affect the economy of this State and of every other timber producing State within the United States; will discourage reforestation and prevent enjoyment of the benefits that flow therefrom and retard the economic development of the timber growing States, without comparable benefits to the National Government: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida:

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to defeat any measure before that body, which has for its purpose the elimination of the right to capital gains treatment relating to timber as now allowed under provisions of section 631(a), section 631(b), 1221, and 1231 Internal Revenue Code of 1954, or which has for its purpose any increase in the income taxes now assessed, levied, and collected by the United States of America with respect to the sale or use of timber.

"SEC. 2. That the secretary of state of the State of Florida is hereby directed to certify a copy of this memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to the U.S. Senators and Representatives from the State of Florida."

By Mrs. SMITH (for herself and Mr. MUSKIE):

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maine; to the Committee on Commerce:

"JOINT RESOLUTION —

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to promptly and favorably consider S. 702 and H.R. 3965 which would authorize the procurement and distribution of domestically produced fishery products under the food-for-peace program

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine in the 101st legislative session assembled, most respectfully present and petition your honorable body as follows:

"Whereas the Federal Government has embarked on a program for food for peace to facilitate the purchases of domestic food surplus for sale to needy foreign nations; and

"Whereas the use of healthful, high in protein fishery products would contribute to the success of the program; and

"Whereas the development and progress of the fishery resources of the United States requires expanded domestic and foreign markets; and

"Whereas the offshore fishery resources of the United States are being harvested by foreign powers unconcerned with proper conservation measures and the domestic market flooded with low-cost produced imports; and

"Whereas the fishing industry is one of our Nation's greatest present and potential sources of foodstuffs: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we, the memorialists, request and recommend that Congress give prompt and favorable consideration to S. 702, introduced by Senators MAGNUSON, BARTLETT, and KENNEDY and H.R. 3965, introduced by Congressman MCINTIRE, bills which would make domestically produced fishery products eligible for procurement and distribution under the food-for-peace program to assist that program and the development of the domestic fishery resources; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this memorial, duly authenticated by the secretary of state, be immediately transmitted by the secretary of state to the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Vice President of the United States, and the Honorable JOHN MCCORMACK, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Congressman from the State of Maine.

"Read and adopted in the house of representatives, April 16, 1963.

"HARVEY R. PEASE,
"Clerk.

"Read and adopted in senate chamber, in concurrence April 17, 1963.

"CHESTER T. WINSLOW,
"Secretary."

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. DIRKSEN (for Mr. EASTLAND), from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1003. A bill for the relief of the Middlesex Concrete Products and Excavating Corp. (Rept. No. 162).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. METCALF:

S. 1376. A bill relating to the establishment of concession policies in the areas administered by National Park Service, and for other purposes; and

S. 1377. A bill to provide needed facilities and services not otherwise available for the accommodation of visitors in the areas administered by the National Park Service, by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to guarantee loans which are part of concessioner investments in such facilities and services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MCGEE (for himself and Mr. SIMPSON):

S. 1378. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey certain lands in the State of Wyoming to the county of Laramie, Wyo.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 1379. A bill to incorporate the McCarran Memorial Institution and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 1380. A bill for the relief of Dr. Diago Aranda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 1381. A bill for the relief of Santa Giammalva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 1382. A bill for the relief of Sunnyside Seed Farms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 1383. A bill to amend section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 to clarify the projects to be subject to certain amendments made by that section to the Flood Control Act of 1948; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 1384. A bill to amend the National School Lunch Act so as to permit the serving of school lunches to children attending kindergarten in certain nonprofit private schools; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 1385. A bill for the relief of George Alexander Doumani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

S. 1386. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo A. Castaldo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 1387. A bill to strengthen the agricultural economy; to help to achieve a fuller and more effective use of food abundances; to provide for improved levels of nutrition among economically needy households through a program of food assistance to be operated through normal channels of trade; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 1388. A bill to add certain lands to the Cache National Forest, Utah; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. CLARK, and Mr. HART):

S. 1389. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to sue for the protection of the constitutional right to the equal protection of the laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. DOUGLAS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 1390. A bill for the relief of Charles H. Denny; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

S. 1391. A bill to provide that in determining the amount of retired pay, retirement pay, or retainer pay payable to any enlisted man, all service shall be counted which would have been counted for the same purposes if he were a commissioned officer; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1392. A bill to amend section 704 of title 38, United States Code, to permit the conversion or exchange of policies of national service life insurance to a new modified life plan; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MCCARTHY (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY):

S. 1393. A bill to amend section 4216(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the determination of constructive sale price for purposes of applying manufacturers excise taxes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 1394. A bill to establish daylight saving time uniformly throughout the United States during the months of June, July, and August of each year; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. ROBERTSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McGEE:

S.J. Res. 71. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the conduct by the Federal Trade Commission of a comprehensive investigation of chainstore practices which may be in violation of the antitrust laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. McGEE when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HART (for himself and Mr. McNAMARA):

S.J. Res. 72. Joint resolution favoring the holding of the Olympic Games in America in 1968; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. HART when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEATING:

S.J. Res. 73. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to term of office of President and Vice President, and providing for election of candidates for President and Vice President by popular vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEATING when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

JOHN R. DEVEREUX—REFERENCE OF BILL TO COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. BEALL submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 130); which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the bill (S. 245) entitled "A bill for the relief of John R. Devereux" now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the Court of Claims; and the court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28 of the United States Code and report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand, as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT A STUDY ENTITLED "DOCUMENTS ON INTERNATIONAL ASPECTS OF THE EXPLORATION AND USE OF OUTER SPACE, 1954–62"

Mr. ANDERSON submitted to the following resolution (S. Res. 131); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the study entitled "Documents on International Aspects of the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, 1954–62" prepared for the use of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, United States Senate, by the Historical Office, Bureau of Public Affairs, Department of State, shall be printed with illustrations as a Senate document. There shall be printed three thousand additional copies of such Senate document which shall be for the use of the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

AMENDMENT OF SCHOOL LUNCH ACT

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, for some years now I have had a strong interest in the Passaic Guidance Guild Nursery School of Passaic, N.J. The Guidance Guild Nursery School is an interracial, nonprofit, nonsectarian school which provides a child-care and kindergarten program. It has received strong endorsement from both local and State officials and has been supported by those in our State who recognize the invaluable service it provides. The school is sponsored by the Guidance Guild, Inc., and the Passaic section of the National Council of Jewish Women, and licensed and approved by the New Jersey State Department of Education.

The problem the Passaic Guidance Guild presently faces in respect to full participation in our programs of food distribution for schools would appear to be representative of similar situations throughout the Nation. At one time, the guild was ruled eligible to participate in the National School Lunch Act, though the records are somewhat confused concerning the exact basis for the determination of eligibility. In any case, the Department of Agriculture has presently ruled that the guidance guild has no right to take advantage of the benefits of the national school lunch program.

The guild, like others that share its status, presently receives foodstuffs under other Federal agricultural programs but has been excluded from receiving those classes of foods generally distributed under the national school lunch program. For fiscal 1962, for example, this amounted to over $280 million of food and included products as canned meat, vegetables, and fruit—foods usually not available under other programs.

The National School Lunch Act states that:

> For the purposes of this act, "school" means any public or nonprofit private school of high school grade or under and, with respect to Puerto Rico, shall also include nonprofit child-care centers certified as such by the Governor of Puerto Rico.

Under the general interpretation of the act made by the Department of Agriculture, this may or may not be inclusive of kindergarten schools and programs. If the kindergarten program is part of an eligible public or profit school then its students will benefit by the act. But if the kindergarten school or program is independent of a participating secondary school, or part of an ineligible child-care center—not in Puerto Rico—then the children who attend will not receive these foods. This distinction was stated quite clearly in a Department of Agriculture memorandum—SL 2–1—presently in effect:

> Prefirst grade schools such as kindergartens, nursery schools, and child-care centers are not eligible to participate. Children who are receiving prefirst grade instruction in an eligible participating school may participate in the school's lunch program.

Operationally, this becomes somewhat of a curious distinction. In that part of the act which provides for the apportionment of funds to the States, no such division is made. In fact, States receive funds on the basis of "the number of children therein between the ages of 5 and 17 inclusive." Which means States receive funds based on the number of children in both eligible and ineligible categories as established by the Department of Agriculture. Five-year-olds in ineligible kindergartens are counted in determining each State's share of the total funds, though they are ineligible to receive the foods that these funds buy.

This distinction of eligible and ineligible kindergarten programs becomes least understandable and most unsatisfying when we realize that most of the kindergarten students who are eligible to participate, because their kindergarten is part of an eligible participating school, are just those children who are least likely to participate, for most of them attend school for only half a day and eat their lunches at home.

Kindergarten students enrolled in a nonprofit, private, independent kindergarten school, or those in a program part of a child-care center, are those who would seem to need most the benefits of the National School Lunch Act. Many of these students—as is the case with those of the Passaic Guidance Guild—spend the entire day in school for they require special care or attention. Often both parents spend the entire day working outside the home.

In terms of kindergarten participation, as it stands now, the act provides food benefits for those children with the least need and the least opportunity to participate, while denying those benefits to those children with the greatest need and the best opportunity to participate.

The National School Lunch Act had declared it to be a policy of Congress "to safeguard the health and well-being of the Nation's children." I feel this bill to amend the act is truly within the spirit of this declaration.

My able colleague and good friend, Representative CHARLES JOELSON, of New Jersey, shares my concern for the future of the Passaic Guidance Guild Nursery School and schools in similar situations. I am pleased to announce that he will soon introduce an identical bill in the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1384) to amend the National School Lunch Act so as to permit the serving of school lunches to children attending kindergarten in certain nonprofit private schools, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AUTHORIZING THE ATTORNEY GENERAL TO SUE FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, for myself, the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], and the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], I introduce a bill authorizing the Attorney General to sue for the protection of the constitutional right to the equal protection of the laws.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks and that the bill may be held at the desk for additional cosponsors until the close of business May 1.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this bill will be recognized as a revision of so-called title III legislation previously before the Senate. Such legislation was first debated by the Congress in 1957 in a form in which the Attorney General was authorized to sue for the protection of constitutional rights "in the name of the United States but for the benefit of the real party in interest." It was then urged that the principal need for the title III proposal was based on the inability of many Negro citizens, because of lack of means and because of physical and economic coercion, to sue for the vindication of their constitutional rights. This element was also emphasized in a modified title III proposal which I first introduced in 1958—as part of S. 3257—and which has since been sponsored and supported by many of my colleagues. The modified proposal, which was last introduced by me in the 87th Congress in S. 1434, authorized the Attorney General to sue whenever a person or group of persons is unable to seek effective legal protection for the right to the equal protection of the laws.

The title III proposal which I am offering today both simplifies and broadens the previous proposals for action by the United States to redress constitutional rights through judicial action. Under the new bill the Attorney General may sue whenever there is a threat to deprive any person of the right to equal protection of the laws because of race, color, religion, or national origin. The concept of "real party in interest" and the limitation to cases where private persons are unable to sue for the redress of their own rights, have been eliminated from this bill.

It is too often true that while Congress merely marks time on necessary legislative reform the Nation moves ahead. This certainly has been the case with respect to proposals enabling the Attorney General to sue for the vindication of the right of citizens to the equal protection of the laws. Since the first legislative proposal to authorize suits by the Attorney General on behalf of individual Negro citizens and those of other minorities who are unable freely to vindicate their own rights through judicial suits, there has emerged a new doctrine of Federal intervention to protect the constitutional rights of citizens. This doctrine recognizes the direct obligation of the United States to preserve the Constitution through judicial action, all apart from the ability or inability of individual citizens to vindicate their own constitutional rights. For when the Constitution is violated, the Department of Justice has the right to intervene in order to defend the Constitution. And we should never forget that the 14th and 15th amendments are as integral parts of the Constitution as any other provisions of that great document.

The recognition that there was a national obligation to secure general compliance with the 14th amendment probably first emerged at the time of the Little Rock crisis, when the Federal Government provided massive intervention for the preservation of the Constitution. The obligation of the Federal Government to secure constitutional rights generally was next given recognition in the 1960 Democratic Party platform calling for nationwide "first step compliance" by 1963 with the school desegregation mandate. Since that time, in the freedom ride protest and the aftermath of new Federal regulations, and in a variety of situations calling for the intervention of the Attorney General, we have more and more come to recognize the direct interest of the United States in securing general compliance with the equal protection of the law guarantee.

The legislation I introduce today is predicated on our renewed awareness that great constitutional rights and their observance are not merely matters of private concern—that as a nation and a society we have a direct and impelling stake in the achievement of a living Constitution. Accordingly, this bill would authorize the Attorney General to sue for the preservation of the constitutional right to equal protection whenever and wherever there exists a threat that equal protection will be denied to any person in the land because of race, color, religion or national origin.

I call upon my colleagues in this Congress for their earnest support in the enactment of this legislation. I know of no more urgent matter today, 100 years after emancipation, than the achievement of the equal treatment for our millions of Negro citizens which remains in so many sections and areas of our national life a mere constitutional promise rather than a living constitutional right. We can go and we will go a long way toward achievement of our constitutional ideal, if we will at least authorize the Attorney General in the name of the United States to seek general compliance throughout the Nation with the equal protection guarantee of the 14th amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, in accordance with the previous unanimous consent granted, the bill will be printed in the Record and held at the desk until the close of business May 1.

The bill (S. 1389) to authorize the Attorney General to sue for the protection of the constitutional right to the equal protection of the laws, introduced by Mr. Douglas (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1980 of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1985) is amended by adding thereto a paragraph (4) to read as follows:

"(4) Whenever any person has engaged or there are reasonable grounds to believe that any person is about to engage in any act or practice which would deprive any other person, contrary to the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, of the equal protection of the laws because of race, color, religion or national origin, the Attorney General may institute for the United States, or in the name of the United States, a civil action or other proper proceeding for preventive relief, including an application for a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order or other order. The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction of proceedings instituted pursuant to this Act."

NATIONWIDE ACCELERATED TIME PERIOD FOR JUNE, JULY, AND AUGUST

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to create a nationwide accelerated time period for the summer months of June, July, and August. I am prompted to do this now, notwithstanding that it is a relatively minor matter as compared with the great issues that confront Congress.

On Sunday morning, the time in the District of Columbia will change; and the change will create a great deal of confusion. Of necessity, Government workers who live in the adjoining areas of Virginia and Maryland must operate on the same time as that which is in effect in the District, so their time will change. But outside the 10th District of Virginia, the other 9 districts will remain on standard time until the last of May. Then they will go on fast time and will continue on fast time until the last of August.

In World War I, we had the fast time, partly as a war measure calculated to increase production. That was done under the constitutional right of Congress to provide for interstate commerce and also to provide for weights, measures, and so forth. Following that war, the farmers—especially those in the dairying areas of Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Virginia—objected so much to getting up before daylight that Congress repealed daylight saving. President Wilson vetoed that act, but it was passed over his veto.

So we drifted on, with some States and the District of Columbia thereafter having daylight saving, until we inaugurated it again during World War II. As I recall, during that war daylight saving was in effect for so long a period of time that we would be getting up in the night time, just to reach our offices by 9 a.m. Of course, that situation was so objectionable to so many persons that Congress repealed that act.

So what do we find now? The railroads, the airplanes, and the buses operate on standard time; but they must have schedules which show the time of arrival at and the times of departure from terminals which operate on a different time. It costs the railroads alone $500,000 to have those additional schedules, and probably it costs the airplane companies $250,000. That involves large expense for all the transportation agencies.

Those of us who live in Virginia have to know, when we have a speaking engagement, where it is. If it is in the 10th District, it is on one time; if it is elsewhere, it is on another time; and that situation continues until the last of May, before it changes.

Mr. President, all of us know that daylight saving is primarily for the benefit of the office workers; it gives them more leisure time in the daylight hours during the spring and summer months.

However, we also know that it is not fair to the farmers—who have to get their produce to the markets early—to have to get up an hour before daylight in the spring; and we should try to reconcile the interests of the farmers, and also the interests of the schoolchildren, who have to get on the school buses at 8 a.m., and in some cases earlier, both in the spring and in the fall.

So, Mr. President, with a view to being fair to the farmers and the schoolchildren, and also to reaching a compromise with the interests of the office workers, who presumably would like to have daylight saving in effect from late in April until some time in October, I believe, I am proposing that we have daylight saving for only 3 months—June, July, and August.

I hope very much that the committee to which the bill will be referred will give it early consideration. I do not assume that the bill can be acted on within a week or two; but certainly it can be acted on in time to end daylight saving for the Nation by the end of August. The bill will provide that it applies to the entire Nation; and also—in keeping with the decision of the Supreme Court that when Congress fully covers a field, the States are precluded from acting in it—the bill will provide that no State law in conflict with this daylight saving measure shall be passed. So the law will be uniform. In my opinion, it will be fair to all concerned; and it will prevent a great deal of confusion.

Again, I say I hope the Senate will act promptly on this measure. Of course, this is not a vital matter; but the present situation can cause a great deal of unnecessary trouble and inconvenience.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1394) to establish daylight saving time uniformly throughout the United States during the months of June, July, and August of each year, introduced by Mr. ROBERTSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION INVESTIGATION RESOLUTION

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, in recent weeks I have spoken to this body on my concern over the decline in beef prices. At the time I pointed out that the combination of circumstances surrounding the decline of those prices indicated to me that factors other than the traditional ones of supply and demand were at work in the marketplace.

In conjunction with those remarks I wrote a letter to Mr. Rand Dixon, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, suggesting that an investigation by his agency was in order to determine why in those market fluctuations very few if any of the savings resulting from the reduction of the producer's income were passed on to the consumer. It appeared to me that there is a very strong possibility that some of the large chain stores were using their mass purchasing power to influence the market in their favor.

My original concern was over beef but as I looked further into the pricing practices of the chainstores, circumstances very similar to those that occurred with respect to livestock appeared in other commodity markets where the chain stores are large purchasers. There has been considerable fluctuation in prices of baked goods, milk, and various canned goods in areas served by the large grocery chains.

As a result of these findings, Mr. President, I am introducing today a joint resolution to direct the Federal Trade Commission to conduct a full and complete investigation of the purchasing, processing, marketing, and pricing practices of chainstore operators with a view to determining whether any of such practices are in violation of provisions of the antitrust laws. This joint resolution further provides that the FTC shall transmit to the Congress its findings, a report of any action taken, and such recommendations for further legislation as the Commission believes appropriate.

Mr. President, too many self-styled defenders of the free enterprise system spend a lot of time paying lipservice to the small independent operator and praising the virtue of initiative and competition but are strangely silent when the small businessman or the farmer is being squeezed by the industrial and commercial giants that develop in a free society.

It is the job of our Government to protect our citizens from unfair competition in the marketplace. This is indeed an onerous assignment, for there is a very thin line between protection and restriction and yet that line must be drawn. I would emphasize that I am not opposed to size per se.

Supermarkets have a right to be large-scale operations and if they are able because of large-scale purchasing to offer goods at a lower price I would consider this a demonstration of the validity of the law of supply and demand. The growth and development of the chainstore has certainly contributed much to the reduction of the cost of food to the American family and the great increase in variety and quality of foodstuffs we have enjoyed since the end of World War II.

But size in a commercial enterprise creates the ability to squeeze little competitors out of the market or to force demands of performance or price upon suppliers. Therefore size does create the necessity for supervision. History has ample illustrations to demonstrate there are always those quite willing to use their power unfairly if given the opportunity.

I am convinced, Mr. President, that this joint resolution would be in the best interests of the consumer, the producer, and indeed the middleman himself. For certainly if there are unfair practices and they are allowed to grow until they become blatently obvious, not only those who are guilty of these practices but our whole free enterprise system will be discredited. And already many complaints about chainstore pricing have been received in Washington.

In his reply to my letter Mr. Dixon said:

> It has been our observation, based upon complaints and past as well as current investigations and formal actions, that the activities of the various chainstores are indeed difficult, if not impossible, to understand under our system of free, competitive enterprise. I suspect that much of the trouble is occasioned by the vertical integration not only of the meat industry but also of the food industries as a whole and of the chainstores as well.

Mr. President, in the interests of justice and fairplay I think it imperative that the suspicion cast upon these chain store operations be ended and I can see no better way to do that than by an impartial investigation. Honor in the marketplace is one of the touchstones of our free enterprise system and must be preserved at all costs.

Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 71) to authorize and direct the conduct by the Federal Trade Commission of a comprehensive investigation of chainstore practices which may be in violation of the antitrust laws, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McGEE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

OLYMPIC GAMES OF 1968—RESOLUTION

Mr. HART. Mr. President, one of the recurring events which combine drama and excitement and national cooperation is the Olympic games.

It has been 34 years since the United States served as the host to these events, which attract the interest and spark the imagination of peoples all over the world. Under the leadership of Mayor Jerome P. Cavanagh, the city of Detroit has been designated as the city in this country to bid for the 1968 Olympics. This successful effort by Detroit has stirred all people in the sportsminded city of Detroit. I hope that the leadership given in this effort by Mayor Cavanagh and his committee will be rewarded by success in bringing the games to the United States. To support this effort and to reflect the unreserved welcome which this country would accord the competitors and visitors to the games, I send to the desk for myself and the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] this resolution of encouragement and support of the bid of the city of Detroit. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed at the conclusion of my remarks and appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 72) favoring the holding of the Olympic games in America in 1968, introduced by Mr. HART (for himself and Mr. McNAMARA), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the United States Olympic Association will invite the International Olympic Committee to hold the Olympic games at Detroit, Michigan, in 1968; and

Whereas Detroit has demonstrated a willingness and capacity to provide excellent facilities for the games and the visitors who attend them; and

Whereas Detroit's midwestern location will offer foreign visitors a revealing look at the American heartland; and

Whereas the United States has not hosted the games since 1932 and would be honored to welcome this enterprise in international good will: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Government of the United States, therefore, expresses the sincere hope that the Olympic games will be held in this country in 1968 and pledges continuing support of the principles on which the Olympic games are founded.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of State is directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the International Olympic Committee.

JOINT RESOLUTION ABOLISHING ELECTORAL COLLEGE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution providing for the election by popular vote of the President and Vice President.

This joint resolution would abolish the electoral college, and would permit our Nation's highest leaders to be chosen directly by the people.

The acute interest in electoral reform evidenced after every close election fades rapidly in the period between elections. There may be situations in which it is unwise to legislate at the height of public indignation. In this case, however, waning public interest has helped perpetuate for too many years the cumbersome and unreasonable system under which the American people choose their President and Vice President.

Diminishing public interest is only one of the factors which discourage a change in the present system. Another is disagreement, by those who agree that the present system is archaic and unfair, as to the procedure which should be adopted.

There is even substantial disagreement as to the reasons for dissatisfaction with the present system. In my judgment, the most serious flaw in the present system is that it permits the election of a minority President. In our history there have actually been three cases in which a President who received a smaller number of votes than the number received by his closest opponent was elected: John Quincy Adams, in 1824—over Jackson; Rutherford B. Hayes, in 1876—over Tilden; and Benjamin Harrison, in 1888—over Cleveland. In the first case, the minority President was chosen by the House of Representatives; in the other two, he was chosen by a majority vote of the electoral college.

There is a widespread view that the present system is heavily weighted in favor of the larger States. Nothing could be further from the fact.

This is illustrated by some actual figures. In the 1960 election, New York's 7,276,000 voters elected 45 electors. This is a ration of 1 elector for approximately 162,000 voters. In the smallest State, Hawaii, on the other hand, 185,000 voters elected 3 electors, a ratio of 1 elector for every 62,000 voters. In Mississippi, 181,000 voters elected 8 electors, for a ratio of 1 elector for every 23,000 voters. On a comparative basis, this means that under the present electoral college system, the voting weight of a Hawaiian citizen is almost 3 times that of a New York citizen, and the voting weight of a Mississippi citizen is almost 7 times that of a New York citizen. Many other examples of this situation could be cited. They refute completely any argument that the present method of electing the President and Vice President favors voters in the larger States.

In my view, every citizen should have an equal voice in the selection of the President. This is not accomplished by simply allowing each voter to vote for the same number of electors, as is proposed in some other joint resolutions dealing with the electoral college. Actually, there is only one way to assure voter equality in the selection of a President and Vice President, and that is by having them chosen by the people in a direct election. Direct election of our Chief Executive is also the only sure method of preventing the election of a minority President. Under a direct election system, furthermore, no State, large or small, would have an undue influence in the choice of the President. Instead, each State would have only the weight it was entitled to have by virtue of its voting population.

The direct election system eliminates any need for an electoral college. This vestigial remainder of an era in which the people were not fully trusted to choose the President no longer has any place in our Republic.

I believe that the joint resolution I am today introducing represents the only effective method of eliminating all the hazards of the present system, and that it must be the ultimate goal of those who seek basic reform in the process of electing the Nation's leaders.

This joint resolution, following a proposal on which I joined the majority leader in the 87th Congress, would also reduce the period of delay between November 7 and January 20, before the newly elected President assumes office.

That is very important because the problems of the world with which our Nation is concerned simply do not await the formalities of a presidential inauguration.

The conditions which prevail today and which we must assume will exist for decades, make it essential that the powers of the Presidency be exercised as soon as possible by the new designee instead of a lame duck. Under the provisions of this joint resolution, a newly elected President would take office on December 1 rather than January 20, which will cut down substantially on the hazardous period of transition and also give the new President time to shape his legislative program before Congress convenes.

The necessity of dealing with the problems of the electoral college by constitutional amendment, which requires a two-thirds vote of Congress and ratification by three-fourths of the States, precludes any optimism as to their solution. A willingness to compromise on all sides is necessary if any progress is to be made.

The whole question has been the subject of study by the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary. We have had extensive hearings. Speaking as one member of that committee, I certainly am ready to make concessions and compromises in order to bring about some solution of the problem. I rather apprehend that that is the attitude of other members of that committee. But it seems to me the goal of one American, one vote, however, should be basic.

The joint resolution which I am today introducing in my judgment is the best way of assuring its accomplishment.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed following my remarks the text of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 73) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to term of office of President and Vice President, and providing for election of candidates for President and Vice President by popular vote introduced by Mr. KEATING, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by conventions in three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE—

"SECTION 1. The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his office during a term of four years, and, together with the Vice President, chosen for the same term, shall be elected by votes cast by the people of the several States. No person constitutionally ineligible for the office of President shall be eligible for that of Vice President of the United States.

"The Congress shall determine the time of such election, which shall be the same throughout the United States. Until otherwise determined by the Congress, such election shall be held on the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November of the year in which the regular term of the President and Vice President, as herein provided, is to begin.

"The persons voting in each State in such election shall have the qualifications requisite for persons voting for members of the most numerous branch of the legislature of that State. The places and manner of holding such election shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof, but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations. The candidates for the Offices of President and Vice President shall be selected in such manner as the Congress shall by law provide. The names of the candidates so selected shall be placed on the ballot in each State, and shall so appear thereon that a single vote will be cast by each voter for the candidate of a political party for the office of President and the candidate of the same party for the office of the Vice President.

"SEC. 2. Within two weeks after such election, the chief executive of each State shall make distinct lists showing the number of votes cast in such State for the candidates of each political party for the offices of President and Vice President, which lists shall be signed, certified, and transmitted under the seal of such State to the seat of the Government of the United States directed to the President of the Senate.

"On the twenty-first day following such election the President of the Senate shall open all certificates in the presence of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Chief Justice of the United States, and the votes shall then be counted. The candidates for the offices of President and Vice President having the greatest number of votes shall be President and Vice President, respectively. If two or more candidates shall have an equal number of votes for President and Vice President and such number is greater than that received by any other candidate, the candidate shall be deemed elected who shall have received the greatest number of the votes in each of the greatest number of States. The Congress may by law provide for the case wherein one or more of the persons referred to in the first sentence of this paragraph are unable to be present on the day fixed for the opening of the certificates, declaring who shall act in their places.

"SEC. 3. The terms of the President and Vice President shall end at noon on the first day of December in the fourth year of their term; and the terms of their successors shall then begin.

"SEC. 4. The first, second, third, and fourth paragraphs of section 1, article II, of the Constitution, the twelfth article of the amendment to the Constitution, that part of section 1 of the twentieth article of amendment to the Constitution which refers to the terms of the President and Vice President, and section 4 of the twentieth article of amendment to the Constitution are hereby repealed.

"SEC. 5. This article shall take effect on the first day of June following its ratification.

"SEC. 6. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by conventions in three-fourths of the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by Congress."

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963—AMENDMENTS

Mr. TOWER submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 5517) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to House bill 5517, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS TO SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. JAVITS submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.R. 5517) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 2, line 10, after the period insert the following:

"No part of the amount made available under this head in the Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1963, for 'Payments to States and Puerto Rico' shall be paid to any State in which the participants in, or beneficiaries of, the State programs carried out in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture are segregated, or otherwise discriminated against, on account of race, creed, or color."

Mr. JAVITS also submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 5517, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. JAVITS submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.R. 5517) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 3 line 11, before the period insert the following: ": *Provided*, That no part of such additional amount shall be used in any State in which the participants in, or beneficiaries of, the programs of the Farmers Home Administration are segregated, or otherwise discriminated against, on account of race, creed, or color".

On page 3, line 18, before the period insert the folowing: ": *Provided*, That no part of such amount shall be used for loans, or advances in connection with security for such loans, to provide rental housing or related facilities which are not available, or will not be available, to individuals without regard to race, creed, or color".

Mr. JAVITS also submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 5517, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. DOUGLAS submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.R. 5517), the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1963, the following amendment, namely:

"TITLE V

"This title may be cited as the 'Federal Elections Act of 1963'.

"Part I—Table of contents and definitions

"Table of Contents

"SEC. 501. This Act is divided into parts and sections according to the following table of contents:

"TABLE OF CONTENTS

"Part I—Table of contents and definitions

"Sec. 501. Table of contents.
"Sec. 502. Definitions.

"Part II—Campaign practices

"Sec. 503. Organization of political committees.
"Sec. 504. Reports by political committees.
"Sec. 505. Reports by others than political committees.
"Sec. 506. Reports by candidates.
"Sec. 507. Formal requirements on filing reports and statements.
"Sec. 508. Duties of the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate.
"Sec. 509. Duties of clerks of United States district courts.
"Sec. 510. General penalties for violations.
"Sec. 511. Expenses of election contests.
"Sec. 512. Effect on State laws.
"Sec. 513. Partial invalidity.
"Sec. 514. Repealing clause.

"Part III—Amendments to criminal code

"Sec. 515. Definitions.
"Sec. 516. Publication or distribution of election materials.

"Part IV—Effective date

"Sec. 517. Effective date.

"Definitions

"SEC. 502. As used in this title and title II, unless the context clearly indicates otherwise—

"(1) The term 'election' includes a general, special, or primary election, including a preferential primary, and a convention or a caucus of a political party held for the purpose of nominating candidates;

"(2) The term 'candidate' means an individual whose name is presented at an election for nomination for, or election as, President or Vice President, or Senator or Representative in, or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress of the United States, whether or not such individual is nominated or elected;

"(3) The term 'political committee' includes any committee, association, or organization which accepts contributions or makes expenditures in an aggregate amount exceeding $2,500 in any calendar year for the purpose of influencing or attempting to influence in any manner whatsoever the election of a candidate or candidates or presidential or vice presidential electors;

"(4) The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit, of money, or anything of value, or transfer of funds between committees, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforcible, to make a contribution;

"(5) The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift, or money, or anything of value, or transfer of funds between committees, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforcible, to make an expenditure;

"(6) The term 'person' includes an individual, partnership, committee, association, corporation, and any other organization or group of persons; and

"(7) The term 'State' includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, any possession of the United States, and the District of Columbia.

"*Part II—Campaign practices*

"Organization of Political Committees

"SEC. 503. (a) Every political committee shall have a chairman and a treasurer. No contribution shall be accepted, and no expenditure made, by or on behalf of a political committee for the purpose of influencing an election until such chairman and treasurer have been chosen. No expenditure shall be made for or on behalf of a political committee without the authorization of its chairman or treasurer.

"(b) Every person who receives a contribution for a political committee shall, on demand of the treasurer, and in any event within five days after the receipt of such contribution, render to the treasurer a detailed account thereof, including the name and address of the person making such contribution, and the date on which received. It shall be the duty of the treasurer to see to it that all contributions received by or for a committee shall be kept separate from any personal funds and deposited in a special account.

"(c) It shall be the duty of the treasurer of a political committee to keep a detailed and exact account of—

"(1) all contributions made to or for such committee;

"(2) the name and address of every person making any such contribution, and the date thereof;

"(3) all expenditures made by or on behalf of such committee; and

"(4) the name and address of every person to whom any such expenditure is made, and the date thereof.

"(d) It shall be the duty of the treasurer to obtain and keep a receipted bill, stating the particulars, for every expenditure by or on behalf of a political committee exceeding $100 in amount. The treasurer shall preserve all receipted bills and accounts required to be kept by this section for a period of two years from the date of the filing of the statement containing such items.

"Reports by Political Committees

"SEC. 504 (a) The treasurer of a political committee shall file reports of receipts and expenditures with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, on forms to be prescribed by him, and shall transmit a copy of such reports (except as provided in section 509 (b)) to the clerk of the United States district court for the district in which the principal office of the committee is located. Such reports shall be filed, complete as of June 30 and December 31 of each year, and as of the tenth day next preceding the date on which an election is to be held, and as of the thirtieth day following an election, with respect to which contributions were received or expenditures made by such committee. In each instance reports shall be filed not later than the third day following the reporting date as above provided. Each report shall contain—

"(1) the amount of cash on hand at the beginning of the reporting period;

"(2) the name and address of each person who has made a contribution to or for such committee in one or more items of the aggregate amount or value, within the calendar year, of $100 or more, together with the amount and date of such contribution; and for the purposes of this paragraph the term 'contribution', as used herein, shall not include transfers of funds to or from political committees or candidates;

"(3) the total sum of individual contributions made to or for such committee during the calendar year and not stated under paragraph (2);

"(4) the name and address of each political committee or candidate from which the committee received any transfer of funds, together with the amounts and dates of all such transfers;

"(5) the total sum of all contributions made to or for such committee during the calendar year;

"(6) the name and address of each person to whom an expenditure has been made by such committee in one or more items of the aggregate amount or value, within the calendar year, of $100 or more, and the amount, date, and purpose of such expenditure;

"(7) the total sum of all expenditures made by such committee, during the calendar year and not stated under paragraph (6);

"(8) the name and address of each political committee or candidate to which the committee made any transfer of funds, together with the amounts and dates of all such transfers; and

"(9) the total sum of expenditures made by such committee during the calendar year.

"(b) The reports required to be filed by subsection (a) shall be cumulative during the calendar year to which they relate, but where there has been no change in an item reported in a previous report only the amount need be carried forward.

"(c) The report required to be filed as of December 31 shall cover the entire calendar year.

"(d) In the case of political committees supporting candidates for President, Vice President, or Senator, a copy of the report filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives under subsection (a) shall be filed with the Secretary of the Senate.

"(e) The reports required to be filed by subsection (a) of this section shall also contain a list of the names of candidates in whose behalf contributions were received or expenditures made. In the case of political committees supporting more than one candidate (and State and local candidates), the amount of the total expenditures allocable to each candidate—

"(1) shall be in the same ratio as expenditures on behalf of each candidate for printing and advertising, radio time, and television time bears to the total of such expenditures, or

"(2) where no expenditures were made for Federal candidates for any of such purposes there shall be charged to each Federal candidate an amount equal to the full expenditure divided by the total number of candidates, Federal and State;

except that expenditures specifically designated for an individual candidate shall be charged to such candidate.

"(f) Whenever any report is filed by the treasurer of any political committee pursuant to subsection (a), such treasurer at the same time shall transmit a true and correct copy of such report to each candidate on whose behalf such report reflects any contribution received, or any expenditure made, by such political committee.

"Reports by Other Than Political Committees

"SEC. 505. Every person (other than those filing reports pursuant to section 504) who makes an expenditure in one or more items aggregating $100 or more within a calendar year, other than by contribution to a political committee, for the purpose of influencing, in two or more States, election of candidates, shall file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, on a form to be prescribed by him, an itemized detailed report of such expenditures in the same manner as required of the treasurer of a political committee by section 504, and shall file a copy thereof (subject to the provisions of section 509(b)) with the clerk of the United States district court for the district in which such expenditures are made, and in the case of any expenditure in support of a candidate for President, Vice President, or United States Senator, shall file a copy of the report with the Secretary of the Senate.

"Reports by Candidates

"SEC. 506. (a) Every candidate shall file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, on a form to be prescribed by him, reports of receipts and expenditures and shall transmit a copy thereof to the Secretary of the Senate if a candidate for Senator, and (except as provided in section 509(b) to the clerk of the United States district court for the district in which the candidate resides. Such reports shall be complete as of the tenth day next preceding the date on which an election for the office for which he is a candidate is to be held, and as of the fortieth day following such election, and in each instance shall be filed not later than the third day following the reporting date; except that where a candidate in order to qualify for the general election must run in two successive primaries in one party no second report on the first primary will be required for those candidates participating in the second primary if reports filed for the second primary are cumulative and supplementary of the report filed before the first primary. Such reports shall contain a correct and itemized detailed report of contributions received and expenditures made by him in aid or support of his candidacy for election, or for the purpose of influencing the result of the election, in the same manner as required of the treasurer of a political committee by section 504, including amounts expended from his own funds.

"(b) The reports required to be filed by subsection (a) shall be cumulative, but where there has been no change in an item reported in a previous report, only the amount need be carried forward.

"Formal Requirements on Filing Reports and Statements

"SEC. 507. The reports and statements required by this title to be filed by a candidate, a treasurer of a political committee, or by any other person, with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the copies thereof required to be filed with the Secretary of the Senate, and (subject to the provisions of section 509(b)) with the clerk of the United States district court—

"(1) shall be verified by the oath or affirmation of the person filing such report or statement, taken before any officer authorized to administer oaths;

"(2) shall be deemed properly filed when delivered to the specified recipient, or when deposited in an established post office within the prescribed time, duly stamped, registered, and properly addressed, but in the event it is not received, a duplicate of such report or statement shall be promptly filed upon notice of its nonreceipt by the officer with whom it is required to be filed; and

"(3) a copy shall be preserved by the person filing it for a period of one year from the date of filing.

"Duties of the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate

"SEC. 508. It shall be the duty of the Clerk of the House of Representatives and of the Secretary of the Senate—

"(1) to preserve the reports and statements filed under this title for a period of six years from the date of receipt;

"(2) to make such reports and statements available for public inspection during regular office hours;

"(3) to make such reports and statements available for such inspection within twenty-four hours of their receipt by them; and

"(4) to permit copying of any such report or statement by hand or by duplicating machine, as requested by any person, at the expense of such person.

"Duties of Clerks of United States District Courts

"Sec. 509. (a) It shall be the duty of the clerks of United States district courts—

"(1) to receive and maintain in an orderly manner all reports and statements required by this Act to be filed with such clerks;

"(2) to maintain such reports and statements for public inspection for a period of six years from the date of receipt;

"(3) to make such reports and statements available for public inspection during regular office hours;

"(4) to make available for public inspection each report and statement within twenty-four hours of its receipt; and

"(5) to permit copying of any such report or statement by hand or by duplicating machine, as requested by any person, at the expense of such person.

"(b) In States where the secretary of state or other State official is authorized to perform the duties specified in this section, the filing of reports and statements under this title shall be with such State official in lieu of the filing with the clerk of the United States district court.

"General Penalties for Violations

"Sec. 510. (a) Any person who violates any of the provisions of this part shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

"(b) Any person who willfully violates any provision of this part shall be fined not more than $10,000 and imprisoned not more than two years.

"Expenses of Election Contests

"Sec. 511. This Act shall not limit or affect the right of any person to make contributions or expenditures for proper legal expenses in contesting the results of an election.

"Effect on State Laws

"Sec. 512. This Act shall not be construed to annul, or to exempt any candidate from complying with, the laws of any State relating to the nomination or election of candidates, unless such laws are directly inconsistent with the provisions of this Act.

"Partial Invalidity

"Sec. 513. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the Act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

"Repealing Clause

"Sec. 514. All other Acts or parts of Acts inconsistent herewith are repealed.

"Part III—Amendments to Criminal Code

"Definitions

"Sec. 515. Section 591 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

" '§ 591. Definitions

" 'When used in sections 597, 599, 602, 608, 609, 610, and 612 of this title—

" '(1) The term "election" includes a general, special, or primary election, including a preferential primary, and a convention or a caucus of a political party held for the purpose of nominating candidates;

" '(2) The term "candidate" means an individual whose name is presented at an election for nomination for, or election as, President or Vice President, or Senator, or Representative in, or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress of the United States, whether or not such individual is nominated or elected;

" '(3) The term "political committee" includes any committee, association, or organization which accepts contributions or makes expenditures in an aggregate amount exceeding $2,500 in any calendar year for the purpose of influencing or attempting to influence in any manner whatsoever the election of a candidate or candidates or presidential or vice presidential electors;

" '(4) The term "contribution" includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit, of money, or anything of value, or transfer of funds between committees, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforcible, to make a contribution;

" '(5) The term "expenditure" includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift, of money, or anything of value, or transfer of funds between committees, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforcible, to make an expenditure;

" '(6) The term "person" includes an individual, partnership, committee, association, corporation, and any other organization or group of persons;

" '(7) The term "State" includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, any possession of the United States, and the District of Columbia.'

"Publication or Distribution of Election Materials

"Sec. 516. Section 612 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting after the word 'names' wherever it appears therein the words 'and addresses'.

"Part IV—Effective date

"Effective Date of Titles I to III

"Sec. 517. Titles I and II and the amendments made by title III shall take effect on January 1, 1964, except that the provisions of this Act shall not apply to contributions and expenditures made prior to such date; but nothing in this Act shall relieve any person from filing any statements or reports required under the law in force prior to the date of enactment of this Act."

Mr. DOUGLAS also submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 5517, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

PRICE OF CERTAIN RADIO AVIGATION CHARTS AND OTHER RELATED MATERIAL SOLD BY COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of the bill (S. 1336) to provide that the price at which the Coast and Geodetic Survey sells radio avigation charts and certain related material to the public shall not be less than the cost thereof, the name of my colleague from Colorado [Mr. Dominick] be added as a cosponsor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills:

Authority of April 18, 1963:

S. 1334. A bill to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act: Mr. Douglas.

Authority of April 22, 1963:

S. 1342. A bill to prohibit the introduction into interstate commerce of any shipping container manufactured in the United States from imported steel unless the container is marked so as to indicate the country of origin of the steel: Mr. Clark, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Moss, Mr. Randolph, and Mr. Simpson.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were order to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

Interview by Ann M. Corrick and Jim Snyder of Senator Mansfield on April 22, 1963, on the radio program "Washington Viewpoint."

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Statement concerning attractions of the State of West Virginia, the West Virginia Centennial and achievements of that State, including excerpts from advertising section 11, The New York Times, Sunday, April 21, 1963.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR CANNON

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am keenly pleased and happy to offer for printing in the Record a resolution passed on April 18 of this year by the Nevada Legislature Senate. The resolution extends congratulations to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon] for his distinguished service in the U.S. Senate and his able representation in this body of the State of Nevada.

Not only is the resolution well deserved, Mr. President, but it was passed unanimously by the Nevada State Senate, and I believe that bespeaks a great deal—when the members of both parties, sitting as senators in the Nevada State Senate, pass a resolution in high praise of this very able Democratic Member of the U.S. Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 34—Senators Brown, Bay, Berrum, Bissett, Dial, Dodge, Frank, Fransway, Gallagher, Humphrey, Lamb, Lemaire, McGowan, Monroe, Parks, Slattery and Whitacre

Whereas U.S. Senator Howard Cannon was born at St. George, Utah, and received his education at various institutions of learning in Utah and Arizona; and

Whereas Senator Cannon is a member of the bar of the States of Nevada, Utah, and Arizona, and recently received, in recognition of his signal ability and achievements, the honorary degree of doctor of laws from Arizona State College; and

Whereas as a member of the U.S. Army Air Force during World War II, Senator Cannon served his country nobly and well, and so distinguished himself for gallantry above and beyond the call of duty that he was the recipient of numerous awards, including the Distinguished Flying Cross and the Purple Heart; and

Whereas Senator CANNON has ever demonstrated a keen interest in the progress of the State of Nevada, and has ever sought to promote the best interests of his fellow Nevadans, as is shown by his membership and active participation in such organizations as the Lions International, the Southern Nevada Industrial Foundation, Inc., the National Institution of Municipal Law Officers and the Las Vegas Chamber of Commerce; and

Whereas since 1959, Senator CANNON has ably and tirelessly worked in behalf of the people of the State of Nevada, and of all Americans, in the capacity of U.S. Senator, in which capacity he has served as a member of the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee, the Armed Services Committee, the Commerce Committee and the Rules and Administration Committee; and

Whereas the life and works of U.S. Senator HOWARD CANNON serve as an inspiration to all and furnish a shining example of devotion to country, dedication to duty and service to one's fellow man: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Nevada, the Assembly concurring, That the members of the 52d session of the Legislature of the State of Nevada hereby extend their congratulations to U.S. Senator HOWARD CANNON for his many outstanding achievements and for his selfless dedication to the welfare of the people of Nevada and of all Americans; and be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be prepared and transmitted forthwith by the legislative counsel to U.S. Senator HOWARD CANNON.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the new reports on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting a nomination, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(For nomination this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the new reports on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Alfred C. Dumouchel, of Rhode Island, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 5, with headquarters at Providence, R.I.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Frank E. Smith, of Mississippi, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority for the term expiring May 18, 1972.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

GUANTÁNAMO STORY HUSHED UP

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Guantánamo Story Hushed Up" which was written by Jack Anderson, and is published today in the Washington Post.

I respectfully suggest that the Senate Armed Services Committee would well serve the Senate by making inquiry into the charges and allegations set forth in the article, so that we can have from our own Armed Services Committee official information as to the charges raised by Mr. Anderson. They are very serious charges, and I take the position that we should have an official statement in regard to them. They seem to me to fall clearly within the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee; therefore, I hope that committee will consider them, and I believe it to be its duty to report to the Senate in regard to this matter.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 26, 1963]

GUANTÁNAMO STORY HUSHED UP

(By Jack Anderson)

One of the most explosive incidents of the long Cuban crisis—the shooting of a Cuban spy during a scuffle with his Marine escort officer—has been hushed up by the Defense Department.

For their part in the incident, four officers were railroaded out of the Marine Corps without a formal hearing and were warned to keep their mouths zippered.

First to get the boot was Capt. Arthur J. Jackson, husky hero of World War II, who shot the Cuban in self-defense.

Back in 1944, Jackson won the Medal of Honor, the Nation's highest award, for defying deadly enemy fire and storming Japanese pillboxes on Peleliu Island as an army of one.

After he had finished his havoc, witnesses counted 12 pillboxes and 50 Japanese soldiers that he alone had wiped out with a blazing submachinegun and phosphorous grenades.

Yet 18 years later, Gen. David Shoup, the Marine Corps Commandant, was so upset over possible repercussion from the Cuban shooting that he ordered Jackson and his family thrown off the Guantánamo Naval Base.

"You are not fit to wear the same uniform as Col. John Glenn," Shoup shouted at the hero of Peleliu Island.

From careful interviews with those involved, this column has pieced together the suppressed story of how Ruben Lopez, a Castro agent, died near the gates of Guantánamo and how Captain Jackson was stripped of his commission for defending himself and disposing of the body.

CASTRO SPY CAUGHT

Although Lopez had been marked by Naval Intelligence as a spy for Castro, he had been allowed to keep his job as a bus driver on the Guantánamo base.

Watched closely, he was caught by Jackson in a restricted area and was unable to give an adequate explanation for being there.

Jackson decided to kick the Cuban off the base and routed another Marine officer, Lt. William A. Szili, out of bed to assist in the ceremony.

They decided to evict Lopez through a back gate but noticed the lock on the gate was broken. So Szili drove off in a jeep for tools to repair it, leaving Jackson alone with the spy.

A big man, Jackson appeared deceptively heavy-footed, and the Cuban apparently thought he could catch the Marine off guard.

Suddenly, Lopez whirled and lunged at Jackson, grabbing for his gun. The hero of Peleliu fired, and Lopez fell dead at his feet.

When Szili returned, the pair realized that Premier Fidel Castro could make an international incident of the shooting with consequences that might echo around the world. Foolishly they decided to dispose of the body themselves by heaving it over a cliff.

Next morning they returned to cover the body so a Cuban patrol wouldn't discover it. But they brooded about it later, still fearing discovery.

BODY SECRETLY BURIED

Finally they enlisted the help of three other officers and six enlisted men to haul the body back up the cliff and bury it on the base. But inevitably word leaked to their superiors, and they were called on the carpet.

Result: Four of the officers were drummed out of the corps, the fifth, was allowed to finish his 2-year hitch. The enlisted men were merely disciplined.

Jackson demanded a court martial, which could not be granted without revealing the incident. When he took his demand all the way to Shoup, the Commandant angrily threatened to call in two officers and hold a court martial on the spot. He made it clear what the verdict would be.

The ousted officers, their Marine Corps records cloudy, have had trouble finding work.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS—OREGON WHEAT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in the near future the Senate will have an opportunity to review the agricultural appropriation bill. This measure is always of particular interest to my State, since agriculture is our second largest industry.

We are particularly proud of the fine quality of our wheat, both on the basis of our total production and on the basis of the yield per acre harvested.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD tables prepared by the Oregon Crop and Livestock Reporting Service, under date of April 8, 1963, which set forth our crop statistics for 1961 and 1962.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

OREGON CROP AND LIVESTOCK REPORTING SERVICE

Oregon: Winter, spring, and all wheat—Acreage planted for all purposes, harvested for grain, yield per acre harvested, and production, 1961 crop (revised)

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Statistical Reporting Service, 304 U.S. Courthouse, Portland, Oreg., and Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oreg., released, Apr. 8, 1963

District and county	Winter wheat				Spring wheat				All wheat			
	Acreage		Yield per acre harvested	Production	Acreage		Yield per acre harvested	Production	Acreage		Yield per acre harvested	Production
	Planted, all purposes	Harvested for grain			Planted, all purposes	Harvested for grain			Net seeded[1]	Harvested for grain		
District 1:	*Acres*	*Acres*	*Bushels*	*Bushels*	*Acres*	*Acres*	*Bushels*	*Bushels*	*Acres*	*Acres*	*Bushels*	*Bushels*
Benton	3,350	3,200	31.2	100,000	1,100	1,100	20.0	22,000	4,450	4,300	28.4	122,000
Clackamas	7,450	7,100	28.0	199,000	1,500	1,500	19.3	29,000	8,950	8,600	26.5	228,000
Lane	3,550	3,400	30.3	103,000	1,300	1,300	25.4	33,000	4,850	4,700	28.9	136,000
Linn	5,300	5,100	32.7	167,000	3,200	3,200	20.6	66,000	8,500	8,300	28.1	233,000
Marion	18,000	17,500	31.4	550,000	2,400	2,300	23.9	55,000	20,300	19,800	30.6	605,000
Multnomah	400	400	35.0	14,000					400	400	35.0	14,000
Polk	12,200	12,000	33.8	406,000	1,000	1,000	21.0	21,000	13,200	13,000	32.8	427,000
Washington	17,500	17,200	31.9	548,000	500	400	22.5	9,000	18,000	17,600	31.6	557,000
Yamhill	16,200	16,000	32.8	525,000	750	700	27.1	19,000	16,950	16,700	32.6	544,000
Total, district 1	83,950	81,900	31.9	2,612,000	11,750	11,500	22.1	254,000	95,600	93,400	30.7	2,866,000
District 2:												
Clatsop												
Columbia	400	400	30.0	12,000					400	400	30.0	12,000
Coos												
Curry												
Lincoln												
Tillamook												
Total, district 2	400	400	30.0	12,000					400	400	30.0	12,000
District 3:												
Douglas	250	200	20,0	4,000	400	400	20.0	8,000	650	600	20.0	12,000
Jackson	300	300	30.0	9,000	250	200	35,0	7,000	550	500	32.0	16,000
Josephine					100	100	30.0	3,000	100	100	30.0	3,000
Total, district 3	550	500	26.0	13,000	750	700	25.7	18,000	1,300	1,200	25.8	31,000
Total, western Oregon	84,900	82,800	31.8	2,637,000	12,500	12,200	22.3	272,000	97,300	95,000	30.6	2,909,000
District 4:												
Gilliam	92,000	89,000	25.2	2,245,000	3,100	2,700	20.4	55,000	94,600	91,700	25.1	2,300,000
Hood River	100	100	20.0	2,000					100	100	20.0	2,000
Morrow	109,500	94,300	18.9	1,780,000	23,500	23,200	17.8	412,000	120,000	117,500	18.7	2,192,000
Sherman	94,300	92,000	24.7	2,275,000	4,300	4,000	18.0	72,000	98,600	96,000	24.4	2,347,000
Umatilla	198,550	197,000	25.2	4,960,000	3,200	3,000	20.0	60,000	201,700	200,000	25.1	5,020,000
Wasco	57,200	55,000	27.5	1,512,000	5,300	5,000	18.8	94,000	62,400	60,000	26.8	1,606,000
Wheeler	5,900	5,000	25.4	127,000	600	500	20.0	10,000	6,500	5,500	24.9	137,000
Total, district 4	557,550	532,400	24.2	12,901,000	40,000	38,400	18.3	703,000	583,900	570,800	23.8	13,604,000
District 5:												
Baker	8,500	8,100	32.3	262,000	3,800	3,500	20.6	72,000	12,200	11,600	28.8	334,000
Malheur	800	700	28.6	20,000	12,750	12,600	45.2	570,000	13,550	13,300	44.4	590,000
Union	39,100	38,600	31.1	1,200,000	1,800	1,600	20.6	33,000	40,900	40,200	30.7	1,233,000
Wallowa	13,650	13,200	32.1	424,000	4,250	4,000	19.2	77,000	17,900	17,200	29.1	501,000
Total, district 5	62,050	60,600	31.5	1,906,000	22,600	21,700	34.7	752,000	84,550	82,300	32.3	2,658,000
District 6:												
Crook	1,650	1,500	57.3	86,000	900	900	52.2	47,000	2,500	2,400	55.4	133,000
Deschutes	550	400	40.0	16,000	300	300	43.3	13,000	750	700	41.4	29,000
Grant	3,750	1,100	26.4	29,000	500	200	25.0	5,000	4,250	1,300	26.2	34,000
Harney					1,250	900	12.2	11,000	1,250	900	12.2	11,000
Jefferson	15,600	15,400	34.3	528,000	8,200	8,000	28.9	231,000	23,800	23,400	32.4	759,000
Klamath	250	200	35.0	7,000	7,600	7,300	33.6	245,000	7,850	7,500	33.6	252,000
Lake	7,700	7,600	18.7	142,000	4,150	4,100	17.3	71,000	11,850	11,700	18.2	213,000
Total, district 6	29,500	26,200	30.8	808,000	22,900	21,700	28.7	623,000	52,250	47,900	29.9	1,431,000
Total, eastern Oregon	649,100	619,200	25.2	15,615,000	85,500	81,800	25.4	2,078,000	720,700	701,000	25.2	17,693,000
State total	734,000	702,000	26.0	18,252,000	98,000	94,000	25.0	2,350,000	818,000	796,000	25.9	20,602,000

[1] Excludes winter wheat reseeded to spring wheat.

Oregon: Winter, spring, and all wheat—Acreage planted for all purposes, harvested for grain, yield per acre harvested, and production 1962 crop (preliminary)

District and county	Winter wheat				Spring wheat				All wheat			
	Acreage		Yield per acre harvested	Production	Acreage		Yield per acre harvested	Production	Acreage		Yield per acre harvested	Production
	Planted, all purposes	Harvested for grain			Planted, all purposes	Harvested for grain			Net seeded[1]	Harvested for grain		
District 1:	*Acres*	*Acres*	*Bushels*	*Bushels*	*Acres*	*Acres*	*Bushels*	*Bushels*	*Acres*	*Acres*	*Bushels*	*Bushels*
Benton	3,000	2,700	50.0	135,000	850	800	37.5	30,000	3,850	3,500	47.1	165,000
Clackamas	4,650	4,200	50.0	210,000	750	700	37.1	26,000	5,350	4,900	48.2	236,000
Lane	3,200	2,900	49.0	142,000	1,050	1,000	30.0	30,000	4,250	3,900	44.1	172,000
Linn	5,000	4,200	48.6	204,000	1,700	1,600	36.2	58,000	6,700	5,800	45.2	262,000
Marion	13,000	12,100	55.2	668,000	1,300	1,200	35.0	42,000	14,300	13,300	53.4	710,000
Multnomah	300	250	52.0	13,000	50	50	40.0	2,000	350	300	50.0	15,000
Polk	11,100	10,400	55.4	576,000	850	800	30.0	24,000	11,950	11,200	53.6	600,000
Washington	15,600	14,500	55.3	802,000	350	300	40.0	12,000	15,950	14,800	55.0	814,000
Yamhill	15,200	13,700	53.6	735,000	550	500	40.0	20,000	15,750	14,200	53.2	755,000
Total, district 1	71,050	64,950	53.7	3,485,000	7,450	6,950	35.1	244,000	78,450	71,900	51.9	3,729,000

See footnote at end of table.

Oregon: Winter, spring, and all wheat—Acreage planted for all purposes, harvested for grain, yield per acre harvested, and production 1962 crop (preliminary)—Continued

District and county	Winter wheat				Spring wheat				All wheat			
	Acreage		Yield per acre harvested	Production	Acreage		Yield per acre harvested	Production	Acreage		Yield per acre harvested	Production
	Planted, all purposes	Harvested for grain			Planted, all purposes	Harvested for grain			Net seeded [1]	Harvested for grain		
	Acres	*Acres*	*Bushels*	*Bushels*	*Acres*	*Acres*	*Bushels*	*Bushels*	*Acres*	*Acres*	*Bushels*	*Bushels*
District 2:												
Clatsop												
Columbia	300	200	40.0	8,000					300	200	40.0	8,000
Coos												
Curry												
Lincoln												
Tillamook												
Total, district 2	300	200	40.0	8,000					300	200	40.0	8,000
District 3:												
Douglas	200	100	20.0	2,000	450	400	25.0	10,000	650	500	24.0	12,000
Jackson	450	200	40.0	8,000	250	200	30.0	6,000	700	400	35.0	14,000
Josephine	50	50	40.0	2,000	50	50	40.0	2,000	100	100	40.0	4,000
Total district 3	700	350	34.3	12,000	750	650	27.7	18,000	1,450	1,000	30.0	30,000
Total western Oregon	72,050	65,500	63.5	3,505,000	8,200	7,600	34.5	262,000	80,200	73,100	51.5	3,767,000
District 4:												
Gilliam	86,400	77,900	31.5	2,450,000	4,200	3,600	26.7	96,000	89,100	81,500	31.2	2,546,000
Hood River												
Morrow	85,200	74,500	30.4	2,266,000	26,900	26,000	25.3	657,000	111,100	100,500	29.1	2,923,000
Sherman	90,300	84,100	37.9	3,186,000	4,000	3,400	23.5	80,000	93,500	87,500	37.3	3,266,000
Umatilla	175,000	170,500	41.5	7,068,000	4,000	3,500	31.4	110,000	177,500	174,000	41.3	7,178,000
Wasco	55,000	47,500	40.4	1,919,000	5,300	4,500	27.6	124,000	59,800	52,000	39.3	2,043,000
Wheeler	5,500	4,000	31.2	125,000	550	500	28.0	14,000	6,050	4,500	30.9	139,000
Total, district 4	497,400	458,500	37.1	17,014,000	44,950	41,500	26.0	1,081,000	537,050	500,000	36.2	18,095,000
District 5:												
Baker	7,700	6,200	40.0	248,000	3,100	2,300	30.0	69,000	9,800	8,500	37.3	317,000
Malheur	700	600	38.3	23,000	9,100	9,000	53.0	477,000	9,800	9,600	52.1	500,000
Union	33,300	31,500	43.8	1,380,000	1,700	1,500	30.7	46,000	34,600	33,000	43.2	1,426,000
Wallowa	14,500	13,000	38.5	500,000	2,350	2,000	25.0	50,000	16,350	15,000	36.7	550,000
Total, district 5	56,200	51,300	41.9	2,151,000	16,250	14,800	43.4	642,000	69,950	66,100	42.3	2,793,000
District 6:												
Crook	1,400	1,300	48.5	63,000	1,100	1,000	46.0	46,000	2,500	2,300	47.4	109,000
Deschutes	450	300	38.3	11,500	250	200	42.5	8,500	700	500	40.0	20,000
Grant	4,400	900	21.7	19,500	200	100	25.0	2,500	4,600	1,000	22.0	22,000
Harney					1,000	800	15.0	12,000	1,000	800	15.0	12,000
Jefferson	14,500	13,000	50.9	662,000	8,350	8,000	41.0	328,000	22,750	21,000	47.1	990,000
Klamath	400	200	25.0	5,000	6,800	6,500	39.7	258,000	7,200	6,700	39.3	263,000
Lake	6,200	6,000	25.2	151,000	2,900	2,500	23.2	58,000	9,050	8,500	24.6	209,000
Total, district 6	27,350	21,700	42.0	912,000	20,600	19,100	37.3	713,000	47,800	40,800	39.8	1,625,000
Total, eastern Oregon	580,950	531,500	37.8	20,077,000	81,800	75,400	32.3	2,436,000	654,800	606,900	37.1	22,513,000
State total	653,000	597,000	39.5	23,582,000	90,000	83,000	32.5	2,698,000	735,000	680,000	38.6	26,280,000

[1] Excludes winter wheat reseeded to spring wheat.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have drawn attention to the foregoing statistics in order to indicate to Senators the importance to the total Oregon economy of this major crop. These yields are due in part to the magnificent work which has been carried on by the Department of Agriculture and the land-grant colleges which so successfully over the years, through research and education, have made this production possible.

In my testimony before the agriculture appropriations subcommittee, under the distinguished leadership of the able senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] I urged that ample provision be made for research funds. I drew to the attention of the subcommittee my interest in this matter and my hope that in this year's bill, ground could be broken for an expansion of facilities dedicated to furthering soil conservation and water-conservation research. This is a subject which I had previously discussed with the subcommittee in my testimony before it during the 87th Congress.

The Oregon Wheat Commission, an instrumentality of the State of Oregon, shares my view that it is in the national interest that such facilities, particularly the one proposed to be located in Pendleton, Oreg., be given early approval by the Congress. The views of the commission are set forth in a telegram which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PENDLETON, OREG.,
April 23, 1963.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

The need for a soils and water conservation research facility in the Pacific Northwest:

In 1958, in response to a request of the Senate Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, the Secretary of Agriculture appointed a committee which prepared the most comprehensive study ever made in the field of soil and water conservation research. The findings of the committee were published as Senate Document No. 59—86th Congress. The report documented the need for over $20 million of additional funds for research scientists and engineers, scientific equipment and facilities, and operating expenses to carry on additional research in urgently needed soil and water research.

In the intervening years since the study was made, limited progress has been made on the implementation of the recommendations contained in the report. Today, approximately 20 of the 46 facilities or program items have been either partially or fully implemented entailing only about 20 percent of the recommended funding. This appears to be inconsistent with the intent of the 86th Congress and President Kennedy's announced concern with the conservation of two of our greatest natural resources—soil and water.

The intelligent management and development of these resources will be a major factor in our future economic growth. Both basic and applied research is needed for the solution of problems of soil and water conservation. The expansion of water resource development through intensified research is needed to meet the water requirements of our increasing population. There will be increased competition for available water supplies by expanded industries, intensified agriculture, spreading municipalities, and newly developed recreational facilities.

The need for a central soil and water research laboratory in the Pacific Northwest wheat area as recommended in Senate Document No. 59 is critical. The Pacific Northwest and the Columbia Plateau in particular present a special problem in water runoff and soil erosion not generally found in other areas of the United States.

Here is what happens:

1. Snow falls on frozen ground. As the weather turns warm, the snow melts and gradually begins to cut small rills in the

cultivated fields. The soil is frozen and cannot absorb the water from the melted snow. Fifty percent of the annual precipitation of 8 to 20 inches occurs during the winter months when the ground may be frozen.

2. Warming weather is often accompanied by high intensity rains. The soil is still frozen so the volume of water and topsoil runoff increases. Soil losses may run as high as 150 tons or an average of 1 inch of topsoil per acre on a 32 percent slope Farming on slopes of 30 to 50 percent is not uncommon in the region.

3. Large gullies several feet deep are sometimes formed in a 24-hour runoff period. The gullies vary in size and often require the use of heavy equipment to re-form the land so it can again be farmed. Obviously the productiveness of the remaining soil is depleted.

4. The resulting flash floods of muddy water cause great damage in the adjacent towns and cities. Bridges and highways are often taken out and general damage is high.

Why the problem is critical:

Erosion is no longer solely an agricultural problem. Although we deplore the loss of highly productive agricultural land, the effect on the general economy and well-being of the people of the United States is also of concern:

1. The inevitable result of eroded land is decreased productivity, leading to higher per unit costs and higher food prices to consumers.

2. Silt pollution of streams contaminates reservoirs and endangers city water supplies.

3. Deposits of silt in basins behind dams decreases irrigation storage capacity, flood control capacity, electric power generation and recreation value.

This is what can be done to help solve the problem:

Senate document No. 59 (page 160) recommends construction funds of $425,000 to provide office, laboratory, and related capital construction at Pendleton, Oreg. Proposed operating funds of $285,000 annually were indicated to "develop information needed for effective field practices to conserve moisture, prevent erosion, and maintain good tilth on the Ritzville and Walla Walla soils in the Pacific Northwest."

In 1960 the Senate Committee on Appropriations placed the Pendleton facility No. 22 on the list of 45 priority items. It is now very near the top (second or third of the remaining facilities). We strongly urge the Congress to follow the priority list established by your committee in 1960 and to continue the policy of implementing a few of the top priority projects each year.

Provision of this facility and operating funds would permit a staff of scientists and technicians to effectively work on the pressing problems of the area. For example, improved mechanical and management systems could be developed to:

1. Increase infiltration and storage of water on the land. Holding moisture where it falls for later use in the ultimate in soil and water conservation in dryland areas.

2. Implement fundamental and applied research in the microbiological field which is greatly needed to solve the problem of maintaining good soil tilth, with a high level of decomposed organic material present, in order to raise the water absorption and retention capacity of the land.

3. Provide a detailed research program using all types and levels of different commercial fertilizers to maintain adequate soil productivity while maximizing economic efficiency in farm operations.

4. Initiate further development of efficient production methods to allow better utilization of crop residues. Present techniques are considered too slow and costly. Stubble mulch farming in Pacific Northwest permits competition from weeds and grasses as well as problems with plant diseases.

5. Augment ground water recharge to stabilize streamflow for all season irrigation.

6. Improve intake and storage of water on rangeland and reduce water consumption by nonproductive plants.

7. Ascertain the value and practicality of small catchment basins on cultivated land.

New knowledge in the above aspects of soil and water conservation when applied to the land will reduce extreme water runoff with its resultant loss of the highly productive top soil so important to our agricultural production and to our greatly expanding population. It will also provide means to help prevent the above mentioned silting of rivers and harbors, lessen sedimentation in reservoirs used for municipal water supplies, recreation, and irrigation water storage as well as conserve surplus water runoff for efficient and economic utilization through the growing season.

How the research would be carried out:

As recommended in Senate Document No. 59, the Central Laboratory would be located at Pendleton, Oreg. The work would be carried out in cooperation with various local, State, and Federal agencies. Parts of the work would be conducted at existing experiment stations away from Pendleton such as at Moro, Oreg., and Lind, Wash., and on farmer's fields or other experimental sites throughout the region in order to develop practices which are applicable to the varied climatic, soil and topographic conditions encountered.

In summary, research facilities and programs are urgently needed at Pendleton to develop methods and techniques to keep the limited and poorly distributed precipitation on approximately 26 million acres of land which will help reduce or spread peak runoff and resultant damaging floods, and improve sustained water yields from upstream watersheds.

The Pendleton facility has been endorsed by several organizations such as:

1. The associations of soil conservation districts in the States of Idaho, Oregon and Washington.

2. The wheat growers associations in Oregon, Idaho and Washington.

3. The area and national association of soil conservation districts.

4. The National Association of Wheat Growers.

We all appreciate the efforts that have been made in the past toward implementing Senate Document No. 59. We look forward to continued progress.

OREGON WHEAT COMMISSION.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in my view the factual nature of the argument voiced by the Commission is most persuasive. It is my hope that the Senate Appropriations Committee, as it considers the various items in the bill, will give most careful consideration to this request for needed funds.

THE ANTIDUMPING AMENDMENT

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I am pleased to cosponsor Senate bill 1318, and I take this opportunity to voice my support of the bill introduced by the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and other Senators, which would amend and strengthen the Antidumping Act of 1921. Many Senators are aware of the difficulties being experienced by some of our domestic industries, including steel, cement, and others, which difficulties can be traced, at least in part, to dumping in this country by foreign manufacturers. Statistics presented very recently here on the floor of the Senate abundantly illustrate the impact of the unfair competition engendered by dumping.

One important point which I think should be kept in mind concerning the Antidumping Act is that this Act is not basically a tariff law imposing restrictions upon international trade. It is designed to promote, in the international sphere, a free, but fair, competition, just as our antitrust laws are designed to promote the same thing in the domestic sphere. Its purpose is to prevent producers in foreign countries from selling their products in this country at prices lower than those at which they sell in their home market.

It would appear to me that, from the domestic producers' point of view, there are two serious deficiencies in the Antidumping Act, as it is now written. The first of these problems is the delay in procuring determinations on an antidumping complaint. Senate bill 1318 attacks this problem by imposing a time limitation of 6 months on Treasury proceedings on antidumping complaints. The second major problem faced by a domestic producer is that of proving injury. One section of the proposed amendment would require the Secretary of the Treasury to aggregate complaints regarding the dumping of the same class or kind of merchandise. The Treasury now sends cases to the Tariff Commission on a country by country basis, which in many cases makes proving injury difficult.

For example, if there were six foreign manufacturers of a given product, each located in a different foreign country, and each of whom sent to this country a rather small proportion of the total consumption here of that product—say 5 percent of our total consumption—a domestic producer might have difficulty in showing that any single one of these foreign producers was really working injury to the unhappy domestic producer. If, however, the domestic producer could show that dumping accounted for roughly one-third of this country's consumption of that product, which would be the case if each of six foreign producers had 5 percent of this country's market, then his sales would also presumably be decreased by about one-third, and it should be relatively easy for him to demonstrate that he was being injured by the dumping. This example is not farfetched; similar cases have occurred, and are occurring today.

Senate bill 1318 represents a needed step forward in solving the difficult problems facing our domestic producers in trying to meet the unfair competition which is thrust upon them when foreign products are dumped in the United States. I feel strongly on this matter; and in addition to wholehearted support of this bill, I also hope that in the course of hearings the committee will go even further, and will find, within the reference of existing legislation, other ways to combat this serious problem. For example, it appears to me that the injury provisions might be strengthened by requiring the Tariff Commission to make a finding of injury to the domestic industry if imports of foreign goods accounted for 10 percent or more of our domestic sales of that type of goods.

Let me repeat that although I feel that Senate bill 1318 could be strengthened further, it is a good bill in its present form, and represents a step forward in solving this difficult problem of dumping.

AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES CODE REGARDING TRIAL OF ALL OFFENSES BEGUN OR COMMITTED UPON THE HIGH SEAS OR OUTSIDE THE JURISDICTION OF ANY PARTICULAR STATE OR DISTRICT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate passed the bill, H.R. 2842, to amend section 3238 of title 28, United States Code, which had already passed the House. My attention has been called by a staff member to the fact that there may be an error in the bill, despite the fact that it has the support of the Department of Justice. I believe that I am dutybound to examine one section. So I enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill, H.R. 2842, to amend section 3238 of title 28, United States Code, was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). The motion will be entered.

WORLD PROBLEMS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR GOLDWATER

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an address delivered by the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] before the Union League of Philadelphia on April 25.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF A SPEECH BY SENATOR BARRY GOLDWATER, OF ARIZONA, BEFORE THE UNION LEAGUE OF PHILADELPHIA, APRIL 25, 1963

There are two places in the world today where the activity of Americans deeply concerned by national security problems can wind up being described as warmongering. One is Moscow. The other is Washington, D.C. In Washington there are refinements of the terms, of course. The language is generally more colorful there. One term emerged during the Cuba crisis, or more accurately, the part of the continuing crisis that won official recognition as a crisis. At that time, we read, advocates of a strong policy were called hawks; advocates of softer policies were called doves. Frankly, I don't see how one can tell who won in that case. Perhaps we need a new term, something like dawks, an animal that talks tough but flies backwards so everybody can see the olive branches clutched firmly in both of its padded feet. I say feet because, obviously, a dawk has no claws.

More recently, thanks to a nationally syndicated columnist, we get the term "war whoops," a supposedly devastating pun based on the older term "warhawks." A war whoop is supposed to be a person who talks tough because he is safe on the sidelines. The term is absurd. No one is safe on the sidelines today. No one in this audience is safe on the sidelines. There are no sidelines. And yet, from the same sort of critic who can conceive of little dandies like war whoop, there come barrages of suggestions that almost all of us go and sit on the sidelines, leaving the massive matters of war and peace, of survival, surrender, defense, and decay up to the all-wise, the all-knowing specialists, to platoons of palace pundits perched in ivory towers of vast disdain for the opinions of mere mortals.

I deeply resent this exclusionist tendency, this slamming of the policy door in the faces of 180 million Americans who never before in their history have been faced with graver decisions or more decisive ones.

We are all citizens. The consensus of our consent is the bedrock requisite of all our governing processes. We consent to be governed. We do not elect to be ruled.

I have been sent to the Senate by a constituency which should find me derelict if I abdicated my role in national security matters to any group of so-called specialists whose constituency is a battery of computers and not a bastion of citizens. You, as citizens, would be derelict in not recalling any man who did so abdicate his responsibility.

As citizen, as Senator—no one is going to tell me that national security matters are best left to any clique or club. And no one should tell any of you that either.

Is this simply a partisan view? It is not. In your communities and on both sides of the aisles in the Senate and the Congress there have been and will continue to be efforts to develop a real consensus on national security matters, a truly bipartisan one. The chasm we must bridge is partisan in an entirely different sense. It is the partisanship of one branch of government, the executive, versus the popular representation of another branch, the legislative. It is the partisanship of secret diplomacy versus open covenants openly arrived at; the partisanship of secret correspondence between heads of state versus the open sentiments of the hearts of nations. This is not political partisanship in the sense we have known it. It is personal partisanship in a sense we have never known before.

If we must negotiate with tyranny on the terms and in the trappings of tyranny, then we have lost the object of the negotiation before we even begin. Exclude the people or the representatives of the people from the formulation of national security policy and you exclude the very thing the policy is intended to secure.

Thus, in my remarks, I do not feel that I am walking where angels should fear to tread—I feel I am talking in areas where free men and women must feel free to be heard.

In the inflated rhetoric which is the currency of the present administration, depreciation of sound meaning and lasting value may have carried us nearly to the edge of national disaster. We have long since reached the state of utter confusion.

Let's attempt, then, to restore the concept of national security to its true meaning—and to spell out its crucial implications. And let's not fool ourselves for one moment: National security affairs are matters of life and death. They are matters of national survival. And more even than that: They are instruments to our overriding national goals—to what, in a free society, comprises 180 million individual strategies for achieving a good life, of material abundance and spiritual reward.

National survival is the crucial instrument to personal fulfillment. And the instrument of national survival is, in turn, national security. It is just that simple—and as profoundly meaningful.

Let's attempt, also, to reorient the concept of national security in its true context. As an instrument of survival, it is thus a function of prior political decisions—political in the classical and broadest sense. Not the game of partisan advantage. Not a matter of winning public debate or even elections. Making sense of national security depends on our making prior sense of where we—as a nation and as free people—think we are going, and of how we intend to get there.

It depends on marshaling all our resources—which are vast but not endless—and then using these resources with all possible efficiency. It depends, most of all, on first identifying the barriers to our aspirations—barriers of domestic shortcomings and of worldwide conspiracy—and then on our unwavering resolution to overcome them.

One of these resources is the professional skill and dedication of our Armed Forces. Another is military hardware—in being, in production, and on the drawing board. And our success in the war for national survival and national achievement depends on the wisdom with which the elected servants of the American people put these resources to use. I say "servants" deliberately. Surely the Members of Congress so consider themselves; I simply remind the temporary leaseholder in the White House that his status and his responsibility are the same—no less, and no more.

I have already said that national security affairs is no proper area for partisan political games. Neither is it an arena for executive-legislative infighting. This should not be an occasion for bitter competition but only an opportunity for meeting our mutual obligations to the American people—in equal partnership.

What, in more concrete terms, does this mean?

It means that the Congress must have the information it needs in order to share in such critical decisionmaking—not controlled leaks but hard facts.

It means that the Congress must be consulted about the basic policies of the war for national survival—presented not with slick slogans and precooked package deals but with realistic alternatives.

It means that the Congress must not be deluged nor let itself get lost in a mass of technical details about force levels and weapons systems but rather that it focus on the area in which it is indeed expert—on the purposes of the American people, and on their self-imposed commitment to provide the resources and pay the bills.

It means the production of information and not the management of news. It means to sum it up, that the people through their Congress must not be ignored.

An equal partnership in high national policy—to put it more concretely still—means an end to haggling over precise numbers of RS-70's and exact emplacement of Atlases and Minutemen. But it does and must mean constant and continuous consultation over the key question: What mix of men and material will eliminate the gaps and lags and lapses in our total national security posture? What must we do—we as freemen and citizen taxpayers—to see to it that the day never arrives when this Nation lacks the power to enforce its political and moral purposes?

Our problems begin with the definitions of those very purposes. Just what is the national security policy of this Nation today? Certainly the Congress has never been let in on the secret. Nor have the people generally, if my reading of their comments is correct.

Instead of a policy we have a series of departmental and compartmental decisions. We have razzle-dazzle reactions to the demands of certain moments but no long-range purpose on which our allies can depend or upon which our enemies can ponder.

It is commonly accepted that we run continual grave risks from the probing actions of the enemy. But why are those probing actions necessary? Because, simply and sadly, the enemy has no reason to know that there are limits to our patience, that there is real shape and content to our determination, unshakable goals for our aspirations.

The enemy is all too aware that American policy is a seesaw of accommodations and not a scale of decisiveness. Thus he is encouraged to probe and test, to threaten, to risk recklessly just to discover something which our policy should clearly enunciate. The first essential of any deterent policy, for example, is that it be believable. Is ours? Obviously even allies such as France do not find it so. How then can it deter the Kremlin?

Across the map, the Red lines of these risky probings are apparent. In Cuba the probing came within just a few days of installing missiles which could have wrought devastation on portions of our Nation. Perhaps such devastation would have solved some political problems for some people but it would scarcely serve the cause of freedom very well.

And still the Cuban seesaw is rocking back and forth. It was high for the blockade. It bumped low later when it became apparent that no followup was planned, that the situation was going to drift in tides agitated by the enemy and not powered by our own policy.

In our woeful wrangling over a nuclear test ban at Geneva we seesaw between compromise and confusion. We play a deadly numbers game with onsite inspections without any real rules for the biggest game—the purpose of such negotiations. On the one hand we admit that the Soviets would be quite free to violate a test ban treaty even if they signed one. On the other hand we negotiate for months on the basis of illusory hopes that they will behave nicely, and they never have.

Actually the root problem of the nuclear control situation lies in the preparation for tests. Until such preparations can be policed—and there isn't even the vaguest hope for that—no test ban treaty would be worth the paper it is written on. The Soviets in such a treaty would simply immobilize the sincere United States while leaving itself completely free to get itself ready for a future violation from which might come a weapons breakthrough which would fatally shift the balance of power. Meantime, we would be months or even years behind in such preparation just as we were as the result of our foolish unilateral test suspension previously.

But where is the national security purpose in all of this? Do you know? Do the negotiators know?

Southeast Asia represents an area in which the seesaw of indecision and mixed policy has become a veritable roller coaster. Once, we heard, Laos was a keystone in our national security planning. Then it became essential to neutralize it. Now there is the problem of ridding it of the Reds who now are overrunning it. Did a policy guide that ride to chaos? I sincerely hope not. Rather, I feel, lack of policy, lack of experience, lack of realism let it happen.

Look at Vietnam. We are fighting there. We are dying there. Meantime, we have no policy that covers the very situation that makes the war in Vietnam so incredibly complex. The Communists there can be supplied from supposedly neutral Cambodia, from Laos, from Red China. The enemy keeps his lines flexible. We hold the fighting, on our part, to rigidly drawn rules that stop, as they did in Korea, always short of the enemy's supply lines.

The southern flank of that lopsided struggle offers another challenge to the little policy that isn't there. There, Indonesia looms as a base for Soviet and Red Chinese thrusts. How has our policy or lack of it served Indonesia? It helped them but not us.

Recently, when Indonesia laid violent claim to Dutch-held West New Guinea we intervened as negotiator but as negotiator without apparent principle, purpose, or allegiance.

On one side of the negotiating table was an old and gallant ally, the Netherlands. On the other side the Red-backed dictatorship of Indonesia. Being helpful, we swept aside Dutch hopes for self-determination by the natives of western New Guinea. We swept aside the concern for another ally, Australia, for the implications of an Indonesian presence on an island which is the gateway to their land and in which they share ownership.

Our negotiating skill came up with a plan to turn the Dutch area over to the Indonesians after a short, token supervision by the United Nations.

And what will we reap from that sowing of senseless seed? This August there is scheduled to be put toegther the Malay Federation. Combining Singapore, Malaya, North Borneo, Sarawak, and Brunei, it could be a strong anti-Communist force in the area. What threatens it, threatens it to the point that Great Britain even now is sending troops into the area? Red Chinese and Indonesian pressure and guerrilla infiltration is the threat. And while the British troops deploy, our policy seems to have gone no further in concept or conviction than the recent help it gave Indonesia.

Consider the question of foreign economic aid which we are told is essential to our national security. Under no executive leadership, Republican or Democrat, have we developed a meaningful purpose for this aid. Nor has the legislative been able to take the lead in seeking the definition. Instead, great dollops of aid proposals are heaped upon the hapless Hill in Washington, from the eager White House, and the debate rages about dollars and cents—not about definitions and consensus.

One man says the aid is essential because it is good. We bother not to question our ability to determine what is good for the world. We don't even discuss it. We just react, like conditioned circus animals. Another man says the aid keeps nations from communism. We see no evidence and we know there are proofs to the contrary but we plunge ahead, discussing programs when we should be discussing purposes. We say that the aid is to help the helpless underprivileged and yet we watch it pour into Government coffers from which it emerges as part of the state's power and seldom if ever as direct assistance to needy or worthy individuals or to individual enterprise.

The list of contradictions and vague assumptions is almost endless. The point is simply that we have no doctrine in this crucial area—only programs, only rhetoric.

Personally, I feel that proper doctrine to guide such aid would have to be based upon the goals of our own national security. It would not be a doctrine of vague altruism but of concrete effort to extend freedom. It would recognize the vastly different capacities of vastly different nations to absorb aid, and use it advantageously in terms of building free institutions.

And it would certainly never approach the struggle between East and West as a mere exercise in bribery, with the booty going to the side that promises to spend more. Rice Christianity, the buying of converts, has failed time and time again in the missionary field. Rice freedom is bound to fail as often and as surely.

And when it comes to resistance to Communist incursions, I feel that foreign aid doctrines, well thought out and defined, rather than emotionally shouted, would recognize that military aid—not welfare-centered economic aid—has always been the really successful frontline against Red imperialism.

Force, not bribery, has repelled communism always in the past: driving their forces from power in Greece in 1947; away from Quemoy in 1958; from Lebanon in that same year, and so forth and so on through the entire rollcall of Red rollbacks.

Those are tactical examples of the lack of consistent policy. The greater gap is strategic. It is the gap in national objectives and concepts through which Communist will and determination daily filters and sometimes floods.

There is lack of even a widely agreed definition of the nature of the enemy. Objective history sees the Communist enemy as totally committed to a conflict doctrine whose objective is the destruction not merely of Western and neutral sovereignties but of Western civilization. Its subversion is global and constant. Its record is an unbroken one of the use of force and violence and treachery and subversion in achieving its imperialistic aims. Seventeen nations have been butchered and bayoneted behind the Iron Curtain. And we in the West have watched each of them as their national lifeblood poured out.

Five were taken by overt military action: Azerbaijan, Byelorussia, Turkistan, Georgia, and the North Caucasus. One was brought back from captivity, Azerbaijan, in 1946, by one of the strongest diplomatic pressures ever applied by this country. Against force, counterforce worked—an interesting lesson from which we seem to have learned virtually nothing.

Four of the nations were taken over by acceptance of ultimatums or treaties forced on them by Soviet arms: Armenia, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. The Ukraine and Poland were taken over by invasion while at war with a third power. Poland, then, was retaken after the Second World War by internal Communist conspiracy. So was Czechoslovakia.

Hungary and Bulgaria were taken by invasion covered by a war situation. Rumania was toppled by Communists in coalition with other parties who were eventually deposed. Albania went behind the curtain (and whether it's iron or bamboo is small comfort) through guerrilla action.

Where in that horrible list was there the action of a country capable of civilized conduct as we know and expect it? And yet, where in our policy is there any real recognition of this? Instead we have an overabundance of personal theories posing as policies. We have one theory that sees the Soviets mellowing. We have another that sees us moving closer to them as they move closer to us. We have another that sees us joining together to resist Red China. Another says that the Soviet is as desperately interested in arms control as we foolishly are. The list is virtually as long as the list of executive agency advisers and decampused professors.

It is a grab bag of theory, not a national security policy. And it is from this grab bag that we are expected to draw sensible conclusions. It is impossible.

Further, the single unifying thread through the grab bag is one of the most potentially dangerous of all. That trend is the possibility that, by Executive whim, the decision has been made to divide the world into two spheres of influence, one ours, the other the Soviet's. All of the grab bag's contents would seem to lead in that direction.

And you and I, you and your elected Representatives are as far from having a voice in debating this as you are from having the full story of the Bay of Pigs invasion. We are not to be trusted with the information. It's too important apparently. You and the Congress in the eyes of the wagonmaster are too damned dumb.

Negotiations and plans of the sort that characterize the grab-bag, slap-dash approach to policy formulation require secrecy lest the people reject them out of hand. And secrecy is one policy which is emerging as a clear and present one in Washington today.

Just the other day a colleague of mine, the Senator from Arkansas, Mr. FULBRIGHT, decried the fact that too much foreign policy information was being made public. It was making partisan attacks on the policies all too possible and too frequent, he suggested.

I suggest that my colleague and his friends in the Central Government take some time to study the Government of which they are only part. The limitation of power is certainly a principle of that government. That's why ideally we seek a balance between the three branches of government so that no one branch can dominate the others to the exclusion of dissenting views. But we should not confuse the limitation of power with the limitation of information. In a representative government, where all ultimately have some voice in major national directions, information is vitally and constantly needed, debate is needed, dissent is needed, so that the final decisions can be informed and agreed upon.

We will never re-create any form of bipartisan foreign policy in this country so long as the executive branch of government, and its satellite spokesmen in the legislative, constitute themselves a party unto themselves. In such a situation what we will get is bipartisan agreement, through political pressure, but not bipartisan policy through partisan discussion—which is what we sorely need.

By its very definition, the limitation of debate which the executive partisans are calling for is a flagrant denial of any chance to achieve bipartisanship. In fact it is a sure way to achieve the most onerous partisanship of all, a partisanship based on a single branch of Government, the executive, and not even on a single political party.

In the Congress and Senate today there is more genuine bipartisanship across the aisles on major issues than there is between the legislative branch as a whole and the executive branch with its aloof and disdainful distrust of debate, fear and distrust of the people, and management of information.

There can be bipartisanship only if the Executive recognizes that this is a two-party system and not a one-branch monopoly. Certainly there is great bipartisanship regarding, for instance, Cuba. Senators and Congressmen of the Democratic Party have spoken side by side with Republican colleagues in demanding facts, in challenging assumptions, in warning of drift and indecision and of fear.

It is the Executive that stands apart from the debate, issuing edicts and giving grudging TV chalk talks as substitutes for genuine discussion. We hear that if we discuss Cuba we will endanger our intelligence networks. How will it endanger those networks to discover why their findings lagged so far behind those of individual Members of Congress and the Senate in alerting us to the missile threat? Would not such a discovery, instead, strengthen the obviously imperfect communications between intelligence and executive functions? I have great faith in our intelligence systems after Cuba. I have little reason for faith in the proper utilization of them. But official blindness cannot be cured by an official blackout on discussion.

Revealing the dates of our overflights of Cuba was supposed to similarly endanger our intelligence operations. But who in the world would know the dates of those flights better than the Soviet troops who watched them? Why is it bad for Americans to know these things, but perfectly all right for Soviet soldiers to know them?

An even more serious indictment is possible from reviewing just the known facts of the Cuban situation. It is an indictment that strikes through to a very sensitive nerve in our entire national security situation.

As the facts slowly seep into sight, we see the outlines of a Cuba policy, particularly in regard to the Bay of Pigs invasion, which was dominated by executive theorists. We see professional military advice only in the far background, more ignored than followed.

We know, at very least, that no competent military advice, if heeded, would have permitted such an invasion attempt, no matter who undertook it, to proceed with such feeble protection, with ammunition stored largely on one ship, which was destroyed, with so little attempt to destroy enemy air cover; with so little effort to provide reconnaissance, and so on.

How deeply, we can well ask, does the deafness to professional military advice affect our overall national security policy?

Let me cite some other examples which make the question pertinent, although the Executive undoubtedly would call it impertinent. Why was the TFX all-purpose fighter plane contract awarded in direct contradiction of multiple recommendations by professional military review boards? What role can the military men of our Nation be playing in our national security policies when one man in the Pentagon, on the basis of a personal evaluation, can decide that all of the professionals are wrong and that he and he alone is right?

Perhaps the one-man Army-Navy-Air Force is correct. I would always admit that possibility. But it does occur to me that it's a hell of a way to run a railroad, or a defense organization, when you begin by silencing, ignoring, and even impugning the good sense of your soldiers, sailors, and airmen.

Should we not know, as well, why an executive decision has scuttled the development of our most immediately available antimissile missile, the Nike-Zeus? In its place has been substituted the Nike-X. But that protective weapon system will not be available, under present plans, until 1970. In the meantime, we have reports that the Soviets will have an anti-missile-missile system in operation by 1966.

Beyond all of the other possible explanations of this apparently deliberately created gap in defensive systems, we can see clearly the outlines of Secretary McNamara's theory that if the Soviet achieves a sure second-strike capability it will no longer have to fear us and no longer have a reason to launch a nuclear attack. Does the carefully calculated gap in missile defenses, which might give the Soviet a 4-year lead, a gratuitous 4-year grace period, does this gap by Executive order tie into the McNamara theory? Is it a deliberate step in support of that theory? We cannot be expected to find the answer in the silence that Executive secrecy has imposed on the situation. What do professional military men think of these moves? What do you think of them? Even more importantly, when will you be permitted to think about them on the basis of facts? When will we have the facts?

Now to another area. We, meaning simply and exclusively the executive branch of the Government, are now proposing to our already skittish friends in Europe that NATO's nuclear naval forces be manned by crews drawn from the various nations in the pact.

Could that conceivably have been a plan that resulted from listening to professional military advice? I doubt it very strongly.

For one thing, you can scarcely have a multinational captain for the ship or submarine. So, immediately, there is a question of command that makes the multinational crew idea an absurdity to begin with.

But there are other questions. Just asking them makes the suggestion seem the result of a glandular disorder, certainly not of orderly military thinking. If there is an American captain and a French executive officer who have keys, both of which must be turned to fire a nuclear missile, how does the French officer get his government's approval for the firing when the captain gets his? From an Italian radio operator? Will the crew hold a multinational conference to decide when to fire and at what? If they do, how effective will the firing be? If they don't, why bother with the multinational manning in the first place? I could go on—and so could you, I am sure. This is as clear an example of the confused thinking in Washington that I could present—an invitation to defeat.

I would make this concrete suggestion, toward a more effective national security system. Let the executive theorists seek some national security bipartisanship right in their own backyard. Let them start listening, at least listening, to the advice of professional military men before they issue their rhetorically inspiring but realistically confusing computer blinking marching orders.

I respect very deeply, as a part-time member of the Armed Forces myself, the concept of a civilian commander in chief who controls and limits our military organization. But, as a civilian, I also appreciate the fact that the men who fight our wars and erect our defenses must be given the same order of respect we accord to other professionals. I do not feel that this order of respect is reflected at all in the relations between the executive, civilian branches of government and the military today.

Congress and the Senate must play an important role in restoring this respect. The massive computer curtain that descends when we hold defense hearings needs to be ripped a bit so that we see beyond the overwhelming array of bookkeeper's figures and see instead the shape of the objectives and purposes which are as meaningful as dollars and cents in hammering out defense policies.

Where are we going? The bookkeeping, for instance, doesn't tell us in what ways our current defense policies are being designed in support of Secretary McNamara's recent statement that it might be to our advantage if the Soviet Union had a sure second strike capability—a capability which it apparently does not have today. Ledger sheets won't let us dig our teeth into the proposition that greater enemy strength is to our advantage. But don't you want to know the answer to that? I know that I do.

The summary is simple to state but surely not simple to achieve. National security, first of all, requires a statement of national objective. There is no such statement today. There is the appearance, as I have said, of policies of personal diplomacy leading toward a world half slave and half free. And we know who holds the initiative, the overwhelming weapons of treachery in such a world. We can imagine how long it would be before the free half became a quarter, then a tenth, then nothing.

Next, national security requires the security of our system of government, the security of our representative forms, our own channels of individual responsibility. And this requires restoration of the balance between executive and legislative powers so that national policy can be truly national, truly bipartisan, truly believable to friend and foe alike.

National security is not the security of the White House alone. It is the security of your house and the larger house of freedom. It is as a great American answered to a woman who in this city asked, "What have you given us, Mr. Franklin?" and he answered, "A republic if you can keep it." Those men, of whom he was one, gave the world a concept of freedom—and tonight I restate Franklin's challenge, "Will you keep it?"

BORDER TRADE BETWEEN MEXICO AND THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a speech by Congressman Ricardo Carrillo Duran, Member of the Mexican Parliament, which he delivered on March 18 on the problems encountered in border trade between Mexico and the United States.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN RICARDO CARRILLO DURAN, COMMITTEE III, MARCH 18, 1963, SPECIFIC MEXICAN-NORTH AMERICAN PROBLEMS; BORDER TRADE BETWEEN MEXICO AND THE UNITED STATES

Our northern border has an extension of 2,597 kilometers. Mexican border cities presented a depressing contrast, a few years back, under a very special social and economic situation.

The desert, inadequate communications, and other unfavorable factors had isolated these cities from the rest of the country. At the same time, they were so geographically close to the United States, that sometimes only the river or a barbed wire in the middle of the street separated them.

They acquired their clothing, food, shoes, medicines, and other household supplies as well as water, gas, electricity, and even fire department services from their U.S. neighbors. This was due to the fact that domestic goods and services were produced so far away, they were too late in coming, too expensive, and often of inferior quality.

The merchants of the other side came to consider the Mexican border section as a natural American market.

So, our populations that only sold tours, curios, crafts, raw materials, and cheap manual labor, contributed greatly to the prosperity of the U.S. border cities, but did not share in such prosperity because of a lack of capital, technique, and capacity for consumption. Because of this, they also were not able to develop their agriculture, their industries, and their commerce in the same proportion.

The majority of our border visitors unfortunately were not made up of the tourist who travels with his family—a healthy and desirable kind of tourism—but on the contrary, it consisted of persons looking for improper entertainment, creating situations that equally affect the good name of those who pay for this entertainment as well as that of those who provide it.

But in this atomic age the events occur amazingly fast. The two World Wars brought about radical transformations on humanity. Simple friendship, charity, and one-sided gain are not enough to guarantee a growing and stable business among people.

It must be based on a reciprocal treatment that will assure mutual benefit, an equally shared prosperity and general well-being. This, in turn promotes peace, friendly cooperation, and mutual respect. Through the fairs or commercial expositions held in Mexico City, it is easy to see at a glance that Mexico is no longer the exporter of cheap raw materials and consumer of expensive imported products—with their natural sequel of poverty, devaluation, and economic colonialism—but that is entering fully into mechanized agriculture, a period of commercial progress and is developing an industry whose capacity for production surpasses domestic consumption and is beginning to export—and that while working at only 50 percent of its possibilities.

This transformation is improving the standard of living of the people, helping them to solve their longstanding problems. All of this not to be considered as adverse to the economy of the United States. On the contrary, it should be taken as something beneficial. As our capacity for consuming and producing increases, so does our capacity increase for purchasing imported articles, especially those that require capital and techniques we do not have.

We are fully aware that no man or nation will do for us what we should do for ourselves. Through the creative impulse of our revolution, genuinely Mexican in its ideals, program, and purpose, we are tirelessly fighting against poverty, disease, and ignorance.

We have before us the stimulating example of the people of the United States who as soon as they achieved their independence from England, began to import men, techniques, capital, and all that was necessary to work tirelessly and become the Nation with the highest standard of living in the world and achieve the most important economic phenomenon of all times.

It has been justifiably said we are engaged in a second war for independence—an economic war—and we are convinced that without it, political independence can neither be complete or efficient.

We have a long way to go to achieve our ideals of social justice. But, having gained a political stability exceptional for Latin America, the peace and tranquility resulting from it have permitted us to look to the future with optimism. We are enjoying such benefits as highways, dams, harbors, electricity, oil, manufacturing, farm production, and schools. We have skilled technicians, good workers, and an ambitious young generation with a genuine desire for progress.

But our economic development requires not only industrial progress but also a greater demand for goods; that is, markets and consumers who will profit from the production of our factories and will induce the creation of new manufacturing centers. And we must continue to strive for Mexicans to consume what is produced in Mexico, since this production is of excellent quality and is offered at very attractive prices.

Because of this, governments of the revolution have carefully planned recovery of border markets and have ceased to consider these "a part of Mexico on the other side of the desert," with cities depending on their neighbor. They are now becoming an area well communicated with the rest of the country and with a strong economy.

The international border zone comprises such important areas as lower California, Sonora, Chihuahua, Coahuila, Nuevo Leon, and Tamaulipas. They have many natural resources and people noted for their hard work and loyalty.

Across the border are States of extraordinary development and future: California, which is surpassing New York as the State with the largest population in the Union; Texas, where important research programs are being carried out such as the space program; New Mexico, which also participates in this same program as well as the atomic energy program; and Arizona, with so many important industrial companies.

For more than a century, the wealth of the United States—in population, industry, and culture—was concentrated in the North and East. In the last years, however, national attention has turned to the South and West.

The opportunities for better living are so evident in this area that they have attracted an unprecedented inmigration. The Mexican border States have more than doubled their population in the last 20 years, while border cities have almost tripled their population.

These cities have grown at an impressive rate: Tijuana had 11,000 inhabitants in 1930 and now has 170,000. Ciudad Juarez grew from 43,000 to 325,000 in the same period of time.

U.S. border counties increased their population by 41 percent in the same 20-year period—a rate of growth superior to the rest of the union by 10 percent.

The border and its area of influence are inhabited by 16 million people in the United States and 5 million in Mexico. They have an average personal income much greater than that of their respective fellow citizens. The average personal income of the U.S. population is $2,200 a year, while that of the Mexicans is 8,200 pesos, or 135 percent greater than the 3,500 pesos which makes up the average annual personal income for the rest of Mexico.

Mexican customs handled 1 million tons of goods in 1940 and 6 million in 1960. Bank deposits in six of the Northern States alone amounted to 24 percent of the nation's total. The Federal District accounted for 49 percent while the other 23 States combined accounted for 27 percent.

Five million people crossed the international bridge at Ciudad Juarez from north to south in 1940; 12 million crossed it in 1950, and 30 million in 1960. Of these, 60 percent were Mexican and 40 percent U.S. citizens.

Border trade and tourism accounted for $700 million in 1961, while the rest of the country received only $130 million spent by the 600,000 tourists that went south that year.

Such is the border market in general, gentlemen—a market that has chiefly benefited the United States. Recovery of this market on a national scale and participation in an international one presents a challenge to the capacity and spirit of enterprise of the Mexican.

That is why, when President Adolfo Lopez Mateos said the time has come for the borders and ordered the national border program instituted, we realized the vital importance of incorporating the border cities with the rest of the nation both spiritually and economically knowing that such a program would help elevate their standards of living and assure an overall general development.

The national border program already has planned and has begun the transformation of the Mexican border into a true reflection of Mexico and an area of great economic activity.

The plan is to convert Mexico's 2,597 kilometers of frontier into "the greatest display window of the world looking toward the world's richest market," whereby the modest but clean and orderly appearance of our cities, the high standard of living of its inhabitants, the Mexican articles to be acquired there, the centers of honest entertainment, museums and handicrafts, and accommodations, the millions of U.S. tourists that visits such cities will become aware of the true cultural, social, and commercial aspects of their neighbor to the south. They will discover the beautiful and hospitable Mexico unknown or distorted to them.

This is why the program seeks the distribution of domestic goods in the border zone, competitive in price and quality to help develop this important market, increase national production and lead to the establishment of new enterprises.

The physical regeneration of these cities has a special significance since man does not live as he thinks, but rather thinks as he lives. Thus, inhabiting a poor and unsanitary place it is only natural that he should feel depressed and dissatisfied.

Unfortunately for us, plans and good will are not enough to resolve economic problems. Capital is indispensable, and this is formed by savings. Our possibilities of saving are not enough to create the capital necessary for programs such as the national border program.

This is why outside aid is necessary to step up the economic development of Latin America. This should be in the form of long-term, low-interest loans, so that such important projects as the national border program may be carried out rapidly rather than in the many years that would be required if only local resources were used.

Fortunately, Mexico enjoys an excellent international credit rating because it has always met its obligations on time.

We consider of great importance the progressive views of those whose opinions coincide with that of a great contemporary American, the Senator from Oregon, the Honorable Wayne Morse, who has said that if assistance is given the national border program the benefits will be reaped by both the United States and Mexico, because as our economy is strengthened our purchasing power will increase in direct benefit of both countries.

We want the support of the U.S. legislators in Mexico's progressive efforts. The prosperity and tranquility of Mexico assume greater collective importance every day, considering the close interdependence imposed on all America at this critical hour of humanity.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, that speech was one of the speeches delivered by a distinguished Member of the Mexican Parliament at our parliamentary conference in Mexico last month. It is an intensely interesting and factual discussion of the so-called border problems which exist between Mexico and the United States.

The speech is very persuasive in support of the so-called border project that Mexico is conducting in connection with clearing up and cleaning up some of the slum conditions in towns on the Mexican side of the border. Interestingly enough, it is a program which is receiving the support of city after city on the American side. In fact, in Los Angeles even the city council, I am advised, adopted a resolution urging U.S. support and cooperation in connection with the program.

However, those in charge of the Alliance for Progress program have indicated that they are not inclined to include the project within the Alliance for Progress program. I only desire to say that if the project does not fall within the Alliance for Progress program, it would be difficult for me to determine what program would. I understand that among their objections, the administrators of the Alliance for Progress program object on the ground that support of this border project program might result in Mexico improving its economic status in this area of the country whereby they might be selling more to the United States than buying.

I thought that one of the economic purposes of the Alliance for Progress program was to help the Latin American countries stimulate and develop their economies so that they could raise the standard of living of the people of their country, which will mean that they will have to develop their wealth-producing industry. They will have to develop that economic income of their people so that their standard of living can be raised.

If that is to be the narrow and selfish attitude of the administrators of the Alliance for Progress program throughout Latin America, I may say, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, the program is doomed before it gets off the ground, and it is anything but off the ground at the present time.

I have asked to have the speech of Congressman Duran printed in the Record because I think it may be helpful to Members of the Congress in evaluating the economic program that should be developed between the United States and Latin America. It may be asking too much for me to think that it might be helpful to the administrators of the Alliance for Progress program, but at least it ought to be helpful to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations in connection with the suggestion I made at the committee hearing the other day that there should be no further delay on the part of the Foreign Relations Committee in going forward with an examination into the administration of the Alliance for Progress program because, in my judgment, it needs an early examination.

COMMEMORATION OF LAW DAY AT DUKE UNIVERSITY

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, tomorrow, April 27, one of the Nation's great universities is commemorating Law Day jointly with the dedication of its new law school building. The imposing number of men distinguished in the law now assembled on the Duke University campus for this great event, is indeed impressive. The list of eminent guests includes:

The distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky; the Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court; the president of the Association of American Law Schools; the Solicitor General of the United States; judges of three circuits of the U.S. Court of Appeals; justices of the supreme courts of three States; and delegates from each of the Nation's major law schools.

This notable group of lawyers who will be present indicates the national respect for excellence in legal education which Duke University commands.

The building which will be dedicated is the result of years of planning—a major effort to develop the best possible facilities for the law students and professors at Duke.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from a recent issue of the Durham Morning Herald, and a copy of my letter to Dean Latty, of the Duke University School of Law, both concerning the new law building, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpts and letter were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Durham (N.C.) Morning Herald, Apr. 21, 1963]

New Duke Law School Building

Although the program participants are men of wide travel and experience who have seen many impressive buildings, they probably will give their unstinting admiration to Duke's new law school building.

Six Associates, Inc., of Asheville, was the architectural firm for the building, with W. Stewart Rogers, a 1928 Duke graduate, as the partner in charge of the project.

After close coordination with Dean E. R. Latty, of the law school, and with Prof. E. C. Bryson, chairman of the school's building committee, the architects established a program designed to embody functional and esthetic considerations and goals.

Moreover, to help formulate an approach to the building, the architects, together with Dean Latty and Professor Bryson, visited other law buildings in various parts of the United States and also reviewed a number of plans of other structures which were obtained from the National Association of Law Schools.

"When the basic functions and space requirements were determined, the primary goal of the architects was to create an environment of refinement and dignity which would reflect the objectives of contemporary professional education of law students at Duke," Rogers explains.

"At the heart of the law school is the library and the teaching program seems to relate to this area much more than in other professional schools," he continues.

"Consequently, the library at Duke is near the center of the total complex both horizontally and vertically," Rogers notes.

The library's main reading room is a spacious one with the treatment designed to be inviting and conducive to quiet and study.

At various points in the four floors of bookstacks are tables and individual study, typing, and reading areas. All these were planned with a view to giving the students efficient and adequate spaces for study and research.

The library provides for an ultimate volume capacity of 300,000 and seating for 340 students.

A small separate library with a lounge, located off the mezzanine, was designed to fill a more specialized need of the faculty for research and study at their level.

The attention given needs other than those of the library was no less painstaking.

"The concept of the classroom for law instruction is quite different from standard chair-desk arrangement," Rogers explains.

"Students participation in the class procedures and a need for extra desk space for writing and bulky reference material dictates a forum-type room," he adds.

"Utilizing this concept, classrooms of various sizes to accommodate groups from very large to very small are provided," Rogers notes. "Special attention in these rooms was directed to acoustics, sight lines, lighting, and finishes."

Another vital part of the school's program is the moot or practice courtroom. So this need, too, was given intensive study to create an environment that would reflect the dignity of a court of law, as well as the importance of law education at the university. The courtroom seats 225 persons, is walnut panelled and has a coffered ceiling.

"Spacious student lounges on each floor were designed to attract the students at off-class times to relax and exchange ideas in an informal atmosphere," Rogers says.

The World Rule of Law Center, an important adjunct to the Duke Law School, has quarters on the second floor.

The building also has individual offices for faculty and administrative officials, editorial offices for various law publications, work spaces for school organizations, and library processing areas.

Nor were future needs overlooked. The structure was designed so that a major addition can be made and the library facilities extended at a future date.

April 24, 1963.

Dean Elvin R. Latty,
Duke University School of Law,
Duke University,
Durham, N.C.

Dear Dean Latty: I want to congratulate you and the Duke University School of Law on the occasion of the dedication of your new law building. Since its inception, your school has established an impressive tradition of excellence and has achieved national recognition in the field of legal education. Your faculty has made an impressive contribution to legal scholarship; the legal periodicals you publish are read throughout the Nation and, in some instances, throughout the world; your alumni have demonstrated the high quality of their training at Duke by occupying posts of immense responsibility; and, as I am informed, your present law students also compare favorably with those of any law school in the Nation.

Last fall I had the pleasure of taking a brief tour of your new law building and was greatly impressed by the manner in which it combined efficiency with beauty. It is altogether fitting that, to dedicate this remarkable building, you will have present a nationally prominent assemblage of lawyers, jurists, and professors.

I appreciate your invitation to attend the dedication exercises, and I regret that pressing legislative commitments and previous engagements make it impossible for me to attend. In addition to the formal dedication I would have especially enjoyed hearing the address by my colleague, Senator COOPER, and attending the seminar of "The Judicial Process," where undoubtedly there will be discussions of the juridical problems that I vividly remember from my service on the North Carolina Supreme Court.

Often I have had occasion to refer, and always with pride, to the Duke University School of Law. I am proud of Duke's leadership in the field of legal education and of its outstanding faculty, its World Rule of Law Center, its well-known legal publications, and its high-quality legal research. Undoubtedly your new building will facilitate your continuing to do the splendid work that you have done in the past; and so, its dedication is a very significant event.

With congratulations to you on your fine leadership and with all kind wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

SAM J. ERVIN, Jr.,
Chairman.

ESSAY ON SMOKING

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I note with great satisfaction the increasing interest in the close connection between smoking and lung cancer. Many States are either holding or planning conferences on the subject.

The American Cancer Society has long promoted this kind of publicity and is now beginning to see its results. Along that line, I am pleased to call the attention of my colleagues to the excellent essay by Miss Penny Paczesniak on the subject of "Smoking: An Invitation to Lung Cancer." Penny is a student at Marshfield High School in Coos Bay, Oreg.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Miss Paczesniak's prize-winning essay which appeared in the April 18, 1963, edition of the Coos Bay World be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SMOKING, CANCER ESSAY WINNER MISS PACZESNIAK

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Presented here is the winning essay, written by Penny Paczesniak, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Walter Paczesniak, Coos Bay, in the American Cancer Society essay contest at Marshfield High School. For her winning essay on the subject of "Smoking—An Invitation to Lung Cancer," Miss Paczesniak received a $25 U.S. Savings Bond. Susan Baker was runnerup in the contest.)

(By Penny Paczesniak, Marshfield High School senior)

The American journalist, Alexander Wollcott, once remarked, "All the things I really like to do are either immoral, illegal or fattening." This witticism may be applied indirectly to smoking. While smoking is not unlawful or pound-producing, this practice is, unquestionably harmful to the point of being lethal. Excessive smoking can contribute to death—a self-imposed death.

An increasing number of persons have been toying with the suicidal smoking habit. In fact, Americans over 14 years of age are consuming annually 200 packages, or 12 pounds of tobacco per person. Seemingly, the temporary satisfaction of puffing dried leaves rolled in paper is more appealing than adding 5 years to one's life.

The smoker of two packages of cigarettes a day has a 1-in-10 chance of contracting lung cancer, as compared to the nonsmoker having 1 in 170. The treacherous thing abount lung cancer is that it sneaks up on a person without warning and is rarely recognized in its early stages. Unfortunately, lung cancer has a silent phase in which there are few or no detectable symptoms. When the symptoms do become evident, the cancer has already taken hold, and effective treatment is almost impossible. In one study including 948 patients being treated, only 59 persons were operable, and only 6 percent were alive at the end of 5 years.

The low rate of successful treatment of lung cancer is contributed to the difficulty of early diagnosis.

Smokers either fail to realize that cigarettes are cancer villians, or they lack the willpower to give up an expensive pleasure for their health. Such persons should heed the following facts: lung cancer is rarely present in a nonsmoker; smoking is found to be much greater among lung cancer patients than among other patients; the enormous increase in cigarette sales in the United States parallels the increase in lung cancer.

Further evidence reveals that a smoker's giving up tobacco does not insure protection against cancer. The damage may already have been done. Clinical signs of lung cancer may appear as long as a year after complete cessation of smoking. Three cases on record show that lung cancer developed 10 years after the patients had stopped smoking. All three had been smoking for 30 years or more.

In view of the statistics that all but confirm the cancer-tobacco link, it is evident that something must be done to combat the deadly smoking habit. Knowing the facts is not enough: a combination of knowledge, understanding and action is the only way to curb the destruction of the cancer stick—the cigarette.

TEXAS LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION ON TAXES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Texas House of Representatives has just passed a resolution concerning the proposed tax changes adversely affecting the oil industry.

The resolution states that these proposals will serve to damage an already weakened industry and will have a bad effect on the economy of the State of Texas.

I ask unanimous consent that this resolution by the Texas House of Representatives be placed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 235

Whereas the petroleum industry is an outstanding example of free enterprise, both in Texas and in the world at large; and

Whereas the petroleum industry is one of the major bulwarks of the Texas economy; and

Whereas the petroleum industry has contributed heavily to the finances of State Government by paying 27 percent of all local property taxes and 30.2 percent of all State taxes collected in Texas during the year 1961; and

Whereas such taxes collected amounted to 42 percent of the cost of public education maintained in Texas; and

Whereas the Texas petroleum industry has borne the largest proportion of loss of markets suffered during recent years by the petroleum industry as a whole; and

Whereas the tax program of the present national administration proposes additional Federal tax burdens on the already overburdened petroleum industry; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this House respectfully requests that these tax proposals affecting the petroleum industry be withdrawn, and that copies of this resolution be sent to the President, Vice President, Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, and to all Members of the Congress of the United States.

BYRON TUNNELL,
Speaker of the House.
DOROTHY HALLMAN,
Chief Clerk of the House.

DES MOINES TRIBUNE SUPPORTS GI BILL OF RIGHTS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the hearings by the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on S. 5, the cold war G.I. bill, have been going on for the past 3 weeks, and the public response has been most gratifying. The press has been most faithful in covering those hearings and I wish to express my appreciation to them for their service to the American people. This coverage has caught the attention not only of the general public but also of the management of the newspapers of this country. I know that the members of the working press have long been interested in this cold war G.I. bill, because I have talked to a lot of them and many of them have told me that they got their journalism education and training under similar bills in the past.

Mr. President, as the Senators know, I have long advocated the need for a cold war G.I. bill for the veterans as presently set out in S. 5. In all of the years of this advocacy, I have never seen a greater interest from the people of this country. I am sure that the 38 other Senators who have joined me in cosponsoring this legislation can testify to the truth of that statement. Each day more and more letters pledging support of this bill are being received. Each day more and more people realize the benefits that would accrue to our Nation from the enactment of this legislation. They merely measure its prospects by looking back at what the previous GI bills have done for the country. They realize that our Nation today needs the brain power and the skills which are now being wasted. They look at the unemployment figures and find that the rate of unemployment is highest in the age group of cold war veterans who would be in a position to utilize the readjustment benefits provided by this bill, and give to America the human resources which are needed today and will even be more desperately needed in the future in the execution of our cold war.

A man vitally concerned with both education and the welfare of the cold war veteran is Mr. Robert R. Hileman, Director, Veterans Education and Training Division, Department of Public Instruction, State of Iowa, Des Moines, Iowa. In a recent letter to me he enclosed an editorial from the Des Moines Tribune, entitled "Proposal for a New GI Bill of Rights," which was published on April 16, 1963.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following my remarks, the letter from Mr. Robert R. Hileman and the editorial from the Des Moines Tribune, entitled "Proposal for a New GI Bill of Rights," dated April 16, 1963.

There being no objection, the letter and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF IOWA,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,
Des Moines, Iowa, April 22, 1963.
Hon. RALPH YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: Enclosed is an editorial entitled "Proposal for a New GI Bill of Rights," which appeared in the April 16 issue of the Des Moines Tribune.

We think that you will appreciate this statement from a strong Midwestern daily newspaper. Certainly the men and women who have entered the Armed Forces since Janaury 31, 1955, are vitally interested in the provisions of S. 5.

I wish to take this opportunity to thank you and the other Senators who have endorsed S. 5 for introducing this bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who have served in the Armed Forces. We all appreciate your continued efforts to secure suitable legislation for veterans.

Sincerely yours,
ROBERT R. HILEMAN,
Director, Veterans Education and Training Division.

[From the Des Moines Tribune, Apr. 16, 1963]

PROPOSAL FOR A NEW GI BILL OF RIGHTS

A U.S. Senate subcommittee began hearings last week on a measure, sponsored by 39 Senators, to reestablish a trimmed-down version of the GI bill of rights. The proposal calls for college, vocational training, and loan assistance benefits for post-Korean War veterans. A similar measure was adopted by the Senate in 1959, but no action was taken in the House.

The GI bill was adopted for veterans of World War II and reinstituted in 1952 for Korean war veterans. Those serving since January 31, 1955, however, have received no special training or loan benefits.

The chief puropose of the educational provisions of wartime GI bills was to enable veterans to resume the training interrupted by military service. Many were drafted soon after graduation from high school and few were permitted to finish college. The readjustment problem of today's veteran is not comparable. The typical draftee now is 22 or 23. If he is enrolled in college, he usually is permitted to complete his education before being called into service.

But today's draft is considerably more inequitable than in the wartime years. Many escape military service altogether as a result of marriage or enrollment in school until the age of 26, when they are no longer likely to be drafted. A study last June showed that, of the total male population of 1,110,000 at age 26, only 530,000 had been in military service. Less than half—45 percent—of those with a military obligation now actually serve and the proportion is expected to drop to 40 percent by 1965.

The proposed GI bill could take some of the inequity out of the present system by awarding those who do serve with useful benefits. The measure also could encourage voluntary enlistment. Many a youngster just out of high school would welcome the opportunity to work his way through college or a vocational training school at the rate of 1½ days of training for each day in military service.

Congress recently adopted a 4-year extension of the draft law with little thought to the inequities involved. The proposed GI bill deserves consideration as a means of making the law more fair while providing training that has value for veterans and the country as a whole.

THE CUBAN SITUATION

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, the April 24, 1963, issue of the Washington Daily News had two excellent pieces. One was the lead editorial entitled "Now Is the Hour," and the other was the column of that very knowledgeable journalist, Virginia Prewett, an outstanding authority on Latin America, entitled "A Dangerous Change of Course." Both pieces deal with the Cuban situation.

Because of their excellence I invite the attention of the Members of the Senate to them, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial and column were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, Apr. 24, 1963]

NOW IS THE HOUR

There have been two plausible reasons for the recent relatively tolerant policy of the Kennedy administration on Cuba.

A desire to save the lives of the prisoners, including those captured at the Bay of Pigs.

A wistful hope Khrushchev might have peaceful intentions and really meant to remove his troops from the island.

The prisoners now have been freed, by ransom and exchange of Cuban criminals held in this country.

In 6 months Khrushchev has moved some troops out, meanwhile moving some new ones in. There is disagreement on figures but at the lowest of estimates at least 12,000 remain and Khrushchev doesn't even suggest he intends to get them out.

Now, it seems to us, is the time to toughen Cuban policy, displaying some of the urgency evident before the blockade and the strung-out negotiations which have followed it.

This is urged not only by Republican critics of the Administration but by Democratic leaders as well. Mike Mansfield, Senate Democratic leader, just has urged a program which merits careful consideration.

He would recognize a Cuban government in exile, clamp on a tight quarantine similar to that used against Trujillo in the Dominican Republic, and halt movement of Castro-Communist agents from Cuba and other American countries.

Agreement among the exiles on a government would be difficult and what such a government could accomplish is problematical anyhow. But it is desirable that anti-Castro measures be stepped up to make the Soviet occupation as expensive as possible. Blockade and direct military intervention should be reserved as last resort.

Action is imperative because "the United States cannot tolerate the continued existence of a Soviet military and subversive base 90 miles from our shore."

Those are the words of Richard Nixon, spoken last week here in Washington, but President Kennedy often has expressed himself with comparable vigor including, "Let the record show that our restraint is not inexhaustible. We and our Latin friends will have to face the fact that we cannot postpone any longer the real issue of the survival of freedom in this hemisphere itself."

Those words were spoken just after the Bay of Pigs disaster. The passage of 2 years hasn't altered their pertinence.

[From the Washington Daily News, Apr. 24, 1963]

A DANGEROUS CHANGE OF COURSE

(By Virginia Prewett)

The Kennedy administration is establishing a notable record of invoking the Communist menace when it wants something—such as appropriations from Congress—and accusing other people of aiding communism and risking nuclear war when they want decisive action on Communist Cuba.

The latest example is Attorney General Robert Kennedy's strictures on Dr. Miro Cardona of the Cuban Revolutionary Council.

ABANDONED

The emerging truth about the administration's Cuba policy is this: After its election on a "we'll help our friends platform," the administration has abandoned a hemisphere defense machinery long prepared by this Nation for the specific emergency we now face in Cuba.

We have a fully recognized treaty—the Treaty of Rio de Janeiro, signed in Brazil under President Harry Truman's Democratic administration—which spells out an exact remedy for the Communist intrusion in the Caribbean. Until President Kennedy chose to ignore it, this treaty has always had bipartisan support.

If anything could take us to nuclear war over Cuba, it is this plunge of American diplomacy away from its long-prepared, open positions and into a welter of over-complicated behind-scenes ploys.

The Kennedy administration has repeatedly stated that it alone will make this country's foreign policy. It is a tremendous misreading of the way the American system works if the White House honestly believes that election means a carte blanche to create a foreign policy outside the Nation's popular consent.

STEP BY STEP

Much less does election authorize the White House to make overriding secret agreements and try to keep them dark until our public has been led "step by step" to accept a radical change in our long-prepared foreign policy positions.

Such agreements are doubly dangerous, for if they can't be revealed to the American people, they can be used by Moscow in generating secret pressure on our President's own policies.

These and other considerations lie behind today's rising press demand to know why the Washington-Moscow correspondence about the October 22 confrontation is being kept secret. How can it be for reasons of security, when Moscow is on the other end of the correspondence?

And what is really happening in Cuba? Two national newspapers report authoritatively that there are from 30,000 to 40,000 Russian troops there. Another reports a missile-tracking station keyed to the Soviet's new anti-missile-missile station in Russia.

All this is breeding a sense of peril among us—a dangerous development that could, for the want of a frank leadership and an open diplomacy based on honorable treaties, explode into a real war hysteria.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If there is no further morning business, morning business is closed.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL REGISTER ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill (H.R. 2837) to amend further section 11 of the Federal Register Act (44 U.S.C. 311) was passed yesterday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion will be entered.

TEMPORARY SUSPENSION OF DUTY ON CORKBOARD INSULATION AND CORK STOPPERS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 144, H.R. 2053.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 2053) to provide for the temporary suspension of the duty on corkboard insulation and on cork stoppers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment, on page 1, after line 10, to strike out:

(1) "cork insulation, wholly or in chief value of cork, cork waste, or granulated or ground cork, in blocks, slabs, boards, or planks";

(2) "stoppers, over three-fourths of one inch in diameter, measured at the larger end, wholly or in chief value of natural cork bark"; or

(3) "stoppers, three-fourths of one inch or less in diameter, measured at the larger end, wholly or in chief value of natural cork bark".

And, in lieu thereof, to insert: "as 'cork insulation, wholly or in chief value of cork, cork waste, or granulated or ground cork, in blocks, slabs, boards, or planks'."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 160), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of H.R. 2053, as amended, is to suspend for a 3-year period the duties imposed under paragraph 1511 of the Tariff Act of 1930, on cork insulation.

GENERAL STATEMENT

Cork insulation is a material particularly suitable for low-temperature applications, such as cold storage rooms, refrigerator cars and trucks, warehouses, ice cream hardening rooms, fur storage vaults and similar purposes. After cutting and fitting, cork insulation is also used for pipe coverings and similar specialty purposes. For example, it is used in U.S. Navy vessels, for pipe coverings, for ammunition plugs for guns, etc.

Cork insulation is no longer produced in the United States. The former producers now join in requesting that it be imported free of duty.

The bill will be effective with respect to articles entered or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, during the 3-year period beginning on the day after the date of enactment, and also with respect to articles covered by entries the liquidation of which has not become final on the date of enactment by virtue of the provisions of section 514 of the Tariff Act.

The bill as referred to the Finance Committee would have suspended the duty on certain cork stoppers and on cork insulation. The committee amendment would retain the present tariff treatment on all cork stoppers and suspend the duty only on cork insulation.

The fact that the House-passed bill did not include so-called shell corks in the suspension created some dissension in the industries affected and there was agitation either for the inclusion of shell corks or for the general exclusion of other cork stoppers. A shell cork is a hollow stopper-cover, generally used in connection with a glass stopper.

There were requests for hearings should attempts be made to include shell corks in the suspension and considerable opposition to the inclusion of other cork stoppers unless shell corks were restored as a part of the bill. The various firms concerned have generally agreed that requests for hearings will not be made and support will be given to the amendment excluding all cork stoppers from the bill and suspending the duty only on insulation.

The reports of the Departments of Treasury and State expressed no objection to the temporary suspension of import duty on corkboard insulation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there is no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An act to provide for the temporary suspension of the duty on corkboard insulation."

APPROPRIATIONS FOR MILITARY PROCUREMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2440) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1964 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer apointed Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. STENNIS, and Mr. SALTONSTALL conferees on the part of the Senate.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS 1963

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 139, H.R. 5517.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 5517) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 5517) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

"REFLECTIONS ON THE PACIFIC COMMUNITY"—ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE HARLAN CLEVELAND

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address by Hon. Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, at a banquet of the conference on "Reflections on the Pacific Community," at Palo Alto, Calif., March 29, 1963.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REFLECTIONS ON THE PACIFIC COMMUNITY

(Address by the Honorable Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs)

I

All of a sudden, it seems, we have begun to talk of a Pacific community. And when we do, we get very close to the heart of U.S. foreign policy. It therefore is worthwhile, I think, to begin by putting that framework around the subject of your conference.

It is easy to forget that the very possibility of any kind of human community at all is a relatively recent phenomenon. For most of man's history to date, he wandered in search of food—a lonely gatherer and hunter of sustenance. No earlier than 10,000 years ago—a mere blinking of history's eye—man first discovered how to domesticate plants and grow his own food. It was an epic technological breakthrough; and its social fallout was the beginning of social complexity—tiny communities of human beings, beginning in the earliest settlements to learn to live together—by living together.

The story of man since then is the emergence of ever-widening communities—the clearing, the village, the town, the city, the city-state, the nation. At each stage new technology made possible—and stimulated—the larger community.

Now we already can say with comfortable confidence that when future historians look back on the decades immediately following World War II, they will write it down that our present times were notable for another breakthrough—a matrix of international communities, overlapping and interacting the most dynamic political force of the 20th century. Suddenly—the historians will exclaim—the world was no longer made of continents and oceans but of communities. And the writers of our history will be bound to note that the nation with the closest links to most of the new commonwealths was the United States of America.

Behind the new force lies the new technology: the new technology which drives groups of nations together against the threat of thermonuclear war—the new technology which drives nations together in history's first organized war against poverty and disease—the new technology which some day must drive nations to organize international peacekeeping institutions as a substitute for war itself. In the age of jets, great oceans which once served as hostile barriers between nations become friendly inland lakes for communities of nations around its shores. And so we can begin to talk realistically about a Pacific community—for political trends cannot be far behind the technology that makes them possible—and necessary.

II

There is no major area in the whole free world where impulses toward unification, integration, or partnership among new nations are not at work; only in the so-called Communist world is the trend in the opposite direction.

The most spectacular of these regional developments, of course, is in Western Europe where nations that have been at war with each other, off and on, for most of the modern era, are now finding unity. Europe, where these same nations are now putting together the world's second greatest industrial complex to serve a market of over 300 million prospering consumers.

I hope I do not have to stress the point that the recent check to European integration is not a checkmate. Our friends the historians will see it—or so we yet believe—as a bump along a road—a road which has some hazardous passages but leads in a clearly marked direction. Today's biggest headline seems fated, like so many other headlines, to wind up as a quaint footnote in the future's books about the present.

But the new Europe is only the most advanced case of a movement which engulfs all but that reactionary world which is still struggling with the hopeless task of adapting to stubborn reality the theology of Marx and Lenin.

In Latin America aroused peoples are beginning to act as if they had something in common besides a common background—and poverty. The Organization of American States, the Alliance for Progress, the widespread resentment of Soviet intervention in Cuba—all are symbols of a new sense of community still inadequately expressed in workable institutions. There are the beginnings of two customs unions—one in Central America and one—the Latin American Free Trade Association—consisting of the principal South American countries and Mexico. In Latin America there is a new economic momentum—and common institutions for development have just been given another push in the Declaration of Costa Rica.

Elsewhere, similar unity moves are part of the atmosphere.

In north Africa, a Maghreb confederation is being talked about.

In southeast Asia, there are impulses toward regional arrangements and regional programs for economic and social cooperation.

In the Arab world, it is hard to believe that the drive toward unity will not overcome the most bitter of divisions.

Even in tropical Africa, where strident nationalism has been used as a jimmy to pry new nations out of old empires, the first institutions for regional integration are coming into being.

And you meet here in California today to explore the early outlines of a Pacific community.

Several years ago Sir Oliver Franks drew a careful bead on this postwar trend and described regionalism as "a halfway house at a time when single nations are no longer viable and the world is not ready to become one." It would be hard to say it better.

III

The growth of regional communities is of course quite in line with the obligations and opportunities of every member of the United Nations.

The U.N. Charter explicitly recognizes the role of regional organizations in articles 52 and 53 and even foresees their use to help the U.N. keep the peace in emergencies. The U.N. economic commissions are themselves organized on a regional basis, and spawn other regional groupings, like the Mekong River project in southeast Asia.

Regional organizations, in short, can help relieve the United Nations of burdens which otherwise might sink the universal boat we are all in together.

But the point I want to make here is that support for and participation in these overlapping communities of the free is at the doctrinal heart of U.S. foreign policy. Our concept of an emerging new system of world order depends heavily upon the growth and health and strength of the new communities within the broader framework of the U.N. system—for they weave the fabric of order with the strong yarn of consent. They reflect our kind of world of pluralism and color—our open society projected around the globe. They are the exact antithesis of the gray and monolithic world order—the universal closed society—of which the Communists dream.

This is why we—you and I, as Americans—carry around without embarrassment a whole pocketful of memberships and associate memberships in interlocking and mutually reinforcing regional organizations. The last time I counted, which was yesterday, there were 18 of them—8 in our own hemisphere, 10 in Europe and Asia. For any member of this conference who can name all of them without a reference book, the Department of State will offer a modest prize. It will have to be modest; the Congress gives us just enough money to help finance these organizations, and none at all to finance guessing games.

IV

In the Pacific we speak of community—not yet of an organization, hardly even a concept that any two nations on the Pacific rim would define alike. But if we have yet to formulate just what brings us together except the lapping waters of this greatest and least turbulent of oceans, we Americans do share with our neighbors in the "near west" one very special interest—the bits and pieces of land and small groups of people scattered on that ocean's surface.

They are dependent territories, most of them. As the great colonies of Asia and Africa wriggle free from their colonial apronstrings, the 50 or 60 enclaves and island groups still regarded as colonial remnants around the world are beginning to show up clearly on the horizon of the emotional debates on colonialism in the U.N. and elsewhere.

More than a dozen of these dependencies are in the Pacific—including the smallest of them all, Pitcairn Island of mutinous memory; 146 people live there on 2 square miles of real estate which has been British for 124 years. The 3 U.N. Trust Territories that now remain of the original 11 are all in the Pacific: tiny Nauru and huge, primitive New Guinea, both administered in trust by Australia; and the scattering of Micronesians on the old Japanese mandate, now the Trust Territory of the Pacific, which is entrusted to us to govern under arrangements that can only be changed by the Security Council of the United Nations.

As a case study in building a Pacific community, let us consider for a moment the condition and destiny of these 78,000 island people, speaking 9 different languages and unnumbered dialects, spread over an ocean expanse of 3 million square miles, on 2,100 individual islands that aggregate hardly 687 square miles of dry land.

We have left a part of our own history, and a good deal of our lifeblood, in some of those scratches on the map—in Truk, where our aviators neutralized a powerful naval base, and in Saipan and Tinian, where the crucial land battles of the Marianas were won.

I am here to tell you that the administration in Washington is paying very special attention to these people on those islands. And none too soon.

In an era when American power and technical progress is felt in every corner of the free world, when young volunteers and middle-aged technicians are helping every free people to build the institutions of modernity, none of our foreign aid programs are available to the only foreigners who have been specifically entrusted to our care by the world community.

The Voice of America has no program for the islands; the citizens of Trust Territory are not quite foreign enough to qualify for a rating as an audience. The Soviet radio is not as reticent: Radio Moscow can be clearly heard in Japanese in many islands of the Trust Territory.

Until the administration and the Congress got busy last year to increase the funds for education in Micronesia, we were spending an average of $33 per child per year for elementary schooling. In a well-meaning but unrealistic attempt to protect the islanders from the shock of 20th century civilization, most education has been in whatever vernacular happened to be the local language—which was nice and comfortable for the parents, but hardly a golden opportunity for the children. In all honesty, we have not been equipping these people for modern living.

The small numbers of people, and the enormous distances involved, make a decent educational system extremely difficult to organize. But we can do lots better, and the U.S. Department of Interior which administers the islands which the United States holds in trust under the United Nations Charter, is starting out to do just that.

A properly American attitude toward the development of the Pacific islands, is surely plain, if difficult to carry into action all at once. Ignorance is not bliss, we say, not even on lovely islands washed by the bluest of waters and cooled by the gentlest of breezes. Poverty is not picturesque, illiteracy is not Elysian, and backwardness is not the road to happiness.

As our modernization policy gathers momentum, the somehow familiar names of these remote islands—the Marianas, the Marshalls, the Carolines—will lose their recent connotation of war and death and acquire a new meaning as symbols of life, and peace, and the self-determination of peoples.

V

From time to time groups of islanders have expressed an interest in becoming permanently associated with the United States. We are flattered by this interest and perhaps a little embarrassed; we are not quite sure we have entirely merited this admiration. In any event we feel these expressions of interest to be premature. We do want the inhabitants of Micronesia to exercise their inherent and inalienable right of self-determination. We do not think, however, that this choice should be made until these people have acquired a firsthand knowledge of both the benefits and the responsibilities of 20th century civilization.

This is indeed what we have undertaken by treaty to do. The Charter of the United Nations, as ratified by the Senate, describes in these words the aims of the trusteeship system:

"(b) to promote the political, economic, social, and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the trust territories, and their progressive development toward self-government or independence as may be appropriate to the particular circumstances of each territory and its peoples and the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned, and as may be provided by the terms of each trusteeship agreement."

Not racy language, that. But the meaning is clear: the islanders themselves will in the end determine their own future, and we shall see to it that they get the chance to learn the issues and exercise the choices.

The winds of change are blowing, still sometimes at zephyr strength, over the other island areas in the central and southern Pacific. What is to become of these bits and pieces of old trading empires: too small and too remote for meaningful nationhood, too much in the spirit of the times to remain old-style dependencies?

How much real estate is necessary to make a nation? How many persons add up to a people?

Can anyone seriously imagine dozens, even hundreds, of sovereign, and independent nations fashioned from the multiple island groupings of the Pacific basin, each with its own flag, its currency, and national anthem, its independent day celebration and its seat in the United Nations? Must Pitcairn Island, for all its reknown, choose a Foreign Minister from its 146 good people?

Wisely the General Assembly of the United Nations, in resolutions designed to hurry the decolonization process, has provided a considerable range of options for the exercise of the right of self-determination. One of the alternatives recognized by the Assembly is for a people to combine with others; another kind of self-determination is to opt for free association, on an agreed basis, with a metropolitan power.

But this constitutional no-man's-land that lies between sovereign independence, which is now so fashionable, and colonial dependency, which is now so rightly out of fashion, needs a great deal more exploration by the lawyers and the political scientists. For if small populations are going to be asked to determine their future, they must be offered something better than a Hobson's choice between permanent dependency and fashionable illusion.

In the Pacific islands, and in each of the major nations around the Pacific rim, a stirring of new thought and new action is more than evident. Things will be on the move, and you in California will have a ringside seat. If we think hard, and act boldly on careful plans, we will surely find ways of assisting the Pacific community in its growing interdependence with the rest of the world. And that's what we mean, isn't it, when we speak here, so late in the evening but so early in history, of a Pacific community?

HUMANE LAWS FOR EXPERIMENTAL ANIMALS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Humane Laws For Experimental Animals," the main portion of which is a letter written by Dr. Gerry B. Schnelle, published in the magazine, "Our Dumb Animals," by the Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, April 1963.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HUMANE LAWS FOR EXPERIMENTAL ANIMALS—A.V.M.A. STAND CHALLENGED BY GERRY B. SCHNELLE, V.M.D.

Last October the U.S. House of Representatives held a public hearing on H.R. 1937 and H.R. 3556, two bills concerning themselves with the humane treatment of animals used in experiments and research. At this hearing our society placed itself on record as being in favor of legislation of this type which would minimize animal suffering. At this same hearing, Dr. L. Meyer Jones, speaking for the American Veterinary Medical Association, stated that the association is opposed to such legislation. We print here a letter from Dr. Gerry B. Schnelle which we feel will be of interest to our readers.—Editor.

APRIL 1, 1963.

To the EDITOR,
Journal of the A.V.M.A.,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR SIR: Dr. L. Meyer Jones, speaking for the A.V.M.A., did not speak for all its members when he said before a Congressional subcommittee hearing on H.R. 1937 and H.R. 3556 that the A.V.M.A. is "irrevocably opposed to Federal licensing and policing of scientific investigators and laboratories." He goes on to say that "We do not accept the a priori premise of these bills, i.e., that animals in scientific laboratories in the United States are ill-housed and mistreated." I do not accept the premise that all research-minded M.D.'s Ph. D.'s or D.V.M.'s are a priori kind, decent, and possessed of higher motives and sensitivities, nor that all the animals they use are well housed and humanely treated. Is it not true that disclosures have been made (and were made at the above hearing) that animals used for research paid for by U.S. funds have actually been horribly ill-housed and maltreated? What about the Franklin, Mass., case in which dogs, for which funds for housing and care were provided by the N.I.H., were in fact subjected to heart surgery, and when recovered from anesthesia just put out of doors in a Massachusetts winter, with a few boards tacked on trees as shelter, and with garbage or a few dead chickens their only food unless they ate each other? (They did.) These dogs were seized by Massachusetts State police and brought to this hospital (Angell Memorial Animal Hospital) for care. The pleurisy and endocarditis present in two of them exceeded anything I have ever seen in spontaneous disease.

I have very great respect for the medical profession, and both friendship and deep regard for many physicians, but I have been witness to most indifferent care given laboratory animals in highly respected medical schools for many many years. I cannot understand the reason for irrevocable opposition to the feelings of a rather large segment of the population who want to insure humane and decent care for animals that must be used in research and, in fact, want to exert some control over research which causes pain and death to living creatures. Defense of the stand taken by the American Veterinary Medical Association now seems mainly to take a position against regulation of research by laymen. In rebuttal to this it should be pointed out that regulation would apply only when tax money is used and that it is concerned mostly with housing of animals and prevention of repetitious and unnecessarily cruel experimentation.

Money and effort is being expended to create a public image of the veterinarian that is favorable to him. While I am sure the image of the American Veterinary Medical Association membership created by the opposition to these bills is favorable to the American Medical Association, I wonder if the general public who know about it is equally impressed. The public image of the physician has been tarnished during the past decade or so and we should think carefully and fully before teaming with American Medical Association on legislation. While close alliance of the medical and veterinary professions is undoubtedly the proper course to our foreseeable goal, we should feel free to express independent thought on matters concerning our patients. With all the American Veterinary Medical Association members' money that is being spent for somewhat nebulous public relations it seems to me that higher regard might be gotten from much of the public and perhaps from more member veterinarians if the American Veterinary Medical Association were to join forces with the proponents of the Griffith or Moulder bills and help them to write workable legislation which will insure as far as is possible proper housing and decent treatment of animals used in research that is paid for by public moneys.

Dr. L. Meyer Jones stated that "humane care and use of experimental animals cannot be obtained by simple legislative act." Perhaps not, but human slaughter is being enforced by simple legislative act after humane persons fought for nearly 50 years to correct slaughter abuses, and they fought without much help from American Veterinary Medicine Association.

Respectfully submitted,
GERRY B. SCHNELLE, *V.M.D.,*
Chief of Staff of the Angell Memorial Animal Hospital.

At this writing, similar legislation, S. 533, the Clark-Neuberger bill, has been introduced in the U.S. Senate. Our society will support this bill with the hope that there may be some strengthening amendments.

THE POPE'S ENCYCLICAL

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the encyclical of Pope John XXIII on peace has been highly praised by Catholics and non-Catholics alike throughout the world. His message emphasized the ideals toward which the people of the world should strive in addition to stressing the realities existing in today's world which can be employed to attain these goals.

Specifically, His Holiness underscored the importance of utilizing the United Nations as an effective organization for safeguarding world peace. He appealed to the leaders of nations who are deadlocked in controversy to lend support and work through the U.N. in efforts to build a better, more peaceful and safer world.

One of the finest of many good editorials on the Pope's encyclical appeared in the Rochester, N.Y., Democrat and Chronicle of April 11. It reflects the feeling of so many of us who warmly welcomed this stirring message of His Holiness to all men of good will.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this editorial may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A POWERFUL PLEA FOR PEACE

It is apropos to the approach of Easter, when men's hopes for peace are renewed, that one of the most statesmanlike encyclicals ever issued offers the world a formula by which a durable peace could be achieved.

The encyclical is unique in that it was addressed, not alone to 550 million Roman Catholics of the world, but to non-Catholics as well.

Pope John's message is a mixture of idealism and realism. Since his plea touched on treatment of minorities, underprivileged countries, religious freedom, colonialism, racial discrimination, economic distress and political tyranny, it implies no easy road to peace. Only when oppression and bigotry are surmounted can any real progress toward a just peace be expected; only when idealism is implemented by deeds will this happen.

Realism stands out, too, when the Pope calls for the deterrent of arms equality to be superseded by a reduction of arms stockpiles and a ban on nuclear weapons. These goals are within man's reach if he has but the will to make disarmament work. The Pope reminds us of the alternative—the conflagration of war set off by some uncontrollable and unexpected chance.

The most compelling passage is Pope John's appeal that the United Nations become an effective authority to safeguard peace. He is in a position to observe, perhaps better than any other, that national leaders are locked in an impasse of power and are incapable individually of world leadership. Only some world authority, such as the United Nations, serving all nations by conscious and free choice, in the Pope's view, can take on world leadership. Because the Pope's message was both powerful and conciliatory, its impact will be felt by thoughtful people everywhere.

"THRESHER" TRAGEDY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, America—in fact, the entire world—was shocked and saddened by the sinking of the submarine *Thresher* with the loss of 129 lives. This tragedy will go down in history as one of the worst disasters in peacetime naval operations.

Throughout the Nation, Americans are pausing and reflecting upon this disaster—a disaster that brought death and destruction to men and machine in the course of our efforts to maintain our freedom and security. America is proud of these men who so nobly gave their lives in the course of duty when their country called upon them.

Mr. President, one of the most thoughtful editorials I have seen on this tragedy appeared in the Brighton-Pittsford (N.Y.) Post on April 18. Andrew D. Wolfe, editor and publisher of this newspaper—one of a group of weeklies in the Rochester suburbs which is among the Nation's finest—has written of the *Thresher* and its men in a most sympathetic manner.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Wolfe's editorial may be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

"Thresher"

Every so often the bright and bubbly American world of the 1960's is penetrated by a reminder that peace is being preserved only by the courage and determination of many unsung men and women.

The tragedy of *Thresher* is yet another such reminder.

One can wish for a world in which "nuclear deterrent" and "countervailing force" were only silly phrases mouthed by militarists to whom no one paid any attention.

But the fact remains that the world's leaders number men who apparently are willing to use death and destruction as a means of attaining national and political objectives. Much as many of us would like to change this world, there is no hiding the fact that there is yet no rule of law among nations.

As we grope for that goal, the doorway toward an acceptable world order is held open by the men who guard the Western World.

This often is a bitter, dangerous, and unrewarded task. The outpost lines in Korea, the dangerous sorties in Vietnam, the aerial reconnaissance along the borders of the Soviet, and a thousand other such tasks call for endless amounts of courage and self-discipline.

As pioneers in warfare against potential submarine threats, *Thresher's* men constantly rode the near side of danger.

Their courage and their fate are a reminder of how much we owe to such men in these uncertain times.

KAISER STEEL CORP.'S PROFIT-SHARING PLAN

Mr. JAVITS. I wish to call to the attention of the Senate what to me is an extremely important report, that the Kaiser Steel Corp. has made an initial payment to its 3,930 steelworkers of $312,000 under the company's unique cost-saving and profit-sharing plan. It will amount to an average bonus of $79 for each employee.

I ask that articles dealing with this subject, appearing in this morning's Wall Street Journal and in this morning's New York Times, be printed in the Record as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 26, 1963]

Kaiser To Pay 3,930 Steelworkers $312,000 in Share-Savings Plan—Initial Bonus To Average $79 Each Under Unique Program; Union May Spread Idea in 1964

San Francisco.—Some 3,930 Kaiser Steel Corp. workers are due to be paid bonuses averaging $79 a man for the opening month of the company's unique cost saving and sharing plan.

The workers, members of the United Steelworkers of America at Kaiser's Fontana, Calif., plant, will receive $312,000 of $962,000 in savings achieved on material, supply, and labor costs from 1961 rates. The company retains the rest.

The savings-sharing plan went into effect at Kaiser March 1. If the program works, the steelworkers are expected to seek similar agreements with other steel producers. Union pressure for a sharing agreement isn't likely this year, but the steelworkers could move for such a pact in 1964.

Under the Kaiser agreement, eligible union members share in 32.5 percent of all material, supply, and labor savings. The workers, however, still are guaranteed at least the minimum wage and fringe benefits won by the steelworkers at other companies.

About 7,000 workers at Kaiser's Fontana plant are members of the union, but not all are eligible for the first monthly payment. The payments are made to clerical and technical salaried workers and to hourly workers who aren't covered by other incentive programs.

Payments under the plan will vary from worker to worker, depending on the work performed. A Steelworker official estimated the payments covering March savings will range from 15.1 to 45.1 percent of wage rates. The smallest payment to an eligible worker, he said, will be 31.5 cents an hour for an employee who is in the lowest incentive category and who earns the lowest wage, $2.10 an hour. An employee in the top category earning $3 an hour will receive an added payout of $1.35 an hour.

The union spokesman predicted the March share will be typical of the monthly payments that Kaiser will be making under the program. April shares may be slightly smaller, he said, because March was a month of rapidly rising production when unit costs per ton tended to be low.

Increased worker coverage, however, could reduce the individual payments, it was noted. The Kaiser-Steelworker agreement provides that employees covered by other incentive plans may join the cost-sharing program.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 26, 1963]

Kaiser Steel Gives Bonus to 4,000 as Cost Reduction Is Achieved

(By Gladwin Hill)

Fontana, Calif., April 25.—Nearly 4,000 workers at the Kaiser Steel plant here received today a month's bonus averaging $75.

It was the first monthly application of an unusual labor-management program for sharing production-cost savings.

The program was adopted by the company and the United Steelworkers Union as an outgrowth of their settlement after the 1959 steel strike.

Under the plan, production costs for a month are compared with the corresponding 1961 period. Any saving in such costs is divided, with about two-thirds going to the company and 32½ percent to labor. In the steel industry labor costs represent about that fraction of production costs.

For March a saving of $962,000 was calculated. Of this, $312,000 goes to 3,930 eligible union members. That number covers about half the plant's working force. Some departments are still operating under old incentive plans, with options of shifting to the new plan.

Monthly benefits in the long-range sharing plan are divided among individual workers in proportion to their base pay.

The program differs from conventional employee profit sharing in that it hinges entirely on production costs, without respect to profits.

The plan was instituted for a 4-year trial, following which it could be canceled by the company or the union.

It is the major innovation produced by a nine-member long-range committee set up in the strike settlement to maintain harmony and equity with special respect to the fruits of progress. Three members represent the company, three the union and three the public.

The union has 6,500 members in a production and maintenance local at the plant and 500 in a clerical-technical local.

Kaiser Steel ranks ninth among the country's producers. It set a landmark in the industry last year by abolishing the traditional price premium for steel west of the Rockies.

Last year the corporation had a net loss of $5,207,000 on sales totaling $232,316,000. This was said to have reflected a "generally lower demand for steel in the West throughout the year, coupled with a marked increase in foreign imports into the company's marketing area."

Jack L. Ashby, president, said prospects for this year were more favorable.

The production-cost savings registered in March were said to reflect "not only additional efforts of employees, but also the effect of a company-wide cost-reduction program underway for the past year."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I firmly believe that this action is clearly indicative of the direction in which our economy must go and that profit-sharing and stock ownership must play a major role in the future economy of our country. It is critically important to the economy of our Nation that every encouragement be given to this practice.

Indeed, Mr. President, the incentives inherent in the execution of this idea—based on actual productivity gains, which are shared between the company itself and its workers, and conforming to the company's ability to pay—must form an important element in the solution of the mounting problems of industrial relations. In my view, it may well be the key to its solution.

One of the recommendations made, at my suggestion, by the minority in the 1963 Joint Economic Committee report on the President's Economic Report was that consideration be given during this session of Congress to various means of encouraging profit sharing by employees, including restricted stock options, stock purchase plans, and other methods of stockholding as a part of, or in lieu of, wages and salaries.

There is no reason why restricted stock options should be confined to executives and salaried employees. They should extend to production workers and blue collar workers, so that they too may have a vested interest in the economy of our Nation, which is a true answer to communism.

Profit-sharing programs bring greater returns to stockholders as well as to workers who share in a company's profits through such plans.

Mr. President, I believe that this is the wave of the future. I consider it a great privilege to be able to insert reports on this development in the RECORD, and to call attention to the extraordinarily fine record of the Kaiser Corp. in this pioneer effort, which is so critically important to our Nation.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5517) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

Mr. PASTORE obtained the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the Senator from Rhode Island, the Senator in charge of the consideration of H.R. 5517, will move to have all the committee amendments agree to. It is my further understanding, under the procedures and under the rules, that as we carry out action on such motions, the bill would become a clean bill and be open to amendment.

In order to give notice and be perfectly fair, I wish to invite the attention of the Senator from Rhode Island to the fact that with respect to one amendment—on page 9, line 3, after "$450,000,000," to insert "to remain available until June 30, 1964,"—not only with respect to the amount which is in the bill but also with respect to the legislation contained in the language there will be some discussion, and several amendments will be offered. I simply wished to give that notice. I have no objection to the Senate adopting all the committee amendments with that understanding.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from Rhode Island so understands.

Mr. President, the committee recommendations total $1,486,096,841, a net increase of $47,405,335 over the House bill and a net reduction of $166,203,615 from the total supplemental budget requests of $1,652,300,456.

For the information of the Senate, I shall highlight amendments proposed by the committee.

The committee recommendation of $2 million for the land-use adjustment program in the Department of Agriculture will permit the Department to make payments this fiscal year on contracts entered into under the pilot land-use adjustment program. This recommendation is an increase of $1,850,000 over the House bill.

For the Farmers Home Administration, the committee recommendation of $1,222,900, to be derived by transfer, an increase of $100,000 over the House bill, is for increased pay costs and administrative expenses in connection with the initiation of the new rural housing program for the elderly, authorized by Public Law 87–723, approved September 28, 1962.

In addition, $2 million of a requested $5 million will enable the Department to establish a revolving fund to be used for making direct loans to nonprofit organizations for senior citizens in rural areas. The House bill provided nothing for this item.

The committee recommendation of $20,000, of a requested $34,000, for the Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure is required to fund the operations of this Commission until December 31, 1963, its statutory termination date. The committee was informed that current expenses of the Commission are being paid out of the personal funds of the Chairman of the Commission.

The recommendation of $75,000 for salaries and expenses of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, as requested in the supplemental budget estimate, is for funds to enable the Commission to initiate the general war damage claims program authorized by Public Law 87–846 on October 22, 1962. The House bill provided nothing for this item.

The $6 million recommendation for the Bureau of Reclamation for emergency construction of facilities in the Wellton-Mohawk Irrigation and Drainage District of Arizona is for the alleviation of the salinity problem associated with the delivery of Colorado River water to Mexico. This item was not considered by the House, and the committee recommendation includes language approving the appropriation of this amount on a nonreimbursable basis.

The single largest amendment proposed by the committee provides $30 million of a requested $61,900,000 for the shelter survey and stocking program for civil defense. The House bill made no provision for this program. It is felt that the amount recommended should permit this program to continue pending an opportunity later to review further requirements.

I should also call to the attention of the Senate that in the study of funds included herein for the District of Columbia, the committee review resulted in amendments reducing the House bill by $1,183,376.

In accordance with the usual practice, the House bill makes no reference to, nor does it include funds for, Senate items. The committee recommendation for Senate pay costs has been included in the bill in the amount of $1,179,990, a reduction of approximately $60,000 from the budget estimate; includes $67,500 for payments to widows of deceased Senators, and several other small items.

With regard to requests for additional funds for increased pay costs, which amounted in total to approximately $403 million and which the House reduced by 5 percent across-the-board, the Senate committee is recommending that we stay with the House.

In conclusion, the single largest item in the bill—$450 million for public works acceleration—is recommended without change as to amount. The committee has added language to make these funds available until June 30, 1964, and has struck from the bill a proviso limiting Federal-funded projects to forest preservation activities of the Interior and Agriculture Departments. However, in the report the committee "directs that not to exceed 10 percent of the funds appropriated be allocated to all-Federal projects."

I shall be happy to answer any questions. In accordance with the understanding as enunciated by the majority leader, no votes will be taken on this bill until next Tuesday.

At this time I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as thus amended be regarded for the purpose of amendment as original text, provided that no point of order shall be considered to have been waived by reason of agreement to this order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, as I understand, there is no limitation of debate; there is no limitation as to germaneness; all the motion does is make the bill with the committee amendments original text. Is that correct?

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct; subject to amendment, subject to debate, subject to any other modification the Senate desires to make.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The agreement will not modify the rule with respect to germaneness.

Is there objection? If there is no objection, the request is agreed to.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 3, line 1, after "(76 Stat. 606)", to strike out "$150,000" and insert "$2,000,000".

On page 3, at the beginning of line 9, to strike out "$1,122,900" and insert "$1,222,900".

On page 3, after line 11, to insert:

"RURAL HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY REVOLVING FUND

"For loans pursuant to section 515(a) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1484; 76 Stat. 671), including advances pursuant to section 35(a) of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 (7 U.S.C. 1985), in connection with security for such loans, $2,000,000."

On page 4, after line 16, to strike out:

"OFFICE OF TRADE ADJUSTMENT

"Trade adjustment assistance

"For administrative expenses necessary to carry out the functions of the Secretary of Commerce under title III of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, and for expenses of technical assistance to firms under such title, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, $25,000."

On page 5, line 6, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$500,000" and insert "$750,000".

On page 5, after line 18, to insert:

"STUDY OF HIGHWAY PROGRAM FOR ALASKA

"For expenses necessary to make engineering studies and estimates and planning surveys relative to a highway construction program for Alaska, as authorized by section 13 of the act of October 23, 1962 (76 Stat. 1149), $800,000, to remain available until expended."

On page 6, after line 9, to insert:

"DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL FUNCTIONS

"Department of the Army

"Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control

"General Investigations

"For an additional amount for 'General Investigations', $15,000."

On page 6, after line 16, to insert:

"CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

"For an additional amount for 'Construction, General', $25,000."

At the top of page 8, to insert:

"CLAIMS, DEFENSE

"Not to exceed $3,300,000 may be transferred from the appropriation for 'Retired pay, Defense,' fiscal year 1963, to the appropriation for 'Claims, Defense,' fiscal year 1963."

On page 8, after line 4, to insert:

"DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL DEFENSE

"Civil defense, Department of Defense research

"For an additional amount for research, including continuing shelter surveys, marking and stocking, $30,000,000, to remain available until expended."

On page 9, line 3, after the figures "$450,000,000", to insert "to remain available until June 30, 1964", and in line 7, after the word "Congress", to strike out the colon and "*Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used for any project that does not require a financial contribution from State or local sources except projects dealing with preservation of forests in the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior".

On page 9, line 22, after the word "activities", to strike out "$5,430,000" and insert "$12,230,000", and in the same line, after the word "which", to strike out "$5,300,000" and insert "$12,100,000".

On page 10, line 6, after the word "Act", to strike out "$500,000" and insert "$1,000,000".

On page 10, line 14, after "(37 U.S.C. Chap. 7)", to strike out "$315,000" and insert "$290,000".

On page 11, line 15, after the word "Services", to strike out "$288,500" and insert "$175,000".

On page 11, after line 16, to strike out:

"GRANTS FOR MATERNAL AND CHILD WELFARE

"For an additional amount for 'Grants for maternal and child welfare', $3,500,000, of which $3,000,000 shall be available for child welfare services, and $500,000 for research, training, or demonstration projects in child welfare."

On page 11, line 24, to strike out "$102,500" and insert "$68,000".

On page 12, line 4, to strike out "$443,000" and insert "$425,850".

On page 12, after line 4, to strike out:

"OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

"Educational television facilities

"For grants to assist in construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, as authorized by part IV of title III of the Communications Act of 1934 (76 Stat. 64), and for related salaries and expenses, to remain available until expended, $1,500,000 of which not to exceed $75,000 shall be available for such salaries and expenses during the current fiscal year."

On page 13, line 15, after the word "fund", to strike out "$955,000" and insert "$977,000".

On page 13, after line 16, to insert:

"COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RULES OF JUDICIAL PROCEDURE

"Salaries and expenses

"For expenses necessary for the Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure, $20,000, to be available from January 1, 1963, and to remain available until December 31, 1963."

At the top of page 14, to insert:

"FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses', $75,000."

On page 17, after line 14, to insert:

"The Administrator shall not be required to pay interest to the Treasury on transfers heretofore or hereafter made from capital of the 'Direct loans to veterans and reserves revolving fund' to the 'Loan guaranty revolving fund' and adjustments shall be made for previous payments of interest on such transfers."

On page 19, after line 17, to insert:

"CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

"For an additional amount for 'Construction and rehabilitation,' $6,000,000, to remain available until expended and to be nonreimbursable."

On page 20, line 2, after the word "Fund", to strike out the comma and "of which $300,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for 'Loan program' and $700,000 shall be derived from the appropriation for 'Construction and rehabilitation', Bureau of Reclamation, fiscal year 1963".

On page 20, after line 16, to strike out:

"REVOLVING FUND

"For an additional amount for the 'Revolving Fund, Virgin Islands Corporation', $3,350,000."

On page 21, line 9, after the word "Recreation", to strike out "$200,000" and insert "$100,000".

On page 21, after line 9, to insert:

"OFFICE OF SALINE WATER

"Salaries and expenses

"The limitation under this head in the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1963, on the amount available for administration and coordination is increased form $525,000 to $582,000."

On page 22, line 6, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$130,000" and insert "$70,000".

On page 22, line 12, after the word "Marshals", to strike out "$1,110,000" and insert "$1,054,000".

On page 23, after line 1, to strike out:

"TRADE ADJUSTMENT ACTIVITIES

"For necessary expenses to carry out the functions of the Secretary of Labor under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, $100,000."

On page 23, line 11, to strike out $20,000,000" and insert "$22,000,000".

On page 23, line 15, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "$3,300,000".

On page 23, after line 16, to insert:

"SENATE

"For payment to Imelda E. Chavez, widow of Dennis Chavez, late a Senator from the State of New Mexico, $22,500."

On page 23, after line 20, to insert:

"For payment to Georgia Lowe Dworshak, widow of Henry C. Dworshak, late a Senator from the State of Idaho, $22,500."

On page 24, after line 2, to insert:

"For payment to Grayce B. Kerr, widow of Robert S. Kerr, late a Senator from the State of Oklahoma, $22,500."

On page 24, after line 4, to insert:

"SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

"Administrative and clerical assistance to Senators

"For an additional amount for administrative and clerical assistants to Senators, $7,600: *Provided,* That the clerk hire allowance of each Senator from the State of California shall be increased to that allowed Senators from States having a population of over seventeen million, the population of said State having exceeded seventeen million inhabitants, that the clerk hire allowance of each Senator from the State of Georgia shall be increased to that allowed Senators from States having a population of four million, the population of said State having exceeded four million inhabitants, and that the clerk hire allowance of each Senator from the State of Washington shall be increased to that allowed Senators from States having a population of three million, the population of said State having exceeded three million inhabitants."

At the top of page 25, to insert:

"CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

"Miscellaneous items

"For an additional amount for 'Miscellaneous Items', fiscal year 1962, $5,000."

On page 26, line 18, to strike out "$6,588,500" and insert "$6,088,500".

On page 27, line 10, after the word "contingencies", to strike out "$250,000, which shall be available for expenses of organizing and holding the World Food Congress in the United States, as authorized by the Act of October 18, 1962 (Public Law 87–841)", and in lieu thereof to insert "including expenses of organizing and holding the World Food Congress in the United States, as authorized by the Act of October 18, 1962 (Public Law 87–841), $550,000, of which $18,000 shall be available for official functions and courtesies in accordance with said Act."

On page 29, line 6, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$441,000" and insert "$413,500".

On page 29, line 12, after the word "Columbia", to strike out "$3,170,000" and insert "$2,902,800".

On page 29, line 15, to strike out "$1,300,000" and insert "$526,601".

On page 34, line 5, after the word "transportation", and strike out "maintenance" and insert "manufactures".

At the top of page 43, to strike out:

"President's Advisory Committee on Labor Management Policy: 'President's advisory committee on labor management policy', $4,750;".

On page 50, after line 1, to insert:

"Senate:

"Salaries, officers and employees, $901,980;

"Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate, $10,110;

"Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, $1,460, to remain available until expended;

"Contingent expenses of the Senate;

"Legislative reorganization, $5,935;

"Senate Policy Committees, $15,630;

"Joint Economic Committee, $10,590;

"Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, $11,435;

"Joint Committee on Printing, $5,255;

"Automobiles and maintenance, $1,300;

"Inquiries and investigations, $153,800;

"Folding documents, $1,705;

"Miscellaneous items, $44,640 including $21,500 for payment to the Architect of the Capitol in accordance with section 4 of Public Law 87–82, approved July 6, 1961;".

On page 51, after line 18, to insert:

"Senate office buildings, $16,150;".

On page 53, line 14, after the word "traffic", to strike out "$125,970, of which $95,860 shall be payable from the highway fund" and insert "$35,775, which shall be payable from the highway fund"; on line 17, after the word "engineering", to strike out "$315,020" and insert "$289,738"; in line 18, after the word "which", to strike out "$74,960" and insert "$64,743", and on line 19, after the word "and", to strike out "$57,570" and insert "$42,505".

On page 54, line 21, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document Numbered 14 and", and in line 22, after the word "Congress", to strike out "$16,993,400" and insert "$20,567,545".

On page 55, after line 9, to insert a new title, as follows:

"TITLE IV

"Philippine Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1963

"The Act entitled 'An Act to authorize the payment of the balance of awards for war damage compensation made by the Philippine War Damage Commission under the terms of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of April 30, 1946, and to authorize the appropriation of $73,000,000 for that purpose', approved August 30, 1962 (Public Law 87–616), is hereby amended to read as follows:

" 'That there is hereby authorized to be paid by the Government of the United States to the Government of the Republic of the Philippines the sum of $73,000,000 less the administrative expenses referred to in the third section of the Act: *Provided*, That such payment shall not be made until the Secretary of State shall have received assurances satisfactory to him from the Government of the Republic of the Philippines that such sum will be received by the Government of the Republic of the Philippines in full satisfaction and final settlement of any and all claims arising out of awards for war damage compensation made by the Philippine War Damage Commission under the terms of title I of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 128) and that the Government of the Republic of the Philippines shall insure that no part of such sum shall be directly or indirectly paid to any former Commissioner or employee of the Philippine War Damage Commission as compensation for services rendered as attorney or agent in connection with any such claim.'

"SEC. 2. All documents currently held by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission and relating to unpaid claims arising out of war damages in the Philippines, except for internal documents of any agency of the United States, shall be transferred to the Government of the Republic of the Philippines by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.

"SEC. 3. Funds appropriated by the first paragraph of title V of the Foreign Aid and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1963, not heretofore expended for administrative expenses, shall be used for making the payment authorized by the first section of this Act, except that of such funds, not to exceed $20,000 shall be available to the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission for administrative expenses which may be incurred in terminating its functions with respect to awards for war damage compensation made by the Philippine War Damage Commission under the terms of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 and in transferring documents in accordance with the second section of this Act.

"SEC. 4. This title may be cited as 'The Philippine Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1963.' "

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk sundry amendments to the bill which is before the Senate; namely, Calendar No. 139, H.R. 5517, and ask that they be printed under the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I did omit one item I should like to supplement at this time. I wish to call attention—and I think this is very important—that we have added title IV to the bill, which is subject to a point of order—and a motion is already on file in the event it becomes necessary—which has to do with the Philippine Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1963.

I ask unanimous consent that the proposed amendment of title IV be placed in the RECORD at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

TITLE IV

PHILIPPINE REHABILITATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1963

The Act entitled "An Act to authorize the payment of the balance of awards for war damage compensation made by the Philippine War Damage Commission under the terms of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of April 30, 1946, and to authorize the appropriation of $73,000,000 for that purpose", approved August 30, 1962 (Public Law 87–616), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That there is hereby authorized to be paid by the Government of the United States to the Government of the Republic of the Philippines the sum of $73,000,000 less the administrative expenses referred to in the third section of the Act: *Provided*, That such payment shall not be made until the Secretary of State shall have received assurances satisfactory to him from the Government of the Republic of the Philippines that such sum will be received by the Government of the Republic of the Philippines in full satisfaction and final settlement of any and all claims arising out of awards for war damage compensation made by the Philippine War Damage Commission under the terms of title I of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 128) and that the Government of the Republic of the Philippines shall insure that no part of such sum shall be directly or indirectly paid to any former Commissioner or employee of the Philippine War Damage Commission as compensation for services rendered as attorney or agent in connection with any such claim.

"SEC. 2. All documents currently held by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission and relating to unpaid claims arising out of war damages in the Philippines, except for internal documents of any agency of the United States, shall be transferred to the Government of the Republic of the Philippines by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.

"SEC. 3. Funds appropriated by the first paragraph of title V of the Foreign Aid and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1963, not heretofore expended for administrative expenses, shall be used for making the payment authorized by the first section of this Act, except that of such funds, not to exceed $20,000 shall be available to the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission for administrative expenses which may be incurred in terminating its functions with respect to awards for war damage compensation made by the Philippine War Damage Commission under the terms of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 and in transferring documents in accordance with the second section of this Act.

"SEC. 4. This title may be cited as 'The Philippine Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1963'."

DAY CARE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, one item in this particular bill which interests me very greatly is the denial of any appropriation for children's day care centers, notwithstanding the fact that we have authorized an amount for them and that the House appropriated $3 million for that purpose.

I am strongly in favor of that appropriation, and shall join with the Senator from Connecticut, who I understand will move to restore all or part of that appropriation.

A recent study indicates that a minimum of 400,000 children under 12 are currently without any kind of care while their mothers are at work.

In 1900, only 18 percent of the Nation's labor force were women; but by 1960, the ratio had risen to fully one-third. By 1970, an estimated two out of every five women in the United States will be working outside the home.

Adequate day care for children of such women and other mothers who must be away from home for long periods is a serious national concern. Without such care during their most formative years, the children of the Nation risk permanent damage to their emotional and moral character.

Economic necessity is the argument most often given for the need for day care, but other reasons loom large in documenting need. Many children need day care because of behavior problems or because they have physical handicaps, because of illness at home, or because the home is overcrowded and the mother constantly overworked.

I know of no provision which could save us more, both in social and economic terms, than help in day care centers, because in many families where the mother could work, and not be on relief or welfare, she is prevented from doing so because of lack of services to care for her children such as a day care center can provide.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record as a part of my remarks some evidence showing how greatly inadequate are these services throughout the country and how much we need such services.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Extracts From a Children's Bureau Study (1960) on Day Care Facilities

1. Number of licensed day care centers: California, 767; New York, 524; and Texas, 551.

2. Aggregate capacity of licensed centers: California, 28,816; Florida, 5,625; Illinois, 10,135; New York, 20,819; and Texas, 15,665.

3. Source of funds includes 76 centers subsidized through the department of welfare in New York City and 23 centers in Texas.

4. Group of children: Reported by eight States (District of Columbia, Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, North Carolina, Tennessee, Wisconsin). Twenty-six of these centers are in New York City and may serve mentally retarded and emotionally disturbed children as well as the physically handicapped. For convenience in tabulation, all these centers are reported above as serving the physically handicapped. They are not included in the count of other types of centers.

5. Reported by 14 States (Arkansas, California, District of Columbia, Florida, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Tennessee, and Wisconsin). Forty-four of these centers are in Illinois and 12 in California, where they are licensed by the department of mental hygiene. Delaware reported that some day care centers (not licensed by the department of public welfare) are operated under the direction of the superintendent of the hospital for the mentally retarded. Other States, of course, also may have unlicensed facilities for this group of children (or for the other groups listed in this table) that are not included in the counts reported.

6. Reported by five States (District of Columbia, Illinois, Michigan, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, and Pennsylvania). Thirteen of these centers were reported by New York and 4 by Pennsylvania.

Mr. JAVITS. So, Mr. President, I emphasize for Senators who will vote on this matter on Tuesday that we are not talking about eleemosynary questions. This is a matter of hard reality, and in terms of the welfare workload. As legislators, we would definitely prefer that people be given the opportunity to have the dignity of earning their own living, and have their own money on which to rely, than to be on welfare. This is one way we can encourage that.

ANTIDISCRIMINATION AMENDMENTS

On another aspect of the bill, I ask unanimous consent that amendments I have submitted be printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks.

(The amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. Javits are as follows:)

On page 2, line 10, after the period insert the following: "No part of the amount made available under this head in the Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1963, for 'Payments to States and Puerto Rico' shall be paid to any State in which the participants in, or beneficiaries of, the State programs carried out in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture are segregated, or otherwise discriminated against, on account of race, creed, or color."

On page 3, line 11, before the period insert the following: ": *Provided*, That no part of such additional amount shall be used in any State in which the participants in, or beneficiaries of, the programs of the Farmers Home Administration are segregated, or otherwise discriminated against, on account of race, creed, or color".

On page 3, line 18, before the period insert the following: ": *Provided*, That no part of such amount shall be used for loans, or advances in connection with security for such loans, to provide rental housing or related facilities which are not available, or will not be available, to individuals without regard to race, creed, or color".

Mr. JAVITS. These amendments relate to the Extension Service and the Farmers Home Administration, which are part of the Department of Agriculture. I think they go directly to the point recently made by the U.S. Civil Rights Commission about discriminatory use of Federal funds. The Federal Government is subsidizing segregation and discrimination in many of the programs in which it is providing the money derived from taxes on all citizens. In the programs relating to the Extension Service and the Farmers Home Administration that fact is so clear, as I shall demonstrate with evidence on Tuesday, that limitations against nonsegregation and nondiscrimination are absolutely demanded. That is what I intend to propose. I think that these proposals are eminently deserving.

Mr. President, I have laid down a principle for myself that I shall follow where its application is clear. I have no desire to spread a wide net in connection with this subject. However, where the evidence is clear, as it is in these two cases, I consider it my duty to ask the Senate to act, fortified, as I am, by the recommendation of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission regarding discriminatory use of Federal funds.

It is a crying shame, considering the situation we face in connection with civil rights, that we should countenance the expenditure of Federal funds to subsidize segregation and discrimination in the programs in which Federal funds are needed.

ACCELERATED PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAM—MONTANA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, perhaps the best received and most beneficial of any new program associated with this administration has been the accelerated public works program. This program in conjunction with the Area Redevelopment Act and the Manpower Retraining Act is making a determined effort to get to the heart of the unemployment and depressed economic conditions which plague our Nation.

In Montana, as the distinguished Presiding Officer (Mr. Metcalf in the chair) knows, the accelerated public works program has been extremely well received. There are many more projects seeking assistance than there are funds authorized, a situation encountered throughout the country. Funds made available under this program have made employment available in our national forests during the winter months when there is generally serious unemployment, it has helped to finance local public works projects where needed, it has enhanced the natural resource development program in the State and it has been especially important to the seven Indian reservations in Montana.

Recently I received a letter from the president of the Northern Cheyenne Tribe, John Woodenlegs, in Montana in which the gratitude his people felt and the improvements that had been made since the establishment of these accelerated public works projects were expressed. My good friend, John Woodenlegs, stated as follows:

> The work program is the best thing that ever happened on our reservation. It is beginning to look better since it is being developed. Roads are better for traveling, fences improved and the timber looks better since it is being thinned out. I am happy to say that even the children look better because we notice they dress better and are getting plenty to eat. I wish you could see for yourself how happy everybody looks now since they have jobs and are bringing home good pay checks, they are willing to work no matter what the weather is like. I believe the Cheyennes would rather go out and work than depend on relief and welfare. By drawing relief and welfare they merely exist. But with employment they earn money enough to buy clothing, more groceries and other necessities they have always wanted and need.

I wish to point out, as the Presiding Officer (Mr. Metcalf in the chair) well knows, that the Northern Cheyennes have very little in the way of financial resources and because of little opportunity for development on the reservation land it has been extremely difficult for these people to make any tremendous progress without substantial help.

The appropriation of the additional authorized funds for the accelerated public works program will be an investment in the future of our Nation, a contribution to the well-being of those persons and communities who are presently confronted with economically depressed conditions.

Mr. President, to illustrate the impact that the program has had in Montana, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Congressional Record a list of those Montana projects already approved and a list of accelerated public works grant applications for the State submitted to the Area Redevelopment Administration by participating Federal

agencies for consideration when additional funds are made available. While processing of these project applications is not completed in the field they have been determined eligible for accelerated public works assistance.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Status of APW[1] projects in Montana

Area	Project	Agency	APW[1] grant	Status (date approved)
5(a):				
Butte:				
Silver Bow	Fabricate cattle guards	Interior Bureau of Land Management	$160,000	Jan. 30, 1963
Deer Lodge National Forest	Develop national forest	U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service.	60,000	Oct. 28, 1962
Do	do	do	30,000	Feb. 15, 1963
Do	do	do	70,000	Jan. 16, 1963
Kalispell:				
Lincoln	Develop national forest	do	50,000	Oct. 28, 1962
Inter-Mountain States Reservoir	Conservation	do	50,000	Jan. 16, 1963
Kootenai National Forest	Develop national forest	do	100,000	Oct. 28, 1962
Flathead National Forest	do	do	45,000	Feb. 15, 1963
Kootenai National Forest	do	do	65,000	Do.
Flathead:				
Glacier National Park	Recreation facilities	Interior	400,000	Oct. 31, 1962
Hungry Horse	Tourist center	do	175,000	Feb. 4, 1963
Carbon	Construct trails, bridge, reservoir	Interior, Bureau of Land Management	50,000	Jan. 30, 163
Custer National Forest	Conservation	U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service.	25,000	Feb. 15, 1963
	Develop national forest	do	50,000	Oct 28, 1962
Bridger	Sewers	Community Facilities Administration	143,000	Feb. 16, 1963
Custer	Develop national forest	U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service.	5,000	Feb. 15, 1963
5 (b):				
Deer Lodge:				
Beaverhead National Forest	do	do	70,000	Jan. 16, 1963
Deer Lodge National Forest	do	do	80,000	Do.
Do	do	do	50,000	Oct. 28, 1962
Lake:				
Flathead National Forest	do	do	50,000	Do.
Ronan	Sewer	Community Facilities Administration	38,000	Mar. 5, 1963
Bison Range	Recreation facilities	Interior Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.	60,000	Oct. —, 1962
Musselshell:				
Lake Mason National Wildlife Reservation	Fence building	do	40,000	Feb. 4, 1963
Park:				
Gallatin: Gallatin National Park	Develop national forest	U.S. Department o Agriculture Forest Service.	50,000	Jan. 16, 1963
Ravalli:				
Bitterroot National Forest	do	do	100,000	Oct. 28, 1962
Do	do	do	50,000	Jan. 16, 1963
Sanders:				
Kaniksee National Forest	do	do	20,000	Jan. 16, 1963
Lolo National Forest	do	do	50,000	Do.
Do	do	do	100,000	Oct. 28, 1962
Bison Range	Recreation facilities	Interior Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.	40,000	Do.
Indian reservations:				
Blackfeet—Pondera: Blackfeet Reservation	Water and waste	Health, Education, and Welfare	38,000	Feb. 3, 1963
Do	Erosion control	Interior	165,000	Jan. 18, 1963
Crow Reservation	do	Interior Bureau of Indian Affairs	91,000	Do.
Flathead	Water and waste	Health, Education, and Welfare	48,000	Feb. 3, 1963
Do	Roads	Interior Bureau of Indian Affairs	51,000	Jan. 18, 1963
Fort Belknap: Belknap	Community center	do	47,000	Do.
Fort Peck	Water and sewage	Health, Education, and Welfare	166,000	Feb. 3, 1963
Northern Cheyenne: Cheyenne Reservation	Erosion control	Interior Bureau of Indian Affairs	276,000	Oct. —, 1962
Rocky Boys	do	do	210,000	Do.

[1] Accelerated public works.

Programs submitted for consideration under the supplemental appropriation for Montana, Apr. 4, 1963

Area	Project	Agency	Amount
5(b):			
Lolo National Forest, Sanders	Road construction	U.S. Department of Agriculture—Forest Service.	$47,000
	Construction of buildings, recreational facilities	do	10,000
	Land treatment	do	23,000
Bitterroot National Forest, Ravalli	Road construction	do	44,000
	Construction of buildings, recreational facilities	do	84,000
	Repair buildings, recreational facilities	do	10,000
	Land treatment	do	30,000
Custer National Forest, Carbon	Road construction	do	62,000
	Construction of buildings, recreational facilities	do	69,000
5(a): Deerlodge National Forest, Butte (Silverbow)	Road construction	do	47,000
	Construction of buildings, recreational facilities	do	71,000
	Repair of buildings, recreational facilities	do	16,000
	Land treatment	do	24,000
5(b): Deerlodge	Road construction	do	50,000
	Construction of buildings, recreational facilities	do	70,000
	Repair of buildings, recreational facilities	do	22,000
5(a): Flathead National Forest, Kalispell (Flathead)	Road construction	do	7,000
	Construction of buildings, recreational facilities	do	127,000
	Repair of buildings, recreational facilities	do	2,000
L.S.: Gallatin National Forest, Livingston (Park)	Road construction	do	32,000
	Construction of buildings, recreational facilities	do	74,000
	Repair buildings, recreational facilties	do	9,000
	Land treatment	do	5,000
5(b): Kaniksu National Forest, Sanders	Road construction	do	20,000
	Construction of buildings, recreational facilities	do	125,000
	Repair buildingls, recreational facilities	do	10,000
	Land treatment	do	5,000
5(a):			
Kootenai National Forest, Kalispell (Lincoln)	Road construction	do	20,000
	Construction of buildings, recreational facilities	do	80,000
	Land treatment	do	20,000
Beaverhead National Forest, Butte (Silverbow)	Construction of buildings, recreational facilities	do	12,000

Programs submitted for consideration under the supplemental appropriation for Montana, Apr. 4, 1963—Continued

Area	Project	Agency	Amount
5(b): Deerlodge	Road construction	U.S. Department of Agriculture—etc.	$35,000
	Construction of buildings, recreational facilities	do	39,000
	Repair buildings, recreation facilities	do	10,000
5(a): Intermountain Station, Kalispell (Flathead)	Road construction	do	54,000
	Land treatment	do	30,000
Supplemental work:			
5(b):			
Lolo National Forest, Sanders	Road construction	do	31,000
	Construction of buildings, recreational facilities	do	7,000
	Land treatment	do	17,000
Bitterroot National Forest, Ravalli	Road construction	do	30,000
	Construction of buildings, recreational facilities	do	56,000
	Repair buildings, recreational facilities	do	7,000
	Land treatment	do	20,000
Custer National Forest, Carbon	Road construction	do	41,000
	Construction of buildings, recreational facilities	do	20,000
5(a): Deerlodge National Forest, Butte (Silverbow)	Road construction	do	32,000
	Construction of buildings, recreational facilities	do	47,000
	Repair buildings, recreational facilities	do	11,000
	Land treatment	do	16,000
5(b): Deerlodge	Road construction	do	34,000
	Construction of buildings, recreational facilities	do	47,000
	Repair buildings, recreational facilities	do	10,000
	Land treatment	do	5,000
Flathead National Forest, 5(a): Kalispell (Flathead)	Road construction	do	5,000
	Construction of buildings, recreational facilities	do	58,000
	Repair buildings, recreational facilities	do	1,000
L.S.: Gallatin National Forest, Livingston Park	Road construction	do	21,000
	Construction of buildings, recreational facilities	do	50,000
	Repair buildings, recreational facilities	do	6,000
	Land treatment	do	3,000
Kaniksu National Forest, 5(b): Sanders	Road construction	do	14,000
	Construction of buildings, recreational facilities	do	83,000
	Repair buildings, recreational facilities	do	7,000
	Land treatment	do	3,000
5(a):			
Kootenai National Forest, Kalispell (Lincoln)	Road construction	do	13,000
	Construction of buildings, recreational facilities	do	54,000
	Land treatment	do	13,000
Beaverhead National Forest, Butte (Silverbow)	Construction of buildings, recreational facilities	do	8,000
5(b): Deerlodge	Road construction	do	23,000
	Construction of buildings, recreational facilities	do	26,000
	Repair buildings, recreational facilities	do	7,000
5(a):			
Intermountain Station, Kalispell (Flathead)	Road construction	do	56,000
5(a):			
Kalispell, Flathead County	Flathead Route 13, grading, drainage, base, and paving	Bureau of Public Roads	365,000
Kalispell	Flathead Route 13, construction of bridge	do	260,000
5(b):			
Ravalli County, Hamilton	Post office, repairs, improvements	General Services Administration	27,000
Indian reservations:			
Fort Peck Reservation, Wolf Point	Community water and sewage	Health, Education, and Welfare—Public Health Service.	200,000
Fort Belknap Reservation:			
Milk River Valley	Community water, individual waste	do	200,000
Beaver Creek	Individual water and waste	do	200,000
Northern Cheyenne Reservation: Lame Deer	Community water and individual waste	do	30,000
Blackfeet Reservation: Babb, St. Mary	Individual water and waste	do	165,000
Flathead Reservation:			
Polson area	do	do	80,000
Ronan area	do	do	90,000
5(a):			
Butte (Silver Bow County): Butte (St. James Community Hospital).	45-bed addition, expansion of service	do	784,905
Kalispell (Lincoln County): Eureka (Eureka Community Hospital).	9 general beds and 28 nursing beds (new)	do	240,000
Kalispell (Flathead County), Kalispell General Hospital.	Expansion of X-ray facilities and other services	do	159,500
5(b):			
Carbon (Carbon County), Red Lodge, Carbon County Memorial Hospital.	Add 16 nursing beds to general hospital	do	105,000
Musselshell (Musselshell County), Roundup, Roundup Memorial Hospital.	Add to 15 nursing beds, remodel kitchen, heating plant, and oxygen system.	do	100,000
5(a): Kalispell (Lincoln), Libby	Stabilize pond and outfall	do	361,600
5(b):			
Fort Peck (Roosevelt):			
Froid	do	do	20,000
Poplar	do	do	11,000
Lake County: Roman	Stabilize ponds, interceptor, and outfall	do	38,400
Ravalli County: Darby	Stabilize pond and outfall	do	25,000
Sanders County: Thompson Falls	do	do	75,000
5(a):			
Columbia Falls (Flathead County)	700 water system (new)	Housing and Home Finance Agency—Community Facilities Administration.	186,000
	790 sanitation (new)	do	406,000
Libby (Lincoln County)	230 Municipal buildings (new)	do	79,000
Butte (Silver Bow County)	510 Roads (new)	do	209,000
	do	do	415,000
	do	do	524,000
	do	do	598,000
	do	do	506,000
	do	do	576,000
	do	do	468,000
	do	do	488,000
	do	do	502,000
	do	do	511,000
	do	do	494,000
5(b):			
Bridger (Carbon County)	do	do	195,000
Roberts (Carbon County)	700 water system (new)	do	38,00
Lake County:			
Polson City	790 Sanitation (new)	do	49,000
Ronan	do	do	38,000
(S):			
Musselshell County: Roundup	do	do	40,000
Roosevelt County: Culbertson	700 Water system (new)	do	84,000
Assiniboine and Sioux Tribes of Froid:			
Roosevelt County	230 Municipal buildings (new)	do	120,000
	790 Sanitation (new)	do	44,000
Wolf Point	900 Parks (new)	do	60,000

Programs submitted for consideration under the supplemental appropriation for Montana, Apr. 4, 1963—Continued

Area	Project	Agency	Amount
5(b) Indian:			
Blackfeet Reservation	Road construction, timber stand improvement, construction of community centers, erosion control.	Interior—Bureau of Indian Affairs	$347,000
Fort Belknap Reservation	do	do	59,000
Northern Cheyenne Reservation	do	do	65,000
Rocky Boy's Reservation	Road construction, improvements, community centers	do	22,000
Crow Reservation	Road construction, erosion control, timber stand improvement, construction or repair of community centers.	do	51,000
Flathead Reservation	do	do	64,000
Fort Peck Reservation	Road construction, erosion control, construction or repair of community centers.	do	81,000
5 (a):			
Kalispell (Flathead County), Glacier National Park	Tunnel lining, reconstruction of bridges, visitors center, access roads.	Interior—Park Service	1,000
Kalispell, (Flathead County), Creston National Fish Hatchery.	Construction of raceways to replace ponds, relocate pipelines and drains, pave roads and parking areas, picnic area.	Interior—Sport Fisheries and Wildlife	100,000

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words in explanation of title IV of the pending bill, dealing with the Philippine Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1963.

At the outset I should like to say that I do not approve, in general, of the procedure whereby basic law is changed by amendment of an appropriation bill. However, I think that under the present circumstances the procedure is entirely warranted. In the first place, prompt action is necessary because the payment of claims under existing law is imminent. The Foreign Claims Settlement Commission has completed processing some of the Philippine claims and is on the point of disbursing payments. Also, it is important from the standpoint of our relations with the Philippines that this matter be settled as quickly as possible in order that the Philippine Government and people will not be concerned that the moral commitment of our Government will be breached. Furthermore, a change in the law technically requires an appropriation, or reappropriation of the funds already appropriated under existing law. So the Appropriations Committees have a legitimate interest, and an appropriation bill is the proper vehicle for such a change.

Also, the provision which is included in the appropriation bill is one which is not novel in its approach but, on the contrary, was the method preferred by the State Department under the Eisenhower administration and is acceptable to the present administration. Furthermore, it has been considered by the committees having legislative jurisdiction and is and has been an alternative method to which the Philippine Government does not object.

I should like to repeat the substance of a statement which I made at the conclusion of the Foreign Relations Committee hearing on April 18 when this matter first came to public attention. This is that this matter involves questions about the relationships between two friendly states—the United States and the Philippine Republic. I hope nothing which has occurred and which will occur as a result of consideration of this amendment will disturb the historic friendly relations between this country and the Philippines. The Committee on Foreign Relations and the Department of State have taken every reasonable step which has occurred to them to avoid such a consequence.

It certainly is the intent of the Foreign Relations Committee, and I am sure of the Appropriations Committee, that no action should be taken by the Congress or the administration which would violate any understandings or pledges between the two countries. Although we believe that the facts which have been brought to the attention of the Congress demonstrate that changes should be made in the so-called Philippine war claims legislation, the basic original intent of that legislation should be preserved in a manner which will permit the full benefits of the act to be realized by the Philippine economy.

The report of the Committee on Appropriations, on pages 32 and 33, describes the legislative background of the amendment as follows:

> On April 23, 1963, the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, by direction of the Committee on Foreign Relations, appeared before this committee in behalf of an amendment to Public Law 87-616 which would change the manner of payment of the $73 million balance of awards for war damage compensations made by the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of April 30, 1946.
>
> The amendment is the result of public hearings held by the Committee on Foreign Relations on April 18, 1963, printed under the title "Activities of Nondiplomatic Representatives of Foreign Principals in the United States," part 2.
>
> The amendment would transfer responsibility for disbursement of said funds from the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to the Government of the Republic of the Philippines, provide specifically that such sum would be deemed to be in full satisfaction and final settlement of any and all such claims and require that Government to insure that no part of such sum shall be directly or indirectly paid to any former Commissioner or employee of the Philippine War Damage Commission as compensation for services rendered as attorney or agent in connection with any such claim. The amendment would return the legislation to the original intent of the 1946 Philippine Rehabilitation Act.
>
> The Committee on Foreign Relations had determined that the change in the method of payment was desirable for reasons which appear evident in the above-cited hearings and recommended this method of making the change to the Committee on Appropriations in view of the imminence of the payment of claims under the existing statute.
>
> The Committee on Appropriations concurs with the Committee on Foreign Relations in this matter.

I should like to make a few remarks with respect to Mr. John O'Donnell's activities in connection with the Congress. As has been reported, Mr. O'Donnell made contributions to a number of Members of both Houses, and the newspapers, as is their tendency, have emphasized this fact, in my opinion, beyond its real significance.

There has been some testimony before the committee with respect to outlawing campaign contributions from foreign sources. Both Under Secretary Ball and Deputy Attorney General Katzenbach testified in favor of such legislation, and I doubt that any Member of the Senate would oppose such a move. I intend to propose such a provision as an amendment to the Foreign Agents Registration Act. The fact is, however, that even if such a law had been in effect in 1960, no Member of Congress receiving a contribution from Mr. O'Donnell would have known, had Mr. O'Donnell sought to conceal it, that the contributions which he made actually originated from a foreign source. Mr. O'Donnell used bank treasurers' checks which are difficult to trace and failed to itemize them on his foreign agents registration statement.

Mr. President, in that connection, I wish to correct and clarify a statement which was published in the New York Times on April 18, 1963, under a Washington dateline, which stated as follows:

> The political contributions were made by cashiers' checks purchased October 12 and November 1, 1960, from the Union Trust Company here. Photostats were made available to the committee by the General Accounting Office.

The statement that photostats were made available by the General Accounting Office is incorrect. The General Accounting Office made no documents of any kind, including these checks, available to our committee. I think this item has been the source of some misunderstanding and possibly embarrassment to the General Accounting Office.

As has been customary for many years, the committee borrows certain accountants to assist our staff in making complicated calculations with regard to such matters. The accountants perform their duties completely and entirely at the direction of the Committee on Foreign Relations and its staff. They supply us with nothing. As a matter of policy, the General Accounting Office has no responsibility whatever for any documents or anything else, other than merely the mechanical or statistical work which may have been involved.

I wished to make it perfectly clear that no Member of Congress or anyone else should hold the General Accounting Office responsible for any of the activities which entered into this transaction.

Mr. O'Donnell, in his letter transmitting the contributions, sought to leave the impression that the contribution was his own:

He says, in transmitting the contributions:

> DEAR ———: It is my privilege to send you the enclosed modest campaign contribution.
>
> I am well aware that candidates for office have a heavy financial load; I consider it an obligation to help wherever I can. In these troublesome days our country needs the very best public servants and I value you high among them. Knowing your reputation, moreover, for unqualified fairness in dealing with causes in the public interest, I need not emphasize that neither I nor my friends in the Philippines, for whom I occasionally speak, are expecting any favored position by reason of my small help.
>
> With personal regards and all good wishes for your success in the election November 8, I am,
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> JOHN A. O'DONNELL.

It is true, of course, that Mr. O'Donnell refers to his "friends in the Philippines, for whom I occasionally speak," but, very clearly he sought to leave the impression that the contribution was his own—as he says, "my small help."

Speaking from recent personal experience I can understand how, in the first place, many Members of the Congress would not have had personal knowledge of the contribution—and may not yet—and, in the second place, did not know of its true source or significance.

Most Members must rely upon contributions for financing campaigns, until some better system is formulated, and there was little, if, indeed, any, reason for distinguishing Mr. O'Donnell's contribution from any other which they may have received. I should also say that few campaigns are so well financed that candidates can afford to turn back contributions in the absence of knowledge, on their part, of why they should not be received.

One further thought which has arisen, not only as a result of this particular action, but of others, as well: I believe many lobbyists make this type of contribution at least as much, and often more, to impress their clients, as to impress or influence candidates. In our study and in other connections, I have come to realize that some foreign agents contribute small sums and then describe their import in exaggerated terms to impress their foreign principals as to their effect. It is a part of the process of "puffing" themselves, which also is evident in other aspects of their trade, and which enables them to obtain or maintain their clientele.

The fact is, in respect to contributions, as in some other respects, O'Donnell did not so much influence Congress as he deceived it.

As Deputy Attorney General Katzenbach testified, a foreign agent, registered under the Foreign Agents Registration Act "would have to report campaign expenditures here that were made on behalf of his principal as part of his employment undertaking and expenses." O'Donnell did not do this. In fact, his entire procedure, in obtaining the funds, purchasing what he thought were untraceable bank treasurer's checks, and transmitting them, was so designed as to obscure the source of his funds.

I have stated that Mr. O'Donnell deceived Congress. The records of the committee clearly show this to be the fact. Our records show that in July of 1951, less than 4 months after Mr. O'Donnell left the Philippine War Damage Commission, he entered into arrangements, for payments to him, for work on further legislation and for representation on behalf of Philippine claimants upon whose claims he had so recently passed judgment. These arrangements ultimately resulted in payments to him and his associates by 1960 of over $1 million.

I wish to emphasize that this amount does not include payments made under the bill passed in 1962. O'Donnell had been registered as a foreign agent as early as 1952, but it was not until 1959 that he indicated in his Justice Department registration any interest in war-damage legislation. This indication was made to appear only incidental to his representation as an agent for sugar interests in the Philippines for which his fees were far less than from claimants. Nowhere in his registration did he describe his activities or his expenses in any way which would inform a reasonable person of the extent of his interest in such legislation. On several occasions, Mr. O'Donnell testified before committees of the Congress in support of war-damage legislation; but always he left the impression that he was testifying as a former Commissioner, and nowhere did he voluntarily disclose his personal financial interest.

At our hearings on March 1, Mr. O'Donnell actually testified that he did not disclose, in previous testimony before the committees of Congress, that he was acting in fact, if not in law, as the agent of foreign principals, and for his own interests. The fact is that, on one occasion, under questioning, he obliquely acknowledged a portion of his representation. On June 12, 1962, when testifying before the Foreign Relations Committee, the following colloquy occurred between the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and Mr. O'Donnell; at the time, the Senator from Alabama was acting as chairman, during my absence:

> Senator SPARKMAN. Do you or any of your clients have any interest in any claims?
>
> Mr. O'DONNELL. Yes. I represent the Philippine Sugar Association.
>
> Senator SPARKMAN. Is it one of the claimants?
>
> Mr. O'DONNELL. It would be one of the claimants, yes.
>
> Senator SPARKMAN. What would be the amount?
>
> Mr. O'DONNELL. Of the claims?
>
> Senator SPARKMAN. That have been adjudged.
>
> Mr. O'DONNELL. Offhand, insofar as the final report of the Commission is concerned, I would like to read—I don't know the answer to your question, but just to give you an idea, so far as the statements by the Commission are concerned. I read from page 15 of the final report of the Commission where it says:
>
> "Claimants probably received no more than 20 percent of today's cost of reproduction of their homes, farms, and businesses."
>
> As to the total amount of the balance owed to the claimants in the sugar industry, I don't happen to have those figures with me at the moment.

Mr. President, I submit that answer is partly unresponsive, and certainly it is not clarifying as to his role before the committee.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] of course at that time did not have the information which now is available to the committee, and he had no reason to pursue the matter.

From 1954 until 1959, Mr. O'Donnell was registered as a lobbyist, under the Domestic Lobbying Act, for the Philippine War Damage Claimants Association. I emphasize the Domestic Lobbying Act, as distinguished from the Foreign Agents Registration Act. The Lobbying Act is not within the scope of my committee's jurisdiction; and I do not purport to be an expert on it, although it is my general impression that it is not particularly effective in identifying interests or activities of domestic lobbyists. At any rate, Mr. O'Donnell was not registered for the claimants association, during the period of 1960, 1961, and 1962, under any act when Philippine war damage legislation was most actively being considered, and when, in fact, he was testifying in behalf of it before congressional committees. And nowhere was he ever registered for the individual claimants for which he was paid or intended to be paid for his services in behalf of the legislation passed in 1962.

I think it is quite clear that the intent of the original Philippine Rehabilitation Act of April 30, 1946, was the economic rehabilitation of the Philippines, and that the making of payments to individuals, companies, and associations suffering losses as a result of war was merely a vehicle to accomplish this purpose.

The fact that it was the vehicle which coincided with the interests of Mr. O'Donnell was by no means accidental. Very soon after his leaving office as a member of the Commission, Mr. O'Donnell made arrangements on his own to represent one group of claimants; and his fellow Commissioner, Mr. Delgado, conceived the purpose of obtaining enactment of further legislation which would, and did, result in great financial benefit to Mr. O'Donnell.

As I have indicated, he and his associates have already received in excess of $1 million, and more would come to them if the existing law should be allowed to stand.

I should like to emphasize a very important point: that further payments on claims, according to Mr. O'Donnell's own testimony, would be upon the same claims which Mr. O'Donnell and Mr. Delgado had adjudicated as members of the Philippine War Damage Commission.

The evidence taken from Mr. O'Donnell's own files indicates that he and Mr. Delgado promoted the so-called moral obligation to pay further claims, and kept the issue of further payments alive after "enthusiasm on the part of the interested parties and the—Philippine—Government have cooled off. Nothing has been done and no one seems to be interested enough to take the initiative in having some action by the Government on the matter of additional war damage compensation."

That quotation is from a letter to Mr. O'Donnell from Mr. Delgado, dated January 13, 1952, which, as I have indicated, was less than a year after these two gentlemen had ceased to act as Commissioners of the original Claims Commission. That letter is merely indicative of, and an example of, many other letters which indicate the beginning and the pursuance of an activity on the part of these gentlemen to create in the Philippines, and eventually in the Congress, the belief that there was a moral obligation to pay further claims—an obligation which, in my opinion, did not exist at the time when they initiated that activity.

To initiate further action, early in 1952, still less than a year after they had left the Commission, Mr. O'Donnell and Mr. Delgado even attempted to obtain a list of the 120,000 claimants under the original act.

> It is regrettable—

Mr. O'Donnell wrote to Mr. Delgado, after he found he could not get the list—

> that we did not make up this list before we left the Commission, but this is little solace now.

In explanation of that, I may state that he had written to the custodian of the files of the Commission, requesting a list of all the claimants—which list, as he stated, he had neglected to take with him when he left the Commission in 1951.

So, Mr. President, I repeat that Congress was deceived. I think the record is quite clear on the point that if Congress had been informed of the true facts as we now know them, the legislation in the form in which it was actually passed would not have been enacted. In this statement I am supported by the statements, in our committee hearings of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who conducted the hearings during which the committee considered the legislation, in my absence, and by the ranking minority member, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], who also attended those hearings.

Some suggestion has been made that this change in the law, which the Foreign Relations Committee and the Appropriations Committee are proposing, is an attempt to enact legislation aimed at a single man or a group of men. The statement that it would have this effect is, I believe, correct. However, who would disagree with the principle which, in fact, is incorporated in present law—namely, that an official of this government should not be allowed to enrich himself on the basis of matters which he handled while he was an official. It is not for me to judge the applicability to this case of the present conflict-of-interest laws and statutes. However, the principle of which I have spoken, and which is incorporated in existing law, is certainly no less correct because its implementation in this legislation is directed to the purpose of preventing further enrichment of those who may have violated the spirit of those laws.

There has been some discussion as to what would be the best means of amending the act passed last year, so as to prevent those who have interfered with our legislative process from receiving benefits from that legislation. Two courses have been suggested: One would be to transfer full payment to the Government of the Philippines, which accepts funds "in full satisfaction and final settlement of any and all claims" arising out of the 1946 legislation and "insures that no part of such sum" goes to O'Donnell and his associates.

A second course would be to retain the present form of payment by our Government to individual claimants, and simply amend the current legislation so as to preclude the payment of compensation from awards to O'Donnell and his associates.

The Committee on Foreign Relations has studied closely both approaches. Neither provides an absolute guarantee that fees contracted for prior to 1962 will not eventually reach the lobbyists. However, a number of factors led the committee to choose the government-to-government payment route.

First, since almost all the claimants come under the legal jurisdiction of the Government of the Philippines, that Government would be better able to enforce prohibitions of payments to O'Donnell. No matter what language is written into the current act, in the end it would be legally effective only against persons within the jurisdiction of the United States.

Second, the government-to-government payment is more in line with the economic development purposes of the Rehabilitation Act of 1946. I do not feel it necessary here to retrace the history of that act, but only point out that our Government, faced with the demand for repayment generated for the most part by O'Donnell, Delgado and their clients, proposed this form of payment in 1960.

There are suggestions that this money paid to the Philippine Government will not find its way down to the small claimant. I want to point out that such fears are usually voiced by the big claimants—the less than 3 percent of the total number of claimants who stand to receive over $50 million of the $73 million contained in this bill.

If the Philippine Government decides to pay all the claimants, it can; if it decides to pay the small ones, it can; if it decides that such payments would not contribute to the economy, it can devote the money to public works. The choice will rest with the Philippine Government—although I note that in the last mentioned case neither O'Donnell nor his associates would have any basis whatsoever to obtain any fees.

The Senate has the opportunity today to correct faulty legislation, return a law to its original intent and deny to those who tampered with the legislative process the financial benefits of their labors.

There is this one further benefit to be gained by our action of this bill. It will serve as notice to those who would attempt to promote similar self-serving legislation that the Senate is willing to admit its errors and take the necessary corrective action.

In closing, I would like to say that it was not the intention of our committee, when it began its study of activities of nondiplomatic agents, to go beyond a review of the adequacy of the Foreign Agents Registration Act in order to determine its effectiveness under present circumstances. The facts of the O'Donnell case have diverted us only for the moment. I want to assure my colleagues and the public that this case not only showed the weaknesses in the Philippine War Claims Act, but has revealed some major flaws in the Foreign Agents Registration Act.

When our study concludes, I believe that the O'Donnell case, and others, will provide the committee and, I hope, the Congress with enough facts so that we may be able to legislate effectively in this rather complicated but important area of Government.

Mr. President, due to the complexity of some of the laws relating to claims, I have had prepared a memorandum which deals with the War Claims Act of 1948. In some of the reports there has been some confusion between the original Philippine Rehabilitation Act, which was passed in 1946, and the subsequent War Claims Act of 1948, which is title 50, section 2006, of the statutes.

If I may paraphrase a little, the purpose of the War Claims Act of 1948 was the payment of the claims of American citizens who had been interned or deprived of property during the war. A section was included in that act which related to the reimbursement of certain affiliated religious organizations for their expenditures for supplies, food, clothing, hospitalization, and so on, for members of the Armed Services. As I have said, that was 1948.

Then in 1952 the War Claims Act of 1948 was amended. Under the amendment approximately $20 million was paid to certain religious organizations.

In 1956 the War Claims Act of 1948 was further amended. Under that amendment approximately $8,700,000-plus was paid. Altogether almost $29 million was paid.

Some of the fees to which I have referred as being included in the $1 million figure, of course, arose out of the amendments. But the claims that arose under the amendments were related to the original claims on behalf of these religious institutions.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the memorandum to which I have referred, for the clarification of Senators and the public.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM, WAR CLAIMS ACT OF 1948 (TITLE 50, APP. SEC. 2006), APRIL 26, 1963

SECTION 2006. Claims of religious organizations; certification of claim:

The Commission is authorized to receive, adjudicate according to law, and provide for the payment of any claim filed by any religious organization functioning in the Philippine Islands and affiliated with a religious organization in the United States, or by the personnel of any such Philippine organization, for reimbursement of expenditures incurred, or for payment of the fair value of supplies used, by such organization or such personnel for the purpose of furnishing shelter, food, clothing, hospitalization, medicines and medical services, and other relief in the Philippines to members of the Armed Forces of the United States or to civilian American citizens (as defined in sec. 5 [sec. 2004 of this appendix]) at any time subsequent to December 6, 1941, and before August 15, 1945. Any claim allowed under the provisions of this section shall be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment out of the war claims fund established by section 13 of this act [sec. 2012 of this appendix] (July 3, 1948, c. 826, sec. 7, 62 Stat. 1245).

Basic purpose of the War Claims Act of 1948 was the payment of claims of American citizens who had been interned or deprived of property during the war.

THE 1952 AMENDMENT TO WAR CLAIMS ACT OF 1948

The 1952 amendments: Subsection (a) constituted the entire section prior to amendment by act of April 9, 1952.

Subsections (b)–(g) added by act of April 9, 1952:

(b) Compensation for loss or damage to real property used in educational, medical, or welfare work.

(c) Compensation to replace facilities.

(d) Determination of claims.[1]

(e) Investigation; determination of replacement costs; basis used.

(f) Filing of claims; adjudication; place and use of payments.

(g) Claims of internees and prisoners of war unaffected.

According to O'Donnell (letter dated May 11, 1959):

Paid on relief claims of religious organizations under paragraph 7(a), $2,857,899; paid on property claims of religious organizations under paragraph 7(b), $17,238,396.

THE 1956 AMENDMENT TO WAR CLAIMS ACT OF 1948

The 1956 amendment: Subsection (h) added by act of August 6, 1956.

(h) Denominational organizations:

The report of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House and the Senate states that the purpose of the proposed legislation "is to add a new subsection to the War Claims Act of 1948 (50 App. U.S.C., sec. 2006) to broaden the act to make cognizable claims by any religious organization functioning in the Philippines which is of the same denomination as a religious organization functioning in the United States."

According to O'Donnell (letter of May 11, 1959): Paid on property and relief claims of religious organizations under paragraph 7(h), $8,711,482.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent also to have printed at this point in the RECORD a memorandum on the constitutional question raised by the proposed amendment to Public Law 87-616.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTION RAISED BY PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO PUBLIC LAW 87-616

CONCLUSION

Claimants to whom awards were made under the terms of title I of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 would not be deprived of property in violation of the fifth amendment to the Constitution by the enactment of the proposed amendment to Public Law 87-616.

Public Law 87-616 directed the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to provide for the payment of the unpaid balance of awards previously made under title I of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946[1] and authorized the appropriation of funds for that purpose. In addition, among other provisions, Public Law 87-616 established certain conditions governing eligibility for payment, and directed the Commission to take certain steps with respect to notification to the prospective beneficiaries of the act and determination of their eligibility for payment.

The Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 had established the Philippine War Damage Commission, and authorized it to "make compensation" under specified conditions and to certain classes of persons, for "physical loss or destruction of or damage to property in the Philippines," resulting from certain perils of war enumerated in section 102 of the act. In general, the effect of the act was to make compensation payable for injuries to property resulting from acts of war in the Philippines on the part of either side during World War II. The act also made provision for the filing of claims and the determination of their validity, and authorized the appropriation of funds for the payment of awards made by the Philippine War Damage Commission. Numerous claims were in fact filed with the Commission, approved in whole or part, and paid in whole or part, prior to the enactment of Public Law 87-616.

It is now proposed to amend Public Law 87-616, so as inter alia to eliminate the provisions for payment of the unpaid balance of previous awards to claimants by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. Instead, payment would be authorized to the Philippine Government of a sum "to be administered by the Government of the Republic of the Philippines for such purpose, or purposes, as it considers appropriate", "such sum to be deemed to be in full satisfaction and final settlement of any and all claims arising out of awards for war damage compensation made by the Philippine War Damage Commission under the terms of title I of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946."

Would this amendment violate any property rights of claimants protected by the fifth amendment? In our judgment it would not, for the following reasons:

First, there appears to be no constitutional obligation upon the U.S. Government for payment of any of the compensation for injury to property which the acts of 1946 and 1962 authorized to be paid, and consequently no person so injured could have any right to exact such payment. As a general proposition the United States is not legally responsible for destruction of property resulting from its legitimate exercise of the constitutional powers to declare and wage war,[2] and it could hardly be argued that the U.S. Government is legally responsible for damages resulting from acts of an enemy invader. Such injuries to property of themselves give rise to no objections under the fifth amendment. The acts of 1946 and 1962, therefore, bestowed or authorized the bestowal of gratuitous benefits on those who came within their scope.

Consequently, any claim of deprivation of property without due process in the present situation must rest upon the premise that the enactment of Public Law 87-616 itself vested in those claimants who were successful under the prior act rights which are protected by the fifth amendment. This, however, is not the case.

In general, property rights which are vested, and not merely the subjects of a hope or expectation of becoming vested at some future time, are constitutionally protected; but it cannot be argued here that the claimants who stand ultimately to benefit from Public Law 87-616 have, prior to payment, any title to any part of the funds authorized to be appropriated in the act.[3] Ownership of these funds remains in the U.S. Government until they are duly appropriated and lawfully paid out.

Nor do the claimants have any vested right in the continued existence of the legislation under which they hope eventually to recover compensation. In general, there are no vested constitutional rights in the continuation of a rule or provision of law even though particular rights under such rule or provision, so long as it exists, may be constitutionally protected.[4]

In particular, there is no constitutional right to the continued existence of a statute conferring benefits bestowed by Congress in the first instance purely as a matter of grace.[5]

The Cummings case cited in the preceding footnote is closely analogous to the present situation, and in our judgment is determinative of the question presented by the proposed amendment to Public Law 87-616. In the exercise of the constitutional war powers, Congress had enacted the Trading With the Enemy Act, authorizing seizure of property of alien enemies. Later, the Settlement of War Claims Act was enacted, authorizing return under certain conditions of property seized pursuant to the earlier legislation. The respondent corporation duly made application for return of certain property so seized, and was found entitled to the return by the Alien Property Custodian. Subsequently, however, Congress adopted Public Resolution 53, declaring that all deliveries of property authorized by the Settlement of War Claims Act were to be postponed until certain arrearages on the part of the German Government in the satisfaction of claims of American nationals were eliminated. The question was presented to the Supreme Court whether Public Resolution 53, in withdrawing the benefits granted to former owners of confiscated property by the Settlement of War Claims Act, deprived such persons of property rights without due process of law. After finding that the Settlement of War Claims Act did not of itself rest title to the

---

[1] (d) Determination of claims: Claims filed pursuant to subsection (b) [of this section] shall be determined and paid upon the basis of postwar cost of replacement which shall be ascertained by the War Claims Commission. In making such determinations the Commission shall utilize but not be limited to the factual information and evidence contained in the records of the Philippine War Damage Commission; the technical advice of experts in the field; the substantiating evidence submitted by the claimants; and any other technical and legal means by which fair and equitable postwar replacement costs shall be determined.

[1] 60 Stat. 128.

[2] *U.S.* v. *Pacific R.R.* (7 S. Ct. 490, 120 U.S. 227, 30 L. Ed. 634 (1887))

[3] See *Cummings* v. *Deutsche Bank und Disconto-Gesellschaft* (57 S. Ct. 359, 300 U.S. 115, 81 L. Ed. 545, reversing 83 F. 2d 554, 65 App. D.C. 297, certiorari granted 57 S. Ct. 34, 299 U.S. 527, 81 L. Ed. 388).

[4] *Truax* v. *Corrigan* (Ariz., 42 S. Ct. 124, 257 U.S. 312, 66 L. Ed. 254 (1921)); *Middleton* v. *Texas Power & Light Co.* (Tex., 39 S. Ct. 227, 249 U.S. 152, 63 L. Ed. 527 (1919)); *Battaglia* v. *General Motors Corp.* (169 F. 2d 254, certiorari denied 69 S. Ct. 236, four cases, 335 U.S. 887, 93 L. Ed. 425 (1948)); *N.L.R.B.* v. *Edward G. Budd Mfg. Co.* (169 F. 2d 571), certiorari denied; *Foreman's Ass'n of America* v. *Edward G. Budd Mfg. Co.* (69 S. Ct. 411, 335 U.S. 908, 93 L. Ed. 441 (1948)).

[5] *United States ex rel. Burnett* v. *Teller* (107 U.S. 64, 2 S. Ct. 39, 27 L. Ed. 352 (1883)); *Cummings* v. *Deutsche Bank und Disconto-Gessellschaft,* supra (6.48 Stat. 1267).

> property in the former owners, and that the respondent corporation did not in fact have title as of the time of the adoption of Public Resolution 53, the Supreme Court declared:
>
> "The grant to former alien enemy owners of the privilege of becoming entitled upon conditions specified to have returned to them the property of which they had been deprived by exertion of the war power of the United States was made by the Congress in mitigation of the taking and in recognition of 'the humane and wise policy of modern times.' *Brown* v. *United States* (8 Cranch 110, 123).
>
> * * * * *
>
> "We think it clear that the grant by the Settlement of War Claims Act was made as a matter of grace and so was subject to withdrawal by Congress. *United States* v. *Teller* (107 U.S. 64, 68). *Frisbie* v. *United States* (157 U.S. 160, 166). *Lynch* v. *United States*, supra, 577. The resolution does not infringe the fifth amendment."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I hope that the Senate will adopt the amendment which has been proposed by the Committee on Appropriations. As I stated in my opening statement, the procedure is an unusual one, but I believe the circumstances which warrant the procedure are also unusual.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I believe on the whole the Senate Committee on Appropriations did a good job in holding down the expenditures included in the supplemental appropriations bill now before the Senate. There were several sizable budget estimates which the committee refused to consider. As finally approved by the Appropriations Committee, the bill would now appropriate a sum $166,200,000 under the budget estimates.

The Senate Committee on Appropriations decreased the figures proposed by the House relating to several items, but it also increased in a few instances some of the items over the figures included in the House bill. When the Senate committee made such increases, it did so only when absolutely necessary, and when the appropriations were such that, if not made in the supplemental appropriations bill, they would have to be approved later in a regular appropriation bill.

Mr. President, one item which I thought should be drastically cut or eliminated entirely was the very large item of $450 million for the accelerated public works program. It is true that many of the projects under this program are good ones, but in my opinion they should be considered as are all other public works projects. They should be considered by the appropriate committees of Congress rather than merely being considered and approved by bureaucratic officials here in Washington. It is not good government procedure to handle any program in that manner. If projects are worthy, they should come before the Congress as all other proposed projects, and be required to have the same benefit-cost ratio as other public works projects are required to have.

Mr. President, I shall support an amendment to cut drastically the $450 million item to which I have referred.

In closing, I wish to commend Mr. William L. Batt, Jr., administrator of the program, for doing a good job. I think he is one of the better administrators in government. If it had not been for his good administration, the program would be in much worse shape than it is now.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FEES FOR LOBBYISTS—REPORTING OF PRIMARY ELECTION CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am very glad that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright] has been pursuing the investigations into lobbying by the lobbyists for foreign governments; and I take some pride in the fact that, as a member of the Finance Committee, I have sponsored for years the legislation to remove the subsidy or bonus of nearly $55 a ton which until the latter half of last year was given to producers of foreign sugar, and which I was successful in getting the Congress partially to adopt last year.

I hope I may be pardoned if I also take pride in the fact that questions I asked during Finance Committee hearings last year concerning the fees received by lobbyists for foreign sugar interests and governments launched the investigation which is now being carried to fruition by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

It is my intention to support the proposal which the Senator from Arkansas has made to deprive the Philippine lobbyists of the fees which apparently they would otherwise collect if the bill of last year, which was endorsed by nearly all the newspapers in the country, and was endorsed by the administration, is permitted to stand. But, Mr. President, I think we should go further than the Senator from Arkansas has gone and use this occasion to improve our system of reporting expenditures in campaigns for election.

We now properly require the reporting of campaign contributions for final elections. I am very happy to state I reported the contributions to my 1960 campaign, including a contribution of $100 by Mr. John O'Donnell, whose name has been mentioned in this connection. But, unfortunately, there is a great gap in our procedures. There is no requirement to report contributions in primary elections, but in the one-party States as in the Democratic States of the South, in some States of New England, the middle border, and at one time, the Far West, the very crucial time is the primary election.

My proposal would require a full statement of contributions both in the final and primary elections, and by both committees and individuals.

I am very hopeful the Senator from Arkansas, who has shown such diligence and public spirit, will strike out at another taproot of corruption by applying the principle of reporting expenditures in primary as well as general elections.

So in accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the pending bill, H.R. 5517, the Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1963, an amendment, which I send to the desk with written notice under the rule.

I think I should add that the language of this amendment is from the bill (S. 559) which was introduced on January 28, 1963, by Senators Long of Missouri, Keating, Bartlett, Clark, Cooper, Humphrey, Inouye, Kuchel, McIntyre, Morse, Moss, Muskie, Proxmire, and Randolph.

I believe that this disclosure language—which is the part of the Long bill I am offering—derives from earlier proposals by the late Senator Thomas C. Hennings, Jr. So, with this distinguished sponsorship, and with the trail so splendidly blazed by the junior Senator from Arkansas, I hope we may at last get publicity of expenditures in primary as well as general elections.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The notice will be received and printed.

(See the foregoing notice printed in full when submitted by Mr. Douglas, which appears under a separate heading.)

THE FOOD STAMP ACT OF 1963

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I note that the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry [Mr. Ellender] today has introduced a bill called the Food Stamp Act of 1963. This is the administration bill and it provides a national food stamp program similar to that which has been operated on a pilot basis for the past 2 years.

The present program was established by Executive order, using the funds provided by section 32 of Public Law 320, 74th Congress. The administration bill would provide legislative authorization for the program. If adopted, the funds to operate the program would come from regular appropriations rather than section 32 receipts.

The purpose of the program is to improve the diets and the nutrition of needy persons. The program is also intended to make more effective use of our agricultural surpluses and food abundance.

The pilot food stamp program established by the Kennedy administration is in operation in 31 cities and counties, and it has received strong support. Many other counties and cities have sought to become eligible to participate and this bill provides a legislative basis for a nationwide program.

Under the present pilot program an eligible family purchases stamps at a rate equivalent to the amount of money normally spent for food; the family receives, in effect, additional free stamps in an amount determined by family size and family income. In the pilot programs the average family has received $1 in food stamps for each 63 cents in cash expended for stamps.

The eligibility requirements for participation are set by the States, using such factors as they now employ in providing welfare assistance. However, State standards are worked out with representatives of the Department of Agriculture and the State plan must have the approval of the Secretary to insure that the standards conform to the objectives of the program.

The food stamp program is not a surplus food distribution program. It operates through the normal channels of trade, and retailers who accept stamps redeem them through wholesale food concerns or through banks.

The pilot program has been operated on a budget of $50 million. The budget request for next year is approximately $51.5 million, but, of course, if the program were to be widely expanded the appropriations would have to be increased. This is a decision which the Congress would make each year, depending upon the needs.

I commend the administration, and the chairman of the committee as well, for their support of the program.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I should like to express pleasure at the statement just received from the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy] with regard to the food stamp program and the action of the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and share with the Senator from Minnesota the hope that we will soon see acceptance of the program which, in its pilot operation, has demonstrated its effectiveness.

PROXMIRE PAYMENT TO THE TREASURY—A HOME RUN FOR INTEGRITY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire] has repeatedly demonstrated his honesty and courage in his 5½ years in the Senate.

Recently he once again showed a striking devotion to the highest standards of public office, when he took the remarkable action of paying more than $9,000 to the Federal Treasury out of his own pocket, as an unconditional gift.

This payment by Senator Proxmire represented the full salary paid to his top assistant since that assistant went to work on the Senator's payroll on August 27, 1962.

Senator Proxmire also has announced he will pay his chief assistant's full salary from April 1 to mid-June from the Senator's own pocket. This is an additional $3,000.

Senator Proxmire is doing this although his top staffman has been working hard and well for him on Senate business since he was hired last August; and will continue to work for Wisconsin's senior Senator while taking graduate work at the University of Wisconsin in Madison.

Mr. President, the Library of Congress has indicated only one public record of a Senator paying any of his Senate staff out of his own personal income, and that was a multimillionaire. The Senator from Wisconsin is a man of modest means.

The senior Senator from Wisconsin has been under vigorous attack in his State for having this man work for him on his Senate payroll while taking courses at the University of Wisconsin.

What Senator Proxmire has done in assuming the full and total cost of this assistant's work is remarkable. I salute him for it.

I ask unanimous consent to place in the Record at this point an editorial from the Washington Daily News of April 25 crediting Senator Proxmire for hitting a home run for this action. Indeed he has.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Proxmire's $9,007 Correction

Recently Senator Proxmire aroused something of a storm in his home State of Wisconsin when it became known his top-paid senatorial office assistant was a graduate student at the University of Wisconsin and doing all his work there.

This was a shock to most people, especially Wisconsin constituents, because the Senator seems to have an unusually keen understanding of public-life proprieties.

Despite his insistence that his man-in-Madison worked hard and served well (primarily helping Wisconsin industries get defense contracts), the complaints continued. So the Senator out of his own pocket paid the Government $8,895 his assistant had received in salary, plus $111 in interest—and took him off the public payroll. The Senator said he concluded the complaints were right.

Well, it was an expensive political lesson, and we're surprised Senator Proxmire had to learn it in such a painful way—$9,007 is nearly a third of his salary. But his action also must set some kind of a new record. Most politicians, when caught, either assume a defense of pious righteousness or point to some other politician doing the same thing. * * * They rarely reimburse the taxpayers for their lapses. But the Senator rebounded like a ballplayer who atones for a fielding error by hitting a homer the next time up.

THE TFX WARPLANE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the Chicago Daily News of April 10, 1963, there appears an article by Max Freedman on the TFX question.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the body of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Now McNamara Must Justify Short Circuiting of TFX Evaluation

(By Max Freedman)

Washington.—In the last few days the bitterness in the TFX warplane controversy has sensibly declined. The Defense Department has dropped its campaign against the motives of the Senate investigating committee in holding an inquiry into the circumstances that gave the huge TFX contract to General Dynamics Corp. even though its bid was higher than the one offered by the Boeing Co.

In return the committee has become less suspicious of the Pentagon's conduct in trying to ward off ugly questions. This relaxed atmosphere allows us to turn to the central issues of public policy that have been thrust into the background during the angrier phases of the controversy.

It should be understood that the TFX bids were analyzed by the Air Force evaluation team at the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base. During the 4 evaluations this team consisted of 235 members who spent 275,000 man-hours in their analysis of the proposals. It seems to have escaped public notice that 82 percent of the team members were civilians. They were civilian specialists in science and engineering and related fields.

The evaluation team prepared exhaustive reports on all aspects of the contract, including engineering, cost, management, and performance. Then the reports were supplemented by data furnished by the Bureau of Naval Weapons on those features peculiar to the Navy version of the TFX—carrier compatibility. The Navy team also consisted of a high percentage of civilians.

Thus it is not correct to suggest that a group of military people in the Defense Department decided in favor of Boeing and then were overruled by the civilian chiefs. The fact is that many expert civilians took part in the evaluations and it is utterly misleading to picture this controversy as an issue involving a military challenge to civilian control.

The commander of the Tactical Air Command, the logistics command, the systems command, and the Chief of the Bureau of Weapons all endorsed the recommendations of the source selection board. These concurrences then went to the Air Force council.

The council consists of eight Air Force generals. For the TFX competition three Navy admirals also sat on the council. The council unanimously recommended Boeing for the contract. The Air Force chief of staff and the chief of naval operations agreed with this.

It was at this point that Defense Secretary Robert McNamara, supported by the Air Force and Navy Secretaries, intervened to award the contract to General Dynamics.

Later evidence may compel new conclusions but at this stage of the inquiry five points stand out clearly:

1. No one has questioned the honesty or integrity of McNamara, just as no military leader has offered the slightest challenge to civilian control.

2. It is an abuse of a sacred principle, however, to suggest that civilian control means that civilians should make all the decisions or that civilians are entitled to make arbitrary decisions.

3. In the TFX contract, McNamara named the contractor while the Navy and the Air Force, which have to command and fly the plane, objected that they were not getting what they wanted or needed. They were overruled without the civilian chiefs even bothering to talk out the issues with them.

4. In previous cases, the controlling principle has been competition on its merits with professional military committees, assisted by civilian scientists and technical experts, having the responsibility to recommend what weapon best meets their requirements, within the terms of a competition explicitly defined from the start.

5. Tested system has thus evolved that could not be rigged or controlled by an arbitrary decision of one or two civilian chiefs. This protection of the public interest was inherent in the process since it involved a large number of professional people, with professional careers, drawn from different services, checking and balancing each other. Too many people were part of this procedure to permit them to be influenced by pressures from industry or politics.

These five principles have not been scrupulously followed in the TFX case. The onus rests squarely on McNamara to show that his method is an improvement over these tested procedures. Perhaps he will succeed triumphantly but the committee still awaits his answers.

THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on the 23d of April 1813, Stephen Arnold Douglas was born in Brandon, Vt. The career of this great American has been somewhat obscured and, indeed, somewhat belittled because of the fact that in the senatorial campaign of 1858 in Illinois he was the successful rival of Abraham Lincoln, and because in the presidential election of 1860 he was the unsuccessful candidate of the northern Democratic Party.

On Tuesday of this week we celebrated the 150th anniversary of the birth of Stephen A. Douglas, and I should like to take this opportunity to make a few comments about the man and his significance to American life.

In a natural desire to magnify the qualities of our noble politician-saint, Abraham Lincoln, there has been a tendency to disparage and deprecate Stephen A. Douglas, his opponent. As Lincoln has been properly cast in the role of hero, what is more inevitable for those who love sharp contrasts than to assign Douglas the part of villain. So in discussing these memorable debates in which a century and 5 years ago Illinois' two ablest sons struggled across our hot prairies and which were in fact the prelude to the Civil War, many writers, and orators, swayed by a sense of drama and, at times, by partisan feeling, have generally drawn a sharp comparison between a Douglas who is pictured as squat, arrogant, morally obtuse, and none too bright, and the tall, majestic, all-comprehending Lincoln.

This is a grave distortion of the truth. Without disparaging Lincoln in the slightest, I hope that in the few minutes at my disposal, I may put the debaters in a more accurate perspective.

In the first place, Douglas' energy and ability were such as to make him a foeman worthy of Lincoln's steel. No neutral can study the debates including the Chicago, Bloomington, and Springfield speeches without concluding that Douglas was very often the superior, and it is well to remember that it was Douglas and not Lincoln who won the senatorial election.

Born in Vermont in 1813, Douglas came to Illinois at the age of 20 with but a single dollar in his pocket. He disembarked at the little Illinois River hamlet of Naples, and then walked 12 miles to the little village of Winchester. After teaching school at Winchester for a few months, he was admitted to the bar shortly before he was 21. A few months afterward he was chosen States attorney of Morgan County. Elected to the legislature at the age of 23, he served with Lincoln where he made a distinctly better record than the latter. At 27, he became secretary of state for Illinois and shortly afterwards the youngest judge ever to serve on our State supreme court. Then in 1843 at the age of 30, he was elected to Congress, and 3 years afterward, at the age of 33, to the Senate of the United States. As Clay, Calhoun, Webster, and Benton faded from the scene, Douglas became the intellectual leader of the Senate, and the voice of young America, and of western expansion.

He received a number of votes for the Democratic nomination for the Presidency in 1852, and barely missed being nominated for the Presidency in 1856, when he was 43 years of age. When he appeared in this campaign for the Senate in 1858, he was the foremost statesman of the Nation.

Douglas was, as I have said, the advocate of western expansion. He had supported the Mexican War and the acquisition of what is now New Mexico, Arizona, California, and Nevada, and also a large section of Texas. He worked aggressively for an Oregon treaty which would bring the Pacific Northwest under the American flag, and he looked forward to the day when all of North America would be joined to us in political union with continental free trade and with democratic institutions prevailing for all. To cement such union, he put through the Illinois Central Railroad running from Galena and Chicago in the North to New Orleans in the South, and which was designed to tie the Middlewest with Mississippi and the Gulf States. In doing so, he avoided the later abuses and scandals of the railway grants of the 1860's and 1870's, and gave to the State of Illinois a share of the revenues of the road and a voice in its control.

I may say that he was scrupulous in seeing to it that he did not profit personally from any land grant. Then he pushed through legislation for a railroad from Chicago to the Pacific Ocean to connect the Middle with the Far West.

It was here that he helped to set in play the forces which were his ultimate undoing. For the immediate question of the late 1840's and of the 1850's was whether the new territories which were being acquired were to be slave or free; the ultimate issue was no less than the fate of the Nation as a whole. The southern fire-eaters wanted to extend slavery into the North, and Tombs of Georgia boasted that he was going to call the roll of his slaves from the foot of Bunker Hill Monument. The Northern Abolitionists, on the other hand, wanted slavery to be abolished in the South. If either of these groups were to fail in their objectives, each preferred secession and separation to union in a divided country.

Midway between these groups stood Douglas. As a compromise, he proposed that the people of the newly established territories should have the right to decide whether or not they wished to legalize slavery, and that the Federal Government should preserve strict neutrality.

To obtain Southern support for his Western railway, he got Congress in 1854 to pass the Kansas-Nebraska Act which repealed the Missouri Compromise of 1820. This compromise had prohibited slavery in new territories north of the extension of the southern boundary of Missouri, but Douglas now opened them up to local option on the question. While disclaiming any moral concern over the question of slavery and stating that he did not care whether slavery was voted up or down, Douglas nevertheless insisted on the right of the people of the territories to make a free choice, and the duty of the Federal Government to be neutral in fact as well as in word. When the Buchanan administration violated this principle, and with the aid of armed bands from Missouri tried to jam a proslavery constitution down the throats of the people of Kansas, Douglas broke with Buchanan and fought with all his strength for fair play and free elections. In the senatorial election of 1858, he was therefore being opposed by the Buchanan Democrats as well as by the newly founded Republican Party under its leader, Lincoln. These latter two groups, widely divided as they were in their ultimate aims, were nevertheless united in a common effort to end the political career of Douglas.

Lincoln's opposition was, of course, deeper than any personal rivalry. Like Douglas, he occupied a middle ground between the two sets of extremists. But unlike Douglas, he maintained that the Federal Government should not merely be neutral. He contended that since slavery was wrong, it should instead prevent its extension into the territories. By thus preventing the spread of slavery into new territory, he believed that the economic wastes of that institution would ultimately lead to the freeing of the slaves in the South. But he wanted this to be done peacefully, voluntarily, and with full compensation to the owners.

These, then, were the momentous issues which a century ago were being threshed out on the prairies of our beloved State and which faced the debaters here on this very spot. For it was here that Lincoln asked Douglas the crucial question as to how he could reconcile the Dred Scott decision that slaveowners could take their slaves into free territories, and possibly even into free States, with his doctrine of the supremacy of popular sovereignty. Douglas' instant reply was that by local ordinances and by the sentiments of the people, the Dred Scott decision could be made inoperative in the territories. This won for him the senatorial election of 1858. But his answer split the Democratic Party between its northern and its southern wing and led to his own defeat in 1860 as the presidential candidate of the northern section.

It was in this latter election that Douglas rose to true greatness. Seeing that his defeat was inevitable, he toured the South and begged them not to secede. If they would only let the issue be freely decided on the frontier, he argued that the divisive issue could be insulated from the mainstream of the Nation's political life so that the Union could thus be preserved.

But neither North nor South would listen. The North went for Lincoln and the South for Breckinridge and then the South seceded rather than live under the Presidency of a hated northerner.

It is a common belief, one which apparently is true, that at the inauguration Douglas sat beside Lincoln and held Lincoln's hat in his hand, and was his friend, as Lincoln was taking his solemn oath of office.

When the issue was presented to the Nation, Douglas did not hesitate for a moment. He almost immediately pledged his support to his rival, Lincoln, and went on an extended speaking trip through southern Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois to rally the Democrats behind the Union cause. In this he was largely successful, and he even brought over such violent Southern sympathizers as John A. Logan and John A. McClernand, who had been Democratic Congressmen and bitter opponents of Lincoln, but later became Union generals.

One of the interesting conjectures of history is whether Douglas was able to have the rank of general conferred upon Logan and McClernand as a condition for their support of the Union.

In this effort, worn out by heat, overexhaustion, and strain, Douglas succumbed to a fever and died more or less penniless on June 3, 1861, at the early age of 48.

Lacking the moral nobility of Lincoln, Douglas nevertheless deserves well of our country. A passionate fighter for American unity, his body lies near the shores of Lake Michigan and into the coolness of his tomb, the stormy waters of the inland sea send, at times, their clangor. He would have had it thus, and his fiery spirit would take pride in his last words for his children which are engraved upon the base on his monument:

> Tell them to obey the laws and support the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I have listened with great interest to the brief but splendid biography of a great American. I just noted the Senator's concluding statement Douglas died when he was only 48 years old.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. If I ever knew that fact before, it had become obscured by the great stature of Douglas as an intellectual giant. I have frequently cited the splinter party behind Breckenridge as a historical example of how the Democratic Party can defeat itself, as it did when Lincoln was elected. While I am a believer in States rights, I do not believe those who supported Breckenridge gave the correct interpretation of States rights. It is a historical fact that while Jefferson could not attend the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia in 1787, he strongly favored a provision in the new Constitution to prohibit slavery.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. At Jefferson's insistance, his friend James Madison offered such a proposal, but it was rejected.

Incidentally, without any invidious comparison with those in the North who were engaged in the slave trade, in my opinion there was nothing in the Constitution either to establish or to prohibit slavery; therefore, I believe Congress did not have the power to say who should have slaves and who should not. I think Douglas was right in saying that that question should be left to each sovereign unit.

However, I believe it was unfortunate that the South turned down Douglas in 1860, and that it was tragic that Abraham Lincoln should have been assassinated before he had a chance to do anything to heal the wounds that resulted from an unfortunate fratricidal war.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Virginia for his perceptive and generous remarks. They give me hope that perhaps the Democratic Party will not split in the future and that possibly the South and the North may go forward with a program of equal rights for all citizens under the protection of the 14th and 15th amendments to the Constitution.

The tragic example of what happened to our party in 1860, with all the consequences which flowed from it, should, I think, be a lesson to it, so that our Southern friends will not push us too far, as the Southern Democrats tried to push Stephen Douglas.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield again?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Virginia will certainly support a program of equal rights; but at the present time he has to fight for the rights of the white man. It is just a different viewpoint.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, lest it be thought that there is personal and family vainglory connected with my remarks, I may say that although I occupy the Senate seat formerly occupied by Stephen A. Douglas, I am not a direct relative of his. I think that probably we sprang from common stock in Massachusetts, somewhere around 1700; but I have never been able definitely to establish a connection. So I cannot claim blood relationship, although some great-grandchildren of Douglas have adopted me as a so-called kissing cousin.

PROPOSED TAX CHANGES

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Not as Bad as Painted," published in the Salt Lake City Tribune of March 25, 1963, and an editorial entitled "Which Is Better Way, Tax Cuts or Welfare?" published in the Atlanta Constitution of March 26, 1963. The editorials support the President's program for a tax cut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Salt Lake City (Utah) Tribune, Mar. 25, 1963]

NOT AS BAD AS PAINTED

President Kennedy's proposed changes in capital gains tax treatment are being attacked as an indirect, if not devious, plan to soak the rich and penalize the pursuit of profits. If the reforms were not accompanied by tax reductions, this indictment would have some merit. But even if the tax structure remains unchanged, there is no justification for some present capital gains loopholes.

Providing capital gains treatment to profits on real estate transactions is one glaring example. It has contributed to excessive speculation and unrealistic price rises simply because tax gimmickery, rather than economic considerations, has been a dominant factor in real estate operations. The President's proposal to tax depreciated real estate gains at ordinary rates would not end risk taking or speculation; but it would put a stop to the taxmanship that has motivated so much of the potentially dangerous dealings in real estate.

Similarly, Mr. Kennedy can be commended for requesting that restricted stock options, designed to lure and keep executive talent, should no longer be eligible for capital gains treatment. Stock options have not spurred individual initiative; on the contrary, they have immobilized executive talent.

The President's recommendation to lower the capital gains tax on assets held over 1 year is hardly a soak-the-rich move. Indeed, it is a liberalization that should help to thaw investments long frozen by the present capital gains tax, thereby encouraging new risk-taking ventures. It would cut down the part played by taxes in making investment decisions.

This new proposal, though, penalizes the short-term risk taker, who plays a vital midwife role in the market. He supplies depth, breadth and liquidity, which are essential to an active and dynamic economy. There is a big difference between the bona fide speculator in the stock market and the tax-conscious speculator in real estate, yet the administration fails to distinguish between the two.

The President's capital gains reforms are not so bleak as they have been painted. They stop some glaring abuses without stifling individual incentive. These are the twin objectives that should govern any change in the tax code.

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution, Mar. 26, 1963]

WHICH IS BETTER WAY, TAX CUTS OR WELFARE?

In another plea for tax cuts, President Kennedy again has warned that our slow rate of economic growth will result in rising unemployment, recession and other woes unless preventive steps are taken now.

In a speech in Chicago, the President said that jobs for the sixties is the No. 1 domestic concern. This rising unemployment, he pointed out, is an economic waste that will be accompanied by higher welfare payments, weaker consumer markets, recurrent problems of crime and delinquency and unstable labor relations.

Supporting this view, Secretary of Labor Wirtz said in Washington yesterday that the current 6.1 unemployment rate is a deplorable problem that can be met only by creation of 3 million jobs. Unemployment among youths between ages 16 and 21 is roughly 16 percent. This is at a time when the number employed is at a record.

Tax cuts may not provide the complete answer but in boosting consumer income they offer a quick and effective stimulus to jobs.

RIGHT-TO-WORK LAWS AND THE REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, we often hear it asked today, "What are we doing today about the breakdown in the institution of collective bargaining?" This question is not only misposed, but it is also misleading. Free collective bargaining has, and continues, to work well. Over 150,000 collective bargaining contracts are in force in America today. One-third of our nonfarm work force is covered by a collective bargaining contract. Yet 98 percent of the Americans covered by collective bargaining contracts did not strike in 1962.

More than twice as many man-days were lost from work injuries than were lost because of strikes in this Nation last year. Even more important is the comparison of time lost through unemployment and the time lost through strikes. Secretary of Labor Wirtz put time losses due to strikes in perspective; he said in December that our Nation "lost more man-hours of production * * * in th last 11 months from unemployment than we have in the last 35 years from strikes."

In showing that the strike picture has been exaggerated, I do not intend to "whitewash" strikes. What must be realized is that one can no more understand or appraise industrial relations by examining strikes alone than one can understand human psychology by studying abnormal behavior alone. In short, the strike must be analyzed in the total context of free collective bargaining.

Although there is no breakdown, there is a crisis in the institution of collective bargaining. Our institution of free collective bargaining is being emasculated by so-called right-to-work laws. And without free collective bargaining, we could return to the jungle of unfettered industrial strife—an era this Nation abandoned years ago.

To protect free collective bargaining, I introduced last week a bill to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act. Section 14(b) makes it possible for States to enact laws prohibiting union security arrangements long sanctioned by Federal law and agreed to by employers and employees. Under Federal law, an employer and a majority of the workers can agree to union shop or agency shop. This form of union security means that the only lawful requirement that may be imposed on an employee as a condition of employment is the payment of dues, or, if the employee does not want to join the union, a service fee to cover the costs of administering a collective bargaining contract.

It is inconsistent for Congress to favor union security on a national level and yet allow a few States to pass laws outlawing union security and benefiting no one but those whom Senator Taft called freeriders. No other provision of the National Labor Relations Act subordinates Federal law to State law where State law would be more restrictive. In appraising this aberration to an otherwise uniform industrial relations law, we must neither forget nor ignore the fact that the Democratic platform of 1960 was expressly pledged to the repeal of section 14(b). The other party platform was silent on this matter. Richard Nixon, however, said that the Republican Party platform was to retain section 14(b).

Based on word magic—not fact or logic—the right-to-work concept is the rallying point for enemies of trade unions and free collective bargaining. Of course, a person could no more oppose an honest right-to-work law than a person could oppose a right-to-breathe law.

Secretary of Labor, Willard Wirtz has characterized the term "right-to-work" as a "corruption of the English language which prejudices the consideration of the real problem involved."

Secretary Wirtz related an interesting experience. When he taught law he used to give his class a questionnaire. One question read, "Are you in favor or opposed to right-to-work laws?" Two-thirds of the class said they were in favor. Another question on the same page read, "If an employer and a majority of its employees agree that all employees should or should not become a member of the union, should Government interfere with their decision?"

Two-thirds of the class answered "no"—just exactly opposite to their answer on the right-to-work question. This experience of Secretary Wirtz certainly shows that the term "right-to-work" is deliberately misleading and hangs a murky cloud over the basic issues.

Before giving my reasons for the need to repeal 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, let us take a brief look at the basic philosophy of the advocates of right-to-work laws. These persons seem blind to many areas of our economic life where job choice is restricted. If the right-to-work advocates are really sincere about preserving occupational choice—which I doubt—they should rally around the fair employment practices idea. However, I have never heard the right-to-work advocates support this concept. I suggest, therefore, that either they are blind to some of the realities of our occupational life, such as denying a man a job because he is a Negro, or they are exploiting noble thoughts about freedom to cripple unions and collective bargaining.

My basic argument for repealing right-to-work laws is based on the nature of the community called the bargaining unit, and on our democratic concept of majority rule. It is not based on misleading, specious talk about the right to join or not to join a union.

Under the majority rule principle of our national labor policy, a union has the affirmative, enforcible duty to represent all employees.

This means that a union which represents a majority of the workers doing a particular type of work, must represent all the workers doing that work, whether or not they are members of the union. If there are 75 union members and 25 nonunion workers, the union is required by law to negotiate for the nonunion employees as well as for their own dues-paying members.

There is a very good reason for this policy. In means there will be only one union for each particular skill or trade. If the policy were otherwise, there might be a number of different unions competing for the votes of the workers and representing various social and political views. This is the situation in many countries in Europe today. Suppose an employer had to negotiate a contract with the Democratic auto workers, the Republican auto workers, and the nonpartisan auto workers; the already complicated process of collective bargaining would become completely unwieldy.

Our national labor-management policy has wisely, and expressly, rejected this fragmented system of collective bargaining in favor of having one union represent all the employees in a particular bargaining unit.

The union's duty of fair and equal representation means that a union must negotiate a contract that will benefit all employees. It means that a union must police and administer the contract to the best interests of all employees. It must process grievances for all employees. Credit union privileges, health welfare, and pension trusts are provided all employees, not just union members.

At this Nation's birth we declared that "taxation without representation is tyranny." To enjoy the fruits of collective bargaining without assuming the costs and responsibilities, is equally oppressive.

When union members bear the costs of collective bargaining for free riders, the union members feel like dupes. The resulting resentment has the effect of disrupting the harmony so necessary to an effective, responsible union.

It is a well-known fact that labor-management stability and peace are not enhanced when a union becomes insecure because of a large number of free riders. This insecurity fosters exaggerated, misdirected efforts on matters which would normally be of small concern. The union must show its value to gain new members, and may do so by fighting and bickering. For instance, the union may call unwarranted strikes, it may become overly legalistic in processing grievances, or it may become just plain obstinate in dealing with management. To this extent, labor peace and stability are jeopardized. Thus, right-to-work laws diminish the quality of collective bargaining and, thereby, adversely affect our Nation's economy and security.

The advocates of right-to-work laws base their argument on the analogy of the voluntary association. Nothing could be more invalid than comparing the community of workers called a bargaining unit with a voluntary association.

The union differs from a voluntary association in that a person who drops out of a voluntary association does not continue to reap the benefits the association provides. A union, in contrast, has a continuing duty to confer the benefits of collective bargaining on all employees. In this context, therefore, the usual right of withdrawal from a voluntary association is not relevant. The continuing duty of a union to represent all employees justifies some limitation on the dissenting minority, especially since majority rule is necessary and appropriate for stable collective bargaining.

In right-to-work discussions, three facts often become blurred. First, the employer, not the union, hires employees. Second, no employer need bargain over a union shop or agency shop unless the union has been selected by a majority of the employees in a secret election conducted by the NLRB. Third, should the employees ever decide to give up the union shop or agency shop, Federal law provides an election procedure whereby a mere 30 percent of the employees can bring the union security question to a vote. This is a very democratic procedure; it provides for majority rule, but also allows this majority a method to change the structure of their employment relationship.

Simple justice, and responsible collective bargaining thus dictate that a union required to represent all employees should have the support of all employees. To tolerate free riders, is to sanction a concept, which if applied to our Government, would mean that after an election, the voters of the losing party could stop paying taxes, refuse to serve the Army, or refuse to perform any of the obligations imposed upon a citizen of the United States. Surely, we should not deny to the industrial sector of our society our cherished standard of democratic responsibility—majority rule.

Another danger is developing from the right-to-work laws. In many of the so-called right-to-work States, opponents of collective bargaining and union security ask State courts to outlaw the agency shop under the right-to-work laws. The agency shop agreement merely requires a nonunion employee to pay his fair share of the costs of collective bargaining.

The agency shop has been outlawed in a few right-to-work States. Recently, the Supreme Court of the United States heard arguments on an appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Florida.

It is unfortunate that the agency shop has been placed in this tenuous legal position. The agency shop agreement has great potential for keeping industrial peace, especially when a company or the employees do not want a union shop agreement.

The importance of the agency shop was recently illustrated in a dispute in the aerospace industry. Nearing the end of the cooling-off period, President Kennedy appointed a three-man panel to aid the parties to reach a settlement and avert a strike that might endanger the national security. The panel, headed by George Taylor of the University of Pennsylvania, recommended a union shop agreement. The company and the employees might have settled for an agency shop arrangement, according to the New York Times. But, because the agency shop had been questioned by the courts, it was not recommended by the panel.

During this dispute, an interesting event occurred. When Dr. Taylor, who is extremely competent in the labor-management relations, recommended that the employees vote on whether or not they wanted a union shop, the protectors of the so-called right-to-work notion chided Dr. Taylor severely. From their antics, one would gather that it is somehow undemocratic to allow employees to vote on whether they want to have a union shop or not. To deny free men the right to vote is in direct conflict with our democratic principles. If we consider it proper to amend our Constitution by a vote, surely men can alter their work conditions by a vote. To deny majority rule and to call it foreign to American concepts of individual freedom makes a mockery of logic and our democratic principle of majority rule.

Aside from the fact that right-to-work laws are destructive to free collective bargaining, there are numerous misconceptions about the economic, social, and moral aspects of right-to-work laws. For instance:

First. Right-to-work States as various studies have consistently indicated, do not receive more than their proportionate share of new industry. Moreover, the enactment of right-to-work laws is not responsible for increases in employment. Industry moves South for three primary reasons: Interest in the southern market, interest in southern materials, or interest in the availability of adequate low-cost labor.

The enactment of right-to-work laws cannot conceivably provide an economic advantage for most industries. Right-to-work laws cannot create markets where none exists; these laws cannot increase consumer buying power, these laws cannot produce an available supply of raw materials, water, or low-cost power. Most important, right-to-work laws cannot provide an adequate supply of skilled workers or improve worker efficiency.

Basic to the claim that right-to-work laws attract industry, is the assumption that all industry is anxious to avoid unions. This is simply not the case. Many industries have opposed right-to-work laws. For example, Dan A. Kimball, president of Aerojet-General Corp., manufacturer of propellents for the Titan, Polaris, and Minuteman missiles, said:

> The right-to-work law constitutes a real threat to our national security at a time when industrial harmony is essential. I am convinced this proposal would do more to disrupt industrial harmony than anything the Communists themselves have been able to achieve during the cold war. I've examined both sides of the right-to-work proposal and have found * * * that it is bad for the employee, for the employer. I am against it.

Another businessman, J. Irwin Miller, chairman of the board of Cummins Engine Corp., and president of the National Council of Churches, has pointed out:

> The classic argument against the union shop is the right-to-work argument. The average American manager feels that there is a character known as the loyal employee and this is a fellow who is supposed to figure that joining the union is a fate worse than death. Well, this man is in the same category, in my opinion, as the Easter bunny and Santa Claus. I've never found him.

Forbes Marketing Research, Inc., of New York, conducted an exhaustive survey of reasons why industries located new plants or expanded existing plants in Indiana, a State that enacted a right-to-work law in 1957. The detailed study covered 100 industries selected by the Indiana Department of Commerce as being representative of the more important new industry locations and expansion of Indiana facilities which occurred after 1957.

The Forbes survey clearly demonstrates that right-to-work laws do not attract industry. In order of importance, the reasons Indiana was selected for new plant sites were: Proximity of established markets and potential of local markets; supply of skilled labor and favorable employer-employee relations; access to raw materials; occupancy costs, including the availability of developed industrial sites; taxes and government; availability and cost of electric power and fuel, including oil and coal, and living conditions, including housing and cost of living, schools and religious facilities, community development.

Other factors listed were general business climate, available industrial facilities and transportation.

What about the right-to-work law? Only 7 of the 100 industries even mentioned it. The Forbes survey concluded:

> The right-to-work law has had a negligible effect on the attraction of plant location or expansion in Indiana.

Second. Right-to-work laws do not reduce strikes or promote industrial peace. For the 7 years prior to 1947, the combined 11 original right-to-work law States had an annual average of 3.55 percent of the Nation's strikes. But for the 7 years following 1947, the average in these same 11 States increased to 4.51 percent.

Third. Right-to-work laws are opposed by employees. In the first year of voting on union security arrangements under the Taft-Hartley Act, with approximately 2 million employees voting, 98 percent of the elections resulted in approval of a union shop. By 1951, the union shop elections were so conclusive that Senator Taft, the chief architect of the Taft-Hartley Act, advocated the elimination of this voting requirement from the law. Taft concluded in his report to the Senate that the elections conducted by the National Labor Relations Board "have almost always resulted in a vote favoring the union shop."

Taft's comment came out of this background: From August 1947 to October 1951, the NLRB conducted 46,119 union shop authorization polls. The union shop was authorized in 44,795 of these polls or 97.1 percent.

Fourth. Right-to-work laws are opposed by many religious groups on grounds that such laws are an unnecessary restriction on free collective bargaining. These religious groups include the general board of the National Council of Churches, the United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., the Board of Social and Economic Relations of the Methodist Church, the Rabbinical Council of America, and the Catholic Committee of the South. Typical of such church positions is that presented by the Board of Social and Economic Relations of the Methodist Church:

> It now appears that certain States by means of right-to-work laws would inject further restrictions by law. Such States would forbid union maintenance agreements even when mutually satisfactory to management and labor. Such laws are miscalled right-to-work laws since they do not oblige anyone to give an individual a job. Their real menace lies, however, in denying by law the possibility of increasing the quality of individual freedom.
>
> We believe that the role of the State is that of regulation so that individuals may

have the maximum freedom of choice consistent with the welfare of the group, while groups may have maximum freedom for the group action consistent with the welfare of the Nation. Therefore, we hold that union membership as a basis for continued employment should be left to agreement by management and labor through the process of collective bargaining.

In conclusion, let us remember that the American worker develops his fullest potential by effective participation in the growth of our Nation's economy. And it is American trade unions that insure workers a democratic institution for this participation. Individual freedom, individual responsibility, and individual development, therefore, flourish when there exists a collective bargaining contract to secure each individual's rights and privileges in his place of work.

For this worthwhile institution to continue, the misnamed "right-to-work" laws must be eliminated These laws create no new rights; they create no new jobs. These laws merely create unrest and weak unions. This, in turn, fosters industrial strife and may destroy the industrial jurisprudence we cherish and need in today's complex industrial society.

PROPOSED LOCATION IN BOSTON OF NEW YORK CITY REGIONAL OFFICE OF INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on April 5, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue appeared at a closed session of the Senate Finance Committee, to submit to questioning by committee members. The committee was kind enough to invite other interested Senators, including me, to the hearing, where the Commissioner discussed proposed administrative changes in the field organization of the Internal Revenue Service. The transcript of his testimony was released on April 11 to the public.

The Commissioner testified at length on the overall reorganization of district and regional offices around the country, as well as changes in plans for the installation of new automatic data processing equipment, which is called ADP—for it seems that today almost everything is referred to by initials—at regional centers.

In addition, the Commissioner provided answers to a set of detailed questions which had been prepared by my colleague [Mr. JAVITS] and me, and had been propounded to him, on the proposal to eliminate the present New York City regional office, and to consolidate its functions into the regional office at Boston.

The April 5 proceedings before the Senate Finance Committee do not lend themselves to breezy, off-the-cuff analysis. Comprehensive reorganization plans in the executive branch quite obviously are not generated out of the thin air. Months, even years, of managerial and statistical studies go into the effort. This case was certainly no exception. It is also a plain fact that whereas the Commissioner personally consulted—in advance of announcing the plan—with the chairmen of the various congressional committees concerned with tax and fiscal matters, we of the minority party had no inkling of even the barest outline, not to mention the close details, of any changes affecting Internal Revenue Service offices in our States, until such changes were publicly announced as a hard decision.

Mr. President, under the circumstances, and especially when it is claimed that the proposed structural shakeup will save millions of taxpayer dollars, those who have legitimate questions as to the wisdom of the reorganization cannot risk "shooting from the hip." The proponents of the reorganization plan know that, and they count very heavily on it. Certainly the facts must be known, sifted, and scrutinized carefully before a sound judgment can be reached.

My study of the Commissioner's testimony before the Committee on Finance, coupled with other available information, has led me to the inescapable conclusion that there is no rational, objective basis for the proposed removal of the New York City regional office to Boston.

One thing, Mr. President, I wish to make absolutely clear: We in the Congress are primarily here to legislate. It is certainly not our business to supervise the day-to-day running of the executive branch of the Federal Government, which includes the matter of organizing the field offices of agencies with operations throughout the United States. But so far as administrative discretion is concerned, we in the legislative branch do have a duty to the entire Nation and to our own constituents to point out wherever in our opinion there are abuses of this administrative discretion. It is my judgment that in this case there has been a gross abuse of administrative power. Therefore, the people should know about it.

Let us look at the facts concerning the present organization of the New York and Boston regions.

The existing New York City regional office supervises the field operations of the Internal Revenue Service throughout all of New York State. The Boston regional office exercises like responsibility for the entire New England States area. New York State has a population of 16.8 million; the New England States, 10.5 million. In fiscal year 1962, the New York region accounted for 10.7 million tax returns filed, the Boston region only 6.2 million. By 1970 these figures will grow to 11 million and 6.4 million respectively. In supervising collections at the field level in 1962 the New York region was responsible for revenues of $18.95 billion as compared with Boston's $5.53 billion. As we from New York continually try to point out to our colleagues, New York State is responsible for generating 20 percent of all Federal revenues.

Let us look at the operating costs of the two offices in 1962. In New York they came to $5,776,000 and in Boston $3,451,000. If we compare the revenue collected in the two regions with the cost of collection, we will find that it cost the American taxpayers more than twice as much to supervise the collection of each dollar of revenue in the Boston region as it did for each dollar of revenue in the New York region. It is important to note, too, that since the New York region has 6,801 employees to Boston's 3,569, the operating costs average $7,358 per regional employee in New York as compared to the greater amount of $8,120 per regional employee in Boston. The New York region is clearly not only the more important of the two in terms of returns serviced and revenues collected, but also clearly the more efficient of the two in terms of the cost of supervising the collection of each dollar of revenue and in competence and productivity of its employees.

This is only part of the picture. In 1952, before a major reorganization of the Internal Revenue Service was effected in the wake of the many tax scandals of that era, there were outstanding a total of $1.6 billion in tax delinquencies nationwide. From 1954, when the present field structure of the Internal Revenue Service was instituted, to the end of fiscal year 1962, these delinquencies were driven down by $500 million, so that they now stand at $1.1 billion. Now over the same period, in the Manhattan office alone, under New York regional supervision, delinquencies were reduced from $329 million to $110 million, a drop of some $219 million, representing almost 44 percent of the total national improvement over the period in question. But the Boston region over the same period actually had an increase in total delinquencies from $41 million to approximately $43 million.

The short of it then is that the New York regional office has made over the past 9 years or so a tremendous achievement. This the Commissioner conceded in his own testimony. On the other hand, as the Commissioner also readily agreed in the hearing before the Committee on Finance, the Boston office is one of the worst-managed offices at this time. Commissioner Caplin's testimony to this effect will be found on page 22 of the hearing transcript.

The poor record of the Boston office for the last decade is, of course, a matter of concern to the Internal Revenue Service. It also is a matter of concern to every elected official. We put a premium, of course, on making sure that the necessary evil of taxation and collection of taxes from the American people are accomplished at the minimum possible expense consistent with providing essential services to the taxpayers themselves. However, improvements in administrative efficiency do not invariably require major structural change. They certainly do not invariably require elimination of an entire operating unit that has been distinguished by its fine work merely in order to infuse a weaker unit with better administrative leadership. Selected personnel changes, without major organizational overhaul, is always feasible. I am glad to note that the Commission has made certain personnel transfers to the Boston area and it is his hope that there will be some improvements there under the new leadership. There is also little doubt in my mind that some top people from the New York office who have demonstrated their ability and competence could assume authority up in Boston and help improve matters still more. But all this does not justify wiping out the New York regional office bag and baggage. Given the remarkable achievements of the New York regional office in the past decade, in my judgment only the most cogent grounds of efficiency and economy would warrant tinkering with that unit for the sake of giving a lift to faltering operations elsewhere. And in my judgment no such grounds exist.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is making a very important speech not only as it relates to the economy of New York thus performing a service to the New York taxpayers, but also as to the general policy of our country. My colleague and I have undertaken the struggle to which he refers and have participated in the questioning of Commissioner Caplin before the Committee on Finance. We have lent our aid to the review which is being made by Secretary of the Treasury Dillon on this question because we believe that the fundamental principle of putting the Federal administration where the weight exists in terms of what the administration is seeking to accomplish is the basic principle which is being violated. My colleague is rendering a distinct service not only to his State but also to the Nation in this typically distinguished and thorough analysis of the situation which he is presenting. I desire to identify myself with it. It is almost unthinkable that the proposed regional move should take place from the principal taxpaying center of the country to an area which, compared with New York, does not rate that kind of emphasis.

We have challenged the transfer. We shall continue to challenge it. I compliment my colleague on his very important and weighty contribution to the effort.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I appreciate the kind comments of my distinguished colleague from New York. He and I have worked together on the problem. He has most emphatically expressed his dissent from the decision. It is the joint hope of both of us that the presentation of the facts will result in the Secretary of the Treasury taking a different view of the proposed move.

There are other moves with reference to this reorganization which have been the subject of dissent by other Members of Congress. This particular move which I have analyzed, and which I plan to analyze fully, seems to me without any justification whatever. If there is to be any move in that direction for consolidation, the only move which makes sense at all is to move the Boston office to the New York office; to move the lesser, more poorly operated office into the much larger and better operated office.

I am very grateful to my colleague for his comments. I assure him that I shall work with him in every way to try to improve this situation.

I would like to point out that on page 68 of the hearing transcript Commissioner Caplin indicated that there was absolutely no doubt in his mind that merged regional headquarters of the New York and New England regions would be in New York were it not for the factor of the service center at Lawrence, Mass. This service center, therefore, lies at the crux of the entire problem and it is to that factor that I wish to pay the greatest amount of attention.

I quote from Commissioner Caplin's testimony at page 8:

> The decisive factor was the existence in the Boston area of a going service center at Lawrence, Mass., which is to be converted to our newer automatic data processing techniques and will serve all of the present Boston and New York regions.

In other words, this is a going service center all right, but it is not equipped to operate as an ADP regional service center. A new and larger facility will be required for the ADP regional service center. The present installation in Lawrence, Mass., is not even large enough to house the total work force that will be required. When the Commissioner, therefore, talks about a going service center at Lawrence, he is not talking about a service center that will fit into the Service's plans for a complete automatic data processing establishment in the Service. In addition, approximately 1,500 additional employees will have to be recruited and trained for ADP operations wherever they may be located. The existing large number of key punch operators in Lawrence, Mass., know only the mechanical function of operating punching machines. The New York region presently has some 700 clerical workers who will be displaced when the complete automatic data processing system is installed, whether in New York or Lawrence or some other place it does not matter. If the new ADP regional center were located in New York, the 700 clerical workers presently there, with their knowledge of and experience in the field of taxation, could perform very useful technical functions for which key punch operators have had no training.

Here, in my judgment, is the key to the entire matter. Commissioner Caplin, as appears on page 20 of the transcript, testified as follows:

> It is one of the most important factors throughout the country to locate a service center in close proximity to a regional office wherever possible.

If this is true, the regional service center to process both the New York and Boston regions could equally have been located in New York close to the existing regional office there as well as being located close to the regional office at Boston. The choice was struck for Boston. Why? Well, as the Commissioner further testified—and I quote again—

> It would be a terrible blow to move the Lawrence service center and the people there. These are not high-salaried people. It is a depressed area.

This is the key, in my judgment. The Commissioner first testified, at the very beginning of the hearing before the Finance Committee:

> The sole purpose of the proposed realinement is to save on our executive and administrative overhead, and thereby to make positions and funds available for direct tax work.

If this indeed is the sole purpose of the proposed realinement, of what possible relevance is the fact that there is an amount of unemployment in the Lawrence area, that it is a depressed area? Now let there be no mistake about my position. If there is unemployment in the Lawrence area, that is an unfortunate situation. We also have a lot of unemployment in New York. In some areas as in Buffalo and the Niagara frontier area, unemployment is running at the rate of 8.4 percent. These pockets of unemployment are of grave concern. But the answer is not to make an emergency public-works project out of a reorganization of the Internal Revenue Service. Even if the unemployment picture were relevant to the situation, that still would not require a disruption of the existing New York regional office and the devastating effect that that is having upon the morale of the people who work there.

Now we come to the question of savings to the taxpayer. It is the position of the Commissioner that by merging the Boston and New York regions the Government will save 102 positions and the salary of those positions which amounts to $801,700 annually. This savings, however, is independent of the question whether the merged headquarters would be in New York or in Boston. In either event the savings is the same. It is the position of the Commissioner that it would be more expensive and upsetting to transfer 126 positions from Boston to New York than to transfer 76 positions to Boston from New York. But if 76 positions are transferred to Boston, that represents a managerial and support increase to the present staff there of 70 percent. Contrariwise, if 126 positions are moved to New York, that would represent a managerial and support increase of only 16 percent there. These percentages are relevant when considering the savings in rent involved in any move. The New York regional office occupies a Federal building on which no rent is paid. An increase in personnel of only 16 percent would not tax these facilities at great cost to the Government. However, the Boston regional office is presently renting space for some of its activities because it does not have adequate room in rent-free space. Therefore, a managerial and support increase to the Boston staff of 70 percent would indeed result in substantial expense to the taxpayers in rental for premises.

If the regional office is going to do a good job, it must also exercise close supervision over the district offices. Today the New York regional has ready access to both the Brooklyn and Manhattan districts, which are, of course, two of the most important districts in the entire country. The dollar and time costs of travel and communications in the New York area are minimal. If the new regional office is located in Boston, in order for the new regional office to supervise the affairs of the districts very closely, there will be greater travel and time involved if frequent visits are made from Boston to the Brooklyn and Manhattan districts—of course there will have to be. Now what about the service center? As has been true for the last 8 years, the service center located in Lawrence, Mass., receives its work directly from the district office in the form of returns, and not from the regional offices. Whether the regional service center were to be located in New York, Boston, or some other area, it still would have to receive shipments in bulk from all the outlying districts within the region. Thus, the importance of the proximity between the regional service center and the regional headquarters has tended to be exaggerated. This is readily seen from the structure in other areas. For example, the service center for the far western region which is headquartered in San Francisco, is now located in Ogden, Utah, more than 800 miles away. Commissioner Caplin, in his testimony, said that the regional service center for the Far West could better be located in either San Francisco or Los Angeles. Still, Los Angeles is 400 miles away from the regional headquarters at San Francisco, while New York is only 210 miles from Boston.

Mr. President, let me summarize the bootstrap thinking that has gone into this reorganization plan. Here is the way it goes: The Boston and New York regions have to be merged in order to save money. In terms of number of positions and salary the amount of savings would be the same regardless of whether the move were made to Boston or to New York. Boston was chosen over New York because of the existing service center in Lawrence, Mass. It is true that the existing service center is inadequate to do the job that will be required of it under the automatic data processing system. A new center will therefore have to be established. The new center will have to remain somewhere in the Lawrence, Mass., area because there is a lot of unemployment there. It is also necessary to locate the new service center in the Lawrence, Mass., area because the regional headquarters will be located in Boston, as we have already decided.

This, Mr. President, represents the sum and substance of this grandiose plan to uproot the New York regional office which has served the people of this Nation and the State of New York for some many years with high distinction, and to transfer to Boston, Mass. which is one of the worst managed offices in the country. This naturally is resented very much. The Internal Revenue Service, which is paid for out of the taxpayers' hard-earned dollars, belongs to all the people of this country. It is in existence to serve them, with impartiality and fair dealing, and without regard to persons or interests. To the extent that this is extremely difficult under a system of high taxation such as we have in the United States, the Internal Revenue Service has done a fine job. I want to keep it that way.

Secretary Dillon has already been advised of my strong protest. He has also received a detailed analysis of the plan from the New York Congressional Steering Committee. I know that protests have poured into his office, from among other entities, the New York chapter of the Federal Bar Association, the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, and the Internal Revenue Service employees involved, through their organizations. These are all well considered communications, in my judgment. They deserve more than perfunctory treatment. I have confidence in the Secretary of the Treasury that they will receive the mature consideration to which they are entitled. And it is my fervent belief that, once it is perceived that there is no rational basis for the proposed elimination of the New York City regional office, this planned merger will be scrapped in its entirety. The Nation will be the better for it.

EXTENSION OF VOLUNTARY FEED GRAIN PROGRAM

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the vote yesterday by the other body in extending through 1965 the voluntary feed grains program is an encouraging victory for American agriculture, and for consumers and taxpayers as well.

During the past 2 years this voluntary program has not only increased the income of American agriculture by hundreds of millions of dollars, but has also sharply reduced farm program costs.

The successful passage of the feed grain bill, as was noted in a front-page story of the New York Times of today, was made possible by the strong support of Congressmen from the big cities of the Nation. I feel this kind of support of agriculture by Members of Congress from cities—and I hope this will include many of the Members of the Senate when this legislation is before us—vindicates the support which I and other farm State representatives gave to the mass transit bill a few days ago.

I support constructive legislation to make our cities healthier and better communities, because I believe it is in the public interest; but it is easier for those of us who represent primarily agricultural States to do so when the representatives from city districts, as they did yesterday in the House of Representatives, in turn support legislation that is very urgently needed by the agricultural States of the Nation.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to assure my friend, as a representative of what is largely an urban State, that he can count on my support for measures which are needed by his State, and which are in the national interest, to the same extent I have noted I can count on his support for measures, such as the mass transit bill, which are so badly needed by my State.

Mr. McGOVERN. I appreciate that statement. I was sure that was the case. It is this kind of cooperation between representatives of agricultural and industrial States that makes possible broad programs of this kind that are in the public interest.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following my remarks, the article from the New York Times to which I referred a moment ago be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE APPROVES FEED-GRAIN CURB—BACKS KENNEDY—URBAN DEMOCRATS HELP PASS BILL, 208–196—GAIN FOR WHEAT PLANS FORESEEN

(By William M. Blair)

WASHINGTON, April 25.—The administration won a narrow victory tonight as the House passed a farm bill that Democratic leaders hope will influence the important national wheat referendum next month.

By a rollcall vote of 208 to 196, the House approved a feed-grains bill. The support of city Democrats was important in the vote.

The city Democrats' aid also offset a sizable defection of other Democrats and helped beat down, 205 to 196, a Republican attempt to send the bill back to committee.

WOULD EXTEND PROGRAM

The bill would extend the present feed-grains program through 1965. It provides direct Federal payments to producers of corn and other livestock feed grains who leave acres unplanted in the fight to cut surplus production.

Party pressures played a major role in the House fight. Both parties sought to influence the vote in the wheat referendum scheduled for May 21. Wheat farmers will vote then on a new tough wheat production-control plan.

Opponents are aiming to defeat the wheat plan in an effort to reverse the course of administration farm policy.

The feed-grains bill would activate a provision of the wheat program that is calculated to make it more attractive to growers in some areas. This provision would permit wheat producers to grow wheat on feed-grain acreage and feed grain on wheat acreage.

By this plan, it is hoped that wheat producers who must accept a cut in production could shift to feed grains and maintain or increase their income.

A two-thirds vote of eligible farmers is necessary to adopt the wheat-control plan, which would become effective next year.

Less trouble on the feed-grains bill is expected in the Senate which may take it up next week.

BROAD EFFECT DOUBTFUL

Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, Democrat, of Louisiana, who is chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, has said he does not believe it will have much influence on the wheat vote. But he is ready to guide the bill through the Senate. Administration officials have conceded it is a "sweetener" for the wheat referendum.

In effect, both votes tonight were on recommitting the bill until after the wheat referendum. Republican farm leaders emphasized their aim was not to kill the bill but to send it back to committee until after the wheat vote.

Republicans, including those whose farm constituents benefit most from the direct payments for reducing surplus-producing acres, stood solidly behind the first rollcall to return the bill to committee. Farmers have been paid about $1,500 million for taking acres out of feed-grain production.

LONE REPUBLICAN VOTE

Only one Republican voted for passage of the bill on the second rollcall. He was Representative ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, of Wisconsin.

The Republicans' solid lineup for sending the measure back to the House Agriculture Committee was another display of party discipline. Similar discipline has been displayed in the farm fights of the last 2 years.

Before the voting, the House engaged in nearly 6 hours of oratory, most of it devoted to the wheat referendum. The feed-grains bill seemed almost incidental.

City Democrats have been balking at farm bills because of pressure from their constituents complaining about high farm program costs. Today they were under pressure from administration leaders all day.

Speaker JOHN W. McCORMACK, of Massachusetts, and other party leaders, and administation aids roamed the House precincts to hold city Democrats in line.

One major point emerged from the lengthy struggle: City Democrats seemed determined not to bail out wheat producers if they turned down the new production control plan. President Kennedy has said that the administration will not offer a new wheat plan if the plan is rejected.

Republicans, however, have said they will offer a new wheat program should the plan be rejected as they hope.

Representative FRANK THOMPSON, JR., Democrat, of New Jersey, spoke for city Democrats on the bailout issue. He supported the feed-grains bill but said that if wheat farmers turned down the new wheat plan he would vote against any effort to bail them out.

NEED FOR CONGRESSIONAL REORGANIZATION

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I desire to return to the subject of the need, the critical need, the immediate need, for congressional reorganization, the need for congressional reorganization before the 1st session of the 88th Congress has terminated.

I should like to speak about a particular aspect of congressional reorganization which has to do with the need for bringing the policies of our national political parties and of the President of the United States to bear on, and within, the Congress of the United States.

In this morning's Washington Post appears a most interesting editorial on this subject, and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the point made by the editorial writer is one which I have made before on the floor of the Senate, and desire to make again. The spectacle of the policies of a Democratic President, who is also leader of the Democratic Party, being obstructed by Democratic Members of both Houses, acting for the Democratic majority of committees that are the agents of a Democratic Congress, is indeed one calculated to amaze Americans and to confound foreign observers.

Prof. James MacGregor Burns, in his recent excellent book "The Deadlock of Democracy," has pointed out that there are really four parties in the Congress, not two. There is the Presidential Democratic Party, and the congressional Democratic Party. Sometimes they do not even speak to each other. On the other side of the aisle, there is the National Republican Party, and the congressional Republican Party. Sometimes they do not speak to each other, either.

One of the real needs for bringing the legislative body back into the Government of the United States so that it can, with the judiciary and with the executive, play its proper role in the Government of our country, is to work out ways and means and procedures by which the programs announced by both of the major political parties in their national platforms once every fourth year can be brought to the floor of the House and the floor of the Senate and voted upon on their merits.

In short, we should devise ways and means by which any measures strongly recommended by the President of the United States should be entitled to come to the floor with either a favorable or an adverse recommendation and to be voted on while the Congress is in session, so that members of both political parties may be placed on record as to whether they will support the platform of their party or whether they will not.

The situation can become a little obscure when the President belongs to one political party and a majority of Congress or even a majority of one House belongs to another party. However, that is not the case today. It was the case, of course, during 6 of the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration. In that period President Eisenhower was frequently in trouble because the Democratic majority in the two Houses would not report to the floor for action bills which the President favored.

I believe we would have done a greater service to the country if we had brought these bills to the floor with adverse recommendations and permitted them to be voted upon, and usually voted down. This, I believe, would have made for greater party responsibility and, therefore, for more effective government.

Today, however, we have a situation where both Houses of Congress and the President are of the same political party. We have, in my opinion, an excellent National Democratic platform, approved by the National Democratic Convention in 1960. Yet we have had considerable trouble in bringing legislation which would put into effect planks and promises of that platform to the floor for action.

I would like to see our procedures changed, so that this could be done. I call attention to some rather sardonic sentences in the editorial to which I have referred. The writer of the editorial says:

> The two Democratic parties have arrived at a nice division of function: One makes promises and the other breaks them. This formula for stalemate is weakening American democracy by depriving it of the power to reach policy decisions. If this weakness is to be remedied American leadership is going to have to give attention to the structure of government.

This, I contend, is the clear, unvarnished truth. There is a need to find ways and means to unite the Presidential Democratic Party with the congressional Democratic Party. There is a clear need to find ways and means to unite the extreme right wing of the congressional Republican Party, the Birchites and the like, with the more moderate Republican Party represented by ex-President Eisenhower and other elements in the party which in large part dictated the 1960 platform.

I agree with the editorial writer when he says:

> When the voters elect a Democratic administration they have a right to expect that its measures at least can be brought to a vote in a Democratic Congress. If these measures cannot be brought to a vote they must be left to conclude either that the administration itself is impotent, inadequate, and inefficient—

Which it is not—

> or that the system under which it operates has serious defects. The situation, in either case, calls for political action.

Mr. President, on January 15, 1963, I submitted Senate Resolution 42. It was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, together with 45 other measures for reforming the Standing Rules of the Senate, submitted by a number of Senators, less than one-third of them being submitted by me. My resolution is awaiting the pleasure of our beloved chairman of the Subcommittee on Standing Rules, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. He has promised that there will be—and I hope it will be soon—a public hearing held on these proposed rules changes, including the one to which I now refer. I hope the hearing will be held promptly, and that a number of these resolutions will be reported to the full committee and then to the floor with a favorable report; or, if that cannot be done, that some way will be found to discharge the committee to bring these badly needed proposed rules changes to the floor for action.

Senate Resolution 42, to which I have referred, reads as follows:

> *Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that each standing committee of the Senate shall consider any legislative proposal of the executive branch of the Government referred to it within a reasonable time prior to July 4 of any year and report its recommendations for or against enactment to the Senate, so that the Senate as a whole will have an opportunity to consider the proposal and the recommendations of the committee prior to the adjournment of the session at which the recommendation was made.

I hope that we can report out and adopt the resolution, and that such technical changes as may be necessary could be made in the Standing Rules of the Senate to give that resolution the force of parliamentary law.

I am happy to commend the Washington Post and its editorial writer for calling to the attention of the country the chaotic party system under which we now operate in Congress, and of the need to have the system changed in the interest of orderly and efficient government.

EXHIBIT 1

CHAOTIC PARTY SYSTEM

The President's assertion that much of his program would be approved in the House of Representatives, if the Rules Committee would permit these measures to come to a vote, surely is an eloquent commentary on the American party system.

The Rules Committee, after all, is headed by a member of the President's own party.

It is composed of the members of both parties, with a two-thirds majority of Democrats. The spectacle of the policies of a Democratic President, who also is the leader of the Democratic Party, being obstructed by a Democratic Congressman, acting for the Democratic majority of a committee that is the agent of a Democratic House, is one to amaze Americans and confound foreign observers.

Of his total program, the President said: "The only thing that has ever concerned me is whether the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives will release it for a vote." Why can't the leader of the Democratic Party and the head of a Democratic administration get the Democratic House Rules Committee to bring his bills before the House?

James MacGregor Burns has given one explanation in his book "The Deadlock of Democracy." The Democratic Party of which the President is the head and the Democratic Party of which the chairman of the Rules Committee, Mr. Howard Smith, is a member, are two different Democratic parties. Mr. Kennedy is the head of the Presidential Democratic Party. Mr. Smith is a leader in the congressional Democratic Party.

The Presidential Democratic Party is a great national organization that makes its appeal to 60 million citizens all over the country who generally believe in activist government. The congressional Democratic Party, by Mr. Burns' definition, consists of some 90 members, elected by about 2 million of the Nation's 60 million voters. It controls the House by its mastery of the committee chairmanships and its occupation of the power centers of the House. It is not only the Rules Committee that obstructs the President's program; many of the legislative committees are equally obstructive. The House District Committee, led by another member of the congressional Democratic Party, is bottling up the President's home rule bill and his financial program for the District of Columbia. While the President was speaking, Senator George Smathers, of Florida, another member of the congressional Democratic Party, was disclosing that his subcommittee will not permit the President's program on hospital care for the aged to get to a vote in the Senate.

The two Democratic parties have arrived at a nice division of function: One makes promises and the other breaks them. This formula for stalemate is weakening American democracy by depriving it of the power to reach policy decisions. If this weakness is to be remedied American leadership is going to have to give attention to the structure of Government. Means will have to be found to unite the Presidential Democratic Party with the congressional Democratic Party, to make those members of the party in the House and Senate sufficiently respectful and responsive so that administration measures at least can be brought to a vote. Much could be done in the House itself, where the power now dispersed to committee chairmen responsible to no one must be gathered up once again and lodged in the leadership of the majority so that the Members of the House can regain control of their own legislative processes. The existing fragmentation of power and responsibility is a danger, not only to the President's program, but to democracy itself.

When the voters elect a Democratic administration they have a right to expect that its measures at least can be brought to a vote in a Democratic Congress. If these measures cannot be brought to a vote they must be left to conclude either that the administration itself is impotent, inadequate and inefficient, or that the system under which it operates has serious defects. The situation, in either case, calls for political action.

THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION AND THE KERR-MILLS ACT

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, a front-page headline in the current issue of the AMA News, published by the American Medical Association, boldly and baldly proclaims "Kerr-Mills Covers 93 Percent of Aged." This statement is the sheerest nonsense.

This is not even managed news. It is complete distortion. I can understand that the AMA might try to work such a misleading and deceptive claim into its propaganda directed at the American people.

But surely, if the AMA does not feel compelled to tell the truth to the American people, it should make some efforts—no matter how painful—to be honest with its physician members to whom this paper is primarily directed.

This failure on the part of the AMA to be honest in its own publication can only be characterized as irresponsible.

It is easy to see where the AMA gets its 93 percent.

It does so by lumping together the old-age assistance program—which existed long before Kerr-Mills was enacted—with the medical assistance for the aged program—which was established under Kerr-Mills.

The old-age assistance program is for the totally indigent—that is, people on relief.

The medical assistance for the aged program was intended to bring help to a new category—people who presumably could meet usual daily living expenses—but who could not cope with the high costs of illness.

Perhaps it is correct that 93 percent of the elderly live in States which have one or both of these programs.

But the AMA's word "coverage" is grossly misleading. It is not true that 93 percent of the people are eligible for assistance under Kerr-Mills.

The true test of the Kerr-Mills program is the extent to which people not on relief but who need help can qualify for that help.

A further test is the extent to which the help that is provided actually meets their needs.

Kerr-Mills medical assistance for the aged, on a national basis, is woefully inadequate on both counts.

These are the facts about Kerr-Mills medical assistance for the aged that the AMA neglected to point out:

First. Only 58 percent of our older population live in those 25 States which have medical assistance for the aged programs in operation.

Second. In any single month, barely 1 out of every 100 older persons receives any help in those 25 States.

Third. The medical assistance for the aged programs all have restrictive eligibility requirements and, with few exceptions, provide only limited benefits. Both of these factors exclude medical assistance for the aged help to millions of aged persons who need assistance.

Articles evaluating Kerr-Mills recently appeared in two outstanding publications. One atricle is entitled "What About Kerr-Mills?" and appears in the April issue of Hospital Progress, the official publication of the Catholic Hospital Asociation. The other article entitled "What's Holding Up Kerr-Mills?" was taken from Medical Economics and appeared in the February issue of Social Progress, published by the Board of Christian Education of the United Presbyterian Church.

Both of these fine pieces afford a realistic view of Kerr-Mills in sharp contrast to the sweet mouthings of the AMA. I ask unanimous consent that the attached excerpts from the articles be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

What About Kerr-Mills?

(By Barbara Callahan)

When the Kerr-Mills Act (Public Law 86-778) was enacted in 1960, it was heralded as a giant step forward in providing a source of the medical expenses of older citizens who had not previously been eligible for help.

The law had two objectives:

1. To authorize Federal participation in approved State plans furnishing medical assistance to recipients of old-age assistance.
2. To establish a new category of public assistance—medical assistance for aged persons not on old-age assistance but whose incomes and resources are insufficient to meet the costs of necessary medical services. This portion of the law is covered in this report.

The American Medical Association has been stanch in its support of the Kerr-Mills legislation and has frequently expressed its confidence that "It is possible to help every aged American who needs help to pay for health care (through Kerr-Mills) when properly implemented by all the States."

The AMA board of trustees reaffirmed this support in an eight-point program designed to "help the Nation's older citizens live fuller and more satisfactory lives" announced by Percy E. Hopkins, M.D., Chicago, chairman of the AMA board of trustees. (AMA News, Feb. 18, 1963.)

The report pointed out that the "AMA recognizes that some of the aged have problems, some need help" and called first for a reevaluation of attitudes toward the elderly. Second, it listed "implementation and revision of the Kerr-Mills law." Elaborating on how it should be done, the report stated: "The AMA will continue to urge adoption of Kerr-Mills programs in all States where the need for them exists and to expand existing programs where it appears justified. Recognizing that some aged need financial assistance in meeting the cost of medical care, the AMA has supported the Kerr-Mills Federal-State matching fund program as a sound and constructive method of providing this help. Many States have already enacted Kerr-Mills programs providing a wide range of medical benefits to help those who need help. Revisions in the law will be sought by the AMA to ease eligibility in certain cases. Some State Kerr-Mills laws disqualify persons or couples for income above specified amounts.

The AMA will recommend that a person with higher income who suffers a major illness be allowed to qualify for benefits if the expense of his illness would reduce his income for the year below the maximum provided. Another recommended amendment to Kerr-Mills is that free choice of hospital and doctor be specifically guaranteed.

Government spokesmen, however, are less optimistic over the ability of Kerr-Mills to meet the needs of older citizens who become medical indigents.

In "Performance of the States: A Report to the Special Committee on Aging" (U.S. Senate), issued June 15, 1962 Chairman Pat McNamara, Senator from Michigan pointed out that an analysis of 18 month's experience with Kerr-Mills "shows quite conclusively that measured against anticipated results, Kerr-Mills has fallen considerably short of the goals set by its more optimistic proponents." (An HEW Bureau of Family Services report,[1] issued January 15, 1963, disclosed the following statistics for 26 States and territories participating in the medical assistance for the aged program: Applications received, 23,640; applications disposed of, 22,309; applications pending at end of month, 21,920. Cases authorized during month, 13,061; and cases continued to next month, 181,145.)

(On January 31, 1963 Jay B. Constantine, research director for the Special Committee on Aging assured Hospital Progress that the evaluative statements contained in "Performance of the States" are not dated by any means. They are equally, if not more, applicable today.)

In the report, Senator McNamara declared: "This situation arises not through any lack of good faith or good intentions, but because of the weakness inherent in this legislative approach which prevents it from being a significant weapon in meeting the medical requirements of America's elderly.

"It was the intent of Congress," the report continues, "that the Medical Assistance for the Aged program would result in providing the broad medical services to many aged needing such help but ineligible or unwilling to apply for relief.

"Achievement of such a goal would require that all States establish a medical assistance for the aged program which would include a comprehensive range of medical services consistent with the needs created by the chronic health conditions faced by the aged with eligibility requirements determined on the basis of their medical costs, income and health conditions, and with its benefits made available without humilitating or degrading our older people."

STATE PROGRAMS

As of February 4, 1963, the Bureau of Family Services of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare reported 28 States and territories had operative programs in effect (and approved by the Department): Alabama, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Guam, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Hampshire, New York, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Puerto Rico, South Carolina, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, Virgin Islands, Washington, and West Virignia.

New Jersey passed enabling legislation on January 7, 1963, which it hopes to put into effect by July 1963.

Ohio has a law pending in the legislature.

Four States have enacted legislation as follows: Georgia (1961) no funds available; Iowa (1961) no appropriation; New Mexico, plan withdrawn, no appropriation, and Virginia (1962) appropriation effective January 1, 1964.

One area of discontent in the implementation of the law is the means test, which the special committee report describes as "a basic requirement for eligibility under the public assistance relief approach. After a lifetime of independence and thrift, submission to the humiliation of the test of need is a painful experience for an aged person to accept—particularly when he is under the emotion and stress that accompany serious illness."

According to the report, at least 15 States utilize more inflexible tests of financial eligibility under medical assistance for the aged than they do under old-age assistance. The report points out, for example, "an elderly individual with an income of $1,500 whose anticipated needs amount to $2,000 might be considered for medical care under the relief program. In the same State, however, the individual would automatically be 'cut off' from medical assistance for the aged assistance regardless of his needs."

Dr. C. H. Peters, councilor of the Sixth District Medical Society, in a speech before the AMA (published in the Congressional Record, Apr. 11, 1962) declared "The AMA survey shows that in many States, medical assistance for the aged is being considered as 'just another welfare program,' an old-age assistance medical care program for a slightly higher income level. The applicant must go through the same routines, the same type of tests, the same type of investigations, and he receives his care through the same channels as the old-age assistance recipient. Too stringent a means test can force the applicants to pauperize themselves past the chance of recovery before they can obtain aid. Rigid administration methods developed to deal with the long-term needy can discourage applications for help. Lack of differentiation between the totally needy and the medically needy, and the way care is provided, can be so humiliating that many will not apply except as a course of desperation, and again be unable to regain independence once the medical crisis has passed."

In several States, revision of the means test is high on the list of changes being sought in State laws implementing Kerr-Mills.

Another source of discontent is the uneven and inequitable distribution of Federal funds among the States. The wealthiest States are receiving the lion's share of the Federal funds for the program, although each State fixes responsibility on varying sources.

The special committee report explains that "the payment of Federal funds to any State depends upon whether the State has a program and how extensive the program is. With the open-ended formula for Federal matching in the medical assistance for the aged program, the wealthier States most able to raise funds for their own share of a comprehensive program are able to secure the greater amounts in Federal matching funds."

As of June 1962 (and there is no indication that the situation has changed) almost 90 percent of all medical assistance for the aged expenditures were made in four States: California, New York, Massachusetts, and Michigan. Altogether these four States have an aged population of perhaps 25 percent of the U.S. total—and in spite of the fact that only 10 percent of the aged live in New York State, a report by the State of New York in April 1962, indicated that 54 percent of the total medical assistance for the aged funds spent throughout the United States in a 10-month period were expended for services in New York State. The Federal share comes from the general revenue to which all States, including those which cannot afford Kerr-Mills, contribute.

FIVE MAJOR RECIPIENTS

The Bureau of Family Services report for November 1962 revealed that of the total $22,712,711 paid for recipients that month in the United States, those four States, plus Pennsylvania, accounted for $19,564,889. (New York, $6,935,036; California, $5,479,972; Massachusetts, $3,911,009; Michigan, $1,891,903; and Pennsylvania, $1,326,969.)

The Tax Foundation has estimated that the 12 States with the lowest per capita incomes contribute slightly more than 10 percent of the total Federal taxes. In March 1962 the total Federal return in medical assistance for the aged matching funds to those of the 12 States that participate in medical assistance for the aged amounted to some 6½ percent of the total medical assistance for the aged grants. Thus, Mississippi, which contributes one-half of 1 percent of Federal taxes, received no money in March 1962; while New York, which pays 13 percent, received more than 45 percent of the total.

When the Kerr-Mills Act was under consideration, it was felt that all States would eventually implement the medical assistance for the aged to cover with comprehensive care some 10 million aged persons. As the late Senator Robert Kerr, of Oklahoma, coauthor, expressed it in the Committee on Finance report at that time:

SENATOR KERR'S STATEMENT

"I understand that there are 16 million people in the country over 65. On the old-age assistance rolls are 2,400,000 and under that part of the bill would be immediately eligible for this program. That leaves 13,600,000. The Finance Committee estimated that about 10 million of these might be in a position of needing medical care which they could not provide. This bill sets up a program to provide medical care for those who need it."

Later, the Senator told physicians that it was up to them to make the law workable. Speaking before the fifth Medical Progress Assembly in Birmingham, Ala., September 30, 1962, he urged doctors to find out how the Kerr-Mills was operating in their own States and to make their views known to State legislators and Congressmen. He said that inadequate implementation "gives ammunition" to those who favor financing health care of the aged over 65 through social security.

"You've got as much right to be represented in Congress as other guys," he declared, and suggested that physicians turn on their best bedside dispositions to win friends among legislators.

Referring to proposals for proving medical care for the aged under social security, Senator Kerr told the doctors: "You can't beat something with nothing and you can be sure the problem won't go away by ignoring it," as he pointed out that there are now 17 million persons over age 65 and "this will grow into 25 million within the lifetime of many present in this room."

In its enthusiasm for the Kerr-Mills law, the AMA has stated that: "Its benefits are unlimited;" and indeed, ideally and theoretically, it could be because of the open-ended matching offer of the Federal Government. As of June 1962, however, only three, Hawaii, Massachusetts, and North Dakota had plans classified as "comprehensive" by HEW's Bureau of Family Services. According to the Bureau, comprehensive plans are those which include all five areas of service without significant limitations on illnesses and the amount of care given: (1) Hospital care; (2) physicians' services; (3) nursing home care; (4) prescribed drugs; and (5) dental care.

MEDICAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE AGED ACTIVITIES OF THE 54 JURISDICTIONS[2]

Programs in effect (28 States and territories): Alabama, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Guam, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Hampshire, New York, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Puerto Rico, South Carolina, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, Virgin Islands, Washington, West Virginia.

Need legislation (21 States and District of Columbia): Alaska, Arizona, Colorado, Delaware,[3] District of Columbia, Florida, Indiana, Kansas, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, North

---

[1] The report generally includes data for November 1962. Complete data for Pennsylvania and Washington was not available. Connecticut data is for October, and Guam data is for September.

[2] From a report of the Department of HEW, Bureau of Family Services, for the period from Nov. 9 to Dec. 31, 1962.

[3] Does not have in operation vendor payment for medical care in old age asistance; legislation was enacted in 1962.

Carolina, Ohio, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Texas, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

Programs not yet implemented: Georgia (enacted in 1961, no funds available); Iowa (enacted in 1961, no appropriation); New Jersey (enacted in 1963; effective July 1, 1963); New Mexico (plan withdrawn, no appropriation); Virginia (enacted in 1962, effective January 1, 1964).

A survey of the States which now have medical assistance for the aged laws indicates that many changes and revisions are being made in an attempt to make the law workable, while other States are offering "Medical care only" additions to their old age assistance legislation.

Whatever criteria is used in judging the value of the law, both proponents and opponents agree that the use of the law is limited, and increasingly, the State medical societies and welfare officials are working together to implement current legislation and to introduce more effective legislation. In some States, representatives of the State medical societies and public welfare officials have appeared before legislative hearings to request the same improvements of State laws to implement Kerr-Mills. Virtually all of the Federal Government agencies, State welfare departments and medical societies and other informants were most cooperative in answer to queries by Hospital Progress early this year.

WHAT'S HOLDING UP KERR-MILLS?

(By Michael Crothers)

"Give it time; it will work."

Almost from the day it was enacted, that's been the rallying cry for Kerr-Mills—the Federal act that lets States set up their own programs of medical care for the aged, with Uncle Sam footing from 50 to 80 percent of the cost.

When President Eisenhower signed the bill 2 years ago, most U.S. doctors probably viewed it as medicine's alternative to social security-financed care for the aged. Yet now, even stanch supporters of Kerr-Mills concede that so far the legislation hasn't been anywhere near as effective as they'd hoped. And some critics of the act are charging that no State-operated plan for health care of the aged will ever work.

How—in fact—is Kerr-Mills working today? Medical Economics recently put the question to medical leaders, Federal and State officials, and others across the country who are concerned with medical care for the aged. Their answers are reflected in this article.

First, let's focus for a moment on the Kerr-Mills act itself. Remember, it's really two care-for-the-aged plans. One plan extends the existing old-age assistance law to provide more Federal money for medical care services to persons eligible for relief under State old age assistance programs. The other plan—medical assistance for the aged—is an entirely new program. It's meant to provide benefits for those elderly who aren't on relief, yet who can't afford needed health care.

Now let's narrow our focus to medical assistance for the aged alone. Since it's designed to provide care for those aged who weren't eligible before, it's the key to Kerr-Mills' effectiveness in warding off social security-paid medicine. And the key is a different shape in almost every State. Some State medical assistance for the aged programs offer shallow, minimal benefits; others provide comprehensive care; still others stress protection against major illnesses only.

The way medical assistance for the aged programs differ from State to State helps to explain why opinions differ about Kerr-Mills' overall effectiveness. Still, no one is completely satisfied as the plan enters its third year. Here's why:

Medical assistance for the aged has been adopted by hardly more than half the States. Twenty-six States have working medical assistance for the aged programs. Thirteen other States and the District of Columbia are using Kerr-Mills funds for medical care only to people eligible for old-age assistance. Of those States, Iowa and Mississippi have passed medical assistance for the aged enabling legislation but haven't appropriated funds to get the plan going; Virginia has authorized a medical assistance for the aged program to take effect in 1964; and New Mexico has the legislative authority to implement medical assistance for the aged, but withdrew its program, because it lacked funds. The 11 remaining States haven't handed out a penny of Kerr-Mills aid.

In only a few States has medical assistance for the aged helped a significant number of people. During February of this year, for instance, $16 million in benefits was paid to more than 78,000 medical assistance for the aged recipients. But four States—California, Massachusetts, Michigan, and New York—accounted for more than 90 percent of those benefits on behalf of more than 70 percent of all medical assistance for the aged recipients. By contrast, New Hampshire's minuscule plan spent only $1,265 on 17 recipients.

Even in those States with big medical assistance for the aged programs, utilization isn't fully developed. Many recipients of medical assistance for the aged benefits would have been eligible for medical care through other public assistance programs. The wording of the Kerr-Mills Act makes it possible—and profitable—for some States to switch persons eligible for medical aid under expanded old-age assistance to the new medical assistance for the aged plan. A staff report to the Senate's Special Committee on Aging (the McNamara committee) points out that "many of the new cases now being listed as medical assistance for the aged beneficiaries would undoubtedly have received care under old-age assistance had Kerr-Mills not been enacted."

In Massachusetts according to a tax foundation report, nearly all the 15,000 medical assistance for the aged recipients in 1961 were transfers from old-age assistance. California, which just started its booming medical assistance for the aged program the first of this year, found that four-fifths of its first month's applications came from old age assistance recipients.

Backers of social security-financed medicine for the aged insist that medical assistance for the aged's spotty record of utilization proves that most States haven't the money or inclination to make Kerr-Mills work. And, they add, it would cost the Federal Government too much money to make it work. In early spring, ABRAHAM RIBICOFF added up the statistical score against medical assistance for the aged and sent it off to Congress with this predictable conclusion: "Existing public-assistance legislation alone would not only fail to cover many aged people in need but would also be very costly in general revenues."

Shortly afterward Congressman BURR P. HARRISON, Democrat, of Virginia, a member of the House Ways and Means Committee who originally voted for Kerr-Mills, announced a change of mind. His own studies had convinced him that medical assistance for the aged is "a bottomless pit, the most extravagant and expensive thing this Government ever undertook short of war."

Such fears that Kerr-Mills will bankrupt the Nation are based on the fact that medical assistance for the aged is funded out of a Federal open-end budget. The law sets no limit to the amount States may spend on their programs, and the Government guarantees that it will spend at least that much more. Yet the record indicates that this particular fear of national bankruptcy is pretty far removed from reality. Here's the reason:

The McNamara committee reckoned last year that the ultimate cost of nationwide medical assistance for the aged would be in the neighborhood of $800 million annually, and that the 1-year cost of the 20 state programs then operating would be $330 million. Former HEW Secretary Ribicoff's projection of medical assistance for the aged expenditures for the fiscal year ending this past June 30 was $215 million. Yet, actual expenditures for the first 8 months of that period were under $110 million.

Thus, while medical assistance for the aged's opponents cry that the program is going to cost too much, its supporters wonder why it's not costing more—and doing a bigger job.

To find out why it's not, Medical Economics interviewed the men charged with medical assistance for the aged administration—the welfare commissioners—in those States where medical assistance for the aged seems to drag.

"We probably have one of the outstanding medical assistance for the aged programs in the Nation," says Carlyle D. Onsrud, executive director of the North Dakota State Welfare Board. (The U.S. Bureau of Public Assistance agrees, rating North Dakota's plan second to none in comprehensiveness and medical content.) Then why is North Dakota spending only $140,000 a month on a program that's budgeted to cost over $5 million a year? Onsrud explains:

"When we budgeted the program, we didn't know how many people would apply for aid. We had no income data on the aged in North Dakota. Nor did we know how much medical care they regularly require. And since we have a closed-end budget and our legislature meets only every 2 years, we asked for more than ample funds."

Right now, medical assistance for the aged is saving the State a lot of money. For years North Dakota has paid "medical only" benefits under old-age assistance largely with State funds. Now, persons who would have qualified under old-age assistance are being switched to the medical assistance for the aged program, since the State gets a bigger percentage of Federal money for medical assistance for the aged.

"Good or not, that's the natural pattern of funding," Onsrud explains. "Remember that a State administrator has to use all the Federal funds available; he'd never be forgiven for using State and county money when he didn't have to." At the same time, he concedes that this kind of funding is distorting an otherwise excellent Kerr-Mills program by excluding all but the very poor.

One State that came in cold is Kentucky. "With no reliable statistics of our own on the number of aged in the State, we got some figures out of Washington," recalls Aaron Paul, director of Kentucky's Division of Public Assistance. "We were supposed to have 82,000 persons eligible for Kerr-Mills aid. Simple arithmetic showed that the $1 million a year we had to spend on the program wouldn't go far when spread among that many people." (Kentucky, like North Dakota, has a closed-end budget and a 2-year interval between meetings of its legislature.)

So the State scaled medical assistance for the aged benefits way down and set family income limits for eligibility at $1,800. Even so, public assistance officials frankly expected the appropriation to be nibbled down to zero long before the first year of operation ended. But after 9 months, they were shaking their heads, wondering why only 2 percent of their medical assistance for the aged money had been spent.

A partial explanation is that Kentucky's old-age assistance recipients aren't being transferred to medical assistance for the aged—as they are in other States. That's because Kentucky's old-age assistance program covers nursing-home care, whereas its medical assistance for the aged program doesn't. Then, too, there's not much difference between the income limits of the two programs. Actually, the State would gain nothing by encouraging old-age assistance recipients to switch.

Another State where response to medical assistance for the aged apparently has lagged is Illinois. The State has nearly 1 million aged. Yet only 3,259 applications were screened for medical assistance for the aged from August 1961—when the program was put into effect—through March of this year. And less than two-thirds of those applications were finally OK'd. Zane Polemis, who handles the program analysis for the State's public aid commission, explains why there are so few recipients in such a populous State:

"We're dealing mainly with cases of truly catastrophic illness. Most of our cases involve long-term care. We provide hospitalization without restrictions on the duration of stay and doctors' services for 30 days following hospitalization. But that's about all we provide. Our program also requires that the patient applying for aid show that he's already paid 10 percent of his income toward medical bills. That deductible feature filters out all but the most serious cases."

Illinois' income limits for medical assistance for the aged eligibility are relatively high—$1,800 for a single person, $2,400 for a couple, plus $600 for each dependent living in. Yet, because the program's benefits are primarily geared for major illnesses, relatively few oldsters have applied, and Illinois' $20 million medical assistance for the aged budget has hardly been dented. The State law permits an expansion of benefits at any time, but those in charge of the program are reluctant to let costs get out of hand.

"Nevertheless," says Polemis, "we believe we're applying medical assistance for the aged in the spirit in which it was intended: to provide care for people who really need it and have no way of getting it without first pauperizing themselves. Why, in some instances, we're paying as much as $4,000 for a single case."

The variety of shapes that medical assistance for the aged comes in would seem to indicate that Kerr-Mills has been tailored to meet the needs of individual States. But that's not how those States without a working medical assistance for the aged program view the matter. For example, although the Kerr-Mills Act requires that medical assistance for the aged must be administered by a State welfare agency, the program departs sharply from traditional welfare ideas. That's why it's bucking stiff resistance in States that readily adopted the Kerr-Mills provision for medical payments through old-age assistance.

Indiana scrapped a proposal to implement medical assistance for the aged primarily because, according to Welfare Administrator Albert Kelly, the State "was reluctant to create a double standard in public aid." For one thing, medical assistance for the aged stipulates that its records be held in confidence by the administering agency; for another, it prohibits a lien being slapped on a recipient's property. (The Kerr-Mills "no lien" stipulation doesn't necessarily protest a medical assistance for the aged recipient's estate. Ten States reserve the right to make a claim for past benefits against his estate after his death—which, in effect, is what States with old-age assistance lien laws do.)

Other States fundamentally in favor of medical assistance for the aged are plagued by special circumstances. Florida, for instance, must face an influx of elderly vacationers each winter. At its last meeting, the Florida Legislature decided to put off the medical assistance for the aged portion of Kerr-Mills until the law permits States to set up length-of-residency requirements. New Jersey has three separate medical assistance for the aged bills before its legislature, but none of them will pass until the State and counties come to terms on how to split up the non-Federal share of expenditures.

Meanwhile, those few States without any Kerr-Mills action pending are sitting on the sidelines to see what happens. At one end of the bench sits Rhode Island, convinced that social security funding is the only way out of its aid-for-the-aged difficulties. At the other end are traditionally conservative States—such as Arizona—that dislike accepting Federal aid of any kind.

Doctors aren't likely to witness any dramatic upsurge in medical assistance for the aged utilization this year or next, though there'll probably be slow, groping gains. For after 2 years, Kerr-Mills is still experimental. The inhibiting factor seems to be more a lack of confidence than a lack of money.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I commend the Senator from Michigan for the critical attitude he has taken on the rather distorted statement of the American Medical Association with respect to health care for the elderly generally, and the Kerr-Mills Act in particular.

In Pennsylvania the Kerr-Mills Act has been an unqualified failure. It is perfectly clear it is never going to meet the health needs of our senior citizens.

I noticed—and incidentally, I wonder if the Senator from Michigan saw it—a statement on the part of the leaders of the AMA in the last few days stating that the reason why the President's health care bill for the elderly was not brought forward was that it did not have the votes.

Does the Senator from Michigan share my view that if we can ever get the bill to the floor of the Senate, it can be passed by this body, and that we will pass it before the 88th Congress adjourns?

Mr. McNAMARA. First, I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for his complimentary remarks.

The problem is not in the Senate, as he well knows, because he has been active in the campaign to provide relief in this much-needed area. The problem is in the other body. If the bill can be brought out of committee in the other body, I have every reason to believe, as does the Senator from Pennsylvania, that it can be passed at this session of Congress.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan further yield?

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. For the last 4 years, the Senator from Michigan has been the able and distinguished chairman of the Special Committee on Aging. By reason of the inexorable workings of the Senate seniority system, he has now become chairman of the Committee on Public Works, and hence has resigned his position as chairman of the Special Committee on Aging. Another Senator has taken over, who does not share the enthusiasm of the Senator from Michigan and myself for health care for the elderly under social security.

I should like to state publicly, for the Record, that I shall remain on that committee so long as it is necessary to see to it that the views of the majority of the committee, who I am confident support the President of the United States, are given adequate representation in the committee, and that further investigation may go forward across the country during the next year or two to assure that the needs of our senior citizens for health care under social security may eventually be given adequate recognition by Congress.

I ask the Senator from Michigan, who I hope will remain on that committee, whether he will not join me in this endeavor.

Mr. McNAMARA. Of course I expect to remain on the committee. I hope to continue to play a role to the degree I am able to in the work of the committee. I am not too pessimistic about the prospects of future action by the committee. I am sure that, like the Senator from Pennsylvania, the other members of the committee are truly dedicated to this work and that they will continue their efforts.

I think there has been expressed in the press and in other places undue alarm and concern about the change in committee personnel. Actually, the membership of the committee is predominantly the same as it was before.

Mr. CLARK. The committee has an excellent staff, and I hope they will continue to work with the committee and do the outstanding work they have been doing.

SABOTAGE OF POLICIES OF KENNEDY ADMINISTRATION

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I desire to speak about what seems to me to be increasing evidence of sabotage of the policies of the Kennedy administration at intermediate and perhaps lower echelons of the administrative structure. I think there has been a pattern of incidents or events intended to discredit individuals within the Kennedy administration who are carrying out faithfully and well the policies of that administration, and also to discredit, by way of leaks from anonymous sources, leaks from faceless men, statements of fact which are going to the President from his top level advisers.

Hanson W. Baldwin is an able and veteran reporter on the New York Times. He is a graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis. Such is his ability that, I am confident, had he chosen to remain in the Navy, he would now be a deep blue sea admiral. But he did not do so. Instead, he has become one of the leading military and naval analysts in the newspaper world today. Of course, he has kept the friendships he made at Annapolis, in the Naval Academy, and I am sure he has added a great many more, for he is a likable and congenial gentleman who makes friends easily.

Mr. Baldwin has never been known as a strong defender of diplomatic as opposed to military action to solve outstanding problems confronting this country in its foreign relations. I certainly would not accuse him of being what Walter Lippmann calls a "war whooper." He is not that. But I will say that he seems to take a special delight in pointing out areas where the United States should perhaps be considering military action.

I note that in the New York Times, of April 20, earlier this week, Mr. Baldwin's byline is over an article entitled "Soviet Strength In Cuba Put High—Some Experts Believe Count May Be 30,000 to 40,000."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Baldwin's article may be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOVIET STRENGTH IN CUBA PUT HIGH—SOME EXPERTS BELIEVE COUNT MAY BE 30,000 TO 40,000

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

A recent reassessment of Soviet forces in Cuba has convinced some intelligence experts that there may be 30,000 to 40,000 Russian military personnel on the island.

Many experts believe the number has not actually changed greatly since last fall; the upward revision of past figures stems from a close study of all available intelligence facts. The experts believe, too, that the Russians are rotating troops to Cuba, not withdrawing them.

These interpretations provide the background for the recent assertion by Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, New York Republican, that Russian strength in Cuba, despite withdrawals announced by the President, was still about 17,000 men.

At a news conference, April 3, the President estimated that 4,000 Soviet troops had been withdrawn in recent weeks. He did not estimate the number that remained, but left the impression that about 13,000 were still there.

CAPITAL'S OPINIONS VARY

There is no consensus in Washington about how many Soviet troops are in Cuba. In fact, some of the highest Government officials and many intelligence officers admit that they do not know how many are on the island.

It is far easier to estimate tonnages of equipment and numbers of guns than numbers of personnel. Last fall, emphasis in the intelligence community was fixed on the Soviet medium-range missiles in Cuba and there was a tendency, until after the crisis had passed, to neglect the details of the ground forces and of conventional equipment.

Moreover, it has been possible to estimate approximately the numbers of Soviet troops withdrawn from the island in recent weeks, but not how many have been brought in.

Many officials are convinced that the total number has not changed greatly and that the Russians are replacing the troops they have withdrawn in a rotation plan similar to those the United States uses for its oversea units.

SOVIET UNITS LISTED

Details are lacking on what some Pentagon officials now call the "Soviet expeditionary force" in Cuba. But some experts believe the Russians are maintaining the equivalent of a heavily reinforced motorized rifle division. Such a division normally numbers about 13,000 men.

The four principal tactical ground units, identified in the past as battalion-size units, are still on the island and have made no attempt to conceal their identity.

Other units of field artillery, antiaircraft, infantry, and so on, are said to be somewhat harder to pinpoint, and a large number of the Russian forces are crews for the antiaircraft and coast defense missiles and provide communications, maintenance, and specialist services for their own and Cuban forces. An unknown number wear civilian clothes and blend into the population.

Though many intelligence experts and some Government officials say they do not know how many Russian troops are in Cuba, one said he would bet a year's pay that the number was closer to 30,000 than to 17,000, and a month's pay that it was closer to 40,000 than to 17,000.

There appears to be a consensus that no major reduction in Soviet strength has taken place and that the Russians are rotating troops, rather than withdrawing them.

The purposes of the continued presence of so large a Soviet force in Cuba could be multiple.

VARIOUS FUNCTIONS SERVED

It was undoubtedly intended originally to provide protection for the long-range missiles that Premier Khrushchev attempted to install there last fall, which have now—in the opinion of most intelligence experts—been withdrawn. Since the withdrawal of all or part of these missiles, the troops appear to have a number of functions:

To help protect the island against any invasion by the United States or by exile forces aided by the United States.

To perpetuate Premier Fidel Castro's rule and to secure the Communist government there against internal revolt.

To train Cuban forces and other Communist Latin-American cadres.

To provide small infiltration and subversion units capable of exporting armed communism to other areas of the Western Hemisphere.

To maintain a base of Soviet Communist military power in the Western Hemisphere for psychological and political purposes and as a bargaining gambit in the world conflict.

Some experts believe the President may not have known of the revised estimates of some intelligence experts when he implied a few weeks ago that Soviet troop strength in Cuba had been reduced to 13,000.

Some observers have been concerned that official intelligence estimates that have reached some of the highest officials during and since the Cuban crisis may have been shaped—perhaps unconsciously—to conform with policy rather than evaluating the Russian capabilities boldly.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, readers of the RECORD will note that Mr. Baldwin avers:

> A recent reassessment of Soviet forces in Cuba has convinced some intelligence experts—

Not naming them, not giving the slightest indication at what level of government they exist—

> that there may be 30,000 to 40,000 Russian military personnel on the island.

That is the lead paragraph. The article continues:

> Many experts believe the number has not actually changed greatly since last fall—

Who are those "many experts," one might ask? No indication whatever is given. The article continues:

> the upward revision of past figures stems from a close study of all available intelligence facts. The experts believe, too—

And note, now that the phrase has now become "the experts"; not "some experts," not "many experts," but "the experts"—

> that the Russians are rotating troops to Cuba, not withdrawing them.

Mr. Baldwin goes even higher up, as the article proceeds. He states:

> Some of the highest Government officials and many intelligence officers admit that they do not know how many are on the island.

Who are those "highest Government officials"? Needless to say, their names are not given. I wonder why their names are not given. I wonder if it is because Mr. McNamara, our first-class, splendid Secretary of Defense, has recently issued a rule that any member of the Department of Defense who talks with a reporter should make a written record of that fact, so that it can be told where the anonymous, faceless leaks, which do so much damage to the policy of the administration and, indeed, to our country, are coming from. The article also states:

> Some experts believe the President may not have known of the revised estimates of some intelligence experts when he implied a few weeks ago that Soviet troop strength in Cuba had been reduced to 13,000.
>
> Some observers have been concerned that official intelligence estimates that have reached some of the highest officials during and since the Cuban crisis may have been shaped—perhaps unconsciously—to conform with policy rather than evaluating the Russian capabilities baldly.

Mr. President, I suggest that the persons who furnished Mr. Baldwin with that information—if they did—and I assume they did, because Mr. Baldwin is a truthful, honorable gentleman—were sabotaging the Kennedy administration. They should be sought out, identified, and disciplined.

Let me reiterate that I have no criticism at all of Mr. Baldwin himself.

Obviously it is his right, under the Constitution and the right of free speech, to have published any article which contains anything which anyone told him, and also to have printed any article which he dreams up himself, if in his own conscience and judgment he believes what he includes in the article to be true.

I do not criticize Mr. Baldwin at all; but I do criticize those who were sabotaging their own Government by making reckless and unsupportable statements which were given the aura of truth when they appeared in an influential newspaper, such as the New York Times.

Mr. President, I make this rather strong charge because of an excerpt from the President's press conference of April 24, as reported on Thursday of this week in the New York Times. It reads as follows:

> Question. Mr. President?
>
> Answer. Yes.
>
> Question. Senator [KENNETH B.] KEATING says that according to his information there's been no reduction in the number of Russian troops in Cuba. He said several thousand have left, several thousand have arrived there with no change in the overall number since November. Would you care to comment?
>
> Answer. Yes. I've already said that the best information we have from the intelligence community—and I rely upon the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency as chairman of the intergovernmental intelligence community for the information which I have given publicly. And we attempt to ask any Congressman or Senator who has information to the contrary for his sources so they can be evaluated.
>
> I've stated that our information was that—I think the last time we met that 4,000, we

> thought, left in March and that no substantial number had come in this winter. There is some evidence that some have left in April, but not a large number.
>
> Now, of course, the equipment itself seems to still be there, however, so that I would think there's been some reduction this winter in the number of Russian personnel on the island.
>
> There has not been a substantial reduction in the equipment. There has been no evidence, however, of any substantial introduction.
>
> It's not, in my opinion, a grave question as to whether there's 17,000, 15,000, 13,000. There are still important elements still on the island and there's still Soviet equipment on the island. So I don't think that Senator KEATING and I are debating a serious question unless there's a challenge on one side or the other of good faith, and I'm sure there isn't.
>
> It's our best information that 4,000 or 5,000 have left since January and that there has not been an equal number come in. In fact, much, much less—300 or 400 at the most.
>
> That's our best evidence, and I repeat it as it's been gathered by our intelligence sources.

Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that the President was asked for his views about charges, which had been made, that the overall number of Russian troops had not been reduced since November. Let us note carefully that he was asked whether the overall number had been reduced; he was not asked, as Mr. Baldwin suggested, whether the overall number had been built up to 30,000 or 40,000.

The President said—and I believe him, and I hope all other Senators believe him:

> Yes, I've already said that the best information we have from the intelligence community—and I rely upon the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency—

Who is John McCone—

> as chairman of the intergovernmental intelligence community for the information which I have given publicly. And we attempt to ask any Congressman or Senator who has information to the contrary for his sources so they can be evaluated.

I think that is an entirely reasonable request; and I hope the sources will be relayed to the President, so that those who make the statements can be questioned, and so that accurate determination can be made as to whether the basis of their information is higher and better than the information which Mr. McCone is providing the President.

The President, in continuing, said that at an earlier press conference he had indicated that he thought 4,000 Russians had left Cuba in March "and that no substantial number had come in this winter. There is some evidence that some have left in April, but not a large number. It's our best information that 4,000 or 5,000 have left since January and that there has not been an equal number come in. In fact, much, much less—300 or 400 at the most. That's our best evidence, and I repeat it as it's been gathered by our intelligence sources."

Mr. President, I hope that during the coming months there will be a cessation of such sabotage of both the information and the policies of the Kennedy administration.

There have been a number of other incidents, going back to the early days of this year, when the position of Adlai Stevenson with respect to the Cuba crisis of last fall was viciously distorted in the press, and statements, not at all in accord with the facts, were made. A number of other incidents of the same sort have occurred; and all of them have had the result—whether intended to do so or not—of discrediting the policies of the Kennedy administration.

I repeat that such reporting without a careful check on the sources of the information is within the law. I have no sympathy with it; but it is within the laws and customs of the country. It has been a well-known method of reporting ever since the days of George Washington, who was extremely vexed and harassed by the unjust and unfair criticisms which he received from the press of Philadelphia while he was President of the United States.

I hope some way can be found to curb such internal sabotage, so that the administration, without violating in anyway the Bill of Rights or the freedom of speech for the freedom of the press, will be able to find means to discipline persons who are disloyal to their superiors.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TUESDAY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate adjourn until 11 o'clock a.m. Tuesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Tuesday, April 30, 1963, at 11 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate April 26, 1963:

JUVENILE COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Orman W. Ketcham, of Maryland, to be associate judge of the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia for the term of 10 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires May 5, 1963.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 26, 1963:

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Alfred C. Dumouchel, of Rhode Island, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 5, with headquarters at Providence, R.I.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Frank E. Smith, of Mississippi, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority for the term expiring May 18, 1972.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

West Virginia Centennial 1963 Highlights Achievements and Future as Mountain State Hosts Tourists in Record Numbers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 26, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, 1963 marks the 100th anniversary of the admission of West Virginia as a State of the Union. In commemoration of this historic event citizens of the Mountain State are enthusiastically supporting plans and programs for memorable centennial observances designed to illustrate not only our rich heritage, but also rededication to a new 100 years of achievement and growth.

In his open letter of centennial welcome to the public, Gov. William Wallace Barron observes that—

> West Virginia has launched an intensive economic development program which has already seen a major cleanup and facelifting program carried out statewide; unemployment ranks substantially reduced; an unprecedented highway construction program implemented; and major new tourist and industrial development measures instituted. Thousands of our citizens have been retrained to give them the skills and capabilities required to attain the better life for themselves and their families. Tourists and new industries are coming into West Virginia in record numbers and our existing plants are expanding at an unparalleled rate.

Section 11 of the April 21 issue of the New York Times, was composed of colorful and well-written advertisements informing readers of the beauties, resources, and capabilities of West Virginia, and advising them of the meaningful activities which are to be held shortly in connection with our centennial year celebration.

Responsible for the compilation and publication of this attractive pictorial magazine was the West Virginia Department of Commerce, created in 1961 by the State legislature. This purposeful group, headed by the respected and energetic business leader, Hulett C. Smith, acts as a well-rounded, frontline economic task force to spearhead the drive for new industry, more tourists, increased business activity and community development.

In conjunction with the Department's seven-man advisory board, composed of keen-minded businessmen and industrialists from all sections of the State, policy and operating procedures were established for this economic development unit composed of three divisions.

> 1. Planning and research, which serves as the State planning agency, working with local groups in the field of community development by providing counsel and coordination for such activities.
>
> 2. Industrial development, which, with its trained, professional staff of industrial and

> financial specialists, works with out-of-State industrialists to fill their requirements as to location and financing and assists existing State firms to expand and prosper.
>
> 3. Travel development, which works in all fields of activity concerned with developing the tourist trade, attractions, facilities, and accomodations.

But this was only the beginning in the wide range of activities the Department of Commerce was to undertake, and the efforts of our citizenry have been an added and powerful force.

An indication of West Virginia's determination to continue this pattern of civic interest is found in the strong emphasis which is being placed on education. The informative material carried in the Times is quoted as stating that—

> The recent history of higher education in West Virginia is descriptive of dramatic progress, encouraging stability, and wise planning for the future.
>
> The educational accomplishments of the State can be regarded as the response to the challenge of historical hardships—of frontier isolation, of uncoordinated efforts, of poor financial resources. But the urge to educate was there from the beginning.
>
> Men such as Edmund Randolph, Patrick Henry, and Ebenezer Zane were planning academies for the western counties of Virginia as early as 1787. These institutions, drawn from the loins of the mountains, hewed from virgin timber, performed some of the functions of a junior college and graduated men prominent in law, surveying, the ministry, and politics.
>
> Colleges in the modern sense date back to 1839. The number that flourished and declined during the past century does not reflect lack of interest but rather the adverse effects of economic hardships. If anything, the abandoned buildings were a tribute to the daring sacrifices of people who highly valued a college education.
>
> Impressively surviving the Spartan process of elimination in West Virginia are 20 vigorous, modern collegiate institutions, including three junior colleges and two State universities, with a median age of 75 years. They offer all the more common curriculum on the undergraduate and graduate levels, including law and medicine, and present some unique and highly successful studies on the undergraduate plane.
>
> Rivalry, always a spur to greater effort, is wisely tempered to common purposes by West Virginia's three college associations: one for the seven 4-year private colleges representing six leading religious affiliations; one for the State-supported institutions, and a third for all—the West Virginia Association of College and University Presidents.
>
> The latter is currently coordinated by means of a unified project backed financially by the Claude Worthington Benedum Foundation. It is the only group in the country in which the privately financed and publicly supported colleges of a State are working together in a cooperative program.
>
> Through research and discussion of mutual interests, problems are defined, solutions proposed, and the public is made aware of the fine opportunities for higher education within the State.

Among the leading industries in the Mountain State is the production of glass and glass products. More than 70 factories make West Virginia one of the Nation's leading manufacturers of glass. Included are such impressive names as Blenko, Fostoria, Corning, Rainbow, Johns-Manville Fibre Glass, Libbey-Owens-Ford, Pittsburgh Plate Glass and Fenton Art Glass Co., along with the Vitro Agate Co., world's leading manufacturer of marbles, and the Morgantown Glassware Guild whose glassware, Mrs. John F. Kennedy has announced, graces the White House tables.

Popular tours are conducted through the glass plants where the visitor can enjoy a first-hand look at glass as it is crafted by hand using basic methods unchanged through centuries. Such an inspection is an educational and recreational experience.

And, the production of bituminous coal has long been an extremely important factor in the economic well-being of West Virginia. Ranked as the Nation's No. 1 producer of this widely used fuel, the Mountain State has felt the squeeze of unemployment resulting from the introduction of methods of automation in coal mining. However, rich deposits of this widely used mineral will continue to provide a source of power for eastern markets and commercial support for industrial growth in West Virginia.

The following excerpt from the April 21 issue of the Times clearly illustrates the importance of coal in West Virginia:

> West Virginia's economy is quite literally built on bituminous coal, which underlies all but 7 of her 55 counties. Coal production is the State's leading industry and on the ready and economical availability of this fuel a good portion of the Mountain State's industry is based.
>
> West Virginia is the Nation's No. 1 coal producer, with an output of 113 million tons in 1961. Based on an average price of $4.94 per ton at the mine, this meant that West Virginia's coal production pumped nearly $660 million into the State's economy.
>
> The task of producing more than a quarter of America's coal output has not seriously tapped West Virginia's reserves of bituminous coal. Beneath her hills and valleys lie more than 103 billion tons of coal yet unmined.
>
> Although an important amount of West Virginia's coal is used within her borders, the demand for it is worldwide. Important tonnages of high quality metallurgical coal are shipped from West Virginia to Norfolk, Va., thence through the Panama Canal to the steel mills of Japan. Other metallurgical coal from West Virginia goes to the steel industries of Canada, and to West Germany, Italy, and other European countries.
>
> Most West Virginia coal moves from mine to market by rail, over the seven major carriers serving the State. However, barges are important West Virginia coal carriers also. Nearly 9 million tons a year move on the Kanawha, Guyandot, Monongahela, and Ohio Rivers from West Virginia mines. And modern electric generating stations, which use coal almost exclusively, transmit coal's energy to thousands of customers in and out of the State.
>
> This transportation network will be supplemented during the next few years by interstate pipelines and extra high voltage transmission lines. At least one pipeline is planned to carry coal from northern West Virginia to the New York-Philadelphia area. A large electric generating station near Morgantown, to be completed in 1967, will be tied in with a network of 500,000-volt lines carrying electricity to Philadelphia and New York. It will consume 1.3 million tons of coal a year.

Another aspect of growth in West Virginia is the State's concerted effort to attract new industry and plant expansion in order to create additional jobs and bolster the economy. A program showing major industrial sites, in which private and public agencies work together, opens to American industry the opportunity to evaluate potential plant locations in West Virginia and check price tags without fear of premature disclosure of plans, or of fluctuations of costs.

A majority of the sites involved are held under long-term options or some other form of control by the utilities serving the State, all of them members of the West Virginia Industrial Development Association.

By agreement these properties may be shown to prospects by the State Department of Commerce, local or regional development groups, subject only to final approval by the controlling company.

The controlled properties are chiefly in larger acreages, from 25 to 100 acres, and substantially more. Some are served by river transportation in addition to rail and highway.

Transportation is another area in which West Virginians are exerting a major effort. The year 1963 is destined to be a significant one in the construction of highways and in the improvement of existing roads. The Times carried the following information concerning the State's road network:

> West Virginia's centennial year may well go down in the State's history as the greatest year from the standpoint of highway construction.
>
> The Interstate System, crisscrossing the State, represents significant strides in roadbuilding. More than 49 miles of interstate highways are now open to traffic and much additional mileage is expected to open to traffic during 1963.
>
> Interstates 64, 70, 77, 79, and 81 coming into West Virginia from the Great Lakes, Midwest, east coast and New England are opening up the State to more industrial and tourist traffic.
>
> Highway transportation throughout West Virginia is on the upswing as far as new road construction is concerned. The Interstate System is giving State officials every reason to believe that new industrial opportunities are growing with every mile of new road leading into and out of the State's vast resource centers.

Naturally, transportation is a vital factor in the attraction of tourists from other areas of the United States. The scenic wonders of the Mountain State are without rival in their unspoiled beauty, and with the construction of convenient routes of access, tourism will continue to grow.

In 1962, over 8 million persons visited West Virginia, an increase of 14 percent over the previous year. Some $300 million were spent by tourists in the State in 1962, and private interests are now committed to investing some $17½ million aimed at hoisting tourist trade.

A 5-month period in that year saw an increase of 42 percent in visitation at the National Monument at Harpers Ferry; the annual demand for accommodation in the State parks increased 20 percent; during the first 6 months of 1962, the State sold more nonresident fishing licenses than in all of 1961.

These are but a few tangible indications that more and more Americans are becoming conscious of the fact that enjoyment, education, and relaxation await the visitor in West Virginia—accompanied by a natural hospitality and charm which has been a hallmark of the area for a century.

As Governor Barron has stated:

> Here in this land of relaxation is one of the greatest outdoor recreation reservoirs in the country for the vacationer. Here the worker and his employer find the finest in religious, cultural, educational, and recreational facilities a few minutes from the plant or office. Our welcome mat is always out in West Virginia * * * particularly so during this, our centennial year.

Washington Viewpoint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 26, 1963

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, recently I was interviewed on the radio program "Washington Viewpoint," by Ann M. Corrick and Jim Snyder, of the WBC Washington News Bureau. I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of this broadcast be included in the Record:

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Transcript of Senator Mike Mansfield's Interview on the Radio Program Washington Viewpoint, Produced by the WBC Washington News Bureau

Guest: Democratic Senator Mike Mansfield, of Montana, majority leader of the U.S. Senate.

Interviewed by: Ann M. Corrick, assistant chief, WBC Washington News Bureau and Jim Snyder, chief, WBC Washington News Bureau.

Miss Corrick. Good evening. This is Ann Corrick with Jim Snyder in the Senate Radio-Television Gallery on Capitol Hill. Our guest on Washington Viewpoint this evening is the majority leader of the Senate, Democratic Senator Mike Mansfield, of Montana.

Senator, this is the time of year to engage in the annual pastime of assessing the work of Congress to date. This was a late starting Congress, which so far has produced only two or three major laws. Some of your colleagues are beginning to think this slow pace is quite acceptable to President Kennedy, that he would just as soon Congress didn't get into some of his more controversial new frontier proposals until his tax cut and foreign aid programs are well on their way through. Is the administration willing to let everything else go down the drain in order to push taxes and foreign aid?

Senator Mansfield. No. Some of my colleagues to whom you refer are expressing their own thoughts and wishes rather than the facts. The President does want his program passed. The Congress, at least the Senate, after a slow start due to the fight on the change in rule XXII, and the makeup of committees, did get underway about a month and a half ago. The committees since then have been functioning quite well. The legislation which has been reported out has been given quick consideration on the floor of the Senate. And I am very satisfied with what the committees and the Senate as a whole have done. I think we've made a respectable record, and we'll do our very best to get the President's program enacted into law. May I say that it isn't a question of quantity, but rather a question of quality. We should not be judged on the number of bills which we pass or report out of committees, but on the type and the quality of the bills which are considered and become laws.

Miss Corrick. Have the Democratic leaders considered sitting down with President Kennedy and working out a schedule of priority for his major bills so that the Members of Congress can get its work done and get out for the year at a reasonable time?

Senator Mansfield. No, we've never done that. We know what the President's chief priority is every session. For example, last year it was the matter of the trade-policy bill. This year it's the tax-plus reform measure. There's nothing we can do in the Senate on that until the House completes its hearings and debates the measure. That will be the first of June. Then it will come over here. Chairman Byrd will hold hearings which will consume half the time that the House has, and we'll report a bill, probably in August, and pass it by Labor Day.

Miss Corrick. That sounds like it's going to be another late session this year.

Senator Mansfield. No. We were delayed so much at the start that I thought we'd be in until Thanksgiving Day. Being able now to guess at a Labor Day adjournment is pretty optimistic in comparison.

Miss Corrick. Jim Snyder.

Mr. Snyder. Senator Mansfield, the public image of the Congress seems to have suffered quite a bit in the last year or so. And at the beginning of this session the wrangles over the rules changes, all this talk about a slow legislative pace, now charges of congressional cheating, seem to have dropped the congressional stock in the minds of some people. Does this concern you? And do you feel perhaps that reform of congressional procedures should have a higher priority than it seems to have been given?

Senator Mansfield. Well, image seems to be the word nowadays to describe a lot of things. The Congress goes along. It has its ups and downs. Attempts are made to reform it or to speed it up. But somehow or other it is able to take care of its legislation, and look after the interests of the country, and the individual Senators are able to look after the interests of their States as well. Now there is a need for some reforms, but I certainly do not think we ought to act hastily. I think we ought to act on an evolutionary basis, and do what we can to keep alive the principle of long-drawnout discussions on occasion, on most important questions, and certainly not reform ourselves to the extent that we operate under the 5-minute rule, and thereby speed it up to such an extent that the consideration of legislation is almost impossible to see in a fair light. Some reforms are needed; very few. The Senate has functioned quite well. It has been a safeguard for the American people. These reforms will come in time, but they will not come overnight.

Mr. Snyder. What are some of the reforms you feel are needed?

Senator Mansfield. Well, I would like to see a change from the two-thirds rule to close off debate, down to three-fifths. In other words, from 67 down to 60 if all Members are present and voting. I would not under any circumstances go below that. I would not be in favor of a bare majority to close off debate because it means that one or two votes could be shifted to one side or the other and an extremely important question thereby settled. I think also this question of the secret session, which we had the other day, ought to be looked into, because I don't believe any two Members should have the power if they desire to use it, and they have now, to force the Senate to go into secret session. I believe in more open hearings and while there is a need for secret sessions, I think that ought to be decided by a majority vote in the closing of the doors and the holding of the session, and not by the first step of two Members asking for it as it is now .

Miss Corrick. Senator Mansfield, Senator Case said on this program a few weeks ago that he thinks President Kennedy might take the initiative in trying to bring about some reforms of the legislative procedures, because, Senator Case said, the President is the one man who has the most to win or lose in the sense of getting his legislative program through. Do you think this area is one that President Kennedy should get into?

Senator Mansfield. I certainly do not. And I do not think that Members of the Congress should always throw the ball to the President. After all, as far as we're concerned, this is our responsibility. I would be opposed to the President interfering in any way in the internal affairs of the Senate. We're down here; we have responsibilities; we have authority; and if we can't keep our own house in order and do what we think must be done, then I think we all better go home and let somebody else take over our jobs.

Miss Corrick. Senator, in a little different area, the debate over Cuba continues without letup. One of your colleagues recently called for a multilateral invasion of Cuba as a last resort; this is, a combined effort by the Organization of American States, with active U.S. participation. Do you think that is the ultimate answer, that eventually we'll have to take direct action?

Senator Mansfield. No. I cannot see that in the foreseeable future. It may happen, but I think anyone who looks upon that as the ultimate answer is taking an awful lot of responsibility and authority on his shoulders. It appears to me that what we ought to consider there, and this has been brought out by other Members of the Congress over the past months, is the possible recognition, and this is the Smathers idea, incidentally, of a Cuban Government-in-exile. At the present time you have 12 major groups of anti-Castro Cubans. You have more than that in smaller groups. There is no coordination to speak of, and the result is that the administration cannot, because of this diffusion of feelings, responsibility, and power on the part of the Cubans, work with the Cubans as a whole. Until the Cubans get together and organize the different anti-Castro groups into one body under a responsible and recognized leader, it will be impossible to bring about the recognition of a government-in-exile.

But, getting back to your question, I think that some of the measures we could take at the present time are perhaps the reimposition of a quarantine by the Organization of American States, which would include us, against Cuba on the same basis that it was imposed against the Dominican Republic in 1960 and imposed effectively. And then I think what we ought to consider most seriously is the prevention of the training of propagandists and agents between Cuba and Latin America, and do that on a both way basis, two-way basis, and in that way lessen contacts between the Communist leaders in the parties in Latin America with their counterparts in Cuba. Then there's one thing more we ought to consider, and that is this, that the Organization of American States ought to, instead of passing resolutions and making declarations, use the power it has in its organization to take more of a lead in facing up to Castro, because Castro is not a menace just to us alone, he is a menace to the entire hemisphere, and, therefore, it is a hemispheric responsibility.

Miss Corrick. Senator, just how far can we go without reaching that point where we will be forced to commit ourselves militarily? And, if you agree, once we do reach that point of committing ourselves militarily, it's not going to be just a simple one division of Marines or something, it would be a full military operation. What is that point?

Senator Mansfield. Well, that's a point that we cannot foresee at the present time, but some of these possibilities which I've just suggested might be able to take up some of the slack in the meantime, and perhaps could even solve the problem. Unless they're tried, we'll never know. But I would point out that those who are considering an invasion of Cuba, direct military action, better face up to the realities of the situation. It would take a long time, a matter of a couple of weeks, I believe, to mount such a force and I have understood that if such action is undertaken it will take approximately six divisions, and it would be successful, of course, but what you would have confronting you then would be guerrilla-type activity, and we know on the basis of activities of this type in other parts of the world, and even in Cuba, just how effective action of that kind can be.

Mr. Snyder. Senator, in recent months you've made several efforts to discourage your Republican colleagues in the Senate from making speeches attacking Cuban policy. And you seem to have made some progress in that direction. It has been softening and just the other day Senator Keating made what you called a statesmanlike speech on the subject. However, now we find that Governor Rockefeller has made a few statements here and there on the subject. Do you feel that despite your best efforts in the Senate that this thing is going to become terribly involved in the Presidential campaign, the debate that went on in the Senate will now move out to the political stump?

Senator Mansfield. Oh, I think it's a strong possibility. It was a factor in the last campaign. The action by the President on October 22 in calling back the leadership and imposing a quarantine on Cuba and, in effect, laying down an ultimatum that the Soviet missiles should be withdrawn, took it out of the campaign temporarily because the people as a whole understood fully that this action took us to the very brink of nuclear war, and that if the missiles were not removed that very likely there would be nuclear activity between this country and the Soviet Union. Now, as far as the present situation is concerned, I would say that by and large the Republicans have not been too unrestrained in what they've had to say. Most of them have been fairly constructive in their criticism. Others have offered alternative policies, and some have even indicated that we ought to invade Cuba or blockade it, which is an act of war. Well, you may disagree with those people, but at least they are making their position known and they are offering an alternative. The people who criticize for the sake of criticism are the ones who are doing the country no good, and making it more difficult to administer the foreign policy of the Nation as a whole. Now you mentioned Mr. Rockefeller. He was down in Washington lately. He met Republicans of all stripes and of all factions. He certainly was running for the Presidency. I dare say he considers himself the frontrunner. But he did not act like a statesman while he was in Washington because he indirectly accused the President of appeasement. He, by innuendo, raised the question of a possible relationship correspondencewise between Khrushchev and Mr. Kennedy. And I think he did himself and his party little good, but much harm. And I think he was a disappointment, because he wasn't the Rockefeller that the people knew who had worked with him.

Mr. Snyder. Senator, on another topic, there's been quite a bit of bitterness between the Pentagon and the Senate over the TFX investigation. Are you concerned about Pentagon charges that the investigation is causing unnecessary damage and expense to the Defense Department, and has provoked lamentable questioning of the integrity of the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara?

Senator Mansfield. No, I'm not provoked or disturbed about it. I think that Mr. McNamara and his aides should be subject to call by the appropriate committees on specific subjects. This is a very important subject. I think an explanation is in order. Mr. McNamara has given his explanation, is prepared to justify his decision in this matter. And I think that the Senate and the Congress generally is extremely happy to have a man of Mr. McNamara's capability, ability, integrity, and know-how, as our Secretary of Defense. And speaking personally, I think he is by far the best Secretary of Defense we've had. I think he has brought about a type of accommodation between the Joint Chiefs of Staff, which was not noticeable before. And I think also that he has once again emphasized what is in our Constitution and what General Eisenhower in his last speech before leaving the Presidency stated, and that was that in the Department of Defense the military must be subordinate to a civilian head and when it comes to making decisions, if they can't do so, Mr. McNamara is there; he's made them; he will make them; and I hope he continues to make them because that's his job and he's living up to his responsibility.

Mr. Snyder. The TFX contract investigation is continuing.

Senator Mansfield. That's right.

Mr. Snyder. Do you favor that?

Senator Mansfield. I certainly do. I think that Mr. McNamara or any other Cabinet official should, under certain circumstances, be subject to call by the appropriate committee. This is over a $6 billion contract. There is an argument between General Dynamics on the one hand, which has been given the contract and Boeing on the other. Mr. McNamara made his decisions. He is prepared to justify what he has done, and I think that the Congress has a right to ask questions on this matter.

Miss Corrick. Senator Mansfield, the administration is getting criticism from another direction. This is on our effort to negotiate a nuclear test ban treaty. This criticism isn't all coming from Republicans. Just recently an influential Democrat—Congressman Holifield—expressed some misgivings and warned against acceptance of what he calls a weak treaty. With all this demonstration of suspicion before a treaty is even worked out, do you think the Senate would ratify one if presented any time soon?

Senator Mansfield. I would say that it would be most difficult to ratify at this time. Much would depend upon the type of treaty negotiated, as you have indicated. There has not been much progress made to date. At one time I believe we wanted 21 or 22 on-site inspections. The Soviet Union would stand for none. And they have come up to three on-site inspections. We have gone down to eight or nine. And I would suppose that we would be prepared, and I do not know whether this is true or not, to carry on negotiations to probably split the difference. If there is a treaty negotiated, it must be one which allows for enough on-site inspections and must be one which will allow the regulation of this inspection so that we will not be caught short and there will be mutual trust, if that is possible, between the two sides in this particular area.

Miss Corrick. President Kennedy has said there are many risks in negotiating a test ban treaty, and Secretary of State Rusk has admitted that chances of getting an acceptable treaty from the Russians are quite slim. How long do you think we should go on trying?

Senator Mansfield. Well, we've been going at this for 3 or 4 years now, and I think there's nothing to be lost while we keep on trying to negotiate. And who knows, some day a satisfactory arrangement might be made, and it should never be said that we failed because we were too proud or too huffy to negotiate. We have to keep in mind the fact that if we ever engage in a thermonuclear war, it will be devastating on both sides or all sides if it comes to that, so there's little to lose through talking. There's much to lose through the unleashing of the nuclear terror.

Miss Corrick. Do you think we're going to have to resume nuclear testing in the atmosphere?

Senator Mansfield. I wouldn't know the answer to that. I would suppose that would be up to the members of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Defense Department, in view of what the relation of the resumption or lack of resumption of tests would be to our national security and defense.

Mr. Snyder. Senator Mansfield, back in February as Chairman of the special four-man committee which toured southeast Asia, you made a series of recommendations on our aid programs in that area. In that report you expressed doubts about the effectiveness of our aid to South Vietnam and you stressed the importance of our not permitting the South Vietnam war to become our war. Now the situation out there has been deteriorating lately with new fighting in Laos. Do you still feel the same about our South Vietnam policy, and do you think it may become necessary for this country to again send troops to calm things down in Laos?

Senator Mansfield. Well, that's a far-ranging question or series of questions. I would say that the suggestions made in the report on southeast Asia by Senator Pell of Rhode Island, Senator Boggs of Delaware, former Senator Smith of Massachusetts, and myself, would still hold up. That report has, of course, received a good deal in the way of criticism since it was issued several months ago. It still comprises the combined thoughts of the four-man group, which visited Vietnam and other parts of southeast Asia. I want to say that I have a high regard and a great respect for Ngo Diem, the President of South Vietnam who, I think, is one of the really good rulers, despite his deficiencies, and we all have them, but who is a man of integrity, devotion, and patriotism, and who I hope would take a more active personal interest in the running of the affairs of his country. I was happy to note, incidentally, that he did make a broadcast a few days ago to his people, known as "operation open arms," in which he promised forgiveness and amnesty to certain rebellious groups, not their leaders, not the hard core people, but the people themselves, if they would come over to the government's side. I commend him for it, because he is doing something which I think could have a beneficial effect, and it's in the tradition of the Tungku's policy in Malaya and President Magsaysay's policy in the Philippines.

Now as far as Laos is concerned, I still think that the only reasonable solution there is the possibility of the tripartite government between the rightests under Phoumi Nosavan, the neutralists under Souvanna Phouma and the Pathet Lao, the extreme leftwingers, under Souphanouvong. We all understood that such a coalition was tentative at best. It may or may not work out. But we ought to do everything we possibly can to see that it does work out and Souvanna Phouma remains in power as Premier, and we ought to do what we can also to get the King Savang Vathana to take a more active interest in the affairs of his country and use his personality and prestige as a level to bring these groups closer together. At the present time things do not look too good in Laos, but I do not think we ought to accept all the reports we receive at face value because it is easy to overemphasize the picture in that country as far as hostilities and fatalities and things of that sort are concerned. But if the coalition government doesn't work, then I suppose the next step would be a division, but I hope that the coalition government does work and that the partition does not come to pass.

Mr. Snyder. One final question, Senator, how do you feel about the pattern of price increases that has been established in the steel industry in the past week?

Senator Mansfield. Well, steel has a case because they have had—last year their profits were the lowest in a decade and maybe two decades. Their costs have increased, and I think that in contrast to the political attempt last year to raise prices across the board, which I think could be looked upon possibly as collusion, that this year it is the economic facts which have motivated the steel industry, and they have indicated that on the basis of selectivity, there are certain products which they produce which they feel they must raise their prices on. And I would point out also that the number one in the steel industry—United States Steel—has raised its price on fewer products—more, of course, over the total produced—and their prices have, in general, as I understand it been below the $6 average which was inaugurated by Wheeling Steel. I would express the hope that steel would show industrial statesmanship to the end that inflation would not run hog wild, and would recognize the fact that in this matter of price increases that they do have a responsibility and that that responsibility is theirs primarily and not the Government's.

Miss Corrick. Thank you, Senator Mansfield. I'm sorry to have to bring this discussion to a close, but our time has run out. Our guest on Washington Viewpoint this evening has been Senator Mike Mansfield, Democrat, of Montana, the majority leader of the Senate. This is Ann Corrick with Jim Snyder in the Senate Radio-Television Gallery on Capitol Hill.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Karl Applbaum of Avenue M Jewish Center, Brooklyn, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, who discerns all and knows all, who guides the destinies of men, who created man in His own image and made him a partner in creation, who endowed man with wisdom and privileged him to shape his own destiny, unto Thee we pray.

We invoke Thy blessings upon the deliberations of this great legislative body, which has been charged by the millions of citizens of our great democracy to implement and put into practice our ideals of brotherhood, freedom, and the dignity of man. Inspire them with the wisdom to choose the path that leads to righteousness. Grant that their decisions shall be wise and their efforts fruitful.

The people of these great United States have always demonstrated their dedication to the ideals of the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God, upon which our great Nation is founded. The Jewish people, the world over, shall be eternally grateful that at a critical juncture in human history 15 years ago, it was this august body which gave its support and recognition to the reestablishment in Thy Holy Land of an abode for the harrowed and harassed children of Israel. Today our people reap the fruits of the presence of a great fortress of freedom in the Near East, the State of Israel, which is dedicated to the same ideals which we hold sacred.

Fulfill for all mankind the words of an ancient prayer of Rabbi Ami, "May your lips speak knowledge and preach righteousness, and may your steps ever hasten to the coveted goal of peace which is Thy name." Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 25, 1963, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On April 23, 1963:

H.R. 4715. An act to incorporate the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation.

On April 26, 1963:

H.R. 277. An act to amend the Act of April 22, 1960, relative to the transfer of certain public lands to the Colorado River Commission of Nevada;

H.R. 1087. An act to release the right, title, or interest, if any, of the United States in certain streets in the village of Heyburn, Idaho, and to repeal the reverter in patent for public reserve;

H.R. 1544. An act to authorize David H. Forman and Julia Forman to bring suit against the United States to determine title to certain lands in Maricopa County, Ariz.;

H.R. 2291. An act regarding a homestead entry of Lewis S. Case;

H.R. 2294. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land situated in the vicinity of Unalakleet, Alaska, to Mrs. William E. Beltz;

H.R. 5067. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and

H.J. Res. 234. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of John Nicholas Brown as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2833. An act to amend subdivision d of section 60 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 96d) so as to give the court authority on its own motion to reexamine attorney fees paid or to be paid in a bankruptcy proceeding;

H.R. 2849. An act to amend section 47 of the Bankruptcy Act; and

H.R. 4549. An act to amend section 4103 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the appointment of the Chief Medical Director of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2053. An act to provide for the temporary suspension of the duty on corkboard insulation and on cork stoppers.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 495. An act for the relief of Evanthia Christou;

S. 732. An act for the relief of Antonio Zorich, Rosetta Amabile Zorich, and Fiorella Zorich;

S. 787. An act for the relief of Zofia Miecielica; and

S. 1196. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maria Nowakowski Chandler.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 2440) entitled "An act to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1964 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. Russell, Mr. Stennis, and Mr. Saltonstall to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. Johnston and Mr. Carlson members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the U.S. Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the Report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 63–11.

ARTHUR H. GREENWOOD

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, many in southern Indiana were saddened this week by the news of the death of Arthur H. Greenwood, who served in Congress for 16 years from the district which is now largely the seventh district.

Mr. Greenwood was born near Plainville, in Daviess County, Ind., in 1880. He graduated from the high school in Washington, Ind., and the law department of Indiana University in 1905. He began the practice of law in Washington, and subsequently served as county attorney and prosecuting attorney in Daviess County.

He was elected to the Congress in 1922, commencing his long service in 1923. In serving until 1939 he represented this district longer than anyone else has ever done. He served on the George Rogers Clark Memorial Commission, which among other things left a beautiful monument to that distinguished American on the banks of the Wabash at Vincennes.

He served on the Rules Committee and he was the Democratic whip in the 72d Congress.

I came to know Mr. Greenwood many years ago, and he would frequently stop in at my office in Martinsville when he was passing through. I found him to be a man of considerable education and learning, keen insight and very warm humanity. Upon a short and casual acquaintance one soon became aware of the many qualities which made him so well respected and loved. In recent years he occasionally visited Congress and we have had many pleasant conversations.

In recent years he lived in Florida, and with a daughter and son in the Washington, D.C., area. I know there are many in the Capital area who join those of us from Indiana in mourning his passing.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this occasion to join my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY], in paying tribute to the late Arthur H. Greenwood. I first heard of him when he was one of the few Democratic Congressmen from the State of Indiana back in the 1920's. We followed him in the Congress with great interest while he was a member of the Committee on Rules and whip of the House. I did not know him personally until I was a member of the Indiana Legislature when he was a member of the George Rogers Clark Memorial Commission, but I got to know him very well here in Washington. As my colleague pointed out, he lived in Florida, but he spent the summers here in Washington with his son and daughter. He was keenly aware of the acts and everything that took place here in the House of Representatives, and he spent a great deal of time here on the floor of the House of Representatives. Many of the Members he was formerly associated with were no longer here, so he spent most of his time sitting with the Indiana delegation on my side of the House. I was keenly aware of his interest in the legislation, how well informed he was. And, he was a fine man to advise the younger men who entered the House. I want to take this occasion to offer his family my sincere sympathy, and they can take pride in the useful life he lived and the many, many friends he left behind.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from the Eighth District of Indiana [Mr. DENTON], just referred to the fact that when our late departed friend, Arthur Greenwood, first came here, he was one of the few Members from that side of the aisle then in the House.

That leads me to say at the outset that when I first came here in 1935, for 4 years I was the lone Member from the State of Indiana on this side of the aisle. Coming here as I did, on the minority side, I certainly needed all the friendly assistance and help that I could get. In Arthur Greenwood I found a true friend. He was always helpful to me, courteous, understanding, friendly. For that I shall always remember him.

I, too, have greeted him as he has come back here since he was no longer a Member. I do not think he ever came back and was around the Chamber or in the Speaker's lobby but what he did not have something to say to me as I had something to say to him. He was a fine and a great person who achieved distinction in this body as he had achieved distinction in many other matters of consequence before he came here. He never lost his sense of feeling for the House of Representatives. That certainly was evidenced by his continuing interest in all of the problems that have confronted us.

So, I am privileged to join with my friends from Indiana in an expression of sympathy to his family. I trust there is solace and comfort for them in the fact that while they have lost a dear one, they must know and understand that his was a great contribution to his beloved country. His was a life that was marked with accomplishments in many fields and that, I am sure, they can take great satisfaction in knowing.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. Mr. Speaker, I did not have the honor of serving with Arthur Greenwood but I became well acquainted with him shortly after I became a Member of the House. He was a kind and considerate person. We talked at length many times particularly about the office of the whip. He had great affection for the House of Representatives. As a friend of Mr. Greenwood I wish to join the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY], in this word of tribute to our departed former colleague. I extend my deepest sympathy to his loved ones.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 days in which to extend their remarks on the passing of the Honorable Arthur Greenwood.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, while I did not serve with Arthur Greenwood, I became well acquainted with him during his many visits here to the House. We were attracted to each other at first largely because he bore the same name as my hometown of Greenwood, S.C. Arthur Greenwood was a kindly man, a humanitarian, and had a genuine love for the House of Representatives as a great American institution. I will miss his frequent visits here and his warm personality. I extend my deepest sympathy to his many friends and his family.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I want to add a few words of tribute to this distinguished Indianian—Arthur Greenwood—who so ably served in the House of Representatives.

I did not serve in the House with Arthur Greenwood, but I came to know him after he moved to Florida and I developed a great respect and affection for him. I had the opportunity to visit with him frequently when he came back to Washington and was such a welcome guest here in the House Chamber with us.

He was a great American and he never lost his keen interest in and affection for the House of Representatives, where he was so well loved and respected.

All of us will miss Arthur Greenwood, and I join you in extending to his family my sincere sympathy.

THE LATE HONORABLE PHIL J. WELCH, A FORMER MEMBER OF THE HOUSE FROM THE STATE OF MISSOURI

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I have the sad duty of announcing to the House of Representatives the death of our friend and former colleague, the Honorable Phil J. Welch of St. Joseph, Mo.

Phil Welch served in the House of Representatives in the 81st and 82d Congresses, representing the old Third District of Missouri which included many of the counties of the present Sixth District which I am privileged to represent.

He came to the Congress as a man experienced and skilled in government and politics. He had been mayor of St. Joseph 10 years, longer than anyone else in that city's history. He had served two terms as city treasurer before becoming mayor and had also served as an Assistant Director of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in Kansas City.

Many of the Members here today will remember Phil Welch from having served with him from 1949 through 1952. He was kindly, considerate and effective, a man who thought first of his Nation, State, and district and after that of the Democratic Party whose ideals he served with such dedication.

A close friendship existed between Phil Welch and former President Harry S. Truman. He was a valued friend also of the Speaker of the House, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, and former Speaker Sam Rayburn.

He did not elect to run for a third term in the House after two successful terms, deciding instead to seek the Democratic nomination for Governor of Missouri, a race which he lost.

Although out of public office since then, he had maintained his great interest in government and in the Democratic Party.

He lost his only son, Melvin, an Army flyer in World War II.

He was most compassionate to all who came to him for aid and advice but especially was he the kind friend and adviser to servicemen and their families.

Phil Welch was my friend. My heart goes out to his lovely wife, his daughter, his grandchildren, and to the people of St. Joseph.

He was an ideal companion, true friend, dedicated public servant, a man who loved his country and his State, who loved the House of Representatives where he served magnificently, who loved his God and died in His grace.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks at this point on the life, character, and service of our former colleague, the late Honorable Phil J. Welch.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Subcommittee on Education be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

PHILIPPINE WAR CLAIMS COMMISSION

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing bills which would provide the exclusion of former officials of the Philippine War Claims Commission, or any other individual for that matter in any way associated with that Commission from benefiting directly or indirectly by obtaining fees from payment of the Philippine war damage claims.

Further, Mr. Speaker, I obtained the 1-hour special order for tomorrow to review and bring into proper perspective the entire issue of the Philippine claims, particularly my role as chairman of the Far East Subcommittee and my purpose and intent in working as hard as I did over the years on behalf of the legislation to settle the outstanding obligation.

It is my purpose also tomorrow to discuss the bills I am today introducing to further control the activities of an agent of a foreign principal.

EQUAL PAY ACT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Thompson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, a new equal pay act is being drafted.

This new bill will reflect the work of my subcommittee which conducted hearings on the administration's proposal, as well as from the bill recommended during the 87th Congress, in that it will amend section 6 of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Our decision, at the subcommittee level, to follow the fair labor standards route, keeps the faith of proponents who testified, and reacts to objections raised by opponents.

In essence, proponents urged broad coverage and enforcement procedures. The administration proposal protected an estimated 25 million jobs. This proposal will protect an estimated 27.5 million jobs. The prohibition against discrimination solely on the basis of sex is enforcible to the same extent that minimum wage and maximum hours are enforcible under fair labor standards, and by the same people.

Opponents to the administration bill, without exception, endorsed the principle of equal pay. Some suggested there was no need for legislation. Others were critical of the administration bill. Their criticism largely boiled down to a fear that a new bureaucracy would be established with a new set of investigators and a new set of rules. One witness specifically urged that we follow the Fair Labor Standards Act; others recommended that we adopt all the definitions and procedures of fair labor standards.

As a result there have been consultations with the Department of Labor and with those from the other body handling this legislation. There has been substantial agreement within the subcommittee, on both sides of the aisle, that an amendment to fair labor standards is the most expeditious way to draft legislation prohibiting wage discrimination on the basis of sex.

It is planned for the new legislation to be simultaneously introduced in both Houses of Congress. I invite cosponsors.

Mr. Speaker, I make this progress report, so that Members may have some guidance in answering correspondence. Judging by inquiries to the subcommittee, there is a great interest in this legislation.

DR. KARL APPLBAUM

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride I call the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives to the fact that the invocation was given today by a resident of my congressional district, Dr. Karl Applbaum, of Flushing, N.Y.

Dr. Applbaum is associated with the Avenue M Jewish Center in Brooklyn, N.Y., and is the chaplain of the department of New York Reserve Officers Association of the United States. He has been active in that association for many years, and in various veteran, fraternal, and professional organizations. In addition to being a rabbi, he also holds degrees as a doctor of philosophy, doctor of juridical science, doctor of divinity, and doctor of laws.

I might also point out that Dr. Applbaum's brother, Rabbi Sydney Applbaum, of the Rabbinical Council of America, is giving the invocation in the U.S. Senate tomorrow. This is, I believe, most unusual, and the fact that two brothers, both rabbis, have offered opening prayers in both Houses of Congress within the same week might possibly constitute a historic first under the dome of the U.S. Capitol.

My welcome also is extended to the many residents of Queens County who are here today to attend the Queens Society in Washington dinner tonight. It is a distinct pleasure to have them with us today.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join my distinguished colleague from the Borough of Queens [Mr. Rosenthal] in recognizing the significance of today's invocation. Two brothers, both outstanding clergymen, are opening the sessions of the House and Senate respectively within a day of each other.

I refer to my dear long-time friend, Dr. Karl Applbaum, chaplain—major—U.S. Army Reserve, and rabbi of the Avenue M Jewish Center of Brooklyn, and his brother, Rabbi Sidney Applbaum, of Brooklyn's Congregation Beth Judah, vice president of the Rabbinical Council of America.

Although Rabbi Karl Applbaum's pulpit is in Brooklyn, his activities and friends in Queens, where he resides, are legion. As a distinguished rabbi, as a highly respected member of the bar, as an active participant in professional, fraternal, veterans, and political organizations, Dr. Karl Applbaum has contributed invaluably to the spiritual, moral, and civic strength of our Nation.

His brother Sidney is similarly active in community affairs in his native Brooklyn. As a leader of the Rabbinical Council it is significant to point out that he is cochairman of that national organization's Israel commission.

The fact that two distinguished brothers are delivering the invocations in both bodies of this great Congress is indeed unique and historymaking. This is undoubtedly a congressional first, and I want to take recognition of the occasion and pay my respects to these fine brothers.

Mr. Speaker, it is also worthy of note that the occasion falls at the same time Israel is celebrating its 15th birthday anniversary, thereby adding further inspiration to the historic event.

CUBAN EXILES

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully invite the attention of this House to a bit of unmanaged news.

Following are the two lead paragraphs of a story by Earl H. Voss, Washington Star staff writer, which appeared in yesterday's Sunday Star:

> Premier Fidel Castro's trip to Moscow reflects a new sense of confidence in the security of his own position in Cuba, American officials believe.
>
> Recent bottling up of Cuban exiles' raids has contributed to his confidence, these sources estimate.

The sources referred to by Mr. Voss are not identified. That is probably just as well since they obviously are committing heresy against the administration's official line.

Commonsense is such a rarity in this administration, and particularly in the State Department, that it is welcome even when it is anonymous.

The House may recall that on April 1 following the unprecedented restrictions imposed by this administration on the Cuban exiles, I sent a telegram to the President urging the Government to end its harassment of these exiles.

The House may also recall that the telegram in its entirety was a verbatim quotation of a statement made in Johnstown, Pa., in October 1960, by Candidate Kennedy.

I have had no reply from the President. I did receive a letter from Assistant Secretary of State Dutton containing the usual doubletalk. It also contained this interesting statement:

> The President has pointed out that they (the hit-and-run raids) may have the * * * effect of strengthening the Soviet position in Cuba and tightening Communist control in Cuba.

Mr. Voss and his anonymous sources have pretty well exploded this myth.

It is the incredible policies of the present administration, and not the hit-and-run raiders, which are strengthening Soviet and Communist control in Cuba and thereby making it safe for Mr. Castro to go junketing to Moscow.

WHEAT REFERENDUM

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I urge farm organizations to man all voting precincts in the May 21 wheat referendum with carefully trained poll watchers. Secretary Freeman has assured me the Department of Agriculture will not object.

This vote is vitally important to all farmers, not just wheatgrowers. If the referendum carries, a harsh bushel-acre control program for wheatgrowers will be authorized. This would be the opening wedge for similar mandatory supply-management schemes for feed grains, livestock, and other commodities.

Reports from various parts of the country make it clear that the Department of Agriculture's vast ASCS organization is already being mobilized to get an affirmative vote. This makes poll watching by private farm organizations all the more important.

Poll watchers should be fully trained on election procedures, particularly eligibility rules, so they can effectively protect the rights of those wishing to vote.

Mr. Freeman was before the House Agriculture Committee Friday, and at that time gave me his assurance of cooperation.

A REMINDER THAT COMMUNISM REMAINS AT THE THRESHOLD OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Fidel Castro's trip to Moscow serves as another strong reminder that international communism flourishes at our back door. The Soviet Government staged a reception for Cuba's dictator typical of those reserved for its highest visitors. The entire event illustrates the tie between Communist Russia and Communist Cuba.

The good-will tour of Fidel Castro is plain in its meaning to Americans. Not long ago Cuba was a friendly island at the threshold of the U.S. mainland. Now it is the center of a storm which threatens to inject communism in this entire hemisphere.

The paradox of Cuba is startling when we take just a moment to reflect on the events of the past 4 years. But even more startling is the fact that no sufficient steps are being taken to return Cuba to the free world.

To overlook the growing consensus throughout America and the free world that Cuba must be liberated would be disastrous. Fidel Castro has existed on the dawdling of his enemies. He poses problems which are the responsibility of the entire hemisphere. However, the responsibility for leadership falls on the United States.

U.S. leadership in this hemisphere with the OAS must be asserted.

ADJUSTMENT OF FEDERAL STATUTORY SALARY SCHEDULES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 108)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I forward herewith the annual comparison of Federal salaries with the salaries paid in private enterprise, as provided by section 503 of the Federal Salary Reform Act, and recommended adjustment of the Federal statutory salary schedules in accordance therewith, to be effective in January 1964. The Civil Service Commission will send to the Congress in the next few days a draft bill which would put these recommendations into effect. The budget which I have proposed for fiscal year 1964 contains a provision for $200 million for this adjustment.

The Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962, the most important Federal employee pay legislation in 40 years, declares that Federal salary rates shall be comparable to private enterprise salary rates for the same levels of work, and provides in section 503 that:

> In order to give effect to the policy stated in section 502, the President: (1) shall direct such agency or agencies, as he deems appropriate, to prepare and submit to him annually a report which compares the rates of salary fixed by statute for Federal employees with the rates of salary paid for the same levels of work in private enterprise as determined on the basis of appropriate annual surveys conducted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and, after seeking the views of such employee organizations as he deems appropriate and in such manner as he may provide, (2) shall report annually to the Congress (a) this comparison of Federal and private enterprise salary rates and (b) such recommendations for revision of statutory salary schedules, salary structures, and compensation policy, as he deems advisable.

By Executive Order No. 11073, I directed the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission to make the required annual comparisons and to refer the Bureau of Labor Statistics' findings and their comparisons to the Federal employee organizations for their views. Under the order the Director and the Chairman are to report these comparisons and employee views to me, and to make recommendations with respect to the several statutory salary systems after consultation with the Postmaster General, the Secretary of State, and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

The first annual report of the Director and the Chairman is attached. The Bureau of Labor Statistics' National Survey of Professional, Administrative, Technical, and Clerical Pay shows that private enterprise rates increased in 1961 to 1962. The new levels of private enterprise rates are reflected in the revised statutory salary schedules proposed in the attached report.

To carry out the intent of the 1962 Salary Reform Act, the schedules in the attached report, which will be in the bill to be submitted by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission should be adopted in lieu of the second-phase schedules provided in that act, to be effective in January 1964.

The Salary Reform Act, pending adjustments in executive pay, imposed a temporary $20,000 ceiling on the GS-18 salary, in place of the $24,500 rate I had recommended. As one consequence of this ceiling, the act established rates below the 1961 comparability levels for all grades above GS–7. The schedules I am now proposing include the increases necessary to bring salary rates for all grades through GS–15 up to full comparability. The scheduled rates proposed for the grades above GS–15 approach as near to full comparability as is feasible at this time, in light of the review now being made of top executive salaries. It is highly desirable, in the interests of equity and the solution of pressing problems in professional and administrative staffing, to achieve full comparability rates for all grades as soon as possible. The draft bill to be submitted by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, which would put into effect up-to-date career salary schedules, will take account of the relationship with executive pay by providing that the rates above $20,000 in the recommended career schedules shall go into effect only upon adjustments in top executive pay.

In accordance with the recommendations of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, a study of executive pay is now underway. Development of an objective approach to Federal executive pay poses important and complex problems. Consequently, I have asked the Advisory Panel on Federal Salary Systems to study the subject and to recommend a course of action.

The views expressed by employee organizations, which are contained in appendix C of the attached report, are thoughtful and constructive. The greatest concern expressed by employee representatives is for reductions in the time lag between BLS reports and adjustments in the statutory salary rates. The spirit of the comparability principle and natural considerations of equity require that the lapse of time be held to the minimum possible, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and Chairman of the Civil Service Commission will review the process and renew discussion of the subject with employee organizations. Several other suggestions of substance have already been or will be studied and discussed with employee organizations.

The Government's action in this, the first year of operations under the Salary Reform Act, is critical to the rights and reasonable expectations of Federal employees and to the needs of Federal agencies. The Government has adopted the principle of comparability with private enterprise and a process for accomplishing it which are noteworthy for objectivity and clarity. By our actions in this first year's test we can demonstrate that the Government has sincerely committed itself to the twin proposition of fair treatment of its employees and adequate compensation for recruitment and retention purposes.

John F. Kennedy.

The White House, *April 29, 1963.*

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 31]

Avery
Ayres
Barrett
Becker
Beermann
Belcher
Brock
Bromwell
Buckley
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cameron
Celler
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clark
Colmer
Davis, Tenn.
Diggs
Donohue
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Fino
Foreman
Forrester
Gallagher
Giaimo
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Pa.
Gubser
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Hanna
Hansen
Harsha
Hawkins
Healey
Hébert
Henderson
Hoffman
Horton
Ichord
Jennings
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Ala.
Kelly
Kirwan
Kornegay
Landrum
Lennon
Lesinski
Lloyd
Long, Md.
McDade
McDowell
Macdonald
MacGregor
Madden
Mathias
Miller, Calif
Miller, N.Y.
Monagan
Morrison
Multer
Murphy, N.Y.
Nedzi
O'Neill
Patten
Pepper
Philbin
Pirnie
Powell
Rains
Reifel
Reuss
Rich
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Rodino
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Roudebush
Roush
Ryan, Mich.
St. George
Shelley
Sibal
Smith, Iowa
Stafford
Stephens
Taft
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Ullman
Utt
Walter
Watson
Whalley
Wickersham
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wydler

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 323 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

REDUCTION OF TEMPORARY ADDITIONAL FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT TAX AND AUTHORIZATION OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 326) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

> *Resolved,* That upon the adoption of this resolution, it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4655) to amend title IX of the Social Security Act with respect to the amount authorized to be made available to the States out of the employment security administration account for certain administrative expenses, to reduce the rate of the Federal unemployment tax for the calendar year 1963, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority members of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, and said amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means may be offered to any section of the bill at the conclusion of the general debate, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Trimble] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, this resolution (H. Res. 326) provides for consideration of H.R. 4655, a bill to amend title IX of the Social Security Act with respect to the amount authorized to be made available to the States out of the employment security administration account for certain administrative expenses, to reduce the rate of the Federal unemployment tax for the calendar year 1963, and for other purposes. The resolution provides a closed rule, waiving points of order, with 2 hours of general debate.

H.R. 4655 makes three changes involving the unemployment compensation system:

It reduces the extra Federal unemployment tax attributable to the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1961, from 0.4 to 0.25 percent with respect to wages paid in 1963. This will make the combined net Federal unemployment tax for 1963 wages 0.65 percent—apart from any reduced credit provisions that might apply in particular States.

The bill substitutes for the $350 million limitation on grants to the States to cover the administrative costs of unemployment compensation and the employment service, a flexible ceiling of 95 percent of the estimated receipts under the regular 0.4 percent net Federal unemployment tax. Applied to fiscal year 1964, this ceiling will be about $460 million.

The bill extends from 5 to 10 years the period during which States may obligate, for administrative purposes, certain funds transferred from excess Federal tax collections.

The bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means, and the administration has indicated that it has no objection to the provisions of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 326.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown] and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Arkansas has explained, this resolution makes in order consideration of the bill, H.R. 4655, a bill to amend certain sections of the Internal Revenue Code dealing with Federal unemployment tax matters. The rule provides for 2 hours of general debate, and is a closed rule because it contains certain technical provisions in connection with taxes. It also waives points of order.

As the House knows, I am sure, I am usually opposed to closed or gag rules on all types of legislation. However, I shall not oppose this rule simply because this bill makes only a minor change or two in the law, and it would not be necessary or wise, to throw the Social Security Act open to any and all amendments.

Some of the Members have already asked me today about the possibility of an amendment being offered to fix certain standards for the payment of unemployment benefits. I think it should be pointed out at this point in the RECORD that unemployment benefit standards are fixed by the States and not by the Federal Government. There has, of course, been a very strong reluctance, if not a very strong opposition, by the Congress to giving to the Federal Government of any power to fix standards for unemployment compensation but, instead, to insist on reserving that right, or those rights, to the States because of the peculiar conditions that exist with respect to unemployment in various parts of this country.

With the passage of this bill today we will see history being made, modern history, for, believe it or not, this bill will actually reduce Federal taxes on business and industry. It will actually reduce the excise tax that now is being levied on employers for unemployment purposes by the Federal Government.

You will recall that when the program for payment of unemployment compensation was first set up by the Roosevelt administration legislation was passed providing there be a tax of 3 percent levied on all payrolls, or pay up to $3,000 a year or less for each employee, in any establishment having eight or more employees, a tax against the employer. I think I should emphasize this points up something that too many people overlook, and that is the fact that the worker, the employee, pays no tax whatsoever for unemployment compensation. Such taxes are all paid, whether they be State or Federal, by the employer and not by the employee.

The original bill, back in the days of the Roosevelt administration, provided any State that might set up an unemployment compensation system of its own would be credited with 2.7 percent, or 90 percent of the 3 percent tax, levied by the Federal Government as an excise on employers' payrolls. That has been done, and it has been followed for a good while. The Federal tax on employers was thus 0.3 percent. Then that rate was increased a few years ago to 0.4 percent. Later, when the unemployment situation became worse in 1961, the Congress, in its wisdom or lack thereof, according to how you may look at it, decided the Federal Government should pay out of the General Treasury certain sums to the various States. The increase in compensation was according to the length of time unemployment benefits were paid by the States to those out of work. So, for that purpose the Federal payroll tax was increased from 0.4 to 0.8 percent for the calendar years 1962 and 1963. This legislation will reduce this Federal tax being levied on employers for employment purposes from .8 to 0.65 percent for this calendar year of 1963, dating back, of course, to January 1, and then at the end of the year, beginning with 1964, if I am correct.

Then the complete 0.4 percent tax increase will be taken off, so again the regular tax of four-tenths of 1 percent will apply. This actually means a saving of quite a good deal of money to the employers of this country. It in no way affects the employees or the compensation that they may receive because of becoming unemployed.

Now there are two other sections of the bill which are more or less minor in character. One would permit continued use of some Federal funds which had been allocated out of this excise tax, as mentioned a moment ago. The Federal Government does pay the cost of administration of the unemployment program in the various States, as the Federal Government is to a certain extent a partner in this matter. Certain funds have been set aside for the use of the States from this particular amount of Federal tax money.

It does set aside, or provide, for the administrative cost of administering unemployment compensation and employment services. Some of these funds are used to help people get jobs, by the way, and to run the employment services in the various States. A ceiling would be fixed on that amount at $400 million.

I say that this legislation is in the best interests of the employers of the country, and it is seemingly a good law or will be a good law and will be very helpful.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. I am interested in what the gentleman has had to say about these funds being used to get people jobs and also the fact that these funds are contributed by employers. I am sure the gentleman from Ohio agrees with me that the most important thing facing the Nation today is to get the unemployed back to being regularly employed. I intend to go into this matter in more detail on the HEW bill, but I would like to say to the gentleman that these employment agencies have gone far afield from any attempt to try to put the unemployed back to work. Most of the jobs they are filling are taking employed people and putting them into other jobs, as I shall point out on the floor tomorrow.

From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, on one day this employment agency that is supposed to be putting people to work was advertising for someone to go to Argentina, an open hearth superintendent at $24,000 a year, and that they had a job in Tanganyika, Africa, that they were advertising for somebody to go to for $14,000. They wanted to relocate a man in Florida. It seems to me if this agency fulfills the job it was set up to do they will be trying to get unemployed people back to work and not using employers' funds to pirate people away from existing jobs where they have been trained by the employer who is paying the bill.

I hope to go into this in more detail tomorrow.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I agree with the gentleman. I hope he does go into it thoroughly. Of course, the facts are that the Ways and Means Committee which brought forth this bill does not fix how the money shall be spent or how the administration of this particular activity shall be conducted. That, I believe, belongs to a different agency of the Government, but it only provides for the raising and division of funds.

Mr. BOW. I may say to the gentleman, if the gentleman will yield further, that the Federal Government controls, and the Federal Government has gone out and said they are more interested now in the transfer of people from one job to another than they are in placing unemployed people in new jobs. I think we should make it a point to see this agency that is set up for that purpose accomplishes it. They ought to go out and attack this unemployment situation rather than pirating people away.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I agree with the gentleman. I am trying to point out that the Ways and Means Committee, through this legislation, did not set up the agency, does not control the agency, does not operate it, and does not oversee its functioning, but simply did provide in the tax bill a certain amount of funds should be available for this purpose, presuming of course, as they had a right to presume, that there would be halfway good administration.

I think the gentleman has made a great contribution here by calling the attention of the House to any abuses that may exist. I hope in his position he will be able to bring about a correction.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. It seems to me that this is a responsibility of the Committee on Ways and Means to look over the operations of the whole area of employment security. This particular program is in their province, that is, the method in which the program operates. The Committee on Ways and Means in this bill has changed the authorized amount for the employment security program from $350 million to a new formula approach which, under the formula applied this year, would raise the total amount available from the unemployment compensation trust fund to $460 million—not $400 million but $460 million. In the bill before the House tomorrow we have authorized for use of the unemployment compensation trust fund a total of $350 million. This has been going on for a number of years. The Senate has always come back and added to it, $400 million to $420 million, by writing legislation on an appropriation bill in the Senate, something that the Committee on Ways and Means should have handled but has been handled in the Senate Appropriations Committee through legislation. Now, I hope that the Committee on Ways and Means, when they presented this bill to the Committee on Rules, did not give an indication that this program should cost $460 million in this coming year, as this formula, if applied to this year, I think is very high.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I assure the gentleman they did not give that impression. I would like to call to the attention of the gentleman, because I am sure he is better informed on this whole matter than I, that the provisions in this bill to which he refers do not refer only to the unemployment service but also to the administrative cost of the entire unemployment activity.

Mr. LAIRD. That is a separate appropriation item, however.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Well, it is not a separate item in this bill.

Let me continue. Let me answer, if you will. I find myself in disagreement, much as I dislike to be in that position, with my distinguished friend, because I know that he is always well informed on these subjects. But, I just cannot agree that the Committee on Ways and Means itself, the tax-raising committee of the Congress, the committee in which tax legislation must originate, has the responsibility of following up on all tax funds that are raised by all the various tax programs of the country to see to it that every dollar of tax money so collected is spent according to Hoyle, or according to what somebody thinks ought to be done. I think that responsibility rests with the agency that has charge of the functioning of that particular program or activity.

Mr. LAIRD. I am not willing to give it over to an agency of the Government. These are taxpayers' funds.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Perhaps the great Committee on Appropriations of this House has some responsibility in this field, too, as well as the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. LAIRD. I think the Committee on Ways and Means has the responsibility.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman from Wisconsin raises the question of the responsibility of the Committee on Ways and Means in this area. There is undoubtedly a responsibility, as I view it, to see that these funds are used for the purposes for which they are made available. This money, as my friend from Ohio has said, is collected by the Federal Government for purposes of grants to the States for administration of their unemployment compensation laws and for the operation of employment services. I would think, too, that there is at least an equal responsibility in the committee of the gentleman from Wisconsin to see that the funds are properly spent, because we are not making available funds here in this legislation. What we are saying is that the Committee on Appropriations and the Congress cannot for this purpose spend more than a certain amount. It is the gentleman's committee that makes the funds available in some specific amount.

I would point out if we have a responsibility in the Ways and Means Committee, at least there is an equal responsibility in the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I certainly accept that responsibility. The only point that I was trying to make and, perhaps, it was not made too clear, is this: I believe that the authorization language under this program should be reviewed by the Ways and Means Committee, because I find that in this program we are using the taxes levied on employers in the United States for purposes which I do not believe the Ways and Means Committee intended they be used in the various States. For instance, let us take the agricultural employment program. This is a program that is running into billions of dollars a year. This program was not a program that was before the Ways and Means Committee the last time this legislation was reviewed. We are using the three-tenths of a percent tax to finance this program which does not have any benefit so far as the employers contributing the tax or the employee involving billions of dollars.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Ohio yield to me at this point?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. I appreciate the comment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD]. He is correct. It is very difficult for the Ways and Means Committee, and I am sure it is difficult for his Committee on Appropriations, to keep up with all of the various ramifications of the use of these funds by the State agencies, because other committees of Congress, just as the gentleman points out—not the Ways and Means Committee, but other committees of Congress—have over the years by legislative direction required the use of the unemployment services within the States to perform functions that other committees desire to be performed. It is true that if we limited the need for money to the employment security agencies of our States to merely handle unemployment compensation and to find employment for the people unemployed, considerably less money would be required. But the Congress itself has called upon the State agencies to perform these additional functions.

If the gentleman will yield further, I would like to say this: The Ways and Means Committee has called for a report from the Labor Department on this very problem suggested by our distinguished friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, let me conclude the debate on this particular matter by pointing out I believe the House Committee on Government Operations, and the Senate Committee, also, on Government Operations, each has a responsibility, and the authority, to look into the expenditure of public funds of any nature under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government, or any agency thereof. The Comptroller General of the United States is authorized and directed to do so, to see that Federal money is spent according to the purposes for which it was appropriated. And, there are other legislative committees that have something to do with these particular matters. Perhaps the Committee on Education and Labor or perhaps some other committee that deals with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—or some other particular agency of Government—may have some responsibility and has some right to look into all phases of the problem with which they are given authority to deal, should they desire to do so.

So, it is a mixed responsibility, Mr. Speaker, as far as authority is concerned, and one that I do not believe can be solved by the enactment, or lack of enactment, of this particular bill which deals only with the levying of taxes, and not with the way that the money furnished by such taxes is actually spent, or whether it is spent efficiently and effectively. That is indeed another matter.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROMOTING THE COORDINATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF EFFECTIVE PROGRAMS RELATING TO OUTDOOR RECREATION

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 306 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

> *Resolved,* That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1762) to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH]; pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 306 provides for the consideration of H.R. 1762, a bill to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes. The resolution provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

The purpose of H.R. 1762 is to implement certain recommendations of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, which was created in 1958 and made up of four Members of the

House, four Members of the Senate, and seven Presidential appointees.

The Commission has recommended, among other things, the establishment of a Recreation Advisory Council composed of members of the President's Cabinet and of a Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in the Department of the Interior. These steps have been taken by the President and the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary has transferred to the new Bureau certain functions heretofore performed by the National Park Service.

One major function which the Commission envisioned for the Bureau is that of promoting the coordination of the activities of the various Federal agencies in this field. The importance of this task is apparent when it is realized that there are at least 18 Federal agencies which have a stake in this field or whose activities touch on it fairly directly.

The role of the Bureau would be to review and coordinate the diverse Federal efforts. It would not engage in the management of any lands, waters, or facilities, which would continue to be the responsibility of the agencies which now have those duties. The Bureau would have no control over the administrative activities of any existing department or agency. It would, however, be responsible for reviewing recreation developments connected with Federal lands and programs, and its written comments could accompany plans of other agencies submitted to the Executive Office and to the Congress. The proposed Advisory Council would serve to achieve cooperation among departments and between the several departments and the Bureau.

In addition, there is need for encouraging the Federal agencies to cooperate with the States and their local organizations and for stimulating recreational planning by furnishing the States and private organizations with technical assistance.

H.R. 1762 includes a general declaration of policy and authorizations to the Secretary of the Interior.

The President's budget for fiscal year 1964 requests an appropriation of about $2,460,000 for the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. It is expected that future costs will approximate this amount and that, if there are any substantial increases other than those which may occur because of the enactment of additional legislation, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will be promptly advised that it can assess their reasonableness.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 306.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as stated by the gentleman from California [Mr. Sisk] this resolution provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for the consideration of the bill H.R. 1762.

My understanding of the purpose of the bill and the need for it is precisely that which the gentleman from California [Mr. Sisk] stated and I concur in his statement.

In addition thereto, may I simply state that the purpose of the Bureau here would be to review and coordinate the various diverse Federal efforts. The Bureau would have no control over the administrative activities of any existing department or agency. However, it would be responsible for reviewing recreation developments connected with Federal lands and programs. According to the report, it is my understanding that the budget does include some $2,480,000 for this new Bureau.

I am further informed that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Westland] and I believe some others feel that this should not be under the Department of the Interior and that it should be a separate agency. My understanding is that amendments along that line will be offered during debate on this bill in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SIMPLIFYING ADMINISTRATION OF THE LEAD-ZINC SMALL PRODUCERS STABILIZATION ACT

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 308 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3120) to simplify administration of the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of October 3, 1961 (75 Stat. 766). After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Smith] and, pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 308 provides for the consideration of H.R. 3120, a bill to simplify administration of the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of October 3, 1961. The resolution provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

H.R. 3120 will simplify administration of the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act by, first, establishing the calendar year as the time unit which determines one of the qualifications of producers for participation in the program, and second, specifically setting forth the date by which a producer shall file or have filed an application for participation in the program.

The act of October 3, 1961, authorized a program of payments to small domestic producers, who, during any 12-month period between July 1, 1956, and the beginning of the period for which payments are sought under the act, have not produced or sold more than 3,000 tons of lead and zinc combined.

Lead and zinc producers generally maintain their production records on a calendar year basis and report production to the Bureau of Mines, which maintained nationwide statistics, on a similar calendar year basis. In addition, it is burdensome to require the Government administrators to check every combination of 12-month periods since January 1, 1956, to make certain that during no 12-month period did an applicant produce over 3,000 tons of lead and zinc.

Enactment of H.R. 3120 will rectify this situation and permit qualification based on a calendar year.

Enactment of the bill will not entail any increase in budgetary requirements.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 308.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may utilize, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, as stated by the gentleman from California [Mr. Sisk], this resolution is an open rule providing for the consideration of the bill H.R. 3120, with 1 hour of general debate.

The gentleman from California has explained the purpose of the bill and its main provisions, and it is my wish to be associated with those statements.

The Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act was passed in 1961. There is a present program of payments to small domestic producers who, during any 12-month period between January 1, 1956 and the beginning of the period for which payments are sought under the act, have not produced or sold more than 3,000 tons of lead and zinc combined.

Apparently there was some difficulty in determining this 12-month period and whether or not some of the producers did produce more than 3,000 tons in this particular 12 months. Their particular year may be from February to the following January or maybe from September to the following August. I think two or three of them did not get in so they could get paid. I think the main purpose of this bill is to waive this time limit and place it on a calendar-year basis and make it possible for two or three producers that inadvertently failed to fill out the necessary forms in time to be paid. This involves money previously appropriated and no further funds are needed.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KYL. Was any information given to the Committee on Rules as to the exact number of people who would be affected by an improvement in status?

Mr. SMITH of California. As to the exact number, I cannot say. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] before the committee spoke on that, and I would yield to the gentleman to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. EDMONDSON. We now have information that has been supplied to us that there would be a total of 10 producers who would be made eligible for 1962 payments under section 2 of H.R. 3120 who otherwise would not be eligible.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REDUCTION OF TEMPORARY ADDITIONAL FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT TAX AND AUTHORIZATION OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4655) to amend title IX of the Social Security Act with respect to the amount authorized to be made available to the States out of the employment security administration account for certain administrative expenses, to reduce the rate of the Federal unemployment tax for the calendar year 1963, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of H.R. 4655, with Mr. ZABLOCKI in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER] will be recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the bill reported by your Committee on Ways and Means does three things involving the unemployment compensation system. These are not highly technical matters and are easily understood. I believe we can conclude the general debate on this bill in much less than the 2 hours provided under the rule.

Mr. Chairman, the bill, first, reduces the temporary increases in the Federal unemployment tax that will apply to wages in the calendar year 1963. Second, it raises the ceiling on grants to States for the administration of their unemployment security programs. Third, it extends the time in which States can use, for administrative expenses, and for purposes other than the payment of benefits, certain distributions of surplus Federal funds.

Very briefly, Mr. Chairman, permit me to discuss each of these three provisions. It will be recalled by the Members—in 1961 at a period when we had a high level of unemployment—the Congress provided for a program of temporary extended unemployment compensation benefits. The Congress provided in that legislation a means for the repayment of these amounts expended in 1961 to the general fund of the Treasury. The Congress provided for a tax with respect to 1962 wages and 1963 wages of four-tenths of 1 percent on all wages subject to tax, namely, wages up to $3,000 a year.

What we call the net Federal unemployment tax is the amount that must be paid to the Federal Government after the employer takes the allowable credit for State taxes and for the State experience rating. Normally, the gross Federal tax is 3.1 percent of the first $3,000 of taxable wages, the credits 2.7 percent, making the net Federal unemployment tax 0.4 percent of the first $3,000 of wages. The net tax was raised to 0.8 percent for 1962 and 1963.

It appears now that the extra collections under a rate of 0.8 percent for these 2 years will produce too much revenue. The additional revenue produced will be about $950 million while the total extended benefits under the 1961 program amounted to $778 million. Thus, if we permit the provisions of existing law to apply to wages in 1963 we will collect $172 million more than we need.

The effect of this provision, Mr. Chairman, therefore, is to reduce this from four-tenths of 1 percent of wages in the calendar year 1963 to twenty-five hundredths of 1 percent of wages in 1963, or a savings to the employers of the United States of approximately $180 million.

In all frankness, I think we should point out to the membership that this may result in a failure to repay about $8 million of the original $778 million expended in the benefit program of 1961; but it is about as near as we can get percentagewise for tax purposes to an exact balance between the amounts spent in 1961 and the amount that would be collected to repay the general funds of the Treasury. This is the first provision.

At this point I will include a table which will be of interest:

TABLE 1.—*Federal unemployment tax rates—Present law (after credits and assuming no restoration of 1958 temporary unemployment compensation or title XII amounts by States)*

[In percent]

	1963, wages payable January 1964					1964 wages, payable January 1965				1965 wages, payable January 1966				1966 wages, payable January 1967			
	Basic	TEUC, 1961 [1]	TUC, 1958 [2]	Title XII	Total	Basic	TUC, 1958	Title XII	Total	Basic	TUC, 1958	Title XII	Total	Basic	TUC, 1958	Title XII	Total
Alabama	0.4	0.25	0.15	--------	0.8	0.4	0.3	--------	0.7	0.4	0.45	--------	0.85	0.4	--------	--------	0.4
Alaska	.4	.25	.15	0.45	1.25	.4	.3	0.6	1.3	.4	.45	0.75	1.6	.4	--------	0.9	[3] 1.3
Arizona	.4	.25	--------	--------	.65	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4
Arkansas	.4	.25	.15	--------	.8	.4	.3	--------	.7	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4
California	.4	.25	.15	--------	.8	.4	.3	--------	.7	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4
Colorado	.4	.25	--------	--------	.65	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4
Connecticut	.4	.25	--------	--------	.65	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4
Delaware	.4	.25	.15	--------	.8	.4	.3	--------	.7	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4
District of Columbia	.4	.25	--------	--------	.65	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4
Florida	.4	.25	--------	--------	.65	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4
Georgia	.4	.25	--------	--------	.65	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4
Hawaii	.4	.25	--------	--------	.65	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4
Idaho	.4	.25	--------	--------	.65	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4
Illinois	.4	.25	--------	--------	.65	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4
Indiana	.4	.25	.15	--------	.8	.4	.3	--------	.7	.4	.45	--------	.85	.4	--------	--------	.4
Iowa	.4	.25	--------	--------	.65	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4
Kansas	.4	.25	--------	--------	.65	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4
Kentucky	.4	.25	--------	--------	.65	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4
Louisiana	.4	.25	--------	--------	.65	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4
Maine	.4	.25	--------	--------	.65	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4
Maryland	.4	.25	.15	--------	.8	.4	.3	--------	.7	.4	.45	--------	.85	.4	--------	--------	.4
Massachusetts	.4	.25	.15	--------	.8	.4	.3	--------	.7	.4	.45	--------	.85	.4	--------	--------	.4
Michigan	.4	.25	.15	.3	1.1	.4	.3	.45	1.15	.4	.45	.6	1.45	.4	0.6	.75	[4] 1.75
Minnesota	.4	.25	.15	--------	.8	.4	.3	--------	.7	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4
Mississippi	.4	.25	--------	--------	.65	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4
Missouri	.4	.25	--------	--------	.65	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4
Montana	.4	.25	--------	--------	.65	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4
Nebraska	.4	.25	--------	--------	.65	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4
Nevada	.4	.25	.15	--------	.8	.4	.3	--------	.7	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4
New Hampshire	.4	.25	--------	--------	.65	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4
New Jersey	.4	.25	.15	--------	.8	.4	.3	--------	.7	.4	.45	--------	.85	.4	--------	--------	.4
New Mexico	.4	.25	--------	--------	.65	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4
New York	.4	.25	.15	--------	.8	.4	.3	--------	.7	.4	.45	--------	.85	.4	--------	--------	.4

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Federal unemployment tax rates—Present law (after credits and assuming no restoration of 1958 temporary unemployment compensation or title XII amounts by States)*—Continued

[In percent]

	1963, wages payable January 1964					1964 wages, payable January 1965				1965 wages, payable January 1966				1966 wages, payable January 1967			
	Basic	TEUC, 1961 [1]	TUC, 1958 [2]	Title XII	Total	Basic	TUC, 1958	Title XII	Total	Basic	TUC, 1958	Title XII	Total	Basic	TUC, 1958	Title XII	Total
North Carolina	0.4	0.25	--------	--------	0.65	0.4	--------	--------	0.4	0.4	--------	--------	0.4	0.4	--------	--------	0.4
North Dakota	.4	.25	--------	--------	.65	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4
Ohio	.4	.25	--------	--------	.65	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4
Oklahoma	.4	.25	--------	--------	.65	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4
Oregon	.4	.25	--------	--------	.65	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4
Pennsylvania	.4	.25	0.15	0.15	.95	.4	0.3	0.3	1.0	.4	0.45	0.45	1.3	.4	--------	0.6	[4] 1.0
Puerto Rico	.4	.25	--------	--------	.65	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4
Rhode Island	.4	.25	.15	--------	.8	.4	.3	--------	.7	.4	.45	--------	.85	.4	0.6	--------	1.0
South Carolina	.4	.25	--------	--------	.65	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4
South Dakota	.4	.25	--------	--------	.65	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4
Tennessee	.4	.25	--------	--------	.65	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4
Texas	.4	.25	--------	--------	.65	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4
Utah	.4	.25	--------	--------	.65	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4
Vermont	.4	.25	--------	--------	.65	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4
Virginia	.4	.25	--------	--------	.65	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4
Washington	.4	.25	--------	--------	.65	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4
West Virginia	.4	.25	.15	--------	.8	.4	.3	--------	.7	.4	.45	--------	.85	.4	.6	--------	1.0
Wisconsin	.4	.25	--------	--------	.65	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4
Wyoming	.4	.25	--------	--------	.65	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4

[1] TEUC—Temporary extended unemployment compensation.

[2] TUC—Temporary unemployment compensation.

[3] Title XII repayment rate will increase by 0.15 percent each year through taxable year 1970 when the rate will be 1.9 percent.

[4] Pennsylvania and Michigan rates for taxable years following 1966 will be only the basic 0.4 percent.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Employment Security.

The second provision has to do with the so-called ceiling on what Congress can appropriate for grants to the States for administration of their unemployment compensation laws and for the operation of employment services.

It should be borne in mind, Mr. Chairman, that the Congress in 1960 increased from 0.3 percent to 0.4 percent the so-called Federal tax to take care of administrative costs of the State-administered employment security offices in 1961. It will be recalled in connection with the temporary extended unemployment compensation program, Congress authorized for that fiscal year $385 million for these administrative expenses as a ceiling, and in 1962 there was authorized temporarily a ceiling of $415 million, as I recall. In 1963—I am talking about fiscal years now—the ceiling according to existing law will be $350 million. It was necessary for the appropriation bill to be amended in the Senate in order to provide the $400 million that it was deemed was required in the administration of this program at the State level.

What we have here is a proposal to eliminate a fixed amount as a ceiling for these appropriations and to substitute for it a so-called flexible ceiling. The flexible ceiling would be 95 percent of the estimated collections under a net Federal unemployment tax rate of 0.4 percent. It is estimated by the Department of Labor that that translates into a figure, for the fiscal year 1964, of approximately $460 million. This is a ceiling, of course.

In answer to the question raised during the discussion under the rule by the gentleman from Wisconsin, of course, the Ways and Means Committee does not anticipate that the ceiling would be immediately reached by the Appropriations Committee of either the House or Senate in providing funds for the administrative costs of this program.

What we are trying to do here is to develop a ceiling that will take care of the needs of this agency for some time in the future. I think we can estimate that if we adopt this flexible provision it will take care of the necessary cost of the administration of this program for some 5 years into the future. The request this year from the administration for the administration of this program is $432,600,000. I would assume that the Committee on Appropriations in its wisdom would find some basis for reducing that amount, for in the year 1963 $400 million was appropriated but there was some $407 million requested at that time. So this is merely a ceiling. It is not the determining factor. The determining factor will be the presentation made by the Department of Labor and these employment security administrators in appearances before the Appropriations Committees of the House and the Senate.

The third provision has to do with the extension of the time within which the States may use certain funds returned to the States by the Federal Government for purposes other than the payment of benefits. In the past, collections of Federal unemployment taxes have been in excess of the amount necessary to cover administrative costs. Since 1954, these excess Federal tax collections have gone into a loan fund and when the fund exceeded certain prescribed levels, the remaining excess collections were returned to the States. Surplus funds were returned to the States in this fashion in 1957 and 1958. The law dealing with these distributions of surplus funds provides that the State may obligate the surplus funds for administrative expenses during a period of 5 years following the distribution. After that time, unobligated funds may be used only for benefits. Almost all of the surplus funds that have been used by the States for administrative purposes have been used for the construction of buildings. A number of States have funds available from the 1958 distribution. In order to permit a more orderly disposition of these funds, the bill increases from 5 to 10 years the period during which they may be used for administrative expenses. This will permit the States to proceed with their building programs without the necessity of having to rush into the obligation of funds before the end of the present fiscal year.

The following table presents information on this aspect of the bill:

Selected cost factors in State employment security administrative expenditures, fiscal years 1953–64

Fiscal year	Average covered employment	Employers covered by State employment service laws [1]	Average annual salaries of State employment service employees	Rentals for premises (millions)	Equivalent number of positions in employment security agencies
1953	36,325,000	1,541,552	$3,563	$11.9	42,974
1954	36,022,000	1,570,735	3,725	12.5	42,089
1955	35,661,000	1,598,912	3,751	13.1	45,602
1956	37,864,421	1,718,319	3,913	14.2	45,251
1957	39,732,000	2,014,015	4,103	15.8	46,576
1958	39,012,000	2,067,784	4,283	17.1	51,244
1959	39,037,000	2,114,063	4,308	19.3	54,038
1960	40,611,000	2,276,075	4,631	20.5	51,338
1961	40,332,000	2,284,311	4,708	22.1	[2] 56,934
1962	41,060,000	2,232,965	4,929	24.5	[3] 61,178
1963	41,600,000	2,359,124	5,126	27.8	57,790
1964, estimated	42,400,000	2,440,000	5,301	30.0	58,665

[1] Employers covered as of end of calendar year ending in fiscal year.

[2] Includes 1,128 temporary extended unemployment compensation equivalent positions.

[3] Includes 2,656 temporary extended unemployment compensation equivalent positions.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. I would like to inquire. I find no printed copy of the testimony before the committee. Was there such a record made?

Mr. MILLS. You know, when you get to the point of reducing taxes sometimes you do not need to have a hearing. There were no requests before the committee for a public hearing, and the committee, busy as it is on so many subjects, decided to forgo the invitation for hearing.

Mr. VANIK. One further question. Did the Bureau of the Budget pass on this?

Mr. MILLS. The Bureau of the Budget has approved all the provisions of this bill. I will repeat again. The bill came from the Ways and Means Committee, as I recall it, by unanimous consent, and therefore I would commend it to the membership of the House and trust it will pass by unanimous consent.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the purposes and the general purview of this bill have been fully and completely explained by the chairman.

The bill which we are presently considering, H.R. 4655, as introduced by the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, is a companion bill to the bill introduced by my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES]. The bill, H.R. 4655, has three purposes:

First, it reduces the temporary unemployment tax increase which was enacted to finance the temporary extended unemployment compensation program under the 1961 act. At that time a special tax increase of 0.4 percent was levied on 1962 payrolls, payable January of this year and on 1963 payrolls, payable in January of 1964. While the 1962 tax increase has already been collected, it became apparent some time ago that the collection of this entire increase would result in a surplus—meaning collections on the tax would exceed unemployment benefits paid out under the 1961 act. Therefore, your committee feels that it is proper at this time to reduce the rate of this special tax to be collected on 1963 payrolls from 0.4 percent to 0.25 percent of taxable payroll.

The reduced rate of tax is designed to produce only the amount of revenue required to pay for that program, and no more. This reduction in the tax rate of 0.15 percent will save employers about $181 million of taxes due next January.

Second, the bill substitutes a flexible ceiling on the aggregate which can be used in grants to the States to cover the administrative costs of unemployment compensation and the employment service.

In addition to the special tax of 0.4 percent, which I referred to above, there is also levied a permanent Federal tax of 0.4 percent to cover grants to the States. Under the Social Security Act these grants cannot exceed in the aggregate the sum of $350 million annually. That ceiling dates back some years and has been deemed inadequate. Because of this, temporary legislation has been required for the past few years to raise the ceiling limitation. For fiscal 1961, the ceiling was raised to $385 million; for fiscal 1962, the ceiling was raised to $415 million; for fiscal 1963, the ceiling was raised to $400 million.

The bill provides for a variable ceiling based upon the amount of the net Federal unemployment tax. For fiscal 1964, if employment continues at its projected level, the ceiling will be about $460 million. However, this does not mean that the full $460 million will be used. The actual amount which will be available will depend upon the Appropriations Committee.

Finally, the bill extends for an additional period of 5 years the period within which the States may obligate excess Federal unemployment taxes for administrative purposes.

Under the Social Security Act, the excess unemployment taxes were credited to the States under certain circumstances. These excess funds could be obligated for administrative purpose for 5 years thereafter. If the funds were not obligated by the State within 5 years from the date credited to the account of the State, the funds could only be used for unemployment benefits.

There have been no excess funds credited to the States since July 11, 1958. Those funds credited prior to that date would be unavailable for administrative purposes unless the 5-year period is extended. The extension is to finance existing building programs in a number of the States, which then can continue to draw upon these funds for that purpose.

The bill was reported favorably by unanimous consent by the Committee on Ways and Means. It is in my judgment and the judgment of the nine other Republican members of our committee that this is meritorious legislation. It is the first time to my recollection since I have been a Member of this body that we have presented an outright tax-reduction bill to the Congress. This bill does reduce the taxes of employers for this year by $181 million. Simply, that amount of money was a surplus.

I would suggest, not facetiously, that it would not be a good precedent or good logic to leave that $181 million rolling around downtown, and we ought to return it to the source from which it came; that is, the employers of the United States. The gentleman from Arkansas, the chairman of the committee, has fully explained the flexible formula which does operate to raise the ceiling but does not in itself raise the amount of money involved. It could go to $460 million. As far as the operation is concerned, the Committee on Appropriations will certainly look intently and searchingly at the justifications for the use of the money. I look forward to the day when there can be further reductions not only in this tax but in all other taxes.

Mr. Chairman, I consider the bill certainly in the public interest and urge its adoption by this body.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I regret that public hearings were not held on this bill which provides certain sectors of the business community with an annual tax cut of over $180 million.

The Members of this body who are denied an opportunity to amend or revise this legislation because of the closed rule under which it is being considered, are certainly entitled to detailed testimony on the net effect of its enactment.

This Congress, during recent times, has been most generous with the business community. Immediately after the administration revised business depreciation schedules with a tremendous tax bonanza, Congress came through with the 7-percent investment credit to add billions of dollars of tax benefits to the business and industrial sector of our economy.

The abatement of $180 million in employment taxes provided by the enactment of H.R. 4655 apparently comes without any public plea from the business and industrial sector.

This action may not appear very prudent if the economy fails to recover according to expectations. If conditions should warrant a reenactment of the temporary Unemployment Benefit Act, the increased tax may be very difficult to achieve.

This bill is one of the major pieces of legislation to be considered by the House this year—and yet it was discussed in the House for less than 14 minutes. Congress is frequently criticized for its policies of rapid and extravagant spending. The action on this bill sets a record for voting tax cuts. On this bill we reduced taxes for business at the rate of $12,850,000 per minute for an annual total of $180 million.

I am not convinced that our action on this bill was either deliberate or wise.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, permit me to inquire of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER] if he has any further requests for time.

Mr. BAKER. We do not have any further requests.

Mr. MILLS. We have no further requests on this side, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the bill is considered as having been read for amendment.

H.R. 4655

A bill to amend title IX of the Social Security Act with respect to the amount authorized to be made available to the States out of the employment security administration account for certain administrative expenses, to reduce the rate of the Federal unemployment tax for the calendar year 1963, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 901(c) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C., sec. 1101(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking out "June 30, 1961," at the beginning of paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1964,";

(2) by striking out "(not in excess of $350,000,000 for any fiscal year)" in paragraph (1)(A) and inserting in lieu thereof "(not in excess of the limit provided by paragraph (3))"; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) For purposes of paragraph (1)(A), the limitation on the amount authorized to be made available for any fiscal year is—

"(A) in the case of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, an amount equal to 95 percent of the amount estimated by the Secretary of the Treasury as the net receipts during such fiscal year under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, and

"(B) in the case of any fiscal year thereafter, an amount equal to 95 percent of the amount estimated and set forth in the Budget of the United States Government for such fiscal year as the net receipts during such year under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act.

Each estimate of net receipts under this paragraph shall be based on a tax rate of 0.4 percent. The Secretary of the Treasury shall report his estimate under subparagraph (A) to the Congress within 30 days after the date of the enactment of this paragraph. Such report shall be printed as a House document."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 3301 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to rate of Federal unemployment tax) is amended by striking out the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following new sentences: "In the case of wages paid during the calendar year 1962, the rate of such tax shall be 3.5 percent in lieu of 3.1 percent. In the case of wages paid during the calendar year 1963, the rate of such tax shall be 3.35 percent in lieu of 3.1 percent."

(b) Section 3302(d)(1) of such Code (relating to definitions and special rules) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) RATE OF TAX DEEMED TO BE 3 PERCENT.—In applying subsection (c), the tax imposed by section 3301 shall be computed at the rate of 3 percent in lieu of the rate provided by such section."

(c) Section 905(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. sec. 1105(b)) is amended by striking out "50 percent of the amount" and inserting in lieu thereof "50 percent (with respect to the calendar year 1963), or 5/13 (with respect to the calendar year 1964), of the amount".

SEC. 3. Section 903(c)(2) of the Social Security Act (52 U.S.C., sec. 1103(c)(2)) is amended

(1) by striking out "four preceding fiscal years," in subparagraph (D) of the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "nine preceding fiscal years,",

(2) by striking out "such five fiscal years," in subparagraph (D) of the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "such ten fiscal years,", and

(3) by striking out "fourth preceding fiscal year" in the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "ninth preceding fiscal year".

The CHAIRMAN. No amendments are in order to the bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 25, strike out "years," and insert: "years".

Page 4, line 2, strike out "years," and insert: "years".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further committee amendments?

Mr. MILLS. There are no further committee amendments, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ZABLOCKI, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4655) to amend title IX of the Social Security Act with respect to the amount authorized to be made available to the States out of the employment security administration account for certain administrative expenses, to reduce the rate of the Federal unemployment tax for the calendar year of 1963, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 326, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROGRAMS RELATING TO OUTDOOR RECREATION

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Unon for the consideration of the bill—H.R. 1762—to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 1762, with Mr. SLACK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to lay the foundation for consideration of H.R. 1762 by setting out the background of the bill and indicating to you something of its importance.

This bill is an outgrowth of the work of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, a body which, as the report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs points out, was created by act of Congress. A number of distinguished Members of the House, past and present, served on the Commission and contributed strongly to its work. They were our colleagues, Congressmen Saylor, of Pennsylvania; Rivers, of Alaska; Kyl, of Iowa; Rhodes, of Arizona; Ullman, of Oregon, Collier, of Illinois, and Mrs. Pfost, of Idaho. I was not a member of the Commission, but I followed its work closely and was consulted from time to time by my colleagues in the House who served on it and by the Chairman of the Commission, Mr. Laurance Rockefeller, whose outstanding work in the field of conservation and recreation is well known to many of us.

One of the important recommendations of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission was that the Federal Government put its house in order. For many years the Congress has been authorizing and making appropriations for the establishment of recreation areas all over the United States. We have been doing so in connection with our national forests. The National Park Service has many such areas under its jurisdiction; as recently as the 87th Congress we authorized three important new ones—the Cape Cod, Point Reyes, and Padre Island National Seashores. The open space program of the HHFA involves recreation for many people with federally assisted financing. Many of the great reservoirs created by the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Tennessee Valley Authority furnish opportunity for water-based recreation for the American people. The Bureau of Sports Fisheries in the Department of the Interior is another agency which is operating in this field.

Let me put the matter in another light. How many men and women do you suppose are employed by the Federal agencies who work full time or part time on recreation matters? The answer is that there is no fully reliable estimate on this subject, but Dr. Edward Crafts, head of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, has given me what he calls "a rough approximation." His data, admittedly incomplete, show nearly 10,000 in the National Park Service, about 5,600 in the Forest Service, 3,100 in the Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife, 1,900 in the Corps of Engineers, 1,300 in the Coast Guard, and so on and on, with an estimate for the entire Federal Establishment of well over 22,500.

Mr. Chairman, the work that we in Congress and in the agencies have been doing has been without benefit of any overall plan which shows us where we are, where we are going, or what our needs are. It has been done, too, without benefit of such knowledge on the part of Congress about what the States are doing, what local communities are doing, and what private interests are doing as it ought to have. I think I am correct in saying, in addition, that even our congressional committees—for these matters are handled by a number of different committees, depending on what agency is involved—have often had to act without benefit of knowledge of what other committees are doing and how their plans fit into the picture.

Creation by the President of a Cabinet-level Recreation Advisory Council and the setting up in the Department of the Interior of a Bureau of Outdoor Recreation were important steps toward correcting some of these deficiencies. The bill which we are now considering, with the amendments recommended by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, will be another step in this direction.

I regard this bill as, among other things, a long-range money saver. We may be sure that, whatever else happens, there will be more and more need for outdoor recreation facilities by the American people. This is inevitable with our growing population and our people's increasing leisure time. We may be sure, also, that this need will reflect itself in legislative authorizations and administrative actions. If we do not have adequate machinery for sorting out the worthwhile proposals from those that are not so worthwhile, if we do not have adequate recommendations on which Federal agency should undertake what and on which proposals should be left for State and local action, and if we do not have an overall plan by which to guide ourselves, we can spend an inordinate amount of money without its doing the good that it should. H.R. 1762 will itself cost money—in the neighborhood of $2 million to $2,500,000 a year—but it will be money well spent if, as I confidently believe, it will serve to coordinate efforts downtown and to add some degree or orderliness to Federal participation in a national recreation program.

As of a few days ago—April 15 to be precise—the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, the agency which will administer the bill after it is enacted, had 74 professional employees in Washington and in its five field offices. Its Director tells me that he expects the number of professional employees to rise to perhaps 180 over the next 3 or 4 years and that he hopes to add another field office to those he already has.

I want to add parenthetically that it is well understood by all concerned that if the program threatens to overrun substantially the figures I have just given, its administrators will return to our committee for consultation before taking any further steps.

Coordinated field planning, of course, is not the sole purpose of the bill. In addition, H.R. 1762 is intended to equip the Secretary of the Interior with authority to furnish the States and local interests with technical assistance and advice in the field of outdoor recreation. The States are asking for this since, in spite of a total of over 210,000 paid recreation and park workers at the State, county, and city levels, the performance is uneven and planning work, except in a few outstanding States, is very spotty. Such Federal assistance as this bill contemplates will, we expect, spur the recipients to undertake recreational measures which will fit into the overall needs of the country and which, though they are too small and too numerous to warrant serious Federal consideration, might otherwise cry out for direct Federal action.

Let me say in closing a few additional words about this bill. First, I have heard the fear expressed that what will happen is that someone will dream up a gigantic nationwide detailed recreation plan and insist that everyone, from top to bottom—Federal, State, local, and even private—follow its every chapter and verse. Nothing could be further from the truth. The bill provides no such authority and, if it attempted to do so, could not possibly be enforced. Plans we must have if we are to proceed sensibly, but the plans, as I foresee them, will have to be fairly general and usually in the shape of guidelines rather than details. Above all, they will not be compulsory on anyone outside the Federal executive agencies.

Second, I have spoken about the Recreation Advisory Committee, which the President created by Executive order, and of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, which the Secretary of the Interior has set up in the Department of the Interior and to which he has assigned certain planning functions which have heretofore been carried on by the National Park Service. Neither of these is mentioned in the bill as the Committee amended it. This omission is deliberate. We did not think it proper to create the impression, even by implication, that the Recreation Advisory Council is being frozen into position by legislation and that the President cannot change its composition or its duties if experience shows this to be desirable. Likewise, we thought it best, as far as the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation is concerned, to follow the Hoover Commissions' recommendations of some years ago that responsibility should be centered in the heads of the departments of the Government and that the distribution of this authority to subordinates should be left to the discretion of the head of the department concerned. I have great confidence in the good judgment and administrative ability of Dr. Edward Crafts who, as I have already said, is the present head of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, and I am sure that Secretary Udall does, too. It is everyone's full expectation that the functions vested in the Secretary by this bill will be delegated by him in large measure to Dr. Crafts and his organization. But I think that all will agree that it will be better in the long run if we adhere to the Hoover Commission recommendations and leave room for desirable adjustments to be made administratively as experience is gained, subject of course to the usual right of congressional review.

Mr. Chairman, this is all that I have to say for the present. Our colleague, Congressman Morris, the able chairman of our Subcommittee on National Parks, will give you more details when he speaks. I urge the passage of H.R. 1762.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. The report on page 4 states that coordination of recreation will be one of the major tasks of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation for which authority is provided in H.R. 1762. I find no reference whatever in the bill to a Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. Is it in the bill or have I overlooked it?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'Brien] has expired.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, my time having expired, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. Morris].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Did the gentleman from New Mexico hear the question I addressed to the gentleman from New York and can he provide me with any information with respect to that question?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes, I heard the gentleman's question. The Bureau is set up now by the Executive. The bill which we have presented to the House will give the statutory authority for this Bureau to the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. GROSS. To do what? To give statutory authority to create the Bureau or what?

Mr. MORRIS. The authority will be vested in the Secretary instead of in the Director of the Bureau.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I am glad to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. As the gentleman well knows, in the committee we discussed the cost of this agency. I do not see any definite figures in the bill and it is pretty much of an open-end affair. However, in the report it says that by fiscal year 1964 there would be a request made for an appropriation of about $2,460,000. I wonder if the chairman of the subcommittee would have any objection to an amendment at least to tie this down to some particular figure, let us say, $2½ million.

Mr. MORRIS. I do not think I would have any objection. It is not the purpose to build up a large agency with this Bureau. I would not have any objection to an amendment limiting the appropriations to $2½ million. There was only appropriated at this time $1.6 million approximately.

Mr. HALEY. I realize that, but I think in the bill we should have some figure. Let us not just turn them loose. If they need more, they can come back and we will consider it. I think there should be a ceiling on this.

Mr. MORRIS. The gentleman may offer that amendment at the appropriate time.

Mr. Chairman, the years following World War II contained surprises for many of us. On both economic and political fronts the experts and prophets were often wrong. One of the most astounding domestic developments was the great upsurge in demand for outdoor recreation. Even yet we are not sure of all the reasons why or how high it will carry. The new demand was so amazing that it caught the official agencies more or less flatfooted. The outdoor recreation facilities just were not adequate and existing facilities deteriorated under overuse. As might be expected of competent, dedicated administrators and technicians, they attempted to step up their programs on a planned basis. The National Park Service came forward with Mission 1966 and from the Forest Service we were presented with Operations Outdoors, and the multiple-use aspects of forest areas were reemphasized. Several of the States did a good job of expanding their activities and facilities in outdoor recreation, as did several other Federal Government agencies. But there just was not enough resources to meet the demand.

It became increasingly clear that we had no overall plan or program as to how our rich, prosperous, and progressive Nation proposed to meet this avalanching demand for outdoors. Indeed we had no adequately comprehensive survey of our recreation resources, the existing recreation industry, nor of the probable demand in years to come—demands for which we and our children are responsible.

To fill some of those enormous gaps, to provide a basis for necessary next steps, the 85th Congress passed legislation authorizing and creating a bipartisan Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. The President approved that legislation on June 28, 1958—Public Law 85-470. Mr. Laurance S. Rockefeller served as Chairman of the Commission which included four Members of the U.S. Senate, four of our colleagues in the House of Representatives, and six Presidential Commissioners. The act provided also for an Advisory Council including Federal liaison members and other members who were distinguished in some aspect of this very broad field. A small but experienced staff was directed by Francis W. Sargent.

After 3 years of surveying many aspects of U.S. recreation needs and resources, the essence was presented in a report to the President and to the Congress in January 1962. That report of 246 pages was supported by nearly 30 study reports, many of which have since been published, amounting in all to many, many hundreds of pages. Many facts are presented, many aspects are dealt with. Needless to say, the work of the Commission, its report, and its numerous study reports are monuments in a previously inadequately surveyed area of our national life. I mention all of this because such recent history is basic to a full understanding of why we are considering H.R. 1762.

A major recommendation of the Commission was that a Bureau of Outdoor Recreation should be established in the Department of the Interior to have overall responsibility for leadership of a nationwide effort by coordinating the various Federal programs and assisting other levels of Government to meet the demands for outdoor recreation—"Outdoor Recreation for America," a report to the President and to the Congress by the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, January 1962, Washington.

On April 2, 1962, a Bureau of Outdoor Recreation was established in the Department of the Interior, under the authority of Reorganization Act No. 3 of 1950. Several functions relating to general park, parkway, and recreational area planning and cooperation with the States and other agencies are being carried out through this Bureau. It also serves as a secretariat, in a staff capacity to the Recreation Advisory Council, which was established by Executive order in April 1962. The purpose of H.R. 1762 is to provide a more appropriate administrative basis for the activities of that Bureau, to serve, so to speak, as the organic act for the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation.

In essence, H.R. 1762 would provide for coordination of programs and recreation land planning among more than 20 Federal agencies and numerous State agencies, in the formulation of a comprehensive nationwide outdoor recreation plan.

Under this bill, if enacted, the Bureau would develop some of the needed basic foundation work on outdoor recreation. Such inventory, classification, planning, and cooperation is considered to be a necessary prerequisite to an effective sound action program which should soon follow. As such it deserves our full support.

I might say that the committee spent several days of hearings on this bill. As I recollect, there was no substantial opposition in the committee.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield.

Mr. McFALL. I would like to clarify one question for the record. In the committee amendment adding section 3 to the bill is a provision that the heads of Federal departments and independent agencies shall carry out their responsibilities in general conformance with the nationwide plan provided for in section 2(c) of the bill. Am I correct in my understanding that this provision would not override other provisions of law under which the heads of Federal departments carry out their responsibilities?

For example, the multiple-use Sustained Yield Act of June 12, 1960, directs the Secretary of Agriculture to administer the national forests under principles of multiple use and sustained yield. Thus, any action to be taken by the Secretary of Agriculture in general conformance with the nationwide plan to be developed by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation under section 2(c) would be consistent with the responsibility of the Secretary of Agriculture to administer the national forests under multiple-use and sustained-yield principles.

Mr. MORRIS. The gentleman is exactly right.

Mr. McFALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I might require.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is the culmination of 5 years of hard work.

In 1958 the Congress authorized the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, composed of four Members of the House, four Members of the Senate, and seven citizens appointed by the President.

I was privileged to be one of the members appointed by the House, and I served throughout the entire time that the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission was in existence.

Parenthetically, I might say it was one of the few Federal agencies created by Congress with a time limit and a financial limit. It completed its work within the time prescribed, and turned back some of the money appropriated by the Congress for the fulfillment of its duties. If the Appropriations Committee in the supplemental appropriation bill for 1959, the deficiency appropriation bill for fiscal 1959, had included the money that the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission asked to enable it to get underway, we would have been able to save probably a quarter of a million dollars more.

One of the recommendations of this Commission was that there be created in the Department of the Interior the Office of Director of Outdoor Recreation, and to give him complete jurisdiction over the recreational facilities of all agencies of the Government. That is just what this bill does.

There was some question in the minds of a few people as to whether the bill as originally drafted by the Department of the Interior was broad enough to require the other agencies of Government, which are referred to in our report, to confer with and be bound by a nationwide plan for recreation. In light of the question that was raised, members of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs requested the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to get together and to determine whether or not they could agree upon language which would make sure that the Director of Outdoor Recreation would have the overall planning authority, and that all agencies of Government must clear through him.

Section 3 of the bill as it appears on pages 4 and 5 of H.R. 1762 contains that language, and I am sure that it is the intention of the members of the committee that the Director of Outdoor Recreation shall have charge of formulating a nationwide plan and that all of the agencies of Government that have any facets of recreation under their jurisdiction should confer with and have their plans fit into the nationwide plan called for in this act. I feel that this bill is a good bill after the committee amendments will have been approved, and I certainly hope that the final report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Commission will be fully implemented by the action of the President in creating in the Department of the Interior the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation and by Congress in this bill of creating a Director of Outdoor Recreation.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I will be happy to yield to my colleague from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. As has been previously indicated, you were a member of this group that made the study, which is known as the Rockefeller report.

Mr. SAYLOR. The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Report.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. You stated that the jurisdiction of this agency that is to be created would coordinate the Department of the Interior plus that of the Department of Agriculture which dealt with outdoor recreation or recreation. Is that what the main objective of this bill is?

Mr. SAYLOR. No. One of the main objectives of this bill is to give congressional recognition to the Office of Director of Outdoor Recreation.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. What I am trying to ascertain, having established the Office of Director of Outdoor Recreation as this bill would do, what is his jurisdiction? I understood you to say it was to coordinate the administrative agencies in the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior which dealt with outdoor recreation. Now, is that what is intended by section 3 of this bill?

Mr. SAYLOR. If you read section 3, it says that:

> In order further to carry out the policy declared in section 1 of this Act, the heads of Federal departments and independent agencies having administrative responsibility over activities or resources the conduct or use of which is pertinent to fulfillment of that policy shall, either individually or as a group, (a) consult with and be consulted by the Secretary from time to time both with respect to their conduct of those activities and their use of those resources and with respect to the activities which the Secretary of the Interior carries on under authority of this Act which are pertinent to their work, and (b) carry out such responsibilities in general conformance with the nationwide plan authorized under section 2(c) of this Act.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SAYLOR. The Secretary of Agriculture has agreed to this, and it is my understanding that the Secretary of the Interior has conferred with the other agencies of Government and they have all agreed to this overall supervision.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I will be happy to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Following the gentleman's point, the basic purpose behind the act is to provide the coordinating of the various agencies within Government that are dealing with outdoor recreation; is that not true?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. And there are about 18 such agencies; is that not true?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. But this bill does not carry any further authorization for the expenditure of any further sums; is that correct?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is also correct.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Would the gentleman care to express an opinion as to whether because of the passage of this bill further funds will be requested by the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. SAYLOR. No, but I will comment that I think in the report we have stated that we expect the overall annual cost of this Department to be about $2.46 million. It is my understanding that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY] at the proper time will offer an amendment fixing the limitation of this bureau at $2.5 million, and if at any time more money is needed the Secretary will have to come back to the Congress for further authorization.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. If my memory serves me correctly, we had an appropriation bill up here earlier and this Department was mentioned within it, and it was stated that the creation of this Department, because of the coordination and, therefore, the reduction of the duplication of effort within the agency, it would in effect save the Government money as contrasted to costing us more money; is that correct?

Mr. SAYLOR. I think that if this bill, with the amendment which has been agreed to by the executive agencies of the Government, is passed, it will get rid of a great deal of duplication and save the taxpayers money.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. If that is true, is there any need for any further additional money? If you have 18 agencies, with the cost of the programs going on within them, and if the creation of this Department will in effect save money, is there any need for any authorization for any funds in this bill?

Mr. SAYLOR. The only reason for the authorization of funds is to make sure that this Bureau of Outdoor Recreation has funds with which to do its job. After this bill is passed it then becomes incumbent upon the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives and of the Senate to take a careful look at the other 18 agencies of Government to determine what portion of their funds should be cut as a result of the work being done following the passage of this bill.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Therefore, it is the gentleman's feeling that this is one time that the matter should be passed on to the Appropriations Committee, because of the number of agencies involved?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Following up further the interrogation of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON] it seems to me what you are doing here is turning over to the Secretary of the Interior the responsibility for the spending of all this money, rather than providing for it to be expended by these several different agencies that are mentioned; is that correct?

Mr. SAYLOR. No, that is not correct. The only thing we are doing in this bill is requiring the other agencies to confer with the Secretary of the Interior so that there is no duplication of effort.

Now, we have found in the hearings before our committee that there is duplication in the other agencies for the basic reason that there is no overall planning. As the result of the passage of this bill there will be a plan and all agencies of the Government will be included in it.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. If the gentleman will yield further, as I read the bill—and I have read it a couple of times since I have been on the floor here—the only authority that is extended under this bill goes to the Secretary of the Interior. When one refers back here to section 3 that the gentleman just read, you say to carry out the responsibilities and the general conformance with the nationwide plan authorized under section 2(c) of this act. All of that authority is given to the Secretary of the Interior. So it seems to me what you are doing here is this: You are giving him, to one man, the authority to determine what everybody else does.

Mr. SAYLOR. What we are giving to the Secretary of the Interior is the overall jurisdiction in the field of recreation. Under the department created by this act all, and I impress upon each and every one of the members of this committee, all final jurisdiction in the Bureau of Recreation is hereby vested in the Director of the Bureau of Recreation and that all agencies of the Government must clear through him.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. You are also providing here that he has to confer with others, but there is no obligation for him to be influenced by or to carry out any recommendations of these other agencies that are now performing these services.

Mr. SAYLOR. The executive agencies of the Government agreed to this language. The Executive order which created the Bureau placed it in the Department of Interior and gave the Secretary of the Interior the overall jurisdiction.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. SAYLOR. Yes, sir.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The gentleman says that by Executive order this Bureau was created. Why did we not create the Bureau through legislation rather than by Executive order?

Mr. SAYLOR. The gentleman will have to ask President Kennedy why he chose the method he did. I do not know. But President Kennedy followed the report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, and he by Executive order created a Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in the Department of the Interior.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. If the gentleman will yield further, permit me to ask the gentleman this question: Does the Congress have the authority to create these Bureaus and to set up all of what the Bureau shall do?

In fact, it does not seem to me to be a Bureau. It seems to me that the Secretary of the Interior is going to do everything that is provided for in this bill; is that not correct?

Mr. SAYLOR. No, the Secretary of the Interior is not going to do so. In other words, Congress frowns upon independent agencies. The only way that the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission felt that this could be properly handled was to make sure it was placed in a department. The Department of the Interior was chosen as the proper department. This is the third such agency which was actually created by Congress in the Department of the Interior.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I call attention to section 1 and observe that the language is extremely broad. I want to draw the attention of the gentleman to the two lines at the bottom, and these are the objectives of the legislation, "that prompt and coordinated action is required by all levels of Government and by private interests on a nationwide basis."

My question of the gentleman is this. Does that language, in the gentleman's judgment, when coupled with other phraseology in the bill, vest in the Secretary of the Interior any more authority over State programs than he now has? In other words, after this bill is passed, with this general language could Secretary Udall tell the Huron-Clinton Metropolitan Authority in my State what they should do with regard to their own funds for recreation-conservation purposes?

Mr. SAYLOR. It does not. The language in section 1 is made necessary because the committee found that there is a great deal of duplication at the Federal level, at the State level, and at the local level, as well as in the private sector. What we are trying to do is to make sure that where a State or a local area or the private sector is doing a job, that there will be no duplication by the Federal Government.

Mr. MEADER. But there would be no additional authority or power through this legislation, if we could in fact constitutionally give it, over State programs, than there is now before the bill becomes law?

Mr. SAYLOR. No. I might say that a group from the State of Michigan came before our committee with the Outdoor Resources Review Commission and requested that the States and the local municipalities be included in the overall plan.

Mr. MEADER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. In response to the gentleman from Michigan, the gentleman from Pennsylvania stated positively that this group would have nothing whatsoever to do with the Recreation Division of the State of Michigan or the parks therein; is that correct?

Mr. SAYLOR. In the sense that they cannot tell them what to do, that is correct. They requested, and the State of Colorado is another State which has requested of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, that the State plan be included in any national plan, but that the functions which the State is now performing will continue to be performed by, and that the State may not be interfered with in any way by this program.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The State of Colorado asked that they be included in the national plan. One of the eighteen agencies or several of the eighteen agencies have operations within the State of Colorado. Should it develop that the agency make certain recommendations as provided in this bill, is there any obligation on the State of Colorado because of the recommendations thus made that they should carry those recommendations out?

Mr. SAYLOR. Not as far as the State is concerned.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. What about the Federal Government?

Mr. SAYLOR. As far as the Federal Government is concerned, I think there is, all agencies of the Federal Government will have to cooperate with the States and the local governments.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Do you mean to say that Fish and Wildlife or Geological Survey, or the Bureau of Land Management, should have one program, and they have their statutory provisions outlined, and they are carrying out their duties and responsibilities, but this agency we are today creating should be in a position to say to them how they should administer their division?

Mr. SAYLOR. No, nowhere in this bill, but the four agencies the gentleman referred to are also under the Secretary of the Interior and they are going off in different directions. This is what we are trying to get them to do in this bill: To take all their programs and to make sure that they do not waste money as we have found they are doing in many, many instances.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. If the Bureau of Land Management, as an example, and Fish and Wildlife disagree as to the proper use that should be made of a tract of land in the State of Colorado, as an example, what would happen?

Mr. SAYLOR. I do not see, very frankly, how that can happen, because if the Bureau of Land Management has jurisdiction Fish and Wildlife as an agency of the Department of the Interior has no jurisdiction.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I am glad to hear that, because I have that problem.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL].

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I asked for this time simply to try to answer some of the questions which have been raised. This is a good bill. It is a bill which can stand sunlight. I hope we have an opportunity to get answers to your questions, because I think once you know exactly what is in the bill you will like it.

If we go back to the beginning of this Outdoor Recreation Bureau, we find this step-by-step process. The Congress of the United States authorized an Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission study on the recreational needs of the country to the years 1975 and to 2000. This was a congressional act. The report was made by that Commission to the Congress and to the President. There were many recommendations. Subsequently the President set up a Bureau of Outdoor Recreation and as a sort of a supervisory agency for that Bureau of Outdoor Recreation created an Advisory Council. This, as matters worked out, proved to be a rather unworkable proposition because we have several Cabinet heads working together to try to coordinate a program. There was always a question of who will be Chairman this year, who will be Chairman next year, and who has the real responsibility. Who is "boss" of the Bureau and its Director.

So the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House in its wisdom amended the bill, as you will note in a few minutes, to take out the language concerning this Advisory Council and to fix the responsibility for the action with the Secretary of the Interior. This is exactly as you would want it, because you want to know where the responsibility is lodged in any of these bureaus. Furthermore, I think you would want this responsibility fixed so that you know the Secretary of the Interior is responsible for what goes on in his Department. The procedure here is not unusual. As a matter of fact, there is only one Bureau within the Department of the Interior which has an actually named legislative existence—the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. The Bureau of Reclamation does not have any such legislative name.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KYL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MORRIS. There is one other agency that I think the gentleman overlooked and might mention and that is coal research.

Mr. KYL. The Office of Coal Research is the second one—yes, that is right. But, the Bureau of Land Management is not so named specifically in legislative action. Even the Reclamation Bureau which has many matters in the State of the gentleman from Colorado is not mentioned.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KYL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I believe you stated that the Bureau of Land Management has no control over any recreational matters.

Mr. KYL. No, no; that was not the statement at all. The gentleman, apparently, misunderstood. This is what we are delineating now. The gentleman from Iowa asked why we do not name the Bureau of Recreation in this bill. The Bureau of Land Management was not named in such a bill. The Bureau of Reclamation was not named. The responsibility for an activity was given to the Secretary of the Interior. The legislation provided for certain actions just as this bill provides for actions and the Secretary is then responsible for setting up the bureau or the department within his agency to carry out this purpose.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further for a specific illustration?

Mr. KYL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The Fish and Wildlife have a certain duty and responsibility on the public lands.

Mr. KYL. That is correct.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. And we have heretofore passed what we call a coordinating act which also requires the State fish and game commission to agree with the Fish and Wildlife people as to certain recreational features and the Bureau of Land Management has to grant rights-of-ways for ditches and whatnot and conveyance of water and so forth. Do I understand by this piece of legislation you are creating a commission which will say to the director of the fish and wildlife of my State and the Fish and Wildlife of the Federal Government how these questions shall be resolved.

Mr. KYL. Let me allay the gentleman's fears right there. Permit me to continue because I have just a few moments left and I want to answer the gentleman's question. There is absolutely nothing in this bill which changes any Federal-State relationship or responsibility. As a matter of fact, the basic reason that I like this legislation is that it returns to the States and to the local governments the responsibility for providing outdoor recreation, with some assistance in coordination and planning and so on from the Federal Government. This assistance is available only if the local governments ask for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Iowa.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL] is recognized for 4 additional minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KYL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. We have these departments that are now created with certain duties and responsibilities. One of them I mentioned a moment ago was the Fish and Wildlife. Another is the authority that we place with the State directors and the fish and game departments of the respective States. Before you can get rights-of-way over the lands under the control of the Bureau of Land Management, you must have the permission and coordination of those two bodies or you do not get it. What I want to know is—if this legislation is approved, will the administrator or coordinator be in a position to step in and say to the fish and game director of the State of Colorado and the Fish and Wildlife of the Federal Government, this shall be settled in this manner and the rights-of-way granted. Does he have any such authority?

Mr. KYL. I will answer the gentleman's question as directly as I can. There is nothing in this bill which will change that relationship whatsoever. If the gentleman desires such legislation and introduces it, I am sure the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will give it consideration. This bill does not do anything of that sort. Let me give you a few illustrations in the last couple of minutes available here so that I may answer some other questions that have been put out.

We have one geographical situation which illustrates the purpose of this Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in its coordination efforts. We have legislative proposals to create what is known as the Lewis and Clark Trail which starts in St. Louis, Mo., and goes to Oregon. The Corps of Army Engineers at the present time controls all this trail along the Missouri in South Dakota and all but 125 miles in North Dakota. The Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife has many miles of land involved on this same stream. The National Park Service has some. The Bureau of Land Management has some unassigned land.

This Bureau or Department of Recreation can assist in coordinating the efforts so that the people get a maximum use from a coordinated program. The effort here is toward coordination; it is not for the establishment of any new authority either in the Department of the Interior or among the departments of Government. And it promotes coordination. It does not force it. It simply gives some legislative sanction to an Executive order and at the same time improves that Executive order by fixing the responsibility for the program. Instead of its being in the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, and so forth, it fixes the responsibility in the Secretary of the Interior, and then fixes that machinery so that these departments can work together in carrying out the recreational aspects of all the programs. That is the purpose of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, the Federal Government has no business in such wholesale activities in recreation. It does no good as I see it to say that we need a new Bureau for Recreation to coordinate present activities in 18 Federal agencies.

Admittedly overlapping and duplication are wrong, but I do not intend to approve such Government participation in recreation as this bill carries. This is a good example of Parkinson's first law that more and more Government and employees are needed to do less and less.

The seven reasons for this legislation as outlined on pages 4 or 5 of the report effectively inject the Government into areas where Government has no place being. Such activities are not constitutional. The Government has no constitutional right to encourage and promote recreational activities, individually or collectively. Swimming, skiing, fishing, golfing, are all fine recreations, and I enjoy them. Some do; some do not. But it is not a matter of Federal subsidy. It does not follow that money should be taken in taxes to subsidize these and other recreations.

The Government has no business in assessing or specifying or promoting or encouraging needs and demands of people in recreation. Nor do we need more Federal educational programs, as specified in the bill, to teach and encourage certain recreational programs at the expense of the taxpayer.

The answer is not to coordinate and expand Government recreational activities. The answer is to get the Government gradually out of this field so far as possible. I refuse to approve such use of the taxpayers' money.

It is still appropriate in this new program costing $2,460,000 as a starter to ask who is going to pay for it? We are deficit financing.

Let us examine to see how many of the 18 existing agencies' activities in recreation we can limit. Let us not expand Government, adding another Bureau, calling it less Government participation in our lives.

It is high time that we start reducing Federal Government's intrusion into recreation. People know how to provide their own recreation nor should they be forced to support through their taxes, other peoples' recreational activities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress finds and declares that the general welfare of the Nation requires that all American people of present and future generations shall be assured such quantity and quality of outdoor recreation resources as are necessary and desirable for the physical, spiritual, cultural, recreational, and scientific benefits which such resources provide, and that prompt and coordinated action is required by all levels of government and by private interests on a nationwide basis to conserve, develop, and utilize such resources for the benefit and enjoyment of the American people.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out the word "desirable," and insert in lieu thereof: "desirable for the physical, spiritual, cultural, recreational and scientific benefits which such resources provide,".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I should like the attention of the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] in charge of the legislation on the majority side, and I should like to ask whether or not the gentleman heard the colloquy between myself and the ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR]?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. If the gentleman will yield, I regret to say that I did not.

Mr. MEADER. I wanted to ask the gentleman from New York essentially the same questions I asked the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and I call attention to lines 9 and 10 on page 1 of the bill: "and that prompt and coordinated action is required by all levels of government and by private interests on a nationwide basis to conserve, develop, and utilize such resources for the benefit and enjoyment of the American people."

I asked this question of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and I would like to ask the same question of the gentleman from New York. Does the gentleman believe that this gives additional authority to the Secretary of the Interior that he does not possess under existing law to direct or order State recreation programs?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. My answer to that would be unequivocally "No." My understanding is that this provides for coordinated authority over Federal Government activity in these programs.

Mr. MEADER. If we could constitutionally do so, this legislation does not vest any additional authority in the Federal Government or the Secretary of the Interior over State recreation programs or State departments concerned with recreation activities.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield.

Mr. KYL. This is a declaratory section and it simply sets forth the idea that the time is getting rather late to acquire land for park and recreational purposes after commercial and residential interests have encroached upon areas desired for recreational purposes.

Mr. MEADER. It does not vest any additional authority in the Federal Government to plan State programs or encroach upon State authority?

Mr. KYL. Not at all.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I want to commend my colleague from Michigan for calling this to our attention. The language is very broad and vague:

> That the Congress finds and declares that the general welfare of the Nation requires that all American people of present and future generations shall be assured such quantity and quality of outdoor recreation resources as are necessary and desirable for the physical, spiritual, cultural, recreational, and scientific benefits which such resources provide—

And so forth. If that is only a declaration of policy, perhaps it may not be so meaningful. But it is very broad, vague, and general.

I call your attention to section 2, on page 2 of the bill which reads that:

> In order to carry out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized.

And so forth. Then, the bill continues to itemize the various functions which the Secretary is authorized to perform in order to carry out the purposes of the bill.

My question would be: What are the purposes of the bill? Is the policy statement both a policy statement and a statement of the purpose of the bill? If it represents the purpose of the bill, then it is a mighty broad purpose which is almost without limit.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. I would answer that question with another question.

Would the gentleman from Michigan prefer that we say it is the specific purpose of the Federal Government to provide this recreation, or would he prefer that we say it is the duty of the Federal Government, the State government, the county government, the municipal government, and the private interests of the country to do this job?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I would much prefer the recognition that the States, local and private interests do have a function to perform.

I do not think that answered the question.

Mr. KYL. I am surprised to find this objection.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I do not know that I object, but I am attempting to find out what the bill will do.

Mr. KYL. I like the language. I thought we were centralizing the authority back where it belongs, with individual citizens, with local governments, rather than the Federal Government.

Mr. GRIFFIN. This legislative history is helpful. However, I do not find much language in the bill to confirm the assurances which have been given.

Mr. KYL. The gentleman does not find too much language in the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I can agree that there should be coordination among the many agencies with recreation programs blossoming out all over the Government these days. There should be coordination, but with it I would like to see economy. I am disturbed by the language on page 4 of the bill:

> Any department or agency furnishing advice or assistance hereunder may expend its own funds for such purposes, with or without reimbursement, as may be agreed to by that agency.

This looks to me like a blank check authorization to any agency of Government presently engaged in some form of recreational programs to go ahead and spend money as it sees fit.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa. I hope the gentleman can shed some light on the meaning of these words.

Mr. KYL. These departments already do this.

Mr. GROSS. That does not necessarily make it right.

Mr. KYL. Allow me to give the gentleman the B section, and then you will understand that there is an economy involved here.

Suppose a question is asked of this Bureau of Outdoor Recreation by a State relative to management of forest resources for recreation. Naturally, the place for him to go is the Department of Agriculture, which has been engaged in this activity for a long time. Instead of saying that you have to conduct a new research program to study this, as we have done so frequently in the past, we say we do not want to spend additional money, we are going to the people who know how to do this, get their answer, and proceed without any expenditure. So there is an actual economy involved in this.

Mr. GROSS. I hope the gentleman is right, but I do not see it as related to the language on page 4, where the bill validates the expenditure of money on the part of other agencies of Government.

Mr. KYL. In my way of looking at it, it prevents the matter of duplication, which is costly. Instead of saying, We want you to study this business of recreation and forest areas, we say, Go to the people who know and get their answer in much cheaper fashion and give it to these people.

Mr. GROSS. I say this language of the bill validates the spending of money on the part of other agencies for this purpose. As I understand it, the Department of the Interior in January of this year added another 2,000 employees to its payroll. A number of these employees, I understand, are allegedly for the purpose of administering recreational programs.

This is one more reason why there ought to be a cutback in employment and a cutback in spending on the part of other agencies if this legislation is adopted and administration centered in the Interior Department.

Incidentally, I was intrigued the other day to learn that the Secretary of the Interior awarded a contract to the Applied Psychology Corp. of Arlington, Va., a $27,500 contract, to study whether campers in the national parks would rather camp on high ground or low ground; whether they saw too many bears in the national parks or too few bears. And, I wonder if someone could tell me why, with all of the park rangers, who see these tourists when they come into the parks, they could not find out whether they prefer to camp on high ground or low ground or whether they see too many or too few bears?

I would like some one to tell me if the House Interior Committee approved the hiring of a psychology corporation to answer questions of that kind.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, this was not brought officially to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. This was a proposal by the National Park Service. I understand there was some objection raised to it, and they are not going to enter into such a contract.

Mr. GROSS. Well, I hope the gentleman is right. I am fearful, if we are going into the hiring of this kind of service, that when we get the famous fish palace down at Haines Point, someone will be hiring a psychology outfit to find out whether the people saw enough fish or how the fish felt about the people looking at them. It just could be possible, too, you know, that the bears resent this business of spending $27,500 for the hiring of psychologists to evalue their attractiveness.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose of trying to clarify the real intent and purpose of the creation of this agency. We have been told under section 3:

> In order to carry out the policy declared in section 1 of this Act.

And then in section 1 of the act:

> The Congress finds and declares that the general welfare of the Nation requires that all American people of present and future generations shall be assured such quantity and quality of outdoor recreation resources as are necessary and desirable for the physical, spiritual, cultural, recreational, and scientific benefits which such resources provide.

Now, the reason I read that is that the first part of section 3 of this act refers to section 1, which I have just read, and then we say "the heads of Federal departments and independent agencies having administrative responsibility over activities or resources the conduct or use of which is pertinent to fulfillment of that policy shall."

Does that mean that every agency, be it the Department of the Interior or Agriculture or Labor that has charge of the physical, spiritual, cultural, recreational, and scientific benefits which such resources provide, or any agency of the Government that has control of any of these departments, then comes under section 1? Does anybody have an answer to that question?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, in the very broad, somewhat vague and obvious declaration of policy we do refer specifically to outdoor recreation resources, and then we apply those physical, spiritual, cultural, recreational, and scientific benefits to people.

The committee felt that it was quite desirable that any agency of Government should consider the broad policy outlined in matters of outdoor recreation and that they should be compelled to consult with and be consulted by the Secretary in that particular area. It seems to me that is the only way we are going to get any kind of uniform plan. I think, too, that section (b) helps carry a great deal of additional weight.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I thank the gentleman for answering my question. I would like to go further and state that these groups which are assigned this responsibility then under this act "shall consult with and be consulted by the Secretary from time to time both with respect to their conduct of those activities and their use of those resources and with respect to the activities which the Secretary of the Interior carries on under authority of this act which are pertinent to their work, and (b) carry out such responsibilities in general conformance with the nationwide plan authorized under section 2(c) of this act."

Now, my question is this: Under section 2(c) of the act it is a nationwide plan. Is that all about which they can confer with the Secretary, this nationwide plan?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I would say under the language in the bill that they are required to confer with the Secretary in steps leading up to the formulation of the plan and then after the plan is agreed to they are required to act in conformance with the nationwide plan adopted.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That leads to the next question, the nationwide plan that will be adopted. Now, are we then obligated after these departments and everybody in the Government, including all of those in the Department of the Interior and others, if they should arrive at a nationwide plan and adopt it, then does that become a Federal plan to the point that it can and will be enforced throughout the United States without further action of Congress?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. GRIFFIN: On page 1, line 3, after the word "declares", strike out all that follows down through the word "basis" on page 2 in line 1, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "it is to be desirable that all American people of present and future generations be assured adequate outdoor recreation resources, and that it is desirable for all levels of government and private interests to take prompt and coordinated action to the extent practicable without diminishing or affecting their respective powers and functions".

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the committee I should like to read the section as it would read in full with the amendment I have offered:

Beginning on line 3, it would read that the Congress finds and declares it "to be desirable that all American people of present and future generations be assured adequate outdoor recreation resources and that it is desirable for all levels of government and private interests."

Mr. Chairman, I do not have the balance of the language at my desk. I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be permitted to read from the amendment at that point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will again read from the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows: "to take prompt and coordinated action, to the extent practicable without diminishing or affecting their respective powers and functions"——

Mr. GRIFFIN. Then the language would continue to read: "to conserve, develop, and utilize such resources for the benefit and enjoyment of the American people."

I offer this amendment because I think it correctly reflects the intent which has been indicated in the colloquy that preceded the offering of this amendment. In other words, there is no intent, as I understand it, to diminish, impair, or reduce State or local responsibility in this field. If that is the case I should think this amendment clarifies that intent.

Also, my amendment would shorten and take out some of the poetry in the so-called policy statement of the bill. The bill purports to require that all people shall have all of the quantity and quality of outdoor recreation resources that are necessary and desirable for their physical, spiritual, cultural, recreational, and scientific benefit. That is a mighty broad statement of policy. As I indicated before, section 2 would give the Secretary of the Interior a number of powers to carry out the purposes of the act. When reading section 2, it is well to ask: What are the purposes of the act? If what I have referred to in the policy statement also constitutes the purpose of the bill, then the purpose is so broad that the Secretary could do anything with those powers. Therefore I have tried to put the language in the bill which would be more reasonable.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the gentleman that I have no intention of quarreling over a handful of adjectives. I did think the language of the bill had a certain lilt, but I have no pride of authorship in the language. I am sure the language suggested by the gentleman from Michigan is very fine, too, and I should like to say that the committee would have no objection to it.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I thank the gentleman very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] is agreed to.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

> On page 2, line 4:
>
> "SEC. 2. In order to carry out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, after consultation with the Recreation Advisory Council and with the heads of Federal departments and agencies concerned, to perform the following functions and activities:
>
> "(a) INVENTORY.—Prepare and maintain a continuing inventory and evaluation of outdoor recreation needs and resources of the United States, including, to the extent practicable, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.
>
> "(b) CLASSIFICATION.—Prepare a system for classification of outdoor recreation resources to assist in the effective and beneficial use and management of such resources.
>
> "(c) NATIONWIDE PLAN.—Formulate and maintain a comprehensive nationwide outdoor recreation plan, taking into consideration the plans of the various Federal agencies, States, and their political subdivisions. The plan shall set forth the needs and demands of the public for outdoor recreation and the current and foreseeable availability in the future of outdoor recreation resources to meet those needs. The plan shall identify critical outdoor recreation problems, recommend solutions, and identify the desirable actions to be taken at each level of government and by private interests. The Secretary shall transmit the initial plan, which shall be prepared as soon as practicable within five years hereafter, to the President for transmittal to the Congress. Future revisions of the plan shall be similarly transmitted at succeeding five-year intervals. When a plan or revision is transmitted to the Congress, the Secretary shall

transmit copies to the Governors of the several States.

"(d) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—Provide technical assistance and advice to and cooperate with States, political subdivisions, and nonprofit organizations with respect to outdoor recreation.

"(e) REGIONAL COOPERATION.—Encourage interstate and regional cooperation in the planning, acquisition, and development of outdoor recreation resources.

"(f) RESEARCH AND EDUCATION.—(1) Sponsor, engage in, and assist in research relating to outdoor recreation, directly or by contract or cooperative agreements, and make payments for such purposes without regard to the limitations of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529) concerning advances of funds when he considers such action in the public interest, (2) undertake studies and assemble information concerning outdoor recreation, directly or by contract or cooperative agreement, and disseminate such information without regard to the provisions of section 321n, title 39, United States Code, and (3) cooperate with educational institutions and others in order to assist in establishing education programs and activities and to encourage public use and benefits from outdoor recreation.

"(g) INTERDEPARTMENTAL COOPERATION.—(1) Cooperate with and provide technical assistance to Federal departments and agencies and obtain from them information, data, reports, advice, and assistance that are needed and can reasonably be furnished in carrying out the purpose of this Act, and (2) promote coordination of Federal plans and activities generally relating to outdoor recreation. Any department or agency furnishing advice or assistance hereunder may expend its own funds for such purposes, with or without reimbursement, as may be agreed to by that agency.

"(h) DONATIONS.—Accept and use donations of money, property, personal services, or facilities for the purpose of this Act."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out the word "desirable," and insert in lieu thereof "desirable for the physical, spiritual, cultural, recreational and scientific benefits which such resources provide,".

Page 2, line 4, after the word "authorized" strike out ", after consultation with the Recreation Advisory Council and with the heads of Federal departments and agencies concerned,".

Page 2, line 10, after the words "United States" change the comma to a period and strike out the remainder of the sentence.

Page 2, line 24, strike out "identify the" and insert "recommend".

Page 3, line 10, strike out "nonprofit organizations" and insert "private interests, including nonprofit organizations,".

Page 3, line 24, strike out "section 321n," and insert "section 4154,".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I have several amendments to section 2, which I ask be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments:

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. WESTLAND: Page 2, lines 4 through 8, strike out all of section 2 and insert:

"SEC. 2. In order to carry out the purposes of this Act, there is hereby established in the executive branch of the Government an independent agency to be known as the United States Outdoor Recreation Agency. The Director of said Agency shall be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate and shall receive a salary of $——— per annum. He shall:".

Page 3, line 2, after "The" strike out "Secretary" and insert "Director".

Page 3, line 7, strike out "Secretary" and insert "Director".

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of these amendments I have offered is to set up a Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. As has been commented several times here this afternoon by Members of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES], for instance, said:

> I thought we were having a Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, but nowhere in the bill can you find that phrase, those words, actually setting up a Bureau of Outdoor Recreation.

What this bill as it is presently constituted does is give additional authority to the Secretary of the Interior. I am pretty sure the Secretary of the Interior is a busy man. He has a lot of bureaus under him. I think it might be imposing additionally upon his time to delegate all this additional authority of arranging for this outdoor recreation program.

It is also a fact that the report states that one of the major functions of the New Bureau of Outdoor Recreation is that of promoting the coordination of the activities of the various Federal agencies stance, said:

In the words of the Commission, the role of the Bureau would be to review and coordinate diverse Federal efforts. The Commission also stated that the Bureau's written comments could accompany plans of other agencies submitted to the executive office and to the Congress.

It is difficult for me to see how a bureau that is housed in a department could possibly make independent judgments, do independent coordinating with other agencies when the authorities are granted in this legislation run to the Secretary of that department rather than to the director of the bureau.

If these amendment that I am offering are accepted, then the authority will go to the Director of the Bureau and not to the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WESTLAND. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Under your amendment, would the Director of the Bureau have the authority to coordinate in the same manner as has been discussed?

Mr. WESTLAND. He would, but he would be specifically designated in the legislation rather than the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Would he have any authority whatsoever to say to the Fish and Wildlife or to the Federal Power Commission how they should resolve these areas as it relates to recreation?

Mr. WESTLAND. No, he would have no more authority than is granted to the Secretary of the Interior in this present legislation.

It is my belief in the exercise of his functions, the Director of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation should be expected and permitted to operate independently of the Department in which the Bureau is housed. The administration's report on the bill made it clear this type of action is contemplated whenever the Bureau is serving in a staff capacity to the recreation advisory council. But I do not think this is sufficiently broad. This independence should cover all functions of the bureau including program, budgetary, and legislative review.

In the report of the Interior Committee of the other body, the quote is made that the independence of the Bureau, its actions and contacts, whenever it is serving in its capacity as staff or secretarial, is essential for the council to function properly and make effective use of the Bureau. In other words, this legislation, as it is presently before us, merely delegates additional authority to the Secretary of the Interior.

We have heard that there are some 18 to 20 agencies presently involved in outdoor recreation and you are setting up one coordinating agency, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. I think the legislation should read to that effect so this agency may operate independently and not be under the thumb of any department whether it is the Department of the Interior or the Department of Agriculture, GSA, or any other department.

Mr. Chairman, I hope these amendments will carry.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington for several reasons. There was a report issued several years ago by the Hoover Commission that strongly recommended that all authority and functions of the agencies be vested in the heads of departments.

The Outdoor Recreation Review Commission report on pages 121 and 122 recommends this authority be vested in the Secretary of the Interior.

There are several reasons for this. One is that most of the recreational activities of the Federal Government are centered in the Department of the Interior. There are other reasons that have an important bearing on this question of authority and that is the housekeeping activities. The Director will be able to draw on the housekeeping activities of the entire Department of the Interior, if the authority is vested in the Secretary.

General legislative history shows that the Congress has been reluctant to authorize independent agencies. The Secretary of the Interior is a Cabinet officer. If this authority were vested in an independent director there would be no Cabinet representation for this important Bureau, and I think it would severely handicap the ability of this Bureau to coordinate all the recreational activities of the Federal Government. It seems to me the authority must be vested in a Secretary. I strongly oppose the amendment offered by my good friend from Washington and hope the committee will defeat it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. What role does the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation play in the scheme of things, if all authority is vested in the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. MORRIS. They provide the technical staff and coordinate the activities.

Mr. GROSS. We really do not need a bureau, then; all the Secretary needs is more employees.

Mr. MORRIS. We do not think that he needs so many more employees; we think he needs an agency to coordinate activities that are already going on. We would be in a much better position to evaluate whether or not other employees were necessary if we had a coordinating agency which we are getting set up under this legislation.

Mr. GROSS. I would not think the Secretary needs more employees. He had 2,000 added in January to bring him up to 64,000 employees in his department. I think he has enough employees, but I just do not understand what role the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation is going to play if all authority is vested in the Secretary.

Mr. MORRIS. The Bureau will be the staff to coordinate and plan and try to bring some order out of all the recreational activities we have going on in the Federal Government. At the present time about 18 agencies are involved in one way or another.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Westland]. Let me make the record clear.

The chairman of the subcommittee that handles national parks has correctly quoted from the report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, in which they recommended that the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation be set up in the Department of the Interior. At the time this proposition was considered by the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission the only real sharp division that occurred in 2½ years of debate on that Commission occurred as to whether or not they should be an independent agency or whether it should be set up as an agency under the Department of the Interior. I was one of those at that time who spoke for an independent agency, and I still believe that an independent agency would be desirable. One of the best reasons I can think of is the reason advanced by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. Morris] for voting this amendment down. His reason was that there would be no Cabinet representation. No, this would be better than Cabinet representation, because the only person to whom the Director of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation would report would be the President himself. He would not have to worry about whether or not the respective Secretary got the right message, whether or not he had to settle disputes between two Cabinet members; he would report directly to the President.

It is true, I think, that the Hoover Commission reported against setting up independent agencies, but sometimes it is necessary to set up an independent agency, and ultimately we are going to have to set one up to consolidate the recreational resources of this country—recreation association or a recreation agency of your Federal Government which will affect the lives not only of the tax-paying American public, the 180 million Americans who are living today, but also the 200 million who will be living here in 1975. They need some individual, someone to report directly to the President on the need for outdoor recreation of these our people.

I hope that the amendments offered by the gentleman from Washington, setting up an independent agency, are adopted.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield,

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I would like to ask the gentleman, if this independent agency was set up, which committee of Congress would that agency report to?

Mr. SAYLOR. I think we can make that very clear. We can make a little change in the rules of the House, add a section to the Rules of the House. We can discuss that matter with the Parliamentarian, Mr. Deschler, and make sure that all legislation concerning outdoor recreation goes to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House. I would urge that the Senate do the same thing.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. In view of that position, why should we not also call upon the executive end of the Government that has knowledge, that can give this opportunity to the Secretary of the Interior. The gentleman has made the point that this legislation might emanate from this independent agency. Why not go all the way and let the Secretary run the show?

Mr. SAYLOR. This is a matter of opinion. I think the Secretary might have a friendly friend over in the Department of Agriculture, he may have a friend in the Department of Defense, and rather than try to agree on what is best for recreation he might try, whoever the Secretary is, to satisfy his friends rather than satisfy the needs of the American public.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment. In the first instance, this amendment would give to the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation a status which the Bureau of Reclamation does not have, a status which the Bureau of Land Management does not have, a status which only two of the agencies of the Department of the Interior do have; namely, the Bureau of Fisheries and Wildlife and the Office of Coal Research.

Second, Mr. Chairman, we have to keep this entire matter in perspective. In most instances, the recreational aspects of Federal and State projects are secondary—extremely important, but secondary. There are some areas where the primary consideration, if we would include esthetic and physical benefits, would be from recreation. In the case of projects of the Corps of Army Engineers the most important features are flood control and navigation. Elements of recreation are secondary.

This last week a subcommittee visited an area in Wisconsin, where the primary benefit is scientific, because that particular small area includes almost all different visible effects of glaciation. It is primarily scientific. Certainly there would be concomitant recreational aspects. We want to coordinate the recreational activities of all agencies of government, but we do not want to make this particular feature of our national life the most important thing in the creation of a separate office. It would have a tendency to elevate the office out of all perspective.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KYL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman from Iowa, and the other members of the committee, to the fact that the Coal Research Office, which the gentleman referred to, only applies to the 26 coal-producing States, and the Reclamation Bureau only applies to 17 Western States. But this agency affecting recreation which we are here creating applies to 50 States, and as was pointed out, includes Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, and the trust territories.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The Chair will count. [After counting.] Seventy Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 32]

Aspinall
Avery
Ayres
Barrett
Becker
Beermann
Belcher
Blatnik
Bolton,
  Frances P.
Brademas
Bromwell
Buckley
Cahill
Carey
Celler
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clark
Davis, Tenn.
Diggs
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Farbstein
Fino
Foreman
Forrester
Giaimo
Goodell
Grabowski
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Gubser
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Hawkins
Healey
Hébert
Henderson
Hoffman
Holifield
Horton
Ichord
Jennings
Johnson, Calif
Jones, Ala.
Kelly
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Lennon
Lesinski
Lloyd
Long, Md.
McDade
McDowell
Macdonald
MacGregor
Madden
Mathias
May
Miller, Calif.
Miller, N.Y.
Monagan
Morrison
Multer
Murphy, N.Y.
Nedzi
O'Neill
Patten
Philbin
Powell
Rains
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Rich
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Rodino
Rogers, Tex.
Roosevelt
Roush
St. George
Schwengel
Shelley
Short
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Stephens
Taft
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Walter
Watson
Whalley
Wickersham
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Slack, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 1762, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 333 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Rogers] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, when the point of no quorum was made we were considering an amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington which in effect sets up a separate bureau and creates a director and, I think, gives him a good deal of authority. My objective is to try to ascertain if this amendment would clarify the situation that exists in my own State at the present time. This legislation requires that outdoor recreation be coordinated at all levels of government.

The situation that I outlined is: The Water Board of the City and County of Denver made application to the Federal Power Commission for a dam across a stream. When they issued the license in connection, they put certain restrictions on outdoor recreation; that is to say, they required the building of causeways for fish and other recreational purposes. Thereafter, the Secretary of the Interior believed the Federal Power Commission had overstepped its bounds and intervened in that action before the Federal Power Commission.

I would like to know from the gentleman from Washington, if his amendment is adopted would this special agency have the right and the authority to settle the dispute that now exists between the Federal Power Commission and the Secretary of the Interior and the Fish and Wildlife Division?

Mr. WESTLAND. First of all, I think this legislation is pretty plain, in that it sets it up as a coordinate agency. I seriously doubt it has any more authority in the case the gentleman from Colorado has mentioned. In view of the amendment accepted by the gentleman from Michigan, the answer more definitely is no to the question asked by the gentleman from Colorado. I cannot recall the exact phraseology of the amendment that was adopted, but it was to the effect that without impairing or reducing their respective powers. There was nothing added. If anything, it was reduced, and I frankly believe the answer is no.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. It would be the gentleman's thought, if his amendment is adopted, it would not add any power nor give authority to anybody to make the Federal Power Commission and the Secretary of the Interior get together and resolve this problem.

Mr. WESTLAND. They have no power. They could request.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Then, if they did not, why should we have a separate agency?

Mr. WESTLAND. There are many other problems involved besides the problem the gentleman mentioned. There are problems of recreation throughout the 50 States.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The Federal Power Commission say they have some jurisdiction in this recreation matter, having issued the order to my Board in Denver that you must keep these causeways open for fish and wildlife. What I am trying to do is to coordinate them, and if your amendment will do that, all right. If not, I do not think we should adopt it.

Mr. WESTLAND. This asks for coordination between the various agencies.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. May I say they have tried heretofore to coordinate them, and apparently it was not accepted. Even if the gentleman's amendment is adopted, how would it be any different?

Mr. WESTLAND. Perhaps we should substitute coercion for coordinate.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I would like to suggest to the gentleman that in the absence of any other authority or power to try to coordinate differences of views and to resolve differences of views in the Department or any agency, the bill as reported by the committee is the most constructive step you will have a chance to vote on this year, and I hope the gentleman will support this bill.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct a question to the gentleman from Colorado or the gentleman from Washington or both. I was, of necessity, off the floor during general debate. I am not sure that this question may not have been answered. Has there been any report filed with the Congress either by the Bureau of the Budget or by the Department of the Interior as to the number of man-years of additional personnel that would be required under this legislation?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I am not a member of the committee, so I will defer to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. MORRIS. We have a letter signed by Mr. Edward C. Craft addressed to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Aspinall], chairman of the full committee, which says that as of this date this bureau has 74 employees and they expect to have, possibly, in the next 3 or 4 years, no more than 186.

Mr. JOHANSEN. In other words, am I to understand from the gentleman that the provisions of Public Law 801 of the 84th Congress, which require the filing with the Congress of estimates for each of 5 years of the total number of man-years of civilian employment, have been complied with?

Mr. MORRIS. In substance, they have.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I trust, if I may say so to the gentleman, and I speak as a member of the Manpower Utilization Subcommittee, that the Department will be reminded that this does go to the requirement for each of the 5 years and not in just broad generalizations of the type mentioned. So, it is my understanding, then, that the number will increase possibly from 74, to what number did the gentleman say?

Mr. MORRIS. Approximately 186.

Mr. JOHANSEN. 186?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Well, I would say that is a good, normal, healthy growth for a bureaucracy in that period of time.

Mr. MORRIS. If the gentleman will yield further, this is expected to be the top that the bureau would have of employees.

Mr. JOHANSEN. That would be the top?

Mr. MORRIS. This is expected to level off at that figure.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I have great respect for the gentleman and I know he speaks with great sincerity and good faith. I am reminded of the comments some of my children used to make when they were young, "Want to bet?" I am not questioning the good faith of the gentleman in the least, but this could be a substantial and expensive expansion once they get started.

Mr. MORRIS. I am sure with the assistance of the Manpower Utilization Subcommittee and the Subcommittee on National Parks of the Committee on the Interior, we can between us see that this is complied with.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I appreciate the implied compliment to the subcommittee. I am not sure that the subcommittee is that good, but I would say that perhaps one of the best forms of weight control or girth control in the bureaucracy is retroactive birth control of some of these agencies.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Westland].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Westland) there were—ayes 54, noes 99.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Griffin of Michigan: On page 4, line 19, replace the period with a semicolon and add the following: "*Provided, however,* That within 60 days following the close of each calendar year, they shall submit to the Congress a report for each such calendar year which report shall itemize with particularity and describe in detail the source, value, purpose, and use of each donation of money, property, personal services, or facilities accepted or used under authority of this or any other Act."

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that that amendment be amended. It should read:

Provided, however, That within 60 days following the close of each calendar year, the Secretary of the Interior shall submit to Congress—

And the amendment would then be as it was read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the modification of the amendment?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will now report the modified amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 4, line 19, replace the period with a semicolon and add the following: "*Provided, however,* That within 60 days following the close of each calendar year, the Secretary of the Interior shall submit to the Congress a report for each such calendar year which report shall itemize with particularity and describe in detail the source, value, purpose, and use of each donation of money, property, personal services, or facilities accepted or used under authority of this or any other Act."

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, this or a similar amendment should be in every piece of legislation which authorizes any agency of the Government to accept and use donated funds or property. Certainly, insofar as the Secretary of the Interior and the National Park Services are concerned, the use of donated funds and property serves a good purpose in most instances. However, Mr. Chairman, it seems to be difficult for a Member of Congress to find out just how much money is donated to the Secretary of the Interior and the National Park Service, from whom it comes, and the use to which such funds are put.

He who pays the piper calls the tune. Mr. Chairman, Congress can exert control over the bureaus and agencies of Government only if Congress controls the funds which the bureaus and agencies spend. When we authorize any agency of the Government to accept donations of property or funds, and allow them to be used under broad authority such as is contained in this bill, Congress loses a great deal of its control and supervision.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would merely require that the Secretary of the Interior file an annual report giving information to Congress concerning the source, value, purpose, and use of any donated funds or property.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the committee to adopt this amendment.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment in its present form. I believe a point of order would lie against the amendment as offered by the gentleman from Michigan. The committee would have no objection to the amendment if the author would strike out the words "or any other act" which I think carries us beyond the legislation we are considering today.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I yield.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I believe this or similar language should be attached to every act involving use of donated funds. However, I respect the gentleman's point; and, therefore, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be amended to read "under authority of this act."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'BRIEN of New York to the amendment offered by Mr. GRIFFIN: "Strike the last four words."

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment I offered falls squarely across the agreement which the gentleman from Michigan was willing to make. I think it is obvious.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I yield.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I believe even the gentleman's amendment does not quite do the job because if he strikes the last four words he strikes the word "act", and I believe he wants the language to read "under authority of this act."

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. The gentleman is correct. I was under the impression the gentleman's amendment included "the purposes of this act or any other act."

Mr. GRIFFIN. It now reads "under the authority of this or any other act".

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I intended to strike from the gentleman's amendment "or any other act."

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from New York asking unanimous consent to modify his amendment to the amendment?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I ask unanimous consent so to modify the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is out of order. He may not offer a substitute at this point.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may not offer an amendment to the amendment at this point.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken this time merely to state that apparently the only way out of the dilemma that confronts us now, if we are going to avoid trying to cover the whole field and getting into the jurisdiction of a number of other committees and other departments, is to vote down this amendment after which it will then be in order to offer a different amendment that covers particularly this point. And certainly those of us on the committee who are in support of this legislation have no objection to the purpose of the gentleman from Michigan in offering it and we see some very worthwhile things that could be accomplished by it. But I think we are getting into distant fields when we try to cover the whole gamut of all departmental and agency activities and all other acts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. As I understand the gentleman's observation, he suggests that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] be voted down and then a Member will be able to offer another amendment to the Griffin amendment; is that correct?

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman is entirely correct and I appreciate his clarification.

Mr. McCORMACK. I concur in the gentleman's statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MORRIS to the amendment offered by Mr. GRIFFIN: In the last sentence of the amendment, strike out the words "or any other".

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk read the whole amendment again for clarification.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GRIFFIN:

On page 4, line 19, replace the period with a semicolon and add the following: "*Provided, however,* That within sixty days following the close of each calendar year, the Secretary of the Interior shall submit to the Congress a report for each such calendar year which report shall itemize with particularity and describe in detail the source, value, purpose, and use of each donation of money, property, personal services, or facilities accepted or used under authority of this or any other Act."

Amendment offered by Mr. MORRIS to the amendment offered by Mr. GRIFFIN: In the last sentence of the amendment, strike out the words "or any other".

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, you have seen another fine example of what happens when we, the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress, try to write legislation on the floor of the House by people who have no connection with the bill whatsoever. Do any of you have any idea how far reaching the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] goes? No. Not a one of you has any idea.

What is more, let me tell you what is underneath the whole matter. The Committee on Appropriations have decided that they would like to find some way to get the Secretary of the Interior to tell them how much money freedom-loving Americans have given him to purchase items in the Secretary's budget, because the Secretary of the Interior, the present one and his predecessor, have come before the Appropriations Committee for the past number of years and requested money for the buying of certain of these resources all over the country. And what has happened? He has been turned down, and the price has been going up and up and up and up.

There are American citizens in this country that love it. There are American citizens who love their country above price, there are people in this country who fortunately do not want to keep all of their money and who are willing to give it to the Secretary of the Interior, so that he can buy for the benefit of all of the people of the United States some of these treasures that are being wasted away.

And what has happened? The Appropriations Committee would love to find out how much the Secretary of the Interior is getting so that they can cut down the amount of the appropriations he has already been given. That is what you are trying to do with this amendment. I am surprised that the Members of the majority say they are willing to accept such an amendment. It strikes at the very heart of this bill, it strikes at the very heart of this program. There are people who are willing to give huge sums of money to the Secretary of the Interior, because they love this land of yours and mine, but if they are going to be held up to public ridicule and scorn and the report is going to be published as to how much they give, you might just as well forget it. If you want to gut this bill completely, if you want to do away with the very purposes of it, then all you have to do is take this amendment.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I take it that the gentleman is against both the broadgaged amendment of the gentleman from Michigan and also the more restrictive version that has been offered by the gentleman from New Mexico?

Mr. SAYLOR. Absolutely.

Mr. EDMONDSON. So the gentleman is against any kind of reporting requirement in the bill?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am against any kind of reporting of donated funds particularly aimed at this bill. If that is the position that the Congress of the United States wants to take, the attitude of coming in here and bringing in a general piece of legislation that requires every agency of the Government to report every donation, that is one thing, but to pick out the Secretary of Interior in this bill, I think, is completely wrong.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Of course, the gentleman realizes under the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico that the only requirement for reporting would be for donations made under this act to carry out the recreation planning and coordination program.

Mr. SAYLOR. It may be acquisition too. I think both amendments ought to be voted down.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Why should not the Congress and the public of this country know what these financial transactions are, I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I am carrying no torch for the Committee on Appropriations. It is the first time I have heard of such an alleged involvement. I would like to know why this, all of this financing, is not public business?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SAYLOR. It may be public business if the Congress of the United States decides that every agency of the Government is required to report.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know of a better place to make a start than right here.

Mr. SAYLOR. Well, I do know a better place to start. And that is in the Ways and Means Committee in a very basic change to the tax laws of the United States.

Mr. GROSS. I am not singling out the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. SAYLOR. That is just what you are doing.

Mr. GROSS. I would apply this to every other bill where there are donated funds involved, if any. It seems to me the public and the Congress are entitled to know about these financial transactions.

Mr. SAYLOR. In other words, what you are saying to this committee is that you are in favor of every department in the Government telling everybody the name of whoever comes in and who wants to make a donation of any sort or description.

Mr. GROSS. Certainly, why not—what is wrong with that?

Mr. SAYLOR. I agree with the philosophy of your position, but I oppose the isolated application of it to the Secretary of Interior.

Mr. GROSS. Well, what is wrong with it?

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MEADER. I think there is something very basic involved in this principle, and I believe the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] has made a great contribution in calling it to the attention of the Committee. I recall in the conflict of interest bill which our Committee on the Judiciary reported out, there was a provision prohibiting any official of the Government from accepting pay for doing his official business. It seems to me, if large amounts of funds are being donated to the Secretary of the Interior for him to manage in such fashion as he may desire in connection with programs that are authorized by the Congress or any programs proposed that are unauthorized by the Congress, it seems to me that the public ought to know about it because he is a public official.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, and no matter who the Secretary of the Interior may be. It does not make any difference.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to managed information and secrecy except where it directly bears on the defense and security of this Nation. There is no such element here involved and I support the amendment and the public right to know public business.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, let it be understood that I am not opposed to full disclosure of all facets of the operation of our Government. What I oppose is the singling out of the Secretary of the Interior and the new agency here created, to a standard not required of any other agency of our Government.

If the Congress desires full disclosure of any dealings by its citizens with its Government, I will be the first to agree. Let us ask the Secretary of the Treasury to require such reports on your income tax returns. Let all agencies of the executive department stand in the same light and no one will object—Yes; those of us who oppose this amendment will lead the fight for full disclosure, but let us not persecute and prosecute the Secretary of the Interior, present or future.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to join the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] in his position on this matter. Some of us who have been very much concerned with reference to matters of recreation and natural resources for the development of our national parks and with the need for increased areas all over our Nation, seashores and otherwise, have seen many instances of individuals coming in who have been very helpful and who have contributed freely of their time and their wealth in making it possible for Americans across our country to enjoy some of these natural wonders, and some of these things which I believe probably are our greatest sources of wealth. I do not believe that now is the time to attempt to do something here in this bill to hold these people up in a sense to public ridicule. I simply do not think on this particular piece of legislation which I feel to be important to recreation and to the preservation of our natural resources in this country, we should attempt to force the Secretary of the Interior to do something which, in my opinion, will be a step backward in preserving many of these areas for posterity. I would hope that this amendment will be defeated.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I am glad to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am searching for understanding and information about this. I would like to get the gentleman's thinking that leads him to say it would hold somebody up to ridicule to have a report to the Congress of the United States that he had given a donation of land or made a gift of money to help develop a recreational project. I cannot personally see how this would create ridicule for the individual, to have it known that he tried to help out in the development of a public recreational project.

Mr. SISK. I may say to my good friend from Oklahoma I am not saying it would necessarily hold them up to ridicule, but I think the gentleman knows what has happened in the case of some individuals or foundations and others in this country who have contributed many, many millions of dollars. I am sure the gentleman knows some of those whom I am talking about. I simply think that to require a complete accounting from these people who have so generously given of their private wealth across this country because this country has been kind to them, is hardly fair to them. I say to the gentleman that if we insist on such a requirement it may be that some of these individuals and foundations may hesitate to make contributions similar to those they have made in the past.

In the matter of justice and equity and any question of conflict of interest that might arise regarding some of these gifts I am sure there are congressional committees which have the jurisdiction and the authority to look into these things, as they are doing now and have done in the past.

I feel that to require a report by the Secretary of the Interior of every person who donates time, money, land, or anything else would not be in the best interest of the United States in the preservation of our great national resources. I have had experiences with these things in the past.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from California yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield.

Mr. KYL. Are not reports now made to the General Accounting Office and to the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. SISK. It is entirely possible that they do report them to the Appropriations Committee. I could not say offhand whether they do or not; but the point I am making here is that I simply do not feel it is fair to legislate a requirement of this kind. I think it works against the preservation of our great national resources to publicize this type of procedure. I may be wrong, but it is my honest opinion that it will react against the preservation of these areas. That is my reason for joining with the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think the gentleman is entirely straightforward in his position, but I think some of us would favor having a report of donations under this act. I think the real point of view is that greater public interest may be served by the absence of secrecy than will be served by giving the impression that these will be kept secret. I personally feel that there is a little public feeling at the present time that there is too much secrecy.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan as amended.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SAYLOR) there were ayes 105, noes 31.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment. Page 4, after line 19, insert the following:

"SEC. 3. In order further to carry out the policy declared in section 1 of this Act, the heads of the Federal departments and independent agencies having administrative responsibility over activities or resources the conduct or use of which is pertinent to fulfillment of that policy shall, either individually or as a group, (a) consult with and be consulted by the Secretary from time to time both with respect to their conduct of those activities and their use of those resources and with respect to the activities which the Secretary of the Interior carries on under authority of this Act which are pertinent to their work, and (b) carry out such responsibilities in general conformance with the nationwide plan authorized under section 2(c) of this Act.

"SEC. 4. As used in this Act, the term 'United States' shall include the District of Columbia and the terms 'United States' and 'States' may, to the extent practicable, include the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HALEY: On page 5, after line 12, insert:

"SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, but not more than $2,500,000 per year, as are required to carry out the purposes of this Act."

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment. The report on page 5 says that the cost of the program is estimated at $2,460,000. I am merely trying to put a ceiling of $2½ million on it so that we will not allow them to go over the amount, except to the extent of $40,000 more than they have requested.

I hope the Chairman will accept the amendment.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SLACK, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1762) to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution No. 306, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the so-called Griffin amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 4, line 19, replace the period with a semicolon and add the following:

"*Provided, however,* That within sixty days following the close of each calendar year, the Secretary of the Interior shall submit to the Congress a report for each such calendar year which report shall itemize with particularity and describe in detail the source, value, purpose and use of each donation of money, property, personal services or facilities accepted or used under authority of this Act."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 292, nays 50, not voting 91, as follows:

[Roll No. 33]

YEAS—292

Abbitt
Abele
Abernethy
Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Alger
Anderson
Andrews
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Auchincloss
Baldwin
Baring
Barry
Bass
Bates
Battin
Becker
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Boggs
Bolling
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonner
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Bruce
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cameron
Cannon
Casey
Cederberg
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clausen
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Delaney
Dent
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Diggs
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Edmondson
Elliott
Ellsworth
Everett
Evins
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Ford
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gill
Glenn
Goodell
Goodling
Grant
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Griffin
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gurney
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hays
Hechler
Hemphill
Herlong
Hoeven
Holifield
Holland
Horan
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Hutchinson
Jarman
Jensen
Johansen
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kilburn
Kilgore
King, N.Y.
Knox
Kornegay
Kunkel
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Lankford
Latta
Leggett
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
McClory
McCulloch
McFall
McIntire
McLoskey
McMillan
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Meader
Michel
Milliken
Mills
Minish
Minshall
Montoya
Moore
Morgan
Morrison
Morse
Mosher
Moss
Murray
Natcher
Nelsen
Nix
Norblad
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
Osmers
Ostertag
Patman
Pelly
Pike
Pilcher
Pillion
Poage
Poff
Pool
Powell
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Randall
Reid, N.Y.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rosenthal
Roudebush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
St. Onge
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker

Scott
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Short
Shriver
Sibal
Sikes
Siler
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stinson
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Thornberry
Toll
Tollefson
Trimble
Tuck
Tupper
Tuten
Utt
Van Deerlin
Van Pelt
Vinson
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Weaver
Weltner
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Charles H.
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wright
Wydler
Wyman
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—50

Blatnik
Boland
Burke
Burkhalter
Burton
Carey
Conte
Daddario
Dawson
Denton
Dingell
Finnegan
Fogarty
Gallagher
Gonzalez
Joelson
Karsten
Keogh
King, Calif.
Kluczynski
Kyl
Libonati
Moorhead
Morris
Morton
Murphy, Ill.
Nygaard
O'Hara, Ill.
Pepper
Perkins
Price
Reid, Ill.
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rooney
Rostenkowski
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St Germain
Saylor
Sickles
Sisk
Slack
Staebler
Thompson, N.J.
Udall
Ullman
Vanik
Westland
White

NOT VOTING—91

Aspinall
Avery
Ayres
Baker
Barrett
Beermann
Bolton, Frances P.
Bromwell
Brown, Calif.
Buckley
Cahill
Celler
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clark
Davis, Tenn.
Donohue
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Edwards
Fallon
Farbstein
Fino
Foreman
Forrester
Friedel
Garmatz
Grabowski
Green, Pa.
Gubser
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Hawkins
Healey
Hébert
Henderson
Hoffman
Horton
Ichord
Jennings
Johnson, Calif.
Kelly
Kirwan
Lennon
Lesinski
Long, Md.
McDade
McDowell
Macdonald
MacGregor
Madden
Mathias
Miller, Calif.
Miller, N.Y.
Monagan
Multer
Murphy, N.Y.
Nedzi
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Neill
Passman
Patten
Philbin
Pirnie
Rains
Reifel
Rich
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Rodino
Rogers, Tex.
Roosevelt
Roush
St. George
Schwengel
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Steed
Stephens
Taft
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Walter
Watson
Watts
Whalley
Wharton
Wickersham
Willis
Wilson, Bob

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Walter with Mr. Miller of New York.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Avery.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Reifel.

Mr. Henderson with Mr. Schwengel.

Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Clancy.

Mr. Rodino with Mr. Foreman.

Mr. Monagan with Mr. Bob Wilson.

Mr. Johnson of California with Mr. Taft.

Mr. Grabowski with Mr. Beermann.

Mr. Duncan with Mr. Ayres.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Wharton.

Mr. Farbstein with Mrs. Dwyer.

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Pirnie.

Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Baker.

Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Chamberlain.

Mr. Philbin with Mr. Whalley.

Mr. Donohue with Mrs. St. George.

Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mrs. Frances P. Bolton.

Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Fino.

Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Rich.

Mr. Dulski with Mr. Cahill.

Mr. Jennings with Mr. Bromwell.

Mr. Garmatz with Mr. McDade.

Mr. Fallon with Mr. Gubser.

Mr. Friedel with Mr. MacGregor.

Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Hoffman.

Mr. Patten with Mr. Mathias.

Mr. Rains with Mr. Horton.

Mr. Lennon with Mr. Roosevelt.

Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Hagen of California.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Multer.

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Murphy of New York.

Mr. Madden with Mr. Clark.

Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Green of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Willis with Mr. McDowell.

Mr. Watts with Mr. Wickersham.

Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Nedzi.

Mr. Steed with Mr. Roush.

Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Ichord.

Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Smith of Iowa.

Mr. Forrester with Mr. Healey.

Mr. POAGE changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. MARTIN of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MARTIN of California. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MARTIN of California moves to recommit the bill (H.R. 1762) to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARTIN of California) there were—yeas 18, nays, 183.

Mr. MARTIN of California. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. (After counting.) Two hundred and sixty Members are present, a quorum.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to promote the coordination and development of effective programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 20) to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress finds and declares that the general welfare of the Nation requires that all American people of present and future generations shall be assured such quantity and quality of outdoor recreation resources as are necessary and desirable, and that prompt and coordinated action is required by all levels of government and by private interests on a nationwide basis to conserve, develop, and utilize such resources for the benefit and enjoyment of the American people.

SEC. 2. In order to carry out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, after consultation with the Recreation Advisory Council and with the heads of Federal departments and agencies concerned, to perform the following functions and activities:

(a) INVENTORY.—Prepare and maintain a continuing inventory and evaluation of outdoor recreation needs and resources of the United States.

(b) CLASSIFICATION.—Prepare a system for classification of outdoor recreation resources to assist in the effective and beneficial use and management of such resources.

(c) NATIONWIDE PLAN.—Formulate and maintain a comprehensive nationwide outdoor recreation plan, taking into consideration the plans of the various Federal agencies, States and their political subdivisions. The plan shall set forth the needs and demands of the public for outdoor recreation and the current and foreseeable availability in the future of outdoor recreation resources to meet those needs. The plan shall identify critical outdoor recreation problems, recommend solutions, and identify the desirable actions to be taken at each level of government and by private interests. The Secretary shall transmit the initial plan, which shall be prepared as soon as practicable within five years hereafter, to the President for transmittal to the Congress. Future revisions of the plan shall be similarly transmitted at succeeding five-year intervals. When a plan or revision is transmitted to the Congress, the Secretary shall transmit copies to the Governors of the several States.

(d) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—Provide technical assistance and advice to and cooperate with States, political subdivisions, and private interests including nonprofit organizations with respect to outdoor recreation.

(e) REGIONAL COOPERATION.—Encourage interstate and regional cooperation in the planning, acquisition, and development of outdoor recreation resources.

(f) RESEARCH AND EDUCATION.—(1) Sponsor, engage in, and assist in research relating to outdoor recreation, directly or by contract or cooperative agreements, and make payments for such purposes, including advance payments without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes (39 U.S.C. 4154) for initial costs of such research to any educational institution, or other nonprofit organizations when necessary and in the public interest; (2) undertake studies and assemble information concerning outdoor recreation, directly or by contract or cooperative agreement, and disseminate such information without regard to the provisions of section 321n, title 39, United States Code; and (3) cooperate with educational institutions and others in order to assist in establishing education programs and activities and to encourage public use and benefits from outdoor recreation.

(g) INTERDEPARTMENTAL COOPERATION.—(1) Cooperate with and provide technical assistance to Federal departments and agencies and obtain from them information, data, reports, advice, and assistance that are needed and can reasonably be furnished in carrying out the purposes of this Act; and (2) promote coordination of Federal plans and activities generally relating to outdoor recreation. Any department or agency furnishing advice or assistance hereunder may expend its own funds for such purposes, with or without reimbursement, as may be agreed to by that agency.

(h) DONATIONS.—Accept and use donations of money, property, personal services, or facilities for the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 3. The term "United States" as used in this Act shall include the District of Columbia; and, to the extent practicable in carrying out the provisions of this Act, the terms "United States" and "States" may include the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MORRIS: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 20 and insert the provisions of H.R. 1762, as passed.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to promote the coordination and development of effective programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 1762) was laid on the table.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE LEAD-ZINC STABILIZATION ACT

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 3120) to simplify administration of the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of October 3, 1961 (75 Stat. 766).

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 6(a)(2) of the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of October 3, 1961 (75 Stat. 766, 768, 30 U.S.C. 686), is amended by deleting the phrase "during any twelve-month period" and substituting therefor "during any calendar year".

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, insert:

"SEC. 2. Section 4 of said Act is hereby amended as follows:

"'SEC. 4. The Secretary is authorized to establish and promulgate such regulations and require such reports as he deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act. Such regulations shall assure equitable distribution of the benefits of the programs provided by this Act among the small domestic producers affected: *Provided, however,* That—

"'(1) Any small domestic producer who filed application for participation in such programs during the first ten months of 1962, if otherwise eligible therefor, shall be entitled to stabilization payments on sales made from, on, and after January 1, 1962. Small domestic producers who filed applications during November and December of 1962, if otherwise eligible therefor, shall be entitled to stabilization payments only on sale made on and after January 1, 1963.

"'(2) Any small domestic producer who, after January 1, 1963, files or has filed an application for participation in such programs during the first month of any quarter, if otherwise eligible therefor, shall be entitled to stabilization payments on sales made from, on, and after the first day of the quarter during which the application for participation is filed. Small domestic producers who, after January 1, 1963, file or have filed applications for participation in such programs during the second or third month of any quarter, if otherwise eligible therefor, shall be entitled to stabilization payments only on sales made during and after the following quarter.'"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining, which considered and reported favorably on H.R. 3120, as amended, I take this time to state some of the basic points in support of the bill.

This bill is designed to make sure that small producers can obtain the benefits intended for them under the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Act of October 3, 1961 (75 Stat. 766). We reported to the House 2 weeks ago, during consideration of another bill, that the response from industry has not been as great as had been forecast by the Department of the Interior.

I would like, today, to bring up to date the statistical data pertaining to the program. Out of a projected potential of between 276 and 638 small producers, only 117 have to date applied for participation in the program and 89 have been certified as eligible for the program. Of those eligible, a total of 55 received $1,012,580 in payments for their 1962 production—as compared with an estimate of $4.5 million which was authorized and appropriated.

Those who participated in the 1962 program were listed at page 6383 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for April 11, 1963. In addition, at this point, under permission previously granted to extend my remarks, I include a list of those 34 who have been found eligible since the eligibility for payments in the 1962 program was completed, and two additional tables bringing up to date the distribution of the total of 89 small producers:

PRODUCERS CERTIFIED FOR PARTICIPATION UNDER LEAD-ZINC SMALL PRODUCERS STABILIZATION ACT

Rush Creek Mining & Smelting Co., Inc., Yellville, Ark.
Paul Bare, Lone Pine, Calif.
Nabob Silver-Lead Co., Kellogg, Idaho.
Joseph L. Ausich, Mackay, Idaho.
Ivan I. Taylor, Mackay, Idaho.
Silver Syndicate, Ind., Wallace, Idaho.
Woodrow McLin, Kellogg, Idaho.
Arthur G. and Donald Anderson, Mackay, Idaho.
O. K. Tucker, Baxter Springs, Kans.
Jim Stone, Baxter Springs, Kans.
Carey and McCoy Mining Co., Picher, Okla.
Frank Lloyd, Pioche, Nev.
Bristol Silver Mines Co., Pioche, Nev.
John F. Alg and Lucy Dee, Montello, Nev.
Consolidated Eureka Mining Co., Salt Lake City, Utah.
W. R. Dobson and W. L. Dobson, Magdalena, N. Mex.
C. A. Enders Mining Co., Picher, Okla.
Zuvekas Mining & Milling, Baxter Springs, Kans.
Frank Jones Mining Co., Quapaw, Okla.
Aztec Mining Co., Tulsa, Okla.
Wendell Mitchell and Bobby Harry Smith, Heber, Utah.
Dell Gordon and Floyd Smith, Heber, Utah.
Privateer Mining Co., Springville, Utah.
Kenneth Kummer, care of United Pari City Mines, Heber, Utah.
Don Luis Ryan and Victor Provost, Heber, Utah.
Floyd Reed, Midvale, Utah.
WM & W Mining Co., Picher, Okla.
L & B Mining Co., Picher, Okla.
Charles E. Goetz, Phoenix, Ariz.
Ivey Construction Co., Minerals Point, Wis.
Residue Mining Co., Picher, Okla.
Croff & Montague, Monarch, Mont.
Herman & George Heinecke, Midvale, Utah.
Marko Zarko, Midvale, Utah.

LEAD-ZINC SMALL PRODUCERS STABILIZATION ACT

TABLE 1.—*Distribution of small producers by size*

Size of mine	Number in 1956	Number in 1960	Number of participants in the program
Production per annum:			
499 tons or less	558	244	54
500 to 999 tons	27	8	11
1,000 to 1,999 tons	29	14	21
2,000 to 2,999 tons	24	7	3
Total	638	273	89

TABLE 2.—*Distribution of small producers by States*

State	Small producers		Participants in the program
	1956	1960	
Alaska	1	3	0
Arizona	43	24	2
Arkansas	0	1	1
California	27	11	3
Colorado	93	40	0
Idaho	69	50	15
Illinois	9	6	0
Kansas	40	5	6
Kentucky	1	1	0
Missouri	13	1	0
Montana	98	38	7
Nevada	55	29	8
New Mexico	29	11	2
North Carolina	1	1	1
Oklahoma	74	3	21
Oregon	2	0	0
Tennessee	3	2	0
Utah	54	39	22
Washington	13	1	0
Wisconsin	13	7	1
Total	638	273	89

While a low participation rate is no reason to open the program up beyond its original contemplation, it points up the necessity of making certain that we do bring to those for whom it was designed the opportunity to share in the program. H.R. 3120 is such a bill, designed to permit all legitimate small producers of lead and zinc to participate in the program for payments under the Stabilization Act.

For the record, let me mention at this point that the stabilization payments provided for in the 1961 act are based on 75 percent of the difference between 14½ cents per pound and the average market price of lead and 55 percent of the difference between 14½ cents per pound and the average market price of zinc, calculated on a monthly basis. During 1962 the price of lead fluctuated between approximately 10 and 9½ cents per pound while the market price of zinc started out at 12 cents per pound and dropped last April to 11½ cents per pound where it has remained.

In order to qualify as a small domestic producer, the applicant is required to show that he had not produced or sold over 3,000 tons of lead and zinc combined "during any 12-month period between January 1956, and the first day of the period for which he seeks payment under this act."

While it was the intention of your Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, in reporting the Stabilization Act, to restrict participation to legitimate small producers, it was not our intention to encourage unreasonable regulations that would eliminate a small businessman from participation on technical grounds. The term "any 12-month period" has been interpreted to mean any combination of 12 successive months without regard to either a calendar or fiscal year basis. Inasmuch as production records are reported to the Bureau of Mines on a calendar year basis and the committee has been advised that mining companies generally keep their books on a calendar year basis, it is only logical to amend the act to delete the "any 12-month period" requirement and substitute the calendar year as the basis for calculations. This will help both small business and Government bookkeeping.

During committee consideration of H.R. 3120 we were advised that, although the stabilization program had become law October 3, 1961, rules and regulations were approved April 26, 1962, for the operation of the program but were not published in the Federal Register until July 28, 1962.

Section 501.5(i) of the regulations states:

> (i) Except for applications for participation received during the first three quarters of 1962, an applicant may be eligible for payments under the regulations in this part only with respect to sales in a quarter commencing after the date of the receipt of his application.

When these regulations were prepared in April 1962 they anticipated allowing 5 months for the filing of applications to cover the first three quarters of 1962, which ended September 30, 1962. When the regulations were withheld from publication pending receipt of appropriations, their publication on July 28, 1962, had the effect of cutting this period to 2 months, which the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs believes to be an unreasonable restriction.

Accordingly, the committee amendment to H.R. 3120 would permit any persons or firms, otherwise eligible for the program, to participate to the extent of their 1962 production if their applications were filed before the end of October 1962. This has the effect of giving 3 months' notice from the time the regulations were published rather than the full 5 months that had been anticipated initially by the Administrator of General Services as a fair period of notice.

We are interested in being fair. We are interested in doing the right thing. In the instances brought to light in connection with H.R. 3120, we think a little liberalization for the benefit of legitimate small producers is necessary, just as in the bill (H.R. 3845) brought up on the floor 2 weeks ago we presented a situation that required restrictive action.

I urge adoption of H.R. 3120 with the committee amendment.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining, I rise in support of this bill and the amendment thereto.

The purpose of this bill, as has already been stated, is to simplify the administration of the Small Producers Lead-Zinc Act, by establishing the calendar year as the time unit to determine the qualifications of producers to participate under the program.

While this measure was before our committee it was brought to our attention that regulations to implement the act of October 3, 1961, were not published in the Federal Register until July 28, 1963. Thus producers were permitted only 2 months in which to comply. In the opinion of the committee this 2-month period was too restrictive. This amendment simply extends the time for 1 month, thus permitting small producers who made a reasonable effort to comply and would have complied except for the time restriction.

I urge the passage of this bill.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I favor enactment of H.R. 3120, to simplify administration of the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of October 3, 1961 (75 Stat. 766), because the bill makes good sense.

The 1961 act was designed to help the small businessman-producer of lead and zinc by providing Government subsidy payments for a percentage of the difference between the market price of lead or zinc and the statutory stabilization price of 14½ cents per pound. Two weeks ago we discussed this statute when the House adopted an amendment which will strengthen the Stabilization Act—see the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 11, 1963, at page 6380 and those that follow.

The bill that was passed 2 weeks ago will serve to make the program more restrictive by eliminating some large producer-participants who were not intended to share the benefits of the program. The bill which we bring before the House this afternoon is designed to make certain that all small producers for whose benefit the law was enacted are indeed able to take advantage of its provisions. We think this is a two-way street: those who should not benefit should not be permitted to come in on the program while, on the other hand, we should make certain that all who are entitled to benefit do in fact receive the payments.

H.R. 3120 was introduced by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] for the purpose of simplifying administration of the act by amending the law to permit base period calculations for qualification in the program to be made on a calendar year basis instead of being related to "any 12-month period" since 1956.

The amendment is reasonable and I urge adoption of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

THE ARMY CONGRESSIONAL COMMAND AND OPERATIONS GROUP

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the citizen soldier has been the bulwark of our forces of defense since the earliest days of this Nation. During wartime they have served in every service, on every front, in every battle. During peacetime they assist communities during natural calamities and keep themselves ready to spring again to the defense of their homes and country. It has always been our way of life to maintain relatively small Regular forces and trust the defense of this Nation to the Reserve forces. They have never failed and I am sure they never will.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that I am privileged to be a member of this never ending column of citizen soldiers, the Reserve forces of the United States of America. I have been affiliated with the Reserves since before World War II and am grateful that I have had, and continue to have, the opportunity to serve my country in this capacity.

As most of my colleagues know, I am associated with an outstanding group of other Reserve officers in the Army Congressional Command and Operations Group, here in the Capitol. It is through this group that training facilities are provided Members of Congress, their staffs and committee staffs, who are Army Reserve officers.

Training for this group consists of weekly training meetings, 1- and 2-day visits to military installations for orientation and, where possible, 2-week tours of active duty training during the fall congressional adjournment period.

The weekly meetings are held at a time and place most convenient to our heavy congressional duties. They consist of a short intelligence briefing followed by instruction in administration, tactics, personnel and supply, activities and operations of units and staff, and includes future plans and research of organization, weapons, and so forth. Instruction is not limited to the Army, but also includes briefings by Navy and Air Force personnel on their operations, thereby providing cross-service training, giving a fuller understanding of the operatioits and problems of the other services in the defense team. The sum of these activities is a well rounded annual program of instruction which provides an excellent opportunity for those of us who are Reserve officers to keep abreast of not only operations of the Army, but the entire Defense Establishment.

Members of the unit do not receive pay for attendance at meetings, but points are awarded for retirement credit to those who can qualify.

Present membership in the unit is 91, made up of 7 Senators, 30 Representatives and 54 staff members. They range in rank from major general down to second lieutenant. Longevity extends from 2 years for the junior to almost 38 for the senior. Average attendance at weekly meetings is 63.

I take great pride in listing below the Members of Congress in the Congressional Command and Operations Group:

Representative E. Ross Adair, of Indiana.

Representative Carl Albert, of Oklahoma.

Representative Robert T. Ashmore, of South Carolina.

Representative William G. Bray, of Indiana.

Representative Hugh L. Carey, of New York.

Senator Frank Church, of Idaho.

Representative Steven B. Derounian, of New York.

Representative John J. Flynt, Jr., of Georgia.

Representative L. H. Fountain, of North Carolina.

Representative Don Fuqua, of Florida.

Representative G. Elliott Hagan, of Georgia.

Representative Harlan F. Hagen, of California.

Representative Durward G. Hall, of Missouri.

Representative Ralph R. Harding, of Idaho.

Senator Philip A. Hart, of Michigan.

Representative Kenneth W. Heckler, of West Virginia.

Representative Frank J. Horton, of New York.

Senator Daniel K. Inouye, of Hawaii.

Senator Henry M. Jackson, of Washington.

Senator Jacob K. Javits, of New York.

Representative W. Pat Jennings, of Virginia.

Representative Hastings Keith, of Massachusetts.

Representative Glenard P. Lipscomb, of California.

Representative Clark MacGregor, of Minnesota.

Representative John O. Marsh, Jr., of Virginia.

Representative John M. Murphy, of New York.

Representative Alexander Pirnie, of New York.

Representative Richard H. Poff, of Virginia.

Representative Graham B. Purcell, Jr., of Texas.

Representative Ben Reifel, of South Dakota.

Representative Henry S. Reuss, of Wisconsin.

Representative John J. Rhodes, of Arizona.

Representative J. Edward Roush, of Indiana.

Senator J. Strom Thurmond, of South Carolina.

Representative Albert W. Watson, of South Carolina.

Senator Ralph W. Yarborough, of Texas.

WILLIAM R. BENNETT HONORED FOR SAVING LIFE OF MONTANA BOY

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, the State of Montana is proud to have as a native son, William R. Bennett, of Butte, Mont., who saved the life of a 2-year-old boy who had wandered into the path of his railroad engine, Butte, Anaconda & Pacific Railway ore train last June.

Little Mark Erickson was present in the Nation's Capital to see Mr. Bennett receive the award, which includes a trophy and a $500 check. The Honorable Governor Clement, of the State of Tennessee, joined Brotherhood Locomotive Firemen & Engineers President H. E. Gilbert and myself in presenting the award to Bill Bennett.

President Gilbert said:

> Bill Bennett's heroism is apparent to all. We believe he exemplifies the type of men that work in the craft of Locomotive Firemen and for that matter, all men employed on the Nation's railroads.

Governor Clement in his speech turned to Mr. Bennett and said:

> I join your brothers in applauding you and to say that yours is the unselfishness, the willingness to sacrifice, and the courage that is in keeping with the highest American tradition.

Mr. Speaker, prior to attending the dinner in honor of Mr. Bennett, I talked with my mother back in Montana, via long distance. When I told her how I was to take part in the ceremonies to honor Hero Fireman Bennett, my mother simply replied:

> You know, Arnold, that ought to be a pretty good answer to all the featherbedding business.

THE 1962 ANNUAL AWARD

"I don't know what I would do without both my boys. My wife and I can't thank you enough. There is no measure to a child's worth." These are some of the comments of Ed Erickson, a young college student and father, trying to express his gratitude to William R. Bennett, an employee of the Butte, Anaconda & Pacific Railway.

Bill Bennett, in the role of a locomotive helper—fireman—on a 28-car ore train, saved the life of Mark Erickson, 2, when the child wandered from his home last June. The event had its heroic and hair-raising moments. It bears retelling.

It was midmorning of June 22, 1962. Bill Bennett was the engineer and Ed Kendall the fireman on a B.A. & P. ore train, operating between Butte Hill Yard and Rocker, Mont. The track is on a descending grade. Visibility is limited to 50 feet over a portion of the track outside the Butte city limits. Bennett had turned over control of the locomotive to Kendall, so that the fireman could gain experience necessary in handling the heavy train on a tricky downgrade.

Thus, Bennett was in the fireman's seat when he saw a child on the track, directly in the path of the moving train. He call to Kendall to "dynamite, her, Ed"—set the brakes in emergency. Realizing the downgrade speed of 15 miles per hour would prevent Kendall from stopping the train in time, Bennett jumped from the moving locomotive, and raced ahead of the train as it began to slow down. He grabbed the boy and both rolled down a rocky embankment.

Mark Erickson was safe in the arms of his rescuer. Bennett suffered a severe cut on his leg and other bruises—small injuries when compared with what might have happened. The locomotive and nine cars had moved over the spot where Mark had been playing.

The Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen honors William R. Bennett as a man who characterizes the American spirit of selfless heroism; as a man who placed his own life in jeopardy in order to give life to a bright-eyed little boy; and, finally, as a railroad man, skilled in his duties, alert to the dangers of his industry, and dedicated to safety.

We recognize William R. Bennett as "Locomotive Fireman of 1962."

CENTENNIAL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and to include an address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, last July 2, 1962, this Congress marked the 100th anniversary of the Morrill Act. That act permitted States to use revenues from the sale of public lands to establish colleges "for agricultural and industrial classes." Massachusetts was one of the first States to take advantage of the act and, on April 29, 1863, this land-grant college was officially born with the signing of the charter of Massachusetts Agricultural College by Gov. John A. Andrew.

On this day of April 29, 1963, the college marks its Centennial Charter Day observance. Mr. Speaker, this institution of learning has come a long way in the century past. Its evolution has been remarkable—the more so because private colleges of higher learning had dominated the educational scene in our part of the country. But change was inevitable—change in direction, curriculums, size, staff—and these changes have run the gamut of what had to be done to meet the challenges of the times, today and in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks important dates in the history of the University of Massachusetts.

IMPORTANT DATES

July 2, 1862: Morrill Act allows States to use revenues from sale of public lands to establish colleges for the agricultural and industrial classes.

April 29, 1863: Gov. John A. Andrew signs charter of Massachusetts Agricultural College.

October 1864: First land acquired at Amherst.

November 29, 1864: First president, Henry Flagg French, elected by the board of trustees: father of Daniel Chester French, noted sculptor.

Spring, 1865: Construction begins.

1867: Four buildings receive first class of 56 students and faculty of 4.

1869: Faculty increases to 10. Military drill starts.

1871: Twenty-seven students receive B.S. degrees at first commencement.

1882–84: Funds made available for new construction and scholarships; curriculum now includes liberal arts.

1892: First woman student.

1896: First two master's degrees awarded.

1902: First Ph. D. degree awarded to Warren E. Hinds.

1920: First women's dormitory, Abigail Adams House, opened.

March 26, 1931: Official name changed to Massachusetts State College.

1941–45: World War II decreases male enrollment. Facilities used for military training programs.

1946: New construction starts as veterans return. Branch at Fort Devens (Ayer) established to accommodate veterans.

May 7, 1947: Governor Bradford signs bill making college the University of Massachusetts.

October 1956: "Freedom bill" improves salary incentives for faculty.

1956–63: Major construction program results in some 110 instructional and dormitory facilities, many self-liquidating.

July 1962: Fiscal autonomy law gives university greater self-management of funds.

April 29, 1963: Celebration of 100th anniversary. University's enrollment at an all-time high of 7,600.

Mr. Speaker, our university is fortunate in having as its president a forceful, dynamic, extremely able and brilliant educator and administrator. President John W. Lederle has caught the urgency and necessity of the task that is his. He has programed first things first and through friendly persuasion, demonstration, and education he has won the cooperation, assistance, and confidence of the executive and legislative branches of our State government. Without this support it would have been impossible to move the university in the brilliant direction it is headed.

This day, April 29, 1963, the 100th year of the birth of the University of Massachusetts, is indeed a golden day.

As President Lederle points out:

> It is a proud day—a day in which we will honor a productive past and dedicate ourselves to an even more productive future.
>
> We will, above all, renew our commitment to our Massachusetts youth, to all the many thousands who, having ability and motivation, deserve to have full opportunities to reach the highest levels of education.
>
> We recognize that, ultimately, students must educate themselves. The university must, for its part, furnish an intellectual atmosphere and environment where persons with good minds—faculty members and students—undertake to establish profitable communication and hence education.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate President John W. Lederle, the board of trustees, the staff, both teaching and administrative, the alumni and all the students of the University of Massachusetts on this centennial observance—surely a magnificent milestone in the history of this great institution. I join with all in a sincere wish that the plans for the future of this university will be realized, for in the full fruition of these plans will come the realization of the ambitions of the unaccountable numbers who will seek light and knowledge here.

Mr. Speaker, I have also asked permission to have the names of the members of the board of trustees, of the University of Massachusetts, included with my remarks at this point:

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

William Michael Cashin, A.B. (Boston College), Brighton, 1963.

Joseph P. Healey, A.B. (Harvard University), M.B.A. (Harvard Business School), LL.B. (Harvard Law School), Arlington, 1963.

Alden Chase Brett, B.S., LL.D. (University of Massachusetts), Belmont, 1964.

Ernest Hoftyzer, B.S. (Ohio State University), Marion, 1964.

J. John Fox, LL.B. (Boston University), Boston, 1965.

Miss Victoria Schuck, A.B., M.A., Ph. D. (Stanford University), South Hadley, 1965.

Dennis Michael Crowley, B.S., M.S. (University of Massachusetts), LL.B. (Boston College), Boston, 1966.

Mrs. Kathryn Foran Furcolo (Elmira College), (Northeastern Law School), Chestnut Hill, 1966.

Frank Learoyd Boyden, A.B., A.M. (Amherst College), A.M. (Williams College, Yale University), Sc. D. (Colgate University), Ph. D. (New York State College for Teachers), LL.D. (Wesleyan University, Bowdoin College, Kenyon College, Harvard University, University of Massachusetts), L.H.D. (Amherst College, Williams College, Princeton University), Litt. D (Tufts College), Deerfield, 1967.

George L. Pumphret, Dorchester, 1967.

Harry Dunlap Brown, B.S. (University of Massachusetts), Harbor Coves, North Chatham, 1968.

John William Haigis, Jr., B.A. (Amherst College), Greenfield, 1968.

Most Rev. Christopher Joseph Weldon, D.D., A.B. (St. Joseph's Seminary), (Montreal College), (Catholic University of America), J.U.D. (Holy Cross College), LL.D. (St. Michael's College, Boston College, St. Anselm's College), Springfield, 1969.

MEMBERS EX OFFICIO

His Excellency John A. Volpe, D. Eng. (Northeastern University), L.H.D. (St. Michael's College), Boston, Governor of the Commonwealth.

John William Lederle, A.B., A.M., LL.B., Ph. D. (University of Michigan), President of the University.

Owen B. Kiernan, B.S. (Bridgewater State Teachers College), Ed.M. (Boston University), Ed.D. (Harvard University), Commissioner of Education.

Charles Henry McNamara, Commissioner of Agriculture.

OFFICERS OF THE BOARD

His Excellency John A. Volpe, D. Eng. (Northeastern University), L.H.D. (St. Michael's College), Boston, Governor of the Commonwealth.

Frank Learoyd Boyden, A.B., A.M. (Amherst College), A.M. (Williams College, Yale University), Sc.D. (Colgate University), Ph. D. (New York State College for Teachers), LL.D. (Wesleyan University, Bowdoin College, Kenyon College, Harvard University, University of Massachusetts), L.H.D. (Amherst College, Williams College, Princeton University), Ltt. D. (Tufts College) Dearfield, chairman.

Kenneth William Johnson, B.S. (University of Vermont), Amherst, treasurer.

John William Ryan, A.B. (University of Utah), M.A., Ph. D. (Indiana University), Amherst, secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I also include the text of the address delivered at the Centennial Charter Day observance by Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. Dr. Seaborg said that he was pleased to know that the University of Massachusetts was looking forward to a doubling of its student body, to 15,000 students, by 1975. The challenge of the future to the University of Massachusetts and indeed to all higher education, he said, is unprecedented in the history of learning as we now enter the early stages of the scientific revolution. He outlines the challenge in these words:

> You must double your enrollment in a little more than a decade, all the while striving to increase the quality of learning. The nature of our world calls upon you to produce, if you can, a new and wiser breed of men and women. As a group they must see and comprehend larger horizons than men have ever known. They must know the total world and yet have the foundation for the special skills the world requires. They must cherish old values—especially our humane, liberal heritage of freedom—and be able to perceive and preserve those values in a constantly changing world. They must have the flexibility to welcome change, in order to cope with an environment that more than ever tests man's capacity to adapt. They must understand the enormous new power of man, its sources and its potentials; and they must know how to use it with wisdom and restraint. They must come closer than ever before to the real practice of the philosophy that all men are brothers.

Dr. Seaborg's entire address follows:

PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION AND THE NATIONAL GOOD

(Remarks by Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, at the Centennial Charter Day Convocation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Mass., April 29, 1963)

It is a privilege indeed for me to be here today to salute the University of Massachusetts on its Centennial Charter Day and to congratulate it upon this extended period of service to the Commonwealth and to the Nation.

A century is the measuring rod of history, and its passage gives men special reason to pause for reflection. Besides, we like to deal in neat, round numbers, and 100 years is an easy figure with which to reckon. We are ourselves a part of the century past. Each of us has lived in that time, our lives have been immediately shaped by it, and we have given to it what we could. Therefore, we are prone to believe we can understand the currents of our own century. If at times we hold this opinion more strongly than we should, perhaps we can be forgiven, for our attempts to organize some coherence out of the immediate past provide an important guide to our actions in the future.

To attempt to understand recent events is, I believe, more important than ever before in man's history. The growing power of man and the rapidity of social evolution call for constant, current interpretation. In a sense we have packed several centuries of history, by the yardsticks of the more remote past, into the last 100 years.

It is especially appropriate, therefore, that we should consider the past century and what it can tell us of the future; especially as those matters relate to the Land Grant College Act and its symbol here, the University of Massachusetts. Let us first review briefly some of the significant events in Western society leading up to the enactment of that act and the founding of this university and let us then try to visualize the place of this institution and its sister land-grant institutions in the future of American culture and the larger future of civilization.

If we look back a number of centuries to the Middle Ages, we find that man and society in the Western World were dominated by rather static concepts. The individual was born into a world that was essentially unchanging by our standards. He was not very important. Poverty, disease, toil, and natural calamities were simply an inevitable part of life. He accepted the proffered explanations of the world and the universe, and his curiosity was not encouraged. Man was a fearful and superstitious plaything of his environment. The concept that man might improve his lot was not widely considered. Nor were the tools at hand for such a task.

The beginning of the changes in this outlook are generally identified with the Renaissance and the Reformation. The questioning and inquisitive human spirit could not be stifled forever. Men began to question old forms and beliefs—in religion, politics, and the law; in art and literature; and in science and philosophy.

The process of breaking out of a closed world and liberating the mind was a slow one, and it is by no means complete. There were many landmarks, established by many brave men in all walks of life, on the route to liberation. An example was the overthrow, by the evidence produced by Copernicus and Galileo, of the dogmatic concept that the earth is the center of the universe. It is difficult for us today to estimate the impact, on a closed system of thought, of the knowledge that the earth and the other planets revolve around the sun. If such an important belief could fall, were not others vulnerable? While science was opening man's eyes to the truth of his surroundings, a change was in the making concerning the concept of man himself. The themes of individual rights and freedom were being developed in the period of the enlightenment and the first crystallization of these revolutionary ideas was in the American Revolution—the first revolution of which I am to speak to you today. Beginning with the Declaration of Independence and culminating with the adoption of the Constitution, the place of the State was confined to protecting the rights of the individual and becoming the instrument for man's self-government.

Surely, no place has a more intimate identity with the great struggle for freedom—our first Revolution—than Massachusetts. Here the torch of liberty was first lit, here the first battles for our freedom were fought, and here the first sacrifices to our ideals were offered.

The first American Revolution guaranteed to us the inalienable rights of freemen. One of these, the right of free inquiry, nurtured in the universities, made possible the modern concept of the institution of higher learning as a center not only for the preservation and cultivation of the intellectual treasures of the ages; but also as a dynamic source of new knowledge that energizes the evolution of society.

A consequence of the revolutionary movement nourished by the enlightenment and brought to fruition by our first Revolution was that it also brought the material well-being of man into focus, and science was the power which gave greatest hope toward accomplishment of this boon to mankind. A memorable expression of this hope was contained in a letter from Benjamin Franklin to Joseph Priestley in 1780, in which Franklin said: "The rapid progress true science now makes occasions my regretting sometimes that I was born too soon. It is impossible to imagine the height to which may be carried, in a thousand years, the power of man over matter. We may perhaps learn to deprive large masses of their gravity, and give them absolute levity, for the sake of easy transport. Agriculture may diminish its labour and double its produce; all diseases may by sure means be prevented or cured, not excepting even that of old age, and our lives lengthened at pleasure even beyond the antediluvian standard."

The freedom to embrace new ideas, the concept that men need not accept miserable conditions of life, and the hope inherent in science, unleashed as never before the economic energies of man. Our second revolution, the industrial revolution, and the rise of science and technology, saw a beginning of the realization of Franklin's dreams—a huge increase in industrial and agricultural production at a cost of less total labor, the conquest of many diseases the lengthening of life, the improvement of health.

Another consequence of the great movements of liberation generated by the American Revolution was that education must be widespread if the citizens are, through intelligent participation, to make democracy work. Thomas Jefferson was a disciple of this ideal. While he and others recognized the primacy of a liberal education as an essential to meaningful living, they also accepted the importance of practical education as a means of material improvement of the individual and society. Jefferson was one of the most powerful advocates of the American ideal that there should be opportunity for education to the highest level of the individual's ability.

The actual democratization of education, however, was slow in being implemented. In the early days of the Nation, Washington's proposal of a national board of agriculture—a proposal to improve farm production through scientific methods—and the suggestion of a national university were blocked largely because of narrow interpretations of the Constitution and the functions of government. These proposals, I might add, were philosophical antecedents of the land-grant colleges.

In these early days we were too preoccupied with the frontier to implement the educational ideals of the Revolution. We were concerned with the practical, not then realizing that the practical has its roots in the theoretical, in the expansion of knowledge. It was not until the frontier had been largely conquered and the land largely settled that we initiated a national effort to put into effect one of the ideals of the Founding Fathers. This was accomplished by the Land Grant College Act, sponsored by Congressman Justin Smith Morrill of neighboring Vermont, which was passed by Congress and signed by President Lincoln in 1862.

It is not surprising that one of the first States to take advantage of the provisions of this act was Massachusetts. While the private institutions of Massachusetts distinguished themselves in the field of higher education from the earliest colonial days, few of the sons and daughters of the poor could at that time afford to attend these colleges. Nor, for the most part, were their curriculum attentive to the needs of the industrial revolution. The Morrill Act took care to provide "the leading object shall be without excluding other scientific and classic studies, and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts * * * in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions of life." As one might expect of a State with the rich educational heritage of Massachusetts, it quickly responded to this new opportunity by incorporating the Massachusetts Agricultural College in April 1863.

The land grant colleges developed, at different rates in various locations, into institutions that did not resemble the outlines of the original concepts. It was clear to many States that a curriculum emphasizing applied science and accompanied somewhat peripherally by the liberal arts was inadequate to meet the intellectual needs of the people and to reap the real benefits of science. The States themselves became the main sources of financial support for the colleges. In many places broad and impressive curricula in the liberal arts evolved. Equally important efforts in fundamental science developed. Although training in practical arts and in the performance of agricultural extension and other services was not abandoned, many of the institutions developed truly creative roles in teaching and in basic research, with impressive graduate schools for the advanced learning so important today.

This engagement of the concept of the land grant colleges in some States was taking place at a most propitious time in American history. With our preoccupation with the practical, our main emphasis had been on technology, in which we became preeminent. For well over a century fundamental science was an orphan in American society. It was widely regarded as useless, and existed on the periphery, practiced by a relatively few dedicated votaries. From time to time in emergencies such as the Civil War and World War I, scientists were called upon for major efforts to apply their skills to technological problems. But each crisis was followed by a return of the scientists to their isolated provinces of the laboratory.

By the 1930's, however, America had developed a sound and broad base of fundamental science. There existed a core of original scientists across a broad spectrum of fields. American contributions to the expansion of knowledge were becoming important. Moreover, much of this effort was being made in land grant institutions in which the larger educational concept had been accepted. The third revolution—the scientific revolution—had begun, and the land-grant colleges were a big factor in its development. Indeed, by 1953 the National Manpower Council was able to say that "the most important single governmental step in connection with the training of scientific and professional personnel was the Morrill Act of 1862 which laid the basis for the country's extensive State college and university system."

After the Nation's scientists had been called to the colors in World War II they returned, as usual, to the laboratories after the emergency. But during the course of the war and immediately afterward, the impressive power of basic science had been dramatized more clearly than ever before. The release of nuclear energy was perhaps the most persuasive demonstration in history of the Jeffersonian principle that "knoledge[1] is power." Moreover, the application of this knowledge so soon after discovery of the fundamental principle was one of many wartime demonstrations that the gap between discovery and application had become almost imperceptible in many cases.

The Federal Government felt it prudent, therefore, through the Atomic Energy Commission, to continue to support basic research in physics as a matter of national interest. Through the Office of Naval Research and agencies of the U.S. Public Health

---

[1] Jefferson spelling "knoledge."

Service other programs in basic science were supported. The National Science Foundation was established to provide a continuing, broad base of scientific research. Industrial and governmental technology programs hungrily devoured the outpouring of new knowledge.

Science is no longer a peripheral activity of society. It is in many respects the central one. It is the source of the growing confidence of man in creative evolution—in the idea that man can create an environment of his own choosing, an environment of dignity and well-being. It is this central, creative position of science in society that constitutes our third or scientific revolution. A significant portion of our national resources now goes into scientific research.

We are touched by the results of this Scientific Revolution in many ways. Some of our large industries are built wholly out of knowledge gained in the last two decades. Agriculture, transportation, and medicine have been revolutionized. Our means of national defense is essentially new. The influence of science runs deep through our economy, industry, our social structure and political decisions. Our new way of life rests upon science. Moreover, a part of our new way of life consists of the fact that it will be replaced by still other ways of living and working tomorrow, and still other ways the day after.

In short, our practice of creative evolution has brought us to the beginnings of a democratic scientific society. For explorations in basic science ahead, we must give the most advanced training to the largest possible number of our most talented people. With the advancement of knowledge, the frontier both recedes and enlarges, and we require more scientists. And while the frontier recedes and expands, we must have more engineers and technicians to make use of the new discoveries for the advancement of man's well-being.

The dynamic evolution of our environment and of our material condition is echoed in the moral and philosophical fabric of life. Old and fundamental values, developed in a slower time, are constantly tested, and must be related to new frames of reference. The very leisure men have always sought—and succeeded in achieving—is, paradoxically, a serious problem. New motivations must be found to replace in part the lessening pressure to toil for survival. Our third revolution—the scientific revolution—is the principal cause of technological unemployment, the population explosion, and the increases in the percentage of older people. Around the world less privileged people are attempting to jam our three revolutions into a twinkling of time. We are faced with a continuing international crisis that promises to continue for decades, with an opposing political system determined that the revolutions around the world will be interpreted in reactionary, authoritarian terms.

There are deep implications in this new stage of social evolution for higher education in general and for the land grant institutions in particular. It is clear that we are now dependent, and will be increasingly dependent, upon intense cultivation of brainpower for our present and future welfare. We need wider and higher levels of education in all fields for effective working of our complex, swiftly moving, technical democracy. We cannot have too much cultivated intelligence and special training for intelligent political decisionmaking, for expansion and exploitation of new knowledge, for the solution of social problems, for the management of industry, for the interpretation of human events, for the enrichment of life associated with the advancement of the arts and the humanities, and for the achievement of permanent peace and improvement of human welfare around the globe.

The very large and distinguished role of private colleges and universities will continue. However, an increasing share of mass higher education must be borne by public colleges and universities, which are largely an outgrowth of the Land-Grant Act. A large part of the task of educational democratization lies within the tradition and responsibility of these colleges. The act constituted a substantial recognition by the Nation that public resources should be devoted to providing the opportunity for talented individuals, whatever their economic status, to obtain advanced education.

Parenthetically, I should like to say that I have personal reason for being a strong supporter of the use of public resources in higher education. I graduated from a public high school at the beginning of the great depression. Had there not existed a land-grant institution near my home in the Los Angeles area, it is probable that I should not have had a chance to obtain a higher education. Indeed, upon my graduation from the University of California at Los Angeles, another campus of the same public institution, at Berkeley, offered me the opportunity to go on to graduate work. From my experiences as a teacher, researcher, and administrator in that university, it is clear that, even though we may live in relatively affluent times, many gifted students will not be able to cultivate their talents unless fine educational facilities are available to them at minimum cost.

The increasing obligation in higher education derives not only from the nature of modern society but also from the great increase in population. Recent studies reflect that while in 1960 some 18 percent or 400,000 of the Nation's 22-year-olds took baccalaureate degrees, there will be this demand on the part of 25 percent or 875,000 in 1970. If this essential doubling of graduates appears to be staggering, we can take heart from our experience with explosive expansion in the past as we more than doubled the annual number of baccalaureate recipients between 1940 and 1960.

Programs to meet these needs of our people and the Nation are going forward vigorously in the various States, and I believe it is essential that our public institutions of higher learning continue to grow in strength and capacity in the years ahead. The self-interest of a society that has made much progress through exploitation of the intellect requires constant vigilance to insure educational opportunity, on a quantitative as well as a qualitative scale, commensurate with the cultural and economic level of that society. In the light of past returns no investment of public resources today will pay better dividends than do shares in higher education. The lesson of the relationship between the level of education and the national good must not be lost, and in our age every State must turn increasingly to public resources to achieve the necessary intellectual endowment.

I am pleased to hear that the University of Massachusetts is looking forward to a doubling of its student body, to 15,000 students, by 1975. Your progress is symbolic of the national trend among land grant colleges—from a small agricultural college to a State college in 1931 and to a university in 1947. I have no doubt your progress will continue and that your significant contribution to the State and Nation will become even larger. I sympathize with those of you on the faculty and in the administration who have the difficult problems of maintaining high quality in the face of explosive growth—quality in teaching staff in the face of heavy competition, quality of facilities needed to remain up to date in teaching capabilities. In my position as chancellor of the Berkeley campus of the University of California these were my most difficult problems, even when I was aided by the generous support of a public that has always placed its faith largely in the public education tradition.

In your efforts to provide sufficient opportunities for your young citizens, I would remind you that there is increasing awareness by the Nation as a whole that the States must receive help from the Federal Government. In particular, Federal Government studies have recognized the need to give assistance to graduate teaching and research programs.

In regard to the conduct of your undergraduate program, I have one suggestion that derives from my views of the nature of today's world. It relates closely to citizens of a State that had such great influence in the founding of our democratic Nation. It has been said—and truly, I believe—that a liberally educated person is one who can make critical judgments about affairs that affect him. In our time, every citizen is deeply affected by the affars of science and technology. Intelligent citizenship in our scientific democracy would seem to require some general knowledge of science if the citizen is to participate effectively in the democratic process. Science formed a significant part of the knowledge of the educated men who founded our democracy. Yet paradoxically, as American science began to have a potent effect on our affairs, there was a serious decline in the science content of liberal education. A move to redress the balance was initiated after World War II, yet it is doubtful that science has been restored sufficiently to the curriculum of the liberal arts. I believe you can significantly contribute to the preparation of your graduates for intelligent participation in the modern democratic scientific society by insuring that your liberal arts graduates have some knowledge of the content, the methods, the history, the potential, and the sociological implications of science and technology.

I am well aware that there is a corollary to this advice. Despite the burden of knowledge that must now be passed on to undergraduate science students, it is more essential than ever that the future scientist have a thorough exposure to the humanities and the social sciences. Scientists are increasingly required to take part in political and social decisionmaking. To participate most effectively, they should have a broad background in the humanities, the social sciences and the arts.

In my opinion, the most important response to these challenges of education in our times is harder work. Our productivity and increased knowledge have made advanced education both essential and possible on a mass scale. There is a corresponding need for increased intellectual toil. To the student this may seem like a bitter harvest of the scientific revolution. Real intellectual achievement, however, has always required relentless toil. Nor have those who have deeply explored this form of labor been left wanting in satisfaction and fulfillment.

In addition to hard work, I should like to suggest that some progress in the enlargement of the undergraduate's horizons can be achieved by a special kind of cross-fertilization on the academic staff. I wonder if it would not be fruitful, for example, to systematically make provision for a member of your department of economics to be a man with special interest in science? Should not a member of the philosophy faculty be well grounded in science, especially the modern science which is so deeply affecting thought today? A history professor who specializes in the influence of science on historical processes could make a significant contribution to the scientific literacy of his students. A systematic sprinkling of your science faculties with professors having particular command of the arts or humanities might, likewise, significantly increase the cultural heritage of science students.

I should like to add a footnote to my suggestion of undergraduate breadth for the specialist and depth for the generalist. We must not neglect to provide a sound foundation for specialization. Several years ago a study demonstrated that the liberal arts colleges had provided the undergraduate training for a surprisingly large number of American scientists. I urge you to continue and expand your excellent undergraduate training in this area. No less important is a sound undergraduate curriculum preparatory to graduate training in the social sciences and the humanities. Our new democratic-scientific society calls for more highly trained men and women in every field.

As we now enter the early stages of the scientific revolution—our third revolution—the full flower of creative evolution is bursting upon us. Yet powerful as the forces of science and technology have already demonstrated themselves to be, relatively speaking we are only beginning to feel their influence. Our Nation and the world are committed to an accelerating cycle of knowledge-gathering and knowledge-exploitation. We cannot visualize in detail the consequences for the future. We can, however, clearly see that we can, if we have the wisdom, create an environment essentially of our choosing. The scientific revolution can provide for the essential needs of men around the globe. Our small world will grow smaller. At the same time our perspective will be broadened unimaginably by the exploration of space. We can only guess at the distant impact of this dynamism on man, his institutions, the content of thought and the quality of life. We can be sure, however, that successful adaptation to the changing environment can be achieved, in an atmosphere of freedom, only through advancement of men generally to higher levels of education.

The challenge of the future to the University of Massachusetts—and, indeed, to all of higher education—is unprecedented in the history of learning. You must double your enrollment in a little more than a decade, all the while striving to increase the quality of learning. The nature of our world calls upon you to produce, if you can, a new and wiser breed of men and women. As a group they must see and comprehend larger horizons than men have ever known. They must know the total world and yet have the foundation for the special skills the world requires. They must cherish old values—especially our humane, liberal heritage of freedom—and be able to perceive and preserve those values in a constantly changing world. They must have the flexibility to welcome change, in order to cope with an environment that more than ever tests man's capacity to adopt. They must understand the enormous new power of man, its sources and its potentials; and they must know how to use it with wisdom and restraint. They must come closer than ever before to the real practice of the philosophy that all men are brothers.

This is a tall order. But these are tall times. The people of Massachusetts have contributed more than their share of leadership to the American Revolution, to the industrial revolution, and to the scientific revolution. Through the University of Massachusetts, I am sure they will bear their full share of responsibility in meeting the primary challenge of our times—the fullest possible democratization of higher education.

NATIONAL RAISIN WEEK—OUR OLDEST FOOD INDUSTRY CELEBRATION

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, in this week the American raisin industry and its friends throughout the Nation are celebrating the 86th birthday of the introduction of this delicious, healthful, and versatile food to our American markets. On Thursday, May 2, in agreement with my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN], we will serve in the House restaurant delicious raisin pie, by courtesy of the California Raisin Advisory Board, and we will join in distributing raisins to all the Members. We hope all will thus enjoy participating in National Raisin Week.

The great, fertile San Joaquin Valley of California produces in the area represented by the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN] and myself almost all of the raisins grown in America and about half of those produced worldwide. This important food industry contributes greatly to the economy of California and the country, with an annual crop valuation of a quarter of a billion dollars. It is estimated about 100,000 persons depend on this income.

Raisins are one of our most important nonbasic, specialty crops which stand to gain—or to lose—so much in today's changing world trade picture. It is vitally important to this industry that its opportunity to market its products in foreign lands be not impaired and that its doors to commerce remain open at competitive marketing prices. It is vital to this industry and many other similar specialty crops that their interests and problems be understood and represented in trade negotiations.

The raisin industry has led the Nation in self-help programs to stabilize production and marketing and to improve the quality of its products. It operates under both Federal and State marketing orders, designed to balance supply and demand and to expand existing markets and open new ones. It is a prime example of a farm industry determined to put its own house in order, find markets and bring fair income to its growers, processors, and workers at fair prices to consumers.

While the raisin industry has had its difficult problems through the years, including the one just passing, these marketing programs have been of great assistance in smoothing out the wild, unregulated economic cycles which beset so many of our farm industries, and in general, raisin growers have prospered. Certainly, the raisin industry has greatly benefited under marketing programs.

Raisins are a delicious food, with a great variety of uses to provide fine flavor and quick energy, alone or in combination with other food products. This Congress is entitled to share the credit for broadening and diversifying raisin markets, because our appropriations have financed successful research programs which have made possible inclusion of raisins in a wide variety of cereal, baking, and other food combinations of the types now in great use.

Then, also, both growers and consumers are protected by Federal raisin inspection services which, though sometimes irksome, are nonetheless essential to maintain the quality and purity for which our domestically produced raisins are noted. The raisin crop now being marketed is of unusually fine flavor and quality and marks a vintage year for raisins. You may be sure the packets upon your grocers shelves are the very best and most savory product of the vine.

May I again invite my colleagues to share the delights of raisin pie with us in the House restaurant this Thursday, as well as to enjoy the packets to be distributed to their offices with the compliments of the California Raisin Advisory Board, the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN], and myself.

SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE FREEMAN SHOULD RESIGN

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, the Members of this House know that I am not a man to act in haste and on most occasions will give anyone the benefit of the doubt. For 2 days last week we considered the extension of the Feed Grain Act. During much of the discussion charges were made that the Secretary of Agriculture wanted to use this extension to help try to secure a "yes" vote on the wheat referendum coming up May 21 of this year. These charges were denied by responsible members of the Democratic Party on the floor of this House. I am sure that their statements were based on information given to them by the Secretary, on which they had every right to rely.

Mr. Speaker, on April 26, 1963, Secretary Freeman appeared before the Committee on Agriculture and his statements there were reassuring. Our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN], questioned the Secretary at some length about an article that had appeared in the Wall Street Journal, under date of April 25 stating in substance that the Department of Agriculture was going all out to secure a "yes" vote on the coming wheat referendum. The article stated that the Department was going to use film and have speakers going through the wheat areas of the country trying to sell the program. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] asked Mr. Freeman if there was any truth to this statement.

In response to the question, the Secretary had this to say:

> It is true the Department is seeking to bring to every voter in the wheat referendum information as to the law that was passed by the Congress and as to the alternatives if he votes "yes" or if he votes "no." As I understand this, my responsibility under the law is to do this and I am doing it. To the

> extent there is an inference that the Secretary or the Department is conducting a campaign, per se, for a "yes" vote, that is not true.
>
> Mr. HOEVEN. Isn't it the Secretary of Agriculture's function in a referendum to be a referee rather than be an actual participant in one way or another to try to influence an election?
>
> Secretary FREEMAN. This is the function I am seeking to perform, Mr. HOEVEN.
>
> Mr. HOEVEN. You are not trying to influence the vote?
>
> Secretary FREEMAN. We are trying to bring information. I am not trying to tell any farmer how to vote. I have said expressly many times and I have so directed the Department that it is not our function to tell any farmer how to vote but it is our responsibility to bring him information so that he will know what the issue is when he votes. And that is what we are doing.

While the Secretary of Agriculture Mr. Freeman was giving this testimony before the Committee on Agriculture a letter was being delivered to my office, dated April 22, 1963. It is a long letter, quite detailed and earth shaking in light of Secretary Freeman's statement before the Committee on Agriculture. The full text of the letter is as follows:

> U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
> AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION
> AND CONSERVATION SERVICE,
> *McCone County, Mont., April 22, 1963.*
>
> Mr. JIM BATTIN,
> *U.S. Representative,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> HON. JIM BATTIN: This letter is being written in our official capacities as Government employees connected with the administration of Federal farm programs at the county office level. It is realized that action of this nature has broad legal significance. This aspect of the problem is beyond our comprehension and ability to cope with, therefore we feel that it is our official duty to inform people in responsible positions of the following situation in the hope that these persons will be able to bring about the correct solution to the problem.
>
> On Tuesday, April 16, 1963, during a regular meeting of the county committee with the following persons present: Chairman, E. R. Merriman; vice chairman, Harold Meissner; regular member, Milo Hilstad; State office employee, Harry Pipal; and office manager, Francis Kelly, instructions were given by the farmer fieldman to the county office officials to carry out certain activities that would tend to influence a "yes" vote in the forthcoming referendum.
>
> Those instructions were, in brief:
>
> 1. The county committee was to select and contact four local farmers who favor a "yes" vote to serve as promotional men between now and the referendum day. It was our understanding that these people would work with the newly formed wheat commission in disseminating material on the wheat referendum.
>
> 2. The county officials were informed that a fund slightly in excess of $900 had been made available and was earmarked for use in McCone County to promote a "yes" vote. It was suggested that this money be used in the following manner—Hold three meetings with the community committee to discuss and encourage a "yes" vote. It was suggested that one of these meetings be held in the evening with a potluck dinner where the wives would be present and county office officials could socialize with community committeemen and their wives for the purpose of encouraging conversation on ways to get out a "yes" vote.
>
> 3. It was suggested that the county committee provide a poll watcher at each community polling place. The function of this individual would be to appraise the people who are voting and should it come to his attention that certain farmers who are known to favor a "yes" vote have neglected to appear, he is to contact that farmer and encourage him to come to the poll and cast his ballot. This so-called poll watcher could be one of the referendum committeemen or it could be another individual should it happen that, in the discrimination [discretion—sic] of the county committee, the three referendum committeemen would not take favorably to a suggestion of this nature.
>
> It is needless to say that the county office personnel are strictly prohibited from carrying out activities of this nature. In addition to being instructed to carry out restricted activities there is also the question of misuse of public funds. We refer not only to the approximately $900, but also to the apparent misuse of administrative funds by the use of federally employed persons to disseminate information that will influence the outcome of the referendum and the preparation of printed material of a biased nature.
>
> There are two other recent developments which affect county office administration which we believe should be reviewed for possible relationship to the above. One recent development is the instructions given to this office on April 16, 1963, to the effect that we must reduce our staff of permanent employees by one. It was indicated that several other offices throughout the State were receiving similar cuts in permanent staffs. It has occurred to us that there is a possibility that this apparent lack of administrative funds to provide service to farmers and to administer the programs, could be linked to the cost of engaging in unauthorized promotional work on the forthcoming referenum. The average cost of administration of this office for the fiscal years of 1959, 1960, 1961, and 1962 has been approximately $53,500. Anticipated operating cost for the 1963 fiscal year is not substantially higher. We have had the same number of permanent employees in this office since 1959. Since the enactment of such programs as the wheat stabilization program and the feed grain program, county office workload and responsibility has increased. The point we wish to make is that to the best of our knowledge, there has been no decrease in the amount authorized by Congress to administer programs and provide service to farmers. If this be the case, we then wish to raise the question, "Why is it necessary to reduce the number of county office employees on a rather large scale and bring about the resulting reduction in service to farmers?" We sincerely suggest that it would warrant close review to determine if administrative funds have not been diverted into promotional cost on the referendum.
>
> The other point which we believe would warrant a close review is the recent change in administrative regulations relative to the termination of the employment of county office personnel. Paragraph 260 of the county office administrative handbook has been amended to provide for dismissal of a county office employee under the provisions of without prejudice. If this action is taken, it does not require that there be any reason stated for the dismissal. The affected employee does not have any rights of appeal.
>
> We are not in a position to ascertain what motivated this type of regulation, but it is apparent that it could be misused to influence employees in carrying out actions they would otherwise be reluctant to perform. We believe that this new regulation should be considered in the light of its possible misuse. It occurs to us that the provision of this regulation is entirely contrary to present-day trends in employee-employer relationship.
>
> As previously stated, we are submitting this letter because we believe it is our official duty to inform people in responsible positions of an apparent violation of the intentions under which Federal farm programs are to operate. It is our opinion that if we were to follow any other course, we would be guilty of dereliction of our duties and responsibilities. We consider that we have now met our responsibilities and sincerely hope that proper corrective action will be taken.
>
> Very truly yours,
>
> E. R. MERRIMAN,
> *Chairman, McCone County ASC Committee.*
>
> HAROLD MEISSNER,
> *Vice-Chairman, McCone County ASC Committee.*
>
> MILO O. HILSTAD,
> *Regular Member, McCone County ASC Committee.*
>
> FRANCIS D. KELLY,
> *County Officer Manager, McCone County ASCS.*
>
> This letter is being sent to national, State, and local officials.

Mr. Speaker, this letter was written 4 days before the Secretary testified—the meeting of the ASCS committee in Circle, Mont., was held on April 16, 1963, 9 days before the Secretary testified. Yet the Department of Agriculture was sending a paid employee from the State ASC office around to influence a "yes" vote in the coming wheat referendum. Secretary Freeman's words sound hollow:

> I have said expressly many times and I have so directed the Department that it is not our function to tell any farmer how to vote but it is our responsibility to bring him information so that he will know what the issue is when he votes.

Maybe the Secretary can distinguish between the words "tell" and "influence." Maybe he can explain taxpayer's money being spent to promote his supply management program, but Mr. Speaker he will never be able to explain his deceit to me and other members of the House of Representatives.

The plan proposed by the politically appointed State ASC committee, a committee whose direction comes from an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, is well worked out. It even takes into consideration good political organization. Quoting again from the letter:

> The county committee was to select and contact four local farmers who favor a "yes" vote to serve as promotional men between now and the Referendum day.

The suggestion of poll watchers to get those sure "yes" votes to the polls and not "all" votes to the polls, leaves me with the distinct impression that a "yes" vote is being directly sought by the so-called referee who now heads the Department of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman.

The psychological approach is also being used. Remember these words from the letter:

> It was suggested that one of these meetings be held in the evening with a potluck dinner where the wives would be present and county office officials could "socialize" with community committeemen and their wives for the purpose of encouraging conversation on ways to get out a "yes" vote.

All of these proposals, underhanded as they are, are not as bad as Secretary Freeman's action before the Agriculture

Committee when he implied nothing was being done to secure a "yes" vote by the Department of Agriculture. A man who holds high office has a great responsibility to his country. His authority and action should be exercised in such a way as to bring credit to his country, his President and his party. The Secretary has fallen far short in any measure you wish to apply. I am certain the country and certainly his political opposition would admire him more if he were to be forthright in his statements and action. The truth has a way of finding light and no Government official can suppress it for long.

Perhaps if the truth had been known the Feed Grain Act extension would not have passed—maybe it would—the point, however, is more important. It was not debated in full light of all the now known facts.

This Congress and the country owe a debt of gratitude to Messrs. E. R. Merriman, Harold Meissner, Milo O. Hilstad, the three elected county committeemen of the McCone County Agriculture Stabilization and Conservation Committee and to Mr. Francis D. Kelly, the office manager, for having the courage to face a problem and to seek an honorable solution. The months ahead will not be pleasant for them. Much will happen that they could not anticipate.

If the State ASC committee follows a pattern started last year, they will be removed. Mind you, politically appointed members of the State ASC committee will remove the duly elected and qualified county committee. They will be harassed by some of their neighbors and investigated by other agencies of the Federal Government.

The precedent for this was established in 1962 when the Glacier County, Mont., ASCS Committee refused to rubberstamp the State ASC's demand for certain "average yield figures" in their county. Kyle Momberg, William Held, Glenn Lindberg, and later the alternate, John Broadhead, stood up and fought for those who elected them and they in turn were removed from office. Warren Swenson, another elected alternate, continued to battle while the State ASC committee took over jurisdiction of the county committee's function.

You can see why I have a great deal of respect for my constituents.

I sent the following wire to the elected county committee in Circle, McCone County, Mont.:

> Your letter of April 22, 1963, received today. The facts related show a shocking disregard for our representative form of government. I shall support the committee in finding a correct solution to this situation. You have done a service to those who have elected you and to the Nation in revealing the practice being carried out by the State agricultural stabilization and conservation committee.

I shall support the county committee in its effort to find a solution to this far-reaching problem as I am sure every Member of the House of Representatives would support me if undue influence or unfair methods were used against me.

The question is a big one. The answer is simple. The law provides that farmers shall make a choice on a farm control program for wheat. It does not say that the Government shall make the choice or that the Secretary of Agriculture shall make the choice or that Members of Congress shall make the choice.

I have been asked by groups and individuals to state my position on a "yes" or "no" note in the wheat referendum. I have been consistent. It is none of my business and therefore I will not inject myself into an election that the law provides will determine the economic condition of our Nation's wheat farmers for the following year. This I believe should be the position of Secretary Freeman and the State and local ASC committees.

Unfortunately, since Secretary Freeman has been less than fair with the great Committee on Agriculture in presenting his testimony and as a result of his actions in trying to influence a "yes" vote in the coming wheat referendum, the only assuring solution is for the Secretary to submit his resignation to the President, to be effective immediately.

BUREAUCRATIC SQUANDERING OF THE TAXPAYERS' MONEY

Mr. **ALGER**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. **ALGER**. Mr. Speaker, the hearings on military appropriations have brought some interesting material to light concerning Government economizing—or failure to economize—that contradicts all sound fiscal policies.

It has been estimated that an additional $11 million cost will result in a contract of approximately $100 million by the Government's insistence that production be shifted from Dallas, Tex., in private facilities to Warren, Mich., in Government-owned plants for unemployment reasons.

Mr. Speaker, squandering money is not the way to cure unemployment and none of us can see the end result of such policies except bankruptcy and dictatorship.

The contract in question is a development contract for the Army's Lance missile to the Ling-Temco-Vought Co. of Dallas.

It has been brought to my attention that Secretary McNamara overrode his military and civilian advisers in this case. Design competition contracts for the Lance were originally to go to three producers—General Electric, Chrysler, and Ling-Timco-Vought. But at the last minute, the Secretary stepped in and arbitrarily eliminated General Electric. The contract went to Ling-Temco-Vought whose bid was based on the work being performed at the firm's plant in Dallas, not in Government plants.

I am informed the contract was finally awarded after an agreement had been reached to move production of the missile from Dallas, Tex., to Warren, Mich., and, on orders from McNamara's office, the Army revised its budget figures to conform with the contract switch to Warren, production in Government-owned facilities.

Mr. Speaker, here again we see what dictatorial action and disregard of accepted and orderly procedures is costing the American people—millions of dollars. If the administration officials are going to continue to substitute their own decisions for those based on experience and expert knowledge, there is little hope that we can continue to maintain the military and economic strength needed to win the war for capitalism against socialism.

While I am glad that a Dallas concern won this contract, I am not pleased with a bureaucratic decision by one of President Kennedy's officials which is going to cost the people of Dallas, along with all our people, an unnecessary $11 million. Contracts should be awarded on merit and cost factors.

It is time that Congress put a stop to the dictatorial decisions coming out of the White House, the Pentagon, the State Department and other divisions of the executive branch.

[From the Northern Virginia Sun, Apr. 23, 1963]

McNamara-Congress Feud Now Includes Missiles, Submarines

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

Defense Secretary Robert McNamara's bitter wrangling with Congress is spreading.

On top of his still-far-from-finished clash in the Senate over the multibillion-dollar TFX plane award, the Pentagon boss has become embroiled with a House appropriations subcommittee, headed by Representative George Mahon, Democrat of Texas, over a big development contract for the Army's Lance to the Ling-Temco-Vought Co., of Dallas, Tex.

The solid-fuel Lance is scheduled to replace the Army's Honest John and La Crosse ground-to-ground missiles. Lance is to be more mobile, have greater firepower, longer range, and increased accuracy.

As in the case of the hotly disputed TFX contract, the congressional probers have evidence that McNamara flatly rejected recommendations of his military and civilian experts and awarded the Lance contract to a company of his own selection.

The Mahon committee also has learned that McNamara's decision, like his TFX contract award, is very likely to increase the cost of the new weapon by millions of dollars without any corresponding improvement in its effectiveness.

As pieced together from the testimony of a number of Army witnesses, the House investigators have compiled the following account of McNamara's juggling of the unpublicized Lance contract:

Design competition contracts for the Lance were originally to go to three producers—General Electric, Chrysler, and Ling-Temco-Vought. But at the last minute, McNamara stepped in and arbitrarily eliminated General Electric.

After that ruling, the Army made its choice, recommending the contract go to Chrysler on the basis of its past performance, personnel, plant facilities, and bid.

Rejecting this recommendation, McNamara ordered Dr. Harold Brown, Director of Defense Research and Engineering, to award the contract to the Ling-Temco-Vought Co. Its original bid was based on the work being performed at the firm's plant in Dallas.

According to one Army official, the Lance contract award was made after officials of the firm conferred with McNamara and Army Secretary Cyrus Vance and agreed to move production of the missile from Dallas to Warren, Mich., an area of high unemployment.

On orders from McNamara's office, Dr. Brown then directed the Army to revise its budget figures to conform to the contract switch to Warren. This move will boost Lance's cost by $26 million, according to figures given the House committee by the Army. McNamara also approved the use of Government facilities at Warren by Ling-Temco-Vought.

These and other details of the contract, which will run into hundreds of millions of dollars before completion, will be aired when the committee's hearings are released to the press.

Thresher fallout: The mystery-cloaked tragedy of the *Thresher* is having a direct bearing on a major submarine controversy that has been raging for weeks between Defense Secretary McNamara and Navy Secretary Korth and his top admirals.

McNamara is insisting the Navy undertake a 5-year program for rehabilitating a number of conventional powered submarines as attack vessels rather than rely on a fleet of nuclear subs.

It is McNamara's contention the Navy is proceeding too fast in building nuclear attack submarines without being sure all their bugs have been solved.

Secretary Korth and his admirals emphatically disagree. They hold McNamara's plan would be a waste of money, as the two additional nuclear submarines they want to build have a much greater overall attack capability and can operate at far greater depths than diesel-powered subs.

This tense backstage clash has been blunted by warnings from Navy scientists that the *Thresher* disaster may have been caused by metal fatigue from operating at too great depths.

According to this theory, the change of water pressure on a submarine from numerous deep dives (more than 600 feet) could cause the hull to collapse just as metal failure led to the series of British Comet jet crashes a few years ago.

Adm. George Anderson, Chief of Naval Operations, has put enough credence in this theory to order all nuclear submarines to limit their operating levels to depths above 400 feet until more is known about the *Thresher* disaster.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. ELEANOR ROOSEVELT

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, on March 15, 1963, the Legislature of the State of Oregon passed house concurrent resolution 7, a tribute to Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt.

A copy of the resolution was transmitted to each of Mrs. Roosevelt's children. Because of my great respect for Mrs. Roosevelt and for her able son, our hard working colleague, I would like to introduce a copy of house concurrent resolution 7 into the body of the RECORD on behalf of both myself and the gentleman from California, Congressman ROOSEVELT.

I ask unanimous consent that it be included in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 7

(Introduced by Representatives McClure, Musa, Back, Bateson, Bennett, Chappel, Crothers, Detering, Dooley, Eymann, Field, Gallagher, Haight, Hand, Hansell, Holmstrom, Howard, Howe, Hoyt, Hulett, Hunt, Jones, Kelsay, Kennedy, Kirkpatrick, Lang, Leiken, Lent, Maher, McBain, McKinnis, Meek, Morgan, Orr, Ouderkirk, Peck, Redden, Ridderbusch, J. L. Smith, Turner, Whelan, Willits, Wilmot, and Senators Chapman, Alice Corbett, Fadeley, Flegel, Hallock, Hopkins, Ireland, Monaghan, Naterlin, Stadler, Thiel, Willner.)

Whereas Eleanor Roosevelt was niece of a President, wife of a President, mother, teacher, politician, stateswoman, author, and journalist; and

Whereas she labored with dignity and courage in behalf of those who sought her help; and

Whereas Eleanor Roosevelt devoted herself to the poor, the neglected, the young, the minorities, not for personal advantage or gain, but out of love and out of deep understanding and out of an abiding faith in mankind; and

Whereas Eleanor Roosevelt was a humanitarian who cared about people with a warmth and willingness to fight for their rights that made her whole life a mission for human rights; and

Whereas no woman of this generation and few in the annals of history have so well understood and articulated the yearnings of mankind for social justice; and

Whereas her good works stand as monuments to her life: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, That the 52d Legislative Assembly express its admiration for the courage and spirit of Eleanor Roosevelt and its sense of loss at her death; and be it further

Resolved, That duly authenticated copies of this resolution be transmitted to Mrs. Roosevelt's children.

Adopted by house March 5, 1963.

CECIL L. EDWARDS,
Chief Clerk of House.
CLARENCE BARTON,
Speaker of House.

Adopted by senate March 15, 1963.

BEN MUSA,
President of Senate.

WORLD'S NO. 1 PARLIAMENTARIAN

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an article from the Washington Star.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks I am pleased to include an article appearing in the Sunday issue of the Washington Star of April 28, 1963, written by Neil Gilbride paying deserved tribute to Lewis Deschler, House Parliamentarian. Lewis Deschler, my valued friend, whom I profoundly respect, is as Speaker McCORMACK well said, "Parliamentarian No. 1 of the world," but more, he has enjoyed the confidence, respect, and friendship of every Speaker he has ever worked under, as well as all Members of both branches of the Congress.

Throughout the years his advice has been sought by members of both political parties.

Lewis Deschler is not only the Parliamentarian of the House, but the adviser to Speakers and Members.

Lewis Deschler richly deserves, and more, the fine things said about him in the written article:

WORLD'S NO. 1 PARLIAMENTARIAN—THIS OFFICIAL KEEPS THE HOUSE IN ORDER

(There's a man here who never was elected to anything, yet has a powerful influence on the Nation's laws and history. Without his work, for instance, the Franklin D. Roosevelt New Deal could have been grounded at the beginning; Alaska and Hawaii might not yet be States. This is the story of the House of Representatives Parliamentarian, Lewis Deschler.)

(By Neil Gilbride)

Meet the man who lays down the law to the Nation's lawmakers.

He is Lewis Deschler, Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives—a big, genial Ohioan who for 35 years has passed judgment on legislation affecting millions of U.S. citizens and the world at large.

"I don't make rulings, I just give opinions," Mr. Deschler insists.

But so seldom have his opinions been challenged over more than a third of a century of both Democratic and Republican rule that he is accepted without question as the lawgiver of the House.

Mr. Deschler, a 6-foot, 3-inch, 250-pound former tackle for Miami (Ohio) University, describes the job as something like refereeing at a football game.

But no football referee ever faced the problems of the man who must have every one of the 11,000 rules of the House at his fingertips and keep the 435 Members from each other's parliamentary throats.

Only once has he been overruled by the House, and then with his own agreement in order to straighten out a technicality.

He acts as constitutional lawyer, historian, adviser, and confessor to the always independent, sometimes rambunctious Members of the House.

MAN OF OPINIONS

Many Members call him "judge," but he has never presided over a courtroom or served as an attorney, and he didn't even have a law degree when he first took the job.

Yet Mr. Deschler's opinions can decide the course of the Nation's history.

There would probably still be only 48 States instead of 50 if he had not searched a century of House precedents to find a rule allowing the Alaska and Hawaii statehood bills to bypass the Rules Committee, where they had been blocked.

And in depression days, he thumbed back through 15,000 pages of House rulings to find in President Andrew Jackson's era the legislative key that opened the door for President Franklin D. Roosevelt's "100 days" of high-speed reform legislation.

At the same time, Mr. Deschler gave impartial parliamentary advice to Republicans who sought to use the rules to block Mr. Roosevelt's programs.

Mr. Deschler's opinion can mean victory or defeat in a bitter legislative battle, but Members of both parties trust him.

"They come to me and ask me questions. I answer them," he says. "It does not matter to me what party they belong to. They are all entitled to the same service."

More than one President has had reason to be grateful to Mr. Deschler.

When he was introduced to Franklin Roosevelt as "the man who has kept four House Speakers straight," the President—plagued by a balky Senate—replied:

"Why don't you let him work on the Senate."

ANONYMOUS BY CHOICE

Mr. Deschler's anonymity in the midst of a whirl of nationally known Washington personalities is by his own choice.

"I am not an unduly modest man," he says. "I just believe these Members who have to run for reelection every 2 years should get any credit there is. I'm not running for anything."

"He is less well known in the United States than many men of less importance here," says Representative Bolling, Democrat, of Missouri.

Speaker McCormack calls him "The No. 1 Parliamentarian of the World."

Says the Republican House leader, Charles A. Halleck, of Indiana: "I have known no other person more fiercely proud of the highest traditions of the House."

"Without the rules, and Mr. Deschler to interpret them" added Mr. Halleck, "we never would get anything done around here."

The late Democratic Speaker Rayburn used the highest accolade in his lexicon to describe Mr. Deschler: "A big brain man."

Mr. Deschler's minute knowledge of the complex workings of Congress would make him invaluable to any industry, but he has turned down offers to become a lobbyist at many times his $22,000-a-year salary.

"This is my life, my love," he says.

Mr. Deschler was a Republican when first appointed assistant parliamentarian by GOP Speaker Longworth in 1927, but now, as to politics, "I wouldn't describe myself at all."

Mr. Deschler's opinions have ranged from such solemn matters as the procedure for declaring war, to deciding how soon Americans could buy a drink after the repeal of prohibition.

After a mixup in timing between the House and Senate, Mr. Deschler advised that April 7, 1933, was the earliest date a thirsty citizen could legally hoist a highball. The ruling stood.

The Constitution, Thomas Jefferson's Manual and the nearly two centuries of precedents make up the rules of the House. They have confused more than one trained lawyer, but Mr. Deschler boils down the legalistic maze to one basic principle:

"The Nation," he says, "is entitled to fair play in enacting its legislation."

Mr. Deschler has been around so long that now, he says, "I can walk out on the floor and feel it when something is going to happen."

ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION

But one proceeding he failed to anticipate was the recent eulogy to mark his 58th birthday and 36th year as Parliamentarian.

A rare House tribute usually reserved for congressional bigwigs or other national notables, it covered nearly five pages of the Congressional Record.

Looking proudly down from the gallery were Mr. Deschler's parents, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Deschler, both now in their eighties.

"I never dreamed when I was a barefoot boy in Chillicothe that I would ever be here," Mr. Deschler said later.

If Mr. Deschler ever doubted his value to the House, there is no question in the minds of its Members, past and present.

One of them—President Kennedy—sent Mr. Deschler this message:

"You have played a unique and vital role in the life and work of the House of Representatives. I had an opportunity myself as a Member of Congress to know of your wise and effective influence."

MAY DAY ORDERS TO COMMUNIST PARTY, U.S.A.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, Wednesday will be May Day, the traditional date for Communist Party hoopla in the public squares to push forward the party's line. Advance directions have been distributed among Communist leaders as to the tack the party faithful shall take at the big Union Square rally in New York City and others around the country.

Communist leaders are to stress the current Soviet line of peace and peaceful coexistence between East and West. They will call for universal disarmament, a German peace treaty and an end to the cold war. They also will call for a cease fire in South Vietnam, a nuclear test ban treaty and a hands-off policy in Washington toward Cuba.

Rally speakers are supposed to castigate the administration for aggressive policies in South Vietnam and Cuba, according to the instructions, and to chastise the ultraright for its adventurous and provocative attitudes. By Communist definition at the moment, the extreme rightists are the Goldwater wing of the GOP, the Rockefeller-Keating wing and the Thurmond-Stennis Dixiecrat wing of the Democratic Party.

These speakers also are supposed to call for continuing the drive against antisubversive laws, especially the Internal Security Act of 1950.

Assuming audiences are still attentive, the speakers shall, according to instructions, touch on labor questions, but the broader themes of cold war and coexistence must be interwoven at the time. They will suggest, as a cure for unemployment, a peace economy with a smaller defense program plus more trade with Communist countries. To make the Communist program as a whole more palatable, speakers must demand a 35-hour week with no cut in pay, a $1.50 minimum wage and protection from automation.

In arranging tomorrow's celebrations, Communists are ordered to hew to a united front, that is, join with non-Communist individuals or groups whom they think they can exploit for their own purposes.

In the larger cities, Communist groups have been told to issue a Spanish language leaflet for May Day because of the heightened interest in Latin America. In smaller communities, where the Communist Party has insufficient adherents for public rallies on May Day, the order of the day is for house meetings and similar lesser actions.

KENNEDY WOOL POLICIES CREATING A GIANT DEPRESSED AREA IN NEW ENGLAND

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Cleveland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, on April 25, Dartmouth Mills, Inc., of Claremont, N.H., shut down operations. Three hundred persons have been thrown out of work.

Claremont has lost a sizable payroll. Retailers as well as the millworkers will feel the pinch.

Who is to blame?

President Kennedy and people within this administration have repeatedly promised special treatment for America's wool industries. In spite of the promises nothing has been done.

New England legislators supported the Trade Expansion Act because the administration gave assurances that wool would be treated "as a thing apart."

The following article from the Manchester, N.H., Union Leader shows the value of a Kennedy promise. It says:

> WOOLEN MILL EMPLOYING 300 IS SHUT DOWN
>
> Claremont.—Dartmouth Mills, Inc., producers of women's wear woolens and employing 300, shut down Wednesday and last night Lawrence Ellis, the manager, said he does not know when production will be resumed.
>
> Ellis blamed "(President) Kennedy and the tariff" for the situation, saying there is "no business" because of foreign imports of wool.
>
> George A. Dorr, Jr., of Newport, head of the Dorr Woolen Co., in Guild, which worked only 4 days this week, said the slowdown in his mill and others in the area is significant, since this is normally a busy season for woolen mills.
>
> Dorr said foreign imports so far this year are 33 percent above last year's, when they ran "substantially" more than in 1961. Dorr's plant, which employs 360 persons, was forced to shut down on Monday only because of a lack of work.
>
> He said he believes the plant will be in production on its regular schedule next week.
>
> At the Dartmouth Mills, some of the workers laid off Wednesday said they understood they would return next Tuesday, but Ellis last night said there are no definite plans for reopening.

Mr. Speaker, New England Congressmen and Senators have done everything in their power to make known the gravity of wool imports, but all our actions prove what was already known: the President is the only official who can take effective action to save our wool industries and the thousands they employ.

Our economy has suffered much. In New Hampshire 1,400 jobs are at stake. To President Kennedy we must now look for succor. I hope he will remember his New England origin, if not his promises.

I have written the President once again, asking for action to save New Hampshire's wool industries. My letter says:

> Congress of the United States,
> House of Representatives,
> *Washington, D.C., April 29, 1963.*
>
> The President,
> *The White House,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> My Dear Mr. President: On February 2, 1963, I wrote you a letter spelling out the

threat to New England's woolen industry created by imports from abroad. I asked you to impose quotas pending an agreement with wool-trading countries similar to those granted cotton in 1961. To date you have done nothing.

The situation in New England has steadily worsened—worsened to the point where our fellow citizens are being thrown out of work.

In Andover, Mass., the J. P. Stevens Co. will shut down its Marland plant. Four hundred and fifty-three Massachusetts workers will lose their jobs.

In Claremont, N.H., the Dartmouth Mills, Inc., shut down on Wednesday, April 25. Three hundred persons are now out of work. Claremont has lost a substantial payroll. If this trend continues, New England will become a giant depressed area.

Wool imports come from countries which have repeatedly refused to assume their fair share of defending the free world. All have refused to increase aid to underdeveloped countries.

Italy and Britain have shown reluctance to pay their way in NATO. Japan has received, and is receiving, military assistance from the United States. Nevertheless, Japan has maintained a passive attitude to the Asian problems while American GI's are dying in South Vietnam to make Asia safe for Japanese democracy.

Mr. President, is it your intent to write off New England woolen industries?

Is it your intent to create a giant depressed area of all of New England?

The people of New Hampshire have a right to know.

Previous statements by you and administration spokesmen have created an impression that you intended to treat wool as "a thing apart." If this is no longer the case, in all honesty you should say so.

Fair play demands equal treatment for wool as was previously granted by you to cotton.

Respectfully,

JAMES C. CLEVELAND.

Mr. Speaker, I am under no illusions as to the probable effect of my letter to President Kennedy; therefore, I am going to send a telegram to Gov. John King, of New Hampshire, asking him to come to Washington and arrange a meeting with the President and all interested parties.

If President Kennedy will not listen to a New Hampshire Congressman, perhaps he will listen to a Governor of his own party. I intend to afford Governor King and President Kennedy every opportunity to prove that they are really interested in improving our economy and providing jobs for the unemployed.

FIFTEENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, today is the 15th anniversary of the independence of Israel. The United States was among the first nations in 1948 to recognize the sovereign existence of the newly formed nation. Thus, in our time, we have witnessed the historic fruition of the Jewish people's courageous struggle to regain the homeland of their ancestors.

It is a singular tribute to the resourcefulness, steadfast courage, and relentless tenacity to the ideal of a national homeland that Israel, after 15 years, has achieved the enviable status of a strong, vibrant, and politically stable young nation. Fifteen years is a limited yardstick to measure and judge the development of any state, but 15-year-old Israel is already a responsible adult in the family of nations.

A stanch friend of the West, Israel has received bountiful aid from friendly nations, but more important has been the assistance, both spiritual and material, that she has received from her own people from the private sectors of many lands. This notable development is an eloquent testimony to the industry and immense capacity of the Jewish people.

We are confident that there will be a continued lessening of the psychological conflicts that exist in this area of the world, and that nations such as Israel will get on with the necessary business of constructing a stronger world economy. In this regard it is significant to note that Israel is already assuming a share in this responsibility in extending to underdeveloped countries the benefits of her technical knowledge and know-how.

So today, Mr. Speaker, I salute and congratulate Israel and her friends everywhere on her 15th anniversary. She has a remarkable record.

FURTHER CORRESPONDENCE WITH DR. STANLEY I. STUBER

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, several times in the last 2 years I have placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the parts of a long-continued series of letters I have exchanged with Dr. Stanley I. Stuber, executive director of the Missouri Council of Churches. The most recent of these insertions was on March 21 of this year and appeared on pages 4627–4629 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that day.

At the time of this most recent insertion I mistakenly said that my first contact with Dr. Stuber came when he wrote me urging the abolition of the House Un-American Activities Committee. I wish to correct this mistake and make it quite clear that Dr. Stuber did not write asking that the committee be abolished, but rather that there be a curbing of certain abuses which he cited. I am very happy that Dr. Stuber has written to clarify this mistake and once again to disassociate himself with the movement to abolish the committee. Many of those in Dr. Stuber's position have taken the position that the committee should be abolished, but I am happy to make clear that Dr. Stuber has caught the real issue in this and is anxious to correct abuses which exist.

The most recent of Dr. Stuber's letters makes a fuller statement of his relationship to the organizations with which his name has been linked in the public records of the House Un-American Activities Committee. I am happy to place this letter and my response to it in the RECORD.

MISSOURI COUNCIL OF CHURCHES,
Jefferson City, Mo., April 5, 1963.

Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS,
Old House Building,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CURTIS: I greatly appreciate the way in which you have supported the proposition that the House Committee on Un-American Activities should modify its policy regarding the release to the public of unevaluated file material. And I am pleased to note that you are fully aware of how this material is being used unfairly and out of context to smear civic and religious leaders who do not happen to have rightest positions.

While you have championed my right to challenge the House Committee on Un-American Activities in regard to the public release of its files, at the same time you urge me, as a public duty, to make known why my name has been connected with certain causes of which the House committee does not approve. I am very glad to do this, as I have done many times before, not because I am forced to, but because I feel that such a statement will render a good public service.

It should be clearly understood that this explanation is given freely with an absolutely clear conscience. Never in all my life have I ever belonged to or supported a Communist or a Communist-front organization. Never have I attended any kind of a subversive meeting. My sympathies are not with communism, but with Christianity—a cause which I have tried to serve faithfully all of my life. Whatever I have done or said has been within the Christian framework and under the same circumstances I would do and say the same as I have all through the years. I have no apologies; neither am I making a single retraction.

Now in regard to the public file which the House Committee on Un-American Activities has under my name, it should be clearly pointed out that these are not charges, nor are they indications of guilt. I have never been called before this committee; my name has never been before it even on a discussion basis. The file merely constitutes unevaluated material sent to the committee from various sources. Even material from such an unreliable source as the Daily Worker is used. Also newspaper clippings and letterheads are employed. Such material represents the poorest kind of evidence, as you have pointed out. Yet this is used as "official" material from Washington by the apostles of discord who are determined to smear all those who do not agree with them. This is truly un-American and must be challenged in the name of the first amendment which grants all citizens the right of free expression.

When the items in the file under my name are examined honestly, with the date of the occurrence correctly stated, every single one of them breaks down. There is not only a lack of proof in regard to membership, but no reason for even thinking that I support anything un-American.

Take the first item, for example. Here is the exact listing from the file of the House Committee on Un-American Activities: "The Communist Daily Worker of December 27, 1950, page 3, reported that '32 prominent Americans' had announced the 'formation of a national committee to repeal the McCarran (Internal Security) Act.' Stanley I. Stuber, identified as 'chairman, Commission on Religious Liberty, Baptist World Alliance, New York,' was listed among the sponsors. He was also named among prominent Americans who urged repeal of the act, on a circular and petition distributed by the National Committee to Repeal the McCarran Act (I-1956) with a letterhead dated May 25, 1951."

It should be noted that President Truman considered this McCarran Act so unfair that he vetoed it. Many other prominent Americans have opposed it. Therefore why should my opposition to it be considered un-American or subversive? I was opposed to it in 1950-51 and I am still opposed to it. Moreover, in all fairness (even on the basis of the House committee listing) it should be pointed out that the National Committee To Repeal the McCarran Act was not listed until 1956. Therefore I was not even related to the charge at this much later date. To make it appear that I was connected with this committee as of yesterday, is not only a violation of the facts, but is plainly dishonest.

The second listing reads as follows: "A letterhead of the Inter-Church Committee of the American Russian Institute (A-1949; J-1952; I-1956), received by the committee July 26, 1949, named Dr. Stanley I. Stuber as secretary-treasurer." This was a world relief committee composed entirely of denominational executives, with the Reverend Dr. Ralph W. Sockman chairman. It was an autonomous group working in conjunction with the American Russian Institute in New York City. At the time of its existence, during World War II when Russia was our ally, there was absolutely no indication that the institute was subversive. I was appointed to the Russian Relief Committee by the American (Northern) Baptist Convention, since at that time I was executive secretary of its World Relief Committee. I am proud of this relationship and the opportunity to render Christian service on an interfaith basis through the Interfaith Committee. There was nothing un-American about this service, and under the same circumstances I would do it all over again.

The third item reads as follows: "The Daily Worker of October 17, 1947, page 4, reported that the Reverend Stanley I. Stuber was a signer of a statement issued by the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship (C-1944; A-1947; I-1956; S-1956). A pamphlet ('How To End the Cold War and Build the Peace,' p. 9) listed the Reverend Dr. Stuber as a signer of a statement sponsored by that organization in praise of an open letter to Stalin, May 1948. He was identified as director of public relations, Northern Baptist Convention, New York. Another pamphlet ('End the Cold War—Get Together for Peace,' December 1948) named him as a signer of an appeal sponsored by the organization."

Here again it is significant to note that I was not named a member of the organization—which at this time was highly praised by both President Roosevelt and General Eisenhower. I did sign statements asking for world peace, and I would do so again, because this is a part of my Christian conscience. This concern has nothing to do with communism, but is based firmly upon Christ's teachings in the Sermon on the Mount.

If a Christian cannot work, write, and support the cause of world peace, then there is something terribly wrong with our American Christianity. New Testament Christianity distinctly commands us to be "peacemakers." And I will continue to be, to the best of my ability, a Christian peacemaker.

The fourth item is as follows: "The call for a national emergency conference (C-1944), held in Washington, D.C., May 13 and 14, 1939, named Dr. Stuber as a sponsor."

Once again I am not charged with belonging to any organization. I am named as sponsoring a call to a meeting—which I never attended. This was in 1939—24 years ago. At that time I was chaplain-consultant at the Clifton Springs (N.Y.) Sanitarium and Clinic. To be associated with a meeting which I never attended, and which was never thought of as subversive until 5 years after the event, is certainly hitting below the belt in more ways than one.

The fifth item reads as follows: "A letterhead of the American Committee for Spanish Freedom (A-1949; C-1946) dated January 21, 1946, listed Dr. Stuber as a sponsor of that organization."

Here again I was not a member of the organization. Three years after I had supported the cause represented by the organization it was listed. This does not make me in any degree linked to a Communist-front organization. I am perfectly free to protest what Franco did in Spain. I did so in 1946 and I continue to do so in 1963. I am against the Franco dictatorship and I am doing all I can to restore democracy to Spain, and especially to give Protestants some true religious liberty. At a Baptist I will continue to fight for full religious freedom for all Protestants in Spain, and I hope that the II Vatican Council (to which I have been invited by Cardinal Bea as a guest of the Vatican Secretariat for the Promotion of Christian Unity) will do something realistic about this serious matter of liberty of conscience for all, Roman Catholics as well as Protestants.

The last item is, "The Call to the Mid-Century Conference for Peace (C-1951; I-1956), May 29 and 30, 1950, Chicago, named Dr. Stuber as a sponsor."

I never attended this conference. I got word that it might be Communist inspired and I refused to go. This item also can be written off, because it is not valid and has no relationship to the reality of the situation. Besides, it was not cited until a year after it was held. How can one be held guilty for something he never did?

Here is the complete file on me. I maintain that it is utterly impossible to link me with any Communist or Communist-front organization on the basis of this unevaluated material. I also maintain that as a Christian minister I was duty bound to support the causes of world relief, religious liberty and world peace. If I had not done so, I would have been untrue to my denomination and unfaithful to my Lord.

We may not agree fully on the positions I have taken throughout the years in relation to world relief, Christian liberty, and a creative peace, but I do believe you will agree that I have a perfect right as a Christian, and as an American citizen, to take specific stands as led by my conscience. Otherwise what becomes of our cherished Bill of Rights? Instead of condemning each other when we are not in total agreement, we ought—for the sake of American democracy—grant one another the right of disagreement. I feel very strongly that to deny an American citizen the right of dissent is to undermine the very Constitution of the United States. And when we do that we are really being subversive.

I can assure you, Congressman Curtis, that I have been extremely careful in what I have joined and in what I have said. I have confined my activities (except as a member and president of a Rotary Club) in the Christian church.

All my motivation and action is Christ centered. The teachings of the New Testament has served as my moral and spiritual guide. Whatever stand I have taken (and I feel led by the spirit of truth to take certain positions) has been Christian, according to my understanding of the Christian gospel. If at any point my Christian position seems to coincide with the principles of communism, this is not my fault. I cannot stop working for world peace just because the Communists also pretend to be working for peace; neither will I turn my back on the United Nations, just because the Communists have abused its true purposes. Neither will I repudiate the National Council of Churches just because a few ultra-right-wing fundamentalists call it falsely communistic. As you indicate, I do have a public duty to make my position clear. My position is to follow without fear my Christian conscience in the area of Christian action. And I feel sure that you would want me to do just this.

Mr. Congressman, I want to thank you for another opportunity to explain rather fully the reasons why I have supported certain causes, and I trust that you will make this statement available through the Congressional Record to those who have read our constructive and friendly correspondence.

Sincerely yours,

Stanley I. Stuber,
Executive Director and
Ecumenical Minister.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., April 25, 1963.

Stanley I. Stuber, Th. M., D.D.,
Missouri Council of Churches,
Jefferson City, Mo.

Dear Dr. Stuber: Thank you for your letters of April 2 and April 5 carrying forward our correspondence on the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives. I appreciate very much having these further items from you and, as you have requested, your full statement of April 5 will be placed in the Congressional Record along with this letter.

I regret that I connected your name with those seeking abolition of the committee. My remarks will clarify that error on my part.

I can assure you that I have nothing but the highest regard for your motives in your work. I share your feelings about the activities of those who misuse the material prepared and circulated by the committee from its public files. The fact that you have given your disclaimer of any Communist affiliation to the committee, to be made a part of its public files, is to be commended as helping clarify a picture which, improperly presented, is destructive of our efforts to preserve and promote the American way of life.

With best wishes.

Yours very truly,

Thomas B. Curtis.

SCHOLARSHIP FOR HOUSE PAGE KENT KALIHER

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Langen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to call my colleagues' attention to a distinct honor that has been bestowed upon one of our hard working and conscientious pages. His name is Kent Kaliher of Minneapolis, Minn., who has been awarded a 4-year college scholarship by the National Merit Scholarship Corp.

Only a limited number of these scholarships are awarded each year by this corporation, which is composed of various businesses, industries, foundations, and a number of colleges. Kent successfully competed with thousands of other high school students across the country and was awarded a stipend of $1,400 a year for the next 4 years.

He has selected Rippon College, in Wisconsin, and will major in mathematics. Kent tells us that he may even take a minor degree in political science, although he has no ambition to join us as a colleague in the future.

Kent Kaliher came to Washington as an appointee of our former colleague, the Honorable Walter Judd, of Minnesota. Kent's record as a page and the honor now bestowed upon him are great credits to Kent, Dr. Judd, Kent's family, his State, and the Nation.

This young man comes from a family of modest means but with a wealth of character and desire. His widowed mother, Mrs. K. F. Kaliher, resides in Minneapolis and leads an active life although physically handicapped. Kent has an older brother in the Air Force, an older sister who is a senior at the University of Minnesota, and a younger sister who is in junior high school. They are rightfully proud of Kent. We are, too.

As far as I have been able to determine, this is the first time a National Merit Scholarship has been awarded one of our pages. It is an honor for all of us and we wish Kent Kaliher every success as he leaves these Halls for other pursuits. May the time spent participating in the affairs of his Government give him strength as he takes his place as an adult citizen of our great country.

REDUCTIONS IN POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Riehlman] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Post-Standard of Syracuse, N.Y., concerning threatened reductions in postal service by the Postmaster General deserves the attention of my colleagues.

When the appropriations bill for the Post Office Department came before us, I went along with the committee's recommendations that the sum was adequate. I believed it then and I do so now.

The Post-Standard editorial of April 25, 1963, points out that the Postmaster General is adopting tactics of putting the heat on legislators through the public in order to restore funds. It follows:

[From Post-Standard, Apr. 25, 1963]

Improve Postal Service—Public Resents Blackjack Threat

Having boosted first-class postal rates by 25 percent and the costs of other mail accordingly, the Post Office Department is now threatening to curtail service rather than improve it.

Postmasters of 22 New York State cities have been summoned to a meeting today to discuss how to pare the cost of operation of their services by $15 million.

"We might drop Saturday deliveries or reduce business deliveries from two or three a day to one," Sean Keating, director of the New York State region, is quoted as saying.

Sixty-eight of the largest post offices in the Nation have been ordered not to hire any additional employees and to restrict overtime regardless of need.

Postmaster General J. Edward Day has indicated that this curtailment of personnel may make it necessary to cut service further, possibly by refusing to extend mail delivery to new office buildings and to housing developments not now served.

All of this has a familiar ring.

It's the same old story of cutting where it hurts the most in order to put the heat on legislators who are trying to keep budgets in line.

Syracusans are familiar with the technique.

They saw the local board of education try it more than a year ago when the tight city budget for schools brought threats of cutting out adult education evening classes, summer school courses, and other popular and essential services. When city hall did not budge from its financial position, somehow funds were found to continue such urgently needed parts of the school program.

In April of 1957, Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield dropped Saturday deliveries, curtailed post office window hours, and reduced business deliveries in a successful effort to force Congress to give him $41 million of a supplemental budget of $47 million he had requested. But at that time much lower postal rates were in effect.

This time, the House of Representatives has cut a $4,900 million (that's billions) postoffice budget for fiscal 1964 by $92 million and has reduced a supplemental budget of $166,800,000 for May and June by $8,300,000.

These new reductions have brought about what House Republican Leader Charles A. Halleck calls an attempt to blackjack Congress by curtailing services.

Coming less than 4 months after the imposition of the 25-percent increase in first class mail rates, this latest maneuver by the Post Office Department is unconscionable.

The public is entitled to better mail service, not less.

It's been a long time since we have had twice-a-day residential mail deliveries, although speeded-up transportation facilities would make such service much more advantageous than in the old days.

The post office service generally has been deteriorating in recent years. First class mail is being handled more and more carelessly and is taking longer to reach its destination. In Syracuse, as in most other communities, mail pickups from residential area boxes are being made less often and much earlier, with the result that urgent business mail has to be taken to the main post office at night, and even there no convenient curbside facilities are provided for late deposit of mail.

The April 15 jam of income taxpayers posting their returns is a fine example of poor postal planning in Syracuse.

Any mail carrier being burdened down every day with junk mail can offer suggestions for a more efficient operation, but his political superiors prefer instead to put the heat on Congress for more money.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ALBERT. Madam Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler], I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to sit during general debate on Thursday, May 2, 1963, and Friday, May 3, 1963.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. Hansen in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. ALBERT. Madam Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be permitted to sit during general debate on tomorrow, April 30, 1963.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISCLOSURE OF PERSONAL FINANCIAL STATUS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Van Deerlin] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Madam Speaker, following the example of several colleagues, led by Congresswoman Edith Green, of Oregon, I take this occasion to enter into the Record a full disclosure of my personal financial status. In line with the gentlewoman's suggestion, it is my intention to offer such a statement each year so long as I shall remain in Congress.

By the nature of his calling, a public official places himself in a status that is different from the ordinary citizen. Inasmuch as I shall probably be asking the voters of my California district to "renew my contract" at 2-year intervals, they are entitled to know that I am free of financial ties that might influence my actions as their Representative.

To avert possible conflict of interest, my wife and I disposed of our only stockholdings before I took my congressional seat. Under California's community property law, we jointly own a residential rental property on 3 acres, zoned commercial, in Poway, Calif.; an equity in the family home we occupy in San Diego, and a commercial lot in Imperial County, Calif.

My salary as a Member of Congress represents more than 90 percent of total income.

Beginning with the present year, let me add that my personal income tax returns will always be available for scrutiny by the press or any other responsible body.

ISRAEL'S 15TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Gallagher] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Madam Speaker, as we approach the 15th anniversary of the founding of the State of Israel, it is fitting that we recognize the birth and development of that free nation as the most significant international event of our times. In a period in which many free nations were overrun and in which others ceased to exist as national entities, Israel came into being. As a nation, she suffered but overcame adversity. Her people, with great courage and sacrifice, and by the application of the latest scientific methods, made the arid desert bloom, produced vegetable and fruit and raised cattle. The methods that worked for Israel, are now being tried, with the help of Israeli farmers on the parched farmlands of African nations.

Israel is already extending aid to less developed nations, just as, I am proud to say, the United States extended aid to the newly founded country of Israel.

That great young nation should be proud that she is represented in the United Nations and in other international councils by young men of courage, vigor, refinement and intelligence. These men, and those who govern at home, are characteristic of the people who are responsible for Israel's birth and growth.

Although just a decade and a half since her founding, Israel is already contributing to world culture through the arts and literature. Her industrial and business development has been substantial and has contributed greatly to that country's balanced economy.

It is to the credit of the Jewish people in the United States that they contributed so substantially to the young nation.

We may all take heart in the knowledge that the strength of character, the courage and spirit of sacrifice that made Israel the dynamic nation it is today persists in its people and the future holds promise for even greater accomplishments.

PUBLIC REACTION TO FOUNDATION STUDY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. Hansen). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Madam Speaker, as the Members know the House Small Business Committee has been engaged in a study of tax-exempt foundations and their impact on our economy. This study was started in the 87th Congress, under my chairmanship, and is being continued under the present chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee the Honorable Joe L. Evins. Our interim findings, under date of December 31, 1962, were submitted to the committee members for their consideration. The subject is now being handled by Subcommittee No. 1, of which I am the chairman.

I have received thousands of letters in support of the investigation, all of which express great concern over the ever-increasing number and influence of tax-exempt foundations. The reactions to our study will no doubt be of interest to the Members. I, therefore, wish to insert in the Record excerpts from a few of the letters received since the first of this year. These are in addition to those which were placed in the Record by me last summer and last fall. I include also articles from the U.S. News & World Report of January 21, 1963, and the Shreveport Journal of April 8, 1963.

Our study has been confined to privately controlled, tax-exempt foundations that are required to file tax return Form 990-A or 1041-A. This excludes first, religious organizations; second, educational organizations if they normally maintain a regular faculty and curriculum and normally have a regularly organized body of pupils or students in attendance at the place where their educational activities are regularly carried on; third, charitable organizations, or organizations for the prevention of cruelty to children or animals, if supported in whole or in part by funds contributed by the United States or any State or political subdivision thereof, or primarily supported by contributions of the general public; fourth, or organizations operated, supervised, or controlled by or in connection with a religious organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code.

J.H., Adrian, Mich.: "We want to commend you for making this investigation and hope you will be able to get results. We are back of you 100 percent."

M.D., Detroit: "It is high time someone who represents our country spoke up about this. The poor people are paying the taxes for the millionaires of our country."

P.M., Detroit: "I'm for everyone paying their fair share of taxation * * *. All an organization has to do is call itself a charitable foundation or a charitable trust and it becomes a sacrosanct untaxable thing. Let's get back to fair taxation."

T.S., Detroit: "I should like to see something done about the so-called charitable trusts who are engaged in big business, yet escaping their share of taxes on the grounds of charity. The ordinary citizen is greatly penalized by high taxes made necessary through the loopholes open to big business for evading their rightful share of tax payment."

A.Z., Detroit: "All tax-exempt foundations and charitable trusts should be taxed."

K.K., Detroit: "You are to be highly commended for exposing practices which fall little short of 'highway robbery.'"

S.H., San Diego: "Please continue your investigation into the tax-free foundations. We need it. The foundations are much too powerful and have been abusing their tax-free privilege at the expense of the public."

F.K., St. Petersburg, Fla.: "I believe we should have control over them (foundations) and that all but a few of them should be taxed."

W.J., Arlington, Tex.: "I feel the time has come to eliminate the tax-free foundation that has become a menace more often than a benefit. Thank you for the thought and effort you are putting into this important matter."

W.B., Waterford, Conn.: "Your report on tax-exempt foundations and charitable trusts is a very excellent study of a situation which appears to be getting out of hand. In a democratic nation certain developments which start from the finest of motives sometimes have a tendency to become strangulating, undemocratic growths which require some regulation to protect the general public. This appears to be the case here. Furthermore only the national legislative branch appears to be competent to apply the remedies. Your recommendations, on the whole, appear to me to be sound and should be pursued to the end of checking the undesirable feature of these tax-exempt foundations.

A.R., Dallas: "We admire your temerity in tackling the giant tax-free foundations."

M.A., Lone Star, Tex.: "I surely appreciate your watchfulness and diligence in looking into this haven for tax dodgers."

E.H., Port Chester, N.Y.: "Let me offer my deepest congratulations to you and your committee for the very fine job you have done with your work in this matter. Keep up your good work."

E.C., Barrington, R.I.: "I have been following the work of your committee relative to foundations and feel like you do that something should be done to either limit or bar their creation, or control their activities. It has always puzzled me why—with all the talk about tax cuts, tax reform, and bigger budgets—nothing is said about plugging the biggest loophole of all, the establishment of foundations as a means of salting away huge fortunes. Over the years, as a means of avoiding taxes, the Fords, Mellons, Rockefellers, the A. & P. Hartfords, Royal Little and his Textron manipulations, and many more like them, have put their millions in deep freeze, and with them exercised tremendous economic power. I think something should be done to curtail the foundation racket that has the effect of at least keeping the rich rich, if not richer, while impoverishing the rest of us."

J.B., Bellaire, Tex.: "There has never been a time when this information needs to be gotten before the people like it does at this time. These organizations need to be exposed."

J.T., Compton, Calif.: "Thank you for your interest in a closer look into tax-exempt foundations. Surely these millions of dollars would be better spent on the national debt. You have my great appreciation in your efforts to get the facts and letting the facts be known to the American people."

F.H., Ferndale, Mich.: "I see by the papers you are investigating the various tax-exempt foundations. I think that is the best news I have heard in a long time."

L.S., Palm Beach, Fla.: "I think it is perfectly outrageous that so-called personal foundations are free of inheritance taxes, and the Government therefore deprived of much needed income. The tax-free status of these foundations prevents the Government from receiving revenue which it could well apply to the billions expended on research on space and the Atomic Energy Commission. Certainly the Government should not be deprived of inheritance taxes on money expended on establishing foundations, whether through lifetime gifts or by will, when the Government is operating at a deficit and needs the taxes for much more useful purposes than most of the foundations attempt to cover. I hope you will continue and expand your fight against the ridiculous tax-free status of these so-called foundations."

H.H., New York City: "I have very frequently protested against any and all tax exemptions (while we are being strangled). Why is there a tax-exempt status?"

V.B., Jamestown, N.Y.: "Read the article, 'Why Foundations are Under Fire' in the January 21 issue of U.S. News & World Report. This is only a start of what is going on, the unfairness and the unbalanced way costs are borne. You should cover the entire field with the study and enact legislation to plug all and every loophole."

M.F., Coronado, Calif.: "I want to compliment you upon the publication of a most complete and searching report. I am hoping that you will continue your good work toward eliminating some of the inequities that exist by reasons of tax exemptions."

J.R., New Orleans: "I have just read your report. It is good. For some time I have been interested in the activities of the foundations, particularly the influence of foundations on the colleges and universities."

R.E., Winston-Salem, N.C.: "I am very interested in foundations that exist in Winston-Salem. The financial arrangements and personalities involved are very interesting, and I feel the information could give me a greater knowledge of how my hometown is controlled and owned. I feel that I may not be able to get your entire point of view from the Journal and Sentinal newspapers. I would appreciate any information that you can send me."

T.B., Deal, N.Y.: "Many thanks for your committee report. It's startling. If the country at large knew of it, there would be a howl. I congratulate you and your associates on having the courage to invade the sacred precincts of the mighty, who seem to feel that they are beyond the pale of the law."

C.J., Norfolk, Va.: "Please accept my thanks for the copy of tax-exempt foundations and charitable trusts. I trust the general public will someday realize the effects of your patriotic contributions to society. May your efforts soon be rewarded."

I.M., Torrance, Calif.: "I have seen much evidence of your fight against foundations. My hat is off to you."

J.S., Newark, N.J.: "I am interested in obtaining a copy of your report. * * * This country needs more men like you to protect the little fellows for if your elected officials do not do it, who will?"

E.D., New York City: "It is a much needed investigation. I, and so many people I know, will be behind you."

K.S., Phoenix: "I wish to commend you for your report on tax-exempt foundations and your effort to justly tax these foundations and trusts. I have read this work and firmly believe it is time something is done to prevent corporations hiding behind foundations, thereby escaping taxes. It would certainly lighten the public income tax load and could even reduce our deficit if this could be accomplished. Hope Congress takes a good, hard look at your report."

G.S., Martinez, Calif.: "May I commend you for this important work of research and publication. Though your attempts to counter the barrage of false information disseminated by foundation apologists may not be well rewarded, I hope that you will persist in making available all the information required for intelligent study by the public."

D.M., Redondo Beach, Calif.: "We, in the South Bay area, are deeply grateful for all you are doing and we support you. God bless you and your staff."

H.D., Sunland, Calif.: "I wish to commend you upon the unceasing effort you have made to expose to the public the works of this big segment of our economy. I feel that these foundations and the questionable use of much of these foundations is a definite injustice to all taxpayers."

C.S., Whittier, Calif.: "I wish to thank you and your committee on the investigation of tax-free foundations in this country. I hope results are forthcoming from your published report."

J.D., San Jose, Calif.: "Thanks very much for your courage. We ask you to please continue the investigation."

J.S., San Diego: "Keep up the good work. I am a registered Republican, and I urge you, sir, to keep right on going after the foundations."

L.H., Albuquerque: "I do hope nothing will stop or interfere with your intentions. * * * What I have read on the subject makes me feel you are on the right track. Accept my good wishes for your success."

W.B., Orangeburg, S.C.: "We commend you for your investigation of the abuses of foundations in our great country."

C.S., Bartlesville, Okla.: "Congratulations on your report on the foundations."

R.W., Napa, Calif.: "I have long felt that these funds have been allowed to write their own ticket. * * * I strongly support your stand."

J.W., Warrensburg, Mo.: "I find the summary of your presentation to be very interesting, timely, and well said."

A.B., New York City: "It is about time this was done and done thoroughly."

H.B., Houston: "I wish to thank you for the report on tax-exempt foundations and your great work to bring this to the attention of the public."

W.B., Deming, N. Mex.: "We heartily commend the activities of Congressman PATMAN's committee and hope that the tax-favored groups will be studied with the tax-free groups as a source of increased revenues."

P.H., Monsey, N.Y.: "This writer finds merit in the continued investigation of tax-exempt foundations by your committee."

G.P., Honolulu: "I hope you can get legislation that will tax foundations . . . I am a Republican. It seems to me that altogether too many groups are being exempted from paying taxes. We realize that we have to have taxes in order to run the Government and to defend ourselves. Some of us are acutely aware of this at this time of the year. We are glad to pay taxes, but it is somewhat shocking to find so many groups that are exempt from this privilege and responsibility. Take, for instance, the foundations. Some of these are organized for the glory of the founder. They perpetuate his name. Others may be a means of avoiding taxes when a person's fortune has grown tremendously."

J.S., Encinitas, Calif.: "Keep up the fine work you are doing on your committee . . . dealing with tax-exempt foundations."

B.R., Beach Haven, N.J.: "Needless to say I am personally very much in favor of your efforts and hope nothing happens to prevent you from fully concluding them."

E.R., Las Vegas: "May I tender my compliments on what you are doing. You have already got the foundations on the defensive. I am increasingly outraged at the slick public relations of tax-exempt entities. Hence my sincere thanks for your two-fisted fighting."

C.G., Cranston, R.I.: "I agree wholeheartedly with the findings covering foundations. Your report is a gold mine of interesting facts, well written and to the point. I wish that every adult American citizen could read your report. The third President of the United States, Thomas Jefferson, was 100 percent correct when he said that a democratic society must have an educated and well-informed citizenry. I'll bet that if a majority of the electorate read your report, it would have overwhelming support."

R.M., Pittsburgh: "Please accept my congratulations for your valuable study on tax-exempt foundations. I have just finished a first reading of your report dated December 31, 1962. I am amazed, astonished, and at a loss to explain how the Congress has permitted the growth of this power without restraint. Your recommendations appear both reasonable and necessary to prevent further concentration of power and abuse.

"It would be interesting to compare the total sales of the foundations in the stock market during the first 6 months of 1962 with sales of the 20 largest mutual funds. The side effects would also be tremendous, such as selling of similar stock from college endowment funds whose officers might be connected with the same foundations and know in advance of the contemplated unloading of certain securities. It would be interesting to determine the connections between certain mutual funds and these foundations to discover parallel sales.

"I encourage you to continue your efforts."

R.T., Redlands, Calif.: "I think you are perfectly right on this issue (despite the Saturday Evening Post apologia for foundations)."

M.F., LaCrescenta, Calif.: "I agree with you that something must be done to eliminate the tax loopholes which such foundations enjoy. If the American people could be told the facts, they will back you up, and I hope the news media will cooperate."

A.D., Adams, Mass.: "I would appreciate your sending me your recent report. * * * One way to popularize this subject publicly is to give it a healthy circulation. Massachusetts is hardly immune from the insidious growth of these foundations, and the public should be educated to its ways."

B.L., Miami: "We hope you are successful and close down on the tax-exempt foundation racket."

R.W., New York City: "I have just read in the Saturday Evening Post the Hibbs presentation of how the Ford Foundation and others direct the conduct of education in schools and colleges, through grants. Do you realize that making grants to colleges gives those who make the grants influence in shaping the education and political thinking of the American people? This is a dangerous power. If our Government collected taxes from foundations, there would be less individual and business taxes."

C.C. Hillsboro, N.H.: "Indeed, it is refreshing to realize that, at last, someone of intelligence is questioning the real object behind the so-called foundations, funds and trusts that are so ostentatiously set up to help someone or something."

W.H., San Diego: "I sincerely hope you will be able to penetrate the foundations this time and get the information they don't want you to have."

R.M., Tacoma, Wash.: "I have admired your unending efforts in the investigation of the tax-free foundations."

C.B., Sebastopol, Calif.: "On reading of your determination to reveal the foundation tax dodgers you are to be congratulated. Why should we farmers and other producers pay the fare so these parasites can ride free?"

F.R., Sun Valley, Calif.: "Congratulations on your energetic campaign to curtail the foundations' tax dodge situation."

K.G., Klamath, Calif.: "It would appear that a huge portion of tax-exempt foundations are set up in trusts for the benefit of private schools. May I suggest that these funds have been withdrawn from public school support and directed to the support of those educational institutions who subscribe to the ideological and experimental theories acceptable to the various foundation boards. The intellectual elite graduating from these foundation-supported schools have found teaching places within our national system of education as educator educators."

A.S., Eugene, Oreg.: "I am one of an increasingly growing number who is getting completely fed up with some of the connections of a number of foundations—information not given in the newspapers, of course."

K.B., University Park, Pa.: "I have just read your report on foundations and want to express my enthusiasm for the questions that you raised and the position that you took. Personally, I am worried about the possibility of a return to the late 1920's and 1930's when social science investigation tended to be controlled by 'one group' within society. A number of the foundations now determine the areas and subjects that should be investigated and then offer funds to academicians. As one would expect, the offers are difficult to turn down."

M.S., Boise, Idaho: "In these days of confusion there are so many wrong things going on that one hardly knows where to begin, but if you can get things changed to compel the huge foundations to pay taxes, they will have that much less money to use to the disadvantage of the United States as many of them are now doing."

B.P., Newtown, Conn.: "In the interest of greater revenue for the economy, as well as of tax law violations, this is a very justifiable probe. It is to be earnestly hoped that effective action will result from your endeavors."

R.W., Alhambra, Calif.: "Those of us who have followed the investigations of tax-exempt foundations by congressional committees feel that in every instance great pressure was brought to bear to discourage and defeat the efforts of the investigators to get at the truth. Whatever eleemosynary goals the great foundations may have set forth as their reason for existence, it is now quite clear that tax avoidance and not charity has been the dominant factor in their establishment. The fact that the number of tax-exempt foundations trebled in the 10 years from 1952 to 1962 is not, I feel quite sure, due to burgeoning altruism but to discovery of 'a good thing' by canny businessmen. Certainly there is urgent need for thorough and complete investigation of the concept, machinery, and actions of the tax-exempt foundations. It will be most interesting to see what pressures will be used to interfere with and discredit your efforts to expose the truth to public view. Along with other conservatives, I hope success and wide publicity attend your efforts."

H.S., Dickerson, Md.: "Your recently expressed concern against the dominance of our economy by the tax-exempt foundations shows a sage concern for a very grave development in our society."

D.G., Pasadena, Calif.: "I have just finished reading the chairman's report to the Select Committee on Small Business on tax-exempt foundations. This is a brilliant study and its findings are most shocking and very valuable to help American citizens understand why the tax burden is so heavy. Is there any chance of Congress doing something about the situation?"

B.L., Sacramento, Calif.: "We feel that your report would be of great assistance to us in the administration of our laws and enabling us to analyze and evaluate any proposed State legislation relating to tax-exempt foundations."

J.S., Los Angeles, Calif.: "I believe that tax-free foundations should be investigated. This has been long overdue."

C.P., Los Angeles, Calif.: "We are so proud of you and your courage in your investigations of the tax-free foundations."

W.S., Midland, Tex.: "I wish to commend you for your work and to urge your continued effort in this matter."

F.P., Bellevue, Wash.: "I have read with great interest the various newspaper articles regarding your concern that tax-exempt foundations have strayed from the charitable work for which they were granted tax exemption, and I am glad to learn that someone thinks this should be looked into."

R.F., Los Altos Hills, Calif.: "My sincere congratulations to you and your staff for your courage and good conscience in exposing the many abuses existing and multiplying among tax-exempt foundations. Unfortunately, the newspapers and periodicals give all too few details of the abuses you have discovered and uncovered."

B.D., Laguna Beach, Calif.: "With daily complaints about taxes your investigation of tax-free foundations is most timely."

J.R., Encino, Calif.: "There is no question that they (foundations) are used as a tax dodge and are abusing the principle on which they are allowed. However, I think two simple rules would eliminate these abuses. First, no tax-exempt foundation should be allowed to own any real property or any equities except their own premises. Second, all income must be disbursed for charitable purposes within 1 year after it is earned.

The first measure would eliminate the main reason these foundations are formed, the passing of control of stock to the foundations so that inheritance taxes will not disperse this control. The second measure would insure that they really act as charitable organizations and not just as a front for a tax dodge.

All measures short of these two basic proposals will only skim the edges of the problem, not erase it. These proposals would destroy the usefulness of this gimmick as a tax dodge."

R.G., Austin, Tex.: "I hope you continue your work in this area."

R.L., Spokane, Wash.: "I recommend you for your faithfulness to our Nation and hope you will continue the investigation."

D.P., Levelland, Tex.: "In your long campaign against these foundations and their use as tax loopholes * * * You have my full support and encouragement."

L.C., Wainscott, L.I., N.Y.: "Permit me to thank you for instigating this investigation, which I consider an important service to the country."

M.G., Mineola, N.Y.: "Many thanks for bringing tax-exempt foundations and their tax dodging before the Congress."

R.E., Seattle: "More power to you. I can fully share your concern for the implications of this draining off of tax dollars under the guise of 'public service' or other noble-sounding alleged purposes which is the excuse offered by these devices for dodging a fair share of the burden."

D.A., Canton, Ohio: "These trusts and foundations go on for years and years, growing larger and larger. After a certain number of years, they should be disbursed. In fact they are established in the first place to avoid taxes, and to allow them to go on for years and years is not right."

E.D., Newport Beach, Calif.: "You are serving the interests of the country well by bringing to the public's attention through your work in the Congress the immense scope of the activities of tax-exempt foundations in our Nation today and their widespread impact on the country today."

F.R., Detroit: "Congratulations for your sincere attempt to investigate our foundations in this country. Keep up the good work."

J.C., Los Angeles: "Your continued work in enforcing the tax laws to include these tax-exempt foundations is certainly needed."

K.S., Columbia, S.C.: "It certainly works untold hardships on young couples, trying to rear children, to have to pay such high taxes, and let the billions in foundations go tax free."

D.V., Dearborn, Mich.: "I am certainly in favor of your investigation of the foundations and I hope you will be successful in your endeavor."

J.B., Midland, Mich.: "Just a word of commendation for your courageous stand on tax-exempt foundations. I hope the great research effort you have put forth will result in the repeal of these exemptions."

H.C., Hope, N. Mex.: "I do congratulate you on this fine work and wish you could have lots of health."

M.S., Fresno, Calif.: "May I commend you for the revealing report on the tax-exempt foundations. I also commend you for your dedication to good government, to your constituents, and the people of the United States."

F.M., Cloquet, Minn.: "I very much appreciate your looking into foundation tax abuses. This project is long overdue and in my opinion local, State, and Federal units of the government are suffering tremendous tax losses through the abuses."

N.O., Cincinnati: "Continue your fight against the tax-free foundations."

T.R., Houston: "We are most encouraged and pleased to see your interest in the tax-free status of powerful political groups in the form of foundations."

W.K., Santa Barbara, Calif.: "I feel that you are performing a tremendous public service in disclosing facts on these organizations."

I.E., Fort Lauderdale, Fla.: "May I congratulate you on your investigation of tax-free foundations. This is something that must be done and I thank God for men like you. These foundations should be brought under control."

T.B., Minneapolis: "I commend you for lowering the boom on this racket in tax-exempt foundations. And you're lowering the boom on the Internal Revenue Service because of their absolute laxity in handling these tax-exempt foundation returns. They have actually defied the Congress."

W.E., Charleston, W. Va.: "I am in accord with your views on this subject. It is my opinion that a tax-exempt organization should not be permitted to enter into industry. I further believe that a complete review of the records of many tax-exempt organizations would disclose many fringes are enjoyed by their personnel, which fringes are presently under attack by the Revenue Service in the examination of privately owned enterprises. The Internal Revenue Service should be required to serve notice on the tax-exempt groups that they will be examined the same as other businesses and the Commissioner should issue some new regulations outlining the postion of the Service in these matters."

M.B., Dallas: "Thanks very much for your efforts to expose the evils of the tax-free foundations. Please keep up the good work."

J.D., Claremont, Calif.: "Your work and report on tax-exempt foundations is interesting and commendable. I urge you to proceed with your investigation and my sincere good wishes go with you."

H.O., Westbury, Long Island, N.Y.: "What disturbs me is the financial power exercised by these foundations without, apparently, any sense of justice or responsibility. They receive, at the expense of their fellow citizens, immunity from taxation and various other benefits. Is this power not subject to any control?"

P.P., Santa Cruz, Calif.: "You are so right about the tax-exempt foundations robbing our Treasury of hundreds of millions of dollars. Congress should compel them to pay their full share of the cost of government."

E.H., Detroit: "Stick to the investigation on tax-exempt foundations."

F.D., Redlands, Calif.: "Please push forward with this investigation."

A.D., Fort Lauderdale, Fla: "I want to congratulate you for your excellent work in exposing the laxity of the Internal Revenue Service in enforcing the Federal income tax laws which are being violated by many tax-exempt foundations. I trust that you will be able to get some prompt action and have Congress call a halt to this laxity."

R.R., Newark, Del.: "I should like to take this opportunity to encourage you in the work you are doing to protect the profit system. Taking on a 'holy cow' like tax-exempt institutions shows considerable fortitude on your part. In all probability you will be denounced as being against the 'public welfare.' If you are, ignore it."

F.S., Dallas, Tex.: "This note is to commend you on your very fine work on tax-exempt foundations. I am a widow and my tax is terribly unjust. Yet I must pay all that Congress assesses. I believe each foundation should pay the first 5 percent of their earnings to the Government which protects them, and furnishes them with this fine country to live in. It is not honest of many of them to shirk their part of the country's Government expenses. Your job in bringing this to the House is a big one. I pray God to give you courage and strength."

E.B., New Orleans, La.: "I thank you for your efforts on 'foundations' and hope you will continue them."

J.J., Summit, N.J.: "You have definitely hit 'pay dirt' in your inquiries re tax-exempt foundations. I hope to see that this matter is pursued further and with real vigor."

G.C., Amarillo, Tex.: "We Texans hope that you will allow no pressures to prevent your investigation. We need to know what is true and what is false."

J.W., Stockton, Calif.: "You are to be heartily congratulated for bringing attention to some of the many detrimental features of our many tax-exempt foundations. I am a Republican. While I am sure you are not in need of compliments from me, I nonetheless feel strongly impelled to express my appreciation for your presence in the Congress."

K.D., Boston, Mass.: "The country owes you a great deal for your excellent work on the so-called charitable funds and trusts."

J.T., Lansing, Mich.: "I sure am glad someone has started to do something about these foundations. Here in Lansing we have the two biggest department stores and a new large building owned and operated by the Mott Foundation of Flint, Mich. This foundation also owns one store in East Lansing, one in Owosso, Mich., one in Flint, Mich., and one in Saginaw, Mich. They are all run in competition to other retail department stores and are the largest in all of these cities. Something should be done to change this abuse."

A.R., Dallas: "It is my belief that not only are industrial and commercial enterprises being increasingly affected by the power of the tax-exempt foundation, but practically every phase of our lives including our schools and our churches."

G.D., New Haven, Conn.: "I have no objections to charitable organizations and other institutions whose objectives are to help people that are faced with unusual circumstances however. Institutions of this nature are on the rise throughout the country. I firmly believe that there should be an immediate investigation to determine if there are any loopholes that are existing and which tend to offer more benefits to the controllers than the recipients for whose benefit the institutions have been established. Unscrupulous methods can be employed by various groups in avoiding taxes by incorporating under this classification."

A.B., Pacific Palisades, Calif.: "It is high time that the true nature of foundations' activities are brought into the open. If this can be accomplished, it will indeed be an achievement for our Congressmen."

V.H., Phoenix: "Keep up the good work, and know you have our full support."

H.M., Ridgewood, N.J.: "Such an investigation is long, long overdue."

E.H., Corpus Christi, Tex.: "I am in favor of something being done in regards to these foundations."

[From the U.S. News & World Report, Jan. 21, 1963]

Why the Foundations Are Under Fire

(Are tax-exempt foundations used more and more to dodge taxes? Keep control of vast wealth in a few hands? Give a tax haven to what is actually a profit operation?

(Those and other charges are made in a report to a committee of Congress. If the recommendations are adopted, foundations set up by families and others face closer scrutiny soon.)

Tax-exempt foundations, with more than $10 billion of wealth, have just been accused of wholesale violations of tax law and the tax-exemption privilege.

Representative Wright Patman, Democrat, of Texas, retiring as chairman of the House Select Committee on Small Business to become chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, has handed the Small Business Committee a 135-page report based on a survey of 534 of this country's 45,000 or more foundations.

Some abuses listed by Mr. Patman:

Failing to report to the Internal Revenue Service on operations and on holdings of wealth, with little or no effort by IRS to enforce the law.

Accumulating income and reinvesting it for more tax-free income, instead of pouring it out for charitable purposes.

Running heavy expenses—averaging 10 percent of receipts—with emphasis on payments for public relations programs.

Engaging in thousands of business enterprises in direct competition with all kinds of taxpaying companies.

NAMING NAMES

Few, if any, of the well-known foundations failed to make the list of those cited for one or more alleged abuses.

Some large foundations: the Ford Foundation and other Ford family foundations, with assets of 2.8 billions; the Rockefeller family foundations, with 1.1 billions; the Duke Endowment, with 463 millions; the Carnegie foundations with 414 millions; the John A. Hartford Foundation, with 309 millions; the Mellon-controlled foundations, with 242 millions, and many others.

The growing practice, among wealthy families, of setting up foundations, the report charged, is scooping up huge and growing segments of American industry into tax-exempt aggregations that threaten to concentrate control of industry in a few powerful hands, and already deprive the Treasury of large amounts in annual revenues.

Control of some of America's best-known corporations was found to be concentrated in tax-exempt foundations. Included: Ford Motor Co., Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., Eli Lilly & Co., Kellogg Co., Callaway Mills, Inc., Duke Power Co., S. S. Kresge Co., and many others.

A QUESTION OF MOTIVES

Operations of many foundations, the report charges, suggest that creators of foundations are motivated more often by a desire for personal and family gain than by charitable instincts.

Among the "abuses" listed:

Wealthy individuals arrange to avoid estate taxes on their fortunes, yet retain control of their wealth for themselves and their families in perpetuity.

Some foundations lend money to the creators, their relatives, or their corporations—often at "preferential" rates.

Family members serve as officers, directors and paid administrators.

Foundations often donate big sums for pension or other benefits to the creators' corporations.

Creators of foundations can, and do, vote large stockholdings of their foundations in proxy fights and, so, gain control of major corporations.

CONTROL OF INDUSTRY

"It is a well-known fact," Mr. Patman reported to the Committee, "that the Rockefeller family controls Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), and the Rockefeller-controlled foundations own a substantial part of the corporation. At the close of 1960, seven Rockefeller-controlled foundations owned 7,891,567 shares of Standard Oil of New Jersey with a market value of $324,946,110."

Yet these same foundations, said Mr. Patman, "own substantial interests in Esso's competitors—Socony Mobil Oil Co., Continental Oil, Ohio Oil, Standard Oil of Indiana.

"To date," the report says, "our records disclose 111 foundations that owned 10 percent or more of a least 1 class stock in 1 or more 263 different corporations on December 31, 1960."

"Foundations today," said Mr. Patman, "bear a frightening resemblance to the bank holding companies that were invented by the champions of monopoly and combination in the early 1900's.

"It is evident that control of our industrial and commercial enterprise is to an ever-increasing degree passing into the hands of tax-exempt foundations through stock ownership."

TAX ANGLES

"Obviously," says the report, "tax-exempt foundations have been used and are being used, in part, to avoid Federal estate taxes. Thus huge fortunes are kept from being returned to public use for channeling into our economy without limitations.

"The late Secretary of the Treasury [Andrew W.] Mellon used a charitable foundation to avoid estate taxes on a multi-million-dollar estate.

"Of more recent date, the Ford Foundation was used to reduce the taxable estates of Henry and Edsel Ford and to avoid having to sell Ford Motor Co. stock to the public in order to meet large estate taxes.

"So substantial parts of the great fortunes of those who have profited by the enormous expansion of American industry have found their way into tax-exempt foundations. These foundations have already passed and will continue to pass—by right of inheritance—to the control of heirs or their trustees. This enables a few individuals to control ever-increasing tax-exempt wealth."

OTHER TAXES INVOLVED

Mr. Patman describes other uses of foundations to avoid income and capital-gains taxes.

Cited as examples: the complicated operations of the Howard Hughes Medical Institute, the Hughes Tool Co., and Hughes Aircraft Co.; and the relations of Morgan Guaranty Trust Co. and Chemical Bank New York Trust Co., both of New York, with foundations these big banks recently set up.

Referring to the use of foundations to avoid income and capital-gains taxes, Mr. Patman says, "The net result of this legalized tax dodging is that the public's treasury suffers and the bill must be picked up by the taxpayers, including small businessmen."

"When business organizations operate in the guise or cloak of charity primarily to evade taxes and to gain advantage over other business enterprises," said Mr. Patman, "it is time to carefully examine this field."

WHAT TO DO?

Mr. Patman calls for a 2-year moratorium on the granting of tax exemption to new foundations and proposes new laws that would alter drastically the character and role of foundations.

Foundations, he urges, should be limited to 25 years of life and prohibited from engaging in business, directly or indirectly—with no foundation permitted to hold more than 3 percent of the stock in any corporation.

Foundations would be prohibited from speculating in stock, from commercial lending, and from many other practices.

There are signs that the Kennedy administration is ready to take up some of Mr. Patman's ideas. The Internal Revenue Service has just issued a new set of rules requiring far more detailed reporting of assets and operations of foundations.

In addition, high administration officials are saying privately that they are very much interested in questions that are being raised by the immense and widespread activities of tax-exempt foundations.

[From the Shreveport (La.) Journal, Apr. 8, 1963]

Foundations Make Income Taxes Higher—House Group Favors Investigation and Much Correction

(By Alice Widener)

New York City.—Modern American novelist have taken apart the industrial tycoon of Detroit, the huckster of Madison Avenue, the political boss of Tammany Hall, the preacher, doctor, and lawyer of Main Street.

But no novelist with a strong social conscience has taken apart the foundation man. He is a social scientist lolling in an office in a remodeled private palace and dreaming up how to give away tax-exempt charitable money while you and I painstakingly fill in our social security numbers on life insurance and savings deposit forms so that no single taxable dollar of our hard-earned annual income can escape the gimlet-eyed scrutiny of the Internal Revenue Service.

What is the staggering total of untaxed income enjoyed by the tax-exempt foundations in our country? Nobody knows, not even the U.S. Treasury Department. As of December 31, 1960, there were 45,124 tax-exempt foundations in the United States. Of these, 534 had aggregate untaxed receipts of almost $7 billion during the period 1951–60. Their assets at the end of 1960 were no less than $10 billion. What is the total assets figure for the 45,124 tax-exempt foundations? Nobody knows.

One thing sure, the foundations are engaged in doing just about everything under the sun. They do research on space vehicles and mud-hut building; some are moneylending at a profit and other giving away money at a total loss. They are in position to rule or ruin many universities, to topple or maintain some foreign governments, to advance or retard the careers of teachers, artists, writers, scientists, doctors and—fellow social scientists. Above all the last. It almost might be said that the foundation man is a social scientist laboring on behalf of social scientists for the purpose thereof.

As your income tax payment deadline approaches, midnight April 15, you ought to inquire into the tax-exempt foundation situation. It affects you. You are paying more taxes because the foundation man isn't paying any at all. You are a tax slave; he is a scot-free overlord of American education, science, social science, art, medicine, stock market transactions, moneylending, influence peddling, and a thousand-and-one other fields and activities.

Like most of us, the foundation man is good and bad. But unlike us, he isn't subject to the same financial controls. To find out exactly which ones the foundation man is subject to, Congressman Wright Patman, of Texas, addressed nine basic questions to Internal Revenue Commissioner Mortimer Caplin. His answer to seven of these was "no" or "none." As a result, Representative Patman, chairman of the House Select Committee on Small Business (87th Cong.) reported, "There seems to be almost no limit to what the foundations can do."

Two reasons why you and I groan over our punitive income taxpayments are the annual $10 billion fixed interest charges on our national debt, and the hundreds of millions of dollars which annually escape taxation and thus put a heavier burden on us.

The foundation man declares that his giving away tax-exempt money does our country and other countries nothing but good. The truth is that it does both good and harm, and there is much evidence that the harm is beginning to outweigh the good, because of many foundations' monopoly controls, unfair business practices, and other abuses.

In New York City, the mayor is talking about the urgent need to increase the 3-percent city sales tax. This will raise the cost of living for every New Yorker, no matter how poor. Also in New York City, a large midtown hospital recently went broke and the Ford Foundation is taking over the entire property for its tax-exempt offices.

On December 31, 1962, the U.S. Government Printing Office issued the document "Tax-Exempt Foundations and Charitable Trusts: Their Impact on Our Economy." It lists the names of tax-exempt foundations in New York City, of which the aggregate wealth is in the billions. They and others bear, says the House select committee, "a frightening resemblance to the bank holding companies that were invented by the champions of monopoly and combination in the early 1900's."

Almost every day I receive in the mail the most elaborately printed, extravagantly produced public information releases from tax-exempt foundations. Their direct mail—tax-exempt except for postage—is more regal than Tiffany jewelry store ads. There is not the slightest difference between the huckstering of tax-exempt foundations to advertise their do-gooding to the press and the huckstering of commercial companies to advertise their wares to the consumer except that the latter practice is justifiable.

The House Select Committee on Small Business believes that the whole situation of the foundation man requires further investigation and much correction.

ISRAEL INDEPENDENCE DAY

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ryan] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. **RYAN** of New York. Madam Speaker, we were honored to have with us at the opening of the day's proceedings Rabbi Karl Applbaum who reminded us of the struggle of the State of Israel and the meaning of Israel to the Jewish people. Our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rosenthal], who is Rabbi Applbaum's Representative, spoke eloquently of the dedicated service of Rabbi Applbaum.

I rise now to commemorate a great event, the 15th anniversary of the State of Israel. At a time when Israel is still surrounded by hostile states, when the Soviet Union is sending modern weapons of destruction to Egypt, when German scientists are assisting in the development of Egyptian rocketry, it is vitally important for the Congress and the President to express our strong and continuing support for Israel. The recent proposed merger of Egypt, Iraq, and Syria in a new United Arab Republic is a cause for concern, especially when the President of the existing United Arab Republic, formerly known as Egypt, still vows to destroy the democracy of Israel.

Madam Speaker, Israel's accomplishments are truly remarkable. Fifteen years ago, as the last of the British Palestine mandate forces were loaded onto waiting ships, the Jewish National Council met and issued the historic proclamation which established the independent State of Israel. This declaration of sovereignty was the culmination of the hopes of the Zionist movement of the past 50 years. It had been the dream of the Jewish leaders throughout the world to create a homeland free from oppression and discrimination.

Immigration to Palestine had been increasing steadily since the end of the 19th century and had been given an impetus when the Balfour Declaration was issued in 1917, in which the British Government "viewed with favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people." Those who had immigrated before Hitler's rise to power were looking for a place to settle, to live in peace void of persecution. Those who arrived after the havoc of World War II were escaping from horrible memories, from concentration camps and slave labor. Little did they realize that they would once more be fighting for the survival of their lives, their religion, their way of life. This will to survive, coupled with their solidarity against a common enemy, enabled the Israelis to persevere against attacks from three sides. The momentous announcement of May 14, 1948, triggered a conflict which remains today.

A truce, followed by signed armistice agreements, was arranged under United Nations' auspices and in 1949 brought about an end to open warfare. However, infiltrations, sabotage, and border skirmishes continue to plague the uneasy peace.

After the cessation of open hostilities, the fledgling government, led by President Chaim Weizmann, the leader of the World Zionist Movement, and Premier David Ben-Gurion, an important political and labor personage, found itself in dire straits. Much of the industry of Israel had been destroyed during the war. The land, desert in the south and marshes in the north, could not support the population. Above all, the increasing influx of immigrants from Europe and other countries throughout the world were causing grave economic problems which had to be solved immediately. The young nation aided by the United States heroically faced these problems and began to build the most modern state in the Middle East.

The Negev, the southern desert, is being developed and will fulfill the dream of Premier Ben-Gurion to make the desert bloom.

Around the capital city of the region, Beersheba, several cities are being built to house those who will work in the industries of the Dead Sea. Arad, a typical site, was once the domain of a Canaanite king and a Roman fortress. Today, 200 housing units have been constructed, a nucleus of the city which will eventually hold a population of 50,000. From Arad, laborers will go forth to work in phosphate plants and porcelain and white cement factories. Marble, too, will be cut and exported to oversea markets.

In the south, the port of Elath—Eilat—once the flourishing marine center of King Solomon, is being developed as both a winter resort and a port city, capable of handling Red Sea trade. An 11-story skyscraper is one of 3 new hotels which have recently been built to house the tourists who come to enjoy the wild beauty of the desert as well as the bathing facilities of the Red Sea. Elath, too, is the nearest city to the Timna copper mines, the famous legendary King Solomon's mines, which was reopened for production. There are plans for a Club Mediterranée vacation village and a marina system of hotels, motels, villas, and children's camps, to be completed for tourist use in 5 years.

In the north, industry has been in existence for many years. Haifa, Tel Aviv, Acco—Acre—and Jerusalem comprise the largest industrial centers in the state. Here may be found the industries which make Israel the stable nation it is—oil refineries, steel and iron mills, fertilizer plants and chemical factories. The recent discovery of rich oil pockets has enabled the Government to expand its oil industry. In Haifa, a new crude oil plant was begun this year, with a planned output of 20,000 tons per year, sufficient to supply 80 percent of the country's domestic consumption of basic lubricants. Four chemical plants have also been planned to manufacture petroleum byproducts, such as ethyl and detergents. It is the hope of the Government that with this new construction, importation will be kept to a minimum.

Shipping, another major industry of Israel, has expanded tremendously in the intervening 15 years. In 1948, there were four vessels belonging to Israel, with a tonnage of only 6,000. In 1961, the number of vessels has increased fifteenfold, to 60, and shipping tonnage has jumped to 517,000 tons. Construction was begun on a shipyard which will, within 15 years, build 80,000 tons of shipping annually and repair 1½ million tons of additional shipping. When completed, the shipyard will be witness to the historic occasion of the laying of the keel of the first vessel to be built in Israel.

The rich farmlands of the north were insufficient to produce enough foods to satisfy the wants of the rapidly increasing population. Irrigation of desert regions has proved to be very expensive; for example, a waterline from Lake Kinneret in the north to the Negev lands has cost approximately $100 million. To alleviate this situation, the marshlands in the extreme northern section of the country, surrounding Lake Huleh, are being drained and now form a large part of the total increase of 638,000 acres of new arable lands. Agriculture continues to account for a major portion of Israel's gross national product, with one-fifth of the population engaged in agricultural pursuits. A diversity of products has been stressed in order to attain self-sufficiency, with emphasis for exportation placed on citrus production.

Madam Speaker, education is perhaps the greatest achievement of the state, one of which all Israelis are proud. The first Jewish institute of higher learning was begun in 1918 when Dr. Weizmann laid the cornerstone for the Hebrew University on Mount Scopus. Since then students are now able to attend the Weizmann Institute of Science, the Ruppin Institute of Agriculture, the ORT Vocational Center, Afro-Asian Institute for Labor Studies and Cooperation, Hadassah Medical Center, and the Technion. There are approximately 650,000 students attending classes with 100,000 of these relegated to postprimary classes. Graduates of the institutes and vocational centers provide the majority of teachers and experts who venture to other countries as emissaries of their government, in order to help develop other independent states.

Israel is known throughout the world not only because of its strategic position in the Middle East and its development ambassadors, but also because of its cultural efforts. The philharmonic symphony has been considered one of the greatest orchestras in the world, its ranks containing some of the finest musicians. Furthermore, companies of touring song and dance groups have brought before international audiences the beautiful and haunting rhythm and sound of the Jewish homeland. The starkness of the desert and the dynamic growth of the cities are portrayed in the paintings of leading Israel artists, whose works are at present being exhibited throughout the United States.

To Africans and Asians, Israel is recognized also for its foreign aid program. Begun in 1954 when a Burmese delegation visited the country to study Israel progress and methods, the program has expanded into a going concern, affecting strongly the emerging African states as well as the independent nations of four continents. Eighty-three states and territories are recipients of Israel's technical assistance program, with emphasis placed on training and institution building. Students who come to Israel to be trained learn about cooperation in agriculture, industry, commerce, child welfare, home economics, journalism, and many other studies beneficial to the development of a nation. When the courses are completed, the students return to their own country, taking with them methods which have proved so successful in the building of Israel. Sometimes, instructors accompany their students to help them establish their own courses and businesses.

The Israel program is also involved in the organization of joint companies for construction. Office buildings, apartments, hotels, factories, bridges, dams, irrigation works, and shipping are a few of the joint projects undertaken by the technical aid program. Projects are managed and capital is advanced until they are self-sufficient. Then Israeli interest is sold and management is withdrawn when native trainees are able to take over. A few examples will show how successful are these technical aid programs. Ghana signed an agreement in 1957 to establish the Black Star Shipping Line. The concern was launched with a capital of 500,000 pounds, 60 percent forwarded by the Ghanaian Government, 40 percent by Israel's Zim Navigation Co. This project has proved so successful that the Ghanaian Government was able to buy out Israel interest within a few years.

A treaty of friendship and technical cooperation was signed between Israel and Madagascar in 1961. The agreement provided for the cooperation of the two countries in agricultural and industrial development, education and youth training, public health and medical supervision, and vocational and scientific instruction. Furthermore, there were afforded several scholarships to Malagasy students to study in Israel, as well as provisions made for experts and advisers to be called upon according to the wishes of the Malagasy Government.

The influence of this technical assistance program has reached Latin America where a cultural cooperation agreement was promulgated with Argentina and a technical cooperation agreement was signed with Brazil. In cooperation with the Organization of American States, 200 Latin Americans will be trained in Israel in agricultural techniques. Furthermore, cooperative villages are being established in Brazil, Venezuela, Ecuador, and Bolivia, to demonstrate one solution to the rural problems affecting these countries.

As shown by the preceding examples, the influence of such a technical aid program is strongly felt in the participating nations. And because of its widespread adherence and popularity, the program continues to expand. In 1962 some 1,623 trainees studied in Israel on scholarships, 326 Israeli experts traveled to other countries to assist the requesting governments with their development, and 800 Israelis worked on joint economic ventures. This is a remarkable record for a country which, 15 years before, began its own independence amid almost insurmountable conditions.

Madam Speaker, Israel today is a far different place than it was in 1948. With the influx from everywhere—Yemen and Morocco, Russia and Poland, the United States and Canada—the population resembles a United Nations of its own. But they are all united to build together a nation based on individual freedom and the dignity of man. As the proclamation of independence states:

> The State of Israel * * * will be based on the principles of liberty, justice, and peace as conceived by the prophets of Israel; will uphold the full social and political equality of all its citizens, without distinction of religion, race or sex; will guarantee freedom of religion, conscience, education and culture; * * * and will loyally uphold the principles of the United Nations Charter.

We in the United States are proud to have played a part in the history of this state, in having Israel the friend and ally it is today. As this democracy celebrates its 15th independence anniversary, let us honor this nation with remembrance of its declaration of independence and our deep commitment to its continued existence and success.

Mr. CELLER. Madam Speaker, it is sorrowful indeed that Yitzchak Ben-Zvi, President of the State of Israel, did not live to witness the commemoration of the 15th year of Israel's existence as a free and independent and democratic state.

He was a gentle man. His learning, his subtlety, his passion for justice, his reverence for the traditions of his people never marred, as these qualities so often do, the mark of gentleness that was uniquely his. He served his people well, living through all of the crises this little country was heir to, with the certainty that his people would survive the trials and the burdens history had placed upon them.

I recall my visits with President Ben-Zvi and our talks which were always punctuated with illustrative stories, flavored and nurtured by the rich traditions of the past.

His was a life fulfilled, for he lived through the miracle of the rebirth of Israel. He saw this barren land grow green. He saw the hopeless, the maimed, the oppressed, the despairing made welcome in Israel, and molded into a viable culture. He witnessed the flourishing of the sciences and the arts in a land that had lain covered with dust for centuries. He saw cities grow—Tel Aviv, Haifa. He saw, in a land with no water, the growth of trees, the cultivation of the soil through artificial irrigation. He saw his people torn by invasion and war, and saw the wounds heal again. He knew their danger as they knew it, and lived with it. He knew that danger was real, more particularly, now that Israel may be surrounded by the new United Arab Republic, equipped and armed by the Soviet Union.

As we view 15 years now gone by, we are conscious of the sound of Israel, the sound of a nation growing. In 1962, Israel's per capita income was $850. It is the highest of all non-European countries with the exception, perhaps, of Venezuela. This is remarkable when we consider this land of only 8,000 square miles with no water, no power, no coal, no forests, a bit of minerals, a little bit of oil, the burden of defense costs which must be maintained, and the amalgamation of thousands upon thousands of immigrants. This achievement can be most clearly understood when we realize that the per capita income of the United States is only four times as large. Air transport, shipping, and tourism are growing rapidly. There is a dynamic housing program. The introduction of new industry, the building of new ports, the development of new skills bring a virility to Israel that is difficult to emulate.

When one considers what Israel has done in the last 15 years, starting, as it were, from scratch, it is a source of wonderment. Israel was not allowed to grow in peace, but suffered invasion on the very day of the declaration of independence. She has lived under threat of annihilation, and life in Israel is guarded and tense. Yet, withal, Israel has encouraged art, music, literature, and the theater. All of this was done within the framework of a living democracy, oriented toward Western ideals of sacredness of the individual and the preciousness of freedom.

Fifteen years are less than a grain of sand in the eternal march of history. Yet, in the achievements, in the progress, and in the vision of this free state, are the proportions of a mountain.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Madam Speaker, the birth of the State of Israel on May 14, 1948, fulfilled the aspirations of those who sought a national homeland in Palestine for the Jewish people. It was their belief that this promised land would offer a refuge where Judaism could flourish.

In these 15 intervening years since independence, development of the state has surpassed all expectations of the founders. On this, their anniversary, we extend to our friends in Israel highest praises for their achievements, for the State of Israel stands for many things.

For those of us who are Jews, it represents the fulfillment of an ancient, burning vision. For those of us who value democracy, it is an outpost of popular, democratic government in a part of the world otherwise ridden with tyranny and despotism. For those of us who strive for social justice, it stands as a fortress of freedom and a haven for the homeless and oppressed. For those of us who cherish national independence, it shines as a beacon in a turbulent world. For all Americans it serves as an example of what youth, dedication, and courage can achieve against overwhelming obstacles.

As a Jew, and an American, I am proud to salute the people of Israel and to pay tribute to all they have accomplished.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Madam Speaker, in joining with my colleagues in congratulations and in salute to the brave State of Israel, I am expressing the heart-deep sentiment, not only of myself, but of all my constituents in the Second Congressional District of Illinois.

The ties that bind the people of the second district and the people of Israel are very close. Each year many of our people visit Israel, and they return filled with the spirit and the inspiration of this miracle land of the modern world. Through the challenging and eventful years of Israel's history they have stood by with their money and their prayers. Their rejoicing over the triumphs that have attended Israel in all the years of her national sovereignty nowhere has been greater in sincerity and in measure.

In the second district we feel that we have a personal representative in the building of a great nation in the Near East in Dr. Morton Berman, who resigned as the beloved rabbi and spiritual leader of Congregation Isaiah Israel, to return to the land of his fathers and of his youth. Dr. Berman's departure for Israel some years ago was noted in the remarks of many members of the Illinois delegation in the well of this historic Chamber.

Israel indeed is close to the hearts of the men and women, of all religions and of all creeds, in the district I have the honor to represent.

It is in the interest of the United States and of the free world that every assistance should be given Israel in establishing and maintaining her rights as a sovereign nation, including that of free and unhampered access to international waterways. On this there can be no compromise. I am firmly convinced that recognition of this right should be made a condition of the grant of our foreign aid. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs this has been my position in several Congresses. It is still, and shall remain as long as I am in the Congress, my uncompromising position.

Madam Speaker, I would not wish to close my remarks on this happy birthday anniversary without complimenting Israel and her government on the expanding good will for Israel that I found throughout Africa on my last study mission to that continent. From her slender means Israel has contributed far more in proportion than have we to helping less fortunate nations to their feet. This gesture in the friendship of brotherhood, reflecting the desire of the young nation of Israel to give a helping hand to younger nations, was the subject of many applauding comments in the countries I visited.

Mr. MINISH. Madam Speaker, the State of Israel has reached its 15th year. In its path of progress it has shown the world the dedication of the Jewish people, not only to the ideals on which that State was founded, but to insuring its success in spite of pressures of the greatest magnitude both from within and without.

For a few moments, let us review the story of the Jews' search for freedom under their own rule of law.

The Jews of the ancient world had already known persecution for hundreds of years when their great spiritual leader, Moses, led the captive Jews of the Joseph tribe across the Red Sea into the Sinai—to the land of Canaan. Subsequently the ancient Kings of the Jews—Saul, David, and Solomon—brought to the Jews a national unity within a nation of their faith, under the Kingdoms of Israel and Judah. After the Babylonian sack of the Temple of Jerusalem in 586 B.C., the Jews found themselves again under the domination of foreigners, a domination which continued on through the Romans, who conquered the Holy Land in 63 B.C. After repeated sackings of Jewish cities, persecutions and enslavements of Jewish people, culminating in 116 B.C. with a fierce Roman pogrom, the Jews were scattered throughout the Mediterranean world, to be absorbed into local communities. Through continued persecution, wars, and ghetto living, the Jew became an orphan from his cradle land.

In the centuries following the Jews, used for their mercantile abilities, were yet hated for their successes; they were beaten down and all too often isolated into separate communities, segregated, and even expelled from their homes and dwelling places where some had been for generations. In 1290 the Jews were expelled from northern Italy, in 1306 from areas of France, in 1496 from Portugal, in the 1880's under Alexander III there was organized persecution in Russia—and these were but a few of the campaigns against Jews through the years.

Following the Nuremberg laws of 1935 in Hitler's Germany, the mass extermination of the Jewish population in captured Europe began. The shock and horror felt at the enormity of Hitler's crime, as it became known, galvanized the Jewish people's efforts to throw off their resignation to fate that had haunted them for some many hundreds of years. This new force could not be rolled back. Their goal, freedom from persecution in an independent State of Israel, was a goal which had to be won.

The idea of an eventual Jewish homeland was nurtured in the mind of a Viennese journalist, Theodore Herzl. It was he who conceived and gave dynamic force to the 19th century Jewish national revival. The idea of a Jewish national homeland was conceived in idealism, but throughout tough-minded realism guided it through the obstacles to be overcome. Palestine was to be the homeland scene—yet Palestine was ruled by the Turks. Some Jews were living there, however, and work was started amongst them through the creation of Hebrew schools, and community farms, by some of the early pioneers of the movement such as David Ben-Gurion and Yitzchak Ben-Zvi. The coming of war halted these early attempts at the creation of a Jewish national movement in the Palestine area, but at its conclusion, and with allied victory over the Turks who had controlled the area, the movement regained strength and many more dedicated pioneers were drawn to the cause.

Great hope was given to the Jewish nationalists by the British Government in 1917 when by the Balfour Declaration they agreed, at least in principle, to the establishment in Palestine of a Jewish national home. The 20 years following this declaration was a foretaste of the future. Violent Arab objection to Palestinian land being given to the Jews resulted in angry clashes between Arabs and the Jews resident in the Jerusalem area. The British, by way of the Peel Commission Report, saw the only way out to be partition of Palestine into Jewish and Arab sectors, with limited Jewish immigration into their area. This still did not soothe the strong emotional conflict between the two races but the situation did remain fairly quiescent. During the period of the British mandate some 425,000 Jews immigrated into the Palestine area as the World Zionist Congress, in meetings and roundtable discussions throughout Europe, fought for international support for the Jewish homeland against indifference and resignation of Jew and non-Jew as well as mounting Arab hostility.

This quarrel was soon submerged into the greater holocaust of the Second World War. It took the death of 6 million Jews during the war to bring to bear enough force, both on world Jewry and a shocked free world, to bring about fulfillment of the dream of a Jewish homeland.

However, there was still much blood to be shed. Out of ghetto and concentration camp a new and militant Jewish movement—with the heroic resistance of the Warsaw Ghetto fighters as a model—and with a trained army and fierce determination, set as its goal a Jewish Palestine. They fought British, Arab, and all others who would interfere. The British Government, in April 1947, announced that they would give up their mandate over the area and requested the United Nations to adopt the problem. A special session of the United Nations General Assembly was held in April and May of 1947, and the Special Committee on Palestine was created. The committee recommended partition of Palestine between Arab and Jew, with Bethlehem and Jerusalem to be internationalized. The Arabs refused the terms and, with fear that recurring outbreaks of hostilities between Arab and Israeli would lead to war, the General Assembly appointed a mediator for Palestine, Count Folke Bernadotte. He managed to establish a truce between the two forces, but his brutal murder on September 17, 1948, brought even more danger to the explosive situation. Dr. Ralph Bunche took over the United Nations Palestine mission and, in spite of a continued battle, finally established a workable armistice.

In the midst of all the fighting the State of Israel was born, on May 14, 1948. The armistice, which was not finally concluded until July 1949, brought a nervous peace between Israel and her Arab neighbors—Egypt, Lebanon, Jordan, and Syria.

To put the principles of idealism, which were an important creative force for the nation, into effect in a context of the harsh realities of hostile neighbors and hostile soil was the first necessity of the new state.

Israel has become a nation of many nationalities—of Russians, and Yemenis, of Germans and Slovakians—all with vastly varying backgrounds being welded into one. In the army, acting as the greatest catalyst in this phenomenon, all men and women serve, for all are acutely aware of the forces in opposition to Israel, for in spite of the armistice, Arab pressure has never let up.

With a population that has grown from some 900,000 to over 2 million in 15 years the problems of adjustment are staggering. Thus the attack against the problems at hand had to be mounted with vigor from the very beginning. Imagination and hard work have inevitably led to success, especially in economic development. For example, there was a shortage of iron ore, so a pioneering type of structural concrete which requires a minimum of steel was developed. In the process of such development, Israel has become one of the world's largest exporters of concrete. One of the vastest development projects is the $150-million irrigation plan to take the waters of the Jordan River into the Negev Desert to bring that area to life. Water and hard work are all that is needed and both, due to insistent demands by the Government and peoples of Israel, should be made available for the development of the Negev.

Though the Arab world closed the Suez Canal to Israeli shipping, and prevented ships of other nations from sailing to Israeli ports, Israel has become an exporter of foods, household goods, and machines the world over. Judicious use of over $800 million in U.S. foreign aid—which after 1959 was no longer needed—has assisted in the phenomenal development of the Israeli economy since independence. Despite the Arab blockade the Government gold reserves are high and a national airline and steamship service serve an expanding economy. In the beautiful cities of Israel such as Tel Aviv, Haifa, and Jerusalem, and in the rich farming land surrounding the kibbutzim—one can see the results of Israel's gigantic strides forward.

Israel is now extending technical assistance and foreign aid on her own to many underdeveloped countries, especially in Africa. In spite of blockade, Arab intransigence, vestiges of discrimination in too many parts of the world, and often confused and divisive internal influences, Israel progresses and shows a willingness to meet her obligations as a responsible nation to the rest of the world.

Yet the pressures, external and internal, do not let up. We were all saddened at the death of Israel's President Yitzchak Ben-Zvi. His moderating influence will be sorely missed. It is as the 121st Psalm says, "he that keepeth Israel shall neither slumber nor sleep." After 2,000 years of dispersal the people of Israel, and their leaders, are determined to keep Israel free. They do not sleep at their task. I would like, at this time, to salute their efforts.

Mr. MULTER. Madam Speaker, the identification of the Jews with Palestine is centuries old. Since the time of Moses, since the days of David and Solomon, there were Jews in this land. The temple erected by Solomon in the Holy City was held to be the most sacred spot on earth. Even when the Romans forbade the presence of those of the Hebrew faith in Jerusalem in 132 A.D., the city continued to be regarded as his spiritual home by every Jew wherever he had settled in the world.

When the Zionist movement began in the 19th century, it was the belief of its leaders that there was a definite need for a national homeland. Throughout the centuries since the diaspora, persecution was always present where there were Jews. But in the 19th century, there was more fear from being assimilated into European society, to lose faith and customs, than from persecution.

From Russia and Poland, Germany and Hungary, Jews came to Palestine, the promised land. Early in this century, the Jewish National Fund was organized and began to buy land for the newly arrived Jews. With the help of Baron Rothschild, land was purchased, communities settled, and institutions built.

The Balfour Declaration in 1917 threw official British support behind such an idea. Yet it was not until the holocaust of World War II that the world took cognizance of their plight. Sympathy for the Jews and their proposed homeland became worldwide when Nazi tyranny began its preplanned program of annihilation. The Warsaw ghetto was one such example.

With the fall of Warsaw, the German conquerors initiated a systematic extermination of the 450,000 Jews in the city. First came an enforced segregation. Then, because of a limitation of the number of Jews who were permitted to work, starvation and pestilence became rampant. Famine and disease did not prove as effective as they wanted, so the Germans, in the summer of 1942, inaugurated a plan to send 5,000 Jews daily, to death camps at Treblinka and Auschwitz. The number was raised to 7,000, then 10,000. By 1943 only 50,000 were left in the ghetto. Resistance was hopeless, but the survivors decided to die heroically rather than be herded like cattle to extermination. The first battle occurred on April 19, 1943, the beginning of the Passover celebration. This fierce struggle was to last for 3 weeks, with token resistance holding out until September. The outcome was known before the fight had begun. German might demolished block after block until the ghetto was leveled and all the living removed.

Their heroic deaths were not in vain. Because of world news coverage this battle became one of the most celebrated of World War II, one which gave major impetus to the Zionist cause.

Following the war, the U.S. Government steadfastly exerted its influence in favor of the Zionist cause. Although the case was discussed at length and without definite solution in the United Nations, the withdrawal of the British Mandate forces on May 14, 1948, gave the Jews their chance to express their ambitions by proclaiming an independent Israel.

This act automatically enshrined the millions of Jews who had died during the world war, during the riots of past centuries, during the massacres following the destruction of the city of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 by Titus and his Roman soldiers. Once more Israel existed on maps and was not just a name printed on the pages of the Bible.

A struggle ensued between the Arab States—who claimed Palestine as part of the Arab world—and the protectors of the newly proclaimed state. Solidarity among the defenders soon drove back the attacking Arab forces and held the acquired territory until the United Nations could arrange a truce. A tense atmosphere remains at the frontiers, with occasional raids on border outposts, but this so-called peace gave Israelis the chance to build their new state into a bastion of democracy.

There is evidence, everywhere, of this labor of love which the populace has poured into their country. Tel Aviv is now a gleaming metropolis of modern architecture. Eilat, on the Red Sea, is undergoing an ambitious expansion drive. Acco, the ancient Acre of crusader times, is becoming the center of steel and iron production.

Modern Israel has grown away from the kibbutz, the Jewish communal village originally established in Israel. Settlements are being created to house the thousands of immigrants who arrive monthly seeking a new life. As each new town is laid out in proposed industrial areas, wells are dug, apartments and stores constructed, workers settled, and life begins. It is the expectation of the designers that each industrial city will house 50,000 and will become a separate entity unto itself.

The people who come to these cities to live and work do so from all over the world. Living in Israel are representatives from 102 countries. The breakdown among the people, though, is three main groups, the Ashkenazim—those from Europe and the western-oriented countries, the Sephardim—those from Asia and the Arab countries, and the Sabras—those who have lived all their lives in Israel. The population is truly a melting-pot, yet the divergencies and dissimilarities are slowly disappearing.

The army plays a large part in molding the new Israeli citizen. Since military training is compulsory for all young men and most young women, all are unified into one modern fighting organization, nationalistic and Israeli oriented. As they leave the service, the young people take with them their training and teaching. Those living and working near the borders must always be alert and prepared for snipers and invaders.

Young men and women are also taking part in world politics and international development. The Government of Israel began in 1954 a program of technical assistance to underdeveloped countries. Since their country is ringed with a wall of Arab hatred, it was the intention of the Israel leaders to create an atmosphere of friendship between Israel and other states outside the Arab sphere of influence. There are 83 states and territories now receiving this technical assistance, proving how successful this plan is.

Educational facilities in Jerusalem, Haifa and Tel Aviv are proving the most important component of this program. To these institutions come the natives of the underdeveloped nations who wish to learn techniques which have been implemented in Israel to bring progress. In 1962, 1,623 students enrolled on scholarships provided by the Israel Government. The courses undertaken encompassed a wide field including medicine, engineering, agriculture, business administration, and public health. These students, as they complete their courses, will return and apply what they have learned to the building of their own countries.

Not only do these scholars return with ideas on construction and improvement. They carry with them the greatest learning that Israel has to offer, that of democracy. One living in Israel for any length of time must become susceptible to the democratic processes which are a part of the everyday life of the Israel citizen. For this reason Israel is, indeed, the bastion of democracy in the Middle East.

Since its inception, Israel was destined to be a democracy, having a government of the people and for the people, dedicated to the principles of liberty, equality, and justice for all. It has a legislative body, called the Knesset, to which the populace sends 120 delegates of their choice, to represent them in the Government. This supreme authority elects the President who holds office for a term of 5 years. The Cabinet, headed by the Prime Minister, is responsible, too, to the Knesset. For these reasons, elections in Israel are of great interest, with participation by practically the entire adult population.

Since political equality is guaranteed without distinction of religion, race, or sex, political parties have arisen to insure much opposition to the strongest party, the Mapai, of which the leading government personalities are members. Because of the numerous parties, a majority in recent years has been difficult to attain. Yet, although fragmentation may be the result, true democracy has been championed.

The Government in recent years has fostered a "sell Israel" campaign, not only through the technical assistance programs, but also by having people come to see for themselves how democracy works. Tourism in Israel is now becoming big business. Last year alone, 184,000 tourists visited the country and earnings amounted to $33 million.

What, though is the attraction to visit this land? Primarily, people come to see the development of the country, to see, as in the case of the Jews from America, for what their money has been spent. They also come to renew themselves in the land of their faith. Those outside the Jewish faith, come to visit the historic Biblical sites, cited both in the Old and New Testaments. The city of Tiberias on Lake Tiberias—Lake Kinneret—contains ruins of the summer villas and palaces of Roman consuls and Jewish kings. It is the same water known in Jesus' time as the Sea of Galilee.

The desolation of the area of Sodom would appeal to artistic eyes. Acre—Acco—on the coast became legendary during the crusades and again, when the city withstood the siege of Napoleon. The Dead Sea with its burning salts and sand is always a novelty to the adventurous. Was it not the Red Sea whose waters parted for Moses? Is not King Solomon's copper mine again in operation?

Yet, aside from the historical or religious connotations, Israel is expanding its tourist facilities to please those travelers who come to rest, to vacation in the sun. The port of Eilat on the Red Sea will, within 5 years, become a resort town of the first magnitude, offering bathing facilities as well as rugged desert terrain. The present accommodations comprise 8 hotels, including an 11-story skyscraper, and construction is underway on a marina-type system of hotels and motels which will double the present 260-room capacity and entice the tourist to enjoy modern comfort in Eilat.

Another way in which the country becomes more enticing to the world traveler is in the government's relentless pursuit of Israel's ancient past. Each year, archeological expeditions go forth to preselected sites, mounds, caves, or ruins, and unearth for posterity the records of past civilizations. Scholars are using the Old Testament of the Bible to prove the existence and locations of sites under exploration. At the same time, by these finds, the Bible is being proved to be one of the greatest factual histories ever written.

Of current excitement in the archeological field is the Dead Sea scrolls. In the bluffs adjoining both sides of the Jordan River and the Dead Sea, caves have been located which contain artifacts and papyri of historical importance.

On the Jordanian side, early texts of the New Testament came to light in recent years.

On the Israeli embankment, the important letters of Bar Kochba, the leader of the Jewish revolt in A.D. 132, against the Romans, were discovered in excellent condition.

From these documents, historians are able to piece together the events leading up to the rebellion, the location of Bar Kochba's main encampment, conditions during the brief tenure of the rebel, and subsequent suppression by Roman legions. All have been in virtual obscurity since few written records existed before the present find on this major event of Jewish history.

The Government Department for Preservation of Historical Sites has undertaken extensive excavations at Ramat Rahel, which is situated near Jerusalem, and has determined the site was the citadel of one of the last kings of Judah, Jehoiakim, who reigned just before the Babylonian forces destroyed that kingdom. The diggings will now be made ready for tourist use, bringing to the public the living Bible.

On the Mediterranean coast stands the quiet town of Caesarea. As the name implies, the town was once the showplace of Palestine, Herod the Great's chief port. All that remains of the once proud city are ruined buildings of Turkish architecture and piles of rubble. The main part of the ancient city lies under the sea, a victim of neglect and the erosion of breakwaters. Underwater explorations are expected to find the collosi, which guarded the harbor's entrance and perhaps the villa of Pontius Pilate, bringing us once more back to the Bible.

Recent tours by the Israeli Philharmonic Orchestra and folk dance groups have played an important part in bringing Israel international attention. Furthermore, life in the homeland has been preserved in paintings by such leading artists as Rubin and Levanon, whose paintings are part of an exhibition touring the United States at this time.

Although not a citizen of Israel, Leon Uris acted as an Ambassador for the state when he portrayed superbly the early struggles of the young state in his book "Exodus." Modern day life, told in a comical vein, is portrayed in the play "Milk and Honey," now delighting audiences in Washington, D.C., and throughout the United States. All have contributed to bringing Israel international renown.

One day, in the not too distant future, Israel will become the showplace of the Middle East, perhaps the finest example of what a small nation can achieve. The potentials are great—as an industrial state, tourist spot, urban life or archeological paradise. Without much needed water, though, development cannot continue. Therefore, experimentations in water have top priority. The potential for agricultural development is there, if the vast desertlands can be reclaimed. With water, the land could become a huge garden, fertile enough to grow practically any vegetable or fruit. In the near future a $100 million pipeline will be opened, permitting water from the Sea of Galilee in the north to flow into the sand tracts of the Negev in the south. The cost of constructing another is almost prohibitive. Fortunately scientists have discovered a process for cheap desalinization so that sea water, through the use of solar energy, can be used in the irrigation of the desert. When this problem is solved, then Israel will truly become the land of milk and honey.

All this can be destroyed if the dictator of Egypt is allowed to pursue his course without hindrance. The following article from the Congress Biweekly of March 18, 1963, a publication of the American Jewish Congress, is an apt commentary on the attitude of President Nasser toward his Arab neighbors, toward Israel, and toward the Western Allies:

NASSERITE TRIUMPHS

> The rebellious pro-Nasser army officers who took control of Syria in a lightning revolt must add to the misgivings, not only of Israel, but of all people who realize the threat posed to peace by the pattern of unrest in the Middle East, which has seen the revolt in Iraq, a coup d'état in Yemen, and a reported plot against Jordan's King Hussein. The people in this country, who seek comfort from these coups by strong men and charismatic colonels, because these men are trying to rid their nations of domestic Communists, fail both to reflect on recent history and on the nature of these events. The notion that these pro-Nasser countries will now swing their sympathies to the West because they will alienate the Soviet Union is totally unrealistic, as clearly demonstrated by the fact that Nasser has long persecuted the Communists within his realm while receiving the continuous aid and support of the Soviet Union.
>
> The temptation then to draw the conclusion that the Middle East events represent a gain to the West and a setback to the Soviets must be strongly resisted. A straw in the wind about Arab sentiment in this regard is the statement made by Salah Bitar, Syria's new Premier, who is reported to have said that he is more worried about Israel and Western policies in the Arab world than about communism.
>
> What can be said about the Middle East events is that they will undoubtedly endanger stability in other Arab countries, since pro-Nasser forces will exploit their successes in Iraq and Syria to intensify their efforts at subversion. Another palpable result of Nasser's triumph is that Israel will become more hard pressed and its security even more seriously menaced. Egypt's leading newspaper, Al Gumhoria, leaves no doubt about the intentions of the Nasserites. "The Syrian revolution," it proclaims exultantly, "has completed a circle to blockade reactionary bases in Jordan and Saudi Arabia and the imperialist base in Israel."
>
> Whether the United States will have second thoughts about its policy which, until now, has been based on the assumption that any supposed barrier to Communist designs merits its support, is not clear. To be sure, Secretary Rusk has indicated that the United States would frown on any efforts to undermine the security of Jordan and Saudi Arabia. Presumably he meant to include Israel, too. Whether this betokens a more realistic appraisal of the imperialist character of Nasserism cannot, at this juncture, be determined.
>
> The sooner any illusions about Nasser's aspirations are laid, the better will it be for all mankind. Only when Nasser realizes that the independence and security of all Middle East states will be defended by the free world will he be given pause in his reckless ambitions.

A realistic reappraisal of U.S. foreign policy goals would, I believe, leave no doubt in the minds of those who look on Nasser as a bastion against communism, that he is in reality nothing but an opportunist who is endangering the whole stability of the Middle East.

Through the efforts of Premier David Ben-Gurion and the late Presidents Chaim Weizmann and Yitzchak Ben-Zvi, Israel has attained a position of respect in the world community. Their dreams became concrete plans, their plans realities. This nation has achieved in a few years a remarkable record.

As a friend of the free world, we in America are proud of this friendship and wish to congratulate the people of Israel on their 15th anniversary of independence.

Mr. TOLL. Madam Speaker, on April 29 Israel celebrates the 15th anniversary of its independence.

On May 14, 1948, when a group of brave men gathered in Tel Aviv to proclaim the establishment of the State of Israel, the country was already in the midst of war. Irregular Arab bands had crossed the border some months earlier and were attempting to "throw the Jews into the sea." Only a few hours after the Declaration of Independence was read by David Ben-Gurion, the armies of the surrounding Arab states also attacked the new state. At great cost, Israel managed to survive and defeat her enemies. Even more, blockaded and harassed by guerilla warfare, the people of Israel opened their doors and hearts to over one million immigrants. They built industries and irrigated wastelands. In every field of endeavor they bettered themselves despite tremendous obstacles.

But today, 15 years later, Israel still finds itself surrounded by enemies and threatened with war. The people of Israel deserve peace. They have been persecuted for centuries and, arising from the ashes of Hitler's destruction, they have built a homeland. We, in America, have done much to help them. We have given generously both financial and moral support. But money and good will are no longer enough. A war in the Middle East will not only destroy the people of the area, it may well engulf the whole world.

It is the duty of our Government, as the leader of the free world, to raise its voice and exert its influence to bring the leaders of Israel and of the Arab states together at the peace table. It is our duty to guarantee Israel's integrity. I hope that next year's anniversary will see the realization of these goals and that Jerusalem, the city of peace, will indeed be at peace.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Madam Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the citizens of the great State of Israel on the occasion of the 15th anniversary of Israel independence. The magnificent achievements of those 15 years would not have been possible without the fine spirit and dedication to hard work of the Israelis. Their example has been an inspiration to emerging peoples everywhere. In 15 years they have carved a nation out of the desert. Modern cities have sprung up where just a few years ago there was nothing but small groups of shabby huts. Thriving agricultural cooperatives have come into being throughout the nation, a testimony to the selflessness and industry of their members. Israel has taken its place among the community of nations, self-reliant and proud, looking toward the future with confidence, while preserving the traditions of the past.

There is a striking similarity between the development of Israel and the early days of our own great land. In both countries, groups of people who had suffered religious persecution and economic privation in their own lands came into a wilderness to make a new nation in which they could worship as they pleased and govern themselves according to their own lights, securing for themselves and their posterity the benefits of the abundance locked in the land. While the achievements of both countries would not have been possible without the great character of those who founded them, both countries have in common that their accomplishments were given impetus by the contributions of outsiders. There were those outside both countries who wanted to see these noble experiments succeed. None of our present-day problems can make us forget the wonderful contribution of the French and individuals in other lands in those early days when our situation was so precarious. Likewise, no matter to what great heights they may rise, the people of Israel can never forget the contribution of those outside their own country, Jew and non-Jew alike, who supported their attempt to make a new home for themselves and their families, and gave their aid at the time of greatest need.

One of the most important vehicles through which this aid was given was the Israel bond program. In 1951, when the infant nation desperately needed capital for essential projects, Israeli Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion formed the Development Corporation for Israel to sell bonds directly to the people of the United States. This was against the advice of many brokers and bankers, who felt that the shaky condition of Israel's finances and economy mitigated against the feasibility of the sale of public bonds. But the response of the people of the United States was overwhelming, eclipsing even the most optimistic estimates. In that first year alone, more than $50 million worth of Israel bonds were sold in the United States, and from that time to the present, more than $600 million worth have been purchased.

During this period there has been a radical change in the attitude toward Israel bonds. At first, it was assumed that the purchases of these bonds was a gift, and that the principal, much less the interest, would never be repaid. In fact, when I gave a talk at one of these early bond dinners, a man approached me and told me that while he was going to buy a bond, he did not think it was proper for me to emphasize the bonds as an investment since they were not going to be repaid, but rather that it was quite obvious that such sums should be considered only a gift. Well, a few weeks ago I met that same man at another dinner, and asked him whether he thought it was still unfair to talk of the bonds as an investment. He replied:

> No, of course not, since they are going to redeem the first bonds this year.

But, then, he told me, somewhat ruefully, he had thought so little of the bond in terms of its redemption possibilities that he had misplaced it, and when his wife learned that redemption was about to begin, she was furious with him.

This points up better than anything else I know the change in attitude toward these bonds. They are now universally looked on as fine investments, and indeed pension funds, labor unions, banks, and other groups are increasingly looking to Israel as a place to invest their funds. Private venture capital is flowing into Israel. These bonds, sold in 29 countries throughout the world, have provided since 1951 approximately one-quarter of the development budget of Israel, and have enabled groundwork to be laid for new industrial enterprises, harbors to be financed, new roads to be constructed, the expansion of communications and power facilities, the exploration and exploitation of natural resources, the establishment of new irrigation systems and the construction of the oil pipeline from Elath to Haifa. In addition, they have helped in the construction of immigrant housing and new schools.

This year the original 12-year bonds will be redeemed. All future bonds will be redeemed as they come due, and in fact, the financial position of Israel is so strong that annuity bonds as well as capital appreciation bonds are now being sold, all at higher interest rates than originally.

The bond program, so successful in the past, continues to play an integral part in the upward movement of the state of Israel, and on the occasion of the 15th anniversary of this nation, we can look forward to new and greater achievements, made possible by the combination of dedication of the Israelis and the help of their friends throughout the world.

Israel has proved her friendship for our country. All Americans have good reason to record their faith and good wishes for Israel and her people.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Madam Speaker, the year 1963 marks the 15th year of independence for the State of Israel.

During its very few years of existence, this small nation has made such great strides both economically and politically that today it stands as a modern and free country, a strong ally of the United States.

I rejoice with Israel as it reaches another milestone in its history. May the years ahead bring peace, prosperity, and continued freedom to Israel, the bulwark of democracy in the Near East.

Independence day observances in Israel have been saddened by the passing of Yitzchak Ben-Zvi, Israel's second President. Mr. Ben-Zvi, was a leader in the struggle for the establishment of an independent Jewish homeland. I extend my sympathy to the people of Israel upon their great loss. His tough-minded determination to have Israel succeed will not be a message written in water for succeeding generations. Independence will continue to be an act of faith in the midst of irrational hatred. I hope that our Government will reaffirm our intention to defend Israel's independence and in doing so, insure the peaceful, political, and economic development of all the Near Eastern nations.

Mr. DADDARIO. Madam Speaker, today marks the 15th anniversary of the great historical events which reestablished the statehood of Israel. The people of Israel, as well as the Jewish community in the United States, must surely experience an unusual sense of joyful accomplishment as they look back over the years and recall their achievements in reconstructing Israel as an independent and democratic state.

Today we see Israel as an outpost of freedom and democracy among the turbulence of the Middle East. Although surrounded by political as well as by natural enemies, Israel has successfully strived to maintain peaceful atmosphere under which her people can transform the land into a flourishing nation. Israel's soaring economic growth and development gives testimony to her accomplishments in reviving the agricultural and industrial interests of the entire area.

Although still very young among the nations of the world, Israel was quick to assume responsibilities in the community. Under an unusually generous and farsighted policy of foreign aid, Israel has offered economic and technical assistance to some 20 countries of Africa and Asia. When so many newly independent nations face the difficult problems of developing modern political economic and social institutions, Israel stands as not only a worthy example to follow but also as a ready source of aid and encouragement.

We in America have strong ties with Israel and we are proud that she has looked to us in the past for guidance in shaping her destiny. We congratulate her on her glorious achievements and we salute her as a worthy member of the family of nations.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, as Israelis celebrate their 15 years of independence, they can be proud of the progress which they have achieved since the declaration of independence was first proclaimed on May 14, 1948. From a fledgling nation with fed resources and little manufacturing, the people have built their country into the stronghold of democracy which the Western World recognizes as a friend and ally.

From the first, the Israelis were forced to persevere over almost insurmountable odds. The massed attacking Arab forces threatened the very existence of the newly established state. Yet unity and the desire to survive helped the Jews to throw back their enemies and to acquire needed additional territory. Out of war-torn factories were constructed modern oil refineries and phosphate plants. Crops were planted in irrigated desert land to provide for the ever-increasing number of immigrants who came to live in this promised land. Everywhere in Israel there has been some form of development—the harbor and recreational facilities of Eilat, the irrigated lands of the Negev, the shipyards of Haifa, and the schools of Jerusalem and Tel Aviv.

The record of development is stupendous. Credit for this achievement lies with the Jews who founded the state, with those who came to settle and to prosper, and with the leaders of the government, such as David Ben-Gurion and the late Chaim Weizmann and Yitzchak Ben-Zvi, who had the foresight to plan ahead for the future.

On the 15th anniversary the future has been reached, yet even newer goals must be set so that Israel will continue to prosper. On this their important occasion, we in the United States extend our congratulations on the progress of

Israel and offer our continued friendship to the people of this dynamic nation.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, on April 29, the gallant State of Israel marks its 15th anniversary.

I am filled with deep admiration for the tremendous accomplishments of this tiny country, in this incredibly short period of time, against almost insurmountable odds.

The people of Israel have opened their doors to their brethren from the displaced persons camps in Europe, from countries behind the Iron Curtain, from Asia, Africa, and the Arab lands. They have housed and given employment—and a chance to start a new life—to more than 1 million immigrants since 1948. They have conquered the desert and have created cities where not so long ago there was nothing but desolate wilderness. They have built hospitals and schools, increased their agricultural output and industrial production and have doubled their exports.

But even more important, Israel has not forgotten the debt it owes to nations of the free world. Just as the countries of the West came to Israel's aid when the new state needed technical, financial, and moral support, so Israel has come to the assistance of the new nations of Africa and Asia.

Last year, more than 300 Israelis were providing expert knowledge in agriculture, education, health, construction, and economics to governments on four continents. Another 800 Israelis were at work on projects sponsored jointly by Israel interests and the foreign governments. And over 1,600 students from Africa, Asia, and Latin America came to Israel on scholarships. Although small and poor in material resources, Israel now has a technical assistance program in 83 states and territories. And the fact that its program emphasizes training makes it unique. The foreign student who comes to Israel returns to train others. The Israel expert abroad acts as a teacher—sympathetic and knowledgeable—but interested mainly in helping his student to independence. With this kind of program, Israel is bringing the tenets of democracy to the far corners of the world. These people are learning that even new nations, facing all kinds of problems, economic and social, can grow and prosper in a democracy. The success of Israel's experiment in independence is encouraging and so many of these new countries look to Israel as an example and guide for their development. This little country has certainly come of age and it now stands as a fully independent and self-sustaining nation in the world. Israel can be very proud of its 15th anniversary. I salute the people of Israel and wish them continued success.

Mr. Speaker, I wish at this time to express my deep sorrow upon the death of His Excellency Yitzchak Ben-Zvi, President of Israel. My sympathy is extended to the people of Israel; they have lost a distinguished scholar and statesman. The democratic world has lost a great leader and humanitarian.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, Israel is celebrating its 15th anniversary as a state, and I am happy to have the opportunity to join with Israel's many friends in observing this date.

We know that the joy of the people of Israel in reaching this milestone in their history has been diminished by the death of their great leader and dearly beloved President, Yitzchak Ben-Zvi. Their happiness is also marred by the most recent threat against their existence—the treaty of union signed by Egypt, Syria, and Iraq, which, it is reported, includes an article calling for the destruction of Israel. How tragic it is that this brave, new state, which was attacked only a few hours after achieving its independence in 1948, has been forced to exist in a state of war ever since; that her neighbors refuse to grant her the peace for which Israel has begged and for which she has always aimed. Premier David Ben-Gurion, in his 15th independence anniversary message to his people, described for us the true, splendid character of the people of Israel and the deepest wishes of the state when he said:

> Let us all realize that before making demands on others we must first of all make demands on ourselves. Let us steadfastly and confidently continue to hold out our hand in peace.

The Israel people are to be congratulated upon their many splendid achievements in the face of overwhelming odds; truly, they have performed miracles. One miracle is that this small country has managed to survive, to grow, and flourish, despite a program of immigrant absorption that no one could believe possible and that no other country in history has ever undertaken before. Israel has managed to resettle and rehabilitate more than a million immigrants.

The people of Israel have labored with unbelievable energy and devotion. No tasks are too great, no sacrifices too costly in their efforts to reach their goals for their homeland. They have made the desert bloom. Worthless land has been made fertile and it now produces 75 percent of the food required to feed the people. Israel has followed an ambitious plan of economic development; she has created a diversified industrial structure, and the list of new and enlarged Israel industries is an impressive one; chemicals, pharmaceuticals, textiles, building materials, precision instruments, electrical appliances, metalworks, household and sanitary equipment, wearing apparel, and processed foods, and others. In addition to the expansion in industry and agriculture, the Israel Government has sponsored large investments in mining. Giant strides have been made in the field of education; three great universities have been opened. Housing, transportation, building construction, cultural advancement, are other goals which have been reached.

Because the new State of Israel has made such phenomenal progress, she is a shining example to newly created states of Africa and Asia who now seek to emulate her. Israel is responding generously; to the fullest extent possible, it is sharing its experiences with those who request it. Manpower training in Israel is provided; experts, advisers, instructors, and survey teams are sent on request; Israel teams plan and organize training facilities abroad, and trained personnel prepare and implement itinerant courses in developing countries, utilizing the latest training aids. Israel plays a leading role in a number of vast multilateral development plans. Israel trains nurses for medical and public health work and at present manages and directs several hospitals in Ethiopia and Ghana; an eye clinic was established in Liberia by Israel surgeons and physicians. The technical program plus the unselfishness of the Israelis, their dedication to their tasks, and their achievements in their own country have all combined to infuse the new nations with the hope that they can accomplish the same wonderful results.

We must admire Israel for her foreign-aid program; we can be grateful that the emerging underdeveloped nations look to her, for Israel has proved what united, dedicated people of a new nation can accomplish under a democratic form of government. All this is a powerful weapon against the spread of communism in the new nations. The United States must continue to do all in its power to help preserve the security of Israel and to save her from destruction.

We salute the State of Israel, our ally, our bastion of democracy in the Middle East. We hail her valiant citizens who, daily, have unflinchingly faced aggression by their neighbors. We praise them for their myriad achievements and their unselfishness in assisting others although still confronted with serious problems in their own land.

We pray that the gallant country of Israel will be granted the just rewards it has earned; happiness for its people and peace for the nation.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the valiant people of Israel on the 15th anniversary of the establishment of the State of Israel.

The phenomenal growth of this country in population and economic stability against the greatest of odds stands as a monument to the will and sacrifices of her people. With all that this country has had to do, we might think her only task was to build her own resources, but these people have extended the helping hand of friendship to those in need on four continents.

This anniversary is marred only by the passing of a great leader, Ben-Zvi, and the continual striving of other nations to destroy this valiant country. We know that these great people, with the help of all free people, will survive these dark hours and go on to greater achievements.

The United States has been generous in its aid to Israel. Where has our aid done a greater job? We can take justifiable pride in our part in the establishment of Israel, congratulate her on this 15th anniversary, and pledge our continued support to her worthy goals.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Near East Report, a newsletter edited in Washington by Mr. I. L. Kenen, has published a most interesting issue in commemoration of the 15th anniversary of the State of Israel on April 28. I am including an article setting out a view of Israel's position in the world and excerpts from a second article reporting some of the aid Israel has extended to other nations.

The first article follows:

ISRAEL'S 15TH ANNIVERSARY

Many years ago, a contemporary Jewish prophet made a significant prediction about the Jewish state that would some day come into existence.

"It will be unique," he said. "In traditional colonization, the motherland exploits the colony economically, while the colony exploits the motherland culturally and spiritually. With Israel, it will be the reverse."

This was profoundly true. The Israel that was established in May 1948 had a Jewish population of 650,000. More than a million newcomers made their home there and Israel needed substantial assistance to settle them. The motherland, the Jewish diaspora, gladly helped Israel to absorb her immigrants, to build her economy, to insure her survival.

Friendly nations—most of all our own Government—generously provided grants and loans. And, as a result, Israel's economy and defenses have been strengthened. Today, she is a sturdy democracy, on the road to economic independence.

But what has Israel given in return? Has she in fact become the spiritual and cultural center she promised to be? What message does she have for others?

Jews who are old enough to remember when Hitler came to power, just 30 years ago, recall their horror at the brutality of nazism, the callous indifference of it collaborators, the paralysis of its opponents. They sank into a nadir of despair, numbed and shocked at the vast betrayal of conscience.

The struggle which culminated in the establishment of Israel restored the faith of Jews in their capacity to shape their future. It promised Jewish survival. If Israel had done nothing more than that, it would still have made a glowing contribution to the regeneration of the Jewish people.

In the beginning there was Israel's act of humanity. Her doors would always be open to every Jew in need of a home. She took them all—the old and the young, the sick, the strong and the dying, the educated and the illiterate. This act of compassion was also an enactment of judgment, eloquently reminding the world that too many doors had been closed to the Jews when barbarians turned Europe into a vast charnel house.

In that act, Israel counseled a world that had become obsessed with material things and the art of destruction that it must cherish and honor people.

But Israel has come to mean much more. She has a message, not merely for Jews, but for the peoples of many lands. For Israel has come to symbolize respect for the right of the individual man to be free in his own home, to work with others in the common effort toward a better life and to be safe from the oppression of masters and the hostility of neighbors.

Israel was not overwhelmed by the squalor and desolation of the Near East slums and deserts. She forged ahead to higher standards of living. Her example challenged her neighbors to raise their sights and to become restless and unwilling to dwell in the stagnation of the past. And, most significantly, she has literally become a light around the world.

Overleaping the frontier of ignorance and hostility, she has sent her teachers and scholars to the far corners of four continents. She is teaching that every human being is entitled to live a full life, not a vicarious one, to develop his own personality, as he wills it and not as it is molded for him, and that he may work in cooperation with his neighbors, not in regimented battalions. Israel has become—in terms that can be grasped and understood—the promise and the proof that the free society works, that it truly offers the fullest opportunity.

The little nation remains independent, even though she is surrounded by enemies who threaten to destroy her. More than that, Israel tells us, people can advance and can overcome combinations of hostile circumstance by the cooperation of self-respecting free men.

Today, Israel is engaged in social action on an international scale, conducted by a people who have always preached that salvation is won by a life of good works in the present.

Mr. Speaker, although faced with demanding problems of development within its own borders, Israel has given aid to other countries as described in the following article:

In Asia: The Israel aid program started in Burma as far back as 1954. There are now 12 Asian countries where Israelis have been helpful—in irrigation, power, health, in the development of cotton and sugarbeet crops, in the establishment of frontier villages.

Some of these nations are threatened by the influence and power of Communist China, as is Africa.

In Africa: With many African countries on the verge of independence Israel was able to establish links with their future leaders, whom Israel's Histadruth representatives knew as fellow trade unionists.

These relations began on the west coast, but the end of the Aqaba blockade and the opening of Eilat facilitated new relations with countries on the east coast.

Every week a ship carries cargo back and forth between Israel's southern port of Eilat and the African ports of Massawa, Assab, Djibouti, Mombasa, and Dar es Salaam.

Once a month it carries passengers—most of them experts and businessmen. On return journeys it brings students. Some 60 percent of the 1,600 foreign students come from Africa, and most of these are from the more accessible and less expensive east coast. Tanganyika alone has sent more than 250 students to Israel.

Israeli scholarships are available in some African protectorates which are still part of the British empire. And in some countries, British officials who resisted the Zionists in Palestine in the 1940's now give their blessing as promising students depart for Israel to prepare themselves for independence.

Africans welcome the Israel offers of scholarships because authorities can be sure the students will wind up in Tel Aviv, Haifa, and Jerusalem and not in Moscow, Peking, or Sofia, as might happen if the scholarships were channeled through some third party neutral.

In Latin America: In the last 2 years, the program has spread to our hemisphere.

Some Latin American leaders know that they face communism if they do not push reform.

In Palm Springs, Calif., last month, Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, described Israel as an ally in the struggle for democracy in Latin America.

Israel recently entered into an agreement with the OAS to provide scholarships. Some 200 trainees will take courses in cooperation, agricultural planning, arid zone development, and youth leadership. Others will study trade unionism. These courses will all be in Spanish.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, it is again my honor to rise to note another anniversary of the founding of the State of Israel—its 15th.

This year much of the joy of the celebration is marred by the untimely passing of Israel's President, Yitzchak Ben-Zvi. He was an outstanding statesman, scholar, and author who was beloved by the people of Israel and all those who knew him. President Ben-Zvi served for 11 years, during which time Israel made great progress in its development. His death is a great loss to the people of Israel and the world.

Last year, in noting Israel's 14th anniversary, I concluded my remarks with the following:

> It is my hope that when the State of Israel reaches its 15th anniversary, peace will reign in the Middle East so that all of the peoples of that area of the world can start on the all-important job of developing the Middle East and improving the standards of living of the residents.

In view of recent developments in the Middle East, it is unfortunately obvious that my hopes have not been realized. Instead of making efforts to restore peace, Egypt has, with the aid of West German scientists, embarked upon a missile and aircraft development program. Combined with the new Federation of Arab States into the United Arab Republic and President Nasser's continuous threats, Israel once again finds her security in serious jeopardy.

Faced with this new buildup Israel must take steps to protect herself. Egypt's action will undoubtedly start a new armaments race in the Middle East. We must, at all costs, prevent such occurrence as it is not only a threat to Israel, the Middle East, and Africa, but to the entire free world.

It is consistent with the foreign policy of the United States to take steps to prevent any military action against the State of Israel. The United States has negotiating points with which to work. They range from the discontinuance of economic assistance to the members of the United Arab Federation to action in the United Nations; that further assistance to these nations depends upon their endeavors toward the achievement of a just peace through negotiations of all controversial issues.

It is my earnest hope that the problems of the Middle East can be peacefully settled. I have said, and have introduced resolutions, and I believe that the way to achieve peace in the Middle East is to have all parties involved participate at a peace conference. It must be the duty of the nations of the Western alliance to insure the independence of Israel and other sovereign states in this area. The United States must again take the lead before it is too late.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, none of us needs reminding that this is the 15th anniversary of the independence of Israel. The occasion is being commemorated, not only in synagogues and Jewish homes across the country, but also by all of us who cherish the values of freedom, democracy, and self-determination.

Today it seems hard to believe that only a few short years ago it was possible to despair of the Jewish people. Millions had been murdered by the Nazis; hundreds of thousands of others had been driven from their homes. But those who despaired in the dark years of the war forgot one thing: that the Jewish people had a vision—a vision of one day returning to their ancient homeland. The Jewish people sustained that vision, and the vision sustained them. And in the following years, like a phoenix from the ashes, the State of Israel arose—proud, strong, and free.

Today it ought to be possible simply to praise and rejoice at all that the people of Israel have accomplished. It ought to be possible simply to rest assured that the independence of Israel is inviolable. But of course, just as 15 years ago, Israel is in danger. Foreign rocket experts in Egypt are adding daily to that country's armed strength. The union of Syria and Iraq with Egypt will almost certainly lead to a revival of Arab militancy directed against Israel. Recent disturbances in Jordan pose a threat which cannot be ignored.

And, just as they did 15 years ago, the people of Israel look to us in the United States for assistance in restraining the Arab States, for support in the United Nations, for diplomatic moves to reduce tension throughout the Middle East. We in this country can no more think of denying support to Israel today than we could in her hour of greatest peril. I am sure all Members of Congress will agree with me when I say this—that the people of Israel may be confident that the United States is not going to abandon them now or in the future. I take this opportunity to reiterate America's friendship for the people of Israel and to pay tribute to their enormous devotion, industry, and heroism.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to pay tribute in honor of the 15th anniversary of the State of Israel.

Since its establishment, the State of Israel has made considerable development and is now the most progressive and stabilized country in the Middle East. Its population has been more than doubled by the influx of persecuted refugees from all over the world, particularly from Arab and Moslem countries.

To me, Israel is a foothold of democracy in the Middle East. A strong Israel is important to the security and welfare of the United States. Of all the countries in the Middle East, the State of Israel stands out clearly as the most dependable exponent of democracy. I sincerely believe that our American policy should always be one of close friendship with the State of Israel, which the United States helped to create.

Notwithstanding all the wonderful achievements brought about by the people of Israel, the enemies of Israel continue plotting the destruction of the only truly democratic state in the Middle East. In its struggle, Israel needs the sympathetic and wholehearted support of all right thinking Americans. We must not permit Egypt and the members of the Arab League, which hates Israel, to block the progress of the young, democratic State of Israel. When we help the State of Israel, we are not only helping the people of Israel, but we are making an everlasting friend and ally for the United States.

There must be peace between Israel and the Arab States in the Middle East.

I wish for the State of Israel and its gallant people, a continued future of peace, prosperity, security, and liberty.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join my distinguished colleagues in commemorating the 15th anniversary of the State of Israel.

The creation of the State of Israel in 1948, following the termination of the British mandate of Palestine, fulfilled the hopes and dreams of millions of persons of Jewish faith and ancestry all over the world.

Many of them were survivors of the most calculated attempt at genocide in the history of mankind. They dreamed of a state which would stand as a haven of democracy, freedom, and peace for themselves and their children. They dreamed of a modern day "land flowing with milk and honey."

But these people were more than mere dreamers. They were practical men and women of action. They gave unstintingly of their labors in order to make the deserts bloom and the cities prosper. We all are aware of how well they have succeeded.

In the 15 years which have elapsed, the State of Israel has given its citizens individual liberties and material prosperity. Unfortunately, its efforts to bring peace to its people have been unsuccessful. The Middle East, traditionally a region beset by strife and turmoil, has continued to be in ferment. Ancient enmities have survived to imperil the tranquillity of the area.

Even today events are taking place which once again cause us to look to that part of the world with apprehension and concern. As we extend our best wishes to the State of Israel upon this important milestone in its history, it is our earnest hope that the nation and its neighbors may soon find solutions to their conflicts and embark upon an era of mutual cooperation which must, of necessity, benefit all.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RYAN of New York. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ISRAEL'S 15TH ANNIVERSARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Madam Speaker, I am proud to join in saluting the State of Israel on the occasion of her 15th Independence Day.

We are all familiar with the phenomenal record of achievement which this small but courageous nation has made since its founding in 1948.

Fifteen years in the life of a less worthy and spirited nation would not have meant what it has in the case of Israel. It would not have meant, as it has in Israel, that the poverty of the desert has been overcome, that the diseases of the desert have been eradicated, that the hostile desert has been forced to support thriving industries and flourishing farms.

It is typical of the short national life of the people of Israel that miracles in economic and social development have become commonplace.

What is most worthy of our consideration in the Independence Day is Israel's dedication to the ideals of human will, human dignity, and human brotherhood.

We have just commemorated the 20th anniversary of the Warsaw Ghetto revolt. In doing so, we have called to mind the brilliant courage which men can muster in the face of tyranny, the hideous cruelty which men can perpetrate in the grip of insanity. We have seen, all too frequently in our own lifetime, examples of oppression and degradation similar to the Nazi extermination of Polish Jewry.

The hopeless rebels of Warsaw were fighting for a death with honor. Their spirit is continued in the people of Israel, who are fighting for a life of honor and who are seeking that kind of life not only for themselves, but for the people of new nations throughout the world.

This is why Israel, who needs all the human resources she can find for her own development, is lending these resources of know-how and understanding in a technical aid program that reaches 83 nations in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

On May 14, 1948, leaders of the Palestine Jewish community gathered in a small museum in Tel Aviv to declare the establishment of the State of Israel. A few hours later, the surrounding Arab countries attacked, in a war which the Secretary General of the Arab League termed "A war of extermination and momentous massacre." The Palestinian Jews know that their brethren, the survivors of the European holocaust, had been the victims of just such extermination and momentous massacre. And so, despite their own desperate situation, they opened their doors to the refugees. In the midst of her war for independence, Israel welcomed over 100,000 persons.

And this was only the beginning.

Between 1949 and 1952, nearly 600,000 more immigrants entered Israel, from Europe, from Arab and North African lands, from behind the Iron Curtain. During the next 6 years, another 200,000 came.

During the first 15 years of Israel's existence, more than 1 million human beings, from 100 different countries throughout the world, have found a life with honor within her narrow borders.

Such numbers simply cannot convey what it means, in human terms, for Israel to effect the ingathering of the exiles.

Imagine, if you will, the tremendous effort required to absorb one family of immigrants into the life of the new country.

Landing at Haifa Harbor, this family is prepared to begin its new life with nothing more than the possessions it can carry and the clothes it can wear. The Government must prepare, even before the boat docks, to house this family and employ its father.

The Government must transport the family to a settlement, which has only recently been established, and provide medical and educational facilities. It must offer social services, vocational training and guidance. Very often, it must teach the immigrants the resurrected language of the new land.

The financial cost of such an undertaking is tremendous. The strain of it is felt in every Israeli pocket.

Revenue which would normally be used to raise the standard of living must be diverted into rehabilitation and settlement of the newcomers. Improved housing for the original immigrants must be sacrificed to provide temporary housing for the new immigrants. In the same way, schools, hospitals, and even food and jobs are provided for the new settlers on a priority basis.

The people of Israel give without end so that others may have the opportunity to live as freemen, secure in their own homeland.

This dedication to the welfare of people has not been restricted by Israel to its nationals. Israel's technical aid program in underdeveloped lands has certain qualities which make it unique. Israel cannot offer financial aid. But she can offer training in agricultural and industrial development, cooperative organizations, health, education, and social service, because she has struggled herself with the problems of development, she is still struggling and she knows how to win.

Because she was herself a colony at one time, Israel's aid is free from the taint of colonialism which often soils the generous hand of Western nations.

Because Israel's motives begin with human kindness and end with human dignity, her aid is not weakened by fear of an enslaving ideology, which accompanies the aid of some Eastern nations.

Israel's aid program is personalized.

Last year alone, 1,623 students came to Israel for training; 326 Israel experts went abroad to train experts and teachers; and 800 Israelis were at work on joint economic projects. The students who come to Israel return home, equipped not only to practice their new skills, but to pass them on to others. Every Israeli expert who visits a developing nation leaves behind him native experts, who can carry on and expand his work.

Most important, Israel's aid program is self-liquidating. For instance, Israel and another government will agree to establish a jointly owned and managed corporation. As soon as local employers and employees have acquired the know-how necessary to run the corporation by themselves, Israeli interests sell out to native holdings.

Thus, Israel helps to bring new nations toward the economic takeoff. And once they have reached that point, she expects no reward other than friendship. This is what she has received, and deservedly so.

Israel would be the first to admit that the advances of the past 15 years could not have been accomplished without the help of the United States. From the moment that President Truman announced recognition to the infant state, we have committed ourselves to the growth of Israel. Both our Government and thousands of our citizens have contributed generously to her economic stability and to the absorption of immigrants. Our assistance has paid off. And it must be continued.

Immigration to Israel has not ended. And the cost of her defense is increasing.

The Arab States are receiving the most modern weapons from the Soviet Union, plus economic assistance from the West. In order to maintain peace and stability in the Middle East, there must be a balance of military power. If we are not prepared to supply Israel with arms, we must at least continue our economic aid. Any diminution of this aid would adversely affect not only the power balance but would also affect the gains which Israel has made internally.

I said earlier that we have consistently supported Israel's integrity and right to survive. This right is now being challenged by the increasing strength of Egypt's President Nasser. While Israel has a world of friends, she lives in a neighborhood of enemies.

Unless our Government makes it clear to the Arabs, in no uncertain terms, that we will not countenance any attack on Israel, we may see the outbreak of a war which could engulf the entire world.

A statement of policy guaranteeing the security of Israel, coupled with earnest action of the part of the administration to bring Arabs and Israelis together at the peace table, is the only way that we can make our position unmistakably clear. And clarity from us may mean prevention of war.

Madam Speaker, on this 15th anniversary of its independence, Israel has still not secured peace. May the coming year see the dream of peace realized not only for the good of Israel, but for the good of all mankind.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Bromwell (at the request of Mr. Schwengel), for April 29, 1963, on account of illness in the family.

Mr. Aspinall (at the request of Mr. Rogers of Colorado), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

Mr. Rodino (at the request of Mr. Minish), for the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. Becker (at the request of Mr. Halleck), for April 29, on account of official committee business.

Mr. Forrester (at the request of Mr. Weltner), for the remainder of the week, on account of illness.

Mr. Healey (at the request of Mr. Pike), for Monday, April 29, 1963, on account of illness.

Mr. Beermann (at the request of Mr. Cooley), until the morning of May 9, to attend the 22d Plenary Meeting of the International Cotton Advisory Committee at Bangalore, India.

Mr. Hagan of Georgia (at the request of Mr. Cooley), until the morning of May 9, to attend the 22d Plenary Meeting of the International Cotton Advisory Committee at Bangalore, India.

Mr. Duncan (at the request of Mr. Rogers of Colorado), for Monday, April 29, 1963, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Patman, for 15 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Zablocki, for 1 hour, tomorrow, April 30, 1963.

Mr. Ryan of New York, for 15 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks; and for 45 minutes on Thursday and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. Halpern, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. Schadeberg (at the request of Mr. King of New York), for 1 hour, Tuesday, April 30.

Mr. Moore (at the request of Mr. King of New York), for 1 hour, Tuesday, May 7.

Mr. Halpern (at the request of Mr. King of New York), for 30 minutes, Tuesday, April 30.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mrs. Griffiths.

Mr. Hosmer and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Mills and to include certain tables and extraneous material while in the Committee of the Whole on H.R. 4655.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. King of New York) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Fino.

Mr. Alger in three instances.

Mr. Burton.

Mr. Derounian.

Mr. Morse in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Albert) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Wickersham.

Mrs. Hansen.

Mr. Toll.

Mr. Blatnik.

Mr. St. Onge.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 495. An act for the relief of Evanthia Christou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 732. An act for the relief of Antonio Zorich, Rosetta Amabile Zorich, and Fiorella Zorich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 787. An act for the relief of Zofia Miecielica; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1196. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maria Nowakowski Chandler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2833. An act to amend subdivision d of section 60 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 96d) so as to give the court authority on its own motion to reexamine attorney fees paid or to be paid in a bankruptcy proceeding;

H.R. 2849. An act to amend section 47 of the Bankruptcy Act; and

H.R. 4549. An act to amend section 4103 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the appointment of the Chief Medical Director of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 30, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

746. A letter from the General Counsel of the Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled, "A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to suspend in time of war or national emergency hereafter declared the reports required under chapter 145 on the progress of cataloging and standardization"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

747. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting a report on the service rendered by the Small Business Administration during the calendar year 1962, pursuant to the provisions of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

748. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on examination of rentals charged for equipment owned and operated by Morrison-Knudsen Co., Inc., Boise, Idaho, a subcontractor under Department of the Air Force prime contract AF 33(600)–29717 with Western Electric Co., Inc., New York, N.Y., in construction of the White Alice communication system in Alaska, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67), and the authority of the Comptroller General to examine contractors' records, as set forth in 10 U.S.C. 2313(b); to the Committtee on Government Operations.

749. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of eligibility requirements, rents, and occupancy of selected low-rent housing projects, Public Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency; pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Housing Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 1435); to the Committee on Government Operations.

750. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office, U.S. Courts, transmitting the Annual report of the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, 1962, pursuant to section 604(a) (4), title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

751. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 2 of the act of February 11, 1903 (32 Stat. 823, as amended, 15 U.S.C. 29, 49 U.S.C. 45), commonly known as the Expediting Act"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

752. A letter from the president, Congressional Medal of Honor Society, U.S.A., Washington, D.C., transmitting the auditor's report and the annual report for calendar year 1962 of the society, pursuant to Public Law 642, 85th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 3200. A bill to redesignate the Big Hole Battlefield National Monument, to revise the boundaries thereof, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 248). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 3887. A bill to authorize the acceptance of donations of land in the State of North Carolina for the construction of an entrance road at Great Smoky Mountains National Park, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 249). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 4893. A bill relating to age limits in connection with appointments to the U.S. Park Police; without amendment (Rept. 250). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BARING: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 4151. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in the State of Nevada to the county of Lincoln, State of Nevada; with amendment (Rept. No. 251). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BARING: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 4588. A bill to provide for the withdrawal and reservation for the Department of the Navy of certain public lands of the United States at Mojave B Aerial Gunnery Range, San Bernardino County, Calif., for defense purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 252). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MONAGAN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Report pursuant to House Resolution 60, 87th Congress on Captive European Nations (Rept. No. 253). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 254. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BARING: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 2293. A bill to validate the homestead entries of Leo F. Reeves; with amendment (Rept. No. 247). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1206. A bill for the relief of Kazimierz Krupinski; without amendment (Rept. No. 255). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. POFF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1237. A bill for the relief of Clara G. Maggiora; without amendment (Rept. No. 256). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1275. A bill for the relief of Miss Ann Super; with amendment (Rept. No. 257). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1332. A bill for the relief of Mario Rodrigues Fonseca; wtih amendment (Rept. No. 258). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. POFF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1366. A bill for the relief of Vagharshag O. Danielian; with amendment (Rept. No. 259). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1393. A bill for the relief of Janet Lundie Farmer; without amendment (Rept. No. 260). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. POFF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1518. A bill for the relief of Maxine Angela Lazarus Provost and Barbara Theresa Lazarus; with amendment (Rept. No. 261). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1734. A bill for the relief of Luba Siedlecki Simon; with amendment (Rept. No. 262). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1736. A bill for the relief of Assunta DiLella Codella; with amendment (Rept. No. 263). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3629. A bill for the relief of Pong Yong Jin (also known as Pang Yong Chin); with amendment (Rept. No. 264). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 74. An act for the relief of Dr. Olga Marie Ferrer; without amendment (Rept. No. 265). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1560. A bill for the relief of Constantinos A. Grigoras (Gregoras); with amendment (Rept. No. 266). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3218. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kazuko (Joseph James) Kapp; without amendment (Rept. No. 267). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H.R. 5904. A bill to authorize the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture to furnish and receive emergency assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 5905. A bill to amend section 1871 of title 28, United States Code, to increase the per diem and subsistence, and limit mileage allowances of grand and petit jurors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5906. A bill to extend to 30 days the time for filing petition for removal of civil actions from State to Federal courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 5907. A bill to amend section 1825 of title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the payment of witness' fees in habeas corpus cases and in proceedings to vacate sentence under section 2255 of title 28, for persons who are authorized to proceed in forma pauperis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVINS:

H.R. 5908. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to permit for 1 year, the granting of national service life insurance to certain veterans heretofore eligible for such insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 5909. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition and other expenses paid by him for his education or the education of his spouse or any of his dependents at a college or university; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 5910. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the costs of education or training shall be deductible as trade or business expenses when incurred in order to obtain a new or better job, as well as when incurred in order to maintain existing skills, status, salary, or employment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 5911. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to provide financial assistance to municipalities and others for the separation of combined sewers, to authorize the issuance of regulations to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate or navigable waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon (by request):

H.R. 5912. A bill to extend for 3 years the provisions of the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 5913. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exempt from tax musical instruments sold to students for school use; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 5914. A bill to clarify the relationship of interests of the United States and of the States in the use of the waters of certain streams; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.R. 5915. A bill to equalize the pay of retired members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 5916. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 5917. A bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase the authorization for appropriations and to modify the personnel security procedures for contractor employees; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 5918. A bill to amend the Area Redevelopment Act to clarify the areas which may be designated as redevelopment areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 5919. A bill to amend the Area Redevelopment Act to clarify the areas which may be designated as redevelopment areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 5920. A bill to amend the Area Redevelopment Act to clarify the areas which may be designated as redevelopment areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 5921. A bill to amend the Area Redevelopment Act to clarify the areas which may be designated as redevelopment areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 5922. A bill to amend the Area Redevelopment Act to clarify the areas which may be designated as redevelopment areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 5923. A bill to amend section 234 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to procure liability insurance for personnel of the Department of Medicine and Surgery covering claims against them alleging malpractice; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

H.R. 5924. A bill to amend section 612 of title 38, United States Code, to liberalize the completion of bed occupancy care program of the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.R. 5925. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exempt from tax musical instruments sold to students for school use; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 5926. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to provide for research to determine criteria and means for abating objectionable aircraft noise; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 5927. A bill relating to rates of postage on publications designed specifically for religious instruction classes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 5928. A bill to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to admissions to a moving picture theater; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 5929. A bill to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for the payment of travel cost for applicants invited by a department to visit it for purposes connected with employment; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.R. 5930. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to extend for 2 additional years the provisions permitting the lease and transfer of tobacco acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 5931. A bill to amend the act of March 4, 1907, to provide that the 16-hour limitation upon continuous duty for certain railroad employees shall apply to employees installing, repairing, and maintaining signal systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5932. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 so as to authorize certain teachers employed by the Board of Education of the District of Columbia to participate in a health benefits plan established pursuant to such act and to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 so as to extend insurance coverage to such teachers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 5933. A bill to promote the conservation of the Nation's wildlife resources on the Pacific flyway in the Tule Lake, Lower Klamath, Upper Klamath, and Clear Lake National Wildlife Refuges in Oregon and California and to aid in the administration of the Klamath reclamation project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H.R. 5934. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, to promote quality and price stabilization, to define and restrain certain unfair methods of distribution and to confirm, define, and equalize the rights of producers and resellers in the distribution of goods identified by distinguishing brands, names, or trademarks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 5935. A bill to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Payment Act of August 30, 1962 (Public Law 87–616) to prohibit the payment of fees to certain persons for representing claimants under that act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 5936. A bill to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, to prohibit political contributions and lobbying by agents of foreign principals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 5937. A bill to amend the Area Redevelopment Act to clarify the areas which may be designated as redevelopment areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HALEY:

H.J. Res. 391. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America providing for a 4-year term for Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PURCELL:

H.J. Res. 392. Joint resolution to provide stricter controls over expenditures by Members of Congress traveling outside of the United States, to require employees of Members to serve at specific places, to provide for the reporting of annual financial statements by the Members of Congress, to establish a uniform code of ethics for Members of Congress and employees of the Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. Con. Res. 144. Concurrent resolution expressing the determination of the United States with respect to the matter of general disarmament and arms control; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H. Con. Res. 145. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the adoption in the United States of the metric system of weights and measures; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. McINTIRE: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine recommending that Congress give prompt and favorable consideration to S. 702, introduced by Senators Magnuson, Bartlett, and Kennedy and H.R. 3965, introduced by Congressman McIntire, bills which would make domestically produced fishery products eligible for procurement and distribution under the food-for-peace program to assist that program and the development of the domestic fishery resources; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, concerning taxation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to qualifications of electors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Guam, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to respectfully petitioning the Congress of the United States to institute an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit citizens of the United States who reside in American territories and possessions to vote in national elections for President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting consideration of legislation to provide for the stockpiling of foodstuffs in Hawaii; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass a Youth Employment Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to provide medical and hospital benefits to aged persons through a social security insurance program and to provide similar benefits to retired Federal employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States urging the Congress of the United States to appropriate adequate Federal funds for the erection of a Federal laboratory equipped with facilities and personnel to conduct chemical, physiological, anatomical, and mechanical studies on the nature and remedy of the stated problems; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, memorializing the Congress of the United States to give prompt and favorable consideration to S. 702 and H.R. 3965 authorizing the procurement and distribution of domestically produced fishery products under the food-for-peace program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EDWARDS:

H.R. 5938. A bill for the relief of Salvador Ochoa-Gomez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 5939. A bill for the relief of Martha Gonzalez Ramirez and daughter, Nebia Gonzalez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARVEY of Michigan:

H.R. 5940. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bonifacia Cruz Wojcik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 5941. A bill for the relief of Julian A. Erskine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 5942. A bill for the relief of Jacob M. Poss; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H.R. 5943. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis Livitsanos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H.R. 5944. A bill for the relief of Eva Cuaycong deCastro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

97. By the SPEAKER: Petition of International Chamber of Commerce of Albay, Legazpi City, Philippines, petitioning that a resolution be passed objecting to the proposed amendment to the War Damage Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

98. Also, petition of the Citizens' Study Club of Oahu, Honolulu, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting the Congress of the United States to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act as provided for in S. 747; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

99. Also, petition of the city of Rocky River, Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing the sentiments of council of the city of Rocky River, Ohio, pertaining to Communist goods being sold in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Americans Dying in War That Is Not a War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following news item from this morning's Wall Street Journal notes the 80th American boy to die in the fighting in South Vietnam. Why are American boys dying in a war the President refuses to call a war yet commits our forces to it? What does the Nation tell the parents and loved ones of these boys who are dying on a lonely battlefield in a faraway and strange land? What are we, the Congress, going to tell the American people as we stand by and allow American boys to be engaged in a war not declared by Congress? We have taken a solemn oath to uphold and defend the Constitution and the Constitution gives only Congress the power to declare war. By what right does President Kennedy commit armed forces to a continuing war without the sanction of Congress in accordance with the Constitution?

Mr. Speaker, is it not time for Congress to exert its constitutional responsibility and notify the President that we expect him to live up to the supreme law of the land? In keeping with the oath we took as Members of Congress, we must return to Congress the powers delegated to us in the Constitution. Perhaps, then, we can bring about a policy which will make some sense in our dealings with foreign nations and the Communist threat. At least, American boys will not be sent to die in an undeclared war.

The news item follows:

Red guerrillas in South Vietnam killed a U.S. Army master sergeant and 40 South Vietnamese troops in a battle 320 miles north of Saigon, Vietnam military sources said. About 60 other Government troops were missing. The U.S. sergeant was the 80th U.S. military adviser to die in South Vietnam since the United States began aiding South Vietnam militarily 2 years ago.

Israel's 15th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, this weekend marked the 15th anniversary of the reemergence of the State of Israel and viewing the past, Israel has much in which she can take pride.

Skeptics said that Israel, surrounded by a sea of hostile forces, with arid land, depleted resources, and a divergent and impoverished people, could not survive. They were wrong.

Today the agriculturally cultivated land has more than doubled its acreage of 1948. Irrigation has steadily increased; and she has developed a well-working industrial plant.

Diplomatically, Israel began from scratch. Today it is a nation with high standards, with highly trained statesmen, and with established government agencies that match those of the most experienced in the world.

On her 15th anniversary, the great homecoming continues; more than a million Jews have reached her shores since 1948. Over the past years, Israel has performed the monumental task of receiving, rehabilitating, and resettling these tens of thousands.

There has been scientific and cultural advancement, and a system of higher learning has been established which is on a par with the finest systems throughout the world.

Israel's record for creativity is a good one, and in the process of sharing with the Israelis joy of seeing the small state prosper, we in the United States express the strong hope that the relations between our two countries will continue in close harmony with mutual devotion to the principles of freedom.

Israel has had more than her share of handicaps and heartaches in her first years of independence. Not one, but a hundred challenges have been met and mastered.

This weekend we commemorated these achievements. Israel's success is the highest testimony of all to the dedication and energy of her people. More than anything else, it is proof that the will to live and create can survive all the handicaps of history and can triumph through tears.

A National Lottery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, when Congress forced prohibition on the American people, the only ones who reveled in it were the bootleggers and gangsters because it had provided them with a new source of revenue.

However, we learned the hard way that prohibition did not stop people from drinking. It merely forced legitimate human desires to go underground. After spending millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money in trying to enforce an unenforceable law, we found ourselves caught in a net of terrorism, gangsterism, and corruption.

It was only the sensible repeal of prohibition, Mr. Speaker, and the subsequent governmental regulation, control and supervision of the alcoholic industry that finally put an end to that bloody bootleg era and started to pump billions of dollars into our economy and into our own treasury.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of this House some very interesting figures. Since 1935, the Federal Government has collected over $93 billion in revenue from this industry. Last year alone, the Treasury took in over $5½ billion. The revenue to the individual States and local governments, since repeal, came to over $33 billion. In addition, this industry has made a tremendous contribution to our national economy. Recent figures show that it employs over 1⅓ million workers with earnings of over $5 billion a year.

The point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is that it was only after we took the liquor trade out of the hands of the underworld that we were able to restore normalcy in the drinking habits of our citizens, enrich our Government treasuries and contribute to our national economy.

Today, Mr. Speaker, because of our sanctimonious attitude about gambling, we have permitted and allowed this activity to grow into a $50 billion a year business and become the chief source of revenue for organized crime.

It should be crystal clear by now that our antigambling laws have not stopped—and never will stop—that normal human urge to gamble. Like prohibition, these laws against human nature have driven that desire underground. It should be further obvious to us that no matter how much we try to tighten and strengthen our laws against the professional gamblers, we will never quench the American thirst to gamble.

Mr. Speaker, just as repeal of prohibition brought an end to the bootleg era and new revenues into our treasuries so would the end of hypocrisy in our treatment of gambling strike a lethal blow at organized gambling and pump a good portion of these moneys into the coffers of our Federal Government.

Only a national lottery could tap this $50 billion a year gambling business and produce at least $10 billion a year in new revenue for our treasury which could be used to cut our taxes and reduce our gigantic national debt.

Let us not compound the errors we made with prohibition. Let us have the Government regulate and control this gambling industry so that our economy, our treasury and our people will become the beneficiaries.

Government Fiscal Irresponsibility Catching Up With Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, many of us have been warning that the Kennedy and liberal Democratic lack of understanding of our economic system and the reckless spending which has gone on for three decades would someday bring us to a day of reckoning.

It may be, Mr. Speaker, that this day is closer than we realized. The following editorial from the Richmond News-Leader provides material for some provoking thoughts. Perhaps it is not yet too late to save our system of free enterprise, capitalism, from the onslaughts of the dreamers who thought the dream could go on forever without an awakening to the hard reality that someday, somehow, debts must be paid.

[From the Richmond News-Leader, Apr. 23, 1963]

DAY OF RECKONING

"DECLARATION OF INTERDEPENDENCE

"In order to pursue the greater security of our country, and of our fellow citizens in the ranks of business and industry, we shall vigorously promote broad ownership of U.S. savings bonds, and the benefits of acquiring these instruments of security through systematic payroll savings. By so doing, we hope to strengthen the interdependent resources of our people, our industry, our Nation.

"We recognize, further, that increased public ownership of the national debt—through U.S. savings bonds—is essential to the sound management of our Government's finances, to the stability of our currency, and—consequently—to our continued ability to meet our responsibilities in the defense of the free world. This volunteering exercise of thrift secures both individual and Nation against adversity and emergency, and earns the participant a greater share in the abundance of America.

"DOUGLAS DILLON."

The foregoing document is impressive and tolerably well turned out. In fact, it is an expensive piece of printing, on fine parchment. With these flourishes, the Secretary of the Treasury is promoting thrift—not for the Government, but for the average citizen. Mr. Dillon beseeches the Nation's business leaders to back the most intensive payroll savings bond drive since World War II. Translated from the Newspeak, the Secretary's Declaration of Interdependence means one thing: The country is going broke, and we're all in the crackup together.

The old puritanical virtues have disappeared from Government, but luckily Mr. Dillon has found them in the people. He is in a quandary because we're losing our gold at the same time that the big bond issues of the wartime years are coming due. Twenty-one percent of the national debt is in U.S. savings bonds. Mr. Dillon already has proposed that both gold and silver backing be removed from all forms of paper currency. But more important is what the Treasury calls "sound debt management" to postpone the day of reckoning.

Sound debt management is based upon some rather arresting principles: What is the public debt? "Nothing other than the difference between what we have spent as a Government since 1789 and what we have received in the form of taxes and other receipts," says the slick campaign literature. How much have we spent since 1789? "Your Government has spent through last December a shade under $1 trillion 600 billion." How much did we get? One trillion 300 billion dollars." How much of that debt has been incurred since 1945? Oops, no answer.

But there are other answers for the worrywarts. "A debt of $300 billion seems like (sic) it must be a huge burden upon our economy and it is, of course, a very sizable amount." The real worry lies elsewhere: "The major problems of debt management are not related to the size of the debt, per se, but rest in two other areas: rapid changes in the size of the debt and the structural aspects of the Federal debt." Those rapid increases—er, changes—are never explained.

Surprisingly, Mr. Dillon already has persuaded 28 of the busiest executives in the country to put their names to a national proposal which they could hardly endorse for their own businesses. He makes a blatant appeal to self-interest, saying that industry should be grateful for the Kennedy tax credits. He urges company presidents to pass the thinly veiled threat down the line by putting the bond campaign in the hands of promotion-minded aids.

But with all these dubious aspects, the campaign does have one hopeful aim. Secretary Dillon desires to get the national debt out of reckless Government hands. His plan would put "ownership of the national debt in the hands of genuine savers." We wonder how Walter Heller is these days.

Report From Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report to my constituents:

YOUR CONGRESSMAN, VICTOR WICKERSHAM, REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON

APRIL 1963.

THE TRUTH ABOUT WAURIKA

Much newspaper space has been devoted to the Waurika project and accompanying legislation. One of the more recent articles, written by Mr. Allan Cromley, Washington correspondent for the Daily Oklahoman, deserves some comment. In his usual slanted style of mismanaging the news against me, although the next election is more than a year away, Mr. Cromley infers that I was wrong in introducing the Waurika bill this year in the House, and states that friction between me and Representative Walter Rogers of Texas is holding up action on the bill in his committee. Mr. Cromley says the Waurika project is caught up in a legislative snarl. I submit just the opposite.

First, I introduced the bill in the House, and it was referred to Mr. Rogers' committee, giving the project two routes through the House this year—through Mr. Rogers' committee and through the Public Works Committee. This was in line with an agreement between the late Senator Kerr and myself in the 87th Congress and was in compliance with the wishes of those promoting the project. Whether the Public Works Committee or the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee approves the project, both the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation stand ready to build it. Two routes are better than one; it is not important who builds the dam, but that it is built. I am confident that action will be taken on it in a short time.

Second, if there is any friction between myself and Congressman Rogers, it exists only in the mind of Mr. Cromley. All Mr. Rogers wants are assurances that Texas' historical water rights will not be disturbed when the Mangum project is built. I sympathize with Mr. Rogers' problem, for much of the watershed for the Mangum project is in Texas. It is understood by most people in Washington that until Mr. Rogers is satisfied over these water rights, there will be no Waurika project or any other Oklahoma Bureau of Reclamation project approved through his committee. It is just that simple. I stand ready to assist Mr. Rogers and work with him in any way I can. The Interstate Water Compact Committee must make its finding, which I am hopeful will meet with everyone's approval. Mr. Cromley has a unique style of writing. I know of no other reporter that can keep as close to the facts and still twist the meaning into a distorted picture for the reader. He has taken journalistic potshots at me for several years, with limited success. Apparently the Daily Oklahoman's editorial opposition to the Waurika Dam is now taking on a different approach, through its Washington bureau.

DUKE ARA PROJECT APPROVED

Biggest news for the people of southwestern Oklahoma came in April when a $2,636,725 Area Redevelopment Administration loan was approved for Republic Gypsum Co. to construct a $4 million wallboard plant at Duke. The huge plant will create more than 200 new jobs and bring untold benefits to the economy of southwestern Oklahoma. With the approval of this loan, the way is paved for other new industry to come into the area. Construction is expected to begin in 60 to 90 days on the plant, which will manufacture gypsum wallboard used in the construction industry and have an annual payroll of $1 million. Another ARA project soon to be approved is a loan to Sequoyah Mills, Inc. at Anadarko. A $60,000 loan has already been approved to Caddo Electric Cooperative for relending to the mill which will manufacture carpet for a five-State area.

VISITS WITH CONSTITUENTS ENJOYABLE

The Easter recess of Congress provided me with an opportunity to return to Oklahoma and visit with my constituents, the first such opportunity this year to do so. I was able to visit all 23 counties. The tour was interrupted when it was necessary for me to return to Washington to vote on a $450 million accelerated public works appropriation bill. I cast my vote in favor of the bill to restore funds cut in committee. The APW program has already spent $636,000 in Grady County and $64,000 in Greer County to help unemployment in those areas. The program is a good one and should be continued.

AGRICULTURE HEARING HELD IN LAWTON

More than 100 farmers, ranchers, industrialists, and agriculture officials met in Lawton April 12, at my request, for a discussion of the general status of agriculture in Oklahoma. Testimony presented at the meeting will be prepared into a report and transmitted to the Secretary of Agriculture. Many farmers never have an opportunity to air their views on the solving of Oklahoma's farm problems. I think this meeting was a step in the right direction, as it allowed the farmer to be heard and allowed me to become better informed on what most farmers want in the way of a farm program.

POST OFFICES DUE IMPROVEMENTS

Post office improvements are scheduled in the near future for Anadarko, where a $207,000 modernization program is planned, and at Elk City, where $386,000 will be spent to build a new post office-Federal building. Post office improvements are also slated at Waurika, Frederick, Hollis, Lawton, and Mangum.

CLINTON-SHERMAN AFB HOUSING PLANNED

Construction of 100 new family housing units at Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base costing $1,477,059 will get underway soon, another sign that Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base is on the map to stay, playing a vital part in the defense of our country.

NAVAL ACADEMY APPOINTMENTS

Three fine young men, Thomas Rock and Curtis Cowgill III, both of Beaver, and Donald Waid, Waurika, have won my appointments to the U.S. Naval Academy for 1963. They were appointed on the basis of scores made on competitive examinations. My best wishes go with them for their future careers.

CUBAN SITUATION OUTLINED

Much of the mail the past few months has concerned Cuba and Castro. At the present time, here is how we stand in regard to Cuba:

The policies of the United States toward Cuba are to continue to insure the security of the United States, fight the spread of Castro communism, tighten the noose and isolate Cuba, and seek to free the Cuban people. We have substantially isolated Cuba, trade has been cut drastically. Rationing of goods is becoming more and more common. We are attempting to control the spread of Castro communism by supervising the travel of people to Cuba, watching the spread of literature and the transfer of funds from other nations to Cuba. At present, 14 countries have broken relations with Cuba, 5 still maintain them. We have beefed up our propaganda by broadcasting 9 hours per day in Spanish over the Voice of America and are putting out tons of anti-Communist literature.

Support of Castro in Cuba is limited, though he remains strong. I am of the opinion, however, that if Castro is ever removed, it will be done by the Soviet Union, not by the Cuban people. Security measures are very tight and removal of Castro by the Cubans themselves would be almost impossible. Castro and Cuba are costing the Soviet Union $1 million per day, with Cuba facing the worst economic year in its history in 1963. The Soviet Union will have to bolster its aid if Castro is to survive. Those who advocate the ouster of Castro by American intervention must remember that war will be the consequence of that action. We must arrive at another solution. This will most probably be through the Organization of American States and a united action by member nations.

Any time I may be of service to you, please call on me. I always enjoy hearing from my constituents.

Cordially your friend,

Victor Wickersham,
Member of Congress.

Israel's 15th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 15th anniversary of the independence of Israel. This event is being observed by the people of Israel and by Israel's many friends in the free world.

The festivities are marred this year by the death of Israel's President, Yitzchak Ben-Zvi, last week. An outstanding scholar and statesman, he was loved by the people of Israel and many people in other lands who knew him. He was President of his country during 11 of 15 years of independence, and under his administration Israel made great progress in every endeavor. His death is a loss not only to Israel but to the whole free world.

Over these 15 years of its existence, Israel has maintained the most cordial relations with the United States. Her people enjoy a democratic form of government, very much in the image of American democracy. Israel has utilized our economic assistance to the best advantage of its people, so that today the head of our foreign aid program, the Agency for International Development, is able to report to the American people—as he recently did—that Israel has made great economic strides and our aid in this field will no longer be needed in the future.

For a number of years the general situation in the Middle East has been relatively quiet, and many of us in this country had hoped that peace could be attained for all concerned. Unfortunately, Egypt has recently embarked on a program for the development of nuclear missiles, with the aid of scientists from West Germany. As a result of this situation, Israel now feels that its security and its independence are threatened since President Nasser, of the United Arab Republic, repeatedly keeps talking about destroying the State of Israel.

The recent federation of several Arab States into the United Arab Republic and the work being done on nuclear missiles in Egypt constitute a definite threat to the peace and stability of the Middle East as a whole, and to the security of Israel in particular. Israel finds itself in a very precarious position militarily. She sees the balance of military power shifting toward Egypt, and consequently she is forced to adopt means to build up her own military power. This will undoubtedly lead to a new arms race in the Middle East, which can only have tragic consequences for the nations directly concerned and possibly also for the world.

I believe the United States should take immediate steps to prevent an explosion in this area, which could lead to a new world war. Our country must exert every possible effort to convince Egypt to discontinue its activities in the field of nuclear weapons and to send back to Germany the scientists working on the development of these horror weapons. We have been furnishing vast economic assistance to Egypt these past few years, reaching as much as $150 to $200 million per year in the form of grants, loans, and surplus food commodities. The least we should get from Egypt in return is a definite guarantee that she will not stir up trouble in the area and refrain from attacking her neighbors.

In the event President Nasser, of Egypt, refuses to abide by our request, I would strongly urge the following steps, which I am sure many of our colleagues will support:

First. That we discontinue immediately all economic assistance to Egypt, including grants, loans, and the shipment of all food commodities.

Second. That we issue a declaration guaranteeing the security and independence of Israel in the event of an attack by the United Arab Republic.

Third. That we inform Egypt that unless she suspends immediately her work on nuclear missiles and sends home the German scientists, the United States will supply Israel with the necessary arms to defend herself.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that such steps would be in the interests of world peace and consistent with American foreign policy. It would help maintain stability in the area and preserve the independence of existing states, including Israel.

On the occasion of Israel's 15th anniversary of its independence, I extend my greetings and sincerest wishes to the people of Israel and to all friends of Israel in this country. We wish for it many years of genuine peace, prosperity and freedom.

President's Envoy Seems To Be Confused

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the current visit of the President's special envoy to Moscow, Averell Harriman, emphasizes the futility of the Kennedy policies in dealing with the Communists. Harriman, the architect of the Lao disaster, the man who arranged the coalition government in Laos, tells us now he has won agreement from Khrushchev "in principle" on the need to keep the Lao fighting from getting out of hand.

Did not Khrushchev agree "in principle" last year when the coalition government was set up? The President said he did and, if you remember, the Kennedy administration hailed last year's agreement on Laos as a great victory for the free world. Was somebody fibbing then? Did not Khrushchev agree to the coalition and promise to pull out the Russian influence?

Mr. Speaker, the failure in Laos is just another in the long list of failures of President Kennedy who seems unable to cope with a world on fire or to understand the motives or objectives of the Communists. Unless we can somehow reach the President and instill in him the knowledge and the courage to pursue a policy of strength and determination to halt Russian Communist aggression, this Nation and the entire free world is in imminent danger.

The following news item from today's Wall Street Journal, concerning the Harriman visit, is full of foreboding for the future if this is the type of impractical representative we are depending on to deal with the Communists.

The news item follows:

> Averell Harriman, U.S. Under Secretary of State, left Moscow for London at about the same time Castro was arriving. Harriman, who discussed the Laotian crisis with Soviet officials and Khrushchev, said he had won agreement in principle from Khrushchev on the need to prevent the Laotian fighting from getting out of hand. But there was no certainty Russia has enough control over pro-Reds in Laos to prevent them from continuing military advances against "neutralists."

President Yitzchak Ben-Zvi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, President Yitzchak Ben-Zvi, of Israel, died last week at the age of 78. Few men typify more accurately the pioneering spirit of the Israeli people than their late President.

Born in the Ukraine in 1884, Ben-Zvi carried on the Zionist tradition of his father. After visiting Palestine in 1904 to see firsthand the work of the Zionist settlers, he returned to Russia to found the labor Zionist movement. When the Pogrom of 1905 broke out, Ben-Zvi managed to escape the fate of his family, who were exiled to Siberia, and traveling through Europe he made his way to Palestine.

In Palestine, the Jewish settlers were forced to fight not only the rocky, barren soil, the swamps, malaria, and typhoid, but bands of marauding Arabs as well. Together with David Ben-Gurion, who became a lifelong friend, Ben-Zvi organized the first Jewish defense force in Palestine, known as Hashomer—The Watchman—to guard the new settlements. After World War I, Hashomer became the Haganah, which, after bearing the brunt of the war of independence in 1948, became Israel's Army.

Not satisfied with purely military accomplishments, Ben-Zvi went on to help organize both the Mapai Party, the foremost political party in Israel today, and the Jewish Federation of Labor, the Histadruth, which now counts among its members nearly 90 percent of Israel's working force.

After the First World War, Ben-Zvi was asked to join the governing body of the Jewish community in Palestine. He became chairman of its executive committee and, from 1945 to 1948, served as president of the National Council of Palestine Jews.

Ben-Zvi's service to his people did not end with the birth of the State of Israel. He was elected to Parliament twice. And when Israel's first President, Chaim Weizmann, died in 1952, Yitzchak Ben-Zvi was elected to succeed him, and he was reelected for two succeeding terms.

In the tradition of his people, Ben-Zvi was more than a politician. He was an outstanding scholar and a prolific author. His books included a study of the Samaritans, an ancient Jewish sect; the history of the Jews of Peki'in, a village in Palestine where the Jews lived uninterruptedly since the destruction of the Second Temple; a history of Palestine, and geographical treatises. He was especially interested in the oriental Jewish communities and the communities of the Middle East.

With his passing, the citizens of Israel have lost one of their greatest leaders, Jews everywhere one of their outstanding scholars, and the world, a statesman.

Greater-Lawrence Chamber of Commerce Receives Award of Merit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I call the attention of the House to the award to be given this evening to the Greater Lawrence, Mass., Chamber of Commerce. The Greater-Lawrence Chamber has been named one of the top 25 chambers in America. This award is richly deserved.

The chamber has done an outstanding job of revitalizing the economic life of the Lawrence area. It has come up with exciting solutions to the serious economic problems facing our area of New England, and has worked closely with similar groups in surrounding communities to meet the challenges of the times through a program known as "Operation Bootstrap."

This award is a tribute to the chamber's leadership, to its membership and to the community. Similarly, it is an outstanding tribute and memorial to the late Allan B. Rogers who died suddenly last June after being elected president of the organization being honored in Washington today. It was Mr. Rogers who initiated the climactic stage of the chamber's now famous program.

Those who have followed the chamber's activities today recognize the outstanding work of President Robert M. Maguire, Executive Vice President Elbert G. Moulton, Jr., Walter Demers, Jr., and Albert B. Gordon, to mention just a few, as symbolic of the community's and organization's success. These officials of the Lawrence Chamber of Commerce are attending the 51st annual meeting of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and will be presented the National Chamber's Award of Merit signifying the Greater-Lawrence Chamber's standing as one of the top 25 chambers in the Nation.

This is a proud moment for the Greater-Lawrence area community, as evidenced by the accomplishments of the Greater-Lawrence Chamber of Commerce.

Selective Service Mental Tests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, Parade, a magazine section that is published in many Sunday newspapers, including the Washington Post, contained the following article on April 28, 1963, under a column entitled "Intelligence Report," which I would like to call to the attention of my fellow Congressmen:

> Who's smart? Which selective service registrants fare best and worst on the mental tests given them for military induction? Those from Utah and Washington pass the tests most frequently. Those from South Carolina and Kentucky fail most frequently. More than half the South Carolinians and Kentuckians fail. Their failure rate is 54.6 percent. The failure rate of those from Utah and Washington is only 4.7 percent.

To the above might be added that Utah, which has long been proud of and has emphasized education, ranks No. 1 in the number of years of schooling completed by persons 25 years of age and over. The average number of grades completed by this age group is 12.2—1960. It further follows that with this same age group, Utah ranks first in the number of persons completing at least 4 years of high school. Furthermore, we rank top, along with Colorado and Delaware, in the number who have completed at least 4 years of college.

In Utah's secondary schools, 49.4 percent of our teachers hold master's degrees; 98.6 percent have bachelor's degrees; and 93.2 percent of our elementary teachers hold bachelor's degrees.

This admirable achievement has not come easy to the people of our State, or our teachers, for there have been many difficult and seemingly insurmountable hurdles to overcome, among which are some of the following: Because of the percentage of school-age children per capita, which places us as second in the Nation; our high percentage of pupils attending public schools—97.4 percent; and our lower percentage of disposable income per capita; it has been necessary for both teachers and all Utah citizens to make many sacrifices in the interest of better education. It has been necessary for us to levy taxes to the extent that Utah has the second highest percentage of State taxes earmarked for educational purposes for higher education, and is first percentagewise for State and local expenditures for all public education. Even with this effort on the part of State and local governments, the result has been large-size classes—Utah ranks 39th in the Nation in average number of pupils per classroom teacher in public elementary and secondary schools—and lower salaries for our devoted teachers—90.1 percent of the national average.

Another factor which I would like to point out is that much of our land in Utah is federally owned—second only to the States of Nevada and Alaska. Thus we are unable to draw revenue for State and local government from this land. We do receive some aid for our schools through Federal appropriations such as Public Law 874 and Public Law 815; however, I am proud to say that the bulk of our education expense is carried by the people of Utah, for only 4.8 percent of all schools are paid by the Federal Government. This might be compared with Alaska, which receives 24 percent of its school costs from the Federal Government.

I am proud to say further that Utah is one of nine States which has no State debt for education. We have followed in our State a sound fiscal policy of meeting current expenditures with current revenue—this also holds true in other departments of our State government.

The success of our school system in Utah may be attributed to many factors, but for the most part it is the educational philosophy of our founding forefathers, who felt that the first order of importance was establishing schools. This inherent philosophy of the value of a good education is apparent with all people throughout our State. This, coupled with the devotion to and love of education demonstrated by our teachers, has made Utah one of the top States in education in America in the past, as well as at present.

Water Pollution Control Program in Georgia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, the Labor-HEW appropriation bill, H.R. 5888, would reduce the funds for water pollution control grants from the $100 million requested by the President to only $90 million. In view of the fact that there are now applications already on hand for $170 million of Federal aid, any reduction would be an unfortunate setback to this urgently needed program.

It is particularly disturbing that the cut was made on the erroneous basis that communities could turn to the accelerated public works program to make up the loss. The fact is that that program is available only in communities with high and persistent unemployment, so that the communities which would lose out under this cutback could not necessarily use the other program. More importantly, the Congress in authorizing the accelerated public works program and in appropriating funds for these grants did so in order to make a net addition to the construction activity and thereby create jobs to relieve unemployment. A basic principle of that program is that the funds are not to be used for projects which would have been built without the aid and are not to be used to replace funds for regular Federal programs.

Last Wednesday, a list of nearly 1,600 communities which have applications pending under the water pollution program was inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD beginning on page 7037. Because of the special method of processing followed in the State of Georgia, whereby applications must be a completed or final package, it was not possible to include a full listing for that State. Even the additional information now available does not present a complete picture since I understand there are many communities in Georgia actively developing projects under this program. I am inserting in the RECORD a listing of a number of additional communities in that State which have been pending applications for grants under the water pollution control program and which could be adversely affected by the reduction in funds made by H.R. 5888.

Supplemental list of pending applications for municipal waste treatment works construction grants

GEORGIA

Municipality:	*Grant request*
Alma	$33,190
Augusta	600,000
Athens	410,400
Barnesville	10,487
Brunswick	165,800
Columbus	350,000
Dalton	110,000
Fayetteville	73,400
Fulton County	465,000
Hazelhurst	61,200
Jefferson	32,430
Macon	441,000
Milledgeville	600,000
Ocilla	56,700
Savannah	61,500
Valdosta	269,700

Bonneville Stands on Its Own Feet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, recently, my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Honorable JOHN P. SAYLOR, has taken unusual interest in the fiscal problems of Bonneville Power Administration. His interest certainly is most welcome and proper and his concern is appreciated. Unfortunately, however, the gentleman from Pennsylvania made certain comments which I fear left wrong impressions.

My distinguished colleague advocates a BPA rate increase on a the-sooner-the-better basis. His insistence comes at a time when the 88th Congress has before it a program that would permit BPA to net between $6 and $15 million a year by marketing surplus power in the Pacific Southwest.

My first point is this: Any BPA rate review should await the approval or disapproval of Congress on the proposed marketing program.

The proposed Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest intertie would have a very favorable impact on BPA's financial position. BPA rates come up for review and possible change at 5-year intervals. Existing rates will continue until December 20, 1964. BPA Administrator Charles F. Luce has stated BPA will not wait that long, however, to review its rates. That will be done this year after Congress has had a chance to act on the intertie program. There will be plenty of time, after Congress considers the intertie, to review rates and recommend adjustments.

Can you imagine what would happen if a private utility were to appear before its regulatory agency and petition for a rate increase at the same time ignoring a sales program that would substantially increase its revenue? Surely, only one thing would happen. The increase would be denied. And the utility probably would be chided for upsidedown thinking. It would be nudged out the door and admonished not to return until its marketing program was resolved.

After Congress wishes are known, BPA can thoroughly review its financial requirements. It can take many factors into account, including the intertie, and Mr. Luce will then recommend to the Federal Power Commission whatever rate revisions are necessary.

I spoke of wrong impressions. For one thing, the gentleman from Pennsylvania said this—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 4:

> Mr. Luce has indicated in his letter that BPA realizes that a rate increase may be required for the period 1964–69. This realization will be welcomed warmly by the taxpayers provided that the increase is sufficient to eliminate the drain which the BPA currently inflicts on taxpayers' funds.

First of all, BPA does not currently inflict a drain on taxpayers' funds. BPA pays its own way with interest.

I shall explain this in a moment. But first, may I emphasize that when BPA repays the investment in Northwest power projects, these projects will continue to produce revenues for the U.S. Treasury for the benefit of the Nation's taxpayers for scores of years.

The Federal Government's investment in 15 Pacific Northwest multipurpose projects in operation as of June 30, 1962, totaled $1,880 million. Of this amount $1,540 million is to be repaid from power revenues. The rest is charged—and properly so—to such nonreimbursable benefits as recreation, navigation, and flood control. Another $520 million invested in transmission lines raises BPA's total obligation to the Treasury as of June 30 to $2,060 million.

BPA receipts to last June 30 totaled $860 million. Of this, $221 million was used to repay in full annual appropriations for operations and maintenance. Another $318 million was applied to interest on the capital investment. The remaining $321 million was used to repay capital investment and, as of June 30, this amount was about $20 million more than the repayment schedule called for.

Thus, while it is correct to say that the taxpayers' money has been invested to develop Northwest multipurpose Federal projects, this is an investment that is being repaid—with interest. This is more than can be said of many public works financed with Federal appropriations in other parts of the country. The service life of the Columbia projects will span many, many years beyond the repayment period.

Now, this brings us to my distinguished colleague's remarks on interest, which I fear also left the wrong impression. I was disturbed and left more than a little confused by his reference to interest rates—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 4, page 3426—and by what he left unsaid. So I delved into the matter. I found that the interest rate paid on U.S. Treasury marketable securities from 1939 through 1960 averaged 2.252 percent. BPA has paid 2.5 percent on projects constructed by the Army engineers and on one small reclamation project, and 3 percent on other Bureau projects, which include Grand Coulee and Hungry Horse Dams.

The Congressman from Pennsylvania did not make any particular point on interest rates other than to imply, perhaps, that they should have been higher, although, as it was, they still were above the going Federal rate.

My distinguished colleague makes no reference to the fact that private utilities, in effect, have obtained interest free loans from the Government through fast writeoffs amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars. Frankly, I am critical of this omission.

If my distinguished colleague's goal is to see BPA operate on a sound financial basis, he should support programs such as the intertie. This program, if built at Federal costs, certainly will pep up BPA's financial outlook.

In these days of intense international competition—a contest which involves our very survival—we must take great care not to impose an economic handicap or burden on any region. I am confident that my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania realizes that he cannot promote the economic interest of his own region by hobbling the forward progress of the Pacific Northwest.

President Kennedy made this point ably in August 1962 in connection with BPA's 25th anniversary. He said:

> When you help build a region, you help build your nation. The economic growth of the Pacific Northwest has created a bigger market for Detroit cars and Pittsburgh steel and Boston shoes and Atlanta textiles. The list is almost without end, and proves again that the economic vitality of one region affects the economic vitality of all other regions.

A selfish approach to regional interest does not build the Nation's strength. Indeed, such an approach is fraught with peril.

If the intertie program and its attendant legislation should fail to pass, the opponents of these measures would perpetuate restrictions that prevent BPA from selling at a profit power that now wastes into the Pacific Ocean. This is power available whenever streams are above minimum flows.

In each of the past 5 years when BPA has had annual deficits, electrical energy substantially greater than the year's deficit went unsold for lack of a market. The water was spilled unused over the dams. In other words, in these 5 years we wasted power worth approximately $125 million. Surely this is a waste in natural resources that we can ill afford.

Water is a self-replenishing resource and by using it prudently we may conserve our supplies of fossil fuels. It makes good sense to do so.

BPA in the past 25 years has achieved a remarkable record of marketing Federal power at the lowest possible cost. As Administrator Luce has stressed, BPA is committed to a program that will put it back on a sound financial basis.

Because of a surplus accumulated prior to 1957, BPA is still cumulatively $20 million ahead of schedule in meeting its obligations to the Treasury. We realize that a rate increase may be required for the period 1964 through 1969.

The amount of any increase will rest largely on what Congress does with the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest intertie. An essential part of this program is the legislation which I described and which, by the way, is supported unanimously by the Pacific Northwest congressional delegation. If Congress approves this program, the raise in BPA rates will be small and not likely to hinder electric consumers. The program also will lessen a shameful waste in natural resources. These things are, of course, vital to our country's welfare.

Test Ban Letters to Colleague

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, interest has been revived in letters I sent to colleagues last month under dates of April 3 and April 4 on the test ban issue. They were triggered by a communication to the Members from William C. Foster, Disarmament Agency Director. In order that the content of these letters be available to anyone interested, I have asked that they be reproduced in the RECORD as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTITIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 3, 1963.

Re nuclear test ban treaty.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Yesterday you received a letter from the Director, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, mentioning the risk of "surprise abrogation" inherent in test ban treaty.

This would be the situation if Soviets prepared clandestinely in their laboratories for a vital testing series. This could be done over a period of years behind the secrecy of the Iron Curtain. The Soviet Union then would suddenly announce withdrawal from the treaty and capitalize on this surprise factor by conducting intensive tests.

The Director states the risk of Soviet achievement of nuclear superiority in this manner could be reduced by a U.S. policy of maintaining readiness to test in such eventuality.

However, the impossibility of keeping U.S. progress up under these circumstances was adequately stated by President Kennedy on March 2, 1962, in announcing U.S. test resumption following the breach of the then existing informal testing moratorium.

The President's words were as follows:

"In actual practice, particularly in a society of free choice, we cannot keep top-flight scientists concentrating on the preparation of an experiment which may or may not take place on an uncertain date in the future. Nor can large technical laboratories be kept fully alert on a standby basis waiting for some other nation to break an agreement. This is not merely difficult or inconvenient—we have explored this alternative thoroughly and found it impossible of execution."

The Director's letter briefly mentions arguments for a test ban treaty. A more complete and fair discussion can be found at page 3234 of the Congressional Record of February 28, 1963.

The subject also is covered in the American Security Council's March 18, 1963, Washington Report which accompanies this letter.

Sincerely yours,

Craig Hosmer,
Member of Congress.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., April 4, 1963.

Dear Colleague: If a nuclear test ban treaty will serve to reduce the world's risks, it is only an effective treaty which will do so—one which in fact stops nuclear weapons progress equally on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

Negotiation of an ineffective treaty would surrender the benefits an effective one might achieve.

Disarmament Agency Director William C. Foster wrote you on April 2 declaring "significant Soviet advances" by cheat testing "would require a series of tests." He added that under present U.S. treaty proposals "the probability is high that any meaningful series would be discovered by seismic and intelligence means."

I respectfully differ with Mr. Foster based on scientific facts brought to light during recent hearings of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The AEC's Director of Military Applications testified that all nuclear weapons of military interest except very large super H-bombs, which the Soviets have anyway, can be developed by underground tests which create seismic signals of very small size.

The Defense Department's seismologist testified about the inherent limitations on seismic instruments to detect and identify as cheat tests signals of this very small size (10 millimicrons and less).

The net effect of this testimony was that intelligent Soviet cheating would create signals which might be detected outside the U.S.S.R. but would be too small to identify as cheat tests. This is because such signals cannot be distinguished from the seismic signal of hundreds of small earthquakes occurring annually in Soviet territory.

Therefore, there exists a "big hole" for cheating and clandestine development of Soviet nuclear weapons superiority under U.S. nuclear test ban treaty proposals.

This "big hole" can be closed, and an effective treaty achieved, only by U.S. insistence on manned seismic stations inside the U.S.S.R. Unmanned "black boxes" won't do the job because they are not tamperproof.

Although Mr. Foster mentions "intelligence" as another means to spot cheating, when one recalls the difficulties even of finding out what is going on in nearby Cuba, wisdom dictates little reliance be placed on this alternative.

Sincerely,

Craig Hosmer,
Member of Congress.

The American Security Council March 18 Washington Report referred to in the first letter was reproduced in the Congressional Record on March 25 at page 4914.

A Five-Point Plan for Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I believe that Republicans are fully aware of the President's responsibility for the conduct of our foreign policy and stand ready to support him in any course of action we believe will contribute to the extension of freedom throughout the world and promote peace with security and justice. But I believe we have a responsibility to oppose administration policies which result in a deterioration of America's position abroad—for example, the policies which permit a Communist beachhead to remain 90 miles off our shore.

Last Thursday evening, April 25, the chairman of the national Republican congressional committee, Congressman Bob Wilson, of California, issued a direct reply to the President's wish in a recent press conference that opponents of his foreign policy would submit specific alternatives to his Cuban policy. The Baltimore Sun carried the story the next morning with a front page banner headline, and under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to place in the Record both the remarks of Congressman Wilson and the story by the Sun's highly respected and extremely competent reporter, Howard Norton:

EXCERPTS OF CONGRESSMAN WILSON'S REMARKS

Candidate Kennedy came into office pledged to revitalize the Western alliance, restore bold, imaginative leadership to the free world, and renew America's prestige abroad. In contrast, his administration has followed a foreign policy which can best be described as one of defeat, retreat, and deceit. From our humiliating defeat at the Bay of Pigs to the present Communist drive to take over Laos, New Frontier foreign policies are collapsing all over the world. It is difficult—if not impossible—to name one area where the United States, under the so-called leadership of John F. Kennedy, has stood up to our enemies as vigorously as it has opposed our friends.

America suffered a major defeat at the Bay of Pigs because the President committed American prestige, but failed to deliver the required military and naval support. We not only have failed to remove the Communist threat from this hemisphere, but we have retreated from our demands for an on-site inspection of the island. We have openly accepted the continued presence of Soviet troops and so-called technicians in Cuba, and have clamped down with "vigah" on raids by Cuban exiles. As far as I can tell the only congratulations President Kennedy has received for his bold action have been from Fidel Castro.

In other parts of the world we are in serious trouble. We have not halted the advance of communism in southeast Asia, but we have succeeded in toppling the pro-Western government in Laos and replacing it with a coalition which—as we feared and forecast 15 months ago—is resulting in a Red takeover of that country. The architect of this brilliant bit of foreign policy, that famous failure, Averell Harriman, has been rewarded with a promotion to Under Secretary of State.

We have not removed the Soviet influence from Africa, but we have removed from power the only pro-Western anti-Communist leader in the area, Moise Tshombe, and denied self-determination to the people of Katanga. Today we not only do not have peace in the Congo, but we see increasing evidence that the Central Congolese Government, which we helped bring into power, is playing the Soviet's game in Africa.

We have reached the point in our history where we, as American citizens, can no longer believe what our Government says. We have witnessed a policy of deceit blatantly practiced by administration officials who glibly claim that its the right of the Government to lie. For what purpose? To try to keep high the ratings and solid the image of the architect of the plan—John F. Kennedy.

Is this the bold, imaginative leadership Candidate Kennedy had in mind? I believe we could do with a little less of it and a little more frankness and commonsense. I believe, in short, it's time for a change.

There are a number of courses of action open to this Nation if the Kennedy administration really wants to eliminate the Communists from this hemisphere. As a starter, I would suggest:

1. Recognition and support of a Cuban Government in exile.

2. An economic quarantine which would include the cutoff of all U.S. aid to nations which trade with Cuba and a cutoff of U.S. funds to Latin American nations which insist upon maintaining economic and diplomatic ties with Castro.

3. Closing of the Panama Canal to Cuban trade from Red China and the Soviet bloc countries, which has risen sharply in recent months and is sustaining Castro economically.

4. An ultimatum to the Soviet Union that we will sever diplomatic relations unless Soviet troops are removed from Cuba within 30 days.

5. The strict enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine in the future to prevent more "Cubas" from developing in Latin America.

Because of the Kennedy administration's reluctance to take these five steps, the American people must supply the sixth step toward eliminating the Communist menace from the Western Hemisphere and restoring this Nation's respect and honor in every corner of the globe. The sixth step must be the election in 1964 of a Republican President and a Republican House of Representatives to put some backbone into our sagging foreign policy.

We need but 1 winner to accomplish the former and but 40 to achieve the latter. With the help and organization of devoted Republicans in particular and disgusted Americans in general, we can—and will—change what has become a retreat for the United States around the world into an all-out defense of freedom.

[From the Baltimore Sun, Apr. 26, 1963]

GOP ASKS ULTIMATUM TO RUSSIA ON TROOPS IN CUBA—WITHDRAWAL OF ALL SOVIET UNITS URGED—SEVERANCE OF TIES SUGGESTED IF 30-DAY DEADLINE ISN'T MET

(By Howard Norton)

Washington, April 25.—The Republicans tonight unveiled a five-point plan for defeating the Communists in Cuba and all of Latin America.

The plan includes an ultimatum to Moscow, threatening the severance of diplomatic ties unless all Soviet troops leave Cuba within 30 days.

In a speech before 2,000 GOP women from all parts of the Nation—a speech believed to be a preview of what the Republicans will offer in the coming campaign—Representative Wilson, Republican of California, chairman of the Republican congressional committee, urged:

1. That the Government close the Panama Canal to Cuban trade from Red China and other Soviet bloc countries—a trade that has risen sharply in recent months.

SUPPORT EXILE GROUP

2. That the U.S. Government give formal recognition and support to a Cuban government in exile.

2. That the White House send an ultimatum to the Kremlin, announcing that this country will sever diplomatic relations with Russia within 30 days unless all Soviet troops are removed from Cuba.

4. That Washington declare an economic quarantine which would automatically cut off all U.S. aid to countries which trade with Cuba. This should also include the cutting off of all U.S. funds to Latin nations which insist on maintaining economic and diplomatic ties with Castro's Cuba.

5. That this Government announce a strict enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine in the future to prevent more Cubas from developing in the future.

PREDICTION MADE

Wilson told the nationwide gathering of GOP women that if the Kennedy administration does not do these five things, then the American people next year must take a sixth step—the election of a Republican President and Congress, "to put some backbone into our sagging foreign policy."

Senator Morton, Republican of Kentucky, chairman of the Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee, commented upon President Kennedy's statement that he thought it "unfortunate that he (Castro) was permitted to assume control in the 1950's and perhaps it would have been easier to take an action then than it is now. But those who were in positions of responsibility did not make that judgment," he added.

"The facts are," Morton said, "that those who are in a position of responsibility did make a judgment and did take action. In March of 1960 under the Eisenhower administration steps were begun to train and equip an expeditionary force of the Cuban exiles to invade the island.

"For various reasons, among them the difficulties of finding the proper leadership, that invasion could not be implemented during the remaining months of the Eisenhower administration.

"It was attempted in April of 1961, under the Kennedy administration," Morton said.

IT FAILED

"It failed."

"Most people agree," Morton continued, "that its failure was caused by Castro's air superiority. The attorney general says that the invaders were never promised air cover.

"Yet evidence is clear that the invaders were assured that there would be no air opposition.

"It is also generally accepted," Morton declared, "that militarily Castro's forces are 10 or 15 times as effective today as they were in April 1961."

Morton pointed out that when the President finally took his firm stand against the Russian missile installations in Cuba, he supported him "to the hilt," as did most Republicans.

Some Republicans and some very important Democrats asked for even stronger measures, Morton said.

"In any event, the United States was hailed throughout South and Central America and, indeed, throughout most of the free world for seizing the initiative.

"Unfortunately," Morton told the Republican women, "in conforming our Cuban policy to expediency, we have seen the edge of our blade dulled. The bold initiative of last fall has become a wishy-washy policy of backing and stalling this spring.

CANNOT GO UNCHALLENGED

"I repeat, the statement made by President Kennedy yesterday cannot go unchallenged."

Morton also told the women that 1964 is going to be a Republican year in the Senate.

Of the 34 Senate races at stake, he noted, only 9 are held by Republicans, and 25 by Democrats, only 4 of these in the deep South.

Under these conditions, he indicated, GOP gains in the Senate are virtually assured.

Morton, with tongue in cheek, told the women that he didn't care to make any predictions himself so, to insure objectivity, he quoted from a statement issued recently by his opposite number in the Democratic Party—Senator Magnuson, Democrat, of Washington, chairman of the Democratic senatorial campaign committee.

He quoted the Washington Senator as saying that only 7 out of the 25 Democratic senatorial aspirants for reelection were "sure things."

Magnuson admitted, according to Morton, that a number of Democratic Senators are in danger of being unseated, including: Burdick, of North Dakota, Hart, of Michigan, Hartke, of Indiana, McGee, of Wyoming, Moss, of Utah, Yarborough, of Texas, and Young of Ohio.

Even Senator Mansfield, of Montana, the Senate majority leader, faces a tough fight to keep his seat, according to Magnuson's analysis, and he is quoted as saying that stiff battles are ahead also for Cannon, of Nevada, Dodd, of Connecticut, Jackson, of Washington, Kennedy, of Massachusetts, McCarthy, of Minnesota, Muske, of Maine, Proxmire, of Wisconsin, and Williams, of New Jersey.

Morton called on the GOP women to encourage aggressive and articulate candidates to come forward in their States to seek the Republican nominations.

The only other speaker at the opening session of this 3-day annual meeting of Republican women leaders was a Republican woman Congressman, Charlotte T. Reid, of Illinois.

The only new woman Member of Congress this session, Representative Reid noted that women are the predominant force in politics today.

"There are 4 million more women voters than men, and the majority of these women vote Republican," she said.

PLEA MADE TO WOMEN

She urged the women not only to vote, but to use their influence—particularly on the men.

The chairman of the opening session was Mrs. Clare B. Williams, assistant chairman of the Republican National Committee.

The speakers, however, were introduced by the national committee chairman, Representative Miller of New York. Miller did not himself deliver a speech.

At morning and afternoon sessions tomorrow and Saturday, the GOP women are to hear a variety of Republican national leaders, including Senator Goldwater, Republican, of Arizona, a leading contender for the GOP presidential nomination; Representative Halleck, Republican, of Indiana, minority leader in the House; Senator Dirksen, Republican, of Illinois, minority leader in the Senate; William O. Walker, Negro leader and currently director of industrial relations for the State of Ohio.

A number of Republican Governors also will be heard, including the first Republican to head the State government in Oklahoma, Henry Belmon, and Gov. John Chaffee, of Rhode Island.

There is to be a banquet tomorrow night, featuring an address by Miller, and an idea-swap session on Saturday, for the exchange of tactics that have proved successful in past campaigns.

Before presenting the GOP ideas for defeating the Communists in Latin America, Representative Wilson described the New Frontier's policy as one of defeat, retreat, and deceit.

"From our humiliating defeat at the Bay of Pigs to the present Communist drive to take over Laos," he said, "New Frontier foreign policies are collapsing all over the world."

DIFFICULTY NOTED

"It is difficult—if not impossible," he declared, "to name one area where the United States, under the so-called leadership of John F. Kennedy, has stood up to our enemies as vigorously as it has opposed our friends."

"In addition," he asserted, "we have reached a point in our history where we, as American citizens, can no longer believe what our Government says.

"We have witnessed a policy of deceit blatantly practiced by the administration officials, who glibly claim that it's the right of the Government to lie."

The reason for this lying, he argued, is simply to try to keep high the ratings and solid the image of the architect of the plan—John F. Kennedy.

SENATE

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Vice President.

Rabbi Sidney Applbaum, Congregation Beth Judah, Brooklyn, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, as this august and revered body assembles in this hour of our country's, as well as humanity's, critical need, we raise our eyes to Thee, O Lord, whose kingdom is the kingdom of all ages and who alone is sovereign over all.

Bless Thou and uphold the citizens of our Nation, implanting within us the love of and loyalty to liberty and justice which will bind us in a genuine fraternity of the free. Teach us, moreover, our Heavenly Father, to realize that our strength lies not alone in arms but in spirit, our wealth not alone in production but in ideals, our victory not alone over our enemies but over ourselves. Grant, therefore, that in our power and affluence we may never forget our great opportunity to do the right and loosen the chains of wickedness that all the oppressed may go free. May we learn to share our plenty with the hungry, to welcome the tempest-tossed to our shores, to clothe the naked wherever we see them, and never turn our eyes from the misery of our fellow men.

Grateful are we that Thou hast enabled us with pride and honor upon this day to greet a sister democracy which celebrates, even in the tension of possible encirclement, the establishment but 15 years ago of its free and sovereign statehood. It was our beloved country, O Lord, which by its recognition of the State of Israel enabled that ancient yet new land to open its heart and its doors to the oppressed remnants of the Hitler holocaust, holding aloft to the hapless returnees a vision of renewal and rebirth. Mayest Thou, O Eternal God of Israel and guardian of all mankind, bestow upon us Thine ancient benediction to bless us and eternally watch over us, to cause Thy light to shine upon us and ever be gracious unto us, to lift Thy face unto us and to grant us Thy most precious blessings of peace, now and forevermore. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 26, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3120. An act to simplify administration of the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of October 3, 1961 (75 Stat. 766);

H.R. 4655. An act to amend title IX of the Social Security Act with respect to the amount authorized to be made available to the States out of the employment security administration account for certain administrative expenses, to reduce the rate of the Federal unemployment tax for the calendar year 1963, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 4997. An act to extend the feed grain program.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H.R. 2833. An act to amend subdivision (d) of section 60 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 96d) so as to give the court authority on its own motion to reexamine attorney fees paid or to be paid in a bankruptcy proceeding;

H.R. 2849. An act to amend section 47 of the Bankruptcy Act; and

H.R. 4549. An act to amend section 4103 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the appointment of the Chief Medical Director of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 3120. An act to simplify administration of the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of October 3, 1961 (75 Stat. 766); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4655. An act to amend title IX of the Social Security Act with respect to the amount authorized to be made available to the States out of the employment security administration account for certain administrative expenses, to reduce the rate of the Federal unemployment tax for the calendar year 1963, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 4997. An act to extend the feed-grain program; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

At the request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences and the Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization of the Committee on Banking and Currency were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, TO SUSPEND CERTAIN REPORTS IN TIME OF WAR OR NATIONAL EMERGENCY

A letter from the General Counsel of the Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to suspend in time of war or national emergency hereafter declared, the reports required under chapter 145 on the progress of cataloging and standardization (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Administration, for the year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS, RENTS, AND OCCUPANCY OF SELECTED LOW-RENT HOUSING PROJECTS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of eligibility requirements, rents, and occupancy of selected low-rent housing projects, Public Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, dated April 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 2 OF ACT KNOWN AS THE EXPEDITING ACT

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 2 of the Act of February 11, 1903 (32 Stat. 823, as amended, 15 U.S.C. 29, 49 U.S.C. 45), commonly known as the Expediting Act (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF DIRECTOR OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE U.S. COURTS

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, his report, together with reports of the proceedings of the Judicial Conference of the United States, for the fiscal year 1962 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, Railroad Retirement Board, Chicago, Ill., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

DEDUCTION OR CREDIT AGAINST TAX FOR CONTRIBUTIONS TO NATIONAL AND STATE POLITICAL COMMITTEES

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to allow a deduction or credit against tax for contributions to national and State political committees, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Finance.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 69

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, general session of 1963 (the Senate concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States be, and hereby is, respectfully requested to enact H.R. 5121, 88th Congress, 1st session, or other appropriate legislation, to provide for the stockpiling and storage of foodstuffs, including wheat and feed grains, in Hawaii and elsewhere in the United States, to assure supplies adequate to meet emergency civil defense needs and other purposes; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be sent to the Vice President of the United States, the President pro tempore of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the members of Hawaii's delegation to the Congress of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Finance:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 4

"Whereas lingering illnesses and mounting hospital and medical bills may darken the twilight of a person's life; and

"Whereas previous well-made preparations for physical care may crumble, and a once independent, self-reliant person becomes resourceless and incapable of self-help when illness suddenly strikes; and

"Whereas increasing lifespan, urbanization, industrialization, and changing socioeconomic patterns have made these problems more widespread and acute requiring overall national solution: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the second legislature of the State of Hawaii, regular session of 1963 (the Senate concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby respectfully requested to enact legislation to provide medical and hospital benefits to aged persons through a social security insurance program and to provide similar benefits to retired Federal employees; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That duly certified copies of this concurrent resolution be sent to the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, President of the U.S. Senate, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, to the Honorable HIRAM L. FONG and the Honorable DANIEL K. INOUYE, U.S. Senators from the State of Hawaii, and to the Honorable THOMAS P. GILL and the Honorable SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, U.S. Representatives from the State of Hawaii."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii; ordered to lie on the table:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 52

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to pass a Youth Employment Act

"Whereas each year there are an increasing number of American youth completing or terminating their education and seeking a place in the labor market; and

"Whereas the transition from student to worker has not been an efficient process in recent years as evidenced by such factors as the unusually high rate of unemployment among younger workers; and

"Whereas high rates of unemployment and related problems including increasing juvenile delinquency lessen the potential productive capacity of the United States; and

"Whereas part of the transitional problem is attributable to inadequate vocational training and preparation of American youth for entry into the labor force; and

"Whereas President John F. Kennedy has recommended as a partial solution the creation of a Youth Conservation Corps and the development of State and community youth employment programs; Now therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Second Legislature of the State of Hawaii, general session of 1963 (the House of Representatives concurring), That the 88th Congress of the United States be, and is hereby respectfully, requested to pass a Youth Employment Act which would authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and advance the conservation, development, and management of natural resources and recreational areas, and authorize State and community youth employment programs; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to Hawaii's delegation to the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 9

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress Assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that:

"Whereas weeds cause greater agricultural losses than any other pest or impediment or condition; and

"Whereas the persistence of this problem is due to the ability of weed seeds to lie dormant in soil for decades and scores of years and even centuries, and then germinate and reinfest land when conditions become favorable; and

"Whereas all cultivated fields are endowed with this condition; and

"Whereas no significant scientific results have been obtained toward the solution of this vital problem; and

"Whereas no State can realistically attack the magnitude of this problem because of its national scope and significance: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, By the 37th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session (the Senate and House of Representatives concurring), That we respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to appropriate adequate Federal funds for the erection of a Federal laboratory equipped with facilities and personnel to conduct chemical, physiological, anatomical and mechanical studies on the nature and remedy of the stated problem; and be it further

"Resolved, That this laboratory be located at the University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho, because of the unusual natural ecological variety which the environment at the University of Idaho provides in temperatures, altitudes, precipitation, great soil groups, agricultural endeavors and weed floras; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 48

"Concurrent resolution ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to qualifications of electors

"Whereas the 87th Congress of the United States of America in both Houses by a constitutional majority of two-thirds thereof has made the following proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States of America, in the following words:

" 'Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualifications of electors

" 'Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

" ' "ARTICLE —

" ' "SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax.

" ' "SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation' ": Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Florida (the house of representatives concurring), That the proposed amendment set forth below to the Constitution of the United States be, and the same is hereby, ratified by the Legislature of the State of Florida.

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax.

" 'SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation'; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of the foregoing preamble and resolution be immediately forwarded by the secretary of state of the State of Florida, under the great seal, to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maine; to the Committee on Commerce:

"JOINT RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO PROMPTLY AND FAVORABLY CONSIDER S. 702 AND H. 3965 WHICH WOULD AUTHORIZE THE PROCUREMENT AND DISTRIBUTION OF DOMESTICALLY PRODUCED FISHERY PRODUCTS UNDER THE FOOD-FOR-PEACE PROGRAM

"We your memorialists, the senate and house of representatives of the State of Maine in the 101st legislative session assembled, most respectfully present and petition your honorable body as follows:

"Whereas the Federal Government has embarked on a program of food-for-peace to facilitate the purchase of domestic food surplus for sale to needy foreign nations; and

"Whereas the use of healthful, high in protein fishery products would contribute to the success of the program; and

"Whereas the development and progress of the fishery resources of the United States requires expanded domestic and foreign markets; and

"Whereas the offshore fishery resources of the United States are being harvested by foreign powers unconcerned with proper conservation measures and the domestic market flooded with low cost produced imports; and

"Whereas the fishing industry is one of our Nation's greatest present and potential sources of foodstuffs: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we, the memorialists, request and recommend that Congress give prompt and favorable consideration to S. 702, introduced by Senators MAGNUSON, BARTLETT and KENNEDY and H. 3965, introduced by Congressman MCINTIRE, bills which would make domestically produced fishery products eligible for procurement and distribution under the food-for-peace program to assist that program and the development of the domestic fishery resources; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this memorial, duly authenticated by the secretary of state be immediately transmitted by the secretary of state to the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Vice President of the United States, and Hon. JOHN MCCORMACK, Speaker of the House of Representatives and to each Senator and Congressman from the State of Maine."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Kansas; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 23

"Concurrent resolution petitioning the Congress of the United States to call a convention for proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, unless Congress shall sooner have submitted such an amendment, to provide for the election of the President and Vice President in a manner fair and just to the people of the United States

"Whereas under the Constitution of the United States, presidential and vice presidential electors in the several States are now elected on a statewide basis, each State being entitled to as many electors as it has Senators and Representatives in Congress; and

"Whereas the presidential and vice presidential electors who receive the plurality of the popular vote in a particular State become entitled to cast the total number of electoral votes allocated to that State irrespective of how many votes may have been cast for other elector candidates; and

"Whereas this method of electing the President and Vice President is unfair and unjust in that it does not reflect the minority votes cast; and

"Whereas the need for a change has been recognized by Members of Congress on numerous occasions through the introduction of various proposals for amending the Constitution: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Kansas, the House of Representatives concurring therein; That application is hereby

made to Congress under article V of the Constitution of the United States for the calling of a Convention to propose an article or amendment to the Constitution providing for a fair and just division of the electoral votes within the States in the election of the President and Vice President; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That if and when Congress shall have proposed such an article or amendment this application for a convention shall be deemed withdrawn and shall be no longer of any force and effect; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the secretary of state is hereby directed to transmit copies of this application to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, and to the several Members of said bodies representing this State therein; also to transmit copies hereof to the legislatures of all other States of the United States.

"Adopted by the senate, March 5, 1963.

"HAROLD H. CHASE,
"*President of the Senate.*
"RALPH E. ZARKER,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*

"Adopted by the house, April 1, 1963.

"CHARLES ARTHUR,
"*Speaker of the House.*
"L. O. HAZEN,
"*Chief Clerk of the House.*"

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Kansas; to the Committee on Finance:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 35

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress and the President of the United States to take all necessary and appropriate action to secure continued access for U.S. agricultural exports to the countries comprising the European Economic Community

"Whereas, for many years the exports of U.S. agricultural commodities to the European Economic Community countries have been substantial amounting in the calendar year 1961 to a total of $1,191 million, or 23 percent of the total U.S. agricultural exports to all destinations, and 31 percent of all U.S. agricultural exports sold for dollars; and

"Whereas, such trade has been satisfactory and beneficial to both the United States and the countries comprising the European Economic Community; and

"Whereas, the United States has advocated and practiced for a number of years a policy of expanding international trade and pursuant to that policy has supported the establishment of the European Economic Community; and

"Whereas, since its establishment the European Economic Community has adopted a policy with respect to agricultural imports which is highly protectionist and based upon the imposition of arbitrary and unreasonable restrictions on the importation of competitive agricultural commodities; and

"Whereas, the continuation of such a policy will seriously interfere with the previously existing satisfactory and beneficial trade relations between the United States and the European Economic Community and the loss of such trade will adversely affect the economy of both areas; and

"Whereas, the economy of the State of Kansas as an important producer of wheat and feed grains as well as other agricultural commodities will be seriously impaired if the present restrictive program of the European Economic Community is continued; and

"Whereas, the Congress of the United States enacted during the past year legislation submitted by the President giving him broad powers in the field of world trade expansion: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas, the Senate concurring therein;* That the Congress and the President of the United States and the Representatives of Kansas in the Congress of the United States be and they are hereby respectfully urged to take all necessary action to see that the channels for agricultural exports from the United States to the European Economic Community countries are kept open and that in the administration of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 no concessions be made to the European Economic Community or the countries comprising such community on agricultural or industrial exports to the United States without satisfactory reciprocal concessions giving fair and reasonable access to U.S. agricultural commodities, be it further

"*Resolved,* That the secretary of state be instructed to transmit enrolled copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States; to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress; to the chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate; the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House; the chairman of the Senate and House Committees on Agriculture; to U.S. Senator FRANK CARLSON, U.S. Senator JAMES B. PEARSON, and Representatives ROBERT J. DOLE, WILLIAM H. AVERY, ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH, JOE SKUBITZ, and GARNER E. SHRIVER.

"Adopted by the house, April 1, 1963.

"CHARLES ARTHUR,
"*Speaker of the House.*
"L. O. HAZEN,
"*Chief Clerk of the House.*

"Adopted by the senate, April 10, 1963.

"HAROLD H. CHASE,
"*President of the Senate.*
"RALPH E. ZARKER,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*"

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 41

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States, the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the U.S. Tariff Commission to reduce and control the importation of beef and other red meats from foreign countries and to establish smaller quotas and other controls on such imports, and to investigate the buying and selling of beef and other red meats by large retail outlets, including chain stores operating within the continental limits of the United States and to take such action thereon as may be indicated

"Whereas, in the past 2 months, the price of beef has dropped approximately 25 percent; and

"Whereas this drop in price can be attributed largely to controlled buying and selling by large retail outlets in the United States; and

"Whereas the expanding imports of beef and other red meats on the hoof and in the frozen or processed form, including canned and pressed meats, pose a very serious threat to the domestic cattle and livestock industries of this country; and

"Whereas such imports into this country of beef and other red meats are currently expanding at a rate which is altogether out of proportion to any justifiable need and at the present time such imports constitute a high percent of our domestic consumption of beef and other red meats; and

"Whereas the domestic livestock producers of this country have for some time been expending their own funds to expand the national market for beef and other red meats and if imports of these commodities are not further restricted any expansion in said national market will result only in providing foreign competitors with a most attractive market at the expense of the American producers; and

"Whereas the feeding of grain to cattle and livestock by the domestic cattle and livestock industries provides the principal means of solving the burdensome feed-grain surplus now depressing the total agricultural market; and

"Whereas a reasonable restriction on imports of beef and other red meats would provide a means of reducing this feed-grain surplus, as Americans would then consume American-fed beef and livestock rather than that fed in foreign countries; and

"Whereas the further prosperity and strength of this country is in a large measure dependent upon a prosperous and growing domestic agricultural economy: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas (the senate concurring therein)*, That we respectfully urge and request the Congress of the United States, U.S. Tariff Commission and the U.S. Department of Agriculture to do everything within their respective powers to bring about a reduction and stricter control of the importation of beef and other red meats in any form from any foreign country and to establish smaller quotas for the importation of the same, such quotas to be predetermined on an annual basis, thus providing American beef and livestock producers with the needed protection and vital encouragement necessary for the maintenance and welfare of their own industry, and helping insure the future prosperity and strength of this country. It is further urged that an investigation be made of the buying and selling of beef and other red meats by large retail outlets, including chain stores operating within the United States; and that appropriate action be taken to restrain any practices which are deemed inimical to the welfare of the citizens of the United States; Be it further

"*Resolved,* That the secretary of state be directed to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to the President and Vice President and Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, to each member of the Kansas delegation in the Congress of the United States and to the Chairman of the U.S. Tariff Commission.

"Adopted by the house, March 28, 1963.

"CHARLES ARTHUR,
"*Speaker of the House.*
"L. O. HAZEN,
"*Chief Clerk of the House.*

"Adopted by the senate, April 10, 1963.

"HAROLD H. CHASE,
"*President of the Senate.*
"RALPH E. ZARKER,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*"

A resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Guam; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"RESOLUTION 102

"Resolution relative to respectfully petitioning the Congress of the United States to institute an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit citizens of the United States who reside in American territories and possessions to vote in national elections for President and Vice President

"Whereas the people of the territory of Guam, American citizens all, are extremely proud of their membership in the great American Commonwealth and cherish deeply the privileges and responsibilities of such citizenship, the territory of Guam having demonstrated its patriotism and loyalty not only during the Second World War and the occupation of Guam by the enemy, but since that grim time, large numbers of Guamanians having volunteered for service in the Armed Forces of their country, and the people of Guam taking great pride in the role the territory plays as a major defense base for the United States; and

"Whereas the territory of Guam, although enjoying limited self-government and all the basic civil rights granted other American citizens, is still without the right to vote in national elections, there being no provision for electors from Guam to sit in the electoral college, which means that the citizens of Guam are not as much a part of the American Government as they desire, having no voice in the selection of their President; and

"Whereas although the Legislature of Guam cannot presume to speak for the other offshore territories of the United States, it is advised that citizens of those areas who are also American citizens, strongly desire the privilege of voting in national elections, and accordingly the legislature in urging provision for voting by citizens of Guam, also urges that the citizens of other offshore territories be similarly privileged: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Seventh Guam Legislature does hereby on behalf of the people of Guam respectfully petition and memorialize the Congress of the United States to institute an amendment to the Constitution of the United States so as to permit those U.S. citizens resident in the offshore territories of the Nation to vote in national elections for President and Vice President; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the speaker certify to and the legislative secretary attest the adoption hereof and that copies of the same be thereafter transmitted to the President of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House, to the chairman of the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, Senate and House, to the chairmen of the Committees on the Judiciary, Senate and House, and to the Governor of Guam.

"Duly adopted on the 19th day of April 1963.

"V. B. Bamba,
"Legislative Secretary.
"M. U. Lujan,
"Vice Speaker."

A resolution adopted by the International Chamber of Commerce of Albay, Legazpi City, Philippines, relating to the payment of claims under the War Damage Act; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Rocky River, Ohio, expressing the sentiments of that council pertaining to Communist goods being sold in the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

MEMORIAL TO THE CREW OF THE U.S.S. "THRESHER"—RESOLUTION

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, in my home city of Cranston, R.I., the busy intersection of Park and Warwick Avenues will stand as a memorial to the gallant crew of the U.S.S. *Thresher*.

Ever mindful of the individual courage of members of our Armed Forces who make the ultimate sacrifice for our country, the city council of the city of Cranston has dedicated this intersection in memory of the officers, men, and civilians who were aboard the *Thresher* when it sank in the Atlantic Ocean on April 10, 1963. The citizens of Cranston, like Americans everywhere, were deeply moved by this tragedy.

As a further memorial to these gallant men, I request that the text of the resolution be printed in the Record at the conclusion of these remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution 29 of the City Council of the City of Cranston

Whereas on Wednesday, April 10, 1963, the U.S. submarine *Thresher* sank in the Atlantic with a loss of 129 aboard; and

Whereas these gallant and dedicated men have given up their lives in serving the interest of their country: So be it

Resolved, That we, the Honorable Council of the City of Cranston, pay honor to the memory of these courageous men by naming the intersection of Park and Warwick Avenues as the Thresher Memorial Square; and be it further

Resolved, That the president of this council be empowered to name a committee of three whose function would be the planning of dedicatory services which would appropriately honor the memory of these courageous men.

Passed April 15, 1963.

Approved April 17, 1963.

G. Edward Silva,
Council President.
James DiPrete, Jr.
Mayor.

LOYALTY DAY—PROCLAMATION BY GOVERNOR OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, Gov. John Dempsey, of Connecticut, has proclaimed Wednesday, May 1, 1963, to be Loyalty Day, a day on which Connecticut citizens are requested to reflect upon the many sacrifices which have been demanded in the past of Americans in the cause of freedom.

On behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to insert this proclamation of Governor Dempsey in the Record.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Proclamation of the State of Connecticut

Since proclaiming their independence 187 years ago, Americans have displayed unyielding loyalty to their flag and country on every occasion when their concepts of freedom, justice, and human dignity were challenged.

To give all of us opportunity to reflect on the many sacrifices which have been demanded in the past of Americans, both as a people and as individuals, in the cause of liberty, the Congress of the United States and the General Assembly of Connecticut have ordained that a day be set aside each year as Loyalty Day.

Mindful that the challenges confronting us today require of Americans the same willingness to make sacrifices shown by our forebears, I hereby proclaim, in accordance with our statutes, Wednesday, May 1, 1963, to be Loyalty Day.

On this day and throughout the year, let us make it clear once again to those who would imperil our way of life that they will always find us unshakeable and united in our allegiance to our American ideals.

I urge all Connecticut citizens to cooperate with the Veterans of Foreign Wars, sponsors of this observance, in supporting Loyalty Day events which give us an opportunity to demonstrate publicly our loyalty to our Nation and its ideals.

John Dempsey,
Governor.

By His Excellency's command:

Ella T. Grasso,
Secretary of State.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CLARK, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, without amendment:

S. 874. A bill to authorize the construction and equipping of buildings required in connection with the operations of the Bureau of the Mint (Rept. No. 163).

REPORT ENTITLED "CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 164)

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I ask unanimous consent to submit a report entitled "Constitutional Rights," together with individual views, pursuant to Senate Resolution 260, 87th Congress, 2d session, as extended.

I ask that the report, together with the individual views of the Senator from New York [Mr. Keating], be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from North Carolina.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL PERSONNEL AND PAY

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report on Federal employment and pay for the month of March 1963. In accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the Record, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Federal Personnel in Executive Branch, March 1963 and February 1963, and Pay, February 1963 and January 1963

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

(See table I)

Information in monthly personnel reports for March 1963 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is summarized as follows:

Total and major categories	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In March numbered	In February numbered	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In February was	In January was	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total [1]	2,485,738	2,483,511	+2,227	$1,190,931	$1,382,948	−$192,017
Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense	1,429,054	1,421,632	+7,422	678,071	800,169	−122,098
Department of Defense	1,056,684	1,061,879	−5,195	512,860	582,779	−69,919
Inside the United States	2,316,153	2,314,127	+2,026			
Outside the United States	169,585	169,384	+201			
Industrial employment	560,425	563,329	−2,904			
Foreign nationals	166,463	168,502	−2,039	26,336	[2] 27,549	−1,213

[1] Exclusive of foreign nationals shown in the last line of this summary.

[2] Revised on basis of later information.

Table I breaks down the above figures on employment and pay by agencies.

Table II breaks down the above employment figures to show the number inside the United States by agencies.

Table III breaks down the above employment figures to show the number outside the United States by agencies.

Table IV breaks down the above employment figures to show the number in industrial-type activities by agencies.

Table V shows foreign nationals by agencies not included in tables I, II, III, and IV.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during March 1963, and comparison with February 1963, and pay for February 1963, and comparison with January 1963*

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	March	February	Increase	Decrease	February	January	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):								
Agriculture	102,847	101,201	1,646		$44,303	$60,942		$16,639
Commerce	30,428	30,272	156		17,585	19,853		2,268
Health, Education, and Welfare	78,308	77,859	449		38,014	42,027		4,013
Interior	66,632	64,209	2,423		31,888	[1] 35,656		3,768
Justice	31,736	31,874		138	19,566	22,982		3,416
Labor	9,102	8,954	148		4,981	5,630		649
Post Office	583,683	582,097	1,586		258,472	314,188		55,716
State [2] [3]	41,698	41,430	268		19,882	22,458		2,576
Treasury	89,893	89,758	135		47,604	52,490		4,886
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	364	354	10		236	257		21
Bureau of the Budget	465	463	2		386	444		58
Council of Economic Advisers	58	52	6		33	56		23
Executive Mansion and Grounds	76	75	1		35	45		10
National Aeronautics and Space Council	29	28	1		25	28		3
National Security Council	40	40			31	35		4
Office of Emergency Planning	436	418	18		336	375		39
Office of Science and Technology	45	65		20	27	28		1
Independent agencies:								
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	34	27	7		20	23		3
American Battle Monuments Commission	400	385	15		77	84		7
Atomic Energy Commission	7,026	7,020	6		4,871	5,562		691
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	601	602		1	372	424		52
Civil Aeronautics Board	831	831			592	674		82
Civil Service Commission	4,102	4,141		39	2,359	2,714		355
Civil War Centennial Commission	5	5			4	4		
Commission of Fine Arts	7	7			6	6		
Commission on Civil Rights	86	84	2		49	55		6
Delaware River Basin Commission	2	2			2	3		1
Export-Import Bank of Washington	284	283	1		182	200		18
Farm Credit Administration	239	241		2	164	185		21
Federal Aviation Agency	45,593	45,332	261		28,942	34,467		5,525
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	6	1		4	5		1
Federal Communications Commission	1,427	1,441		14	945	1,075		130
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,231	1,238		7	749	867		118
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,221	1,217	4		777	852		75
Federal Maritime Commission	228	216	12		149	164		15
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	391	391			317	370		53
Federal Power Commission	1,108	1,094	14		711	797		86
Federal Trade Commission	1,144	1,139	5		749	848		99
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	119	115	4		58	63		5
General Accounting Office	4,541	4,584		43	2,776	3,209		433
General Services Administration	31,934	32,038		104	14,599	16,729		2,130
Government Printing Office	7,176	7,145	31		3,645	4,238		593
Housing and Home Finance Agency	13,888	13,808	80		7,929	9,086		1,157
Indian Claims Commission	23	21	2		19	23		4
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,370	2,390		20	1,525	1,786		261
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	27,163	26,673	490		19,025	20,986		1,16
National Capital Housing Authority	433	423	10		186	202		16
National Capital Planning Commission	60	56	4		35	38		3
National Capital Transportation Agency	84	85		1	54	64		10
National Gallery of Art	321	322		1	128	151		23
National Labor Relations Board	2,012	2,017		5	1,297	1,485		188
National Mediation Board	137	134	3		114	133		19
National Science Foundation	1,025	956	69		578	644		66
Panama Canal	15,741	15,730	11		5,100	5,320		220
President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity	52	47	5		30	32		2
Railroad Retirement Board	1,989	2,004		15	1,034	1,216		182
Renegotiation Board	211	208	3		159	189		30
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	157	163		6	91	102		11
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,381	1,402		21	886	1,034		148
Selective Service System	6,837	6,811	26		2,034	2,344		310
Small Business Administration	3,226	3,212	14		1,919	2,218		299
Smithsonian Institution	1,391	1,382	9		655	739		84
Soldiers' Home	1,066	1,055	11		341	373		32
South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission	33	40		7	31	39		8
Subversive Activities Control Board	27	26	1		21	23		2
Tariff Commission	266	267		1	185	211		26
Tax Court of the United States	156	156			116	126		10
Tennessee Valley Authority	17,465	17,272	193		9,809	11,478		1,669
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	128	124	4		103	85	$18	
U.S. Information Agency	11,614	11,553	61		5,018	5,398		380
Veterans' Administration	173,146	173,405		259	72,964	83,380		10,416
Virgin Islands Corporation	1,075	1,157		82	162	152	10	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,429,054	1,421,632	8,208	786	678,071	800,169	28	122,126
Net change, excluding Department of Defense			7,422				122,098	
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense [4]	2,115	2,079	36		1,555	1,687		132
Department of the Army [4]	378,677	381,685		3,008	177,087	199,572		22,485
Department of the Navy [4]	341,729	343,432		1,703	175,703	199,399		23,696
Department of the Air Force [4]	303,448	305,293		1,845	145,120	167,324		22,204
Defense Atomic Support Agency	2,008	2,019		11	932	1,081		149
Defense Communications Agency	539	526	13		250	310		60
Defense Intelligence Agency [4]		311		311	197	219		22
Defense Supply Agency	25,117	24,965	152		10,988	11,951		963
Office of Civil Defense	1,054	1,044	10		771	913		142
U.S. Court of Military Appeals	39	39			30	36		6
Interdepartmental activities	14	14			8	15		7

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during March 1963, and comparison with February 1963, and pay for February 1963, and comparison with January 1963*—Continued

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	March	February	Increase	Decrease	February	January	Increase	Decrease
Department of Defense—Continued								
International military activities	58	58			$27	$42		$15
Armed Forces information and education activities	420	414	6		192	230		38
Classified activities [4]	1,466		1,466					
Total, Department of Defense	1,056,684	1,061,879	1,683	6,878	512,860	582,779		69,919
Net decrease, Department of Defense			5,195				69,919	
Grand total, including Department of Defense [5] [6]	2,485,738	2,483,511	9,891	7,664	1,190,931	1,382,948	28	192,045
Net change, including Department of Defense			2,227				192,017	

---

[1] Revised on basis of later information.

[2] March figure includes 16,603 employees of the Agency for International Development, as compared with 16,536 in February and their pay. These AID figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The March figure includes 4,202 of these trust fund employees and the February figure includes 4,218.

[3] March figure includes 898 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 872 in February and their pay.

[4] In March 1,466 employees and their functions were transferred to classified activities as follows: 1 from the Office of the Secretary of Defense, 702 from the Department of the Army, 174 from the Department of the Navy, 269 from the Department of the Air Force, and 316 from the Defense Intelligence Agency.

[5] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency.

[6] Includes employment by Federal agencies under the Public Works Acceleration Act (Public Law 87-658) as follows:

Agency	March	February	Change
Agriculture Department	6,907	5,974	+933
Interior Department	7,354	5,610	+1,744
Tennessee Valley Authority	44	32	+12
Veterans' Administration	113	46	+67
Department of the Army	564	494	+70
Total	14,982	12,156	+2,826

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside the United States employed by the executive agencies during March 1963, and comparison with February 1963*

Department or agency	March	February	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	101,659	100,005	1,654	
Commerce	29,773	29,625	148	
Health, Education, and Welfare	77,708	77,274	434	
Interior	66,032	63,666	2,366	
Justice	31,384	31,533		149
Labor	9,005	8,858	147	
Post Office	582,223	580,646	1,577	
State [1] [2]	10,616	10,496	120	
Treasury	89,269	89,135	134	
Executive Office of the President:				
White House Office	364	354	10	
Bureau of the Budget	465	463	2	
Council of Economic Advisers	58	52	6	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	76	75	1	
National Aeronautics and Space Council	29	28	1	
National Security Council	40	40		
Office of Emergency Planning	436	418	18	
Office of Science and Technology	45	65		20
Independent agencies:				
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	34	27	7	
American Battle Monuments Commission	7	7		
Atomic Energy Commission	6,992	6,987	5	
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	601	602		1
Civil Aeronautics Board	830	830		
Civil Service Commission	4,096	4,136		40
Civil War Centennial Commission	5	5		
Commission of Fine Arts	7	7		
Commission on Civil Rights	86	84	2	
Delaware River Basin Commission	2	2		
Export-Import Bank of Washington	284	283	1	
Farm Credit Administration	239	241		2
Federal Aviation Agency	44,572	44,323	249	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	6	1	
Federal Communications Commission	1,425	1,439		14
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,229	1,236		7
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,221	1,217	4	
Federal Maritime Commission	228	216	12	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	391	391		
Federal Power Commission	1,108	1,094	14	
Federal Trade Commission	1,144	1,139	5	
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	76	72	4	
General Accounting Office	4,454	4,497		43
General Services Administration	31,922	32,026		104
Government Printing Office	7,176	7,145	31	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	13,704	13,625	79	
Indian Claims Commission	23	21	2	
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,370	2,390		20
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	27,152	26,661	491	
National Capital Housing Authority	433	423	10	
National Capital Planning Commission	60	56	4	
National Capital Transportation Agency	84	85		1

Department or agency	March	February	Increase	Decrease
Independent agencies—Continued				
National Gallery of Art	321	322		1
National Labor Relations Board	1,977	1,983		6
National Mediation Board	137	134	3	
National Science Foundation	1,012	944	68	
Panama Canal	153	148	5	
President's Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity	52	47	5	
Railroad Retirement Board	1,989	2,004		15
Renegotiation Board	211	208	3	
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	157	163		6
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,381	1,402		21
Selective Service System	6,684	6,658	26	
Small Business Administration	3,171	3,158	13	
Smithsonian Institution	1,374	1,366	8	
Soldiers' Home	1,066	1,055	11	
South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission	33	40		7
Subversive Activities Control Board	27	26	1	
Tariff Commission	266	267		1
Tax Court of the United States	156	156		
Tennessee Valley Authority	17,463	17,270	193	
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	128	124	4	
U.S. Information Agency	3,240	3,213	27	
Veterans' Administration	172,138	172,398		260
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,364,280	1,357,092	7,906	718
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			7,188	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense [3]	2,050	2,016	34	
Department of the Army [3]	326,550	329,588		3,038
Department of the Navy [3]	317,349	319,108		1,759
Department of the Air Force [3]	275,261	276,982		1,721
Defense Atomic Support Agency	2,008	2,019		11
Defense Communications Agency	508	498	10	
Defense Intelligence Agency [3]		311		311
Defense Supply Agency	25,117	24,965	152	
Office of Civil Defense	1,054	1,044	10	
U.S. Court of Military Appeals	39	39		
Interdepartmental activities	13	13		
International military activities	38	38		
Armed Forces information and education activities	420	414	6	
Classified activities [3]	1,466		1,466	
Total, Department of Defense	951,873	957,035	1,678	6,840
Net decrease, Department of Defense			5,162	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,316,153	2,314,127	9,584	7,558
Net increase, including Department of Defense			2,026	

---

[1] March figure includes 2,736 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 2,736 in February.

[2] March figure includes 617 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 596 in February.

[3] In March 1,466 employees and their functions were transferred to classified activities as follows: 1 from the Office of the Secretary of Defense, 706 from the Department of the Army, 174 from the Department of the Navy, 269 from the Department of the Air Force, and 316 from the Defense Intelligence Agency.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during March 1963, and comparison with February 1963*

Department or agency	March	February	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	1,188	1,196		8
Commerce	655	647	8	
Health, Education, and Welfare	600	585	15	
Interior	600	543	57	
Justice	352	341	11	
Labor	97	96	1	
Post Office	1,460	1,451	9	
State [1] [2]	31,082	30,934	148	
Treasury	624	623	1	
Independent agencies:				
Atomic Battle Monuments Commission	393	378	15	
Atomic Energy Commission	34	33	1	
Civil Aeronautics Board	1	1		
Civil Service Commission	6	5	1	
Federal Aviation Agency	1,021	1,009	12	
Federal Communications Commission	2	2		
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	2	2		
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	43	43		
General Accounting Office	87	87		
General Services Administration	12	12		
Housing and Home Finance Agency	184	183	1	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	11	12		1
National Labor Relations Board	35	34	1	
National Science Foundation	13	12	1	
Panama Canal	15,588	15,582	6	
Selective Service System	153	153		
Independent agencies—Continued				
Small Business Administration	55	54	1	
Smithsonian Institution	17	16	1	
Tennessee Valley Authority	2	2		
U.S. Information Agency	8,374	8,340	34	
Veterans' Administration	1,008	1,007	1	
Virgin Islands Corporation	1,075	1,157		82
Total, excluding Department of Defense	64,774	64,540	325	91
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			234	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	65	63	2	
Department of the Army	52,127	52,097	30	
Department of the Navy	24,380	24,324	56	
Department of the Air Force	28,187	28,311		124
Defense Communications Agency	31	28	3	
Interdepartmental activities	1	1		
International military activities	20	20		
Total, Department of Defense	104,811	104,844	91	124
Net decrease, Department of Defense			33	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	169,585	169,384	416	215
Net increase, including Department of Defense			201	

[1] March figure includes 13,867 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 13,800 in February. These AID figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The March figure includes 4,202 of these trust fund employees and the February figure includes 4,218.

[2] March figure includes 281 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 277 in February.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during March 1963, and comparison with February 1963*

Department or agency	March	February	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	3,825	3,793	32	
Commerce	5,518	5,467	51	
Interior	8,565	8,543	22	
Post Office	253	254		1
Treasury	5,254	5,244	10	
Independent agencies:				
Atomic Energy Commission	256	253	3	
Federal Aviation Agency	2,990	2,977	13	
General Services Administration	1,760	1,782		22
Government Printing Office	7,176	7,145	31	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	27,163	26,673	490	
Panama Canal	8,110	8,095	15	
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	156	157		1
Tennessee Valley Authority	14,280	14,117	163	
Virgin Islands Corporation	1,075	1,157		82
Total, excluding Department of Defense	86,381	85,657	830	106
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			724	
Department of Defense:				
Department of the Army:				
Inside the United States	[1] 136,910	[2] 138,347		1,437
Outside the United States	[1] 4,580	[2] 4,592		12
Department of the Navy:				
Inside the United States	195,537	196,974		1,437
Outside the United States	1,282	1,280	2	
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside the United States	132,621	133,327		706
Outside the United States	1,199	1,196	3	
Defense Supply Agency:				
Inside the United States	1,915	1,956		41
Total, Department of Defense	474,044	477,672	5	3,633
Net decrease, Department of Defense			3,628	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	560,425	563,329	835	3,739
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			2,904	

[1] Subject to revision. [2] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE V.—*Foreign nationals working under U.S. agencies overseas, excluded from tables I through IV of this report, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid, as of March 1963, and comparison with February 1963*

Country	Total		Army		Navy		Air Force	
	March	February	March	February	March	February	March	February
Canada	36	37					36	37
Crete	61	62					61	62
England	2,838	3,150			111	107	2,727	3,043
France	21,114	21,882	17,731	17,876	10	11	3,373	3,995
Germany	81,190	81,992	68,647	[1] 69,105	85	85	12,458	12,802
Greece	254	264					254	264
Greenland	136	138					136	138
Japan	51,819	51,909	18,433	18,507	14,379	14,266	19,007	19,136
Korea	6,205	6,224	6,205	6,224				
Morocco	2,204	2,231			763	763	1,441	1,468
Netherlands	51	56					51	56
Trinidad	555	557			555	557		
Total	166,463	168,502	111,016	111,712	15,903	15,789	39,544	41,001

[1] Revised on basis of later information.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

Executive agencies of the Federal Government reported civilian employment in the month of March totaling 2,485,738 as compared with 2,483,511 in February. This was a net increase of 2,227, including an increase of 2,826 in temporary employment under the public works acceleration program authorized by Public Law 87-658.

Civilian employment reported by the executive agencies of the Federal Government, by months in fiscal year 1963, which began July 1, 1962, follows:

Month	Employment	Increase	Decrease
1962—July	2,510,950	14,455	----------
August	2,512,199	1,249	----------
September	2,485,324	----------	26,875
October	2,482,982	----------	2,342
November	2,498,312	15,330	----------
December	2,486,628	----------	11,684
1963—January	2,477,940	----------	8,688
February	2,483,511	5,571	----------
March	2,485,738	2,227	----------

Total Federal employment in civilian agencies for the month of March was 1,429,054, an increase of 7,422 as compared with the February total of 1,421,632. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in March was 1,056,684, a decrease of 5,195 as compared with 1,061,879 in February.

Civilian agencies reporting the larger increases were Interior Department with 2,423, Agriculture Department with 1,646, and Post Office Department with 1,586. Increases in Agriculture and Interior Departments were largely seasonal.

In the Department of Defense the larger decreases in civilian employment were reported by the Army Department with 3,008, Air Force Department with 1,845, and Navy Department with 1,703.

Inside the U.S. civilian employment increased 2,026 and outside the U.S. civilian employment increased 201. Industrial employment by Federal agencies in March totaled 560,425, a decrease of 2,904.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies and compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

FOREIGN NATIONALS

The total of 2,485,738 civilian employees certified to the committee by Federal agencies in their regular monthly personnel reports includes some foreign nationals employed by U.S. Government activities abroad, but in addition to these there were 166,463 foreign nationals working for U.S. agencies overseas during March who were not counted in the usual personnel reports. The number in February was 168,502. A breakdown of this employment for March follows:

Country	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force
Canada	36	--------	--------	36
Crete	61	--------	--------	61
England	2,838	--------	111	2,727
France	21,114	17,731	10	3,373
Germany	81,190	68,647	85	12,458
Greece	254	--------	--------	254
Greenland	136	--------	--------	136
Japan	51,819	18,433	14,379	19,007
Korea	6,205	6,205	--------	--------
Morocco	2,204	--------	763	1,441
Netherlands	51	--------	--------	51
Trinidad	555	--------	555	--------
Total	166,463	111,016	15,903	39,544

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States, dated April 24, 1963, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Adm. Jerauld Wright, U.S. Navy, retired, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to China;

Chester Bowles, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to India;

E. Allan Lightner, Jr., of Maine, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the United Kingdom of Libya;

Aaron S. Brown, of New Hampshire, a Foreign Service officer, for promotion from class 1 to the class of career minister;

Henry A. Byroade, of Indiana, a Foreign Service officer, for promotion from class 1 to the class of career minister;

Fulton Freeman, of California, a Foreign Service officer, for promotion from class 1 to the class of career minister; and

Graham A. Martin, of Florida, a Foreign Service officer, for promotion from class 1 to the class of career minister.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in addition, I report sundry nominations which have previously appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In order to save the expense of printing them on the Executive Calendar, I ask that they lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nominations will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Alabama.

The nominations are as follows:

Bryan R. Frisbie, of California, and sundry other persons for appointment and promotion in the Foreign Service.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HILL:

S. 1395. A bill to expand and improve certain Federal programs providing assistance in the education of handicapped children; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. FONG:

S. 1396. A bill to consent to the institution of an original action in the Supreme Court for the adjudication of the claim of the State of Hawaii to certain land and property situated within that State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 1397. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, as amended;

S. 1398. A bill to promote safe driving, to eliminate the reckless and financially irresponsible driver from the highways, to provide for the indemnification of certain persons suffering injury or loss as a result of the operation of motor vehicles by uninsured motorists, and for other purposes;

S. 1399. A bill relating to overtime work performed by officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the U.S. Park Police force, or the White House Police force, and for other purposes;

S. 1400. A bill to amend section 13 of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, as amended;

S. 1401. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to acquire, construct, operate, and regulate a public off-street parking facility;

S. 1402. A bill to amend the Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, 1928, as amended, to exempt from licensing thereunder physicians employed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia;

S. 1403. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for commitments to, maintenance in, and discharges from, the District Training School, and for other purposes", approved March 3, 1925, as amended;

S. 1404. A bill to amend the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia, approved May 25, 1954, and for other purposes;

S. 1405. A bill to amend the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia; and

S. 1406. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Junior College Division within the District of Columbia Teachers College, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 1407. A bill for the relief of Rafael I. Fernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1408. A bill to amend section 312 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that leukemia developing a 10-percent degree of disability after separation from the service shall be considered to be service connected; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. McNAMARA (for himself, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. RANDOLPH):

S. 1409. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce and to provide for the restitution of wages lost by employees by reason of any such discrimination; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. McNAMARA when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HART (for Mr. HARTKE):

S. 1410. A bill for the relief of Pietro Maggio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND):

S. 1411. A bill to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish the Saint Augustine Quadricentennial Commission, and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1962 (76 Stat. 386), to provide that eight members of such Commission shall be appointed by the President and to authorize appropriations for carrying out the provisions of such joint resolution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 1412. A bill authorizing construction of a dam and reservoir on the Price River and its tributaries, Utah, in the interest of flood control and allied purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. MOSS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 1413. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from gross income certain gain from the sale of his personal residence by an individual who has attained age 55; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMATHERS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. INOUYE:

S. 1414. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Kam Oi Hu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 1415. A bill to provide maternity benefits for the spouses of persons called to active duty during the Berlin crisis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RANDOLPH (by request):

S. 1416. A bill to amend section 104(b) (5) of title 23, United States Code, to provide for the submission of certain cost estimates for the completion of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. RANDOLPH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE:

S. 1417. A bill to establish a U.S. Department of Transportation; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. INOUYE:

S. 1418. A bill to provide that the unincorporated territory of Guam shall be represented in Congress by a Territorial Deputy to the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KUCHEL:

S. 1419. A bill for the relief of Col. John T. Malloy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 1420. A bill for the relief of Susanna Moscato (Reverend Mother Charitas);

S. 1421. A bill for the relief of Ernesto Enzo Russo; and

S. 1422. A bill for the relief of Dr. Saul Hoffman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUCHEL:

S. 1423. A bill to prohibit the use of measuring devices to measure the work of an individual employee in the Postal Service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. KUCHEL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 1424. A bill to increase the combined rate of pay that certain retired officers of the United States may receive in retired pay from the United States and as compensation as civilian employees of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. MCCARTHY):

S. 1425. A bill to transfer in trust to the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, White Earth Indian Reservation, certain submarginal lands of the United States, and to make such lands parts of the reservation involved; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separte heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1426. A bill to assist voluntary nonprofit associations offering prepaid health service programs to secure necessary facilities and equipment through long-term, interest-bearing loans; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 1427. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, the Investment Company Act of 1940, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

S.J. Res. 74. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the week of May 26 to June 1, 1963, as "National Highway Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S.J. Res. 75. Joint resolution to direct the Interstate Commerce Commission to investigate the rate structure applicable to the shipment by railroad of grain in carload lots from the upper-midwest region of the United States; to the Committee on Commerce.

EQUAL PAY FOR EQUAL WORK, REGARDLESS OF SEX

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, Senators MORSE and RANDOLPH, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide equal pay for equal work, regardless of sex.

This bill amends the Fair Labor Standards Act to provide that payment of a discriminatory wage rate, where the discrimination is based on the sex of the employee, shall in the future be a violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

As we all know, the Fair Labor Standards Act provides that workers must be paid a decent minimum wage; that if employees must put in long hours, they must be paid at an overtime rate; and that children may only be employed under rigid conditions which protect their health and safety.

The bill I now introduce would add one additional fair labor standard to the act; namely, that employees doing equal work should be paid equal wages, regardless of sex.

This measure represents a great deal of thought and deliberation which has taken place since our consideration of S. 910, which I introduced earlier in this session.

Because of the long history and experience of Government and business and workers with the Fair Labor Standards Act, a simple expansion of that act to include the equal pay concept offers the most efficient and least difficult course of action.

The Fair Labor Standards Act has been on our statute books now for almost a quarter of a century.

Over that time the Department of Labor, which has the responsibility for enforcement of the act, has developed a now familiar system of regulations and procedures for investigation, administration and enforcement, which will be utilized fully to complement the new provisions.

Such a utilization serves two purposes: First, it eliminates the need for a new bureaucratic structure to enforce equal pay legislation. And second, compliance should be made easier because of both industry and labor's long-established familiarity with existing fair labor standards provisions.

Perhaps the most worthy result in this approach is in the question of coverage. This bill neither extends nor curtails coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act but simply provides that those employers and/or employees who are presently covered by that act shall be covered by the new provisions relating to equal pay for equal work, regardless of sex.

Mr. President, it is the intention of the Senate Labor Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, to give this bill thorough and speedy consideration when we meet next Monday, May 6.

I am hopeful that it will soon be before this body for approval and I am confident that it will be so approved.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1409) to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce and to provide for the restitution of wages lost by employees by reason of any such discrimination, introduced by Mr. McNAMARA (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

MULTIPLE-PURPOSE DAM ON PRICE RIVER

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I am today introducing a bill to authorize the construction of a multiple-purpose dam and reservoir on the Price River and its tributaries in the interest of water supply, flood control, and allied purposes.

An extensive study of this region is now underway by the Corps of Engineers of the U.S. Army. I shall do what I can to see that the study is expedited so that we will have full information on feasibility and benefits on which to act at the earliest possible date.

Flooding on the Price River and its tributaries, notably Willow Creek, has been a problem in Carbon County, Utah, for some years. In 1961, at the request of the Price River Water Improvement District, I asked the Corps of Engineers to investigate the possible construction of a flood-control structure on Willow Creek, which joins the Price River at or near the southern limits of the town of Castle Gate. At the junction there is a narrow canyon, in which is located the Carbon plant of the Utah Power & Light Co., constructed at a cost of $32 million and also there is the main line, as well as the Castle Gate switching yard, of the Denver and Rio Grande Western Railroad. Utah Highway 33 also crosses the creek and railroad at this point.

Most of the worst floods on the Price River have originated on this tributary, and upstream flood control works are a must if the structures, improvements and cities lying downstream are to be protected. They have been jeopardized time and again.

During the course of that first investigation by the Corps of Engineers, it developed that local interests were interested in a multiple-purpose dam and reservoir, which would encompass not only flood control, but water supply, water conservation, and recreation, and would make the best total use of the area's water resources. After representatives of the corps inspected two potential sites on the Price River about 5 and 7 miles upstream from the mouth of Willow Creek, and it appeared that the high cost of storage at both of these sites would exceed the benefits, and that neither project could be economically justified. The corps reported, however, that flood control improvements at Castle Gate appeared to be economically justified and further studies were warranted.

I was not satisfied with writing off Price River and Willow Creek protection at these sites, however, and was successful in getting $20,000 written into the fiscal year 1963 budget to undertake more detailed investigations. These investigations included a public hearing at Price on December 13, 1962, at which time local interests again urged improvements on Willow Creek for flood control and to protect a game bird farm along the Price River near Carbondale, but put even greater emphasis on the development of municipal and industrial water supplies. Three possible reservoir sites were suggested.

The scope of the investigation must, therefore, be widened, which will take both more time and more money. I am ready to seek adequate financing at the proper time and when facts are available.

Information acquired by the Corps of Engineers from other Federal agencies and the preliminary analysis by the Los Angeles district office of the Corps of Engineers indicate that a small amount of firm water supply could be developed at Willow Creek, but that the operation should be integrated with other projects in the area, including the existing Schofield Reservoir, which is operated by the Bureau of Reclamation, and the proposed watershed work plan for the North Sanpete Watershed.

Because of the expanded scope of the project, it will be impossible to complete the feasibility study by June of this year as previously planned. But the new schedule must be accelerated. I am introducing this bill today as a way of showing my determination to step up full water development for Carbon County. I shall press for a multiple-purpose dam on the Price River, or one of its tributaries, at the earliest moment possible. To do this we must develop rapidly the information needed to permit sound action.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1412) authorizing construction of a dam and reservoir on the Price River and its tributaries, Utah, in the interest of flood control and allied purposes, introduced by Mr. Moss, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE TO EXCLUDE FROM GROSS INCOME CERTAIN GAIN FROM SALE OF A RESIDENCE

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, which would exclude from gross income certain gain from the sale of a personal residence by an individual who has lived in such residence for a period of 5 years or more, and who has attained the age of 55.

Under the provisions of the bill, the gain on the top sale price of $35,000 would be exempt from the capital gains tax under existing law provided the individual is at least 55 and has lived in such residence for a period of 5 years or more.

It would work in the following way with respect to sales of property in excess of $35,000.

For example, if the house sold for $50,000, thirty-five fiftieths or seven-tenths of the gain realized would be exempt from the capital gains tax. The bill provides that this relief could only be exercised once by an individual or a couple in a lifetime. By limiting the privilege the possibility of utilizing this right for speculative purposes is eliminated.

There is a real need for this legislation because it would permit senior citizens who find themselves after raising their families with large homes in a position of making it difficult for them to sell by virtue of the capital gains tax they would be required to pay under existing law.

Much of their lifetime savings is represented by home ownership, and in their retirement years their income is substantially reduced making it necessary to exercise economy to a far greater extent than they heretofore practiced. In my opinion, these savings reflected in their present home ownership should be exempt from tax and utilized by them for retirement purposes.

Testimony taken in all parts of the country by the Senate Special Committee on Aging, of which I am now chairman, indicates this to be one area in which there is indisputable need for legislative action. Senior citizens should be encouraged to sell the big house which has sheltered a family of children during their younger years, and which now provides a home for only a couple. This should be accomplished as many years as possible before it becomes an absolute necessity. In this way they would be encouraged to choose a smaller home in a neighborhood suitable for their retirement purposes.

The enactment of this legislation would, in my opinion, bring on the market at a very good time larger homes needed for growing families. At the same time it would provide a financial stimulus for the owners of such houses who undoubtedly would find it difficult to maintain in retirement years.

Smaller homes for elderly couples are much more in line with their physical ability and financial need.

Mr. President, I sincerely trust that the Congress will act promptly and favorably on this legislation so vitally essential to the senior citizens of this Nation, who are already suffering economic difficulties due to the plight in which they find themselves by virtue of fixed incomes and the high costs of living.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1413) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from gross income certain gain from the sale of his personal residence by an individual who has attained age 55, introduced by Mr. Smathers, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO SUBMISSION OF CERTAIN COST ESTIMATES FOR COMPLETION OF NATIONAL SYSTEM OF INTERSTATE AND DEFENSE HIGHWAYS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill relating to the submission of certain cost estimates for the completion of the national system of interstate and defense highways. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a letter from the Secretary of Commerce, and a letter from the chief clerk and staff director of the Committee on Public Works, relating to the bill, be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and without objection, the bill and letters will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1416) to amend section 104(b)(5) of title 23, United States Code, to provide for the submission of certain cost estimates for the completion of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Randolph, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first and second sentences of subsection (b)(5) of section 104 of title 23, United States Code, are deleted and there is hereby inserted in lieu thereof the following:

"(5) For the Interstate System for the fiscal years 1960 through 1971:

"In the ratio which the estimated cost of completing the Interstate System in such State, as determined and approved in the manner provided in this paragraph, or the Federal share thereof, bears to the sum of the estimated cost of completing the Interstate System in all of the States, or the Federal share thereof. Each apportionment herein authorized for the fiscal years 1960 through 1971, inclusive, shall be made on a date as far in advance of the beginning of the fiscal year for which authorized as practicable but in no case more than eighteen months prior to the beginning of the fiscal year for which authorized."

Sec. 2. The eighth and ninth sentences of such subsection are deleted and there is hereby inserted in lieu thereof the following: "The Secretary shall make a revised estimate of the cost of completing the then designated Interstate System, after taking into account all previous apportionments made under this section, in the same manner as stated above, and transmit the same to the Senate and the House of Representatives within ten days subsequent to January 2, 1965. Upon the approval of such estimate by the Congress, the Secretary shall use the Federal share of such approved estimate in making apportionments for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1967, June 30, 1968, June 30, 1969, and June 30, 1970. The Secretary shall make a revised estimate of the cost of completing the then designated Interstate System, after taking into account all previous apportionments made under this section, in the same manner as stated above, and transmit the same to the Senate and the House of

Representatives within ten days subsequent to January 2, 1969. Upon the approval by the Congress, the Secretary shall use the Federal share of such approved estimate in making apportionments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971."

The letters presented by Mr. Randolph are as follows:

The Secretary of Commerce,
Washington, D.C. April 19, 1963.

Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: The Department of Commerce has prepared and submits herewith as a part of its legislative program for the 88th Congress, 1st session, a draft of a proposed bill "To amend section 104(b)(5) of title 23, United States Code, to provide for the submission of certain cost estimates for the completion of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways and for other purposes."

Section 104(b)(5) of title 23, United States Code, provides for the apportionment of Interstate System funds for the fiscal years 1960 through 1969 on the basis of periodic estimates of the cost of completing the Interstate System prepared by the Secretary of Commerce in cooperation with the respective State highway departments. The following provision is made for apportioning Interstate System funds for the fiscal years 1967, 1968, and 1969:

"The Secretary (of Commerce) shall make a revised estimate of the cost of completing the then designated Interstate System * * * and transmit the same to the Senate and the House of Representatives within 10 days subsequent to January 2, 1966, and annually thereafter through and including January 2, 1968. Upon approval of any such estimate by the Congress by concurrent resolution, the Secretary shall use such approved estimate in making apportionments for the fiscal year which begins next following the fiscal year in which such report is transmitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives."

Under this provision, Interstate System funds for the fiscal years 1967, 1968, and 1969 are to be apportioned on the basis of cost estimates transmitted to the Congress for approval within 10 days after January 2, 1966, and annually thereafter through and including January 2, 1968. However, section 104(e) of title 23 requires the Secretary of Commerce to certify to each of the State highway departments the sums apportioned for the fiscal years 1967, 1968, and 1969, on or before January 1, 1966, 1967, and 1968, respectively. Therefore, with respect to the fiscal year 1967, 1968 and 1969 apportionments of Interstate System funds, it will not be possible for the Secretary to comply with the requirements of section 104(e) because at the time he is required to certify apportionments to the States, the estimates upon which the apportionments are to be based will not yet have been approved by the Congress.

In addition, section 103 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1961 (75 Stat. 122) authorized the appropriation of funds for the Interstate System for the fiscal years 1970 and 1971. No provision was made, however, for apportioning such funds on the basis of cost estimates already provided for under the law or on the basis of an additional or final estimate for completing the system. It is considered essential that legislation be enacted in this session of the 88th Congress providing for the submission of the next cost estimate for completing the Interstate System in January of 1965 rather than in 1966 as now prescribed by the law. The preparation of such a comprehensive estimate must be commenced at least a year, and preferably more, in advance of the time of submission of the report to the Congress. If such legislation is enacted, an estimate submitted in January 1965, would be the basis, after congressional approval, for the apportionment of funds for the fiscal year 1967, which normally would be made in the summer of 1965. It is considered desirable that such estimate also be used as the basis for apportioning funds authorized for the fiscal years 1968, 1969, and 1970, rather than requiring cost estimates to be made annually through 1968 as is the case under existing law. A final cost estimate should be submitted in January 1969, to serve as the basis, after congressional approval, for the apportionment of funds authorized for the fiscal year 1971, which would normally be made in the summer of 1969, and would constitute the final apportionment of Interstate funds authorized by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1961.

It is recommended also that the apportionments of interstate funds authorized for the fiscal years 1967 through 1971 be based on estimates of the Federal share instead of the total cost to complete the then designated system. If the State apportionment factors developed by the 1965 estimate and the final estimate are based on the Federal share of the completion cost in the several States, rather than on the total cost including the States share, the apportionments based on such estimates will correct any imbalances which may have previously occurred in apportionments to the States due principally to the fact that the Federal share of the cost of Interstate System projects is not the same in all States because of the sliding scale provisions of 23 U.S.C. section 120(c) applicable to public lands States. This recommendation is in accord with the comments of the Comptroller General in his report to the Congress of the United States dated August 15, 1962, entitled "Review of Apportionments of Federal-aid Highway Funds, Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, for Fiscal Years 1956–63," as follows:

"It appears that changing the basis for apportionment of interstate funds from the total estimated cost of completing the Interstate System in the respective States to the Federal share of such cost would result in more nearly achieving the desired objectives of making available to each State the amount of Federal funds needed to complete the Interstate System and bringing about the simultaneous completion of the system in all States."

* * * * *

"The Congress may wish to consider amending section 104(b)(5) of title 23, United States Code, to provide for the apportionment of Interstate System funds on the basis of the Federal share of the estimated cost of completing the Interstate System in the several States."

The enclosed draft legislation will accomplish the objectives set forth herein and is recommended for the favorable consideration of the Congress.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there would be no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

Luther H. Hodges,
Secretary of Commerce.

U.S. Senate,
Committee on Public Works,
April 26, 1963.

To: Mr. Ron M. Linton, chief clerk and staff director.

From: Mr. John L. Mutz, professional staff member.

Subject: Analysis of amendments proposed by Secretary of Commerce to highway acts.

The 1956 Highway Act provided that interstate apportionments be made to the respective States, for fiscal years 1960 through 1969, in the ratio which the estimated cost of completing the Interstate System in each State bears to the sum of the estimated cost of completing the entire system.

The 1956 act provided that a new estimate of cost of completing the Interstate System should be prepared and submitted to Congress by January 12, 1958. Upon approval by Congress, this was used as the basis for apportionments, in the ratio as described above, for fiscal years 1960, 1961, and 1962.

The 1956 act provided that a new estimate of cost of completing the Interstate System should be prepared and submitted to Congress by January 12, 1962. Upon approval by Congress, this was to be used as the basis for apportionments, in the ratio as described above, for fiscal years 1963, 1964, 1965, and 1966. In 1958 the Congress directed that the estimate of cost scheduled for January 12, 1962, be submitted by January 12, 1961. This was done because the apportionments to States should be made at least 12 months in advance of the beginning of the fiscal year for which funds are authorized. For example the apportionments for fiscal year 1963 needed to be made by July 1961. If the date for submission of the report were left at January 12, 1962, there would only be about 5 months before the beginning of the fiscal year for which they would be used as the basis for making the apportionments of funds to the States. In addition the law provides that "On or before January 1, preceding the commencement of each fiscal year, the Secretary of Commerce shall certify to each of the State highway departments that sums which he has apportioned to each State for such fiscal year * * *." This requirement coupled with the data of submission of reports created a situation which was impossible to solve.

Inasmuch as the 1958 amendment to the Highway Act dealt only with the January 12, 1962 report, it is necessary for the same reason as described above to change the date of submission from January 12, 1966 to January 12, 1965 for approval of cost estimates and apportionments for fiscal year 1967.

The 1956 act assumed that the last apportionment would be made for fiscal year 1969 and accordingly provided that in addition to the January 12, 1966 report there would be submitted reports on January 12, 1967 and January 12, 1968. In the 1961 act it was recognized that the time for completion of the Interstate System needed to be extended and that the final apportionment would be made for fiscal year 1971. However, the technicality of report submission was not dealt with.

The Secretary of Commerce is now suggesting (1) that the January 12, 1966 reporting date be advanced to January 12, 1965 for apportionments for 1967 and that the report serve also for 1968, 1969, and 1970 apportionments; (2) amend the present law to provide for apportionments up to fiscal year 1971; and (3) provide for the submission of a report in January 1969 to serve as the basis for the apportionment of funds for the fiscal year 1971. This would constitute the final apportionment of funds authorized by the 1961 act. The Secretary also suggests language which would limit the apportionments to States to the Federal share so that any imbalances in any previous apportionments can be corrected and bring about simultaneous completion of the Interstate System in all States.

MASS TRANSPORTATION

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill to establish a U.S. Department of Transportation, and ask that it be appropriately referred.

A few weeks ago, the Senate wisely approved a bill to grant assistance for the preservation and extension of urban mass transportation facilities. Important as this step is, we are far from out of the woods in solving the critical mass transit problems of metropolitan areas. For unless the sickness of the transportation industry as a whole can be cured, there is not likely to be any long-range solution to the rehabilitation of these services in urban areas.

For this reason, I am reintroducing my bill to create a Department of Transportation at Cabinet level.

In his last budget message in office, President Eisenhower endorsed this proposal. The Commerce Department study on transportation submitted to the former President concluded:

> National transportation is presently out of balance. It is less a national system than a loose grouping of individual industries. We have built vast networks of highways, railways, inland waterways and seaports, airways and airports, and pipelines with little attention to conflict among these expanding networks.

Today the Federal Government expends billions of dollars in the construction of highway programs, from farm-to-market roads to giant highways of the Interstate System, linking all our major cities. The Government promotes airport construction and has prime responsibility for air navigaton. It dredges and develops our rivers and harbors, and after it spends hundreds of millions in these programs, it spends additional hundreds of millions to maintain these port facilities. It administers airline and merchant marine subsidies.

Few, if any, of these Federal programs help the railroads. In fact, some of these programs increase the railroads' difficulties in competing with other forms of transportation. All in all, the Federal Government today is pursuing a variety of programs, designed to regulate, subsidize and promote various forms of transportation, and it spends billions of the taxpayers' dollars doing it—or trying to do it.

But there is little, if any, coordination among these programs. Some modes of transportation, for example, are regulated and some are not. Some forms are subsidized and some are not. The fortunes of some kinds of transportation are promoted effectively and some are not. There is constant competition for the tax dollar. There are inequalities in the size and kind of subsidy accorded different carriers. The component parts of the system are not developed as a whole. The public is not served to the extent it might be because of this patchwork of regulations and subsidies which helps to prevent the development of the best in each transportation system.

To administer these highway, airway, waterway, and a variety of other programs, a number of Federal agencies have sprung up. None is concerned with the needs of the other. Each has its own promotional job to do. Each tends to serve as special counsel and advocate for its own kind of transportation.

The more the public pays in subsidies, real and hidden, the more confused the objectives seem to be.

Nowhere in the executive branch of the Federal Government today is there centered the responsibility for formulating transportation policy.

We must develop a coherent and modern system out of the present unstable conglomeration of diverse and unrelated transportation systems. Short of this, we will likely fail to meet such specific problems as the maintenance of essential rail passenger service. Only in a coherent framework can the development of a truly national transportation policy result—a framework within which we will be able to keep all our transportation systems in balance and capable of functioning effectively.

Because I believe we are falling short of this mark today, I am reintroducing the bill to create a single Federal transportation agency.

My bill puts diverse functions of our scattered Federal agencies together under one roof—under a separate Department of Transportation. Accordingly, I would transfer to the new Department headed by a Secretary of Transportation the functions of the Federal Aviation Agency, the Maritime Board, the Maritime Administration, the Bureau of Public Roads, and certain other agencies with obviously related roles and missions.

At the same time, I believe that the regulatory commissions, where possible and appropriate, should be left with the issue of regulation alone. Accordingly, because many of the functions allocated to the regulatory agencies today have become intertwined, the bill directs the Secretary of Transportation to make a complete report of his study and recommendations to the President and Congress so that we would have his expert judgment as to just which nonregulatory functions should be transferred by law to him.

The purpose would be to transfer promotional and administrative functions of the regulatory commissions to the new Department. Thus, the Interstate Commerce Commission would need not administer railroad loan and safety programs as it does today. The Civil Aeronautics Board need not concern itself with discovering new types of subsidy to grant air carriers, but would leave it to the new Secretary to determine what, in the overall transportation interest, should be subsidized and to what extent.

The bill also directs the Secretary to make recommendations with respect to which activities of other agencies, for example, the Army Corps of Engineers, should be transferred to the new Department. The Engineers promote river and harbor projects. There is no fixed policy at present on the imposition of user charges or greater local participation in the cost of a navigation project.

This is the kind of question that should be looked at from an overall point of view in terms of the effect of such policies, not only on water carriers, but other competing modes of transportation.

I believe this bill provides a logical approach to the objective. The Rockefeller brothers report, and later Governor Rockefeller himself, the Hoover Commission task force, and the report of the advisory group to the Senate Commerce Committee, known as the Doyle report, have strongly supported the concept of a single transportation agency.

The people of my State have a special stake in this matter. For we will fail, in the long run, to reach our objective for maintaining essential rail passenger service unless we delevop the means for providing an economically balanced transportation system.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1417) to establish a U.S. Department of Transportation, introduced by Mr. CASE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Department of Transportation Act of 1963".

ESTABLISHMENT

SEC. 2. There is hereby established an executive department of the Government to be known as the United States Department of Transportation (hereinafter referred to as the "Department"), at the head of which shall be a Secretary of Transportation (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary"), who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at the rate provided by law for heads of the executive departments.

UNDER SECRETARY AND ASSISTANT SECRETARIES

SEC. 3. There shall be in the Department an Under Secretary of Transportation, such Assistant Secretaries as shall be determined by the President to be necessary, and a General Counsel, each of whom shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall perform such functions and duties as the Secretary may prescribe, and shall receive compensation at the rate provided by law for under secretaries (other than the Under Secretary of the Department of State), assistant secretaries, and general counsels, respectively, of the executive departments. The Under Secretary (or, during the absence or disability of the Under Secretary, or in the event of a vacancy in the office of the Under Secretary, an Assistant Secretary determined according to such order as the Secretary shall prescribe) shall act as Secretary during the absence or disability of the Secretary or in the event of a vacancy in the office of Secretary.

PROVISIONS OF LAW APPLICABLE TO THE DEPARTMENT

SEC. 4. Except to the extent inconsistent with this Act, all provisions of law applicable to the executive departments generally shall apply to the Department.

SEAL

SEC. 5. The Secretary shall cause a seal of office to be made for the Department, of such design as the President shall approve, and judicial notice shall be taken thereof.

DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY

SEC. 6. The Secretary may, without being relieved of his responsibility therefor, and unless prohibited by some specific provision of law, perform any function vested in him through or with the aid of such officials or organizational entities of the Department as he may designate.

TRANSFERS FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

SEC. 7. (a) The Federal Maritime Board is transferred to the Department and all functions of the Secretary of Commerce with respect to such board are transferred to the Secretary.

(b) The Maritime Administration is transferred to the Department and all functions of the Secretary of Commerce being administered through such Administration are transferred to the Secretary.

(c) The Bureau of Public Roads is transferred to the Department and all functions of the Secretary of Commerce being administered through such bureau are transferred to the Secretary.

(d) The Defense Air Transportation Administration is transferred to the Department and all functions of the Secretary of Commerce being administered through such Administration are transferred to the Secretary.

(e) All officers and other personnel, property, records, obligations, commitments, and unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, and other funds, which the Director of the Bureau of the Budget determines are used primarily in relation to any board, administration, bureau, or function transferred under the provisions of this section, are transferred to the Department.

(f) The office of Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation in the Department of Commerce is abolished.

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

SEC. 8. The Federal Aviation Agency, together with its personnel, property, records, obligations, commitments, and the unexpended balances of its appropriations, is transferred to the Department where the Administrator of such agency shall exercise his functions subject to the supervision and direction of the Secretary.

STUDY AND RECOMMENDATIONS WITH RESPECT TO FURTHER TRANSFERS TO THE DEPARTMENT

SEC. 9. (a) For the purpose of determining and making recommendations with respect to which functions of the various departments and agencies of the Federal Government with respect to transportation are administrative, promotional, or nonregulatory in nature, in order that all such functions may be transferred by law to the Secretary to be exercised in a coordinated manner, the Secretary shall make an investigation and study of the functions of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and such other departments and agencies of the Government as he deems appropriate to carry out the purpose of this section. The Secretary shall make a complete report of his study and recommendations under the provisions of this section to the President and the Congress not later than January 31, 1962.

(b) All departments and agencies of the Federal Government shall provide the Secretary with such information as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

TRANSFER MATTERS

SEC. 10. All laws relating to any agency or function transferred under this Act shall, insofar as such laws are not inapplicable, remain in full force and effect. Any transfer of personnel pursuant to this Act shall be without change in classification or compensation, except that his requirement shall not operate to prevent the adjustment of classification or compensation to conform to the duties to which such transferred personnel may be assigned. All orders, rules, regulations, permits, or other privileges made, issued, or granted by any agency or in connection with any functions transferred by this Act, and in effect at the time of the transfer, shall continue in effect to the same extent as if such transfer had not occurred, until modified, superseded, or repealed. No suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against any agency or any officer of the United States acting in his official capacity shall abate by reason of any transfer made pursuant to this Act; but the court, on motion or supplemental petition filed at any time within twelve months after such transfer takes effect, showing a necessity for a survival of such suit, action, or other proceeding to obtain a settlement of the questions involved, may allow the same to be maintained by or against the appropriate agency or officer of the United States.

EXPENDITURES AUTHORIZED

SEC. 11. The Secretary is authorized to make such expenditures (including expenditures for personal services and rent at the seat of government and elsewhere, for lawbooks, books of reference and periodicals, and for printing and binding) as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, and as may be provided for by the Congress from time to time.

REPORTS TO CONGRESS

SEC. 12. The Secretary shall make at the close of each fiscal year a report in writing to Congress giving an account of all moneys received and disbursed by him and the Department, describing the work done by the Department, and making such recommendations as he shall deem necessary for the effective performance of the duties and purposes of the Department.

AMENDMENT

SEC. 13. Section 158 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (5 U.S.C. 1), is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"Eleventh: The Department of Transportation."

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 14. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to enable the Department to carry out the provisions of this Act and to perform any other duties which may be imposed upon it by law.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 15. The provisions of this title shall be effective on the date of enactment of this Act except that sections 7 and 8 shall be effective after ninety days following such date of enactment.

END MEANINGLESS WORK MEASUREMENT IN THE POST OFFICE

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the elimination of the Post Office Department work measurement system, as it concerns the individual post office clerk who distributes mail.

I have been in receipt of many communications from postal clerks in my State, and from their local organizations, over quite some period of time, all of them in opposition to the individual guidelines in the postal service. These communications contend that the guidelines under the work measurement system in the postal service are a speedup system, and that it is affecting individual employees adversely.

They have stated that the guidelines, or the work measurement system, makes no provision for fatigue or for disabled veterans or older clerks; that there is not an accurate count of mail, inasmuch as it has been found that there can be as high as a 250-piece variation in 2 feet of mail. They further contend that this system has brought about nervousness and a great deal of tension among postal clerks. All of this, they advise, is causing dissension and poor management-employee relations.

On the other hand, the Post Office Department has contended in public statements that if the work measurement system, or guidelines system was done away with, it would be necessary for the Department to ask for an additional appropriation of approximately $100 million. They do not, however, explain this; so far it is just a statement. They also claim that this system works no hardship upon the individual employee; that there is no counseling, or penalization.

The bill I am introducing is not a "meat ax" approach. It is a bill to eliminate the guidelines, or work measurement, as they concern an individual employee only. It will not, as far as I can see, prohibit the measurement of the amount of mail by the Post Office Department on the unit basis, or the overall basis within a post office.

I feel, if this bill is passed by the Congress, it will not in any manner hinder the Post Office Department in their effort to acquire the necessary knowledge concerning the amount of mail and the movement of mail within the post office.

In any event, there is considerable controversy among postal employees concerning the operation of the work measurement system, and in view of the fact that this controversy does exist I feel that consideration should be given to legislation such as this for the purpose of determining the true facts. And, for that reason, I am introducing this legislation and I am hopeful that there will be early hearings by the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for the purpose of making the necessary recommendations to the Senate concerning this system.

Mr. President, I ask consent that the bill I have just introduced be printed at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1423) to prohibit the use of measuring devices to measure the work of an individual employee in the Postal Service, introduced by Mr. KUCHEL, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That hereafter no Post Office Department official, Postal Field Service supervisory official, or other persons shall be permitted to use a timing or measuring device to make a time study, or use any weighing or measuring device through such mediums as work measurement programs, guidelines, work performance standards operation, or any other method to measure the amount of mail distributed by an individual post office clerk for the purpose of determining his efficiency or for other purposes.

TRANSFER OF RESETTLEMENT LANDS TO MINNESOTA CHIPPEWA TRIBE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], a bill to transfer in trust to the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, White Earth Indian Reservation, some submarginal lands of the United States, and to make such lands parts of the Chippewa Reservation. I ask that this bill be referred to the appropriate committee.

An overall economic development plan for the White Earth Reservation has been approved by the Department of Commerce. The plan is based on the assumption that this submarginal or so-called resettlement lands will be transferred to the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe. The tribe is obviously reluctant to invest funds in submarginal lands to which it does not hold title.

The Minnesota Chippewa Tribe is currently engaged in a most commendatory drive to improve the economic and educational opportunities available to tribal members. As the president of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, Allen Wilson, recently explained to me, the transfer of these resettlement lands is an important factor in the success of this overall effort. I am indeed hopeful that Congress will give prompt and favorable consideration to this legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1425) to transfer in trust to the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, White Earth Indian Reservation, certain submarginal lands of the United States, and to make such lands parts of the reservation involved; introduced by Mr. Humphrey (for himself and Mr. McCarthy), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

HEALTH SERVICES FACILITIES ACT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in this age of scientific miracles, the strides that are being made in medicine are phenomenal. Thanks to the wonders of modern medicine, we can look forward to healthier and longer lives. Each day brings new triumphs in medicine. We are indebted to the dedicated physicians and those in related fields who are doing so much to win the battle against illness and disease.

The great strides being made in the field of medicine have given rise to new and complex problems. One of these problems is the heavy financial costs of modern medicine. The new medical techniques and equipment necessarily mean a steep rise in medical costs. This is a problem with which we are all only too familiar. This is a problem not only for those receiving medical treatment but for hospitals and physicians as well.

This high cost of modern medicine is being acutely felt in the more sparsely populated areas of our country. The days of the horse-and-buggy doctor are now a thing of the past. Today's physician, to do his job properly, requires an up-to-date medical office, equipment and laboratory facilities. All too often our smaller communities do not have such facilities and, as a result, quite understandably few of our graduating physicians desire to practice in such areas. It is only natural that they would prefer to establish a practice in metropolitan centers where the necessary medical equipment and facilities are readily available.

The formation of voluntary nonprofit associations which offer prepaid health service programs has become one excellent way of attracting young physicians to smaller communities and a means of keeping them there. Through such associations it is possible to construct necessary modern medical facilities equipped with up-to-date equipment which today's physicians require. These associations through obtaining a community pool of funds, derived from prepayments, also assure an adequate income to the participating physicians regardless of the dips and rises in the local economy.

Over 10 years ago President Truman's Commission on the Health Needs of the Nation recommended as follows:

> Federal loans be made to local organizations desiring to institute prepayment plans associated with group practice, for the purpose of encouraging the establishment of group practice facilities.

In the past several Congresses I have introduced legislation in accord with this recommendation. Today I again offer this bill entitled the "Health Services Facilities Act."

This legislation provides that if a group of people in a community with inadequate health facilities form a voluntary health plan organization and are prepared to assume related financial responsibilities, they may apply for low-interest, long-term loans from the Federal Government to enable them to finance the facilities which their community requires.

I emphasize, Mr. President, that my bill provides for loans—not grants—to these voluntary health associations. The funds will be repaid to the Federal Treasury with interest. In my opinion, this represents a sound and wise investment.

The best alternative to increasing Government control of the practice of medicine is to insure adequate medical facilities to every segment of the American population, residents of smaller communities as well as city dwellers. I strongly believe that the encouragement of private, local, and voluntary citizen health associations will meet a definite need that currently exists throughout the United States.

In past years this legislation has been supported by the Group Health Association of America, the American Public Health Association, and the AFL–CIO, among others.

I understand that a similar bill drafted by the administration may be introduced if the heavy work schedule of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare permits. I have advocated such legislation for many years and I sincerely hope that it will be possible to consider such legislation in the 88th Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the Health Services Facilities Act be printed at this point in the Record. I also ask unanimous consent that the bill remain at the desk for an additional 3 days so that other Senators who wish to consponsor this bill may do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record, and will lie on the desk as requested by the Senator from Minnesota.

The bill (S. 1426) to assist voluntary nonprofit associations offering prepaid health service programs to secure necessary facilities and equipment through long-term, interest-bearing loans, introduced by Mr. Humphrey, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act be cited as the "Health Services Facilities Act."

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

Sec. 2. It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to encourage people in the United States who undertake solution of their common problems through voluntary action at the local community level. The Congress finds that one common problem is that of developing means and methods whereby the people can create for themselves and their communities such health service facilities as will help make available to them the benefits of modern medical science.

The Congress further finds that in many areas of the country there have been or might readily be formed nonprofit associations for the purpose of enabling the membership or subscribers of such associations to adequately compensate professional medical personnel and to prepay in an orderly manner the cost of efficiently organized, modern medical care. It is recognized, however, that in many instances, particularly in rural areas, such associations, while financially able to maintain or arrange for the operation of such nonprofit medical service plans, do not have access to resources sufficient to provide the capital funds needed for the construction or acquisition of the physical facilities and equipment necessary for the provision of such care. Proper facilities and adequate equipment are essential to the economic operation of such programs, to render effective care, and to attract a sufficient number of professional personnel. It is therefore declared to be the purpose of this Act to provide long-term loans at reasonable rates of interest to such associations which demonstrate their readiness and ability to maintain such voluntary associations.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION

Sec. 3. In order to carry out the purposes of this Act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, the sum of $10,000,000 and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, the sum of $10,000,000 and for each of the next three succeeding fiscal years such sums as may be necessary.

LOANS FOR HEALTH-SERVICE FACILITIES

Sec. 4. To the extent that funds are available, the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service is authorized and directed to make loans in amounts not to exceed 90 per centum of the cost of acquisition, construction, and equipping of health-service facilities incident to the operation of a health-service program to nonprofit associations which submit to the Surgeon General satisfactory evidence—

(a) of local interest in and financial support for the successful operation of its prepaid health-service program, and such financial support shall be in an amount of not less than 10 per centum of said cost;

(b) of an organizational structure which vests control over professional services in connection with the health-service program solely in the professional personnel;

(c) of an organizational structure which vests control over the general administration of the association's operations in a governing board, a majority of whose members shall be persons who do not themselves furnish, or represent other persons that furnish, health services;

(d) that its methods of compensation will be on a basis mutually satisfactory to the professional personnel and to the governing board of the plan;

(e) that in cases of emergency the facilities and services of the plan shall be available to any resident of the community, provided that the association shall be entitled to require compensation on a fair and reasonable basis for all such utilization of its facilities or services.

RULES AND REGULATIONS

Sec. 5. In carrying out the purposes of this Act, the Surgeon General shall, with the approval of the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, formulate rules and regulations for the making of loans to eligible associations. Such rules and regulations shall provide equitably for—

(a) determination by the Surgeon General that the applicant is an association which accords with the requirements of section 4 of this Act;

(b) determination by the Surgeon General that the facilities planned are adequate and suitable for carrying out the purposes of the association;

(c) determination of priorities for the making of loans to eligible applicants in accordance with a formula to be developed by the Surgeon General, which formula shall include, among other factors, the degree to which the plan provides for comprehensive medical care including preventive as well as curative treatment, the group practice of medicine, and sound method of repayment; and the Surgeon General shall, to the extent possible in determining priorities, attempt to bring about an equitable distribution of funds in the various geographic regions of the country.

TERMS OF LOANS

Sec. 6. (a) Loans shall be made in an amount not in excess of 90 per centum of the total cost of facilities and equipment.

(b) Each loan shall bear interest at the rate arrived at by adding one-quarter of 1 per centum per annum to the rate which the Secretary of the Treasury determines to be not more than the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt as computed at the end of the fiscal year next preceding the issuance of such loans and by adjusting the result so obtained to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum.

(c) No loan may be made for a period exceeding twenty-five years.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Sec. 7. At the request of groups operating health service plans which have received financial assistance under this Act or at the request of responsible groups contemplating the organization of such a plan with such assistance, the Surgeon General may provide technical assistance in making needed surveys and in advising on organizational methods, facilities planning, and operating procedures. The Surgeon General may expend for such assistance and for Federal administration of this Act not to exceed 10 per centum annually of the appropriations made to carry out the provisions of this Act.

ADMINISTRATION

Sec. 8. The Surgeon General shall carry out his functions as provided herein under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. In carrying out his functions, the Surgeon General is authorized pursuant to agreement between the Secretary and the head of any Federal agency to utilize the services and facilities of such agency and to pay therefor either in advance or by way of reimbursement as may be provided in such agreement.

ANALYSES AND REPORTS

Sec. 9. The Surgeon General shall make periodic, comparative analysis of the operations of health service plans and shall transmit reports thereon to such plans and to interested organizations, and shall furnish to Congress at the beginning of each regular session a full report of the administration of this Act.

DEFINITION

Sec. 10. For the purposes of this Act—

(a) the term "health service" means services provided by physicians and related professional groups, laboratory and X-ray services, and other services related thereto;

(b) the term "States" include Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia.

(c) the term "nonprofit association" shall include such subsidiary corporations as may be required or desirable for ownership and operation of facilities.

EFFECTIVE DATE

Sec. 11. The effective date of this Act shall be the date of its enactment.

ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY TO REGULATE CERTAIN SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT COMPANIES

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am today introducing, for appropriate reference, a bill which would grant to the Small Business Administration additional authority to regulate certain small business investment companies and simultaneously remove those companies from regulation under the Investment Company Act of 1940.

This bill is being introduced at the request of the National Association of Small Business Investment Companies, an industry group which represents a substantial majority of SBIC's.

The industry maintains that duplicating and overlapping regulation by the Small Business Administration and by the Securities and Exchange Commission has brought about serious operating difficulties. I have been assured by industry, however, that it has no desire to be exempted from any control which will protect the interests of investors in the stock of publicly owned small business investment companies, which are registered under the Investment Company Act of 1940.

At the present time, these registered small business investment companies are closely regulated by the Small Business Administration—which has licensed them, which sets the procedures under which they may operate, which requires reports on all their activities every 3 months, and which conducts periodic examinations.

Mr. President, in closing, let me say that I believe the small business investment companies industry have embarked upon a mission of great importance to the country. Small and independent businesses have for too long been hampered in their growth by an inability to obtain needed long-term credit and equity capital. Small business investment companies are federally licensed, but privately owned and operated, financial institutions which have been created to fill the previous gap.

In the 4 years since the first small business investment companies were licensed, I believe that the concept has been proved sound; I believe the program has compiled an admirable record; I feel strongly that Congress and the administration should support all steps which, without sacrificing the public interest, will enable the new industry to make even greater contributions to the vigor of competition in our free enterprise economy.

This proposal of the National Association of Small Business Investment Companies merits thoughtful consideration by the Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1427) to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, the Investment Company Act of 1940, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Williams of New Jersey, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 102 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 is amended by striking the words "That this policy shall be carried out in such manner as to insure the maximum participation of private financing sources", and by substituting in lieu thereof the words, "That this policy shall be carried out in such manner as to protect the interest of investors in said program to the end of insuring the maximum participation of private financing sources".

Sec. 2. Section 103 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 is amended by adding the following definitions, numbered as follows:

(8) The term "affiliated person" of another person means (A) any person directly or indirectly owning, controlling, or holding with power to vote, 10 per centum or more of the outstanding voting securities of such other persons (B) any person 10 per centum or more of whose outstanding voting securities are directly or indirectly owned, controlled, or held with power to vote, by such other person; (C) any person directly or indirectly controlling, controlled by, or under common control with, such other person; (D) any officer, director, partner, copartner, employee or close relative of such other person; (E) if such other person is a small business investment company, any investment adviser thereof.

(9) The term "assignment" includes any direct or indirect transfer or hypothecation of a contract or chose in action by the assignor, or of a controlling block of the assignor's outstanding voting securities by a security holder of the assignor; but does not include an assignment of partnership interests incidental to the death or withdrawal

of a minority of the members of the partnership having only a minority interest in the partnership business or to the admission to the partnership of one or more members who, after such admission, shall be only a minority of the members and shall have only a minority interest in the business.

(10) The term "close relative" includes only brothers and sisters (whether by the whole or half blood), spouse, ancestors, and lineal descendants.

(11) The term "control" means the power, directly or indirectly, to exercise a controlling influence over the management or policies of a company, through the ownership of voting securities, by contract or otherwise. Any person who owns beneficially, either directly or through one or more controlled companies, 25 per centum or more of the voting securities of a company, shall be presumed to control such company. Any person who does not so own more than 25 per centum of the voting securities of any company shall be presumed not to control such company.

(12) The term "convicted" includes a verdict, judgment, or plea of guilty, or a finding of guilt on a plea of nole contendere, if such verdict, judgment, plea or finding has not been reversed, set aside, or withdrawn, whether or not sentence has been imposed.

(13) The term "equity capital" means funds received by an incorporated small business concern in consideration for the issuance of its equity securities.

(14) The term "equity securities" means (A) stock of any class or type; or (B) convertible debentures which are convertible into stock of incorporated small business concerns; or (C) any right or warrant issued and/or acquired in connection with the purchase of any stock, convertible debenture or debt instrument under section 305 of the Act, which right or warrant provides the holder thereof with an option to purchase a specified maximum number of shares of stock of the issuer at a price established by negotiations between the small business concern and the small business investment company at the time of issuance; or (D) any combination of the foregoing.

(15) The term "investment adviser" of a small business investment company means (A) any person (other than a bona fide officer, director, or employee of such company, as such) who pursuant to contract with such company regularly furnishes advice to such company with respect to the desirability of investing in, purchasing, retaining, or selling securities of a small business concern or is empowered to determine what securities shall be purchased, retained, or sold by such company, and (B) any other person who pursuant to contract with a person described in clause (A) regularly performs substantially all of the duties undertaken by such person.

(16) The term "joint enterprise or other joint arrangement or profit-sharing plan" means any written or oral plan, contract, authorization or arrangement, or any practice or understanding concerning an enterprise or undertaking whereby a small business investment company or a controlled company thereof and any affiliated person of or proponent of such small business investment company or any affiliated person of such a person or proponent, have a joint and several participation or share in the profits of such enterprise or undertaking, but shall not include an advisory contract subject to section 308(j) of the Act.

(17) The term "net asset value" means the value of the assets of a small business investment company remaining after deducting all liabilities and the amount of any preferred stock involuntary liquidating preference plus accrued dividends on such preferred stock, if any, from total assets, with assets valued at market value where readily available or, in the case of assets having no readily ascertainable market value, at fair value as determined in good faith by the board of directors of the small business investment company.

(18) The term "paid-in capital and paid-in surplus" means the amount received in cash or eligible Government securities by the small business investment company in consideration for the issuance of its capital stock, plus the outstanding amount of any loans or commitments made by Small Business Administration pursuant to section 302(a) of the Act, less any amounts shown on the books for organizational expenses.

(19) The term "person" means a natural person, a corporation, partnership, pension fund, profit-sharing fund, an association, a joint-stock company, a business trust and any other organization of whatever nature.

(20) The term "proponent" means a person who, acting alone or in concert with other persons, is initiating or directing, or has within one year initiated or directed, the organization of a small business investment company, including any person who executes and submits a proposal.

(21) The term "value" means, with respect to securities for which market quotations are readily available, the market value of such securities; with respect to other securities and assets, fair value as determined in good faith by the board of directors of the small business investment company.

SEC. 3. Section 301 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 is amended by adding the following subsections:

"(d)(1) It shall be unlawful for a small business investment company to have as an officer, director, investment adviser or affiliated person of an investment adviser or to sell 5 per centum or more of its voting securities to—

"(A) any person who within ten years has been convicted of any criminal offense involving dishonesty, fraud, or a breach of trust or other fiduciary relationship;

"(B) any person who by reason of misconduct involving dishonesty, fraud or breach of trust or other fiduciary relationship is permanently or temporarily enjoined by order, judgment or decree of any court of competent jurisdiction because of such misconduct; or

"(C) any person who the Small Business Administration determines, in its discretion, after investigation of his character, experience, qualifications and financial responsibility, is not eligible to participate in the program.

"(2) Any person who is ineligible by reasons of paragraphs (d)(1) (A) or (B) of this section to serve in any capacity set forth in paragraph (d)(1) hereof or any person who disputes a preliminary determination by the Small Business Administration, under paragraph (d)(1)(C) of this section, that he is not eligible to serve in such capacity, may file an application with the Small Business Administration for an exemption from the provisions of this subsection (d). The Small Business Administration may grant such application either conditionally or on an appropriate temporary or other conditional basis if it is established that the prohibitions as applied to such person are unduly or disproportionately severe or that the conduct of such person has been such as not to make it against the public interest or detrimental to carrying out the provisions of the Act in accordance with the purposes of the Act.

"(e) A majority of the directors of a small business investment company must be citizens of the United States.

"(f)(1) It shall be unlawful for a small business investment company to have a board of directors more than 60 per centum of which are officers and employees of, attorneys for, affiliated persons of attorneys for, investment advisers of, affiliated persons or stockholders of an investment adviser of, such small business investment company or persons controlling or controlled by such small business investment company or affiliated persons (other than solely as directors) of controlling or controlled persons of such small business investment company or investment adviser: *Provided, however,* That in no event shall officers and employees of such small business investment company, taken together, comprise more than a minority of the members of the board of directors of such small business investment company.

"(2) If by reason of the death, disqualification, or bona fide resignation of any director or directors, the requirements of the foregoing provisions of this section in respect of directors shall not be met by a small business investment company, the operation of such provisions shall be suspended as to such small business investment company for a period of thirty days if the vacancy or vacancies may be filled by action of the board of directors, and for a period of sixty days if a vote of stockholders is required to fill the vacancy or vacancies, or for such longer period as the Small Business Administration may prescribe, by rules and regulations upon its own motion or upon application by a small business investment company.

"(3) No person shall serve as a director of a small business investment company unless elected to that office by the holders of the outstanding voting securities of such company, at an annual or a special meeting duly called for that purpose; except that vacancies occurring between such meetings may be filled in any otherwise legal manner if immediately after filling any such vacancy at least two-thirds of the directors then holding office shall have been elected to such office by the holders of the outstanding voting securities of the company at such an annual or special meeting. In the event that at any time less than a majority of the directors of such company holding office at that time were so elected by the holders of the outstanding voting securities, the board of directors or proper officer of such company shall forthwith cause to be held as promptly as possible, and in any event within sixty days, a meeting of such holders for the purpose of electing directors to fill any existing vacancies in the board of directors unless the Small Business Administration shall extend such period.

"(g) The articles of incorporation of every small business investment company shall provide for only one class of common stock, all shares of which shall have equal voting rights.

"(h)(1) The articles of incorporation of a small business investment company may provide for the issuance of preferred stock but such stock may be issued only if it has, immediately after issuance, an asset coverage, after deducting all liabilities, of 110 per centum, which shall not be subsequently reduced by the declaration of any dividend on the common stock (except a dividend payable in common stock of the company), the declaration of any other distribution on the common stock or the purchase of any common stock of the company.

"(2) Any preferred stock shall have priority over the common stock as to distribution of assets and payment of dividends, which dividends shall be cumulative at least to the extent earned in any one year; be entitled, as a class, to representation on the board of directors by at least two members at all times; and be entitled to elect a majority of the board of directors if at any one time dividends are accrued and unpaid equivalent to two years' requirements, such right to continue until sufficient income applicable to such stock has been earned to pay, or otherwise provided for such accruals and such payment or provision for payment is actually made.

"(3) Whenever the right to elect a majority of directors shall have accrued to holders of the preferred stock, the proper officers of the company shall call a meeting for the election of directors, such meeting to be held not less than ten days and not more than thirty days after the receipt of such request. Conversely, whenever sufficient income applicable to the preferred stock, upon which dividends are in arrears, as above, has been earned to pay or otherwise provide for such arrears, and such payment or provision for payment has been made, thus entitling the holders of the common stock to their full voting rights, the proper officers of the company shall call a meeting for the election of directors, such meeting to be held not less than ten days and not more than thirty days after the reversion to the holders of the common stock of their full voting rights."

SEC. 4. Section 302 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 is amended by adding the following subsections:

"(d) A small business investment company may not voluntarily reduce or increase its paid-in capital and paid-in surplus without the prior written approval of the Small Business Administration.

"(e) Subject to the provisions of subsection (d) above, a small business investment company that is not indebted to the Small Business Administration pursuant to section 302 or 303 of this Act, may repurchase its own securities only in accordance with and subject to such rules and regulations as the Small Business Administration may prescribe and, provided, that prior to the repurchase of any securities hereunder, any plan or other program of repurchase of its own securities shall have been approved at a meeting duly called for such purpose by a vote of the holders of two-thirds of the outstanding voting securities of such company, and further provided that any securities repurchased shall be immediately retired and canceled.

"(f)(1) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (e) of this section, a small business investment company may call or redeem any security of which it is the issuer in accordance with the terms of such securities or the charter, indenture or other instrument pursuant to which such securities were issued: *Provided*, That if less than all the outstanding securities of a class are to be called or redeemed, the call or redemption shall be made by lot, on a pro rata basis, or in such other manner as will not discriminate unfairly against any holder of securities of such class.

"(2) A small business investment company which proposes to call or redeem less than all of the outstanding securities of a class, shall file with the Small Business Administration notice of its intention to partially call or redeem such securities at least thirty days prior to the date set for the call or redemption.

"(g) A small business investment company may issue its securities only for (1) cash, (2) direct obligations of, or obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by, the United States, (3) securities of which it is the issuer, in connection with a reclassification or recapitalization of its capital structure approved by SBA, (4) services previously of the small business investment company, (5) physical assets to be currently employed in the operation of the small business investment company, (6) as a dividend, or (7) in connection with a statutory or other type of merger or consolidation with another licensee, approved by the Small Business Administration: *Provided, however*, That any shares of stock issued as a part of the initial minimum capital required by paragraph (a) of this section may be issued only in consideration of the simultaneous payment of cash or upon the simultaneous transfer to the small business investment company of securities permitted by section 308(b) of the Act and regulations thereunder: *And provided further*, That a small business investment company may issue its common stock for equity securities of a small business concern pursuant to the provisions of section 304(c) of the Act.

"(h) A small business investment company may issue stock options to its officers and employees, provided such options qualify as restricted stock options under section 421 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 as such section now exists or may hereafter be amended, subject to such rules and regulations as SBA may promulgate governing the issuance and exercise of such options. No such options may be granted to any officer or employee who has any interest in, direct or indirect, or who receives compensation from, an investment adviser of the small business investment company.

"(i) A small business investment company shall not sell any common stock of which it is the issuer at a price below the current net asset value of such stock, exclusive of any distributing commission or discount, except (1) in connection with an offering to the holders of one or more classes of its capital stock; (2) with the consent of the holders of two-thirds of its common stock; (3) upon conversion of a convertible security in accordance with its terms; (4) upon the exercise of a warrant, right or option issued by the small business investment company or (5) under such other circumstances as the Small Business Administration may permit."

SEC. 5. Section 303(b) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 is amended by striking the words "formation and" from the first sentence thereof.

SEC. 6. Section 307 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 is amended by striking subsection (c) thereof in its entirety.

SEC. 7. Section 308(c) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 is amended by striking the first sentence thereof and by substituting in lieu thereof the following: "The Administration is authorized to prescribe regulations governing the operations of small business investment companies as it may deem necessary and appropriate in the public interest and in the interest of investors in such companies, in order to carry out the provisions of the Act, in accordance with the purposes of the Act."

SEC. 8. Section 308 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 is further amended by adding the following subsections:

"(f) No small business investment company shall, unless authorized by the vote of two-thirds of its outstanding voting securities and with the prior approval of the Small Business Administration—

"(1) deviate from its policy in respect of concentration of investments in any particular industry or group of industries, as recited in its application to operate as a licensed small business investment company.

"(2) cease to be a licensed small business investment company and surrender its license.

"(g)(1) Every small business investment company shall transmit to its stockholders, at least semiannually, reports containing the following information and financial statements within forty-five days after the date as of which the report is made:

"(A) a balance sheet accompanied by a statement of the aggregate value of investments on the date of such balance sheet;

"(B) a list showing the amounts and values of securities owned on the date of such balance sheet;

"(C) a statement of income, for the period covered by the report, which shall be itemized at least with respect to each category of income and expense representing more than 5 per centum of total income or expense;

"(D) a statement of surplus, which shall be itemized at least with respect to each charge or credit to the surplus account which represents more than 5 per centum of the total charges or credits during the period covered by the report;

"(E) a statement of the aggregate remuneration paid by the company during the period covered by the report (i) to all directors for regular compensation; (ii) to each director for special compensation; (iii) to all officers; and (iv) to each person or entity of whom any officer or director of the company is an affiliated person; and

"(F) a statement of the aggregate dollar amounts of purchases of equity securities, and long-term loans, other than Government securities, made during the period covered by the report.

"(2) Financial statements contained in annual reports shall be accompanied by a certificate of an independent certified public accountant or independent licensed public accountant, certified or licensed by a regulatory authority of a State or other political subdivision of the United States. The certificate of such accountant shall be based upon an audit not less in scope or procedures followed than that which independent public accountants would ordinarily make for the purpose of presenting comprehensive and dependable financial statements. Each such report shall state that such independent public accountants have vertified securities owned, either by actual examination, or by receipt of a certificate from the custodian.

"(3) The Small Business Administration may, in its discretion, require the inclusion of such other information in such reports as it deems appropriate.

"(h) Every person who is directly or indirectly the beneficial owner of more than 10 per centum of any class of outstanding securities (other than short-term paper) issued by a small business inevstment company or who is an officer, director, investment adviser, or affiliated person of an investment adviser, of such a company shall, in respect of his transactions in any securities of such company (other than short-term paper), be subject to the same duties and liabilities as those imposed by section 16 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 upon certain beneficial owners, directors, and officers in respect of their transactions in certain equity securities: *Provided, however*, That the Small Business Administration shall, by rules or regulations or order after notice and opportunity for hearing in particular cases, exempt transactions of a director, officer, or the beneficial owner of 10 per centum or more of the voting securities of a small business investment company who is engaged in the investment banking business and who is a broker-dealer registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission pursuant to the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and any corporation or partnership in which such director, officer, or stockholder is an affiliated person, where such transactions are engaged in solely for the purpose of maintaining or participating in the maintenance of a market for the benefit of investors in the securities of such small business investment company.

"(i) A small business investment company shall not lend money or property to any person, directly or indirectly, if such person controls or is under common control with such company.

"(j)(1) A small business investment company which obtains investment advisory services from an investment adviser on a continuing basis, shall contract in writing for such services, which contract shall be submitted to the Small Business Administration for its written approval prior to such contract becoming effective. Such written contract shall specifically—

"(A) describe such services;

"(B) describe all compensation to be paid thereunder;

"(C) state the duration of the contract;

"(D) provide for its termination by the small business investment company, without penalty, on not more than sixty days' written notice;

"(E) provide for its automatic termination in the event of its assignment by the person performing the services;

"(F) be approved by a vote of a majority of the outstanding voting securities of the small business investment company prior to such contract becoming effective; and

"(G) be approved annually by a vote of a majority of the outstanding voting securities of the small business investment company or by the vote of a majority of its board of directors, including the approval vote of a majority of those members of the board of directors who are not parties to, or do not have a pecuniary interest, direct or indirect, in such contract.

"(2) Contracts for appraisal, custodial, collection, bookkeeping, accounting and legal services shall not be considered investment advisory services for purposes of this part.

"(k)(1) A small business investment company may not adopt as part of its name or title, any word or words which the Small Business Administration finds to be deceptive, misleading, inappropriate, or not suitable.

"(2) A small business investment company may not include the words "United States", "National", "Federal", "Reserve", or "Government" in its corporate name.

"(l)(1) No small business investment company, in issuing or selling any security, shall represent or imply in any manner whatsoever that such security has been guaranteed, sponsored, recommended, or approved by the United States or any agency or officer thereof, and a statement to such effect shall be included in any solicitations to investors.

"(2) No person affiliated with any small business investment company shall represent or imply in any manner whatsoever that such person has been sponsored, recommended, or approved, or that his abilities have in any respect been passed upon by the United States or any agency or officer thereof.

"(m) A small business investment company shall not, without the prior written approval of the Small Business Administration—

"(1) purchase any security or other property from any affiliated person or proponent of such small business investment company or any affiliated person of such a person or proponent;

"(2) sell any security or other property to any affiliated person or proponent of such small business investment company or affiliated person of such a person or proponent; or

"(3) borrow money or other property from any affiliated person or proponent of such small business investment company or any affiliated person of such a person or proponent.

"The provisions of this subsection shall be applicable to any transaction effected within six months following the date of termination of any affiliation which would otherwise operate to make such transaction subject to this subsection.

"(n)(1) A small business investment company shall not participate in, or effect any transaction in connection with, any joint enterprise or other joint arrangement or profit-sharing plan in which any affiliated person of or proponent of such small business investment company or any affiliated person of such a person or proponent, is a participant and which is entered into, adopted or modified subsequent to the effective date of this subsection of the Act unless an application has been filed with the Small Business Administration for the prior approval of such joint enterprise, arrangement or profit-sharing plan and the Small Business Administration has granted approval.

"(2) Notwithstanding the requirements of this subsection, no application need be filed pursuant to such subsection with respect to any of the following:

"(A) Any profit-sharing plan provided by any controlled company for its officers or employees, provided no affiliated person of any small business investment company which is an affiliated person of such controlled company participates therein.

"(B) Any plan provided by any small business investment company for its officers or employees if such plan has been qualified under section 401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and all contributions paid under said plan by the employer qualify as deductible under section 404 of said Code.

"(o) Each small business investment company shall, pursuant to a written contract, place and maintain its securities, similar investments, and cash assets in the custody of a bank which shall have at all times an aggregate capital, surplus, and undivided profits of not less than $500,000 and which shall be a member of the Federal Reserve System, or a nonmember insured bank, subject to such rules and regulations as the Small Business Administration may prescribe.

"(p) A small business investment company may not effect any plan of recapitalization or reclassification of its capital structure, or merge or consolidate with any other company without the approval vote of the holders of two-thirds of its voting securities and the prior written approval of the Small Business Administration, which may prescribe such rules and regulations in reference thereto as it deems appropriate.

"(q)(1) Every small business investment company which is a party and every affiliated person of such company who is a party defendant to any action or claim by a small business investment company or a security holder thereof, in a derivative capacity against an officer, director, or investment adviser, of such company for an alleged breach of official duty, which such action or claim is commenced or asserted after the effective date of this subsection of the Act shall transmit, unless already transmitted, to the Small Business Administration, the documents specified in paragraph (2) hereof if—

"(A) such action has been compromised or settled and such settlement or compromise has had the approval of a court having jurisdiction to approve such settlement or compromise; or

"(B) a verdict has been rendered or final judgment entered on the merits in such action.

"(2) Within thirty days after such settlement or compromise, verdict or final judgment, copies of all pleadings and any written record made in such action, together with a statement of the terms of settlement or compromise, if such terms be not included in the record, shall be transmitted to the Small Business Administration.

"(r)(1) Any condition, stipulation, or provision binding any person to waive compliance with any provision of the Act, or with any regulation or order thereunder, shall be void.

"(2) Every contract hereafter made in violation of any provisions of the Act or of any regulation or order thereunder, the performance of which involves the violation of, or the continuance of any relationship or practice in violation of, any provision of the Act, or any regulation or order thereunder, shall be void (A) as regards the rights of any person who, in violation of any such provision, regulation, or order, shall have made or engaged in the performance of any contract, and (B) as regards the rights of any person who, not being a party to such contract, shall have acquired any right thereunder with the actual knowledge of the facts by reason of which the making or performance of such contract was in violation of any such provision, regulation, or order.

"(s) No person may cause to be done, directly or indirectly, any act or thing through means of any person which such person is prohibited from doing under the provisions of the Act or any regulation or order thereunder.

"(t) No person shall solicit or permit the use of his name to solicit any proxy, consent, or authorization in respect of any security issued by a small business investment company except upon compliance with such rules and regulations as the Small Business Administration may promulgate for the purposes of this Act.

"(u) Whenever, in the opinion of the Small Business Administration, any director, officer, or investment adviser of a small business investment company shall have continued to violate any law or duly enacted regulation relating to such company or shall have continued to be guilty of misconduct or abuse of trust in respect of such company, after having been warned by the Small Business Administration to discontinue such violations of law or regulations, the Small Business Administration may cause notice to be served on such person to appear before it to show cause why he should not be enjoined from acting in such capacity. If after granting the accused director, officer, or investment adviser a reasonable opportunity to be heard, the Small Business Administration finds that he has continued to violate any law or duly enacted regulation relating to such company or has continued to be guilty of misconduct or abuse of trust in respect of such company, after having been warned by the Small Business Administration to discontinue such practice, the Small Business Administration in its discretion, may order that such director or officer be removed from office or that such investment adviser cease to act in such capacity: *Provided*, That such order and findings of fact upon which it is based shall not be made public or disclosed to anyone except the director, officer, or investment adviser involved and the directors of the small business investment company involved.

"(v) Whoever steals, unlawfully abstracts, unlawfully and willfully converts to his own use or to the use of another, or embezzles any of the moneys, funds, securities, credits, property, or assets of any small business investment company shall be deemed guilty of a crime, and upon conviction thereof shall be subject to the penalties provided in subsection (w) hereof. A judgment of conviction or acquittal on the merits under the laws of any State shall be a bar to any prosecution under this subsection for the same act or acts.

"(w) Any person who willfully violates any provision of this Act or of any rule, regulation or order hereunder, or any person who willfully, in any application, report, account, record, or other document filed or transmitted pursuant to the Act, makes any untrue statement of a material fact or omits to state any material fact necessary in order to prevent the statements made therein from being materially misleading in the light of the circumstances under which they were made, shall upon conviction be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than two years or both; but no person shall be convicted under this section for the violation of any rule, regulation, or order if he proves he had no actual knowledge of such rule, regulation, or order.

"(x)(1) After one year from the effective date of this subsection, neither the charter, certificate of incorporation, nor the bylaws of any small business investment company nor any other instrument pursuant to which such company is organized or administered, shall contain any provision which protects or purports to protect any director or officer of such company against any liability to the company or to its security holders to which he would otherwise be subject by reason of willful misfeasance, bad faith, gross negligence, or reckless disregard of the duties involved in the conduct of his office.

"(2) After one year from the effective date of this subsection, no contract or agreement under which any person undertakes to act as investment adviser for a small business investment company shall contain any provision which protects or purports to protect such person against any liability to such company or its security holders to which he would otherwise be subject by reason of willful misfeasance, bad faith, or gross negligence in the performance of his duties, or by reason of his reckless disregard of his obligations and duties under such contract or agreement."

SEC. 9. The Small Business Investment Act of 1958 is further amended by adding the following section:

"SEC. 312. (a) The Administration, by rules and regulations upon its own motion, or by order upon application, may conditionally or unconditionally exempt any person or any class or classes of persons, securities or transactions, from any provision of the Act or of any rule or regulation thereunder, if and to the extent that such exemption is necessary or appropriate in the public interest and consistent with the purposes fairly intended by the policy and provisions of the Act.

"(b) A small business investment company whose outstanding securities (other than short-term paper) are beneficially owned by not more than one hundred persons and which is not making and does not presently propose to make a public offering of its securities is exempt from the provisions of sections 301(f) and 308(g), (h), (m)(3), (n), (o), and (t) of this Act."

SEC. 10. Section 3 of the Investment Company Act of 1940 is amended by adding to subsection (c) thereof a new paragraph to read as follows:

"(16) Any small business investment company licensed and operating under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958."

Section 18 of the Investment Company Act of 1940 is amended by striking out subsection (k).

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at the request of the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], and with the understanding that the request has been approved by the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules and Administration be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 1336) to provide that the price at which the Coast and Geodetic Survey sells radio avigation charts and certain related material to the public shall not be less than the cost thereof, and that bill be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FORMATION OF SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS TO CONSIDER AIR AND WATER POLLUTION LEGISLATION

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I would like to announce the formation of a special subcommittee of the Senate Public Works Committee, to deal with air and water pollution legislation.

The chairman of the new subcommittee will be Senator EDMUND MUSKIE.

Other members for the majority will be Senators RANDOLPH, MOSS, METCALF, BAYH, and NELSON. The minority members will be Senators BOGGS, MILLER, and PEARSON.

Referred to this subcommittee will be bills relating to Federal air and water pollution. It also may conduct studies and hearings on these important subjects, with a view to assisting all levels of government to find solutions to these problems.

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT A STAFF MEMORANDUM ENTITLED "THE AUTHORITY OF THE SENATE TO ORIGINATE APPROPRIATION BILLS" (S. DOC. NO. 17)

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the staff of the Committee on Government Operations has caused to be prepared a summary and analysis of the debates and actions of the Constitutional Convention of 1787 and other source materials with reference to the authority of the Senate to originate appropriation bills. This comes to me from the Committee on Government Operations. Normally this would go to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

I have conferred with the distinguished majority leader about it, and he is quite agreeable that I ask unanimous consent that this be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LOANS FOR STUDENTS OF OPTOMETRY UNDER S. 911, THE HEALTH PROFESSIONS EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1963—AMENDMENTS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, amendments to S. 911, the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963, which would make optometry students eligible for student loans as provided in part C of the bill. As introduced, S. 911 would provide grants for the construction of medical, dental, pharmaceutical, optometric, podiatric, nursing, osteopathic, and public health teaching facilities. However, under the student loan provisions of the act, only students of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy could qualify for the loans. In my judgment optometry students, because of the vital role which that profession plays in protecting the vision of our citizens, should be also eligible for these loans.

Few Americans go through life without at some time requiring professional vision care. There are many reasons for the continuing need for more and more optometrists, but there are two which seem to stand out above all others. One is our rapidly expanding population and the other is the demands of the space age for maximum visual efficiency in all walks of life. Our population is growing by leaps and bounds due to an increased birth rate and a reduced death rate. As our population increases the need for vision care expands, and in order to properly satisfy this need we must train more optometrists.

Research has proven conclusively that proper vision care for business and industrial employees can pay for itself many times over in efficiency and reduced accidents. While management recognizes this, five out of six companies still lack fully adequate vision programs. If the other 83 percent were to install adequate programs, the professional personnel to man them could not be found.

I know we are all vitally concerned with the problem of reducing highway accidents, and recent studies show that three out of every five motorists have a vision problem which can be corrected. Public officials and organizations promoting highway safety look to the optometrist's specialized service to establish and maintain proper vision standards for motorists.

Mr. President, psychologists and educators recognize more and more the importance of vision in child development. How many children, for example, have been handicapped in learning reading skills because of an undetected vision problem, and lost forever as useful and productive members of society? This neglect of vision care certainly plays a part in causing the already formidable problem of school dropouts—the untrained and unemployable, and often functionally illiterate, youth we are now hoping to help through the proposed Youth Employment Act and the National Service Corps. To meet this need we must train more optometrists.

Vision is also an important factor in leisure time activities for the young, the middle aged, and those who have retired. Virtually every type of activity to which Americans turn in their growing hours of leisure—whether boating or hunting, reading, or television viewing—can be made more enjoyable, more productive, and in many cases safer by improved vision. In the case of our older citizens, particularly, the visual care and aids which are available today can contribute greatly to their self-reliance and happiness.

I should also call specific attention to the fact that from 15 to 20 percent of the optometrists who graduated in 1962 were commissioned in the armed services. In this age of space exploration, supersonic aircraft, intercontinental ballistic missiles, and nuclear power, it is evident that maximum visual efficiency is an indispensable item in our defense program.

Mr. President, this brief summary of our Nation's present and future vision needs clearly shows, I believe, that we are going to require increasing numbers of trained optometrists. Optometrists are already essential to our country's vision care. Today approximately 75 percent of all Americans visit optometrists when they seek vision care. As in the case of all categories of physicians, there is a serious shortage of ophthalmologists—the optometrists' counterpart in the medical profession. And to complicate the problem, ophthalmologists are for the most part located in the larger metropolitan areas, while the vast majority of the 75 percent of our population which relies upon optometrists is in our smaller communities and rural areas.

Following World War II, under the impetus of the GI bill's educational benefits, many veterans entered schools and colleges of optometry, with a resulting expansion in optometric graduates. However, since then there has been a steady decline in the enrollment of our schools and colleges of optometry.

This has been caused primarily by the great advance in salaries paid graduate engineers and technicians. However, in my judgment the length and scope of the optometric curriculum must also be taken into consideration. All schools of optometry require a minimum of 5 years of study at the college level and some require a sixth year for the O.D. degree. The optometric curriculum includes, of course, subjects directly related to vision care. Yet it also includes courses in anatomy, physiology, pathology, and so forth, so that about one-fourth of the student's work constitutes a broad study of the human body. This enables optometrists to refer, for appropriate professional medical care, patients whose eyes reveal evidences of possible diseases.

As a result of the attractive salaries available to graduates in engineering and technology and the long and difficult curriculum which must be undertaken, the number of optometric graduates during the past few years has been less than the number who, through death or retirement, have left the ranks of the active practitioners.

Recently some interesting figures pertaining to optometric manpower in my own State have been called to my attention. In 1952 there were 856 New Jersey optometrists listed in the Blue Book of Optometry, a publication which lists all licensed optometrists in the United States. Ten years later, in 1962, there were only 739 listed for New Jersey, a decrease of 14 percent. During this same period, the population of the State of New Jersey increased by 25 percent from 5,066,000 to 6,244,000. This means that we have 1 optometrist for about 9,500 of the population, while the proper ratio should be no greater than 1 to 7,000.

It is also important to note that optometrists who have been able to complete their professional education through privately financed student loan funds have an outstanding record for repayment of these loans.

Mr. President, while the amount involved in extending S. 911's loan provisions to students of optometry is small, it is in my judgment an essential investment in our Nation's health and security, and would help eliminate the shortage of trained health personnel which the President has termed "perhaps the most threatening breach in our health defenses." I urge the Senate to help close this critical gap by acting favorably on the amendments I am submitting.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963—AMENDMENTS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 5517) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. HRUSKA) proposed an amendment to House bill 5517, supra, which was ordered to be printed.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT TO SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. DOUGLAS submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.R. 5517) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, the following amendment: namely, on page 55, line 12, immediately before the words "The Act" insert "SEC. 401."

On page 57 at the end of line 4 insert quotation marks.

On page 57 line 5 strike out "SEC. 4. This title," and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 402. Sections 401 and 402 of this title."

On page 57, immediately after line 6 add the following new sections:

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 403. As used in section 403 through 415, unless the context clearly indicates otherwise—

"(1) The term 'election' includes a general, special, or primary election, including a preferential primary, and a convention or a caucus of a political party held for the purpose of nominating candidates;

"(2) The term 'candidate' means an individual whose name is presented at an election for nomination for, or election as, President or Vice President, or Senator or Representative in, or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress of the United States, whether or not such individual is nominated or elected;

"(3) The term 'political committee' includes any committee, association, or organization which accepts contributions or makes expenditures in an aggregate amount exceeding $2,500 in any calendar year for the purpose of influencing or attempting to influence in any manner whatsoever the election of a candidate or candidates or presidential or vice presidential electors;

"(4) The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit, of money, or anything of value, or transfer of funds between committees, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforcible, to make a contribution;

"(5) The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift, of money, or anything of value, or transfer of funds between committees, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforcible, to make an expenditure;

"(6) The term 'person' includes an individual, partnership, committee, association, corporation, and any other organization or group of persons; and

"(7) The term 'State' includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, any possession of the United States, and the District of Columbia.

"CAMPAIGN PRACTICES—ORGANIZATION OF POLITICAL COMMITTEES

"SEC. 404. (a) Every political committee shall have a chairman and a treasurer. No contribution shall be accepted, and no expenditure made, by or on behalf of a political committee for the purpose of influencing an election until such chairman and treasurer have been chosen. No expenditure shall be made for or on behalf of a political committee without the authorization of its chairman or treasurer.

"(b) Every person who receives a contribution for a political committee shall, on demand of the treasurer, and in any event within five days after the receipt of such contribution, render to the treasurer a detailed account thereof, including the name and address of the person making such contribution, and the date on which received. It shall be the duty of the treasurer to see to it that all contributions received by or for a committee shall be kept separate from any personal funds and deposited in a special account.

"(c) It shall be the duty of the treasurer of a political committee to keep a detailed and exact account of—

"(1) all contributions made to or for such committee;

"(2) the name and address of every person making any such contribution, and the date thereof;

"(3) all expenditures made by or on behalf of such committee; and

"(4) the name and address of every person to whom any such expenditure is made, and the date thereof.

"(d) It shall be the duty of the treasurer to obtain and keep a receipted bill, stating the particulars, for every expenditure by or on behalf of a political committee exceeding $100 in amount. The treasurer shall preserve all receipted bills and accounts required to be kept by this section for a period of two years from the date of the filing of the statement containing such items.

"REPORTS BY POLITICAL COMMITTEES

"SEC. 405. (a) The treasurer of a political committee shall file reports of receipts and expenditures with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, on forms to be prescribed by him, and shall transmit a copy of such reports (except as provided in section 410 (b)) to the clerk of the United States district court for the district in which the principal office of the committee is located. Such reports shall be filed, complete as of June 30 and December 31 of each year, and as of the tenth day next preceding the date on which an election is to be held, and as the thirtieth day following an election, with respect to which contributions were received or expenditures made by such committee. In each instance reports shall be filed not later than the third day following the reporting date as above provided. Each report shall contain—

"(1) the amount of cash on hand at the beginning of the reporting period;

"(2) the name and address of each person who has made a contribution to or for such committee in one or more items of the aggregate amount or value, within the calendar year, of $100 or more, together with the amount and date of such contribution; and for the purposes of this paragraph the term 'contribution', as used herein, shall not include transfers of funds to or from political committees or candidates;

"(3) the total sum of individual contributions made to or for such committee during the calendar year and not stated under paragraph (2);

"(4) the name and address of each political committee or candidate from which the committee received any transfer of funds, together with the amounts and dates of all such transfers;

"(5) the total sum of all contributions made to or for such committee during the calendar year;

"(6) the name and address of each person to whom an expenditure has been made by such committee in one or more items of the aggregate amount or value, within the calendar year, of $100 or more, and the amount, date, and purpose of such expenditure;

"(7) the total sum of all expenditures made by such committee, during the calendar year and not stated under paragraph (6);

"(8) the name and address of each political committee or candidate to which the committee made any transfer of funds, together with the amounts and dates of all such transfers; and

"(9) the total sum of expenditures made by such committee during the calendar year.

"(b) The reports required to be filed by subsection (a) shall be cumulative during the calendar year to which they relate, but where there has been no change in an item reported in a previous report only the amount need be carried forward.

"(c) The report required to be filed as of December 31 shall cover the entire calendar year.

"(d) In the case of political committees supporting candidates for President, Vice President, or Senator, a copy of the report filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives under subsection (a) shall be filed with the Secretary of the Senate.

"(e) The reports required to be filed by subsection (a) of this section shall also contain a list of the names of candidates in whose behalf contributions were received or expenditures made. In the case of political committees supporting more than one candidate (and State and local candidates), the amount of the total expenditures allocable to each candidate—

"(1) shall be in the same ratio as expenditures on behalf of each candidate for printing and advertising, radio time, and television time bears to the total of such expenditures, or

"(2) where no expenditures were made for Federal candidates for any of such purposes there shall be charged to each Federal candidate an amount equal to the full expenditure divided by the total number of candidates, Federal and State;

except that expenditures specifically designated for an individual candidate shall be charged to such candidate.

"(f) Whenever any report is filed by the treasurer of any political committee pursuant to subsection (a), such treasurer at the same time shall transmit a true and correct copy of such report to each candidate on whose behalf such report reflects any contribution received, or any expenditure made, by such political committee.

"REPORTS BY OTHERS THAN POLITICAL COMMITTEES

"SEC. 406. Every person (other than those filing reports pursuant to section 405) who makes an expenditure in one or more items aggregating $100 or more within a calendar year, other than by contribution to a political committee, for the purpose of influencing, in two or more States, election of candidates, shall file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, on a form to be prescribed by him, an itemized detailed report of such expenditures in the same manner as required of the treasurer of a political committee by section 405, and shall file a copy thereof (subject to the provisions of section 410(b)) with the clerk of the United States district court for the district in which such expenditures are made, and in the case of any expenditure in support of a candidate for President, Vice President, or United States Senator, shall file a copy of the report with the Secretary of the Senate.

"REPORTS BY CANDIDATES

"SEC. 407. (a) Every candidate shall file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, on a form to be prescribed by him, reports of receipts and expenditures and shall transmit a copy thereof to the Secretary of the Senate if a candidate for Senator, and (except as provided in section 410(b)) to the clerk of the United States district court for the district in which the candidate resides. Such reports shall be complete as of the tenth day next preceding the date on which an election for the office for which he is a candidate is to be held, and as of the fortieth day following such election, and in each instance shall be filed not later than the third day following the reporting date; except that where a candidate in order to qualify for the general election must run in two successive primaries in one party no second report on the first primary will be required for those candidates participating in the second primary if reports filed for the second primary are cumulative and supplementary of the report filed before the first primary. Such reports shall contain a correct and itemized detailed report of contributions received and expenditures made by him in aid or support of his candidacy for election, or for the purpose of influencing the result of the election, in the same manner as required of the treasurer of a political committee by section 405, including amounts expended from his own funds.

"(b) The reports required to be filed by subsection (a) shall be cumulative, but where there has been no change in an item reported in a previous report, only the amount need be carried forward.

"FORMAL REQUIREMENTS ON FILING REPORTS AND STATEMENTS

"SEC. 408. The reports and statements required by this title to be filed by a candidate, a treasurer of a political committee, or by any other person, with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the copies thereof required to be filed with the Secretary of the Senate, and (subject to the provisions of section 410(b)) with the clerk of the United States district court—

"(1) shall be verified by the oath or affirmation of the person filing such report or statement, taken before any officer authorized to administer oaths;

"(2) shall be deemed properly filed when delivered to the specified recipient, or when deposited in an established post office within the prescribed time, duly stamped, registered, and properly addressed, but in the event it is not received, a duplicate of such report or statement shall be promptly filed upon notice of its nonreceipt by the officer with whom it is required to be filed; and

"(3) a copy shall be preserved by the person filing it for a period of one year from the date of filing.

"DUTIES OF THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

"SEC. 409. It shall be the duty of the Clerk of the House of Representatives and of the Secretary of the Senate—

"(1) to preserve the reports and statements filed under this title for a period of six years from the date of receipt;

"(2) to make such reports and statements available for public inspection during regular office hours;

"(3) to make such reports and statements available for such inspection within twenty-four hours of their receipt by them; and

"(4) to permit copying of any such report or statement by hand or by duplicating machine, as requested by any person, at the expense of such person.

"DUTIES OF CLERKS OF UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS

"SEC. 410. (a) It shall be the duty of the clerks of United States district courts—

"(1) to receive and maintain in an orderly manner all reports and statements required by this Act to be filed with such clerks;

"(2) to maintain such reports and statements for public inspection for a period of six years from the date of receipt;

"(3) to make such reports and statements available for public inspection during regular office hours;

"(4) to make available for public inspection each report and statement within twenty-four hours of its receipt; and

"(5) to permit copying of any such report or statement by hand or by duplicating machine, as requested by any person, at the expense of such person.

"(b) In States where the secretary of state or other State official is authorized to perform the duties specified in this section, the filing of reports and statements under this title shall be with such State official in lieu of the filing with the clerk of the United States district court.

"GENERAL PENALTIES FOR VIOLATIONS

"SEC. 411. (a) Any person who violates any of the provisions of this part shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

"(b) Any person who willfully violates any provision of this part shall be fined not more than $10,000 and imprisoned not more than two years.

"EXPENSES OF ELECTION CONTESTS

"SEC. 412. This Act shall not limit or affect the right of any person to make contributions or expenditures for proper legal expenses in contesting the results of an election.

"EFFECT ON STATE LAWS

"SEC. 413. This Act shall not be construed to annul, or to exempt any candidate from complying with, the laws of any State relating to the nomination or election of candidates, unless such laws are directly inconsistent with the provisions of this Act.

"PARTIAL INVALIDITY

"SEC. 414. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the Act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

"REPEALING CLAUSE

"SEC. 415. All other Acts or parts of Acts inconsistent herewith are repealed.

"AMENDMENTS TO CRIMINAL CODE—DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 416. Section 591 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

" '§ 591. Definitions

" 'When used in sections 597, 599. 602, 608, 609, 610, and 612 of this title—

" '(1) The term "election" includes a general, special, or primary election, including a preferential primary, and a convention or a caucus of a political party held for the purpose of nominating candidates;

" '(2) The term "candidate" means an individual whose name is presented at an election for nomination for, or election as, President or Vice President, or Senator or Representative in, or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress of the United States, whether or not such individual is nominated or elected;

" '(3) The term "political committee" includes any committee, association, or organization which accepts contributions or makes expenditures in an aggregate amount exceeding $2,500 in any calendar year for the purpose of influencing or attempting to influence in any manner whatsoever the election of a candidate or candidates or presidential or vice presidential electors;

" '(4) The term "contribution" includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit, of money, or anything of value, or transfer of funds between committees, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforcible, to make a contribution;

" '(5) The term "expenditure" includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift, of money, or anything of value, or transfer of funds between committees, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforcible, to make an expenditure;

" '(6) The term "person" includes an individual, partnership, committee, association, corporation, and any other organization or group of persons;

"'(7) The term "State" includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, any possession of the United States, and the District of Columbia.'

"PUBLICATION OR DISTRIBUTION OF ELECTION MATERIALS

"SEC. 417. Section 612 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting after the word 'names' wherever it appears therein the words 'and addresses.'

"EFFECTIVE DATE

"SEC. 418. Sections 403–419 shall take effect on January 1, 1964, except that the provisions of this Act shall not apply to contributions and expenditures made prior to such date; but nothing in this Act shall relieve any person from filing any statements or reports required under the law in force prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

"SEC. 419. Sections 403 through 419 of this title may be cited as the 'Federal Elections Act of 1963'."

Mr. DOUGLAS also submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 5517, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

DONATION OF SURPLUS FEDERAL PROPERTY TO STATE PARK AGENCIES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] be added as cosponsors to S. 1238 to permit the donation of surplus Federal property to State park agencies, and that their names be added to this bill at its next printing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON THE NOMINATION OF JOHN PRIOR LEWIS TO BE A MEMBER OF THE COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I should like to announce that the Committee on Banking and Currency will hold hearings on the nomination of John Prior Lewis, of Indiana, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers. The hearing is scheduled to be held on May 10, 1963, in room 5302 New Senate Office Building at 10 a.m.

Any persons who wish to appear and testify in connection with this nomination are requested to notify Matthew Hale, chief of staff, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5300 New Senate Office Building, telephone CApitol 4-3121, extension 3921.

THE FORGE OF DEMOCRACY—THE FUNCTION OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there has recently been published a book on the House of Representatives by the Time correspondent, Neil MacNeil. It is most appropriately entitled "Forge of Democracy," for it has been that function which the House has served faithfully since the beginning of the Nation. The House has been close to the grassroots at all times; the storms which have rocked the people throughout our history have pounded in its Chamber. It has played the great role in this Government of putting the stamp of the people on the legislation of the Nation. It has been the voice of Main Street, echoing in its many accents, in our national activities.

Those of us who have served in the House know, firsthand, of the high significance of that body and the dedication both to the institution and to the Nation of its many Members throughout the decades. Too often, the great contribution of this coequal branch of the legislature is overlooked if for no other reason, I suppose, than that it is harder to get to know and too complex to interpret readily. I am afraid that much of that situation is the fault of the press and those engaged in other means of communication, because they have placed too much emphasis on the Senate and not enough emphasis on the House and the activities of the Members who comprise it.

I am delighted, therefore, that Mr. MacNeil has seen fit to take on the job. Judging from the reviews of his book, I believe he has done it most effectively.

Mr. President, as one who served 10 years in the House and as one who has always found Members both cooperative and constructive in the joint chores of the Congress, I should like to take this occasion to express my own high regard for the coequal branch of the Federal Legislature, the House of Representatives, the "forge of democracy." I ask unanimous consent that several reviews of Mr. MacNeil's book of that title be included at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the reviews were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, April 28, 1963]

THE UNDERESTIMATED HOUSE OF CONGRESS

"Forge of Democracy: The House of Representatives," by Neil MacNeil (MacKay; $6.75).

To welcome this book only as a comprehensive story and study of the congressional branch "closest to the people" would be faint praise. Mr. MacNeil, a Washington news correspondent steeped in American history and political philosophy, does more than describe, narrate, and report. He does remarkably well in the extremely difficult task of defining the sometimes ignored and often underestimated House.

This product of years of research and observation clears away much misunderstanding and ignorance. It tries to present the House in its rightful position and perspective as a constitutional parliamentary body and a political, popular-based and pressure-ridden institution with moods, tempers and a "mind of its own, a sense of itself, that defies specific analysis."

In flavoring—not padding—the pages with anecdotes and quotations concerning colorful congressional characters past and present, Mr. MacNeil weaves them into the main fabric as meaningful examples and elaborations. He keeps in proportion the antics or abuses of some members and the occasional bedlam or silliness of House sessions. He stresses the generally little appreciated ability, dedication, and anonymity of many others as well as the inherent power and ultimate sense of responsibility of the House to get things done.

The worthiest aspect of this ambitious book is its accuracy and objectivity. Scholars and specialists may spot minor factual errors, certainly not readily discernible to readers reasonably well acquainted with Congress. Some may dispute the inclusion of James K. Polk among "men of inferior stamp" or question the appraisal of Thomas Reed as "perhaps the greatest of Speakers of the House."

WHERE IS THE PRESS?

Here and there the casual reader may skip stretches explaining legislative rules and machinery. The press gallery may wonder why the author managed to insert so little news about the fourth estate and its association with the House, for better or worse.

History buffs may complain mildly that House personages and events of the last few years take up far more space than do those of earlier exciting eras. While Mr. MacNeil does not profess to write for posterity, some current references could seem superfluous or outdated surprisingly soon. That, of course, is a hazard of telling the story of a House which presently is conservative, powerful and vigorous but has not always been so and could change again.

Only the crabbiest critic or thinnest-skinned Congressman, however, would accuse the author of being opinionated in interpretation, dogmatic in conclusions, cruel in characterizations or a hero worshipper of these leaders and Members he obviously admires.

NO PUNCHES PULLED

Commentary on the House Committee on Un-American Activities pulls no punches but is fair and balanced, as accounts of that controversial group usually go. The entire chapter on the Rules Committee expansion battle of 1961 is an outstanding reportorial achievement based to a large extent on Mr. MacNeil's personal and professional experience in covering Congress. It gives readers, now and to come, a minutely detailed example of "mighty struggles which periodically have convulsed the House and wrenched apart the orderly routine of its ways and tested the mettle of every Member."

If this book slights the Senate it does so principally because the House so often has been buried as a "lower body" in historical and legislative writings. The House admittedly has a rather poor reputation among citizens who consider only its superficial sound and fury and the all-too-evident doings of some mediocre, demagogic or chiseling public servants.

All this and more goes into the "Forge of Democracy" but the final product is worthy of the toil and talent Mr. MacNeil put into it.

ROBERT K. WALSH.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 28, 1963]

GLORY FILLS THE HOUSE THAT HISTORY BUILT

(Reviewed by Richard L. Lyons)

"Forge of Democracy: The House of Representatives," by Neil MacNeil (McKay, 496 pp., $6.75).

An important difference between the House of Representatives and the Senate is that the House has not had a good press agent.

The House usually has been hidden in the shadow of the Senate which seems more important because it has fewer Members and talks more. The House makes the headlines when it is being a nuisance. Visiting scholars have always despaired that it would ever amount to much. Probably no institution of government is less understood or more underrated.

This is a pity because if you know the players the House is the most fascinating show in town. It is a complex machine overloaded with rules which were intended to permit the huge body to operate, but which sometimes prevent it from operating at all. It is an informal, raucous assembly, fiercely proud that in the beginning it alone was chosen to be the directly elected representatives of the people. Its debate is shorter than the Senate's and often sharper. Its Members are less known than Senators but often more expert in their special field. And as the pendulum swings back, the House again has assumed the dominant role as the battlefield where the President's program will pass or fail.

Strangely, almost nothing has been written on the House as an institution. Pieces of its story have been stuffed into biography and political science tracts. But aside from George B. Galloway's slender volume 2 years ago, Neil MacNeil's book is the first effort in nearly half a century to trace the growth of the House as a living institution, relate its present to its past and put it in perspective. It is a major and valuable contribution.

MacNeil has covered the House for more than a decade as a reporter for United Press and now for Time magazine. He tells all sides of a complex story in the style of a good reporter, but essentially he is a friend of the House.

Those who fear that the House is about to come apart at the seams and needs basic reform might wish for an extra chapter on this subject. But the whole story of the infinitely complex arrangement of the House and the history of drastic reform may be helpful to the reformers. It would take more to change the House than knocking a couple of stubborn old men over the head. And when the House knocked down a despotic Speaker 50 years ago it set up a despotic Rules Committee.

MacNeil presents a big slice of history and at its best—telling the frantic floor maneuvers to win a close vote—it is a crackling good story. His chapter on the titanic battle between the late Speaker Sam Rayburn and the conservative chairman of the Rules Committee, Representative HOWARD W. SMITH, Democrat, Virginia, for control of the legislative machinery in 1961 is the most complete account that has been printed.

The House has seen some great and wild times. Clay, Webster, and Calhoun made their names there. Clay served as Speaker every day he sat in the House. John Quincy Adams served in the House after he had been President. Abraham Lincoln sat in the House briefly. So did Davy Crockett and a former heavyweight boxing champ.

In 1812 before the House had learned how to stop a filibuster, a band of Democrats burst into the chamber during a late evening speech and made such a noise banging spittoons and throwing them around that the member holding the floor was scared into his seat. The warhawks then pushed through a declaration of war against England. A few years ago, the late Adolph Sabath, Democrat, Illinois, while chairman of the Rules Commitee, achieved a somewhat similar effect by blocking a conservative resolution by feigning a heart attack at the committee table.

One of the House's greatest moments as an institution occurred in the 1890's when Speaker Thomas Reed of Maine by the sheer force of his personality changed chaos to order and pushed through rules that permitted the majority to operate. Have you heard of Tom Reed?

[From the New York (N.Y.) Herald Tribune, Apr. 29, 1963]

LIFE AND TIMES OF THE (LOWER) HOUSE

(By John K. Hutchens)

"Forge of Democracy: The House of Representatives," by Neil MacNeil (McKay, 496 pp. $6.75).

Propped up against a local soda-fountain counter during the recent 16-week darkness was a newspaperman who allowed that if this thing went on much longer he was going to run for Congress, or something. If he still feels an urge so desperate, a fellow journalist in Washington by the name of Neil MacNeil has a hefty sort of handbook for him—though it's something of a question as to whether "Forge of Democracy: The House of Representatives" would bring an amateur politician scurrying or send him scampering.

Mr. MacNeil, Time magazine's chief congressional correspondent, is clearly a House of Representatives buff—he could scarcely be otherwise and still have devoted himself so wholeheartedly to this long, factual, generally admiring study of the lower House, past and present. "Lower House"? Only an outsider, or anyhow a nonmember, would dream of calling it that.

Certainly no one would have dared to in the presence of, say, the late Speaker Sam Rayburn. For while Mr. MacNeil is at pains to point out all the forbiddingly complex machinery, the frequent absurdities and the occasional skulduggery of the House, it is his major theme that the Senate's legislative brother has historical reason to feel itself a proud Chamber—one that, by and large, has been what the Founding Fathers intended it to be, the governmental institution most immediately responsive to the will of the people.

By the time he has finished its story, telling it from the beginning, with recurring references to the present, Mr. MacNeil has suggested a pair of contrasting images. On the one hand, the Senate, sedate, club-like, and smug in its prestige. On the other hand, the House, often rowdy, unpredictable as an overcrowded corner saloon, and taking no nonsense from anybody—not, at least, without a fight.

It is that unit of the body politic in which a subcommittee chairman (Louisiana's OTTO PASSMAN) could in effect tell two Presidents, Eisenhower and Kennedy, to go fly a kite when they asked the House Appropriations Committee for more foreign aid than Congressman PASSMAN deemed necessary. It is also the Chamber which, in Mr. MacNeil's view as in its own, has explored legislative problems more thoroughly than its partner and rival, the Senate, and has left a greater imprint on the law of the land.

Although the tyranny of such Speakers as Thomas ("Czar") Reed and Uncle Joe Cannon is long vanished, outrageous things still happen there—as when, in 1956, the Rules Committee reputedly killed a housing bill in 8 minutes without so much as reading it. Congressmen making foreign tours at public expense are still shameless; even ADAM CLAYTON POWELL does not hold the record. The speeches Congressmen write for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the folks back home, days after a debate is over and the vote taken, are a caution.

But the machinery, Mr. MacNeil is convinced, is generally successful if cumbersome. Even committee chairmanship by seniority is preferable to its alternative, dictation by a Speaker. Freshmen Congressmen are more considerately treated than they once were. It is a long time since one solon threatened another with a gun on the House floor, as in the days when southern and northern legislators were warming up for the Civil War. Investigation committee procedures are still abused, but when did we last have anything quite comparable to the House Judiciary Committee solemnly listening to a maniac's testimony that President Grant had seduced his sister and forced him into exile?

If you could select from the old days, you might ask for the eloquence of old John Quincy Adams, the charm and brilliance of Henry Clay, and the savage repartee of Alexander Stephens, who heard a gigantic opponent roar that he could swallow little Aleck whole. "If you do," said the future Vice President of the Confederacy, "you will have more brains in your belly than you ever had in your head."

Thorough as he is, Mr. MacNeil never does tell how Congressmen get elected, but that is something else again, and perhaps another book. Meanwhile, here is a good one, rewarding alike to potential candidates and to mere constituents who write letters that begin: "You must have been crazy when you said the other day in the House."

DANGERS OF ANOTHER KOREA IN VIETNAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there have been suggestions that U.S. planes should bomb lines of communications and supply depots in North Vietnam. The individuals who give voice to these ideas are no doubt well-intentioned. They see this tactic as a way to end the conflict in Vietnam quickly, cheaply, and easily.

I am afraid that the tactic will have precisely the opposite effect. It is likely to prolong the conflict, raise the price in American lives and money, and make a real solution in Vietnam much more difficult to achieve. It is likely to involve the United States in another Korean conflict, which is precisely what we should be trying to prevent. The truth of the matter is that there are no quick and easy solutions in Vietnam any more than there were in Korea, in Cuba or anywhere else in the world. To give the American people the impression that there are is to do them no service.

No one can foretell how the tides of conflict may run in Vietnam or what we may be compelled to do. But unless we are looking for another Korea, we will not deliberately enlarge the U.S. involvement and commitment in that country.

The President's policy is based upon supplying the help which his military and other advisers and the Vietnamese officials told him not much more than a year ago was all that was necessary to bring about a solution to the problem of security in South Vietnam. Not 5 months ago in Vietnam, three colleagues and I were told in Saigon that all was going well and there was not the slightest suggestion that American help was anything but entirely ample.

Nevertheless, my colleagues and I warned, in a report to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on February 25, 1963, against expecting quick and easy solutions. Now we see the first pressures to deepen the U.S. commitment beyond its present great depth, a depth which has already cost many American lives. So it seems to me that it is time to repeat what was said in our report. We can reduce our commitment. We can get out of Vietnam. But in present circumstances we can hardly increase that commitment by bombing in North Vietnam and south China without turning the Vietnamese conflict into predominantly an American war at a cost in American lives and money which would not be commensurate with any American interest in present circumstances or, for that matter, with the basic interests of the Vietnamese people. I repeat what we said in the report: The conflict in Vietnam is a Vietnamese conflict. It is not an American war, and, in present circumstances, I repeat, ought not to be permitted to become one, to be paid for primarily with American lives.

So I would say to the advocates of extension of the Vietnamese conflict that to call for what looks like an easy and cheap way of doing the job in Vietnam—by bombing in the north—is to advocate a long step toward another Korea. We had better think hard about such a proposed course. Those who advocate such a course had better recognize now that that is what they are proposing to the American people.

FIFTEENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL AS AN INDEPENDENT NATION

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on Monday, April 29, the State of Israel marked the 15th anniversary of its establishment as an independent nation. I want to take this opportunity to extend my congratulations to the people of this young state on this notable occasion.

The world has recently been saddened by the news of the death of Izhak Ben-Zvi, who became President of Israel in 1952. The people of Israel will certainly miss his leadership. But the deeds and dedicated service of men like Izhak Ben-Zvi and Chaim Weizman, Israel's first President, will aways stand as examples to the people of that Nation and to people all over the world engaged in the monumental task of nation-building. Israel's many other outstanding leaders will continue to provide the country with sound and wise leadership.

The people of Israel have indeed accomplished much in the past 15 years, although they have been beset with many problems which might have overwhelmed a less hardy and determined people. They have established a stable central government in an area of the world where political instability is a common phenomenon. They have achieved and maintained this stability even in face of the pressures generated against them by hostile neighbors. An uneasy truce has existed for the past several years between Israel and the nations which surround it, but Israel has continued, in spite of the daily threats to its existence, to build a nation strong not only politically, but economically and culturally as well.

Israel's record of economic development is indeed remarkable and worthy of our commendation. She has made the most of the limited natural resources available to her to improve her domestic economy, and has embarked on an important program of technical assistance, in the fields of agriculture, health and education, to nations in Africa and Latin America. In the past, Israel has been the recipient of aid from other nations, particularly the United States, to assist her along the road to economic development. Now she finds herself in the enviable position of having progressed to the point where she is in a position to share her skills with other developing nations. In this achievement she holds an unusual position among the small nations of the world. We in America are trying to encourage other nations to shoulder some of the immense burden of foreign aid, and we salute the Israeli nation for assuming responsibilities in this area.

The resourcefulness and vitality of the people of Israel serve as examples to all of us in the free world and to people in the areas of the world still engaged in the struggle against totalitarian powers. Their devotion to the same principles of freedom which are at the foundation of our own Government has withstood powerful and continuing challenges, both internal and external. They are determined to preserve their democratic way of life, emphasizing the dignity and rights of the individual and to strengthen the Biblical homeland promised to Moses, where all Jews might find refuge from persecution.

We Americans owe a debt to the many people of Jewish heritage in our own country. These people display many of the same characteristics of vitality and energy which describe the builders of the State of Israel, and their contributions to the betterment of life here in the United States have been many.

We all hope that in the coming year we will see a mitigation of world tensions so that nations such as Israel can devote their full energies to peaceful, domestic development. I congratulate Israel for its 15-year record of advancement and wish them continued success.

SENATOR JOHN J. WILLIAMS, OF DELAWARE, RECIPIENT OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON AWARD OF THE AMERICAN GOOD GOVERNMENT SOCIETY

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the American Good Government Society held its annual George Washington Dinner at the Sheraton-Park Hotel, in Washington, D.C., on the evening of April 27, 1963. At that time it bestowed upon two of our distinguished colleagues, Senator A. Willis Robertson, of Virginia, and Senator John J. Williams, of Delaware, its George Washington Award.

I was invited by the society to make the presentation of the George Washington Award on its behalf to our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Delaware.

I ask unanimous consent that the remarks made by me on that occasion, and the resolution of tribute and honor accompanying the award to Senator Williams, be printed at this point in the body of the Record.

There being no objection, the remarks and resolution of tribute and honor were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senator John J. Williams of Delaware

I am deeply grateful to the American Good Government Society for inviting me to present the George Washington Award on its behalf to my colleague and friend, John J. Williams, the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware.

The society always invites Democrats to present its awards to Republicans and Republicans to present its awards to Democrats. This practice arises out of the society's veneration for that most truthful American, George Washington, and its recognition of the fact that Democrats will tell the truth on Republicans, and Republicans may tell the truth about Democrats.

While John Williams pleads guilty to the charge of being a Republican, he cannot deny his intellectual kinship with at least three great Democrats—Andrew Jackson, John C. Calhoun, and Grover Cleveland. He accepts the Jacksonian thesis that a national debt is "A national curse" and ought to be paid. He believes with John C. Calhoun that "the very essence of a free government consists in considering offices as public trusts, bestowed for the good of the country, and not for the benefit of an individual or a party." He accepts as valid the declarations of Grover Cleveland that the functions of government "do not include the support of the people" and that government ought not to exact "more of the people's sustenance through taxation than is necessary to meet the just obligations of government and expenses of its economical administration."

A North Carolina school committeeman informed his neighbor that the school board had decided not to renew for an additional year the contract of the man who taught science in the high school. The neighbor expressed his surprise at this action of the board, stating that he understood that this particular teacher had attended many colleges and earned many degrees. The school committeeman replied: "That's the trouble with him. He has been educated way past his intelligence."

John Williams has not been "educated way past his intelligence." As a consequence, he belongs to the hardheaded and not to the eggheaded school of economic thought.

It is well that this is so because the eggheads operating on the Washington scene are striving to sell the public some economic nostrums, which hardheaded economists will not buy. For example, the eggheads assert that if it spends more than it receives in revenue, the Government will have an active deficit, which is desirable because it may spur the economy to great activity; but if it receives in revenue less than it spends, Government will have a passive deficit which is undesirable because it indicates a sluggish condition of the economy.

John Williams refuses to take this quack medicine. He asserts that a deficit in Government finances is inconsistent with sound economics, efficient Government, and good morals, regardless of whether it is called active or passive, and regardless of whether it results from the Government spending more than it receives or receiving less than it spends. Like Mr. Micawber, the outspoken character in Dickens' David Copperfield, he believes that a surplus causes happiness and a deficit produces misery. The Senator maintains that Government should always seek to pay its way as it goes. It is difficult to comprehend why anyone should disagree with Senator Williams on this point. After all, when one has a deficit he has less than he had when he had nothing.

There are, however, those who do disagree with Senator Williams. Some of them have recently derided the conviction that Government ought to make an honest effort to keep its budget in balance at all times as an obsolete Puritan ethic.

Despite this derision of one of his basic convictions, John Williams stands erect and four-square in the Senate Chamber and wages unrelenting battle against unbalanced budgets and other fiscal follies. It is inevitable that this should be so. When all is said, John Williams has much of the strength of the Puritan in his makeup. This is made plain by the famous declaration of Wendell Phillips that the distinction between Puritans and others was simply that Puritans practiced what they believed.

An old story informs us that many years ago a Member of the British Parliament introduced a bill providing for the issuance of an enormous quantity of bonds. Under the terms of the bill, the proceeds of the bonds were to be expended immediately, but no payments were to be made upon the principal of the bonds during the 50 years following their issuance. Another Member of Parliament, who entertained convictions similar to those of Senator Williams, arose and protested that the bill was not fair to posterity. The author of the bill replied: "Posterity has never done anything for me, and I don't propose to do anything for posterity. Moreover, posterity can't vote in the next election."

John Williams believes that the Founding Fathers left us a goodly heritage, that it is our supreme duty to transmit that heritage in an unimpaired state to our children and our children's children, and that we would be derelict in the performance of our duty if we should rob them of their future resources to ease our own burdens.

John Williams did not learn economics sitting at the feet of those who promise "abundance for all by robbing selected Peter to pay collective Paul." He has had the hardihood to accept the economic truths plainly visible to all persons who possess the capacity and willingness to meet reality face to face. He knows that earth yields nothing to man except the products of his own labor. He knows that free men cannot be induced to produce things of value unless they are permitted to retain a fair share of the fruits of their labor for themselves and their families and the causes they hold dear. He knows, moreover, that man can be free only if he is willing to accept the responsibility for his own life which is inseparable from liberty.

It is difficult to overmagnify the contributions which Senator Williams has made to his country. He is an industrious Senator who studies public issues and is thoroughly informed in respect to them. He is, moreover, a courageous Senator who champions the causes he believes to be right, irrespective of whether such causes be popular or unpopular. He may be described as the gadfly of the Senate, who on many occasions has stung the Congress and the executive agencies and officials into righteous conduct. And, finally, he is a great American who loves his country above all things.

It is a great privilege and a high honor to present to Senator Williams in behalf of the American Good Government Society the George Washington Award and its accompanying citation.

Resolution of Tribute and Honor—John James Williams

Farmer and businessman, statesman and patriot—began in the grain business at 18 and came to the U.S. Senate at 42, where he made his mark in his first term. He is now in his 17th year of distinguished service in the Senate.

His character and courage, perseverance and integrity, inspired confidence in his revelations of wholesale corruption in the Bureau of Internal Revenue which led to a complete reorganization into the Internal Revenue Service. His inquiries uncovered fraudulent practices in the Commodity Credit Corporation involving many millions of dollars, most of which was recovered.

Senator Williams is a relentless foe of dishonesty in government. Held in high esteem by his colleagues, he ranks with the ablest Senators who have represented the first State to ratify the Constitution. The people of Delaware can take just pride in his notable achievements.

Ed Gossett,
President.
(For the Board of Trustees, American Good Government Society.)
April 27, 1963.
J. Harvie Williams,
Secretary.

MAKE FREEDOM REALLY RING

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the Fourth of July bellringing plan first proposed by two Connecticut Yankees is receiving a tremendous response all across the land. The reaction to the proposal to make bellringing a traditional part of Independence Day observances throughout the country is indeed heartening.

The editors of This Week magazine deserve great credit for the enthusiastic way they have advanced this fine idea. The April 28 edition of This Week contains an article entitled "Make Freedom Really Ring," which describes the progress of the Fourth of July bellringing campaign and the great support and interest being shown in it. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record at the end of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Connecticut? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the listing of the cosponsors of Senate Congressional Resolution 25 in the article inadvertently omitted the names of the two distinguished Senators from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska and Mr. Curtis]. Actually, the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis] was the first cosponsor of the bill and his colleague [Mr. Hruska] has shown great interest in the measure from the time it was introduced.

Exhibit 1

Make Freedom Really Ring

July 4, 1963, will inaugurate a great new national observance of American independence. Bells will peal across the land—from churches, from government buildings, from college campuses. The proposal for an annual bellringing celebration of the Fourth—reminiscent of the joyous clangor that greeted the first anniversary of the Declaration of Independence at Philadelphia in 1777—was first advanced in This Week. From White House and Capitol Hill to thousands of grade schools, response has been so enthusiastic, it is certain that the bells will ring out.

President Kennedy, who will award the Freedom Medal for the first time this Fourth of July, believes the bellringing custom will help renew citizen awareness of our heritage (see letter from General Clifton, Presidential Military Aide, below).

Senator Abraham Ribicoff, of Connecticut, introduced a supporting resolution in the U.S. Senate—fittingly, since the idea was conceived by two of Senator Ribicoff's constituents, writer Eric Hatch and artist Eric Sloane. Nineteen other Senators joined in presenting the resolution, which was also introduced in the House by Representative Francis E. Walter, of Pennsylvania.

STATES JOINING IN

Meantime action has gone ahead on the State and local level. State Governors have urged their cities and towns to plan bellringing. The Connecticut and California legislatures have passed supporting resolutions and proclamations have been issued in other States.

Many national fraternal, service and veterans' organizations, with memberships in the millions, are urging their local branches to get in on the project. Hundreds of local groups and thousands of individuals have acted on their own, calling on town officials, talking to pastors and school authorities, forming committees. USO plans to carry the bell-ringing around the globe as part of Fourth of July observances of the Armed Forces overseas.

Mayor James H. J. Tate of Philadelphia has assured us that the Liberty Bell itself will be given a ceremonial tap, and the bell in the tower of Independence Hall will lead the great chorus.

HEARINGS SCHEDULED

As for the exact time, the congressional resolution urges the ringing to take place simultaneously at 2 p.m. e.d.t. This and other details will be set at hearings of the Senate Judiciary Committee. You'll be reading the official decisions in daily papers and in This Week shortly.

Everything points to the beginning this Independence Day of a great American tradition that will last as long as the Fourth of July itself.

EVERYBODY'S RINGING BELLS

Resounding support for the Fourth of July bellringing has poured in from all over the United States and from Americans abroad. Here are a few samples as we go to press:

Governors from coast to coast were among the first to pledge support. Governor George Romney of Michigan wrote: "Your plan for the nationwide ringing of the bells on the Fourth of July as a rededication to our rich heritage of freedom sounds wonderful and has my wholehearted support."

Governors Dempsey, of Connecticut, Hughes, of New Jersey, Barron, of West Virginia, Carvel, of Delaware, Scranton, of Pennsylvania, Faubus, of Arkansas, Morrison, of Nebraska, Egan, of Alaska, Hatfield, of Oregon, King, of New Hampshire, Reed, of Maine, Brown, of California, Hoff, of Vermont, Clyde, of Utah, Chafee, of Rhode Island and Harrison, of Virginia all echoed the commendation and pledged their support.

Nineteen U.S. Senators joined in backing the resolution offered by Senator Ribicoff, of Connecticut: Senators Bayh, of Indiana, Boggs, of Delaware, Clark, of Pennsylvania, Dodd, of Connecticut, Douglas, of Illinois, Gruening, of Alaska, Hart, of Michigan, Humphrey, of Minnesota, Javits, of New York, Keating, of New York, Kefauver, of Tennessee, Long, of Missouri, McGee, of Wyoming, McIntyre, of New Hampshire, Pastore, of Rhode Island, Pell, of Rhode Island, Prouty, of Vermont, Scott, of Pennsylvania. In the words of the resolution "Congress hereby declares that the anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence should be observed each year by the ringing of bells throughout the United States."

In New York City, Times Square will be wired for sound to play a bell-ringing record. So will Coney Island.

In Chicago, S. L. DeLove, president of Chicago's Independence Hall Association promises his group's support.

In Philadelphia, not only will the bell in Independence Hall ring but the Reverend Ernest A. Harding, rector of Christ Church, informs us that the bells in Christ Church tower, hung there in 1754, cast in the same foundry in London as the Liberty Bell, will ring out as they did on July 4, 1776.

In Bristol, R.I., where the town population swells from 14,000 to 60,000 for the Fourth of July parade, Manuel A. Sousa, chairman of the Fourth of July Committee, says bellringing is an important part of Bristol's annual celebration, held since 1785.

In Freedom, Calif., 29 members of the fourth-grade class of Freedom School will ring the big school bell.

In Lebanon, Ill., Chip Chapman, of McKendree College, writes that the oldest bell in the United States, cast in the eighth century in Spain, now on the McKendree campus, will ring out on the Fourth.

In Japan, Okinawa, and Korea, bells of U.S. Air Force chapels, will ring one day early—since the Fourth of July comes a day ahead in the Far East. Col. Dean E. Hess, of 5th Air Force Headquarters, reports the proposal to join in the national bellringing came from Staff Chaplain Col. Roy M. Terry.

In Webster Groves, Mo., men, women and children will take turns ringing the bell at Emmanuel Episcopal Church. Chief Bell Ringer John W. Cook says: "The bell is heavy enough so that when it gets swinging, and you keep hold of the rope, it will carry you up to the ceiling. The kids will get a bigger kick out of bellringing than out of shooting off fireworks."

In Ann Arbor, Mich., 7-year-old Ronnie Frey got so excited when his mother read him This Week's article that he went to the mayor about it. Mayor Cecil O. Creal not only listened, he promised Ronnie that all kinds of bells would ring in Ann Arbor on July 4, and made a 15-minute radio speech about it on Washington's Birthday.

In New York, Burgess Meredith, director of Colpix Records Play and Player series, has put into production a 12-inch "Let Freedom Ring" record. Fredric March will read the Declaration of Independence on side 1; famous bells and carillons across the Nation will ring out on side 2. So, hi-fi fans and stereo buffs can have bells ringing right in their own homes, while communities that have no real bells can remedy the lack with the record via radio or an amplifying system.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 25, 1963.

Mr. WILLIAM I. NICHOLS,
Editor and Publisher,
This Week Magazine.

DEAR MR. NICHOLS: The sound of bells is one that should stimulate and intensify the patriotic and spiritual observance of our Nation's birthday this Fourth of July.

President Kennedy is aware of This Week magazine's proposal for the ringing of bells across the Nation on Independence Day, and feels that it is a worthwhile and symbolic ceremony which should certainly renew citizen awareness of our heritage.

The Liberty Bell rang for freedom, and the ringing of bells in 1963 can remind us how precious freedom really is, not only to Americans, but to people everywhere.

Sincerely,

C. V. CLIFTON,
Major General, U.S. Army, Military Aide to the President.

TRIBUTES TO RABBI SIDNEY APPLBAUM AND RABBI KARL APPLBAUM

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am honored to call the attention of my colleagues to the significance of today's invocation. Two brothers, outstanding clergymen in my State, opened the sessions of the House and Senate respectively with prayers within a day of each other.

Rabbi Sidney Applbaum, who offered the prayer at today's session of the Senate has a distinguished record of service to his congregation, Beth Judah, in Brooklyn, as well as to his community. He is a vice president of the Rabbinical Council of America, and cochairman of that organization's Israel Commission.

His brother, Rabbi Dr. Karl Applbaum, delivered the invocation yesterday before the other body. Dr. Karl Applbaum is a noted clergyman from the Borough of Queens in New York City, who serves as the rabbi of the Avenue M Jewish Center in Brooklyn.

I congratulate these two religious leaders of our great city of New York and think it is extremely fitting that they appeared before both Houses of the Congress as the State of Israel is celebrating its 15th anniversary as a nation.

ISRAEL INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, only 15 years ago, the birth of this young and dynamic Republic marked a significant milestone in the history of human freedom. Certainly no less significant is the remarkable spirit which has lifted Israel from the struggles of her infancy and spurred her on to many noble accomplishments as a free and independent nation.

In a very real sense, the story of Israel is a renewal of the story of America. Just as we struggled to be free, just as we carved a nation out of a wilderness, so, too, has Israel triumphed over seemingly insurmountable obstacles to win its place in the councils of the world and in the esteem of men the world over. That is why a special sympathy, a special feeling of friendship, should and must always exist between the United States and Israel.

I have always taken a special, personal pride in the fact that my name is permanently linked to Israel by the Ken Keating Forest located outside the Holy City. This magnificent Freedom Forest links the aspirations and ideals of Israel with the 50 States and the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, Americans have always looked with pride on the accomplishments of Israel—the political, economic, humanitarian, and spiritual endeavors which have been such an important part of the life of this young nation. But, most important of all, Israel today stands as living proof of the power of people to create their own destiny—to mold their lives according to their own aspirations. Israel is a showcase of free government in the Middle East today—a region where nations seem to be continuously involved in the turmoil of choosing their own systems of government. Certainly the other nations can learn and profit by Israel's phenomenal growth and progress.

One of the most remarkable facets of present-day Israel is the ambitious and successful program the young nation is pursuing to share her expertise, experience, and knowledge with the underdeveloped countries of the world. This cooperative venture is in the highest traditions of Israel and reflects new credit on her leaders and her people. It is doing much to make a better life for millions of people in the so-called emerging nations.

Mr. President, unfortunately just as Israel has come of age and much of the world has recognized that Israel is here to stay, her Arab neighbors have intensified their campaign of hate and vituperation. Israel has repeatedly offered to cooperate and share her talents with the Arab world but she has been rebuffed and her very survival threatened by the aggressive designs of President Nasser and his partners in the Arab world.

Mr. President, another cloud—in addition to the threat of Arab imperialism—hangs over Israel today, because the nation mourns the passing of her President, Yitzchak Ben-Zvi. Elected in 1952 to succeed the immortal Dr. Chaim Weizmann, this gentle scholar was an effective partner with Premier David Ben-Gurion in Israel's struggle to maintain her independence and achieve progress.

We in America who admired President Zen-Zli's contributions to the Jewish national homeland join the people of Israel in mourning his passing.

Mr. President, as Israel looks forward to a new year in the unfolding story of her independence, I salute her and extend my heartfelt best wishes to the leaders and the people of this vital and young Republic.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, this week men who cherish freedom, throughout the world, join in celebrating the 15th anniversary of the founding of the State of Israel.

The creation of the State of Israel was a supreme act of faith, an act of faith which seemed to fly in the face of all logic.

On the day of its birth, the Jewish population of the newborn state barely exceeded 600,000 people. Though they had quantities of small arms, they possessed no organized army and no heavy armament.

Surrounding Israel on the day of its birth were Arab States that had sworn to prevent its creation, possessing powerful armies with modern equipment.

When the Arab States invaded Israel from three sides, it seemed that the fate of the new-born state was sealed. But in this situation, as has happened before in history, faith and strength of spirit prevailed over force of arms.

The armies of the invaders were halted or routed. The State of Israel survived as a fulfillment of the Biblical prophecy, as a haven for the persecuted Jews of central Europe and of the Mideast, as a beacon of social progress and political democracy for the poverty-ridden and backward nations of the southern Mediterranean area.

Fifteen years ago there were many who scoffed and many who doubted. But today the voices of the scoffers and doubters are still. Israel exists. The vitality of its existence is attested to by the amazing accomplishments which have characterized its 15-year history.

In the 15 years of its existence, Israel has absorbed more than 1 million Jewish refugees. Its total population has more than tripled—from 785,000 in 1948 to some 2,300,000 today. The area under cultivation during the same period has increased from 400,000 acres to more than 1 million acres; the number of pupils in the education system, from 146,000 to more than 650,000. Although scores of thousands of the refugees who arrived in Israel were suffering from disease and in poor health, Israel's model public health services have given it the lowest mortality rate in the entire world —5.7 per thousand—while life expectancy in Israel is higher today than it is in the United States and Britain and other advanced countries.

These are some of Israel's accomplishments; and Israel has been quick to share her accomplishments with the awakening nations of Asia and Africa. Through the various technical missions she has dispatched to these countries, Israel has already made an impressive contribution to their economic improvement and social betterment.

But in paying tribute to Israel on this, her 15th anniversary, we cannot confine ourselves to praise for her accomplishments and for the spirit of her people, or to pious good wishes for her continued well-being.

Israel today remains a nation beleaguered by hostile states who proclaim night and day that it must be wiped from the face of the earth.

Israeli shipping and foreign ships bound for Israel are still denied access to the Suez Canal, despite two resolutions of the U.N. Security Council calling upon the United Arab Republic to grant freedom of navigation through the Suez Canal to all nations, including Israel.

Most alarming of all is the news that the United Arab Republic has been able to purchase quantities of rockets from the Soviet bloc and that it is now building its own rocket industry with the aid of West German technicians. Maj. Gen. Moshe Dayan, former commander of the Israeli army, pointed out a few weeks ago that some of these rockets cost several hundred thousand dollars each, and that it is improbable that such expensive missiles have been built just for the purpose of delivering conventional explosives. He warned that Nasser was almost certainly planning to develop or obtain nuclear warheads.

Nasser's rocket buildup is all the more reason for concern because of his subversive activities in the countries of the Arab world, his armed aggression against Yemen, and the militantly anti-Western, anti-American quality of his propaganda.

I hold no brief for the backward and cruel monarchies that still govern in some of the Arab lands. I believe that political reform in these countries is a prerequisite to any kind of progress. But it is one thing for the countries of the Arab world to make their way forward through a process of self-reform; it is a completely different thing when the Government of the United Arab Republic, in the name of reform, openly propagandizes for the overthrow of other Arab governments, sends in its agents to subvert them, or sends in 20,000 troops to accomplish the subversion, as it did in Yemen.

It is an altogether different thing, too, when Nasser couples his so-called program to reform the Arab world with the vicious anti-American propaganda conducted by the Afro-Asian Peoples Solidarity Organization, which has its headquarters in Cairo. Within recent weeks the Afro-Asian Peoples Solidarity Organization has held a meeting to demonstrate the support of the Afro-Asian peoples for the Castro government; it has accused "U.S. imperialism and its lackeys" of assassinating the leftist cabinet minister, Quinim Pholsena in Laos; and it has called for armed revolt by the people of Africa who still do not enjoy self-government.

We cannot afford to stand on the sidelines as passive spectators in the Middle East. If the processes I have here described continue much longer, there is a serious danger of war between the Arab States and Israel; and if such a war should ever erupt, the peace of the rest of the world would be in serious jeopardy.

I believe that there is no essential conflict between the interests of the Arab States and the interests of the State of Israel. It is in their common interest that peace be maintained and that their differences be resolved by diplomatic means. This is the approach of the Israel leaders. But unfortunately, it is not yet the approach of Nasser and the other Arab leaders.

In commemorating the 15th anniversary of the founding of the State of Israel, we have the duty to concern ourselves with the vital and immediate problem of creating the conditions for a stable peace in the Middle East.

While offering Nasser our friendship and our aid, I believe we must make it unequivocally clear that we will not tolerate an Arab attack on the State of Israel.

I believe we should insist that Nasser abide by the Security Council's resolutions calling for freedom of navigation for all nations in the Suez Canal.

I believe we should urge the Arab leaders on every appropriate occasion to join with us and with the United Nations in a concerted effort to solve the Arab refugee problem, which, so long as it exists, will remain a constant source of tension and unrest.

I believe we should embark on a determined and sustained diplomatic effort to bring the Israel and Arab leaders together, to halt the tragic arms race that impoverishes and threatens them both, and to persuade them to join forces with us in a master plan designed to dramatically better the conditions of the peoples of the southern Mediterranean.

Only if we commit ourselves to such a program, will the commemoration of Israel's founding have real meaning for today and enduring significance for the future.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, this is the week in which the State of Israel celebrates the 15th anniversary of its independence. This is an occasion which all the world should note. At no time in recent history has there been a nation which has made so much progress in 15 years, under such difficult conditions and against so many obstacles.

The State of Israel was born in 1948, under attack from its neighbors. Many nations did not grant official recognition at that time. We can be proud that the United States, under President Harry Truman, was the first Nation in the world to recognize Israel.

It was my privilege last year to visit in Israel and see the progress that is being made there. The population has tripled. The desert has been made to bloom. Oil and gas and valuable minerals have been discovered. Both the cities and the kibbutzim are flourishing, and the nation is able to provide an ever-increasing standard of living for its people.

So successful has Israel been that it can now export technical assistance, in the form of experts and training programs to 83 nations.

Most important of all, the State of Israel, as a viable democracy, is succeeding in the historic mission it has undertaken as a homeland for the Jewish people.

As we observe this anniversary, which is a most significant one, the United States reaffirms its policies; to keep peace in the Middle East; to try to prevent the spread of armaments; to find a solution to the refugee problem; and to extend a helping hand to nations, like Israel, who are our friends, who practice democracy, and who are engaged in a national effort of self-development, full of both economic and spiritual significance to all the world.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, yesterday marked the 15th anniversary of the free independent nation of Israel. Fifteen years ago not many would have given this young country much chance for survival. But today Israel stands as a proud bastion of democratic ideals in the stormy Middle East.

Faced with a desperate struggle for survival from the beginning, the Israelis established their independence through their determination and courage. Once a shaky peace was established with the help of the U.N., Israel began her truly remarkable development. Through rigorous self-discipline and hard work, the Israelis have built modern ports and factories, prosperous cities, and have literally made the desert bloom. This ancient and historic land is vibrant with new and vigorous life.

When reading about Israel's remarkable progress, we are often reminded of her past heritage of greatness; King Solomon's mines are once more producing copper, and the modern port of Aqaba—pronounced Akaba—is established on the site of his outlet to the Red Sea.

The inhabitants of Israel come from all walks of life and all parts of the world. Yemenis mingle with Germans, Russians with Moroccans. All are members of a modern state, one that is pledged to defend democracy and the rights of its citizens. As a friend and ally of the United States, Israel remains committed to the fight against international communism. As the people of Israel celebrate their 15th anniversary of independence, we in America salute them and extend to them our praises for their achievements in promoting progress and stability throughout the world.

But even today, after 15 years of successful development Israel is still beleaguered by hostile forces. While building her economy to a point where she is almost independent of foreign aid, Israel has had to spend precious resources on defense to protect her independence in the midst of an uneasy peace. Now there is a renewed danger that the armed truce which prevails in the Middle East will be broken and the newly united Arab nations will again attempt to crush this small but proud nation.

All of us in the United States have watched with sympathy and admiration the progress of Israel over the past years. As we see her remarkable achievement again endangered by hostile encirclement, we must hope that the United States will use all her power and influence to bring a lasting peace to this troubled part of the world, so that Israel may grow to reach the greatness which is her destiny.

PREMIER DAVID BEN-GURION AND HIS LAND OF MILK AND HONEY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, Premier David Ben-Gurion, whose contributions to the miracle that is Israel today have been monumental, recently wrote an excellent summary of Israel's first 15 years for the New York Herald-Tribune. In addition to reviewing the remarkable strides made by his gallant nation since 1948, he emphasized the "sword of Damocles" which continues to hang over Israel as a result of the aggressive designs of the Arab nations and his country's deep yearning for a world of peace and security.

He also noted the magnificent manner in which Israel has freely shared its pioneering spirit, experience, and know-how with the emerging lands of Africa, Asia, and Latin America. It is, as Premier Ben-Gurion puts it, a "modest contribution to this partnership of all mankind." Of course, it is much more than that—and the people of Israel deserve worldwide commendation for the way in which they are helping to close the gap between the have and the have-not countries of the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article by Premier Ben-Gurion, which appeared in the Herald Tribune of April 28, 1963, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ISRAEL, NOW AGED 15, STILL A LAND OF MILK AND HONEY

(And so it came to pass, that on the 5th day of the Hebrew month of Iyar, the Jewish people received their "promised land"—the state of Israel was reborn. Tomorrow, Israelis—and their brethren throughout the world—celebrate the 15th anniversary of that Independence Day. One of the guiding lights in the Israelis' battle to survive and grow has been the present Premier—David Ben-Gurion. At the request of Herald Tribune Editor-in-Chief John Hay Whitney, Mr. Ben-Gurion has written this review of his country's 15-year struggle, and his hopes and aspirations for the future.)

(By David Ben-Gurion)

At the end of the first 15 years of her renewed independence, Israel can look back over a stretch of road not inconsiderable in length and difficulty that she has succeeded in covering.

This is, I believe, the only state in the world whose neighbors proclaim night and day that it must be wiped off the face of the earth, though they all belong to the United Nations, which obligates its member-states to settle all their disputes by peaceful means. The U.N. has been rightly concerned over any dispute that has broken out in any corner of the world, knowing that a single spark might kindle a world conflagration, and it has taken great pains to heal the breaches and smooth over the controversies. But it has not found it necessary to take any steps to insure, or even to demand, that the incessant threats from Egypt, Syria, Iraq and others against Israel's peace and existence should be stopped by its members. Twice—in 1951 and in 1956—the Security Council decided that Israel, like any other country, must be assured freedom of navigation in the Suez Canal. A Security Council resolution is not merely a recommendation, like the resolutions of the Assembly; it is binding on all members; yet this decision is openly and constantly violated—and no one has a word to say.

On February 20, 1957, the President of the United States, Gen. Dwight Eisenhower, in a broadcast to the American people, following the aftermath of the Sinai campaign, said that the United States recognized that military action against Egypt had resulted from grave and repeated provocations, and noted that Israeli forces had been withdrawn from much of the territory they had occupied, though they still remained outside the armistice lines. He declared that if Israel withdrew, the United Nations should see to it that in the Middle East there would be a greater degree of justice and compliance with international law than had been the case prior to the Sinai campaign. I received a letter from the President, in which he stated, among other things:

"It has always been the view of the Government that after the withdrawal there should be a united effort by all of the nations to bring about conditions in the area more stable, more tranquil, and more conducive to the general welfare than those which existed heretofore. Hopes and expectations based thereon were voiced by your Foreign Minister and others. I believe that it is reasonable to entertain such hopes and expectations and I want you to know that the United States, as a friend of all the countries of the area and as a loyal member of the United Nations, will seek that such hopes prove not to be vain."

I had the privilege of knowing General Eisenhower before he became President, and I also had a long talk with him during his term of office on many problems of the area and of the world at large. I know that he is not in the habit of giving promises that he and those he represents do not intend to keep, and I have not the slightest doubt that all his statements, whether by word of mouth or in writing, were made with complete sincerity. But I must point out, with deep regret, that the United Nations did not fulfill the hopes placed in it by the United States, through President Eisenhower, and it cannot be said that the hopes and expectations voiced by our Foreign Minister, Mrs. Meir, at the U.N. Assembly at the beginning of March 1957, have been realized.

The sword of Damocles hangs over our heads as before; the Arab League boycott has been intensified; the threats to our survival continue and grow more violent; the leading Arab country, whose grave and repeated provocations President Eisenhower stigmatized, continues to violate the U.N. Charter and the decisions of the Security Council, so that not a single Israel ship, or even a foreign ship bound for Israel, can pass through the Suez Canal; from both sides of the cold war barricades there is a constant flow of aid to Egypt: From the one side—the East—aggressive armaments of all types for land, sea, and air forces, dedicated to the destruction of Israel, and from the other—the West—enormous sums of money, facilitating the acquisition and utilization of these armaments; moreover, scientists from the West are teaching the Egyptians how to use the most murderous weapons to carry out their designs against Israel, while respected and highly placed officials of the State Department defend these scientists on the ground that but for them their places would be taken by scientists from the East.

In the shadow of these dangers and injustices, Israel perseveres for the 15th year in succession in her arduous and constructive endeavors: The ingathering of the exiles, the conquest of the desert, the advancement of education and science, fraternal cooperation with new and developing states in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

The trebling of the population in this small and impoverished country, flowing with milk and honey but not with sufficient water, rich in rocks and sand dunes but poor in natural resources and vital raw materials, has been no easy task; indeed, practical men, with their eyes fixed upon things as they are, regarded it as an empty and insubstantial utopian dream.

But it seems that, besides the visible material reality, there is also a spiritual reality, which works out of sight. It is this reality that has been on our side and has refuted all the dismal prophecies that the unlimited immigration of impoverished masses, untrained and uneducated—as were the great majority of the immigrants during the period of the state, unlike those who came before the dreadful holocaust that destroyed 6 million of the European Jews with their spiritual and material resources—would bring ruin and disaster to the young state. This immigration indeed brought to Israel many sufferers from various diseases from Asian and African countries, but today Israel is in the first rank for expectation of life and birth. It stands at 70.67 years for men and 73.47 for women—which is higher than in the United States, Britain, France, Germany, or any of the other highly developed countries, with the exception of the three Scandinavian lands, Sweden, Norway, and Denmark, and Holland; and our mortality rate is the lowest in the whole world—5.7 per thousand.

In addition to half a million immigrants of European origin, we have absorbed over half a million from Asian and African countries, most of them entirely without capital, skills and education, brought up in backward ghettoes and earning their livings by peddling—and they have created hundreds of villages in Galilee and the Jerusalem Corridor, in the south and the Negev, and built over a score of development towns where they work in every branch of industry and handicrafts, from textiles to electronic and petrochemical manufactures.

On May 15, 1948—the day the state was founded—we had 333 urban and rural settlements; at the end of 1962 the number had risen to about 875. At the first census, on November 8, 1948, the population was 785,678—716,678 Jews and 69,000 Arabs. At the second, on May 22, 1961, the total was 2,179,491—1,932,357 Jews and 247,134 Arabs.

In 1948–49 there were 146,017 pupils—134,887 Jews and 11,130 Arabs—in our entire education system. By 1961–62 the total had grown to 641,986—586,539 Jews and 55,447 Arabs. In post-primary schools (academic, vocational, agricultural and teachers' training colleges) there were 10,945 students, including 14 Arabs, at the establishment of the state, and 77,416, including 1,587 Arabs, in 1961–62.

Every boy and girl between the ages of 5 and 14 is obliged to attend kindergarten (at the age of 5–6) and elementary school (between 6 and 14), and education is free. Secondary education is not yet compulsory or free, but tuition fees are graded according to the financial position of the parents, and poor students receive scholarships from the government.

In 1949 the Weizmann Institute was established in Rehovot for research in all branches of the natural sciences, and its standards are not inferior to those of similar institutions in the most highly developed European countries.

Israel still faces grave educational problems, however, for the gap between the pupils whose parents came from Europe and America and those originating from Asian and African countries is still great; there are considerable economic and cultural differences between children from wealthy and developed countries and those from poor, backward ones, especially as it was the poorest from the latter who came to settle in Israel. Intensive efforts are therefore being made, by lengthening the schoolday in kindergartens and elementary schools, establishing special schools, building dormitories for talented children from poor and large families, and other means, to close the gap; but, although the results of these efforts are encouraging, we still have a long way to go.

When the state was established, we found ourselves facing economic chaos. The Arab invasion, which was scotched only at the beginning of January 1949, the enormous mass immigration, which brought in some 700,000 immigrants in the first 4 years of the state—more than the entire population on the day it was created—the enormous expense and damage resulting from the War of Independence, confronted the young state with appalling economic problems and shortages, which seemed to be almost insoluble. Until the end of the mandate, our country belonged to the sterling area. Our production, agricultural and industrial, depended largely on the presence of the British Army, which consumed but did not produce. There were economic ties of export and import with the neighboring countries. Complete isolation from the neighboring countries when independence came, together with the war and the Arab boycott, on the one hand, and the mass immigration that trebled our population in less than 4 years, on the other, faced us with a growing shortage of housing, food, employment, teachers, schools, and hospitals. A superhuman effort was required to overcome these tremendous shortages, and although we cannot claim to have succeeded 100 percent even at the end of our 15th year, by the end of the first-decade we had already broken the back of the crisis. Today all sections of our economy, agriculture, and industry, land, sea, and air transport, are expanding, branching out into new fields and improving their efficiency; there is full employment in the country, and in some places there is even a shortage of labor.

The state budget, which in 1948–49 stood at I£20,855,000, amounted to I£2,990,000,000 (about $1,000 million) in 1963–64.

The cultivated area, which covered some 400,000 acres (of which 75,000 were under irrigation) in 1948–49, totaled almost 1,030,000 acres, of which 380,000 were irrigated, in 1962–63. The afforested area increased from 13,000 acres in 1949 to over 80,000 in 1961. In 1949 the Arabs cultivated 85,000 acres; in 1961 they tilled 220,000. There were 681 tractors in the country in 1948 and no less than 7,835 in 1961.

Before the establishment of the state, our industry was concentrated in the narrow coastal strip between Rehovot in the south and Haifa in the north, and was devoted mainly to industries producing for home consumption, such as food, textiles, woodworking, paper and printing; in fact, it was chiefly concerned with the final processing of materials for the local market. During the 15 years of the state, our industry has been comprehensively reorganized. Output, employment, and exports have grown. New branches have been established: metalworking, chemicals, petrochemical manufactures, electronics, arms manufacture and their secondary branches, and output in other industries has been increased. In September, 1955, oil was first discovered in Israel, in southern Judea, at a depth of 4,905 feet, and in 1957 a rich source of natural gas was found at Zohar, near the Dead Sea. Extensive deposits of phosphates have been discovered in the Negev, and copper mines at Timna, not far from Eilat. After the Sinai campaign, an oil pipeline was laid from Eilat to the refineries which the British left in Haifa.

By the end of 1962 there were 14,500 enterprises in the country, employing almost 200,000 workers, as against 88,000 in 1950. Between the rise of the state and 1962, some I£1,600 millions (at 1955 prices) were invested in industry; in 1962 alone I£253 million were invested, as compared with I£85 million in 1959. Industrial output totaled I£500 million in 1962, compared with I£3.5 million, at the same prices, in 1949—an increase of 14 percent per year. Industry had emerged from the narrow limits of the coastal strip, in which it had been confined, expanding northward to Kiryat Shmona and Nahariya, and southward to Kiryat Gat, Ashkelon, Dimona, Mitzpeh Ramon and Eilat. Industrial exports grew twenty-fivefold—from $10.5 million in 1949 to $250 million in 1962–63.

Israel has not yet succeeded, however, in balancing her foreign trade. In 1949, with exports at $28.5 million and imports of $253.2 million, exports were 11 per cent of imports. In 1962, the percentage was 46 percent—with $282 million exports and $616 million imports. In absolute terms, therefore, the deficit has increased, but exports per capita grew from $27 in 1949 to $212 in 1962, while the trade deficit per capita fell from $213 to $144.

Productivity of labor in Israel is steadily on the increase, although in most industries it is still lower than that of the most advanced countries in Europe; in others, however, it is approaching American standards of productivity.

Israel's economic and cultural progress is due to three things: The pioneering spirit that inspires the best of our immigrant and Israel youth, who respond to the challenge of our desolate areas and the ingathering of the exiles; the feeling of Diaspora Jewry that they are partners in the enterprise of Israel's resurgence in the ancient homeland of the Jewish people; and the power of science and technology, which Israel unceasingly—and not without success—tries to enhance.

Israel is aware that she cannot equal other nations in military force, wealth, numbers, or material resources, but she believes that there is no impediment to equality with the greatest nations in the world in intellectual capacity and moral standards—the only heritage bequeathed to her by Jewish history, which is imbued with suffering and spiritual valor.

By virtue of the pioneering energies of three generations, Israel is creating new ways of life in agricultural settlement, in cooperative transport on land and sea, and in a considerable part of her industry which is founded on labor partnership and mutual aid. Thus there have been created the hundreds of kibbutzim, smallholders' settlements and cooperatives in urban and interurban transport, shipping, and basic industries. The medical services of the Histadrut, the General Federation of Labor, encompass some three-quarters of the nation. The Israel Defense Forces are dedicated not only to defense against the external enemy, but also to the molding of the human beings assembled from all over the globe into a single national and cultural entity, the welding of the fragments of the nation and its dispersed tribes with bonds of language, culture and labor, with an understanding of our people's past and its vision for the future. For this purpose a special formation called Nahal (the Hebrew initials of No'ar Halutzi Lohem—Fighting Pioneer Youth) was founded, which has already established 29 kibbutzim and 4 smallholders' villages in the Negev and northern Galilee, most of them border settlements.

The army strives to fructify the desert in both the natural and the human landscape of our country. This is also the central task of the Labor Federation, which is unique in its organizational structure and methods. It is not only a trade union organization, a cooperative body, and an educational institution, but also a league of builders of the homeland and the nation, makers of a new society founded on cooperation and brotherhood.

These special characteristics and creations of Israel have made her a lodestone for the best of the world's Jewish youth, not only from lands of distress and poverty but also from the affluent and prosperous countries. Moreover—and no less important—they have served as a model and example for the states that were established at the same time as Israel and in recent years, as well as for a number of ancient nations, in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

From the very beginning, Israel knew that independence is not the end but only a beginning—a gateway to development and progress, material and spiritual. The new states that have been established by the score in Africa and Asia have learned this truth from their own experience, and most of the problems with which they are wrestling are being solved in Israel. Thus in recent years Israel has become a school for thousands of young people from Asia and Africa, and Israel instructors in military training, agricultural settlement, health and education have been working in scores of countries in Asia and Africa—and recently in some Latin-American countries as well. Israel does not possess the manpower, the wealth, and perhaps the know-how of the United States, or even of the countries of Western Europe—not only of France, Germany, Britain, or Italy, but even of Holland, Belgium, or the Scandinavian countries. But in her spirit and her pioneering experience in development, education, social organization, and health, she is no whit inferior to any country or nation in the world. Thousands of young people, from 36 countries in Africa, 14 in Asia (including India, the Philippines, and Japan), and, in recent years, from 20 countries in Latin America and the Caribbean, as well as 5 in the Mediterranean basin (Cyprus, Greece, Persia, Turkey, and Malta), have come to Israel to study her methods in agricultural settlement, the labor movement, youth education in Nahal and the "Gadna" Youth Corps, vocational training, cooperation, and various branches of science at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, the Technion in Haifa and the Weizmann Institute in Rehovot. There are 634 Israel experts in African countries, 137 in Asia, 75 in the Mediterranean Basin, and 23 in Latin America.

Israel realizes that her destiny is bound up with that of humanity as a whole, and her safety depends on peace among all the nations. In her own country she strives for the maximum ingathering of the exiles, the fructification and population of the wasteland, economic independence, the advancement of the individual, progress in education and science, and the establishment of a society built on liberty, equality, tolerance, mutual aid and love of humanity, as laid down in her state education law of 1953. In her foreign policy, she aims at maintaining friendly relations with all states, irrespective of their internal regimes, and permanent peace and cooperation with the neighboring countries, for the sake of peace and progress in the Middle East. Israel is convinced that only by closing the material and spiritual gap between the wealthy, highly developed nations and the poor, developing ones, by the establishment of true cooperation between all countries, will peace be established in the world, and she does all in her power to make her modest contribution to this partnership of all mankind.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR GEORGE A. SMATHERS, OF FLORIDA

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the April 26 issue of the Congressional Quarterly contains, beginning on page 665, an article relating to the appointment of my distinguished colleague from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] as chairman of the Senate Special Committee on Aging.

The article also covers Senator SMATHERS' distinguished service in this body, the other important appointments that he has received, such as his service as acting majority leader during the absence of the majority leader, now the Vice President; his chairmanship of the Democratic senatorial campaign committee, 1956–60; and his appointment as secretary of the Democratic conference in 1961.

It is with the greatest pleasure that I ask unanimous consent that this excellent biographical sketch of my distinguished colleague be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the biographical sketch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACT SHEET ON GEORGE A. SMATHERS: SMATHERS APPOINTED CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON AGING

Senator GEORGE A. SMATHERS, Democrat, of Florida, March 4 was appointed chairman of the Senate Special Committee on Aging by the Democratic Steering Committee. SMATHERS, 49, who voted for tabling (killing) the administration's social security medicare proposal in 1962, replaces former chairman Senator PAT MCNAMARA, Democrat, of Michigan. The implications of SMATHERS' appointment on future attempts to get social security-financed medical care through the Senate are not immediately discernible. However, one thing is certain: SMATHERS will bring to the chairmanship a considerably more conservative philosophy of medical care than that of his predecessor who had vigorously supported the administration's proposal.

A southern conservative and third-ranking Democrat on the Finance Committee, SMATHERS has been cool toward medicare legislation. Although he has been a close friend of the President and faces a large aged voting population in Florida, he declined to take a firm stand on the issue until 1962. On August 2, 1962, he stated in a press release, "I firmly believe that we should make every effort to develop a medical program under the free enterprise system * * * independent of govermental regulation."

In 1960, SMATHERS voted in the Finance Committee for adoption of the Kerr-Mills bill (Federal grants to States for medical care) over the social security approach sponsored by then Senator John F. Kennedy, Democrat, of Massachusetts. The Kennedy bill had received the endorsement of MCNAMARA who was then chairman of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee's Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging (made a special committee in 1961). The Aging Subcommittee at that time had issued a report (S. Rept. 1121) which, among other recommendations called for aid to the aged through social security. The special committee's annual report (S. Rept. 8) at the beginning of 1963 reflected similar recommendations.

Since the special committee only studies and investigates problems and reports findings and recommendations, and cannot report legislation, the chairman does not wield such influence as does a regular committee chairman. Consequently, he must generally go along with the committee majority. This is the situation confronting SMATHERS, as his committee is heavily weighted with promedicare members. Of the 14 Democrats and 7 Republicans on the committee in 1962, 12 Democrats and 1 Republican voted in the Senate against tabling the administration's medicare scheme. An aid to SMATHERS said that while the Senator felt there were many problems, other than the social security approach to medical care, on which the committee could concentrate, he "definitely would not stand in the way of the majority."

GEORGE ARMISTEAD SMATHERS was born November 14, 1913, in Atlantic City, N.J., and moved to Florida with his family in 1919. He attended Dade County (Miami) public schools and the University of Florida, where he was an outstanding athlete and debator, as well as president of the student body. As a law student at the University in 1938, he got his first break in politics by managing former Senator CLAUDE PEPPER's (Democrat, 1936–51), reelection campaign on the campus. PEPPER repaid SMATHERS in 1940 by obtaining a job for him as assistant U.S. attorney in Dade County.

SMATHERS joined the Marines in 1942 and was discharged in 1945 as a major after spending much of his service in the Pacific. Upon his return he was appointed special assistant to the U.S. Attorney General and was given assignments which kept him in Florida. With the help of PEPPER, SMATHERS won his first term to Congress in 1946 and was reelected for a second term in 1948. In recognition of his service in the House, the National Junior Chamber of Commerce named him one of the 10 most outstanding men in the Nation in 1948.

A disagreement in political philosophy, namely PEPPER's espousal of the Fair Employment Practices Commission, caused SMATHERS in 1950 to choose to run for PEPPER's Senate seat. In one of the most bitter campaigns ever fought in Florida history, SMATHERS won in the Democratic primary with a plurality of about 60,000 votes.

States righters and Republicans lauded the victory over PEPPER as a defeat for the Truman administration and the New Dealers. SMATHERS, however, warned the Republicans that they should get little comfort from his victory, which he regarded as "a repudiation of extremism and radicalism in Florida, not as a trend toward Republicanism."

Despite the fact that he defeated a New Dealer, SMATHERS found himself within the inner circle of the Democratic leadership in the Senate. During his first term he was appointed deputy floor leader and often served as acting majority leader in the absence of then Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Democrat, of Texas. He served as chairman of the Democratic senatorial campaign committee (1956–60) and was appointed Secretary of the Democratic conference in 1961.

At the 1960 Democratic convention in Los Angeles SMATHERS received 29 votes from the Florida delegation as a favorite son. Since Kennedy won on the first ballot a determination on how the votes were to be released did not have to be made. In August 1960, he was appointed assistant chairman of the Democratic National Committee and general manager of the Kennedy-Johnson campaign in the South. SMATHERS declared at that time, however, that "acceptance of this assignment does not in any way mean that I express approval of the Democratic platform nor indirect support of the Republican platform. Both of them are obnoxious and unrepresentative."

A Methodist, SMATHERS married the former Rosemary Townley March 19, 1939. They have two sons, John, 21, and Bruce, 19.

SENATE CAREER

In addition to the chairmanship of the Special Committee on Aging and the third ranking Democratic position on the Finance Committee, SMATHERS currently serves on the Foreign Relations Committee, where he is the newest Democratic member, and as third ranking on the Select Small Business Committee. He also remains as secertary of the Democratic Conference, which makes him third ranking in the leadership behind Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, and Majority Whip HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota.

SMATHERS has previously served on the following committees: Interior and Insular Affairs (1951–53); Post Office and Civil Service (1951–52); and the Commerce Committee (1953–62), where he was chairman of the Surface Transportation Subcommittee.

His interests range from Latin American affairs to the plight of the railroad industry. On both subjects he has been outspoken.

As early as 1951, he warned that communism could gain a foothold in Latin America and become a much graver threat to the hemisphere than such dictators as Trujillo. He predicted soon after Castro came to power in 1959 that his regime was Communinst-infiltrated and urged in the ensuing years that the United States take a hard line policy in protecting the hemisphere from subversion. In the Senate March 15, 1963, he proposed that the United States recognize a Cuban Government-in-exile as a major step in offering the Cuban people an alternative to Castroism.

SMATHERS' interest in the railroad industry is reflected in his authorship of the Transportation Act of 1958, which authorized the Interstate Commerce Commission to operate a $500 million program of guaranteed loans to aid the railroads. He has also sponsored amendments to repeal the 3-percent tax on freight and the 10-percent passenger tax on rail, ship, and bus tickets.

The interests of the small businessman and laborer have concerned SMATHERS. In 1962 he sponsored a successful Finance Committee amendment to the Trade Expansion Act to provide that the Federal Government pay the full cost of the unemployment compensation for workers under the bill. He was also instrumental in the passage of a bill (H.R. 10) providing for a retirement pension fund for self-employed persons, which had failed of enactment since 1951.

In 1963, he has reintroduced legislation to provide a deduction from taxable income for parents sending their children to schools of higher education and legislation to establish a nationwide primary to nominate party candidates for the office of President.

While close to the leadership, SMATHERS has been described as somewhat of a lone wolf. He has enjoyed the advantages of being a close personal friend of President Kennedy and of his position as secretary of the Democratic conference. His 4 years as chairman of the Democratic senatorial campaign committee were marked with success: Democrats made a net gain of 16 seats during the period. However, his independent judgment has always guided him. Commenting on the President's recommendation for a $13.5 billion tax cut, SMATHERS, February 1, said, "If this program is wrong, if this tremendous cut is decided upon and if it fails to stimulate our economy as planned, we will have destroyed the fiscal soundness of a nation which has been described as the last best hope of men."

Congressional Quarterly's studies of voting behavior during the 87th Congress showed that Smathers supported a larger Federal role 28 percent of time, opposed it 61 percent of time; supported the President's position on foreign and domestic policy 55 percent of the time, opposed him 31 percent of the time; and voted with the conservative coalition 76 percent of the time and against it 15 percent of the time.

THE ANTIDUMPING AMENDMENT

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I was pleased to join as a sponsor of the bill, S. 1318, to amend the Antidumping Act of 1921, introduced by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott], and cosponsored by several other Senators.

Antidumping laws are enforced in most major commercial countries as a means of protecting domestic producers against predatory price cutting by competing foreign suppliers. The existing American statute provides for the levy of dumping duties on goods which the Treasury finds are being imported at less than fair value, that is, less than the price in the exporting country, provided the Tariff Commission finds that an American industry is being injured by the competition from the dumped goods. Thus, the Antidumping Act is not basically a protective tariff, but rather a means of enforcing free and fair competition, similar to the Robinson-Patman Act in domestic commerce.

Last April 1, at Villanova University in Philadelphia, I had the pleasure of addressing a conference on industrial property protection, antitrust laws, and the European Economic Community. At that time I pointed out that the growth and success of the European Common Market might increase the problems of American industry in competition with foreign producers, particularly the possibility of additional dumping here. As industries within the Common Market grow in size and develop large-scale mass-production techniques more effectively, they may feel the necessity to dispose of their surplus production abroad by dumping techniques, against which we should be legally prepared.

A number of leading industries—cement, chemicals, copper, and brass, man-made fibers, pharmaceuticals, steel, wire and cable, and others—have been concerned about weaknesses in the present law. S. 1318 corrects the most conspicuous shortcomings and loopholes in the present law, and has wide backing from within those industries most familiar with the problem, as well as from several interested labor union representatives.

Although S. 1318 proposes a number of helpful changes, most of them have to do only with the role of the Treasury. For that reason, I am not sure it deals with all the major problem areas. For example, a finding of dumping by the Treasury does not lead to any action unless the Tariff Commission determines that a domestic industry is being or is likely to be injured or is prevented from being established. The fact is that since this power was placed in the Tariff Commission in 1954, out of 24 dumping cases determined by the Commission, it has found injury in only 5. Thus, even after dumping has been found to exist, in most cases the affected industry has not been granted any relief. I hope it may be possible to have a full exploration of these problems during the course of hearings so that further study may suggest additional amendments to S. 1318 that may be necessary.

FREE LAND—THE HOMESTEAD ACT

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the May issue of the Rotarian, the magazine of Rotary International, carries a splendid article on the Homestead Act and the settling of the West by Paul Friggens, a roving editor of the Reader's Digest and himself a son of the sodbusters he so colorfully describes.

This article was called to my attention by a warm personal friend, Mr. Calvin Webster, who is the son of a Nebraska homesteader, and who is now city attorney of Tucson, Ariz.

This article will be read with great interest, Mr. President, by the thousands of people like Mr. Webster, scattered throughout the country, whose parents and grandparents opened the West for settlement and made it the Heart of America.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Free Land" from the May 1963 issue of the Rotarian be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

FREE LAND—THE U.S. HOMESTEAD ACT DREW THE THOUSANDS OF HARDY SETTLERS WHO TAMED THE WILD WEST

(By Paul Friggens)

Speaking in the early 1840s, an eloquent Member of Congress pictured the then unknown and forbidding American West. Said he: "What do we want with this vast, worthless area, this region of savages and wild beasts, of deserts of shifting sands, and whirlwinds of dust, of cactus and prairie dogs? To what use could we ever hope to put these great deserts or these endless mountain ranges, impenetrable and covered to their base with eternal snow?" The speaker concluded with a vow that "I will never vote 1 cent from the public treasury to place the Pacific coast 1 inch nearer to Boston than it now is."

It was a commonly held view, in Congress and out. In 1820 Maj. Stephen H. Long explored the Great Plains to the Rockies (climbing the snowy 14,255-foot peak west of Denver which today bears his name) and reported a region "almost wholly unfit for cultivation, and of course uninhabitable by a people depending upon agriculture for their subsistence." Long dismissed it on his maps as the "Great American Desert," suggesting that someday the area might be useful as a "barrier to prevent too great an extension of our population westward, and secure us against the machinations or incursions of an enemy." Appropriately, Congress voted $30,000 to equip the Army with a camel corps for future travel over the American Sahara, and before the novel experiment finally was abandoned one caravan actually made it to far-off California.

But Major Long's hopeless and irreclaimable desert had a destiny. Within a few years the advancing fur traders, gold seekers, and cattlemen had breached the frontier of the Indian and buffalo; and then, with the ringing shout "Free land!" came the expectant sodbusters, driving their plodding oxen into the sunset and riding high hopes of fortune across the wide "Massaura." For just a century ago Congress enacted the Homestead Act, opening the great American desert to farming and final settlement, and bringing Boston, incidentally, a great deal closer to California.

In the spectacular land rush that followed, a million and a half determined homesteaders strung their fences in 17 Western States,[1] settled some 270 million acres, and gave a vast surge to our industry, population, and politics. They made the desert bloom and helped the United States become the greatest food producer on earth.

The Homestead Act was unprecedented in history and peculiarly American. Indeed, Nebraska Senator Roman L. Hruska, addressing Congress on the homestead centennial, declared, "Probably no other one law has done so much toward shaping the democratic nature of this country. By a single act, the Nation made possible the development of small, family-sized farms, for decades the economic and sociological backbone of America." And for much of the world demanding land reforms today, the Homestead Act is still a beacon.

The idea that the land belongs to the people is as old as the U.S. Republic. As early as 1776, Thomas Jefferson advocated the gift of small quantities of land to western settlers, and through the years the homestead movement became a national political issue. Events in the 1860's finally forced a showdown. The Nation was concerned with new homes and opportunities for its returning Civil War veterans, and at the same time famine, overpopulation, and revolution in Europe were flooding U.S. shores with immigrants. Spurred by these developments, a crusading Pennsylvania Congressman, Galusha A. Grow, took up the cause of the Homestead Act. Typifying the times, a new song, "Uncle Sam Is Rich Enough To Give Us All a Farm," skyrocketed into popularity.

Grow's bill provided that every U.S. citizen, 21 or over, or person who declared his intention to become a citizen, could file a claim to one-quarter section, or 160 acres. The homesteader would be required to live and work on his land for 5 years, after which he could "prove up" and acquire deed. The measure was bitterly fought in Congress. Southerners opposed it for fear of peopling the western territories with antislave settlers, while easterners feared the westward movement would depress land values at home. A Republican election victory, coupled with the South's secession, finally cleared the way, and Congress on May 20, 1862, passed the homestead law. President Lincoln enthusiastically signed it, and promptly at midnight on January 1, 1863, when the law took effect, a furloughed Union soldier became one of the first homesteaders in the United States.

Hearing of choice lands out West, Daniel Freeman, of Ohio journeyed to the frontier town of Brownville, Nebraska Territory, to look around during his holiday leave. He found the town already thronged with hungry land seekers and good sites going fast. The soldier borrowed a horse and rode 70 miles westward in an icy wind to stake out

---

[1] Thousands of homestead entries were also made in the Midwest, and even parts of the South. The Congress had granted vast tracts of western lands to the railroad builders, too, and millions of acres were sold to homesteaders.

160 acres of rich bottom land on Cub Creek, then galloped back to town. There the crowd of land seekers good-naturedly agreed the furloughed Union soldier should be allowed to make the first homestead filing, and the U.S. land agent obliged by stepping out of a New Year's Eve dance and opening the land office for a few minutes after midnight. Daniel Freeman made history and hurried back to his regiment. After the Civil War he brought his bride and settled on his homestead for life. Today the Freeman farm, located 4 miles northwest of Beatrice, Nebr., is officially considered homestead entry No. 1 in the United States, and is a national monument.

The homestead law was widely advertised in America and Europe and before long lured tens of thousands to the West in one of the greatest migrations in history. Take a family we'll call the Lars Hansons.

Attracted by the glowing reports and fanciful stories about life in America—"You never get sick: only when you overeat"—the Norwegian emigrants set sail for the United States. Traveling steerage, they were cooped up in foul-smelling bunks below decks, subsisted on moldy bread and tainted meat. At their first glimpse of America the family of four knelt and cried. From New York they rode the newfangled cars to Chicago, from where they shipped their meager belongings in a boxcar to rail's end. Then the family drove oxen overland another 90 miles in the booming Dakota Territory. First thing, Lars declared his intention to become a citizen, then hurried to stake out his treeless 160 acres. He did his temporary surveying by wagon with a rag tied on a wheel spoke—each revolution counting off about 13 feet. An Illinois farmer's newly patented invention, called barbed wire, would enable Lars to fence his piece of land. Unlike the eastern farmer with his small patch of ground, the sodbuster could scarcely build a stone fence around his 160-acre empire. Indeed, without barbed wire the homestead movement might have failed.

The Hansons dug a well, and from the buffalograss plowed squares of fresh, clean, sod to lay up their one-room habitation. During heavy rains or snows, the earthen home leaked rivulets, and during dry spells the dirt cracked and fell off in chunks. It attracted mice, gophers, and snakes. Still this cavelike dwelling provided amazing insulation against 30-below winters and scorching summers—and above all it was the family's own and free. Hannah cooked on a sheet-iron stove, for which the children gathered buffalo chips and twisted dry prairie hay. The family ate on a packing box and the diet was monotonous cornmeal, salt pork, wild greens, and occasional game. Life was primitive and hard at times, Hannah hungered for just the sight of another woman. That winter she nearly died in childbirth—there was no way to reach a doctor, or even a midwife—and to pull his family through the long, terrible blizzards, Lars once lugged flour 80 miles on his back from the nearest gristmill.

The first year the immigrants harvested 10 acres of corn, broke more sod, and Lars, standing proudly on his 160 acres, was monarch of all he surveyed. Then drought set in—three searing seasons, with withering fields, dusty streambeds, and hope vanishing on the hot prairie winds. "I hear the climate will change with cultivation," Lars cheered his family. It was a common belief. Like the eternally hopeful homesteader, Lars hitched up his belt for next year.

But on the heels of drought came grasshoppers—so thick in some sections of the Great Plains that they blotted out the sun and stopped the new train. A contemporary account said grasshoppers ate "everything but the bills." A pioneer editor described the grasshopper plague of 1874: "Harvesting had barely begun when on August 6 there appeared in the northwest a peculiar looking cloud. By 4 o'clock that afternoon it had gradually settled and millions of grasshoppers attacked the crops. Attempts were made to continue harvesting but the insects clogged the machinery. When night came they moved on, leaving behind them a scene of desolation, broken hopes, and saddened homes." From Minnesota, railroad dispatchers reported a single grasshopper column between Moorhead and Mankato that was 225 miles long. Frenzied farmers ditched their fields; battled the insects with shovels, tar, fire and even resorted to tub thumping and a brass band to frighten off the marauders. Invading right after the panic of 1873, grasshoppers nearly wiped out the homesteaders. Nebraska issued grasshopper bonds to relieve distress, and the Federal Government—in one of its first relief handouts—shipped destitute Dakota homesteaders 75,000 pounds of flour and 25,000 pounds of bacon. Frontier newspapers promptly scorned the $150,000 handout.

Despite drought, grasshoppers, and privation, the Hansons hung on and in 5 years celebrated two tremendous events. One day Lars journeyed to the county seat to obtain his full America citizenship, and soon afterward proved up on his 160 acres, worth, with all his other possessions, probably $1,000. He hurried home clutching his precious Government patent. "See here," he showed Hannah, "it's signed by the President of the United States."

Within 15 years the Dakota wilderness boasted a farming population of half a million stouthearted families like the Hansons. Neighboring Minnesota claimed 400 towns with Scandinavian names, and there was an Irish colony named "O'Neill" in Nebraska. The country was growing up, but still it was raw, untamed frontier.

Early Montana settler David Hilger describes homesteading in the Judith Basin country: "Vast herds of buffalo were still to be seen grazing the range. Deer, antelope, and elk were plentiful; wolves traveled in packs, raiding cattle, and buffalo herds; and coyotes howled from every hill and lurked in the coulees."

A McPherson County, S. Dak., pioneer gives this graphic account of homesteading: "Very few could boast of a kerosene lamp. The typical prairie lamp was a rag wick smeared with lard and twisted into a saucer of lard or butter. Lard in the lamp meant no lard for food. On the other hand, lard for food meant long winter evenings by stove light or in darkness.

"Our closest market for milled flour was 60 miles distant. This trip the farmers usually made twice each winter. Four or five men, seeking supplies for perhaps eight families, would go with one team of oxen or, if the trails were drifted deep with snow, on skiis of their own making, pulling boxes on skiis behind.

"They brought back along with the flour, real coffee, and other articles of food, then very rare and luxuries indeed. The pioneer, in the place of coffee, often used barley, browned in the oven and ground by rolling a round bottle over it. Real coffee was saved for Sunday or other holidays and when visitors came.

"Few saw much real money in those days. I remember that father walked a distance of about 260 miles to get work digging cellars at $1.20 per day and we were getting rich."

Yet within one or two generations many of these same struggling homesteaders were sending their children to college, and bringing culture and "gentility" to the frontier. The prairies nurtured the distinguished authors Hamlin Garland, O. E. Rolvaag, Willa Cather, and artist Harvey Dunn. They also reared strong men and women, imbued with the spirit of freedom and rugged individualism that made their country what it is today.

The sodbusters spilled from Canada to Mexico, settled most of the choice land, and then stampeded into the last native sanctuary of the Indian in Oklahoma. On the sunny morning of April 22, 1889, some 20,000 "boomers"—on horseback and bicycles, in buggies and covered wagons, and on foot—lined up along the Indian Territory boundary. At a volley from U.S. Cavalry, the boomers thundered across the starting line in a choking cloud of dust. Before night they had settled on 1,920,000 acres, and soon afterward newborn Oklahoma City claimed a tent-dwelling population of 10,000; Guthrie, 15,000. In 1893, with opening of the 200-mile-long Cherokee Strip, another army of land seekers reenacted the great Oklahoma rush. "We were in a thundering movement of horseflesh and crash of vehicles that whipped past like a calamity," a spectator recalls. Before sundown the strip was completely occupied.

By 1900 the sodbusters had filed on more than 80 million acres of the great American desert—double the area of all New England—and the first great wave of homesteading was over. Interestingly, a good part of this region had been bought from France in the Louisiana Purchase for only 4 cents an acre.

The homestead era produced dramatic change and conflict. The lure of free land attracted Europeans by the boatload, and greatly stimulated the native growth—U.S. population doubled in just four decades. Fencing in the free open range, the "nester" clash head-on with the cattlemen snaking their bawling longhorns up the trail from Texas to Montana, and triggered bloody range wars. The cowmen corralled the water holes and otherwise harassed the homesteaders. There were cattle-rustling episodes and fence-cutting feuds, and, contrary to the synthetic TV "westerns," the "cattle barons" were sometimes the victims. After a night storm on the Nebraska plains that stampeded and scattered a trail herd, vengeful "soddies" rounded up and butchered hundreds of longhorn steers. An all-ganger jury turned the settlers loose. "Before the nesters came," an old Texas Trail driver told me a few years ago, "I don't remember seeing a fence between Fort Worth and Cheyenne, and it oughta be this way today. God never intended this cattle country for farming."

The homesteader spurred farm mechanization. Before 1862 the average eastern farm was only about 50 acres and worked by one or two men and a plow. But with 160 rolling acres on the Great Plains, power farming got its impetus; and in place of the walking plow, hissing steam engines pulled 12-bottom gang plows that ripped up the prairies. In the Dakotas, eastern capital consolidated homesteads and railway land grants into 75,000-acre bonanza farms that attracted world attention. The big farms were tailor-made for the revolutionary new McCormick reaper and the threshing machine, and so were introduced the itinerant harvest crews, who worked their way from Texas to Canada with only the shirt on their backs and maybe an extra pair of socks. The homestead era speeded up the invention and use of the twine binder, threshing machine, gas tractor, and eventually the fantastic growth of the entire farm-implement field. "Within 25 short years after the Homestead Act," says the U.S. Bureau of Land Management, "the United States became the greatest producer of farm products in the world." By coincidence, the farm revolution was greatly advanced by two other historic measures passed the same year as the Homestead Act: one established the land-grant colleges, and the other the U.S. Department of Agriculture, whose scientists and experimentors have had so much to do with the Nation's embarrassing farm abundance.

Altogether, the Homestead Act caused profound changes, but it also had many faults and failures which might well be an object lesson to other countries. The United States demonstrated with this law that Government can legislate and give away land, but it can't make farmers and guarantee crops. The homestead law attracted thousands who because of their inexperience, or because their land was unfit for farming, were doomed to failure. Thousands more were deceived into thinking homesteading was too easy. Historian Everett Dick points out that the Government encouraged failure by requiring only a shack for a home, 10 acres under cultivation, and a well. There was no mention of ability to farm or of equipment.

Another trouble was that the law was often rendered inoperative by fraud and evasion. Instead of building the required home, some deceptive sodbusters mounted a shack on wheels and moved it from claim to claim to "prove up." Still others certified the required 20-by-30 habitation, but they defrauded with toy houses 20 by 30 inches. Countless adventurers and gamblers relinquished their rights to speculators or sold out to cattlemen. There was widespread claim jumping, and a pioneer recalls, "I had to sit on my doorstep with a shotgun." Killings were frequent. "The Great Plains bear the scars of thousands of homesteaders who never received title to their claims," says an official history. Besides these problems, the homesteaders had to contend with poor markets, frequent farm panics, prohibitive freight rates, and 12 to 18 percent interest.

In the end, thousands in that first great wave of homesteaders didn't make it, and their sod shanties were left to crumble on the sun-baked plains. The disillusioned turned back East with signs on their wagons reading, "From Kansas where it rains grasshoppers, fires, and destruction," and "Busted. Going back to live with the wife's folks." A traveler in Nebraska stopped at a sod hut for water and found the well dry, the homestead abandoned, and this sign on the door:

"This claim for sale. Four miles to the nearest neighbor. Seven miles to the nearest schoolhouse. Fourteen miles to the nearest town. Two hundred feet down to the nearest water. God bless our home. For further information, address Thomas Ward, Oskaloosa, Iowa."

At length Congress recognized the faults of the original homestead law and belatedly amended it. The chief weakness was the 160-acre limitation imposed by eastern legislators unfamiliar with the West. While a family could wrest a living from a quarter section in subhumid eastern Nebraska or Kansas, for example, they would likely starve west of the 100th meridian—a line from Bismarck to Dodge City—and in drought years they'd starve for sure. The low rainfall and short growing season of Major Long's great American desert proved disastrous, and so there was a growing clamor for larger homesteads. Under pressure, Congress increased the homestead grant to 320 acres, and eventually a stock-raising homestead of 640 acres. It allowed citizens to buy additional Government lands as well. With these changes, homesteading got its second wind in the early 1900's and a new wave of settlement swept the West. In acreage it vastly exceeded the first. During the next 30 years, this second wave settled nearly two-thirds of all the land homesteaded in the United States.

As a youth in western South Dakota, I vividly remember the period. My family homesteaded and proved up part of our own ranch and our place, with lush feed and water, was a favorite campsite for the Montana-bound "honyockers," as they were then nicknamed (nobody knew why). The honyocker came from all walks of life—barbers, carpenters, clerks, schoolmarms, and a few farmers seeking a quick fortune in wool and wheat. They filed on Government land or bought from railroads or speculators, hastily flung up a tarpaper shack, and planted a crop. Before World War I they struck a few good wet years and the mushroom towns did a "land office business." Then, following a 5-year drought, I saw the ruined, disillusioned honyockers flocking back East, their scanty belongings jouncing on a rickety hayrack, together with their hungry, shabby children. My folks used to feed them and their bony horses.

A handful of the honyocks stuck it out, however, and prospered. The bachelors married the schoolmarms (thereby acquiring extra land) and they built thriving farms and communities that are the backbone of the West today. Mrs. Bertha W. Ingalls, of Colorado Springs, Colo.—until her death at 94 recently the Nation's oldest homesteader—exemplified the quiet courage of these pioneers. "All of my 13 children were born in our sod home and we never had a doctor," Mother Ingalls recalled. "One time when I was alone I gave birth to twins. Our nearest neighbors were 4 miles away. We didn't have a tree, and coyotes and wolves prowled around the place." The saga of homesteading is also written in a woman's trials and tears.

By the late 1920's the homesteaders had virtually conquered Major Long's desert and the supply of desirable land, even for stockraising, was running out. Finally in 1934 the Government closed "the unreserved and unappropriated public domain" and consolidated its remaining holdings for lease under the Taylor Grazing Act. Since that day homesteading has been confined to a few Western irrigation projects and Alaska, and another chapter in the American Dream is being closed. Gone are the plucky pioneers who braved blizzards, drought, floods, twisters, grasshopper plagues, prairie fires, isolation, and, as one recalls, put up "a hard fight with a short stick" to lay claim to 160 acres. Perhaps the prairie statesman William Jennings Bryan paid them their finest tribute: "They were men and women who gave the world more than they took from it."

Today the homesteaders are a vanishing breed—ex-GI's, veterans of World War II and Korea—and unlike the problems of survival that beset Lars Hanson, they're faced with raising from $30,000 to $50,000 in capital and machinery just to grow the first crop. The modern homesteader faces other problems as well.

Take the bronzed, clean-cut young settlers I visited recently on the 76,000-acre Minidoka north side pumping project near Rupert, Idaho. There the Government has tapped a vast underground water storage and opened some 600 units to homesteading. The drawings attracted more than 5,000 veterans from 47 States—young hopefuls like Daniel Freeman and the honyocks. After 10 years the Minidoka is a panaroma of 80- and 100-acre homesteads with lush pastures, waving grain, and prideful electrified homes springing out of the Idaho sagebrush. But the new pioneers still have to rough it.

In the beginning there's the blinding, choking lava dust as new fields are levelled. "I could barely see to drive home," a settler's wife told me, "and when I got there I couldn't spot my husband 10 feet away." During the "black blizzards," Minidoka women hang wet towels over their windows and doors and boil water in open pans to moisten the stifling air.

Like their sunbonneted ancestors, the G.I. wives labor from dawn to dark in the fields—drive tractor and harvester, fight crop pests, and help with the backbreaking job of hoeing and thinning sugarbeets.

At times, social life is apt to be rugged. During the spring rains, which mired the roads, a Minidoka housewife drove a tractor 3 miles to a neighborhood party, then gayly carried her shoes through the mud to the house.

In traditional pioneer fashion, Minidoka settlers planted and harvested the crops of a neighbor who was invalided for 2 years after he was pinned under his tractor.

In this spirit the homesteaders are writing their farewell chapter in the West. I remember the Ernie Jones family in particular. I found Ernie, wife, and baby living in the cramped quarters of their garage, scrimping to buy more land and thus make better use of their costly farm machinery. In their spare time—and with their own hands—Ernie and Jean are building a three-bedroom dream house beside their garage. "But the farm comes first," Ernie told me. Then he added with determination: "I'm proud that in America a man can still go it alone if he wants to, and we're glad to sacrifice a few things now for a better future."

Stouthearted, independent, freedom-loving Americans, I thought as I left the homesteaders. And imagine the U.S.A. without their venturous breed.

OKINAWA THE KEYSTONE

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, a recent issue of the magazine, Army, contained a thoughful and well-done article on Okinawa and its importance to the security of the United States.

The report particularly caught my attention because it was my privilege to visit this strategic island stronghold last fall as a member of the Appropriations Committee.

An important and significant footnote to the article has been written by Col. Harry Woodbury, the district engineer in Omaha. In a letter to the magazine, he points out that—

> The single greatest strategic asset that Okinawa has to offer the United States is freedom of action, an asset that makes it different from Japan, the Philippines or the Halmaheras.

Colonel Woodbury's comment concerned an article whose author, Lt. Col. Forrest K. Kleinman, says in summary:

> Having just come from Vietnam, I have cogent reasons to appreciate the strategic potential of this powerpacked military base, Nothing should ever be permitted to erode our military position and strength here. It is absolutely vital to our national security stance.
>
> Not only does it affect the unity and posture of SEATO but of NATO. To continue to prosper, our traditional allies of Western Europe as well as the Orient must have markets and sources of raw materials. Neither we nor they can afford to let any more of the world fall behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.
>
> Without a position of mobile military power on Okinawa, we would have to fall back to the shores of our 50th State. So Okinawa is more than the keystone of the Pacific. It is a hearthstone in our global strategy for preserving freedom.

Colonel Woodbury, who has done an outstanding job in his present post, will on July 1, take up his new assignment in the important position of 8th Army Engineer in Korea. It is good to know that we have men of his caliber and understanding of the principles which he and his comrades in uniform are called upon to defend around the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Record, the article entitled "Report on Okinawa" from the October 1962 issue of Army and Colonel Woodbury's letter, entitled, "Okinawa, the Keystone," from the February 1963, issue of Army.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT ON OKINAWA

(By Lt. Col. Forrest K. Kleinman)

Not many years ago a soldier with orders for the bleakest outpost in Korea could tell himself that he was lucky. He might have been sent to Okinawa.

Newsphotos gave a grim picture of Army life on Okinawa in those days. Sandblasted quonset huts chained to pilings appeared to be the only dwellings that could withstand the 100-mile-per-hour gales up typhoon alley. Even they were sometimes vacated when mountainous seas and monsoon rains forced troops and families to flee to high ground.

Worst of all was the boredom. What do you do for recreation on a shell-scarred string bean of land only 67 miles long?

Today Okinawa is rated one of the most desirable duty stations in the world. You don't have to be here long to see why. Modern barracks and cottages of typhoon-proof design have replaced most of the quonsets and some now boast awnings and air-conditioning units. Terraced green lawns cover sand dunes and coral hills.

For recreation there are seaside resorts, coral colored beaches with special service equipment for fishing, and water skiing, theaters, television, bowling alleys, golf courses, night clubs, and swimming pools galore. All this at "fringe benefit" prices. Yes, that lobby-eaten phrase still means something here. Unlike some stateside posts I've visited, noncoms on Okinawa don't have to moonlight as janitors in order to support their families. One Special Forces soldier I met even had a free fruit stand of bananas growing in his backyard.

Typhoons still boil up from the south five or six times a year, of course, but skillful engineering and long established safety procedures minimize both property damage and interference with normal duty schedules. Typhoon Nora with winds over 75 nautical miles per hour just passed through bringing torrential rains. Yet streets and yards are dry and only a few displaced signboards give evidence of her passing fury. Even when Nora was well into condition II—storm center approaching—classroom instruction at the counter-insurgency school continued as usual and families dined out at the officers' club.

As for the scars of World War II's largest and most destructive battle in the Pacific—all are healed by lush vegetation and new construction. Despite the devastation and heavy casualties suffered by Okinawans during the 1945 operation that capped the Pacific campaign, there are more friendly smiles for an American per city block than I have encountered anywhere in the Orient. It is the only place I've ever visited where tips are not only unsolicited but cheerfully declined.

But the battle for Okinawa is still going on. Nearly every day it is reenacted at the Ryukyu Command's Armed Forces museum on a large scale model of the island. In chronological sequence, each phase of the operation is portrayed by an elaborate system of colored lights. Taped battle sounds, commentary and background are skillfully coordinated with visual effects to produce a spine tingling experience.

Audience appreciation of the production is heightened by the knowledge that it is the handiwork of a man with a frontline foxhole memory of the battle. He is M. Sgt. Phil F. Ficurra, museum curator, who earned the Silver Star and a second cluster for his Purple Heart as a rifle platoon sergeant in the operation.

The green and coral landscape of Okinawa can never look quite the same again to even the most blase visitor after a session with Sergeant Ficurra. Wherever you go on the island you keep remembering that every square mile now occupied by our Armed Forces cost more than 100 American lives. You remember, too, the respect in his voice when he spoke of our former enemy. For every American life, the Japanese lost 10. It was the only battle of modern times that took the life of the supreme commander on both sides. So intense was the struggle that at one point nearly a quarter million men confronted each other on a battleline less than 20 miles long.

Today American soldiers on Okinawa are rehearsing for a radically different kind of war—a war that knows no battlelines, no fixed front, no shoulder to shoulder attack or defense. It is the kind of war now going on only 5 air-hours away in southeast Asia.

Outside of Vietnam I have never seen more earnest devotion to combat training anywhere. Troops move out on tactical exercises as realistically as if the island were infested with Viet Cong. Even when crossing public highways and nontactical areas, they play it for real—completely oblivious to the curious stares of onlookers.

Many soldiers on Okinawa—particularly in the First Special Forces Group—are veterans of recent operations in Laos and Vietnam. In addition to a sense of urgency, they have brought back many valuable combat lessons to incorporate in their parent unit training programs.

For Special Forces men, the TDY tour from Okinawa to Vietnam is now 6 months. According to a Laotian veteran I consulted this period is about right for Americans who must spend all of their time under combat conditions in the jungle. It is long enough for them to get results but not so long that jungle rot, malaria, and dysentery get out of control.

For personnel of other military units stationed on Okinawa, TDY to Southeast Asia varies with operational needs of the Military Assistance Command. While I was in Saigon, I met several psychological warfare officers from Okinawa. They were on TDY when the Vietnamese conducted a very effective leaflet drop, parade, and display of captured weapons in Saigon publicizing an important victory over the Vietcong on the Plain of Reeds north of the city. But they discreetly declined any credit for the morale building program.

The importance of psychological warfare units in counterinsurgency operations is demonstrated by the number stationed here. Just leafing through the Okinawa military phonebook, I noticed four psy war battalions listed. There is need for a change in nomenclature of such units, linguists here say. In most oriental languages, psychological warfare is translated as "thought police."

Okinawa is much more than a well placed counterinsurgency and military assistance base. It is the strategic and logistical keystone for a speedy response to any kind of military emergency that might arise in the Far East. Our triservice forces here are capable of both amphibious and airborne operations—nuclear or nonnuclear. In a matter of hours they can answer a call for help from a SEATO pact power—as they did in Thailand—or reinforce the 8th U.S. Army in Korea.

Though the precise composition and strength of the forces here are classified, of course, they are publicly known to include: the 1st Special Forces Group, 2d Airborne Battle Group, 502d Infantry (Parachute), 3d Marine Division, 313th Air Division, 30th Artillery Brigade (Air Defense), batteries of 8-inch, 155 and 105 howitzers, the 9th Logistical Command, and an Army helicopter company equipped with the new turbojet HU1A.

Powerful radio facilities on Okinawa enable the command to keep direct contact with all key headquarters in the Pacific around the clock. Both ionospheric and tropospheric scatter stations are used.

Under the single management system, the Army handles subsistence procurement and supply for all services. It operates the only military bakery and milk plant on the island.

The Army also operates the military port of Naha on the East China Sea and a subport at White Beach on the Pacific Ocean side of the island. Together, they handle about 50,000 tons per month. If necessary, the workload could be quickly quintupled.

Nearly all hard-surfaced roads on the island were built by the Army for military purposes. But they also benefit the civilian economy. The system consists of 24 miles of four-lane blacktop and 104 miles of two-lane paved road. One of the highways bears road signs with a sinister reputation to Vietnam veterans. It is Highway No. 1—better known in Vietnam as "The Street Without Joy" because of numerous ambushes there by the Viet Cong.

The integrated electric power system here is operated by the Army for both civilian and military purposes. Many Okinawans also use the Army's water system which delivers about 18 million gallons daily. Maximum use is made of natives for civilian employees. Altogether the Army and its people employ nearly 30,000 Ryukyuans in clerical, technical, and domestic jobs.

Though it is commonplace in this day of criss-cross command lines for an Army commander to wear two hats, Lt. Gen. Paul W. Caraway is probably the first to wear four. What's more, his official wardrobe of headgear includes a homburg. Here is how he got it:

Under the peace treaty with Japan, the United States was given administrative, legislative, and jurisdictional powers over the Ryukyus—the archipelago 374 miles long of which Okinawa is the largest island. In 1952, the United States encouraged the population to establish an indigenous central government for the islands. The U.S. Civil Administration of the Ryukyu Islands (USCAR) acts in an advisory capacity to the Government, which includes an appointed chief executive, independent judiciary and an elected legislature.

As High Commissioner of USCAR, General Caraway reports, homburg in hand, to the Secretary of Defense through the Secretary of the Army.

With one of his three scrambled egg hats, he is "Representative of the Commander in Chief Pacific for the Ryukyu Islands." In this capacity he is responsible to CINCPAC in Hawaii for handling military matters of joint concern to the various Armed Forces components stationed in this area. This job includes coordination of plans for joint operation in emergencies such as island defense, natural disaster, domestic disturbance, and emergency evacuation. But there is no joint command or overall commander in the Ryukyu Islands. Only in case of military emergency, or when directed by CINCPAC, would a unified command be established.

With his other two scrambled egg hats he is Commanding General, U.S. Army Ryukyus, and IX Corps. In this dual capacity he reports to the Commanding General, U.S. Army Pacific, also in Hawaii. Thus General Caraway has four hats and three direct superiors. But there is no need for Mr. McNamara to send a headquarters cutter here. The entire military staff for all four jobs requires much less office space than a single corps headquarters I visited in 1951 in Korea.

It may come as a surprise to some readers—as it did to me—to learn that IX Corps is no longer in Korea. But the move to Okinawa is really several years old. Considering Okinawa's hublike position in relation to the potential hotspots of all Asia, it is certainly a logical site for such a tactical command nucleus.

Having just come from Vietnam, I have cogent reasons to appreciate the strategic potential of this powerpacked military base. Nothing should ever be permitted to erode our military position and strength here. It is absolutely vital to our national security stance.

Not only does it affect the unity and posture of SEATO but of NATO. To continue to prosper, our traditional allies of Western Europe as well as the Orient must have markets and sources of raw materials. Neither we nor they can afford to let any more of the world fall behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

Without a position on mobile military power on Okinawa, we would have to fall back to the shores of our 50th State. So Okinawa is more than the keystone of the Pacific. It is a hearthstone in our global strategy for preserving freedom.

OKINAWA THE KEYSTONE

Your report on Okinawa by Forrest Kleinman in the October issue is both factual and timely. It's a story that needs to be told over and over to our military and our civilian friends, for Okinawa is truly a keystone of the free world in the Western Pacific. Too few really appreciate its significance.

Particularly noteworthy is the statement, "Nothing should ever be permitted to erode our military position and strength here. It is absolutely vital to our national security."

Unfortunately, the article, while factual, was not complete. It omitted identification of the single greatest strategic asset that Okinawa has to offer the United States: freedom of action, an asset that makes it different from Japan, the Philippines or the Halmaheras. In failing to identify this most important asset, your article fails to identify that element of our strength which we may be first to lose. And once lost, Okinawa is lost as a keystone.

Okinawa is important to the free world because the United States, under its treaty with Japan, has the same freedom of action on Okinawa that it has in Hawaii or Guam or in this country, a freedom we do not enjoy in the Philippines or in Japan or in the Halmaheras. On Okinawa we are unhampered by the compromising effects of status of forces and base rights agreements. We are not concerned with getting the permission of a president of an allied power for deploying weapons, no prime minister can dictate the nature of our forces, no king can foreclose on our airbase leases, and we are beholden to no one for the safety and security of our forces and their families.

This unique and invaluable asset, so essential to our position in the Pacific, if lost will be lost not as a result of an attack on Okinawa by Chinese Communists, nor by the operation of the Hukbalahaps in the Philippines, nor any subversive activity on Okinawa, but by inadvertence.

Freedom is a magic word. Let us not forget that our freedom may well depend on retaining our freedom of action on Okinawa.

WHY FOREIGN AID?

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, one of the most cogent justifications of the Nation's oversea aid program which I have read is the address by the Hon. Chester Bowles at the University of Texas on April 24.

Mr. Bowles is perhaps as well qualified to speak on both the problems and the prospects of U.S. foreign assistance as any other American. He brings to this task an unusual background of experience and success as a private businessman, Government administrator of the Nation's price-control program in World War II, Governor of a great State, Ambassador to India, former member of the House Foreign Relations Committee, Under Secretary of State and Special Adviser to the President.

Last year, he authored an important memorandum setting forth toughminded, realistic and workable criteria for our oversea aid program. His address of April 24 gives us the further benefit of Mr. Bowles' thinking on this subject which is of such deep concern to all of us concerned with the preservation of peace and the advancement of human dignity.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Bowles' address be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY FOREIGN AID?

(Address by the Honorable Chester Bowles, President's Special Representative and Adviser on African, Asia, and Latin American Affairs, at the University of Texas, Austin, Tex., April 24, 1963)

It is a pleasure to be here in Texas; a State where people are accustomed to speaking their minds frankly and with commonsense.

Perhaps it is fitting that my subject tonight is one on which we Americans have lately expended all too little commonsense. I refer to foreign aid—the program of U.S. assistance to less developed nations.

This spring the foreign aid program is once again undergoing its annual drubbing on Capitol Hill and in certain elements of the Nation's press.

As has become their custom, many frustrated legislators and editorial writers are once again attacking the program on every possible score while many others who have been among its most loyal friends appear to be on the defensive.

Yet there is a paradox in this situation. On the basis of recent Gallup polls, the program's popularity in the country as a whole is at the highest level since its inception. According to Mr. Gallup, 58 percent of the American people are in favor of it, with only 30 percent opposed.

What is more, most of those who remain opposed to foreign aid grossly overestimated its cost, with the majority of guesses ranging anywhere from 10 to 50 percent of our budget.

In fact, of course, foreign assistance amounts to less than one twenty-fifth of our annual Federal expenditures, and even this percentage may be reduced further as our national wealth increases and our loans are repaid

Now how are we to explain this paradox: the clear contradiction between apparent public approval and vocal political opposition?

I believe that the answer lies largely in our inadequate efforts in the last 10 years to explain the real objectives of our aid program to the American people and to their Congress.

The official reasons offered in support of the program during the 1950's were often contradictory, inaccurate, or irrelevant. The upshot has been widespread public confusion on the program's real objectives and widespread disillusionment when it fails to achieve the false goals so often proposed.

For instance, the program has been most widely presented in terms of simple anticommunism. Since a major U.S. objective is to stop communism, this implies that if communism did not exist, there would be little or no reason for the program itself.

For many years this negative perspective was actually written into the preamble of the enabling foreign aid legislation through language suggesting that the program would be necessary only as long as the Communist conspiracy threatened U.S. interests.

For developing countries seeking aid, such a view also ironically turned communism into a valuable natural resource, such as oil or uranium.

By the logic of the argument, any developing nation devoid of a powerful Communist neighbor or a noisy Communist minority becomes per se a poor candidate for U.S. economic assistance. It has been suggested sardonically that a developing nation which lacked a Communist minority should plant and nourish a small but vocal Communist movement—and then implore the United States to provide the funds to squelch it.

Since even Communists are sometimes blessed with a sense of humor, it is not surprising that Soviet spokesmen talking to the people of Asia and Africa have said:

"The Soviet Union offers you loans and technicians to speed your development. For this you are grateful. But you should be equally grateful to Moscow for whatever aid the Americans give you. They are quite frank in saying that if they were not so frightened of us Communists, they would give you nothing."

In 1959, as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I introduced an amendment to the preamble of the foreign aid bill which outlined the purposes of the aid program in the affirmative terms of our traditional dedication to freedom and opportunity. Although my amendment was approved overwhelmingly, our thinking on aid is still bound in major degree by the same narrow, self-limiting anti-Communist obsession.

A second fallacy in our past presentation of foreign aid is the claim that the program will bring us military allies, win us votes in the United Nations, or gain us support against Cuba and the Red Chinese. In other words, it is assumed that the program's primary objective is to make friends and buy votes.

This argument is equally hollow and futile. It is no more possible to buy the long-term loyalty of a nation than it is to buy the enduring loyalty of a friend. To attempt to do so can lead only to frustration and antagonism.

Suppose a wealthy resident of the Texas town in which you live should offer to build a swimming pool for your children, a new library, and an extension to your townhall—provided only that you and your neighbors agree to support his political views on public questions.

What would you do? You would invite him to take his money and go live elsewhere.

Unfortunately, in the past we Americans have inadvertently placed ourselves often in the position of the richest man in the world community, naively trying to buy friends and supporters for our views. Yet commonsense and a knowledge of human nature should tell us that foreign aid will not make us love our neighbors, make our neighbors love us, or win international popularity laurels for us—and we should not expect it to do so.

Finally, it has often been wrongly assumed that the success or failure of the aid program should be judged by purely and simply the rate of economic growth in the recipient country.

Obviously increased agricultural and industrial production is of the utmost importance. Yet the record shows that when the added production is badly distributed, it only widens the gap between rich and poor—and, in the process, inevitably erodes the political stability which we are striving to create.

There are many examples. Some of the most productive countries of Latin America, for instance, already have per capita incomes greater than several European countries. Yet because the privileged minority at the top may be getting rapidly richer while the impoverished, embittered masses at the bottom of the ladder are making little or no progress, these nations can be as politically explosive as the poorest African or Asian country whose per capita income may be no greater than $100 a year.

In view of our past failure adequately to explain the program, it is a tribute to our national commonsense that so many Americans have continued to give tacit support to foreign assistance for basically humanitarian reasons.

This leads us back to the basic question: If the purpose of our aid program is not simply to combat communism, and if it cannot be expected to buy friends or votes, and if faster economic growth alone is no sure cure-all, what exactly is foreign aid good for? What will it do?

The answer to this question is deceptively simple to state: A wisely administered U.S. aid program can help build nations that are increasingly prepared to defend their independence against totalitarian enemies—external or internal, overt or covert—and increasingly willing to work with us as partners on common projects which may lead the world a little closer to peace.

In other words, the purpose of our aid program is to develop independent nations able and willing to stand on their own feet—and thereby to share with us a dedication to peace and freedom.

To put the question more sharply, we have a critical choice: We can help to guide the economic and social upheaval now sweeping Asia, Africa, and Latin America into constructive, peaceful channels, or we can sit back nervously and ineffectually, while the revolution of rising expectations in Asia, Africa, and Latin America slips into the hands of reckless extremists who despise everything we stand for—and a succession of Red Chinas and Red Cubas comes into being.

Within this more realistic framework of achievable objectives, let us now consider to what extent our aid program has thus far succeeded—and to what extent it has failed.

In the years since 1946, the most dramatic success of the foreign aid program has come, of course, in Western Europe.

Following World War II a political and economic vacuum existed in Europe. Bombed out industries lay in ruins, and each nation's economy was scarred by inflation, vast unemployment, and utter hopelessness.

In the United States, meanwhile, shortsighted political leaders of both parties led a mad scramble to disband our victorious armies and draw back into our isolationist shell.

With most of Eastern Europe already overrun by the Red armies, with large and well-organized Communist parties in France, Italy, and elsewhere, and with nearly 200 battle-tested Soviet divisions still under arms, Stalin was confident that communism could quickly fill the entire European vacuum.

Yet his efforts failed. Soviet pressures toward the Mediterranean through Greece and Turkey were forestalled by the prompt counteraction of a massive military and economic assistance program under the Truman doctrine.

Within months, Marshall plan aid was provided to rebuild the wartorn economies of Western Europe, followed by the creation of NATO as an effective military shield between our allies and the Communist world.

Although the Communist danger was obviously on our minds, Secretary of State Marshall was careful to present our aid effort within an affirmative framework. Its objective, he stressed, was not negatively to oppose some other ideology or ism, or to win subservient satellites but positively to create prosperous, independent European nations capable of standing on their own feet and making their own decisions.

It is noteworthy that in the 15 years since the Marshall plan got underway, and quite contrary to Stalin's confident expectations, there have been no Communist territorial gains anywhere on the European Continent. Indeed, Western Europe has achieved a measure of political stability and economic prosperity unparalleled in its history.

There were many of our fellow citizens who charged at the time that the $13 billion we invested in the Marshall plan was a "giveaway"—just as there are many today who describe our present aid program in Asia, Africa, and Latin America as a "giveaway."

Yet the wisdom of this investment becomes all the more apparent when one compares the dismal Soviet record in Eastern Europe with the booming economic and political conditions of Western Europe today.

While the Kremlin is still forced to bolster many of its East European satellites with economic loans, U.S. economic aid to Western Europe has ceased and we are now selling well over $6 billion worth of American goods each year to former recipients of Marshall plan aid. Even the diehards must admit that that is a remarkably good return on our postwar investment in Europe's recovery.

What we have witnessed in Europe—what our foreign assistance program has helped to create there—is nothing less than a new economic and political renaissance.

To be sure, for the moment some of the symptoms of Europe's new vitality can be irritating to us. Nevertheless, our aid program to Europe brilliantly accomplished what it set out to do and today we are dealing with prosperous, independent allies. Would any thoughtful man prefer that we deal instead with the chaotic Europe of 1947?

In many other parts of the world foreign aid has also been a major success.

Let us consider, for example, what has happened in less than a generation in India, an underdeveloped country of 450 million people, equaling the combined population of Africa and Latin America—a country which I know well.

Since I left India as U.S. Ambassador in 1953 Indian national income has increased by 42 percent, with food-grain production up by 56 percent. In 1947 it was estimated that 100 million cases of malaria developed annually; now this debilitating disease has nearly disappeared. Life expectancy in India in 1947 was 27 years; it is now 42.

In a country that was only 10 percent literate 15 years ago, 60 percent of all Indian children under 12 now go to school. Indian industrial production is expanding by 10 percent annually, one of the highest rates in the world.

In its first years of independence India developed a Constitution that combined features of both the United States and British experience. Since then India has held three national elections—each the largest exercise of the democratic privilege in the world—in which a higher percentage of people voted than in the United States.

India has freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of the press, and a private enterprise sector that has been chalking up sizable gains.

India's success has been in large measure due to its own efforts. The Indian people have worked hard, developed able leadership, learned by hard experience, and maintained a sound civil service based on solid British training.

But the Indians would be the first to agree that the outlook for the success of Indian democracy would not be so bright today had it not been for generous assistance from the United States.

In the last 15 years we have granted or loaned India $3.9 billion in economic aid. Approximately 55 percent of this assistance was in the form of surplus commodities—wheat, cotton, corn, etc. Another 42 percent was in dollars for the purchase of materials—steel, railroad, transportation equipment, and machinery, manufactured mostly in the United States and produced by American workers. The remainder went for technical advice and instruction.

India's record of achievement is of great significance to that nation's future and security. Yet this record is also profoundly important to our own security.

Only through a free India, with growing strength and confidence, can we expect to see the development of a political and military balance to Communist China in Asia. What is more, a successful, expanding India demonstrates to all of the doubters and the fainthearted in Asia, Africa, and Latin America that democracy is more than an impractical Western political luxury; it is a realistic political and economic system that actually works in practice, that produces results.

The Indian third 5-year plan proposes that within the next 10 years the need for foreign assistance will begin to be reduced; and it foresees its eventual end as India's takeoff point of self-sustaining growth is finally reached.

But India is by no means the only dramatic example of successful aid use outside Western Europe. In the same subcontinent, Pakistan is taking equally impressive strides toward national development with U.S. assistance. Together, these two nations hold the key to the future security of south Asia against pressures from Communist China.

These south Asian examples, moreover, are matched in other parts of the world. In Japan, Greece, Formosa, and Israel, our aid program has either accomplished its purpose and been terminated, or is in the process of being phased out. Indeed, Japan and Israel are already extending such assistance to others. In Nigeria, Colombia, Tunisia, and many other countries steady progress is being made.

Therefore, the record shows that foreign aid, when handled wisely, can succeed in doing what it sets out to do—it can help to create viable independent nations.

On the other hand, where the program has not been handled wisely, the results have naturally not been so good. Similarly where our expectations have been unrealistic and grandiose, we have inevitably met disappointment.

In regard to the wise handling of economic assistance, we have learned some hard lessons from our Latin American experience in recent years; and today we are now attempting to apply these lessons through tightened standards for aid distribution through the Alliance for Progress.

The primary lesson that we must learn from Cuba is that the United States cannot afford to support, or even to tolerate, corrupt, oppressive regimes, of whatever ideological base, which deny the basic aspirations of their own people for human dignity and a better life. As President Kennedy has himself pointed out on more than one occasion, we wouldn't have Castro if it had not been for Batista.

Reactionary rightwing governments constitute the weakest defense against totalitarianism of the left. They are sitting ducks for the Castro-Communists because they deny the dignity and rights of the majority of people—and their eventual overthrow through violence is inevitable as the economic and political pressures intensify.

What is the nature of these pressures? Consider these facts:

In Latin America today one and a half percent of the people—those with 15,000 or more acres each—are said to own half of all agricultural land. Only a handful of countries have an effective income tax. In several countries local capital is being accumulated in Swiss banks for safekeeping at the same time that U.S. aid is requested, while scarce foreign exchange goes for perfume and Cadillacs instead of for machinery, tools, and fertilizer plants.

In many Latin American countries the reforms needed to produce prosperity and stability are dangerously overdue. Yet because the essential economic and social revolution in many cases has not yet taken place, great wealth continues to exist explosively side by side with abject poverty.

What is important about the new AID program is the fact that its administrators now have the will to use it as a lever to induce reform and not, as so frequently happened in the past, as a backstop for the doomed status quo. In the broadest political and human sense, we intend to use this program to prevent situations getting so far out of hand that we are forced to make the impossible choice between the Castros and the Batistas of this world.

Those countries that are unable or unwilling to curb luxury spending, to stop the flight of capital, and to undertake far-reaching social and economic reforms should be dropped as aid recipients; or, in some cases, I believe our assistance should be limited to a modest U.S. presence through the Peace Corps and technical assistance programs.

There will, of course, be inevitable exceptions in those situations where overwhelming strategic or political considerations make continuance of a dole necessary for our own security.

In such exceptional instances, however, let us at least frankly admit that our purposes are political, and not confuse these exceptions with the constructive development policies, operations, and standards of the rest of the program.

So much for the lessons of our 15-year aid program. What must we Americans do here and now, as the annual aid debate begins to rage again?

What we need to do now, as citizens and as a government, is to strengthen the program, to support it and explain it, and to recognize it as a basic arm of American foreign policy without which we would be sorely, perhaps fatally, handicapped.

In this regard, I believe that we should keep in mind five clear sets of objectives:

First, we have an overriding responsibility to explain to ourselves and to others what the program can and cannot do. We should never fall prey to the tired old fallacies that have previously distorted our views of aid's possibilities.

Properly administered foreign assistance can do one thing, and one thing only: It can help to build independent nations capable of standing on their own feet and making their own free choices. And if we can do that, we can help create a rational world in which communism is steadily declining in influence—a world that holds some prospect of peace.

Second, we are now establishing and publicizing clear working criteria for the distribution of economic aid. The need for such criteria has been strongly implied in the Act for International Development as passed by Congress and the recent Clay report has reemphasized this need.

Let us remember that the Congress has directed us to do precisely what experience has taught us must be done if our oversea assistance effort is to succeed. For instance, the act says:

"Assistance will be based upon sound plans and programs, be directed toward the social as well as economic aspects of economic development; be responsive to the efforts of the recipient countries to mobilize their own resources and help themselves; be cognizant of the external and internal pressures which hamper their growth and should emphasize long-range development assistance as the primary instrument of such growth."

In the spirit of the congressional legislation, we are now posing for ourselves some searching questions in regard to all requests for assistance from abroad.

These questions relate to the applicant's present per capita income and its distribution; the competence of the government, and its sensitivity to the needs of the population; the existence of well-conceived, long-range national economic development plan; the adequate distribution and collection of the nation's tax burden; the priority given to the vast majority of citizens who live in the rural areas; the development of equitable land distribution and the creation of an integrated approach to community development; the existence of a favorable climate and adequate incentives for foreign and domestic private investment; and the maintenance of effective controls over the expenditure of foreign exchange for luxury imports.

Most important of all, we are asking ourselves whether a government which seeks our assistance exists with at least the general consent of its own population; in other words, is it sufficiently rooted in public support to assure the broad backing of its people necessary for a bold program of economic and social development?

Although obviously no nation could respond affirmatively on all these counts, these are objectives that we must stress in developing priorities and standards for distribution of assistance.

Now let us consider a third general objective—the need for improvement in the planning and integration of the foreign aid program, not only within our own Government, but in connection with the wide and complex variety of international agencies and other countries that also operate in this field.

The U.S. Government provides unilateral aid through the Export-Import Bank, which helps the underdeveloped nations finance the purchase of industrial goods in the United States; the Development Loan Fund, which provides long-term loans on easy terms payable in both dollars and soft currencies; U.S. technical assistance, which offers a wide range of specialists in planning and technology; the Peace Corps, which provides several thousand volunteers trained in teaching, nursing, rural development, and the like; and food for peace, which distributes U.S. surplus farm products, including wheat, rice, powdered milk, and cotton.

But economic assistance for the developing nations is not solely an American enterprise. Loans and technical assistance are available from many international agencies. These include the World Bank, which provides loans payable in hard currencies, the International Development Association, which provides soft loans, the International Monetary Fund, which helps stabilize currencies; and the so-called Specialized Agencies of the U.N.—the World Health Organization, Food and Agricultual Organization, and UNESCO.

Finally, West Germany, France, Britain, Canada, Australia, Japan, Switzerland, and Israel also provide unilateral economic assistance on a generally similar basis.

The staggering number of sources to which the developing nations can turn for assistance inevitably creates confusion and some overlapping of effort. This suggests the need for careful planning to make sure that the right kind of aid is made available, and that its use is effectively coordinated with the resources of the developing country itself.

Now let me emphasize a fourth basic consideration of particular importance: orderly political growth in the developing nations is dependent in large measure upon what happens in the rural areas where 80 percent of the people live.

When the rural areas are oppressed with poverty, exploitation, and injustice, they are easy targets for Communist infiltration. Moreover, it is impossible for any developing nation to increase its industrial output rapidly if four-fifths of its people lack the purchasing power to buy its factory-produced goods.

Our aid program therefore should be more and more closely related to the improvement of agriculture, the encouragement of land reform, the creation of rural extension services, and the building of rural schools, roads, and clinics.

Fifth and last, let us take an imaginative approach to questions of public and private ownership, developing new mixed forms to meet management problems.

This question is one of practicality, not morality. We Americans are wedded to a system of private ownership which has done so much for us. However, as a matter of pure realism the overburdened governments of the developing nations have enough to do without taking on the multiplicity of economic problems inherent in government management of production.

Twenty years of Government service have made me increasingly aware of the limits of government. As long as they are getting results, it is not our prime responsibility to impose our ideas on the recipients of our aid. To do so would be to open a Pandora's Box of imperialistic charges and to contribute to a less effective utilization of our own aid.

In summing up, there is no question but that our foreign aid program is an absolutely vital instrument of American foreign policy, and that it has already made an enormous contribution to our national security.

The frustration that so many Americans seem to feel with this program has resulted partly from inevitable mistakes in new areas of effort, partly from the complexities of the cold war, but more than anything else from the unbalanced presentation in recent years of what the aid program can and cannot do.

Yet it would be folly to allow our frustrations to thwart our capacity to deal with the present-day world. The fact is the program in spite of many errors has on the whole been a brilliant success, and its continuance is essential if we are to develop the kind of peaceful world community in which we ourselves can prosper.

We Americans have one peculiar national habit: We tend to act much better than we sound. Why this is so I shall leave to the psychologists.

However, the fact of the matter is that we are likely to give the worst reasons for some of our most noble acts.

Thus we argue that the time has come to grant our Negro citizens first-class citizenship not because they have been waiting 180 years since the Declaration of Independence asserted that "all men are created equal" but because the colored majority of mankind in Asia and Africa is said to be breathing down our necks.

In order to win public support for urgently needed scholarships to our universities, we call the legislation the National Defense Education Act and we fit it out with reassuring anti-Communist disclaimers.

Through our fears and frustrations of this disorderly new world, we have come to act as though our chief national purpose is not to maintain and extend our basic American commitment to human dignity, but to thwart the Russians and Chinese in whatever they decide to do.

And while we strive to outfox the Communists abroad, we concentrate on keeping up with the Joneses at home. Politicians, journalists, businessmen—even college professors—increasingly give the most cynical reasons for their most high-minded activities.

We smile with a knowing self-assurance as we explain that scandals in high places and the misuse of positions of national trust simply go to prove that politics is politics.

Northern officeseekers assure their southern colleagues that they vote for Negro rights only because of the political pressures back home.

Businessmen contributing to boys' summer camp funds and hospital-building drives rush to cover up their decent motivations by pointing out that it is good publicity for their business—and after all, isn't it tax deductible?

In regard to foreign aid we indulge ourselves in the same labored, cynical rationalizations instead of proudly presenting this crucially important program for what it is—an earnest unprecedented effort to help new nations ease poverty, illiteracy and disease so that they can remain free within their own cultures—we explain that our real purpose is to buy friends and supporters in the United Nations, or to keep restless peasants and workers from asking hard questions, or to fill empty bellies on the mistaken assumption that well-fed peasants will more easily tolerate the injustices and harassments of the feudal societies in which they live, and thus joyfully join us in support of the status quo.

The constructive leadership of America is now challenged, not simply to stand up to the Russians, but to understand the nature of our revolutionary world, to explore the forces at work in Communist societies and to put itself in touch with the aspirations of the people in between—the men, women and children of Asia, Africa, and Latin America who see our planet as something more than an arena for Soviet-American conflict.

As we move to meet this challenge, we may be reminded of the words of Woodrow Wilson who once told a graduating class at Annapolis:

"There have been other nations as rich as we; there have been other nations as powerful; there have been other nations as spirited; but I hope we shall never forget that we created this Nation, not to serve ourselves, but to serve mankind. No other nation was ever born into the world with the purpose of serving the rest of the world just as much as it served itself."

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS—CENTENNIAL CHARTER DAY CONVOCATION

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, yesterday I had the pleasure of attending the Centennial Charter Day Convocation of the University of Massachusetts. Many educational and civic leaders from all over New England come to Amherst to pay tribute to this fine university, which has devoted itself for so many years to the service of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the education of its young people. Its many contributions are well known, and the work it is doing today under the leadership of President John W. Lederle is of the highest quality.

The principal speaker at the convocation was Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. I ask unanimous consent that his remarks on the occasion of the convocation be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY DR. GLENN T. SEABORG, CHAIRMAN, U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION, AT THE CENTENNIAL CHARTER DAY CONVOCATION, UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS, AMHERST, MASS., APRIL 29, 1963

PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION AND THE NATIONAL GOOD

It is a privilege indeed for me to be here today to salute the University of Massachusetts on its Centennial Charter Day and to congratulate it upon this extended period of service to the Commonwealth and to the Nation.

A century is the measuring rod of history, and its passage gives men special reason to pause for reflection. Besides, we like to deal in neat, round numbers, and 100 years is an easy figure with which to reckon. We are ourselves a part of the century past. Each of us has lived in that time, our lives have been immediately shaped by it, and we have given to it what we could. Therefore, we are prone to believe we can understand the currents of our own century. If at times we hold this opinion more strongly than we should, perhaps we can be forgiven, for our attempts to organize some coherence out of the immediate past provide an important guide to our actions in the future.

To attempt to understand recent events is, I believe, more important than ever before in man's history. The growing power of man and the rapidity of social evolution call for constant, current interpretation. In a sense we have packed several centuries of history, by the yardsticks of the more remote past, into the last 100 years.

It is especially appropriate, therefore, that we should consider the past century and what it can tell us of the future; especially as those matters relate to the Land-Grant College Act and its symbol here, the University of Massachusetts. Let us first review briefly some of the significant events in western society leading up to the enactment of that act and the founding of this university and let us then try to visualize the place of this institution and its sister land-grant institutions in the future of American culture and the larger future of civilization.

If we look back a number of centuries to the Middle Ages, we find that man and society in the Western world were dominated by rather static concepts. The individual was born into a world that was essentially unchanging by our standards. He was not very important. Poverty, disease, toil, and natural calamities were simply an inevitable part of life. He accepted the proffered explanations of the world and the universe, and his curiosity was not encouraged. Man was a fearful and superstitious plaything of his environment. The concept that man might improve his lot was not widely considered. Nor were the tools at hand for such a task.

The beginning of the changes in this outlook are generally identified with the Renaissance and the Reformation. The questioning and inquisitive human spirit could not be stifled forever. Men began to question old forms and beliefs—in religion, politics and the law; in art and literature; and in science and philosophy.

The process of breaking out of a closed world and liberating the mind was a slow one, and it is by no means complete. There were many landmarks, established by many brave men in all walks of life, on the route to liberation. An example was the overthrow, by the evidence produced by Copernicus and Galileo, of the dogmatic concept that the earth is the center of the universe. It is difficult for us today to estimate the impact, on a closed system of thought, of the knowledge that the earth and the other planets revolve around the sun. If such an important belief could fall, were not others vulnerable? While science was opening man's eyes to the truth of his surroundings, a change was in the making concerning the concept of man himself. The themes of individual rights and freedom were being developed in the period of the Enlightenment and the first crystallization of these revolutionary ideas was in the American Revolution—the first revolution of which I am to speak to you today. Beginning with the Declaration of Independence and culminating with the adoption of the Constitution, the place of the State was confined to protecting the rights of the individual and becoming the instrument for man's self-government.

Surely, no place has a more intimate identity with the great struggle for freedom—our first revolution—than Massachusetts. Here the torch of liberty was first lit, here the first battles for our freedom were fought, and here the first sacrifices to our ideals were offered.

The first American revolution guaranteed to us the inalienable rights of free men. One of these, the right of free inquiry, nurtured in the universities, made possible the modern concept of the institution of higher learning as a center not only for the preservation and cultivation of the intellectual treasures of the ages; but also as a dynamic source of new knowledge that energizes the evolution of society.

A consequence of the revolutionary movement nourished by the enlightenment and brought to fruition by our first revolution was that it also brought the material well-being of man into focus, and science was the power which gave greatest hope toward accomplishment of this boon to mankind. A memorable expression of this hope was contained in a letter from Benjamin Franklin to Joseph Priestley in 1780, in which Franklin said: "The rapid progress true science now makes occasions my regretting sometimes that I was born too soon. It is impossible to imagine the height to which may be carried, in the thousand years, the power of man over matter. We may perhaps learn to deprive large masses of their gravity, and give them absolute levity, for the sake of easy transport. Agriculture may diminish its labor and double its produce; all diseases may by sure means be prevented or cured, not excepting even that of old age, and our lives lengthened at pleasure even beyond the antediluvian standard."

The freedom to embrace new ideas, the concept that men need not accept miserable conditions of life, and the hope inherent in science, unleashed as never before the economic energies of man. Our second revolution, the industrial revolution, and the rise of science and technology saw a beginning of the realization of Franklin's dreams—a huge increase in industrial and agricultural production at a cost of less total labor, the conquest of many diseases, the lengthening of life, the improvement of health.

Another consequence of the great movements of liberation generated by the American Revolution was that education must be widespread if the citizens are, through intelligent participation, to make democracy work. Thomas Jefferson was a disciple of this ideal. While he and others recognized the primacy of a liberal education as an essential to meaningful living, they also accepted the importance of practical education as a means of material improvement of the individual and society. Jefferson was one of the most powerful advocates of the American ideal that there should be opportunity for education to the highest level of the individual's ability.

The actual democratization of education, however, was slow in being implemented. In the early days of the Nation, Washington's proposal of a National Board of Agriculture—a proposal to improve farm production through scientific methods—and the suggestion of a national university were blocked largely because of narrow interpretations of the Constitution and the functions of Government. These proposals, I might add, were philosophical antecedents of the land-grant colleges.

In these early days we were too preoccupied with the frontier to implement the educational ideals of the revolution. We were concerned with the practical, not then realizing that the practical has its roots in the theoretical, in the expansion of knowledge. It was not until the frontier had been largely conquered and the land largely settled that we initiated a national effort to put into effect one of the ideals of the Founding Fathers. This was accomplished by the Land-Grant College Act, sponsored by Congressman Justin Smith Morrill of neighboring Vermont, which was passed by Congress and signed by President Lincoln in 1862.

It is not surprising that one of the first States to take advantage of the provisions of this act was Massachusetts. While the private institutions of Massachusetts distinguished themselves in the field of higher education from the earliest Colonial days, few of the sons and daughters of the poor could at that time afford to attend these colleges. Nor, for the most part, were their curricula attentive to the needs of the industrial revolution. The Morrill Act took care to provide "the leading object shall be without excluding other scientific and classic studies, and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts * * * in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions of life." As one might expect of a State with the rich educational heritage of Massachusetts, it quickly responded to this new opportunity by incorporating the Massachusetts Agricultural College in April 1863.

The land-grant colleges developed, at different rates in various locations, into institutions that did not resemble the outlines of the original concepts. It was clear to many States that a curriculum emphasizing applied science and accompanied somewhat peripherally by the liberal arts was inadequate to meet the intellectual needs of the people and to reap the real benefits of science. The States themselves became the main sources of financial support for the colleges. In many places broad and impressive curricula in the liberal arts evolved. Equally important efforts in fundamental science developed. Although training in practical arts and in the performance of agricultural extension and other services was not abandoned, many of the institutions developed truly creative roles in teaching and in basic research, with impressive graduate schools for the advanced learning so important today.

This enlargement of the concept of the land-grant colleges in some States was taking place at a most propitious time in American history. With our preoccupation with the practical, our main emphasis had been on technology, in which we became preeminent. For well over a century fundamental science was an orphan in American society. It was widely regarded as useless, and existed on the periphery, practiced by a relatively few dedicated votaries. From time to time in emergencies such as the Civil War and World War I, scientists were called upon for major efforts to apply their skills to technological problems. But each crisis was followed by a return of the scientists to their isolated provinces of the laboratory.

By the 1930's, however, America had developed a sound and broad base of fundamental science. There existed a core of original scientists across a broad spectrum of fields. American contributions to the expansion of knowledge were becoming important. Moreover, much of this effort was being made in land-grant institutions in which the larger educational concept had been accepted. The third revolution—the scientific revolution—had begun, and the land-grant colleges were a big factor in its development. Indeed, by 1953 the National Manpower Council was able to say that "the most important single governmental step in connection with the training of scientific and professional personnel was the Morrill Act of 1862 which laid the basis for the country's extensive State college and university system."

After the Nation's scientists had been "called to the colors" in World War II they returned, as usual, to the laboratories after the emergency. But during the course of the war and immediately afterward, the impressive power of basic science had been dramatized more clearly than ever before. The release of nuclear energy was perhaps the most persuasive demonstration in history of the Jeffersonian principle that "knoledge[1] is power." Moreover, the application of this knowledge so soon after the discovery of the fundamental principle was one of many wartime demonstrations that the gap between discovery and application had become almost imperceptible in many cases.

The Federal Government felt it prudent, therefore, through the Atomic Energy Commission, to continue to support basic research in physics as a matter of national interest. Through the Office of Naval Research and agencies of the U.S. Public Health Service other programs in basic science were supported. The National Science Foundation was established to provide a continuing, broad base of scientific research. Industrial and governmental technology programs hungrily devoured the outpouring of new knowledge.

Science is no longer a peripheral activity of society. It is in many respects the central one. It is the source of the growing confidence of man in creative evolution—in the idea that man can create an environment of his own choosing, an environment of dignity and well-being. It is this central, creative position of science in society that constitutes our third or scientific revolution. A significant portion of our national resources now goes into scientific research.

We are touched by the results of this scientific revolution in many ways. Some of our large industries are built wholly out of knowledge gained in the last two decades. Agriculture, transportation and medicine have been revolutionized. Our means of national defense is essentially new. The influence of science runs deep through our economy, industry, our social structure and political decisions. Our new way of life rests upon science. Moreover, a part of our new way of life consists of the fact that it will be replaced by still other ways of living and working tomorrow, and still other ways the day after.

In short, our practice of creative evolution has brought us to the beginnings of a democratic scientific society. For explorations in basic science ahead, we must give the most advanced training to the largest possible number of our most talented people. With the advancement of knowledge, the frontier both recedes and enlarges, and we require more scientists. And while the frontier recedes and expands, we must have more engineers and technicians to make use of the new discoveries for the advancement of man's well-being.

The dynamic evolution of our environment and of our material condition is echoed in the moral and philosophical fabric of life. Old and fundamental values, developed in a slower time, are constantly tested, and must be related to new frames of reference. The very leisure men have always sought—and succeeded in achieving—is, paradoxically, a serious problem. New motivations must be found to replace in part the lessening pressure to toil for survival. Our third revolution—the scientific revolution—is the principal cause of technological unemployment, the population explosion, and the increases in the percentage of older people. Around the world less privileged people are attempting to jam our three revolutions into a twinkling of time. We are faced with a continuing international crisis that promises to continue for decades, with an opposing political system determined that the revolutions around the world will be interpreted in reactionary, authoritarian terms.

There are deep implications in this new stage of social evolution for higher education in general and for the land-grant institutions in particular. It is clear that we are now dependent, and will be increasingly dependent, upon intense cultivation of brainpower for our present and future welfare. We need wider and higher levels of education in all fields for effective working of our complex, swiftly moving, technical democracy. We cannot have too much cultivated intelligence and special training for intelligent political decision making, for expansion and exploitation of new knowledge, for the solution of social problems, for the management of industry, for the interpretation of human events, for the enrichment of life associated with the advancement of the arts and the humanities, and for the achievement of permanent peace and improvement of human welfare around the globe.

The very large and distinguished role of private colleges and universities will continue. However, an increasing share of mass higher education must be borne by public colleges and universities, which are largely an outgrowth of the Land Grant Act. A large part of the task of educational democratization lies within the tradition and responsibility of these colleges. The act constituted a substantial recognition by the Nation that public resources should be devoted to providing the opportunity for talented individuals, whatever their economic status, to obtain advanced education.

Parenthetically, I should like to say that I have personal reason for being a strong supporter of the use of public resources in higher education. I graduated from a public high school at the beginning of the great depression. Had there not existed a land-grant institution near my home in the Los Angeles area, it is probable that I should not have had a chance to obtain a higher education. Indeed, upon my graduation from the University of California at Los Angeles, another campus of the same public institution, at Berkeley, offered me the opportunity to go on to graduate work. From my experiences as a teacher, researcher, and administrator in that university, it is clear that, even though we may live in relatively affluent times, many gifted students will not be able to cultivate their talents unless fine educational facilities are available to them at minimum cost.

The increasing obligation in higher education derives not only from the nature of modern society but also from the great increase in population. Recent studies reflect that while in 1960 some 18 percent or 400,000 of the Nation's 22-year-olds took baccalaureate degrees, there will be this demand on the part of 25 percent or 875,000 in 1970. If this essential doubling of graduates appears to be staggering, we can take heart from our experience with explosive expansion in the past as we more than doubled the annual number of baccalaureate recipients between 1940 and 1960.

Programs to meet these needs of our people and the Nation are going forward vigorously in the various States, and I believe it is essential that our public institutions of higher learning continue to grow in strength and capacity in the years ahead. The self-interest of a society that has made much progress through exploitation of the intellect requires constant vigilance to insure educational opportunity on a quantitative as well as a qualitative scale, commensurate with the cultural and economic level of that society. In the light of past returns no investment of public resources today will pay better dividends than do shares in higher education. The lesson of the relationship between the level of education and the national good must not be lost, and in our age every State must turn increasingly to public resources to achieve the necessary intellectual endowment.

---

[1] Jefferson spelling "knoledge."

I am pleased to hear that the University of Massachusetts is looking forward to a doubling of its student body, to 15,000 students, by 1975. Your progress is symbolic of the national trend among land-grant colleges—from a small agricultural college to a State college in 1931 and to a university in 1947. I have no doubt your progress will continue and that your significant contribution to the State and Nation will become even larger. I sympathize with those of you on the faculty and in the administration who have the difficult problems of maintaining high quality in the face of explosive growth—quality in teaching staff in the face of heavy competition, quality of facilities needed to remain up to date in teaching capabilities. In my position as chancellor of the Berkeley campus of the University of California these were my most difficult problems, even when I was aided by the generous support of a public that has always placed its faith largely in the public education tradition.

In your efforts to provide sufficient opportunities for your young citizens, I would remind you that there is increasing awareness by the Nation as a whole that the States must receive help from the Federal Government. In particular, Federal Government studies have recognized the need to give assistance to graduate teaching and research programs.

In regard to the conduct of your undergraduate program, I have one suggestion that derives from my views of the nature of today's world. It relates closely to citizens of a State that had such great influence in the founding of our democratic Nation. It has been said—and truly, I believe—that a liberally educated person is one who can make critical judgments about affairs that affect him. In our time, every citizen is deeply affected by the affairs of science and technology. Intelligent citizenship in our scientific democracy would seem to require some general knowledge of science if the citizen is to participate effectively in the democratic process. Science formed a significant part of the knowledge of the educated men who founded our democracy. Yet paradoxically, as American science began to have a potent effect on our affairs, there was a serious decline in the science content of liberal education. A move to redress the balance was initiated after World War II, yet it is doubtful that science has been restored sufficiently to the curriculum of the liberal arts. I believe you can significantly contribute to the preparation of your graduates for intelligent participation in the modern democratic scientific society by insuring that your liberal arts graduates have some knowledge of the content, the methods, the history, the potential, and the sociological implications of science and technology.

I am well aware that there is a corollary to this advice. Despite the burden of knowledge that must now be passed on to undergraduate science students, it is more essential than ever that the future scientist have a thorough exposure to the humanities and the social sciences. Scientists are increasingly required to take part in political and social decisionmaking. To participate most effectively, they should have a broad background in the humanities, the social sciences, and the arts.

In my opinion, the most important response to these challenges of education in our times is harder work. Our productivity and increased knowledge have made advanced education both essential and possible on a mass scale. There is a corresponding need for increased intellectual toil. To the student this may seem like a bitter harvest of the scientific revolution. Real intellectual achievement, however, has always required relentless toil. Nor have those who have deeply explored this form of labor been left wanting in satisfaction and fulfillment.

In addition to hard work, I should like to suggest that some progress in the enlargement of the undergraduate's horizons can be achieved by a special kind of cross-fertilization on the academic staff. I wonder if it would not be fruitful, for example, to systematically make provision for a member of your department of economics to be a man with special interest in science? Should not a member of the philosophy faculty be well grounded in science, especially the modern science which is so deeply affecting thought today? A history professor who specializes in the influence of science on historical processes could make a significant contribution to the scientific literacy of his students. A systematic sprinkling of your science faculties with professors having particular command of the arts of humanities might, likewise, significantly increase the cultural heritage of science students.

I should like to add a footnote to my suggestion of undergraduate breadth for the specialist and depth for the generalist. We must not neglect to provide a sound foundation for specialization. Several years ago a study demonstrated that the liberal arts colleges had provided the undergraduate training for a surprisingly large number of American scientists. I urge you to continue and expand your excellent undergraduate training in this area. No less important is a sound undergraduate curriculum preparatory to graduate training in the social sciences and the humanities. Our new democratic-scientific society calls for more highly trained men and women in every field.

As we now enter the early stages of the scientific revolution—our third revolution—the full flower of creative evolution is bursting upon us. Yet powerful as the forces of science and technology have already demonstrated themselves to be, relatively speaking we are only beginning to feel their influence. Our Nation and the world are committed to an accelerating cycle of knowledge-gathering and knowledge-exploitation. We cannot visualize in detail the consequences for the future. We can, however, clearly see that we can, if we have the wisdom, create an environment essentially of our choosing. The scientific revolution can provide for the essential needs of men around the globe. Our small world will grow smaller. At the same time our perspective will be broadened unimaginably by the exploration of space. We can only guess at the distant impact of this dynamism on man, his institutions, the content of thought and the quality of life. We can be sure, however, that successful adaptation to the changing environment can be achieved, in an atmosphere of freedom, only through advancement of men generally to higher levels of education.

The challenge of the future to the University of Massachusetts—and, indeed, to all of higher education—is unprecedented in the history of learning. You must double your enrollment in a little more than a decade, all the while striving to increase the quality of learning. The nature of our world calls upon you to produce, if you can, a new and wiser breed of men and women. As a group they must see and comprehend larger horizons than men have ever known. They must know the total world and yet have the foundation for the special skills the world requires. They must cherish old values—especially our humane, liberal heritage of freedom—and be able to perceive and preserve those values in a constantly changing world. They must have the flexibility to welcome change, in order to cope with an environment that more than ever tests man's capacity to adapt. They must understand the enormous new power of man, its sources and its potentials; and they must know how to use it with wisdom and restraint. They must come closer than ever before to the real practice of the philosophy that all men are brothers.

This is a tall order. But these are tall times. The people of Massachusetts have contributed more than their share of leadership to the American Revolution, to the industrial revolution, and to the scientific revolution. Through the University of Massachusetts, I am sure they will bear their full share of responsibility in meeting the primary challenge of our times—the fullest possible democratization of higher education.

THE ENDURING WORLD OF THOMAS JEFFERSON

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I have often said that Thomas Jefferson was our greatest political philosopher. In fact, I would be willing to rate him as equal to any political philosopher of recorded history. In any event, his political philospophy was embodied in an experiment in government that has endured longer than the present form of any government in the world. Dr. Julian P. Boyd, who is the editor of "The Papers of Thomas Jefferson," of which 16 volumes out of an anticipated total of 50, already have been produced, undoubtedly is the greatest Jeffersonian scholar of our day and time, says that the political philosophy of Jefferson is an enduring one.

On the 270th anniversary of the granting of the royal charter to the College of William and Mary, Jefferson's alma mater, Dr. Boyd delivered a memorable address at William and Mary, entitled "The Enduring World of Thomas Jefferson."

> Our age of crisis—

Said Dr. Boyd in that address—

> like that which fostered the world of Jefferson, compels a reassessment of values and a probing of the fundamental principles of government.

Writing of the Williamsburg Convention in the early summer of 1776, which produced Virginia's famous Bill of Rights, Jefferson said:

> Ours was not only the first of the American States, but the first nation in the world, at least within the records of history, which peaceably, by its wise men, formed, on free deliberation, a constitution of government for itself, and deposited it in writing among their archives, always ready and open to the appeal of every citizen.
>
> That convention—

Dr. Boyd noted—

> assembled without any sanction of law, without even the color of formal legality which the revolutionary parliament of 1688 and the Federal Convention of 1787 possessed. But its epochal significance lies

neither in that fact nor in the unprecedented manner in which, of its own free deliberation, it declared all government to be totally dissolved and then proceeded to establish a new "Mode of civil polity" for the commonwealth. The cataclysmic nature of the Revolution of 1776 was that it overturned a theory that had back of it the sanction of centuries of experience. Its glory was that the people in whom, under the new theory, sovereignty was henceforth to be lodged accomplished this revolution with a minimum of dislocation in the social structure.

The unprecedented and enduring significance of the pivotal year 1776, then, is that it affirmed a moral proposition for this Nation and for all men. It assumed that the old dialog between those who feared and those who trusted the people would be continued, not only because it was natural but also because it was necessary. But from that time forward, though he might travel a long, hazardous journey before making himself into a wise and benevolent sovereign, man himself was the repository of all power. This was an irreversible decision in human history.

Mr. President, the fundamental principle of good government so pronounced by Thomas Jefferson will endure as long as there is a free world. And it is timely to repeat it because there are many who agree with the English essayist, who, years ago, felt that he was "suspended between two worlds—the one dead and the other not yet capable of being born."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Boyd's wonderful address at William and Mary last February may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ENDURING WORLD OF THOMAS JEFFERSON

(By Julian P. Boyd)

The world of Thomas Jefferson was closer to that of Aristotle than to ours. In casting our glance backward today we might do well to remember what he had to say of Athenian ideas of government. "So different was the state of society then, and with those people, from what it is now and with us," he wrote of the ancient Greeks, "that I think little edification can be obtained from their writings on the subject of government. They had just ideas of the value of personal liberty; but none at all of the structure of government best calculated to preserve it. They knew no medium between a democracy (the only pure republic, but impracticable beyond the limits of a town) and an abandonment of themselves to an aristocracy, or a tyranny, independent of the people."

This was the mature opinion of a man who already knew his Thucydides and Livy before he entered this college, who was in fact one of the most assiduous students of history in an age that considered a knowledge of the Greek and Roman past to be a fundamental necessity for the enlightened citizen and the legislator. This was the opinion of a man who had no confidence at all in the mere structure of government, or indeed of any laws and constitutions, as a means of preserving liberty—that sacred fire could be kept alive only when the people cherished and tended it with zealous care. When they failed in this, no institutions or forms could preserve it for them. This was the opinion of a man, in brief, who at once found history the most relevant of studies and yet turned his back on much of past experience as being either useless or an encumbrance to the task before him and his age. History was a bench mark, not a blue print. The distinction is worth noting by a people who look to the past for guidance so earnestly as Americans do.

We are now being assured by the intellectual fatalists of Europe, and by some among us who echo them, that more than 2,000 years of Western civilization are drawing swiftly to a close and that past experience has no meaning or use for us in the tasks of a totally new epoch. The glimpse we are given of a future dominated by science, controlled by technology, and paralyzed by the tyranny of impotent but multiplying man who conquered his environment before disciplining himself under a rule of law seems to support this assumption. It is a vision to make stout hearts quail. The philosophers of despair, unable to embrace the comfort of religion, yet march parallel with those who look for man's salvation on another shore and in a better land. United in accepting the propensity for evil as a dominant force in man, these two attitudes of despair and of faith seem to be joined also in the comfort they sometimes unwittingly afford to the forces of traditionalism and reaction.

We may accept readily enough the proposition that the great era in history that we characterize as Western civilization is closing or has closed. Ours indeed seems to be the most revolutionary upheaval in all history, and it may well be that man will obliterate himself before discovering that his Western society has been supplanted by a world society that is no longer his. Even now the moment seems upon us in which the old argumentum deductione of the existence of life on other planets may be verified or set at rest by actual exploration. This, if proved, will elevate to a new plane of philosophical discussion the question of the meaning of life, a discussion comparable to that precipitated in the Europe of Ferdinand and Isabella by the discovery of the American aborigines. Our age of crisis, like that which fostered the world of Jefferson, compels a reassessment of values and a probing of the fundamental principles of government.

It is natural to assume in the face of such cataclysmic change that Jefferson's world will recede further and further from our view and its meaning will seem less and less relevant. Yet we should not be too sure. One element that seems certain to remain with us from the past is that of tyranny—the tyranny of man's injustice to man, the tyranny of national hatreds, the tyranny of war, and the tyranny of a thousand nameless fears for which icy despair and religious faith seem the only available alternatives. Even so, the whole course of past experience justifies an equally confident belief that another element will remain and will serve as a countervailing legacy from that world—that is, Jefferson's resolute way of looking at tyranny in whatever form it might assume over the mind of man.

The tyranny that the world of Jefferson faced seems almost idyllic by comparison with the manifold forms that loom up before us. "The King, Lords, and Commons * * * compose the 'constitution', and supreme legislature, of the British Empire," declared one who lived in that world. "Every member of our Empire is born under this control, must live subject to it while he is a member, and is protected by it as such: whether he reside in Europe, Asia, Africa, or America. British freedom then is a freedom of law, a constitutional freedom, a freedom of acting and speaking what is right, a freedom founded in reason, happiness, and security." Such was the affirmation of a man who, like Jefferson, had sworn allegiance to the sovereign that presided over this empire of law and liberty.

Despite the long catalogue of misdeeds of that sovereign as recorded in the Declaration of Independence, it would be a rash historian who should attempt to deny that this constitutional monarchy, the richest and most powerful on earth, possessed the essential attributes of freedom under law. Jefferson was free to voice his opinions and did so without let or hindrance. He was assured of a trial by a jury of his peers if he committed a crime, and the great bulwark of the common law stood between him and any arbitrary invasion of his rights. There were no ruling oligarchies to be overthrown, no hereditary classes to be dispossessed of their privileges, no masses of peasantry waiting to be liberated from intolerable burdens as in Europe. No ecclesiastical establishments oppressed him, for those that existed, whether Anglican as in Virginia or Congregational as in New England, were of the people rather than hierarchical. By what process, then, could the sensitive, scholarly young man who was nurtured in this college two centuries ago by teachers as loyal as himself come to believe in a scant decade and a half that his sovereign was a tyrant and that rebellion to him was obedience to God? What moved him toward treason and caused him to become one of those whom Dr. Samuel Johnson called zealots of anarchy?

It is impossible even as an act of imagination to recreate a world that has disappeared: Our own biases are too fixed, the records are too lifeless and fragmentary, the glare of the present too blinding, and the motives of men too inscrutable. It is easy enough to see the outward artifacts of such a world and to comprehend the blind intransigence with which men of opposing convictions debated the nature of the British imperial constitution, for we have yet with us, in unprecedented magnitude and complexity, that old, central problem of politics of balancing the rightful claims of the part against the just claims of the whole.

From our vantage point we can see how the issue might have been settled and the constitution preserved, as in fact was done a century and a half too late with the creation of a commonwealth of self-governing dominions linked by allegiance to a common sovereign. But the abstractions of the world of Jefferson and the true configuration of its character seem as elusive to us as drifting fog. What we cannot grasp is the indefinable quality that leads some men to call anarchy what others call freedom, some to regard as tyranny what others consider constitutional liberty. As the Marquis de Chastellux observed while in Virginia, when men are determined to be free it is exceedingly difficult to prove them wrong.

The first and most important meaning that the world of Jefferson has for us, therefore, is that there are two ways of looking at what we call sovereignty. Since that troublesome abstraction is a central problem for us as it was for Jefferson, we should do well to remember the tragic yet hopeful fate that our two ways of looking at sovereignty are really two ways of looking at man. These two necessary and enduring attitudes, as the world of Jefferson understood well but as we seem to have forgotten, are grounded on emotions whose origins lie deep in our primordial past.

One attitude is that exhibited by a young Briton who came to Williamsburg on the eve of the upheaval. So astute an historian as Edward Gibbon, preoccupied with the causes of Romes' decline, could sit unheeding in the gallery of the House of Commons as the fairest part of the British Empire slipped from the hands of Lord North. But the sensitive, cultivated British traveler saw at once on landing in Virginia that great events for ominous ends were being fostered by a kind of man he had not known in Europe. "A few weeks since," he observed, "the Thames was the most considerable river I ever beheld; it is now, comparatively, reduced to a diminutive stream." American men seemed as different as American topography. They were shrewd, penetrating, litigious, and dominated by a sense of equality—that most subversive element in the whole arsenal of republican principles. They were led by factious, designing men who aroused class hatreds and made "the inferior orders of people" discontented with their lot in this world. They could not fail to become a great political and commercial power, he saw with apprehension, or be "retained as British subjects, otherwise than by inclination and interest."

His way of meeting the impending danger reflected the enduring premise on which it rested. The creation of an order of colonial nobility, the establishment of ecclesiastical dignitaries, the multiplication of the ties of commerce, and other prizes in the great lottery of imperial politics would cause men to adhere more steadily to their duty to church and state and would rivet more firmly the attachment of colonies to empire. A whole phalanx of thoughtful members of the religious, political, educational, and legal establishment of Great Britain from Blackstone to Adam Smith would have agreed both in the analysis of this discerning young traveller and in the solution that he proposed. The benefits and protections afforded by the sovereign extended downward and outward to the limits of the empire, requiring a reciprocal obedience and duty on the part of the subject that could best be exacted—human nature being what it was—by appealing to the inclinations and interests of men.

The other attitude toward sovereignty and toward mankind is perfectly symbolized by a Plutarchian opposite of the young British traveller, Thomas Jefferson, who may well have seen him on the Duke of Gloucester Street at the outset of a career that spoke uniquely for free men. The tall, shy young man from the upper reaches of the James arrived at this college at precisely the right moment. Half a century earlier he might have lived and died a cultivated planter and lawyer, indulging his taste for music and science, living happily in a prosperous society of well-ordered institutions to whose sovereign he could give steady allegiance. Half a century later he would no doubt have become as star-crossed as those whose tragic fate it was, as Jefferson feared it would be, to challenge sovereignty on other and indefensible moral grounds. But one of those miraculously transforming experiences that occur when seed, sun, and good soil are in conjunction fell to him as the responsive student of a teacher to whom world history owes much. William Small and Thomas Jefferson explored together, in friendship and in complete harmony of mind, the world of Bacon, Newton, and Locke—a world conceived in the Renaissance, nutured in the reformation, and brought to its moment of fulfillment here in a new land under the beneficent rays of the enlightenment. To this college belongs the honor of having assisted nature and history in preparing Jefferson to meet the sun as it arose on the new empire of liberty.

Here, then, two attitudes toward man met symbolically on the streets of Williamsburg. One feared man's propensities for evil, distrusted his capacity to make reason predominate over his passions, and believed an appeal to his selfish inclinations and interests would keep him orthodox in religion, dutiful to his sovereign, and obedient to law. The opposing attitude rested on confidence in man's better nature, faith in his capacity for self-government, and hope that, in an ordered universe governed by natural law and under the influence of expanding science, he would go on improving himself and his condition. The attitudes were as old as man. They were, as Emerson declared, attitudes of conservatism and of innovation that had divided the State and "disputed the possession of the world ever since it was made." Jefferson, Franklin, Adams, and other thoughtful leaders accepted this natural cleavage in opinions and assumed that political parties would become organized around them—opinions which, as De Tocqueville declared, "are perpetually to be met with under all the forms and all the names which have ever obtained in free communities—the one tending to limit, the other to extend indefinitely, the power of the people." As Franklin expressed it in 1786, parties "will exist wherever there is liberty, and perhaps they help to preserve it." Jefferson agreed that the natural division of parties was the most wholesome that could "exist in any government, and well worthy of being nourished, to keep out those of a more dangerous character."

But Washington in the Farewell Address warned his countrymen "in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party," and added: "This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its roots in the strongest passions of the human mind. It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but, in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness and is truly their worst enemy." Neither Jefferson nor De Tocqueville could have agreed with the incomparable leader of the Revolution, though many a dispossessed Loyalist nodded approval of sentiments that echoed so faithfully those they had expressed in the years of debate preceding the Revolution. To Jefferson, who understood from the outset that the sea of liberty would be boisterous and that the great decision of 1776 was a "bold and doubtful election," this was too close to the belief of Hume that the theory of representative government was a noble dream belied by all history and experience. To De Tocqueville, it seemed that the extinction of parties might lessen public strife but it would also cause a loss of public morality. In this lies the clue to what meaning the world of Jefferson has for our world of crisis.

We have long been assured by historians that the American Revolution was a conservative one because it had no need to overthrow the structure of society to insure its triumph. I believe it to be, on the contrary, the most epochal of all revolutions. Late in life Jefferson wrote of the convention which met here in Williamsburg in 1776: "Ours was not only the first of the American States, but the first nation in the world, at least within the records of history, which peaceably, by its wise men, formed, on free deliberation, a constitution of government for itself, and deposited it in writing among their archives, always ready and open to the appeal of every citizen." That convention assembled without any sanction of law, without even the color of formal legality which the revolutionary Parliament of 1688 and the Federal Convention of 1787 possessed. But its epochal significance lies neither in that fact nor in the unprecedented manner in which, of its own free deliberation, it declared all government to be totally dissolved and then proceeded to establish a new "Mode of civil Polity" for the commonwealth. The cataclysmic nature of the revolution of 1776 was that it overturned a theory that had back of it the sanction of centuries of experience. Its glory was that the people in whom, under the new theory, sovereignty was henceforth to be lodged accomplished this revolution with a minimum of dislocation in the social structure.

The unprecedented and enduring significance of the pivotal year 1776, then, is that it affirmed a moral proposition for this Nation and for all men. It assumed that the old dialog between those who feared and those who trusted the people would be continued, not only because it was natural but also because it was necessary. But from that time forward, though he might travel a long, hazardous journey before making himself into a wise and benevolent sovereign, man himself was the repository of all power. This was an irreversible decision in human history. It was a wager of awesome dimensions on man's humane dispositions, and it was made in the face of tremendous odds furnished by nature and by recorded experience.

The American people were inflamed by the boldness of this unprecedented moral stature that men in America had assumed. Thomas Paine was merely stating, as usual, what was in the minds of multitudes when he declared it was this moral principle that made the American Revolution "the greatest and completest * * * the world ever knew." This was true, he thought, because the people had assumed "on the theater of the universe a character hitherto unknown," as if a newly created world had been entrusted to their hands. An obscure settler in Kentucky echoed him by saying: "We have struck out a new track in some things, why not in all?" A merchant in New England voiced the same acceptance of moral responsibility and the implied meaning that it held for a progressive improvement in man's condition: "Our country," he wrote, "has already credit among the enlightened for the first establishment of religious liberty, the first complete separation of constitutional from legislative power, the creation of the first national judiciary that was ever impowered to decide not only doubtful points of jurisprudence but constitutional law, and likewise the first legitimate provision for amending the Constitution itself: It remains * * * for some of her most illustrious lawgivers to complete the high civil achievements by completely remolding that fundamental law of a republic—the manner of giving suffrages." The American was still human, still imperfect, still limited: But he had assumed a moral responsibility that was unprecedented. He had invested for himself a share in the government and henceforth the public interest was his responsibility.

The Americans of that revolutionary epoch, already enjoying a general equality of material things, of education, of suffrage, and of the apparently endless resources provided by a bountiful nature, were able by long preparation to produce and to elevate to positions of leadership statesmen who devised a workable Federal system and adapted it to a great expanse of territory. That system has not only survived its hazards and travail to become the oldest republic on earth: It has gone on expanding even into the wastes of the Pacific and the Arctic at the very moment that other empires have been receding or are ended. It has become the wealthiest and most powerful of all nations. It has used its vast power in the recent past in a gesture of generosity to other nations that is without precedent either in magnitude or in character. In the face of these facts it is not to be wondered at that the intellectuals who embrace despair in our time have dated the decline of Western civilization from 1789—a revolution that attempted the overthrow of the structure of society and failed—rather than from 1776. Our venture, as Learned Hand affirmed, may be a venture unproved, and the obstacles ahead seem almost insuperable. But the epochal wager placed on man's humane dispositions has not been lost—not yet.

The agrarian republic of Thomas Jefferson has disappeared forever. We may note in passing that he did not invent it and was never so doctrinaire as to elevate to the the level of a political theory the proposition that democratic principles depended for their validity upon the trade that men followed. If, as many have thought, its inevitable disappearance proves him to be an unrealistic theoretician and, moreover, a reactionary who wished to preserve a static republic of yeomen farmers, it can only be said that the same terms must be applied to one who has never been regarded as an impractical visionary—Benjamin Franklin. The essence of the Jeffersonian position is that, under the pervading moral principle embraced at the outset, change was inevitable, change in the direction of improvement was always to be sought, and in fact nothing was unchangeable save the inalienable rights of man. The earth, he asserted, belongs to the living, and the dead have neither rights nor power over it. It may be that mankind whose life is guided by an overarching technology will not have its capacity for self-government enlarged by the hail, storm, and flood that seemed to do this for an agrarian society in the 18th century. But this was a schooling of necessity and that school, like nature itself, encouraged virtue and vice with an indifferent hand. Tyrants, as well as republicans, were nurtured on the soil and the same may turn out to be true of the laboratory.

What the world of Jefferson has to offer us, therefore, is only an abstraction and an example drawn from an era that may be wholly irrelevant in the world that we face. It offers us first of all a warning. It assumed that self-government was possible only when the people were informed, that all issues affecting human institutions would be viewed from the two old and natural dispositions which lead men to contest for power, and that the outcome would depend ultimately on the continuance of the dialog. Dissent and the right of legitimate opposition, then, provided the impulse for those "vibrations of power" between the two opposing attitudes that Alexander Hamilton believed to be the peculiar genius of our system.

This is a warning that we have not heeded. In education, in the press, in the industrial community, and in the world of philanthropy where innovation is a particular responsibility, controversy is shunned and too often dissent is regarded almost as an equivalent of disloyalty. The press, which was the foundation of Jefferson's world and which until recently maintained in vigorous health the dialogue of the opposing points of view, marches steadily on in its monopolizing course, arm in arm with the marketplace and only here and there daring to raise the responsible voice of criticism. Pamphleteering addressed to fundamental issues, raising realistic questions about the problems of this new age, and proposing their solution by practical confrontation rather than by outworn stereotypes is hopefully present amongst us in the same pragmatic way in which the pamphleteering of Adams, Jefferson, and others faced issues realistically and proposed workable if imperfect solutions in their day. This affords ground for hope, but some of the best of this pamphleteering has been stigmatized as controversial and none of it has yet found such a zealous audience as Jefferson's world possessed.

In politics, debate is all but stilled. Political power coalesces not around the two ancient standards of opposed attitudes by which a hesistant and lurching progress forward is insured, but around arrangements and negotiations whose method is derived from the most inappropriate of sources—the marketplace. The warning about the politics of negotiation was issued in memorable words by Adam Smith a long time ago: the piddling arts of trade, he declared, should not be "erected into political maxims for the conduct of a great empire." Such a discussion of the nature of government as took place in our early history between two opposing views is now manifested chiefly by the Supreme Court, making the law in this and in other respects a teacher of incalculable importance. In our representative system the primary responsibility for conducting debate on great issues rests with our legislators, but the ultimate responsibility for its absence rests with us: from 1776 onward this was a moral responsibility that we could not avoid. It is therefore profoundly true, so it seems, that the success of the venture in this new age—indeed its capacity to survive—depends first of all on our remaining faithful to the proposition we accepted for ourselves in the beginning. It is probably true that ours is a world society in which the legal right of revolution can no longer be tolerated, but the alternative to a steadfast adherence to the idea of self-government by the use of reason is one for which history offers even more hazardous odds than that on which our awesome wager is placed.

The solemn warning that the world of Jefferson has for us is symbolized in a scene that took place in 1798 in the Senate of the United States. A bill was being debated that its sponsors hoped would stifle dissent, control political opposition, and protect Americans from alien ideas by the old and fallible instruments of oppression—persecution, fines, and jail. It was a bill born of one of the two enduring attitudes of man—a fear of subversion and a distrust of man's capacity for reason—and it was being challenged by one legislator who stood on the countervailing proposition. His arguments went unheeded, for the majority of the Senate abandoned their red morocco chairs and went to the windows to look down upon the soldiers marching by Independence Hall with drums, fifes, and flying colors. The troops were also watched by a populace whose passions had been inflamed against a nation that had only recently been an ally in the struggle for independence and for the establishment of a new character in the universe. The Senator went on speaking to empty desks, defending the rights of a free men to speak freely. But other legislators in that chamber who were also sworn to uphold the right turned their back on the Bill of Rights and looked for the Nation's security in the suppression of new ideas, in a narrow and inflamed patriotism, and in the source that stands as an automatic confession of insecurity—military power. They turned their backs, that is to say, on the moral proposition that the Nation had embraced. The lonely defender was overwhelmed on that day of treachery. But the new character in the universe was now sovereign and 2 years later, under Jefferson's leadership and with the same outraged majesty with which the king of an earlier day flung to outer darkness those who affronted the kingly dignity or sought to undermine the regal power, this new-found sovereign scornfully dispossessed the attempted subverters of its rule.

This solemn and symbolic warning from the world of Jefferson admonishes us not to look for our security in armaments, not to turn our back on the source of our strength, not to abandon the moral responsibility we assumed before all mankind. It was Jefferson's hope, sustained with the fervor of religious faith, that man would place his reliance in reason and in justice. In a world that has given so many and such cruel blows to this humane aspiration, we may find it difficult to believe that men still cherish this new character in the universe, still care about striking off on a new track in a new age, still understand the moral principle necessary to sustain them in the venture. Yet all past experience seems to indicate that the alternative would be worse. In addition to this solemn warning, we thus have one other legacy from the world of Jefferson. Hope, he was forever saying, is better than despair. The hope that he held for the American people was that they would aspire to a goal beyond the reach even of Athenian destinies and would not lose sight of the principle that alone might make this possible.

ANALYSIS OF ANTI-POLL-TAX AMENDMENT

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the Congressional Quarterly fact sheet for the week ending April 26, 1963, has a very interesting analysis on the 24th amendment, commonly known as the anti-poll-tax amendment, introduced by my very able and distinguished colleague, Senator HOLLAND.

The analysis points out that ratification of the anti-poll-tax amendment is very near, with 32 States already having taken action along this line.

This is indeed a remarkable achievement, and I am very pleased to again congratulate my colleague for his persistent efforts, which obviously now are to be crowned with success.

I ask unanimous consent that the factual statement appearing in the Congressional Quarterly fact sheet be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the factual statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RATIFICATION OF ANTI-POLL-TAX AMENDMENT VERY NEAR

The proposed 24th amendment to the U.S. Constitution, banning the payment of a poll tax as a qualification for voting in Federal elections and primaries, appears assured of ratification, although failure of passage by a single State may hold up its final approval in 1963.

As of April 25, 32 of the 38 States needed for final ratification of a constitutional amendment have passed the measure. In three other States—Delaware, Missouri, and Oklahoma—the amendment has passed one house of the legislature and is awaiting approval in the second.

Only Mississippi, one of the five States still having a poll tax, rejected the amendment, although Arizona, South Dakota and Wyoming ended their regular legislative sessions without taking final action on the measure this year.

The legislatures of four other States—Maine, New Hampshire, North Carolina, and Texas—are still in their regular sessions, but the latter two are not expected to approve the anti-poll-tax amendment.

Thus, if the three States that have given partial passage to the amendment plus Maine and New Hampshire approve the measure, it will still be one short of the three-quarters (38) of the States necessary for final ratification.

It is conceivable, however, that one of the States that adjourned its legislature without passing the amendment may be recalled into special session to reconsider ratification. In any case, two of those States, Arizona and South Dakota, plus Kentucky, have regular sessions of their legislatures scheduled for early 1964 and can be expected to provide the necessary ratifications at that time.

INTRODUCED BY HOLLAND

The proposed anti-poll-tax amendment was introduced in Congress by Senator SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, Democrat, of Florida, who has long favored the abolition of poll taxes. During his days in the Florida Legislature, HOLLAND was one of the chief backers of the bill that abolished the poll tax in Florida in 1937. He has introduced an anti-poll-tax amendment in every Congress since 1949, but none was ever reported out of the Senate Judiciary Committee. In 1962, the Holland amendment was brought to the floor of the Senate by adding the anti-poll-tax provision to a minor resolution, bypassing the Judiciary Committee. The Senate, after a mild Southern filibuster, March 27, 1962, passed the amendment by a wide margin, as did the House August 27.

The ratification process of the proposed amendment was given a boost when President Kennedy on March 22 sent telegrams to the Governors of 23 States that had not yet ratified the amendment urging them to support ratification by their legislatures. "Because very few State legislatures will meet in 1964," the President said, "action by individual States now is essential if the proposed amendment is to be effective during the 1964 elections."

Although there has been no organized compaign in favor of the amendment, many Congressmen and Senators from both parties have urged their State legislatures to approve it and both national committees have announced their support. The rapid progress of the anti-poll-tax amendment through the State legislatures has surprised many observers who had earlier predicted that the ratification process would take a number of years if it was successful at all.

The amendment would have practical effect only in the five States that now levy a poll tax as a requirement for voting—Alabama, Arkansas, Mississippi, Virginia, and Texas. The Texas Senate has approved a proposed State constitutional amendment to end its own poll tax, but has also passed an annual voter registration bill to replace the poll tax as a voting prerequisite.

Following is a table listing the States that have ratified the amendment; the votes in each chamber of the legislature, when available; and the date of final ratification:

States ratifying

	Senate	House	Date of final ratification
1. Illinois	29-12	150-12	Nov. 14, 1962
2. New Jersey	18-0	58-0	Dec. 3, 1962
3. Oregon	25-3	51-4	Jan. 25, 1963
4. Montana	51-4	56-37	Jan. 28, 1963
5. West Virginia	32-0	94-0	Feb. 1, 1963
6. New York	52-2	(1)	Feb. 4, 1963
7. Maryland	27-0	125-3	Feb. 6, 1963
8. California	34-0	70-3	Feb. 7, 1963
9. Alaska	19-0	27-8	Feb. 11, 1963
10. Rhode Island	33-0	72-0	Feb. 14, 1963
11. Indiana	47-0	(2)	Feb. 15, 1963
12. Michigan	30-0	98-0	Feb. 20, 1963
13. Utah	23-0	51-4	Do.
14. Colorado	32-0	64-0	Feb. 21, 1963
15. Minnesota	(1)	(1)	Feb. 27, 1963
16. Ohio	31-0	119-3	Do.
17. New Mexico	18-10	63-0	Mar. 5, 1963
18. Hawaii	25-0	51-1	Mar. 6, 1963
19. Idaho	35-1	55-2	Mar. 8, 1963
20. North Dakota	27-20	79-28	Mar. 12, 1963
21. Vermont	(2)	157-63	Mar. 15, 1963
22. Washington	44-0	95-1	Mar. 14, 1963
23. Nevada	14-0	34-0	Mar. 19, 1963
24. Connecticut	33-0	251-4	Mar. 20, 1963
25. Tennessee	22-1	55-20	Mar. 21, 1963
26. Pennsylvania	50-0	183-1	Mar. 25, 1963
27. Wisconsin	30-0	93-0	Mar. 28, 1963
28. Kansas	24-8	111-0	Do.
29. Massachusetts	36-0	223-0	Do.
30. Nebraska		[3] 41-0	Apr. 4, 1963
31. Florida	36-6	105-3	Apr. 18, 1963
32. Iowa	48-0	92-4	Apr. 25, 1963

[1] Unanimous.
[2] Voice vote.
[3] Unicameral legislature.

"THE ISSUES OF TODAY"—STATEMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, on April 26, the Vice President of the United States, LYNDON B. JOHNSON, addressed the Young Democratic National Committee luncheon on the subject, "The Issues of Today."

The remarks of the Vice President are worthy of note and I ask unanimous consent at this time to insert them in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ISSUES OF TODAY

I realize politics may be an ugly word to some. It may seem shallow and superficial and nonintellectual to others. But a Democrat is never really a Democrat unless he is practical about politics.

That is why—here before you who are the heirs and hope of our party's future—I want to talk practical Democratic politics today.

In this year of 1963, our party holds the White House. We hold the Congress. We occupy a majority of the statehouses. We are the majority party among the millions of registered voters.

But these are not measures enough.

Too many Democrats too easily forget that the Democratic Party, as the majority party, is much more the historic exception than the historic rule.

Out of the last 30 years, since 1933, Democrats have held the White House all but 8 years—Congress all but 4 years. Yet, this represents three-fourths the time Democrats have been in power in this century and two-thirds of the years of Democratic rule since Lincoln.

Democrats can and proudly do invoke the names of Wilson and Roosevelt and Truman and Kennedy. But of these 20th-century Democratic Presidents, only F.D.R. was elected to office with a majority of the popular vote.

Starting with Jefferson, the victories of the Democratic Party have been hard-won victories. It is not coincidence that all the great Democratic Presidents have been—and had to be—eminently practical politicians because the political battles of the people are never casually won.

A LANDMARK REPORT

On January 19 of this year, the Democratic National Committee's Subcommittee on Party Organization—under the chairmanship of Congressman NEIL STAEBLER, of Michigan—made a landmark report. Every Democrat should read it and reread it—and take it to heart. In that report, NEIL STAEBLER'S group rendered this most urgent conclusion: "The United States is in the middle of a period of political change. The majority of the voters in the United States consider themselves to be Democrats. President Kennedy enjoys an almost unprecedented popularity. Despite this, the Democratic Party is not certain of a majority of the presidential or congressional vote. The Democratic Party clearly must adapt its party activities and its organization to mobilize its full political support in 1964.

That report goes on to say what far too many Democrats may not want to hear—that underlying social and political trends are changing the political responses of the American people.

There is no need to belabor the obvious. We are living in different times, changing times, new times. When Harry Truman surprised Tom Dewey in 1948, 79 percent of the families in the United States had less than $5,000 a year income. When John F. Kennedy outlined the Democratic Party program of the New Frontier to the Nation in 1961, 59 percent of the families had incomes over $5,000 a year.

When Woodrow Wilson brought his New Freedoms to the people, he delivered his entire first inaugural address without mentioning foreign affairs. In 1933, F.D.R. began his first term with a memorable inaugural in which foreign affairs was dealt with in three paragraphs—and deliberately assigned a role of secondary interest. In John F. Kennedy's Presidency, foreign affairs and foreign programs have dominated every month and week and virtually every day.

In these years, the Presidency has changed. The lives of the people have changed. The party of the people—the party which exists to serve the people's needs—must change, also, if it is to be responsive to the people—and if it is to receive the people's trust and confidence and support at the polls.

The Democratic Party is not a slum party, not a depression party, not a crisis party. It is the party of the people. It can—and it must—serve the people wherever they live, whatever their private economic condition, whatever the state of tensions in the world.

RESPONSIVE TO TIMES

The man who today leads our party—as well as our Nation—is offering his fellow Democrats courageous and practical leadership to make our Democratic Party responsive to the time. If he is to succeed in this vital effort—and if our party is to succeed as the majority party of the people—President Kennedy must have the full and enthusiastic support of Democrats everywhere.

We have a message to carry to the people—whether they live in the heart of the city or in the suburbs. It is the message of a Democratic President, a Democratic administration, and a Democratic Party offering responsible new answers to the new needs of today.

I realize there are a few Democrats who in this year of 1963 complain they are being denied the opportunity to relive what has become the legend of 1933. I happen to have lived through both times, here in Washington. When I was the age of many of you, or younger, I knew F.D.R. nearly as well as I know John F. Kennedy.

I believe that the issues before us now—and the opportunities open to us as a party—are far more challenging and far more exciting than those of 30 years ago. Our national abilities are much greater. The prospects of what we can achieve are infinitely broader. As Democrats, we can—if only we will make a party effort worthy of the opportunity—achieve much more for our country, for the people and for our party than was done a generation ago.

The aged have new needs. So do the young. Full use of our human resources is a new challenge.

The urbanization of American life presents the most urgent new problems.

In 1900, life expectancy at birth was 49 years—today, it is 70. At the age of 65, a woman now can expect 16 more years—a man can expect 13 more years. Yet, of more than 17 million of our senior citizens, 7 out of 10 are trying to get by on social security checks ranging from $66 for a widow to $129 for couples. Eighty percent of these citizens suffer from some kind of chronic ailment. But health insurance is covering from only 10 to 15 percent of their costs.

THE PARTY OF ACTION

This problem of the people must be answered—and the Democratic administration offers responsible answers.

While there are 17 million Americans past 65, there are 70 million under 20—and by 1970, there will be 86 million. Just this year, there are 1 million more 16-year-olds than last year.

Boys and girls out of school between the ages of 16 and 21 represent only 7 percent of the labor force but 18 percent of the unemployed. The Nation must in this decade provide 26 million new jobs for young people—and this is the objective of the responsible programs and efforts of this Democratic administration.

Employment is high. But unemployment persists in our economy. At a time when we must mobilize all our resources to the fullest, our underuse of human capacity is costing us $30 to $40 billion annually in goods and services which we could use. The problem must be answered—and this Democratic administration offers initiative and leadership to produce the answers.

Today, three-fourths of our people live on only 2 percent of the land of the United States. This metropolitan concentration is compounding old problems—and creating many new problems. Adequate and economical mass transit must be provided. We must control the pollution of the air which endangers life in 6,000 of our cities, costs us $11 billion a year in economic losses, and in some of our cities dumps as much as 25,000 tons of contamination on the residents annually.

OBSTRUCTION

For these new needs of America, the Democratic administration is offering the answers which are required from responsible national leadership. But the partisans of extremism are offering the people little but criticism of those answers, and determined obstruction to the adoption of solutions these times require.

I believe that the principal issue of American politics today has become the difference in response of the two parties to the problems of the people.

We have new capacities. We have new potentials. We stand at the edge of a new era of human progress in our own country and in the world. At this decisive moment of opportunity, the party of the opposition offers only the slogan, "America cannot do it—America cannot afford the programs that we need."

This outlook of the two parties is the primary and most fundamental issue of American politics today, and we should carry this issue to the people wherever they live. One party proposes action; the other party proposes only to block action.

Let the people decide whether it is a proper standard of politics to campaign solely on a platform of preventing someone else from doing something.

Let the people decide whether the conduct of this Nation's relations with other nations in times of great danger and peril to us all should be subject to harassment and exploitation.

In power, and out of power, the Democratic Party has always manifested the highest order of responsibility toward the conduct of our national affairs. When the national interest was involved, our support has not had to be asked for; it has been given without hesitation.

Democrats in these postwar years have agreed with the words of the distinguished American who said: "The United States cannot successfully bring about a coalition for peace unless the two major political parties cooperate an all major policies."

You and I subscribe to those words, and I would commend to the partisans of the opposition this rule laid down by John Foster Dulles.

The American majority is constructive, and our party is today serving that constructiveness. If the issues of the times are laid before the people, if the Democratic answers are carried to the people, we shall continue to enjoy the majority trust and the majority position.

This is the challenge to all of us who are Democrats, young or old.

BACK TO STANDARDS

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, the Sunday Star, April 28, carried an article by Marine Col. John Glenn, the man whose personal courage and dedication teamed up with our technological know-how to put America back in the space race 2 years ago.

With his space flight, and in subsequent events, Astronaut Glenn has been shown to the Nation as a man of courage and patriotism who does not feel that it is "corny" to wave the flag or to declare his obeisance to God.

Writing in the Washington Sunday Star, he again displays his grasp of the truth behind the question, "What's wrong with America?" and he provides some compelling answers.

For a journey into the hard realities and pitfalls of life in the land of the affluent society, I recommend Astronaut Glenn's message, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

In the End We Get Back to Standards

(By John Glenn)

(Note.—In venturing into space, Astronaut John Glenn was afforded the rare opportunity of looking upon earth from long range, seeing it as a unity rather than many nations. He has also taken a close look at American life and finds some things that should give us caution. Here, excerpted from an address to the Associated Press annual meeting last week, are remarks which set down the Glenn philosophy and point of view.)

Life today is not tough for the average American. There is ample leisure time and the motivating challenges of the past are felt little, if at all.

A good many of us today are content to be fat, dumb, and happy. With a polyunsaturated diet of the coming 35-hour week, the fly-now-pay-later vacation, and fringe benefits, many of us live in a chromium-plated world where the major enemy we face is crabgrass.

We have gone from improving our national lot as wilderness settlers, to territorial expansion and acquisition of additional natural resources, to improvement by production and development of a complex but comparatively wealthy society.

Our next challenge can well be the development of the individual, not as a regimented automaton, but as an individual with many capabilities. We can term this period the era of attainment, signifying that we are on the threshold of achieving the goal which has really been our objective since the founding of this country.

There are those, of course, who, discussing our affluent society, would have us do just the opposite and retire large segments of our population until our productivity and our numbers of people balance each other. This is certainly not the method by which America gained its preeminence in such rapid fashion, nor is it the way I think most Amercans should or would like to go in the future.

ON LIVING ON THE DOLE

The average American does not want to live on the dole, be it called featherbedding, unwarranted subsidy, or premature retirement.

For every person being supported for doing nothing, someone else must work twice as hard, or our national capability is reduced. Rather than a domestic goal of loafing and indolence, I feel certain most Americans would prefer to remain active and apply themselves.

I suppose everyone has his own idea as to what real progress is, but to me, progress is that which will give the greatest numbers of people beneficial control over their future.

We need to have the same respect and admiration for academic achievement and excellence that we have for excellence in little league, or football, or basketball teams. For the greatest resource we have, and that which we sometimes take the least pride in developing, is the human mind.

Facts, inventiveness, and possession of knowledge are good, but unprincipled and unguided use of the power of knowledge could be ruthless. There must be guidelines for us to follow.

SOME SPIRITUAL WORDS

Guidelines based on intangible principles have gone a long way toward making this country what it is today. Here I would think about such words as "ideals, standards, religion, pride, and patriotism." These are all spiritual words. Aren't they somehow funny and old-fashioned for these modern, practical times?

Aren't people strictly "squares" to be talking this way about moral standards and spiritual beliefs? Isn't this rather a time to forget all that—to live it up, to look for kicks, to grab the buck, and to live for the day?

Well, there is only one way that I know of to answer these questions:

It is by looking back to chart the rise and fall of other civilizations. And when you do that, you suddenly find that ideals—far from being impractical—are the very stuff of survival.

Every great society which came into being, and long endured, did so on the basis of convictions and beliefs so strong that they lifted individuals clear out of themselves and caused them to live—and die—for some aim or purpose, nobler and better than themselves.

Look back and you will see that the whole fabric of this Nation's growth, of its success and its glory, was woven of belief—belief in God, in the individual, in the land, in liberty, and in the emerging concept of democracy, as summed up in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States.

STRATEGY AND THE DEFENSE INTELLECTUALS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post, the weekly feature entitled "Speaking Out" is written by Gen. Thomas D. White, former Air Force Chief of Staff who is now a contributing editor for Newsweek magazine. The article is entitled "Strategy and the Defense Intellectuals." Nowhere have I found a better assessment of the fallacies inherent in the strategy plotted by the newly created legion of gray-flanneled field marshals than in this most perceptive article by General White. It should be read and studied by every American and particularly Members of the Congress. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Strategy and the Defense Intellectuals

(By Gen. Thomas D. White)

(Note.—A military expert says the academic theorists in charge of our defense lack understanding of war and the enemy.)

In common with many other military men, active and retired, I am profoundly apprehensive of the pipe-smoking, tree-full-of-owls type of so-called professional defense intellectuals who have been brought into this Nation's Capital. I don't believe a lot of these often overconfident, sometimes arrogant young professors, mathematicians and other theorists have sufficient worldliness or motivation to stand up to the kind of enemy we face. War is a brutal, dirty, deadly affair. Our enemy is a coarse, crooked megalomaniac who aims to kill us. Exceptions to the thesis that brute force, not theory, wins wars are so rare that every schoolboy can go back 3,000 years to David and Goliath.

Stewart Alsop's recent look at "Our New Strategy—The Alternative to Total War" (Saturday Evening Post, December 1, 1962) and his exposition of the defense intellectuals and their viewpoint form the basis of my commentary. It is perfectly clear to me from Mr. Alsop's context that by "defense intellectuals" he means civilians and not military officials.

Stewart Alsop is too experienced a reporter to intrude his own views into the type of article cited. I accept what he has written, therefore, as an accurate picture of how some of our strategy-makers see themselves and our strategy. My comments, therefore, are on these images reflected in Mr. Alsop's mirror.

The term "defense intellectual" conveys a nice, cozy, unwarlike and nonmilitary feeling, as though modern war could be settled on a chessboard in an ivy-covered great hall. Couple it with such relatively reassuring terms as "mutual deterrence," "stability," "no-cities response," "second-strike counterforce capability" and other quasi-military shibboleths, and we have created an atmosphere and mislanguage which to my mind is dangerously deceptive. Alsop wrote, "The jargon has an unreal and academic ring at first, like the debates of medieval theologians." I must add that even after a lifetime in the military service I consider most of these terms as recent inventions, as nontechnical and unprofessional. They smack of "status words" used by amateurs to impress their listeners.

I am quite sure that few of the terms and none of the so-called strategy behind these terms intended to deliberately mislead the public. But it is exactly this fuzziness, the innocence and naivete which worry me. The very fact that some of the strategy-makers refer to their jobs as "thinking about the unthinkable" is in itself a revelation of the weightless dreamland in which they move and have their influence.

BLEATING AND BOUQUETS

Because of their lack of experience and their muddled reasoning, these modern strategy-makers failed to evaluate properly Washington's action in getting Soviet missiles removed from Cuba. The U.S. Government was courageous in the recent Cuban crisis. Yet it seems to me we had little choice. Here was our sworn enemy in our own front yard with a dagger about to be pointed at our heart. If we had not been decisive we surely could never have stood up to Khrushchev anywhere else in the world. Nevertheless all over this country there was a great pounding of our chests and loud bleating about the great American victory.

It has been my observation that these bouquets aimed at ourselves came from three sources: those with understandable political motivation, the ignorant and the defense intellectuals.

Perhaps the most dangerous aspect of American strategy-making today is that military influence apparently is so disparaged by the so-called intellectuals. The Alsop article makes one single reference to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. An extended interview with Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara on the new strategy never mentions the Joint Chiefs, the Nation's highest military authorities designated by law as the principal military advisers to the President.

To be sure, Gen. Maxwell Taylor, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, stands high in the echelons of the defense intellectuals. But it is worth noting that many military men look upon General Taylor as a political appointee and not a purely military strategist.

Perhaps the most striking oversimplification of the present-day defense dilemma was given a few months ago by Under Secretary of State George Ball when he said, "In the field of modern defense there is no received wisdom, no tablets of the law, no copybooks, not even any demonstrated military precepts." And it is indeed true that only two atomic weapons have been used in all warfare—and these, most significantly, by the United States of America.

Certainly things have changed. The stakes are far higher, the mechanisms more complex and the margins for error fine. In my opinion the change is greatest at the politico-military level. In war our military have always gambled with literal life or death. They realize their decisions are measured in casualties; sometimes their own lives are at stake. Our politicians and diplomats in the past have played only with personal careers and relatively minor national stakes. Today the civil authorities deal with national existence and in atomic war risk as much personally as a military man at the front. The range of maneuver in the nuclear arena requires that every possible civil and military tool be at hand. But it seems to me the old strengths still apply. In my opinion the two that count for most in the nuclear space age, regardless of academic cerebrations, are national determination and military forces designed to achieve victory, not tailored to obtain compromise. Professional military training teaches the philosophy of victory, whereas politics is based on compromise.

If "thinking men in and out of the Pentagon are beginning to question the value of the nuclear weapon as the chief military instrument of national policy," as Mr. Alsop wrote, then I know that the gremlins of wishful thinking and fear are afoot. I recall my tourist's view of the crumbled vestiges of long-forgotten civilizations which failed to grasp the significance of a decisive new tool of war.

Certain scientists, having harnessed the atom, today are consciously or unconsciously influenced by guilt and wish to derogate their profession's role in war. In misguided idealism they find secret hope that an out-of-sight, out-of-mind policy will preserve the peace or at least turn the clock backward and save civilization from the specters of nuclear and space warfare.

Overconfidence, derived perhaps from hope, seems to be another image of unreality glimpsed in some corridors of the national capital. When I read that "very soon now our defense combination will be unbreakable" I am certain amateurs are at large. In this age when technology moves ahead every 4 years as much as in the 100 years prior to 1945 it is utterly unsafe to consider any military situation will stay put more than briefly.

Stability of military power has always been subject to sudden upset, but in these decades the balance is particularly precarious. At the very time we claimed vast superiority over the Soviet Union Mr. K.'s missiles in Cuba came perilously close to turning some tables. Yet this was only a shift in deployment. What makes the blood of military realists run cold is that a technological breakthrough (for example, a positive defense against ICBM's and Polaris missiles, or space weapons, or a doomsday bomb with adequate booster) by the U.S.S.R. could challenge our freedom. We could find ourselves helpless because the lead time of modern weapons—that is, the time from concept until they are operational—runs from 5 to 10 years.

It is well to recall that the Russians produced an atom bomb and a hydrogen bomb long before the date our national intelligence had forecast; they orbited a military man in space, and we were helpless to match the feat for 10 months. And we still have not equaled their man-in-space projects.

If it were not reputable reporting of a modern strategist's explanation of "counterforce doctrine" I would consider it a joke when he is quoted as saying, "If you aim at the shoulder, and the other fellow aims at your heart, you've got to have another bullet left to aim at his heart." It is precisely that kind of thinking which is so dangerous. For human beings as for nations in atomic wars, the fellow who hits you in the heart first probably won't have to worry much about that second shot of yours.

Fuzzy thinking about war in the atomic age is a dangerous avocation and one we can ill afford around Washington. Some of it indicates willingness to plan idealistic, impracticable, or unrealistic alternatives which play into an alert and cynical enemy's hands. It worries professional military men who have spent their lives facing the realities of warfare, many of them in two or more wars.

These officers do not object to civilian control. Civilian supremacy is fundamental to our form of government. I have never known an officer who would have it otherwise. But many officers wish there were more opportunity for professional military opinion to be heard before decisions are made.

Our military officers do not all have Ph. D.'s or other degrees, but a great many do. Moreover, they will have to carry out the military aspects of our national strategy. They will have to fight under the plans and orders and with the weapons which have evolved under the influence of those, often far junior in age and experience, who come into Government, for a few years at most, from colleges and foundations. These temporary experts are leaving a heritage of piecemeal academic solutions for individual problems. This heritage may so stultify the development of long-range concepts and strategies that the career military strategist would find it impossible to untangle them in time of dire emergency.

This country needs all the brains, all the talent it can mobilize to bring to bear on the problems of national security. By national security I mean not only the military defense of the country but also the diplomatic, economic, and sociological aspects, as well as the search for safeguarded arms control. We need the professors, the computer men, and other specialists expert in their own limited fields. But the theorists should be used more as they are in the business world, as consultants rather than as major weights in decisionmaking.

The pendulum has swung too far. Academic dialectics and even pure reason are no match for the ruthless cynicism of militant communism. Experience, intuition, and above all the compulsion inherent in knowledge that he will have responsibility for the professional execution of our war plans uniquely qualify the military man for a far larger role in our strategymaking than he appears to have today. I particularly wish the military had more influence at the staff levels far below the Secretary of Defense. Military initiative is being stifled and military counsel ignored by the "professional" civilian expert at the vitally important third and fourth echelons of policymaking.

There are of course scores of patriotic, right-minded, and dedicated public officials serving this Nation in Washington and elsewhere. Outstanding among them are the two top officials in the Department of Defense, Secretary Robert S. McNamara and Deputy Secretary Roswell Gilpatric.

Even Mr. McNamara's severest critics will grudgingly admit he has done an almost superhuman job in reorganizing, reorienting, and managing the Department of Defense. I happen to agree with most of his management concepts and long fought for stronger and more centralized control of the Armed Forces.

But I am puzzled about what seems to be our grand strategy and some of the reasoning behind it, for which Mr. McNamara bears a major responsibility.

For example, attainment by the Soviet Union of a second-strike capability would mean, in simple terms, a very considerable net increase in our enemy's military strength and nuclear power. Yet Mr. McNamara is quoted by Mr. Alsop as saying that the Soviets will achieve a sure second-strike capability." It is then said that many of the military men, like General Taylor, agree in substance with McNamara's curious but logical reasoning that for our benefit the sooner the Soviets achieve second strike, the better." I am dead certain the majority of military men flatly disagree with the concept that a major increase in enemy strength is helpful.

THE WILL TO USE POWER

I must note also that in enumerating the tests of adequate support of national interest Mr. McNamara is directly quoted as saying, "First, you have to have the power to support your policy. Second, you have to know you have that power. Third, he—the other side—has to know you have that power, and he has to believe that you will use it if your vital interests are threatened." It seems to me there is a fourth requirement particularly in need of emphasis today. And that is that we Americans not only have to know that we have the power but must have the willpower and determination to use it when necessary.

Finally, in the published accounts of Mr. McNamara's appearances before Congress this year I find the implication that an atomic stalemate between the United States and U.S.S.R. may be acceptable as an inevitable future condition. The new military programs which establish ever-increasing dependence on static, inflexible, single-mode weapons such as Minuteman and Polaris and major emphasis on conventional forces are strongly indicative of a Government willingness to arrive at a stalemate. Development of high-performance aircraft and space-weapons systems, which might prevent a stalemate, has been discouraged.

These trends seem to me to need reversal. Stalemate may happen, but it will be only temporary. Technology will see to that. Our national policy should be to provide maximum flexibility in our nuclear forces, maximum effort in developing new weapons, offensive and defensive, with the avowed aim that stalemate shall not occur. Only by striving for continued superiority in military strength can this Nation hope to survive.

But the reports on defense intellectuals reflect the fact that termites are at work. There are too many of them, each with his bit to nibble. Sooner or later they influence their bosses, and their bosses influence their bosses. Eventually we may have a facade of esoteric terms created by defense intellectuals instead of a national strategy and the proper forces to go with it.

ALASKA RAILROAD RATES UNDER ICC

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, last week the President of the United States issued an Executive order placing the regulation of rates of the Alaska Railroad under the Interstate Commerce Commission. The purpose of the Executive order is to promote fair competition among carriers in Alaska by authorizing the Interstate Commerce Commission to disapprove Alaska Railroad rates when they are unjust or unreasonable, and by requiring the Alaska Railroad to give the same notice in filing tariffs as do other carriers. The need for this action has been recognized by many in Alaska including the Alaska Railroad and the Alaska motor carriers. The order will help protect the public by providing a means of having questionable rates and practices of the Alaska Railroad reviewed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, the independent Federal regulatory agency with the expertise necessary to make determinations of this type.

The Secretary of the Interior was responsible for both the operation of the railroad and for the final review of all tariff complaints. Acting in a rate case as both defendant and judge was awkward; it was also unrealistic. The general manager of the railroad cannot avoid making rate decisions that increase or decrease the amount of traffic moved on the Alaska Railroad and as a consequence affect the volume of traffic carried by the private carriers in competition with the railroad. Regardless of how sincere an effort is made by the Alaska Railroad to be fair to all concerned, the reasonableness of the Alaska Railroad tariffs should be subject to review by an independent expert body.

I have been convinced of this for a long time. In 1959 I introduced legislation to place the rates of the Alaska Railroad under ICC jurisdiction. This bill passed the Senate and passed the House of Representatives but was vetoed in July 1960 primarily on the grounds that the legislation constituted an improper delegation of Executive power to an independent regulatory agency. In 1961 I reintroduced the legislation only to meet the same objection. To avoid this problem the Bureau of the Budget, with very close cooperation with the Department of the Interior, the Alaska Railroad and the ICC, proposed this approach, using an Executive order. I am extremely pleased that the President of the United States has taken this action which many of us have sought for so long. I salute the Alaska Railroad for the splendid effort it has made to help solve this problem and I salute the Alaska motor carrier industry in its effort.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the Executive order in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the Executive order was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE ORDER 11107—ADMINISTRATION OF ALASKA RAILROADS

By virtue of the authority vested in me by the act of March 12, 1914, entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to locate, construct, and operate railroads in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes," 38 Stat. 305, as amended (hereinafter referred to as the Alaska Railroad Act), it is ordered as follows:

SECTION 1. General responsibility for railroad: The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to operate the railroad or railroads, branch lines, feeders and telegraph and telephone lines incident thereto, constructed or acquired under the act of March 12, 1914, or acts suplemental thereto, in all respects and to all intents and purposes as if the operation thereof had been placed by law under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, except that the authority of the Secretary under this order "to fix, change, or modify rates for the transportation of passengers and property" shall be subject to the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission under section 3 of this order.

SEC. 2. Rates: Secretary of the Interior: In connection with carrying out the authority under the Alaska Railroad Act "to fix, change, or modify rates for the transportation of passengers and property," the Secretary of the Interior from time to time:

(a) Shall allocate to the national public purposes which to a substantial extent prompted the construction, expansion, maintenance, and improvement of the railroad, the proper portion of the capital investment of the railroad.

(b) Shall fix, change, or modify the rates with due regard for the actions of the Interstate Commerce Commission authorized under this order.

(c) Shall post the rates for public inspection and file them with the Interstate Commerce Commission.

SEC. 3. Rates; Interstate Commerce Commission: (a) In respect of rates filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission pursuant to the provisions of this order, the Commission may act, to the extent practicable, and subject to the limitations provided in subsection (b) of this section, in the same manner as though the railroad were subject to sections 1(1)(a), 1(4), 1(5), 1(5½), 1(6), 6(3), 6(6), 6(9), 13(1), 13(2), (to the extent that it relates to action by the interstate Commerce Commission on its own motion), 15 (except 15(12) and 15(14), 15a, 202(c)(1), and 202(c)(2) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended.

(b) When determining the justness and reasonableness of rates or charges maintained, or from time to time proposed to be maintained by the railroad, the Interstate Commerce Commission shall exclude for valuation and cost-finding purposes the portion of capital investment allocated to national public purposes by the Secretary of the Interior under section 2(a) hereof, and such rates and charges shall not be deemed to be unjust or unreasonable by reason of failure to yield sufficient revenues to cover any amounts for taxes not actually required by law to be paid or provide a return on capital investment.

SEC. 4. Transitional provisions: (a) The issuance of this order shall not affect any action heretofore taken by the Secretary of the Interior or his representative until such action has been modified or revoked in accordance with the provisions of this order.

(b) As promptly after the date of this order as may be convenient. the Secretary of the Interior shall post for public inspection and file with the Interstate Commerce Commission rates as referred to in section 2(c) of this order. The rates posted and filed under this subsection may be the rates in force on the date of this order, with or without subsequent changes or modifications, or new rates.

This order supersedes Executive Order No. 3861 of June 8, 1923, and shall be codified for inclusion in the Code of Federal Regulations.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 25, 1963*.

NEED FOR FISH PRODUCTS IN FOOD FOR PEACE

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, every person concerned with the American fishing industry, concerned with the problem of our American fishermen and the need to develop our fishery resources, knows that a substantial improvement over the present situation will be required to save this vital industry and our fishermen, and these resources, from extinction. The industry is faced with an unstable market and enormous foreign imports made possible by heavily subsidized or state-owned foreign fishing fleets. The American fisherman is faced with widely fluctuating prices and competition from modern, well-equipped, technically advanced vessels. As a consequence, our offshore fishery resources are being exploited by foreign vessels; our fresh water fishery resources are underdeveloped.

During the first days of this Congress, a number of legislative proposals were introduced to help turn the tide by promoting fishery research and development, by encouraging our fishing fleets to modernize and by expanding foreign markets for domestic fishery products. Fishery research and development will be encouraged primarily through two legislative proposals. One, S. 627, authorizes a new $5 million annual State matching program which recognizes that the States and the Federal Government have a mutual responsibility for fishery research and development in the offshore and inland waters. This bill which I introduced is cosponsored by 30 Senators representing all sections of the country. The second bill, S. 744, introduced by the senior Senator from Washington, authorizes the construction of two modern stern ramp trawlers for use in research, training, and experimentation on the high seas. Senator Magnuson, chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce, has asked me to hold hearings on these two bills.

The modernization of the fleet will be encouraged by the enactment of a bill, S. 1006, authorizing a fishing vessel construction subsidy which will be paid to offset the present inequities in the law which required American fishing vessels to be constructed in high-cost American yards. To my knowledge, no other nation in the world penalizes its fishermen by requiring them to build their fishing vessels in construction yards that are twice as expensive as the construction yards of their competitors. The chairman of the Committee on Commerce, Senator Magnuson, has scheduled hearings, which I will conduct, on this bill for May 6.

I believe that both foreign and domestic markets for American fishery products will be expanded by the enactment of S. 702, which will permit domestic fishery products to be used in the food-for-peace program. I hope hearings can be scheduled on this measure in early summer. All the ills of the fishing industry cannot be cured by Federal legislation, but I am convinced that this legislative program, if enacted, will be a significant start toward making our fishing industry competitive.

Today, Mr. President, I would like to single out one of these legislative proposals, S. 702, and outline my basis of support for this measure. The bill was introduced by Senator Magnuson and is cosponsored by Senator Kennedy, Senator Saltonstall, and myself.

I ask that the text of the bill be inserted in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 702

A bill relating to domestically produced fishery products

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That any domestically produced fishery product shall be available for the food-for-peace program and distributed as a surplus agricultural commodity under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, if the Director of the food-for-peace program (or other appropriate official designated by the President) determines that the utilization of such product will contribute to the success of the food-for-peace program carried out under such Act, and if the Secretary of the Interior determines that the utilization of such product will assist in the development of a fishery resource or segment of the fishing industry.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the bill would permit domestically produced fishery products to be used in the food-for-peace program when the director of the program determines that the utilization of a specific fishery product would contribute to the food-for-peace program and the Secretary of the Interior determines that the inclusion would contribute to the development of the fishery resource or assist a segment of the fishing industry.

Two questions, therefore, arise. First, can fish products contribute to the food-for-peace program? Secondly, can the inclusion of fish products in the program assist the development of a fishery resource or a segment of the fishing industry? The answer to both questions, Mr. President, is in the affirmative.

The primary purpose of the food-for-peace program under Public Law 480 is to fight starvation, malnutrition, and hunger. Public Law 480 was enacted in 1954 primarily as a means of disposing of agricultural surpluses. But during the past 8 years, the emphasis has shifted from an agricultural surplus disposal program to primarily a program of food for peace—meeting the problem of world hunger while assisting numerous segments of our economy and promoting American foreign policy objectives. This shift in emphasis toward food for peace has been recognized, and in fact encouraged, by the President of the United States.

On January 31, President Kennedy submitted to Congress a special message concerning the food-for-peace program. The President said:

> An increasingly important tool of American foreign policy—and of particular significance to our mutual assistance and development effort, including the Alliance for Progress—is the food-for-peace program. It is now being expanded to assume a larger share of the cost of mutual assistance. We make a grave mistake if we regard food for peace as merely a program for disposal of surplus commodities.

The food-for-peace program must be a balanced program, one capable of meeting the full range of nutritional needs. The World Health Organization has estimated that two-thirds of the world population does not receive an adequate daily diet. At the Food and Agriculture Organization Conference, held in Washington on fish in nutrition in 1961, the chairman of the conference stated:

> The dietary nutrient most lacking in deficient diets all over the world is a good quality protein.

This statement is supported by a series of careful studies that have been completed by the U.S. Interdepartmental Committee on Nutrition for National Defense. Since 1955, the United States has been engaged in a program to help underdeveloped nations assess the nutritional needs of their population. Ten of the twenty-one countries studied to date were found to have a protein deficiency. These include Ethiopia, Libya, Ecuador, Chile, Colombia, Thailand, Bolivia, Jordan, and the West Indies, all of which have been included in foreign-donation shipments under the food-for-peace program.

Fish is one of the world's finest sources of protein, and is also a good source of calcium, phosphorus, iron, and a number of vitamins. Its usefulness in the food-for-peace program becomes readily apparent when it is realized that this superior source of protein is easily preserved and transported and is relatively inexpensive. Obviously canned and cured fishery products are particularly well suited for the program.

It is generally recognized that fish, eggs, milk, cheese, and beef are among the best sources of protein. Of these, dry skim milk and cheese are presently included in the food-for-peace program. Both of these commodities are more susceptible to deterioration than canned fish. Beef and eggs, which are not in the program, are more expensive.

It is estimated that the minimum daily requirement of protein, 70 grams, can be obtained by drinking approximately one-half gallon of milk, eating one-half pound of cheese or 10 to 12 ounces of fish. The cost of these items is not easily computed because of variations in composition and unit cost. But the estimate I received indicates that the daily protein requirement can be met by the use of dry skim milk at a cost of approximately 6 to 18 cents a day per person, depending on whether the open market or support price is used; or, with cheese at a daily cost of approximately 18 to 20 cents, according to the grade of cheese; and with fish at a cost of 6 to 30 cents, depending on the type of fishery product. I should add that fish flour would probably be the least expensive at a daily cost, I understand, of under 2 cents.

The relative value of fish products as a source of protein has also been pointed out in the 1962 Report on Marine Resources to the Committee on Natural Resources of the National Academy of Science, National Research Council. The report states:

> Using the only rough figures available, it is estimated that 500 million people, many of them fronting on the Indian Ocean, are short by about 10 grams per day per capita of a reasonable amount of animal protein. Probably the cheapest and most efficient way to supply this deficiency is through fish from the sea.

Fish protein is not just a supplement to the present commodities used in the food-for-peace program, but fish protein, in my opinion, and in the opinion of many others more expert than I, is vitally needed in the program. Compared to other food commodities fish products can provide on balance an inexpensive, concentrated and easily preserved and transported source of protein.

Mr. President, I am convinced that the addition of fishery products to the food-for-peace program would not only contribute to the success of the program, but would tremendously benefit our fishing industry.

Under the present food-for-peace program, as administered under Public Law 480, surplus agricultural commodities are disposed of by sale or grant to friendly foreign nations. In 1962, approximately 75 percent of the distribution was through sales. These agricultural products are disposed of under the several programs within Public Law 480, either from private stocks held by individual American exporters or from Government stocks held by the Commodity Credit Corporation. Of course, the Commodity Credit Corporation holds no stocks of fishery products. Therefore, under the proposed legislation, fishery products could be utilized only as surplus agricultural commodities held in private stock can be used under Public Law 480. This means that fishery products would not be included in the grant program to foreign nations for emergency relief—under title II of Public Law 480—or under the barter program for strategic materials—title III, both of which are limited to commodities actually held by Commodity Credit Corporation. Fishery products could be included in the program of sales for foreign currencies—title I—the oversea food donation program—title III—and the long-term loan program—under title IV—under each of which commodities held in private stock may be utilized.

In summary, the legislation would assist the fishing industry by helping to open foreign markets for domestically produced fishery products in three ways.

First, an American exporter of fishery products at the present time can sell abroad only when the prospective foreign purchaser has American dollars to pay for the product. Underdeveloped nations in need of protein have no dollars to spend on American fishery products. Under this bill, these friendly nations would be permitted to buy American fishery products and pay for them in their own local currency. The local currency will be accepted as payment and used in the recipient country by the U.S. Government and the American supplier receives a dollar equivalent from the C.C.C. in the United States.

In pointing out the importance of foreign currencies made available to the U.S. Government under title I of Public Law 480, the director of the food-for-peace program in February of this year stated:

> In most of the countries our Government does not own sufficient currency to cover all day-to-day requirements and we ordinarily purchase currency on the local market. However, through the availability of currencies from these Public Law 480 sales, we are able to reduce our dollar purchases, thus leveling our balance of payments deficit.

Numerous programs are supported by local currencies generated by food-for-peace sales. A sizable portion of local currency sales proceeds has been used to finance our common defense. Proceeds from sales have also been used to pay the cost of the international student exchange program, to construct new embassies, office buildings, and military family housing units and to make loans for economic development and for American business expansion. This is accomplished within the scope of authorizations by Congress, which has allocated $4.5 billion for titles I and II for 1962, 1963, and 1964.

Secondly, a foreign purchaser at the present time must pay for American fish products in cash which is also a hindrance to the development of export markets. Under the bill, long-term loans could be made available to importers in friendly countries interested in buying American fish products for dollars. This program, which has no budget authorization ceiling, permits CCC to hold notes from foreign countries and make payment for exports in dollars to American exporters.

And finally, the food-for-peace program is engaged in an extensive effort to help feed the undernourished in friendly foreign nations. This bill would permit domestic fishery products to be included in this grant program as it is being administered through some 17 American voluntary relief agencies, including Catholic Relief Services, CARE, Church World Service, UNICEF and Lutheran World Relief. At the present time, food is being distributed through these agencies to approximately 73 million needy persons abroad.

Mr. President, I am convinced that the fishing industry in all sections of the United States would receive a tremendous boost if export markets could be encouraged by permitting sales for foreign currency, by making long-term loans available and by adding fish to our oversea food donation program. Once a country becomes familiar with the product first supplied under the food-for-peace program, the country frequently later is prepared to import the American product for dollars.

If properly understood and energetically pursued by Government and industry, the proposed legislation would be particularly helpful in developing underutilized or unutilized fisheries in all coastal and many inland States.

On the west coast, California would greatly benefit from this legislation. This State long enjoyed a very substantial foreign market for canned sardines, mackerel and squid. In recent years this foreign market, I understand, has diminished considerably, due largely to the inability of foreign countries to make dollars available for purchase of these products. These are all low-cost, high protein, and highly nutritious products with long storage life under even the most unfavorable conditions. The resource is presently being used at only a fraction of its potential. Processing facilities and trained personnel exist to engage in this operation immediately, and the results on the local economy would be extremely beneficial to California. Large quantities of hake also exist for which there now is no existing fishery. The California Fish Canners Association has written me expressing strong support for the bill.

Washington, Oregon, and Alaska would also benefit by the enactment of this legislation. The potential herring fishery off the northwest Pacific coast is unknown, but one group has indicated its ability and willingness to can 100,000 cases if a market can be found. This is a September-February fishery and would give employment to many shore and vessel persons during a chronic unemployment season in the Pacific Northwest. The significance of this legislation has been noted by the Association of Pacific Fisheries which has gone on record favoring enactment.

Similarly, the North Pacific waters off Alaska have abundant populations of cod which are fished very lightly by this country. This species can be cured for shipping and is a favorite with many countries particularly the Latin American and African countries. Other offshore fishery resources near Alaska can also be tapped or more fully developed. I am pleased to place in the Record at this point a copy of the resolution adopted by the Alaska Legislature supporting S. 702.

Senate Resolution No. 16

In the Legislature of the State of Alaska, third legislature, first session, relating to the food-for-peace program.

Be it resolved by the senate:

Whereas the Federal Government has embarked on a program of food for peace to facilitate the purchase of domestic food surpluses for sale to needy foreign nations; and

Whereas the use of high-protein value fishery products would contribute to the value of the program; and

Whereas the development of the offshore fishery resources of the United States can be protected only if expanding domestic and foreign markets are provided and developed; and

Whereas the untapped offshore fishery resources of the United States are being harvested by foreign powers unconcerned with proper conservation measures: be it

Resolved that Congress is respectfully requested to give favorable consideration to S. 702, introduced by the Honorable Warren G. Magnuson with Senators E. L. Bartlett and Theodore Kennedy, a bill which would make a domestically produced fishery product available for distribution under the food-for-peace program to assist that program and the development of the domestic fishery resource; and be it further

Resolved that copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate; the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable Warren G. Magnuson, chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce; the Honorable Herbert Bonner, chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries; and the Members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

Passed by the Senate February 19, 1963.

Frank Peratrovich,
President of the Senate.

Attest:

Emily K. Stevenson,
Secretary of the Senate.

Gulf coast States would also be favorably affected. Although certain grades and sizes of shrimp are now scarce, the supply of small shrimp for canning exists far beyond present utilization. Again, facilities and personnel exist on the gulf coast, and the potential of canned small shrimp for export is very promising.

A new development in the canning of mullet in Florida provides an excellent source of animal protein, hightly nutritious, at a moderate price. Presently, the majority of mullet are sold fresh or frozen and the demand is quite low and static. As a result, this valuable resource is being fished at only a portion of its potential. I have been advised that the development of a canned mullet product will do much to stimulate the local economy in Florida and create employment in areas that currently are in serious need of additional employment.

The alewife fishery in the mid-Atlantic States of Maryland, Virginia, and North Carolina, is only partially utilized. At one time this was one of this country's most thriving fisheries and was a major economic asset to many localities in these middle Atlantic states. Alewives are an extremely inexpensive fish to produce and process and can be either canned or cured.

The New England waters support an abundance of hake which are excellent for curing and canning. This is a low-cost item to produce and, when cured, is capable of sustaining quality during extended transportation and storage.

Canned Maine sardines represent a commodity that is relatively inexpensive, high in protein, nutritious, and capable of extended storage. Normally this species is abundant in far greater numbers than the industry can profitably pack. The location of the plants is such that the facilities and trained personnel could be utilized to a much greater extent than they are now, and local economies could receive a badly needed boost. Senator MUSKIE has recognized the importance of this legislation to Maine, as has the Department of Sea and Shore Fisheries of the State of Maine, the Maine Sardine Council, and the Maine Sardine Packers Association.

Experiments to can the fresh water carp failed to meet with success in this country because of the lack of a high degree of product developmental research. With some stimulus, as provided for in S. 702, efforts to produce a superior pack for export would probably develop. If this were to occur, nearly all of the Midwest States could contribute to the fishing economy since this species occurs in abundance in nearly all of the fresh water lakes and rivers in the United States.

Fish flour or fish protein concentrate is another fishery product that could be made available for exportation through the food-for-peace program by enactment of this legislation.

It is known by all, Mr. President, that this beneficial and vitally needed product is at present being kept from the American market by the unfortunate and widely criticized decision of the Food and Drug Administration. The recent report to the National Academy of Science that I cited earlier states:

> Our Food and Drug Administration has declared such a whole-fish flour unfit for human consumption. This is no great help in this politically and socially unstable world. However, the need is so great and the benefits could be so enormous that even the bureaucratic obstacles must finally yield.

I agree. I add only that this obstacle has been suffered too long.

It is true that the Food and Drug Administration decision does not apply to exports, but the practical effect of this unfortunate decision on export possibilities is significant. Most of these underdeveloped countries look to the United States for intelligent leadership; if Americans are prohibited from selling fish flour commercially in the United States, they assume it is injurious to eat. In fact, the very opposite is true. It is hoped that some underdeveloped country with an equally underdeveloped bureaucracy will act more intelligently, will be interested in purchasing American fish flour using their own currency. I am confident that some independent and concerned country with intelligent leadership will do just that. But now we must intensify our efforts to have the decision reconsidered in light of more recent findings and research. This enormous obstacle to meeting the world nutritional needs must be removed and soon.

I understand that approximately 7 billion pounds of presently unutilized fish are available annually off the coasts of the United States. Harvest of these species would provide an important year-round diversification for our fishermen. In the Pacific Northwest there are abundant stocks of grayfish, rockfish, and other species which are not fully utilized. In Alaska, Bering Sea bottom fish, now taken by Japan and Russia in amounts of more than 2 billion pounds per year, and in California, hakes, sauries, and anchovies, all lend themselves to use for fish protein concentrate. In the Gulf of Mexico, the harvesting of unutilized fish for manufacturing fish flour could give employment to thousands of fishermen in the Gulf States. The total potential annual harvest from the fishing resources of the Gulf of Mexico has been estimated to be as high as 5.8 billion pounds.

The New England fisheries, which are experiencing present economic hardship, could be aided by an estimated annual harvest of some 600 million pounds of hake and other unutilized fishes for processing into fish flour.

I sincerely hope that all concerned with the American fishermen and fishing industry and with the development of our fishing resources will recognize the significance of this legislation, that they will endorse it and that they will give to it the attention it justly deserves. This is a new long-term program, it is bold, it is imaginative. I believe the inclusion of American fishery products in the food-for-peace program can contribute toward establishing a stronger fishing industry, as it has contributed toward stabilizing American agriculture.

The food for peace program has made a substantial contribution toward solving a basic problem of agriculture in the United States. The problem has been to find a means of disposing of agricultural surpluses accumulated over the years under a price support program. Unlike other nations such as the United Kingdom and Norway, the United States has never adopted a minimum price support program for our fishing industry. No surplus of fishery products accumulates because all are sold in open competition at the going price, regardless of how low that might be. The fishing industry of the United States has never been able to establish the markets necessary to permit the successful expansion and development of the industry. Our domestic markets have been swamped with foreign fishery imports taken by foreign subsidized fishing operators who have often caught the fish immediately off our coast. The foreign operators are usually subsidized in numerous ways which prevent our fishermen from competing. When we cannot compete and are driven off the high seas, the foreign governments establish important international fishing rights immediately off our coast.

One approach to the problem of the fishing industry would be a Government price support subsidy. I would prefer another approach—that of the Government helping our domestic fishing industry to expand its markets. Under this program, the Government would serve primarily the function of a bank accepting foreign currencies for dollars and providing long-term loans. No fishery products would be accumulated for storage at Government expense and no Government price support subsidy would be involved. By expanding exports, the industry can better compete in the American domestic markets.

The inclusion of fishery products in the food-for-peace program offers an approach to this serious problem of the fishing industry as it has offered a solution to the problem of American agriculture. While helping to solve these problems the food for peace program can promote our defense and security and our humanitarian goals of providing economic development and food for our friends.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S TAX REFORM PROPOSAL

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I am sure most people in the country realize that it has always been Senate policy to await House action on tax proposals before beginning formal consideration of them. The House has traditionally been the tax-writing body, and until the House Ways and Means Committee reports a bill, there is no measure on which to base Senate hearings. The House committee is now wrestling with a draft of a tax bill, and I hope one will be forthcoming soon.

The fact that the Senate waits for the House to act first has not deterred us, of course, from studying, analyzing, and dissecting the President's recommendations to Congress for both tax reform and tax reduction, and from coming to some firm conclusions on the principles involved. Nor, I am glad to say, has it kept the people of the country from doing the same, and from writing to us in the Senate to tell us, in no-holds-barred-language, what they think.

I realize that no subject is more controversial than Federal income taxes, and that the subject is at its sorest point around the time we all undertake our annual battle with form 1040. I realize also that there is a tendency to favor "status quo" in tax reform—that there is always the fear that any change may be for the worse.

However, I believe that neither of these considerations has become a factor in the storm of criticism that has blown up around the reform proposal to limit individual itemized deductions to those which exceed 5 percent of the taxpayer's adjusted gross income. I know that they do not color in any way my own assessment of this recommendation.

I say without reservation that this proposal is ill conceived. It is grossly unfair to many people, and it would be detrimental to religious and social progress.

It would strike directly at the taxpayer who itemizes his deductions instead of taking a standard 10 percent, since it would allow him to itemize only those deductions above 5 percent of his gross income. In other words, a man whose deductions total 15 percent of his income would actually get no more tax credit than a man who takes the standard 10-percent deduction.

The reaction against this proposal has been widespread and vigorous—and rightly so. It has not been concentrated within any one vocal minority group interested in protecting its vested interests. The criticism has come instead from ministers, church associations, directors of charitable organizations, homeowners, construction leaders, real estate associations, economists, financial writers, scholars, and the average taxpayer. It is difficult to recall when any tax provision has had such widespread, and I believe valid, criticism launched against it.

I would like to illustrate in some detail one way in which I feel the 5-percent floor would be unfair. Members of various church denominations, such as the Methodists, and the Latter-day Saints, are asked to contribute a tenth of their income to their church. Regardless of whether or not the 5-percent floor is adopted, people who are now contributing to their church will, I am sure, continue to do so.

On the other hand, individuals who do not accept such a serious responsibility toward the financial support of a religious denomination already contribute a smaller amount of their income to their church, and some of them may be inclined to contribute even less.

The inequity, therefore, of this proposal is most serious to the conscientious contributor—the 10 percenter—because he will lose a deduction amounting to 5 percent of his contribution. The person who contributes only a minimum of his income now, and might even be inclined to contribtue less, has much less to lose under the proposed change. Thus, the person who gives less than 5 percent or nothing at all, would benefit the most.

This form of discrimination could become the pattern not only in religious bodies, but among those who contribute to educational and welfare and charitable organizations. The dedicated will continue to make their large contributions, and to suffer loss in their tax deductions, but the occasional, once-in-awhile contributor may be discouraged from making any substantial contribution at all. This provision could substantially cut the amounts raised by the United Givers Fund, by school endowment drives, and by other similar activities. It would be contrary, in my opinion, to established American attitudes and philosophies toward agencies which work for the good of mankind.

Among those who would be hardest hit by the adoption of the proposal would be present and prospective home buyers. Those who have already bought homes, and are paying on them, would be caught. There would be little they could do except take whatever loss in deductions for mortgage interest and real estate taxes the new law thrust on them. They would undoubtedly find that the net cost of homeownership would increase.

The prospective homeowner, on the other hand, could still stop and think—do I want to take on the financial strain of home buying and the additional hours of work required to maintain a home, if I am denied part of the deduction for mortgage interest and property taxes? This would be a substantial part of my budget, and the difference in being able to deduct all of my interest and taxes and just part of them might be the margin on whether I could swing homeownership. He could decide to stay in his rented quarters.

In both instances, not only would the individual and the families lose, but there would be an adverse effect on the home-building industry and on the economy in general.

Now, I am well aware of the fact that the administration feels its recommendation for tax reductions would offset loss suffered by tax reform. I have seen and studied the charts prepared by the administration which show that even with the 5-percent floor on deductions, the average family would be dollars ahead because of the overall income tax reduction proposed. This may be true, but it does not take out the inequities in the situation—does not protect the dedicated tithe payer to his church or the generous contributor to his charity.

I understand that a number of members of the House Ways and Means Committee feel as I do about this 5-percent floor on individual deductions, and that it quite possibly will be deleted from the tax reform proposals before any bill is reported. I hope this is correct. If, however, it should be recommended, I shall certainly do what I can to see that it is deleted when the bill reaches the Senate. To accept the proposal would be to admit into our tax structure a force that would be disruptive of present social, economic, religious, and political structures.

JOBS FOR YOUTH

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, the need for a stepped-up program of vocational education in this country is being emphasized time and time again by statements and studies of those closest to the problem.

An editorial in the April 30 edition of the Washington Post is one of the latest comments and one deserving the attention of Members of this body.

I hope that this emphasis on the need for vocational education will not go unheeded and will result in passage of S. 1222, a bill I have introduced to expand vocational education throughout the country.

I would also like to mention at this time, Mr. President, the pressing need for greater understanding of the forces of automation. The increased automation of industry goes hand in hand with joblessness of youth because for the most part youth are unskilled. Automation generally replaces the unskilled in the country's work force. S. 185, which I introduced last year and again on January 15 of this year, provides for a White House Conference on Automation. Every passing day underlines the need for such a conference and the individual State conferences which would precede it. Too little is understood about the problem by the country at large. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial "Jobs for Youth" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOBS FOR YOUTH

The quotation books are full of apothegms on the evils of idleness, including the incontestable observation that the Devil finds work for idle hands. And idleness is at its very worst when it is involuntary and inflicted upon the young and vigorous who would like to work. It is an inescapable fact, however, as the President's Committee on Youth Employment has just pointed out in its report, that the unemployment rate for boys and girls 16 to 21 years of age is now so high as to constitute a most serious national problem.

The problem is at its worst, as might be expected, in cities, among the poorly educated, among Negroes and Puerto Ricans; that is, among those least able on their own to do anything about it. Their unemployment grows out of inadequate training, inadequate motivation to learn and, of course, out of discrimination by employers on account of race. The Committee therefore recommends thrusts in two directions: improving the preparation of young people for jobs, and opening up job opportunities.

The fact of the matter is that for a great many American youngsters education today is unrelated to contemporary reality. While the members of the Committee were in some disagreement about the make-work projects of the President's youth employment bill, they were much more united in urging an improvement in general education, especially for children who are not bound for college. They urge improved vocational training in classes small enough to afford individual attention and with materials which are not

exclusively oriented to middle-class family culture.

It is interesting that Francis Keppel, Commissioner of Education, had almost exactly the same counsel to offer when he testified recently before the House General Subcommittee on Education. He put it very plainly.

"It may not be long before virtually all jobs will require some kind of specialized training, together with a good background in general education. If we do not make provisions in our schools for vocational education opportunities for everyone who might need them, we will be compounding for the future our present problem of hard-core unemployed. More specialized training opportunities for dropouts, special work-study programs for potential dropouts, and special programs for those with academic, socioeconomic, and other handicaps are urgently needed."

Those who complain, as some undoubtedly will, that this remedy is bound to be a very costly one, ought to compute the social and monetary costs of youth idleness, with its attendant delinquency, crime, and contempt for all the community's values.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its deliberations today it stand in adjournment to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, is is so ordered.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1963

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, has the unfinished business been laid before the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5517) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment .

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, is is so ordered.

A NEW CRISIS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to lay before the Senate a situation which I see as a new threat to international peace rising on the horizon and coming from the Middle East. Once again, this region may stand on the brink of an armed conflict, and nothing less than considered and prompt action by the U.S. Government, the United Nations, and the free world can stop the escalation of events toward that possible eventuality.

To stop a mounting war threat now—and foreclose also renewed Communist mischief—the United States, in concert with the United Kingdom, France, and other interested nations, should offer to join in a collective defense agreement with Israel and any other Middle East state willing to join and carry out its obligations—for the preservation of peace and security in the Middle East, guaranteeing military assistance and cooperation to prevent or thwart any effort to alter its boundaries by force. Such a collective defense agreement would include, if need be, any means needed to secure and protect the territorial integrity and political independence of any other nation party to the agreement requesting this aid against armed aggression, pending the development of a more comprehensive system of regional security in the Middle East area. Such an agreement would be essentially comparable to the mutual defense treaty we signed with the Philippines in 1952.

I refer Members of the Senate to that treaty, because I think it is so apposite to the situation we now face in the Middle East. That treaty also was designed to be an interim treaty. I quote from the treaty itself, which is to be found at 59 Stat. 1031, adopted on August 30, 1951, which called for the treaty pending the development of a more comprehensive system of regional security in the Pacific area.

The treaty was a treaty without date, and could be denounced by either party on 1 year's notice, carrying out the idea that it was interim in character.

In addition, the treaty provided for the contingency of armed attack, and related to mutual aid between the United States and the Republic of the Philippines in the case of armed attack—I quote from article 4 of the treaty—"in the Pacific area." I repeat those words, "in the Pacific area."

So the treaty was limited in operation by both sides, that is, aid by the Philippines to us and aid by us to the Philippines, in the event of armed attack in the Pacific area, rather than an undertaking of a general worldwide agreement, as are the implications and terms of NATO and other defense agreements to which the United States is a party. Of course, the treaty had the usual clause with which we have now come to be familiar, namely, that the parties would act to meet the common dangers in accordance with the constitutional process. It provided also for coordination with the Security Council of the United Nations and with United Nations procedures, and showed it, as it was, to be a defense agreement which was consistent with what was contemplated by the United Nations. So the analogy is a very clear one.

As to the interest of the United States, I think it is sufficient to point out, in respect of that interest that in 1956 we considered the area so critically important to American security and international peace that, with the support of congressional legislation, the President sent the Marines and fleet units to Lebanon in order to maintain the peace and security of that area.

Having outlined what I consider to be the needs of the situation, I invite attention, historically, to the fact that there is a three-party declaration to which the United States, the United Kingdom, and France are parties, which was dated, as I remember, in May, 1950—a declaration which still, in law at least, remains in effect—in which the three parties pledged themselves to hold the borders as between Israel and the Arab States inviolate and to assure and guarantee those borders.

One might ask, therefore, Why a new agreement? Why a new mutual defense treaty in face of the declaration by those three powers at that time?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, or does he prefer to complete his statement?

Mr. JAVITS. Let me finish my thought, and then I shall be happy to yield.

The point made is twofold. First, the treaty is a bilateral arrangement. The declaration of May 1950 has been interpreted as a unilateral declaration. Second, the number of events which have taken place since that declaration has been such as to raise questions as to whether it still remains the valid commitment of the three powers.

In addition to that fact, if there is need for a redeclaration of that commitment in order to make the world understand the import of it, I think we might as well go to the point of modernizing the relationship as between the United States and Middle East security, as it was shown to be capable of modernization by the example of the Philippines Mutual Defense Agreement, and incorporate an agreement of this character in our foreign policy, in view of the fact that, as Secretary Dulles stated, the fundamental tenet, at least, that there shall be in the Middle East a secure and independent Israel, has never been challenged.

I now yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Are not the borders of Israel still inviolate? In other words, there have been no aggressions inside the borders since the time the Senator has spoken about, have there? That is my first question.

My second question is, Are not the United Nations patrols still in existence in that area? And if that is not enough, are we not bound, under our United Nations agreement, as we were in the case of Lebanon, to go into that area without any new pact?

I have asked the Senator three questions.

Mr. JAVITS. In response to the first question, as to whether Israel's borders have or have not been violated, of course they were violated very materially in the situation which preceded the United Nations' action taken in response to moving into the Suez area in 1956. In addition, it is asserted that the borders are being violated all the time by firing across the border, especially in the Sea of Galilee area, by Syrian forces posted on the other side.

So that, coupling the so-called fedayeen raids, which preceded the 1956 act and the recurrent firing, which have taken place since that time, certainly in the Galilee area, one cannot say that the borders of Israel have not been violated.

The third aspect, which I will develop in the course of my remarks in a few moments, is the fact that the mounting course of events, including the arms race, gives indication of the grave threats to Israel's independence and security. It is such a small country, and occupies such a small space, that it is entirely possible that we could be faced with a fait accompli in one afternoon. Israel is located continguous to those who swear that its elimination is their unswerving policy. Therefore, we cannot take any comfort from the fact that it has not had its borders actually violated, as was the case in 1948.

The second point deals with the United Nations patrol. There is today a force which continues to patrol the border between Israel and Egypt, and that relates to the border in the so-called Gaza Strip, and the border considerably to the south, in the so-called Sharmel-Sheikh area.

Considering modern means of warfare and the development of rockets, as well as naval power in the possession of Egypt, and access to Israel from Syria, which is its northern neighbor, which is now a part of the tripartite United Arab Republic, it is not believed that the United Nations patrol gives any real protection, and that therefore a more definitive commitment, of the kind that I have described, is necessary.

The third point raises the question: Are the borders now guaranteed. The only guarantee is the tripartite declaration of May 1950. I have explained that there are two points as to that. First, it is unilateral in character; second, it has never been implemented by any defense planning or anything else that anyone knows of, and it is now widely regarded as being somewhat blunted by the passage of time and many changed circumstances.

However, it is an effective declaration, and I believe that in the event of trouble the United States, as well as Great Britain and France, would take action. However it is certainly not a clear enough understanding to deter Arab action or that Israel could rely on it for help to come reasonably and effectively. It is not a clear commitment. However, the situation is such that it requires something far more definitive than anything that now exists.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from New York, then, draws a distinction between the case of Israel and the case of Lebanon. Is that correct?

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is correct. In the Lebanon case the internal government itself was threatened with civil commotion and subversion, which, of course, was fomented from without. In the case of Israel, there is a strong government in that country, capable of making the kind of treaty that I have described, and performing very effectively under it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his participation in the debate. He has helped me materially in the presentation of my thesis.

As to the factual basis upon which it rests, riots in Jordan by pro-Nasser mobs and near martial law in Jordanian Jerusalem—indeed, the closing of that border—have followed as a consequence of the agreement by Egypt, Syria, and Iraq to form a "tripartite" federal state, and from Cairo radio's repeated incendiary exhortation to its followers with implications of death threats against King Hussein.

Mr. President, in connection with the closing of the border, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point a news report published in the Washington Post of this morning.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Jordan Imposes Travel Curbs

Amman, Jordan, April 29.—A state of emergency and a 5 p.m. curfew have been imposed on Jordan's frontier areas, the Interior Ministry announced today.

The action was taken to "prevent infiltration of arms and subversive elements."

Under the decree, travel to and from Jordan will be only along authorized routes. Permission to leave the country will be controlled by district military commanders.

King Hussein's regime has been the target of recent rioting by Jordanians who favor union with the United Arab Republic. The situation here and in other Jordanian cities was reported to be quite normal today.

Mr. JAVITS. With respect to the Cairo radio, and every analysis that I have read, the formidableness of the threat of the Cairo radio coverage emphasizes the fact that it is a very important factor in keeping the Middle East in turmoil.

Israel is in a state of alert because of the danger of a pro-Nasser takeover of Jordan. We are familiar with the difficulties which King Hussein is facing in his own government. Indeed, on April 24 Egypt's Ambassador to the United Nations, Mahmoud Riad, threatened Israel by saying that Egypt was committed to putting the Arab refugees in possession of Israel. Let us remember that about half a million Arab refugees are concentrated on the border of Israel and Jordan. The implication as to where they would come from is, therefore, clear.

Israel is also alarmed over the disclosure that Egypt with the help of German scientists and technicians—many of them reported to be unrepentant Nazis—is seeking to develop missile weapons—at least capable of use with nuclear as well as conventional warheads—as well as supersonic aircraft. And Saudi Arabia is still bristling over the Nasser-inspired revolt and civil war in Yemen supported by a reported 28,000 Egyptian troops as well as planes and armor.

In that respect, again there is some news this morning which may indicate a certain degree of pacification in that area. It is a considerably "iffy" report, but nevertheless it does represent a matter of special pride to me, and to all of us, because of participation in some effort to ameliorate the situation. It is reported in the press that Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker, has been in Yemen and that some agreement for a pullout by the United Arab Republic from Yemen is under consideration, conditioned upon Saudi Arabian help to Yemen, and that such an agreement has actually been negotiated.

Mr. President, in connection with this agreement, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point a news report published in the Washington Post of this morning.

There being no objection, the news report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Egypt, Saudi Arabia Sign Pact on Yemen

United Nations, N.Y., April 29.—Egypt and Saudi Arabia were reported today to have signed an agreement to end their intervention in the Royalist-Republican war in Yemen.

Diplomatic sources said the agreement is now in the hands of U.N. Secretary General U. Thant. They reported he is prepared to move within 24 hours to set up a U.N. observation team in Yemen to see that the pact is carried out.

This could mean the end of the conflict that began last September and threatened to explode into a full-scale war between the U.A.R. and Saudi Arabia.

Under the agreement, Egyptian President Nasser and the Republican Government of Yemen agreed to the withdrawal of the approximately 20,000 Egyptian troops now in Yemen. In return, Saudi Arabian Premier Prince Faisal promised to end all military aid to Yemen's ousted monarch, Mohammed al-Bard.

Thant is expected to announce in a report to the Security Council Tuesday that the agreement had been signed. Sources said he would send an advance party immediately to Yemen's capital, Sanaa, to arrange for dispatch of the U.N. observation team.

The reported signing of the agreement came more than 2 weeks after U.S. mediator Ellsworth Bunker returned from the Middle East with the formula for ending the outside intervention. Thant held up a decision on U.N. supervision until he obtained a written pact.

In January, President Kennedy wrote Nasser and King Saud privately, urging restraint.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this could result in an improvement, but it could also result in a worsening of the situation through the repatriation of Egyptian troops which have now had battle experience and by giving President Nasser one front, Israel, instead of two, Jordan and Yemen, to be active on.

It is also another indication of what so many of us understand about the Near East arms race, with the battle-trained Egyptian troops making the situation more threatening than it has been in recent years.

In this tense climate Israel is the prime target of the new union and of Nasser propaganda. In a joint announcement, the three Arab states warned that the proposed joint Arab military force would "liberate" Israel, which is described as a territory under foreign occupation. While it may be difficult to see how the three Arab countries which have so little in common and a record of political instability can make a federal union work, neither the United States, Israel nor the free world can ignore this development except at their peril.

This is the third major effort by President Nasser to achieve his openly proclaimed ambition to bring about an Arab union under his leadership. Moreover, the Soviet Union's support of Nasser goes far beyond even the huge masses of guns, tanks, planes, submarines, and ships that it has poured into Egypt to reequip Nasser's armies. Because the Kremlin knows Israel is committed to the free world by conviction as well as every other tie, it regards Israel as legitimate prey, and it will—as it has already—use every opportunity to stir up the Arabs and support their attacks on Israel.

In my opinion, the United States as well as Israel can remain indifferent to the potential of this Arab union for trouble only at their own peril. Nevertheless our Government has taken the position that the negotiations among Egypt, Syria, and Iraq involve problems only of internal Arab relations, and therefore it would not be appropriate for the United States to express its views at this time. However, the United States has made it clear that it is not opposed to any arrangement arrived at through a process of free negotiations as long as it is not directed at any other state in the area. I have already made it clear that it is directed at a state in the area, namely, Israel.

The United States expressed concern over the arms race acceleration caused by the disclosure that Egypt is employing German scientists and technicians on rockets, missiles, and jets. In response to protests which my colleagues in the Senate and I, under the leadership of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] have made, the U.S. Government assured us of its "deep and continuing interest in the security of Israel and other Middle Eastern States," and that "it is exploring all avenues of approach to an effective amelioration of a worrisome and complicated problem."

However, realism recognizes that time is running out on peace in the Middle East, and that it is already too late for factfinding explorations and theories which call for evenhanded dealing with Egypt and Israel.

Mr. President, this is the central thesis that I wish to lay before the Senate and the country: We cannot equate Israel's defensive measures with the announced intention of the United Arab Republic to attack and destroy Israel by armed force. We cannot equate Prime Minister Ben Gurion's constant reiteration of Israel's desire and willingness to make peace with the Arab States by negotiation, whether direct or indirect, with the announced determination of the Arab States not to sit down with Israel and to treat her as an interloper in the Middle East, but omit completely and refuse even to comprehend her existence as a State, and to have only the determination to drive her people into the sea. I do not consider it evenhanded to extend that kind of national intention and design, as so profoundly expressed before the world, one with the other. I do not see how we can equate defense with the announced intention of attack to destroy by armed aggression, which is the juxtaposition of policy with which we are faced in the Middle East.

Israel is a dependable and effective ally of the free world in the Middle East—one of the very few there. No one can say as much for the United Arab Republic. For example, on 73 issues in the U.N. General Assembly in 1950, the United Arab Republic voted with the U.S.S.R. 53 times, with the United States 4 times, and abstained 16 times. We cannot ignore the fact that Israel has repeatedly and unconditionally offered to enter negotiations for peace and stands ready to support our objective of stability in the Middle East, while President Nasser's policy measures and continued agitation serve to block U.S. objectives.

We have been of great help to President Nasser. I think it is time to reevaluate whether our help in that respect has been the right kind.

U.S. recognition of the regime in in Yemen helped to extricate President Nasser's army from a possible military disaster; and current truce negotiations, on which I reported a moment ago, while most welcome, do not change this aspect of the situation. The massive U.S. aid program to Egypt, which totaled $250 million in 1962, rescued President Nasser's government from collapse. It is feeding Egypt's hungry millions, training its students, helping to develop new industries, and, as a result, presenting President Nasser with the kind of prestige he needs for his Pan-Arab ambitions. This aid and our mediation in Yemen were risky moves on our part. I believe it is high time for us to wake up to the fact that President Nasser is incorrigible, and that we cannot effectively neutralize him, much less keep him from threatening world peace. Nor can we let him feel free to threaten world peace, because he threatens us with communism as an alternative to him. That would be much less likely—namely, the alternative of communism—if President Nasser were not allowed to plunge the Middle East into flames, which is the ultimate direction of his policy.

The situation, therefore, calls for a sharp change in our present policy of dealing evenhandedly with friend and foe alike in the Middle East. There should be no ambivalence about our policy, for there can be little doubt that President Nasser's foreign policy has been helpful to the Soviet Union and to the Communist cause; little doubt, too, that this support is largely in payment for Soviet military and economic assistance and for the Kremlin's support aganst Israel. There is little doubt, too, that the support of the United States in large measure helped President Nasser with his ambitions; and there is little doubt that the Kremlin's support, which in effect is support against Israel, is support in terms of Soviet military and economic assistance which is rendered to President Nasser.

I believe that the United States should do all it can—including the phasing out of foreign aid—with Egypt to cause it to abandon the arms and missile race as a useless and senseless waste of its resources. The fact that we can have considerable influence on President Nasser when we set our minds to it is evident from the Yemen situation, in which apparently our mediation may bring about some result. By offering to guarantee the security and territorial integrity of Israel and any other qualified Middle East state, as we have seemingly guaranteed Jordan and Saudia Arabia, we should be able to drive home to President Nasser the futility of his dream of destroying Israel and the expensive vanity of his huge arms preparations. By dispelling all fears of aggression by Egypt or Israel, we could then initiate the first measures toward excluding the Middle East from the cold war, and thus endeavor to bring to an end the present state of belligerency, and move toward disarmament and peace.

We should make it very clear that if Egypt refuses to halt its rocket race and arms buildup, we must then help to provide Israel with the arms she needs to defend herself.

Again I emphasize, as I did in answer to the question asked by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], that this very fine country could be extinguished in an afternoon. A look at the map indicates the bulge of Jordan into Israel at the place where Israel's greatest amount of industry and population is concentrated. So we must deal with the question of the capability for maintaining a defense on the ground and in the air. We should help Israel under present circumstances, as well as provide a more enduring guarantee of her security, which guarantee, no matter how fast we might move, would still take a few days to mount. We have already done something in that respect by providing Israel with defensive Hawk missiles. I think that was our own recognition, through the Pentagon, of this policy.

While I am talking about the Pentagon, I think it is important, as an aspect of American policy, to think back upon the time when we sent our troops into Lebanon, and to recall our views at that time. That action would have been impossible had it not been for the fact that our troops had a secure mode of egress, in that we were secure on the flank in respect of Israel. The gentlemen who do our planning at the Pentagon are very unromantic. They are not too much concerned about the Jewish national home, or anything else; or who may have been persecuted and harassed peoples everywhere.

The appraisal at the Pentagon was that Israel represents a tough, hard corps of absolutely dependable defense in terms of the free world in the Middle East; the one area on the eastern shore of the Mediterranean that can be tied to. It seems to me that that is the decisive argument in terms of what we ought to do about seeing that it continues there, and on our side, instead of being pushed into the sea or absorbed in some anarchic Arab maelstrom.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it not also true that besides everything which the Senator from New York has said about Israel being a hard core in that area, certainly, from my knowledge, and I am sure even more from the Senator's knowledge, we have done everything we can to build up Israel economically and socially, and in every other way, for the past 20 years. If Israel fails now, all our efforts during that period of time will have gone to waste.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is exactly correct; I thank him for that contribution to the discussion. Looking down the long corridor of history, it is a fact that this showcase of what can be accomplished by modern technology, modern development, and modern ideas of freedom and culture is bound to have its effect upon dispelling the gloom of night which surrounds so much of the Arab States. I see something of an analogy concerning our deep feelings with respect to West Berlin, which also stands as a beacon in the Communist sea. So long as it stands and shines, it gives hope to the hundreds of millions enslaved by the Communists. Although the Arab States enslavement of their own people is in illiteracy, in disease, in shortness of life tenure, and in lagging behind the rest of the world by 50 years, it is nonetheless a kind of slavery, even though self-imposed. In the ultimate it is this example which is being developed in the Middle East which will cause the ferment that will bring about a change. As the Senator from Massachusetts has so properly said, this is the great vindication of American policy, which would be swept down the drain if we did not give our attention to the security issue now.

The economic issue is closely associated with peace, and Israel's economic problems are intimately linked with the political situation. Israel needs every dollar of foreign exchange to pay for past debts and sustain its armed forces as well as to maintain its current economic efforts. Israel needs our help to resist the corroding effects of the Arab boycott and blockade.

These steps toward collective security backed by concrete action would be a course consistent with United States and free world interests and security. It would provide a positive initiative toward an end to the arms race, an end to boycotts, discrimination and other obstacles to the free flow of trade, a negotiated settlement of the outstanding differences between Israel and the Arab States, and the beginning of an era of peace in which the full potential of the Middle East could be developed for its benefit and that of the world.

Mr. President, I should like to close by emphasizing the pinioning keystone character of Israel in that area of the world. We have some confidence that King Hussein's courage, so largely personal, will pay off. I do not say for a minute that Hussein is any more favorable to Israel than any other ruler or Arab State. He has taken his position with them as being dead set against Israel. But the fact is that if Israel's security were impaired, we would hold out very little hope for the maintenance of the free world's position in that area of the world. I emphasize that point because I recur to the hard realities of an appraisal of Israel's meaning and strength in that area of the world, which is the final determinant as to what ought to be America's policy, and which I believe must now be directed by an affirmative and meaningful step to assure that Israel will not find herself exposed and alone as the power declared to be against her and designed for her elimination mounts and is consolidated, as is being done right now.

I yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the excellent remarks of my colleague from New York, and to commend him for his extremely thoughtful treatment of the crisis in the Middle East. I have been proud to work shoulder-to-shoulder with my distinguished colleague over the years in an effort to influence American policies affecting that area of the world.

I think there is a great deal of merit in the proposal he has outlined today for the formulation of a collective defense agreement with Israel and any other Middle Eastern nations which choose to join. This is a forceful, clear and explicit means for making known America's dedication to the freedom and security of Israel—and it could be a significant step toward bringing stability and peace to this troubled area.

As my colleague has indicated, there are precedents for such an agreement and under different circumstances, at least, such compacts have proved successful. It may well be that a coordinated defense understanding is the best means for educating President Nasser and his allies to the fact that his scheme to destroy Israel will not be countenanced by the United States and her friends.

I want to assure my colleague of my deep interest in his proposal and my willingness to join in any effort to bring it forcefully to the attention of the State Department and others in a position to implement it.

Mr. President, let there be no doubt about it: we are moving into a time of real crisis in the Middle East. The fact is clear to many of us who have been following recent developments there—especially those of us concerned about the fate of Israel.

Unfortunately, there seems to be little sense of urgency in the statements and actions of our Government. While we profess to be the watchdog of the Middle East, that has presently come to mean simply that we watch and do not take action.

The continuing sense of complacency among high officials in our Government holds dangers of incalculable magnitude for the whole world. Although there is only smoke and no fire in the Middle East today, an outbreak of hostilities—which could engulf the whole world—could be just around the corner.

In addition, there seems to be lacking within our Government today an adequate demonstration of real feeling for the plight of Israel—and of America's deep commitment to the preservation of a free and secure Israel.

If the onset of Nasser's Arab union, the presence of outside experts busily developing vicious ground-to-ground missiles for Egypt, and the general escalation of the Middle East arms race has not alerted our Government to the potential dangers in that area, I do not know what will do the job. A number of us who are concerned about these developments have repeatedly urged action, but in response we have received only assurances that the situation is "viewed with alarm."

Mr. President, I submit that the time for viewing with alarm is long past. The time for studying avenues of approach—and other excuses for inaction—should be a thing of the past.

It is the task of all of us to do what we can to stimulate our Government officials to view the plight of Israel with the same alarm that they apparently regard the situation in Laos or the problem of Berlin.

A most significant step would be for the President to issue a strong and decisive reaffirmation of America's dedication to the preservation of a free and secure Israel. This should be a hard-hitting, no-fooling declaration which would serve the dual purpose of reasserting our interest in Israel's independence and warning the Arab nations to keep hands off this bastion of free government.

I am convinced that a stern, clear statement by the President would have the support of the American people and would command proper respect among the leaders of the Arab world. It would also give heart to the courageous people of Israel.

The President's statement should be followed up by a series of vigorous and fast-moving efforts to bring about some kind of an arms-control agreement in the Middle East. Private, diplomatic, and public means should be employed to quarantine this potentially explosive area before the proliferation of destructive weapons gets completely out of control.

If we continue to let the situation drift, it seems inevitable that Nasser, aided by his outside rocket experts, will develop ground-to-ground missiles which can rain destruction on Israel. The whole balance of forces in the Middle East, to which our Government policies seem so dedicated, would thus be knocked into a cocked hat, and with it the fate of Israel might be sealed.

The ironic thing is that Nasser's feverish efforts to develop the means to blow Israel off the map are at least partially made possible by the generous foreign aid we are supplying him. This assistance has permitted Egypt to divert its own funds to the expensive task of developing a potent rocket force.

The lesson here is obvious. We must make clear to Nasser that although we want to help promote a better life for his people, we do not approve of his using our aid to free funds to develop military muscles.

In negotiations with top Egyptian officials we should emphasize that we regard the use of funds freed by American assistance to build an offensive missile capacity as an abuse of the program which we will not tolerate.

Furthermore, Nasser should be put on notice that if he does not mend his ways, Congress may well write additional guidelines into the foreign aid bill this year which will substantially deny him the sustenance which makes possible his expansionist designs.

Having made clear to the Arab leadership the folly of continued aggressive ambitions, we should proceed with strong efforts to bring the Arabs and Israelis together for face-to-face negotiations on a disarmament understanding in the area. Such a meeting, if possible should be arranged under the aegis of the United Nations, where the pressure of world opinion would certainly be helpful in encouraging the Arabs to join in good faith participation.

At the same time, we should make strong representations to the Soviet Union to enlist its cooperation in the formulation of this regional arms compact.

There is reason to hope that the leaders in the Kremlin might be receptive to sealing off the tinderbox that is the Middle East. The apparently strong anti-Communist nature of the emerging Arab union may well have disenchanted the Soviet Union, thus making possible their necessary cooperation in this vital venture for peace.

To those skeptics who say it is impossible to develop a workable disarmament agreement in the Middle East, I say that the stakes are so high that we must not hesitate any longer in making a decisive attempt. Certainly, the world would applaud some kind of an understanding which would keep offensive missiles and nuclear weapons out of the area and police it with an effective inspection system.

By utilizing the forum of world opinion of the United Nations, by enlisting the cooperation of the Soviet Union, and by making clear to Nasser that aid may be denied him if he uses our help to divert funds for the development of military arms, I think we have a fighting chance to make real progress in this field.

The implications of a pilot arms control understanding in the Middle East could be tremendous. It could serve to spur the great powers of the East and West to renew their efforts to reach an agreement on the momentous subjects of world disarmament and nuclear testing.

Our Government has repeatedly shown its willingness to sit down with the Russians in the major leagues of world disarmament. We should be no less willing to devote our time and energies to stopping the minor league arms race in the Middle East.

If we are truly concerned about the world arms race, we should seize this opportunity for a breakthrough on a limited scale which could serve as a model for a worldwide understanding to save all mankind from the inferno of a nuclear conflict.

As we pause today to pay tribute to the brave people of Israel, as we salute their many accomplishments, let us also look ahead and plan ahead so that in the future this brave bastion of free government will remain independent and secure. That is the grave question which must concern all of us today. That is the challenge to which I am hopeful our Government will respond before it is too late.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am very grateful to my colleague for his customary eloquence and the constructive character of his additions to what I have said. I appreciate them very much.

I should like now to yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I should like to compliment the Senator from New York for a very brilliant address to the Senate today. He pictures a problem that gives us the deepest concern. In associating myself with his observations, I think I can best characterize the peril by reciting an adage that "a stitch in time saves nine." No matter how we regard the situation, unless we adopt a forthright policy with reference to that part of the world, any engagement there will ultimately involve us. It might be the spark that would start the conflagration which would wreak havoc upon civilization. My friend from New York has made a most timely presentation; and I wish the Record to show that I wholeheartedly agree with him. I am very happy to associate myself with his observations.

Mr. JAVITS. I am very grateful to my colleague.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to yield to Senators as I have observed them rise. First, I should like to yield to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case], then to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall], and then to the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening].

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished senior Senator from New York. I wish to associate myself with the remarks that he, his colleague from New York [Mr. Keating] and others have made in their deep concern about the disturbing configuration of events in the Middle East, which I think is increasingly threatening the security of this bastion of democracy and the peace of the area, if not the entire world.

It is bitterly ironic that on the 15th anniversary of the establishment of this great democratic state this situation should be so threatening. The events are as follows:

First. The growth of Nasser's influence in Iraq, Syria and Yemen is tending to strengthen Israel's most implacable foe.

Second. There were violently pro-Nasser demonstrations recently in Jordan, whose takeover by the United Arab Republic would further the encirclement of Israel.

Third. There has been a mounting armament of the United Arab Republic, including the participation by German scientists in the development and construction of ground-to-ground missiles and other weapons.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point in my remarks part of a column by Hanson W. Baldwin which appeared in the New York Times on Thursday, April 25, presenting an estimate of the current state of the Egyptian armed forces.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MIDEAST POWER BALANCE

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

Egypt's forces are the largest and have the most modern equipment of the Arab-bloc states. President Nasser's government maintains regular forces of perhaps 60,000 to 100,000 men, with a total mobilization potential of about 160,000.

The regular land forces include four infantry divisions (one incompletely organized), one armored division, and part of another, and a commando and paratroop brigade. These might be expanded by two to four more infantry divisions upon mobilization, though equipment and trained officers are insufficient to support such a force fully. The Egyptians are believed to have about 1,000 tanks, chiefly Soviet JS–III and T–54 heavy and medium models.

There are estimated to be 20 air squadrons totaling 300 to 400 planes, chiefly Mig–19 and Mig–21 fighters, equipped with Russian air-to-air, infrared-guidance missiles. The IL–28 light bombers are being replaced by the newer TU–16 mediums. About two squadrons have been formed.

FLEET HAS 10 SUBMARINES

Egypt has 10 Soviet W-class submarines, each of which is believed to have a small cadre of Russians aboard, and seven destroyers, plus half a dozen Komar motor torpedo boats, equipped with guided missiles. Soviet SA–II ground-to-air missiles are emplaced around Cairo and Aswan and at both ends of the Suez Canal.

Two types of long-range ground-to-ground bombardment missiles, each of which can carry about a ton of conventional explosives, have been developed with the aid of German and other foreign technicians. One has a range of about 350 miles, the other 180 miles.

There is no evidence that the Egyptians have any nuclear warheads or are attempting to develop any.

The quality of these Egyptian forces has improved since their defeat by Israel in 1956, particularly in the technical services. The

> ability of the Egyptians to supply their forces in Yemen, under difficulties, has been impressive. But the Egyptians suffered about 2,000 casualties there against inferior resistance, and the quality of their infantry and particularly of the officer corps of the line appears to be low.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, our own Government terms its policy, which is probably the crucial factor in the maintenance of peace in the Middle East, one of "even-handed" treatment of both sides. However, in the light of recent developments, I think it is more accurately described as a policy of "wishful waiting." Our Government hopes that the growing size of the United Arab Republic and its growing armament will somehow not threaten Israel's security. We wish that the Middle Eastern arms race would somehow go away. But I believe it is time to ask ourselves some hard questions.

Have we made every effort to assure the security and territorial integrity of Israel? Have we made every reasonable representation to the West German Government to discourage its scientists from contributing to a military buildup in the United Arabic Republic? Have we exerted every possible influence on behalf of the opening of direct negotiations between Israel and its Arab neighbors, and the achievement of a peaceful settlement of outstanding issues between them? Have we fully explored the possibility of developing to the full the United Nations potentialities for peace in the area? Have we made it clear that if all efforts to halt the continued development of aggressive military power by the United Arab Republic fail, the threat to Israel's security will be met in full measure by U.S. assistance?

We have not as yet had clear answers from our Government to these vitally important questions.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am very grateful to my colleague from New Jersey, who has been an indefatigable and stalwart supporter of the general position stated with relation to our own security, understanding full well the situation which surrounds the small country of Israel.

I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I appreciate the Senator's courtesy in yielding to me. I wish to state my understanding of what the Senator has said. He has emphasized that the agreement of 1950 with France and England should at this time be stimulated; that planning should be done under it, and that steps should be prepared so that we will be ready for whatever quick action is needed. In that statement I heartily agree with the Senator.

I should like to ask the Senator a further question. The Senator referred to Syria, to Cairo, to Yemen, and so on, but made no reference to Lebanon. It is my understanding that although the Lebanese are Arabs in the full sense of the word, they have a democratic form of government which has been cooperating with us to a very large degree. Does the Senator feel as strongly about Lebanon as he does about the other Arab countries?

Mr. JAVITS. The main thrust of my speech today was directed against President Nasser's leadership and those he has actively enlisted in it—namely Syria and Iraq—rather than against the other members of the Arab League—and Lebanon is a member of the Arab League—which may be enlisted as events unfold, if Nasser's hand is strengthened, or may go the other way, if Nasser's hand is not strengthened.

I would not speak as strongly on that subject, although Lebanon has identified itself with the general Arab position of driving Israel into the sea.

For our present discussions, I would not wish to include them as being one of the embers being fed into the flames now, but would rather concentrate my attention on the implications of the union which President Nasser is getting together.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And to stimulate our action on our side with France and England.

Mr. JAVITS. I thoroughly agree with that. The Senator's thesis, based on his vast experience in military matter, is entirely correct.

We are moving toward the idea of a mutual defense treaty like that with the Philippines; toward an alert status in international terms, as Israel is on an alert status in national terms.

Mr. GRUENING rose.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield to my colleague from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I highly commend the senior Senator from New York for his masterful, forthright, and entirely correct presentation of the present situation in the Middle East.

I visited the Middle East last fall and this winter as a member of the Committee on Government Operations, to look into the operations of our foreign aid program. I found that throughout the Middle East there was great apprehension about the growing power of Nasser and a resentment over the manifestly lavish aid which the United States was giving to him, which he uses to achieve his objectives—the objectives of conquest and domination of that entire area, the extermination of the free State of Israel and driving its people into the sea.

We found these objectives voiced by officials in Turkey, in Iran, in Syria—before the latest revolt—in Lebanon, in Jordan and in Greece. Their expressions varied, but there was wonderment as to why we neglected our friends and built up our potential enemies, and their enemies.

President Nasser has made no secret whatever of his purposes and intentions. His broadcasts, both through the official radio station, Radio Cairo, and through the secret radio station which he entirely controls, clearly show his intentions. Opinion and expression in Egypt and the United Arab Republic are 100 percent controlled, with no freedom of the press whatsoever. In fact, there is greater control—more nearly absolute control—than is found almost anywhere else. Not only are the newspapers forbidden to print anything that President Nasser does not want, but also they are instructed precisely what to print, what not to print, what to conceal, and how to slant and color the news. Thus the people become pawns in Nasser's ambitious programs and cannon fodder in the wars of his making and planning.

Through the years President Nasser has preached openly the assassination of the rulers and other officials of the countries which he wishes to subvert.

It has been alleged by some defenders of our policy in this area that Nasser is softening his tone, that he is not as rambunctious or violent in his declarations as he has been in the past. That is not the case. He continues to preach assassination. He continues to preach violence. He continues to incite to subversion in neighboring countries. He continues to preach warfare. He makes no secret whatsoever of his determination to destroy the little country of Jordan, which is one of the democratic hopes in the Middle East, and little Israel.

I very much fear unless the U.S. policy of building up Nasser by pouring in money to enable him to carry on his military and subversive ventures is reversed, that there will be a bloody war in the Middle East, for which we shall bear a considerable responsibility, and into which we shall perhaps be inevitably drawn.

As recently as March 19 of this year there was a broadcast of "The Voice of the Arab Nation," from Cairo. I could cite and quote from many other such broadcasts, but this is a clear illustration of what is going on today; not 5 years ago, not 2 years ago, and not 1 year ago although it went on then. This type of propaganda—this type of incendiary preachment of assassination of rulers and officials of friendly countries—has been going on all through this period of time.

The Voice of Cairo on March 19 broadcast as follows:

> Free officers, soldiers, students, and Arab brothers in Saudi Arabia and Jordan, how long are you going to tolerate Saud and Hussein?

Saud and Hussein are the respective monarchs of those two countries.

> The time has come for the army and the people to purge the Arab land of the imperialist vestiges—the lackeys who have sold their honor and dignity and who cooperate with the archenemies of the Arabs—the English, the Americans, and the Jews.

These are the words of the Voice of Cairo in a country which we have subsidized and are continuing to subsidize to the extent of millions of dollars, and in greater amounts now than ever previously. These words list us among, indeed call us—Americans—the "archenemies of the Arabs." This is but one more example, among many, of "biting the hand that feeds you."

The broadcast goes on:

> Free Arab soldiers and officers, the people call on you to shoulder your full responsi-

> bilities in the forthcoming battle for the liberation of Palestine. You will not be able to do so as long as the traitorous renegade clique is controlling the fate of the country.

Those words are addressed to the people of Saudi Arabia and of Jordan.

> Even the Arab people in other parts of the Arab homeland will meet great difficulties in the battle for the liberation of Palestine as long as there are people like Hussein in Jordan and people like Saud and Feisal in the Arabian Peninsula.
>
> Imperialism was able to establish the State of Israel in 1948 after deceiving the Arab people with the lackey Arab rulers to whom it entrusted leadership.
>
> Free men in Jordan and Saudi Arabia, the situation is serious. Our Arab people are irrevocably determined to wipe away the disgrace of Israel and to purge the Holy Land of the remnants of Zionism, which is hostile to the Arabs and humanity.
>
> Our Arab people call upon the free Arabs, both military and civilian, to unite their efforts to purge Jordan and the Arabian Peninsula of the traitors. All the Arab people stand at the side of the Arab liberation revolutions in any part of the Arab homeland, because the Arab liberation battles and the aims as regards the fate of the Arab nation are indivisible units.
>
> Free officers, come forward and fix the zero hour; surge like flames to the palaces in Riyadh and Amman—

The respective capitals of Saudi Arabia and of Jordan—

> and destroy the hireling traitors—enemies of God and of the people.
>
> We will then march together on our dear usurped land—Jerusalem, Jaffa and Haifa—and the crime of Israel will no longer exist.
>
> We call the army and the people in the Arabian Peninsula and Jordan to quick action and to bloody revolution. Death to the enemies of God and of the people.

This comes as the official voice of the ruler whom the western world and the United States in particular has repeatedly saved from extinction. The United States saved him at the time of the Suez crisis. Since that time we have poured in hundreds of millions of dollars to help him, presumably to rehabilitate Egypt's economy, but in effect, finance his wars. He went into the Yemen some 9 months ago, sending in first 18,000 men, and then 20,000, and now, I am reliably informed, 28,000 troops by daily airlifts in Russian-supplied planes. That war is costing Nasser at the very least, $500,000 a day. It has continued for 9 months. It has cost him more than $100 million to date. While we are pouring in money on the one hand to aid him in domestic rehabilitation he is pouring it out in warfare on the other.

What kind of policy is that for people of the United States who are dedicated to promoting peace in the world?

At the same time Nasser is receiving military aid from Soviet Russia, he has a great many ex-Nazis working to provide the modern weapons of destruction for his purpose to carry on the war against Jordan and Israel. In a recent book entitled "Behind the Egyptian Sphinx," which was called to our attention by our American military in Egypt, are listed a number of ex-Nazis who are wanted in Germany for their manifest crimes, who are not merely safely ensconced in the U.A.R. but are employed to help Nasser in his sinister purpose to destroy his peaceful neighbors.

I read the names of a few:

SS Col. Otto Skorzeny; son-in-law of Dr. Hjalmar Schacht, who is recruiting former Nazis, and is an importer—arranges for arms shipments into Egypt.

SS General Dirlewanger; known as the "Butcher of Warsaw," a Nasser military adviser on guerrilla warfare.

SS Sturmführer Baumann, alias Ali ben Khader; who is with the Algerian rebel government in Cairo, and was involved in Warsaw massacre.

Willi Berner, alias Ben Kashir; who is with the Algerian rebel government in Cairo, and was an SA führer and guard at Mauthausen Concentration Camp.

Karl Luder, alias Abdel Kader; who is with the Algerian rebel government in Cairo, and was a Hitler youth leader in Danzig.

Dr. Erich Alten, alias Ali Bella; who is with the Algerian rebel government in Cairo, who played a major role in the assassination of Prof. Theodor Lessing at Carlsbad in 1934, and who was gestapo "Commissar for Jews" in Galicia.

Leopold Gleim, alias Lt. Col. Al-Nasher; who is in charge of Nasser's state security cadre, modeled after Hitler's SS corps, and was a chief of Hitler's personal guard, and a gestapo security chief in Poland.

Joachim Daemeing; who is an adviser on special activities—concentration camps in Egypt—a former chief of the gestapo in Düseldorf.

Dr. Hans Eisele; who is a cochief of medical program at concentration camps; who is a former chief physician at Buchenwald.

SS Haupstarzt Heinrich Willermann, alias Lt. Col. Naim Fahum; who is a cochief of medical program at concentration camps, and the former medical director at Dachau.

SS Führer Bernhardt Bender, alias Col. Ben Salem; who is in charge of Nasser's security police which runs the prisons, and was chief of intelligence service of Wehrmacht security division in Ukraine.

SS Gruppenführer Moser, alias Col. Hassan Suleiman; who is in charge of youth training.

SS Gruppenführer Buble, alias Lieutenant Colonel Amman; who is assistant to Moser.

Johann von Leers, alias Oman Amin von Leers; who is in charge of propaganda work for Nasser, and was formerly in the Berlin Foreign Ministry.

Louis Heiden, alias Louis al-Hadsch; former chief of Deutsche Press Agenter; works with Leers—distributes Arabic translation of "Mein Kampf."

Daniel Perrit-Gentil, former SS führer, worked for Wehrmacht Intelligence Service in France during war—sentenced to death by France but expelled. Now is French program director of Radio Cairo.

Georges Dieudonné, alias George Oltramare; former leader of Swiss Nazi Party. Works on anti-Semitic and anti-Israel propaganda with Von Leers.

And so forth.

What possible justification can there be for the United States to be pouring in its dollars, not only to support, but to encourage, a regime of this kind, which has drawn to itself all the elements which are antithetic to the professed purposes of the United States, in order to carry on a warfare which Nasser has never ceased to preach and for his objective to conquer and destroy.

Unless the United States reverses its program promptly, and does more than merely study, review, and view with alarm, unless we act definitely, there is going to be a destructive war to the death in the Middle East in which thousands of people will be killed and in which we will inevitably be involved.

I may have more to say on this subject at a future time, but I think I should again pay tribute to and commend the fine statement of the Senator from New York and say that in my view he is absolutely correct. We have been led down a false trail in the Middle East.

It is about time that we supported and prevented the destruction of the one free nation in that area, the one that has worked for the rehabilitation of its own and other people, the one that has manifested only peaceful intentions, that is trying merely to exist and do its work to advance civilization at home and abroad.

If the United Arab States, under Nasser would, instead of planning to go to war, emulate Israel, work to educate their people, to sanitate their countries, irrigate their deserts, and make a contribution to peace, we would have peace in the Middle East and all its countries would progress and prosper.

It is a notable fact that of the many nations in the Middle East which have received our foreign aid, none was more conspicuous in the effective utilization of foreign aid than was Israel. None showed more public appreciation of this aid. It is somewhat depressing to note in many countries which we have helped to lift up from dire destitution, to see how little they have shown their appreciation. That has not been the case with Israel. Not only did we see signs on highways proclaiming that the roads were built as a result of joint efforts by the United States and Israel, but Israel has, at its own expense, issued a very beautiful documentary film in color, going into detail giving an historic account of what U.S. aid has done to help the people of Israel rehabilitate themselves.

I think it is time that we realized that this is one country that honestly is for peace and civilization, that is firm in its democratic faith, whose people enjoy all the freedoms, a little country which has no aggressive designs, that merely wants to live and let live, but which is actually also doing something for backward countries by sending its own scientists there, and that we ought to affirm the policy which we should long ago have stood for, namely, that we will not countenance invasion and destruction of Israel. We will not permit our funds to be used to finance an aggressive war in the Middle East, which, unless we adopt such a policy, is bound to come.

Mr. JAVITS. I am very grateful to the Senator from Alaska. The experience and thoughtful considerations resulting from his trip through the Middle East were a real inspiration to me—indeed, the moving cause for me to come forward with the suggestions I have made. The Senator's analysis is extremely accurate. It is based on considerable personal experience. Whether he had fortified my thesis or not—and he has, of course—I am deeply indebted to the Senator from Alaska for the research, stimulating thought, and high patriotism which have gone into the position he has described so magnificently.

Mr. GRUENING. I may say to my good friend and colleague from New York that I think we have been led into this situation by mistaken judgment. I think some of those who have represented our country in the Arab Republic have fallen prey to a natural tendency to be friendly with the ruling power, to appreciate and second their efforts, to the extent that they are worthy, in helping to improve the lot of their own people. But in following this policy, which is understandable, we have been led to building up what may become a Frankenstein monster—in fact, already is so. There is a striking analogy between the Nasser policy and the policy of Hitler when he published "Mein Kampf." Very few people took him and the declarations in that book seriously. They said that what he threatened in the book could not happen; that it was too horrible. But it did happen.

Gamal Abdel Nasser has never ceased to preach the destruction of Israel, the destruction of Jordan, because it is not in his orbit, and the destruction of the Saudi Arabian Government. I do not hold any brief for that Government, but I think it is time we stopped financing Nasser's aggressive wars. In effect, we financed the war in Yemen. Nasser adopted the line that this was a revolution which called for his aid, and that he went to the aid of the oppressed people in response to their call. The fact is that he fomented that revolution to conform with his expansionist designs and it could not have gotten anywhere without his troops. Russian planes were ready. Nasser's troops were ready. They have been in Yemen ever since that time. The Russian planes' airlift has been supplying the 28,000 Egyptian troops in Yemen.

I think it is not unfair to say that we in the United States are not without responsibility for Nasser's military ventures as a result of having poured in aid for economic purposes on one side of Egypt and having thereby financed his war on the other side. It is time that policy was reversed.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from New York for bringing the question of the Yemen crisis in the Middle East to the floor of the Senate and to the attention of the country. There is now a trinational Arab federation of Egypt, Syria, and Iraq. As the Senator from Alaska has mentioned, Yemen may soon join the coalition. There are Nasser-inspired riots inside Jordan, where the number of Palestinian refugees is very great, indeed.

As the Senator from Alaska has pointed out, one of the avowed purposes of this federation is to obliterate the State of Israel, or in the language which is commonly used, drive Israel into the sea.

I think this is a matter of concern so far as the peace of the world is involved. The United States acted in 1956 to restrain Great Britain, France, and Israel in their attacks on Egypt. As the Senator from New York pointed out in his speech, we acted to send the Marines and fleet units to Lebanon to prevent the government of that country from being overthrown.

If my memory serves me correctly, early in the 1950's, the three countries of France, Great Britain, and the United States signed a declaration in which they stated that they would oppose the alteration of the existing boundary lines in the Middle East and would regard it as an offense against the peace of the world, and at least gave some Middle East pledge that they would take steps actively to oppose it.

I am glad that the Senator does not ask unilateral action on the part of the United States, but, instead, proposes action in concert with Great Britain and France, and such other nations as may be interested. I think the load is probably too heavy for the United States to assume alone.

I have always taken the position that I would not pledge myself to guarantee the existence of the present frontiers solely by action on the part of the United States; but I think it would be well to revive this earlier agreement, which has been lost sight of, and almost forgotten. While I know that any such action on our part would invite reproaches from Great Britain and France, in view of the fact that we checked them in 1956, I do not think this fact should stop us from trying. I think we can make our position one of defense of the peace from any aggression coming from any source, and any attempt to alter the existing territorial boundaries which prevail there, unsatisfactory as some of these may be.

I am sure Egypt and her allies are in a much stronger military position than they were in 1948 and again in 1956. I was in Egypt, Jordan, and Israel shortly after the attacks. The Egyptian Army made an extremely poor showing at that time, and was in complete flight. Had the intervention of the United Nations, at our instance, been withheld for 2 days, in all probability Egypt would have been ingloriously defeated and Nasser would have been out.

I am not reproaching the Eisenhower administration for acting as it did in 1956. I supported the action at the time because I felt it was necessary to preserve the peace, and I am not criticizing it after the fact. But I do say that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of action after the offense has occurred.

If we could obtain a tripartite agreement, which would serve as a warning for the United Arab Republic, which is really dictated to by Nasser, I think it would have a very salutary effect.

I therefore commend the Senator from New York. I should like to say something else, which perhaps may seem ungracious. There is no doubt as to the attitude of both Houses of Congress with regard to this subject.

The Foreign Service of this country has many fine qualities, but I believe that the Foreign Service under all administrations has tended to be pro-Arab. I wish to add quite clearly that I do not regard the Foreign Service in any way to be anti-Semitic. However, it is pro-Arab.

President Truman found that to be the case when he recognized the independence of the State of Israel, and was compelled to go outside the Foreign Service to find the initial Ambassador to that country, in the person of Mr. James G. McDonald. We have all sensed that fact in the negotiations which have occurred.

Without wishing to impugn or characterize the American Foreign Service in the slightest, I believe that Members of Congress should be aware of the roadblocks which the Foreign Service is very likely to erect against any such action as is proposed, because Presidents may come and go and Secretaries of State may come and go, but the Foreign Service, like Tennyson's brook, likes to think it goes on forever.

Mr. JAVITS. I am grateful to my friend from Illinois, and thank him for the very fine contribution he has made to this debate.

I may say, in respect to the Foreign Service, that I have run into elements and ideas in the Foreign Service on this subject which have concerned me very deeply. I do not believe that it characterizes now or will characterize the policy of our country. We have shown ourselves capable of making decisions which we must take, notwithstanding any such feeling. However, I believe that what the Senator says on that score only buttresses me in the moral position of my advocacy, on the floor of the Senate, of a departure of policy. The Senate is a very persuasive place.

Also, I am pleased that the Senator has emphasized the concept of dealing in concert with our allies, France and Great Britain, and carrying through and implementing the declaration of May 1950, to which the Senator has referred.

I agree with the Senator that I do not believe that the Suez situation, in respect to which I took the same position that he took, and in connection with which I took some political risk, because I was running for public office in New York State, would intrude into some considered support on a high level to meet what seems to be the threat to peace mounting over the horizon, and a very serious threat.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. I commend the Senator for the splendid way in which he has presented and called to public attention the failure of a policy and the importance of now moving firmly and promptly toward collective security backed by action.

I applaud what the Senator has said, including his recommendation that the United States offer and seek common support of others in guaranteeing the integrity and sovereignty of Israel and its Arab neighbors. This would serve to protect not only Israel but also Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and Yemen, which are threatened by Nasser. I should like to make note at this time that last evening, in a speech before the Adas Israel Congregation in Washington, I pointed out, along these same lines, that Nasser was following a policy dedicated to the destruction of Israel. I suggested 4 points as a program, and I shall later ask unanimous consent that the four points may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

I should also like to suggest that we are moving away from, rather than toward, collective security, as shown on numerous occasions, in which we have at least condoned this trend in the Middle East, if not in fact supported it.

I cite one other example, and that is the presence of 30,000 Egyptian troops occupying and fighting in Yemen. Those troops, who are armed with the most modern Soviet weapons, are also supported by Soviet-built jet fighters and bombers, who fly some 150 sorties a day against the defenseless Yemeni villages. The United States recognized the revolutionary or quisling Sallad regime in December on Nasser's promise to withdraw his troops. He then had 12,000, and has now increased them to 30,000. His excuse was that Saudi Arabia was supplying the Government with arms and ammunition.

The Egyptians have been fighting a very dirty war in Yemen, and there are many who believe that at least the aid of $250 million over the years to Egypt has assisted it in preparing arms and in financing this war, a war in which it bombs villages and strafes shepherds and their flocks, and also drops antipersonnel booby traps—a war in which those who have been displaced in the Government of Yemen wonder why the United States seems to be paying to have them conquered by Nasser. While so much attention has been directed toward Cuba, Berlin, and other places, U.S. aid is making possible aggression against an inoffensive country for obviously expanding purposes. It is clear that the situation in the Middle East, under Nasser, is pointing toward one ultimate goal, and that is the ultimate goal of the destruction of Israel.

We should reconsider our policy on Yemen and toward Nasser, and follow the suggestions which the Senator from New York has made, and made so well, looking toward collective security and peace.

I again thank the Senator for his speech.

Mr. JAVITS. I am grateful to the Senator from Pennsylvania for his leadership, which produced the declaration of U.S. policy on the question of the so-called experts, many of them unrepentent Nazis, as the Senator from Alaska has pointed out, giving names, dates, and places of those who are working in Egypt.

Mr. SCOTT. I ask unanimous consent that there may be included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the text of the speech I delivered last evening.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is indeed a happy occasion. We are observing the 15th anniversary of the date on which the Jewish people regained their homeland. They made the desert bloom, brought democracy to the Middle East and created a state that has a world of friends even if it still has a neighborhood of enemies.

I speak to you tonight, not only as an admirer of the accomplishments of a great little state, but as an American who is truly concerned for the security of one of our important allies.

In the past several months the Middle East has been in ferment. Governments and alliances between governments have been shifting as if they were in a kaleidoscope. Most recently, Gamal Abdel Nasser has apparently incorporated Egypt, Syria, and Iraq into the new United Arab Republic. He is also threatening the existing governments of Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and Yemen.

It is entirely possible that all those countries will end up under Nasser's domination with the principal objectives of (1) Arab unity, and (2) the destruction of Israel.

I am especially troubled by the similarity between the Israel-Arab situation today and the United States-Cuban situation of last September.

We know that the Russians are there in force, Soviet weapons are pouring in, the objective is war, and foreigners are working on missiles and rockets. The only things missing are the aerial photographs of offensive missiles on launching pads.

We were lucky last year. But we cannot be certain that the Israelis will be so fortunate.

I believe that the situation in the Middle East is so great a threat to peace that the United States should begin to provide the leadership that is so sadly lacking today.

I recommend that our Government take the following steps:

One. Announce its position in favor of direct peace negotiations between Israel and its Arab neighbors, and offer the good offices of the United States to bring that about. It is strange how the State Department refuses to take this step which President Kennedy promised in the 1960 presidential campaign.

Two. End the so-called even-handed policy that is reminiscent of the old Cliveden set. Every time the State Department refuses to take some constructive action in the Middle East, it explains with this phrase—they probably have it printed on white cards—"we attempt to deal even-handedly with all states in the Middle East." Israel is a democracy; her neighbors are not. Israel is for peace; her neighbors are not. Israel is our friend; not all of her neighbors are. Is there any reason why the United States cannot act in support of peace, democracy, and a trusted friend?

Three. Issue a new statement of policy guaranteeing the integrity and sovereignty of Israel and of its Arab neighbors. This would serve to protect not only Israel but also Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and Yemen which are threatened by Nasser.

Four. Observe the recent directives of Congress which has voted overwhelmingly that U.S. aid should not go to countries that (1) blockade international waterways, (2) discriminate against Americans because of their race, color, or religion, or (3) divert their own economic resources either to support the Communist bloc or to hurt friends of the United States. Nasser has been doing all of that and United States aid is still pouring into the United Arab Republic.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from New York knows that I conferred with him earlier in the day with respect to the subject matter of his speech. I told him that I wished to associate myself with him in the thesis that he has presented to the Senate this afternoon. I completely agree with the Senator from New York, and I want the RECORD to show it. I am sure the Senator from Alaska will not object or take exception to my saying that, several days ago I happened to note that he wrote to the President of the United States on two different occasions with regard to this subject. I was taken into his confidence by being allowed to see the contents of his letters. I told him then, as I say to him publicly now on the floor of the Senate, that I completely agree with what he said in his letters to the White House. I believe he has performed a service to the President by forewarning the President as to what is going to happen in connection with American foreign policy if a check is not placed on the State Department, very quickly, vis-a-vis Communist and American foreign policy.

As the Senator from New York knows, although he and the Senator from Illinois and I usually agree on all facets of American foreign policy, I did not share the viewpoint of the Senator from New York and the Senator from Illinois in connection with the so-called Suez crisis. At that time I was active in my opposition to the Middle East doctrine. I thought at the time that it was very unsound foreign policy for the United States to follow in the Middle East. I believe that subsequent events have borne out the position I took at that time.

Be that as it may, I wish to say to my administration from this side of the aisle: "You are headed straight to a great deal of trouble in connection with the Middle East if you persist in the policy that you are now following with respect to Nasser." I quite agree, so far as giving support to the war in Yemen is concerned, that we cannot justify the expenditure of American money. I say to the former Governor of New York, Mr. Harriman, that I completely disagree with at least the observation he is reported to have made, according to press reports, that if we do not join in sending German scientists to be of assistance in the Middle East in developing nationalistic atomic nuclear power on the part of these countries, the Russians will.

I say to Governor Harriman: So what? Are you trying to tell the American people that fewer people will die from nuclear bombs perfected by German scientists and dropped in the future by dictators in the Middle East than will die from nuclear bombs that may be developed by Russian scientists and dropped by Arab States? What a non sequitur. What fallacious reasoning. What an evasion of the real issue that confronts the United States and our foreign policy, which is this: Are we going to give support to countries which, at the very time we support them, are threatening the peace of the world? There is no question about the position that the Arab leaders have taken. They have publicly announced that within their design is the destruction of nearly every nation in the Middle East.

I offer no apology for announcing on the floor of the Senate today that I will never support the Kennedy administration in that phase of its foreign policy, because it is dead wrong. The Kennedy administration ought to change that policy, and change it immediately. We must say to the Arab countries: "We will give you support. We will help you build up a system of political and economic freedom in your country just as rapidly as you want us to help you to build it up, subject to the condition that we have a commitment from you; namely, your pledge, and the carrying out of that pledge, that you do not intend to make war in the Middle East and do not intend to destroy the only bastion of freedom that exists in the Middle East—the State of Israel." The situation is as simple as that.

What we must do with respect to American foreign policy is to go back to the basic, commonsense, simple truths on which we make our nice-sounding representations concerning the objectives of American foreign policy. But the policy which has been developed concerning the Middle East by the Kennedy administration cannot be reconciled with the basic, historic ideals of American foreign policy.

I desire to have the Record show that I associate myself with the statement which the senior Senator from New York is making today. I do not ask him to associate himself with the conditions to it that I have stated; but I want my administration to know what the position of the senior Senator from Oregon is as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I will not support this administration in what I consider to be its present trend of foreign policy in the Middle East, because this administration cannot reconcile that trend with peace in the Middle East. If war breaks out in the Middle East, it will not be limited to the Middle East.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator from Oregon for his contribution to the discussion. In order to bear out at least one of the statements he has made, I should like to submit for the Record, and make a part of my remarks, the text of the joint communique of the government of the Chinese Peoples' Republic—that is, Communist China—and the government of the United Arab Republic, issued on April 25, which I have just been handed. In it, Chou En-lai, the Chinese foreign minister, and Ali Sabri, who is Nasser's righthand man, agree that the United Arab Republic reiterates its support for what it said is the "just struggle of the Chinese people to liberate their own territory of Taiwan and for the restoration of the rightful position of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations."

Second, the United Arab Republic paid its respects to the Chinese invasion of India, too; and the two parties exchanged their views about the peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question.

Third, the two parties were of the opinion that the current international situation is most advantageous to the peoples of all countries and most disadvantageous to imperialism and colonialism.

Mr. President, that statement only indicates how the Communist-oriented dictators buttress each other. Castro can take great comfort from the fact that his friend Nasser is a friend in the sense that he supports the present state of the world—that it is good, not bad. We do not think so, but President Nasser does.

Because I think the communique is extremely important, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the communique was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Text of Joint Communique

At the invitation of the Premier of the State Council of the Chinese People's Republic Chou En-lai, His Excellency Ali Sabri, member of the Presidential Council and Chairman of the Executive Council of Ministers of the United Arab Republic, paid a friendly visit to China from April 21-25, 1963. Accompanying him were His Excellency Zakari al-Adli Imam, Ambassador of the UAR to the CPR; Minister Plenipotentiary Abd al-Aziz Mustafa Khalifa, Director of the Asian Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs; Minister Plenipotentiary Mustafa Kamal Murtagi, Director of the Research Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs; Mahmud Abu Zayd, Chief of the Cabinet of the Chairman of the Executive Council of Ministers; and Husni al-Hadidi, press secretary of the presidency.

His Excellency Chairman Ali Sabri and his party toured Peiping, Shanghai, and Canton and were accorded a sincere welcome and friendly hospitality by the Chinese Government and people.

During their visit, Chairman of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China Mao Tse-tung and Vice Chairman of the CPR Soong Ching-ling received Chairman Ali Sabri and the other distinguished guests from the United Arab Republic and had friendly talks with them. The Premier of the CPR State Council Chou En-lai held talks with Chairman Ali Sabri on international questions of common concern to the two countries, on the situation in Asia and Africa, and on the further development of the relations of friendship and cooperation between China and the United Arab Republic.

Also taking part in the talks on the Chinese side were Vice Premier of the State Council Nieh Jung-chen, Vice Minister of Foreign Affairs Chang Han-fu, Chinese Ambassador to the United Arab Republic Chen Chia-kang, Director of the West Asian and African Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs Wang Yu-tien, and Vice Director of the First Asian Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs Chang Tung.

Also taking part in the talks on the United Arab Republic side were His Excellency Zakari al-Adli Imam, United Arab Republic Ambassador to the CPR; Minister Plenipotentiary Abd al-Aziz Mustafa Khalifa, Director of the Asian Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs; Minister Plenipotentiary Mustafa Kamal Murtagi, Director of the Research Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs; Mahmud Abu Zayd, Chief of the Cabinet of the Chairman of the Executive Council of Ministers of the United Arab Republic; and Husni al-Hadidi, press secretary of the Presidency. The talks proceeded in a frank and amicable atmosphere.

The two parties noted with satisfaction that, since the Bandung Conference and the formal establishment of diplomatic relations in 1956, the friendly relations between the two countries have developed continuously in the political, economic, and cultural fields. The trade agreement and the agreement on cultural cooperation between the two countries have been and are being carried out smoothly. The two parties are of the opinion that the principle of peaceful coexistence between countries with different systems and the 10 principles of the Bandung Conference are a reliable basis on which to promote friendly relations between the two countries, and they are of the deep conviction that the relations between the two countries established on this basis will be further consolidated and developed.

The two parties are happy to see that since the Bandung Conference tremendous changes have taken place in the situation in Asia and Africa. In Africa, a series of newly independent countries have come into being; and the two parties expressed warm congratulations and sincere greetings to the people of these countries. The two parties expressed their profound sympathy and resolute support for the African peoples who have not yet won independence or complete independence and are waging courageous struggles against imperialism and old and new colonialism, and for complete national liberation; they also expressed their determination to exert every effort to strengthen the great unity of the Asian and African countries in their struggle against imperialism and old and new colonialism.

The Chinese side reiterated its support for the just struggle of the Arab nations to safeguard their independence and achieve their unity, and for the rights of the Arab people in Palestine; it expressed appreciation for the foreign policy of nonalinement, peace, and neutrality pursued by the United Arab Republic.

The United Arab Republic side reiterated its support for the just struggle of the Chinese people to liberate their own territory of Taiwan and for the restoration of the rightful position of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations.

The two parties exchanged their views on the peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question. The Chinese side expressed its appreciation for the efforts made by the six friendly Asian and African countries which took part in the Colombo conference to promote direct negotiations between China and India. The United Arab Republic side expressed its appreciation for the important measures of cease-fire, withdrawal, and the release of all the captured Indian military personnel which had been taken by the Chinese side on its own initiative for the relaxation of the situation on the Sino-Indian border. The two parties were of the agreed view that, in the interest of Asian-African solidarity and world peace, China and India should peacefully settle the Sino-Indian boundary question through direct negotiations.

The two parties were of the opinion that the current international situation is most advantageous to the people of all countries and most disadvantageous to imperialism and colonialism. They declared their resolute opposition to the imperialist policies of aggression and war and their support for the people of all countries in their just struggles to win national independence and defend world peace. They expressed their determination to strengthen the friendship between the two peoples and to work jointly in international affairs to strengthen Asian-African solidarity and safeguard world peace.

His Excellency Ali Sabri extended an invitation in the name of the United Arab Republic Government to Premier Chou En-lai to visit the United Arab Republic. Premier Chou En-lai has accepted the invitation with pleasure.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the senior Senator from New York has rendered a service to the Senate and to the country in stating today the very difficult questions which our country may face with respect to the Middle East. I cannot say at this moment that I would support his proposal, that the United States should enter into a defense pact with the country of Israel. However, the Senator from New York stands on firm ground when he says that the United States and its allies should make it clear that they will not condone—in fact, that they will resist—aggression in the Middle East from whatever quarter, as aggression was resisted in 1956.

In 1956, the United States, under the leadership of President Eisenhower, took a strong and brave position in standing against its allies, Great Britain and France, and I include its friend Israel. The United States stood on the ground of principle that disputes should not be settled by force. I do not believe the action of the United States was appreciated as it should have been, even by the Arab nations. Some of the neutral countries seemed to be more impressed when the Soviet Union threatened to intervene with force. But in direct contrast to the Soviet Union, our position was one of principle and one which was against aggression and force. In the same manner in which we stood against aggression and force in 1957, the United States and its allies ought to reaffirm their position with respect to Israel today—that they will stand against any aggression directed at Israel. I am not prepared to say that we should do it by a defense pact; but we should reaffirm our position that if the threat of aggression is made by the Arab nations against Israel, we will be as brave and determined as we were in 1957, when Egypt was attacked.

I make one further point. I do not want to criticize this administration carelessly, because it must deal with difficult problems for our country. Nevertheless, I believe it can be said that, though he was criticized, Secretary John Foster Dulles made clear, from time to time, that the United States would stand firm against aggression in specific areas, and I believe his policy deterred aggression. I believe the present administration could be—should be—clearer about its positions. It should have been clearer concerning the Soviet entrance into Cuba, and the withdrawal of its force. But that is another subject.

I add my commendation to those of other Senators for the enlightening and, I believe, helpful address which the senior Senator from New York has made.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am extremely grateful to the Senator from Kentucky. There is no confirmation of my own view in the Senate that I would value more. There are some that I would value as much, but none that I would value more than that of the senior Senator from Kentucky, who speaks with almost transcendent responsibility and authority in foreign affairs. The difference in views as to an attack or a reaffirmation is not, I believe, material to the cause. Therefore, I welcome in a very real sense the confirmation of my own thinking that the time has come to commit ourselves to a defense of the Middle East, if need be, from the flames of war, which seem to be building up now in a serious way by this development; and that our policy with respect to President Nasser has not taken account of the fact that he was taking our money with his right hand while preparing to plunge us all into destruction with his left hand. As the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] has pointed out, this is completely unrealistic and unwise.

I never wish to stand on the floor of the Senate and take any position with respect to the security of Israel except a position which is in the interest of our own country—the United States. I think I fully qualified myself in that respect in 1956, when I believed we had to do what we did in terms of being a country that had to stand against aggression when it was tough to stand against it, just as I think we must take a stand against aggression now. No Member of the Senate has been more active than I in aid to the Arab States for their development, and that will always be my position, whatever may be said about me, because it is essential to our world that they come out of the night into which their people have been plunged for so many centuries.

I am grateful to the Senator from Kentucky for putting these problems into focus, as he has.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator from New York and other Senators who have spoken on the critical situation that remains and continues in the Middle East, and which is now being increased in terms of tension, have made a real contribution to the discussion of public policy and foreign policy.

The situation is this, so far as our country's national interest is concerned: The Middle East is not an isolated section of the world, where developments that may lead to conflict will leave us untouched. There is not a single area in the world in which we have made greater commitments, than the Middle East, unless it be Western Europe.

Furthermore, the Middle East, as we know, represents the bridge between Asia, Africa, and Europe, and represents in many ways the fulcrum upon which many of our security and defense policies depend. We have the 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean. We have mutual assistance pacts with certain countries in that area. Obviously, we are involved in the developments in the Middle East, as a matter of protection of the southern flank of NATO, because NATO includes Turkey, Greece, and Italy, which in a very real sense are Mediterranean powers; and obviously the Middle East is a part of the great Mediterranean area. So we have a direct national security interest in developments in the Middle East.

The Senator from New York stated that in 1956 he stood with our Government in insisting upon halting the military action and aggression which had taken place in the Middle East. He certainly did, as did I. I felt exactly the same way, and I spoke out on the subject. But I must also say that over the years I have been deeply concerned about the failure to obtain any reconciliation in that area in regard to the refugee problems, the boundary problems, and the problems between the Arab States themselves—because there are problems between them—and also the failure to obtain a reconciliation between certain of the Arab States and the State of Israel.

It seems to me that the following should be clearly understood:

First, that U.S. foreign policy supports the territorial integrity, independence, and freedom of the State of Israel.

Second, that the United States supports the legitimate aspirations of the people of the Arab nations for their sovereignty, independence, prosperity, and progress. Those of us in this body who have voted for foreign aid have always voted for it knowing full well that a good deal of it went to Arab countries, and that some of it—limited amounts, as a matter of fact—went to the State of Israel.

Recent events have been worrisome; and I do not think we can regard them as outside the sphere of our immediate interest. The expenditure of large sums of money in the Middle East for arms is ridiculous. It is a threat to the peace of the world, and it is also a threat to the safety of that area itself.

I have been in the United Arab Republic, in Egypt, in Israel, in Jordan, and in Syria, and I have witnessed unbelievable poverty—for example, in the city of Cairo. I know that the Government of that country has undertaken programs to alleviate these conditions; but what a tragedy it is that large sums of money are spent—money obtained by mortgaging the cotton crop, for example—in order to purchase missiles and rockets. And for what reason? There is no real threat to the independence of these countries. In fact, if there were such a threat, we would be committed to prevent any such aggression. Under the tripartite agreement of 1950, the United States, Britain, and France are committed to halt any aggression by any state in the Middle East. In other words, insofar as military aggression is concerned, we are committed to oppose any alteration in the national boundaries or any change in sovereignty. So I see no reason in logic or in good sense why large sums of money should be spent by those countries to purchase missiles or rockets, or for the importation of scientists to develop such weapons and other fantastic weapons of destruction.

So from this forum, the U.S. Senate, I wish to call to the attention of the American people the tragic waste of the resources of these countries when the governments of the countries in the Middle East use such funds for an arms buildup. Israel, in order to be able to defend herself, has to tax her people and go deeper into debt and convert a large amount of her production into weapons for her security. Why? Because her neighboring states have vowed to destroy her. The United Arab Republic says it is afraid of aggression from Israel or from some Arab state. So each of these countries proceeds to build up huge armaments.

I ask any Senator who has traveled in these areas whether any amount of armament in that particular area of the world could really change the balance of power between the United States and the Soviet Union.

If one of the countries of the Middle East says it is arming because it will thus be able to help defend freedom, I point out that the best way for such a country to defend freedom is to give some meaning to political, domestic institutions which are free—by means of education, by means of health, by means of improved agriculture, by means of greater production of food and clothing for her people. All the funds which these countries have and every bit of the resources on which they can put their hands should be utilized, not for the purchase of arms, but to uplift their people, who for centuries have lived in misery, tragedy, and poverty.

That should be our policy. We should speak out with almost religious fervor against the sort of military buildup that is occurring. We should do everything possible to thwart it. We should make it crystal clear that if such military power is used, we will do everything we can to stop it.

Therefore, I should like to make two or three points. I thank the Senator from New York for yielding this long to me; he has been most considerate.

First, the increased buildup of arms in the Middle East not only is a threat to that immediate area, but also constitutes a loaded pistol pointed at the heart of that entire part of the world. It could really bring about a holocaust, because the Middle East represents a power position; and if something there explodes, it might be the fuse which would ignite the world and destroy all of us. It could be the ignited fuse which would set off a nuclear war.

Therefore, it is imperative that the flow of arms to the Middle East be stopped. In connection with our arms-control discussions, we should be taking action to reduce the arms buildup in such countries. How foolish it is to have countries in Latin America try to build up their military power—to be used only to enable some little colonel to engage in a military coup in an attempt to destroy popular institutions of government. Increased military power in such countries does not add anything to the military strength of the free world; in that respect, a few more tanks, guns, or missiles in such countries would be of little importance. How unfortunate it is when African nations—which are appealing to country after country throughout the world for help—build up military establishments. Indeed, it is foolish and tragic.

On the contrary, how wonderful it would be if the governments and the peoples of the Middle East would go to work to build better roads, to improve their agriculture, and to raise their standard of living. How tragic it is when large portions of the limited resources of such countries are used for the purchase of military equipment. If our country would take the lead in working for arms control and for the reduction of armaments in the Middle East, and if our country would help impose an embargo on the shipment of arms to the Middle East, how important that would be for the cause of peace throughout the world.

Some may say that if the United States and her allies are unwilling to have military supplies sent to these countries, the Russians will send it there; and it is said that if we attempted arms control or an arms embargo, the Russians would oppose it. But certainly that is not the answer, in any case. The answer is that it is patently wrong for countries which are literally impoverished and are living off foreign aid to spend vast sums of money for military weaponry. Our country should speak out clearly in righteous indignation and should implement public policy in order to stop this tragic development. Certainly the United States should take the lead in the United Nations in seeking an arms embargo in the Middle East, plus regional arms control in that area; and the United States should reaffirm her allegiance to the Tripartite Declaration and to the commitment, under that declaration, of the United States, Britain, and France to work for arms limitation and control in the Middle East.

This declaration of the early 1950's was designed to halt aggression in that area.

Third, I suggest that the United Nations Emergency Force, UNEF, must be maintained in the Middle East. There should be a major effort to solve the serious financial difficulty of the U.N.'s peace-keeping operations.

I should like to pause for a moment on that point. Unless we can come to some understanding as to how we will pay for the peace-keeping operations of the U.N., the United Nations Emergency Force will be withdrawn from the Middle East. I ask Senators what force will then be in that area to give any stability or any reasonable degree of fairness to the operations in the Middle East?

The UNEF has been a force for good, peace, and tranquillity; and it is living on borrowed time and on borrowed capital. Apparently, if we cannot resolve the financial difficulties facing the U.N. on its peace-keeping operations, UNEF will be withdrawn. If UNEF is withdrawn and things start to go from bad to worse in the Middle East, I predict that the United States of America will have substantial numbers of its military forces committed to that area. The cost of the UNEF will then, by comparison, be small indeed.

It is ridiculous to argue about limiting the costs of the U.N. peace-keeping operations, when the costs do not amount to anything in terms of the actual military costs of our own Military Establishment.

Finally, the United Nations should assign observers immediately to other areas of the Middle East. For example, new observers should be sent to Damascus, in Syria, to Yemen, and to Saudi Arabia.

In other words, the United Nations ought to spread out into that area what might be called the surveillance of the U.N., so that we can at least have some way of communicating and bringing the eyes and ears of the United Nations a little closer to the developments that are taking place in that area. With a strong attitude on the part of our own Government and a commitment to countries that believe in freedom, I think that would be helpful.

I do not know whether such a plan would offer a solution, but, as I have said it from 101 platforms, and am proud of having done so, in the State of Israel there are free elections.

Israel has a Parliament, and freedom of speech; and the people of that country have demonstrated their responsibility as a people and as a nation. They have given of their own technical and professional skills to a program of technical assistance in Latin America and to help the Alliance for Progress. They are now training agriculturists. Hundreds of students from Africa and Asia are in their universities. Today Israel is giving technical assistance to 50, 60, or more nations. I know she is keeping her commitments to the United Nations. I know she has defended her frontiers. Her people have a loyalty to the Government and to the principles of a constitution that guarantees political freedom.

What are the objectives of our foreign policy? What is the purpose of our foreign aid? The purpose of our foreign aid and our foreign policy is to protect and expand the areas of freedom. The State of Israel represents an area of freedom. It is a very small area, but it is a potent one. That area of freedom should not be under a constant threat of invasion and destruction. If our country does not take a firm stand to protect countries that are free and that desire to be free, there will not be any free countries left.

We must make up our minds to do something about it before an act of aggression, or we will find ourselves in a more difficult position once the act of aggression takes place. The sooner we make crystal clear that any act of aggression or any buildup that lends itself to aggression is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations and contrary to the commitments that our country has made, the better off we shall be.

If the State of Israel or any other state that has free government, free institutions, holds free elections, and is struggling to be a free nation, loses its sovereignty, or is bled white because of an armaments race, the United States of America will have suffered a blow as well.

Countries cannot be nibbled off one by one. The "Operation Nibble" that goes on in our world will soon get down to where the core is attacked, and the core and the heart of freedom is here in our country.

I appreciate the privilege of speaking on this subject today with Senators, because I believe that the American people and the Government of our people ought clearly to understand that there is a sense of concern in the Senate. There is a sense of indignation over what is taking place.

It does not make sense to pour money into a country or to send food into a country and have that food and money converted into arms which act as a threat to someone else. We have something better to do with our resources than that.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to express my gratitude to the distingushed Senator from Minnesota for his eloquent contribution to the debate.

I should like to make one or two brief observations. It seems to be the consensus that, at the very least, we need to reaffirm the declaration of May 1950. The major point I have added to that is the idea of a collective defense agreement or defense treaty, on the Philippine model, which would enable us to engage in some planning, which is essential because Israel is so small that it could be snuffed out in an afternoon. A declaration might be put into effect in a day, 2 days, or a week, but there might not be that much time in such a situation.

Second, the U.N. force is critically essential, not only because it is a stabilizing factor on the Gaza Strip, but also because it answers Egypt's fears. How can Egypt pretend for a minute that she is afraid of aggression when the U.N. force is precisely posted between her and Israel to prevent such aggression?

Finally, what the Senator has said about the reconstruction of the Middle East, instead of spending its substance for arms, leads me to the following thought: No one, including myself, wishes to deprive the Arab States of any new-found target or capacity which can come through their enthusiasm to have a greater Arab consciousness or a greater sense of unity or destiny of the Arab peoples. If that is a channel of fire, let it burn out the ignorance, the disease, and the decadence which is incident to millions upon millions of lives in that country. Our policy must channel that fire to see that it goes down the right path. Instead of going down the right path, it seems now to be burning itself up and everything else in its path. That is pertinent and important. No one wishes to deprive Nasser of what he may do to inspire the Arab people to a new goal, courage, and creativity. We are not against that. We are for it. But let us channel the effort constructively, instead of permitting it to be channeled, as it is presently being channeled, destructively—to kill and to drive people into the sea, to dominate, and to destroy. Israel has 8,000 square miles. The Arab States embrace an area of almost 3 million square miles. Israel has 2,300,000 people; the Arab States have more than 57 million.

What is this all about? I am grateful to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to permit me to make one further observation?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not wish my remarks to be misinterpreted. I have the same feelings about the aspirations of the Arabic people for what they call Arabic unity. It has been my view of President Nasser that the United Arab Republic could make a great contribution to the history of the world, in molding the United Arab treaty or the unity of the Arab peoples, he would do it with one purpose. That is the singular purpose of bringing to those people the great dignity that they so justly and richly deserve, and the reality of modern science, technology and modern living.

On two occasions I visited with the President of the United Arab Republic. I found him intelligent, exceedingly able, and a very dedicated man. Today on the floor of the Senate I appeal, as I have appealed privately to him, to lead the people of the Middle East in the path of peace and reconciliation, and to make a real contribution to peace and justice in the world.

The Middle East has given us very much, including our Bible, our cultural background. Much of it comes from the great civilizations of the Middle East.

What a great opportunity there is for a leader in the Arabic world to rise above petty nationalism, to rise above the current wave of emotional nationalism which lends itself to potential aggression—to rise up to be a real leader of a great culture and a great people, the Arabic people.

Anything we can do to encourage that will receive the support of every American citizen, either Jew, or Gentile, and whatever may be the religious faith or political conviction. I am sure it is the desire of the American people that the people of the Middle East, and of the whole world, have better lives. That is what we are talking about.

We are justly concerned, not merely because we see a waste of human and physical resources in such an armament program. We are justly concerned because if a spark should ignite in that section of the world it could bring us into the terrible vortex of fire and destruction.

I do not wish to see that happen. I think we must speak out as effectively as we can to encourage new moves on the part of our Government to prevent it.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Minnesota very much.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to my colleague from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. I highly approve of the sentiments which have been expressed by our able friend from Minnesota, but I think we must go beyond a simple reassertion of principles, making wonderful apostrophes to liberty, justice, and peace. We are dealing with reality. We are dealing with a situation in which bloodshed has taken place and is threatened on a far greater scale. It has taken place largely, and will again in my judgment, because of our mistaken policy.

It is clear to me, from what I have seen, that the hundreds of millions of dollars which the United States has poured into Egypt have been used in large part to make war in another country.

I do not share for a moment the alleged official version with respect to Egypt, that it went to aid a country struggling to free itself from tyranny. I hold no brief for the former government in Yemen, but the revolution of Yemen was made by Nasser, exactly as the upsets in Syria and Iraq were made by Nasser, and exactly as he is now trying by all means, by infiltration and subversion and the preachment of assassination and subversion to take over the government of the friendly country of Jordan.

Jordan has a king, to be sure, but Jordan is oriented toward freedom and democracy. Its purposes are clear.

Nasser has the most complete police state ever imagined. There is no freedom of press whatsoever. It is a police state in which there is no freedom of expression.

Next door is the little country of Israel, which, as my colleague from Minnesota has pointed out, is a democracy. It is a free state. It espouses the principles in which we believe, and which we try to promote, and would like to see wherever possible.

Preachment will not do the job with respect to Nasser, any more than it would have done it with respect to Hitler. It is time that we served notice that our funds are not to be used to make war. If Nasser wants our money, he should use it for the purposes for which it is intended; namely, to educate his people, to rid them of ill-health and disease, to irrigate the land, to uplift the people and give them better standards of living and better opportunities for a livelihood.

The time for mere noble declarations of sentiments on our part has passed. We shall be responsible for the bloody war if we continue our policy of subsidizing preparation for it. It is as certain to come as that the sun will rise tomorrow. We have had the precedents of history to study. We have seen the example of Hitler. We have seen one country after another in the Middle East being subverted by means of infiltration, by means of assassination, by means of arms.

What a strange bedfellowship. There are Russian arms. The totalitarian Russian is supplying arms, ammunition, and planes to Egypt. There are ex-Nazi scientists in Egypt working on rockets and missiles. And there is our money. What a wonderful combination to enable Nasser to achieve his declared purpose of conquest and destruction.

I charge that the responsibility will be largely ours if this happens, and not that of anyone else. We can prevent it.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to say to my good friend from Alaska that I think the record should be clear that the regime of the United Arab Republic, at least in the past 2 or 3 years, has not closely associated itself with the Soviet Union. I think that its flirtation with Khrushchev and the Communists was one from which it learned a great deal, and as a result the leaders have taken another look. I believe the Soviet Union has suffered a substantial setback in its relations with the United Arab Republic.

In addition, there is the fact that the peoples of the Arabic areas are not prone to Communist sympathy or Communist ideology.

I am deeply concerned, as I said earlier, about the utilization of American funds for the purpose of an arms buildup and for purposes which lend themselves to aggression. We ought to say, however, in respect to our policy in the Middle East, that it has not been one which has been unmindful of these troubles. In fact, we have been and are very much aware of them.

We have attempted to show the Arabic people, particularly the people of the United Arab Republic, the dangers of any flirtation with the Communist forces. I believe we have been somewhat effective in working out a better relationship between our respective countries and minimizing the threat of communism in the area.

This within itself is not sufficient, but at least it represents a constructive step. I have been hopeful—and until the past few months I thought there was reason to be hopeful—that there would be a simmering down, that there would be a settling of some of the antagonisms in the area, and that time within itself, plus wise statemanship, would lead to a reconciliation between the United Arab Republic and the State of Israel.

I believe there were people in the Government of the State of Israel who felt that way. I think there still are people who feel that this could be the case.

All I urge is that we use our good offices to expedite this possibility and that, at the same time, we make it crystal clear that any attack in the area, or any aggressive move, will be met by our active opposition, either through the instrumentalities of the United Nations or under our commitments under the tripartite agreement.

I believe that such policies are reasonable and feasible. I say to my good friend from Alaska that the Government of the United States, though it has had difficulties over the years in coming to what I think is a sensible Middle East policy, is closer to that sensible policy today than it has been for a long time. At least the policy is directed toward economic improvement, toward reconciliation, toward leading the Arabic States away from any flirtation with the Communist force.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I beg to disagree with my friend from Minnesota. That is not our policy. We are not heading in the right direction but we are heading in the wrong direction, for the reasons I have pointed out. We could reverse that policy tomorrow with a clear-cut statement that we will defend Israel against aggression and that we will no longer finance military ventures which have for their only purpose the upsetting of existing governments in the Middle East.

Our policy in the Middle East has gone along under the theory, as the Senator has stated, that we have somehow moved in on the Russians in the United Arab Republic, but that is not wholly in accord with my view of the situation. I believe that the Russians have not been able to inculcate their particular brand of communism in Egypt, but they are playing Nasser's game and to a degree their own, by supplying him with all the modern weapons he wants, and we are indirectly paying for them.

That is why I think we are not making progress and why, unless our policy is reversed—whatever may have been our good intentions in the past—that which we seek will be nullified.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am not arguing about the fact that we should stop economic assistance which lends itself toward weapons or the building up of arms. I am only saying that there has been an improvement in the policy, despite the difficulties.

The Senator from Alaska has been in that area. I have been in that area. I have talked with the heads of state there.

I have talked with the leaders of both countries.

I believe it can be stated that it was the view of certain responsible leaders in the State of Israel that there was a possibility of improvement in the state of relations until the recent buildup in missiles and in rocketry. This has caused great concern, and rightly so.

We have made commitments under the tripartite agreement that we will not permit aggression. We acted quickly and promptly in the instance of the Lebanese crisis. We acted quickly through the United Nations in 1956. I believe that our Government is prepared to act promptly and effectively again. If we need an official statement from the highest sources of this Government, to be helpful on that score, then I would subscribe to that proposal as well.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to point out to my colleague from Minnesota, bearing upon his most recent statement, relating to the need for an official statement, that in my view it must be incorporated in some kind of mutual defense treaty. I gave the Philippines as an example.

I should like to state for the Senator's consideration two points.

First, the minute that Nasser thinks he is underway, he immediately moves over actively to the Communist side. I have put into the RECORD the joint communique issued by Ali Sabri, Nasser's right-hand man, and Chou-En-lai, of Communist China. That declaration is dated April 25.

The very first thing the United Arab Republic leaders do is to get on the bandwagon. They get on the bandwagon with respect to Chinese action with regard to Taiwan; Chinese action with respect to India; and with respect to the claim that the state of the world today is great. We do not think so, but they do.

The minute President Nasser smells something, he is right on the ball with the most destructive forces available. I am not being critical. I am far beyond the stage of mere criticism in this matter. We had an opportunity in 1962 to support the efforts to have 16 African nations undertake direct negotiations between Israel and the Arab States. We flubbed it. We voted against it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We made a big mistake in that decision.

Mr. JAVITS. I say, we flubbed it. I am not finding fault. There seems to be a sort of test as to whether certain action is evenhanded. It is suggested that if Israel is buying arms and rockets, we must stop her as well as the Arab States. Otherwise, we are not being evenhanded. If we can stop it that way, then it is evenhanded. But we must make it crystal clear that we will stop, by force, if need be, any attempts at aggression, and we must make sure that the aid—$250 million this year—being granted to Egypt is channeled in other directions than those of mass destruction, and that the energies of the Arab States in the new unity must not be used in destroying another country.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I could not be more in agreement with the Senator. I hope that when the aid bill is before the Senate, and when we consider the area we are now discussing, economic and technical assistance and the food programs, we will make clear, either by amendment, resolution, or legislative history, what the intent of this Congress is with respect to that kind of situation. I know of no better time to do it than when we feed money into the pipeline. This is a preliminary discussion of what I think will be a continuing policy question.

It is my hope that the discussion today will have a tendency to firm up the hands of those who believe that a nation that is free and independent will have its integrity protected, and that those who seek to build arms to increase world tensions will not be able to do it at our expense. I agree with the Senator. We will be able to make our intention known when that part of the aid legislation is before us. I shall be more than happy to join the Senator in whatever effort he makes in that direction.

Mr. JAVITS. I shall certainly join the Senator from Minnesota, the Senator from Alaska, and other Senators, in a sort of Hickenlooper-type amendment to deal with that type of problem.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. This debate has been excellent and constructive, and I congratulate my colleague, the Senator from New York, for his statement and for his leadership in the discussion which has followed. The melancholy fact is that, of all the areas of our globe, it should be the Middle East where the crisis could come and the processes of extermination begin.

The Middle East has spawned three great religions to guide men, and we are witnessing an inching forward, to the possibility of conflict, and thus to a very sad paradox.

The Senator from New York is entirely correct. The United States has a stake in the peace and the security of that unhappy area. It is not a new stake. It is a continuing one.

I recall when the Congress, under President Eisenhower, adopted the Middle East resolution, and did it with very little opposition, under which the legislative branch of our Government confirmed in the President the authority to commit the armed strength of the Government of the United States in that area of the world in order to keep the peace.

Mention has been made of the tripartite agreement. It is my understanding that that is still a part of the foreign policy of the Government of the United States, but I agree with the Senator from Alaska that a statement of policy is not enough.

We have another policy, Mr. President. It is a policy which is against proliferation of nuclear weapons. It is a good policy. It is a little difficult to understand, sometimes, just how the policy is to be enforced. The Government of France is about ready to join the nuclear club. Red China is in the wings. But in some respects we have been able to utilize that policy to keep the world from rushing pellmell toward a point where nuclear weapons would be easy to obtain by any country, great or small.

The sad fact is that, according to newspaper accounts, the buildup in arms in the United Arab Republic, as my able friend has pointed out, is of a fashion which could utilize nuclear warheads. What of the fate and future of that small and gallant democracy, Israel, in the face of this growing danger?

The Senator from New York is eternally right in demanding that the Government of the United States, with courage and in unmistakable terms, demonstrate to the world that a war or a conflict in the Middle East would be of dire and immediate concern to the people of the United States; that, under our commitments in connection with the tripartite agreement, France and the United Kingdom would share that immediate concern, and that steps would and should and must be taken to prevent it, or to quell it.

Beyond that, I think the discussion which the Senator from New York has engaged in, with respect to a multilateral agreement, should well be explored by the executive branch. I remember one time several years ago, when I attended a North Atlantic Treaty Organization Parliamentary Conference, listening to some of our colleagues from legislative branches of NATO countries talk about jurisdiction of NATO. Where, if a conflict erupted, would NATO draw the line? How would we decide what was potentially injurious to the Atlantic community, and what was not?

Every member of the Atlantic alliance has a keen and crucial stake in peace in the Middle East, quite aside from the three members of the tripartite agreement.

I do not want to belabor what I am sure will be an excellent record, and perhaps, if I may suggest it, something of a guide—required reading—for the executive branch of our Government. At any rate, what has been said here today needed saying, and I give my congratulations to my colleague for the leadership in the discussion which he has provided.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator from California. What he said needed saying. It is an affirmation from a Member of the leadership on this side of the aisle of the solidarity of view on this subject and its instructiveness with respect to the foreign policy of this Nation, which the Senator from California is able to carry out in periodic discussions which take place with the President of the United States, who is responsible for our foreign policy.

I am grateful also to all the other Senators who have participated in this debate, which I consider to have been most instructive.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I believe that the subject has been very fully covered. I thank also the Senator from California for his very valuable contribution. I wish to call attention to a point which may not have been covered before, and that is that we should view this situation in relation to our declared foreign policy purposes. The basic purpose of our foreign policy is peace in the world—presumably, peace with justice. In order to help attain it we try to promote the economic development of countries, so that their people may no longer live in dire poverty and want, and so that they may have greater creature comforts, and greater hope.

When we view a situation like the one now in the Middle East, where one nation is clearly intent on destroying other nations, and is building up its arms, and consequently little Israel is compelled to buy and install Hawk missiles, and when there has been some talk in our official circles that by our sanctioning such purchases we demonstrate our neutrality or evenhandedness, while Nasser is getting his arsenal from the Soviet Union, and being aided in weaponry by German scientists, I feel compelled to ask what kind of policy that is.

By Nasser's armament policy Israel is compelled to devote a part of its economic resources and to withdraw funds from peacetime needs to increase its defenses. In that way we are nullifying the basic objectives of our foreign policy both in United Arab Republic and Israel. On the one hand, Nasser is devoting millions of dollars to making war, money which should go for peacetime needs and, on the other side, Israel feels compelled to buy missiles for its defense. The whole thing is absurd.

It seems to me that when our foreign aid program comes before the Senate we should try to write some amendments into the act to prevent more of such armament races with their needless waste, and prospective bloodshed, and insist that our dollars shall be used only for the great variety of needs so crucial in the Arab countries where disease, poverty, and illiteracy prevail so widely.

Mr. JAVITS. I shall certainly be ready, and I am sure there are other Senators who also will be ready, to devote my mind to that subject in trying to arrive at some positive way in which that can be done.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I have read with considerable interest the advance copy of the speech which the Senator from New York had prepared, and I regret that I was not on the floor during its delivery. I am grateful that he has raised, in the fashion in which he did, the concern which he has voiced, a concern that is shared by all of us in the Senate, in connection with this subject.

I was struck by the suggestion made by the Senator from Alaska that we have available a means of approach to an element of this concern. The appropriateness of these remarks was heightened by the significance of the 15th anniversary of Israel. I am grateful for the opportunity as a Member of the Senate to express the warmest good wishes to that nation on this occasion of its 15th anniversary.

On this 15th anniversary of the statehood of Israel, the efforts of individual men to establish their primacy should come clearly to our minds. More than 4,000 years of history span Israel's first nationhood and her restoration to freedom. The redemption of the people of Israel from Egyptian bondage is a point of climax in the progress of mankind. It was Henry George who made the meaning so clear when he wrote:

> From between the paws of the rock-hewn Sphinx rises the genius of human liberty; and the trumpets of the Exodus throb with the defiant proclamation of the rights of man.

It was the flight across the Red Sea which preserves a revolutionary idea—an idea which could not have evolved in the despotism of the Pharaoh. The idea was based upon the sovereignty of God; the ruler of the universe, the embodiment of righteousness, the loving Father of all creation.

That story of the Exodus, the classic first episode of national liberation, comforted our drive for national independence. Among others, Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin cited and guided on it. We celebrate this anniversary of statehood as a great event because it vindicates the faith of those who see human beings as the primary agent of historic process and as a crushing argument against those who deny the human will a central part in governing the world's destiny. This sanctuary for the principles of free government, this land whose citizens fix the highest value on freedom, must be preserved in freedom. As Americans we must insist on this not out of some sentimental reason but for our own great good.

Freedom can survive in this world only if we plan in terms of striving. This principle should hold even greater meaning to the people of this country as we pause to honor the people of Israel on this anniversary of their independence.

And let us recognize too the necessity of making clear to any power which would seek to destroy Israel our determination that such a reversal of freedom's cause would not be tolerated.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this is a very appropriate note on which to end this very illuminating and, I hope, extremely helpful discussion, as both a prelude to future action and as a basis of appreciation for the achievements of this small State of Israel, as shown in the last 15 years. I believe the official anniversary date was yesterday. It is significant that this discussion should take place contemporaneously with the 15th anniversary of the recognition of the new State of Israel by the President of the United States.

I again express my gratitude to my fellow Senators.

I yield the floor.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1963.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5517) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is my understanding that the supplemental appropriation bill contains an item of approximately $30 million for civil defense. This is an increase in the amount appropriated by the House, since the House appropriated nothing for this item. As I understand, this amount is to provide for stocking civil-defense shelters. Congress has already appropriated sufficient money, so that some 47 million units or reservations, so to speak, can be stocked. The ultimate aim of the program is to stock some 70 million units; that is, places for 70 million people who would be able to find fallout shelters in the event of a nuclear attack.

Is it not true that at present some 7 million of the 47 million places are stocked, and that there is enough money now available, without additional appropriations, to enable a further 40 million places to be fully stocked?

Mr. PASTORE. I do not wish to commit myself as to the precise number. Much of what disturbs the Senator from Wisconsin disturbs me and also disturbed our subcommittee, which considered this question quite exhaustively. The primary question was why this item had to be included in a supplemental bill; why could it not wait for the regular appropriation bill?

One hundred eleven million dollars has already been committed under the program. A survey was conducted, and the survey indicates pretty well that a very modest approach, and a good, practical approach can be made to the whole subject of establishing fallout shelters. Some persons feel that if an atomic attack came, it would be cataclysmic and devastating, and they ask, Why would any protection at all be needed? That position is an obvious fallacy.

Even if we began to produce antimissile missiles, on which we are spending many millions of dollars for development, it would not be possible to fire an antimissile missile without causing some fallout.

So the big question is: What are we going to do about the situation? At one time an investigation was made. The recommendation was that in the neighborhood of $20 billion be provided. That is an astronomical, fantastic figure. I am not arguing this afternoon whether we should have such an expensive program. What is proposed in the supplemental bill is a very modest program.

The Federal Government has negotiated with building owners and has contacted municipal authorities, who have agreed to permit certain public and private buildings to be used as fallout shelters. If one travels out Connecticut Avenue, for example, he will see fallout shelter designations on the outside of many buildings. After buildings have been designated as shelters, it is necessary to place food and water in them. There is no sense in having a shelter unless it contains water and food to sustain the occupants. That is the purpose of this appropriation.

Thus far, about two-thirds of the program has been carried out; one-third remains to be completed. It is argued that if the funds for stocking are terminated now, the supply pipeline will be broken in such a way that when it is again attempted to resume supplying, not only will the continuity have been broken, but it will be much more expensive and will take more time to restock.

In view of the fact that the House eliminated the entire $61,900,000, the committee thought that the Senate should restore one-half the amount, so we decided on the arbitrary figure of $30 million. We can take the amendment to conference. I do not know what the conference will do. At least, we believe some amount should be provided to provide continuity. We ought to provide some amount to show that the Senate, at least, believes that something must be done. We cannot live with the paradox of spending billions upon billions of dollars to make atomic bombs, but do nothing about civil defense.

In answer to the question raised by the Senator from Wisconsin, it is true that some of the shelters have been stocked. It is true that many more will be used for stocking purposes. It is also possibly true that if we did nothing now, we could resume stocking later; but following the hiatus, stocking would be more expensive; and a hiatus might create an atmosphere of indifference. A hiatus might injure the whole program. So the committee felt, in all reason and commonsense, that we should at least provide one-half of the amount rejected by the House, take it to conference, and see what we could work out.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I agree wholeheartedly that something must be done. I also agree that this is an excellent civil defense program in every sense. Economically and practically, it would provide protection. I think it is the best thing we could do. It would cost about $2.42 per person. We might consider it in the sense that it costs $2.42 per life.

Also, I think it is a very wise investment in the sense of making our deterrent more believable. It is not only good in terms of saving American lives, but good in that it strengthens our position to be able to meet the challenge of the Soviet Union, if we are pressed to the ultimate.

While I feel as I do about the value of the program, I do not believe a case has been made in the hearings or in the committee report, frankly, for providing the additional $30 million in the supplemental appropriation bill. I say that with all respect to the Senator from Rhode Island, because it is my understanding that, even if the stocking program were stepped up greatly, it is unlikely that the funds for the program would be exhausted in 8 or 9 months—I calculate 13 months—for filling 47 million places with 10,000 calories of food and water. Under the circumstances, I thought it would be more orderly and sensible to bring this up in the regular appropriation bill. However, in view of the fact, I think this money should be spent anyway. It would be wisely spent. We could, I think, properly eliminate this item from the appropriation bill. But that elimination would not be real economy. It would not be a permanent saving, but only a postponement of the expenditure for a period of 3, 4, or 5 months. Therefore I believe the course taken by the Senate Committee on Appropriations cannot be seriously challenged. I am perfectly willing to accept the amendment. I merely suggest that it is difficult, under these circumstances, for me, at least, to understand why, if we should take this $30 million out of the supplemental, there would necessarily be a break in the pipeline, as the Senator from Rhode Island contends there might be.

I questioned the Civil Defense officials; and in pressing them they did not convince me that there would be a break or an interruption, or that if there were an interruption that there would be any additional cost. However, I am willing to accept the position of the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin. What disturbs him also disturbs me. This is the answer that was given by Mr. Steuart L. Pittman, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Civil Defense, as it appears on page 187 of the hearings:

> I also want to mention that there is a supply line, involving the schedules of 2,600 manufacturers and shippers, which is a going concern. If we do not use fiscal year 1963 funds to maintain the supply line, we will be forced to start all over again and create a new system. There will be about a 6-months' startup time, in production of these shelter supply items, which will set us back in excess of 6 months. This means that the 5,000 municipal and county governments which are on the receiving end of this supply system may feel that they need not go through with their end of a very burdensome job. Of course, this applies to the owners of buildings, as well, who may withdraw, if the Federal Government appears to falter.

I repeat: It is a matter of judgment; and under all the circumstances, I believe this was the only judgment the committee could have made.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I shall not reiterate my position at length, except to say that it was my conclusion, after having studied the situation, that there would not have been any interruption. The program could easily extend over a period of 10 or 11 additional months without any further appropriation.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I regret to recall that some members of our subcommittee looked with disfavor on recommending any part of the civil defense budget item to which the Senator is now directing his attention. Speaking for myself, I would have voted for the entire amount. I believe in civil defense, and in this particular program. I say to my very able friend, the Senator from Rhode Island, that I think he was correct in proposing, as a compromise amendment to this supplemental bill, one-half of the total amount requested by the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara.

I believe it would be well to have printed in the RECORD the letter from Secretary McNamara, which appears on pages 953 and 954 of the hearings, so that Senators and others who are interested can read it, because the position of the Secretary of Defense, who now is clothed with the responsibility of civil defense in the event of a nuclear conflict, is an excellent one. He has achieved a rather unique goal in having State, local, and Federal governmental entities jointly participate across the country in determining what structures are presently available for civil defense, and then stocking them. So I believe it would be well to have his letter printed in the RECORD, if the Senator from Wisconsin does not object.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I have no objection whatever; I shall be very happy to have the letter printed in the RECORD.

I agree with the Senator from California that this program is essential, both from the standpoint of national defense and from the standpoint of protecting the lives of American citizens.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., April 12, 1963.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Department of Defense has reviewed the supplemental appropriation bill, H.R. 5517, as passed by the House of Representatives on April 10, 1963. With respect to civil defense, the House has eliminated the funds requested for survey, marking, and provisioning of community fallout shelters, which would stop this joint Federal, State, and local undertaking in midstream. I believe that this action is detrimental to the national interest and I am transmitting herewith a justification requesting full restoration of the amount of $61.9 million proposed in the budget estimate.

Following transfer of civil defense functions to the Department of Defense some 20 months ago, the Department thoroughly examined alternative approaches to the civil defense problem and, as a first step, adopted a low-cost program based upon making maximum use of protection afforded by existing structures. A nationwide survey to determine the extent of this protection was initiated late in 1961 and has just been completed. The results have exceeded our most optimistic projections, showing that there is in existence adequate shelter against fallout radiation for over 100 million people.

A joint Federal, State, and local effort is well advanced to make 70 million of these shelter spaces usable by marking and provisioning them with supplies essential to survival under fallout conditions. The supplemental request is needed for survey updating and provisioning the last one-third of the 70 million shelter spaces.

The supply line to these shelters cannot be maintained without a damaging interruption of many months' duration unless the requested fiscal year 1963 funds are made available.

This project represents the first positive Federal action to provide State and local governments with the means to develop shelter systems around which to build realistic local survival programs. It has received the support of States and localities who are making their resources available to complete the job. If supplemental funds are not provided to complete the provisioning, the program would come to a premature and confused halt with loss of local support which would be very difficult to obtain again at a later date.

The substantial progress in civil defense which can be achieved by completing the task of stocking existing fallout shelter space is a key element in a balanced national defense program for our country. As I indicated during the recent military posture hearings, the effectiveness of an active ballistic missile defense system in saving lives depends in large part upon the existence of an adequate fallout shelter system. For this reason, I believe the current minimum civil defense program should be given priority over any major additions to the active defenses and is a clear requirement with or without antiballistic missile systems now in the developmental stage.

I urge full restoration of the appropriation in the amount of $61.9 million requested by the President.

Sincerely,

ROBERT S. MCNAMARA.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Rhode Island. My question relates to the public works acceleration program, referred to on page 11 of the report. The $450 million would be used to accelerate public works projects throughout the country.

Subsequently there will come before the Senate an appropriation request of the General Services Administration which, I understand, entails the expenditure of approximately $170 million for certain public buildings in various cities. My concern is as follows: If this acceleration provision is enacted into law, is it likely that there might be a deceleration of the normal budget of the General Services Administration for funds with which to build structures which have been programed, and on which architectural work has been done, and for which properties have been acquired, and on which the work is ready to be commenced.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I can answer the question very readily. The answer is that of course I hope not, because that would defeat the very purpose of the public works acceleration program. The House voted $450 million of the $500 million which had been requested; and the House included a requirement that the money must be matched by the States and local communities, and also that the projects included must be only Federal projects having to do with forest preservation. The House used the word "preservation," but clearly it meant also conservation, under the control of the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture. So only they could share in this program, which includes the public works program to which the Senator from Ohio refers.

We have deleted that language—merely in order to take the item to conference, for refinement. But it is generally thought that only a very small fraction of this money should be used for projects which are not the subject of matching funds by the States and the local communities.

I would hope the committee would not begin to emasculate or contract in any way the regular appropriations, which are predicated upon needs and preferences which are rather well understood. I hope that if a post office building or some other Federal building is to be built, no congressional committee will delete the funds for it from the regular appropriation bill, and suggest that, instead, the funds for it should be sought under the acceleration program, which was never intended for that purpose.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I understand. This program is labeled an acceleration program to hurry the construction of certain projects.

Mr. PASTORE. Yes, in places where there is a large unemployed labor force. That is the purpose and the criterion which must be met.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Does the Senator from Rhode Island agree with me that the adoption of an accelerated program at the expense of the well-designed program of the General Services Administration ought not to be perpetrated?

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct. It would be inconsistent, inimical, and incompatible with the very philosophy which gave birth to the acceleration program. I cannot state the situation any more simply than that.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As the chairman of the subcommittee knows, I intend to offer an amendment to cut the $450 million to $250 million. Several other Senators will join me in sponsoring the amendment. I agree with the Senator from Rhode Island that it is our hope that this provision will not affect the construction work already contemplated under the regular public works program; I refer to buildings to be paid for entirely with Federal Government funds. As the Senator from Rhode Island has said, the bill includes a provision that the States must contribute to the accelerated program, except for such construction on certain public lands.

Let me say that the point made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] was brought out in the committee; namely, that this provision does not contemplate that the buildings will be constructed entirely with Federal funds.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes. In other words, adoption of this accelerated public works program provision will not be allowed to operate adversely upon the established and existing General Services Administration program.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes.

Mr. PASTORE. All I am saying is that it would be a violation of the spirit and philosophy of it, if anyone were to do that—although, of course, we could not prevent a House committee or the House itself from taking such action.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes. But it is understood that the normal program should go forward first, and then the accelerated program can come along.

Mr. PASTORE. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes.

My point is merely that the $450 million is more than can properly be spent.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes; and I appreciate very much the answers given by the Senator from Rhode Island and his courtesy in yielding to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, if there are no further amendments to be offered——

Mr. PASTORE. There will be some other amendments. I hope that the Senator from Massachusetts will bring up his amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 9, line 3, it is proposed to strike out "$450 million" and insert in lieu thereof "$250 million."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the amendment now before the Senate would reduce the amount recommended by the committee for the accelerated public works, which is $450 million, to $250 million. This would be a reduction of $200 million.

Last year when the Senate passed the authorization bill and prior to the time the Senate adjourned, there was appropriated $400 million for accelerated public works. Of that $400 million by the middle of this month there had been, I believe, $275 million obligated, and there remained $125 million which the Commissioner said was earmarked but not obligated.

I pause in my presentation to ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, with respect to the committee request for an appropriation of $450 million, unless the language amendment, which must be agreed to by a two-thirds vote to be adopted, were adopted, the administration would have to obligate before July 1 of this year approximately $575 million. That figure is reached by adding the $450 million which is recommended in the bill to the $125 million which is not yet obligated.

That, in my opinion, would be inefficient and unrealistic. Therefore, I personally believe we should extend the time. I shall offer a second amendment later to ask that the time be extended to January 31, 1964. That would allow another 6 months for the obligating of the money, to see that it is used for proper objectives.

If $375 million has been obligated in 6 months, it would seem logical to allow another 6 months to obligate approximately $375 million more.

I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that in the conference report of last year this language was used regarding the accelerated public works program:

> The committee felt, therefore, that it would be desirable to provide a partial appropriation—

Namely, $400 million out of an authorization of $900 million—

> which would permit this program to get underway at the maximum possible rate for the next 4 months with the understanding that the administration can submit a supplemental estimate in January, at which time they should be in a position to support a definite program with specific recommendations for projects to be undertaken and justifications therefor.

That has never been done. These projects have never been justified up to the present time, so far as I know. This means that although a substantial number of the projects have been suggested for use in the program of accelerated public works, those projects have not been justified, and the administration has not been able to allocate them or to allocate and obligate the money as it should to make the program successful.

If the entire $900 million were to be appropriated, it is my understanding that that would create 110,000 onsite jobs, and off-site another 110,000. With respect to relieving unemployment, it is my understanding that that would represent a very small percentage.

Furthermore, we must keep in mind the type of labor to be employed. In Massachusetts three textile mills have been closed in the past month. We are all very sorry to know that. Also, a rifle plant has had to cut down. I suppose that the three textile plants and the rifle plant employ from 2,000 to 2,500 men. I do not know the exact figure.

Would the accelerated public works help those people? I do not see that it would help to put a man who is expert in making rifles to work on a public works program of this character. I cite that only as an example, because there are many people whom the passage of the bill would not help in any way.

As has been pointed out to me, if a contractor is doing work on a public works program and he needs additional workers—let us say an expert in mixing cement, or something such as that—presumably he would give the work to the man he knows, who is working on the project, rather than try to break in and train a new person.

Another reason for not appropriating all the money at this time is that at the present moment the unemployment rate is down. It is down very slightly, to be sure, but it is down in the month of March. All the news reports indicate that employment is going up—we hope—and business will get better—we hope—in the next 2, 3, or 4 months.

I believe that if we appropriate $250 million rather than $450 million at this time, with the $125 million which is available, there would be $375 million to be obligated, and that would be all the money which could be properly spent during this session of Congress and until January 31, 1964.

I agree with the Senator from Rhode Island, the chairman of our subcommittee, that the time for creating the work, the time for appropriating and obligating the money, should be extended beyond July 1. I hope it will be extended until January 31, 1964. The chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Rhode Island, says it should be for another fiscal year. In any event, the time should be extended. I believe it should be extended for 6 months. Congress could examine the program again in January, and appropriate more funds if the funds could be properly used at that time.

I hope that the amendment—which would provide $250 million instead of $450 million—will be agreed to. If it is agreed to, I shall move that the time be extended from July 1, 1963, until January 31, 1964, which will be a later amendment. It would be a legislative amendment which would require a two-thirds vote.

I hope that the pending agreement will be agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. In reference to the accelerated public works program, does it appear in the bill as a single item or is it embodied in the amounts which appear for the various activities covered by the bill?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is a separate item in and of itself. The information can be found on page 11 of the report.

Mr. CURTIS. How much is involved?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The committee voted $450 million. I have offered the amendment which is now being debated, to cut the amount by $200 million, to $250 million.

Mr. CURTIS. How much did the House provide?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The House provided $450 million, after a very extended discussion and on a fairly close vote.

Mr. CURTIS. Is this a correct interpretation of how this money is handled: It is appropriated to the President, and he allocates it to various programs in sums that are over and above and in addition to that for which the regular appropriations have been made in the past?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is my understanding; and the States or the localities have to provide 50 percent of it if they are financially able to do so. If they are not financially able to do so, they must provide 25 percent, except on certain public lands. Possibly language should be put in the bill so that it would not apply on certain public lands.

Mr. CURTIS. Is this the first appropriation for the accelerated program?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is not. We passed an appropriation of $400 million last autumn, on an authorization bill of $900 million, to be effective until next July.

Perhaps the Senator from Nebraska was not present in the Chamber when I quoted from the committee report of last year. The committee of conference adopted this language, which was the Senate committee's language:

> The committee felt, therefore, that it would be desirable to provide a partial appropriation which would permit this program to get under way at the maximum possible rate for the next 4 months with the understanding that the administration can submit a supplemental estimate in January, at which time they should be in a position to support a definite program with specific recommendations for projects to be undertaken and justifications therefor.

They have not yet been able to justify them or carry out the recommendations of the committee.

Mr. CURTIS. Does the Senator mean that the money already being given has not been spent?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The $275 million has been obligated, and another $125 million was unobligated as of the middle of this month.

Mr. CURTIS. It was my hope that the entire item could be stricken out, because what it amounts to is almost half a billion dollars, at a time when there is not any money in the Treasury, and it increases the national debt.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Some of the minority members, not all, of our committee discussed that question. In view of the House vote, whereby the figure of $450 million was adopted, and in view of the feelings of some members of our committee, we believe a reduction would be more advisable, practical, and possible than eliminating the whole amount.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the amendment. I do not like opposing my good friends, the senior Senator from Massachusetts, the senior Senator from North Dakota, and the senior Senator from Nebraska, because I hold their opinion and judgment in high regard. But I want to state the case, as I see it, for the appropriation of the full amount of $450 million recommended by the committee for the accelerated public works program.

In the first place, I point out that this amendment is not directed against the program itself. It is an amendment which seeks to reduce the amount which may be provided for this program.

I want to begin my remarks by recalling the action of the Senate last year in the process of its consideration of the substantive bill, the Public Works Acceleration Act, which established the program and authorized an appropriation of $900 million, and of the appropriations bill which provided $400 million. It seems to me the action which the Senate and the Congress took last year, on these two bills demonstrated that it was the purpose of the Congress to complete the appropriations for the entire $900 million authorized.

If the $450 million fixed by the Appropriations Committee is maintained, the total appropriated will be $850 million. When the emergency public works bill was sent to the Congress last year, it requested $2,600 million—$2 billion to be a so-called standby fund. I opposed, in the Public Works Committee, the standby authority. It was deleted, but the Senate authorized an expenditure of $1,500 million. The House then reduced it to $900 million. When the bill came back to the Senate, the authorization was maintained at $900 million.

Then when the appropriation bill came before the Senate last year, I believe I am correct in saying that an amendment was offered by the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Massachusetts similar to the one before us now—to reduce the $400 million recommended by the Appropriations Committee. It was defeated. So it seems clear that the course of action taken by the Senate last year both on the authorization bill and the appropriation bill, indicated that it desired to appropriate the full amount of $900 million.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to point out to the Senator, which he probably knows already, that as a member of the Public Works Committee, and the senior Republican on that committee at the present time, certainly he would want justification of the project. One of the arguments that appeals to me the most is that, while there may be an ample number of projects on which this money can be spent, if it was desired to do it, they have not been justified, and the administration has not been able to justify them up to this time. What we really are doing is giving carte blanche to the administration to spend money on projects the location of which we do not know and which have not been justified to the committee, even though the committee asked for justifications this year.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I think the RECORD needs to be clarified on this point. I do not know what the Senators mean by "justified." I know these projects have been approved by the various departments concerned, according to the criteria and the formula of the law. Of course, if it is meant by "justification" that the moneys could not be committed, of course they could not be. How could they be? That is why these requests are being made. The projects have qualified. I do not know what the Senators mean when they use the word "justify." They have been approved. The money cannot be obligated unless the funds are appropriated. That is why we are here.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I was getting ready to respond to the question raised by the Senator from Massachusetts. But first, I would like to give my chief reason for supporting this program, and for supporting approval of the whole $900 million. I am for the program because it offers opportunity to provide work for some of the nearly 5 million people out of work in this country. Whatever the efforts made by industry, many of these people cannot be put to work. We will be debating in this session the necessity of a tax cut to stimulate the economy, with the chief purpose that of immediately stimulating investment and consumption, so that private industry will be in time able to employ more workers. But after a tax bill is enacted it will take time—I hope not over a year or two—before the economy will be stimulated and private enterprise will come into full play in increasing employment. I ask what is going to be done with the unemployed people while we are waiting for a tax cut to stimulate the economy? I believe the Congress and the country have the duty to take action to help those who are out of work through no fault of their own.

Public works programs are not ideal for employment. This I recognize. But at least it is a program. According to the estimates given by Mr. Batt, the head of the Area Redevelopment Administration, the first $400 million furnished have put 50,000 people to work. It is estimated that the appropriation of $450 million in this bill will put another 60,000 people to work for a year.

It is also estimated that the total additional employment stimulated by the 2 appropriations will provide around 250,000 jobs for a year. That is no small amount of jobs.

I want to turn now to the question of whether these projections were justified. I am not on the Appropriations Committee, but I am a member of the Public Works Committee. I have been interested in this program, and I have followed its progress. I have followed the projects initiated in my State, and I have discussed the program with the officials of the agency in order to learn how they operate the program. I have read the statements made before the committee, and I have attended some of the hearings. The Secretary of Commerce operates the program. The money is allocated to agencies that are presently operating Government programs. The projects are justified to these agencies in the same way that similar projects are regularly justified for appropriations. That is my understanding. I should like to have the comments of the committee members on that point.

I will give an example, and then I will yield to the Senators who wish me to yield. I cite the Community Facilities Administration. This is an established Government agency. The agency lends money to communities for construction of sewage and water facilities. A great many of the projects under the accelerated public works program are for sewage and water facilities—the same type of projects that are justified to the Community Facilities Administration, in the same way as under their regular appropriations.

Mr. PASTORE. If the Senator will yield I should like to say that the amount of money involved here is less than the cost of a nuclear aircraft carrier. We are talking about 250,000 people. Those are 250,000 souls. What we are saying is let us cut the amount in half, and then we will have to worry about only 125,000 people, instead of 250,000. What is wrong with helping 250,000 people who are out of work?

How about the hospitals that we are building? That requires more people to staff the hospitals, and we create more hospital beds. As a matter of fact, we are actually putting the money where it belongs, where it will do a great deal of good.

We come to the floor of the Senate and appropriate a half billion dollars to build an aircraft carrier without batting an eyelash. However, if we try to appropriate $450 million to put people back to work, everyone begins to talk about balancing the budget.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. It is not that question at all. It is not a question of helping to put people back to work. What the Senator from Massachusetts and I are trying to do with the amendment is to bring about a better procedure in the spending of Federal money. If it is desired to build a post office, for example, that building must be justified before the Appropriations Committee. No building is put up until that is done. An agency must come to the Appropriations Committee and justify a proposed construction. That is all we are asking. What is wrong in having this agency come back to the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. PASTORE. If the Senator will yield further, I should like to say that that question came up when the authorization was before us last year. We went over that hill a long time ago. The Senator voted against it, but the majority of the Senate voted for the program. What the Senator from North Dakota is saying is, "I do not like this program. I never voted for it. I do not want it. Let us cut it in two. We cannot kill it, but let us tease it to death."

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I am not saying that at all. We are trying to bring about a better procedure for the spending of Federal money. What would happen if all projects were dealt with in this way? What if an agency downtown was given $4 billion to spend virtually as they saw fit?

Mr. PASTORE. As a matter of fact this money is being put under the surveillance of the President of the United States. In my book he is a better judge than any agency.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Is there one project in the bill in connection with which the Appropriations Committee has had a chance to say whether it wanted to appropriate money for that project? Is there one such project involved in the pending bill? This is a blanket amount of money for any project that the agency wishes to engage in.

Mr. COOPER. I am not a member of the Appropriations Committee, but I believe I am correct in the illustration I will give. Many of the projects for which money has been obligated under the accelerated public works program are known as community facilities projects. They are projects for the construction of sewage facilities and water facilities. This has been a Government program for a long time, administered by the Community Facilities Administration. I believe the Appropriations Committee makes available to the Community Facilities Administration for its regular annual program a certain amount of money, but I do not believe that the Appropriations Committee passes upon the specific sewage facility projects or water projects which the Community Facilities Administration approves, and for which it makes loans from the lump-sum appropriation made to it by the Congress.

The Community Facilities Administration, under the accelerated works program, is doing exactly the same kind of work and following the same procedures that it does under the regular appropriation bills. The distinction is that, with respect to the emergency program, it varies the percentage of the grant, depending upon the rate of unemployment in the community, or its surrounding labor market, a rate attested by the State unemployment agencies.

As another example, I cite the forest work. I believe we appropriate money to the Department of Agriculture for the improvement of forest roads and trails. We do not approve every specific forest road or trail. The Department of Agriculture decides what forest roads and trails shall be improved. The same procedure is followed under the accelerated public works program.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I believe that is true with respect to some minor projects under HEW. However, in almost every other respect the Department must show where the research laboratories or other projects will be built or where new buildings will be built on an Indian reservation.

Mr. PASTORE. The trouble is that there is a complete misconception here. What the Senator from North Dakota is talking about is Federal projects. Let us take the example of an authorization to appropriate $250,000 under the Hill-Burton Act, for the construction of hospitals. Do those people have to come up and tell the Appropriations Committee where they are going to build the hospital?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. But the State has a hand in it.

Mr. PASTORE. The State must play its part here too.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. What State agency has passed on any of these projects?

Mr. PASTORE. What does the Senator mean? The public works department of the State.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. There is no State agency involved here.

Mr. PASTORE. They must submit their projects. Otherwise how can we get matching?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I will shortly yield the floor to a member of the Committee on Appropriations. Before I close, I summarize by saying that I believe that the Senate's course of action last year indicated that it was the purpose of the Senate to approve the full $900 million. A number of projects are pending. They are very probably pending because of the belief that the money would be appropriated. That reason, however, is not to me the most compelling one. My chief reason for supporting this appropriation and the program is that it is a means to provide employment to people who are out of work. I do not see how we can fail to take note of the plight of the many people who have been out of work for so long a time.

The third point I make is that the Community Facilities Administration and other agencies apply the same test in approving these projects for emergency public works funds as they do for their regular programs. I wish to be fair about the point raised by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. It is correct that, with respect to some regular programs, State agencies may first be required to give approval; but I do not believe that, with respect to the community facilities program, the approval of a State agency is required.

I support the appropriation recommended by the committee. I hope that some Senators on this side of the aisle will give their support. I think that cuts in appropriations can be made this year, and that reductions of $3 or $4 billion can be made. But I do not wish to make reductions at the expense of people who have no jobs.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Massachusetts.

On October 13, 1962, Congress appropriated $400 million of the $900 million previously authorized for projects under the Public Works Acceleration Act. It was understood at the time Congress appropriated the $400 million that the administration could submit a supplemental estimate in January. President Kennedy has requested $500 million as the supplemental appropriation, and the present bill comes before us with approval by the House of Representatives of $450 million.

On October 24, 1962, the President signed the bill appropriating $400 million, which had been passed by Congress on October 13, and on the same day he allocated the first $165 million to six Federal agencies. Within days after the first allocation was made, men went to work on direct Federal projects in the national parks and forests, and on flood control and soil conservation projects. Within a month, 85 percent of the first allocation had been committed to projects.

On December 17, 1962, the President allocated $198 million to 11 Federal agencies. The balance of $37 million, allowing a small reserve of $3.7 million for contingencies, was allocated by the President by the end of February.

Within less than 5 months, therefore, the entire amount of $400 million had been allocated by the President to the participating Federal agencies, and virtually all of it had been committed to public works projects in all parts of the country. To protect local communities from proceeding with the preparation of applications and the raising of local moneys for projects which could not be funded, the Area Redevelopment Administration announced in early February that the processing of further applications would be discontinued, except those coming from economically most distressed areas. Since that time, applications have been accepted and dated as to the time of receipt, but have not been processed. The ARA, therefore, presently has applications for over 4,500 grant-in-aid projects totaling more than $960 million and applications for approximately 1,700 direct Federal projects totaling over $260 million in accelerated public works funds, thus making a total of more than 6,200 projects amounting to $1.2 billion in accelerated public works funds. I am advised that additional applications are being received from States and local communities at the rate of $300 million a month.

On October 24, 1962, the date when the President signed the appropriation act, rules and regulations were issued governing the distribution of moneys under the Public Works Acceleration Act that called attention to the fact that funds can be approved only for projects: First, which can be initiated or accelerated within a reasonably short period of time—meaning that preference will be given to projects which can be undertaken immediately, and that there must be reasonable assurance that onsite work will start within 120 days after funds are obligated; second, which will meet an essential public need; third, a substantial portion of which can be completed within 12 months after initiation or acceleration—"substantial portion" being interpreted to mean that more than one-half must be completed within 12 months from the first employment of onsite labor; fourth, which will contribute significantly to the reduction of local unemployment; and fifth, which are not inconsistent with locally approved comprehensive plans for the jurisdiction affected, wherever such plans exist.

The regulation prescribed that contractors and subcontractors for projects are required to employ qualified persons residing regularly in the area involved, except where such persons are not available, or where a lawful collective bargaining contract requires a contractor to offer employment to present or former employees, the number of employees not to exceed 20 percent.

No grants could be made for projects undertaken principally for the purpose of relocating a commercial or industrial plant from one area to another.

No funds could be made available for all-Federal projects with costs in excess of $400,000.

No more than 10 percent of the funds could be made available to any one State, and not less than $300 million of the $900 million authorized could be allocated to redevelopment areas designated under section 5(b) of the Area Redevelopment Act.

Additionally, the act provided that, notwithstanding any provision in existing grant-in-aid programs limiting grants to less than 50 percent, grants may be made under the Public Works Acceleration Act to bring the total Federal contribution up to 50 percent of the project cost, or up to 75 percent if the applicant lacks economic and financial capacity to assume the financial obligations required. In this regard, the regulations established criteria for relating grants above 50 percent to economic and financial capacity.

Areas having median family incomes of $1,700 or above, but less than $1,800, or twice the national unemployment rate for 3 of the last 4 years, are eligible for 58-percent grants. At the time of Senate hearings on the bill there were 64 such areas.

Areas having median family incomes of $1,600 or above, but less than $1,700, or twice the national unemployment rate for all of the last 4 years are eligible for 66-percent grants. At the time of Senate hearings on April 4 there were 99 such areas.

Areas having median family incomes under $1,600 or three times the national unemployment rate for all of the last 4 years are eligible for 75-percent grants. There were 166 such areas at the time the committee heard testimony on the bill.

The number of economically distressed areas eligible for assistance under the act increased from 1,069 as of September 8, 1962, to 1,228 at the time our committee held its hearings on the bill.

Out of the first $400 million appropriated, more than 3,700 projects have been financed in 50 States, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam. They are estimated to generate 52,000 man-years of on-site employment. They include over 2,100 direct Federal projects, requiring $105 million in accelerated public works funds and estimated to generate 12,000 man-years of on-site employment, and approximately 1,600 State and local projects requiring $289 million in accelerated public works funds and estimated to generate 40,000 man-years of on-site employment. The State and local projects would require additional local matching funds.

I should like to reiterate the statement I have just made: Out of the first $400 million appropriated, more than 3,700 projects have been financed. These include more than 2,100 direct Federal projects, requiring $105 million in accelerated public works funds, and approximately 1,600 State and local projects, requiring $289 million in accelerated public works funds.

As of February 28, 1,299 projects, involving $150 million in accelerated public works funds were actually underway, and the Area Redevelopment Administration estimates that another 500 projects were started in March.

Preference was given to projects requiring local matching funds, with 28 percent being allocated to direct Federal projects and 72 percent to grant-in-aid projects.

I think that Mr. William L. Batt, Jr., Administrator, Area Redevelopment Administration, is to be congratulated on the good administrative performance rendered in connection with the distribution of moneys under the first $400 million appropriation. In this connection, I should like to commend Mr. Sidney Woolner, Commissioner, Community Facilities Administration; Mr. Ivan A. Nestingen, Under Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and the heads of other participating agencies, and also to call attention to the fact that only $2.6 million out of the $400 million, or less than seven-tenth of 1 percent, was allocated for all administrative expenses of the ARA and the other agencies.

Turning now to the bill before us, which provides $450 million of the remaining $500 million authorized, I have been assured that the full $450 million can be legally obligated for essential public works projects by the end of the present fiscal year on June 30.

On April 5, in similar telegrams to Mr. Batt, Mr. Woolner, and Mr. Nestingen, I asked each to supply me with a firm figure adequate to meet the appropriation needs for accelerated public works projects which are sound and justifiable, and which may wisely be legally obligated by June 30, 1963. My telegrams were worded as follows:

> Prepare for me a firm figure adequate to meet the appropriation needs for APW projects which are sound and justifiable and which may wisely be legally obligated by June 30, 1963. If House of Representatives fails to restore House Appropriations Committee cuts at least in sufficient amount to meet cost of justifiable project applications which may be obligated during remainder of this fiscal year, I shall urge Senate Subcommittee on Deficiencies and Supplementals, of which I am a member, to so restore. The remaining portion of the $500 million previously included in the original $900 million authorization could then be appropriated when we mark up regular bill making appropriations for fiscal year 1964. I will press for that additional appropriation as a member of Senate subcommittees making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and for public works projects.

On April 9, 1963, in response to my telegram, I received from the Area Redevelopment Administrator, William L. Batt, Jr., a telegram which I shall read:

> Thank you for your telegram advising that you will urge Senate Subcommittee on Deficiencies and Supplementals to restore accelerated public works funds if House fails to do so. Careful scrutiny of applications indicates that $450 million can be obligated by June 30, 1963, for sound and justifiable projects.

On April 17, 1963, Commissioner Woolner responded to my April 5 telegram with a letter from which I shall read:

> This is in response to your telegram of April 5, asking for a firm figure adequate to meet the appropriation needs for accelerated public works projects which are sound and justifiable and which may wisely be legally obligated by June 30, 1963.
>
> We have made a careful survey of the projects now in hand but not yet approved and have determined that we can obligate whatever portion of a $450 million or $500 million appropriation would be allotted to us.

Mr. Nestingen replied on April 26, by letter, saying that:

> The three participating programs in this Department inform me that, in total, they could obligate $228,164,921 by June 30, 1963.
>
> This total has been computed as follows: Waste treatment works construction grant program, 613 projects requesting $102,814,921 accelerated public works assistance; Hill-Burton hospital construction program, 261 projects requesting $121,498,063 accelerated public works assistance; Indian health sanitation program, 10 projects to use $1,800,000 accelerated public works assistance.

These assurances by Mr. Batt, Mr. Woolner, and Mr. Nestingen were made after each had diligently examined his files of applications which could be legally obligated by June 30 of this year.

Mr. President, in view of the experience already gained under this program, and in the light of the benefits which have accrued and presently are accruing from a well-administered accelerated public works activity, it is obvious that the requested $450 million supplemental appropriation could do much to alleviate an imperative need insofar as economically distressed communities are concerned. At the same time, the expenditure of this appropriation could also serve the Nation in a wholesome fashion, because our economy is intricately interdependent, and islands of economic distress could retard the advance of the overall economy of the country.

In the face of other national expenditures, the sum of $450 million is relatively small—as has already been pointed out by the chairman of the subcommittee. But the good which can be realized from this appropriation will have a progressive effect on the economy far in excess of the money involved.

In West Virginia, the accelerated public works program is proving itself to be a positive force which is helping to bring about the economic emergence of many stricken communities. It is also a force which has stimulated in many communities a remarkable, cohesive effort to gather together their depleted energies for this opportunity to get back on their feet.

It is not trite to say that the accelerated public works program is giving fresh hope and encouragement to thousands of persons who for the past several years have been living submarginal and marginal existences. But how many of us appreciate the difficulties which most economically distressed communities have been undergoing in order to raise from among their shriveled resources the 25 percent or 50 percent share of their cost of a project which may embody hopes and ambitions for a better future. It is, indeed, illuminating and rewarding to know that depressed communities, when offered a helping hand, can be relied upon to scrape the bottom of an already well-scraped barrel, for the sake of a more promising tomorrow.

In West Virginia, there is heartfelt appreciation of the Public Works Acceleration Act. The direct Federal grants have been substantial. The State has received $788,000 in Corps of Engineers projects; $1,245,000 for National Forest work; $1,062,600 from the Bureau of Public Roads; $250,000 for the National Park Service; and $203,000 for Interior Department construction.

In addition, there have been 80 participation project approvals through the Community Facilities Administration and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. These total $16,044,260 in grants. Altogether, therefore, West Virginia has received $19,592,860 under this program. I am informed by Mr. Paul Crabtree, assistant to West Virginia's Governor W. W. Barron, that this, when supplemented by local moneys, should provide a total of about $30 million in new construction, and that it will mean at least 1 year's work at good wages for 3,000 persons in need of jobs.

As of today, West Virginia localities have 151 applications pending for accelerated public works funds, totaling $41,301,363 in Federal grant requests. These include 104 projects, amounting to $22,928,856 pending with the Community Facilities Administration, and an additional 47 projects, with a dollar value of $18,372,507, pending with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The $41,301,363 worth of pending West Virginia accelerated public works applications is not large, in terms of moneys, especially when measured against correlated values. The sum is the approximate cost of five B–52 bombers or the price of about 40 M–60 tanks. But in terms of employment opportunities in West Virginia, $41,301,363, when matched with approximately $20 million in local funds, could mean job opportunities approximating 6,000 man-years of work. In terms of bricks, mortar, glass, wood, steel, and other building materials, this sum of money also means additional employment opportunities in American industries. And in terms of direly needed community facilities, this sum could mean new water systems, protection against water pollution, the development of tourist facilities, and the availability of other essential public accommodations which serve to make communities more attractive to industry and to business.

One further effect could result from the expenditure of additional moneys through the accelerated public works program in West Virginia. It could help to end the outmigration of many young people from my State—people who have been forced to go elsewhere in search of jobs.

The Census Bureau has reported that West Virginia lost an additional 4.7 percent of its population between the time of the 1960 census and July 1, 1962—a condition which no other State experienced during that period. According to figures released by the West Virginia Department of Employment Security, this population loss continued through 1962, for it has reported that there were 6,800 fewer nonagricultural wage and salary workers in the State's labor force in January, 1963, than were recorded in January, 1962.

As a vehicle for providing job opportunities, the accelerated public works program will more than prove its worth. As a means of providing our country with facilities of growing and enduring economic value, the program is exceptionally meaningful.

There have been charges that the program nurtures boondoggling at the taxpayers' expense. Mr. President, nothing is farther from the truth. Contracts for projects are bid upon competitively by responsible business firms which usually are required to meet certain construction deadlines. These firms could not afford shovel-leaning or other time-killing attitudes on the part of persons they employ.

Let it be said unequivocally: The accelerated public works program puts idle people to work—not to work at being idle.

Pending applications for accelerated public works projects far exceed the requested $450-million appropriation as I have already indicated. It is my hope that additional funds can be provided for the program for the fiscal year 1964. In the meantime, however, the need for congressional approval of the requested supplemental appropriation is most urgent. Failure to provide the $450 million requested for the program for the remainder of this fiscal year would be an action unworthy of the American tradition of helping those of our neighbors who earnestly need assistance, and are willing to work and to contribute to help themselves.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, a list of the West Virginia projects that have been approved, under the accelerated public works program, as of April 25, 1963, together with a list of West Virginia projects pending with the Community Facilities Administration and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, as of April 25, 1963.

There being no objection, the lists were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Accelerated public works projects approved in West Virginia through Apr. 25, 1963

Area	Project	Agency	Number	APW grant	Date approved
5a Beckley:					
Raleigh:					
Beckley	Administration buildings	CFA	28G	$168,000	Jan. 11, 1963
Do	Municipal garage, shop, and parking	CFA	29G	63,000	Do.
Do	Waste treatment	HEW	----------	54,000	Feb. 14, 1963
Stephens Lake	Recreation facility	CFA	12G	1,200,000	Mar. 26, 1963
Bluefield:					
Mercer:					
Princeton	Library	CFA	79G	114,800	Mar. 22, 1963
Green Valley	Sewers	CFA	43G	428,000	Mar. 29, 1963
Do	Water facility	CFA	64G	338,000	Apr. 12, 1963
Midway PSD	do	CFA	21G	11,500	Feb. 22, 1963
Bluefield	Parking facility	CFA	23G	190,000	Jan. 23, 1963
Do	Sewer system	CFA	----------	318,780	Apr. 24, 1963
Athens	Streets	CFA	93G	94,000	Apr. 12, 1963
Midway PSD	Waste treatment	HEW	----------	16,550	Mar. 25, 1963
Charleston:					
Kanawha:					
Kanawha River	Install mooring locks	CE	----------	150,000	Nov. 2, 1962
South Charleston	Hospital addition and remodel	HEW	----------	541,000	Nov. 1, 1962
River Bend	Water facility	CFA	53G	41,500	Feb. 22, 1963
St. Albans	do	CFA	16G	149,000	Jan. 17, 1963
Do	Library	CFA	5G	69,000	Nov. 5, 1963
Chesapeake	Sewers	CFA	102G	147,500	Apr. 12, 1963
Clarksburg:					
Harrison:					
Clarksburg	Streets	CFA	9G	602,000	Mar. 12, 1963
Milford	Water facility	CFA	14G	69,000	Jan. 17, 1963
Lumberport	Water and sewers	CFA	8G	140,000	Nov. 17, 1962
Salem	Water facility	CFA	19G	59,000	Feb. 5, 1963
Taylor:					
Grafton	do	CFA	2G	230,000	Nov. 1, 1962
Fairmont:					
Marion:					
Fairmont	do	CFA	18G	199,000	Jan. 17, 1963
Munnington	do	CFA	88G	192,000	Apr. 3, 1963
Huntington-Ashland:					
Cabell:					
Huntington	Hospital addition	HEW	----------	1,005,000	Feb. 14, 1963
Monel Park	Sewers	CFA	24G	106,000	Feb. 6, 1963
Ceredo	Waste treatment	HEW	----------	18,000	Nov. 15, 1962
Do	Boat dock facility	CE	----------	60,000	----------
Spring Valley	Water facility	CFA	27G	59,000	Mar. 16, 1963
Fort Gay	Sewers	CFA	33G	50,000	Mar. 8, 1963
Boone:					
Madison	General hospital	HEW	----------	660,000	Nov. 2, 1962
Lincoln:					
Hamlin	Courthouse	CFA	7G	396,000	Mar. 7, 1963
West Hamlin	Waste treatment	HEW	----------	66,000	Feb. 14, 1963
Logan:					
Logan	Courthouse	CFA	78G	1,208,000	Feb. 9, 1963
Morgantown:					
Monongalia:					
Morgantown	Airport	CFA	75G	397,000	Feb. 22, 1963
Do	Remodel city hall	CFA	48G	9,000	Feb. 5, 1963
Westover City	Streets	CFA	42G	109,600	Feb. 6, 1963
New Martinsville:					
Tyler:					
Sisterville	Library	CFA	47G	49,000	Feb. 22, 1963
Oak Hill-Montgomery:					
Fayette:					
Montgomery	Waste treatment	HEW	----------	107,000	Nov. 2, 1962
Mount Hope	Repair municipal stadium	CFA	87G	31,000	Apr. 9, 1963
Parkersburg:					
Pleasants:					
St. Mary's	Hospital addition	HEW	----------	450,000	Jan. 10, 1963
Do	Courthouse heating	CFA	----------	12,500	Apr. 23, 1963
Wood:					
Parkersburg	Streets	CFA	69G	70,000	Feb. 22, 1963
Vienna	do	CFA	4G	14,000	Nov. 1, 1962
Ritchie:					
Cairo	Sewers	CFA	34G	63,000	Feb. 22, 1963
Point Pleasant-Gallipolis:					
Mason:					
New Haven	Waste treatment	HEW	----------	33,000	Feb. 14, 1963
Do	Sewer system	CFA	----------	84,000	Apr. 23, 1963
Point Pleasant	Streets	CFA	45G	325,000	Mar. 6, 1963
Jackson:					
Ravenswood	do	CFA	22G	117,000	Jan. 26, 1963
Ronceverte-White Sulphur Springs:					
Greenbrier:					
Monogahela National Forest	Forest development	FS	----------	81,000	Oct. 28, 1962
Do	do	FS	----------	40,000	Feb. 11, 1963
Forest Highway 98	Widen and realine road	BPR	----------	270,000	Nov. 1, 1962
Monroe:					
Forest Highway 98	do	BPR	----------	330,000	Do.
Red Sulphur PSD	Water system	CFA	----------	113,000	Apr. 24, 1963

Accelerated public works projects approved in West Virginia through Apr. 25, 1963—Continued

Area	Project	Agency	Number	APW grant	Date approved
5a Welch:					
McDowell:					
Welch	Courthouse	CFA	117G	$50,000	Feb. 26, 1963
Do	Streets and sidewalks	CFA		140,250	Apr. 24, 1963
Keystone	Water facility	CFA	111G	26,000	Mar. 16, 1963
Kimball	Streets	CFA	63G	7,000	Feb. 22, 1963
Do	Fire station	CFA	38G	7,000	Feb. 6, 1963
Do	Parking lot	CFA	37G	5,000	Do.
Wheeling:					
Ohio:					
Bethlehem	Waste treatment	HEW		183,000	Jan. 15, 1963
Do	Sewers	CFA	26G	281,000	Mar. 29, 1963
Wheeling	Water treatment plant	CFA	10G	858,000	Nov. 9, 1962
Do	Recreation facility	CFA		137,460	Apr. 24, 1963
Moundsville	Sewers and streets	CFA	11G	766,000	Jan. 29, 1963
Pikeville-Mingo:					
Mingo:					
Williamson	Waste treatment	HEW		272,000	Nov. 14, 1962
Chattaroy PSD	Water and sewers	CFA	73G, 74G	294,000	Apr. 2, 1963
5b Braxton:					
Braxton:					
Sutton Reservoir	Recreation facility	CE		400,000	Nov. 2, 1962
Gilmer:					
Gilmer:					
Glenville	Waste treatment	HEW		211,000	Feb. 2, 1963
Do	Sewers	CFA	15G	71,000	Feb. 7, 1963
Grant:					
Grant:					
Monongahela National Forest	Forest development	FS		11,000	Oct. 28, 1962
Do	do	FS		5,000	Feb. 11, 1963
Bayard	Flood protection	CE		168,000	Nov. 2, 1962
Hampshire:					
Hampshire:					
George Washington National Forest	Forest development	FS		10,000	Jan. 10, 1963
Hardy:					
Hardy:					
George Washington National Forest	do	FS		15,000	Do
Do	do	FS		113,000	Oct. 29, 1962
Moorefield	Waste treatment	HEW		40,000	Nov. 14, 1962
Lincoln:					
Lincoln:					
West Hamlin	do	HEW		66,000	Feb. 14, 1963
Nicholas:					
Nicholas:					
Monongahela National Forest	Forest construction	FS		60,000	Jan. 10, 1963
Do	Forest development	FS		8,000	Oct. 29, 1962
Summersville	Administration building	CFA	50G	165,000	Mar. 7, 1963
Forest Highway No. 39-1 (1)	Widen, patch, repave, and shoulders	BPR		208,600	Apr. 11, 1963
Pendleton:					
Pendleton:					
George Washington National Forest	Forest development	FS		50,000	Jan. 10, 1963
Monongahela National Forest	do	FS		30,000	Do.
George Washington National Forest	Forest construction	FS		30,000	Do.
Do	Forest development	FS		87,000	Oct. 29, 1962
Monongahela National Forest	do	FS		55,000	Do.
Pocahontas:					
Pocahontas:					
Monongahela National Forest	do	FS		60,000	Jan. 10, 1963
Do	Forest construction	FS		100,000	Do.
Do	Forest development	FS		85,000	Oct. 29, 1962
Forest Highway No. 45	Replace bridge	BPR		200,000	Oct. 26, 1962
Preston:					
Preston:					
Forest Highway No. 219	Highway improvements	BPR		54,000	Jan. 10, 1963
Rowlesburg	Water facility	CFA	35G	147,000	Feb. 22, 1963
Do	Sewers	CFA	36G	32,000	Feb. 6, 1963
Do	Waste treatment	HEW		83,000	Jan. 15, 1963
Randolph:					
Randolph:					
Monongahela National Forest	Forest development	FS		20,000	Jan. 10, 1963
Do	Forest construction	FS		80,000	Do.
Do	Forest development	FS		40,000	Oct. 29, 1962
Beverly	Water facility	CFA	3G	80,000	Nov. 1, 1962
Summers:					
Summers:					
Blue Stone Reservoir	Recreation facility	CE		10,000	Nov. 2, 1962
Hinton	Administration building	CFA	71G	12,700	Mar. 26, 1963
Do	County court building	CFA	55G	13,000	Feb. 6, 1963
Do	City hall	CFA		54,120	Apr. 24, 1963
Tucker:					
Tucker:					
Monongahela National Forest	Forest development	FS		30,000	Jan. 10, 1963
Do	do	FS		56,000	Oct. 29, 1962
Parsons	Water facility	CFA	6G	102,000	Nov. 9, 1962
Upshur:					
Upshur:					
Buckhannon	Sewers	CFA	41G	25,000	Feb. 6, 1963
Webster:					
Webster:					
Monongahela National Forest	Forest development	FS		10,000	Jan. 10, 1963
Do	Forest construction	FS		150,000	Do.
Do	Forest development	FS		19,000	Oct. 28, 1962
Webster Springs	Addition to general hospital	HEW		76,000	Nov. 3, 1962
Addison	Streets	CFA	62G	57,000	Mar. 22, 1963
LS Martinsburg:					
Berkeley:					
Martinsburg	Water facility	CFA	70G	236,000	Feb. 22, 1963
Do	Waste treatment	HEW		550,000	Mar. 19, 1963
Jefferson:					
Harpers Ferry National Monument	Clean-up	NPS		250,000	Jan. 17, 1963
Lee Town Hatchery	Buildings	SFW		203,000	Jan. 14, 1963
	Total projects			19,592,860	

NOTE.—Figures rounded to nearest thousand in some instances.

Accelerated public works projects approved in West Virginia through Apr. 25, 1963—Continued

WEST VIRGINIA PARTICIPATION IN THE ACCELERATED PUBLIC WORKS ACT

Community facilities administration (62 projects)	$11,603,710
Health, Education, and Welfare (18 projects)	4,440,550
Corps of Engineers	788,000
U.S. Forest Service	1,245,000
Bureau of Public Roads	1,062,600
National Park Service	$250,000
Department of the Interior	203,000
Subtotal	3,548,600
Total	19,592,860

West Virginia projects pending with Community Facilities Administration, Apr. 25, 1963

Project No.	Locality	Type of project	Grant request
WVA-APW-161G	Philippi	City building	$177,350
WVA-APW- 82G	Martinsburg	Streets	562,000
WVA-APW- 49	Cabell County	Courtroom	86,300
WVA-APW-158G	Cabell County court	Recreation	36,000
WVA-APW- 56G	Huntington	Sewer	37,000
WVA-APW- 57G	do	do	15,800
WVA-APW- 58G	do	do	15,200
WVA-APW- 59G	do	do	54,300
WVA-APW- 60G	do	do	31,600
WVA-APW-136G	do	Streets	150,500
WVA-APW- 61G	do	Sewer	21,000
WVA-APW-144G	do	Streets	110,200
WVA-APW-157G	do	do	58,700
WVA-APW-152G	Milton	Reservoir	115,529
WVA-APW- 77G	Pea Ridge PSD	Sewer	564,000
WVA-APW-131G	Grantsville	Swimming pool	29,700
WVA-APW- 91G	Fayetteville	Streets	15,000
WVA-APW-135G	do	do	347,004
WVA-APW- 81G	Oak Hill	do	853,733
WVA-APW-100G	Smithers	do	27,508
WVA-APW-162G	Glenville	do	146,023
WVA-APW- 20G	Greenbrier County	Courthouse	37,389
WVA-APW- 51G	Lewisburg	Pumping station	66,000
WVA-APW-145G	do	Water	60,060
WVA-APW- 84G	White Sulphur Springs	Streets	55,555
WVA-APW-120G	Benedum Airport	Terminal building	53,586
WVA-APW- 25G	Hepzibah PSD	Water	349,000
WVA-APW- 86G	do	do	245,000
WVA-APW- 39G	Nutter Fort	Sewer	74,000
WVA-APW- 30G	Stonewood	do	418,000
WVA-APW- 44G	Ripley	Swimming pool	40,000
WVA-APW-134G	do	Water	43,250
WVA-APW-141G	do	Streets	68,500
WVA-APW-107G	Cedar Grove	do	10,000
WVA-APW- 67G	Charleston	Incinerator	566,000
WVA-APW-101G	Chesapeake	Streets	96,000
WVA-APW-104G	Dunbar	do	68,000
WVA-APW-167G	East Bank	do	37,000
WVA-APW- 98G	Glasgow	Recreation	122,500
WVA-APW-106G	do	Water system	15,000
WVA-APW-110G	do	Dike	29,000
WVA-APW-165G	Kanawha County	Library building	430,000
WVA-APW-133G	Poca	Sewer	35,000
WVA-APW- 72G	St. Albans	do	25,000
WVA-APW- 83G	do	Streets	111,000
WVA-APW-128G	West Virginia SRC	Maintenance building	140,000
WVA-APW- 31G	Lincoln PSD	Water	120,000
WVA-APW- 68G	Pleasant View PSD	Sewer	36,874
WVA-APW- 46G	West Hamlin	Water	184,887
WVA-APW-166G	Logan	Parking	172,500
WVA-APW-119G	Fairmont	Streets	161,000
WVA-APW- 85G	Marshall County PSD	Water	192,560
WVA-APW-142G	Moundsville	Municipal building	142,065
WVA-APW-132G	Hartford	Water	59,975
WVA-APW-148G	Henderson	Streets	$198,750
WVA-APW-155G	do	Sewer	47,700
WVA-APW- 52G	Point Pleasant	City building	300,000
WVA-APW- 54G	Bluewell PSD	Water	519,000
WVA-APW- 76G	Lily Grove PSD	Sewer	135,300
WVA-APW- 92G	Princeton	Streets	297,518
WVA-APW-112G	Princeton Sanitary Board.	Sewer	37,450
WVA-APW- 65G	Mingo County	Courthouse	1,615,500
WVA-APW- 80G	Williamson	Streets	1,125,000
WVA-APW-124G	Laurel Point PSD	Water	75,000
WVA-APW-143G	Monongalia County	Courthouse	1,277,160
WVA-APW- 99G	Morgantown	Library building	156,600
WVA-APW-140G	do	Streets	497,640
WVA-APW- 66G	Paw Paw PSD	Water	197,200
WVA-APW-159G	Star City	Streets	244,200
WVA-APW-122G	Red Sulphur PSD	Sewer	404,000
WVA-APW-149G	Richwood	do	64,839
WVA-APW-150G	do	Streets	111,870
WVA-APW- 13G	Wheeling	Auditorium	1,357,000
WVA-APW-156G	Franklin	Water	36,731
WVA-APW-125G	Belmcnt	Storm sewer	218,875
WVA-APW-164G	Durbin	Streets and sidewalks	46,592
WVA-APW-129G	Putnam County	Courthouse addition	45,750
WVA-APW- 89G	Mabscott	Streets	27,000
WVA-APW-154G	North Beckley PSD	Sewer	714,000
WVA-APW- 94G	Raleigh County Armory Board.	Calendar board	225,000
WVA-APW-153G	Shady Springs PSD	Sewer	875,000
WVA-APW- 95G	State armory board	Armory renovation	22,500
WVA-APW-115G	Roone County	Courthouse and library Building.	795,000
WVA-APW-147G	Spencer	Streets	51,480
WVA-APW-138G	Hinton	do	232,398
WVA-APW-114G	Grafton	Sewer	139,000
WVA-APW-146G	Thomas	Water	101,300
WVA-APW-108G	Paden City	Storm sewer	29,982
WVA-APW-116G	Paden	Water	23,250
WVA-APW-118G	Paden City	Streets	607,000
WVA-APW-163G	Sistersville	Sewer	50,000
WVA-APW- 40G	Buchannon	Streets	644,916
WVA-APW-160G	Kenova	Water	49,000
WVA-APW-168G	Wayne	Sewer	12,000
WVA-APW-169G	do	Water	22,000
WVA-APW-170G	do	Streets	87,000
WVA-APW-109G	Addiscn	Sidewalks	77,025
WVA-APW-151G	Webster Springs PSD	Sewer	171,346
WVA-APW- 96G	New Martinsville	Streets	520,500
WVA-APW-103G	do	Recreation	93,400
WVA-APW- 97G	Parkersburg	Reservoir	71,686
WVA-APW-123G	do	Streets	44,000
WVA-APW-113G	Vienna	do	446,000
WVA-APW-127G	Pineville	Water	68,250

Total projects pending, 104, $22,928,856.

West Virginia projects pending with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Apr. 25, 1963

Locality	Type of project	Dollar value
1. Elkins	Memorial General Hospital	$2,125,860
2. Wheeling	OVG Hospital—quarters	435,000
3. Summers County	Summers County General Hospital.	1,486,708
4. Wheeling	Sewer treatment plant	31,900
5. Lilly Grove PSD	do	27,700
6. Pea Ridge PSD	do	454,035
7. Webster Springs	do	232,945
8. Green Valley-Glenwood PSD	do	212,665
9. Marmet	do	191,888
10. Milton	do	61,851
11. Salem	do	294,545
12. Charleston	do	923,725
13. Cameron	do	243,902
14. Fairview	do	109,718
15. Charleston	do	422,550
16. Parsons	do	111,500
17. Chesapeake	do	143,364
18. Morgantown	do	2,211,540
19. Pleasant PSD	do	39,884
20. Hepzibah PSD	do	429,750
21. Petersburg	do	141,290
22. Grafton	do	650,000
23. Mason	do	19,167
24. Parkersburg	do	113,348
25. Barboursville	Sewer treatment plant	$57,500
26. Huntington	do	572,344
27. Keyser	do	445,000
28. Farmington	do	95,700
29. Red Sulphur PSD	do	85,000
30. Burnsville	do	82,750
31 Chatteroy PSD	do	211,650
32. Logan	do	74,800
33. Franklin	do	40,787
34. Fairmont	do	1,910,000
35. Richwood	do	264,585
36. Mannington	do	422,240
37. Webster Springs PSD	Sewer system	239,682
38. Henderson	Sewa e treatment plan	31,400
39. Thomas	Sewage system	84,525
40. Star City	Sewer treatment	77,913
41. North Beckley PSD	do	243,000
42. Shady Springs PSD No. 1	do	222,000
43. Hamlin	do	18,146
44. Wayne	do	64,000
45. Montgomery	Laird Hospital addition	900,000
46. Lewisburg	Greenbrier Health Center	99,000
47. Weston	Stonewall Jackson Hospital	1,015,650
Total projects pending		18,372,507

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point excerpts from the Federal Register of November 10, 1962, and excerpts from the Federal Register of November 21, 1962, in which appeared the regulations and rules which govern the administration of this worthy program.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Federal Register, Nov. 10, 1962]

TITLE 44—PUBLIC PROPERTY AND WORKS

CHAPTER VII—OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR, HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY (COMMUNITY FACILITIES)

Part 705—Public works acceleration

The heading of chapter VII of title 44 of the Code of Federal Regulations is changed to read as set forth above. Chapter VII is amended by adding the following new Part 705—Public Works Acceleration, as follows:

Sec.
705.1. Purpose of Public Works Acceleration Act.
705.2. Scope.
705.3. Definitions.
705.4. Grants.
705.5. Criteria for grants in excess of 50 percent.
705.6. Loans.
705.7. Eligible applicants.
705.8. Eligible areas.
705.9. Eligible public works.
705.10. Requirements for assistance.
705.11. Net increase in applicant's public works expenditures.
705.12. Projects eligible under other grant programs.
705.13. Time in which projects must be initiated.
705.14. Time in which projects must be completed.
705.15. Projects which meet an essential public need.
705.16. Contribution to reduction of local unemployment.
705.17. Local employment preference.
705.18. Relationship to locally approved comprehensive plans.
705.19. Prevailing rate of wage and overtime requirements.
705.20. Information, application forms, and applications.

Authority: §§ 705.1 to 705.20 issued under sec. 204 of Housing Amendments of 1955, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 1494, and sec. 402(c)(1) of Housing Act of 1950, as amended, 12 U.S.C. 1749a(c)(1).

§ 705.1. Purpose of Public Works Acceleration Act.

The purpose of the Public Works Acceleration Act (Public Law 87–658) is to provide immediate useful work for the unemployed and underemployed in those communities in which projects assisted under the act must be located, and to help these communities to meet longstanding public needs, improve community services, and enhance the health and welfare of citizens of the Nation.

§ 705.2. Scope.

This part relates to that segment of the Public Works Acceleration Act administered by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

§ 705.3. Definitions.

(a) Act: "Act" shall mean the "Public Works Acceleration Act" (Public Law 87–658).

(b) Administrator: "Administrator" shall mean the Housing and Home Finance Administrator or a Housing and Home Finance Agency officer empowered to exercise any of the Administrator's functions under the act.

§ 705.4. Grants.

The act authorizes the Administrator to make a grant of 50 percent of the cost of construction of any project for public works or facilities of the type for which financial assistance could have been provided by the Administrator under the public facility loans program (sec. 202(a)(1) of Housing Amendments of 1955, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 1492 (a)(1)) on September 14, 1962. Grants up to 75 percent of the cost of construction are authorized for such projects that are located in certain areas in which the State or local government does not have economic and financial capacity to assume all of the additional obligations required to complete the project.

§ 705.5. Criteria for grants in excess of 50 percent.

Criteria for determining in which areas eligible projects may receive grants in excess of 50 percent will be published by the Secretary of Commerce. On the basis of income and unemployment criteria published by the Secretary of Commerce, and after considering and making deductions for any net revenues that are expected to be generated by the project, the Administrator will authorize, in these areas, grants of 50 percent, 58 percent, 66 percent, or 75 percent of the cost of construction of an eligible public works project.

§ 705.6. Loans.

The act authorizes the Administrator to make loans under the public facility loans program to finance the remainder of the cost of any project for public works or facilities partially financed by grants made under the act, when the applicant is otherwise unable to borrow, on reasonable terms, its share of the cost of such project.

§ 705.7. Eligible applicants.

Only public entities described in section 202(a)(1) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 as amended (42 U.S.C. 1492(a)(1)), are eligible for grant assistance. The public entities described therein include: municipalities and other political subdivisions and instrumentalities of States (including public agencies and instrumentalities of one or more municipalities or other political subdivisions in the same State); and Indian tribes.

§ 705.8. Eligible areas.

In order to qualify for assistance, a public works project must be located in:

(a) An area currently designated by the Secretary of Labor as having been an area of substantial unemployment for at least 9 of the preceding 12 months, or

(b) An area currently designated by the Secretary of Commerce under section 5 (a) or (b) of the Area Redevelopment Act (42 U.S.C. 2504 (a) or (b)) as a "redevelopment area."

§ 705.9. Eligible public works.

(a) To be eligible for grant assistance, a public work must meet an essential public need and be within the legal authority of the applicant to plan, finance, and construct.

(b) No assistance will be provided to finance the construction of urban mass transit facilities; to finance housing projects other than employee housing which is incidental and necessary to an otherwise eligible public works project; or, directly or indirectly, to finance the planning or construction of any school or other educational facility.

§ 705.10. Requirements for assistance.

Assistance will be made available only for projects:

(a) Which can be initiated or accelerated within a reasonably short period of time;

(b) Which will meet an essential public need;

(c) A substantial portion of which can be completed within 12 months after initiation or acceleration;

(d) Which will contribute significantly to the reduction of local unemployment;

(e) Which are not inconsistent with locally approved comprehensive plans for the jurisdiction affected, wherever such plans exist.

§ 705.11. Net increase in applicant's public works expenditures.

As a condition to receiving grant assistance, an eligible applicant will be required to:

(a) Certify that its proposed or planned total expenditure (exclusive of Federal funds) for capital improvement projects will be increased, for the fiscal year in which the assisted project is to be initiated, by an amount approximately equal to the non-Federal funds required to be made available for public works projects assisted under this act; and

(b) Submit such supporting documents as the Administrator may require.

§ 705.12. Projects eligible under other grant programs.

No grant assistance will be made available for any public works project eligible for grant assistance covering any part of the cost of construction of the project under any other Federal program.

§ 705.13. Time in which projects must be initiated.

To be eligible for grant assistance, a public works project must be initiated or accelerated within a reasonably short period of time. Consideration will initially be given only to projects for which there is a reasonable expectation that onsite work will commence within 120 days following approval of an application for grant assistance.

§ 705.14. Time in which projects must be completed.

To be eligible for grant assistance, a public work must be such that a substantial portion of it can be completed within 12 months after initiation or acceleration. A project will be deemed to meet this requirement if there is reasonable expectation that over half can be completed within 12 months after first employment of onsite labor.

§ 705.15. Projects which meet an essential public need.

To be eligible for assistance, a public works project must meet an essential public need. A project will be deemed to meet an essential public need if it will provide a needed service to the public and will be usable upon completion.

§ 705.16. Contribution to reduction of local unemployment.

Financial assistance is authorized only for public works projects the construction of which will contribute significantly to the reduction of unemployment in the area in which the project is located. To assure that financial assistance does contribute significantly to the reduction of local unemployment, no grant assistance will be provided for any public works project unless the estimated onsite employment costs exceed 20 percent of the total direct construction costs of the project.

§ 705.17. Local employment preference.

Eligible applicants which undertake public works assisted with a Federal grant shall require all contractors or subcontractors on such public works project to give preference in employment on such public works, insofar as practicable, to qualified local labor.

§ 705.18. Relationship to locally approved comprehensive plans.

To be eligible for grant assistance, a public works project must not be inconsistent with locally approved comprehensive plans for the jurisdiction affected, wherever such plans exist. Whenever there has been developed a comprehensive plan, land use program, or other plan for the orderly growth of an area in which an eligible applicant proposes to locate a public works project, evidence will be required that the public works project proposed is not inconsistent with existing approved plans or programs.

§ 705.19. Prevailing rate of wage and overtime requirements.

All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on public works projects which receive grant assistance shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a–276a–5), and every such employee shall receive compensation at a rate not less than one and one-half times the basic rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of 8 hours in any calendar day or 40 hours in the workweek as the case may be and in accordance with the provisions of the Contract Work Hours Standards Act (Public Law 87-581, 40 U.S.C. 327-332).

§ 705.20. Information, application forms, and applications.

Information and application forms may be obtained from, and applications submitted to, the Director of Community Facilities in the Regional Office of the Housing and Home Finance Agency which serves the area in which the applicant is located.[1] Application for a grant may be made on the form CFA-1101 series and prepared in accordance with the instructions and guides given in Form CFA-1102. Application for a loan under the public facility loans program to finance the remainder of the cost of any project partially financed by a grant made under the act may be made on the form CFA-701 series and prepared in accordance with the instructions and guides given in form CFA-702.

Effective as of the 10th day of November 1962.

ROBERT C. WEAVER,
Housing and
Home Finance Administrator.

[F.R. Doc. 62-11257; Filed, Nov. 9, 1962 8:51 a.m.]

[From the Federal Register, Nov. 21, 1962]

TITLE 44—PUBLIC PROPERTY AND WORKS

CHAPTER VIII—OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE (PUBLIC WORKS ACCELERATION)

Estabishment, organization, and procedures

Chapter VIII of title 44 of the Code of Federal Regulations relating to the establishment of standards and procedures under the Public Works Acceleration Act (Public Law 87-658) and Executive Order 11049 dated September 14, 1962, is issued to read as follows:

Part 801—Establishment

Subpart A—Introduction

Sec.
801.1 President's Executive Order.
801.2 Definitions.
801.3 Purpose.

Subpart B—Functions

801.10 Allocation request for Federal public works.
801.11 Allocation requests for financial assistance to State and local government agencies.
801.12 Recommendations for allocation of funds to participating departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government.
801.13 Maintenance of information and reporting.

Authority: §§ 801.1 to 801.13 issued under sec. 3, Pub. law 87-658, E.O. 11049, 27 F.R. 9203.

Subpart A—Introduction

§ 801.1. President's Executive order.

Presidential Executive Order 11049 provides that the Secretary of Commerce shall assist the President in the carrying out of the Public Works Acceleration Act (Public Law 87-658). It also delegates to the Secretary certain authorities vested in the President by the act, and prescribes that Federal departments and agencies receiving funds under the act shall cooperate with the Secretary and follow rules, regulations, and procedures established by the Secretary.

§ 801.2. Definitions.

(a) Secretary: "Secretary" when used without further designation shall mean the Secretary of Commerce.

(b) Act: "Act" when used without other designation shall mean the Public Works Acceleration Act (Public Law 87-658).

(c) State: The term "State" when used in connection with the sponsorship of a public works project shall include those public entities, departments, instrumentalities, agencies, and authorities owned and controlled by a State and by and through which a State may provide public services and accommodations.

(d) Local government: The term "local government," when used in connection with the sponsorship of a public works project shall include municipalities, counties, and other sub-divisions of State governments and those public entities, departments, instrumentalities, agencies, and authorities owned and controlled by any such municipality, county, or other sub-division of State government and by and through which any such municipality, county, or sub-division of State government may provide public services and accommodations.

(e) Agency: The term "agency" when used without further designation shall mean any department, agency or instrumentality of the Federal Government responsible for the construction of Federal public works projects or for the administration of laws authorizing Federal financial assistance to public works projects of State and local governments.

§ 801.3. Purpose

The purpose of the Public Works Acceleration Act and the program authorized thereby is to assist those areas of the Nation which are burdened by the highest rates of unemployment and underemployment by providing immediate employment opportunities and enhancing the capabilities of these areas for economic growth.

Subpart B—Functions

§ 801.10. Allocation requests for Federal public works.

The head of each department, agency, and instrumentality of the Federal Government responsible for the construction of Federal public works projects shall submit to the Secretary of Commerce allocation requests setting forth those Federal public works projects which have been authorized by Congress and which such department, agency, or instrumentality desires to initiate or accelerate in "eligible areas." Such requests should include a general description of each project or program to be initiated or accelerated, the location, and an estimate of the projected cost. All requests should be directed to the Administrator, Area Redevelopment Administration, Department of Commerce, Washington 25, D.C.

§ 801.11. Allocation requests for financial assistance to State and local government agencies.

The head of each department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal Government responsible for the administration of laws authorizing Federal financial assistance to public works projects of the State and local government shall submit to the Secretary of Commerce allocation requests setting forth estimates of the total Federal financial assistance which such department, agency, or instrumentality believes necessary to initiate or accelerate public works projects of State or local governments in eligible areas. All requests should be directed to the Administrator, Area Redevelopment Administration, Department of Commerce, Washington 25, D.C.

§ 801.12. Recommendations for allocation of funds to participating departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government.

(a) The Area Redevelopment Administration of the Department of Commerce shall (1) review and evaluate all allocation requests received from participating Federal departments, agencies, and instrumentalities; (2) prepare comprehensive allocation proposals for the Secretary of Commerce; and (3) assist the Secretary of Commerce in developing recommendations to the President for the allocation of funds appropriated to carry out the Public Works Acceleration Act among the several participating departments, agencies, and instrumentalities.

(b) The Secretary of Commerce shall make recommendations to the President for the allocation of such funds.

§ 801.13. Maintenance of information and reporting.

(a) The Area Redevelopment Administration, Department of Commerce, shall maintain a list of those areas which the Secretary of Labor has designated for the current

---

[1] Footnote 1 reads as follows:

Region	Address	States under each region
I	346 Broadway, Room 906, New York 13, N.Y., Rector 2-8000.	Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Rhode Island, Vermont.
II	Widener Bldg., Room 1004, Chestnut and Juniper Sts., Philadelphia 7, Pa., Locust 8-0400.	Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virginia, West Virginia.
III	645 Peachtree-Seventh Bldg. NE., Atlanta 23, Ga., Trinity 6-3311.	Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee.
IV	Room 1500, 360 North Michigan Ave., Chicago 1, Ill., Harrison 7-4700.	Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Wisconsin.
V	Federal Center, Room, 2000, 300 West Vickery Blvd., Fort Worth 4, Tex., Edison 5-4211.	Arkansas, Colorado, Kansas, Louisiana, Missouri, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas.
VI	989 Market St., 3d Floor, San Francisco 3, Calif., Klondike 2-2350. Area office, region VI, 450 Federal Office Bldg., 909 1st Ave., Seattle 4, Wash., Mutual 2-3300.	(Alaska), Arizona, California, Guam, Hawaii, (Idaho), (Montana), Nevada, (Oregon), Utah, (Washington), Wyoming, (for States in parentheses see area office, region VI). Alaska, Montana, Oregon, Washington, and in Idaho, the counties of Adams, Lemhi, Valley, and Washington and all others north of those counties.
VII	4th Floor, Garraton Bldg., 1608 Ponce de Leon Ave., Post Office Box 9003, Santurce 17, P.R., San Juan 3-6280.	Puerto Rico and Virgin Islands.

month as having been areas of substantial unemployment for at least 9 of the preceding 12 months.

(b) The head of each department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal Government participating in the accelerated public works program shall submit to the Area Redevelopment Administration, Department of Commerce, such periodic and special status reports and other information as the Secretary of Commerce or his representative shall request in order to fulfill those duties assigned to him under Executive Order 11049.

(c) In order to fulfill its responsibilities for evaluating and coordinating the public works acceleration program, the Area Redevelopment Administration shall (1) maintain current lists of eligible areas as defined in section 3(a) of the Public Works Acceleration Act; (2) maintain current records of all amounts allocated by the President under this act; (3) maintain records of progress and accomplishments under such allocations; and (4) review such periodic and special status reports and other information as may be required of the several participating departments and agencies and prepare consolidations and statistical summaries, together with appropriate recommendations, to apprise the Secretary of the status of the public works acceleration program and to serve as the basis for the Secretary's recommendations to the President.

(d) The head of each agency shall be responsible for taking all possible steps to assure that all obligations for accelerated public works projects incurred by his agency adhere carefully to the restrictions and requirements of the act, the allocation made by the President, and the approved program upon which such allocation was based. Particular care should be exercised that such projects do not merely replace public expenditures which would otherwise occur during the period. It is intended that funds allocated under the act shall be supplementary to other Federal funds which otherwise would be expended in eligible areas and the Secretary or his representative may require as a part of the reports from agencies evidence that this objective is being accomplished to the fullest extent practicable.

(e) To enable the Secretary to carry out his responsibilities in assuring that adequate consideration is given to the relative needs of eligible areas, that the required benefits shall be made available to areas designated under section 5(b) of the Area Redevelopment Act, and that no more than 10 percent of all amounts allocated under the act shall be made available for projects in any one State, each agency shall prior to making any final commitment with respect to funds for any project provide the Area Redevelopment Administration with a reasonable identification and description of the proposed project and shall receive notification from the Area Redevelopment Administration that such project is not inconsistent with the above requirements.

Part 802—Use of Allocated Funds

Subpart A—General rules

Sec.

802.1. Eligible areas.
802.2. Limitation to any State.
802.3. Time in which projects initiated.
802.4. Time in which projects can be completed.
802.5. Essential public need.
802.6. Contribution to reduction of local unemployment.
802.7. Relationship to locally approved comprehensible plans.
802.8. School or other educational facility.
802.9. Employment of local labor.

Subpart B—Federal projects

802.20. Authorization by Congress.

Subpart C—State and local projects

802.30. General.
802.31. Grants to extent of 50 percent.
802.32. When grants-in-aid over 50 percent.
802.33. State or local share as extra effort.
802.34. Not for relocating industry.
802.35. Application forms.
802.36. Report forms.

Authority: §§ 802.1 to 802.36 issued under sec. 3, Pub. Law 87–658, E.O. 11049, 27 F.R. 9203. Additional authority is cited in parentheses following the sections affected.

Subpart A—General Rules

§ 802.1. Eligible areas.

(a) For the purposes of this act, the term "eligible area" means those areas which the Secretary of Labor designates each month as having been areas of substantial unemployment for at least 9 of the preceding 12 months; and those areas which are designated by the Secretary of Commerce under subsections (a) and (b) of section 5 of the Area Redevelopment Act as "redevelopment areas."

(b) Public works projects must be located in an eligible area in order to qualify for assistance under the act.

§ 802.2. Limitation to any State.

Not more than 10 percent of the total amount appropriated by Congress for the purposes of the act shall be made available for public works projects within any one State.

§ 802.3. Time in which projects initiated.

To be eligible for assistance under the act a project must be such as can be initiated or accelerated within a reasonably short period of time. Preference will be given to those projects which can be undertaken immediately following obligation of funds and with respect to all projects there must be reasonable assurance that on-site work will commence within 120 days after funds are obligated, subject only to conditions outside the control of the contracting parties, such as adverse weather conditions.

§ 802.4. Time in which projects can be completed.

To be eligible for assistance under the act a project must be one with respect to which a substantial portion can be completed within 12 months after initiation or acceleration. This shall mean those projects for which there is reasonable assurance that the same may be more than half completed within 12 months after first employment of on-site labor.

§ 802.5. Essential public need.

To be eligible for assistance under the act a project must be such as will meet an essential public need. In applying this standard, consideration may be given to the prospective effect of the project upon the health, safety, and welfare of the citizens of the area, and the implementation of economic development.

§ 802.6. Contribution to reduction of local unemployment.

To be eligible for assistance under the act a project must be such as will contribute significantly to the reduction of local unemployment. In applying this standard primary consideration shall be given to employment involved in the project construction. Supporting consideration may be given to the employment opportunities which may be created as a result of the completion of the project.

§ 802.7. Relationship to locally approved comprehensible plans.

To be eligible for assistance under the act a project must not be inconsistent with locally approved comprehensive plans for the jurisdiction affected, wherever such plans exist. Many areas and communities have, pursuant to the Area Redevelopment Act and otherwise, developed and approved overall economic development programs, land-use programs, and other plans for the orderly and effective promotion of the areas' best potentials. Where such plans and programs exist, projects assisted under the act must not be in conflict therewith.

§ 802.8. School or other educational facility.

No part of any allocation made by the President under this act shall be made available for any planning or construction, directly or indirectly, of any school or other educational facility.

(Sec. 4. Public Law 87–658)

§ 802.9. Employment of local labor.

(a) For the purpose of advancing that objective of the act to increase employment opportunities for the unemployed and underemployed within the eligible areas, every contractor and subcontractor undertaking to do work on any project assisted under the act which is or reasonably may be done as on-site work shall be required to employ in carrying out such contract work qualified persons who regularly reside in the eligible area where such project is situated or in the labor market area as designated by the U.S. Department of Labor wherein such project is situated, except:

(1) To the extent that qualified persons regularly residing in the area are not available.

(2) For the reasonable needs of any such contractor or subcontractor, to employ supervisory or specially experienced individuals necessary to assure an efficient execution of the contract.

(3) For the obligation of any such contractor or subcontractor to offer employment to present or former employees as the result of a lawful collective bargaining contract, provided that in no event shall the number of nonresident persons employed under this subparagraph (3) exceed 20 percent of the total number of employees employed by such contractor and his subcontractors on such project.

(b) Every such contractor and subcontractor shall furnish the U.S. Employment Service office in the area in which the public works project is located with a list of all positions for which it may from time to time require laborers, mechanics, and other employees.

(Sec. 2. Public Law 87–658)

Subpart B—Federal projects

§ 802.20. Authorization by Congress

The head of the department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal Government responsible for the construction of any Federal public works project to be initiated or accelerated pursuant to the terms of this act shall, in addition to assuring compliance with the terms and conditions as set forth in subpart A, determine that the Congress of the United States has previously authorized such project by class or item.

Subpart C—State and local projects

§ 802.30. General

The heads of departments, agencies and instrumentalities authorized by law to extend Federal financial assistance for public works projects of States and local governments may, subject to the terms and conditions of the act, this chapter, and the law otherwise governing such departments, agencies, and instrumentalities as amended by the act, use funds allocated under the act for financial assistance for elligible public works projects.

§ 802.31. Grants to extent of 50 percent

Except as hereinafter provided in section 802.32, grants-in-aid made from allocations under this act with respect to projects otherwise qualified for assistance, may in the discretion of the head of any department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal Government administering an authorized grant-in-aid program be extended in such amount as shall not exceed 50 percent of the cost of such project: *Provided further, however*, That where existing legislation permits a grant-in-aid in excess of 50 percent of the cost of a project, then a grant-in-aid under this act may not exceed the percentage of the cost of such a project allowable under such existing grant-in-aid program except as authorized by section 802.32. In determining the cost of a project the department or agency extending the financial assistance shall be guided by the policies and standards applicable to its regular programs of assistance.

§ 802.32. When grants-in-aid over 50 percent

(a) Grants-in-aid from allocations under this act with respect to projects otherwise qualified for assistance, may be extended in an amount up to 75 percent of the cost of a project in those eligible areas where the State or local government does not have economic and financial capacity to assume all of the additional financial obligations required as evidenced by the incidence of unemployment or low family income. In determining the maximum grant which may be made within any eligible area, the head of a participating Federal agency shall utilize the following criteria:

Criteria for establishing maximum grant	*Maximum grant (percent)*
Three times the national average unemployment rate for 4 out of 4 years (1958, 1959, 1960, 1961) or median family income under $1,600	75
Two times the national average unemployment rate for 4 out of 4 years (1958, 1959, 1960, 1961) or median family income $1,600 or above but less than $1,700	66
Two times the national average unemployment rate for 3 out of 4 years (1958, 1959, 1960, 1961) or median family income $1,700 or above but less than $1,800	58

(b) The Area Redevelopment Administration will maintain a current list of "Maximum Grants-in-Aid for Eligible Areas" which list shall be kept available for public inspection during the regular business hours of the Department of Commerce.

(c) In determining the exact percentage of the grant in excess of 50 percent to be made available for each particular project, the head of the participating Federal agency shall consider the net revenues which should be available to the borrower from fair user charges generated by the project and reduce the grant percentum accordingly.

§ 802.33. State or local share as extra effort

As a condition to the extension of any financial assistance under this act, any State or local government making application shall be required to:

(a) Certify to the head of the participating agency that the proposed or planned total expenditure (exclusive of Federal funds) of such State or local government for all its capital improvement projects has been increased for the fiscal year in which the assisted project is to be initiated by an amount approximately equal to the non-Federal funds required to be made available for such public works project; and

(b) Submit such supporting documents which the participating Federal agency may require to determine that the planned or proposed increase in capital improvement expenditures will occur.

(Sec. 4, Public Law 87-658)

§ 802.34. Not for relocating industry

Whenever the project for which financial assistance is sought is undertaken principally to assist the establishment or expansion of commercial or industrial plants and facilities and the head of the participating agency has reason to believe that such establishment or expansion is being created with the intention of closing down or reducing the operations of an existing business entity in the area of its original location or in any other area where it conducts similar operations, financial assistance shall not be extended under this act.

§ 803.35. Application forms.

Application for financial assistance under this act shall be made directly to the Federal agency responsible for the administration of the law authorizing Federal financial assistance to the particular public works project to be initiated, and shall be made by filing the regular agency application form together with such additional information which may be required by such participating agency.

§ 802.36. Report forms.

Every State and local government receiving assistance under the terms of this act shall file with the participating Federal agency such periodic status report setting forth such information as shall be requested by the participating agency.

In accordance with the provisions of section 4 of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 1003) it has been found that notice and hearing on the foregoing chapter VIII of title 44 of the Code of Federal Regulations is unnecessary for the reason that all matters therein relate to agency management, personnel, loans, grants, or benefits; and for the reason that because of the nature of these rules, such notice and hearing would serve no useful purpose. The provisions of chapter VIII of title 44 are effective October 24, 1962.

Dated November 14, 1962.

EDWARD GUDEMAN,
Acting Secretary of Commerce.

[F.R. Doc. 62-11532; filed, Nov. 20, 1962; 8:47 a.m.]

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I trust that the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts will be rejected.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished colleague from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I have listened with intense interest to the excellent presentation of my colleague from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. He has presented the facts with characteristic resourcefulness and resolution.

It has been a privilege and a responsibility for those of us within the West Virginia congressional delegation to cooperate in a vigorous manner in connection with the strengthening of the economic base of our State and providing, so far as possible, those intelligent programs which will bring about increased employment of our people. In the forefront of all these efforts has been my colleague from West Virginia. I wish the RECORD to indicate that I have in this instance found the accelerated public works program of vital aid.

As a chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Manpower and Employment of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee in the 86th Congress, it was my responsibility to conduct hearings on an accelerated public works program as a stimulant to employment. And as a member of the Public Works Committee it was my privilege to cosponsor the measure authorizing the appropriations to which my conscientious colleague has been addressing himself. I am, therefore, deeply conscious of the valuable contributions made by my colleague from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] in helping to guide the appropriation of funds for the accelerated works program.

Mr. President, only this morning we heard testimony in our Labor and Public Welfare Committee by Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz which emphasized some elements of the labor force problems we will be facing. This testimony highlights my colleague's cogent comments concerning the need to supply both job opportunities and the upgrading of public facilities in many of our communities. Acceleration of public works will do much to provide a stronger foundation for employment and redevelopment in eligible areas.

The knowledgeable Secretary of Labor called our attention to the fact that more than 5½ million new young workers who will not be going to college, but will be looking for work in the next 3 years, will present the most difficult and pressing manpower problems this Nation has ever faced. He explained that this unprecedented number of non-college-bound young persons seeking jobs is expected to consist of nearly 3½ million youths with a high school education and approximately 2 million young men and women school dropouts. Altogether, these young jobseekers will account for three out of every four new labor force entrants during the 1963-65 period, Secretary Wirtz reports.

Of course, we have passed in this body the Youth Employment Act which, if accepted by the other body, will help ameliorate this plight in some degree. But it needs to be supplemented by the commendable public works acceleration program which provides broad and favorable economic impact at the same time that it develops permanent public facility improvements for the communities in eligible areas.

Exaggerating the problem of the labor force additions, the Secretary of Labor pointed out, is the fact that for the young persons entering the force the leadtime for adequately preparing them for entrance has virtually disappeared. And he says that young persons are already experiencing difficulty in securing jobs as demonstrated by their high unemployment rate in these years of the early 1960's.

Mr. President, it is imperative that the funds be provided for the continuance and expansion of the public works program now under consideration.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I thank my colleague. I yield the floor.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I am cosponsoring with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] the amendment to cut the accelerated public works appropriation to $250 million. There are, in fact, some very good arguments for completely eliminating accelerated public works from the bill and sending it back to committee. The same arguments can be made for cutting it by $200 million as proposed in this amendment.

We are being asked to approve an additional obligation of $450 million for projects which have not received individual approval, let alone the usual scrutiny, of the subcommittees of the Senate Committee on Appropriations that normally consider these items. We are being asked to ride rough shod over the system built up in our Appropriations Committee of first receiving justifications on all requested projects. Ordinarily we consider projects line-item by line-item in hearings where the specialized subcommittee most knowledgeable in the area of the proposed expenditure can examine the proposals and hear witness in support or in opposition to them.

Ordinarily, every department and agency of government is required to justify to the proper legislative committees projects they have submitted to the Congress. It is only then that these departments and agencies can come before the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress to ask for funding.

The accelerated public works program before us today is based on nothing more than proposals. I daresay that many of them would not be approved by Congress if they were submitted through normal channels.

A good example of normal procedure applies to the Army Corps of Engineers who submitted a budget in excess of $1 billion to Congress last January. They must come before the Appropriations Committees of the Congress and justify every project, no matter how small or large, and there are many of them. They cover rivers and harbors, navigation, flood control, beach erosion, and so on.

The Engineers' budget is only slightly higher than the $900 million authorized for the accelerated public works program. But, I do not think the Corps of Engineers, or any other established agency of our Government, would consider coming before Congress and asking us to appropriate millions for projects which they could not firmly back up in testimony. Additionally, the Engineers must prove a dollar benefit to the public exceeding the dollar cost.

We are being asked today to give the accelerated public works program and its administrators carte blanche authority to spend $450 million.

As late as April 26, the Area Redevelopment Administration was unable to come up with a firm prediction as to what projects would be approved if the $450 million were allowed for spending this fiscal year. But the criteria and standards which we have established, such as benefit-cost ratio, that are part and parcel of our system on the Appropriations Commitee, are not to be applied to this budget request. It is no wonder that the full Committee on Appropriations in the House eliminated the whole $450 million request.

There was nothing firm about the projects proposed under the $400 million appropriation last fall, and there is nothing firm now. As a mater of fact, I found it difficult to learn about the nature of projects on Indian reservations in my North Dakota area, even after the projects were publicly announced.

This amendment does not take the broad-brush approach to this bill. It is recognized that the country may need some pumppriming, and that in what this administration must feel is a time of extraordinary need, then extraordinary measures must be taken. But, even extraordinary measures must be kept within efficient bounds. Acceleration beyond a certain speed can result in a crackup. Not just safety, but control is lost. And no expenditure of funds, in any field, can be of help without at least a minimum of those controls which experience has taught us are intrinsic to a successful program.

We are saying: "You cannot possibly go this fast and do the job well. You cannot go this fast and keep even the minimum standards which our Government must maintain if the program is to succeed."

From October 13, 1962 to April 4, 1963, a 6-month period, we fell $125 million short of obligating the $400 million made available under this program. Certainly, $250 million, added to present balances, will almost overburden our ability to spend money on the most worthwhile projects. Anyone could throw the money faster, but we insist that with a little less acceleration there may be a little more considered judgment.

Mr. President, I do not hold the administrator of this program responsible for the enabling act or the program as conceived. I believe William L. Batt, Jr., has done a good job under difficult circumstances.

I am convinced, Mr. President, that $450 million is not justified and I believe that my colleagues in the Senate should adopt the $250 million figure proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] and myself.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have heard with interest the comments of my able friends the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], with whom I very generally associate my own views. I find I cannot agree with them on this particular question.

The distinguished Senator from North Dakota called attention to the fact that in the normal case the Congress authorizes public works projects. Of course, that is true as to sizable projects.

The Senator from North Dakota is the ranking minority member of the subcommittee which handles the Public Works Appropriation bill. Every time the Congress passes a Public Works Appropriation bill, as the Senator knows well, there are three blanket funds which are not broken down by authorization at all. One of them is for small authorized projects. Another is for small unauthorized projects. Another is for the maintenance of projects which have already been constructed.

The distinguished Senator and I have served on the same subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee which handles appropriations for forest trails and forest roads. I think the Senator recognizes, along with me, that the Congress has never sought to authorize those projects separately, but has provided in every bill covering that subject very substantial funds to be used in the discretion of the Department of Agriculture, which has jurisdiction over the national forests, for the construction of trails and roads in national forests.

I could continue to discuss many other fields. For example, in the field of community facilities there is a provision of substantial funds, which are apportioned by the agency which handles them to the various communities for financing the planning of community facilities in various areas.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. The Senator mentioned forest roads and trails. It is true that Congress appropriates a blank sum of money for the Department for the building of those roads, but when the witnesses come before the committee to justify the request for the money there is an opportunity to ask, "What roads will you build? What is the justification for them?" Under this program we have no idea what projects even will be approved. I think the Senator from Florida is as ill-informed as I am as to what projects would be undertaken if the money is appropriated. I do not think the Senator could point out one. I cannot.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, there is substance in the comment made by my distinguished friend.

The fact is that we have never attempted in the Appropriations Subcommittees, on which the Senator has served as a very able member and on which I have also served, but not in such an able manner, to receive justifications for all forest roads and trails, or for all community facilities to be served, or for all the maintenance which is to be done, or for all the unauthorized public works projects, or for all the small authorized projects; because it is necessary to delegate authority somewhere, and we have delegated that authority to able agencies to meet the needs which arise.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I will yield in a moment to my distinguished friend from Colorado.

The point I make is that the projects to be handled under this program are in their very nature similar to the small projects about which we have been talking. They are found in the small communities where there is unemployment, where there has been a constant loss of population, and where there will be a real tragedy unless some agency comes in to provide an opportunity for useful employment.

In my State there are perhaps 15 or 17 counties only, out of the 67, involved in the area redevelopment program. I think we should be happy that that is the case, rather than unhappy.

I hear from those counties. With two exceptions they are small counties, counties which have had continued unemployment, and many of them counties with a continuing loss of population.

I hear nothing but a chorus of approval as to the kinds of projects which have been approved.

Our State development board has made its services available in this field. It is required to cooperate in the ordinary area redevelopment program, but has been equally active with reference to these particular projects and the small community facilities.

Mr. President, there are two exceptions which I shall name. Those are the two large counties in the southeast corner of my State, where there are nearly 200,000 Cuban refugees. Congress in its wisdom recognized that this was a situation which deserved particular attention. Such attention was given. I have received nothing but approval from those two counties, which have been hard pressed for employment for thousands of their people, as to the types of projects approved—such as sewerage projects, small outlying fire stations, small outlying post-office annexes, water projects, and things of that kind.

I now gladly yield to the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator is, of course, not only an able member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, but also an able member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The Senator mentioned a few moments ago, in response to the inquiry by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], that the committee had never received individual justifications for agricultural or forest roads. Does not the Senator agree, however, in all fairness, that when agricultural appropriation bills come before the committee the Senator has always been able, as I have always been able, and as every other Senator has always been able, to get specific information on every proposed forest road within the United States about which the Senator cared to inquire.

Mr. HOLLAND. The agencies have been very responsive to our requests along that line. I would also have to say that there has not been one such request for every 100 such projects, because we have appropriated about $30 million for that particular objective, as I recall the figure, and have not even sought to put them down item by item or to have the people from the Forest Service justify them item by item. Frequently we have not even known where the need for the letting of contracts to harvest the timber was going to exist in the year covered. We have left that judgment to the experts who are handling our forests. I think that was proper.

Mr. ALLOTT. If the Senator will yield further, the harvesting of timber is only one matter, and perhaps the Senator does not have occasion in his State for this, but those of us who come from States which have very large forest areas, such as there are in the West, do have occasion to follow the forest trails and the forest roads.

So far as the Senator from Colorado is concerned, there is no comparison between the bill under consideration—as to which we do not even know what will come up in the future, and may never know until it is done—and the situation with respect to forest trails. There is a very limited amount of forest roads and we can always find out what we wish to know. Whether it be in the State of the Senator from Florida, or in my State, or in some other State, we can find out, if we wish to know, where the Department of Agriculture proposes to put in roads in the next year.

In this respect I think there is a legitimate distinction between the two.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I respect the opinion of my distinguished friend.

There are three national forests in my State. There is a substantial need for the forest trails and roads, both for the harvesting of timber and for recreational purposes. Some have been constructed in connection with this particular project. There has never been a time when, by going to the officials in the Forest Service, I could not find out what they intended to do in connection with this or any other program.

The situation I am pointing out is that we have had exactly the same opportunity to obtain the information, and we have obtained that information in respect to this program, as we have in respect to the normal programs.

Mr. President, I shall not take much time of the Senate. I opposed the bill last year in the form in which it was originally introduced, because half of the program was left in the discretion of the President to activate it or not. I voted to eliminate that part of it from the bill. I am glad we were successful in cutting that part out of the bill. I insisted that Congress should retain control of the purse strings to the degree that it would release for expenditure the amount determined in advance as the amount which should be released for that year. We followed that policy in the later consideration of the bill. I supported the bill in that form.

It seems to me that Senators who are now opposing the fulfillment, or the near fulfillment, of what we determined last year are those who, in the main, took the position last year of opposing the whole bill.

When Congress puts its hand to the plow and starts on a program, as it has started on this program—and it has done very well for the first year; it can do better for the second year—when there is a backlog of projects, we must have a good reason for taking our hand from the plow. I do not think we have good reason to do so.

If I heard the Senator from Massachusetts right, he thought we should cut down, or stop the program because employment is better now than it was. If it is better, I say "Hallelujah." That is one of the objectives we were trying to accomplish by the adoption of the program last year. Certainly, everyone will have to admit that some contribution to the better employment picture has been made by the program. In my State, where the program has operated in a limited way, it has brought about substantial results in the field of employment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have said that as of February 15 only a number equal to seven-tenths of 1 percent of the unemployed were provided with jobs.

I have as much desire to help the unemployed as has the Senator from Florida. At present the unemployment rate is going down. More people became employed this last month than ordinarily are employed—800,000 as opposed to the usual figure of 200,000.

I have great respect for the Senator from Florida, with whom I generally agree; but are we to continue with the accelerated program if unemployment keeps going down and business conditions become better? Does he still say the money should be spent without Congress knowing where it is going, as is true under the ordinary procedures?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am certainly ready to concede that no one is more interested in relieving unemployment than is the Senator from Massachusetts. He has a big heart, and sometimes he lets it run away with his judgment, just as some of the rest of us do. In this particular instance the Senator from Florida thinks that when there has been a limited improvement, to which this program has contributed, but when there is still very heavy unemployment, is not the proper time to stop the program. To my mind this program gives an appearance of having succeeded in part. Let us go ahead and carry out, in a larger way, the improvement in employment which we have already obtained.

If any Senator thinks there is not any unemployment which could be helped by the program, he is perfectly free to vote against the measure. I myself would vote against the bill if I thought that were the case. But as I look at the figures reported from various sources, there is still too much unemployment to afford much satisfaction with what is being done. Unemployment is concentrated in various places where there is a degree of depression and distress. This measure would not help approximately 50 percent of the counties in my State. I am happy that there is no need for it there. I am happy for every Senator who does not have a need for an unemployment program. This program means a great deal to those portions of my State where there is heavy unemployment. I know it has meant much to West Virginia. I am familiar with that situation because I have many relatives there. I know the program has meant a great deal to Pennsylvania and other areas of the country. The mere fact that it means more to them than it happens to mean to my State should be no occasion for me to change my mind about the need of the program.

I think it is needed badly in certain parts of our country; that the program has been well administered; and that we can well go along with the House in the small cut of about 10 percent, which it has imposed.

I hope the pending amendment will be defeated. I reluctantly take the floor against the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from North Dakota, because so often in the Appropriations Committee we take the same view. I think they are being misled in two directions. I think they fear a great deal of money has been wasted in the program. That has not been the case in my State. I also believe they think the unemployment situation has been alleviated more than it really has been. Otherwise, I do not think they would take the position they have taken. There is a more carefully approved backlog of projects than was the case a year ago.

So I hope the Senate will defeat this amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the eminent Governor of New York, Governor Rockefeller, has said that unemployment is unduly high in the United States?

Mr. HOLLAND. I saw such a statement attributed to him in the press. I confess that I do not follow the statements made by the distinguished Governor of New York as closely as some others follow him, but I saw such a statement attributed to him.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would not the Senator therefore think that the members of the same party as that of the Governor of New York would pay attention to his statements?

Mr. HOLLAND. I would hope they would, because I would not like to see them err in this connection, when I know how humanitarian they are in their instincts and how far they go whenever they see a need. I would like to see them clean off their spectacles a little and look a little harder. I think they would see a continuing need.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, may I ask the Senator from Illinois if he always follows the leadership of his party?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Not always, but I think in this respect the Governor of New York was correct in saying that the volume of unemployment was unduly high.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think the comments of my distinguished friend from Illinois and those of Senators on the other side have pointed out one fact which is clear, and that is that this is not a partisan matter. It is not a party matter. This is a matter of people, a program affecting the people in many communities. I think there is a need to alleviate conditions in communities which are distressed, and I am thankful to say, there are only a few in my State. I think this program is a good one. I think Congress should control it, and not leave it to the control of the Executive, as was planned in the first version of the bill last year. We should continue to control it. I think more good will be done this year in the program.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I do not think I have ever voted against Public Works appropriation bills. I believe in public works programs. The Senator from Florida has been a good member of the Appropriations Committee. He has always insisted on economy, and has always insisted that Government agencies should justify their appropriations. Would the Senator want all appropriations to be considered as this one is?

Mr. HOLLAND. I certainly would not. I agree with the Senator's statement that, in connection with normal appropriations, we should keep a closer rein, continue our inspection, have specific authorization, and exercise other usual controls. I stand for all of them and insist on all of them. But in view of the heavy unemployment, and inasmuch as apparently some good has been done by the program, I believe it would be bad to stop in the middle of the row, instead of going to the end.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I suppose if I were a Democrat I would consider voting for the bill. At least I would have more justification for doing so. It is difficult for a Republican to find out anything about the programs even after they are announced. When we call up to find out about a program, we cannot learn anything about it. If one were a Democrat, he would at least have the advantage of knowing what the project was all about.

Mr. HOLLAND. So far as I am concerned, I have had no difficulty in obtaining information. I do not think I am exactly in such high standing with my party that it would have much to do with by obtaining that information. It seems to me this is a bipartisan program, and should be kept as such.

I know of areas in Pennsylvania which I believe have greatly needed this program. It has not bothered me at all that the people of that State changed to a Republican Governor last year. I would be just as much interested in helping them this year as I was last year. I am sure that would be the case also with the Senator from North Dakota. If it is true that the Senator from North Dakota has had withheld from him information of that kind, I would join him in insisting that such a policy is wrong, and that it should not continue. I found no difficulty in getting information on such matters during a recent Republican administration. I find the situation to be the same under a Democratic administration. I hope the distinguished Senator will make himself heard loud and long on the floor of the Senate if he was treated in this way, because I will come to his assistance.

Mr. YOUNG or North Dakota. If the Senator from North Dakota is unable in the future to get such information, will the Senator from Florida help him get it?

Mr. HOLLAND. Very gladly. I yield the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, it is not my intention to speak at great length, but I wish to support the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. I expect to support the amendment because last year, when we were holding hearings in the Appropriations Committee, in the 4 or 5 hours that we spent on this matter, continuing until about 7:30 in the evening, I am sure that the three of us who were present most of the time left with a feeling of utter confusion. The distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana conducted those hearings, the Senator from Colorado was present during a good portion of the time, as was also the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. That was the first time in my life that I had ever seen the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] at all confused about his purposes. The people who testified about the bill at that time, I am sure, had all of us equally confused as to the direction in which we were going.

I know that this is a wonderful bill in which to pull out the stops. One is either for or against motherhood, and either for or against sin, and all that.

The cold fact is that there is no justification for large grants to individual communities, unless on the basis of hardship. There is no reason why the country as a whole should finance a community facility, by making grants of 50 or 75 percent for sewers and for street extension or something else in an individual community, unless it is based wholly upon hardship, and upon public welfare.

The cold truth is that this is not an approach to the problem in any of its basic concepts. The administration itself admits that it is not. Once we start a program of this sort, it rolls on and on, like a tide, but we do not solve anything; we merely prolong it.

I am not unsympathetic, for example, with the position of the distinguished Senators from West Virginia or the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. The situation in my own State is comparatively favorable, but we also have a rather depressed situation in the city of Pueblo. The projects that have been lined up for the city of Pueblo are not going to cure the unemployment situation in Pueblo. It could have been stopped if, during the past 4 or 5 years, the previous administration and this one had paid a little attention to tariffs and quotas on imports of steel. If that had been done, steelworkers would not be walking the streets of Pueblo. We can go into Colorado today and buy barbed wire from Belgium and Luxembourg and Japan cheaper than we can buy it from a steel mill in Pueblo. I am sorry to say it, but it is the truth. We can do that in almost any town in the country.

In providing public works, we have not solved any problem in the State of Colorado; nor have we solved it in West Virginia, Kentucky, or anywhere else. All we have done is to prolong it. We have provided a euphoria for these people, a few cocaine leaves to chew on, which will make them believe for a little while that something is happening that is good for them. When we get through with it all we will be facing the same problem.

That is the trouble with the whole basic bill. I was against it before, and I am against it now.

There is adequate proof in this country that this proposal does not work. We had such a program from 1932 on through 1948. We had one public works project after another, from 1932 to 1941, and in 1941 there were still 13½ million people unemployed in this country. How long is it going to take us to learn the simple fact that we cannot solve our problems in this way, that we do not even approach a solution in this way? The administration admits it.

I wish to read from page 960 of the hearings, particularly from a letter written by Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Supplemental Appropriations. I read a part of the third paragraph, which is a complete thought in itself. However, if any Senator thinks that I am quoting out of context, he may have the entire letter printed in the Record. I read from the third paragraph, as follows:

> This matter has been given further attention by appropriate officials throughout the executive branch since receiving your letter. In view of the fact that it would be difficult to obtain the appropriation language as originally proposed, we have determined that the language and the amount as passed by the House represent a reasonable and acceptable solution to the problem at this time.

This is the significant part:

> You should be advised that in accepting the appropriation of $450 million with availability limited to the current fiscal year, we are in effect, establishing a situation where a 1964 appropriation will become a necessity.

Mr. President, not only will a 1964 appropriation become a necessity, but a 1965 appropriation will also become a necessity.

I have received letters from communities. I have a letter from Walsenburg, a city which is 48 miles south of the city of Pueblo, Colo. It is a coal mining community. It is a community which has been left behind economically because it was chiefly a one-industry community, a coal mining community. We all know in general what has happened to the coal mining industry in this country. The situation is not at all different from what has been described by the distinguished Senators from West Virginia.

As it is, the question I have to ask myself is, Shall I vote for the biggest pork barrel bill I have ever seen since I became a Member of the Senate, a bill having no criteria established, and with no way of finding out what will happen? If one is a Republican, he quickly learns that he cannot get much information from Government agencies. Or as an alternative, should I vote against the appropriation? Much more is being asked this year than was sought last year. If my recollection serves me correctly, $900 million was sought. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender] and I were told in the committee hearing that all of the funds could be used or pledged before the new fiscal year. Actually, that has not been done, and it could not be done on any intelligent basis.

What should we do in a situation like that? I think more is involved than merely the appropriation, whether it be $450 million or $250 million. To me, the basic principle involved is, Where are we going, and what are we going to do about it? For a long time we have tried the Government's spend-and-spend theory, the theory of spending the country into prosperity. But the cold fact is that in communities which are essentially one-industry communities—whether the industry be coal, steel, glass, or something else—there will be no prosperity until such time as the people, with the assistance of the Government—and heaven knows, we have such assistance under area redevelopment, and everything else—are able to bring new industries into the communities and reestablish a multiple base economy, which means a projected, somewhat level prosperity.

Perhaps the alternative in a coal community is to find a new use that will create a greater demand for coal. But a public works project is merely a little cocaine to deaden the nerves for awhile. Perhaps it will feed the people for a little while. But we were supposed to have area redevelopment and other programs to renew areas and restore them to a sound economic basis.

I would not argue whether employment is improving or not. Recently I read that unemployment throughout the country was increasing. To me, that is convincing proof that the economic policies of this administration are anything but successful; in fact, they are a failure.

So we must consider what we will do in the future about the unemployed. Let us recall that we have an Area Redevelopment Act and a Manpower Training Act, which devote millions of dollars to these particular activities. I should really like to see them work, but I do not believe we will make anything work in this way. We will not bring any prosperity to or recreate prosperity in any community with this kind of bill. We will not do it now; we will not do it 6 months from now; and we will not do it a year from now.

I do not care what anyone says; there are no firm criteria in the bill for the work that is to be done under the act. In view of the fact that Congress has provided no meaningful review of its action in any respect; in view of the fact that it would be necessary to expend, if the bill passed, not only $450 million, but another $125 million before the first of July, which is now only 2 months away; I say that the work cannot be done practically, it cannot be done with the kind of stewardship that my people, at least, expect from me as a Senator from Colorado.

So I hope the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts will be agreed to. As I see it, it will keep the authorities in line. It will keep them thinking about the fact that we must make this money count. It will keep them from merely doling out the money to anyone who comes in and asks for it. In the long run, I think we shall be serving the economy of the country.

Mr. ELLENDER obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

PROPOSED UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to propound a unanimous-consent agreement. I believe that Senators most interested have given their approval. If not, I will stand subject to correction.

I ask unanimous consent that on the pending amendment there be a limitation of 40 minutes, 20 minutes to a side, the time to be under the control of the majority leader and the minority leader or of other Senators whom they may designate.

Mr. PASTORE. That is, with the exception of the so-called Javits amendment on civil rights?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No; this relates only to the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have the floor. I do not wish to have the agreement apply to me. I do not know how long I shall speak.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I modify my request to provide that the time limitation shall begin after the Senator from Louisiana has finished his remarks and after a quorum call has been suggested, so that the minority leader will have time to come to the Chamber.

I ask unanimous consent that on all other amendments there be allocated a period of 1 hour, 30 minutes to a side.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I do not believe I will have occasion to speak at length, but I should like to have some time; therefore, I must object to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado withhold his objection?

Mr. ALLOTT. I will withhold my objection at this time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a limitation of 2 hours of debate on the bill. In that way, we may possibly provide the additional time needed by the Senator from Colorado and his colleagues.

Mr. ALLOTT. With the assurance that there will be all the time needed, I will withdraw my objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am perfectly willing to agree to the time on the amendment; but so far as the time on the bill is concerned, until it is known what will be in the bill, I do not wish to approve a unanimous-consent request which provides for so short a limitation of time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. This is the usual practice. I hope the distinguished Senator from Florida will understand the conditions as they exist at the present time and will give his concurrence to the request.

Mr. HOLLAND. My recollection is that the two amendments pending, or which were pending a short while ago, relate to the integration question. Until I know what the disposition of this subject will be, I would not wish to give my consent. It may be that I would not need to give my consent to a short duration of debate on the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is my intention to move to table those amendments.

Mr. HOLLAND. I sincerely hope that the Senator's intention proves to be successful. I shall try to be of assistance in that movement. But until I know what the disposition will be, I still must take the same position.

I gladly accede to that part of the unanimous-consent request relating to all amendments.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I must point out that the unanimous-consent request, unless specially phrased, would include the word "germaneness." Therefore, I am unwilling to agree to the request on that basis. So far as I am concerned, the Senator from Montana has 98 other prima donnas to deal with, so I would be willing to accede to the unanimous-consent request with the understanding that it will apply to amendments which are at the desk and have been printed, and that the germaneness provision of the unanimous-consent request will apply to the amendments which have been printed and are pending.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from Montana will yield further, let me ask whether—in order to accelerate the passage of this measure—the Senator from New York is willing to withdraw his amendments which have to do with the immigration question.

Mr. JAVITS. No; I am not.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I understand that the proposed agreement would apply to amendments at the desk, plus all other amendments and motions which might be made, but that there would be no agreement with regard to the third reading and passage of the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct; and the Senator from New York has consented to that proposal.

Mr. PASTORE. So I understand that the proposed agreement would not rule out his amendments.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is true.

Mr. JAVITS. That is correct.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, if the Senator from Montana will yield to me, let me say that I have an amendment, which I submitted today; and it has not yet been printed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. However, it would be included.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. It is an exceedingly important amendment; and I desire to debate it, and I shall request a yea-and-nay vote on it. Let me inform the majority leader that the House of Representatives struck out the $30 million appropriation for fallout shelters for civil defense purposes and for stockpiling them with more so-called survival biscuits. We hear much loose talk about economy; but our committee has included that $30 million item. I wish to debate my amendment and to have a yea-and-nay vote taken on the question of agreeing to it. However, the amendment has not yet been printed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senator's amendment comes within the proposed agreement, and I shall have no objection to having a yea-and-nay vote taken on the question of agreeing to his amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Then, Mr. President, I have no objection to the proposed agreement.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Montana will yield to me, let me say that I have an amendment which pertains to funds raised by political committees; and the amendment also pertains to primaries. I believe the amendment is extremely important. All of us are indebted to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] for raising certain issues in connection with the Philippine war damage bill. I am heartily in favor of his amendment, and I shall support it most enthusiastically—even though it might be ruled out on a point of order. But I believe his amendment is an excellent one; and in that connection I call attention to my amendment, which pertains to contributions to political committees and to funds to be used in primary contests.

Mr. PASTORE. Let me ask whether it is the understanding of the Senator from Montana that all amendments will be subject to a motion to lay on the table.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Any amendment would be subject to such a motion; but it is also understood that under this proposal a time limitation would apply to all amendments, including the one now under consideration.

Mr. PASTORE. But a motion to lay on the table would not be precluded, would it?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It would not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed agreement?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should like to have the proposed agreement read by the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that the proposed unanimous-consent agreement provides for 1 hour of debate on any amendment, with the time to be equally divided between the two sides, and that the proposed agreement would be applicable to the amendments now at the desk.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And also those still to be offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; and also those still to be offered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Did the Senator change the 40 minutes to 1 hour?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No. That has been applied to all amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To all pending amendments.

Mr. RUSSELL. Would it include a quorum call?

Mr. MANSFIELD. There will be one, after this is over.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was under the impression that under the rule it is necessary to have a quorum call before a unanimous consent agreement is entered into.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that that is necessary before the adoption of an agreement in connection with the passage of a bill or joint resolution.

Mr. RUSSELL. Then, Mr. President, there is a distinction. In other words, could debate be precluded, without having a quorum call, on an amendment, but not on the question of the passage of a bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. But the proposed agreement applies only to the pending amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I shall object; I do not approve of having unanimous-consent agreements entered into in the absence of notification to all Senators.

Mr. MANSFIELD. However, I understand that the present amendment is subject to a time limitation of 40 minutes at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and after the absence of a quorum has been suggested.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I express to all Senators the hope that the Senate will vote on this amendment tonight because many Senators have important meetings with delegations from all 50 of the States.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is an amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. There would be no time limitation on an amendment to that amendment, would there?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that there would not be.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to raise a question. I asked unanimous consent that there be a time limitation of 40 minutes on the pending amendment. That request was agreed to by the Senate; and it is my interpretation that at the end of 40 minutes this amendment will come to a vote.

Mr. RUSSELL. That certainly would not be the case, unless it were specifically spelled out in the order which was entered, following the request. I was not present when the request was made. I had been listening very attentively for the bells, and I hoped I would reach the Chamber before any unanimous-consent request in regard to this measure was made.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the unanimous-consent agreement be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BREWSTER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the pending amendment has been debated at length, and it is not my purpose to add very much to what has already been said.

I could well agree to the pending amendment, because I opposed the authorization last year. But after Congress authorized the $900 million, as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee which dealt with public works, I was assigned the job of obtaining the authorized amount of $900 million.

Hearings were held for quite some time as has been indicated by my good friend, the Senator from Colorado. I was then of the opinion, as was he, and as were other members of the subcommittee, that a case had not been made for appropriation of the entire $900 million. Last year there was not a single project approved and presented to the committee provided with a request for funds; and we elicited from the Administrator the information that it would require some time until he could select the projects that would make up the program.

We felt that if the whole amount were provided, many of the areas entitled to some of the money would not receive it because it probably would be the tendency of the Administrator to go pretty fast in distributing the funds, so that the date set in the law, which was June 30 of the present year, could be reached.

The evidence produced at the hearing this year showed that the Administrator had done a very good job with the funds that were provided, and that he now has approved projects in excess of $1.2 billion that are eligible for these funds if and when Congress provides for them. It strikes me that Congress should continue the program, since it has been started, and since so many communities have gone to the trouble of spending quite a bit of their funds in anticipation of Congress passing this appropriation. We promised it. I think it was well understood during the hearings of last year that the only reason Congress did not provide the entire $900 million was that we felt that the projects were not ready. But, as I understand it, they are now ready. I think a good case has been made in that direction.

Mr. President, the Congress passed the Public Works Acceleration Act last year to accomplish a twofold purpose; first, and foremost, useful employment for unemployed in the chronic surplus labor areas; and second, the construction of needed public works in these distressed areas. The main features of the enabling act may be summarized as follows:

First. Areas eligible for assistance include all areas designated as redevelopment areas under sections 5(a) and 5(b) of the Area Redevelopment Act. Section 5(a) areas, as you know, are urban areas of high unemployment; section 5(b) areas are the rural and small urban areas of low income, underemployment, and high unemployment so designated by the Secretary of Commerce. Also eligible are those areas designated by the Secretary of Labor as having been areas of substantial unemployment for at least 9 of the preceding 12 months. Substantial unemployment is defined as above 6 percent.

Second. Federal public works projects in eligible areas which have been authorized by Congress can be initiated or accelerated.

Third. Public works projects of States and local governments for which Federal financial assistance is authorized in other legislation, can be initiated and accelerated. For such projects, grants up to 50 percent of the total cost are authorized, and grants up to 75 percent can be made if the State or local government lacks economic or financial capacity to assume the additional financial obligation.

Fourth. No State may receive more than 10 percent of the funds allocated, and no less than $300 million of the $900 million authorized must be allocated for the nonurban small labor market areas, low income areas, and Indian reservations designated under section 5(b) of the Area Redevelopment Act.

Fifth. Adequate consideration must be given to relative needs of eligible areas, and certain criteria are established which the selected projects must meet. These criteria assure that projects can be initiated or accelerated within a reasonably short period of time; will meet an essential public need; will have a substantial portion completed within 12 months after initiation; will contribute significantly to the reduction of local unemployment; and are not inconsistent with locally approved comprehensive plans for the areas affected, where such plans exist.

It is clear that Congress recognized the need for improving public works facilities in these eligible areas, set up specific criteria for selection of projects, and expressed its desire to carry the program forward as rapidly as possible.

The House in approving $450 million of the remaining $500 million authorization included two provisos in the appropriation language which are in the nature of restrictions or limitations. The first:

> *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used for any project that has ever been rejected by the Senate or House of Representatives or by any committee of the Congress.

Certainly, this is a good proviso which received the full support of the Appropriations Committee. The second proviso initiated by the House reads as follows:

> *Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used for any project that does not require a financial contribution from State or local sources except projects dealing with preservation of forests in the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior.

The effect of this proviso would rule out the allocation of funds to a depressed area which did not include a national forest if that area were so hard hit that it was beyond its capability to raise funds for its share under one of the matching programs. In addition, this proviso would have the effect of ruling out certain needed Federal projects on other public lands, particularly in the West. For these reasons the committee recommended the deletion of the second proviso.

In taking this action, the committee did not want to be in the position of promoting competition between Federal agencies and local governments for the limited amount of public works acceleration funds allocated to a particular State. Quite the contrary, the committee in its report stated that it desired the agencies exercising responsibilities under this program to use the funds available to them to the maximum extent practicable for projects in which the local governments are required to make contributions toward the cost of the projects. Accordingly, the committee directed that not to exceed 10 percent of the funds appropriated be allocated to all-Federal projects.

Our committee also placed a prohibition upon the use of funds in this bill for the construction of all-Federal research laboratories of the type normally requiring separate item review and approval of the Congress in the regular appropriation process, or for any all-Federal projects of other types costing more than $400,000 each.

I believe that the bill as reported by the Appropriations Committee, with the additional restrictions placed on the use of the money as discussed in the committee report, will assure that the maximum benefits will be obtained from the Federal funds provided.

Therefore, I should say that the amount provided in the bill should be voted.

I would not mind if the whole amount were provided for, because it is my belief, even if we provided the entire amount, we would go only half way toward meeting the projects that have been presented to the Administrator which are now eligible for servicing.

I hope that the pending amendment will be rejected and that the full amount of $450 million will be provided.

The committee approved a very important amendment, I believe, in extending the time limit within which that particular amount of money can be obligated. I would hesitate to vote for such a large amount, if the Administrator only had until June 30 of the present year in which to obligate the funds. But since the bill contains a provision extending the time limit in which the money is to be obligated to June 30, 1964, it is my belief that ample time is granted in order that a good job can be done in distributing the funds to localities that are really in need of them and to do help alleviate unemployment in those distressed areas.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Was the amendment extending the time adopted in the omnibus action taken by the Senate on the request of the chairman of the committee for the adoption of all committee amendments?

Mr. PASTORE. Yes; it was included.

Mr. HOLLAND. Then the bill as it now stands and is being considered includes the extension of time of which the Senator has spoken?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct, except that any Senator can raise a point of order if he desires to do so. I hope no Senator will. As I have said, I believe Congress would make a serious mistake in providing such a short period of time in which that amount could be obligated.

If we do not take that action, my fear is that the Administrator might hasten the allocation of the funds; and certainly we do not desire that to happen. I hope that the point of order will not be raised and that the full amount provided by the bill will be approved by the Senate.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts. The people of the United States are looking to the Congress for greater discipline, looking toward more fiscal responsibility. As a result of the President's proposal in his state of the Union message to the effect that tax liabilities should be reduced, but at the same time a record budget should be adopted, Americans have reacted strongly. The mail seems to be running heavily against the idea of substantial tax reduction without some reduction in expenditures. Tax reduction is needed as a stimulus to the economy. But if we are to be responsible, we must also reduce expenditures. The bill affords a good opportunity to reduce expenditures.

I am unmoved by crocodile tears over unemployment. To begin with, the amounts that we propose to spend would not permanently relieve the unemployment situation. They would only temporarily affect a few people. They would be mere drops in the bucket.

The best thing that could be done for the employment situation in this country would be for the administration to do what it has not done to date, and that is to take some action that might cause the business community in our country to have confidence in the administration, to the extent that money will be invested and more productivity created, more jobs, and a higher level of consumption. I think now is the time for us to discipline ourselves and to bring the budget into line within our income.

Furthermore, I cannot be moved by crocodile tears over unemployment when I consider that my children and their children, and their children's children will be paying the money that we are appropriating here today if we pass this $450 million appropriation. We are in debt up to our ears. We have saddled generations yet unborn with debt in order to afford things for ourselves. That is a selfish attitude. It is economically unsound and amoral.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 2 minutes to me?

Mr. PASTORE. The Senate is not on limited time. The Senator may have as much time as he desires.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, so far as I know, this is the first time since I came to the Senate that my colleagues have been referred to as crocodiles. I have heard us called a lot of mean things, but never have I thought that we were to be considered crocodiles. So far as I am concerned, I am quite ready to shed tears for the status of the unemployed in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. But I do not consider myself a crocodile when I do. I know, and I presume every Senator who has made any study of the subject knows that the money for this accelerated public works bill has been wisely spent to date for important wealth-producing public works which are to the benefit of practically every section of the country.

My own State has applications on file for necessary and wealth-producing public works far in excess of the amount available. My regret is that in its wisdom the committee cut the appropriation from the authorization of $500 million back to $450 million. At one time I had considered proposing a floor amendment to restore the full amount of the authorization. I have decided not to do so. All I can say is that I hope sometime in the next 6 months another public works acceleration bill will be brought to the floor of the Senate from the Committee on Public Works of the Senate for a new program of $2 billion, because that is the best way that I know to remedy, quickly with important wealth-producing public works, the situation of chronic and persistent unemployment which affects not only my State, but a large number of other States of the Union.

I am really rather amazed that my good friend from Massachusetts, for whom I have the highest regard, and who is familiar with a condition in his own State with respect to which the public works program could be of immense benefit, should undertake to cut the proposed appropriation from $450 million to $250 million.

I hope the amendment will be soundly rejected.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to my good friend from Texas, if he will promise not to call me a crocodile.

Mr. TOWER. I did not mean to imply that my good friend from Pennsylvania was a crocodile. My reference was to crocodile tears. I did not even make specific reference as to who I thought was shedding those tears.

I know that my good friend from Pennsylvania is aware that I have much respect for his intellect and great intellectual honesty.

Mr. CLARK. It is a respect which is shared by the Senator from Pennsylvania for the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

If we are to relieve unemployment, let us approach the problem from the standpoint of doing something which is genuinely calculated to relieve unemployment by creating a favorable climate for the conduct of business. Let us get away from the old idea that what is good for business is bad for the workingman. That is the worst myth ever perpetrated on the American people.

Mr. CLARK. I say to my friend from Texas, to whom I was happy to yield, that practically every nickel of the money appropriated for public works is spent by private contractors for the benefit of private laborers within the economy of the free enterprise system, and merely helps to shore up, with the aid of the free enterprise system and business, the badly deficient needs in the public sector of our economy.

Mr. DIRKSEN obtained the floor.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to my distinguished friend from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. The distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], I believe, made the estimate that this program might result in employment of 125,000 people. I do not understand how anyone could contend that this would make more than the smallest dent in the total unemployment picture.

We should be working toward long-range solutions of the problem, rather than temporary measures which involve coming to the Congress year after year for more money which goes down the drain in static expenditures. We need some dynamic investment in this country which will cause economic growth, if we are really to have a long-range solution to the problem, or to at least mitigate the unemployment problem in this country.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield for that purpose?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this may be done without affecting the rights of the distinguished minority leader to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Georgia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, it is the anticipation of the leadership that there will be a motion to adjourn within a reasonable period of time. There will be no voting today, so every Member of the Senate is on his own from now on, until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Fortunately or unfortunately, the Senator from Rhode Island is the Senator in charge of this bill. How does that affect him? Are we going to recess or adjourn within a reasonable hour?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Whichever the Senator desires, we will do.

Mr. PASTORE. I think we ought to adourn within a very reasonable hour, if we are not going to have any votes here tonight.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the Senate cannot adjourn. I have the floor.

Mr. PASTORE. I suggest respectfully that the minority leader move to adjourn.

FEDERAL STATUTORY SALARY SYSTEMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 108)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the President of the United States has transmitted to the Senate today a message on adjustment of statutory salary schedules. This matter was transmitted to the House on yesterday, and appropriately referred.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the message received today be printed in the RECORD without having been read, and that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

I forward herewith the annual comparison of Federal salaries with the salaries paid in private enterprise, as provided by section 503 of the Federal Salary Reform Act, and recommended adjustment of the Federal statutory salary schedules in accordance therewith, to be effective in January 1964. The Civil Service Commission will send to the Congress in the next few days a draft bill which would put these recommendations into effect. The budget which I have proposed for fiscal year 1964 contains a provision for $200 million for this adjustment.

The Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962, the most important Federal employee pay legislation in 40 years, declares that Federal salary rates shall be comparable to private enterprise salary rates for the same levels of work, and provides in section 503 that:

> In order to give effect to the policy stated in section 502, the President: (1) shall direct such agency or agencies, as he deems appropriate, to prepare and submit to him annually a report which compares the rates of salary fixed by statute for Federal employees with the rates of salary paid for the same levels of work in private enterprise as determined on the basis of appropriate annual surveys conducted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and, after seeking the views of such employee organizations as he deems appropriate and in such manner as he may provide, (2) shall report annually to the Congress (a) this comparison of Federal and private enterprise salary rates and (b) such recommendations for revision of statutory salary schedules, salary structures, and compensation policy, as he deems advisable.

By Executive Order 11073, I directed the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission to make the required annual comparisons and to refer the Bureau of Labor Statistics' findings and their comparisons to the Federal employee organizations for their views. Under the order the director and the chairman are to report these comparisons and employee views to me, and to make recommendations with respect to the several statutory salary systems after consultation with the Postmaster General, the Secretary of State, and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

The first annual report of the director and the chairman is attached. The Bureau of Labor Statistics' National Survey of Professional, Administrative, Technical, and Clerical Pay shows that private enterprise rates increased in 1961-62. The new levels of private enterprise rates are reflected in the revised statutory salary schedules proposed in the attached report.

To carry out the intent of the 1962 Salary Reform Act, the schedules in the attached report, which will be in the bill to be submitted by the chairman of the Civil Service Commission, should be adopted in lieu of the second phase schedules provided in that act, to be effective in January 1964.

The Salary Reform Act, pending adjustments in executive pay, imposed a temporary $20,000 ceiling on the GS-18 salary, in place of the $24,500 rate I had recommended. As one consequence of this ceiling, the act established rates below the 1961 comparability levels for all grades above GS-7. The schedules I am now proposing include the increases necessary to bring salary rates for all grades through GS-15 up to full comparability. The scheduled rates proposed for the grades above GS-15 approach as near to full comparability as is feasible at this time, in light of the review now being made of top executive salaries. It is highly desirable, in the interests of equity and the solution of pressing problems in professional and administrative staffing, to achieve full comparability rates for all grades as soon as possible. The draft bill to be submitted by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, which would put into effect up-to-date career salary schedules, will take account of the relationship with executive pay by providing the rates above $20,000 in the recommended career schedules shall go into effect only upon adjustments in top executive pay.

In accordance with the recommendations of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, a study of executive pay is now underway. Development of an objective approach to Federal executive pay poses important and complex problems. Consequently, I have asked the Advisory Panel on Federal Salary Systems to study the subject and to recommend a course of action.

The views expressed by employee organizations, which are contained in appendix C of the attached report, are thoughtful and constructive. The greatest concern expressed by employee representatives is for reduction in the time lag between BLS reports and adjustments in the statutory salary rates. The spirit of the comparability principle and natural considerations of equity require that the lapse of time be held to the minimum possible, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and Chairman of the Civil Service Commission will review the process and renew discussion of the subject with employee organizations. Several other suggestions of substance have already been or will be studied and discussed with employee organizations.

The Government's action in this, the first year of operations under the Salary Reform Act, is critical to the rights and reasonable expectations of Federal employees and to the needs of Federal agencies. The Government has adopted the principle of comparability with private enterprise and a process for accomplishing it which are noteworthy for objectivity and clarity. By our actions in this first year's test we can demonstrate that the Government has sincerely committed itself to the twin proposition of fair treatment of its employees and adequate compensation for recruitment and retention purposes.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 29, 1963.*

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5517) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I shall make my speech tomorrow, and shall not speak tonight except for one short observation. I took note of the interesting colloquy between the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. The distinguished Senator from Texas mentioned crocodile tears. I am sure our very worthy colleague misunderstood and thought he had been talking about crocodiles. It cannot be called a crocodile in Pennsylvania. If it had been called an alligator, that would have been different, but crocodiles live in salt water. I think that is correct. So if he had called it an alligator, it might have been different.

I think I know the reason for the deep concern of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania. I have noted that, out of the first $400 million, his State received $31,502,000. There are a few more people in his State than there are in the State of Illinois, but not too many more, because Illinois has a population of 10½ million. I notice that my State received only $10,634,000, which is only one-third of what was received by the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

I allude to that fact while it is still fresh in the minds of Members of the Senate.

Beyond that, the remarks I have to make I shall make tomorrow in good time.

REPORT ON THE CURRENT STATUS OF KREBIOZEN

Mr. DIRKSEN. Meanwhile, Mr. President, I should like to submit for the RECORD, and ask unanimous consent to have printed, a report from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on the current status of a drug known as Krebiozen, over which there has been a great deal of controversy; and also, in connection with the same subject matter, under the title "Unproven Methods of Cancer Treatment," a statement by Dr. Stevan Durovic and the Krebiozen Research Foundation, which was distributed to the 59 divisions of the American Cancer Society for their information. With that I am content to yield the floor.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT ON THE CURRENT STATUS OF KREBIOZEN—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, WASHINGTON

Shortly after Dr. Kenneth M. Endicott became Director of the National Cancer Institute in July 1960, he met with Drs. Andrew Ivy and Stevan Durovic to discuss the possibility of a National Cancer Institute test of this drug. Drs. Ivy and Durovic agreed to analyze their data accumulated during the investigational study of the drug and to present the analysis to Dr. Endicott. Dr. Endicott agreed to study the report and to decide whether it provided a basis on which the National Cancer Institute could sponsor a clinical trial.

In April 1961, during the pendency of a libel suit between Dr. Ivy and Dr. Stoddard in the northern district of Illinois, District Judge Miner concluded that he could not decide the case without deciding whether Krebiozen had any merit as a cancer treatment. He wrote to Dr. Endicott asking that the Department undertake an evaluation of the drug.

Secretary Ribicoff replied with a detailed statement of what would be needed to enable the Department to appraise the drug as a cancer treatment. Briefly, Judge Miner was told that we would have to have complete information about composition, how and where the drug was made, the controls exercised to assure its safety and effectiveness, the analytical methods available to control its composition, and full information about all of the claimed cures. Secretary Ribicoff's letter indicated that, since the drug had been used for a considerable period of time under an investigational use label, it had had a comprehensive human test, and that the records should show whether or not the drug had any merit in the treatment of cancer. He told the firm that the Department would have to have full documentation on each claimed cure, including the diagnosis (with biopsy), treatment given before and after Krebiozen, details of Krebiozen treatment, and the basis on which it had been concluded that Krebiozen was effective.

On September 29, 1961, Drs. Ivy, Durovic, and Pick brought to Dr. Endicott (1) a voluminous rought draft report, (2) a manuscript to be considered for publication in the Journal of the National Cancer Institute, and (3) two small vials containing minute amounts (considerably less than the 10 milligrams they claim to have delivered) of a whitish material which was said to be Krebiozen.

The manuscript was submitted to the editorial board of the Journal of the National Cancer Institute, and the vials were delivered to chemists for analysis. The editorial board rejected the manuscript on the ground that it did not meet established standards for publication in the Journal. Dr. Andervont wrote to Dr. Ivy on December 1, 1961, explaining the reasons for the rejection.

The analysis of the report and of the material in the vials required some months. On March 7, 1962, Dr. Endicott wrote to Drs. Ivy and Durovic detailing the inadequacies in the data and requesting additional information.

The next the Department heard on this was a letter from Dr. Ivy which was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on July 20, 1962. A copy of this letter was delivered to Dr. Endicott's office on July 17, 1962. This letter challenges many statements in Dr. Endicott's letter of March 7, but it does not present any additional scientific data. Nothing that has been submitted to the National Cancer Institute, or has otherwise come to the Department's attention, lends, in our judgment, any scientific support to the claims published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (vol. 108, pt. 11, pp. 14287–14288) under the heading "Improvement, Objective and Subjective, in 35 Tumor Types (Organ Groups) Treated With Krebiozen."

For some time Krebiozen has been promoted and sold as a cancer remedy. On November 29, 1962, Commissioner Larrick of the Food and Drug Administration received a voluminous promotional piece for Krebiozen, which includes the chart reproduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and claims that substantially all forms of cancer yield to Krebiozen therapy in a significant percentage of cases.

There is no license or approved new drug application for this product. Its sale without a license is prohibited by the biological control provisions of the Public Health Service Act. It is being distributed ostensibly for investigational use on human patients. That there has not been compliance with the regulations for the investigative use of drugs is evident from the fact that the records required to be kept and made available are not available.

The National Cancer Institute has stated that it cannot help to resolve this long-continued controversy without the scientific evidence on which the claimed merit of Krebiozen rests. The Institute cannot design a clinical study and ask volunteers to submit to this drug without dependable information about how it is made, standardized and controlled and without substantial evidence from preclinical studies to establish its safety and clinical evidence from the 12 years of its widespread use for investigational purposes to support the idea that the drug may possibly have merit in some types of cancer. This is the information which Drs. Ivy and Durovic were asked to supply by Dr. Endicott's letter of March 7.

The basic difficulty is that Drs. Ivy and Durovic either cannot or will not supply this necessary information. Perhaps to some extent they do not have it, but are relying on secondhand reports about the action of the drug. In their letter, which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, they suggest "that the National Cancer Institute obtain the services of other Federal agencies with legal authority and power to secure this information from hospitals and physicians who have refused to give it to us."

The Food and Drug Administration and the Division of Biologic Standards of the Public Health Service are initiating an appropriate investigation. They will ask Drs. Ivy and Durovic to cooperate by giving the names and addresses of treated patients and of the physicians who know about their cases. While the letter of July 17 states that the promoters of the drug have case reports attested to by licensed physicians, no such reports have yet been submitted to the Department.

The objective of our investigation will be to learn the full details on the manufacture, standardization, and control of Krebiozen; to obtain adequate samples for analysis; and to examine the complete reports on treated patients to arrive at a conclusion whether there is any scientific evidence to support the design and execution of a clinical trial. The investigation also will determine whether the drug is being distributed in accordance with the applicable regulatory laws.

If the drug is to continue to be sold, it will have to be licensed by the Public Health Service or approved as a new drug under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. If it is to be continued as a drug for investigational use on human patients, it will have to comply with the requirements promulgated in accordance with the Kefauver-Harris Drug Amendments of 1962. These regulations provide that for drug investigations that were underway on August 10, 1962, the sponsor of the investigational program has 120 days from February 7, 1963, to gather and present to the Department the necessary information about the composition and identity of the drug, its preclinical investigations, the plan and results of clinical investigations carried out thus far, and a rational plan for the continuation of such investigations.

It is the Department's purpose to gather the clinical records on patients who are claimed to have been treated successfully, in an effort to answer definitely the question of Krebiozen's merit, and, at the same time, to assure that the distribution of this product comports with Federal regulatory laws.

FEBRUARY 1963.

[From CA–A Cancer Journal for Clinicians, 1962]

UNPROVEN METHODS OF CANCER TREATMENT

The following statement concerning Krebiozen, a preparation proposed for the treatment of cancer by Dr. Stevan Durovic and the Krebiozen Research Foundation, was recently distributed to the 59 divisions of the American Cancer Society for their information.

"KREBIOZEN

"Krebiozen is reported to have been originally produced by Stevan Durovic, M.D., a Yugoslavian physician, in Argentina, and brought to the United States in 1949. According to Dr. Durovic, the original 2 grams of powder, from which he said 200,000 doses were prepared, was obtained as an extract of the blood of 2,000 Argentine horses which had previously been injected with a sterile extract of Actinomyces bovis, a micro-organism which causes a disease called lumpy jaw in cattle. In October 1960 Dr. Durovic was quoted in newspapers as stating that, during that year, he had made two batches of Krebiozen in Illinois, each yielding about 250 milligrams (1/120) of an ounce), approximately 50,000 doses of the drug. He stated that analysis of the material showed it contained lipopolysaccharides, consisting of a mixture of six sugars, since reported to be galacturonic acid, galactose, glucose, glucosamine, arabinose and xylose, combined with a fat molecule. Dr. Durovic said that this was the same substance found by chemical analysis in his original batch of Krebiozen.

"Since mid-1959, a drug made in the same way as Krebiozen, but called Lipopolysaccharide C, has been prepared and studied by Dr. Andrew C. Ivy, professor emeritus of the University of Illinois, who has been interested in Krebiozen since 1949. According to Dr. Ivy, Lipopolysaccharide C, which he stated is the scientific name of Krebiozen, consists of a fatty substance conjoined with a substance containing several sugars, six of which have been identified. Different batches of the lipopolysaccharide are reported to have different strengths. Efforts are being made to produce this substance synthetically.

"Three organizations have been primarily concerned with the production, use, and distribution or sale of Krebiozen. At present, Krebiozen is being distributed by Promak Laboratories, Inc., of Chicago. This corporation was originally organized as the Instituto Biologicao Duga of Buenos Aires, and later was known as the Duga Laboratories, Inc., of Buenos Aires and Chicago. It is owned by Dr. Stevan Durovic and his brother, Marko Durovic, a lawyer.

"The Krebiozen Research Foundation, Chicago, Ill., is registered in the State of Illinois as a nonprofit corporation. It furnishes Krebiozen to physicians who request it for investigational use. According to the foundation, patients treated with Krebiozen are requested, through the physician who obtains it, to make a contribution to the Promak Laboratories which supplies the drug.

"The Ivy Cancer Research Foundation, Chicago, Ill., was incorporated as a not-for-profit corporation on March 4, 1959. In a fund-raising brochure, distributed in 1960, it is stated that: 'The foundation is dedicated to furthering research conducted by Dr. Andrew C. Ivy and others whose projects may be approved by the foundation, on the use of Lipopolysaccharide C.'

"Several other organizations and individuals have been active in disseminating information about, and seeking to arouse interest in, Krebiozen as a treatment for cancer.

"Preliminary results with Krebiozen as a treatment for cancer were first announced, both to the medical profession and to the public, at a meeting called for this purpose at the Drake Hotel in Chicago on March 26, 1951. Following this announcement, several medical centers were given small amounts of the preparation for experimental use. During the intervening 10 years, no scientifically acceptable report substantiating the usefulness of the drug has been issued.

"In September 1961 the Krebiozen Research Foundation and Dr. Andrew C. Ivy gave representatives of the National Cancer Institute a small amount of Krebiozen, reported to be 10 milligrams ($\frac{1}{3.000}$ of an ounce), together with an analysis of clinical data on 4,200 cancer patients. The National Cancer Institute studied these data. In March 1962, Dr. Kenneth M. Endicott, Director of National Cancer Institute, reported that he had notified Drs. Durovic and Ivy that more information must be provided before the decision could be made whether and how to test the preparation in human beings. The American Cancer Society hopes that acceptable scientific evidence concerning the value or lack of value of this preparation may be obtained without further delay for the information of physicians who have the responsibility for the treatment of patients with cancer.

"There is no evidence available to the American Cancer Society, up to the present, that demonstrates that Krebiozen is of proven merit in the treatment of human cancer."

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have not yielded the floor yet.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If the Senator will yield, was the Senator speaking in behalf of Krebiozen or against it?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Does the Senator mean the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. LAUSCHE. No; the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I was not doing either. I was submitting a report from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which undertook some experimentation at the request of a distinguished U.S. judge from Chicago.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What did the experiment show?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Evidently that all the claims for Krebiozen made until now are not substantiated by this report.

Mr. LAUSCHE. A serious argument is being made by the Krebiozen people to the effect that it is of greater benefit than the health services have admitted.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; I understand that to be the case. I try always to keep an open mind.

AUTOMATION AND UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, yesterday the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], while presiding over the hearings of the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, stated that he had addressed a letter on that date to Hon. Willard W. Wirtz, Secretary of Labor, suggesting the formation of a Cabinet level Council on Automation. Our distinguished colleague from Oregon addressed similar communications to the Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare, Commerce, and Agriculture, urging them to bring to the attention of the President the need for such a Council, which would in the words of the Senator from Oregon seek "to identify and describe what has taken place in the field of automation, what is currently occurring in this area, and what is likely to occur within the next decade, together with specific proposals designed to meet and ameliorate these adverse effects upon the men and women who make up our working force."

I share the concern expressed by my courageous colleague in the Senate, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], and I register my personal gratitude to him for urging upon the President and the Cabinet the formation of such a Council.

Having witnessed for more than a decade the rapid replacement of men by machines in the coal mines of West Virginia, I am acutely aware of the economic and social dislocations that can follow the process of automation. And I emphasize to my colleagues that the coal industry is not unique in this respect. The process of technological innovation is occurring throughout the spectrum of American industry and commerce.

While it is quite true, as Vannevar Bush stated last year that there is "nothing new about automation, except the term itself," the pace with which changes are occurring presents the problem in dimensions that we have not yet faced. The rapid acceleration of automation has assumed these new dimensions largely because of the massive national investment in industrial research and development. In 1959, for example, our industrial research and development efforts amounted to $8.36 billion, of which the Federal Government supplied some $4.76 billion. That is, in 1959 the Federal Government spent $4.76 billion in research and development activities, a large portion of which went into the acceleration of that kind of technological development which is broadly covered by the term automation.

By fiscal 1962 the figures had increased to a total national investment in industrial research and development of $10.87 billion, of which $6.31 billion was supplied by the Federal Government.

Despite this tremendous investment, the dean of one of America's leading graduate schools of business stated before the American Assembly on Automation last year that while "industrial research grew at an extraordinarily high rate in the 1950's," it will probably "expand more slowly in the late 1960's."

Perhaps the rate of acceleration, or expansion, of research will not be as great as in the previous decade, but this does not imply that the application of research findings will not continue to increase at a rapid rate. In fact, it would seem to me that the pressures of competition from abroad and the built-in dynamics of scientic technology would lead to precisely this kind of accelerated application of the practical findings of research.

In the past few decades, Mr. President, we have looked to the service industries and trade to absorb the displaced workers from agriculture, mining, and manufacturing. But there is serious question whether this rather automatic sponging operation will continue to prevail. For if there is one central feature in the present phase of automation, it is the impact of computer technology.

Reference has been made to that type of technology by my friend the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Beall] with whom I had the privilege of serving in the U.S. House of Representatives when we represented districts separated only by the Potomac River. I invite the attention of the distinguished occupant of the Chair [Mr. Brewster in the Chair], who serves so very well the State of Maryland, to the fact that the comments which were made by his colleague from Maryland have some validity. We sometimes think too much in terms of statistics and not enough in terms of the impact on human beings.

The conclusion is, in my opinion, an inescapable one that we must mobilize the full resources of Government, industry and the academic world in order to plot the path of the future, to minimize the social and economic dislocations that follow in the wake of technological development, and to realize the full benefits of the new technology in greater employment and prosperity for all Americans. At this point I ask to have printed in the Record a letter I recently wrote to the editor of the Washington Star in reference to a most compelling article on this subject by columnist, Ralph McGill.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Man Versus Automation

Ralph McGill, in his column "A Protest Against Automation," has once again demonstrated his unique capacity for reducing sociological and economic abstractions to their fundamental human terms.

While Government administrators and private planners are quite rightly concerned with such concepts as "the growth rate of our gross national product," and "structural unemployment versus frictional unemployment," we are prone to forget that the ultimate meaning of such terms is given in the lives of individual people. It matters little in the final analysis to the writer of the letter to Mr. McGill, and the millions of other unemployed and underemployed persons whether they are the victims of structural or frictional unemployment. The important facts to them are loss of income, shrinking economic opportunities and the attendant erosion of dignity and self-respect.

We may not, as Mr. McGill, stated, being "committed to morality * * * refuse to hear" the voices of these persons. As a member of the Manpower and Employment Subcommittee of Labor and Public Welfare, I have heard their voices, not only in our State of West Virginia, but throughout the United States, wherever our subcommittee has conducted hearings.

> The problems of reducing unemployment and assuring greater economic opportunities for all our working men and women, have long been matters of concern to me. They constitute, in my opinion, the major domestic challenge in America during this decade and within the foreseeable future. And their solution will test to the utmost our resources of intelligence and ingenuity in bringing about cooperative efforts on the part of Government, industry and labor.
>
> JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
> *U.S. Senator From West Virginia.*

REVISION AND REVIEW OF THE ANTITRUST LAWS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] may join as a cosponsor of the bill, S. 1255, to appoint a commission to revise the antitrust laws of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. I consider it a great honor to join the distinguished Senator from Maryland, who also served on so important a matter in the other body, in sponsoring the bill. I believe it needs to be emphasized almost continuously that American business runs up against the buzz saw of antitrust law which in many respects are obsolescent. They urgently need review in the interest of enabling private business to really do the job for our country here and abroad which is needed to be done.

If we need an example, there is the recent advisory ruling of the Federal Trade Commission which prevents druggists, for example, from pooling their advertising allowances in order to advertise a product, because, the Commission advises, the advertisement mentions a price; whereas that is the only way that they can compete with the big drug chains. The basis for the ruling, of course, is the antitrust laws, which urgently need review. It is about 20 years since the last time this job was done.

Therefore I consider it a very fine thing that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] should join with me in this effort.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I commend the senior Senator from New York for suggesting the establishment of a study commission to review our antitrust laws. I have felt for a long time that both the Clayton Act and the Sherman Act needed careful review and revision. They have not been carefully reviewed since they were drafted and enacted into law many years ago. It is the feeling of the Senator from Maryland that at times they are much too stringent in their application to present business conditions, and therefore at times inhibit and unwisely limit further business expansion. Therefore I am very happy to join with the senior Senator from New York in sponsoring the proposed legislation.

I again commend the distinguished senior Senator from New York for bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate and the Nation.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague.

FIRST MEETING OF PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON REGISTRATION AND VOTING PARTICIPATION, MAY 8, 1963

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, on Wednesday, May 8, the President's Commission on Registration and Voting Participation will convene its first meeting here in Washington.

I am delighted that this Commission has been created by Executive order to look into the reasons why so many Americans fail to exercise their right to vote, and to propose possible solutions to the problem.

Less than 65 percent of Americans of voting age cast ballots in the 1960 presidential election. As registration chairman for the Democratic National Committee in 1956, I learned at firsthand some of the problems that confront potential voters across this Nation.

President Kennedy deserves high commendation for taking the important and tangible step of creating this Commission as a means of expressing his deep concern about the vexing problem of nonvoting in our democracy. I call the attention of the Senate to a portion of the excellent statement the President made when he created the Commission on Registration and Voting Participation:

> Responsible Americans are increasingly concerned with the widespread failure of our citizens to exercise their right to vote and restrictions which prevent many Americans from voting. I have recommended legislation to protect voting rights against discrimination on the basis of race and color in my message to Congress on civil rights of last month. However, the problems are by no means limited to this type of discrimination.
>
> It has been estimated that some 8 million Americans were unable to vote in the election of 1960 because they were unable to comply with State and local residence requirements, which penalize the Nation's mobile population. Additional millions of Americans are precluded from exercising their franchise because of limitations on absentee registration and voting—a problem especially important in the case of military and civil service personnel whose work requires them to be located outside of the State in which they vote. Other Americans are prevented from voting by registration procedures which make voting unnecessarily difficult.
>
> I have, therefore, today established the President's Commission on Registration and Voting Participation to study the reasons for the failure of many citizens to register and vote in elections for Members of Congress, the President, and Vice President, including laws which restrict registration and voting on the basis of residence, economic status, registration procedures, absentee voting provisions, and other reasons for nonvoting.

Mr. President, the Chairman of this Commission is Richard M. Scammon, a distinguished political scientist who is Director of the Bureau of the Census. His colleagues on the Commission include other outstanding political scientists and educators, noted civic workers, and political leaders of both major parties. Mr. Donald Herzberg of the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers University has been appointed as Acting Staff Director. I am confident that the Commission will undertake a thorough study of these problems and will present a useful and thought-provoking report to the President.

The Washington Post, in a lucid editorial commenting on the creation of the Commission, made this comment:

> A free country where voting is solely a matter of individual choice can never expect to equal the turnout of a totalitarian country where voting is in fact or in effect compulsory. But a vast improvement in the American voting record could be made by simply modernizing the laws so as to encourage participation instead of making it unnecessarily burdensome.

The Washington Post has made a well-reasoned contribution to the dialog on this subject, and I commend that newspaper for it.

I wish the Commission well in its studies and deliberations and shall look forward to reading the Commission report after it has been submitted to President Kennedy on November 30.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of the public statement and Executive order by which the President created the Commission on Registration and Voting Participation, as well as the text of the Washington Post editorial on the subject.

There being no objection, the statement and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE ORDER ESTABLISHING THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON REGISTRATION AND VOTING PARTICIPATION

Whereas less than 65 percent of the U.S. population of voting age cast ballots for presidential electors in 1960; and

Whereas popular participation in government through elections is essential to a democratic form of government; and

Whereas the causes of nonvoting are not fully understood and more effective corrective action will be possible on the basis of a better understanding of the causes of the failure of many citizens to register and vote;

Now, therefore, by virtue of the authority vested in me as President of the United States, it is ordered as follows:

SECTION 1. (a) There is hereby established the President's Commission on Registration and Voting Participation (hereinafter referred to as the Commission).

(b) The Commission shall be composed of not more than 11 members, each of whom shall be appointed by the President. One of the members of the Commission shall be designated by the President as the Chairman thereof.

SEC. 2. The Commission shall:

(a) Study the reasons for the failure of many citizens to register and vote in elections for selection of Members of Congress, the President, and Vice President including:

(1) Laws which restrict registration and voting on the basis of residence, economic status, or other reasons;

(2) procedures for registration of voters;

(3) absentee voting provisions; and

(4) causes of nonvoting by persons who are otherwise qualified to vote.

(b) Prepare and present to the President recommendations for increasing citizen participation in Government through the exercise of the right to vote.

SEC. 3. The Commission shall not consider matters placed under the jurisdiction of the Commission on Civil Rights by the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (71 Stat. 634), as amended.

SEC. 4. All who may be in a position to do so are requested to furnish the Commission information pertinent to its work and otherwise to facilitate the Commission's work.

SEC. 5. Each member of the Commission shall receive compensation of $75 for each day such member is engaged upon the work of the Commission, except that any member who then receives other compensation from the United States shall serve as such member without compensation under this order. The Commission is authorized to appoint such personnel as may be necessary to assist the Commission in connection with the performance of its functions without regard to the civil service and classification laws, but no such personnel shall receive compensation at a rate in excess of $17,500 per annum. The Commission is authorized to obtain services in accordance with the provisions of section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not in excess of $75 per diem for individuals.

SEC. 6. The compensation of the members and personnel of the Commission, lawful allowances therefor, and any other necessary expenses arising in connection with the work of the Commission shall be paid from the appropriation appearing under the heading "Special Projects" in title III of the Treasury-Post Office Departments and Executive Office Appropriation Act, 1963, 76 Stat. 310, and such appropriation as may be provided for the same purposes for the fiscal year 1964. Such payments shall be made without regard to the provisions of section 3681 of the Revised Statutes and section 9 of the act of March 4, 1909, 35 Stat. 1027 (31 U.S.C. 672 and 673).

SEC. 7. The General Services Administration is hereby designated as the agency which shall provide administrative services for the Commission on a reimbursable basis.

SEC. 8. The Commission in its discretion may transmit to the President such preliminary or interim report or reports as it may deem appropriate. It shall transmit its principal study and recommendations to the President not later than November 30, 1963, together with such supporting materials as it deems appropriate. The Commission shall terminate not later than 60 days after the submission of its principal report to the President.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 30, 1963.*

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 17, 1963]

WHY DON'T THEY VOTE?

President Kennedy is quite properly concerned about the 37,500,000 Americans of voting age who do not go to the polls. In the congressional elections the number of stay-at-homes is much larger. Last year only 49 percent of the potential voters actually cast ballots. What kept the majority away? Fortunately, the President's concern has prompted him to name a Commission under the chairmanship of Richard M. Scammon, Director of the Census Bureau, to find out why so many avoid the polls and to recommend what should be done about it.

Many millions of Americans lose their votes each year because of changes in their places of residence. Some of this loss is unavoidable in a society on wheels, but an enormous amount of it is a direct result of voting laws carried over from the horse-and-buggy days. In many States the residence requirement for voting is unreasonably long. Others offer inadequate opportunity for registration. So much has been said in recent years about racial bars to voting (which are a special concern of the Civil Rights Commission) that other major impediments have been much neglected.

Another serious weakness is the system for absentee voting as it operates in many of the States. Why should not absentee ballots be made available to all qualified voters who are hospitalized or ill at home and to those who are away from home for any purpose as well as to the personnel of the armed services? Wider use of absentee voters' ballots could add many millions to the list of voters in a general election.

Some allowance always will have to be made for the few who take a walk on election day because of irritation with both parties and for those who have not sufficient interest in public affairs to go to the polls. A free country where voting is solely a matter of individual choice can never expect to equal the turnout of a totalitarian country where voting is in fact or in effect compulsory. But a vast improvement in the American voting record could be made by simply modernizing the laws so as to encourage participation instead of making it unnecessarily burdensome.

DEATH OF JAMES L. McDEVITT, DIRECTOR, AFL–CIO COMMITTEE ON POLITICAL EDUCATION

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, it was with profound sadness that I learned of the recent death of James L. McDevitt, director of the AFL–CIO Committee on Political Education. His contribution to the labor movement has spanned many years, from his early beginning as a plasterer to the important and responsible post he held as director of COPE. The progress made within the ranks of organized labor in the field of political education stands as a living testament to Jim McDevitt's dedication and belief in the very essence of democracy—an informed electorate. One example of this was the all-out support he gave nonpartisan registration drives and his support of American Heritage Council activities in this field. We in Congress who were privileged to know and work with him will miss him.

I should also like to comment on the efforts of Al Barkan, who for many years has served as Jim McDevitt's deputy in COPE. Mr. Barkan, too, began his efforts with organized labor in the early days of the trade union movement with textile workers. Before he came to his present position, he taught school, worked as a labor organizer, served on the CIO Council in New Jersey, and then started his long career with COPE—first within the CIO and now with the merged union movement. He, too, has been vitally interested in increasing voter registration and lending his efforts to this end. Along this line, too, he has made a most important contribution to labor and this Nation by helping to develop and intensify local leadership so as to help unionists become more effective in basic political action and better informed and aware of their civic responsibilities.

I feel it would be the highest form of tribute to the memory of Jim McDevitt if his deputy and the man indoctrinated in his ideas and views were selected to succeed him as director of AFL–CIO COPE and if he were to be the man who worked so long and so closely in kindred spirit and dedication with him—Al Barkan.

LAUBACH FUND PUSHES BACK BARRIER OF ILLITERACY

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, we live today in a world converted into a neighborhood because of scientific and technological progress.

At the start of this century, traveling from one continent to another was a prolonged process. Today it is but a matter of hours.

A century ago, communication was a lengthy and tedious operation. Today it is instantaneous.

Yet while the size of the world has indeed shrunk and physical barriers and boundaries have all but disappeared, the lines of distinction between peoples, the differences and corollary friction among them have persisted and prevailed, because they have failed to reach each other's souls and spirits.

Beneath this failure to achieve international understanding lies largely one reason—illiteracy. For even the wondrous advantages provided by modern communications facilities are negated where the written word is not comprehended nor understood.

Aside from the heavy drag it exerts on international affairs, illiteracy, as many of us would admit, also lies at the root of our own problem of racial minorities within our own borders. This is the reason why Congress has spent much time in the consideration of measures designed to remedy this unhappy situation.

Today I wish to note with pleasure that we are not alone in our endeavors along this line. Many of our fellow citizens are generously engaged in the unselfish labor of eradicating illiteracy, and in the process improving understanding among peoples of divergent origins, as well as improving the condition of those who have come to our shores to seek their future under the shelter and blessings of our democratic system.

I cite with justifiable pride the activities of a nationwide organization which is very active—especially among Americans of Mexican descent—in my home State of California.

This organization is known as the Laubach Literacy Fund. Its founder and president is Frank C. Laubach. His "each one teach one" program has enlisted dedicated, unselfish workers. As a result, his organization has been instrumental in eradicating illiteracy among those less fortunate in our Southwest. It has helped to improve their lot and, as a result, to provide an opportunity for them to better themselves in our society.

More than this, the Laubach Literacy Fund has expanded its sphere of activities to include projects in South America and Asia where there are now a good number of Americans helping duly-constituted governments fight the blight of illiteracy.

They and their other unnamed coworkers in both the domestic and foreign projects of the Laubach Literacy Fund justly deserve our appreciation and gratitude for their public-spirited work.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article in the San Clemente Sun-Post for March 3, 1963, be printed at this point in the RECORD. The article details the effect of the program I have outlined.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN BORN LEARNING ENGLISH BY OBJECT ASSOCIATION

(By Beth G. Murphy)

Damian Orozco is 16. Tall with a deeply bronzed skin, flashing the smile that is typical of his race, he's a Gulliver among his pygmy schoolmates in the 7th grade in the Capistrano school district. Now and then, both in school and on the playground he senses that the ripples of mirth from his mateys is agin' him rather than for him, but he laughs too. Some day, very soon, he'll know the meaning of the laughter, for he's learning English, and fast, under the Laubach literacy program instituted here last June.

Rigaberto Garcia, aged 24, is husky, a laborer at the San Onofre Ranch. What he learns at the twice-weekly evening lessons in the education center of the United Presbyterian Church, he carries back to his fellow Mexican nationals. The program is designed for that purpose.

In front of the two boys is the teacher, with a chart. She points to a picture. It depicts an ear.

"This is one ear," says Damian, clutching at his right lobe.

"This is the other ear," says Rigaberto, touching his left lobe.

"We have two ears," they both chorus. Teacher looks pleased.

"This is a dish.

"This is my arm.

"This is a apple." Teacher softly repeats "an apple," but lays no stress on the correction. They proceed to their extremities and suddenly find out that one and one don't make two "foots," but two feet.

Teachers in this kind of learning always praise the learner. Thus they feel a freedom to try, knowing that they are not losing face. English is the hardest of all languages to learn. As a single example of what a foreigner is up against in the bewildering changes rung on the same English spelling, let the reader try this: "I should come though a tough cough plough through me."

Learning is by association of pictured word and simple vocabulary. Dr. Frank Laubach instituted this kind of crash linguistic program, known as each one teach one, some 25 years ago in the Philippines when illiteracy was 84 percent. Enormously successful, he carried the work of devising alphabets where none existed, teaching the language of the country. In 96 countries and in 274 languages (which include numerous primitive dialects in primitive places) he emphasized the simplicity with which each learner could teach another illiterate.

It's no accident that this program is torched in this city, so close to the Mexican border, from whence come families for seasonal work. Here too, hardly realized, live numerous Japanese, Korean, Italian, French any other nationalities, wives of servicemen attached to Camp Pendleton.

"It is for us good," says Celia Corona, a sprayer with the local Gregori Copper Co. She's teamed up in her duo with Etrlvina Ramirez (one teacher to two pupils only). Together, with liberal hard play, in English, they convey that they love America and would like to speak the language freely.

The advised method of teaching the Laubach literacy program, uses the picture-word chart, followed by handling of the actual materials. The cup is on hand, so is the dish, so is the apple, so are the various household items a girl would want to define. Etheline knows all the words pertaining to cooking (she is a housekeeper). Both she and her companion recognize the cooking vessels and what articles around a home are called in English. They both burst into gales of laughter when they pronounce "bird" or "girl." They are thrown by the staccato sound. The majority of languages are phonetic. That is, each vowel and consonant get full value. Not so in English. It is filled with idioms, exceptions, and an average of six sorts of sound for each vowel.

But along with learning, these twice-weekly meetings are a social party for the oftentimes lonely foreigners isolated in tight little groups here. Sometimes papa and mama come bringing their flock. They have no place to leave the youngsters. The children are beautifully behaved. The older children manifest concern for their parents. They want to be with them. "They may be afraid," the children say. Children readily attain language ability in school but at home, unless the parents too can speak English, they revert to their own tongue.

Some 18 adults were present at the classes on George Washington's Birthday. The lesson had been about him. They had spoken of his being the Father of his Country. He had a wife named Martha. He was a farmer. He was a very honest man. He was a liberator like Juarez and Father Hidalgo. He was asked if he had cut down a cherry tree, and he said yes, he did it.

That evening the teachers had provided cookies made like hatchets, little American flags and napkins. This was a real party. They loved it.

Some 60 people have now taken the course in its 6 months' inception in San Clemente. Their meeting place here is a convenience. The program belongs to no creed, color, or race. It is universal. In farflung countries, they meet in the open, or in a thatched hut. To each is given the power of teaching another.

Oftentimes, a brilliant student in his own country comes to take the program, so that he may go home and pass on the Laubach method. Currently, Alfonso LaCuesta, aged 26, from Mexicali, hopes to do just that.

Officers and chairmen of the South Coast Literacy Council in this area are Mrs. F. Line, president; J. Leslie Putnam, secretary; Mrs. Roy Rudolph, treasurer; Mrs. Zack Magness, devotions; Mrs. Victor Semrau, publicity; Mrs. Jean Lyman and Mrs. Dora Reese, coordinators for the teaching course.

More volunteers in this heart-warming experience are needed. A few hours teaches the method. Mrs. Line, GY 6-9131 or Mrs. Lyman, GY 6-5258 will supply needed information.

THIRD-COUNTRY NATIONALS IN AID PROGRAMS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I have been told that there are hundreds—perhaps thousands—of technical jobs being filled by third-country nationals in some of our AID projects overseas. My source is George E. Fischer, secretary of the nonprofit Overseas Craftsman's Association, with headquarters in Los Angeles and New York City.

For example, Mr. Fischer tells me, on an AID project in Cambodia a substantial number of Philippine nationals are performing such jobs as operating heavy earth-moving equipment for which there are qualified Americans available.

Mr. Fischer points out that AID's manuals state clearly that third-country nationals may be hired only if qualified American technicians are not available.

Another example he cites—though not an AID project—is the employment of some 140 Philippine nationals to rehabilitate facilities on typhoon-struck Guam, a U.S. possession.

Mr. Fischer writes:

> I am totally unable to understand why our American tax dollars continue to be used to provide employment for third-country nationals when we do have qualified people in the United States to perform these functions.

Fischer observes that many of the jobs could be filled from the heavy ranks of our unemployed in the United States.

And he adds that there are any number of qualified secretarial and clerical personnel in the United States who would be overjoyed at the opportunity of working on AID projects overseas.

Mr. Fischer states there are at least 605 jobs being held by third-country nationals in the Far East and southeast Asia alone—and probably many more.

I think Mr. Fischer's complaints are worthy of competent and thorough investigation and correction, and I am taking steps to help to assure that this will be done, as it should be done.

OPPOSITION TO PROPOSED HAWAII LAND LAW

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I invite the attention of my colleagues and readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to an inspiring and eloquent sermon entitled "When Small People Think Big," recently delivered by Rev. Dr. Abraham K. Akaka, of Honolulu. The setting for his message was the historic Hawaiian Kawaiahao Church, across the square from Iolani Palace, the seat of Hawaii's State government.

Inside the palace, where the State legislature is meeting, a group of senators is vigorously attempting to enact into law a land measure which many leaders of the Hawaiian community and many others greatly fear will work to the detriment of citizens of Hawaiian and part-Hawaiian blood.

A substantially similar measure has already passed the Hawaii House of Representatives.

Under the proposed senate measure, landowners such as the Bishop estate, a charitable educational trust established by Princess Bernice Pauahi Bishop, whose main source of revenue is land lease rentals, would be compelled to sell lands leased for 15 years or longer if the lessee desires to buy.

The trustees of the Bishop estate have used the income of the trust for the maintenance and upkeep of the Kamehameha Schools for students of Hawaiian and Part-Hawaiian blood, now numbering about 2,500 students.

Plans are underway to enlarge the enrollment to 3,500 students, to hold classes on our neighbor islands, and to provide adult education instruction.

To understand the full significance of the land measure to the people of Hawaiian and Part-Hawaiian blood, we must understand that the Hawaiian people—that is, the Polynesians—were the first to settle these mid-Pacific islands in the Hawaiian chain. They lived in isolation for about a thousand years; but when foreigners discovered their islands, the warmhearted natives welcomed with graciousness and generosity these aliens of many tongues, of many skins, and of many cultural backgrounds.

The fact that the multiracial, multicultural, multicolored citizens of Hawaii live in harmony and concord today is due in great measure to the aloha spirit, the spirit of brotherhood, manifested by the native Hawaiian people, which they transmitted to all newcomers.

As the decades went by, the number of native Hawaiians in relation to other peoples on the islands steadily diminished, and their voice in island life became relatively weaker. Whereas once the native Hawaiians were the major ethnic group in Hawaii, now the Hawaiian and Part-Hawaiian people comprise only about 17 percent of our total population.

The Hawaiian people are a gentle people; and in the fiercely competitive world, they chose not to struggle for power or ascendancy over others. Instead, with patience and without rancor, they have endured the gradual decline of their preponderant majority, the steady erosion of their economic substance, principally land, and the lessening of their governmental influence in Hawaii.

But the current attempt to take away their last and biggest tangible asset, the eleemosynary landed estates held in trust for the Hawaiian people, tested their patience beyond the breaking point. Such is their deep concern and anxiety that the Hawaiian societies have joined forces to counter what they overwhelmingly regard as a real threat to the future of the Hawaiian people. To express their deep feeling, they gathered at Kawaiahao Church, met in prayer, listened to their pastor, who counseled restraint and dignified conduct, and then, under flaming torches, and singing hymns, they marched in parade to the palace, to protest the land bill.

Later—on Sunday, April 21—Reverend Akaka, himself the proud possessor of native Hawaiian blood, and the shepherd of his flock, spoke strongly against moves to jeopardize these remaining assets devoted to the children, the orphans, the destitute, and the aged of Hawaiian ancestry—indeed, to all the native Hawaiian people. He urged that the Kamehameha schools, the Bishop Estate, the Liliuokalani Trust, and Lunalilo Home be protected and preserved and held inviolate for all time for the native people of Hawaii.

Reverend Akaka issued a clarion call for the Hawaiian people and the friends of the Hawaiian people to seek justice for the native Hawaiian people, who, as he pointed out, once constituted a proud nation to whom the Hawaiian Islands belonged. He said:

> Let it not be said to native people in other nations that the native people of Hawaii had to plead for the last precious things they have inherited and that they own as a people, that the poor were deprived in favor of the rich.

Reverend Akaka told his parishioners that they cannot "just wait and hope for a best that never materializes." He exhorted them to "try by faith to take hold of life and discipline our lives to high purpose."

The particular circumstances which inspired Reverend Akaka are unique to Hawaii. But his message of hope and inspiration has universal application for minority peoples everywhere. His plea for united action by native Hawaiian people and concentration on fundamentals that unite, and not on details that divide their strength, is sound counsel for Cuban exiles in America who long to set free their homeland, for captive peoples of Europe and Asia who yearn for liberty and self-determination, and for downtrodden minorities, wherever they may be.

In order that others may have the benefit of Reverend Akaka's stirring message, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the sermon be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHEN SMALL PEOPLE THINK BIG

(By Rev. Dr. Abraham K. Akaka)

This is a critical and important week for our Hawaiian people, and my sermon is entitled "When Small People Think Big." Because of the Maryland law matter, I would like to speak of our need as a people and to ask for the understanding and the help of our friends here in our islands.

This is the season we call Eastertide. Eastertide is the season of Resurrection and new life for Christians everywhere; and this morning I have chosen for our text from the Gospel according to St. John, this situation in which our Lord is picking his disciples. Our Lord calls Philip to follow Him; and then Philip finds Nathanael and says to Nathanael, "We have found Him of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph." Nathanael cannot believe that the Messiah could come out of such a small town as Nazareth and so he asks Philip, "Can anything good come out of Nazareth?" In Nathanael's voice is honesty, and no guile, but Philip ignores the question and he does not argue with Nathanael. He merely says, "Come and see."

One of the most eye-catching ads I've seen recently is one put out by the Volkswagen people. Smack in the center of a whole big page of a magazine is the picture of a tiny car with the words, "Think small." This was a small car's way of thinking big and Volkswagen sales today prove the success that comes when small things or places, or people think big.

Yesterday morning I had the joy of visiting in the home of Minnie Miller and saying the prayers of blessing upon the home. She is one of our Hawaiian mothers, a makua, a member of our Kaahumanu Society, who bought a tiny piece of land by the Ala Wai—only about 2,000 square feet, and on it was a tiny house when she bought it. It was a drab and rundown little house, when she bought it. But with her own hands, she knocked out some of the walls, repainted, refurbished until now it looks like a big house. She started with something small and unpromising but with fresh ideas about how to make the little house look big and more attractive, she has something now that is new and beautiful and that looks big. I am very proud of this Hawaiian mother.

A few days ago a haole friend of mine said, "You Hawaiians are the only racial group that does not vote as a block. Of all the people in Hawaii, you have the deepest needs and these needs could be easily filled if you used your voting power, but I don't suppose the Hawaiians will ever achieve the necessary solidarity." To me, this friend sounded something like Nathanael saying, "Can any good thing come out of the Hawaiians?"

The answer to this question lies within the Hawaiian people themselves. What happens to us depends upon what kind of thinking goes on in our heads and in our hearts, even while obsession with economic achievement on the part of our culture and our society tends to bury coldly the Hawaiians with Maryland law efficiency. It's a shame and disgrace, I think, to any country when the native people within that country have to plead and beg not for a handout, not for something new, but for the last remaining things they still own as a people, things desperately needed for their redemption and renewal. I think it's a shame when they have to plead that these not be taken from them.

Governor Burns in his statement to the Hawaiian Civic Club meeting in Kona last week is reported to have advised our Hawaiian people to forget race and special privilege. There is a certain poignancy to such advice to our Hawaiians, and this poignancy is due to the fact, I believe, that while professing love for our Hawaiian people he seemed to speak without sufficient understanding of the deepest feelings of our Hawaiians. We are not asking for special privilege. We are asking that all other races in Hawaii remember the Hawaiian and how much he has given and lost in the past; that they remember how great his present need is; and that they remember what his future would be like if he is deprived of the last things he now owns.

On one hand, it is a loving thing for Governor Burns to profess interest in the well-being of our Hawaiian people. But I think it's a tragic thing when the way suggested to our higher well-being misses the mark. The advice that our Hawaiian people or any race or power entity forget itself cannot be taken seriously in a competitive, cooperative situation. The reason why it cannot be taken seriously and why it cannot succeed is that, if I may use the ukulele as an illustration (I wish I had the ukulele here, but think of the ukulele), this approach tends to force all the strings on God's multiracial ukulele to the same pitch; or it would drive toward the elimination of the individuality of the strings; or it can even lead to the elimination of the string that is untuned.

What an awful ukulele it would be if all the strings were tuned alike; or if one or more strings were missing. If the ukulele strings were tuned alike, the thin strings, capable of a higher pitch, would be tuned too low; the thick strings that should be tuned low, would be tuned too high. Nobody is comfortable. Every string hopes for the moment when it can be itself rather than forget itself—when it can have and keep its Wesak Day, or its Narcissus Festival, or its Rizal Day and its Native Lands. The truth of the matter is that no string can forget itself until it has first affirmed itself. Then it can make its contribution to society, but only after it has attained its own proper pitch.

No string can forget itself, can forget who it is and what it is; and no string can be forgotten until it achieves the pitch that is proper for itself in the sight of God. A string that needs tuning should not be forgotten. A race or a string passes from noisemaking to musicmaking when it is helped up or when it comes up to its right individual pitch. Only then can it forget itself, forget itself into the harmony of the instrument; only then can it be forgotten as a vital element in the total well-being of the instrument. The good society recognizes its responsibility and debt to the string or strings that need tuning.

This is the great thing; this is the great idea that our Hawaiian people and Hawaii can give to the world today. We need to see life whole, and we need to see its parts. We need to be teaching the truth that the essence of Aloha is the affirming of one's God-given individuality, but in a way that gives creatively of the self and receives gratefully the harmonic resonances of one's neighbors.

Being in tune and being on pitch with God means that ours is not raw power and wild individuality, or partiality. Raw power and wild individuality without God's justice is the source of evil in the world. Hitler's master race is an example of such evil. But a race's power that is tempered with justice is better. However, without Aloha to sweeten justice, man's use of power is not good enough. Our job, therefore, is to tune up the world to God's pitch—not to forget race but to affirm it, in the spirit of God, that is, in the spirit of justice and Aloha. It is written, "What doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with your God."

Statistics show that our Hawaiian people as a whole are the neediest of all the races in Hawaii. Certainly, we do have some rich Hawaiians, and others who own lands, but it is the poor that must not be forgotten. Our Alii gave their estate—the Bishops estate, the Liliuokalani estate, the Lunalilo estate—these were given primarily for the poor among our Hawaiians. We need to bring our folks up then to tune, and this tuning we must do with the help of almighty God. We can't do it without Him. Prayerfully, we Hawaiians must now do our own thinking, our own deciding, our own self-affirming. Because we are the poorest in the land, we Hawaiians face a supreme challenge and opportunity for growth, and for improvement. Our council of Hawaiian organizations seeks to take advantage of this great opportunity.

We rejoice in the rich racial and cultural individualities in our community because these are like the different sounds of different strings on God's ukulele. And as each string first affirms itself, then it can forget itself into the well-being of others. It cannot do the latter without first doing the former.

I have not read Governor Burns' speech in its entirety, but what was reported of it impresses me as being only half right. He has the cart but not the horse. He would be all right, I believe, if he now put the horse before the cart by insisting first that the gifts of God, of our Alii for the self-development of our native Hawaiian people, gifts so necessary to our right pitch and by which our individuality can be creatively affirmed, and these are the Kamehameha Schools and Bishop Estate, the Liliuokalani Trust and its work with orphans and destitute Hawaiian children, and Lunalilo Home to care for our aging Hawaiians, that these gifts be protected and preserved and held inviolate for our native people of Hawaii for all time. Justice to our native people will be served when our Hawaiian eleemosynary estates are excluded from land and legislation. I urge all friends and our Hawaiian people to call on our Governor and legislature for justice to our native Hawaiian people, who once was a proud nation, not tribes of wandering Indians, and to whom these islands belonged.

Let it not be said to native people in other nations that the native people of Hawaii had to plead for the preservation of the last precious things they have inherited and that they own as a people. That the poor were deprived in favor of the rich.

If ever a people needed to expand their thoughts about themselves, it is our Hawaiian people who must use our own heads and make our own plans now. We must listen to the advice of others but we must also examine that advice very carefully.

Like our Lord Jesus Christ, born in a stable, for whom there was no room in the inn, about whose hometown it was derisively asked, "Can anything good come out of Nazareth?" We must let our Lord Jesus turn our Hawaiian people and our Hawaii into a meaningful people, into a significant spot of hope for peace in our world. It is for this high purpose that Kamehameha Schools was founded and it is this high purpose that our State should honor and keep for our native people and for Hawaii. It is a purpose higher than dollars and cents and material considerations. It has to do with the salvation of a native people and the redemption of mankind. Our Hawaiian people are a small people today, but they are beginning to think big, beginning to have the courage to stand up for their beliefs and their convictions, to assert the spirit of Kamehameha as well as the gentle spirit of Pauahi.

We have something unique to give the world, something in which the hopes and the fears of the future are gathered. Our Lord Jesus is saying to us as He said to Philip and Nathaniel long ago, "Follow Me, follow Me." We will follow, for without Him we lose our way and our identity.

Our Lord Jesus holds steady for us the great landmarks of the past—Opukahaia and Kanui, Kaukeaouli and Malo, Kaahumanu and Pauhai, Lunalilo and Kekela. Our modern world is different from theirs, yes, but the Christian faith of Bernice Pauahi is, fortunately, the strongest part of her will. She wanted to see the children of her race become moral rather than immoral men and women; become good and industrious people; became creative persons in their generations. She wanted us to think big, so she wrote in her will that all trustees and teachers at Kamehameha Schools must forever be Protestant Christians. She knew how the men and women of the past who had been touched by the hand of our Lord Jesus took their healing and redeeming faith around the world, changed the climate of their generations, and left a mark upon the world that could not be wiped out.

From a small, unknown people, they became a people with divine identification, sons of God in a godless world; they were people who took their cue from Jesus Christ their Lord and from no one else. Can anything good come out of the Hawaiian people? A new vitality is already appearing among us. Out of drab little Nazareth, the hope and faith of Christianity came. Out of our Hawaiian people great things will come as we begin to think greatly. It isn't what a people have been in the past that matters most, but what we are to become in the future. What visions call us forward; what motives impel; what thoughts and feelings fill our hearts. It is the spirit of Christ inside of us and the high purpose He sets for us that will matter most in the days to come.

This is one reason why Kamehameha schools and the Christian training of our young people is so important to our people. Most of all we need today a vision of God, a vision of what life can become. Philip found the vision and hope in our Lord Jesus Christ, and when Nathaniel did not believe and questioned, Philip said, "Come and see."

We Hawaiian people must be careful not to get lost in a maze of trivial goals and activities. Our time and our life are wasted if we run after things that really do not matter. We cannot be a people who just wait and hope for a best that never materializes. We must try by faith to take hold of life and discipline our lives to high purpose.

And when our life on this earth is ended, what will we hold up for God to see of it? I hope that the big thinking we will do, each one of us, will have brought us close to our Lord, will have transformed our own lives by the power of His spirit, will be a testimony of the blessings of new life and the resurrection that our Lord Jesus Christ brings to all the poor in spirit, the mourners, the meek, the hungry and thirsty after righteousness, the merciful, the pure in heart, the peacemakers, and the persecuted for righteousness' sake. Indeed, our Lord calls to us to bear His name on our foreheads, to be the salt of the earth, to be the light of the world, and to let our light so shine before men that they may see our good works, not to glorify us but to glorify our Father who is in Heaven. He calls us to be, to be the people described in His Sermon on the Mount for the salvation of the world and for our own salvation.

May we be faithful to His call.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR KUCHEL ON THURSDAY, MAY 2

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I have discussed with the majority leader the request I am about to make: I ask unanimous consent that following the morning hour on Thursday, I be recognized, to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

ELIMINATING POLITICS FROM DEFENSE CONTRACTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am cosponsoring a proposal by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case] to keep a close congressional watch on the huge contract decisions of the Defense Department, and to let the public know exactly what political influence, if any, has entered into these determinations.

Recently, Roscoe Drummond dealt with this situation in a remarkably able article; and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Investigating Defense—McNamara's Offer to Congress

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The much investigated and sometimes harassed Secretary of Defense, Robert McNamara, and his deputy, Roswell Gilpatric, favor more and better congressional investigation—not less.

They mean it.

If they are invited, they are prepared to testify in favor of new legislation strengthening the investigative arm of Congress to check on the huge contract decisions of the Defense Department and to put every major action under the lens of public scrutiny.

Both Mr. McNamara and Mr. Gilpatric have informed Senator Clifford Case, Republican, of New Jersey, who has recently introduced bills to further these ends, that they are wholly responsive to what he has in view. They're for it.

After the uncomfortable and lacerating inquiry into the contract for the TFX, the dual-service fighter plane—which the Navy and Air Force wanted to build one way and Mr. McNamara another—this is an unconventional response.

And a welcome one.

But Mr. McNamara is an unconventional public official. He is confident without being arrogant. He has sufficient self-confidence to be willing to adopt a policy of timely and total disclosure.

If I understand Mr. McNamara correctly, he is saying that if Congress wishes to set up the machinery for fuller, continuous, and orderly scrutiny of the huge Pentagon contract decisions, he will put the facts in its hands—and on the public record—at every significant decision-making point.

That's good, very good.

But if Congress is to do its part forcefully and fairly, it will need to strengthen its mechanism for investigating and weighing the facts. This is why Senator Case is proposing:

1. A special Joint House-Senate Investigating Committee for defense and space contracts to be made up of one Democrat and

one Republican from the Senate and House Armed Services Committee, from the two Appropriations Committees, and from the Committees on Space and Government Operations.

2. A requirement that all communications affecting these contracts from any source, except the bidders, be open to public inspection. (In other words, keep the lobbyists, whether congressional, executive, or private, in the open.)

3. Sufficiently early and full disclosure of the basis on which these contracts are awarded to make possible the most useful congressional scrutiny.

In his letter to Senator CASE, Secretary McNamara stated that he is "in complete agreement with these objectives." The Defense Department is making its own study of the wording of the proposed legislation to make sure that, in its view, the bill accomplishes its purposes and it will be ready to testify when and if called by the Senate Armed Services Committee.

I am not suggesting that Mr. McNamara and Mr. Gilpatric are just panting to be investigated, that they relish nothing so much as having Congress constantly looking over their shoulders and second-guessing them.

They're not "Little Lord Fauntleroys." But they know that Congress is going to investigate them whether they like it or not—so they have decided to like it. They also know that in allocating billions of dollars of public funds every year, it is crucial that they maintain public confidence. It can't be maintained by secrecy.

Congress has the right and duty to check on how the executive branch uses the money it appropriates. But congressional investigation ought to be continuous, not sporadic, expertly staffed, conducted in an atmosphere of getting-at-the-facts, not just getting-at-the-culprits.

Mr. McNamara is big enough to say yes. Congress ought to take him up on it promptly.

FAA TOO FAT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, recently the Washington Daily News published an article entitled "FAA Too Fat." In the article it is reported that the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association recommends a cut of nearly $300 million in the $885 million budget for the FAA. I am very happy to have such a recommendation made, because these men use the facilities made available by the FAA, and I have felt for a long time that this expenditure by the Government has been rising at a rate which is very difficult to justify. It has risen from approximately $220 million in 1957 to some $885 million in the present budget.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAA TOO FAT

The Nation's biggest organization of private pilots today called the Federal Aviation Agency a "fat and sated Agency" and urged a 36 percent cut in its budget.

The blast came from the 90,000-member Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association in a 27-page document filed with the Senate and House Appropriations Committees.

AOPA told Congress that FAA's $800 million budget request for fiscal 1964 could be cut by nearly $294 million without affecting air security.

The document also sharply criticized the Civil Aeronautics Board for ignoring investigation of general aviation accidents. It said the CAB has turned this aspect of air safety over to the FAA, resulting in about 4,500 accidents a year not being investigated by an independent group.

WISCONSIN'S GREAT MINK INDUSTRY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, recently the Monthly Review of the Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis published an article on the mink industry. In the article, it is pointed out that the Wisconsin mink industry is the largest in America—and, as a matter of fact, is almost three times larger than that in any other State. The next in rank is Minnesota.

The article is a fine account of the accomplishments of this industry, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OF MINK AND MEN

Among the oldest crafts known to our civilization—and one of the least familiar to most people—is the fur industry. Details of trapping, trading, manufacturing craftsmanship, and finance have remained comparatively mysterious to those not actively engaged in the fur business. And a relatively new development in the industry—fur ranching—is, for the most part, familiar in detail only to the ranchers themselves and to their associates.

Fur ranching, the breeding and raising of animals for their pelts, developed early in the 1920's with fox farms. When the overproductive foxes caused a glut on the fur market, mink, to a large extent, became popular.

The mink is classed zoologically between the weasel and the otter, and North America is by far the largest producer of the valuable little animal, which is found in most sections of the United States. Many of the first mink ranches were set up near the Canadian border by trappers who snared the original stock, some of which were kept and some sold for breeding stock to other beginning ranchers. Interest in mink ranching grew and spread over the country, until pelts of the ranch variety now far exceed in number—and equal in quality—wild mink pelts. In 1961, 6,727,000 pelts, three times as many as 10 years before, were produced by over 6,500 mink farmers on mink ranches in 35 States.

The search for pelt quality and production improvement gradually has eliminated direct descendants of the original wild stock and has led to the development of an improved variety of quality animals. Results attributed to the raising of mink in captivity have been more pliable leather, pelt color, and quality uniformity, and new colors of fur.

Easily the most popular of the higher priced furs, mink accounts for at least 80 percent of the total international retail market value of furs, largely as a result of the discovery in the 1940's that it is feasible to produce mink in different colors. Breeding experiments have produced a number of mutations, some of which rank among the most valuable of all pelts. A mutation is a suddenly produced variation where the offspring is different from the parents in some well-marked characteristic; in mink, this variation is one of color and combination of colors. Today, there are seven popular mutations, including a white one called Jasmine, and these mutations account for over half the entire fur business in the United States.

The ninth district States of Wisconsin and Minnesota lead the United States in ranch mink production; Michgan ranks sixth. In 1961, Wisconsin produced a crop of 2,115,000 mink, 137,000 more than the 1960 total, and Minnesota yielded 770,000 new mink, 113,000 more than the year before.

State	Number of kits produced (thousands)	Percent of of total U.S. mink production
1. Wisconsin	2,115	31.4
2. Minnesota	770	11.5
3. Utah	395	5.9
4. Washington	372	5.5
5. Illinois	361	5.4
6. Michigan	351	5.2
7. Oregon	338	5.0
8. New York	331	4.6
9. Ohio	281	4.2
10. Pennsylvania	247	3.7
Total	5,541	82.4

Source: National Board of Fur Farm Organizations 1962 statistical report.

Present-day mink ranches are scattered throughout the three States. Typically, they are small-scale family ventures, perhaps entered into as a hopefully profitable sideline that will in time become (or which already have become) the main source of the family income. Mink are delicate animals, expensive to rear. (The sound of a jet airliner passing overhead has been known to wipe out large percentages of mink herds.) The mink rancher is a specialist who must be adept at experimentation in diet, shelter measures, sanitation procedures, disease control, and the use of controlled breeding to produce increasing numbers of quality pelts in a variety of colors. Poor quality mink will not pay for the cost of producing and maintaining them.

Mink ranching is a year-around job with a production cycle that starts about January 1 and runs through the year, during which most of the months are spent in preparing for the whelping of mink offspring—called kits—in May and for the pelting operation, which usually takes place in fall or early winter.

Mink are housed in wire pens out of doors or in sheds with capacities ranging from around 50 cages to as many as 600. The shed size varies, of course, with the extent of the operation, but a typical shed housing 200 mink in 2 rows may be 180 feet long and 22 feet wide, probably with an entrance on each end and measures taken to provide a sheltered but natural environment.

Mink diets vary from ranch to ranch and in accordance with the level of mink development during the yearly growth cycle. The greedy mink favors raw horsemeat, which may account for roughly 80 percent of his diet, while tomatoes and codliver oil supplement the typical mink meal. An aid to the mink rancher has been the development of specialized formulas by the commercial feed industry.

Maturity is reached in 7 months (December), but mink fur usually reaches its highest quality level in the late fall when the first "late adolescent" winter coats have "furred out." Pelt quality and color deteriorate after December and are never recovered, so the pelting procedure is scheduled from late November through December on most ranches. Mink saved for breeding purposes are eventually pelted, but their darker, coarser fur brings lower prices.

Nearly all ranchers produce two or more types of mink, and in order to take advantage of market changes, they prefer to sell one type of pelt in December or January, another in the early spring, and the balance toward the latter part of the selling season; it is generally conceded that June is the time by which most mink crops have been sold out.

The individual rancher has several alternatives in marketing his pelts. He can sell them at his ranch to traveling buyers, some of whom buy mink in the carcass and arrange their own skinning, fleshing (removing fat and excess flesh) and pelt drying; the rancher can ship to any of a large number of skin dealers and brokers, or the pelts can be sold to one of several manufacturers who buy directly from the ranch. There are even a few retail furriers who buy from ranchers. By far the large majority of ranchers, however, sell through a fur auction house.

Five recognized fur auction establishments operate in the United States, one of them is located in Minneapolis. The Minneapolis auction reported an average 1961 price of $18.11 for all mink pelts sold at auction there. In December 1962, pelts sold at between $17.50 and $57 for male mink pelts, and between $13 and $25 for the smaller female pelts. Fur price variations are due to a number of factors, not the least of which are market volume, the demand for certain colors dictated by fashion innovations from year to year—and pelt quality, of course. Since 1951, U.S. mink marketing has been aided by an embargo retained in the Trade Expansion Act, which prevents the importing of mink from Russia and China. Almost a million mink pelts were exported from the United States in 1961, a quarter of them going to the United Kingdom.

It is likely that mink coats will always be in demand, and about 75 pelts are required for each coat. In recent years, mink has begun to appear as trimming on cloth coats and on accessories to fashion ensembles. Stores now feature mink-trimmed gloves, scarves, boots, earmuffs, earrings—and even false eyelashes. Mink ranching, a family enterprise in which the Ninth District plays a large part, will probably see its produce displayed in exclusive shops on the best avenues, for a long time to come.

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT'S BILLION DOLLAR INVENTORY WASTE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, recently the Comptroller General appeared before the Joint Economic Committee and made a presentation which was very astonishing. In it he pointed out that hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars of inventory have been lost by the Defense Establishment, literally lost. The Department does not know how much inventory of various weapons it has. The Comptroller General gave as an example the $164 million worth of one kind of equipment which had been lost, and he informed us that it took a considerable investigation to find out what had become of it.

On the basis of that revelation, I asked whether it could properly be inferred that literally hundreds of millions of dollars of inventory, and perhaps billions of dollars of inventory, had been misplaced or overlooked; and representatives of the Office of the Comptroller General agreed that that was true.

Mr. President, the loss of such inventory items is just like losing money, because if it is impossible for the Air Force, the Army, or the Navy to know what inventory it has, then when there is need for that particular weapon, if it cannot be located, a requisition for more of it is made, and more of it is purchased, and the taxpayers' funds are used to make the purchases.

The Comptroller General made suggestions about remedying this situation; and he emphasized that Congress should not relax its efforts to end this chaotic and wasteful situation, just because computers are available, inasmuch as computers are only as good as the human beings who put the facts into the computers.

I ask unanimous consent that a brief colloquy at the Joint Economic Committee between representatives of the Comptroller General and myself and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the hearing was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Excerpt From Joint Economic Committee Hearing on March 29, 1963

Senator Proxmire. On page 12 of your statement you say you have found many examples where millions of dollars of assets were lost for all intents and purposes, referring to the unreliability of records. You say many examples where millions of dollars were lost.

What does this really mean? Does this mean that the lost items constitute a complete waste or does this mean they simply could not account for this?

Mr. Newman. Senator Proxmire, we have found in the services that there are assets that exist at installations levels that complete inventories have not been taken, adequate records have not been kept of those assets; and as a result when the procurement people, the buyers, get requests to buy, they don't know what really is in the system, what resources they have.

These particular assets in the Air Force I think, there was around $40 million or $50 million of generators and that type of equipment where the procurement officials were out buying this equipment, and they may cost as much as $10,000 apiece.

Senator Proxmire. They didn't know they had them?

Mr. Newman. In the Navy we had the same thing at ASO we had a tremendous amount of inventory. There seems to be a tendency of getting this information on the electronic machines, the data processing equipment. But there is not a tendency to go out and take an inventory to see what we already have.

The same thing happened at St. Louis at the Transportation Command there.

Senator Proxmire. This is simply indicative of what undoubtedly can be magnified several-fold.

Mr. Bailey. Senator, we have a specific example that we can give you of this type of situation if you would care to hear it. I would like to ask Mr. Bell to give you an example of what has happened in this area.

Mr. Bell. Senator Proxmire, sometime back we made an examination of the control the Air Force had over used allowance equipment, that is used by the various using equipment. It would involve sciloscopes, generators and this type of thing. We found over a period of some years they had bought approximately $600 million work of equipment.

This is the type of stuff that doesn't wear out. But the inventory reports that came into the buyers on this type of equipment indicated $164 million worth of this equipment had been lost in the system.

Senator Proxmire. Had been lost?

Mr. Bell. For all practical purposes.

Senator Proxmire. $164 million had been lost?

Mr. Bell. $164 million of equipment was presumably some place but no one knew where. Since the two principal factors that buyers have to have in order to operate or to know what is needed and measure that against what they already have, if you don't know where the stuff is, then you have to take some other course of action.

To illustrate that specifically in this period the Air Force had bought some 10,000 oscilloscopes. The requirements that came up from the using commands indicated they only needed 5,700, indicating an excess of approximately 4,300 oscilloscopes somewhere in the system.

At that time there were 1,700 unfilled requisitions for new oscilloscopes that the buyer was proceeding to place orders for, which was added to the excess they would have had. We had our men go out to various places in the Air Force and take a physical inventory and we found a large number of these so-called lost assets.

This information was passed back to the buyer and the equipment was redistributed and the procurement of some $27 million of equipment was deferred.

Senator Proxmire. You would assume on the basis of this example that there undoubtedly are hundreds of millions and maybe billions of dollars of items which are not inventoried, that the Army, Navy and Air Force don't know what they do have, and therefore they can't use it. It is lost and wasted.

Mr. Bell. I could not give you a real projection.

Senator Proxmire. I am making a conclusion. Would this be a reasonable conclusion based on your experience?

Mr. Bell. I think it would.

Senator Proxmire. It would be reasonable?

Mr. Bell. I think our tests covered about 15 percent of the items and you can project from this to 164 and get a tremendous figure.

Senator Proxmire. Then you say that conclusion might be a reasonable conclusion?

Mr. Bell. Yes, sir.

Senator Miller. Would the Senator yield?

Senator Proxmire. Yes.

Senator Miller. Just to try to develop this point a little further, how long ago was this investigation made?

Mr. Bell. That particular report was delivered to the Congress in 1961.

Senator Miller. I am wondering if the development of the electronic data processing equipment, inventorying by the Air Force in this subsequent period of time might not have relieved this problem somewhat?

Senator Proxmire. My understanding is that it did not from your initial response.

Mr. Newman. In talking about it from an overall standpoint it is probably true, that maybe the Air Force has cleaned this one up. We find generally, gentlemen, that when we come along the data processing equipment doesn't cure all the ills.

The basic principle of taking inventories and continually taking inventories to know the equipment you have, generators as well as electric lamps or sparkplugs, whatever it may be, is important. It has to be constant, because the electronic brain unit is throwing out information of where to go to get the delivery of the item.

In the case of the Army at TMC on which we have issued a report, in that case they went ahead and just took the information off the books, put it in the electronic brain, and then went ahead and funneled through the requests and gave out shipping orders.

When the shipping orders came out to deliver from a certain depot, the depot replied, "We have not had this in 3 years." The Army had not taken inventory.

There seems to be a general tendency that we don't need to take inventories. This is one basic thing that we feel is paramount. You have to know what you have on hand.

Senator Proxmire. You say there is no substitute for the regular physical inventory at frequent intervals and the Armed Forces have not done this adequately?

Mr. Newman. That is right.

SECRETARY McNAMARA SHOWS HOW TO ACHIEVE ECONOMY AS RESPONSIBILITIES BECOME HEAVIER

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, recently Secretary McNamara appeared before the Joint Economic Committee. In the course of his testimony he revealed that, despite the fact that we shall have a much larger military complement next year, the Defense Department is going to reduce substantially the number of civilians working for the Department both this year and next year. It is the only Government agency which is not increasing the number of employees.

I asked Secretary McNamara how he will accomplish this economy. He replied:

> The President has emphasized that if we are—we civilians in Government—to participate in what might be called productivity wage increases, as do other sectors of our society, we, too, must expect to achieve productivity gains.
>
> In the case of the Defense Department, we employ about a million civilians in addition to something on the order of 2¾ million military personnel. In any part of our society in which a million individuals are employed, it seems reasonable to me to expect productivity gains.
>
> I must confess that our system doesn't permit us to measure them in the Defense Department. I think it should, but it doesn't. Since it doesn't, I assume they are there. Therefore, we have arbitrarily reduced the authorized civilian personnel by what I consider to be the minimum productivity gain we should accomplish, this in pursuance of the President's instruction.

I think this is the kind of economy by any extremely competent man who has achieved great gains in military power in our Defense Department that should set an example for the rest of our Government.

I ask unanimous consent that a brief part of the colloquy be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the hearing was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Excerpt From Secretary McNamara's Testimony Before Procurement Subcommittee of Joint Committee, March 28, 1963

Senator Proxmire. As I understand it, your Department is the only major department of Government which is not increasing its personnel; in other words, which has decreased its personnel. We have had hearings before the Joint Economic Committee on the budget and related to it and I wonder if the chairman would indulge me just to ask if you could tell this committee how you were able to achieve this, with a bigger budget and bigger responsibilities, how you were able to cut your personnel in contrast to the inability of other department heads to do the same.

Secretary McNamara. First, I must confess we have increased the military personnel, not, I think—

Senator Proxmire. Civilian personnel has been reduced.

Secretary McNamara. That is correct. We have increased the military personnel but not in any way proportionate to the increase in combat readiness or strength. In any case, they have been reduced.

Senator Proxmire. Which would suggest that you have to have an increased civilian component to take care of them and you haven't got that.

Secretary McNamara. I think that is a reasonable conclusion and it is one that some have brought to my attention inside the Department. In any case, the President has emphasized that if we are—we civilians in Government—to participate in what might be called productivity wage increases, as do other sectors of our society, we, too, must expect to achieve productivity gains.

In the case of the Defense Department, we employ about a million civilians in addition to something on the order of 2¾ million military personnel. In any part of our society in which a million individuals are employed, it seems reasonable to me to expect productivity gains.

I must confess that our system doesn't permit us to measure them in the Defense Department. I think it should, but it doesn't. Since it doesn't, I assume they are there. Therefore, we have arbitrarily reduced the authorized civilian personnel by what I consider to be the minimum productivity gain we should accomplish, this in pursuance of the President's instructions.

Senator Proxmire. This is based on what your productivity gains were and then let them work it out.

Secretary McNamara. Yes. Anybody who has a substantial number of a million people working for him ought to be able to figure ways of doing the job more efficiently. I say you will do it by *x* percent and you figure out a way to do it.

Senator Proxmire. That is very encouraging.

Chairman Douglas. To give qualitative value to the statement of the Secretary, between June 30, 1959 and June 30, 1962 we increased the military personnel by 206,000, but the Secretary decreased the civilian personnel by over 3,000.

Secretary McNamara. Yes. We have a 10,000-man reduction in civilian personnel planned for fiscal 1964. I see no reason at all why we shouldn't accomplish it.

Senator Proxmire. You have 10,000 reduction planned for 1964?

Secretary McNamara. Yes, sir.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5517) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

JUSTICE RESERVOIR SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, at my request, and following testimony by officials of the Army Corps of Engineers, the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Deficiencies and Supplementals included in the bill before us $25,000 to initiate preliminary planning and engineering work on the authorized Justice Reservoir, in Wyoming County, W. Va. The reservoir will be situated on the main stem of the Guyandot River.

The Army Engineers would use the money for ground support of aerial photography already undertaken of the area encompassed by the reservoir site, as well as for real estate mapping and core drilling at the damsite.

Col. Leonard Goodsell, who is attached to the office of the Chief of Engineers, testified before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Deficiencies and Supplementals that the $25,000 "would, in effect, speed up the initiation of construction—of the Justice Reservoir—by about 1 year."

Mr. President, the Justice Reservoir is vitally needed by downstream communities which suffer repeated major flood damage when heavy rains pour down on the Guyandot River Basin. On March 12 of this year, the flood that struck the Guyandot Valley exceeded in height and in damage the previous highest flood of record, the January 29, 1957, flood.

Following the January 1957 flood, and the subsequent floods in March 1962 and in March 1963, the communities of Logan and Man, downstream from the authorized Justice Reservoir, were declared to be major disaster areas by Presidential proclamation.

I visited the stricken areas of Logan and Man at the time of the January 1957 flood, again immediately after the March 1962 flood, and again this year following the March 12 flood. During each of these visits, I was appalled by the mud, muck, and misery, so evident on every hand.

My activities in behalf of flood relief for the communities along the Guyandot Valley date back to the time of the January 29, 1957, flood. Following my visit to the area at that time, I introduced a resolution in the House of Representatives to authorize the U.S. Army Engineers to review a report of the survey which was submitted in 1931, House Document 150, 72d Congress, 1st session, with respect to possible flood control measures in the Guyandot River basin. Representative Elizabeth Kee, of the Fifth West Virginia Congressional District, introduced a similar resolution in the House. Congress subsequently authorized the review by the Army Engineers.

On December 17, 1957, the Army Engineers held a public meeting at Logan, W. Va., to determine the views and desires of parties interested in the control of floods in the Guyandot Valley. I attended that public hearing. On July 19, 1958, the Army Engineers held a meeting with local interests at Amigo, W. Va., to consider the possibility of locating a reservoir on Devils Fork—one of the sites which was being studied in the overall survey of the Guyandot basin.

As the Army Engineers' studies progressed, it became evident that a system of small reservoirs which could afford even a fair degree of protection against floods of record offered little possibility of economic justification. On February 24, 1961, I was advised in a letter by Capt. Raymond G. Clark, Jr., Acting District Engineer, Huntington, W. Va., that there was little possibility of economic justification for a system comprising enough small reservoirs "to give even a fair degree of protection" to the Logan area.

On February 17, 1962, the Army Engineers, Cincinnati, Ohio, Division, recommended construction of the Justice Reservoir as a multipurpose facility which would afford protection against any flood of record to the communities of Logan and Man, as well as for all other communities downstream.

Mr. President, the Congress leans heavily upon the recommendations of the Army Corps of Engineers. Consequently, the Congress last year authorized construction of the Justice Reservoir.

The people of the Guyandot Valley wholeheartedly support the authorized Justice Reservoir. There is fear, however, that the area will be ravaged by additional floods before the dam is built. Thus, any effort to hasten completion of the reservoir is certainly justifiable when viewed against the staggering property damage and the possible loss of life which rampaging floods can and do cause.

On March 26 of this year, at my request, the Area Redevelopment Administration granted $10,000 to the Army Engineers for the purpose of taking aerial photographs of the area encompassed by the reservoir before the bloom of spring foliage. If this money had not been made available, this photographic work would have been delayed until November, or possibly until the spring of 1964.

With respect to the requested $25,000, at the time hearings were being held by the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Deficiencies and Supplementals for fiscal year 1963, I asked Colonel Goodsell the following question:

> Do you feel that an additional appropriation at this time could be wisely and efficiently utilized by the Army Engineers for planning the Justice Reservoir?

Colonel Goodsell replied in part:

> We could go on Justice now to initiate preconstruction planning by expanding from the aerial photography that has been made available through the ARA funds, the ground control, and to get detailed topographic mapping. This would speed up the mapping of the area. We could pick up probably 5 to 6 months, because the other funds would not be available, wouldn't have the assent of Congress for a new planning start until about October. The amount of money involved here, as I stated, is not great, but it is something that could be used to advantage for the topographic survey. That would be an engineering capability of $25,000 for 1963 to initiate planning—actually to extend the work that was done under the aerial photography, using the ARA money.

Mr. President, in recent months certain objections have again been voiced to the construction of Justice Reservoir. In my judgment, however, these objections have been effectively refuted by the Army Engineers.

For example, it has been said that more than 57 million tons of coal will be lost in the area encompassed by the reservoir pool. The Army Engineers say that this claim is without foundation, that the development of the coal reserves would not interfere with project purposes, and that the only loss in coal recovery would be negligible.

It has also been said that a local protection project which would include channel widening, levies, and floodwalls, would afford Logan adequate protection against recurring floods. To this, Brig. Gen. Jackson Graham has replied, in an April 29, 1963, letter addressed to me:

> In all instances, the local protection projects lacked economic justification. At Logan, for example, the local protection project would cost about $27 million. This project would have a high degree of protection but the annual benefits would amount to only 30 percent of the annual charges.

Also in the April 29, 1963, letter, Brigadier General Graham states:

> The Justice Reservoir will provide almost complete control of flooding downstream from the damsite and also provide substantial flood control benefits along the Ohio River. Flood control benefits alone which would accrue from the project are estimated to be in excess of $2½ million annually. The recent severe flood of March 12–14, 1963, was the flood of record on the Guyandot River, with damages in the basin estimated at $8,370,000. Logan was hard hit for the second consecutive year with heavy damages. The 1963 flood is a new flood of record at Logan. If the Justice Reservoir had been in operation, over $5,650,000 of these damages would have been prevented, and the damages below the damsite would only have amounted to $388,000.

On Friday, April 26, 1963, President John F. Kennedy announced that he was submitting to the Congress some revisions in the fiscal year 1964 budget requests for public works which are the responsibility of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. One of these revised budget requests is for the Justice Reservoir. The original fiscal 1964 budget request was for $150,000 with which to initiate planning and engineering. In the revised request, this figure has now been increased to $300,000, which the Corps of Engineers has indicated will constitute its capability for fiscal year 1964.

President Kennedy's action indicates his awareness of the difficulties that have so often been the lot of people in southern West Virginia communities when heavy rains fall upon the Guyandot Basin. The revised budget request for Justice Reservoir also indicates President Kennedy's sincere interest in affording flood relief to the people of the Guyandot Valley as quickly as is humanly possible.

The $25,000 supplemental appropriation request is a mere pittance in the total request before us for the balance of fiscal year 1963. But to the people in the Guyandot Valley, especially those who live on the flood plains of Logan and Man, this requested $25,000 means advancing the time when they can feel free of the fear of ravaging floods that destroy life and property with merciless repetition.

It makes good business sense to expedite the prevention of this terrible economic waste in the Guyandot Valley by affording the Army Engineers a modest $25,000 with which to shorten by approximately 1 year the completion date of the Justice Reservoir.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letter addressed to me on April 29, 1963, by Brig. Gen. Jackson Graham, Director of Civil Works, U.S. Army, together with a letter addressed to me under date of April 30, 1963, by Brigadier General Graham.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 29, 1963.

Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: The following information is in response to your recent request covering items pertinent to the Guyandot River survey report and the Justice Reservoir project authorized by the 1962 Flood Control Act.

In the investigation of the Guyandot River Basin, the Corps of Engineers recognized that acquisition of certain mineral rights within the Justice Reservoir area would be necessary, primarily at and in the vicinity of the Justice damsite. The joint policy of the Departments of the Interior and of Army relative to acquisition of reservoir project lands, published in the Federal Register dated February 22, 1962, provides that mineral, oil and gas rights will not be acquired except where the development thereof would interfere with project purposes. In line with this policy, the Government will acquire only those lands and estate in underlying minerals necessary to insure the requirements of the project, and to protect construction of the dam and reservoir. Adherence to this policy for the Justice project, it is believed, will minimize the effects of the project on mineral resources in the area. It is planned to provide access to existing facilities, which may be disturbed by the project, equivalent to those currently available. Coal mining in the reservoir area would continue, using standard mining safety practices. It is considered that there would be little loss of coal mineral reserve as the result of the project.

Any loss in natural gas recovery would be small. Available data indicates that all producing wells are above the conservation pool level. Although some wells are in the flood control pool and subject to occasional flooding by the reservoir, production can continue, and where the land is taken in fee in producing areas, the affected owners could still recover the gas by drilling in close proximity to the taking lines.

During the course of the investigation in the Guyandot River Basin, consideration was given to means for flood protection other than the Justice Reservoir. These considerations included the possibility of providing local protection at urban areas experiencing the greatest damages from headwater floods. These areas were Mullens, Mare, Stollings, Logan, and Chapmanville. The improvements studied were channel widening, levees, and floodwalls. In all instances, the local protection projects lacked economic justification. At Logan, for example, the local protection project would cost about $27 million. This project would have a high degree of protection but the annual benefits would amount to only 30 percent of the annual charges.

Several plans involving reservoirs on tributaries were studied. It was found that these plans either lacked economic justification or would not greatly alleviate the flood problem in the Logan area. The studies concluded that the only economically feasible project providing a high degree of flood protection along the Guyandot River was the Justice Reservoir on the main stem of the Guyandot River.

The Justice Reservoir will provide almost complete control of flooding downstream from the damsite and also provide substantial flood control benefits along the Ohio River. Flood control benefits alone which would accrue from the project are estimated to be in excess of $2½ million annually. The recent severe flood of March 12–14, 1963, was the flood of record on the Guyandot River, with damages in the basin estimated at $8,370,000. Logan was hard hit for the second consecutive year with heavy damages. The 1963 flood is a new flood of record at Logan. If the Justice Reservoir had been in operation, over $5,650,000 of there damages would have been prevented, and the damages below the damsite would only have amounted to $388,000.

I hope the above information will serve your present purpose.

Sincerely yours,

JACKSON GRAHAM,
Brigadier General, U.S. Army, Director of Civil Works.

APRIL 30, 1963.

Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: I refer to your recent request for information on the urgency of initiating a new planning start in fiscal year 1963 for the authorized Justice Reservoir, Guyandot River.

In testimony before the Senate Appropriations Committee at pages 886 and 887 of the "Hearings, Supplemental Appropriations for 1963," it was brought out that Logan, W. Va., is the standout location with regard to flood damages insofar as the March 1963 flood is concerned, and it is the standout, of course, in West Virginia. It was also brought out that possible remedial actions are urgent for other areas in Kentucky.

Logan, W. Va., has had three major floods since 1957—the March 1963 flood being a new flood of record. The study which recommended the Justice Reservoir was authorized in 1958 and has proceeded on an expedited basis throughout its life because of the very great need that is apparent for flood protection at Logan, the Guyandot basin and the Ohio River basin, with Logan as the focal point of consideration. The Justice Reservoir was authorized in 1962 by the Congress. The need for providing immediate flood protection for Logan has again been demonstrated as the result of the March 1963 floods. A planning start for fiscal year 1963 on the Justice Reservoir would advance initiation of construction from fiscal year 1966 to fiscal year 1965; possibly eliminating flood damage for 1 year. The March 1963 floor caused preventable damages estimated at $5,650,000, in the Guyandot Basin.

The areas in Kentucky are within the drainage areas of the Big Sandy River, the Kentucky River, and the Cumberland River. Here, too, there is an urgency for immediate action. For this area it is proposed to incorporate experience of the March 1963 flood in the interim flood control report on the Big Sandy scheduled for completion by the District Engineer in 1963 which covers both Kentucky and West Virginia areas.

The Senate Committee on Appropriations report on supplemental appropriation bill 1963 has included recommendations for fiscal year 1963 funds for general investigation to initiate review studies on the Kentucky River and the Cumberland River. These review studies will investigate possible flood protection measures for areas hard hit by the March 1963 flood.

Sincerely yours,

JACKSON GRAHAM,
Brigadier General, U.S. Army, Director of Civil Works.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, we are now considering the appropriation of funds for the accelerated public works program. Some people have criticized this program as a discredited idea from the 1930's that has been dusted off to give employment to people on "make work" projects that are not important or needed. It has also been contended that this expenditure is unjustified, especially at a time when we expect to have a budget deficit.

I think the experience we have had, since the initial appropriation of $400 million was approved last October, belies these charges, and I am encouraged by the Senate Appropriations Committee decision to recommend an additional $450 million to continue the program.

There was an enthusiastic response from all sections of the country to the original appropriation last year and it was allocated to approved projects within a 5-month period.

In general, I think the projects approved to date are worthwhile ones.

The 32 projects in Connecticut approved so far, to receive $4.1 million in accelerated public works assistance, illustrate the good use that can be made of this money.

New Britain has qualified for $142,000 for an addition to its general hospital.

Sharon is receiving $426,000 to construct a hospital.

Waterbury has already qualified for $500,000 for work on its sewage facilities.

A total of $96,000 of the funds needed for Danielson to complete work on sewage facilities will be accelerated public works funds.

Bridgeport has qualified for $429,000 to help with four sewage projects.

And I could go on listing the fine public projects that are being undertaken in my State with funds from this particular program.

Money used to construct a hospital or a hospital addition, a sewage treatment plant, or water facilities, is money spent for a good purpose.

The value to a community of additional hospital beds, or an adequate sanitation or water system is indisputable. If the only defense of this program were that it hastened the day when some cities and towns will have these facilities available for use, it would be a compelling reason for congressional approval last year.

But there are other reasons why this program has made an important contribution. It has put unemployed workers back on the job. These funds go to those communities which, because of a higher than average unemployment rate over a period of time, have the most difficulty in raising money to finance important public projects.

So we are easing their burden in this respect, by making available financial assistance that can be a crucial factor in deciding whether or not a project can be undertaken.

Additional job opportunities are thus opened up for the unemployed in these labor surplus areas. I know it is difficult to pinpoint the exact impact this can have on unemployment figures. But a brief reference to the figures for Connecticut will illustrate my point.

It is estimated that the 32 projects in my State will provide over 6 million man-months of work. Surely this many hours of work will help ease the unemployment problem in these communities.

If it were not for the lack of funds, there are other projects in Connecticut which no doubt would have been approved as eligible for assistance by now.

The pending requests for funds with which I am familiar are sound ones, for needed community improvements, and I have been in contact with many local officials who are deeply concerned over the fate of this $450 million appropriation.

This concern is certainly understandable, because the individual cities and towns cannot plan to start work on their projects until new funds are made available for the program and the final processing of their applications is completed.

In some cases, the amount of Federal assistance requested is substantial, and I have received assurances that prompt consideration will be given to them, once the necessary money is appropriated by Congress.

For example, Meriden has asked for $267,000 for a new sanitation system, $353,000 for a new water system, and for help on a number of other projects.

Bristol has a number of applications in, including one for $494,000 to improve city streets, and another for $160,000 for a new sanitation system.

Seymour has requested $300,000 in help to construct a new sanitation system.

Derby has an important sewage treatment plant and interceptor sewer project, and has an application pending for $700,000.

Ansonia needs $650,000 to help with its sewage treatment plant.

Middletown has two significant requests for funds pending, one for $438,000 to improve its water resources, the second for $900,000 for an interceptor sewer and force main.

I think this brief listing and my previous reference to approved projects will serve to establish the point that Connecticut benefits substantially from the accelerated public works program.

I am not contending here that we extend and expand the scope of the program. But I do feel that we should at least provide enough funds to complete what we originally authorized in 1962.

I wish to take this opportunity to commend the members of the Senate Appropriations Committee for their sympathetic and prompt consideration of this appropriation. I hope the Senate will reject any efforts to reduce this figure.

FUNDS FOR ACCELERATED PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAM

Mr. HART. Mr. President, those of us who represent the State of Michigan are acutely aware, daily, of the need to provide jobs for the thousands who are unemployed. We are a State with many areas that are suffering from relatively continuous substantial unemployment.

And so I was one of the early supporters of the accelerated public works program, and sought the maximum appropriation to carry it out. We recognized that it was not a cure-all for unemployment; we saw it as a constructive step which would put people to work and improve conditions in our communities.

For example, under it we have made substantial investment in our natural resources: sewer systems and sewage treatment works have been speeded, to help maintain the purity of our rivers and streams; roads, recreation facilities, reforestation, wildlife management, and fire control have been advanced in our national forests. Michigan, as well as many other States, will be a better place in which to live because we are doing this long-postponed job.

This has been a good program for Michigan. In the report issued by the Department of Commerce as of March 1, 1963, our State is No. 1 nationwide in the number of projects approved—162—and No. 1 in estimated man-months of on-site employment—33,298 under this program; nearly $26 million was invested in our State in urgently-needed community facilities and other public works. And yet, so great is the need and so admirably is this legislation designed to meet it that at the present moment there are more than 300 applications on file from Michigan communities who are anxious to be given an opportunity to participate in the program. Indeed, many of them have been critical that they have not received funds to date, given the high rate of their unemployment and the community need for the facility. It has been difficult to explain that although $900 million was authorized, only $400 million was appropriated. Countless mayors and city managers have wired and written me, urging support of this supplemental appropriation.

I have assured them that I fully recognize the urgency of the need and have been urging early and favorable action on the supplemental appropriation. I would like to add that I think we all owe a word of commendation to those who have been administering this program. Working incredibly long hours and under great pressure, they have seen to it that the money moved fast to the communities, with a minimum of redtape. Insofar as I know, this gigantic job was done with a minimum of error. I for one would like to express my appreciation to those in the departments and agencies who have made this contribution to responsive government.

Clearly the Senate should now in the supplemental bill before us appropriate the full amount anticipated and needed for this most useful accelerated public works program.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to an item in the supplemental appropriation bill which I believe is of vital interest to Americans everywhere. This is the provision of $30 million for the continued stocking of shelter space under the civil defense program.

Originally the Defense Department sought $61.9 million to continue the marking and provisioning of community shelters which have been designated in existing spaces found to be suitable in a recent survey conducted by the Department. The House of Representatives denied this entire amount and Secretary of Defense McNamara subsequently stated that the cutoff of funds would result in a damaging interruption of many months duration in supplying the shelters.

As a consequence, the Senate committee restored approximately half of the requested amount by providing the $30 million item in the bill before us today. Civil Defense officials, while gratified by the Senate committee's action, say that reduction from their original request would force a certain slowdown and they express concern that even this $30 million might not be provided. I hope this will not be the case.

I want to emphasize that in making this statement, I am well aware of the controversy which is attached to the justification of our civil defense efforts. The severest critics of the program have charged that it constitutes a vested interest in war or that, in the nuclear age, it is an exercise in futility. I, myself, believe that our best defense against nuclear weapons in the years ahead lies along the path of disarmament. But, in the interim, it seems to me that the modest program being undertaken to stock existing shelters is a prudent investment in our national safety.

EUROPE'S ECONOMIC BOOM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to a series of articles published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch relating to the economic recovery and economic development of Western Europe.

Mr. President, the economic development of Western European nations in the past decade is both an inspiration and a challenge to the United States.

Europe today continues to thrive economically. Problems remain, but the strength of Western Europe nations is dynamic, and it represents a solid bulwark against Communist advances in that area of the world.

The United States helped to provide the foundations for Western Europe's increasingly healthy economies. And today, the United States is challenged in world markets by the commerce and industry of Western Europe nations.

The story of the continuing economic growth of these nations is fascinating. It is also important for us to understand the story, and the lessons which can be drawn from it.

Mr. Thomas W. Ottenad, a Washington correspondent for the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, spent 6 weeks, traveled 10,000 miles, and interviewed hundreds of leaders in Europe to produce a fascinating, informative and thorough series of articles titled "Europe's Economic Boom: A Study of How and Why."

I commend Mr. Ottenad and the St. Louis Post-Dispatch for this example of responsible and effective journalism. These articles should be read by all of us in the Congress. I hope the articles will have a very wide circulation also among the general populace.

I have read the articles and I wish to say that I have received more information about the development of the Common Market and the principles on which the recovery was based from these articles than from anything else I have read in contemporary journals.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the series of seven articles by Thomas Ottenad in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch be printed in the RECORD. I commend this splendid journalist, and the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, for the accuracy of the information and the quality of the articles themselves.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EUROPE'S ECONOMIC BOOM—A STUDY OF HOW AND WHY

(By Thomas W. Ottenad)

(First of a series)

WASHINGTON, April 13.—The United States stands at what may be the most challenging economic frontier it has faced since the great depression of the 1930's.

The path it chooses will affect the pocketbooks of most Americans, help or hinder millions of the unemployed in finding jobs, and strongly influence business conditions. It also will do much to determine whether the United States will move forward in prosperity or remain mired in a dangerous swampland where its economic growth has fallen far behind that of much of Western Europe.

Less dramatic but more sophisticated and subtle than the problem of the 1930's, the question confronting the United States now is both difficult and complex: How, in a generally affluent and seemingly unconcerned society, to achieve and sustain faster economic development in order to meet the Nation's needs, epitomized most poignantly by persistent and high unemployment.

So far, the principal answer has been President Kennedy's proposal to cut taxes and deliberately run up sizable Federal deficits in an effort to pump new life into the economic bloodstream.

Powerful voices have been raised in opposition to the administration's plan, for it offends the fiscally orthodox and provides opportunity for those so inclined to rant against Federal spending. More importantly, there is a sense of unease among many Americans, some of whom intuitively dislike deficit spending. While the United States has had tax cuts and budget deficits before, the Council of Economic Advisers believes this is the first time the package has been put forward as a deliberate device for boosting long-term growth. Its fate in Congress remains in doubt. After lengthy hearings, the House Ways and Means Committee is preparing a bill now.

Economics, European style, are greatly influenced by the public's view of government budgets and its attitude toward the role of government in the economy. In this area the differences between European and American opinion are startling.

Many Americans are uncomfortable about giving the Government a major hand in the economy. On the other hand, Europeans seem to accept major government action as natural and necessary.

In an effort to appraise Mr. Kennedy's scheme, to find out why western Europe has boomed while the United States has lagged and to learn what economic policies have been used by European governments, a Post-Dispatch reporter recently completed a 6-week journey through western Europe. The trip covered 10,000 miles and six countries, with studies of economic trends in five of them—France, Germany, Italy, Great Britain, and Sweden.

Among the persons interviewed were government officials, private businessmen, bankers, economists, academicians, and representatives of the European Common Market and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

Their views showed several basic differences between recent economic practice in Europe and the United States. On the whole, experts agreed, major European governments have been inclined to use more economic tools than the United States and to employ them faster and with more flexibility.

In addition, many European governments play a larger, more direct and heavier role in economic development through a broad range of measures such as nationalized industries, government partnership with businessmen in ownership of some firms, and direct and indirect government investment.

Analysis by European experts also produced a number of clear conclusions explaining Europe's economic strides:

1. The extremely low economic position from which some European countries started after World War II made it relatively easy to achieve impressive-looking gains. This was particularly true in France, West Germany, and Italy.

2. Large scale American economic help since the war has been important. By last summer the total was nearly $29 billion in loans and outright grants, $12 billion of it through the Marshall plan alone.

3. Especially favorable circumstances like Germany's large labor pool of East German refugees, helped enormously in some places.

4. Lowering of intra-European trade barriers through the Common Market, as well as other international efforts, contributed substantially.

5. Conscious efforts to encourage high rates of both public and private investment provided money for growth.

6. Government policies, some of them bolder than those of the United States, furnished a boost. Taking a variety of forms, these programs included national economic planning in France, heavy public spending in Italy, generous incentives for business in Germany and the use of advanced budgetary concepts, notably in Sweden. The measures used by individual countries will be examined in some detail in subsequent articles.

Significantly, there was widespread agreement among those interviewed that much of the bloom is off the European picture. Slower growth rates, rising unemployment, and inflationary pressures are beginning to appear. Furthermore, many Europeans doubted that a nation as advanced technologically as the United States could achieve growth rates as high as those of Western Europe.

There was a general conviction, however, that the U.S. Government must take vigorous action if this country is to regain full economic vitality and full employment. In this connection, it was felt that Europe's experience offered a number of worthwhile lessons, especially in the fields of budgetary policy and economic forecasting.

The currents that stream across Europe's economic map run in many directions. Although big strides have been made toward ending some of the old, divisive rivalries, nationalism lurks beneath the surface, with the result that Europe's economy, like its military and political life, still is a long way from unity. It remains, in large part, a collection of separate governments, or individual men and varying policies.

In Brussels, for example, Prof. Walter Hallstein, President of the Commission of the European Economic Community, seeks to hold the Common Market together and keep it outward looking after the battering it endured last January when the French vetoed Britain's application for membership. In France, the unpredictable, one-man rule of President Charles de Gaulle received its most severe test recently when miners in the nationalized coal industry struck and defied even a threat of arrest. In Germany, Vice Chancellor Ludwig Erhard has called for an end to wage demands and price increases, warning that they might nullify the nation's spectacular progress.

Great Britain, which recently witnessed the extraordinary phenomenon of riots by the unemployed, is, like the United States, trying to put higher octane fuel into a sputtering economic engine. Chancellor of the Exchequer Reginald Maudling this month proposed, as expected, an expansionary budget with a record deficit. In Italy, nationalization of most of the electric industry by Premier Fanfani's government has caused fear among businessmen of further government moves. In Sweden, Krister Wickman, brilliant young under secretary of finance, and his colleagues refine and review measures recently taken that will make the government a larger and more important source of investment capital. Wickman recently came to Washington at the request of American officials to explain the workings of Sweden's unusual investment reserve system that encourages businesses to put aside money in good times for investment in periods of slack.

In Paris, an American expert, discussing the French attitude, remarked, "The French take it for granted that the government is responsible for full employment, that it should worry about prices and that it should have a policy for economic growth." The commission of the European Economic Community goes even further. In a report issued last fall, the executive branch of the six-nation Common Market said flatly: "It must be remembered that an economic order based on freedom can only exist in the world today at the price of constant state intervention in economic life." Such views sound heretical to many Americans.

The differences between the old and new worlds is even more marked on deficit spending. A top official of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, the 20-member international consulting and study agency to which the United States belongs, put it this way: "The European public couldn't care less about having a deficit in the government budget. Instead of worrying about it as Americans do, they don't even think about it."

In many European countries the budget is viewed as one of the most important policy tools available for promoting both long-range growth and short-term economic stability. A surplus is sought in good times; a deficit may be used as a stimulant during periods of slowdown. There is little of the psychological preoccupation with balancing the Federal budget each year that is found in some American circles. Said an OECD economist: "If you require the budget to be balanced regardless of economic conditions, you deprive yourself of a very important tool for influencing the economy."

The American distaste for deficit government spending has a curiously ironic twist to it, for many Americans who oppose Federal deficits think nothing of taking on sizable debts themselves for automobiles, furniture, even vacations. They seem to preach public thrift while practicing private prodigality.

What ails the American economy? Europeans, for the most part, shared the Kennedy administration view that the Nation is suffering from rapid technological change and 5 years or more of underutilization of its resources. Like a powerful engine, it has been idling far below its best sustained cruising speed. A survey late last year showed only 83 percent of the Nation's manufacturing capacity was in use. Similarly, manpower resources have not been fully employed.

The economy has been moving upward, it is true, setting new records in personal income, employment, wages, salaries, and corporate profits. Yet failure to reach its full potential has cost the Nation dearly. The price was spelled out by the Council of Economic Advisers last January in a comparison of actual and potential gross national product, the total value of all goods and services produced by the economy. The council estimated that between 1958 and 1962 actual GNP fell $170 billion below what the Nation was capable of with already existing resources. That amounts to nearly $1,000 for each man, woman, and child.

The state of the American economy is told in more than statistics, which skillful economists and unwary amateurs can, and often do, use to prove just about anything. It is told most meaningfully in the painful human terms of unemployment, a persistent evil that has continued despite the Nation's generally prosperous state.

Unhappily, since mid-1957, on the average, one out of about 16 workers has been out of a job. The average level of unemployment last year was 5.6 percent of the work force. A rate of 4 percent, roughly the average of the first postwar decade and a level the Kennedy administration would be happy to reach, has not been neared since the spring of 1957. Last year 67,800,000 Americans were at work, a new record, but there also were 4 million workers without jobs. For some Americans, particularly the unskilled, today's clouds have had no silver lining for a long time. Increasing numbers have been without jobs for longer and longer periods. Between 1957 and 1962 the number out of work 6 months or longer rose by almost 150 percent.

The sluggishness of the American economy stands out in contrast when compared with what has been happening in Europe. A study by the OECD last November showed that the average yearly increase in GNP in the United States in the decade between 1950 and 1960 amounted to 3.3 percent. This tied America with Denmark for 14th place among the 20 nations studied. In contrast, some European nations showed gains of more than double the American rate. West Germany led the race with an annual increase of 7.5 percent in GNP. Italy was 4th with 5.9, and France, 10th with 4.3. Sweden and the United Kingdom trailed the United States, with average yearly rises of 3.2 and 2.6 percent, respectively.

The United States fared just as poorly in a comparison of increases in GNP per worker. Its average yearly gain of 2.1 percent for the decade was fourth lowest among 14 countries studied by the OECD. While some Americans like Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican, Webster Groves, object that GNP is not a full measure of economic growth, it is used as a major yardstick by the OECD and other international groups.

In addition, other measurements by the OECD and other authorities show a similar picture of more economic bounce in much of Europe. With the exception of Germany and Italy, where high unemployment has been cut substantially in the past year or so, major European countries have enjoyed much fuller employment than the United States. Industrial production has risen faster in the five European countries studied by the Post-Dispatch than in America.

The portion of GNP being put into fixed investments by private business firms has been lower here than in most other industrialized countries. Except for 1957, the United States, because in part at least of its heavy burden of foreign aid, has suffered balance-of-payment deficits each year since 1949, while some European coutries have accumulated sizable surpluses. The United States has had four recessions since the war; Europe has had two.

On the other hand, the United States has displayed far greater price stability than its European competitors. Between 1953 and 1961 the cost of living in the United States rose by about 12 percent. In the five other countries studied, increases ranged from a low of 14 percent in Germany to a high of 38 percent in France in the same period.

While the United States has limped economically in recent years, it still stands out like a giant among pygmies. A study prepared last year for the Joint Congressional

Economic Committee showed that in 1960 the U.S. GNP was nearly double that of the Soviet Union and 5 to 10 times that of individual western European nations. Using a complicated conversion formula based on internal purchasing power parities in 1955, the study showed the following comparative GNP's expressed in billions of dollars: United States, 504.4; Soviet Union, 235.5; Western Germany, 92.2; United Kingdom, 85.4; France, 84.8; Italy, 43.8.

Even the combined economic power of the members of the Common Market, assuming they formed a cohesive unit, is far less than that of the United States. The Joint Congressional Committee study, as well as analyses by the Common Market itself, put the overall GNP of the Common Market at a little more than half that of the United States. The European Economic Community estimated that in 1959 its industrial production amounted to 54 percent of that of the United States. By 1972, it predicted, the Common Market total would be no more than 60 percent of American output.

The differences that have existed between European and American economic performance in recent years may narrow somewhat in the future. This is the nearly unanimous belief of experts interviewed by the Post-Dispatch. They pointed out that a slowdown in economic growth rate already has become evident in some European countries. The evidence is that the Continent will find it more difficult to achieve rapid growth in the 1960's than it did in the 1950's. Europe may be reaching the stage where it will begin to encounter the same kinds of problems the United States has struggled with for many years.

Last year the United States enjoyed above average growth that ranked high in the international scale. The Council of Economic Advisers put the increase in real GNP in 1962 at 5½ percent. However, part of the gain was attributed to the upswing from the recession that started in 1960. It is not expected to be duplicated this year.

Long-range economic trends throughout much of the free world will be influenced in the future by the path followed by the Common Market. Will the six-nation Community set up a high tariff wall to protect its members, or will it become outward looking and favor free trade? The final answer has been lost in the haze of confusion that followed France's veto of the British application to join the Common Market.

Another important factor in future world developments is the influence of the OECD. The international Organization in 1961 set a target of an overall increase of 50 percent in real GNP by 1970 for its 20 member countries. The OECD is bringing the pressure of public attention to bear on its members in an effort to reach its goal. For example, in two reports late last year, the Organization expressed concern that the United States had fallen below the yearly growth target of 4.4 percent set for it in the OECD plan. It urged prompt action to stimulate American growth.

There was remarkable agreement among European economists and Government officials as to what the United States should do to perk up its rate of development. It needs a bold fiscal policy, they said. In plain language they meant: Cut taxes and unbalance the budget. Some also would like to see higher Government expenditures, although others thought these could be put off until after the budget deficit has led, hopefully, to more nearly full employment. Standby authority to change tax rates and Government expenditures to deal more rapidly with changing economic conditions also were suggested.

Steps have been taken by the administration in its effort, as Mr. Kennedy promised so frequently in the 1960 presidential campaign to "get this country moving again." Among them are larger depreciation allowances, a 7-percent tax credit for new investment, aid to depressed areas, the manpower development and training act, extension of the social security and public welfare programs and an accelerated schedule of public works.

None of these measures is as far-reaching, as controversial or as novel to Americans as the pending proposal for cutting taxes by $10.2 billion and deliberately putting the Federal budget into the red by $11.9 billion in the coming fiscal year. The theory is that such action will encourage a higher level of business activity and private spending. This in turn will stimulate growth, produce new jobs and more government revenue.

This is the theory. Will it work? Experts disagree. It is uncertain, too, whether Congress will accept the plan in anything like the form proposed by Mr. Kennedy.

The situation is made more difficult by its very complexity. Modern economies have become so complicated that, as the President said in a speech last May, they involve matters "which are beyond the comprehension of most men."

As a result, the public reaction to new and unproven measures is likely to be apathetic, skeptical or antagonistic. Mr. Kennedy recognized this hazard in his speech a year ago. He observed wryly that today's complicated economic problems "do not lend themselves to the great sort of passionate movements which have stirred this country so often in the past."

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, Apr. 15, 1963]

FRANCE'S "LE PLAN," ONCE A JOKE TO EUROPE, HAS GIVEN ECONOMY VITALITY, STABILITY, AND GROWTH—BASICALLY IT CONSISTS OF SETTING GOALS THAT ARE VOLUNTARY IN CONCEPT AND EXECUTION BUT BACKED BY GOVERNMENT INCENTIVES AND CONTROLS

(By Thomas W. Ottenad)

WASHINGTON, April 15.—Talk to almost anyone in Europe about France's great economic leap forward, and he is likely to begin—and end—with "le plan."

The French system of national economic planning has become an object of widespread interest in the wake of a dramatic change in the country's life. Once regarded derisively by other Europeans as almost comic-opera joke, the French economy has suddenly gained a vitality, stability, and growth that have won respect and attention.

Critics like to point out that many factors besides planning have contributed to French growth, that Germany, without national programing, has grown faster than France. Said Jacques Plassard, director of an economic research center supported by large French industrial firms, "The plan behaves like a rooster that sings when the sun rises and says, 'See, I have made the sun rise.'"

Pierre Masse, the friendly, mild-mannered chief of the French Economic Planning Commission, readily concedes that the plan has not singlehandedly fashioned the country's economic boom. In fact, in his office in a rather worn-looking building on the left bank in Paris, he goes to considerable length to show visitors that hard work, ingenuity, and other reasons having nothing to do with economic planning have played a large part in France's robust growth.

Nonetheless, it is "le plan" that has captured the imagination and even elicited the envy of countries whose growth rates have trailed the French mark. Economists and government officials have been flocking to Paris from many parts of the world, including the United States and Great Britain, to see how the French so-called indicative planning system works.

Basically, the French approach consists of setting 4-year targets for economic growth, investment, production, wages, prices, and a multitude of other factors. The plan spells out steps needed to reach these objectives and offers incentives and indirect controls for pushing the economy across the goal line.

Preparation of "le plan" begins with formulation of several alternatives, general schemes of economic development by Masse's office, the Commissariat General du Plan. After one of the alternatives is approved by the French Cabinet, it becomes both a policy statement of government intentions and a basic framework around which is built the final, working program.

In an extraordinary, cooperative undertaking, representatives of government, business, trade unions, and nearly every sector of society join to carry out the painstaking job of program building. A total of about 3,500 persons, serving without pay, work on 25 planning committees, preparing the components of a comprehensive scheme.

Twenty of the committees tackle individual sectors of the economy, such as agriculture, steel production, or education. The other five groups deal with general problems of manpower, overall balance and financing, research, productivity, and regional planning.

Out of this massive community effort comes an equally massive economic development plan, hundreds of pages long and almost infinite in detail. It sets production targets and other goals for every major branch of the economy. In addition, for some industries, like steel, cement, and publicly owned operations, there are specific objectives for individual firms.

Masse and his brilliant young assistant, Paul Lemerle, emphasize that the French plan is voluntary both in concept and execution. Masse likes to call it "planning without planners, or planning by the planned."

The target for each economic sector is much the same as the sum of the plans by individual firms in that branch, he stressed. "The goals have not been dictated by government bureaucrats, but have been set by the people who run the businesses and who do the work," he said.

Firms are not compelled to participate. Nor are they required to expand their output in agreement with the plan's outlines unless they choose to do so.

While it is true that French businessmen voice little objection to "le plan" and seem happy to take part in it, the system contains a variety of incentives and financial controls that give the Government a large voice in shaping, directing, and regulating the economy.

Some major examples: The Government may grant low-interest loans to firms whose programs are in accord with the plan. If a concern's plans are out of step with the national scheme, the Ministry of Finance may not allow it to issue bonds for financing its proposals. On the other hand, firms with approved projects may receive a 7-year exemption from a 50 percent tax on part of their dividends.

In addition, there are Government grants, subsidies for scientific and technical research, equipment bonuses and other alluring devices.

Masse and his aids are willing to concede that "le plan" has been directly responsible for only a small part of France's economic growth. Lemerle, in an off-the-cuff estimate, suggested that of the 4.5 percent average annual increase in production since the planning process was started in 1946, perhaps up to 1.5 percent resulted from the program itself.

The French planners attribute much of the nation's growth to the ingenuity and hard work of French employees, many of whom still work 46 hours a week. The growth of the Common Market has helped by providing new outlets for French products. The devaluation of the franc three times since World War II has aided financial stability.

Experts outside the Government cite a number of other contributing factors. Important among these was the stagnation of French industry between the First and Second World Wars. When technological advances from other countries began to be adopted after World War II, French production showed spectacular gains.

Highly important, too, is direct Government influences through public ownership of a large part of the economy. French experts estimate that the nationally owned sector accounts for about 30 percent of their nation's economic activity. The big Renault automobile manufacturing works, the Air France commercial airline, a number of major commercial banks and insurance firms, railroads and coal mines are among the more important, publicly owned industries.

Since the Government controls directly or indirectly about half of all investment, it can do much to shape the nation's economic course. Other factors that have contributed to French growth include American aid and inflationary price increases.

When all of these elements are considered, the major value of le plan, in the view of Masse, American experts, and others, has been in developing a cooperative spirit among business, government, and labor and in creating a climate conducive to growth.

The painstaking studies made in the planning process also have provided a better public understanding of economic realities, made it possible to consider the relation of individual sectors to the entire economy and encouraged industries to adopt higher growth targets than they might otherwise have done. The nation's development has been more regular and orderly than it would have been without planning, said Lemerle.

There is no question that the French plan has been bold about setting high flying targets. The present program, covering the years 1962 through 1965, aims for an average yearly increase in gross domestic product of 5.5 percent. Actual performance last year beat this goal by a sizable margin, reaching an increase of 6.3 percent.

Last year's achievements gave the nation a strong start toward reaching its 1965 goals. In 1962, nearly every sector equaled or exceeded the yearly objectives spelled out in the plan. The only branches falling short were construction, electricity, and a miscellaneous category that includes services.

The daring nature of the plan is clearly indicated by the amount of growth it seeks for some individual sectors. Using 1959 as a base year, the current program aims at boosting electric power output by 1965 by 8 percent, chemical production by 57 percent, construction by 46 percent, and communications by 59 percent. For industry as a whole the overall target is an increase of one-fourth over 1959 output.

While the French economy has been shooting upward, "le plan" has had to endure some failures. None of the four plans adopted since 1946 has succeeded in controlling inflation. Nor have they met the nation's need for housing and schools.

Some experts outside the French Government have serious reservations about le plan. They wonder how far state planning can go without becoming all-compelling and controlling. They suggest that the real test of whether national planning will work is still to come as France begins to struggle once again with its old enemy, inflation, and with the new need to create jobs for a labor force that is expanding for the first time since the war. Masse himself admits that planning will be more difficult in the freer international climate expected to flow from the European Common Market. Nonetheless, he sees great, unrealized potential in the planning process. He believes that over the period of a generation or more it may transform living conditions and alter the basic direction and orientation of modern society.

He suggests that through long-range planning a nation can choose what it wants from the glittering baubles of an affluent society. Masse believes the present plan is moving France in the direction of stressing public needs like health, education, housing, culture, and scientific and technical research in preference to what he has described as "the proliferation of individual consumer goods."

Like so many forward-looking movements in Europe le plan bears the imprint of Jean Monnet. The brilliant Frenchman who later fathered the Common Market served as France's first planning director. The initial plan concentrated French resources on six basic industries and reached most of its targets by 1953.

The second program, placing emphasis not only on producing more but producing better, beat its goals in the period from 1954 through 1957. The third plan was just about on target when it concluded in 1961 after some of its initial goals were cut back. In view of the current U.S. effort to stimulate its economic growth, should some kind of long-range national planning be tried here? Among conflicting answers was this interesting reply from Plassard, the director of the business-sponsored French Center for Economic Research:

"The question of whether the United States should plan depends on political and psychological considerations. That is, does the United States need reassurance that its future will be sound? If it does, then it needs economic planning. If it does not require reassurances, then it does not need national planning."

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, Apr. 16, 1963]

GERMANY'S ECONOMY, FASTEST GROWING IN WESTERN EUROPE, SLOWS—INFLATION NEW PROBLEM—SO-CALLED SOCIAL MARKET SYSTEM REVERES FREE ENTERPRISE AND COMPETITION AS BEST REGULATORS BUT LEAVES ROOM FOR GOVERNMENT ACTION, TOO

(By Thomas W. Ottenad)

WASHINGTON, April 16.—Between Frankfurt and Bonn along the river Rhine, stark German hills brood against the sky. Although their slopes are steep and their soil thin, many have been tilled almost to the summit. Grapevines march in rows to the top. Retaining walls built of stones carried laboriously up the rugged inclines keep the hills from washing away in heavy rains.

The incredibly hard work that has gone into these hillside fields illustrates one reason for West Germany's great growth since World War II. The German capacity and appetite for hard, unremitting labor have played a large part in restoring a defeated, shattered nation to its former position as one of the most powerful economic machines in the world.

Unlike its neighbor, France, where national planning has become an important factor in economic growth, Germany stands stolidly against government programing. "Turn the people and the money loose, and they will make the country strong," is the rallying cry of Ludwig Erhard, the rotund Minister for Economics who may be the country's next Chancellor.

But even the removal of restraints and of Nazi State controls, plus extraordinarily hard work, does not explain why this once prostrate nation has been able to hoist itself faster and farther than any other Western country. It is not enough to account for an increase of 162 percent in German industrial production between 1950 and 1961. Nor is it adequate to explain a 7.5 percent average annual increase in gross national product between 1950 and 1960 as Germany topped 19 other major Western nations in the new international game of growthmanship.

Many factors account for the German performance. One of the most important is a set of peculiarly favorable circumstances over which the Germans themselves had no control.

"The 'Wirtschaftswunder,' or economic miracle, that has been achieved here," said one well-informed official in a recent interview with the Post-Dispatch in Bonn, "is principally the result of the situation in which the Germans found themselves, one that was conducive to fast growth."

Quickly he ticked off some of the conditions: large postwar demand by many countries for heavy machinery, one of Germany's most important exports; a large pool of cheap labor as some 13 million Germans, many of them refugees from the Soviet zone, fled into Western Germany before the Berlin wall was built in the summer of 1961; relatively low and stable wages—in 1950 the average weekly earnings of German industrial workers amounted to about $16; enormous reconstruction needs, and the low level to which wartime devastation had reduced the German economy, making fast, big gains easy.

Also important was large-scale and timely American aid. Up through last June 30 the United States had provided slightly more than $4 billion in assistance to West Germany.

There is a feeling in some quarters that events in postwar Germany have, at least until recently, been far more favorable to German business concerns than to their workers.

"Look at it this way," said one German official. "Our firms have invested heavily in expanding their plants, with much of the money coming out of high profits. But it was the consumer who provided the profits through the prices he paid. If he was a German worker, he was paying, too, through the relatively low wages he was making until recent years. Our tax burden is large and it falls heavily on lower and middle-income groups."

Reflecting this view is the fact that many of the Government's economic policies have been designed for the benefit of business firms and investors. Typical was a generous provision allowing concerns to deduct from their taxable incomes up to 50 percent of profits if the money was reinvested.

Explaining the Government philosophy, Dr. Johann Schollhorn, chief of the Federal Economics Ministry's branch dealing with planning, growth, and anticyclical policies, remarked: "The major policy since 1949 has been to promote investment, especially in the basic industries, through tax subsidies, big allowances for depreciation and tax benefits for investment." The result has been an investment boom in which gross investment has regularly amounted to about one-fourth of gross national product.

Although Germany puts more emphasis on private initiative and minimum Government controls than any other country studied by the Post-Dispatch, it has not hesitated to use a full and imaginative arsenal of Government tools to direct and encourage economic growth.

The Government also has played a major role in the country's growth through its role as an investor. It makes direct investments in public works and provides subsidies to agriculture and the federally owned railroad system. Indirectly, it has provided money through loans for housebuilding, agriculture, and shipbuilding. Investment of public funds last year amounted to 25 billion marks (about $6.25 billion). Slightly more than half of it consisted of direct investments by Federal, State, and local governments, while the rest was used for loans.

Germany's so-called "social market system" reveres the free marketplace and competition as the best of all possible economic regulators, but it provides room for major Government action, too. The state stands willing to influence and correct the economy through tax-related measures, and it follows an active policy of promoting economic growth and price stability.

Furthermore, there is room in years. Gross national product rose by 5.7 percent in 1961 and by only 4.1 percent last year. Both marks were well below previous levels. The 1962 gain was the lowest of the postwar period except for 1958.

New problems, chiefly inflation, rising costs and a shortage of workers are beginning to plague the German economy. "Yes, we have inflation now," said Schollhorn.

He pointed out that the German price index rose 18 percent from 1954 to 1960. Since then the rise has steepened, going up 3 percent in 1960, 4.1 percent in 1961 and 4.2 percent last year. Average wages and salaries rose 30 percent from 1959 through 1962. All in all, prices and costs have risen faster in Germany than in most industrial countries in the last couple of years.

Schollhorn termed the present inflationary spiral one of the worst the country has encountered since the war. It was exceeded in intensity only by the ruinous period immediately following World War II and by that experienced in 1951 and 1952, stemming chiefly from the Korean war.

The Government's principal policy for dealing with the present situation has consisted for the most part of appeals to labor and management to keep wage and price increases below gains in productivity, expected to amount to about 3.5 percent a year. The Government is trying to hold increases in its own expenditures within the same limit.

Despite dire warnings by Erhard, there are signs that the policy is not working very effectively. A number of workers, including Federal civil service employees have recently won wage increases exceeding the Government's guideline. Government expenditures appear to be going over the limit, too. The budget proposed for this year calls for spending at least 6 percent higher than last year, while some experts think the final rise may be closer to 10 percent.

Dr. Wilhelmina Dreissig, a senior staff director of the Deutsche Bundesbank, or German Central Bank, warned in an interview that inflation is "the most dangerous aspect" of Germany's present economic situation. It may be aggravated by a labor shortage and continuing heavy demand for housing. Although some 700,000 foreign workers are employed in Germany, a survey last November showed 600,000 unfilled jobs with only 90,000 workers unemployed. The demand for housing is such that residential building costs have risen nearly one-third since 1958.

Prosperous and thriving, Germany shows little resemblance to the broken nation that started and lost World War II. It is again one of the world's leading economic powers. Depending on the measuring scale used, its gross national product ranks first or second in Western Europe. Its steel production in 1960 was second highest in Europe, exceeded only by that of the Soviet Union. Its share of world trade has climbed back to its 1929 mark. Living standards have surpassed the prewar level. Average incomes more than doubled between 1950 and 1960.

This somber country with its sober, stolid people seems driven by a desire for prosperity and power. The memory of the misery and poverty it endured after its great war lives vividly in the ruins still visible in Berlin, in the large number of men with limping gait or artificial hands, in the words of a German who said passionately:

"The German people will never forget the period from 1945 to 1948. The economy broke down completely. A cigarette was worth 5 or 6 marks. Nobody wanted money; it was worthless. The trains were crowded with people going to the country to try to get food. They offered jewelry, clothes, furniture, anything they had. If they didn't have anything to swap, they starved."

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, Apr. 17, 1963]

Confident Italy Expects Economy To Keep on Growing—Spending by Government a big Factor—Atmosphere Born of Success Pervades Ancient Land—Upsurge Since War, One of World's Fastest—Technology Has Vital Role

(By Thomas W. Ottenad)

Washington, April 17.—An American businessman smiled as he glanced out his office window on a sunny, spring day in Rome recently.

"The Italian people," he remarked, "have fallen in love with growth."

Outside the office the Via Veneto, Rome's most fashionable street, was thronged with smartly dressed, prosperous-looking men and women. Shops displayed chic, Italian-designed clothes and elegant jewelry with beauty and prices that took one's breath away. The traffic jam, as usual, was enormous; the confusion, ferocious, and the scent of success, strong and heavy.

In this street scene there was something youthful and vital about an ancient land that once ruled most of the known world. The attitude was somehow that of a teenager, growing fast and full of unlimited confidence about the future.

It was an atmosphere born of success, created by a tremendous surge of power displayed by the Italian economy in recent years, a record that shows growth and more growth at nearly every turn.

Italy's gross national product last year was nearly double its 1953 level; so was national income. Average income per person in 1961 was 3½ times what it was in 1948. By the end of 1960, compared with 1953, industrial production had risen by 85 percent; imports had doubled, and exports had trebled. Italy's holdings of gold and foreign exchange ranked behind only those of the United States, Germany and the United Kingdom.

This was a country where from 1928 to 1948 the income of average Italians had not risen one cent. Yet since World War II the nation has had one of the world's fastest growing economies.

Throughout the 1950's national output rose at a yearly average of 5.9 percent, two-thirds above the American level and fourth fastest among 18 European nations. In recent years the boom has been even faster. In 1960 the gross national product climbed by 7.1 percent; in 1961 by 7.9 and last year by 5.5.

While future growth is likely to be slower than this dizzy pace, both Italians and impartial observers expect it to continue to advance strongly. H. Gardner Ainsworth, the capable and experienced economics counselor for the American embassy in Rome, observed, "Sustained high growth should continue for years and years because there are large-scale demands still unmet here."

Ainsworth predicted annual average growth of between 5 and 6 percent for the rest of this decade. The significance of such a rate is clearly indicated by the fact that it would double the Nation's income in about 12 years.

Despite its history as one of the world's oldest and greatest civilizations, Italy in its recent years of advance, have been, in many ways, like a young, underdeveloped nation, because it had so little.

Just how little Italians had is clear from one of Ainsworth's studies. I 1938 average income per person was about $200 a year, a bare 10-percent higher than its level 10 years earlier. Mussolini's grandiose dreams of empire and his repressive fascist regime had done little for the economy except to clamp tight controls and state ownership on much of it.

By the end of World War II income had dropped even lower. Cut to half its prewar level, it stood at what was probably its lowest point in 75 years.

The beginning of post war reconstruction brought it back up to $200 by 1948, and the impetus of the Marshall plan yielded further gains by 1953 when most major wartime reconstruction had been completed. Since then the rise has been even faster. By 1961 average income stood at $700, or 3½ times the 1948 level.

The depressed position from which Italy started has played an important part in its recent big gains. Modern technology, replacing antiquated methods, boosted output sharply. Workers shifted from low-producing agriculture to higher paying, higher producing industrial jobs as new factories sprang up. The industrial plant, which had been small, highly protected and rigidly controlled under Mussolini, expanded, pulled down its trade barriers and emerged suddenly on the world scene as a vigorous competitor. Abundant cheap labor and relative price stability also helped.

In the opinion of Ainsworth and other students, including Giovanni Landriscina, economics expert of the Italian Budget Ministry, the Government action that contributed most to Italy's outstanding growth has been a continuing policy of high public expenditures and investments.

Between 1951 and 1961, one study showed, Government spending rose by 86 percent, or slightly faster than the gross national product. When public investments, rather than merely operating expenses, are taken into account, the role of the Government becomes even more impressive.

Of all the money plowed back into investments in 1961, nearly 40 percent came directly or indirectly from the Government. The rate of both public and private investment has been nearly double that of the United States. Last year 21 percent of all available resources went into investment.

In typically Italian fashion, the nation's economy is highly individualistic. It seems to disregard most rules, intertwining public and private elements perhaps more closely than any other Western nation. The Government plays one of its most significant roles through what are delicately described as "state holdings." These are firms owned either wholly or in part by the Central Government.

Fountainhead of the system is composed of two state holding companies—IRI, the Institute for Industrial Reconstruction, and the better known but smaller ENI, or National Hydrocarbons Agency. Experts estimate that as much as one-third of all production comes from state-controlled firms.

IRI controls more than 100 operating concerns and exerts a pervasive influence. Through its subsidiaries it controls the entire radio, television, and urban telephone systems; virtually all airline business through the Al Italia commerical line; 80 percent or more of shipbuilding and pig iron production; more than half of steel output and passenger shipping; one-fourth of electric power generation; and one-fifth of the banking system.

ENI has five main management firms, around which are grouped 75 operating companies, some of which carry on important business abroad. Concentrating principally on oil and gas exploration and production, it also operates a chain of service stations, restaurants, and motels.

The Government role in the field of business is a growing one. Last year the electric power industry was nationalized. IRI and ENI together have 325,000 employees. By 1965 the number of workers employed directly or indirectly by state-controlled firms is expected to reach 500,000.

Some of the most important Government expenditures have been those in the poverty-stricken southern half of Italy. In an effort to make agricultural and industrial development possible there, the Government has undertaken to finance the entire cost of providing roads, water systems and other public utilities for the south. More than 2,000 billion lire (about $3,200 million) in Federal money has been provided under a 15-year program that started in 1950.

Despite its extraordinary growth in recent years, the nation still lags far behind other large Western countries. Using exchange rates for conversion purposes, a study by Ainsworth showed Italy's gross national product in 1961 was about $35 billion.

That was only a little more than one-third the total output of the United Kingdom and about one-fifteenth of the U.S. level. National income at $27 billion showed about the same ratios.

The extraordinary paradoxes of Italy—where modern automobiles creep slowly through narrow archways in the ancient city wall of Rome, where the impressive ruins of the superbly proportioned Roman colosseum contrast sharply with modern, box-like apartment buildings splashed with garish colors—extend into the country's economic life.

Although the Government has spent and invested heavily, its action, in the view of most impartial observers, was not deliberately designed to stimulate growth. The major aim, rather, was simply to meet accumulated public needs. The threat represented by the Italian Communist Party, the largest in Europe outside the Soviet Union, lent political urgency to the task.

There is paradox, too, between economic performance and philosophy. Although Italians think nothing of mixing public and private spending in a strange potpourri, they hesitate at the thought of using other strong Government action should their booming economy slip. Italian officials made it plain they would not like to employ the stimulus of a tax cut and budget deficit, now being considered by the United States.

Their reluctance is doubly paradoxical, for the Italian budget has shown deficits regularly for at least 40 years. Italian officals point out, however, that the deficits were small and were not deliberate growth devices, but resulted from spending programs that were believed to be needed.

"The Italians really are quite conservative in their economic notions," said one well-informed observer. "Like the United States, their Government dislikes tinkering with fiscal measures.

"They recall vividly the severe inflation they suffered after the war, and they don't want to risk anything that might lead to it again. Besides, with the boom they have had, they haven't needed tax cuts or other stimuli."

The Italians have jumped on the economic planning bandwagon that has been rolling through much of Western Europe recently. A Government commission has been at work on an initial report aimed at establishing a planning system, but little action is expected until after the national elections later this month.

Informed sources expect eventual development of a rather limited system of long-range economic projections and forecasts, but without the detailed production targets that mark the French economic planning system.

Full of vitality and bursting with confidence, Italians are looking to the future without worry. Although creeping inflation has been apparent for about 18 months—the cost of living rose 5 percentage points last year and salaries climbed 20 percent for Government workers and an average of about 15 percent in private industry—most Italian officials see little serious danger ahead.

In love with growth, Italy expects to keep right on growing for some time to come.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, Apr. 18, 1963]

Britain, Turning to Long-Range Planning, Pins Hopes on Twin Agencies for Economic Uplift—"Neddy" and "Niccy" Created To Increase Output and Meet World Price Competition—$2 Billion Deficit Recommended in Budget

(By Thomas W. Ottenad)

Washington, April 18.—The British are counting heavily on a set of economic twins, which with their fondness for nicknames, they have labeled "Neddy" and "Niccy," to revive their sluggish economy.

"Neddy" is the National Economic Development Council (NEDC). Its objective: To prepare a national plan of economic development that will increase the country's economic growth by 4 percent each year through 1965. "Niccy" is the National Incomes Commission. Its task: To help achieve a noninflationary income policy that will make British prices more competitive in the world market.

Both agencies are seeking measures that will produce sustained, long-term growth. In addition, the Government has taken a number of short-range actions designed to quicken the nation's erratic business pulse. Chief architect of this program is Reginald Maudling, who became chancellor of the exchequer last July in a Cabinet shakeup.

Since then he has boosted Government spending, cut indirect taxes and eased credit, all in the hope, as the British put it, of "reflating" the economy. More importantly, he now has taken the same course President Kennedy has proposed for the United States—sizable tax cuts and a whopping Government deficit.

In a budget submitted less than 2 weeks ago for the fiscal year that began April 1, Maudling recommended a record overall deficit of $2 billion. Along with tax cuts, he boosted public expenditures. He estimated his fiscal plan would put $700 million in added spending or purchasing power into the economy.

Both "Neddy" and "Niccy," as well as Maudling's short-range measures, have come under heavy fire from many sides. Liberal economists, some businessmen and the Labor Party, which scents victory in elections expected to be held next year, argue that the Tories' program is too little and too late to rescue Britain from its stagnant economic backwaters.

In the last few months, which have come to be known ruefully as the winter of Britain's discontent, nature and man seemed to conspire against the British. The winter brought some of the most extreme and prolonged cold weather in history. Across the Channel French President de Gualle produced another kind of chill by dashing Britain's hopes of entering the Common Market. Unemployment rose alarmingly and some of the jobless rioted outside Parliament.

Back of it all was a basic economic problem that is distressingly familiar to the United States—an agonizingly slow rate of growth in a period when other nations have been booming.

Throughout the 1950's Great Britain could achieve no more than a modest yearly increase of 2.6 percent in its gross national product (the value of all goods and services). This was an even poorer showing than that of the United States, which managed to climb by 3.3 percent in the same period.

Comparison became all the more invidious when Britain looked across the channel where some of its continental neighbors were scaling the economic heights at a pace two or three times as fast as Britain's. Throughout Europe's fabulous fifties, Germany boosted its gross national product by a yearly average of 7.5 percent; Italy, by 5.9, and France, by 4.3. All in all, Britain ranked no better than 18th of 20 nations studied by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

Compounding the British ailment was a frustrating stop-and-go pattern of development. At times domestic demand for goods and services would rise smartly. But this was regarded with some concern in Britain where about one-fourth of gross national product depends on exports. Heavy home demand tended to send prices up, increase imports, reduce exports, adversely affect the nation's balance of payments and cause concern about the soundness of British sterling, one of the world's major currencies.

In the face of such developments, the Government on several occasions moved to curb demand at home. Typical was the summer of 1961, when it increased bank interest rates and taxes, called for a "wage pause," limited public expenditures and tightened credit. Measures such as these periodically slowed the British economy to a crawl. Then, one by one, the restrictions would come off and stimuli would be used to encourage growth once again.

Out of all this has come slow, sporadic development. The British economy has lurched forward only to stop suddenly, like a car with a powerful set of brakes applied too fast.

There is disagreement over whether this stop-and-go policy was necessary. Hugh Weeks, a keen businessman who is a director of the Industrial and Commercial Finance Corp., believes it was not. In a recent interview with the Post-Dispatch in his office in the financial district of London, he suggested that what Britain has needed all along are strong measures to expand production.

"The balance of payments might have suffered at the outset," he predicted, "but eventually exports would have risen and it would have been remedied."

On the other hand, Peter G. Davies, a young and impressively capable economics adviser to the Treasury Department, believes the problem is especially difficult for both the United Kingdom and the United States because of their positions as the world's major bankers. "Other countries," Davies remarked, "can take more chances with their currencies because they don't have everyone peering over their shoulder, waiting to pounce on them. Both the United States and Britain have had to be on guard lest extremely rapid economic growth upset their balance of payments too drastically."

Harried by its unsatisfactory performance, Britain now, for the first time, has turned to long-range economic planning in an effort to find a way out of its vicious circle. Surprisingly enough, it was British businessmen, impressed by the success of national economic planning in France, who took the lead in demanding that Britain, too, move into this field. "Neddy" was the government's answer.

Since its establishment in February 1962, the British agency has been engaged principally in what one observer rather caustically termed "the arithmetic of the possible." It has set a target of 4-percent annual growth for a 5-year period and has been busily computing what this would mean to the economy.

It has had little to say on the much more difficult subject of how the target is to be achieved. "It will be difficult to get agreement (among government, business, union and public representatives on "Neddy") on what should be done," one informed source said.

Persons closely associated with Neddy expect it to put heavy emphasis on the need for achieving price stability by keeping wages and other incomes from rising faster than productivity. It is likely also to offer government incentives to industry to expand, as well as enlarge, programs of education, job training, and financial aid for workers displaced by industrial changes. Other devices to boost and sustain growth may be recommended, too.

Although there is disagreement over whether Neddy will succeed, the chances for Niccy are rated very low. While Niccy is designed to review wage problems and agreements, it lacks enforcement power. It may be somewhat useful in mobilizing public opinion.

The National Institute of Economics and Social Research, a nonprofit, study organization in London, has been calling for much more forceful action by the Government. It has urged adoption of an active expansionary policy aimed at boosting output by 5 percent this year.

F. T. Blackaby, editor of the institute's widely respected Economic Review, told the Post-Dispatch that the Government should risk worsening the balance-of-payments situation to promote growth. If the balance of payments becomes too critical, he said, Britain should be willing to devalue the pound. There seems little possibility of such action, however, for Conservatives and Laborites have said they oppose devaluation.

The gravity of the British situation is emphasized by recent developments. Slow growth has become even slower, with gross national product rising only about 2 percent for each of the past 3 years. The cost of living climbed by 30 percent between 1953 and 1962, third highest increase among major Western European countries. Industrial production rose only 30 percent between 1953 and 1961, far less than in other European nations.

After enjoying a high level of employment since the war, Britain saw unemployment suddenly shoot up during the winter. In February it reached its highest point since the war except for a short period in February 1947, when a shortage of fuel forced many industries to shut down. The unemployment rate of 3.9 percent reported 2 months ago would have been substantially higher if computed according to American procedure.

As 1963 started, the part of the British industrial plant standing idle for lack of orders was believed to be higher than at any time since the war. The balance of payments, however, has displayed some improvement. After showing a deficit in 5 of the 8 previous years, the balance of monetary movements shifted into a slight surplus in 1961 and a somewhat larger one in 1962.

Britain's economic problems have been intensified by the failure to win admission to the European Common Market. After having counted heavily on membership in the EEC for an economic shot in the arm, the British now have been forced to look elsewhere.

Politics is further muddying the economic waters. The Labor Party is widely expected at present to win general elections that are likely to be held next spring. If it does, it plans to nationalize additional industries. It also would probably strengthen Neddy or replace it with a kind of economic planning that would be virtually compulsory in nature. Because of the political uncertainty, officials within the Government, speaking privately, concede that Neddy is not likely to make any significant progress prior to the elections. If the Labor Party wins, Niccy might be abolished.

Meanwhile, with their usual outward calm, the British are patiently casting about for some path to higher economic ground. Edward du Cann, secretary to the treasury department and one of the Conservative government's young new frontiersmen, told the Post-Dispatch: "There is nothing new in our having difficulties to live through.

"We have always been a tiny little country with giants to deal with, whether they were Napoleon or Hitler. We are still a small country, and we must live by our skills and our wits in the shadow of the United States and the Soviet Union."

There was a calm assurance in his attitude that Britain would once again win through despite big odds. But to some observers, there seems to be a curious, although perhaps only temporary, lack of momentum. Like a swimmer treading water, the British economy is going through a lot of motions, but it does not seem to be getting anywhere very fast.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, Apr. 19, 1963]

Sweden Supports Economy by Emphasizing Stability Rather Than Great Expansion—Extensive System Developed and Applied Almost Constantly—Investment Reserve Fund Is Effective Tool—Tax Revisions Seldom Used

(By Thomas W. Ottenad)

Washington, April 19.—A small, calm land in the far north boasts one of the world's most extensive and complete sets of tools for keeping its tiny but impressive economy in smooth working order.

In Sweden, where neutrality and conciliation have become a way of life, the Government uses a wider range of measures than most other countries in highly successful efforts to avoid economic troubles or, if they occur, to deal with them swiftly.

Significantly, in a period when economic growthmanship has become a favorite international game, Sweden has put its emphasis on stability rather than great expansion.

"Oh, yes, we would like to move a little faster, but we don't want to try to copy the very rapidly growing countries," says Bengt Metelius, economic adviser of the Svenska Handels-Banken, the big Swedish Bank of Commerce. This calm view was echoed repeatedly by businessmen, labor leaders, and Government officials in interviews recently with the Post-Dispatch.

While Sweden's growth has been far below that of the booming economies of Germany, Italy, and some other nations, its performance in regulating demand and keeping it high, and its achievements in smoothing out economic peaks and troughs are regarded by many economists as outstanding.

Principal distinguishing characteristic of its economic first aid kit is its variety. Going far beyond the usual fiscal and monetary measures used by most industrialized nations, Sweden has developed new cures or added refinements to old ones. Among the most important:

An investment reserve system allowing business firms to put money aside in periods of prosperity and receive a sizable tax credit if they spend it for plant expansion or other authorized works in slack periods.

A new national pension scheme that not only sets one of the world's most ambitious targets for old-age benefits but also provides the Government with a mammoth source of capital for investment.

Government appropriations that are to be used only when needed to increase employment.

An emergency budget to finance public works that can be started on short notice when the economy needs help.

Sweden seems to regard a stable economy as one of the obvious responsibilities of a welfare state. In a country where free hospital care is available to everyone, where sickness insurance covers all and where a new pension system aims at providing old-age benefits equal to about two-thirds of each worker's salary, the Government apparently believes it has an equal obligation to keep the economy on a sound footing.

In Stockholm, the beautiful capital, where lovely Lake Malaron flows into the Baltic Sea, the Government keeps the economy under almost constant surveillance through both short-term and long-range economic planning and forecasting. Through seemingly endless dissection and discussion, every possibility is examined and little is left to chance. Aiding the process is the high sense of responsibility and cooperation displayed by Government, business, and labor in their dealings with one another.

Through their varied and active policy of economic management, the Swedes have been able to take most of the sting out of economic recessions. Since the war their economy has grown in every year except 1951 when it dropped a scant four-tenths of 1 percent.

The speed and effectiveness with which the Government moves were demonstrated clearly in two recent economic dips. When a recession developed in 1958, a billion Swedish crowns (about $200 million) was released from the business investment reserve fund to finance expansion by private industry. Building restrictions were eased, public expenditures were raised sharply and emergency public works were ordered.

Similar measures were taken last year after a survey in December 1961 predicting a downturn in private industrial activity in 1962. About one-fourth of the investment reserve which totaled nearly half a billion dollars at the start of 1962, was released to finance business expansion last year.

The record shows there was no loss of output in 1958; in fact, the gross national product rose by 1.1 percent. Industrial investment increased in both years, and in the spring of 1959 an additional 60,000 persons were put to work. Few details are available as yet on the result of last year's action, but it is believed that at least two-thirds of an expected cutback in industrial investments was forestalled.

In its willingness to use the Government budget as an instrument for influencing the economy, Sweden is far ahead of the United States. The budget is viewed as a tool for balancing the entire national economy. Whether or not the Government account itself shows a deficit is regarded as relatively unimportant. As long ago as 1937 the Government adopted a policy of trying to balance its budget over a period of years covering the business cycle, with Government surpluses during booms and deficits during slumps.

The Swedes do not rely heavily on changes in the tax structure for offsetting shifts in the economy. They believe other measures, principally their investment reserve system and increases in Government exepnditures are more effective because they are faster.

Despite this reservation, the tax weapon has been used. Krister Wickman, Sweden's capable, 38-year-old Under Secretary of Finance, recalled that a national 4-percent sales tax, since raised to 6 percent, was levied in 1960. It was designed to offset expansionary forces that were felt to be too strong.

Unlike the United States, Great Britain, France, and Germany, Sweden is making no effort to establish an income policy, or Government guideline concerning the size of wage increases that may be granted without creating inflationary pressure.

In part, this decision appears to be politically motivated, reflecting the strong influence of the Swedish Confederation of Trade Union, or LO. In part, too, it stems from the unique cooperation shown by the LO and the Swedish Employers' Confederation or SAF, which carry out wage negotiations on an industrywide basis.

The Government takes the position that LO and SAF will consider the national interest in their wage negotiations if they have faith in the general economic policy that is in effect. The record shows, however, that wages and costs have risen substantially. Since 1953 the cost of living in Sweden has climbed 33 percent. Among major European countries that was second only to France's increase of 44 percent. In the same period the consumer price index in the United States rose only 13 percent. Hourly earnings for workers in Sweden manufacturing industries rose 46 percent between 1954 and 1960.

The labor-management peace that has prevailed in Sweden is extraordinary. The last big, general strike occurred in 1945.

Sweden's cherished, 150-year-old policy of neutrality enabled the nation to emerge from World War II in a highly favorable position. Its economic plant was undamaged while much of the rest of Western Europe lay in rubble. In the immediate postwar period, there was heavy demand for Sweden's principal exports—woodpulp and timber, iron ore, steel and metal products.

Building on this comfortable base, the country has evolved living standards that its people proudly compare with those of the United States. In both wage level and gross national product. Per capita, Sweden stands far ahead of its European neighbors. On both counts, its level is a little better than half that of the United States.

Nonetheless, Sweden's growth has been slow. For the decade of the 1950's the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development estimated the country's annual increase in gross national product, at an average of 3.2 percent. That was just under the American average of 3.3 percent for the same period but far behind the 7.5 percent yearly gain shown by Germany and the 5.9 percent annual increase achieved by Italy.

Swedish officials believe the rate has been curtailed by the slow growth of population and by the fact that nearly the whole labor force has been employed. Unemployment has been at 3 percent or less since 1947.

The Government's long-range economic plan for 1961–65 calls for raising the growth rate to an annual level of 4 percent. However, both the Swedish Finance Ministry and nongovernment experts doubt that the target will be reached, at least this year. They expect an increase of about 3.5 percent in 1963, the same level achieved in 1962.

Bertil Kugelberg, managing director of the Swedish Employers' Confederation, believes rising costs are the main problem facing the country now.

"They are putting a squeeze on profit margins," he remarked.

With an unemployment rate of only 1.9 percent last month, Government officials are concerned about the possibility of overemployment next summer in the building industry, a development that might send costs even higher.

While Swedish life is remarkably free of discord, the Government's increasingly important role as a source of investment capital has run into some criticism. Both Kugelberg and Prof. Bertil Ohlin, leader of Sweden's opposition Liberal Party, were critical of the new supplementary pension scheme, which will expand the Government's influence in this field. Ohlin saw the pension fund as "a major, possible socialistic development that may force business to go to the Government to get credit."

Such an ominous warning may sound strange in a country that has had a socialist goverment for 30 years. But despite its Government, Sweden has remarkably little socialism. There is Government ownership in transportation, power, part of the iron and timber industries and in other areas, but there is no extensive or active program of nationalization. Ninety-one percent of all industry is privately owned.

The pattern of the Swedish economy in this as in other areas is moderate but highly sophisticated.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, Apr. 21, 1963]

LESSONS FOR AMERICA FOUND IN EUROPE'S ECONOMIC TEXTBOOKS—10 MAJOR POSSIBILITIES FOR AMERICAN CONSIDERATION MENTIONED BY OFFICIALS AND EXPERTS QUESTIONED IN 6-WEEK POST-DISPATCH STUDY

(By Thomas W. Ottenad)

WASHINGTON, April 20.—The United States needs to remodel old economic policies and draft a blueprint for the future if it hopes to break out of the rut of slow growth that has retarded it in recent years.

That was the virtually unanimous conclusion of Government officials, businessmen, economists, representatives of major international organizations, and others who were questioned by this reporter on a recent 6-week trip through Western Europe.

Topping all other views was strong and enthusiastic support for President Kennedy's proposal to cut taxes and deliberately put the Federal budget in the red. From Stockholm to Rome and from London to Bonn, Europeans saw the plan as a major and necessary step for boosting the U.S. lagging economic development. There was none of the worried reaction found in the United States, where the proposal has been greeted with anxiety, doubt and skepticism.

The only reservation among Europeans was fear that the administration's program was not strong enough to yield a sustained level of higher growth and to reduce chronic unemployment.

There was a strong feeling that the United States might learn a lesson or two from Europe, that some of the varying economic policies that have contributed to the continental postwar boom might be useful to America. Among major possibilities mentioned were:

1. Long-range economic planning or forecasting to help in understanding and meeting future needs.

2. Higher spending by the Government to pump more life into the economic bloodstream.

3. More flexible use of the Federal budget and less fear of Government deficits. The objective should be to balance the country's economy, not just the Government's financial accounts.

4. An investment reserve system allowing business firms a generous tax credit for putting money aside in prosperous times and investing it in expansion projects in periods of slack.

5. More direct Government aid for depressed areas in place of incentives for private activity, which have not proved completely successful.

6. Standby tax-cutting authority and emergency public works to cope quickly with any downturn in the economy.

7. Establishment of an effective, noninflationary policy for wages and prices.

8. Less fear that fast economic growth will upset the balance-of-payments applecart; stronger domestic development may in the end improve the country's international position.

9. Recognition that the economic facts of life have changed drastically since the simpler days of America's infancy and that today the Government must play a major role in directing the economy.

10. Increasing attention to such basic needs as education, job training, technical skills, and scientific and technological research.

The support won in Europe by Mr. Kennedy's proposal for cutting taxes and accepting a deficit is in startling contrast to the lack of enthusiasm for the program in the United States. Some Europeans suggested that the plan should go even further. In Germany, for example, a banker proposed larger tax cuts for corporations and high income groups in order to stimulate investment. A British economist agreed with some American experts who have urged that the entire $10,200 million tax reduction recommended by Mr. Kennedy be made effective in 1 year instead of 3 as contemplated by the President.

Of five countries studied by the Post-Dispatch, only one, Italy, showed any reluctance about using tax cuts and budget deficits to stimulate its own economy should action be needed to combat slow growth. In every other country—Great Britain, France, Germany, and Sweden—Government officials and private citizens alike said they were confident their Governments would take such steps if necessary.

A number of Europeans who felt that tax reduction and a budget deficit would not be adequate for curing the United State's economic ills, advanced higher Government spending which directly creates jobs and stimulates the economy quickly. This view is more in line with the doctrine of compensatory government spending advocated by the economist John Maynard Keynes.

Most Europeans saw little risk for the United States in an expansionary economic policy. They doubted that dangerous inflation would result or that the American balance-of-payments deficit, which has existed for 12 of the past 13 years, would be aggravated. They felt there is sufficient slack in the American economy in the form of continuing high unemployment and idle plants and machinery to avoid any damaging pressure from excessive demand.

Of all the potential lessons in Europe's economic textbook, the one that would arouse most controversy in the United States is the use of national economic planning. Although it has almost no chance of being adopted here at present, some experts regard the device as highly useful, perhaps even necessary, for the United States.

Planning, said its advocates, is a logical tool for dealing with an economy that is becoming increasingly complex and more difficult to handle. It would focus a clear light on the United States' long-range needs, showing how they relate to, or conflict with, one another. It would show future needs for schools and teachers, hospitals and doctors, and a variety of other public demands, together with the requirements of private business and industry. It would enable the Nation to choose more readily where its resources should be concentrated, to decide what its goals and objectives should be.

While many in the United States regard public economic planning as "socialistic," it is becoming increasingly popular in Europe.

Except for Germany, it is under consideration or in actual use in each of the nations studied by the Post-Dispatch, as well as in several other countries, and has gained wide acceptance. In Great Britain, businessmen took the lead in demanding that the government initiate economic planning.

France is the major exponent of economic programing in Europe. Many experts agreed, however, that its detailed, quasi-compulsory system would be completely unacceptable to the United States and perhaps even unnecessary. Probably more acceptable would be the type of long-range planning done in Sweden. The Swedish studies are limited for the most part to projections of likely economic trends. They do not set specific production targets or contain the variety of incentives and indirect controls that "le plan" does in France. They provide expert comprehensive information that can be used by the government in formulating its plans.

Sweden's novel investment reserve system also might be useful to the United States in evening out the ups and downs of the business cycle, some experts suggested. Under this plan, Swedish firms may deduct up to

40 percent from their taxable income if they place the money in a special, government-supervised reserve. In slack periods the money is released to the concerns for use in expanding their plants or for other investments approved by the government. Both businessmen and labor leaders strongly indorsed the program.

Krister Wickman, Sweden's under secretary of finance, thinks it could be used advantageously in the United States after minor modifications. The Swedish system actually is a variation of the basic philosophy of providing tax credits as an incentive for business investment. A 7-percent tax credit was voted for this purpose by Congress last year. Wickman believes his nation's plan is more effective because it acts faster and can be applied when needed to counteract recessionary movements in the economy.

Conversations with nearly 100 European experts, including representatives of the Common Market and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, produced a vivid impression about what Europe wants from its spectacular postwar boom. For better or worse, what it wants is what the United States already has.

Said an observant and powerful businessman in Brussels: "Europe is trying to build a mass consumption market and a mass production economy. It is seeking a society just like the one the United States has, with high wage levels and high purchasing power for a large section of the population."

A similar view was expressed by a high official of the Common Market. Speaking privately, he remarked, "What Europe is trying to achieve is the United States' standard of living. We want all the things you have—houses, cars, television sets, gadgets, higher wages and a shorter workweek. But we won't reach your level for at least another decade."

There was clear evidence that no single pattern accounts for the European boom. Economic policies varied sharply from country to country. Almost the only common approach was a general willingness to have the government take a major hand in shaping the destiny of the economy through flexible budget policy, deficit spending when needed and other measures.

Progressive business men, politicians, and others repeatedly emphasized the need for Europe to achieve some measure of economic unity. They conceded that, despite booming growth since the end of World War II, the individual economies of Western Europe still are relatively small in a world that is dominated by two massive powers.

The doorway to economic union, and perhaps even eventual political integration, has been opened by the Common Market. But the path ahead of the European Economic Community is a long and difficult one. Much of the movement's momentum was stalled by France's recent refusal to allow Great Britain to join.

Should the Common Market develop as a true economic unit, it is not yet clear whether it will be a force for good or evil in international economic relations. Will it adopt a low external tariff, thus encouraging freer international trade, or will it put up protective barriers to keep the United States and others out?

At its headquarters in Brussels, officials of the Common Market like Commission President Walter Hallstein expressed confidence that the European Economic Community will fulfill its great promise and become an outward-looking force for improved world trade. However, the evidence so far is mixed. Its early actions on agricultural policies indicated a trend toward increased protection for its six members from the rest of the world. Its policy on industrial products remains somewhat obscure.

A key test of the EEC's intentions will come in its attitude toward tariff-cutting negotiations under the Trade Expansion Act voted by Congress last year. A potential hazard lies in the fact that the negotiations, scheduled to commence a year from now, will be conducted under a clause that until 1966 allows individual members of the EEC to veto any reductions in its external tariffs.

In every country visited, there was high hope that the approaching, so-called "Kennedy round" of tariff negotiations will prove successful. Should they fail, the setback would be enormous.

While President Kennedy and others have been critical about America's slow economic pace, many Europeans are inclined to be more tolerant. Although the U.S. rate of growth has been only about half as fast as that of leading European nations for more than 10 years, the picture is not so gloomy as the figures indicate.

European experts pointed out that growth rate is a result of many factors, including the level of economic development and the stage of technological advancement. An advanced society like the United States devotes much of its resources to services like education, medical care, and other similar activities. These do not show up heavily in the economic scales nor produce the impressive growth that comes from expansion of basic industries.

As a result of such factors, a number of economists suggested, it may be impossible, perhaps even undesirable for the United States to try to match the growth of Germany, France, or Italy.

Furthermore, growth for growth's sake is not a worthy objective, they suggested. The purpose of growth should be to improve the Nation's economic health and especially to end the plaguing distress of continued high unemployment. There was agreement that the United States can do both if it is willing to use fundamental fiscal measures that will stimulate demand.

The question is: Does the United States want to master its economy or let its economy master the Nation?

FEDERAL AID FOR OUR SCHOOLS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the former Commissioner of Education, Dr. Sterling McMurrin, speaks out on "Why We Need More Federal Aid for Our Schools" in the pages of the March 23, 1963 Saturday Evening Post.

He speaks out with great knowledge in setting forth the present degree of involvement of the Federal Government in education, and with unassailable logic for increased support and better coordinated action on the part of the Government in this vital area.

As he so well reminds us, the question of whether or not we should have Federal aid for education was answered in the affirmative long ago. The question now is rather one of what kind, in what amounts, and within what framework can Federal aid to education be administered.

A major problem of Federal financial aid at present is that it has produced an educational imbalance due to the success of support for specific areas such as science and mathematics. The solution is not to attempt to starve these areas into a resumption of ignorance but rather to address ourselves and our resources to the other areas of known critical need.

I digress to commend the Saturday Evening Post for the fine articles that publication is carrying relating to subjects of public interest. There is a page in the Post which is labeled "Speaking Out." The editor of the Saturday Evening Post has seen fit to permit articles which are controversial and yet of great public interest to be featured on the pages of that fine magazine. I believe this demonstrates again a high quality of journalism, and true educational journalism in its finest sense.

I commend the reading of this particular article by Dr. McMurrin to every Member of the Senate and every Member of the Congress who is interested in education, because the former U.S. school chief says quite frankly that Federal money can help to solve our education problems. He is a great educator. He had an excellent record in the Government of the United States. He spent 20 months as the Commissioner of Education in the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. He resigned, as Senators know, in 1962 to teach philosophy at the University of Utah, where he had served as president before his term of Federal office. Dr. McMurrin made a great sacrifice for his country in coming to Washington, and I believe we are indebted to him in a great way for his fine public service.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. McMurrin's article may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY WE NEED MORE FEDERAL AID FOR OUR SCHOOLS

(By Dr. Sterling McMurrin)

I insist that the specter of a Federal bureaucracy eager and ready to pounce on the schools and colleges is a politically inspired horror story that does not deserve the credence of intelligent citizens.

I do not believe giving the Federal funds to public schools will lead to Federal control of public education, for the simple reason that no one wants it. The educators don't want it, the taxpayers don't want it, and quite certainly the people in government don't want it. Yet Washington has, as I believe it should have, a heavy financial involvement in all levels of education in this country. The Federal Government's part in education now costs about $3 billion a year, and this figure is certain to rise, whether or not President Kennedy gets what he has asked for in his vast new $1.2 billion education bill.

The problem of Federal control should be debated—and so, of course, should the weaknesses in our present system of local, private, and State control. The problem must be taken seriously—and as Federal investment in education rises, it will become more difficult. The Federal Government has spent many billions of dollars on education since the Morrill Act provided for the land-grant colleges in 1862, but no one can argue that we now have Federal control. The trouble is that most of what is said on the subject is merely an outpouring of political emotion, or else part of the grand debate on our economy.

I believe that we must preserve our present general pattern of educational organization. The States should continue to control the public schools. Colleges and universities, public and private, should continue to have their present large measure of independence. But it is ludicrous to argue this, as some do, on the ground that the Federal Government is bad or incompetent. I suspect that the Federal education officials with whom I have worked have been, on the whole, more competent than most of their

State and local counterparts, and their integrity is most admirable. It is just not true, as some critics find it useful to pretend, that they are questionable characters bent on destroying our institutions. My experience as U.S. Commissioner of Education showed me quite clearly that the people who administer the Government's educational affairs in such agencies as the Office of Education and the National Science Foundation are thoroughly opposed to Federal control.

IS WASHINGTON INEFFICIENT

Nor does another argument against Federal participation in education hold water—the belief, fostered by a steady barrage of clichés, that Federal educational programs are less efficient and more costly than similar programs run by the States. If money were the only consideration, it would be hard to argue against Federal management of every school and college in the country. However, the clinching argument against a federally run educational system has nothing to do with money nor with any easy presumption of villainy in Washington and virtue in the provinces.

We are told often enough that a nation's success depends on the quality of its education. What is perhaps more important is the extent to which the character of a nation is bound up with the kind (not merely the quality) of education it has. Our national character has always been one of enormous diversity, of people, languages, sects, and prejudices swirling about in disharmonious union. The great and frequently exasperating variety of American ways of life (there is, of course, no single "American way of life") is squarely opposed to the block structure of totalitarianism. Our educational system reflects and nourishes this variety—and to change from the variety of State and local control to a central, monolithic structure would be to destroy the individual's best guarantee against the overwhelming power of the State.

Such would be the danger if education in the United States were controlled by even the most enlightened Federal officials. But recognizing this does not mean that we should continue our sometimes absurd educational provincialisms. The plain fact is that education is now a national as well as a State and local concern.

The problem is not—and has not been for decades—whether we should have Federal aid to education. We have it, and need more of it. The problem is what kind of aid to have. Actually few people, even those who are supposed to be enemies of Federal aid, oppose programs already in existence. Continuing aid to land-grant colleges, for instance, is one of the most popular programs in the Congress, and vocational-education programs have been established so long in some parts of the country that the most thoroughgoing conservatives would be shocked at the thought of discontinuing them—at least in their districts. Such programs are accepted as part of the normal pattern of school financing, and the Federal origin of the money is usually forgotten.

It is, of course, the new aid proposals that bring cries of outrage. So far, opposition has been overwhelming to any plan for general aid—all-purpose funds to be used at the discretion of college or school-district officials. The Congress has never passed a general aid bill, and it is conceivable that it never will. Yet a strong case can be made for general aid. It is surely in the national interest, for instance, to raise the level of education in the poorer States. The principle of equal primary and secondary education within each State is well established, so why not make the level of education equal throughout the Nation? But the ability of individual States to pay for education is almost impossible to measure accurately, and it is almost as hard to find agreement on what the national needs in education are. In any case, the parochial school question complicates the discussion.

Many aid programs to meet specific needs have been established by the Congress. Specific aid programs now in force, in addition to the land-grant-college and vocational-aid appropriations mentioned earlier, include funds to provide loans for college and university dormitories, and to train and equip teachers of sciences and foreign languages. Much of the money is available in the form of matching funds, and local participation is, of course, voluntary. The President's new bill, a compound of such specific programs, calls for, among other things, continuing "pin-point" aid to public schools in federally impacted areas; a 3-year, $1-billion plan for construction loans to public and private colleges; a new program of grants to public and private institutions for graduate schools, library facilities and technical education; aid to public junior colleges, and an expanded teacher-training plan.

I think the argument for specific aid of the kind the President has proposed is entirely persuasive. There is just too much to be done to improve American education that cannot, or will not, be done by the States or the local school districts. Some problems, such as upgrading high-school teaching in the basic subjects, require a massive attack of both talent and money, beyond the means of all but the wealthiest States. In other areas, although the money required is not great, the solution of a problem may require a concerted national effort rather than sporadic local activity. An instance is the present Federal investment of $3 million over a 2-year period to attract and train better teachers for the deaf. (I have heard it argued by critics who see "Federal control" in any specific aid program that if the same $3 million were added to a general-aid appropriation, the teaching of the deaf would be taken care of. I regard this as patent nonsense.) Finally, there are some areas, such as the teaching of important but uncommon foreign languages, for which there may be no local interest, although there is a national need.

Large Federal investments can, of course, unbalance our educational system. Currently the unbalance favors science and engineering. Huge Federal appropriations for defense research not only have built up the Nation's military strength but also have produced an explosion in knowledge, talent, and creativity that has endless implications for the future. We cannot turn away from such achievements; the imbalance must not be corrected by having less science, but by a larger investment in the humanities and the arts. I seriously doubt that this can be done without Federal action.

Naturally, to say that a particular aid program is justified does not mean that it should continue indefinitely. Nor should use of Federal money be permitted to rob States, local districts or private groups of their responsibilities in education. It is quite true that Federal money can tempt a State or local board to make unwise decisions, say in the spending of matching funds. But this is no argument against Federal aid; we are entitled to expect wisdom and integrity in our educational leaders, and virtue often depends on the capacity to say no.

WHO MAKES THE DECISIONS?

The seeming detachment of government officials from the schools themselves is a drawback of Federal aid in the minds of some critics. Obviously men who approve or deny applications for Federal funds can influence a university or a school district. But their decisions are commonly made on the advice of experts from outside the Government, and money is spent according to regulations drawn up with the aid and approval of persons broadly representative of the schools and colleges. There is a constant flow into and out of Washington of university presidents, scientists, scholars, State and local school superintendents, and experts in every branch of educational finance.

A rich crop of confusion is reaped whenever Federal aid is mentioned merely because of the sprawling, uncoordinated nature of the Government's involvement in education. A man with time on his hands can identify over 250 separate U.S. Government educational operations carried on by 12 departments and 26 independent agencies. It is impossible to administer these programs from one department—many involve technical research geared to defense, atomic energy, space exploration and the like. But better coordination is necessary.

The only way to achieve the necessary order, it seems to me, is to give full Cabinet status to education. At present the Office of Education is merely one of a conglomerate of agencies in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Considering the growing importance of education to our society, this makes no sense. Only a full-fledged Department for Education—perhaps a Department of Education, Science, and the Arts—will enable the American people to deal with the large problems of education at the national level.

SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS CORPORATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there are a few matters which I wish to put in the RECORD, but I shall be brief.

On April 27, 1963, the Washington Post and Times Herald published an editorial entitled "Picayunish." In the editorial it was stated:

> It is picayunish to say that Congress cannot require the Senate to scrutinize appointments to a body of such great national importance.

I ask unanimous consent to have the full editorial printed at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 27, 1963]

PICAYUNISH

The Senate wisely recognized the fight against confirmation of the 14 founding officers of the Communications Satellite Corp. for what it actually was—an effort to obstruct the Telstar system. The Senators who raised the constitutional issue against the confirmations had filibustered against the Communications Satellite bill to prevent its enactment last year. As indicated by the 75–15 vote against their constitutional argument on Thursday, they represent only a small minority of the Senate.

It is true, of course, that the Constitution requires senatorial confirmation of only ambassadors, judges, and other high officials of the United States. Since the new Communications Satellite Corp. is a semiprivate agency, there could be no constitutional requirement for confirmation of its officials, but Congress required their confirmation under its general legislative powers. It is picayunish to say that Congress cannot require the Senate to scrutinize appointments to a body of such great national importance. One would expect the advocates of public ownership of the satellite communications system to be the first to recognize the desirability of a senatorial check on the men who will set up the semiprivate agency.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this is the contribution by the Washington Post to the analysis of a debate which occurred in the Senate for quite some time as to the application of article II, section 2, of the Constitution. At no time did I find in the Washington Post an accurate story about the debate. At no time did the Washington Post report the debate over the meaning of article II, section 2, of the Constitution.

Let us see how picayunish it was for those of us who sought to defend the Constitution—and article II, section 2 thereof—to suggest the elementary principle of constitutional law that the Congress of the United States by legislative act cannot amend the Constitution. That is basic to the debate, for it is admitted by all sides that the nominations the Senate went through the empty gesture of confirming the other day were not nominations of people to be public officers.

But, says the Washington Post, it is picayunish to insist that we keep faith with our oaths taken when we came into the Senate, to uphold the Constitution of the United States.

The Washington Post editorial of April 27 admits that the incorporators of the Satellite Corp. do not qualify for confirmation under article II, section 2, because they are not officers of the United States.

This is an interpretation of the powers of Congress that does not deserve to be followed in the case of these incorporators or any other case. These incorporators have no designated public responsibilities; they make no report to public officials; they carry out no prescribed public function on behalf of the Government; they cannot be guided, supervised, or dismissed by the President or the Senate. They are responsible only to the corporation, which is established for private profit.

Under the Constitution of the United States, no power is vested in the Senate of the United States to confirm such nominees. The Senate can go through the gesture of confirming, but that does not make it a constitutional act of the Senate, because the Senate is without power, under the confirmation language of the Constitution, to confirm persons who are not public officials. The question is that elementary and that simple, although I do not see how we can criticize editors for ignoring the rule that 75 Senators ignore.

In justification, we are told that the advise and consent procedure was devised in last year's statute, not as an exercise of article II, section 2, but under the powers of Congress under article I, section 8, to regulate commerce. We are told further, that under those powers the President and the Senate can be told to do something they are not permitted to do under article II, section 2.

In other words, we are told that the Senate can ignore article II, section 2 and proceed to confirm the nominations of nonpublic officers under some other section of the Constitution. Yet neither the Senate nor the Post has ever succeeded, nor will it ever succeed, in pointing out the language of the Constitution which gives the Senate confirming powers, other than article II, section 2 of the Constitution.

The Post will find itself in an uncomfortable position when it is advocated that in carrying out its mandate under article I, section 8, to "exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever" for the District of Columbia, Congress reinstitute investigative arrests, overturn the Mallory rule, and disregard any other requirement of the fifth amendment that a majority in Congress may find inconvenient.

Yet that is the construction put upon the powers of Congress in connection with these nominations. Fortunately, the Supreme Court has not gone along with it.

Most recently, in Kennedy against Mendoza-Martinez, the Supreme Court found that in exercising its power under article I, section 8 to "establish a uniform rule of naturalization," it had infringed the due process of law guarantee of the fifth amendment. The same Attorney General who claims these nominations are constitutional also tried to prosecute and defend the faulty section of the Immigration Act. But to no avail. The Supreme Court told Congress that, of the Immigration and Naturalization of 1952:

> We conclude, for the reasons stated that section 401(j) and section 439(a)(10) are punitive and as such cannot constitutionally stand, lacking as they do the procedural safeguards which the Constitution commands.

I say, most respectfully, that if it is ever possible for us to get the unconstitutional act of the Senate, taken the other day, before the Supreme Court of the United States, the Senate and the Washington Post will get an interesting lesson in constitutional law applied by the Court. I am satisfied that the Court will, in effect, say section 2, article II, means exactly what it says. The power of the Senate to confirm is limited to that article, and the Senate does not have the power to amend the Constitution by implication, reading into it a power from another section of the Constitution which does not contain a syllable about confirmation.

The notion that Congress need heed only these sections of the Constitution which confer power upon it, and may ignore the rest, is so contrary to our constitutional history that it would be laughed at were it not being invoked on behalf of the profit of some of the Nation's greatest industrial giants. The Constitution also commands that the President "shall nominate, and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint officers of the United States."

That provision is not subject to qualification by act of Congress any more than is the fifth amendment.

The Attorney General of the United States, and the Washington Post, and, in my judgment, the Senate, are going to rue the day when the Senate set the shocking example and precedent it set the other day when it sought to confirm the nominations of private incorporators of a private corporation who, all admit, were not public officials.

ARREST PROCEDURES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, critical as I am of the Washington Post for the very silly editorial to which I have referred—I say silly, because its writer shows such gross ignorance of the issue that was involved—I also commend another editorial in the Washington Post, I assume it was written by another editorial writer, because it is hard to imagine that an editorial writer could be such a Jekyll and Hyde as to write a silly editorial on one occasion and such a sound editorial on another. I commend the Washington Post for its editorial on arrest procedures, written on yesterday, April 29. In it, the Post suggested, as had the senior Senator from Oregon some days before on the floor of the Senate, that the Congress of the United States wait until the American Law Institute had completed its study of the rule in the Mallory case and related problems raised by that case before giving further consideration to the various proposals for amending that rule.

On April 22, I pointed out that the Ford Foundation had made a grant of $215,000 to the American Law Institute, as the Washington Post stated in the editorial referring to this matter, but I take it for granted that it was unaware that some days before the senior Senator from Oregon had discussed the same matter on the floor of the Senate. They apparently had not been advised by their Senate correspondents, but that is no new experience of the Senator from Oregon with Washington Post correspondents. In fact, I consider myself lucky when they do not write about me, because at least inaccuracies will not be written about me in the Washington Post. But on April 22 I did speak on the floor of the Senate about the subject matter which was subsequently covered by the Washington Post in its editorial on arrest procedures.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the very good editorial on arrest procedures, in which the writer continues to support the position taken by the Washington Post, in opposition to the various proposals to scuttle by legislation the rule in the Mallory case.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 29, 1963]

ARREST PROCEDURES

An opportunity is at hand for a sober, detached, nonpolitical look at the controversial Mallory rule. The Ford Foundation has made a grant of $215,000 to the American Law Institute to enable that body of distinguished lawyers to draft a model code on prearraignment procedures—on the treatment, this is to say, of arrested persons between the time they are taken into custody by a police officer and the time they are taken before a judicial officer and charged with a specific violation of law. Congress would be well advised to await the completion of this study before undertaking any legislative revision of the Mallory rule.

The arrest problem is beclouded by a great deal of emotion, guesswork and sheer misinformation. It is said, for instance, that the Mallory rule has greatly handicapped law enforcement in this city. But there is simply no evidence to support this assertion. The rule, which does no more than forbid the Government to use confessions obtained by unlawful police conduct, cannot rationally be said to have any effect whatever on the incidence of crime. Neither does it keep the police from questioning suspects as extensively as they please prior to arrest. The rule affects prosecution only. And in this connection a former U.S. Attorney, Oliver Gasch, has said, "In fact, Mallory questions, that is to say, confessions or admissions, are of controlling importance in probably less than 5 percent of our criminal prosecutions."

The job of the police would be easier, it must be acknowledged, if they could interrogate arrested persons for prolonged periods in police stations. Such interrogation undoubtedly would produce confessions from frightened persons ignorant of their right to remain silent and unable to employ a lawyer. Against this convenience to the police, however, must be weighed competing social considerations—whether society wants to compromise its ideal of equal justice by letting policemen take advantage of the poor and the ignorant; and whether it wants to permit police interrogation under circumstances which have historically resulted in abhorrent third-degree practices.

Every free society handicaps its police in some degree. To renounce the use of confessions obtained by prolonged detention in police stations is, in principle, much the same as renouncing the use of physical evidence obtained by unwarranted searches. If it impairs public safety to an extent, it protects privacy and individual freedom. The American Law Institute is an admirable body to weigh and bring into rational balance these competing values.

Mr. MORSE. Along with that, Mr. President, for the enlightenment of the writer of the editorial, I ask unanimous consent that there be incorporated in the RECORD some remarks the senior Senator from Oregon made on the same subject matter on the floor of the Senate on April 22, in the course of which I said, speaking on the subject:

> Which will be available for the study. I certainly think it would be shortsighted for the Congress to proceed to act until this scholarly report—of the American Law Institute—and study is completed.

The editorial writer, apparently quite independently of the position the senior Senator from Oregon had taken, reached the same conclusion. I am pleased about that, and I ask that the comments of the senior Senator from Oregon on April 22, as they appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, be incorporated at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MALLORY RULE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in today's issue of the Washington Post there appears an excellent editorial entitled "Protecting Defendants."

The editorial deals with the position of the Washington Post in regard to the Mallory rule. The position stated happens to be my position. It is also the position that was taken by a majority of the members of the District Bar Association at a meeting here in Washington, D.C. last week. The editorial comments briefly upon the so-called Acheson proposal—the proposal of the U.S. district attorney—in this area. It criticizes the Acheson bill. I think every word of the criticism is sound. The Acheson bill is a most unacceptable compromise. When one concludes a reading of the Acheson bill, he discovers he has nothing but a meaningless hodgepodge left.

I believe that the position of the Washington Post is so sound in its criticism that I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"PROTECTING DEFENDANTS

"The explosion at the District Bar Association meeting last week was a thoroughly healthy one. It reflected a rank-and-file rebellion against an attempt by the Board of Directors to put through a resolution which would have placed the association on record behind proposed legislation designed to diminish the protection of defendants in District courts.

"An overwhelming majority of the 900-odd lawyers who attended the meeting voted against three bills proposed by a special committee (set up in disregard of the regular criminal law committee) aimed at revising the Mallory rule and permitting easy interrogation of suspects by policemen. The outcome was immensely becoming to independent lawyers in a free country—where one of the functions of a lawyer is to protect individuals against arbitrary or overbearing governmental conduct. Lawyers are, in a special sense, the champions of legal and constitutional rights. The District Bar Association ably vindicated that special responsibility.

"The Senate and House District Committees are both now considering a sheaf of proposals to deal with the admissibility of criminal confessions in court here. In one way or another these seek revision of the *Mallory* rule laid down by a unanimous Supreme Court in 1957, although no real showing has ever been made that the *Mallory* rule interferes unduly with effective law enforcement.

"Conspicuously absent from this sheaf of proposals is any recommendation from the Department of Justice, which has had the subject under consideration for many months. Instead, there is a bill proposed by U.S. Attorney David Acheson after consultation with Department officials but without their expressed concurrence or any official administration endorsement.

"The Acheson bill seems to us longer but not much better than the proposal rejected last week by the bar association. It hems and haws, advances and retreats, gives with one hand and takes away with the other. It makes a gesture at protecting constitutional rights by providing that arrested persons be plainly advised of their right to remain silent by police officers—but not by a judicial officer—and by providing that arrested persons be afforded reasonable opportunity to notify a relative or friend and consult with counsel—but it does not assure provision of counsel for the indigent and the ignorant.

"This proposal by the U.S. attorney is undoubtedly a conscientious effort to reconcile the exigencies of criminal prosecution with the imperatives of constitutional liberty. We think it ends in whittling away dangerously at vital procedural safeguards. It is a sound principle of law that arrested persons should be taken before a judicial officer without unnecessary delay, that they should be advised of their rights by a judicial officer and that they should be subject to detention only upon the authorization of a judicial officer. The only effective way we can think of to make the police observe this principle of law is to forbid the use of any evidence, including confessions, obtained in violation of it."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that an article which appeared in the Washington Post this morning, announcing that the American Law Institute will undertake a study of the whole question of investigation arrest and the assurance that there shall be adequate notice and hearing on arraignment prior to long police examination. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"LAW GROUP TO PROBE ARREST ISSUE

"The American Law Institute plans a deep probe into a legal issue that is generating attention and controversy in Washington—the period between the arrest of a suspect and his appearance before a magistrate.

"The Ford Foundation announced yesterday in New York City that it has made a grant of $215,000 to the institute, to draft a model statute that it hopes will be a guide for State legislation and for Federal, State, and local officials.

"The model code on prearraignment procedures will be drafted by a small research staff and reviewed by a committee of judges, lawyers, law teachers, police officers, and sociologists. No time limit was set for the production of the code, but Washington lawyers said some of the studies carried out by the institute have lasted 3 or more years.

"The rights of crime suspects stirred controversy here with the banning of investigative arrests effective March 15, a move defended by civil liberties advocates and attacked by those who feel the court's liberal rulings will let criminals go free.

"Legislation is also before Congress to modify the Mallory rule, which requires that an arrested person be arraigned promptly and that he be instructed of his rights if a confession obtained from him after his arrest is to be used to convict him. Police officers have protested that overly strict enforcement of the rule hampers interrogation of suspects.

"Although the District of Columbia operates under Federal procedural rules, systems vary widely in the 50 States and many authorities complain that the functions of police and prosecutor remain unregulated during the prearraignment period.

"Officials here say the newly announced probe will be discussed when the institute holds one of its regular meetings at the Mayflower Hotel, May 21–25.

"Another grant of $500,000 was made by the Ford Foundation to the Walter E. Meyer Research Institute of Law to probe criminal justice, particularly the handling of petty offenses. The Meyer Institute's program also will include research on family disorganization and juvenile crime as dealt with by the courts; reparation for victims of auto accidents; protection of consumers against deceptive products and practices; the integrity and efficiency of police, courts, and other agencies in large cities; and problems of local government and community services.

"Among the other grants announced by the Ford Foundation was one of $175,000 to Morgan State College in Baltimore. The grant is to expand that predominantly Negro college's program of education in public affairs. It will include internships in political offices, field research, and related activities."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Oregon may proceed for an additional 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say to those in the Congress who are so anxious to have quick action reversing the U.S. Supreme Court landmark decision in the Mallory case that we should wait until the American Law Institute completes its study of the subject.

A group of scholars, judges, and law enforcement officers will prepare the study. We will then in my judgment for the first time have a sound, factual, and scholarly basis on which to act on the Mallory rule.

I strongly recommend a postponement of any further consideration of the matter in the Senate until the American Law Institute prepares its report.

The article, entitled "Law Group To Probe Arrest Issue," states:

"The American Law Institute plans a deep probe into a legal issue that is generating attention and controversy in Washington—the period between the arrest of a suspect and his appearance before a magistrate.

"The Ford Foundation announced yesterday in New York City that it has made a grant of $125,000 to the institute—"

Which will be available for the study. I certainly think it would be shortsighted for the Congress to proceed to act until this scholarly report and study is completed.

DATES FOR FURTHER HEARINGS ON S. 580, THE ADMINISTRATION'S EDUCATION BILL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have been asked by my colleagues on the Education Subcommittee, of which I have the honor to serve as chairman, of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to announce to the Senate the plan of the committee for further hearings on S. 580, which is the administration's education bill.

The Education Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is currently holding its hearings on S. 580, the administration's comprehensive education bill, and measures relating to it. For the information of Senators and others who wish to present testimony in this area, I announce that the subcommittee will take testimony concerning title I of the bill relating to student loans, work-study, graduate fellowships, and student loan insurance proposals, on Tuesday, May 14.

On May 15 and 16, it is planned that testimony will be taken on title II of the bill, which concerns the higher education section of S. 580.

In order that members of the subcommittee may devote themselves to other committee business which has been scheduled for the week of May 19, it is the plan of the Education Subcommittee to recess at the conclusion of hearings on May 16 until Monday, May 27, at which time such witnesses as wish to testify on title II of S. 580 who could not be heard will be scheduled, and immediately following their testimony, testimony would be taken on title III of the bill. Title III relates to measures designed to improve educational quality including teacher institutes, teacher preparation programs, teachers and related personnel requiring specialized training, and amendments to the Cooperative Research Act and title VII of the National Defense Education Act.

On May 28, it is our intention to open our inquiries into title IV of S. 580, which relates to selective and urgent improvement of public elementary and secondary education, the extension of title III of the National Defense Education Act, and amendments to title V of the National Defense Education Act concerning guidance, counseling, and testing. On May 29, it is anticipated that witnesses can be heard on the extension and amendments to Public Laws 815 and 874.

At a later date I shall announce the times at which the subcommittee can hear witnesses on title V of S. 580, relating to vocational and special education, and title VI, expansion of continuing education. All individuals and organizations who have not previously communicated with the subcommittee requesting invitations to appear on the titles I have just announced are cordially invited to do so at their earliest convenience in order that arrangements may be expeditiously concluded.

It is my hope, and I shall strive to make it a reality, that hearings on this very extensive bill can be completed not later than June 15.

I should like to bring whatever action the committee is going to take to the floor of the Senate as early in July as possible.

This is an entirely different problem facing the Senate committee this year than it faced in the past 2 years, because there are in the six titles in the President's omnibus education bill subject matters which heretofore have been independent, separate bills. In years gone by, the procedure ordinarily would be to take one subject matter and complete hearings on it and take action on it in committee and then send it to the calendar of the Senate. Then, concomitant with its consideration in committee and in the Senate, the committee would be holding hearings on other bills on education.

However, the procedure which was recommended by the administration this year was that a package bill be presented to the Senate. I shall do my very best to do it that way.

However, I wish to say to those who want to know when there will be some action in the Senate on the administration's proposal on education that I do not see a chance of getting anything on the calendar, so far as the omnibus bill is concerned, prior to the first part of July. We are working at it as hard as we can, and speeding it up as rapidly as we can.

I ought to announce today that it may probably become necessary, procedurally, to require a considerable number of witnesses to submit written statements for the record. I shall do my best to accommodate as many as we can, and allow them to appear personally and at least summarize orally their point of view on various parts of the bill, and to subject themselves to any questions that members of the committee may ask.

However, let us make it very clear that providing a public hearing does not require that a Senate committee must hear everyone who wants to testify in person. That question has been ruled on over and over again as a matter of law. No one wants to give a personal hearing to witnesses more than does the senior Senator from Oregon. However, sometimes it is physically impossible to hear all the witnesses who wish to be heard.

I shall do my best to accommodate as many witnesses as possible, but it should be announced now, so that there will be due notice, that in all probability it will become necessary to require some witnesses to file written statements. That will undoubtedly occur when we get into the so-called cumulative stage of the hearings. In a matter as widespread as this there comes a time when witness after witness starts giving us a repetition of argument that has already been put into the record over and over again.

The subcommittee thought I ought to make the special announcement on this subject tonight, so that it may be available in the RECORD tomorrow, that tomorrow, at 10 a.m., in the committee room in the New Senate Office Building we will have a panel of witnesses, who will testify as a panel.

This is a hearing procedure that we inaugurated before my subcommittee last year. I recommend it most highly. It is very helpful to a committee. It functions somewhat in the nature of a seminar. We call in a distinguished panel of witnesses, and very often consider their testimony as we would consider a discussion at a seminar. The witnesses tomorrow will be:

Dr. Walter W. Heller, Chairman, Council of Economic Advisers.

Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission.

Dr. Edward L. Katzenbach, Jr., Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense—Education.

Dr. Alan T. Waterman, Director, National Science Foundation.

Mr. James E. Webb, Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, Director, Office of Science and Technology.

This is a panel of witnesses the competence of which needs no comment from the senior Senator from Oregon. It is a panel of great public servants. As chairman of the subcommittee, and in behalf of it, I wish to thank these men for their willingness to appear tomorrow to inform us, as they can, about various aspects of S. 580 on which they have special competence to testify.

AUTOMATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my last item this evening refers to an announcement that I said at the hearing this morning I would make on the floor of the Senate before the close of the day. The best way in which I can do it is to read a release which I have issued today in respect to this subject:

Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat of Oregon, today released the text of a letter sent by him as chairman of the Education Subcommittee on the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to the Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare; Labor, Commerce, and Agriculture, expressing his concern over the problems which automation is creating for our labor forces today. The text of the letter is as follows:

"DEAR MR. SECRETARY: At the opening of session on April 29, 1963, of the hearings before my Education Subcommittee on S. 580, the administration's comprehensive education bill, I announced that I was writing to you and to your Cabinet colleagues, Secretaries Celebrezze, Freeman, Hodges, and Wirtz, voicing my concern over the problems which the phenomenon of automation is week-by-week creating in these United States.

"The rapidity with which automated change is affecting adversely both our blue and our white collar labor forces poses serious problems which should be met.

"These problems are of particular concern to those of us currently engaged in reviewing the President's recommendations concerning the quality and the kind of training to be given our school-age population. However, in my judgment, they are problems the nature of which transcends this one area. They are problems, the magnitude of which should make them of paramount concern to your Department and those other Federal departments of Cabinet level I have specified.

"I am, therefore, suggesting to you and to each of your colleagues that you consider carefully, and I hope favorably, recommending to the President of the United States that he establish a broad gage Council on Automation composed of such members both within and without the Government as he may deem desirable, which shall be charged with the responsibility of reporting to him such steps as should be taken by the Government of the United States to identify and describe what has taken place in the field of automation, what is currently occurring in this area, and what is likely to occur within the next decade, together with specific proposals designed to meet and ameliorate these adverse effects upon the men and women who make up our working force.

"Since this problem cuts across departmental lines, it seems to me only appropriate that your recommendations, based upon the advice of your technicians and staff specialists, should be a joint Cabinet recommendation to the President.

"Sincerely yours,"

I said further in the course of the hearings on the administration's education bill, S. 580, that this is a problem "which we should have met yesterday, not today or tomorrow." I stressed the fact that the problem of automation is not only affecting our working force now, but will affect future citizens, and is therefore closely connected with the problems which confront us today.

It is always really impossible to be accurate when we speak of "some problems" or "the most important problems" facing some group or facing the Nation. I shall not run that risk of inaccuracy. But let me stress that the problem of automation is of such critical proportions that the American people simply cannot run the risk of ignoring it or of trying to sweep it under the rug.

As has been brought out in our hearings—in fact, the President's message some time ago contained this statistic—the point has already been reached in automation where it is necessary to supply 25,000 new jobs a week, just taking into account the ameliorating and alleviating of the present loss of jobs caused by automation. That number will increase to a tremendous figure if we do not do something about it immediately.

I have selected the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Labor, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as the four Departments whose Secretaries, in my judgment, have a particular responsibility and duty to go forward with joint consideration in recommending national action to help solve the problem of automation.

One does not have to give way to his imagination to see very clearly what will happen if the problem of automation is not solved immediately. Failure to solve the problem will not alone result in unemployment; it will result in spreading areas of poverty within individual communities throughout the country. The economy of the country will soon look as though it were infected with economic smallpox if a vaccine is not developed quickly to remedy the serious danger of this economic epidemic. The people of the country are entitled to immediate action by this administration in regard to the problem of automation.

It does not require any imagination to point out that if this economic epidemic proceeds to make our body politic a sick one, serious social, political, and economic problems will arise. We shall have to build new prisons, and build them much larger. We shall have to do much with respect to the whole subject of welfare spending.

Mr. President, sit with me in the meetings of the committee and read the account which the Secretary of Labor, for example, presented today and the account which the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare presented yesterday as to what is happening in the country with regard to our school dropouts. The senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], with the high approval of the Secretary of Labor, referred to them as "leftouts." They are being left out of the economy of the country.

Or take the vital statistic presented by the Secretary of Labor this morning of 700,000 married men 25 years of age and under, who now are so lacking in training, educational and vocational, that they cannot make a subsistence living. Take into account their families, including the many thousands of children who will have to live in such home environment, and one will understand the importance of my recommendation to the four Cabinet officers that they confer with one another and lay plans for recommending to the President that a National Council on Automation be formed forthwith and that that Council proceed to come to grips with this very serious problem.

That will require money. So far as I am concerned, the recommendations that that Council may make for appropriations to be of assistance in attacking this problem will have my support. I know it will be a huge sum. But if anyone can tell me of any defense dollars which we are spending that are more vital to the survival and security of the Nation, I should like to hear what those funds are. If our economy goes down—and automation can take it down if we do not put automation to use for the strengthening of our economy—we will have lost the greatest defense weapon we have.

So I plead; I beg, if it is desired that I beg; I strongly urge that the Cabinet officers give favorable consideration to the recommendations of the senior Senator from Oregon. The Cabinet officers will speak for themselves. Some of them are expected to be here to speak on this subject, because it was contemplated that I should make this announcement earlier this afternoon.

Many members of my subcommittee feel just as deeply as I do about the importance of the recommendation which I am making. The distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] commented on it this morning. Other members of the committee have done so. I am publicly announcing the proposal tonight. But this will not be the last comment I shall make on it, because I intend to pursue the problem with frequency. The people are entitled, in my judgment, to have the Government respond with action to this critical situation which has arisen within the social, economic, and political structure of our country as a result of the problems created by automation.

LAW OBSERVANCE AND INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS—ADDRESS BY HON. DAVID L. BAZELON, CHIEF JUDGE, U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Chief Judge David L. Bazelon, of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, spoke today at the National Press Club on the subject, "Law Observance and Individual Rights."

Judge Bazelon made some observations that I find particularly useful and relevant to the argument about crime conditions in the District of Columbia and the reasons for them.

The speech by this distinguished jurist comes as no surprise to me, because I recognize Chief Judge Bazelon as one of the brilliant minds of the Federal bench.

I recommend this address to Senators, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAW OBSERVANCE AND INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS

(Address by David L. Bazelon, Chief Judge, U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit)

For three-quarters of a century the 1st day of May has been an occasion on which people in America have marked their aspirations for a better social order. The May Day demonstrations of the 1880's by American trade unions seeking the 8-hour day are, so far as I am aware, the beginning of this tradition in our country; long, be it noted, before the emergence of Communist regimes which have made May Day an occasion for parading symbols of might rather than of right. Today we find the observance of May 1st extended from the labor movement to the Nation at large and from the limited and long-achieved goal of an 8-hour day to the broader goal upon which depends all social reform and advance in a democratic society: the rule of law.

Remarks in connection with our May 1st observance of Law Day often cover a broad spectrum: international affairs, communism, democracy, and many aspects of our system of government. Speaking on the eve of Law Day, I want to consider only some aspects of law observance in our own city of Washington. My remarks will be addressed to our observance of the criminal law and the rights of individuals. The two must always go together.

The popular concern growing out of our much-publicized crime problem here in the District of Columbia is not with white collar crime or with organized crime, but with crimes of violence, robbery and the like. More precisely, it is with the supposed excess of such crimes. Violence has always been with us but now we are really alarmed, and some of us are afraid to be out on the streets. We are alarmed with some cause, but we must retain a proper perspective. As Berl I. Bernhard, staff director of the Civil Rights Commission, pointed out earlier this month, there is a general impression that this District has the highest crime rate among the major cities of the Nation, whereas FBI figures show that, in number of crimes per thousand of the population, Washington actually ranks 13th among the 25 largest cities. And Mr. Bernhard reports that "compared to a national crime increase of 7 percent for the calendar year 1962 over the year 1961, the crime rate in Washington increased only 4.9 percent."

Unlawful behavior in the District has been attributed to a variety of causes—the Mallory rule; the previously existing cussedness of the human race; the Durham rule, of course; and soft sentencing policies—a charge which nicely ignores statistics showing that District of Columbia felons average a longer stay in prison than do felons in the States or in other Federal jurisdictions. The average length of time served by felons in the District of Columbia is 40.4 months; in the States it is 28.3 months; and the average of all Federal jurisdictions is 19.5 months. Other alleged causes have included the former inadequate number of juvenile court judges, the absence of corporal punishment and a consequent breakdown of discipline in our school system, and so on. Still other reasons have been reached for and found. Not yet sun-spots, however.

I don't know the whole answer, if there is one, to our crime problem, but I think I know some parts of it. One part was forcefully brought home to me one September when I returned to the city after being away for several weeks. There had been a phenomenal rise in the crime rate during August—something like 16 or 18 percent. I discussed the increase with a friend of mine, a veteran police officer. "For such a marked rise," I said to him, "you must have some sort of explanation." "Oh, yes; it's quite simple," he replied, "You see, August was a very wet month." When I pressed him further, he pointed out: "These people wait on the street corner each morning around 6 or 6:30 for a truck to pick them up and take them to a construction site. If it's raining, that truck doesn't come, and the men are going to be idle that day. If the bad weather keeps up for 3 days," he continued, "we know we are going to have trouble on our hands—and sure enough, there invariably follows a rash of purse snatchings, housebreakings and the like." Then he added: "These people have to eat like the rest of us, you know."

Thus one gets a painfully sharp illustration of the direct relationship between unemployment, poverty, and crime—a theme to which James B. Conant has drawn attention in his significant study, "Slums and Suburbs." The mass of school dropouts who are without employment and without hope of employment constitute the combustible material which Conant fears will burst into a crime explosion on a scale we have never known.

Both crime and morality have their generative conditions. So we need a probing awareness of the conditions of physical and mental life which are essential to the standards of law and morality we have adopted. We must face up to the absence of the essential conditions and not merely cluck our tongues about it. Only then will there be any real chance of altering personal circumstances and behavior in the right direction. This was recognized by the District Commissioners' Crime Council of which former U.S. Attorney Oliver Gasch was cochairman. It pointed out:

"All of the police forces, public recreational facilities, and wholesome activity programs that money can buy will not miraculously turn a youth from antisocial behavior, if his share of city life reveals only deprivation and discrimination. Substandard housing, unequal job opportunities, and many other discriminatory practices lend themselves most powerfully to the creation of a psychological climate hardly conducive to good citizenship."

We must ask ourselves these questions: Does the citizen of a free, affluent society have a right to health and development, and to the adequate upbringing on which these depend? Do we want this included in our concept of modern democratic citizenship? If we do, then the illness and other failures of our citizens who have been denied such an upbringing must be seen as failures of society as well. An alternative view is that society need accept only limited responsibility for the sick and miseducated individuals it creates; need give only limited recognition, for example, to mental illness in criminal proceedings; need not recognize that mental illness is a large part of the problem of crime and that social illness accounts for much of the remainder. By that alternative, "we," the more successful part of society, get off easy.

When rules are enforced against individuals who lack the training and capacity to follow them, the rules become instruments of oppression. It is not always the moral prescriptions that are wrong. What is always wrong is our failure to recognize the conditions that are essential for their observance. For I take it that morality is a real thing, but also that its functioning is based on real conditions; on the educative conditions which give an inner structure to the individual, and the interwoven social conditions in the context of which the individual acts out his fate.

Many people feel that any discussion of criminal law and morality which does not concentrate on the issue of free will evades the real question. I am neither a philosopher nor a theologian and have no desire to discuss free will in the usual abstract terms. I am satisfied that the concept of morality relates to choices—real choices, the grounds of which are never exclusively spiritual, because they also concern the multiform conditions of social life. If belief in free will necessarily assumes that there is always a choice and that all choices are equally available to differently situated actors, then I heartily disagree. Intellectual, physical and emotional capacity, wealth, social status, all extend or limit the area of choice. To impose moral responsibility where there is no real choice is exactly what leads to Sunday morality, since it equates the illusion of choice with actual choice. We would all do well to return again and again to the irony of Anatole France when he said: "The law, in its majestic equality, forbids the rich as well as the poor to sleep under the bridges, to beg in the streets, and to steal bread."

One evades all sorts of disturbing problems if one talks in terms of complete free will instead of examining the range of actually available choices; attributes antisocial conduct to inborn evil instead of questioning how the evil got there; adheres to the strict responsibility of criminals and ignores the other side of the coin, responsibility for criminals.

What are "society's responsibilities"? They can be discussed from scores of viewpoints, including the educational and job opportunities we offer our young and our reaction when badly socialized human beings annoy us by getting into trouble. But I suggest that most problems concerning the responsibility of society finally come down to a question of the allocation of resources—material and emotional; what we give and what we fail to give; finally, understanding and money. One might even say, love and money.

This assertion of society's responsibilities may smack of "welfare-ism." But is there really any other way of looking at the matter? The most violent opponent of the welfare state concept probably acts much like a welfare state toward his own family. Even if he rules his roost with an unforgiving iron hand, he would never admit that he had been parsimonious toward his children with his affections and his funds. Even when social Darwinism was in vogue, its most convinced exponent was paternalistic at home. He may have been a stern Victorian father but he took seriously his responsibilities toward his dependents.

Social Darwinism, like isolationism, persists in America only as a nostalgic dream. It persists sub rosa, as a mood, but it has ceased to be intellectually respectable. The balanced budget promises to take its place as the No. 1 rationalization of social irresponsibility. Though social Darwinism is not the pleasing source of self-righteousness it once was, the motif of economy in the allocation of resources still accomplishes what social Darwinism intended. It is not easy for the strong and fortunate to give up the idea that the weak and miserable should be left to their own scant resources. There is probably no area in the entire administration of the criminal law which is not affected by preoccupation with economy of money and economy of human feeling. That our wealthy society approaches its responsibilities in forma pauperis, as it were, is a national scandal. It daily contradicts the democratic humanism under which we profess to live.

While we debate how and whether to attack the roots of the problem, what measures do we and should we take against those who endanger us by violent crimes? No one would deny that we need vigorous law enforcement. But should this entail, for example, the use of terror evoked by the threat of setting beasts against human beings?

I refer, of course, to the use of police dogs. Although I am not aware that this use has reduced the crime rate, the police assert that it is effective. Assume for the moment that it is. A full-scale reign of terror might be effective, too. But could we respect ourselves if we instituted one? Can we pretend that resort to such tactics will foster respect for the law and not merely respect for brute force? By measures such as these, perhaps you can force even the most unsocialized and antisocial people into a kind of submission—and not have to bother to look for the reasons for their plight. But at what a price. As a practical matter, the head of one municipal police force has explained to me, only respect for the law can insure public safety upon the thousands of city blocks of a large metropolis. It isn't feasible to maintain a policeman on each block 24 hours a day, even if that were thought desirable.

Many people persist in thinking that withdrawal of legal rights and safeguards from those accused of crime would have a beneficial effect. We are told that crimes cannot adequately be solved if the police are not permitted to make arrests for investigation. And we hear that the rules established in the Mallory and Durham decisions increase our crime rate by enticing offenders into the District of Columbia from outlying areas. I doubt that the perpetrators of crime calculate nicely the length of time during which they may be interrogated by the police before deciding where to snatch a purse, or consider that, if caught, the chance of being sent to a mental hospital instead of a prison may be greater here than it would be elsewhere.

I suspect that the causes of aberrant behavior run a good bit deeper than this, and that the factors which trigger it are less subject to rationalization. But suppose I am wrong. Suppose, for instance, it could be shown that the Durham rule increases the crime rate. Then we should have to weigh the morality of punishing mentally ill people by prison or by death. Perhaps we would even go so far as to abolish the insanity defense. But, as Justice Cardozo remarked: "If insanity is not to be a defense, let us say so frankly and even brutally, but let us not mock ourselves with a definition that palters with reality. Such a method is neither good morals nor good science nor good law."

Some of the measures which are advocated to deal with the problem of crime raise serious issues under our Bill of Rights. We have generally assumed that we are not subject to arrest unless the police have probable cause to think we have committed a crime. But the police tell us they need to make arrests without probable cause and solely for investigation in order to solve crime. Such experience as we have had since the District Commissioners' courageous action to halt arrests for investigation does not bear them out. But even if the position of the police should later prove to be factually correct, we should have to decide whether such arrests violate the fourth amendment, as the local bar is convinced that they do; and if so, then whether the fourth amendment must be abandoned in an attempt to stem the crimewave. But we should heed the warning of Justice Douglas in *Jones* v. *United States* that "though the police are honest and their aims are worthy, history shows they are not appropriate guardians of the privacy which the fourth amendment guarantees."

I urge that we face the constitutional issues which lurk in some of the proposed solutions to the crime problem. I do not mean that we should see if the words of the Constitution can be juggled so as to reach a desired end, but whether what is planned would in fact offend the letter and the spirit of the Constitution. I suspect that sub rosa infringements of constitutional guarantees are more dangerous than frontal attacks. With the latter we can see just how far our basic principles are being surrendered: with the former, the erosion may go a long way before we understand what is happening.

We should be aware that if the protections of the Bill of Rights are restricted we shall, in practice, be affecting directly the rights of only one section of our population.

When we talk about arrests for investigation, lengthy police interrogation prior to arraignment, and the like, the subject under discussion is not you or me. We don't get arrested without probable cause because, to put it plainly, we don't look as if we would commit acts of violence and we do look as if it might not pay to trifle with our rights. Nor would you or I be subjected to long interrogation by the police without the benefit of counsel. Nor do you and I live in neighborhoods where the police dragnet is used, and where suspects are subjected to wholesale arrest.

So the issue really comes down to whether we should further whittle away the protections of the very people who most need them—the people who are too ignorant, too poor, too ill educated to defend themselves. On Law Day it is appropriate to inquire whether we can expect to induce a spirit of respect for law in the people who constitute our crime problem by treating them as beyond the pale of the Constitution.

Though the direct effect of restricting constitutional guarantees would at first be limited in this way, indirectly and eventually we should all be affected. Initially the tentacles of incipient totalitarianism seize only the scapegoats of society, but over time they may weaken the moral fiber of society to the point where none of us will remain secure.

A debate earlier this month at a meeting of the District of Columbia Bar Association showed the healthy concern of the legal profession with the perennial and inevitable conflict between police demands and constitutional mandates. The overwhelming vote which followed that debate demonstrated that lawyers are still in their rightful place at the forefront of the movement to protect civil rights. There could have been no better prelude to Law Day than that.

Our attitude toward crime reflects our view of the value of the individual in society. In our deepest democratic and national commitments, we are a society of individuals. It is for the protection of individuals and of society that one who is accused of crime is deemed innocent until proved guilty and is afforded all the other legal safeguards. In protecting him, we protect ourselves. In a sense the entire system of criminal jurisprudence is symbolic, since every part of it stands for something more than itself; namely, the preservation of the worth of each individual in the society of individuals. We must deter not only crime, but also the debasement of the individual.

ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate adjourn until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, in accordance with the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 1, 1963, at 11 o'clock a.m.

◆

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 30, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Isaiah 55: 6: *Seek ye the Lord while He may be found, call ye upon Him while He is near.*

Eternal and ever-blessed God, we thank Thee for this new day, calling upon us to be grateful for the joys which cheer us and for the trials which teach us to put our trust in Thee.

We humbly acknowledge that life often seems to be full of hardships but may we never allow their hardness to get into our hearts and fill them with weariness and wretchedness.

May we be numbered among the seekers and finders of God in order that we may learn the meaning and value of life and know the secret of carrying on faithfully and courageously.

Gird us with strength and sturdiness of faith for we know that if our faith holds then the way of life before us will brighten but if we lose our faith then we will stumble and stagger.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SHAME

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, sooner or later the United States must move on Cuba. There is no use waiting for a trumped-up excuse.

Castro's Moscow reception is an insult to every American citizen. Our people cry for an end to the Communist military buildup in Cuba.

The other day in London, on his way to Moscow to cringe and beg once again, Averell Harriman said:

> It is very important that we make the Communists realize that we are not going to stand for any nonsense.

The only thing Mr. Harriman did not take with him was his umbrella.

If there is any combination of words that the Communists do understand it is that this kind of gentlemanly nicety means once again that we are unwilling to stand up and be counted for freedom. To say we will stand for no nonsense in Laos and do nothing about Communist military operations in Cuba is worse than the language of Munich, because it deceives the American people. I suppose we should come to expect this from the Kennedy administration because it has happened so often.

While Kennedy pussyfoots Communist ships continue to dock in Havana. Communist personnel and goods of war and potentials of war continue to be accumulated in our own backyard by the Godless punks who plot our destruction.

Mr. Speaker, whatever the Senate does or does not do, whatever the President does or does not do, I say shame on this House of Representatives for failure to urge the Executive to run the Communists out of Cuba with the full force and authority of the United States of America. Let us put politics aside long enough to tell the White House, as that branch of the Government closest to the people, our people want communism out of Cuba. Every day that we delay now in ending Communist preparations in Cuba will eventually cost untold added numbers of American lives.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 34]

Alger
Anderson
Ashley
Aspinall
Beermann
Buckley
Cameron
Celler
Chelf
Clancy
Clark
Colmer
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Dent
Forrester
Gary
Gavin
Hagan, Ga.
Hardy
Healey
Hébert
Henderson
Hoffman
Jensen
Lennon
Lesinski
McDade
Macdonald
Miller, Calif.
Miller, N.Y.
Nedzi
Osmers

Pillion
Powell
Rich
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Rogers, Tex.
Roosevelt
Shelley
Staebler
Taft
Walter
Willis
Wilson, Bob

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 386 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE INVESTIGATING HIGHWAYS

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Subcommittee Investigating Highways, of the Committee on Public Works, have permission to sit this afternoon and the rest of the week during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce have permission to sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

ROY L. WHITMAN, OFFICIAL REPORTER OF DEBATES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to say a word of tribute to a fine and faithful servant of the House, Mr. Roy Whitman, dean of the Official Reporters of Debates, who is at his post of duty recording the proceedings of the House for the last time today.

Mr. Whitman has served the Congress since shortly after World War I. The business he has recorded over more than 40 years has ranged from committee hearings on the League of Nations during President Wilson's day to the legislative debates of the space age. The names and utterances of many of the immortals of American political history have been entered in his shorthand book.

Mr. Whitman has been a working witness to congressional action and reaction through some of the most momentous days of the House and the Nation. His career took its form and substance from the daily work of the House. He has recorded the talk and temper of this body as it dealt with the issues of war and peace, depression and prosperity. He has recorded the words of our last four Presidents and of many distinguished visitors from abroad. He has set down for the benefit of this House and future generations the words of poets, statesmen, and military heroes.

He has seen the House in all its moods. He has seen it divided and united. He has transcribed words of debate spoken by noble men; words which have described the pattern and texture of events in the daily life of a great legislative body.

In the early days of the Congress there were no Official Reporters of Debates. Until 1872 when the Speaker appointed five Official Reporters, making them officers of the House, no provision was made for the recording and publication of debates. Anyone desiring to know what was said on the floor had to rely upon newspaper reports, which were necessarily incomplete, and which might include or delete, emphasize or ignore, as desired. Political researchers can thank their stars for the daily chronology prepared by Official Reporters. And we can thank ours that we have had the good fortune to have as the Dean of the Official Reporters of Debates for these many years a man of Mr. Whitman's expertise, loyalty, and dedication. His skills have served the House well these many years. We say adieu to Mr. Whitman with a feeling of mingled sorrow and delight—sorrow because he is leaving us as an official reporter, delight because of the magnificence of his performance over the years.

We wish him a full life in retirement and many happy days spent with his wife of 49 years, and with his children and grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. McINTIRE].

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I join with Members of the House of Representatives today in honoring Mr. Roy L. Whitman, dean of the corps of official reporters of debates in the House of Representatives, who retires after 51 years as a reporter and 31 years as a recorder of debates in this Chamber.

As Roy retires his absence will cause a shadow to fall upon this Chamber, a shadow which, gratifyingly, quickly will become dissipated by the bright light of efficient and dedicated service that will be left in the wake of his departure.

Roy was born September 23, 1892, in Marlboro, Mass. He was educated in the public schools of Massachusetts and Maine, and in Maine attended grade school in Auburn and Lewiston. He graduated in 1912 from the Clark Business School of Tremont Temple, Boston, Mass., and in his studies there he specialized in shorthand.

He did his first reporting in February 1912, before the Committee on Medicine of the Massachusetts State Legislature.

Mr. Whitman came to Washington in February 1913, through a Civil Service appointment to the Post Office Department. In that Department he served nearly 6 years, 2 of them as Secretary to the Solicitor of the Department, Mr. Lamar. He was also the official reporter in the Fraud and Lottery Section of the Department during his service there.

In 1918 he resigned from the Post Office Department and opened his own reporting business. In December of that year he reported his first committee in the House of Representatives, the Committee on the District of Columbia, and during the ensuing 14 years reported many committees of the House and Senate. He reported many proceedings of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations when Senators Lodge of Massachusetts, Borah of Idaho, and Johnson of California constituted the great triumvirate of that committee during the days when the League of Nations was one of the prime matters of this country's foreign policy under President Wilson.

During the operation of his private reporting business, Roy was one of the reporters on the famous Teapot Dome oil cases tried after World War I, following these proceedings from the hearings before the Senate committee to the conviction of Secretary Fall and the acquittal of Mr. Doheny. He also participated in reporting other large wartime conspiracy cases involving lumber and shipbuilding.

In 1932 he was appointed as an Official Reporter of Debates of the House of Representatives, which position he has filled until this day. He remembers the time when the cutaway coat was standard day dress for Senators and even some Members of the House of Representatives. He also has a vivid and kind recollection of the aged Mr. Howard of Nebraska, the grand champion of the Indians who used to wear his hair in curls that fell to his shoulders.

When Roy lays down his pen today and enters upon retirement, he will have completed more than 51 years' active practice of his profession.

In 1914 he married Erie M. Turnbull of Delhi, Ontario, and in 1964 they will celebrate their 50th wedding anniversary. Erie has been Roy's constant companion, and she has worked with him countless nights into the wee hours of the morning to help him in establishing his business.

Mr. and Mrs. Whitman have two children and six grandchildren. A son, Dr. Benaiah L. Whitman, is a physician in Philadelphia, Pa., while a daughter, Mrs. Wayne K. Hill, is a portrait artist in Silver Spring, Md.

My State of Maine is proud of the fact that it shares a place in the life of Roy Whitman, and I am certain that his summer visits to his seaside home at Seal Cove on Mount Desert Island have developed in his heart a real and deep affection for the Pine Tree State.

I know that he has a host of friends and neighbors in this Maine community, folks who anxiously await the arrival of Roy and Mrs. Whitman each year. I sincerely hope, along with many other Maine residents, that their retirement years will permit Roy and Erie to spend even more time with us in Maine.

On a personal note, I want to say that I treasure Roy's friendship, highlighted by his cheerful greeting he extends me each day I see him on the floor in company with a hearty smile. This friendship has been punctuated by frequent exchanges and comments about our mutual friends in Maine. This pleasant association with a very pleasant person will hold a permanent place in my memories.

And as Roy is personable, so is he efficient, his efficiency being demonstrated against a background of quiet demeanor. Unquestionably, he exemplifies the highest standards of his profession, having performed outstandingly in the vital service of reporting debates in this legislative body.

Roy's vast experience has most assuredly brought him a harvest of satisfaction, for he has recorded the words of a multitude of this country's distinguished citizens. Probably there is none other that has had his experience in intimately recording the details of unfolding historical events of the United States.

I know that all Members of this House of Representatives are anxious and eager to join with me in expressing appreciation for the dedicated service that Roy Whitman has given to this legislative body and to his country.

And it is our heartfelt wish that as he has given, so should he receive—may providence extend him the just fruits of his labors, bestowing upon him and his wife, Erie, a bounty of health and happiness against the background of a bounty of years.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, it has been a real privilege for me to have known Roy Whitman. His sterling character, real ability, and friendly personality have made a strong impression on me and I wish to extend my best wishes for a healthy and happy retirement. He has earned the appreciation of all Members of this House.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am informed that in the near future our good friend and valued associate, Mr. Roy L. Whitman, dean of the corps of Official Reporters of Debates in the House of Representatives, will retire from the important duties which he has performed in such a brilliant, outstanding manner for many years.

Mr. Whitman, zealous, gifted public servant to whom we are greatly indebted, was born September 23, 1892, in Marlboro, Mass., in my district. He was educated in the Maine public schools and graduated in 1912 from the Clark Business School of Tremont Temple, Boston, Mass., where he specialized in shorthand.

He did his first reporting in February 1912, before the Committee on Medicine of the Massachusetts State Legislature.

He came to Washington in February 1913, through a civil service appointment to the Post Office Department. In that Department, he served nearly 6 years, 2 of them as Secretary to the Solicitor of the Department, Mr. Lamar. He was also the official reporter in the Fraud and Lottery Section of the Department during his service there.

In 1918 he resigned from the Post Office Department and opened his own reporting business. In December of that year, he reported his first committee in the House of Representatives, the Committee on the District of Columbia, and during the ensuing 14 years, reported many committees of the House and Senate. He reported many proceedings of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations when Senators Lodge of Massachusetts, Borah of Idaho, and Johnson of California, constituted the great triumvirate of that committee during the days when the League of Nations was one of the prime issues of this country's foreign policy under President Wilson.

During the operation of his private reporting business, he was one of the reporters on the famous Teapot Dome oil cases tried after World War I, following that case from the hearings before the Senate Committee to the conclusion of the proceedings. He also participated in reporting other large war-time conspiracy cases involving lumber and shipbuilding.

In 1932, he was appointed as an Official Reporter of Debates of the House of Representatives, which position he has filled until this day. He remembers the time when the cutaway coat was standard day dress for Senators and even some Members of the House. He remembers, particularly, the kindly old Mr. Howard of Nebraska, grand champion of the Indians, who used to wear his hair in curls that fell to his shoulders.

When he lays down his facile pen today and enters upon retirement, he will have completed more than 51 years active practice of his profession.

In 1914 he married the charming Erie M. Turnbull of Delhi, Ontario. Next year, 1964, they celebrate their 50th wedding anniversary. She has been his constant companion and has worked with him many nights to the very late hours helping him establish his business. They have two children, and six grandchildren. His son, Dr. Benaiah L. Whitman, is a distinguished physician in Philadelphia, Pa. His daughter, Mrs. Wayne K. Hill, is a celebrated portrait artist in Silver Spring, Md.

We will greatly miss Roy Whitman, who has left an indelible impression in our great deliberative body. He has made an enviable record of efficient, devoted, outstanding service in the House. He will be remembered here for his magnificent work and the many solid contributions which he has made throughout the years to the House of Representatives and its Members.

Always friendly, helpful, considerate of others, he enjoys the esteem, and affection of our Members, staff, and all who know him.

His retirement leaves a void in our vital reportorial services that will be very difficult to fill. We will long continue to be most grateful for his loyal, dedicated, unselfish service to the House and its Members. We will miss his modest, gracious presence in these historic halls.

In expressing my great pride in the tremendous, memorable record which Roy Whitman has made here with us, I take pleasure in congratulating him and his lovely wife and family, and wishing them all choicest blessings in the time to come.

I hope that Roy Whitman and his family will enjoy every measure of success, happiness, contentment, and peace for many years to come and that he will visit us often.

Godspeed and good fortune to a beloved, respected associate, and great American, our cherished friend, and benefactor, Roy Whitman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I regret to learn that my friend, Roy Whitman, one of our Official Reporters of Debates in the House of Representatives, is soon to retire.

No employee of the House has been more efficient and faithful. He has gone about his daily work quietly and yet he has a rare sense of humor that comes to the surface infrequently to demonstrate that his seriousness is born of his application and faithfulness to his work.

I say again that I regret that he will soon leave us and yet I am glad for through his long years of service he has well earned a rest from his appointed rounds on the House floor.

To Roy and Mrs. Whitman my best wishes for good health and many years of happiness in retirement.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, our good friend Roy L. Whitman, Official Reporter of Debates, served his last day in the House on April 30. I join his many friends in paying tribute to the dean of its Reporters.

His magic pen has moved steadily throughout these many years—since 1932—inking the history of the House in debate and recording for all time the business of the greatest deliberative body in the world.

Only an individual of great patience, alert dexterity of hand and finite mind could have survived those many years of trying experiences—noting the ravings of fork tongued orators whose fiery words spilled in multisyllabic phrases that would deaden the blast of a French horn and stultify the mind of even Noah Webster, the ruler of the world of words.

But perhaps the antidote was at hand in the soothing gentleness of the melodious voices of the orators of yesteryear. Their sweet-sounding phrases from melliferous lips must have had a soothing effect on an authority in grammatical instruction like Roy, who revered spiced descriptions of heavenly thoughts as a cultural contribution to the beauty of the language.

Roy was very cooperative in solving the many problems brought to him for solution by Members of the House. He was unselfish and obliging in the correction of statements attributed to the contributor on the floor. He was zealous in calling attention to a slip of the tongue in debate.

His long and varied experience in his profession (over 51 years) established him as an authority.

His long service in the "Cave of the Winds"—enduring the stunning babble of ear-splitting voices and straining for the whispering inaudible nothings of ill-prepared readings earned for him his full retirement. He and his darling wife, Erie, who also was his helpmate in his professional life are deserving of this new happiness—a healthy and permanent vacation. May the blessings of God and well wishes of the Nation keep them with one another and their love of family for many years.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks on the life and work of Roy L. Whitman at this point in the Record and also, Mr. Speaker, that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, this is an important day in the annals of the House for today we are celebrating the birthday of the leader of the Illinois delegation, Thomas J. O'Brien. Under his leadership which is reflected by the strength of the Illinois delegation in the House of Representatives in supporting good measures in this legislative body for the welfare of the people of this Nation; we from the State of Illinois are thankful that in 1933, after many years of distinguished public service at the State and local levels, Thomas J. O'Brien was sent to Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I know I speak the sentiments of all my colleagues when I say as a dedicated servant of the people, Thomas O'Brien stands high in honor and respect of the membership of this body. He is representative of the conscience of good government and is acclaimed as the highest type of dedicated leadership which the American people have come to expect from the Nation's great statesmen who are gathered here.

Mr. Speaker, recently our good leader had difficulty in a serious illness, but because of the strength within this vibrant and vital man, and because of the cleanliness of his way of life and of his spirit, he has overcome that illness and has achieved what medical authorities say is a miraculous recovery.

We are proud to welcome him back to this body today practically in the fullness of health albeit somewhat weakened by the serious illness which he recently suffered.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that each man and woman on the floor of this House today believes in the spirit of O'Brien and lauds his great record in this body.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIBONATI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I cannot let this moment pass without joining the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, in saying Happy Birthday to our colleague, Tom O'Brien. Many happy returns of the day to Tom. I know I speak the sentiments of every Member when I say that we wish for Tom O'Brien many more years of happy and useful service in this House. He is one of God's rare creatures. There is no other like him. When the Lord made him He broke the mold.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with my colleagues today in commemorating the anniversary of the birth of one of the great leaders in the House of Representatives, the Honorable Thomas J. O'Brien, of Illinois.

When I first came to Congress 15 years ago it was my good fortune to have Tom O'Brien, out of his vast store of knowledge about the House of Representatives, give me the counsel which every freshman Congressman needs. Today I am still happy to count him among those whose advice I most respect and whose friendship I most cherish.

It was Mr. O'Brien, I might note, who as the member of the House Ways and Means Committee from my region, cosponsored my appointment to the Foreign Affairs Committee. For this and countless other good works done on my behalf, I am forever in debt to him.

It gives me a great deal of pleasure to have the opportunity to join with those who, with deep sincerity, wish Tom a very happy and blessed 85th birthday, and many more to come.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Libonati] and the Majority Leader, Mr. Albert, in paying this deserved tribute to our beloved colleague, the Honorable Tom O'Brien.

No Member of this House enjoys the admiration, respect, and esteem of his colleagues more deservedly than does this stalwart dean of the Illinois delegation.

I am grateful for the privilege which has been afforded me to know Mr. O'Brien and to enjoy his great friendship. Happy birthday to you, my friend.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, no Member of this body is more beloved than the peerless dean of the Illinois delegation, Tom O'Brien, and no one is more beloved by the people of Chicago. To us all this is a day of great happiness, the beloved Tom O'Brien in our midst and we, his colleagues on both sides of the aisle, celebrating with him his birthday. Tireless in his service to his city, his State, and his Nation, unceasing in the giving to all peoples from the richness of his heart and his mind, indestructible Tom O'Brien will continue for many years to come his service in this Chamber, wielding a mighty influence for all that is good and worthy. On this day of rejoicing on a happy natal anniversary, our warmest congratulations and affectionate good wishes go to the dean of the Illinois delegation and to the noble and gracious woman who has been his strength and comfort. It is a perfect marital team, and to congratulate Tom O'Brien without including Mrs. O'Brien would be only a 50-percent felicitation.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks at this point in the Record in commemoration of the birthday of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'Brien].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5888) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to 3 hours, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird] and the other half of myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 5888, with Mr. Thompson of New Jersey in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the consent agreement the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty] will be recognized for 1½ hours and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird] for 1½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to have the privilege of presenting for your consideration the annual appropriation for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare today. This is the 13th year I have had this privilege as chairman, and I have served on this subcommittee for the past 17 years.

I would like to start out by thanking the members of our subcommittee for their attendance at all the hearings. I do not know of any other committee that has a better record. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Denton], who has served for many years on this subcommittee has been of inestimable help to me in our consideration of the budget for these Departments; and we have this year the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Lesinski], a new Member, who has been very faithful in his attendance at the committee hearings. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird] has served as ranking member of the committee for many years, along with Mr. Michel. I am pleased to be able to say that we bring to you for consideration a bill with a unanimous report from the subcommittee. And, Mr. Chairman, I could not make these statements about the members of the subcommittee without referring to the clerk of our committee, who has been one of the most faithful, one of the most diligent, one of the most able we have in the House of Representatives. Mr. Robert M. Moyer has certainly been a great help, not only to me but also to every member of the committee, and I think to every Member of this Congress who has ever had occasion to call on the committee for information. Mr. Moyer has been willing and able to supply this particular information.

Every year Congress enacts additional legislation which establishes new programs for these Departments. The budget for fiscal year 1964 included the unprecedented number of 106 individual appropriation requests. In order to thoroughly analyze these requests, our hearings ran even longer than usual. The subcommittee heard 256 Government witnesses and 117 Members of Congress and interested individuals outside of Government. No Member of Congress, or any other individual who had an interest in this bill was refused the opportunity for a hearing. The record of our hearings totals over 4,200 pages.

In total the bill includes $5,449,988,000, which is a reduction of $309,501,000 from the request and a reduction of $118,810,600 below the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1963 including funds contained in the supplemental appropriation bill for 1963 as it passed the House.

The committee does not presume to claim that its recommendations in the bill will save the U.S. Treasury a total of over $300 million. Over half of the reduction recommended is the result of a reestimate of the needs based on information that is currently available. In this category is the reduction of $175 million under the appropriation "Grants to States for public assistance," and $25 million in the Department of Labor under the appropriation "Manpower development and training activities." In both of these instances information available to the committee simply indicated that the programs would require no more funds than are included in the bill—in other words, the reduction in the appropriations does not represent a cut in the program that would otherwise prevail.

On the other hand, it should be pointed out that 60 of the 106 requests for appropriations have been reduced, and most of these reductions represent a cutback from the program anticipated by the budget. For instance in the Department of Labor the committee cut out funds for 225 of the permanent positions requested in the budget; for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the budget positions were reduced 955; and 120 positions were disallowed for the related agencies. In addition to this reduction in personnel many millions of dollars budgeted for grants had been disallowed.

I am not bragging about these cuts but simply relating facts. I have still to see an appropriation bill for these Departments that I am satisfied with. I am sure that other members of the committee can make the same statement for other reasons than mine. As always happens, this is a compromise and in my opinion a fair compromise. Since I do consider it to be a fair compromise I intend to support the bill as a whole and the recommendations it contains, individually.

Since there has been an unusual amount of interest in the level of Federal personnel, I will mention a few additional statistics concerning this subject before going on to some of the individual recommendations in the bill concerning money. The budget for appropriations to these two Departments and the various independent agencies that come under the jurisdiction of the Labor-HEW Subcommittee, would have supported 92,383 permanent Federal positions. This compares with 87,338 permanent Federal positions for which funds were appropriated for the current fiscal year 1963. Of the 5,045 additional positions requested the committee has allowed 3,745 and has disallowed 1,300. Almost all of the increase allowed is in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and in very large part is to handle additional workload required by recent legislation passed by Congress. The committee asked the Department to prepare a statement setting forth all of the legislation that has been passed by the last four Congresses that have an impact on their workload. This statement which sets forth the requested information in summary form covers 17 pages of the hearing record starting on page 1290 of part 1. Just one appropriation, that for the Bureau of Old Age and Survivors Insurance, provides for an increase of 1,791 additional positions or almost one-half of the total increase allowed by the committee. This increase is necessary if the Department is to properly administer the ever-increasing program provided by the Social Security Act, and is almost certain to continue to increase somewhat during the next several years.

In the Department of Labor, excluding trust fund, the bill includes $384,884,000, a reduction of $42,336,000 from the budget, and an increase of $24,430,450 over the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1963.

Overall, I think we have a good bill for the Department of Labor, which is one of the most stable departments of Government today.

In total the bill includes $17,805,000 for the Bureau of Labor Statistics which represents roughly one-half of the increase they requested. There has been no reduction made in any funds requested in connection with the Consumer Price Index.

The committee has made a reduction of $25 million from the $165 million requested for the "Manpower development and training activities," but as I mentioned earlier this is simply a recognition of the fact that this program has expanded much more slowly than was anticipated. In the opinion of the committee the $140 million included in the bill will adequately provide for a training program of the size that can be developed during the next fiscal year.

The next significant change is in connection with the appropriation for grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration. The bill includes $350 million, which is a reduction of $82,570,000 from the request and $50 million less than was appropriated for fiscal year 1963, however, the amount in the bill is the maximum that is authorized to be appropriated under legislation as it now exists. A bill was passed yesterday which, if enacted into law, will increase the maximum authorization. The committee recognizes that additional funds will be needed and will expect that this amount will be increased when the legislative amendment is enacted. The committee has only allowed about half of the amount requested for trade adjustment activities due to the fact that very little activity under this program can be foreseen in view of developments to date. The committee did not intend to curtail the program but simply could not see how more money than that contained in the bill could be required.

There are several other appropriations in the Department of Labor section of the bill but the changes are relatively small and are explained in the report.

So all in all there are no increases in the Department of Labor budget, and we have cut the request of the Department of Labor by over $42 million.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I have a letter received yesterday from the assistant dean of the College of Engineering at Iowa State University. If the gentleman will permit, I would like to read a few sentences from the letter:

> In the Department of Labor's appropriation request currently being offered to the Congress there is provision whereby the Bureau of Employment Security would take over the operation of college placement facilities. We are definitely opposed to this proposal, feeling that the colleges themselves are in a much better position to provide placement activities not only for graduating seniors but also for alumni who may request assistance in making a change in employment.
>
> It is believed that college placement activities are an integral, inseparable, and vital part of an institution's operations, providing them with valuable information concerning supply, demand, and quality of their programs and graduates.

May I ask the question if that is correct?

Mr. FOGARTY. It is not correct.

I received the same kind of a letter from the president of my State university. When Mr. Goodwin, head of the U.S. Bureau of Employment Security, was before our committee, I read the letter in its entirety in the hearings starting on page 254. The answer was a categorical "No," given by Mr. Goodwin. They do not go on these campuses, unless they are asked by the president of the college or university. He testified that they have not been doing this, and they will not do it, without an invitation from the school.

The president of my university seemed completely satisfied with the answer, but there are some who are still not satisfied with the answer because they do not believe the employment services should give any help, even if requested by the president of the university.

Mr. Goodwin said in the hearings, categorically, they will not go on any campus where they are not asked by the school, and we expect them to hold to what they have said in the hearings beginning on page 254.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. I want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee for the very explicit statement he has just made. The gentleman will recall that it was my privilege to appear before his subcommittee and to present a witness who was speaking for approximately 1,000 college placement bureaus. They were able to coordinate their testimony and presentation to the subcommittee, and I was honored, of course, that a constituent of mine was selected to make the presentation.

As I understand the reply by the gentleman from Rhode Island to the gentleman from Iowa, it is essentially this, that if there is an existing college placement bureau, the U.S. Employment Service will not enter the college campus to assume any of the functions or to trespass on the jurisdiction of the existing placement bureau.

Mr. FOGARTY. That is absolutely right, and it is spelled out in the hearings starting on page 254. I think Mr. Goodwin gave a categorical answer to a specific question asked in this regard.

Mr. AVERY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. I am not sure I heard the gentleman correctly in regard to the Department of Labor. You said that the funds are below those of 1963 or below those of the budget estimates for 1964?

Mr. FOGARTY. I said that we cut the budget estimate for 1964 by over $42 million, and did not make any increases in the budget.

Mr. CURTIS. For the Labor Department there is an actual increase over the expenditure level for 1963.

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes, overall the increase is $24 million-plus over the 1963 appropriations.

Mr. CURTIS. Apparently the actual increase is $69 million in the Manpower Development and Training Act, at least, and there must be a net decrease in all other areas to give you the plus 24; am I correct in that?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is right.

Mr. CURTIS. Now, I wanted to ask this question. I do not see anything in here budgeted, and I wanted to ask the question whether there was any request for the retraining under the trade adjustment features of the Trade Act of 1962.

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes, there is.

Mr. CURTIS. Where will that show?

Mr. FOGARTY. Well, it is right at the end of the Labor Department part of the report.

Mr. CURTIS. I am reading the forepart. It is not in the narrative.

Mr. FOGARTY. It is explained on page 7, at the bottom of the page. They asked for $7,635,000 and we gave them $4 million.

Mr. CURTIS. I see. I did not read far enough. That is 3.9. That is a plus item, is it not?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes, it is, $3,900,000 over 1963.

Mr. CURTIS. Over and above 1963. What I wanted to inquire about was the 1963 level.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. As far as the question asked by the gentleman from Missouri is concerned, it is a plus item over 1963, but after all this is the first year that there has been any operation. Thus far the Tariff Commission has turned down every application that has been made. I believe, even with the reduction of $3.6 million, that a further reduction undoubtedly could have been made in this particular item, because I don't think we are going to have many people eligible for training.

Mr. CURTIS. I was really asking for information on the judgement feature. If the gentleman will yield for my comment:

I would definitely agree. I felt that this was a bad provision in the Trade Act of 1962 because it was redundant. I thought that we were really taking care of this under the Manpower Training Act, and to try to separate our unemployed on the basis of those who were unemployed because of trade problems and those who were unemployed for other reasons was a very erroneous base. However, I was really just seeking information from the gentleman from Rhode Island and the gentleman has given that information to me.

The only other thing I was going to ask about, in the Department of Labor these pluses over the 1963 expenditure level are really for these two new programs.

Are there any other plus items?

Mr. FOGARTY. No other large ones.

Mr. CURTIS. Since these two pluses total about $72 million or $73 million, there must be a cut of about $45 million in other areas?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is right.

Mr. Chairman, the first item in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is the Food and Drug Administration. The committee allowed the full amount of the budget request for $35,805,000 which is an increase of $6,740,300 over the appropriation for 1963. In my personal opinion we have never appropriated enough to the Food and Drug Administration to enable them to offer the protection to the American public that the American public has a right to expect under the food and drug laws. So I think a large increase should have been appropriated even in the absence of any new development. But in addition there are such new developments as the Kefauver-Harris Act and changes in the drug regulations prompted by events of the recent past such as the thalidomide incident. Also the Food and Drug Administration has been criticized for certain weaknesses by the recent citizens committee report, and others. In my opinion this increase is one of the best justified in the entire bill.

In the Office of Education the committee made a rather substantial reduction of $5,500,000 in the cooperative research program, but this still leaves an increase of $4,515,000, or approximately 65 percent, over the amount appropriated for 1963.

Both the budget and the bill provide for a substantial reduction in funds for schools in federally impacted areas under Public Laws 815 and 874. This is due solely to the fact that the temporary provisions of the legislation expire at the end of fiscal year 1963. The amount in the bill is sufficient to pay 100 percent of estimated entitlements under the permanent provision of the law. When and if the temporary provisions are extended, supplemental appropriations will undoubtedly be made to finance them.

The bill includes $125,415,000 for the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation which is a reduction of $6,020,000 from the amount requested but an increase of $22,489,000 over the amount appropriated for 1963. The committee made no reduction in the grants to States appropriation. The budget and the bill recommended by the committee continue the policy followed in recent years of providing funds to match the steadily increasing funds provided at the State and local level, in accordance with the formula in the basic legislation. During the current year it is expected that 110,400 disabled people will be rehabilitated under the program. It is estimated that a new record high of 126,500 rehabilitations will be reached during fiscal year 1964. This will be 25,000 greater than the 1962 total. This increase, in 2 years, compares with the historical fact that it took 42 years to reach the first 100,000 annual total. This, in the opinion of the committee, is an excellent example of what can be done by Federal-State partnerships strongly supported by each.

There are 36 appropriations in the Public Health Service and some increase was provided in the budget for most of them. In most cases the committee approved a portion of the requested increase but made some reduction in the total amount requested for 25 of these items. In total, both the change from the budget and the change from fiscal year 1963 are relatively small. The bill includes a total of $1,546,058,000, a reduction of $51,826,000 from the amounts requested, and $34,848,950 over the amounts appropriated for fiscal year 1963.

I doubt that there is any other group of appropriations that this Congress makes that provide for programs of more direct interest and importance to the American people, or for that matter, of more importance to future generations. In recognition of this, the committee spent more time on this section than any other that it included in the bill. The record of our hearings with Government and public witnesses on Public Health Service items covers approximately 2,000 pages.

Since the hearing record is quite complete and these items are all covered individually in the committee report I do not intend to spend time now discussing each one individually; however, in view of the great interest in the work of the National Institutes of Health, I do think it is worth taking the time to make some explanations to the House.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to be able to report that after a most painstaking and thorough review, the committee has found the President's budget for the National Institutes of Health to be—in general—soundly conceived for 1964. This, I may say, is a most encouraging development. For as the Members of this House well know, we haven't in recent years found administration budget requests too helpful in identifying the Nation's health needs and rising to meet them through vigorous and forward-looking research programs.

For 1964, however, I think it fair to describe administration proposals as forward looking. While the request by no means rises to all of the program opportunities identified to the committee in this year's hearings, it does provide moderate increases in most program areas. In the major increases in the mental health area, it does in fact reflect considerable progress.

We are pleased, therefore, to recommend for House approval, substantially the program proposed by the President. I say "substantially" because the bill before you contains two significant reductions below requested funding levels. Neither of these reductions will affect the balance among program efforts which we consider to be generally good.

One of the reductions recommended by the committee applies to a new program of "Hospital improvement grants" in the mental health area. Twelve million dollars were requested for this program, to demonstrate new and improved methods of care and treatment in our State institutions for the mentally ill and mentally retarded. In an area of such obvious need, the committee would ordinarily be most receptive to a program proposal of this kind. However, it was apparent from the evidence presented that program details had not been thought through adequately. Members were left with the distinct impression that, as yet, what we were asked to review was more idea than viable program. For instance, the nature and extent of State and local participation was not specified; also, operating details were lacking in such important matters as guidelines, review mechanisms, relationships to existing activities such as the Hill-Burton program. How this program will fit in with longer range plans of the Mental Health Institute is not clear either. Because convincing assurance was not presented on these important details, there was no alternative but to recommend deferral of this $12 million program, at least until the National Institute of Mental Health provides definitive answers to these questions to the full satisfaction of the House and the Senate. Personally, I would like to see this program started as soon as these details are worked out.

In summary, a total of $962,454,000 is recommended for programs of the National Institutes of Health in 1964. This represents a decrease of $18 million below the administration's request. It also reflects an increase of $70,146,000—roughly 8 percent above the 1963 appropriation level.

A substantial increase is earmarked for the mental health area. This, I believe, is reasonable, in view of special circumstances this year. The increase for mental health responds to compelling national needs, as identified by the Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health, and as reiterated in a special message to the Congress by the President.

Mr. Chairman, I can support the recommended levels for these vital health research programs for 1964, as a minimum required to sustain the research momentum built up over the years since World War II. I believe that Members of this House are well aware of the detailed and intensive review given to the appropriation requests for the National Institutes of Health. For proof of that thoroughness, I refer anyone to the record of hearings. I might add that there is a real education in those hearings, for anyone who wants to become better informed about the nature and extent of national health problems, and what can be done and is being done to meet those problems now.

On the basis of that painstaking review, I see the recommended funding level as meeting the single most urgent program need in 1964: It sustains the critically important forward momentum of these programs that contribute so much to the health and well-being of the American people. Even so, I cannot help but observe how tiny a fraction of the Federal Government's $15 billion budget for research and development is being requested for research aimed at the improvement of the well-being of our people and the conquest of diseases that take their toll in death, suffering, human misery, and social deprivation.

If the Members of the House will bear with me, I will run down quickly the principal program increases proposed for 1964:

There is an increase of $38.8 million for research grants. Of this total, the Mental Health Institute will receive an additional $12.3 million including funds for mental health "new look" grants and for expansion of mental retardation research programs.

Fellowships are increased by $4.5 million, with mental health and mental retardation receiving $2.6 million of this total.

Training grants are increased by $22.1 million; of this total, $16.7 million is provided for training programs primarily designed to meet the critical professional manpower shortages in the professions providing mental health and mental retardation services. All of the training programs of the National Institutes of Health represent a crucial investment in the training of biomedical manpower for the future.

Additional funds for direct research activities in the Institute and for the servicing of the programs of the nine Institutes and several Divisions of NIH will approximate $4.7 million.

During its review of the budget for the National Institutes of Health, the committee probed extensively into a variety of issues raised by current criticism of the management of NIH and other PHS grant programs. In its report on the 1963 appropriation bill, the committee instructed NIH to provide it with a detailed progress report on these matters because we wished to determine the precise nature of the problems and the steps which the Public Health Service was taking to resolve these problems. On the basis of this report, available for all to read in the record of the hearings, the committee is convinced that the Public Health Service has evolved a sound framework of organization, policy, operating philosophy, and procedure absolutely essential to the effective administration to the Government's major research effort devoted to the health and well-being of its people.

It is evident, also, that most of the significant changes have stemmed from a continuing and ceaseless process of self-scrutiny and evaluation by the National Institutes of Health in the interest of improving its administration of its nationwide grant programs. Policies and procedures are now embodied in a "manual of grant administration" to guide institutions and their scientists in the proper use of grant funds. In transmitting this manual to grantee institutions, NIH has asked for a formal report of the steps being taken and the systems which will be followed in carrying out the guides set forth in the manual.

The committee is pleased with the progress which NIH has made in specifying the conditions and the restrictions governing the use of public funds.

But there is another—and I believe, equally important—facet to the general problem of administering the NIH grant programs. As the Members of this House must know, these programs have been widely praised over a period of years by scientists both here and abroad. NIH programs have been praised precisely because while stimulating productive research to meet national needs, they have maintained conditions which have safeguarded academic freedom and have nourished the spirit of productive scientific inquiry.

I for one would be thoroughly aroused if in our effort to correct a knock in the engine, we stall permanently the vehicle of scientific progress. Arbitrary and unduly rigid restrictions may thwart the progress of medical research by imposing straitjacket limitations upon scientific freedom and flexibility in the conduct of research, by saddling institutions with unreasonable and distracting administrative burdens thereby forcing an inordinate expansion of administrative staffs and processes both in the universities and at NIH. Mindful of these real and present dangers, the committee in its report has admonished the NIH against a response to criticism so overzealous that conditions favorable to free scientific inquiry and to scientific productivity are endangered.

Over the years, the committee has also recognized the imperative necessity to maintain a dynamic balance between the support for current research and for the resources—manpower and facilities—required for the future. The training programs of the National Institutes of Health have contributed substantially to assuring an adequate supply of highly qualified researchers. In this connection, the passage of H.R. 12 is especially gratifying because it will help to enlarge the resource base for all of the health professions with patient care, community service, for research and for teaching.

Mr. Chairman, if I may digress for a moment, I wish to take this opportunity to commend my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas, OREN HARRIS, for his wisdom, his courage, and his peerless leadership in securing the passage of H.R. 12.

I would also like to pay special tribute to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS] of the same committee.

The courage, wisdom, tenacity, and foresight exhibited by my esteemed colleagues is in the finest tradition of their predecessors, Percy Priest and Charles Wolverton. These men have blazed the trail in providing a sound statutory base aimed at meeting the health needs of the American people, as these needs have transcended State boundaries and entered the domain of the national interest.

In so doing, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has shaped and guided the basic legislation governing all activities of the Public Health Service, including the statutes which broadly define the missions of the National Institutes of Health and prescribe the manner in which these missions shall be pursued. Bearing in mind the amply documented legislative history of congressional intent and the resultant framework of clear-cut and foresighted statutory authority, we have subjected the NIH budget to a thorough and searching review.

As health needs have changed and as new exceptionally promising scientific opportunities have been identified by scientists and expert witnesses, the Appropriations Committee has sought to exercise its best judgment on the firing line, within the sound legislative base provided by the substantive committees of the Congress.

For example, in March 1955, in its report on the appropriation bill for 1956, the committee stated:

> A great and a growing problem in this country is the problem of the mentally retarded children. It is estimated that there are from 3 to 5 million American children who fall in this category, yet the problem has gone almost unnoticed by the leaders in education and in medical research. So little attention has been paid to the problem that we have only the haziest notion of what percentage of the unfortunate children, of at least equally unfortunate parents, could be helped medically and through educational techniques fitting their needs, so that they could lead useful and satisfying lives.

That year, 1955, the committee recommended and the Congress appropriated funds over the budget to launch research in this field. Since then, NIH scientists and grantees have discovered a way to detect one of the known causes of mental retardation during the first 2 weeks of life. More important, these children can develop normally with proper dietary treatment if the biochemical deficiency is detected during these first few weeks of life. This new knowledge, when applied, will insure that thousands of newly born children every year will be enabled to experience the joys of a normal life; will no longer be condemned to the twilight existence of retardation. To achieve this objective as speedily as possible, the appropriation for 1964 includes funds for a program which will demonstrate the detection technique and method of dietary treatment.

I am proud to be able to report such progress; I am proud that the leadership of this House in appropriating funds for medical research has made possible such a heartwarming contribution to the health and well-being of generations yet unborn. I am equally proud of the committee's responsiveness to the need for improving the health and well-being of our present population—190 million strong.

The committee has listened with great care while leading scientists have identified needs and opportunities for improving the health of the American people through research. The committee's reports, year after year, have identified specific problems or approaches for increased emphasis. These reports have urged action in areas such as mental retardation, cancer chemotherapy, speech and hearing defects, psychopharmacology, cystic fibrosis, and cardiovascular diseases. The budget proposed for NIH for 1964 continues the tradition of aiming at very specific and important goals, as well as providing a sound, basic underpinning for the broad spectrum of biomedical research. I wish to emphasize that the committee in its report this year has encouraged the NIH to proceed rapidly in breakthrough areas and to move ahead with cooperative studies such as those designed to first, determine the feasibility of lowering cholesterol in the diet; second, carry out intensive investigations of viruses suspected as causes of human cancer; and third, utilize the combined resources of Government, academic institutions, and industry, in the national vaccine development program to speed the development of vaccines against the common cold and other viral respiratory diseases.

The bill before you includes a total appropriation of $962,454,000 for the National Institutes of Health. This amount is $18 million less than the $980,454,000 requested in the President's budget. Nevertheless, the bill does provide an increase of $70,146,000—about 8 percent above the 1963 appropriation of $892,308,000.

However, I would be less than candid if I did not set forth for the record some of my reservations. This is substantially less than the professional judgment budget which the responsible science administrators deem essential for continued progress in the fight against disease and for the advancement of the Nation's health. Quite frankly, I feel a sense of uneasiness about the cutback in funds for the excellent clinical research center program. And, as the committee has already indicated in its report, we are much concerned that the level of funding for the construction of health research facilities is falling far behind national needs. This is true despite the fact that this bill provides the maximum amount authorized by Public Law 87-838.

During the year ahead, NIH will be evaluating the feasibility of large-scale, all-out collaborative studies to accelerate the discovery of new knowledge and to speed up its application through effective therapy. And NIH will be adjusting to the organizational changes occasioned by the creation of two new Institutes and a new Division of Research Facilities and Resources. Taking these special circumstances into account, it is the committee's considered judgment that the bill provides an adequate level of funds for 1964.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman from Alabama would just like to compliment the gentleman from Rhode Island and his committee on this bill.

The gentleman and his committee has done a splendid job, and the gentleman and his committee is due the plaudits and the credit of this House.

Mr. Chairman, I would like especially to commend the gentleman on the funds which have been provided for accident prevention and for air-pollution control, and for carrying out the construction of the new Child Health Institute and also in the field of educational television.

The gentleman knows that I have the honor to handle the authorizing legislation for these programs. We are delighted to see these items in the bill.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. ULLMAN. I am greatly concerned about the water-pollution problem and have an interest in certain matters that are being developed. I assume that the gentleman from Rhode Island went thoroughly into the matter of water-pollution control, as he does into every item, and that there was justification for these cuts. Does the gentleman anticipate that this will in any way stop the great progress we have been making in water pollution in the country?

Mr. FOGARTY. No. It was the feeling of the committee that it would not. It does not cut out part of the program, but merely slows it down a little bit. It does slow it down to some extent in the large river basin studies throughout the country.

Mr. ULLMAN. It does not in any way act as an indication on the part of the committee that the committee is displeased at all with the progress being made in the water pollution program?

Mr. FOGARTY. No, it does not. I think it was the consensus of the committee that we need to be spending a substantial amount of money in this area and will have to continue to do so for a long time to come.

Mr. FOGARTY. Going on to the other items in the bill; the committee has approved a change in the type of appropriation requested for St. Elizabeths Hospital. While it will mean no great change in the cost to the District of Columbia or to the Federal Government the change is somewhat complicated and is explained in detail in the committee report. In essence it involves a change to an indefinite appropriation for St. Elizabeths Hospital but with a limitation placed on their budget. This limitation is $27,413,000 which compares with estimated obligations of $25,617,000 for the current year, or an increase of $1,796,000 of which over $1,500,000 is for mandatory cost increases.

In the Social Security Administration the significant change from the budget is for grants to States for public assistance. For this purpose, the bill includes $2,275 million, a reduction of $175 million from the request, and $13,300,000 from the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1963. It is quite obvious that if there are as many ineligibles, proportionately, on the welfare rolls as was indicated by a study made in the District of Columbia, a considerably larger cut could have been made in this appropriation.

Other factors which could indicate that certain savings could be made in the program are the new rehabilitation features which are aimed at removing welfare recipients from the rolls and anticipated slight improvement in the unemployment situation during the coming year and an improvement in the general welfare administration under the liberalized training program that has been incorporated into the program financed by this appropriation. On the other hand, those who should be experts in the field, testified that they feel sure that the situation in the District of Columbia is not at all typical, and that result from the rehabilitation and training program will be relatively slight for the next year or two. Whatever amount is required under the formulas prescribed in the Social Security Act will, of course, have to be provided. However, it is the opinion of the committee that the amount requested is more than will be required.

Considerable interest has been expressed in the new day-care center program which was budgeted in the appropriation request for the Children's Bureau. The committee has provided the full amount requested for this and other programs of the Children's Bureau with the exception of $57,000 that was budgeted for an increase in allowance for overhead in connection with research grants.

The remainder of the bill includes several relatively small changes from the budget and from fiscal year 1963 appropriations which are explained in the report. The only remaining change which involves a rather large percentage of the request is that made in the budget for juvenile delinquency and youth offenses. The committee allowed $6,700,000 of the $13,200,000 requested. The reduction of $6,500,000 represents the funds requested to finance projects after fiscal year 1964. The committee has followed its past policy in disallowing funds for such forward financing.

In closing I would simply like to repeat that this bill is, as usual, a compromise but in my opinion it is a good compromise. I believe that this same opinion is shared by others on the committee, for we do have a unanimous report. Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill and deserves the support of the House. I hope that it passes without amendment.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] and the members of this committee on H.R. 5888. This bill represents a reduction in the budget of $309.5 million below the 1964 budget estimates submitted by the executive branch. It also represents a reduction of $118.8 million below the actual appropriations for 1963 for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare and related agencies.

This bill provides an answer to those who accuse the Congress of doing nothing about our problems and also a response to those who accuse the Congress of financial irresponsibility.

In this one bill, we have provided substantial sums for such important areas of public need as the control of disease and the investigation of its causes, nursing services, hospital construction activities, air pollution, public assistance, education of the blind and surplus property utilization.

Of particular interest to the State of Connecticut is the provision of $5 million for educational TV facilities. In spite of a substantial increase in this field and in other new areas however, the bill constitutes a reduction not only in the budget estimate, but what is more important, over last year's actual appropriations.

I congratulate the chairman and the committee and I will support this bill with enthusiasm.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank my colleague.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DENTON. I congratulate the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] who serves as chairman of this committee. I assure him it has been a pleasure to serve with him on this committee. He has an intimate knowledge of all the details of this bill and has put in many long hours so as to be able to bring out all the facts to justify the various appropriations involved here, and while I do not agree with all that is in the bill, I think, overall we have a good bill.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank my colleague.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BAKER. With reference to the funds for medical aid to the aged under what is known as the Kerr-Mills program, I do not find any breakdown. Of course, you show the breakdown to the States under public assistance, but I do not find any breakdown otherwise.

Mr. FOGARTY. There is not any breakdown in the bill, but in the bill there are sufficient funds to provide the amount that was requested, which was about $200 million I believe, and an increase from about $150 million in 1963. Each of the past 3 years it has been increasing up to the point where I think the budget now is about $200 million for this purpose.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAIRD. The figures for 1962, 1963, and 1964 as far as the Kerr-Mills program are to be found on page 251 of the hearing record. The total cost of this particular program is estimated at $209,500,000 for fiscal year 1964. On page 856 this program is broken down State by State as far as the Kerr-Mills program is concerned, and also the regular medical program under old-age assistance.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank my colleague.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to compliment the gentleman from Rhode Island on presenting this bill to the House. The gentleman and his committee have always brought a good bill to the floor of the House and today, as always, he has done a remarkable job in explaining the bill to our colleagues. In paying this compliment to the gentleman, I would join all the Members on both sides of the aisle.

I think, Mr. Chairman, this is a good place to point out one of the really great agencies with which this committee deals, and that is the Social Security Administration. I am sure practically every Member of the House of Representatives has had dealings with the Social Security Administration.

This agency performs a very difficult job and has employees throughout all of the 50 States of the Union. I know of no agency in the Government that is as kind and as considerate to the people who visit their offices as the Social Security Administration. The statistics which have been detailed in your hearings on page 719 indicate the fantastic workload that is taken care of by this agency of Government and the job that it does. I think its efficiency and productivity in the past year has increased greater than in any other agency of Government.

Mr. Chairman, I want to tip my legislative hat to the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration, Mr. Robert M. Ball, and also to Victor Christgau who is Executive Director of the Social Security Administration and all the employees who work for this great and important arm of our Government.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank my colleague.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join my colleagues in expressing my personal appreciation to the chairman of the subcommittee for his usual outstanding job of summarizing the important parts of this bill and explaining to us some of the very substantial cuts that have been put into effect.

I was personally a little bit concerned so far as the effect upon water-pollution control and the waste-treatment programs when the gentleman said that there would be some slowdown in that work. I know in our section of the country, thanks to the leadership of the gentleman from Rhode Island and others in that field, there has been a great new awareness of the need for accelerating the fight against water pollution and the need for working out better ways to take care of the problems that we are confronted with in this regard in the Middle West.

To me it is rather distressing to hear that there is going to have to be a slowdown in this direction. Just how much of a slowdown do you think it will be in the overall?

Mr. FOGARTY. I cannot give a direct answer to that particular question. This is a $2 million cut, and is applied to the large river basin studies. It is a real cut. We have many cuts applied throughout the bill. But $2 million out of $30 million certainly is not to be considered drastic.

Mr. EDMONDSON. There is a pretty considerable volume of projects awaiting Federal participation, is there not?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes, there is.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Do we understand the gentleman to say that there had been a cutback in funds for research and various studies such as the study of the natural behavior or interpersonal relationships of husband and wife, things of that sort?

Mr. FOGARTY. These were gone over in the committee. Some of these things were mentioned by the gentleman a year ago and 2 years ago.

Mr. GROSS. But there has been a cutback in funds for this purpose. Is that correct?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes. Some of the members of the committee have asked questions similar to those asked by the gentleman this year, last year, and 2 years ago.

Mr. GROSS. In other words, we can be assured that we are not going to waste more funds on this kind of foolishness.

Mr. FOGARTY. In the field of research there are a number of things I do not understand myself. They are given peculiar names, but many that sound peculiar turn out to be good, very good, 4 or 5 years afterwards. But to answer the gentleman, this matter was discussed in the committee and we have an explanation of these projects in the hearings.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad some of these studies ripen with age.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. HALEY. This is, however, one of the fastest growing departments of the Federal Government. The appropriations today are about 5 times what they were in 1957 and 1958.

Mr. FOGARTY. It is one of the fastest growing agencies and has done the most good of any agency I know of in the Federal Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Rhode Island has consumed 35 minutes.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, the bill that we have before us today appropriates funds to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Department of Labor. It contains $5.4 billion in direct appropriations, but many times we overlook the other public funds that these departments are authorized to spend—the so-called trust funds.

In addition to the $5.4 billion we authorize in this bill for expenditure during fiscal 1964, these agencies will spend $22,132 million from the so-called trust funds account. The largest part of that authorization for expenditure, of course, is in the social security trust fund. Then there are other trust funds such as the railroad retirement fund and the unemployment compensation trust fund.

An expenditure limitation is established in the bill for salaries and expenses of these various agencies but, in addition, they are authorized to spend vast sums from these trust accounts, during fiscal year 1964, for payments to beneficiaries. So we are really considering here an expenditure program in excess of $28 billion in fiscal year 1964. This is the largest bill, with the exception of the defense appropriation bill, that will be considered by the House of Representatives in this session of Congress.

If you will look over the President's budget document for 1964, you will find in that document summary tables of estimates of obligations and expenditures from the general revenues of the Treasury.

The total new obligational requests for the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare and Labor and related agencies in the President's budget transmission is over $7.7 billion.

Some of you may ask why does our report show only $5,759 million being requested when the budget transmission of the President of the United States called for this much higher figure.

One reason is that there are a few programs that come under the jurisdiction of other subcommittees but the main reason for that is that in the budget transmission of the President, when he requested this Congress for $108 billion of new obligational authority for fiscal year 1964, he included in that budget transmission a total of over $1,700 million worth of programs that are covered in legislation which he was requesting this session of Congress to enact.

It is impossible, of course, for our committee to consider this $1,700 million estimate, which is part of the obligational requests, because the authorizations have not passed. It is important, I think, if we are going to make substantial reductions in "New obligational authority" requests of the President, to bear in mind that there will be transmitted, if the various bills requested by the President for new programs are enacted into law—and I hope that will not be true—requests for $1,700 million in new obligational authority to be added to this budget we are considering today.

What are some of those new programs?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to run through some of the programs pending before the Congress that will, if enacted by Congress, result in these new requests for funds in the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare and Labor.

Among the new programs which the President seeks to have authorized in this Congress, there is the Youth Employment Opportunities Act, and the effect upon this budget, if that bill passes, is $100 million in new funds—in new obligational authority in fiscal 1964.

For "Payments to school districts," the legislation that is presently pending before the Committee on Education and Labor to extend the present formula for aid to federally impacted school districts, including construction, totals another $254 million in requests we will receive for "New obligational authority."

In addition to that, there is H.R. 3000 pending before the Committee on Education and Labor. That particular bill adds a total of $1,215 million of new obligational authority for fiscal 1964. That is not included in this bill, but it is part of the "New obligational authority" request carried in the President's $108 billion budget.

In addition to that, there is the new hospital construction program pending before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the medical education program which has recently passed the House of Representatives but has not been passed by the Senate. In that particular area we find about $100 million of authority to appropriate funds, which is not reflected in the bill which we have before us today.

Running through these programs we find that we have legislation pending for payments for military service credits to the social security program which would amount to $63 million in new obligational requests if this legislation is enacted into law.

In addition to that, we have payments of military service credits to the railroad retirement fund, and this particular request amounts to $11,658,000.

We have legislation pending in the House of Representatives to authorize a new program for maternal and child health services. For that particular program, if authorized, "New obligational authority" would be increased by an additional $17 million in 1964.

I go through a few of these to show you that these new programs, new programs to be started in this session of the Congress, if the requests of the President are affirmatively acted upon by the House and the Senate, would add to this bill an additional $1.7 billion in fiscal 1964 if fully funded.

Mr. Chairman, this bill has been cut by 5.3 percent. I read on the news ticker a few minutes ago that there are some people questioning one of the cuts made in this bill that has to do with grants to States for public assistance. We have a survey going on throughout the United States which has been financed through our committee. The first survey was made here in the District of Columbia, and we found that payments were being made illegally to as high as 50 percent of the recipients under that program. In the spot checks which have been so far completed throughout the United States, we have found in some sections that those on relief roles, but not eligible to receive payments, are running as high as 10 percent in one State to 14 percent in another. We have found that Federal officials carrying on this particular program have been pressuring some of the States to change their definitions as far as eligibility is concerned.

Mr. Chairman, we have found that in the State of Michigan, which has had no program for aid to dependent children of unemployed fathers, when the legislature went forward and enacted a program, the administration here disqualified that program because it was not liberal enough.

I find in my own State, increased costs because of undue centralization of rulemaking and the administrative powers. Along this line I include in the RECORD a resolution I received very recently.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION 3

Resolution rescinding rulemaking powers, State department of public welfare

Whereas under section 46.22, Wisconsin statutes, there is hereby created a county department of public welfare; and

Whereas, in Waupaca County, using round figures, we have an expenditure of over $788,000 a year; and

Whereas the local taxpayers have to raise for the county's share of the above appropriation upward of $125,000 to carry out this welfare program; and

Whereas, due to Federal and State aids under this welfare program they, the Federal and State Governments, set up rules and regulations governing the county welfare department; and

Whereas, this leaves practically no voice in the matters of the county welfare departments by the local governing bodies; and

Whereas, in the opinion of the attorney general of 1957, book No. 46, on page 139, the last three paragraphs reads as follows: "The matter of hiring and firing county welfare department employees, therefore, has been pretty effectively removed from the direct control of the county board of supervisors," (44 O.A.G. 262, 266).

For the like reasons, the matter of wages of county welfare department employees is beyond the direct control of the county board of supervisors.

The State department of public welfare has established rules and regulations for the fixing of salaries of employees in the county welfare department (Wis. Adm. Code, PW–PA 10, secs. 10.04 and 10.25–10.30); and

Whereas, the salaries paid to county welfare department employees are so out of proportion to salaries paid other county employees having comparable the same or even a greater responsibility; and

Whereas, with these existing conditions, under present laws the local governing bodies do not have any control, as stated by the attorney general, and this is very unfair to the local units of government; and

Whereas, generally speaking, all legislators seem to go along with the State department of public welfare and continue to give them more rulemaking powers, etc., which is entirely wrong for the operation of good government; and

Whereas, you cannot have a merit system plan on a statewide level and be fair to the smaller counties and the taxpayers that are paying the bills for local, State, and Federal Governments: So be it

Resolved, That the legislators take necessary action to eliminate this unfairness immediately, and return these administrative powers to the local governing bodies where they so rightfully belong; and be it further

Resolved, That the legislators in Federal and State Governments enact laws to make this Federal and State aid programs more flexible, so as local units of government can function more economical, without being dictated to by the Federal and State Governments; be it still further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by our county clerk to all legislators of the Federal and State Governments representing our county, district, and State, also the county boards association.

Mr. Chairman, these particular programs are to be administered by the States and financed through a State-Federal matching program. There is no reason why they will have to come back to the Federal Congress, under any one of these programs, for more funds. There are sufficient funds in the bill for every program that is presently authorized.

No additional funds will be needed if there is proper administration of these programs in each of the States. Certainly, the surveys that have thus far been conducted, the one completed in the District of Columbia and the spot checks that have been made in other States in this Nation, would lead any reasonable person to decide that the amount of money provided in this bill is more than enough to adequately take care of those individuals who are truly in need under this program.

Mr. Chairman, we heard some discussion when the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] was speaking about a so-called slowdown in the water pollution program. There is no slowdown, as far as the water pollution program is concerned, proposed in this bill. The amount of money made available for waste treatment works construction in this bill is $90 million, the same level that was provided for in 1963. We merely provided the Federal funding level that we provided in the 1963 program, $90 million.

Mr. Chairman, there are many of us on both sides of the aisle who have serious questions as to whether the construction of sewage treatment plants is a proper responsibility of the Federal Government. If there is any question in this bill it is not whether enough money has been appropriated but how much too much has been recommended for appropriation as far as sewage treatment plant construction is concerned.

Mr. Chairman, let us just look at this so-called slowdown that was referred to by the gentleman from Oklahoma. Not only are we providing the same amount of money that was provided in 1963 for sewage treatment plants and related construction in this bill, but, also, in the accelerated public works program, under the first $400 million that we appropriated last year, $44 million of that went into this type of construction.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the other day in the supplemental appropriation bill we appropriated another $450 million for the accelerated public works program. Of that $450 million, if it is approved, and it looks like it will be, of that $450 million additional appropriation for the accelerated public works program, they have earmarked $71,750,000 for construction of waste treatment works. So, let us not kid ourselves about slowing down this program as far as Federal appropriations are concerned.

Mr. Chairman, I did not support the legislation for this program, and I do not believe that the Federal Congress has had a responsibility in this area. But the charge that was made that this program is being slowed down by the cut in the President's budget of $10 million is absolutely ridiculous.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I am happy to yield to my colleague from Washington.

Mr. WESTLAND. I have had several inquiries from friends of mine at home concerning the mental retardation program, and they have asked me to support legislation which is now before the Senate and before the House concerning, I believe, a $35 million program initially with an additional $10 million annually thereafter under some sort of matching arrangement. I have not had the opportunity to study the legislation. Can the gentleman tell me what this bill provides in the field of mental retardation?

Mr. LAIRD. I should be very happy to supply the gentleman with the figures that we have on appropriations for programs in the field of mental retardation.

Let me state first that there is a bill pending to authorize a new program in the field of mental retardation. Personally, I think we have plenty of legislation on the statute books to take care of the problem of mental retardation. The authorizing legislation in this field is so broad now that it covers a dozen programs in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I do not believe any new legislation is needed, but let us look and see what we are providing in this bill in the field of mental retardation.

In this bill we are appropriating approximately $80 million for programs in the area of mental retardation. This includes grants to the States.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt the gentleman? I know many States—the State of Washington and I believe the gentleman's State of Wisconsin—already have programs in effect. Does the appropriation in this bill implement those State programs?

Mr. LAIRD. Yes; and some of them are on a matching basis. The grand total of funds as far as this program is concerned is in the area of some $80 million for the fiscal year 1964. From trust funds we also authorize $75 million to be spent in this general field. This program is being increased in the National Institutes of Health.

Mr. WESTLAND. These are not just programs for the NIH?

Mr. LAIRD. Oh, no. These are not just programs for the NIH.

These include the State programs, Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, Office of Education—just about all the Department's major agencies. NIH has the basic responsibility in the area of medical research in mental retardation. We have some very outstanding programs being carried on and funding in that area, and they are being substantially increased in this particular bill.

Mr. WESTLAND. Is it the gentleman's opinion that the funds appropriated in this bill will implement the President's Commission that made the report on mental retardation?

Mr. LAIRD. Yes, I believe this will implement the President's Commission's report. I do feel, however, as far as the President's Commission's report is concerned that that Commission did not give enough recognition to many of the things that are presently being carried on in the field of mental retardation.

Our committee report refers to this. We are somewhat critical of the failure of the Commission to take into account the programs that the Congress has already started in this area and has been funding. I would refer the gentleman to page 8 of our report where the subject is discussed in some detail.

Mr. WESTLAND. I want to thank the gentleman for elucidating on this problem.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, this is the first time since I have been on this subcommittee, and I have worked on this subcommittee since the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was created, that we have come in with any reductions as far as the National Institutes of Health are concerned. This bill does reduce certain programs in the National Institutes of Health. I believe that the Congress is making a step in the right direction by exercising better control over these programs.

It is assumed that as far as the National Institutes of Health are concerned there will be substantial increases added by the other body. Last year I brought the conference report on this bill back in disagreement and made a motion to recommit the conference report because of the tremendous additions that were placed in this bill when it reached the other side of the Capitol. We lost that rollcall vote last year by some 17 votes. The other body undoubtedly will add in the area of the National Institutes of Health as they have done every year for many years. I hope that this year, if the other body will not yield to our position, that we will be able to get those 17 votes that we lost last year and keep this program at an adequate but proper level as is proposed in the bill now before the House.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SNYDER. I have a question in regard to the decrease of some $200 million in the payments to school districts and assistance for school construction under the 1963 appropriation, as shown on page 55 of the committee report. That is because of the impacted area bill, is that correct?

Mr. LAIRD. That is correct. That is one of the items that is pending before the Committee on Education and Labor.

It is part of the President's original request of $7.7 billion but it could not be considered by our committee because it has not been authorized. I hope there are modifications in that program and that the same formula that is presently used is not continued.

Mr. SNYDER. But it would be reasonable to presume that if the authorization for that program does come out of that committee, then the total provided by this bill as compared with 1963, when you get the supplemental appropriation in, would exceed 1963?

Mr. LAIRD. That is true. It does exceed 1963 in the President's recommendation. We cannot show that here, though, because that program has not been authorized. It is part of the $1,700 million of programs still pending. As far as that program is concerned, it should be drastically revised, in my opinion, because we are spending tremendous amounts of money in the area around Washington, D.C., that are not justified. It seems to me that program should be limited somewhat.

Mr. SNYDER. I know the gentleman as a member of the subcommittee is opposed to that, but in this bill in the same items for 1963, not including items left out such as the impacted areas, would it be a bigger bill than 1963?

Mr. LAIRD. You would have a much bigger bill than 1963. I want you to understand that very clearly. If all of these requests are approved by the Congress, if H.R. 3000 is approved, and if the impacted areas bill is approved, and the others I mentioned, you would have a bill that is $1,600 million more than in fiscal year 1963.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say that I have listened to the gentleman's analysis of this bill with great interest. He has given the House information which I think should be given on every bill that comes before this House.

I commend the gentleman for his part in reducing this budget by $309 million. I commend the membership of the entire committee for bringing to this House a good bill. I am sure the membership of the House will agree that this is a good bill after hearing our able chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], explain the bill and then the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD]. I only hope that when the bill is passed by the other body and goes to conference that the House figures will prevail substantially.

Mr. LAIRD. I thank the gentleman from Iowa for his comments.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, before going into the matter that I have prepared to speak on here today I should like to say I think this committee has done an excellent job in these cuts of $309 million, as I think some of the other committees also have done excellent jobs on their cuts, and cuts that have been made on this whole budget that the President said "could not be cut." We have now had cuts of 9 percent on one bill, 2 percent in another, 12 percent in another, and now 5¾ percent on this bill, which demonstrates I think very clearly that budgets can be cut, and I think also demonstrates the fact that people are beginning to hear from the folks back home, and the people of this Nation want budget cuts and there are going to be some cuts, and they are going to be very substantial by the time this session is over.

I should like to express the appreciation of those of us who have accepted some responsibility here to cut the budget.

Mr. Chairman, the matter I had intended to speak on today and which I had mentioned on the floor of the House last week is a matter that has to do with the U.S. Employment Service and the State employment services that are now creating a manpower monopoly. This is a matter that has nothing to do with any criticism of this committee, may I say hurriedly, nor is it in criticism of anyone in the Congress. But I think it is time that this House began to take a look at this agency and what they are doing with the dollars that are being appropriated for them and try to get them back on the track as to what they ought to be doing.

As I said the other day, I think the most important thing facing the Nation today is the question of unemployment. We should make every effort we can to see that people get back into permanent employment. It seems to me that the State employment agencies and the U.S. employment agency have this responsibility. But they are not working with the unemployed to the extent I think they should and to the extent to which this Congress is making appropriations.

USES—MANPOWER MONOPOLY

Mr. Chairman, I have here a classified advertisement from the Cleveland Plain Dealer listing a number of very desirable professional positions for which help is wanted.

The first item on the list is for a professional open-hearth superintendent who is willing to locate in Argentina where there is a job that would pay $23,754 per year.

Dropping down an item, there is an offer of $14,000 per year for a job analyst and trainer who is willing to relocate in Tanganyika, Africa, and someone in Florida wishes to hire an administrator at $12,000 per year.

I call your attention to this advertisement only because I was astonished to learn that the Ohio State Employment Service is recruiting for positions of this kind. It is unlikely that people capable of filling these positions are unemployed, and, even if they were, they should be in a position financially and educationally to conduct their own job research. Yet here was an advertisement costing some $85 of public funds to recruit highly talented individuals for a number of well-paid positions including one in South America and one in Africa.

This and other advertisements of similar nature led me to make inquiries which have revealed that 60 percent of the people who were placed by the State agencies connected with the U.S. Employment Service last year were people already employed.

Only 40 percent of those placed were unemployed.

In short, I find that the Employment Service no longer is primarily interested in serving the unemployed, the function for which the agency was established.

Instead, it is building a new empire of service to the employed and to business and industry that is in search of skilled and professional people.

At a time when everyone in and out of Government agrees that unemployment is the principal economic and social problem of the day, the agency that has always been charged with helping the unemployed to find work has turned its back on them.

While an administration elected to office on the promise to cure unemployment still struggles unsuccessfully to find a cure, the Employment Service is head over heels in the business of college placements, professional placements, recruiting to fill labor shortages and related activities for people who already have jobs or who certainly do not need the aid of the U.S. Government or of the 50 States in order to find jobs.

The Cleveland advertisement is no isolated example.

I have here a scrapbook several inches thick showing examples of expensive classified advertising placed by the various State employment services, in line with the policy dictated by the USES here in Washington, advertising professional and skilled positions. Also included in this scrapbook are the advertisements placed by these agencies in the yellow pages of the phone books of the Nation, and I have another scrapbook equally heavy that is filled with examples of the expensive brochures and pamphlets pointing out that the Employment Service is a placement agency for better jobs for those who already are employed.

The Ohio advertisements claim that there is "no charge for placement service" if you deal with Ohio State Employment Service. In some of the ads there is a legend proclaiming that "no fee is charged" or that it is a "no-fee agency."

Let me point out that the activities of this agency are supported by taxes levied against the employers of the Nation. These are public funds. And when the Ohio State Employment Service pirates a trained employee from an industry in order to give him a better job in that industry, it is conducting the operation on funds paid by the original employer and others who certainly never thought that the money they are required to pay by reason of the unemployment compensation laws will be used to pirate employees.

The Cleveland help wanted page reveals other aspects of this new bureaucratic empire.

It is no longer possible to register for work and receive your unemployment compensation check in the same place. No, indeed. The agency must now maintain two or three offices, in a sort of a class system that segregates the unemployed from the man who has a job.

For example, in Cleveland, according to this advertisement, the professional, clerical, and sales people who wish better jobs apply at an office at 623 St. Clair Street N. The industrial and service workers must go to an office at 2400 Euclid Avenue.

Another advertisement, this one from Akron, reveals that these superemployment agencies are very well staffed. I find that Mr. Jaqua will interview candidates for three positions listed in the ad. Mr. Nemeth is responsible for the next four. Mr. Hawkins will talk to you if you wish to fill a spot for an experienced linoleum layer. Repairmen see Mr. Quier. Applicants for 10 other jobs are advised to contact Mr. Cunnington. And for the women, Mrs. Martin, Mrs. Greer, Mrs. Smith, Mrs. Robinson, and Mrs. Sharkey will do the interviews. I submit that we do not need to use public funds to maintain a staff of these dimensions to help employed people in Akron find new jobs.

Mr. Chairman, the American people do not need a public agency to help employed people find better jobs. Employed people have been finding their own opportunities for advancement for many years, and if they need help they have available to them the expert services of many, many private free-enterprise personnel agencies.

It would be unbelievable, if we did not have the evidence at hand, that the USES and the 50 State agencies are engaged in a campaign to establish 1 central manpower agency to be in charge of all the hiring in the United States of America, and are determined to put the private enterprise agencies out of business.

If anyone doubts that last statement, may I say that this attitude was clearly expressed by Mr. Milton Davidson, of the Toledo, Ohio, office in a television interview. Asked if his agency were not in competition with private enterprise, Mr. Davidson replied:

> I have no compunction about competing with private employment agencies. I want to make it very uncomfortable for these fee-charging agencies.

And, may I add, as I develop this subject, I will give you evidence that the USES also has engaged in unwarranted competition with non-fee-charging agencies such as the placement boards of American colleges and universities.

NEGLECTING UNEMPLOYED

The evidence is clear that the U.S. Employment Service is cheating the unemployed who should be its primary concern. It has contributed nothing to the effort to find work for the unemployed and the solution to our pressing problems of unemployment. It is blissfully ignoring this problem while setting out to establish itself as the central manpower agency of our Nation, and I think we had better call a halt to this activity.

Mr. Chairman, I believe a review of the legislative history of the USES will support my contention that its primary responsibility is to find work for the unemployed.

Although USES was originally established in 1918, it was not until the Wagner-Peyser Act of 1933 that it became a vital and important agency.

Unfortunately, the language of this act is rather vague and general, giving the USES ample room for interpretation to support the ambitions of the empire builders. But if we keep in mind the conditions under which it was enacted and refer even casually to the reports and debates, it becomes clear beyond doubt that the intent of Congress was to establish an agency to help people who were out of work.

To see this legislation in historical perspective, one must remember that the great depression reached its depths in 1933. Nearly 13 million Americans—24.8 percent of the labor force—were without jobs.

Unemployment was the issue that gave everyone concern and it was the issue that Congress wished to meet with the enactment of the Wagner-Peyser Act. The intent of Congress is apparent in the report of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor which read:

> We have in the proposed bill, then, a Federal agency set up to work in the various States in cooperation with the State employment agencies for the purpose of reducing unemployment and for the purpose of stabilizing labor conditions throughout the States.

The report of the House committee said:

> In conclusion, the committee feels that the passage of this legislation will do much to bring about desired results in helping to relieve the unemployment situation through the country by providing employment services whereby the Federal Government and the States may work in harmony and avoid duplication of effort.

The same theme runs through many, many speeches in House debate.

My predecessor, Representative Thom, said:

> I feel very friendly to this legislation and I hope the system will be officered by men of vision and competency, so that it shall become not merely a system to provide a few jobs for employment agency clerks, but that

> the staff will consist of men who are principally interested in the solution of the problems of unemployment.

Representative Truax said:

> The greatest problem in all of our minds has been the unemployment problem.

Congressman Wood said:

> It is very necessary that some tribunal or some agency or instrumentality of government be set up that will systematically ferret out among various industries the jobs that will be suited to those who are unemployed who happen to be skilled in a certain line of employment. To my mind that is one of the greatest accomplishments of the legislation.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] said:

> Senator Wagner has labored long to bring this bill about. It was part of his original program to alleviate suffering and misery caused by unemployment and the displacement of labor by machinery.

Representative Condon said:

> The problem of unemployment is a permanent one in this country, in my opinion. For that reason I am happy to note that the Committee on Labor has brought back this bill that deals so fully with this problem.

Representative Weideman said:

> I hope the men who have been out of work longest will be given the first chance to secure employment under this bill.

Representative Cochran said:

> I do not think we can spend too much money to place unemployed in jobs.

Obviously, the intent of Congress in 1933 when it passed the Wagner-Peyser Act revitalizing the U.S. Employment Service was to find a solution to the unemployment problem. In 1934, a year after enactment of the legislation, a spokesman for the Employment Service described USES "as essentially the center of the National Recovery Act" and said that "only through the existence of a properly constituted Employment Service could effective placements be made in the tremendous public works projects inaugurated by the Federal Government." In line with this description and with the clear intent of Congress, the USES served primarily to find openings for unemployed persons during the remainder of that decade.

EMPIRE BUILDING

As I have indicated, the agency has now departed from its proper concern with the unemployed. The original purpose has been subverted without legislative action by an administrative interpretation on the part of the Department of Labor.

The degree to which congressional intent has been bureaucratically distorted is apparent from a recent letter written by Robert C. Goodwin, Director of the Bureau of Employment Security and Administrator of USES.

Mr. Goodwin states that the purpose of the Wagner-Peyser Act was "to give effect to public recognition of the need for an Employment Service to serve workers and employers in all industries in all sections of the country." If this is true, it is strange indeed that the legislation effecting that recognition mentions "employers" only in section 10 in connection with a Federal Advisory Council. In section 3 which delineates the purpose of the bill, the word "employer" is conspicuously absent.

Mr. Goodwin also maintains that the responsibility of the Employment Service is "to provide a placement service to everyone legally qualified to work regardless of whether they are employed or unemployed." While the phrase "legally qualified" comes verbatim from the language of the bill, the disclaimer about employment status is not to be found in the legislation.

Admittedly, the wording of the Wagner-Peyser Act is broad, but to read between the lines to the extent that Mr. Goodwin does is, to say the least, highly imaginative. Yet he must if he is to present any justification in law for the "Employment services activities" that I discussed in my opening remarks and on which I would like to enlarge.

Mr. Goodwin told the Appropriations Subcommittee in 1962:

> Our greatest effort this last year has been in initiating a major overall improvement and the buildup of the U.S. Employment Service.
>
> We feel that the local public employment office must of necessity be the focal point of the manpower efforts of the community. These manpower centers should be searching for and constantly aware of developments which are affecting employment and unemployment in a community.
>
> The local employment office should lead in mobilizing action on manpower problems of communitywide concern.
>
> They should collect and provide community leaders with occupational and labor market data for use in planning school curriculums and training of all types.
>
> Since late in the spring of 1961 we have been intensively engaged, as I have said, in improving the Employment Service. Last year this committee approved and Congress subsequently appropriated $26,421,000 to add another 4,100 positions in the Employment Service, and funds for another 169 positions in the Bureau.

This statement clearly indicates the tremendous recent growth of USES and suggests ominously the intent of USES to assume increasing control of the Nation's manpower allocation. Parenthetically, let me say that I am pleased the committee this year recommends no further expansion of the service.

ACTIVITIES OF USES

Although this agency makes public so little data on its operations that an exact determination of its recent activities is impossible, sufficient evidence is available to outline the story. It is relatively simple, as the following suggests, to see what USES is not doing.

The trend of the USES budget has been steadily upward and has skyrocketed in the last several years. The appropriation for fiscal year 1963 is roughly double that for 1957. Yet the expenditure of increasing amounts of money every year has done nothing to solve our basic labor-force problems. For example, the trend of unemployment is obviously upward and a particularly significant indicator, the average duration of unemployment, has more than doubled in the past decade.

In this period of a steadily worsening employment picture, the activities of the Employment Service are not keeping pace with the problems, let alone helping solve them. The number of placements made each year by USES has varied only slightly in the past 10 years with just about the same number of placements in 1962 as in 1953.

Obviously, USES is not devoting its rapidly expanding efforts to the true, top-priority problem of unemployment. If the USES is not devoting itself fulltime to the unemployed, it must be active in other areas of manpower allocation, as I have indicated earlier. To the extent that this is true, USES is building its new empire at the expense of the millions of American breadwinners who are without work and who have every right to expect first call on the services of this agency.

I have already stated that approximately 60 percent of the placements made by USES last year were of persons already employed who sought to better themselves. Mr. Goodwin is my authority for this statement. He has written that "three out of five new hires are employed workers changing jobs."

There is every reason to believe that this is the area in which USES wishes to continue to expand, and as I have indicated, it is doing so in many ways.

One of the projects it is pushing, instead of helping the unemployed, is an expanded professional placement service. Cloaked in the mantle of encouraging "the continuing development and progress of not only the United States but the entire free world," the Employment Service is busily recruiting applicants from scientific and professional fields, including nurses, teachers, engineers, and many others, to fill its rosters.

I have already mentioned the advertisements in Cleveland for professional persons to relocate in Africa and Argentina. This is only a sample of the kind of work USES is pushing at the expense of the unemployed. And, as I have said, the unemployed are not welcome, one may judge, in the separate offices to serve professional people that are being set up in new quarters suitably located and equipped. As it is explained in Employment Security Review for April 1962:

> The image of the Employment Service is also being changed by providing spacious, well-lighted, and well-furnished quarters which will be attractive to professional applicants.

Under the aegis of professional placement, USES has set up numerous nurses registries operating on a 24-hour basis, established centralized teachers' agencies, and, in general, made a tremendous effort to help those who should be most able to help themselves.

A special convention placement service has been organized in which USES personnel cooperate with a professional society to assist in the pirating of employees which frequently takes place at national conventions. The Service boasts:

> Over four dozen conventions of national societies have received convention placement services during recent years * * * 10 more are already scheduled for the coming year.

It lists as some of its objectives for the professional program:

> Approaching a greater number of professional people through their societies in an attempt to develop a more favorable impression of the Employment Service.
>
> Establish a more favorable attitude toward the Employment Service among those who are leaders in education, from the primary school through the university level.
>
> More active promotion of convention placement service, particularly with large organizations that have never used it.
>
> Stimulating employer relations programs to develop openings for professional people.
>
> Encouraging and supporting public relations activities of the States to enhance opportunities for professional people.

It is indeed difficult to see how these activities can do anything to help alleviate our sorry unemployment situation.

COLLEGE PLACEMENT

Another project currently being expanded by USES at the expense of the unemployed is in the area of campus recruiting. Traditionally handled satisfactorily by college placement offices in cooperation with corporate personnel representatives and the proper mechanisms of private enterprise, this field has been strongly invaded by the Employment Service.

The College Placement Council, Inc., reports:

> The U.S. Employment Service acting through State employment services and aided by the Department of Labor is moving strongly into the field of professional placement. This movement seriously threatens institutionally supported placement offices as they now exist.
>
> In addition, this movement has long-range political implications of State and Federal control of employment both professional and nonprofessional in the United States.

The council cites the example of California where several colleges "have sanctioned the California State employment service to take over their placements" and where legislation has been introduced "asking that all professional educational employment in the State of California be under the jurisdiction of the USES." Also singled out for comment is a university in Nebraska which "has the Nebraska Employment Service assign a full-time man to the campus to handle both placement and personnel."

The president of Brigham Young University, Ernest L. Wilkinson, reported in correspondence with the U.S. Chamber of Commerce:

> One of the State universities in Utah has partially abandoned its responsibility and privilege in the placement of college graduates. It did so by bringing a full-time USES staff member into the placement offices at no cost to the university.

Mr. Wilkinson is deeply disturbed about the larger problem of unwarranted growth of this Federal bureau and the degree to which it is taking over from private enterprise and from colleges responsibility in the field of personnel and placement, counseling and testing.

Concerned about this unwarranted invasion of the Nation's campuses, representatives of the College Placement Council have consulted at length with Labor Department officials.

Here is the Council's report:

> Officers of the U.S. Department of Labor, however, in three conferences with representatives of the College Placement Council, have remained inflexible in their determination: (1) That all college seniors shall be registered with the State employment agencies; (2) that State employment agencies shall be the sole judge as to whether a college placement office is providing adequate service or whether it is deemed to require supplementation by State employment agency personnel; and, (3) that all employers shall be offered a free recruiting service wherein State employment agency personnel would represent such employers for on-campus recruiting without revealing the identity of the prospective employer to the placement officer.

This monolithic, bureaucratic inflexibility can only be described as frightening in its nightmarish resemblance to the manpower methods of the Iron Curtain countries.

In the 1963 hearings, Mr. Goodwin was confronted with a letter from the president of the University of Rhode Island, which you may find on page 253 of the hearings, in which he related that he had been approached by a representative of the State employment service relative to using its facilities in lieu of the regular college placement service.

In commenting on the letter, Mr. Goodwin said:

> We have had a policy in the public employment service for many years that where there is a nonfee charging service available, we do not wish to compete with it. Our basic policy is that we do not want to put them out of business.

This statement is interesting for two reasons:

First, it contradicts what we know has been an effort by the various employment services, encouraged by Mr. Goodwin's agency, to compete with and in fact displace college placement services.

Second, by making plain that his agency does not wish to put the nonfee-charging agencies out of business, Mr. Goodwin is clearly leaving the door open for competition with the fee-charging agencies and I am certain from the mountains of evidence I have seen that it is his intention to put them out of business if he can.

RECRUITING

Another evidence of USES expansion into fields that can be of little or no assistance to the vast numbers of unemployed is the great importance that the services place on the recruiting function. The basic and most important manpower problem facing this country is a shortage of jobs, yet USES devotes a great deal of its efforts to recruiting job applicants—a strangely inverse approach to solving the unemployment problem.

Many articles in the Labor Department's Employment Security Review describe various techniques for insuring a fulsome flow of applicants into local employment offices. One details the effectiveness of public service radio announcements and gives step-by-step procedures for getting local radio stations to cooperate.

Incidentally, I should think that stations would be most unwilling to cooperate inasmuch as this same agency, spending literally millions on classified advertisements in the Nation's newspapers, refuses to pay for advertising on radio stations. This was called to my attention by a radio station manager in my district last fall and it was not until I received his complaint about the injustice of using only the newspapers for advertising that my interest in this new bureaucratic empire was aroused.

Another technique for insuring plenty of recruits is called closing the gate. This means that employers are persuaded to post conspicuous signs at their plant entrances stating that "applicants for employment will please apply to the State employment office." In this latter case, not only is USES actively recruiting applicants but also, to whatever extent this technique is successful, they are creating for themselves a monopolistic control of the local labor market.

The executive committee of the National Association of State Employment Officers has recommended:

> That the States be encouraged to (1) exercise all means to insure effective recruitment of job applicants including the use of paid advertising, and (2) adopt the practice of extending job placement service to all persons, regardless of their employment status.

And with all these applicants crowding into employment offices, the Massachusetts State Employment Service, which advertises itself as "the State's largest employment agency," made the United Press International wire service in February when it advertised for 200 additional people to join its staff as interviewers.

Of course, USES must also recruit employers who may have jobs available—not necessarily jobs that can be filled from the rosters of the unemployed, but jobs for engineers, managers, doctors or anyone at all. To this end, USES has a very active program to persuade employers to use the Employment Service for all their hiring. This involves special team visits to employers and other methods of persuasion, some soft-sell, others tougher.

One of my constituents visited by an Employment Service man who was harshly critical of private employment agencies became incensed, and rightly so at this newest Government encroachment on private enterprise. I hope there are many others who feel this way.

Another example is a circular letter distributed by the Massachusetts State Employment Service which begins:

> On your payroll—without charge—the largest, most experienced personnel department in this area.
>
> Yes, you do have a personnel department in your company. As a matter of fact, it's one of the best equipped, best staffed personnel departments in this area. It's your State employment office.

A more direct approach is evident in a notice to employers issued by a New York City union:

> As of Friday, October 19, 1962, local 11's employment office will be under the supervision of the New York State Employment Service.

> When requesting help, whether it be steady or temporary replacements, you must call the New York State Employment Service.
>
> Any deviation in securing help from the above procedure will be regarded as a violation of your contract.

One explanation of the USES frenzied search for job applicants may be found in a report issued in January 1963, on local labor shortages. The report cites 23,706 job openings across the country of which 13,469 are professional or managerial, 2,880 clerical and sales, and 4,691 skilled workers.

DANGEROUS DIRECTIONS

While this may reveal why USES wants applicants, the Service's preoccupation with labor shortages will certainly do little to help the millions of unemployed, most of whom fall into the service, semiskilled, and unskilled labor categories.

These, then, are some of the ways in which USES dilutes its efforts and cheats the unemployed of the Nation.

The expansion of the USES into the many fields I have described creates inequities which can no longer be ignored. They are:

First. Public money is used to help those citizens who are most able and should be most willing to help themselves, at the expense of those least able to help themselves.

Second. Money and effort is being diverted from the Nation's No. 1 manpower problem of unemployment to areas best described as "frills and extras" and to the empire builders of this bureau.

Third. The unemployed are placed in direct competition for whatever job openings exist with those already employed—a competition in which the unemployed, quite naturally, have the cards stacked against them.

Fourth. Inasmuch as the money financing USES comes completely from a payroll tax imposed on employers, employers are not only paying for a service to employees but in many cases are also paying an agency to pirate their personnel away to other jobs.

Fifth. But the biggest and most frightening problem presented by USES activities is found in its tendency toward establishing a Government monopoly in labor and employment matters affecting private enterprise.

There is a great deal of evidence that monopolistic control of the entire labor force is, in fact, the goal of the Employment Service under Mr. Goodwin's direction.

In an article entitled "The New USES Charts Its Course," appearing in Employment Security Review, we read:

> We must reorient our program thinking, widen our perspective, and greatly improve our operating effectiveness. We must operate as the manpower agency, concerned with all aspects of human resource development and utilization in the labor market and in the economy.
>
> It is intended that the employment office in each locality will become the community manpower center.

Commenting on this development, Nation's Business reported:

> If a new Washington plan succeeds, you might have to get that promising young college graduate you need by asking the Government for him. All it will take is a phone call to the nearest U.S. employment office.

The thinking and purpose that exists within the agency is revealed in remarks by Bernard Teets, director of the Colorado employment service:

> We are not living in a free-enterprise system, but rather operating under a controlled economy—

Mr. Teets has said.

> In 5 years, if we are not hampered by new restrictions and we can get adequate funds from Congress, we'll be handling 90 percent of the business—

Says Mr. Teets.

FEDERAL CONTROL

Inasmuch as the Employment Service is nominally a joint Federal-State program, one may ask how the centralized control necessary to a systematic monopolization of manpower allocation can be exercised. The answer is simple; the Federal Government authorizes state budgets in the area contingent on the State's meeting Federal standards. Consequently a State not playing the game according to the Labor Department rules quickly finds itself without funds. This is made amply clear in the minutes of a meeting of State employment service directors last fall:

> Mr. Teets raised a question of whether there was any real accomplishment in discussing the need for funds for State agency programs with the Bureau if the Bureau is going to continue a practice of using purse-string control to require the States to follow Bureau program direction.

This simple yet most effective form of control virtually eliminates the States from any determination of Employment Service policy and leaves Washington in the driver's seat.

I suggest that the Congress should use some of the same purse-string control to stop this misguided tendency in the Federal bureau.

If we do not, the agency will continue unchecked for, as the Ohio director has said, the State agencies are in no position to resist the pressures from the Federal Government.

If the Federal Government continues to consolidate its control of the Nation's manpower through USES, the consequences are not difficult to imagine. Naturally, it will mean less freedom for both employers and employees. If the Employment Service persuades a number of employees in a community to hire only through USES, a jobseeker no longer has freedom of application. He will be referred to an employer only on the bureaucratic whim of the Employment Service. Nor does the employer have access to the total labor market; he is confined to only those applicants referred by the Government agency. If USES is permitted to carry its program to its logical conclusion—if it can capture even 90 percent of the market as the Colorado director predicted—it will mean that few people if any can get a job without relying on a Government employee to refer them to an employer, and few employers, if any, can hire anyone unless he is referred by that same agency.

This Congress would never enact a law to give this agency such tremendous power over the Nation's manpower. The question is, are we going to let them take that power without legislative enactment, simply by doing nothing while continuing to hand out money to finance the takeover.

It is obvious that with employment controlled, the controlling agency has a de facto control of wages and wage levels on a nationwide scale.

It should now be ovious that an examination of the work of the USES, from any point of view, leads to two inescapable conclusions:

First, USES is cheating the Nation's unemployed by giving them less than half the effort the American people are paying for and that must be applied if the unemployment problem is to be solved.

Second, continuance of the present expansion of USES activities at the expense of the unemployed can only result in complete and absolute Government control of American manpower and its allocation.

Socialism is usually defined as Government control of the means of production. In American, as in all other societies, the basic means of production is the manpower of the nation. If the control of manpower and its allocation is to be assumed by the Federal Government, as seems to be clearly indicated by the evidence, the United States will finally succumb to socialism. The surrender of free enterprise and capitalism will be complete.

The truism that control of a nation's manpower provides absolute control of that nation has been a central fact in all totalitarian governments. For example, an early step in Castro's program to socialize Cuba was reported as follows:

> HAVANA.—Labor Minister Maj. Augusto Martinez Sanchez signed an order Saturday forcing all state and private enterprises in the Greater Havana area to hire help through his ministry after next Saturday, rather than hiring them freely as in the past.

Those of you who have read the "Consultation with John Santo," recently released by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, have a clear picture of how jobs are manipulated in Hungary, under the control of an agency that can require the employment, promotion or dismissal of any individual, and assign any individual to whatever job the government may desire.

One of the great safeguards of our Republic is the fact that in few, if any, fields of endeavor is there sufficient centralized control to make possible a complete takeover of power by anyone, left, right or otherwise. We have wisely resisted attempts to bring education, law enforcement, and many other areas of our society under a central control. This is a tremendous source of freedom and a tremendous obstacle to anyone who wishes to destroy our system. Certainly we cannot permit any agency to take over control of all, or even 90 percent, of the manpower assignments in our country.

For those who wish to develop this subject in more detail, and I think that every one of us would be well advised to do so, permit me to suggest some questions, developed out of the experience of personnel people all over the country, that will expose the entire development in all of its frightening details.

We may ask:

What percentage of the budget is being used for professional activity—the area in which unemployment is almost nonexistent, affecting industries where the employee is sorely needed?

How much of the budget is allocated to overtime for offices staying open evenings, both labor and indirect?

How much of the budget is allocated to advertising for and maintaining training classes for improving skills of those already employed?

How much, total or per placement, or both, is spent to serve employed persons?

Bearing in mind the President's request for tax cuts, what percentage of the fiscal year 1964 budget for USES is allocated only to placing and retraining the unemployed?

How much money is budgeted for preparation of applicant's work histories?

How much does it cost to make one permanent, white-collar administrative or professional placement?

How much has the annual budget for the USES and its State subsidiaries increased since 1950, during which period unemployment with minor variations has remained at almost 4 million to 4,500,000?

In the light of the above, how can Congress justify continued expansion of an activity which in 13 years has produced practically no measurable reduction in unemployment?

With the great debate as to the feasibility of a tax cut in the light of the mounting national debt, would it not be logical to repeal the Reed Act and return the surpluses now diverted to the expansion of the State employment services to the general fund as formerly, or directly to the reduction of the national debt?

What percentage of the people placed are already employed?

Why should the Government assume the cost of finding employed people other jobs?

Since 60 percent of the placements of the USES, by their own admission, are of employed persons who are fully able to finance their own job advancement, why should the USES budget not be reduced by a similar amount and relieve business of financing this expensive pirating of its own personnel?

Since the USES is a Government business operating in competition with private business and at its expense, should it not be required to operate on a break-even basis by charging employed persons for services and receiving a credit from unemployment compensation funds for those services performed for those receiving unemployment compensation?

Would it not be more effective in reducing unemployment to base the allocation of funds to individual State employment services on the basis of unemployment claimants placed—with placement being defined as having to last a minimum of 90 days?

Is the allocation of unemployment compensation tax funds to the placement of personnel compatible with their original purpose? Would it not be more appropriate to have these funds concentrated on the purpose of correcting or alleviating the unemployment problem than creating turnover for industry at its own expense?

A study by Northeastern University in 1955 indicated that only 7 percent of the unemployed in the study area found new jobs through the USES while 80 percent were obliged to find their own through personal contact or referral by friend or relative. All this at a time when the USES had them registered as claimants yet was concentrating upon the enlargement of its activity in the placement of employed personnel. Does this not seem inconsistent with a good business practice of reducing unemployment claimants and at the same time placing the most workers possible on tax-producing payrolls?

In 2 of the 7 Texas Employment Commission offices in Houston, there is 15,000 square feet to house 60 employees, or 250 square feet each. This is double what good office planning suggests for private industry. Does this not seem extravagant?

Why should the USES budget provide for allocations such as $100,000 for construction of a parking lot in Cincinnati, Ohio, and $10,900 for an addition to the parking lot at Youngstown, Ohio, providing free parking at the taxpayers' expense for job applicants, 60 percent of whom are already employed and capable of financing their own job advancement? Is there another $100,000 parking lot included in this year's budget?

Why is it necessary in a city such as Fort Wayne, Ind., to have oak-paneled offices with individually partitioned interviewing offices furnished in the latest, most modern manner?

Why is it necessary for the Government to provide offices in prime rental districts and expensively furnished to serve people seeking employment?

What is the average per square foot rental in professional division offices opened during the past year? What for next year? How much over or under the previous average?

Why is it necessary to have separate locations for different classes of employment and for filing claims when the basic goal of the employment service should be to help the unemployed?

Why is it necessary to travel from location to location—first to file a claim and then to seek work? Does this not involve duplication of staff and facilities as well as unnecessary expense to jobseekers?

Why cannot the USES handle clerks, machinists, pipefitters, salesmen, accountants, and engineers through the same employment office, the same as nearly all industry does, rather than have separate facilities, separate staffs and duplicate overhead?

Is it not inconsistent with the requirement that unemployment compensation claimants be actively seeking employment to qualify to separate claims and employment offices sometimes by many miles? Is it not a duplication of space and staff requirements and does it not leave a loophole for the unemployment malingerer and place a burden on the conscientious but unfortunate worker?

USES has justified itself by stating not enough private agencies exist to do an effective job in specialized and professional areas. Since the number of private agencies has increased substantially since 1946, is this not evidence that the need and the opportunity are being recognized and fulfilled through private initiative?

The Employment Security Review of April 1962, has stated:

> It is intended that the employment office in each locality will become the community manpower center.

Does this not have social and economic implications which far transcend the need for employment services furnished by the Government at taxpayers' expense?

Is it incumbent upon the laborer and low wage earner to be taxed to operate an employment service for highly paid, already employed executive and professional workers who are fully capable in every respect of handling and financing their own job advancement programs? And is it incumbent upon the small businessman to carry the recruiting burden of large firms who are urged to use the USES as their employment and recruitment department?

Is it a necessary expenditure of tax money to have 3 representatives in a city of 130,000 calling upon employers 5 days a week from 9 to 4 to seek employment openings for other taxpayers' employees?

The only evaluation of the effectiveness of USES has come from USES alone. Would it not be advisable to have an objective measurement by an outside source to evaluate actual performance against cost, for, when the test of economic feasibility cannot be met, should not limitations be applied?

Is it proper to advertise "no charge to applicant or employer" and imply this is a free service when both have paid generously through their taxes already and will continue to do so throughout their entire taxpaying life, even though no service was or ever will be requested or rendered?

Since there is but one office in a city to which a claimant must go to draw unemployment compensation, there is no need to run telephone directory or newspaper ads, nor to have expensive electric outdoor signs to direct him. Why, then, the advertising budget to carry out the obvious?

Would it not be more sensible to eliminate all public advertising for applicants and direct those funds toward the placement of the unemployed whose availability is a matter of record with the USES offices?

Why should the USES be advertised as a free service to employer and applicant when it is not free to either by virtue of its tax cost?

How much money is spent nationally advertising for applicants in classified newspaper columns during the past 12 months, breaking it down by States?

On what basis does the USES advertise and refer to itself as an employment agency, in Massachusetts, or in other States, when, in fact, it does not abide by or meet the criteria of State or local licensing laws for private employment agencies?

If the USES does not have the intention of directly competing with privately owned agencies, why would they openly boast in their yellow-page ad in the Boston telephone directory: "Massachusetts Largest Employment Agency"?

Does it seem necessary to appropriate tax funds to pay $1,056 per year for yellow page telephone directory advertising in a city such as Tampa, Fla., or to finance 27,732 field visits of USES representatives in Omaha, Nebr., to assist employers with their personnel problems involving selection and recruitment of workers? Does it seem requisite upon the American taxpayer to finance such programs that are aimed to pirate his personnel in the one instance or to finance a personnel department for a competitor in another?

Is it consistent with the best national interest for the USES to enter a tight labor market to recruit personnel through advertising to move to another city or State, thus aggravating the local situation and removing from local tax rolls workers who would otherwise be maintaining a high level of local prosperity—often at a time when the city or State is expending moneys to attract more industry to its area or to make it more attractive to those already there?

Why should a business be taxed to have the USES run newspaper advertising to attract its presently employed personnel for employment elsewhere? This increases its rate of employment turnover, decreases the efficiency of its work force, and brings it ever closer to the brink of no-profit operation.

How can one justify the USES advertising for applicants for positions that require "no previous experience; minimum education—high school graduate; fulfilled military obligation; available for Pennsylvania State extension night school courses," in an unemployment distress area?

How do you justify advertising for policemen and school teachers to move out of a State in which they are needed?

Is it constructive and in the best national interest to subvert the marketing potential of a State or city to recruit its professional applicants for employment, either private or Government, in another area?

Why should the Government provide placement counselors on college campuses; individuals not acquainted with the curriculum, not on the college faculty, not wanted by the colleges nor by the industries who recruit on these campuses? Is this not a prerogative and responsibility of the individual colleges?

Should not testing and counseling of secondary school students rightfully be a responsibility of the public school system? Should not trained educators and psychologists conduct such programs rather than State employment service personnel?

By having the Government test and counsel our secondary school children as to what they should do the rest of their lives, are we not adopting the same socialistic patterns as communism and fascism?

Will not the vesting of the placement of employment as well as unemployed in the USES ultimately place in its power the control of wages, the determination of school and college curriculum, the selection of the teachers of our children?

Is this not the ultimate goal of empire building—Government control of employment, not by legislation but by a sly, sophisticated establishment of administrative law that will give that control without proper legislation by the Congress?

Was the recent increase in the Federal unemployment compensation tax due to the increased activity into non-unemployment-oriented functions, such as separation of claims and employment offices, college recruiting, and so forth?

Why should any portion of the budget be allocated to college recruitment except for Government positions?

To make tax reduction more realistic and provide industry with immediately realizable funds for plant improvement and research, why not take the USES out of management consulting practices, junior and senior high school testing programs, college placement offices, employed personnel placement and also out of its own capital construction programs? This would permit a reduction of the Federal unemployment compensation tax.

The Secretary of Labor has been directed to use the added appropriations authorized by Congress for 1962 and 1963 to achieve certain goals, among which was the "elimination of the 'unemployment office' public image of Employment Service offices, preferably by complete physical separation of employment service and unemployment insurance operations." Why is it important to relegate the unemployed man to a secondary status, force him to go from one office to another to seek employment so that the already employed individual may be served as a first-class citizen without the outward taint of having to associate with the unemployed? Does this serve the ultimate goal of our Government to get our country and our industry moving ahead to greater production and income? Would it not be more desirable to expend these funds on alleviating unemployment than on capital expenditure and duplicate staffing?

What proportion of the total appropriation last year was spent for the direct relief of unemployment and what were the results?

If a national goal is the elimination of the hard-core unemployment, why are three credits given for the placement of a professional man and only one-fourth for a laborer? Where would the USES naturally concentrate? Where is the need—with the professionals or the laborers?

In 1962, according to USES figures, 4,080,000 employed workers were placed—out of a total of 6,800,000 placements. Would it not be more fruitful to spend the funds and effort utilized in this activity of robbing one employer for another in educating or retraining the hard-core unemployed, hoping for an eventual reduction in their number and percentage of the total work force?

The director of the Colorado State Employment Service has stated that 60 to 65 percent of his budget is devoted to serving already employed persons; that his budget was at that time handling 60 percent of the employment business in his State and that in 5 years it would handle 90 percent. When questioned about his use of this tax money to create an empire in competition with private enterprise agencies, Director Teets replied:

> We are not living in a free enterprise system but rather operating under a controlled economy.

Does this not seem to bear out the statement made in 1957 by the then president of the National Association of Manufacturers:

> The time may come when we will be unable to choose our own careers, change jobs, start a business, buy or sell property, take out a mortgage, move from one place to another, borrow money, or even send our children to college without getting permission from some Government bureaucrat.

Does it not seem that the Government bureaucrat in Colorado is trying to make this prediction come true so far as choosing careers and changing jobs?

Why should individual States be threatened with the withdrawal of Federal funds for noncompliance by the Department of Labor's Bureau of Employment Security when their best judgment dictates that local situations do not require the same procedures and expenditures of funds that might apply elsewhere? Does this not almost force State administrators to expend funds needlessly and foolishly upon pain of being criticized and dismissed for malperformance of duty?

Would it not be easier for the unemployed worker to find employment if the USES did not actively seek employed applicants for its openings to compete with him? This is assuming, of course, that the employed worker is generally better qualified than the unemployed who is drawing compensation and at a disadvantage in terms of capability.

Why is it necessary for the USES to maintain a TWX hookup across the country to shuffle high-priced executive personnel from one taxpayer to another? This is not a hurry-up type of placement at best, nor one that need be publicly financed.

Is it in the public interest for the USES to make available their testing facilities and employment services for hourly rated personnel only if a firm lists all its openings with the Government office, as has been threatened in Fort Wayne, Ind.? Is this not leading to Government control of all hiring?

False placement reports from individual USES offices give distorted figures. Such falsifications have been publicly reported in Arkansas and Texas. Since individual allocations from Federal funds are largely based on these performance figures, does not this indicate there is good reason to revise the basis of allocation to one that does not give such broad latitude to the individual employment office and one that is tied more closely to solving our unemployment problem?

Does not the concentration of USES effort on the placement of the employed, who in nearly all instances are easier to place, not only tend to perpetuate our unemployment ranks but also tend to perpetuate those who handle the unemployment claims? Why reduce the rolls when it might eliminate your job or make it harder?

When energy and money are diverted from the task of placing the unemployed—those drawing unemployment compensation—to the placement of the employed worker, which ratio is estimated by Mr. Goodwin at three employed workers to every two unemployed, does it not seem unwarranted, improper and inconsiderate of the true purpose of the public employment service?

Should a study not be made with employers to learn their desire for and acceptance of an enlarged USES, 60 percent of whose efforts are presently devoted to placing their employees; also to learn if they would not prefer to handle this facet of their operation through private initiative and in return receive a reduction in their Federal unemployment compensation tax?

An employer in Ohio has made the statement that he lists his positions with USES, not because he receives desirable applicants, but because he feels that, unless he did, he would not receive favorable attention when he was protesting unemployment claims; this and for no other reason. Is this reason enough for employers to use the USES and for them to be taxed to support it?

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, it has been alleged by those who would cut the already limited funds of the U.S. Employment Agency budget that the Employment Service was created as a temporary agency which has grown beyond original expectations, and that the Employment Service competes with fee-charging agencies.

As a matter of record, the Federal-State employment service system was created under the Wagner-Peyser Act of June 6, 1933, to promote establishment and maintenance of a national system of public employment offices. The act states that it shall be the province and duty of the Employment Service to promote and develop a national system of employment offices for men, women, and juniors who are legally qualified to engage in gainful occupations, and to assist in establishing and maintaining systems of public employment offices in the several States. The act requires also that the Employment Service shall assist in coordinating the public employment offices throughout the country and increase their usefulness by developing and prescribing minimum standards of efficiency; assist them in meeting problems peculiar to their localities; furnish and publish information as to opportunities for employment, and maintain a system for clearing labor between the several States.

It is clear, therefore, that the Employment Service was created not as a temporary agency but to carry out continuing comprehensive responsibilities from the very inception of the Wagner-Peyser Act.

Over the years, the public employment service, begun as a placement agency, has had heaped upon it increasing manpower responsibilities in line with the changing needs of our economy. These have been due to such factors as rapid and dynamic changes in the labor market, the requirements of defense and space age industries, explosive population and labor force gains, increasing requirements for services to youth, older workers, minority groups, handicapped, and other groups in our work force having special employment problems, the impact of automation and technological changes, occupational and industrial shifts, the movement of workers from agricultural to urban areas, including growing worker concentration in the larger metropolitan areas.

In addition, the national character of many manpower problems are far beyond the capacities of individual, geographically limited, private employment agencies that must operate for a profit and that must, therefore, tailor their service to individual desires regardless whether these are in the general public interest or meet the manpower problems of our changing economy.

During the past 10 years, nonagricultural placements made by the public employment service have ranged between 5.1 and 6.7 million a year. During those same years, in spite of so-called competition, the number of private employment agencies reporting under State unemployment insurance laws grew from 810 in 1953 to 2,189 in 1962—an increase of 170 percent. Similarly, the staffs of these agencies increased by 22 percent from about 6,000 in 1953 to over 19,000 in 1962. Financial statistics are not available for the same 10-year cycle but the 225-percent increase in fees collected in 1958 over 1948—$100.5 million versus $30.0 million—illustrates the growth of their business. Since it is estimated that both private and public employment services account for only 20 percent of the total job openings filled in the national labor market, it is obvious that there is need for service and ample room for expansion on the part of both types of agencies.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is both interesting and pertinent to note that my own State of California has been highly successful in utilizing the increased funds which Congress in its wisdom has provided for the improvement of employment services. The State of California Employment Service has increased its placements in business and industry from 533,988 in fiscal year 1961 to approximately 850,000 placements in fiscal year 1963. Placement of young people has increased by 67 percent between 1961 and 1962. Placement of workers 48 years of age and over has increased by 41.8 percent, during the same period and placement of the handicapped has increased by 5,000 during the same period of time.

Mr. Chairman, President Kennedy has called for a reduction of hard-core unemployment and the full utilization of our manpower resources—a goal with which I am sure we all agree—and Congress has already taken decisive action by enacting the Manpower Development and Training Act.

Maintenance of a strong Federal-State employment service, however, is absolutely essential to the accomplishment of these manpower goals, and I urge that the full level of funds recommended by the committee to accomplish this vital national purpose be approved. In addition, and at the appropriate time, I urge that the full amount of $432,570,000 requested in the administration's budget be approved so that our efforts may be further extended to the end that our free economy realizes the full potential of each individual member of its work force.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that since becoming a member of this Subcommittee on Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare that I have ever ended up voting for the final version of this appropriation bill. This is the first year I find myself in a position where I can support the recommendations of our subcommittee and the full Committee on Appropriations. It is the first year in my recollection that we have ever come up with a bill that has shown no increase in budget figures, but rather a decrease in many items while holding the line in others. I intend to support this bill as reported to the House with only the reservation that the Committee of the Whole House refrain from raising any item reported in this bill.

As is always the case there must be a give and take and compromise in committee. The chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], is well known in the Congress for the many causes which he presses enthusiastically. And I must say in all fairness to him that he has been most considerate of the views of the minority; namely, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], and myself.

There are items in this bill which I would like to have seen reduced further, but there are items which could have come to the floor with a higher figure and which were compromised. And I must respect those on the committee who have given in on their positions in the spirit of true compromise.

As has been pointed out by our subcommittee chairman and ranking member, the bill reflects a reduction of $309,501,000 from the budget estimates for the fiscal year 1964, and the actual figures in this bill undercut the 1963 total appropriations for these departments by $118,810,600.

Now there are some substantial increases in the Department of Labor.

Specifically, the Bureau of Labor Statistics asked for 209 new permanent positions and an increase of $4,427,000, but we cut this figure back by $2,100,000, leaving them with an increase of $2,227,000 to improve the work of this Bureau.

The President's Committee To Appraise Unemployment and Unemployment Statistics has found that figures compiled by this Bureau are very sound and reliable but that there are some areas in which improvements should be made.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics also receives $420,000 from other departments and agencies for their reports. In the Bureau's original plans they would expand the size of unemployment samples by contacting an additional 17,500 families in 1964 or an increase of 50 percent. The President's Committee has recommended an expansion of this sample but there is a limitation to which we can go. Currently, the Census Bureau employees who do the footwork for this program call on 35,000 households in 333 areas of the United States with a form once a month. The household is in the sample for 4 months and out for 8 months.

In the Bureau of International Labor Affairs my own personal position was one of knocking out all of the increases, but in the spirit of compromise we allowed an increase in half of their new programs and cut back their budget request by $53,500. It is my own personal feeling that this Bureau overlaps into activities of the State Department and more specifically AID.

By way of comparison we now have 68 labor attachés abroad as compared with 61 for the Department of Agriculture, and I would simply make the point that in my opinion we are getting much more for our money from our agricultural attachés than for our labor attachés. We are exporting billions of dollars of agricultural products and there is a return to be realized from an aggressive trade development program which in many cases centers around the activities of our agricultural attachés. I frankly do not know what benefits we derive from our labor attachés other than a collection of statistical data and transmission of information between posts and the Department.

Under the request for the Bureau of Employment Security I would point out that we are finding the Federal Government moving more and more into the field of employment service, and I am very distressed about it. The U.S. Employment Service was brought into being by an act of Congress back in 1933 in the depression years to deal with the masses of unemployed. It is a necessary institution to assist in the placement of jobless and handicapped and particularly those who have not the education nor background to explore fully job opportunities. We are now finding these folks right on our college campuses, and it seems to me this is getting completely out of hand. College graduates are not the ones needing the counseling and guidance of the U.S. Employment Service, for if they have not grasped this much via their college education, then God help them. I am sorry to say that some of the great universities around the country have found it convenient to station permanently on the campus personnel from the U.S. Employment Service, although the vast majority of our institutions of higher learning provide this counseling and guidance and fund it in the institution's own budget.

There are many privately owned employment agencies all over the country, who necessarily charge either the applicant or the employer a fee. Since the State employment agencies offer "free" services, eventually these small agencies are going to be put out of business.

We have received letters from all over the country from these small employment agencies, protesting the encroachment of the vast network of tax-supported agencies into this field of private enterprise. Some go so far as to say this might eventually lead to a vast Government-controlled employment system—socialized employment—as well it might.

One of the best quotations in these letters comes from an employment service in our own district, as follows:

> I, for one, feel that this is adding insult to injury, not only on our already overburdened tax dollar, but as an employment counselor, it is using my money to be in competition with myself.

The Employment Security Review of April 1962 has stated:

> It is intended that the employment office in each locality will become the community manpower center.

Does this not have social and economic implications which far transcend the need for employment services furnished by the Government at taxpayers' expense?

Is it incumbent upon the laborer and low-wage earner to be taxed to operate an employment service for highly paid, already employed executive and professional workers who are fully capable in every respect of handling and financing their own job advancement program?

Would it not be more sensible to eliminate all public advertising for applicants and direct those funds toward the placement of the unemployed whose availability is a matter of record with the USES offices?

If the USES does not have the intention of directly competing with privately owned agencies, why would they openly boast in their yellow page ad in the Boston telephone directory: "Massachusetts' Largest Employment Agency"?

The director of the Colorado State Employment Service has stated that 60 to 65 percent of his budget is devoted to serving already employed persons; that his budget was at that time handling 60 percent of the employment business in his State and that in 5 years it would handle 90 percent. When questioned about his use of this tax money to create an empire in competition with private enterprise agencies, Director Teets replied:

> We are not living in a free enterprise system but rather operating under a controlled economy.

Does this not seem to bear out the statement made in 1957 by the then president of the National Association of Manufacturers:

> The time may come when we will be unable to choose our own careers, change jobs, start a business, buy or sell property, take out a mortgage, move from one place to another, borrow money or even send our children to college without getting permission from some Government bureaucrat.

Why is it necessary for the USES to maintain a TWX hookup across the country to shuffle high priced executive personnel from one taxpayer to another? This is not a hurry-up type of placement at best, nor one that need be publicly financed.

I think it might be well at this point, Mr. Chairman, to recite a few quotes from State employment service personnel as follows:

> In 5 years, if we are not hampered by new restrictions and we can get adequate funds from Congress, we'll be handling 90 percent of the business" (editorial "Goliath Gets Out of Bounds," from the Denver Post, June 10, 1959, quoting Bernard Teets, director of the Colorado State Employment Service).

Then another from a broadcast by Milton Davidson, manager of the Toledo, Ohio, office of the Ohio State Employment Service, over station WSPD-TV, Toledo, on August 5, 1962:

> I have no compunction about competing with private employment agencies * * * and if I could do anything about it, and I'm going to try my best to do it, I want to make it very uncomfortable for these fee-charging agencies.

It seems to me that such statements as the foregoing made by responsible officials are a bald expression of empire building. I do not think these kind of statements show a real concern for the placement of the unemployed. They seem to be made by men more concerned with the expansion of their own authority and that of the Federal Government.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to move into the area of Health, Education, and Welfare and particularly the National Institutes of Health and the ever-growing grant-in-aid programs.

In the broad functional area of health services and research, expenditures have really mushroomed in the past 10 years. In the fiscal year 1954 the figure was $288 million; in 1956, $342 million; in 1958, $540 million; in 1960, $815 million; in 1962, $1,128 million; and in 1964 it will be better than $1,600 million. All of this is not for the National Health Institutes alone, but they comprise the largest part. There are nine Institutes covering various medical fields. Grants through the Institutes are made to institutions and individuals for two purposes—to undertake research projects, and to provide training. Fellowships are given, designed to develop research talent. The Institutes conduct research themselves and participate in collaborative studies with other institutions. Funds and technical assistance are given the States for mental health purposes.

The level and division of activities is indicated by the following distribution of obligations for the Institutes. These figures will naturally not compare with expenditures for the same years, but will exceed them.

[In millions of dollars]

	1962	*1964 estimate*
Grants:		
Research	370	541
Fellowships	27	46
Training	115	173
State programs	7	11
Subtotal	519	771
Direct operations:		
Research	62	71
Collaborative	38	58
Other	20	31
Subtotal	120	160
Total	639	931

The reason for indicating the ramifications of the Institutes' programs is twofold: First, it suggests why Congress may have authorized funds over the recent past with such an unrestrained hand, it has been generally acknowledged that more has been provided than could be constructively spent; second, it suggests why the Institutes have had such a management problem, since it is not conducive of prudence to have more money than can be well handled.

The Committee on Government Operations of the House of Representatives has conducted hearings and inquiry into the management deficiences of the institutes for several years. Its reports, based on studies of its Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, leave no room for doubt that too much money has been appropriated and too much has been injudiciously spent. Excerpts from the report of June 30, 1962, follow:

> The committee is dissatisfied with the slow progress which NIH has made to strengthen the management of the grant programs for health research * * * relatively little effort has been made to improve the overall management of these important grant programs. In particular, the committee has found no significant improvement in the inadequate fiscal review of project requirements on which it reported last year.
>
> In the absence of appropriate policies, procedures, and adequate staffing, the nongovernmental scientists who serve on study sections are, in effect, determining the budgetary needs of research projects. Yet, the Director of NIH has testified that these consultants have neither the background, the time, nor the inclination to act as budget examiners.
>
> Under its present inadequate administrative arrangements NIH does not know whether or not grant funds are expended prudently and for the intended purposes and, consequently, NIH cannot provide reasonable assurance that the misuse of grants is not widespread.
>
> However, freedom for the scientists should not be confused with license or fiscal irresponsibility. One cannot condone waste and extravagance wherever it exists as being either in the public interest or in the interest of science. Grant money that is uneconomically or inefficiently spent deprives other scientists of support for their work. Moreover, the injudicious use of research funds is grossly unfair to the American public which is required to support this activity through taxation. What we must achieve is a harmonizing of freedom for the investigator with responsibility to the public in the expenditure of Government funds. NIH has the obligation to develop adequate policies and procedures for assuring that grant funds are prudently spent within this context.
>
> According to the NIH for rating grant projects, the average quality of such projects has been steadily declining in recent years.
>
> It is probable that the large annual increases in the NIH appropriation made in the past several years has contributed to the increasing support of lower quality research. * * * A related matter is the need for NIH to increase the capability of its own professional staff for determining whether the projects recommended by the scientific consultants should be supported.
>
> It appears that the Congress has been overzealous in appropriating money for health research. The conclusion is inescapable, from a study of NIH's loose administrative practices, that the pressure for spending increasingly large appropriations has kept NIH from giving adequate attention to basic management problems.

The entire field of Federal grants to the States has grown over the years in both cost and controversy.

Their growth has been documented by numerous official and private studies, but a recent statement by Deputy Director of the Budget Bureau, Elmer Staats, suggested the saturation point has been reached as far as the number of grants is concerned—the point for future pressure thus becoming the amount of aid which any given program can command. Mr. Staats said:

> It is probably safe to predict that grant expenditures will rise at a slower rate than in the past 6 years, although the volume of dollars will continue to be a highly significant factor in planning State-local finances. The possibilities for entirely new large-scale grant programs, except for education, are somewhat remote inasmuch as every major, and practically all minor, functions of Government are covered in one form or another by a program of Federal financial assistance. The Congress has under consideration 29 new or expanded grant programs at the present time. The initiative and ingenuity of those seeking a new grant program by no means is underestimated. However, the pattern of grants is well-established and additions are expected to be less frequent than in the past. The real issue in the years that lie ahead will be the amounts to be allocated to individual programs.

Those who favor strong Central Government and its participation in functions of State and local governments consider the grant-in-aid a necessity. Support for grants also comes from groups interested in the increasing Federal funds for teachers' salaries, school buildings, college facilities, community facilities, urban renewal, transportation, and various other purposes.

Those who favor a minimum of Central Government participation in State and local governments consider grants-in-aid unnecessary, and detrimental to the responsible operation of our Federal system. Basic to this view is the belief that State-local initiative and responsibility are indispensable to an effective and stable democracy.

There are various classifications and listings of Federal programs of assistance to States and communities. Depending on the classification, the number of grants ranges between 45 and 60. A "Handbook of Federal Aids to Communities" documents Federal aid under headings of grants, loans, technical assistance, Federal construction, procurement, surplus; and it classifies them by 50 specific programs in broad categories of community economic development, community facilities, housing, community welfare, and civil defense. The scope of Federal aid and the selling job being done by the Government regarding them are indicated in the foreword:

> For communities which have Federal programs already underway, as well as for communities seeking initial assistance (the handbook) will serve as a checklist by means of which community leaders can make certain they have considered all available sources of Federal assistance.

The budget for fiscal 1964 lists some 60 items of grants-in-aid, the newest being for open spaces. The increasing expenditure pattern in both new and old programs is clearly shown in the following table.

Nondefense grants-in-aid to States and communities

[Millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year—			
	1953	1961	1963	1964
Administrative accounts:				
Health and welfare	1,608	2,569	3,553.9	3,749.9
Education	231	322	447.0	560.0
School lunch:				
Removal of surplus commodities	52	268	512.2	498.5
Lunch and milk programs	68	239	263.1	281.2
Urban renewal, etc	8	144	264.1	313.5
Mass transportation	------	------	6.0	10.0
Other [1]	68	483	514.1	786.4
Subtotal	2,035	4,025	5,560.4	6,199.8
Employment service [2]	202	356	341.8	413.2
Highway program [2]	544	2,591	2,967.7	3,353.1

[1] Largest components are low-rent public housing and area redevelopment assistance (public works).

[2] Trust funds.

The dollar volume above suggests the degree to which the Federal Government has involved itself in the affairs of the States and their communities. The Federal stimulation has had decisive weight on the planning and fund allocation decisions of the States. The growing volume of Federal aid to localities, starting with hospital and airport construction and now including mass transportation systems, is bypassing the State authority and dealing directly with the thousands and thousands of local communities across the country.

Since the area of State and local functions supported by Federal aid has widened, Federal control and influence over both State and municipality are being felt more often, and with more impact. The result is a loss of State-local autonomy with every increase of Central Government aid.

There are many obstacles to terminating grants. With every grant, vested interests are created, both in and out of Government. This is pointed up by the Advisory Council on Intergovernmental Relations in its June 1961 study on congressional review of Federal grants:

> Subject matter staffs are created or expanded at National, State and local levels of government for the purpose of administering the grant program * * * their recommendations for change in the grant program are

typically in the direction of expansion rather than contraction.

Pressure for continuance comes from State and local officials, too. The grant programs have become an integral part of their budgets, an apparently reliable source of revenue not to be given up readily. In addition, the public has been conditioned to a grave misconception that Federal money is free money. Many are thus prone to favor "getting the money from Washington" rather than doing the job and paying for it at home. Also, there are those who believe Federal grants are fundamentally necessary. However, all of these resistances could be broken down if a dedicated effort were made to show that the States could do without them, and would in fact be better off without them.

Although the cliche that "grants are here to stay" is not necessarily true, it can be used as a framework for a change of pattern in grants. Changing from many separate grants to one comprehensive grant, for example, would cut both pressures for Federal aid and the cost of it. The shift would thus constitute a workable basis for the gradual elimination of the Federal grant technique.

The goal would be first reduced Federal participation and finally no Federal participation in State-local functions. The vehicle would be substitution of a block grant for the fragmentized grant approach, to be followed by regular, prescheduled reduction of the overall amount of aid every year over a 10-year period, to complete elimination.

Such a step could be, politically, very difficult to achieve. However, there would seem to be no more direct means to the end of reducing centralism, than there would be to establish a single, "fiscal assistance" grant to States, with no restriction or regulations as to how the States could use it. It would simply be a revenue supplement for the States to use according to their own plans and purposes. It would be a closed end grant. It could, however, be set up on an equalization formula with a flat sum minimum. It would not only replace all specific purpose grants, but all the compliance regulations they involve.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. I have been listening carefully to the gentleman's remarks, particularly with respect to the U.S. Employment Service on college campuses. Several other Members have also addressed themselves to this same problem. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Michel], now in the well, was on the floor when I propounded a question to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty], and I would like to ask, as a member of the minority, if he is not in full agreement with the construction of the language in the hearings as to the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor in this regard that they are not to "invade" the college campus if that particular school is maintaining such a program of their own?

Mr. MICHEL. I am glad to respond to the gentleman's inquiry. During the course of the hearings I specifically asked the question how far the Department intended to go into this program, and in response to my question I got the reply that "we only go in when the institution asks us to be there." Yes, there have been some institutions which have asked for this service. I do not like it; I do not like to see it, but I would say the preponderance, the vast majority, of the colleges would not like to see this service on their campuses.

Mr. AVERY. Is it clearly stipulated who must make these requests to the U.S. Employment Service if they are to enter a college campus?

Mr. MICHEL. I am sure it must come from the president of the university himself. Is that not right, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. FOGARTY. They will not go in unless the president requests it.

Mr. MICHEL. Specifically, the president of the university must request it.

Mr. AVERY. I thank the gentleman, and I applaud the position taken by the subcommittee.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. I note, of course, that the report of the committee says that this budget has been reduced $118 million over last year's appropriation. The reduction of the unemployment compensation for Federal employees and exservicemen amounts to $39 million; the payment to school districts reduction is $177 million; hospital construction activities is $48 million. If you delete those three items from this proposed bill, actually you have an increase in the other services covered by this bill of approximately $147 million; is that substantially correct?

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I think it is important to point out, as I did a few minutes ago, that the President's request for new obligational authority in this area this year is $7.6 billion as compared with appropriations for 1963 of $5.5 billion, so the increase in the President's budget for new obligational authority in this area we are talking about today is over $2 billion. Now, of that $2 billion increase that the President has asked, $1.7 billion is in programs that have not been authorized in this session of the Congress.

Mr. HALEY. Therefore, it could not be included.

Mr. LAIRD. They could not be included in this bill.

Mr. HALEY. Therefore, it is misleading to say that you have reduced this budget $118 million because in the services and the individual items covered by this actually you have increased it $147 million.

Mr. LAIRD. Well, that is not quite correct. If the gentleman will look at the table, he will find that of the President's requests for $7.6 billion, the items that we could handle in this bill total $5.7 billion.

Those are, of course, authorized programs. We reduced the President's request in these going, authorized programs by $309 million. It is my hope that some of the authorization requests that have been submitted by the President will be defeated when the legislation comes to the House for consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. Frances P. Bolton].

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I feel that I am rather back in my own territory when I begin speaking about nursing, which was my work for a great many years of my life, and I am particularly happy to have this opportunity to spread before this House and the committee responsible some of the needs of which I see no mention in the minutes of the meetings or in the reports.

Perhaps the newer Members might just as well suffer for a moment—the older ones know that I have since 1941, I think it was, when there was an emergent need for nurses, asked the Congress to appropriate $1.2 million to help the larger schools of nursing to add to the number of students which they could train. This was back in 1941 when we needed them desperately. The money was granted with hardly a question. So excellent was the work done in the Public Health Department by Miss Pearl McIver that there was no hesitation on the part of the House or the Senate when I asked to have set up the U.S. Cadet Nurse Corps. Some 125,000 young women received their training in this Nurse Corps during the nearly 6 years of its life.

Mr. Chairman, in 1955 I introduced a bill setting up a commission similar to the Hoover Commission to collect the splendid research the nursing profession had done, and to evaluate it and set it in motion. The nurses had been making studies and had been doing research for at least 15 years, but we do not have more nurses.

This commission was planned and was to be composed of representatives of nursing, hospital administrators, doctors, waywise laymen and also Representatives of the Senate and House. Senator Alexander Smith introduced its counterpart in the Senate.

I had worked for many years with the various areas of nursing and have found them exceedingly fine to work with. I was forced to realize that the intelligent layman who knew what it was all about was the key to the situation. Only such people could bring the attitudes and points of view of the different areas of experience into workable form and only such people could speak with authority to hospital administrators, to boards particularly, of hospitals, and of special nurse organizations. Nurses are trained not to talk back to the doctors and hospital people and doctors do not always get on with administrators, and so forth, as you very well know.

But there was another very real invisible element in my proposed commission, and that was the extreme emergent need of the patient. I wonder, back 10 or 15 or 20 years ago whether you tried to get a nurse when you needed one. Have you tried recently? The patient is the man who is most concerned. He certainly needs a champion and a spokesman.

Unfortunately, the then leadership of the nursing profession felt that the intrusion of the nonprofessional person could not be tolerated. So they killed the bill in the committee. It is most unfortunate, but any real increase in the number of bedside nurses just has not happened.

Of course there has been a certain increase in the number of registered nurses since 1955. For, thank heaven, there will always be women who are motivated by a basic urge to care for the sick and make them well.

Since that time, the so-called practical nurse has been brought into the picture for the care of the sick. She is a very much needed individual, but she should have much more training than is usually given her even in the licensed schools. She has not filled and she is not expected to fill the need for some 50,000 to 70,000 registered nurses for which hospitals and patients everywhere are crying. I have great regard for the practical nurse for whom we have a magnificent school in Cleveland, one of the top schools in this country. I know them well and respect them highly. But they are not supposed to replace the scientifically trained bedside nurse.

I have read the report issued by the Surgeon General's Consultant Group on Nursing with great interest. I find nothing in it that will contribute to filling the tragic shortage of bedside nurses. It is my earnest hope, Mr. Chairman, that the Subcommittee on HEW Appropriations will begin to give some very real thought to the need that continues to grow with the years.

It is quite true that unless we have teachers, unless we have supervisors, unless we have these top positions, we cannot have more students; but that is true through all our educational areas.

Taking care of the sick today is more complicated than it used to be and it also includes a new element, the teaching of health. We need a team. That is not a very hard team to describe. We need highly skilled, trained persons at the top, the teacher, the administrator. Then we need the technically trained registered nurses, 50,000 to 75,000 extra ones. And we need the practical nurse also by the thousands, very definitely. Whoever goes into nursing must have a heart. She must want to help the sick. First she must want to be truly a woman or she will be a poor nurse and you would not want her a second time. Fortunately there are women like that. There are women who long to have the training that they should have, and it has been made very difficult for them to get it.

It is my earnest hope that this subcommittee will look into this matter very carefully, possibly starting with a review of the material supplied to the Subcommittee on Health and Science of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in 1956. The country is in dire need in this area of its life, a need that the nursing researches of many years have not even begun to fill.

I am hoping very much that the committee will consider this very seriously in the next year. It was possible to have a U.S. Student Nurse Corps. I question whether such a plan would meet today's need—but surely a method can be found that will use both government schools and private institutions attracting more young women to the nursing profession and keep them there for the deeply satisfying life to be had in nursing as in no other. Why does she not stay in? Partly because in the hospital she is on an 8-hour day, but her 8 hours are divided in the middle. Who wants to stay in town 12 hours, if she lives in the country, just because there is an interval of 4 hours in the middle? No one wants that. But that is only one small matter which added to other such keeps the shortage a dangerous thing for us all.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. I should like to compliment the gentlewoman from Ohio on the statement she has made. I do not believe anybody in the House has done more for the nursing profession than the gentlewoman addressing us now. I assure her that we will take her suggestions under consideration at the proper time and bring them to the proper authorities. I thank the gentlewoman for her statement, which concerns a most involved problem. It should be considered seriously.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman. It is certainly an involved and complicated problem, but not one without solution. Of that I am quite certain.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SNYDER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, it is represented that this bill appropriates $118,810,600 less than the comparable appropriation bill for the current year. This is one of the poorest jobs of book juggling that we have seen. We would expect a little better cover up job if it is going to be represented that this bill is less than the current year.

There is one example which standing alone shows that this is not true. There is $217,802,000 shown as being deleted because the temporary provisions of the impacted areas school bill have not yet been authorized for the coming year. We are assured that this legislation will at least be extended for 1 year thereby requiring an additional appropriation of at least this amount. How many other items that have been omitted from this bill—which were in last year's bill—it is difficult to determine.

If you take each item for which money is appropriated in this bill as compared to the corresponding item of last year the bill is considerably more than last year.

Salaries and expenses are up as follows: Bureau of Labor Statistics $1,894,750—for a new total of $16,485,000; Bureau of International Labor Affairs $73,250—for a total of $882,000; Bureau of Apprenticeships, and so forth $247,800—for a total of $5,460,000; Office of Welfare and Pension Plans $1,565,000—this is taken out of the Bureau of Labor Standards funds in 1963 but the said Bureau is reducing its salaries only $1,215,550; Bureau of Employee's Compensation $303,200—for a total of $4,285,000; Wage and Hour Division $1,026,400 for a total of $19,300,000; Office of the Solicitor, $208,300; for a total of $4,570,000; Office of the Secretary $270,550 for a total of $2,364,000; trade adjustment activities $3,900,000 for a total of $4 million—basically a new program; Food and Drug Administration $6,740,300 for a total of $35,805,000; Office of Education $2,116,000 for a total of $14,761,000; Office of Vocational Rehabilitation $419,000 for a total of $2,905,000—and on and on it goes—and mind you this is just increases in salaries and expenses.

Rather than so many new employees—and I understand that about 3,700 new people are in this bill at an estimated cost of $25 million—we could well help more in the areas comparable to those served by the American Printing House for the Blind to help people help themselves. The answer to the unemployment problem is not to put all citizens on the Federal payroll.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take this opportunity to rise in favor of the appropriation bill which has been recommended by the subcommittee headed by my good friend and colleague from Rhode Island.

The bill which has been presented by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] and his committee and the report which accompanies it are striking evidence of the hard work and searching inquiry that characterizes the activity of the committee.

I am particularly pleased that the administration saw fit to present a budget request that merited the favorable consideration that it has received. I note, however, that in the bill and the report that two significant programs have been deferred by the committee which merit the serious and early consideration of this Congress. These two programs of the Public Health Service deserve special consideration because they represent on the one hand a far-reaching domestic problem to all of the people of this country and on the other a problem of dual consequence domestically and of serious international concern to our friends to the south and in the countries of South America.

First, I should like to discuss the deferral of the $12 million program from the appropriation of the National Institute of Mental Health.

I do not need to describe for you here the tragic inadequacy of care for patients in these human warehouses. We all know that in spite of the downward trend in hospital populations during recent years, our public institutions—which cost the taxpayers more than a billion dollars each year to maintain—still have more than 500,000 hospitalized mentally ill. The President described their plight for us when he said:

> I believe that the abandonment of the mentally ill and the mentally retarded to the grim custody of mental institutions too often inflicts on them and on their families a needless cruelty which this Nation should not endure.

The $12 million deleted from the President's budget is a small sum indeed when viewed in the perspective of what it would accomplish: We know that if we only apply the knowledge we now have we can restore countless thousands of patients to productive lives. This money would make it possible for mental hospitals to apply new techniques so vitally necessary to help realize the President's assertion that, if we give patients something more than custodial care, we can cut the mental hospital population in half within a decade or two.

I am sufficiently aware of the programs of the National Institute of Mental Health to assure you that the Institute already is developing guidelines and criteria and review procedures to assure efficient management of this important aspect of the mental health program. I believe that this vital demonstration program, the only part of the President's proposals which offers immediate hope to those patients presently hospitalized, is one which we cannot afford to abandon.

ERADICATION OF AEDES AEGYPTI

Now I would like to say something about the appropriation request, which was disallowed, for $5 million and 600 positions to initiate a program to eradicate from the United States the Aedes aegypti, which is the mosquito that carries yellow fever. Perhaps I can speak more feelingly on this subject because I am from New Orleans where for generations this disease was one of our most dreaded scourges. Hardly a family escaped the deadly Yellow Jack, as our people called it. While happily we have had no cases for many years, our physicians and health authorities are well aware that a single yellow fever infected person, or monkey, or mosquito, arriving in our city could be the means of starting another devastating epidemic. The reason, of course, is that we still have the yellow fever mosquitoes, and so we still have the means for wide spread of the deadly disease.

We in the Southland where these mosquitoes still exist—and I mean we in all the Southern States from Florida to Texas, from Tennessee to Louisiana—are grateful to our neighbors in Latin America for the splendid job they have done in eradicating this mosquito from their cities. We may well feel that if they, with their much more limited resources for public health and disease control, can do this vital job, it is not too much for them to expect their wealthy neighbor, the United States, to do its part so that the entire hemisphere may be rid of this serious health threat.

Nor is it any idle threat that I speak of. Within the past week we have had reports of outbreaks of jungle yellow fever in two South American countries. If these countries had not eradicated the aegypti mosquito from their cities, we might now be in serious trouble.

We all remember the apprehension that was felt, a few years ago, when a traveler from Mexico was found to have smallpox when he reached New York City. Yet, we learn that the Mexican health authorities find their greatest problem in Aedes aegypti eradication from their country today is along the Mexican-United States border, because these mosquitoes still exist and no effective eradication measures are taken on our side of the border.

Of the 21 members of the Pan American Health Organization, 13 have been certified as free of the yellow fever mosquito. Three more have completed their eradication program, but not long enough ago to be certified. Cuba and Venezuela expect to have the job finished in 1964. Only Haiti and the United States have not lived up to the agreement to carry out eradication measures. We are in a situation, now, where if reinfestation occurs, that is, if these mosquitoes reappear in countries that have been certified free of them, and this happened, it will be obvious that the mosquitoes come from the United States. They might just as well have the American flag painted on their wings, for all the world to see. Because it will be only the United States in this hemisphere that is harboring these dangerous mosquitoes.

Mention was made of the fact that we have a good vaccine against yellow fever. This is true, and it is an accomplishment for which we can be exceedingly grateful to our scientists who developed it. Yet, vaccination is too costly a measure to rely on for control of yellow fever in large population groups. It is valuable for those who have to go into the jungle, where mosquito eradication may be impractical or impossible.

It was extremely valuable for our troops during World War II when they had to fight in jungle areas overseas. But to vaccinate the entire population of our Southern States would cost far more than to eradicate the mosquitoes.

Further, on the economic side, we might consider the effect a yellow fever scare would have on the winter tourist business in our Southern States. Florida experienced a little of that last year when encephalitis, also mosquito borne, was epidemic in just one part of the State.

I, therefore, look upon this bill as the minimum support needed to capitalize on the advances made thus far and to make further use of this Nation's scientific manpower in the fields of health and medicine.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, there is absolutely no need for further expansion of Federal programs and personnel beyond last year's highest peacetime budget in history.

We are acting as though there were no limit to the money. Who is going to pay for these programs? We are in a period of deficit financing.

The budget of each Department of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare should be cut at least 10 percent below last year's budget, not increased in area after area. Of course, this would force an agonizing reappraisal in department after department of Government. Certainly some Federal workers would lose their jobs. This agonizing reappraisal is long overdue. Better that we do it now by choice rather than be forced by bankruptcy of our Federal Treasury and debauching of our currency. This debt course cannot be followed indefinitely.

Due notice should be given to the deletion of the impacted areas school education funds. These funds will be forthcoming in another appropriation bill while shown here as a reduction.

This is misleading. This is not economizing, as the report accompanying the bill might lead some to believe.

This bill provides considerably more than last year in countless new programs, and 3,700 additional new Federal employees. Parkinson's law is working with a vengeance.

Where now is fiscal responsibility? Where now are those interested in preventing inflation of our currency? Morally it is wrong to spend money that we do not have and charge to the future. Financially, it is suicide for our country. Finally, socialism cannot solve problems that capitalism can. Government cannot solve local problems as can local and private efforts. Also, and for the same sound commonsense, it is unconstitutional. There are many activities in the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare that are not the province of Federal Government. Many such activities must be terminated and the way to start in this direction is to reduce spending.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my firm support of the $350 million limitation on grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration.

The public employment service in the United States dates back to the Wagner-Peyser Act of June 6, 1933, and was created largely to serve the millions of unemployed of the depression years. Since then, as many additional responsibilities have been assigned our Federal-State public employment service, it has adapted to meet changing conditions in the Nation. The public employment service was called upon to properly match jobseekers with public works jobs during the depression, and to fill the demand for workers with specialized skills during the defense buildup when World War II began in Europe. Upon our entry to the war, the public employment service was called up to recruit experienced workers, find trainees, and to meet the manpower needs of defense production and essential industries. At the war's end and demobilization, the public employment service provided jobfinding and employment counseling assistance to returning servicemen and to workers required to shift from defense to civilian production.

In the early 1950's, to meet production needs during the Korean period, the public employment service was called upon for nationwide recruitment of workers with shortage skills such as machinists and engineers. With the changing economy of the 1950's, with its several recession periods, changing technology, growth of older workers and youth in the labor force, growing demands for professional, technical, and white-collar workers, and decline in demand for unskilled workers, the public employment service responded with services to help meet the needs of our economy and of the various groups in our society who have been particularly hard hit by unemployment, and to the actions of the Congress.

In various pieces of legislation, the Congress has called upon our Federal-State public employment service system to play a major role in helping to solve local problems of unemployment.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to point to some of the activities of the Department of Employment of California. The California Department of Employment has earned a position as one of the outstanding employment security agencies in the Nation.

The California department was created in 1935 to administer a newly adopted law which since has become the California Unemployment Insurance Code. Among the functions provided for by the code are the operation of public employment offices for men, women, and juniors, including a veterans' placement service and a program to expand employment opportunities.

At this juncture, Mr. Chairman, I wish to call to your attention portions of a report by Paul W. Little, chief, Division of Public Employment, California Department of Employment, outlining program accomplishments of the business and industrial employment division. This summary of activities in 1962 demonstrates the phenomenal growth of service of the department and is a strong argument for our retaining the full $350 million provided for grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration. The excerpts follow:

EXCERPTS OF REPORT OF DIVISION OF PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT OF THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT

In placements, we are firmly in command of the second spot in the Nation, second only to New York. In July of 1962, our monthly placements exceeded New York's for the first time. This was repeated in August and, in September, New York exceeded us by only 35 placements. We anticipate moving permanently into the No. 1 spot in 1963.

In clearance placements, also, 1962 was the most active year since World War II in point of volume of activities. We made 48,880 clearance placements and 57,761 applicant holding acceptances. Our agency has led the Nation in clearance activities by a considerable margin for the past 4 years.

Placements of handicapped applicants totaled 25,497 during calendar 1962. When compared with placement totals for handicapped applicants of 19,742 for 1959, 19,800 for 1960, and 21,592 for 1961, it can be seen that the placement total for 1962 represents a significant increase in our success in finding employment for the handicapped. Since 1957, monthly placement figures of handicapped applicants have exceeded 1,900 for only 15 months. It is important in evaluating recent placements of the handicapped to note that 9 of these 15 months were in 1962. This indicates that placements of handicapped applicants were sustained at a very high level throughout most of the year.

Placements of workers 45 years of age and over in calendar 1962 totaled 161,576 and represented a 41.8-percent increase over 1961. The State total placements increased 33.8 percent as contrasted to the 41.8-percent increase for older workers. The high quality of the placements of older workers is reflected in the fact that 19 percent were in the professional codes.

An expansion of the group session approach to job problems characterized program development for older workers in 1962. Job guidance clinics, an extension of group counseling techniques found to be highly successful in our local offices, were held in Santa Monica, Pasadena, Glendale, San Bernardino, Los Angeles, North Hollywood, Vallejo, and Stockton. These clinics have been cosponsored with community service organizations such as the Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Altrusa Club, YWCA, Jobs After Forty Committee as well as the adult division of the school systems. The year 1962 also saw the extension of experience unlimited to San Francisco, Palo Alto, San Jose, Oakland, Whittier, Fullerton, Norwalk, and El Monte.

The Ford Foundation conducted the gathering of data for a research project to analyze the placement programs for jobseeking middle-aged and older workers established by the employment service and to develop recommendations for appropriate changes in public policies. The California section of this study was conducted in 14 local offices. This is part of an international study.

For a number of years, California has held a substantial lead over all other States in the placements of veterans. In calendar 1962, we made 191,198 veteran placements, a record in the history of the California State Employment Service. This exceeds even the veteran placements made in 1946, when veterans were being released from the Armed Forces in great numbers.

The youth employment program of the California State Employment Service has become increasingly effective as a means of helping young Californians find jobs. During 1962, we placed over 174,000 young people on jobs, an increase of 67 percent over 1961. This figure includes over 6,000 placements of school dropouts in 1962, in itself an increase of 50 percent over 1961.

Many imaginative and productive special community job promotional activities for youth are responsible for the department's increased youth employment accomplishments. One of the outstanding programs was, "Employer Recruitment Day," conducted by the Stockton office involving 275 preselected students from 5 local high schools and 1 junior college. Over 500 job interviews were conducted by 51 recruiters representing 32 firms resulting in more than 100 students having a job waiting for them upon graduation. As recent as February of this year, employers are still reinterviewing forhire candidates who were first interviewed on "Employers Recruitment Day."

The California State Employment Service is now serving over 70 percent of the high schools in California which enroll over 92 percent of the graduates. Local offices placed over 24,000 terminal students. This represents a 10.2 percent increase over 1961 accomplishments. A 48.9 percent increase occurred in the placement of school dropouts.

It is estimated that local offices, in cooperation with schools, have made available for showing the outstanding film, "When I'm Old Enough Goodby," to over 100,000 California high school students.

with the State department of education and

Cooperative procedures were developed the division of apprenticeship standards which resulted in establishing the pilot apprenticeship information center in Fresno. Apprenticeship information centers provide one place in a community where all information about apprenticeable occupations is available. It is anticipated that the establishment of these centers will be accelerated during 1963.

In test development, we were commended by the Bureau of Employment Security for "excellent work and valuable contribution to the USES test research program." Our agency headed the list of States for USES aptitude test development studies completed and submitted to the USES national office.

In MDTA activity, we also lead the Nation in the most important respect, that is, the number of trainees enrolled in training courses. As of January 25, 1963, we had enrolled 3,775 trainees, which represented 18.3 percent of all trainees enrolled throughout the Nation. In the number of projects initiated, we were second to Pennsylvania—60 for us, 86 for Pennsylvania.

Local offices also did outstanding work in connection with several mass layoffs, as exemplified by the Skybolt layoff in the Los Angeles area. Cancellation of the multibillion dollar air-to-ground missile Skybolt project was anticipated late in 1962. Involved would be employees of the Douglas Co. facilities at Santa Monica and Culver City, and the Northrop-Nortronics plant at Hawthorne.

Working as a team, the Santa Monica, Culver City, and Inglewood local offices took direct and positive action to find new jobs for the laidoff workers who, by February of 1963, totaled 5,237. Application and claims forms were issued at the plants, recruiting desks manned by employment service interviewers were established on the employer's premises and even at local hotels. The California State Employment Service was mentioned prominently by all media giving publicity to the layoff. Through the clearance network, including the use of Lincs West, approximately 30 local offices acted to soften the economic impact of this mass layoff. The full story of the department's participation will be told in the April 1963 issue of the Employment Security Review.

Many industrywide arrangements and exclusive hiring agreements with employers were consummated during 1962, thus adding to the strengthening of the employment service. Typical of these are the agreements reached with U.S. Forestry Service, J. J. Newberry Stores, some machinists unions, Purity Stores, and Manpower, Inc. In addition, negotiations were begun (and are well underway) with the California Hotel & Restaurant Association; California Tavern Owners Association; California Motel, Hotel, Culinary & Bartenders Union; Building Service Employees Association; Bakery & Confection Workers International; Retail Clerks Union; Retail Stores Association; Thermidor Co.; and Bethlehem Steel. Central office, area, and local office staff worked jointly and separately on these agreements and negotiations.

PROTECTING THE HEALTH OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, once again I want to express to the gentleman from Rhode Island, Chairman FOGARTY, and members of his subcommittee my sincere appreciation for their work in drafting this bill and the fine report which accompanies it.

I am receiving many letters, as I am sure other Members are, too, protesting the size of the Federal budget and demanding extensive cuts in appropriations. It would be comparatively easy to cut this particular appropriation bill, because it is one of the largest of all of the bills other than the defense measures, and then we could all boast that we had slashed the so-called welfare state. However, I am glad that the Committee on Appropriations heeded the recommendations of the Fogarty subcommittee and approved this very large measure with a full understanding of the importance of these programs to the lives and safety of the American people, and to the future of this country.

NEARLY $1 BILLION FOR MEDICAL RESEARCH

Nearly $1 billion in this bill is appropriated just to the National Institutes of Health. Undoubtedly this is a lot of money. But who can measure in dollars the saving of lives from cancer, heart disease, or communicable disease? Who can measure in dollars the prevention of blindness or the cure of mental illness, or the alleviation of painful arthritis? These are the purposes of the $962 million recommended in this bill just for the National Institutes of Health alone. I will take the word of the Fogarty subcommittee that this money can be spent efficiently and will be spent properly, and will accomplish the purposes the subcommittee intends. The NIH constitutes today a vast medical research arm primarily because of this subcommittee, and the achievements of the NIH are a monument to the work of this subcommittee. I know of no subcommittee in the House which has a more exacting and more difficult job, or which does it with any greater degree of conscientious attention to detail as well as to concepts.

SUBSTANTIAL INCREASES FOR FDA

My purpose in speaking today, in addition to voicing approval of the medical research appropriation is to call attention particularly to the increase in funds recommended for the Food and Drug Administration. As most of the Members know, I have given the FDA close and continuing personal attention ever since coming to Congress more than 10 years ago. When the previous administration in its first budget cut the FDA budget, I bitterly protested. As we all know, subsequent events clearly demonstrated that while FDA suffered then from many problems, its greatest problem was—and still is—lack of adequate funds to do the kind of enforcement job which all Americans have a right to expect from the agency which is supposed to assure wholesome foods, safe cosmetics and effective and pure drugs.

There is a substantial increase for FDA in this bill. It brings the agency appropriation up to a level about seven times greater than it was when I first came to Congress. Some may say that the FDA cannot find sufficient well-trained scientists to fill the vacancies which will be created by this bill. My answer to that is that the people who work for this agency can now take real pride in their professional standing; for we have taken the Food and Drug Administration out of the category of a stepchild agency and put it in the forefront among Government agencies assigned to protect the American public. Thanks to the funds we provided for this agency in recent years, and particularly since 1955, we have been able to attract outstanding scientists with a sense of mission and dedication. Who knows, or can guess when additional employees of the Food and Drug Administration will have earned the world's grateful thanks as Dr. Frances O. Kelsey has done in the past year?

NEW RESPONSIBILITIES FOR DRUG REGULATION

Mr. Chairman, we passed a very far-reaching drug control law last year which placed upon Dr. Kelsey and her associates, and upon the entire FDA, many vital new responsibilities. I use the word "vital" in the literal sense: lives hinge on the enforcement of this new law, and of the standards set up under it. About half of all of the new positions which would be created in the Food and Drug Administration by this bill would be positions in connection with the administration of the new drug law.

NEED FOR STRONGER LAWS ON COSMETICS

I have been working since 1953 for a safe cosmetic law similar to the law now in effect for food additives. But, in the absence of a tight and loophole-free cosmetic law, the FDA has a difficult job in tracing unsafe or impure cosmetics and removing them from the market. A safe cosmetic law would, in the long run, simplify procedures and cut down on expenditures for enforcement. But until that day arrives, then we must make certain that the Government can act quickly and effectively to remove from the market any cosmetic item which could cause blindness or skin disease or cancer or any other serious injury to the millions of women—and, yes, to millions of men, too—who daily use cosmetic items.

FRAUDS, CHEATS, AND BOOTLEGGERS

Similarly, because of loopholes in the present law, we need vigilant enforcement action against the bootleggers of pep pills and barbiturates, the peddlers of fake cancer cures, the economic cheats who use false labeling and deceptive packaging in food, drugs, or cosmetics. We cannot strengthen this law through the appropriation process, but we can take steps to make sure the enforcement agency has the funds to do the best job it can within the limitations of the law.

Mr. Chairman, the public is concerned, and deeply so, over the recurring incidents which have come to light of pesticide residue in foods, of radiation fallout in foods, of contamination from other sources in our food supplies. FDA must be given the funds to expand its program of consumer protection. I urge approval of the funds recommended for the Food and Drug Administration in this bill.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to commend the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], chairman of the Appropriations Committee Subcommittee on Health, Education, and Welfare for making necessary allocations for programs under the authority of the Juvenile Delinquency Control Act.

These appropriations are necessary to fund the New Haven and Cleveland projects which are now planned and ready for action. If adequate funds were not provided, the investment made in planning would be lost and the usefulness of the planning effort would deteriorate. This appropriation endeavors to utilize a planning investment already made.

The Cleveland project entitled "Community Action for Youth," is about to be launched in Cleveland. It will tackle the serious problem of young people in the Hough area of Cleveland. In this area, 77 percent of the out-of-school youth are unemployed. A third of the families with children are on public assistance, and the juvenile delinquency rate is double that of the county as a whole. One-half of the births to adolescent girls in 1961 were illegitimate. Although the cost of juvenile court, welfare, and education continue to climb, there is no end in sight for these problems without new approaches realistically planned.

Community Action for Youth would strengthen basic educational programs affecting 12,000 young people. It would provide vocational counseling, work training, and job placement for 500 boys and girls a year.

It would reduce caseloads of public assistance workers and juvenile court probation officers who deal each year with 4,000 or more families. This would make it possible to provide effective counseling to families who are now at the end of their hopes, overwhelmed with family conflict, unemployment and bad housing. At the same time, the adult leadership of the community would be mobilized on a block-by-block basis to upgrade the community and to provide leadership and guidance for youth. Young people themselves would have a chance to serve their community while learning important new skills through community service projects. This program represents the combined determination of the city government, the school board, the county commissioners, juvenile court, and many other public and private organizations to find new answers and, in fact, to change their programs where necessary, to stem growing problems.

This program is planned not only to meet the urgent needs of Cleveland. Through detailed measurement of the results and careful reporting of each step taken, information of importance to every similar community in the country will be available. This program will not only involve a partnership among many local groups, but also test the possibilities of coordinating many Federal programs in relation to a seriously depressed community. These include programs in HEW, employment-training programs in the Department of Labor, and urban renewal programs. The demonstration grant funds of the President's Committee are the key to setting this entire program in motion. Any cut in appropriations would seriously jeopardize this program.

The Cleveland community is in the process of raising $1 million in local funds to back up a 4-year program. The Cuyahoga County commissioners and the Cleveland Board of Education are in the process of making a contribution of $250,000 each. Other local agencies are endeavoring to make up the balance before a May 15 deadline.

Although the area in this project includes substantial portions of my congressional district, I am sure that the entire Nation will profit by the Cleveland approach to the urgent problems of our unattended youth.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, by cutting the appropriation for the U.S. Public Health Service, I fear that we might jeopardize programs and research that are basic to the well-being and livelihood of citizens in every State in the Nation. I wish, particularly, to bring to the attention of my colleagues the far-reaching impact of budget slashes in the area of water pollution control and matching grants for construction of waste treatment facilities. I want to emphasize, as I have before, that the benefits of these programs extend to areas of need among the smaller communities of the country—communities with serious problems of stream pollution abatement and sewage treatment. In Oregon's Second District, 16 community grants have been made since the program started in late 1956 and 3 applications are now pending. In the entire State of Oregon 74 grants have been made to date with a total dollar value of $5,522,556—24 applications are pending statewide.

Mr. Chairman, economy is not being served by a $10 million cut in a program to cope with a problem of staggering proportions, a problem that is growing more alarming with each passing year. To cut back this program merely postpones the day of reckoning.

The $2 million cut in the appropriation for water pollution control threatens to eliminate several comprehensive research projects of the Public Health Service. Restoration of these funds is of utmost importance to continued research in areas of unusual water pollution problems. The largest center of population in my district is adjacent to the Upper Klamath Lake in Klamath County, Oreg. This community is plagued and threatened with a problem that is not of their making and one that is beyond present methods of control. Noxious algae in Klamath Lake has resulted in serious economic losses not only to Klamath County but to all of the California counties included in the Klamath River Basin.

Mr. Chairman, on this subject, I wish to quote briefly from "A Proposed Study for the Control of Noxious Algal Bloom," by Mr. Kenneth McLeod, Jr., research consultant at Southern Oregon College at Ashland, Oreg.:

> The heavy load of algae in the waters of the Klamath reach from the mountains to the sea and have created serious hazards of aquatic life, resulting in dramatic fish kills. There is some concern that livestock drinking the water may develop physical and physiological manifestations that might be misinterpreted as nutritional deficiencies or some similar ailment. Botulism which annually attacks ducks in this area is largely attributed to effects created by algal bloom.

Noxious algae is not only a problem in my own district, but is a significant cause of water pollution in many areas of the country. The unique characteristics of the Klamath Falls area make is particularly suited for a general investigation into the causes of this nationwide water pollution problem. The Upper Klamath Lake is relatively free of industrial and domestic contaminants so an algae research project centered in this area would more easily be able to isolate the particular causes of this type of water pollution.

Mr. Chairman, research in methods of controlling such a hazard on one of the largest fresh water lakes in the West should not be subjected to the uncertainty of an across-the-board slash in appropriations. Postponing the research necessary to solve these water pollution problems until such time as the resulting health hazards and economic losses have reached critical levels is certainly false economy. Let us attack these problems now while they are still manageable. These important programs for the health and well-being of the American people should not be delayed or permanently jeopardized.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to see that apparently no effort will be made to reduce the appropriation to carry on the work outlined in the Juvenile Delinquency Control Act of 1961. We had heard reports that an effort would be made to reduce this year's appropriation of $6.7 million by $2¼ million.

I share with my colleagues a great concern that apparently Federal bureaucratic redtape has been delaying the successful implementation of this program at the local level. It should be of serious concern to all of us that even though this act was approved 2 years ago, only a handful of communities are now engaged in pilot projects.

It is quite apparent that this whole program is suffering from the same kind of bureaucratic paralysis that too often frustrates the will and intent of Congress. It is my hope that the administration will impress on those responsible for implementing this program that the American people expect action from the New Frontier.

We all fought very hard for this legislation 2 years ago, and I am proud to say that I was in the forefront in the effort to win approval for this program. I have no intention of sitting idly by and seeing this whole program bogged down because of bureaucratic redtape.

But, Mr. Chairman, I am mindful of the fact that sound planning must precede the execution of this program. Two years ago Congress authorized this program with the sincere hope that mankind would finally start compiling in a methodical manner some sound information on why young people become juvenile delinquents. While we here in Congress quite properly become impatient with the delays in this program, I for one would not want to stampede anyone into presenting a poorly planned, ill advised program on which a vast sum of taxpayers' money would be spent with no significant results. I believe my position can be best summed up by a stern determination that while I recognize the need for diligent advance planning, I would not want this to be used as a shield for indecision on the part of those responsible for this program.

I know for a fact that the pilot project being planned in two of the most difficult neighborhoods in Chicago will in the final analysis give all of us a better idea of how best to deal with this problem of juvenile crime.

Mayor Daley recently appointed one of Chicago's most prominent citizens, Pat Hoy, to head the Chicago effort. I am proud that Mr. Hoy and his associates have been able to mobilize in Chicago all of the private agencies, the public agencies, the schools, the police department into a comprehensive project which we firmly believe will provide guidelines for successfully dealing with this problem of juvenile delinquency. Understandably, all of this took time, but we in Chicago are now ready to roll. I shall look with great concern upon any efforts to delay the Chicago program at the Federal level.

And so, Mr. Chairman, while we should all be concerned with delays in this program, I do not think we should blanketly indict Federal employees who have been in charge. I am confident that with adoption of today's appropriation, these pilot programs throughout America will bloom out in full force, and this Nation and the world will for the first time start obtaining some convincing data on how best to deal with the problem of juvenile delinquency.

I hope that no one here today will attempt to upset this program by suggesting cuts at this time. This is a very modest appropriation, albeit, $2 million is a tremendous amount of money in any man's language. However, I am sure that when this program is completed, we will save the taxpayers of America uncounted millions in human resources.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I have no more requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Grants to States, next succeeding fiscal year: For making, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to States under title III of the Social Security Act, as amended, and under the Act of June 6, 1933, as amended, for the first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary, the obligations incurred and the expenditures made thereunder for payments under such title and under such Act of June 6, 1933, to be charged to the appropriation therefor for that fiscal year: *Provided*, That the payments made pursuant to this paragraph shall not exceed the amount paid to the States for the first quarter of the current fiscal year.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to make some inquiry of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Michel]. I notice on page 759 of the hearings, in connection with the cost of the International Social

Security Association meeting, the gentleman from Illinois said to the witness:

> It would be a hard thing to sell—a dinner and reception and an excursion for $14,000. That is living pretty high off the hog.

I might say to the gentleman from Illinois he has not done much of a selling job on this. May I ask him to explain to me what this $14,000 representation allowance is that provides for a reception, a buffet dinner, and an official luncheon, with $600 for coffee?

I was amazed also to find that the testimony here is that this was based upon consultation with the State Department.

I can assure the gentleman that anyone who goes to the State Department for advice on representation allowances is going to get a pretty high figure. I wonder if the gentleman from Illinois would like to start his sales pitch now for that $14,000.

Mr. MICHEL. In responding to the gentleman, may I say, as indicated by the hearings, this is indeed a very hard item to sell. I did not feel exactly qualified to do so at the time of the hearing and I really do not feel qualified at this point. It points up what some of these social functions do cost in the name of cementing international relations. The gentleman from Ohio, I am sure, as has the gentleman from Illinois, gone abroad on a number of trips. After exercising our responsibilities during the course of the day, in practically every country there is scheduled a social event for every evening. Personally I would rather be on my own. Frankly, it would be cheaper for the country visited and it would be better for us as far as getting an adequate amount of rest is concerned. We find that in this whole business of international relations apparently it becomes, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] once said, a necessary tool of the trade to have these social functions. It is difficult to explain and justify to you at this time a dinner the cost of which does seem to me very monumental. I cannot stand here and tell the gentleman I could get him a cutrate of half that amount and expressed myself clearly during the hearings on page 759.

Mr. BOW. May I ask the gentleman this: In marking this up at $14,000, there is no other testimony here, but this is a $17.50 dinner, which is pretty expensive in anybody's restaurant. But did the gentleman also go to the State Department to get an estimate, or did he just accept it? There is no further testimony here except that somebody asked the State Department. I can assure you that if you are going to get advice, that is a bad place to go to.

Mr. MICHEL. I will agree with the gentleman. I think somewhere in the testimony I made the point that some of the departments had requested for the entire year for their representation allowance no more than $3,000 or $5,000 and I do say, compared to that, this is a very high figure. May I say as I said during general debate, I don't agree with all the specific figures in this bill but support it in view of concessions made to me on much larger figures by the subcommittee on other items.

Mr. BOW. One reason that this comes to my attention, I can say to the gentleman, is that the U.S. Information Agency, Mr. Murrow's Agency which deals with people going back and forth from foreign countries all year round is asking for $5,000 this year. Here is an outfit, on social security, and boy that is social security when you start getting $17.50 a meal—that is something to get on social security—but Ed Murrow is asking for $5,000 for the entire year. I will point to another item. Here is one—reception—one dinner, one buffet—$14,500. I might say there is an excursion there to Mount Vernon. I would suggest to the gentleman that I would hope the committee in its wisdom would offer its own amendment to see that this is brought in line.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, MEXICAN FARM LABOR PROGRAM

> For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to carry out the functions of the Department of Labor under the Act of July 12, 1951, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1461–1468), including temporary employment of persons without regard to the civil-service laws, $1,135,000, which shall be derived by transfer from the Farm labor supply revolving fund.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am interested to hear that junkets now have become excursions. I agree with my friend, the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Bow, that $14,500; was that the figure——

Mr. BOW. Yes; $14,500, or $17.50 a plate.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I agree that that is eating real high on the hog, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] just described it, especially when it involves social security spending.

Mr. Chairman, I arose to ask a question or two concerning the bill. I have looked through the hearings and I cannot find any list of the study subjects under the National Defense Education Act. A year or so ago the committee listed them and we found then that under the Defense Education Act they were studying jazz, the theatre, and the ecology of flowing waters and so on. There were a number of other similar subjects. But this year I cannot find the list of the studies being pursued. Is it in the hearings?

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAIRD. We have such a list. It is not published in the hearings this year. We would be very happy to make it available. It is a thick publication put out by the Office of Education and, of course, is a public document and since it was in published form, there was some question as to whether it should be reprinted in these hearings. Our committee, however, contrary to what the gentleman from Ohio might imply, is economy minded and I can assure the gentleman that a copy of that booklet will be on his desk tomorrow. The project needs have not changed very much. You still have jazz studies and you still have folklore studies and we still have these studies in these various areas that the gentleman was talking about last year.

Mr. GROSS. It will come just a little bit late tomorrow.

Mr. LAIRD. We may have a copy of the document here.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know what I could do with it at this late stage, but I would hope the committee would someday tell those who are administering the act that it is time they centered on courses of study that are related to national defense.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. LAIRD. We do not have a copy of the document here on the floor of the House this afternoon, and I apologize to the gentleman for not bringing one here to the floor with me today.

Mr. GROSS. I accept the apology.

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to direct your attention to page 17 of the bill beginning with line 18. There you will find that as far as the fellowship program is concerned we have written in language which I think would suggest that the efforts of the gentleman from Iowa I believe move in the right direction.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. Now, could the gentleman tell me whether the committee in any way restricted funds for the Labor Department to the extent that the Secretary of Labor would not be able tc send someone out to the Washington ballpark to remove the picket line so the President could go to the opening ball game? Is there any restriction of that nature?

Mr. LAIRD. Yes, we restricted that; we eliminated it.

Mr. GROSS. In what way did you eliminate it?

Mr. LAIRD. The Secretary wanted a special assistant to take care of the ball games, and he wanted a man who would take care of helping him in the District of Columbia and be his personal representative out at the ball park. We cut that money out of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. But according to the news reporters, the Secretary of Labor got a union leader and sent him out in his Cadillac to the ball park to call the pickets off.

Mr. LAIRD. There is no charge for that.

Mr. GROSS. I just wondered if the committee had in any way hampered the Secretary of Labor in putting pressure on union pickets so that they will not interfere with President Kennedy's pleasure.

Mr. LAIRD. We took out the request for the special assistant in the Secretary's budget.

Mr. GROSS. And it was in the national interest that the pickets be removed so that the President could enter the ball park, was it not?

Mr. LAIRD. It was in the national interest just as the effort of Secretary Goldberg in his very deliberate and prolonged negotiation which he carried on with the Metropolitan Opera was in the national interest. I believe that the Secretary of Labor is making a mistake getting involved in every dispute all over the United States; and in answer to a question I put to him he admitted that he was making a mistake getting involved in these particular disputes.

The Clerk read as follows:

PAYMENTS TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS

For payments to local educational agencies for the maintenance and operation of schools as authorized by the Act of September 30, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C., ch. 13), $104,466,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall also be available for carrying out the provisions of section 6 of such Act.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Ryan of New York: On page 16, line 10, immediately before the period insert the following: "*Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for payment for the maintenance or operation of any school to which any student is denied admission on the basis of his race, creed, color, or national origin."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman if he will agree to a unanimous-consent request that the committee in considering this amendment also consider a second amendment which is at the desk. It would come at line 21 on page 16. Will the distinguished Chairman consider the two amendments together?

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, the amendments touch the same thing, and I have no objection to them.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting]. One hundred and one Members are present, a quorum.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, the second amendment will have to be taken up separately.

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I renew my request that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 7 minutes, the last 2 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty].

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Fogarty and Mr. Mathias.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 78, nays 29.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I renew my unanimous-consent request that the pending amendment be considered together with a second amendment which is at the Clerk's desk, so that we have both parts of the program related together. That amendment is similar to the one read by the Clerk and may, out of my time, the Clerk read the second amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Ryan of New York: On page 16, line 21, immediately before the period insert the following: "*Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for providing any school facility to which any student is denied or will be denied, admission on the basis of his race, creed, color, or national origin."

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, the two amendments which I have offered deny funds under the impacted areas program to school districts which refuse to admit students to schools on the basis of race, creed, color, or national origin. The amendments apply to both the school maintenance and school construction programs.

Nearly 10 years ago the Supreme Court, in a historic decision, ruled that segregation in the public schools is illegal. The Court ruled that school districts be desegregated with all deliberate speed. Although the Court's ruling is the supreme law of the land, this decision is still debated, still defied, still ignored, and a large segment of our population is still condemned to second-class citizenship. The history of noncompliance with the Supreme Court decision is a sad one. But even sadder and more incredible is the fact that the Congress has continued to support segregated schools through the impacted areas program.

In fiscal year 1962 the Federal Government spent $297,169,905 for school maintenance and construction under the impacted areas program. Of this total, 36 percent or $106,129,107, was allocated to the Southern and Border States. A subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee in 1962 prepared a statistical sample of school districts in Southern and Border States which received Federal funds for school maintenance and operation under this program in fiscal year 1961. The study shows that 63.6 percent of the funds allocated to this area went to segregated school districts.

A recent study of the Civil Rights Commission shows that for the 1962–63 school year schools in military base impacted areas in Alabama, Georgia, South Carolina, and Mississippi are totally segregated. The amount of Federal funds spent in those areas totals $16,592,733. There is a total of 174,255 children residing both on and off these military bases.

The Justice Department has instituted five suits to desegregate seven school districts in impacted areas in four States: Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, and South Carolina. In Texas, Florida, Virginia, and Tennesseee 15 impacted area school districts have voluntarily desegregated. It is regrettable, however, that in eight school districts, which are segregated in the States of Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, and South Carolina, the Government plans to build desegregated schools on the military bases instead of fighting for compliance with the Supreme Court desegregation decision.

There is no doubt that the impacted areas program uses Federal funds to support segregated school districts. It is inconsistent with the Constitution and the Supreme Court to continue this practice as well as ironical that our Government, which sends troops to Mississippi, spends money for segregated school districts. It is our responsibility to protect the rights of all our citizens and to insure that no citizen is treated differently because of his race, color, or religion. In regard to the impacted areas program, we have the added responsibility of protecting the children of those citizens in Federal service. My amendments would eliminate our support for segregated schools. In doing so, we will clearly demonstrate that the U.S. House of Representatives upholds the right of every citizen to develop to his full potential regardless of race, color, or religion. I urge all my colleagues to join with me in voting for these amendments.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment and wish to compliment the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ryan] on bringing this persistent injustice in the disposition and use of Federal funds to the attention of the House.

I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ryan] and urge the House to adopt this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ryan] has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendments offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ryan]. I respect the views of my colleague, but we have been faced with this proposition on an appropriation bill now for 4 or 5 years in a row. It has been the contention of the subcommittee that the proper legislative committee should hold hearings on and bring out the necessary legislation. We have said in the past that this is in effect legislating on an appropriation bill and we have always opposed it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time, and ask for a vote on the amendments.

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say how ironic it is that the Democratic Party in the Senate uses the filibuster—unlimited debate—to kill legislation on civil rights but uses the reverse technique in the House where it cuts off debate. Only the active collusion of northern and southern Democrats makes this possible. Only through the cooperation of northern and southern Democrats who control this House is it possible to cut off debate on this vital national issue. In this way, the Democratic Party is killing in the House civil rights although, as a national party, they campaign vigorously as champions of civil rights.

We, in my party, are not interested any more in carrying on the debate from the speaking platforms across the country. We have done that; we consider the issue settled and the conclusions obvious. Now we want to debate it in the U.S. Congress. Here and here only can we enact the laws that will give our people the rights which our Constitution pledges to them. But it is here that the coalition of northern and southern Democrats—the National Democratic Party, in fact—recoils from the thought and chokes off every earnest effort to debate this vitally important issue.

This Congress is dawdling. It is going to go down in history as the record dawdler of all time. It is fumbling and not even doing that very well. It is timorous and uncertain; it is fiddling while Rome burns. But as we dawdle, we are told apparently that there is no time to carry on this debate; no time even to discuss it as responsible representatives of the American people. Twice since this session began, the majority party has stifled efforts to bring the issue of civil rights to full and open debate.

Oh, I know about the assurances that civil rights will be debated later on "in their proper place," as a very distinguished Member, a leader of the Democratic Party, put it last week. We shall see. But even if we are given, and some of us doubt that we will, this chance to debate it at some unspecified future time, what of these bills before us now? What of the medical education bill and the impacted areas bill and other general programs that may be brought up? Is it right that we should pass these without hearing arguments on civil rights? Is it right that these programs should be approved which provide Federal money even to beneficiaries which discriminate on the basis of race, creed, religion, and national origin?

The answer, Mr. Chairman, is that it is not right. Each instance is the proper place to carry on this debate. The issue of civil rights runs through the whole fabric of what we do here. The basic civil rights program, which is promised later, is also vital, but it will not of itself repair the omissions we have already condoned by enacting discriminatory legislation.

I have introduced a broad civil rights bill myself along with many others, and would welcome the coming debate that is promised. But that is no reason why we are not to attack this problem on all fronts.

We are missing opportunities, Mr. Chairman, or rather it is the majority of this House that is missing opportunities. And it is doing so deliberately. In fact, this will be legend of this Congress: it will be recorded as the Congress of lost opportunities; the Congress of deliberate avoidance of issue. And every opportunity missed now will make it that much more difficult for a succeeding Congress to make up lost ground.

It is sad and it is shameful.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RYAN of New York) there were—ayes 25, noes 79.

So the amendments were rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Loans and payments under the National Defense Education Act, next succeeding fiscal year: For making, after March 31 of the current fiscal year, loans and payments under title II of the National Defense Education Act, for the first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year such sums as may be necessary, the obligations incurred and the expenditures made thereunder to be charged to the appropriation for the same purpose for that fiscal year: *Provided*, That the payments made pursuant to this paragraph shall not exceed the amount paid for the same purposes for the first quarter of the current fiscal year.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to direct a question or two to the chairman and the ranking member of the subcommittee. I wonder if the chairman of the subcommittee can tell us the total number of additional Federal personnel requested or involved in the original request to the Committee on Appropriations, and the number actually involved in the recommendation brought in by the committee.

Mr. FOGARTY. The additional positions requested in the budget totaled about 5,000. The committee allowed 3,700, one-half of which will be employed by the Old Age and Survivors' Insurance Office in this country. And I will say that you may expect that program to increase in the years to come. The committee cut back about 1,500 positions that were requested but we still allowed 3,700.

Mr. JOHANSEN. May I ask the distinguished chairman whether this increase in the Social Security Administration is on the basis of increased workload or on the basis of anticipated new legislation?

Mr. FOGARTY. No; everything in this budget is based on the actual workload being experienced at this time.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I wonder if the chairman can make any comment as to the rather substantial increase in employees in the Social Security Administration in view of the considerable amount of automation and computer equipment being used by social security.

Mr. FOGARTY. The increase perhaps would be 2 or 3,000 more personnel under social security if we were not using electronic equipment that we have at the present time.

Mr. JOHANSEN. One final question; can the gentleman reduce to dollars the amount of the request and the amount of the reduction?

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not have that in dollars, but I should be glad to supply it for the RECORD.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I appreciate that, and I thank the gentleman. And in line with the comment of old Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes, that we are grateful for small favors and larger ones in proportion, we are grateful for these reductions. As a member of the Manpower Utilization Subcommittee I should like to say that we are constantly concerned about the increased number of Federal personnel and I regret the circumstance that has resulted again in a net increase.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MICHEL. One point that has not been mentioned here in response to the gentleman's inquiry is that 644 of these increases come in the Food and Drug Administration. Both gentlemen on this side of the aisle supported the budget figure. I think the gentleman will recall back in 1957 when attempts were made to cut back in this area even in insignificant amounts, we were beaten down on something like 14 rollcalls.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I recall that.

Mr. MICHEL. This year we gave them that increase and hope that they will perform the job that they say they can do.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I yield.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I want to applaud the gentleman's Subcommittee on Manpower Utilization on their attitude on this matter. The increases indicated by the gentleman from Rhode Island, a majority of them were due to the Social Security Administration's request for increases in the social security provisions last year. I might say that this is one agency in which productivity and efficiency have increased perhaps much more than in any other agency of the Government.

The gentleman well knows, because of his fine appreciation of the efforts of employees, that this is one of the best agencies with respect to dealing with the public in all of the 50 States, and the fantastic number of district offices which it has. I think perhaps this agency better than any other renders greater courtesy and more service and actually treats the people better than any of the other agencies in our Government.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I appreciate the gentleman's observation. I repeat that the thing that is of most importance to the committee members and to me as an individual member is that we have a doubletrack interest in this matter of personnel cost. We have a continuing increase in the number of Federal employees. It is because of the debate we had last year on the principle of comparability that we are now also confronted with proposed increases in pay which are pyramided one on top of the other, as we were very well reminded of yesterday when the President's message came up.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES

To carry out the provisions of title VI of the Act, as amended, $177,914,000, of which $100,000,000 shall be for grants or loans for hospitals and related facilities pursuant to part C, $5,628,000 shall be for the purposes authorized in section 636, and $70,000,000 shall be for grants or loans for facilities pursuant to part G, as follows: $20,000,000 for diagnostic or treatment centers, $20,000,000 for hospitals for the chronically ill and impaired, $10,000,000 for rehabilitation facilities, and $20,000,000 for nursing homes: *Provided*, That allotments under such parts C and G to the several States for the current fiscal year shall be made on the basis of amounts equal to the limitations specified herein: *Provided further*, That funds made available under section 636 for experimental or demonstration construction or equipment projects shall not be used to pay in excess of two-thirds of the cost of such projects as determined by the Surgeon General.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RYAN of New York: On page 26, line 22, immediately before the period insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That no part of the amounts appropriated under this paragraph may be used for grants or loans for any hospital, center, facility, or home established, or having separate facilities, for population groups ascertained on the basis of race, creed, color, or national origin."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposed would deny funds appropriated under the Hill-Burton Act for hospitals, nursing homes, or other establishments which maintain segregated facilities or which refuse to admit individuals on the basis of race, creed, color, or national origin.

The Hill-Burton construction program is an example of one of the most flagrant violations of the constitutional principle of equal treatment for all regardless of race or color. Under this program the 11 Southern States have received more than one-half billion dollars for hospital construction. It has been pointed out that nearly all of these institutions discriminate against Negro citizens. In fiscal year 1962 alone, $36,755,994 was allocated for 103 facilities which discriminated against American citizens on the grounds of color.

The New York Times on February 13, 1962, reported that, according to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 100 of the 4,000 Hill-Burton hospitals barred Negroes. Others admit Negro patients, but segregate them within the hospital. It was reported, for example, that one hospital in Georgia provided only 12 beds for Negro patients, and the beds were located in a segregated section of the hospital in the basement. In addition, many Southern hospitals refuse to hire Negro doctors.

It is clear, as it is in the impacted areas program, that Congress is supporting segregation through the appropriation of Federal funds for segregated programs. If we are serious in our determination to uphold the Constitution and the dignity of all men regardless of color, we must refuse to continue to support segregated programs. The use of Federal funds for segregated hospital facilities is an affront to our democratic principles. We can no longer allow our citizens to be deprived of the best medical care available because of the color of their skin. I hope that those of my colleagues, who voted last week to deny funds to medical and dental schools that discriminate, will take this opportunity to show their disapproval of discrimination in medical facilities. And I hope that all my colleagues will join me in ending discrimination in this area.

Mr. Chairman, unfortunately it is doubtful that a comprehensive civil rights bill will reach the floor from the legislative committee. Today may be the only opportunity to make it clear that Congress no longer will tolerate the expenditure of Federal funds for segregated programs. I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Again I say I appreciate the views of the gentleman from New York, but I use the same argument as I did before that it is the considered judgment of our committee that this is something which should be brought before the proper legislative committee and should not be considered on an appropriation bill. Therefore, I ask that the amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RYAN of New York) there were—ayes 26, noes 75.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

GRANTS FOR WASTE TREATMENT WORKS CONSTRUCTION

For payments under section 6 of the Water Pollution Control Act, as amended (33 U.S.C. 466e), $90,000,000.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLATNIK: On page 29, line 5, at the end of the line following the comma, strike out "$90,000,000" and insert "$100,000,000".

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, the last 5 to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes, the last 5 to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, what this amendment does is to restore $10 million for Federal grants for the construction of water pollution control facilities by municipalities to the $90 million for this purpose already authorized in this appropriation bill. This restoration of funds raises the appropriation again to the $100 million figure authorized in the original act.

The authorizing act is Public Law 87-85, which was, by the way, initiated by the House on July 20, 1961. My colleagues will recall that the water pollution program until 1961 was operating at a $50 million Federal grant level. We have raised that $50 million to $100 million by a series of $10 million a year increases. Public Law 87-85 of 3 years ago provided for the fiscal year 1961, $50 million; for 1962, $80 million; for 1963, $90 million—that was last year—and then $100 million for 1964 and annually thereafter until 1967.

For every dollar of Federal grant money made available to a local municipality, the municipality raised $5 as its share. Not grant this increase, at this point, would be to pull the rug out from under this program, and I say it would be reneging on the statements we made to these municipalities which, during these past 3 years, have undertaken plans for their water pollution projects, even in some cases bonding themselves to make funds available for financing. There are today approved—not under consideration or pending, but approved—applications for water pollution grants numbering over 1,500. These have been approved according to criteria laid down by the act of Congress. The total amount of money is $177 million. There is currently a total construction backlog of $2.2 billion in facilities for the United

States as a whole. The present construction goal of the Public Health Service, in view of the Nation's needs, is set at $600 million annually. But by 1973, 10 short years from now, as a result of dollar inflation, increases in construction costs, and expected population growth, PHS estimates that we will have to spend a staggering $807 million annually on water pollution control facilities in order merely to keep up with routine needs. And today we are disputing the expenditure of a fraction of that amount.

I know it is not the intent of Congress to, at the last moment, pull the rug out from under the municipalities ready to proceed and go ahead. The intent of Congress is to live up to its decision and to participate with the municipalities in these control projects.

At the present time, the level of expenditure for water pollution projects is the highest in the history of the program. We are just beginning to level off, to take care of pollution as it has increased each year; for the first time in history we are holding the line. Widespread support is necessary for this important program, just as widespread support is necessary and vital to the preservation and the utilization of water, an increasingly important resource. Therefore I urge that this $10 million be restored. This $10 million will generate an additional $50 million in local projects already pending, qualified, and ready to go.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Minnesota. In Westchester County on Long Island Sound, N.Y., there is a clear and serious water pollution problem. I think the gentleman's amendment should be supported. At Mamaroneck, in particular, there is a request and application on the order of $600,000 for a treatment sewage plant involving seven communities. This is an urgent health matter for Westchester residents and affects my county's entire water pollution control program. I think there is a clear need for an expanded Federal program in this area, and I urge that the amendment be adopted.

Mr. BLATNIK. I appreciate the gentleman's fine statement. This is a fast-growing need across the country.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I am happy to yield to one of the original sponsors of the legislation, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON].

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Minnesota for the months and years of hard work he has put in to make this program one of the finest programs I think that has ever come out of our committee, and certainly in the House.

Will the gentleman tell me, Does he know any more serious problem that faces the country than lack of fresh water in the future?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. McFALL].

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge the approval of the full $100 million authorized under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and restore the $10 million cut by the committee.

It would seem difficult to justify or approve this reduction in view of the action taken by this House on April 10, when we restored $150 million to the accelerated public works program by a vote of 228 to 184 to the supplemental appropriation bill. Two weeks ago we were concerned—and properly so—with the need for increasing national employment and shoring up the economy. We felt that public works were needed and we consequently authorized a Federal program at an expenditure level of $450 million. Now we are being asked to cut $10 million from another public works program which in many respects is more effective and even more desperately needed. We find ourselves in the inconsistent position of providing nearly full funding for a program that concerns a limited, though important, part of our country and cutting the funds for an almost identical vital program to the entire country.

The effect of this cut is far more than $10 million. The Federal water pollution control program, in its grants to cities for sewage treatment works, has consistently stimulated public works expenditures at the rate of one Federal dollar invested to five local dollars. When the committee now asks us to reduce our investment in sewage treatment facilities under the water pollution control program, in other words, we are thus being asked to sacrifice $60 million in new jobs, new construction, and needed plants.

The Federal water pollution control program has been outstanding in stimulating public works. In the early 1950's, before the act was passed, our country was spending less than $300 million each year for sewage treatment facilities, all of it local money. This was far less than was needed. It did not keep up with the needs of our growing population and industry, and it was entirely insufficient to make up for previous years of outrageous neglect.

In 1956 the Federal program began to send Federal money into this field and there was an almost immediate upsurge in construction. Funds used for treatment facilities rose to above $400 million annually, of which—under the 1956 law—$50 million was authorized in Federal funds. This was still not enough to protect our rivers and streams but it was certainly better than before.

Under the leadership of our distinguished colleague from Minnesota, a more realistic Federal program was devised in 1961. This called for $80 million in fiscal year 1962, $90 million in fiscal year 1963, and $100 million in fiscal year 1964 and the years following. The result was another upsurge in construction, which continues today. For the first time in our Nation's history we now have some reasonable hope for eliminating raw sewage in our water.

Throughout these years of Federal aid, funds have been spent efficiently and with the very minimum of redtape. Our money has played the role of "seed" money, stimulating local communities to go ahead and meet their responsibilities. And the ratio of 1 to 5 has continued.

So, Mr. Chairman, I return to my original question, If 2 weeks ago we were justified in appropriating $450 million for public works—and we were justified—how can we strike out $10 million for a more effective, equally important program, so essential to our country's welfare?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota has stated very well the issue that is before us today in connection with this amendment. We are either going to keep faith with these local communities who have come in to participate in this program by providing the full amount authorized by the authorizing legislation or we are going to cut back on it and by so doing reduce substantially the level of work being done in this vital field.

There is no question about the effect of these grants in bringing about stimulated activity in terms of waste treatment control in the local communities.

Since the program started there has been a dramatic increase in the program all over the country. The increase was 60 percent almost immediately after we started the program. In 1961 it went up another 25 percent, in 1962 another 25 percent. We are operating now at a national level of over $545 million being spent to control the pollution of our streams. We are only having to put up one-fifth in Federal funds to get this volume of activity in a vital area where the best evidence we have indicates an annual expenditures of more than $600 million is needed for the next 10 years, to meet urgent needs for pollution control.

Now, the pollution of our streams is one of the most serious problems the country faces today, and while we can be economical in many other areas and justify cuts in many other programs with good reason, I think this is an area in which we cannot afford to cut back on the authorized programs and on the request of this administration.

Mr. Chairman, I urgently hope that the amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, this item in the bill was gone over very thoroughly by our committee. There was some thought that since this year the program was established at $90 million, the fiscal year 1964 program could very well be carried at the same level as fiscal 1963. Others thought it should be cut lower. There are several reasons why I feel that the $90 million figure is quite adequate. Most important is the fact that from the $400 million which was made available in the supplemental bill passed last year $44 million was channeled into waste treatment or sewer facilities. In the first general supplemental bill of this Congress which passed just a week ago here in the House, $71 million will be channeled into waste treatment facilities or sewer facilities. This makes a total available for expenditure in fiscal 1964 of about $115 million over and above the program in fiscal 1963. We are merely recommending in this bill that the program level for sewer and waste treatment facilities be kept at the 1963 level. There will still be a very large increase in total Federal funds for this type of activity.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, during the last Congresses, this body voted for authorizations for appropriation on the level of $100 million a year for grants to States for construction on a matching basis of sewer and water pollution abatement works. Most of us went home, and told our constituents what we had done to abate and eliminate water pollution. This is a chance today to vote to continue what we have done on this desperately important matter and to continue investing in the future of the United State by giving our children and our grandchildren and our people today pure water and by giving them an adequate level of construction of pollution abatement facilities on the local level. This is perhaps the most successful program that this Congress has ever enacted in terms of securing local participation and abatement of water pollution. It would be a great shame if we were to let this program go funded less than the amount requested. Just remember, when each of us goes home from this Congress, we will have to justify our activities to our people and to those who believe in outdoor activities and to those who concern themselves with what goes into each glass of water that they use in their home or in their household. This vote will be an important one, not only important in a sense of justification of our activities to our people but important to those who utilize this water.

Our water is our most precious natural resource. Failure to meet this level of expenditure requested, $100 million will cause reduction of local effort by 4½ to 1. In this case if the Congress fails to spend these funds, we will be putting into pollution abatement $60 million less this year.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, since the turn of the century, while our population has a little more than doubled, there has been an eightfold increase in the use of water. Our population, now in excess of 185 million, is using water at the rate of 350 billion gallons a day. Its use will reach 600 billion gallons a day by 1980, and 900 billion gallons a day by the turn of the century. In the meantime, our maximum dependable supply will remain constant at an estimated 525 billion gallons a day.

This does not mean our grandchildren will run out of water by the year 2000 and industry will cease to expand and agriculture will shrivel because of insufficient water. Even now, the waters of the Ohio River are used an estimated 3.7 times during periods of low flow before they join the Mississippi. This will be a common alarm everywhere in a few more years.

Seriously impeding such reuse is the amount of pollution in our surface waters. There is now nearly 6 times as much wastes in our rivers, streams, and lakes as there was 60 years ago. The President has described this condition as "a national disgrace, endangering health, limiting our country's business opportunities, and destroying recreation. Whether we approach this problem of pollution on a piecemeal basis or whether we do it intelligently and sensibly depends upon the support of this Congress of comprehensive studies. Out of the work now going on will come blueprints for meeting critical water supply and pollution problems in all areas of the country. These will represent the joint and cooperative effort of many agencies and many scientific and economic interests. The President's budget for 1964 proposed a 10-year schedule for the completion of water pollution control studies in each of our major river basins. With the reduction made by the House Appropriations Committee, this target date cannot possibly be met.

Three programs now underway in the Chesapeake Bay-Susquehanna River, the upper Ohio River, and the Columbia River will be delayed; four new projects will be postponed entirely, including the Tri-State area including Lake Champlain, Long Island, the Mohawk and Hudson River Valleys, and the New York Harbor complex; the southeastern river basins of Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, and Florida; and the lower Missouri and Red River of the North.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a table.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, the program of Federal aid for local water pollution control programs is one of the best investments this country has ever made. While it represents only a tiny fraction of the overall Federal budget, it plays a key role in protecting the health and safety of our people and in saving our water resources which are one of our greatest national assets.

Just 2 years ago the House authorized a long-term program of Federal aid for waste treatment plants by an overwhelming 3 to 1 vote. That law provided for annual appropriations over a 6-year period including the $100 million of authority for the coming fiscal year. It was deeply disturbing to learn that the bill reported by the Appropriations Committee cut $10 million from the amount requested for this program. I have the highest esteem for the members of the Appropriations Committee and I am sure that when they have heard all sides of this question that they will reconsider their action and support the restoration of these funds.

In my judgment, we should be doing more, rather than less, in the field of water pollution control. In fact, the pending applications on hand right now add up to over $170 million in Federal aid. Even the full $100 million authorization for this year cannot immediately meet all these needs but it would be a false economy to provide less than that authorized for this highly important purpose.

One of the most significant aspects of this program is the fact that it is primarily a small town program and that is the way the law is written. The ceiling of $600,000 per project and the reservation of funds for small and medium-size cities insures that smaller towns will share fully in the benefits. The Congress has enacted many programs aimed largely at meeting the problems of our larger population centers but this is one instance where it has given special recognition to the smaller community.

A particular benefit of this program in the current economic setting is the tremendous number of jobs it creates throughout the country, including jobs in the factories which produce the materials, the trains and trucks which haul them, and the further economic stimulant that comes from the spending and respending of the incomes generated.

I am very pleased to note that my own State of Alabama shares fully in the benefits of this program. Many projects in the past have been built with this aid and many more will be built in the future. Right now, there are applications pending here in Washington for some 44 Alabama communities awaiting the enactment of the current appropriation. These applications call for Federal grants of some $3 million and represent total construction costs of $10 or $15 million. These plants will make an important contribution to making Alabama an ever better place in which to live and work. I am inserting in the RECORD at this point a list of the applications now on hand under the water pollution control program from the State of Alabama:

Pending applications for municipal waste treatment works construction grants

ALABAMA

Municipality:	*Grant request*
Opelika	$250,000
Talladega	105,000
Tuskegee	90,000
Alexander City	103,350
Berry	7,500
Childersburg	60,000
Fayette	36,000
Jackson	60,000
Springville	30,000
Sylacauga	150,000
Elba	73,170
Jefferson County (Leeds)	90,000
Jefferson County (Tarrant)	180,000
Newton	24,000
Sulligent	15,000
Vernon	12,000
York	58,500
Bayou LaBatre	22,500
Boaz	151,530
Brewton	132,000

Pending applications for municipal waste treatment works construction grants—Con.

ALABAMA—continued

Municipality:	Grant request
Chickasaw	$161,100
Clayton	32,700
Collinsville	12,000
Columbia	6,000
Columbiana	14,190
East Brewton	9,600
Fultondale	12,000
Hamilton	24,000
Leeds	52,500
Leighton	21,000
Luverne	24,000
Mobile	180,000
Mobile	250,000
Muscle Shoals	120,000
Oakman	9,000
Prichard	135,000
Parrish	15,000
Samson	16,500
Thomasville	13,500
Warrior	34,500
Butler	60,690
Foley	61,500
Gordo	19,260
Trussville	36,000

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON] for 2 minutes.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. In the subcommittee, I voted against the reduction of these funds from $100 million to $90 million and I reserve the right to oppose this reduction on the floor of the House. The reduction was made because accelerated public works funds had been used in constructing waste treatment plants. That defeats the very purpose of the Accelerated Public Works Act. Its purpose was to relieve unemployment by building worthwhile public projects in the so-called distressed areas. If we reduce funds which would otherwise have been used for that purpose, we are, in effect, repealing the Accelerated Public Works Act.

This is also unfair to communities which are not in the so-called distressed areas. I am sure that most of you have had complaints from these communities that they are not receiving the same benefits as those in distressed areas. By this amendment, you are cutting the funds which would otherwise be available to the nondistressed areas because the money is spent in distressed areas. People in nondistressed areas have sewage problems the same as those in distressed areas and, after all, the purpose of this law is to prevent the pollution of our streams. Our streams can be polluted by both distressed and nondistressed areas.

Most of the district I represent is on the Ohio River and this program was very important to my district. Sewage is dumped into the Ohio River and people drink that water. Before the locks and dams were built it was not such a serious problem as running water purifies itself, but when the river reached the pool stage, it became a very serious problem. However, every city in my district on the Ohio River, either has a sewage disposal plant or has one being built. Probably there are some communities away from the river that will have to build sewage disposal plants. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] had printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a list, showing the communities which have applications for sewage disposal plants pending and not one is in my district. I speak about this fact to show that I am not favoring this amendment because of a special concern for the district I represent. I do not want to be in the position of seeing my district get the benefit of the act and then lose interest in it.

This program has been highly successful but for some reason it is continually met with opposition. You will remember that the fund was originally $50 million and the budget recommendations were always lower than that. Our subcommittee generally raised the appropriation to the full amount authorized by law. For some time, it was obvious that $50 million was not an adequate sum for the Government's share in this program. Twice Congress raised this sum and both times, the bill was vetoed. Finally, in 1961, legislation was passed, increasing the ceiling to $80 million for the first year, $90 for the second year, and $100 million for the third year. As of the first of this year, 4,112 grants were made, totaling $354 million under this program for waste-treatment plants, costing $2.2 billion. Thus, it will be seen that for every $1 spent by the Federal Government, local governments spend $5. There are 1,701 requests for sewage treatment plants now pending which would require $190 million. It is estimated that about 5,000 communities needing sewage disposal plants will require over $2 billion. It is estimated that it will require an overall expenditure of $600 million and $100 million by the Government, anually, to keep abreast of these funds.

These waste-treatment plants are going to have to be built and to deny funds for that purpose now will mean that more funds will have to be appropriated and spent at a later date and construction costs will be higher then.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] for 2 minutes.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota, and wish to compliment the gentleman for offering the amendment at this time. I will say that the experts who appeared before the Committee on Public Works of this Congress established that we must maintain construction contracts at a level of $600 million for a period of 10 years. We are now already behind some $50 million toward this goal.

Mr. Chairman, if the House of Representatives reduces the level of expenditures authorized in 1961 for construction of waste-treatment facilities by the $10 million recommended by the Appropriations Committee, it will in effect: first, fail to meet the objectives set by the Water Pollution Control Act of 1961 to underwrite a maximum Federal effort to solve the water pollution problem; second, deny the economy some $60 million worth of badly needed construction activity; and third, reduce also by some $60 million the practical effectiveness of the public works acceleration program for which the House overwhelmingly approved $450 million within the last 2 weeks.

If the Congress acquiesces to the Appropriations Committee recommendation to deny the additional $10 million in construction funds authorized by the Water Pollution Control Act of 1961 it will be breaking the pledge it made in that year to support a maximum Federal effort to clean up the Nation's growing water pollution problem.

The effect of denying additional $10 million authorized by the Congress in 1961 is that an additional $60 million worth of badly needed sewerage construction activity will not take place, and the very substantial amount of employment activity that this expenditure would involve this year will be lost. This is true in that the ratio of local to Federal dollars invested in this program has been about 5 to 1.

The House less than 2 weeks ago approved an additional $450 million for accelerated public works activities. This program was overwhelmingly approved because the Members recognized its tremendous importance as a stimulant to employment in those areas of the Nation where economic activity has lagged. The House, if it sustains the denial of these funds for the construction of waste-treatment plants, will, in effect, be reducing the $450 million accelerated public works appropriation something in excess of $30 million. Those Members who support the accelerated public works program will remember that the funds authorized under that program were to be used, not as a substitute for local money or Federal money already authorized, but were to be in addition to programs planned for and funded by the governments involved.

Indeed, the whole objective of the program is to stimulate State and local governments to raise new funds over and above what they had planned to spend by providing Federal matching grants so as to stimulate employment and to provide badly needed public facilities at the State and local level.

If the House approves this reduction in the authorization for grants for waste-treatment plant construction, the principle of the public works program will have been violated and precedence set to cut back on other Federal programs involving construction activities. Such cuts can only result in the complete loss of the stimulatory effect of the public works acceleration program on employment.

Through the Water Pollution Control Act of 1961 we finally succeeded in getting Congress to approve of construction activity which we needed 10 years ago and which we will finally achieve this year if we can move the program in accordance with the request of the President. For the House to acquiesce to the reduction proposed by the Appropriations Committee would be a serious setback to the program and will mean that many of the Nation's communities will be forced to curtail and delay actions long overdue to clean up serious pollution problems.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I have in my hand a letter written by the League of Women Voters to the editor of the Washington Post. I would like to quote just one paragraph from the letter:

> We are in full sympathy with the desire of the Congress to cut Federal expenditures. We believe, however, that in this field the Nation cannot allow itself to slide backward. The economy, the national defense, and the health of the Nation are dependent on clean water. Unfortunately, there is a limited supply of water which meets standards of purity essential to industry in the areas where industry is located. That supply is being threatened by increasing burdens of pollution. The efforts presently being made to clean up these and other streams are endangered by the action that the Appropriations Committee has taken.

Then they go on to state that they would appreciate the efforts of the Congress in restoring the $10 million that was cut by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] for yielding to me at this time. I rise in support of this amendment and say that a vote for the amendment is a vote for a healthier and stronger America. In my opinion those who vote against it will be voting against that concept.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO] for 2 minutes.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I urge the committee to follow the lead of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] as we have followed him in the past in these matters dealing with water pollution. There is no question but that this item of legislation is one of the best received programs by our people back home. I know that in my own district there is already action in this direction with some of our Connecticut communities gathering together to do in concert what they cannot do separately.

Mr. Chairman, this is not only an important national program; it is a new way through which communities can be of aid and assistance to each other.

Mr. Chairman, I urge this committee to restore in the appropriation bill the full $100 million authorized for fiscal year 1964 for municipal sewage treatment construction grants under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. I do this in defense of this country's water resource, which in many parts of this country is already being taxed to the utmost.

Since the Nation's beginning nearly two centuries ago, our dominant interest in water has shifted greatly. When our country was young the major water interests were canals and waterwheel power for small industries. Later, when our growing population began moving westward, we began to give increased attention to flood control and irrigation. Later came a new interest in hydroelectric power.

Now, for the first time in some of our water-rich areas, we are beginning to fear for the quantity of water which Nature has given to us. There is an increasing competition for water among domestic, municipal, agricultural, industrial, and recreational users together with increasing pollution of streams and lakes by these users.

We can get some idea of the economic factors involved from studies carried on 3 years ago by the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources. These studies indicated that we are now spending some $10 billion annually in development of our water resources. During the next 20 years we will need $12 billion alone simply for new dams and reservoirs and $42 billion for new municipal and industrial sewage works.

Against this overwhelming economic demand, what does our present Federal Water Pollution Control Act do and what will be the effect of a cut of $10 million.

First, water pollution control is absolutely central to our water resource problem. Increasingly we will be using the same water over and over again and increasingly we must meet this challenge to water quality by installing adequate waste treatment facilities. These are expensive and the burden of their cost falls primarily—as figured on a per capita basis—on the small and middle-sized community. Helping these cities is the goal of the construction grant part of the Federal act.

The bill as authorized for fiscal year 1964 calls for an expenditure of $100 million for construction. We know from past experience that this will be matched by some $500 million which will be contributed by the local community and in some cases, by States. The effort, in short, will result in $600 million in new sewage treatment construction.

It is sobering to think that it will take 10 long years at this rate of construction before we can say that we are abreast of our municipal needs, but this is true. An interruption at this stage of $10 million will delay this past 10 years and may, through some snowballing effect, have even more serious consequences.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI].

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK].

Mr. Chairman, the waste-treatment program has been one of the most popular ever authorized by Congress. The cities like it. The States like it. It has been well administered. And most important, it is doing what it was intended to do—speed up the construction of sewage treatment plants.

Have you ever observed a polluted stream? It is offensive to sight and smell; to plant and animal. The water it contains is foul and unusable and shunned by all. Polluted water is an offense to civilized man and it can strangle the development of our country. We must have clean water to survive. It is literally the lifeblood of the Nation.

The 1961 amendments to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act authorized the full kit of tools required to control pollution. One of the most important of these was increased financial assistance for waste-treatment works construction.

Many of us felt when the 1961 amendments were being debated that the 1956 act did not provide enough assistance to the larger communities, so the maximum grant was increased to $600,000. As a result, cities over 50,000 population now receive 23 percent of all grants as compared to 13 percent the earlier act. We also established incentives for communities to get toegther to build the more sensible and economic multimunicipal projects.

I note from the report of hearings before the Subcommittee on Appropriations this year that we have had quite a number of large projects approved since 1961 which will serve groups of cities and towns. One example is San Diego, Calif., where 10 cities and districts joined together to build a project costing $50 million with grants totaling only $2.1 million. Another is being built by the Madison, Wis., Sewerage District at a cost of $2.7 million with a grant of $360,000. This will serve 13 Wisconsin communities.

It has been stated and restated since 1956 that it will take $100 million a year in grants to encourage sufficient construction to bring the municipal waste problem under control. The testimony to this appropriation bill repeatedly emphasizes the importance of the full appropriation. Those closest to the problem, the State water pollution control administrators testified that the backlog of needed treatment works is still very large and we cannot afford to grow complacent. They said that the authorized increase from $90 to $100 million for construction grants next year is fundamental to continued progress in pollution abatement.

No one questions the importance of a strong program of waste-treatment works construction. We would all argue, I am sure, that we must preserve and protect our water resources. There is no alternative before us. Waste treatment is absolutely essential to the conservation of this resource. Public investment in the construction of these facilities is a necessity, not a luxury. Failure to appropriate the full $100 million in Federal funds will mean the loss of about $50 million in local matching funds. It will mean that at least 100 municipalities will continue to pour their wastes into our lakes and streams. It will mean that we have failed to implement fully the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and have placed in peril the future of this great country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BASS].

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Blatnik amendment and urge its adoption. I think it is important and vital to the health and welfare of the Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty] to close the debate.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. As all members of our committee have already said there were some of us who thought that more money ought to be appropriated for this item or that item, and some thought less money ought to be appropriated. This was a compromise in our committee. It was the judgment of the majority of the committee that this amount be kept down to the 1963 level. I am supporting the committee action.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, the point has been made several times today that the bill as it passed the House provided an authorization for the fiscal year 1964 of $100 million. If we were going to appropriate in this bill on the basis of 100 percent of authorizations, this bill would be increased by at least a half billion dollars. We have pointed out that in the fiscal year 1964 the expenditure level, when you include the accelerated public works program will be some $200 million for waste treatment and sewer facilities compared with $90 million for the fiscal year 1963.

This $10 million increase which is provided in this amendment is not necessary. We do not break faith with any community in the United States.

We all talk about limiting Federal expenditures. Here is a place where we should certainly keep the limit of expenditures in the part of this program provided in the bill under consideration at the 1963 level.

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Hechler].

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Blatnik amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the observation has been made that there is sufficient money available in the accelerated public works program to take care of all these waste-treatment construction grants. It seems to me that failure to vote the full $100 million provided in the President's budget undercuts the accelerated public works program, and violates the will of the House expressed when it recently voted $450 million for that program.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, small communities throughout the Nation will suffer unless we vote the full amount requested by the President. The West Virginia Water Resources Commission recently reported that 65 communities with a population of 212,200 still discharge untreated sewage into streams in the State. Eight more towns of 51,400 persons need plant enlargement or additions. The total cost of municipal sewage treatment needs in West Virginia is $46 million.

The grants under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act have enabled many towns to proceed with needed treatment plants, and it is anticipated that the State will need all of the assistance it can get from this important program in the years ahead. I believe West Virginia has a vast potential for development of tourism and recreation for millions of people along the Atlantic seaboard, and if we are ever to develop these facilities to the fullest we must take early and effective action to clean up stream pollution.

For these reasons, I strongly urge adoption of the Blatnik amendment to increase the appropriation for waste-treatment grants from $90 to $100 million. I thank the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty] for yielding to me.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, with regard to the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin I wish to point out that we are appropriating funds for the coming fiscal year. The public works accelerated program which he spoke of as an alternative, expires on June 30 and there has not even been much talk of appropriating funds under that program yet for fiscal 1964.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAIRD. The point I wished to make on that was that according to the report that I received this morning, in the next 2 months $71 million will be obligated under this particular program for sewer facilities, under the public works program. All these expenditures will be made in the fiscal year 1964. This is in addition to the $90 million provided in this particular bill. There is an expenditure rate of $400 million made available under the public works accelerated program and of that amount $41 million is being expended in the fiscal year 1963. But this expenditure will be made in the fiscal year 1964. The obligation will be made before June 30 under the terms of this particular legislation.

The obligations that will be made before June 30 come under the terms of this particular legislation. Your program in this area will be increased by about 25 percent in fiscal 1964. Many of the programs that were approved by the State boards of public health under this program have been shifted into the accelerated public works program in those areas that are depressed. These funds will be used to a greater extent in the areas that are not qualified under the present program. I do hope that the funding level of 1963 will be maintained by the House today.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the membership, I should like to announce that when we get back into the House I am going to ask permission for everyone to extend his remarks on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Blatnik].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Laird) there were—ayes 105, noes 97.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Laird and Mr. Blatnik.

The Committee again divided and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 124, noes 147.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

GRANTS FOR MATERNAL AND CHILD WELFARE

For grants for maternal and child-health services, services for crippled children, and child-welfare services as authorized in title V, parts 1, 2, and 3, of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U.S.C., ch. 7, subch. V; 74 Stat. 995–997), $86,943,000, of which $25,000,000 shall be available for services for crippled children, $25,000,000 for maternal and child-health services, $33,000,000 for child-welfare services, and $3,943,000 for research, training, or demonstration projects in child welfare: *Provided*, That any allotment to a State pursuant to section 502(b) or 512(b) of such Act shall not be included in computing for the purposes of subsections (a) and (b) of sections 504 and 514 of such Act an amount expended or estimated to be expended by the State: *Provided further*, That $1,000,000 of the amount available under section 502(b) of such Act shall be used only for special projects for mentally retarded children.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to make inquiry of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird] with respect to the Kerr-Mills program. On page 250 through page 253 testimony by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Celebrezze, and also by Mr. Cohen, establishes the fact that some 28 States are already participating in the Kerr-Mills program. I note further that one State, New Jersey, is in the process of submitting a plan pursuant to legislation enacted by New Jersey. I note further that a short time ago the States of Indiana, Ohio, South Dakota, and Nevada were in the process of qualifying for participation. I should like to state to the Committee and to the gentleman from Wisconsin that the Minnesota State Senate a week ago today passed enabling legislation by unanimous vote, and that the house of representatives of my State is in the process of passing this legislation. In all probability it will be signed by the Governor of Minnesota.

The question I should like to direct to the gentleman from Wisconsin is this: In light of the itemizations of the funds allocated to States as set forth on page 251 of the hearings, will the new States such as Indiana, Ohio, South Dakota, Nevada, Minnesota, and others that may pass enabling legislation, be entitled to participate during fiscal year 1964 in the Kerr-Mills program?

Mr. LAIRD. The answer to that question is "Yes," they will be able to participate in the Kerr-Mills program. There is a table on page 251, to which the gentleman from Minnesota refers, that covers only those States and the estimates for fiscal year 1964 for those States that the Department was reasonably certain would be participating in the Kerr-Mills program during 1964. There was no way of telling at the time what action would be taken by the other States, such as Minnesota. After the Minnesota Legislature completes its action it must then submit its plan to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for approval. With that approval I am sure funds will be made available for the program of Minnesota.

Mr. MacGREGOR. I appreciate the response of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MacGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island, chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. FOGARTY. There are other States that are considering coming under this program. My own State of Rhode Island is not in the table on page 251, either. But this week the State Legislature is considering legislation to take advantage of the Kerr-Mills program. Under the Kerr-Mills program, any State that adopts a law and whose plan has been approved by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, is assured of funds to carry out their program under the basic law and this appropriation bill.

Mr. MacGREGOR. I thank the gentleman.

On page 37 of the bill, which the Clerk has just read, there is the item of $2,725 million for grants to States for public assistance. Under this authorization will funds be available for new States which may qualify under the Kerr-Mills program during fiscal year 1964?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is correct.

Mr. MacGREGOR. I thank the gentleman.

The Clerk read as follows:

INTERNATIONAL SOCIAL SECURITY ASSOCIATION MEETING

For expenses necessary for organizing, and holding in the District of Columbia, during calendar year 1964, the Fifteenth General Meeting of the International Social Security Association, including advances without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529); personal services without regard to civil service or classification laws; employment of aliens; hire of passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding without regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U.S.C. 111); rents in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; and not to exceed $14,000 for official reception and representation expense, $95,000, to remain available until June 30, 1965.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Bow: On page 40, line 7, strike out "$14,000" and insert "$7,000", and in line 8, strike out "$95,000" and insert "$88,000".

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, this amendment goes to the question of representation allowances for 1 dinner for supposedly 800 people who are going to be there. The budget has in it $14,000 for "Reception and buffet"—just a dinner. This is not a large amount we are reducing here, but it is a precedent I think we should be very careful about. If we begin to allow items such as $14,000 for a dinner to entertain our friends from abroad for that many people, I can say to you we are establishing a very bad precedent.

In the hearings it is said that this agency consulted the State Department as to how much they would need. Now, if there is any place they should not have gone if they wanted to be economical, they should not have gone to the State Department on the question of representation allowance. But, I think we here in the House had better begin to set limitations on these amounts. What I have done is cut it in half, from $14,000 to $7,000 and left them enough money to carry on this meeting. I hope the House will go along with this idea. This is not meant in any way as criticism of this committee. I wish the House would go along, as we bring up these representation allowances from now on, and help us keep down these amounts. One agency will come in that is going from a $4,500 a year request to about $67,000 a year. It is completely out of hand. This is a good place to establish now, without hurting anybody, a reduction from $14,000 to $7,000 for one reception, buffet. I notice they have got $600 in here for coffee.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I assure the gentleman that since this transcript has been released, they have assured me that they are also going to serve coffee, tea, and milk.

Mr. BOW. I am glad the dairy farmers are getting some of it, but I will bet some of the people are now before the Foreign Trade Commission for relief because the whisky people are out of work, and probably they will get a little extra work out of this.

Mr. LAIRD. I might be able to support the gentleman's amendment if he had perhaps gone to $10,000 in this item.

Mr. BOW. Oh, now; for 800 people? This is not the king of Morocco we are going to entertain, when they pay out $35,000 for the dinner, but these are social security people. They ought to set an example. What are they going to think if we give them a $7,000 dinner over here while they are having one terrific time getting along on what they are getting on social security? Now, let us get down to a sensible basis. Let us cut out this idea of lavish dinners for the social security administrators and see if we cannot save a little money and maybe some day give the people on social security a little more relief instead of big banquets for VIP's here in Washington.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, on page 759 of the hearings there is a breakdown of the $14,000 for entertainment of 800 people. Part of it is to provide a dinner which will cost $8 per person. There is $600 in there for coffee, tea, and milk, and if anybody expects that any distiller is going to make a dime out of this $14,000 request, they are just wrong. I do not believe this is enough money. I believe they will come back for more, and I think they should.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. When did the price of milk go up?

Mr. FOGARTY. I understand Government supports are keeping the price of milk up.

Mr. GROSS. Has the price of milk increased that much lately, can the gentleman tell me?

Mr. FOGARTY. I think it is probably due to the support price.

Mr. GROSS. Then, we ought to drive a herd of cows in and let these people milk the cows. That would be cheaper.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

The question was taken; and the Chairman being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 75, noes 72.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION

For the construction and equipment of buildings and facilities on the grounds of Howard University, under the supervision of the General Services Administration, including planning, architectural, and engineering services, and site acquisition, $6,245,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the unexpended balances as of June 30, 1963, of appropriations heretofore made available for planning, construction, or purchase of any Howard University facility, shall be merged with this appropriation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do this in order to inquire as to whether the provision of the bill under "Construction," to be found on page 43—that is the second item on construction—includes the purchase of Griffith Stadium, in other words the old baseball park?

Mr. FOGARTY. If the gentleman will yield, that is right.

Mr. GROSS. Tell me whether this was appraised? What is the price tag on this abandoned ball park?

Mr. FOGARTY. It is $1.5 million for the land.

Mr. GROSS. Is this considered to be a fair price, or what is the story?

Mr. FOGARTY. Well, I am no real estate appraiser, but about a year ago Howard University, because of the need for expansion, looked at this land and selected an independent appraiser who I am told has been acceptable to the courts of the District of Columbia. They came up with an appraisal of $1,450,000 for the land and about $250,000 to demolish the present stadium and clear the site. The price amounted to $3.76 a square foot, I am told. Then the General Services Administration was called in and they made an appraisal. The price finally agreed on was $1.5 million which would be reduced by the amount of rent they pay prior to taking title. The cost of clearing the site in addition to this. The price the owners wanted was $2,500,000.

Mr. GROSS. But does the gentleman from Rhode Island think the Government got a fair deal?

Mr. FOGARTY. Well, the price is in conformity with the expert appraisers' estimate. That is all the information we have on the subject.

Mr. GROSS. Well, it certainly was a white elephant, was it not?

Mr. FOGARTY. I really do not know. The gentleman from Iowa knows more about it than I do. I do not know much about it.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know much about it, or I would not be up here asking questions.

Mr. FOGARTY. This is the information which our committee received from representatives of Howard University, and GSA, that these two appraisals were made, and they thought they were fair appraisals. Whether it was right or not, I am in no position to make any judgment.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman have any comparisons as to the value of property which is located around the stadium, or ball park?

Mr. FOGARTY. No, the committee does not have, but the appraisals on both the part of the GSA and the independent appraisers certainly must have considered the value of the property surrounding Griffith Stadium.

The Clerk read as follows:

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY AND YOUTH OFFENSES

For grants for demonstration, evaluation, and training projects, and for technical assistance, relating to control of juvenile delinquency and youth offenses, and for salaries and expenses in connection therewith, $6,700,000, to remain available only until June 30, 1964.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I was one of the members of the subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor which worked on the program that is here being appropriated for. At that time the Congress changed very considerably the ideas that the Department had concerning this particular program. We decided instead of the Federal Government going out and actually trying itself to control delinquency, we would merely provide some seed money for some demonstration projects and then the administrators would try to analyze these demonstration projects and develop some information for other cities or areas to use.

That was the nub of the projects program. It will expire in 1964 and the last year of appropriations under that act are in this bill. However, we find that in the administration of the program, most of the money that was spent was spent for what they call planning. Planning, as used by those administering the program, does not mean what planning means as we know it in Army Engineers' terms. As they use the term, it really consists of forming a superstructure to tell the local people what they have got to do. According to the hearings, the administrators say that they will spend most of the money in 1964 for the demonstration projects rather than planning. In the appropriation language it is limited so money cannot be held for spending in future years.

I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee this question. As I understand it as to any new projects started in 1964, the cities in which those projects are located will not have any reason to believe that they are going to get more money in 1965 or 1966; is that correct?

Mr. FOGARTY. Not unless the committee decides to extend the present law beyond June 30 of this year. The action by this committee ends this program a year from June unless the legislative committee decides to extend the present law.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. The fact that you have stricken full funding in this does not in any way change that?

Mr. FOGARTY. No, there is no money after 1964.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to make it clear that I concur in the statement made by the gentleman from Rhode Island. We are making no commitment beyond 1964 in this program.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. There are to be three more demonstration projects awarded in 1964. So far the Department has required that they all be almost identical—comprehensive. That was not to have been the case under the law; they were to have distributed them around the country. There are none in the South. There are really none in the rural areas. They were to have different types of projects to be measured so that information could be distributed that would better pertain to different type areas. So I question whether we are going to get demonstration value out of the additional projects of the same type. However, I was one of those who brought this up in the full committee and the committee ruled to leave the funds for the additional projects in the bill so we now have the proposition of permitting these other projects for the 1964 year.

I should like to point out that there are 16 "planning" projects being "planned" at the present time. According to the Administrator's statements before the committee only three of these under funds left in this bill will become action demonstration projects. I know the Department has been telling people in the 16 cities they are to get one of these projects, but the people in 13 cities are being played for suckers, because only 3 are to get them. They were committed at the time the bill passed to place one in the District of Columbia. So the chances are 14 to 1 that people who think they will get approval of comprehensive projects will not receive it.

I bring this up at this time so those who support these programs may know it is not being administered in accordance with the intent of the law. Six out of the seven members of the subcommittee agree it is not being administered according to the intent of the law. So those of us who helped draft the legislation are giving a warning that a close look should be taken at the authorizing legislation when they come up for an extension next year with a view to either changing it or not extending it.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this afternoon our committee had the right to sit during general debate. We were informed that we would be notified when general debate closed, and that we would then cease and come over when we started to read the bill. The first notice we had was the one bell when you had a teller vote.

When I got over here I found we were on page 16. I had in mind raising a point of order against the expression on page 13, line 12, regarding the Food and Drug Administration, with respect to compensation for informers. That is clearly legislation on an appropriation bill.

It strikes me that if the Food and Drug Administration want to use public funds to pay informers, an authority in some cases I think they should have, they should come before our committee and we should have some standards and some understanding as to what this money is to be used for and how it is to be used. I think it is unfortunate that an agency in getting an appropriation should have the legislative right to use money to hire informers without any restrictions or without any instructions or without any other further consent on the part of Congress.

I wanted to return to this page by unanimous consent, but my good colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], said no, we could not allow that, because if we did other questions would arise.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNGER. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. I am sorry the gentleman was not here at the time, but I could not accede to the request. The main reason we went along with this proposed language was that it was known by the Department that the General Accounting Office at one time informed the Narcotics Division when they had a similar matter under consideration that there was such language in the appropriation bill. This is the same language that was used in connection with the Narcotics Act and by other Government agencies, and it is being used for the same purpose as in connection with the enforcement of the Narcotics Act.

Mr. YOUNGER. Last year when we had the Food and Drug Administration before us the question arose of complaints that inspectors in drugstores and canning factories were using concealed recorders so that when they went through the plants they were recording secretly the conversations. If you will look at the report of our committee at that time, we reached an agreement with the Food and Drug Administration that they would discontinue the use of such recorders. I have received one complaint since then. I do not know how many complaints we are going to get. On account of the background, I do submit that we ought to have some legislative standards if we are going to allow the Food and Drug Administration to pay informers and do "gestapo" work. I am sorry that this legislation is in an appropriation bill. It is purely legislation. I am sorry that I do not have the privilege of objecting to it. We will try to get it out some other way.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNGER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAIRD. The statement that the gentleman made that this is clearly legislative is open to some question because in the basic Food and Drug Act there is an implied provision that the use of informants by the Food and Drug Administration would be authorized. This language merely gives authority to make these payments so that the General Accounting Office will not raise any question with regard to this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise and associate myself with the remarks of my colleague from Iowa [Mr. SMITH], relating to the problem of juvenile delinquency and youth offenses. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, it was my thought that the people dealing with juvenile delinquency could get along with somewhat less than the money which was given to them by the committee.

However, having a great deal of respect for and confidence in the chairman and the subcommittee, I shall abide by the wishes of the full committee and I shall not offer an amendment at this time to reduce the amount of money for the juvenile delinquency program.

However, Mr. Chairman, I would be less than honest with the Members of this House if I did not state to them that as a former member of the legislative committee which drafted this legislation, as a Member who has interested himself in the entire problem of juvenile delinquency control and as a Member who happens to have one of these planning grants in his own city of New Haven, Conn., I would be less than honest, as I said, if I did not state that I am not completely happy with the way this program has been conducted to date.

I think the President of the United States is to be commended for his great efforts to make a start in the field of juvenile delinquency control. I think the idea is good. I think the motive and the purpose are excellent. But, I do think we have to change the approach which those who are administering this juvenile delinquency program have used to date in many cases.

We hear a great deal about comprehensive planning. We hear a great deal about the need for planning grants and we hear that these planning activities must be comprehensive in nature.

What we need in this field and what was intended by the legislative committee, however, was not so much planning of a comprehensive nature—there has been planning and study for many years by all kinds of agencies—but action programs; as I understand it, that is the legislative intent. In other words, we felt that the Government should initiate action programs and demonstration programs so that we can learn from these programs and communicate this knowledge to other cities and other towns throughout the United States.

I am informed that most of the money in this appropriation today is for action programs. Is it correct, Mr. Chairman, that this money is intended to start three new action programs in addition to the two others initiated in fiscal year 1963?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is right. Funds in the bill are principally for that purpose.

Mr. GIAIMO. I would also like to repeat that this program ends in 1964 and will undoubtedly come up for renewal. Unless many of us see a great deal more in the field of action and unless we see a reduction in this quantity of comprehensive planning, I am very much concerned that this program will not stand a good chance of renewal. There are many of us who are extremely concerned about this today.

I would urge Members of this House to support the recommendations of the committee on this appropriation, bearing in mind that there are many of us who are seriously concerned about the future progress of the juvenile delinquency project, how it is administered and how the funds will be used to get us action in the field rather than reports and planning.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Rhode Island, if he would be good enough to answer a question.

I understand that the $6,700,000 provided here in this appropriation under the heading of "Juvenile delinquency" is not all that is going to be appropriated for juvenile delinquency in this bill; is that correct?

Under the National Institute of Mental Health there is an additional amount. I see from the hearings, on page 319, that better than $8 million is going for that purpose. Is the whole $8 million budgeted for juvenile delinquency appropriated under the $177 million in this bill for the Institute of Mental Health?

Could the gentleman tell me where this $8 million will be expended? The mobilization for youth program in New York indicated they are receiving more than $5 million from the National Institute of Mental Health.

Mr. FOGARTY. There is no way in which I can tell the gentleman where this money will be expended. We are making it available for the fiscal year 1964. None of it will be expended until allocations are made by the Mental Health Institute and passed upon in the usual way by, I think, the Advisory Council. So some of that may not be expended until May or June of the next calendar year.

Mr. QUIE. Could the gentleman give any indication what communities might have a program that would come under this expenditure of money?

Mr. FOGARTY. I am sorry but I cannot.

Mr. QUIE. Is there any requirement that this money be used for the study of mental health? Or can it be used on any program of juvenile delinquency?

Mr. FOGARTY. No; there is none in the bill.

Mr. QUIE. There is an additional amount of money indicated for the juvenile delinquency program under the "Office education, $760,000." Is the full request granted?

Mr. FOGARTY. A large part of it.

Mr. QUIE. And also under the Children's Bureau, another $371,000.

Mr. FOGARTY. The full amount was allowed.

Mr. QUIE. And the additional amount under "Vocational rehabilitation." Is that full amount, $340,000, available as well?

Mr. FOGARTY. We cut the vocational rehabilitation program for research and training by $5 million and so there may be a reduction there.

Mr. QUIE. I thank the gentleman.

This means that the Federal Government is financing a tremendous amount of social studies and action on juvenile delinquency all over the country. We are under the assumption that we are going to be expanding juvenile delinquency study by $6,700,000, but instead we find that between $8 and $9 million more is appropriated in this bill for this purpose. When the authorization bill was before this Congress in 1961, we were led to understand that this would be a demonstration action project program limited to five to seven areas where the people all over the country could see what was happening.

Some of us tried to have an amendment adopted providing that this would be done in the District of Columbia, that the District of Columbia would be the demonstration project because it is the Capital of the United States and the problem here is as great, if not greater, than any other place in the United States. This is essentially a Federal responsibility, a Federal role here in the District of Columbia because it is the responsibility of all 50 States, and yet to date nothing has been done other than some preplanning work. We are long on planning and short on action. The people in the District are thinking of some action programs this coming year, but when you take a look at activities after 2 years here in the District of Columbia you find nothing has been done. It shows again how slowly the Federal Government acts, how slowly the Government moves. Our Government people spend all their time planning, planning, and planning, and then make reports. There have been studies in many States. They have set up commissions and have been studying the problem continually of juvenile delinquency. There are volumes and volumes and volumes of studies, and now this money that we have appropriated in the past to the program has just added more studies to fill up the library shelves with additional volumes. I say it is time we had some action programs so we can see what happens when progress is made, rather than to make more studies.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am terribly interested in this problem. I greatly respect the sentiments that have been expressed by gentlemen who are on the subcommittee, all of whom I admire greatly. The findings they report disturbed me. I am very sorry I have not had the opportunity to read the hearings except in a most cursory fashion.

Now, if I may have the benefit of the attention of the gentlemen who have addressed us, it is very important for me to call attention to a letter I have received from a very distinguished professor of criminology at the University of California, a most eminent authority in his field, who has written me on this subject. I took the matter up with a couple of colleagues who are interested but because of this discussion this afternoon, in my opinion, it is worth reading parts of Professor Lohman's letter.

He states:

> I am writing to follow up our telephone conversation of the 19th concerning the Federal program dealing with juvenile delinquency and youth crime. It would be unfortunate if the act did not receive continuing support at this time.

May I say at this point, I am very glad we are going along with the program.

He states further, however:

> An effective program of Federal aid that would help tap and mobilize local resources could be of immeasurable value in developing new emphasis in coping with the burgeoning problems of delinquency and crime.

He goes on to say:

> I believe that an unfortunate distinction has arisen in the minds of some of your colleagues in regard to their thinking between planning and action. In traditional terms, the distinction has been appropriate. However, the planning grants under the act are so designed as to activate communities in new and promising considerations of the problem. For example, one immediate fruit of planning is the active reallocation of resources which, in many instances, is as important as the supply of additional resources. In any event, I believe it would be ill advised to support programs which do not significantly relate to the total community context in which the delinquency arises, and one of the most important fruits of the current program is to sensitize and encourage exploration of the problem in these terms. If this is not done, there is grave danger that Federal money would be siphoned off in traditional and ineffective ways.

That is the burden of Professor Lohman's statement. I do hope it will be taken up and considered.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHELAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. The professor is assuming he has the answer and that that is the only answer. We are saying there are a number of projects, and that all of the money should not be spent in identical projects. We should have one or two of them and other projects. I do not think anybody should believe they have the whole and complete answer, and that only one project should be tried. If that were so, we should not pass the legislation. We want demonstration projects to find out the whole picture.

Mr. COHELAN. I think authorities of the caliber of Professor Lohman would certainly agree with the gentleman, but there is a mighty wide distinction between planning and action, and it is most important to coordinate local activities and local resources in these action programs.

The Clerk read as follows:

> SEC. 905. The Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, are each authorized to make available not to exceed $5,000 from funds available for salaries and expenses under titles I and II, respectively, for entertainment, not otherwise provided for, of officials, visiting scientists, and other experts of other countries.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: Page 51, immediately after line 6, add the following new section:
>
> "SEC. 906. None of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be used to conduct or assist in conducting any program (including but not limited to the payment of salaries, administrative expenses, and the conduct of research activities) related directly or indirectly to the establishment of a national service corps or similar domestic peace corps type of program."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is simple. It would prohibit the use of funds appropriated in this bill for any activities—including the payment of salaries—of the so-called Domestic Peace Corps Study Group, which is located in offices at 736 Jackson Place.

This is the outfit which was set up some time ago, without specific authority of Congress, to beat the drums for a Domestic Peace Corps, or National Service Corps as it is now called. The study group is staffed with personnel borrowed from other Government agencies and departments, including, or so I am told, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I intend to offer identical amendments to other appropriation bills in the hope that this unauthorized study group will be put out of business.

As I mentioned previously, the study group has been operating for some time—at least since the first of the year—and yet it was not until April 11 that President Kennedy submitted to Congress a special message proposing a National Service Corps and it was on that date that the administration's National Service Corps bill was introduced.

Since I first learned of the existence of the study group, in January, I have endeavored to obtain as many facts as possible concerning the operations of the outfit. In dealing with an administration which admits to a policy of news management, it has not been an easy task.

I do know that there are at least 20 persons, and probably more, on the study group staff. I do not know all of their names or their salary levels for the simple reason that the chief National Service Corps planner, Robert Hackett, special assistant to Attorney General Kennedy, has refused to respond to my requests for this information. That is one effective way to manage the news—just ignore a request for information, no matter how simple or legitimate.

I also know that the group has been busy sending out thousands of "national service program" questionnaires to all parts of the country. I also know that at least one study group staff member has been traveling around the country in an effort to build up public support for the program. Someday I hope to find out what all this is costing the American taxpayers, and perhaps one of my colleagues with some influence with the New Frontier might be willing to lend me a hand.

I contend that all of the activities of the study group, including the borrowing of personnel from other agencies and departments—in behalf of a National Service Corps which has never been authorized and which was not even formally proposed to Congress until April 11—are being conducted without authority. It is for this reason that I offer this amendment, and I would hope that it will receive the support of all Members who want to protect the prerogatives of Congress.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, we had no requests for appropriations in this area at all. The committee did not have any authority to appropriate any funds in this area so we have included nothing in the bill. I do not see that the amendment accomplishes anything. At the same time, I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that I do not see any reason for arguing about the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5888) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended to pass.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BOW. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. Bow moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

JERSEY CITY, N.J., ANNUAL AMERICANIZATION DAY PARADE

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday afternoon, April 28, 1963, Jersey City, N.J., held its annual Americanization Day parade which brought out 50,000 people in addition to those participating in the parade. This year's event honored the 20th anniversary of the death of the four chaplains who so valiantly sacrificed their lives when the troopship SS *Dorchester* was torpedoed off Greenland, February 3, 1943. The parade was an auspicious occasion and one which I feel might well be brought to the attention of my colleagues and the people of our country, particularly at this time in our history.

Clinton E. Fisk, Post No. 132, Veterans of Foreign Wars, is to be complimented for sponsoring this annual patriotic observance.

The Hudson Dispatch, a local newspaper published at Union City, N.J., in my congressional district, editorialized this event in its issue of Saturday, April 27, 1963, and it reads as follows:

GREAT PARADE HONORS GREAT HEROES

Once again for the 32d year, Jersey City will be the locale of one of the Nation's unsurpassed patriotic spectacles—the Americanization Day parade sponsored by Capt. Clinton E. Fisk Post, Veterans of Foreign Wars. This 1963 observance, which will be held tomorrow, is of unusual significance, in that it is being dedicated to the heroic memories of the famous four chaplains—two Protestant ministers, a Catholic priest, and a Jewish rabbi, who sacrificed their lives in order that others aboard the *Dorchester* might survive when their troopship was torpedoed off Greenland, February 3, 1943.

There may be similar demonstrations of Americanism in various parts of our great Nation that may approach the Hudson County rally in numbers of units participating and in the intensity of patriotic devotion displayed, but we are certain none has, or will ever outdo it. With the cold war worsened because of the Cuban and Laotian crises and the renewed demands of the Kremlin for a united Germany at the same time the Soviets thwart all efforts to achieve disarmament, it is most fitting that such a demonstration of what our treasured American heritage means is presented.

Clergymen of the three faiths represented by the wearers of the cloth who gave up their life preservers and went down with their sinking ship will serve as grand marshals for this year's Americanization Day parade. They are Rev. Abram Pepling, of Second Reformed Church; Rev. Edmund Rigney, of St. Anne's Roman Catholic Church; and Rabbi Abraham Gottesman, of Congregation Beth-David. Gov. Richard J. Hughes is expected to be in the reviewing stand at Pershing Field, along with Mayor Thomas Gangemi.

It was Governor Hughes who proclaimed February 3 last—the 20th anniversary of the tragic loss of 677 lives—as Dorchester Day in honor of Rev. John P. Washington, assistant pastor of St. Stephen's Roman Catholic Church, in Hudson County's Arlington; Rev. Clark V. Poling, Schenectady, N.Y., and Rev. George L. Fox, Sharon, Vt., both Protestants, and Rabbi Alexander D. Goode of York, Pa. New Jersey American Legion sponsored a special program at the War Memorial Building in Trenton. In February 1951, President Truman dedicated in memory of the heroic chaplains a $200,000 edifice in Philadelphia, built with contributions from 10,000 members of different religious faiths.

Some 25,000 marchers, accompanied by more than 50 bands and drum and bugle corps, will participate in tomorrow's colorful parade. Covering the traditional route from Belmont Avenue and Hudson Boulevard, north to Manhattan Avenue, east on that thoroughfare to Pershing Field will be members of veterans' organizations, military, fraternal, religious, and civic groups, and Boy and Girl Scout troops. Tens of thousands of spectators will gather along the line of march to view the spectacle and Pershing Field will be thronged as usual for the program following the parade. With fine weather forecast, new records are likely tomorrow both in numbers of those parading and in onlookers.

Mr. Speaker, it was a distinct pleasure for me to join in the program; and I also commend to my colleagues that they read the fine inspiring patriotic addresses made by Maj. Gen. James F. Cantwell, Chief of Staff, New Jersey Department of Defense; Col. Stephen V. Ralph, Assistant Commander, 2d U.S. Army, Camp Kilmer, N.J.; Capt. Lester L. McDowell, U.S. Naval Reserves, 3d Naval District; and Edward J. Neron, national commander, Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., delivered to the large audience in attendance at Pershing Field, Jersey City, N.J., on this occasion:

REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN DOMINICK V. DANIELS

Mr. Chairman, reverend clergy, distinguished guests, and fellow Americans, I am greatly honored to have the privilege of participating in this Americanization day parade and to join with you in paying homage to the heroic memories of the four Army chaplains, of three different faiths, Reverend Washington (Catholic), Reverend Poling (Protestant), Reverend Fox (Protestant), and Rabbi Goode (Jewish), who sacrificed their lives when the troopship S.S. *Dorchester* was torpedoed off Greenland, February 3, 1943.

They were brave and heroic men, who gave up their life preservers to save others aboard their sinking ship.

They made the supreme sacrifice to protect and preserve the freedom and independence which all Americans now enjoy, and we, the living, owe them a debt of gratitude.

And so, today, when we recall with ever-deepening pride the valorous acts of these four chaplains, we must dedicate our hearts, our minds, and our lives to the cause of their devotion and sacrifice.

The importance of this commemoration is appreciated when we realize that we live in a world of chaos and great tensions, in a world of two conflicting political philosophies—democracy versus communism—the former believes in the democratic ideal of individual freedom, and the dignity of man, while the later denies the existence of God and freedom of man and demands that all men exist for the state.

These two philosophies are diametrically opposed and cannot exist side by side.

The continuation of our independence and freedom has never been a certainty. We have no guarantee that our independence and freedom will continue; particularly is this true today when we see godless communism stirring up unrest and creating tensions amongst the free nations of the world and openly boasting that atheistic communism will dominate the whole world, including the United States; witness the troubles occurring in Laos, Vietnam, South and Central America, Germany and Cuba.

Therefore, it behooves us as loyal and patriotic citizens, to be ready and willing to continue, with utmost determination, the struggle to preserve our freedom and liberty.

We must be willing to make sacrifices that Americans were never called upon to make before. We are the leader of the free world and we shall continue to be the strongest Nation in the world, both economically and militarily, so long as we the people have the will and determination to be free and independent.

We assemble here today to honor four American chaplains who gave their lives in the cause of democracy and to pay tribute to America, its institutions and traditions and to the thousands of men and women who gave their lives to secure for us the freedom and liberty which we, as citizens, enjoy.

In conclusion, I wish to express my thanks to the Clinton E. Fisk Post No. 132, V.F.W., for sponsoring this annual parade for the 32d year which serves to remind us of our precious heritage and to inculcate in the minds and hearts of our people, especially our youth, the desire and the will to preserve the spirit of our freedom and liberty, for ourselves and future generations.

Thank you.

REMARKS OF MAJ. GEN. JAMES F. CANTWELL, CHIEF OF STAFF, NEW JERSEY DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, TRENTON, N.J.

It has been my privilege and my pleasure to participate in Jersey City's Americanization Day observance for several years.

I have come to look forward to this yearly occasion, wishing to add my own small contribution to the great success that it is.

These are my sentiments because through this observance, the Veterans of Foreign Wars are presenting to this community an opportunity to state its attachment to all that we cherish and love in our American democracy.

The Clinton E. Fisk Post, with the active cooperation of the mayor and many civic-minded citizens, have given us this opportunity to declare, in no uncertain terms, that the meaning of Americanism has not changed.

It has been noted, I am sure, that there are three grand marshals—clergymen—representatives of all clergymen who served as chaplains in the Armed Forces of the United States.

But at this time we also commemorate the four chaplains who died, heroically, in the sinking of the troopship *Dorchester*, on February 3, 1943.

It was reported by survivors that these chaplains gave their lifejackets to other men aboard the torpedoed ship. In so doing, they sacrificed their own lives.

There is a lesson for us in this commemoration. It is one we must learn if we are to preserve our American heritage—our way of life.

There is no doubt in my mind that at the moment when the four chaplains gave their lifejackets, they were not thinking specifically of Americanism or patriotism. Their only thought was to save others—to do something for a fellow human being.

And this, I believe, is the very essence of Americanism—to recognize that each one of us has responsibilities toward his fellow man and to live and act according to this principle.

Americanization Day, therefore, is the time for us to take inventory of ourselves—of our spiritual and moral resources—the time to insure that patriotism and love of country do not become empty words, merely excuses for a parade.

Patriotism is lived every minute of every day; otherwise it is an empty show.

If we analyze the heroism of the four chaplains of the *Dorchester* we find a common denominator of deep religious faith in each of them.

For these men, their love of country was an extension of their religious faith. It was this fact that made it possible for them to sacrifice their lives.

For them, patriotism was not a cold and impersonal attitude. It was a warm, positive and living emotion.

This is the quality we must bring to our patriotism if we want our democracy to endure.

In our country, we are free to choose—we are free to make our own decisions. We choose our own destiny and build our lives in accordance with the highest principles of self-government.

Ours is a representative democracy which is successful only because individual citizens and groups of citizens such as the Veterans of Foreign Wars, help to make it successful. In this representative democracy, freedom should move ever forward. And patriotism is the way to achieve this.

As I said earlier in these remarks, patriotism is not merely a parade. It is many basic and essential actions and attitudes. Patriotism is a way of life for individuals who work together, who cooperate, to make a better society, a better community of people.

The patriot is loyal to the principles of the Declaration of Independence. He believes, and acts to insure the equality of all men, regardless of race or creed.

The patriot respects his country, its laws, and is therefore a good citizen.

The patriot answers the call of his country to military service and performs that service to the best of his ability.

We will never know in advance if heroism will ever be required of us. But we do know that patriotism is required of us now.

It is patriotism which makes us fully aware of the duties as well as the rights of citizenship.

If we would truly commemorate the chaplains of the *Dorchester*, if we would truly raise a lasting memorial to them, then we must show in ourselves the same qualities they possessed so fully.

I emphasize this because our hope lies not in armies and weapons but in the minds and bodies of good Americans, for they are the durable and lasting strength of this Nation.

In the foreseeable future we will live in an atmosphere of cold war—becoming warm and hot from time to time. This means that we must be prepared at all times to defend our free institutions, our way of life.

But, I repeat, that defense must start now and it must start with ourselves.

Our soldiers, sailors and airmen will not be, and indeed, cannot be stronger than the people from whom they are drawn. If the people are strong in their convictions, individually and collectively, the Armed Forces will be strong, too, for they will reflect the strength of character of a whole nation.

In closing, let me say that I am fully convinced that we will not allow our liberty to be lost by default. There are too many good Americans who cherish the ideals and the heritage of Americanism too much, to allow this.

Again, I thank you for giving me this opportunity to express my thoughts. Let me assure you that being with you today has served to inspire me and to make me proud of being a citizen of this Nation and this State.

Thank you.

REMARKS OF COL. STEPHEN V. RALPH, ASSISTANT COMMANDER, 2D U.S. ARMY, CAMP KILMER, N.J.

Mayor Gangemi, members of the Jersey City Council; members of the Capt. Clinton E. Fisk Post, Veterans of Foreign Wars; Reverend Pepling, Reverend Rigney, Rabbi Gottesman, and friends, I am delighted to have the opportunity to be in Jersey City on this Americanization Day, and, as the personal representative of Maj. Gen. James D. Alger, Commander of 2d U.S. Army Corps, to bring you the best wishes of the commanding general, 1st U.S. Army, Gen. Garrison H. Davison. I want, in particular, to salute the members of the clergy who you are honoring today.

The hardy people who early shaped the American tradition were moved to leave their homelands because they held genuine moral and religious ideals which they regarded above their own individual safety. They braved dangerous oceans and treacherous winds and currents to get here. They knew not what was beyond the horizon, but they did not need to know; they held in their hearts the courage of their moral and religious convictions and that courage carried them through.

America exemplifies her true being today in the same spirit of active and devoted citizenship. Moral citizens are motivated by an awareness of God which engenders the highest standards in personal and national conduct. Active citizens insure just and flexible government which best serves the needs of the people, and a sound economy, based on honest toil, opportunity for all, and faith in the future. Devoted citizens are willing to fulfill the obligation of citizenship at whatever personal cost because they think in terms of service and sacrifice, rather than rights and privileges. For nearly three centuries the people of this area have played a leading role in building American tradition, both in peace and war. Today, you march in the vanguard of those who accept the challenge to preserve and defend the great heritage handed down to us. I hope and believe that the observance of this, the 31st annual Americanization Day, by the people of Jersey City, and others like it throughout the Nation, will serve to bring that challenge into clearer focus for all Americans.

Events during the past year have placed increasingly forceful emphasis on the fact that an imperative national task is to knit our Armed Forces, our civilian community, and our allies into the stoutest possible and most desirable mantle of strength for the defense of freedom and the dignity and rights of man.

What endeavor is more worthy of the utmost vigor and dedication that is in us, than the crusade for freedom in which we are engaged. Let us all reaffirm our loyalty and dedication to liberty.

Let us leave nothing undone, no effort spared, to make it crystal clear to all the world that freedom and democracy are not just things we talk about, but that they form the living basis of our everyday life * * * that they provide the environment in which nothing man dreams is impossible.

REMARKS OF CAPT. LESTER L. MCDOWELL, U.S. NAVAL RESERVE, 3D NAVAL DISTRICT

"Greater love hath no man * * *." We Americans are gathered here today to reaffirm our belief in the American way of life; and, in our gathering here today, we carry on a local tradition dating back over 30 years. But, in a larger sense, we are exercising one of our basic American rights, the right of peaceful, public assembly; and, in so doing, we are reminded of the other basic rights guaranteed by our Constitution, and upheld by our courts.

Another of these, freedom of religion, is especially in our thoughts today, as we honor the four chaplains.

Twenty years ago, an American troopship, the SS *Dorchester*, heavily laden with soldiers bound overseas, was torpedoed and sunk with great loss of life, in the icy February waters of the North Atlantic. The four Army chaplains aboard joined together in a unity of purpose: to bring order out of the confusion on the sinking ship, and to bring reassurance to the distraught soldiers who suddenly faced the dread unknown in lonely, frigid waters.

When life jackets had been passed around, and there were no more left, these four heroic Americans—these men of God—took off their own jackets and gave them to others, well knowing that they thereby condemned themselves to certain death in the icy waters.

What sort of men were these, who could, in a brief moment, make a brave decision that would cost them their lives? They were men who knew themselves. They had demonstrated their love of God by their ordination. They had demonstrated their love of country in their commissioning as Army chaplains. And, in their final hour, they demonstrated, as never before, their love of man by their selfless devotion to their principles.

The four were now Army chaplains. Fox and Poling were Protestant ministers; Goode, a Jewish rabbi; Washington, a Catholic priest. The fortunes of war had brought them together on one ship as chaplains for the troops embarked thereon. Their duties as chaplains are easily described: "To bring God to man and man to God" in their respective organizations.

None of them were supermen. All were ordinary mortals. One of them grew up and lived in our neighboring towns. He was the son of an Irish immigrant family, with a wonderfully American name: Father John Washington. He was born and brought up in Newark, attended Seton Hall and Darlington; and was a parish assistant in Elizabeth, Orange, and Arlington, before he entered the Army.

Another, George Fox, the oldest of the four chaplains, was brought up in Altoona, Pa., the son of a poor railroad worker. Young George lied about his age—just 16—and served with the Marines in World War I. He returned from France with a brace of decorations, and resumed life after the war, with the Guarantee Trust Co. in New York City. Some years later, he entered the ministry, and fulfilled his ministerial calling in small villages in Vermont until he entered the Army. It is interesting to note that, in addition to other civic duties, he was very active in veterans' affairs, and was State chaplain, and also State historian, in the American Legion in Vermont.

The other two chaplains, Alexander Goode and Clark Poling, followed a family tradition as clergymen. Rabbi Goode was born in Brooklyn and brought up in Washington, where he served a number of years in the National Guard. Later, while serving a congregation in York, Pa., he commuted to Baltimore, where he received his doctorate from Johns Hopkins University; and entered the Army soon after Pearl Harbor.

Clark Poling was born into a family of ministers. He was brought up in Ohio, Massachusetts, and later New York, while his father was at the Marble Collegiate Church. He left his own church in Schenectady to join the Army at the outset of World War II.

We should count ourselves fortunate that we live in a land that boasts such sons as these. What godless nation can equal their act of love, their demonstration of human dignity?

Their selfless act shall forever remind us that with freedom goes responsibility. Freedom is not necessarily free, and it must be bought again and again by those who would have it.

The four chaplains had known each other but a short time when they faced their greatest trial; but they knew themselves, and each knew and respected the principles of the others. The memory of their heroic act of self-sacrifice shall live forever as an inspiration to all mankind, and as a constant reminder of the dignity of man. "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends."

REMARKS BY EDWARD J. NERON, NATIONAL COMMANDER, VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I OF THE U.S.A., INC.

Mr. Chairman and distinguished guests, I consider it a distinct honor and privilege to be asked to speak briefly to this wonderful gathering on this occasion which has been set aside as Loyalty Day.

We are proud of the steadfast efforts made by the Veterans of Foreign Wars to establish Loyalty Day as a counteraction against the demonstrations of the Communists on May Day which occurred in so many cities on our eastern seaboard. We know that the existence of this Nation as a free and independent America is totally dependent upon the unswerving loyalty of its people. We know too that the priceless heritage of freedom is in constant danger from forces who are in opposition to our concepts of free government. Therefore it is particularly fitting that we meet here today to give expression to our feelings with regard to our American heritage.

We are aware that the Communists for many many years have been endeavoring to sell the American people on the proposal that their system represents the government of the future. This concept, of course, we can never accept.

In recent years it appears in some circles that the word "loyalty" has been considered as being oldfashioned and as being subject to ridicule. We must never succumb to this doctrine. We are alert to the fact that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty and that free and responsible citizenship means more than just repeating the Allegiance to the Flag. We are appreciative of the wonderful privileges we enjoy as U.S. citizens and we rebel against a regimented society where people and institutions are dominated by a central government.

Communism lives by the torch, it must tear down and destroy institutions and freedom loving people in order to maintain its existence. We have only to look at the plight of countries which have fallen under the yoke of Soviet Russia to realize just what life under Communist dictation means to freedom loving people.

People from all sections of the world would give up their most cherished possessions to join us in American citizenship. The enslaved nations throughout the world cling to their hope of freedom and we should never be satisfied with a world order that commits a free and independent people to the domination of a foreign power and an alien way of life.

Personal liberty is a cherished possession but the price of its continuance is alertness and vigilance.

So we give thanks today to the inspiring work of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in attempting to alert the citizenship of this Nation as to the dangers of international communism and the efforts of alien forces to undermine and destroy those principles of freedom and democracy which are the heritage of liberty loving people.

THESE ARE THE GUILTY

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, on February 12, 1963, Hon. Carleton Putnam addressed a Lincoln's Birthday dinner at the Willard Hotel in Washington. Mr. Putnam is the author of "Race and Reason," a current best seller, which deals with race relations from an objective viewpoint.

Mr. Putnam's brilliant Lincoln Day address is of such significance that I feel it worthy of being included here as part of my remarks:

THESE ARE THE GUILTY

(Address by Carleton Putnam)

Mr. Chairman, Mr. German, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, let me begin by acknowledging a debt—a debt of gratitude and appreciation to Clifford Newell and Mark German for arranging this impressive meeting tonight. An attendance of over 600 is more than any of us expected, especially in the face of an ice storm in Maryland and Virginia. I'm proud and grateful to your committee for inviting me to speak here, and I'm proud and grateful to you for coming.

It's true that about 2 years ago I wrote a short book—hardly more than a monograph—called "Race and Reason" which has caused some controversy. A few attacks have even been made on it. Therefore, every now and then, friends of mine, here and there, have been good enough to give me a platform—like this one tonight—from which to answer those attacks.

So far it hasn't been an overwhelming task. I won't say that I expected a somewhat higher caliber of opposition, for that might be discourteous to our opponents. But there are only a few loose ends to clean up this evening, and then, ladies and gentlemen, I propose to launch an attack of my own. If I were a lay preacher I would take as my text the 16th chapter of Paul's epistle to the Romans: "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark those who cause divisions and offenses in opposition to the doctrine which you have learned * * * . For such persons * * * by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple."

I propose to suggest to you tonight, in this world of rising racial tensions, just who they are who have caused divisions and—however sincere their motives and beliefs—have deceived the hearts of the simple. And in view of the fact that the last time I made a speech one of the press services complained because I referred to a certain individual "whom I did not name," tonight I intend to name names—not all, indeed, because large organizations are involved—but enough to satisfy the press. And I intend to say to you, and to them: these are the guilty.

But first let's go back to where it all began. I suppose nobody in this room doubts that the crusade for racial integration and the claim that races are all alike has its roots in the same soil in which most of the leftwing movements of our time originated. The socialism of Saint-Simon in France, of Marx in England and Germany, of Lenin in Russia, the Fabian Society of Bernard Shaw and the Webbs in England, all were, at least in part, an attempt to meet a horrifying problem among those who worked primarily with their muscles and their hands. They all had one valid common denominator among their objectives—improving the condition of the poor.

I will go so far as to say that many of us here, facing the situation that reformers found in England in the eighteen fifties and sixties, would have thought and felt exactly as they did. Here is the death notice in the London papers of Mary Anne Walkley, 20 years old, who in June of 1863 after sewing in a dressmaking establishment an average day of 16½ hours—during the season often 30 hours at a stretch—simply died of overwork. The doctor's words at the inquest were: "Mary Anne Walkley died from long hours of work in an overcrowded room. * * *" Because she could not stop for Death, Death kindly stopped for her.

As for the food the poor ate, their bread was bought mostly from what were called the undersellers and was adulterated with alum, soap, pearl ashes, chalk and Derbyshire stone-dust. Here is a description taken from official reports concerning conditions in the baking trade: "He [the poor man] had to eat daily in his bread a certain quantity of human perspiration mixed with the discharge of abscesses, cobwebs, dead blackbeetles, and putrid German yeast, without counting alum and sand." Of course, many of the poor simply starved. It wasn't until well along in the next century that the government stopped publishing statistics of deaths from starvation in London for lack of casualties.

Forgive this repetition of what will be to many of you an old story, but it seemed wise to refresh our recollections concerning the origin of today's leftwing ideologies. In those times and in those conditions were born all sorts of emotional attitudes and intellectual concepts, as well as practical schemes. Some of them succeeded and some of them did not, but progress was certainly made. The radical of 1963 inherits a legacy which we must understand. A year or so ago a reporter for Time magazine interviewed me on the race question and it wasn't until our talk was practically over that I finally managed to make him give me his view on the subject. He was from the South and he was an integrationist. As he spoke, tears welled up in his eyes. But I could tell from what he said that those tears didn't have their source in the Negro problem, which he hadn't really thought through. They were part of the old legacy. They went back much further than Mary Anne Walkley.

There is no reason to doubt the humanitarian purpose of many of the welfare movements of those earlier days or to question their considerable accomplishments. Much poverty has been relieved. The problem now is to keep the floor under misery and failure without slapping a ceiling on everybody else—and to winnow out the large company of those who use the cry of humanity and brotherly love as an excuse for creating legal ways to break the Eighth Commandment. But that is a topic for a different forum from ours tonight.

I want to touch on only one aspect of that problem which leads us directly into our own field. Implicit in much leftwing theory and rhetoric, because it seemed to make existing conditions all the more reprehensible and in need of correction, was the doctrine of the equality of man. Few Socialists ever took the doctrine seriously in practice, I doubt if the Fabians ever took it seriously in theory, but we have all heard the slogans of the French Revolution and the Declaration of Independence.

I shan't go over again here what the evidence clearly shows regarding Jefferson's meaning—both as to the word "men" and as to the word "equal" in the phrase "all men are created equal"—nor need I repeat Hamilton's recognition that liberty and equality are mutually exclusive. It is obvious the Founding Fathers had no illusions about the equality of men in any sense except in equal rights to justice, and the Negro was not included even in that. But in America as the years went on, helped by the controversial Franz Boas, the notion of a utopian social, economic, and even biological equality persisted as a sort of demagogic fetish until things reached the point where the Swedish Socialist Myrdal actually dared to write in his "American Dilemma" that in the conflict between liberty and equality in the United States "equality is slowly winning," and Handlin, the Harvard professor, could bring himself to declare: "There is no evidence of any inborn differences of temperament, personality, character, or intelligence among races."

This last remark lands us finally in the middle of our subject with a splash. For the benefit of the press I give the full name, Oscar Handlin, professor of history at Harvard University, and while again I do not impugn his motives or sincerity, I assert that in my opinion Handlin's declaration is one of the most groundless and dangerously misleading statements to be found in print today.

Let us quickly review the evidence. All that we need is contained in that short, concise little book, "The Biology of the Race Problem," which I shall cite hereafter simply as the George report. In spite of the example of the equalitarians, a thousand pages are not required to come to the point on this subject.

If you will consult section IV of the George report, you will note the findings of Bean, Connolly, and Vint on the differences in frequencies of occurrence of certain features of white and Negro brains. The importance of these differences is plainly set out in quotations and citations from and to Penfield, Halstead, Brodmann, and Herrick. I repeat, you will find it all in the space of 10 pages in section IV. If you want more data, I can refer you to the leading article in the Mankind Quarterly, volume 2, no. 4, which amplifies and still further documents Dr. George's material. The differences in question are physical and hereditary. That they account for differences in temperament, behavior, and intelligence between the two races is beyond doubt. That these differences make the amalgamation of the races undesirable is just as clear. All the other sections of the George report confirm these facts.

There isn't time enough tonight to discuss the full report. But I will call your attention to something on which Dr. George does not touch: In 1940 the illegitimacy rate for Negroes throughout the United States was eight and a half times the rate for whites. Nineteen years later, 19 years in which Americans have struggled hard to raise Negro standards, the rate is 10 times that for whites. In other words, as their environment has been improved, their performance has gone down. Taking the single State of Virginia in the 20 years between 1938 and 1958, the white illegitimacy rate declined slightly from 2.6 to 2.3 percent. In this same period which witnessed astonishing gains in Negro education, Negro housing, Negro income, and Negro job opportunities, the rate of Negro illegitimacy increased from 19.5 to 22.9 percent. This is difficult to explain if the Negro's limitations are due solely to his environment.

Speaking of explanations, it's going to be still more difficult for the professors to evade Bean, Connolly, and Vint. They've already begun to say: "Oh, but the samplings aren't adequate." [These samplings varied from 30 brains in some cases to 165 in others.] Well, I have a question to ask these professors and all those who criticize the George report on this most vital point. If you don't like the samplings of Bean, Connolly, and Vint, why have you never produced anything better? You have most of the money, you have the captive foundations—they have hundreds of millions—and there are plenty of other sources anxious to help you. Yet to the best of my knowledge you haven't even tried to assemble any contrary evidence. Don't tell us that you can't be bothered or that this isn't important. This is the most important point in the whole controversy. Either the Negro's limitations are innate or they're not, and this evidence settles the matter. So I ask again, why have you never even tried to produce any other samplings?

The answer is simple. You haven't tried because you don't dare. You know well enough what the results would be, provided you had an objective study and included a Dr. George or two on the panel. I suggest that you now make such a study—a series of any size you like of average West African Negro brains, because there you get the least diluted essence of the Negro, against a series of average white brains—the study to be jointly run by scientists on both sides of the question. Meanwhile we have Bean, Connolly, and Vint; Penfield, Halstead, Brodmann and Herrick. I dislike being rude to amiable Harvard professors but I must say to Oscar Handlin (and I'm going to say it to several others this evening): the time has come to put up or shut up. Either answer Bean, Connolly, and Vint, or explain to the public why you can't.

While I'm on the subject of the George report I have another suggestion to offer. The press quotes George F. Carter, a professor of geography at Johns Hopkins University, as having said about this report: "The arguments they put up in that booklet are Swiss cheese—full of holes." It so happens that early last fall a mutual acquaintance communicated to me Carter's complaints about the George report—this acquaintance listed 50 of them, acting as a sort of agent for Carter. I considered these 50 points carefully, and then I submitted them to Dr. George. Thereafter they were submitted to scholars in New York. All of this occurred before the Putnam committee undertook the distribution of the report, and it was unanimously decided that, apart from three or four points about which some shadow of argument might be made but which did not bear on any essentials, the 50 points were without any substance whatsoever.

There was one item which Carter considered to be a quotation out of context and which we corrected with an erratum sheet. Jerry Doolittle of the Washington Post made much out of this correction in the Post for December 9. So I have a question to ask Doolittle: Assuming Carter is right in his statement that differing climates had identical effects in the way they "sharpened the wits" of all mankind, can either you or Carter honestly believe that the climate of the tropics and the climate of northern Europe over tens of thousands of years had identical effects on the development of those special qualities of the civilized forebrain; namely, foresight and long-range planning? Carter's dwelling on one aspect of molding does not exclude the existence of other aspects. If Doolittle thinks it does, he had better consult someone else besides a geographer. He will find experts on that subject in other sections of the George report.

But let me come to Carter's 50 points and give you 2 examples: On page 27 of his report, Dr. George cites the work of Bean which was published in 1906. On this Carter remarks: 'Reference from Bean is nearly 60 years old. Haven't there been any developments or thoughts in this long period?" If Carter had read the report with any attention he would have found that Connolly's work was published in 1950 and Penfield's in 1957. This brings Bean right up to date. But are we in some sort of competition here on dates? Does its date make Newton's law of gravitation invalid?

Secondly on page 68 Dr. George writes: "If there were more Negroes with talents for civilization, we would have no race problem or it would be a very different one." To which Carter remarks: "Again nonsense. Boston had a race problem with the Irish. Many people have a Jewish race problem even though these races have talents for civilization." Well, ladies and gentlemen, is not this what Dr. George has already just said? He has just said, "or it would be a very different one." And that is precisely what the Irish and Jewish problems were, "very different ones."

I leave you to judge where the nonsense lies in these two examples, and I invite Carter to publish in the newspapers all of his 50 criticisms of the George report, just as he has seen fit to publish his Swiss cheese. I have a science degree but I am not a professional scientist and I do not debate with professional scientists. However, I dare say scientists can be found who will answer Carter—also in the press. I simply suggest to Carter that he prepare better criticisms than the ones our mutual acquaintance submitted to me, unless he wants to lose the game by a score of 50 to nothing. And I warn him that before he can walk with Alice in the wonderland of unbridled environmentalism he must first get by the narrow gate of Bean, Connolly, Vint, and Penfield. I could have sat next to Caruso for dinner every night for a lifetime and never sung as Caruso sang. No amount of cultural contact, no amount of integration would have made the slightest difference, except that if I had tried to sing with Caruso I would have spoiled the opera. And what is true of the vocal chords is true of the frontal lobes.

Out at the University of Chicago, there is another professor who thinks he can brush Dr. George aside. For the benefit of the press, let me name him, Manning Nash, associate professor of anthropology. Nash had begun by attacking "Race and Reason" in a long article in Current Anthropology last June which was answered by me in a few short sentences on Bean, Connolly, and Vint which I put in a letter I sent to Sol Tax, editor of the magazine. Thereupon Nash wrote me saying he doubted if my letter would ever be published so he was going to answer me right off privately. He proceeded to ignore all the substantive issues by calling Dr. George, who is considerably above him in academic status, unscientific, and then he urged me to read the Constitution of the United States, the Declaration of Independence, and the Articles of Confederation so that I might learn something about the legal equality of all human beings.

To Nash I answered: "Regarding your paragraph on the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, you appear never really to have read 'Race and Reason,' or much American history. Jefferson, who wrote the Declaration, refutes you on page 62, lines 4–8, of 'Race and Reason'; Lincoln refutes you on pages 8–9. It so happens that Lincoln was a lawyer and you are not. Until the aberration of the 1954 Supreme Court decision no competent lawyer supposed that there was any legal right on the part of the Federal Government to force Negroes into white schools. And that Court reached its decision on sociological and pseudoscientific rather than legal grounds."

But to get back to the George report, when this report was first issued there appeared in many newspapers throughout the South, by some sort of spontaneous combustion, an answer from a man named Charles C. Perkins, chairman of the department of psychology at Emory University in Atlanta. Perkins was very patronizing, very sure that no even moderately reputable psychologist would come up with findings such as the report contained, quite forgetting Dr. Garrett, for 15 years head of the department of psychology at Columbia and a past president of the American Psychological Association. Perkins then went on to remark that while there "just aren't many facts that allow positive conclusions" and while he didn't want even his rebuttal evidence to be taken too seriously, nevertheless "Alpha examinations given World War I soldiers indicated the average northern Negro was smarter than the average southern white man."

It is difficult to understand Perkins' willingness to use this material even with apologies. This is the well-known and long-discredited Klineburg twist, and for the benefit of the press I am referring to Otto Klineburg, professor of psychology at Columbia University. What Klineburg did in this case was to take the four Southern States where the white averages were lowest and compare them with the four Northern States where the Negro averages were highest. If we take the whites in the same Northern States as the Negroes, these whites scored far above the Negroes. It's an old equalitarian trick to compare the best of one group with the worst of another and, of course, such a procedure has no validity whatever. If you take an above-average Negro and give him a lot of advantages he will do better than a below-average white man who has had very few. Wherever you have overlapping statistical distributions, the top of one will always exceed the bottom of the other. This is not the problem under discussion. The thing we are interested in is what the average Negro will do when compared with the average white man under like conditions. Anyone interested in the latter question will find decisive answers in the George report. This is the only issue, and it is the issue Perkins is clouding and confusing. I urge you in dealing with these people to keep them to the point. Their specialty is irrelevance.

I might say that I think the championship in this respect goes this year to a man up at the University of Connecticut. I refer to one Donald C. Simmons who is listed as a member of the department of sociology and anthropology. It would hardly seem proper to take your time with this 36-year-old assistant professor were it not for the fact that the New Republic magazine has seen fit on two separate occasions to publish his attacks which now include both "Race and Reason" and the George report.

My first brush with Simmons occurred last summer when the New Republic printed a review by him of "Race and Reason" in which he accused me of quoting scientists out of context. When I asked him for one example he was able to give none. Perhaps he was basing his criticism on hearsay from an article by Howard Margolis of Science magazine. Margolis made the same accusation, and when asked to provide an example gave my quotation from Kluckhohn on page 51 of "Race and Reason." I answered this accusation in a letter which Science published. I also answered it in a speech in New Orleans a year ago. I have heard nothing from Margolis since. And I doubt if I hear any more on this subject from Simmons either.

Simmons' most recent effort appeared in the New Republic for January 5 and is of a somewhat more specific nature. He begins by referring to the George report and the measurement of intelligence by brain size. Simmons mentions a group of male Negro brains which he says were found to weigh more than a certain group of female white brains. You will remember that on page 61 of the George report there is a footnote which reads in part as follows: "The essential point here is that, other things being equal [such as sulcification and microscopic structure of the cortex] and considering higher animals in general perspective the larger the brain relative to body size, the greater the intelligence." Note the phrase "relative to body size." Among other factors, the average body size of women is notably smaller than that of men. Thus their brain size would be expected to be smaller without lessening of intelligence. Apparently we have another case here of a man who hasn't read with any attention what he's attacking.

Next Simmons dances the Klineburg twist, about which no more need be said, and then he gives us a quotation from the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues which reads as follows: "The more comparable the background of white and Negro groups, the less the difference in intelligence." However, if you will turn to the American Psychologist magazine for May of 1962 you will find that Dr. Garrett answered that statement by showing that there have been six studies on the subject and all of them contradict the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues.

Our Connecticut friend then moves on to comment about some experiments in Baltimore purporting to show that no difference can be found between white and Negro infants up to 40 weeks, and that differences thereafter must be due to socioeconomic factors. But the lower centers of the brain and nervous system, in human beings and in animals, are the ones which mature first; the higher centers mature last. Therefore similarity of performance in the early stages of life signifies nothing as to adult potentiality.

Finally Simmons remarks on what he calls the racist accusation that the Negro never invented an alphabet and points out that many other races didn't either. But if he will read the "Biology of the Race Problem" he will see that George makes no such accusation. George says that the Negro never invented a system of writing. It is true that alphabets are rare. Systems of writing are not. The Negro never invented either. I shan't weary you further with Simmons. My only comment must be one of surprise at the acceptance of this sort of material for the second time by the New Republic.

Well, we've had a look at Harvard, Columbia, Johns Hopkins, Chicago, Emory, and the University of Connecticut. Let's return to Harvard for a moment, the university where the FBI had to arrest Zborowski, a research associate in the department of anthropology. I do not mention this in any criticism of the department at Harvard. It might have happened anywhere. I cite it as an example of how important the Communists consider it to be to corrupt the minds of our young people in this field.

The New York Times on December 9, 1962, ran a review of Dr. Carleton Coon's book, "The Origin of Races." This review was written by Prof. William W. Howells, chairman of the department of anthropology at Harvard. Up until the last two paragraphs Howells sticks to his subject and I have no comments to make. However, in the last two paragraphs he launches a thinly veiled attack upon my pamphlet, "Evolution and Race: New Evidence." He opens the first of these paragraphs with the remark that certain parts of Coon's book have been "pounced on with delight by the present cohort of racists." This opening gambit is the usual introduction used by these people in order to arouse anger rather than reason in their readers. If a man acknowledges the facts of race, he's a racist. I suppose if he acknowledges the facts of sex he's a sexist.

But I move on. Howells next says that even if Coon is correct, it is not possible to use his hypothesis to measure modern racial differences. Let's think about that for a moment. If Coon is correct, the Caucasian race passed the threshold of evolutionary development in brain structure from homo erectus to homo sapiens 200,000 years ahead of the Negro. This matter of brain structure is biological, inherent, hereditary. Evolution is a continuing process. If one race has a head start of 200,000 years over another, does Howells mean to suggest that this head start has no significance—does he see no possible relation between it and the differences found by Bean, Connolly, and Vint in white and Negro brains, or the results of intelligence tests, or the figures on crime and illegitimacy, or the level of civilization in Haiti, or the stability of governments in the Congo? Nobody is trying to take a pair of calipers and declare what is the exact measure of difference in the two races today. But I will tell Howells it makes enough difference to the southern mother when she puts her girls in school.

This amiable Harvard professor, furthermore, is not above playing a guessing game in these final paragraphs. At one place he refers to a passage from page 9 of the introduction to Coon's book which reads as follows: "It is a fair inference * * * that the subspecies which crossed the evolutionary threshold into the category of homo sapiens the earliest have evolved the most and that the obvious correlation between the length of time a subspecies has been in the sapiens state and the levels of civilization attained by some of its populations may be related phenomena." On this passage Howells makes the comment in parenthesis: "Those who are too tickled with page 9 of the introduction might try continuing to page 661."

Of course the average reader of Howells' review will not have at hand a copy of "The Origin of Races" and hence will not be able to evaluate the parenthesis because he will have no access to page 661. Does Howells intend to leave the implication of some contradiction? Page 661 deals both with selection and with the tendency to eventual resegregation of genetic characters in racial interbreeding. I wonder if Howells supposes this to be compensation to southern society which, after many generations of chaos, might look forward to such an eventuality. Thereafter the chaos would start all over again.

And while we're jumping about from page to page I might call Howells' attention to page 336. I shan't keep you in the dark about what is on that page. Here Coon refers to "the great variability of 20th century human beings, in evolutionary grades as well as in racial lines." Coon calls these differences important. He also says that from the perspective of life as a whole, they are slight. Obviously if you run the gamut from the amoeba to man they are slight. But what a whale of a difference a few brain cells make. You can find that discussed in the George report at page 34.

Finally our amiable Harvard professor sums up his view of my pamphlet in this extraordinarily penetrating remark: "Anyhow I see no way of using such arguments (the 200,000-year evolutionary lag) to disprove the Constitution of the United States." Would anyone in the audience care to tell me where the Constitution mentions the integration of schools? If we look at the 14th amendment, do we see any reference to schools? Ladies and gentlemen, I would like to share with you a not very well kept secret. The people who put the integration of schools into the Constitution were Howells and his kind, the equalitarian anthropologists and sociologists who misled the Supreme Court and the American people with their mess of half-truths and slanted evidence.

I say now to Howells and all his crowd: You have not only misled the Supreme Court and the American people, you have fooled the Negro about himself. You have poisoned his mind with expectations that cannot be realized and inflamed him with an arrogance that has no justification. You have set him against the white man. You have made him think he has a grudge against the white race when the truth is he owes the white race a greater debt than he can ever repay. Offer a few Negroes one-way tickets to Africa, where they can enjoy the culture of their own race, and see how many takers you get.

I tell you without fear of contradiction that the American people are as kindly a people as any in the world, that nowhere else in the world would Negroes in such numbers have found a better haven. Yet James Baldwin and these much publicized "angry black men" writing books and long articles for the New Yorker magazine damn the white American. Baldwin writes pityingly about his ancestor who was dragged to America in chains. But I say to Baldwin that if his ancestor had not been brought here in chains, he would have died a far more terrible death as a slave in Africa. Baldwin is lucky to be here.

And I say to Leopold Stokowski that I revere him as a musician but when he appears on David Susskind's "Open End" TV program and declares that the white man owes the Negro an apology he is guilty of a groundless and inflammatory statement on a subject about which he is incorrectly informed. He is encouraging the Negro to violence and revenge against a race to which the Negro owes an infinite debt.

In this matter Susskind and Stokowski and other public figures across the Nation run blindly with the pack. Yet standing here tonight it is not primarily these that I indict, nor the New Republic, nor even the Supreme Court. Least of all is it the average Negro. I indict the men who have fooled and goaded the Negro—the men who have made it necessary for the rest of us to point out truths which the Negro might otherwise have been spared the telling. I indict the Howells, the Nashes, the Perkins, the Carters, the Klinebergs, the Handlins, the Herskovitses, the Simmonses, and the Sol Taxes who have spawned our racial tension here and abroad.

And I indict their associations. These men indeed run in packs. They have provided the basis for this whole house of cards that is starting to fall around their heads. If white settlers are being dispossessed and murdered in Kenya, if nuns are being raped in the Congo, if white men and girls are being slugged on the streets of our northern cities, if the Supreme Court has to warn its employees about going home at night, look to the source. "Mark those who cause divisions and offenses * * * and deceive the hearts of the simple."

Here I would like to incorporate by reference what I said a year ago in New Orleans (in "The Road to Reversal") about my exchange of correspondence with the president of the American Anthropological Association, Sherwood Washburn. Then I would like to ask: Have I now given you enough cases to demonstrate the utter lack of facts on the equalitarian side of this controversy and the poverty of their arguments? Out of all these universities and the resolutions of these associations not one iota of evidence or one shred of argument has come that cannot be exploded in 30 seconds. It is all as stale and empty as the notion that the sun revolves around the earth.

Have I also provided enough illustrations of the way these scientists operate? Because, if not, I could go on. I could mention the fact that on one occasion when a certain scientific association was about to pass a resolution condemning "Race and Reason" there was a pause in the proceedings. And someone asked for a show of hands on how many had read the book. In a room full of people how many do you suppose had read it? Three. And yet they were about to pass, and did pass, a resolution damning something they'd never read. Does that episode need any further comment from me?

Listen to what the man who was for 15 years head of the department of psychology at Columbia University (he was a member of the faculty for 30 years) has to say about these political resolutions by a scientist. I quote you Henry Garrett in a letter to me last October:

"I knew Franz Boas personally. I was able to observe the influence of Boas as founder of the science of anthropology in America and to evaluate the extent to which Boas' socialistic ideology dominated his thinking and permeated the teaching of his disciples, first at Columbia and later at other universities fed from the Boas cult. I was also able to observe the increasing degree of control exercised by this cult over students and younger professors until fear of loss of jobs or status became common in the field of anthropology unless conformity to the racial equality dogma was maintained.

"I will go so far as to assert that the supporters of the equality dogma in science in America today fall into three classes—those who are intimidated, those who are driven by leftwight political motives and those who are honest but mistaken humanitarians. I can testify from repeated personal observation to the intimidation and to the pall of suppression which has fallen upon the academic world in the area of which I speak. It encompasses not only anthropology but certain other related sciences. In the light of this situation the resolutions are not surprising."

Dr. Robert Gayre has told me that not since the days of Galileo has science seen anything like it. When Simmons reviewed "Race and Reason," he asked if I were looking for an "apostate" anthropologist. You know what that word means. An apostate is one who departs from a dogma. Here, in other words, is one of the younger generation who doesn't even realize his self-betrayal—who has never learned that science is a matter of research and facts, not dogma.

In the face of this grotesque state of affairs I'd like to ask the Kennedy brothers a question. Next to population control, the race problem is undoubtedly the most urgent in the world today; it is basic to everything else, even to the cold war. Do you, or do you not, consider it desirable that you inform yourselves on both sides of this matter? All your lives you have been listening to political propaganda masquerading under the name of science. It would take you less than an hour to read section IV of the George report and the article in the Mankind Quarterly, less than an hour to talk to Dr. George or Dr. Garrett. Have you done either?

The decision of the Supreme Court does not relieve you from studying the subject. You've seen what that decision has done to the Nation. You are not President and Attorney General solely for the Negro population or the northern or western radicals. You also happen to be serving millions of people who believe the decision was viciously wrong and who know more about the matter firsthand than you'll ever know. Why have you never given a hearing to the scientists on their side? Are you afraid of losing some votes? Are you afraid of the Catholic Church? I have been told that this is the case, but I refuse to believe it. Any man who buys a vote by doing the wrong thing, or the ignorant thing, in a job like yours is on the skids of history, and you're smart enough to know it. And as for the Supreme Court, it would switch fast enough if you discovered the truth and went out and told it on the mountain. The American majority would respond with a roar and these minority-group arguments would vanish like last year's snow.

Stop and think for a minute. You have the record of the centuries and of today in Africa, you have the facts in certain countries of South America and you have them in Haiti. In the United States you have crime records and you have illegitimacy records. You also have 40 years of intelligence tests. All these point in one direction; namely, that the Negro has created his history and environment (not vice versa) and will create it again wherever he's allowed to. Next you have the microscopic studies of Vint, the morphology of Bean, Connolly, Halstead, and Penfield, and the recent evidence presented by Dr. Coon, president of the American Association of Physical Anthropologists. You have pages of other evidence in the George report. Finally you know the background of the equalitarian school, you know who started it and the political and social views of most of its leaders. All of this points in one direction.

For each of the above items some farfetched excuse might be conceived. Any one of them might possibly be debated. But consider them all together.

Let me suggest a parallel. You are walking along a hotel corridor, and as you pass a bedroom door you hear loud, angry voices. Then you hear one of the voices say, "Take that, you dirty dog!" and you hear two shots and the sound of a body falling. So you open the door, and you find one man standing with a smoking gun in his hand, looking down at another man with two bullets in his heart.

After some personal risk and minor injuries you manage to capture the man with the gun, and at the trial the following facts develop. The dead man was shortly to have married his childhood sweetheart and was said by several witnesses to have been joyful over this, having courted her long and earnestly. Further, it appears that the dead man, the week before, had inherited $1 million, after taxes, from an uncle he had never seen. The accused, on the other hand, according to reliable testimony, had coveted the dead man's sweetheart and had been repulsed my her. In fact, he had several times sworn he would kill the deceased. The gun is found to have been the property of the accused.

The defense pleads that the death is a suicide. The point is made that the dead man might just conceivably have changed his mind about his fiancee and have become depressed at the thought of marriage. As for the million dollars, after taxes, this might not have been enough to compensate for the death of the uncle he had never seen. Regarding the remark, "Take that, you dirty dog!" this may have been the deceased talking to himself. Upon your telling the court that you knew the voice of the dead man, with whom you had been associated for many years, and that the voice was not his, the defense replies that the deceased was only 30 years old, and his voice may have been changing.

Concerning the gun, which turns out to be a Smith & Wesson, the defense proposes that this might just possibly have been stolen by the deceased from the accused, because, although the deceased had a Colt of his own in the bottom of his suitcase, he preferred suicide with a Smith & Wesson. Finally, in regard to the threats of the accused, these might by a remote chance have been unrelated to the shooting and due instead to cultural deprivation on the part of the accused.

On the basis of this evidence, the Court takes the case away from the jury and directs a verdict in favor of the accused. Although the accused has threatened to kill two other men in the community, his gun is returned to him and he is complimented and set free. The newspapers are loud in their praise of this verdict. A few weeks later you read in one of them that the other men who were threatened have indeed died under mysterious cricumstances thought by the staff writer for this paper to be suicide. On the following Sunday you turn on your TV and you see and hear certain prominent men apologize to the accused for the inconvenience the community has caused him. In the press that same Sunday appear editorials bitterly attacking the prosecuting attorney in the case. Clearly the whole tragedy, according to these papers, was a matter of cultural deprivation on the part of the dead man. As a matter of fact, you read in the news section that the prosecuting attorney has lost his job and is on relief.

At this point you might be forgiven if you put down your paper with a sigh, particularly after hearing on the radio that counsel for the defense was a fraternity brother of the judge.

A man with a weak, confused mind might perhaps be persuaded that some one or two of the following things were true, namely, that the deceased was depressed at the thought of marrying his childhood sweetheart, or that he could not bear the loss of his uncle he had never seen in spite of the million dollars after taxes, or that he preferred to steal a Smith and Wesson rather than kill himself with his own Colt, or that his voice was changing at the age of 30, or that the threats against him were due solely to cultural deprivation—but a man who could believe all these things ought to be in a mental institution.

By the same token, anybody who can believe that the Negro's limitations are solely environmental in the face of African history, and of Haitian history, and of U.S. crime records, and of U.S. illegitimacy records, and of 40 years of intelligence tests, and of the microscopic studies of Vint, and of the morphology of Bean, Connolly, Penfield, and Halstead, and of the latest synthesis of Carleton Coon, and of the other evidence in the George Report, and of the unmasking of the infiltration of the life sciences by political dogma—any person, I say, who can believe the Negro is the product of his history and environment (instead of vice versa) in the face of all those facts may not belong in a mental institution, but I dread the thought of his teaching any child of mine.

I must warn you that on the equalitarian side of this controversy there is great cleverness and great evasiveness. Do not let yourself be distracted from the point. There is just one issue, and I will put it in this way: In one group you have masses of brains which, on the average, are at a certain evolutionary level. In a separate group you have other masses of brains which, on the average, are at a different evolutionary level. Is it wise to adopt public policies which will encourage the biological mixing of those two groups of brains?

You must not be confused by the mulatto red herring, or the overlap red herring, or the religious red herring, or the legal red herring, or the civil rights red herring, or the red herring of American democracy. These matters are all of the greatest importance but they have nothing to do with the fundamental issue. If the mixing is wrong, then public policies leading toward it cannot be Christian, they cannot be American, they cannot be civil rights—and they ought not to be legal.

Cleaning up the situation is going to require inspection of the evidence by intelligent public leaders, it is going to require listening to both sides and studying both sides. It is going to require going down to the end of the road on each item—statement and answer, rejoinder and surrejoinder, rebuttal and surrebuttal, until neither side has anything left to say. But I assure the President and the Attorney General: If you will investigate this matter and hear both sides impartially and to a conclusion, there is no doubt what that conclusion will be. You ought to have done it long ago. Eisenhower ought to have done it in 1954.

With particular reference to the Supreme Court, do you realize that most of the material we've been discussing tonight never was put before it? The whole record in the school cases is a scientific travesty. What is needed now—and has been needed since 1954—is executive leadership in channeling a new case based on new evidence up to the Court. I suggest to the President and the Attorney General that, having satisfied themselves as to the facts, they throw their weight behind getting a new case heard, instead of blindly talking about their duty to enforce a judicial decision which is a nightmare scientifically, legally and morally.

Let me add one last remark about my hotel drama. Any similarity between that episode and the groups in our racial controversy is purely a coincidence. Actually and in all seriousness I intend no parallel whatever between the Negro and the accused. I leave you to judge how I feel about counsel for the defense and the other characters in the story.

The time has come for me to draw these comments to a close. Today we have celebrated the birthday of a great man. He was not only an America hero. He was beloved throughout the world. He was a devout Christian, a man of wide compassion and sensitive tenderness. We know what he thought and said about the Negro and I shan't quote him on that subject again. We know that in 1858 he made it clear that he did not favor in any way the social or political equality of the white and black races. We also know that in 1864, when his days were nearly done, he wrote a letter to the Governor of Louisiana barely suggesting his hope that some very intelligent Negroes might be admitted to the franchise—of course under the control, and at the discretion, of the States. Surely with this we may agree.

However, I think we may be equally sure that Lincoln would have had nothing but contempt for these latter-day reconstructionists sitting here in Washington and elsewhere who at bayonet point would force the Negro into schools and other social situations with white children against the wishes of their parents. He would have had nothing but contempt for a welfare agency which farms out helpless white orphans to a Negro foster home. He would not have blamed the Negro for this. If ever there was a leader who would have cleansed the temple with a lash on the backs of the real culprits, Lincoln was the man.

But Lincoln was kind. I think he would have liked Dr. Garrett's way of expressing the difference between the white and Negro races. Dr. Garrett prefers to speak less of inferiority than of racial immaturity, and I have changed this slightly so that I speak now of racial youth. Indeed I have tried to make it clear wherever I have used the word inferiority that I am referring solely to limitations in adaptability to our specific Western culture. But watch the scientists and the equalitarian press—they will always drag out the phrase "Negro inferiority charged" and put it in headlines when they attack us. Like the word racist, it is a badge of their demagoguery.

Lincoln was kind, too, in his attitude toward the South. Had he lived he would have bound up the South's wounds as well as the North's. There would have been no Reconstruction period. And although the 14th amendment was passed after Lincoln's death, I will go so far as to say that if he could see the manner in which that amendment is being abused today, and hurled against the South, he would turn in his grave.

So tonight I am not going to end this talk with a quotation from Lincoln about the Negro. I am going to end it with a different quotation from Lincoln which I recommend to the meditations of the two anthropological associations, and of the Supreme Court and of John F. Kennedy and of Dwight Eisenhower: "You can fool all of the people some of the time, and some of the people all of the time, but you can't fool all of the people all of the time."

I might add that you can't fool nature any of the time. Genetic racial differences in intelligence, character, and behavior are the basic reality of life. As Dr. Coon has said, there is great variability in the evolutionary status of human populations all over the earth. This is the fundamental fact in the world today. National or international policy built on any other foundation is a house built on sand.

MILAN STEFANIK: HERO OF CZECHOSLOVAK FREEDOM

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, on May 4 we will pause in memory of the tragic death of Milan Stefanik, who would have been a leader in any nation. It is an irony of history that he could claim a nation as his own for only a few years before his death.

Born in Slovakia, then as now under foreign domination, he grew up in a scholarly atmosphere and left his native country town to take a doctor of philosophy degree at Charles University in Prague. Lack of freedom drove Stefanik to France in 1902 where, after years of struggle, he attained great distinction as an astronomer, doing valuable research in Europe, Africa, the Americas, and in the South Seas.

In 1914, when Stefanik was 34 and a naturalized citizen of France, war came to Europe. He immediately joined the French Air Force, where his distinguished service brought him new honors and the rank of major general. Combining political foresight with his heroic military contribution, he joined Thomas G. Masaryk and Edouard Benes in the Czechoslovakia National Council, from which at war's end the independent State of Czechoslovakia was to grow. As Minister of War in the new state he dedicated himself to the preservation of its independence. While flying back from a conference in Italy, his plane crashed on landing at Bratislava, on the 4th of May 1919. All aboard were killed.

This tragic loss to the world of science and to his newly founded nation was deeply felt by all. The sense of tragedy to his country was expressed in the funeral oration:

By his death the Czechoslovak cause sustains an irreparable loss. He was in every respect a gentle knight, whose record and example will be an inspiration to future generations of his fellow countrymen.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I salute the memory of this hero-statesman.

A DAY OF NATIONAL HUMILIATION, FASTING, AND PRAYER

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Hall] may extend his remarks at ths point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago today President Abraham Lincoln called for "a day of national humiliation, fasting, and prayer." I believe his proclamation to be as timely today as it was a century ago and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues. Doubtless, this Nation's salvation is now in faith and spiritual dedication. Let us repurify ourselves each in his own way, but without "absolutism" and with humble thanks to our Supreme Being.

A Day of National Humiliation, Fasting and Prayer

(President Lincoln's proclamation for April 30, 1863)

In volume 5 of "Messages and Papers of the President" is a significant proclamation from Abraham Lincoln. Though issued in 1863 it accurately fits our present distress:

"Whereas the Senate of the United States, devoutly recognizing the supreme authority and just government of Almighty God in all the affairs of men and of nations, has by a resolution requested the President to designate and set apart a day for national prayer and humiliation; and

"Whereas it is the duty of nations as well as of men to own their dependence upon the overruling power of God, to confess their sins and transgressions in humble sorrow, yet with assured hope that genuine repentance will lead to mercy and pardon, and to recognize the sublime truth, announced in the Holy Scriptures and proven by all history, that those nations only are blessed whose God is the Lord;

"And, insomuch as we know that by His divine law nations, like individuals, are subjected to punishments and chastisements in this world, may we not justly fear that the awful calamity of civil war which now desolates the land may be but a punishment inflicted upon us for our presumptuous sins, to the needful end of our national reformation as a whole people? We have been the recipients of the choicest bounties of Heaven; we have been preserved these many years in peace and prosperity; we have grown in numbers, wealth, and power as no other nation has ever grown. But we have forgotten God. We have forgotten the gracious hand which preserved us in peace and multiplied and enriched and strengthened us, and we have vainly imagined, in the deceitfulness of our hearts, that all these blessings were produced by some superior wisdom and virtue of our own. Intoxicated with unbroken success, we have become too self-sufficient to feel the necessity of redeeming and preserving grace, too proud to pray to the God that made us.

"It behooves us, then, to humble ourselves before the offended Power, to confess our national sins, and to pray for clemency and forgiveness.

"Now, therefore, in compliance with the request, and fully concurring in the views of the Senate, I do by this my proclamation designate and set apart Thursday, the 30th day of April 1863, as a day of national humiliation, fasting, and prayer. And I do hereby request all the people to abstain on that day from their ordinary secular pursuits, and to unite at their several places of public worship and their respective homes in keeping the day holy to the Lord and devoted to the humble discharge of the religious duties proper to that solemn occasion.

"All this being done in sincerity and truth, let us then rest humbly in the hope authorized by the divine teachings that the united cry of the Nation will be heard on high and answered with blessings no less than the pardon of our national sins and the restoration of our now divided and suffering country to its former happy condition of unity and peace.

"In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

"Done at the city of Washington, this 30th day of March, A.D., 1863, and of the independence of the United States the eighty-seventh.

"Abraham Lincoln."

THREAT TO JOBS IN NEW HAMPSHIRE WOOL INDUSTRY

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Cleveland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I inserted in the Record a news item from the Manchester, N.H., Union Leader announcing a shutdown of Dartmouth Mills, Inc., of Claremont.

Late yesterday I received word that this woolen mill may open on a temporary basis for 1 or 2 weeks.

This is good news for the mill's 300 workers and their families who face looking for jobs in an area where jobs are getting scarcer.

This opening and closing of Dartmouth Mills is symptomatic of the troubles facing New Hampshire's wool industries. One week the mill is forced to shut down, the next it opens for a limited period.

New Hampshire wool mill workers live under a cloud of uncertainty. They never know from one week to the next whether their jobs and families will be secure.

Imports of wool goods from Italy, Japan, and Great Britain are chiefly responsible for this lamentable situation.

Even though the Dartmouth Mills has reopened temporarily, I sent the following telegram to Gov. John W. King yesterday. It said:

Gov. John W. King,
Governor of the State of New Hampshire,
State House, Concord, N.H.:

Closing of Dartmouth Mills in Claremont as a result of unregulated wool imports underscores direct threat to 14,000 jobs in New Hampshire wool industry.

I have repeatedly asked President Kennedy to take action. He has done nothing.

I urge you to join me in efforts to protect 14,000 jobs in New Hampshire wool industries. You can help by arranging a meeting with President Kennedy in Washington with all interested parties.

Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy is the only official in this country whose actions can save New Hampshire's wool mills. Perhaps Governor King, belonging to the same party as the President, can intervene in behalf of New Hampshire wool mills and the 14,000 persons they employ.

LOOK AT WHO IS BUYING WHOSE WHEAT

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in view of the debate last week over the 1962 feed-grain bill, the entire scope of the farm program was subject to discussion.

Very shortly we will have before us the annual appropriation bill for foreign aid and a fascinating similarity between the two was provided by the editorial in the Friday, April 26, Chicago Tribune. I include the article in the Record at this point since it dramatizes the inconsistencies and direct cross-purposes under which our disposal of surplus farm products and our foreign-aid program work:

Look Who's Buying Whose Wheat

Brazil has announced a 5-year, $600 million trade agreement under which it will send coffee, cacao, and cotton to Russia in exchange for Russian oil, wheat, and machinery. The agreement would be enough cause for indignation in this country even if it didn't provide for the export of Russian wheat to Brazil.

To appreciate the full absurdity of this deal, it will help to bear in mind the following facts:

The United States is urgently looking for customers for our vast store of surplus wheat.

Brazil is an importer of wheat, to the extent of about 1 million tons a year. It has been buying most of this from the United States under our food-for-peace program with Brazilian cruzeiros. This doesn't contribute to our dollar receipts, to be sure, but it's better than paying to store the unwanted grain.

Although Russia once was a leading exporter of wheat and continues to export wheat to favored customers, it has recently been having trouble filling its own needs, and last year even had to import some Canadian wheat.

The State Department has just announced a new loan of $400 million to Brazil.

During the talks which led to this loan, Brazilian negotiators repeatedly belittled reports that Brazil was edging toward closer relations with the Soviet Union.

Meanwhile, David Bell, foreign aid administrator, assured Congress that the Kennedy administration wants our foreign aid to be used, as much as possible, for the purchase of American products.

Now, if Russia had insisted that Brazil take Russian wheat as part of the price for helping to relieve Brazil of her own surpluses, we might have been able partly to understand, if not appreciate, Brazil's slap at us.

But as it is, we doubt that Mr. Khrushchev is begging anybody to take his wheat. We must, therefore, assume that it was largely Brazil's idea and that Russia considers the deal of such strategic importance that it is worth the wheat. What might have been explained as economic expediency thus becomes a gratuitous slap at the United States as well as deliberate complicity in Russia's penetration of Latin America.

When our overly generous foreign aid yields this sort of duplicity, it is time to reexamine the whole program instead of blindly turning the other cheek and shelling out more money.

IS PRESIDENT KENNEDY PREPARING US FOR ANOTHER BACKDOWN IN CUBA?

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Alger] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, when the Kennedy administration announced we would begin protecting Castro from attack by Cuban freedom fighters, the fuzzy little dictator announced that the United States had accepted the first of his four-point ultimatum. Is the President now preparing the country for another backdown in Cuba?

A number of disturbing news items have appeared in papers across the country during the past few days regarding Guantánamo. In these feeler stories there seems to be the same old pattern of softening up the American people for abandonment of our base there. Remember the shocked denials that the President had made a deal with Khrushchev to remove our bases in Greece and Turkey? Yet, within less than a year that is exactly what we did. Congressional committees have been warning us that part of the Communist strategy intensified since Hungary, is to soften up the free world to the inevitability of the Communist takeover.

White House statements have declared that we would never abandon Guantánamo. Yet, within the past week we begin to hear about a strange case of a murdered Cuban spy who was given free run of our base. It will be interesting to learn all the facts about this case and how and why it only now has been leaked to the press.

Even now the House Armed Services Committee is studying the Defense Department proposal for an alternate base to Guantánamo to be set up in Puerto Rico.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen this pattern in operation and I think the President should assure the country now that he is not going to give in to Khrushchev and the Russian puppet, Castro, on this second point of the Communist ultimatum. The failure of President Kennedy to handle the Cuban situation should not be allowed to go any farther. We cannot continue to allow a weak administration to give in on point after point until the Communists are in a position to take over the Western Hemisphere and seriously challenge the security of this Nation.

Just how far is President Kennedy prepared to go to keep from ruffling the feelings of Khrushchev? What has the President to fear in a policy of strength and determination to protect the sovereignty of the United States? History has proved that the Communists gain ground only when we appear to be weak. They have backed down and the free world has chalked up victory whenever the United States was tough, strong, and let our enemy know in no uncertain terms that we have the means and the will to protect ourselves and our allies.

If the design is to soften us up for giving away Guantánamo, are we also prepared to give up the Panama Canal? Driving the United States out of the Canal is also on the Communist agenda. Will President Kennedy give in to their demands on that question?

Convinced that history is on their side the Communists patiently whittle away at freedom's foundations by using every means to convince the world that the rule of communism is inevitable and we must accept this. Have those close to President Kennedy convinced him of the inevitability of communism? Are we now being prepared, on that basis, to accept the demand that we give up Guantánamo?

Mr. Speaker, we can rid this hemisphere of Communist aggression and the threat it poses to this country. All that is needed is a courageous President who will assume the role of leadership expected of him, impose the Monroe Doctrine, refuse to make any further concessions to Khrushchev in Cuba and set a time limit for the complete removal of Communist troops and missiles from that island. The United States cannot stand many more Kennedy failures and giving up Guantánamo could be the final blow to send freedom reeling throughout Latin America and cause our allies to desert us everywhere in the world.

It could be that the news stories are not an indication of another backdown. If they are not, Mr. President, prove them wrong by demonstrating to Khrushchev and Castro that we will not give up Guantánamo and are prepared to defend our rights there.

WANT A $200 TAX CUT?

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Adair] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, having in mind the concern which virtually all Americans have over the possibility of a tax reduction and the need for a cut in Federal expenditures, I thought the attached editorial from the LaGrange Standard, LaGrange, Ind., was well written and illuminating:

Want a $200 Tax Cut?

As of February of this year, there were only 47 workers in private employment to support each 10 workers for our various governments.

And make no mistake: Every American worker must pay about a fifth of the salary of a government worker, plus fringe benefits, office space, equipment, mimeograph paper, and all the things a government worker uses.

The average American makes between $5,000 and $6,000 a year and pays about a fourth of that in taxes. In a lifetime, the experts say, the average individual earns about a quarter of a million dollars—a rather princely sum—and pays out about $60,000 in taxes, at the current rate.

There are about 50 million families in the United States. All government expenses must be paid by them, and the businesses they own, on the local, State, and Federal levels.

A growing population almost automatically means larger local and State expenses, but the Federal Government does not meet population-connected needs of police, firemen, schools, sewers, and other local services in any great degree. Yet, Federal expenses have been growing much faster than our population has.

The administration's new budget of more than $107 billion in actual spending works out to over $2,100 for each American family.

Too much of this budget is made up of loans to prosperous groups, aid to prosperous communities, grants to often uncooperative and wasteful—and even corrupt—foreign governments, status projects for local areas, and many other items which could and in many instances should be either canceled or deferred to a time when we can afford them.

The reason the budget is so big is that small groups who want specific projects are very demanding, while taxpayers in general suffer in silence.

But relatively minor decreases in the Federal budget could mean very significant reductions in the burden on individual taxpayers.

For instance, a $1 billion reduction works out to a $20 tax break for the average family. A $10 billion reduction would mean lightening the average family tax load by $200.

Congress needs to hear from you. Your message to Congress could well be that your family needs $200 more than it needs new or expanded Federal projects.

The only sure way to cut taxes is to cut spending.

NATIONAL SHARECROPPERS FUND

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Lindsay] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, recently I had occasion to study with care the annual report to the board of directors of the National Sharecroppers Fund, written by Fay Bennett, executive secretary.

It is an excellent report summarizing the plight of migrant farmworkers and low income farm families in this country. Of particular interest are the paragraphs which deal with the application of Federal aid programs. Every Member of Congress will be interested in the fund's conclusion that applications for loans and other government aid are being processed in a discriminatory and therefore ineffective fashion. This is a point worth noting when Members come to the problem of considering fair opportunity requirements in Federal legislation.

I would urge every Member of the House to examine the fund's report for 1962, and for that reason I am, with the permission of the House, placing the report in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

National Sharecroppers Fund

THE YEAR IN BRIEF

Human waste, men displaced by machines, exploitation of the hungry, foreign workers competing for vanishing jobs—progress is coming too little and too late for many farm families of America.

The year 1962 saw several real changes for the better: action, in which National Sharecroppers Fund has played a role, toward bringing industry to the underemployed workers of the rural South and retraining those who must or wish to leave the land; increased union organizing and collective bargaining activities, particularly in California and Louisiana; a significant drop in the number of imported contract workers, because the Department of Labor enforced more diligently the provisions to prevent adverse effects on domestic wages and working conditions; a Federal health program for migrants; progress in implementing Federal aid programs for the rural families who need them most.

But these few restrained measures are pitted against an agricultural revolution which has forced millions of people off the land in the last 10 years. As one result, untrained workers are arriving in cities where jobs are already scarce and necessary skill levels are rising. This same agricultural revolution has concentrated economic power so that one-half of 1 percent of all our farms (those with annual sales of over $100,000) account for 20 percent of all farm products sold, while the workers those farms employ receive the lowest wages and have the highest unemployment rate of any group in our economy, and lack the cushion of social legislation which protects other workers.

CONCENTRATION OF CONTROL; WEALTH VERSUS POVERTY

There were 5.4 million farms in 1950. These were reduced to 4.8 million in 1954; to 3.7 million in 1959. Between 1959 and 1960 an estimated 370,000 more, involving over a million people, have given up. Two-thirds (about 2 million) of the families who stayed on their farms earned less than $1,000 a year from both farm and nonfarm work.

Only 21.5 percent of U.S. farms have sales of $10,000 or more, which the Department of Agriculture estimates will return a minimum family income of $2,500. But it takes $4,000 to place the multiperson family above poverty in the American context today, according to the Conference on Economic Progress and other authorities. At the other end, only 2.7 percent of the farms have sales of $40,000 or more. They control 20 percent of all farmland and 14 percent of all cropland harvested, and profit from more than 30 percent of all farm products sold.

GREATEST POVERTY IN THE SOUTH

About one out of every six southern farm operators is Negro. Less than one-third own or even rent their own farms; about 40 percent are sharecroppers, and the rest are tenant farmers.

The average size white-operated commercial farm in the South is about 382 acres; the average nonwhite commercial farm, 56 acres. The average value of land and buildings is $37,816 for whites, and $7,328 for nonwhites. The average value of products sold is $10,396 for whites and $3,029 for nonwhites. Displacement, greater in the South than elsewhere, is proportionately greater among Negro farmers. In the last decade the South has lost half its Negro-operated farms. The number of tenants, both Negro and white, dropped about 45 percent and the number of sharecroppers about 55 percent.

HIRED FARMWORKERS

Average annual earnings of farmworkers dropped from $1,125 in 1960 to $1,054 in 1961 because of increased unemployment in agriculture and the difficulty of finding supplementary nonfarm work; a slight rise in hourly wage rates was thus counterbalanced. Migrants fared even worse. Their 1960 average of $1,016 dropped to $902. Employment of seasonal workers declined for the third straight year in 1962.

DISPLACEMENT ACCELERATED BY MECHANIZATION

The need for new jobs in the rural South has been intensified by acceleration in cotton harvest mechanization. In 1950, only 8 percent of the cotton crop was machine harvested. By 1959, this had risen to 40 percent. The Department of Labor estimated that in 1961 the harvest was 57 percent mechanized. Between 1959 and 1961, peak employment declined by at least 250,000, while production dropped less than 3 percent.

Agricultural workers are even being displaced by geese. The Wall Street Journal has reported: "Growers here in the Southwest and in other cotton regions are finding that geese * * * can do weeding better and more cheaply than men with hoes * * *. Machines such as cottonpickers and cultivators, plus herbicides, had already slashed their employment opportunities, and now the increasing use of geese is further reducing jobs."

Each year sees new crops coming under mechanization as development of both machines and plants continues. For instance, in 1962, 95 percent of the Massachusetts cranberry crop (one of the largest on record) was harvested by picking machines.

MEXICAN CONTRACT WORKERS

By far the largest number of foreign workers came from Mexico, but total employment of Mexican contract workers (braceros) was down one-third, from 291,420 in 1961 to 194,978 in 1962. But with many apparently recontracted, some 244,000 braceros worked here for an average period of about 3 months in 1962. Less than 1 percent of American farms used braceros. A primary reason for the decrease was the U.S. Department of Labor's decision—bitterly protested by bracero employers—to set minimum wage rates for braceros in keeping with its statutory responsibility to prevent adverse effects on the wages and conditions of domestic workers. The minimum wages set ranged from 60 cents an hour in Arkansas to $1 in California and Michigan and were below State average farm wages in every case.

The National Sharecroppers Fund submitted testimony at all open hearings held by the Department of Labor in bracero-employing areas before the minimum rates were set; NSF asked that the minimum be not less than the average State or National farm wage, whichever was higher. NSF has also urged the Department of Labor to recommend to Congress that Public Law 78 (under which Mexicans are imported) be permitted to expire at the end of 1963.

Green-carders: Mexican workers are entering the United States as immigrants in greatly increasing numbers. Between 1951 and 1960, nearly 300,000 were admitted, a 395-percent rise over the 60,589 admitted in the previous decade. In fiscal 1961 alone, 41,632 were admitted.

The immigrant farmworker is free to move from job to job and does not pose so great a threat to labor standards as the contract worker. But, like the native worker, he lacks the protection of a minimum wage and other standards. Some growers in border areas pay such low wages that the immigrants cannot afford to live here, so they leave their families behind and cross the border daily.

Blue carders. A similar problem is caused by Mexicans who have border-crossing permits to visit or shop but not to work in the United States, and who nevertheless do work here. More than 135,000 of these permits were issued in fiscal 1962, but precise information is not available as to how many border crossers are working illegally. Completely unprotected and therefore exploited, these workers have contributed to undermining wage rates in the Southwest, which sometimes range from $2.50 to $3.75 a day. The Texas AFL–CIO is suing the Federal Government, demanding a halt to this illegal use of cheap labor.

PUERTO RICAN FARMWORKERS

In 1962, 13,526 Americans from Puerto Rico came under contract to work on mainland farms. Their guaranteed minimum wage was 90 cents an hour, an increase from the 80 cents minimum in 1961. In addition to a guarantee of 160 hours of work in each 4-week period, the contract included workmen's compensation coverage, health insurance, and English classes for workers who wish to further their education.

OTHER FOREIGN WORKERS

Other specially imported foreign workers for American agriculture in 1962 included approximately 1,200 Japanese, 125 Filipinos, 13,000 British West Indians, and 8,700 Canadians. Peak employment of all foreign contract workers was the lowest since 1950.

FARMWORKER ORGANIZATION

The Agricultural Workers Organizing Committee, AFL–CIO, centered in California, spent last year in strengthening its locals and registering eligible farmworkers as voters. Increased organizing and collective bargaining activities are predicted for 1963.

In Louisiana, the organizing drive of the Agricultural and Allied Workers Union No. 300 (formerly the National Agricultural Workers Union) made notable progress in 1962. Overcoming strong opposition, this affiliate of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America won recognition for some workers at Sweetlake Farms, a 6,000-acre rice, cattle, and poultry operation employing some 200 people, including 46 tenant farm families.

SUGAR ACT BENEFITS DENIED FARMWORKERS

During the 1962 congressional debate on extension of the Sugar Act, which guarantees subsidies and import quotas to American sugargrowers, Senator EUGENE MCCARTHY proposed that the minimum wage set under the Fair Labor Standards Act be substituted for the present vague "fair and reasonable wage." His proposal failed. In 1962, minimum hourly wages for sugarworkers in this highly protected industry ranged from 60 cents in Louisiana to 95 cents in sugarbeet fields. In Hawaii, where sugar workers are members of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, the lowest paid receive $1.46 an hour, plus valuable fringe benefits.

FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Farmers Home Administration: FHA has greatly increased its activities and liberalized its criteria in the past 2 years. In 1962, FHA granted $754 million in loans to rural families, the largest amount in any 12-month period in its history. Of the 214,000 families who used FHA facilities in the last fiscal year, 10,000 were Negro borrowers. This represents an increase of about 40 percent over fiscal 1960.

Rural Areas Development: The Office of Rural Areas Development in the Department of Agriculture implements the Commerce Department's Area Redevelopment Administration projects to help depressed rural areas. Some 2,700 economic development projects were submitted to Rural Areas Development in the past 18 months; 317 projects were approved, involving an estimated $90 million and 45,000 new jobs. About 950 industrial or commercial projects were reported in the planning stage or "underway" in the rural South.

Retraining: The training programs of the Area Redevelopment Administration and the even broader program of the Office of Manpower, Automation, and Training in the U.S. Department of Labor, include provisions to raise the skill levels of unemployed and underemployed farmworkers so that they can qualify for better paying jobs in agriculture or industry. They also provide for training farm youth between the ages of 16 and 22 years. The U.S. Department of Labor reports a need for year-round hired farm laborers able to perform a wide variety of tasks: operating and maintaining farm machinery, pruning and cultivating, and making safe use of chemical insecticides and weed killers.

FEDERAL AID PROGRAMS NOT APPLIED EQUALLY

Most of the southern rural counties eligible for Rural Area Development and Area Redevelopment Administration aid meet the criteria of need because of the abject poverty of their Negro families, but most of the aid goes to the white families. There are about 1 million rural Negro families (1960), at least 85 percent of them in the South and most of these in the coastal plain between southern Virginia and eastern Texas. Fifty-seven percent of them have incomes of less than $2,000 a year, while only 19 percent of the white population are in this bracket.

The discrepancy is increasing. The median income of Negro farm families was 52 percent of that of white southern farm families in 1950 but only 45 percent by 1960. In 1950 the proportion of white southern farm families who had hot and cold piped water inside their homes was only seven percentage points higher than the proportion among Negroes; by 1960 it was 50 percentage points higher. The proportion of young people obtaining a high school education has increased among both groups, but not nearly so rapidly among rural Negroes as among rural whites.

The distribution of FHA loans (1959–61) in nine counties of South Carolina, reported in a Southern Regional Council study, is revealing. In five counties, more than half the farmers were Negroes, and Negroes made up at least 39 percent of the farmers in the other four counties. Only 29 percent of Negro applications for farm ownership loans were approved, while 42 percent of the applications by whites were granted. Of the money advanced for farm ownership loans, Negroes received only 4.5 percent; of the money lent for farm housing, only 6.1 percent.

In this and other Government programs, the policy of the Federal Government to have local control has created the problem. Applications for loans and other Government aid are processed by appointed committees of local farmers, who function without definite guidelines and with little Federal supervision or administrative review. Negroes are almost never represented and play no part in the decisionmaking of the committees, which are ostensibly intended to represent and safeguard the interests of the whole community. This is, of course, typical of the local power structure throughout the South, but its extension to the implementation of Federal policy frustrates the intention of the Congress to aid the very people who are most disadvantaged.

LEGISLATION

The Migrant Health Act: The 1962 Health Services Act authorizes up to $3 million annually for 3 years for health projects in areas with a sizable influx of migrant workers. This can be used for such services as family clinics which are convenient to migrants and regularly scheduled visits by public health nurses to migrant camps.

Other legislation: A bill to limit child labor in agriculture passed the Senate and went to the floor of the House for action but never came to a vote. Three other bills passed the Senate but were stopped in the House by the Rules Committee. These would have provided aid to States to improve educational opportunities for migrant children, set up an Advisory Council on Migratory Labor, and required registration of labor contractors. New bills to help farmworkers in these and other areas (such as minimum wage) have been introduced in the 88th Congress.

NATIONAL SHARECROPPER FUND FIELD SERVICE PROGRAM

The National Sharecropper Fund analysis of a steadily deteriorating economic situation in the rural South has resulted in a new emphasis and expansion of effort.

National Sharecropper Fund is stepping up its program of providing information, guidance, and organizing help to local groups throughout the South, to enable them to take advantage of these Federal aid programs before they are deprived of their land and homes, or to make alternatives available to those already dispossessed. The National Sharecropper Fund staff works to insure that applications for aid that originate outside the established local power structure receive the same consideration as any others. When Negro sharecroppers in Mississippi were denied Federal surplus commodities in the winter of 1962, after participating in voter registration drives, National Sharecropper Fund joined with other groups in protesting this attempt by local power structures to use denial of Government food as a means of intimidation, and the Department of Agriculture responded by seeing that the commodities were distributed in some of the affected counties. The executive secretary of the National Sharecropper Fund serves as a member of the National Advisory Committee on Rural Areas Development of the Department of Agriculture.

A second field representative was added to the NSF staff at the turn of the year. He is Mr. L. S. James, who will work in his home State of South Carolina to help low-income farmers and farmworkers qualify for Federal aid programs. Mr. James is cosponsored by the South Carolina Council on Human Relations. Like NSF's Tennessee field representative, Mr. Allen Yancey, Jr., Mr. James will help farmers apply for FHA loans, assist communities in qualifying for RAD and ARA projects, and cooperate in organizing retraining projects to teach new skills to underemployed and unemployed farmers, farmworkers, and youth.

A BETTER LIFE FOR FARM FAMILIES

That such work needs to be done and that additional staff representatives are needed to answer increasing requests from other States was made clear by enthusiastic response to the National Sharecropper Fund Southern Rural Conference at Bricks, N.C., in November 1962. More than 160 people attended this pioneering conference, called to inform low-income southern farmers about the new Federal programs and to discuss how to go about obtaining their benefits locally. Participants ranged from an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture to sharecroppers from Mississippi. Others came from Louisiana, Alabama, Georgia, Tennessee, South Carolina, North Carolina, and Virginia. Those in official positions were brought face to face with people who live daily with poverty and frustration. Proceedings of the conference, entitled "A Better Life for Farm Families," have been published and are being widely circulated.

Fayette County, Tenn.: With the help of USDA and ARA officials, residents of Fayette County, where hundreds of tenant farmers and sharecroppers were evicted 2 years ago after registering to vote have formed a corporation to attract new industry into the area. The West Tennessee Development Co. grew out of a local, biracial committee formed by National Sharecroppers Fund field representative Yancey to provide industrial jobs on a nondiscriminatory basis for persons who are no longer able to make a living in agriculture but who nevertheless want to remain in the area.

CONCLUSION

At the present time, a major part of National Sharecropper Fund goes toward its southern program. As funds permit, the staff will be enlarged to include representatives in other States, with Mississippi probably next in line. Other National Sharecropper Fund grants in 1962 were made for: A survey of Louisiana sugarcane workers; the pension fund for members of the old Southern Tenant Farmers Union; the National Council on Agricultural Life and Labor; the National Advisory Committee on Farm Labor; and the Migrant Children's Fund.

The National Sharecroppers Fund reports and releases are sent to a large number of newspapers and magazines, libraries, public officials, and concerned citizens. National Sharecropper Fund will continue its efforts to improve the conditions of seasonal and migratory farmworkers across the country by backing needed legislation, supporting union organizing efforts, and providing literature and speakers for a growing audience. It must also look ahead to a steadily declining demand for seasonal workers; to the virtual end of sharecropping; and to the dispossession of the marginal farmer. Alternatives planned now can secure a better future for these workers of the land.

WHEN IS THIS ADMINISTRATION GOING TO DO SOMETHING BESIDES TALK?

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Cramer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting into the Record an editorial which appeared in the April 24, 1963, issue of the Fort Lauderdale News. I am doing so because it directly and forcefully puts into words what many Americans have been thinking privately: "When is this administration going to do something besides talk on Cuba?"

For all those who, like myself, have deep reservations about the administration's policy toward Communist Cuba, I recommend the reading of the following editorial:

Washington Says One Thing, Does Another, and Citizens Get Bewildered, Confused

In all the long history of this country we don't think there has ever been a time when our people have been more confused, bewildered, and perhaps just plain disgusted over the actions of their Government than they are right now.

We are not a devious kind of people. We like forthright action and blunt talk. Yet, what we are witnessing today is anything but forthright action, and the talk we are hearing from our Government officials is like something taken right out of Alice in Wonderland.

One can understand President Kennedy's reluctance to do anything which even remotely might get this Nation involved in a nuclear war with Soviet Russia. One can also understand well enough why the Cuban situation has to be viewed as just one part of a global picture.

Yet, if we are going to do nothing about getting Russian troops out of Cuba, and if we have decided on a policy of peaceful coexistence with a Communist satellite in our backyard, as now appears to be the case, then why in heaven's name do Mr. Kennedy, Secretary of State Dean Rusk and other administration bigwigs keep on mouthing phrases and cliches that conflict completely with their own actions.

For instance, we have been told time and again this Nation cannot accept the presence of Russian troops in Cuba. Presumably, this means the troops must go or we are going to do something to force the issue.

But when are we going to do something besides talk? Admittedly, this is a touchy subject for the administration. But one reason it is so touchy is that so many administration officials from the President right on down the line have declared the Russian troops must go, that they are verbally committed to doing something that actually they are afraid to do. In truth, they have been caught up by their own tongues, but instead of admitting this has happened they go on talking in the vain hope that if they talk long enough everybody will forget a lot of what has been said or who said it.

Unfortunately for Mr. Kennedy and some of his bumbling advisers this is not happening. Our people still remember being told right from the White House that communism in this hemisphere was not negotiable. Yet, it has not only been negotiated but it is now even being protected by our own Navy and our own Coast Guard on direct orders from this same White House.

And what about the fairy story of our Government having nothing to do with the ransom payments to Fidel Castro? Can anybody in their right mind believe that New York lawyer James B. Donovan has not been representing our Government in his dealings with Castro? For Government officials to deny this is absolutely preposterous, yet they do it with a straight face and then wonder why people think they are lying through their teeth.

We can understand why our Government wants to deny any responsibility for this shameful deal and particularly when it was reported a short time ago that Castro got a cool million dollars in cash out of it for his own pocket. But why carry on with such a patent falsehood? Do our officials believe one deception merits another? Do they think the American people are such stupid idiots they can no longer put two and two together and come up with four?

We hope not, but the more we hear out of Washington these days the more we become convinced this is the prevalent attitude and particularly among the shiny domes in the State Department who have made such an incredible mess of things that most Americans now have to pinch themselves to realize it all isn't just a horrible dream.

Perhaps we are overly bitter, but we think it is about time the American people did get bitter over what is happening to this great country because their leaders are too fearful to do what needs to be done.

Words can never substitute for deeds no matter how brave, how noble and how resonant the words sound. And the trouble with us today is that we have too many men in high places who are so charmed with the sound of their own words that they are even deceiving themselves on what the words mean.

We don't think there is a person in this country who isn't fearful of what another war might bring. But there are times when fear of war can be carried to the point where it is just as destructive to a nation's interests as war itself and we may well be reaching that point in this Nation right now.

We have talked big and we have acted mighty small. Call that restraint if you will but to many, many Americans there is another word for it and it is not a nice one. The people know this only too well and that is the reason they are as confused, bewildered and disgusted as they are right now.

BRAZIL AGREEMENT TO TRADE WITH RUSSIA FOLLOWS U.S. AID

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, on March 18, I discussed on the floor of this body the administration's policy concerning Brazil and specifically the multimillion dollar U.S. loan for which the Brazilian Finance Minister, San Tiago Dantas, was at that time negotiating.

In my remarks, I quoted the following United Press International story from Rio de Janeiro:

RIO DE JANEIRO.—Brazil is about to sign a long-term $160 million a year trade agreement with the Russians as part of a 3-year plan the United States will be asked to help finance, it was reported today.

Government sources said they do not expect the United States to press for curbs on Iron Curtain trade which will be approximately doubled by the new agreement and may increase to as much as $300 million a year by 1965.

A mission headed by Finance Minister San Tiago Dantas is to leave soon for Washington to seek liberalized terms on existing loans and $1.5 billion in new U.S. loans and investments over the 3-year period.

Likewise, in the Evening Star of March 11, as a result of an interview with Finance Minister Dantas this was reported:

"Brazil's Finance Minister said today that part of the financial help he is seeking here would be used to develop trade with all countries—including Russia.

"Francisco San Tiago Dantas made that statement to newsmen after conferring at the White House with President Kennedy.

"Mr. Dantas, a former Foreign Minister for his government who voted against the expulsion of Cuba from the Organization of American States, said of his talk with Mr. Kennedy:

"'I think it was a very interesting conversation and I hope that my visit will be helpful for the mutual understanding between our countries. We had a general picture of the situation and before I leave for Brazil we will have a new talk.'

"A reporter asked whether 'some of this loan you are seeking from the United States' would be used to help develop trade with Russia. No, Mr. Dantas replied, 'with all the countries.'

"'Including Russia?' he was asked.

"'Including Russia,' he replied.

"Mr. Dantas is reported to be hoping to persuade the United States to add some $84 million to the $553 million in U.S. aid given Brazil since 1951, and to obtain a postponement of the $450 million Brazil is due to pay to the United States this year on its debts.

"He said that in his talk with Mr. Kennedy there was mention of a visit to Brazil. No date has been fixed he said, but Mr. Kennedy confirmed that it would be this year."

On March 16, I made a request through Mr. Moscoso's office that I be informed concerning the requests that had been made by Brazil as to loans and aid and also what was being discussed with regard to trade between Russia and Brazil. I was denied any information other than that negotiations were underway.

Although the State Department would not admit it at the time for fear of rightful indignation by the American taxpayer, they obviously knew that even while negotiating this loan negotiations were underway to increase Brazil's trade with Russia. No one can deny that the U.S. loan will be used, partially at least, to enable Brazil to carry out its end of the deal, witness subsequent events.

On April 21, 1963, the following very revealing Associated Press story confirming my charges appeared in the St. Petersburg Times.

At this point, I am inserting this article in the RECORD:

BRAZIL SIGNS TRADE PACT WITH RUSSIA

RIO DE JANEIRO, BRAZIL.—Brazil signed a new 5-year trade agreement with the Soviet Union yesterday. A Brazilian official indicated it might be expanded into an economic and technical assistance program with the Russians.

The trade agreement calls for an exchange of more than $600 million worth of goods in the next 3 years. Trade for this year will amount to $160 million—more than double that of last year. It will increase to $200 million next year and $225 million in 1965.

Ironically, the terms were spelled out in U.S. dollars.

Brazil will export coffee, cacao, and cotton to Russia. The Russians will send petroleum and wheat, two chief Brazilian imports, plus manufactured goods and goods of production.

The Brazilians tacked onto the agreement a guarantee that the Russians would not resell any of the Brazilian products to other countries. There had been local newspaper reports the Russians would sell the coffee to Cuba.

Brazil began trading with the Soviet Union in 1959 on a small scale. The exchange of goods since then has amounted to about $145 million.

United States-Brazilian trade for 1962 alone amounted to $1.15 billion worth of goods.

But Finance Minister Francisco San Tiago Dantas gave every indication Brazil wanted to expand economic ties with the Soviet Union.

"Brazil finds in the Soviet Union a market of unforeseeable potentiality not only for coffee and other tropical products, but even for consumer goods manufactured in our country," San Tiago Dantas said.

This story proves conclusively that the aim of this loan was to beef up Brazil's ability to trade with Russia, to purchase Russian equipment and goods, at the expense of the American taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, this purposeful act by our State Department warrants closer examination. Let us briefly review the facts under which this loan was made:

First. Brazil is one of only five Latin American nations still recognizing and doing business with Castro.

Second. In testimony before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Lincoln Gordon, U.S. Ambassador to Brazil, stated that Brazil's Government, student groups, and labor organizations are heavily infiltrated with Communists.

Third. That Goulart's cabinet is infiltrated with Marxists was admitted to me personally by the Brazilian Ambassador to the United States, Senor Campos, in my office on April 24, 1963.

Fourth. The Communist inspired Continental Congress of Solidarity with Cuba was held in Brazil last month with no real opposition from Goulart's government.

Fifth. In addition, Brazil was one of the few Latin American nations who opposed our position at Punte Del Este, supported the recent United Nations Cuban smear campaign against the United States, and, in view of all these facts, we still loaned Brazil American dollars to build up her trade with the Soviets.

Mr. Speaker, how devoid of purposeful leadership in dispensing aid money has our State Department become? How absurd can we get?

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY—MOORE-McCORMACK LINES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, the celebration this year of the 50th anniversary of the foundation of Moore-McCormack Lines, one of the Nation's largest steamship companies, is a graphic reminder of the greatness which has come to this country through our system of free enterprise. The release which I am asking to have inserted into the RECORD today gives a thrilling picture of the part played by the American shipping industry in expanding American trade and cementing our international relations throughout the world.

Moore-McCormack Lines is but one of the fine American companies that are in partnership with the Government under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 to build and operate ships for our economy and national defense.

Our commerce continues to grow, and I believe can grow even more dynamically through greater cooperation between management, labor, and the Government in fostering a strong and adequate American-flag merchant fleet. I believe that progress in our transportation system, using the most recent fruits of advanced technology, can be a great source for increased employment of our citizens.

The history of this one American steamship line impresses me so much that I want to commend it to the attention of the House.

The history of Moore-McCormack Lines' rise from a 1-ship operation 50 years ago into a 44-ship, 4-continent, American-flag shipping service today follows:

Moore-McCormack Lines, one of the Nation's largest steamship enterprises, will celebrate this year the 50th anniversary of the voyage which launched the company's growth from a one-ship operation into a four-continent American-flag shipping service.

A new era in Western Hemisphere shipping began one day in July 1913, when the freighter *Montara,* chartered by the then unknown firm of Moore & McCormack, steamed into Rio de Janeiro's harbor on the first visit by a U.S. ship to that South American port in 26 years.

From that modest beginning, Moore-McCormack Lines has grown into an international shipping concern which operates a fleet of 44 modern passenger and cargo vessels from ports on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts and the Great Lakes to South America, Europe, and Africa. It also maintains 28 offices in the United States and abroad and is represented by hundreds of agents all over the world.

William T. Moore, chairman of the board and president of Moore-McCormack Lines, announced that as part of its golden anniversary observance, the company has published a 68-page booklet reviewing its history and describing its activities as one of the world's foremost carriers of passengers and freight. Illustrated with detailed maps, photographs, and charts, the booklet is a pioneering effort by Mooremack, as the company is popularly known, to illustrate the importance of an efficient, modern, privately operated, American-flag merchant fleet to the Nation's economy.

"Moore-McCormack Lines faces the next half century with a high degree of confidence," Mr. Moore said. "The last 50 years have provided us with the techniques, experience, and a modern fleet to meet the changes that are occurring throughout the world today. These changes are certain to have a profound impact on the future of the American merchant marine.

"They currently include the dynamic concept of the European Common Market, new international trade relationships, the emergence of new nations, the new needs resulting from the steady expansion of the world's population, vastly improved communications, the historic commitment of the American people to world leadership."

Moore-McCormack Lines grew out of a unique partnership between Emmet J. McCormack and the late Albert V. Moore. Operating out of a small office in the old building which once stood at 29 Broadway, the two men chartered the freighter *Montara* in 1913 for an experimental voyage to South America. The reception given to the ship by Brazilian and American shippers convinced the little firm of the desirability of a regular American-flag service in the route. J. P. Morgan was one of the original backers of the enterprise.

The American Republics Lines service, as it became known, grew rapidly. By 1915 passenger accommodations were added. Two years later, the Mooremack house flag was introduced to ports as far south as Buenos Aires.

Meanwhile, the company branched out into Scandinavian service, beginning with a voyage of the *Catalonia* in 1918. The new route developed rapidly and by the early 1920's Moore & McCormack was the dominant American-flag steamship company serving Norway, Sweden, Denmark, and Finland.

The South American and Scantic services flourished during the 1920's. In 1928, the Russian port of Leningrad and the Polish port of Gdynia were added to the run. In fact, Mooremack played a major role in transforming the little fishing village of Gdynia into a valuable seaport that served not only Poland but all central Europe.

During the depression years, the company adopted a program of expansion. In the early 1930's, it converted four freighters into the combination passenger cargo carriers *Scanpenn, Scanmail, Scanyork,* and *Scanstates* which became very popular on the Scantic route. They also served as valuable troopships during World War II.

Responding to President Roosevelt's call for a regular American-flag passenger liner service to South American east coast ports, the company inaugurated in 1938 the famous good neighbor service with the rebuilt liners *Uruguay, Brazil,* and *Argentina.*

Moore-McCormack Lines was one of the original companies to apply for subsidies under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. This law established a partnership between the Government and private companies for building and operating modern oceangoing ships. By the outbreak of World War II, Mooremack had already begun to build up a fleet of new cargo ships. These ships were impressed into military service as baby flattops and other invaluable Navy auxiliaries.

Just before the outbreak of the war, Mooremack had acquired the Pacific Republics Line. Ships in this route sail from port on the Pacific coast of the United States and Canada through the Panama Canal to ports along the northern and eastern coasts of South America. Then they return to the Pacific coast via the Straits of Magellan with occasional calls on the Pacific coast of South America. This service is a prosperous part of Mooremack's enterprise today.

The company's knowledge, experience, and equipment were put to good use during World War II. Acting as agent for the Government, Mooremack operated 707 different merchant vessels on 2,199 voyages. These ships moved some 20.4 million tons of cargo to every theater of war throughout the world.

Mooremack's ships also played a vital role in the Korean war. The *Meredith Victory* astounded the world by rescuing in one voyage 14,000 refugees fleeing the advancing Communists in North Korea. During much of the trip, many of these people were so tightly packed that they had to stand on open decks. But all were delivered safely to Pusan.

Since World War II, Moore-McCormack Lines has continued to grow. In 1957, the company acquired the Robin Line service between the United States and Africa. Founded in 1935, the Robin Line was noted for its dependability. The service has been expanded under the Mooremack house flag with new ships.

The new and ultramodern passenger liners *Argentina* and *Brasil* replaced the old *Brazil, Argentina,* and *Uruguay* in the passenger route to South America in 1958. These deluxe liners were built to provide the ultimate in sea travel. Handsomely decorated and completely air conditioned, each ship has two swimming pools, a movie theater, and many other features. All staterooms are outside, each with private bathroom.

Mooremack also offers an exceptional cruise program with the *Argentina* and *Brasil* in voyages ranging from 6 to 63 days. The cruises include the famed Sea-Safari to Africa and the Mediterranean via the Caribbean and South America, the regular month-long cruise to Buenos Aires featured by the annual Carnaval cruises to Rio de Janeiro, the popular spring and summer visits to Scandinavian and European ports, and also the shorter and more economical trips to the Caribbean islands.

As the company enters its second half century, it is engaged in a $400 million fleet replacement program. Two passenger ships and eight new cargo vessels already in service since the program got under way in 1958 are establishing new patterns of speed and efficiency. Six new fast cargo liners are under construction.

Only last fall, Mooremack expanded its Scantic run to include the ports of Rotterdam and Antwerp. Some of the company's newest ships have been assigned to the route to provide a fast service for the route.

Mooremack's headquarters are in the new building at 2 Broadway which recently replaced the venerable Produce Exchange. The company's passenger liners sail from Pier 97, Hudson River and 57th Street. Its bustling freight operations in New York are centered at a mammoth new terminal at 23d Street, Brooklyn. Of equal importance to the company's worldwide services are the many ports on three coastal areas of the United States including Philadelphia and Baltimore, plus the coastal area from Maine to Florida—on the west coast from Los Angeles to Seattle and Vancouver—and through the St. Lawrence River from Quebec and Montreal into the wide expanse of the Great Lakes area.

WEATHER VANES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, the course of events does not follow a straight line. History is a tangled skein of yarn, and the thread changes direction almost imperceptibly. One age glides into the next, and only later can observers detect the change in direction. Historians find it tidy to date the change with some event which attracts unusual attention. Such an event was the Cuba confrontation last October.

For the last 20 years or so, philosophers and politicians have been all wrapped up in the one world concept. The Communists have made no bones of their intention to raise the Red flag over all six continents. The Western version of the concept was an accord of capitalistic states closely bound together militarily, economically, and culturally. The two systems met toe-to-toe in Cuba—and refrained.

True, this is still a most dangerous world. Actually, it has always been a dangerous one. Terror has always crouched like a wild beast just over the mountain, or beyond the sea, or across the sands of the desert. But we seldom knew exactly where it lay. Today we know, and we watch. And because we watch, the world senses instinctively that there is going to be no all-destroying war. Kaiser Bill and Mussolini and Hitler are all dead, and their would-be successors, if any, have better foresight. A precedent was set in the Cuba affair. It will be far easier to draw back in any future confrontation. This is a positive gain in world morality in our generation.

An immediate result of Cuba was the collapse of unity in both camps. No manipulation of words can conceal the basic distrust of the great Communist societies for each other, a distrust springing from longstanding racial antagonism. In the Western World, the members quarrel among themselves over the Common Market, control over weapons, political alinements, even over what one statesman is alleged to have said about another. The members of a family do not fall out with each other when danger is imminent. But the moment tension relaxes, individual interests and ambitions assert themselves. There is infinite divergence of purpose and of method. That is exactly what is happening in the families of nations today. It is a turn in affairs that calls for rejoicing rather than for despair.

Why? Simply because man is by nature a competitive animal. The only successful noncompetitive society known is that of the bees, and its accomplishments do not inspire imitation. The whole idea of world empire is as antagonistic to human nature as it is fantastic in political planning. Experience avers this fact. The highly percipient Dr. Arnold Toynbee notes that the universal state is the final stage of a dying society. Each of the great civilizations which has sprung up through the course of history, has, in turn, tried to dominate the world. To the extent that it succeeded, it assured its own destruction. Internal dissension tore it apart. Everything that had been planned and accomplished fell to pieces. What followed was chaos. The last and best-known example is the Roman Empire, whose collapse was followed by the centuries known as the Dark Ages.

Hence the differences of opinion and of purpose springing up all over the world are happy omens, and not dark ones. They are signs of awakening imagination and vigor. They indicate that people almost everywhere are beginning to assess their own peculiar capabilities and put them to work. They still have the vitality and the will to preserve and perpetuate their own purposes. Therein lies the heart of growing and progressive societies. There is not going to be any universal world empire. There is not even going to be a single Western empire, or a single Communist empire, or a Western Hemisphere empire. The direction of the wind has changed. A normal and healthy competitiveness, without which there can be only stagnation and decay, comes back into existence. The true and dependable nature of man reasserts itself. The one-world concept is on the scrap heap.

What we can look forward to now is competition—and cooperation. For, strange as it may seem at casual inspection, competition is by no means incompatible with cooperation. Take for example the professional baseball teams making up a big league. Nowhere is rivalry more intense. Yet they band together in mutual protection and in mutual furtherance of baseball interests. Are the vision and the commonsense appropriate to an athletic league less available in international relations than on a baseball diamond? If so, the blame must be assigned to political figures on the world scene. And that applies to a great many of us who in one way or another help to formulate international and domestic policies.

Toynbee chose an apt word to characterize a progressive and growing society. That word is "creativity." A society on the march must be a creative society. The times are always changing. New ways of making a living and of acting out the drama or life are invented. New wants arise, and new methods of satisfying those wants. Each poses a new problem, a challenge to society. Old answers to old problems are not necessarily the right answers to the new problems. Creativity is not the product of minds which function only in a groove. If society meets challenges as they come, it will flourish and grow stronger. If it fails, decay and death are just over the horizon. Today, creativity of the highest order is called for to answer challenges that grow increasingly complex and more immediately threatening.

In the United States, it is evident that our natural inventive genius has not as yet been thrown into high gear. For one thing, too many grooves of partisan political thinking obstruct progress toward creativity. For the solution of both domestic and international problems, what we need today is unbiased creative answers to specific situations, rather than wornout carpings over what has been done, or has not been done, in the past. Too much energy is being expended on objections based on history rather than on the needs of today.

The problems of the new age vary enormously from nation to nation. From a distance, it is not always possible to identify the crucial problem. In Latin America, for instance, history seems to suggest that land distribution, coupled with rapid industrialization, is the vital need. The Alliance for Progress attempts to promote those ends. But progress in that direction is slow and uncertain. Perhaps in time it will become more rapid. We have difficulty in imagining a modern nation in which there is not equality of opportunity and high industrial activity. But possibly something more fundamental may need to be attacked before we can hope to reach such a goal. The President of Nicaragua recently stated that the ways of doing things, whether they are political, economic, or otherwise, which seem logical in the United States may not necessarily be applicable in his country. Again, in the Congo, the policy advocated by the United Nations insists on forcible union of the various subdivisions. Before that policy can lead to political stability and economic progress, it must be adopted by the Congolese as their own policy. There must be doubt that it can be imposed from without.

All of this is a way of saying that creativity must be a homegrown product. Help from the outside—yes. But the plan itself must be native to its environment, and the help must conform to the needs that are realized locally. In the case of seriously underdeveloped nations, creativity may indeed be a dormant force. In such a situation, the problem of the nation which means to help, and not to govern, is to find some way to spark and inflame the local genius of self-improvement.

Turning to the nations with which we were so closely associated during and after the war, their present diverging points of view surely marks a nascent flow of national creativity. At last they feel reasonably free from external disaster. Each is attacking its most acute internal problem in its own way. Its self-reliance calls for approval, and not for apprehension. The family of nations is growing up. Its members are capable of looking after themselves in many ways; guidance and control are both unnecessary and irritating. De Gaulle may be an irritant to the United States, but France's policy is creative and constructive for the first time in years. Progress and stability are becoming norms in a nation which has been hampered by indecision and decline since the days of Napoleon.

The necessary corollary is that the United States may now turn its attention more closely to domestic problems. We have borne too long the burden of the world upon our shoulders. A news commentator notes with approval the thoughtful opinions on international relationships expressed by the students of eight large American universities which he had surveyed, and one of them was West Virginia's. "Washington," the students say, "must relinquish the messianic role," "must get rid of the 'holier-than-thou' attitude." Conditions call for a thorough examination of all our foreign policies and programs to determine which are valid and useful in a new age. As our responsibilities overseas lessen, time and money and energy will be set free to revitalize our own economy and to serve our own national interests. It is time to set an altered course. Along with the rest of the world, the United States must display creative activity in fashioning for itself a future commensurate with its resources and capabilities.

It is within our power to do a great deal if we have the vision and determination. Defense of our own Nation and, so far as it may be needed, defense of the free world must remain a major preoccupation. But new methods of defense do make it possible to abandon some of our expensive military operations overseas, thereby helping to reduce an unfavorable balance of trade. It is hardly necessary to enumerate the domestic problems which demand ingenuity and resourcefulness. A most vexing one is Communist infiltration in Cuba and in Latin America. Russian military forces in Cuba constitute a festering sore. Few Americans believe they pose an immediate threat. No one wants to rescind the Monroe Doctrine. Yet military action might trigger another universal war. Up to the present time, Latin American sentiment would not favor the use of force. On the contrary, our Latin American friends would regard it as unwarranted interference and an exhibition of American imperialism. To devise a plan that would remove Communist influence from the Western Hemisphere would be an act of superior creativity. Clearly, procedures that would have been appropriate 50 years ago are not the right answers now. Today there is doubt that the "Remember the *Maine*" uproar was the wisest possible course even then.

The problem of finding employment for millions of adult Americans and the millions more who are entering the labor market each year is a more serious one than is fully realized. Discussion of stimulating the economy is somehow a deluding exercise. It does not pinpoint the crucial problem. We must find jobs for would-be workers. Otherwise, we leave the door wide open for communism, not only in Latin America, but in the United States. It is reported that only 75 percent of our citizens share the blessings of our supposedly affluent society. The other 25 percent are either unemployed or underemployed. Full employment of this 25 percent would produce a boom in economic activity never before achieved. The idealistic impulses of the Nation must be turned loose by some creative action hitherto not invented.

Scarcely less dangerous is the startling increase of crime and violence throughout the Nation. Widespread poverty and the frustration rising from unemployment have been used as an excuse for this condition. Lawlessness is not justified by economic plight. The real culprits are collapse of character and the decay of public and private integrity. Common morality is an indispensable characteristic of a vigorous society. In this age of almost universal greed and loss of moral sensitiveness, government on all levels can not be indifferent to the injunction of the Founding Fathers to preserve morality as the most precious jewel in our heritage.

Many of the social ills of our time are placed on the shoulders of the schools. They are being charged with failure to prepare young people morally, emotionally and vocationally for the age in which they live. A public school education for everybody is a concept with no more than half-century of history behind it. To demand that the schools inspire every youngster with the will to succeed, to equip him with the necessary knowledge and skills, and then to find an active place for him in society is a large order. Nevertheless, it is necessary to believe that it can be done, given adequate resources of money and personnel.

These are a few of the acute problems which have been neglected during the years of crisis and, being neglected, have accumulated. The new turn in world affairs relieves us from the pressure of devoting a major part of our energy to areas outside our national boundaries. We cannot govern the world if we would—and we have no such ambition. Each nation in the world must go its own way, and each nation is in the process of deciding what that way will be. It is our duty to do the same. This is not a policy of isolation. We are vitally concerned with what goes on elsewhere, whether politically, economically or culturally. That interest must be expressed in cooperation, indeed in competition. We are prepared to welcome, even to promote, rivalries in using national resources and energy in ways most likely to raise the general level of well-being everywhere. In all things for the good of mankind we will cooperate, always with full recognition of our own interests along with that of others. Candor requires us to state clearly and unequivocally what courses we intend to take in individual cases, so that no one can misunderstand. Positive attitudes in external affairs, and creative attacks on domestic needs are the possibilities made available to us by what has been happening in the world since that day in October of 1962.

A serious impediment to the consideration of new and creative plans for a new age is the universal fear of inconsistency. Those who help to mold public opinion and those who must put programs into action feel that they are irrevocably committed to a course which they have supported in the past. Politicians especially are burdened with this frightful incubus. To such as feel this burden, it is necessary to say that real inconsistency lies in adhering to methods and programs that are no longer valid. The essence of creativity is a disposition to abandon the old and embrace the new when the situation changes. Whether it is in business or labor, in education, or in the various branches of Government, progress lies in continuous reevaluation of conditions as they arise. We are going to live in the future, not the past. True consistency consists in meeting the challenges of a new age with new solutions, even though they may differ radically from those which were so appealing in situations which are past and gone.

TO MAKE FOOD, DRUG AND COSMETIC ACT APPLICABLE TO CIGARETTES AND OTHER SMOKING PRODUCTS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which would amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to make that act applicable to cigarettes and other smoking products. Since this legislation, if enacted, would impose some measure of Federal control over a $7 billion industry, I should like to say a few words in its behalf at the outset of what is likely to become a long and heated debate.

My colleagues may wonder why I have taken up this particular cudgel, and I believe they are entitled to know. As a parent I have viewed with some concern two developments of recent years. First, I have read the reports issued by our Nation's leading medical authorities testifying to the harmful, and in fact deadly, effects of cigarette smoking; secondly, I have observed the increasing tempo of advertising in all media designed to lure young people into the use of cigarettes.

Last fall constituents suggested to me that some limitation be made on radio and television advertising of cigarettes, beer and such products. The thought was that, if commercials for these products were restricted to late evening hours, children might not be corrupted by them. While exploring this possibility I put a question on the subject in a questionnaire mailed to my district, and 56 percent of my respondents said they would approve such legislation. However, I have not yet introduced such a bill because my study indicates it might be both ineffective and discriminatory. I find that children are likely to be watching television or listening to the radio at almost any hour. Furthermore, such legislation would leave magazines, newspapers, billboards and other media free to carry the same sensuous and alluring commercials they carry today for these products.

Out of this experience, however, I have learned how powerful the tobacco industry is. Merely by asking a question, without introducing legislation or even indicating what my position was, I was made the target of a vehement attack by a west coast advertising magazine which asked how America's children were going to be protected from Congressmen such as Mr. UDALL. Radio and television people around the country wrote me, sent me telegrams, and let me know that they were not going to take any reduction in their cigarette advertising revenues without a fight.

I find this rather frightening. We are living presumably in the age of science. Science has told us in emphatic terms that cigarette smoking is taking a terrible toll in our society and yet we are told we must do nothing to upset the industry that is responsible for this toll. It has been estimated that more than 40 percent of the deaths from coronary artery disease are traceable to cigarette smoking. The American Cancer Society tells us that among men who smoke 2 packs a day, more than 25 times as many die of lung cancer than those who do not smoke at all. The U.S. Public Health Service says that the death rate among persons who have smoked is 32 percent greater than for persons who have never smoked and that among cigarette smokers the ratio of deaths from cancer is approximately 10 times that of nonsmokers.

I am aware that the huge tobacco industry has hired its own scientists to try to counter these demonstrated facts, but they are wasting their money until they direct their efforts toward their product itself, and not just its image.

The Surgeon General of the U.S. Air Force said last year:

> The ever-increasing evidence linking cigarette smoking with lung cancer, pulmonary diseases, cardiovascular diseases, and so forth, can no longer be ignored.

Just a few weeks ago the California Medical Association, acting on a report from its Commission on Cancer, voted to take steps on a statewide basis to publicize, particularly in schools and homes, the harmful effects of cigarette smoking.

All right, what business is this of the Congress of the United States? Obviously, we are not going to pass, and I do not advocate, a law to stop people from smoking. I am sure a majority of the Members of this body are smokers. However, our Nation is faced with a most serious public health problem in the increasing use of cigarettes. As of 1960 the annual consumption of cigarettes in this country was at the rate of 4,000 cigarettes for every adult American. Through the enticing efforts of the advertising industry this number is steadily growing, particularly among young people who are the obvious targets of the sensuous appeals we see and hear every day everywhere we go in this country.

I fully expect the tobacco industry will resist this proposal with all the power at its command. However, I doubt that this huge industry can forever expect to remain immune from the scrutiny that so clearly is indicated by abundant scientific evidence now available.

The Food and Drug Administration presently has authority to limit the nicotine content of food, particularly as it might show up through its industrial use in insecticides. The FDA permits nicotine to be present as a residue in food only to the extent of 2 parts of nicotine to 1 million parts of food. Compare this stringent limitation with the quantity of nicotine that enters the human body through cigarette smoke—not 2 parts in a million but 12,000 parts in a million.

Is this right? Is it right that we place a limitation on the poisons contained in food products but totally ignore the same poisons in smoking products? I don't believe it is, and I have introduced this bill today to correct a serious defect in our food and drug laws.

Mr. Speaker, these are my reasons for introducing this legislation, and I now await the impending onslaught from the tobacco industry.

THE PHILIPPINE WAR DAMAGE CLAIMS LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain correspondence and editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, working behind closed doors, without the benefit of an open, public hearing, and in an apparent frenzy, two separate committees of the other body acted last week to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1962—a law which was studied for over 2 years, voted upon, reconsidered, and finally approved by both Houses of Congress.

This decision to amend the 1962 law by handing over to the Philippine Government, first, $73 million of the American taxpayers' money and second, the responsibility for discharging our Nation's debt to some 86,000 Filipino claimants, was considered today by the Senate.

This precipitous decision on legislation which has aroused not only nationwide but international controversy, will lead any sensible person to conclude that the other body has acted—to say the least—with unseemly haste.

What is even more peculiar is the method used by a group of certainly honorable and influential Members of that body to impose their personal convictions upon the entire Congress.

Instead of following an orderly, established legislative procedure, they ducked full discussion of their amendment by attaching their hastily drawn proposal as a rider to an unrelated bill previously approved by the House of Representatives.

In so doing, and for reasons known only to them, they apparently hope to preclude full discussion of their amendment in the House of Representatives and in its duly constituted committees.

I do not intend to let this happen. I am taking the floor of the House today to show how the other body's proposal, ostensibly conceived in righteous indignation but developed in a peculiar secret fashion, proposes:

To overrule the will of the Congress.

To cause the United States to welsh—at least partially—on a commitment made some 17 years ago.

To jeopardize the payment of the balance due on war damage claims awarded by the United States to some 86,000 Filipino claimants.

To provide a multimillion-dollar handout to the Philippine Government—all under the guise of correcting abuses which cannot, which will not be corrected in this manner.

If anything can subvert the workings of our national legislature and, in the process, leave a lasting blemish upon the conscience of this body, it is surely this ill-conceived and irresponsibly executed action of the other body.

In fairness to the taxpayers of the United States who stand to lose $10 to $20 million if the Senate amendment is enacted——

In fairness to the reputation of the Congress—especially of the 194 Members of this House who voted for the Philippine Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1962, in fairness to the good name and faith of the United States of America—the full story of this legislation must be retold once again.

As one who has been directly associated with this legislation during the past 3 years—and maligned in the process—I shall attempt to tell that story.

I shall tell it from the official documents of the Congress—including the hearings and the reports of the other body which I presume are read by the Members of that body.

I believe that my presentation will fully support what I have just said about the Senate amendment, and at the same time point the way to cleaning up of abuses which that amendment will leave virtually untouched.

THE PHILIPPINE REHABILITATION ACT OF 1946

The matter before us began with the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946—or, actually, with World War II which motivated its enactment.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the Philippine Islands were not an independent nation during World War II. They were the possession, and the ward, of the United States. Our country, therefore, had and has a special relationship, and a special obligation, to the Filipinos—an obligation lesser, to be sure, than our responsibilities to our own U.S. citizens, but certainly much greater than our obligations to citizens of any foreign, independent nation.

In acknowledging this obligation, President Roosevelt, in wartime declarations, and the Congress, in passing the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, committed the United States to compensate individuals in the Philippines for part of the damage which they sustained as a result of World War II.

This damage, according to official records, was visited upon the Philippines in three stages: In the course of the Japanese invasion, during the Japanese occupation, and, finally during the campaign which saw the Japanese driven out of the islands.

The "scorched earth" policy of the Japanese invaders was responsible for a good part of the damage. But the bulk of it, according to the testimony presented in 1946 before the House Committee on Insular Affairs by Hon. Paul V. McNutt, High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands—pages 11 to 12 of the hearings—was inflicted by American bombing planes, by U.S. artillery fire, and by other forms of combat involved in driving the Japanese invaders out of the Philippines.

The U.S. commitment to compensate the Filipinos for part—75 percent—of the war damage was embodied in the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946—an act approved before I, and before most of the Members of this House were elected to Congress.

In sections 102(a) and 104(a), the 1946 act clearly established two principles which are placed in jeopardy by the Senate amendment:

The first was that the United States committed itself to pay war damage compensation directly to individuals in the Philippines; and the second was that the extent of this compensation should be equivalent to 75 percent of the value of the approved claims.

DOCUMENTATION OF CONGRESSIONAL INTENT

With respect to the first principle, section 102(a) of the 1946 act states explicitly that—

> Compensation shall be payable to qualified persons having, on December 7, 1941 (Philippine time), and continuously to and including the time of loss or damage, an insurable interest as owner, mortgagee, lien holder, or pledgee in such property so lost or damaged.

The 1946 act did not constitute, therefore, a commitment to the Philippine nation as a whole, or to its Government. It was an outright commitment to individual Filipinos whose properties were destroyed or lost during the war.

With respect to the second principle, section 102(a) of the 1946 act provides that "in case the aggregate amount of the claims which would be payable to any one claimant under the foregoing provisions exceeds $500, the aggregate amount of the claims approved in favor of such claimant shall be reduced by 25 per centum of the excess over $500."

Section 104(a) of the same act, which dealt with the manner in which payments were to be made to claimants, added a further provision which reads:

> No claim shall be paid unless approved by the Commission or its authorized representatives, and on account of each claim so approved the Commission may make immediate payment of (1) so much of the approved amount of the claim as does not exceed five hundred dollars or one thousand Philippine pesos, plus (2) such percentage, not in excess of 80 per centum of the remainder of the approved amount of the claim as the Commission shall make applicable to all approved claims, due consideration having been given to the total funds available for distribution. After the time for filing claims has expired, the Commission shall determine the amount of money available for the further payment of claims. Such funds shall be applied pro rata toward the payment of the unpaid balance of the amounts authorized to be paid pursuant to section 102 of this title.

Did the Congress, in enacting this law, intend to pay 75 percent of the approved claims even if the $400 million originally appropriated proved insufficient for this purpose? Some parts of the record are not clear on this question. This point is open to debate if we consider only the legislative history of the original 1946 Act. Some exchanges, however, during the House hearings in 1946 on that legislation—pages 74 to 75 of the hearing of March 1, 1946—a provision in the House report—page 32, House Report 1921, 79th Congress, 2d session—and some exchanges on the floor of the House—pages 3442 to 3443 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 1946—indicate clearly that it was the intent of Congress that the entire 75 percent of approved claims should be paid.

The fact remains that in our American system, the full meaning and intent of a given law is not always crystal-clear from the start. Frequently, it evolves gradually—through administrative interpretations, through judicial decisions, and through clarifying legislative amendments.

Furthermore, where our commitments to others are concerned, we should and we do pay attention to how we communicate our intent to them, and how they interpret it.

Viewed from this angle, in its entirety, the record of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 throws further light on the nature and extent of our commitment to the Filipino claimants.

It is a fact, for instance, that a U.S. Government form—PWDC Form 40, dated April 1948—devised and printed by an instrumentality of the U.S. Government, and mailed out by a U.S. Government commission to each and every Filipino claimant who had an initial payment coming on his claim, indicated explicitly that these claimants would receive full 75 percent of their claim awards.

This form had three entries of particular significance. They were labeled:

"Amount of the claim approved."

"Amount due this payment."

"Amount to be paid."

The last two entries—"Amount due this payment" and "Amount to be paid"—added up to 75 percent of each approved claim over $500.

Each qualified Filipino claimant was told explicitly, therefore, under the signature of the three Commissioners of the U.S. Philippine War Damage Commission—he was told in pesos and centavos—that he was going to receive the full 75 percent of his award over and above the initial $500.

This was the word of the U.S. Government, and it was taken as such.

This was a pledge which was made 17 years ago.

The Filipino claimants have not received the full 75 percent of their claim awards. According to the "Final Report of the U.S. Philippine War Damage Commission," page 4—and this information was subsequently confirmed during hearings before the Committee on Foreign Affairs. They received the first $500, plus 52½ percent of the award made to them over and above this initial $500. And then the money—$400 million—ran out.

And some 86,000 Filipino claimants are still waiting for us to live up to our pledge.

But the Filipino claimants are not the only ones who believe that the United States has an outstanding obligation which should be settled.

The Philippine Government—and two U.S. administrations—the Eisenhower administration and the Kennedy administration—took the very same position on this issue.

The U.S. Philippine War Damage Commission, at that time in no disrepute before disbanding, recommended that additional funds be appropriated to settle the balance outstanding on these claims.

WHERE DID THE IDEA FOR THE 1962 LEGISLATION COME FROM?

The facts which I have outlined are a matter of public record and show clearly that at the time when the U.S. Philippine War Claims Commission completed its work in 1951 because the funds appropriated were depleted, the United States had an unfulfilled commitment to some 86,000 Filipino claimants.

The Commission thought so, and recommended that additional funds be appropriated by the Congress to settle those claims.

Some Members of Congress shared that feeling—but the Korean war made prior claims on our national resources, and these claims were put aside.

What caused the Congress, a few years later, to revive its interest in this matter? Did this occur only because of the activities of one or more lobbyists—or were there other reasons for the renewed interest in the Philippine war damage claims legislation?

Let us again look at the record.

Perhaps the best direct quotation that I can give, Mr. Speaker, on the source of energy which propelled this legislation to its ultimate enactment in 1962 came from the gentleman whose integrity has been recognized by the Republicans as well as by the Democrats.

I am referring to Secretary C. Douglas Dillon, who has served our country with distinction under the Eisenhower administration and now serves with equal honor in the Kennedy administration.

Appearing in an executive session before the Subcommittee on the Far East and the Pacific of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on February 25, 1960, and replying to a direct question on this point from me, Mr. Dillon, then Under Secretary of State, had this to say:

> The initial idea to make a $73 million payment came from the State Department, when we had * * * when the Filipinos were talking to us about all the various claims.

It first came up at the time President Garcia was here and this was one of a number of claims which was put forward by him during the course of his visit here. At that time we told them * * * we would look into them all, and we felt there might be some merit in this particular one that had to do with war damage payments. Therefore we looked into it and decided there was some merit and we had a whole series of discussions jointly with the Department of the Treasury.

For those whose memory for detail may not be too perfect, I would like to point out for the record that President Garcia visited the United States from June 16 to June 26, 1958—some time before I introduced the legislation which was approved by the Congress in 1962.

Secretary Dillon had some further things to say on this subject.

He said that the U.S. Treasury computed "the figures of what is still owed"—and I repeat his words, "what is still owed"—and arrived at the figure of $73 million.

He said further, and I quote him again, that the United States' obligation "really flows to the citizens of the Philippines who suffered these damages."

And he said, finally, that the Philippine Government had indicated to the United States that it was not in favor of receiving a lump-sum settlement for these claims, with an offset for the $24 million which their country was in arrears under the Romulo-Snyder agreement, because—and I quote him again—because "the first commitment was a commitment to certain citizens and the other is an intergovernmental agreement."

The record of the executive hearings from which I quoted is available for inspection in the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Far East Subcommittee hearing, February 25, 1960.

Even prior to the hearing attended by Secretary Dillon, I had been approached by the executive branch regarding the Philippine war damage claims in my capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on the Far East and the Pacific.

I participated in some of the discussions with President Garcia in 1958.

During 1958 and 1959, State Department officials, including the then U.S. Ambassador to the Philippines, the Honorable Charles E. Bohlen, called on me to discuss the possibility of getting action on legislation to settle this matter.

And on August 4, 1959, the Department of State issued a lengthy press release on this subject.

Under permission granted I insert the text of that press release in the RECORD at this point.

UNITED STATES REPLIES TO PHILIPPINE OMNIBUS CLAIMS

The United States today replied to the Philippine Government's omnibus claims. The reply was contained in a note handed to Philippine Ambassador Carlos P. Romulo by the Acting Secretary of State. The note also replied to Philippine claims presented separately regarding U.S. coconut oil and sugar processing taxes.

The Acting Secretary presented to Ambassador Romulo a check for $23,862,751 representing final satisfaction of the Philippine claim arising from the revaluation of the dollar in 1934.

The claims of the Philippine Government to which the note replies were submitted to the U.S. Government during the period January–April 1955. Since then they have been the subject of the most exhaustive and sympathetic study by the agencies concerned, as a result of which the United States has informed the Republic of the Philippines that:

1. The U.S. Government will, at the next regular session of the Congress and in connection with the legislative program for fiscal year 1961, request appropriate legislation enabling the settlement of the Philippine claim for payment of additional war damage compensation in accordance with the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 (Public Law 370, 79th Cong.). The amount of $73 million, according to the records of the War Damage Commission, reflects the statutory maximum of such unpaid private claims authorized by the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946.

2. The United States is prepared to discuss in detail with the Philippine Government possible adjustments of the amount owed by the Philippines under the Romulo-Snyder agreement of November 6, 1950.

3. In view of the fragmentary and general nature of evidence submitted in support of the Philippine claim for reimbursement of expenses incurred in connection with the Recovered Personnel Division, the United States is willing to consider any further evidence in support of the claim that the Philippine Government might wish to make available.

4. With respect to the remaining 13 claims formally presented by the Philippine Economic Mission of 1955 and the 2 presented separately requesting refunds of the payments of the U.S. coconut oil and sugar processing taxes, the United States considers these claims are invalid. The U.S. Government has examined exhaustively all of the arguments and evidence submitted in support of each of these claims. When it concluded that it was under no legal obligation, the U.S. Government further considered the claims in an effort to determine whether there might exist any basis for their approval as a matter of equity. The most careful and sympathetic study led the United States to the conclusion that none of the rejected claims warranted approval on this basis. They have thus been finally rejected.

The United States has noted that most of the claims submitted deal with payments to the Philippine veterans who served in the U.S. Armed Forces or as guerrillas during World War II. From the end of that war through 1958 payments to Philippine veterans and dependents as well as survivors by the U.S. Veterans' Administration totaled about $700 million. These payments are continuing. They are made to approximately 130,000 individuals in the Philippines each month, and currently amount to some $60 million annually. In addition, payments made by the United States for arrears in pay, redemption of guerrilla currency and other matters, have totaled appproximately $250 million.

A list of the claims is attached.

LIST OF OMNIBUS CLAIMS

1. Import duties and other customs charges.
2. Claim under Executive Order No. 22.
3. Deductions from arrears in pay of the equivalent of 3 months' advance pay.
4. Payment of arrears in pay to members of the Army of the Philippines who were suspended from duty because of criminal charges preferred against them.
5. Expenses of the Recovered Personnel Division.
6. Deductions for clothing issued upon return to military control.
7. Deductions from arrears in pay on account of guerrilla or emergency notes received during the Japanese occupation.
8. Arrears in pay canceled by the Adjutant General records depository after previous approval by the Recovered Personnel Division.
9. Deductions from arrears in pay of personnel who failed to report to military control on or before August 15, 1945.
10. Arrears in pay under the Missing Persons Act of 1942.
11. Currencies confiscated by Japanese authorities during World War II.
12. Unpaid quarters allowances.
13. Additional war damages.
14. Erroneous deductions of national service life insurance premiums from arrears in pay.
15. Dollars devaluation (gold revaluation claim—1934).
16. Adjustment of accounts under the Romulo-Snyder loan agreement.
17. The case of the Philippine Army veteran (Service determination and other matters).
18. Request for refund of processing tax on Philippine sugar.
19. Request for refund of the 3-cent processing tax on coconut oil.

At this time I wish to call attention to a paragraph from the release which is particularly pertinent:

> The U.S. Government will, at the next regular session of the Congress and in connection with the legislative program for fiscal year 1961, request appropriate legislation enabling the settlement of the Philippine claim for payment of additional war damage compensation in accordance with the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 (Public Law 370, 79th Cong.). The amount of $73 million, according to the records of the War Damage Commission, reflects the statutory maximum of such unpaid private claims authorized by the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946.

It was because of these developments, and acting in my capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on the Far East and the Pacific, a subcommittee which has jurisdiction over matters of our relations with the Philippine Republic, that I sponsored legislation dealing with these war claims in the 86th Congress.

Basing my own legislation on bills which were previously introduced on this subject in the Congress, and on such incomplete information as was then available to me, I introduced H.R. 4311 into the 86th Congress for the purpose of having something upon which our discussions with the State Department could center. I did this in my capacity as chairman of the subcommittee.

I introduced a revised bill, H.R. 12078 the following year, to take account of new estimates and recommendations made by the executive branch, and of the changes adopted by my subcommittee.

Again as chairman of the subcommittee, I introduce this legislation as H.R. 1129 in the following Congress. The State Department suggested certain further changes, relating largely to exchange rates and other technical provisions. My subcommittee accepted them. Members of the subcommittee and the full committee proposed further changes strengthening the conditions under which payment would be made, including a reduction in the amount of fees payable to attorneys representing claimants from 10 percent to 5 percent.

These amendments were accepted unanimously.

A clean bill, H.R. 8617, was introduced, approved by the Foreign Affairs Committee and brought before the House. The House rejected it in the conviction that the legislation should embody additional safeguards—primarily relating to the requirement of the original 1946 law that all payments had to be invested in the economic rehabilitation and development of the Philippines. We added those safeguards and another version of this legislation, H.R. 11721, was reintroduced by me at the request of the executive branch. This version—making payment directly to claimants—was passed by both Houses of Congress and became Public Law 87-616.

There is another reason why our subcommittee, regardless of party, preferred payments direct to the claimants rather than in a lump sum to the Philippine Government.

Having cut the standard 10-percent fee payable to American lawyers for alien property claims collection to 5 percent in this bill, we also wanted to make certain that money paid out by our Government actually was received by the claimants themselves.

Information of a classified nature had come to our committee from both United States and Philippine sources to the effect that corrupt elements in the Philippine Government at that time might thwart this purpose if a lump-sum settlement of $73 million, over which we had no control, were handed over. Since the measure was claims legislation, not foreign aid, we wanted to be sure that the individual Filipino was paid and without further government intervention. We wanted that recipient to know where the money came from and for what purpose. Because we properly have no control over foreign governments, including the Philippines, and because we were paying an individual debt, we wanted to control what happened to the money. That is all there was to it then; that is all there is to it now.

In all, my committee put out three reports on this legislation, held a half dozen hearings, and many more meetings with the representatives of the executive branch.

We have given this legislation—and so have the House and the executive branch—thorough and meticulous study.

Every possible effort was exerted to safeguard the public interest, to prevent outrageous fees and windfalls, and to discharge the U.S. commitment to the individual claimants in the Philippines in the most efficient, economical, and equitable manner.

Frankly, I wish that I could say that the same effort was exercised by the other body. There, only two brief hearings were held from which the chairman was absent. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD indicates that only five Senators participated in the floor debate. It filled only 2½ pages of the RECORD.

DEMAND BY THE NATION'S PRESS

Mr. Speaker, at this point I think it appropriate to note that the final passage of the Philippine War Rehabilitation Act was in large measure due to the demand from the press. Our Nation's newspapers were almost unanimously in favor of paying the claims, and of paying them directly to the claimants. As examples I would like to include here editorials from the New York Times, Milwaukee Journal, Washington Post, Washington Star, Washington News, New York Herald-Tribune, and Christian Science Monitor in support of the legislation.

[From the New York Times, May 11, 1962]

MISTREATING THE PHILIPPINES

House defeat of a bill to authorize payment of the remaining Philippines war damage claims was a foolish and indefensible act.

This is money the United States has owed the Philippines for more than a decade.

Compensation for property damaged in the Philippines by American forces during World War II (when the islands were American territory) was sanctioned by act of Congress in 1946. The amount later appropriated did not cover all approved claims, and year after year Congress has failed, as the House did on Wednesday, to vote funds to pay the remaining $73 million due despite pleas of the State Department and Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy.

The Republic of the Philippines is one of our stanchest and most important allies; its people and governments have been consistently friends of the United States. Filipinos are justifiably dismayed and angered by this repudiation of an acknowledged debt. The House vote denies to the Philippines funds that had been counted on to bolster efforts of the progressive new Macapagal administration to spur the Philippine economy.

Emanuel Palaez, Philippines Vice President and Foreign Secretary, characterized the House action as evidence that "the United States treats her friends more shabbily than those who are not for her" and said, "One has to blackmail Americans to get anything from them." Unhappily many in the Philippines and people in other countries will agree with him.

The Senate has not acted on the war claims bill. It must, and the House must, reverse itself on this unwise, unjust vote.

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, May 16, 1962]

FILIPINOS' JUST COMPLAINT

The pro-American President of the Philippines, Diosdado Macapagal, has canceled a state visit to the United States. He says he feels that this country doesn't reciprocate his friendship. Basis for that belief lies in the refusal of the House of Representatives last week to approve payments of $73 million to some 86,000 Filipinos to settle damage claims growing out of World War II.

Macapagal's irritation is understandable. In 1946 Congress passed a bill sanctioning war damage payments to the Filipinos. But it has never appropriated enough to cover the damages agreed upon. Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy made pleas to get the matter settled. Congress has never done the job.

When the measure came before Congress this year it seemed certain of passage. But a few Congressmen, obviously without knowing the history of the matter, called it a "handout" and succeeded in killing the appropriation.

Representative ZABLOCKI, Democrat, of Wisconsin, who had studied the matter thoroughly, was shocked, as were others who understood the situation. Now, with President Kennedy's blessing, ZABLOCKI and several others are reintroducing an appropriation measure to pay the Filipinos what they have coming.

We have arrived at fair settlements on all other matters with the Philippines, including that of military bases. Congress itself agreed as long as 16 years ago that damage claims were just. So let the United States pay its bills. To keep good friends one must treat them fairly.

[From the Washington Post, May 14, 1962]

REBUFF TO OUR FRIENDS

The House of Representatives was suffering from the political jitters when it rejected the Philippines war-damage bill. The justice of payments by this country to compensate the Filipino people for damages caused by American military forces in driving the Japanese out of the islands in World War II was fully recognized by Congress in passing the Philippine Rehabilitation Act in 1946. The question at issue in the House was the appropriation of $73 million to complete the payment of these claims. To reject the final payment after the claims have been established comes close to being an act of bad faith.

This is not, of course, the first time that Congress has failed to meet its obligation. Three successive administrations have tried to secure funds to complete these payments to the Philippines. The present performance is especially inexcusable, however, because the House rejected the bill in a rollcall vote after tentatively approving it. And its thoughtless slap at the Philippines comes only 6 weeks before President Diosdado Macapagal is scheduled to visit this country.

President Kennedy has sought to minimize the damage by urging President Macapagal to come in spite of his disappointment. The new chief executive in Manila must know that this action of an economy-minded House does not reflect any unfriendliness on the part of the American people. Nevertheless, it is most unfortunate that the House should turn down the payment of a debt to our good friend and protege in the Pacific merely because an election is in the offing. The administration should find a way to reverse this decision if it is at all possible.

[From the Washington Star, May 14, 1962]

DISHONORING A JUST DEBT

We share the dismay of Philippine officials over the unjustified repudiation by the House of the $73 million debt still owed the Philippines under terms of a 1946 War Damage Reparations Act. Emanuel Pelaez, Philippine Vice President and Foreign Secretary, had reason, we think, to describe the House rejection of the claim as "shabby treatment" of a longtime friend and ally.

The appropriation sought by the administration was to have settled remaining claims growing out of damage inflicted on Philippine properties during World War II. Congress, after careful study of the situation a year after close of the war, authorized payment for the damage, but at the time appropriated insufficient money to meet all the awards approved by a United States-Philippines War Damage Commission.

Apparently most of the opposition during debate on the measure centered around awards to large firms, including a brewery and a racetrack corporation. However, all the awards have been held to be justified by the reparations commission and others who have investigated the claims. To default on the entire debt because of dissatisfaction of several Members of Congress with the nature of certain awards is to dishonor a national obligation in a manner that affronts our ally in the Far East. We hope the House will reverse its unwise action of last Thursday and that the Senate will give overwhelming approval of the bill.

[From the Washington Daily News, May 16, 1962]

Changed Minds in the House

It is quick good news that more than a score of the Congressmen who voted against the Philippines war damage claims bill, in an unfortunate moment last week, have now changed their minds.

This is the reassurance from Representative Clement Zablocki (Democrat, of Wisconsin), who sponsored the measure. Representative Zablocki is chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee's Subcommittee on the Far East.

These erstwhile opponents of the bill—which would have settled $73 million worth of American I.O.U.'s long outstanding to the Filipinos—now regret their action, they told Representative Zablocki. Further, they expressed hope that they would have an opportunity to correct the record.

That is it precisely—the record must be corrected. For we can't believe a majority of the House really favors such sorry treatment of the friendly people who are our strongest ally in the Pacific.

Similar sentiment was expressed by Senator Hubert Humphrey, of Minnesota, assistant majority leader, who sponsors a companion measure in the Senate. But favorable House action must come first, and it must come speedily if our sagging relations with the Philippines are not to deteriorate further.

The newly introduced House bill incidentally carries an amendment requiring all payments in excess of 25,000 pesos (about $6,500) be reinvested for economic rehabilitation of the Philippines. This should dispose of any misgivings that some of the larger firms with sizable claims were getting an inexcusable handout. And it still benefits the thousands of small claimants concerned who have waited so long for the United States to make good on its word.

Not the slightest justification now remains for opposing this legislation—so let's get on with it.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, May 15, 1962]

Despite the Wrongheaded House We Need the Philippines

"I feel that our people would never understand how, under the circumstances, at this time, I could go the United States and dwell on the subject of good will," said Philippines President Diosdado Macapagal, in explaining why he had postponed his visit to this country indefinitely. "At this present moment," he added, "the word will sound empty."

Many Americans will be startled to learn that the closest friend America possesses in the Far East, the Philippines Republic, considers good will as between the two allies an empty word. Some will, with justice, be worried. For at this moment more than almost any time in recent years, the United States needs friends in Asia and the adjacent islands. The Laotian crisis has made SEATO, the alliance of which the Philippines is a most vigorous member, of first importance.

The trouble stems from an act of unusual wrongheadedness by the House of Representatives. After a tangled debate, the House turned down a bill authorizing $73 million as a final payment on the claims set up under the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946.

There were varying degrees of validity in the arguments used against the bill. But none of them are any more than niggling in view of the central issue. To the Philippines, there is an enormous importance, going far beyond the money involved, in the Rehabilitation Act.

To assist the islands to recover from the terrible devastation of the war, Congress passed an act to indemnify certain classes of individuals and groups for war damages, providing that these claimants reinvested the money in the Philippines. The sum of $400 million was authorized. But the claims which were approved under the terms of the act exceeded the initial authorization by $73 million.

There is no dispute about the validity of the claims, nor that they come within the framework of the 1946 act. The people of the Philippines regard the full payment as a moral obligation of the United States—and they are right.

It could be argued that the Philippines, having received in all some $1,650 million in economic and military aid from the United States in the last 17 years should not quibble about $73 million. But there is far more point in saying that the United States is wrong, morally and politically, than to quibble about a debt of this kind.

To offend the Philippines, needlessly and wantonly, when it is so necessary for the good will of all the Pacific free peoples to be much more than an empty word, is sheer folly.

The administration has been trying to revive the defeated bill. It must be done, and the measure quickly passed.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, May 17, 1962]

Discharge the Philippine Debt

After World War II the U.S. Congress enacted the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946. It established a War Damage Commission and authorized $400 million for payment of claims. The object was to make payment in full of losses up to $500 and payments up to 75 percent of awards above that figure.

Representative Walter H. Judd, then a member of the Insular Affairs Committee, recalls that no one then knew what the claims would total. The committee decided to ask for $400 million and come back for $100 million more if needed. As it turned out, this covered 52½ percent of the claims, leaving 22½ percent due under the 75-percent formula.

For several years various administrations have come back to Congress asking $73 million to discharge this implied obligation. Members of the House of Representatives who voted down this bill last week gave persuasive reasons for their opposition to it—but none which would offset the impression, especially among Filipinos, that the United States was failing in a commitment to a most loyal ally.

It is true that American aid to the Philippines since the war has totaled $1,765 million; that only $550 million in reparations was collected from the Japanese, who invaded the islands; and that development projects may at this time be more important to the Philippine economy than war damage restitution.

Yet many of the thousands of corporate and individual claimants already have made investments up to the 75 percent they expected to receive. If the money were given to the Philippine Government, it probably would distribute it to the same claimants. And use of the money by them would surely benefit the economy of a republic which is a free world bastion in these days of Chinese Communist threats to southeast Asia.

Completion of payment of the Philippine war damage awards would be one of the best proofs the United States could offer that it honors a moral responsibility.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S POSITION

An allegation was made recently that the Eisenhower administration and the Kennedy administration have not favored a direct settlement of the outstanding Filipino war damage claims.

The record on this point is very clear. I have already mentioned the testimony of Secretary Dillon. In addition, I would like to refer to House Report 2014, 86th Congress; House Report 1042, 87th Congress; House Report 1715, 87th Congress; and the testimony of Secretary Harriman before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, given under the date of June 12, 1962.

On August 4, 1959, Assistant Secretary of State William B. Macomber, Jr., outlined the position of the Eisenhower administration in these words:

> While the United States is under no legal obligation to make further war damage payments in the Philippines, it is the view of the Department of State that a payment in settlement of this matter would be of substantial assistance to the United States in attaining its foreign policy objectives. The Philippine people feel that the program provided for by the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 was not carried out as fully as the law permitted * * *. Additional war damage payments are therefore looked on by the Filipinos as the fulfillment of a moral obligation, already recognized by our Congress, to provide assistance because of war damage sustained in the defense of the interests of the United States and the Philippines.
>
> In 1950 the economic survey mission to the Philippines, generally referred to as the Bell mission, came to the conclusion that further war damage payments to individuals would not contribute materially to economic development in the Philippines and that continuing assistance by the United States should be for development projects in agriculture and industry related to the specific needs of the Philippine economy rather than as additional war damage payments to individuals. Following the submission of the Bell report, the Department of State, accepted its general conclusions, and indicated its support for the view that additional war damage payments would not be necessary. The report of the Bell mission, however, did not address itself to the question as to whether such a solution would be regarded as equitable by the Philippines, and this question has now become of primary importance. The Philippine Government and people sincerely feel that the failure of the United States to appropriate additional war damage compensation has defeated a legitimate expectation of assistance from the United States to a firm ally which was severely damaged in the mutual war effort. The Department of State considers that settlement of this claim would remove any basis for the Philippine belief that the United States has not fulfilled its promises to the Philippines.

Speaking for the Kennedy administration, Assistant Secretary of State Edwin M. Martin stated on June 1, 1961:

> This administration * * * supports the enactment of H.R. 1129. * * * as the best means of attaining U.S. policy objectives by providing for the payment of additional war damage compensation to the full extent authorized by the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946.

On Tuesday, June 12, 1962, the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs met to hear testimony on two bills, both dealing with Philippine war damage claims. Both authorized an appropriation of $73 million to pay the balance of the awards for war damage compensation. S. 2380, introduced by Senator Humphrey, called for direct payment to claimants. S. 3329, introduced by Senator FULBRIGHT, provided for a lump-sum payment to the Philippine Government. In testimony at that time, Assistant Secretary W. Averell Harriman reiterated the administration preferred direct payments to the individual claimants in these words:

> I am speaking here on behalf of S. 2380. The administration believes that on balance this bill is the best manner in which the obligations which we have in connection with the final payments for Philippine war damage can be fulfilled. We appreciate that Chairman FULBRIGHT has some important reasons for presenting his legislation, but on balance, we feel very strongly that S. 2380 is a better way to deal with it.
>
> There are several reasons for that. One reason is that we will be fulfilling the obligation which was undertaken in 1946 to pay individuals in order that they might reconstruct their properties.
>
> * * * * *
>
> There was another reason for it, in that some of these claims have been paid in one way or another through separate legislation. This bill is war damages and there have also been contributions to war claims which were paid for under different legislation. Some of them overlap. I believe that something between $4 and $5 million will be retained by the Treasury if this bill goes through, rather than if the full amount is paid to the Philippine Government.

As still further evidence of the executive branch support for the direct method of payment, let me cite a letter from Assistant Secretary of State Frederick G. Dutton to Senator FULBRIGHT, dated June 8, 1962, and included in Senate Report 1882, 87th Congress:

> It is the view of the Department of State, as set forth in testimony before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on June 1, 1961, and by letter of the Assistant Secretary for Far Eastern Affairs to Mr. ZABLOCKI on May 21, 1962, that payment to individual claimants as was done under the original war damage bill (Public Law 370) would best serve the interests of the United States.
>
> "It has been determined that certain claimants (chiefly religious institutions), have already received compensation equivalent to the balance due them on claims approved by the War Damage Commission through provisions of the War Claims Act of 1948. Such amounts paid out between 1953 and 1959 are therefore deductible from the $73 million appropriation we are seeking and would be so deducted under legislation providing for individual payment (S. 2380 introduced last year by Senator HUMPHREY and H.R. 11721 introduced recently by Mr. ZABLOCKI). This would result in a substantial return to the U.S. Treasury, probably totaling several million dollars. The fact that these individual claimants have already been compensated up to the legal limit makes it all the more desirable and equitable to continue payment on an individual basis to the balance of the claimants. Payment of the balance of the private claims would remove the principal irritant of United States-Philippines relations and complete settlement of war claim payments on the basis previously employed.
>
> * * * * *
>
> A lump-sum payment of $73 million as provided by S. 3329 would be virtually a no-strings-attached grant. Payment to individuals and corporations, which would actually total somewhat less than $73 million, would be going to entities which, on the basis of previous experience, may reasonably be expected to utilize them in a way conducive both to strengthening the private enterprise sector of the Philippine economy and also to stimulating U.S. exports to the Philippines, since the larger beneficiaries are among the largest importers of U.S. products into the Philippines.

PHILIPPINE REHABILITATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1962

The matter of paying the outstanding Philippine war damage claims finally was authorized in the last Congress. By a vote of 194 to 35, the House of Representatives reconsidered its decision of April 9 and approved legislation to provide for the payment of the balance outstanding on these claims. The Senate did likewise. The Philippine Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1962 became Public Law 87–616 on August 30, 1962.

What did the 1962 law provide? The answer is very simple.

Basing itself on U.S. Treasury estimates, Congress authorized an appropriation of $73 million to pay off the balance due to the Filipino claimants under the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946.

No new claims were allowed.

Payments were to be made to the individual claimants by the U.S. Foreign Claims Settlement Commission on the basis of the original claims awards made by the U.S. Philippine War Damage Commission.

All of the records involved were compiled by U.S. Government authorities and were in the possession of the U.S. Government.

It was made clear in the law that no payment could be made unless the claimant complied with the intent of the original 1946 act—that is, unless the full value of his award was invested in the economic rehabilitation and reconstruction of the Philippines.

The fees of the middlemen—the lawyers and others who assist individual claimants with the presentation of their claims—were limited to 5 percent—even though the Congress, in prior claims legislation, has consistently allowed them 10 percent.

And a final saving provision was put into that law, to the effect that any funds not used to pay off the original claimants must revert to the Treasury of the United States.

By the most recent estimate of the U.S. Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, this last provision may save the U.S. taxpayers between $10 and $20 million. Some of the claimants are dead, some cannot be found, and some have been paid off under special laws approved by Congress during the 1950's. This money, therefore, will revert to the U.S. Treasury.

The total cost of settling the Filipino claims outstanding since World War II is now expected to amount to between $55 and $65 million.

In my opinion, the 1962 law provides the least costly, the most direct, the most effective, and the most equitable way of settling these long-overdue claims.

THE CASE OF ATTORNEY O'DONNELL

All the effort to settle our long-standing obligation to the Filipino claimants is now in jeopardy because of the hearings which were released last week by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and the subsequent action by its chairman.

Those hearings contained the testimony of Attorney John A. O'Donnell that he contributed varying amounts to the campaigns of some 20 Senators and Representatives in an effort to influence them in favor of a Philippine war claims bill from which he hoped to gain sizable attorney fees.

I was among those to whom he sent a contribution. It was the largest ever sent to me in my political career. It was obvious I could not accept it. Upon my return to Washington after the election, I contacted Mr. O'Donnell and told him I would have to return the check. He suggested that it be used to purchase tickets for an upcoming $100-a-plate National Democratic Committee fundraising dinner. I agreed and the proceeds of the check were returned to be used for that purpose.

I am certain that Mr. O'Donnell's contributions to various members of Congress, and his other lobbying activities, had no influence on the contents or the disposition of the Philippine war damage claims legislation. I say this in spite of Mr. O'Donnell's glowing accounts to his correspondents in the Philippines of his alleged influence in these Halls. I firmly believe that the legislation the Congress enacted in 1962 stands on its own merits. I think that any impartial appraisal of the record will lead to the same conclusion.

Personally, I would have supported and worked for the payment of the balance of the claims to the claimants themselves whether or not I had ever heard of John A. O'Donnell. Moreover, I will continue to fight for what I believe to be right and the only just and economical way of handling the matter.

But what of John O'Donnell? He is a lobbyist. If we are honest with ourselves, we must admit that there are hundreds like him here in Washington and in State capitals throughout the land. Lobbyists, for better or worse, have been an appendage—at times rather nasty and troublesome appendage—of our political system. They swarm about legislatures like moths around a flame. Within the laws which we have enacted to protect the public and ourselves from them, most of them keep out of trouble.

John A. O'Donnell apparently failed to register properly as an agent of a foreign organization.

He failed to identify himself as having a personal financial interest in the Philippine war damage bill when he testified as an expert witness—a former administrator of the program—before my subcommittee.

He told only half the truth when questioned about his interests by Senator SPARKMAN during hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the war claims bill.

He moved around the corridors on Capitol Hill indefatigably and—as I imagine any lobbyist interested in keeping or finding clients would do—he sent frequent and glowing reports of his benevolent activities and influence to his correspondents abroad.

But did his actions in any way debase the method by which the Congress decided to satisfy the U.S. commitment to the Philippine war damage claimants?

Does his action in any way cast opprobrium on the officials of the Eisenhower and the Kennedy administrations who endorsed this method of payment?

And did his actions cancel the debt which we owe—and have owed for 17 years—to some 86,000 Filipino claimants?

I firmly believe that the answer to these three questions is an emphatic "No."

I fear that the Senate committees—for reasons which I still fail to understand—are throwing out the baby with the dirty bath water.

I hope, I trust, that the House of Representatives—which knows a lot more about this legislation than any other body I can think of—will not be stampeded into making the same mistake.

I am delighted to learn that my views on this subject are shared by the Honorable Edward D. Re, Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.

In a moment, I will introduce the full text of Chairman Re's report to Secretary of State Dean Rusk in the RECORD. At this point, however, I would like to quote only one paragraph from it. It reads:

> Having reviewed the proceedings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee giving rise to the proposed legislative action, the Commission is of the opinion that nothing has been brought out which in any way affects the statute, its aims, goals, or merits. Since the proposed amendment is apparently designed to preclude the payment of compensation to lobbyists or agents who may have participated in influencing the enactment of Public Law 87–616, it would seem that a simple amendment to that effect could be drafted and enacted to accomplish this purpose. I am certain that members of the legal staff of the executive branch could be made available to assist the committee staff in the preparation of such an amendment.

THE WAY TO EFFECTIVE REFORM

Mr. Speaker, I have not tried to secure legal help from the executive branch but I did draft two bills which would, in my opinion, accomplish much more effective reform than the Senate amendment.

I introduced these bills Monday, and invite the junior Senator from Arkansas to cosponsor them in the other body.

One bill, H.R. 5935, provides that no amount from the $73 million authorized for the Philippine war damage claims can be directly or indirectly paid to any former Commissioner or employee of the Philippine War Damage Commission as compensation for services rendered as attorney or agent in connection with any such claim.

This takes care of the immediate problem. But my second bill goes further than that. It is aimed at preventing future incidents of the type brought to light by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

My second bill, H.R. 5936, would make it unlawful for a citizen of the United States who is lobbying for a foreign government or special interest to expend any funds in connection with his foreign lobbying activities: First, for political activities within the United States; second, for political campaigns of others in the United States; third, or with view to influencing the legislative processes of the U.S. Government.

The full text of the bills are following:

H.R. 5935

A bill to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Payment Act of August 30, 1962 (Public Law 87–616) to prohibit the payment of fees to certain persons for representing claimants under that Act

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 6 of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize the payment of the balance of awards for war damage compensation made by the Philippine War Damage Commission under the terms of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of April 30, 1946, and to authorize the appropriation of $73,000,000 for that purpose", approved August 30, 1962 (50 App. U.S.C. 1751–1785 note; Public Law 87–616), is amended by inserting immediately after the first sentence therein the following: "Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, no remuneration shall be paid directly or indirectly to any former commissioner or employee of the Philippine War Damage Commission as compensation on account of services in connection with any application filed under this Act."

H.R. 5936

A bill to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, to prohibit political contributions and lobbying by agents of foreign principals

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, is further amended by inserting after section 4 thereof the following:

"SEC. 4A. (a) It shall be unlawful for any agent of a foreign principal to make any contribution or expenditure to or on behalf of any candidate for nomination or election to any elective office under the United States, or any State or political subdivision of a State, or to or for any political committee or political party in the United States.

"(b) It shall be unlawful for any agent of a foreign principal to make any contribution or expenditure to aid in the accomplishment of any of the following purposes:

"(1) The passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States; or

"(2) To influence, directly or indirectly, the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States.

"(c) For the purposes of this section—

"(1) the term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit, of money, or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement to make a contribution, whether or not legally enforceable;

"(2) the term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift, of money, or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement to make an expenditure, whether or not legally enforceable; and

"(3) the term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House.

"(d) Whoever violates this section shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both."

This, Mr. Speaker, I believe is the way to effective, lasting reform.

I believe that by following the course which I have outlined, the House of Representatives will make a real contribution to the future safeguarding of the integrity of our legislative processes, remedy the abuses which have been brought to light, and at the same time preserve the sound and necessary provisions of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1962.

WHERE DO WE STAND TODAY WITH RESPECT TO THE FILIPINO CLAIMS?

There is one more word I would like to add about the current status of the Filipino war damage claims.

The following report from Chairman Re to Secretary Rusk, dated April 22, 1962, outlines the status in detail:

FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT
COMMISSION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Reference is made to an informal inquiry made by the Department of State this date relative to the proposed amendment to Public Law 87–616, scheduled for consideration by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on April 23, 1963.

Please be advised that the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission is currently administering that statute under a congressional authorization to utilize $500,000 of the $73 million fund for the current fiscal year. The Commission has mailed approximately 115,000 claim applications to potential awardees. Approximately 50,000 completed claim applications have already been filed. In addition, nearly 15,000 have been returned by the post office as undeliverable because of improper address, and an additional 15,000 have been returned marked "deceased."

The Commission has practically completed its staffing and taken other necessary action to accomplish its functions under the act. Its field staff in Manila is presently undertaking the necessary actions to trace the applicants or their heirs in those cases where applications have been returned as undeliverable.

The Washington staff of the Commission has completed action on about 2,500 of the claims involved.

Having reviewed the proceedings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee giving rise to the proposed legislative action, the Commission is of the opinion that nothing has been brought out which in any way affects the statute, its aims, goals, or merits. Since the proposed amendment is apparently designed to preclude the payment of compensation to lobbyists or agents who may have participated in influencing the enactment of Public Law 87–616, it would seem that a simple amendment to that effect could be drafted and enacted to accomplish this purpose. I am certain that members of the legal staff of the executive branch could be made available to assist the committee staff in the preparation of such an amendment.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD D. RE,
Chairman.

The executive branch has made impressive progress in implementing the 1962 law. A total of 115,000 applications have been mailed to potential claimants of record; 50,000 completed claim applications have been received; 30,000 applications have been returned either because they were undeliverable, or because the claimants were deceased. Action has been completed on 2,500 claims.

And the staff of the Commission, in Washington and in the Philippines, is doing its best to complete its work within the 2-year statutory period provided in the 1962 act.

I am advised by Chairman Re that the current rate of application returns, if it continues, may involve a much larger saving to the U.S. Treasury than was originally estimated. A minimum—I say a minimum—of $10 to $12 million should be returned from the $73 million provided for the completion of this program. This saving could be as high as $20 million if the direct payment method is continued.

I am surprised that Chairman Re's report, which I understand was made available to the other body, was not included in the record of the hearings released recently by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. It certainly has a very direct and appreciable impact on the issues at hand.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I want to emphasize these points:

First. The other body has acted in haste, and in my opinion, unwisely.

Second. The Senate amendment, if sustained, will subvert the purpose of the original Philippine Rehabilitation Act. It will subvert the original act by providing a handout of up to $20 million to the Philippine Government. It will subvert the Philippine Rehabilitation Act by possibly depriving thousands of Filipinos of what they believe is rightfully theirs—and what the Congress provided for them, and it will subvert the safeguards embodied in the 1962 law by opening the way for agents representing the claimants before the Philippine Government to collect unlimited fees and windfalls.

These are serious issues—and they deserve to be considered fully.

The remedy to the situation which has caused the stampede in the other body is available in the bills which I have introduced.

I call upon my colleagues to stand together for parliamentary principles, for fiscal responsibility and common justice.

I believe we should, we must, refuse to consider the Senate proposal while measures which go to the root of the problem are under consideration in our own body.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I want to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin how many days his subcommittee put in in the study of the original Philippine claims bill?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. In 1960 the Far East Subcommittee had four meetings on this subject, two of which were executive and two were open. The full committee had six executive meetings that year on the bill. In 1961 the subcommittee had one open and one executive session and the full committee considered it in two executive sessions. Again in 1962 the full committee had an executive session on the bill. Over 3 years, therefore, the subcommittee had six sessions on the claims bill and the full committee had nine sessions. As the gentleman will recall, every word, every phrase, and every comma in this legislation was fully discussed and analyzed.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Who were the members of the subcommittee? Would the gentleman from Wisconsin name the members of the subcommittee?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. In addition to myself, the members of the subcommittee in the 86th Congress were Congressman Pilcher, Congressman Saund, Congressman Meyer, Congressman Judd, Congressman Merrow, and Congresswoman Church. In the 87th Congress the members were Congressman Pilcher, Congressman Saund, Congressman McDowell, Congressman Johnson, Congressman Judd, Congresswoman Church, Congressman Broomfield, and Congressman Whalley.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Is it true that the subcommittee reported the bill unanimously to the full committee?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. That is correct.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Every member of the subcommittee voted in full approval of the bill?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Every member present voted for it.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. The bill contained a clause limiting the amount that could be paid for service in connection with these claims?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Yes. It was the gentleman's amendment which limited the amount of fees payable to any attorney or party representing a claimant, reducing it from the usual standard of 10 percent to 5 percent.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Which is the standard set in all pension legislation?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. It is 10 percent.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. It is 10 percent.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Yes. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his contribution.

AMENDMENT TO THE PHILIPPINE REHABILITATION ACT OF 1962

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Barry] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin, chairman of the subcommittee which unanimously reported the bill that finally became the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1962, has just come before us to support his amendment to the law that would prohibit any fees to any former Commissioner or employee of the Philippine War Damages Commission, as compensation for services in connection with any application filed under the act. It is odd indeed that the Member who managed the bill, who had the most to say at the time of enactment last year before the elections, is now attempting to remove from the bill that portion from which he has already reaped a substantial $2,000 campaign contribution.

The reason prompting this amendment is well known to this body. The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations has uncovered the activities of two former Commissioners of the War Claims Commission who received over a million dollars in fees for work done on behalf of claimants. This amount does not include fees for their work in behalf of the 1962 bill. The present attempt to block these fees under the light of the discoveries made by the Senate committee is a correct one, although it is doubtful if it would have been offered except under the now exposed circumstances. There is one further danger we should protect against; namely, that if this amendment is adopted by the body, would a former Philippine national, member of the Commission who, according to the Senate investigation, had an important role in creating the atmosphere for the favorable passage of this legislation, still be eligible for substantial fees? I quote here from a column which recently appeared in the Evening Star by Charles Bartlett:

> The bill could be amended to keep the lobbyists from getting any of the money, but this would be legally difficult because Mr. Delgado (Francisco A. Delgado) is not a citizen of the United States and the money would be out of the U.S. control as soon as the checks are mailed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the other body, who initiated the investigation, has provided a more effective remedy to the act by an amendment to H.R. 5517, the supplemental appropriation bill passed by this House. This corrective amendment has been approved by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the Senate Appropriations Committee and provides that the $73 million shall be paid to the Philippine Government which, in turn, could expend the money for public works projects for the benefit of all the Philippine people or pay it to the individual claimants.

The amendment further provides that the Philippine Government shall insure with the Secretary of State of the United States that no part of such sum shall be directly or indirectly paid to any former Commissioner or employee of the War Damages Claim Commission as compensation for services rendered as attorney or agent in connection with such claim.

Mr. Speaker, this approach is far wiser and a more effective way to curb abuses and still achieve the intention of the law. It is significant to note that the other body considered these two approaches of amending this law to prohibit fees and selected this one. I quote from page 7200 of the Congressional Record of April 26, 1963:

> The Committee on Foreign Relations has studied closely both approaches. Neither provides an absolute guarantee that fees contracted for prior to 1962 will not eventually reach the lobbyists. However, a number of factors led the committee to choose the government-to-government payment route.
>
> First, since almost all the claimants come under the legal jurisdiction of the Government of the Philippines, that Government would be better able to enforce prohibitions

of payments to O'Donnell. No matter what language is written into the current act, in the end it would be legally effective only against persons within the jurisdiction of the United States.

Second, the government-to-government payment is more in line with the economic development purposes of the Rehabilitation Act of 1946. I do not feel it necessary here to retrace the history of that act, but only point out that our Government, faced with the demand for repayment generated for the most part by O'Donnell, Delgado, and their clients, proposed this form of payment in 1960.

This amendment offered in the Senate is partially consistent with the approach I have supported in the past that this money could best be employed for all the people rather than for a few, provided of course that the Philippines selected this method of payment.

Therefore I urge that the amendment from the Senate, if passed, be granted full and deliberate consideration in the light of revelations made in the Senate on Friday, April 26, 1963, beginning on page 7198 of the Congressional Record.

When we have the opportunity to consider this amendment I urge my colleagues to accept the Senate's solution.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include the minority and additional views of Report No. 1042 which accompanied H.R. 8617, the Philippine War Rehabilitation Act of 1962 passed by the 87th Congress.

Had these views prevailed last year the Congress would not be in this unhappy position today.

The minority and additional views follow:

MINORITY VIEWS

We oppose a favorable report of this bill.

The Philippine Rehabilitation Act, Public Law 370, 79th Congress, of April 30, 1946, made provision for payment of compensation for damages to private property in the Philippines incident to World War II.

The act appropriated $400 million for this purpose, and established the method of payment—first, full payment of all damages under $500; and second, to use the rest of the money for pro rata payment of 75 percent of remaining damages. It set up a Philippine War Damage Commission to pass on claims of damage.

The $500 claims have been paid in full. Fifty-two percent of the remaining claims have been paid, and it will require about $73 million more to pay the remaining claims up to 75 percent.

The present bill provides for further payments to the same persons (or their successors) whose losses have already been verified by the Philippine War Damage Commission and who have already received part payment.

Bills to complete the payment up to 75 percent have been before the Congress on several occasions during the past 10 years.

Claims are not based on war damage for which the United States is legally liable

The hearings this year are entitled "Philippine War Damage Claims," but these are not war damage claims in the sense in which those words are usually used—as for example where property has been seized for use in war and should be paid for.

What is here involved is really aid for rehabilitation of a war-torn country. This is indicated by the title of the act, "Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946," and by the committee reports and testimony at the hearings. In order to achieve rehabilitation at the grassroots, the act provided that the aid should not go to the Government, but should go by way of compensation to those who could prove that they had suffered war damage.

It is too late to accomplish the original purpose of the law—rehabilitation of a war-torn country

The rehabilitation has taken place, and further payments would be in the nature of windfalls.

Acting Secretary of State Douglas Dillon's letter of March 3, 1960 (Foreign Affairs Committee Supplemental Hearings on H.R. 12078, 86th Congress, 2d sess., p. 23), stated:

"The executive branch believes that rebuilding, replacement, or repair of war-damaged private property in the Philippines is no longer practicable. Moreover, in view of the time which has elapsed since the original claims were approved, and since the U.S. Philippine War Damage Commission went out of existence on March 31, 1951, it is not considered practicable for the U.S. Government to assume any responsibility for the payment of the balance of approved individual private property claims."

The State Department's letter of August 5, 1959 (id., p. 21), stated:

"In 1950 the Economic Survey Mission to the Philippines, generally referred to as the Bell Mission, came to the conclusion that further war damage payments to individuals would not contribute materially to economic development in the Philippines and that continuing assistance by the United States should be for development projects in agriculture and industry related to the specific needs of the Philippine economy rather than as additional war damage payments to individuals."

Secretary of the Treasury Anderson's letter of June 14, 1960 (id., p. 24), stated:

"The Treasury Department strongly prefers S. 3238, the bill recommended to the Congress by the executive branch. This bill would authorize a payment of not to exceed $73 million to the Government of the Republic of the Philippines 'in full satisfaction and final settlement' of all awards made under the earlier legislation. Under the administration bill payment to individuals would be left to the Philippine Government. Payment in this manner would be in conformity with the spirit of the original enactment; that is, to rehabilitate the Philippine economy and not merely to compensate individual claimants."

Total U.S. economic assistance to the Philippines since 1946 has been $773 million, of which $273 million was from ICA since 1951.

To try to give further compensation now for damage which occurred 15 years ago is impractical and unsound

The Commissioner of Accounts, Department of the Treasury, testified last year as to the state of the records as follows (id., p. 3):

"The records which we have of the Philippine War Damage Commission consist primarily of accounting records. When the Commission expired in April 1951, it turned some of the records over to the archives in San Francisco and some to the archives in Franconia, Va., close by. It destroyed some records. The records which we got consisted mostly of administrative records covering the unexpended balance of the appropriations, unliquidated obligations, and claims records which I think is the part in which you are particularly interested.

"We have about 87 volumes of claims records. They are bound records, which represent the payments made to claimants. They are called registers, but they are copies of vouchers the originals of which were sent to the General Accounting Office with the account current at the time of payment."

He also testified that there were some IBM punchcards which were the basis for preparing the above-referred-to 87 volumes of vouchers, but that the cards had become so damaged that they could no longer be run through the machines.

Secretary Robert B. Anderson's above-mentioned letter of June 14, 1960 (id., p. 1), commented on this situation:

"Almost 10 years have elapsed since the Philippine War Damage Commission went out of existence, and undoubtedly there will be great difficulties involved in locating claimants and determining the appropriate heirs, next of kin, or successors in interest of original award recipients who have since died or gone out of existence. The administration bill has the great advantage that it would turn over funds to the Philippine Government in full satisfaction and final settlement of all of these awards, leaving to the Philippine Government the detailed administration of the payment of the balance of the awards."

Payments to corporations

It was brought out in the committe discussions of last year that a large proportion of the money to be appropriated would go to the payment of large corporate claims, many of which would benefit American owners and would have little relation to the rehabilitation of a country ravaged by war over 15 years ago.

The original act of 1946 provided (sec. 104(c)) that to the fullest extent practicable payments should not be made without a showing that the lost or damaged property on which the claim was based had been rebuilt, replaced, or repaired. This requirement is waived in H.R. 8617 (p. 2, line 12), although there is a similar requirement applicable only to payments made outside the Philippines to any claimant residing outside the Philippines (p. 4, lines 7-16).

Extent of obligation

It is admitted that there is no legal obligation.

There is some moral obligation, but there might be some difference of opinion as to how strong it is.

After all, the original act of 1946 provided for a gift—a gift to a brave ally which would help rehabilitate the country and help the general free world situation in the Far East.

A reading of the record of the original hearings indicates that some members of the committee wanted to have it understood that the claims would be paid up to 75 percent, and that if the $400 million authorized was not sufficient, more would be provided. But the majority of the committee did not go along with that view, and the committee report indicates no such commitment.

To be sure, the committee did base the amount of the authorization on its estimate of the amount needed to pay the $500 claims in full, and the remaining claims up to 75 percent. This fact, as stated in the hearings, became a matter of public knowledge, and to that extent resulted in a moral obligation.

Laurence Curtis.
Wayne L. Hays.
Robert R. Barry.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

To compensate for damages 20 years after destruction of property when the original purpose of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act was to rehabilitate a war-torn land, does nothing but violate principles of equity and commonsense.

Those who made the greatest sacrifices are those who lost their beloved and their providers. Compensating widows, semiorphans, or aged parents who have made the real sacrifice would sustain the principle of concern for human rights worthy of a great benefactor nation. If a moral obligation does indeed exist, let us ferret out the real sufferers from the war's devastation.

ROBERT R. BARRY.

THE THREAT TO OUR NATIONAL SECURITY OF COMMUNIST SUBVERSION OF UNITED NATIONS TRADE POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHADEBERG] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I sent to President Kennedy a telegram of the utmost urgency on a matter of gravest concern to the security of the United States. I shall read that telegram:

> Respectfully alert you to dangers to United States, posed by Soviet Union in 1964 United Nations International Conference on Trade and Development. Article in April 29, 1963, issue of Barron's, by Alice Widener, spells out threat in detail. Urgently appeal to you to adopt and carry out four recommendations as follows: (1) Request Secretary-General U Thant appoint experienced American businessman as United Nations Under Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs; (2) scrutinize caliber and security of U.S. nationals now holding executive economic policy and research posts in U.N. Secretariat; (3) strengthen American business representation within U.S. mission to United Nations; (4) appoint an outstanding business executive, with broad experience in international trade, as follows: (1) Request Secretary General International Conference on Trade and Development. Request you give earnest heed to warning sounded by Mrs. Widener and take the above steps to guarantee protection of free enterprise and American business and industry, and, at same time, guarantee failure of Communist plot that has been 16 years in the making.

Mr. Speaker, when the cold war is won and the United States is presenting laurels for major contributions to that victory, a special award should be reserved for Mrs. Alice Widener, nationally syndicated columnist, for her alertness to the very real dangers to U.S. security to be found in the massive nonmilitary phases of the war being waged by the Soviet Communist conspiracy.

In this connection I call to the attention of the Congress the article by Mrs. Widener as it appears in the April 29, 1963, issue of Barron's, the national business and financial weekly. The article, entitled "Memo to American Businessmen on Red Role in U.N. Trade Parley," exposes the aims of the Soviet Union in the United Nations International Conference on Trade and Development to be held early in 1964. Those aims, spelled out by Mrs. Widener, are part of an offensive the Communists have had in the making for some 16 years—an offensive calculated by the Kremlin to at once salvage and bolster the badly sagging Soviet economy and bring our free enterprise economy gradually to its knees.

The seriousness of the threat to our national security posed by the military and subversion buildup in Cuba is apparent. So also are tinderbox conditions in Laos, Vietnam, Berlin, the Congo, and other points around the globe in which the Communist conspiracy is relentlessly at work. We must never underestimate the perils inherent in these potentially explosive areas. On the other hand we must not allow them to divert our attention from the more subtle strategy and maneuverings of the Communists in their nonmilitary but very aggressive cold war offensive.

Mrs. Widener has sounded the alarm. Added to that, she has propounded a very wise course of action for our Government to take, to defeat the Soviets in this major engagement and at the same time to protect the life of American business and industry and our working men and women. Yes, it is not overstating the case a bit to say that the business and industrial complex of America—the greatest the world has even known—is directly in the sights of the Communists' most potent nonviolent weapons, and the survival of our national free-enterprise economy is at stake. The danger to our security is being mounted painstakingly by the Kremlin. The arena in which the battle will be fought is the United Nations. And that battle, as I mentioned a moment ago, will be what goes on in the United Nations International Conference on Trade and Development to be held early in 1964.

I have consistently suggested that one of the major responsibilities of this Government is to recognize that we are engaged in a cold war. It is not of our making. It is not our desire to be placed in a position in which we are forced to wage this war but the reality of the present time demands that we do not shirk our responsibilities. We must not sound retreat. We must wage these battles with the full intent of achieving full victory. Anything less would be to break faith with the people who have entrusted this country to our care. This Nation has never been found wanting in its ability, capacity, and will to wage battle in a military action when our security and freedom were seriously threatened. We were able to build the best machines and to mold the most modern weapons by which we could achieve victory. Let me suggest in all seriousness, without in the least belittling the contribution of those who fought our wars, that freedom is not bought by achieving victory in military action. Victory in military action only buys time in which we pursue and extend and make secure our freedom.

It is precisely because we, as a nation, have been so successful in military engagements and, I might add, successful under free enterprise in building the machines and inspiring the men that are necessary to bring victory, that the enemies of freedom have devised new means by which to achieve their aim to fasten their brand of slavery—economic and otherwise—upon the unsuspecting people of good will in our world. We now know we are engaged in a cold war. We are belatedly recognizing that we must work as diligently to achieve victory in the cold war as we would to achieve victory in a hot war. Victory or defeat in a hot war decides whether or not we will have time to pursue freedom. Victory or defeat in the cold war will decide whether or not we will have the freedom that was purchased with the sacrifices of the very lives of those who waged our hot wars. The stakes are high. The battle is being joined. The issues are clear. The future of freedom itself is at stake.

The waging of a cold war dictates that we devise weapons designed to bring us victory. These must be not merely defensive weapons, for if we hold only to what we have, time will be on the side of the enemy. We must devise cold war weapons which are offensive in nature. To strengthen our position in the United Nations International Conference on Trade and Development by having an American businessman appointed as United Nation's Under Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs; by strengthening American business representation within the United States mission to the United Nations; and by having an outstanding business executive with broad experience in international trade appointed as the chief U.S. delegate to the United Nations International Conference on Trade and Development will go a long way in providing the offensive weapon necessary to bring victory for free enterprise on the economic battlefield on which we are now locked in conflict.

Because I believe the issue is so clearly presented by Alice Widener in her "Memo to American Businessmen on Red Role in U.N. Trade Parley," as it appeared in the April 29, 1963, issue of Barron's, I want to read into the RECORD her article.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in proper sequence those parts I will not take the time to read. Before reading the article I wish to inform my colleagues that I have been interested in the developments that have arisen within the U.N. regarding world trade for some time and have done considerable research within the past few months. In the interest of saving time I will read only the first part of the article and close my remarks with the author's constructive suggestions:

MEMO TO AMERICAN BUSINESSMEN ON RED ROLE IN U.N. TRADE PARLEY

(By Alice Widener)

In mid-September of 1962, Andrei Gromyko, Soviet Minister of Foreign Affairs, sent the following letter to United Nations Secretary General U Thant:

"On the instruction of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republic, I request the inclusion in the agenda of the 17th session of the United Nations General Assembly of the following item of an important and urgent character: 'Convening of an International Conference on Trade Problems.'

"In accordance with rule 20 of the General Assembly's rules of procedure, I attach an explanatory memorandum."

This document stated that the Soviet Government deemed it necessary "to draw the special attention of the United Nations and its member countries to the fact that the task of restoring international trade to normal is at present assuming a very great and increasing importance for all states in the world."

U.S.S.R. ROLE IN TRADE

It is not surprising that Mr. Gromyko described the Soviet call for an international trade conference as urgent. The Soviets' own statistics on their foreign commerce, furnished for the first time to the U.N. in 1957, disclosed that the U.S.S.R. accounted for only 2 percent of total world trade.

The Soviet memo underscored a number of alleged unfavorable features in the world trade picture, including the "appearance of closed grouping such as the Common Market in Western Europe." It also called for normalization of international (East-West) trade as a "prerequisite for economic development of underdeveloped countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America."

The Soviet Government went on to say that the "main task" of the proposed U.N. International Conference on Trade and Development should be "to set up a standing international trade organization, embracing all regions and countries of the world without any discrimination whatsoever."

Last December the U.N. General Assembly voted overwhelmingly in favor of holding the Soviet-proposed U.N. International Trade Conference and scheduled it "for early 1964." The same body also set up a preparatory committee to work on the conference agenda, policies and documentation in New York and Geneva.

PROPAGANDA BARRAGE

At once, all pro-Communist propagandists threw their weight behind the Soviet position. On January 27, 1963, the Communist newspaper, the Worker, in New York City carried an article against the European Common Market by A. Krchmarek, who supported the Soviet trade conference proposal that the United Nations "preclude every form of (trade) discrimination."

Simultaneously, the Worker carried the headline, "Drop Trade Bars, Says Cyrus Eaton," and the text, "Eaton, who has received the Lenin Peace Prize for his work on behalf of friendly relations between the United States and U.S.S.R., stated in a Sun-Press interview in Cleveland, that the United States was the greatest threat to world peace." The Communist Worker quoted Mr. Eaton as saying that the United States should drop all its trade barriers and that he is "for trading wherever we can."

Actually, last year's Soviet proposal was not new. The Reds have been seeking an International Trade Organization ever since the Havana Conference of 1947, which drafted the "Havana Charter," subsequently rejected by Congress because of its many provisions aimed at socializing trade through arbitrary controls over price, production, and distribution.

The Soviets won U.N. assent to their latest trade conference proposal by resting it on two themes popular with the U.N. majority: (1) "Development of the underdeveloped countries"; and (2) "economic and social consequences of disarmament." By linking both concepts, Moscow succeeded in persuading the U.N. majority that mobilization of "world opinion" at a U.N. trade conference would enable "poor nations" to drain away billions of dollars in government aid from the rich nations.

The official summary records of the first session of the U.N. Trade Conference Preparatory Committee show that Soviet economic strategy is to disrupt capitalist markets and trade, then socialize such trade for their own benefit. In preparation, the Soviets are framing a series of slanderous indictments against U.S. business for presentation at the U.N. Trade Conference. To further their aim, they also have enlisted the support of some Marxist-minded demogogs among the Latin American, African, and Asian member nations.

The great business companies of the West and of Japan will be charged with monopoly practices and economic aggression against Socialist countries and nations emerging from exploitation by imperialist colonialism.

U.N. LEXICON

To understand the dialog among U.N. delegations and within the U.N. Secretariat, one must acquire some familiarity with a lexicon of U.N.-ese. Here the Communist states are defined as "the centrally planned economies," backward nations are called "developing nations"; all Western restraints on socialization of trade are branded as "economic discrimination"; and U.S. refusal to furnish the Soviet bloc with strategic materials is called "economic aggression" and "economic pressure."

With these U.N.-Soviet definitions in mind, American businessmen seeking to understand the real meaning of Soviet documents presented at the U.N. should also be aware of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine (which Premier Khrushchev says he'll abandon only when shrimps whistle): "World peace can be achieved only through the abolition of capitalism."

The U.N. General Assembly set the stage for the International Trade Conference by appointing as its Secretary-General Mr. Raul Prebisch (Argentina), head of the U.N. Economic Commission for Latin America. Within the U.N. Headquarters Secretariat, Mr. Jacob L. Mosak (United States) was put in charge of conference research and policies. Mr. Mosak occupies the post of Director, Bureau of General Economic Research and Policies in the U.N. Department of Economic and Social Affairs, which is headed by Under Secretary Phillippe de Seynes (France).

Prior to Mr. Mosak's present assignment, he had acted as chairman of the special U.N. committee which prepared the controversial U.N. report "Economic and Social Consequences of Disarmament."

In 1959 a significant organizational change took place in Mr. Mosak's U.N. bureau. What had been called section 4 became the Centrally Planned Economies Section. This is U.N.-ese for Communist economies section. Today it is staffed as follows:

Senior economic affairs officer: Stanislav Braun, Poland. Economic affairs officers: Israel Borenstein, United States of America; Stanislav Polaczek, Poland; Lazio Csapo, Hungary; Arkadiy M. Voinov, U.S.S.R.

As may be seen, four out of five economic affairs officers in Mr. Mosak's Centrally Planned Economies Section are Communist nationals.

(Last year, the London Times carried an article questioning the reliability of all Soviet economic statistics, including those furnished to the United Nations. Yet the U.N. Bureau of Statistics and Centrally Planned Economies Section continually welcome, feature and distribute phony Soviet statistics, thus lending them an aura of U.N. impartiality and prestige.

(To illustrate, the March 1963 United Nations Monthly Bulletin of Statistics carries as the first item in a group of special features a table headed "Gross Production of Industry in the U.S.S.R." The figures contained therein were drawn mostly from Izvestia and Pravda and all were issued by the central statistical administration of the council of ministers of the U.S.S.R.

(The economically absurd and dangerously misleading result of such U.N. statistical practice often is reflected in the press at home and abroad. For example, on March 25, 1963, the Christian Science Monitor carried the news item, "United Nations: Soviet Production Soars—Gross industrial production in the Soviet Union in 1962 rose to 145 percent of the 1958 level, according to the United Nations statistical office. Large increases were recorded in refrigerators, television sets, natural gas, petroleum, meat, and canned goods." Doubtless the 1962 Soviet soar in meat production caused the soar in Soviet meat prices announced last June.)

NOT EVEN A TROIKA

Creation of the special section for centrally planned economies wasn't even a troika move. It was strictly a one-sided affair which could be interpreted as contrary to the impartiality of the United Nations Charter. Some informed people within the U.N. Secretariat were surprised that Economic and Social Affairs Under Secretary de Seynes agreed to such an arrangement. For since 1945, the General Assembly (acting on recommendations of the Economic and Social Council) has approved the setting up of four regional U.N. economic commissions—for Europe (ECE), for Latin America (ECLA), Asia and the Far East (ECAFE) and Africa (ECA). However, there is no regional economic commission for the socialist countries, nor should there be, since regions are viewed geographically, not ideologically, under the U.N. Charter.

Intensified Secretariat work for the forthcoming International Trade Conference draws attention to several aspects of U.N. personnel policies, including the allocation of Under-Secretaryships in the major departments. Since 1945, the U.N. Department of Political and Security Council Affairs has been headed by a Soviet Under-Secretary (except for a brief period when this strategic post was held by a Yugoslav Red).

Originally there was created within the United Nations a Department of Economic Affairs and a Department of Social Affairs. In 1953, the late Dag Hammarskjold consolidated these two departments into a single Department of Economic and Social Affairs, which, every since, has been headed by Under Secretary de Seynes.

HOW IT ALL STARTED

In view of these facts, it is important to recall the following historical account by the Honorable Trygve Lie, first Secretary-General of the United Nations, in his book "In the Cause of Peace":

"The choice of the Assistant Secretaries-General, who would constitute my cabinet, was, of course, my first concern (in 1945). It soon appeared that it was equally the concern of some of the great, and a number of the lesser, powers.

"Mr. Vyshinsky (Andrei, U.S.S.R.) did not delay his approach. He was the first to inform me of an understanding which the Big Five (France, China, United Kingdom, United States, and U.S.S.R.) had reached in London (at the U.N. Preparatory Commission) on the appointment of a Soviet national as Assistant Secretary-General for Political and Security Council Affairs. Mr. Vyshinsky simple spoke of an 'agreement'—he said nothing of its binding quality.

"Mr. Stettinius (Edward R., Jr., U.S. Chief Delegate to U.N.) confirmed to me that he had agreed with the Soviet delegation in the matter. But both Mr. Stettinius and the French stressed that their agreement to the Soviet post was a limited one. * * * It was not understood that a permanent lien on the office of Assistant Secretary General for Security Council Affairs was granted to the Soviet Union. * * *

"I felt it was both necessary and desirable to secure nominations from governments * * * for positions of the rank of Assistant Secretary General. * * * What did the Americans want for themselves? To my surprise, they did not ask for a department concerned with comparable substantive affairs, like the economic or the social."

Today it is a historical fact that at the United Nations the "premier" post of Political and Security Council Affairs Under Secretary has always been held by a Communist, but the equally important post of Economic and Social Affairs Under Secretary has never been held by an American.

HARMFUL RESULTS

This one-sided state of affairs had many unfortunate consequences for Americans in general and for U.S. businessmen in particular. United Nations activities increasingly tend to involve economic matters. Governments of underdeveloped nations, which lack economic experts, often rely on the U.N. Secretariat for all kinds of guidance. Moreover, most of the U.S. personnel in the U.N. Department of Economic and Social Affairs, including Mr. Jacob L. Mosak, lack practical managerial experience gained through past employment in U.S. companies.

Executive decision regarding U.N. personnel rests in the hands of the U.N. Secretary General. Since the forthcoming U.N. International Conference on Trade and Development is a result of successful Soviet economic strategy, many American and foreign economists believe that the State Department should request Secretary General U Thant to assign Mr. de Seynes to another post and appoint an experienced American businessman as Under Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs.

The United States, after all, is the largest single trader in the world. Moreover, it is vitally concerned in all U.N. economic and social activities, for which Americans at present contribute almost a third of the regular assessed budget, and 40 to 60 percent of the voluntary budgets.

The Soviet Union is seeking to convert the 1964 U.N. Trade Conference into a political and economic debacle for the West. Unfortunately, the American business community cannot rely for adequate protection of its interests on the State Department personnel within the U.S. mission to the U.N. U.S. delegates there are experienced in diplomacy and social welfare, but not in business affairs. Trade is business.

In the Soviet Union, the government owns and controls all business; hence at the U.N. Trade Conference the voice of the Soviet Government will be one and the same as the voice of Soviet business. But the State Department's voice will not necessarily be that of U.S. private enterprise, or of the companies which are slated to be prime targets of Communist-bloc attack.

JEKYLL AND HYDE

The Soviets, aware of their own economic failure, are doing everything possible at the U.N. to blacken the name of American business and at the same time to extract its know-how and profits for Soviet benefit. The Jekyll-Hyde arrogance and insecurity of the Soviets is plainly evident in the U.N. summary records of the recent Preparatory Committee session for the Trade Conference.

On January 23, 1963, the U.N. thus summarized the remarks of Mr. Arkadyev, Soviet delegate: "World public opinion was deeply concerned at the poor economic relations existing among the more powerful states, and the matter should be taken up at the Conference. The U.S.S.R. had never begged for trade with any other country. * * *

"It was not possible to order the United States and the Soviet union to trade, but trade between them could and should be discussed. * * *

"Another important point which the conference should discuss was economic aggression. Economic aggression was practiced by the Federal Republic of Germany against the German Democratic Republic, by the countries of the West against the People's Republic of China, and by the United States against Cuba."

The same U.N. summary record shows that the Polish delegate attacked the obstacles to their primary commodity exports suffered by the underdeveloped countries which were created by the activities of private monopolies.

On February 2, 1963, the U.N. summarized as follows the remarks of U.S. delegate Isaiah Frank: "Without wishing to deny the reality of the economic consequences of disarmament or the existence of problems concerning East-West trade (particularly the embargo on strategic materials), the U.S. delegation hoped that those questions would not be raised as such at the conference. A political discussion of that kind would lead the conference far away from the concrete elements of its agenda."

To this, Mr. Arkadyev retorted that the question of trade barriers and unjustified embargoes was essentially economic and was unquestionably within the jurisdiction of the Conference.

And so it went, for weeks, for hundreds of pages of U.N. summary records, all showing that Soviet economic strategy at the United Nations today is precisely as outlined by Mr. Krchmarek in the Communist Worker.

The American business community would be well advised, for its own protection, to keep closest possible watch on current U.N. preparation for the International Conference on Trade and Development. By the time it takes place, the agenda, official documentation and leading protagonists will have been predetermined.

To make sure of a fair hearing for, and adequate protection of, free enterprise, it would seem essential that the American business community urge the State Department to take the following steps:

1. Request Secretary General U Thant to appoint an experienced American businessman as U.N. Under Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs;
2. Scrutinize the caliber and security of U.S. nationals now holding executive economic policy and research posts in the U.N. Secretariat;
3. Strengthen American business representation within the U.S. Mission to the U.N.;
4. Appoint an outstanding business executive, with broad experience in international trade, as chief U.S. delegate to the United Nations International Conference on Trade and Development.

If these four steps are put into effect now, there will be far greater likelihood of thwarting Soviet economic strategy at the United Nations. Better still, the true and inspiring record of American capitalism will be made known to politicians, intellectuals, and technical experts throughout the world.

AN ACTION PROGRAM TO PREVENT WAR IN MIDDLE EAST

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I am so concerned about the dangerous new Arab threat to peace in the Near East, jeopardizing the national security of the United States, that it would be a hollow mockery for me to voice pious platitudes on the occasion of Israel's 15th anniversary.

Instead, I wish to review developments and to propose an action plan to preserve peace in that strategic region.

In recent days we took note of another anniversary, the 20th anniversary of the heroic but ill-fated uprising of Jews in the Warsaw ghetto against Nazi barbarism. Our President issued a beautifully worded statement. But I would have preferred actions by our Government that would have given real meaning to the sentimental verbiage.

The terrible truth is that our Nation is doing nothing effective to halt the drift to war in the Near East set in motion by Gamal Abdel Nasser's expanding United Arab Republic. The new Arab union of Egypt, Iraq, and Syria may be compared in some ways to the Nazi-Soviet pact that preceded and helped bring on the Second World War.

The first communique issued by the expanded, new United Arab Republic pledged a drive to "liberate Palestine," an open pronouncement of intended aggression against America's friend, the State of Israel. Meanwhile, German scientists and technicians continue working in Egypt on missiles for another try at that "final solution of the Jewish problem" that Adolf Hitler sought in the Warsaw ghetto and the crematorium camps of Nazi Germany.

The West German Government has found all kinds of legal pretexts and excuses for inaction. After all, only a few days after our President voiced concern over the presence of the German rocket men in Egypt, the State Department, through a fatuous and inane statement by Under Secretary Averell Harriman, sought to justify and rationalize the continued presence of the Germans in Egypt.

At the same time, while our own Government follows a Munichlike policy of appeasement and drift—or, should I say, lacks any real constructive policy—the Soviet Union is shipping new offensive arms to the United Arab Republic. These arms are more modern and dangerous than those we insisted that Cuba get rid of. Indeed, we went to the brink of thermonuclear war to get them out of Cuba. Now, today, we are in the incredible situation of helping Nasser pay Russia for even more destructive offensive arms. I am speaking of *Komar* class missile-firing warships, ground-to-air SA-2 missiles, air-to-air missiles, TU-16 jet bombers, Mig 21 and even Mig 23 jet fighters, as well as tanks and artillery even more modern than much of the present NATO equipment.

Yes, I have heard a lot of public mourning in the last few days about the Warsaw ghetto. But I am waiting for our State Department to lift a finger to prevent a new and greater tragedy for the Jewish people.

The cold and terrible truth is that the momentum in the Near East is moving inexorably toward a United Arab onslaught against Israel. This would obviously lead to a real danger of escalation into a new world conflagration, this time with ultimate weapons. And, I might add, this would not just involve the final solution of the Jewish problem but the final solution of humanity.

There are realistic steps that can be taken to forestall the peril of an explosion in the Near East.

As a cosponsor of the so-called Keating-Halpern amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act, I have looked carefully throughout the past year for implementation of that expression of the sense of Congress which voiced opposition to aiding those nations, like the United Arab Republic, which use their own resources to buy Soviet munitions of war.

But, instead of implementation of this amendment, the executive department gave the United Arab Republic $250 million of our taxpayers' dollars in the year 1962. We subsidized Nasser's domestic needs, freeing his treasury for payments to the Soviet Union for jet bombers and missile warships and for payments to former Nazi rocket scientists now building mass destructive weapons in Egypt. On one hand, our leaders oppose proliferation of the rocket race to additional countries. On the other, we indirectly subsidize such spread of rockets to such an irresponsible nation as the United Arab Republic.

The State Department, in Mr. Harriman's letter, advocated what it termed "even-handed" treatment of Israel and the United Arab Republic. Mr. Harriman ignored the fact that the United Arab Republic has 20 times the population of Israel. He ignored the access of the United Arab Republic to the arsenals of the Sino-Soviet bloc. He wanted Israel to accept the German collaboration with Egypt.

This "even-handed" approach of the State Department appears to mean the open palm filled with dollars outstretched to Nasser and the back of the hand to Israel.

Now Israel is permitted to buy, at tremendous cost, some American Hawk antiaircraft missiles. These Hawks are effective only against aircraft. They will meet last year's threat, that of aerial bombing of Israel's cities. This year's threat is not the manned bomber but the huge ground-to-ground missiles the Germans are building for the United Arab Republic.

What is Israel to do? Build its own huge ground-to-ground missiles? What good will that do? Israel does not want to liquidate masses of Egyptian peasants. Israel is concentrated into a small, vulnerable target zone. The United Arab Republic is spread out across millions of square miles. Even if Israel develops a means to kill off all those millions of misled Arabs, what can she gain? Israel cannot occupy all that territory, even if enough Israelis survived to contemplate the fruits of a so-called victory. Israel can lose all and win nothing.

But Israel has no alternative to a deterrent power because of our peculiar encouragement of Nasser's rocket race. The only winner will be the Sino-Soviet bloc which would use such a conflict to extend its penetration.

The State Department conveniently forgets that at a recent session of the United Nations General Assembly the United Arab Republic voted with the U.S.S.R. on 53 issues and only 4 times sided with the United States.

At the recent Conference at Moshi, Tanganyika, the so-called Afro-Asian People's Solidarity Conference, Nasser's Egyptian delegate, the Secretary General of the Conference, expressed pleasure that "the imperialists," as he phrased it, "headed by the United States of America have become weaker." The United Arab Republic official, spokesman of the Government we gave $250 million this fiscal year, said:

> The United States of America, imperialists as they are, have several times tried to undermine the revolutionary government of Cuba and once more put the Cuban people under the domination of U.S. monopolies.

And what about Mr. Nasser's own imperialist drive to dominate the Arab world? Mr. Lincoln White of our State Department said a few days ago that the trouble in Jordan came only from some high school students. He said there was no outside intervention. But King Hussein blamed the United Arab Republic for sending in agitators, arms, propaganda, and money for the overthrow of his pro-Western regime. Indeed, actual camps have been established in neighboring Syria to train terrorists who infiltrate into Jordan.

The King has now been forced to seal off his borders. Of course, we cannot expect him to know as much about the problem he faces inside his own country as our State Department boys in Washington. He must wince when he hears the statements of Mr. Nasser's apologists in Washington, not at the United Arab Republic Embassy—but in the Department of State.

Some respected American intellectuals continue to support Nasser's "Arab socialism" as the wave of the future. These cloud cuckoo land theorists, seeing themselves as liberals, are not even supported by true Egyptian liberals who are horrified by Nasser's police state. Egyptian liberals see Nasser's brand of "Arab socialism" reminiscent of Adolf Hitler's "national socialism." But Mr. Nasser's fawning admirers in the United States want us to see Nasser as another peaceful, progressive, agrarian reformer.

Nasser makes a far better personal impression than his raging, bearded Cuban counterpart, Fidel Castro. Nasser is suave, charming, and diplomatic, making him all the more dangerous. Instead of a two-faced demagog, he is portrayed by our diplomats as a sort of lovable Robin Hood who defies cruel Arab monarchs and robs the rich to aid the poor.

Consistent with this idealized notion of this uptown clean-shaven version of Castro, the United States granted diplomatic recognition to the puppet regime Nasser imposed in Yemen by force of arms. The liberated Yemenite people did not seem too happy about their progressive new "people's paradise." They fought like demons to throw the intruding Egyptians out. But, backed by the State Department, Nasser fastened his hold on Yemen and established a puppet regime.

Is Nasser devoted to raising the standards of living for the impoverished Egyptian masses? Food, medical care, education, housing, and other aspects of human advancement would seem to be indicated as the priority items of a truly progressive regime. But Nasser's priority of budget is devoted to missiles and jet bombers. He showed his loving care for the Arab masses by spending $1 million a day for military adventures in Yemen, including the bombing of primitive native villages. His bombers emulated the role of Mussolini's air force years ago in Ethiopia, by blasting helpless people in Yemen.

Nasser also feels the Egyptian poor are well enough off for his budget to afford approximately $20 million a year for political subversion and terrorism in neighboring lands.

Subversive agents and payments to native agitators figure in United Arab Republic efforts to install Nasserism in Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Aden, Oman, Somali, Ethiopia, Tunisia, Libya, Algeria, Morocco, Lebanon, and elsewhere.

Cairo beams broadcasts daily in 27 languages, loaded with incitements for such events as the murder of King Hussein and King Saud and the mass murder of the Israelis. And the United States, I am sorry to say, is helping to pay for his powerful radio transmitters.

The periodical, Public Opinion Quarterly, organ of the American Association for Public Opinion Research, recently reported on a detailed study of the Arab press. Nasser's United Arab Republic was found more antagonistic to the United States and more favorable to the Soviet Union than any other Arab State.

United Arab Republic ships trade with Communist Cuba, with total disregard for President Kennedy's proclamations. The Egyptian press condemns Mr. Kennedy and praises Mr. Castro. But the State Department still can see no evil in the Castro of the Near East.

Even United Arab Republic diplomats figure in intrigue against their host countries. In Washington, United Arab Republic diplomats arrogantly denounce Members of Congress, intruding themselves into our domestic legislative processes, because some Congressmen do not admire the tactics of Nasser. These Arab agitators should be declared persona non grata and kicked out by the seat of their pants.

In recent years, the Congo expelled the entire United Arab Republic Embassy staff; Liberia ousted the United Arab Republic chargé d'affaires; Upper Volta, just last year, expelled the whole United Arab Republic Embassy, and a few months ago, Sierre Leone asked Nasser's chargé d'affaires to pack his bags.

The "thinkers" who would sell us down the Nile have not conveyed many of the facts I have reviewed. Nasser is as dangerous in the Near East, exporting his revolution through terror and assassination, as Castro is in Latin America. Perhaps even more so. For we insisted that Cuba get rid of its missiles while we help to finance Nasser's acquisition of missiles.

Ben-Gurion would be fully as justified in demanding that shipments of offensive weapons to the United Arab Republic be stopped as we were in making the same demand concerning Cuba. At least we have 90 miles separating us from Cuba, while the United Arab Republic is within eyesight of virtually all of Israel.

The only cement that binds the United Arab Republic, in the final analysis, is Arab unity based on hatred of Israel and plans for aggression against her.

In view of the things that I have outlined, I am gravely concerned. I do not advocate helpless handwringing. I do advocate a sweeping action program, not only to safeguard Israel, but to salvage peace and the true national interests of the United States and the entire free world.

First, in accordance with the commitment I assumed in sponsoring the House version of the Keating amendment, adopted last year, I am today introducing legislation to put teeth into this clause. I feel the time has come for a mandatory measure requiring the severance of aid to any nation like the United Arab Republic which uses its own funds to spread the rocket race in a manner so hazardous to world peace and to purchase Soviet offensive arms, while violating United Nations resolutions calling for an end to warlike acts against a neighboring state.

We must also adopt a realistic program of Near Eastern regional security in view of the one-sided rocket race now under way. Possibly in concert with the tripartite nations, Britain and France, or maybe through some sub-NATO structure or CENTO arrangement, we should offer a definite, ironbound mutual security guarantee to Israel or any other Near Eastern state willing to pursue a peaceful and nonaggressive policy.

Such a firm guarantee to Israel would solve the problem of the possible explosion that could occur if Jordan collapsed under United Arab Republic terrorist pressures. I do not see how we could expect Israel to quietly await the final blow as Nasser establishes rocket launching pads on all of Israel's extended borders—if Jordan collapses.

We must show Nasser that he cannot get away with aggression before he attempts it. We must head off a push-button war even as the Nazi technicians are busily installing new weapons systems. To do less is to invite disaster. Nothing short of an outright military assistance pact with Israel will suffice.

We should exert diplomatic pressure on the West German Government, which is now seeking more NATO nuclear weapons power for themselves, to end the doubletalk and get their people out of Egypt.

We must make clear that we will supply Israel with deterrent arms essential for her defense. To do less would invite disaster under present circumstances. But arms alone will not suffice. We must head off trouble before the rockets fly. No one can really win a rocket war.

We must use every means to bring the Arabs and Israel together for direct negotiations to promote a pilot arms control agreement. This could be the subject of United Nations initiative if the State Department does not oppose this as it did oppose a U.N.-Arab-Israel peace move not long ago, the Brazzaville resolution, to appease Nasser by saving him from a peace conference.

The hope for Near Eastern peace lies in preventing a war before it erupts. It is time for the State Department ostriches to extract their heads from the desert sands. We are at a momentous confluence in human events. This is not a time for partisan domestic political faultfinding. Our policies under both present and previous administrations have failed to fully respond to the realities in the Near East.

Yet, I am confident that members of both parties are united in their devotion to peace and justice in the Near East.

It is apparent, however, that the Congress must more strongly assert its convictions. The State Department approach to the Near East must be made responsive to the demands of reality and the cause of peace. Another Munich, this time sacrificing Israel instead of Czechoslovakia, will only expedite aggression and our own jeopardy.

Let us address ourselves to the task and use some of that "vigor" we hear so much about in Washington.

ONE TAX CHANGE WHICH SHOULD BE DEFEATED

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I have already spoken directly to a number of members of the Committee on Ways and Means, in opposition to the pending proposal to revise the present law on deduction allowances for religious and charitable contributions.

Nothing I have read in defense of this proposal has altered my conviction that the final result of the change would be to reduce the level of citizen contributions for some of the Nation's most significant institutions.

The change would almost certainly operate to reduce the contributions of many people to their churches.

Its effect upon the Salvation Army, the American Red Cross, the Young Men's Christian Association and the Y.W.C.A., the Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts, Community Funds and a host of other service and philanthropic causes, is almost impossible to calculate.

While I have read the opinions of some tax experts that the results would be slight, I have found no one to question the judgment that the result would be injurious.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, it is possible to meet our Government's need for operating revenues without injury to the organizations and institutions which are the backbone of American conscience and community service.

I am opposed to this proposal.

On April 29, I made that opposition a matter of official record in a letter to Chairman WILBUR MILLS of the House Committee on Ways and Means. The text of the letter follows:

APRIL 29, 1963.

The Honorable WILBUR MILLS,
Chairman, House Committee on Ways and Means, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Since speaking to you personally on the subject of my opposition to pending proposals for reduction in the deduction allowance for religious and charitable contributions, I have done some research on one very important aspect of this matter which I feel sure will be of interest to you and your committee. In view of the general concern over our progress in the cold war and the need to do all in our power to advance constructive and beneficial programs in the undeveloped countries of the world, I believe special consideration should be given to the impact of this deduction cut upon the foreign missions of the churches of our country.

Dr. Charles Malik, the distinguished former Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Lebanon and 1959 President of the United Nations General Assembly, recently wrote:

"What has been the greatest American contribution to the rest of the world? Has it been money? Has it been medical skills? Has it been military might? Has it been industrial know-how? I can assure you that it has been none of those things.

"The greatest thing to come out of America has been the American missionary effort: the quiet, selfless men and women who left the comfort and security of their homeland to bring the Gospel of Christianity to less favored nations. In China, in India, in Africa, in the Middle East and in hundreds of far-off places, these obscure missionaries have been far more effective ambassadors than any of the money men or the agricultural experts or the industrial technicians."

This is not the judgment of an American clergyman, Mr. Chairman, but rather the firm conclusion of an experienced diplomat, statesmen and student of world affairs.

Without in any way downgrading the substantial achievements of many dedicated men and women in the oversea service of our Government, I have personally found much truth in Dr. Malik's conclusion. Long before the Marshall plan, long before the atoms-for-peace proposal, long before the Peace Corps and the Alliance for Progress (all of which have had my firm support), the American missionary effort was advancing the fundamental beliefs which have made our Nation great, and giving the world a living example of unselfish service and sacrifice for mankind.

How do we measure the value of this missionary effort? I know of no computer which can calculate it, and of no judgment in this capital of experts with the wisdom to evaluate it.

The Library of Congress tells me that more than 37,000 missionaries from American churches were known to be in foreign service in 1962.

The total number of missionaries from Protestant American churches—including those registered in 3 major mission associations and those reported by Protestant missions not affiliated with these associations—is stated in Missions Annual-1962 to be 28,951, backed up by 1,138 in home staff mission work.

United States Catholic oversea missionary personnel as of January 1, 1962—as reported by the Mission Secretariat in August of 1962—totaled 7,146, including all priests, brothers, nuns and lay personnel.

It is significant that the great majority of these missionaries, Catholic and Protestant alike, are serving in countries and areas we recognize as "undeveloped" or "underdeveloped" by modern economic and industrial standards. Most of them live and go about their life's work in regions of the deepest poverty and deadliest disease. They are a "people to people" movement in the finest sense of the term.

In Latin America, for example, are found more than 10,000 of our country's missionaries. The Southern Baptists alone have 513 missionaries in Latin America. Among the poverty-stricken Indians of Bolivia—to name only one deeply distressed country of that continent, where so many are distressed—215 Catholic missionaries from the United States served in 1962.

In Africa, an equally impressive number serve today. The American Lutheran Church reported 249 missionaries in Africa in 1962; two divisions of the Methodist Church reported 438 in Africa; the United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America reported 331 in the same year; Presbyterian Church in the United States, 149. From the Seventh Day Adventists, 410 were serving in Africa in 1962; the United Church of Christ reported 143; the Assemblies of God, 246. These are only a few examples of our impressive church representation in Africa.

The picture in the Far East, and in India, Pakistan, Ceylon, Nepal, and other distant lands, also reflects an impressive picture of American missionary effort. Catholic reports show 2,185 mission personnel in Asia in January, 1962. The Protestant Church total for the Far East totals 6,843 in the same year.

This effort, Mr. Chairman, is being supported by the churches of the United States.

The tax change under consideration would almost certainly reduce the ability of our churches to support and maintain this effort today. In my judgment, it could only bring comfort to those enemies of our country who scream "Yankee, go home."

I hope and trust it will be rejected.

Sincerely,

Ed Edmondson,
Member of Congress.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

THE PEACE ISSUE MAY RISE AGAIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDowell] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the noted political commentator, Gould Lincoln, writing in the Evening Star newspaper, Washington, D.C., of April 27, 1963, said that the peace issue may rise again, and with profound political results.

Gould Lincoln wrote that:

> Woodrow Wilson nearly half a century ago won reelection to the Presidency on the slogan "He kept us out of war." Political history may repeat itself once again when President John F. Kennedy next year runs for a second term in the White House. In 1916, Mr. Wilson was harshly denounced by Republican leaders—particularly former President Theodore Roosevelt—for not adopting a firmer policy toward Germany. President Kennedy is denounced today by Republicans for hesitation and vacillation in his policies toward Communist Cuba and its master, Russian Soviet Premier Khrushchev. Mr. Wilson was reelected—but that election did not keep us out of the First World War.

Mr. Gould Lincoln then drew this interesting parallel:

> If Mr. Kennedy is reelected, as many believe he will be, that too, may not keep us out of a third world war. But, as in the case of President Wilson, President Kennedy may reap the benefit of having kept us out of war with the Cuban and Russian Communists—unless hostilities shall have broken out between today and the 1964 national election.

Since Gould Lincoln is one of the ablest observers on the national scene, I include, as part of my remarks, his article to which I have referred.

I also include, as part of my remarks an excerpt from a broadcast over the American Broadcasting Co. national network system by Edward P. Morgan in which he declares that there is no quick, simple way to get rid of the Cuban problem. This excerpt was published in the AFL–CIO News of April 27, 1963.

Finally, I include an article by Willard Shelton, managing editor of the AFL–CIO News, commenting on the Cuban issue.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, April 27, 1963]

The Peace Issue May Rise Again

(By Gould Lincoln)

Woodrow Wilson nearly half a century ago won reelection to the Presidency on the slogan, "He kept us out of war." Political history may repeat itself once again when President John F. Kennedy next year runs for a second term in the White House. In 1916, Mr. Wilson was harshly denounced by Republican leaders—particularly former President Theodore Roosevelt—for not adopting a firmer policy toward Germany. President Kennedy is denounced today by Republicans for hesitation, vacillation in his policies toward Communist Cuba and its master, Russian Soviet Premier Khrushchev. Mr. Wilson was reelected—but that election did not keep us out of the First World War.

If Mr. Kennedy is reelected, as many believe he will be, that, too, may not keep us out of a third world war. But, as in the case of President Wilson, President Kennedy may reap the benefit of having kept us out of war with the Cuban and Russian Communists—unless hostilities shall have broken out between today and the 1964 national election.

When Mr. Wilson was renominated by a Democratic National Convention in St. Louis, Gov. Martin Glynn, of New York, spoke eloquently of the Wilson policy of neutralism to keep us of of war. "This policy," said Governor Glynn, "may not satisfy * * * the fire-eaters or the swashbucklers, but it does satisfy the mothers of the land at whose hearth and fireside no jingoistic war has placed an empty chair." And William Jennings Bryan, who earlier had been Wilson's Secretary of State, but was attending the convention as a newspaper reporter, when called upon to speak by a roaring mass of delegates, said: "I agree with the American people in thanking God we have a President who has kept us—who will keep us—out of war."

CAN FORECAST SPEECHES

President Kennedy is now being shot at by the Republican leaders, including Governor Rockefeller, of New York; Senator Barry Goldwater, and former Vice President Nixon, of California. He is hailed by his supporters for calmness and patience—for his watchful waiting—a policy adopted in those earlier days by Woodrow Wilson. They—and the President himself—demand to know if his critics are urging that we invade Cuba and run the risk of an atomic war with Russia. And if the peace, even an uneasy peace, continues, it is easy to forecast the speeches at the next Democratic National Convention, aclaiming him in words similar to those used in praise of Mr. Wilson in 1916.

Mr. Wilson's tactics, his firm notes to Germany, many in number, his demands upon the warring powers to let the United States frame for them a peace without victory were unavailing. Finally the German announcement that there would be unrestricted submarine warfare, after repeated sinkings of our merchant vessels, brought President Wilson to Congress with his demand for a declaration of war.

SHOWED WILLINGNESS

President Kennedy's problem with Cuba and world communism is vastly different from Woodrow Wilson's problems with the Central Powers. But in Wilson's day, this country was unprepared for war. Today, the United States is the most powerful Nation in the world because of its arms and its resources. In Wilson's day the war was far from our shores, threatened only by submarine attack. Today, because of the deadly change in arms, war may be at our doors. The Kaiser in 1916 did not understand our willingness to fight. President Kennedy showed that willingness when he amassed huge naval, air, and land forces on the Atlantic coast and threatened to use them if the Russians did not withdraw their nuclear missiles from Cuba. And Khrushchev backed away.

In the last 6 months, there has been swelling criticism of the President, among Americans and now among the Cuban exiles in this country, because of what appears to be only a waiting policy—waiting for something to turn up to the disadvantage of Fidel Castro and his Communist government. President Kennedy answers these criticisms with statements of the economic pressures he and other nations of the free world, including Latin America, are placing on Castro's Cuba, as well as this country's determination, along with Latin American republics, to prevent Communist incursion and subversion in our sister nations to the south of us.

There remains the hard fact, however, that Soviet Russia has and retains a Communist base in the Western Hemisphere, and millions of Americans do not like it, any more than the millions of Americans who did not like the sinking of American ships by German submarines in 1916.

There Is No Quick, Cheap Way To Get Rid of the Cuban Problem

(This column is excerpted from the nightly broadcasts of Edward P. Morgan, ABC commentator sponsored by the AFL–CIO. Listen to Morgan over the ABC network Monday through Friday at 7 p.m. d.s.t.)

(By Edward P. Morgan)

President Kennedy cleared the air slightly in the Cuban crisis but so brooding and beclouded has the atmosphere become that the issue drags on, distracting our attention and our energies from larger problems. There is nothing magnificent about our obsession with Castro. We seem at times to be so utterly hypnotized by the subject that nothing else matters. Unfortunately, as we should have sense enough to know, the end of communism in Cuba, when it comes, will still leave us with almost the same bulging bagful of worries that we had before.

What we forget, or refuse to remember, is that there is no cheap, quick way to get rid of the Cuban problem. The President reminded the country of that in his question-and-answer session with the American Society of Newspaper Editors exactly 2 years minus 1 day after he had to report to the same group on the tragic fiasco at the Bay of Pigs, which is perhaps still the greatest and most painful mistake of his administration.

The curious, cutting irony of the situation is that the country was, by all appearances, more solidly behind the President in the anguish of the affair for which he shouldered the blame, than it is now in the wake of his October triumph of forcing Khrushchev to dismantle the Soviet offensive missile threat.

Why has Kennedy's success in his grave test of will with Moscow become so blurred in less than 6 months that it is almost forgotten in the angry allegations and swirling anxieties that remain? There are several ingredients to the answer. One is, I suspect, that we Americans have come to regard the Cuban problem not only as a threat to our security but an affront to our honor. Rather in the manner of a wronged husband we are demanding not only justice but vengeance for the deception. That attitude in turn has made us especially receptive to the dramatic and not always responsible criticisms of the administration's Cuban policy.

But the administration itself surely must share the blame for the befuddlement. For though Government policy, as the President told the editors, does not embrace either invasion or blockade under present circumstances, some of the administration's actions, or at least its gestures, have encouraged the conclusion that sometime, somehow, we would stage some kind of repeat of the charge up San Juan Hill. Though the President declared that nobody in the Government ever promised exile leaders or anybody else that the United States would launch another invasion of Cuba, the administration apparently never made that crystal clear.

Indeed the tone if not the substance of Kennedy's ASNE speech 2 years ago was that of a man determined to see that wrongs were righted. And the President's appearance before the ransomed freedom fighters in Miami's Orange Bowl last December 29 was so drenched with emotion, so choked with the gorge of militant patriotism that his embrace of the social revolutionary principles behind the Alliance for Progress and his implied warning that reactionaryism must not be returned to Cuba, these vital aspects of his speech went virtually unnoticed.

It was almost as if the administration, committed to an undramatic course of increasing multiple pressures against Castro, couldn't bear to renounce completely the romantic course of a war of liberation.

Admittedly the feuding factions among the Cuban exiles have been exceedingly hard to deal with. Exiles always are. It remains to be seen whether the withdrawal of Dr. Jose Miro Cardona from the leadership of the Cuban Revolutionary Council will make U.S. relations with the exiles any more realistic. Our embarrassing fact is that a large number of the exiles in Florida are not really interested in the social reforms called for under the Alliance for Progress and do not recognize the delay in democratizing Cuba gave a major assist to the Communist takeover.

One thing is clear. The Cuban issue, having been complicated by politics, will become an increasingly dangerous political issue in the 1964 presidential campaign unless the administration can restore with the consistent and candid execution of its policy the public confidence it has lost since the triumph of last fall.

It is true that the President has said before that there is an issue here larger than Cuba, and it is the security and welfare of the hemisphere.

But he will have to say it again and he will have to explain again, to North Americans and South Americans alike, that the removal of a Communist regime in Cuba does not in itself guarantee the salvation of the hemisphere—that indeed one of the best ways to assure a short life for Castroism is to quicken the peaceful social revolution in the rest of Latin America which the Alliance for Progress stands for, and without which free societies in our Pan American neighborhood will fall.

IT'S YOUR WASHINGTON

(By Willard Shelton)

One of the mysteries in this country is the emphasis devoted by the daily press to such a speech as former Vice President Nixon gave on the Cuba issue to the American Society of Newspaper Editors. The play was big and splashy.

Mr. Nixon was beaten for the Presidency in 1960, although narrowly. He was beaten again, not so narrowly, when he ran for Governor of his home State of California last year. He renounced future political races, in a welter of self-pity and despair, in a press conference ranting at the political reporters whom he accused of disliking him personally.

No realistic reporter took Nixon at his word and wrote him off as a Republican figure. He has long-established connections within the party, including its money givers; he might easily come to occupy a role such as that which former Governor Dewey played in 1952 in floor-managing the bitter convention fight to take the Republican nomination away from Senator Taft and name General Eisenhower for the race.

But Nixon's Cuba speech was a type with the sloganeering of the early Eisenhower years, when there was talk of unleashing Chiang Kai-shek on Taiwan to invade mainland China.

Nixon favored a new freedom doctrine. He favored some kind of unleashing of the Cuban exiles whose hit-and-run raids on Soviet shipping obviously might involve this country in a confrontation with the Soviet Union not at our choice of time and nature. He wanted to apply only the minimum force needed to uproot Castro's regime, but also whatever action is necessary to reduce the Soviet beachhead in Cuba.

This is mere verbalizing without content. So was Nixon's further comment that the Kennedy policy toward the Soviet Union is one of containment. As a matter of strict fact, the Eisenhower policy for 8 years was precisely that—containment—and it began with an armistice in Korea accepting division of the country because Mr. Eisenhower saw no other way to end the shooting.

Responsible Democrats recognized this and did not hamper Mr. Eisenhower with partisan and vain attacks. And it passes understanding that the daily press should treat a partisan Nixon speech as if it were the profound utterance of a rising party leader.

It must be acknowledged, parenthetically, that the editors tried first to get a fresh Republican voice—such as Governor Rockefeller or Governor Scranton, of Pennsylvania, or Governor Romney, of Michigan—as the chief GOP spokesman, and settled for Nixon when the others preferred not to expose themselves in April 1963 to a national editors' audience.

ISRAEL

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. **FARBSTEIN**. Mr. Speaker, I released a letter today that I sent to the President on April 19 of this year, which reads as follows:

> DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On April 5 I wrote to Secretary of State Rusk declaring my alarm of the report of German scientists helping the United Arab Republic in the production of rockets which could lead to war. In reply thereto, I received an answer from Averell Harriman, Under Secretary for Political Affairs. Copies of both letters are attached hereto.
>
> Mr. Harriman seems to suggest that an arms balance is being reached in the Near East; hence, a hands-off approach is required. What is completely disregarded is the U.A.R. employment of German scientists to develop an offensive missile capacity which, together with population, geographic and financial factors, creates an imbalance imperiling the very existence of Israel. I might also add that Egypt, Syria, and Iraq, in a communique issued in Cairo, April 17, formally pledged the new U.A.R. will liberate Palestine.
>
> Although Mr. Harriman states in his letter that this country has a "deep and continuing interest in the security of Israel," the same is canceled, in my opinion, by the apparent negative position taken by him.
>
> I am concerned lest the hands-off approach of Mr. Harriman lend encouragement to Mr. Nasser or be interpreted to mean tacit approval of the hiring of German scientists and the development of offensive weapons.
>
> I urge you, therefore, Mr. President, to clarify our country's policy regarding the security of Israel.

I trust I shall shortly receive an answer from the administration that will clarify its position in connection with this deplorable situation in the Middle East. We have previously taken a position with relation to the security of Israel, and I do not believe there will be a change in that position.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the existence of Israel is very important to the world, because the existence of Israel and the security of Israel negates a possible war, a possible conflagration in that area. You have all been reading about the possible revolution taking place in Jordan, and I feel that Israel has taken the position that the presence of the United Arab Republic in Jordan will put a gun to the head of Israel. So, Israel cannot permit this situation to exist.

I therefore say, let us not be too disturbed until we hear from the President or until we hear from the administration as to the position that the administration takes in connection with the situation in that area.

Mr. **O'HARA** of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **FARBSTEIN**. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. **O'HARA** of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege and my pleasure and to my immeasurable profit to serve with the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] on the Committee on Foreign Affairs for a number of years. The gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Illinois always have stood together in stout friendship for Israel. Together we have authored and fought in our committee for Israel and for Israel's right to free and unhampered access to international waterways. During the years of my close association with LEONARD FARBSTEIN I have come to know him as one of the ablest members of the committee.

I am very happy to say that, as the gentleman will recall, our committee has been almost unanimous if not entirely unanimous in the support of Israel as matters have come up. Israel is very close to the interests of the United States. If Israel should fall, that fall would mark a tragedy in history.

I regret that there has been a partisan approach to the present situation that deeply concerns us. I am referring now to some of the remarks of the gentleman from New York who spoke under the previous special order. The gentleman is among my close personal friends and I appreciate the emotions under which he spoke. I am sure it was not his intention to place the sacred cause of Israel in a partisan political arena.

I have served under three Presidents, one Republican and two Democrats, and in all three administrations friendship for and defense of Israel, even to the extent that under no circumstances will we permit Israel to fall, has been part of the foreign policy of the United States. I have heard, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] has heard Mr. Secretary Dulles make that statement as well as other Secretaries of State without exception in all three administrations. Why, at this late hour, in this period of danger, an effort should be made to bring the Israeli question into the area of partisan politics is beyond my ability to understand.

Mr. Speaker, I have complete confidence in President Kennedy. I know that President Kennedy is the friend of Israel. I have faith that President Kennedy's greatest ambition is to bring permanent peace to this troubled world. I have the utmost confidence in Secretary of State Rusk and for the former great Governor of the great State of New York, Averell Harriman. I have the same feeling that possessed many millions of Americans when they thought he would make a great President of the United States.

So, in this grave matter that has come up, the solution of which we must find in reason as well as in strength, I do not like aspersions being cast for partisan reasons on our President and a dedicated Secretary of State and on a great former Governor of New York, Averell Harriman.

Mr. Speaker, as far as Africa is concerned, no country in Africa wants any part even of the cold war. Occasionally even our allies do things that embarrass us.

Mr. Speaker, I can think of no greater harm done to the interests of the West in Africa than when France exploded an atomic bomb over the Sahara Desert. Therefore, anything that might be done on the part of Egypt or on the part of anybody else to bring into Africa an armed conflict will be repudiated by the nations and the peoples of Africa and will bring upon the instigator a mountain of crushing disapproval.

Mr. Speaker, certainly there should not be permitted to be built up an armed force with the design of the destruction of Israel. It is unthinkable. If it should reach a pass where such a force had been built up and an effort was made to destroy Israel by armed force, then without any question of doubt we are going to have world war III. Make no mistake about that. The United States cannot permit the destruction of Israel by armed force, and I think in that respect I am speaking the sentiments of all the American people. Israel stands for that for which we stand, for our way of life. It is the one country in all of that area that has our spirit and our purpose and our determination. Any effort to destroy Israel by arms will force our country to resort to arms itself. And, if that should come, we will have world war III.

Now, to prevent that, men of good hearts and of good minds and the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, the Assistant Secretary of State for Political Matters, Governor Harriman, are working at this time to prevent that happening which would bring on world war III and at the same time to protect to the utmost the security of Israel. I think we serve our country, the State of Israel, and the free world best by letting them know that they have our confidence and our support as long as the guide is reason and the goal the permanent security of the State of Israel in a world of peace.

I am satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that all the American people stand with our President, our Secretary of State, and Governor Harriman in protection of the security of Israel and in determination that Israel shall not be destroyed, while at the same time preventing the bringing on of an incident that could trigger world war III that will destroy, if it comes, Israel, Russia, Egypt, Western civilization, all of humanity. So, I have no misgivings as to the intention of this administration to protect in every possible way, and in case it becomes necessary, by force of arms, the independence and the life of the brave State of Israel. I suggest again that politics ends at the ocean line. The problems that beset us in the most critical period of the world's history will not be solved in the climate of partisan speechmaking.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding to me. In my book the gentleman is tops in statesmanship, in vision, and of dedicated service to America and to Israel.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his very fine contribution.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York yield to me?

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I would be very pleased to yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from New York, my colleague and friend [Mr. FARBSTEIN], for his very fine statement, and to join with the gentleman in the sentiments that he has expressed.

Mr. Speaker, it is always easy when one is a member of a legislative body—and we have seen some examples of it perhaps on this floor and in the other body in recent weeks—to seem to have an easy solution to some of the difficult problems of the world and to come up with an easy and simple answer and to berate those in positions of responsibility for not having followed the action that seemed to be so simple and easy to the individual legislator who was proposing it.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the situation in the Middle East is a highly complex one. I would certainly yield to no one in my concern over the military buildup that has been going on in Egypt and the activities of German scientists and aviation engineers that have been reported as taking place in Egypt. As a matter of fact, I reported this information to the House several weeks ago and, just as the gentleman from New York did, I brought this to the attention of the Department of State and the Department of Defense and asked them to check into these statements and see whether they were true and to advise me of the course that the Government should take.

I might advise the Members of the House, Mr. Speaker, that I have received replies from both the Secretary of State and from the Secretary of Defense on this subject, in effect substantially confirming the serious information that came to my attention about the extent of German scientific participation in trying to build up both a missile capacity and a high-performance jet aircraft capacity in the United Arab Republic.

I regard this, as does the gentleman from New York, as a matter of most serious concern. The letters I got back from the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense indicated that this was by no means taken lightly by the Department of State or by the Department of Defense.

I think that the gentleman from Illinois who spoke here so eloquently a moment ago hit the nail on the head when he said that the basic policy of our Government is certainly to defend the independence of Israel. I do not expect the leaders of our Government or the Department of State to outline in detail publicly all of the steps that they are going to take, any more than I would demand, as some members of the other body have recently been demanding, that we should detail everything that we are going to do to knock Castro off his seat down in Cuba. But I accept the commitment that our President made in his press conference the other day. The answers which I have received and which I have made known to the press from the Department of State and the Department of Defense have made clear the deep concern which our Government has for stability in the Middle East. I would subscribe to what the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. O'HARA, said that when the chips are down there is no question about where we stand. I feel confident that the policy of our Government is going to be directed in ways that will defend the independence of Israel and will prevent Nasser and his Egyptian Government from jeopardizing that independence in any way.

But because this is a diplomatic matter and because we cannot invade these countries, certainly right off the bat, I do not think we can expect the executive branch to give us all of the confidential details as to how this policy is being implemented.

I want to join with the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] in expressing my conviction that certainly our policy must be directed toward the independence of Israel, toward building up its strength and its ability to defend itself.

We have got to face with great concern the developments that are taking place in the United Arab Republic. But I, too, feel confident that the policy of our President is the policy that we are going to follow. I still cannot forget that it was under the previous administration that the effort on the part of Israel to defend itself against aggression by the United Arab Republic and by Mr. Nasser was aborted by the leadership taken by the executive branch of this Government.

I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman for yielding to me on this matter.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] for his fine contribution.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HALPERN. First, Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment and extend my sincere commendations to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] for his concern and for his invaluable activity and contributions in this field.

I regret, Mr. Speaker, that there has been any interpretation of partisanship taken from any of my remarks. In my comments I emphasized that there is no question—no question whatsoever—of political partisanship on this issue. This is not a Democrat or a Republican issue. It is a matter on which all Americans should be concerned. I stated that I was equally as outspoken—and I repeat—I was equally as outspoken during the previous administration when I felt State Department policy was wrong. I shall continue to speak out when I feel our policy is wrong. I shall not commit the sin of remaining quiet. That is my obligation, Mr. Speaker, as a Member of this House and as an American citizen. And I know the distinguished gentleman from New York will continue to speak his mind as he has done so effectively in the past when his conscience calls on him to do so. So too, I pray, will all the Members of this Congress regardless of party affiliation. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that this was beautifully exemplified in the other body today when so many Senators of both parties spoke out so protestingly and forcefully on this same issue—U.S. policy in the Near East.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I want to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] for his contribution.

I might say that I feel that certainly peace in the Near East and possibly peace in the world is not the subject of politics. I feel we are too deeply involved and it is too serious a subject for anyone to engage in partisan politics.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. RYAN of New York. I, too, want to join in supporting the sentiments which have been expressed this afternoon by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN], who serves on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and who has brought to the attention of the House the fact that he has asked for clarification of administration policy. I believe very firmly that we must, all of us, be committed to the preservation of peace in the Near East and to the preservation of the State of Israel.

Yesterday on the 15th anniversary of the State of Israel I pointed out that Israel today is surrounded by hostile neighbors and there is a real threat which must be faced in that area. I certainly hope that the State Department and the administration will make every effort to urge upon the Government of West Germany the removal of the scientists who are presently reported to be in Egypt working on rocketry there. I certainly believe that this House and Members on both sides of the aisle will firmly and constantly express their full support for the State of Israel and its independence.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

In closing, I would say that I expect that the alarm that has been expressed here this afternoon in connection with the Arab-Israel situation will be dispelled when I receive a reply from the administration to the last letter that I wrote to the President on April 19, 1963.

NEW HAMPSHIRE LOTTERY LAW

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, this is a happy and joyful day for the people in the State of New Hampshire. As everyone has learned by now, the Governor of the State of New Hampshire has signed a lottery bill for that State.

This represents a victory for the people of New Hampshire as well as for me. It points up the fact that my efforts for the establishment of a national lottery here in Congress have at last been recognized. The adoption of this proposal by the State of New Hampshire has broken the ice in the United States.

The New Hampshire Legislature and Governor King are to be congratulated for their courage and wisdom in resisting the strenuous objections from the bluenoses and hypocrites in responding to the wishes of the people of that State.

Now that the State of New Hampshire has recognized that the urge to gamble is a part of human nature and that this universal human trait should be regulated and controlled, I hope that the Members of this House will show equal wisdom and courage.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CLARK (at the request of Mr. BARRETT), on account of illness in the family.

Mr. CHENOWETH, for the balance of the week, on account of official business with Board of Visitors to the Air Force Academy.

Mr. DENT (at the request of Mr. NIX), for the balance of the week, on account of illness.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina (at the request of Mr. ASHMORE), for the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. PELLY, for today, on account of official business.

Mr. SCOTT (at the request of Mr. BONNER), for the remainder of the week, on account of illness in the family.

Mr. FLYNT, for May 1 and 2, 1963, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. EDMONDSON, for 10 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. McDOWELL (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 15 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HEMPHILL (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 1 hour, on Tuesday, May 7, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FARBSTEIN, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. MACGREGOR), for 15 minutes, on Thursday, May 2, 1963.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BAKER, and to include a speech by Mr. CURTIS.

Mr. FOGARTY, and to include extraneous matter while in the Committee of the Whole on H.R. 5888.

Mr. HORTON.

Mr. MICHEL, while in the Committee of the Whole on H.R. 5888 and to include tables and extraneous matter.

Mr. LAIRD (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), to include tables and extraneous matter, while in Committee of the Whole on H.R. 5888.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. MACGREGOR), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. JOHANSEN.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances, in one of which to include a table.

Mr. MACGREGOR in four instances.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. STEED in two instances.

(The following members (at the request of Mr. RYAN of New York) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KASTENMEIER.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 1, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

753. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed amendment to the budget for fiscal year 1964 involving a decrease in the amount of $2,622,000 for the Department of the Interior to defer construction of irrigation facilities on the Seedskadee participating project pending final recommendations of the Wyoming reclamation projects survey team. (H. Doc. 109); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

754. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting cost ascertainment report for fiscal year 1962, as authorized by 39 U.S.C. 2331; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

755. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report relative to authority for reprograming certain allocated funds so as to provide for additional facilities at Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Ala., and Edwards Air Force Base, Calif., pursuant to section 3 of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act for the fiscal year 1963 (76 Stat. 383); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

756. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to allow a deduction or credit against tax for contributions to national and State political committees"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. POFF: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 390. Joint resolution authorizing the Attorney General to cancel deportation proceedings in the cases of certain aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 268. Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOULTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 5945. A bill to establish a procedure for the prompt settlement, in a democratic manner, of the political status of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H.R. 5946. A bill to establish a procedure for the prompt settlement, in a democratic manner, of the political status of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 5947. A bill to establish a procedure for the prompt settlement, in a democratic manner, of the political status of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H.R. 5948. A bill to establish a procedure for the prompt settlement, in a democratic manner, of the political status of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H.R. 5949. A bill to consent to the amendment by the States of Colorado and New Mexico of the Costilla Creek compact; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 5950. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend for corporations the period for the carryover of excess charitable contributions and to provide for a carryback of excess charitable contributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 5951. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that full benefits (when based upon the attainment of retirement age) will be payable to men at age 60 and to women at age 55; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 5952. A bill directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Kansas to the State of Kansas Forestry, Fish, and Game Commission; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 5953. A bill to amend section 4216(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the determination of constructive sale price for purposes of applying manufacturers excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 5954. A bill to authorize the conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a certain island in the Yellowstone River to the State of Montana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 5955. A bill to establish the Department of Urban Affairs and prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 5956. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5957. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 5958. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to give its protection to employees of certain large hotels, motels, restaurants, and laundries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WATTS:

H.R. 5959. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend for corporations the period for the carryover of excess charitable contributions and to provide for a carryback of excess charitable contributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H.R. 5960. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 5961. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide coverage for employees of nursing and convalescent homes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 5962. A bill to amend section 6(o) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to provide an exemption from induction for the sole surviving son of a family whose father died as a result of military service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 5963. A bill to amend section 18 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide free transportation on any railroad carrier subject to that act for individuals receiving pensions or annuities under that act, and for their dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 5964. A bill to provide for the inclusion of Hopkins County, Tex., within the Paris Division of the Eastern District for the U.S. District Courts in Texas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 5965. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 5966. A bill to clarify paragraph 4 of section 15 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 368); to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 5967. A bill to provide that those persons entitled to retired pay or retainer pay under the Career Compensation Act of 1949 who were prohibited from computing their retired pay or retainer pay under the rates provided by the act of May 20, 1958, shall be entitled to have their retired pay or retainer pay recomputed on the rates of basic pay provided by the act of May 20, 1958; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 5968. A bill to amend the Area Redevelopment Act to clarify the areas which may be designated as redevelopment areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 5969. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 5970. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce and to provide for the restitution of wages lost by employees by reason of any such discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 5971. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce and to provide for the restitution of wages lost by employees by reason of any such discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 5972. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce and to provide for the restitution of wages lost by employees by reason of any such discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 5973. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to make that act applicable to smoking products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. AVERY:

H.R. 5974. A bill directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Kansas to the State of Kansas Forestry, Fish, and Game Commission; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 5975. A bill to provide Government transportation on a space available basis to certain members of the Glassboro State College International Relations Group; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 5976. A bill to amend section 102 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MACGREGOR:

H.R. 5977. A bill to amend section 502 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 relating to the reporting of foreign currencies expended by Members of Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SIBAL:

H. Res. 328. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 5978. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Eduvigis Aran Heffernan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 5979. A bill for the relief of Frederick Henry Todd; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5980. A bill for the relief of Vincent S. Lukas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 5981. A bill for the relief of Andreas P. Visvardis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H.R. 5982. A bill for the relief of Peter Palermo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 5983. A bill for the relief of Dr. Juan Alberto Oleaga Ruiz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5984. A bill for the relief of Maria Freni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Address by Hon. Thomas B. Curtis Before the 18th Annual Convention of the National Limestone Institute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOWARD H. BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Congressional Record I include the very fine speech made by Congressman Thomas B. Curtis, of Missouri, before the 18th Annual Convention of the National Limestone Institute, Inc., which gives a clear picture of the fiscal situation of the U.S. Government as it relates to the proposal to cut taxes at this time.

The speech follows:

Address by Congressman Thomas B. Curtis, of Missouri, Before the 18th Annual Convention of the National Limestone Institute, Inc.

It's a pleasure to have the opportunity of talking with a group like this on probably one of the most crucial issues that's going to face the 88th Congress. It's been played up in the press, as everyone is well aware, this question of tax cut. And I don't think there's any question that everyone in this country would like to see a tax cut. Unfortunately, whether or not to cut taxes isn't the sole issue. It's important, I think, that we get this entire fiscal question in context, in order to understand what we're going to face.

Probably the easiest way to get it into context is to discuss a little about the priorities that are going to exist as far as legislation coming before the House of Representatives, as reported by the Ways and Means Committee. I mention the House of Representatives rather than the Senate, because tax measures, revenue measures, must originate in the House of Representatives, and is one reason why the Ways and Means Committee becomes of key importance.

The President, in his budget message, said that one of the first measures that this Congress was going to have to act upon was to continue the temporary $308 billion ceiling on the Federal debt. The Ways and Means Committee is the committee that has to consider where we get the revenues to pay our bills. If we don't get them from taxation, we have to get them from selling bonds. The so-called debt limitation bill is really not a debt limitation. Its correct title is the Amendments to the Liberty Loan Act. The so-called debt ceiling is descriptive of how much and of what kind of bonds—obligations of the United States—that may be outstanding at any given time. It is the outstanding obligations that are referred to when they talk about the debt ceiling. The law allows at the present time $308 billion of bonds that can be outstanding representing the debt. The actual total debt obligations of the United States may be more because all such obligations are not subject to the limit. Incidentally, the $308 billion ceiling was put on a temporary basis last year, and is automatically to revert to $285 billion on July 1, 1963, with intermediate adjustments. So, it's very obvious in light of the budget that has been presented to us, that we are going to have to do something about this debt ceiling almost immediately as a first order of business.

The President also said in his budget message, that sometime around July or August, he will have computed what the debt ceiling is going to have to be for 1964, and this session of Congress is going to have to do something about that. He has estimated around $315 billion, and actually, I think a realistic guess would be around $320 billion. Now, here's a problem that faces the Congress, the representatives of the people. What do we do in this deficit financing atmosphere to handle the Federal debt involving a rollover of around $90 billion a year of maturing bond refinancing? Fortunately, the Treasury has done a fairly good job of anticipating bond maturities so we only have about $60 to $70 billion to refinance. Add to this refinancing problem the problem of marketing, if we're going to have a $10 billion deficit, or you're going to have a $10 billion tax cut, marketing this additional $10 billion plus of new bonds necessitated by new deficits and a possible tax cut.

One of the arguments the Executive presents to us is that tax cutting is necessary to stimulate our economy. I don't think anyone could be more in favor of tax reforms than myself. I have been trying to point out the need for lower taxes for many, many years, and so have others. The real damage that is being caused to our economy and to our business opportunities is due to this high tax rate structure. But, when we point this need out we have also tried to point out that in order to accomplish tax reduction we have to get our Federal expenditures down to a point of manageable size. We have to control spending so that when we talk in terms of tax cuts we are not talking about financing a tax cut by a new bond issue. Because, all a bond is is deferred tax increases.

A question I have asked Dr. Heller, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, Secretary Dillon of the Treasury, and other witnesses of the executive branch who appeared before us last August when we were talking about a "quickie" tax cut to stimulate the economy is—"What is the impact on the economy when we give $10 billion back to the private sector in the way of cut taxes, and then market $10 billion of bonds to finance that cut? Can we take the same amount back?" Well, Dr. Heller in effect replied: "I don't expect you to sell the bonds to the private sector. I expect the Federal Reserve System to absorb a good portion of them." I asked Dr. William McChesney Martin, Chairman of the Federal Reserve, the same question, and he said: "Well, we can't handle this kind of bond. You put this additional amount in the Federal Reserve System, and all you're doing is monetizing the debt, you're just printing more money."

This raises the danger of what will inflation do to our economy? These are not easy questions. Yes, I'd like to be able to tell this group and other groups around the country, "Let's go to it. We're going to cut taxes." But, if we cut taxes without cutting expenditures, we run into debt management problems, and I am very concerned over this impact of additional problems in the field of debt management on our balance-of-payment problem. We don't owe this debt just to ourselves. The nationals and governments of foreign countries—people abroad own over $20 billion of our dollar obligations. What's going to be the impact on those people and their willingness to hold our debt? Are they going to buy more of these bonds? Will they create a market or will they demand gold?

Last August the Treasury offered $750 million, 30-year bonds, 4¼ percent, the highest return that we've ever offered, and we sold $250 million worth. Sure we're selling a lot of E-bonds to our people, but our people are cashing in more E-bonds than they're buying. Now, has our country come to the point where we're not willing to face up to these problems? I begin to wonder when I read the press. I've said what I'm saying here, for months now, and, if there happens to be any press here, they'll quote me and say that Congressman Curtis said that tax reform is very necessary and is right in line with the President's request for tax reform. They forget that what I've been saying all along is that this must be in a context with expenditure reform at the same time as tax rate reform, unless somebody has a new idea, a new way, whereby you can just continue marketing bonds without creating these impacts.

Let me turn to a little brighter page, in one sense. The theory on which the administration has promoted this concept of tax reform is that deficit financing actually will stimulate an economy. That Federal expenditures by the political bureaucracy with its alleged better understanding of what and how money should be spent will stimulate the economy. Well, this is the old New Deal theory, except that the New Deal never urged tax reduction. This concept of deficits may have had some validity in a society which has an economy based on the laws of scarcity. But, today our society, the first society in history, is moving into an economy where plenty is the problem, not scarcity. I don't say we are there yet; but this very group that I'm talking to will recognize what I'm saying, because in the agriculture sector, what would happen if you increased consumer purchasing power? Would we increase demand for agricultural goods and services? You increase consumer purchasing power which is automatically converted into consumer demand; the consumer demand for the goods and services increases the utilization of our plant and that employs more people. Now, are we going to utilize more of our agricultural plant if we increase consumer purchasing power? I think it's very clear that we are not going to do a thing in this great field of agriculture with its surpluses by increasing consumer purchasing power. Our doctors actually are telling us to eat less, not more, and we have a deliberate Government policy to close down some of our agricultural plant.

The argument is made that if we create a bigger deficit by cutting taxes that we will not let loose the forces of inflation because we have idle plant capacity, and we have men who are unemployed. It is argued that you do not create inflation by putting more purchasing power out. Let's relate that again to agriculture. Would some of the lands that are now being put out of production be restored to production? Would some of the people who are now, and have been since this country was established, going out of agriculture as an employment pursuit return to agriculture? People will agree with my use of the agriculture example but will say: look at steel which is operating at 60 percent of capacity. What would happen if we increased consumer purchasing power at a time when we are having in many respects a record-breaking year? For 2 years in a row automobiles and construction, two of the great users of steel, are at these high levels. I suggest that this idle steel plant capacity is not in demand and would not be in demand even at a higher consumer demand because it is a capacity that is obsolete. Look what steel did this year with a 60-percent plant capacity utilization, it spent well over a billion dollars building more plant. More plant to produce the kind of steel for which they had the plants? No. This billion dollars is to produce a very thin steel sheet so that they can compete with plastics and other metals such as aluminum, that are moving into the markets that steel once held.

These are the problems of rapid economic growth, not of a tired, sick economy going nowhere. You don't have obsolete equipment and obsolete skills in a tired economy. If your economy is going nowhere, you have no change. Whatever your occupation is, it is still useable. It's only when your economy is growing rapidly that you have this increased obsolescence of plant and equipment. And so these are some of the problems, gentlemen, that underlie this issue of whether or not to cut taxes that is before the Ways and Means Committee; and then it will move on to the floor of the House and to the Senate. Briefly on the subject of tax rate reform I would say that reducing the corporate tax rate from 52 percent to a rate of 49 percent or a 47-percent rate actually would produce more revenue, in my judgment, because we are now beyond the point of diminishing returns in the high rates. Now, that kind of reform can come at any time, and should come at the earliest possible time, but it follows a completely different economic philosophy from that which says that this tax reduction is going to release purchasing power to the private sector, or investment power if you want to use the money for investment. Support for the need to cut the corporate rate and the top bracket individual rates is on the theory that the tax rates themselves are so high that they produce diminishing returns. I think that if we can get some people to come along with that kind of thinking, we may come forward with some tax reform legislation.

Tax reform of the nature urged by the administration is going to take many months to develop if it is developed at all, because of the requirement that if we cut taxes, we have to compensate revenue-wise by closing what are called loopholes. Well, what is one man's loophole in another man's equity. And one of the most important areas that has been pointed out as a loophole is something that affects your industry. I refer to the depletion allowances. Is this allowance really a loophole? Actually, it's a differential, reflecting the fact that in the extractive industry, you are bringing out capital—a portion of what you dig out of the ground is depleting your capital asset, and under the 16th amendment capital recovery is not to be taxed as income. Depletion is necessary so that when you have depleted an ore body or mineral deposit, you can replace it and remain in business. But, if an attack on depletion is going to be the kind of reform that the administration urges or if the Treasury comes forward with the proposal to repeal the dividend credit, which was put into the tax laws in 1954, then there is serious doubt that there will be substantive tax reform this year.

I want to say just a word about this dividend credit and then close out my remarks. The dividend credit was put in the tax laws not to give a break to the investor at all. The issue is this. There are three ways a business can finance its growth. One is from retained earnings, another is from borrowing—either from a bank or debt financing—and the third way is through equity financing by floating new stock issues. The first two ways are taxed only once. Retained earnings have the corporate tax of 52 percent, but they do not get taxed against the individual holder, that is unless he wants to sell, and then it's only taxed at 25 percent. Certainly if you borrow from the bank to finance your growth, or issue bonds to finance growth, you deduct the interest that you pay from the income subject to the 52-percent corporate tax, and it's only taxable once. A new equity issue, the healthiest way, I might say, to finance growth, is taxed twice. It's taxed at the 52 percent, and then when the corporation declares the dividends, it's taxed at the personal income rates. And all we were trying to do in 1954 was to, in a small way, bring about a little equalization so that this form of financing was not put at a disadvantage with these other two methods.

But, you notice, and the only reason I use this to illustrate it, some of the complexities involved in some of these tax issues, particularly as you relate them to economics and you relate them to economic growth. The issue of tax reduction and reform is not anything that's going to be decided immediately. The area of tax reform is something that we should be in at all times. I have a number of bills introduced that I hope we can move forward on. One is a small business tax bill. I call it the seed corn bill. I was talking with a group this morning to see what chances there might be of moving this forward, and I told them this: "Don't lose hope, because once we open the door to reviewing our tax structure, we don't have to pursue the economic line that the administration has presented, which I do not agree with because it is based upon this concept of deficit financing." The kind of tax reform I am now advocating and discussing is always applicable. It is a matter of equity. It's a matter of specifics. In your industry you can point out that tax rates are impeding your economic growth. We have something to talk about when we deal with sound fiscal principles, sound economics, and sound tax policy. Under those conditions I think that we might have some good tax reform, even in this coming Congress, and that would be, I might say, with the help of people on both sides of the aisle.

Address by Senator Gaylord Nelson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday night, over 400 loyal Democrats of my district—the Second Congressional District of Wisconsin—gathered for their annual dinner. Featured speaker of the evening was one of the most well known of my constituents, Senator Gaylord Nelson. His address shows his continuing concern with the welfare of our citizens, a concern that inspired his highly successful tenure as Governor of Wisconsin and which will make him a particularly effective Member of the Senate. I include a press release and his speech in the Record at this point:

Press Release No. 22

Waukesha, Wis.—Senator Gaylord Nelson told Second Congressional District Democrats here Saturday night that America still has 40 to 50 million persons living in poverty.

Continued existence of such mass poverty corrodes democracy and proves that while conquering outer space, Government has failed to meet some of the simplest human problems, Nelson said.

"As the brilliant technology of our new society hurtles us into outer space and tames the cosmic wilderness, we may forget that this same advancing society has left behind a great mass of humanity for whom the new age promises but one thing—a bare existence in a life of poverty," Nelson said.

Nelson said that a number of studies of the poor had concluded that there were 40 to 50 million Americans earning less than $2,000 a year for a single person or $4,000 for a family of 4.

"They are the poor farmers, especially in marginal farming areas, who eke out an existence on $500 to $1,000 a year, unreached by a Federal farm program which pours $5 billion into our economy each year," Nelson said. "They are the migrant laborers; the unskilled and unorganized workers in offices, hotels, laundries, hospitals, and restaurants.

"They are the victims of automation in a strange industrial economy which marches forward at the same time that millions of workers slip backward. They are the residents of depressed areas. One-fourth of them are Negroes and Puerto Ricans.

"They are our senior citizens, an estimated 8 million of whom live in poverty and 1 million of whom live on less than $580 a year."

NELSON said these poor persons were largely unreached by Government programs designed for the purpose.

"Most of them do not qualify for unemployment compensation, workmen's compensation, social security, farm subsidies, or Federal loans," NELSON said. "And almost every time we pass a new Government program, we carefully exempt them.

"The urban renewal bulldozers knock down the homes of the poor and replace them with shiny new apartments for the middle class, and the poor are compressed even more tightly and more invisibly in some distant slum."

NELSON concluded: "If we consign a fourth of our people to a life of poverty in the midst of our own prosperity, we corrode democracy. And we confess that in solving the greatest problem of all—the maintenance of the dignity of our fellow men—we have not triumphed at all. We have failed."

ADDRESS TO SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT DINNER, ST. JOSEPH'S CHURCH, WAUKESHA, WIS., APRIL 27, 1963, HONORING REPRESENTATIVE ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

Mankind has entered the most challenging age in the history of human existence. Within our lifetimes, it now seems certain that America will shoot a man to the moon, and the fabulous mysteries of outer space, which have fascinated but eluded men for centuries, will be conquered by our own children. This age of breathtaking discovery should excite the minds of men everywhere and stand as a tribute to the power of human intelligence to solve the problems of the world.

Yet as the brilliant technology of our new society hurtles us into outer space and tames the cosmic wilderness, we may forget that this same advancing society has left behind a great mass of humanity for whom the new age promises but one thing—a bare existence in a life of poverty.

It seems old fashioned today to talk about the poor. Everyone knows that America is more prosperous than ever before. Everyone knowns that the New Deal of the 1930's, the war prosperity of the 1940's and the economic boom of the 1950's struck a massive blow against poverty in America. Imaginative government programs helped business back on its feet in the 1930's. Unemployment compensation protected men thrown out of work. Social security gave the aged a resource for the day the paychecks stopped. We are striving today to continue the gains of the New Deal: Area redevelopment loans are helping depressed areas; small business loans are encouraging the entrepreneur; and we are fighting to add hospital care to the benefit guaranteed the elderly.

But it is a sad fact that these great changes of the last 30 years—this inspiring demonstration of the power of the cooperative effort of our people—has not eliminated poverty. It has only concealed it.

The Bible says we will have the poor with us always. And they are with us today. The changes in our society have simply made them harder to see. What we have with us today has been described as "the invisible poor."

Are there really very many of them—enough to worry about? There are 40 to 50 million—one-fourth of the people of the richest nation on earth—not just uncomfortable but unable to get the mere necessities of life—living a shabby life of denial in what the New Yorker magazine has called a long vestibule on the way to death.

Who are they? They are the poor farmers, especially in marginal farming areas who eke out an existence on $500 to $1,000 a year, unreached by a Federal farm program which pours $5 billion into our economy each year.

They are the migrant laborers; the unskilled and unorganized workers in offices, hotels, laundries, hospitals, and restaurants. They are the victims of automation in a strange industrial economy which marches forward at the same time that millions of workers slip backward. They are the residents of depressed areas in the north, West Virginia, and the rural south. One-fourth of them are the Negroes and the Puerto Ricans—last to be hired and first to be fired—who get about half the average wage of a white man when they do find jobs.

They are our senior citizens, an estimated 8 million of whom live in poverty and 1 million of whom live on less than $580 a year.

And finally, they are our citizens with special problems—the handicapped, the alcoholic, the hillbillies who forsake their ancient society in the mountains for a life of confused poverty in the cities.

Why are they invisible?

Because the great American middle class, twice as big and twice as prosperous as before, has moved to the suburbs and left the poor behind in the central cities;

Because these 40 to 50 million Americans don't have powerful organizations to plead their cause;

Because their lives of grimy dullness don't make bright feature stories or technicolor movies;

Because old folks don't live with their children anymore but in upstairs rooms in gray old houses that are never written up in the beautiful magazines;

Because the rest of us have become so gay and so prosperous that we don't want to look at them.

Do they have problems? Well listen to these conclusions from a New Yorker review of several studies of the poor:

The very poor are four times as disabled by chronic illness as the well-to-do. Their illness is three times as likely to be psychiatric. If they do have a psychiatric problem, it is far more likely to be psychotic than neurotic—when compared with the well-to-do. They need hospital insurance the most, but they have it the least. They pay more taxes in proportion to income than do most of the rich. They have a drab social life. Most of our clubs are for the middle class and the well-to-do. Over one-third of the children of the poor don't go beyond the eighth grade, and probably will perpetuate the poverty of their parents.

Unlike the poor of the past, many of whom were new immigrants fired with hope for the future, the poor we have with us today are lacking in motivation and discouraged by the handicaps of age, race, environment, physical and mental defects.

But most of all, they are handicapped because they are a disorganized minority, without a spokesman, without a voice, without the means to bring their case to public attention.

The great Government programs which we have forged to meet their problems have met someone else's problems—but not theirs.

Most of them do not qualify for unemployment compensation or workmen's compensation or social security or farm subsidies or ARA or SBA loans. And almost every time we pass a new Government program—we carefully exempt them. When the fair labor standards act was broadened in 1961 it was deliberately drawn to exclude 483,000 laundry and dry cleaning employees. Even the pending hospital-care bill will exclude many because of its $90 deductible feature, which is 10 percent of the annual income of 3 million Americans. The urban renewal bulldozers knock down the homes of the poor and replace them with shiny new apartments for the middle class, and the poor are compressed even more tightly and more invisibly in some distant slum.

That is the face of America's poor which I wanted you to see. If you can't see them, I don't know who will. If we consign a fourth of our people to a life of poverty in the midst of our own prosperity we corrode democracy. And we confess that in solving the greatest problem of all—the maintenance of the dignity of our fellow men—we have not triumphed at all. We have failed.

Soviet Treaty Violations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, officials of the Soviet Union, from the 1917 Bolshevik revolution onward through 45 years of Communist rule, have established an undisputed reputation for breaking their most solemn pledges.

The Soviet regime's consistent viewpoint on the relative unimportance of promises is not restricted to its dealings with other countries, but extends with equal force to its relationships with the Russian people and the various minority groups which comprise the U.S.S.R.

Only 3 days after the November 7, 1917 revolution placed it in power, the Communist regime abolished freedom of the press as a privilege too dangerous to be entrusted to the people. The people were promised, however, that the decree would be rescinded just "as soon as the new regime took root." This 45-year-old promise notwithstanding, the order still applies today.

Other instances in which the Soviet Republic has broken faith with its own people are legion. The revolution of 1917 was carried out in the name of democracy, and ever since "democracy" has been one of the most frequently used words in the Communist lexicon. But while the Communists have capitalized on the word, they have radically altered its definition—from "government by the people" to "government for the good of the workers." Since the Communists keep for themselves the right to determine what is "good" for the workers, the Soviet definition of democracy in fact has become "government by Communists."

After 1917, the Russian people wanted not only democracy but its specific institutions: a constitution, a parliament, elections, a secret ballot, trade unions, and so forth. They were given all these things, but in name only.

The Soviet Constitution is an interesting document to read. However, it is violated or ignored by the regime as a matter of course. The Soviet parliament meets regularly, but it possesses neither power nor function. Elections are held every 4 years, but the single-slate ballot gives the voters no choice. A "secret ballot" is provided, but its purpose is to identify dissenters rather than protect them. Trade unions flourish, but only to make the worker more subservient to his employer, the state.

That promises mean next to nothing to the Communist official mind has been admitted by Soviet leaders:

> V. I. Lenin: "Promises are like pie crust, made to be broken." "It would be mad and criminal to tie one's hand by entering into an agreement of any permanence with anybody."
>
> J. V. Stalin: "Words have no relation to actions—otherwise what kind of diplomacy is it? Words are one thing, actions another. Good words are a mask for concealment of bad deeds. Sincere diplomacy is no more possible than dry water or wooden iron."
>
> G. E. Zinoviev (first head of the Communist International): "We are willing to sign an unfavorable peace—it would only mean that we should put no trust whatever in the piece of paper we should sign."

The Soviet Communist regime has entered into hundreds of international agreements. The accompanying table shows how well the Soviet leaders keep their promises when it no longer appears to be in their interest to do so. It is emphasized that the accompanying table is by no means complete. Hundreds of other agreements have been entered into by the Soviets and broken. The table is only illustrative:

ILLUSTRATIVE TABLE OF SOVIET TREATY VIOLATIONS

Important note: This table is illustrative only. It is by no means a complete tabulation of Soviet treaty violations.

THE AGREEMENT	THE RESULT
May 7, 1920: Soviet regime signs treaty with independent Georgian Republic, pledging no interference in Georgia's internal affairs.	February 11–12, 1921: Soviet troops invade Georgia, in step leading to absorption of Republic in U.S.S.R.
March 16, 1921: In trade agreement with Britain, Soviet Union pledges not to engage in propaganda in that country.	May 26, 1927: Britain ends agreement because of Soviet violations, including failure to stop propaganda as promised.
June 5, 1922: Soviet Union concludes friendship agreement with Czechslovakia.	June 29, 1945: U.S.S.R. compelled Czechoslovakia to cede Carpatho-Ukraine to the Soviet Union.
December 12, 1943: U.S.S.R. and Czech government-in-exile sign treaty of friendship and mutual assistance.	February 25, 1948: Czechoslovak Government forced to accept Communist ultimatum, as Soviet Union completes arrangements to force country into its satellite empire. Ultimatum compels appointment of a cabinet of Moscow followers and climaxes Soviet postwar drive to absorb once-independent Czechoslovakia.
December 17, 1925: U.S.S.R. signs nonaggression and neutrality pact with Turkey.	March 20, 1945: U.S.S.R. denounces this pact, begins campaign to secure control of Black Sea straits.
August 31, 1926: Soviet Union concludes nonaggression pact with Afghanistan.	June 14, 1946: U.S.S.R. forces Afghanistan to cede border territory of Kushka.
September 28, 1926: Soviet Union makes nonaggression pact with Lithuania; later extending this agreement through 1945.	June 15, 1940: Soviet troops invade Lithuania. August 3, 1940: Lithuania is annexed by Soviet Union.
September 27, 1928: Soviet Union adheres to Kellogg-Briand Pact for renunciation of war.	Soviet Union violates this pledge by 1939–40 invasions of Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Rumania, and Finland.
January 21, 1932: U.S.S.R. agrees to nonaggression pact with Finland.	November 30, 1939: Soviet military forces invade Finland.
February 5, 1932: Soviet Union signs nonaggression pact with Latvia.	June 16, 1940: Soviet troops invade Latvia. August 5, 1940: Latvia is forcibly incorporated into the U.S.S.R.
May 4, 1932: Soviet Union pledges nonaggression in agreement with Estonia.	June 16, 1940: Soviet military forces invade and occupy Estonia. August 6, 1940: Estonia is annexed by U.S.S.R.
July 25, 1932: Soviet Union signs nonaggression pact with Poland.	September 17, 1939: Soviet troops invade Poland.
May 5, 1934: U.S.S.R.-Poland extend nonaggression pact for 10 years.	September 29, 1939: U.S.S.R. signs agreement with Nazi Germany to partition Poland.
June 9, 1934: U.S.S.R. recognizes Rumania, guarantees her sovereignty.	June 27, 1940: Soviet Army invades Rumanian provinces of Bessarabia and Northern Bukovina. Soviet occupation of these areas completed in 4 days.
September 15, 1934: U.S.S.R. enters League of Nations, pledging thereby "the maintenance of justice and a scrupulous respect for all treaty obligations in the dealings of organized peoples with one another."	August 23, 1939: U.S.S.R. makes treaty with Nazi Germany, termed "a joint conspiracy" to deprive Poland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Finland, and Rumania of their independence and territorial integrity.
August 21, 1937: Soviet Union signs nonaggression pact with Republic of China.	October 2, 1949: U.S.S.R. breaks relations with Republic of China, after recognizing Communist Chinese regime it helped to gain power.
July 30, 1941: U.S.S.R. concludes agreement with Polish government-in-exile, pledging mutual aid and cooperation.	April 25, 1943: U.S.S.R. breaks relations with Polish government-in-exile on pretext of Polish request for Red Cross investigation of Katyn Forest massacre.
September 24, 1941: Soviet Union pledges adherence to Atlantic Charter, which provides that agreeing countries seek no aggrandizement, that the countries desire no territorial changes not made in accord with freely expressed wishes of the people concerned, and that they respect the right of all peoples to choose their own form of government.	Against these promises stands the Soviet Union's record of occupation and domination of Rumania, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania,
January 29, 1942—Soviet Union, with Iran and Britain, signs treaty of alliance, providing for military use of Iranian territory only until end of military operations against Germany.	
February 4–11, 1945—At Yalta Conference, U.S.S.R. agrees on various postwar measures—including adoption of a resolution that the liberated peoples of Europe should have the opportunity to solve their economic problems by democratic means.	
February 11, 1945—U.S.S.R., at Yalta Conference, agrees to declaration that Polish provisional government "shall be pledged to the holding of free and unfettered elections as soon as possible on the basis of universal suffrage and secret ballot."	
April 11, 1945: U.S.S.R. signs 20-year treaty of friendship, mutual aid, and cooperation with Yugoslavia.	
June 14–18, 1945: President Truman and Premier Stalin agree, in an exchange of letters, to "free access by air, road, and rail from Frankfort and Bremen to Berlin for U.S. forces."	
July 17–August 2, 1945: At Potsdam Conference, U.S.S.R. agrees that there should be uniform treatment of the German people throughout Germany.	
August 14, 1945: The Soviet Union enters into treaty with Republic of China, containing these pledges: "Each high contracting party undertakes not to conclude any alliance and not to take any part in any coalition directed against the other high contracting party * * *. The treaty comes into force immediately * * * and shall remain in force for a term of 30 years."	
March 10, 1947: Council of Foreign Ministers, meeting in Moscow, agrees that all German prisoners of war should be repatriated by December 31, 1948.	
May 4 and June 20, 1949: Four Power Agreements of New York and Paris guarantee United States, British, French, and Soviet Union joint control of Berlin, all access routes to and from the city, and freedom of movement within the city.	
July 27, 1953: Military armistice established between United Nations Command and opposing Communist forces, assisted by U.S.S.R., of China and North Korea. Armistice agreement pledges signers to "cease introduction into Korea of reinforcing military personnel."	
January 14, 1956: U.S.S.R. signs agreement with Yugoslavia, pledging $110 million in credits for industrial construction.	
August 4, 1956: U.S.S.R. pledges an additional grant of $175 million, bringing total to $285 million.	
October 19, 1956: U.S.S.R.-Japanese Joint Declaration pledges the Soviet Union to refrain from interference in Japan's internal affairs.	

TREATY VIOLATIONS—Continued

THE RESULT

Czechoslovakia, Tannu Tuva, Afghanistan territory, Hungary, East Germany, Albania, Bulgaria, Poland, North Korea, Mongolia.

Soviet Union refused to withdraw its troops from Iran at the end of World War II.

In violation of this agreement stands the U.S.S.R.'s record of domination in Bulgaria, Rumania, Poland, East Germany, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia, and other countries which were forced into postwar roles as satellites of the Soviet Union.

January 5, 1947: Soviet Union refuses to participate in meeting with Britain and the United States to secure compliance with the 1945 agreement pledging free elections in Poland.

January 19, 1947: Communist-controlled fraudulent election carried out under conditions of Soviet military occupation.

September 29, 1949: Soviet Union denounces this agreement.

April 1, 1948–May 12, 1949: The Soviet Union imposes the Berlin blockade by severing all land and water routes between Berlin and West Germany. Western Allies supply Berlin by airlift. March, 1962—Soviet Union harasses flights by Allied airplanes between Berlin and West Germany.

East Germany today continues to be a rigidly controlled Soviet satellite. Its people have been denied free elections, isolated from the people of West Germany, and victimized by the same kind of regimentation, police rule, and economic restrictions imposed on the peoples of all the Soviet-bloc states in Europe.

February 14, 1950: These pledges were broken when the U.S.S.R. made a new agreement with the Communist Chinese regime it had helped create. The Soviets did not even bother to change the basic wording. The new treaty also pledges: "Both high contracting parties undertake not to conclude any alliance against the other high contracting party and not to take part in any coalition or actions or measures directed against the other high contracting party * * *. The present treaty will be valid for 30 years."

August 3, 1955: Soviet regime furnishes West German Red Cross with data on the health and whereabouts of only 20 of the approximately 14,000 Germans known to be still held in the U.S.S.R.

September 20, 1955: U.S.S.R. unilaterally transfers Soviet control over all access routes to and from Berlin to East German regime.

August 13, 1961: Construction of Berlin wall completely prohibits free passage from the Soviet sector to the Western sectors.

July 11, 1955: U.N. Command details long list of armistice agreement violations by Communist Parties.

May 6, 1957: U.N. Command, in another of series of official complaints, charges that Communists have sent troops into Korea's demilitarized zone six times in period of less than 4 months.

May 28, 1958: Yugoslav sources disclose that the Soviet Union has postponed for 5 years the grant to Yugoslavia amounting to $285 million. This represented an attempt to retaliate against Yugoslavia for its refusal to accept the Soviet Communist Party's ideological leadership.

1958: During the weeks preceding Japanese elections of May 22, Soviet radio beams propaganda at Japan violently opposing the reelection of Premier Kishi's government.

1959–60: U.S.S.R. threatens Japan with the possibility of nuclear war if Japan ratifies United States-Japan Security Treaty, signed January 19, 1960.

Robert S. Kerr: Pioneer for the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, Senator Robert S. Kerr's outstanding book, "Land, Wood, and Water," one of the most substantial contributions to the field of conservation literature, has been reprinted this month in softcover form, in a revised version. Thus it will become available to a new circle of readers. One of the last acts of the Senator before he was fatally stricken January 1 was to complete the revisions for the new edition.

In one sense, Senator Kerr's political career lasted exactly 21 years. His announcement party as a candidate for Governor of Oklahoma was held on Jefferson's birthday, April 13, 1942, at Ada. And his final act as Senator was to complete the arrangements for the revised edition of "Land, Wood, and Water," to be published on Jefferson's birthday, April 13, 1963. An introduction by Vice President JOHNSON says in part:

> Bob Kerr had the strength of the pioneers of old and the daring of the pioneers of today, and he gave both to his country in full measure. To his friends, he gave his brain, his compassion, and his wit. It is a duller world without him.
>
> Just as history has identified George Norris with the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Arkansas River of tomorrow, bustling with the traffic of commerce and recreation, will be a living monument to the vision and leadership of Bob Kerr. This laboratory of trial and success in the Southwest is pointing the way for a national program of harnessing our rivers and cleansing the waters.
>
> Now that he is gone, his printed message takes on new significance. It can help fill the vacuum of his absent leadership and inspire new effort for the cause of conservation, to which he dedicated his energies and his very life.

In a revision in the paperback, Senator Kerr recalls that the Special Senate Water Committee, of which he was chairman, urged the comprehensive development of the Nation's river basins, and the Kerr plan became the accepted pattern to bring this about. He quotes President Kennedy as saying that:

> The administration accepts the goals urged by the committee to develop comprehensive river basin plans by 1970, in cooperation with the individual States.

And Senator Kerr concludes:

> The Arkansas-Red River Valley is already showing the way to do this.

Senator Kerr always revered Thomas Jefferson for his fundamental principles and as the patron saint of the Democratic Party. In recognition of this, Bob Kerr chose to launch his own political career on Jefferson's birthday, at his hometown of Ada. His father, Sam Kerr, a Jeffersonian Democrat and an Ada pioneer, had a profound influence on Bob Kerr and his political thinking.

On April 13, 1942, a big rally was staged for Kerr at Ada for the formal launching of his candidacy for Governor of Oklahoma. His father had died 2 years before, but Kerr's mother was still living and occupied a place of honor on the platform. Kerr made several references to his father and the early influence. The Ada Evening News began its account with the statement that "Sam Kerr would have been proud of his son that night." His father had first planted the seeds of political ambition in his oldest son, and the governorship was the first goal.

Senator Kerr's staff member and biographer, Malvina Stephenson, recently found some handwritten pages prepared by him for a speech, most of which was devoted to Jefferson. One part says:

> Jefferson, who saw far beyond his times and who helped build a foundation for a better day, was revered by many and loved by most. He was, however, hated by a few because of his so-called radical proposals, one of which was freedom of religious worship. He opposed the existing order whereby the church dominated the State and through it compelled all to become members of and to support the established church.

Like Jefferson, Robert S. Kerr saw far beyond his own day and helped to bend the future to his will. Like Jefferson he built his home on a mountaintop overlooking the wide valleys and far-spreading plains of his native State, and from this commanding vista ever broadened his own horizon.

On the occasion of the publication of the revised book the Ada Evening News, one of a number of newspapers running excerpts from it in installment form, commented editorially on the Senator's career. This article, an appropriate tribute from the newspaper of Robert S. Kerr's hometown, follows:

[From the Ada Evening News, Apr. 16, 1963]

AIM HIGH—ACCOMPLISH GREAT THINGS

"What is the use of living if it be not to strive for noble causes and to make this world a better place for those who will live in it after we are gone."

The above quotation is from Winston Churchill, who lived to accomplish great things after he was 65 years old. It was not a political statement nor any effort on his part to appear as a missionary. He said what he thought and felt and knew. And he knew that for society to continue to live well, improvements must come.

We use the quotation, not to praise Churchill, but to illustrate that most great men have become great because they had great visions and brought those visions into realities.

The Ada News began yesterday an 18-installment series of "Land, Wood, and Water," a book written by the late Senator Robert S. Kerr which has already won a high place in libraries of science, government and sociology. You will feel elated, depressed, challenged, and above all informed by reading this condensation.

The book sums up the dream Bob Kerr had to make Pontotoc County, Okla., and the United States "a better place for those who will live in it after we are gone."

The book represents in no small way a lifetime of study and thought about the conservation of natural resources. But he had no opportunity to put his conclusions into practical application until he had gained power in the U.S. Senate. But even then he did not depend entirely upon his own conclusions. He formed a research group, headed by Don McBride, to study water problems principally in Oklahoma, but also in the United States as a whole. The book includes the results of the research as well as the things learned while Bob was a lad working in the field, a student at East Central State College, a student at Oklahoma Baptist University, a student of law, and the research into natural resources by the organization now known as Kerr-McGee Oil Industries. All of these studies were coordinated and brought down to sentences packed with thought and ways to accomplish the essentials to preserve nature's gifts.

If you did not read Monday's first installment, be certain to get your paper and read it carefully. Then you should read each installment as it comes out. And we suggest also that you clip the installments, fasten them together and keep them for reference in the future.

Bob Kerr did great things in many lines. His was a multipurpose mind and intellect. He built an empire of developing natural resources he had learned existed in various parts of this country. He contributed to churches and educational institutions. He got the Congress and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to put a research laboratory here near the center of the White, Arkansas, and Red River watersheds. This institution, which should grow to be of vast importance to all the Southwestern States, will soon rise on a beautiful hilltop 2 miles south of the campus of East Central, with which it will be coordinated. It will also be the first of what Ada folk believe will be a vast park for Government and private research. And naturally it will include a complex of Kerr memorial buildings, including the cabin in which he was born.

But don't overlook the opportunity to read the condensed version of the famous book, or if you prefer, get the book and keep it in your home.

The Ada News is delighted to bring this condensation to you. In fact, we consider it an honor to do just that.

Representative Cederberg Urges Firm Dedication to the Principles of Historic Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, recently our able and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG], addressed the annual Rendezvous Banquet of the National Society of Women Descendants of the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company here in Washington.

Our colleague's remarks were very timely and presented a challenge to all freedom-loving Americans. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include his address at this point in the RECORD:

REPRESENTATIVE CEDERBERG URGES FIRM DEDICATION TO THE PRINCIPLES OF HISTORIC HERITAGE

It is particularly pleasant to speak to an audience composed of women descendants of the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company. I am doubly pleased to be here because your president, Mrs. Hugh Glover, Jr., comes from my congressional district. Your organization is made up of American patriots who have a deep appreciation of our national traditions. You can look backward with pride and forward with vigilance.

The founding members of the Artillery Company, of course, were British subjects. The day of independence, which was to rock the entire world with its revolutionary concepts, was yet 138 years in the future.

As you know, on March 13, 1638, a charter was granted to Robert Keayne, Nathaniell Duncan, Robert Sedgwick, and William Spencer, providing that they, "and such others as are already joined with them and such as they shall from time to time take into their company, shall be called the Military Company of Massachusetts."

Several changes in the name were made during the first century of the company's existence. Since 1738 it has usually been designated as the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company.

A multitude of changes have taken place since the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company was organized on the first Monday in June 1638. The colonial settlements prospered, our independence from the mother country was achieved, a new constitution was adopted, and a nation was wrested from the wilderness.

As important as they are, the dates, places and events of the colonial, Revolutionary and postwar period in which the early members of the Artillery Company lived, fought, and died may be said to be of secondary consequence when compared with the motives which produced these events.

I say all this because all of us know that greater, at least to themselves, than is the the reasons men give their lives are always fact that they are making such great sacrifices.

It was just this motivation, this devotion to the principles we recognize today as America's historic heritage, which allowed the militiamen of Massachusetts and the other colonies not quite 200 years ago to throw off the shackles of tyranny and found a land of freedom and plenty, the greatest the world had ever known.

Our internal economy has developed along lines undreamed of by our pioneer forebears. Our place in world affairs has changed, and the change has brought increased burdens and responsibilities.

MEANINGFUL HERITAGE

Despite all that has occurred in the past 325 years, the heritage left to us by our forefathers has meaning in the world today.

Liberty, patriotism, courage, industry and initiative—these are the principles that have made America great. These are the principles that will continue to sustain us in the years to come.

It does not minimize the problems faced by our forefathers to say that the world in which we find ourselves today is in a state of chaos and confusion.

Everywhere the evil forces of communism press against the frontiers of the free world. Crisis follows crisis. What the future may hold for us and for those unborn cannot be foretold.

Of one thing, however, we may be certain. The eternal verities by which men live will not lose their luster. In the critical days ahead the values that are so essential a part of the American tradition will be those that have always guided man in his long journey from darkness to light.

We have seen in the history of our country how in generations past this Nation has repeatedly been brought out of confusion because patriotic heroes stood fast.

They were not ordinary men. They were men who shared with Patrick Henry the noble sentiment "Give me liberty or give me death." They were men who would have scorned the shameful motto, "Better Red than dead."

They held in their keeping the safety and progress of the Republic. They kept alight the lamp of liberty because they refused to betray their spiritual heritage by abandoning the eternal values embodied in the concepts of truth, justice, mercy, and high regard for the integrity of their fellow men.

I know that I do not need to urge on this assemblage the value of perpetuating our American heritage. I am certain that we are agreed on the need to inculcate in the younger generation a sound knowledge of American history.

I fear the privilege of living in the United States in an atmosphere of liberty often suffers the same fate as many of the other good things in our lives. They are often taken for granted and treated with indifference.

REAWAKEN MEANING OF CITIZENSHIP

It is on occasions like this that we are reawakened to the meaning of citizenship in this land of ours. We are put on notice that we owe our country a firmer loyalty, a more active patriotism. This recognition is a stimulant for all of us.

The danger to America lies in certain attitudes that have become too common.

First, there is the attitude of certain sophisticates and pseudointellectuals who ridicule the idea of patriotism and the feeling of reverence for our great charters of freedom.

Second, there is the appalling ignorance of the American tradition on the part of a large body of our countrymen.

Third, there is the apathy toward our national traditions by those who have knowledge of them but think of them as true but trite.

Patriotism must mean more than merely cheering when the flag goes by. It must be active, not passive, deep rooted, not superficial.

As American citizens we must be vigilant and unwavering in defending our form of government and our way of life.

Civilizations have perished because individuals ceased to have a fighting faith in their cause and in themselves.

Our abundance and power among nations is attributable only to the principles that all men of this land should be forever free and be allowed to pursue happiness in their own manner, with the least possible interference or direction from government.

These principles were set down in the Declaration of Independence and were made legal guarantees in our Federal Constitution. In the composition of the latter document, painstaking care was taken to preserve its meaning and intent. A system of checks and balances was decreed for our Government to forever eliminate the possibility of dictatorial rule by the executive, the judiciary, or the legislative branch.

The most specific language was employed to protect the individual freedoms of all Americans, and the right of redress for wrong, whether by government, individuals, or private groups, was made amply clear.

DANGEROUS ATTACKS ON CONSTITUTION

It is paradoxical that many of the attacks on our Constitution have been launched in the name of the very freedoms it guaranteed.

It is on these grounds today that the Communists, who have pledged to destroy our form of government, insist in the courts that freedom of speech, assembly, and press, which are our heritage, guarantees them the right to go about, quite openly, with their seditious and traitorous programs.

It is on these grounds that most of the other assaults have been made. Freedom of people to worship has been misinterpreted to mean that worship itself should be prohibited or restricted in certain cases. The freedom our forefathers enjoyed in raising their own food on their own land has been held to be a denial of the freedom of others to obtain a high price for their produce, and the Federal Government now tells us whether we are to sow or harvest and what, if anything, we may plant.

I could go on, for these attacks are continuous and are being carried out with ever greater determination and success, but I do not wish to take so much of your time with details.

It should be sufficient to say that our constitutional liberties are constantly under attack and the enemy is winning. He is winning because the average American either is apathetic to the patriotism which burned so brightly in our society during the first 150 years of our independence or because he accepts at face value the false premises of those who hold alien philosophies.

In fact, there is no phrase in the propaganda arsenal employed by the anticonstitutionalists with such telling effect as the term "superpatriot."

When I was a boy, I was taught that just about everyone who fought for American independence was a patriot, and it was implied, at least, that the superpatriots were those who made the extra sacrifice in the cause of freedom, such as Nathan Hale.

Today, this term is being used in application to everyone who believes in our Constitution and an assorted lot of extremists who don't. The inclusion of crackpot elements under the same covering term as is applied to those who are truly patriotic is a studied and calculated attempt to discredit those of us who sincerely believe in our constitutional system.

But there is one certain way to defeat such not-so-subtle attempts to discredit true patriotism. That is through the avenues still left open to us by the existing guarantees of our Constitution—the ballot. Your vote in behalf of patriotic candidates can and should be as powerful as the muskets in the hands of the minutemen.

BE PROUD OF PATRIOTISM

In addition, it would be well if all Americans were a little prouder of their patriotism, as you are. I think former President Eisenhower expressed this belief best when he said recently:

"Too many of us Americans have become so sophisticated that we are inclined to think of any honest emotion, including a public display of patriotism, as corny. It is hard for me to imagine anyone being ashamed of patriotism, yet there it is. And this attitude can scarcely fail to seep down to our children."

General Eisenhower also recommended that American parents spend more time with their children in discussions of the proud deeds and idealistic traditions of our country.

It is our duty to see that the knowledge of this heritage is transmitted to our children. Our efforts in that direction have been hampered by so-called progressive educators. Over the last 30 years they have succeeded in introducing into many schools the so-called core curriculum. Under this system, history, Government, geography, English, and possibly other subjects are thrown together in a core course, taught by one teacher. At best, it is not always easy to secure teachers with sufficient knowledge of one of these subjects to teach it well. To find teachers who can teach all of them effectively is almost a hopeless dream.

In many cases the result is that students complete the course with little knowledge of any of the subjects involved.

Some years ago the New York Times conducted a survey to determine the proficiency of college freshmen in American history. Seven thousand students in 36 colleges and universities in all sections of the country were examined.

A large majority of the college freshmen showed that they had virtually no knowledge of even the most elementary aspects of American history. They knew almost nothing about many phases of our country's growth and development.

Many of the students could not identify such names as Abraham Lincoln, Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, or Theodore Roosevelt.

They had little conception of the significant trends that have made the United States the Nation it is today.

Even more alarming than the lack of knowledge was the amount of misinformation that the survey disclosed.

For example, 1,705 of the 7,000 students, or almost 25 percent, did not know that Abraham Lincoln was President of the United States during the Civil War. Over 150 students thought that Jefferson Davis was President of the United States during that period. Only 1,126 of the 7,000 students, or 16 percent, were familiar with the contributions made by Thomas Jefferson. Nearly 50 percent of the students confused President Andrew Jackson with Gen. Thomas J. "Stonewall" Jackson of Civil War fame.

Forty men were listed as President of the United States who never held that office.

The catalog of deplorable ignorance could be continued almost indefinitely, but these few examples serve to illustrate our need. The situation becomes more alarming when we reflect that this examination was given, not to school dropouts or to vocational students, but to those actually enrolled in a program of higher education.

One of the conclusions reached as a result of this study was that students are in need of a course in U.S. history on the college or university level. The results may also indicate that we need more emphasis on the subject on the secondary level.

Factual and inspirational sketches in American history might even replace such insipid narratives as "John and Jane Visit the Garbage Dump" as reading material on the elementary level.

Forty years or more ago, 1 year was devoted to the high school course in American history. The passing years have made it necessary to include much additional material. It may be that the course has been spread too thin. It is possible that 2 years rather than 1 should be devoted to the American history course in our high schools.

Cicero said, "Not to know what happened before one was born is always to be a child." We cannot go about this world of men as children.

A factory worker can push the buttons of an industrial machine with little knowledge of the technology behind the machine; but if he pushes the buttons of a voting machine without knowledge of American history and Government, our Nation is in danger.

In times of peril a nation can count among its resources not only its material strength but also its heritage of the spirit, a treasure built up by the struggles and accomplishments of generations of patriots and pioneers.

Our revolutionary ancestors bequeathed to us such a heritage in their triumph over the formidable odds posed against them by the might of the British Empire.

Their descendants and those who came later to our shores perfected that liberty. They added to our heritage by their fortitude and courage in the conquest of the frontier and by their industry and initiative in the development of our resources.

Your organization, I know, has been extremely active in teaching American principles to our children and I am convinced that these efforts will be rewarded many times over. For the youngsters who today learn and appreciate our American heritage will be the patriotic voters who fight alien philosophies tomorrow, and it is in them that we may find our Nation's survival in freedom.

It is my sincere hope that your campaign spreads and is taken up by other societies, associations, and organizations throughout the land.

SEEK REBIRTH OF PATRIOTISM

All of us, particularly you and I who are so aware of the dangers America faces, must work toward a rebirth of patriotism if we are to halt the erosion of our constitutional rights and restore the freedoms which our forefathers meant us to have.

Let us explain to our children the importance of historical events. Let's point out the significance of our national holidays—and we have several coming up soon. Let's make sure they understand the why of American history.

The history of America is the record of the experiences upon which our institutions are built. If we are to keep and develop these institutions, we must learn the names, dates, places, thoughts, ambitions, passions, sacrifices, and splendors that make up the story of human experience in America.

Today America is challenged by history. We can meet that challenge only if we know our history. We can be true to our heritage only if we understand that heritage.

The challenge can neither be declined nor ignored. The forfeit is freedom—national and personal alike.

Let's think of the cherished principles that are enunciated in founding documents when we observe the anniversary of our independence in July. Let us remind ourselves that if our constitutional freedoms are destroyed, then all freedom itself will vanish from the earth. Let us not forget that it was our revolution, our beliefs and courage, which set the pattern followed by other nations throughout the world in winning their own independence.

And let us always keep in mind that what made our forefathers sacrifice their lives for this country was patriotism, but not of the simple type which has been exhibited in a thousand wars and revolutions since the beginning of time. It was the true and dedicated patriotism which is so firmly rooted in human rights, individual liberties and personal freedoms.

We cannot, indeed, we shall not desecrate the graves of those great patriots who died that we may be free by supinely abandoning the fruits of their victory.

It is your fight, and mine, and our children's. With firm dedication to the principles of our historic heritage, we will win.

Secretary Freeman Should Resign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to second a motion offered here yesterday by the distinguished gentleman from Montana [Mr. BATTIN]. He called upon the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman, to submit his resignation to the President, to be effective immediately.

This is certainly a most timely suggestion. Since Mr. Freeman took office, we have learned that the number of Agriculture Department employees has increased in a startling inverse ratio to the decrease in the number of the Nation's farmers. If Mr. Freeman should depart, this disparagement would be reduced by one.

Of course, I am not suggesting that this remedy would be anything but temporary. Someone undoubtedly would take his place. But the farmers of the Nation might then entertain the hope, even if it were a forlorn one, that Mr. Freeman's replacement might not support a farm program which has lost all semblance of sanity.

They might even hope for a reduction in the vast army of Department of Agriculture snoopers who are going about the country to make sure that our farm lands are not too productive. Our farmers, without Freeman, might dare to hope that a new Secretary would even let them grow enough feed grains to feed their own livestock and poultry. Then they wouldn't have to go out and buy their feed at unrealistic support prices.

The farmers would not be alone in hailing the departure of Mr. Freeman. The taxpayers would join their ranks. They are footing the bill for about half of the Nation's farm income, which is now about $12 billion a year. The Congress generously, with the taxpayers' money, appropriates about $6 billion a year to support Mr. Freeman's farm price support program.

In the B.F. (before Freeman) years, one of our most stable and successful farm products was soybeans. The production was selling out, at home and abroad. But now Mr. Freeman has $50 million worth of them in his bean bins. He has also piled up $300 million worth of butter, cheese, and dried milk in Government warehouses. By August, cotton support at 32 cents per pound will account for an unprecedented 10 million bales in Freeman's warehouse stockpile.

Certainly a new Secretary of Agriculture would have to try awfully hard to beat this kind of a record. But if Freeman would only quit, we might all hope that the new man would not try so hard.

The Warsaw Uprising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, before this month comes to a close, all of us should pause for a moment and pay tribute to those brave men, women, and children of the Warsaw Ghetto, who 20 years ago this month, rose in revolt against the ruthless oppression of Nazi tyranny. Theirs is a tragic, heartbreaking story, an all too vivid reminder of man's inhumanity to man.

The outstanding bravery of these Polish Jews and their 6 million brethren who died in Nazi horror camps, cannot and should not be forgotten. As others the world over have, let us join in reverence for the memory of these brave people.

Administration Tax Bill Would Help Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Taxation of the House Select Committee on Small Business, I have worked for the last several years in the area of the tax structure as it effects the opportunities for expansion of our independent businesses. I have sponsored legislation as have other members of the committee, because we feel that our hearings have shown clearly that our Main Street small business firms are placed at an unfair disadvantage under the present system in comparison with giant corporation competitors.

I am happy that President Kennedy's tax proposals, now being considered by the distinguished Committee on Ways and Means, contain several provisions which would have a healthy, stimulating effect on small business enterprises in the United States.

In a letter to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Arkansas, Wilbur Mills, I recently set forth these provisions in detail. They are of such significance that I want to call them to the attention of Members, as they affect the small business economy, by entering here the full text of the letter:

Select Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives of the United States,
Washington, D.C., March 26, 1963.

Hon. Wilbur D. Mills,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: In connection with the administration's tax bill now pending before your committee, I should like to call your attention to several provisions of the bill which would have a salutary effect on small business enterprises in the United States. The Subcommittee on Taxation of the House Select Committee on Small Business of the 87th Congress, in its final report, dated January 3, 1963, made the following observation:

"Taxation has two major areas of impact on the business community in general; each acts with even greater effect within the small-business sector. The first of these is the effect upon business profits. Since, as has been shown in this report, small businesses produce a smaller net profit than larger businesses, any retarding effect caused by the tax structure is naturally more of an impedance upon small businesses.

"The primary area of impact, though, is upon the availability of investment capital. Present tax laws discourage investment in small businesses. Since most small businesses are obliged to use retained income to finance expansion, this is, of course, directly related to the impact of taxation upon profits.

In view of the public hearings which your committee is now conducting on the President's tax recommendations, I believe the best interests of the small business community would be served by directing the attention of your committee to certain provisions in the administration's bill which would help the small businessman overcome the problems mentioned in the report of the Subcommittee on Taxation. Specifically, I would commend to you the following provisions included in the President's recommendations."

1. Rate reductions—individuals and corporations.—The Select Small Business Committee of the House in its final report to the 83d Congress in 1954 reached the following conclusions which I believe to be equally as valid in 1963:

"This committee is of the opinion that current tax rates have acted as a major deterrent to an improved competitive status for small business enterprises. As mentioned earlier, many small concerns have been unable to retain sufficient earnings after taxes to finance necessary expansion through additions to working capital and fixed assets. Lack of capital has, therefore, placed undue emphasis on longer term borrowing which in itself has been difficult to obtain. It is felt that a healthier climate for small business might be achieved through further relief from the tax burden."

The corporate and individual tax rate reductions recommended by the President should contribute substantially to this healthier climate. The after-tax profits of the small enterprises will immediately increase as a result of the recommended corporate and individual rate reductions. Also, the reduction in rates should have the most desirable effect of attracting new risk capital to small business as a direct result of the increase in profitability of these enterprises. For the same reasons, the borrowing power of these small firms should improve. The proposed modifications in the taxation of capital gains of individuals and corporations should result in increased investment in small companies as investors discover that the lower effective rates of tax on capital gains facilitates new investment decisions.

I would particularly direct your attention to the recommendations which would reduce corporate income tax rates for companies with a net income of $25,000 or less from 30 to 22 percent. For many years, small business spokesmen and interested congressional and executive study groups have urged upon Congress the necessity of reducing effective tax rates on net income of $25,000 or less. For example, the House Small Business Committee recommended at the conclusion of the 84th Congress in 1958 that the existing rate structure be amended to effect a substantial reduction of the corporate income tax rates on small corporations. In 1959, at the close of the 85th Congress, the committee recommended legislation which would have reversed the existing corporate normal and surtax rates and increased the surtax exemption. Since we have previously advocated reversal of the surtax and normal rates, I am, of course, pleased that it is now an administration proposal and heartily endorse the proposal.

2. Income averaging: The incomes of unincorporated businesses, farmers, and ranchers vary widely from year to year; the income-averaging provision contained in the President's proposals would be of particular benefit to these small businessmen. If the impact of high tax rates on "bunched income" can be lessened, many small, unincorporated businessmen will receive the equivalent of a substantial tax rate reduction. This, in turn, will promote the favorable results mentioned above in connection with the direct rate reductions.

3. Multiple corporations: In 1958, the House Committee on Small Business specifically recommended that the tax laws be examined to see if they could be amended to assist the small retailer in his struggle for survival. The administration's multiple-corporation proposal should directly serve this goal. Under existing law, chains of multicorporate units are in effect paying small

business tax rates by virtue of the multiple $25,000 surtax exemptions available to these units, yet they are simultaneously benefiting from the economies inherent in large businesses. As a result, the genuine small businessman or small corporation is placed at a competitive disadvantage vis-a-vis large businesses which are operating in multiple-corporate form. A collateral effect of this tax inequity is to render the truly small enterprise a less attractive investment. The President's proposal would allow only one surtax exemption to multicorporate enterprises, and thus restore competitive balance and enhance the prospects of small businesses to attract outside capital.

4. Research and development: The administration recommends, subject to certain conditions, a current deduction for tax purposes for expenditures for machinery and equipment used directly in research and development activities. Under the general rule of the proposal, expenditures for equipment used only part time for research and development purposes, or used to any extent in the performance of a Federal contract would not qualify for immediate deductions. Nevertheless, under a special provision for small business, any expenditures for equipment used directly for research and development could be expensed in an amount up to 4 percent of $500,000 of total expenditures for research and development. For purposes of this special provision, equipment used only part time but at least 50 percent of the time for research and development would qualify, as would research and development equipment not used exclusively in the performance of a Federal contract. The current deduction for research and development expenditures for equipment used in Federal contract work should materially improve the position of the small businessman in competing for Government contracts. In the final report of the House Small Business Committee to the 87th Congress, the committee concluded that the percentage of Government contract awards for research and development going to small business was inadequate. The President's proposal should increase the capability of small firms to participate in these programs. The long-term interests and perhaps the ultimate survival of this country will depend to a considerable extent upon the effectiveness and speed with which its defense research and development program is carried out. Small business has contributed in the past to this important effort, and I believe the enactment of the President's proposal will provide incentives for future participation.

I am hopeful that your committee will give serious consideration to the effect of new tax legislation on the small businessman as you begin executive sessions on the administration's bill. The strength and health of the small business community which the President's proposals will generate should provide a strong stimulant for the entire economy. Since this result is of such vital importance to this country today, I believe that the President's proposals deserve your most serious consideration.

Sincerely yours,

TOM STEED,
Member of Congress, Chairman, Subcommittee on Taxation, Select Committee on Small Business.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 1, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Harold L. Gore, chaplain, St. Elizabeths Hospital, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Proverbs 29:23: *A man's pride shall bring him low; but honour shall uphold the humble in spirit.*

O God, our Heavenly Father, from whom we come, without whom we are nothing, and to whom we owe everything that we are and have, mercifully grant to us an awareness of Thy presence, that in the execution of the responsibilities which are ours we may not feel alone. Instill in us the sense of purpose that enables us to see our work as work for Thee, and, therefore, Thy work. In difficulties may we not be ashamed to admit our limitations and in accomplishments may we not overestimate our abilities. Help us to see ourselves not as masters but as servants, and as servants, our principal duty, that of humble obedience. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Inter-State and Foreign Commerce may sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

THE FORGE OF DEMOCRACY—THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, "The Forge of Democracy—The House of Representatives"—is the work of Neil MacNeil. It is an aptly titled, excellent, well-written biography of this House. It was penned by a highly competent, engaging, and brilliant writer.

Neil MacNeil knows this House of Representatives—its strength and its power—its weakness and its failures—as few reporters do. When many others in his profession have concentrated on another body, he has made it his business to study and understand this body. His intimate knowledge of its inner workings, his personal acquaintance with many Members, his fine appreciation of what is accomplished here have caused him to admire and love this place.

Because he combines a friendly personality, fine intellect, and a high degree of fairness and objectivity, it is easy to understand the high regard in which he is held by those who know him on this Hill and by his associates in the great field of journalism.

"The Forge of Democracy" fills a vacuum in the vivid, fascinating story of this House. I am sure that historians and students will avidly welcome and acclaim its publication.

Richard L. Lyons, who so ably and fairly covers the activities on this side of the Capitol for the Washington Post, is another of the all-too-few reporters who know this House. Let me quote him on this book:

> Strangely almost nothing has been written on the House as an institution. Pieces of its story have been stuffed into biography and political science tracts. But aside from George B. Galloway's slender volume 2 years ago, Neil MacNeil's book is the first effort in nearly half a century to trace the growth of the House as a living institution, relate its present to its past, and put it in perspective. It is a major and valuable contribution.

Listen to Neil MacNeil as he brings his fine work to a close:

> The House of Representatives was created in the 18th century as the representative branch of the Government. The 19th century saw the President claim the same representative character. The 20th century found the once aristocratic Senate making the same claim, and even the Supreme Court has taken on a representative quality. The history of the American Republic has been the continuing success of the Nation's continuing experiment in freedom through representative government.
>
> In this historic process, the House of Representatives has played a primary and fundamental role, and by so doing, the House has helped create a nation more prosperous, more powerful, and more free than the world has ever known. The House has been, in this larger sense, the solemn assembly of which Josiah Quincy spoke a century and a half ago.
>
> It has remained what it was then, the representative of the people, the depositary of their power and the image of their wisdom.

Mr. Speaker, I noted that the distinguished Senator from Montana and majority leader of the Senate, Senator MANSFIELD, paid tribute to Neil MacNeil and his book in remarks made on the Senate floor yesterday. I am delighted and happy to join in this praise and I congratulate Time magazine's chief congressional correspondent, Neil MacNeil, for the great contribution he has made to history in his story of the House of Representatives.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that our colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] has taken this time to pay a well-deserved tribute to a great Capitol reporter, Neil MacNeil, for the fine book he has written on the House of Representatives, under the title of "The Forge of Democracy."

It has been my privilege to read this book from cover to cover.

As an historical document on the House of Representatives, it has no equal; as a report of the activities of the House which I have known during my service here, it is an unusually accurate treatise. Mr. MacNeil has been a close observer of the House and an able and devoted student of its processes. I believe he has succeeded in describing the role of the House and in stating its position in the American system of government as no other person who has written in this field in recent years. His book should help give to the House the public image which it deserves.

The House of Representatives is the most important arm of the Federal Government, because it is the people's arm. It may not always have been the most spectacular or the most glamorous, but it has always been the most responsive to the people's will.

Mr. MacNeil has told this story through the lives and services of many of those immortal Americans who have preceded us here. He has brought many of our most renowned predecessors back to life and described their activities in this historic Chamber. He has told us who it was that made the House what it is.

The book will appeal particularly to Members of the House who are familiar with the proceedings of the House, who know their colleagues, who know something about the day-to-day, the week-to-week, and the year-by-year operations of this body.

This book comes as one of the few that describes the House we know. Most textbooks on Government fail to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Neil MacNeil on his fine work. I recommend it to my colleagues, to students, and to all those interested in representative government as it operates in our country.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, by the generosity of Mr. MacNeil, I have a copy of his book. I have not finished reading it, but I have read far enough to know that he has written a good account of the position, the prestige, and the standing of the House of Representatives.

As one who has served here, may I say, Mr. Speaker, almost the major part of my life; as one who certainly has spent most of his adult years here in the House of Representatives; and, as one who has elected to stay in the House of Representatives when other very attractive opportunities have been offered, I have through the years become not jealous of the position of the House of Representatives; I have become one who believes that the House of Representatives through the years has in truth and in fact been the forge of democracy.

So, I am happy on this occasion to join in commendation of Neil MacNeil who has written a very readable book, one that I hope will be read by millions of Americans who, reading it, will be better informed as to the position of the House of Representatives in this great Republic which, after all, is a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself with the remarks made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND], the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma, [Mr. ALBERT], and the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]. I think it fitting that these remarks should be made on today. This is May 1. This is the day that we have established in our country to counteract the Communist celebration on May 1—a celebration which we have called Law Day. All over our country today we are marking this occasion.

Mr. Speaker, one cannot talk about law, about justice, and about all of the other concepts which have made this country what it is, the greatest country in the history of mankind, without reflecting on the magnificent role played by the House of Representatives in establishing and maintaining these freedoms. We have some people in our country today as in the past who like to criticize this body, who say that we have been unable to keep up with the times, so to speak. Yet when we look at the record and realize what the House of Representatives and the other body, for that matter, have done in moving the United States ahead in the space age, the atomic age, through the magnificent developments of the 20th century, then I think we can renew our faith in popular government as represented by the House of Representatives and dismiss the critics as men of little faith.

I think this book needed writing. I think Mr. MacNeil has done an outstanding service in writing it, and I join with all of the others in extending congratulations to him. He is an outstanding writer and a fine man. He is a credit to his profession.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the leadership on both sides and the man who instigated this, our distinguished colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] in praising and bringing to the attention of our colleagues this extraordinary book.

It is, I believe, the best book on the House of Representatives that has been written to date in American history. Certainly this is true in modern times. It is full of history. It is full of anecdotes. It is altogether a fascinating book. This view, which is obviously shared by many of us who have read it, is also shared by a man who knows more of the precedents and the history of the House of Representatives than any man living. I refer to the Parliamentarian, Lewis Deschler.

Mr. Speaker, Lewis Deschler is quoted as saying:

> I found "Forge of Democracy" so fascinating that I could not lay it down. A great book, it makes abundantly clear the complex inner workings of the House of Representatives and gives the House the recognition that it deserves for its endeavors and achievements.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this book to every Member of the House of Representatives and to all those in this country who are truly interested in our Government.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, for a better knowledge and greater appreciation of this body in which we serve, I urge every Member of the House of Representatives to read Neil MacNeil's superb book "Forge of Democracy." More importantly, all Americans should study it carefully in order to secure a better understanding of the interesting history and vital role the House has played in the preservation and expansion of the Nation's freedom. This book is a timely and affirmative answer to the criticisms of the legislative branch of the Government. I congratulate the author on a scholarly commentary and on his most helpful contribution to a proper evaluation of the legislative process.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in their laudation of the book, "Forge of Democracy," written by my good friend, Neil MacNeil. I thoroughly enjoyed reading this book. It is scholarly without being dull. He presents the facts in a readable manner. He gives meaning and life and color to historic events and personages, some well known and others little known. This book should be must reading for those who wish to understand the Congress, and particularly the House of Representatives. This book is of such character that it would make excellent supplemental reading for any textbook on government.

Mr. Speaker, those of us who have spent so many years in the House of Representatives and who love this House of Representatives, as so often said by the late Speaker Sam Rayburn, find in this book many, many things of tremendous interest. Neil MacNeil has made a distinct contribution in having the House better understood as the voice of the American people. My congratulations to Neil on an extraordinary, fine book.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in commending this historic book on the House of Representatives. I have had an opportunity to read this book. It is a significant book because it effectively and lucidly analyzes the historical role of the House of Representatives. It places in proper perspective the very crucial and decisive role the House was designed to play and has played in the history of this great country of ours. There is no other history of the House of Representatives that shows the insight and the understanding of this body so well.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this book to my colleagues in the House.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the name of a distinguished resident of the Sixth Congressional District of Maryland has been mentioned on this floor today. Certainly nothing that has been said about Neil MacNeil overemphasizes or exaggerates his fine qualities as a writer.

Neil MacNeil has said that his purpose in writing the "Forge of Democracy" was to "define the House of Representatives."

In so doing he has quoted a number of earlier descriptions of this great body which his animated scholarship has brought to light.

One that caught my eye was that of an 18th-century commentator:

> The design of the House of Representatives is to represent the people of the United States, and to protect their liberties.

In protecting the liberties of the people, this House collectively and its Members individually are often misunderstood. Catcalls, calumny, and caricature are the result. Members are accused of bolshevism on one hand and negative obstructionism on the other. In most cases they are guilty of neither, but have been representing their people in accordance with their conscience and in the light of their experience in life.

Neil MacNeil tells how the House operates and the way in which the Members of this body dedicate themselves to their high calling. The problems of the House are described and analyzed. The achievements of the House in preserving liberty are recorded.

In my judgment, this history of the House will make it at once more human and more understandable, and at the same time more noble and elevated in the opinions of men and women throughout the world.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to join my colleagues in praise of Neil MacNeil for his outstanding work "Forge of Democracy." This book is written by a true student of the legislative process who has recorded the actions of the House of Representatives in true form.

The importance of the House is often underestimated by those who do not understand its constitutional powers and its actual operations. Neil MacNeil does with accuracy.

"Forge of Democracy" should be read by each Member of Congress and all Americans who want to have a greater understanding of the body that speaks as the voice of the American people.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have permission to extend their remarks on the subject of Neil MacNeil's book, "Forge of Democracy," at this point in the RECORD; and that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on that subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, Neil MacNeil's "Forge of Democracy" is a gripping epic of the House of Representatives. Mr. MacNeil has succeeded in portraying the House as the living, dynamic, political institution that we, as Members, know it to be. It brings to the reader historically accurate information about its membership, past and present, and presents it in a manner that brings each episode to life.

I have known Mr. MacNeil for many years and his book reflects his sincerity and the tremendous effort that he has put into its writing. I congratulate him for making this excellent documentary on the history of the House of Representatives available to the reading public, and to students of government.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries have permission to sit until 1 o'clock today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CASTROPHOBIA—A LATIN AMERICAN EPIDEMIC

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the predictions are that a disease seems to be spreading through our sister continent to the south. Castrophobia, a new form of virus, is emanating from Communist Cuba to infect the nations of Latin America. Fidel Castro's disillusioned former administrative aid recently predicted that Communist takeover of Latin America is imminent. Joaquin Ossorio, just arrived in the United States after being freed through arrangements of lawyer James Donovan last week, said in Miami that "Mexico will go first, Cuba will be the base, and the takeover has been prepared there."

Ossorio continued by saying that he did not believe the United States could stop the Communists even if they tried. Americans know better.

Mr. Speaker, how fortunate we are in the United States to be privileged to live in a stable society, with government chosen and upheld in systematic order. This fact comes to us clearly today, May 1, Law Day. Yet to the south, many nations of Latin America are in comparative chaos. Life and property there are protected by law at one moment, are subject to destruction the next.

Mr. Speaker, Law Day brings to every American the responsibility to honor and strengthen the system under which we live. Law Day should cause our Government to examine the responsibility it has to the governed. And Law Day points up the great need for this Nation to exercise its responsibility for leadership in this hemisphere to stem the tide of communism in Latin America.

BLACKOUT ON CRIME NEWS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, for almost a year now I have raised the issue on the floor of this House of the high incidence of crime in the District of Columbia and the impossibility for people in the District or their visiting friends to walk the streets of the District either day or night, for fear of their lives.

I am calling the attention of the Committee on the District of Columbia to this situation. They are now holding hearings on legislation to try to correct it. I am wondering how many of us recognize that within the last 10 days, as they have gone through the Washington newspapers, they have found absolutely no record of the crime in the District of Columbia. It has been blacked out of the newspapers. I find on just a little investigation that the Police Department is being prevented from issuing this information to the press. The Committee on the District of Columbia should be investigating, and if they are not I hope they will, investigate this crackdown on the Police Department to keep this important news out of the newspapers. When you talk about managing the news, they have got it right here in the District of Columbia so far as the Police Department is concerned. I think it is a crime that that news is being blacked out of the newspapers. I am surprised the press has not said something about it.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 35]

Aspinall
Beermann
Buckley
Celler
Chenoweth
Conte
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Edmondson
Flynt
Forrester
Hagan, Ga.
Hansen
Healey
Hébert
Leggett
Lennon
Lloyd
Miller, Calif.
Nedzi
Powell
Reid, Ill.
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Tex.
Roosevelt
Ryan, Mich.
St. Onge
Scott
Shelley
Sisk
Staebler
Van Pelt
Walter
White
Willis

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 396 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK ACT EXTENSION

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 325 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

> *Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3872) to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank o' Washington, to extend the period within which the Export-Import Bank of Washington may exercise its functions, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for the consideration of the bill H.R. 3872, a bill to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, to extend the period within which the Export-Import Bank of Washington may exercise its functions, and for other purposes.

The resolution is an open rule, providing for 2 hours of general debate.

The purpose of the bill is to extend the life of the Export-Import Bank for 5 years, to increase the bank's authorization for insurance and guarantee from $1 to $2 billion, and to increase the limitation on the amount of loans, guarantees, and insurance outstanding at any time from $7 to $9 billion.

Mr. Speaker, when the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, appeared before the Committee on Rules to request a rule on this bill, he stated that he would offer an amendment to the bill which would remove the Treasury borrowing authority for the Export-Import Bank from the bill, and would substitute therefor the provision that annual appropriations would be requested for the lending authority. I have seen the amendment, which is in the nature of a substitute, and it will be offered when the House goes into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no opposition to the rule.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 325 is a 2-hour open rule. On its adoption the House will consider H.R. 3872, which is a bill to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, to extend the period within which the Export-Import Bank of Washington may exercise its functions, and for other purposes.

This bill would, first, extend the life of the Export-Import Bank for 5 years to June 30, 1968; second, increase the lending authority of the Bank by $2 billion; and, third, authorize a $1 billion increase in the exporter insurance program of the Bank.

So far as I know there has only been one point of controversy on this bill. That turns on the point of whether the $2 billion of increased lending authority of the Bank would be financed by back-door borrowing from the Treasury or with appropriated funds.

The chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee in his appearance before the Rules Committee, informed our committee he would offer an amendment when the bill was brought before the House, to subject the provision of funds for the increased lending authority to the appropriations process. I believe that should eliminate the controversy on the bill.

There is general agreement the Export-Import Bank has operated on a sound business basis and that it is a valuable instrument in assisting private financial institutions in financing our foreign trade.

Now it is known, of course, if the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] offers an amendment here which he has stated he will do, which eliminates the back-door spending and ties it down to appropriated funds, it can then, of course, go to the other body and the back-door spending language could be inserted back into the bill. Then it will come back over here and there may be a conference and it may be that we would eventually find that language in the bill.

So, in order to make a little history on the rule here today, I would like to ask some questions of the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] so that we can determine specifically what his intent is and what his attitude throughout this legislative procedure will be. Would the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] be so kind as to answer a few questions for me?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMITH of California. My understanding is that you intend to offer an amendment deleting the back-door spending and tie it down to appropriated funds; is that correct?

Mr. PATMAN. It is my plan and purpose and I will offer a substitute to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert language as follows:

> In order further to enable the Bank to carry out its objects and purposes under this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed upon an appropriation of funds for that purpose to purchase from time to time such additional obligations as the Bank may issue in an amount not to exceed $2,000,000,000 outstanding at any one time.

Mr. SMITH of California. May I ask the gentleman further: We are aware that if it goes to the other body and it is amended there and the language on back-door spending is put back in, then I wonder what your position will be following that?

Mr. PATMAN. As a conferee I will uphold the position of the House, and I feel it will be the duty and obligation of each of the conferees on the part of the House to assume that attitude and be firm in that position.

Mr. SMITH of California. May I ask if the language is the same as you told me before we started on the rule, then you would be adamant in your position with respect to the position of the House?

Mr. PATMAN. That is right. The gentleman uses the correct word to describe it. We would be adamant in our position.

Mr. SMITH of California. I have been informed by one of the Members on this side that if this bill comes back with that back-door language in it, he would object and send it to the Rules Committee.

Mr. PATMAN. Of course, if the other body should be adamant in its position, then we would have no legislation at all. This act expires on June 30. I think this legislation is too important for either side or for any Member not to try to get the act extended, and if we get into an impasse, then we would have to do the best we can after consulting those with whom we should consult and take such action as the leaders and others feel we ought to take.

Mr. SMITH of California. Just one other question, if I may.

One of the Members came to me just a short while ago and stated to me that he had heard information or a rumor to the effect that the Export-Import Bank has just recently concluded a loan to Communist Yugoslavia. Are you aware of anything like that?

Mr. PATMAN. No, I am not aware of it.

Mr. SMITH of California. I wonder if this information is brought to your attention, if you will have your committee check into a situation like that.

Mr. PATMAN. That would be something that is up to the executive branch of the Government, I would assume. What kind of a loan is involved, if any? Is it possibly a loan that the gentleman from California might agree with? I do not know just what it might be.

Mr. SMITH of California. I just do not happen to believe that the Export-Import Bank should be lending money to Communist Yugoslavia which is out to take over our Government. I would like to have somebody check that particular situation to see if it exists.

Mr. PATMAN. Generally, I am opposed to doing any business with any Communist country, but it is conceivable if the executive branch of the Government in looking after the foreign affairs of our Government believes that loans should be made under certain conditions that would help the United States of America, then perhaps we might look at the thing in a different light.

Mr. SMITH of California. I thank the gentleman.

As far as I know, if the back-door spending is eliminated, and there are some 13 Members who signed the minority report stating that was their objection, the suggested amendment here will clear up that objection. There is no objection to the rule.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3872) to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, to extend the period within which the Export-Import Bank of Washington may exercise its functions, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 3872, with Mr. LANDRUM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Chairman, the purposes of H.R. 3872 are not in controversy.

One purpose is to extend the life of the Export-Import Bank of Washington. Under present law the life of the Bank expires on June 30 of this year. The bill would extend the life of the Bank for another 5 years, or until June 30, 1968.

The second purpose of the bill is to enlarge the Bank's lending, insurance and guarantee authority. At present the Bank is limited to $7 billion of loans and other obligations it can have outstanding at any one time. The bill would increase this amount by $2 billion.

Within this increased total obligational authority, the bill would also permit the Bank to have up to $2 billion outstanding in the form of guarantees and insurance for export credit. At present the Bank is limited to $1 billion for this particular program.

Our committee heard representatives of large and small businesses, representatives of banking, insurance, the AFL–CIO, the Farm Bureau Federation, the National Cotton Council of America, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, and others. All witnesses were in support of the proposal to extend the life of the Bank and increase its financing authority.

EXIMBANK HAS GOOD RECORD

The Export-Import Bank has made an extremely good record. It has been in existence now for more than 29 years. It has helped American business firms finance their exports abroad, and it has thus helped these firms make sales they otherwise would not have been able to make. These exports have also helped many underdeveloped countries of the world advance their economic development. The Bank has thus stimulated trade, all parties to which have benefited.

Over most of the life of the Bank, it has been engaged in making what are called project loans. These are loans to some foreign government or private enterprise, or to some American company operating abroad to develop facilities such as harbors, railroads, or factories. In these instances, the loans are made to the recipient country, or company, on the condition that U.S. business firms supply the materials, equipment and services which go into the project. Almost all of these funds are required to be spent in the United States. Only in exceptional cases, where some incidental part of a project is best secured from other sources, may any of the loan funds be spent other than in the United States. Such project loans involve credit of a rather long-term nature.

In view of our acute balance-of-payments problem, Congress in 1961 enacted legislation expanding the Bank's guarantee and insurance authority, to enable the Bank to institute a program of export credits and guarantees. Such export credits and guarantees cover the whole range of commodity exports and usually involve credit of a rather short-term nature.

Over the years that the Bank has been in operation it has paid its administrative expenses, paid for the cost of its money and still made a profit.

The Bank is capitalized with $1 billion of stock, which is owned by the U.S. Treasury. The Bank has paid Treasury dividends on this stock amounting to $306 million. In addition, the Bank has an earned surplus held as a reserve, amounting to $805 million.

For its financial operations, the Bank is authorized to borrow funds from the Treasury—at present up to $7 billion. On the funds borrowed from the Treasury the Bank pays the Treasury an interest rate equal to the Treasury's cost of borrowing 7-year money.

HELPS BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

One point should be emphasized. The operations of the Export-Import Bank do not create any flow of dollars abroad. On the contrary, the dollars which the Bank lends or spends never leave the United States. Its operations are indeed very helpful toward a correction of the deficit in our balance of payments. Last year the Bank's operations made a net contribution of $700 million toward bringing our international payments into balance.

On the basis of the Bank's record and the reliance we are now placing on the Bank to increase our exports and thus help correct our balance-of-payments problem, I believe there should be no objection to extending the life of the Bank and increasing its financing authority.

The Committee on Banking and Currency reported the bill unanimously. Only one objection was made to the bill. This was an objection to the method whereby the Bank is financed.

SO-CALLED BACK-DOOR FINANCING

This objection is to the method by which the Bank has been financed over the last 29 years, which is the so-called back-door spending method.

Because our balance-of-payments problem is an extremely critical one—indeed, a problem which is influencing all of the economic policies of our Government and because delay is inadvisable—I will offer an amendment to the bill to require that the financial operations of the Bank be approved by the Appropriations Committees of the House and the Senate.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that after this bill had been reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Secretary of the Treasury advised one of the committees of the House that the purposes of this legislation could be accomplished through the appropriations process, it has been decided to recommend the procedure which the gentleman from Texas has just described; is that not correct?

Mr. PATMAN. The majority leader is correct according to my understanding. Since the gentleman mentioned that unfavorable testimony of Secretary Dillon, I will place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point, by permission granted when we go back into the House, the actual testimony before the Appropriations Subcommittee referred to by the distinguished majority leader of which the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] is chairman; and I will also put in the questions and answers.

Our committee on Banking and Currency was strongly in favor of continuing financing in the same manner the Bank has been financed over the 29 years of its life, which is improperly labeled "back-door financing." We were strong for it. Our committee voted the bill out that way. Of course, the Republicans, the minority, voted the other way on that one point. However, they are for the Export-Import Bank. They are for everything except the method of financing.

After we had reported the bill out we discovered that a statement was being circulated to other Members of the House containing this testimony of Secretary Dillon, and our opponents were citing this testimony as a good reason why they could not support the committee's position on what they call back-door financing. Naturally this testimony was very damaging to our cause.

I will insert Mr. Dillon's statement in the Record.

SECRETARY DILLON ON THE METHOD OF FINANCING

The following colloquy with Secretary of the Treasury Dillon took place before a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives on Treasury-Post Office Departments and Executive Office appropriations for 1964, House of Representatives, 88th Congress, 1st session, page 71.

Secretary Dillon was testifying on February 26, 1963. The hearings were printed on April 1, 1963.

The Committee on Banking and Currency ordered the Export-Import Bank bill (H.R. 3872) reported on February 28, 1963, and the report was filed on March 11, 1963:

Extension of Back-Door Spending of Export-Import Bank

Mr. Gary. Mr. Secretary, the law under which the Export-Import Bank operates will expire June 30, 1963. I understand that the administration is recommending the extension of that authority for 5 years, together with an increase in capitalization of $2 billion through backdoor spending.

Why could not the increase be in the form of a direct appropriation?

Secretary Dillon. It could.

Mr. Gary. My guess would be that the administration would have a much easier time getting it through if they would make it that way. Last year similar action was taken in connection with the International Monetary Fund, and that increase in capitalization was ultimately made by direct appropriation rather than by backdoor spending.

I see no reason why this could not be done in the same way, and I think you would have lots less opposition to it.

Secretary Dillon. It could. We were responsible in the Treasury for the IMF appropriation, and, although we initially thought it would be easiest to do it in the way that it had always been done in the past, which was by borrowing authority, when we observed the feeling of the Congress, we figured it would be just as easy to do it the other way, and we did it. We got the appropriation, and it went just as well.

The Export-Import Bank is, of course, not under the Treasury, and they had some discussion of this, which way to go. Over the past 25 years, they had received their funds through this borrowing authority. I think they consulted with the chairman of the committee, and he seemed to feel they ought at least initially start that way. He seemed to think that preferable.

Mr. Gary. The chairman of which committee?

Secretary Dillon. Of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House.

Mr. Gary. He probably does not realize that there are a great many of the Members of the Congress that have resolved that they are not going to vote for any more backdoor spending.

Secretary Dillon. That may be. The answer is that we have to get the Export-Import Bank's charter extended. We cannot allow it to die on the 30th of June, and I think they need the new funds. I think they can convince an Appropriations Committee as well as the authorizing committee, and I think, in one way or another, they will have to get their new funds.

Mr. Gary. Personally, I think the Export-Import Bank has done a good job.

Secretary Dillon. Yes; I think it has.

Mr. Gary. And I would like to vote for the increased capitalization, but I am one of those opposed to backdoor spending.

Secretary Dillon. You may well have the chance to vote for the appropriation for them a little later on.

Mr. Passman. Are they running out of authority, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Gary. The law expires.

Secretary Dillon. It has always been a dated law and expires about every 5 years, and they do have to go to the Banking and Currency to get it extended. That is a regular thing. It just happens to be coming up.

Mr. Chairman, I am disappointed in the position Mr. Dillon attributed to me. It is to the effect that he thought the Bank officials consulted with me and I was only tentatively and moderately in favor of continuing the Bank's 29-year method of financing. The suggestion is that I was just going to offer this method as a feeler, and if it ran into opposition, I would back down.

Well, I never felt that way about any issue in my life, and certainly not about this particular issue. I have always been strong for the Treasury method of financing because it has been successful and, by all logic, is the method best suited to the Bank. I regret that anyone who conferred with me, or that Mr. Dillon in conferring with me, got that impression. I certainly did not intend to leave such an impression that I was not strong and insistent upon the position of the Treasury method as we have had it over the last 29 years.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Am I correct in assuming that the extension and the increased borrowing authority of the Export-Import Bank would still prohibit the making of loans which would be payable in foreign currencies?

Mr. PATMAN. The Bank has never made loans repayable in foreign currencies, but whether it is prohibited from doing so, I cannot say. I would have to examine it. I do not have the information right before me.

Mr. WAGGONNER. If the gentleman will yield further, I think that is the point that is very vital to this particular legislation, considering some of the controversy involved.

Mr. PATMAN. Of course, the object of this legislation does not involve foreign currencies at all. The object of this legislation is to make loans to people here, or to other countries, payable in dollars. The dollars do not leave the United States of America. The goods are purchased and are shipped to the person or firm receiving the loan.

Mr. WAGGONNER. If the gentleman will yield further, loans are made which are repayable in foreign currencies and it is most likely that these dollars would never be made available to the U.S. Government again.

Mr. PATMAN. I think some of the foreign lending agencies like AID and the Development Loan Fund, maybe some of them do that. But if the Export-Import Bank is doing it it is certainly on a very limited scale, if at all; certainly it is not a major consideration.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KILBURN. The answer is no; the loans are repayable in dollars.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. In the light of what the gentleman has said about the dollars staying in this country will he explain the necessity for the insurance program? What does it cover?

PROPOSALS OF EXPORT CREDIT INSURANCE

Mr. PATMAN. The insurance program is to cover credit extended for exports, to protect people against certain types of losses.

Mr. GROSS. What people are we encouraging?

Mr. PATMAN. We are encouraging the people who get the loans for the purpose of helping the underdeveloped countries and for other purposes, and to encourage U.S. business to make more export sales.

Mr. GROSS. By people does the gentleman mean Americans, U.S. citizens?

Mr. PATMAN. Some of them are: General Motors, Ford Motor Co.; and some of them are small business concerns.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. I would like to inform the House, in answer to the gentleman's question, that the guarantee program is for the benefit of American citizens and American companies. It gives them guarantees for which they pay a premium. This is to encourage our people our companies, American corporations, American citizens, to export their products abroad in competition with foreign products. We sell them the same guarantees and insurance that foreign countries give to their nationals. This is completely an American program, to foster and to promote American export trade.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman what coverage is provided in this insurance?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. The coverage would vary from case to case. The Export-Import Bank, under the basic statute, has the right to issue guarantees and insurance; and instead of doing it itself it also has the right to reinsure. There is a consortium, or group of insurance companies, private insurance companies, who have gotten together to write this insurance in the first instance for our American exporters. They take the reinsurance for which they pay a premium, from the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. GROSS. To guarantee against what?

Mr. MULTER. Against political risk, and guarantee against credit risk. They have two kinds of insurance which will guarantee them against loss, because a foreign country may confiscate their property or their money.

Second, there is the credit risk. It is simple credit insurance, the same as you can get here at home. If you are extending credit, you can buy credit insurance. This is the same kind, except that our private insurance companies issue it to the American exporter and those insurance companies get reinsurance from the Export-Import Bank under their basic insurance, for which they pay.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman for the explanation.

BANKERS AND BUSINESSMEN SUPPORTED TREASURY FINANCING

Now, in offering this amendment to change the method of financing the Bank, I am frank to say that the objection to the method whereby the Bank has been financed over the last 29 years was not raised by any banker or businessman or any other witness who testified before the committee. We had tremendous opposition, true, but only from certain Members of the House.

Members of the House presented a petition—I believe the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] was chairman of a group of 70 or 80 Members who signed a petition saying that they would not vote for this method of financing. So we had tremendous opposition to this method before Mr. Dillon's testimony. After Mr. Dillon's testimony we lost a lot of support, and I will have to say that it was the conclusion, after much consideration, of the leadership of the House, that we should not insist upon the so-called backdoor method of financing, and that we should yield to the appropriation method because we did not have a reasonable chance of getting the bill through unless we did. So just being practical about it, we had to use what we considered to be commonsense and accept the opposition's method, so we could get the bill through the House, rather than insisting on the method that the polls indicated we could not be successful on.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. I want to compliment the gentleman on his commonsense.

Mr. PATMAN. The witnesses before the Banking and Currency Committee felt that the operations of the bank were inherently unsuited to the regular appropriations process, and they gave some cogent reasons why they felt that both confidence in the bank and the efficiency of the bank would be hurt by the appropriations requirement. They gave practical reasons, based on experience with the Bank.

The objection, on the other hand, was raised by certain members of the committee and other Members of Congress who have argued that certain theoretical and tactical advantages would accrue from a change in the method of financing.

It has been made plain by those who object to the Treasury method of financing, furthermore, that they are not objecting in any way to any programs or the operations of the Export-Import Bank. Rather they have said that what they wish to do is to amend each and every authorization bill going through Congress, to require separate approval by the Appropriations Committees.

REASONS FOR OBJECTION TO TREASURY FINANCING

It had seemed to me that since the target of this maneuver is not the Export-Import Bank or the merits of the method by which the bank is financed as this method applies to the bank, but a more general target, it would be much better to put forward the objectives which have been stated in a general resolution to make the policy apply across the board to all programs and agencies.

One of the objectives of this effort to stop so-called backdoor spending is set out in a letter to the committee from the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY]. His letter argues that by stopping the so-called backdoor spending, the House can better foreclose the Senate from initiating financial measures.

It had not seemed proper to me to use this particular piece of legislation for inviting a jurisdictional squabble with the Senate, particularly when the purpose being advanced is not the legislation before us, but a more general strategy.

INEFFICIENCY OF THE CONGRESS

I must also be frank to say that I am concerned with the effects of movements of this kind on the efficiency of the Congress and the ability of the Congress to act. The widespread public criticism being made to the effect that as the years go by Congress stays in session longer and gets less and less done is not to be taken lightly. The criticism can fairly be made that the Congress has established too many bottleneck procedures which tend to assure that it will not act rather than that it will act and act with reasonable promptness to the national needs for action.

Under present arrangements the Export-Import Bank legislation must clear the Committees on Banking and Currency of both the House and the Senate. It must clear the Rules Committee of the House. It must have the approval of the two Houses of Congress; and finally it must be signed by the President.

Eliminating the so-called backdoor spending method means only that the legislation will also have to receive the approval of the Appropriations Committees of the two Houses of Congress; and it means that the legislative program must go through the whole legislative process twice, instead of only once. After the legislation has been approved by the Banking Committees of the two Houses, approved by the two Houses of Congress, and approved by the President, it must then be approved by the Appropriations Committees of the two Houses, approved again by the two Houses of Congress, and signed a second time by the President. In other words, it will take the enactment of two laws instead of one, and nothing else is accomplished.

And of course the officers and executives of the Bank have to spend twice as much time testifying before committees of Congress instead of attending to their duties at the Bank.

It was on the basis of these and other considerations that the Committee on Banking and Currency voted for a bill which would continue the method of financing by which the Bank has been successful over the past 29 years.

As for myself personally, further reflection has not changed my views on this matter. Rather I am offering an amendment to the bill to meet the objection that has been made to the bill in order that this important program may at least receive its first approval. I believe the quicker we act on the legislation the better, so the Appropriations Committees of the two Houses may get their work done, in the hope that the Congress can then act again on the matter before the life of the Bank expires next month, on June 30.

I ask that the substitute be offered immediately following the reading of the first section of the bill. The only material change in the substitute, in fact the only change, is to require the financing to be done through the appropriations method. I assume there will be no fight on the rest of the bill, as no one has opposed the bill except as to the method of financing.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3872. I am especially interested in this bill because of the potential opportunities available to small business to enter into export trade under the programs of the Export-Import Bank.

The House Small Business Committee, of which I serve as chairman, has held recent hearings concerning small business and export trade. At these hearings Mr. Harold F. Linder, President and Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank, appeared before the committee. The testimony submitted thus far certainly indicates that there are real potentials and opportunities for small business in the export trade field. I also think it can be fairly said that the foreign credit risk is more important to small business in export trade than price itself. As a result, the services provided by the Export-Import Bank are peculiarly geared to aid small business.

As set out in Mr. Linder's statement—very ably presented to the committee—the new insurance program initiated by the Export-Import Bank through the Foreign Credit Insurance Association could be of special help to small business.

We were advised by Mr. Linder that during the first year, 150 policies insuring against credit loss or political loss were issued to small and medium-sized businesses that had never exported before.

We were advised that an applicant has never been turned down for insurance under this program because of smallness.

We were advised that one-fourth of the transactions under the credit guarantee program were for less than $25,000 each.

Under the project loan program there are possibilities for small businesses to participate in the supplying of services and materials for these projects, either through direct contracts or through subcontracts.

Mr. Chairman, such programs as have been instituted by the Export-Import Bank through legislation passed by Congress are more important now to our economy than ever before. With an expanding worldwide economy, with stronger and stiffer competition in world trade, with expanded export trade possibilities, it is absolutely necessary that the United States extend its foreign trade. We brag about free enterprise. Can our free-enterprise system compete with the rising nations of the free world? Can we do less for our business community than the programs furnished by other countries? We must match them or we cannot compete. We must compete because world economic leadership cannot be separated from world political leadership.

This country is at a crossroad where we cannot stand still when it comes to foreign trade. We must either expand our foreign trade—compete in the world markets—or revert to isolationism. The dreams of Cordell Hull are within actual reach and the action we take on the floor of the House today concerning the Export-Import Bank will be of significant importance.

Mr. Chairman, I do not mean to say that everything is being done for small business than can or should be done in this field. In fact, the surface has just been scratched. There is evidence that small businesses are not fully realizing the benefits that are provided through the Export-Import Bank. However, this legislation contains potential for small business that cannot be overlooked.

The programs of the Export-Import Bank can be of material helpfulness to small business—as the services and programs of the Export-Import Bank are fully available to small business.

I strongly support the provisions of H.R. 3872, providing for the extension of the Export-Import Bank and urge passage of this legislation.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, I think the chairman of our committee has covered most of the points, but I think I can add a few. In the first place, the Export-Import Bank is run well. It is run for the benefit of the exporters. It helps our trade. It helps business and helps labor. It has been run in such a way as to make money for the Government which is a strange thing to me in these times.

I might add they have disbursed approximately $9 billion in loans of which $5,200 million has been repaid. They have paid interest to the Treasury of $432.5 million. They have paid dividends into the Treasury of $306 million. Their losses over the years have been approximately $100 million or only about 1.1 percent. So that is how they could make a profit and they have confined their loans to hard loans. They take a look at every loan and they do not try to allocate them to countries and they do not try to allocate the loans to industries or to states or anything else. A loan application comes in and they make the loan, if they think the loan is sound. They also make the loan many times in conjunction with banks that participate in the loan. So the whole operation has been an excellent one under Mr. Harold F. Linder and under the previous heads of the Bank.

Our chairman took quite a lot of time, it seems to me, on a dead horse and that is the backdoor spending. I would just like to inform the House that the amendment was offered in the committee by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HARVEY] to do away with backdoor spending. We were voted down. Hence, the minority report on this bill. I am delighted the chairman of the committee has seen the light and is now going to offer an amendment for appropriation financing.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL].

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, at this time I rise in support of the bill and want to express my confidence in the Export-Import Bank operation. I believe over a period of years they have, through their program and operation, shown a consistently fine operating record. It is one group organized by our Government that is a distinct credit to the people of America. As to the new credit guarantee program that is just getting off to a start, I regret at the hearings we did not have any testimony from exporters who are involved in the program. We have been assured that later on this year, an opportunity for hearings will be given so that exporters may come in with their suggestions, criticisms, and constructive ideas, as to the program and its operation today. This can be helpful in formulating policy for the future. I urge the House to support this program. I, too, am happy that the backdoor spending will be eliminated by the amendment that will be offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PATMAN. I think the gentleman is not correct in his statement that we did not hear exporters at the hearings. We heard some of the biggest exporters in the United States and they testified. Their testimony is in the printed hearings. I believe you will find them, if you examine the record.

Mr. WIDNALL. I think we had testimony from those who financed the exporting to a large extent but not from the exporters themselves. I just hope we can bring them before us in the near future.

Mr. PATMAN. Now, we had the statement of Mr. John O. Yeasting, vice president and general manager, Transport Division of Boeing Aircraft.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I am still at sea with respect to the loan guarantee operation. I would like to address a question or two to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Now, is this the insurance program or, let me put it this way, do we have one insurance program for all of these international lending agencies, or does the Export-Import Bank have its own insurance program?

Mr. MULTER. Under the Export-Import Bank Act there are provisions which authorize the Export-Import Bank to set up an insurance and guarantee program, which it has done, and I think what the gentleman from New Jersey, [Mr. WIDNALL], was referring to is the fact that this is a new program; it is just getting off the ground, and we, in the committee, have not yet had an opportunity to inquire into its complete operation. We have not been quite satisfied that they are moving fast enough, but having in mind that it is a new operation, we cannot push them into something that will cause tremendous losses. But, our committee does want to review that entire program as it is presently operating to make sure that it is operating at its full effectiveness for the benefit of our American exporters.

Mr. GROSS. Is this an adaptation of the program that has been in effect several years, dealing with the mutual security program?

Mr. MULTER. No.

Mr. GROSS. Forget the mutual security program; let me say other international lending agencies.

Mr. MULTER. Under your so-called mutual security and foreign aid bills there has been an insurance program that has been operating quite apart from this program. This is a new program that the Export-Import Bank has always been authorized to implement but has only recently implemented.

Mr. GROSS. Do you guarantee against civil strife, rebellion, insurrection, and all the coverages of the other programs?

Mr. MULTER. If civil strife, civil insurrection, and rebellion can come within the definition of political risk, yes. The Export-Import Bank is authorized to insure against damage, political risk, which takes in any action by a foreign government which would make it impossible for the American to receive payment of his debt.

That is the political risk. In addition to that, they have the right to insure and are insuring against the credit risk, which is the ordinary credit insurance as we know it here at home.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to see someone undertake to explain this matter. This is a real sugar-coated pill, these words "political risk."

Mr. MULTER. Let us be sure we understand this.

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. MULTER. This must be operated on a financially sound basis.

Mr. GROSS. Oh, I do not question that.

Mr. MULTER. They set up a premium schedule and the premiums in their judgment must be enough to pay for the losses.

Mr. GROSS. I am not questioning the soundness of it. I am pointing to the euphemy that is being used. In one guarantee program the coverages are set out and defined as insurrection, riots, civil strife, revolution, convertibility of currency, expropriation, and so on and so forth. I am surprised that the State Department did not dream up political risks instead of laying it out in words that one can understand. "Political risk" covers the waterfront, does it not?

Mr. MULTER. Of course, it can cover the waterfront, but I am sure it is delineated in the statute so that it does not cover the waterfront.

Mr. GROSS. The dollars advanced under this program stay in this country?

Mr. MULTER. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Under the loans made through the Export-Import Bank the dollars stay in this country?

Mr. MULTER. The money is usually used for purchases here at home.

Mr. GROSS. So, the guarantee is to what in the foreign country? Is it to the machinery that has been shipped over and not paid for, for instance?

Mr. MULTER. Let us not confuse the two. You, first, have your loan program.

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. MULTER. Your loan program is a loan made by the Export-Import Bank to the American exporter who is selling his goods abroad and cannot finance his sale unless he gets the money when he is ready to make delivery.

Mr. GROSS. He is guaranteeing what? His money?

Mr. MULTER. There is no guarantee involved when the Export-Import Bank makes a loan to you or to me as an exporter. That is it. When we make delivery to whomever we are selling—to the foreign country, or an individual in the foreign country—we get our money against our documents and then the money will eventually be repaid. That is quite apart from the guarantee insurance program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman from New York yield me an additional 5 minutes?

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me on that point?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. I think under the existing law, in fact, I know that all political risk is carried—all political risk is guaranteed and insured.

Mr. GROSS. All political risk is guaranteed?

Mr. PATMAN. That is right; and 50 percent of the commercial risk. Mr. Linder testified that they are working with the insurance companies to the end that very soon they will have full commercial risk insurance. I think there is pretty good coverage now. Based upon a lot of experience which they have had, all of the political risk and 50 percent of the commercial risk will be covered.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is referring to the guarantee and insurance program. There are no guarantees and insurance concerned when the loan is made by the Export-Import Bank to an American exporter. That is one deal. The loan is made and that it is. He does not need any guarantees any longer.

Mr. GROSS. I did not think so.

Mr. MULTER. That would be the Export-Import Bank which would be looking for the guarantee and it would have to look for the guarantee from whoever agreed to pay the debt, which would be the individual in a foreign country or, the foreign company. Before they make that loan they must be sure this is a sound loan and there is reasonable assurance of repayment. That is part of the inquiry which the Bank must make before making the loan. When the loan is made, that transaction is at an end except to await repayment.

The guarantee and insurance program was entered into in an effort to try to take the Export-Import Bank out of the lending program as far as possible, and instead of making a loan to you or to me in the first instance, as a result of which we got our money and shipped our goods abroad, instead of that you or I would go to the local bank or the Export-Import Bank and say "We want to sell this merchandise to John Jones, or whatever his name is in a foreign country, or to a foreign country."

This is guaranteed, No. 1, against political risk, and No. 2, against the credit risk for which we are paying a premium, and you or I selling this merchandise may not want the credit risk. We may determine that if we got a guarantee against political risk that is enough, and we will not buy that insurance, but if we want a credit coverage we will buy that.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that particular operation. Now, before my time expires I want to get into another phase of this business. The gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH], in presenting the rule on the bill, spoke of the loan to Yugoslavia. I have in hand a letter signed by Mr. Harold F. Linder, President and Chairman of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, saying, and I will read briefly from it:

> Following discussions which began early in 1960 under the leadership of the International Monetary Fund, the Yugoslav Government in the fall of 1960 requested financial assistance from the Export-Import Bank. On February 16, 1961, the Export-Import Bank authorized a credit (credit No. 1461) to the Government of Yugoslavia in the amount of $50 million to assist in financing the acquisition in the United States and exportation to Yugoslavia of materials, machinery, equipment and related services, all of U.S. origin, necessary for the economic development of Yugoslavia.

In the interests of time, I shall not read further from the letter. It is incredible to me that the Export-Import Bank should be extending any credit for the benefit of Communist Yugoslavia for the purpose of—although this letter does not so state—but as I understand it, for the construction of tankers in Yugoslavia for the Soviet Government.

Mr. MULTER. I would doubt that this loan or any part of it was being used for military equipment.

Mr. GROSS. I said tankers; not tanks.

Mr. MULTER. If these tankers are used in connection with the economics of the country, in connection with industry, then I think it could very well and properly be considered a good loan.

Mr. GROSS. I am not questioning whether it is a good financial risk or a bad one. I am questioning the principle of the Export-Import Bank extending credits for the benefit of Yugoslavia under any conditions.

Mr. MULTER. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. MULTER. Political considerations are the determination of the State Department. Any time the Export-Import Bank wants to make a loan to a foreign country it must clear with the State Department first. It may not make a loan to any of our enemies, and it may not make a loan even to our allies or to any one of our friendly allies, unless the State Department on the basis of political considerations says it is all right.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman does not consider Yugoslavia to be a friendly ally, does he?

Mr. MULTER. This is not my determination; this is the determination of the State Department. If this loan has been approved by the Export-Import Bank it is only because the State Department said that it is all right.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. STINSON].

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] a question. As the bill is constituted is there nothing in it to prevent this money from being loaned to a Communist country?

Mr. GROSS. So far as I know, that is right. I was amazed to find out that the Export-Import Bank was making loans to Yugoslavia.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman from Texas if any precautions have been taken to insure that there is no money loaned from these funds to Communist countries?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am not familiar with what the gentleman said about the Yugoslavian loan, but certainly we do not want anything to happen that would be against the interests of the United States. We do not want these loans used to help any Communist country. If a loan can be used in aid of the United States in its program for peace, naturally we want that done. But I do not understand what the loan is for; but it will be looked into. It is certainly not the intention to make a loan to any Communist country against the interests of the United States.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman from Texas think it would be appropriate to write an amendment of that kind into the bill?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not think we should write it into the act unless we have clear cases of abuse. Just the mention of a loan I do not think proves that we have had an abuse. We should make sure that we do not go to any extreme to cripple this fine agency, without some proof of wrongdoing.

We have no proof of wrongdoing. All our proof is that it is doing well, doing fine. I believe the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] brought out a fear that there was a proposed law to increase it to the tune of about $50 million. I believe that does provide some funds. But he did not give us any details about it. I do not know what they are, but I am going to look into it.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. I think the answer that the gentleman is seeking is in the Export Control Act, where all exports come under Government scrutiny and certain types of exports are subject to license, and some are subject to general licenses. So I would think that the State Department would scrutinize very carefully any type of item that was financed by this type of legislation, and not approve any exports of military significance that went to a Communist country.

Mr. STINSON. Does the State Department make a practice of authorizing any kind of loans to Communist countries?

Mr. PELLY. I think the policy of our country and our State Department is to encourage trade with Yugoslavia, but they try to discourage or put an embargo on anything that has military significance. I do not agree with the determinations they make in this respect, but they do scrutinize them.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, may I suggest to the gentleman that the Export-Import Bank is an independent agency and it has a distinguished advisory committee consisting of some of the most distinguished industrial and financial leaders in the entire United States. Let me read the names of those comprising this advisory committee:

Carl J. Gilbert (chairman of committee), chairman of the board, the Gillette Co., Gillette Park, Boston, Mass.

Dr. James A. McCain, president, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kans.

Gustav Riedlin, consultant, George Fry & Associates, Inc., 3540 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.

Michael Ross, director, International Affairs Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

William R. Biggs, vice president, the Bank of New York, 48 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

George H. Chittenden, vice president, Morgan Guaranty Trust Co., 23 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

David M. Kennedy, chairman of the board, Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago, Lock Box H 90, Chicago, Ill.

Wilfred McNeil, president, Grace Line, Inc., 3 Hanover Square, New York, N.Y.

Philip W. Pillsbury, chairman of the board, the Pillsbury Co., Pillsbury Building, Minneapolis, Minn.

I do not believe our Export-Import bank officials or these gentlemen would be a party to permitting loans to be made that would be against the interest of the United States. I do not believe that they would be a party to permitting the Export-Import Bank to make loans for the purpose of helping a Communist country. Therefore I do not think it would be necessary to write any amendment into the act with regard to it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK].

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, my concern is with the substitute that will be offered to the bill which is under consideration. Frankly, I deplore the capitulation which is reflected by the substitution of new legislation for the original bill which was reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

In my opinion, and I think most people will concur, the use of Federal funds by the Export-Import Bank has not warranted a need for changing the means by which the affairs of the Bank are funded. The Export-Import Bank has handled its business expeditiously, efficiently, and properly. The business of the Bank is big business and for the primary benefit of business and domestic employment. It is only with great reluctance that I go along with the substitute, which reflects improperly, I think, on the activities of the Bank, which have been so favorably established in the testimony before the committee and in its records.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, when our distinguished colleague, the honorable gentleman from Texas, chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, first introduced the proposed bill, H.R. 3872, it was so done on the assumption that the Export-Import Bank would be authorized by the Congress to borrow the additional fund of $2 billion needed from the Treasury on a debt transaction without the necessity of Congress appropriating those funds. This has been the traditional method used to finance the Bank ever since it was first created by this Congress in 1945 as an independent agency of the Government. This method of financing has proved over the years to be excellently suited to the operations of the Bank, as evidenced by laws enacted by this Congress at regular intervals in order to successively increase the funds and scope of activity of the Bank.

I am, therefore, somewhat apprehensive at the present move by some Members of this Congress to change this procedure for that of annual appropriation process, in spite of the unanimity of feeling in this House that the Bank has conducted its business always in an exemplary manner and has achieved substantial success in its basic objective of promoting foreign trade of this country. This change of procedure is being advocated on the contention that whenever an agency's spending is not subject to the kind of annual congressional review required by the appropriations process, the fiscal fate of the Nation is endangered or in doubt.

In the case of the Export-Import Bank, however, as in all Government corporations, annual scrutiny and financial control of its operations are already being carried out by the Congress under the provisions of the Government Corporation Control Act. In accordance with the provisions of the act, a wholly owned Government corporation, such as the Export-Import Bank, is required to submit an annual budget program containing a statement of financial condition, a statement of income and expense, an analysis of surplus or deficit, a statement of sources and application of funds, and estimates of operations for the current and ensuing fiscal years including estimates of administrative expenses, borrowings and the amount of capital funds which shall be returned to the Treasury during the fiscal year, or appropriations required to provide for restoration of capital impairments. These budget programs as modified, amended or revised by the President are then transmitted to Congress as a part of the annual budget. After reviewing these programs, Congress may enact whatever legislation it deems necessary to increase or limit the appropriations or funds available for operating and administrative expenses of such a corporation.

I should like to point out another significant facet of congressional control over the operations of such a corporation. It is the requirement of an annual audit by the General Accounting Office. The audit includes such comments and information as may be necessary to keep Congress informed of the operations and financial condition of the corporation, together with any recommendations with respect to it that the Comptroller General may deem advisable. The Comptroller General is also required to note specifically any program, expenditure, financial transaction or undertaking which, in his opinion, has been carried on or made without authority of law.

I have taken the liberty of enumerating the checks and controls as above in detail in the hope of emphasizing that under existing law there is sufficient scrutiny over such Government corporations, such as the Export-Import Bank, that are financed by obligational authority on a debt transaction, without the necessity of going through the appropriations process.

I would like to advance some of the following considerations which I believe support my concern over a change in the method of financing the operations of the Bank which have been followed since its founding.

First, if the Bank's funds are made available by appropriation there is danger that the Bank will experience pressure to program its lending each year by type of financing, or by areas, or by countries. Thus an appropriation of funds might well lead the American exporting community to expect the Bank to lend its entire appropriation in a given period regardless of the merits of the transactions submitted to it. Among borrowing countries there might be similar pressures that the Bank set quotas and consume the appropriated funds irrespective of the needs or soundness of the projects for which financing is sought. The Bank has never programed its funds in this manner. Rather, it employs its funds as needed to conduct its operations. I believe this to be a sound way to operate the Bank—any bank—and the Bank's experience convinces me that it is imperative to avoid the implication that any segment of American industry or geographical area of the world has any claim on the Bank for a certain volume of loan funds per year.

Second, as a corollary of the preceding argument, I believe that it is the desire of all concerned to distinguish the loans of the Export-Import Bank from the activities of the Agency for International Development. This point, of course, is not made in derogation of that Agency nor its activities. However, it is accepted that the Bank is the "hard" lending agency of the United States and that its purpose is to finance our foreign trade. If the Bank is forced to go the appropriation route after the Congress, upon recommendation of the Banking and Currency Committees, authorizes an increase in its funds there is the added danger that the Bank's activities will be linked to those of the Agency for International Development.

Thirdly, traditionally the Bank, operating upon an obligational authority rather than appropriated funds, has been able to meet emergencies by extending legitimate assistance to a foreign country which is a good customer of the United States when foreign exchange difficulties have threatened to impede or curtail that country's normal level of imports from the United States. Our experience with Canada last year is illustrative. In June, in cooperation with the International Monetary Fund and the Treasury Department, the Bank established a $400 million line of credit for Canada. That Government was able to reestablish its balance-of-payments position without any drawings on our line of credit and subsequently requested that the line be canceled; $250 million being canceled in August and the remainder in December of last year. The Bank was compensated for this tieup of its funds under the line of credit by charging Canada a modest, but adequate, one-quarter of 1 percent commitment fee on the unutilized funds for the periods involved. Emergency requirements of this kind frequently used for only short periods cannot be anticipated. To meet them is required a substantial reservoir of uncommitted lending authority.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, many distinguished Members of the Congress in both Houses have spoken eloquently on the practicality of the traditional method of financing such agencies as the Bank in comparison to the appropriations process. I wish to quote here for the benefit of this House an extract of a statement made in July 1959 by the distinguished Republican from Indiana, the Honorable Homer E. Capehart, made in the course of a debate on the financing of the Development Loan Fund, but which has definite relevance to our present deliberations:

> I want to talk about the practical aspect of the matter, not whether the Federal Government should or should not lend money. The practice of authorizing the Treasury to lend money has developed as a result of Congress authorizing or passing laws to enable the Federal Government to lend money to many different kinds of projects.
>
> For example, there are two kinds of expenditures at the moment in the Federal Government. One is expenditures for business purposes, expenditures which we would call expenses. In other words, the money is spent 100 percent as expenses.
>
> In the case of a bank, a bank lends money and expects to get the money back. It lends the money out of its treasury, and the loans are repaid to the treasury * * *.
>
> When we authorize the Treasury to lend money for a specific purpose, such as the Export-Import Bank, the Commodity Credit Corporation, the International Bank, and a half a dozen housing projects, we do not know whether the money will be lent in 1 year or over a longer period of time.
>
> Therefore, if we appropriate $1 billion, and there is a request for only $500 million to be loaned, then there is $500 million in an appropriation bill which will not be used.
>
> I think we would be much better off to authorize the Treasury to lend money in instances when the money will be repaid to the Treasury, than we would to go the appropriation route. I think we ought to have all the safeguards that we can possibly get with reference to authorizations for the Treasury to lend money for specific purposes.
>
> As a practical business matter, there would be better control over the funds and over the money if the Treasury were authorized to lend money to the corporations or the institutions to which the loans are to be made, than by the appropriation route, in my opinion.
>
> If we appropriate the money, the attitude will be taken that it is appropriated and will be gone. But since we are going to lend money which will be repaid and we are going to have collateral—a note or some other sort of instrument—it seems to me, purely from a business standpoint and a practical standpoint that it would be better to go that route than the appropriation route.
>
> I myself would favor a rule which provided that when money has been expended and the Government never expects it to be returned, such funds be considered by the appropriation route.
>
> When the money is to be lent, and we expect it to be returned when the loans are repaid to the Treasury, I think it would be wiser to go to the other route. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 105, pt. 10, pp. 12440–12441.)

Now the gentleman whom I have quoted—was and is not exactly a "flaming liberal" on economic matters, but he is an individual whose commonsense and business sense tells him that there must be some exceptions to the "traditional financing." Particularly, he sees that where money is to be lent, he feels that "it would be wiser to go the other route"—that is, authorizing the Treasury to lend.

I now wish to invite your attention to another quotation of an extract of a statement made on the same occasion by the Honorable STUART SYMINGTON, the Senator from Missouri:

> If the Development Loan Fund is to be an efficient and effective program, its administrators must know what funds will be available for loans over a period of several years. It often takes a considerable period of time to develop a loan project and the lending authority must be assured that funds will be in the till when the project is finalized.
>
> Moreover, it is highly desirable for foreign nations to know what the program is. There would be a tangible demonstration of America's intention to help these lesser developed countries now in the process of an industrial take-off.
>
> It is also necessary to help them lay plans for economic development.
>
> I believe that these conditions can only be achieved by financing the Development Loan Fund on a banking basis, like that of the Export-Import Bank and that of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; that is, authorizing the Fund to borrow money from the Treasury over a period of years * * *.
>
> I do not believe that the process of annual appropriations can provide these prerequisites for a successful program.
>
> Our 2 years experience with the Fund demonstrates this clearly. Two years ago the Senate adopted an administration-backed proposal to finance the Fund through a public debt transaction, and to authorize it to lend $2 billion over the next 3 years.
>
> The House of Representatives substantially cut the authorization and insisted on the regular appropriation procedure.
>
> The Mutual Security Act of 1958, as it was finally passed, authorized $1,125 million to be appropriated annually over the next 2 years.
>
> In actual fact, only $850 million has actually been appropriated in 1958 and 1959; and even this sum has only narrowly missed crippling reductions, as witnessed by the House Appropriations Committee report to delete any appropriations for the Fund from the 1959 supplemental appropriation.
>
> The uncertainty which derives from this procedure prohibits the businesslike operation of this business enterprise. Not only does it have the effect of discrediting the Fund in the eyes of the countries which it is designed to help—the annual appropriations hassle is not a very reassuring spectacle to our foreign friends—but it also severely inhibits American negotiations in making contracts.
>
> Paradoxically, it may also have the reverse effect in some cases, and force the hasty conclusion of loans near the end of the year so that the Fund will be in a better position to ask Congress for another appropriation. While it is true that there is no fiscal year limitation on appropriations for the Fund, and hence unused money may be carried over for use in another year, it is a reality of the appropriations procedure that if an agency ends up the year with unused money, its next year's appropriation is very likely to be reduced.
>
> The public debt transaction is a tried and tested institution which has demonstrated its superiority for financing certain types of programs.
>
> Normally, public debt transactions are used for lending programs where the amounts advanced will be loaned on interest.
>
> In the case of the Export-Import Bank and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, this advance represents a capital contribution.
>
> Few would have us believe that the public debt transaction is an evil device insidiously employed only in recent years to bring on the bankruptcy of the United States. This could not be further from the truth. It is a legitimate and valuable method of financing which has been incorporated into

some of our most successful and respected pieces of legislation over the past quarter of a century.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would be remiss if I did not mention the contribution Eximbank has made to our balance-of-payments situation. On April 2, 1963, the financial section of the New York Times, in an article entitled "Agencies Report on Ways To Stem Dollar Outflow," reported that the Government has instituted a plan as of last spring to help reduce the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit by compiling a so-called gold budget which required all Government agencies to report all oversea spending and income and set targets for reducing the gap wherever it would not hurt the national interest. The Budget Bureau is said to be in the process of reviewing with each of the agencies concerned the first of what will be quarterly reports. The article mentioned that out of last year's balance-of-payments deficit of $2,200 million, the difference between $34,200 million that flowed out and $32,000 million that flowed in, the Government share of the totals is said to be roughly $5,100 million in outflow and $3,200 million in inflow. In the Committee on Banking and Currency Report No. 86 on the Eximbank Act Extension, I note that the Bank's operations during the calendar year 1962 made a net contribution of $700 million toward bringing our international payments into balance. This is an impressive contribution indeed for Eximbank to have a significant 22 percent of the $3,200 million in the Government share of the inflow in the balance-of-payments totals mentioned.

In recent years, the Export-Import Bank, I understand, has increasingly operated on the basis of guarantee rather than furnishing financing, particularly in its exporter credit and insurance programs. During the past 2 calendar years the Bank has been able to authorize over $3 billion, and, significantly, to disburse $1.6 billion without any net borrowing from the Treasury. This phenomenon is due to the readiness of the commercial banks and other financial institutions to honor the Bank's guarantees in the certain knowledge of the Bank's ability to borrow money from the Treasury on authorization of the Congress without the necessity of it going through an appropriation procedure.

In the Export-Import Bank of Washington, the Congress has one of the most solidly established and respected Government agencies of the United States.

Its position with the banking and business community of the United States and of the free world is largely attributable to the fact that since its inception the Congress has financed its activities by replenishing its funds through the borrowing authority procedure. The Bank today is a critically important instrument for the expansion and promotion of American exports. A change at the present in the manner in which it obtains its funds will not add to congressional control over its operations but may weaken the position of the Bank in dealings with the banking and business communities of the United States and abroad and in its vital function of helping to reduce our international balance-of-payments deficit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 2(c)(1) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 is amended by striking out "$1,000,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$2,000,000,000".

(b) Section 6 of such Act is amended by striking out "$6,000,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$8,000,000,000".

(c) Section 7 of such Act is amended by striking out "$7,000,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$9,000,000,000".

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Patman: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That (a) section 2 (c)(1) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 is amended by striking out '$1,000,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$2,000,000,000'.

"(b)(1) Section 6 of such Act is amended by inserting '(a)' immediately after 'Sec. 6.'.

"(2) Such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"'(b) In order further to enable the Bank to carry out its objects and purposes under this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed, upon appropriation of funds for that purpose, to purchase from time to time such additional obligations as the Bank may issue in an amount not to exceed $2,000,000,000 outstanding at any one time.

"'(c) For the purpose of enabling the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase obligations of the Bank pursuant to subsection (b), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated at any time without fiscal year limitation $2,000,000,000, to remain available until expended. Any funds paid to the Treasury by the Bank as repayment on account of the principal of obligations purchased as provided in subsection (b) shall continue to be available for the purchase of additional obligations by the Secretary of the Treasury under subsection (b).

"'(d) Each obligation issued by the Bank to the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to the provisions of subsection (b) shall be governed as to interest and maturity by the provisions of subsection (a). Payment of interest by the Bank on account of any obligations purchased under subsection (b) shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.'

"(c) Section 7 of such Act is amended by striking out '$7,000,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$9,000,000,000'.

"Sec. 2. Section 8 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 is amended by striking out 'June 30, 1963' and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 30, 1968'."

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, a great deal has been said here today on the subject of this back-door spending. Since this is the amendment that pertains to that subject, I would just like to make these few brief remarks.

The amendment offered by the chairman of the committee is most unusual. It strikes out all of the committee reported bill and substitutes an amendment offered by the chairman as a complete substitute for the bill reported by the committee. It is not a committee amendment as no meeting of the committee has been called to approve the amendment. It is a most unusual procedure.

However, Mr. Chairman, I wish to assure the Members of this House, the amendment offered by the distinguished chairman of our committee is all right. What it does is strike out all of the reported bill and then restate, unchanged, the provisions of the reported bill relating to extension of the life of the Bank, increase in its lending authority, increase in its exporter credit insurance program and in addition changes the method of financing the increase in lending authority from a back door to an appropriated fund basis.

This last mentioned change; namely, the requirement for appropriations, is the only change made by the chairman's amendment. And that change, except for the nonconsequential substitution of the word "that" for "such," and the insertion of the word "thereof" is verbatim the language of the amendment I offered in committee to require that funds for the increased lending authority be provided through the appropriation process. For the Record, I submit the exact text of my amendment: On the first page, strike out lines 6, 7, and 8, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(b)(1) Section 6 of such Act is amended by inserting "(a)" immediately after "Sec. 6.".

(2) Such section is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsections:

"(b) In order further to enable the Bank to carry out its objects and purposes under this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed, upon appropriation of funds of said purpose, to purchase from time to time such additional obligations as the Bank may issue in an amount not to exceed $2,000,000,000 outstanding at any one time.

"(c) For the purpose of enabling the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase obligations of the Bank pursuant to subsection (b), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated at any time without fiscal year limitation $2,000,000,000, to remain available until expended. Any funds paid to the Treasury by the Bank as repayment on account of the principal of obligations purchased as provided in subsection (b) shall continue to be available for the purchase of additional obligations by the Secretary of the Treasury under subsection (b).

"(d) Each obligation issued by the Bank to the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to the provisions of subsection (b) shall be governed as to interest and maturity by the provisions of subsection (a). Payment of interest by the Bank on account of any obligations purchased under subsection (b) shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts."

Mr. Chairman, in a speech on the floor of the House on April 3, 1963, I made clear that it would come as no surprise to me to have my amendment taken away from me. I stated and I quote:

> I full well realize, Mr. Speaker, that I may be denied the opportunity of offering this amendment purely because under parliamentary procedure a member of the majority may be recognized to offer the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, no matter how this amendment is camouflaged and irrespective of the unusual procedure utilized to bring it before this body, the fact remains that what it does is conform the bill to the position taken by the Republican members of the Banking and Currency Committee. I support the amendment. It should be adopted.

The fact remains this is the amendment that was offered by the Republican minority.

May I also say, in response to remarks of some of the distinguished members of the committee on the other side of the aisle, who have been critical that back-door spending has now been taken out of this bill, that this action reflects a concern among many of us in the House over the deficits that this administration has been responsible for, not that they are peculiar to one administration or another, but this administration has been responsible for during the last 3 years. We are greatly concerned about the fact we are now headed for the first time into an era of planned deficits. Very frankly, we regard this sort of thing as loose financial practice, as we set forth in our minority views. It is for that reason I believe it should be taken out.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. I am in the process of preparing a study of the financial statements of the 200 largest corporations of the United States. I expect to show where a good part of the deficits started. It started from the investment credit bill which we passed last year. I will be able to pinpoint the dollars and cents of the tax losses to the Treasury because of this one item. It also stems from the depreciation schedules adopted last spring which took millions of dollars out of the Federal Treasury and put it into the black-ink ledgers of the 200 largest corporations of the country. I can explain where a great part of the deficit has been created. It has been created in order to stimulate a better atmosphere for business in the country. We can replace a good part of that deficit.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. The gentleman may be sure I will look forward to the study. On the subject of back-door spending, I think the administration itself recognizes the validity of the use of the appropriation process for they use the Budget Bureau in connection with governmental expenditures from the administrative end. It seems to me that it makes good sense, in that we do the same thing here in the use of the Appropriations Committee in the legislative process.

I wholeheartedly support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to substitute financing the Export-Import Bank through the regular appropriations process rather than by back-door borrowing authority as contained in H.R. 3872.

On February 25, 1963, I filed with the House Committee on Banking and Currency a joint letter on behalf of myself and a group of 85 other Members of the House expressing our opposition to the back-door provisions of this legislation to increase the Export-Import Bank's obligational authority. In this letter we urged that financing be done through the usual appropriations process and we noted that significant progress had been made in eliminating back-door spending practices in that only 2 such bills were enacted in the 2d session of the 87th Congress containing borrowing authority of only $437 million in contrast to the previous 1st session when the executive requests of 11 such bills totaled in excess of $28 billion and of which more than $19 billion was enacted into law.

Mr. Chairman, discontinuance of financing programs through legislative borrowing authority clearly enhances the opportunity to legislate in a more responsible and orderly manner within a framework of competitive priorities. Especially is the question important to the maintenance by the House of its historic prerogatives and supremacy in money matters. The other body through the years has indulged heavily in originating back-door spending bills.

In support of this amendment, Mr. Chairman, I wish to point out that when other programs similar to the Export-Import Bank which were previously funded through the back-door method of borrowing from public debt receipts were changed to the appropriations procedure it has been effected without any disruption. For example, last year the President was supplied through the usual legislative authorization—Public Law 87-490—and appropriation method—Public Law 87-872—with $2 billion additional subscription to the International Monetary Fund. As I say the U.S. participation heretofore had been by public debt authority carried in a legislative bill and this change in method of funding for the International Monetary Fund was recommended by the executive branch and the Committee on Banking and Currency. Certainly, there is no reason against a similar change for the Export-Import Bank, where its operating budget is already subject to annual review and approval in regular appropriations bills.

A similar example is the Small Business Administration where additional loan capital is supplied as necessary through the regular appropriation bills. So, Mr. Chairman, as I say, with significant progress having been made by the House in restoring fiscal control to the Congress by way of the appropriation procedure in lieu of direct public debt expenditure authority, I hope this amendment is unanimously adopted.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, I am impelled to urge at this time that the House take this action in firm resolve to return the funding of all programs to the appropriation process where there is assurance of an annual scrutiny and review by the Appropriation Committee. It is essential in the interest of fiscal responsibility that one committee, and one committee alone, have the heavy responsibility of weighing the need and urgency of each program in relation to other bills and also in respect to the overall condition of the Treasury. By adoption of this amendment the House will stand on principle and comply with the constitutional provision that no money shall be drawn from the Treasury except in consequence of an appropriation made by law. Let the Congress from now on follow this provision of the Constitution and restore to itself control of expenditures which in many cases heretofore it has abrogated to the executive branch and agencies of the Government.

I urge adoption of this amendment.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORHEAD. I am sure that the gentleman shares my concern over the international balance-of-payments deficit, and I would hope that the gentleman would support an adequate appropriation by the Committee on Appropriations so that we are sure that the Export-Import Bank will have sufficient funds to take care of any unforeseen contingencies, which will have an important bearing on our balance-of-payments deficit.

Mr. PELLY. May I say to the gentleman I think this Export-Import Bank has been well managed. It is a very important program toward financing our exports, and I thank the gentleman.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The **CHAIRMAN.** Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LANDRUM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3872) to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, to extend the period within which the Export-Import Bank of Washington may exercise its functions, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 325, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The **SPEAKER.** Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER.** The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The **SPEAKER.** The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous-consent requests. First, that all Members have the privilege within 5 days to extend their remarks on the bill just passed; and that the Members who spoke on the bill while the House was in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union may have the privilege of extending their remarks and also inserting extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency be permitted to sit tomorrow afternoon while the House is in session during general debate.

Mr. Speaker, I have cleared this with the minority members.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 36]

Aspinall
Barrett
Beermann
Belcher
Blatnik
Buckley
Celler
Chenoweth
Clark
Davis, Tenn.
Dent
Diggs
Dowdy
Flynt
Fogarty
Forrester
Fountain
Gray
Hagan, Ga.
Harsha
Healey
Hébert
Holifield
Karth
King, Calif.
Kluczynski
Lennon
Miller, Calif.
Nedzi
Pepper
Powell
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Tex.
Roosevelt
Ryan, Mich.
Scott
Shelley
Sisk
Smith, Calif.
Thomas
Van Pelt
Waggonner
Walter
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 371 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

AMENDING THE FOREIGN SERVICE BUILDINGS ACT

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 312, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

> *Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5207) to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE], and pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 312 provides for consideration of H.R. 5207, a bill to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act of 1926, to authorize additional appropriations for the acquisition of sites and buildings in foreign countries for use by the United States, and for other purposes. The resolution provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

The principal purpose of H.R. 5207 is to authorize an appropriation of $26,324,000 for the purchase, construction, major alteration, and long-term leasing of buildings overseas needed by the Department of State in connection with the operation of its 286 posts. The amount authorized in the bill will make available to the Department sufficient funds to carry out the 2-year building program justified to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The bill also authorizes the appropriation of $23,500,000 for the operational activities of the building program such as maintenance, repair, and furnishings. Finally, the bill deletes from existing law all references to the Foreign Service Buildings Commission.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 312.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 312 makes in order the consideration of the bill H.R. 5207. The principal purpose of H.R. 5207 is to authorize an appropriation of $26,324,000 for the purchase, construction, major alteration, and long-term leasing of buildings overseas needed by the Department of State in connection with the operation of its 286 posts. The amount authorized in the reported bill will make available to the Department sufficient funds to carry out the 2-year building program justified to the committee.

The bill also authorizes an appropriation of $23,500,000 for the operational activities of the building program, such as maintenance, repair, and furnishings.

Finally, the bill deletes from existing law all references to the Foreign Service Buildings Commission. The Foreign Service Buildings Act of 1926, as amended, empowers the Secretary of State to acquire sites and buildings abroad for our diplomatic and consular establishments as well as for representatives of certain other Government agencies. When title to sites and buildings cannot be acquired by purchase, authority is granted to permit the acquisition of leaseholds of not less than 10 years.

The 1926 act authorized an appropriation of $10 million for the building program. Additional authorizations of $1,625,000 in 1936 and of $5 million in 1938 brought the prewar authorizations up to $16,625,000. Appropriations against these authorizations never exceeded $2,700,000 in any one year; usually the appropriations were smaller. From 1936 to 1939, inclusive, no appropriations were made. During the war years the program came to an almost complete standstill.

At the present time the chart shows that there is a division between different localities; that is, Africa, American Republics, Europe, Far East, Near East, and South Asia.

Thus the committee recommends an authorization that is $4,176,000 below the amount requested by the Executive. The Executive asked for $30,500,000 and the committee has cut that by $4,176,000. The largest dollar reduction was made in the program for Africa. Costs often were unreasonably high, the size of the American complement was unusually large, and unsettled internal conditions make it advisable to defer construction at this time. Proposed office buildings for Accra, Ghana; for Ouagadougou, Upper Volta; and for Lome, Togo, were not approved by the committee, although in both Togo and Upper Volta funds were included for the development of sites. In Ghana the office building is adequate for the needs of the Department of State.

The committee recognizes the pressing need for adequate residential and office accommodations in Mogadiscio, Somali, but the unsettled conditions in that part of Africa make it desirable to proceed cautiously with costly construction.

In Latin America the committee expressed its opposition to particular projects in Colombia and Mexicali, Mexico.

It seems, Mr. Speaker, that the committee has been reasonable and has cut where it could. Of course, it is always possible to cut a little more. There seems to have been no dissenting views according to the report. I believe there is no possible objection to the approval of the rule.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. I should like to make this one observation. I do not suppose this bill is one that any of us approach with much enthusiasm, because we will probably not receive much accommodation in our respective districts. We are authorizing the expenditure of money for embassies and other facilities in foreign countries. However, I should like to compliment the committee for language they have placed on page 3 of the bill, which I should like to read:

> To the maximum extent feasible, expenditures under this act shall be made out of foreign currencies owned by or owed to the United States.

I think it has always been a matter of policy to utilize such available funds, but I think it dignifies the policy to have it explicitly written into the bill.

It is my opinion, and I would not pose as infallible in this area, that countries that are presented in this bill to receive the largest allocations would be the very countries in which the United States would have the greatest amount of available currency either owned by or owed to it. This is certainly a sound procedure. I would hope that this language in the bill plus this colloquy here on the floor would serve as a reminder to those having to do with the administration of this program to utilize these funds to the extent of every dollar that is feasible.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I may say that I, too, am very glad to see this language. I trust it means counterpart funds. As the House knows these funds can be used only in the country of origin, and we have a good many of them all over the world. The more we can use them for this sort of construction and other expenses the better off we will be, and I think on the whole it will also please the best country.

Mr. AVERY. I might say this would certainly have a most favorable effect on our balance of payments if we can utilize these funds rather than make a further demand upon our gold reserves.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. It certainly would.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5207) to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 5207, with Mr. O'NEILL in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this is essentially the same legislation the House passed last year. The reason it is up again, as I am sure most of you know, is that it went over to the other body, which added a rider having to do with equal rights for women. It was impossible to get agreement for the bill to go to conference, and the legislation died.

I may say that the subcommittee of which I am chairman had little heart for further exercise along this line, but unless we did act there was no possibility of a Foreign Service buildings bill being considered. We did hold several hearings. There are 216 pages of them, actually.

As the gentlewoman from New York said, we have cut the bill where we thought it was justified and in the interest of the country. Actually, the administration asked for a total of $54 million. That included the building and money for maintenance and leasing. We cut it to $49,824,000—or cut it $4,176,000.

I want to commend the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY] for what he had to say. We have written this language into the bill, that they shall make maximum use of counterpart funds or foreign currencies wherever they can. I think it is worthy to note that in the report on page 4 we have a table which shows that since the inception of this act in 1926, through several administrations, a total of $209,100,000 in foreign currency has been expended over against $32,525,000 in U.S. dollars. So that, actually, we have had something on the order roughly, and this is a rather rough approximation, $6 of counterpart funds for every dollar in U.S. currency. I am not sure that the Department can keep up that ratio because in some of the countries where we need buildings badly and where we have authorized them, there is no foreign currency available. But I believe, in view of the record they have established, we can consider that probably they will do a pretty good job on using foreign currency wherever and whenever they can.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to belabor this and I do not want to take up a lot of time. I think the committee is prepared to try to answer any questions that you may want to ask, but I would like to point out one thing that was a factor and had some bearing on our decisions.

For example, in the hearings you will see that in Cameroon, there is a building which we expect to buy which will cost $75,000 and on which we are now paying $13,796 a year rent. In other words, if we buy that building, it will be paid for in 6 years. In many of these cases, the lease is written so that the money or at least part of the money already paid in rent can apply to the purchase price. While we do sometimes wish that we were not in the position of having to approve some of these things, the committee finds that in the interest of good business it would be better to buy the building when we can write it off in 6 years than it would be to pay rent on it for that length of time.

For example, in Libreville, in Gabon we are going to buy a building for $60,000 or at least the committee approved the authorization and I trust that the Committee on Appropriations will approve it, a building on which we are paying $23,000 a year rent right now. In other words, that building can be written off in less than 3 years.

To pick out another case, in Abidjan on the Ivory Coast we are buying a building that we are now occupying for $95,000 on which we are paying $9,800 a year rent. So that building will be amortized in a little less than 10 years.

I might say to you that the committee studied each of these items carefully. We had the department produce pictures wherever pictures were available and in most cases they were, of the buildings that we are now occupying and intend to buy. We tried to exercise the best judgment that we could.

The subcommittee reported the bill out unanimously, Mr. Chairman. We took it to the full committee and we got a unanimous vote there where the vote was 23 to 0.

I think it is significant to report that present on that occasion there were my friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. THOMSON] who is a member of the subcommittee. While both Mr. THOMSON and I had reservations on a couple of items, especially one in Somali, we just could not quite say, "Well, you ought not to build it or you ought to build it." There is so much argument on both sides that the best we could do, we thought, when we agreed to this, was to authorize the item and to tell the department to exercise a great deal of caution in their analysis of the situation in this country before they proceed with the building. I might say we told them to do this in all cases.

As the gentlewoman from New York said in her statement on the rule, we did in Africa, because of the unsettled conditions on that continent, strike out some projects and recommend a good deal of caution in the consummation of other projects.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MICHEL. The gentleman spoke of countries in which we have foreign currencies available. Is the gentleman in a position to tell the House the number of countries in which we have foreign currency balances and the total amount involved?

Mr. HAYS. I think the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR] has the answer to that and I am glad to yield to the gentleman to answer his inquiry.

Mr. ADAIR. That question was raised in the course of the hearings. The answer given was that there was such a constant change, having in mind demands for currency, that that question has to be answered as of the particular time when building or leasing is to go forward.

There is a constant record kept, but because it is one that constantly fluctuates, we did not think it worth while to put in the report.

Mr. HAYS. What the gentleman is saying is that any figure we might put in as of the date of the hearings would not be an accurate figure as of today.

Mr. MICHEL. I appreciate that. I would make this observation to supplement the comments of the gentleman from Kansas. This is to a very noble end that we utilize these funds for the purpose of generating or offsetting any money under Public Law 480. I was wondering if we could specifically nail down how many countries we find this actually put into practice. If it is one or two countries, we have not done very well. If it is a greater percentage, I would say hats off.

Mr. HAYS. I do not know whether the gentleman was present and heard me read the figures in the record, but up to the present time we have used about $230 million in foreign currency as against about $30 million in U.S. dollars. I think I can speak for both sides of the committee when I say that the subcommittee has a good deal of confidence in the man who is conducting this foreign building program. He was frank with the committee, and we believe he will use every single available cent of foreign currencies he can get his hands on. My guess is that 50 percent of this construction money will be foreign currencies, and perhaps a good deal more.

Mr. MICHEL. I will say to the gentleman I applaud that because these funds have been generated in some of the countries and are laying idle, not to the advantage of the Congress for use when Members are traveling in those countries and when the State Department states it does not want Americans depositing dollars in banks and then traveling in foreign countries. This is one way it could be used to good advantage, and it should be pressed to the fullest extent.

Mr. AVERY. Another thought has occurred to me. I think it might be helpful to have it a part of this debate. It seems to me there could be a situation arise where there might be a matter of priority as to whether these funds might be utilized for this purpose or as a matter of judgment of the Administrator as to where he might prefer to use them in some other category. I would like to have the legislative history in the debate on this measure today reveal—at least the gentleman from Kansas feels—this particular utilization should come in under high priority for the utilization of these currencies rather than to preserve them for a more dubious or less useful purpose.

Mr. HAYS. I think the gentleman's viewpoint is shared by the committee. It is certainly shared by the chairman of the subcommittee.

I may say to the gentleman the department is well aware of the fact that this subcommittee is watching their procedures. As the gentleman will note, this is only for 2 years. We did not make any veiled statement about that. We said it plainly, that what you get in another 2 years will be in great measure dependent on how well you use what you are getting now.

Mr. AVERY. I appreciate the gentleman's observation.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I would like to direct the attention of the Members to the remarks that the gentleman made with reference to the unanimous support the subcommittee and the full committee, gave this bill. You may recall that in the early part of February, when new Republican assignments were made to the committee, there was considerable criticism of the type of men appointed on this side of the aisle. It was charged there would be a battle royal whenever any bill came to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Those of us who now serve have been getting along very well, and we find that the committee is a friendly and cooperative group. The point is that in this case the gentleman from Ohio and his subcommittee convinced all of us that that use of the funds was most practical, and the fact that the committee gave a unanimous report was an indication of the effective job that was done in that respect.

I agree with the gentleman from Ohio that if there is any abuse, it will receive our interested attention in 2 years, and I think the unanimous approach of the committee is extremely revealing.

Mr. HAYS. I thank the gentleman. May I say, I never heard anything except very complimentary remarks about the new members on the committee, so I am a little in the dark about it. But, I appreciate his remarks anyway.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to echo what the chairman of the subcommittee has said in many directions. I have sat on that committee for some years with a good deal of distaste and a good deal of unhappiness. This year I assure every one of you that we went into these matters in such detail that even I, who am a Connecticut Yankee, could not find any objection.

There were questions, yes. The gentleman from Wisconsin, Governor THOMSON, had a number; the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] had a number; I had several I did not voice because I did not think they were worth it. And, I was determined to do all possible to make this a practical program where we had squeezed out every single bit that we could, that we felt could be lifted out.

I hope very much, Mr. Chairman, that the committee will vote for this very much needed bill. We did not have anything last year, and it is very necessary that we maintain our buildings, that we repair them, that we build additions, and that we erect new buildings in places where we have never had them. That is one of the great problems. I echo what the chairman said, that the men who are doing this work for us are very capable men, something we have not had before. They are top men. They were never reluctant to answer our questions or give us any information that we wanted. Their pictures were as good as could be taken by any Kodak, and we felt very, very inclined to assist in doing the things that they were proving to us were necessary. We have a particular feeling for Mr. Johnstone and Mr. Crockett, who are the two headmen, and we would like to see them continue for a bit so that we can really see the results of this year's planning and operations.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, there are some additional things about this bill that I think ought to be called to the attention of the members of the committee. Adequate mention has been made of the fact that the subcommittee under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Ohio worked very diligently. Both the minority and the majority are convinced that we squeezed about all of the excess expenditures out of this measure. Therefore, as has heretofore been said, we are in accord on it.

It might be pointed out further, Mr. Chairman, that although we have tried to draw certain guidelines in this bill, we have at the same time allowed the Department of State a measure of elasticity, within which they can operate. Members will note from page 5 of the committee report that the executive request as to the building or capital account part of the measure and the committee recommendation are broken down into five parts: One part for Africa, one each for the American Republics, Europe, Far East, Near East together with southeast Asia. In other words, within these large geographical areas the Department does have the right to move and to make certain decisions, although the committee has given them very clearly our thinking upon what buildings and what types of buildings ought to be constructed.

I think further, that it would be of interest to the members of the committee to know that last year our total authorization was for $53,899,000.

This year, Mr. Chairman, the request was for $54 million. We have proposed the authorization of $49,824,000, or a reduction of $4,176,000. This is for both the capital account, that is, the construction and the long-term lease side of the program, and for the current or maintenance side.

Mr. Chairman, some Members have expressed to me a concern lest even though we have reduced this proposal to its present figure, that we still perhaps are spending money that we ought not to spend at a time when we are facing a very large deficit. But I would say to those who do have that mental reservation concerning this bill that in the long run, measured over a period of even a relatively few years, the financial benefits to our country will outweigh the short-term expenditures. There is also the fact that in some countries this is the only way we can get needed office and residential accommodations for our American personnel. Therefore, we do believe that this is a necessary and prudent program.

If Members are interested in specific proposals, I would invite their attention to the tables between pages 2 and 3 of the hearings and there they can find listed the buildings, the locations, the types of structures which are proposed.

Mr. Chairman, this measure should pass here speedily and receive the prompt and favorable attention of the other body. I would conclude by saying, as others have said, that we do have confidence in Mr. Crockett and Mr. Johnstone and would hope that they may be continued in their present assignments in the Department because of the quality of the work that they are doing.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN].

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I just want to make one comment: This legislation was handled, as has been made obvious here, in a strictly nonpartisan manner. Not only that, but the committee examined into each individual project. This was not treated in a gunshot manner. This was not treated in an omnibus manner so that all the Embassies in particular countries would be treated as one. There was examination into each individually proposed Embassy and into each individually proposed building. Therefore, we had a thorough knowledge as a result of examination and cross-examination of the proponents of the various Embassies and buildings and they had to furnish every detail that we sought.

Mr. Chairman, it is on the basis of this close examination that this legislation was submitted. I therefore say that it is certainly deserving of the concurrence of the House.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY].

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, at this time I do want to compliment our chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS], for bringing this bill to the floor only after deep scrutiny into all of the projects involved in the bill. I also want to say that it is supported by members of both parties. It reflects the needs of our country to secure better physical accommodations for our personnel and agencies abroad.

This is a reasonable bill. I want to say that I am pleased that I am a member of this committee. As a result of my trips abroad, particularly in Europe, I am better able and qualified to judge those projects proposed in the countries in which I have visited. I had to depend, of course, on those who had traveled in other sections of the world for their firsthand knowledge of our building needs in those areas and countries.

This is another evidence that on-the-spot inspection is most useful to members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and to Members of the House. I earnestly urge and recommend to my colleagues more travel abroad. Such travel pays invaluable dividends in handling a bill of this kind.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I would like to make a few additional observations. H.R. 5207 represents many months of work by the members of the Subcommittee on State Department Organizations and Foreign Operations of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. This bill will grant authority to the Department of State to carry out its foreign building program for the next 2 years and to maintain and operate its existing facilities during that period.

The Foreign Service Buildings Act has five principal objectives. They are:

First. To provide consolidated office space for the Foreign Service and other U.S. agencies operating in cooperation with the Foreign Service, except where leasing arrangements are more advantageous.

Second. To secure maximum security at minimum expense through consolidation of facilities.

Third. To provide Government-owned, furnished residences for all Ambassadors and Ministers.

Fourth. To provide Government-owned, furnished residences for officers in charge of consular posts and senior officers of principal missions, including attachés of the Department of Defense and other agencies.

Fifth. To provide Government-owned, furnished quarters for American staff at posts where special housing problems exist, such as health, security, and long-range housing shortages.

In addition to these objectives, the Department of State makes office space available, in its worldwide facilities, to the Department of Defense, USIA, Veterans' Administration, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Federal Bureau of Investigation, General Accounting Office, and for key staff personnel of the Agency for International Development.

A bill similar to H.R. 5207 was passed by both the House and the other body last year. Unfortunately, however, conferees were not appointed.

There are two principal purposes set forth in this bill. The first authorizes $26.3 million for the purchase, construction, major alternation, and long-term leasing of buildings required by the Department of State for its oversea posts. This authorization is $4.1 million below the Executive request. The principal reductions were in the program for Africa due to the unreasonably high costs, the unusually large size of the American complement and unsettled internal conditions in some countries. The other authorizes $23.5 million for the rental, maintenance, repair, and furnishing of existing posts for the next 2 years.

In addition, the bill eliminates the present reference to the Foreign Service Building Commission. This Commission was abolished in 1939 by Reorganization Plan No. II. The bill formally transfers the functions of the Commission to the Secretary of State who has exercised them since 1939.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs has recommended the following amounts for the various areas of the world:

Committee recommendation

Area:	*Million*
Africa	$7.14
American Republics	5.36
Europe	6.84
Far East	2.35
Near East and South Asia	2.71
Subtotal	24.40
USIA	1.12
Agriculture and Defense attaché housing	.8
Total	26.32

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe I have had the opportunity to visit a number of the buildings occupied by American personnel, both as offices and as residences. Hence I gave particularly close attention to the Department's plans for that area.

The original Executive request for Europe for the next 2 years was $7,650,000. The committee recommends a sum of $6,839,000—a reduction of $811,000 or more than 10 percent. We specifically deleted proposed projects for Nassau, Bahamas; Hamilton, Bermuda; and Ottawa, Canada—all posts that come within the European area program.

I have always been disturbed by the absence of adequate accommodations for our personnel in Geneva. That city is rapidly becoming an important center of international activity both for government and for private business. Presently we lease space in four office buildings at an annual rental of $100,000. Plans in the 2-year program in this bill will permit the acquisition of a site and the construction of a building for less than $1,400,000. We urgently need a residence for our representative in Geneva. The Committee will be pleased to know that we have had an offer from an American citizen of an old chateau just outside of Geneva. This property has been appraised at $500,000. Efforts are underway to secure additional private money to rehabilitate the residence. If that can be done, the United States will own a most desirable piece of property.

While an outlay of more than $4 million is planned for the rehabilitation of our properties in Paris, the ultimate consolidation of our scattered properties and the sale of some of them such as the present Ambassador's residence will result in the recapture of most of that money. In Lisbon we have been renting an Embassy for more than 30 years; our present annual rent is $10,800. To me it makes sense to buy this property now.

Our annual rentals and quarters allowances for presently occupied buildings in Europe which we can acquire under the authorization contained in this bill amounts to $144,000. To acquire these buildings or construct our own will cost about $1,850,000. Thus in less than 13 years we will have recovered our present annual outlay. This is based on the assumption that rents remain steady. But in Europe, as at home, rents are increasing as the demand for buildings increases. I am convinced therefore that we are making a sound investment for our Nation.

At the present time the United States owns or has under long-term lease overseas, 205 office buildings; 158 residences for Ambassadors and other principal officers; 277 residences for other officers; 269 other residential units; 251 apartment buildings containing 2,366 individual units; and 128 other buildings such as garages and warehouses. The current value of these facilities exceeds $200 million.

It is important to note that the bill directs the use of excess local currencies to the maximum extent possible. Since 1926 local currencies in the amount of $209.1 million have been appropriated for use in the Federal Service buildings program and 32.5 million U.S. dollars have been used. Thus, approximately 87 percent of the funds expended on the program have been in local currenices.

This authorization covers fiscal years 1964 and 1965. About one-half of the funds authorized will be obligated during each year.

In conclusion I wish to bring to the attention of the House the recommendation contained at page 6 of the committee's report concerning the purchase, of furnishings for our oversea posts, in the United States. It is the committee's view that the furnishings should be purchased in the United States, not only to give the benefit of this business to American firms but for the further reason that our oversea posts should serve as showcases of the skills and artistry of American craftsmen and industry.

This program is essential to the efficient operation of our Foreign Service and I urge the adoption of this bill.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN].

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, this is what we call a housekeeping bill. In other words, when the U.S. Government has 286 posts throughout the world, including embassies and other governmental buildings, it is obviously essential that, like any good landowner or building owner, attention must be given to the maintenance and upkeep of these buildings, to the leasing of adequate quarters and to the construction, where necessary, of buildings adequate to house our staffs and to house the offices which are essential to carry on the business of the Government. That is what this bill, H.R. 5207, does.

When the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] spoke, at least by implication, he seemed to be paying a tribute to the subcommittee. I should like to underline what he said and to pay a tribute particularly to the chairman of the subcommittee the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. HAYS], for the manner in which these hearings were conducted, for the tolerance which he exhibited, and for the thoroughness with which he and members of the committee went into the proposals that were made by the representatives of the Department of State when they appeared before the committee. It was this cooperative attitude and this constructive method of carrying on the hearings that gained the support of the full committee, including the fairminded members to whom the gentleman from Illinois alluded.

Also I should like to emphasize again the excellent relations that existed between the committee itself and the representatives of the executive branch. These representatives showed themselves to be interested in our recommendations and we were able to discuss matters back and forth in a constructive and friendly manner; suggestions were made by us and they took recommendations in various particulars made by the committee, as they had done in the past.

In this connection, there is one point in the report to which I should like to call attention. It appears on page 6 wherein the statement is made that:

> The committee is concerned that too many of the furnishings of our buildings abroad are of foreign design and manufacture.

The recommendation is made at this point and the further statement is inserted to stress that the Committee expects that there will be increased use of American products in our buildings abroad. The representatives of the executive branch did testify that these recommendations, which have been made by the Committee in the past as well, had been taken to heart and, in fact, in the hearings at page 149 and 150 there is a statement of the various bids that have been requested of American firms to provide furnishings for our embassies abroad. This does not mean that we are taking any jingoistic attitude. It is simply a feeling that for artistic reasons and reasons of propriety as well as stimulation of national industry, first call should be given to American manufacturers in this regard.

So for these reasons, particularly, Mr. Chairman, in consideration of the fact that this bill does represent, as has been said, a reduction of $4,176,000 below the executive request, I am happy to support this bill and I hope that the Committee and the House will do the same.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I have taken this time to ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS], a question regarding the language on page 2, subparagraph (F), regarding a limitation on the facilities of the U.S. Information Agency. I suggest to the gentleman that in the budget there are some new broadcasting facilities being requested, and I should like to ask the gentleman whether the word facilities here refers in any way to the construction of new radio facilities throughout the world.

Mr. HAYS. I can say to the gentleman the language may be unfortunate, but it has no reference whatever to radio facilities. It applies only to buildings to house the Information Agency personnel in a list of countries which is available in the hearings. It has nothing to do with radio broadcasting facilities in any way, shape, or form.

Mr. BOW. Did you gentlemen give consideration to the fact that the buildings, for instance, in Liberia, where they have to have some housing for people, and in other places, might refer to radio broadcasting facilities? For instance, there are to be radios in the Philippines.

Mr. HAYS. They said nothing to us about that and we have no requests for buildings for radio facilities.

Mr. BOW. The use of the word facilities here refers to housing and not to the building of radio transmitters and the buildings that have to go along with them?

Mr. HAYS. This refers only to housing or office space or information centers. It has nothing to do with radio broadcasting facilities. It refers only to housing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes to close debate.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to thank the members of the subcommittee for their attention and their attendance in the hearings on this bill. Both the majority members and the minority members were faithful in their attendance. They asked a lot of good questions. I should like to refer to what the gentlewoman from New York said. There was hardly any time that a situation was alluded to in a specific country that some member of the subcommittee had not an on-the-site inspection and had some on-the-site information. The gentle lady from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON] was very helpful in the African end of it, and other members were experienced in other areas where they had had committee business and where they had traveled abroad.

I do want to close by mentioning the fact that I believe the entire subcommittee is grateful to both Secretary Crockett, Assistant Secretary of State for Administration, and Mr. Johnstone, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Foreign Buildings, for their very frank and forthright answers. I trust the fact that there has been public mention of the fact that Members of Congress have confidence in these gentlemen will not hurt them down in the State Department.

I would like to say this, I try to be a friend of the State Department because with some it is popular to use them as a whipping boy. The State Department has no constituency. But I try to be fair-minded and friendly to them. But I have really gotten the impression sometimes that if they have any member on their staff who establishes himself as having rapport and the confidence of the Congress, they immediately do something to get rid of him. We did find these two gentlemen to be very forthright and frank and the committee felt they could rely on their judgment.

I say again, I hope that these expressions about these gentlemen by our colleagues will not react unfavorably to them downtown.

I hope we quickly conclude the reading of the bill and under the 5-minute rule if anyone has further questions, we will be glad to try to answer them.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding the unanimity with which the committee reported favorably upon this measure and my belief that every possible effort has been made to curtail unnecessary expenditures in this bill, I still must rise in opposition to it. My objections are threefold.

First, although the committee report sets forth the fact that counterpart funds, or foreign currencies, are used primarily for the proposed construction, there is no assurance written into the legislation that such must be done, and, therefore, our presently poor financial condition could be further aggravated by unwarranted expenditures in carrying out the provisions of this bill. If we are to spend additional millions of dollars for construction of governmental facilities, I feel that such should be done here in this Nation so as to help relieve our present unemployment situation, rather than in foreign countries.

As I have been a strong advocate of strict economy in all proposed new expenditures in all Government activities here at home, I should likewise object to the expenditure of millions of dollars in foreign countries. Actually, I consider this more or less another facet of our foreign aid program which I do not believe has produced the desired results.

Second, I object to the passage of this Foreign Service buildings bill because it provides for the construction of new buildings in many emerging nations throughout the world where the government is at best most unstable and the net result could very well be that we would be constructing office buildings for some renegade governmental official such as Castro to confiscate. I believe it the better part of wisdom for us to continue to lease our facilities in these foreign countries until such time as these nations indicate a greater degree of responsibility and permanence.

Also, in this connection, I feel it is extremely difficult, if not impossible—because of the instability of these emerging nations—for us to accurately anticipate the size of diplomatic staff necessary in these various countries. Accordingly, how could we possibly know the requirements for housing and business purposes?

My third objection to this particular measure arises from the report of the

Foreign Affairs Subcommittee in which it appears that primary consideration for the use of these office buildings and living quarters will be given to the State Department, U.S. Information Agency, and Aid for International Development with only secondary consideration given to such important agencies as the Federal Bureau of Investigation, General Accounting Office, the American Battle Monuments Commission, and similar agencies. If such new office buildings and living quarters are to be constructed in the amount of $26,324,000, I believe all of our foreign activities should be given priority according to need rather than special preference given to some particular agencies whose effectiveness I seriously question.

Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, I must register my strong opposition to the passage of this particular measure and urge my colleagues to consider long and hard our financial condition as well as the necessity for the expenditure of these millions of dollars overseas.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4 of the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, as amended (22 U.S.C. 295), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) In addition to amounts authorized before the date of enactment of this section, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of State—

"(1) for acquisition, by purchase or construction (including acquisition of leaseholds) of sites and buildings in foreign countries under this Act, and for major alterations of buildings acquired under this Act, the following sums—

"(A) for use in Africa, not to exceed $7,140,000 of which not to exceed $3,270,000 may be appropriated for the fiscal year 1964;

"(B) for use in the American Republics, not to exceed $5,360,000, of which not to exceed $4,030,000 may be appropriated for the fiscal year 1964;

"(C) for use in Europe, not to exceed $6,839,000, of which not to exceed $1,820,000 may be appropriated for the fiscal year 1964;

"(D) for use in the Far East, not to exceed $2,350,000, of which not to exceed $2,200,000 may be appropriated for the fiscal year 1964;

"(E) for use in the Near East, not to exceed $2,710,000, of which not to exceed $2,100,000 may be appropriated for the fiscal year 1964;

"(F) for facilities for the United States Information Agency, not to exceed $1,125,000, of which not to exceed $720,000 may be appropriated for the fiscal year 1964, and

"(G) for facilities for agricultural and defense attaché housing, not to exceed $800,000, of which not to exceed $400,000 may be appropriated for the fiscal year 1964;

"(2) for use to carry out the other purposes of this Act, not to exceed $23,500,000, of which not to exceed $11,500,000 may be appropriated for the fiscal year 1964.

Sums appropriated pursuant to this authorization shall remain available until expended. To the maximum extent feasible, expenditures under this Act shall be made out of foreign currencies owned by or owed to the United States."

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do so for the purpose of inquiring of the chairman, under paragraph (G), why is it necessary to single out housing for the agricultural attaché and the defense attachés in the amount of $800,000. How about the other attachés, such as labor, and so forth? Why do we have to single out the agricultural attaché and the defense attaché in this case?

Mr. HAYS. The best answer I can give the gentleman is that it is up to the State Department to provide housing for these people and these are the ones they asked housing for. We did not allow every request, but they did ask for housing for the agricultural attachés and the defense attachés.

Mr. MICHEL. I am glad to hear the gentleman's response to that question for many times in the past the agricultural attaché at these foreign posts has been left out in the cold. I am glad to see that at this particular juncture, they are being recognized for housing at least.

Mr. HAYS. I think I can say to the gentleman that these two categories, these people, come from these particular Government departments whereas your labor attaché, for example, is actually from the State Department and is usually a Foreign Service officer and is taken care of in that category. Whereas, of course, as you know, the defense attaché is from the Department of Defense and the agricultural attaché is from the Department of Agriculture, but it is the responsibility of the State Department to procure housing for them.

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the gentleman.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) Section 2 of the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926 (22 U.S.C. 293), is repealed.

(b) The first section of such Act (22 U.S.C. 292) is amended—

(1) by striking out ", subject to the direction of the commission hereinafter established,";

(2) by striking out "under such terms and conditions as in the judgment of the commission may best protect the interests of the United States,";

(3) by striking out ", to the extent deemed advisable by the commission,"; and

(4) by striking out ", which buildings shall be appropriately designated by the commission, and the space in which shall be allotted by the Secretary of State under the direction of the commission" and inserting a period and the following: "The space in such buildings shall be allotted by the Secretary of State".

(c) Section 3 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 294) is amended—

(1) by striking out ", subject to the direction of the commission," and "in the judgment of the commission,"; and

(2) by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: "and without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (31 U.S.C. 529)".

(d) Section 4 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 295) is amended by striking out ", subject to the direction of the commission,".

(e) Section 9 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 300) is amended—

(1) by striking out "with the concurrence of the Foreign Service Buildings Commission,"; and

(2) by striking out ", as in the judgment of the Commission may best serve the Government's interest".

(f) Section 1(e) of Reorganization Plan Numbered II of May 9, 1939 (53 Stat. 1432), is repealed.

(g) All references to the Foreign Service Buildings Commission, originally established by the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, in all laws of the United States are hereby repealed.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

May I say if anyone is interested, the reason for these last amendments is that all of the functions of this Commission were transferred to the Secretary of State in 1939 and under the reorganization plan. The Commisison has never met since then. I, for one, happen to be a great believer that there are too many laws now, and when we have deadwood we should take it out. We have repealed this, believing it to be in conformity with the facts as they exist.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. O'NEILL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5207) to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 312, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR BALANCE OF THE WEEK

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the majority leader if he can give us some information as to the program for the balance of this week and next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, this completes the legislative schedule for the week, and I know of no other business that will be before the House under our general reservation of programing additional business or conference reports for the balance of the week. We would like to have leave to wait until tomorrow, however, to finish the program for next week.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma, and I will make the request for further information on tomorrow.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

EXTENDING TIME WITHIN WHICH CERTAIN FEDERAL-STATE AGREEMENTS ON SOCIAL SECURITY MAY BE MODIFIED

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. St Germain] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, the bill I am introducing today is similar to one I introduced last year on the same subject. This measure would extend from 1963 to 1966 the time within which certain Federal-State agreements may be modified to give noncovered State and local employees under the divided retirement system procedure an opportunity to elect coverage without undue financial hardship.

As I pointed out at the time I introduced this legislation last year, my State of Rhode Island now has what is known as a "divided retirement system." This means that the State of Rhode Island employees who belong to the State retirement system were enabled for social security purposes to divide, by referendum, the retirement system into two parts: Part a, those desiring coverage; part b, those who indicated by a "no" vote in 1958 their desire not to be covered by social security.

The main obstacle to most State employees in joining the social security system is the prohibitive cost of making payments retroactive to 1956. To correct this problem, it is necessary for the States to have a further period of time in which to negotiate new Federal-State agreements and that the States be given the authority to determine the amounts their employees would pay in order to receive retroactive coverage under the social security system.

This bill is introduced after extensive consultation with the Honorable Raymond H. Hawksley, General Treasurer of Rhode Island, whose help and guidance have been invaluable. Since this measure meets a very real need, it is my hope that it will be favorably considered by the Congress.

THE CUBAN SITUATION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Gibbons] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, the President requested that the critics of our Cuban policy recommend constructive proposals rather than criticism of the present situation. I wish to present the following proposals in reply to that request.

Unless a more definite policy is established toward Cuba, we will be confronted with similar situations in other Latin American countries. Cuba has become a center of Communist subversion. Now that the Communists have established a beachhead in the Western Hemisphere, they will use this small island to prepare and train personnel to spread their insidious doctrine throughout Latin America.

For that reason, I believe that the following proposals certainly deserve close consideration if we are ever to arrive at the point of regaining the initiative which slowly slipped away from us after our short-lived blockade:

First. Prohibit all ships that carry cargo to Cuban ports from entering American ports. Also prohibit the owners and countries of such ships from trading with the United States. If they want to trade with Cuba, let them; but, let them know that they will not be able to trade with us.

Second. Establish a Cuban government in exile. This could be done through a special election. This is the democratic process. This would be the most practical solution, rather than to support a half dozen or so splinter groups. We should deal with one recognized government.

Third. Encourage hemisphere governments to prohibit travel to Cuba by Latin Americans for indoctrination and training in subversion and guerrilla warfare.

Fourth. Maximize the Soviet cost of supporting the Cuban regime by a selective boycott of those trading with Cuba.

Fifth. Maintain constant air and on-the-ground surveillance of Cuba.

Sixth. Prevent export or use of arms now in Cuba outside of Cuba.

Seventh. Continue to work toward complete political and economic isolation of Cuba by countries of the Western Hemisphere as well as the rest of the free world.

The free world trade with Cuba has declined from $1.3 billion in 1959 to an estimated $225 million in 1962. This amounts to an 83-percent decline. We should expand this battle through radio, press, books, television, and films, as well as through greatly expanded efforts to make contact with special groups, such as labor, student bodies, and the intellectual and cultural elite.

Eighth. Insist upon removal of all Russian military personnel from Cuba. Certainly 10,000 to 12,000 troops would hardly make a difference to Castro's military force which is now second only to the United States in the Western Hemisphere, unless these Russian troops were to be used to put down an internal uprising or to man missiles which we are told are no longer in Cuba.

To accomplish this end, we must be firm. If all troops are not completely removed, and substantial evidence given to this effect, within a specified period of time, we should reestablish a firm blockade, and be prepared for stronger action if necessary.

We must not let up at all on our effort until we have accomplished the goal of returning Cuba to a free society. However, a free Cuba will not mean a hemisphere free from the threat of communism. Only by successfully overcoming the basic economic and social problems of the region, can we conquer the threat.

LAW DAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Corman] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, today marks the sixth observance of Law Day. In 1961, Congress designated May 1 as Law Day, U.S.A. The theme this year is "Law—Rule of Right not Might."

There are three objectives of Law Day: First, to make more meaningful to Americans their heritage of individual freedom under law; second, to foster increased respect for law and the courts which protect the rights of all citizens; and, third, to emphasize the rule of law in our system, as contrasted with the rule of force and fear under communism.

While we are honoring the rule of law, and the role that it plays in our society, the Communists are parading their military might throughout the Soviet Union and their satellite states. This indeed is one of the essential differences between these systems. We rely on reasoned adjudication to settle our disputes. We jealously guard individual liberties. Their government crushes any dissent by force. Minorities have no rights in the Communist state.

The Constitution is the document which established the institutions of our Government and created the Federal system. This Constitution has been the vehicle for combining an unprecedented amount of freedom of action for individuals and Government with a minimum amount of friction between them. No other nation has achieved this fine balance.

The Supreme Court, at the head of the judicial branch, is the arbiter of our system. This is not an easy task, but I believe that it has done an excellent job of balancing individual and governmental interests. In recent years, the Court has increased the effectiveness of the guarantee of the Bill of Rights and made a living truth of the inscription on the Supreme Court building, "Equal justice under law."

Our courts are a unique instrument for the settlement of disputes. While

Congress legislates broad solutions, often based on partisan politics, the courts permit particularized adjustments, based on reason. This is a very important aspect of our Government. We should cherish it as one of the best assurances that individual freedom will continue to be protected.

Today, however, these foundations of our Nation are under their heaviest attack in recent years from rightwing extremists. Some would limit the jurisdiction of the courts. Others would impeach the Chief Justice. These groups have proposed three constitutional amendments which would radically alter the structure of our Government. The first would permit two-thirds of the State legislatures, acting separately, to submit amendments to the Constitution directly to the States. This would eliminate the national influence of Congress and the National Constitutional Convention, which presently plays an important part in the amendment process. The second would reverse the decision in Baker against Carr and forbid the Federal courts to intervene in the apportioning of State legislatures. The third would create a so-called Court of the Union, composed of the Chief Justices of the 50 State Supreme Courts, which could overrule the decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court.

These amendments would make profound changes in the structure of the judiciary, the relationship between the Federal and State Governments and the stability of the Federal Constitution.

I believe that these amendments would destroy our present Federal Union. They would dissipate our national strength by fragmenting our society. The United States that we have fought so hard to protect from external enemies would perish at the hands of those who subverted it from within.

The dangerous and divisive effect of these attacks on the Court and our Federal system should be countered by those most competent to do it, the members of the bench and bar. Our most prominent legal scholars have recently pointed out that it is the duty of lawyers to promote understanding and voluntary public acceptance of the decisions of the courts. Due to their training and background, lawyers have a special opportunity to explain the fundamental principles of justice on which our society is based and to advance the highest ideals of our society.

On this Law Day, let all lawyers dedicate themselves to this goal. Let us all pledge to take an active role in the fight to preserve and strengthen our legal system. There is no more noble or worthwhile undertaking for our profession.

THE FOREIGN SERVICE BUILDING ACT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Pool] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill, for it calls for spending which has no urgency and whose chief benefits would be the increased physical comfort of those in the Foreign Service of the United States.

The United States must borrow money with which to pay its debts. In this situation, it is as immature for the United States to order a glamorous new embassy in Paris as it is for a girl without a bank balance to charge a new hat. Both can wait until there is enough money for a splurge.

I find myself thinking of the projects which do have urgency, which we must have here at home not merely for the comfort but for the livelihood of our heavily taxed people. And I think of the necessary costs for programs which will capture and hold our natural resources for the day when water and forest land are luxuries.

Surely we must establish a chronology for our spending. Somehow, as individuals and as a Government, we must regain the thinking which made it a virtue, not a shame, to say, "We cannot afford that now."

MEETING STREET SCHOOL CHILDREN'S REHABILITATION CENTER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to invite the attention of the House to the outstanding work being done by the Meeting Street School Children's Rehabilitation Center in my home city of Providence.

Over the years, Rhode Island has made a number of unique contributions to the cause of education for the handicapped child. Rhode Island started the first day school programs for mentally handicapped children in 1896 and established the Emma Pendleton Bradley Hospital for emotionally disturbed children in 1931, to cite just two examples.

In 1946, reacting to the loss of residential treatment for children with cerebral palsy—due to circumstances beyond the control of the previous sponsor—the Rhode Island Society for Crippled Children and Adults started the Meeting Street School for physically handicapped children.

Initially, its activities were limited to helping the child afflicted with cerebral palsy. Today the school is a diagnostic and treatment day center for any child who needs to learn to walk, to talk, to use his hands. It stands ready to help victims of cerebral dysfunction, neuromuscular disorders, learning difficulties, cleft palate, congenital anomaly or amputation, hearing loss, speech defects, quadri- or hemiplegia, aphasia, cerebral palsy, postparalysis, or muscular dystrophy who will benefit from coordinated therapeutic treatment.

In addition, parents and families, caught up in a situation almost as emotionally acute as that besetting their children, are given instructions that will enable them to adjust to the handicapped. For, while medical science continues to bring its utmost force to bear upon these afflictions in an effort to eliminate them in future generations, the problem of caring for today's victims, who need training for useful living, remains with us.

The enthusiasm and ingenuity with which this voluntary organization offers substantial aid to a sizable group of handicapped children marks it as one of the most invigorating forces on the New England medical scene. While shielding the physically handicapped child from the day-to-day competition of the outside world, it helps to prepare him for eventual entry into that world. With no lack of attention to its appointed chores, it has managed a benign infiltration into the community at large that has produced an increasingly enlightened approach to this entire problem.

By its very nature, rehabilitation must lean heavily upon the community in which it is effected. Its usefulness is governed by the avaliability of recourse to professional and other community resources. It invokes numerous disciplines and specialties and its ultimate success depends upon the interrelationship of many factors in our social and economic life for acceptance of its byproduct—and completion of the rehabilitation cycle.

The city of Providence has accepted and responded wholeheartedly to this school whose services remain largely unduplicated in the surrounding area. The city has displayed great empathy for the project, providing material support and integrating the Meeting Street School into its overall plan of services for the disabled. But, most of all, it has demonstrated a true sense of responsibility for absorbing the crippled and disabled into the full life of the community.

Few organizations in the health and welfare field can match the caliber of the Meeting Street School's board of directors. Typical of the citizenship that guides its course are Dr. Eric Denhoff, medical director, and Mrs. John Langdon, executive director.

Mr. Denhoff is president-elect of the American Academy of Cerebral Palsy. He is also a member of the Professional Advisory Committee of the National Society for Crippled Children and Adults and is known throughout the medical world as the author of "Cerebral Palsy and Associated Disorders."

The work of Mrs. Langdon was best described by Dr. John Farrell of the Rhode Island Medical Society a year or so ago when he wrote that "she brought to this project a leadership and enthusiasm that has marked the past decade as one of the brightest chapters in the State's history of voluntary efforts in behalf of crippled children."

Under the dynamic leadership of these two, school functions have been expanded to accommodate ever increasing numbers of handicapped children, even as the effectiveness of services currently offered have been improved. In addition, new services have been developed that reflect a realistic evaluation of community needs.

In 1962 this rehabilitation center helped some 540 children with various physical disabilities in various ways. This year, it anticipates helping more than 600 children—and their parents.

Following the Biblical injunction, the other working members of the Meeting Street School team also "suffer little children to come unto" them. Compelled beyond self-consideration, dedicated to the rescue of handicapped children from the drossheaps of society, they perform their humanitarian tasks in a manner that merits our attention and richly deserves the tributes I offer them here today.

POLITICAL STATUS OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, yesterday four Members of the House introduced identical bills to establish a procedure for the prompt settlement in a democratic manner of the political status of Puerto Rico. I have read these bills and I am at a complete loss to understand why they were introduced. They are not in accordance with the treaty between the United States and Spain following the war with Spain. They are not in accordance with all of the acts which Congress has passed for many years affecting Puerto Rico. They are not in accordance with the joint resolution of the Puerto Rican Legislature, which is as follows:

Joint Resolution To Propose to the Congress of the United States of America the Procedure for Establishing the Ulterior Final Political Status of the People of Puerto Rico

Whereas the people of Puerto Rico favor the determination of the final political status of Puerto Rico in such manner that no doubt may remain about the noncolonial nature of such status; and

Whereas the people of Puerto Rico consequently favor, in different proportions, three forms of political status for Puerto Rico: Commonwealth status, based on common citizenship and developed to the maximum that may be agreed upon between the Congress of the United States and supporters of such status in Puerto Rico; federated statehood, under conditions equal to those of the federated States that already compose the American Union; independence as this status exists in the Latin Republic of America; and

Whereas those who favor commonwealth status and the supporters of federated statehood are against the separation of Puerto Rico from the United States, and most of the proponents of independence favor that such status be achieved in friendship with the United States; and

Whereas those who support commonwealth status conceive its maximum development, in permanent union with the United States of America, under the following principles:

1. The recognition and reassertion of the sovereignty of the people of Puerto Rico, so that no doubt may remain of their capacity to enter into a compact under conditions of juridical equality;

2. The assurance of the permanence and irrevocability of the union between the United States and Puerto Rico on the basis of common citizenship, common defense, common currency, free market, common loyalty to the values of democracy, and of such other conditions as may be considered, in the compact, of mutual benefit to the United States and Puerto Rico;

3. The specific definition of the powers of the United States with respect to Puerto Rico, which shall exclusively be those essential to the union;

4. All other powers shall be exercised by the constitutional organisms of the people of Puerto Rico;

5. Participation by the people of Puerto Rico in the powers exercised, under the compact, by the Government of the United States, in matters affecting Puerto Rico, in a measure proportional to the scope of such powers. This may include, among other ways of implementing such participation, the right to vote for the President and Vice President of the United States;

6. The adoption of a formula under which the people of Puerto Rico will contribute to defray the general expenses of the U.S. Government, in a manner compatible with the stability and economic growth of Puerto Rico; and

Whereas those who favor federated statehood conceive it as the only desirable form of permanent union with the United States, in the way enjoyed by the 50 States of the Union; and

Whereas those who favor independence conceive it in the form already known in other countries of the Americas; and

Whereas such three forms of political status are and should be based on the sovereign capacity of the people of Puerto Rico, whether it be for joining the Union as a federated State, for becoming independent, or for developing Commonwealth status, in permanent union with the United States, as requested by its supporters and as the Congress may agree, along the lines of the fourth whereas of this resolution:

Whereas it is hereby clearly expressed that nothing in this resolution shall be interpreted as an endorsement by supporters of Commonwealth status of either federated statehood or independence; or as an endorsement by supporters of federated statehood of either Commonwealth status or independence; or as an endorsement by supporters of independence of either Commonwealth status or federated statehood: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico, That—

Section 1. To propose to the Congress of the United States the prompt settlement, in a democratic manner, of the political status of Puerto Rico, applying the principles here expressed in accordance with the whereases of this resolution.

Sec. 2. The Congress once having expressed the form which it is willing to agree that Commonwealth status may take in consonance with the principles contained in the fourth whereas of this resolution, the three status formulas here specified be submitted to the vote of the people of Puerto Rico, on the basis of such expression by Congress and in accordance with the laws of Puerto Rico, so that the winning formula remain established or be established pursuant to the will of the Puerto Rican people.

Sec. 3. A copy of this resolution, in the English language, be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico in the United States.

Sec. 4. This resolution shall take effect immediately upon its approval and shall continue in effect until its purposes are achieved pursuant to the provisions of section 2 hereof.

Nor are they in accordance with the statements of the White House affecting Puerto Rico as they appeared in the Federal Register on July 25, 1961. That Presidential document follows:

Presidential Documents—Title 3—The President—Memorandum of July 25, 1961, Concerning the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico—Memorandum for the Heads of the Executive Departments and Agencies

The White House,
Washington, July 25, 1961.

Because of the importance and significance of Puerto Rico in the relations of the United States with Latin America and other nations, it is essential that the executive departments and agencies be completely aware of the unique position of the Commonwealth, and that policies, actions, reports on legislation and other activities affecting the Commonwealth should be consistent with the structure and basic principles of the Commonwealth.

On July 25, 1952, the Governor of Puerto Rico proclaimed the establishment of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico under its constitution. This proclamation was the culmination of a series of legislative and electoral steps which began with the passage of Public Law 600, 81st Congress, 64 Stat. 319 (1950). Public Law 600 made provision for the organization of a constitutional government by the people of Puerto Rico. In a referendum held on June 4, 1951, the proposals of this law received the overwhelming approval of the people of Puerto Rico.

Following approval, a Puerto Rican constitutional convention drafted a constitution, which was approved by a referendum held on March 3, 1952. The Congress in turn approved this constitution—Public Law 447, 82d Congress, 66 Stat. 327 (1952).

The Commonwealth structure, and its relationship to the United States which is in the nature of a compact, provide for self-government in respect of internal affairs and administration, subject only to the applicable provisions of the Federal Constitution, the Puerto Rican Federal Relations Act, and the acts of Congress authorizing and approving the constitution.

On November 27, 1953, the General Assembly of the United Nations recognized that the people of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, exercising effectively the right of self-determination in a free and democratic way, had achieved a new constitutional status and that, in view of this new status, it was appropriate that the United States should cease the transmission of information with regard to Puerto Rico under Article 73(e) of the Charter, U.N. General Assembly Resolution 748 (VIII) (1953).

All departments, agencies, and officials of the executive branch of the Government should faithfully and carefully observe and respect this arrangement in relation to all matters affecting the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. If any matters arise involving the fundamentals of this arrangement, they should be referred to the Office of the President.

The legislative steps which have led to the achievement by Puerto Rico of Commonwealth status have made inapplicable the provisions of Executive Order No. 6726 of May 29, 1934, insofar as they pertain to or are connected with the administration of the Government of Puerto Rico. This order no longer applies to Puerto Rico.

This memorandum shall be published in the Federal Register.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

[F.R. Doc. 61-7103: Filed, July 25, 1961; 4:05 p.m.]

TYPHOON DAMAGE TO GUAM AND SAIPAN

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention of our colleagues to a news item concerning Guam and Saipan in the Mariana Islands located in the Western Pacific. These islands have been buffeted by Typhoon Olive during the past 36 hours.

Damages of serious proportions have been inflicted by the storm according to radio dispatches received this morning. Members will recall that last November Typhoon Karen struck Guam. The island was just getting back on its feet when the second typhoon struck yesterday.

The radiograms from Governor Guerrero of Guam and Deputy High Commissioner Benitez are as follows:

APRIL 29, 1963.

RICHARD F. TAITANO,
Director of Territories, Department of Interior, Washington, D.C.:

Assessment of damages of Typhoon Olive indicates it is imperative we request immediately that the President declare Guam a major disaster area. Island buffeted by winds of major intensity, heavy rains over 48 hours. Practically all repairs from Typhoon Karen wiped out. Over 90 percent temporary housing units destroyed. Major problem is restoration of power which now is out islandwide. Majority telephones out. Anticipate breakdown water system as emergency power units break down. Restoration of power could take 2 weeks. Most patients Guam Memorial moved to Navy hospital now operating on emergency generator. Same applies to radio station. Attempting to organize mass feeding plan for literally thousands in schools, churches, other shelters. Initial survey indicates damage to public facilities over $2 million. Figure includes roads, bridges, utilities, staff housing. Local chapter Red Cross asks you notify national headquarters of seriousness of situation. No facilities. Few injuries. But expect some degree of general demoralization of local residents who have been subjected to just too much suffering in recent months.

MANUEL GUERRERO,
Governor of Guam.

APRIL 30, 1963.

MR. RICHARD TAITANO,
Interior Department of Territories,
Washington, D.C.:

Typhoon Olive caused tremendous damage on Saipan. Unable to reach Rota or Tinian. Typhoon passed over both as well as Saipan. It is imperative for us that the President declare a major disaster area in the Marianas. Typhoon eye more than an hour over Saipan. 95 percent of houses badly damaged. Power lines destroyed. Water system inoperative. New hospital roof destroyed. Supply and public works centers badly damaged. All agriculture crops destroyed. No deaths known. Situation very serious. Waiting for your immediate steps. Will supply additional information as known.

JOSE A. BENITEZ.

GORGAS MEMORIAL LABORATORY IN PANAMA

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, April 27, an extension to the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory in the Republic of Panama was dedicated.

This extension was made possible by an appropriation of the Congress of $500,000.

The Laboratory—a part of the Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, established by an act of Congress in 1929, was named for Alabama's Gen. William Crawford Gorgas.

It was my privilege to make the principal address at the dedication ceremony. The address follows:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN ARMISTEAD SELDEN, DEDICATION CEREMONIES, APRIL 27, 1963, PANAMA CITY, PANAMA

It is indeed an honor to be here today to take part in the dedication of this important new structure—a structure that symbolizes the common humanitarian goals of the people of Panama and of the United States.

We are dedicating more than a structure, however. This institution represents nothing less than a joint humanitarian venture—one in which Panama and the United States can share great pride.

Although these are troubled times for our hemisphere and for the world—in the humanitarian work that is conducted by this institution—the people of Panama and the United States are as one.

As chairman of the Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee of the House of Representatives, I had a part, along with my Alabama colleagues, Senator LISTER HILL and Representative KENNETH ROBERTS, in securing the enactment of legislation to maintain and operate this great research institution. This is especially true of the act of 1960 which authorized the appropriation of $500,000 to build and equip the structure we are now dedicating.

We meet here today not only to dedicate a building, but to pay homage to one whose name is borne by these institutions—the Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc., and the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory.

Not only do we pay honor to the greatest practical sanitarian of the ages, but also to all those who, through the years, have given so much of their time and talents to the work of the Institute and the Laboratory. In addition, we today recognize and honor all the personnel—scientific and nonscientific, on the isthmus and in Washington—who have effectively and loyally performed their exacting duties in behalf of this institution.

The Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, a nonprofit institution created by an act of the Congress of the United States was incorporated under the laws of the State of Delaware on October 25, 1921. The work of the Institute was limited to the United States until the act of May 27, 1928, authored by Congressman Maurice H. Thatcher, formerly a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission and a great friend of Panama, created the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory to be located in the Republic of Panama. The measure also authorized an annual appropriation of $50,000 for its maintenance and operation.

The activities of the Laboratory began January 1, 1929, under the immediate director of Dr. Herbert C. Clark. The Institute restricted its labors to the field of tropical disease as it does today. In connection with the origin of the Institute, it is interesting to note that Dr. Belisario Porras, President of the Republic of Panama, and Joseph E. Lefevre, representing the Panama National Health Board, are both signers of the articles of incorporation. The other incorporators were citizens of the United States. As provided by its bylaws, the Institute has always had an honorary president, the President of the United States.

This valuable site, and its original buildings, were donated to the Institute as the home of the Laboratory by the Panamanian Government.

I shall not attempt in the time allotted to me this morning to give a detailed account of the splendid achievements of the past century in the study and conquest of many of the more deadly diseases, which throughout all the ages have plagued the human race. Ross, Manson, Pasteur, Jenner, Lister, and Reed have been among those who have successfully dealt with our human ills.

However, it remained for William Crawford Gorgas of the Medical Corps of the U.S. Army to plan and execute in Cuba the first campaign to eradicate "Yellow Jack" as a centuries-old plague. By similar methods he also greatly reduced malaria there. This was during the years of U.S. occupation of that island following the Spanish-American War. Then he was sent to Panama, where the great canal was being constructed, and there achieved successful results similar to those he brought about in Cuba. Had the work of Gorgas on the isthmus been unsuccessful, the canal probably would not have been built. Sanitation and the establishment of order were indispensable to the success of the engineering labors that made possible that historic undertaking.

I have mentioned in general terms the great achievements of Gorgas in Cuba and the Isthmus of Panama. As a fellow Alabamian, I feel it would be appropriate on this occasion to remind you of a few of the more interesting details of the life of this great physician.

William Crawford Gorgas was born October 3, 1854, in the environs of Mobile, Ala. He was the eldest son of Josiah Gorgas and Amelia Gayle, daughter of an early Governor of Alabama. Josiah Gorgas, a graduate of the Military Academy at West Point, was of Pennsylvania birth, but he chose Alabama as his home. Young William Crawford Gorgas spent his earlier years in Richmond, Va., where his father was located as chief ordnance officer of the Confederate military forces. His father's Army career greatly influenced the youthful Gorgas to wish for a military career. After the close of the War Between the States, young Gorgas sought an appointment to West Point, but failed to obtain it. His ambition then turned to medicine and a career in the Medical Corps of the U.S. Army. He was a student at the University of the South at Sewanee, Tenn., graduating there in 1876, 66 years before I graduated from the same institution. At the time young Gorgas attended the University of the South, his father was serving as its president.

Gorgas became a student in Bellevue Medical College in New York City in 1876, graduating 3 years later. The years at Bellevue intensified his ambition for a career in the Army Medical Corps. He successfully passed the examination required and became a member of the corps. For the next 10 years he served in the Army Medical Corps chiefly in Texas, North Dakota, and Florida.

During these years, he volunteered and was sent to Fort Brown, near Brownsville, Tex., where for the first time he came to grips with yellow fever—the great enemy he was afterward to know so well and to finally master.

It was at Brownsville he met a Miss Marie Doughty of Cincinnati, Ohio, who was visiting her sister, the wife of the commanding officer of the post. There was an epidemic of yellow fever at the fort, many were dying, and panic was everywhere. Miss Doughty became stricken. Dr. Gorgas ministered to her, and, when her death seemed imminent, he was asked to attend her burial and to read the accustomed service. This he agreed to do, but fate intervened. The young woman began to recover, and recover she did. In turn, the courageous young physician was stricken, but he too survived. Out of these dramatic circumstances a romance sprang, which ripened into marriage. Having experienced yellow fever, both were immune to it. Thus, they were especially fitted to go anywhere it might strike, to live with it, to fight it, and to finally master it. In later years, Mrs. Gorgas remarked: "It would be untrue to say that 'Yellow Jack' was the best man at our wedding; but it would be perfectly true to say that, in a sense, he was an usher."

Then came the Spanish-American War, with Gorgas, a Medical Corps officer with the rank of major, in charge of the yellow fever camp at Siboney in fever-ravaged Cuba. Later in the year 1898, he was back in Havana and was soon made its chief sanitary officer. Gorgas instituted an overall plan for the removal or destruction in the Havana area of every receptacle in the entire region which might be the breeding site of the Stegomyia mosquito and its larvae. Drainage and fumigation practices were maintained. These processes and strict quarantine in a few months destroyed the presence of yellow fever, and the city became one of the healthiest anywhere to be found. To the extent necessary, similar sanitary practices were followed elsewhere on the island, and yellow fever was banished from the whole of Cuba.

Then, in 1904, the United States took up the challenge to build the Panama Canal. Gorgas was appointed chief sanitary officer of the Canal Zone, and assumed his duties as such in the early summer of 1904. He served in this capacity until his appointment in 1907 as a member of the second Isthmian Canal Commission in charge of the health and sanitary work on the isthmus.

He accomplished in Panama what he had accomplished in Cuba. The isthmus, which had come to be considered one of the plague spots of the world, became a region of health. Yellow fever was eradicated and malaria greatly reduced. The centers of population on the isthmus became as healthful as cities of the United States.

Thus Gorgas had again proved to the world that the people of the temperate zones could live and thrive in the tropics if proper sanitation were provided.

In the fall of 1913, Colonel Gorgas went to South Africa, on invitation of the Transvaal Chamber of Mines, to investigate and report on the subject of pneumonia then raging among the laborers in the gold and diamond mines in that region. He accepted the call, made the required trip and studies, and submitted recommendations for methods to be employed based on his handling of the same problem among the laborers on the canal project.

The adoption of these recommendations was followed by a gratifying lower death rate from pneumonia in the affected South African areas.

Then, on the invitation of the Government of Rhodesia, in 1914, he visited Salisbury, and suggested methods for handling malaria, which was ravaging that country. While there, he learned by cable that he had just become General Gorgas, through his appointment on January 16, 1914, by President Wilson, as Surgeon General of the U.S. Army with the rank of brigadier general. A year later, by an act of Congress, he became a major general.

As Surgeon General, Gorgas was called on to perform an unprecedented task in arranging the assembly of a mighty army of fit soldiers following our Nation's entry into World War I in April, 1917.

In the summer of 1916 he had served as Chief of the Special Yellow Fever Commission of the Rockefeller Foundation, and had visited various countries in Central and South America which were potential or actual yellow fever centers. He had given advice to local authorities on methods to be employed to eradicate these sources of peril. Everywhere he received the evidences of affection and esteem. The great mission of his life was to aid in the complete extermination of this frightful disease. He found in various places his measures against yellow fever and malaria were being carried out with complete success.

When he retired his post as Surgeon General in 1918 at the age of 65, he promptly accepted the directorship of the yellow fever work of the International Health Board of the Rockefeller Foundation. On May 30, 1920, he sailed for West Africa to make a study of yellow fever conditions there. Then came the stop in London, his illness and death on July 4.

The death of General Gorgas was mourned throughout the British Isles, as well as the United States, Panama, Cuba, and in the world at large. At the command of the British King and by order of the British Government, there was provided for him a funeral service in St. Paul's Cathedral, with the highest military honors. In the historic sanctuary—which is the last resting place of some of the greatest soldiers and sailors known to British history—impressive homage was paid to one who had walked humbly, but had so long successfully labored for his fellow man. He died in the faith in which he had ever lived—that there would be a better tomorrow, and that all should be given the opportunity to live healthy, fruitful lives.

His remains were carried by ship back to his beloved country, and laid in the sacred soil of Arlington National Cemetery in Washington.

General Gorgas was the recipient of an ever-increasing list of accolades and honors, but one of the greatest was the last—bestowed at his bedside in a London hospital by King George the Fifth himself—the insignia of Knight Commander of the Most Distinguished Order of St. Michael and St. George. The King had come to the hospital because, as he said, General Gorgas could not come to the palace to receive the honor.

Today, the fame of this Laboratory bearing his name is known far beyond the boundaries of this hemisphere. Its findings were, in large measure, used for the benefit of the Allied Forces in World War II, especially in the South Pacific areas. Its work is collaborative, not duplicative; its malarial techniques are of the first order.

Panama is an ideal site for the location and operation of a tropical research laboratory. Situated at a center of international traffic and a crossroads of the world—the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory is unrivaled in its opportunity for service to humanity in the field of tropical medicine.

This new building that we today are dedicating is destined to serve its purpose to the benefit of all mankind.

We gratefully acknowledge the splendid aid and cooperation which the Government and the people of Panama have always accorded the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory. This institution has ever been a common denominator of friendship and good will between our two countries.

The conquest of human disease and misery brings our countries and our people together—and so may the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory continue to symbolize that which unites, rather than separates, good neighbors of the Western Hemisphere.

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE ROBERT S. McNAMARA

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am inserting an extremely important and very well reasoned commentary by Joseph Alsop which appeared in the Washington Post this morning.

This column should be read by everyone who is sincerely interested in the defense of the United States.

It should be read by everyone who wishes to preserve and maintain the traditional American principle of civilian control over the military.

It should be read by everyone who appreciates the sacrificial services of a dedicated American like Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara and who applauds his determination to bring about effective and meaningful unification in our armed services.

It should be read by everyone who recognizes the need for our Nation's getting the maximum value from the defense dollar.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 1, 1963]

THE ATTACK ON McNAMARA

(By Joseph Alsop)

This week, Senator JOHN McCLELLAN's special investigating committee will resume its hearings on the TFX contract. The word is going round the Capital that the Senator, a determined man, means to keep the hearings going until July, and expects to "turn the TFX contract around."

That means, in effect, that Senator McCLELLAN hopes to force the resignation of Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara. For the Secretary can hardly accept the reversal of his decision, to award this contract to General Dynamics instead of the Boeing Co., without resigning because his judgement has been reversed.

The TFX controversy turns upon technicalities which outsiders, conspicuously including Senate investigating committees, are by no means well qualified to weigh. Secretary McNamara, who had to fight hard to get even one brief hearing from the committee, has had no real chance to tell his side of the story.

But the rights and wrongs of the TFX affair are very much less important, in any case, than the rights and wrongs of the attack on McNamara, for which the TFX affair is merely the vehicle. If this vehicle had not served, another one would have been made to serve. That was inevitable, in view of the nature of McNamara's effort.

Since the Defense Department was established, all the successive Secretaries before McNamara have been divisible into two categories. The good Secretaries were primarily interested in national defense. To these, the contemporary members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff invariably behaved with extraordinary arrogance.

The bad Secretaries were primarily interested in budgetary economies. To these, the Joint Chiefs invariably behaved with shameless servility. When the pie was big, in short, the uniformed Chiefs of the armed services complained because there was not more pie; and when the pie was limited, they bowed to the ground to get the largest slice.

This curious rhythm was only once interrupted. In the early summer of 1948, after the Czechoslovak coup d'etat, the Joint Chiefs confronted James V. Forrestal with combined requests for a defense budget of $24 billion. Forrestal, although intensely defense minded, rather than budget minded, knew he could not get so large a sum in those days. Hence he asked the Chiefs' help in making cuts.

Knowing Forrestal was defense minded, the Chiefs refused to help. Forrestal then worked almost from dawn until late at night, day after day, week after week, through all that summer and autumn, making his own line-by-line cuts to reduce the defense budget to $18 billion. The strain of that unaided effort was what, in fact, killed James Forrestal.

Despite that warning, McNamara has set out to accomplish more than Forrestal ever attempted. He is just as defense minded as Forrestal was, and his first requirement is a fully adequate national defense program, but he has also been trying to reduce the unit cost of national defense, which has risen continually and remorselessly, and not least under the economizing Defense Secretaries like Charles E. Wilson and Louis Johnson.

To obtain maximum defense at minimum cost, in turn, McNamara has had to use his own judgment, just as Forrestal was driven to do in that summer of desperate overwork which caused his breakdown and death. For a Secretary of Defense who wishes to do what McNamara is trying to do, there is no alternative to relying on his own judgment.

This is the case because the Army, Navy, and Air Force have never been able to agree among themselves, not just on their own roles and missions, but also and far more importantly, on the basic strategy and tactics of our national defense. With three wholly different defense concepts, the Chiefs of Staff invariably ask for appropriations to defend the country in three different ways at once.

In these circumstances, if there is to be a unified strategic and tactical defense concept, it has to be imposed on the Chiefs of Staff by the Defense Secretary. In the existing system no one else can insist upon a unified concept. Yet if a unified concept is not insisted upon, one of two results must follow.

Either the cumulative bill for satisfying three conflicting concepts will be completely astronomical or the bill will be reduced to meet budgetary limitations and the defense program will be inadequate. In the last 16 years the Joint Chiefs have repeatedly shown that they prefer the risks of an inadequate defense program to the strain of agreement on a unified defense concept.

McNamara has been trying to change all this, by improving a unified concept. In other words, he has been trying to get the United States the best weapons that money can buy, but no more weapons than are really needed, and at the lowest manageable unit cost. That is the source of his troubles with the Joint Chiefs, which are the sources, in turn, of the TFX affair.

POPULATION FACTORS IN THE ECONOMY

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a subject of crucial importance to economic growth is population increase and change, including change in the age-sex mix of the total population. In my opinion, this subject has great relevance to our current economic situation and should be studied in more detail.

Although little work has been done in this field by the economics profession, I was pleased to note a study prepared recently by Fiduciary Counsel, Inc., a private investment advisory firm. Conclusions reached by this study support my own belief that population factors do carry considerable weight in influencing general economic conditions.

At the present time, the 15 to 29 age group is exploding, while the 30 to 44 group is declining. Since the 30 to 44 ages comprise the "biggest spending and most productive age group," its failure to grow has had an important impact upon economic growth. In the latter part of the sixties and the early 1970's, however, this trend will be reversed, with a resulting increase in the demand for residential construction and durable consumer goods. Furthermore, the nonproductive age groups—19 and under and 65 and over—are increasing at a more rapid rate than the population as a whole. It is projected that this segment will account for more than half of the total population in the latter part of the decade, placing the need for maximum productivity upon the working men and women.

Mr. Speaker, this subject of population factors is of crucial importance for determination of future government policies and I ask unanimous consent that these excerpts from "Population Factors in the Economy" be inserted in the Record at this point.

Excerpts From "Population Factors in the Economy," Prepared for Fiduciary Counsel, Inc., by John H. Manley, 1963

There are three major movements in the character and location of the U.S. population importantly influencing general economic conditions and specific investment decisions: (1) Great variations in the rates of growth in different sections of the country; (2) a continuation of the very long term trend toward concentration of the population in relatively few huge urban areas, which appears to be accelerating; (3) an age distribution oddity resulting from an abnormally low birth rate in the 1930's and an abnormally high rate in the late 1940's and 1950's * * *.

The approximate 15-to-29 age group is certainly exploding but there is a middle group from 30 to 44 which is declining and there is also evidence of a resumption of a long-term decline in the birth rate, which probably was only interrupted in the war and postwar years. * * *

This surge in the population in the high teens and in the twenties has several other significant investment and general economic implications. Particularly in the lower portions of this age group, these young people are not large buyers of new cars. However, as every parent knows, they do represent a very heavy pressure of demand for secondhand cars, firming prices in that market and thereby reducing the effective cost of a new car to the older and more affluent segments of the population. Similarly, these young people are not significant buyers of single family homes. The high teens and low twenties, however, is where the bulk of new family formations are to be found, with a resulting requirement for new living space of some sort, mostly apartments. The present very high rate of activity in apartment building as a percentage of all residential building is explainable largely by this fact. In the latter part of the 1960's and the early 1970's this wave passing through the population will create a heavy demand for individual home construction unless, because of high land prices and high construction costs, there is a tendency toward increased general preference for multiunit residential building. Such a development, to a degree, is probable. * * *

Probably the biggest spending and the most productive age group is that from 30 to 44. This segment of the population is expected to decline by some 2 million people during the current decade. This, of course, represents the trough reflecting the low birth rate in the thirties and early forties. The failure of this age group to exert any positive demographic force in the sixties is a very important economic fact which is opposed to the earlier designation of the decade as the "soaring 60's."

The very high percentage increases in the population in the late teens and the twenties now going on and to continue through the decade creates problems of finding employment for these young people. It is also expected to mitigate the upward pressure on wages by increases in the work force which should tend to weaken the effectiveness of the labor unions. There are a number of other elements entering into this very complex situation, including the rapidly increasing trend toward automation in most industries, the change in the educational requirements for members of the labor force, the tendency toward an increased number of women in the work force and the like * * *.

In the aggregate, this nonproductive group (19 and under and 65 and over) is increasing at a more rapid rate than the population as a whole. In the latter part of this decade it will account for half of the total population compared to only 42 percent in 1950. This certainly points to a need for maximum productivity for the working portion of the population which must support a nearly equal number in the nonworking age groups. It probably also points to some increase in the normal working life, although the social security system and the recent reduction in the permissible retirement ages for both men and women is a powerful incentive in the opposite direction.

LEGISLATIVE OPERATIONS ROUNDTABLE, A FORWARD STEP BY CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Widnall] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the American people have had more than one opportunity in the past few months to be proud of the work of the U.S. Civil Service Commission in protecting the merit basis of the civil service system, and improving the effectiveness of Government employees. I want to call specific attention to a new program, cosponsored by the Office of Career Development, U.S. Civil Service Commission, and the American Political Science Association, called Legislative Operations Roundtable for Executives, running the week of May 13 to 17, 1963.

The purpose of the roundtable is to "enhance the Federal career executive's knowledge and understanding of executive-legislative relations through an examination in depth of congressional functions and processes, and the relationships between these and executive branch operations." Participating in the roundtable will be 30 Federal civilian and military executives who are at the GS-15 level, or its equivalent, and above.

Each day will feature two or more lectures by outstanding political scientists and governmental leaders. Preparatory readings from the best works on the subject of Congress and the legislative process are assigned before each lecture, with supplemental reference reading suggested as well. Following each session, a roundtable discussion will take place to exchange ideas and impressions and gain added perspectives. The lecturers and subjects are as follows:

LEGISLATIVE OPERATIONS FOR EXECUTIVES

PROGRAM SCHEDULE

Monday, May 13, 1963:

From 9:45 to 12: "Congress and the American System," Dr. Charles S. Hyneman, professor of government, University of Indiana.

From 1 to 3:15 p.m.: "The Organization of Congress," Dr. Nelson W. Polsby, assistant professor of government, Wesleyan University.

Tuesday, May 14, 1963:

From 9 to 11 a.m.: "The Legislative Process," Dr. Ralph K. Huitt, professor of political science, University of Wisconsin.

From 1 to 2:45 p.m.: "External Pressures on Congress," Mr. James W. Foristel, legislative representative, the American Medical Association.

From 3 to 4:45.: "Social and Geographical Influences on Congressional Composition," Mr. Richard M. Scannon, Director, Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce.

Wednesday, May 15, 1963:

From 9 to 11 a.m.: "Representing and Informing the People," Hon. Morris K. Udall, Representative from Arizona, U.S. House of Representatives.

From 1 to 4 p.m.: "Work Behind the Scenes—The Congressional Staff," Mr. Stephen Horn, legislative assistant to Senator Thomas R. Kuchel, Mr. Leo H. Irwin, Chief Counsel, Committee on Ways and Means, U.S. House of Representatives.

Thursday, May 16, 1963:

From 9 to 10:30 a.m.: "The Executive Side of the Coin," Mr. Bradley H. Patterson, Jr., National Security Affairs Adviser, Office of the Secretary of the Treasury, Department of the Treasury.

From 10:45 to 12: "Liaison Between the Executive Branch and Congress," Mr. Kenneth M. Birkhead, Assistant to the Secretary (Legislative Liaison), Department of Agriculture.

From 2:15 to 4:30 p.m.: "Financial Policy Determination and the Appropriations Process," Mr. Robert A. Wallace, Assistant to the Secretary, Department of the Treasury.

Friday, May 17, 1963:

From 9:30 to 10:30 a.m.: "Representing and Informing the People," Hon. Clifford P. Case, Senator from New Jersey, U.S. Senate.

From 10:45 to 12:30 p.m.: "Congress and the Courts," Dr. Carl B. Swisher, professor of political science, the Johns Hopkins University.

From 2:30 to 4:30 p.m.: "Legislative-Executive Branch Relations," Dr. Richard E. Neustadt, professor of government, Columbia University.

Mr. Speaker, as can be seen by the above list of subjects, and the number of sessions, this project has been well conceived and thoughtfully produced. The Civil Service Commission has recognized the need to make executive branch employees more responsive to the total legislative process. Certainly the increased knowledge on the part of these public servants will decrease any suspicion or lack of understanding between the two branches of Government.

There is an additional significance in this joint effort between the Office of Career Development and the American Political Science Association. It indicates the opportunities available for cooperation between public agencies and private organizations in improving the democratic process, and enlightening those participating in it. Special credit should go to Mr. James R. Beck, Jr., Director, Management Institutes, Office of Career Development, U.S. Civil Service Commission, and Mr. Donald G. Tacheron, assistant director, American Political Science Association, for their imagination and foresight in producing this program.

LAW DAY, U.S.A.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Shriver] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, throughout the Nation we are observing today Law Day, U.S.A. One of the extensive observances being conducted is in Wichita, Kans., where the Wichita Junior Chamber of Commerce has erected a replica of the Berlin wall in the downtown area. The Wichita Bar Association is actively in the forefront of Law Day activities.

It is highly appropriate that we observe a day set aside as Law Day because our Nation's very society and structure rest upon the philosophy of the rule of law. Significantly, the United States observes its Law Day at the same time that Communist nations, led by the Soviet Union, use May Day to demonstrate their disregard for law and freedom.

There is no more appropriate occasion than May Day—May 1, 1963—for us to recall the basic moral and philosophical principles upon which our free society is based and contrast these principles with the cynical, immoral, and atheistic philosophy that underlies international communism.

Above the entrance to the U.S. Supreme Court Building is engraved the inscription: "Equal justice under law." This is a fitting motto, not only for the Court, but for all Americans. For it is the law which has made this a great and strong Nation. We must remember that ours is a government of laws—not men. We must never take our liberty for granted and we must remain ever alert. Each of us should consider himself a watchdog of all the basic human rights which are part of our American heritage.

REDS STRUT ON MAY DAY

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Alger] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, today is the traditional holiday of the worldwide Communist conspiracy. From Peiping to Moscow to Cuba the Reds strut and bluster, showing off their military strength and reemphasizing the final Communist objective—the destruction of freedom and worldwide domination of the Communist conspiracy.

The show of military might, the bragging and the threats are not new. This is a traditional demonstration from the top of the wall of the Kremlin. What makes this May Day different is the worldwide show being put on in Moscow where Khrushchev is staging a special production featuring his little bearded Cuban puppet and using the occasion to thumb his nose at the United States and give Castro an opportunity to tell how he has humiliated and brought to terms the mightiest nation in the world, the leader of the free world.

Khrushchev and Castro have been given this propaganda initiative because of the failure of the Kennedy administration to rid Cuba of Russian Communist aggression. The Red dictator can sneer at the leadership of the United States because President Kennedy has not pursued a policy of strength and firm determination to win the cold war against communism. Spurred on by the Kremlin apologists who evidently are shaping our foreign policy, the President has relied on pleading with Khrushchev to honor treaties, by attempting to make deals such as pulling our missile bases out of Greece and Turkey and protecting Castro against his own people who are fighting to regain their freedom.

The Kennedy concessions to Khrushchev have not brought peace in the world. They have resulted, instead, in a renewal of war in Laos. While the President sends an envoy with hat in hand to Moscow to beg agreement, American Armed Forces are committed to an undeclared war brought on by the Communists in South Vietnam and 80 American boys have died there.

From the top of the Kremlin today Khrushchev and Castro can tell the crowds that Cuba is still a Communist stronghold in the Western Hemisphere containing Russian arms, missiles and thousands of Russian troops. They can say they have defied the United States to drive them out. And they are right because the President through fear, or lack of understanding of the Communist conspiracy, or because of his belief in his own superior wisdom and ability will not face up to communism in Cuba.

On this May Day the failure of the President to deal with the Communist conspiracy is shown in all its stark reality.

Mr. Speaker, this day should bring forth new resolution on the part of the United States to take the offensive against communism. We should resolve now to get the Communists out of Cuba, every last Russian soldier and weapon and we should see for ourselves that they are out, not take the word of an international liar and gangster who lacks morality and who firmly believes in the rightness of breaking his agreements. We should reimpose at once, the Monroe Doctrine.

If President Kennedy is unwilling or unable to assume the leadership expected of him as President and Commander In Chief of our Armed Forces, then it may be time for the Congress and the people to force the issue in order to protect the sovereignty of the United States and the security of our people. We dare not allow another May Day to record additional failures of the Kennedy administration. Another year may be too late.

The larger tragedy seems to be that, if forced to take action, the President may still not understand why—expedient actions when not in a clearly understandable framework of recognizable principles, are extremely dangerous, at best. What we really need is a firmly announced, clearly understood foreign policy that reestablishes the Monroe Doctrine and U.S. sovereignty. This posture the world would understand and would respect and honor. This posture, I am now convinced, President Kennedy can neither understand nor assume.

COMMUNIST FILMS IN FAIRFAX COUNTY

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, public attention has been strongly drawn in recent days to several films obtained for public showing by the Fairfax County Public Library. The local American Legion organization has vigorously opposed use of these films because the authors or producers were believed to be Communists or Communist sympathizers.

The films entitled "Picture in Your Mind" and "Japan" were produced by Julien Bryan.

The film "The Brotherhood of Man" was coproduced by Gene Weltfish.

Mr Speaker, I would like to insert at this point the factual records of these two persons as furnished me from the files of the House Committee on Un-American Activities:

GENE WELTFISH

Gene Weltfish, president of the Congress of American Women (A–1948: C–1949: I–1956), New York, spoke at a meeting of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born (A–1948: C–1942: I–1956), according to Daily People's World, November 10, 1947, page 2. The Daily Worker, March 4, 1948, page 2, reported that Gene Weltfish was among the signers of a committee * * * statement attacking deportation of Communists. The same publication, August 10, 1950, page 5, listed her among signers of the committee's statement against denaturalization. She was named as a sponsor of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born in the following sources: an undated letterhead received in July 1950: a 1950 letterhead, an undated letterhead with a speech given by Abner Green at a conference held December 2–3, 1950; a book of coupons issued by the organization, undated; a letterhead of the Midwest Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, April 30, 1951; and the Daily Worker, April 4, 1951, page 8. The Daily Worker, August 24, 1951, page 8, reported that Prof. Gene Weltfish, sponsor of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, was among those who signed an open letter to the President, protesting the jailing of Abner Green, secretary of the organization.

The Daily Worker, March 15, 1951, page 8, reported that Dr. Gene Weltfish was a sponsor of the American Peace Crusade (C–1951: I–1956: S–1958). She was shown to have been a sponsor of the American People's Congress and Exposition for Peace (I–1956) held under the auspices of the American Peace Crusade in Chicago June 29–July 1, 1951, by the Call to the Congress and a leaflet entitled "American People's Congress * * * invites you to participate in a National Peace Competition" June 29, 1951. The Daily Worker, May 1, 1951, page 11, reported that Dr. Weltfish was a sponsor of a contest of songs, essays and paintings advancing the theme of world peace, under the auspices of the American Peace Crusade.

Dr. Gene Weltfish spoke at a mass rally to protest lynchings, held in New York August 28, 1946, under the auspices of the Civil Rights Congress (A–1947: C–1947: I–1956: S–1957), as shown on a handbill entitled "Lynch Terror Stalks America." The Daily Worker, February 28, 1947, page 2, reported that Gene Weltfish signed a statement issued by the congress in defense of Gerhart Eisler. A program for a conference of the Civil Rights Congress of New York, October 11, 1947, indicated that Gene Weltfish participated in a panel at that meeting. She was shown to be a sponsor of the group's National Civil Rights Legislative Conference, January 18–19, 1949, in a leaflet, "Let Freedom Ring" containing the conference program. A Civil Rights Congress letterhead dated May 7, 1948, showed that Gene Weltfish was among the signers of an open letter to Congress urging defeat of the Mundt anti-Communist bill, circulated by the congress. The Daily Worker, August 3, 1948, page 2 reported that Dr. Weltfish signed a congress statement protesting the arrest and indictment of Communist Party leaders. The same publication on January 25, 1949, page 10, reported that she was a member of an organization delegation to the Freedom Crusade in Washington, D.C., which urged dismissal of indictments against the Communist leaders. An advertisement in the Evening Star, October 30, 1951, page A–7, "paid for by contributions of signers," listed Gene Weltfish among the signers of an open letter to the Attorney General of the United States on behalf of the four jailed trustees of the bail fund of the Civil Rights Congress. The Daily Worker, November 12, 1951, in an article on page 6 and an advertisement on page 8, named Dr. Weltfish among those scheduled to speak that evening at a memorial and protest meeting in New York City urging support of a petition to the U.N. entitled "We Charge Genocide," circulated by the Civil Rights Congress under whose auspices the meeting was to be held. She was listed among those who were to speak at the sixth anniversary dinner of the Civil Rights Congress, March 26, 1952, in the Daily Worker of that same date, page 3.

Gene Weltfish was president of Woman Power, published monthly by the Congress of American Women (A–1948: C–1949: I–1956), as shown in testimony of Walter Steele before this committee on July 21, 1947 (p. 35 of his testimony). Dr. Weltfish was president of the Congress of American Women as shown by an organization letterhead dated February 25, 1949, and the Bulletin of the Congress of American Women, July 28, 1946, page 2. A leaflet entitled "What Is the Congress of American Women?" named Dr. Weltfish as vice chairman of the Continuing Committee of the Congress of American Women (undated). Soviet Woman, July-August 1946, page 4, reprinted a report by Gene Weltfish to the Executive Committee of the Congress of American Women on the International Democratic Women's Federation which met in Paris in June 1946. According to the Daily Worker, February 11, 1948, page 10, Dr. Weltfish was a member of the Executive Committee of the Women's International Democratic Federation (C–1949: I–1956), with which the Congress of American Women was affiliated.

According to the program for the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace (C–1949) held in New York March 25–27, 1949, under the auspices of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions (C–1949: I–1956), Gene Weltfish was one of the sponsors. An edited conference report entitled "Speaking for Peace," pages 72 and 143, reported that Dr. Weltfish spoke at the conference on the subject, "Fascism, Colonialism, and World Peace." She was a sponsor of the conference of the national council * * * October 9–10, 1948, as shown in a leaflet entitled "To Safeguard These Rights * * *" published by the council's bureau of academic freedom.

Dr. Gene Weltfish, anthropologist and author, was among members of the Continental Committee for U.S. Participation in the American Continental Congress (C–1951) in Mexico City, September 5–10, 1949, according to the Call to the Congress and the Daily Worker, July 29, 1949, page 5. A leaflet entitled "World Congress for Peace—Paris," (I–1956) April 20–23, 1949, listed Dr. Gene Weltfish as a member of the American sponsoring committee for the Congress.

A press release of the American Council for a Democratic Greece (A–1948) dated March 17, 1948, contained the name of Dr. Weltfish in a list of members of the organization's board of directors.

The program for a testimonial dinner given by the American Slav Congress (A–1948: C–1949) in New York October 12, 1947, listed Dr. Gene Weltfish among the sponsors for that affair. The Slavic-American, official publication of the American Slav Congress, in its fall 1948 issue, page 18, reported that Dr. Gene Weltfish, professor of Columbia

University, spoke briefly at the closing session of the 4th American Slav Congress in September 1948, in Chicago.

The Daily Worker, April 6, 1952, page 8, magazine section, reported that Dr. Gene Weltfish was the speaker at a conference to safeguard the welfare of our children and our homes, held March 22, 1952, in New York City under the auspices of the American Women for Peace (C–1951).

Dr. Gene Weltfish was named as one of the sponsors of American Youth for Democracy (A–1947: C–1944: I–1956) in the program for a dinner marking the organization's first anniversary, October 16, 1944.

The call for a conference on China and the Far East, October 18–20, 1946, was issued on an undated letterhead of the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy (A–1949: I–1956: J–1952) which was setting up the conference in conjunction with the National Committee To Win the Peace (A–1947: I–1956). Dr. Gene Weltfish was named among sponsors of the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy on this letterhead as well as on others dated January 9 and July 11, 1947 and May 28, 1948. Gene Weltfish was among those said to have signed an open letter to the President of the United States, released by the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy October 7, 1946, and contained in the pamphlet, "What Price Philippine Independence?" by George Phillips (p. 32).

The Daily Worker, September 20, 1947, page 8, and the Worker, September 28, 1947, page 10, named Dr. Gene Weltfish as a speaker for the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade (A–1947: C–1944: S–1955). The Daily Worker, January 15, 1948, page 5, named Gene Weltfish as having participated in a picket line against Franco, which was sponsored by Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade.

Dr. Gene Weltfish was one of the signers of a petition to the President of the United States "to bar military aid to or alliance with Fascist Spain" which was circulated by the Spanish Refugee Appeal of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee (A–1947: C–1944: I–1956) as shown by a copy of the petition attached to an organization letterhead dated May 18, 1951.

Letterheads of "Soviet Russia Today" (C–1944: J–1952) dated September 8 and 30, 1947, and an undated letterhead received in April 1948, contained the name of Gene Weltfish in a list of members of that publication's advisory council.

Dr. Gene Weltfish, identified as an anthropologist, was named as having sent greetings to women of the Soviet Union on the occasion of International Women's Day, along with other members of the Committee of Women of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship (A–1947: C–1944: I–1956: S–1956). The program for the "Congress on American-Soviet Relations," December 3–5, 1949, named Gene Weltfish as an endorser of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship.

A pamphlet, "For a New Africa," named Gene Weltfish as having participated in a conference on Africa in New York City April 14, 1944, held under the auspices of the Council on African Affairs (A–1947: I–1956). A booklet, "Seeing Is Believing—Here Is the Truth," published in 1947 by the Council on African Affairs, listed on the back cover the names of council members including that of Dr. Gene Weltfish. The Daily Worker, April 26, 1947, page 12, reported that Gene Weltfish was among the signers of a statement issued by the council. The same publication in its issue of March 29, 1948, page 7, named Dr. Weltfish as a member of the council's executive board.

Gene Weltfish was a signer of the brief submitted by Cultural Workers to the U.S. Supreme Court during the October 1949 term, in behalf of John Howard Lawson and Dalton Trumbo. The following reference to John Howard Lawson, Dalton Trumbo, and others, appeared in a report of the Committee on Un-American Activities, December 31, 1948, page 9: "Each of these witnesses refused to affirm or deny membership in the Communist Party. * * * In each case the committee presented voluminous evidence to show affiliations with Communist organizations and a copy of the witness' Communist Party registration card." Lawson and Trumbo were convicted of contempt of Congress and sentenced to 1 year in jail and fines of $1,000 each (Washington Times Herald, May 30, 1950, p. 1). They began serving their sentences June 11, 1950 (New York Times, June 11, 1950, p. 3).

The Daily Worker, February 16, 1949, page 2, and February 20, 1949, page 10, named Gene Weltfish as one of those protesting the procedure in the trials of Communist leaders. The same publication, November 30, 1948, page 11, reported that Gene Weltfish signed a telegram in behalf of Robert Thompson, a Communist; on December 15, 1948, page 1, the Daily Worker showed her to be a member of a delegation on behalf of Mr. Thompson. She was one of the sponsors of the National Nonpartisan Committee To Defend the Rights of the 12 Communist Leaders, as shown on the reverse side of an organization letterhead dated September 9, 1949. Robert Thompson was one of 11 Communist leaders who were convicted October 14, 1949, of conspiracy to teach and advocate the violent overthrow of the U.S. Government (New York Times, Oct. 15, 1949, p. 5).

The Daily Worker, June 11, 1947, page 5, reported that Gene Weltfish was among the sponsors of a banquet in celebration of the 85th birthday anniversary of Mother Ella Reeve Bloor.

An undated leaflet, "Prominent Americans Call for * * *" (received in September 1950) named Prof. Gene Weltfish as having endorsed the World Peace Appeal (C–1951).

Letterheads of the Voice of Freedom Committee (A–1953) dated June 16, 1947, and May 12, 1948, listed the name of Dr. Gene Weltfish among sponsors of the organization.

A brief item on Gene Weltfish was included in "Biographical Notes on Convention Personalities," released by the Progressive Party (C–1956: I–1956) just prior to its convention in Philadelphia in July 1948.

The 20th Anniversary Almanac of the Metropolitan Music School (C–1957) published by the Citizens Committee for the Metropolitan Music School, on page 6 listed Dr. Gene Weltfish as an honorary chairman of the committee.

Dr. Gene Weltfish was shown to have been one of the original sponsors of the National Committee To Secure Justice for the Rosenbergs (C–1955: I–1956) in an article in the Daily Worker, January 3, 1952, page 3, in which announcement of formation of the organization was made. Dr. Weltfish was shown as an organization sponsor in the following sources: numerous letterheads during the period from January 1952 through June 1953: pamphlets entitled "Let's Not Have a Dreyfus Case in America," back cover; "The Rosenberg Case: A Fact Sheet," back cover; and "To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case," by William A. Reuben, page 32 (all distributed in 1952 by the National Committee To Secure Justice for the Rosenbergs). The Daily Worker, October 15, 1952, pages 3 and 6, reported that Dr. Gene Weltfish was among those urging that the death sentence against Julius and Ethel Rosenberg be set aside. The same publication, January 21, 1953, page 7, listed Dr. Weltfish among artists and writers seeking clemency for the Rosenbergs.

Dr. Weltfish testified before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in September and October 1952, in hearings on the subversive influence in the educational process, at which time she took the fifth amendment when questioned as to Communist affiliations. Subsequently she appeared before the Senate Subcommittee on Investigations, Committee on Government Operations in March and April 1953, again taking the fifth amendment. During her testimony before the latter committee she revealed that her tenure as a professor at Columbia University would cease at the end of the semester. The Daily Worker, April 2, 1953, page 5, in an editorial attack on her dismissal from the Columbia faculty, blamed the discharge on her adherence to "the principles of academic freedom." On page 6 of the same issue, she was reported as having taken the fifth amendment because she did not "want to enter into an arena of political manipulation." Daily People's World, April 8, 1953, page 7, reported Dr. Weltfish's dismissal from the Columbia faculty as having resulted from her use of the fifth amendment.

Julien Bryan

"Soviet Russia Today," May 5, 1936, page 5, contains photographs by Julien Bryan. This publication was cited as "a mouthpiece of the Communist Party" in the June 25, 1942, report of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities (p. 21) as a Communist front in the committee's report on March 29, 1944.

The Daily Worker of May 6, 1937, page 5, lists Julien Bryan as a lecturer for New Masses, which Attorney General Biddle cited as a "Communist periodical" and the Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited as a "Communist front * * *" on a number of occasions. It is one of the official organs of the Communist Party.

Several sources list Julien Bryan as a guide or tour conductor to the Soviet Union and as having lectured on the Soviet Union. (See Daily Worker, May 1, 1937, p. 6, and April 5, 1937, p. 7; and New Masses, March 16, 1937, p. 29.)

Julien Bryan's name also appears as a leader of a seminar in the Intourist Bulletin, March 1, 1939, page 3. Intourist Bulletin was a publication of Intourist, Inc., the Soviet State Tourist Co.

Volume 1 of the Public Hearings of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities contains a reprint of a great deal of evidence submitted by Mr. Walter Steele in connection with his testimony before the committee on August 17, 1938. This material contains the following reference to a speech on Russia made by Julien Bryan:

"The United Farmers' League is a section of the International Peasant Council of Moscow. It was organized in the United States in 1926. It is active in farm strikes. Alfred Taile, secretary of the league, has an extensive jail record for his agitational activities and leadership of mass resistance of farmers in the Middle West. Its organ is the United Farmer. The league was merged with the Farmers' National Committee for Action at a national convention held in Chicago in 1933.

"'A Call to Action' was issued to farmers asking them to 'unite their fight.' Russian farmers were described in glittering terms by Julien Bryan in a lecture on Russia. Clarence Hathaway, of the New York bureau of the Communist Party, addressed this 'united front' congress. Fifty-nine farmers' organizations were reported represented, but the Communists edged in the Communist Party, the (Communist) Labor Sports Union, the Young Communist League, the Young Pioneers, the United Farmers' League, the Communist Unemployed Councils, the Share-

Croppers Union, and scores of State committees of action, quickly organized by them in order that they might assure the Reds control."

In addition to the above references to Julien Bryan, the following on Julien Bryan are found:

Photographs by Julien Bryan appeared in the Daily Worker on April 14, 1936, page 5 and March 31, 1936, page 5.

In volume 1 of the Public Hearings of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, a reference to Julien Bryan appears in the evidence submitted by Mr. Steele, in connection with his testimony on August 17, 1938. The following paragraphs appear:

On June 4, 1936, the Washington Times editorially criticized the production of "Communist approved films" by the March of Time. The pictures were said to have been photographed in Russia by Julien Bryan, a professional lecturer on Soviet Russia, and a member of the national committee of the communistic Friends of the Soviet Union in 1933.

Bryan gave an illustrated lecture at Washington Irving High School in New York, May 15, 1936, under the auspices of Soviet Russia Today, the organ of the Friends of the Soviet Union, a communistic movement headed by Corliss Lamont, son of the partner of Morgan, the Wall Street banker (public hearings, p. 541).

TESTIMONY OF WALTER S. STEELE, 1947

The International Film Foundation, Inc., 1600 Broadway, New York, N.Y., is promoting film plays on Russia. It propagandizes among American youth. Julien Bryan is executive director (exhibit 51).

Mr. Speaker, I have presented this material as a service to the American Legion and all citizens who have taken an interest in this public controversy in order that they might have full information to guide their future actions.

I am compelled to add that the long record of Communist activities on the part of these film producers makes it impossible for me to believe other than the films were made as Communist propaganda vehicles.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HEALEY, for Wednesday, May 1, 1963, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. LINDSAY (at the request of Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin), for 45 minutes, on May 8.

Mr. FOGARTY (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 15 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CORMAN.
Mr. FLOOD.
Mr. TOLL.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on April 30, 1963, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2833. An act to amend subdivision d of section 60 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 96d) so as to give the court authority on its own motion to reexamine attorney fees paid or to be paid in a bankruptcy proceeding;

H.R. 2849. An act to amend section 47 of the Bankruptcy Act; and

H.R. 4549. An act to amend section 4103 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the appointment of the Chief Medical Director of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 2, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

757. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting the seventh report of the Office of Civil Defense, Department of Defense, on property acquisitions of emergency supplies and equipment for the quarter ending March 31, 1963, pursuant to subsection 201(h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

758. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on payment of insufficient rental by Curtiss-Wright Corp., Wright Aeronautical Division, Wood-Ridge, N.J., for commercial use of Government-owned facilities furnished by the Department of the Air Force, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67), and the authority of the Comptroller General to examine contractors' records, as set forth in 10 U.S.C. 2313(b); to the Committee on Government Operations.

759. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled, "A bill for the relief of Chief M. Sgt. Samuel W. Smith, U.S. Air Force"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 5985. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 5986. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the rate of duty on brooms made of broom corn; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5987. A bill to terminate the retailers excise tax on cosmetics and other toilet preparations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5988. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the manufacturers excise tax on all-channel television sets shall be 5 percent instead of 10 percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.R. 5989. A bill to amend section 872 of the act of March 3, 1901, relating to indecent publications in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 5990. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Charitable Solicitation Act to require certain findings before the issuance of a solicitation permit thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 5991. A bill to establish a procedure for the prompt settlement, in a democratic manner, of the political status of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 5992. A bill to provide time off with pay for certain Government employees engaged in certain grievance settlements and labor-management business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 5993. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to provide for a mid-decade census of population, unemployment, and housing in 1965 and every 10 years thereafter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 5994. A bill to license and regulate private employment agencies in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 5995. A bill to provide for appointment of temporary employees to career positions in postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H.R. 5996. A bill to increase the participation by counties in revenues from the National Wildlife Refuge System by amending the act of June 15, 1935, relating to such participation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 5997. A bill to amend the Area Redevelopment Act to clarify the areas which may be designated as redevelopment areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 5998. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to extend the time within which certain Federal-State agreements may be modified to give noncovered State and local employees under the divided retirement system procedure an additional opportunity to elect coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 5999. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Academy of Foreign Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 6000. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to change the method of computing retired pay of certain enlisted members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H.R. 6001. A bill to authorize the conveyance to the Waukegan Port District, Illinois, of certain real property of the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.J. Res. 393. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim October 9 in each year as Leif Erikson Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina:

H. Res. 329. Resolution amending clause 2 (a) of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting the Congress to delete from the 1964 defense appropriation bill the provision allotting an arbitrary percentage of repair and conversion work on the vessels of the U.S. Navy to private shipyards, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON:

H.R. 6002. A bill to provide for the free entry of one set of musical handbells for use of Emmanuel Lutheran Church, Rockford, Ill.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 6003. A bill for the relief of Remi L. Pizarro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 6004. A bill for the relief of Jose Honorio Picos-Millan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINNEGAN:

H.R. 6005. A bill for the relief of Christos Deligiannis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 6006. A bill for the relief of Harold McDonald Maloney and his wife, Yvonne Angela Maloney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 6007. A bill to permit the vessel *SC–1473* to engage in the fisheries; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SCHADEBERG:

H.R. 6008. A bill for the relief of the widow and minor children of the Reverend Donald Aksel Olsen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H. Res. 330. Resolution honoring the late Rossell G. O'Brien; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

100. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Americans for Constitutional Justice, Inc., San Diego, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to a redress of grievance relating to alleged violations of the civil rights of Adolphus Hohensee and Donald K. Smith who have been convicted of conspiracy to commit fraud, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 1, 1963

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Vice President.

Rabbi Solomon B. Freehof, Rodef Shalom Temple, Pittsburgh, Pa., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our God, amid Thy chosen servants in Senate assembled, we rise in reverence of Thee. For this blessed land which we ever serve, for the bounties with which Thou hast dowered it, for its unfading love of liberty, and for its privilege of being the fortress of human freedom, we thank Thee and shall ever praise Thy name.

Grateful are we that this, our beloved Republic, is not alone in its world mission; that there are those, near and far, who stand by our side. On this 15th anniversary of the independence of the State of Israel, we thank Thee especially that among our allies is the small and precious Republic built in the Holy Land where Thou didst first reveal Thyself unto us all. The origins of this new state are much like ours. From the beginning it has held up a torch of welcome for the homeless, and with courage and wisdom it is building a land of promise.

O bless that new Republic. May it ever be as ours has been, a land of freedom and of hope. May Thy benediction rest upon us all, that in Thy light our path may grow clear as we walk toward the fulfillment of Thy purposes for the children of men. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 30, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 20) to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 5888) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 5888) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the following committees and subcommittees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Production and Stabilization Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee.

The Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations.

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with the new reports.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with the new reports, will be stated.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the diplomatic and Foreign Service.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I should like to have the RECORD show that I oppose confirmation of the following nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service:

First. The nomination of Chester Bowles.

Second. The nomination of E. Allan Lightner, Jr.

Third. The nomination of Henry A. Byroade.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc. The question is on the confirmation of the nominations.

The nominations were confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service which had been placed on the Secretary's desk.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of all these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON CONSTRUCTION OF ADDITIONAL UTILITY INSTALLATIONS AT MARSHALL SPACE FLIGHT CENTER, HUNTSVILLE, ALA.

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the construction of additional utility installations at the Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Ala.; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

COST ASCERTAINMENT REPORT, POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a cost ascertainment report of that Department, for the fiscal year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 59

"Whereas there is a provision in the 1964 defense appropriation bill which authorizes the allotment of 35 percent of the repair and conversion work on vessels of the U.S. Navy to private shipyards; and

"Whereas the best interests of national defense would be served if the workload and the skilled labor force at the Pearl Harbor Shipyard is kept at its present level; and

"Whereas diversion of work from the Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard as a result of the application of said provision would result in a subsequent reduction in force at the shipyard; and

"Whereas the reduction in force at the shipyard would have a serious effect on the import income of the State of Hawaii; and

"Whereas the employees laid off would be forced to seek employment elsewhere in the State of Hawaii where unemployment is already high; and

"Whereas some skilled workers may find it necessary to migrate elsewhere or seek other types of employment, thus removing or allowing to deteriorate, skills which have been developed at the expenditure of much time, energy and money by both the skilled workers and their employer, the U.S. Navy: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved, by the House of Representatives of the Second Legislature of the State of Hawaii, General Session of 1963, the Senate concurring,* That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby respectfully requested to delete from the 1964 defense appropriation bill the provision authorizing the allotment of 35 percent of the repair and conversion work on vessels of the U.S. Navy to private shipyards; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be sent to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators from the State of Hawaii, the Honorable DANIEL K. INOUYE and the Honorable HIRAM L. FONG, and to the Representatives from the State of Hawaii, the Honorable THOMAS P. GILL and the Honorable SPARK M. MATSUNAGA.

"ELMER F. CRAVALHO,
"*Speaker, House of Representatives.*
"SHIGETO KANEMOTO,
"*Clerk, House of Representatives.*
"NELSON K. DOI,
"*President of the Senate.*
"SEICHI HIRAI,
"*Clerk of the Senate.*"

PRICES OF CATTLE AND HOGS—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF KANSAS LEGISLATURE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, there is great concern in the livestock industry over the recent drop in prices of cattle and hogs.

The recent session of the Kansas Legislature approved House Concurrent Resolution 41, in which they urged and requested Congress, the U.S. Tariff Commission, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture to do everything in their respective powers to bring about a reduction and stricter control of the importation of beef and other red meats from any foreign countries.

Many of our cattle feeders have suffered severe losses during the past few months and it is my hope that action will be taken that will protect the markets for these producers.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 41

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and the U.S. Tariff Commission to reduce and control the importation of beef and other red meats from foreign countries and to establish smaller quotas and other controls on such imports, and to investigate the buying and selling of beef and other red meats by large retail outlets, including chainstores operating within the continental limits of the United States and to take such action thereon as may be indicated

Whereas in the past 2 months, the price of beef has dropped approximately 25 percent; and

Whereas this drop in price can be attributed largely to controlled buying and selling by large retail outlets in the United States; and

Whereas the expanding imports of beef and other red meats on the hoof and in the frozen or processed form, including canned and pressed meats, pose a very serious threat to the domestic cattle and livestock industries of this country; and

Whereas such imports into this country of beef and other red meats are currently expanding at a rate which is altogether out of proportion to any justifiable need and at the present time such imports constitute a high percent of our domestic consumption of beef and other red meats; and

Whereas the domestic livestock producers of this country have for some time been expending their own funds to expand the national market for beef and other red meats and if imports of these commodities are not further restricted any expansion in said national market will result only in providing foreign competitors with a most attractive market at the expense of the American producers; and

Whereas the feeding of grain to cattle and livestock by the domestic cattle and livestock industries provides the principal means of solving the burdensome feed-grain surplus now depressing the total agricultural market; and

Whereas a reasonable restriction on imports of beef and other red meats would provide a means of reducing this feed-grain surplus, as Americans would then consume American fed beef and livestock rather than that fed in foreign countries; and

Whereas the further prosperity and strength of this country is in a large measure dependent upon a prosperous and growing domestic agricultural economy: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas, the Senate concurring therein: That we respectfully urge and request the Congress of the United States, U.S. Tariff Commission, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture to do everything within their respective powers to bring about a reduction and stricter control of the importation of beef and other red meats in any form from any foreign country and to establish smaller quotas for the importation of the same, such quotas to be predetermined on an annual basis, thus providing American beef and livestock producers with the needed protection and vital encouragement necessary for the maintenance and welfare of their own industry, and helping insure the future prosperity and strength of this country. It is further urged that an investigation be made of the buying and selling of beef and other red meats by large retail outlets, including chainstores operating within the United States; and that appropriate action be taken to restrain any practices which are deemed inimical to the welfare of the citizens of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be directed to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to the President and Vice President, and the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, to each Member of the Kansas delegation in the Congress of the United States, and to the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission.

CHARLES ARTHUR,
Speaker of the House.
L. D. HAZEN,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Adopted by the Senate April 10, 1963.

HAROLD H. CHASE,
President of the Senate.
RALPH E. ZARKER,
Secretary of the Senate.

TRADE PROGRAM WITH COMMON MARKET COUNTRIES—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF KANSAS LEGISLATURE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, U.S. exports of over $1 billion worth of agricultural commodities to the European Economic Community countries are most important to the agricultural economy of our Nation.

Every effort must be made to keep these markets open and expand them in every way possible.

Under the proposed trade program with the Common Market countries, agriculture is in a most difficult situation. Our negotiators must ever keep in mind the importance of this market and not trade agriculture down the river.

The Kansas Legislature approved House Concurrent Resolution 35 with regard to the importance of this agricultural market.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the Record, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 35

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress and the President of the United States to take all necessary and appropriate action to secure continued access for U.S. agricultural exports to the countries comprising the European Economic Community

Whereas for many years the exports of U.S. agricultural commodities to the European Economic Community countries have been substantial, amounting in the calendar year 1961 to a total of $1,191 million, or 23 percent of the total U.S. agricultural exports to all destinations, and 31 percent of all U.S. agricultural exports sold for dollars; and

Whereas such trade has been satisfactory and beneficial to both the United States and the countries comprising the European Economic Community; and

Whereas the United States has advocated and practiced for a number of years a policy of expanding international trade and pursuant to that policy has supported the establishment of the European Economic Community; and

Whereas since its establishment the European Economic Community has adopted a policy with respect to agricultural imports which is highly protectionist and based upon the imposition of arbitrary and unreasonable restrictions on the importation of competitive agricultural commodities; and

Whereas the continuation of such a policy will seriously interfere with the previously existing satisfactory and beneficial trade relations between the United States and the European Economic Community and the loss of such trade will adversely affect the economy of both areas; and

Whereas the economy of the State of Kansas as an important producer of wheat and feed grains as well as other agricultural commodities will be seriously impaired if the present restrictive program of the European Economic Community is continued; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States enacted during the past year legislation submitted by the President giving him broad powers in the field of world trade expansion: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representative of the State of Kansas, the Senate concurring therein, That the Congress and the President of the United States and the representatives of Kansas in the Congress of the United States be and they are hereby respectfully urged to take all necessary action to see that the channels for agricultural exports from the United States to the European Economic Community countries are kept open and that in the administration of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 no concessions be made to the European Economic Community or the countries comprising such Community on agricultural or industrial exports to the United States without satisfactory reciprocal concessions giving fair and reasonable access to U.S. agricultural commodities; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be instructed to transmit enrolled copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress; to the chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate; the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House; the chairman of the Senate and House Committees on Agriculture; to U.S. Senator Frank Carlson, U.S. Senator James B. Pearson, and Representatives Robert J. Dole, William H. Avery, Robert F. Ellsworth, Joe Skubitz, and Garner E. Shriver.

Charles Arthur,
Speaker of the House.
L. D. Hazen,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Adopted by the senate April 10, 1963.

Harold H. Case,
President of the Senate.
Ralph E. Zarker,
Secretary of the Senate.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment:

S. 762. A bill to provide for increased wheat acreage allotments in the Tulelake area of California (Rept. No. 166).

REPORT ENTITLED "ANTITRUST MONOPOLY ACTIVITIES, 1962"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 165)

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary I ask unanimous consent to submit a report entitled "antitrust and monopoly activities, 1962" pursuant to Senate Resolution 258, 87th Congress, 2d session, as extended, together with individual views.

I ask that the report, together with the combined individual views of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska], be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Tennessee.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana (for himself and Mr. Ellender):

S. 1428. A bill to provide for the disposal of certain easements in IWW, Lake Charles Deep Water Channel; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Long of Louisiana when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BURDICK:

S. 1429. A bill to amend the authorization to appropriate money for the maintenance and operation of three experimental stations of the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Burdick when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

S. 1430. A bill for the relief of James Jouravloff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

S. 1431. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act in order to exclude from the definition of interstate commerce for the purposes of such act commerce directly between any point in a State and any point on the Outer Continental Shelf and commerce between points in the same States through such Continental Shelf; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 1432. A bill to prescribe a national policy with respect to the acquisition, disposition, and use of proprietary rights in inventions made, and in scientific and technical information obtained, through the expenditure of public funds, and for other purposes; and

S. 1433. A bill to amend the Sherman Act to prevent restraint of trade and monopolization arising from the use of proprietary rights in inventions made through the expenditure of public funds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DODD (for himself, Mr. Ribicoff, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Saltonstall, and Mr. Pell):

S. 1434. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Northeastern Water and Related Land Resources Compact; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Dodd when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 1435. A bill for the relief of Evelyn F. Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

S. 1436. A bill to prescribe with greater particularity the conditions under which proprietary interests of the United States in inventions may be waived pursuant to section 305 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. Kuchel):

S. 1437. A bill to amend section 8(b)(4) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Humphrey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. Magnuson, and Mr. McCarthy):

S.J. Res. 76. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim October 9 in each year as Leif Erikson Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DISPOSAL OF CERTAIN EASEMENTS IN INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LAKE CHARLES DEEP WATER CHANNEL

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, some time ago, in the interest of navigation, it was necessary for the U.S. Engineers to relocate a portion of the Intracoastal Waterway in southwest Louisiana. This relocation caused a portion of the canal south of Sulphur, La., to become obsolete. Since this portion of the canal no longer serves any purpose in the interest of navigation and can be effectively utilized by the Calcasieu Parish police jury, I am introducing a bill, in behalf of myself and my colleague the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], to transfer the responsibility for maintenance and upkeep of this obsolete channel to Calcasieu Parish. Since this portion of the canal was authorized by Congress for navigation, this legislation is necessary in order to change the authorization and eliminate the portion of the canal that no longer serves navigation. It is my understanding that this transfer of responsibility is in the best interest of all concerned and will receive a favorable report from the agencies concerned.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1428) to provide for the disposal of certain easements in Intracoastal Waterway, Lake Charles Deep Water Channel, introduced by Mr. LONG of Louisiana (for himself and Mr. ELLENDER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR MAINTENANCE OF THREE EXPERIMENTAL STATIONS OF DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which has been submitted and recommended by the Department of the Interior pertaining to the appropriations for the maintenance and operation of the Bureau of Mines Experiment Stations in three areas including Grand Forks, N. Dak., in my own State. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Assistant Secretary of the Interior, John A. Carver, which accompanied this proposed legislation, be printed in full at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1429) to amend the authorization to appropriate money for the maintenance and operation of three experimental stations of the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BURDICK, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The letter presented by Mr. BURDICK is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., April 23, 1963.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is a draft of a proposed bill "to amend the authorization to appropriate money for the maintenance and operation of three experimental stations of the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes."

It is suggested that the proposed bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and we recommend that it be enacted.

Section 1 of the bill eliminates the limitation on the authorization for appropriations for the maintenance and operation of the Bureau of Mines experiment stations at Reno, Nev. (rare and precious metals); Grand Forks, N. Dak. (lignite research); and Schuylkill Haven, Pa. (anthracite); and authorizes the appropriation of such sums as are necessary for the purpose. The limitations were included in three acts passed during the period between 1942 and 1950.

The limitations upon the authorization for appropriations which are contained in these acts presuppose a situation in which specific appropriations are made for the individual stations. However, the appropriation process does not follow that pattern. Requests for funds for the Bureau of Mines are not phrased in terms of specific programs to be carried out at individual research stations, nor are appropriations made on that basis.

Appropriations requests for "Conservation and development of mineral resources, Bureau of Mines," are submitted in terms of 5 major activities, which are divided into a total of 15 subactivities. The items in such a request are justified and explained in terms of the programs which they are designed to carry out, without respect to the geographical locations or the particular stations at which various phases of the work may be done. This procedure enables the Congress to consider on an integrated basis the program proposed by the Bureau of Mines in each major area of work for the ensuing fiscal year, in the field of conservation and development.

A lump sum appropriation is made by the Congress for "Conservation and development of mineral resources." After appropriations have been made by the Congress, the Bureau adjusts its programs to conform to the action and instructions of the Congress and allocates funds among its stations in such a manner as most effectively to accomplish the programs for which funds have been made available. As a result, experimental or research stations of the Bureau may undertake assigned work in one or more of the major activities for which funds have been appropriated.

Thus, in fiscal year 1963, each of the three stations mentioned in the proposed bill received an allocation of funds from a lump sum appropriation "For expenses necessary for promoting the conservation, exploration, development, production, and utilization of mineral resources, including fuels, in the United States, its territories and possessions; and developing synthetics and substitutes; $26,675,000."

We believe that the limitations on the appropriation authorizations mentioned above should be repealed because, as a practical matter, they are inconsistent with the current appropriation process. There are no similar limitations applicable to the other 17 experimental and research stations of the Bureau of Mines and we believe that there is no need for such limitations. The enactment of the proposed legislation will put all such stations in the same status in this regard.

Section 2 of the proposed bill would eliminate an annual reporting requirement of the Lignite Research Laboratory no longer required of any other facility of the Bureau of Mines. The report on this single part of the Bureau's program has been specially prepared each year for the Congress. It contains the same information which is included in other reports published by the Bureau of Mines, including its annual report.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this draft bill from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. CARVER, JR.,
Acting Secretary of the Interior.

NORTHEASTERN WATER AND RELATED LAND RESOURCES COMPACT

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill sponsored by me and Senators RIBICOFF, PASTORE, COTTON, SALTONSTALL, and PELL providing for a Northeastern Water and Related Land Resources Compact.

I cosponsored legislation on this subject during the 87th Congress and a similar measure passed the House during the last session. Hearings were held on the House-passed version, H.R. 30, by a special subcommittee of which I was chairman and a report of the hearing was printed. Because of the pressure of other business this legislation was not considered by the Senate during the closing days of the last session.

The compact, calling for the integration and consideration of the whole of New England as one viable, interdependent and geographical unit, is absolutely essential if the wastage, poor planning and mistakes of the past are to be avoided.

Mr. President, we in New England have precious few natural resources left and if we do not properly conserve and preserve what remains we will leave a lean heritage indeed to our children and our children's children.

The compact would develop an agency with cooperative membership from the six States and interested Federal agencies, which could recommend, survey, and encourage overall planning with a view to properly developing our remaining natural resources in New England.

Without the compact, New England may well fail to maintain its leadership in agriculture, industry, and in recreation. With the compact, New England can plan to properly develop its resources in an intelligent and efficient manner in this highly industrialized and fast-moving era in which we live.

Four New England States—Connecticut, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island—have already ratified the compact and agreed to participate in it and now it is necessary to secure Federal approval by the enactment of this legislation.

The opposition to the compact has been largely expressed in regard to procedural matters, and, with notable exceptions, not in opposition to the philosophy or the ultimate aims of the compact.

For example, interested Federal agencies have raised questions regarding voting procedures under the compact. I am sure that questions of this type can be resolved without disturbing the language of the compact as ratified by the four New England States and can be made a part, if necessary, of the enabling provisions of the bill.

I am hopeful that this year we can get early committee action in the Senate and get this legislation, which has so much long-term significance for my area of the country, on the floor of the Senate where it can be voted upon.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1434) granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Northeastern Water and Related Land Resources Compact, introduced by Mr. DODD (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the consent and approval of Congress is given to the Northeastern Water and Related Land Resources Compact, as hereinafter set out. Such compact reads as follows:

"NORTHEASTERN WATER AND RELATED LAND RESOURCES COMPACT

"Article I

"Findings

"The northeastern part of the United States is by virtue of geographic location and other characteristics a great natural resource area which, with more intense use of natural resources, increasingly requires coordinated planning as a basic ingredient of effective resource management and orderly growth of the region. The work of the New England-New York Inter-Agency Committee demonstrated that a continuation and furtherance of activities such as those undertaken by it would be of great value. To this end, it is the intent of this compact to establish and provide for the operation of a joint agency for the Northeast.

"Article II

"Purpose

"It is the purpose of this compact to provide, in the northeastern region, improved facilities and procedures for the coordination of the policies, programs, and activities of the United States, the several states, and private persons or entities, in the field of water and related land resources, and to study, investigate, and plan the development and use of the same and conservation of such water and related land resources; to provide means by which conflicts may be resolved; and to provide procedures for coordination of the interests of all public and private agencies, persons and entities in the field of water and related land resources; and to provide an organization for cooperation in such coordination on both the federal and state levels of government.

"Article III

"Creation of Commission

"There is hereby created the Northeastern Resources Commission, hereinafter called the Commission.

"Article IV

"Membership

"The Commission shall consist of one member from each party state to be appointed and to serve, in accordance with and subject to the laws of the State which he represents, and seven members representing departments or agencies of the United States having principal responsibilities for water and related land resources development to be appointed and to serve in such manner as may be provided by the laws of the United States.

"Article V

"Functions

"It shall be the responsibility of the Commission to recommend to the states and the United States, or any intergovernmental agency, changes in law or policy which would promote coordination, or resolution of problems, in the field of water and related land resources. The efforts of the Commission in coordination of work and resolution of conflicts may be directed towards all state and federal activities involved in water and related land resources development responsibilities and shall include the coordination of the following:

"(1) Collection and interpretation of basic data.

"(2) Investigation and planning of water and related land resources projects.

"(3) Programing (including scheduling) of water and related land resources construction and development.

"(4) Encouraging of the referral of plans or proposals for resources projects to the Commission.

"The Commission shall use qualified public and private agencies to make investigations and conduct research in the field of water and related land resources, but if it is unable to secure the undertaking of such investigations or original research by a qualified public or private agency, it shall have the power to make it own investigations and conduct its own research. The Commission may make contracts with any public or private agencies or private persons or entities for the undertaking of such investigations, or original research within its purview.

"Article VI

"Voting

"No action of the Commission respecting the internal management thereof shall be binding unless taken at a meeting at which a majority of the members are present and vote in favor thereof: provided that any action not binding for such a reason may be ratified within thirty days by the concurrence in writing of a majority of the Commission membership. No action of the Commission respecting a matter other than its internal management shall be binding unless taken at a meeting at which a majority of the state members and a majority of the members representing the United States are present and a majority of said state membership together with a majority of said members representing the United States vote in favor thereof: provided that any action not binding for such a reason may be ratified within thirty days by the concurrence in writing of a majority of the state members and the concurrence in writing of a majority of the members representing the United States.

"Article VII

"Finances

"A. The Commission shall submit to the Governor or designated officer of each party state a request for funds to cover estimated expenditures for such period as may be required by the laws of that jurisdiction for presentation to the legislature thereof. Any such request shall indicate the sum or sums which the Commission has requested or intends to request be appropriated by the United States for the use or support of the Commission during the period covered thereby.

"B. With due regard for such monies and other assistance as may be made available to it, the Commission shall be provided with such funds by each of the several states participating therein to provide the means of establishing and maintaining facilities, a staff of personnel, and such activities as may be necessary to fulfill the powers and duties imposed upon and entrusted to the Commission.

"With due allowance for monies otherwise available, each budget of the Commission shall be the responsibility of the party states, to be apportioned among them on a weighted formula based 50% on population and 50% on gross land area, such population and gross land area to be determined in accordance with the last official U.S. Census of Population, but provided that the last contributions of all of the states shall not be required to exceed $50,000 annually and provided further that regardless of the number of states party to the compact at any time the maximum annual contribution required of any state shall not exceed its share of the $50,000 as determined above. Any state may contribute such funds in excess of its share, as determined above, as it may desire.

"C. The Commission shall not pledge the credit of any jurisdiction. The Commission may meet any of its obligations in whole or in part with funds available to it under Article VIII (E) of this compact, provided that the Commission takes specific action setting aside such funds prior to the incurring of any obligation to be met in whole or in part in such manner.

"D. The members of the Commission shall be paid by the Commission their actual expenses incurred and incident to the performance of their duties, subject to the approval of the Commission.

"E. The Commission shall keep accurate accounts of all receipts and disbursements. The receipts and disbursements of the Commission shall be subject to the audit and accounting procedures established under its by-laws. However, all receipts and disbursement of funds handled by the Commission shall be audited by a qualified public accountant and the report of the audit shall be included in and become a part of the annual report of the Commission.

"F. The accounts of the Commission shall be open at any reasonable time for inspection by such agency, representative, or representatives of the jurisdictions which appropriate funds to the Commission.

"Article VIII

"Administration and Management

"A. The Commission may sue and be sued and shall have a seal.

"B. The Commission shall elect annually, from among its members, a chairman, vice-chairman and treasurer. The Commission shall appoint an executive director who shall also act as secretary, and together with the treasurer, shall be bonded in such amounts as the Commission may require.

"C. The Commission shall appoint and remove or discharge such personnel as may be necessary for the performance of its functions irrespective of any civil service laws which might otherwise apply. The Commission shall establish and maintain, independently, by contract or agreement with the United States or an agency thereof, or in conjunction with any one or more of the party states, suitable retirement programs for its employees. Employees of the Commission shall be eligible for social security coverage in respect to old age and survivors insurance provided that the Commission takes such steps as may be necessary pursuant to federal law to participate in such program of insurance as a governmental agency or unit. The Commission may establish and maintain or participate in such additional programs of employee benefits as may be appropriate to afford employees of the Commission terms and conditions of employment similar to those enjoyed by employees of the party states generally.

"D. The Commission may borrow, accept or contract for the services of personnel from any state of the United States or any subdivision or agency thereof, from any intergovernmental agency, or from any institution, person, firm or corporation.

"E. The Commission may accept for any of its purposes and functions under this compact any and all appropriations, donations, and grants of money, equipment, supplies, materials and services, conditional or otherwise, from any state or the United States or any subdivision or agency thereof, or intergovernmental agency, or any institution, person, firm or corporation, and may receive, utilize and dispose of the same.

"F. The Commission may establish and maintain such facilities as may be necessary for the transacting of its business. The Commission may accept, hold, and convey real and personal property and any interest therein.

"G. The Commission may adopt, amend, and rescind by-laws, rules, and regulations for the conduct of its business.

"H. The Commission shall make and transmit annually, to the legislature and Governor of each party state, and to the President and Congress of the United States, a report covering the activities of the Commission for the preceding year, and embodying such recommendations as may have been adopted by the Commission. The Commission may issue such additional reports as it may deem desirable.

"*Article IX*

"Other Compacts and Activities

"Nothing in this compact shall be construed to impair, or otherwise affect, the jurisdiction of any interstate agency in which any party state participates nor to abridge, impair, or otherwise affect the provisions of any compact to which any one or more of the party states may be a party, nor to supersede, diminish, or otherwise affect any obligation assumed under any such compact. Nor shall anything in this compact be construed to discourage additional interstate compacts among some or all of the party states for the management of natural resources, or the coordination of activities with respect to a specific natural resource or any aspect of natural resource management, or for the establishment of intergovernmental planning agencies in sub-areas of the region. Nothing in this compact shall be construed to limit the jurisdiction or activities of any participating government, agency, or officer thereof, or any private person or agency.

"*Article X*

"Enactment

"A. This compact shall become effective when entered into and enacted into law by any three of the states of Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont, and when the United States has provided by law for the designation of its representation on the Commission. Thereafter it shall become effective with respect to any other aforementioned state upon its enacting this compact into law.

"B. Upon consent of the Congress of the United States of America, any other state in the northeastern area may become a party to this compact, by entering into and enacting this compact into law.

"*Article XI*

"Withdrawal

"This compact shall continue in force and remain binding upon each party state until renounced by it. Renunciation of this compact must be preceded by sending three years' notice in writing of intention to withdraw from the compact to the governor of each of the other states party hereto and to such officers or agencies of the United States as may be designated by federal law.

"*Article XII*

"Construction and Severability

"The provisions of this compact shall be severable and if any phrase, clause, sentence or provision of this compact is declared to be unconstitutional or the applicability thereof, to any state, agency, person, or circumstance is held invalid, the constitutionality of the remainder of this compact and the applicability thereof to any other state, agency, person or circumstance shall not be affected thereby. It is the legislative intent that the provisions of this compact be reasonably and liberally construed."

SEC. 2. The consent of Congress is given to any of the States of Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont to become a party to the Northeastern Water and Related Land Resources Compact in accordance with its terms.

SEC. 3. The President is authorized to appoint seven members, representing, and responsible to the heads of, departments or agencies of the United States having principal responsibilities for water and related land resources development, to the Commission created by the Northeastern Water and Related Land Resources Compact. All such Federal representatives shall be employees of the United States and shall serve without additional compensation.

SEC. 4. Nothing in the Northeastern Water and Related Land Resources Compact or in this Act shall be construed as impairing or in any manner affecting any right, power, or jurisdiction of the United States, or any agency thereof, in and over the region which forms the subject of such Compact or as authorizing the Northeastern Resources Commission to impair or in any manner to affect any such right, power, or jurisdiction of the United States, or any agency thereof.

SEC. 5. Nothing contained herein shall be interpreted or construed as authorizing an agreement with the Commission by the United States or an agency thereof for participation of any employees of the Commission in any retirement program established for Federal employees.

SEC. 6. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is expressly reserved, and no change proposed to be made in the Compact approved by the Act shall become effective until it shall have been approved by Congress.

LEIF ERIKSON DAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and my distinguished colleague from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim October 9 of each year as Leif Erikson Day.

The purpose of this joint resolution is to extend belated recognition to Leif Erikson for his achievement in discovering the North American Continent about the year 1000 A.D.

While there are no contemporary written accounts of the early Norse explorations, we do have information that has come to us through sagas that were reduced to a written form at a later date, and through archeological discoveries.

On the basis of colonization alone, the Norse claim is clear. Greenland is more closely associated with the mainland of North America than the islands of the West Indies that Columbus discovered 500 years later. In about the year 984, Erik the Red, the father of Leif Erikson established a colony in Greenland. Norse colonies existed there until about 1450. According to the Catholic Encyclopedia, 16 parishes were established, churches and a few monasteries were built, and at least 16 bishops were nominated to the Gardar Bishopric between the year 1000 and the early part of the 15th century.

However, the Norse claim to the discovery of America does not rest on the colonization of Greenland alone, but is strengthened by subsequent exploration. The records of these voyages to the mainland have been preserved in the "Flateyarbók," the "Hauksbók" and in the vellum codex AM557 in the Arna-Magnaean collection in Copenhagen.

The "Flateyarbók," compiled somewhere around 1390 A.D., is a collection of sagas, short tales, poems, and annals. Among these are two selections the titles of which may be translated as the "Saga of Erik the Red" and the "Tale of the Greenlanders." Most of the material which relates to Leif Erikson's voyage is in the latter. The tale as recounted there is usually referred to as the "Greenland Saga."

The "Hauksbók," another large collection, written around 1330, also contains a "Saga of Erik the Red," which, with minor variations, is preserved also in AM–557. Both appear to have been copied from an earlier manuscript, which is now lost.

Prof. Finnur Jónsson believes that the original story was written about 1200 A.D. or at least not later than the first quarter of the 13th century. The account as presented by these two manuscripts is sometimes referred to as the "Karlsefni Saga" or the "Iceland Saga." In addition to these sagas, there is a brief reference to the Norsemen in Vinland, a name which they applied to a part of the American Continent, in "Descriptio Insularum Aquilonis," a work written by Adam of Bremen around 1070. This is the first authentic reference in world literature to the American Continent.

It appears from the sagas that Leif Erikson, one of three sons of Erik Thorvaldson, was born in Iceland around the year 979. About 985 Erik sailed with his family and a band of followers to establish a settlement in Greenland. He established his new home at Brattahlid in Eriksfjord.

In 999, when he was about 20 years old, Leif set out to see the world. Instead of following the old sailing route by way of Iceland, he boldly set his course directly east across the open ocean to Norway. There he visited King Olaf Trygvason. He spent the winter at the King's court, and there, under Olaf's influence, he became a Christian. When he set out for Greenland the following summer, he took with him a priest and some teachers to undertake the task of converting the settlers in Greenland.

It is at this point in Leif's life that the two versions show a marked discrepancy. According to the "Karlsefni Saga," Leif, on his return from Norway, probably in the year 1000, was carried far out of his course by contrary winds, and his ship was driven into unknown seas. After a considerable period of drift, he came upon new lands, on which grew self-sown wheat fields, vines, and large trees, before finding his way home to Greenland.

The "Greenland Saga" tells us that the first white man to sight American shores was Bjarni Herjulfson, who, however, did not land there; and that Leif's expedition, in the year 1002 or later, was a planned one to explore the lands previously sighted by Herjulfson. Landing first at a place they called Helluland, and then at a level, wooded land which they named Markland, they came at last to a region where wild grapes grew. At this place, which they called Vinland, they erected houses and spent the winter. They sent out exploring parties, each having orders to go no further than the distance from which the adventurers could return by evening. In the spring, with a cargo of timber, they made their way back to Greenland.

Scholars have studied these documents carefully in the light of both internal and external criticism. They have discovered what appear to be interpolations made at a later date. They have subjected them to almost endless interpretation. There has been disagreement on details, particularly as to the exact year of Leif's first landing on the American continent and the exact location of that landing. Various writers have fixed the location of Vinland at points from Labrador to Georgia. However, scholars have found an area of agreement on the fundamental fact—that Leif Erikson did land at least once on the American continent and spent some time there, probably staying over the winter and returning to Greenland in the spring.

Nor was the discovery of America by Leif Erikson an isolated incident. It was rather the first of a series of exploratory voyages and attempts at colonization carried on by Thorvald Erikson, Thorstein Erikson, Thorfinn Karlsefni, and Freydís, Erik's daughter, over the next few years. Recently remains of ancient buildings have been excavated on the coast of Newfoundland. It has been determined by carbon tests that artifacts found there date from about the year 1000. It seems probable that the buildings belonged to Leif or to one of the expeditions made in the years immediately following.

Sometime after 1340 the western settlement in Greenland completely disappeared. In 1354 Magnus Erickson, King of Norway and Sweden, appointed Paul Knutson leader of an expedition to locate and bring back to the Christian faith the colonists who had left the western settlement. There is some evidence to indicate that a part of this expedition penetrated as far as Minnesota, probably by way of Hudson Bay, around the year 1362. The rest of the expedition returned to Norway in 1364. Nicholas of Lynn, an Englishman who is believed to have accompanied the expedition, wrote a report, "Inventio Fortunata," no copies of which are known to exist. It is not improbable that Columbus had knowledge of that report.

The Norse expeditions, and particularly the discovery of North America by Leif Erikson, can no longer be regarded as myths. The sources have been examined and studied too carefully for that. The time is long overdue for the recognition of Leif Erikson's role in the discovery of the New World.

This joint resolution acknowledges this historic and courageous achievement by providing for the designation of October 9 of each year as Leif Erikson Day, by Presidential proclamation, and by encouraging its observance by suitable exercises in schools and churches. October 9 has traditionally been observed as Leif Erikson Day by many Scandinavian groups through the years. Its proximity to Columbus Day provides an opportunity for Americans to celebrate the heroic explorations of both these great discoverers at the same time.

Mr. President, my Democratic colleagues from Minnesota in the House will be introducing similar joint resolutions in the near future. I am particularly pleased to have the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] as the coauthor of this proposal. His abiding interest in the accomplishments of his Scandinavian ancestors is well known and his advocacy of this resolution will be a significant factor in achieving its passage in the Senate and House. I know his enthusiasm for a national Leif Erikson Day equals, and perhaps even surpasses, my own.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of this joint resolution be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks. I also ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution remain at the desk for an additional 3 days so that other Senators may become cosponsors if they so desire.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the Record and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Minnesota.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 76) to authorize the President to proclaim October 9 in each year as Leif Erikson Day, introduced by Mr. Humphrey (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Whereas Leif Erikson did make the original discovery by nonnative Americans of the North American Continent in about the year A.D. 1000, and subsequently explored portions thereof; and

Whereas proof of this historical fact rests solidly, not only on two independent accounts in the Norse sagas, but on archeological discoveries and evidence from the archives of European libraries; and

Whereas the fact of this discovery is further supported by the writings of numerous historians, and in encyclopedias and textbooks for school use; and

Whereas it is fitting that due recognition should be accorded to this historic exploit in early American history: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to officially proclaim October 9 in each year as Leif Erikson Day, and to issue annually a proclamation calling upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all Government buildings on such day, inviting the people of the United States to observe such day in schools, churches, and other suitable places with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

FEDERAL AND STATE PROGRAMS RELATING TO OUTDOOR RECREATION

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on Senate bill 20.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 20) to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert the following:

That the Congress finds and declares it to be desirable that all American people of present and future generations be assured adequate outdoor recreation resources, and that it is desirable for all levels of government and private interests to take prompt and coordinated action to the extent practicable without diminishing or affecting their respective powers and functions to conserve, develop, and utilize such resources for the benefit and enjoyment of the American people.

Sec. 2. In order to carry out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to perform the following functions and activities:

(a) Inventory.—Prepare and maintain a continuing inventory and evaluation of outdoor recreation needs and resources of the United States.

(b) Classification.—Prepare a system for classification of outdoor recreation resources to assist in the effective and beneficial use and management of such resources.

(c) Nationwide Plan.—Formulate and maintain a comprehensive nationwide outdoor recreation plan, taking into consideration the plans of the various Federal agencies, States, and their political subdivisions. The plan shall set forth the needs and demands of the public for outdoor recreation and the current and foreseeable availability in the future of outdoor recreation resources to meet those needs. The plan shall identify critical outdoor recreation problems, recommend solutions, and recommend desirable actions to be taken at each level of government and by private interests. The Secretary shall transmit the initial plan, which shall be prepared as soon as practicable within five years hereafter, to the President for transmittal to the Congress. Future revisions of the plan shall be similarly transmitted at succeeding five-year intervals. When a plan or revision is transmitted to the Congress, the Secretary shall transmit copies to the Governors of the several States.

(d) Technical Assistance.—Provide technical assistance and advice to and cooperate with States, political subdivisions, and private interests, including nonprofit organizations, with respect to outdoor recreation.

(e) Regional Cooperation.—Encourage interstate and regional cooperation in the planning, acquisition, and development of outdoor recreation resources.

(f) RESEARCH AND EDUCATION.—(1) Sponsor, engage in, and assist in research relating to outdoor recreation, directly or by contract or cooperative agreements, and make payments for such purposes without regard to the limitations of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529) concerning advances of funds when he considers such action in the public interest, (2) undertake studies and assemble information concerning outdoor recreation, directly or by contract or cooperative agreement, and disseminate such information without regard to the provisions of section 4154, title 39, United States Code, and (3) cooperate with educational institutions and others in order to assist in establishing education programs and activities and to encourage public use and benefits from outdoor recreation.

(g) INTERDEPARTMENTAL COOPERATION.—(1) Cooperate with and provide technical assistance to Federal departments and agencies and obtain from them information, data, reports, advice, and assistance that are needed and can reasonably be furnished in carrying out the purposes of this Act, and (2) promote coordination of Federal plans and activities generally relating to outdoor recreation. Any department or agency furnishing advice or assistance hereunder may expend its own funds for such purposes, with or without reimbursement, as may be agreed to by that agency.

(h) DONATIONS.—Accept and use donations of money, property, personal services, or facilities for the purposes of this Act: *Provided, however,* That within 60 days following the close of each calendar year, the Secretary of the Interior shall submit to the Congress a report for each such calendar year which report shall itemize with particularity and describe in detail the source, value, purpose and use of each donation of money, property, personal services or facilities accepted or used under authority of this Act.

SEC. 3. In order further to carry out the policy declared in section 1 of this Act, the heads of Federal departments and independent agencies having administrative responsibility over activities or resources the conduct or use of which is pertinent to fulfillment of that policy shall, either individually or as a group, (a) consult with and be consulted by the Secretary from time to time both with respect to their conduct of those activities and their use of those resources and with respect to the activities which the Secretary of the Interior carries on under authority of this Act which are pertinent to their work, and (b) carry out such responsibilities in general conformance with the nationwide plan authorized under section 2(c) of this Act.

SEC. 4. As used in this Act, the term "United States" shall include the District of Columbia and the terms "United States" and "States" may, to the extent practicable, include the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, but not more than $2,500,000 per year, as are required to carry out the purposes of this Act.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An Act to promote the coordination and development of effective programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes."

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments adopted by the House of Representatives, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. JACKSON, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. KUCHEL, and Mr. ALLOTT the conferees on the part of the Senate.

REVISION OF FEDERAL ELECTION LAWS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of the bill (S. 559) to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes, the name of the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] be added as a cosponsor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY OF VETERANS HAVING DEAFNESS OF BOTH EARS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 141, House bill 199.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill (H.R. 199) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans having the service-connected disability of deafness of both ears was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 157), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

H.R. 199 authorizes the payment of additional compensation in the amount of $47 per month to a veteran who has a service-incurred disability of deafness of both ears, with absence of air and bone conduction.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The Congress has long maintained a system of statutory awards for compensating veterans who has specified service-connected disabilities, the award being in addition to the basic rate of compensation. For example, a veteran who has lost an arm above the elbow could be rated at 80 percent resulting in the monthly payment of basic compensation in the amount of $170. In addition to this amount he would receive as a result of the statutory award law, $47, making his total monthly compensation $217.

Under the current schedule for rating disabilities, total deafness is ratable at 80-percent disabling, which results in compensation for wartime cases of $170 monthly. This present 80-percent rate is a reduction ordered at the discretion of the Administrator from the previous 100-percent rating. The passage of this legislation would result in the veteran who suffers from total deafness receiving $170 monthly for his wartime disability, plus $47, to make a total of $217.

The Veterans' Administration estimates that there are approximately 1,200 cases who would be eligible for this statutory award at a minimum additional cost of $666,000 the first year. There would be a slight increase each year for the succeeding 4 years.

INCREASES IN RATES OF DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION PAYABLE TO CHILDREN AND PARENTS OF DECEASED VETERANS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 142, House bill 211.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill (H.R. 211) to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide increases in rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to children and parents of deceased veterans was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 158), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 211 is to increase by 10 percent (with fractions rounded off to next higher dollar) the monthly rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable for eligible parents and children of veterans dying of service-connected causes.

GENERAL STATEMENT

Chapter 13 of title 38, United States Code (dependency and indemnity compensation), restates a portion of the Servicemen's and Veterans' Survivor Benefits Act (Public Law 881, 84th Cong., Aug. 1, 1956). This act established a new and modernized benefits program of dependency and indemnity compensation for survivors of veterans dying from service-connected causes on or after January 1, 1957.

The rate of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to widows is geared to basic active service pay. As the service pay is increased the widows' rates under this program are automatically increased. The basic service pay was last increased June 1, 1958. This automatic adjustment is not applicable to the monthly rates for parents (38 U.S.C. 415), children (38 U.S.C. 413-414), or the allowance to widows with children (38 U.S.C. 411(b)) in cases where payments under the Railroad Retirement Act, Social Security Act, or 38 U.S.C. 412 is below a certain amount.

H.R. 211 proposes to increase by 10 percent (with fractions rounded off to the next higher dollar) the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation not subject to automatic adjustment. These rates have not been changed since they were established.

In his budget message of January 17, 1963, the President recommended a cost-of-living increase for the groups covered by this bill. The increase in the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation proposed by H.R. 211 is commensurate with the increased cost of living since the rates in question were established.

The effect of this legislation is as shown in the following tables (italics indicate rates in H.R. 211).

Rates of dependency and indemnity compensation to widows, children, and parents for service-connected death occurring on or after Jan. 1, 1957 [1] [2]

Widows[3] and children	Children, no widow
Widow alone: $112 per month, plus 12 per centum of basic pay of deceased husband, with total amount adjusted to next highest dollar. Rates range from $122 in an E–1 case with less than 2 years' service to $316 in case of an O–10 with over 30 years' service. If deceased was serving as Chairman of Joint Chiefs of Staff, Chief of Staff of Army, Chief of Naval Operations, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, or Commandant of the Marine Corps, regardless of cumulative years of service the widow's rate is $337.	Children under age 18: 1 child, $70 (*$77*). 2 children, $100 (*$110*) (equally divided). 3 children, $130 (*$143*) (equally divided), plus $25 (*$28*) for each child in excess of 3 (equally divided).
Widow and 1 child under age 18: Same as amount payable to widow alone.	Child age 18 or above who became permanently incapable of self-support prior to that age: $95 (*$105*) (basic $70 (*$77*) rate increased by $25 (*$28*); total rate with $25 (*$28*) supplement variable where there are other children).
Widow and 2 or more children under age 18: Same rate as that payable to widow alone with following exception: Where total amount payable under the Railroad Retirement Act or Social Security Act, or under sec. 412 of title 38, U.S.C. (veterans' benefits), based upon an assumed fully and currently insured status, is less than $128, the compensation payable to widow by VA increased by $25 (*$28*) for each child in excess of 1, but the total increase may not exceed the difference between the amounts payable under the above and $128.	Child or children ages 18 to 21 attending school: Same as basic rate payable to children under age 18 where there is no widow. (Payment barred if child commences program of war orphans' educational assistance.)
Widow and child or children age 18 and above permanently incapable of self-support where incapacity began under age 18: Regular widow's rate payable to widow, plus $70 ($77) for each such child payable to child.	
Widow and child or children age 18 but under 21 attending school: Regular widow's rate payable to widow, plus $35 (*$39*) payable to each such child. (Payment barred if child commences program of war orphans' educational assistance.)	

1 PARENT ONLY

Total annual income		Monthly rate
More than—	But equal to or less than—	
	$750	$75 (*$83*)
$750	$1,000	60 (*66*)
$1,000	$1,250	45 (*50*)
$1,250	$1,500	30 (*33*)
$1,500	$1,750	15 (*17*)
$1,750		0

2 PARENTS LIVING TOGETHER [4]

Combined annual income		Monthly rate to each
More than—	But equal to or less than—	
	$1,000	$50 (*$55*)
$1,000	$1,350	40 (*44*)
$1,350	$1,700	30 (*33*)
$1,700	$2,050	20 (*22*)
$2,050	$2,400	10 (*11*)
$2,400		0

2 PARENTS NOT LIVING TOGETHER

Total annual income of parent		Individual rate
More than—	But equal to or less than—	
	$750	$50 ($55)
$750	$1,000	40 (44)
$1,000	$1,250	30 (33)
$1,250	$1,500	20 (22)
$1,500	$1,750	10 (11)
$1,750		0

---

[1] Persons eligible for death compensation based on death occurring before Jan. 1, 1957, may, under certain conditions, apply for and receive dependency and indemnity compensation.

[2] Except in certain missing persons cases the dependents of veterans who die on or after May 1, 1957, while their life-insurance premiums are waived pursuant to 38 U.S.C. 724 (formerly sec. 622 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended) are not eligible to receive dependency and indemnity compensation but may be paid death compensation notwithstanding the fact the death occurred after Dec. 31, 1956.

[3] The term "widow" includes the widower of any female veteran if such widower is incapable of self-maintenance and was permanently incapable of self-support due to physical or mental disability at the time of the veteran's death.

[4] Applies also to remarried parent living with spouse, with income of spouse counted.

DEPARTMENTAL VIEWS

The Veterans' Administration and the Bureau of the Budget favor enactment of this legislation.

COST ESTIMATE

The Veterans' Administration estimated the bill would benefit the first year 44,900 children at a cost of $3,082,000 (secs. 2 and 3) and 30,900 parents at a cost of $1,743,000 (sec. 4). It was estimated that the cost of section 1 of the bill would not exceed $209,000. The total first year's additional cost of the bill was thus estimated to be approximately $5 million. It is the belief of the Veterans' Administration that the additional cost will decrease slightly for the next 4 years.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am happy that House bill 211, to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide increases in rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to children and parents of deceased veterans has finally been passed. The struggle to have it passed has been a long one, but has been most worthwhile. The passage of this bill is overdue; but at last the bill has been considered and passed, and I think this is a great day for the dependents of our deceased veterans.

ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR VETERANS HAVING COMPLETE APHONIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 143, House bill 214.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill (H.R. 214) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans suffering the loss or loss of use of both vocal cords, with resulting complete aphonia, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 159), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

H.R. 214, authorizing the payment of additional compensation of $47 per month to a veteran who has a service-incurred disability of complete organic aphonia (loss of speech).

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

The current Schedule for Rating Disabilities provides that complete organic aphonia (loss of speech) with constant inability to communicate by speech will be rated as totally disabling with compensation payable in the total amount of $250 a month. This bill provides that the statutory award rate ($47) now applicable for other appropriate disabilities for a specific loss shall be added to the total rate. This $47 a month allowance would mean that the veteran would receive $297 monthly if this bill is enacted into law.

The Veterans' Administration indicates that there are only twenty known cases involving complete organic aphonia meeting the criteria of this bill, which means that the annual cost would be $11,280.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, these are three very important bills. All have been reported from the Finance Committee, under the chairmanship of the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. They were reported unanimously by the Finance Committee; and they were reported unanimously from the policy committee; and, so far as I know, they have the unanimous support of the Members on the Republican side.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. As a member of the Finance Committee, I wish to say that I was present when these bills were considered by it. They were unanimously approved by the committee, and the committee was proud and pleased to do so.

COMMENDATION FOR PRESERVATION OF SECRECY

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, while the distinguished majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] are on the floor—both of whom, along with me, had some remarks to make in regard to the secrecy of the recent secret session of the Senate—I invite attention to the fact that several weeks have now transpired since that secret session was held; and, so far as I have been able to read, notice, or hear, there have been absolutely no "leaks" from that secret session of the Senate. For that, I wish to commend Senators and to express my own appreciation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am delighted that the Senator from Tennessee has seen fit to make that statement, because it is accurate and true; and it speaks well for the fact that we did, in an extraordinary secret session, discuss many things, none of which, so far, at least, has reached the public or to the press.

MIDDLESEX CONCRETE PRODUCTS AND EXCAVATING CORP.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 145, Senate bill 1003.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill (S. 1003) for the relief of the Middlesex Concrete Products & Excavating Corp., was considered, order to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Middlesex Concrete Products and Excavating Corporation, of Woodbridge, New Jersey, the sum of $1,600, in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for additional compensation for work performed at the direction of the Department of the Army in excess of the requirements of contract numbered DA-30-075-Eng-8601 for the construction of permanent family housing site work (outside lease lines) at Fort Wadsworth, New York, the Department of the Army being unable to pay such additional compensation because of the limitation on the expenditure of funds for such site work contained in section 505 of the Act of September 28, 1951 (12 U.S.C. 17481).

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 162), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill is to pay to the Middlesex Concrete Products & Excavating Corp., of Woodbridge, N.J., the sum of $1,600 in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for additional compensation for work performed at the direction of the Department of the Army in excess of the requirements of contract No. DA-30-075-Eng-8601 for the construction of permanent family housing site work (outside lease lines) at Fort Wadsworth, N.Y., the Department of the Army being unable to pay such additional compensation because of the limitation on the expenditure of funds for such site work contained in section 505 of the act of September 28, 1951 (12 U.S.C. 17481).

STATEMENT

The Department of the Army has no objection to the enactment of this legislation.

The claimant entered into a contract with the U.S. Government for permanent housing site work and utilities outside the Capehart lease boundary line within Fort Wadsworth, N.Y., in the amount of $77,364. The contract was awarded by the U.S. Army Engineer District, N.Y. Subsequently the contractor submitted a claim for $5,825 additional compensation covering alleged extra work performed in installing 470 feet of 8-inch water distribution main with fittings and valves. The claimant corporation alleged that it was required to do the work by the contracting officer even though it was not required to be constructed under the terms of the contract, since the lease boundary line was not indicated on the pertinent drawing. The claim was denied by the contracting officer, who found that although the lease boundary line was not shown on the drawing, it was shown on a large scale portion of the same drawing and could be established readily on the other drawing by scaling.

The division engineer reviewed the claim and determined that an ambiguity existed in the drawings relative to the new 8-inch water line and that this was misleading to a reasonably prudent bidder and, therefore, the contractor should be compensated for this additional work under the contract.

Subsequently, new negotiations were made between the Corps of Engineers and the Middlesex Corp. and it was agreed that $4,000 was due the contractor. The Army had already allocated funds within $2,400 of the maximum allowable. The contractor was paid this $2,400, leaving a balance due of $1,600.

The report of the Department of the Army indicates that the only reason for not paying this balance was the absence of available funds and that "it would be against justice and good conscience for the Government to accept the work performed without compensating the contractor. Therefore, this Department interposes no objection to the bill."

In view of all of the foregoing, the committee concurs in the report of the Department of the Army and recommends that the bill, S. 1003, be considered favorably.

THIRTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF WOMEN'S LEAGUE OF ISRAEL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the 35th birthday anniversary of the Women's League for Israel, an organization of 20,000 American women who have made extraordinarily fine contributions to America's interest in Israel and have taken many constructive actions for the benefit of the young people who are making their homes and seeking their opportunities there.

The Women's League has established centers in Israel which have been likened to our own "Y" centers, and at one time were characterized as "a home away from home, located in the spiritual home of all mankind, Israel," by the late Mrs. Franklin Delano Roosevelt, during the course of one of her visits to the Holy Land.

I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a recent editorial by the Seven Arts Feature Syndicate of New York entitled "Memorable Anniversary," which summarizes the fine record of this women's group and lauds its accomplishments.

There being no objection the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORABLE ANNIVERSARY

The three and one-half decades of service to the young people of Israel being marked this year by the Women's League for Israel, which is now observing its 35th anniversary, covers a vital period in the life of the organization.

Since its official founding in 1928, the league has helped close to 50,000 persons in its five Israeli homes—one in Jerusalem, two in Haifa, one in Tel Aviv, and one at Nathanya, where it also maintains a training center for the blind.

Headed by Mrs. Ann Cahane-Neiditz as president, the league has accomplished a great deal. It has received and absorbed the newcomers, integrating the many victims of oppression and homelessness, training the handicapped to self-sufficiency, and now, is aiding future Israeli leaders and students from many lands to a university education in an atmosphere of freedom and democracy.

This year the league will complete construction of a new $500,000 three-unit university student center in Jerusalem at the Hebrew University, where it has already built dormitories, a student cafeteria, and donated funds to maintain a chair in sociology.

The league's history mirrors recent tragedies and joys of millions of the Jewish faith. Convinced as early as 1928 that no adequate housing existed for young women arriving to live in the Yishuv (Jewish settlements), the group pledged its resources to provide its first home for women in Haifa.

The tragic massacre at Hebron in 1929, brought the decision from Yishuv leaders that serious measures for self-defense of the settlements were needed. The league similarly decided that its building program must be accompanied by training and integrating facilities for the new immigrants. The Hitler holocaust increased the already speedy tempo of its work.

Its greatest satisfaction came of course with the arrival of the independence of Israel, for the organization had worked hard toward its achievement.

On its 35th anniversary I commend the league for its dedication and accomplishments.

DESEGREGATED HOSPITAL FACILITIES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed at this point in the RECORD three papers of an article from the American Journal of Public Health, April 1963, entitled "Achieving Equal Opportunity in Use of Medical Service and Hospital Facilities." The papers are by Richard V. Marks, secretary-director, Detroit Commission on Human Relations; the Right Reverend Richard S. Emrich, bishop of Michigan, Protestant Episcopal Church, Detroit; and Dietrich C. Reitzes, Ph. D., deputy director, Commission on Youth Welfare, Chicago, Ill.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACHIEVING EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IN THE USE OF MEDICAL SERVICES AND HOSPITAL FACILITIES

(The need to make health services and facilities available to all regardless of race, creed, or national origin is today accepted as a basic principle of a democratic society. One of our national problems is the fact that this principle has not yet been fully implemented. The following three papers offer the experience of one community, Detroit, in endeavoring to deal with this problem as it affected the Negro population. Certain conclusions are drawn.)

I. THE CATALYTIC ROLE OF GOVERNMENTAL HUMAN RELATIONS AGENCIES

(By Richard V. Marks)

Basic to the medical profession and to a democratic society is the belief that medicine must be available to all men. In the Detroit area, local government has attempted to implement this principle and insure the availability of medical care to all persons regardless of economic status, race, religion, or national origin. We can give service to the financially distressed in public hospitals, but what can a community do to guarantee competent, adequate service to all persons seeking private medical consultation and treatment?

The Mayor's Interracial Committee, Detroit's first intergroup agency, addressed itself to this question early in 1952. In our area, as in many other urban centers, hospital facilities, medical personnel, and training opportunities were generally inadequate, and the problem of servicing the needs of the community's Negro population, which had doubled in one decade, was acute.

Many persons in our community voiced the belief that racial discrimination within the field of medicine was placing minority group members at a disadvantage and that this inequity must be eliminated. The occasion of our city's first study of hospital facilities, resources, and needs in relation to our total population became the focus around which these community concerns were expressed. When the study of needs was complete and a plan for using Federal funds in conjunction with the Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Act was initiated along with the raising of $19 million in private construction funds, the issue of "who" would participate became a question of communitywide significance.

This was clearly a situation which deserved the attention of the medical profession and the city's intergroup agency. The Mayor's Interracial Committee and its successor, the Detroit Commission on Community Relations, were assigned a responsibility "* * * to promote good will, and to cultivate responsibility for the common welfare." It "shall seek to correct situations * * * endangering the peace and welfare * * * or to be unjust and discriminatory." It shall do these things "* * * through negotiation and conciliation."

In fulfilling its responsibility, the commission attempts to find community solutions to community problems and depends upon civic leadership and support in these undertakings. With the belief that discrimination in health services is unjust and causes dissatisfaction and tension in the community, the commission created citizens' committees.

The Medical and Hospital Study Committee was created in 1952, under the sponsorship of the Mayor's Interracial Committee, and accepted as its responsibility the task of surveying the racial factors in the field of medical training, service, and the facilities for the care of the ill in the Detroit metropolitan area. The factfinding activities of this committee were completed in 1956 with the publication of the Medical and Hospital Study Committee's Reports.

A second citizens' committee, the Advisory Committee on Hospitals, was established in 1957 to implement the recommendations of the study committee and seeks to correct unfair practices outlined in the original study.

The importance of the committee approach in solving community problems has been demonstrated many times over, and the success of any committee program is dependent upon its personnel. It was the intent of the commission to bring together representative citizens of good will who had an appreciation for the problems to be studied and a desire to work toward a resolution.

Leaders in many fields have brought not only status to the program of the study committee and the advisory committee, but dedication to the goal of achieving nondiscrimination in all phases of medicine and hospital operations in Detroit. The varied interests in our community represented on the committees included business, labor, church, community (including minority groups) and professional, medical, nursing, and hospital leaders. With singleness of purposes, the membership reviewed racial factors in hospital policy and practice and explored logical and efficient means for eliminating discrimination based upon race, creed, color, or national origin. Persons were asked to serve who were involved in the problem and in its solution. At the outset they were chosen for committee membership on the basis of their recognition that a racial problem did in fact exist. Their job became one of honestly setting forth the facts and finding avenues of solution.

Within the framework of their general assignments, the committees functioned as autonomous groups, with complete freedom to shape their own policies, define the scope and form of the study, and the contents of their reports.

In the sequence of committee activity, the study was first defined through the selection of six specific areas for investigation. The survey itself was designed to determine the extent of the problem in each of these areas.

Institutions were asked to state policy governing selection of personnel and trainees in the areas of nurse training, medical training, medical staff, nursing staff, and nursing service, and hospitals indicated their bed assignment policies. Data, furnished and in some instances interpreted by hospitals and other training institutions, illustrated current practices in the areas under study. The committee in subgroups and as a whole analyzed all available information to determine if the patterns, as they emerged in the various categories, suggested the exclusion of or segregation of minority group members.

The study committee discharged its full responsibility in 1956 with the reports of findings, conclusions, and recommendations for the clarification and implementation of nondiscriminatory policies.

As a result of committee conferences, the State Office of Hospital Survey and Construction, in 1958, required a declaration and guarantee of nondiscrimination from all recipients of Federal funds. In 1960, the Detroit Area Hospital Council publicly supported our community goal and urged all member hospitals to adopt statements of nondiscrimination similar to the one suggested by the State agency. The Metropolitan Detroit Building Fund for Hospital Construction has also indicated a willingness to include a clear policy requirement in all contract agreements. Each report of the advisory committee marks a step toward the achievement of our eventual goal and recognizes the adoption of and demonstration of a nonrestrictive policy within a category of institutions. Thus in 1957, progress with the college nursing schools was reported; in 1958, the report of medical schools was issued; and the committee report of enrollment policies of hospital nursing schools was made public in 1959.

The committee began the resurvey of individual hospitals offering medical training programs in 1959. Here again, significant progress has been made as a result of lengthy negotiations. One major medical training hospital has not only adopted a satisfactory policy but has agreed to implement this policy through a program of informal recruitment of qualified Negro medical school graduates.

In none of its negotiations has the committee advocated the revision of professional standards; the emphasis has been upon the application of these standards without regard to race, creed, color, or national origin.

Detroit's redevelopment project application for the medical center area provided a situation for accelerating our community goal of equal opportunity in medicine. The chairman of the advisory committee and commission staff participated in conferences, convened by the mayor of Detroit, to discuss and resolve the community controversy arising over the use of Federal and city funds for the expansion of institutions charged with the practice of discrimination. In early 1961, the four hospitals within this area, all offering medical training programs, submitted declarations of commitment to a policy of nondiscrimination in all phases of their operations. Not all these hospitals are moving ahead "with deliberate speed." At least one of these hospitals is acting on its pledge with such reluctance as to endanger the entire program.

The business of changing established practices in our society is slow. Such attempts meet with organized and individual resistance. The progress we have made, however, strengthens our position as we meet new situations.

Next steps in our program include contact with Blue Cross-Blue Shield and the medical society to ask for their active endorsement of democratic practices within the profession, continued conferences with hospitals offering medical training opportunities to urge a clearly demonstrated policy of inclusiveness, and contact with hospitals not offering training on the matter of staff appointments and bed assignment policies.

Detroit has benefited greatly through the operation of its citizens' committees. Outstanding persons have given of their time and influence to become knowledgeable in the area of medicine, to plan a realistic corrective program, and to carry out this program with determination. These committees have successfully interpreted the concerns of the community to hospitals and other institutions and have helped the community understand better some of the administrative and professional problems within the field of medicine.

Over the past 9 years, Detroit has been investigating itself to define the real problem in the area of discrimination in medicine and attempting to correct practices which are unjust and which create tension in our community. Our goal is as worthy of support and conscientious effort today as it was in 1952 and the problems which remain are as great a handicap to our city and the medical profession as the ones now behind us. We are grateful for the opportunity to discuss and describe our methods and techniques in the belief that our success can be duplicated in other American communities.

II. ACTIVITIES OF THE CITIZENS' ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON HOSPITALS OF THE DETROIT COMMISSION ON COMMUNITY RELATIONS

(By the Right Reverend Richard S. Emrich, Ph. D., D.D.)

Background

The medical and hospital study committee was created in 1952 for the purpose of reviewing racial factors in hospital policy and practice and recommending logical and efficient means for eliminating this problem in our community. The committee was sponsored by the mayor's interracial committee, predecessor of the present commission on community relations. Staff services for the study committee were provided by the interracial committee. Following its review, the study committee, composed of 35 distinguished citizens representing all aspects of Detroit's community life, issued six reports on the major phases of hospital and medical services: Nurse training and employment; medical training, including medical schools and internship and residency training programs; medical staff appointments; and bed utilization and assignment practices in 47 Detroit area hospitals. In its reports, the committee dealt only with the scope of the problem; it did not single out any hospital or institution by name. The medical and hospital study committee completed its work in the summer of 1956, when it submitted its reports of findings and recommendations to the Detroit Commission on Community Relations, and thus to the public.

The study committee found some serious problem in the areas studied. For example, only two of the nine hospital-affiliated nurse training schools had any record of consistent enrollment of qualified Negro students. Only 4 of the approximately 20 hospitals offering internship training had any record of accepting Negro interns. Comparatively few of the 170 Negro physicians in Detroit held staff appointments in the voluntary nonprofit hospitals. Except for governmental hospitals, patient segregation in wards and semiprivate rooms was the prevailing pattern.

Advisory committee on hospitals

In 1957, the commission on community relations created the present advisory committee on hospitals to implement the recommendations made by the study committee. Its goal is that Detroit lead the Nation in achieving a completely nondiscriminatory, equal opportunity system of medical and hospital practice. The 20 members of the committee are leaders in business, labor, medicine, nursing, and the religious and civic life of the city. Staff services for the committee are provided by the commission.

The advisory committee has approached the problem on three levels: (1) The individual hospital or institution; (2) hospital planning and funding organizations; and (3) governmental action.

Achievements

1. On the level of individual hospitals, the advisory committee concentrates its attention on one category of hospitals or institutions at a time. Thus the 2 schools of medicine, the 2 colleges of nursing, the 7 hospitals now offering nurse training, and the 10 additional hospitals offering internship and residency training programs have been resurveyed as groups by the committee. Where necessary, negotiations have been undertaken with the administration and board of trustees of institutions whose practices have been found to fall short of the standards enunciated by the study committee. When the resurvey and negotiations are satisfactorily completed for the institutions in a category, the advisory committee submits its report on the institutions to the commission on community relations. At this time, the committee reports become public information.

Following this procedure, the advisory committee has reported that the Schools of Medicine at Wayne State University and the University of Michigan and the Schools of Nursing at Mercy College and Wayne State University have demonstrated their openness to all qualified students. The report on the seven hospital-affiliated schools of nursing stated that six had satisfactorily demonstrated nonrestrictive policy and practice in admission to the schools. The board of trustees of the seventh hospital assured the committee that the enrollment of its school of nursing would reflect an inclusive pattern of admissions at the earliest opportunity. Subsequent to the publication of the committee's report that school enrolled its first Negro student nurse.

The committee is presently resurveying and conducting negotiations with hospitals offering internship and residency training programs. The committee is now concentrating its attention on negotiations with the major teaching hospitals in the Detroit area. Progress is slow, partly because of the unavoidable lag between the making of a policy decision and the demonstrated implementation of that decision, and partly because of reluctance on the part of some institutions to recognize any responsibility for the solution of problems called to their attention, or, in some cases, to recognize the existence of such problems. To date, no hospital has been certified by the committee as being free of discriminatory practices in all phases of its operation.

2. On the level of hospital planning and funding organizations, the advisory committee has concluded an agreement with the Michigan Office of Hospital Survey and Construction that, pursuant to its obligations under Federal law, no hospital would receive public funds for the construction of any facility unless it could provide guarantees that it was either operating without reference to race in the service of people, or could guarantee and covenant that it would so operate. The State office developed a model resolution of nondiscriminatory policy whose adoption is required of hospitals seeking funds under the provisions of the Hill-Burton Act. This resolution states:

"That the Board of Trustees of ——— Hospital does hereby certify that all phases of the operation of ——— Hospital shall be without discrimination against individuals or groups of individuals on the basis of race, creed, color, or national origin and that the administrator of ——— Hospital is hereby directed to take such action as is necessary to assure that ——— Hospital shall in fact be so operated."

Following this action by the office of hospital survey and construction the advisory committee called the resolution to the attention of the governing bodies of the hospital planning and coordinating agency and of the major fundraising organization, urging their endorsement and adoption of the policy resolution. Following exploratory discussions with members of the advisory committee, the executive committee of the Greater Detroit Area Hospital Council, Inc., adopted a resolution recommending nondiscriminatory policy and practice by member hospitals, and further recommended their adoption of the above resolution. The hospital council serves as the planning and coordinating agency for 70 member hospitals in the Greater Detroit area.

Similarly, at the advisory committee's suggestion and following discussions and negotiations with the committee, the allocations committee of the Metropolitan Detroit building fund moved to incorporate the resolution in its statement of principles and in its contracts with fund recipients. The building fund is a private organization which raises funds for hospital construction and expansion through the contributions of businesses, foundations, and individuals.

3. Early in 1960, the chairman of the advisory committee was invited to assist in the resolution of the community controversy which arose in regard to the medical center redevelopment plan. This urban redevelopment proposal calls for the clearing of some 200 acres in the heart of the city, and the development of a center for medical research, education, and service. At the Detroit Common Council's hearings on approval of the plan, three organizations endorsed the project as worth while, but would not permit the project to proceed until the practices of racial discrimination charged against three of the four hospitals, which would form the nucleus of the center, were corrected. At the suggestion of the chairman, the nondiscriminatory policy resolution quoted above was submitted to the boards of trustees of the four hospitals and adopted. This action was accepted by all parties, and the common council, on receiving the chairman's report of the action, approved the plan.

The events reported here represent significant progress toward the advisory committee on hospitals' goal of a completely nondiscriminatory, equal opportunity system of medical and hospital practice in the Detroit area. However, much work remains before that goal is fully realized.

III. THE DETROIT EXPERIENCE IN THE NATIONAL PERSPECTIVE

(By Dietrich C. Reitzes, Ph. D.)

Supply of medical personnel

An increasing U.S. population requires increases in the supply of trained medical personnel. This is particularly true for the Negro population of the United States. Without implying that Negroes should be taken care of by Negro physicians, it can be shown that, to a large extent, the medical care received by Negroes in this country depends upon the number and quality of Negro physicians. The number of Negro physicians in this country is inadequate. Negroes constitute approximately 10 percent of the entire U.S. population. Negro physicians, however, constitute only 2 percent of all U.S. physicians. Physician population ratios show that there are 132 physicians for every 100,000 population, but there are only 20 Negro physicians for every 100,000 Negro population in this country.

Without an increased effort to do something about this problem, the situation will not improve. While there has been an increase in the number of Negroes attending medical schools, particularly in predominantly white medical schools, Negro students still represent only about 3 percent of the total enrollment in medical schools. Less than 200 Negroes graduate from all medical schools a year. In regard to advanced training of Negro physicians, there has been an improvement. Negro physicians who are certified by the American Specialty Boards have increased 400 percent since 1947 to a total of 369. Yet, even with this increase, only 0.6 percent of all board certified specialists are Negroes.

Patterns of racial integration in medicine

Medical Schools

Today, the shortage of Negro medical students is due primarily to a shortage of qualified Negro applicants to medical schools rather than discrimination on the part of medical schools. This shortage, in turn, is due to:

(a) Discrimination at levels below the medical schools. This means the general problem of discrimination in our society and discrimination in educational opportunities at the lower levels.

(b) The opening up of other professional opportunities for qualified Negroes.

Internships

At the present time this provides no problems for Negro graduates of medical schools. Under the old ghetto system a Negro medical graduate was forced to serve his internship in one of about 10 approved Negro hospitals or go without, save for occasional openings in big northern hospitals like Bellevue in New York City and Cook County in Chicago. Today, under what is called the matching plan, nearly all Negro medical graduates receive acceptances for internship at two, three, or even more hospitals, so that during the last several years the graduates of Howard and Meharry alone have been distributed to about 55 hospitals for their internships. Most of these hospitals have been in the North or West, but some, like the hospitals of the University of Texas and the Medical College of Virginia, have been in the South.

These increased internship openings have resulted chiefly from the fact that there are about 5,000 more approved internships than medical graduates annually. More liberal attitudes, however, have also been a factor.

Residents Training

Essentially, the same situation prevails here as regards to internships.

Advanced Training

The major problem in this area is to find qualified Negro physicians willing to do advanced work beyond board certification. National Medical Fellowships, Inc., which provides scholarships and fellowships for Negro physicians discontinued its program of advanced fellowship simply because there were not enough applicants.

Hospital Staff Appointments

There is general consensus among physicians and medical educators that the most important single factor which determines the kind of medical care that physicians can provide is the opportunity that physicians have for continued education through hospital affiliation. Since private patients are admitted to hospitals through their physicians, the accessibility of hospital beds to

Negro patients is related to these appointments of Negro physicians. This is the area in which the problem of racial discrimination in medical care is greatest across the country.

Factors affecting integration in medicine on the community level

In 1956, we conducted a survey in 14 communities across the United States on the patterns of integration in medicine. In comparing the 14 communities, we found that in each the situation regarding integration in medicine was unique. Nevertheless, it is possible to isolate some of the key factors which make up the patterns.

The uniqueness of each community is the result of the particular way in which these key factors combine to form a particular pattern. The component parts of the pattern tend to be very similar. The main factors which we isolated were the following: (1) the presence and importance of predominantly Negro hospitals; (2) the presence of influential persons and groups actively interested in integration; (3) the existence of opportunities for Negro physicians to establish professional contacts with influential white physicians; (4) the strategy used by Negro physicians in obtaining hospital appointments; (5) the supply of well-qualified and well-trained Negro physicians; (6) the professional relationships among Negro physicians with particular emphasis on referrals; and (7) the general patterns of race relations in each community.

Of the seven factors no single factor was consistently related to the degree of integration found. This was so because in any given community the importance and significance of any of the above factors was greatly influenced by particular characteristics of the other factors in that community.

Implications of the Detroit experience

In Detroit the developments regarding integration in medicine demonstrate the significance of community awareness of the problem, professional contacts between white and Negro physicians, the interest of influential persons in integration, and action by Negro physicians in bringing about a higher degree of integration in medical facilities.

The relative attractiveness and promise of Detroit for Negro physicians was reflected in the fairly rapid increase in the number of Negro physicians since 1946: The 160 Negro physicians in 1956 represented an increase of 21.2 percent. Of this number 52.6 percent were under 50 years of age. Only in Gary, Los Angeles, and Indianapolis was a higher percentage of physicians under 50 years of age. In regard to training, Detroit with 17 board-certified Negro physicians was tied with Philadelphia for fourth place among the 14 communities we studied.

Community awareness

The previous papers have already clearly indicated a high degree of community awareness in Detroit which was focused on the problem of integration in medicine, as demonstrated in the Medical and Hospital Study Committee and the followup committee. Thus, Detroit provides an excellent example of the effectiveness of this approach.

Contacts between white and Negro physicians

The contacts established between white and Negro physicians were among the most important aids to achieving staff appointments at predominantly white hospitals in Detroit. A study of the 25 Negro physicians having such appointments indicated that 15—or 60 percent—had either attended the 2 medical schools in the Detroit area or had spent their internships and residency periods in predominantly white hospitals in Detroit. At these hospitals, they established professional relationships with white physicians which were directly responsible for their appointments to the hospital staffs.

In other cases, professional contacts established in governmental and predominantly Negro hospitals led to affiliations at predominantly white voluntary hospitals. For example, one Negro physician was helped in securing affiliation at a white hospital by staff members of this hospital with whom he had worked at the Veterans' Administration hospital. In another case, close professional relationships between the staffs of a white and a Negro hospital led to the appointments of at least three Negro physicians to the staff of the white hospital. In this instance, the superintendents and medical directors of the two hospitals were close personal friends; some of the key men at the white hospital also served on the staff of the Negro hospital; the chief pathologist of the white hospital conducted most of the meetings for the staff of the Negro hospital; and furthermore, the Negro hospital often used the laboratory of the white hospital.

In another case, a Negro physician was able to get a desired affiliation with a predominantly white hospital as the result of working with an influential staff member of this hospital at the Detroit Receiving Hospital. Still another Negro physician desiring affiliation with a specific hospital deliberately accepted an appointment at a clinic because this clinic was also serviced by important physicians from the hospital with which he desired affiliation. This technique proved successful, and after 2 years the Negro physician was able to get the appointment he wanted.

There was also a number of instances in Detroit where affiliations were secured because a Negro physician had studied or worked under white physicians of high prestige in other communities. We also found instances where Negro physicians on a staff were instrumental in getting other Negro physicians appointed.

In general, we found in Detroit that the majority of appointments to hospital staffs required that somebody on the staff be actively interested in pushing the application. A white hospital administrator made this point:

In every case where a Negro has been accepted he has been screened very carefully, and there was always somebody on the staff who had personal knowledge of the individual concerned and would speak up for him. It would be very difficult for a Negro to be put on the staff if he had not had previous contact with the white physicians already on the staff.

Interest of influential persons

In view of the prevalence of professional contacts between Negro and white physicians, there were comparatively few white physicians or administrators who appeared to be especially active in promoting integration. We encountered, however, two instances where integration in specific hospitals was clearly the result of the interest of key persons on the staffs.

In one case, the hospital was a very large one. Negro physicians on the staff pointed out that their appointments were directly due to the interest taken in their cases by the administrator. This particular person had been interested in integration for many years, but he felt that it should be encouraged by persuasion and education, rather than by determination of policy on his part. Consequently, his effect on integration in hospital appointments developed only slowly and required the operation of some of the other forces that have been discussed.

The other case concerned a medium-size, predominantly white hospital. A number of interviewees stated that the integration in staff appointments was the direct result of the personal interest in integration taken by the chief of staff of this hospital. He initiated the recruitment of qualified Negro specialists and insisted that they be given staff appointments. In this he also had the support of several of the department heads and thus was able to overcome the initial resistance of many white staff members.

Action by Negro physicians

The actions taken by Negro physicians in Detroit in order to achieve integration were an extremely important component of the Detroit experience.

Negro hospitals

The presence and the relative importance of Negro hospitals in a community are significant in two ways: they indicate the degree of integration in the community and they influence the integration process.

Predominantly Negro hospitals were absent in the six communities which had the highest degree of integration as measured by our index of the percentage of Negro physicians having appointments at predominantly white hospitals. These communities were: Gary, New York, Philadelphia, Los Angeles, Indianapolis, and Boston. Detroit, where Negro hospitals were relatively unimportant, was in seventh place, and the communities with important Negro hospitals followed.

Our data indicate that the presence of Negro hospitals influences the process of integration in two ways.

First, that Negro hospitals can provide a focal point for the self-segregation of Negroes. Such a hospital provides a place where Negro doctors can hospitalize their patients and thus reduces the doctors' needs to become affiliated with predominantly white hospitals. Furthermore, a predominantly Negro hospital provides a physical facility where Negro physicians meet, and this, in turn, can easily lead to the formation of a strong Negro ingroup, which may even resist integration.

Second, the presence of Negro hospitals reduces the pressure on white physicians and hospital administrators to admit Negroes to staff positions at predominantly white hospitals. The absence of Negro hospitals, on the other hand, puts strong pressure on whites to make some provision for the needs of Negro physicians and patients.

At the time of study in 1956 Detroit had three predominantly Negro hospitals which were approved by the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals. These three hospitals had a total of 324 beds. In the total situation of medical services for the Negro community and hospital affiliations for Negro physicians, the three Negro hospitals were not significant either in the actual services they provided or in their influence on the actions of the Negro community. This is illustrated by the fact that an attempt to enlarge one hospital and make it a focal point for Negro physicians failed because of the lack of community support. There was no indication that the three Negro hospitals influenced integration in other Detroit hospitals either positively or negatively.

REPORT OF PANEL ON MENTAL RETARDATION

The panel created by President Kennedy to study the problem of mental retardation has published its report, "A Proposed Program for National Action To Combat Mental Retardation." The report defines mental retardation as "a group of complex phenomena stemming from many different causes, but one key common characteristic found in all cases is inadequately developed intelligence." Except in the very young, mental retardation can be distinguished from mental illness by the fact that it is usually present at birth or begins in childhood, whereas mental illness usually occurs after there has been normal development.

Severe mental retardation is frequently associated with organic defects and is usually fairly evenly distributed throughout the population regardless of socioeconomic status. On the other hand, mild mental retardation which constitutes the bulk of the cases can seldom, with our present biomedical techniques, be associated with specific organic defects and cases are heavily concentrated in low socioeconomic income groups.

Some of the measures needed to combat mental retardation cited by the panel are: (1) more research regarding the causes of retardation and in methods of care, rehabilitation, and the learning process of the retarded; (2) better preventive health measures including strengthened maternal and child health programs, protection from known hazards in pregnancy such as radiation and drugs, and extended diagnostic and screening services; (3) educational and vocational programs for both children and adults geared to the needs of the retarded; (4) more comprehensive and improved clinical and social services; (5) development of a wide range of local community facilities for care; (6) a new enlightened legal as well as social concept of mental retardation; (7) intensified recruitment of professional personnel in all fields of science and service with provision of opportunities for them to acquire firsthand knowledge about mental retardation and the creation of a Domestic Peace Corps to stimulate voluntary service; (8) programs of education and information to increase public awareness of the problem of retardation.

The report is available from: Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C.; 65 cents.

Mr. JAVITS. I call attention to the very serious and most distressing situation which exists under the Hill-Burton Act, which, by the terms of the legislation itself, allows separate but equal facilities for whites and Negroes in hospitals as accommodating the requirements of the Hill-Burton Act. This act gives the Federal Government a very important share in the construction of new hospitals and presents a situation which urgently requires legislative attention. It is literally shameful that in this day and age, after the Supreme Court decision of Brown against the Board of Education in 1954, we still have imbedded in the Hill-Burton Act—and, incidentally, in the Morrill Act with respect to land-grant colleges—the separate but equal doctrine which has been struck down by the Supreme Court, and which has caused the whole structure of policy negating the idea that that represents the American way, which it definitely does not.

These articles show how urgently legislative attention is required. I would say that one of the greatest challenges faced by the Congress is whether it can exorcise this completely obsolescent and very damaging and harmful provision of law, or whether it must sit with its hands folded and allow a provision of law with which such a great majority of the country disagrees, and which the U.S. Supreme Court struck down as being contrary to our beliefs. The question is whether that provision must remain imbedded in the law because we do not have the necessary procedures or a way of manifesting our will to change it. I shall do everything I can to bring about such change. It is a real challenge to the Congress, and one of those challenges which will determine how the Congress stands in the eyes of the country. If we cannot cope with anything as elementary as that problem, it seems to me the country must take a very dim view of our capacity for running the country's business.

SIXTH ANNUAL OBSERVANCE OF LAW DAY, USA

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, today, May 1, marks the 6th annual observance of Law Day, USA. Observance of this day, inaugurated by the American Bar Association in 1958, and now designated by Presidential proclamation, gives us Americans an excellent opportunity to reaffirm our devotion to and respect for the great heritage of American law.

Embodied in our Constitution we find the basic tenet that we are a government of laws and not of men. Article V of the Bill of Rights assures each person that the Federal Government shall not deprive him of life, liberty or property without due process of law. The 14th amendment provides that the State government shall respect this same rule. Through the consistent and continuous application of this principle we assure the freedom and equality of every individual.

Due process of law is maintained and protected through our courts. These bodies interpret our legal ideals and maintain our traditional concepts of justice through the impartial application of these principles. While our rules of law and means for enforcing them are not perfect, they allow more personal freedom than any other system known to man.

Many people have been attracted to the shores of this Nation, knowing that in America they need not fear discrimination and tyranny. These immigrants have recognized and appreciated the climate of freedom and security which the Anglo-American tradition of law has been able to offer.

The occasion that we Americans are commemorating today is in sharp contrast to the observances presently going on in Communist nations. We reserve this day as a reminder of the many freedoms we enjoy as Americans, freedoms which are constantly protected by our body of laws. The Communists use this day for a raw display of power which serves to intimidate their people and to make them aware that the only rules guiding their government are rules of physical power, administered by men outside of a framework of law. There is no room in such a system for individual freedom and expression.

We must remind ourselves and the rest of the world that the strength of our system is based on far more than overt displays of physical force. It is our belief in the protection of human rights, rights which the Communists refuse to recognize, which can best express the idea that we seek to make peace and prosperity, with freedom, a living reality throughout the world.

To survive and to fulfill its purpose, our code of law and the Nation which it sustains need the support and dedication of the people whom they serve. Law Day provides us with an appropriate opportunity to reflect on the importance of law in the American way of life.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, today, as on every May 1st since 1958, the Nation is celebrating Law Day. It is altogether fitting that we should pause for a moment in this age of rockets and missiles, to give recognition to our system of law which is so basic to peace and order in our own society as well as in the world at large.

The purpose of Law Day is to help us to become more aware of the significance of the rule of law in the preservation of freedom and the maintenance of peace. Bar associations, civic groups, and private and public organizations across the length and breadth of the Nation will hold ceremonies today directed at fostering an abiding respect for law and providing an occasion for the American people to rededicate themselves to freedom.

Our observance will serve to focus attention on the rule of law where the rights of people are governed by established rules, where the essential interests of individuals are guaranteed through limitations on the authority of the state, and where disputes are decided by impartial courts. It will help to demonstrate to the world the meaning of reliance on the rule of law.

In his proclamation of January 28, requesting our people to observe today as Law Day and to participate in ceremonies suitably signalizing its significance, President Kennedy stated:

> In a time when all men are properly concerned lest nations, forgetting law, reason, and moral existence, turn to mutual destruction, we have all the more need to work for a day when law may govern nations as it does men within nations; when systemized reason may bring us a confident future; when moral development of the human race may assure us a peaceful and law-abiding world.

It is in this spirit and with this hope that we celebrate Law Day today, knowing how essential law has been to the preservation of our own freedom and believing that the greatest promise for the consummation of our expectations of peace and tranquillity for the future lies in the development of a system of law among nations.

"ANATOMY OF DECISION"—FICTIONIZED STUDY OF EXECUTIVE DECISION PROCESS IN AN INTERNATIONAL SECURITY CRISIS

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, 3 months ago on February 1, 1963, a written study was filed at the Air University at Maxwell Air Force Base, Ala., that is of specific interest with relation to the international Haitian-Dominican crisis of the past few days.

It was a fictionized study of the executive decision process in an international security crisis entitled "Anatomy of Decision." I think it is interesting reading on the interplay between the White House, the Department of State, and the Department of Defense on the making of vital decisions in time of crisis.

It is a unique piece of writing, for while it is fiction, it is documented fiction with some 225 citations from some 121 publications. Yet I think its achievement of sustained interest gives it the potentiality of an excellent 3-act play.

Because of the interest that I feel that Members of this body would have in

reading it and because of the potential interest that students of government and international and military affairs might have in it, I ask unanimous consent that it be placed in the body of the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the study was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Anatomy of Decision—A Fictionized Study of the Executive Decision Process in an International Security Crisis

(Prepared by William C. Lewis, Jr., brigadier general, U.S. Air Force Reserve, for completion of vol. II of course 4, War College Extension Course, Air University, February 1, 1963)

PART 1. DETECTION

Chapter I. Discovery

It had been a raw, bone-chilling day so typical of Washington in mid-March. The days were getting longer but that was not much consolation from the mixed weather pattern of snow, sleet, and rain—and those reckless impatient drivers, who literally panicked at the drop of the first snowflake—making the drive home even to nearby Georgetown a nightmare.

Scott Davidson sat by the warming fireside leisurely enjoying his nightly predinner martini with his attractive wife Martha, who had a knack for relaxing him with intelligent conversation about matters other than intelligence—Central Intelligence (14:57), that is. As his right hand stroked the soft hair of the head and back of "Cappy," the English setter, sitting by his chair, he gave a gentle sigh of relief with this fleeting peace of mind.

Central Intelligence Agency

For nearly 3 years things had not been going well for the CIA (91:31). Hindsight on the Quahog Bay invasion failure had cast such a shadow on the Agency for a year that his predecessor as Director had resigned in bitterness (5:7). Faulty intelligence had been a major defeat in the Abuc misadventure (94:68). Scott himself had been one of the critics pushing for the resignation—and when it came the President in a "put up or shut up" manner challenged him to accept the appointment as the CIA Director.

He had no choice but to accept—and now 2 years later he thought he knew how the man he had criticized felt. While he had given the CIA a thorough overhauling, his record was no better on the surface than that of his predecessor. The seemingly dramatic victory in the Abuc missile threat crisis had launched his administration with a great flush of success.

Yet, he and his Agency had not looked nearly as good as Florida's U.S. Senator Cutting, who had been so right so far in advance of the CIA on the Russian buildup in Abuc. Cutting had gambled on the reports of the Abuc refugees and had made a blistering attack on the administration (61:44). The CIA was more skeptical because it had been more cautious—and Cutting had emerged smelling like a rose in public opinion.

And in the 2 years that followed, it seemed as though the first flush of success on the Abuc crisis had actually served as a contrast to make the CIA look worse and worse. When the Ollijurts had been deposed in the Dominican Republic, the Joint Chiefs of Staff had warned of the danger of a Communist takeover. But the CIA had sided with the State Department in urging a hands off policy other than steaming up some naval vessels in the adjacent seas.

Intelligence gathered by the CIA had clearly indicated that the revolution had been led by antidictator rebels rather than by Communists. That intelligence was accurate. But now it did not look so to the American public.

For the vacuum of our hands off policy had been quickly filled by Russia in her exploitation of the fierce nationalism-neutralism feeling of the successful Dominican rebels. Economic and technical assistance was poured into the Dominican Republic by Russia and through such assistance imperceptibly a Russian orientation set in.

On top of this, the Russian representatives and technicians inspired the Dominican rebels to pursue their latent national aspiration to take over neighboring Haiti. And they had done it within 2 years after deposing the Ollijurts—not by invasion or military action, but rather by infiltration and subversion, which they had quickly learned from the Russian representatives and technicians.

New Carribbea

The final act was supposedly a plebiscite of Haiti and the Dominican Republic that voted for a merger of the two countries into the new nation of Carribbea—more accurately, Communist Carribbea. Intelligence gathered by the CIA revealed that it was a rigged plebiscite in which the great majority of anti-Communists and those Haitians opposed to the merger were not permitted to vote. But the United States had been unable to do anything about it because of the doctrine of respect for self-determination and because of the fierce sensitivity of Latin American countries to outside intervention.

Many refugees from Haiti and the Dominican Republic—from the new Carribbea—had gone to Florida and New York—and several articulate ones to Senator Cutting with grave stories of a Russian buildup in new Carribbea. Scott Davidson so often in these days had felt like saying, "This is where I came in" (63:A–15).

No; the days had been long and hard. But this end of a hard, long and cold day was peacefully pleasant with comforting Martha, loyal "Cappy," the glowing fireplace and the martini. Martha had stopped talking for some 5 minutes as she had sensed Scott's retrospective mood.

The President Calls

But the quiet was not to last long as it was pierced by the shrill ring of the telephone on the bookshelf back of Scott's lounge chair. A reluctant "Davidson speaking" was answered with "The President wishes to speak with you" and quickly followed by the irritated and troubled voice of the President.

"Scott, have you heard about the show that Cutting and Hartley put on in the Senate late this afternoon?"

"No, but they do it so aften these days that they're outpacing the Ed and Chesley show—and they say the same thing over and over."

"Well, this time it isn't the same thing. My Senate liaison man was in the gallery and he is of the opinion that it is serious. He said that Cutting not only produced statements of Dominican refugees that the Russians are transforming new Carribbea into a huge bunker (30:42a) (108:28, 30) but also produced what they claim are pictures of Russian missiles, planes, submarines and ships in new Carribbea—and he told me that the pictures are going to be shown on the 8 o'clock 'Today' TV program in the morning with Cutting and Hartley appearing on that program. We checked with NBC and they confirmed this. I also asked Cutting for copies of the pictures—and he told me that he was sending them over."

Straightening up in his lounge chair, Davidson said, "But, as you know, Mr. President, the Defense Intelligence Board has taken the position that the Russians would never put offensive missiles in Carribbea because they would be too exposed (46:4). I'll be right over."

"No need for that Scott, right now. I'm not concerned about Cutting because he is a meticulous man. But I am concerned about Hartley. You'll remember he called for our blasting Abuc out of the Caribbean and he's up for reelection this year and this is a natural for him. Ordinarily he wouldn't be taken seriously, but this time the Cutting pictures could make a difference, and public opinion on new Carribbea seems to be ripe for political exploitation by Hartley.

"What can I do, Mr. President?" Scott said a little wearily.

"Get your CIA boys together with General Mack of the Defense Intelligence Agency (22:197) in the Pentagon. I'll have the Cutting pictures sent over to General Mack's office. I'll have Mack notified to set the conference up in his office for 9 o'clock tonight and to have his people there to meet with you and your people. But be sure to have your dinner because you'll have a full night. I want you and Mack to have a full intelligence report on the Russian buildup in Carribbea together with an analysis and evaluation of the Cutting pictures on my desk at the White House at 6:30 tomorrow morning. That will give me time to prepare comment and reply to whatever Cutting and Hartley say on the 'Today' show."

Chapter II. Investigation

With a "Will do, Mr. President," by Scott the conversation terminated. Scott then called his CIA deputy and gave instructions for the conference in General Mack's office.

Shortly thereafter upon call from the White House, Lt. Gen. Carroll Mack, U.S. Army Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency (21:51) (22:197), in turn called the Army Assistant Chief of Staff for Intelligence (25:140, 148), the ACNO Director of Naval Intelligence (28:156, 160) and the Air Force Assistant Chief of Staff for Intelligence (24:181, 189) and requested their attendance at the conference at 9 o'clock that night. He also called the Director of Intelligence and Research of the State Department (121:5) inviting him to attend the conference.

Intelligence Conference

At 9 o'clock sharp in room 3E258 (27:C–9) in the Pentagon, the conference was called to order by General Mack, who then turned the chairmanship of the conference over to Scott Davidson. By that time several sets of prints of the Cutting pictures had been made. They were passed around to the attendants at the conference. In addition to these prints, the White House had obtained copies late that afternoon from the Senate official reporters of the remarks made by Senators Cutting and Hartley a few hours before in the Senate.

Davidson outlined the situation summing up with the requirement of the President that the group make a thorough but succinct evaluation and analysis of the status of any Russian military buildup in Caribbea—and specifically, evaluation of the Cutting pictures—to be placed on his desk in a little more than 12 hours later at 6:30 the next morning. "In short," he said, "gentlemen, our time is short and our mission is awesome. Yet, we have to a great extent already made our personal evaluations. The only new factor at this point is the Cutting pictures. Are they genuine? Do they make a significant difference?"

The group worked throughout the night (61:50) calling in photographic intelligence experts of their staffs and the latest intelligence evaluations of new Carribbea and its Russian relations. Comparisons and arguments were made. The Air Force and the Navy contended that the Cutting pictures, even if authentic, did not change their evaluations which had been that a very threatening Russian military buildup had been underway for some time and that the Cutting pictures only corroborated those evaluations.

The prior evaluations of the Army and the CIA had been that admittedly Russian military equipment had been sent into Carribbea but that it was in the nature of military assistance for internal security rather than for external action and was of defensive rather that offensive character and thus constituted no serious threat. The State Department Director of Intelligence and Research sided with the evaluation that there was no serious threat.

Evaluation

At 2:30 the combined photographic intelligence experts reported to the group that they were of the unanimous opinion that the Cutting pictures were: (1) authentic and (2) disclosed evidence that was indicative, but not conclusive, that the character and numbers of missiles, IL-28 jet bombers (8:A1) (17:A1), submarines and ships had extensive external potentials.

After an hour of close questioning and discussion, the Army, the CIA, and the State Department representatives concluded that there was indication of a significant change. At that point, two staff members were directed to draft a report. That draft was completed in an hour and a half and then presented to the group. A few changes were made and the final draft was approved by the group, as an informal agent of the U.S. Intelligence Board (5:7) (60:6), and signed by Scott Davidson as head of the CIA and General Mack as Director of Defense Intelligence Agency with noted concurrence by the State Department Director of Intelligence.

The group dispersed to return to their offices or homes for short naps. At 5:30 a.m., Scott Davidson called Jack Brandt, the Special Adviser to the President on National Security Affairs, out of bed with a cryptic, "We've finished the report the President wants. Meet me at the White House as soon as you can get there." At 6 Davidson handed the report to Brandt—and at 6:30 Brandt knocked on the small library room door of the President and entered with the report (2:18).

The President sat down at the small desk and began to read the four-page report, first with a hurried scanning prompted by impatience to get the findings, and then second and third slow readings as if he were digesting the facts and observations supporting the findings—findings that the Cutting pictures were authentic and significant, but at this point only strongly indicative rather than conclusive. He was most impressed with the changed positions of the Army, CIA, and State.

Call of National Security Council

Looking very tired at the very start of the day, he glanced upward and said, "Jack, call the members of the National Security Council (109:31) and tell them to be here for a meeting at 9 this morning. This should be a good test of their ability to bridge the gap between civilian policymakers and military strategists (74:49) for a judicious coordination of our political and military strength—the elements of national policy (74:56). On your way have my breakfast sent in."

At 8 he watched Cutting and Hartley on television. Surprisingly their discussion lacked the dramatic punch he had anticipated. It was conducted on such a restrained key as almost to be dull. Hartley was remarkably restrained. Perhaps it was because the precise and meticulous Cutting dominated the discussion and obviously strained for an unemotional, matter-of-fact tone. Perhaps it was because, at the outset, the obviously proadministration NBC moderator-commentator had cuttingly reminded Hartley of the effective manner in which the President had met the Abuc threat without invasion and bombing.

And perhaps it was because to the untrained eyes of the viewing public the true meaning of the pictures did not come through. Whatever it was, the President was confident that it would not significantly stir the public any further from its already indicated concern about Carribbea.

Yet, the President was concerned because he knew the Russian Embassy was carefully watching the telecast and he could not know what impact the Cutting pictures had on the Russian experts. Because of this and his appraisal of the lack of appeal of the telecast to the public, he called his press secretary at the end of the program and said, "Joe, the telecast didn't hurt enough to require a reply. I want to play it down in order to avoid tipping our hand in any manner to the Russians. So tell the press that I have no comment on the matter."

Chapter III. National Security Council

At 9 sharp the members of the National Security Council (76:56, 57) (108:30) entered the office of the President—Vice President Jim Landon, Secretary of State Arthur Burgess, Secretary of Defense Carter Topping and Emergency Planning Director Tom Kelly. Others present were the secretariat officials Jack Brandt, Special Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs (109:35), his deputy Carl Smith, and the Executive Secretary Brinkley Walter (109:36)—and Scott Davidson.

"I assume you saw Cutting and Hartley on the NBC telecast at 8," was his manner of opening the meeting. Vice President Landon responded first with "Yes, that damn Hartley has more guts than brains—but he can hurt us at the next election."

Open With CIA Briefing

"We're not here to discuss politics," the President observed acidly, "and we might as well get to the point immediately. Scott (109:40) read the report and then we'll get down to brass tacks and make minimum decisions."

When Scott finished reading the report, the President turned to Defense Secretary Topping (26:121, 128) and said, "Intelligence has thus performed its warning role (48:8) Carter, what's your reaction? Are we in real trouble? Are we in a 'falling domino' position as Eisenhower spoke of on Indochina in 1954? (13:261) I mean military and physical danger—aside from the psychological factor and international prestige."

Secretary of Defense

Topping slowly adjusted his glasses, leaned back in his chair, rubbed his nose and stared upward as though addressing the ceiling instead of the President. No offense was taken by the President as he had become accustomed to this gesture—and had even good naturedly told Topping that sometimes he didn't know whether he was talking to a higher Authority or seeking Divine Guidance for his answer.

In measured words, the Defense Secretary said, "I don't know. I thought the Russians after their quick backdown on Abuc would not push so hard again so soon. But I can't forget how accurate Cutting was on the Russian buildup in Abuc. I never did believe that he got all his information from refugees but strongly suspected much of it came directly from sources inside the Pentagon. Whatever the sources, he was right and made us look bad—and I am not about to discount him again on these pictures."

Secretary of State

Turning to Secretary of State Burgess (29:63, 73), the President said, "How about you, Art? Do you think Khrushchev is preparing for two steps forward after his one step backward on Abuc?"

"I doubt it, Mr. President," Burgess quickly replied. "I think Khrushchev learned his lesson in the Abuc crisis on American credibility that our patience and willingness to go more than half way for negotiated peace is not unlimited and that we will fight when we are convinced we are really threatened. But I'd rather get the thinking of my Kremlinologists (7:17) before giving you a firm opinion."

Emergency Planning Director

Nodding at Emergency Director Kelly, the President said, "It's your turn, Tom. What are your thoughts?"

With his typical disarming candor, Kelly raised his hands outward and sighed, "I'm not an expert on this and you know it, Mr. President. My job is to mobilize the resources to back up the military and diplomatic decisions (32a:59). All I'll say is that I wouldn't put a wooden nickel on that loudmouth Hartley. He tries to yell us into a shooting war yet he violently opposes giving us a cent for civil defense and screams about the waste of taxpayers' money on stockpiling."

CIA Director

The irony of Kelly's remarks about Senator Hartley was reflected in the sardonic smile of the President as he wheeled his chair around to face Scott Davidson, who had been seated to his immediate right for reading the report. "And you, Scott?" he questioned.

"Well, this is getting close to policy decision, Mr. President, and you know the CIA is forbidden from policy formulation. I'm ever mindful of the gap (116:26) or line drawn between intelligence and policy (33:17)."

"Come now, Scott, no one thinks you would try to tell me what to do."

"No, of course not, but you never know when that woman on the Senate Armed Services Committee will ask me when I am before the committee whether I ever made policy decisions—and I want to be able to remain snow white pure so that I can say I only collect and evaluate intelligence and never recommend decisions (15:53, 54, 83). They won't be able to ignore her seniority and keep her off the Subcommittee on the CIA forever."

Visibly irritated, the President glared, "Forget about her—there is such a thing as Executive privilege, you know, that even that relentless woman can't pierce. What do you really think?"

"Frankly, I'm concerned, Mr. President. Perhaps it's because I can't forget that Cutting looked so good so far in advance on the Abuc missile crisis. The photographic intelligence analysts say the Cutting pictures are not proof positive but they hedge and say that they should not be discounted or underrated. They resort to the escape clause distinction between the words 'indicative' and 'conclusive'."

The Vice President

At this point, Vice President Landon, who had remained uncomfortably silent since the President had cut him off with the no politics remark, broke in with "I think that's the nub of our problem here. The Cutting pictures are indicative enough—with his past record of being so right—that we can't discount them. Yet, this is too serious and risky business to accept them as gospel truth and act prematurely and precipitously on them. I suggest that we try to corroborate them before we make any decision on how great the threat is and on what we decide to do."

"You've got a point, Jim," the President admitted, "We've got to double check."

With soft sarcasm, Jim Landon replied, "Oh, that's something I learned from politics—especially that time when I was elected to the Senate by a thin 100 votes."

"Touché, Jim. I had a close one myself. But how do we doublecheck without tipping our hand to the Russians? The only thing about the Senate show and the telecast this morning that worried me was the disclosure of the Cutting pictures."

Defense Boss Topping moved forward to the edge of his chair and volunteered, "I don't think that will be too difficult, Mr. President. We already have the Navy-Marine amphibious exercise going on in the Caribbean (19:6) and specifically in the Windward Passage and Mona Passage—maneuvers that were scheduled and announced several weeks ago. We could have some carrier-based aircraft on those maneuvers accidentally fly off course and do photographic reconnaissance on the western half of Carribbea perhaps without arousing suspicion. To cover the eastern half we could have the Air Force from Ramey Air Force Base make flyovers.

"But that would bring diplomatic repercussions and protests from Carribbea," objected diplomat boss Burgess, "and we run the risk of Carribbea protesting to the OAS, and perhaps the U.N. It could damage our image in Latin America.

"To hell with our image in Latin America," exploded the "Veep," "the greatest impairment we had there was from our timidity on the Quahog Bay invasion fiasco. They'll respect us a damn sight more if we do stand up (68:A-14) as we finally did on the Abuc missile issue before backsliding on the submarine bases there. Sure, they may gripe and criticize us—but only like a younger brother scolds his older and bigger brother."

With obviously hurt feelings, Burgess met this explosion with a muted, "I'm a little tired of having the charge of timidity hurled at the State Department—we have just as much courage as anyone else. I'm only trying to think ahead. Besides, if Carribbea should protest to the OAS, it might give the Russians a cue to protest to the U.N. and thus set up a doubleheader program for stalling. That could hamper you, couldn't it Carter?"

Defense Secretary Topping drawled out a slow, "Yes," and then continued, "But since you are thinking about my department, Art, I'll do a little thinking about yours—you know, under the law we do have to integrate military policy and foreign policy. I suggest that to take the focus off of Caribbea we also have carrier-based planes in the maneuvers make the mistake of flying off course and over Jamaica—and the Air Force planes also fly over the northern Leeward Islands.

"Then if they all protest it will tend to confuse the protests of Carribbea and Russia—or if Jamaica and the Leeward Islands don't protest, Carribbea and Russian protests will be discounted to that extent as far as Latin American countries and the OAS are concerned."

Chapter IV. Initial Presidential decisions and staff implementation

At that point, the President broke in, "I agree with Jim that we immediately doublecheck the Cutting pictures. While I'm not so sure, Carter, that pincer aerial reconnaissance you suggest can be pulled off without incident, I think your plan is sound and I want it carried out today."

President's First Decisions

Turning to his Special Adviser on National Security Affairs, he said, "Jack, jot down these decisions from this meeting.

"First, I want the Secretary of Defense upon leaving this meeting to start the ball rolling on the aerial photo reconnaissance over Carribbea—such surveillance would give me hours of warning, time enough to head off any attack (18:47).

"Second, the Director of Defense Intelligence Agency will have a thorough analysis and evaluation made of photographs taken on these flyovers. Then he shall give a briefing to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Director of the CIA, and the Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs.

"Third, that group shall then give its appraisal of the situation in a report—and make it short.

"Fourth, the Secretary of State shall hold a briefing conference with the Under Secretary of State, the State Department Director of Intelligence, the Deputy Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, and the Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs—in anticipation of diplomatic protests against the flyovers. He shall direct the Kremlinologists (7:17) and the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Politico-Military Affairs to prepare a 'think' memorandum for me as to their educated guesses on what Khrushchev and his Caribbean stooges may do about the flyovers.

"Fifth, the composition of the National Security Council is too limited for pooling the best brains on this threat. While I want the NSC to continue as a body for very candid discussion and debate (31:64), I want to make sure that it is more a planning agency than a bargaining forum (44:145). So I'm setting up an Executive Committee of the National Security Council (40:4). In addition to myself, it will be composed of the regular members of the NSC except the Emergency Planning Director, you as my Special Adviser on National Security Affairs, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Attorney General (40:4), the Under Secretary of State, the Deputy Secretary of Defense, the CIA Director, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs and the Ambassador to the United Nations (36:A1) (101:A21). Notify them immediately. The Executive Committee, in effect my 'War Council' will take over as the agent of the NSC until we have made our final decisions. It will take the place of both the old Operations Coordinating Board (47:71, 72) (42:56, 57) (82:64) (109:36) that was abolished in 1961 (81:649) (105:24) and the NSC Planning Board (43:64) (85:20) (109:37), which has been dormant in my administration as contrasted to the Eisenhower administration."

He then rose from his desk with a "That wraps it up. The Executive Committee will meet as soon as we get the evaluations from the flyovers. Good hunting, Carter—and brace yourself, Art, for the verbal blasts from Khrushchev and his Carribbea stooge. Thank you for coming."

Defense Implementation

Upon return to his office in the Pentagon, Carter Topping summoned to his office Deputy Secretary of Defense Gilbert Roswell (26:121, 129), Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Gen. Tigh Maxwell (26:125, 137), Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency General Mack, Assistant Secretary for Manpower Paul Norman (26:124, 133), and Assistant Secretary for Installations and Logistics Robinson Roderick (26:123, 131) and relayed the instructions of the President.

"Tigh, get the wheels turning immediately on aerial photo reconnaissance flights over Carribbea by Navy F84 Crusaders, Air Force RF-101 Voodoos, and SAC U-2's (106:E5). General Mack, give Tigh a set of the Cutting pictures, for I want special attention by the flyovers to those spots the Cutting pictures allegedly cover. I want a thorough analysis, evaluation, and report within 36 hours.

"We didn't get to any discussion of possible action this morning but the broad alternatives are fairly clear now ranging from doing nothing more than a strong diplomatic protest to full-scale invasion of Carribbea—with the possible intermediary thresholds of air and sea blockade or selective pinpoint bombing. We've got to be ready for anything and plan for the worst and hope for the best. Personally I think the Cutting pictures will hold up.

"So, Tigh, I want the JSC to review all war gaming to date and direct intensive war game planning on all reasonably foreseeable potentials (108:30) in this situation. I want Operation X (invasion of Carribbea if ordered) updated (61:50). Get going on this immediately—together with the drafting of such plans and orders as are necessary for movements of personnel and equipment.

"Robby, get your boys working on a report on the logistics capabilities and the major logistics problems arising from the situation. And Paul, I'll want a thorough manpower appraisal (62:96)—especially our Reserve callup capability with specific attention to the airlift capability of the troop carrier wings of the Air Force Reserve.

"Gil, we've got precious little time if the Cutting pictures do hold up. It's the old story of wanting something yesterday on a time target. But I want all of this I have requested as soon as possible because I'm sure the Executive Committee of the National Security Council will be called into session by the President within a couple of days—and then the discussion on decisions to be made by the President will start. I want as much as you can get me by that time. So you've got the job of riding herd on Tigh, General Mack, Robby, and Paul, and putting together their reports in an overall summary for me. That's it—now get going, fellows."

State Implementation

At the same time. wheels had started turning in the State Department. State Secretary Art Burgess called Under Secretary Jim Batt (29:63, 73) to his office and said, "Jim, I've just come from a NSC meeting at the White House and it looks as though we may be on the brink of the moment of truth with Khrushchev for the Communist buildup in Carribbea may be greater than we have calculated. I want to get committees started considering proposals ranging from invasion to a diplomatic approach to Russia (56:A31). I want you to set up a luncheon conference for me today. Besides yourself have the Under Secretary for Political Affairs (29:63, 74), the Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs (29:64, 78) and the Director of Intelligence and Research (29:63, 75) (80:975) there to brief me on the Carribbea situation.

"Also get the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Politico-Military Affairs (29:63, 75) (79:8) together with our Kremlinologists this afternoon for a brainpicking session among themselves on anticipating the Kremlin's mental processes and reaction to our making flyovers on Carribbea—and if necessary, alternative actions ranging from a strong diplomatic note protesting any Communist military buildup in Carribbea to full scale invasion of Carribbea. Tell them I want a 'think' memorandum from them by noon tomorrow. They'll probably have to work all night."

Thus, the spadework started at Defense and State. It continued around the clock the rest of that day and for all of the next day. For the time being the indians were taking over and the chiefs were the "waiters"—for policy, strategic and tactical decisions had to wait for analysis, appraisal and anticipatory evaluation.

Enemy Threat Confirmed

This was a time of a relative behind-the-scenes silence—a silence of urgency that was to be broken 2 days later by General Mack's telephone call to CIA Director Scott Davidson at an early hour of 6 a.m., with the terse words, "The new pictures have been made and fully analyzed—they back up the Cutting pictures 100 percent." (62:95)

"I'll be at your office at 8 sharp," was the reflex response of Davidson, "I'll get the Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs and bring him with me. Will you see that the Joint Chiefs of Staff are there?"

"Right," Mack replied, "it shouldn't take long for the briefing for it's so clear cut. May take a little time for the group to draft an appraisal report for the President."

Four hours later his National Security Affairs Adviser, Jack Brandt, handed the group's three-page appraisal report to the President. He read it slowly at first without expression, oral or facial—put it down on his desk and then sighed, "It's even worse than what the Cutting pictures indicated. Round up the NSC Executive Committee for a meeting here in an hour—at 11 o'clock sharp. Also have General Mack here."

PART 2. DISSECTION

Chapter V. First meeting of NSC executive committee

There was a full attendance at the meeting. The President opened it with the observation "Aerial reconnaissance photographs taken of Carribbea by our RF-101's in Florida, our B-47's at Ramey Air Force Base in Puerto Rico, our U-2's (87:E11) there and at the Guantanamo Naval Base, and the F-8U Navy planes from the Second Fleet on maneuvers in the Windward Passage, establish beyond any doubt that an offensive buildup in Carribbea has reached a highly developed stage (63:A-15). It represents a threat of very serious proportions to the United States both here at home and abroad."

Intelligence Photographic Briefing

"General Mack will now show you pictures taken during the past 2 days."

Detailed blowups of the pictures were then flashed upon a large screen and General Mack meticulously coordinated his briefing pointer and commentary in analysis of the pictures. It was a study of grim faces when the briefing terminated and the lights were turned back on. The pallor grew even heavier when CIA Director Davidson read the three-page Davidson-Mack report which had triggered the President's call of the meeting.

President Frames the Picture

Again the President took over. "As I see it, gentlemen, the beginning of the decision time starts right now—and time is of the essence (104:26) in these decisions. We have certain obvious alternatives (11:45). On one extreme end, I can make the decision to do nothing—to let matters ride along and hope that the buildup is nothing but a calculated bluff by Khrushchev in the belief that he would not start a nuclear war with attack on this country from Carribbea because if he so decided to attack he could strike us with ICBM's launched from Russia itself. I can make the decision to do nothing for fear of starting something that will eventually escalate into nuclear war.

"On the other extreme, there is the alternative of a sudden, without warning full-scale invasion of Carribbea on the hypothesis that with the military advantage of surprise, we can occupy Carribbea as a quick fait accompli before Russia can take any effective retaliatory action. But this involves the greatest risk of all-out-war—and we must guard against disaster (11:46).

"In-between alternatives are (a) carry a protest to the United Nations, or (b) blockade Carribbea until the offensive military capability is removed, or (c) make air strikes on the offensive sites (61:50).

"Which shall it be—or what shall it be—is there any course that will accomplish the objective of meeting the threat without impairing the security of our country? The floor is open for discussion and for the sake of order, we shall proceed by presidential succession seniority. That means that you are up first, Mr. 'Veep.' "

"Veep" Sizeup

In the characteristic gesture that telegraphed nervousness and concern to his close associates, Jim Landon tightened his mouth, pushed his lip up and backwards at the same time and stiffly rubbed them with the three midfingers of his right hand.

"You will recall, Mr. President," he nasally drawled, "that at the meeting 2 days ago of the NSC, I made two basic observations. The first was that we should make the flyovers immediately to double check on the Cutting pictures. The second was that we should do so regardless of the risks—that it was about time we shed our seeming timidity and took on a posture of courage—that our image in Latin America and the world had been weakened far too much by our past caution.

"We shed our timidity at first on Abuc and forced the Russian pullout of missiles and bombers. We established credibility with Khrushchev. But then we backslid as we did nothing when it was discovered that the Russians had missile submarine bases in Abuc under the guise of fishing bases (2:18) and retained Russian aircraft and military forces under the defensive facade. We lost much of the credibility we had gained (18a:35).

"I think the worst decision that we could make now would be the decision to do nothing—to take a cautious wait-and-see decision and to hope for the better. For there comes a time when we must stand. Thank God, we did stand in Abuc up to the point of the submarine bases—but that will mean nothing if we do not stand now.

"I'm not so sanguine now as to advocate that we make a full-scale invasion of Carribbea—because I want to hear what the Joint Chiefs of Staff say first. But if the choice is between do nothing and coast or invade as soon as possible, I'm for invading—because there is only one direction for coasting—and that is down hill. That's my say in a nutshell."

Showing no reaction, the President looked at Art Burgess and simply said, "Your time at bat, Art."

Secretary of State Urges Restraint

Tapping his knee with his fingers, the Secretary of State moisted his lips and said, "Well, Mr. President, I guess that I'm ingrained with the traditional diplomatic attitude that all differences should be settled by agreement at the conference table rather than by bullets on the battlefield, to use archaic war terms. In my first task to identify the crucial international problem (112:64), I must first stress peace through negotiation.

"I disagree fundamentally with the Vice President, for I think the worst thing we can do would be to invade—to be guilty of starting the warfare. It would violate our deepest traditions (19:6). I think even if we pulled it off with complete victory and without any retaliation of force from Khrushchev, we would still be the loser—for we would have lost the impeccable reputation of never having started a war—of never having been the attacker—and we would lose what remaining confidence, prestige and influence we have not only in Latin America, but throughout the entire world as well. We must maintain a decent respect for the opinions of mankind (37:5) (102:14).

"Fortunately, I don't think that we are faced with the disastrous choice of nuclear war or humiliating surrender. I think we can take action that will sober and restrain Khrushchev. That action is to lodge a complaint in the forum of world opinon, the listening post of the human race (115:71)—the United Nations—against the Russians and Carribbea—to exercise our right to bring the matter before the Security Council of the U.N. (47:A-4) and to demand that the U.N. send an inspection team into Carribbea.

"By doing this I think we would expose Khrushchev to the world—and we would win a psychological victory of significant proportions—significant in that it would bring home to the people of Latin America, as nothing else has before, the Communist threat against their own security and freedom. I think, and so do my Kremlinologists, that this would have a significantly enough psychological effect on Latin American countries as to make Khrushchev stop and pause. Our Ambassador to the U.N. shares this opinion.

"I would propose that we concurrently call for a session of the Organization of American States and push for an OAS resolution condemning the buildup and expressing solidarity in opposition to it. We must recognize that foreign policy and defense policy are directed toward the world environment (84:47). My Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs, our Ambassador to the OAS, and my Politico-Military Affairs staff have expressed confidence that we would get solid backing on this in the OAS.

"Even if these estimates should be wrong, we would still have open the alternatives for military action. But I do agree with the Vice President on one point—that I'm not irrevocably wedded to this position because I first want to hear what the Joint Chiefs of Staff—and the Secretary of Defense—have to say—particularly about what military strength we have to back up any stronger foreign relations policy than that which I have now proposed."

Defense Secretary Favors Firmness

Now it was Defense Secretary Carter Topping's turn in the line of presidential succession. He looked at the Secretary of State and directed his initial remarks to him instead of the President with "Art, have you received any protests from Carribbea or Khrushchev on the flyovers?"

"No," replied Burgess, "and frankly I'm very surprised. There hasn't been a peep from them. I think that shows that they are not trigger happy—and that we can have some hope that they are amenable to reason."

Scowling, his face flushed but the knuckles of his hand white with tenseness, the usually impeccably cool Topping, with the cutting incisiveness of an M-60 machinegun, said, "Well, I've received a complaint from them—not in words but in a missile that killed one of my boys now in a watery Windward Passage grave with his U-2 plane. They were trigger happy enough to pull the trigger on him. I received the confirmation of this just before I left the Pentagon for this meeting." (2:18) (57:A2)

Then turning to the President, Topping said, "To me, Mr. President this is more than the loss of a young, heroic Air Force major. It is a clear indication that Khrushchev and his stooges in Carribbea are acting instead of talking—that they are not going to be restrained by diplomatic words alone—that the only thing they will understand and pause about now is action on our part.

"In my opinion, taking this up in the U.N. and the OAS first before acting will not only not restrain them—but will tip our hand and will give them more time to stall and delay us—and in the meantime to accelerate their own buildup in Carribbea.

"I can tell you now that we certainly have the strength to restrain them and whip them if they choose to fight. For this time we will be fighting in an area of greatest advantage to us rather than in a place to their own advantage like Berlin, Laos, or Vietnam.

"I don't think we will have to resort to a full-scale invasion—at least not at the very beginning. I think we can take action short of that. But I do think that we will have to take some military action instead of wishful-hoping diplomacy alone in a United Nations that has amply demonstrated its difficulty in achieving quick response—or in an OAS which, with the exception of the Abuc crisis, has failed to give us solid backing.

"I think we should act first and then take the diplomatic steps—for I think the OAS will be more likely to support us after we have acted unilaterally than if we go hat in hand in advance begging their help.

"I think we have more than one choice between invasion and the U.N. We could invoke a full blockade—or a limited blockade. Or we could decide on selective, pinpoint bombing of offensive points. But I have not reached a firm conclusion in my own mind."

Treasury Secretary Sides With Diplomacy

Now it was Treasury Secretary George Dawson's turn. A direct look from the President was sufficient signal to him. "My judgment is questionable on two points, Mr. President. First, Treasury has little basis for informed judgment as compared to State and Defense. Second, as a former Under Secretary of State, we all know that I am oriented to the diplomatic approach on a matter like this. I agree with Art. I think we should exhaust our diplomatic potentials before resorting to military action—but with a warning in that diplomacy that we will resort to military action if necessary."

Attorney General Raises Moral Issue

"What's the judgment of our legal expert?" the President asked of Attorney General Ken Roberts.

"Mr. President, as a lawyer I think in terms of the legality of any action that we take—and actually that means thinking in terms of the morality of any action that we take," was Roberts' solemn response (19:6).

"The Secretary of State made a good point when he said that we should not stain the impeccable moral reputation and prestige that we have of never having started a war. I agree with him—but I don't think he is quite accurate because our country does have one stain in its record and that was the Mexican War. In my travels around the world that is the one argument thrown against me by the Commies that I have never been able to deny.

"For us to attack Carribbea—either by full-scale invasion or by limited, pinpoint bombing—without warning, would be just as immoral as the Japanese sneak attack on Pearl Harbor (87:E11). It would impair the confidence of the other nations in the world against us for a long, long time. And as a nation we would have a guilt complex for a long time. It just isn't worth the military tactical advantage of surprise.

"Whatever we do—I feel strongly that we should clearly and firmly establish in advance a legal and moral basis for our action," he concluded.

Impact of the Attorney General's words was clear from the prolonged silence among the group. That silence was not broken until the President said, "I don't think there is need for any further discussion from the rest of you present since the rest of the Executive Committee are under those who have already spoken—that is, unless any of you who have not spoken do have a point you would like to make."

Chairman of the JCS Speaks Up

At that point, Tigh Maxwell, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, stood up erectly and said, "Mr. President, as a military man I am not unmindful of the moral obligations we have to mankind and I am proud of the moral history of our country. I want to keep it as high as possible. But there is more than one way to measure morality. It is not immoral to shoot a murderer in self defense. It is not immoral to attack those who, if given more time and further opportunity, will kill all freedom and liberty in the world. The United States must demonstrate by actions as well as by words that we are militarily invincible while supremely devoted to peace." (34:25)

U.N. Ambassador Fires Back

Almost simultaneously as Tigh Maxwell sat down, Steve Adler, the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, was on his feet. This was the second moment of personal difference tension in the discussion and the tremor of Adler's voice threatened an emotional explosion as he said, "Mr. President, we Americans are not the sole judges of morality—and we cannot fashion and shape the standards of morality to suit our own convenience and expediency. Nor can I agree with Defense Secretary Topping that the United Nations has amply demonstrated its difficulty in achieving quick response. I would recall your attention to the magnificently quick response that the United Nations gave when South Korea was invaded by the Communists.

"But that was accomplished only because the Russians had absented themselves at the time in a boycott they were carrying on against the United Nations," broke in Topping, "had the Russians been present they would have used their veto in the Security Council to block and stall action. Look what they did when the Hungarian uprising was brought before the U.N."

Adler then shot back with, "Well, if you decide to invade don't keep me in the dark as you did on the Quahog Bay invasion fiasco and yet look to me to defend such a policy in the U.N." (90:B11)

President Steps In

Sensing that the discussion was about to shift from an objective discussion of policies to a subjective clash of personalities, the President incisively cut in with "Gentlemen, this is no time for the luxury of polemics—or for 'gales of controversy' (67:50) as Senator Jack Henry has put it. Nor is it a time for final decisions.

"But the discussion has been constructive in its brutal frankness. And I could not have asked for greater productiveness than this session has given me. Frankly, it has resulted in steering my tentative decisions in specific directions. Other than to say I am prepared to use force, but prefer to use the threat of force first (101:A21), I am not yet ready to indicate what those directions are—simply because I will not make final decisions until I have more information and more specific evaluation."

Chapter VI. Task forces

"In order to achieve this, I am now appointing five task forces (105:24) to work from the close of this meeting continuously until I call another session of the Executive Committee. I want each task force to be prepared at all times with a succinct but thorough report of its evaluations and recommendations to me in the mission assigned to it. Those missions are clear from the titles of the task forces."

Intelligence Task Force

"Task Force No. 1 will be the Intelligence Task Force. It will be chairmaned by the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, and its members will be the Director of Defense Intelligence Agency, the Director of Intelligence and Research of the State Department (121:5), and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. It will be in effect the U.S. Intelligence Board (32:39) minus the AEC and military services representatives (5:7). It will report to me through Jack Brandt, my Special Adviser on National Security Affairs."

Diplomatic-Political Task Force

"Task Force No. 2 will be the Diplomatic-Political Task Force. It will be chairmaned by the Under Secretary of State with the Vice Chairmen being the Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs and the Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs (6:1-6) (23:23) (26:123, 132). Its membership will be divided into two teams. Team A will be the Soviet Affairs Team captained by the Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs (29:65, 78) and composed of our Ambassador to the United Nations (29:70, 88), the Department of Defense Regional Director for the Sino-Soviet Region (26:124), the State Department Director of the Office of Soviet Union Affairs (29:65, 68), and Art Burgess' 'Kremlinologists.'

"Team B will be the Western Hemisphere Affairs Team captained by the Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs and composed of our Ambassador to the Organization of American States (29:561), the Department of Defense Regional Director for the Western Hemisphere Region (26:132), and the State Department Director of the Office of Caribbean and Mexican Affairs (29:64, 78).

"Task Force No. 2 will report to me through the Secretary of State."

Military Task Force

"Task Force No. 3 will be the Military Task Force. It will be chairmaned by the Deputy Secretary of Defense and the Vice Chairman will be the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and its members will be the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Installations and Logistics, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, and the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Politico-Military Affairs (79:8) (105:24). It will report to me through the Secretary of Defense."

Legal Task Force

"Task Force No. 4 will be the Legal Task Force. It will be chairmaned by the Deputy Attorney General (20:6) and its members will be the Legal Adviser of the State Department (29:63, 75) (20:6) (121:6), the General Counsel of the Department of Defense (26:125, 134), and the Special Counsel to the President (19:6). It will report to me through the Attorney General."

Information Task Force

"Task Force No. 5 will be the Information Task Force. It will be chairmaned by the Director of the U.S. Information Agency and its members will be the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs (23:25), the Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs (26:124, 133) (29:64, 76), the Special Assistant to the President for Congressional Relations, and my Press Secretary. It will report to me through the Vice President.

"I shall expect all task forces to consult, confer and cross-check with each other as may be found necessary or desirable—and I shall expect each task force to prepare a program of implementation in its own area of action once the basic decisions have been made.

"I want the Strategic Air Command put on alert 3 and all other Armed Forces on alert 4 (18:47).

"Be prepared for call at any time, gentlemen. I don't want a case of mixture of improvisation and panic as on Dienbienphu (100:35). That concludes the meeting."

One by one the group quickly filed out of the President's office with a sense of urgency to get the task forces into action. The only remark made was that of the Secretary of State that "Unless we keep our wits, we may be fighting for our lives within a week." (61:54)

Task Forces at Work

Within the hour, all five task forces (86:47) were hard at work—giving real meaning to the observation that "Defense and foreign policy are a seamless web." (44:133) No. 1 (Intelligence) started with the reports of the latest U-2 flyovers of Carribbea and then turned to consideration of intelligence which might give clues as to what might be the objective of Khrushchev and what other steps might be anticipated. Was this merely a squeeze play directed to put pressure to get us out of Berlin? Was it a further move of the Soviets to control the major narrow water passages of the world—the Skaggerak, the Dardanelles, Suez, the Malacca Straits, Panama (49:83, 92) and this time the Windward Passage and the Mona Passage?

Team A of Task Force 2 was brainpicking its Kremlinologists on the possible reaction of "Khrushchev and Company" to each of the alternative courses of action set forth by the President. It then turned to discussion of what had to be done with respect to our allies—especially those of NATO—on these possible courses of action. Should we confer with them before making decisions or should we act unilaterally—but with advance notice and how short notice? Should we bypass the United Nations?

The other half of Task Force 2, Team B, began its discussion with the anticipated reaction of Latin American countries to each of the alternatives and quickly came to agreement that invasion or air strike would alienate these countries in varying degrees. On the other hand, there was general agreement that we should avoid the appearance of asking their permission to act for while that might please their national egos it could indicate weakness and timidity in our leadership.

Defense Secretary Topping, upon return to the Pentagon, called in his special assistant, his comptroller, and his Assistant Secretary on Manpower and gave them instructions for "crash" action. The special assistant was instructed to prepare a memorandum on the economic effects of each of the alternative courses of action. The comptroller was instructed to set the wheels in motion for all financial authority necessary (62:96) The Assistant for Manpower was instructed to draw up necessary papers for a callup of the Reserve and National Guard (62:96).

Task Force No. 3 (Military) began with a review and continued updating of Operation X (61:50), an invasion plan of Carribbea that had first been drawn up 3 months past. It was brought up to the hour with revisions for specified places and timing. Concurrently, it gave instructions that each of the alternative military courses of action listed by the President be war gamed.

After some discussion, it was decided that inasmuch as any military action would be essentially sea and air—at least at the outset before placing any ground forces on Carribbea—the Chief of Naval Operations be designated the operational commander (7:26) (61:50), subject to final decision by the Commander in Chief. In turn, his principal deputies would be the Commander of the Atlantic Fleet (CINCLANT), the Commanding General of the Army Forces, Atlantic (CINCARLANT), and the Commanding General of the Air Forces, Atlantic (CINCAFLANT) (96:11).

It was further decided that sea, air, and land forces should be immediately deployed into pre-positions designed to carry out any of the listed alternative courses of military action instead of waiting until the decision was made by the President on which course of action to take initially. This entailed the movement of Army divisions, Air Force units, and naval forces to the southeastern United States—a concentration of Air Force units at Ramey Air Force Base in Puerto Rico—rushing marines to the Guantanamo Naval Base—and the positioning of naval vessels in the Caribbean area, particularly around the Windward Passage and the Mona Passage and that portion of the North Atlantic between the two passages.

Task Force No. 4 (Legal) first indulged in self-analysis and concluded that its mission was more than just determining the legal aspects of each of the alternative courses, but instead included the drafting of such proclamations (61:52), statements or addresses that the President might make.

Task Force No. 5 (Information) in very short order came to the conclusion that its mission was to get the word out once the final decision had been made—and to not only get the word to the American and foreign press in such form as the President decided but to the key Members of Congress—and to the people of the Caribbean and Latin America areas, especially to the people of Carribbea.

"Cross-Fertilization"

Once all task forces had gotten well underway on their own identifications of their missions and plans to execute those missions, a "cross-fertilization" of inquiries and exchange of opinions between the task forces set in. It was this "cross-fertilization" that actually, even though unconsciously, not only informally coordinated the work of the task forces—but, more important, veered them gradually to some grounds of agreement despite their differing original courses.

For example, the Kremlinologists of Team A of Task Force 2 (diplomatic-political) contacted Task Force 4 (legal) stressing the importance of the legality factor with the report that the Russians "had a feeling for 'legality'" (19:6) and that a good legal basis and presentation would undoubtedly have a sobering effect on the Russians.

Team B (Western Hemisphere affairs) members of Task Force 2 advised Task Force 5 (information) of its opinion that getting information to the people of the Caribbean and Latin American areas, as soon as possible after the principal decision had been made, was extremely desirable psychologically. They requested Task Force 5 to develop plans for requests to selected American radio stations to beam special broadcasts in Spanish once the decision had been made and approval given by the President.

Task Force 2 (diplomatic-political) and Task Force 3 (military) were continuously calling Task Force 1 (intelligence) for the latest intelligence not only on U-2, RF-101 and F-8U photos of the critical sites and area but also for related intelligence with respect to the Soviets and Latin America. These three task forces exchanged opinions not only as to intelligence clues on Khrushchev's real intentions on Carribbea itself but also as a part of the overall pattern on tactics and strategy.

Task Force 2 queried Task Force 3 on the extent of our military strength to back up alternative diplomatic actions, threats and commitments. In turn, Task Force 3 queried Task Force 2 for frank appraisal of what support we could expect from our allies—specifically NATO—as to the best evaluations of their intentions on giving military support. Would they be alienated by a blockade? If the matter was taken first to the U.N. and the OAS for debate before action, how long would it take? How much time would be taken by diplomatic maneuvering—precious time in which military forces could be deployed and prepositioned?

Task Force Reporting

The chairman of each task force reported at least every 4 hours to the Designate for further reporting to the President. These Designates, in turn, did two things—first, they relayed the reports with their personal observations to Jack Brandt, the President's Special Adviser on National Security Affairs—second, they met with each other twice a day to report to each other, to discuss and exchange opinions.

Their reports were then amalgamated into one report prepared by Brandt for the President (43:65). From time to time, the President called one or more of them in to ask questions and to consult further—and to request further information.

Time Closes In

This process continued around the clock for 4 days. In midafternoon of the fourth day, CIA Director Scott Davidson went to the office of Jack Brandt, the President's Special Adviser on National Security Affairs and with grim face said to Brandt, "Our decision planning time has about run out. I've got to see the President."

With automatic reflex, Brandt said, "Let's go," and they walked directly to the office of the President where they were immediately ushered in. As soon as the door closed, Davidson tersely said, "Mr. President, our time for deliberation has run out. The aerial photo reconnaissance (7:18–25) (86: 36–41) (108:29) over Carribbea strongly indicates that the Russian buildup is going at such an amazing pace that their missiles will be fully installed and operational and their bombers will be completely assembled and operational within a week." (2:16)

"That settles it then," the President concluded, "Jack, call a meeting of the Executive Committee of the NSC for tomorrow morning at 9 o'clock. Tell the task forces to be prepared with their final recommendations for tomorrow will be D-day—decision day—for me."

Chapter VII. Task forces' recommendations

The next morning the President opened the meeting on the dot of 9 o'clock with the short statement of "Gentlemen, as you may know, photo reconnaissance over Carribbea in the past 4 days reveals that the Russians and their Carribbea puppets will be ready to go operationally with their missiles and bombers there against us within a week (2: 16). And as you may have guessed, I have not finally decided—but I can no longer delay my final decision. That is what this meeting is for—to hear from the task forces—and the Cabinet members under whom they have worked. We'll start first with the CIA Director heading Task Force No. 1—the Intelligence Task Force. Speak up, Scott."

Intelligence recommends air strikes

CIA Director Davidson pounded and emptied his pipe on the ash tray stand adjacent to his chair as he started with "There is basically nothing that I can add on behalf of the Intelligence Task Force to the briefing that I gave you the other day—other than to state that the situation has grown graver. In our opinion, the Carribbea-Russian forces will be in an operational position, at their present rate of buildup, to strike us within a week or 10 days at the latest. If we are going to take any action other than a protest, we are going to have to take it within the next 2 or 3 days. We just can't wait even a week.

"Were we of the Intelligence Task Force making the decision, we would act first and talk later. For in our opinion, thus far, talk has gotten us practically nowhere. We recommend selective air strikes not only on the missiles (87:E11) (98:A2) and the bombers in place on Carribbea—but also air strikes on the oil refineries and petroleum depots to cripple general operations in Carribbea—strikes to be made without warning for our intelligence estimates are that any advance threat or notice would result in the Russians flying heavy concentrations of their own aircraft in Carribbea ahead of us if they can.

"We believe that the best course of action is fait accompli because we have again lost credibility with the Russians and this is the action that is necessary to restore that credibility. That's our recommendation."

It was clear from the expression on the President's face that this recommendation troubled him as he turned to the Diplomatic-Political Task Force No. 2 Chairman, the Under Secretary of State, and said, "All right, now let's have the advice of the Diplomatic-Political Task Force."

Diplomats Recommend Political Negotiation

Slowly clearing his throat, the Under Secretary of State, in the formal tone that had been ingrained in him as a career foreign service officer, said, "Mr. President, we believe that we must arrive at the kind of measured response that would remove the threat by (a) posing a minimum risk to ourselves and our allies, (b) involve a minimum danger of escalation toward higher orders of violence, (c) be consistent with our treaty obligations, and (d) not contravene the principles for which we stand as a nation. (9:A12) (107:1)

"Mr. President, Task Force No. 2 is of the firm opinion that we should make at least one more try at reason with the Russians. We prefer political negotiation to military action. I want to point out, in this respect, that this preference is fully concurred in by the Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs (10:20), who is regarded as the key person at the crossroads of State-Defense-JCS relations (79:3)—and between the two focal points for 'military' and 'political' advice (109:39).

"To take military action against Carribbea, either by invasion or by selected air strikes, would not only cost us friends and allies in Latin America (61:50), but would brand us as an aggressor in the eyes of the world. It would probably result in the killing and injury of Russian military and technical personnel in Carribbea, which could lead to nuclear retaliation on our country by Khrushchev and we would be escalated into that which we all want to avoid—an all-out nuclear war. Public support for U.S. foreign policy to be effective is absolutely necessary (38:59). We doubt if the American public favors an invasion.

"We recommend that we take the case to the United Nations and to the Organization of American States and show that the peace of the world is threatened, and the security of the Western Hemisphere is jeopardized, by the Russian buildup in Carribbea. We believe that the United Nations will face up to the situation and act just as it did in Korea—and that the OAS member states will at least see the threat and solidly back us."

Military Recommend Invasion

No reaction was registered by the President, who then said, "How about the Military Task Force?"

The Deputy Secretary of Defense stood and said, "Mr. President, it is the considered judgment of the Military Task Force that military action is mandatory and urgent. We do not believe that the Russians will respond to political negotiation. We agree with the conclusion that we have again lost our credibility with the Russians because we have bent over backwards so long in prolonged talk in this protracted conflict of the cold war that they doubt that we will act. We believe that military action is necessary to restore that credibility.

"Nor do we believe that we can obtain the necessarily effective reaction and prompt action in taking our case to the United Nations or the Organization of American States. In the first place, we have seen how our traditional allies—specifically our NATO allies—acted when we tried to persuade them not to trade with Abuc a few years ago and how they initially protested our quarantine as violation of freedom of the seas (16:35).

"We have seen how the so-called neutral nations, who held themselves in such righteous indignation as the moral arbiters of the world, how they were so silent when Khrushchev resumed open-air nuclear tests (13:56) and when Red China invaded the leading neutralist nation, India. And we have seen in the past how difficult it was to gain support from the members of the OAS through attempted persuasion—but how, when we exercised our power and acted, they fell in step behind us in solid unity.

"No, we believe that military action is absolutely necessary in this crisis. For further detail on why and what action we believe should be taken, with your permission, I would like to defer now to the Vice Chairman of the Military Task Force, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Maxwell."

As the President nodded his approval, Gen. Tigh Maxwell strode over to a map on an easel and picked up a pointer. "Mr. President," he said, "what I am about to say is the unanimous opinion of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (26:125, 136). Khrushchev has caught us with our southern flank exposed (71:8). Your attention is first called to this narrow water strait between Carribbea and Cuba—the Windward Passage—and to the Mona Passage between Carribbea and Puerto Rico. We believe that among the principal reasons for Khrushchev's grab for Carribbea is his overall strategy of gaining control of the narrow water passages throughout the world—the Suez Canal, Gibraltar, the Skaggerak, the Dardanelles, the Malacca Straits, the Panama Canal (49:83, 92)—and the Windward Passage and the Mona Passage here.

"If he remains in Carribbea, not only does he present an immediate threat of missile and bomber attacks on our country from Caribbea (68:A–14)—but also a longer range threat of taking over control of the waters approaching the Panama Canal. Not only that, he would greatly neutralize and offset the present military-geographical defensive advantage that we have against unfriendly Caribbea in the Guantanamo Naval Base to her west and Puerto Rico to her east. So much for the Western Hemisphere.

"Now let us look at Europe—and specifically at Berlin. If Khrushchev establishes nuclear-capable, operational missile, bomber and submarine forces in Carribbea, he offsets the present wide advantage and superiority that we have over Russia on ICBM operational capability (99:A15). By such a military 'leap frog' action he will drastically change the missile balance of power (120:46) presently from one of a decided inferiority to one of a clear superiority for Russia.

"For if he moves to take Berlin and to push us out and we threaten to resist, he can then point to his missiles in Caribbea poised to zero in on us. Then we have the choice of backing down or not only of fighting a nuclear war in a place of his choosing but also of his having the ability to rain nuclear bombs on us that he does not now have.

"We do not believe that he is prepared to go to war now—and particularly in an area to his own disadvantage—in the Caribbean Sea—which has been regarded as an American ocean. But if Mr. Khrushchev is ready to go to nuclear war over Carribbea now, he is ready to go to war now or at any future time (61:16) in other places throughout the world far more to his advantage geographically. If he is going to launch missiles from Carribbea, he will simultaneously launch them from the Soviet Union itself (66:A–23).

"We think he's bluffing—otherwise he has picked the wrong war in the wrong area and at the wrong time. And we think he is bluffing from a combination of his own desperate weakness of ICBM inferiority (99:A15) and the lack of our own credibility in his mind. He's bluffing like we did on the ultimatum for him to get out of Laos and when we did nothing when he called that bluff. We think the tables are reversed now.

"We believe we must take military action to call his bluff—again to restore our credibility—and to prevent him from drastically changing the balance of military power by this one bold, desperate attempted leapfrog, this attempted blackmail (55:60).

"That action can range from an air and sea blockade to all-out invasion. We think the most realistic step is the most unpleasant step—invasion. For even if we do blockade and the Russian missiles and bombers are taken out of Carribbea, the Communist government will still be there—and still constitute a potential threat to the peace of the Western Hemisphere and ultimately to our own security."

"We have the necessary capacity (54:A–10) and strength (59:A1, A4) (96:11) (117:A–1, A–5) (96:11) (117:A–1, A–5) for a successful, full-scale invasion (20:37), which could be completed within a few days—or, at the most, a month, if the resistance is strong (61:50)."

General Maxwell then gently laid his pointer at the base of the map and walked back to his seat.

The President then pointed to the Deputy Attorney General and said, "You're up now for the Legal Task Force."

Lawyers Recommend Blockade

"Mr. President, the members of the Legal Task Force are neither military experts nor political-diplomatic experts, so we are somewhat embarrassed to recommend outside the legal aspects. But you have asked us to—and we will—and admittedly with our opinion being dominated by the legal aspects of military action or political negotiation.

"We are opposed to invasion because we do not believe that there is a sound legal basis for it. We are a highly moral-conscious Nation and people—and 'legal' is but another term for 'moral'—for what is right morally. For the same reason, we are opposed to selected air strikes or any other similar military action. We do not want the United States placed in the position of a Pearl Harbor in reverse.

"On the other hand, we can see a sound legal basis for an air and sea blockade against military shipments as contrasted to food, shelter, and medicinal shipments to Carribbea. It would particularly have a sound legal basis if we were to place the proposed blockade before the United Nations and the Organization of American States for their approval. This is what we recommend."

Information Recommendations

All eyes then shifted to the Director of the U.S. Information Agency, the Chairman of the Information Task Force, as the President nodded in his direction. His brow wrinkled and his eyebrows shifted up and down as he looked up with a reticent smile and through the smoke of the ever-present cigarette that had become his trademark in the past pre-Government days with TV audiences.

"I feel as though I was about to do a TV documentary, Mr. President. My Information Task Force is sharply divided on the big decision, although it is unanimous on what to do once that big decision is made, whatever it is. We're practically evenly divided between military action and political negotiation. Perhaps the Deputy Attorney General has given us the easy way out with the middle compromise his task force recommends.

"But, of this, we are unanimous and sure. Whatever the decision—it must be given to as many people as quickly as it can be (93:1, 2)—so that they may know why we have made the decision that we have. And it should be announced as dramatically as possible and with the maximum impact.

"In a democratic society the public must be kept informed of the major issues in national defense policy. It is extremely important that public opinion in our own country vigorously support the decision. It is extremely important that the message be gotten across to the people of Latin America (35:12)—and especially to the people of Carribbea. We must get the message through to the Russian people. We must use all the facilities at our command. Even in this crisis, the truth must be our guide, but dreams must be our goal—dreams of peace (114:4).

"Not only are the media of communication of great importance—but for impact purposes, the forum or forums of communication are of the greatest importance—for the atmosphere, the arena and the surroundings of the message can well control the mental and emotional manner in which the message is received.

"For that reason, we recommend that the President make the announcement of his decision—what it is and why—in the world's foremost international forum, the United Nations. As soon as the decision has been made, we recommend that the President request a time to go before the General Assembly of the United Nations to make an address of utmost importance. We further recommend that such address be televised to the world through our communications satellites Telstar II and Skyfon, thus taking advantage of the U.N. multilingual concurrent translations. We recommend that the Vice Persident shortly thereafter go before the Organization of American States with substantially the same message on behalf of the President.

"Finally, not only do we recommend that all Government broadcast facilities such as VOA (92:1), the AFRTS (78:76) and RIAS (111:86) be assigned to such broadcasts, but also that powerful American commercial non-Government radio stations, that can beam broadcasts to Latin America, be used for such purposes, preferably through voluntary cooperation—but mandatory, if necessary, through national security authority. Any other recommendations we have, Mr. President, deal only with detailed implementation of your decision—and add nothing to the discussion at this time."

PART 3. DECISION

Chapter VIII. NSC members' recommendation

At that point the President pivoted his chair around to face Jack Brandt, his Special Adviser on National Security Affairs, and said, "Jack, you have been coordinating the work of the task forces—and I must say that, in my judgment, the task forces have done an excellent job in spite of their different conclusions and recommendations—they have gone forward with vigor—and you have had the best overall knowledge of the work and the recommendations. Because of that I want to have your opinion and recommendations."

Special Adviser on National Security Affairs

Edging to the front of his chair and biting his lower lip, Brandt said, "It may appear that I'm bellicose—and maybe I am—maybe I'm on the 'hard' side between the division of your 'hard' and 'soft' advisers (55:60)—but the more I think on this and the more information that we get, the more I am convinced that this is really the moment of truth in the cold war up to this point—and that we have no choice but to take a calculated risk of nuclear confrontation that admittedly has a dangerous chance of escalating into nuclear war.

"In my opinon, Khrushchev is either proceeding from great strength or great weakness. If he is proceeding from great strength, then I think he is willing to start a nuclear war now or at any time in the future. So that I don't think that in the long run any temporizing expedient such as political negotiation in the United Nations will either bring peace or enhance our national security.

"It only delays the day of reckoning. And a delay now, that permits him missile, bomber, and submarine operational capability in Carribbea, strengthens him and weakens us in the balance-of-power struggle.

"Because we are so far ahead of him on ICBM strength (99:A15), I am convinced he is leading from weakness. We have the conventional strength with which to invade Carribbea—and I think the term 'liberate' is more accurate and better psychologically than the term 'invade.' Khrushchev doesn't have the conventional strength to match ours—and especially with his enormous problem of logistics, as he would have to fight far from his source of supplies, while we fight almost in our own backyard.

"Thus, it seems to me that the only choice left for him is to decide whether Carribbea is sufficiently in the national interest of Russia—in the long-term strategy of communism—to fight a nuclear war. I don't think it is—because not only do we now have a great ICBM superiority over him but a clear nuclear superiority (120:46).

"No, I think he'll back down—and run away to confront us another day at some other place of greater advantage to him—just like he did in the Abuc crisis. In short, he has again doubted our credibility because we didn't push against his submarine—phony fishing—bases in Abuc. I think this is the chance to prove our credibility to him again. If we don't do it now—it will be that much harder later on—and perhaps fatally impossible.

"Im for all-out liberation military action on Carribbea instead of timid political negotiation. Any in-between action such as blockade or air strikes is only a difference in degree for once we take an act of confrontation, the risk of war is one. The principle is the same as declaration of war from the standpoint of risk—the difference is only in degree."

Decision Count-Down

The President slowly turned his chair as if the words of Brandt had fallen very heavily upon him. There was a long silence in the room as the President thought of how the survival of the world in the next few days depended upon his wisdom and courage—upon how well he could guess—and upon the frightening unknown of how sane and prudent a man Khrushchev really was—or was not—through all of his bluster and bluff. Only the President could make the decision (109:41).

"We must bring this discussion to a close—and I am going to do this by asking the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General, and the Vice President in that order to express their opinions and recommendations. My mind is made up sufficiently at this point to disclose my decision to you when they have finished—but I want to hear them one more time because what they have to say may change my mind in some respects and in some details. Art Burgess, will you start it off and make it as short as possible?"

Secretary of State—Diplomacy

The Secretary of State emitted a sigh audible throughout the room and started with "My position is not easy, Mr. President, but I still believe that there must be left an ounce of reasonableness in Khrushchev. Perhaps we could discuss with him the possibility of our dismantling our missile bases in Turkey if he will do the same in Abuc (1:A21) (69:A25) (75:B–1) (98:A1), as suggested by Columnist Pearlipp and the conservative press in London (50:404).

"Russian history shows a clear pattern of Russia itself refraining from initiating military action except from fear (64:A–13). I do not think we have yet reached the disastrous point where our differences cannot be discussed at the diplomatic table—where we have to start shooting instead of talking. If we shoot, then I think we will destroy the last shred of any reasonableness left in Khrushchev. He will shoot back and the escalation game will be on and will not end until all-out nuclear war has perhaps killed off the entire world.

"I do not like to wear my war record on my sleeve—but I have no choice at this time. As a holder of the Congressional Medal of Honor for action in World War II, I say with all the sincerity of which I am capable that we should not take military action—we should not act unilaterally—we should take our case to the United Nations and the Organization of American States."

Secretary of Defense—Controlled Response and Options

The depth and warmth of feeling with which Secretary of State Arthur Burgess spoke was in sharp contrast to the detached, unemotional, and seemingly cold tone in which Defense Secretary Topping spoke. To some, he was seemingly an electronic, mechanical computer that had taken on human form (62:95). The few close, close friends he had, protested that such characterization did not do the man justice (62:99). But throughout the discussions on the crisis, his image was certainly more than of an electronic machine than that of a mortal human being with emotions and fears.

"It is my concept, Mr. President," he began, "that while this crisis presents grave danger to us, it also gives us a golden opportunity (92:96) in more than one respect. First, it is a golden opportunity because we can make a stand—a confrontation—in an area of the world to our advantage and to the disadvantage of Khrushchev—militarily because of the logistics factor—weaponwise because of our conventional advantage in equipment, in our strike command, in our naval control of the Caribbean—and psychologically in the deeply instilled feeling of the Latinos against foreign control.

"Second, it gives us a golden opportunity to reconvince Khrushchev, beyond any doubt, of our credibility—and I mean specifically nuclear credibility, which the woman Senator alleged we have again lost when we failed to push against his submarine bases in Abuc. I must admit that she apparently was right to some extent because otherwise Khrushchev would not have had the nerve to attempt making Carribbea a submarine, missile, and nuclear bomber base against us. For if we stand—with our conventional superiority at this particular place on the globe—Khrushchev cannot hope to fight a conventional war with us. He then has no choice but nuclear war or a backdown.

"That brings me to the third reason why I feel this is a golden opportunity. It is a golden opportunity for us because it is we, who have the choice. It is we, who have what I call the power of controlled response (3:24) and the exercise of options (2:20). We maintain the initiative from the start—we act first—Khruschev can be kept constantly in the position of reacting and countering. And this is certainly a refreshing change for us.

"We are not in the position of our choice being limited to a surrendering backdown or starting a nuclear war. We have the options (2:20)—and several of them. We can plan step by step. We can force Khrushchev to make the decision to raise the threshold—to escalate—instead of having that decision forced upon us.

"Our missile bases in Turkey are about outmoded and we have been on the verge of removing them (88:B23)—the Joint Chiefs of Staff have made this decision because we have enough intercontinental missiles so that we no longer need the intermediate range missiles (89:D13) in Turkey.

"But the suggestion of a dismantling trade on missile bases in Abuc and Turkey is unthinkable because Turkey is in NATO and this would undermine the confidence of all other NATO nations in us.

"I vigorously oppose limiting our action to an appeal to the United Nations and the Organization of American States. I oppose starting our action that way because it would waste the loss of valuable time—and that could be fatal.

"Nor do I agree with CIA Director Davidson that we make air strikes without warning—or with your Special Adviser on National Security Affairs and with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff that we should invade Carribbea. Either action would limit our options and reduce our controlled response.

"Instead I propose that the first step to be taken be the imposition of a sea and air blockade of Carribbea (98:A1) and that it be maintained until Carribbea and Russia do two things. First, they must dismantle and ship out of Carribbea not only all missiles and bombers but all Communist military equipment, whether from Russia or any of her satellites. Second, I propose further that the blockade be maintained until inspection teams from the Organization of

American States can fully determine that such action has been taken.

"A deadline should be set for the beginning of the dismantling and removal of the missiles, bombers, and submarines—within 48 hours after the announcement of the imposition of the blockade. That deadline should have teeth in it with the notice that unless such dismantling starts within that time we will then exercise what I call our second option—our second degree of controlled response—the bombing of some missile sites.

"If that does not start the Russians dismantling within 24 hours, then I recommend the exercise of our third option—our third degree of controlled response—a full-scale invasion of Carribbea. Our readiness now is such that we can, in my opinion, make successful landings and occupy all of Carribbea within a few days because of present maneuvers that are going on and the concentration of forces we have built up in Florida, Puerto Rico, and Panama. Even if we should run into resistance, complete occupation could be achieved in a month (61:50).

"At no time should we use nuclear explosives first. We should force that decision upon Khrushchev. We should retain the 'conventional option' (3:24). Only after Khrushchev's first use of nuclear explosives should we consider nuclear retaliation according to the damage caused, and the intent indicated, by his use of nuclear explosives. If Khrushchev attacks U.S. soil, then I propose war plan AA-1, which you know in detail, be invoked.

"I recognize that a President is often left to figure out his options for himself (77:56, 57)—but these are my recommended options."

Attorney General—To U.N. and OAS First

Looking at the Attorney General, the President said, "All right, Ken, let's have your final word."

"I am in basic agreement with the Secretary of State that this should first be taken to the United Nations and the Organization of American States. I am bitterly opposed to either air strikes or invasion as I feel this would be immoral—particularly to strike without warning just to have the military advantage of surprise," was the response of the Attorney General.

"I think that we should take the legal step of appeal to the international and regional bodies of the U.N. and OAS first—for actually that is appealing to the highest legal authority there is—the court of world opinion. The U.N. and OAS are our forums—our media of communication—for appeal to the court of world opinion (51:1).

"I admit that we have a good chance of quick military victory with a surprise air attack or invasion. But in the long run (45:20), I think we will lose from it—we will have won a battle but lost a war—for where we now have world opinion on our side, we would lose it—by military attack—and Khrushchev would gain it.

"But I have changed my mind somewhat since the beginning of our discussions. I am no longer completely opposed to any military action—with some reluctance I can see the advantage of the military action of a blockade since it would not mean actual shooting unless Russian ships—or potentially, even ships of our NATO Allies—might try to run the blockade. Even then I don't like the idea of a blockade in that it cuts off shipments of some necessities to the people of Carribbea.

"If your decision should be a blockade or an advance warning of air strike of missile and bomber sites or possible invasion, I feel that we still should go before the United Nations and the OAS with such notice before acting. To that extent we would at least have the semblance—and the image with some—of having acted legally or with a legal basis. And even the legal predicate approach, our Kremlinologists tell us, makes a salutary impression on the Russians (19:6).

"It's a little like the difference between straight touch football and 'flag' football, where grabbing the detachable flag from the waist of the ball carrier removes any doubt and avoids any argument as to whether the ball carrier has been touched or not. And now that I've gone off on touch football I'll stop."

Vice President—All the Way—Invasion

Turning to Vice President Jim Landon, the President said, "Jim, the final quarterback call is yours."

"My first point, Mr. President, is that I disagree with the Attorney General that invasion or air strike would be a reverse Pearl Harbor—an attack without warning. After all for months now—yes, even years—you have been warning that the United States would not tolerate threats to the security of the Western Hemisphere. You have even spelled that out by specifically identifying any Russian offensive military buildup in any nation in the Western Hemisphere as a threat to the security of the hemisphere.

"I'm afraid that the Attorney General, like so many Americans, has been somewhat confused in his thinking by the result of the steady deterioration of our military credibility after the first flush of victory on Abuc wore off—to the extent that our strong words of warning have little, if any, meaning because we did not back up those strong words with strong action on the submarine bases in Abuc. In other words, that our past strong words of warning so lost their meaning by lack of backup action that they have not been considered actually to be warnings.

"I don't like the limited action of a blockade—because even if you do get the Communist missiles, bombers, and submarines removed—and it will not be easy to determine when, and if, that has been done in view of the way the Russians and their puppets have lied—and specifically in denying all along that they were building up in Carribbea. As I started to say, even if you get the missiles, bombers, and submarines removed, you still will not have removed the basic threat—the continued existence of a Communist government in Carribbea that would destroy our country anytime the Communists thought it could be done" (65:A-19).

"The only real way to remove that threat—to cut out the cancer soon enough—is to overthrow the Communist regime—and the only way to do that is by invasion and occupation.

"Let us not delude ourselves on two points that have been raised—on the moral issue—and on the claim that psychologically we would lose the friendship of the Latinos by invasion. If a criminal faces you with a cocked gun on the verge of killing you and then terrorizing your neighbors and your community, whether you are a policeman or not, it is your moral duty to shoot him not only in self-defense but for the protection of your neighbors and your community.

"As for the psychological reaction of the Latinos, make no mistake about it. They respect power (120:46). Historically they have always responded to power. They have contempt for any country that does not use its power for its defense and for its dignity and self-respect. I know—because I have traveled and talked with the man in the street in Latin America. To a man and woman, they have told me that while their politicians would probably have criticized us for a short time if we had invaded Abuc at the time of the invasion fiasco at Quahog Bay, inwardly they would have had much more respect for us if we had gone all the way and thrown out that bearded 'psycho' Ortsac (19:6).

"So I say that we shouldn't throw away this second chance to do the right thing—to go all the way—to invade, throw out the Communist regime and liberate Carribbea with a free, democratic government.

"I have only one further thought. If you should decide to announce publicly your decision in advance by going to the United Nations as recommended by the USIA Director, I believe that you should also go before the Organization of American States instead of me going before the OAS—because the Latinos are proud people and they would feel slighted if you went before the United Nations and did not go before the OAS. Psychologically, they are just as important, if not more important, than the people of Europe and Asia on this matter. That's my say—it's your ball now, Coach."

Chapter IX. Final Presidential decisions

Measured Choices

There was a long silence. Then the President leaned forward placing his elbows on his desk and said, "Thank you, gentlemen. I have made my final judgment (58:A1). Actually it is not a matter of decisions—but rather a matter of choices (77:56, 57)—measured choices (73:E1). It is this—a course of action to start at a minimum place (54:A-10) (118:A-6) with a blockade to get the missiles, bombers and submarines out of Carribbea and, if necessary, to escalate upward first to air strikes and then to invasion.

"I shall observe certain legal and psychological aspects by taking the matter to the U.N. and the OAS and to the American people in broadcasts tomorrow—broadcasts announcing the blockade order and the ultimatum but not disclosing the potential escalating steps—broadcasts that I want sent to every possible person in the world through Telstar II, Skyfon and all the major TV and radio networks and the Voice of America, RIAS and all our facilities for oversea broadcast.

Blockade—Limited

"Now specifically, I have decided to order a sea and air blockade against all shipments of war materials (118:A-6) to Carribbea. The definition and list of war materials will be spelled out by the Legal Task Force and the Military Task Force working together. But it shall specifically include oil (68:A-14). I have decided to cover the oil factor in this manner first rather than following the recommendation of air strikes (72:A-31) on petroleum facilities in Carribbea because of the time and effort it would take to restore such facilities to Carribbea's economy and daily life should they be destroyed. And it shall specifically exclude all items for food, shelter and health of the people of Carribbea.

"The blockade shall start day after tomorrow—D-day—at 6 a.m. and continue until all missiles, bombers and submarines have been removed from Carribbea (118:A-6)—both offensive and defensive because I don't want any loopholes given to the Russians.

"The blockade shall cover the range of longitude 67° W. to 75° W. and latitude 17° N. to 21° N. Pursuant to the previous recommendation of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the blockade shall be commanded by the Chief of Naval Operations."

Give Enemy Time To Think

"I want to avoid the mistake that has been made too often in past wars—the failure to give the enemy a face-saving manner in which to retreat and back down. In this case I want Khrushchev to be able to determine in his own mind that he can honorably back down (70:E1) and that he does not have to start war. I want to give him time to think. (2:16) (4:94)

"For that reason I want the first Russian ship approaching or entering the blockade zone to be permitted to pass through without challenge (73:E1). I think that will give the message to Khrushchev to pause—that we are still reasonable and that he still has the opportunity to back down gracefully and with face.

"However, if he doesn't back down after the first ship is permitted to pass through—then from that time on I want the challenges and inspections with each successive ship entering the blockade zone to be stepped up and become stronger. In other words, stop the second ship but make only a token inspection—then with the third ship make a more detailed inspection, and so on—thus showing Khrushchev we really mean business but that he can still get himself out of the situation peacefully."

Ultimatum To Remove Offensive Weapons

"The declaration of the blockade shall carry an ultimatum that unless dismantling and removal of the missiles and bombers—and removal of submarines and deactivation of submarine bases—starts within 48 hours after the declaration, we shall take military action to render ineffective such weapons and facilities. But we shall not disclose or tip our hands as to what that military action will be.

"I shall announce in the blockade declaration that in order for us to determine whether such dismantling and removal has started within the ultimatum period, that I am ordering continuous aerial reconnaissance and inspection of Carribbea both by high flights by our U-2's and low-level flights at 200 feet (4:93) (53:A-12) (54:A-10) by our RF-101 Voodoos and F-8U Crusaders."

Second Option—Air Strikes

"If such dismantling and removal does not start within the 48-hour ultimatum period, then I have decided that the first offensive military action shall be three air strikes—one against the principal missile site, one against the principal group of bombers, and one against the principal submarine base—all to be made simultaneously at 7 a.m. on D-plus-two day at 1 hour after the expiration of the ultimatum."

Third Option—Invasion

"If these air strikes do not produce a favorable response within 24 hours, then the second offensive military action will be taken with a full-scale invasion of Carribbea, including air strikes against all missile, bomber, and submarine sites. Major forces for the invasion operation shall be SAC and StrikCom (95:19) (96:11).

"Any further offensive military action will depend upon the response to the invasion. Should Russia strike our country, then we shall proceed with the first stage of Operation AA-1, which I have already authorized to the Joint Chiefs of Staff upon a contingency basis."

Take Case to United Nations

"At the close of this meeting, I want the Ambassador to the United Nations to make two requests to the U.N. The first request will be for me to address the General Assembly on an undisclosed matter of extreme urgency at 6 p.m. tomorrow night. The second request will be for an extraordinary meeting of the U.N. Security Council immediately following my address at which time our Ambassador to the U.N. will present our case (47:A-4) (97:A-1) (110:A-21) and call upon Russian to remove the missiles, bombers, and submarines from Carribbea—and ask for adoption of a resolution calling for such action if Russia refuses."

Take Case to Organization of American States

"Also at the close of this meeting, I want our Ambassador to the "Organization of American States to request an extraordinary session of the OAS in Washington for tomorrow night at 8 p.m.—giving me time to return from the U.N. in New York—at which time I shall make an address similar to my U.N. speech but in which I shall call upon the OAS to adopt a resolution which our Ambassador will present immediately following my address.

"That resolution shall propose condemnation of Russian interference in the Western Hemisphere and pledge Western Hemispheric solidarity in support of the decisions I will have announced in my U.N. and OAS addresses. It shall also request the other members of the OAS to provide military and economic support to the United States on the Carribbea crisis. I shall propose in both my U.N. address and my OAS address that the OAS send inspection teams into Carribbea to determine if missiles, bombers, and submarines have been removed following the ultimatum."

Take Case to American People

"Because I want to capture the eyes and ears (119:42) of the people and to enlist their support (119:43), at 10 p.m. I want to make a brief 10- to 15-minute TV and radio report to the American people explaining the urgent necessity of my action (12:35) stating that for the implementation of my decisions, as announced in my U.N. and OAS speeches, I am declaring a national emergency and, under previously enacted congressional authority, am preparing for mobilization of all Ready Reservists and National Guardsmen. The greatest importance of this, for the time being, is to remove any lingering doubt in Khrushchev's mind about our credibility."

Psychological Moves

"And on this psychological score of credibility—again to get the message across to Khrushchev loud and clear that we mean business—even nuclear war, if necessary—I want two other steps to be taken. First, I want all families and civilians evacuated from the Guantanamo Naval Base in Cuba and Ramey Air Force Base and all of our military and naval facilities in Puerto Rico.

"Second, I want low level photo-reconnaissance flights (53:A12) to be made at noon sharp on D-day right over the main streets of Port au Prince and Santo Domingo—close enough for the people in the streets to see clearly the United States markings of our planes and even our cameras, if possible."

Diplomatic Notices

"Three hours preceding my U.N. address, I want our Ambassador to the NATO organization to inform that organization of the contents of my address—and simultaneously our Ambassadors to each nation with which we have a security pact. While this is an American decision made unilaterally, I want to touch all bases (101:A21) with our key allies as well as the U.N. and OAS (11:48). Russia and her satellite countries, including Carribbea, shall not be notified by our Embassies until 1 hour before (103:9) the very beginning of my U.N. address."

Congressional Briefing

"Tomorrow at 3 p.m., I want to hold a meeting here with the Speaker of the House, the majority and minority leaders of the Senate and the House, the Senate and House chairmen and ranking minority members of the Appropriations, Armed Services, and Foreign Relations Committees (61:54)—together with the Vice President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—to brief them on my decisions, and reasons therefor, prior to my U.N. address—and to request that they make preparations for a possible call of a special session to take appropriate legislative action—even declaration of war, if necessary."

NSC Meeting To Formalize Decisions

"Now I want the Vice President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and my Special Adviser for National Security Affairs to remain for a routine meeting of the National Security Council to formalize my decisions. Jack, get Emergency Planning Director Tom Kelly over here immediately—he's the only NSC member who is not a member of this Executive Committee and not here now."

Decision—A Collective Process

"That's it, gentlemen. Only God knows if we have decided right—yes, perhaps even more accurately, if we have guessed right—made the wise choices. I could not have asked more from you. Collectively you have really guided (53:A12) (54:A-10) (118:A-6) and formed my decisions even though only I could make the final decisions—and even though probably none of you agree completely with all facets of my decisions. I could not have had a better team."

Divine Decision

"And in closing this meeting, I ask that you bow your heads and join me in a prayer to Almighty God, who is really the one who will make the final decision in this matter: 'Almighty God, we pray that we may do your will—that our decisions are in reality your decisions—and that in these decisions and our actions we will bring and preserve peace to everyone, regardless of nation, in this world. Amen'."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Alsop, Joseph, "Matter of Fact—Kennedy and Stevenson," the Washington Post, December 5, 1962, page A21, Washington, D.C.

2. Alsop, Stewart and Bartlett, Charles, "In Time of Crisis," the Saturday Evening Post, December 8, 1962, pages 15-33, Philadelphia, Pa.

3. Alsop, Stewart, "Master of the Pentagon," the Saturday Evening Post, August 5, 1961, pages 20-21, 45-46. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 6, pages 21-27.

4. "Anatomy of the Cuban Showdown," Reader's Digest, January 1963, pages 93-98, Pleasantville, N.Y.

5. Anderson, Jack, "John McCone, Secrecy Is His Business," Parade magazine, December 16, 1962, pages 6-7, New York, N.Y.

6. "Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs)," Department of Defense Directive 5132.2, May 20, 1961, pages 1-6.

7. "The Backdown—The Showdown," Time, November 2, 1962, pages 15-29, New York, N.Y.

8. Baulch, Jerry T. (Associated Press), "42 IL-28 Jets Shipped Out of Cuba; Last Bomber Removed, Russians Say," the Washington Post, December 7, 1962, pages A1 and A20, Washington, D.C.

9. Ball, George W., "How the Cuban Decision Evolved," (excerpts from an address of Mr. Ball to the New York Lawyer's Association on December 13, 1962), the Washington Post, December 15, 1962, page A12, Washington, D.C.

10. "The Big Flap—Doves, Hawks, 'Dawks,' 'Hove's'," Newsweek, December 17, 1962, pages 17-20, New York, N.Y.

11. Bowie, Robert R., "Analysis of Our Policy Machine," organizing for national security: selected materials. Prepared for the Senate Committee on Government Operations and its Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery, 86th Congress, 2d session, committee print, 1960, pages 100-107. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 2, pages 45-49.

12. Carleton, William G., "The Growth of the Presidency," Current History, XXXIX, No. 230, October 1960, pages 193-197. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 4, pages 33-37.

13. Carroll, Wallace, "Kennedy Turns to Power," the New York Times, October 13, 1961, page C-16. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 17, pages 55-56.

14. "Central Intelligence Agency," U.S. Government Organization Manual, 1962-63, revised June 1, 1962, page 57.

15. Central Intelligence Agency Director, nomination of John A. McCone to be; hearing before the Committee on Armed Services, U.S. Senate, 87th Congress, 2d session, January 18, 1962, pages 33–83, Washington, D.C.

16. "Cold War," Time, November 2, 1962, pages 32–36, New York N.Y.

17. Corddry, Charles (United Press International), "Russia Ships 3 IL–28 Jets Out of Cuba," the Washington Post, December 4, 1962, pages A1 and A8, Washington, D.C.

18. "Cuba: Almost a Pearl Harbor?" U.S. News & World Report, November 12, 1962, page 47, Washington, D.C.

18a. "Cuba—Castro Defiant," Time, January 11, 1963, page 35, New York, N.Y.

19. "Cuban Crisis: A Step-by-Step Review," the New York Times, November 3, 1962, pages 1, 6, 7, New York, N.Y.

20. "Cuba Invasion Force Was Set, Shoup Says," Washington Evening Star, January 3, 1963, page A–7.

21. "Defense Intelligence Agency," Department of Defense Directive 5105.21, August 1, 1961, pages 1–8. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 10, pages 51–54.

22. "Defense Intelligence Agency," U.S. Government Organization Manual, 1962–63, revised June 1, 1962, page 197.

23. "Defense Organization," Armed Forces Management, VII, No. 2 (November 1960), pages 21–28. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 2, pages 17–27.

24. "Department of the Air Force," U.S. Government Organization Manual, 1962–63, revised June 1962, pages 180–192.

25. "Department of the Army," U.S. Government Organization Manual, 1962–63, revised June 1, 1962, pages 138–154.

26. "Department of Defense," U.S. Government Organization Manual, 1962–63, revised June 1, 1962, pages 121–137.

27. Department of Defense Telephone Directory, winter 1962–63, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

28. "Department of the Navy," U.S. Government Organization Manual, 1962–63, revised June 1, 1962, pages 155–179.

29. "Department of State," U.S. Government Organization Manual, 1962-63, revised June 1, 1962, pages 63–88.

30. Dille, John, "Daring Missions That Bared Cuba's Secrets," Life (Nov. 2, 1962), pages 42 and 42A.

31. Donovan, Robert J., "Eisenhower—The Inside Story," pages 64–67, 110, 261–268, Harper & Bros., New York, N.Y. (1956).

32. Dulles, Allen W., "Intelligence Estimating and National Security," the Department of State Bulletin, XLII, No. 1081 (Mar. 14, 1960); pages 411-417. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 10, pages 37-43.

32a. "Emergency Planning Director," U.S. Government Organization Manual, 1962–63, revised June 1, 1962, pages 58–61.

33. Evans, Allen, "Intelligence and Policy Formation," World Politics, XII, No. 1 (October 1959), pages 84–91. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 10, pages 17–21.

34. "Extracts from the Conclusions and Recommendations of the President's Committee on Information Activities Abroad," the Department of State Bulletin, XLIV, No. 1128 (Feb. 6, 1961), pages 185–195. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 17, pages 23–25.

35. Finney, John W. and Shuster, Alvin, "The Propaganda War—A Case History and the Rival Systems," the New York Times (June 25, 1961), page E–3. In WNCP, volume II, chapter 17, pages 9–14.

36. Folliard, Edward T., "Cuba Crisis Talks Called for Today," the Washington Post, November 23, 1962, pages A1 and A2, Washington, D.C.

37. "Foreign Relations: World Opinion," Time (Sept. 15, 1961), pages 22–23. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 17, pages 5-6.

38. Foster, H. Schuyler, "The Role of the Public in U.S. Foreign Relations," Department of State Publication 7113, January 1961, pages 1–20. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 17, pages 59–67.

39. "Functions of the Department of Defense and Its Major Components," Department of Defense Directive 5100.1, December 31, 1958, pages 1–13. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 9, pages 7–10.

40. Gilpatric, Roswell L. (Deputy Secretary of Defense), "The Department of Defense and National Security Policy," address before the National War College and Industrial College of the Armed Forces, Washington, D.C., November 22, 1961.

41. Goss, Hilton P., "The Administration and Execution of U.S. Foreign Policy 1960–1975." Tempo RM 59TMP–99 Santa Barbara, Calif., General Electric Co., November 30, 1959, pages 20–29. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 5, pages 69–74.

42. Gray, Gordon, "Organizing for Total Defense," the General Electric Defense Quarterly, III, No. 3 (July–September 1960), pages 4–10. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 2, pages 53–57.

43. Gray, Gordon, "Role of the National Security Council in the Formulation of National Security Policy," organizing for national security: selected materials. Prepared for the Senate Committee on National Policy Machinery, 86th Congress, 2d session, committee print, 1960, pages 62–71. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 2, pages 61–68.

44. Griffith, Ernest S., "Congress: Its Contemporary Role," New York, New York University Press, 1961, pages 124–141 and 142–150.

45. Halle, Louis J., "Eventually Public Opinion Prevails," the New York Times magazine (Oct. 15, 1961), pages 25, 113–114. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 17, pages 17–20.

46. Hetherington, Alastair, "Failure of Intelligence Called Frightening Part of Cuban Crisis," the Washington Post, December 8, 1962, page A2, Washintgon, D.C.

47. Hightower, John M., "Kennedy Letter Praises Stevenson Role on Cuba," the Washington Evening Star, December 6, 1962, pages A–1 and A–4, Washington, D.C.

48. Hilsman, Roger, Jr., "Intelligence and Policymaking in Foreign Affairs," World Politics, V, No. 1 (October 1952), pages 2–5, 33–45. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 10, pages 5–13.

49. Hittle, Brig. Gen. James D. (U.S. Marine Corps, retired), "The Grab for Narrow Waters," Life magazine, December 21, 1962, pages 83–92, New York, N.Y.

50. Howe, Quincy, "World Press Comment," Atlas, December 1962, pages 403–409, New York, N.Y.

51. "The Influence of World Opinion," War College nonresident program, volume II, chapter 17, pages 1–2, Air University, U.S. Air Force, Maxwell Air Force Base, Ala.

52. "The Joint Chiefs of Staff," Armed Forces management, VI, No. 2 (November 1959), pages 31–34. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 7, pages 31–36.

53. Kennedy, President John F., "Interview of First 2 Years in Office," the Washington Post, December 18, 1962, page A12, Washington, D.C.

54. Kennedy, President John F., "Interview of First 2 Years in Office," the Washington Evening Star, December 18, 1962, page A10, Washington, D.C.

55. Kenworthy, E. W., "The Making of Policy," the New York Times (Aug. 6, 1961), page E9. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 4, pages 59 and 60.

56. Kilpatrick, Carroll, "Kennedy Affirms His Faith in Adlai," the Washington Post, December 6, 1962, pages A1 and A31, Washington, D.C.

57. Kilpatrick, Carroll, "Kennedy Lauds Units Poised for Cuba Duty," the Washington Post, November 27, 1962, page A2, Washington, D.C.

58. Kilpatrick, Carroll, "Kennedy on Adlai Case; Leave It to Historians," the Washington Post, December 13, 1962, page A1, Washington, D.C.

59. Kilpatrick, Carroll, "Kennedy Praises SAC After Tour of Offutt Base," the Washington Post, December 8, 1962, pages A1 and A4, Washington, D.C.

60. Kirkpatrick, Lyman B., "U.S. Intelligence," Military Review, XLI, No. 5 (May 1961), pages 18–22. Published by U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, Fort Leavenworth, Kans. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 2, pages 5–8.

61. Knebel, Fletcher, "Washington in Crisis: 154 Hours on the Brink of War," Look, December 18, 1962, pages 42–54, Des Moines, Iowa.

62. Kraar, Louis, "The Two Lives of Robert McNamara," Life, November 30, 1962, pages 94–102, New York, N.Y.

63. Lawrence, David, "How Not To Function in a Crisis," the Washington Evening Star, December 18, 1962, page A15, Washington, D.C.

64. Lawrence, David, "Khrushchev's Global Chess Game," the Washington Evening Star, November 29, 1962, page A13, Washington, D.C.

65. Lawrence, David, "Russell Sizes Up the Cuban Issue," the Washington Evening Star, December 7, 1962, page A19, Washington, D.C.

66. Lawrence, David, "Were Cuba Missiles a Hoax?" Washington Evening Star, January 2, 1963, page A23.

67. Legere, Col. Lawrence J. Jr., "Military Advice for a Strong President," Army, XI, No. 11 (June 1961), pages 22–23. Ir. WCNP, volume II, chapter 4, pages 49–55.

68. Lincoln, Gould, "The Political Mill—Cuban Policy Hardening," the Washington Evening Star, December 4, 1962, page A–14, Washington, D.C.

69. Lippmann, Walter, "Blockade Proclaimed," the Washington Post, October 25, 1962, page A–25, Washington, D.C.

70. Lippmann, Walter, "Cuba Etched the Diplomacy of the Nuclear Age" (an address delivered by Mr. Lippmann to the Anglo-American Press Association on November 29, 1962), the Washington Post, December 2, 1962, page E–1, Washington, D.C.

71. Lucas, Jim (Scripps Howard newspapers staff writer), "A.F. Will Keep its Guard Up," The Washington Daily News, December 15, 1962, page 8, Washington, D.C.

72. Marder, Murrey, "Adlai Case Reaction—Policymakers Uneasy," the Washington Post, December 6, 1962, page A–31, Washington, D.C.

73. Marder, Murrey, "An East-West Epoch Is Ending With Cuba," the Washington Post, November 25, 1962, page E–1, Washington, D.C.

74. Morton, Louis, "National Policy and Military Strategy," the Virginia Quarterly Review, XXXVI, No. 1 (winter 1960), pages 1–17. Copyright 1960 by the Virginia Quarterly Review, University of Virginia. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 1, pages 49–56.

75. "The National Scene," the Washington Sunday Star, December 9, 1962, page B–1, Washington, D.C.

76. "National Security Council," U.S. Government Organization Manual, 1962–63, revised June 1, 1962, pages 56–57.

77. Neustadt, Richard E., "Presidential Power," pages 56, 57, 83, 84, 97, 107, 108–151, 154, 179, 205, 206, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, N.Y., 1960.

78. Nielsen, Waldemar A., "Huge, Hidden Impact of the Pentagon," the New York Times magazine (June 25, 1961), pages 9, 31, 34, 36. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 17, pages 75–80.

79. Nitze, Paul H. (Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs), "State-Defense-JCS Relations," address to the Electronic Industries Association, March 13, 1962, Washington, D.C.

80. Ogburn, Charlton, Jr., "The Formulation and Administration of U.S. Foreign Policy," appendix C to a study prepared at the

request of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations by the Brookings Institution, 86th Congress, 2d session, January 3, 1960, Study No. 9, pages 970–975.

81. "Operations Coordinating Board," U.S. Government Organization Manual, 1962–63, revised June 1, 1962, page 649.

82. "Operations Coordinating Board," U.S. Government Organization Manual, 1960–61, revised June 1, 1960, page 64.

83. "Organization of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and Relationships with the Office of the Secretary of Defense," Department of Defense Directive 5158.1, December 31, 1958, pages 1–5. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 7, pages 23–24.

84. Organizing for National Security: The Department of State, the Policy Planning Staff, and the National Security Council. Hearings before the Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, 86th Congress, 2d session, June 17, 1960, part VI, pages 853–860. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 5, pages 47–52.

85. Organizing for National Security: The National Security Council and the Departments of State and Defense. Hearings before the Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, 86th Congress, 2d session, June 10, 1960, part V, pages 696–701. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 5, pages 15–20.

86. Oulahan, Richard, Jr., "Step by Step in a Historic Week," Life, November 2, 1962, pages 42B, 47, 48 (see also pp. 38–41 of issue).

87. Pearson, Drew, "'Flap' Does Adlai No Good," the Washington Post, December 13, 1962, page E–11, Washington, D.C.

88. Pearson, Drew, "Inside Story on Adlai Stevenson," the Washington Post, December 12, 1962, page D–13, Washington, D.C.

89. Pearson, Drew, "Kennedy Wants Adlai To Stay," the Washington Post, December 6, 1962, page B–23, Washington, D.C.

90. Pearson, Drew, "A Pair of Power Struggles," the Washington Post, December 14, 1962, page B–11, Washington, D.C.

91. Phillips, Cabell, "Intelligence Program Faces Major Overhaul," the New York Times (Aug. 6, 1961), page E–10. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 10, pages 31–33.

92. Plesent, Stanley (General Counsel and Congressional Liaison, U.S. Information Agency), letter to Members of Congress on the role of the USIA in the Cuban crisis, November 15, 1962, Washington, D.C.

93. "Principles of Public Information Policy," Department of Defense Directive 5230.13, May 31, 1961, pages 1–2.

94. Ransom, Harry Howe, "Secret Mission in an Open Society," the New York Times magazine (May 21, 1961), pages 20, 77–79. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 10, pages 65–69.

95. Raymond, Jack, "New Air-Ground Force Slated To Start Operations," the New York Times (Oct. 13, 1961), page C–10. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 7, pages 19–20.

96. "A Record for History," Army-Navy-Air Force Journal and Register, December 8, 1962, page 11, Washington, D.C.

97. Roberts, Chalmers M., "Adlai's Cuba Crisis Role Upheld by White House," the Washington Post, December 4, 1962, pages A–1 and A–7, Washington, D.C.

98. Roberts, Chalmers M., "Charge That Stevenson Differed With Kennedy at Time of Cuban Crisis Is Flatly Denied," the Washington Post, December 3, 1962, pages A–1 and A–2, Washington, D.C.

99. Roberts, Chalmers M., "The Cuban Affair: Russian Reconnaissance in Force," the Washington Post, November 27, 1962, page A–15, Washington, D.C.

100. Roberts, Chalmers M., "The Day We Didn't Go to War," the Reporter (Sept. 14, 1954), pages 31–35.

101. Roberts, Chalmers M., "The Stevenson Flap: His Image as U.N. Partisan Damaged," the Washington Post, December 5, 1962, page A–21.

102. Rusk, Dean, "A Fresh Look at the Formulation of Foreign Policy," the Department of State Bulletin, XLIV, No. 1134 (Mar. 20, 1961), pages 395–399. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 2, pages 11–15.

103. Rusk, Dean, "An Hour With the Secretary of State," as broadcast over the CBS Television Network, November 28, 1962, New York, N.Y., pages 6–10 (transcript).

104. Rusk, Dean, "The President," Foreign Affairs, XXXVIII, No. 3 (April 1960), pages 353–369. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 4, pages 21–29.

105. Rusk, Dean, "Role of the Department of State in National Security Affairs," the Department of State Bulletin, XLV, No. 1159 (Sept. 11, 1961), pages 455–458. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 5, pages 23–25.

106. Seagrave, Sterling, "Eyes in the Sky," the Washington Post, December 9, 1962, E–5, Washington, D.C.

107. Shackford, R. H. (Scripps Howard newspapers staff writer), "George Ball Gives His Official Version of L'Affaire Stevenson," the Washington Daily News, December 14, 1962, page 1.

108. "Showdown—Backdown," Newsweek, November 5, 1962, pages 27–35, Dayton, Ohio.

109. Stanley, Timothy W., with Ransom, Harry H., "The National Security Council; The Integration of Political, Military, and Economic Factors in National Policymaking," Organizing for National Security: selected materials. Prepared for the Senate Committee on Government Operations and its Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery, 86th Congress, 2d session, committee print, 1960, pages 73–88. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 2, pages 31–42.

110. Stern, Lawrence, "Adlai Affair Develops New Twist," the Washington Post, December 10, 1962, pages A–1 and A–21, Washington, D.C.

111. Taylor, Edmond, "Political Warfare: A Sword We Must Unsheathe," the Reporter, XXV, No. 4, pages 27–31. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 17, pages 83–89.

112. "Text of American Assembly's Suggestions on Foreign Policy," the New York Times (Oct. 10, 1960), page 21. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 5, pages 63–66.

113. "The Trend to Unification," Armed Forces Management, VII, No. 2 (November 1960), pages 28–29. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 7, pages 27–28.

114. "The Truth Must Be Our Guide, but Dreams Must Be Our Goals," Newsweek (Sept. 18, 1961), pages 24–28. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 17, pages 39–45.

115. "United Nations: Guardian of Peace," Department of State Publication 7225, September 1961, pages 33–37, "Listening Post of the Human Race." In WCNP, volume II, chapter 17, pages 71–72.

116. "U.S. Foreign Policy: The Formulation and Administration of U.S. Foreign Policy," a study prepared at the request of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations by the Brookings Institution, 86th Congress, 2d session, January 13, 1960, study No. 9, pages 92–96. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 10, pages 25–28.

117. "United States Had Five Divisions Set to Invade Cuba," the Washington Evening Star, November 29, 1962, pages A–1 and A–5, Washington, D.C.

118. Voss, Earl H., "United States Has Little Hope of Soviet Policy Shift," the Washington Evening Star, December 18, 1962, pages A–1 and A–6, Washington, D.C.

119. Warren, Sidney, "New Dimensions in the Presidency," Saturday Review, XLII, No. 34 (Aug. 20, 1960), pages 11–13, 40, In WCNP, volume II, chapter 4, pages 41–45.

120. "Who Really Gained in the Cuba Showdown?" U.S. News & World Report, November 12, 1962, pages 42–46.

121. "Your Department of State," Department of State Publication 7168, released May 1961 (revised), pages 4–7, 10–13. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 5, pages 5–7.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, in placing this study in the Record, I am not including the preface and the table of contents in the study. However, I do wish to mention that part of the preface which states:

> In this connection, a disclaimer is made that, while there are marked similarities in this fictionized study to contemporary events and persons, and while such contemporary factors are used for citation purposes in the text, no living person is depicted in this study.

TRANSSHIPMENT OF WHEAT BY POLAND AND YUGOSLAVIA TO OTHER COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, some weeks ago I received a letter in which the writer stated that he had information that wheat shipped to Poland in large tankers is transloaded to other ships in the Baltic and suggesting that this wheat which comes from the United States under Public Law 480 goes behind the Iron Curtain. I have received similar reports about our Public Law 480 program in Yugoslavia.

I asked the staff of the Committee on Foreign Relations to check this matter with the Department of State and I hold in my hand a letter to Mr. Marcy of the Foreign Relations Committee staff from Assistant Secretary of State Dutton. This letter is dated April 19 and I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Department of State,
Washington, D.C., April 19, 1963.

Mr. Carl Marcy,
Chief of Staff,
Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate.

Dear Mr. Marcy: Thank you for your letter of April 11, 1963, requesting a report on the alleged transshipment of Public Law 480 wheat by Poland and Yugoslavia to other Communist countries.

The Department has received in recent months several inquiries about alleged transshipments by Poland and Yugoslavia of the Public Law 480 agricultural commodities they had received from the United States. On each of these occasions the Department made a separate check but no substantiating evidence was uncovered. Upon the receipt of your inquiry, the Department again checked all available sources of information, including intelligence sources, but again there were only negative reports. It should be noted in this regard that Poland and Yugoslavia failed to produce enough wheat last year to meet their domestic needs and were obliged to turn to foreign suppliers.

As you know, our Public Law 480 sales programs are carefully reviewed to assure that the commodities sold are well within the consumption requirements of the receiving country, will not displace normal commercial marketings of such commodities and will not result in the increased availability of those or like commodities for export to other countries. Under the terms of our Public Law 480 agreements, Poland and Yugoslavia agreed not to resell or transship to third countries Public Law 480 commodities unless specifically approved by the U.S. Government.

The Department, which maintains careful surveillance to insure compliance with the

Public Law 480 agreements, would, of course, be seriously concerned about any violation of these agreements. The record shows, however, that Yugoslavia and Poland have always lived up to their Public Law 480 commitments.

If I can be of further assistance to you in this matter, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely yours,

Frederick G. Dutton,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I must say that the letter is a model of ambiguity. In short, it states that the Department has had a number of inquires about alleged transshipments of Public Law 480 commodities but that no substantiating evidence was uncovered. The letter also states that there still continue to be only negative reports, when my specific inquiry was checked against all available sources of information.

After these statements the letter contains some disarming comments about the general nature of our sales to Poland and Yugoslavia and that Poland and Yugoslavia have always lived up to their Public Law 480 commitments.

I hope the Department of State is right. I hope it will be shown that our Public Law 480 shipments to eastern Europe are models of careful management. Unless I am mistaken, however, there is enough smoke not only in the reports I have received but in the ambiguity of the Department's letter to lead me to believe that American Public Law 480 shipments are in fact getting behind the Iron Curtain. Time will tell.

PRESERVATION OF THE NATURAL BEAUTY OF OUR NATION

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, three Missouri newspapers recently published editorials in support of legislation designed to preserve the natural beauty of our Nation. The St. Joseph News Press called for the enactment of the wilderness bill which recently was approved by the Senate. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch and the Columbia Missourian called for the enactment of the Ozark National Rivers bill now pending in committee. Because each of these editorials points out so clearly the need for immediate action to safeguard the natural splendor of our great Nation, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch]

For Action in the Ozarks

Governor Dalton upheld the interest of all Americans, now and in the future, when he again urged the safeguarding of the Ozark rivers by the National Park Service. This message to the Senate subcommittee considering the appropriate legislation again added the official approval of Missouri to the pleas of Senators Symington and Long, of Secretary of the Interior Udall and many others for a major conservation project already too long delayed.

Delay, however, is the chief hope of those who for their own reasons are in opposition. They now have shifted to a proposal for putting the Current and other Ozark rivers under State administration, based on voluntary easements which would disperse essential control among landowners rather than lodge it clearly in public lands.

Surely Congress cannot overlook the fact that because the State found the task beyond its ability, the help of Washington was sought and accepted by Governors and legislatures alike. The suggested reversal of this well-founded policy is akin to the opposition's earlier proposal to turn the rivers over to the Forest Service rather than the National Park Service. This suggests a desire for looser control—or no control at all.

To approach the near unanimity which may be politically necessary to save the rivers, concession after concession has been made to the opposition. The area of the reservation was reduced. Scenic easements were authorized. Hunting was sanctioned. Life tenures of landowners were granted. And so on. Now the opponents describe these concessions incorporated in the pending bill as weaknesses. If weaknesses they be it must be remembered at whose demand they were written into what was indeed originally a superior plan.

Those who would preserve the rivers as nearly as possible in their present, free-flowering state are moved by sincere appreciation of a natural treasure exposed to ever more damaging exploitation. In this, they continue to be reasonable. Though the national interest is overriding, respect is being shown for lesser interests. There is no threat of a roughshod raid of expropriation.

There is ample reassurance in the pending bill's provision for the establishment of an Ozark National Rivers Commission. Its seven Missouri members are to guide the Secretary of the Interior in the development and governance of the reserve. The Secretary himself is to designate one member; two are to serve on the recommendation of the Governor, and four on the recommendation of the county courts of Carter, Dent, Shannon, and Texas Counties. How much more may be asked in reason for a project which was, after all, not initiated in Washington but in Jefferson City?

We hope Congress will agree that the time has come at last for action. Governor Dalton speaks for the overwhelming majority of Missourians when he asks the National Park Service to save the Ozark streams.

[From the Columbia Missourian, Apr. 17, 1963]

Ozark Park Bill

A bill to preserve a 94,000-acre area stretching for 140 miles along the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers in the southeastern Missouri Ozarks is attracting national attention in Washington. More than 40 persons, mostly Missourians, crowded the Senate Interior Committee session and a House subcommittee meeting recently.

The bill was proposed by Senators Stuart Symington and Edward V. Long and Representative Richard Ichord, all of Missouri. The 94,000-acre area consists of strips along a 100-mile reach of the Current River and a 39-mile reach of the Jacks Fork River, a tributary of the Current.

The purpose of the proposed reserve is, under administration by the National Park Service, to preserve the natural beauties of the area and make it more accessible to public use for fishing, hunting, camping, hiking, and float trips on the rivers.

But the opposition to the bill charges that the Federal Government "only wants to get a foot in the door with these national rivers bills." Opponents want to turn over the rivers to the Forest Service rather than the National Park Service, and concession after concession has been made to the opposition; the area of the reservation was reduced, scenic easements were authorized, hunting was sanctioned, life tenures of landowners were granted, and so on down the line.

Supporters of the proposal have eliminated the Eleven Point River area in Oregon County and a reach of the Current River in Ripley County. The entire area now is in Representative Ichord's district, in Dent, Shannon, Carter, and Texas Counties.

The opponents are mostly those who own lands in the area. They are trying to satisfy their own interests.

The bill will not only preserve the beauties of the Ozarks, but it would also help rehabilitate the eastern Ozark highlands economically and biologically. It will protect the area against strip logging, dams, and slum real estate development.

The proposed bill, if passed, will eventually increase tourist visits from the present estimated 1 million to several million yearly in the near future. The tourist business now brings almost $10 million a year into the area, compared to only $2 million for farming.

It is clear that the public interest far outweighs the private interests that are in opposition. It is therefore hoped the Congress will act to safeguard the Ozark rivers by the National Park Service in the public interest.

[From the St. Joseph (Mo.) News Press, Apr. 19, 1963]

Wilderness Areas

For 6 years, Congress has been considering passage of a wilderness bill. Two years ago the Senate passed such a bill, which died in the House. In those 2 years, mining and lumber companies have gobbled up quite a chunk of wilderness area and have established claims on other tracts.

As the population increases, wild areas are decreasing. There are not many spots left where one can meditate in the primitive woods, unspoiled by the hand of man.

The bill before Congress is not a drain on the Federal Treasury. Senator George McGovern, of South Dakota, a cosponsor of the bill, points out that no expenditure of public money is involved. The land is already owned by the Government. The bill does, however, insure that these areas be preserved for present and future generations.

There are cultural, inspirational, recreational, and scientific values involved. There needs to be some place where a person can get away from the blare of loudspeakers, the whine of tires on the highways, the sounds of the city. This is America as our forefathers found it.

And when the areas are made safe from encroachment, we have one more hope: That we don't build a crisscross of roads through them.

FIFTEENTH ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE OF ISRAEL

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I want to join with its many other friends around the world in wishing happy birthday to the State of Israel on the 15th anniversary of its founding as an independent nation.

It has been my privilege to visit Israel several times during the past two decades, and I have been amazed by the great progress which has taken place there. There has been great progress both in the development of democratic institutions and in the work of the Israelis toward making the desert bloom for the benefit of the millions who have come, and still come, to this land of promise to make a new life for themselves and their children.

As a friend of Israel, I am distressed by the recent passing of Israel's President, Mr. Ben-Zvi, and also by the fears on the part of the Israelis and their friends in this country that Israel's security may again be threatened. But I believe, as I have always believed, that Israel will survive these and all future setbacks and perils and remain forever as a light to all men who yearn after freedom.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an article from today's New York Times containing portions of anniversary messages to Israel from Mayor Wagner of New York and President Kennedy.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

City Hails Israel on 15th Birthday—Mayor Issues Proclamation Urging Brotherhood

(By Irving Spiegel)

New York paid official tribute yesterday to Israel's 15th anniversary as a nation.

At a ceremony at City Hall Plaza, Mayor Wagner proclaimed the day as Israel Independence Day before an audience of 1,500. He urged the city's citizens to join in the celebration in harmony and brotherhood.

The anniversary, which is celebrated under the Hebrew calendar of the fifth of Iyar that fell yesterday, was tempered by the death last week of President Itzhak Ben-Zvi, of Israel.

In issuing his proclamation, Mayor Wagner read a special message from President Kennedy addressed to Acting President Kadash Luz, of Israel.

The President's message eulogized President Ben-Zvi as one who had "left his imprint on a vital and fruitful era of Israel's history; his wisdom and patience, his gentle but sure leadership were evident in every aspect of the nation's life.

In hailing Israel's splendid growth and achievement in the last 15 years, President Kennedy said that "new frontiers have been explored, a haven and a new way of life have been provided for countless thousands, and new and promising paths have been charted for the nation; we look forward with you to future proud horizons."

In answering messages, Premier David Ben-Gurion, of Israel, expressed gratification over President Kennedy's message, saying, "It gives eloquent expression to the close bonds of friendship between our two peoples."

Mr. Ben-Gurion wrote that the celebration of Israel's Independence Day "by the greatest city in the world and the city with the largest number of Jews, is a source of pride and inspiration to the people of Israel and to me personally."

With American and Israeli flags in the background, Mayor Wagner lauded Israel's economic, social, and political accomplishments of the last 15 years. He cited Israel's position as a "bastion of democracy, a bulwark of freedom" in the Middle East.

MAYOR CITES ARAB THREAT

Despite these accomplishments, the Mayor said that the existence of Israel is again being menaced. He called attention to the recent merger of Syria, Iraq, and Egypt, saying that these Arab States "apparently united, turn eyes—unfortunately full of hatred—in the direction of the tiny democracy of Israel."

The mayor's proclamation was accepted by Katriel Katz, Israel's Consul General in New York. The ceremonies opened with the playing of the "Star-Spangled Banner" and Israel's national anthem, "Hatkivah," by the department of sanitation band.

There were messages hailing Israel's anniversary. Joseph Ratner, chairman of the American Israeli Religious Cultural Society, appealed to the free world to safeguard against threats of the Arab States.

QUESTION AND REPORT PERIOD

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the proposal to establish a question-and-report period in the Senate has received enthusiastic approval in the Senate and in the press.

Last week I drew the Senate's attention to a Washington Post editorial approving the proposal to question Cabinet members on the floor of the Senate. The senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey] also endorsed the proposal last week, and his name was added as a cosponsor of the resolution which would amend our rules to allow such a question period, Senate Resolution 120.

On March 12, the Johnson City Press Chronicle also editorially endorsed this idea. The Press Chronicle is a very highly respected daily newspaper which is published in Johnson City, Tenn., by Mr. Carl Jones.

The Press Chronicle editorial emphasized the fact that the Senate needs a fresh source of initiative in governmental affairs, and agreed with my idea that the Senate would obtain such initiative by means of the question-and-report period.

In recent years, we have observed the growing strength of the executive and judicial branches of this Government. I think it is very important that the legislative branch continue to grow and strengthen as an institution, so that we will maintain the equilibrium which is necessary in our system of checks and balances.

Mr. President, I am proud that the Johnson City Press Chronicle agrees with me that the question-and-report period would give the Senate fresh initiative in our governmental affairs, and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed following my remarks in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

We Agree, Senator

Quite often we find ourselves in disagreement with Senator Estes Kefauver. However, we have always been in accord with his proposal that Congress adopt a technique of the British House of Commons—the question period.

In Britain, Cabinet members appear periodically in Commons to report on their activities and answer questions from Members of Parliament. Thus there is liaison between the two branches of government.

When he was serving in the House of Representatives, Kefauver proposed that the question period be introduced there, but nothing came of it. Now he is asking that the Senate take the initiative.

In urging action, the Senator says: "The question period would give the Senate a fresh source of initiative in governmental affairs. It would give Senators direct and fuller information with regard to the operation of all departments—not just those supervised by their committees.

"It would also give the Cabinet members a chance to advance their proposals directly to all Members of the Senate. I think the report-and-question period would be even better suited to the Senate than it would be to the House of Representatives, because of the smaller membership and the intimate nature of it."

We agree.

And we think government would be more responsible, on both administrative and legislative levels, by adoption of this practice.

GORDON R. CLAPP

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, it was with deep regret that I learned of the death this past Sunday evening of Gordon R. Clapp, former Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

He was a good and admired personal friend. He was a champion of those things in our natural and social environment that can be shaped to make a better life for all people. He was certainly a friend of the people of my State and of the six other States of the TVA area.

Gordon Clapp's greatest service to the Tennessee Valley Authority, in my opinion, was as its spirited defender against the many efforts that were made in the 1950's to dismember it. But for him, I am confident, this great experiment for the benefit of so many of our people might well have been abandoned or at least sharply curtailed. And his example was surely an inspiration for those who carried on the fight to preserve the TVA after his departure from it in 1954.

It was characteristic of Gordon Clapp that after leaving the TVA, he entered into a consulting partnership with his predecessor as TVA Chairman, Mr. David E. Lilienthal. Their organization helped to bring forth a "little TVA" in Iran and was, at Mr. Clapp's death, working on similar resource development projects in many other parts of the world.

Mr. President, many of the highlights of Mr. Clapp's full and dedicated life are outlined in an obituary appearing in today's New York Times. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in the Record, also, an editorial of the Washington Post of May 1.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, May 1, 1963]

Gordon R. Clapp, Ex-TVA Aid, Dies—Chairman of Agency From 1946 to 1954 Was Public Administration Expert—Former City Official—Served Under Gulick Before Joining David Lilienthal in Consulting Firm

Gordon R. Clapp, former Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority and an authority on public administration, died Sunday evening of a heart attack in his apartment in Stewart House at 70 East 10th Street. He was 57 years old.

At his death, Mr. Clapp was president of the Development and Resources Corp., a consulting firm at 50 Broadway. Before becoming associated with David E. Lilienthal, his predecessor as TVA Chairman, in the consulting organization in 1955, Mr. Clapp had served for a little more than a year as deputy city administrator under Dr. Luther H. Gulick.

Mr. Clapp had been with the TVA from its inception in 1933 until 1954. He had been successively assistant director and then director of personnel, general manager and for the final 8 years Chairman. He was appointed Chairman when President Harry S. Truman named Mr. Lilienthal to head the Atomic Energy Commission.

When Mr. Clapp's term expired in 1954, President Dwight D. Eisenhower failed to reappoint him, and he took the city post, in which he was concerned principally with public power policy and administration. His additional assignments were described by Dr. Gulick as liaison with the department of water supply, gas and electricity and the department of health, with particular reference to water fluoridation; slum clearance and public housing, development and administration of the city's personnel system and installation of its career and salary plan.

CONDUCTED POWER STUDY

Mr. Clapp also conducted a long study of how the city could obtain power to operate its subway most efficiently and inexpensively. He reported that St. Lawrence River power might be the answer, a proposal that Robert Moses, then chairman of the State power authority, termed "fantastic."

The Development and Resources Corp. was formed in 1955 by the investment banking firm of Lazard Frères & Co., with Mr. Lilienthal as chairman and chief executive officer. One of its major projects has been a water-power system in the Province of Khuzistan, a largely desert area in southwestern Iran. The multimillion-dollar Khuzistan project is known as Iran's Tennessee Valley Authority. Last month Mr. Clapp and Mr. Lilienthal attended dedication ceremonies of the Pahlevi Dam across the Dez River, the first major structure of 14 projected dams in the vast system.

The corporation currently has work underway in Puerto Rico, South America and West Africa, and has operated in other parts of the world.

Mr. Clapp was chairman of the United Nations Commission for Economic Survey of the Middle East in 1949. Earlier, he was a member of the President's Advisory Committee on Education from 1936 to 1939 and chairman of the committee on employe relations in public service of the civil service assembly in 1942.

CITED FOR COURAGEOUS FIGHT

In 1956, Mr. Clapp received the annual award of the New York chapter of the League of Industrial Democracy. He was cited for his "wise and courageous fight for civil liberties, racial justice, and social betterment." At the award ceremony a message from Gov. Frank G. Clement of Tennessee praised Mr. Clapp for "his contribution to the Tennessee Valley Authority and the defense potential of America's national economy."

A native of Ellsworth, Wis., Mr. Clapp graduated from Lawrence College in 1927 and received a master of arts degree from the University of Chicago. From 1927 to 1933 he was director of admissions and assistant dean of Lawrence, which awarded him an honorary doctor of laws degree in 1947.

Mr. Clapp was a trustee of the American University at Beirut, Lebanon, and a member of the American University at Beirut. He had been editor in chief of The Public Administration Review and was the author of "The TVA: An Approach to the Development of a Region."

The book contains six lectures Mr. Clapp gave at the University of Chicago on the world's largest integrated electric power system.

Surviving are his widow, the former Mary Chase Peek; two sons, Rufus Carvel and Gordon Russell Clapp; three brothers, Newell, Norman and Carvel Clapp, and two grandchildren. Norman Clapp is Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 1, 1963]

GORDON R. CLAPP

Almost all of Gordon Clapp's crowded, productive life was devoted to public service in the areas of conservation and resource development. He was in the great tradition of the American pioneer—a pursuer of horizons and an opener of frontiers. For 20 years, from its very beginning, he played a vital role in the growth of the Tennessee Valley Authority, the last 8 of them as its chairman. His imagination and zeal contributed invaluably to the effectiveness of that beneficient agency in reinvigorating, enriching and democratizing a great region of the United States. When he left the TVA in 1954, he served for a short while as deputy city administrator of New York and then became president of the Development and Resources Corp., a private concern with wide interests in the promotion of progress in far parts of the earth.

Gordon Clapp combined the best qualities of the educator and the entrepreneur. He was a man of learning with much theoretical knowledge who had at the same time a knack for getting things done. He believed deeply in the best values of democracy and applied them wherever he worked so that individual freedom and improved race relations and social advancement were byproducts of his efforts to promote economic development. His untimely death at 57 is a heavy loss to a nation which has grown to greatness on the basis of just such qualities and capacities.

THE GRAIN TRADE IN A CHANGING WORLD

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, recently there has come to my attention a thoughtful address by Mr. Michel Fribourg entitled "The Grain Trade in a Changing World." Mr. Fribourg, president of the Continental Grain Co., has had a wealth of experience in the field to which he addresses his remarks. I am confident that the Members of Congress will find his thoughts on this important problem of great interest. I ask unanimous consent that his address before the Grain and Feed Dealers National Association meeting in New Orleans on March 14 be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GRAIN TRADE IN A CHANGING WORLD

(By Michel Fribourg)

Gentlemen, I consider it a great privilege and an honor, to address you today at your annual convention. The subject I have selected: "The Grain Trade in a Changing World" is broad in scope. What are the general political and economic trends, which will affect agriculture in the future? Can a dynamic grain trade adapt itself to changing conditions and evolve positive programs for action? We are all interested in these vital questions. I will try to give you certain thoughts I have which will serve as guidelines. I don't profess any particular insight into these difficult problems, nor do I claim to have all the answers. You may challenge my ideas, though some of them will only be proven right or wrong in the passing of time.

Let's first take a look at the major trends in our American agriculture. They are all familiar to you:

1. The trend toward larger farms—mostly family farms.
2. Toward fewer farmers, and
3. The movement from the farms to the cities.

This is nothing new: the number of farms has been declining for over 40 years and the elimination has been mostly in the group of small marginal farmers.

An adjustment in agriculture is taking place faster than many have been willing to admit. Those able to adjust have been moving out of farming. The older, less flexible small operators have remained on the farms but, as they disappear, they are not being replaced, and their farms are being absorbed into the larger ones.

Government programs will gradually lose their importance. These programs have been aimed at assisting adjustments in agriculture without undue hardship to farmers. We are in complete agreement with this objective. I believe, however, that we are achieving adjustments at a rapid rate. In time, it will become unnecessary to protect the marginal farmer who derives his main income from his small farm. Even with the artificial supports he is getting today, he has a hard time making a living simply because he does not produce enough. Therefore, as regrettable as it may seem, he cannot survive economically and will disappear in the long run. As a result, and as our Nation becomes more urban, public opinion will not allow Congress to grant large subsidies to larger and more wealthy farmers. Lawmakers are likely to become increasingly critical of programs which increase Treasury expenditures and increase food costs.

It may seem optimistic to anticipate a reduction in the importance of Government programs in agriculture at a time when there is considerable pressure from some quarters for more Government controls on price, production, and marketing. But I would not be surprised to see a turn in the other direction sooner than one might imagine.

We will, of course, have a transition period when it will still be necessary to provide some income assistance to the marginal farmer. During this time, I believe the soundest approach to the problem is the one of direct payments to farmers. Congress and the Department of Agriculture, at the suggestion and with the approval of the grain trade, have adopted this method for the 1963–64 corn crop. They should be complimented for putting into application this completely new program for grain, which will provide substantial saving to the Government, give a fair return to farmers, and lower prices to consumers. By allowing a free flow of all corn production through marketing channels, the grain trade will be able to accomplish its normal function in the most economical fashion. I am strongly in favor of extending this system to other farm commodities, and first of all to wheat, as I believe it offers many more attractive features than the certificate plan.

If we get a shift to fewer controls—and I have no doubt that this will happen—it will mean that price supports will be gradually reduced, resulting in lower grain prices. American agriculture and the grain trade will have to adjust to this situation. This adjustment can be made without unnecessary hardships. We can foresee new scientific and technological advances which will enable farmers to sell more bushels per acre. As productivity is increased, per bushel costs of production will decrease. Farmers, though receiving lower prices, will still have fair returns and consumers will be paying less.

It is becoming increasingly apparent (and the more successful farmers have recognized this for a long time) that farming is a business, not merely a way of life. Farmers have acted as successful businessmen. They have increased their size of business by use of more capital and have devised means of cutting cost.

The entire agricultural industry has been adjusting to change. In the urbanization of our society, the population growth has been primarily in the coastal regions, which were already food deficit areas. Processing of food, including the feeding of beef and production of poultry, is tending to be located near the population centers rather than close to the sources of feed. This reduces costs and improves service to consumers. More grain is being fed than ever before, but a smaller proportion on the farm where produced. In the 1961 crop year, less than 60 percent of the corn raised in the United States was fed on the farms as compared with over 75 percent 20 years ago. Besides, a much larger share of our grain production is now being exported than was the case only a few years ago. In other words, more grain, in both absolute and relative terms, is moving from farms. This means that more grain will have to be transported over longer distances. There will be more opportunities for us, as it will bring an expansion in our volume of trade, but it will also require some major adjustments in our country and terminal elevator investments. Some locations and types of elevators will become obsolete—some already have—but new challenges will also bring rewards to the farsighted operators.

In line with these trends, it will become increasingly important that the grain trade move its products at the cheapest possible cost. One of the great areas for innovation and change in our grain industry will be in the field of transportation. As you all know, transportation of grains is undergoing a rapid evolution. For years, Government regulations limited the ability of railroads to adjust their rate structure to meet changes and competition. This had the effect of reducing rail traffic of bulk commodities to the benefit of freer truck and water movements. We, in the grain trade, have taken full advantage of these cheaper types of transportation.

President Kennedy's message on transportation completely reversed previous Government policy. The President proposes the removal of minimum rail rate controls. This move will give the railroad an equal opportunity to compete with the other modes of transportation. As advocates of competitive free enterprise, we should wholeheartedly endorse the President's policy. And yet, a great number of industries, including many in the grain trade are fighting for maintenance of historic rate patterns. In many cases they have opposed rate reductions. This attitude may be attributed to any of the following reasons: to the fear of losing certain short-range benefits; to a concern that sharp rate reductions might create general chaos; to a lowering of profits through increased competition; or even simply a resistance to any change. Whatever the causes are, I just cannot, on such a vital issue as this, agree to a position that is in flagrant contradiction with the basic objectives we are all pursuing. We should not compromise on the question of competitive free enterprise. We, as Continental Grain, fully support the liberalization of rail rates. We are in favor of the cheapest transportation costs that will help increase the price to the farmer and reduce it to the consumer. This is one of our main functions and we cannot afford to sidetrack this challenge.

With lower grain prices and lower transportation costs, I am of the opinion that we can substantially increase our food consumption beyond the normal increase which takes place with population growth.

Although nearly everyone in the United States receives enough or even too many calories, many do not have the kind of diets they want or need. American consumers, acting in a free market, have demonstrated they want more meat and less starchy foods. Moreover, they want to substitute more beef for other meats. In our country, few people, if any, cannot afford as much bread as they wish, but many have to restrict the amount of beef they eat. Is it too much to expect that beef be available without undue sacrifices to all consumers? The point is that it takes eight times more grain to produce a pound of beef than a pound of bread. It takes three time more grain to produce a pound of beef than a pound of frying chicken. And, it takes twice as much grain to produce a pound of beef than a pound of pork. We, in the grain trade, can assist in increasing beef production and usage of grain by reducing grain marketing costs.

Optimistic as I am on the possibility of increasing usage of grain in the United States, we must also expand our exports. A hard road lies ahead of us, as we see the immediate picture; however, tremendous opportunities will develop. It will not be a one-way street. Many countries lack dollars to buy the grain they want. Others are trying to protect their own grain farmers by high import duties. However, solutions will be found. I believe we are only at the threshold of our potential growth in volume of exports. Having the cheapest and most abundant source of supply facing an underfed and increasing world population, how can U.S. grain exports fail to increase?

Great political, social, and economic changes are occurring on the international scene. I emphasize these three aspects, because there is a tendency to view them separately, whereas in my mind, they cannot be disassociated. Political and social considerations influence economic reality and vice versa. I am specifically thinking of the trend toward integration of nations, the decline of colonialism, and the creation of new independent nations, and the struggle between the Communist and non-Communist blocs.

The emergence of the European Common Market raises many differing opinions as to the future of U.S. grain exports to this important dollar area. There are two schools of thought on the subject. Pessimists believe the Common Market will move toward self-sufficiency and thereby reduce imports of U.S. products. Optimists believe that the Common Market will increase the standard of living in the member countries to such proportions that they will substantially boost imports of our farm products.

I believe the situation is somewhat different for wheat than for coarse grains. If the ultimate support price in the Community is set high, it will stimulate production and severely curtail our exports of filler wheats. If the support is set low, we can look forward to a satisfactory movement for several years.

As to coarse grains, production in the Common Market will increase, but demand will increase even more, especially if support prices are set low. Therefore, the key is the level of price supports and our Government officials have rightly stressed the need for low prices in the Community. But, "We should practice what we preach." We must, therefore, first lower our prices to the consumer at home and set the example for others to follow.

American agriculture has gone through a very difficult period over the last 15 years, but we now see a possibility that we might find some solutions to our problems. Europe's trends are similar to the ones I have described in our own agriculture, only they are—with the exception of production per acre—at the point we were 20 to 30 years ago. Europe is unaware of what burdensome grain stocks mean. We should urge her to learn from our past mistakes and benefit from our experiences. The sooner she realizes the folly of high support prices and all their consequences, the better off will she be, and so will we.

I would now like to dispel what I believe are some misconceptions about the European Common Market. First of all, I hear and read everywhere about the new levy system which has been set up and creates a tariff wall around the Six. The only thing new is the name levy and the fact that the levy is uniform for all countries. For years, there have been import taxes on grains in Belgium, Holland, and Germany. The major difference is that today, European wheat has a price advantage of $1 per ton within the Common Market, compared with imported wheat of the same quality, and that this advantage may be increased as the integration proceeds. This affects us only in our soft wheat exports. Most of the wheat we sell to Europe is the hard variety type which is not in direct competition with soft European wheats.

We are disturbed, and rightly so, by the idea that Europe wants to build a protectionist community. But let's be realistic about this. The European Common Market wants to become an integrated economic union. By gradual steps, they will equalize the different price supports of each of the members of the Community until, by 1970, there will be one price and complete freedom of trade within the Market. Is this not logical? We have this same freedom within our own frontiers. If this is to be achieved, and our foreign policy has backed this integration since the end of World War II, we will have to get used to the idea, as the Europeans will have to, themselves, of thinking not of France, or Germany, or Holland as separate entities, but of Europe, if not as yet politically united, at least economically. And then, we will come to understand that certain restrictions from outside competition might become necessary within that free trading area. After all, could we conceive, in our own country, free entry of all grains without giving some protection to our farmers? We do have import tariffs on some grains, quotas on others, and even prohibition of imports on some agricultural products, and yet, surely we do not consider ourselves as a protectionist country.

Recent developments, highlighted by the refusal of General de Gaulle to let Great Britain enter the Common Market at this stage, and his concept of a "Europe for the Europeans" appears surely as a major setback for the Western World and for President Kennedy's grand design of the Atlantic Community. Without doubt it came as a great shock to all of us. This situation might be with us for quite some time, but I am convinced that, eventually, the Atlantic Community will become a reality. It will just take longer than its original creators anticipated. "Rome was not built in a day."

As Jean Monnet of France, the "father of the Common Market," said a few months ago, speaking about the future relationship of the United States with the European Economic Community: "America, which has always taken its decisions alone, must now take its decisions in consultation with others. The Common Market countries have had to learn this. Now America is beginning to learn it. In the years ahead," he goes on, "I think America's greatest psychological problem—far greater than any material one—will be in adapting to this new relationship with Europe and the world."

The integration of the European economic bloc is still very far from being completed. and it may need to be strengthened further before it can take on new responsibilities.

I have just returned a few days ago from Paris. My observations are that De Gaulle's position has retarded economic and political integration in Europe. Talking to people from the different European countries, I was amazed at the strong nationalistic feelings which have emerged again, in France as well as in all other five countries of the Common Market. Whereas enthusiasm over the possibilities of European integration had relegated national sentiment to second place, Britain's exclusion from the Community and De Gaulle's bid for leadership and domination of Europe in close association with Germany, has stirred up again all the reservations and balance-of-power arguments, which had remained dormant.

Europe can become an economic and political entity only if each nation is willing to give up some of its prerogatives for the benefit of all and forget old ideas of supremacy. Principles of equality and give-and-take have to prevail if the Community is ever to become a reality. A crisis has arisen, which is serious. It will surely slow down the integration process, but most people believe that, in time, it will be surmounted: Europe is too deeply committed to the Common Market today. The great unknown remains: Who will be the young leaders of tomorrow and what attitudes will they adopt, as older statesmen gradually disappear from the political scene?

We may be disappointed for political and defense reasons that Britain has not yet been accepted into the Common Market. From our own agricultural point of view, we many find it a welcome development. A closer association can be developed between Britain and the Commonwealth. The British market for grain will remain open to us with few or no tariff barriers. This probably would not have been the case, had Britain entered the Common Market under complete European terms.

Furthermore, as long as Britain stays out of the Common Market, the Scandinavian countries will hesitate to join it. If, on the other hand, Spain and Portugal could be induced to enter into some kind of economic association with us, we would be retaining some of our major grain customers in Europe. An expanded European Free Trade Association could yet become viable. We would then be able to face the European Economic Community with a position of greater strength than we can today. Our bargaining power would be enhanced immeasurably for further negotiations toward the more complete integration of the two economic blocs into a true Atlantic Community.

We are deeply concerned with the prospects for grain exports to Western Europe. This area, along with Japan and a few other developed countries, provide the outlet for our sales in convertible currencies. Such sales account for about 60 percent of our exports of agricultural products. These are the type of sales which aid our balance of payments and contribute to the economic progress of our Nation.

But today, a great part of our grain exports are being made under special programs, primarily to the developing countries. These are concessional sales and donations. Payments are made in a variety of ways: local, nonconvertible currencies, barter, and long-term credits. In any event, they imply smaller dollar earnings to the United States than commercial sales. This is particularly true when one considers that most of the local currencies are loaned, or given to the recipient countries for economic development.

Political and social factors have dominated our thinking in our foreign policy toward developing countries, and I believe this is fully justified. From a humanitarian point of view, we have taken the position that poverty has to be eliminated and that the undernourishment, which is still prevalent today, of the great majority of the people in those areas, must disappear. We are committed to the raising of the standard of living in the world. This is our most potent economic weapon in our struggle with the Communist bloc, and, if this can be achieved, then our chances of ultimate success are substantial.

But these special programs, with all their attractive features, are not the complete answer to these problems. Recipient countries have a certain reluctance to receive aid, with the indirect political implications they see connected with it. It does not achieve one of the most important aims of these less developed countries: the expansion of their export trade, vital for their development and growth in living standards. After all, the countries which we refer to as underdeveloped, earn between $30 and $40 billion a year from foreign trade. This is 6 to 8 times as much as the $5 billion they receive in foreign aid. For them trade is aid. If we can help them increase their dollar earnings through exports, we will also be helping ourselves. We are sellers as well as buyers in the international markets, and the amount we sell is directly affected by the level of development in our customers: compare Holland, to which we export goods for a value of $52 per inhabitant, with India, which buys 69 cents worth per inhabitant.

We are no longer in a position, with our international deficits and loss of gold to squander our resources. We need to produce as many dollars as possible through the sale of our agricultural products. We have had some success in this endeavor. After the war large scale Marshall plan aid was provided to a financially insolvent Europe. This helped build up Europe which became a dollar buyer. More recently the same has been true of Japan and now of Spain. However through maintaining aid where it is most needed I feel we could switch more rapidly to dollar sales of our grains in some of the developing countries.

If we are to export our grain to developing countries for dollars we must give them an opportunity to earn dollars. It is a simple economic fact that if a nation wants to export it must import. I would like to propose the following plan to aid developing countries increase their dollar earning power. In addition to paying the world price for specified goods which we import from the developing countries the United States might consider paying them a certain over-price. This over-price would be variable with fluctuation in the world market but would guarantee developing countries a certain minimum price. The widest over-price premium would be paid when world markets are most depressed and none would be paid above a certain world price level. The over-price premiums should be set aside and applied partly to the purchase of U.S. grains and partly to the purchase of U.S. industrial goods.

I realize this plan may be against some of the principles of GATT, but these and other differences could be worked out. Such a scheme would, of course, be a subsidy to developing countries; in fact, we would be giving direct payments for the production of some goods in specified countries. This would have certain definite advantages to both the United States and the developing countries. The United States would receive some dollar earnings from our grain sales. It would enable our nonagricultural industries to sell more manufactured goods. This could prove a competitive advantage, when the developing countries take their place as regular dollar buyers. By temporarily paying higher than world prices for certain materials from these developing countries, we would help stabilize their economies. Prices they would receive from the export of their goods would not be subjected to sharp world market fluctuations. At the same time, the foreign producer, not getting the direct benefit from this increased price, would not be encouraged to expand production beyond the normal world demand.

I believe a system of subsidy or over-price such as I have discussed, is preferable to a widely recommended scheme of international commodity agreements. I base this on observations of the actual operations of the International Wheat Agreement. International commodity agreements can work only when they make economic sense to all participants. As now conceived, I consider their value extremely limited as stabilizers of world prices, and not likely to be very binding on quantity guarantees, whenever they are put to a test for any of these reasons. Besides, they allow those countries which do not participate, to increase their share of the market at the expense of those countries which abide by the rules. This has been the case for the Eastern bloc countries which, until recently, stayed out of the International Wheat Agreement. Would it be conceivable for the International Wheat Agreement to survive, if prices remained for an extended period of time at the high or low range, without any changes being made? Great Britain was a member after the war, when there were severe shortages, but refused to continue in 1953 when it no longer appeared advantageous.

It would be similarly unthinkable that an importing country, if it became self-sufficient, would continue to take its import quota indefinitely. Within a very broad framework, these agreements can have some value, but mostly, I believe, as a forum for countries to discuss mutual problems, to learn from the experiences, good or bad, of one another, and to reach certain understandings of a technical nature.

A most important accomplishment could be to develop close cooperation on providing aid programs for the developing countries.

This is somewhat in line with one of the objectives of the so-called Baumgartner proposal. An ex-Governor of the Bank of France and an outstanding financier, Mr. Baumgartner has evolved a plan for worldwide commodity agreements, which has had the full backing of the French Government. He has devised an ingenious concept, and on the surface, makes it appear as if it solved both our agricultural problems created by the Common Market agricultural policy, and our international balance of payments.

The basic provision of the Baumgartner plan is an agreement between major wheat producers (he takes wheat as a first step) and the Common Market countries to increase the world export price of wheat to the level of the European support price. This theory could have considerable appeal, but, in reality, it has many flaws. I cannot go over all of them, but I can point out that it cannot guarantee a flow of imports by third countries, as quantitative guarantees are excluded by the Rome Treaty. He justifies his high European price support as the world price through the concept that this world price should be based on the highest cost of production of the marginal farmer. We surely cannot condone inefficiency and believe that such a price, on the contrary, should come as close as possible to the cost of production of the most efficient farmer. His attractive price feature is the incentive offered to the United States, to go along with the high support prices to be established in the European Common Market.

This is contrary to our thinking. In our opinion world prices should be low, in order to expand consumer demand and discourage artificial production in areas not suited for low cost growing crops.

I have mentioned to you some of the changes, on the national as well as on the international scene, which can have a major impact on the grain trade in the years to come. On some of these, we have an opportunity to influence the outcome; others are beyond our control. But in all cases, we will have to adapt, to create, and to form a united front. We are in business to render a service at a profit. We must continuously find new ways of providing our services more efficiently, and at less cost. We are the link between the farmers and the food consumers. We must see to it that the majority of the farmers get an equitable income, and that the consumers pay as little as possible for their products. I believe low prices determined in free competitive markets to be an essential element in the development of free grain exchanges, and in the expansion of international trade. I believe no system has been evolved that can replace advantageously the basic laws of supply and demand.

On international policies I would like to quote Federal Reserve Board Chairman William Martin, in a speech he made recently. He replied to certain critics who accused him of putting too much stress on the balance of our international payments, and to others of concentrating too much on domestic goals. Here was his answer: "Both criticisms overlook what seems to me an obvious fact; namely, that our domestic and international objectives are inextricably interrelated. We simply do not have the choice of pursuing one, to the virtual exclusion of the other. Both must be achieved together, or we risk achieving neither."

I fully endorse this type of thinking. We cannot disassociate our domestic from our international policies in grain.

We, in the grain trade, have to form a united front in helping shape Government agricultural and trade policies. I realize that many different interests are involved, and that certain changes can benefit or harm one more than another. Yet, in the last analysis, each one of us has to consider what is best for all from the long range point of view. Temporary hardships can be surmounted, but compromises on basic objectives could lead to the severe weakening of the private grain trade. However, I am sure we can unite and achieve a bright future for the grain trade.

AIR FORCE—REPORTED SHORTAGE IN GOVERNMENT PROPERTY

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on September 8, 1961, I received a report concerning an alleged shortage in Government property which had been furnished to the Air Mod Division, Cook Electric Co., in connection with its contract for maintenance overhaul of C–124 Globemaster aircraft at Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Del.

This information was forwarded to the General Accounting Office; and under date of January 15, 1963, I received a reply confirming that inventory differences representing shortages of some items aggregating $340,500 and overages of other items aggregating $203,800 had been discovered. This represented a net shortage of $136,700.

According to the report from the Comptroller General, in June 1962, the Air Force had accepted the contractor's offer of $25,000 in settlement of this reported inventory difference.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter of the Comptroller General of January 15, 1963, as addressed to me, and a second letter signed by Mr. Hassell B. Bell, Associate Director of the General Accounting Office, as addressed to the Secretary of the Air Force, be printed at this point in the RECORD. These letters outline in greater detail the circumstances concerning these shortages and the settlement thereof.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE
UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., January 15, 1963.
Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: Reference is made to your letter of September 8, 1961, which contained information concerning an alleged shortage of $250,000 in Government property furnished the Air Mod Division, Cook Electric Co., in connection with its contract for maintenance overhaul of C–124 Globemaster aircraft at Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Del.

On the basis of the information furnished in your letter we began a review during October 1961 of the contract records maintained at the Air Force Contract Management Office, Dover Air Force Base, and interviewed Mr. Kreisher as suggested in your letter. Mr. Kreisher advised us that his knowledge of the matter was based only on rumors he had overheard. Since the Air Force was then in the process of investigating these shortages, which represent the value of Government property on the contractor's stock records that could not be located or otherwise accounted for at the time the inventory count was made, we deferred further examination until the Air Force and the contractor reached agreement on the amount of the settlement.

Our examination, which was resumed on August 6, 1962, disclosed that no final and conclusive determination with respect to actual shortages and overages can be made from an examination of the contract records. Neither the contractor nor the Air Force personnel responsible for contract administration were able to satisfactorily explain the shortages and overages except by reference to inadequate records and the contentions of the contractor. However, the Air Force, in negotiations with the contractor, agreed to accept a settlement of $25,000 for the reported shortages.

Since no final determination can be made as to the extent of actual loss to the Government from the records made available for our examination, we have requested the Secretary of the Air Force to comment on the reasonableness of the negotiated settlement. A copy of this letter is enclosed for your information, and we will furnish you a copy of the Air Force reply when it is received.

Sincerely yours,
JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

U.S. GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE,
Washington, D.C., January 15, 1963.
The Honorable the SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE.
Attention: Mr. J. J. McLaughlin, administrative assistant.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The General Accounting Office has examined the settlement negotiated between the Department of the Air Force and Cook Electric Co., Air Mod Division, Morton Grove, Ill., for shortages in Government property furnished the contractor under the fiscal year 1961 contract for maintenance overhaul of C–124 aircraft at Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Del. The shortages represent the value of Government property on the contractor's stock records which could not be located or otherwise accounted for at the time the inventory count was made in July 1961. The inventory count was taken for the purpose of transferring the responsibility for Government property from Air Mod to Hayes International Corp. which was awarded the fiscal year 1962 maintenance overhaul contract.

At the time we began our review in October 1961, the Air Force was in the process of investigating these differences prior to negotiating a final settlement with the contractor. We deferred further examination until the settlement had been completed. In June 1962, the Air Force accepted the contractor's offer of $25,000 in settlement of the reported inventory differences representing shortages of some items of $340,500 and overages of other items of $203,800 or a net shortage of $136,700. Our examination, which was resumed on August 6, 1962, included a review of pertinent contract records at the Air Force Contract Management District, Philadelphia, Pa., at the Air Force Contract Management Office, Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Del., and at Cook Electric Co., Air Mod Division, Morton Grove, Ill.

Negotiated fixed-price contract AF 04(607)–5122, dated July 8, 1960, was awarded to the Air Mod Division of the Cook Electric Co., Morton Grove, Ill., by the Air Force Logistics Command, Warner Robins Air Materiel Area, Robins Air Force Base, Ga. This contract, which covered fiscal year 1961, was the last of four consecutive annual contracts awarded to the Air Mod Division for the maintenance overhaul of C–124 Globemaster aircraft under the progressive aircraft reconditioning cycle concept. The preceding three maintenance overhaul contracts awarded to the Air Mod Division were cost-type contracts. The subsequent contract, for fiscal year 1962, was competitively awarded to the Hayes International Corp. All contract maintenance work performed at Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Del., is administered by the Eastern Contract Management Region, Philadelphia Contract Management District, Dover Contract Management Office, under the Air Force Systems Command.

Pursuant to the general provisions of contract AF 04(607)–5122, the Government was obligated to furnish certain parts and materials which would be required in the performance of the contract. The parts furnished to the contractor are classified, as follows: Category I, "Hi-Valu" items which are subject to special control procedures; category II, property having a unit value in excess of $9.99; and category III, property having a unit value less than $9.99. Additionally, as a separate category of property, the contractor was furnished tools and equipment for use during contract performance. We found that during November 1960 the Air Force property administrator approved the contractor's material control procedures.

According to Air Force records there were no unusual property losses reported by the contractor in performing the first two contracts covering the period from July 1957 to June 1959. In February 1960, before the completion of the third contract, the contractor was directed to make a complete inventory count of all parts and material excluding tools and equipment. This count disclosed the actual inventory was $13,000 less than the contractor's recorded inventory, comprising shortages of $17,100 for some items and overages of $4,100 for other items. The Air Force relieved the contractor of responsibility for the shortage because no facts supporting contractor negligence could be established. This inventory count was accepted by the Air Force and the official records for Government-furnished property were adjusted as of June 1, 1960, for the net shortage of $13,000.

Upon completion of the fourth and last contract, AF 04(607)–5122, an inventory count of Government-furnished property in the possession of the Air Mod Division was taken prior to transfer of this property to Hayes International Corp., the successful bidder for the fiscal year 1962 maintenance contract. The Air Force, Air Mod Division, and Hayes International Corp. personnel participated in the inventory count. A comparison of the inventory count with the contractor's stock record card balances, including those for tools and equipment, showed property shortages of about $552,000 for some items and overages of about $191,000 for other items, or a net shortage of about $361,000.

Subsequently, the contractor conducted a comprehensive review and analysis of 39 high dollar value items. The contractor informed the Air Force on September 22, 1961, that the results of its detailed review, if projected over the entire inventory, showed a net overage of about $10,500 for all classes of property except tools and equipment. This presentation was not accepted by the

Air Force and the contractor agreed to make another review of its inventory records based solely on receipt and issue data. As a result of this latter examination, the contractor reported shortages of $340,500 on some items and overages of $203,800 on other items, and requested that relief from liability for the net shortage of $136,700 be granted. The contractor reported also that the differences were caused by incorrect balances on the stock record cards resulting from errors in posting, errors in documentation, erroneous channeling of supporting documents, and other administrative errors. The contractor contended that the property generally was applicable only to C-124 type aircraft. The contractor stated that any possible shortage could be attributable to the failure of the Government to furnish adequate storage and security facilities to properly store and control the property, and to the use of maintenance repair shops by both Government and contractor personnel.

On the basis of a limited review of stock record cards and in recognition of the various arguments presented by the contractor, the Air Force concluded, after negotiations with the contractor, that $25,000 would be a fair and equitable settlement for the net inventory shortage. In general, the Air Force concluded that a detailed analysis of each item was not feasible and that consideration of selected representative items showed that the actual losses sustained by the Government were, at best, but a small fraction of the shortages indicated by the contractor's records. Furthermore, the Air Force recognized that it contributed in some small part to the poor condition of the records.

Our review of Air Force records showed that during the period of the contract no formal complaints were made by the contractor to support its contention that the Air Force contributed to the shortage by failing to furnish adequate storage and security facilities to safeguard the property and by allowing the maintenance repair shops to be used by both Air Force and contractor personnel.

Our review of the stock record cards maintained by the contractor disclosed (1) inconsistencies in posting transactions, (2) erroneous postings from transaction documents, (3) pencil corrections and notations which could not be explained, and (4) inadequate documentation of receipts and issues. Because of these conditions, the entries on the stock record cards cannot be accepted as a reliable account of property transactions and accountability under the contract. Therefore, no final and conclusive determination with respect to actual inventory shortages and overages can be made from an examination of the contract records. Neither the contractor nor the Air Force personnel contacted in our review were able to satisfactorily explain the shortages and overages except by reference to inadequate records and the contentions of the contractor. However, in negotiations with the contractor, the Air Force has agreed to accept a settlement of $25,000 for the reported shortages.

Since no final determination can be made as to the extent of actual loss to the Government from the records made available for our examination, we would appreciate your comments as to the reasonableness of the settlement and advice as to the current status of the settlement and actions taken to prevent a recurrence of this condition. Copies of this letter are being sent to the commander, Air Force Logistics Command, to the commander, Air Force Systems Command, and to the commander, Eastern Contract Management Region, for their information.

Sincerely yours,

HASSELL B. BELL,
Associate Director.

A RADIO FREQUENCY BAND FOR RADIO ASTRONOMICAL RESEARCH

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly today about a matter which—to the best of my knowledge at least—has not been discussed before this body previously. Yet, in my opinion, even though it is a matter primarily within the area of responsibility of a regulatory agency, it is a matter of great concern to the Congress of the United States, since it concerns the future effectiveness of our space research program.

The matter to which I refer has to do with the possible Federal protection, through the Federal Communications Commission, of a radio frequency band for radio astronomical research. I understand that earlier it had been hoped that the Federal Communications Commission would provide some solid protection for such a channel—but recent developments now indicate that this may not be the case and that some limited commercial operations on the frequency may now be allowed.

According to my information, these limited commercial operations, which could occur on channel 37, would be of very serious detriment to the entire program of the U.S. observations of distant objects in space. The FCC, through a ruling—docket 15022, RM-180—has proposed, for 5 years, to limit operation in this channel to a particular geographical area of the United States. However, they have proposed also to license some commercial stations in New Jersey. If commercial television operations are carried on in this channel anywhere in the United States, it will seriously harm research progress.

It is not essential that channel 37 in particular be free, but it is essential that a free channel be preserved very close to this frequency and 37 is the best choice. There is already a fair amount of international agreement to keep this particular channel open, and it is necessary that the same channel be open on a worldwide basis. Moreover, it seems that this channel is probably the best prospect now available for protection in the United States. It is not sufficient for research purposes that there are clear channels in different parts of the frequency spectrum, because some important astronomical objects have strong energies in this range, and we will be seriously limited if there is not an available channel in approximately every octave of the radio frequency spectrum, including this one.

If the channel is protected for radio astronomy, it will mean the loss of conventional TV broadcasting on only one channel of approximately 69 of the TV spectrum.

It is my personal conviction that national interest and particularly, the wide public interest in research in astronomy and space physics, genuinely supports giving full, unrestricted, and worldwide protection to this channel. Obviously, the FCC can only control the U.S. participation in clearance of the frequency, but our example would go far toward establishing a world agreement on the matter. I cannot emphasize too strongly, that the proposed limits of protection suggested by the FCC are inadequate, and represent a threat to what will otherwise be a crucially significant "window" to radio exploration of space.

It may seem incongruous to some, in light of my established position as being in firm opposition to increasing governmental controls, for me to take to the floor of this body, now urging such a regulatory control. However, if any to whom it might seem incongruous, will take the trouble to look a little deeper, I think it will be most obvious why I am doing so.

There is one area above all where political philosophy must be put aside in order to protect the best interests of the most people—the area of basic space research. I think all who know me will agree that in my work on the Appropriations Committee, I have always taken the position that this is one area where this Nation must surge ahead with all possible practical speed in order that we may fully prepare ourselves for the space age into which we are now entered.

Because I am so firmly convinced that we should let nothing stand in the way of continuing progress in the field of the space sciences, I have written the distinguished chairmen of the Senate Committees on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, and Commerce, urging that these committees give serious consideration, if such is consistent with the policies and the thoughts of the committees as a whole, to recommending to the Federal Communications Commission that some action be taken as quickly as possible to provide such protected facilities for the benefit of our space research program. I urge my colleagues in the Senate to join with me in calling for action on the part of the FCC in this matter, which is so vital to our space research program.

Additionally, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD additional substantive information in the form of a letter from a very dear friend of mine, Dr. Walter Orr Roberts, of the National Center for Atmospheric Research in Boulder, Colo., which he directed recently to Chairman Minow of the Federal Communications Commission; and a draft of the comments on FCC docket 15022, RM-180 by Dr. G. C. McVittie and Dr. G. W. Swenson, Jr., of the University of Illinois Observatory in Urbana, Ill.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 22, 1963.

Mr. NEWTON N. MINOW,
Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MINOW: You have given, I know, careful consideration to the proposed FCC ruling (Docket 15022, RM-180) in respect to the use of TV channel 37 and the needs of radio astronomy. I am sure that there are many arguments for opening this frequency band to TV broadcasting, and I am keenly aware that nature has made things difficult by providing so limited a spectrum range suitable for this service.

However, I believe that the Commission has perhaps not fully recognized the degree to which national interest requires giving full unrestricted and worldwide protection to this channel for scientific research purposes. Even the FCC's proposed limits on the use of the channel represents a threat to this small but crucially significant "window" to space.

The general public will, I am certain, concur with radio astronomers in support for this unique window to the cosmos, and will be fully prepared to make the necessary sacrifice of 1 additional channel among the 50 or more available for conventional television services, as important as these are. Consequently, I hope you will continue your study of this critically important question until a clear decision is reached on the public interest. If the channel is lost for research purposes, I believe that science will be significantly harmed, and that we who are responsible to protect the broad interests of the public will to this extent have failed to provide responsible stewardship of a crucial natural resource.

In making these comments I am speaking as Director of the National Center for Atmospheric Research. NCAR is a basic research laboratory created jointly by 14 universities in response to the recommendation of the National Academy of Sciences. It is sponsored by the National Science Foundation and exists to promote broad national interest in respect to research in the atmospheric sciences.

I am available at any time to amplify my comments to you or your colleagues on the Commission if it will help in reaching a sound decision, and would like very much to call on you personally about this matter. I believe ample technical justification is already in the Commission's hands or abundantly available from the National Academy of Sciences.

You will undoubtedly also hear from the National Radio Astronomy Observatory about this matter. Their role in respect to radio astronomy is similar to ours in respect to atmospheric sciences, and both of us are concerned regarding the protection of channel 37. Please let me know if I can assist in providing further details to you in documenting the research need for this channel.

Very sincerely yours,

Walter Orr Roberts.

Draft Comments on FCC Docket 15022, Rm–180

(Prepared by Dr. G. C. McVittie and Dr. G. W. Swenson, Jr., for Mr. Wm. A. Porter, the university's legal counsel for frequency protection matters)

Comments on sections 4 and 5: Attention is drawn to the phrase "* * * public interest questions raised by the conflicting needs of television broadcasting and radio astronomy with respect to channel 37."

The Commission does not mention the existence of any evidence that the public has demanded more UHF television channels. Indeed the actions (December 1962 and January 1963) of the city of Danville, Ill., of the County Board of Supervisors of Vermilion County, Ill., and of the Senate of the State of Illinois in petitioning the FCC for the allocation of 608–614 Mc/s to the radio astronomy service, show that the opposite is the case. When the public is apprised of the conflicting needs of television and of radio astronomy, the American public is apparently quite ready to give up one of the UHF television channels for the needs of a branch of space science.

The Commission cites the example of Paterson, N.J., as a city where no alternative to the use of channel 37 is possible.

Again there is no reference to any evidence that the citizens of Paterson, N.J., are dissatisfied with the number of television channels which now serve them. This is hardly surprising since Paterson, N.J. lies 15 miles from the center of Manhattan and the New York area is already served by seven television channels.

Comments on sections b(C) and 9:

The Commission wishes to restrict discussion to the 608–614 Mc/s band (sec. 9) but nevertheless itself refers to the protection accorded to the band 404–410 Mc/s in regions 2 and 3 and to 406–410 Mc/s in region 1 (sec. 6(C)). The conclusion might be drawn that since the latter bands are protected in the critical part of the frequency spectrum below 1000 Mc/s, protection at 608–614 Mc/s is unnecessary. This is to misunderstand the nature of the radio astronomy problem: a clear band is needed roughly in every octave below 1400 Mc/s. It should also be stated for the completeness of the record that the draft proposals of the United States for the next ITU Conference (Doc. 6975/4–4.4/3.1.16 Ref. Doc. 6134/2–4.4) contains the proposal to delete the protection accorded to 404–410 Mc/s and thus remove what has been described by European radio astronomers as "this precious asset" accorded to radio astronomy at Geneva in 1959. The precious asset is to be replaced by an unsatisfactory secondary allocation at 328.6–335.4 Mc/s.

Comments on section 10: I. Two general comments are necessary, the first of which refers to the function of a large telescope. Whether the instrument is an optical one or a radio telescope, it is usually built with a definite initial observing program in mind. This initial program, in the case of the University of Illinois radio telescope, is the compilation of a catalog of positions and of flux densities of extragalactic radio sources as described in section 6(A). But this does not mean that, on the termination of the initial program, the instrument ceases to have any use. On the completion of our catalog, it will undoubtedly be necessary to study individual sources further; the addition of a second relatively small radio telescope would turn the 600 by 400 foot parabolic cylinder into a powerful interferometer, with which data on the angular diameters of radio sources could be obtained; studies of the moon and of the planets of the solar system can be undertaken, and so on. The analogy with the (optical) 48-inch Schmidt telescope at Palomar Mountain is useful here. This instrument was built with the National Geographic-Mount Palomar Sky Atlas project in mind. When the Sky Atlas was completed, the 48-inch Schmidt was not dismantled and abandoned as a research tool. It has continued to be used in a variety of research programs in optical astronomy (reports of the director, Mount Wilson and Palomar Observatories). Similarily the 600 by 400 foot parabolic cylinder radio telescope of the University of Illinois is not an ephemeral project which will be abandoned after 5 years. It is the start of a radio astronomy observatory of permanent value, provided, of course, that radio astronomy is permitted to continue on earth. And this continuation is dependent on freedom from interference by manmade radio noise.

The second comment is that nearly all the significant work to date on distant extragalactic radio sources has been done at frequencies below 1000 megacycles. The reason is not far to seek: these sources radiate the more powerfully, the lower the radio frequency. At 1400 megacycles and above their radiation is so weak that only a few of the strongest ones have been studied by these means.

Answers to questions A to F of section 10:

1. The initial observing program (catalog of extragalactic radio sources) ideally requires observations to be made for 24 hours a day for 365 days a year. The obstacles to attaining this ideal are of two kinds (a) natural, (b) man made. These will operate in the following ways:

(a) (i) Presence of the sun on or near the meridian. The sun's radiation at 608–614 megacycles is so powerful as to obliterate the signals from extragalactic sources. (ii) High winds, ice storms, sonwstorms. In these conditions access to the trusses carrying the antennas is dangerous to personnel. Setting the antennas—which has to be done manually—will be impossible in these conditions.

(b) Manmade radio signals from terrestrial radio transmitters, those in satellites, etc., can obliterate the signals from extragalactic radio sources.

2. Initial program: Completion of a catalog of accurate positions and flux densities of extragalactic radio sources. The period of 5 years for the completion of this program quoted in section 7 implied that from 12 to 16 hours a day, free of radio interference, will be available. Sec. 8 suggests that there may be as few as 4 hours a day free of interference under the plan proposed by the FCC. Thus the period for the completion of the initial program could be extended to 15 or 20 years. This is only another way of saying that without proper protection from manmade interference, radio astronomy is in practice impossible.

Later programs: Since the operation of a radio astronomy observatory is a continuing process, it can be anticipated that the initial program will be followed by observing programs of the general types outlined in (I) above. Therefore, there is no foreseeable end to the work of the University of Illinois Vermilion River Observatory any more than there is to the activity of the Mount Wilson and Palomar Observatory or to that of the National Radio Astronomy Observatory.

3. The results of the initial program are expected to be—(a) Better positions than are now available for extragalactic radio sources.

(b) As a consequence of (a), and of the simultaneous measurements of the flux densities of the sources, new and important information regarding the nature of the universe will be obtained. This is because it is highly probable that many of the radio sources are very remote. The rate of increase of numbers of radio sources with decreasing average flux density is an important criterion for identifying the kind of universe in which we live and so of solving the problem of the exact nature of the expansion of the universe.

(c) As a second consequence of (a), the optical identification of extragalactic radio sources will be facilitated. This then permits the study in both the optical and the radio domains, of these exceptional objects. In spite of the work being done at other radio astronomy observatories in the world, at frequencies other than 611 megacycles, the problem of identification is still far from a solution.

(d) The observations will fix one more point on the radio spectrum of each radio source in the important region below 1,000 megacycles. These radio spectra provide one means of identifying the character of the radio emission of galaxies and should ultimately help to explain why one galaxy is an emitter of radio waves while another is not.

The later programs are expected to throw further light on the possible variability of certain extragalactic radio sources, their angular diameters, composite structure, etc. The nature of the emission at 611 Mc/s of the moon and the planets of the solar system would add to the information about the physical characteristics of these bodies.

The exploration of every new field of science necessarily yields results that cannot be foreseen in advance. If such foresight were possible, the exploration would be superfluous. Radio astronomy is leading to new discoveries every day, just as optical astronomy has been doing for the past 2,000 years and still continues to do today.

4. This question appears to be based on the presupposition that radio astronomical observations are so few in number that observing programs can be switched from one instrument to another without a serious net loss in the amount of information obtained. This is as untrue in the radio domain as it is in the optical. The 200-inch telescope at Mount Palomar can do all that the new 120-inch telescope at the Lick Observatory in California can. The existence of both instruments, however, more than doubles the rate at which information can be acquired. The 300-ft. dish at the National Radio Astronomy Observatory, with a collecting area of some 71,000 sq. ft., is the nearest approach to a survey type instrument like that of the University of Illinois. It would be as absurd to suggest that the observing program of the 300-foot dish be abandoned in favor of those of the Illinois instrument, as it would be to propose that the program of the 120-inch telescope at Lick should be stopped in order to take over the work of the Mount Palomar 200-inch.

The answer to question 4 is therefore that there is no alternative instrument in the United States.

It would be equally pertinent to inquire if there were alternative television transmitters in the New Jersey area which could be received in Paterson.

5. The broader the bandwidth is, the more sensitive is the instrument. The sensitivity varies as the square root of the bandwidth. Therefore, the widest possible band should be provided; in no case less than 5 megacycles/second.

6. Mr. Robert F. Kirby of the Central Radio Propagation Laboratory of the National Bureau of Standards has prepared a report entitled "Potential Interference from UHF Television Channel 37 to the Radio Astronomy Service," February 5, 1963. This computations show that the signal from a Channel 37 TV transmitter on the Empire State Building with effective radiated power of 202 kw, would produce a signal at the antenna output terminals of the University of Illinois Radio Telescope of 191 decibels below one milliwatt approximately 5 percent of the time, through the mechanism of tropospheric scattering. This is within the detection capability of the radio telescope and would result in nearly as many spurious sources as real sources being recorded. A transmitter 365 feet high, in Paterson, N.J., with an E.R.P. of 242 kw would produce a similar effect.

Mr. Kirby's computation of the power received by reflection from the moon, for the situation in which the moon is on the horizon of a transmitting station at Paterson, N.J., and randomly oriented with respect to a radio telescope, shows that the power received by the telescope is 222 decibels below 1 milliwatt. This is not considered to be a threat to the University of Illinois program. Further computations, assuming the moon to be randomly oriented with respect to the transmitter and in the main beam of the radio telescope, show a very strong level of interference, namely 163 decibels below 1 milliwatt. One of the programs planned for the Vermilion River Observatory is a series of measurements of the moon's radiation at 610 megacycles; this measurement would be impossible under the conditions of interference described.

Satellites such as Echo (100-foot balloon) are not expected to pose a serious problem because of their rapid motion.

CONCLUSIONS

I. Radio astronomy at 611 megacycles per second has a foreseeable lifetime far longer than 5 years. The University of Illinois radio telescope will thus continue to be used after January 1, 1966.

II. The protection accorded to this instrument by the Commission's proposal is a useful interim measure. But the answer to question F above indicates that many reruns over portions of the sky would be needed in order to distinguish between real sources and the spurious ones due to radio interference. Thus the time needed to complete the initial program would be increased by an unforeseeable amount.

The Commission's proposal is not the final answer to the protection problem for the University of Illinois instrument, or for the continuance of radio astronomy in the United States. The appropriate answer is the reservation of 608–614 megacycles per second for the radio astronomy service throughout the country.

III. If the conclusion of item (II) above is accepted, the granting of licenses for commercial television to operators outside the 600 miles radius will create vested interests that will make the evenutal clearance of 608–614 megacycles per second more difficult.

Attention is drawn to the fact that the Commission mentions no evidence in favor of the proposition that the American public, either in Paterson, N.J. or elsewhere, has demanded that broadcasting on channel 37 be instituted.

METCALF DOESN'T DODGE IN ANSWERING QUESTIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the Independent Record of Helena, Mont., there appears an article by Robert E. Miller entitled "METCALF Doesn't Dodge in Answering Questions." It refers to our distinguished colleague and my close associate in matters of concern to our State and the Nation, the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF].

Mr. Miller's article is in the nature of a report on Senator METCALF's frank exchanges with members of the Helena Chamber of Commerce on various issues of the day. It is an excellent report which emphasizes the Senator's characteristics of courageous honesty, straightforward approach, sound knowledge, and deep dedication to the interests of the people of Montana and the Nation. These are, indeed, the characteristics which have served to raise LEE METCALF to such high esteem in the Senate in the relatively short time that he has been in this body.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article previously referred to be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ISSUE OF THE DAY—METCALF DOESN'T DODGE IN ANSWERING QUESTIONS

(By Robert E. Miller)

Senator LEE METCALF, who addressed the Helena Chamber of Commerce dinner the other evening and concluded his talk by answering a series of questions, left no one in doubt about where he stands on several controversial issues.

On one or two questions he confessed to a lack of information and on some he protested that the subject was too broad to be covered in so brief a time.

On one or two he assured his listeners that he stood with them and would do what he can to advance the purposes enunciated by the chamber of commerce.

One of these had to do with the reorganization of the Helena office of the Internal Revenue Service. He said that he had met with local employees of the office concerning possible reassignments and had been assured that Secretary Dillon will soon announce a new reorganization plan.

"We are not convinced," he said of himself and Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, "that the proposed plan will save money, but we think it will cost jobs and service in Montana."

On another question he also gave the answer that was expected of him.

SMELTER ISSUE

That concerned the East Helena smelter and the issue of whether the import quota of lead ore from South Africa will be transferred to another nation so that imports will remain at the present level and no plants need be closed.

He brought his hearers up to date on one aspect, which is that the Tariff Commission has already ruled that the quota cannot be transferred, that an appeal is being taken and the President will be asked to decide.

But, he warned, the American Mining Congress is split on the issue because some of the big American mining concerns are backers of the South African smelter and they want to import its product to this country.

MORE INDUSTRIES

When he was asked how Montana might attract more industries he confessed that if he knew that answer he would go into the business of attracting industries.

But he pointed out that Montana has two things which are in its favor, first, the brainpower developed at such institutions as Montana State College which is reflected in Montronics, the new electronics industry in Bozeman, and second, its falling water, which might be transformed into cheap power as was done at Hungry Horse Dam to develop the aluminum industry at Columbia Falls.

On Federal aid to education, he revealed that he has not modified his opinion.

"I am convinced," he said, "that the people of America can no longer stand high property taxes needed to care for their educational systems and that we need to supplement this with Federal assistance."

He pointed out that in his opinion the Federal funds for impacted areas are Federal aid, as is the National Defense Education Act. He has had no expression of opposition to this, he said, except from Governor Babcock.

GENERAL ACT NEEDED

"A general act that would spend the same amount of money as these two programs," he said, "would be the cheapest, most beneficial and would take care of Federal activities in the field of education without Federal control."

Concerning the issue of depletion allowances to the oil and mining industries, he charged that his point of view has been distorted by the press.

Depletion allowances for the mining industry, he said, provides for its lifeblood in western Montana. He pointed out that this is a method whereby the government avoids the taxation of capital and said that whether it is 27 percent or 31 percent for oil and 15 or 17 percent for mining is only a numbers game. The important thing is that the program be continued.

One method of improving the depletion allowance, he said, would be to apply it before income is figured so that it would benefit low-profit mining operations, such as those at Butte.

Senator METCALF asserted that he would vote for Federal aid to private colleges, but not for Federal aid to private elementary and secondary schools.

He said that the private colleges, such as Carroll, are making significant and vital contributions to progress and research in this country.

"I differentiate on a historical and traditional basis between contributions to private elementary and secondary schools and contributions to higher education so far as the Government is concerned," he said. "I would vote only for Federal aid to public elementary and secondary schools."

Concerning a pending bill on unemployment compensation, he said that there should be as much States rights and as much State control as possible, but that he does not know exactly what the bill provides.

TAX REFORM

He said that he believes the reform provisions of the proposed tax reduction bill will not be enacted, but that he favors the President's tax proposals which provide for a deficit for the next 3 fiscal years in order to stimulate the economy by a tax reduction that he believes would eventually produce more revenue.

Not all of the questions were controversial, but certainly those on Federal aid to education, Federal aid to private schools, the depletion allowances, cheap electrical power at Government expense, and deficit spending are issues on which he could not have expected unanimity from his audience.

THE MASS TRANSPORTATION BILL

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on April 4, 1963, this body, by a margin of only 11 votes, passed S. 6, known as the mass transportation bill. I vigorously opposed the bill in both committee and on the floor of the Senate. The bill is now pending before the House of Representatives.

Since the Senate passed the bill, there have come to my attention some interesting and revealing comments on the subject matter; one in the form of an editorial appearing April 9, 1963, in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat newspaper, and another in a letter addressed to me by a constituent, whose name I have been requested not to reveal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial and the letter referred to be printed at this point in the Record as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial and letter were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Apr. 9, 1963]

Mr. Kennedy's Mass Transportation Scheme: A Gold-Plated Tax Drain

The first administration victory in this session of Congress was a brand New Frontier pork barrel, gilded with multimillion-dollar hoops. The Senate voted 52 to 41 last week for the President's mass transportation measure.

This program got its fledging start 2 years ago, when the Housing Act of 1961 afforded $50 million loan authority, for studying city transit problems and suggesting solutions. Like so many Federal bureaucracy babies, this one grew as fast as a toadstool.

No longer does the big-spend camel poke its nose in the Government's fiscal tent. It bursts in like a rhino, ripping budget walls, mouth wide in hunger for giveaways from Washington's deficit finance.

This year the administration wanted $500 million to subsidize mass transportation in cities, by grants and loans. This was scaled down, by a specious amendment, to $375 million.

But it would cost Uncle Sam $6 to $10 billion, if Federal Government meets its share of handling mass transit in the United States, as visualized under this scheme.

Here is a gold-plated drain for taxpayers' money that could make TVA look like a power puddle ditch and knock the stuffing out of budgets for decades to come.

The problem of mass transportation in the Nation's cities is difficult and pretty general. But it most certainly should be a local function, as other city facilities are a local function.

If Federal bureaucracy continues to usurp State and local duties, with thick slices of easy subsidy, there can be no end but bankruptcy for the national Government.

It is impossible to justify endowing mass transportation in 26 major cities, or more, at a cost to every taxpayer in the land. It is illogical and wrong, for instance, to tax farmers in Missouri for St. Louis' failure to solve its transit problem.

* * * * *

There is absolutely no question but that public transit systems of large cities, in many cases, are having a hard time. Mass transportation has been a declining industry since general automobile usage—except for the war years. Some kind of rapid transit may be an answer.

It is not clear yet that subsidies generally are essential. But if they do prove necessary they should be a clear public obligation of local areas, not of debt-ridden Big Brother in Washington.

The House should kill the Senate mass transportation measure and balk this new venture into tax prodigality.

The national welfare cannot require a tiff digger outstate or a cow puncher in Wyoming to pay for mass transportation in St. Louis.

Congress should dump this pork barrel before it starts to roll the country into further, soaring deficits.

Hon. Frank J. Lausche,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Frank: Thank you very much for sending the records of the transit hearings. I have read virtually every page.

I have noticed several stellar attempts at managing the facts by the protransit lobby.

Several times it was mentioned that 3 miles of freeway in Cleveland cost a terrible $70 million. What they didn't mention is that these are the 3 downtown miles, including the giant innerbelt bridge across the Cuyahoga Valley. This is not ordinary highway construction. They have been using this Cleveland example for months, even in national advertising, without mentioning the true facts.

A downtown subway for rails in Cleveland was estimated at $35 million for an approximate mile, which is more costly than the $70 million figure for 3 miles of roadway. There will be plenty of costly rapid transit projects in this program.

I noticed the Boston & Maine experiment included, and being pronounced a success. But nobody mentioned how many autos it took off the street during the congested rush hour. The gains they speak of come all across the clock, and from—as mentioned—competing buslines.

For instance, the Erie Railroad in Cleveland has 1 train into Cleveland daily that picks up 12 passengers at the Lee Road Station. If we got Government money, and added 3 or 4 trains during the day, and picked up another 12 passengers, that would be a 100-percent increase. And the added passengers did not come out of rush-hour traffic anyway. All figures are clouded so one cannot tell what rush-hour traffic was picked up (prime point of the proposed subsidies) and did it come from auto or the competing buslines?

Here is a control that is desperately needed on the bill, or else the Government will have no check as to the results of grants.

If you can get someone in the House to add a rider to the bill making it mandatory to receivers of loans to submit ride counts on all lines on the respective systems annually, with severe penalties if this is not done, we will be able to see the results of the transit legislation.

This, Frank, is necessary. Let me give you an example.

The Windermere rapid transit station in Cleveland has been losing riders for the past few years. It is impossible to attract any new auto business to it, and the new Lakeland Freeway has opened to the Euclid area.

With all the national attention beamed on rapid transits, CTS cannot afford to have the Windermere rapid transit station losing riders. So what did they do, effective this weekend? They took off all through buses from downtown Cleveland to Euclid Beach Park on the Lake Shore express on all runs, except during rush hours.

This means that if you stand in front of Euclid Beach Park, Villa Angela, Beulah Beach, the only bus you can get is one that takes you across town, ignoring the new freeway, to Windermere rapid transit depot. Running time is now 45 minutes instead of 22 minutes, but with all the kids and families going to Euclid Beach this summer, this will boost the Windermere station counts.

And I can hear it now in Washington at some future hearing. "In Cleveland, when the Lakeland Freeway was opened, our rapid transit in Cleveland gained riders at the nearest rapid station—Windermere."

That is why it is necessary to keep counts following grants on all routes, a system run to see if they gained any new riders, or if it is just bus diversion. Virtually any gain made on the CTS rapid has been caused by eliminating or diverting buses, not autos to clear up congestion.

Another example of trying to divert bus passengers from the freeways: CTS already charges 5 cents more on the Lake Shore express bus than the rapid, on the basis that it is a fast ride. The other day they were going to establish four stops on East 185th Street so that these citizens could get a fast ride downtown over the new Lakeland Freeway. CTS management wanted another 5-cent premium, or a 40-cent fare to ride buses on the freeway, against 30 cents on the rapid transit.

If you are at St. Clair Avenue and Nottingham Road today, you can't get a bus downtown over the new Lakeland Freeway (a 17-minute run to East Third and Superior), but instead buses at that point carry you to Windermere Station for a 45- to 50-minute ride downtown, another example of diversion.

I realize that you have waged a tremendous battle, Frank, and after reading the records, it was a very trying and fierce one. History books are going to record those who had foresight, against a wave of votes that tried to re-create an age of 50 years ago in big cities. It was like voting subsidies to horse buggy manufacturers when the autos came out.

Thanks for everything, and if you can pass the word to make them responsible by furnishing ride counts as part of Federal law, we'll have something.

Sincerely,

THE WESTERN CHOICE IN EAST-CENTRAL EUROPE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, there have been a number of suggestions in the press in recent weeks that the United States is deemphasizing, and perhaps even planning to abandon its commitment to the ultimate liberation of the captive peoples of Central Europe. Among other things, the press has reported that the funds available for the refugee political groupings, with whom we have heretofore been working, have been sharply curtailed.

I hope that these reports are in error or at the least exaggerated, because I can conceive of no more deadly blow to the cause of freedom or to our national security than the formal abandonment of the captive peoples. This fact is frequently forgotten; but the captive peoples of Europe, so long as the hope of liberation remains alive, have constituted one of the main deterrents to Soviet aggression and, in this sense, have protected the peace.

Of all the refugee political organizations in this country the Assembly of Captive European Nations is unquestionably the best known and most effective. The assembly has recently issued a memorandum entitled "The Western Choice in East-Central Europe." In this memorandum the assembly points out that—

> A Western policy which would not aim beyond stabilization would prompt a bolder Soviet bid for the mastery of Europe, for the simple reason that it would suppress one of the deterrents to a reckless policy of intimidation: the spirit of resistance in East-Central Europe. Paradoxically enough, then, to achieve stability, the West must aim beyond stability to a Europe united in its natural confines.

Mr. President, I consider the memorandum of the Assembly of Captive European Nations to be a document of great significance and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Record at this point, in the hope that all of my colleagues will give it the attention it deserves.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Western Choice in East-Central Europe—A Memorandum

At a time of decision for Western civilization and the entire cause of freedom, it is incumbent upon the Assembly of Captive European Nations to affirm, once again, its conviction that (1) the struggle for Europe, the decisive arena in the global contest between freedom and communism, is far from being over; (2) the people of East-Central Europe are apt to play a very significant role in this struggle; (3) durable and secure peace will remain unattainable as long as Soviet power will be left in control of the geographic center of Europe; (4) to serve both the short- and long-term requirements of a free Europe, moral and political obligation and self-interest equally enjoin the Western Powers to voice and demonstrate by meaningful political action their vital stake in the freedom of the Eastern half of Europe, as well as their steadfast resolve to help, by all legitimate means, the captive peoples recover the exercise of their right of self-determination.

The validity of these views was increasingly confirmed in the last 2 years. Western policy has, nevertheless, tended to move away from them. It has, in fact, been inclined to downgrade, if not to discount altogether, the beneficial impact of an active Western support of the freedom yearnings of the captive peoples upon the outcome of the continuing struggle for the freedom of Europe. Its favorite assumption seems to be that Western restraint generates Soviet moderation, and both beget stability in Europe. Hence, accommodation with the Communist regimes is not only the "realistic" course, but the only way in which the West could extend its influence to the ultimate benefit of the people concerned.

These clearly discernible trends call for more than a reaffirmation of deeply held convictions. They demand (I) an examination of both Western views and current misconceptions on East-Central Europe; (II) a presentation of the views of the assembly on the present stakes of the West in the same area, and (III) an outline of specific measures designed to promote the vital common interests of the Western Powers and their allies in East-Central Europe. This is, indeed, what this memorandum attempts to do.

I

Fairness commands that the examination of Western views on and policies toward East-Central Europe be prefaced by the statement that it is in the legislative bodies of the Western nations, the U.S. Congress above all, and in such international parliamentary assemblies as the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe and the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, that the issue of the freedom of the captive nations receives nowadays the greatest attention and the most outspoken support. It is in such bodies that the purpose of an East-Central Europe—free from outside domination and living under institutions and governments freely chosen by the respective peoples—is most consistently upheld. It is in these respected bodies that practical policies incompatible with the proclaimed purpose find few advocates or supporters.

In the absence of a common policy in the framework of NATO, there is, in the West, on the executive governmental level, a wide range of positions in regard to East-Central Europe. Three major trends deserve examination.

The first, as set forth in authoritative U.S. statements,[1] correctly notes that despite changes in the direction of more internal autonomy, "Soviet military power remains the ultimate force that sustains the power and authority of the Communist minorities, guarantees the continued existence of the regimes, and prevents any national defection from the Soviet bloc." In line with this basic assessment of the situation, the U.S. objective is defined as "to see in Eastern Europe fully independent nations enjoying internal freedom and normal relations with all countries." The expectations are, however, very sober. Because of Soviet domination "any far-reaching change, involving a rollback of Soviet control, is unlikely at an early date," and, except in the event of unforeseen developments, "progress toward the U.S. long-term objective" in Eastern Europe "appears realizable only by gradual means." Extension of U.S. and Western influences "by maintaining and developing more normal and active relations with the Eastern European governments of the Soviet bloc"—is declared to be the practical policy. This is to be pursued to the extent possible to do so without, at the same time, sacrificing basic American principles, "without endorsing the internal and foreign policies of the governments, or accepting or implying that we (i.e., the U.S. Government) accept in any way the status quo of Soviet domination as a satisfactory or permanent condition of affairs in that area."

This neatly balanced definition of goals and means, and sober assessment of future outlook presents one basic flaw. Experience indicates, indeed, that any progress on the road to more active relations with the Eastern European governments is likely to be paid by silence on the ultimate goal ("silence is consent" is an old saying the Russians like to quote when it serves their purpose); by the elimination from the agenda of the United Nations of the one fragment of East European subjugation with which the world Organization is concerned, the question of Hungary which might be an "irritant to the Soviet rulers but is a stimulant to the captive peoples; by subdued information programs; in short, by actions of commission or omission conveying to the people most concerned the depressing message of the acceptance of the status quo.

There seems to be some misconceptions at the root of this attempt to reconcile ends and means which in practice, if not in theory, are mutually exclusive. One is the belief that direct contacts—personal, cultural, economic, through governmental channels are the sine qua non of Western influence with both regimes and peoples. The fact that contacts are but minor means of carrying influence is overlooked. In a situation like the one prevailing in Eastern Europe, the choice of the carrier itself would preclude any positive influence upon peoples profoundly, if mostly silently, hostile to the regimes. As to the ruling groups, it would be self-deceptive to expect that regimes perfectly aware of their utter dependence on Soviet power could be tempted to help engineer their own doom. The main point is that influence is not a function of contacts but rather of the message the West can give to the captive peoples. To the extent to which it succeeds in projecting itself as strong, determined and winning, and to the extent it also cares to identify itself with the goal of the captive peoples, it exercises a stimulating influence on the people and a restraining influence on their unchosen rulers. Conversely, eagerness to develop official contacts is viewed as a sign of weakness. It breeds contempt among the ruling groups and discouragement among the broad masses of the people.

It follows that the pursuit of contact and gradual ameliorations can only be reconciled with the proclaimed goal of freedom and independence, if this goal is never drowned in silence but, on the contrary, is frequently and authoritatively voiced and pursued by meaningful, if not immediately effective, political actions. Past experience would indicate, however, that such efforts at reconciliation are fraught with so many practical difficulties that the prospects of accomplishing them successfully for any length of time appear very dim.

The second trend, quite widespread in Europe, is to regard the issue of Soviet imperialism at the expense of the captive nations as a convenient point of rebuttal whenever Soviet "anticolonialism" displays an excessively cynical form in international assemblies. In this view, the issue of the freedom of the eastern half of Europe is a long-range moral problem; it has ceased to belong to practical politics. The Communist regimes and the status quo of the captive nations' subordination to Moscow are accepted as realities which neither the peoples concerned nor the West is prepared or able to change fundamentally. Contacts and trading with these regimes are viewed as matters of expediency and national interest, and are all the more welcomed as they are deemed to contribute to the evolution of the Communist regimes toward more humane and rational ways.

Lastly, a third trend averts a direct confrontation with the problem of the captive nations by holding out the more far-reaching prospect of a continental system stretching from the Atlantic to the Urals. It rests on a rather sanguine conception of the power of Communist China and the threat it would represent for the Soviet Union.

In spite of being so different, the aforementioned trends rest on a number of closely related, if not common, premises, assumptions, and judgments. They bear a closer review.

1. "The situation in Europe is stabilized and can only be changed at the prohibitive price of war"—is more often than not the

---

[1] Particularly in the most comprehensive recent statement of U.S. policy on the captive nations, the statement of the Honorable William R. Tyler, Assistant Secretary for European Affairs, Department of State, before the Subcommittee on Europe of the U.S. House of Representatives, on Sept. 13, 1962.

fundamental premise of the opponents of an active east-central European policy.

This proposition fails to pass any closer scrutiny. The Soviet Union is as intent as ever to gain further ground in Europe and its rulers believe that they could succeed in this without war, by intimidation and a crisis strategy.

For more than 3 years they have been pursuing this strategy by stirring up the Berlin crisis on the calculation that sooner or later, when faced with a clear-cut choice between risking all or accepting Soviet terms, the West will yield. This, Moscow expects, would undermine the credibility of American guarantee and induce a gradual breakdown of the Western alliances. The fact that a halt was called to this offensive, following the Cuban miscalculation, might only indicate that, before probing again or pushing to a showdown, Moscow wants to complete the buildup of its military potential and certain specific armament programs, bring some order in the Communist house, and in the process, confusion and complacency among its opponents.

A Western policy which would not aim beyond stabilization would prompt a bolder Soviet bid for the mastery of Europe, for the simple reason that it would suppress one of the deterrents to a reckless policy of intimidation: The spirit of resistance in East-Central Europe. Paradoxically enough then, to achieve stability, the West must aim beyond stability to a Europe united in its natural confines.

2. By denouncing the coexistence policy of Khrushchev—one often hears—Communist China has certified the genuineness of this policy.

In fact, Khrushchev himself has called coexistence a form of struggle for the achievement of the ultimate Communist goal. The program adopted at the XXII Party Congress leaves no doubt that for Moscow peaceful coexistence is—in the words of an American authority on Soviet affairs—"a prolonged contest in which it must exert its full strength and will in order to make decisive gains by all means short of nuclear war."

3. Since liberation of East-Central Europe is only possible by some kind of military action, it is said, and since the United States and its allies do not contemplate any such action—it would be irresponsible to represent freedom and independence for the captive nations as an objective of American or Western policy.

Commitment to a purpose is in itself a political action productive of far-reaching effects. The Communists have always recognized and acted upon this truth. Their strength lies precisely in their ability to bring about change in their favor by means short of all-out war. To accept the theory that an area or a people once taken over by communism are beyond recovery by similar means is to admit defeat in advance.

4. It is claimed that Eastern Europe is in the midst of a process of relaxation of terror and gradual liberalization. The process would be disturbed by a Western insistence of maximal goals. It could be, on the contrary, furthered by Western aid and an expanded Western program of contacts, trade, and cultural exchanges.

To begin with, it would be much more correct to speak in terms of relaxation of repression than in terms of liberalization. The changes which have occurred in East-Central Europe since the death of Stalin represent essentially a lessening of irrational and unnecessary terror. They are not changes in the nature of the totalitarian dictatorships, or in the nature of the relationship with the Soviet Union.

These relaxations of repression, varying in degree from country to country, occurred in the past and are likely to appear again in three circumstances:

(a) Uncertainty in regard to the real source of ultimate authority in Moscow, with the ensuing caution and vacillation on all echelons of power. This was the case during the struggle for power in the Kremlin, following Stalin's death.

(b) Communist fear of a general uprising at a particularly inauspicious time. This was the case of Poland, in October 1956, and it caused a substantial tactical retreat on the part of the Communist regime.

(c) Confidence among the ruling groups deriving from international developments favorable to the Soviet Union and from a mood of dejection among their subjects.

The first two of these circumstances were certainly not products of Western aid, credits, contacts or good will. They were the result of a combination of internal and external pressures. As for the third circumstance in which some relaxation occurred in the past, discouragement among the ruled and confidence among the rulers, this certainly involved Western responsibilities. But these were not of a sort that warrant any satisfaction. For discouragement means more security for Soviet Russia and, hence, a bolder Soviet policy toward its main target: Western Europe.

Economic aid, it must be conceded, could at best help in preserving some of the gains secured by popular pressure in a country like Poland, providing, however, that the respective regime is kept aware that any further encroachment on the very limited rights and liberties the Polish people recovered in 1956 would bring about the termination of aid.

A recent report of the Special Study Mission of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, rightly remarks that "the Western European countries tend to look at the Soviet bloc mainly as a market for their exports—while the Communists regard the West primarily as a source of essential goods." "Western exports of capital goods enable the bloc"—continues the report—"to telescope technological progress in various fields." "The Soviet bloc derives greater benefit from this trade than do the countries of free Europe"—concluded the report. The Western Powers seem to be set to pursue such trade. If so, in the light of these findings, they should at least avail themselves of their powerful bargaining position. They do not have to help the expansion of the Communist warmaking machine by credits. And they could use their position to induce an increase in the production of consumer goods. They could even avail themselves of their important economic bargaining power to wrest political concessions that would directly benefit the people in the captive lands. Then, indeed, they could lay claim to a real contribution to the welfare of these people.

II

The Western stake in East-Central Europe derives from the strategic location of the area, from the increment Soviet power is now drawing from the manpower and resources of the region, as well as from the historic incompatibility between Soviet aims and the interests and aspirations of its ancient nations.

East-Central Europe—half a million square miles and 100 million people strong—lies between the Soviet Union proper and free Western Europe. It is the place where the very centers of power of the two contending camps stand in close, direct and decisive confrontation. Just beyond it lie prime strategic goals: westward—free Europe, the great concentration of skills and resources, which is, in the Communist strategy plan, a decisive way station in their drive for world conquest: eastward—the very heart of the Soviet Union. Within this area live historic nations—hostile to the foreign rule and alien pattern of life foisted upon them, nations which yearn to live in freedom and have, therefore, strong reasons to obstruct the Soviets and help the West. From the point of view of manpower and production, East-Central Europe represents a 40 percent increment to the economic power of the Soviet Union.

From the short-range point of view, East-Central Europe may play a decisive role in thwarting the present Soviet strategy of gradual expansion by political means, into the Western half of the old continent. Once this objective is achieved, East-Central Europe would become the area in which the West can accomplish the most significant strategic gains. It is the place where a United States-backed Western Europe can gradually expand eastward, by political means, the border of freedom. An East-Central Europe from which Soviet political control has been eliminated, would change the whole strategic picture. The Soviet Union would become a danger of manageable dimension, a danger which could largely be checked by local means alone, leaving American power free to look after its numerous global commitments. It would become itself a vulnerable target of Western political warfare aimed at transforming Soviet Russia into an open society by the Western-supported exertions of the peoples directly concerned.

The short-range stake of the West in East-Central Europe has increased and not diminished as a result of what, for want of a better name, is described as nuclear stalemate. As long, indeed, as the United States possessed overwhelming nuclear supremacy, the security of Western Europe was absolute. Strategically it mattered little whether the peoples of East-Central Europe were friendly or hostile to the Soviet Union. Once, however, the Soviet Union has acquired a significant strategic nuclear striking power, both nuclear powers are reluctant to resort to these frightening weapon systems. Unlike the West, however, the Soviet Union is systematically engaged in gaining ground by exploiting, on the one hand, its superior ground forces and, on the other, the fear and sense of responsibility of the West.

This analysis of the dangers the West is still faced with in Western Europe seems to be largely confirmed by certain conclusions drawn by responsible quarters of the United States from the Cuban confrontation. It was stressed that the success of the confrontation on the withdrawal of Soviet missiles was primarily due to the strategic advantages enjoyed by the United States in the Caribbean area. It was furthermore underscored that because of the specific strategic conditions involved, the Cuban confrontation does not provide a valid indication of Soviet behavior in different circumstances. This could only mean that in Cuba the United States could impose its will without having to resort to a nuclear war, while the Soviets could only counter U.S. action by having recourse to its strategic nuclear arms. In Europe, the situation is exactly the opposite. Hence the crisis of confidence marked by attempts to build up independent nuclear striking forces in Europe. Hence also the American insistence to build up the conventional forces of NATO and thereby reduce the capability of Moscow to score gains by intimidation and blackmail.

In these conditions, every factor which weighs negatively in the calculus of risk of the Soviet Union acquires strategic significance. One of such factors is certainly the trouble-making capacity of the people of Eastern Europe. Whether or not the Soviet rulers must reckon in their calculations with a significant risk factor in the area lying between their borders and their Western targets may influence the degree of their recklessness. This would be particularly relevant in a situation like that in Berlin, in which the objective is precisely to make the West believe that the choice is confined to risking all-out nuclear war or making concessions that would discredit American reliability and induce in Western Europe "realistic" trends toward disengagement and neutrality.

It is within the power of the West to compel the Soviet rulers to reckon with an important risk factor in Eastern Europe. The risk factor is indeed in direct ratio with the intensity of the spirit of resistance of the people of East-Central Europe. And the latter hinges on the prevailing impression with regard to the will to win of the West and with regard to the Western commitment to the cause of their freedom and independence. These are the sources of hope on which the spirit of resistance feeds.

Until the Cuban events, the prevailing impression on both counts was negative. Hope in a better future and faith in the West, and with them the spirit of resistance, were at their lowest ebb. The Cuban confrontation has somewhat improved the assessment of Western will and power. Should the West, as it is hoped, appear henceforth consistently in the posture of the firm and winning side, the problem of keeping hope alive and thereby strengthening the East-Central European deterrent will have been largely solved. It remains however for the West to prove its concern for the people of East-Central Europe. This can only be accomplished by an early and clear identification of the West with the peoples of the captive countries and their goal to recover free choice in regard to their internal and international affairs.

Such a long-range objective is not unrealistic. Liberation without war, though not without protracted political struggle, is possible. The Soviet empire is obviously rent by serious internal contradictions. The difficulty of maintaining ideological unity and central direction, as illustrated by the Sino-Soviet discord; the inability of the Soviet Union to keep up the armament race without withdrawing some of the material improvements its people have gained in the last few years, and/or without diminishing their abnormally high investments in the heavy industry; the imbalanced nature of the Communist economy and the utter failure of collectivized agriculture; the increasing nonconformity of youth and the ferment among intellectuals; the unbridgeable gulf between the requirements of subordination and exploitation in the Soviet empire, and the national pride of the historic nations of East-Central Europe—these are but a few of the contradictions. If they have, as yet, not generated dramatic consequences, this is largely due to the demoralizing effect of the easy and unnecessary successes Western misjudgment, irresolution and weakness have afforded to the U.S.S.R. Ever since the end of the Second World War, the Soviets have been permitted to show, by their actions, that history was on their side; that changes invariably occur in their favor and that, accordingly, the victory of communism on a worldwide scale is only a matter of time. If the West were to act on the perfectly justified assumption that the Soviet empire has more reasons to fear any major war than the West, it could at least deny its adversary any further successes. The effect would be most far reaching. The latent forces of disruption and opposition, no longer inhibited by a sentiment of futility, would be unleashed in Eastern Europe. In favorable circumstances, which can be fostered by a purposeful Western policy, such as a struggle for supreme power or internal disturbances in the Soviet Union that would tie down the Soviet armed forces, the captive nations could begin making good their escape.

III

In the view of the Assembly of Captive European Nations, the morale of the captive European peoples and their faith in the West would be bolstered, and the interest—short and long term—of both free and captive nations would be advanced should the United States and her principal allies adopt the specific measures listed under "What to do," while refraining from the action listed under "What not to do."

What to do

(1) To raise in all high-level conferences with the rulers of the Soviet Union the issue of the restoration of the right of self-determination to the peoples of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania.

(2) To counter Soviet demands on Berlin with the plan for an overall peace settlement based on the right of self-determination and designed to solve all the unresolved consequences of the Second War in Europe.

(3) To inscribe the question of the denial of self-determination to the nations of East-Central Europe on the agenda of the United Nations regardless of the prospect to secure the required majorities. To raise, in other words, the issue in the U.N. on its merits and not as a mere point of rebuttal.

The initial purpose of such action would be to assure the peoples concerned that their issue is an objective of Western policy, an open and not a closed issue as claim the Soviet rulers. This would be accomplished if a group of Western Powers, backed by the United States, would take the initiative. For durable impact, such action would have to be renewed at every session on the pattern of the wearing-down tactics followed by the Soviet Union on the question of the Chinese representations in the United Nations. The Western Powers could easily pattern their draft resolution on one of the proposals introduced in the United Nations by the Soviet Union. The draft resolution introduced by the Soviet delegation on April 24, 1962, in the Special Committee on Decolonization, is almost ideally suited for this purpose.

(4) To keep the question of Hungary on the agenda of each United Nations General Assembly session and renew steadfastly the demand for compliance with past resolutions.

(5) To give assurance to the people of Albania that the territorial integrity of their country and their right of self-determination will be safeguarded against any intervention on the part of their neighbors.

(6) To maintain carefully the policy of nonrecognition of the forcible incorporation of the Baltic States in the Soviet Union.

(7) To insist that the United Nations Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples is of universal scope and validity and, accordingly, oppose the double-standard gaining ground in the U.N. on self-determination, and to urge the Special Committee of 24 Nations, charged with the implementation of the above declaration, to extend its concern and investigation to the peoples and countries subjected to Soviet colonial rule.

(8) To carry out in the United Nations and at all appropriate international gatherings a campaign of truth with respect to the denial of human rights and freedom in the captive countries.

(9) To give support in the United Nations to the proposal of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions for an investigation of the condition and status of political prisoners and for the elaboration and enactment of an international convention on the regime of the political prisoners.

(10) To be always mindful, in their trading policies, of the fact that the interests of the welfare of the captive peoples and of the security of the West are both adversely affected by the preferential treatment given by the Communist regimes in East-Central Europe to the development of heavy and armament industries, at the expense of the needs of the people concerned. Similarly, to take advantage of trade negotiations in order to press for the suppression of existing prohibitive duties on individual food, clothing, and medicine gift packages from the free world to individuals in the captive countries.

(11) To develop, extend and invigorate broadcasts to the captive countries, and to consider the establishment, in the framework of NATO, of a general staff for political warfare.

(12) To warn all Western visitors to the captive countries against permitting their hosts to use them as tools of their political propaganda, as well as against fraternization with local Communist leaders.

What not to do

(1) Not to engage in actions or enter into agreements implying or suggesting that the Western Powers have reconciled themselves to the status quo and regard it as final. The oft-mentioned idea of a nonaggression pledge or pact between the NATO and Warsaw Pact countries would certainly be construed by the people of East-Central Europe as a Western sellout. Such pledges would give the Soviet Union or their puppets no guarantees of security that are not already embodied in the United Nations Charter. The only reason the Soviet rulers have consistently sought them was their awareness that they would create legal obstacles to any further Western concern with the fate of the captive peoples, and that, by generating discouragement and resignation, they will have consequences highly detrimental to Western security. Past commitments, declared principles and self-interest, therefore equally command to the Western Powers to stand firmly on the position that any and all security arrangements should follow, and not precede, an overall European settlement based on the right of self-determination.

(2) Not to undertake actions and moves which give respectability to the satellite regimes and compound the damaging effects of past acts of recognition.

(3) Not to grant aid, long or short term credits to the satellite regimes. Assistance in the special case of Poland can only be justified to the extent it helps preserve the gains the Polish people wrested in 1956. The helping countries should, therefore, make it clear that any aid would terminate if there is a return to forced collectivization, and/or if the rights of the church, the freedom of worship or any other rights or freedoms were further curtailed.

(4) Not to place undue reliance on the political benefits to be drawn from exchange programs, and to insist on full reciprocity in such exchanges.

NEW YORK, *March 1963*.

FORMATION OF CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR A FREE CUBA

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I wish to draw the attention of my colleagues to a most encouraging development relating to the question of Cuba.

I think we are all agreed that something must be done about Cuba, that the continued existence of a Communist dictatorship 90 miles from our shores is intolerable. We are all agreed that the means must be found, short of war, to liberate the Cuban people from Castroism and to put an end to the threat of Communist subversion and infiltration of the American States by the Kremlin's beachhead forces in Cuba.

It is understandable and proper that there should be differences of opinion on the means to be employed and on the timetable which must govern the application of these means.

It is unfortunate, however, that there should be a polarization of opinion on the question of Cuba, because the solution of this question imperatively demands the greatest possible degree of national unity.

It is also unfortunate that some of the criticism of our present Cuban policy has been characterized by partisan overtones. It is unfair, as well as unfortunate, because some of these partisan critics conveniently forget that Castro came to power under a Republican administration, which for some strange reason ignored warnings from many sources that Castro was a Communist and his movement was Communist dominated.

Last week the press announced the establishment of the Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba, as a broad nonpartisan organization dedicated to the goal of Cuban liberation. I consider this a most welcome development.

In its declaration of purpose, the committee particularly emphasizes its nonpartisan nature. It says that it believes that Cuba is an issue that transcends party differences, and that its solution demands the kind of national unity the American people have manifested at moments of crisis.

The Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba plans to initiate a nationwide discussion on the problem of Cuba, and to establish an information service on Cuba and the Castro-Communist subversion of Latin America. In collaboration with Freedom House of New York, it convened a Free Cuba Assembly, at Ardsleigh, N.Y., last week, at which top authorities on Latin America examined the problem of Cuba in all its aspects. The findings of this assembly will soon be published.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the statement of purpose of the Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba, as well as a list of the distinguished citizens who have thus far joined the committee. I also ask consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial on Cuba which appeared in last Tuesday's Washington Post, and which, I believe, spoke for the American people when it declared that something must be done about communism in Cuba.

There being no objection, the statement of purpose, list of citizens, and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE OF CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR A FREE CUBA

The Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba is being formed in response to a statement issued by Freedom House, on March 25, 1963, calling upon Americans to unite in a movement for a free Cuba.

The committee is nonpartisan. It believes that Cuba is an issue that transcends party differences, and that its solution requires the kind of national unity we have always manifested at moments of great crisis. This belief is reflected in the broad and representative membership of the committee.

The committee holds, with Freedom House, that a Communist Cuba is intolerable, not only for reasons which bear upon our security but also because it has betrayed 6 million people who won their freedom from the Batista dictatorship.

But the enslavement of those 6 million may now lead to the enslavement of the more than 200 million people in the 19 remaining Latin American Republics, for the Communists, from their base in Cuba, have launched a grand offensive aimed at conquering, initially, the entire continent south of the Rio Grande. Ultimately, that offensive is directed at the chief bastion of world democracy, the United States.

The situation of Latin America, thanks primarily to the continued existence of a Soviet base in Cuba, is far worse than the American people realize. The Communist drive there is already on the way toward producing these serious consequences:

1. The demoralization of Latin America's democratic forces, who are beginning to feel overwhelmed before the combined power of the Cuban military-police state, the Soviet Union, and Red China.

2. The resurgence of dictatorial military elements intent on taking power in reaction to the Communist threat.

3. The infiltration and subversion of other Latin American governments at a tempo which may produce additional Cubas before long.

4. The frustration of inter-American efforts to achieve social and economic progress.

If not halted before much more time has passed, the Communist drive south of the Rio Grande could result in the gradual isolation of the United States from its friends and allies in Latin America—the reverse of the effort to isolate Communist Cuba.

The American people are united on the objective of a liberated Cuba. The President and the leaders of both major political parties have publicly committed themselves to that objective. Differences exist, however, on how and when to attain a free Cuba, and the problem is to devise a means of liberating Cuba from communism before communism succeeds in creating other Cubas, yet at the same time preserving the peace of the Americas.

The Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba believes that solutions to the problem can be found, and that, properly presented to the American people, they will command overwhelming support. To that end, the committee proposes:

1. To initiate, free of partisan bias, a nationwide discussion on the problem of Cuba, the threat its Communist regime poses to the Americas, and the measures that must be taken to put an end to it.

2. To establish, as an aid to intelligent and informed discussion, a national information service to disseminate regularly facts on Cuba and the Castro-Communist subversion of Latin America that are generally not circulated.

3. To join in the convening of a Free Cuba Assembly, at which all aspects of the problem will be submitted for the consideration of top authorities in Latin American and global affairs.

It is the hope of the Free Cuba Committee that such a program will help point the way to an effective Cuban policy, and that it will help create a climate of public opinion that will facilitate positive action.

An Alliance for Freedom must now be forged in the Americas if the Alliance for Progress is to succeed, and if the peoples of the Western Hemisphere are to live and work as free human beings for the society of peace and plenty they all seek. It is also an urgent requirement of American national interests. The indispensable first step toward the forging of such an Alliance is the liberation of the Cuban people from Communist tyranny.

The cause of a free Cuba is the cause of the free Americas.

MEMBERSHIP LIST OF CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR A FREE CUBA

Daniel James, executive secretary, author ("Cuba: The First Soviet Satellite in the Americas"), and foreign correspondent.

MEMBERS

Mariada Arensberg, executive secretary, Cuban Freedom Committee.

Murray Baron, labor-management consultant.

Joseph Beirne, president, Communications Workers of America, AFL-CIO.

Nicholas Duke Biddle, chairman, Caribbean committee, International Rescue Service.

Irving Brown, U.N. Representative, International Confederation of Free Trade Unions.

Adm. Arleigh A. Burke (ret.), former Chief, U.S. Naval Operations.

Dickey Chapelle, author and foreign correspondent.

Leo Cherne, president, Research Institute of America.

Ernest Cuneo, chairman of the board, North American Newspaper Alliance; attorney.

Christopher Emmet, chairman, American Friends of the Captive Nations.

John Fisher, president, American Security Council, Chicago.

Dr. Russell H. Fitzgibbon, professor of Latin American history, University of California, Los Angeles.

Dr. Buell Gallagher, president, City College of New York.

Dr. Harry Gideonse, president, Brooklyn College.

Frances R. Grant, executive secretary, Inter-American Committee for Democracy and Freedom.

Paul Hall, president, Seafarers International Union.

Hal Hendrix, Latin American editor, Miami News.

Brig. Gen. Frank L. Howley (retired), New York University.

Dr. Sidney Hook, professor of philosophy, New York University.

Dr. Harry Kantor, professor of Latin American history, University of Florida.

Rev. John Lafarge, S.J., associate editor, America.

Jay Lovestone, director of international. publications, AFL-CIO.

Clare Boothe Luce, former U.S. Ambassador to Italy.

Eugene Lyons, senior editor, Readers' Digest.

Brig. Gen. S. L. A. Marshal, military commentator.

Henry Mayers, president, Cold War Council, Los Angeles.

Benjamin McLaurin, vice president, International Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters.

Dr. Hans J. Morgenthau, director, Center for Study of American Foreign Policy, Chicago.

Edgar Ansel Mower, author and foreign correspondent.

John O'Rourke, editor, Washington News.

Bonaro Overstreet, author, psychologist.

Bishop James A. Pike, Protestant Episcopal Bishop of California.

Virginia Prewett, Latin American columnist, North American Newspaper Alliance.

Victor Riesel, Labor columnist, Hall Syndicate.

Dr. John P. Roche, professor of labor and social thought, Brandeis University.

Serafino Romualdi, American Institute for Free Labor Development.

Sal B. Hoffmann, president, Upholsterers' International Union, AFL-CIO.

Dr. Robert Strausz-Hupe, director, Foreign Policy Research Institute, University of Pennsylvania.

Arthur G. McDowell, secretary, Council Against Communist Aggression.

Dr. Frank Tannenbaum, professor of Latin American history, Columbia University.

William vanden Heuvel, president, International Rescue Committee.

Dr. Arthur P. Whitaker, professor of Latin American history, University of Pennsylvania.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 23, 1963]

REMEMBER THE MAINE

Something like a consensus on Cuban policy is beginning to emerge in this country.

The debate over when and how that policy is to be executed should not conceal the growing accord on the policy itself. Last week, the President, the former Vice President, the State Department, and Republican critics of the State Department had different things to say about Cuba, but on two points there was general agreement. And on these two points there is a gathering agreement in the country.

The broad proposition on which there is accumulating accord is simply this: that the existence of a Communist regime, linked to the Soviet Union, in this hemisphere, is a threat to the safety and survival of the United States and of all other free countries in this part of the globe. No administration that openly opposes this belief can long survive. Sooner or later an administration that denounced this maturing conviction would be followed by an alternative government committed to it. In a negative way, there is almost the same accord on how this policy should not be pursued. There is almost universal agreement that invasion, openly and directly, immediately or in the near future, is not the way to pursue our policy.

This aversion to foreign control of Cuba by a hostile power is the constant of American attitudes toward our island neighbor. The Monroe Doctrine was an expression of a view already long held in this country. It was given even fuller expression in the administration of John Quincy Adams when this country made known its opposition to the transfer of Cuba from Spain to France, England, or any other power. The practical basis of this policy was clearly stated in Daniel Webster's support of President Adams' decision to send delegates to a conference with South American countries, in which the great orator said:

"A member has said that if Spain chose to transfer the island to any other power she has a right to do so, and we here cannot interfere to prevent her. I must dissent from this opinion. The rights of nations in matters of this kind are much modified by circumstances. Because France or Great Britain could not rightfully complain of the transfer of Florida to us, it does not follow that we could not complain of the cession of Cuba to one of them. The transfer of Florida to us was not dangerous to the safety of either of these nations, nor fatal to any of their great and essential interests. Proximity of position, neighborhood, whatever augments the power of injuring or annoying, very properly belong to the consideration of all cases of this kind. What might otherwise never be thought of is justified for these reasons and on these grounds."

If the American people are aware of such dangers now, they are aware of other dangers that unhappily and unfortunately also exist and that must be weighed with equal care and caution. Impetuous and impulsive and ill-considered acts by this country might bring on the dangers of thermonuclear war without diminishing the dangers of Soviet occupation of Cuba.

Therefore, it must be the object of the Government of the United States to develop some alternative to direct action that will further the policy of this country without incurring the hazard of invasion or like military intervention. It is very urgent that the Government develop such a policy and that it disclose it. It is very plain that, throughout this country, the conviction that the Nation is in peril is hardening to a point where no threats and no fears may be sufficient to inhibit the demand for action against the forces that occupy Cuba. Democratic governments are not wholly free agents. A government that does not develop a program of minimum risk runs the danger of being coerced into a program of maximum risks, almost against its will. The absence of an affirmative design, in such a situation, is dangerous—dangerous to this country, to its neighbors and to the peace of the hemisphere and of the whole world.

The Government of this country, the governments of friendly countries and the Government of the Soviet Union as well had better take note of the increasing sense of Americans that the United States is endangered by the Soviet occupation of Cuba. This sense of jeopardy is beginning to pervade the whole body politic. The Soviet Government, whatever its fears and doubts, felt compelled, by such an impulse, to send its forces into Hungary. It ought to understand the much greater force that such sentiments exert upon democratic governments. Every day that passes without the termination of the Soviet occupation of Cuba increases the certainty and multiplies the likelihood that another *Maine* disaster will put the spark to the combustible materials in the Caribbean.

RETIREMENT OF THE VERY REVEREND LAURENCE J. McGINLEY, S.J., AS PRESIDENT OF FORDHAM UNIVERSITY

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on April 25, Fordham University announced the retirement of the Very Reverend Laurence J. McGinley, S.J., from the posts of president and rector of Fordham University. Father McGinley will be succeeded in these posts by the Reverend Vincent T. O'Keefe, S.J., at the end of the current academic year. Father O'Keefe is now executive vice president of the university, a position he has held since June 1962.

On relinquishing his present positions at Fordham, Father McGinley will serve as a consultant in higher education for the Jesuit Order.

Father O'Keefe takes over the duties of president and rector as the university enters on the second phase of its contemporary physical and academic growth at the Lincoln Square and Rose Hill campuses. He recently completed guidance of a 3-year self-study and evaluation of the university as a basis for the overall planning of Fordham's next decade of scholastic development.

Father McGinley has been president and rector of Fordham longer than any other man in its 122-year history. He was appointed February 2, 1949, and this year will participate in his 15th annual commencement exercises as president. During his tenure, the university will have conferred approximately 24,000 graduate and undergraduate degrees from its 9 colleges and schools.

As president, Father McGinley initiated a new university campus in mid-Manhattan—Fordham at Lincoln Square, a $25,500,000 educational center that already houses the school of law and law library. Scheduled for construction in the immediate future are buildings to house the university's schools of education, business, social service, and general studies. As a campus, it will accommodate some 8,000 students and serve as companion to traditional Fordham at Rose Hill. The new buildings are to be ready for occupancy in September 1965.

Other highlights of his tenure as president include the completion of the university's campus center building on the Rose Hill campus, a three-story structure with a wide variety of accommodations for cultural, social, and academic activities; the new Jesuit residence, Faber Hall, with housing facilities for 100 faculty members; the addition to Dealy Hall, the home of the Rose Hill campus division of the school of business; and Martyrs' Court, containing seven residence halls for upperclassmen.

During his presidency, also, charters have been granted to Fordham by these national scholastic honor societies: Phi Beta Kappa; Sigma Xi, a society to encourage original investigation in pure and applied science; and Pi Sigma Alpha, the political science fraternity.

The honors program of Fordham College, initiated to encourage independent scholarship among undergraduates, the junior year abroad, in Europe and in South America, and the Institute of Contemporary Russian Studies, the purpose of which is to foster the understanding of Russian culture and language, were initiated during his term of office. The first Rhodes and Marshall scholarships were won in this same period.

In June of 1961, the university, through Father McGinley, announced the opening of the Center of Intercultural Formation, in Mexico and Brazil, established to prepare both lay and religious personnel for service in Central and South America. The center, which he serves as president of the board of directors, gives intensive 4-month programs in the languages, history and social, economic and cultural conditions of Latin American countries.

A native New Yorker, Father McGinley was born on West 105th Street, September 6, 1905, the son of James and Alice (McCabe) McGinley. For many years his father was chief of staff to the commissioner of accounts of the city of New York. Father McGinley's younger brother, Rev. James J. McGinley, also a member of the Society of Jesus, is president and rector of Canisius College, Buffalo.

Father McGinley attended Public School 128 in Brooklyn and Xavier High School, Manhattan, and for a short period was employed in the First National Bank of New York. Xavier High School recently awarded him its Insignis Medal, given "to honor alumni who by their service to God and the civic community distinguished themselves as eminently representative of their alma mater and worthy of her special recognition."

He has been a member of the Society of Jesus since 1922, receiving his bachelor's and master's degrees from the society's college in Woodstock, Md. From 1929 to 1932 he taught at St. Joseph's Preparatory School, Philadelphia, returning to Woodstock in 1932 for theological studies.

Ordained to the priesthood in 1935, he received his licentiate in sacred theology the following year, and served for a time as chaplain at City Home Hospital on Welfare Island, N.Y. After further studies, he went to Rome in 1937 for graduate courses in theology at the Gregorian University and the Biblical

Institute, receiving his doctorate in sacred theology 2 years later.

In 1939 he served as director of the Vatican radio broadcasts, returning to the United States in the same year to become professor of theology at Woodstock College. After 1942, Father McGinley was prefect of studies, regent of the seminary and director of graduate studies at Woodstock, as well as associate editor of Theological Studies. He was a consultor of the Provincial of the New York Province of the Society of Jesus from 1943 to 1952.

Father McGinley is author of various articles in Theological Studies, Thought, Verbum Domini—Rome—and of the book, "Form-Criticism of the Synoptic Healing Narratives," published in 1944.

Active in educational circles, he is past president and vice president of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools; former vice chairman of that association's commission on institutes of higher education; past president of the Association of Urban Universities, and presently a director of the New York Higher Education Assistance Corp. Other educational organizations of which he is a member are the New York State Advisory Council on Higher Education, and the council on higher educational institutions in New York City.

In 1960, Father McGinley was appointed to membership on the Commission on Federal Relations of the American Council on Education and was elected a director of the parent organization the following year to complete a term which expired in December 1962.

Father McGinley has been active also in the Association of Colleges and Universities of the State of New York, and its commission on independent colleges and universities. He served the association as president from 1957 to 1958, prior to which time he was secretary-treasurer. Since 1959 he has been a director of the New York World's Fair 1964–65 Corp., and director of the Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts since 1956.

Father McGinley was national awards chairman of the Freedom Foundation at Valley Forge in 1959, and has served on the Army Advisory Panel for ROTC affairs since 1958.

Among the honors accorded him are the following:

The American Irish Historical Society Gold Medal, 1960; the University Brotherhood Award of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1960; U.S. Army Outstanding Civilian Service Medal, 1962; Civic Award in Education, the Bronx Board of Trade, 1961; decorations from the Governments of Peru, Brazil, Chile, Italy, and most recently, the Grand Gold Badge of Honor for Merits to the Republic of Austria at the Austrian Embassy, Washington, 1963.

All who know Father McGinley, and all who know of the tremendous contributions he has made to Fordham University and to the whole educational world, will join me in paying tribute to this great scholar and educator as he lays down the enormous burden which he has carried so well for many years.

WHEAT REFERENDUM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Oregon has over 16,000 farmers who grow wheat and feed grains. Annually they produce and sell for cash about $45 million worth of wheat and around $30 million in feed grains.

This is modest production and income compared with the large wheat States—yet for these 16,000 farmers, wheat and feed grains are important and major cash crops—and they represent an important segment of our agricultural economy in Oregon.

Oregon grain farmers take a pragmatic approach to legislation affecting wheat and feed grains for this very reason. For 10 consecutive years, Oregon wheat farmers voted overwhelmingly in favor of marketing quotas in the national wheat referendums.

I am confident wheat farmers of Oregon will make their decision in the May 21 wheat referendum on the same practical dollars-and-cents basis. The difference between a "yes" and "no" vote in the referendum can mean over $15 million in wheat income in Oregon. If I know Oregon farmers, they're going to vote their pocketbooks again in this referendum.

The 1964 wheat program is a good program. It assures a high level of wheat income and it stabilizes wheat production in line with demand, permits orderly disposal of our large surplus stocks.

Wheat farmers understand this. They understand that we cannot go on producing wheat on a continuing surplus basis and maintain price. They understand that they can't receive assured income without stabilizing production at usable levels.

That is why this bill had—and still has—the support of all the farm organizations except one and the support of most all of the cooperative and commodity groups interested in wheat.

Oregon has over 5,500 small allotment wheat farmers. For the first time in the history of wheat programs these farmers will be able to vote in a referendum and participate in the benefits of the wheat program. They will be treated exactly the same as major wheatgrowers. They will receive $2 for their wheat on 80 percent of their quota and the basic support of $1.30 for all the rest they can harvest on their allotment. Additionally, if they so desire, they can divert all their acres and receive diversion payments equal to 50 percent of parity times the average yield times the number of acres.

The certificates—having a value of 70 cents per bushel—represent a built-in insurance feature for all wheat farmers in case of crop failure.

I have no hesitation about urging all the wheat farmers in Oregon to vote "yes" in the May 21 referendum. Since a two-thirds approval is necessary to put the 1964 wheat program into operation this means that attitude alone is not enough; it means that every wheat farmer who cares about his wheat income has to take the trouble to vote on that day.

Any farmer who believes that new and better wheat legislation will be passed by this session of the Congress in the event a "no" vote prevails, is taking the riskiest kind of gamble. My distinguished colleague who heads the Senate Agriculture Committee, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], is reported by the press the other day to have said: "You can put this in bold type: there will not be any more wheat laws passed this year if the referendum fails. I will do everything on earth to stop it."

My recommendation is for wheat farmers to vote on the economic merits of the 1964 wheat program on May 21 and not on any pig in the poke.

In addition to approval of the wheat program, farmers need a feed grain program as well. Two weeks ago the House passed a good voluntary feed grain program—and it is my hope that the Senate will have before it in a few days the same program for consideration. I will support it.

As I read the program passed by the House, it will accomplish four necessary objectives:

First. It will raise farm income, by assuring fairer prices for feed grain producers and by providing a basis of stability for livestock prices.

Second. It will bring down further the surplus stocks of feed grains.

Third. It will save millions of dollars in costs to taxpayers, in contrast to the Government storage program which would be in effect without this legislation.

Fourth. It will give the wheat and feed grains producer new freedom and flexibility in the management and operation of his own farm. It will enable him to substitute acre for acre between feed grains and wheat whenever he finds that by doing so he will increase the efficiency and effectiveness of his own personal farming operation. Since this feed grains program is complementary to and interrelated to the wheat program enacted by Congress last year, prompt action on this feed grains measure is urgently needed so that wheat producers will have all of the available information in making their decision in the referendum on the 1964 wheat program on May 21, 1963.

By providing a permanent wheat program and a feed grain program, Congress will have made one of the most constructive steps in many years toward solving a major and plaguing problem in agriculture—that of income and surpluses, and at much less cost to the taxpayer. Congress and this administration can be proud of this accomplishment after 8 long years of declining farm income and mounting surpluses.

If Congress can move forward in the same constructive way in the other problem areas of agriculture, it will have accomplished a near miracle. I see no reason why we cannot—and I can think of every reason why we should.

I know that efforts are being made to turn this into a vote for or against "Government intervention" in wheat. That is pretty much of a phony issue. Government intervention in wheat production and marketing began in the 1930's, when the depression and its terrible impact upon farming brought about the first efforts to curb production. Let it be remembered that most of the research that has enabled American farmers to grow so much wheat per acre was largely financed by the Federal Government and that was "Government intervention," too.

The offer of a guaranteed price to accompany production controls is the proposal being offered by the Government. Wheat growers are free to reject it; but eventually, wheat production will be curbed by the market conditions that will simply force large numbers of growers to give up farming.

That is the real issue, not "Government intervention."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5517) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], to strike out, on page 9, line 3, "$450 million" and insert in lieu thereof "$250 million." On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is the pending business still the amendment I offered yesterday, or has it been supplanted temporarily by another amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct in the first part of his statement.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. My amendment is still the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to temporarily postpone consideration of the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, there is an amendment at the desk that I want to offer for myself and for both Senators from New York [Mr. JAVITS and Mr. KEATING] and the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] to House bill 5517, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut, for himself and the Senators from New York and Pennsylvania, will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is provided, on page 11, after line 16, to insert the following:

GRANTS FOR MATERNAL AND CHILD WELFARE

For an additional amount for "Grants for maternal and child welfare," $1,000,000, of which $800,000 shall be available for child welfare services, and $200,000 for research, training, or demonstration projects in child welfare.

On page 11, line 24, to strike out "$68,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$90,000."

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to provide some funds so that the day-care program for children of working mothers can get underway without further delay and so that the training of additional child welfare personnel may begin.

I have been as concerned as any Member of this body in the growing problems of welfare throughout our country. I knew these problems as a Governor; and as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare I was anxious to see some constructive progress made in the direction of our Federal welfare programs.

At HEW last year we developed with the Congress the first major reform of the Nation's welfare laws since the Social Security Act was passed in 1935. To its great credit, Congress last year faced up to the problems of welfare and recognized that the only long-range solution lies with prevention of dependency before it occurs and rehabilitation to get people off relief and back into useful roles in society. The Congress, in passing the 1962 amendments, agreed that just giving money to people to keep them alive does not solve the problem. When people need assistance in these prosperous times, poverty is not their only trouble. In fact, they are poor because they have other troubles—bad health, functional illiteracy, lack of skills, or some combination.

A key feature of these amendments was aid to States for the development and expansion of day-care services. We hear a lot of criticism of mothers who could work remaining on public assistance. But a recent study of families with dependent children showed that 90 percent of them had small children at home.

What would happen to those children if these mothers, or even a portion of them, went to work?

In the entire United States, there are just 18,000 licensed day-care facilities, and they can accommodate 185,000 children. But there are, today, 9 million children under 12 years of age whose mothers are in the labor force. If present trends continue, the number of women in the labor force will increase 31 percent in the next decade.

What is to be done to keep their children from roaming the streets, to protect them from the degrading and demoralizing experiences that come to children when they are left on their own too early? We have more latchkey children today than we had at the height of World War II. How much worse can we let this situation get? How much higher will we let our juvenile delinquency rates rise before we follow through on the constructive program authorized a year ago when the public welfare amendments were passed?

Funds for day care for children—to get mothers off the assistance rolls and to protect the children of mothers who are already working—are called for in the 1962 amendments. The funds were authorized; they were not appropriated. They were provided for in a supplemental appropriation last year which failed of enactment during the closing days of the last session. They have been provided in the supplemental appropriation passed by the House. They are not included in the supplemental appropriation bill now before the Senate.

That is why I am proposing an amendment to restore to the supplemental appropriation bill a total of $1 million—$800,000 to make an immediate beginning, in all the States, for day care services, and $200,00 for the training of child welfare personnel. And a few additional positions in the Children's Bureau are needed to get this program started.

Nothing could be more shortsighted than to deny funds for day care and force mothers who could work to give up their jobs and return to the relief rolls. We know that constructive steps can be taken. In North Carolina last year a mother of four children was able to reduce her aid to dependent children payment in half when day care funds made it possible for her to work. A mother of two children, left without support, stayed off relief completely because of day care arrangements for her children that enabled her to get a job as a stenographer. These examples can be repeated throughout the country.

We all want to see the costs of welfare reduced. But in the long run savings will be made only if constructive alternatives are provided to a life of perpetual dependency.

One of the best answers is the opportunity to work. Day-care funds help to give mothers that opportunity.

The States are eagerly waiting to get started on this vital program. Many groups in communities all over the Nation are hopeful they can begin expanding these day-care facilities without further delay. We must not fail them now. The amendments I propose are as follows:

On page 11, after line 16, insert the following:

GRANTS FOR MATERNAL AND CHILD WELFARE

For an additional amount for "Grants for maternal and child welfare," $1,000,000, of which $800,000 shall be available for child welfare services, and $200,000 for research, training, or demonstration projects in child welfare.

On page 11, line 24, strike out "$68,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$90,000."

I also hope that the cut which has been made in salaries and expenses for the Bureau of Family Services will be substantially restored in conference. A major part of the Federal burden of carrying out the 1962 Public Welfare Amendments falls on this Bureau. They carry the Federal Government's responsibility for administering the Nation's $5 billion public assistance programs. We expect them to help States and communities provide the services that will help many of the 7 million needy people become self-reliant and self-supporting. We expect them to see that States operate their programs efficiently so that ineligible people are not certified for aid.

And yet, having added immeasurably to their responsibilities by genuinely progressive legislation, we deny them the personnel to discharge their added responsibilities.

The Congress passed the 1962 Public Welfare Amendments because it wanted to move constructively toward solving the problem of poverty. One ingredient of success is a competent and adequate staff. Fifty positions were included in the House allowance to administer the welfare amendments.

If the 50 positions originally requested were allowed, there would be available to the Bureau of Family Services a total of only 443 positions to administer this multibillion-dollar program. It is my hope that these needed positions will be restored in conference.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I am pleased to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, one of our colleagues in the Senate, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott], and I, too, of course, are interested in the precise definition of what these funds would be used for if they were appropriated in the pending bill.

Section 527 of the Social Security Act, the Public Welfare Amendments Act of 1962, reads as follows:

> Sec. 527. (a) In order to assist the States to provide adequately for the care and protection of children whose parents are, for part of the day, working or seeking work, or otherwise absent from the home or unable for other reasons to provide parental supervision, the portion of the appropriation under section 521 for any fiscal year which is not allotted under section 522 shall be allotted by the Secretary—

And so forth. The point of the question is, What do the words "or otherwise absent from home or unable for other reasons to provide parental supervision" mean? Do they open up a general operation for children who require day care, whatever may be the reason; or is it the intention of the Senator who proposes the amendment—and, of course, that includes me too, and my intention—that it shall be utilized for the protection of children whose parents are working or seeking work?

Is it to be the true classic day-care program; and that these general words of extension, "for other reasons to provide parental supervision," whatever they may mean, will not apply to this appropriation?

Mr. RIBICOFF. The Senator is correct. What we had in mind was the kind of situation where there might be a mother of children of tender years who is not on relief and who is not a public charge, and whose husband has a job, but who suddenly finds herself with the need for a very serious operation. She can go to the hospital for a month. Under those circumstances it would be possible for these minor children to have day care.

I believe that the Senator from New York, who is a cosponsor with me of the amendment, has raised a point which I believe should be in the Record as a matter of legislative history. Therefore I should like to give examples of the type of children who would be cared for under this program.

First. A substantial number of the 15 million children under 18 years of age in the United States whose mothers are working—4 million of these children are under 6 years of age, and 5 million are between the ages of 6 to 11.

Second. The children of employable mothers who are seeking employment—a recent study of families with dependent children showed that 90 percent of them had small children in the home—many of the mothers in these families would be able to seek employment were day care facilities available.

Third. Mentally retarded and other handicapped children whose parents are not able to provide continuing supervision over such children.

Fourth. Children of migrant agricultural workers—a number of States report a great need for this type of care.

In the entire United States, there are just 18,000 licensed day care facilities, and they can accommodate only 185,000 children. All but 3 of 44 States which participated in a recent survey indicated a serious need for additional day care facilities.

The day care program is designed primarily to help women in the low income group who are in the labor force or who are required to seek employment. Those mothers who can pay for part of the costs of day care will be expected to do so.

It is understood that the proposed day care program has been characterized as a baby sitting program. This description is completely inaccurate as indicated by the definition of day care included in the basic statute. There is no intention of providing services for the purpose of relieving parents of the care of their children while they run errands or seek recreation. The care would be related exclusively to those purposes described in the basic statute. Each State plan must include provision: For such safeguards as may be necessary to assure provision of day care under the plan only in cases in which it is in the best interest of the child and the mother and only in cases in which it is determined, under criteria established by the State, that a need for such care exists; and, in cases in which the family is able to pay part or all of the costs of such care, for payment of such fees as may be reasonable in the light of such ability, and for giving priority, in determining the existence of need for such day care, to members of low-income or other groups in the population and to geographical areas which have the greatest relative need for extension of such day care.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I am pleased to yield.

Mr. PASTORE. As the Senator in charge of the bill, I am not in a position to accept the amendments, because I have not consulted with the other members of the committee. It is quite a large committee. However I have discussed the subject with the chairman of the appropriate subcommittee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill].

He has conveyed to me the assurance that, whatever I decide to do, he would support me in it. I certainly support the amendments sponsored by my good friend, the Senator from Connecticut. The amount of $102,500 for salaries and expenses was cut to $68,000. This was done in the markup of the bill. In view of the presentation made by the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from New York, I am sure that if this matter had been called to the attention of the committee, our action would have been otherwise. Also, we would be raising the figure from $68,000 to $90,000. The other amendment provides $1 million for grants for maternal and child welfare.

I believe that the requests are modest, and I hope the Senator will approve them.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I am pleased to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott] was particularly interested in the amendment. I have tried to locate him to have him come to the floor. Before we on this side of the aisle can agree to the amendment I would like to have the Senator from Colorado have an opportunity of at least being consulted.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I am pleased to yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I have talked to the Senator from Colorado, who is detained in the Defense Subcommittee of Appropriations on a matter that demands his presence for some time. What I am trying to get is a firm statement from the Senator from Connecticut. I am willing to commit myself. The Senator from Colorado, I must say, wishes to be recorded as against the amendment, but he will not stand in the way of its being approved. Although the Senator from Colorado is opposed to it, he will not stand in its way, if it is clear what the intent of the amendment is. That is what we want to get from the Senator from Connecticut. Is it clear that this money will be used for the classic day care use, which is for working mothers or mothers seeking work?

Mr. RIBICOFF. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. Whatever the words may include, this appropriation will not be used for anything but that classic case.

Mr. RIBICOFF. There is no intention to provide services for the purpose of relieving parents from the responsibility of caring for their children. That is the responsibility of parents.

However I believe we all recognize the fact that we want to get people off relief. If a mother has children who are 4 or 5 years old, who will take care of the children while the mother is working? The purpose of the program is to have these children cared for. This would be an economical program.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is opposed to the amendment, but he will not stand in the way of the Senator in charge of the bill accepting the amendment. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] feels the same way. However, we must pinpoint the legislative intent; namely, that this money, if finally appropriated, will be used only for the classic day care purpose, that is, for the children of working mothers or mothers seeking work, period.

Does the Senator agree to that?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I agree to that; and that was my intention when I was Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and submitted the proposal to Congress. I believe that will be found in my testimony before the appropriate committees. I know that was the intention of Congress when it passed similar legislation last year.

Mr. JAVITS. Then the Senator from Connecticut agrees to that?

Mr. RIBICOFF. Absolutely.

Mr. JAVITS. I do too. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF]. As a cosponsor I feel this moderate approach has much merit.

More than one-third of Pennsylvania's work force are women. Of these, 149,311 have at least 1 child under 6. A study of child care services in the State made in 1959 by the Fels Institute of the University of Pennsylvania showed that only 4,500 children are in day care centers or family day care homes. I know that many thousands of children of working mothers are inadequately cared for by neighbors or are "latch string children" without any supervision.

With the money which Pennsylvania would receive from Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department would develop new day care services in geographical areas where the employment of women is greatest. This would be done by assisting counties to operate day care centers themselves by reimbursing counties for the purchase of day care services for private agencies, by operating demonstration day care projects in public housing and by conducting training courses for personnel of newly established day care services.

Funds would also be used to expand the number of day care centers conducted during the summer and early fall for the children of migrant laborers who would otherwise be left in the camps under the supervision of older children while their mothers are in the field. The small Pennsylvania program which has been conducted for several years has received national attention. Funds would also be used for salaries of departmental staff to enforce the law requiring licensing of family day care homes operated for profit and to provide consultation to the operators of such homes.

The 1962 amendments to the Social Security Act require steady progress toward the goal of an adequate child care program in each of Pennsylvania's 67 counties. At present, 14 counties have no program and 19 others have personnel standards which do not meet Federal requirements. In order to improve this situation it will be necessary for Pennsylvania to recruit professionally trained personnel or to train promising young people in greater numbers than we have been able to do heretofore. At a recent meeting which the Pennsylvania department held with the deans of the three graduate schools of social work, they learned that student's tuition covers something less than one-half of the cost to the school of educating one student. On this account each of the three schools is planning only a small annual expansion in the future.

The funds which I hope will be restored to the HEW budget would assist the schools to expand their faculties in order that they can accept more students who will prepare for child welfare positions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added to the amendment to the pending supplemental bill previously offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] to restore $1 million to initiate a program of day care services for children of working mothers.

I am pleased that this amendment was adopted, and I wish to associate myself with it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what I am about to propose is, in effect, a repetition of the request I made yesterday afternoon. I ask unanimous consent that on the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and all amendments thereto there be a limitation of debate of 1 hour, the time to be divided between the majority leader and the minority leader or to be assigned by them to whomever they may designate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I turn the control of my time over to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the chairman of the subcommittee, who is in charge of the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, the time for the quorum call to be exclusive of the 30 minutes on each side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I hope the amendment will prevail. The amendment would strike $200 million from the $450 million requested in the appropriation for the accelerated public works program.

As I stated yesterday, of the $900 million that was authorized, of which $400 million was appropriated at the last session, $275 million is now obligated—$125 million was not obligated as of April 4.

If we make the amount $250 million instead of $450 million, and add the $125 million, there will be $375 million to spend for the accelerated public works program.

In addition, the committee of conference last year accepted the Senate committee's recommendation of language that the accelerated public works program should be justified or explained to the committee when the hearing took place this year. Actually, no justifications have been made as yet, because the administration has thus far not been able to present them.

Admitting that there are recommendations of something over a billion dollars from the various States and cities, these recommendations have not been shaken down as projects because many of the cities, towns, and States which will have to contribute have not yet committed themselves to their share of the financing. For these reasons, I maintain that the amount I propose would be entirely sufficient to carry the program forward and to help solve the problem of unemployment.

I believe that one other point that was brought up is very important. If the whole $900 million is appropriated and spent, it will provide about 110,000 on-site jobs. Off-site, it is estimated that there will be another 110,000 jobs created, or a total of 220,000 jobs. As I understand, this number is perhaps less than 1 percent of the total number of persons unemployed. All Senators want to provide employment for people in their States. But what is the best way to do it? Will the proposal in the bill help to do that? It will not help to provide permanent jobs. What we seek to provide are permanent jobs.

In the last month, three textile mills and one gun factory in Massachusetts have closed. That means that between 2,500 and 3,000 persons have lost their permanent jobs. Most of them are skilled workers. They are skilled in textile work and skilled in riflemaking.

Will those persons be helped by providing jobs on construction sites, such as the accelerated public works program calls for? It seems to me that the persons who will be employed on the jobs will be mostly construction workers. If a contractor needs a new construction worker, he will employ someone who has had construction experience. He may perhaps even employ him at overtime rates, rather than hire an inexperienced worker for that job.

My amendment will not necessarily diminish the program; it will make the program more realistic and more practical. If the program should be continued after next January, Congress would have another opportunity to examine it.

Mr. President, the latest figures show that the rate of unemployment is at a lower level than it has been for some time; and that the number of new jobs created in March were some 800,000, as compared with 200,000 fewer in the month of February.

So I hope this amendment, which I believe is realistic and sensible, and will help a comparatively few of our unemployed workers to get jobs during the next 6 months, will be adopted.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. I am very much in favor of the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts to the committee amendment; and I desire to point out that what I had to say during the last session of Congress about the $500 million program certainly holds true here.

I think the Senator from Massachusetts has made it abundantly clear that this money cannot be programed in an amount in excess of the $250 million which will remain if his amendment to the committee amendment is adopted, plus the carryover amounts which have not yet been programed.

So I hope the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts to the committee amendment will be adopted.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. President, it seems to me that this amount, as approved by the committee, is a relatively small one for such a program; and I believe it certainly should not be reduced.

First of all, this $900 million program is relatively small, in view of the fact that there are so many legitimate demands for improvements of this type.

Of course, this amount has already been authorized, and I understand there are no plans to increase the authorization this year. So this program—being nationwide—is a modest one; and almost all of the program requires sizable local contributions in connection with the projects—a requirement which, in itself, is right and fair, and insures that the projects will actually serve the communities involved.

Mr. President, I am greatly impressed by the very fine manner in which—according to my observation—the program has been administered. Last fall, when it was enacted, it was impossible to know what its extent would be or what would be the attitude in connection with its administration. But all the projects which have come within my observation have been very carefully considered and scrutinized, and only the most meritorious have been able to survive. Furthermore, a very able man is at the head of the program; and I believe we can assume that that situation will continue.

This program supplies a very definite need. I understand that 72 percent of it has been on a grant basis; and two-thirds of the projects for which grants have been made have been for sewage-disposal plants or waterworks extension plants.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on that point, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from Mississippi is absolutely correct.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island for his verification.

That means that these essential and most necessary improvements are made in villages, small towns, and small cities. However, they are expensive improvements; and the local governments could not by themselves finance them; neither do they have the ability to borrow sufficient funds with which to meet this need.

So, insofar as many of the villages, small towns, and small cities are concerned, this program doubtless represents the difference between being able or being unable to go forward, rather than gradually fall back and fall out of the economy. I believe this is one of the most appealing virtues and one of the proven, demonstrated qualities which the program has already shown. That fact in itself certainly justifies such a program.

I regret that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] has seen fit to offer his amendment to the committee amendment. His amendment calls for a small reduction. I hope the judgment of the committee that his amendment should be rejected and that the committee amendment should be confirmed will—entirely on the merits of the case—be sustained. In the committee, I did not hear any real objection to the amount or to the program itself; and I think the judgment of the committee should stand.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield to me?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, this appropriation will add to the national deficit during the next fiscal year. So will tax reduction. So will other appropriations which will come before the Senate.

I was interested to hear the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] express his support of the bill. I, too, support it; but I do not close my eyes to the fact that it will add to the deficit.

Yesterday, during debate, the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] said that jobs for 250,000 people are involved in the bill. I do not know by what index that particular number is arrived at. However, assuming it to be a correct estimate, I ask this question: Could a tax reduction of $450 million, thereby adding that amount to the deficit, possibly provide as much employment for the unemployed as the pending bill will provide?

It seems to me that the earnest desire of those who are unemployed may be that they become taxpayers. They are not particularly concerned with a tax cut. Instead, they wish to be able to pay some taxes—in other words, to earn income on which they will owe taxes. So they need, not a tax cut, but jobs.

I share the views which have been expressed about the value of this program and the need for this appropriation. If we must have deficit financing, I choose the kind of deficit by which we shall get something for our money. For the deficit spending contained in the pending bill, we shall have improvements in water facilities and a lessening of the pollution of our streams and of the water table; and we shall also have, to show for the deficit, investments in other community improvements. If our way of life is affluent, if it affords healthful living conditions and opportunities for employment and education, these must be available on the community level.

Theories in Washington are not very valuable unless they are given effect and meaning in the communities throughout our land.

I oppose the pending amendment, support the bill, and only regret that the entire amount requested will not be appropriated. I express the hope that further authorization will be enacted this year.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, what is the time situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts has 23 minutes remaining and the Senator from Rhode Island has 21 minutes remaining.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I assign 3 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, yesterday I spoke in opposition to the amendment offered by my friend the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. Today I again express my opposition to the amendment. I oppose the reduction of the appropriation from $450 million to $250 million because I believe the entire sum is needed to meet the essential purpose of the program. Let us remember that the essential purpose of the program is to provide employment to people living in areas of persistent unemployment, and to those who have been out of work for long periods of time. I agree that a public works program is not the best method of insuring and providing full employment throughout the country. And in time a tax cut will hopefully, stimulate both the economy and employment. But the question I raised yesterday, and the one I repeat today, is what is being done to provide opportunity for the hard core of unemployed people while we wait for a tax cut, investment, and the natural processes of private enterprise to stimulate the economy? As the Senator from Massachusetts has said, it is true that this appropriation and the public works program it supports, will not furnish employment to every unemployed person, and to certain categories of labor. But there are other groups of people for whom it would provide employment.

I could be charged with having an interest because my State is grievously affected by a lagging economy in its coal fields. And I am concerned with the fact that many are out of work in my State, and that their families are suffering. But I do not base my support of the works program, and my opposition to the amendment on parochial grounds. I believe the Congress has the duty, and the responsibility, to consider the plight of those who are unemployed through no fault of their own—wherever they may live in our country. And I believe it is the responsibility of the Congress to provide every reasonable help for their emergency employment until the economy begins to grow at a faster pace.

I can support reductions in the budget in many fields; I shall do so, and I believe $3–$4 billion can be cut. But I do not desire to make my plea for economy at the expense of the people in our country who are out of work—and I do not want to cut out the one available program which offers hope for emergency employment. The emergency public works program to which we are addressing ourselves will provide substantial benefits and improvements throughout the country in many communities—sewage and water facilities, hospitals, and public buildings. But its chief purpose is to give employment. Mr. William Batt, the Director of the program, testified that the addition of this $450 million would mean that the total overall employment generated by this program will be from 225,000 to 250,000 jobs averaging 1 year of work. This is no small achievement.

I support the measures that we can take—a tax cut accompanied by reductions in spending—to achieve fiscal stability and to stimulate the economy. And I voice my own political philosophy in saying that our country, the Congress, and my party have responsibility to people who are out of work and cannot find jobs, while we, and, more important, they, are waiting for the economy to improve.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PASTORE. I assign 1 additional minute to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask the Senator two questions which are important to me.

Those of us who advocate a tax cut and many other things to improve the economy and deal with endemic unemployment must take account of the interim period in which those measures will not have been effectuated. Is that not true?

Mr. COOPER. That is what I have argued. There will be an interim period of at least a year or two.

Mr. JAVITS. In the view of the Senator from Kentucky, is the program designed to fill that void?

Mr. COOPER. I support it as having that purpose.

Mr. JAVITS. Second, does the Senator feel that we have already made the cut in the authorization? I and others, including the Senator from Kentucky, I am sure, voted to cut the proposal for an appropriation of $2 billion down to an appropriation for $900 million. So what we are asked to appropriate now is within the context of what we have already cut. Is that correct?

Mr. COOPER. That is correct, following the action last summer in fixing the authorization at $900 million.

Mr. JAVITS. I appreciate that. I find my own view is parallel to that of the Senator. An exercise of responsibility requires that we go at least that far.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I never cease to be beguiled by the language of the appropriation bills that come to the floor of the House and the Senate. In fact, during the 17 or 18 years that I have served either on the House Appropriations Committee or the Senate Appropriations Committee I have been beguiled because all bills start in the same fashion. They provide that—

> The following sums are appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply supplemental appropriations—

And so forth. The language includes, "out of any money in the Treasury."

Mr. President, on net balance there is no money in the Treasury. Certainly when the books are cast up and we are given an accounting for the fiscal year 1962–63, which will come on the 30th of next month, we will see that the deficit will aggregate as much as $9 billion. But I am now speaking of net balance. We can exercise all the abracadabra we desire, we can borrow, we can set up a complicated system of bookkeeping, but when all is said and done, there is no money in the Treasury out of which the sum proposed can be expended. The money will be borrowed money. We can slice the baloney any way we desire; it will be borrowed money, and there will be a debt service on it from now on.

All anyone need do is to look at the unexpurgated edition of the Federal budget, which looks like an 8-pound Sears Roebuck catalog, and there he will find that interest on the public debt is in the $10 billion bracket. Every time we add to the debt, the interest charge goes up.

I am not insensible of the fact that our country is a growing country. But I am also not insensible of the fact that the interest alone on the public debt is 2½ times the whole cost of the Government—including Army, Navy, and civil functions of all kinds—the year I landed in this town as a freshman Representative in 1933.

Today we have a debt well in excess of $300 billion.

I do not care about the hocus-pocus I have read in the newspapers that the administration proposes to exercise. We are told that the Department of the Treasury will ask to raise the debt ceiling to $320 billion. We are told that they have some kind of scheme now to make it appear to be what it actually is not.

I am reminded a little of that sweet gracious old lady who hired a man to bring together the family genealogy. Unfortunately they found one uncle on the family tree who had been electrocuted in the penitentiary. To make sure that he would command a good fee, the genealogical expert, while puzzling about it, finally said, "There was one uncle who occupied the chair of applied electricity in a large public institution."

That is a wonderful way to put it, but it meant exactly what it was; that he had committed a crime and was electrocuted for it to pay his debt to society.

So I do not care about the fancy words and trappings. This is borrowed money, and we ought to be very careful how we spend it.

Last September the Senate passed the authorization bill. They wanted $2 billion, as the distinguished Senator from New York said. How true. We cut that to $900 million.

Do Senators think they will not be back? Do not be so foolish, because they are back now for the other $500 million we did not give them when we passed the appropriation bill in October of last year. The bill went to the White House for signature. I suppose there were some naive souls who thought, "We will give them $400 million, and perhaps, because of some magic gesture they will not come back." But they are here.

That was last October. This is May. The bill is here. They wanted not a part of it, but all of it, until the House cut out $50 million. So their request was for $500 million, to make up the total of $900 million. Originally it was $2 billion. If we give this to them, then we can wait to see whether they will be back for the remainder of what they want, to be added to the debt.

I noticed with interest what the Secretary of the Treasury said to the chamber of commerce yesterday that there was an upswing and the possibility of generating another billion dollars in taxes. Bless him if it can be done. I only hope so. But I have my fingers crossed, because, when all is said and done, there are only two jobmakers in the country. One is government. The other is enterprise. I do not care how anyone slices that, we cannot get away from it.

The administration takes credit now for having provided some jobs. There are 690,000 more people now working on the State and local payrolls, paid for out of taxes; 126,000 more people on the Federal Government payroll; and 192,000 more persons in the Armed Forces since the Kennedy administration came into power; or more than 1 million more persons receiving their pay through taxes levied on our people. Do Senators call it job giving to take it out of one pocket and put it in another? I suppose that is the reason why there is lack of the rather delicate thing which is called "confidence," which is so necessary to energize and stimulate a country. I do not think the people who have the money for capital investment think this is a correct way to operate a railroad. That is the simple truth.

Confidence is a delicate thing, Mr. President. I am reminded of the lady who got up in the car on the train and walked from one car to another. When she was in the vestibule, between cars, the bell cord snapped and hit her on the cheek. At that time the conductor came by, and she said, "My conscience, what happened?" He said, "Lady, be calm. The train pulled in two." She said, "Is it any wonder? Could you hold it together with a piece of string?"

But that is the piece of string which made this country go, and it will make it go again. We are making it more difficult to make it go. That is what bothers me.

They are here again. They wanted $500 million. The House gave them $450 million. Now we are trying to cut the figure back, by the amendment, $200 million.

I could give Senators all the details in the hearings. I read every word. I read the House hearings. What do Senators think they say? The applications coming into the Housing and Home Finance Agency are running $300 million a month. Those coming to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are running $150 million a month. That is a total of $450 million a month. If we multiply by 12, if that is a consistent pattern, there would be $5.4 billion in applications in a year.

I say, "Is anybody so naive as to believe that this will be the end of this business? Do not kid yourselves."

The hearings show that 6,211 projects were submitted. That covers only three-fourths of the distressed areas, 900 areas out of more than 1,200 areas.

What do Senators think the towns and villages in other areas will do? Do Senators think they will let this grab bag go by without getting their share?

I say to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], "Do you, sir, think that will happen in New Hampshire?" The Senator knows very well that those who did not get their applications in in time will come to the Congress. They will be on his doorstep. They will say to the Senator from New Hampshire, "Senator COTTON, we could not get down there in time with our tincups. We want you now to see that more money is authorized and that more is appropriated. We have to get into this deal."

And they will get into it. We cannot cut off a Federal function like this so easily, with so much money involved.

I know that the majority of projects are for sewers and paving, but there are projects for city halls, too, and for courthouses and for fire stations.

I served for 4 years on a city council, and I know how eager we were to have a city hall. But there was no Mr. Whiskers, better known as Uncle Sam, from whom to get the money. But we finally got a city hall with our own money. We got a courthouse with our own money. And we got a fire station with our own money.

When the people in my town were interested in sewage treatment, I said, "Yes; that must be done. You cannot pour raw effluence into a wonderful river that once upon a time was next to the Columbia River as a fish-producing stream." It broke my heart to see that river contaminated. I helped to carry the ball. My twin brother got into the council, and he helped to carry it. We got a sewage treatment plant.

But, it is said, "Here is free money. Get your hands into the sack." My State is in it for $10 million. The people will not like the speech I make on the Senate floor today, but I have to make it, because there is something more important than a little plant for one of my own towns, and that is the solvency of the United States of America in a day of fever, when countries are foundering in our own hemisphere. Look at Brazil. The cruzeiro went down, I understand, 64 percent in a single month. The Argentine is in danger. There is the problem of Cuba, and many other things. This becomes a taint. It becomes a contagion. It becomes an infection in that part of the world where we live.

Oh, how blithely we discuss this matter and say, "This is a good thing." It is transient. There is talk of 220,000 jobs, about half on-site, and about half off-site, for $900 million. That is what the record shows. I do not believe those figures, Mr. President.

I have great admiration for Mr. Batt, the Administrator.

Incidentally, with respect to the "crocodile" discussion yesterday, when the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] thought the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] had called him a crocodile, I wish to say that he did not call him a crocodile. He was only talking about crocodile tears. But the Senator from Pennsylvania should not shed any crocodile tears, because, if Senators will note the hearings, they will see that the great and good Keystone State will get $31½ million. The limit is 10 percent, and out of $367 million Pennsylvania will get pretty close to 10 percent. They got the Administrator, too, and the Assistant Administrator. So the Senator from Pennsylvania should shed no crocodile tears. He is doing very well under this program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the other day I saw that we were about to observe the anniversary of a rather interesting flight made by a young gentleman named Corrigan. It happened many years ago. He started from New York to California, but, as I understand, he landed in Dublin, Ireland; and they have called him Wrong Way Corrigan from that day to this.

If that is the way to get the country "moving," all I have to say is we are moving in the wrong direction. We are ballooning the debt. The Senator from New Hampshire knows this. We are ballooning the budget. It is not $99 billion. It is $108 billion. Let us be honest with the people. There are $9 billion of new functions and obligations in the budget, in addition to the $99 billion in administrative cash. Then there is a proposal for a $12 billion deficit in 1964. Then, in addition, a tax cut is proposed.

That is why there is a certain euphemism to the language in the appropriation bills that begins, "The following sums are appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated."

The money is not there. It is like the ditty I heard again the other day:

> Last night I saw upon the stair
> A little man who wasn't there.
> He wasn't there again today.
> Oh, how I wish he'd go away.

I am thinking in terms of the solvency of our country. I do not go for all the figures that are so neatly racked up. Mention is made of 220,000 jobs. How much of this is machine work? For many years I was involved in earth machinery contracting work. The book says this is competitive work. If I bid on one of those jobs, all I do is move my machines over to another site. The same manpower, is used. The talk about how many jobs will be created is sheer guesswork. Some jobs will be created. In the very nature of things, that could not be helped. But to say that for one man on-site one man off-site will be put to work is guesswork. What is there in the way of inventory of cast iron pipe for water mains, for example? There is plenty there. The jobs for that particular kind of work are not particularly multiplied. So I take all of these figures with a grain of salt.

I wish we could send out through the country a note of confidence and say that we are going to cooperate with those forces and with the basic philosophical approaches to prosperity that have always worked before.

There is bound to be some pain. No baby was ever born into the world without some pain and travail. We do not get out of fixes and difficulties without some pain. This was referred to as the interim period. There are painful periods, to be sure, but is that an excuse for piling mistake upon mistake and failure to sound forth a position that is best calculated to undergird with confidence the economic structure of the country so that we can really get moving again?

Mr. President, mine may be only a voice in the wilderness, but this has to be said. In that connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table which appears on page 477 of the hearings, which is a summary

by States of projects approved under the $400 million accelerated public works appropriation as of March 31, 1963.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Summary by States of projects approved under $400,000,000 accelerated public works appropriation as of Mar. 31, 1963

[Dollars in thousands]

State	Accelerated public works funds	Other Federal funds [1]	Local matching funds [2]	Estimated on-site man-years
Alabama	$9,446	-----	$7,830	1,293
Alaska	4,626	$43	2,167	346
Arizona	5,170	-----	150	755
Arkansas	5,765	308	4,405	766
California	14,410	250	8,995	1,410
Colorado	2,535	255	1,522	339
Connecticut	4,237	272	4,545	570
Delaware	319	-----	666	31
Florida	6,499	-----	6,115	784
Georgia	6,615	-----	5,235	828
Hawaii	546	-----	-----	91
Idaho	3,606	103	258	401
Illinois	10,634	489	8,004	1,127
Indiana	4,924	566	5,070	571
Iowa	385	-----	-----	21
Kansas	552	-----	730	87
Kentucky	16,447	1,325	17,003	2,830
Louisiana	14,111	1,775	18,810	2,196
Maine	2,426	1,103	2,109	357
Maryland	1,539	-----	842	189
Massachusetts	6,199	609	7,901	715
Michigan	30,958	2,386	25,783	3,368
Minnesota	7,061	735	5,287	823
Mississippi	7,215	317	5,297	1,336
Missouri	5,975	-----	2,866	761
Montana	3,516	-----	263	525
Nebraska	1,337	129	854	124
Nevada	332	-----	66	50
New Hampshire	1,129	504	1,233	102
New Jersey	21,137	1,913	23,141	2,226
New Mexico	8,001	179	1,123	1,191
New York	11,642	805	11,422	1,212
North Carolina	8,988	229	6,089	1,469
North Dakota	497	-----	65	83
Ohio	11,671	896	12,699	1,212
Oklahoma	7,888	35	5,144	833
Oregon	6,479	-----	1,909	917
Pennsylvania	31,502	-----	28,338	3,929
Rhode Island	6,799	1,692	8,007	541
South Carolina	6,094	295	7,754	768
South Dakota	1,139	-----	240	191
Tennessee	10,542	99	10,368	1,832
Texas	9,602	38	8,790	1,211
Utah	3,503	-----	575	558
Vermont	391	549	932	34
Virginia	1,461	236	787	252
Washington	8,389	6	4,309	834
West Virginia	16,932	610	12,017	1,936
Wisconsin	3,917	747	2,738	521
Wyoming	827	58	592	141
Guam	105	-----	-----	11
Puerto Rico	11,422	243	5,854	1,136
Virgin Islands	326	-----	-----	72
U.S. total	367,768	19,790	296,899	45,906

[1] Consists of grants made under the Hill-Burton hospital program and the water pollution program.

[2] Consists of moneys provided by the localities for hospital, water pollution, and local water, sewer, and other public facilities.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, some time later it will probably be my pleasure to submit another table showing how the $450 million is to be disposed of, unless the Senate, in its profound wisdom, is willing to support the Saltonstall amendment. I wish it would. I hope it will. But I do not let my hopes deceive me to the point where I think that objective is going to be consummated.

That is the story, Mr. President; but on this whole issue of economy, other things will be said, and I know there are those who do not share my view. However, that is the glory of this great deliberative body, where we can speak out, contrary to views of others of our colleagues, and be cheerful about it.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the majority leader.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on the remaining amendments and all amendments thereto, as well as motions, there be a time limitation of 40 minutes, 20 minutes to the side, this agreement to apply only to the amendments and motions, and not to the bill.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, this proposal applies to all amendments at the desk, without regard to the rule of germaneness. Is that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, as subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

Ordered, That, during the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5517) the supplemental appropriation bill, 1963, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 40 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided,* That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I understand the majority leader has an official commitment to keep.

May I ask how much time we have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventeen minutes.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long].

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, for 8 years the junior Senator from Louisiana has been voting against the foreign aid bill, not because he found it difficult to justify some sort of foreign aid, but because he thought there had been waste and extravagance in the aid program. The most appealing argument that could be made for the foreign aid bill is that we are helping people help themselves all over the world, whether they are friendly, or neutral, or even enemies. We have appropriated billions of dollars for foreign aid, hundreds of millions of dollars going to countries dedicated to the defeat of the cause for which this country stands. The junior Senator from Louisiana has felt that he should not vote for such wasteful expenditures.

In this case, the administration is pledged to see that our own people are put to work. We have altogether too much unemployment. Undoubtedly, in the next election campaign, Republicans will hold the Democrats responsible for every man who is out of work and who is desirous of obtaining work that will be beneficial to himself and to his community.

We are proposing to help areas that are depressed, where there is a great deal of unemployment, to help themselves. They will match the funds we appropriate. They will put up their own money to match such funds. In my own State, there are 78 such communities that have made application to participate in this program. All of them have a high degree of unemployment. They want to put up their own money to help themselves. They want the Federal Government to cooperate in a continuing program.

I will vote to help such communities to help themselves to provide sewerage facilities, water services, sewage treatment plants, hospitals, and other desirable public works. It will both reduce unemployment and permanently improve the communities involved.

This is a much better program, in my view, than giving millions of dollars to foreign countries, or lending money to them, with repayment to no one but themselves.

How any Senator can proceed to vote against this kind of help for people of his own country who need help, people who want help themselves, and people who want to put up their share of the expenditure in an effort to relieve the recession that we are in, Americans who want to improve the welfare of their communities and their country as a whole, and then proceed to vote a high figure of expenditure for foreign aid, and even provide aid to Communist countries, is something that I cannot understand.

I will vote to help Americans help themselves.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver].

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the arguments for making available without delay the $450 million already authorized under the accelerated public works program are many and convincing.

As my colleagues know, I have supported this program from its inception. Indeed, in years previous, I, along with other Members of this body have proposed legislation to accomplish the same beneficial purposes as the accelerated public works program, with emphasis on job producing, community building, sewer, water, hospital, airport, and other projects.

It is with a feeling of gratification that I find the Senate today considering the appropriation of an additional $450 million for the public works program. This amount, coupled with the $400 million appropriated last year will go a long way toward achieving the goals which I, and many of my colleagues, have sought for many years to raise the standards of living in the many small towns, villages, and the larger municipalities of Tennessee.

The Senate is called upon today to approve funds which to my way of thinking will be in the nature of a final culmination to many years of work which I have had the pleasure and privilege of carrying on.

I recall that almost 6 years ago to the day, we were debating here the Community Facilities Act of 1958, of which I was a cosponsor, which would have expanded the public facility loan program of the Community Facilities Administration to accomplish the same aims as the program we debate today, more employment and better communities. At the same time, over 6 years ago, I placed in the Record voluminous correspondence from mayors and county officials from Tennessee who had written me concerning their vital interest in public works improvements for their areas. From Chattanooga in the south to Bristol in the northeast and across the State all the way to Memphis, I received statements of the vast need and the increasing interest of the leading citizens of my State in a program of Federal aid for public works improvements. In the Congressional Record for April 15, 1958, I inserted over 60 letters I had received from local officials pointing out their need for sewer, water, and other public works programs. The letters came from all over Tennessee, from every size community. We made a determined effort at that time to secure passage of legislation authorizing $2 billion for low-interest loans to provide a sound fiscal structure for the improvement of the physical plants of our local communities. I also recall that I calculated at that time that there were approximately $70 million worth of projects in Tennessee alone which were ready and needful of Federal assistance.

The basis of need was the same then and now, great unemployment and a lack of basic public utilities to guarantee the heath, safety, and comfort of our people. Of course, I do not have to tell the Senate that the problem is even greater today than it was when we argued the pros and cons of Federal aid to local communities in 1958. Population has expanded at a rate that is accurately described as the "population explosion." There are consequently millions of additional Americans who need the services of local public facilities, particularly in our small communities where water and sewage disposal facilities may be most primitive and unsatisfactory.

Mr. President, again in 1959, I was happy to support legislation to expand the loan program of the Community Facilities Administration. I recall in April of that year the executive secretary of the Tennessee Municipal League testified before the Senate Banking Committee that there was an enormous backlog of projects in Tennessee which needed immediate attention, and could only be helped by low interest Government loans, since these localities had dangerously high municipal indebtedness. The estimate at that time for the need of funding in Tennessee alone was $180 million. Consequently, Mr. President, if we approve the $450 million today, and it is added to the $400 million already invested in the accelerated public works program, it will help the problem and the needs of our people, but will not fully satisfy it. This is true, because of the enormous backlog of projects waiting for attention, and I am sure every Senator knows how extensive this backlog is in his home State.

Turning from the needs of the past to the needs of the present, I note that a great number of projects are either already approved for Tennessee or are being processed at the present time.

Among those already approved are airport facilities and a fire hall at Chattanooga, a courthouse for Bradley County, water systems for Smith County, and the cities of Jasper, Alexandria, Vanleer, and Springfield; sewer facilities for Cocke County, Cookeville, Morristown, and East Ridge; sewer and water facilities for Monterey, Camden, and Livingston; and college housing for the University of Tennessee.

Additionally, there are almost a hundred projects pending consideration from practically every community in Tennessee, and I am certainly hopeful that these people and these communities will not be disappointed, but that their needs for facilities to make their communities better places to live will be satisfied through the appropriation we are considering today. These programs for which we are considering approval of funds will attract industry to needy communities, increase employment, and meet the health, welfare, and safety needs of our people. As one who has been interested in Federal assistance for community facilities for many, many years, I urge the Senate to approve this $450 million for the accelerated public works program and keep this important program moving right ahead.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Edmondson in the chair). All remaining time has been yielded back. The yeas and nays have been ordered on the Saltonstall amendment. The question is on agreeing to that amendment. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Bible], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Bible], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett].

If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay," and the Senator from Utah would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf] is paired with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater]. If present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "nay," and the Senator from Arizona would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay" and the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "nay" and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater] is absent on official business as a member of the Board of Visitors to the Air Force Academy.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty] is absent because of death in his family.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] is detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea" and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater] is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona would vote "yea" and the Senator from Montana would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea" and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea" and the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 60, as follows:

[No. 64 Leg.]

YEAS—26

Aiken
Allott
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Hickenlooper
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Lausche
McClellan
Mechem
Morton
Mundt
Pearson
Robertson
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smith
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—60

Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Dodd
Douglas
Eastland
Edmondson
Ellender
Engle
Ervin
Fong
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Keating
Kefauver
Kennedy
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Monroney
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Scott
Smathers
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Williams, N.J.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—14

Bennett
Bible
Cannon
Fulbright
Goldwater
Hartke
Hruska
Magnuson
McGee
Metcalf
Miller
Neuberger
Prouty
Yarborough

So Mr. SALTONSTALL's amendment was rejected.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ACCELERATED PUBLIC WORKS—"EXECUTIVE EXCESS"

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], who is absent on official business, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him on the subject of accelerated public works, dealing with "Executive excess."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HRUSKA

The $450 million supplemental appropriation for a second round of so-called accelerated public works is a further case of an Executive excess by an administration responsible only to its own notions of milking real economic distress for all its political potential. It is another invitation for Congress to abdicate our obligation and our authority in our constitutional system of balanced power, simply to let the administration who "always knows best" have its way, outside the traditional framework of legislative authorization review.

We have before us this request for a $450 million supplemental appropriation, to support another year of so-called accelerated public works. But these are public works with a difference, a big and dangerous difference. These projects are allocated at executive discretion, in areas defined by formulas of almost infinite flexibility and subject only to Executive fiat, funded and controlled as the Executive sees fit, all put forward in the name of relief that may not be effective, for an emergency that may not exist.

Let's not delude ourselves: the bill of $400 million was big enough last year; the supplemental is bigger still; and if experience is any guide, this is only the beginning. Indeed, this whole operation got underway as the direct result of a request for fully $2 billion in "standby" presidential authority, rationalized as an antirecession measure but utterly uncontrolled and entirely outside the limits of detailed congressional authorization and, thus, of effective control.

Is this Nation in fact in the grip of so grave an economic crisis as might conceivably justify another installment in this crash program? If it is, and I do not for one moment, subscribe to any such assumption, does this accelerated public works program provide anything more permanent than short-term relief, if that much? Is it really enough, or just sufficient to provide some useful political pressure in widely scattered marginal constituencies? Is it a way toward lasting solutions for persistent unemployment, or simply an avenue for the dispensation of Executive patronage and partisan preferences?

These are hard questions. They are questions neither the deficit-ridden American taxpayer nor any conscientious Senator can afford to shunt aside. If the answers are satisfactory, well and good. If they are not, then let us fulfill our obligations.

We are told that these public works will generate the equivalent of 100,000 to 120,000 man-years of work and new payrolls of nearly a billion dollars, adding in the State and local matching grants for area redevelopment projects. But at best, this amounts only to a drop in a bucket, about a 2-percent drop in a 5-million-man bucket. And once this money is spent—about half of it for off-the-shelf hardware and not for payrolls at all—what then? Have new skills been created? Have men been trained for permanent jobs in developing labor markets? Once this year's accumulation of projects has been built, what have we to show for our investment, except an ever-mounting burden of debt on generations still to come?

We are told that this program will produce new and valuable community facilities in areas currently depressed. I must note that at least one of the so-called depressed counties in my State is actually one of the most prosperous rural counties in America. But even if the purpose is worth while, then let us by all means argue the matter on its true merits. Why attempt to justify it on trumped-up grounds of emergency relief? Let us, in that case, subject the proposal to calm and deliberate project-by-project analysis, within the traditional framework of Executive proposal and legislative disposal of legitimate public business. Why have we abandoned the traditional procedure in favor of sole Executive discretion? There is before the Senate right now a request for fully $1.7 billion in public works. Let us subject these emergency projects to the same careful scrutiny of our Public Works Committee and decide each case on its merits.

We are not told, except by the evidence of our own eyes and ears and by reports of vigorous armtwisting on the other side of the Capitol of the lengths to which this administration is evidently prepared to go to pressure this program through the Congress. Why, for example, did a district-by-district breakdown, dated March 1, suddenly appear in the halls of the Capitol on April 9 and 10, itemizing favors dispensed and favors promised—a sort of analysis of the futures market in public works? Why the sudden rush of phone calls and wires and special emissaries from State and local officials, and the crude attempt to wrap this program in the mantle of welfare for the needy and aid for the downtrodden?

We are not told, in all the glowing statistics of jobs created, that as of mid-February every single man-year of "made" work represented a governmental outlay of nearly $10,000. Even using the projections for the whole program the cost per job is about $8,200. And that is only the average. The cost per job for one Forest Service project in Alabama was a fantastic $250,000, for "recreational facilities," mind you; for a "land treatment" project in Arkansas, $96,000; and for yet another Alabama "recreational facility," $132,000. At this rate, one of our hardworking and hardheaded colleagues in the other body calculated it would cost at least 30 billions of tax dollars to whip the unemployment problem nationwide.

But that is precisely the point, of course. This is no proper or effective attack on joblessness at all. What is needed, clearly, is stepped-up private capital investment which alone will generate new jobs, jobs that are permanent and that improve the quality of our labor force. What is needed is a business climate based on confidence, on respect for creative enterprise, and on just rewards for risk and initiative. Adding $450 million to a projected budget deficit of $10 or $12 billion is hardly a contribution to a dynamic free economy; this program amounts to a hobble rather than a spur. It is our responsibility and our opportunity to label it for what it is, not what the press agents of executive excess claim it to be.

It is an open invasion of congressional prerogatives. It is not an effective attack on the national problem of persistent joblessness. And it is not a contribution to fiscal sobriety or to business confidence, which alone provide the dynamic spark in a free market economy.

One of our national news magazines, in a cynical account of the pressure politics that revived this program in the other body after an initially unfavorable committee vote, put it this way: "Since when have politicians started voting against the pork barrel?"

The Senate of the United States has all the opportunity it needs to work its will on Government economy and on policies of sound fiscal management. Right here, with this bill, there is both the opportunity and the challenge to restore some measure of balanced good order to our constitutional system.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, without losing the floor, I may yield to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], to call up another amendment, subject to the limitation of time which has been agreed to on my amendment No. 67, which I now propose to call up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. PASTORE. I do not object, provided I am allowed time to respond.

Mr. JAVITS. That is understood.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, and ask to have considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 9, lines 3 and 4, it is proposed to strike out "to remain available until June 30, 1964," and insert in lieu thereof, "to remain available until January 31, 1964."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I understand the amendment is acceptable to the Senator from Rhode Island, who is in charge of the bill.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, after consultation with the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender], who is chairman of the subcommittee which handles public works appropriations, and also after consultation with the agencies involved, we have reached the conclusion that in the interest of saving time and expediting the passage of the bill January 31, 1964, would be a convenient date. I am willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do the Senators yield back the remainder of their time?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield back the rest of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a number of Senators wish to leave the Chamber to attend to other duties. I expect to speak for about 15 minutes on my amendment. I now call up my amendment numbered 67, as modified, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 3, line 11, before the period it is proposed to insert the following: ": *Provided*, That no part of such additional amount shall be used in any State in which the participants in, or beneficiaries of, the programs of the Farmers Home Administration are segregated, or otherwise discriminated against, on account of race, creed, or color".

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Rhode Island. Twenty minutes are available to me on my amendment, and I intend to use perhaps all of that amount of time. My colleague [Mr. Keating] needs 5 minutes, and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] needs 1 minute. Will the Senator from Rhode Island yield that much time to them, so that I may use all the time available to me?

Mr. PASTORE. Yes.

Mr. President, I believe that at the beginning of the debate on this amendment it should be stated that a motion to lay the amendment on the table will be made. So the opposition to the amendment will be in a position to yield back some time.

Mr. JAVITS. Yes.

Mr. President, on the question of agreeing to my amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, at this time will the Senator from Rhode Island yield 5 minutes to my colleague [Mr. Keating]?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, who has charge of the time?

Mr. JAVITS. I have control of the time available to those who support my amendment. But I wonder whether the Senator from Rhode Island will yield 5 minutes to my colleague [Mr. Keating] and 1 minute to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph].

Mr. PASTORE. Yes.

Mr. President, at this time I yield 1 minute to the Senator from West Virginia.

RURAL HOUSING LOANS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President there could conceivably be a misunderstanding of the statement pertaining to rural housing loans, on page 4 of Senate Report 155 relating to supplemental appropriations for 1963. It could possibly cause some confusion and also overlapping of responsibility between two Federal Government agencies. I refer to the committee's action which would direct "the Secretary of Agriculture to make available immediately necessary loan funds, in addition to those allocated under the regular program, to meet the urgent needs of qualified applicants who have been affected by such local disasters," having reference to rural homes damaged in recent weeks "from floods and fire."

I call to the attention of the manager of the bill, my cherished colleague [Mr. Pastore] and to the Senate the fact that the Small Business Administration has for several years had a disaster loan program that covers homes and other properties—other than farmers'—damaged "from floods and fire." The program of the Small Business Administration covers those who receive most of their income from operations other than farm operations, irrespective of the size of the community. Moreover, I stress that this program has been administered very vigorously, and has in many areas of the country enabled people whose properties have been damaged to restore fully such properties. I make particular reference to the disaster last year on the east coast of this country, including New Jersey, North Carolina, Virginia, Delaware, Maryland, and New York. Presently the Small Business Administration has special disaster offices in rural areas in West Virginia and Kentucky.

In a measure, then, Mr. President, the direction given the Secretary of Agriculture could duplicate the authority already vested in the Small Business Administration, and the effect would be that two agencies would be making loans to the same kind of applicants. This, of course, could be very perplexing to residents of rural areas and small towns throughout the country.

So I should like to have a clarification, for I am sure it was not intended to have overlapping activities by the agencies now engaged in this worthwhile work, inasmuch as the Small Business Administration has been very effective. Therefore, I wish to have an assurance that there is no desire on the part of the committee, let us say, to lessen the efforts of the Small Business Administration in this field.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from West Virginia is absolutely correct.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, at this time will the Senator from Rhode Island yield 5 minutes to my colleague [Mr. Keating]?

Mr. PASTORE. Yes, Mr. President; I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New York [Mr. Keating].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

SUPPORT FOR NONDISCRIMINATION AMENDMENT

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, this amendment deals with only one Federal program, a program of assistance to farmers administered by the Farmers Home Administration. It is only one of dozens of amendments which would be needed to conform every Federal activity to the equal protection requirements of the Constitution. I support this amendment, as I would any other designed to prohibit Federal subsidies for Jim Crow projects.

This subject takes on added significance in view of the recent report of the Commission on Civil Rights on the status of the equal protection of the laws in Mississippi.

A number of observers expressed their shock at what they considered the extreme recommendations of the Commission.

In my judgment, anyone who has read the Commission's report should be far more shocked by the conditions it exposed than by its recommendations for remedial action.

In the Commission's words:

> Citizens of the United States have been shot, set upon by vicious dogs, beaten, and otherwise terrorized because they sought to vote. * * * Even children, at the brink of starvation, have been deprived of assistance by the callous and discriminatory acts of Mississippi officials administering Federal funds.

If such conduct does not affront the conscience of the Nation, as the Commission assumed it would, then the Nation certainly needs to engage in some solemn soul searching.

Last year, the residents of States in which constitutional rights are openly flouted received billions in Federal tax funds under various Federal programs. This is several times more than the people in these States contributed to the Federal Treasury. What the Commission recommended was that the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government inquire into the moral and legal considerations arising out of a situation where the lawless conduct and defiance of the Constitution by certain elements in one State are being subsidized by the other States.

This recommendation of the Civil Rights Commission was not the recommendation of an extremist group; instead, it was the thoughtful and unanimous judgment of six outstanding Americans representing every phase of our national life: Father Theodore M. Hesburgh, the president of Notre Dame University; Robert G. Storey, the former dean of the Southern Methodist University Law School; John A. Hannah, the president of Michigan State University; Robert S. Rankin, chairman of the Department of Political Science of Duke University; Spottswood W. Robinson III, dean of the Howard University Law School; and Erwin N. Griswold, dean of the Harvard University Law School. Their views deserve great respect. If their proposals appear to some to be extreme, it is not because of their lack of merit, but is because of the many years we have condoned the flagrant practices described not only in this report, but also in many other reports of the Civil Rights Commission.

These men who serve on the Commission have confronted discrimination not as an abstract philosophical proposition, but as a tragic challenge to every humane and liberal instinct. They have seen and heard the victims of such practices in face-to-face hearings. Their revulsion against conditions such as exist in Mississippi is not an impersonal expression of morality, but a deeply personal expression of outrage at the treatment to which some of our fellow Americans are subjected.

I have for many years protested the continued contribution of Federal tax funds to State programs and projects carried out on a discriminatory or segregated basis. It is ironical that the Department of Justice has initiated several lawsuits to prohibit just such practices despite the refusal of other Federal agencies to condition Federal grants on a policy of nondiscrimination.

No official sworn to uphold the law can ignore the Constitution in carrying out his authority. It is no more legal or moral for Federal agencies to spend Federal funds on unconstitutional projects than it is for State officials to subsidize white-only schools, parks, transportation, or other public facilities.

On several occasions many of us have requested the issuance of an Executive order to require all Federal agencies to insist upon uniform, nondiscriminatory Federal policies in connection with all Federal grants-in-aid. It seems to me that is the way to deal with this problem. If such an Executive order were issued, there would be no need to resort to such amendments to appropriation bills. But such an Executive order has not been issued; and the indications are that this recommendation of the Civil Rights Commission will not be implemented by Executive order.

Under the circumstances there is no alternative except to follow the course of the adoption of an amendment such as this one. Its provisions would bring this program into compliance with the Constitution. It should not be an affront to anyone, inasmuch as the amendment merely provides that Federal tax funds, which are taken out of the pockets and out of the pay envelopes of all our citizens, shall not be used in a way which violates the U.S. Constitution.

The Commission's report expresses a sentiment we all share in its statement that the Commission "does not want the people of Mississippi, either Negro or white, to lose benefits available to citizens of other States." Its goal, and the purpose behind amendments such as we are now considering, is rather "that all citizens in the United States be assured the full enjoyment of the rights guaranteed by the Constitution." In the words of the Commission:

> It is upon adherence to that great charter with its powerful moral premises that our survival as a free society depends.

Mr. President, this amendment would not discriminate against the people of Mississippi. It does not cut off funds to any State or any citizen. What it would do is assure that Federal funds under this program are not used in any part of the country to subsidize segregation. It asks only that those who receive Federal funds—collected from all our citizens without regard to their race—distribute them to the intended beneficiaries without regard to their race. In the simplest, but most compelling terms, it asks only that those who receive Federal funds comply with the Constitution. It discriminates against no State or group of citizens—but it does discriminate in favor of the Constitution and its guarantee of equal protection.

There is nothing shocking about this proposition. What is shocking, is that such a principle still needs to be established at this date in our history. What is even more shocking is the realization that our efforts today probably will be blocked by the same parliamentary devices and legalistic evasions which have doomed past efforts to breathe life into the fundamental law of our land.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 12 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 12 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this amendment is the beginning of a process which, unfortunately, may take a little time during this session of Congress and during this entire Congress. Nevertheless, this procedure must be followed. I say it is unfortunate that it may take a little time, because I believe there is growing among the Negroes in the United States an understandable and worrisome degree of frustration, in regard to the relatively slow progress in the legislative branch in dealing with many of the questions which must be dealt with legislatively in the field of race relations and civil rights. Negro writers, thinkers, and intellectuals, on the one hand, are expressing that kind of frustration and almost despair. I see movements such as that of the Black Muslims—which, incidentally, is being covered in a splendid series of articles being published in the New York Herald Tribune—which constitutes further evidence of the dangers involved. We also are familiar with evidences of violence, including the murder on a public highway of a fine man who was making an integration march; and we also have observed the disorders, requiring the presence of troops at Little Rock, Ark., and at Oxford, Miss., in addition to the shootings, the bombings, and the burnings. From all of these, one begins to appreciate that in this field we are not dealing with a tea party and that, unless an outlet is given for expression of the grievances in this field which men have felt for decades, our country will be in for a very difficult time.

What is being attempted with my amendments is to operate with the scalpel rather than a sword on every particular part of the Federal Establishment which is channeling money to the States, in instances in which the States use the money for purposes which either are themselves segregated or lend themselves to segregation.

Let us take the pending amendment as a practical example. The amendment is directed to the appropriation in the amount of $1,222,900 for the Farmers Home Administration. The Farmers Home Administration is a Federal agency which makes available loans to tenants, laborers, and sharecroppers for farm ownership. It makes available operating loans to farmers and stockmen. It also makes available soil and water conservation loans to farmers and associations. It makes available farm housing loans for construction and improvement of dwellings and other buildings. The Farmers Home Administration program is administered essentially through county committee, usually composed of three local farmers. It is they who decide who is or who is not entitled to credit. So far as can be ascertained by authoritative studies which have been made in the field there is no Negro member on any county committee anywhere in the United States.

Mr. President, the words "never" and "no" are always big words; so I am willing to say there might be one somewhere. I do not know. But so far as we have been able to find out, there are none.

A specific study upon this subject was recently made in South Carolina by the Southern Regional Council. It dealt with nine rural counties in that State: Allendale, Bamberg, Barnwell, Calhoun, Clarendon, Hampton, Jasper, Lee, and Williamsburg.

The study was made of counties in which Negroes constituted 50 percent of the total population. In eight of the counties, Negroes constituted more than 50 percent of the population. In none were Negro farmers less than 39 percent—roughly 40 percent—of the population. In those counties there was no county committee member who was a Negro.

Nevertheless it is the county committee members who determine who shall receive credit and who shall not.

We now know that one of the worst sanctions imposed upon—and one of the prime weapons used against—Negroes in the South who have the temerity to want to vote or get out in registration drives or show any signs whatever of being anything other than compliant citizens willing to stand by and see their fundamental rights as Americans denied to them, is the denial of credit—an economic weapon, an economic sanction.

Also the system of white county committees lends itself to the system which is called in the South sponsorship. If a Negro does not have the sponsorship of some respectable and responsible white citizen in a community, he finds it very difficult to get a job, to get a loan, or to get along at all.

One can never implement situations of this character with the detailed application of farmer A on farm A who suffered this particular type of denial. The problem becomes fuzzy with questions as to whether the applicant's credit was good or bad, or whether he ought to be a farm owner or not. But I would like to give some figures for the RECORD from the recent study by the Southern Regional Council with respect to the nine rural counties in South Carolina.

Over the 3-year period ended June 30, 1962, only nine loans under Federal programs in the entire nine counties were made to Negroes for the purpose of enabling them to acquire their own farms. Five of the nine loans were made in fiscal year 1961.

Of loans either to build or to improve farm housing, only 14 loans were made to Negroes, 5 of those having been made also in fiscal year 1961.

Moreover, out of $1,222,630 advanced by the Farmers Home Administration for farm land acquisition in those countries—fundamental farm ownership—during that period, only $55,550 went to Negro families, and out of $1,328,915 advanced for farm housing, only $81,955 went to Negroes.

In short, in the first case, it was under 5 percent. In the second case it was under 7 percent. When we are dealing with a population juxtaposition in any of those counties, of not less than 40 percent, which the Negro farmer bears to the white and, as we very well know, the Negroes are frequently those who are most in need of loans——

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. My time is limited.

Mr. PASTORE. I will be happy to yield additional time.

Mr. JAVITS. I am happy to yield a minute to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I should like to ask the following question: How many Negroes in the counties of South Carolina to which the Senator has referred asked for loans and did not receive them?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have already said that I cannot testify as to that. In giving the facts and figures, I have said that one must draw a conclusion from the overall situation. I ask unanimous consent to include at this point table 4 of the Farmers Home Administration program for South Carolina giving for the years 1959, 1960, and 1961 operating loans, farm ownership loans, farm housing loans, soil and water conservation loans, and giving records for white and Negro applications received and loans made, so that it will be very clear, as I say to my colleague, what was applied for and what was granted.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE IV.—*Farmers Home Administration program for South Carolina*

Fiscal year	Operating loans				Farm ownership				Farm housing				Soil and water conservation			
	Applications received		Initial loans made		Applications received		Initial loans made		Applications received		Initial loans made		Applications received		Initial loans made	
	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro
1959	919	1,377	570	1,135	287	53	68	3	539	59	298	17	25	0	9	0
1960	773	929	516	670	292	63	76	12	354	47	158	15	36	0	21	0
1961	928	1,259	564	985	365	60	81	4	491	50	290	22	37	1	9	0

Mr. JAVITS. First, I base my argument on the fact that no Negroes are on the county committees which control that kind of credit, which is almost inconceivable when we are dealing with a county 42 percent of whose farmers are Negroes, unless there was a discriminatory pattern.

Second, I base my argument on the overall grant of credit for certain purposes, especially farm ownership, which shows again a complete and radical disproportion between the Negro and the white farmers in that particular set of counties and the figure on home ownership loans granted.

I point out that even the courts in similar situations are willing to accept that kind of evidence—not as conclusive, final, or determinative—but as evidence. That is the sense in which I submit it.

In view of those figures, it is beyond reasonable expectation that there should be other than some form of discriminatory pattern, unless an effort is made to come forward and explain why those figures are as heavily loaded as they are against Negro farmers.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Does the Senator from New York know how many loans made to white people went indirectly to colored people?

Mr. JAVITS. As I pointed out previously, I do not know that. I doubt very much whether anyone would know what loan money to white people went indirectly to colored people. But I point out again that that is a fundamental vice in the whole situation. The theory behind it is that the Negro is not an adult, an American citizen like the rest of us who, if he is entitled to a loan, is entitled to one. He does not have to get it through some channel or through the sponsorship of a white family in the community.

We are all beginning to understand the power of the economic sanction, which has contributed greatly to holding Negroes in subjection in the South.

I should like to make my fundamental thesis, if the Senator will allow me. My fundamental thesis is as follows: We should take an across-the-board position, as the U.S. Civil Rights Commission did in asking the President to cut off all Federal money to Mississippi. If we did that—and the facts indicate they did not—we would be asking the President to lay on with a broadsword, and whatever may have been the evils which Mississippi, by its intransigent position on this subject, has brought down on its head, one can understand—though one may not agree—why a President would not feel that he could do that. But I feel that to require every Government department to go through the list of its programs in detail and to see whether or not there is segregation within the programs for which the Federal Government is putting up the money to account for that to the Congress case by case and program by program is what the Federal Government ought to do and is its duty to do under the Constitution.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] and I have asked each Federal department, by specific letter questions, what is happening in each specific program based upon information that we have of segregation practices, program by program.

We have not yet heard from any Government department. I expect that we shall.

In the meantime, as the appropriation bills come before the Senate, I think it is our duty to pinpoint for the people of the country how the money is to be used. It is our duty to make this fight. This is, in my opinion, the way in which, at long last, we can begin to implement the constitutional guarantees.

I have pointed to our case. There is not a great deal of money involved. The money which is to be provided is $1,222,900, which is to be provided for salaries and expenses; but we all know that if an amendment such as this is adopted with respect to a routine appropriation of this character, as to which the derivative evidence is as crystal clear as it is in this case——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 more minutes.

I repeat, the evidence is crystal clear in this case. It is very clear both on the basis of an example in a State and on the overall basis I have described.

Once we do anything like that, Mr. President—once we indicate that this will be the position of the Congress—then we shall not be dismayed by threats to the effect that "If you do this, the appropriation bill will be hung up forever."

Mr. President, the vote which was taken only a few minutes ago, on the Saltonstall amendment, which was 60 to 26, demonstrates that cloture could be effected if the Senate really had its teeth in a particular measure and felt it was high time to break this pattern of providing Federal money—money derived from taxes on all our citizens, white and black alike—for Federal programs which are segregated in character.

It seems to me that this would also go a long way toward making Negroes who today are so dangerously restless feel that they can get some safeguard and some measure of protection through the legislative process. This is elementary.

President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, and President Truman—all great leaders—have agreed that if there is one area in which we ought to move, morally and constitutionally, it is in the area of not providing Federal money for programs which make a distinction as between black and white, as this program does, and as a whole series of programs do.

It is high time that this battle was fought. We may be beaten time and time again, Mr. President, but the reform will be made. It may not be by way of a legislative bill or amendment, but it will happen. This movement is absolutely glacial in character.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has again expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

The only way we can make it happen, before we get into a great deal of trouble—and trouble is the alternative to these efforts to give justice and understanding in this whole problem—is to begin this fight in a specialized, detailed way, directing it to specific programs with specific amounts of money, as to which the evidence can be marshaled and controverted, if it can be.

I respect my friends from the South. I assume that either today or at some other time of their choice, they will present their evidence. So much the better. This is a case to be tried before the conscience, the morality, and constitutional instincts of the American people. It is in that sense I present it to the Senate.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be adopted, as it richly and justly deserves to be.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, and that the time necessary for the calling of the roll not be charged to either side, on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Rhode Island? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, what is the situation on the time allotment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] has 5 minutes remaining; the opponents have 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator in charge of the bill had to leave the floor on other business, and he asked me temporarily to handle the bill on the floor. Does the opposition wish to use its 5 minutes?

Mr. JAVITS. I have 5 minutes remaining, but if the motion to table is defeated, that is the only time that I will have left. So I would like to reserve that time.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is an optimist. I yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church] for the purpose of his making a motion on behalf of the majority leader.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, on request of the majority leader and in his behalf I move that the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] be laid on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion to lay on the table the amendment offered by the Senator from New York. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senators from Nevada [Mr. Bible and Mr. Cannon], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke] is necessarily absent.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater] is absent on official business as a member of the Board of Visitors to the Air Force Academy.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty] is absent because of death in his family.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] would each vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 38, as follows:

[No. 65 Leg.]

YEAS—47

Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Church
Clark
Eastland
Edmondson
Ellender
Ervin
Gore
Gruening
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Kefauver
Kennedy
Lausche
Long, La.
McCarthy
McClellan
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Monroney
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Pastore
Pell
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell
Smathers
Sparkman
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—38

Aiken
Allott
Beall
Boggs
Carlson
Case
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Engle
Fong
Hart
Hickenlooper
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Mechem
Miller
Morton
Mundt
Nelson
Pearson
Proxmire
Randolph
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smith
Symington
Tower
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—15

Bennett
Bible
Cannon
Dirksen
Fulbright
Goldwater
Hartke
Hruska
Magnuson
Mansfield
McGee
Metcalf
Neuberger
Prouty
Yarborough

So Mr. Church's motion to lay on the table the amendment offered by Mr. Javits was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have had printed an amendment similar in character to the one the Senate has just now tabled. The other amendment pertained to the extension services. Some additional problems exist, both as to whether that amendment is to substantive law and whether it would affect the problem of the increase in postal rates.

In view of the mood of the Senate, as just now expressed in connection with this appropriation bill, I feel that the point I wished to make has been made and has been passed upon by the Senate. Therefore, I shall not press for action now by the Senate on the other amendment, but shall proceed along that line when the occasion next presents itself.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators McGee, Cotton, Dodd, and McIntyre, I submit the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 12, in line 5, it is proposed to insert:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Educational television facilities

For grants to assist in construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, as authorized by part IV of title III of The Communications Act of 1934 (76 Stat. 64), and for related salaries and expenses, to remain available until expended $1,500,000 of which not to exceed $40,000 shall be available for such salaries and expenses during the current fiscal year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, because of a misunderstanding concerning the issuance of the rules and regulations which would apply to the grants to assist in the construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, as authorized by a recent amendment to the Communications Act of 1934 (76 Stat. 64), the appropriation of $1,500,000 contained in the supplemental appropriation bill as it passed the House was stricken.

However, it is now clear that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is ready to implement the program immediately. The rules and regulations are complete and will be issued immediately following the appropriation of funds. In fact, the application forms have been prepared and approved by the Bureau of the Budget. The reason why it has not been adopted and published is that the Department felt it more appropriate that it not be implemented prior to action by Congress on the appropriation.

Many prospective applicants already have received or are in the process of receiving Federal Communications Commission authorizations. State and local agencies have reported to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare sufficient non-Federal funds available now to require a total of $11,100,000 in Federal matching grants. In many States non-Federal matching funds which have been raised lapse at the end of the fiscal year. For example, in Ohio it is reported that a total of $202,990 would lapse, in South Carolina a total of $125,000 would lapse, in New Mexico it has been reported that $100,000 would lapse, and in Alabama nearly $150,000 would be lost if funds are not voted for 1963. A similar situation exists in my home State of Minnesota.

Failure to provide these funds in this appropriation bill would prevent some stations from going on the air in time for the beginning of the academic year 1963–64.

A number of other reasons are set forth in a memorandum which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record.

I urge the Senate to restore the $1,500,000 in the supplemental appropriation as a necessary and important start in implementing the educational television program.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Why the Budget Item for the Educational Television Facilities Act Should Be Restored by the Senate

I. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is ready to implement the program immediately.

A. Rules and regulations are complete subject to approval of Secretary and will be issued immediately following the appropriation of funds.

B. The application form is prepared. It has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget and is ready for publication immediately after funds are appropriated. (It is not proper for a program to be implemented prior to action by Congress on the appropriation.)

C. Preparations have been made so that approximately one half of the proposed program staff can be on duty immediately. This staff will be sufficiently well rounded to provide for processing of applications within 1 week after funds become available.

D. The opening date for acceptance of applications by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will be no later than 2 weeks following final appropriations action. This is to provide time for the applicants to complete the application form.

II. Many prospective applicants are ready to move ahead immediately.

A. Many prospective applicants already have or are in the process of getting necessary Federal Communications Commission authorizations.

1. Nineteen construction permits have been granted and applicants are authorized to go ahead on construction.

2. Nineteen applications for construction permits are now being processed.

3. There are 324 channels currently reserved for educational television and petitions are pending to add 85 additional channel reservations.

B. State and local agencies have reported to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare sufficient non-Federal funds available now, to require a total of $11,100,000 in Federal matching grants.

III. In many States, non-Federal matching funds which have been raised will lapse at the end of the current fiscal year. For example:

(a) In Ohio it is reported that a total of $202,990 would lapse.

(b) In South Carolina a total of $125,000 would lapse.

(c) In New Mexico it has been reported that $100,000 would lapse.

(d) In Alabama nearly $150,000 would be lost.

IV. If funds are not voted for 1963 some stations will not go on the air in time for the beginning of academic year 1963–64. For example in the States mentioned above:

(a) Bowling Green University (Ohio) hopes to activate channel 70 in time for the next academic year.

(b) In South Carolina, channel 29 at Greenville and channel 7 at Charleston hope to be ready for the next academic year.

(c) In Alabama, they hope to have channel 42 at Mobile on the air in time for the school year.

V. Grant funds voted for 1963 can be carried over in 1964. If you cut funds now you slow the whole program down and create a logjam in 1964 because the 1964 budget request (for $7 million) was prepared on the assumption that $2 million would be available from the 1963 supplemental budget request.

(a) Prospective applicants have reported intentions to commence construction on 87 educational television stations before June 30, 1964, provided Federal assistance became available. It has been estimated that an average new station grant will total $175,000. Thus the estimated total need will be far in excess of $15 million in Federal funds.

(b) In addition, 51 established stations have indicated that they are planned for expansion to serve more people over a wider area, to commence work prior to June 30, 1964. The estimated average expansion project is in excess of $100,000. Thus the total need is in excess of $5 million.

(c) Therefore, the request by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for $7 million in 1964 and $2 million in 1963 was very conservative.

For the reasons cited above it is important that funds be provided immediately in order that the educational television facilities program may get underway immediately.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this amendment has been discussed with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Rhode Island, the Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall]. The amendment asks the Senate to approve a sum which was recommended; but because of the fact that certain rules and regulations were not ready to be applied by the appropriate agency, the Senate committee did not adopt the $1,500,000 amount. But I understand that those rules and regulations are now ready.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island, who is fully conversant with this matter.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the original supplemental estimate was $2 million. We allowed $1,500,000. But during the markup of the bill before the full committee, question was raised as to whether the rules for the applications had been promulgated. We were informed they had not been promulgated and would not be ready until June 15. Therefore, we voted to delete the entire amount.

However, upon further investigation we found that the rules were completed, but were awaiting the approval of the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, who in turn was waiting for action to be taken by Congress. It was because of that misunderstanding that he had not approved them. However, he could immediately approve them.

So the rules are complete and action will be taken as indicated in the letter to me dated April 26, 1963, from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. For that reason, we favor the inclusion of this amount.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in view of the facts which have been presented, I have no objection to the action now proposed. But I have very serious objection to such conduct of the business of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, inasmuch as it advised one Member of the House of Representatives that the rules would not be entered until June 15; and, later, when that information came to me, I gave it to the committee, at the time of the markup of the bill. The committee as a whole agreed to have committee staff call the Department in question and ask just what the facts were.

The Department advised committee staff that the facts were as previously reported; namely, that the regulations would not be ready until June 15, or thereafter.

However, as soon as the Senate committee took the action which it was completely justified in taking, under that information, it appeared that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare suddenly discovered that it had not acted or that it did not propose to act as it had previously advised both a Member of the House of Representatives and the Senate Appropriations Committee that it had acted or intended to act.

I am perfectly willing to accede to the proposed restoration of this amount, if it be needed for this salutary purpose and if the facts are as they are reported to be. Of course, I assume that they are. However, I wish the RECORD to show that this Department has acted in this manner, which I think is completely of such nature as not to create confidence on the part of the Senate in the Department's action.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I shall be brief, Mr. President.

First, I wish to confirm fully what the Senator from Florida has said. The action of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in connection with this matter is not such as to give anyone confidence in the Department, although I must say that it is difficult to have confidence in the Department, anyway.

I wish to ask the sponsor of the amendment about it. I understand it will cut the amount requested for salaries from $75,000 to $40,000.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. That means that 23 positions which have been requested—many of them very high grade positions—will also be cut in proportion, does it?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. Down to 50 percent?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I presume the reduction will be in line with that figure.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, with that understanding, I am perfectly willing to support this amendment, because I do not wish to proceed too rapidly with this program. I do not believe that is our responsibility. Furthermore, I see no necessity for the huge Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to handle this whole program now.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, two letters.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., April 26, 1963.

Hon. JOHN O. PASTORE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PASTORE: We have been informed that a question was raised as to the degree of Department readiness for the administration of the educational television facilities program.

This letter is a report on the status of preparations.

Rules and regulations for the program have been completed and are ready for issuance, subject to the approval of the Secretary, immediately following action on the appropriation.

The application form is prepared. It has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget, and is ready for issuance immediately following action on the appropriation.

The opening date for acceptance of applications by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will be no later than 2 weeks following final action on the appropriation.

On the basis of information provided this office by potential applicants, it is clear that there is a large group of potential applicants who already have necessary authorizations from the Federal Communications Commission and are ready to proceed with construction immediately.

Sincerely yours,

IVAN A. NESTINGEN,
Under Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., April 26, 1963.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: This is in response to your request regarding the issuance of regulations for the operation of the educational television program.

The regulations are already prepared and can be issued almost immediately, subject to the approval of the Secretary, upon receiving notice of the availability of funds for the operation of the program. Further, application forms have been prepared and approved by the Bureau of the Budget so that applications could be received and processed in the Deparment almost immediately after issuance of regulations.

Sincerely yours,

IVAN A. NESTINGEN,
Under Secretary.

EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION AMENDMENT TO SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, it would be difficult to overestimate the value to our country of educational television.

Here is a way by which high level educational discussion can be brought before large numbers of Americans, and it can be done at a reasonable cost.

Congress has recognized the potentials of educational television, and a program of matching funds, to help the individual States to activate new educational broadcast stations, was signed into law on May 1, 1962. Unfortunately there have not been any funds appropriated to date to implement this Educational Television Facilities Act.

The 87th Congress adjourned without taking action on the supplemental appropriations bill containing $2 million in the House version and $3 million in the Senate version.

But today we will have a chance to get this program started, if the Senate votes to restore to the pending appropriations bill the $1.5 million for educational television that has already been approved by the House.

Time is important in this instance, and I do not think we should wait until the annual appropriations bill is considered to make funds available for educational television.

At the State and local level, both public agencies and private groups have undertaken extensive plans to establish educational television stations. Money has been raised, through fundraising drives and from appropriations by State legislatures. In some cases the money appropriated by the States will lapse by the end of June unless Federal matching funds are received.

This particular situation is not a problem in Connecticut, but knowledge that the Educational Television Facilities Act is actually in operation would be helpful to the people who are working on educational television in my State.

Connecticut has had an educational television station operating since October 1, 1962. This is station WEDH, channel 24, located in the State capitol, Hartford. The effective range of channel 24 is approximately 30 miles, and coverage is now given to about 40 towns.

Officials of the nonprofit Connecticut Educational Television Corp. tell me that they would like to improve this and extend service to provide cultural and educational programs to more people over a wider area.

Federal matching funds could speed up plans to expand channel 24 facilities, and could also be helpful in setting up other stations in my State so that people in every section of Connecticut will be able to benefit from and enjoy educational television.

The Connecticut State Board of Education has two construction permits at the present time, one for channel 71 in Bridgeport and one for channel 63 in Norwich. The Greenwich Board of Education has an application which is now being processed, for channel 55.

These activities by State and local groups in Connecticut illustrate the extensive work that is now underway throughout the country, to bring closer the day when educational television will be a reality for all of our cities and towns.

And I have been assured that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is ready with the necessary administrative materials. The rules and regulations are complete, subject only to the approval of the Secretary, and will be issued right after the initial appropriation of funds. An application form is prepared, and is ready for publication as soon as funds are available. And HEW expects to be prepared to accept completed applications within 2 weeks after final action on the appropriation.

The pending amendment, which I have joined in sponsoring with Senator HUMPHREY and a number of other Senators, will provide $1.5 million in funds for this program, and I am pleased that the Senate seems willing to adopt it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do Senators yield back the remainder of their time?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 27, line 16, it is proposed to strike out

"$550,000" and insert therefor "$615,000", and on page 27, line 18, it is proposed to add immediately before the period "and $65,000 for the United States contribution to the International Peace Corps secretariat".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I am ready to accept the amendment, which provides $65,000 for the International Peace Corps secretariat. It is a good amendment and should be approved by the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator explain the amendment a little further? I have not been able to follow it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The amendment would provide a sum of money as the U.S. contribution to the International Peace Corps secretariat in the amount of $65,000. That sum has been requested by Mr. Shriver of the Peace Corps. It is our contribution to a rather substantial operation of an international nature.

INTERNATIONAL PEACE CORPS SECRETARIAT

The International Peace Corps Secretariat, or Voluntarios de la Paz, Volontaires de la Paix, was provided for by unanimous resolution of the 43 countries attending the International Conference on Human Skills in the Decade of Development at San Juan, P.R., from October 10 to 12, 1962.

The Conference brought together the diverse experience of both the developed and developing countries on a broad range of topics related to the special role of the middle-level worker—the surveyor, teacher, builder, foreman—in the 10 critical years which lie ahead. Against a background of postwar economic theory which laid special stress on technical professionalism and capital investment, the conference explored the new ingredient of skilled manpower.

The concept of volunteers as exemplified in the U.S. Peace Corps and in volunteer organizations of other nations was recognized by the delegates as one of the important ways to unlock an enormous pool of skills and talents for development efforts. At the Conference it became clear that among the citizens of the industrialized nations there are thousands of skilled men and women willing to give a few years of effort to share their skills with others.

On January 1, 1963, the Secretariat began operations. In just 3 months it has become evident that the delegates at Puerto Rico had neither underestimated the need nor the potential of the Secretariat to operate in this field. The Secretariat is already cooperating with six countries which have begun to implement plans for programs similar to the Peace Corps.

Denmark, for example, has publicly announced the formation of a volunteer organization to be used in the developing countries and plans to have between 20 and 30 volunteers in their first project with an ultimate corps of 200.

On February 12, 1963, The Netherlands announced the establishment of a Dutch Peace Corps modeled after the U.S. Peace Corps. The Netherlands program already has an initial appropriation of $555,000 and plans to start the program with a group of 50, with an estimated 200 volunteers when the organization is at full strength.

In West Germany the Bundestag has appropriated approximately $1.4 million for the initial administrative costs of establishing a peace corps. It has been reported that plans are now underway for a formal announcement in the summer of 1963. Germany plans to send from 200 to 500 volunteers into the field this year and anticipates an eventual expansion to 2,000 volunteers.

Norway has also taken steps to establish a peace corps program and plans to have its first 50 volunteers overseas by next fall.

In New Zealand, Volunteer Service Abroad (VSA) has been established, and Sir Edmund Hillary was named its president.

In addition to these programs, Foreign Minister Muniz, of Argentina, announced recently in a meeting at Peace Corps Washington headquarters the establishment of a program which would send from 200 to 300 teachers from Argentina to other Latin American countries. National peace corps programs are also under serious discussion by the Governments of Italy, Switzerland, and Belgium.

If all of these plans are carried forward, the combined results of these programs will be to have in the field, less than a year after the Puerto Rican Conference, more than 500 volunteers with prospects that the number of volunteers from countries other than the United States will reach 2,000 by the end of 1964.

IN-COUNTRY VOLUNTEER GROUPS ORGANIZED

In addition to its work in the industrial nations, the Secretariat is working with those underdeveloped nations which are actively considering the mobilization of their own youth to work in volunteer service organizations within their own countries. The Secretariat is preparing volunteer corps projects in cooperation with the Agency for International Development in El Salvador and Honduras. Discussions are also underway with officials in other countries in Latin America, and plans are developing for similar discussions in Africa.

Both within the industrial nations and the newly developing nations the Secretariat is planning services and assistance along several functional lines:

First. Placement of volunteers: A number of nations have requested the assistance of the Secretariat in a determination of project assignments for their volunteers, and have consulted the Secretariat for project descriptions and placement opportunities. The Secretariat plans to establish a clearinghouse which will correlate requests for volunteers with the supply of various skills arising within the volunteer programs of the industrial nations.

Second. Training of volunteers: Several countries have requested assistance in developing their training programs. Italy has tentatively offered the Secretariat a tract of land in Sicily which could be used by the European countries for a jointly financed and administered training camp.

Third. Selection of volunteers: Several governments have requested assistance from the Secretariat in the important problem of selecting volunteers.

Fourth. Orientation for peace corps. The Secretariat is also planning orientation programs for Peace Corps directors and administrators of new volunteer programs which will offer a full 5-week program of instruction in the various phases of administration. In addition, a 10-day seminar is also being scheduled for Africa which will bring together interested officials from various African governments to discuss the problems of setting up volunteer service groups.

WORK WITH PRIVATE ORGANIZATIONS

While activity in the public sector has received the primary attention of the Secretariat, its cooperation with the private sector is no less significant. The Secretariat is assisting private volunteer organizations throughout the world in recruiting, selection, training, and placing their volunteers. Also it has been cooperating with the Business Council on International Understanding, an organization of about 40 leading firms of the United States engaged in oversea activity. Representatives of the Business Council on International Understanding attended the Puerto Rican Conference and agreed to undertake the responsibility of establishing some pilot training programs for nonemployee nationals in several underdeveloped countries.

In addition to these principal activities, the Secretariat maintains a regular and systematic program of distributing information. For example, the final report of the Conference will be printed by Harper & Row in book form.

To implement this program, the small Secretariat staff initially detailed from the U.S. Government will soon be supplemented by full-time delegates from Israel and Germany to be financed by those governments. Along with this, eight governments have detailed members of their Embassies in Washington to serve as participant advisers who meet with the Secretariat to provide counsel and assistance.

THE SECRETARIAT COSTS

For the period of January 1, 1963, to June 30, 1963, it is estimated that the total cost of maintaining the Secretariat would be $150,000. Of this sum, $80,000 is being contributed by the Department of State from its International Conferences and Contingencies appropriation, covering all costs of the Secretariat except personnel services. The remaining $70,000 covers the cost of personnel from the Department of State, the Agency for International Development, and the Peace Corps who are detailed to the Secretariat on a nonreimbursable basis.

It was fitting that the U.S. Peace Corps should play a prime role in the Conference that created the Secretariat. The Peace Corps was conceived on the premise that the middle-level skills are essential to economic development and that these skills can be transferred from one person to another by example as well as in a formal teaching situation. The Conference thus arose directly out of this basic experience of the Peace Corps in the field.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. This amount was allowed by the House Committee on Appropriations, but was taken out on the floor of the House.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. Shriver took the subject up with me and several other Members of the Senate, and it was decided that the item should be restored to the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield back whatever time is available to the other side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ALLOTT. Who yielded back the time against the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was the proponent of the amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. The proponent was the Senator from Minnesota. The Senator in charge of the bill, who naturally would have to be in opposition to the amendment, would yield back the opposition time. If the Senator from Colorado wishes time, I will be glad to yield to him.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator in charge of the bill is not in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, he is in friendly opposition.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I am a friendly opponent.

Mr. ALLOTT. The opposition is too friendly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I offer my amendment No. 71 and ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendment of Mr. DOUGLAS is as follows:

On page 55, line 12, immediately before the words "The Act" it is proposed to insert "SEC. 401." On page 57 at the end of line 4 it is proposed to insert quotation marks. On page 57, line 5, it is proposed to strike out "SEC. 4. This title" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 402. Sections 401 and 402 of this title". On page 57, immediately after line 6 it is proposed to add the following new sections:

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 403. As used in sections 403 through 415, unless the context clearly indicates otherwise—

(1) The term "election" includes a general, special, or primary election, including a preferential primary, and a convention or a caucus of a political party held for the purpose of nominating candidates;

(2) The term "candidate" means an individual whose name is presented at an election for nomination for, or election as, President or Vice President, or Senator or Representative in, or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress of the United States, whether or not such individual is nominated or elected;

(3) The term "political committee" includes any committee, association, or organization which accepts contributions or makes expenditures in an aggregate amount exceeding $2,500 in any calendar year for the purpose of influencing or attempting to influence in any manner whatsoever the election of a candidate or candidates or presidential or vice presidential electors;

(4) The term "contribution" includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit, of money, or anything of value, or transfer of funds between committees, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforcible, to make a contribution;

(5) The term "expenditure" includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift, of money, or anything of value, or transfer of funds between committees, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforcible, to make an expenditure;

(6) The term "person" includes an individual, partnership, committee, association, corporation, and any other organization or group of persons; and

(7) The term "State" includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, any possession of the United States, and the District of Columbia.

CAMPAIGN PRACTICES

Organization of political committees

SEC. 404. (a) Every political committee shall have a chairman and a treasurer. No contribution shall be accepted, and no expenditure made, by or on behalf of a political committee for the purpose of influencing an election until such chairman and treasurer have been chosen. No expenditure shall be made for or on behalf of a political committee without the authorization of its chairman or treasurer.

(b) Every person who receives a contribution for a political committee shall, on demand of the treasurer, and in any event within five days after the receipt of such contribution, render to the treasurer a detailed account thereof, including the name and address of the person making such contribution, and the date on which received. It shall be the duty of the treasurer to see to it that all contributions received by or for a committee shall be kept separate from any personal funds and deposited in a special account.

(c) It shall be the duty of the treasurer of a political committee to keep a detailed and exact account of—

(1) all contributions made to or for such committee;

(2) the name and address of every person making any such contribution, and the date thereof;

(3) all expenditures made by or on behalf of such committee; and

(4) the name and address of every person to whom any such expenditure is made, and the date thereof.

(d) It shall be the duty of the treasurer to obtain and keep a receipted bill, stating the particulars, for every expenditure by or on behalf of a political committee exceeding $100 in amount. The treasurer shall preserve all receipted bills and accounts required to be kept by this section for a period of two years from the date of the filing of the statement containing such items.

Reports by political committees

SEC. 405. (a) The treasurer of a political committee shall file reports of receipts and expenditures with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, on forms to be prescribed by him, and shall transmit a copy of such reports (except as provided in section 410 (b)) to the clerk of the United States district court for the district in which the principal office of the committee is located. Such reports shall be filed, complete as of June 30 and December 31 of each year, and as of the tenth day next preceding the date on which an election is to be held, and as of the thirtieth day following an election, with respect to which contributions were received or expenditures made by such committee. In each instance reports shall be filed not later than the third day following the reporting date as above provided. Each report shall contain—

(1) the amount of cash on hand at the beginning of the reporting period;

(2) the name and address of each person who has made a contribution to or for such committee in one or more items of the aggregate amount or value, within the calendar year, of $100 or more, together with the amount and date of such contribution; and for the purposes of this paragraph the term "contribution", as used herein, shall not include transfers of funds to or from political committees or candidates;

(3) the total sum of individual contributions made to or for such committee during the calendar year and not stated under paragraph (2);

(4) the name and address of each political committee or candidate from which the committee received any transfer of funds, together with the amounts and dates of all such transfers;

(5) the total sum of all contributions made to or for such committee during the calendar year;

(6) the name and address of each person to whom an expenditure has been made by such committee in one or more items of the aggregate amount or value, within the calendar year, of $100 or more, and the amount, date, and purpose of such expenditure;

(7) the total sum of all expenditures made by such committee, during the calendar year and not stated under paragraph (6);

(8) the name and address of each political committee or candidate to which the committee made any transfer of funds, together with the amounts and dates of all such transfers; and

(9) the total sum of expenditures made by such committee during the calendar year.

(b) The reports required to be filed by subsection (a) shall be cumulative during the calendar year to which they relate, but where there has been no change in an item reported in a previous report only the amount need be carried forward.

(c) The report required to be filed as of December 31 shall cover the entire calendar year.

(d) In the case of political committees supporting candidates for President, Vice President, or Senator, a copy of the report filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives under subsection (a) shall be filed with the Secretary of the Senate.

(e) The reports required to be filed by subsection (a) of this section shall also contain a list of the names of candidates in whose behalf contributions were received or expenditures made. In the case of political committees supporting more than one candidate (and State and local candidates), the amount of the total expenditures allocable to each candidate—

(1) shall be in the same ratio as expenditures on behalf of each candidate for printing and advertising, radio time, and television time bears to the total of such expenditures, or

(2) where no expenditures were made for Federal candidates for any of such purposes there shall be charged to each Federal candidate an amount equal to the full expenditure

divided by the total number of candidates, Federal and State;

except that expenditures specifically designated for an individual candidate shall be charged to such candidate.

(f) Whenever any report is filed by the treasurer of any political committee pursuant to subsection (a), such treasurer at the same time shall transmit a true and correct copy of such report to each candidate on whose behalf such report reflects any contribution received, or any expenditure made, by such political committee.

Reports by others than political committees

SEC. 406. Every person (other than those filing reports pursuant to section 405) who makes an expenditure in one or more items aggregating $100 or more within a calendar year, other than by contribution to a political committee, for the purpose of influencing, in two or more States, election of candidates, shall file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, on a form to be prescribed by him, an itemized detailed report of such expenditures in the same manner as required of the treasurer of a political committee by section 405, and shall file a copy thereof (subject to the provisions of section 410(b)) with the clerk of the United States district court for the district in which such expenditures are made, and in the case of any expenditure in support of a candidate for President, Vice President, or United States Senator, shall file a copy of the report with the Secretary of the Senate.

Reports by candidates

SEC. 407. (a) Every candidate shall file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, on a form to be prescribed by him, reports of receipts and expenditures and shall transmit a copy thereof to the Secretary of the Senate if a candidate for Senator, and (except as provided in section 410 (b)) to the clerk of the United States district court for the district in which the candidate resides. Such reports shall be complete as of the tenth day next preceding the date on which an election for the office for which he is a candidate is to be held, and as of the fortieth day following such election, and in each instance shall be filed not later than the third day following the reporting date; except that where a candidate in order to qualify for the general election must run in two successive primaries in one party no second report on the first primary will be required for those candidates participating in the second primary if reports filed for the second primary are cumulative and supplementary of the report filed before the first primary. Such reports shall contain a correct and itemized detailed report of contributions received and expenditures made by him in aid or support of his candidacy for election, or for the purpose of influencing the result of the election, in the same manner as required of the treasurer of a political committee by section 405, including amounts expended from his own funds.

(b) The reports required to be filed by subsection (a) shall be cumulative, but where there has been no change in an item reported in a previous report, only the amount need be carried forward.

Formal requirements on filing reports and statements

SEC. 408. The reports and statements required by this title to be filed by a candidate, a treasurer of a political committee, or by any other person, with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the copies thereof required to be filed with the Secretary of the Senate, and (subject to the provisions of section 410(b)) with the clerk of the United States district court—

(1) shall be verified by the oath or affirmation of the person filing such report or statement, taken before any officer authorized to administer oaths;

(2) shall be deemed properly filed when delivered to the specified recipient, or when deposited in an established post office within the prescribed time, duly stamped, registered, and properly addressed, but in the event it is not received, a duplicate of such report or statement shall be promptly filed upon notice of its nonreceipt by the officer with whom it is required to be filed; and

(3) a copy shall be preserved by the person filing it for a period of one year from the date of filing.

Duties of the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate

SEC. 409. It shall be the duty of the Clerk of the House of Representatives and of the Secretary of the Senate—

(1) to preserve the reports and statements filed under this title for a period of six years from the date of receipt;

(2) to make such reports and statements available for public inspection during regular office hours;

(3) to make such reports and statements available for such inspection within twenty-four hours of their receipt by them; and

(4) to permit copying of any such report or statement by hand or by duplicating machine, as requested by any person, at the expense of such person.

Duties of clerks of United States district courts

SEC. 410. (a) It shall be the duty of the clerks of United States district courts—

(1) to receive and maintain in an orderly manner all reports and statements required by this Act to be filed with such clerks;

(2) to maintain such reports and statements for public inspection for a period of six years from the date of receipt;

(3) to make such reports and statements available for public inspection during regular office hours;

(4) to make available for public inspection each report and statement within twenty-four hours of its receipt; and

(5) to permit copying of any such report or statement by hand or by duplicating machine, as requested by any person, at the expense of such person.

(b) In States where the secretary of state or other State official is authorized to perform the duties specified in this section, the filing of reports and statements under the title shall be with such State official in lieu of the filing with the clerk of the United States district court.

General penalties for violations

SEC. 411. (a) Any person who violates any of the provisions of this part shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

(b) Any person who willfully violates any provision of this part shall be fined not more than $10,000 and imprisoned not more than two years.

Expenses of election contests

SEC. 412. This Act shall not limit or affect the right of any person to make contributions or expenditures for proper legal expenses in contesting the results of an election.

Effect on State laws

SEC. 413. This Act shall not be construed to annul, or to exempt any candidate from complying with, the laws of any State relating to the nomination or election of candidates, unless such laws are directly inconsistent with the provisions of this Act.

Partial invalidity

SEC. 414. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the Act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

Repealing clause

SEC. 415. All other Acts or parts of Acts inconsistent herewith are repealed.

PART III—AMENDMENTS TO CRIMINAL CODE

Definitions

SEC. 416. Section 591 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 591. Definitions

"When used in sections 597, 599, 602, 608, 609, 610, and 612 of this title—

"(1) The term 'election' includes a general, special, or primary election, including a preferential primary, and a convention or a caucus of a political party held for the purpose of nominating candidates;

"(2) The term 'candidate' means an individual whose name is presented at an election for nomination for, or election as, President or Vice President, or Senator or Representative in, or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress of the United States, whether or not such individual is nominated or elected;

"(3) The term 'political committee' includes any committee, association, or organization which accepts contributions or makes expenditures in an aggregate amount exceeding $2,500 in any calendar year for the purpose of influencing or attempting to influence in any manner whatsoever the election of a candidate or candidates or presidential or vice presidential electors;

"(4) The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit, of money, or anything of value, or transfer of funds between committees, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforcible, to make a contribution;

"(5) The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift, of money, or anything of value, or transfer of funds between committees, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforcible, to make an expenditure;

"(6) The term 'person' includes an individual, partnership, committee, association, corporation, and any other organization or group of persons;

"(7) The term 'State' includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, any possession of the United States, and the District of Columbia."

Publication or distribution of election materials

SEC. 417. Section 612 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting after the word "names" wherever it appears therein the words "and addresses".

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 418. Sections 403–419 shall take effect on January 1, 1964, except that the provisions of this Act shall not apply to contributions and expenditures made prior to such date; but nothing in this Act shall relieve any person from filing any statements or reports required under the law in force prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 419. Sections 403 through 419 of this title may be cited as the "Federal Elections Act of 1963".

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this is an amendment to the Fulbright amendment, which was submitted by the Committee on Appropriations. The Fulbright amendment deserves support because it was a proper effort on the part of the eminent Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] to strike at the abuses which have been revealed in investigations concerning the passage of the Philippine war claims bill of last year. The eminent Senator from Arkansas, in an effort to prevent Mr. John O'Donnell from receiving fees, has proposed two vital changes in this act which the Congress passed last year at the recommendation of the administration and with nearly unanimous newspaper approval.

The first is that the amounts of the claims are to be paid by the American Government to the Philippine Government, and the Philippine Government will then settle directly with the claimants, instead of the American Government making its payments to the claimants.

Second, a proviso is attached that none of the money is to be paid as fees to those who have served as attorneys or agents in connection with any such claims.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] deserves all praise for his efforts.

I presume that a point of order could legitimately be made against the amendment on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriations bill. But I shall not make such a point of order, and I hope that no other Senator will.

It is also possibly true that the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas may ultimately cost the American Government more money because a lump sum of $73 million will be paid to the Philippines and, to the degree that individual claims are unjustified, this will mean that the money in question will, in all probability, go into the Philippine treasury and not be retained in the American Treasury. In the case of people who have died or moved or for one reason or another do not push their claims, the Philippine Government will nevertheless get the money.

Estimates have been made that the loss may amount to several millions of dollars. It may also be quite possible that the amendment will not affect to any great degree the ultimate amounts which Mr. O'Donnell will receive. Despite the language on lines 7 to 11 of page 56, to the extent Mr. O'Donnell has a legal agreement with the private claimants, in all probability he may well recover the amounts. But whatever the technical faults of the amendment may be, the purpose of the amendment is good. The abuse against which the eminent Senator from Arkansas is striking is real. What he is trying to do is to raise to a higher level the financing of campaigns and the passing of legislation by the Senate and House of Representatives. I heartily agree with that purpose. My amendment is designed to assist the Senator from Arkansas in more fully carrying his laudable desires.

There are at least three weaknesses in our present laws governing the declarations of expenses incurred in political campaigns.

The first is the excessively stringent limitation on the total amounts which a candidate may directly expend in the large States. The limit is $25,000. That may be enough in a small State like Vermont, and possibly enough in a State like Arkansas, but in a State of 10 million people, with 5 million voters, which is the case in my State, that would amount to only one-half of 1 cent per voter. In the State of New York I believe it would be approximately a quarter of a cent per voter. These limitations are excessively stringent and, of course, in practice they become a dead letter. The device which is used to get around the $25,000 limitation is, of course, the creation of independent committees with which the candidate is supposed not to have even a speaking acquaintance, but which in all frankness spend most of the money. That device was first used by the Republicans in Wendell Willkie's campaign of 1940 to avoid the $3 million limitation upon expenditures by presidential candidates.

The Republicans and Mr. Willkie created a host of auxiliary and affiliated committees. No one knows how much they spent. But in the aggregate they probably spent enormous sums, in multiples of the $3 million allotted to the candidate himself.

The example set by Mr. Willkie and the Republicans has been copied in most States, and is a common device.

I emphasize that neither the contributions nor the expenditures of these committees have to be reported. Therefore, the declared contributions and expenditures of the candidates themselves bear little resemblance to the actual facts.

The third weakness in the existing publicity provisions is that no declaration is required in the case of primary campaigns. The candidates have to declare for the final election, but they do not have to declare the expenditures incurred or the contributions received in the primaries.

A few years ago, of the 48 States in the Union, at least 20 were one-party States, 12 in the South and 8 in the North. The number of one-party States has diminished since then, as the Democratic Party has increased in strength in New England, Oregon, and the Dakotas, and as the Republicans have increased in strength in certain States of the South. But I think it is safe to say that there are at least 15 States in the country which are one-party States, where the real contest does not take place in the final election but instead in the primary of the dominant party.

There is no national requirement for the declaration of contributions and expenditures during the primaries. It is a well-known fact that many of the candidates in the one-party States have been financed in the primaries by utility companies, large oil interests, and various big business groups; and yet no knowledge of this situation is permitted to penetrate to the general public.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Does the Senator's amendment seek to strike at fraud which may occur under the existing reporting law? For example, there is no reporting required by committees which accept money on behalf of the candidate in a general election.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. The amendment would provide that committees which receive more than $2,500 must make a full reporting of contributions and expenditures.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Why would the Senator limit it to $2,500?

Mr. DOUGLAS. So the small committees would not be burdened by heavy reporting. If the Senator from Louisiana is dissatisfied and wishes to move a change with respect to those which accept less than $2,500, I shall be glad to accept the amendment, but I hope the Senator will not strain at a gnat and swallow the camel.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I was not seeking to amend the Senator's amendment one way or the other. I heard the debate. The thought occurred that if there were to be a $2,500 exemption a person could have 100 committees and then could proceed to spend a quarter of a million dollars, which would not be reported.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The bookkeeping problem would be very heavy in that case.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Why not have one committee in each county. The average State has nearly 100 counties.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think on the whole this provision which I have suggested, and which the Senate adopted in 1960, is a very good one. What I am seeking to do is to follow in the footsteps of the scholarly Senator from Arkansas and to subject the campaign contributions to pitiless publicity, publicity not merely for the candidate in the general election but also for the candidate in the primary election, and for committees in primaries and in general elections.

This is not a sectional amendment, but it is designed to take away the curtain of secrecy which now operates in this field.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I confess considerable interest in and sympathy with the Senator's proposal. I am wondering if the Senator has introduced it as a bill and had it subjected to the study which the Committee on Rules and Administration would give it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. These features of the bill are taken from another bill introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], along with the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] and other Senators as cosponsors. What we have done is to take out certain appropriate sections from that bill. We would not raise the limitation with respect to what a candidate can spend. We would simply provide for publicity on contributions and expenditures in primaries and in general elections by the candidates and by the committees as well. That would be a great influence toward purifying politics in the one-party States such as those south of the Mason and Dixon Line.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the distinguished Senator's interest in the States south of the Mason and Dixon Line. I understand that the State which I represent in part has the strongest, most comprehensive, and detailed law in this field that exists in the Nation.

Aside from that, the purpose of my inquiry was to discover whether the bill which the Senator now offers as an amendment—or the portion of the bill which the Senator now offers as an amendment—has been subjected to study by the Committee on Rules and Administration, and whether there is available a report and recommendation by that committee.

Mr. DOUGLAS. These measures have a long history, as the Senator from Florida should be well aware. The general idea was put forward by the late senior Senator from Missouri, Mr. Hennings, in 1952, though at that time primary disclosure was not required.

In January of 1953 Senator Hennings filed a report with the Committee on Rules and Administration, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, recommending that primary elections be subjected to the same regulations as general elections.

In 1955 Senator Hennings included political committees in the bill, as well as candidates.

In 1959, in the 86th Congress, 1st session, a bill covering primaries and political committees was introduced. It also included a tax credit, which my amendment does not.

On July 8, 1959, the Committee on Rules and Administration reported a clean bill, S. 2436. This watered down version did not apply to primaries and the revision of the application of the law to committees was not included.

In January of 1960 the Senate took up S. 2436. Senator Hennings, of Missouri, offered the primary amendment, and it was adopted by a rollcall vote of 50 to 30.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point, on my time?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Was not the Senator from Rhode Island recorded as having voted for it?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I did not try to find the actual yea-and-nay vote. I did not wish to put my colleagues on the spot.

Mr. PASTORE. It is not a matter of being put on the spot. The Senator from Rhode Island, because of the unique position he holds, being in charge of the consideration of this bill, will be forced, of course, to move to table the amendment.

I think the Senator from Illinois understands quite well why that will be done, but I compliment the Senator for bringing this matter up and for pinpointing it again. I am in favor of the proposal. I think it is not being brought up in the proper fashion. For that reason, I shall have to move to table it.

It would be good legislation. I was a party to it before. I cosponsored it. I voted for it. I am sorry that I shall have to move to table it today.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope the Senator will not make the motion to table immediately.

Mr. PASTORE. No. I shall do so when the Senator has concluded his remarks.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me again?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Florida asked for the history, and I should like to complete it.

The Senate passed S. 2436, with its provisions requiring reporting in the primaries and by committees. The bill was sent to the House. It died in the House and, therefore, did not become a law.

In January of 1961, the present junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long] carried on in the tradition of his distinguished predecessor and introduced S. 604, which was similar to the strong version of S. 2436, as passed in the Senate. In May of 1961, hearings were held on S. 604.

The full committee reported a clean bill similar to the watered-down S. 2436, which did not apply to primaries and committees.

In September 1961 the bill was called up on the floor. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long] and the Senator from New York [Mr. Keating] offered primary and committee amendments. Both were defeated. A watered-down bill was offered which died in the House.

In this session, the Senator from Missouri and other Senators have introduced the bill from which these two features are carried over in the present amendment.

This measure which has been before the Senate for almost 10 years, has received extensive consideration in hearings and upon occasion it has been favorably reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration. The situation is therefore ripe for action.

I think we should follow the Senator from Arkansas in the fine steps which he has taken, in connection with publicity on contributions; and this is the way to do it.

I hope no motion to table will be made, and I hope the amendment will receive overwhelming support, particularly from Senators from the one-party States, who thus will have an opportunity to show their devotion to the cause of clean elections.

I look to the future with confidence, despite the cold, freezing blasts of the past.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I say again that I have very great sympathy with the Senator's efforts, but I do not want to leave the record unclear as to one part of his statement. I understood the Senator to say that States south of the Mason-Dixon Line were the ones which needed the legislation most.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Most of them need it. Some one-party States north of the Mason-Dixon Line need it, too, but I apply this measure impartially across the country. It so happens that the one-party States are the ones that need it most. As a matter of impartiality, this measure would apply to committee contributions as well as primary election contributions and would hit the North, the East, and the West as well as the South.

Mr. HOLLAND. I want the record to show that various students of politics whom I have seen quoted on this subject all agree that the election laws of the State of Florida, which I represent in part, are the strongest, and go further, and are the most stringent of those of any of the States; that they apply to primary as well as general elections; and that a candidate for a statewide office, in order to protect himself, must obtain a lawyer and secure an accountant to check the expenditures made, because every single expense to be paid must go on a voucher directed to him. While I am perfectly willing to support the effort of the Senator from Illinois, and again confess considerable sympathy with what he is trying to do, although I do not think this is the way to do it, I do not want the record to be unclear on this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator.

Mr. HOLLAND. My State, of which I happen to know most——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I point out that most of my time has been consumed by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PASTORE. For that reason I will yield 10 minutes to the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would like to take 5 minutes, and then yield to the Senator from New York [Mr. Keating].

Mr. HOLLAND. I will finish my remarks in 1 minute.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I assign 1 minute to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator for yielding me 1 minute, as well as 10 minutes to the Senator from Illinois. I want the record to be clear that all interest in cleanness in policies is not confined to the State of Illinois, so ably represented by the distinguished Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I never intimated that it was.

I thank the Senator for pointing out the good election laws of the State of Florida, most of which were brought about I believe as a result of the efforts of my friend, Mr. Nelson Poynter, editor and publisher of the St. Petersburg Times; but Florida is unique in the one-party States in its rigid regulations. I hope States like Virginia, North Carolina, Georgia, South Carolina, Alabama, Mississippi, and Arkansas will fall in line on this matter, so that we may be sustained in our efforts.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I did not mention Louisiana, but if the Senator wants me to do so, I shall be glad to include Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is the Senator offering a motion to suspend the rules?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am offering this amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright]. I think a point of order legitimately could be raised against the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas, because it is legislation on an appropriation bill, although it passed muster in the Appropriations Committee, which generally is very rigid on such matters. If the Fulbright amendment is in order, I submit that my amendment to the Fulbright amendment is in order. I am sure the Senator from Louisiana will not take advantage of parliamentary tactics to throw us out of the ball park.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. For some time I have been trying to persuade the House to consider the veterans' insurance bill. It has passed the Senate on several occasions. If the Senator's amendment is in order, mine should be. I would like to have that amendment adopted.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think the Senator's amendment would be very helpful, and as he knows I am a cosponsor of his bill and have supported it many times. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] may find he has opened a Pandora's box.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. GORE. In that regard, what would be the difference in principle between the Fulbright amendment, with respect to the payment to certain Philippine beneficiaries, and the provision on the next sugar bill that no country shall receive a quota whose agents have made campaign contributions or otherwise paid lobbying fees in this country?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I take some pride in the fact that I have led the fight for years against the subsidy paid to foreign sugar producers. I would be glad to support such an amendment.

Mr. GORE. Does the Senator see any difference in principle?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not.

Senators are operating under a limitation of time. I am very glad to yield to the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], the principal cosponsor of the bill introduced by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], from which I derived my amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am very grateful for the remarks of the Senator from Illinois.

I applaud the effort of the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to deal with the broader problems of campaign contributions while public attention is centered on the lobbying activities surrounding the Philippine war damage claims bill.

Many of us, under the leadership of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], and his predecessor, Senator Hennings, have been trying for years to obtain a general revision of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act which would discourage the improper use of funds to influence elections. The present laws on this subject—wholly apart from any question of contributions by lobbyists for foreign interests—are grievously inadequate. Efforts at reform have been thwarted many times by some of those same Members who are now expressing such strong concern about Mr. John O'Donnell's activities. Of course, I understand this concern and will support the corrective legislation initiated by the Foreign Relations Committee. But simply dealing with this one case will not satisfy the urgent demands for a complete overhaul of our election laws.

One of the most compelling demands for reform, which would be covered by the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, is the extension of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act to primary elections. Any effort to revise our elections laws that fails to extend them to primary elections is about as effective as an appendectomy in which only half of the appendix is removed.

The primary election is the only election that counts in almost one-third of our States in which nomination is tantamount to election. Under the present law even runoff primaries in such States are completely outside the purview of the Federal law. This means that contributions by any persons in connection with such campaigns, need not be reported and can be unlimited in amount insofar as the Federal laws is concerned. What is most significant in terms of the present situation, is that this will continue to be the case even if the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is enacted.

There is no question as to the power of the Congress to deal with primaries for Federal offices. The cases on this point are clear, and there is an obvious precedent in the prohibition in the Labor-Management Relations Act against contributions or expenditures by labor unions, corporations, and national banks in connection with "any primary election or political convention or caucus."

What has been lacking is not power, but desire; and I hope that this missing ingredient has been supplied by the sensational revelations of the Foreign Relations Committee. There is no reason whatever for not striking at this problem now and dealing with it in a meaningful and effective manner. We have had many hearings and debates on this subject. I have joined on many occasions in the sponsorship of legislation substantially identical to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

Why should we fear to grasp the nettle? Why should we legislate an illusion? If we want to do something about corrupt practices in elections, but refuse to touch primaries, it seems to me we are demonstrating more hypocrisy than zeal for reform. There is a crying need for curbing fraud and undue influence in elections, a need which will not be met unless we support with the same enthusiasm and determination the proposal to deal with primary elections as the proposal to deal with the activities of a foreign lobbyist.

We have an opportunity today to do more than respond to recent newspaper headlines. We should use this opportunity to overcome a gap in the laws which has been with us for years and which we cannot afford to neglect any longer. This is the opportunity which the Senator from Illinois has given us. I commend him for his initiative and hope that his amendment will be approved.

If an effort is made to use the parliamentary device of tabling, I hope that such a move will be defeated.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from New York who over the years has vigorously pushed for sound clean-elections legislation. I ask unanimous consent that the letter which the President sent to the Congress yesterday on this subject be printed in the RECORD at this point. I call special attention to the last eight paragraphs of the message in which the President recommends, following the recommendations of his Commission on Campaign Costs, that there be established an effective system of disclosure and publicity in primary and general election campaigns.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD recommendation No. 3, contained in the April 1962 report of the President's Commission on Campaign Costs.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 30, 1963.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: A healthy democratic political system rests on the ability of the electorate to know, understand and judge the attitudes, characteristics, opinions and qualifications of candidates for public office. Clearly, political campaigns are essential to a democracy. But the means by which they are financed have troubled thoughtful observers of the political scene for generations, and the concern has been nonpartisan. The question posed by President Theodore Roosevelt about the propriety of public officeholders being obligated, if only morally, to a comparatively few large campaign contributors is equally pertinent today. Our present system of financing political campaigns is deficient in that it does not insure that candidates, or the parties they represent will have sufficient funds to provide adequate exposure to the electorate, and it has not effectively encouraged small contributions from a very large number of individuals.

To insure candidates will have adequate funds, and to reduce dependence on large contributions of those with special interests, the base of financial support for candidates and parties must be broadened. To accomplish this, improvement of public understanding of campaign finance, together with a system of incentives for solicitation and giving, is necessary.

In October 1961 I appointed a distinguished, bipartisan Commission on Campaign Costs to take a fresh look at the problem of financing presidential campaigns. I was gratified by the enthusiastic bipartisan reception accorded the Commission's unanimous report, made to me last April, and I was pleased to transmit to the 87th Congress legislation designed to carry out its important recommendations. I am transmitting with this letter two of the same legislative recommendations for the 88th Congress.

The first proposed bill is based on the Commission's recommendations of a system of tax incentives for political contributions, providing two alternatives to the taxpayer:

(1) A tax credit against Federal income tax for 50 percent of contributions up to a maximum of $10 in credits a year; and

(2) A tax deduction for political contributions for the full amount of the contribution up to a maximum of $500 per tax return per year (the Commission in its report recommended $1,000).

The contributions eligible for tax benefits would include those made to the national committee of a political party and to one political committee designated by the national committee to receive such contributions in each State. The tax incentive program proposed for an experimental period of two presidential elections is designed to give party solicitors an additional tool to help stimulate individuals to contribute money, in non-election as well as election years.

The Commission stated that if the tax incentive measures it recommended do not accomplish their purposes, alternative approaches would have to be examined, and recommended consideration be given to a matching incentive plan, under which contributions in amounts of $10 or less per person raised by designated political committees would be deposited by those committees with the U.S. Treasury, where the money would be matched by a like sum from Government appropriations. The combined total would be used to pay types of expenses authorized by law, payments to be made by Government check directly to the suppliers of campaign goods and services. The total sum to be matched could be limited by statute. Though this latter plan is not now being proposed in legislative form, I urge the Congress to study this approach, which would encourage party efforts in broadening the financial base of presidential campaigns.

Although there is general agreement that it is undesirable and improper for a candidate for public office to spend money on his candidacy without limit or for individuals to contribute unlimited amounts to candidates, the existing unrealistic statutory ceilings have failed to produce any practical limitation. Because they have not been effective and because existing practices violate the spirit, if not the letter of the law, the Commission has proposed repeal of the ceilings and, as a substitute, establishment of an effective system of disclosure and publicity to reveal where money comes from and goes in campaigns. In the Commission's view, full and effective disclosure, both before and after elections, provides the greatest hope for effective controls over excessive contributions and unlimited expenditures.

The proposed bill would require candidates for President and Vice President, presently exempt from reporting requirements, to report contributions and expenditures in nominating and election campaigns. In addition, the test of whether political committees campaigning for candidates for President and Vice President must report would be changed from whether they operate interstate to whether they raise or spend as much as $2,500 in a year. Further, reports would for the first time be required of individuals and families contributing or spending, singly or in combination, $5,000 or more per year in the aggregate, in connection with the nomination or election of one or more candidates for President or Vice President. Reporting requirements would be extended to include both individuals and groups spending $5,000 or more for bipartisan or multipartisan political activities in any year.

To make the reporting effective, all reports should be submitted to a Registry of Election Finance, a central repository having responsibility to receive, examine, tabulate, summarize, publicize, and preserve the reported data. The proposed legislation would place the Registry under the Comptroller General, with a Registrar, appointed by him, and with a bipartisan Board of Advisers providing guidance.

Two other legislative recommendations which I proposed last year, based on the Commission report, and which I fully support have already been the subject of congressional hearings this session. One bill would suspend for the 1964 campaign the equal time requirements of section 315 of the Communications Act for nominees for the offices of President and Vice President; and the other would promote the orderly transfer of Executive power during transitions between administrations.

These proposals based on the constructive report of the Commission on Campaign Costs have received the approval of former Presidents Harry S. Truman and Dwight D. Eisenhower, former presidential candidates Thomas E. Dewey, Adlai E. Stevenson, and Richard M. Nixon, and of the chairmen of both major political parties.

Although the Commission limited its attention to the problems of campaign costs for presidential and vice presidential candidates and its recommendations go only to such campaigns, it pointed out that "* * * it is our view that the measures we propose would have a desirable effect on all political fundraising." The Congress may therefore wish to consider the applicability of any of the recommended practices to campaigns other than presidential or vice presidential.

The people of the United States are entitled to know their candidates for public office and to be free of doubts about tacit or explicit obligations having been necessary to secure public office. I believe the attached draft bills will, if enacted, significantly help in achieving these goals. I hope they will receive prompt and favorable consideration.

Sincerely,

John F. Kennedy.

Recommendation No. 3—Effective Disclosure and Abolition of Limits on Contributions and Expenditures

The present statutory ceiling of $3 million on the annual receipts and expenditures of an interstate political committee, and the limit on annual individual contributions of $5,000 per person per committee, in no way limit expenditures or contributions. We recommend that they be repealed.

These purported ceilings on committee receipts and expenditures as well as on individual contributions have, if anything, simply stimulated an increase in the number of committees.

The imposition of "realistic ceilings" or "segmental limitations," the latter designed to limit expenditures for certain purposes, e.g., broadcasting, which has been urged by some, would only create a false impression of limitation. Moreover, there is doubt whether individuals could be prohibited from making certain expenditures, instead of contributions if the latter were effectively limited, in view of constitutional guarantees of freedom of expression.

We see no sure way by statute to restrict the amount of money individuals may put into campaigns. Even if there were a way, and if the limitation were fixed at a nominal sum as has been urged upon us, we doubt that the parties could in the near future organize themselves to collect enough money in truly small amounts to meet necessary campaign costs. Limitation must be accomplished, if at all, by other means.

The dependence of candidates on large contributions can best be dealt with by encouraging a growth in small gifts and by an improved system of disclosure.

Under present statutory provisions, there has been inadequate reporting of campaign receipts and expenditures. This has presented to the public an incomplete and distorted picture of presidential and vice presidential campaign finance. The candidates themselves are not required to report at all, and only committees operating in more than one State in the general election must report.

Full and effective disclosure is the best way to control excessive contributions, on the one hand, and unlimited expenditures, on the other. Publicity has a cleansing and policing power far more powerful than that of limitations.

We have been asked to recommend improved ways of financing expenditures required by nominees for President and Vice President. Nonetheless, the financing of campaigns to obtain nomination to those offices is so significant in influencing attitudes toward campaign finance in the general election, and the climate in which solicitation occurs, that we have extended our proposals in this instance to campaigns for nomination as well as election.

We recommend—

That all political committees, interstate and intrastate, State and local, party and nonparty, subsidiary and independent, campaigning directly or indirectly for candidates for nomination or election to the offices of President and Vice President, and raising or spending as much as $2,500 in a year, any part of which aided a candidate for those offices, be required to file campaign finance statements on a regular basis, including reports to be made at a specified time shortly before elections;

That reports should show the totals of receipts (including loans) and disbursements, and should itemize contributions that aggregate $250 or over from one source (including purchases of tickets to dinners or other fundraising events), expenditures of $100 or over, all transfers of funds to or from any candidate or group, and all debts;

That candidates for President and Vice President be required to make similar reports of contributions made to them and expenditures made by them in campaigns for nomination and election, both before and after elections;

That delegates and candidates for delegate to the presidential nominating conventions be required to make similar reports;

That any individual or family (husband, wife, and dependent children) contributing to the above committees as much as $5,000 in the aggregate in a single year, or spending or contributing a combined total of as much as $5,000 per year on behalf of one or more candidates for President and Vice President, for either nomination or election, be required to submit a report of these disbursements;

That individuals and groups taking part or spending money in bipartisan political activities advocated in recommendation No. 1 be required to report any direct or indirect expenditures by them for these purposes that total $5,000 or more in a year.

To assure effective publicity for the information submitted in these reports, we recommend that a central Federal repository, with a nonpartisan or bipartisan advisory board, be established, to be called the Registry of Election Finance. We recommend that the Registry be given responsibility to receive, examine, tabulate, summarize, publish, and preserve the reported data; to prescribe the form in which reports are to be made; to fix the dates of their submission (within latitudes fixed by statute); and to determine how best the data in the reports can be disseminated both before and after elections. We recommend, too, that the Registry have the explicit duty to refer apparent infractions of law to the appropriate law enforcement authorities.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President——

Mr. PASTORE. Does the Senator from Illinois have sufficient time to yield to the Senator from Missouri? If not, I shall be glad to yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thought I had an informal understanding with the majority leader that he yield sufficient time on the bill so that this subject may be fully discussed.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PASTORE. Is there a limitation on the time in which to debate the bill itself?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no time limitation on the bill itself.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois is to be commended for offering this proposal to improve our Federal election law as an amendment to the pending bill. The first bill I introduced on coming to the Senate was a bill to amend the Federal election laws. The present amendment is a part of that bill. However, efforts to bring the nominating process and intrastate political committees within the purview of Federal election laws go back more than a decade.

My predecessor, the late Senator Tom Hennings, worked many years for this needed improvement in the law. His efforts came to a climax in January of 1960 when the Senate approved a clean-elections bill after adopting by large bipartisan majorities amendments offered by Tom Hennings to extend the law to primaries and to require intrastate political committees to comply with Federal reporting requirements. Final congressional action was not forthcoming so in the early days of the 87th Congress, I introduced a bill similar to the one approved by the Senate the year before.

Near the close of the first session, an elections bill was reported by the Senate Rules Committee. This bill was similar to the bill reported by the Rules Committee in the 86th Congress. It did not provide for extending the law to primaries or intrastate committees. When the bill was brought before the Senate, the junior Senator from New York and I joined in offering amendments to correct this inadequacy. However, we were unsuccessful, and these needed changes were not in the bill approved by the Senate. So the provisions of the pending amendment are not new to the Senate. They have been discussed and debated at length in the Senate. They have met with success and failure.

However, I believe this is a most appropriate time to consider this matter again. The recent disclosure of contributions by Mr. John O'Donnell to several Members of Congress points out clearly the need for strengthening the reporting requirements of our present election laws. When campaign contributions come to light under circumstances such as involved in this situation, there is apt to be an air of suspicion aroused in the minds of many people. However, if our election laws were such as to require the reporting of all contributions, then the chances would be lessened that anyone would jump to any false conclusions.

Full and complete disclosure of campaign finances could not help but improve our democratic elective process. It would help the candidate by removing any air of suspicion, and it would help the American voter by providing him with information essential to a sound decision at the polls.

The nominating process is an integral part of our election system. In some States, it is in fact determinative of who is elected. Therefore, the American voter is entitled to know the facts concerning the financing of primary campaigns as well as general election campaigns.

As to intrastate committees, I believe everyone will agree that the great bulk of campaign financing in the election of Members of Congress is handled by such political committees. To exempt these committees from the reporting requirements of Federal law makes these requirements in reality a sham.

In 1961, the President appointed a Commission to study the financing of presidential campaigns. This Commission under the able leadership of Dean Alexander Heard, of North Carolina, considered the problem most carefully and on April 18, 1962, made a number of recommendations for changes in the law. Based on the Commission's report, the President sent letters to the 87th Congress recommending the enactment of legislation.

Yesterday, the Senate again received a letter from the President recommending certain election legislation, which the Senator from Illinois has placed in the Record. One of the proposals recommended by the President is a public reporting bill. While the bill applies only to presidential campaigns, it is appropriate to our discussion today. The bill would require the filing of reports on campaign financing with respect to the nominating process. Also, it would require the filing of reports by intrastate political committees if they receive or expend more than $2,500.

This additional recognition of the importance of full disclosure is significant and I hope the Senate will respond by adopting the pending proposal.

Mr. President, the present law as a practical matter could be considered worse than no law. It fails completely to reach the vast bulk of campaign financing. Yet, abstractly, we do have a reporting law. Thus, many people may be misled into believing that campaign finances are regulated. On the other hand, Members of Congress who have complied completely with the law are sometimes accused of violating the law by failing to report a contribution made either in the primary or to an intrastate committee supporting their candidacy.

The situation can only be cleared up and corrected by the enactment of legislation to strengthen the Corrupt Practices Act—legislation which, in fact, will bring about full disclosure of campaign financing. Then, and only then, will the American voter be in a position to reach a sound decision. Then, and only then, can suspicion with respect to money in politics be eliminated. The approval of the pending amendment would make a substantial contribution to the strengthening of our democracy.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, earlier today an amendment was offered with respect to day care services. I am very appreciative of the fact that the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff] and the distingished Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] took care of the legislative history on that subject, which concerned me very much.

I was opposed to the amendment, as was stated. I should like to have appear in the Record the reason for my nonappearance in the Chamber earlier today. I was engaged at a hearing of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations. That is the reason I could not be present at that time. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point a statement dealing with the subject of grants to States for day care services.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ALLOTT ON GRANTS TO STATES FOR DAY CARE SERVICES

The public welfare amendments of 1962 added an authorization for grants to States for the development and operation of day care centers, authorizing an appropriation of $5 million for fiscal year 1963, $10 million for 1964, $15 million for 1965, and so forth.

The Bureau of Family Services has not at this time issued regulations governing the program. Instructions have gone to the field on the use of funds when they become available and so forth, but the requisite regulations are not issued at this time.

The State plan must require the appointment of advisory committees to advise the State public welfare agency on the general policy involved in the provision of day care services under the State plan. There is no evidence that the advisory committees in all jurisdictions have been appointed and are functioning. It is presumed that funds would be required to pay per diem expenses of such meetings, funds which have not been appropriated.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, what the Senator from Illinois is doing is in line with the desires of all of us. We recognize that there is much to be desired in the present state of the law on this subject. I should like to point out that I have not had an opportunity to analyze the amendment as thoroughly as I would wish.

I notice that the President of the United States has sent his recommendations with respect to a bill dealing with this very subject. In the brief time that I have had a chance to examine the message, I notice that there are some differences between the bill the President proposes and the bill the Senator from Illinois proposes as an amendment to the pending bill. One difference is in the area of what is raised by others than political committees. Under the Douglas amendment, any amount of $100 or more must be reported. Under the proposal of the President of the United States, only amounts aggregating $5,000 or more must be reported.

I do not know why there is such a big difference, but I believe that the President and his advisers have had an opportunity to study this subject very carefully, and there must be a very good reason for drawing the line at $5,000, instead of $100, as the Senator from Illinois has done.

It seems to me that the pending measure is a rather poor vehicle to which to attach an amendment such as this. I recognize that the Senate is not limited by the rule of germaneness; nevertheless, I believe that a little later in the session, when Senators shall have had an opportunity to digest the recommendations of the President as well as the proposal of the Senator from Illinois, the Senate might be in a little better position to decide upon a more suitable vehicle to which to attach this amendment, assuming that the Committee on Rules and Administration does not see fit to report the type of bill which we wish. So I suggest to the Senator from Illinois that he delay a little longer the offering of his proposal.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, we have waited 10 years. Let us act.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I have 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. President, I find no fault with the intent, spirit, and substance of the amendment; but I do find fault with the timing of its presentation. I believe that it would only confuse the supplemental appropriation bill and would confuse the resolution which was adopted by the Committee on Foreign Relations. For that reason, I move to table the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island to lay on the table the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 69 and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Beginning with line 5, page 8, it is proposed to strike out all to and including line 9, page 8.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, this is a very important amendment. If adopted, it would save the taxpayers $30 million. On the amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I shall later renew my request for the yeas and nays.

The supplemental appropriation bill now before the Senate contains a provision, inserted by the Senate committee, for $30 million for civil defense purposes. In its wisdom the other body rejected this item in its entirety, as it should be rejected. However, in the Senate committee report, on page 10, under items for the Department of Defense, there is provision for the expenditure of $30 million for continuing fallout shelter surveys, and for marking, and stocking them. I was shocked to learn that the Senate committee failed to follow the leadership of the other body, which refused to appropriate 1 cent for this purpose.

In England, there are no fallout shelters whatever. In the Soviet Union, there are no civil defense fallout shelters, no holes in the ground, where people can wait for the conquering paratroopers to come, as some of the political has-beens who are occupying paid civil defense positions would have us do in this country. To the contrary, in the Soviet Union the people are being given first-aid instructions and instructions in street fighting from house to house and cellar to cellar.

In the past few months we have heard much talk in favor of economy in Government. Here is an opportunity for Senators to be counted in favor of economy by supporting this amendment, thereby preventing the utter waste of $30 million.

In the original supplemental appropriation bill, a request for almost $62 million was made for this project. This amount was entirely denied by the other body.

Much is said about cutting or pruning Federal expenditures. Here is one place where the taxpayers' money can be saved without in any way curtailing necessary governmental services or jeopardizing the national security. To me, it is unconscionable to wield the meat ax on such budget requests as those for research in communicable diseases and the activities of the Public Health Service, to cite two examples, and then squander $30 million on a completely ineffective civil defense boondoggle.

Some of the so-called civil defense shelters are located in the Federal building downtown in my home city of Cleveland, where a number of men and women are employed. If there should be a sudden nuclear attack, any man worth his salt would not rush to a shelter in the office building where he was employed. He would immediately seek out his wife and children in the outlying portions of the city. He would try to get his family together, perhaps to pray in that moment of terror.

It is foolish to consider appropriating $30 million for fallout shelters, because a nuclear attack could be made upon Washington or any other city of our country by Soviet submarines off our shores, submarines which can fire atomic missiles without giving us any warning whatever. At most, there might be a 15-minute warning of the firing from the Soviet Union of an intercontinental missile with an atomic warhead.

The Cuban crisis proved that our best, and probably only, civil defense in the nuclear age is a firm, determined, resolute stand against aggression, plus the nuclear power to back it up. Last October our President's firm, and unyielding policy in dealing with Khrushchev and Castro's Cuba resulted in our greatest cold war victory. This was because of our nuclear power to support the President's unyielding position.

It would be far wiser to appropriate additional funds for missile programs, jet aircraft, and missile-bearing Polaris submarines than for civil defense schemes which are hopeless at their inception.

Nevertheless, the civil defense planners continue to mesmerize the American public with the illusion that we have an effective civil defense program. Although Congress appropriated $208 million in 1961 and an additional $38 million in 1962 for marking and provisioning fallout shelters, when the crisis came most of them could not be found, were not marked, or were unusable. Only a handful were provisioned. Rations and medical kits on which millions of dollars had been spent were still stocked in Federal warehouses and arsenals. Warning systems were inadequate and virtually useless. This is probably not too important, because in the event of an attack with nuclear warheads there would be, at most, perhaps 10 minutes warning before intercontinental ballistic missiles fell on American cities.

President Kennedy's image had hardly faded from the television screen last October 22nd when the clamor began for more Government spending for fallout shelters. Sharp salesmen were trying to peddle terror, in order to sell more of these utterly useless shelters. It follows, as the night the day, that any new crisis will renew the agitation for holes in the ground to hide in—mainly under a bundle of taxpayers' money. I am trying very hard to save that money.

The Committee of State Governors, meeting in Washington, urged revival of the $600 million fallout shelter program which the Congress had rejected a month before. In my opinion, we acted wisely in doing so.

Of course, if the Governors could persuade Congress to appropriate huge sums of the taxpayers' money, in order to build some fallout shelters and to employ more civil defense officials in their cities, that would add to the political payroll in their States.

What might have happened to that huge sum is indicated by a report of the General Accounting Office, released about the time the Governors were meeting. The report revealed that the Federal Government had distributed $182 million in surplus property to local civil defense units. More than half of this was converted to private use, wasted, or used in the normal operations of local governments to which it had been assigned only for emergency use. That money went down the same drain through which over a billion dollars of the taxpayers' money has been squandered on futile and foolish civil defense projects from 1950 to this good hour.

In the midst of the Cuban crisis, the planners doubled the number of potential shelter spaces, so-called, overnight. By simply using a mimeograph machine, they lowered the suitable safety factor from 100 to 40—meaning that one would supposedly be 40 times safer inside such a shelter than out. Of course, it is highly problematical whether in a nuclear attack lives would be saved, even if a person were 100 times safer in one of these spaces than out of it.

At any rate, signs were hurriedly put up to indicate the shelter areas. Most of the signs were erected after the crisis had subsided. I suppose the main purpose of these shelter signs was to soothe the anxiety of any worried citizen, inasmuch as they certainly would serve no other worthwhile purpose.

All there is to show for the expenditure of hundreds of millions of taxpayers' dollars are black and yellow shelter signs plastered on every building within sight. Now we are asked to throw away an additional $30 million, in order to continue the myth that there is an effective civil defense program.

Mr. President, last year and in every previous year since I have been a Member of this body, I spoke out against these appropriations. I will continue to speak out against this utterly worthless boondoggle.

In February 1959 I was alone in this fight against the civil defense boondoggle. But since then, many other Members of Congress have come to take the same view that I take—namely, that this program is an utterly foolish waste of public funds. We should stop it. Today we again have an opportunity to begin doing so.

I shall ask for a yea-and-nay vote on this question, because I want Senators who have been talking about economy to have an opportunity to vote on this very worthwhile amendment.

Those who favor a massive fallout shelter building program have estimated that it would cost anywhere from $20 to $200 billion. Even then, there is no guarantee that it will be effective. With extensive advances being made in rockets and nuclear technology, such a fallout shelter program would probably be obsolete before being completed. Unless we are prepared to embark on such a vast gamble and to spend perhaps $200 billion of the taxpayers' money, we should carefully consider the wisdom of piecemeal appropriations amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars, with no really effective purpose.

Mr. President, this amendment gives the Senate an opportunity to make an effective saving of the taxpayers' money. I am not standing alone in regard to this matter. I agree with Gen. Curtis LeMay, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, who, in commenting some months ago on fallout shelters, said:

> I don't think that I would put that much money into holes in the ground to crawl into. I would rather spend more of it on offensive weapons, in the first place.

Maj. Gen. John Medaris, now retired, one of the outstanding authorities on missilery, and former chief of the Army Ordnance missile command, gave his view of this matter.

Senators will recall that only during the Eisenhower administration a few years ago, the now discredited theory of mass evacuation of our cities in event of nuclear attack was also being foolishly pushed by civil defense officials.

General Medaris said:

> The concept of mass evacuation of high density population centers and the burial of our citizenry in deep shelters would negate any kind of positive reaction to attack. It would convert our people into a horde of rabbits scurrying for warrens where they would cower helplessly while waiting the coming of a conqueror.

Mr. President, it would be a great mistake for the Senate to add to the bill, as passed by the House of Representatives, $30 million for furthering the civil-defense shelter program. This is a defeatist psychology. My amendment provides an opportunity to strike out that item, and to manifest to all the world our confidence in the fact that at the present time the United States is the most powerful nation which ever existed under the bending sky of God. Our strength lies in our very great nuclear capacity, not in holes in the ground or shelter signs on public buildings.

Mr. President, the taxpayers have a right to know the truth about civil defense. They are tired of high-salaried officials who think up schemes that will not be of any use in event of nuclear war.

Incidentally, I note that in the budget for the fiscal year 1964 the average salary for paid civil defense employees will be $9,520 a year, one of the highest in the entire Federal bureaucracy. By comparison, employees of the Federal Bureau of Investigation will average $8,383; there will be an average salary of $9,122 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; and there will be an average salary of $7,589 for the Small Business Administration—to name a few of the many important Government agencies where the average salary is less than that for civil defense employees.

It would be difficult to find another agency in the Federal Government in which so many have done so little to earn so much.

Mr. President, before we appropriate additional millions of dollars of taxpayers' money to continue this boundless boondoggle, I urge that we take a good hard look at what all these expenditures will accomplish. I also urge that the administration review its entire civil defense policy. I am certainly one Member of this body who desires at all times to support the administration when I can in good conscience do so. I am proud of the present administration. I am proud of the record being made by President Kennedy. I am proud of his firm, determined and resolute policy which compelled Khrushchev to turn tail and withdraw his offensive missiles and airplanes from Castro's Cuba.

However, I feel that administration officials should review this civil defense policy so that we in the Congress may be aware of the ultimate cost of this program, so we know where we are going in this area. Until that is done, I for one, do not intend to vote for further funds for useless shelters. I shall continue to oppose such squandering of the taxpayers' money to the utmost of my ability and energy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I yield.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, due to the fact that a commitment was made yesterday to the Senator from Ohio, and in order to honor that commitment, I am about to make an unusual request, with which I hope the Senate on this occasion will concur. I ask unanimous consent for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGovern in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that will not be a precedent. The situation is unusual. It will not be used again except under unusual circumstances.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, has the Senator from Ohio concluded?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Yes. I yield the floor.

Mr. PASTORE. It has often been said—and I believe it bears repeating—that we are living in times of utmost peril and peculiar paradox. Only this week I attended one of the hearings of the Appropriations Committee on Defense. The budget request for the fiscal year 1964 is more than $52 billion. The $52 billion will be spent in fiscal 1964 to do what? To make the very things that we pray to God will never be used.

Our appropriations for atomic energy are $2.5 billion. Where do we find the paradox? We would spend $52 billion to build a bomb, and yet we would not allot one penny to protect our women and children against the fallout if a bomb were used.

Today the Senator from Ohio tells the Senate that Americans will be scurrying like rats running down into cellars and holes in case a bomb is dropped. The Senator from Rhode Island is willing to concede that if a bomb—God forbid—were to fall on the Capitol today, there is no place that we could go to hide. What if that bomb were in the megaton range? If we could go anywhere—God forbid—there would be nothing to come up to.

But if for one moment we could overcome a total surprise attack—and I pray to God that it never comes—there would be an opportunity if our population has a place of refuge to go. We need not spend $20 billion to give our people that opportunity. We could make it available with the modest program that is before the Senate today.

The program is not a starry-eyed imaginary one. The program does not contain 5 cents for the construction of a shelter. But what have we done? We have had our Defense Department comb the entire Nation. They have gone to every private building owner, the municipalities, and the States, and they have found areas now existing to which people could go.

If a bomb should fall, let us say, on New York and the wind were southward, with the contamination coming towards Washington, a man might not have a chance to leave the Capitol and gather his children and take them home. If he did take them home, where would he put them when he got them home? Down in the cellar.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for two questions?

Mr. PASTORE. I shall yield for 15 questions.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. If a nuclear warhead were to fall on New York or Washington, it would probably come from a submarine without any warning whatever, would it not?

Mr. PASTORE. I do not care where it might come from. I am concerned with where it might fall. How about the people in Baltimore or elsewhere?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. If it came without any warning, what good would the $7 million of biscuits we have already bought from large bakery concerns for stocking the shelters be? I assert that is an utter waste of the taxpayers' money. What good would those biscuits be to anyone?

Mr. PASTORE. If the Senator asks me that question, I shall be glad to answer.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Then I ask the Senator the question, and also the following question.

Mr. PASTORE. Let me answer the first one.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. My second question is as follows: Does not the Senator from Rhode Island know that there are no shelters whatsoever in England?

Mr. PASTORE. We in America—responsible for America are trying to provide them here in America. That is what the program is all about. We have Mr. McNamara's letter assuring us that the program is in the national interest.

The Senator from Ohio is saying, "Let us roll over and die. Let us do nothing, he suggests because the bomb which the Soviets have is so terrible there is nothing we can do about it."

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. The Senator from Ohio repudiates that statement.

Mr. PASTORE. He may, but that is what he implied.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. That is not the attitude of the Senator from Ohio at all. The attitude of the Senator from Ohio is that digging a hole in the ground for a shelter for a man employed in a Federal building so that he might run down in that shelter in a moment of peril, and not go to his wife and children, is not the answer. If he should be saved, he would be the wrong kind of man to be saved.

Mr. PASTORE. I would expect that his wife and children would also have a shelter to which they could go. If the air were contaminated, the worst place for that man or his loved ones to be would be in the streets. One should be underground as soon as possible—in a refuge close by.

The authorities to whom I have referred have combed the United States of America to find places underground.

What would we do with the $61 million? We talk about a boondoggle. We talk about economy. Economy has nothing to do with it. The program is a matter of life and death.

The question is: Will America awaken and realize that there exists a bomb which can destroy the world? How do we protect ourselves against that bomb? That is the question before the Senate today. It is not a question of boondoggling.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Does the Senator deny the statements of General LeMay and General Medaris?

Mr. PASTORE. I do not care who said what. But does the Senator from Ohio deny the statement of Secretary of Defense McNamara?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. The Senator from Ohio states that a submarine has the capability of striking us, without any warning whatever.

Mr. PASTORE. Is the Senator from Ohio saying that when the Russians get ready to take that action—and I hope and pray they never do—the destruction will be so total no one in America could be saved?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. No, indeed. The Senator from Ohio is saying that our power of instant retaliation—our missilery, and Air Force—cannot be destroyed in one strike or in two strikes, and the Senator from Rhode Island knows that. That is our best defense.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from Rhode Island has been connected with the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy since 1953. With all due deference to every other Senator, when it comes to atomic energy, I have devoted more hours to the study of fallout and the damage that can be wrought by a nuclear war than has any other Senator. I do not make that statement as a boast. I state it as a responsibility. The program is not new to me. I never could propose a program involving the expenditure of $20 billion if it were unrealistic. But we have presented a reasonable program. We do not propose to build shelters. We will use what we have. The Senator has talked about dog biscuits. We are not putting dog biscuits or any other kind of biscuits down in the shelters.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Seven million dollars' worth has been purchased from the Kroger Co., as the Senator should know.

Mr. PASTORE. We are putting in them clean water that will not be contaminated. There will be lavatories that can be used. We are putting in things that will save American lives. That is what we would provide in the program. The House eliminated the item. I know that.

The House has always eliminated it. I know that. But the Senator from Rhode Island, who has a responsibility in respect to atomic energy, could not sleep tonight if he were a party to eliminating it all. I could not look my children straight in the face if I voted to knock it all out.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. The Senator from Ohio has the same responsibility.

Mr. PASTORE. I know that. I have a responsibility to see to it that the Senator from Ohio does not do that. That is my responsibility.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. The Senator from Ohio may not prevail.

Mr. PASTORE. That is what I urge the Senate this afternoon. This is a good program. This is a sound program. This is a modest program. This is a program for the American people and for their safety in this very dangerous world.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. The Senator from Ohio thinks that $30 million is a great deal of money.

Mr. PASTORE. The day when we can bury all of the bombs at the bottom of the sea, where they belong, is the day that the Senator from Rhode Island will stop worrying about civil defense. Until that day comes, I shall not be persuaded or dissuaded by cliches about boondoggling, or by high-sounding phrases like, "If you want economy, begin it here—begin it with civil defense."

Do not begin it here. Do not begin it with civil defense. It could spell utter disaster for the American people. There is a chance to survive. Let us choose that chance.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to my friend.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. May I ask the distinguished Senator, who has served on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy for a number of years, if this is not correct: Assuming that the Soviet Union and no other power used atomic weapons on the mainland of the United States, is it not correct to say that we have a great deal of nuclear power and more than we need to defeat them if we decided to use such weapons?

Mr. PASTORE. I have often said, and I repeat today, that there are enough bombs in the stockpiles of the world—that means in the stockpiles of the United States, the Soviet Union, Great Britain and possibly France—so that if every bomb were strategically dropped, man could destroy everything man has built from the time of beginning. That is how extreme the peril is.

But we are making a little progress. We ask for a litttle bit of an approach—to do what? It is to recommend to people that there are places to which they can go. It will say that we have found enough spaces in America to protect 100 million people. That is what we are trying to do.

If a person goes to one of those places, and his child says, "May I have a drink of water," there will be clean water. If his child says, "I am hungry. Will you give me a biscuit?" there might be a biscuit available. What is wrong with that?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. What is wrong with it is the advance of science. What might be effective today will be of no effect a year from now.

Mr. PASTORE. That may be so. Today we live. Tomorrow a new generation will provide for that problem. We must meet the situation as it is. I am not ready to quit because technology has not reached its pinnacle.

I do know—and I say this with all the sincerity at my disposal—that there is a chance; all we are talking about is giving America that chance.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. The Senator from Ohio is not talking about quitting. The Senator from Ohio voted for every appropriation for the defense of our country. We have tremendous nuclear power.

Mr. PASTORE. I never said that the Senator from Ohio was a quitter.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. We could annihilate the Soviet Union.

Mr. PASTORE. I never said that. I said that the Senator is untimely in becoming an economizer with civil defense, at the wrong time and in the wrong place.

"Not here," I say to my friend, "Mr. YOUNG, not here."

This is the great chance we have. Let us give it to America.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. As one who once served on the Committee on Armed

Services and who presently serves on the Committee on Foreign Relations, it seems to this Senator that the most neglected phase of our entire defense program has been civil defense. We have always known, ever since the first day the Soviet Union had atomic weapons, that it was within their capability to get through with some of the weapons, and we know that today.

I would assume, if we were in a large city and a multimegaton bomb hit that city, the bomb would destroy everything immediately surrounding it, but for those who were not in the immediate area of the blast there would be some possibility of survival.

Mr. PASTORE. There would be a chance for them.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Provided there was a place for them to go.

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. What is the matter with that, if Congress is spending billions of dollars to overkill, to provide a capacity to kill everybody in the Soviet Union three times?

Mr. PASTORE. And not one dime for protection.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is what I cannot understand.

Mr. PASTORE. That is what is involved. I cannot understand it either.

Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall].

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Rhode Island.

From an outside source, I happen to have heard recently of the Senator's great assistance in working upon atomic energy and nuclear power problems. The Senator has been working with intelligence and capability and a great deal of persistence. I commend him.

The appropriation recommended is $30 million. The House struck out this item. The House was asked to provide more than $60 million, but struck out the whole thing. We would provide $30 million.

What would that do? At the present time there are a number of shelters in existing buildings. Those would be sufficient for approximately 70 million spaces.

This money would provide the biscuits and the water for the stocking of the existing shelters, up to approximately 70 million spaces if all the money were used. We would not install the full number at the present time, but would put in enough money to carry the program through the fiscal year.

There are existing contracts with biscuit companies and other providers. If we do not provide at least some of the $30 million, those contracts will stop. It would cost much more money to bring them back into existence, after the contracts were stopped and the companies had gone on to other business.

As the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Rhode Island have said, we face two kinds of problems. There is the problem of protecting from blast after a nuclear bomb is burst, and there is another problem in protecting from radioactive fallout. We would help people who may be subject to radioactive fallout. To protect them from the actual blast would cost many billions of dollars.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me 2 or 3 more minutes?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield the 3 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts may proceed for 3 minutes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as I have said, there are two great problems. There is the problem of protecting from blast, and there is the problem of protecting from radioactive fallout. It would cost many billions of dollars to protect from blast.

What would we do? We would provide this program, and also put large amounts of money into counteroffensive weapons, to make it impossible for the Soviet Union or any other country to deliver bombs against our country, because we would counterstrike. That is one way of protecting from blast.

What we seek to do by this program is to protect people from radioactive fallout. The shelters, it is believed, would be the best protection. They might be shelters in existing buildings. They might be shelters in private buildings, or in Federal buildings, or possibly in new buildings yet to be constructed.

This money would provide for the stocking of shelters we know are in existence today.

That is all the $30 million would do. After the first of next year we can reexamine the whole program. There is $300 million in the budget for the next fiscal year. Whether we want to appropriate all of that is a question. This money would provide for the stocking of the shelters we know to be in existence and for the continuation of contracts through June 30 of this year with the companies which are already providing the biscuits and the clean water.

I hope this proposal will be agreed to.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield, if I have any time remaining.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Is it not a fact that many millions of dollars have already been spent for stocking the shelters?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. One hundred and eleven million dollars has already been spent.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Much of that has been spent for stocking shelters.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. If we buy more biscuits and stock more shelters, the only good which will come from that will be that we shall put money into circulation, by giving it to the bakeries.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Oh, no. I have a fine friendship with the Senator from Ohio, and I respect him; but I could not imagine a statement that made less sense.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Does the Senator think that marking shelters in apartment houses makes sense?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The shelters have all been approved by the Federal Government as possible shelters, if stocked; and they are in existing buildings.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. They have been surveyed, but some of them have not been marked or stocked.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. They have been surveyed. This language would provide for 70 million places in such shelters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mrs. NEUBERGER (after having voted in the affirmative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. Bible]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Bible], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church], the Senator from California [Mr. Engle], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers] would each vote "nay."

On the vote, the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "nay," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater] is absent on official business as a member of the Board of Visitors to the Air Force Academy.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] and the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty] is absent because of death in his family.

On this vote, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater] is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona would vote "yea," and the Senator from New York would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] is paired with the

Senator from California [Mr. Engle]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from California would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 18, nays 65, as follows:

[No. 66 Leg.]

YEAS—18

Anderson
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Clark
Curtis
Dirksen
Ellender
Gruening
Lausche
McClellan
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Pearson
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—65

Aiken
Allott
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Cooper
Cotton
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Edmondson
Ervin
Fong
Gore
Hart
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Jordan, Idaho
Jordan, N.C.
Keating
Kefauver
Kennedy
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Mechem
Miller
Monroney
Morse
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Williams, N.J.
Young, N.Dak.

NOT VOTING—17

Bennett
Bible
Church
Engle
Fulbright
Goldwater
Hartke
Hruska
Javits
Magnuson
McGee
Metcalf
Neuberger
Prouty
Russell
Smathers
Yarborough

So the amendment of Mr. Young of Ohio was rejected.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to table that motion.

The motion to table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGovern in the chair). The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I note that title IV of the supplemental appropriation bill is an amendment to the Phillippine Rehabilitation Act of 1963, an act approved by Congress last year I assume, after thorough consideration by the Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill having been reported by those committees and acted upon by both Houses. Now, quite suddenly, we find in the supplemental appropriation bill a title which has the effect of significantly modifying that legislation.

So far as I know, there has been no explanation on the floor of the Senate as to why this amendment was included. No justification has been made for it. Senators know that this subject has been under discussion during the past 6 weeks or 2 months, but the Wall Street Journal for April 30 contains an article which I believe raises some significant questions about the wisdom or propriety of the recommended changes.

I should like to ask some member of either the Committee on Appropriations or the Committee on Foreign Relations, since I assume the amendment was recommended to the Committee on Appropriations by the Committee on Foreign Relations, whether we may have some clarification. The Wall Street Journal, in the opening paragraph of its article, states:

> Goaded by charges that generous agents for Philippine war damage claimants subverted the legislative process, the Senate is ready to gamble up to $25 million to deny a lobbyist legal fees of perhaps $300,000.

I do not know whether that statement has ever been substantiated. It is said that we are taking a gamble on the possible loss of up to $25 million out of the Federal Treasury on the proposal that $73 million be given to the Philippine Government, leaving it up to that government to distribute or use the funds as it sees fit.

What is the judgment of Senators who are members of the Committee on Appropriations or of the Committee on Foreign Relations as to whether that is a proper estimate? Is there a chance that the U.S. Government will lose $5, $10, or $20 million as a result of the proposed change in the law?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, for the answer to that specific question, I shall yield in a moment to the ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. However, in explanation of the amendment, I refer the Senator from Minnesota to the Congressional Record of Friday, April 26, 1963, when the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright] made a quite prolonged and detailed explanation of the resolution which was adopted by the Committee on Foreign Relations and the recommendation made to the Committee on Appropriations, which was adopted and became title 4 of the bill.

With respect to the article which was published in the Wall Street Journal of yesterday, to the effect that by giving all this money directly to the Philippine Government, rather than by paying the money directly to the claimants, the U.S. Government would necessarily lose thereby approximately $20 million. I yield to the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in that connection, I know of no justification for a figure of $20 million that the U.S. Government might lose. In all fairness, it should be said that when the subject was before the Senate last year, two bills were considered. One bill provided for the payment of $73 million directly to the Philippine Government, to be used by that Government as it saw fit. That was in keeping with the original act of 1946, which provided for the rehabilitation of the Philippines, rather than for the settlement of individual claims. However, the administration of the fund that was originally made available was on the basis of individual claimants.

Therefore, when we came to consider the supplemental amount of $73 million, there were two divergent views. One was that we should pay that amount directly to the Philippine Government and let that Government use it as it saw fit, upon the original basis of its being for the rehabilitation of the Philippines.

There was another school of thought which held that since individual claimants had already established their claims, the money should be made available to the individual claimants.

Mr. Harriman, who was Assistant Secretary of State for the Far East at that time, testified before our committee that the State Department was willing to accept either bill. We were told that the Philippine Government was willing to take either bill. Mr. Harriman said it was believed that some of the claimants may have moved or died, their claims may have expired, and that the U.S. Government might save a few million dollars. I do not remember that he gave an exact amount.

Mr. McCARTHY. He said $4 to $5 million.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is the reason why there is no basis for a figure of $20 million. I do not know where that figure came from.

At that time we did not know that there had been active agitation on the part of two former Commissioners and I believe the counsel or comptroller of the Commission to get the names and addresses of claimants and the amounts they were claiming, so that they would be ready to present their claims as soon as the bill became law. It was not until, incident to the investigation carried on by the Committee on Foreign Relations into the nondiplomatic activities of foreign governments, that it was discovered that large fees had been made payable as a result of the agitation and trumping up of business by two former Commissioners and a third official of the Commission.

Frankly, the committee was shocked. As it happened, I was presiding over the committee when the original bill was considered. I myself preferred the claimant bill, but I did so on the basis of what Mr. Harriman testified, namely, that the U.S. Government might save money by it. However, in all frankness, had I known that the former Commissioners were taking advantage of the positions they held and the information they had obtained as Commissioners, together with the other officials, I certainly would not have voted for that bill; I would have voted for the bill which would have provided payment directly to the Philippine Government.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does the fact that that kind of promotion took place in any way change the substance or merit of the bill which was passed last year? Are we to accept this proposal because it has been discovered that someone who was involved in promoting the bill withheld information from us or has not been a good man—if that is the case? Is this proposal intended to make null and void everything that has been done? Are we to say that because we do not like the lobbyist, even though the idea is a good one, we will reverse ourselves and retract what we did, after full consideration and belief that it was the right thing to do? Is it that we have found a Jonah, so we will throw him overboard?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It was not with full information that the committee acted last year. One of the former commissioners testified before the Committee on Foreign Relations. None of us knew that he was representing the claimants. In fact, I asked him the question. He said he was representing sugar planters.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think that is incidental. The fact that the committee did not have full information about him does not in any way affect the substance of the legislation the Congress approved.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We could have passed either bill. I think the committee could have acted in either way. Our own Government said it was satisfied to have the legislation either way. The Philippine Government made it known to us that they would accept it either way. Certainly, we would not have passed the legislation we passed had we known that this condition prevailed.

The Committee on Foreign Relations decided by a vote of all the members then present—I do not recall the number who were present—in favor of this proposal. I understand that the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and the ranking Republican member, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], presented the matter to the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on Appropriations made this change.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the record ought to be crystal clear, regardless of what we do—and no one is being fooled concerning what this is about—that the administration recommended the language of the bill Congress passed in August 1962.

Mr. McCARTHY. Last year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. Last year. The administration did not want to make direct payment to the Philippine Government for reasons that the administration explained in executive session.

The administration recommended the direct payment to individuals because that would permit the Foreign Claims Commission to analyze each claim, rather than turn over a lump sum of $73 million to the Philippine Government, not knowing how the money would be used. That is why we passed that proposed legislation. So let us not deceive ourselves on this issue.

If this lobbyist is to be chastised—and there is very good reason for doing so—that can be done by means of a resolution providing that none of the money shall go to any lobbyist or to any person formerly employed by the Foreign Claims Commission representing any claimant. But if we seek to prevent a lobbyist from being paid, let us repeal the Sugar Act and similar laws. We need corrective legislation and I shall vote for it; yes, I shall support the committee language but I prefer to strengthen it along the lines I have suggested.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope that will be done.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It was lobbying in connection with the Sugar Act which set off this effort. That is what caused some Senators, including the distinguished Senator from Illinois, to propose that this investigation be made; and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] felt that that should be done. He laid the matter before the Foreign Relations Committee; and then it was laid before the Senate, and the investigation was authorized.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arkansas were now in the Chamber, I am sure he would say that that act was not what set off the investigation. He had begun the work even before the Senate was considering the Sugar Act, although when the Sugar Act was under consideration he had something to say about this matter.

Certainly it could have been handled in the way that similar matters have been handled in the past. But since the administration chose to seek to obtain some 2 million tons of sugar in the open market, that brought up the question here; and I believe we welcomed those who came to testify before our committee in behalf of allocations for various countries. I saw nothing improper in doing so. If we were to deny them the right to appear before the congressional committees, we would then be entirely dependent upon the executive branch for information in regard to a problem of great importance.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I was present in the Appropriations Committee when a very dignified presentation of this matter was made by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], who was accompanied there by the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

I remember very well the two principal points which were the basis of their request that this amendment be added to the bill. First, it was felt that the conduct of the lobbyist had amounted to a flagrant abuse of the Foreign Agents Registration Act, and that it could not be allowed to go unnoticed. Second, the only way that appeared to be open for the enactment of such remedial legislation in time to prevent the payment of the funds, which were ready to be paid in such a way that the lobbyists would be able to capitalize upon their violation of the Foreign Agents Registration Act, was to add this amendment as a rider to the pending bill; and immediate enactment was needed in order to deal adequately with the various emergency problems which were faced by many governmental agencies.

I am sure that is correct. I see in the Chamber at this time the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]; and if I have misstated the matter in any way, I hope he will correct me. But I believe those were their two reasons; and I believe I am stating correctly the attitude of the Appropriations Committee in connection with its willingness to follow what I understand was the unanimous attitude of the Foreign Relations Committee in connection with the request that this amendment be added as a rider to the appropriation bill. It seemed to me, as one member of the committee, that that situation required the action which was requested.

If I am in error in my statement of the facts, I hope the distinguished Senator from Iowa will correct me.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield, to permit me to reply to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator from Florida is correct.

There are some additional reasons, which would be rather painful to bring up in open session; but in view of the way the situation is developing, I am afraid that some of the details will have to be brought out, so that the public may know the circumstances surrounding the surreptitious actions in connection with this piece of proposed legislation.

But the Senator from Florida is correct.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, as I recall, there was no very serious debate on the floor of the Senate when this matter was presented to us by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. At that time there was no particular movement on the floor of the Senate to have this proposal enacted into law. We accepted that recommendation generally in the way in which it came to us from the Foreign Relations Committee; and I supported it largely on that basis—largely on the belief that the best way to obtain relief in connection with this matter was to proceed in the way proposed, rather than to have the matter go through a foreign government.

Is there any assurance in regard to how the $73 million would be disbursed by the Philippine Government?

Mr. PASTORE. There is no such assurance.

Mr. McCARTHY. So we do not know whether one dime of this money would be used for the purpose intended. I say such a situation is the height of fiscal irresponsibility. If we wish to provide this much relief to people in the Philippines, let us vote for it directly.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, my answer to that suggestion is that the U.S. Government has never actually acknowledged that it owes the amounts claimed. Those matters were covered in the original act, for purposes of the authorization.

Then this situation was developed, on the ground that this money was owed because of the damage done to property by those who acted for the U.S. Government.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the Senator from Rhode Island has stated the situation correctly.

Mr. McCARTHY. But what the Senator has said still does not answer the question of whether we wish to provide the Philippine Government $73 million to be used for its general purposes, or whether we wish to have the money go to those who suffered the losses. We are told that this proposal does not indicate in any way how the money will be distributed in the Philippines.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Let me ask whether the Senator from Minnesota was as shocked as I was to find that Members of the Senate were smeared by publicity to the effect that they had received campaign contributions in return for supporting this Philippine money bill—a claim which all of us know is false. I know that some of those whose names were publicized in connection with their having received contributions from Mr. O'Donnell never knew the man, and never knew that contributions contributed to their campaign came from him. Yet this investigation of lobbying has resulted in this kind of smear of some of our colleagues both in the Senate and in the House. I think it is disgraceful.

Mr. McCARTHY. There is no question that that point was raised in the minds of many when the whole subject was presented to the public.

Mr. GRUENING. Those who had any part in bringing it to the press itself owe an apology to the Senators who were smeared.

Mr. McCARTHY. Since we accepted pretty much what the Committee on Foreign Relations presented to us when the amendment was recommended, the information would feed back to that committee from some of the members of the committee.

Mr. President, I make a point of order against the inclusion of the language under discussion in the supplemental appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I believe there is a motion at the desk to suspend the rule. In accordance with the written notice which I filed with the Senate on April 24, 1963, I hereby move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI so that I may then propose to the supplemental appropriation bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, House Resolution 5517, the amendment relating to the Philippine Rehabilitation Act, which has just recently been deleted from the bill on a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island to suspend the rule. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Chair inform the Senate as to the issue which is now before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICEER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island to suspend the rule so as to permit the offering of the amendment.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, do I understand that the 40-minute allocation of time applies to the debate on the motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Who will control the time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY].

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 5 minutes to me?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, it is, of course, regrettable that the issue must be raised at this time. Having been rather closely associated with the hearings, the facts, the implications, and the connotations behind this particular activity, I shall endeavor to clear the atmosphere.

First, the bill which proposed to appropriate $73 million to the Philippines was introduced in 1960 under the previous administration. It proposed to pay the money to the Philippine Government. That bill did not clear the Congress. In 1962, under the new administration, the bill was again introduced by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee in the same form in which it had been filed previously.

This bill had struck a snag in the House for some then unknown reason.

A different bill, one paying claimants, failed to pass in the House and an international incident was created. The President of the Philippines threatened to and did cancel his trip to this country, and relations between the Philippines and the United States were seriously impaired at that time because the Philippines charged us with bad faith.

The administration now in power became greatly concerned that a bill be passed.

A bill providing payment to the Philippine Government was ruled out in the other body. No one knew quite why.

The information that I am about to mention is not yet in the RECORD, but I assure Senators that there is ample reason to know that word went from powerful Members of the other body that unless the State Department and the administration accepted the bill as it was altered to make the $73 million payments to individual claimants rather than to the Philippine Government, there would be no bill at all, and the international complications that had arisen as the result of the failure to pass the original bill in the House would continue.

Representatives from the State Department said, "We will take that bill then if we cannot get the other one through the House. If we must go the route of paying to individual claimants, we will take it, because the situation is serious."

The bill was passed in the House, came over here, was passed in the Senate, and became the law which is on the books today.

I have in my hands a copy of the Wall Street Journal of the 30th of April. The article on the subject is not factually well based. It states that there is some possibility of saving $25 million if the bill were to provide payment to individual claimants as against the proposed change in the application of the money. There is not the slightest degree of evidence of that. That idea is completely wrought out of whole cloth and the fiction of someone's imagination.

There is a possibility that $1 million out of $73 million might be saved. But there is no assurance whatever. Perhaps slightly more than $1 million might be saved. Perhaps $2 million. But the possibility is in a highly speculative field. The latest word on that point is from the Foreign Claims Commission itself no later than today. So where the figure of $25 million originated, I do not know. But certain Members have taken it as gospel and have alleged it on the floor of the Senate. There is no foundation for that.

The Committee on Foreign Relations was not necessarily looking into this particular case, nor was it examining any particular individual as a target. The Committee on Foreign Relations was looking into the Foreign Agents Registration Act to determine, first, whether or not it was sufficient; second, if it were sufficient, was it being complied with? If the act were not sufficient, in order to protect the international associations between foreign principals and local representatives, corrective measures might be offered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

As an incident in some ways to the investigation, the fantastic, interesting, and in many ways reprehensible situation was developed in which thousands of dollars was used by certain lobbyists who were profiting, as the chairman pointed out the other day, and would eventually stand to profit, if the measure were enacted through, in a total amount of over $1 million for filing and collecting claims, many of which had already been filed among the so-called church claims, and others of which have been solicited. I do not know whether the claims were solicited by lawyers or lobbyists. If they solicited them as lawyers, those who did so have violated the canon of ethics as lawyers. If they took off their hats as lawyers and put on lobbyists' hats, perhaps they had the right to do so. I do not know. But the claims were solicited by former members of the Commission whose seats had not even become cold when they got off the Commission. They were out drumming up business by international cable, letter, and other contacts to solicit the claims of these people. Then they got busy and stirred up the idea that the United States might be induced to put up $73 million for rehabilitation purposes, but their purpose was to pay it to individuals on individual claims, because they were developing contracts with the individual claimants, and those contracts have been listed in the RECORD. They used a substantial amount of money.

I do not like to see names of Members of Congress or names of other persons brought in. I think the overwhelming number of Members of Congress who have received contributions from time to time, and who have reported them, have been perfectly honest and have acted in perfectly good faith. Nevertheless, the RECORD shows some $18,000 flowing into the hands of lobbyists for the purpose of aiding "our friends" in the Congress of the United States. Those facts were not developed in the hearings on the bill.

One of these men came before the committees of the House and Senate, presenting himself as a former member of the Philippine War Damage Commission, and therefore connoting that he was in a special position of sympathy for and knowledge of the poor people in the Philippines—and many of them did suffer—but he never once disclosed that he was a lobbyist who had solicited business for revenue, based upon his service in the Government. So far as I know, the only thing that saves his hide today up to a certain point is the statute of limitations. He never disclosed his own personal interest in this subject or his own pecuniary interest, or that of his fellow member on the Commission who was equally busy in the Philippines soliciting these claims.

The original purpose of the act, as clearly shown, was not necessarily to pay directly to original claimants. In the inception it was said to be impractical at the time to weed out individual claimants, but it was said that the $73 million should be put into the Philippines as an additional and final rehabilitation contribution.

Yet someplace in the bill's travels from that body to this body, and from certain individuals on the other side of the Capitol to the State Department, the story went out that it was necessary to take the individual claim payment route or there would be no bill. Meanwhile, an international incident had occurred when the House failed to pass the original bill and the Philippines charged us with bad faith.

This situation stinks. How any Senator could stand on this floor and defend it I do not know. It is not a case of denying to some poor little claimants their claims. We are talking about $73 million that the U.S. Government is to provide in addition to the rehabilitation arrangements we made several years ago.

I can well understand that the beneficiaries of this "boodle fund" which came from the Philippines and was passed in conduit through the Philippine Embassy to certain lobbyists, and in turn distributed as largess and bounty, might have a feeling of friendship and cordiality toward the legislation as it was passed. I can understand that, but there are a few other things I still cannot understand.

What was the motivating influence behind the shift in policy in respect to the bill? That is something which certainly the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate did not know and I am quite certain that a majority, at least, of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House did not know.

There were some things which were concealed. This was a racket, and a concealed racket. The administration did not know it. The State Department did not know it. It was not revealed until, almost collaterally and incidentally to a broader investigation by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, the facts did turn up, inevitably, in an examination of the record and the conduct of certain registrants who were suspected of having failed to comply with the Foreign Agents Registration Act.

This is a flagrant case. It is a flagrant case of misuse of friendship, a flagrant case of deliberate withholding of personal interest by witnesses before committees of the Congress, which amounts to complete deception so far as the motives and inspiration of the witnesses are concerned when they testify.

It is a case of a few individuals lobbying constantly and I may say effectively—a few individuals who have not only already greatly enriched themselves, but also stand to enrich themselves to a far greater degree unless we alter the legislation. This would not prevent the money from going into the Philippines. The money would go into the Philippines, but the money would be prevented from going through this very questionable route which has now been revealed—the very questionable route of direct payment, based upon which the malefactor in this case will reap great benefit.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think the Senate and the Congress are obligated to purge themselves from any suspicion of undue influence in connection with this matter.

I yield to the Senator.

Mr. HOLLAND. Did the three former officials—two members of the Commission and a chief examiner—who later appeared in the representation of these claimants register as agents of those foreign claimants under the terms of the Act?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The record shows, from the testimony, that they did not register for the claimants themselves. I think at least one of them registered as a representative of certain sugar interests in the Philippines, but not of the claimants themselves. That was never disclosed.

Mr. President, I do not wish to trespass further on the time of the Senate. I yield the floor, and perhaps will use a minute or so later.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, what is the time situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). The Senator from Rhode Island has 5 minutes remaining. Twenty minutes remain on the other side.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may need.

I agree with much of what the Senator from Iowa has said about the Foreign Agents Registration Act. There has been an indication of the need for a revision of that act.

I think one of the most serious questions raised as a result of the inquiry and the information which has been developed with relation to it is how money from a foreign country can be used for political contributions in the United States without being subject to the same limitations which would apply, let us say, to an American corporation, or to an American labor union, or to an individual who wished to contribute. To be able to bring in money from a foreign country, to sequester it and to make contributions from it to men who do not know the source, is a serious matter.

But I do not think the findings justify the kind of violent action we are asked to take with a basic claims bill, in regard to which we find ourselves asked to approve the transfer of $73 million to a foreign government without any indication as to how that $73 million will be used.

If we are concerned about the action of a lobbyist, about the Foreign Agents Registration Act, or about how money is first gathered and then distributed, those are all matters which deserve the attention of the Senate and of the Congress.

But I do not see that these questions justify the proposal before the Senate today of radically changing the way in which the Philippine Rehabilitation Act is to be carried out.

I believe there are several points about this proposal which should be considered. First, it is not clear that promoting support of this legislation was illegal. Second, there is no reason to believe that the contributions which were made in any way affected the decision of any Member of Congress. Third, this action would indicate a lack of confidence in the Foreign Relations Committee by the Senate, if not by the committee itself. Finally, there is strong testimony that the proposal recommended here to change the method of payment will cost the United State from $5 to $25 million more than it would cost if the individual claims were paid directly.

It is my intention, if the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island is defeated—that is, if he does not secure the necessary two-thirds vote—to move that the rule be suspended and that an amendment be adopted to this effect: That, notwithstanding any preceding law, no remuneration shall be paid, directly or indirectly, to any former Commissioner or employee of the Philippine War Damage Commission, as compensation for any services rendered in the future in connection with any application filed under this act.

It seems to me that, as clearly as possible under these circumstances, such language would reach the very point which the Senator from Iowa has been raising and which was raised in the hearings in connection with this whole inquiry.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I am willing to yield back my time if the Senator will yield back his time. Is that satisfactory?

Mr. McCARTHY. I wish to yield to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I take only a moment to let the RECORD show my own difficulty with respect to the vote soon to be had. Unfortunately, I was not able to attend the hearing of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on this subject, and therefore do not express views based upon that hearing. I point out that I was not in favor of the appropriation in the first place.

This particular amendment causes me worry. It seems to me it has some of the elements of an act of attaint. I realize that activities have been engaged in by lobbyists who were former members of the Philippine War Damage Commission which assault our consciences. I am not sure that justifies action which smacks of conviction without trial; which may be considered ex post facto.

It seems to me, under all the circumstances, the best course the Congress could follow would be to rescind the appropriation entirely. Then Congress could examine the question de novo. Then it could appropriate, or not appropriate, with whatever assurances the Congress might desire with respect to the beneficiaries. I do not now offer that amendment because the question before the Senate is on suspension of the rule in order to enable the amendment to be offered to the bill.

These are not the only lobbyists who perform in a way that shocks the conscience of many people of good will, including many Members of Congress. I call attention to activities with respect to the sugar bill, and many others. I call attention to the need for thoroughgoing legislation with respect to political campaign contributions and expenditures. We need not only regulation of political expenditures, but limitation of political contributions. But it is now proposed that the Senate deal only with a particular element of two or more problems; and I doubt very much if this is a wise course. At least, I shall not vote to suspend the rule. I would vote for an amendment to rescind the appropriation entirely. Then Congress could consider the matter on its merits.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Tennessee that, if the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island is defeated, as I hope it will be, I intend to ask that the rule be suspended so that I may offer an amendment which will provide that, notwithstanding any existing provisions of law, no remuneration shall be paid, directly or indirectly, to any former Commissioner or employee of the Philippine War Damage Commission as compensation for any services to be rendered in the future in connection with any application filed under the Philippine Rehabilitation Act.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I hold no brief or sympathy for persons who take advantage of a former position held in the U.S. Government. Particularly, I do not do so in this case, with respect to an appropriation which I did not favor. But I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that many men wearing stars on their shoulders leave the military service and join firms which are heavily engaged in defense contracts. I call attention to the fact that many men leave the employment of the Atomic Energy Commission and other agencies and do so. So this is not the only instance.

Thus we here pinpoint a small part of two or more problems with which we should be dealing on an overall basis. I did not rise with the expectation, or even the desire, that anyone be influenced by what my views are in this regard; but I felt that, since we are to have a rollcall vote, and I held these reservations, I should state my views.

Mr. McCARTHY. I commend the Senator's effort to broaden consideration of this matter so far as concerns persons who were formerly employed by the Government; but persons who were never employed by the Government carry on lobbying activities to the point where they go out and drum up business, as was said, with foreign governments to have certain bills passed. After action is taken, they represent foreign governments before various agencies of the Federal Government. We might name some of the most reputable law firms in the United States who take accounts with representatives of foreign governments for that purpose.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. THURMOND. I think it is despicable that a man would use his former or present Government position for his private gain. If the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island is defeated, I understand the Senator from Minnesota will offer an amendment that will provide that these lobbyists will obtain no funds whatever from this appropriation. Is that correct?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct.

Mr. THURMOND. Is the Senator sure the amendment is tight enough to accomplish that purpose?

Mr. McCARTHY. It would apply to any former commissioner or employee of the Philippine War Damage Commission, and any compensation he would receive for services rendered in connection with any application filed under the Philippine Rehabilitation Act.

Mr. THURMOND. As I understand, that was possibly the chief motive for including the present provision to the appropriation bill.

It was in revolt to the manner in which these people handled this matter in order to gain the former result.

Mr. McCARTHY. I believe that was the principal argument made. As I understood the remarks of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], that was the burden of the case which he made in the Senate a few minutes ago.

Mr. THURMOND. The amendment the Senator is offering would overcome that difficulty. If that were so, then the amendment would overcome the chief objection that has been raised to the proposal.

Mr. McCARTHY. I believe that would meet the objection, which I believe is a justifiable objection, and it would leave the other question of how the claims shall be adjusted and the procedures in which individual claims shall be received and the manner in which the money shall be paid. It will leave the matter as it has been determined in existing law.

Mr. THURMOND. I have doubts about paying the money to the Philippine Government. It is my feeling that if we can accomplish the purpose of the amendment, as the Senator has suggested, and not change the law so as to pay the money to the Government, it might be to our advantage to do so, because we can investigate each claim; whereas I am not sure that that would be done very carefully if we paid the money directly to the Philippine Government. It is probable that we could save several millions of dollars by our examining each claim. It is possible that some claims will never be submitted, and therefore we could save money by paying our money on those claims.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Under Secretary of State, Mr. Harriman, last year testified that we could probably save from $4 to $5 million, at least. That was a year ago. If other claims have been settled under existing Philippine claims legislation, the saving might be as high as $20 or $25 million. That is the estimate made in the Wall Street Journal.

Mr. THURMOND. If the Senator's amendment will accomplish that purpose, I shall vote for it. As far as the lobbyists are concerned, this is mere chicken feed. I have no sympathy with them, but this is really chicken feed compared with some of the other lobbyists for foreign governments. The present Under Secretary of State was a lobbyist for foreign governments. It might be interesting to the committee if it at some time were to look into the transactions of a former Secretary of State, who is now a lobbyist for foreign governments. These transactions ought to be looked into at some future time, particularly if these governments come before Congress asking for some money.

Mr. McCARTHY. Of course there are a great many big fish in the pond, which we pretend are not there. We have a small one now out in the open, and we suddenly pronounce severe judgment on it.

Mr. THURMOND. I wish it to be clearly understood that the little fish has been exposed and that we ought to punish it. The big fish ought to be punished also. So far as I am concerned, I favor looking into all these situations. However, I do have my doubts about paying this money to the Government of the Philippines rather than letting our own Government handle the claims. By doing so we might save some money and earn friends among the people.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is the most serious consideration connected with the amendment I have offered. The other issue that has been raised, about the lobbyists, I believe will be covered by the amendment which I propose to offer.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I suggest to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that even if a two-thirds vote on the motion were not secured, the Senator would be in the same place that the Senator representing the committee is in now. I mean by that the Senator from Minnesota would have to offer his amendment subject to a two-thirds vote. I suggest, further—and this is the principal reason for my rising—that if the rule is waived the distinguished Senator, with the germane amendment that he has, would have the right to offer it as a substitute for the committee amendment. I suggest that would be the easiest, most direct, and correct way to get his amendment under consideration by the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to suggest that the Senator from Florida is eminently correct, because there is obviously something that needs to be done with reference to the situation. The question is how it should be done. I wish to clarify the record on one or two items. First, the so-called Philippine Rehabilitation Payment Act of August 30, 1962, was an amendment to the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of April 30, 1946. What did the act of 1946 provide? It provided:

> Compensation shall be payable to qualified persons having, on December 7, 1941 (Philippine time), and continuously to and including the time of loss or damage, an insurable interest as owner, mortgagee, lien holder, or pledgee in such property so lost or damaged.

What needs to be established is that the act of 1962 was an amendment to the original Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946.

A lump sum payment to the Philippine Government is a variation from the practice and the standard that had been established in 1946.

Second, the request for the legislation did not come from any lobbyist. I never met this lobbyist in my life. The only man I met from the Philippine Islands who ever talked to me about this legislation was the distinguished statesman, patriot, and former Ambassador of the Philippines, Carlos Romulo, a man who has acceptance in this country second only to the President of the United States. General Romulo is a good man and an honest man. He would not deceive us. He is the only one whoever talked to me about it, other than the Secretary of State.

Two administrations supported compensation or claims legislation—the Eisenhower administration and the Kennedy administration.

I would have my colleagues in the Senate know that in 1959, the State Department—I repeat, in 1959—long before any bill was introduced, in a memorandum following the visit of President Garcia of the Philippines, issued a statement to the effect that the United States would pay the claims which the War Claims Commission had adjudged to be due to Philippine citizens. The Fulbright amendment—section 4 of the bill before us—would grant the $73 million to the Philippine Government. This may well be the only remedy we have in order to correct the deplorable situation which has been revealed as a result of our inquiry. But I do believe that direct payment to individuals after claims have been examined by the U.S. War Claims Commission—an agency of our Government, not the Philippines—is preferable. I believe it will be more honorable, efficient, and fair. But, I want to be sure that there will be no profiteering, no fixes, no exorbitant fees.

In the memorandum the Department of State said:

> The U.S. Government will, at the next regular session of the Congress and in connection with the legislative program for fiscal year 1961, request appropriate legislation enabling the settlement of the Philippine claim for payment of additional war damage compensation in accordance with the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 (Public Law 370, 79th Cong.). The amount of $73 million, according to the records of the War Damage Commission, reflects the statutory maximum of such unpaid private claims authorized by the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946.

Therefore, Mr. President, let us keep the record straight. No lobbyist talked to HUMPHREY. I did not need any lobbyist to talk to me. What is more, I was not in the Senate in 1946, when the earlier legislation was passed. I did not write the memorandum of 1959 from which I have just quoted. I know of no one that lobbied President Eisenhower, who made the original recommendations, or Secretaries of State Dulles or Herter. And, I don't recall that anyone lobbied President Kennedy or Secretary of State Rusk; nor did they consult with me.

The fact of the matter is—and let us have no doubts about it—that the Government of the United States recommended the legislation that we passed. The Secretary of State strongly recommended the legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, would it be permissible, by unanimous consent, to withdraw the quorum call on the point of order and put title 4 back in the bill without a point of order, and have it subject to amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent that may be done.

Mr. PASTORE. Title 4 would be established without a point of order. It will be subject to amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me understand the request. Is it to consider title IV as properly in the bill, not subject to a point of order, and therefore subject to amendment?

Mr. PASTORE. Under limited debate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So there would be no requirement for a suspension of the rule or for a vote on the suspension of the rule.

My second question is, What amendments are proposed?

Mr. PASTORE. One amendment. Will the Senator from Minnesota read his amendment, on my time?

Mr. McCARTHY. My amendment reads:

> Notwithstanding any provision of existing law, no remuneration shall be paid, directly or indirectly, to any former commissioner or employee of the Philippine War Damage Commission as compensation on account of services in connection with any application filed under the Philippine Rehabilitation Act.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, that language is not worth the paper it is written on. Those contracts were made with citizens of the Philippines, which is a sovereign nation. The claims were tested under Philippine law as contractual matters. They cannot be inhibited by action of the U.S. Congress.

Mr. PASTORE. All that is necessary is to reject the amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I want to be certain that we are not going to compound the mistake.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I have 4 minutes remaining. I yield the entire 4 minutes to the minority leader.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, is a unanimous-consent request pending?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. What is the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. PASTORE. None has been agreed to; but the minority leader wishes to make a speech, and I have yielded him my 4 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, these remarks are not being made on my time. I shall be brief.

Along with the majority leader and other Senators, I was called into conference on this subject. I participated and cooperated in trying to put this situation in a good light, so that everyone would be satisfied. A suggestion was made that we get in touch with the Philippine Government, and that was done.

Second, it was agreed that the original act should be amended.

Third, it was pretty well agreed that one of the objects of the amendment was the man O'Donnell, who had scattered checks rather freely. Let us take the cover off the ball: Quite a number of Senators and Representatives received money. So an attempt was made to put this situation in a good light, knowing that it would break on the front page—and it did break on the front page.

I think the committee acted wisely in filing a motion to suspend the rule and then offering the proposed language, because I believe everyone was pretty well agreed upon the procedure. So there the situation stands now.

If it is proposed to put the knife into this lobbyist——

Mr. PASTORE. No one is going to put a knife into anyone. The Senator from Rhode Island will support the resolution as adopted by the Committee on Foreign Relations. All we are doing now is obviating the necessity for a two-thirds vote.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am talking about the language proposed to be offered by the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY].

Mr. PASTORE. The Senate has a right to repudiate it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly; and that is the only point I am making. The proposal of the junior Senator from Minnesota is not worth the paper it is written on. The man Delgado and the Commissioner, and their associates, made contracts with the claimants.

To begin with, this was not a claimants' bill; it was a rehabilitation bill. So if there is some money left over for the Philippines, that will follow the original principle as determined by the Treasury Department, the State Department, and the Bell Mission. I was a Member of Congress at the time the Philippine Rehabilitation Act was enacted, and had a little something to do wih it. So we are not departing from principle. I merely do not want to confuse the situation now.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will yield on the time of the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. The danger in the amendment now being proposed is that we would be setting a precedent that when the United States liberates a country—which is what we did in the Philippines—we will subject ourselves to claims. I hope the Senate will not set that precedent this afternoon.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I share the opinion of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island. I believe it would be a colossal blunder to adopt the amendment proposed by the junior Senator from Minnesota, because the courts of the Philippines would become clogged with claims. Perhaps the Philippine government would even ask our own Department of Justice to lend counsel as amicus curiae.

Mr. President, I prefer to wash the business up right now and follow the recommendation of the committee.

Mr. McCARTHY. The language of my amendment is essentially the same as that of the amendment that was before the committee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes, but the insuring language in the amendment is surplusage.

Mr. PASTORE. The fact is that the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota obviates the payment of money directly to the Philippine government. We are confronted with a serious question. It might be true that the amendment in the bill would cost the United States Government $2 million or $3 million more because some of the supposed claimants are dead, have moved away, or cannot be found. But I ask, What is wrong with that? The United States has gone into many countries and liberated the people. I hope that that will not subject the American taxpayers to damage suits. That is what we did in the Philippines.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the yeas and nays on the present proposal be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I shall be glad to vote on this issue.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Very well. Let us vote.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy] has asked that his point of order be vacated, which means, in the progession of the legislative process, that the order for the yeas and nays would be vacated.

The majority leader has asked unanimous consent that the Senate forgo a yea-and-nay vote and that we subsequently merely include in the bill the present title—I believe it is title IV—which will then be subject to amendment. It seems to me that that is the sensible way to proceed. I ask Senators to accommodate us in following that procedure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa will state it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Is the request inclusive of the rescission of the order for the yeas and nays?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I offer my amendment as a substitute for title IV of the bill now before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

> Notwithstanding any provision in existing law, no remuneration shall be paid, directly or indirectly, to any former Commissioner or employee of the Philippine War Damage Commission as compensation on account of services in connection with any application filed under the Philippine Rehabilitation Act.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on that amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater] is absent on official business as a member of the Board of Visitors to the Air Force Academy.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] and the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty] is absent because of death in his family.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 58, as follows:

[No. 67 Leg.]

YEAS—26

Bartlett
Bayh
Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Clark
Edmondson
Engle
Fong
Gruening
Hart
Humphrey
Inouye
Kennedy
Long, La.
Long, Mo.
McCarthy
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Monroney
Moss
Nelson
Neuberger
Randolph
Thurmond
Young, Ohio

NAYS—58

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Beall
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Case
Church
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Gore
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Jackson
Johnston
Jordan, Idaho
Jordan, N.C.
Keating
Kuchel
Lausche
Mansfield
McClellan
Mechem
Miller
Morton
Mundt
Muskie
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Tower
Williams, Del.
Williams, N.J.
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—16

Bennett
Dodd
Fulbright
Goldwater
Hartke
Hruska
Javits
Kefauver
Magnuson
McGee
Metcalf
Morse
Prouty
Scott
Smathers
Yarborough

So Mr. McCarthy's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island regarding the supplemental appropriation request for the public works acceleration program. Am I correct in assuming that the approval of these funds for the public works acceleration program will not be allowed in any way to prejudice building projects which have already been authorized under the General Services Administration program or for which funds will be appropriated in the General Services Administration budget for fiscal year 1964?

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from Ohio is absolutely correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Committee on Appropriations, to which H.R. 5517 was referred, recommended the allowance of $1 million for the Migrant Health Act—Public Law 87-692—which was passed in the last Congress.

The committee recommendation of $1 million, is a reduction of $500,000 from the supplemental estimate, and an increase of $500,000 over the House allowance.

These funds are critically needed for project grants to State health agencies to pay part of the cost of establishing and operating critically needed family health clinics for domestic migratory farm families. I, therefore, wish to express my gratitude to the Appropriations Committee, and to the senior Senator from Rhode Island, for restoring $500,000 of the $1 million reduction of the House allowance.

Mr. President, applications for funds under the Health Act received by HEW from 24 States indicate an overall need in excess of $2 million. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from HEW explaining in detail the need for adequate funds for fiscal year 1963.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., April 29, 1963.
Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: In response to your inquiry, there is demonstrated minimum need for $1.5 million in fiscal year 1963 for support of health services under the Migrant Health Act (Public Law 87-692).

Applications received to date from agencies in 24 States request Federal support for a total of $2,135,000. Your attention is called to the attached table. Of this amount, it is estimated that $1.5 million will be recommended for approval in fiscal year 1963, as indicated above.

In view of these facts, it is apparent that the intent of Congress regarding the Migrant Health Act cannot be carried out without an appropriation commensurate with the need. We feel that it would be quite inaccurate to assume that the need relates only to the $200,000 in projects recommended for approval by the review committee at its first meeting in January 1963. The remainder of the $1.5 million is expected to be approved at the next meeting of the committee on May 9-10.

The delay in appropriating funds for the 1963 fiscal year has already caused great inconvenience and concern to State and local health departments and other applicant agencies. Further delay will make it impossible for some projects to get into operation during the 1963 crop season. This will mean postponement for another full year of health services which are greatly needed by migrants and which the migrant health legislation enacted last year was designed to provide.

Sincerely yours,
PAUL Q. PETERSON, M.D.,
Chief, Division of Community Health Services.

States from which statewide or local migrant health grant applications have been received, Apr. 29, 1963, and total amount requested

Arizona	$66,748
California	599,642
Colorado	57,433
Florida	122,452
Idaho	39,805
Illinois	67,760
Indiana	15,045
Iowa	5,800
Maryland	21,134
Michigan	52,788
Minnesota	6,230
New Jersey	130,669
New Mexico	1,300
New York	20,735
North Carolina	34,075
Ohio	64,649
Oregon	393,869
Pennsylvania	22,339
Puerto Rico	59,950
South Carolina	47,214
Texas	236,926
Virginia	4,920
Washington	60,479
West Virginia	7,050
Total	2,139,012

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the facts presented in this document indicate that further reductions in the appropriation allowance for Public Law 87-692 would make it exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, for the migrant health program to operate as the Congress intended.

Numerous State and local health agencies have requested funds and have taken great pains to develop health programs to benefit migrant farm families. Thus, a reduction of the present allowance of $1 million would not only make the migrant health program practically inoperable in the 1963 harvest season, but it would also impose an undue burden upon, and inconvenience, those States intending to participate in this worthwhile program.

In conclusion, let me reiterate my judgment that the $1 million allowance is absolutely critical to the effectiveness of the Migrant Health Act, and thank those responsible for insuring that this program will be in operation this summer and alleviate the serious, extensive health problems that confront our Nation's migratory farm families.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, as one of those who received a contribution in the amount of $100 from Mr. O'Donnell during my 1960 campaign, I want to make my position perfectly clear.

First of all I make absolutely no apology for this contribution. I do not know Mr. O'Donnell, nor did I have knowledge of his contribution to a Committee receiving funds for my campaign.

But even if I had known about this contribution, I would have accepted it.

I strongly resent any implication that by so doing, I would be yielding my judgment on any vote to come before the Senate.

My vote is not for sale on any issue no matter how many contributions I might have received from persons interested in that issue. I serve on the Senate Committee on Agriculture and many farmers have contributed to my campaign, but that does not mean that any particular farmer or farm group controls my vote.

I would not sell my vote for a million dollars to say nothing of selling out for a hundred bucks.

If Mr. O'Donnell has violated any statute, he should be dealt with accordingly. But Members of the U.S. Congress whose campaign committees innocently accepted contributions from him should not be criticized in any manner.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM AND ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 12 O'CLOCK NOON TOMORROW

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, before the final vote on the bill, I should like to query the majority leader about the program for the remainder of the week and, insofar as he can state, for the first part of next week.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the distinguished minority leader has had as much opportunity to look closely at the calendar as I have had, and I believe he has a pretty good idea of what the program is.

At the conclusion of the disposition of the pending business, it is the intention of the leadership to move to consider Calendar No. 127, Senate bill 537 to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States.

Following consideration of that bill, it is the intention to proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 136, Senate bill 102 to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for additional commissioners of the U.S. Court of Claims and for other purposes.

Following conclusion of the consideration of that bill, it is intended to proceed to Calendar No. 146, Senate bill 874 to authorize the construction and equipping of buildings required in connection with the operations of the Bureau of the Mint.

There will be only a pro forma session tomorrow. There will be no votes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT FROM TOMORROW UNTIL 12 O'CLOCK ON MONDAY, MAY 6

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourn tomorrow, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. To repeat, there will be no votes tomorrow. There will be speeches, but nothing controversial.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5517) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H.R. 5517) was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the conferees on the part of the Senate be appointed by the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. PASTORE, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HILL, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. MUNDT conferees on the part of the Senate.

COMMENDATION OF SENATOR PASTORE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before I yield the floor, I should like to take this occasion to compliment and commend the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], who, in the past several weeks, has been in charge of a number of pieces of legislation which have been passed by this body. He has shown his usual skill, his usual enthusiasm, and his usual vigor. I desire him to know that the leadership is deeply appreciative to him for the generalship, understanding, and knowledgeability which he has shown. He is indeed a great credit to his State, to our country, and to our party.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader. He is always gracious and generous.

MISSOURI FIRST IN BOTH MAJOR LEAGUES

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, from time to time in recent years, the Senate has properly shown its concern for the vitality of our national pastime, baseball.

Therefore, as evidence that things were never better in major league baseball than they are today, at least from the viewpoint of the State of Missouri, I ask unanimous consent that today's standings in the American and National Leagues, as recorded in the Washington Daily News, be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the standings were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Standings

AMERICAN LEAGUE

	W	L	Pct.	GB
Kansas City	12	7	.632	—
Boston	9	6	.600	1
New York	8	6	.571	1½
Baltimore	10	8	.556	1½
Los Angeles	11	10	.524	2
Chicago	7	7	.500	2½
Minnesota	9	10	.474	3
Detroit	8	10	.444	3½
Cleveland	5	8	.385	4
Washington	6	13	.316	6

NATIONAL LEAGUE

	W	L	Pct.	GB
St. Louis	14	6	.700	—
Pittsburgh	11	5	.688	1
Milwaukee	12	9	.571	2½
San Francisco	11	9	.550	3
Los Angeles	10	11	.476	4½
Chicago	9	10	.474	4½
Philadelphia	8	10	.444	5
Cincinnati	6	10	.375	6
New York	7	12	.368	6½
Houston	7	13	.350	7

AMENDMENT OF THE LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 127, Senate bill 537.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 537) to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, no action will be taken on the bill tonight. I merely wish to have some business pending.

THE BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES AND SURVIVAL—ADDRESS BY SENATOR HUMPHREY BEFORE CONVENTION OF AMERICAN ORTHOPSYCHIATRIC ASSOCIATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on March 7, 1963, it was my privilege to address the 40th annual convention of the American Orthopsychiatric Association which met here in Washington.

This great assembly of behavioral scientists from all over the Nation considered, among other issues, the crucial problem of how best to apply the behavioral sciences in the major issues of war and peace.

REORGANIZATION SUBCOMMITTEE STUDY OF FEDERAL RESEARCH

It may be recalled that, for several years, the Senate Reorganization Subcommittee, of which I am privileged to be chairman, has made studies of overall research and development supported by the U.S. Government.

As one phase, we have focused on a relatively underemphasized area of research—the study of man, himself.

We have explored, for example, Department of Defense research on human motivation, human leadership, human reactions in combat, and on other issues. And we have looked in general at how civilian agencies study, how human beings learn, how they think, how they respond to neighbors, how they deal with friendship or hostility on the part of others.

These issues are not what is sometimes labeled "academic." They are issues which may involve the life of every home, every neighborhood, every community, and of the world itself.

It comes as no news to anyone to state that Government research has been essentially concerned with the study of things, rather than the study of man. In the interest of national survival, we have tended to concentrate on weaponry through the physical and engineering sciences.

But, we will prevent world war III not just by rockets, but by influencing what is in the minds of men on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S INTEREST

I am pleased to report that the President and his Office of Science and Technology have demonstrated, what I believe to be, the greatest interest ever shown at the highest levels of Government in the behavioral sciences.

A Behavioral Sciences Panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee is now actively at work, following up on a previous excellent report which it had made to the President.

I congratulate the president, Dr. Jerome Wiesner, and the latter's staff and associates. They and we know, however, that this Government has a long way to go toward fully mobilizing the behavioral sciences in the interest of man's peace and freedom.

TWO TABLES ON SUPPORT OF HUMAN SCIENCES

As an indication, thereof, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record the text of two tables showing how much, or, as it may be properly interpreted, how little, the U.S. Government has been spending for research and development in the behavioral sciences.

These figures were compiled by the National Science Foundation. With that agency's kind cooperation, I am publishing them in advance of their appearance in the forthcoming edition of Federal Funds for Science, the annual report in which the Foundation summarizes Federal science expenditures.

It should be borne in mind that the sums shown are very small in relation to the overall Federal budget of $14.7 billion for research, development, testing, and evaluation in the 1963 fiscal year.

I ask unanimous consent that, preceding this table, there appear the text of my address before the American Orthopsychiatric Association Convention.

There being no objection, the address and tables were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Behavioral Sciences and Survival

(Address by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat, of Minnesota, before convention of American Orthopsychiatric Association, Washington, D.C., March 7, 1963)

On March 4, 1933, a Nation, gripped with fear, heard Franklin Delano Roosevelt say, "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself."

In March 1963, fear of a catastrophic depression has been eliminated to a great extent. Fortunately, this Nation is on the march to fuller prosperity.

But, fear of a different sort has increased. I refer to fear of international annihilation in a nuclear war.

You have assembled in our Nation's Capital to come to grips with this and other fears.

I welcome your vital role. You could hardly dedicate yourself to a greater goal.

World peace is the world's No. 1 priority. Reduction of tension is an indispensable precondition to an enduring peace.

You of this audience have dedicated your lives to understanding the minds of men and helping them to deal with their problems. It is you, then, to whom Government should turn to help provide answers on the complex problems of human and group relations in international affairs.

Our country urgently needs your counsel, advice, and judgment.

OUR DESTINY MUST NOT BE MUTUAL ANNIHILATION

Thirty years ago, Franklin Roosevelt said that this country "has a rendezvous with destiny."

And we do have a rendezvous in our time. But we should very specific about it. The rendezvous is not just with "destiny," because "destiny" implies alternatives; destiny can be either cruel or kind, favorable or unfavorable.

Today, we can tolerate no alternatives to peace.

Our destiny must—I emphasize "must"—be a triumphant one. Why? Because the alternative is no destiny at all. It could be international suicide in the ashes of a devastated planet.

We must conquer war, or war may obliterate mankind.

But, we must do more than silence guns.

MANKIND'S MANY FEARS

We must enable men to face up to still other stern realities of day-to-day existence.

Many fears plague mankind and the fears are not imaginary.

Hundreds of millions of people in the emerging nations fear a tomorrow as bleak or worse than the misery of their today and yesterday.

We must help these peoples conquer poverty, illiteracy, disease, malnutrition. Otherwise, mankind will fall prey to chaos and to those who would eagerly profit from chaos as a means to promote communism. We must above all help to instill hope.

A RENDEZVOUS WITH HUMANITY

In the remainder of the 1960's, this Nation has a rendezvous with humanity—suffering, downtrodden humanity.

Arnold Toynbee has stated that the 20th century marks the first time in human history that man could think of assisting his most distant neighbors.

In effect, for the first time in human history, we are in a position to enable all mankind to rendezvous with a kinder destiny.

We can assist the landless to gain land, the homeless to find shelter, the jobless to earn their own way, the humiliated to achieve dignity, the uneducated to learn, the hungry to be fed.

One such program is the historic Alliance for Progress. It will only succeed if there is a genuine alliance of human beings—not merely an alliance of diplomats, or of bankers, or of engineers—but of all human beings who have learned to communicate with one another, to understand one another, to help one another.

Here is but one of many challenges to leadership in the behavioral sciences and by the behavioral sciences.

Meanwhile, at home there is a rendezvous in the 50 States of this Union.

THE ILL-CLAD, ILL-HOUSED, ILL-FED

We can and must help our own people to achieve their highest birthright.

Once, Franklin Roosevelt saw "one-third of a nation ill clad, ill housed, ill fed." Today, our people are much better off.

But millions still live in substandard dwellings; millions lack proper nutrition. Despite our prosperity, there are still forgotten men.

You who study these problems, you who belong to the helping professions, must help your political leaders to remember and work for these forgotten people.

CHALLENGES IN HUMAN RELATIONS

Virtually everywhere we look, we see critical challenges in human relations: Deep racial tension, and not just in the South; millions of elderly, retired citizens, living not "golden years" but barren hours; violence in our midst—2½ million crimes committed in our land each year; a prison system which often breeds not "new men" but new offenses; avoidable bitterness in many of the relations between labor and management; anxiety because of job displacement, resulting from automation; 7½ million dropouts from high school, anticipated in the 1960's.

Every one of these problems can and must be met. None is insoluble. I do not, of course, assume that we can usher in "the millennium." But neither do I feel that we should accept these problems fatalistically as if they "will be with us forever."

The conditions I have outlined are stains on our society. They must be cleansed by action.

I urge you to bring to bear on these problems every bit of competence that you can offer, in cooperation with the Congress and the Federal agencies and with State and local government.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S PROGRAM

Legislation proposals on every one of these "fronts" are now pending before the Congress.

In the area of your deepest professional commitment, mental health, the boldest, most far-seeing program in American history has been offered by President John F. Kennedy.

His recommendations, for example, for community mental health centers throughout the United States hold tremendous promise for preventive, diagnostic, curative, and restorative therapy.

RAT RACE OR FULFILLMENT?

But mental health, as the President well knows, is not merely a matter of reducing the enormous population in mental institutions.

It is a matter of helping to uplift the sense of well-being of our population as a whole. It is a matter of helping individuals to find meaning and joy in the life which many Americans now characterize as merely a "rat race."

How, then, can we gain greater satisfaction and sense of purpose in our daily life and our national life? It will take more than gadgets and technology to make America greater still—as great as she can be. It will require more than increasing the gross national product and increasing the number of jobs, houses, schools, hospitals, playgrounds, roads, cultural centers, as important as these are. It will require that man learn more about man; that he gain a better understanding of himself.

True progress means more than understanding and controlling our physical environment. It means changing our social environment—abolishing, for example, urban blight and dealing effectively with suburban sprawl.

It means more than gleaming new buildings; it means making possible gleaming hearts and hopes. It means hands outstretched to help and to share.

Hands imply action. We need to get down to work to apply the knowledge which we already possess on helping human beings in distress.

I am pleased that so many of you in this association have a reputation for working to change things. We need people to build bridges from research to community programs.

The bridges must lead from scientific symposia to the halls of Congress, to Federal office buildings, State legislatures, city halls, school boards, chambers of commerce, trade unions, service clubs, PTA's, churches and temples, neighborhoods, street corners, and every other arena of opinion and action.

The united judgment of the psychiatric and allied healing arts must be heard from more than great conferences such as this, and but once a year. It must be heard and seen in action—in follow-through on the scene. That means wherever there is a battleground of social disorder or of human deprivation.

PROVIDE SHORT- AND LONG-RANGE ANSWERS

It is your job and mine to help find and provide answers to the great social problems now—this year—not just in some nebulous tomorrow.

I believe fervently in long-range planning and programing.

But there are millions of Americans who need our help now—today—and next month.

So, the question is not only: "How can we remedy the desperate scarcity of professional manpower in psychiatry by 10 years from now?"

We recognize that it takes that long to add skilled personnel through undergraduate and postgraduate education.

The question is also: "How can we make the best possible use of existing manpower and facilities right now? How can we adapt therapy, perhaps, so as to be able to get to some of the people waiting on the long lists for psychiatric and social work service—today?"

To be specific on just one small but terribly tragic social problem—some 25,000 Americans will commit suicide this year. They will be dead by next January 1. Long-range actions in 1965 will not save them.

But there is an infinite amount of other human heartbreak—of human anguish, today, in a vast variety of situations which commands our attention.

MOST AGENCIES DO NOT USE BEHAVIORAL SCIENTISTS

Fortunately, the U.S. Government is getting into action.

But, unfortunately, its direct use of the behavioral sciences, particularly psychology, tends to be confined to but one crucial agency—the National Institute for Mental Health.

I emphasize "direct," meaning, in this context, "action oriented" use.

In my judgment, the U.S. Government needs more behavioral science research, but it also needs to put the research to work in shirt-sleeves action.

One such action use, for example, has been the outstandingly successful role of psychologists in screening and training recruits for that great organization, the Peace Corps.

SMALL RATIO OF RESEARCH SUPPORT

A year and a half ago I directed the staff of the Reorganization Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, to analyze the extent to which the behavioral sciences receive support in our overall governmental research program. The staff reported that in the 1960 fiscal year: (a) The Federal Government was paying the bill for $1.9 billion in research and development; (b) of this sum, the behavioral sciences received only $65 million, or 4 percent. This disproportionately low ratio has hardly improved since then.

Current information compiled by the National Science Foundation shows that for the 1963 fiscal year, the Federal research allocation for human or behavioral sciences has increased to $83.8 million. This includes: $44.6 million in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; $20.4 million in the Department of Defense; and $10 million in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

The National Institute for Mental Health is doing the broadest gaged job—both in research and in community programs.

The armed services are supporting research in leadership, in training, in human engineering. The Office of Education is studying learning, communication, motivation. The National Science Foundation is supporting basic research in psychology and sociology. The Office of Vocational Rehabilitation is studying adjustment of the handicapped.

But the grand total of all such Federal support is dismally small in relation to the backlog of need.

SPACE HAPPY OR EARTH SAD

We are all aware of other needs in the physical sciences. Space allocations are passing the $6 billion mark. This Nation has an important stake in the vast adventure in outer space.

But I know that I need not remind this audience that the most crucial space in the world is within the 3 pounds of the human brain.

It is in this "inner space" that we will find the key to man's fate.

You know how much is unexplored in the nature of man. You know how much this generation has suffered because man has not known how to live peaceably on this earth and enjoy it.

This Nation must not, therefore, lose its sense of perspective over the exotic vistas of the stars. We must not become space happy and earth sad.

There are 3 billion of us, spinning on this planet. There is no salvation for us on the Moon or Venus.

We must work out our salvation here on earth—through this most fantastic of instruments—the human mind.

NUCLEAR SWORD HANGS OVER MANKIND

We can only estimate what tragedy might lie ahead unless man can learn. A nuclear sword of Damocles hangs over mankind. Two weeks ago, I felt how slim is the thread that holds the sword, as I observed the deadlocked nuclear test ban negotiations in Geneva.

The behavioral sciences can help us resolve the awesome dilemmas we face.

We need them for what they know. We need them for research in what they do not know. And sometimes we need them just to tell us the difference.

For today, as in times past, the rulers of modern countries may still proceed on unfounded assumptions about the nature of man or the nature of the enemy.

BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES AND DISARMAMENT

A year ago, I called a roundtable conference with representatives of the Defense Department and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. I asked them to use the skill and eagerness of behavioral scientists, so as to explore peaceful answers to international tensions. Since then, as a result of my conference, a joint panel has been set up. But ACDA has had so slim a research budget that it has not felt it could spare a nickel for Federal support of behavioral research to date.

From every standpoint, this is highly regrettable. It is not just the physicist, the chemist, the biologist who can find new answers to the prevention of world war III; it is the psychiatrist, the psychologist, and allied professionals.

From all these people we need not only facts, we need questions. We need new concepts. We need challenges to cherished dogmas. We need imagination.

I urge you not to relax your individual and collective efforts to see that national decisions are made with the benefit of what we know about people—about human behavior.

SPECIFIC ACTIONS THAT SHOULD BE TAKEN

The highest scientific office of this land—the Office of the President's Science Adviser—is keenly aware of this need. Although a physical scientist, like all of his predecessors, Dr. Jerome Wiesner has given more impetus to high-level use of behavioral scientists than at any previous time.

He and his able staff are, however, aware of the persistent "behavioral science gap" in Government. He knows that, although long committed to the concept, the President's Science Advisory Committee still has no behavioral scientist; the Federal Council for Science and Technology still has no behavioral science committee.

An outstanding report by Professor Neil Miller's panel did represent a landmark. Behavioral scientists have been used in other presidential panels. But continuity and action-orientation have often been lacking.

Fortunately, the underrepresentation and underactivity of the behavioral sciences in the National Academy of Sciences is now being improved. The Academy will soon announce a new program for the behavioral sciences.

Let me add this point with respect to the Academy.

CONGRESS SHOULD USE NATIONAL ACADEMY

In these days the Congress, itself, is much interested in the problem of securing counsel from scientists. Many of the individual committees of the Congress have long used scientific panels or individual consultants. The record of congressional hearings contains considerable testimony by behavioral scientists on at least some of the key issues.

But both continuity and better representation of the behavioral sciences in the legislative branch are needed. A logical source to which we should turn is the National Academy.

I learned to my surprise the other day that the National Academy of Sciences is available—not only for responses to "spot" requests, as I always knew, but for definitive reports of the type the Academy has furnished to the President and the Federal agencies.

The Congress remembers that the Academy was set up by President Lincoln as an advisory group to the President, and that it has served the executive departments on many occasions. But the Congress should now recognize that it, too, can use the Academy as a major resource "of its own"—so to speak. This means as an aid to the fulfillment of its constitutional responsibilities—as both a coequal partner of the executive branch and as a check and balance.

Since legislators try to be directly responsive to human needs, it is logical for representatives of the behavioral sciences to play a prominent part in any such program. I pledge you that this political scientist will work to that end.

NEED IN U.S. STATE DEPARTMENT

I will work to the end too, that behavioral science shall be better represented in U.S. foreign relations.

There should be a behavioral scientist in the Office of the Science Adviser to the Secretary of State. Behavioral scientists ought to be present as high-ranking officers in American embassies abroad. Behavioral scientists ought to serve as science attachés abroad.

The State Department has used life scientists—biologists and physicians, but not behavioral scientists to date.

The Department should reach out for this crucial body of skills and insight. It should use them—not just for preparing reports—but for "on-the-firing-line" decision-making in day-to-day challenges.

Meanwhile, in conjunction with the U.S. Information Agency, task forces in the State Department should give objective study to the manner in which the Russians and Communist Chinese are or are not successful in their use of psychology in the cold war.

DEALING WITH NORMAL MEN OR PARANOIDS

The often tragic history of the 20th century to date reveals that international affairs have been in the hands of some men of great ability and of many men of mediocre or almost no ability.

What is more significant, however, history reveals that on occasion, world affairs have been in the hands of extremely neurotic persons—and sometimes great countries have been ruled by irrational madmen. There is no evidence that the State Department ever used a psychiatrist to help it in the problems of dealing with such persons as Adolf Hitler or Joseph Stalin. Yet some of your professional colleagues have told me that Hitler was certainly paranoid and Stalin was to some degree pathological in his distrust of the outside world.

It is not enough for Federal agencies to gather "personality folders" on present-day leaders of foreign countries, or future leaders. I do not doubt that there are thick files on Mr. Khrushchev and on those who may succeed him some day, just as the Kremlin has thick dossiers on U.S. officialdom—present and future.

The American need, as I see it, is to bring psychiatric judgment into the mainstream of evaluation and policymaking now.

The U.S. Government uses giant computers for 24-hour-a-day, split-second North American air and sea defense. But with all due respect to the electronic "brains," the fact is that there are vast untapped resources of the human brain which are needed round-the-clock, too.

Avoiding World War III is very much of a health problem; it is a psychiatric, psychological, social, anthropologic, economic, military problem.

It is a problem which commands the mobilization of every conceivable skill in human relations.

There are "psychological gaps" in our time. This includes the gap between what we know and what we practice; between what we know we should know but don't know and what we are in the process of learning.

It is your task to help close these gaps.

Federal obligations for total research for social sciences

[Thousands of dollars]

Departments	Fiscal years		
	1961	1962	1963
Total, all departments	44,405	64,675	95,210
Agriculture	18,767	20,092	21,892
Commerce	2,437	2,834	3,811
Defense	215	263	342
Health, Education, and Welfare	14,721	20,016	27,624
Interior	1,559	2,038	2,260
Labor	1,659	3,313	6,237
State	190	7,246	19,955
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	40	120	120
Civil Aeronautics Board	70	68	108
Federal Aviation Agency	85	120	60
Federal Trade Commission	152	144	274
Housing and Home Finance Agency	--------	375	1,350
Library of Congress	25	70	80
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	523	1,000	2,000
National Science Foundation	2,773	5,902	7,214
Small Business Administration	304	304	639
Smithsonian Institution	413	395	637
Office of Emergency Planning	472	375	607

Source: Federal Funds for Science, No. XI.

Federal obligations for total research for psychology

[Thousands of dollars]

Departments	Fiscal years		
	1961	1962	1963
Total, all agencies	50,655	64,058	83,869
Department of Commerce	117	120	119
Department of Defense	17,177	18,441	20,400
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	26,910	33,594	44,631
Civil Service Commission	165	171	185
Federal Aviation Agency	274	364	394
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	1,000	5,000	10,000
National Science Foundation	3,319	4,417	6,214
Veterans' Administration	1,693	1,951	1,926

Source: Federal Funds for Science, No. XI.

COMMON SITUS PICKETING: THE NEED FOR ONE LABOR LAW IN AMERICA, NOT TWO

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr.

HUMPHREY], the assistant majority leader, and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 8(b)(4) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

This bill, the so-called common situs picketing legislation, would, if enacted, reverse the Supreme Court's decision in the *Denver Building and Construction Trades Council* case (341 U.S. 675). For over a decade, this decision has adversely affected thousands of building and construction trades workers throughout America and has resulted regrettably in two labor policies in this country: One which applies in an industrial plant, and another which applies on a jobsite.

A Republican President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, first recommended that legislation be enacted along the precise lines we have offered today. That was in 1954. He, and members of his administration acting on his behalf, repeated that recommendation on numerous subsequent occasions.

A Democratic President, John F. Kennedy, as a Senator in 1959, coauthored with me, and some others in both parties, S. 2643 which sought to overcome the Denver decision.

I mentioned that, as a result of the Denver decision, we have two labor policies in America. The employees of a factory can engage in peaceful picketing in a labor dispute. That is their right under the law. Construction workers, on the other hand, are inequitably restricted in this basic freedom because of a technicality in the law which did not take into account the special facts of the building and construction industry.

In the construction industry, instead of one employer with different departments for different kinds of work, there are numerous contractors on the jobsite doing different kinds of work. Yet, under the Denver decision, if the Electricians Union pickets a jobsite because of a dispute with the electrical contractor and the bricklayers, carpenters, and other trades do not cross the picket line, it is held that the Electricians Union is guilty of causing a secondary boycott in violation of section 8(b)(4)(A) of the Taft-Hartley Act because the pickets are said to be inducing the bricklayers and other trades to strike with the object of compelling the prime contractor who employs them to stop doing business with the electrical contractor. Yet it is legal for the electricians union representing electrician employees in a factory to picket the factory site even though the production and shipping room employees and employees represented by other unions in the factory refuse to cross the picket line. This is simply and patently unfair. Change in this decade-old injustice is long overdue.

I agree with the late, distinguished Senator Robert Taft who held that the secondary boycott should be outlawed when it injures the business of a third person who is wholly unconcerned in the disagreement between an employer and his employees. The difficulty, however, is that this principle cannot reasonably be applied to employers in the construction industry. On a jobsite these employers are either engaged as joint venturers or in the relationship of contractors and subcontractors in the work at that site. Thus, within the economic facts of this industry, these employers are neither "third persons" nor "wholly unconcerned" in a lawful labor dispute relating to higher wages, shorter hours, or better conditions of employment, or other lawful objectives by the employees at such site. The realities of the relationships which exist at a jobsite simply refute any valid claim that any of these employers are neutral to any dispute which might occur on that site.

On January 11, 1954, President Eisenhower in a message to Congress recognized this fact when he stated that:

> The prohibitions in the act against secondary boycotts are designed to protect innocent third parties from being injured in labor disputes that are not their concern. The true secondary boycott is indefensible and must not be permitted. The act must not, however, prohibit legitimate concerted activities against other than innocent parties. I recommend that the act be clarified by making it explicit that concerted action against * * * an employer on a construction project who, together with other employers, is engaged in work on the site of the project, will not be treated as a secondary boycott.

This bill we now introduce is thus exactly the Eisenhower recommendation.

This recommendation of a Republican President has had not only the endorsement of the executive council of the AFL-CIO on behalf of the combined labor movement, of the various building and construction trades unions, but also of many building and construction contractors as well. In 1960, officials of the Mason Contractors Association of America, representing 2,000 affiliated mason contractors; the National Electrical Contractors Association, representing more than 15,000 small electrical contracting concerns; and the Painting & Decorating Contractors of America as well as other individual contractors indicated their support for this corrective legislation to the House Committee on Education and Labor which favorably reported this legislation.

I think it is also important to note that in April 1949, when the National Labor Relations Board first rendered its administrative decision in the Denver Building and Construction Trades Council Case, the Taft-Hartley Act had been in effect for only 20 months. The NLRB had no previous experience with the building and construction industry because it had not taken jurisdiction of this industry during the years 1935 to 1947 when the Wagner Act was in effect.

In 1959, when Congress, by the Landrum-Griffin Act, added sections 8(e) and 8(f) to the National Labor Relations Act, it recognized that the typical building and construction job or project is an integrated economic enterprise even though numerous different employers may be engaged in the performance of such work.

Mr. President, this inequality must be corrected. I do hope that the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare can at an early date hold a hearing to consider this measure and that the Administration will favorably urge such action.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill just introduced may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1437) to amend section 8(b)(4) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. KUCHEL), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 8(b)(4) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, is amended to add the following proviso at the end thereof: "*Provided further,* That nothing contained in clause (B) of this paragraph (4) shall be construed to make unlawful, where not otherwise unlawful, any strike or refusal to perform services at the site of the construction, alteration, painting, or repair of a building, structure, or other work and directed at any of several employers who are in the construction industry and are jointly engaged as joint venturers or in the relationship of contractors and subcontractors in such construction, alteration, painting, or repair at such site, and there is a labor dispute, not unlawful under this Act or in violation of an existing collective bargaining contract, relating to the wages, hours, or other working conditions of employees employed at such site by any of such employers, provided that in the case of any such site which is located at any military facility or installation of the Army, Navy, or Air Force, or which is located at a facility or installation of any other department or agency of the Government if a major purpose of such facility or installation is, or will be, the development, production, testing, firing, or launching of munitions, weapons, missiles, or space vehicles, prior written notice of intent to strike or to refuse to perform services of not less than ten days shall be given by the labor organization involved to the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, to any State or territorial agency established to mediate and conciliate disputes within the State or territory where such site is located, to the several employers who are jointly engaged at such site, to the Army, Navy, or Air Force or other department or agency of the Government concerned with the particular facility or installation, and to any national or international labor organization of which the labor organization involved is an affiliate. The notice requirements of the preceding proviso are in addition to, and not in lieu of the notice requirements prescribed by section 8(d) of the Act."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to my able friend.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy and proud to be associated with the distinguished senior Senator from California in the introduction of this proposed legislation. As I recall, the same legislation was once introduced by the then Senator from Massachusetts, now the President of the United States, President Kennedy, along with the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is a rare privilege for me now to be a cosponsor with the Senator from California of remedial legislation. It is remedial because, as labor-management relations have developed in this country, it has been found that there were certain weaknesses in the Labor-Management Act. One of them is in respect to what we call situs picketing.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The proposed legislation we have introduced would correct that weakness, which I think is an inequity in the law. It is a proposal which has brought support by responsible officials of Government and responsible representatives in labor and in management.

I commend the Senator for his initiative in this matter. He and I have talked about it a number of times. We have consulted with labor lawyers as well as with members of the construction industry. I believe if we can get action on this proposed legislation it will do much to relieve certain tensions in the labor-management field.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my friend from Minnesota. I am glad to join him in sponsoring this proposed legislation.

Basically, the bill would cure, as the Senator has suggested, an inequity in the law. We should have in this Nation one labor policy applying to men and women who toil for a living in this country. We have, regrettably, two labor policies with respect to the area covered by our proposed legislation.

I very much hope that we may look forward to early hearings on this proposed legislation, because it is in the interest of the people.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not believe there is need for further comment. The Senator's statement on the introduction of the bill is one in which I join. I know the Senator will permit me to do so. There is no need for burdening the RECORD with additional, explanatory information or material about our bill. It is a good bill.

I join with the Senator in urging upon the appropriate committee, the committee chairman, and subcommittee chairman to hold prompt hearings.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON CANCER

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in the Congress and throughout the land, much time and energy is devoted to discussing and planning the national defense. This is as it should be, for America must be strong and well-fortified against any possible foreign aggression.

But, the Nation must also be alerted to an internal threat more deadly than an H-bomb and more sinister than a network of spies. This enemy kills more Americans every year than the number of our servicemen who were killed during World War II. The menace is not 90 miles from our shores, but in our very midst, actively at work to destroy our people. This enemy's name is not Castro—but cancer.

While it is more dramatic to speak of the great danger which threatens America in a superbomb which can annihilate hundreds of thousands of people at a time, we cannot turn our backs on the millions of Americans who, if present trends continue, are foredoomed to die of cancer. This is not a problem for which there is allocated $50 billion a year as for national defense, but one on which the Federal Government spends less than $1 per American or $150 million annually.

No matter how strongly we feel about the threat of communism to our way of life, not all of us can take up arms and enter the fray. Similarly, few of us have been blessed with the ability to be in the vanguard of research scientists and medical men who meet this enemy daily and strive to conquer it. But each of us is charged with the obligation of supplying the money, material, and moral support needed, both for an adequate defense of our Nation, and for an all-out war on cancer.

America is justly proud of the fine doctors and research scientists who are our strongest defense against the enemy. We all know that one day complete victory will be achieved and we are pleased and hopeful each time a battle is won.

We have made progress and the future is promising. Twenty years ago, only one out of every seven cancer victims was cured. Today, the figure is one out of every three. But it could be better—it must be better. The facile approach to the problem would be simply to say "Give more money to the National Institutes of Health." But, we have been doing that and still we are told that the cure for cancer is decades away.

Each year, for example, the President asks the Congress for certain appropriations to operate the National Cancer Institute, and to make possible the awarding of a number of research grants. Almost every year, the Congress oversubscribes the President's request. We are willing to spend any amount to cure cancer, but we need the guidance of experts to tell us where the money can do the most good. We also need to alert the public to the fact that this is truly a national emergency which, if present trends continue, will eventually strike one out of every four persons in the United States.

Perhaps we need a shift in emphasis and a new approach. Without doubt, in the words of Dr. Sidney Farber of the Harvard Medical School, "we need to make a master blueprint of our resources in manpower, building, equipment, and private financial support of research, to give us a clear picture of the deficiencies which must be met."

With this objective in mind, I will tomorrow introduce a resolution calling upon the President to convene a White House Conference on Cancer, patterned after previous White House Conferences such as those on children and youth and on narcotics addiction.

Years ago, I was among those who called for the convening of a White House Conference on Narcotics Addiction. This meeting, which was finally called last October brought together hundreds of experts in this field and made possible an unprecedented exchange of ideas and information about this health and social problem. One of my own bills (S. 863) was, in fact, a direct result of my having attended the Conference and acted upon a suggestion presented there. I believe the same results can be achieved at a cancer conference.

More specifically, I expect that such a conference would be attended by American medical men and scientists, representatives of the Congress, Government agencies, universities and private foundations, an appropriate number of recent recipients of Federal grants for cancer research, officials of the World Health Organization and cancer experts from foreign nations.

Their recommendations should cover the following points:

First. A plan to outline how Federal, State and private financial resources can best be spent to insure cooperative efforts and maximum use of available facilities;

Second. Means of encouraging sufficient technicians, scientists and medical personnel to enter the field;

Third. Machinery for a continuing consultation between scientists in the United States and other nations, in order to obtain the maximum international cooperation, working through existing United Nations facilities as well as engaging in unilateral contact and consultation when the facts or situation so require.

Mr. President, in the name of 40 million Americans whose lives will be devastated by this disease, I urge prompt passage of this resolution and speedy mobilization of all our resources in this effort.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I move that the Senate now stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until tomorrow, Thursday, May 2, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 1, 1963:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Adm. Jerauld Wright, U.S. Navy, retired, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to China.

Chester Bowles, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to India.

E. Allan Lightner, Jr., of Maine, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the United Kingdom of Libya.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 1 to the class indicated:

To be career ministers

Aaron S. Brown, of New Hampshire.
Henry A. Byroade, of Indiana.
Fulton Freeman, of California.
Graham A. Martin, of Florida.

The nominations beginning Bryan R. Frisbie, of California, for reappointment in the Foreign Service as a Foreign Service officer of class 3, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America, and ending Raymond Villemarette, of Louisiana, to be a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 4, 1963.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A Tribute to a Dedicated Educator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 1, 1963

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, in the span of a few recent years, Richmond Heights in the 22d Congressional District of Ohio has become one of the most rapidly developing suburbs in the State, and with a population increase exceeding 500 percent it has grown from a village to city status.

To provide adequate educational facilities for the influx of children, the village school had to be enlarged quickly to the proportions necessary to meet the needs of a city. It was a tremendous challenge and one man, Russell R. Fair, in a great measure is responsible for the successful transition.

Thirty-five years ago Mr. Fair was one of the 2 teachers in the Richmond Heights Village School of 3 rooms and 50 pupils in grades 1 through 8. He has served the cause of education continuously and will retire after the current school year. Through progressive study and professional associations Mr. Fair augmented his knowledge and skills in the matters pertaining to public instruction and administration. In the Richmond Heights local school district he advanced from teacher to principal and in 1958 was elevated to the high office of superintendent.

Implemented by his knowledgeable leadership the school system will soon be complete. It now has 40 rooms, well-equipped chemistry and physics laboratories, 44 teachers, 16 clerical and service personnel, a guidance counselor, an excellent library, a librarian, a large cafeteria and student enrollment of 678 in kindergarten through eighth grade and 249 in high school. The value of the physical assets exceeds $1,600,000 and the school is operating on a budget of $529,000.

As an educator, Superintendent Fair was dedicated to the educational welfare of the students, their needs were his primary interest and concern. As an administrator he exercised vision and intelligent application of sound moral principles. He wisely evaluated the qualifications of each new staff member. As a financier he objectively analyzed the criteria involved in the various expansions of the school before submitting a recommendation for a levy or bond issue. He consistently maintained that the taxpayer be given the maximum value obtainable for each tax dollar expended. As a public servant he was always acutely conscious of his obligation to the community, the school, and its program.

Superintendent Fair served with integrity and efficiency in all areas of his many responsibilities. Public service rendered on such a lofty plane of proper motivation and conduct deserves high recognition and deep, humble gratitude. Thank you, Mr. Fair, for an exacting task well done. Best wishes for good health and happiness in your retirement.

Marine Corps Weekly Friday Evening Parade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 1, 1963

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have today received by mail an invitation from the Commandant of the Marine Corps, and I have been informed that all Members of Congress have or will shortly receive similar invitations. It is concerning this matter that I desire to make a few remarks.

In the 188 years since the dedicated and freedom-loving farmers of Lexington and Concord startled the world with their strong defense of the ideals of an independent Nation, there have been many demonstrations of the patriotic ardor which was so important to the establishment of this country. It is perhaps unfortunate that all of us cannot daily demonstrate to our neighbors that we are individually possessed of those beliefs which have contributed so significantly to the moral and physical strength which has always characterized this Nation and its citizens. With the expansion of our interests on the international scene, there has been a tendency to concentrate our thoughts on domestic economy and international diplomacy. As a result, I think we often overlook the basic yet profound principles which transformed our land from one which was suppressed and exploited into one which is dynamic and ever devoted to the liberty of its citizens.

To remind us of our heritage and instill in our children the basic values of the American way of life we have erected many memorials to our great leaders and patriots. Though inspiration can be found in these monuments, it is perhaps more meaningful to discover a living link with the spirit of 1775. Within a few short blocks of this Capitol there is an event each Friday which dramatically displays the qualities which inspired the minutemen and have continued to be the fundamental force behind each succeeding generation of Americans.

In dress uniform adorned with colorful medals which they are honored to wear for distinguished service to their country, the marines of the Marine barracks, Eighth and I Streets SE., conduct an evening parade each Friday from mid-May until late September. This hour-long ceremony is held on the parade ground surrounded by buildings and traditions which began over 160 years ago. On a quiet June afternoon in 1801, President Thomas Jefferson rode on horseback from the Executive Mansion into Southeast Washington and directed that a marine barracks be established in the exact area where it stands today. In this weekly review our marines are able to demonstrate the virtues of loyalty, soldierly bearing, and sincere devotion to the ideals of America which we hold in such high esteem.

Upon entering the barracks one is transported instantly from the bustling city to a quiet tree-lined area surrounded by reminders of an earlier era. At the north end of the parade ground is the Commandant's house currently occupied by Gen. David M. Shoup. This remarkable residence, built in 1801, is considered to be the oldest continually occupied Federal structure in the Capital City. To the east and south stands the barracks itself with its three ramparts looking much like a small walled city. From 9 p.m. when the brilliantly shined brass ship's bell is sounded sharply, the parade is performed with great skill and precision.

The drama which exists throughout this famous ceremony is very evident as the celebrated drum and bugle corps plays a slow march and moves across the length of the parade field, returns to its original position, and sounds "Retreat." At this point, everyone stands, raises his eyes to the floodlit sky, and watches the American flag slowly lowered as the national anthem is played. Perhaps nowhere else in America is our national color lowered at the end of the day with such dignity, respect, and meaning.

The evening concludes when the combined elements of the Marine Band and Drum and Bugle Corps play an orchestration of taps under dimmed floodlights. The whole barracks area then becomes completely dark and a taps echo is sounded by a lone bugler who is out of sight but whose music reaches the very depths of every individual who hears it.

In all respects, this weekly Friday evening parade commands admiration for its color and precision but it is its unusual quality of regenerating a sense of pride in and love for America which set it apart from other reminders of a citizens responsibility to his nation. I commend this masterful presentation to the attention of all Members of this distinguished legislative body and urge each of you and your visitors to accept this invitation to spend a truly rewarding evening at the Marine barracks. The event passes all too soon but its impact will certainly remain with you always.

The 75th Anniversary of the Chartering of Temple University, Philadelphia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, in 1861, the year which ushered in one of the mightiest upheavals in American history, a young sophomore at Yale answered the call of his country and joined "Lincoln's Army." From 1862 to 1864 this brilliant youth of stable New England ancestry marched with the boys in blue. Graphic stories from the pen of Russell Conwell, vividly depicting the horrors of the war, earned for him a position as cub reporter and ultimately an around the world trip as foreign correspondent for the New York Tribune and the Boston Traveler.

Enroute from Baghdad to Ninevah, on the banks of the Tigris River a Turkish guide, emulating the timeworn customs of his progenitors, wove endless tales for the entertainment of his American tourists. Ever alert, young Conwell was deeply impressed by a legend about a wealthy Persian farmer, one Ali Hafed, who, lured by the stories of a Buddhist priest, deserted his fruitful lands to wander in search of fabulous wealth in mythical diamond fields. Far and wide he roamed, footsore and weary. Youth and wealth dwindled into nothingness and Ali Hafed, aged and discouraged, died an unhappy pauper.

"And so," said the guide, "after searching far and wide, for many years, Ali Hafed, reduced to poverty, disappointed and disillusioned, died, far from home. Not long after, the fabulous diamonds, acres of them, in the search for which Ali Hafed had devoted his life, were found on his own land." Having finished his story, the Turkish guide chattered on in an effort to amuse his American patrons. But the seeds of a great truth had been sown in a strong mind.

To the guide and other tourists this was just another story, but to the young correspondent it was a lesson in life. To him it said, "Your diamonds are not in far distant mountains or in yonder seas; they are in your own backyard, if you but dig for them." Russell Conwell returned to America.

During the ensuing years Conwell sowed the seeds of service which reaped for him his harvest of opportunities. As a lawyer in Boston, at the age of 36, he was consulted for advice concerning the disposal of a bankrupt church in Lexington. With ready sympathy he determined that the church should not be sold, but rebuilt. How he was ordained and accepted his first charge in that church; how a certain deacon who came to hear him invited him to a struggling Philadelphia pastorate at the salary of $800 a year; how, with 57 cents, he opened the building fund for the Baptist Temple; all these and many more were episodes illustrative of a great spirit and a remarkable vision.

One evening after the Baptist Temple had become a reality, a young man went to Dr. Conwell in his study, expressed a desire to prepare for the ministry, and asked for advice. Always welcoming the opportunity to help someone, Dr. Conwell offered to teach him 1 night a week. Could he bring some friends? As many as he wished. On the appointed evening, seven earnest young men appeared. Here were Conwell's diamonds, here at his home, in his own community, in Philadelphia.

That was in 1884. Within a short time the services of other teachers were enlisted and it was necessary to rent a room, then a building, then two. Within 4 years the group had grown from 7 to 590 students, a college charter was secured and Dr. Conwell took office as the first president.

Meanwhile Dr. Conwell had utilized the old fable to help his enterprise. His famous lecture, "Acres of Diamonds," was first given at a reunion of some of his old Civil War comrades, as he himself described it, "a mere accidental address." But it was called for again and again. It encouraged everyone to "do what you can with what you have where you are today." After each lecture, some worthy student received a check to help him continue his education.

It was 75 years ago, on May 12, 1888, that Dr. Conwell secured the charter of Temple College. This was the beginning of a university which today has an enrollment of almost 31,000.

No one can now say with certainty that Dr. Conwell envisioned a university in his attempt to help one young man, though it is known that he had long pondered the problem of those denied an education in the usual way.

It is certain, however, that the young men and young women who attended those early classes soon became Dr. Conwell's "Diamonds," just as the educational facilities he offered them became their Acres of Diamonds.

In 1891, the College of Liberal Arts established a day department and obtained the power to confer degrees.

By now, the increasing popularity of Dr. Conwell's doctrine of "education for all" brought such a large student body that it became necessary to build Temple College Building and acquire several halls and dwellings adjacent to it.

The growth of the university proceeded with the same extraordinary rapidity. Throughout the years, the different units and divisions came into existence as follows: in 1891, the Samaritan Hospital—now the Temple University Hospital; in 1893, the School of Theology; in 1895, the School of Law; in 1901, the School of Medicine and the School of Pharmacy; in 1907, the School of Dentistry—formerly the Philadelphia Dental College, one of the oldest and largest institutions of its kind in the United States—and the Garretson Hospital—Hospital of Oral Surgery and a part of the Philadelphia Dental College; in 1913, the School of Music; in 1915, the School of Chiropody; in 1918, the School of Commerce—now the School of Business and Public Administration; in 1919, the College of Education; in 1921, the Evening Technical Institute, the School of Oral Hygiene, and the Greatheart Hospital—Maternity Department of the Medical School; in 1935, the Stella Elkins Tyler School of Fine Arts; in 1945, the Day Technical Institute; in 1948, the Community College; and in 1950 the School of Medical Technology.

During the administration of the second president, Charles E. Beury, who was appointed in 1925 to succeed the founder, the university continued its advancement in educational improvement and physical expansion. In addition to the divisions which were formed during this period, other notable achievements were the building of a stadium; the rehabilitation of the professional schools; the building of Carnell Hall, a 12-story recitation building; a new and well-equipped medical school housing several important clinics and laboratories; the building of Mitten Hall, a beautifully and handsomely furnished student recreation center; and construction of the Sullivan Memorial Library.

On September 26, 1941, Robert Livingston Johnson was elected as the third president of Temple University.

In 1946, in an attempt to provide for the increasing influx of students, Temple University opened two new undergraduate centers. As a supplement to these centers, Cedarbrook, a freshman unit, was opened in 1947. By the addition of these college centers, hundreds of students, who could not have attended college, were given the opportunity to begin classes.

At the present time, the Cedarbrook Center houses the Community College where terminal courses are offered for students who wish training for specific objectives, but are unable to take 4-year programs.

In 1956, Temple University's building program accelerated. A new hospital building, an 8-story outpatient building, and an ancillary service building were added to the medical school facilities.

During the summer, classes were held for the first time in Curtis Hall, a newly constructed classroom building. Modern in design and completely air-conditioned, Curtis Hall added 50 classrooms to university facilities.

Also in 1956, construction was completed on Peabody Hall, a new dormitory for women.

Barton Hall, the new science building, was completed in 1960, and Johnson Hall, a new dormitory for men, was opened in 1961. A new chemistry building is virtually complete.

With these projects, Temple University is well advanced in its extensive development program which, eventually, will encompass a 40-acre tract.

Under the leadership of Dr. Millard E. Gladfelter, elected president in 1959, Temple University continues to fulfill a distinct purpose built upon the ideal of Russell H. Conwell, "to make an education possible for all young men and young women who have good minds and the will to work."

A permanent planning committee keeps its fingers on the pulse of the times and continually recommends new offerings as well as changes in curriculums and methods. As it observes its diamond jubilee, Temple University is a growing institution, growing in outlook as well as in size, in usefulness and in the determination to unearth the acres of diamonds yet uncovered.

A Tribute to Cyril and Methodius, on the Occasion of the 1100th Anniversary of the Conversion of the Slavs to Christianity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in a world that is currently engaged in a struggle between the God-fearing decency of democracy and the godless outrage of communism, it is highly rewarding to look back upon Christian history, that we may point up deeds of glory involving those persons dedicated to the will of God. In this way, we are able to trace, in part, the career of Christianity, and to draw from that story the strength inherent therein. This is an old Christian custom, particularly popular with the Slav people of eastern Europe, and one that has served them well over the centuries.

As a people, the Slavs have always sought in this way to emphasize their devotion to the Lord and to Christian teachings, by hailing the names of their great apostles, Cyril and Methodius, whose work in behalf of Christianity, 1,100 years ago, entitles them to sainthood and world recognition.

Cyril and Methodius were brothers, born in Thessalonica in the years 827 and 826, respectively. Although they came from a family long established in politics, and were thereby in a position to serve as senators, both of them rejected political honors in order to enter the church, and thereupon went to live in a monastery. In time Cyril was called upon by the Emperor Michael III to go among the Khazars, a Tartar people theretofore devoted to the pagan religion, and teach Christianity to all who were willing to hear him. This required of Cyril that he learn the language of the Khazars before he even could begin his task. But learn the language he did, and in short time was busily engaged in the process of converting the Khazars to the Christian belief.

Meanwhile, a call was received from the Bulgarians of Thrace and Moesia, and Methodius was sent to minister to their needs. He, too, was highly successful, baptising Bogoris, King of the Bulgarians, and with the blessing of the monarch, evangelizing hundreds and thousands of the Bulgarian people.

At the request of Rastislav, Duke of Moravia, the brothers next entered the Slavic countries within the Moravian domain. German missionaries already had sought to convert the Moravians, without success. It was known, however, that the Germans' inability to speak the Slavonic language was largely responsible for their failure in this regard. On account of their vast lingual abilities, Cyril and Methodius were chosen to try again where the German missionaries had failed. In preparation, they compiled a Slavonic translation of the Scriptures and chief liturgical books, and by their services in the mother tongue were able to win the hearts of the Slav people.

Following their success in Moravia, the brothers were called to Rome to explain their teaching technique to their superiors. Here Cyril died, in the year 869, at the age of 42, thereby depriving the world of one of its great teachers and great linguists. And yet, before passing, he had played so great a part in the lives of the people of eastern Europe that their descendents were never to forget him. Indeed, the Scriptures and the chief liturgical works translated by the brothers into the Slavonic language became the foundation of all Slavonic literature. Moreover, the Cyrilic alphabet, modified out of the Greek by Cyril, superseded the more ancient Slavonic alphabet over a wide area.

At the request of the Moravian princes, Rastislav and Svatopluk, and the Slav Prince Kocel of Pannonia, the Roman Emperor Adrian II formed an archdiocese of Moravia and Pannonia, declared it independent of the German church, and appointed Methodius archbishop.

In the capacity of archbishop, Methodius became a highly controversial figure in consequence of his insistence upon using the Slavonic language in the liturgy. Time and again jealous priests denounced his conduct to the Pope, charging him with unorthodoxy and misinterpretation. And yet, notwithstanding temporary doubts arising from all the accusations, the Pope was obliged to stand behind the work of Methodius, in the knowledge that he was succeeding in spreading the word of the Lord, where no one else, save his departed brother, had managed to succeed in even the slightest degree.

Following many years of strenuous labor in behalf of the Almighty, Methodius passed away on April 6, in the year 885, but not before he was able to recommend a Moravian disciple, Gorazd, as his own successor.

In former times the feasts of Saints Cyril and Methodius were celebrated in Bohemia and Moravia on March 9, but the date was changed by Pius IX to July 5. Leo XIII, by his Encyclical "Grande Munus" of September 30, 1880, extended the feast to the universal church.

To everyone concerned with the worldwide struggle for men's minds, the deeds of Cyril and Methodius have always stood forth as symbols of God-fearing labor and love. Even unto this day, in the regions where Cyril and Methodius lived out their lives, the work of Christ goes on, in the face of great obstacles. Nor will it ever be any different, so long as the Slav people retain their love for the Almighty, which is another way of saying forever.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 2, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, who art the center and soul of every sphere, and yet to each trusting heart how near, in Thee we live and move and have our being. Let not any callousness on our part make Thy presence unreal to us. Wherever goodness is, or truth, or beauty, there Thou art.

Make sensitive our spirits, that knowing Thy grace and power, we may be cleansed and strengthened.

With all our imperfections and fallible judgments, grant unto us a compassion for others which understands and pities and forgives.

In their ministry in public affairs, may Thy servants here be so strengthened with might that the tyranny of majorities and the tirades of minorities may be equally impotent to sway them from the right, as Thou dost give them to see the right.

Undergird us all, we pray, wherever we stand in these days of destiny, with the glorious vision of eternal values which have supported men before us who sought ends too great to be reached in their own lifetime.

We ask it, O Father of our spirits, who hath been our dwelling place in all generations, in the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord, in whom Thou hast freely given us all things. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 1, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3872. An act to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, to extend the period within which the Export-Import Bank of Washington may exercise its functions, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 5207. An act to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 3872. An act to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, to extend the period within which the Export-Import Bank of Washington may exercise its functions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 5207. An act to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency of the Committee on the Judiciary, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the nomination on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

ARMY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Brig. Gen. Paul Leonard Kleiver, Army National Guard of the United States, to be a Reserve commissioned officer of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3392, with the rank of major general.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report on Transfer of Funds by National Aeronautics and Space Administration

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting pursuant to law, on the transfer of fiscal year 1963 research, development and operation funds to the fiscal year 1963 construction of facilities appropriation, and the use of such funds to acquire certain land adjacent to the General Dynamics/Astronautics Plant No. 71, San Diego, Calif., and the construction thereon of a combined systems test stand; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Report on Review of Certain Aspects of Program for Stockpiling Metallurgical-Grade Manganese Ore

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of certain aspects of the program for stockpiling metallurgical-grade manganese ore, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President and General Services Administration, dated April 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Review of Excessive Cost of Leasing Compared With Buying Certain Electronic Data Processing Equipment by Department of the Air Force

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of the excessive cost of leasing compared with buying certain electronic data processing equipment by the Department of the Air Force, dated April 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Payment of Insufficient Rental by Curtiss-Wright Corp., Wood-Ridge, N.J., for Commercial Use of Government-Owned Facilities

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on payment of insufficient rental by Curtiss-Wright Corp., Wright Aeronautical Division, Wood-Ridge, N.J., for commercial use of Government-owned facilities furnished by the Department of the Air Force, dated April 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Suspension of Deportation of Certain Aliens

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. Kennedy):

Resolution of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolution Memorializing the Congress of the United States To Enact Legislation To Increase Allowable Earnings of Persons Receiving Social Security Benefits From $1,200 to $2,000

"Whereas under present law, persons receiving social security benefits are not permitted to earn more than $1,200 in any one year without a decrease in payments received by them; and

"Whereas many of the persons receiving such payments are totally dependent upon them; and

"Whereas an increase of allowable annual earnings from $1,200 to $2,000 will enable such persons to retain their self-respect: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to increase allowable earnings of persons receiving social security benefits from $1,200 to $2,000; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress, and to the Members thereof from the Commonwealth.

"Adopted by the house of representatives April 3, 1963.

"William C. Maiers,
"*Clerk*.

"Adopted by the senate, in concurrence, April 8, 1963.

"Thomas A. Chadwick,
"*Clerk*.

"Attest:

"Kevin H. White,
"*Secretary of the Commonwealth*."

Resolution of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Government Operations:

"Resolution Memorializing the Congress of the United States in Favor of the Establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs in the President's Cabinet

"Whereas the guidance, assistance and supervision of the Federal Government is required in the increasingly complex and vital areas of city planning, urban renewal, traffic control, slum clearance, city administration, and those matters especially pertaining to the social and economic well-being of urban areas; and

"Whereas the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs in the President's Cabinet would assure uniformity of action, eliminate overlapping functions, and insure an integrated program; and

"Whereas the guidance within the President's Cabinet would aid inestimably in the financing of such projects, thus promising relief from burdensome taxation: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to take such action as may be necessary to establish a Department of Urban Affairs in the President's Cabinet; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from the Commonwealth.

"Adopted by the house of representatives April 3, 1963.

"William C. Maiers,
"*Clerk*.

"Adopted by the senate, in concurrence, April 9, 1963.

"Thomas A. Chadwick,
"*Clerk*.

"Attest:

"Kevin H. White,
"*Secretary of the Commonwealth*."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Government Operations.)

Resolution of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Resolution Memorializing the Congress of the United States To Propose an Amendment to the Constitution of the United States Permitting the Recital of Voluntary Prayers in Public Schools

"Whereas in a recent case, of *Engle* v. *Vitale*, the Supreme Court of the United States declared the use of a voluntary prayer as prepared by the Board of Regents of the State of New York to be unconstitutional; and

"Whereas in an earlier case, *Zorach* v. *Clauson*, the Supreme Court of the United States said: 'We are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being'; and

"Whereas the latter decision expresses a truth which goes back to the very beginnings of this Nation and which has been cherished by the vast majority of the people of our country to the present time; and

"Whereas it is the will and desire of this vast majority to recognize the existence of God and our dependence on Him; and

"Whereas it is their belief that there is a great need to instill in the hearts and minds of our youth proper respect and reverence to a Supreme Being; and

"Whereas the recital of voluntary prayers in the public schools will accomplish that purpose and will help maintain traditions cherished by so many of our citizens: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States permitting the recital of voluntary prayers in the public schools; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress and to the Members thereof from the Commonwealth.

"Adopted by the house of representatives, April 3, 1963.

"William C. Maiers,
"*Clerk*.

"Adopted by the senate, in concurrence, April 8, 1963.

"Thomas A. Chadwick,
"*Clerk*.

"Attest:

"Kevin H. White,
"*Secretary of the Commonwealth*."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.)

Resolution of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Resolution Memorializing the Congress of the United States To Enact Legislation Providing for Public Assistance for Mental and Tubercular Patients in Public Institutions

"Whereas there exists an urgent need to allow persons suffering from tuberculosis and mental illness to be eligible for public assistance on the same basis as those suffering from other types of illness: and

"Whereas at the Governors' Conference held in Chicago in November 1961, Senator John E. Powers, the president of the Massachusetts Senate, strongly advocated Federal assistance for State mental health programs; and

"Whereas in May 1962, at the suggestion of Senator Powers the Massachusetts Conference on Mental Health unanimously passed a resolution urging him to request the President's Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, of which he is a member, to study the advisability of Federal public assistance grants for mental and tubercular patients in public institutions, which request was subsequently granted, resulting in a current study by said commission of such assistance grants; and

"Whereas H.R. 3809, now pending before the Congress, provides for the inclusion of mentally ill and tubercular patients for public assistance, which will qualify the Commonwealth for an estimated $25 million in Federal grants; Now, therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact H.R. 3809 or similar legislation which provides for the eligibility of persons suffering from tuberculosis and mental illness for public assistance payments, including medical assistance; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the Commonwealth transmit forthwith copies of these resolutions to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress, and to each Member thereof from the Commonwealth.

"Adopted by the senate April 17, 1963.

"Thomas A. Chadwick,
"*Clerk*.

"Adopted by the house of representatives, in concurrence, April 22, 1963.

"William C. Maiers,
"*Clerk*.

"Attest:

"Kevin H. White,
"*Secretary of the Commonwealth*."

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; ordered to lie on the table:

"Resolution Memorializing the Congress of the United States To Grant Federal Aid or Assistance to Urban and Metropolitan Mass Transportation Facilities

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts memorializes the Congress of the United States to grant Federal aid or assistance to urban and metropolitan mass transportation facilities by granting or providing Federal assistance for the purchase of passenger equipment, and the purchase of acquisition by publicly owned authorities of rights-of-way and for the installation, construction and improvement of said rights-of-way, so as to provide essential facilities to meet the mass transportation needs of the urban and metropolitan areas of this country; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress, and to the Members thereof from the Commonwealth.

"Adopted by the house of representatives April 10, 1963.

"William C. Maiers,
"*Clerk*.

"Adopted by the senate, in concurrence, April 15, 1963.

"Thomas A. Chadwick,
"*Clerk*.

"Attest:

"Kevin H. White,
"*Secretary of the Commonwealth*."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing, which were ordered to lie on the table.)

REPORT ENTITLED "THE MIGRATORY FARM LABOR PROBLEM IN THE UNITED STATES"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 167)

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I ask unanimous consent to submit a report entitled "The Migratory Farm Labor Problem in the United States," pursuant to Senate Resolution 273, 87th Congress, 2d session, as amended, together with individual views.

I ask that the report, together with the individual views of the Senator from Texas, be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from New Jersey.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1438. A bill to regulate agricultural and forestry imports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Carlson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 1439. A bill for the relief of Glenn C. Deitz and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON (for himself and Mr. Magnuson):

S. 1440. A bill to amend section 110(d) of the Housing Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1441. A bill authorizing the establishment of the Pig War National Monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JACKSON (for himself and Mr. Magnuson) (by request):

S. 1442. A bill to provide for the closing of the roll of the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Indian Reservation preparatory to submission of proposed legislation for the termination of Federal supervision over the property and affairs of the Confederated Tribes and their members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1443. A bill to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, relative to the return of certain alien property interests; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. 1444. A bill to amend section 305(f) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 with respect to the waiver of proprietary interests of the United States in inventions; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

(See the remarks of Mr. Morse when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. EASTLAND (for himself and Mr. Stennis):

S. 1445. A bill for the relief of Archie L. Dickson, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DODD:

S. 1446. A bill for the relief of Andreina Viselli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 1447. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to maintain records of fraudulent and other unethical business practices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Keating when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PROUTY:

S. 1448. A bill for the relief of the Shelburne Harbor Ship & Marine Construction Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1449. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the first Union Health Center in the United States by the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Humphrey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 1450. A bill for the relief of Basilio King, his wife, and their children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND (by request):

S.J. Res. 77. Joint resolution establishing a national shrine commission to select and procure a site and formulate plans for the construction of a permanent memorial building in memory of the veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

RESOLUTIONS

AMENDMENT OF SENATE RESOLUTION 79

Mr. SYMINGTON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 132); which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 79, agreed to March 14, 1963, is amended by striking out "May 1, 1963" and inserting in lieu thereof "May 31, 1963."

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON CANCER

Mr. KEATING submitted a resolution (S. Res. 133) for a White House Conference on Cancer, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Keating, which appears under a separate heading.)

AGRICULTURAL IMPORTS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, imports of agricultural and forestry products are causing serious concern to our domestic industries, and are adding substantially and unnecessarily to the cost of the price-support programs.

Domestic prices are at low levels in relation to parity, and do not provide a fair return for the labor and investment of farmers. Yet, even at these low levels, our domestic prices are substantially above world price levels.

The effect of this, of course, is to draw world surpluses to our domestic markets. In the case of products subject to price-support programs, failure to regulate these imports amounts to little less than an attempt to support world prices.

Congress has authorized import controls to prevent unregulated imports from interfering with and breaking down the agricultural programs which Congress has set up in an effort to improve the lot of the American farmer. However, controls under the present laws have not proven adequate in actual operation. The procedure is cumbersome and time consuming, and the results have not been satisfactory. Legislation is needed to provide a more direct and effective means of controlling these imports.

The bill I am introducing is designed to put a stop to this waste of money and to this disruption of American markets by giving the Secretary of Agriculture adequate authority to act in such matters.

Since the administration of our domestic agricultural programs is under the Secretary of Agriculture, it is appropriate to arm him with adequate and effective authority to prevent imports from unduly burdening and undermining those programs. He should have both responsibility and authority in such matters, and should then be held accountable for any injury to the support programs which he permits to occur.

The bill recognizes that there may be instances in which the admission of extra imports may be desirable because of foreign political considerations. The President would be authorized to admit these; but the added cost to the support program of bringing in additional surplus products would be charged to the appropriate foreign program, not to the price-support program.

We have encountered no end of trouble under the present law, through evasion or circumvention of the import quotas. This is because the import quotas regulate only a defined article. By simply varying the article slightly, the quotas can be, and have been, evaded. This situation would be remedied by the bill by reversing the process and by excluding articles not encompassed in the quota definition. This would require the evasive article to get a quota before it could be admitted, and would stop the present practice of bringing in large quantities of evasive imports until the present slow and cumbersome procedure can be used to stop them.

In the case of dairy products, a total import quota would be established for butterfat and for nonfat milk solids, without regard to the form in which they might be imported. This also would help to prevent evasion of the import regulations.

This proposed legislation is needed now, to correct an unsatisfactory situation which is resulting in unnecessary costs, under the price-support program, of millions of dollars a year.

Therefore, Mr. President, I introduce the bill, for appropriate reference; and I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and a statement on this subject be printed at this point in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1438) to regulate agricultural and forestry imports, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Carlson, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Agricultural and Forestry Imports Act".

Sec. 2. No imports of agricultural or forestry products shall be admitted to the United States for consumption except pursuant to authorizations issued by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

Sec. 3. No such authorization shall be issued by the Secretary which would result in total imports for consumption of any agricultural or forestry product in any calendar year in excess of the total average annual quantity thereof which was admitted for consumption during the five calendar years 1956 through 1960.

Sec. 4. The President may authorize, in the national interest, an additional quantity of imports of any agricultural or forestry product the importation of which is regulated under this Act. Additional imports authorized under this section shall be admitted for consumption under special authorizations issued by the Secretary. Whenever additional imports shall be admitted for consumption under this section, the Secretary shall remove from the domestic market a corresponding quantity of articles the sales or other outlets for which are affected by such imports. The cost of removing such articles from the domestic market shall be computed separately and shall not be charged to any agricultural program.

SEC. 5. The Secretary may prescribe such rules and regulations as he deems necessary for the effective administration of this Act.

SEC. 6. Agricultural or forestry products for the purposes of this Act shall include lumber, plywood, and such other forestry commodities or products as the Secretary may designate; milk, dairy products, and any other article containing 10 per centum or more of butterfat, nonfat milk solids, or any combination of the two; and any other agricultural commodity or product the importation of which the Secretary finds would hinder or burden any domestic agricultural program authorized by Congress.

SEC. 7. Import controls under this Act shall supplement import controls under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act and shall apply to articles not actually being controlled at the time by quantitative limitations under said section 22 or which are being controlled by such quantitative limitations but at levels which permit a greater quantity of imports than those prescribed by this Act.

SEC. 8. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 3, in the case of milk, dairy products, and any other article containing 10 per centum or more of butterfat, nonfat milk solids, or any combination of the two, the total quantity of butterfat and the total quantity of nonfat milk solids, without regard to the form, combination, mixture, or article in which such butterfat or nonfat milk solids may appear, which may be imported for consumption in any calendar year shall not exceed the total average annual quantities thereof, respectively, which were admitted for consumption during the five calendar years 1956 through 1960. The Secretary may allocate such portions of such total quantities to such articles or classes of articles as he deems appropriate. Imports under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act shall be included in the computations of such total quantities under this section and imports under said section 22 shall be taken into consideration by the Secretary in allocating such total quantities of butterfat and nonfat milk solids to specific articles or classes of articles.

The statement presented by Mr. CARLSON is as follows:

IMPORT CONTROLS

Effective import controls are essential to the success of any agricultural program for dairy farmers. Total supply in relation to demand includes imports as well as domestic production. To the extent that domestic production exceeds demand, imports add directly to the volume of the surplus.

Domestic dairy prices, even at present low levels in relation to parity, are far above world price levels. At the same time, large supplies of dairy products are available in the world markets. In the absence of import controls, these supplies, of course, would be drawn to the more attractive U.S. market. The imports would displace outlets for domestic production and force additional amounts of domestic production into the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation under the support program.

Any attempt to stabilize domestic dairy prices at fair levels without import controls would, in effect, be a world price support operation and would invite the dumping of world surpluses on our shores.

In this connection, it is interesting to note that the European Common Market has, as a part of its plan of operation, a program to improve the lot of its own agricultural producers in relation to the rest of the economy. One of the objectives is to raise agricultural prices to more equitable levels. This will result in internal price levels which will be above world price levels.

Thus the Common Market is now confronted with the same problem which we have had to face for many years. Internal prices cannot be maintained above world price levels unless imports are controlled and exports are subsidized.

The Common Market nations are meeting this problem effectively. They are setting up import levies to offset the difference between internal and external prices and are setting up export subsidies to enable a fair share of their production to move into world export trade at competitive world price levels.

Ironically, some of these same nations that are now acting effectively to protect their own agricultural economy are the same nations that in the past have strongly opposed any attempt by the United States to protect our own farmers in much the same manner.

At the present time our domestic agricultural programs are protected against a destructive level of imports by quotas established under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

Under this section, whenever imports are interfering with a price-support program, the Secretary of Agriculture can request the President to take action. If the President agrees, he refers the matter to the Tariff Commission for a hearing and recommendation. If the Tariff Commission finds that controls are needed, it makes a recommendation to that effect to the President. If the President agrees with the Tariff Commission finding and recommendation, he may impose controls.

Imports may not be reduced under section 22 to a level lower than 50 percent of the volume which came in during a prior representative period. This protects foreign nations to that extent and is in lieu of other considerations, such as foreign trade policies and international relations.

The following import controls are currently in effect under section 22:

[In pounds]

Product:	*Annual quota*
Butter	707, 000
Butteroil	1, 200, 000
Dried cream	500
Mixtures and substitutes	6, 000
Dried whole milk	7, 000
Dried skimmed milk	1, 807, 000
Dried buttermilk	496, 000
45 percent butterfat products	0
Cheddar cheese	2, 780, 100
Edam and Gouda cheese	9, 200, 400
Blue mold cheese	5, 017, 000
Italian-type cows milk cheese	11, 500, 100

Most of the section 22 quotas were established in 1953 when controls were transferred from section 104 of the Defense Production Act of 1950.

Prior to 1953, controls had been used in a limited sense under the Second War Powers Act and under the Defense Production Act. During the period 1942 to 1948, controls were used to conserve shipping and to prevent fats needed in allied countries from being drawn to the higher priced U.S. market. Controls on butter were continued from 1948 to 1951 to permit the liquidation of Government stocks, and from 1951 to 1953 to prevent an unnecessary burden on the price support program.

As a result of the hearings in 1953, controls were transferred to section 22 on butter and on the cheeses and most of the other products mentioned above.

The Department of Agriculture recommended, in 1953, that the butter quota include also the butter equivalent of butteroil and cream containing 45 percent or more of butterfat.

The Tariff Commission declined to accept this recommendation and thus left open a hole in the dike through which the first great evasion of the quotas was destined to take place a few years later.

Enterprising importers and foreign nations were not long in discovering and taking advantage of the weakness in the Tariff Commission recommendation.

In 1956, a pilot shipment of butteroil cleared customs, and by the end of the year 1.8 million pounds containing over 99 percent butterfat had been imported. Before controls were imposed, another 600,000 pounds came in. These imports were equivalent to 3 million pounds of butter, which at the support price of approximately 60 cents per pound, resulted in an unnecessary and added cost to the support program estimated at $1.8 million.

In 1957, an annual quota of 1.2 million pounds of butteroil was established under section 22. This is the equivalent of 1.5 million pounds of butter per year. With price supports at around 60 cents, this has been a continual, annual drain on the U.S. Treasury and an unnecessary burden on the price-support program of almost $1 million a year ($900,000).

The butteroil proclamation likewise was weak and inconclusive and an open invitation to further evasion. It applied only to butter substitutes, including butteroil, containing 45 percent or more of butterfat and classifiable under paragraph 709 of the Tariff Act.

The U.S. Customs Court ruled last year that butteroil is not classifiable under paragraph 709 but under paragraph 52. An appeal from this ruling has now been dismissed, thus leaving the ruling stand. The effect of this is to take butteroil out from under the quota since the quota only applies to products dutiable under paragraph 709.

By a strange freak of fate, this may operate to the disadvantage of the importers, because a subsequent zero quota on exylone may now be applicable to butteroil and thus exclude further imports.

A way to avoid the poorly worded butteroil quota had been devised by the importers before the quota was ever issued.

The letter from the President setting the scope of the butteroil hearing in terms of paragraph 709 went to the Tariff Commission November 17, 1956. In less than 2 weeks, on November 28, 1956, the first pilot shipment of exylone arrived.

Exylone is a slight variation of butteroil. The imports contained 76.6 percent butterfat, 15.2 percent moisture, 8.2 percent sugar, and a trace of flavor. These ingredients do not affect the use of the butterfat in ice cream.

The pilot shipment was not classified under paragraph 709 and the basis for circumvention of the butteroil quota was established.

By the time the Tariff Commission and the President got around to controlling the butteroil imports in April of 1957, approximately 2.5 million pounds of exylone had already come in through the new break in the dike.

A month after the butteroil proclamation was signed, the President had to start a new proceeding before the Tariff Commission on exylone.

This time the Tariff Commission refused to grant an annual quota based on prior imports and set a zero quota.

Approximately 9 million pounds of exylone were entered before the shipments were stopped. It is estimated that the cost of removing an equivalent amount of butter from the market resulted in an added and unnecessary cost to the support program of approximately $5 million.

The exylone proclamation, like its predecessors, was weak and incomplete. It applied to articles containing 45 percent or more of butterfat, thus inviting evasion by articles containing 44 percent butterfat.

Two months after the exylone proclamation was signed, the importers were working on a product containing 44 percent butterfat and more sugar, 42 percent, with moisture about 14 percent. However, this product became involved in the sugar quota and imports were delayed until this was cleared. The new mixture is called Junex (junior exylone).

About 2.5 million pounds of Junex were imported in 1961 and about 2.9 million pounds in 1962. This represents imports of the equivalent of approximately 3 million pounds of butter. It is estimated that these imports have added an unnecessary cost to the support program of about $1.8 million.

There are no controls on this product and no limits on the additional amounts which can come in; nor has any action yet been taken to do anything about them.

Even more destructive at the present time are imports of fresh cream. These are displacing market outlets for domestic cream, thus forcing the product of our own farms into butter for sale to CCC at less desirable prices.

The cream imports contain 44 percent butterfat and come in through the gap in the exylone quota which the Tariff Commission created when it recommended that the exylone quota apply only to articles containing 45 percent or more of butterfat.

Cream imports in 1962 are estimated at 1.25 million pounds. We understand that about 1.7 million pounds have come in since the first of the year and that another 132,000 pounds were scheduled to arrive in San Francisco this March 19. The estimated cost of removing an equivalent volume of domestic production is estimated at approximately $1 million in added and unnecessary cost to the support program.

As in the case of Junex, there are no limits on the amount which can be imported at extra cost to the support program nor has any action been taken to establish controls.

A further example of the inadequate operation of section 22 developed in 1955. The quota on Italian type cheese instead of being worded in reasonably comprehensive terms applies only to such cheeses made from cows' milk and in original loaves. This was evaded by adding a very small percentage of sheeps' milk until Food and Drug stopped it and by cutting the loaves through the middle and then putting them back together again.

A hearing on this issue was held in 1955, but the error has not been corrected.

In April of 1959, the Tariff Commission turned down a request that the quota on Edam and Gouda cheese be reviewed for the purpose of permitting greater imports.

In October of the same year, the Department of Agriculture recommended that the quota be increased because the supply-demand relationship was beginning to show improvement. This was done notwithstanding the fact that total cheese imports for 1959 were running at a level approximately equal to total cheese purchases made under the support program.

Following a hearing before the Tariff Commission, the quota on imports of Edam and Gouda was increased from 4,600,200 pounds to 9,200,400 pounds and the quota on Italian type cheese was increased from 9,200,100 pounds to 11,500,100 pounds.

The added cost to the American taxpayer and the support program of these additional imports is estimated at approximately $3 million per year.

As indicated above, this increase was based on the fact that some improvement was beginning to appear in the domestic supply-demand picture. Since that time the situation changed for the worse to such an extent that rigid production quotas were recommended for domestic producers. Nevertheless, not one thing has been done to return these quotas to their original level.

With respect to this increase in the quotas, the federation said, "If imports are to be increased each time and agricultural program shows some improvement, then all efforts to get American agriculture on its own feet become quite hopeless. In such a case, the minimum floor becomes a ceiling above which the domestic producer can never hope to rise."

In 1961, a hearing was held before the Tariff Commission to determine whether changed conditions would permit an increase in the quotas for Blue Mold cheese and Cheddar cheese without impairing the price support program.

The Tariff Commission found that any increase in the quotas for either of these types of cheeses would result in material interference with the support program. The Commission pointed out that quotas already in effect under section 22 permitted total imports equal to about 9 percent of total Government price support purchases for 1960.

Notwithstanding this finding of the Commission, the Blue Mold quota was increased in March 1962 from 4,167,000 pounds to 5,017,000 pounds. The estimated added annual cost of this increase to the support program is $315,000.

Another example of fiddling while Rome burns appears in the imports of Colby cheese. This is a slight variation from American-type cheese. Because of the narrow wording of that quota, Colby is not subject to the Cheddar quota. Colby cheese has never been a normal import into the United States. However, since it can be used to avoid the quota on Cheddar cheese, the volume of imports began to rise at an alarming rate about 1958.

In January of 1958, the federation requested the Secretary of Agriculture to take action under section 22 to control these imports and prevent unnecessary cost to the support program.

In June of 1959, we renewed this request, pointing out that imports of Colby cheese from January through April of that year were equal to about 20 percent of the Cheddar cheese purchased during that period by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

In May of 1961, we again renewed our request. Colby imports for February of that year had reached a level of 3 million pounds for 1 month. We estimated that imports at this level were equivalent to added charges to the support program of approximately $1 million per month. Although imports for subsequent months leveled off, imports in calendar 1961 were 15.6 million pounds. The request for action on Colby cheese imports was renewed also in October and December of 1961.

In March 1962, the President announced that New Zealand had agreed to limit its exports of Colby cheese to the United States to 11,600,000 pounds for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and to 6,720,000 pounds for the year July 1, 1962, to June 30, 1963. Any effectiveness of this agreement was promptly scuttled by other nations, and imports of Colby cheese in calendar year 1962 were over 12 million pounds.

The added and unnecessary annual cost to the support program of removing a quantity of domestic production equal to that for which a market has been displaced by Colby imports of 12 million pounds per year is estimated at $4.7 million.

This is particularly significant, because no effective action has been taken in 5 years, a small problem has been permitted to become a big one, and the end is not in sight.

The Federation has recommended two methods to stop the evasion of the quotas and make section 22 an effective protection of the support programs as Congress intended it should be.

As long as quotas are set on listed products with inadequate and narrow descriptions, there is an opportunity to evade the quotas by some variation of the product. This requires a new hearing with expense and loss of time and permits imports to impair the support program before action is completed.

One recommendation we have made is that this be reversed so as to bar all dairy products except those for which a quota is established. Then new products would have the burden of justifying their importation through a hearing before the imports could be brought in. This would be effective to stop evasion such as we have experienced in the past and at the same time would permit quotas for any product if it were shown that its importation at a specified level would not add unnecessary cost to the support program.

Another recommendation we have made is that a limit be placed on total imports of milk fat and on total imports of milk solids, not fat.

The authority for import controls under section 22 relating to protection of the support programs should be vested in the Secretary of Agriculture, since these programs are administered by him, without going through the cumbersome Tariff Commission proceedings. Then the Secretary should be required to report separately the cost of the support programs resulting from imports and should be held accountable for any increased costs resulting from his failure to invoke the authority Congress has given him.

A draft of a bill to accomplish these objectives has been prepared and is attached. We recommend that it be given your earnest consideration.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 305(f) OF NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ACT OF 1958

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to amend section 305(f) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 with respect to the waiver of proprietary interests of the United States in inventions, and I ask unanimous consent that it be referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received; and, without objection, the bill will be referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

The bill (S. 1444) to amend section 305(f) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 with respect to the waiver of proprietary interests of the United States in inventions, introduced by Mr. Morse, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, those who attended the recent Small Business Committee hearings on patent policy were made keenly aware of several fundamental questions now before the Congress.

As Senators Long, Kefauver, and Metcalf have pointed out to the Senate this year, Congress has a long and unbroken record of legislating in favor of retaining, in behalf of the taxpayer, the patents and information which arise out of research and development projects financed by Federal tax money.

BACKGROUND: CONSISTENT CONGRESSIONAL POLICY

Among the acts that provide for such retention of title by the Government are the Housing Act of 1946, the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as well as the Coal Research Act, Saline Water Act, Helium Act, and Tennessee Valley Authority Act.

These statutes rest upon the established and tested common law principle that when an agent or employee is hired to do a job, the work product should properly belong to his employer.

The importance of this policy to our economy and to the American taxpayer can be judged by the fact that last year, the Federal Government spent $14.5 billion employing people to do research and development work. This amount constitutes about 70 percent of all research expenditures in the country. Further, both the amounts devoted to research and development, and the proportion of such amounts furnished by the Federal Government have risen steeply as our country has entered the "race for space."

Government space research, which stood at $3.1 billion in 1962—all agencies—will rise to $5.5 billion in 1963, and this is estimated to constitute 90 percent of the research in the space field.

Previous to the autumn of 1962, there had been an administrative departure from the consistent congressional policy of protection of the taxpayer by the Department of Defense. On January 28, 1963, Representative HOLIFIELD, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Operations, brought to the attention of NASA a report of the Comptroller General which read, in part, as follows:

> The research and development nature of the work in the ballistic missile program provides the contractors * * * with the opportunity to obtain many patents in new areas of great potential significance.

This report went on to note that one company performing on research and development contracts for the Air Force acquired 11 patents which the company considered sufficiently basic and important to provide the basis for a new industry or an entirely new product line. This company also acquired 69 patents considered of secondary importance. Another firm, 90 percent of whose business has been Government research and development, has boosted its net worth from $750,000 to $350 million in 17 years.

These facts demonstrate that innumerable patents, which are already valued at millions of dollars and will be worth millions more, are being developed at taxpayer expense.

The Justice Department confirmed the fact, in February 1962, that companies selected to perform research and development work obtain substantial competitive advantages—for example, acquisition of facilities and training of staff—even without gaining patent rights. These advantages are in addition to a guaranteed profit. In addition, the profit margin is computed on the basis of costs—which are often far in excess of invested capital.

The Justice Department report continued:

> The effect of giving such firms additional patent rights as well, tends to consolidate their already dominant positions and make their preferred status in new and important industries even more immune to competition than it now is.

The extent of this consolidation of advantage can be judged by the fact that, during 1961 and 1962, only about 3 percent of all Defense Department research and development contract money was awarded to small business. Some 10 big companies accounted for 56 percent and 4 of these 10 piled up about 25 percent. From NASA some 11 percent of research and development expenditures have gone to small business. The effect of these policies, in terms of economic concentration, monopoly, and discrimination against small business, has as yet to be fully explored.

PROPOSED CHANGE IN NASA POLICY

Against this background NASA announced in the Federal Register of October 26, 1962, its intention to publish a regulation reversing the patent policy set forth by Congress in the 1958 Space Act which created the agency.

The Space Agency had on several prior occasions advocated such a reversal by way of amendment of the 1958 act, but Congress blocked these attempts. The effect of allowing the proposed October regulations to stand would be to let an administrative agency accomplish a result by indirection which is specifically prohibited by congressional direction.

This proposal is especially hard to accept in light of the direction of section 8 of article I of the Constitution that:

> The Congress shall have Power * * * To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries;

The power over patents is thus specifically confided to the Congress.

It is apparent, however, that the Constitution did not stop the Administrator of NASA from proposing his new regulations in October while, incidentally, the Congress was out of session. Also, incidentally, the regulations were to become effective in December, while Congress would still be out of session.

Fortunately, the objections of several Senators and Representatives brought about the postponement of these regulations, giving this Congress an opportunity to scrutinize them.

What I propose at this time is just such scrutiny by the Senate Space Committee. As a vehicle, I have sent to the desk an amendment to the 1958 NASA Act designed to make it clear that Congress, rather than the Administrator of the Space Agency, formulates patent policy.

The amendment reemphasizes taxpayer rights and interests in Government-financed research and development, and sets forth three simple and definite criteria. Pursuant to these standards a contractor can apply for and obtain such a waiver of Government interests, if he is found entitled to it upon a hearing of the record.

The criteria for waiver in my amendment are as follows:

First, major contribution of funds, facilities, and proprietary information by the contractor; or

Second, affirmative advantage to the interests of the United States; and

Third, assurance that a waiver would not promote monopoly.

This amendment also provides that a representative of the Attorney General participate in NASA's decision in order to infuse antitrust considerations into the proceedings. Such a requirement was suggested by the testimony of the NASA Administrator before the Small Business Committee that there is no provision for consultation with the Department of Justice, either upon waiver decisions or in any other adjudication or regulation relating to patent policy.

Antitrust and monopoly considerations are especially important in this infant field of space where a few companies could obtain such a stranglehold on basic patents at this time that no other companies could enter the field. In that event, the consequences to competition and our free enterprise system would be of major proportions.

Perhaps the Space Committee will feel that other sectors of opinion, such as the Federal Trade Commission, should be represented on the decisionmaking Inventions and Contributions Board. This and other such modifications would be welcome as the considered wisdom of the committee.

In any event, I strongly believe that the committee and the Congress must hear and determine this matter with dispatch. A decision as to the scope of the NASA Administrator's discretion is necessary in order to guide the incumbent and his successors in the conduct of their duties, to preserve the solemn prerogatives of Congress, and to prevent the giveaway of millions of dollars of proprietary information and inventions bought and paid for by taxpayers' money.

HISTORIC GENERAL DEBATE ON PATENT POLICY

Beyond the situation in NASA, which is of immediate concern, the largest issues of patent policy have been placed before the Senate with the introduction on April 9 of S. 1290, which purports: "To establish a uniform national policy concerning proprietary rights in inventions made through the expenditure of public funds."

I certainly commend the chairman of the Patent Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee for his interest in this matter and his desire to hold hearings on this measure. These hearings will certainly benefit the Nation greatly in airing the momentous issues raised by the revolution in research over the past decade, the space race, and massive government expenditures of tax money for research.

I might, with all respect, comment upon one of the so-called uniform patent policy bills now before the Congress. One such bill would grant discretion to the head of each agency to make patent decisions. This would not result in a uniform patent policy, but the exact opposite. Such a statute would allow diversity not only between agencies and departments, but within the same agency, as its reins were handed from one director to another.

Such an approach is also difficult to reconcile with article I, section 8 of the Constitution, which reposes the responsibility for patent policy in the Congress, rather than in a covey of Secretaries and Administrators.

In this spirit of debate, I welcome the introduction of all legislation which will focus attention upon our patent policy. I look forward to a discussion of all the issues in the committee and in the press which will reflect their importance to our country.

MAINTENANCE OF RECORDS OF FRAUDULENT AND OTHER UNETHICAL BUSINESS PRACTICES

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Attorney General to maintain records of fraudulent and other unethical business practices.

Mr. President, there are before the Congress this year, as in previous years, bills that their sponsors claim will promote truth in packaging, truth in lending, and so forth. It is not my purpose here today to comment on these measures, but to point out merely that while we are engaged in considering new standards and criteria of unfair trade practices, the good old-fashioned variety of business frauds, confidence schemes, and outright thieveries in the world of commerce continue to bilk consumers and investors of untold millions. Truth, in other words, is not a commodity whose presence we should want in only limited areas of trade, but in every area. And the fight against fraud and deception, and for adherence to basic principles of morality and ethics in the business arena, must, in my judgment, be waged incessantly with every means at our command.

Let me make clear, Mr. President, that I am not talking in terms of abstractions, in terms of hitherto undiscovered rackets whose full impact is yet to be felt by the American public. Year after year, through the vigorous efforts of State and local prosecutors, State blue-sky administrators and trade commissions, the U.S. Department of Justice, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, and the postal fraud sections of the Post Office Department, thousands of business frauds have been successfully proceeded against by criminal prosecution, civil injunction, and administrative cease and desist orders. These many cases of proven fraud and deception represent actual, not hypothetical, financial losses to the American consumer, and, let me add, to the legitimate American businessman. For it is the overwhelming majority of honest, fair-dealing enterprises that stand to lose most from the depredations of the parasitical minority. The money poured into shady promotions and confidence schemes is money which, if channeled into legitimate hands and sound investments, would generate benefits for both dealer and customer, and ultimately, for the American economy as a whole.

Here is the nub, Mr. President. We know in so many of these cases just who the unscrupulous really are. It is a matter of public record. Yet, because of the manner in which they conduct their businesses, with emphasis on hit-and-run and fly-by-night operations a dishonest or unqualified securities salesman, for example, put out of business in New York one day can show up the very next day in the District of Columbia, searching out new unsuspecting victims. In fact, this has happened. The District of Columbia, to this day, has never had a local blue-sky law requiring examination and licensing of securities broker-dealers.

I understand the District of Columbia Commissioners and the U.S. Attorney's Office here have submitted proposed local blue-sky laws to the Congress this session. But in the meantime, the District of Columbia is rapidly becoming a haven for all the quack securities pitchmen who have been chased out of other jurisdictions for unethical practices. This is a matter of grave concern, both for the victims who have been taken here, for the reputable brokerage houses and salesmen who carry on substantial business here, and for Federal and local law enforcement authorities. But even if a local blue-sky law is put into effect in the District of Columbia—and I shall surely give any such proposed legislation my most earnest consideration—still the hunt for white-collar swindlers must go on. It is to ease the road of pursuit that the bill I am introducing has for its purpose.

This bill, Mr. President, would provide for, in effect, a national clearinghouse of information on shady operations. It would authorize a central file on business frauds and unethical practices to be kept in the Department of Justice. The records to be kept are those which would reflect all injunctions, dissolutions, and other civil or administrative actions involving illegal business operations. Criminal records need not be covered, because these are already kept by the FBI, but criminal prosecutions represent only the part of the iceberg above water, and what is needed is a comparable compilation of noncriminal records in this particular area of illicit activity. The bill provides further that the records that are to be collected would be made available for the use of and exchange with any authorized officials of Federal, State, and local governments.

In short, Mr. President, this bill would aid law enforcement authorities around the country in the difficult task of keeping track of business outlaws and catching up with them before they, in turn, have a chance to catch up new victims in their unholy snare.

This is a moderate measure, in my judgment, Mr. President. It would not be costly. With the ultimate advent of automatic data processing of all governmental records, it would not be at all burdensome to keep the required records current. And most important, it would, to my mind, be most effective in combating the deadly sharks who ply the waters of trade and commerce, scavenging for bigger and better feasts, and breeding nothing but unmerited distrust for legitimate enterprise.

An identical bill is also being introduced today in the other body by Representative JOHN V. LINDSAY, of New York.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1447) to authorize the Attorney General to maintain records of fraudulent and other unethical business practices, introduced by Mr. KEATING, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Attorney General is authorized to provide, within the Department of Justice, for the acquisition, collection, classification, and preservation of records of injunctions, dissolutions, and other civil or administrative actions involving unethical or fraudulent business practices.

SEC. 2. Any records acquired, collected, classified, and preserved pursuant to the provisions of this Act may be made available by the Attorney General for exchange with, and for the official use of, any duly authorized official of the Federal Government, of States, cities, and other institutions.

ILGWU UNION HEALTH CENTER COMMEMORATIVE MEDAL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the first union health center in the United State by the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union.

A momentous step was taken by the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, almost totally composed of immigrants, 50 years ago with the founding of the first union health center in the United States. It was tiny in facilities; but gigantic in conception. It was the acorn of a completely new approach to medical care for thousands of workers that has inspired a vast growth among many other trade unions and socially minded organizations today.

Illness is a calamity to any person, wealthy or poor. But the burden of illness fell with devastating weight upon the worker's family 50 years ago. It went destitute and hungry if the pay envelope skipped even a few days. The breadwinner was always under pressure to strain at work until pain or morbidity became unbearable and to rush back to the job without vital convalescence because the wages were desperately needed for bread and rent.

This was doubly true for the garment workers. Contagion raged in the shops and inhuman sweatshop working conditions combined with slum living fattened a disability and death rate far above the average.

Under the leadership of their dynamic president, David Dubinsky, the original ILGWU center has grown to a coast-to-coast chain of 13 operated by the ILGWU and several hundred operated by other trade unions.

The 13 ILGWU health centers are now located in Allentown, Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Fall River, Kansas City, Los Angeles, Montreal, Newark, New York City, St. Louis, and Wilkes-Barre. In addition, health services are being given to ILGWU members through specially established centers and arrangements in the following cities: Baltimore, Dallas, Houston, Laredo, Minneapolis, San Antonio, and San Francisco.

There is no question that these centers and other health services keyed to a fixed location showed an admirable percentage of membership participation in areas where membership density was high. But there remained the nagging problem of health services in semirural communities, often 50 or more miles from the nearest center. The conception of having a clinic roll to the distant shops on rubber instead of having the workers travel to a fixed center was first tried in the Harrisburg ILGWU area in 1947. Pioneering found the right road and after years of planning and research, a fully equipped "health center on wheels," first in the history of the trade union movement, rolled in Shamokin, Pa., in 1954. There are now six in this fleet of mobile units operating in all parts of the mainland and in Puerto Rico. Created according to specifications, set up by ILGWU medical experts, these traveling units are remarkable examples of compressed design. Custom built on the chassis of transcontinental buses they are close to 35 feet long and carry all needed diagnostic equipment including X-ray.

The centers, and mobile units, all of which run powerful and consistent educational campaigns urging the membership to come in at regular intervals for checkups, are truly dedicated to the ideal of preventive medicine. The records show tens of thousands of cases of cancer, heart disease, diabetes, and other unsuspected ailments turning up under the scrutiny of diagnostic examinations conducted by general physicians and specialists. Early diagnosis leading to surgery when indicated and to proper regimen in the light of future disability, insures many cures. This devotion to preventive medicine postpones the worst effects of chronic ailments for years, aborts catastrophic illness and prolongs useful living free from invalidism.

These ILGWU centers and other health-care programs and services are effectively guarding the medical well-being of the membership in all the important garment markets of the country. They continue to win the admiration of the socially minded among the medical and social service professions everywhere and draw visitors from all the free countries of the world.

The two-room New York center of 1913 now occupies seven floors of a giant office building.

The original physician or two has grown to a coast-to-coast staff of some 500 physicians, 100 nurses, and 375 in laboratory and clerical personnel making a total of close to 1,000. Total capital expenditures and investment has crossed the $10 million mark. In a typical year the centers render about 1,600,000 services to about 135,000 individuals.

The ILGWU is proud that the concept of medical care involved in the pioneer health center a half century ago has been adopted by trade union and other institutions covering millions of people all over the country today. It is of special significance that the idea of the first union health center is credited with planting the seed for the whole conception of health, welfare, and retirement benefits won through free collective bargaining that have become so important an influence on the health and welfare of large sections of the population. The fringe benefit has become a way of life and of lifesaving.

It would be highly appropriate for the Congress to authorize the striking of a commemorative 50th anniversary medal in recognition of this historic step forward in responsible and enlightened trade unionism in this country.

A companion measure to this bill will be introduced in the House of Representatives by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, Mr. CELLER.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of this bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1449) to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the first union health center in the United States by the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in commemoration of the founding in 1914 by the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union of the first health center ever operated by a trade union in the United States thus creating a new conception of medical care for the worker which has been followed by many other unions and socially minded institutions, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to strike an appropriate silver medal with suitable emblems, devices and inscriptions to be determined by the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union and subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to coin and furnish to the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union not more than 2,000 copies in copper of such medal of such size or sizes as shall be determined by the Secretary in consultation with the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union. The medals shall be made and delivered at such times as may be required by the organization in quantities of not more than 2,000 but no medals shall be made after December 31, 1965. The medals shall be considered to be national medals within the meaning of section 3551 of the Revised Statutes.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause such medals to be struck and furnished at not less than the estimated cost of manufacture, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses; and security satisfactory to the Director of the Mint shall be furnished to indemnify the United States for the full payment of such cost. The medals authorized to be issued pursuant to this Act shall be of such size or sizes and of such metals as shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury in consultation with such association.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON CANCER

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference, a resolution calling upon the President of the United States to convene a White House Conference on Cancer.

Over the years, we have spent hundreds of millions of dollars in an attempt to eliminate this disease which strikes 1 out of every 4 Americans. The expenditures have been made willingly, but it is my belief that the time has come to call a conference of experts to determine where our future efforts could be directed most wisely. We need to formulate a master plan of resources and needs in order to speed a cure.

I spoke on this subject yesterday, and my views on the proportions of this problem and the need for the conference are set forth more fully on page 7593 of yesterday's RECORD.

I express the hope that other Senators will want to join with me in sponsoring this measure, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of the measure be printed in the RECORD following my remarks, and that the resolution lie on the table for 10 days to give an opportunity to other Senators who may wish to do so to cosponsor the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will be printed in the RECORD, and will lie on the desk as requested.

The resolution (S. Res. 133) was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

Whereas the dread disease of cancer is a problem of the greatest magnitude affecting the national health; and

Whereas if present trends continue, more than 40 million Americans living today will eventually die of cancer; and

Whereas the Federal Government is charged with doing all in its power to protect and preserve the health of the American people, and to cooperate with the States and private research institutes in this effort; and

Whereas, notwithstanding the gravity of this problem and the resources available to this great Nation, we have been unable to exert a maximum effort because of the shortage of adequately trained personnel, certain restrictions on the use of Federal money and other problems: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the United States Senate that—

(a) The President should call a White House Conference on Cancer, patterned after previous White House Conferences such as those on Children and Youth and on Narcotics Addiction. Such Conference shall be broadly representative of persons engaged in cancer research treatment and should include, but not be limited to—

(1) an appropriate number of the Members of the House of Representatives and Senate; and

(2) representatives of the departments and agencies of the Federal Government concerned with this problem; and

(3) representatives of the American medical profession; and

(4) an appropriate number of recent recipients of Federal grants for cancer research; and

(5) representatives of American universities and private research foundations; and

(6) representatives of the World Health Organization and cancer experts from foreign nations;

(b) Such White House Conference on Cancer should undertake to compile an inventory of all available resources for the purpose of combating cancer in terms of manpower, buildings, equipment, and private financial support, and to recommend—

(1) a plan to outline how Federal, State, and private financial resources can best be spent to insure cooperative efforts and maxi-

mum use of facilities available for such purpose;

(2) means of encouraging sufficient technicians, scientists and medical personnel to enter the field of cancer research;

(3) machinery for a continuing consultation between scientists in the United States and other nations, in order to obtain the maximum international cooperation, through utilization of existing United Nations facilities as well as facilitating and encouraging unilateral contact and consultation when the facts or situation so require, in carrying on research as to the causes and means of prevention and cure of cancer;

(4) such other action as will contribute to the elimination of this disease; and

(c) The White House Conference on Cancer should submit a report to the President and the Congress setting forth its recommendations with respect to this problem.

REMOVAL OF CERTAIN LIMITATIONS ON RETIREMENT OF ENLISTED MEN OF THE COAST GUARD—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name may be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1194) to remove the percentage limitations on retirement of enlisted men of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes, introduced by the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] on March 28 of this year.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DONATION OF SURPLUS FEDERAL PROPERTY TO STATE PARK AGENCIES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1238), for the donation of surplus Federal property to State park agencies.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR ATTORNEY GENERAL TO SUE IN CERTAIN CASES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 26, 1963, the names of Mr. Gruening, Mr. Long of Missouri, and Mr. Williams of New Jersey were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 1389) to authorize the Attorney General to sue for the protection of the constitutional right to the equal protection of the laws, introduced by Mr. Douglas (for himself and other Senators) on April 26, 1963.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATION BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nomination has been referred to and is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

William A. Meadows, Jr., of Florida, to be U.S. Attorney, Southern District of Florida, term of 4 years, vice Edward F. Boardman, transferred.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in this nomination to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Thursday, May 9, 1963, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nomination, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

NOTICE OF POSTPONEMENT OF HEARING ON S. 63, TO PROVIDE FOR REPRESENTATION OF INDIGENT DEFENDANTS AND S. 1057, TO PROMOTE THE CAUSE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE BY PROVIDING FOR THE REPRESENTATION OF DEFENDANTS WHO ARE FINANCIALLY UNABLE TO OBTAIN AN ADEQUATE DEFENSE IN CRIMINAL CASES IN THE COURTS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given that the public hearing scheduled for 10:30 a.m., Monday, May 6, 1963, in Room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on S. 63, a bill to provide for representation of indigent defendants, and S. 1057, a bill to promote the cause of criminal justice by providing for the representation of defendants who are financially unable to obtain an adequate defense in criminal cases in the courts of the United States, has been postponed until Monday, May 13, 1963.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Excerpts from address by him entitled "The Role of Cooperatives in U.S. Agriculture," before the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives, April 29, 1963.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5517) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. Thomas, Mr. Kirwan, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Bow, and Mr. Wilson of Indiana, were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

SELECTION OF J. WALTER KENNEDY TO BE PRESIDENT OF NATIONAL BASKETBALL ASSOCIATION

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, Mayor J. Walter Kennedy, of Stamford, Conn., has just been selected as president of the National Basketball Association.

Organized professional basketball has made the wisest possible choice.

Walter Kennedy is an old and close personal friend of many years. Last fall he ably served as my campaign manager. Walter is a man of outstanding ability and integrity. Basketball, which has enjoyed a phenomenal success, will continue its hold on all sports-loving Americans under the leadership of Mayor Kennedy.

Mr. Kennedy loves the sport of basketball. His wide and varied career includes not only that of mayor of the city of Stamford, Conn., but, in addition, he has been a sports coach, a sports writer, and a social worker.

Mr. Kennedy, a native of Stamford, is a graduate of Notre Dame. He has always been associated with civic causes looking toward a better community and better Nation. Stamford's loss of its great mayor will be a gain for the sport of basketball throughout our Nation. I join his many friends and admirers in wishing Walter a long, happy, and successful tenure as the president of the National Basketball Association.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record articles from today's Stamford Advocate, Washington Post, and the New York Times, setting forth the appointment.

There being no objection, the articles and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Stamford (Conn.) Advocate, May 2, 1963]

A JOB WELL DONE

Mayor J. Walter Kennedy has announced his resignation to assume the duties of National Basketball Association Commissioner. He can do so with the assurance that the city of Stamford is a better place as a result of his administration. The trust the people showed in him by giving him the greatest plurality in history, and by reelecting him, despite a party split, has been repaid.

It is not an easy task to run a municipality the size of Stamford. It is not large enough for the mayor to be a mere policy-forming official. It is too large for him to do everything himself. This means that a mayor has to have a good administration and the vision to make long-reaching policy.

Mayor Kennedy's administration was marked by two outstanding projects. He put the needed pressure behind the urban redevelopment project, which, we are sure, will be brought to a successful culmination. He planned and began the critically needed sewer project for the Glenbrook-Springdale area. Both projects are costly but necessary.

Mayor Kennedy is fulfilling a long-held dream returning to the sports world as "czar" of basketball. The position is one which, in justice to himself and his family, he could not turn down. His acceptance does not in any way embarrass the city. He will not take up new duties until a legally constituted administration is ready to take office.

Mayor Kennedy will be missed. His administration has been marked by its accessibility. He was always available to newspapermen and citizens. He carries with him the best wishes of Stamford in his new position.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 2, 1963]

J. WALTER KENNEDY, MAYOR OF STAMFORD, NEW NBA PRESIDENT

New York, May 1.—J. Walter Kennedy, 49-year-old mayor of Stamford, Conn., abandoned a political career today to accept the presidency of the National Basketball Association at an estimated $35,000-a-year salary. His salary as mayor was $12,500.

Kennedy, former social worker, sports publicist for the league he now heads and coach, succeeds 73-year-old Maurice Podoloff, who has presided over the ofttimes hectic growth of the NBA since its inception in 1946.

Kennedy was elected by a unanimous vote of the usually argumentative owners.

Podoloff will retire with what he described as "a comfortable pension." After September 1, he will serve as honorary chairman of the board of governors (the club owners), although he admitted he was vague as to what his duties might be in that capacity.

Kennedy said his contract as president extended beyond 1 year, although he said he was "not at liberty" to say for exactly how long.

Kennedy, who was elected mayor of Stamford in 1959 and 1961 by unprecedented 2-to-1 majorities, said he no longer wished to pursue a political career.

"I have every expectation of being NBA commissioner for life," he said at a news conference.

Kennedy, born in Stamford, was graduated from Notre Dame in 1934 and later took graduate study at Notre Dame, Yale, and New York University.

He was a social worker in juvenile delinquency and later became athletic director and basketball coach at St. Basil's Preparatory School in Stamford.

He later worked as publicity director for Notre Dame, was the first publicist for the pro basketball league when it was founded as the Basketball Association of America in 1946 and for nearly 10 years worked in that capacity for the Harlem Globetrotters.

Kennedy also has been engaged in his own public relations and business management firm, was associated with the late Ted Husing in broadcasting, has authored sports articles for magazines and has been active in Little League baseball.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, May 2, 1963]

POLITICAL EXPERIENCE EXPECTED TO HELP NEW BASKETBALL CHIEF

(By Robert M. Lipsyte)

For James Walter Kennedy, election yesterday as the president of the National Basketball Association was the culmination of a lifetime of vicarious participation in sports.

"The job epitomizes everything I've been, or done, or wanted to do," he said. "To a kid who used to dream of being a great athlete, knowing he could never even be a good one, the opportunity to be one of the three top professional sports administrators * * *."

The other two top positions are commissioner of baseball and president of the National Football League. It was Judge Kenesaw Mountain Landis, one of baseball's strongest leaders, who made the strongest impression on young Walter Kennedy.

Kennedy recalls with a wry smile that he wrote an essay as a sixth grader outlining his two life ambitions: One was to become mayor of Stamford, his hometown; the other was to be commissioner of baseball.

FATHER PHYSICALLY ACTIVE

Kennedy was born on June 8, 1913, of a family indigenous to the Connecticut city for several generations. His father, a salesman for the City Steam Laundry, was a physically active man. He was rather disappointed when a childhood attack of polio held back his son's athletic development.

An operation on a foot in adolescence helped young Walter greatly, but by this time he was too far behind for varsity-level competition.

Kennedy took another route toward sports participation. While in high school he became official scorer for the Stamford pros, a touring basketball team, at $1 a game; managed his high school basketball team, and starred with the debating society and as a student. At Notre Dame, from which he was graduated in 1934, he spent 4 years working in the sports publicity office.

He returned to Stamford the following year, working with juvenile delinquents for the department of welfare and Catholic charities, and becoming the winning coach of the St. Basil's Prep basketball team. He returned to Notre Dame in 1943 as director of sports publicity.

From 1946 until 1959, he ran his own public relations company; traveled around the world as press agent for the Harlem Globetrotters basketball team; broadcast college and professional football games with Ted Husing; was the first public relations director for the National Basketball Association, and served on Stamford's Park Commission, Board of Recreation and Board of Education.

Four years ago he achieved his first goal when he won the mayoralty of Stamford, as a Democrat, by the city's largest plurality. Last year, in his second term of office, he successfully managed the senatorial campaign of ABRAHAM RIBICOFF.

Although he sleeps only 6 hours a night, Kennedy has little spare time for hobbies or diversions. His chief recreation includes an undemanding best seller before lights out; "The Untouchables" on television or a basketball, baseball or football game. He still lives somewhat vicariously, exulting in the athletic activities of his two sons—21-year-old David, a senior at Notre Dame and a varsity trackman, and 20-year-old Robert, a junior at La Salle and a letter man in soccer and baseball.

Kennedy, 5 feet 7 inches tall, 170 pounds with dark brown hair, lives in a four-level, eight-room house in Stamford with his wife and 16-year-old daughter Kathleen. He drives a Dodge convertible and wears buttondown shirts.

AGGRAVATION DAY

The originator of Stamford's Aggravation Day—in which citizens may walk into the mayor's office once a week and talk—Kennedy feels that he will be sensitive to the public pulse. As basketball leader, he expects to sit in the stands, incognito, and listen to people.

Although his second goal probably will never come true, he feels that the basketball job is a worthy substitute. He hopes to bring his sports background and political experience to the job as well as a credo that even Judge Landis could approve of:

"No commissioner can compromise with anyone—owners, players, fans—if it involves the integrity of the organization."

SOVIET UNION PURCHASES OF CUBAN SUGAR

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, today there was published in the San Antonio Light an article, written by David Sentner, of the Hearst Syndicate, which I should like to read into the RECORD, because I think it indicative of the type of economic warfare being waged by the Soviet Union, and I believe it also gives the lie to the assertion that the colonization of Cuba is costing the Soviet Union a great deal of money.

The article reads as follows:

SOVIET UNION PURCHASES OF CUBAN SUGAR

(By David Sentner)

WASHINGTON, May 1.—The Soviet Union in buying up most of Castro's sugar crop is not only "rooking" the Cuban people but also making a huge profit at the expense of the Russian consumer.

This gouging of the sugar buyer at home and in exports to its Communist satellites permits the Kremlin to virtually finance the Soviet colonialization of Cuba.

The exploitation of the Soviet housewife by selling the cheaply bought Cuban sugar at from 10 to 50 percent more than it costs, further pays the bill for shipment of arms to the Arab world and pays much of the freight for the Soviet economic war against the West.

A Hearst Headline Service survey, including interviews with experts in the State, Agriculture, and Commerce Departments and the U.S. Sugar Beet Association, today revealed the following:

The Soviet Union contracts with Castro to buy most of its sugar crop at 4 cents a pound.

The Soviets are selling the Cuban sugar to their own people at from 47 cents to $1.12 a pound according to whether you figure it at the rate of exchange based on a domestic or tourist ruble.

This tremendous "take" is obviously more than any democratic government of the West would permit private enterprise to register in the till.

Apparently afraid of the effect of such a similar gouging of the population in Communist satellites where discontent simmers, Moscow is only exporting Cuban sugar at the world price—8 cents a pound—which is still twice the price they are paying Castro.

At 4 cents a pound, a metric ton of sugar is worth $88; a thousand tons, $88,184; a million tons, $88,184,000.

Red Cuba exports in 1962 totaled 3,689,000 metric tons to Communist countries—2,112,000 tons to Russia and 938,000 tons to Red China.

The production of sugar in Cuba this year is estimated to reach 3 to 4 million metric tons, a serious falling off of its production which reached 6 million tons in 1961.

The deterioration in this mainstay crop in Cuba is attributed to these factors:

Castro has drafted most of the skilled sugarcane cutters for his revolutionary militia, replacing them with inefficient clerks and taxicab drivers.

He has cut the wages of sugar workers in order to meet the low cost of production represented by the 4 cents a pound price the Soviets have set for their sugar purchases.

Castro takes a cut of 15 percent from the sugarcane workers for the purchase of Government bonds, further slowing up voluntary labor in the sugar fields.

The 4 cents a pound price proclaimed by the Soviets is additionally watered in value by the fact that the Russians only pay 20 percent in cash. The remaining payment is under a barter agreement which is applied to the Soviet shipment of tractors, factories, other products and particularly military hardware.

With the Soviets setting their own evaluation of guns and planes and ships and radar, not to mention missiles, the Cuban people as well as Comrade Castro are being gypped. The Soviets through the sugar crop deal are not only covering all expenses in Cuba (despite the insistence in some official circles that the Kremlin is under a financial strain in occupying Cuba) but they have made a labor sweatshop out of the Cuban sugar fields.

Current figures from the International Sugar Council show—

The consumption of sugar in the U.S.S.R. has grown from 5,837,300 metric tons in 1959 to more than 8 million in 1963.

Soviet sugar production has only attained 6,522,000 metric tons, making it necessary for more than 2,551,554 metric tons to be imported.

Despite this discrepancy between production and consumption figures, the Soviet Union has for the last calendar year exported 894,569 metric tons of sugar to Communist, neutralist and "sensitive" countries.

This political use of Cuba's sugar results in sweet toothlessness for millions of Russians in the homeland.

Mr. President, in connection with the article by Mr. Sentner, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record certain data and figures relating to the production, imports, exports, consumption and stocks, 1959 to December 1962, for both the Soviet Union and Cuba.

There being no objection, the data were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the International Sugar Council Statistical Bulletin, March 1963]

Table 90.—*U.S.S.R.*

A. PRODUCTION, IMPORTS, EXPORTS, CONSUMPTION, AND STOCKS, 1959 TO DECEMBER 1962

[Metric tons, raw value]

Calendar year	Production	Imports	Exports	Net imports	Consumption	Stocks at end of period
1959	6,514,000	334,789	214,347	120,442	5,837,300	2,516,200
1960	5,721,000	1,717,244	261,805	1,455,439	[1] 6,700,000	2,445,750
1961	6,630,000	3,596,890	[2] 950,702	2,646,188	[1] 8,000,000	2,808,800
1962	6,522,000	2,446,123	894,569	2,551,554		
1962—January		181,575	41,099	140,476		
February		250,549	42,243	208,306		
March		307,753	28,949	278,804		
April		486,631	75,355	411,276		
May		215,801	108,547	107,254		
June		269,468	80,317	189,151		
1962—July		275,108	54,187	220,921		
August		150,145	36,429	113,716		
September		105,053	64,566	40,487		
October		23,038	75,997	0		
November		48,852	102,538	0		
December		132,150	184,342	0		

[1] Estimates (including changes in stocks held by retail trade).

[2] Includes loan of 501,000 tons to China (mainland).

B. EXPORTS BY COUNTRIES OF DESTINATION, 1959–62

[Metric tons, raw value]

Countries of destination	Calendar years			
	1959	1960	1961	1962
Afghanistan	27,819	33,113	42,724	37,347
Albania	1,641	1,089	1,040	0
Belgium	0	0	0	24,636
Bulgaria	0	0	0	12,381
Burma	0	0	5,734	0
Cambodia	0	1,862	4,333	8,716
Ceylon	0	0	10,530	33,647
China (mainland)	4,243	0	501,000	0
Cyprus	0	0	5,448	1,955
Denmark	0	0	0	11,875
Ethiopia	543	0	1,304	1,740
Finland	108,723	107,614	107,025	134,963
Germany:				
East	0	0	0	141,814
West	0	0	0	23,660
Ghana	0	4,846	1,388	5,102
Greece	0	0	0	7,833
Guinea	2,185	7,446	5,406	18,080
Iran	41,367	52,440	101,909	135,033
Iraq	5,346	11,860	61,065	89,628
Lebanon	0	0	0	6,073
Libya	0	0	0	14,863
Malaya, Federation of	0	0	1,576	14,930
Mali Republic	0	0	6,742	21,236
Malta	0	0	569	5,468
Mongolia	2,615	1,606	2,996	4,662
Morocco	0	0	0	10,822
Pakistan	0	0	0	5,483
Saudi Arabia	0	0	8,899	7,602
Singapore	0	0	11,639	9,781
Somaliland	0	0	0	9,348
Sudan	8,153	28,877	52,690	23,262
Sweden	0	0	0	28,574
Togo	0	0	0	1,729
United Kingdom	0	0	1,197	18,623
Vietnam, North	3,266	0	0	0
Yemen	8,446	11,052	13,291	13,352
Zanzibar	0	0	1,598	1,104
Other countries	0	0	607	9,247
Total	214,347	261,805	950,702	894,569

C. IMPORTS BY COUNTRIES OF ORIGIN, 1959–62

[Metric tons, raw value]

Countries of origin	Calendar year			
	1959	1960	1961	1962
Cuba	132,528	1,467,792	3,345,000	2,231,987
Czechoslovakia	124,941	128,441	129,707	45,060
Hungary	0	10,765	758	1,122
Poland	77,320	110,246	121,425	167,954
Total	334,789	1,717,244	3,596,890	2,446,123

[From the Lamborn Sugar-Market Report, Apr. 23, 1963]

Cuba—Sugar data

PRODUCTION, CONSUMPTION, EXPORTS, AND STOCKS, CALENDAR YEARS 1956–63

[In thousands of metric tons, raw value]

	1963	1962	1961	1960	1959	1958	1957	1956
Stock on hand Jan. 1	312	1,084	1,081	1,222	547	699	637	1,620
Production during year	(1)	4,815	6,767	5,862	5,964	5,781	5,672	4,740
Available during year		5,899	7,848	7,084	6,511	6,480	6,309	6,360
Deduct—								
Local consumption		456	350	308	295	234	293	288
Utilized for sirup		(2)	(2)	42	42	42	42	42
Exports to United States		0	0	1,958	2,908	3,223	2,743	2,774
Exports to world market		5,131	6,414	3,695	2,044	2,434	2,532	2,619
Total deductions		5,587	6,764	6,003	5,289	5,933	5,610	5,723
Stock on hand Dec. 31		312	1,084	1,081	1,222	547	699	637

[1] Estimated 3,500,000 to 4,000,000 metric tons.

[2] Included in local consumption.

Cuba—Sugar data—Continued

EXPORTS BY SELECTED GROUPS

[In thousands of metric tons, raw value]

	1962	1961	1960	1959	1958	1957	1956
Communist sphere:							
Albania	11	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bulgaria	118	57	0	0	0	0	0
China (mainland)	938	1,032	476	0	50	0	0
Czechoslovakia	156	25	9	0	0	0	5
Germany, East	179	41	62	0	0	7	23
Hungary	0	0	0	0	11	0	20
Korea, North	14	0	0	0	0	0	0
Poland	151	262	144	0	0	0	0
Russia	2,112	3,303	1,578	274	188	359	212
Vietnam, North	10	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total, Communist sphere	3,689	4,720	2,269	274	249	366	260
Americas [3]	103	190	98	200	277	188	277
Europe	366	440	639	857	1,019	1,208	1,049
Africa	460	340	298	203	162	200	162
Asia and Oceania	513	724	391	510	727	570	871
United States	0	0	1,958	2,908	3,223	2,743	2,774
Total, non-Communist	1,442	1,694	3,384	4,678	5,408	4,909	5,133
Grand total	5,131	6,414	5,653	4,952	5,657	5,275	5,393

[3] Other than United States.

PRODUCTION BY HALF-MONTH PERIODS

[In metric tons, raw value]

Period	1963	1962	1961	1960	1959	1958	1957	1956
Start of crop to Jan. 31	216,487	360,640	763,038	473,704	189,983	485,192	374,212	169,141
Feb. 1-15	436,599	242,143	845,211	808,773	455,598	751,539	644,667	546,602
Feb. 16-28	525,408	670,201	815,806	868,138	675,645	840,611	734,869	781,521
Mar. 1-15	504,737	712,714	962,011	989,198	919,473	989,798	908,525	912,916
Mar. 16-31	604,544	732,391	928,774	1,027,240	860,747	1,007,547	1,024,427	911,975
Apr. 1-15	[4] 432,471	768,895	653,255	845,426	948,163	599,734	880,137	720,915
Production to Apr. 15	[4] 2,720,246	3,486,984	4,968,095	5,012,479	4,049,609	4,674,421	4,566,837	4,043,070
Apr. 16-30	----------	561,185	689,071	424,505	870,539	643,515	534,120	471,055
May 1-15	----------	392,132	423,058	286,937	551,121	345,361	338,882	125,625
May 16-31	----------	302,783	421,385	90,940	279,597	93,133	123,386	63,005
June 1 to end of crop	----------	72,139	265,771	46,932	213,240	24,712	108,683	37,653
Total production	----------	4,815,223	6,767,380	5,861,793	5,964,106	5,781,142	5,671,908	4,740,408
Date crop commenced	1-10-63	1-4-62	12-9-60	1-6-60	1-9-59	12-7-57	12-19-56	1-6-56
Date crop finished	----------	6-29-62	8-1-61	8-29-60	7-25-59	7-6-58	8-10-57	6-25-56

[4] Production to Apr. 17.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, it would appear that the Soviet Union is successfully and cleverly waging economic warfare against the free world. I recall that in the 18th century we were victims of British mercantilism. We are now seeing a revival of the old British mercantilism of the 18th century in the form of Soviet mercantilism. The Soviet Union provides the hub or center of the colonial empire. The Soviet Union provides the manufactured products and finished goods for the colonial possessions; and the colonial possessions, in turn, provide the Soviet Union with raw materials both for home consumption and for trade with the rest of the world.

They also afford the Soviet Union markets for their goods. It is a very clever way in which to wage economic warfare. It would appear that the Soviet Union has made the full turn from Marxism to Adam Smith. It would appear that they are adopting some trappings of the capitalistic system in an effort to wage economic warfare against the free world. It is what we might call laissez-faire communism.

I hope that there will be an end to useless and nonsensical talk about the vast cost to the Soviet Union of colonizing the rest of the world. They are actually making a profit from colonialism. We must take measures to combat the economic warfare of the Soviet Union. We must realize that colonialism for the Soviet Union is a profitable operation. Let us abandon the myth of the cost of Soviet occupation of Cuba.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TOWER. We must abandon this foolish myth that the sovietization of Cuba is costing the Soviet Government. The Soviets are actually making a profit. They are buying sugar at below the world market price, selling it at the world market price, and making a substantial profit. They are cheating both the Cuban people and the people of their own homeland.

POLISH 3D OF MAY CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, throughout the world today, Poles and citizens of Polish descent will celebrate the Polish 3d of May Constitution Day, a Polish national holiday. From coast to coast, in cities and towns, such as those in North Dakota, Americans of Polish descent are gathering together to pay tribute to the Polish people and to remind Americans that Poland was one of the first pioneers of liberalism in Europe.

In my State of North Dakota, we have a large group of citizens of Polish descent. These citizens are among the finest in our State and among them are outstanding leaders in community and State government. They are extremely industrious and patriotic. We are proud of them and their achievements.

This year's celebration will mark the 172d anniversary of the 1791 Polish Constitution, which eliminated the most fundamental weakness of the Polish parliamentary and social system. This Constitution with its principles rooted in the Polish love and attachment to freedom and independence, incorporates enduring precepts of public policy and democracy.

This year also marks the 100th anniversary of the Polish uprising of 1863. There have been several Polish uprisings against Russian rule, beginning with the Kosciuszko uprising of 1794, but the one on January 22, 1863, was one of the greatest, longest, and bloodiest in Polish history. This movement spread, and there were instantaneous uprisings in all Polish communities under Russian rule. The Russians brought into Poland 35,000 seasoned troops and the uprisings were halted in April 1865. Over 20,000 Poles were killed in battle, thousands captured, 600 leaders were executed, the rest were sent to Siberia. In paying tribute to these Polish defenders for freedom, we also recognize those who have fought for Poland over the past 1,000 years.

I am proud to join with the Polish-American Congress representing 7 million Americans of Polish ancestry in expressing hope for the ultimate triumph of justice and for a return to the life of freedom for the Polish people.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a very significant holiday is being observed on May 3 by the Polish people, both those residing in the free world and those still in their native land behind the Iron Curtain. On May 3, 1791, a constitution was adopted by the Polish nation; and it established in that country, for the first time, the principle of the responsibility of the ruler to the representatives of the people. That great document established a rough form of egalitarianism, assured the peasants of the protection of their governmental rights, abolished class distinctions, and provided for religious freedom.

Certainly the ideals embodied in the Polish Constitution are ideals which we Americans cherish deeply. We sympathize today with these people, who presently are forced to tolerate the domination of alien forces, and are unable to enjoy the freedom in which they so strongly believe.

Here in the United States we are privileged to have many fine citizens of Polish origin who have contributed much from the rich heritage of the Polish culture to our American civilization. I have had the honor of knowing and working with many of these fine Polish-Americans in Massachusetts, and have seen in them the admirable qualities which were characteristic of their nation's great personalities, including Chopin, Kosciusko, and Pulaski.

The times in which we live are indeed troubled ones for the people of Poland. While those who remain in that country must celebrate in silence this great day in their history, we want them to know that the free world has not forgotten their true hopes and aspirations, and is aware of their determination to achieve once again the freedom which has meant so much to them.

I think it is fitting that all Americans should pay tribute to the Polish people on their Constitution Day, to let them know that as a freedom-loving people we hope the time will soon come when the Polish nation can reestablish a government consistent with the goals and ideals which characterized their 1791 Constitution.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask your leave to read a quote:

> All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the presentation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

This is a perfect description of the very reason we sit here today. It could be from our empowering constitution. Indeed, it is from a constitution. But the country that adopted it today is barred from implementing it.

The quote is from the constitution adopted on May 3, 1791, by Poland. This is the 172d anniversary year of that constitution. Tomorrow, May 3, Poles everywhere and citizens of Polish origin in many countries celebrate as a national holiday—the Polish 3d of May Constitution Day.

The Polish Constitution was adopted 2 years after our own, but obviously both were inspired by the same desire for freedom and individual rights.

Today, we sit as individuals, representing the will of the people as the U.S. Constitution decrees. But the Polish are not so fortunate. Yet we know that, no matter how many times she has been trampled on, Poland has held true to these ideals that inspired the May 3d Constitution.

Let us today, enjoying the life they desire, pause to reaffirm our faith that Poland, too, will one day have again the freedom she holds so dear.

PRESIDENT'S TAX PROPOSALS: PROGRAM FOR THE AGED

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a part of President Kennedy's tax program provides for significant help to people over 65 in all income groups, with the greatest benefit going to those with lower incomes. For example, the special credit for the aged would give 97 percent of its benefits to elderly taxpayers with incomes below $10,000 and 50 percent to those with incomes below $5,000. Although the overall effect of the tax program on people over 65 would give most of the $790 million in benefits to those earning less than $10,000, tax reduction would also be extended up through the $50,000-plus bracket.

These proposals deserve careful study, and I ask unanimous consent that a Treasury Department fact sheet dated February 15, 1963, on the tax program for the aged be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I further ask unanimous consent that two tables which are a part of this fact sheet entitled "Illustrative examples to show the effect of present law and the President's recommendations on taxpayers 65 and over with various sources of income" and "Effect of the Tax Program on Tax Liabilities of Individuals Aged 65 and Over" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the fact sheet and tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TAX PROGRAM FOR THE AGED

President Kennedy's tax program would reduce the total taxes of persons 65 and over by $790 million a year. This includes $320 million from special provisions applying only to the aged, together with an additional $470 million which will result from the other provisions of the overall program of rate reduction and reform.

Under the proposed tax changes for the aged—

All of the 11 million older people who do not now have to file a tax return because their income is low would remain exempt from filing.

Nearly all the 3½ million who file returns, but pay no tax, would still pay no tax.

The taxes of virtually all the 3.4 million older people now paying taxes would be reduced by the specific proposal affecting the aged. The few exceptions are nearly all people with high incomes. Almost all of these will, of course, benefit from the overall program because of the general reduction in tax rates.

Social security and railroad retirement benefits and those other pensions which are now excluded from taxable income would continue to be exempt from tax.

All income would be taxed more equitably than under present law, including the earnings of those who continue to work, who are now taxed more heavily than those who live on income from other sources.

Older people with incomes below $10,000 a year would typically get proportionately greater reductions in their income taxes than would people with yearly incomes above $10,000.

Filing an income tax return would be simplified for many people 65 and older.

If you are 65 or older, this is how the proposed provisions would specifically affect you:

1. You would figure your tax just as though you were under 65, but—

2. As a single person, you would receive a $300 credit which you would subtract from any tax you might otherwise owe. The credit would be $600 if you are married and your wife is at least 65. The benefit of a credit against taxes is far greater than that of a deduction of the same amount against income for all taxpayers.

For example: If, after figuring your income and deductions, you find you owe a tax of $400, you would subtract the $300 tax credit for the aged and actually pay only $100 in taxes.

3. If you receive social security or railroad retirement benefits, or other tax-exempt pensions, your new $300 tax credit would be reduced somewhat—the amount depending on how much you receive in benefits and your income tax rate. Both social security and railroad retirement, of course, remain tax free under the proposed tax program.

For example: Suppose your social security benefits are $1,000 and your other income for the year is taxable at the rate of 14 percent. You would figure the reduction by multiplying one-half of your $1,000 in benefits by 14 percent. That is $70 and thus, your $300 tax credit would be reduced to $230. Under present law, you must subtract all social security benefits in figuring your retirement income credit.

4. The retirement income credit, which fewer than 1 out of 20 older people now use (1 out of 10 who file returns), and the special $600 extra exemption for the elderly would be eliminated. But in virtually every case, the tax savings from the $300 credit plus the rate reductions would more than make up for the elimination of these special provisions.

For example: Since relatively few older people use the retirement income credit, most older people would get a tax saving from the proposed $300 credit that far exceeds the tax saving from the present $600 extra exemption. The $300 credit reduces taxes for a married couple in the bottom bracket more than a $2,000 exemption would. Unless the taxpayer is in the 50-percent bracket or above, the $300 credit reduces his taxes more than the $600 extra exemption.

Most of those who might be adversely affected by the specific aged proposals have incomes in excess of $20,000—but they will also receive a net reduction in taxes because of the tax rate cuts which have also been proposed by the President.

The proposed changes in tax treatment of the aged will bring several decided advantages to the elderly.

TAX SAVINGS WOULD GO TO THOSE WHO NEED IT MOST

Of the $320 million in tax reductions which the specific proposals for the elderly would bring, one-half would go to those with incomes of $5,000 or less and 97 percent to those with yearly incomes of $10,000 or less.

In no circumstance would a single person 65 or over with an income of $2,900 or less have to pay tax—whereas at present an aged taxpayer can be taxed on income in excess of $1,333. For a married couple filing a joint return, when both are over 65, there would be no tax whatever on any income up to $5,778, whereas they may now be taxed on less than half that amount—any income over $2,667.

FAIRER TAX TREATMENT

Those people over 65 with incomes high enough to be subject to tax would have all their income, regardless of source—from wages, private pensions, dividends—taxed more equitably than under the present law.

For instance, older people with income from employment and self-employment, who make up 75 percent of those over 65 who actually pay Federal income taxes, will receive significant benefits from the proposed provisions.

Under the present law, older people with relatively modest amounts of earned income often pay taxes at a relatively high tax rate.

A wage earner over the age of 65, of course, pays taxes on what he earns. But under the complicated retirement income credit, which the new proposal would do away with, a taxpayer has the maximum allowable base for the credit reduced dollar for dollar by earnings in excess of $1,700, thus wiping out the credit entirely when earnings exceed $2,974. In effect, then, he pays double the normal tax rate on part of his earnings. Under the new proposal, this would be impossible, and he would be taxed only at the marginal rate, if at all.

Under the proposals for the aged, as submitted to the Congress, a few taxpayers over 65 with incomes below $10,000 would actually pay a few dollars more in taxes, even after taking the rate reductions into account. This group, however, estimated to involve fewer than 6,000 single people and 2,000 couples, would constitute less than one-seventeenth of 1 percent of all people over 65, and the maximum tax increase any of them could have would be $22 for a single person and $44 for a married couple. As Secretary Dillon pointed out in his testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee, the adverse effect of the program on these few taxpayers could be eliminated by raising the credit to $325, or possibly through some other special provision.

Also, under the present law the tax liability for older people may vary considerably, depending on the source of their income. Consider a couple over 65, for example, with a $5,000 income, electing to use the standard deduction. If their $5,000 income is entirely from earnings from work, the tax is $420 under present law. If the $5,000 is from $1,800 in social security, $1,200 from earnings, and $2,000 from a private pension, the tax is $31. Under the new proposal, if this couple has $5,000 a year in earnings from work, they would pay no tax. If the $5,000 is from $1,800 in social security, $1,200 from earnings, and $2,000 from a private pension, they would pay no tax. Similarly, if this couple's $5,000 were to come entirely from private or public pensions, dividends, or any other source whatsoever, whether they itemized deductions or took the standard deduction, they would, under the new proposal, pay no tax at all. Under current law, a number of such couples might be subject to varying amounts of tax.

The proposed changes will clearly foster greater equality in the tax treatment of the elderly—complete equality in many cases.

OTHER CHANGES AFFECTING THE AGED

Although they are not part of the special tax revisions for the aged, there are several proposals in the overall tax program which also have special meaning to older people. They are:

Medical deductions: Under present law, people 65 or older may deduct the total amount of their medical expenses up to a maximum of $5,000 for a single person and up to $10,000 for a couple, unless there are disabilities or dependents, in which case the ceilings are higher. The proposed revisions would completely remove all such ceilings.

Also, under the present law, older people can deduct the cost of only that portion of their drugs which exceeds 1 percent of their incomes. Under the proposed changes, this limit is dropped, and the total cost of all prescription drugs would qualify as deductible.

Dividend income: Many older people receive a significant portion of their income in the form of dividends, and these people will also benefit under the proposed tax program. The proposed repeal of the dividend credit and exclusion taken alone would increase the taxes of such older people, but this effect will be more than offset by the increase in corporate dividends which will result from the five-point reduction in the corporate tax rate. Thus people 65 or over—who receive 45 percent of the dividend income reported on tax returns, although they file less than 9 percent of all returns—will be among the principal beneficiaries of the increased dividend income resulting from the overall effects of the tax program.

Retirement income credit under age 65: There are now some 100,000 people retired under age 65 who are using the retirement income credit because they are getting retirement pay from publicly financed retirement programs other than social security and railroad retirement. Retired schoolteachers, policemen, and other Government employees fit this category.

To avoid hurting these people who are presently obtaining the retirement income credit and who would not be able to take advantage of the proposed $300 tax credit until they reach 65, it is proposed that they be allowed to continue to use the retirement income credit until they reach 65.

People who have retired between the ages of 62 and 65 and who are receiving social security and railroad retirement benefits would not be affected by the proposed revisions. Their benefits would continue to be tax exempt, but they would be taxed on any other income in the same fashion as all other people under 65 and would, of course, benefit from proposed tax rate reductions.

SUMMARY

President Kennedy's entire tax program will be of significant help to people over 65 in all income groups, with the greatest benefit going to those with lower incomes. The special credit for the aged would give 97 percent of its benefits to elderly taxpayers with incomes below $10,000 and 50 percent to those with incomes below $5,000. And while the final overall effect of the tax program on people over 65 would give the bulk of the $790 million in benefits to those earning less than $10,000, tax reduction would also be extended up through the $50,000-plus bracket.

TABLE 1.—*Illustrative examples to show the effect of present law and the President's recommendations on taxpayers 65 and over with various sources of income—Married couple, both over 65, total income of $5,000*

	Wage earner	Social security beneficiary	Dividend recipient
Wages	$5,000	$1,200	
Dividends			$5,000
Social security benefits		1,800	
Other income (interest, rents, or pensions after return of capital)		2,000	
PRESENT LAW			
Exclusion of social security benefits		1,800	
Dividend exclusion			100
Adjusted gross income	5,000	3,200	4,900
Exemptions	2,400	2,400	2,400
Standard deduction	500	320	490
Taxable income	2,100	480	2,010
Tax liability before credits	420	96	402
Retirement income credit		65	305
Dividends received credit			80
Tax liability after credits [1]	420	31	17
PROPOSED LAW			
Exclusion of social security benefits		1,800	
Adjusted gross income	5,000	3,200	5,000
Exemptions	1,200	1,200	1,200
Standard deduction	500	[2] 400	500
Taxable income	3,300	1,600	3,300
Tax liability before credits	488	224	488
$300 tax credit for both spouses	600	[3] 474	600
Tax liability after credits [1]	0	0	0

[1] The credits may not exceed tax liability.

[2] The minimum standard deduction for a married couple would be $400.

[3] The $600 credit is reduced by one-half the social security benefits received, $900, multiplied by the taxpayer's bracket rate of tax, 14 percent, a reduction of $126.

Source: Office of the Secretary of the Treasury, Office of Tax Analysis.

TABLE 2.—*Effect of the tax program on tax liabilities of individuals aged 65 and over*

Adjusted gross income class	Tax liability present law [1]	Change in tax liability tax program	Number of taxable returns, present law	Percentage reduction in tax liability of class
	Millions	*Millions*	*Thousands*	
0 to $3,000	$40	−$40	460	100
$3,000 to $5,000	200	−160	750	80
$5,000 to $10,000	730	−270	980	37
$10,000 to $20,000	830	−140	410	17
$20,000 to $50,000	990	−90	150	9
$50,000 and over	1,240	−100	40	8
Total	4,030	−790	2,790	20

[1] Excludes alternative tax on capital gains.

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and do not necessarily add to the totals.
Source: Office of the Secretary of the Treasury, Office of Tax Analysis.

WATER PROBLEMS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, a few days ago an editorial entitled "Getting Enough Water," was published in the New York Times. The editorial discusses a problem which is becoming greater in many parts of the country.

About the same time an article entitled "Long-Range Look Taken at Valley's Water Supplies," was published in the Florence (Ala.) Times. It describes what has been done in the TVA area toward the conservation of water resources. The editorial and the article taken together are quite thought-provoking. I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 25, 1963]

GETTING ENOUGH WATER

By coincidence a special report by the Tennessee Valley Authority is published almost simultaneously with adoption by the U.S. Senate of a research bill aimed at the problem of assuring the country an adequate supply of usable water. TVA has achieved precisely this result for the 41,000 square miles in the Tennessee River drainage basin, and its present report is a dramatic account of what can be accomplished through a unified approach to water management.

Streamflow regulation has created more than 600,000 acres of water surface in the Tennessee Valley. Floods have been prevented. Vast new sources of hydroelectric power have been created. Irrigation projects have flourished. Recreation facilities have been developed, and business in the great valley has prospered.

It is now 30 years since Congress created TVA, and over the years, whether under a Democratic or a Republican administration in Washington, the prestige of this pioneer agency has mounted. To be sure, it is still the target of criticism directed against it by many privately owned electric power interests; these interests contend that, even though TVA makes payment to States and counties in lieu of taxes, it is so set up as to provide an unfair yardstick of production and service costs, in comparison with the record of the private power companies.

Nevertheless, despite such criticism, the opinion has certainly gained ground that some water-control and power-production projects are too large and too complex to be undertaken by private capital, that the TVA nexus is one of these, and that in the case Federal initiative, backed by vigorous local cooperation, has built an enduring success.

Here, certainly, is relevant material for any congressional investigation of the problem of developing an adequate supply of water for the years that lie ahead.

[From the Florence (Ala.) Times, Apr. 21, 1963]

LONG-RANGE LOOK TAKEN AT VALLEY'S WATER SUPPLY

In a new report published today, TVA takes a long-range look at the Tennessee Valley's rapidly increasing use of water.

It foresees an ample supply for economic growth, but it also sees some problems to be overcome as water use continues to grow.

"TVA has written this report primarily for the layman," the agency's Board of Directors said. "If the waters of this Valley are to make their maximum contribution to economic and social growth, the problems of water use must be understood at the grass roots. Farmers, foresters, bankers, businessmen, county judges, legislators, teachers—all these and many others—will make the decisions and take the actions that determine how much we benefit.

"While other river valleys, earlier developed, pay an enormous price for errors made in an age of innocence about their water resource, this region can take preventive measures now," the report say. "There is time to plan."

The report foresees large increases in the region's water use by 1975 as a result of urban and industrial growth, and predicts that consumption will nearly double—but it sees no supply problem for the valley as a whole.

"There is now, and there will be in the future a plentiful supply to support the vigorous expansion forecast for the region's productivity," the report says. "In the critical June–September period, less than 1 percent of dry season regulated flow is being consumed at the present time, and only about 2 percent will be consumed in 1975." This refers to the flow, as regulated by TVA dams, during the driest known growing season.

The report points out, however, that the water supply at any point upstream from the river's mouth is always smaller than the flow for the whole basin, so local water shortages can develop in some places in some seasons unless measures to stabilize supply are feasible and are adopted.

It says full utilization of the region's water supply offers a threefold challenge: "to accelerate improvements in the use of rainfall on the land; to husband the assets of the now developed waterways; and to extend streamflow control to every tributary where regulation can be accomplished and is required for economic growth. In the total program the energies of all the area's landowners, the participation of every level of government will be engaged."

The report's title, "Nature's Constant Gift," is from its opening words: "Water is one of the Tennessee Valley's greatest assets. It is nature's constant gift to man, delivered in abundance to use as he chooses."

The report describes simultaneous management of streamflow for multiple purposes, integrated with improved water use on the land. It estimates future demands of various water uses, balancing them against the available supply. It discusses the conflicts arising from recreation, competing uses of shoreland, waste disposal, and irrigation, and means for settling the issues these conflicts present.

Following are comments from the report on some water uses and problems:

Water use on the land: "Every year the trees of this watershed claim more than 25 million acre-feet of water for their use, twice the flood storage capacity of all TVA reservoirs, more than the total volume of water discharged from the mouth of the Tennessee to the Ohio in a dry year. The laws of nature control the process, but the decisions of men determine whether the rainfall will be used by fire-scarred, stunted trees of little value in the market, or by forests which increasingly contribute to the valley's economic growth."

Flood control: "The Federal Government has provided a system of water control which has sharply diminished the damage potential for the valley. The job has been reduced to manageable proportions.* * *

"The combined resources of local, State and Federal agencies can make certain that every year the possibility of damage will be progressively reduced until nowhere in this great river basin will flood danger remain as a threat."

Local flood problems: "Population growth tends to press on the flood plains, and men trespass on the land which nature intermittently requires for the passage of flood waters. With that trespass the Nation's flood damage potential is growing every year, and at a faster rate than protective works can be constructed * * * Danger can now be determined, potential loss can be reduced. Neglect of the problem is tolerable no longer."

Navigation: "If the transportation pattern of the region undergoes no substantial change, commercial traffic on the Tennessee River is estimated to increase to about 25 million tons a year by 1975. Construction of projects on the Tennessee has already provided the standard 9-foot depth for varying distances on certain tributary rivers, and further development of some of these channels may be possible."

Hydroelectric power: "Current trends suggest that by 1975 the area dependent on TVA for its power supply will require more than double the present capacity to satisfy its demand for electricity. Nearly 80 percent of the power potential of the watershed has been realized, and not all the potential can be developed. The costs in some cases would be prohibitive. Nevertheless, there will be some increase in hydro capacity in the next decade."

Recreation: "It is expected that use of the lakes and their shores for recreation will almost double by 1975. Person-days of use are forecast to rise above 80 million per year, the number of summer homes on the lake shores is expected to pass 10,000, commercially operated services and concessions to reach 800, and the total value of equipment and facilities for recreation to exceed $200 million. The water resource will support this larger volume of use."

Waste disposal: "The discharge of waste from industries, from the sewerage systems of municipalities, and from floating craft will increase by 1975 as economic growth continues.

"Although the problem in this watershed is not as critical as in areas of greater population density and more intensive industrial development, there are reaches of the watercourses of the Tennessee Valley where the volume of waste discharged to streamflow already restricts other water uses, and prevents the balanced economic growth which the rivers could otherwise support.

"Financial assistance is provided by the Federal Government, but the determination of the people to protect their water resource from pollution will continue to be expressed through the governments of the States. They will decide whether the rivers of the valley are permitted to make their full contribution to the growth of the area."

Industrial water supply: "An abundance of water of high quality is one of the many assets available to support industrial growth in this watershed. The so-called wet industries, those using large amounts of water for processing and/or cooling, are also the high-wage industries of the area.

"By 1975 industries are expected to withdraw an average of 1,073 million gallons per day from the streams of the valley (about two-thirds of all withdrawals). This is a large figure, but the average industrial user consumes only 5 percent of the water withdrawn. Therefore the increase in the volume of withdrawals will not itself jeopardize the supply required by other users."

Irrigation: "The use of water for irrigation has expanded in the Tennessee Valley, as it has grown throughout the humid East, not to open new land for cultivation but to increase the efficiency of existing farming operations. * * *

"In 1957, after a series of unusually dry growing seasons, some 37,000 acres were being irrigated. Since 1957 the summer season rainfall has been above normal over much of the valley. The irrigated acreage has decreased. It is estimated that at least 90 percent of the water withdrawn is consumed.

"The important issue lies in the local conflicts which may develop between farm and factory, between the demands of municipalities for water and the requirement of irrigators. In a few places, largely on undeveloped tributaries, such conflicts may be serious in the future unless efforts are undertaken to increase the supply of water in all seasons for all purposes."

Water rights: "Dry years will come again, and pressure for protection of their supply by legislation is likely to be renewed by competing groups of water users. Adoption of the principle of prior appropriation may be sought once more. It is another way of saying first come, first served, with a preferred position guaranteed thereafter.

"For this valley of abundant rainfall such a policy may have serious limitations. It would reduce the flexibility required for future growth, as new users for water appear, new opportunities emerge."

State and local action: "In the future new dams will cross the channels, and now-familiar landmarks will provide greater benefits. But whether projects are built with Federal funds as Melton Hill is being constructed on the Clinch, or by some system of joint financing like the one developed for control of Beech River, the dominant feature of the next decade will not be the multiplication of engineering structures. It will be the expanding role of local agencies and of the States in the total program to achieve full utilization of the water resources of the valley."

BIRMINGHAM'S MAN OF THE YEAR

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, an editorial entitled "The Bryan Creed" was published in the Birmingham News of April 19. The editorial discusses Dr. John E. Bryan, who was recently elected as a member of the new government of the city of Birmingham. Dr. Bryan is a distinguished son of a very distinguished father. Dr. Bryan's father was one of the most beloved ministers ever to work in our State or anywhere, so far as that is concerned. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BRYAN CREED

It is a source of warm gratification that John E. Bryan this week was named Birmingham's Man of the Year.

Reasons why are obvious. This is a tall man in many ways. The son of the famed Brother Bryan, a minister who carried humbleness to its human maximum and is remembered today as vividly by many as if it were only yesterday that he had left, John Bryan exemplifies what all of us should be. As his father successfully sought, so has John Bryan tried always to do his best for his community and for individuals of all races, creeds, faiths.

These are not just words, of course. In Dr. Bryan's case they are tangible, they are realities. As with all mortals, someone here or there might once have pointed out a shortcoming. But if in his past he ever has had critics—and being so much in active public life doubtless there have been some of these—none ever said of John Bryan that he was not always trying.

The truth seems to be that failure to try is and has been too much a common fault among many of us. When the way has been hard, too many have turned aside and sought, not solution, but escape from tough problems or assignments.

This never could have been, never has been, never will be said of John E. Bryan.

The man simply does not know the meaning of quitting. After a full career as teacher and long years as superintendent of education for the county, and as head of the Institute for the Blind at Talladega, Dr. Bryan moved on retirement into still another service field: As executive for management of chamber of commerce business. The range of the gentleman's abilities, flexibility of his mind to encompass all manner of problems, would be unique anywhere in the world—and it is remembered he has served in worldwide assignments as well.

But in time Dr. Bryan moved on from the chamber assignment. Even so, John Bryan yet believed, and rightly, that his community had need for him. He wanted still only to serve it. On change of the government, Dr. Bryan was urged by many friends to stand for a council seat, and thus further give of himself, his strength, his fertile and restless mind.

It naturally followed that, having been asked to serve through candidacy, Dr. Bryan qualified as a candidate. And it followed also, and as naturally, that voters of this community gave him the greatest number of votes of more than 80 candidates, for John Bryan, you see, is known to the people.

In the dinner program honoring the man of the year, a traditional service of the Young Men's Business Club, guest speaker Mayor Allen Thompson, of Jackson, Miss., described thoughts on what a public official should be. He said he should "be completely honest * * * know and practice tolerance, self-restraint and self-sacrifice." Public officals, said Mayor Thompson, must realize that "popularity in politics is as fickle as the winds, but a reputation based on a constructive, clean administration is as permanent as the tides on the sea."

All of which need not be a lesson to new Councilman John Bryan.

The man has done so much, given so much, and still so steadfastly keeps his eye on the brightness of a worked-for tomorrow, that one might say he virtually shames the rest of us one and all. * * * "Might say," because, of course, John Bryan never would do anything to shame anyone.

God bless you, Dr. Bryan. How proud your father would have been.

RATIFICATION OF ANTI-POLL-TAX AMENDMENT BY STATE OF DELAWARE

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am exceedingly pleased to announce that the State of Delaware has ratified the anti-poll-tax amendment which would eliminate payment of a poll tax or any other tax to vote in Federal elections. Delaware becomes the 33d State to have taken this action.

I was informed late yesterday that the Senate of the Delaware Legislature approved the resolution ratifying the amendment by a vote of 10 to 5 earlier in the day. The House of the Delaware Legislature on March 18, 1963, approved its resolution ratifying the amendment by a vote of 24 to 8, the senate's action of yesterday thus completing ratification of the amendment by Delaware.

Mr. President, I wish to express my profound appreciation to both Senators from Delaware, the senior Senator [Mr. WILLIAMS] and his colleague the junior Senator [Mr. BOGGS], each of whom cosponsored, supported to passage in the Senate, and worked diligently toward ratification by their great State.

Here again, Mr. President, in Delaware, the first of the original 13 States to adopt the Federal Constitution, is another clear example of the complete bipartisanship with which action has been taken on this important matter, first in the Congress when Members of both of the great political parties cosponsored and supported to passage my resolution proposing the amendment, and subsequently when the Governors and legislative leaders of the respective States have worked together—without regard to political affiliation or interest—in achieving ratification by their States. I pay tribute to Gov. Elbert N. Carvel, of Delaware, who represents one of the major political parties, the two Senators from Delaware who are members of the other party, and the members of both parties of the Delaware Legislature who have taken this most gratifying action.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator for his remarks. On behalf of my colleague [Mr. BOGGS] and myself, I join the Senator from Florida in expressing gratification that our State has seen fit to ratify the anti-poll-tax amendment. I join the Senator in expressing the hope that the necessary number of States additionally required will soon ratify it, likewise.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate those kind remarks. I join in that expression of hope.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I gladly yield to the majority leader, the distinguished Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I join the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware in what he has said covering the Holland amendment to the Constitution of the United States. No one has worked harder for the amendment. I am delighted that after so many years of effort and under adverse circumstances on many occasions the distinguished senior Senator from Florida is within sight of the goal which he set a long time ago.

I express the hope that before very long ratification by the needed number of additional States—only a few now—will be obtained, so that this provision, the Holland amendment, I repeat can become a part of the Constitution.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the distinguished majority leader is most gracious. Of course, I could have done nothing in this regard without his help and the help of the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN]. In previous sessions of Congress it was similarly true that the majority leader and minority leader were most helpful.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Florida has expired.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate allow me 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, as Senators are aware, the Legislature of Florida ratified this important amendment to the Constitution on April 18, 1963, becoming the 31st State to do so. As I informed the Senate when I announced Florida's ratification, the Governor of our State, the Honorable Farris Bryant, included in his regular message to the legislature on April 2 a most forceful recommendation that the anti-poll-tax amendment be promptly ratified. I am deeply grateful to our Governor for his strong cooperation in this matter.

At this time, Mr. President, I request that the section of Governor Bryant's message to the legislature, wherein he recommended ratification, be included at this point as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RATIFICATION OF THE ANTI-POLL-TAX AMENDMENT

> I call to your attention another matter to which I attach great importance. This is the ratification of the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States which would eliminate the payment of a poll tax or any other tax as a requirement for voting for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senators or Representatives in Congress.
>
> I shall submit to the legislature shortly a joint resolution of the 87th Congress of the United States proposing this important amendment to the Constitution. As all of you are aware, the former distinguished Governor of Florida, U.S. Senator SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, is the author of this amendment, which is cosponsored by our other distinguished Senator, Hon. GEORGE A. SMATHERS.
>
> This joint resolution of the 87th Congress was submitted by the General Services Administrator of the Federal Government to the Governors of the respective States of the Union for consideration by their legislatures. It was previously adopted by the Congress of the United States by overwhelming majorities in each House.
>
> I am informed that to date the legislatures of 29 States have ratified the amendment. I am likewise advised that the amendment is now under consideration by the legislatures of several other States whose legislatures are now in session, with excellent prospects of early approval.
>
> In my opinion, adoption of this amendment by the respective States would constitute an important contribution to sound government. It would, without question, bring about greater participation by otherwise qualified voters. The experience which we have had in Florida since elimination of the poll tax in 1937, and the experience of other States proves this, as well as the fact that cleaner local government has resulted in some counties.
>
> Aside from these established facts, I, together with most of you, have felt strongly for years that the voter, who is otherwise qualified, should not have a price set upon his right to participate in the selection of his leaders, nor have his right to vote abridged or denied because of his failure, through poverty or oversight, to pay a poll tax or any other such tax.
>
> The submission by the Congress to the respective State legislatures of this proposed amendment to the Constitution is the proper manner in which this objective should be achieved. It is clear beyond refutation that changes in the election machinery for Federal election are constitutional matters which should not be approached by Federal statutes, as has been unsuccessfully attempted in Congress for more than 20 years, with resulting bitter divisions in our country.
>
> I therefore recommend to the legislature the early ratification of this proposed constitutional amendment. I believe such action would be a constructive step forward toward better government.

DEATH OF HON. JESSICA McCULLOUGH WEIS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it is with a heavy heart that I report the death yesterday of a distinguished New Yorker and former colleague in the other body, Hon. Jessica McCullough Weis. Judy Weis will be sorely missed by all of us who knew her, admired her, and loved her.

Judy Weis was my longtime friend, and was elected as my successor in the House of Representatives. Those of us who have had the privilege of serving in the other body and then of being elected to serve in the Senate always take great pride in having as a successor someone who is outstanding in the community as a citizen and a political ally. It was always an honor to introduce Judy Weis as "my Congressman."

Her life was a story of complete and selfless dedication to many worthy causes, causes that were furthered by her energy and zeal, causes that were dignified and ennobled by her support. She possessed that rare combination of vitality, perception, magnetism, and dedication to the public good which marks great leaders.

Her contributions to my home community of Rochester, N.Y., were many and varied and touched deeply numerous civic undertakings. Her indefatigable labors for the Republican Party are legend. She was, among other things, vice chairman of the Monroe County Republican Committee, president of the National Federation of Republican Women, Republican National Committeewoman from New York, and delegate at large to six Republican National Conventions.

To her work as a Member of Congress for two terms she brought the same charm, vigor and devotion to duty which had marked her previous endeavors. When her failing health necessitated her retirement from public office, the other body lost one of its most popular and most highly respected Members.

Mr. President, as one who worked shoulder to shoulder with this fine woman, as one who cherished her friendship and the warmth of her personality, as one who knew the unique magic that was Judy Weis, I am filled with grief at her passing.

Judy Weis has left us, but not our hearts or our memories. In this hour of great loss, our deepest sympathy goes out to her bereaved family which meant so very much to her, to the great community and State which were so justly proud of her, and to the Nation that mourns one of her most distinguished daughters.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I join the distinguished Senator from New York in his expressions concerning Judy Weis. It was my great pleasure to know her for many years. We were associated through our political contacts and also because she was a Member of Congress.

Never was I associated with her when I did not receive some kind of lift from that association. She was invariably cheerful and invariably accommodating. It was wonderful to know someone who, even suffering under great personal handicap as she did during the last days of her life, was able to impart to others an aura of cheer and an aura of looking forward.

The Republican Party of the Nation and the Republican Party of New York will miss her greatly.

I would feel very remiss if I did not join in expressing my sympathy and condolences to her family and to the citizens of New York who have lost such a great and valued public servant.

I thank my distinguished friend for yielding.

Mr. KEATING. I am very grateful to the Senator from Colorado for his remarks.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, it was with deep regret that I recently learned of the death of Mrs. Charles Weis, of Rochester, N.Y. Judy Weis and her late husband were two of the finest and most-valued friends my wife and I ever had.

Mrs. Weis was not only a great public servant in her own right; she was a devoted wife and mother. No one who knew her could forget her vibrant personality and her interest in the things that count for a better America.

I join my friend, the Senator from New York, in expressing deep regret at the passing of one of the outstanding women of our time, and express deep sympathy to her fine children.

Mr. KEATING. I am grateful for the kind remarks of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am saddened to learn of the passing of Jessica McCullough Weis, a member of the National Committee of the Republican Party and a former Representative in Congress from the 36th District of New York, the Rochester area.

Jessica Weis was a friend of mine, as she was also of my colleague from New York [Mr. Keating] and other Senators. She was an extraordinary woman, very active in the Republican Party ever since 1935, a time measured almost by my own period of activity in the party. I myself started in 1932.

Senator Keating has already spoken beautifully and feelingly about Mrs. Weis as a party worker, a party leader, and a Representative in Congress. I should like to say a word about Judy Weis as a woman. She was one of the most attractive, gracious, dear human beings anyone has ever met. She brought to politics what other women have brought to it so successfully, namely, a sense of personally caring for her associates whom she met in politics.

Judy Weis was always a warm personal friend of those who were her close associates, among whom I am proud to number myself. Not only was she a friend in politics; she was a woman having a very deep feeling about public service. I should like to quote from her obituary in the New York Times of today:

> Once asked why she had embarked on her career, she replied:
>
> "I really went into politics because I got tired sitting around the sitting room and objecting to the way things were being run. I decided I ought to do something about it or stop objecting."

Mr. President, that is practically an American's creed, which each of us has almost the duty to urge upon those who have any mind for public responsibility at all. It is beautifully said, with the typical simplicity and warmth of Judy Weis.

Judy Weis was active not only in political life but also in the life of her community, the Rochester area, where she worked in its hospitals, serving on the women's board of the Genesee Hospital and the board of the Rochester Convalescent Hospital for Children.

Judy Weis was active in the Rochester Business and Professional Women's Club and in almost every other fine community effort that could be imagined.

Mrs. Weis was also a woman of exceptional taste. She conducted a personal poll to help select a national flower. She reported that the rose won—the rose being also the New York State flower—by a heavy majority.

I believe that the most fitting tribute one could pay to Judy Weis is that she was herself a rose in her charming sweetness, her delicacy, and the beauty of her character. She is enfolded in her graciousness to become a part of the beauty of all time.

On behalf of my wife and myself, I bespeak our deep sympathy for the family of Mrs. Weis in their hour of bereavement.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, I was called from the Senate Chamber at the time the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. Keating] was delivering a eulogy on the passing of his successor in the House of Representatives, Mrs. Jessica McCullough Weis. Mrs. Weis was a Republican through and through, but she was not so much a partisan that she could not see some good on the other side. She believed in her party. Above all, she believed in her country. She believed in the body in which she had the honor to be a Representative.

It is with a deep sense of regret that I, together with the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. Keating] and others, note that our former colleague died yesterday in Rochester, N.Y.

I note in the New York Times her reply when she was asked why she had embarked on a political career. Her answer was as follows:

> I really went into politics because I got tired sitting around the sitting room and objecting to the way things were being run. I decided I ought to do something about it or stop objecting.

There could not be a better reason for anyone, man or woman, to enter the field of politics, because it is an area in which those who find objections—and there are many in our country—can face the realities and find out what politics really is.

Mrs. Weis had a distinguished record in the House of Representatives. She was known as the rose lady, because of her interest in the rose as a national flower. She initiated many important pieces of legislation. She represented her district with distinction and honor, and she was an asset to her State of New York and to the Nation as a whole. I join my colleagues at this time in expressing my deepest sympathy to her two surviving daughters, Mrs. William C. Warren, III, and Mrs. Cameron Jameson, and her son, Charles McCullough Weis, a professor at Ohio Wesleyan University, and the six grandchildren.

Mrs. Weis retired from Congress voluntarily. At the time many of us wondered why she was retiring from the Congress, where she was achieving such distinction. We now know the reason. I only wish to state that we will all miss her because of the many contributions she has made to the body known as the Congress.

PRESIDENT'S TAX PROPOSALS: MINIMUM STANDARD DEDUCTION

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, some of the elements of President Kennedy's tax proposals are not fully understood. I am particularly concerned that the proposal aimed directly at helping millions of Americans who are not fully sharing in the Nation's prosperity, namely, the minimum standard deduction, has not received full attention. I therefore ask unanimous consent that a Treasury Department fact sheet on this proposal which would directly benefit more than 13 million people be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the fact sheet was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Fact Sheet on President's Tax Proposals

MINIMUM STANDARD DEDUCTION

One of President Kennedy's tax proposals is aimed directly at helping millions of Americans who are not fully sharing in the Nation's prosperity. These are people with low incomes, and those whose families are large in relation to their earnings.

The proposal would provide a minimum standard deduction, which means that everyone would be allowed to deduct at least this minimum amount from his income before computing his taxes. The minimum would be $300 for a single individual, $400 for a married couple, and an additional $100 for each dependent up to a ceiling of $1,000.

The minimum standard deduction would directly benefit more than 13 million people.

Under present law, the standard deduction cannot exceed 10 percent of the taxpayer's income, or $1,000 whichever is less. Thus the new minimum standard deduction would mean a higher deduction—and a lower tax bill—for all those now using the standard deduction who have:

No dependents and income of less than $3,000.

One dependent (a wife or any other dedependent) and income of less than $4,000.

Two dependents (a wife and child or any other two dependents) and income of less than $5,000.

Three dependents and income of less than $6,000.

Four dependents and income of less than $7,000.

Five dependents and income of less than $8,000.

Six dependents and income of less than $9,000.

Seven dependents and income of less than $10,000.

Some taxpayers who now itemize their deductions would find it advantageous—as well as simpler—to switch to the new minimum standard deductions. Those who can claim deductions larger than the new minimum through itemizing will, of course, continue to itemize.

Those who will benefit most from the minimum standard deduction will be those with the lowest incomes. The total tax loss to the Government from the proposal is estimated at $310 million. Of this amount $180 million will go to people with incomes of less than $3,000 a year. Another $100 million will go to people with incomes between $3,000 and $5,000.

Without the new minimum standard deduction, the tax rate reduction proposed by President Kennedy would not mean much to our lowest income families.

However, with the rate cuts and the new minimum standard deduction the tax saving can be quite substantial.

A single taxpayer with no dependents and an income of $1,000 would find his taxes reduced from the present $60 a year to $14 a year, as a result of the combined effects of the minimum standard deduction and the proposed reduction in tax rates.

A married couple with no dependents, who now pay a tax of $120 on an income of $2,000 would find their taxes cut to $56 as a result of the minimum standard deduction and the rate reduction.

A widow with two children and an income of $4,000 now pays $360 in taxes. With the minimum standard deduction and the proposed rate reductions, she would pay $245.

A couple with seven children and an income of $7,500 now pay $270 in taxes. Use of the minimum standard deduction and the proposed rate cuts will bring their tax bill down to $154.

With rate reduction alone, these tax savings would be considerably less.

The minimum standard deduction was designed specifically to benefit low income taxpayers without a heavy loss of revenue to the Government. Other plans which have been suggested—for example, an increase in the $600 personal exemption—would not do the same job. An increase of only $100 in the personal exemption, bringing it to $700, would, coupled with the proposed new tax rate schedule, result in a loss of more than $2 billion in tax revenues—more than seven times as much as the minimum standard deduction. And only 9 percent of this tax saving would go to those earning $3,000 a year or less, compared with nearly 60 percent under the new minimum standard deduction.

Thus, the new minimum standard deduction offers the most effective way to make sure that the low-income people who need it most get their fair share of the benefits of the tax revision program.

ED NEILAN A FORCEFUL NEW PRESIDENT OF THE U.S. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, a Delawarean, Edwin P. Neilan, last night officially became president of the chamber of commerce of the United States. I predict that before his year's term of office is over, we are all going to hear a lot from him. He is used to speaking out, and people find the listening worth while.

Ed Neilan is not the type to sugarcoat his comments. But you can rest assured that what he says will be based on reasoned conviction.

We of Delaware are proud to have him at the helm of the U.S. Chamber and are confident he will live up to that pride.

Tackling tough jobs is not anything new to Ed. As a matter of fact, tackling is right in his line too. He played 6 years of semipro football in his younger days.

What characterizes his work as chairman and president of the Bank of Delaware in Wilmington is his drive, his eagerness for new ideas, and his close contact with the bank's employees.

He is one of the few bank presidents in the country who answers his own telephone. He thinks hiding behind a secretary wastes time.

And when he wants to talk to someone, he strides down to the other fellow's office. Again, he is restless to get things done.

This restlessness pays off as far as the public is concerned. He has turned his talents and energies to the United Community Fund of northern Delaware, the Welfare Council of Delaware, and the Greater Wilmington Development council, among other civic organizations.

During World War II he served as a lieutenant commander in the Navy and earned a commendation for getting things done—despite redtape. At the same time, I might add, he shocked some of his fellow officers not used to such direct methods.

Ed Neilan was born on his grandfather's farm in Mason County, Mich., in 1905 and spent his earlier years in Leeds, Iowa, and later Omaha, Nebr. Most of his father's career was spent as a life insurance salesman but today, at 82 he is engaged in the making and marketing of vitamins and trace minerals in Oakland, Calif.

After he was graduated in 1923 from Omaha Central High School, Mr. Neilan attended the University of Omaha for 2 years and then, because of a lack of funds, worked for a year as a carpenter's apprentice. His family then moved to Texas where Mr. Neilan received a bachelor of arts degree in business administration from Rice Institute in 1928.

He also attended night school for 2 years at the South Texas School of Law, Houston, and received prestandard, standard and graduate certificates from the Houston Chapter, American Institute of Banking. He completed in 1937 a 3-year combined correspondence and residence program under the Graduate School of Banking, sponsored jointly by the American Bankers Association and Rutgers University.

Mr. Neilan's banking career began during his senior year at Rice when he became a railroad analyst in the investment department of the Houston Bank & Trust Co. In 1933 he became chief trust examiner with the Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas, and between 1936 and 1940 he served as a field examiner for the Federal Reserve Banks of New York and Philadelphia. He joined the Bank of Delaware, then known as the Security Trust Co., as associate trust officer in 1940.

Mr. Neilan was promoted to vice president and secretary, director and chairman of the trust committee in 1946, and became executive vice president in 1952. In 1956, he became president and in 1959 was elevated to chairman of the board and president.

I would not try to chronicle Ed Neilan's many ideas about government. To put it briefly, he thinks there is waste which should not be tolerated. And he is concerned that an ever-growing Federal Government is working to the disadvantage of State and local governments.

"Government must be kept at home as much as possible," he says. "When it gets as far away as Washington, you just can't control it."

The national chamber he heads is a federation of individuals, business firms, and voluntary organizations of businessmen and professional men. It represents the whole spectrum of business and industry. It is composed of more than 3,700 organization members—local, State, and regional chambers of commerce, and trade and professional associations, and more than 30,500 business members—firms, corporations and individuals.

The underlying membership of the chamber is more than 3 million individuals and firms—the members of its affiliated organizations.

It is this far-reaching and influential organization which Ed Neilan now heads, and I know my colleagues join with me in wishing him and Mrs. Neilan and the chamber well in the year ahead.

ST. LOUIS MINISTERS PROTEST SOVIET ANTI-SEMITISM

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, 41 prominent Protestants, Catholics, and Jews from St. Louis, Mo., recently transmitted a message to Nikita S. Khrushchev through the Russian Ambassador to the United States in which they called for the elimination of anti-Jewish discrimination in the Soviet Union.

This message lists factual evidence of denial of religious liberties to the almost 3 million Jewish citizens of the Soviet Union and concludes by asking Mr. Khrushchev when these restrictions will be lifted. It first appeared as an advertisement in the New York Times on December 7, 1962, paid for by several members of the American Jewish Committee. It was signed by 46 prominent persons including Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.C.S., president, University of Notre Dame; Bishop James A. Pike, Dr. Daniel A. Poling, editor, Christian Herald magazine; Rabbi Abraham J. Heschel; Rev. Louis J. Towmey, S.J., editor, social order; and Dr. John C. Bennett, dean of faculty, Union Theological Seminary.

The message should put the Soviets on notice that they must offer more than propaganda words if the world is to be convinced that freedom of religious practice is permitted within its borders.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the message and the list of signatories thereto be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the message and list were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Chairman NIKITA S. KHRUSHCHEV,
The Kremlin, Moscow, U.S.S.R.:

Having read a message addressed to you, December 7, 1962, by 46 leading American Protestants, Catholics, and Jews, urging the elimination of anti-Jewish discrimination in the Soviet Union, we add our endorsement to this appeal.

The Soviet Union declares it is a champion of human dignity and equality. No nation has been more persevering in pronouncing itself a defender of minority rights.

Soviet spokesmen cite your country's Constitution wherein equality of citizens is guaranteed, as proof that religious discrimnation is not countenanced in the U.S.S.R. You yourself have said: "The question of a man's religion is not asked in our country. It is a matter for the conscience of the person concerned. We look upon a person as a person."

BUT WHAT ARE THE FACTS?

The Soviet Government's persistent enmity to religion is a matter of historical record. While most faiths are permitted bare necessities, such as requisites for worship, sacred literature, theological seminaries and central bodies, their activities are sternly circumscribed. Devout citizens—Catholic, Protestant, Orthodox—suffer harassment. Nowhere, not even within the walls of church or mosque, is religion secure from surveillance. This is a fact of Soviet life.

It is also a fact that within the narrow framework of permissible religious practice, discrimination is enforced. Jewish citizens of the Soviet Union, numbering close to 3 million, are denied minimal rights conceded to adherents of other creeds.

Hard pressed as they are by blanket restraints, none of the other major religions of the Soviet people, neither the Orthodox, Armenian, Catholic or Protestant Churches, neither Buddhism nor Islam, have been subjected to the extraordinary disabilities inflicted on Judaism and its followers.

Legally constituted Jewish congregations are isolated from one another. They are forbidden to organize a central body. They are allowed no contact with Jewish religious groups in other countries. Their leaders are singled out for abuse.

Since June 1961, synagogue presidents in six cities have been arbitrarily removed from office; Jewish communal leaders in Leningrad and Moscow have been sentenced to prison for the alleged crime of meeting with foreign visitors to their synagogues.

Scores of synagogues have been closed by the state. The few that remain are served by rabbis who were ordained more than 40 years ago. For more than a generation, Jewish theological seminaries have been banned except for a lone yeshiva in Moscow, opened in 1956. Its enrollment, never permitted to exceed 20, was reduced to 4 in April 1962.

No Jewish Bible has been printed in 40 years. No articles for Jewish ritual can be produced. This year, for the first time in Soviet history, even the sale of unleavened bread, essential to observance of the Passover, was banned. The prayers of Judaism are said in Hebrew, yet the teaching of that language is prohibited.

Although half a million Jews declared Yiddish as their mother tongue in the Soviet census of 1959, their hundreds of schools, their once-flourishing theaters have been stamped out. Much smaller ethnic or linguistic groups have schools, theaters, books and newspapers in their own languages.

These conditions conjure up memories of the anti-Semitic Stalin regime, which you yourself have denounced.

According to the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the constitution of enlightened countries, freedom of conscience and expression is vested unconditionally in every human being.

Unless the Soviet Government conforms its behavior to this universal standard and to its own professed principles, it forfeits the confidence of all peoples.

When will synagogues and Jewish seminaries be reestablished, imprisoned synagogue leaders set free, the ban on unleavened bread rescinded, ritual articles and Jewish prayerbooks made available?

When will the Yiddish-language institutions that sustained Soviet Jewish culture and education be restored?

When will Jewish congregations, like those of other religions, be enabled to form a central body, to join in fellowship for the continuity of their faith?

The world awaits your response.

By deeds alone can your government confirm that the Soviet Union in truth upholds the rights of minorities and the equal dignity of man.

St. Louis Signatories to Message to Khrushchev

Ralph C. Abele, pastor, Holy Ghost United Church of Christ.

Sister M. Francetta Barberis, president, Webster College.

Mother Patricia Barrett, professor of political science, Maryville College.

Bishop George L. Cadigan, Episcopal Bishop of Missouri.

Father C. Dismas Clark, S.J., executive director, Dismas House.

Thaddeus B. Clark, minister, First Unitarian Church.

Dean Ned Cole, dean, Christ Church Cathedral.

Edwin T. Dahlberg, pastor emeritus, Delmar Baptist Church, past president, National Council of Churches of Christ.

Rt. Rev. William H. Drumm, chancellor, Archdiocese of St. Louis.

Rabbi M. H. Eichenstein, chief rabbi of Orthodox Jewish Congregation.

Thomas H. Eliot, chancellor, Washington University.

Rabbi Ephraim Epstein, president, St. Louis Rabbinical Association.

Dr. Wesley Hager, Grace Methodist Church.

R. J. Henle, S.J., academic vice president, St. Louis University.

John J. Hicks, pastor, Union Memorial Methodist Church.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. James Hoflich, secretary of education, Archdiocese of St. Louis.

W. W. S. Hohenschild, S.T.D., rector of the Church of the Holy Communion.

James F. Hornback, leader, Ethical Society of St. Louis.

Rabbi Robert P. Jacobs, director, Hillel Foundation, Washington University.

Curtis Jones, minister, Union Avenue Christian Church.

Trafford P. Maher, S.J., director, department of education; human relations center, St. Louis University.

Very Rev. Louis F. Meyer, director, Catholic Youth Council.

Dr. Clement S. Mihanovich, professor of sociology, St. Louis University.

Dr. Allen Miller, professor of philosophy and theology, Eden Seminary.

Rt. Rev. John W. Miller, executive director, Catholic Charities of St. Louis.

Msgr. P. J. Malloy, pastor, Blessed Sacrament Church.

Msgr. Daniel Moore, editor, St. Louis Review.

John E. Nance, minister, Washington Tabernacle Baptist Church.

Rev. Walter J. Ong, S.J., professor of English, St. Louis University.

Very Rev. Nicholas E. Persich, rector, Kenrick Seminary.

Harry P. Phillips, Jr., pastor, West Presbyterian Church.

Rev. Arthur C. Piepkorn, chairman, department of systematic theology, Concordia Seminary.

Dr. Sterling L. Price, minister, Third Baptist Church.

Very Rev. Paul C. Reinert, S.J., president, St. Louis University.

Joseph Cardinal Ritter, R.C. archbishop of St. Louis.

Amos Ryce, pastor, Lane Tabernacle Christian Methodist Church.

Dr. Howard E. Short, editor, the Christian.

Dr. Sherman Skinner, pastor, Second Presbyterian Church, president, Metropolitan Church Federation.

Rt. Rev. Lloyd A. Sullivan, pastor, Epiphany of Our Lord Roman Catholic Church.

Rev. L. J. Twomey, S.J., editor, Social Order.

Dr. O. Walter Wagner, executive director, Metropolitan Church Federation.

OUR NATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, one of the leading Kansas citizens, Mr. Alfred M. Landon, of Topeka, Kans., continues to maintain a strong interest in the great issues we face today. His continued interest serves not only his intellectual curiosity but is a force for better understanding as he speaks out with honest conviction and persuasion.

On May 2, 1963, Mr. Landon delivered an address at Rockhurst College in Kansas City, Mo., dealing with the issues of unemployment, Cuba, and America's loss of prestige in the world at large. Believing this address to be of vital interest to members of Congress, I ask unanimous consent that the same be printed in the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Our National Administration

(By Alf M. Landon)

Partisan discussions of the great and complex domestic and international problems confronting us are essential to all Americans—provided they are approached in an objective way—instead of mere name calling.

In that spirit, I am going to talk tonight about the three main points raised by the Democrats in the 1960 campaign against the Republicans. I'm going to present to you some of the hard facts in both domestic and foreign policies on those issues that are still with us—still unsolved—today:

1. Unemployment.
2. Cuba.
3. America's loss of prestige in the world at large.

There is something dead wrong in a country where the stock market is booming and employment depressed.

In the Democrat 87th Congress—with an overwhelming majority in both the national House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate, President Kennedy made one recommendation in his messages to the Congress aimed at substantially reducing unemployment. That was his recommendation for the Trade Expansion Act.

He stated his position on that highly important legislation on December 7, 1961, before the National Association of Manufacturers Convention in New York. I advocated the same legislation the next day before the National Press Club. I do not mean to leave the inference that there was any understanding of any kind between us on that legislation. Our positions were arrived at entirely separately.

I did not conceive that legislation as having an immediate impact on our No. 1 domestic problem of unemployment. I believed then—and I believe now—that the only solution to our enormous industrial plants and productivity as well as the size of our agricultural production is to get into the world markets on a larger scale than we have heretofore found necessary.

The President was able to get this legislation through the Congress only with effective Republican support.

The complexities of the problems involved are going to take time and the efficient active and energetic cooperation of both government and business itself.

In his messages to the present Congress, Mr. Kennedy recommended again, as he did to the 87th Congress, a big program of medicare; Federal aid to public schools; and civil rights legislation, along with his fiscal policies to stimulate employment. The last Congress cut up Mr. Kennedy's recommendation for supply management by government for agriculture. He did not renew in this Congress his recommendation for that farm legislation.

He got too much hay down.

This Congress—the 88th—was tied up for its first month or so by administration Senators—but not the party leaders—attempting to change the rules of the Senate for considering legislation in general.

My objection to our President's fiscal policy is that he's basing our national growth—our expansion—and our security—on a completely untried theory in a country of this size with its worldwide commitments.

I believe Mr. Kennedy made a great mistake in urging the fiscal policies of those economists who loosely follow Keynesian economic theories of increasing Government spending and who, at the same time, advocate the cutting of taxes to stimulate consumption and capital investment—thereby creating the greatest deficit in our history.

Mr. Kennedy proposed a $10 billion tax cut spread over 3 years. In February, I raised the question regarding this recommendation: "Will it really ease the citizens' tax load at a time when every State and locality is desperately seeking more revenue and would gladly fill any tax void created by the Federal Government? In considering this question, one must keep in mind that the demands upon the States and localities have been increasing and that they will increase all the more if inflation is the result of the new Federal policy."

The Tax Foundation last month estimated that State taxes alone will increase this year by approximately $1½ billion. When cities, counties, and school districts get through, there will be little left of the 2 billion, 7 million tax cut proposed by President Kennedy for the first year.

As a result, little will be left to pass on to individual citizens of the proposed $10 billion tax cut spread over 3 years, theoretically to stimulate our national economy. Instead will be a great increase in deficit spending, thereby creating a heavy pressure on the value of our American dollar. Already labor and the ADA wing of the Democrat Party are urging more spending and a bigger deficit.

That is a prime factor in the present rise of the stock market. Stocks are being bought as a hedge against the debasement of the American dollar by inflation rather than because of any great increase in business and profits.

Planned inflation by Government works differently on jobs. Fear of debasement of the American dollar is one of the big factors in joblessness. Soft money is not good for business planning and sound national growth.

That inflation, in turn, increases the drain on our gold supply in the financial and business markets of the world. That, in turn, will have an adverse effect on American business being able to take advantage of the President's Trade Expansion Act. As the value of the dollar continues its decline, uncertainty upsets business planning both at home and abroad.

The Democratic policies of spend and spend—tax and tax—elect and elect—work as far as winning elections is concerned. They did not work in the 1930's as far as curing unemployment is concerned. Before the war boom, unemployment under Mr. Roosevelt was almost as great as when he started.

Deliberate planning of inflation by Government is entirely different from mild inflation over the years that accompanies national growth and expanding economy. No matter how neat and tidy the plans of economists and political scientists—there is always a next election. Their planning is upset—even if they were right—and they are always subject to mistakes, like all of us—by politics and the individual planning of millions.

Even in countries like Russia and China where there are no real elections—Communist plans of Marx and Lenin are being watered down to stimulate production by incentive motives for the individual.

In the United States of America—why not stick to the old tested workable fiscal policies—policies that are still successful in other countries—that are not myths. Why not concentrate on expanding world trade based on a sound dollar?

As is always the case, the Congress is being blamed for what is called its apathy toward our President's program for national growth.

Our country is in great need of decisive leadership. Instead, we are being offered confusion with economic policies bewildering in theory—that did not work to the extent that they were tried during Mr. Roosevelt's administration.

Whenever there is a lack of effective leadership in the White House on legislation, the Congress is always blamed. We already have one political scientist advocating a rubberstamp Congress by concentrating more powers in the hands of the executive branch of our Government. By and large, his theory is that there is a presidential party and opposition in both parties, making four parties in Congress instead of two. He divides loosely the Democrats into liberal and conservative, and the Republicans into liberal and conservative—whatever that means.

As a matter of fact, there are four blocs in the Democratic Party. The dominant bloc is labor. The next is the southern agrarian bloc. Then there are the urban bloc and the ADA wing. Labor, urban, and ADA are more or less meshed together on a number of policies. There is still among them, however, a sharp difference on other matters.

The Republican Party is really the only homogeneous party in the Congress.

The grand old terms, "liberal" and "conservative," have been so much abused of recent use that they've lost much of their meaning. I can remember when the liberals were the ones who opposed national prohibition.

The President was able to organize all four blocs successfully in his campaign. It is a horse of a different color when it becomes a matter of hitching them up to pull together on legislation in the Congress.

Another political scientist is predicting that it is only a question of time until all 50 States will fade out of any position of responsibility and authority—that they will all be concentrated in the executive branch of the Government in Washington. That could probably occur if both Congress and State governments are continually weakened by the growth of executive power concentrated in the White House.

Let me point out that this 88th Congress is simply being criticized for refusing to pass legislation recommended by the President that the preceding 87th Congress refused to pass. And there has been an election in between. Therefore, it must be evident that this Congress is representing the thinking and the philosophy and the convictions of the people in their districts and their States.

Congress is even being criticized by political theorists, in a hurry—for being so parochial as to represent the thinking of their districts. That's what we elect them for. That's why we want them to come around and shake our hands every 2 years and ask us for our votes.

I emphatically disagree with General Eisenhower's suggestion that Congressmen's terms should be limited to 12 years. Once a Congressman learns the ropes and the rules and the parliamentary procedure, his value to his district increases. The same is true of a Senator. If democracy means anything, it is up to people in their districts and States to decide when to retire them.

I have believed for a long time that we might consider lengthening the terms of our national Representatives to 4 years. That's not too long a term to get them out of touch with the thinking of their districts. It relieves national Representatives of the expense of a biennial campaign and gives them more time for the highly responsible duties of their office.

I can remember some years ago when the Congress was not acting as fast and as neat and as tidy as political scientists like—when it was proposed that we should adopt the parliamentary government in America in order to bring more unity and party discipline. With a parliamentary government, Canada has had four general elections in the last 6 years.

The great model of those yakking away for a parliamentary system is Great Britain. Ironically, since 1952, that model of parliamentary efficiency—where the executive branch and the legislative leadership are one and the same—has been widely charged as a do-nothing government.

One simple way to restore party discipline in the Congress and in the States would be for the States to repeal what is known as the Massachusetts ballot. Up until about 50 years ago, it was possible to vote in all States a straight party ticket by making a cross at the head of the column. That covered all the candidates.

Then Massachusetts adopted a ballot on which the candidates' names were arranged according to the office they were running for. A citizen had to vote for his choices separately. That encouraged split voting and weakened party organizations and party responsibility. I believed in the Massachusetts ballot then as an intelligent approach to voting—and I believe in it now. But if these political scientists and pundits want to correct the failure of Congress to rubberstamp a president's proposals—a very simple way would be—as I say—to facilitate partisan voting instead of nonpartisan.

Now to point No. 2—Cuba—and point No. 3 of the 1960 Democrat campaign.

The question is being raised by Democrats and Republicans alike as to whether we have a Cuban policy and, if we do, what is it?

That question really is tied up with point No. 3—"America's prestige" in the world. Therefore, I will cover both of them together.

Cuba—the Western Hemisphere—Laos, Europe, Moscow, Peiping—all are tied up in one package. If the string is broken, alarm bells will ring in every foreign office in every country in the world.

There is uncertainty over the successor to Chancellor Konrad Adenauer in West Germany—the impending English election—and the rejection of President Kennedy's grand design for Europe's economic and political future by President de Gaulle, of France.

It is evident that America no longer has the prestige that it had to exercise its leadership in European affairs. Cuba must be dealt with not only in context with Western Hemisphere conditions, but the world at large. Europe must be dealt with not only as Europe, but for its impact on real dangerous conditions in all the world.

If we intervene in Cuba, we are not only intervening against Castro. We are intervening against Khrushchev. He will either have to get out of Cuba or fight. If he backs down, that will leave Mao as top dog in all of Asia, at least, and Khrushchev probably facing a palace revolution in the Kremlin.

Laos occupies a key strategic position. Its jerry-built neutralist structure is collapsing.

The Chinese Communists in Laos then outflank South Vietnam, Thailand, and Cambodia. Malaya, Formosa, and Japan are in greater danger. The Philippines and Australia are then faced by Chinese Communists in positions of strength.

China, poised on the edge of the defenseless rice-rich, oil-rich Indian State of Assam, would like nothing better than to see America tied up in Cuba.

It would seem that factors of even greater magnitude and permanance are involved in the row between Mao and Khrushchev.

It must always be remembered that those two giants have the longest borderline between them in the world. Between them lies somewhat of a no man's land. Both giants are deeply interested and cast somewhat of a jaundiced eye on each others activities in that big nomadic nation—Outer Mongolia.

Also it must always be remembered that China has a population four times that of Russia—plus a much stronger and expanding position in Asia—and Russia is aiding in the military buildup of India—China's enemy.

Russia's ancient ties of acquaintance, business, political, and association are more with Western Europe than they are with Asia. France and Russia have the background of centuries of international pulling together, despite the Napoleonic interlude. Russia is stepping up trade deals with Europe and Great Britain, bartering cheap oil as its strongest inducement. Khrushchev is vigorously trying to fan dissension in the free world.

Most important of all is the slow swing toward Socialist parties in western European countries, all of them, and in Great Britain.

Now, don't misunderstand that. Socialism and communism are not synonymous. Some of the most effective anti-Communist leaders are Socialists. There is, however, more of a common meeting ground for the Russian Communist bloc with European socialism, in long-range goals, than anywhere in Asia or the Western Hemisphere. At a recent 2-day meeting in Brussels of Socialist parties from all the European Economic Community and European Free Trade Association, except Portugal, disappointment and criticism were expressed at the isolationist leadership of the British Labor Party.

If the Labor Party wins the coming election in Great Britain, will its policies increase the pressure on the already weak English pound sterling? Will its leader, Harold Wilson, swing more to the left, and to closer relations with Russia, than his predecessor, the late Hugh Gaitskell, and than Prime Minister Macmillan's party? Then again, American prestige is somewhat at a low ebb in Great Britain because of our inept handling of the Skybolt affair.

All that, in turn, will have deep economic and political repercussions on all the trading associations of Europe, the European Economic Community, the Outer Seven and the British Commonwealth and Anglo-American ties.

Perhaps the greatest, longest lasting, effect will be in the policies of Russia and her Communist bloc itself. Both the Soviet and Red Chinese have badly underestimated the vitality and force of nationalism.

There is no question that the pace of keeping up with America in nuclear and space, civilian and military, standards is telling on Russia. Yet Russians are becoming a "have" people. The Red Chinese are still a "have not" people.

There is no question that Khrushchev is as uneasy over the spectacular success of the Common Market as we are over the Soviet's armed intrusion in Cuba.

There is no question he has some spreading political problems at home. Within the past month, Rumania defied the Soviet by renewing relations with Albania and establishing a new trade agreement with Red China.

Another striking change must not be overlooked in any appraisal of world affairs.

Future historians may well mark the extraordinary visit of Premier Khrushchev's son-in-law to Pope John XXIII as the beginning of a change in relations between Russia and the Western countries.

All of these are factors we must consider in our Cuban policy.

"What is our Cuban policy—if we have one?"—is being asked with increasing doubt and vigor in both Democrat and Republican ranks. Last week Senate Democrat leader MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, and other administration leaders—in advocating cooperation with the OAS in quarantining Cuba—picked up one of the principal points repeatedly urged by New York's Republican Senator KENNETH KEATING. That is an infinitely sounder policy than the implication of our President's highly emotional address to the Cuban refugees last Christmas time on getting communism and Castro out of Cuba.

Of course, I have no inside information or speak with any authority as an expert. I have some knowledge about politics, though. As I understand it, President Kennedy's present world policy, including Cuba, and the OAS, is based on coming changes in Great Britain, West Germany, Russia, a new government in Canada, and on a better chance of peaceful, if stormy, relations with Khrushchev, than with Mao. As for me and mine, I am willing to go along with him on that policy, with the fervent hope that our national administration will be more skillful and mature in handling international relations in the future than in the past.

That is not appeasement. Neither is it singing ourselves to sleep with that dreamy kind of gush—the spirit of Camp David—or unrealism that the cold war is not going to continue for a long time or break wide open at any moment.

It is realism that, with our military and economic might, we can trump any card that Khrushchev or Mao plays, whenever we decide the time has come to protect our position in the Western Hemisphere, and the world, come what may. We must always be as ready to act, as to talk.

There is no question that U.S. Senator KENNETH KEATING, of New York, is right in his warning of the existing military threat from the Soviet in Cuba. His factual statements are a most valuable service in alerting our great country to the facts of life in that Communist armed camp on our doorstep.

There is no question that a blockade would crumple the Soviet armed occupation of Cuba. It also might blockade a turning of the Russian-Communist bloc in the direction of Europe instead of Asia.

Sure, Cuba is a dangerous threat to the United States and the free world. That is not going to be resolved simply by itself either by blockade or invasion. I cannot conceive of a greater mistake than getting bogged down in the jungles and mountains of Cuba as we were in Korea—with as great a force of men as were involved in that war.

The fact remains that Mao, according to Premier Nehru, believes in a nuclear war, is planning a nuclear war, wants a nuclear war. Chou En Lai has publicly stated that a country the size of China—the most populous nation—would have more people left after a nuclear war than any other country.

Khrushchev, on the other hand, boasts that communism will bury capitalism by economic methods. He has spoken a truism repeatedly—that there can be no victor in a nuclear war.

Quoting James Marlow, Associated Press news analyst, "There could be worse than Khrushchev if his successor tries to turn the clock back." We have the question there again—after Khrushchev, after Adenauer, after Macmillan—what?

This is a period of change in the whole world leadership structure of the major powers of both the free world and the Communist world.

There is evidence that Khrushchev himself is laying the groundwork for orderly succession of leadership in the Soviet for the first time. Heretofore, it has been a bloody grab for power.

Until all that is determined, as far as Great Britain and West Germany are concerned, and what is going to happen in the Soviet, in the coming year, it is difficult to come to policy decisions of any permanence. Certainly the relations of all the great power nations are going to be definitely affected.

In this war of nerves, every attempt must be made to bring together democratic governments to act in unison to restrain any action by force in violation of neutral rights or upsetting to the peace of the world.

For sure, lacking foolproof international disarmament, we must keep building up our military strength, conventional and nuclear, on the ground, in the air, and in the seas, regardless of either national or local economics. Unless we do that, our future is sure. It is defeat.

As Republicans, our first duty is to our unique Republic and the idea it stands for. We must not become so concerned with partisan advantage that we would rush the Nation into disaster, and criticism for criticism's sake can mean disaster. There is plenty of room for legitimate differences between our national administration and its bipartisan opposition. Unless we stick to these legitimate differences and keep our eyes on our great and beloved Republic's true interests, our future again is sure—it is defeat.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL JOSEPH CAMPBELL: SAVER OF MILLIONS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am certain that every Member of Congress who is concerned with eliminating wasteful spending of the taxpayers' money holds the Comptroller General of the United States, Joseph Campbell, in the very highest regard. By his thorough and judicious direction of the General Accounting Office he has expertly served the country and the Government. He has saved millions for the taxpayers, not only by exposed wasteful practices, but he has developed constructive suggestions for continuing economy in government which daily save uncounted additional millions.

Because he and his very capable staff work quietly and judiciously, the accomplishments of the GAO are not generally understood throughout the country. Therefore I was very happy to see, in the Chicago Sun-Times of April 28, 1963, a fine editorial about Mr. Campbell and the GAO. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial, entitled "Saved: $162,875,000" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAVED: $162,875,000

The Comptroller General of the United States, Joseph Campbell, has made his annual report of the investigations of his General Accounting Office for the fiscal year 1962 to the President and the Congress. The report makes fascinating reading for anyone who pays taxes.

The Comptroller General determines, by means of exhaustive investigations, how a program or an agency of the Government is operating. Neither he nor his office (the General Accounting Office) has any say in the creation of these agencies or programs. The reports of these investigations go to the President, the Congress and the interested agencies. The Comptroller General serves a 15-year term and he enjoys a rare freedom of operation.

The Comptroller General notes, rather sadly, that it is not always possible to measure in financial terms the savings and benefits resulting from his investigations. He does say, however, that in fiscal 1962 the GAO collected the sum of $48,219,000. In addition, actions taken by the departments and agencies investigated by the GAO during the same fiscal 1962 resulted in—and here we quote the report—"either definite, measurable savings or possible savings of $114,656,000."

The Sun-Times has noted, on this page, a number of the GAO reports that deal with either exceptional sums of money wasted or grossly inefficient management. In the annual GAO report the largest savings seem to fall in the areas of unnecessary or inefficient purchasing, poor management and slipshod care of Government property.

In the "measurable savings or possible savings" area the largest single item, $29,904,000, is in the category of purchasing. Here the GAO found that even though a central agency has been established to provide coordinated and more economical management of supply systems this approach to the problem had not worked too well. The GAO found, for instance, that $21,300,000 worth of military stock had not been transferred to fill existing requirements in other military departments. The fact of transfer made possible additional savings of $2,200,000 in termination of purchase contracts; the saving of $4,700,000 by reducing purchasing contracts, and over half a million dollars in scheduled repairs.

It seems incredible that the GAO should have to tell the military forces, for example, that there were 487 aircraft engines (valued at $15 million available and not being used while the Navy was preparing plans and contracts to purchase an additional 101 of these same engines.

It seems equally astounding that the Air Force would order $5,500,000 worth of new lightweight uniforms for the Air Force when it had on hand slightly heavier weight uniforms valued at $51,200,000—enough uniforms for 10 years. Nor can an ordinary taxpayer understand why the military forces unnecessarily spent $682,000 in fiscal 1962 because they could not come to an agreement over the width of the belt loops and the straightness of the legs of men's trousers.

The military forces are not the only offenders in the long GAO calendar of waste. The investigators discovered, for example, that in 1960 the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corp. had stopped recording depreciation of the seaway plant, property and equipment in its financial statement; nor did the Seaway consider bond interest expense in determining net revenue. In examining the accounting and reporting procedures of the Communicable Disease Center, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education and Welfare the GAO discovered that there was no provision for comparing the costs of operating projects with budgeted costs.

It is clearly evident from the annual report of the GAO that tremendous savings could be effected in government operations without the elimination of a single Federal agency. The pattern of waste, of gross incompetence and methods of management so stupid that it appears it must be a studied effort is very clear.

The 10-year record of Joseph Campbell as Comptroller General of the United States is so good that the Congress could do worse than extend his powers beyond the investigative and reporting areas to embrace those of consideration of the worth and value of a proposed agency or program. His vast experience in the trackless wastes of government inefficiency would be invaluable to the taxpayer—who foots all the bills.

ALASKA APPRECIATES SKILL, COURAGE OF BLM SURVEYORS

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, recently a most interesting article was brought to my attention. The article, "Hop and Jump Surveying," by Elmer W. Shaw, describes the difficult but important work done by Bureau of Land Management surveyors in the State of Alaska. It appeared in the magazine American Forests, January 1963, and I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The task of surveying Alaska land selections is a very large and difficult assignment. To undertake it with the ordinary metes and bounds survey techniques which were used in surveying the original 48 States would be both extremely expensive and time consuming. Instead of this BLM has developed electronic equipment and methods which speed surveying and cut costs. This system makes full use of digital computers, photogrammetry, electronic instruments to measure distances, helicopters, and swamp buggies. Surveyors can accurately measure distances up to 30 miles at a shot and not be off by more than a few inches. Surveyors now make use of helicopters and parachutes to giant step their way across unsurveyed public lands.

The men who do this work are hard working, highly skilled, and proud of their achievements. They have every right to be proud; Alaska is much in their debt.

In his article, Mr. Shaw says:

> This is just one small portion of 103 million acres (an area about the size of California) of State-selection lands that must be surveyed before orderly planning and development by the newly formed State can proceed. Because of the extent of the area and the wild rugged frontier nature of the land itself, Harding (of BLM) describes his assignment as "the biggest and toughest land surveying job in America."

It is indeed a big job. Ninety-nine percent of the land mass of Alaska is now owned by the Federal Government. Under the terms of the Statehood Act the State is allowed to select 103 million acres from public lands in the first 25 years of statehood. The economic development of Alaska will depend in many ways upon the State making full and proper use of these lands. For this reason the State is anxious to obtain title to them. Unfortunately, however—and through no fault of the dedicated employees of BLM in Alaska—the land selection program has fallen behind.

So far, only about 3.2 million acres of lands have been selected by the State, surveyed by the BLM, with title awarded by the Secretary to the State. The State has not been slow in selecting lands; the slowdown has come because of disputed survey techniques. If the land selection process is not speeded up, it will take over 100 years before the State receives the lands promised it by the Congress—the lands so important to its economic development.

The Congress has always realized fully the importance these lands hold for the future economic expansion of our State. The Congress has also recognized that without adequate surveys the titles would be clouded and the land would lose much of its value. It is for this reason that provision was made for BLM exterior surveys of all selected lands.

Senate Report 1163, the 85th Congress, says:

> The subsection provides for exterior boundary surveys to be made by the Secretary of the Interior. This provision is required because a large part of the public lands in Alaska have never been surveyed and such surveys are necessary for the use or conveyance of selected lands.

The report goes on to emphasize "the granted lands cannot be used until surveyed; so, without funds for surveys, the land grants would become an idle gesture."

These grants were not meant to be an idle gesture.

And yet for the second year in a row BLM has sought—in its appropriation request—to reduce the amount to be spent for cadastral exterior surveys. Last year the Congress restored the funds for surveying; I am hopeful it will do so again this year.

In explaining this reduced request, Mr. Karl Landstrom, Director of the BLM, stated that there are "two factors that will slow down, perhaps temporarily, this program. And in view of that possibility this amount is adequate for the present time."

One of the factors mentioned by Mr. Landstrom is the dispute as to the size and shape of the areas being selected and surveyed.

The Secretary of the Interior has said:

> The law provides that all selections shall be made in conformity with such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe taking into account the situation and potential uses of the land involved. Thus, I have a clear duty to consider both the selected areas and the effect a selection or selections will have on the use value of the public lands remaining after selected lands have been patented to the State.

He has maintained that "each selection must be weighed in terms of the situation and the potential uses of the land involved," with the weighing to be done by the Department of the Interior. The effect of this interpretation has been that the Department claims a right of veto over the size and shape of State selections and the right to determine what size tracts shall be given the benefit of exterior surveys.

UNSUPPORTED BY LAW

Let us look at the statute itself. Section 6, paragraph g of the Statehood Act provides:

> Except as provided in subsection (a), all lands granted in quantity to and authorized to be selected by the State of Alaska by this Act shall be selected—
>
> 1. in such manner as the laws of the State may provide;
>
> 2. and in conformity with such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe.
>
> All selections shall be made in reasonably compact tracts—
>
> 1. taking into account—
>
> (a) the situation; and
>
> (b) potential uses of the land involved.

I have placed these two sentences in outline form for the purposes of clarity. No word has been changed nor has the order been altered.

It can be seen that "the land involved" refers to "the selections."

It does not refer to the Federal land surrounding or adjacent to the land selected, as claimed by the Department of Interior.

"The situation and potential uses" refer to the land "selections."

They do not refer to the Secretary's regulations, as has been claimed.

It is difficult to see where the Secretary finds the authority to make regulations defining or concerning what situation or potential land use will be acceptable.

I do not believe he has the authority to consider "the effect a selection or selections will have on the use value of the public lands remaining after selected lands have been patented to the State."

Certainly he may prescribe regulations for selection—time, manner, and so forth—to which the State must conform in selecting. This does not mean, however, that the Secretary may decide which lands are or are not selectable.

SURVEYING A SEPARATE QUESTION

Fully three sentences later, toward the end of section 6(g), and treated as a separate issue, the matter of surveying is discussed.

> Where any lands desired by the State are unsurveyed at the time of their selection, the Secretary of the Interior shall survey the exterior boundaries of the area requested without any interior subdivision thereof and shall issue a patent for such selected area in terms of the exterior boundary survey.

Senators will note there are no criteria set forth surveying; all unsurveyed selections are to be surveyed. Both the law and the report makes this clear.

The Secretary of the Interior shall survey the exterior boundaries of the area requested.

He is not directed to consider "the situation or potential use" of the land in deciding how or whether to survey.

He is to survey.

He is directed to survey the area selected. There is no provision allowing him to bundle together several adjacent selected areas. He is to survey the exterior border of the State request.

Area by area, request by request, he is to survey.

STATE'S RIGHTS ENDANGERED

If the State of Alaska were to accede to the position taken by the Secretary, the State would lose authority over its own land selections. The Secretary of the Interior would be in a position to determine whether the State selections are acceptable to him, the State would have to show him what it intends to do with the land. The Secretary could decide how large or how small the land selection should be; he could decide what development and use he would allow the State to make of the land he had given them; he could decide when and in what size exterior surveys should be made, without regard to the size of the tracts the State had selected.

There is nothing in the act or the committee reports on the act to indicate the Congress intended the Secretary to have such power.

In order that those interested may have a full understanding of the issues at dispute, I ask unanimous consent that the following items be included in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks:

A letter from Secretary Udall to William Egan, Governor of Alaska, dated March 8, 1963.

A brief prepared by the Associate Solicitor, Division of Public Lands, Bureau of Land Management, dated March 28, 1962.

A letter and memo to Senator Hayden, chairman of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations dated March 13, 1963, and a statement prepared by the State of Alaska outlining its position regarding cadastral surveys.

Mr. President, when confronted by a great task, a great American, Sir Winston Churchill, once said, "Give us the tools and we will finish the job." Mr. President, the Bureau of Land Management has a great task in Alaska. The article of which I have spoken describes the tools and talent BLM has available.

BLM has both the tools and the task. Let it get on with the job.

There being no objection, the article, letters, memo, brief, and statement were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Hop and Jump Surveying

(By Elmer W. Shaw, Forester, Bureau of Land Management, Anchorage, Alaska)

Rigged as smokejumpers, two young surveyors lean out of a whirring helicopter in rugged, timbered terrain 200 miles southeast of Fairbanks. As the pilot nears the target area, the spotting jumper signals his partner to stand by. Seconds later the two helijumpers leap from the chopper. Static lines pop open the colorful orange and white parachutes and they drift safely downward.

With power saws and axes dropped on a cargo chute, the jumpers set to work clearing a heliport for the surveyors and electronic equipment to be landed later. For these two helijumpers this is a routine operation. But to the outside observer, it is a key role in the U.S. Bureau of Land Management's tremendous Alaska surveying program.

In Paul Bunyan fashion, BLM engineers and surveyors are using new approaches to old problems. For example, the use of helijumpers for specialized survey work is new. True, the idea was borrowed from the fire fighting smokejumpers, but all techniques and mechanics of adapting it to modern surveying had to be pioneered on the ground and in the air—often by trial and error.

Helijumping into spruce stands is hazardous work, but the four jumpers at the Tanacross camp have had no serious accidents. However, one man had a few tense moments when he landed in the private patio of a huge grizzly. "I guess the bear was as scared as I was," he explained afterward.

According to Don Harding, who has charge of BLM's survey work in the Fairbanks district, 1,800,000 acres lying in a broad belt between Big Delta and Tok Junction are slated for survey by the 21-man camp at Tanacross before the end of 1963. And this is just one small portion of the 103 million acres (an area about the size of California) of State-selection lands that must be surveyed before orderly planning and development by the newly formed State can proceed. Because of the extent of the area and the wild, rugged, frontier nature of the land itself, Harding describes the assignment as "the biggest and toughest land surveying job in America."

In addition, there is the backlog of boundary surveys needed for homesteads, small tracts, townsites, and other special areas of Alaska's 272 million acres of unreserved public domain. Under the U.S. Department of the Interior, the Bureau of Land Management in Alaska is still doing a "land office" business. Also, the Bureau has major responsibility for fire protection, forestry, range, minerals, watershed, wildlife, and recreation on the remaining public domain lands in the 49th State.

The helicopter is just one of the modern devises that the engineers use in tackling their herculean task of surveying frontier Alaska. They also use digital computers, photogrammetry, electronic instruments to measure distance, aluminum towers, theodolites, two-way radios, aircraft, swamp buggies, and lots of mosquito dope. All this is a tremendous improvement over the chain-and-transit methods used by surveyors a decade ago. Even so, BLM is hard pressed to handle the staggering load of data that must be processed and the hundreds of section and township corners that must be accurately set.

Weather is another problem. Helicopters and jumpers can't work in fog, rain, or rough wind. Hence, they take advantage of good flying conditions at every opportunity. Last July a visitor called on the survey camp at Tanacross and found some of the men asleep in the bunkhouse at 10 o'clock in the morning.

"What goes on here?" he asked Ray Harpin, camp boss.

"These men are helijumpers," Harpin explained slowly. "They've worked all night clearing a heliport. We dropped 'em in about midnight because the air was quiet. Here under the midnight sun we can work all hours of the day or night."

ELECTRONIC SURVEYING

Electronics is another space age science that has revolutionized surveying in Alaska. Cadastral surveyors are now leapfrogging from mountain to mountain with electronic distance-measuring outfits. The model used by BLM can measure up to 50 miles and not be off more than a few inches, and it does this remarkable feat with a signal that travels at the speed of light.

To clear line and chain distance by hand would take 5 or 6 men a whole day to run 1 mile of section line through scrubby timber. The electronic method not only saves time; it also saves thousands of dollars in surveying costs. However, it would be virtually impossible to survey much of Alaska by standard methods.

The electronic outfit consists of two units—a master unit that sends out the electronic signal and the remote unit that receives the signal and rebroadcasts it back to the master unit. Both units are portable and can be mounted on tripods. Power is supplied by nickel-cadmium batteries. Both units are equipped with two-way radios so that the operators can talk to each other as they record the measurements, even though they are several miles apart.

The signal beam received at the master unit is made visible on a small cathode ray tube (a cousin to the picture tube in a TV set). By measuring electronically to the billionth of a second the time interval between impulses and its radarlike return, the surveyor can calculate the distance between the master unit and the remote unit. Like light, the beam travels in straight lines and normally must be unobstructed. Ordinarily, it can't shoot over ridges or through dense timber.

But the flying surveyors have licked this problem, too. They have mounted a master unit in the nose of a helicopter with a built-in hover sight. The hover sight is an arrangement of bubble tubes and prisms developed by the Geological Survey. It enables the hovering helicopter to sight in directly over a marked point on the ground. When the vertical position is OK, the operator sends out the signal to the remote unit. This hover sight method gives the surveyor a giant set of stilts and enables him to "see" over the board fence into the ball park.

AERIAL PHOTOS

Aerial photos and modern photogrammetry are also used to speed the survey work in Alaska. When land features are distinctive or in open timber, ground crews can often set predetermined section corners by using aerial photographs. But when the landscape is uniform, as in brush fields or tundra, the system doesn't work well.

The theoretical position of all the township corners in Alaska has already been accurately predetermined by protraction and electronic data processing. The latitude and longitude locations or distance coordinates have all been worked out on paper. The next big job is to set the brass hub monuments in the ground to mark the 6-mile township corners. Section corners or boundary markers are also set on the exterior township lines of a 4-township block at an average of 2 miles apart.

Aerial photos are also used with stereoscopic viewers, scanners, and plotters. With modern equipment and good photos, engineers in the office can read the land almost as well as a survey crew in the field.

Much of the land is a geological mess—broad, flat deltas and flood plains where silt-laden rivers meander in lazy oxbows and ever-changing channels—swamps, bogs, and sloughs where land and water mingle in crazy confusion—countless lakes dotting the tundra underlain with permafrost—jagged mountains rising sharply from the plains—spongy muskeg where moss and other vegetation mantle the soil like a kneedeep blanket—glaciers, snowfields, and roadless wilderness—all part of the unsurveyed face of Alaska.

LIFE IN A SURVEY CAMP

The BLM survey camp at Tanacross has a population of 21, including engineers, surveyors, helijumpers, pilots, mechanics, clerks, and a cook. Most of the men are college students or graduates.

Take helijumper Karl Seethaler, for a typical example. He is a 1956 graduate of Whittier College in California. His degree is in chemistry and he has worked as a chemist in Los Angeles, but he prefers travel and adventure. This is his 4th year as a jumper. In the off season, Karl spends time in such places as Hong Kong, Japan, Samoa, Fiji, Mexico, the Philippines, and Australia. Like many of the other jumpers, he wears a conspicuous mustache.

Or take Karl's partner jumper, Larry Brown. He's working out a master's degree in geology at Kansas State University. Larry is 25 years old and has jumped for 5 years.

And there's Bill Robertson, his wife Pat, and their 2-year-old daughter. Bill has a B.S. degree in Zoology from South Dakota University. This fall he hopes to continue his studies at the University of Alaska.

Others are Steve Cheney, helicopter pilot, who flew his whirly-bird all the way from San Francisco, and Oscar Torres, helicopter pilot from the Argentine. Camp boss is Ray "Tex" Harpin, with his big Stetson and easy-going drawl.

The camp itself is a hodge-podge assortment of buildings, tents, trailers, quonsets, campers, noisy little generators, a locked cache of firefighting tools, and a messhall. Right in the center is a vacant tent reserved for chess players. Next to it is a quonset hut containing more than $18,000 worth of electronic gear and surveying equipment. Off to the side of the parking lot are two aluminum portable towers that can be used to get above the brush and timber with the surveying instruments. Next summer the whole camp will move to a new location and start over again.

THE FUTURE

Alaska is a new State with most of its life yet before it. As in the covered wagon days of the early West, the problem of converting from public domain to cities, homesteads, and highways calls for vision, raw courage, and hard work. Along with the pioneers come the planners and land surveyors. This is one small part of the Bureau of Land Management's contribution to the systematic development of our last frontier. To keep up with the job ahead, the surveyors are literally traversing the land by leaps and bounds.

U.S. Department of the Interior,
Office of the Secretary,
Washington, D.C., March 8, 1963.

Hon. William A. Egan,
Governor of Alaska,
Juneau, Alaska.

Dear Governor Egan: I have given the most careful consideration to the State selection problems about which you spoke in your letter to me of January 14.

Absent an administrative solution of the problem, I am entirely sympathetic to your desire that the Department promptly take such action as will permit the State to seek relief in the courts. As a matter of fact, I have before me for signature a proposed decision rejecting several of the State's selection applications. However, before rendering such a decision, I want to make very sure that we have explored every possible avenue for reaching a mutually agreeable selection procedure.

Perhaps the main issue has to do with the size of the individual selections. The State contends that a reasonably compact area is a half township, roughly 3 miles by 6 miles. Accordingly, the State has made many single applications for tracts of that size. One of the purposes, I understand, is that the State, under the terms of the Statehood Act, is entitled to have the outer boundary of each selected half-township tract surveyed. In the case which is now before me, some 150 of such half-township selections together form a large compact block of land in the Wood River Tikchik Lakes area. It is the Bureau of Land Management's position that these individual half-township selections do not, of themselves, represent reasonably compact tracts, taking into account the situation and potential uses of the lands involved. Based on this concept the State would not be entitled to a survey of the exterior boundaries of each of the half-township selections.

In raising this issue I must make clear that I have no desire to abridge in any way the selection rights which the State has been given by the Congress. Nor do I suggest that this Department dictate what lands the State will select. I do believe, however, that we must keep in mind the land pattern that will develop as the result of the State's selection and make sure that we are not creating future land administration problems for both the State and the Federal Government.

The law provides that all selections shall be made in conformity with such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe taking into account the situation and potential uses of the lands involved. Thus, I have the clear duty to consider both the selected areas and the effect a selection or selections will have on the use value of the public lands remaining after selected lands have been patented to the State.

It is my view that no arbitrary or uniform rules can be laid down as to specific size and shape of individual selections. Each selection must be weighed in terms of the situation and the potential uses of the land involved. Subject to these criteria we are bound by the statute to survey the exterior boundaries of the selected areas. Hence, while the State is not entitled to surveys of the interior or areas of recognizable homogeneity by the device of breaking up the area into numerous selections, there is considerable latitude, under the law, for furthering the survey of selected areas.

If you believe that further discussions could result in some mutually agreeable procedures I will be glad to have someone from this office meet with State officials to take a fresh look at the situation.

Sincerely yours,
Stewart L. Udall,
Secretary of the Interior.

U.S. Department of the Interior,
Office of the Solicitor,
Washington, D.C., March 28, 1962.

MEMORANDUM

To: Director, Bureau of Land Management, Director of Budget and Finance.

From: Associate Solicitor, Division of Public Lands.

Subject: Proposal of Senator E. L. Bartlett regarding the survey of State Selections in Alaska.

The portion of section 6(g) of the Alaska Statehood Act relevant to the above-captioned proposal reads: "All lands granted in quantity to and authorized to be selected by the State of Alaska by this Act shall be selected in such manner as the laws of the State may provide, and in conformity with such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe. All sections shall be made in reasonably compact tracts, taking into account the situation and potential uses of the lands involved, and each tract selected shall contain at least five thousand seven hundred and sixty acres. * * * Where any lands desired by the State are unsurveyed at the time of their selection, the Secretary of the Interior shall survey the exterior boundaries of the area requested without any interior subdivision thereof and shall issue patent for such selected area in terms of the exterior boundary survey."

Senator Bartlett proposes to insert the following language into the report of the Senate Committee on Appropriations for the Fiscal Year 1963: "The additional $175,000 is made available to survey the exterior boundaries of each tract of public land covered by an authorized State application, whether or not adjacent to other selected land."

The second sentence quoted above from section 6(g) was inserted into the Act at the request of this Department. Regarding it, Assistant Secretary Chilson had this to say in a letter dated March 11, 1957, to then Representative Clair Engle (rept. of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, No. 624, 85th Cong., 1st sess., p. 25): "Section 6(g) makes no provision that selections of land by the State of Alaska shall be of reasonably compact tracts. We believe that orderly and efficient procedures and, in general, proper utilization of lands by the State should require that they be selected in fairly compact tracts, except in the case of small tracts which are isolated from other tracts of land open to selection. In order to accomplish this purpose, we recommend that subsection (g) of section 6 be amended by inserting in line 15, page 7, after the first sentence thereof a new sentence which shall read substantially as follows:

> "All selections shall be made in reasonably compact tracts, taking into account the situation and potential uses of the lands involved, and each tract selected shall contain at least five thousand seven hundred and sixty acres unless isolated from other tracts open to selection."

In other words, the words "reasonably compact" related as well to the size of the selection as they did to its shape. It appears clearly intended that the State was to select areas in sizes appropriate for management and utilization; but in no event were they to select blocks of less than 5,760 acres except in cases where the land desired was isolated. Thus, 5,760 acres was the minimum size that could by law be selected; but the Secretary of the Interior was invested with the authority to prescribe such rules and regulations as he deemed appropriate to govern these State selections; and he could, therefore, very well prescribe a rule or regulation defining "compact" as being something greater than 5,760 acres. The reasonable need for such a regulation can readily be found in the last sentence above quoted from section 6(g). In respect to this language, it was stated in Senate Report No. 1028, 83d Congress, 2d session, at page 5, "When these land grants have been vested in the State, it will be the responsibility of the State to perform such detailed surveys as it desires for purposes of use or disposal."

Thus it is clear that Congress did not intend that this Department do any detailed survey work in connection with these State selections; but only that an exterior boundary survey "of the area requested" be made sufficient to identify the lands for the purposes of the grant. It seems axiomatic, in this context, when one considers the magnitude of the overall grant of 102,550,000 acres of land to the State, that Congress intended, wherever and whenever feasible, that the lands selected be identified by a minimal surveying effort. A contrary conclusion in terms of the vast area that otherwise would have to be surveyed would result in a task of prohibitive size in terms of manpower and money without any corresponding Federal return or benefit.

Therefore, it is wholly logical and consistent with the intent of Congress, that the Secretary of the Interior survey blocks of selected lands regardless of whether contiguous to other selected blocks so long as they are in and of themselves reasonably compact in shape thus permitting the maximum possible economy in surveying the requested area in terms of minimum number of lines and monuments adequate to describe the lands and pass title; that is, surveying its exterior boundaries.

On the assumption that Senator BARTLETT means by "an authorized State selection" one which is for a reasonably compact area as above discussed, we do not view the language he proposes as imposing any substantive change in the law.

THOMAS J. CAVANAUGH,
Associate Solicitor,
Division of Public Lands.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE,
March 13, 1963.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman of the Interior Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HAYDEN: On March 1 our subcommittee heard testimony from Mr. Karl Landstrom, Director of the Bureau of Land Management. You will remember, at that time I discussed with the Director the question of the minimum size of the Alaska land selections which BLM is required to survey under the terms of the Alaska Statehood Act. Mr. Landstrom stated the figure 50,000, although the Statehood Act specifies 5,760 acres. I asked that he provide for the subcommittee a brief substantiating BLM's position on the whole cadastral survey problem in Alaska.

I am informed that an opinion on this matter prepared by the BLM Associate Solicitor has now been furnished to the subcommittee for inclusion in the record. This opinion is, in fact, a copy of the one prepared last year when the exterior survey problem was again before the subcommittee. At that time I prepared a short statement setting forth the position of the State of Alaska. I am enclosing a copy of this statement and I would appreciate your making it, and this letter, a part of the hearing record along with the BLM brief.

I have but two comments on the Solicitor's opinion.

First, I note that in the fourth paragraph the language from a Senate report of the 83d Congress is quoted. It appears to me that it is totally irrelevant to make reference to the history of a statehood bill in the 83d Congress. This bill did not become law. Alaska statehood was passed in the 85th Congress and what is relevant here is the legislative history of that act. At that time no qualifications were made on the BLM survey requirements.

Second, I agree with the Solicitor when he says it is both "logical and consistent with the intent of Congress that the Secretary of the Interior survey blocks of selected lands regardless of whether contiguous to other selected blocks so long as they are in and of themselves reasonably compact * * *." As is set forth in the enclosed statement, the Alaska Statehood Act provides that the State of Alaska may select lands that are "reasonably compact" and not less than 5,760 acres in area. It is the responsibility of the Bureau of Land Management to see that each of these selections receives an exterior survey.

Clear title cannot be established to these selections until each receives its exterior survey. It is important to the economic development of Alaska that these surveys proceed with all due speed. They have not done so.

Last year I requested that full funds for Alaska cadastral surveys be restored to the BLM appropriation. The subcommittee understanding the importance of these surveys to my State restored the funds. Again this year the administration has sought to reduce Alaska cadastral survey funds. I am hopeful the subcommittee will restore this money and will urge the BLM to proceed to survey the exterior boundaries of each tract of public land selected by the State, whether or not adjacent to other selected land, provided only that it is reasonably compact and larger than 5,760 acres.

Let us have no more delay or dispute from BLM.

Sincerely yours,

E. L. BARTLETT.

MEMORANDUM

MARCH 21, 1962.

To: Mr. Paul R. Eaton, professional staff member, Appropriations Committee.
From: Senator E. L. Bartlett.
Subject: Interior Department appropriations, cadastral surveys.

This memorandum is sent for your reference to supplement my statement submitted to the Subcommittee on the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies on March 13. From page 5 of the printed text of this statement I quote the following excerpt:

"To clarify to the Bureau of Land Management the meaning of the disputed language of the Alaska Statehood Act, I believe it is essential that the committee report specify that the additional $175,000 is made available to survey the exterior boundaries of each tract of public land covered by a State application, whether or not adjacent to other selected land."

It has been brought to my attention that the clarifying language I requested might be considered as substantive legislation and subject to a point of order. It was not my intent in requesting this language that the law be changed but only that provisions of existing law be effectuated by the Bureau of Land Management.

The pertinent language of the Alaska Statehood Act, 72 Stat. 342, is at section 6(g) which reads in part—

"All lands granted in quantity to and authorized to be selected by the State of Alaska by this Act shall be selected in such manner as the laws of the State may provide, and in conformity with such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe. All selections shall be made in reasonably compact tracts, taking into account the situation and potential uses of the lands involved, and each tract selected shall contain at least five thousand seven hundred and sixty acres unless isolated from other tracts open to selection."

* * * * * *

"Where any lands desired by the State are unsurveyed at the time of their selection, the Secretary of the Interior shall survey the exterior boundaries of the area requested without any interior subdivision thereof and shall issue a patent for such selected area in terms of the exterior boundary survey."

The State of Alaska interprets this language to allow State selection of available land by application to the BLM. The State considers each application it submits as a "selection" as that word is used in section 6(g) of the Statehood Act. It follows that the Secretary of the Interior is obliged to "survey the exterior boundaries of the area requested without any interior subdivision thereof," and further that the Secretary must "issue a patent for such selected area in terms of the exterior boundaries surveyed."

The law is, I feel, quite clear on this point. A selection made by the State may be rejected by the Secretary of the Interior as not covering a "reasonably compact" tract or as including fewer than 5,760 acres but it may not be arbitrarily altered or amended by the Secretary to conform to his opinion as to the definition of compactness.

In the past the BLM has acted in a fashion entirely inconsistent with the statutory scheme. The Bureau has accepted and tentatively approved State selections but in the case of selections adjacent to each other has surveyed only the exterior boundaries of a group of individual selections on a theory that the exterior survey thus completed covered a "reasonably compact" tract. This reasoning cannot be supported under the express terms of section 6(g) of the Alaska Statehood Act. Under the act the State has the prerogative of selection. Its prerogative is limited only by express conditions that selections exceed 5,760 acres and that they cover reasonably compact tracts. Where the Bureau considers a State selection lacking in compactness or acreage it is the duty of the Bureau to reject the State application. Recourse then could be had by the State through the Administrative Procedures Act to have administrative and eventually judicial review of this determination. Nothing in the Alaska Statehood Act warrants alteration of State land selections by the Bureau of Land Management or by the Secretary of the Interior. An individual selection is either acceptable or unacceptable. If it must be amended to conform to a legal determination that it does not meet the requirements of law, amendment can be undertaken by the State only and not by the Bureau. In the words of the act itself, section 6(g) "the authority to make selections shall never be alienated or bargained away in whole or in part by the State." To supplant the judgment of the State with that of the Bureau is an unlawful alienation of State authority.

In view of the express provisions of the Statehood Act I am confident that the language which I have asked the committee to include in its report will not be seen as substantive legislation. To quiet any doubts which may exist, I would suggest a change in the language I submitted on page 5 of my prepared testimony inserting the word "authorized" between the words "a" and "State" on line 6. The clarifying language would then require a survey of the exterior boundaries of each State selection otherwise authorized by law. The Department would, of course, retain its proper administrative authority to reject a State application be it adjudged in some way defective.

Statement of the Position of the State of Alaska With Regard to Cadastral Surveys Selected by the State of Alaska Under Section 6(g) of the Alaska Statehood Act for Public Law 85-508, 72 Statute 339

The land tendered to the State of Alaska by the United States in Patent No. 1226350 comprises seven separate land selections made by the State and given tentative approval on various dates after examination by the Anchorage office of the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior. The State objects to the lumping of individual selections together into one tract as a violation of section 6(g) of the Alaska Statehood Act, Public Law 85-508, 72 Stat. 339, which reads as follows:

"Except as provided in subsection (a), all lands granted in quantity to and authorized to be selected by the State of Alaska by this Act shall be selected in such manner as the laws of the State may provide and in conformity with such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe. All selections shall be made in reasonably compact tracts, taking into account the situation and potential uses of the lands involved, and each tract selected shall contain at least five thousand seven hundred and sixty acres unless isolated from other tracts open to selection. The authority to make selections shall never be alienated or bargained away, in whole or in part, by the State. Upon the revocation of any order of withdrawal in Alaska, the order of revocation shall provide for a period of not less than ninety days before the date on which it otherwise becomes effective, if subsequent to the admission of Alaska into the Union, during which period the State of Alaska shall have a preferred right of selection, subject to the requirements of this Act, except as against prior existing valid rights or as against equitable claims subject to allowance and confirmation. Such preferred right of selection shall have precedence over the preferred right of application created by section 4 of the Act of September 27, 1944 (58 Stat. 748; 43 U.S.C., sec. 282), as now or hereafter amended, but not over other preference rights now conferred by law. Where any lands desired by the State are unsurveyed at the time of their selection, the Secretary of the Interior shall survey the exterior boundaries of the area requested without any interior subdivisions thereof and shall issue a patent for such selected area in terms of the exterior boundary survey; where any lands desired by the State are surveyed at the time of their selection, the boundaries of the area requested shall conform to the public land subdivisions established by the approval of the survey. All lands duly selected by the State of Alaska pursuant to this Act shall be patented to the State by the Secretary of the Interior. Following the selection of lands by the State and the tentative approval of such selection by the Secretary of the Interior or his designee, but prior to the issuance of final patent, the State is hereby authorized to execute conditional leases and to make conditional sales of such selected lands. As used in this subsection, the words 'equitable claims subject to allowance and confirmation' include, without limitation, claims of holders of permits issued by the Department of Agriculture on lands eliminated from national forests, whose permits have been terminated only because of such elimination and who own valuable improvements on such lands."

Your attention is called to this language: "Each tract selected shall contain at least five thousand seven hundred and sixty acres unless isolated from other tracts open to selection. Where any lands desired by the State are unsurveyed at the time of their selection the Secretary of the Interior shall survey the exterior boundaries of the area requested without any interior subdivision thereof and shall issue a patent for such selected area in terms of the exterior boundary survey."

Even though there is a shift of terminology from "tract" to "area" it is apparent that they are synonymous as used here; the important point is that these terms are consistently used in the singular and not plural sense. From this it follows that the United States must under the law (1) survey the exterior boundaries of each tract or area selected by the State and, (2) issue one individual patent for each tract or area selected. In the instant case the United States did not survey the exterior boundaries of each of the seven selections and did not issue a patent for each selection.

To adopt the view that the Secretary of the Interior has discretion to lump selections together into one exterior boundary survey and issue one patent therefore would, aside from depriving the State of the survey of the exterior boundaries of individual selections, open the door to a veritable Pandora's box of troubles. What would be the upper limit as to the number of selections to be lumped together? Today 7 selections have been lumped together, but tomorrow it might be 2, 3, 20, or 100. What would be the upper limit as to the time during which the Secretary must make the exterior boundary survey and issue the patent? If lumpings are allowed the Secretary would be in a position to hold up the survey and patent indefinitely until the State makes selections of contiguous tracts in sufficient aggregate acreage to satisfy the whims of the Secretary as to what exterior boundary survey is to be performed; in other words, the freedom of the State to make its own selections would be subordinated to whatever lumping policies the Secretary might deem appropriate. In turn, the State would be tempted to forgo advantageous selections and perhaps make some disadvantageous ones (from the point of view of potential land use) in an effort to combat or influence particular lumpings. To avoid such internecine warfare it is necessary to follow the plain meaning of the statute: One survey and one patent for each selection.

Under the statute the State is entitled to make selections as small as 5,760 acres, which, of course, is a quarter of a township or equivalent area. This entitlement cannot be abridged by any Federal regulations, for to do so would make this provision meaningless and place such regulations on a higher plane than the statute itself. Providing the statutory requirement of compactness is complied with, the State has the right to individual treatment (survey and patent) for each quarter-township or equivalent area. The discretion to select larger areas resides solely in the State, which in practice is selecting half-townships and may in some future cases select even larger tracts. The State, while recognizing that larger selections might expedite the patenting of selected lands, nevertheless must maintain its right to make quarter-township selections as inherent in the freedom of selection vested in the State by statute.

ALASKA AND NATION HAVE NEED FOR SERVICE CORPS

Mr. **BARTLETT**. Mr. President, I am pleased to add my name as a cosponsor to the bill introduced by Senator Harrison A. Williams to establish a National Service Corps. As the Senate knows, the concept of a National Service Corps has received intensive study for many months by the President's Study Group on National Voluntary Services. The proposal embodied in the measure introduced today is the result of this study. It has not been conceived in haste. It is a moderate and modest beginning: as presently envisioned, the Service Corps will not exceed 5,000 volunteers. These men and women will work on community projects only at the invitation of the community. They will, it is hoped, act as the nucleus for the development of a local attack upon the problems of poverty, misery, illiteracy, and adversity. It is hoped that they will stimulate and mobilize a strong yet latent desire of all citizens to improve their community.

The Study Group reported to the President in January. It recommended the creation of a National Service Corps operating, as it were, as a Domestic Peace Corps. After reading that report, Mr. President, I addressed a letter to the Attorney General who acted as Chairman of the Study Group. In this letter I pointed out that it is in the American heritage of freedom to care for the well-being of his neighbor. I said the National Service Corps will remind us of that heritage.

I also pointed out that Alaska offers a fertile field for the Service Corps. There is much that can be done by the Service Corps volunteers to alleviate the hardship and deprivation experienced by many of the Alaska natives who live in cold and isolation, remote from the benefits of civilization. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter may be included in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

Alaska natives are of three separate racial strains—Eskimos, Indians, and Aleuts. Generally speaking, the Eskimos are to be found along the north and west coasts of the State, the Indians in the central interior and southeastern Alaska, and the Aleuts along the Aleutian Islands.

The Alaska natives in southeastern Alaska and in the population centers of the State are relatively well off. The natives in the vast rural areas of the State are not. They have suffered severe and continuing economic and sociological dislocation. They are unequipped to live in our modern world and are unable to return to the completely primitive world of their fathers. They are ill-housed, ill-clad, and ill-nourished.

The following figures will indicate the disparity that exists between Alaska whites and Alaska natives:

Median school years completed:	
Alaska whites	12.4
Alaska natives, rural	5.6
Percentage unemployed, rural nonfarm:	
Alaska white labor force	9.7
Alaska native labor force	27.5

The Nome office of the Bureau of Indian Affairs estimates that from 50 to 70 percent of all Eskimos between the ages of 18 and 55 are permanently unemployed.

Median income, families and unrelated individuals:	
Alaska white rural nonfarm	$4,209
Alaska native rural nonfarm	2,019

(Prices are 25 to 40 percent and more above the lower 48 States.)

Housing—Percentage structurally sound with plumbing:	*Percent*
Alaska	57.7
Alaska native, rural	13.1

Tuberculosis death rate (per 100,000):	
Alaska natives	73.5
All races, United States	7.0

Infant mortality: 7 percent of all races, United States, deaths are infant deaths; 29 percent of all Alaska native deaths are infant deaths. (These deaths are due to colds, diarrhea, influenza—easily preventable with simple health education.)

Following are specific examples of the hardship and needs of the native Alaskan:

Alaska natives

	Upper Yukon judicial district	Wade Hampton judicial district	Bethel judicial district
Median school years completed	2.5	1.6	2
Median male income	[1] $2,100	$898	$1,316
Number of houses occupied	332	528	1,068
Number of houses with piped water	33	7	168
Number of houses with toilet	15	0	98
Number of houses with sewage disposal	12	0	125
Median persons per room	3	5.5	4.3

[1] Prices in these areas at least 40 percent above U.S. average.

The need is clear, Mr. President, there is ample work to be done to assist the Alaska natives and to teach them how to help themselves.

There are also, Mr. President, many citizens of Alaska who have the desire and ability to be of assistance. An example to indicate the strong interest of Alaskans in such a program as this is the recent conference held at Fairbanks, Alaska. This conference was held to discuss means of improving the lot of the Alaska native living in remote areas of the State. Participating in the meeting were representatives of Federal, State, and local governments, churches, and private organizations interested in social work. I ask unanimous consent that the recommendations adopted by this conference be made a part of the Record at the conclusion of my remarks. A member of my staff, Mr. President, attended this conference. Upon his return he reported to me on the interest he found in the concept of a Domestic Peace Corps. I ask unanimous consent that this report prepared by the able William S. Boesch be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

There is a deep and as yet little tapped reservoir of good will in our people. The extent of this good will was seen in the response of the people to the work of the Peace Corps in the creation of the National Service Corps. We are again calling upon the people. They will not fail.

It is my earnest hope the Congress will early approve this measure.

There being no objection, the letter and memorandum report were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

January 21, 1963.

Hon. Robert F. Kennedy,
Chairman, President's Study Group on National Voluntary Services, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Kennedy: I have just finished reading the report to the President prepared by the study group under your direction. It is an excellent report, proposing a program of great importance to America. I congratulate you and every member of your committee for your fine work.

The creation of a National Service Corps—operating as a domestic Peace Corps—would serve to focus and direct the attention of millions of Americans on the hardship and suffering which exist within our own borders.

The work of the service corpsmen itself will be of high value. The example and effect of this work will be even greater. It is in the American heritage of freedom to care for the well-being of a neighbor. The National Service Corps will remind us of this heritage.

I write to you, now, as I have before, to emphasize both the opportunity and the need for such a Corps to work with Alaska Eskimos, Aleuts, and Indians.

I urge as strongly as I am able that such work be among the very first undertaken by the Service Corps.

In the past I have pointed out the needs of these native Americans: basic education in literacy, vocational training, community development, instruction in sanitation and basic health needs.

Let me point out the opportunities: These citizens are anxious to help themselves. They need someone to show them how.

They know in their evolving world they need to read and write but who in their village can teach them?

They could develop self-help housing programs but they need someone to show them it can be done.

The death rate among native infants is three times higher for native Alaskans than it is for Americans as a whole. These deaths are caused by common infections which common health care could control. These citizens want to maintain basic health care but they don't know how.

Alaska is a fertile field for the Service Corps.

The work it starts will be taken up by the native Alaskans themselves.

The work it starts will be assisted, I am sure, by Alaskans in all walks of life—the churches, the schools, the university, the State government stand ready to help.

Projects undertaken in Alaska could serve as examples for future work undertaken for other Indian groups in other parts of the country.

For my part, if enabling legislation is needed, I stand ready to be of assistance in the Senate in every way possible.

Please let me know also how I can assist in working out a Service Corps pilot program for native Alaskans.

Sincerely yours,

E. L. Bartlett.

Recommendations for Coordinated Plan of Action

(Adopted February 21, 1963, at Fairbanks, Alaska, by Development Conference, sponsored by Churches' Socio-Economic Advisory Committee and Bureau of Indian Affairs)

This meeting was called in recognition of the depressed economic condition of the communities in the Yukon and Tanana River basins, and the desire of those in attendance to help local people toward self-improvement. This statement is to recommend ways to accomplish that purpose.

We recommend—

The creation of a coordinating committee to insure that all available facilities are brought to bear on the total problem. This committee shall consist of (at least) a representative of the Churches' Socio-Economic Advisory Committee, the University of Alaska, the State Government, and the Federal Government. Members of this committee should be selected today.

That the committee should invite on appropriate occasions representatives of organized labor, native organizations, and other groups and organizations interested in their welfare, to meet with it.

That the headquarters of the committee be in Fairbanks.

That the committee, by working with the residents of the communities concerned, inform itself of local needs, problems, and goals. Emphasis shall be given to developing local initiative and meaningful communication between the committee and communities. To this end the committee will designate in each community a person through whom it will work.

That the committee, by calling upon the facilities and skills of the university, churches, State, and Federal establishments will provide for effective guidance and technical help to the communities.

That the committee shall designate communities for concentration of effort at particular times.

The committee shall address itself immediately to—

Adult education geared to basic community needs. Maximum local hire with particular emphasis on State and Federal public works projects.

We attach to these recommendations three proposals to amplify the above:

1. *Continuing Education*—Its place in the Yukon and Tanana River Basins:

A. Adult or continuing education as the path by which rural Alaskans may progress toward achievement of their own goals of economic development and individual fulfillment, has been repeatedly stressed in this conference. The message of one keynote speaker, Dr. W. R. Wood, was drawn from the report "Continuing Education in Alaska" which more generally states this as a new imperative of our times.

"Recognition of the essentiality for educating adults to insure security, productivity, and adaptability of a society facing changing conditions is as old as recorded history" (p. 135).

B. In assigning responsibility for the initiation of adult education this report states: "It is generally agreed that the university has responsibility for developing continuing education as a field of study, for training adult educators, and for research" (p. 117). Training of leaders is the most immediate need at this stage. This is limited not merely to those who have a clearly defined "professional" responsibility. "Some training is also needed by those whose responsibility has been assumed voluntarily but whose duties in churches, or agencies is considerable" (p. 16). Furthermore, ultimate success "will be dependent upon local leaders. These must be trained and trusted with responsibility" (p. 72).

C. The recommended means by which the university is to discharge this responsibility for training is through regular college credit courses for the "professional" educators, and short courses, seminars, extension programs, and institutes for the "voluntary" educators and local leaders (pp. 72, 120).

D. In applying these general statements and recommendations to the Yukon and Tanana River Basins it is clear that the university must immediately secure the services of the most highly qualified "professional" available with service in areas outside Alaska similar to the region of this proposed pilot program. This person will plan and conduct programs for the training of all types of educators and leaders, guiding them in the planning and administration of specific community education programs, learning skills of group discussion, developing a sound philosophical basis for the pursuit of their work.

E. The success or failure of this initial step will depend upon the person recruited. It is recommended that the university take steps to secure the services of Dr. Alexander Laidlaw, of Ottawa, Canada, in inaugurating this program for continuing education in the bush villages of Alaska. In his foreword to Laidlaw's book, "The Campus and the Community," Dr. J. R. Kidd describes him as one of the principal reasons for the success of the Antigonish movement of Nova Scotia and its spread to all corners of the underdeveloped free world: "Since he left Antigonish, Laidlaw has given the same kind of devoted service in India, to cooperative schools in many parts of the world, and latterly to the Cooperative Union of Canada."

The basic approach and philosophy of the Antigonish program has been adopted by the division of northern affairs as the cornerstone of the Canadian development of northern communities and peoples. Those principles have permeated and influenced the extension services of the United States and have served as the model for the economic and village development programs of UNESCO.

They are merely another statement of the "new imperative of our time," which is continuing education for life.

2. Technical assistance:

A. The State's department of economic development and planning, or another representative designated by the Governor, will be responsible for securing technical help from the appropriate State agencies.

B. Through their Projects Development Officer in Fairbanks, the Bureau of Indian Affairs will be responsible for securing technical help from the appropriate Federal agencies.

3. Local hire:

The matter of local hire should be assigned to a subcommittee whose task will be to confer with appropriate Federal and State agencies, organized labor, the Associated General Contractors, and Alaska's congressional delegation.

Thorough legal research should be undertaken to determine existing barriers to local hire, and remedial measures should then be proposed.

It should be noted that efforts in the furtherance of local hire have already been started by the Churches' Socio-Economic Advisory Committee, the Alaska Native Affairs Committee, and other interested groups.

Committee: Bishop William J. Gordon, Jr., churches; Dr. George W. Rogers, University of Alaska; Hubert J. Gellert, division industrial development, State government; Ross L. Miller, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Federal Government.

MEMORANDUM

To: Senator E. L. BARTLETT.
From: William S. Boesch.
Re: Trip to Alaska, February 17–25.

I found strong support for the Domestic Peace Corps:

1. During the course of my trip I was approached by many people enthusiastic about the President's proposed National Service Corps.

2. As you know, the delegates to the developmental conference in Fairbanks, meeting to discuss the problems involved in social and economic development of the bush areas of Alaska, passed a resolution urging the Alaska congressional delegation to support vigorously legislation introduced to authorize the corps.

3. Students at the University of Alaska showed great interest and indicated that they would enjoy working in the undeveloped areas of Alaska but could not afford to do volunteer work unless their subsistence was paid.

4. Several Federal and State officials suggested to me that the service corps workers would be of great help to them in certain one-shot, short-term programs, allowing them to achieve much more in the way of development for a given expenditure.

5. In addition to general support for the National Service Corps, I received a few specific suggestions as to the way the program might be used in Alaska. I have sifted through these and I think the following list will give you a pretty good cross section of what I was told:

(a) The Indian community of Holikachuk is actively planning a move to the brand-new village of Grayling, 40 miles west of their present location. They have had a great deal of help from BIA and the State housing authority and to date achieved a great deal by way of preparation for the move.

It was suggested to me that when the construction season arrives, service corpsmen with a knowledge of carpentry, sanitation, electricity, and other skills, would be more than welcome in helping build the new village.

The skills of the corpsmen would not only be of great service in construction but the people by working with them might acquire proficiency themselves in some of these areas which would serve them in the future. (Clipped hereto is copy of a letter we have received from the village outlining their plans.)

In addition to Holikachuk there are other communities that have plans to move; for example, Fort Yukon will have to relocate if the proposed Rampart Dam becomes a reality. Moreover, the feeling I got was that we will see more and more a tendency for these small isolated villages to move together to form larger units.

(b) In Juneau there is an area called the Indian Village in the very heart of the city, where because of a longstanding doubt as to the ownership of the land, no economic development has taken place. The Indians of Juneau and Indians migrating to Juneau in ever increasing numbers from other areas, have settled in the village, living in substandard housing erected in irregular patterns presenting a sanitation problem, a fire hazard and a generally poor appearance.

When I was in Juneau it was pointed out to me that there were persons in the city, both native and nonnative, interested in cleaning up this area and improving the standards under which these people live.

It was also indicated to me that should a national service corps program be authorized, Juneau would undoubtedly be sending a request for help on this particular project.

Further I was told that in the summertime the Indian women display handicrafts along the streets in front of their houses for sale to tourists. If this area were cleaned up and made more attractive, visitors would be more inclined to visit the Indian community and, as a result, income to the natives from the tourist trade might be increased considerably.

(c) The native peoples of many of the communities of Alaska catch fish for both subsistence and sale. (I refer here not to communities where fishing is the main industry.) Where there is no cannery nearby, fish are dried in the sun exposed to all the elements and insects, especially flies. Much of the food value of the fish is lost in this process of preserving. Moreover, it is extremely unsanitary.

By teaching better methods of preserving fish products, the nutritional value of native food would be improved and it is possible that a new industry for fishery products could be developed, for example, the packaging and selling of smoked river salmon as a delicacy item.

(d) We have heard many ideas concerning adult education in Alaska. The one most often mentioned is adult literacy education. On my trip, however, I heard other suggestions which seem to me to have merit also. For example, it was pointed out to me that the native village councils in most areas are sadly lacking in knowledge of parliamentary procedure. Training in this area might be combined with a basic course in civics and a basic course in State and Federal law. Area Director Bennett pointed out to me that if the leaders of the villages were taught to use communications devices such as slide projectors, felt boards, etc., they could greatly increase the understanding of the villagers for State and Federal programs and laws affecting them. Other areas which might be included in adult education are insurance, mail ordering, and home accounting and budgeting. I was surprised to hear that many fishermen in the southeastern area of Alaska do not know how to care for or repair their boats and equipment. Often they lost part of a season with broken down boats, waiting for a mechanic to work them into his busy schedule. Care and repair of gasoline motors, diesel motors, generators, radios, and possibly heavy equipment such as bulldozers and graders are skills that could easily be taught and are much needed.

(e) A great deal of concern was expressed to me over the village sanitation problem. It was pointed out that the Public Health Service at present does as much as possible toward teaching good practices in sanitation for prevention of tuberculosis. It is my understanding the PHS could definitely use service corpsmen to supplement their field personnel in the program. This could also be part of the general village sanitation program carried on by the State, including the training of medical aids for villages who would be able to perform first aid and administer and dispense medicine. (Clipped hereto is a letter requesting such help from the president of Point Hope, an Eskimo village.) The Bureau of Indian Affairs has formed a committee to consider all possible areas and problems in Alaska which might fit into a national service corps program. Area Director Bennett has offered the facilities of the BIA high school at Mount Edgecumbe, Alaska, for training corpsmen should such a program become a reality. I think that a national service corps would receive a great deal of aid, information, and cooperation from the Bureau of Indian Affairs in Alaska.

I'm sure they would receive an enthusiastic response as well as volunteers from the student body of the University of Alaska.

The various agencies of State government, the chambers of commerce, and the leaders of business and industry are all extremely interested in doing what they can to help the less developed areas and peoples of Alaska.

All in all, I would say that the national service corps would receive not only a challenge in Alaska but also overwhelming support from Alaskans.

HOOSIER SUPPORT FOR SAVING INDIANA DUNES GROWING

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the rising tide of public opinion favoring Federal Government action to save the Indiana Dunes springs in greatest part from within Indiana itself. The recent failure of the Burns Ditch port promoters to secure an appropriation from the State legislature to build a harbor in the midst of the dunes has at last brought many of the facts about this boondoggle to the attention of the people of Indiana. The legislature of course refused such an appropriation, despite what was uniformly reported to be maximum pressures to do so.

A recent editorial in the LaPorte, Ind., Herald-Argus is typical of this increased public understanding and the desire for Federal action.

The editorial correctly points out that, first, while a portion of the central part of the dunes is under destructive and vindictive attack, thousands of acres and miles of shoreline still exist unspoiled; second, no case has been made for a Burns Ditch port and it is extremely unlikely that such a port will ever come into existence; and third, the steel companies could construct their own port if they needed one and this would be most logical, anyway.

The editorial also pleads that the dunes are a national treasure which nature took 10,000 years to create and which, once destroyed, can never be regained.

Finally, it declares that there is a national interest in saving the dunes and correctly points out that if the dunes are to be saved it will have to be by Federal Government action. Moreover, it asks that Hoosiers "get busy with support for the congressional measure which would save the remaining 4 or 5 miles of dunes shoreline for today's generation and for posterity."

The case could not be more accurately and succinctly stated, and it is particularly interesting that this comes from the area directly involved. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial of April 18, 1963, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMOLISHING THE DUNES

"Sands of time ran out at dunes" reads a newspaper headline this week as the sand mining of a Lake Michigan dunes area in the Burns Ditch vicinity began. It is very true that this particular tract in the irreplaceable dunes region is lost forever, its sand sold to Northwestern University for fill for its campus extension. The deal is for 2.5 million cubic yards of sand, with the Bethlehem Steel Corp. the seller.

Not only will an area of dunes be leveled but the bulldozers and earthmovers have been busy creating a road once merely a trail passable only to persons on foot or riding in beach buggies. This road leads away from the lake and its creation destroys some more of what was once unspoiled wilderness. And the changers of nature's face have also cut a drainage trench to the lake from a swampy area once a wildlife haven. The onetime swamp is now just another site dedicated to progress.

As is well known now, Midwest Steel has already built a steel mill in the Burns Ditch area and Bethlehem is ready to begin work on a $250 million plant. These industrial projects and now the sand mining have taken many acres of dunes out of circulation forever as areas for recreation, outdoor enjoyment, and as naturalists' laboratories of rare value. However, there are still several thousands of acres of shoreline dunes left and while the hour is late it is not fatally so.

Because no good case has been made that a Burns Ditch state port would be widely used or would be worth its cost, it is extremely unlikely that a port will ever come into existence along the Porter County shoreline. The steel companies will create their own port facilities if no public harbor is built. And as they would be the principal users anyway of a port this outcome seems logical and satisfactory.

If there is to be any saving of the remaining dunes area, the Federal Government will have to do the saving, which is why the legislation pending in Congress is of such importance to Indiana, the entire Chicagoland area and, in a broader sense, the whole Nation.

The dunes are a natural treasure which should be preserved for the delight and benefit of millions of Americans living today and yet unborn. They cannot be reproduced for nature has taken 10,000 years to create them. Once gone they are lost forever as a haven where the naturalist can wander and where the lover of the outdoors can seek sun and fresh air and the fun to be had away from rigors of urban life.

Before more of these dunes fall to the conveyor belt or the mill builders, Hoosiers should get busy with support for the congressional measure which would save the remaining 4 or 5 miles of dunes shoreline for today's generation and for posterity.

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT HAS SECOND THOUGHTS IN ALASKA—AGAIN

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, 62 miles southeast of Anchorage on a small peninsula of land on Prince William Sound, there lies the military port of Whittier, one of the strangest ports in the world. Surrounded on three sides by high snow-capped mountains and year-round glaciers, this installation has now been abandoned by the Defense Department.

Over the last 10 years as many as 1,000 military and civilian employees and their families worked and lived at Whittier. In September 1960 the port was placed in a state of inactivation. In 1961 there were but 44 men stationed at Whittier; in 1962, 35 men. There are but 34 there now.

On March 29 of this year the Federal Government announced that Whittier is excess real property and is to be disposed of by the military. Only the petroleum distribution system will be retained. This will require the employment of but one man. This one man will walk a strange and lonely city. The Hodge Building stands empty. This building, 14 stories tall, is one of the most modern apartment houses in Alaska. It was built to house 700 persons in comfort and convenience.

Silent now is the $8 million Buckner Building, which once held staff offices, troop quarters, post exchanges, mess halls, snack bars, commissaries, bowling alleys, a service club, a beauty shop, a barber shop, a theater, a bank, and other facilities. It was called the city within a building.

Empty too are the shops, the storage facilities, the warehouses, the gymnasium, the fire station, the volleyball court, and all the other buildings and facilities which made up the port of Whittier—a port in which the Federal Government has invested between $40 and $50 million over the last 20 years.

In the early days of World War II, after the Japanese forces had seized the Aleutian Islands of Adak, Attu, and Kiska, the Army decided that the defense of Alaska required two ice-free, all weather ports to insure the preservation of supply lines between central Alaska and the lower 48 States. And so a port was made in a hurry where no port had been before.

The capital construction cost of the port of Whittier from 1943 through 1952 was $24,247,320. This figure does not include the $5 million spent on the construction of railroad tunnels under the Whittier Glacier to connect the port with the Alaska Railroad at Portage. This single track spur remains the only connection between the port and central Alaska. There is no road into the establishment.

It has always been my feeling—and the feeling of many other Alaskans—that the construction of this port was unnecessary and wasteful. The port of Seward, Valdez, or Cordova could have been adapted to handle this military business. Whittier was expensive to build, expensive to operate, without either economies of location or transport to recommend it. It has always seemed to me particularly vulnerable to enemy attack. A single bomb could bring tons of earth and rock down upon the tunnel entrance, thus closing the port for many months.

On June 17, 1953, the principal dock at the port, a 2,300-foot timber structure, burned down. There were warehouses and other facilities on the dock which were also destroyed. The total damage came to over $8 million. The Army that year sought authorization from the Congress for immediate reconstruction. The Congress approved the request and the Army spent an additional $6,536,187.

At that time I spoke out in opposition to the hasty reconstruction of the port. At that time I said, "Whittier facilities should not be rebuilt," until an examination was made of the long term need for Whittier and of the alternative ports available.

Unfortunately the Army did not make such an examination. It went ahead and spent the $6,500,000 to restore the port and it spent an additional $9 million on new port facilities and the petroleum distribution system. During the years from the fire to the deactivation of the port at the end of 1960, maintenance and operation cost an average of $1½ million a year.

In the 20 years since it was built, the port has handled 1,905,765 tons of dry cargo, and 2,763,518 tons of petroleum products. This makes a total of 4,669,283 tons handled by a $50 million-plus installation.

In other words, the construction of Whittier cost the military $10 for every ton of supplies that crossed the dock. This was the construction cost only. I have no idea what the operating, personnel, and support costs have been through the years.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that estimates of the amounts of cargo passing over Whittier Dock for the last 20 years be made a part of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

And now Whittier is to be sold. Who will buy it, Mr. President? I do not know.

It is isolated and remote. Because of its location at the base of a glacier, at the head of a bay, tightly surrounded by high mountains, its weather is very bad. Whittier has constant rain in the summer, constant snow in the winter, and clouds all year round.

But there it is, Mr. President, a $50 million Federal facility with one man on duty.

In 1953 the Army maintained that Whittier was vital to Alaska's security. Since then the Haines pipeline has been installed to carry military petroleum requirements. Nothing else, however, has changed. Does the Army now feel that two ice-free ports are no longer necessary? If Whittier is not necessary now, was it necessary then?

Does the Army now feel that the cost of running Whittier outweighs the services the port renders? If the costs are high now, were they not high then?

Mr. President, the Defense Department runs its own show in Alaska. It does not often consult Alaskans before it acts. It does not often explain its actions.

Once again, and $50 million later, Alaskans are able to say to the Defense Department, "I told you so."

There being no objection, the estimates were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Tons dry cargo over Whittier dock

Fiscal year:	*Tons*
1944	249, 036
1945	162, 661
1946	67, 782
1947	136, 239
1948	194, 899
1949	178, 015
1950	150, 275
1951	190, 423
1952	143, 316
1953	120, 945
1954	23, 126
1955	61, 460
1956	52, 917
1957	43, 661
1958	39, 522
1959	38, 979
1960	30, 843
1961	8, 636
1962	4, 463
1963	8, 567
Total	1, 905, 765

Petroleum products ex-Whittier

Fiscal year:	*Tons*
1944	24, 813
1945	53, 073
1946	19, 154
1947	36, 917
1948	143, 487
1949	50, 807
1950	59, 674
1951	161, 325
1952	212, 784
1953	275, 283
1954	261, 778
1955	300, 406
1956	326, 367
1957	186, 311
1958	135, 199
1959	124, 474
1960	96, 552
1961	99, 665
1962	119, 736
1963	75, 713
Total	2, 763, 518

PIONEERS OF THE SIXTIES

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, Mrs. Elizabeth Hickethier, of Chisana, Alaska, has written an honest and fascinating account of the life which she and her husband live in an isolated valley of Alaska. The life of these people is as rugged, demanding, and satisfying as that of our forebears when they built our Nation.

Citizens like the Hickethiers are building Alaska as surely as our ancestors built a new world.

Because I know the Senators will be interested in reading this account of Alaskan rural life, I ask unanimous consent that the article, recently published in the National Observer, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WEARY OF THE RAT RACE?—A FAMILY SIMPLIFIES LIFE IN ISOLATED ALASKAN VALLEY

(By Elizabeth Hickethier)

(About the author.—Elizabeth Hickethier, who wrote this article for the National Observer, worked at jobs ranging from waitress to policewoman before moving to an isolated Alaskan village in April 1961. Her husband, Bud, is a well-known big game guide, and Mrs. Hickethier recently was licensed for the same occupation—the first time Alaska has granted this license to a woman. Her ghost town, Chisana (pronounced Shushanna), now has only 17 of its original cabins still standing—and the Hickethiers own 11 of them.)

CHISANA, ALASKA.—Nestled in a hollow of the Wrangell Mountains is a small valley. A glacier reluctantly retreats at one end of it, and gravel deposits stripe the valley floor.

On one of these gravel bars, resting in the sun like oldsters in a city park, are several rows of log cabins. Some bear their age with dignity; others show signs of imminent decay. They are all that remains of a long-dead gold rush town.

This is my home, where I live with my husband and son. We have one neighbor, who lives at the other end of town. Though Chisana once had 5,000 gold rushers, and its 300 log buildings made it one of the largest settlements in the Northwest, fewer than 20 buildings are still standing.

The cabin we live in is 50 years old, and has three rooms. The floor and partitions are made of hand-split spruce boards; the log walls are chinked with moss. The furniture—a few tables and benches, and a heavy hand-carved bed—is of the same vintage as the cabin.

USES A WOOD-BURNING RANGE

The wood-burning range I use for cooking came into Chisana on a horse-drawn sled. The horse trail, which led from McCarthy, on the other side of the Wrangells, was the artery that once kept Chisana alive.

Each fall sledders would cross the glacier and plot a new course across the icefield, made necessary by the ice's constantly heaving and opening new crevasses. These men carried bundles of willow branches, with which they marked the safe route. When winter storms drifted snow over the huge ice cracks, the sledders would lead their horses from branch to branch.

Our freight now comes in by air, once a week from Cordova Airlines. A typical example of our service: Recently an order for a case of bread was overlooked until the last minute. Merle Smith, president of the airline, held the DC-3 at Anchorage's International Airport while he rushed into town and gathered up the missing loaves.

Our airstrip is homemade. We chose a likely looking gravel bar and scraped the underbrush away with a tractor. At 3,300-foot elevation, ours is the highest strip in Alaska approved by the Federal Aviation Agency.

ACROSS UNMARKED TUNDRA

To reach Chisana today you must fly. You leave the Alaska highway at Northway and head due south, flying above unmarked tundra. An apparently impenetrable wall of mountains is wreathed in the distant mists. As you approach you see a gash cut in the cliffs by the river rushing below. Then you enter this narrow pass, and it widens abruptly into a valley of unsurpassed beauty.

In 1912 rich deposits of gold were discovered in gravel beds of Chisana streams, and prospectors poured into the valley. Some poled flat-bottomed boats up the river through a steep mountain pass from the Yukon, about 300 miles to the northwest, while others came in from McCarthy.

The gold was located above the timberline, some 6 miles from here. Soon, dogsled mail service was established, and the town of Chisana was born.

The few original claims yielded more than $1 million in gold. In the winter, using steam boilers, prospectors thawed the frozen gravel a few feet at a time, dug it out, and piled it up. When spring thawed the creeks, the gravel was washed in search of ore.

SOME LEFT WEALTHY

The rich deposits were rapidly worked out, and the people began leaving. Many who hoped to return left their cabins in readiness. Some of them left wealthy; most were poorer than when they came.

The population dwindled to one man. In Chisana's heyday he had been a freight sledder. Left alone, he turned for a living to his knowledge of the wilderness, and became a guide to big game trophy hunters. He stayed in the valley until his death 2 years ago.

A few years before his death, he made my husband his partner. Chisana is now our life. We are not prospectors or farmers, yet our livelihood comes from the valley.

Why are we here? I don't know for certain. Each day we could give a different reason. Yet many problems connected with living here seem insurmountable, though most of them are basic ones of survival in a wilderness. Compared to the average suburban couple, we live a simple life.

If our problems are basic, however, our rewards are immediate. Our meat house is made of peeled logs perched on 8-foot poles. When it is time to prepare a meal, I simply climb the steps and open the screen door.

THE BATTLE AGAINST THE COLD

From the fat-rimmed carcass of a moose or caribou I cut enough tender steak to satisfy the heartiest appetite. Each of the three members of our family is allowed three caribou and a moose each year. Our diet is meat heavy, but we have never eaten our limit.

The cold is our bitter enemy. All of our activities are conducted either in spite of it or because of it. We have 7 months of winter, with snow on the ground 9 months out of 12. And because of our livestock, most of our work is outside.

In the fall, after the hunting season, we take our horses to their winter graze. From January through April, though, they need supplementary feedings of grain. For this purpose we maintain 12 sled dogs. The dogs are kept tied on 6-foot chains. Denied exercise until hitched up to work, they are eager to travel. When the musher hitches the dogs and unties the sled's anchor rope, he had better have a good grasp on the sled. His "Let's go!" is unnecessary.

The daily dog sled trip with horse feed, sometimes in 60-below-zero cold, is not monotonous. The trail skirts the foot of a glacier, crosses a 2-mile-wide river of ice, and winds over a timbered hill. A round trip of 12 miles, it takes 3 hours.

BUILDING A NEW SITE

In the still air, the horses easily hear our sled in the distance. Several of them are belled, and there's a jangle of commotion as they emerge from the woods. Fast work is required. Grain-filled nose bags are quickly slipped on their heads; fumbling can cause a riot among the 16 steeds. The impatient animals kick at their neighbors, or try to rob the dog sled.

As much as we treasure the town's old cabins, it is apparent we are going to outlast them. We have chosen a building site 2 miles from the original town, and already have cut in an airstrip and erected the first of several new cabins. We plan on having a dozen more up in the next 2 years.

A spring-fed stream that never freezes flows behind the cabin. It will furnish us with power as well as water, although we've encountered difficulties in designing and constructing a water wheel efficient enough to furnish our new "town" with year-round electricity.

When our daylight dwindles to 4 hours, light becomes very precious. Fresh foods and other "impossibles" are often mentioned through the long winter, but it is light we crave most.

WHEN THE GENERATOR IS ON

Our answer now is the kerosene lamps that have been in the old cabins since they were built. Though we have a gasoline-powered generator, it's so expensive to operate that we never use it for lights alone. When enough jobs requiring power have accumulated, the generator is turned on for several hours the woods ring with the sounds of saws, drills, and sanders. The washing machine is put to work. And in between loads, the electric clippers are plugged in and the home barbershop opens for business.

We started building the new cabin 2 years ago. Since the Chisana Valley rests almost at timberline, building logs are scarce and we had to snowshoe 2 miles to a good stand to fell 50 logs. The next summer we used horses to drag them to our site. We put them through an ancient sawmill, brought in by dogsled and used by the gold rushers, then stacked our rough lumber up to dry.

Our biggest problem was to find enough straight logs to build a cabin of livable dimensions; the trees in our area are twisted by frozen ground heaving, and their growth is inhibited by altitude and poor soil. By searching the woods for several miles around the cabin site we found enough 10-inch logs to construct a 14- by 18-foot cabin, 11 logs high. A 50-gallon drum, sunk in the ground with a wood-burning heater in it, made us a floor furnace.

ISOLATION ONLY TEMPORARY?

In addition to our 160-acre homestead, we have a 30,000-acre grazing lease for our horses. We are doing experimental work with grains and grasses, attempting to find a fodder that will mature in our short growing season. If we succeed, we will add beef cattle to our livestock. To market them, we would drive them 90 miles across the tundra to the highway, where they could be trucked to Anchorage or Fairbanks.

Right now the lion's share of our income is derived from guiding sportsmen on big game trophy hunts. The isolation of the valley makes it an ideal hunting ground. But this may change.

For several years, exploration parties from various mining companies have roamed the hills searching for the source of the gold that gave birth to Chisana. And tantalizing amounts of rich copper ore have been uncovered. If those mineral exploration efforts should be successful, we can only guess at the effect on our sleepy valley.

So changes may come and go, but we will stay where our hearts are—in Chisana.

TAX INCENTIVE FOR ALASKA STUDENTS

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the Alaska Young Republican Federation, at a recent State convention, adopted a resolution pertaining to tax incentives for Alaska students. I know that the views of the Young Republicans of Alaska on this subject will be of interest to my colleagues, Democratic and Republican alike, so I take pleasure in incorporating the text of that resolution with my present remarks, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas it is generally agreed that the future of any civilization is greatly dependent upon the educational systems thereof; and

Whereas Alaska as a young and growing State is in particular need of educated professional young adults to develop our great natural endowments; and

Whereas the high cost of education for Alaskans is quite often a financial burden causing a dropout of students in our colleges and universities; Be it known that:

The Young Republicans of the State of Alaska do recognize the potential of the youth of Alaska and the great benefits to all the peoples of Alaska to be gained by a citizenry of higher education. The young men and women of our State financing their own education by part-time work are entitled to aid from the State of Alaska; and be it

Resolved, That those residents of the State of Alaska who are full-time students for at least 7 months of the tax year in an accredited college or university are entitled to a second exception on their State and Federal income tax.

DOING WHAT COMES NATURALLY—FARMLANDS FOR RECREATION

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on April 10, 1963, I made some remarks on the floor of the Senate on the recreation potential of our rural areas in this Nation.

The April 17, 1963, issue of the North Woods Call, a weekly which is published in Roscommon, Mich., and which specializes in material of interest to the upstate area, carried a most perspective editorial, entitled "Doing What Comes Naturally."

This editorial wisely suggests that these beautiful rural areas of ours might as readily revitalize their economies by taking advantage of the natural attractions around them as by hustling for industry. It is an intriguing piece, and I commend it to those who are concerned with the economics of rural America.

The North Woods Call is written, managed, edited, published, and sold by Marguerite Gahagan, a most remarkable newspaperwoman and a devoted friend of the birds, animals, and growing things in our north country. Formerly connected with the Detroit News, where, among other duties, she covered the criminal court, she now combines home and business in a cabin in the woods.

From this faraway spot, where no telephone jangles the nerves, her writing spreads around the State of Michigan and to those outside who love that part of our State. In "Doing What Comes Naturally" she furnishes some good material for the Secretary of Agriculture.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial, together with accompanying articles from the same issue of the North Woods Call, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOING WHAT COMES NATURALLY

While the term "multiple land use" is becoming more popular in Michigan because of the big outdoor recreation boom, there are still county boards of supervisors and village officials who waste time, money, and effort beating the bushes to bring in industry. With northern Michigan's future obviously tied in with recreation, a few forward-looking leaders are exploring the multiple land use idea by trying to introduce new recreations that take nothing from the land but give a lot to the growing army of tourists seeking relaxation from industrial cities.

Kalkaska County can by no stretch of the imagination be considered one of the wealthiest of the northern lower peninsula. It is in a cold snow belt and its soil is not conducive to profitable farming. Its hills are not the kind to attract ski center promoters, and its small communities have enjoyed no building booms. Yet in the county today the woods, of which the county is rich, offer a challenge that is being developed; maple sirup production and horesback trails.

Right now almost twice as many maples are being tapped as were tapped in the past due to a new pilot evaporator plant at Kingsley in Grand Traverse County. And Kalkaska County, which had 400 farms in 1950, and which has just 35 full-time operating farms today, is pushing ahead and utilizing its maples. Those same maples add to the beauty of the land and along with the typical pine-birch cover provide ideal trails for the saddle clubs that may give the county a much needed shot in the arm. Thirty-six miles of trails have been bulldozed from five miles south of Traverse City to Kalkaska Village, and in the county crop farmers see a market for hay and oats, and merchants envision a new group of vacationers ready to rent horses and patronize horse motels.

Down below businessmen see in abandoned farms opportunities to cater to a new group of recreation seekers and the appearance of 60 saddle club members last fall when the new trail was opened, was good evidence that Kalkaska's land has uses yet untapped for doing what comes naturally.

Here again is a community conservation cooperative project in which local people have utilized the expert services of a conservation department forester and a county extension service director to open a new field of recreation ideally suited to the land itself with its woods and lakes and rolling hills. By summer more than 100 horses will be available at Empire on Lake Michigan in Leelanau County for those wishing to head east for a day or week ride. And carefully blueprinted for future development is a trail that can cut east into the Deward area, past Grayling, Luzerne, north to Cheboygan or Alpena, or south to Tawas, a trail through mostly State lands.

Outfitters, guides, farmers and small towns near the trail will benefit in addition to those who are tired of crowded State parks and water skiing.

With the riding horse becoming the status symbol comparable to the ski in winter, an influx of southern Michigan riders will be able to bring their horse trailers to the northern woods where Kalkaska County business people are setting a pace in welcoming a new type of vacationer. As the deer hunters were once welcomed and entertained by a dance, the Kalkaska boys, with an eye to the future, forsee square dances and folk songfests for the saddle club folks.

Multiple use of the land may get them economic progress quicker than hustling for industry. And it will provide a lot more hours of relaxation for people hurrying away from those down-below industrial centers.

SADDLE UP—HORSE CLUBS PUSH TRAIL ACROSS STATE

Work is being rushed in the northern lower peninsula for a kickoff on a major recreation boom this summer that is expected to provide a needed economic push in some counties and provide a new attraction for tourists.

Thirty-six miles of horseback trail is being completed from 5 miles south of Traverse City east to Kalkaska. Sponsoring saddle clubs hope to push the trail to Deward, the old ghost town. The blueprint includes plans to develop the trail east toward Grayling, cutting across toward Luzerne and ending at Tawas.

The Top o' Michigan Horsemen and a Cheboygan saddle club are working on a plan to have a spur head north in the vicinity of Waters, cutting east into the Pigeon River area. A group in Alpena is developing plans for a trail to shove west to join the across-the-State trail.

Over 100 saddle horses are already at Empire on Lake Michigan, and in Kalkaska County business people expect to develop horse rentals. Two Ann Arbor businessmen, Robert G. Holliday and Paul J. McDonald, have purchased the old 429-acre Hagni farm in the county. It touches on the horse trail and they plan to operate a horse motel; a fenced pasture where horses can be put up overnight and where feed will be available.

According to Fitch R. Williams, Traverse City attorney and chairman of the Grand Traverse Saddle Club trail committee, work on the trail from Kalkaska to Grayling is expected to get underway this spring.

On the 36-mile trail east to Kalkaska cooperative work by the forestry division of the conservation department is evident. A bulldozer with a 7-foot blade was brought in by Fife Lake State Forester Fred H. Haskin after he approved plans that put the trail on State land where there would be no conflicts of interest.

Three horse corrals have been designated for overnight stops about 12 miles apart. Toilet facilities have already been installed at an overnight camping spot at Little Guernsey Lake on the Kalkaska-Grand Traverse County line on State land, and a pump is due to be installed. About a quarter of a mile away is a horse corral.

Norman J. Brown, county extension director at Kalkaska who has been working with the groups for the past year, said, "Every effort has been made to keep the horse camps remote from the regular forest camp grounds, and the trails away from roads with traffic.

"The land in Kalkaska County has a high recreation potential and riding trails fit in perfectly. The horseback riding can develop along lines similar to canoeing, with liveries which pick up riders at the end of a trip, provide horse trailers and facilities for camping."

Mr. Brown pointed out that a corral may be developed near Kalkaska village so riders can put up in motels after several nights sleeping in the open.

"We have received fine cooperation from owners of private lands where the logical place for the trail might cut across a corner of their land. And the trail committee will take care of camp maintenance, since we know the Conservation Department doesn't have enough money."

The growth of saddle clubs in southern Michigan has been felt in the Kalkaska area already with clubs of 10 and 15 members transporting horses up to join local members on rides.

"The horse has become a new status symbol," he said. "Boats were for a while, and now it's the horse. And business people in the county are planning on doing all they can to encourage this recreation. There is a possibility that a 20-horse trailer will be available to bring up horses for an entire club."

A horse rental and motel for riders is expected to be opened by Art Hagman, who operated Lake Valley Resort as a children's camp. Said Mr. Brown, "He is at the old halfway house location, and plans now to get in on the trail, and provide rooms, showers and a corral for horses."

The upswing in walking following President Kennedy's emphasis on it as a good form of physical fitness, may result in more hikers using the horse trails, too, Mr. Brown said.

"These two forms of recreation are not incompatible, and the trails cutting through wild land mostly are picturesque and safe. The trails are blazed, so there is no chance of getting lost," he added.

Pine and hardwood forests, open plains with wild cherry, and rolling hills are cut by the main trail, which, as it goes farther east, may follow the main Au Sable in some places.

According to William McCourt, of Gaylord's saddle club, the hoped-for tie-in spur in that area would probably be 10 miles east of Gaylord and head north into eastern Otsego County.

"The chamber of commerce is interested in developing such a spur trail," he said. "We have about 20 regular club members, and in the summer we have visiting members."

In Cheboygan Mrs. Margaret Lentini is correlating plans for that club of about 30 members to work with the trail committee.

James Hardy, of Lost Creek Ranch, north of Luzerne, who has promoted rides in that area for several years, said a group will arrive from Flint for a Memorial Day ride to East Tawas.

At the regular monthly meeting of the conservation commission Thursday and Friday in Lansing, the agenda includes a lease of bridle path rights in the Ortonville recreation Area.

According to Arthur C. Elmer, parks and recreation division chief, W. G. Lee, of Ortonville, who owns a 162-acre farm adjoining the State land, wishes to rent horses to the public to use on the bridle paths laid out by the conservation department in the Hadley Hills part of the area.

Said Mr. Elmer, "We have recognized a need in this particular area for such development, and have, in our approved master plan, a dude ranch project with suitable paths. It is our firm belief that this proposal will provide a much needed service and will add a recreational facility much appreciated by our park visitors."

While there are no grandiose plans for dude ranches in the minds of those pushing the horse trails in the northern counties, saddle club members have pointed out some added attractions that they feel can be incorporated in the future. One private renter of horses for trail rides, already uses an old-fashioned chuckwagon to haul hot dinners to riders at an overnight spot.

A supervised program of bonfire songfests, featuring the popular folksongs, and square dances is being considered, and one Kalkaska enthusiast hopes he can work up some dancing horse programs.

The value of trails in nature studies is also being discussed, with promoters considering every potential of what they foresee as a growing outdoor recreation in the northern lower peninsula.

FARM VACATIONS STARTED TO FIT IN RECREATION TREND

Modern farming has had an impact on one northern lower peninsula county: Kalkaska, and not for the best.

In 1950 there were 400 farms in the county. Today there are 35 full-time operating farms, and 180 in the soil bank. Pickles and potatoes no longer are routine crops. But in a county where more fishermen, tourists, campers and vacationers come, recreation is becoming a county commodity, just as potatoes and pickles once were. Know-how is what counts, for today two farmers raise as many bushels as were raised in 1950.

Two farms have moved quietly into the recreation field with farm vacations. Max and Joyce McCool have switched to pigs, selling them at an early age to outside buyers who transport them south for fattening.

And on their 112 acres they have a backdrop for city people wanting a farm vacation. They will start their 7th year taking in one family a week as paying guests this summer, taking advantage of the county's vacation attractions of boating, swimming, fishing and relaxing.

"They have all been city people, most with families and children the age of ours," said Joyce McCool. "Some said they wanted their children to see what a farm was like. Most of the women came to get away from vacation cooking. Some couples came because they were a little homesick for a farm where they grew up as children."

An elderly couple from California picked blueberries and fished. A couple from Missouri enjoyed the cool nights, fished in Lake Charlevoix, pulled weeds in the vegetable garden and relaxed.

One young father spent a whole day on the big tractor out on a field. Youngsters all wanted to learn to milk—and they didn't mean work the modern electric milkers, either.

"The children enjoy everything. They love the pony. Some have never had a cat or dog for a pet. They enjoy the baby chickens, a calf, and little pigs," said Mrs. McCool. "I have an old-fashioned churn and I make butter and homemade ice cream. They all think it's wonderful."

Enjoyed, too, are the family-style meals, with everyone gathered around the table and heaping dishes of food for as many helpings as desired. "I guess they must eat differently in the cities," she said.

Max McCool may have a pond dug, not so much for fishing, but just for enjoyment, a place where farm guests can enjoy peace and quiet and the outdoors. He might qualify for a loan and he asked Norman J. Brown, county extension director, to look the site over.

The McCools are one family trying to combine farming and recreation in a county where an economic boost is really needed.

TAX REDUCTION WITHOUT REFORM A MISTAKE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in its issue of May 1, the New York Times published a very interesting editorial commenting on the recent recommendation of the so-called Business Committee for Tax Reduction in 1963 calling for a simple and immediate $10 billion tax cut without any attempt at tax reform.

The Times editorial very properly calls this approach "single minded," and questions the wisdom of summarily rejecting the recommendations for reforms. It points out that reductions in rates could be greater if reforms are included, and that a basic problem is the damage done to public faith in our tax system by the many special and inequitable privileges now granted. This brief, but thoroughly public spirited, editorial deserves attention and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

All Out for Reduction

With President Kennedy's blessing, the newly established Business Committee for Tax Reduction in 1963 is calling for prompt congressional action to cut taxes by at least $10 billion. This is in line with the administration's own proposal, which calls for gross reductions of $13.5 billion over the next 3 years, accompanied by reforms that will recoup some $3.3 billion. The committee, though, is for reduction pure and simple; it does not want to jeopardize the prospect of a cut by imposing any reforms.

This single-minded approach has great appeal. But while tax cuts are needed, we doubt that the economy would be best served by a big one-shot reduction. The resultant speedup in growth would be temporary, and could lead to an inflationary threat. There would be no argument if we were faced with a recession, but the economy is doing well, and a long period of noninflationary expansion is much more likely if tax reduction is spaced out.

Moreover, we question the wisdom of rejecting reforms. The reductions in rates could be much greater if reforms are included. Also, they would eliminate some of the special privileges that have been so damaging to taxpayer morale. Our jerry-built tax structure is not a myth. It must be strengthened and simplified, and if this is not achieved along with reductions, then the chances are it will never be done.

We are concerned at the President's apparent willingness to lend his support to a group that candidly admits it has no use for the reforms in his tax package. Although Mr. Kennedy has not yet abandoned reforms, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that he is preparing to do so. If long-term growth and not just a shot in the arm is the objective, reform as well as reduction is required.

STAFF FOR LATIN AMERICAN AID GROUP

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey], I announce to the Senate that the Atlantic Community Development Group for Latin America, which is being privately financed by the Ford Foundation, as well as by other foundations and businesses in the United States, Europe, and Latin America, is underway and is very well organized.

In a real sense, the activity which I have undertaken in respect to bringing European interests into the development of Latin America stems from the fact that the Senate designated me to be a delegate to the NATO Parliamentarians Conference, and the Senator from Minnesota has joined with me in this effort.

I announce today the appointment of four officials to operate the organization. One is Julio Gonzalez Del Solar, of Argentina, to be executive director for Latin America.

Mr. Del Solar is the European representative of the Inter-American Development Bank; and he has been made available to this project by the Bank, through the courtesy of its President.

The next is Dr. Aurelio Peccei, of Italy, to be executive director for western Europe. Dr. Peccei is managing director of Italconsult, one of the leading consulting organizations in Europe and, indeed, in the world; and he has been made available to us by that company.

The third is Warren Wilhelm, of Connecticut, to be executive director for the United States. Mr. Wilhem has been in charge of the international activities of Texaco Corp., and has been made available to us by that corporation. He has a very distinguished background in public affairs, as well as in business; and he should prove extremely important to this work.

The last is Herbert J. Blitz, of Washington, D.C., who will be secretary of the group. Mr. Blitz was formerly my special assistant, and I have delegated him for this development project. He has been with me throughout the entire course of bringing it to the present point of operation.

Mr. President, the aim and objective of our work is to encourage Western European investment in Latin America in coordination with indigenous and U.S. private capital on a tripartite basis, and to recommend a permanent mechanism which will serve as a medium for continued private investment in Latin America. I believe that no single effort now being made is more important than this one to the success of the objectives of the Alliance for Progress; and it is a matter of tremendous gratification to me that I have been joined in this by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey], and that we have made so much progress in terms of organization, financing, and the real likelihood of success which I now see before it.

I wish to say to the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel] who also was a delegate to the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, that I am greatly indebted to him for his encouragement and support, which helped so importantly to bring about the work in which we are now engaged.

It is rather unique that Senators of the United States should interest themselves in a matter of this character, which is only partially governmental in its implications, but is of supreme importance to the success of our objectives in regard to the freedom of Latin America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the biographies of the appointees and a statement of the objectives and structure of the Atlantic Community Development Group for Latin America.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Staff for Latin America Aid Group

Senator Jacob K. Javits and Senator Hubert H. Humphrey announced today the appointment of a four-man executive staff to head a new private agency organized to spur investment of European capital in Latin America.

The agency, known as the Atlantic Community Development Group for Latin America, is being financed by the Ford Foundation, as well as by United States, European and Latin American foundations and businesses. Its purpose is to encourage Western European investment in Latin America in coordination with indigenous and United States private capital on a tripartite basis, and to recommend a permanent mechanism which will serve as a medium for continued private investment in Latin America.

Named today by Senators Javits and Humphrey to head the project are three Executive Directors and a Secretary. They are:

Julio Gonzalez del Solar, of Argentina, to be Executive Director for Latin America.

Dr. Aurelio Peccei, of Italy, to be Executive Director for Western Europe.

Warren Wilhelm, of Connecticut, to be Executive Director for the United States.

Herbert J. Blitz, of Washington, D.C., to be Secretary.

Mr. Gonzalez del Solar has been made available for this special project by the Inter-American Development Bank, where he serves as the Bank's European representative.

Dr. Peccei has been made available by Italconsult, Italy's leading engineering consulting firm, where Dr. Peccei serves as Managing Director.

Mr. Wilhelm has been made available by Texaco, Inc. of New York City, where he has been foreign manager of the economics department.

Mr. Blitz was formerly a special assistant to Senator Javits with whom he has worked closely during the past year in organizing this project.

The Atlantic Community Development Group for Latin America is an outgrowth of recommendations adopted last November in Paris by the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference Economic Committee, of which Senator Javits is chairman. Senator Humphrey has worked with Senator Javits in getting the project underway.

Headquarters for the Atlantic Community Development Group is in Paris, with offices in Washington and New York City.

JULIO GONZALEZ DEL SOLAR

Mr. Julio Gonzalez del Solar was born in Tucuman, Argentina, in 1916. He studied economics at the University of Buenos Aires and at Harvard University.

He was an economist in the Central Bank of Argentina until 1945, and was associated with the Banco de Guatemala from 1946 to 1949. In 1949, he joined the staff of the International Monetary Fund, participating in financial missions to Latin American member countries. He became assistant director of the Fund's Western Hemisphere Branch (1954–56) and alternate executive director for Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Ecuador, Paraguay, and Uruguay (1956–57).

Between 1957 and 1959, Mr. Gonzalez was economic and financial adviser to the Ministry of Economics of Argentina, directing banking reform and dealing with stabilization problems. In 1959, he was appointed deputy governor of the Central Bank of Argentina, where he headed missions of the Argentina Government to the United States and Europe to negotiate monetary and credit arrangements. In 1962, he became special representative of the Inter-American Development Bank in Europe with headquarters in Paris. In this capacity, he maintains liaison with European governments, banks, financial institutions, and international organizations in Europe.

DR. AURELIO PECCEI

Dr. Aurelio Peccei was born in Turin, Italy, in 1908, and now lives in Rome. He is a summa cum laude graduate of the High Institute of Economic and Commercial Sciences of Turin.

Dr. Peccei joined the Fiat Co. in 1932 and served with that firm for many years as divisional manager, a member of the steering committee, a director and chief of the Fiat delegation for Latin America.

In 1957, Dr. Peccei helped organize Italconsult, which was set up by IMI, Italian Government credit institution; Fiat, Montecatini, Pirelli, Innocenti, and other top Italian industrial firms. Italconsult's purpose is to plan, coordinate and finance broad industrial engineering and development works.

As managing director of Italconsult, Dr. Peccei has directed a number of surveys and projects in Africa, the Middle East, Pakistan, Argentina, and Peru.

Dr. Peccei is also a director of Euroexport, which was formed early this year by Italconsult in association with similar firms in France and Germany to organize European capital and technology on a broader basis for worldwide engineering works.

WARREN WILHELM

Mr. Wilhelm is an international economist with extensive practical experience in both Government and business. He received his B.A. from Yale in 1939. After a year as contributing editor of Time magazine, he entered Federal service, participating in World War II mobilization planning, and later, serving as an officer in the 7th Infantry Division.

Following his war service, Mr. Wilhelm received a master's degree in economics from Harvard University and served as one of the first research fellows in Harvard's Russian Research Center. In 1950, Mr. Wilhelm returned to Federal service with the Bureau of the Budget, in the Executive Offices of the President. As a deputy head of the International Division, he was involved in the Marshall plan and point 4 program.

For the past 9 years, Mr. Wilhelm has been with Texaco Inc., of New York City, where he has been Foreign Manager of the Economics Department, specializing in international investment problems. His home is in Rowayton, Conn.

HEBERT J. BLITZ

Mr. Blitz was born in Vienna, Austria in 1929, and became a U.S. citizen in 1945. He received his B.A. from Hamilton College, Clinton, N.Y., and his master's degree in international finance and trade from the School of Advanced International Studies of the Johns Hopkins University, Washington, D.C.

Mr. Blitz has served in the International Economic Analyses Division of the U.S. Department of Commerce.

Since 1958, he has been special assistant to Senator Jacob K. Javits of New York, specializing in international trade, foreign affairs, and domestic and international economics. He has been chief assistant to Senator Javits in his work as Chairman of the Economic Committee of the NATO Parliamentaries Conference, and in various missions leading to the establishment of the Atlantic Community Development Group for Latin America.

Objectives and Structure of Atlantic Community Development for Latin America

Pursuant to a recommendation of the November 1962 NATO Parliamentarians' Conference that the "private and public sectors of the member nations of the OECD" be enlisted in an accelerated development program for Latin America in coordination with the Alliance for Progress, the Atlantic Community Development Group for Latin America was established in Paris on April 5, 1963, with the approval of the parliamentary working party of interested Atlantic community nations.

1. Latin America will be a partner in the formulation of any programs undertaken by the group. After shaping the basic elements of the program with Latin American public and private officials, including officials of the Organization of American States, the Inter-American Development Bank, the Latin American Free Trade Association, the Central American Common Market, and the Economic Commission for Latin America, these elements will be discussed with United States and European public and private officials. The creation of an action plan will call for simultaneous contributions of ideas and commitments from all three areas.

2. As the agreed guidelines are formulated, a variety of investment possibilities will be reviewed, in light of the development plans and potentials of the countries. Choices will then be made as to ventures which meet specific Latin American needs and for which European capital can be enlisted, given appropriate commitments on the part of Latin American nations and organizations involved.

As soon as one or more projects are developed in line with sound patterns for continued future investment, the intention is to find means for prompt effectuation. Headed by a tripartite directorate from Latin America, Western Europe and the United States, the group will formulate recommendations for permanent mechanisms to bring together capital from the three areas—risk capital as well as loan capital—for specific projects. In addition, it is hoped to adapt and develop forms of contractual and guarantee arrangements which will meet the needs of Latin American countries, while providing the necessary assurances to the investors.

3. Private initiative should take a lead in conceiving a plan for a decisive European contribution to accelerated Latin American development—parallel to and coordinated with the Alliance for Progress—and it is expected that European and United States private risk capital will be ready to participate with local private risk capital in the sectors and under the conditions which the plan will have to indicate. But private enterprise action must be prepared for and complemented by a host of other measures in the public sector which also call for a substantial European contribution. Therefore, in the group's action plan full recognition should be given to public assistance to the development which Latin America requires and which can be secured only by combining the human and physical resources of Europe and the United States with the aid of international organizations. Such additional forms of economic cooperation would include:

(a) Technical assistance (in addition to the supply of technological know-how which usually goes hand in hand with private investment).

(b) Economic aid, i.e., the flow of foreign public capital which is needed as a complement to domestic public capital to carry out approved programs and projects which cannot attract private capital. On the one hand, it has to be supplied on much easier terms than heretofore available from Europe, and, on the other hand, its application has to be subjected to discipline on the part of all concerned.

(c) Trade facilities—for which aid is not a substitute—must be provided.

These various forms of assistance to development are interrelated and the most efficient balance among them is a basic ingredient of success.

4. As the areas to be considered, the first instance of joint European-Latin American-United States cooperative action should not limit itself to choosing among those countries which have already prepared their development plans. To attract European interests, any investment project which appears sound and is devised by the country will be examined by the group, even if it is expected that in the report to the parliamentary working party in the fall of 1963 recommendations will be made to concentrate attention on some country which has already submitted a development plan.

5. The group has been formed at the initiative of Senators Jacob K. Javits and Hubert H. Humphrey of the United States, the former of whom heads the parliamentary working party of interested Atlantic Community nations which exercises final responsibility over the recommendations of the group. Headquartered in Paris, the group has as its Executive Directors Dr. Auerlio Peccei for Europe, Dr. Julio Gonzalez del Solar for Latin America, and Mr. Warren Wilhelm for the United States, respectively. Serving as advisers to the group are Professor Milton Katz and Dr. Felipe Herrera. Three European personalities still to be selected will serve also in an advisory capacity. Mr. Herbert J. Blitz is Secretary to the group.

6. Continuing liaison has been established by the group with the following institutions and organizations, among others: The Inter-American Development Bank, the Organization of American States, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), the Business and Industry Advisory Committee to the OECD, the Development Assistance Committee to the OECD, the Atlantic Institute, the Committee for European Cooperation with Latin America (CECAL) of the International Christian Union of Business Executives Forum (UNIAPAC).

7. In summary, the group will approach its task in a broad context, taking into account the economic, social and political development of Latin America in which the role of private European, United States and Latin American investment is a crucial part.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

AMENDMENT OF LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 537) to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. KUCHEL obtained the floor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to my able friend from New York [Mr. Keating] without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from California? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR FONG ON NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, last Sunday in New York City our colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong], delivered a significant address on national defense before Benjamin Kimlau Post 1291 of the American Legion in Chinatown.

A veteran of World War II, during which he served as a major in the U.S. Army Air Corps, the Senator from Hawaii is now a colonel in the Air Force

Reserves, and he speaks with authority based on experience and training.

Representing a State which still wears the scars of the Japanes attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, Hiram Fong knows firsthand that military weakness invites attack.

Therefore, in his address, he cautions America to make certain we have superior military forces not only on land, sea, and in the air, but also in the new environment of space.

Whether or not one agrees in detail with every statement of the able Senator, his is a thought-provoking and constructive address to which the attention of all Members of Congress should be invited. I ask unanimous consent that the full text be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address of U.S. Senator Hiram L. Fong, Republican, of Hawaii, Before Benjamin Kimlau Post 1291, American Legion, Dedication of New Headquarters, Chinatown, New York, Sunday, April 28, 1963

I am delighted to be here with you to share in this happy occasion of the opening of your new headquarters. I want to congratulate all of you on the fine results of your time, effort, and funds. This magnificent five-story, $400,000 building, which we are privileged to dedicate today, is a tribute to the zeal and energy of the members of the Kimlau Post. Yet it is far more than that. It is a symbol of the enduring ties which bind you to each other and to the many other American Legion posts throughout our 50 States. As a member of the Kau-Tom Post of the American Legion in Hawaii, may I commend you on your achievement in attaining this building and on your constant leadership for America's security in your community. From legionnaires in Hawaii, our warmest aloha.

As a veteran, I am always impressed that the first and foremost wish of veterans everywhere is "peace on earth—good will to men." Having served in the defense of our country, veterans know the overriding necessity for strong military forces—to deter war, if possible—and to win war, if necessary.

Our Nation's first President, Gen. George Washington, summed up the need with one sentence: "To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving the peace."

This advice is as sound, as solid, and as pertinent today as when it was first uttered in the precarious early days of our Republic.

Today, when one or two megaton bombs could destroy entire cities and millions of people, the need to prevent war takes on added urgency.

We should have learned the folly of military weakness in World War I when we were caught militarily unprepared. We should have learned the folly of military weakness in World War II when we were again militarily unprepared. We should have learned the folly of military weakness in the Korean war when we were for the third time ill-equipped to fight.

Gen. Omar N. Bradley, then Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, declared in 1952: "If we had had the necessary military power at that time, and in the right place, Korea may never have occurred—and certainly would have been short-lived as a crisis. Our weakness only invited attack."

At the end of World War II, 5 years before Korea, the United States was the most powerful military force in the world. We had the biggest and best Army, the greatest Navy, and the mightiest Air Force. In just 5 short years, our Air Force was drastically reduced, our Navy was nearly scuttled, our Army was vastly understrength, and our Marine Corps was whittled down to a home-based force. It was impossible to furnish General MacArthur a single war-strength Marine Corps division which he requested when the fight began in Korea.

Having learned at dear cost how unprepared we were at the start of the Korean conflict, our Nation embarked upon a defense buildup which has since made us so strong that no nation has dared to attack our homeland.

We have the finest Air Force in the world. We have the finest Navy and Marine Corps in the world. We have the finest Army in terms of training and equipment though not the largest in size. Our Secretary of Defense and our President assure us that there is no question but that our strategic retaliatory forces could destroy Soviet targets even if we were attacked by surprise. At the start of 1963, we had a total of 650 manned bombers on 15-minute ground alert, more than 200 Atlas, Titan, and Minuteman intercontinental ballistic missiles on launchers, and about 144 Polaris ballistic missiles on board submarines. This force is rapidly expanding as more land-based and sea-based missiles are added. The Defense Department plans to buy 150 more Minutemen, for a total force of 950. The 1964 budget asks funds for 6 new Polaris submarines making a total of 41 submarines of that class carrying 656 missiles.

The Secretary of Defense has stated that our forces today could destroy the Soviet Union without any help from the deployed tactical air units or carrier task forces or Thor or Jupiter intermediate range ballistic missiles.

The current price tag for our Defense Establishment alone totals more than $50 billion, which is more than one-half of our total Federal budget.

We Americans are willing to pay whatever price is necessary for our defenses. As long as the peace is threatened by those who boast they will bury us, we must never abandon our posture of superior military strength.

Modern, flexible forces must be maintained and constantly improved so that we could prevail in all environments—land, sea, and air.

The hot war in Vietnam proves we still need our Army and Marine troops, helicopters, jeeps, and all the other so-called conventional equipment.

The crisis in Cuba proves we cannot dispense with our Navy ships, planes, and trained crews.

The continuing threat of nuclear war demands that we keep our SAC forces and ICBM forces on alert and ready for action at a moment's notice.

We must do more. We must take the further step of attaining military superiority in a new environment, space. We must anticipate how an enemy might strike us with space weapons, and we must deny him the opportunity.

The eventual development of military spacecraft, with or without men aboard, compels us to push ahead into this new environment with all calculated speed.

For space activities of all kinds, the 1964 budget requests $7.6 billion in new spending funds. Of this, for strictly military space efforts, $1.667 billion are earmarked. This is a negligible increase, less than $200 million over 1963 for military space efforts.

While it is recognized that the so-called civilian space effort will undoubtedly produce information useful in the military space program, many Members of Congress, including myself, are greatly disturbed that we are not doing enough to develop a military space force to give us superiority in this new environment.

Although the individual services have advanced military warfare concepts in space, there is to my knowledge no official, national military space strategy and there are no strategic military space warfare guidelines. I am very troubled by a statement of an Assistant Secretary of Defense that "no really new ideas for the military utilization of space have been evolved" since shortly after Sputnik I was launched in 1957. He said the list of system proposals under active consideration shortly after sputnik is remarkably similar to today's list.

This is truly astonishing to me and raises the question: "Has enough effort been devoted to identifying and specifying the military weapons systems needed for America to attain military superiority in space?"

I am greatly fearful that without a military space strategy and without military space guidelines our space efforts may be too fragmented and too unrelated to the very strict military requirements of reliability, fast reaction, and superior performance.

Meantime, our Air Force Chief of Staff has told Congress that the Soviet Union's space program is entirely military. It is only logical that the Soviet Union would make every effort to outdo us in the vast new area of space. For the Soviet Union knows it does not and cannot surpass our total defense strength on land, sea, and in the air. We can safely assume the Russian goal is to attain military control of space.

To meet this threat, we must develop offensive as well as defensive space vehicles. Space programs of prime military necessity, our experts advise us, are space rendezvous and inspection devices, space stations, and communications satellites.

While some effort is being made in these fields currently, the emphasis on civilian space effort outweighs the emphasis on military space effort by three to one in terms of dollars.

Our national goal of peaceful development of outer space is commendable. At the same time, we must recognize that if other nations use outer space for nonpeaceful purposes, we had better be prepared to defend ourselves.

We have not forgotten the shock of Sputnik I. Let us take steps against a far worse shock of a Russian military space development.

There are other events over the past few months directly related to our national security which have caused widespread concern in Congress and throughout the entire country.

The indecision and the changeability of our Government regarding major weapons systems has caused great confusion among the American people and among our allies in the Atlantic Community regarding what weapons systems are best for the defense of the free world.

In early 1961, the President emphasized the importance of the Skybolt missile. Our British allies counted on using it with their bombers. Our Air Force counted on using it to extend the life of our bombers. Yet late last year, the Skybolt was canceled, without, so far as I know, first consulting the British or other NATO allies.

First our Government told our Atlantic allies to rely on Skybolt. Then the administration switched emphasis to Polaris submarines. Now the administration is urging development of a fleet of surface ships adapted to fire Polaris missiles even though we ourselves are not relying upon such a fleet for our own protection.

Apparently, too, the administration cannot make up its mind whether there is a military need for piloted bombers after the B-52's go in 1970. Under congressional prodding, development of the RS-70 supersonic bomber continued, but only on a skeleton basis. Meantime, it looked as if our retaliatory punch was being put in one basket, the missile basket. Under continued congressional pressure, now the administration may be reconsidering a bomber successor to the B-52.

Last Wednesday, Secretary McNamara told the Senate Defense Appropriations Subcommittee the Defense Department is "studying the possibilities of more advanced aircraft." I am glad to learn that the Defense Secretary is still receptive to the idea that we may have a need for men in our strategic weapons systems for the future.

There is another area of concern to Members of Congress relating to our national security. It seems strange, indeed alarming, that as we spend recordbreaking sums to build and maintain military armament, our Government is taking steps in the direction of unilateral disarmament.

A key part of our present military strike force is our atomic punch. Today our Government leaders assure us we have far greater atomic strength than our nearest competitor, the Soviet Union. What they mean is we have more atomic weapons in our arsenal and more means of delivering these bombs. But, will this be true in the future?

Atomic bombs that cannot be delivered are useless. We must have the vehicles to carry these bombs to enemy territory. Today we have B-52's, B-58's, and other aircraft which can carry nuclear warheads. We have intermediate range ballistic missiles in forward land bases in other countries and at sea on Polaris submarines. We have intercontinental ballistic missiles in soft and hardened sites on land within our own territory.

According to present plans, however, we are reducing our future inventory of delivery vehicles for atomic weapons. Our manned bombers are being phased out, with the B-52 scheduled to go by 1970. The successor RS-70 manned airplane is being developed on a skeleton basis. The Skybolt missile, which was to be launched in the air and carry a nuclear warhead to enemy targets, has been canceled. On the brink of cancellation is the Dyna-Soar program to develop a piloted spacecraft launched into orbit by a rocket booster, gliding back to earth on wings.

While these and other programs have been cut back, canceled, or left to wither on the vine, not one new weapons system started since the present administration took office is now in production.

Is this not unilateral disarmament?

Most of us think disarmament means destruction of weapons of war, the sinking of ships, the demolishing of guns and tanks, and so on. But disarmament can be accomplished by not providing new military equipment, particularly that which can carry atomic weapons; by slowing down research and development; by slowing down or stopping nuclear tests at a time when a potential enemy is pushing ahead in military equipment, in research and development, and in nuclear testing.

To retain our nuclear superiority, we must provide advanced delivery vehicles for atomic bombs. We must also make absolutely certain that any test-ban agreement we sign provides foolproof safeguards against secret testing by Russia.

In the protracted test-ban talks at Geneva, our Government has made one concession after another, until now I fear we have gone beyond the safety level. Once we insisted that we needed a minimum of 20 onsite inspections each year to guard against secret testing. Today there are those who urge us to accept the Russian offer of only three onsite inspections a year.

Mr. Arthur Dean, who until this year was chief disarmament negotiator, says the Soviet proposal would make any test-ban agreement absolutely unworkable. Mr. Dean says three inspections is like having three wheels on a car.

America has learned to her sorrow that there is no substitute for onsite inspection of Soviet missile bases in Cuba. I submit there is no substitute for onsite inspections within the borders of the Soviet Union in sufficient number to prevent secret atomic testing.

There are those who claim that our failure to detect Soviet underground tests would not be risky. They say nothing important could be gained through such low-yield experiments.

Mr. Dean, however, tells us it is possible to conduct underground anti-missile-missile tests as well as neutron bomb tests if the neutron bomb is developed.

A test-ban treaty that cannot protect America against Soviet cheating would be dangerous in the extreme. We should not sign on the dotted line until we can get a cheatproof agreement.

The vice chairman and former chairman of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee, Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, Democrat, of California, recently declared a weak treaty may involve a greater risk to the national security than an arms race.

Mr. HOLIFIELD said testimony before his committee convinced him that "great advances can be made in nuclear armaments by testing and that if we fail to make these gains our adversary will." He further stated, "our enlightened self-interest, therefore, demands that we continue with the further refinement and development of nuclear weapons in the absence of a reasonably foolproof test-ban agreement."

Mr. HOLIFIELD declared that "superiority in nuclear weapons is the best insurance of world peace."

I subscribe to these views.

I urge you as veterans to exert all your influence upon our Government to insist upon a workable and enforcible test-ban treaty. Our diplomats should settle for nothing less.

Failure to provide advanced military equipment for land, sea, air, and space, failure to maintain our superiority in nuclear weapons and nuclear delivery vehicles and failure to insist upon safeguarded atomic test and disarmament agreements can lead to only one destination, grave military weakness in the future—as history has proven time and again, weakness invites attack.

America's military strength today is the free world's shield against nuclear holocaust. Our greatest hope for peace lies in America's continued military strength in the years to come. Until the day when all nations are willing to live in peace and harmony, we must devote the necessary resources and effort to give us the weapons that will prevent war, or, should war come, that will enable us to win.

I know that all veterans of this outstanding Kimlau American Legion post will give their wholehearted support and leadership, so that America's defenses will always be second to none.

Let us all hope and pray the evermore destructive weapons of the future may never be fired in anger and that someday these vast resources and this massive effort can be devoted to improving the lives of men, women, and children all over the world.

WARSAW GHETTO ANNIVERSARY AND THE NEED FOR A NEW LOOK AT AID TO EGYPT

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, all across the Nation and around the world recently observances were held on the 20th anniversary of the Warsaw ghetto uprising. It was my honor to sponsor the Senate joint resolution calling for appropriate ceremonies commemorating this brave and tragic event in human history.

It is perhaps symbolic that on the same day the heroes of the Warsaw revolt were being honored, the Jewish national homeland of Israel was under increasing pressure from a buildup of arms and power in the Arab world. Egypt's President Nasser, seeking to carry out his oft-repeated vow to destroy Israel, was pursuing varied schemes to achieve his objective.

I have long contended that our Government must face up to the realities of these Arab ambitions and vigorously assert our interest in the preservation of Israel as a free and independent nation. On several occasions I have outlined a plan of action which could help bring peace and stability to the Middle East.

Milton Friedman, able Washington correspondent for the Jewish Telegraphic Agency recently noted that our observance of Warsaw Ghetto Day ought to stimulate further thinking about American aid to Egypt. There is certainly need for a hard, new look at this assistance which is helping Nasser build up his offensive weaponry.

Mr. Friedman's article contains much food for thought for all Senators concerned about the fate of Israel and the implications of the growing crisis in the Middle East. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW TO KEEP NASSER FROM DOING HITLER'S GENOCIDAL WORK: IN MEMORY OF WARSAW: A NEW LOOK AT EGYPT—KENNEDY'S STATEMENT ON GHETTO HEROISM NEEDS FUNCTIONAL SIGNIFICANCE

(By Milton Friedman)

WASHINGTON.—There are actions the administration could take to give deeper meaning to President Kennedy's proclamation calling for observance on April 21 of the 20th anniversary of the Warsaw ghettto uprising.

Mr. Kennedy noted that the Jewish martyrs lacked "military resources" but struggled "against the overwhelming forces of the Nazi occupiers for more than 3 weeks, thereby providing a chapter in the annals of human heroism."

Today, the scene shifts to Israel. Nasser's goal—annihilation of Israel—is no different from that of SS Gen. Jurgen Stroop, commander of the Nazi forces assigned to liquidate the Warsaw ghetto.

The survivors of the Nazi holocaust and other Israelis have no desire to die in another fiery and doomed ghetto. They see Egypt being armed and trained by the Soviet Union. Egypt has received Russian offensive weapons more modern than those removed from Cuba at American insistence. Meanwhile, Egypt is developing a new "Afrika Korps" of West German scientists and technicians, including Nazis, to build missiles and supersonic Messerschmitt jet fighters.

But the fact most difficult to live with is the indirect subsidization by the United States of the Egyptian military buildup. State Department officials still refuse to draw a moral distinction between democratic Israel and totalitarian Egypt and equate the two nations as equally worthy. There are hints that if Israel says too much about Egyptian missiles, some people here might start questioning Israel's development of new weapons.

President Kennedy last year met a situation which then existed. He authorized Israel to purchase Hawk antiaircraft missiles from the United States. Negotiations over purchase terms are just ending. The Hawks are yet to be delivered.

The Hawk may be outdated even before it arrives. Its purpose was to shoot down the Soviet jet bombers acquired by Egypt. Now the Egyptians have not only bombers but ground-to-ground missiles and ship-to-ground missiles. Israel has nothing to stop such missiles once they are launched. Even conventional warhead (nonnuclear) would cause devastation of Israel's crowded coastal cities. Masses of Israelis would die.

The population of Israel is slightly over 2 million. Egypt has almost 30 million. Israel is not interested in liquidating masses of Egyptians. She has no ground-to-ground missile or any other kind except, when it arrives, the antiaircraft Hawk.

A gap now exists, to Israel's perilous disadvantage. An escalation of weapons system has occurred. Nasser no longer has to use bombers to blast Israel. He needs only to push buttons and dispatch salvoes of missiles which are unstoppable by Hawks or anything else.

The Egyptian missile does not have to land on top of Tel Aviv's Dan Hotel, Allenby Road will do.

The Hawks will arrive this year to meet last year's situation. Israel once more lags behind.

Nasser has received hundreds of millions of dollars in American loans, grants, and other aid. He uses his own resources, thus freed, to build missiles and pay Nazis. Even funds generated by sale of American surplus food given to Egypt are used partially for military purposes.

The Jewish War Veterans organization recently raise a question about increased American aid to Nasser at a time when Egypt is spending heavily of its own assets for missiles and German scientists as well as Soviet arms.

A reply came from James P. Grant, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs. Mr. Grant said, "the Department of State does not believe U.S. aid contributes significantly to the United Arab Republic's capacity to acquire armaments nor would withholding assistance detract appreciably from that capacity."

Whether the American contribution is significant or only moderate, the American taxpayer is helping Egypt buy Soviet arms, pay Communists for instructing Egyptian personnel and compensate Germans, including nazis, now working in the Egyptian military establishment.

This issue will certainly be raised, by Democrats and Republicans alike, when the aid program comes before Congress this spring.

America finances the Egyptian buildup in another way. It is reported that the same Messerschmitt factory in West Germany which is currently producing parts for the U.S. F-104 jet fighter under provisions of a NATO contract is producing vital components of the new Egyptian Mach-2 jet fighter.

The State Department line is that severance of Nasser from the handout list will make him turn to Moscow. Actually, Egypt is now getting military equipment and technology not only from Moscow but simultaneously from West Germany, cornerstone of NATO.

America is buying Nasser's favor by subsidizing the work in Cairo of former Nazi storm trooper Col. Ferdinand Brandner, who directs one of the new special weapons groups. America also finances, however, indirectly, the German unit's medical officer, the notorious Dr. Eisels, who escaped to Egypt from Germany to avoid trial for atrocities he committed as camp doctor at the Buchenwald concentration camp.

President Kennedy said the heroic uprising of Warsaw ghetto Jews was "an inspiration to the peaceloving people of the world and a warning to would-be oppressors which will long be remembered."

This proclamation was a kind and sincere statement by the President. But it would achieve functional significance if American policy withheld aid from "would-be oppressors" and otherwise prevented Nasser from becoming another SS General Jurgen Stroop.

A fitting commemoration of the Warsaw ghetto uprising could include a new look by Washington at Egypt, the nation which is arming to wipe out the survivors of Hitler's holocaust.

RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES PROTECT THE CONSUMER

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the continuing contribution of rural electric cooperatives to our society is well understood by most Americans, but it is especially heartening to encounter expressions of this understanding in the editorial pages of the daily press.

An editorial showing thorough study and appreciation of the work and problems of rural electric co-ops appeared recently in the Daily Pantagraph published in Bloomington, Ill. This editorial examines the attack being made on the rural co-ops in Illinois by the private utilities, a situation existing in many States, and straightforwardly points out where the public interest lies in this dispute.

This editorial is typical of the work of the Daily Pantagraph. This downstate newspaper is one of Illinois' best and has outstanding direction. Its editor, H. Clay Tate, has been an outstanding Illinois publisher and editor for many years, as well as a distinguished author and community leader. The vitality of the Pantagraph's policies is shown, for example, by the fact that Mr. Tate last year visited Europe to study and report on the Common Market, and that in 1959 he spent considerable time in Asia and the Middle East studying problems there. This type of scholarship aimed at better community service has made the Daily Pantagraph nationally known among editors and publishers as one of the finest community newspapers in the country.

Illinois is proud of this newspaper, and I want to congratulate its publishers for their continuing service and for the fine editorial on the rural electric co-ops. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial, entitled "Private Utilities Open War on Rural Electric Co-Ops" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Bloomington (Ill.) Daily Pantagraph, Mar. 4, 1963]

PRIVATE UTILITIES OPEN WAR ON RURAL ELECTRIC CO-OPS

A full-scale scrap between the private utilities and the rural electric co-ops seems to be boiling up in Illinois. The issue involves territorial rights, and, more fundamentally, survival of the organizations that have brought electrification to the rural areas of this State.

The fight need never have developed. It came about because of the complete failure of the private utilities to serve the rural areas. They actually don't want to serve the sparsely settled areas yet. They want the cream of the co-op business.

The private companies would have all the business but for their own shortsightedness. Those progressive companies in much of northern Illinois have no problem because they met the need. Except for small rural electric co-ops in Princeton, Geneseo, and Elizabeth, the whole vast upper half of the State is served by private utilities.

But here in central Illinois and on to the south the private utilities defaulted and rural electric co-ops were formed. The electrical revolution hit the farm and it is now good business. Urban areas have expanded and some commercial enterprises have been launched in areas served by the co-ops.

Those companies which were most lax in serving the farmers before the formation of rural electric co-ops are the most aggressive now in seeking to take from them their most lucrative business.

There have been at least two instances in Illinois in which private utilities have raided co-ops by building duplicate lines in territories or have fouled up civic developments in court.

Legislation sought by the electric co-ops would protect territorial integrity of both the co-ops and the private utilities.

The private companies seek to put the co-ops under the Illinois Commerce Commission. The commission has repeatedly held in the past that it has no jurisdiction over the co-ops in which every person is a member with a voting control in management.

The commission position here appears logical. The co-op position is vastly different from that of the private utilities which by the nature of their operations constitute monopolies serving hundreds of thousands of persons who have absolutely no control over the company. Here, regulation by a public body is essential.

The sad part of this picture is that the private utilities interpret the commission's job as that solely of protecting their monopoly and guaranteeing a favorable return on their investment.

The public interest is not adequately protected under such an interpretation. It would be an injustice to the co-ops to place them under any body so constituted. We see no compelling reason for putting them under ICC regulation at all, and certainly not before the function of the ICC is more specifically detailed with the public interest clearly defined and protected.

The private utilities have more of a point in opposing co-op 2 percent loans from the Federal Government. However, they are not completely frank on this issue. The same rate of interest for similar purposes is available to private utility firms, and some have used it. Private utilities also get favorable tax writeoff privileges which amount to benefits which probably far exceed that gained by the co-ops from their low interest privilege.

But for co-ops and private utilities which can afford to borrow money at current rates, such as either can do in this area, there should be no such thing as Government loans at interest rates below cost to the Government.

This cleavage in Illinois is unfortunate. Up until this time the co-ops have purchased their current from the private companies at wholesale and retailed it to their members. They have gotten along very well. However, private company maneuvers of late have forced the co-ops to think seriously of providing their own generating plants. The Corn Belt Electric Co-Op here voted at its recent annual meeting to explore this possibility further along with other co-ops in this part of Illinois.

About the only competition there is left is between the private utilities and the electric co-ops. The private companies seek to eliminate this. The general assembly should not be a party to this effort.

INCREASE IN WHEAT ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS IN TULELAKE AREA

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I am about to ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of a bill. Let the record show that it has been cleared by the leadership on the other side of the aisle.

I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 147, S. 762.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 762) to provide for increased wheat acreage allotments in the Tulelake area of California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California? There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment on page 2, line 3, after the word "the", where it appears the third time, to insert "second"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (i) of section 334 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended as follows:

(a) Redesignate the subsection as subsection "(j)";

(b) Insert in the first and second sentences immediately preceding the word "farms" the words "privately owned";

(c) Strike out in the first sentence the language "1958 through 1963" and insert in lieu thereof the language "1963 and subsequent";

(d) Strike out in the second sentence the word "eight" and insert in lieu thereof the word "twelve"; and

(e) Change the period at the end the second sentence to a colon and add the following proviso: "*Provided,* That if with respect to any crop of durum wheat (class II) the Secretary finds that the acreage allotments for privately owned farms producing durum wheat (class II) in said area, as increased under this subsection, are inadequate to provide for the production of a sufficient quantity of durum wheat (class II) to satisfy the demand therefor in the area of the United States west of the Rocky Mountains in which such durum wheat (class II) is normally marketed and processed, further increases may be made in the farm acreage allotments in such area by such uniform percentage as he deems necessary to provide for such quantity."

Sec. 2. Subsection (i) of section 334 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as added by Public Law 87–703 to become effective for the 1964 and subsequent crops of wheat, is amended by inserting in the first sentence thereof, after the words "type of wheat" the first time such words appear in the language, "except for durum wheat (class II) in the irrigable portion of the area known as the Tulelake division of the Klamath project of California, to which the provisions of subsection (j) are applicable,".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I introduced this proposed legislation earlier under a unique situation which pertains to an area in California and also to certain areas in the States of Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Montana, where Durum wheat is produced. Durum wheat is used in the manufacture of high quality macaroni, spaghetti, and similar pasta products.

I am glad to see in the Chamber the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota, a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, who reported the bill to the Senate. I am glad to yield to him for the purpose of making a brief statement.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, this Durum wheat bill was unanimously approved by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and should be passed by Congress as soon as possible. It has to do with Durum wheat, a specialty wheat that is used almost exclusively in the manufacture of macaroni and spaghetti.

Most of this wheat is produced in my State of North Dakota, but there is a market for it on the west coast that because of freight rates, cannot be supplied by North Dakota producers. There is a small area in California, Tulelake, which has the proper soil and climate conditions for the production of Durum wheat. It is one of the few areas outside of the Upper Great Plains where this wheat can be grown. The California growers are seeding the wheat now, and unless the bill is passed immediately, it will not do them any good.

We in North Dakota would like to supply this west coast market, but the freight rate prohibits shipment of Durum wheat to the west coast. It costs about a dollar a bushel to ship it. The only place where it can be produced, so that it may be used in the State of California, is in the Tulelake area of California.

It is good legislation and should be passed immediately.

Mr. KUCHEL. I am pleased to see in the Chamber the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, who likewise looks with favor on this bill. Again, Mr. President, the people of my State tip their hats to our friend from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender].

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the committee report, including a letter the Secretary of Agriculture sent to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

This bill would amend section 334(i) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to—

(1) Make permanent the authority to increase farm wheat acreage allotments in the irrigable portion of the Tulelake area of Modoc and Siskiyou Counties, Calif.,

(2) Redistrict such increased allotments to privately owned farms,

(3) Increase the total acreage allotment for each crop from 8,000 to 12,000 acres for the area, and

(4) Authorize the Secretary to increase privately owned farm wheat acreage allotments in such area for any year if he finds that such allotments are inadequate to provide a sufficient quantity of Durum wheat (class II) to satisfy the demand therefor in the area of the United States west of the Rocky Mountains in which such wheat is normally marketed and processed.

As in the past the increase would be conditioned on the production of Durum wheat on the increased acreage. Durum wheat in the Tulelake area would be excluded by the bill from the general provision authorizing increased allotments for types of wheat in short supply which was added by section 313(4) of Public Law 87–703, to become effective with the 1964 crop.

The need for the bill is fully explained in the favorable report from the Department of Agriculture.

The committee amendment makes no change in substance, but merely specifically designates the sentence being amended.

Passage of the bill is urgent, since it would increase the 1963 allotments in the Tulelake area, where planting has already begun.

Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C., March 27, 1963.

Hon. Allen J. Ellender,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, U.S. Senate.

Dear Mr. Chairman: This is in reply to your request of February 12, 1963, for a report on S. 762, a bill to provide for increased wheat acreage allotments in the Tulelake area of California.

The Department recommends the enactment of this bill.

S. 762 would amend subsection (i) of section 334 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to (1) make permanent the authority to increase farm wheat acreage allotments in the irrigable portion of the Tulelake area of Modoc and Siskiyou Counties, Calif., (2) restrict such increased allotments to privately owned farms, (3) beginning with the 1963 crop, increase the total acreage allotment for each crop from 8,000 acres to 12,000 acres for the area, and (4) authorize the Secretary to increase farm wheat acreage allotments in such area for any year if he finds that such allotments are inadequate to provide a sufficient quantity of Durum wheat (class II) to satisfy the demand therefor in the area of the United States west of the Rocky Mountains in which such wheat is normally marketed and processed.

Section 2 of the bill would amend subsection (i) 334 of the Agriculture Adjustment Act of 1938, as added by Public Law 87–793 to become effective for the 1964 and subsequent crops of wheat, to exclude from the provisions of such subsection Durum wheat (class II) in the irrigable portion of the Tulelake area of Modoc and Siskiyou Counties, Calif., to which the provisions of section 1 of the bill would be applicable.

Durum wheat (class II) is a class of wheat used in the manufacture of high quality macaroni, spaghetti, and similar pasta products, and can be produced only in a few areas of the United States. These areas are located in Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and the Tulelake region of California.

Durum wheat production in the Tulelake area was started 9 years ago when it was discovered that the fertile soil and cool climate of the area was ideal for Durum wheat production which has since proven to be one of the few crops that can be successfully grown there.

The first plantings of Durum wheat on a commercial basis in the Tulelake area were made in 1952. At that time there existed a vast local market for Durum wheat products which had been created by the outbreak of 15–B rust in the major Durum producing States, causing almost total crop failures. Since most farms in the area had very little wheat history when acreage allotments and marketing quotas were imposed on the 1954 crop, current farm wheat acreage allotments in the area would still be very small if based upon accredited wheat acreage history.

Due to the high freight rates from the major Durum producing States to the west coast, manufacturers of pasta products on the west coast have always used a blend of semolina and farina which are made from Durum wheat and locally grown hard wheat,

> respectively. Since such products are inferior to pasta products made from 100-percent semolina, the macaroni industry on the west coast has indicated that it would go to a 100-percent semolina product if it could be assured of a stable supply at competitive prices.
>
> Each of the nine crops of Durum wheat produced in the Tulelake area have moved into west coast market channels at good prices to producers within 3 months after harvest. With a record crop produced in the major Durum producing States in 1962, the Durum crop produced in the Tulelake area in 1962 was moved into the west coast market before December 1 at an average price of around $3 per bushel.
>
> Durum wheat fills a real and immediate need to the economy of farmers in the Tulelake area. Only a limited number of crops can be successively produced in the area such as barley, potatoes, alsike cloverseed, and onions, and market prices for these commodities have declined to the point where there is little profit in the production of such commodities. Only about 1,000 acres of onions are produced in the area and these are produced under contract for dehydration. Vegetable production in the area has never been successful because of the long distances to the metropolitan markets.
>
> Temporary legislation pertaining to the production of Durum wheat (class II) in the Tulelake area would expire with the 1963 crop. We recommend permanent extension of the program as provided in S. 762.
>
> The production of Durum wheat (class II) in the Tulelake area is now and will continue to be ineligible for price support; therefore, there will be no additional expenses involved in carrying out the provisions of this proposed bill.
>
> The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
> *Secretary.*

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 762) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. **KUCHEL**. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. **YOUNG** of North Dakota. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

THE FRIGHT PEDDLERS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the American people are keenly aware of the grave and evil hazards to our freedom and to our way of life which international communism is eternally dedicated to destroy.

Aside from a relative handful of traitorous zealots in the ranks or clutches of the Communist Party, we—all of us in this land—are unalterably committed to deter and, if necessary, to combat and defeat any aggression, Communist or otherwise, against us or our free friends, who, like us, propose to keep our freedom.

I rise today to speak of another danger we confront, not as dread or as foreboding, but equally offensive and evil to all reasonable, rational, free American citizens.

It is the danger of hate and venom, of slander and abuse, generated by fear and heaped indiscriminately upon many great Americans by another relative handful of zealots, in the ranks or clutches of self-styled "I am a better American than you are" organizations.

It results from a strange intellectual strabismus which professes to see our Government crawling with Communists and which, abandoning the processes of reason, pours its spleen upon anything or anybody which does not meet its own queer and puzzling dogmas.

Mr. President, in every day's deluge of mail at my office which sometimes means as many as 5,000 letters, telegrams, and postcards—there are generally a hundred and even two hundred letters which I describe simply as "fright mail."

Most of my colleagues receive such mail and most of them refer to it in much stronger terms. Coming from the most populous State in our Union, California, I think it is safe to say I get as much as anybody.

It is difficult enough attempting to answer thousands and thousands of letters which seek 15 answers to 15 questions on complicated foreign and domestic policies and issues—and by tomorrow at the latest.

Many times, the only economically and mechanically feasible way to reply is to send printed statements, which are then often returned in disgust because I have not answered with a long, personal letter.

But, Mr. President, that is a minor problem compared to what to do about the "fright mail."

I know this is a matter which many of my colleagues have given a lot of thought to privately, but, so far as I know, no one has discussed publicly.

I cheerfully admit that I have, in the past, attempted to reply calmly and factually to "fright mail," mustering all the reason and reserve I could summon.

Yet, I have found over the years that this is not quite the answer.

For most fright mail writers will come right back a week later, terrified about something else, urgently stating that they do not believe me—and that I am either misinformed or worse. Sometimes, they darkly insinuate that treason has prompted the reply they have received.

Treason. I still cannot believe my eyes when I stare at the ugliest word in the American lexicon tossed about in a letter as casually as the "Dear Senator" salutation which opens it. Indeed, I was once charged with treason by a correspondent who then closed his letter a few words later with "Respectfully yours."

Treason. The most heinous crime on the American books. And not always scrawled illiterately on a scrap of a paper bag, but often typed meticulously on embossed paper.

In recent months, I have been casually accused of ignorance or of a desire to sell my country down the river because I have said, for example, that it not only seemed untrue on its face, but was demonstrably untrue, that thousands and thousands of Chinese Communist troops were poised on the Mexican border for an attack on California.

It not only seemed untrue on its face, but was demonstrably untrue that such-and-such American or free world leader—44 of them in all—is a Communist agent. The gallant Eisenhower is a favorite target for their contemptible slime.

What new and frightening charge tomorrow's mail will bring, I cannot begin to anticipate.

But I do want to disclose the two latest and intertwined "frights"—and analyze them in detail—by quoting in its entirety a typical letter I received in recent days.

The letter, on good stationery and carefully typed, comes from a constituent who lives high in the Berkeley Hills in California. It is somewhat mild in its intimations of treason, but otherwise is sadly typical. It reads as follows:

> DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: Thanks for your reply of March 9 regarding the Disarmament Agency.
>
> I do not accept your statement that I have been the victim of misinformation. It is the other way around. Either you do not know what you have voted for in Public Law 87–297, or you are a traitor to the United States.
>
> I would suggest you get in touch with Mr. Theodore Jackman, box 10188, Greenville, S.C. He is an expert on this subject. I had the pleasure of hearing him here in Berkeley a few days ago. Undoubtedly, he will be more than glad to come and talk with you about United Nations control over the United States of America, disarmament, and so forth.
>
> Right at the present time, the U.S. Army is conducting operations in Georgia—Operation Moccasin—which many citizens over the country believe is a prelude and a training exercise for the takeover of the United States in the very near future, under United Nations authority. Of course, due to the large protest from citizens, the Army is denying everything.
>
> Senator KUCHEL, you better study up on what's going on. You have gone on record to me that I am under a misapprehension that we are being unilaterally disarmed. If this country is taken over by the United Nations, I will personally label you a traitor.
>
> You better study up on what's going on in this country.
>
> Sincerely yours,

Mr. President, note carefully the language, typical of the fright letter. The writer is convinced, utterly convinced. There is no room for doubt. Of course, this is happening, he says; and, of course, that is happening, he says. Because "he knows." And how did he find out? And how, if it is possible, can we reach him with simple truth?

First, let us look at what is the simple truth.

Here is an editorial from the Claxton (Ga.) Enterprise, a weekly newspaper published in the area where Operation Water Moccasin was held. It is entitled "Fear of Snakes."

It reads as follows:

> A national furor has been raised over the Army exercise recently underway here, known as Water Moccasin III. Our office has received numerous letters from such places as Richmond, Va.; Savannah; New

Orleans; and Minneapolis—all expressing a grave dread over the operation.

Evidently a lot of folks are scared of snakes, and in their sick minds anything with the name of a snake conjures up visions of a viper or a maneating reptile that sets them off on weird fantasies that defy description.

One Congressman went so far as to suggest that the United States was training "barefooted Africans as guerrilla warriors," to be used to subjugate other African nations.

Another had it figured that the United Nations was sending in foreign troops to be trained to overthrow our Government. Another decided we were being trained in how to surrender our cities to insurgents.

Still another imagined all of this area being "invaded by hordes of Mongolians" who were overrunning the entire area.

It is fantastic what the human mind can dream up over the simple statement that a few foreign students will act as observers in the operation. We were in almost daily contact with an English major and an Italian police officer. We also were visited by an Army team that had a Turkish officer as an observer. But we missed out on the "hordes of foreign Communists."

Some of the statements we have read amount to hysteria, the result of a sick mind, carried away by the self-induced hallucinations. Our experience with the people involved directly in the operation left us with the feeling that we were taking part in some important training that may one day aid our Nation in its struggle for world peace against a foe that uses all sorts of unorthodox tactics. We are glad to know that we have people in our Armed Forces with the ability and training that these men showed during our observation of this operation.

We look forward to Operation No. IV, but we suggest that the Army change the name to Primrose Path IV—or Azalea Trail or some such title—Water Moccasin IV seems to make people dream bad dreams, and act like dope addicts.

The editorial demonstrates, rather savagely, but correctly, I think, the irrational frenzy of my correspondent's claims about Operation Water Moccasin, alleged Army subversion and United Nations takeover of the United States.

I shall send my frightened constituent a copy of it. But will it really convince him? Perhaps, perhaps not. The Claxton, (Ga.) Enterprise could be some clever sort of Communist front, my constituent may suspect.

But what is really frightening, is that I shall also have to send a copy of the editorial to several thousand similarly frightened Californians who have fallen hook, line and sinker for the Operation Water Moccasin "plot" and have asked me to do all I can to halt the operation, if I am a decent American, with any courage at all.

Just listen to some sample quotes from my mail on Operation Water Moccasin:

From Hermosa Beach:

Last night, in Los Angeles, I heard a talk by Mr. Theodore Jackman of Greenville, S.C., about a frightening military maneuver now being held in the State of Georgia, called Exercise Water Moccasin III. It is time Congress demands the facts about Exercise Water Moccasin III, the United Nations War Operations and NATO Operations.

From San Jose:

I am writing you this letter of protest, to the presence of foreign troops on American soil. That there are African Negro troops, who are cannables (sic), stationed in Georgia.

From Hollywood:

It is unconstitutional to quarter American troops in American homes, so how come these pagan, ruthless, brutal, Godless savages? Yes, we know of the U.N. plans to place Mongolian and Congolese troops over our dear United States (the same kind of troops which ravished Katanga) if the U.N. can swing their damnable world police force plan, so undoubtedly these Moccasin troops are to be the same.

From Paradise:

From friends in the State of Georgia, I have a report that at this time there are 15,000 United Nations personnel from 15 countries, participating in what is known as Operation Water Moccasin.

From Westminster, near my home town:

I also understand there are oriental troops in Mexico at this moment waiting to "occupy" parts of California for their training.

From Berkeley:

The news has just broken, although there had been rumors for a week or more, that Georgia is the place for 16,000 African soldiers, being trained by the U.N. for guerrilla warfare. Complete with nose and ear rings. This time, the U.N., and our State Department, have gone too far.

From Sacramento, the capital of my State:

This morning on radio, over Mr. Beirpos' program, I heard the most fantastic thing I have ever heard. Water Moccasin—what is this secret fantastic thing going on in the Deep South. U.N. troops coming to America for some kind of a "war to invade America." Mr. Senator, these things are being said over the radio, and he would not say them if they were not true. He said, "it's a three-point program of the disarmament program."

From Los Angeles:

Water Moccasin—we are asking you to give us a report on what you are doing to protect our constitutional rights. Also repeal income taxes.

From Los Angeles:

I am greatly disturbed at the news of foreign troops on our soil, as in Water Moccasin III. I am convinced we must get out of the United Nations. There is no longer any doubt that it is dominated by the Communists.

From Los Angeles:

I have just heard about one of the most fantastic and truly frightening military maneuvers ever to be held in the United States. The Oxford, Miss., invasion and violence was illegal and completely unconstitutional. I feel the United Nations is responsible. The U.N. is no good. Let's get out of it—now. I'm still sick from the Katanga tragedy.

From Ontario:

These so-called war games are in reality a deceitful way of bringing in the troops that will be used to enforce United Nations law on U.S. citizens. What are you doing about this? Let's get out of the godless United Nations and kick it out of the United States of America.

Mr. President, just think of it—"cannibals stationed in Georgia," they have charged:

Pagan, ruthless, brutal godless savages, Mongolian and Congolese troops—world police plan. Fifteen thousand United Nations troops already here. Oriental troops in Mexico, waiting to occupy California. Sixteen thousand African troops, already in Georgia, with rings in their noses and ears. A war to invade America. A United Nations takeover. Integration part of the disarmament program. Let us get out of the U.N. Investigate NATO.

And abolish income taxes, too—if, presumably, there is still time. [Laughter.]

Frightening is not the word for it. It is incredible.

It is incredible that so many Americans have been so cruelly swindled, and have allowed themselves to be so deceitfully duped, about a U.S. Army troop exercise instructing our soldiers in counterguerrilla warfare—and witnessed, incidentally, by 124, not 15,000 or 16,000, foreign military officers from Canada, the Republic of China, France, Great Britain, Guatemala, Indonesia, Iran, Italy, Japan, South Korea, Liberia, Pakistan, the Philippines, Spain, Thailand, Turkey, and Vietnam.

Now who and what whips up so many Americans to a state of frenzy and despair over such "conspiracies" as the U.S. Army's "sellout to the United Nations" under the "direction of the Arms Control Agency?"

The answers are not hard to find.

Two of my cited correspondents indicated a mysterious "Mr. Jackman, of Greenville, S.C.," has contributed.

Others—as do many of my frightened correspondents—enclosed for my edification another definite source—an ignorant, crude, and equally hysterical leaflet.

I ask unanimous consent that the leaflet be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the leaflet was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The United States Has No Army, No Navy, No Air Force

For doubting Thomases who think this statement is not true, Senate bill No. 2180 [1] entitled "The Arms Control and Disarmament Act" was approved by the House of Representatives as House bill 9118 [2] and was signed into effect as Public Law 87–297 on September 26, 1961,[3] by John F. Kennedy, President of the United States. This bill was prepared to expedite a plan already proposed at Geneva by our administration and State Department (see Publication No. 7277 for full particulars of its terms) to effect the "legal" connotation to disarmament.

The only thing that keeps our Army, Navy, and Air Force from being wiped out of existence is public opinion. At any time he chooses the President of the United States can now transfer our Army, Navy, and Air Force (your husband, father, son, or brother) to the command of Eugene D. Kiselev (Russian) who is Secretary of the United Nations Security Council (World Police Force).

* * * * *

Attributed to secret agreement between Alger Hiss and Molotov confirmed by Trygvie Lie [4] and U.S. State Department [5] and verified by subsequent action, the Secretary of the United Nations Security Council (who is in command of the United Nations Military Secretariat (World Police Force)[6] must always be a Russian.

---

[1] See Congressional Record, v. 107, pt. 14 p. 18692.

[2] See Congressional Record, vol. 107, pt. 15, pp. 20249–20316 (first vote)—vol. 107, pt. 16, pp. 20905–20906 (final and approval).

[3] Congressional Record, vol. 107, pt. 16, p. 21552.

[4] Pp. 45–46 of his book "In the Cause of Peace."

[5] Bulletin No. 422A, dated Aug. 2, 1947.

Here is the record: 1946–49, Arkady S. Sobelov,[7] U.S.S.R.; 1950–53, Konstantine Zinchenko,[8] U.S.S.R.; 1953–57, Ilya Tchernyshev, U.S.S.R.; 1957–60, A. Dobrynin, U.S.S.R.; 1960–62, George P. Arkadev,[9] U.S.S.R.; 1962–—, Eugeny D. Kiselev, U.S.S.R.

Prepared by: United Societies of Methodist Laymen, Inc., Austin, Tex.

Mr. KUCHEL. That is the leaflet. It is very much like the dozens of allegedly "patriotic" fliers and pamphlets and leaflets which pour into my office by the hundreds, attached to frantic, pleading, threatening messages, sometimes typed on the finest stationery.

It is distressing and disillusioning to find persons of normal educational attainments—or any educational level—falling hysterically and emotionally, without reservations, for the unadulterated venom spewed by out-and-out crackpots for paranoia and profit.

It is disgusting to find self-appointed saviors, whether infantile or cunning, preying profitably and psychotically on the fears of Americans in the name of anticommunism. Indeed, the ugly labors they perform are a service to the Kremlin itself. They seek to divide and too often succeed in dividing, our people, far better than any Communist agents could do.

Day in and day out, every Senator and every Government official I know works long, hard hours devoted to one primary mission:

To protect and promote the security, welfare, and best interests of one country and one country alone—the United States of America, a country all of us in this Chamber unashamedly revere.

Do these people really believe, I ask myself—and now I ask them—that a gigantic and incredible and unprecedented conspiracy has occurred in America in which the President and his Cabinet, 99 percent of the Congress, 99 percent of the Nation's journalists, and even the U.S. Army have all taken part to sell out our country?

Do they really believe further that this conspiracy is visible only to a small number of self-appointed saviors, such as Mr. Jackman?

If they do, the only reasonable reply I can give to them which they will understand is the honorable, 100 percent red, white, and blue expression: "Nuts."

Who, we might also ask, is this Mr. Jackman? He is simply the Reverend Theodore Jackman, an available speaker for the American Opinion Speakers Bureau, the "nationwide conservative speakers' exchange" run by the John Birch Society, whose major contribution to the security and welfare of the United States of America was to "unmask" Dwight Eisenhower as a traitor.

Speaking of that highly publicized organization, I digress for a moment to point out to my colleagues, who may not have heard, that the founder of the Birch group has recently revised the party line viewpoint on former President Eisenhower—at least somewhat.

According to newspaper reports, the latest reprints of the founder's memorable book "The Politician," now gives followers the following choice—

> That he—Eisenhower—is a mere stooge, or that he is a Communist assigned the specific job of being a political front man.

But the ludicrous word from high up in the Birch councils on the late former Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, of course, remains: "I personally believe Dulles to be a Communist agent," the founder of the Birch Society continues to profess.

As Ripley said, "believe it or not."

But, returning to the leaflet, I have received so far more than 2,000 letters demanding abolition of the U.S. Arms Control Agency on the grounds cited in the leaflet. Indeed, several hundred constituents have sent to me this leaflet, or variations of it.

And the most depressing statistics of all are as follows:

Only four constituents have raised even the slightest doubt at all about the leaflet's validity—as only six even considered at all the possibility the Operation Water Moccasin fright was a hoax.

To the first few hundred constituents who wrote to me in panic that the Arms Control Act transfers our military to a Russian colonel, I observed mildly, they were victims of misinformation.

As my colleagues know, the forerunner of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency was the Disarmament Administration, which was established under former President Eisenhower.

As my colleagues also know, strong support for the legislation to establish the Arms Control Agency was offered in testimony by such distinguished American leaders as Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, former supreme commander of NATO; Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and now supreme commander of NATO; Henry Cabot Lodge, my party's candidate for Vice President and a good American; Christian Herter, an able, dedicated American and Republican who serves the present administration as he did the last; and Robert Lovett, capable former Secretary of Defense.

Quoting from the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the U.S. Senate:

> The (Arms Control) Agency is to be responsible, under the direction of the Secretary of State, for the acquisition of a fund of practical and theoretical knowledge about disarmament and is directed to conduct research in that field, to engage public or private institutions or persons for such studies, and to coordinate work in this field now being undertaken by other Government agencies in accordance with procedures to be established by the President.

And so, the Foreign Relations Committee of the U.S. Senate, composed of 11 Democrats and 6 Republicans, unanimously went on record in favor of the legislation.

I told my frightened constituents all of this.

I told them that the Arms Control Agency, endorsed by an overwhelming Senate vote of 73 to 14 in 1961, has no power to disarm our country; that the only authority it has is to conduct research on matters of arms control and the effect of any reduction in the level of armaments on various parts of our economy; that it reports to the President and does not act independently; that its function is merely to bring the best talent available so that our representatives and the President can deal effectively with arms control matters; and that no responsible public official believes in unilateral disarmament or disarmament without an effective means of inspection.

What was the result? More leaflets in return, even wilder than the first batch. Plus, new or renewed accusations as to what is prompting my answers.

Let me cite some of the further authority or proof they sent on:

I ask unanimous consent that the text of that creed be printed in the Record in full.

There being no objection, the leaflet was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Handwriting on the Wall: Soon You Will Not Be a Citizen of a Free America

The U.S. Congress has passed a law, No. 87–297, which established an office of dictator. This office to be filled by appointment, appointment by the President.

The appointee is not called dictator: he is called Director of Disarmament and Arms Control.

He shall give his orders to the Secretary of State and to the President; and they shall see that his orders are carried out.

There shall be no jurisdiction over him: neither by the President, nor by the Congress.

The Director shall collaborate with, and receive orders from Eugene Kiselev (Russian), the Secretary of the United Nations.

All the U.S. arsenals and conveyances; missiles, planes, tanks, and ships are through his orders to be placed at the disposal of the U.N. Secretary. Then, all military centers are to be dismantled, and all American military personnel discharged. But afterward, discharged Americans will be drafted by the United Nations, to serve it, in far-away places.

For your free America will be only a vassal state under the U.N. Uncle Sam cannot then move his finger, without permission from the United Nations. But Khrushchev and Russia always veto everything Uncle Sam requests. So then the U.N. will never favor the United States of America under any condition whatever.

Law 87–297 is operating. William C. Foster is the Director. Five atomic submarines, Polaris submarines have been given to the U.N. They have been definitely promised

---

[6] Articles 46, 47 of United Nations Charter.

[7] Had Lt. Gen. A. Ph. Vasiliev as chairman of the Military Staff Committee—the same man who was in charge of a report containing recommendations of the general principles governing the organization of the Armed Forces made available to the Security Council by member nations of the United Nations, and the same man who was granted a leave of absence after setting up this organization to serve as adviser to North Korean Communists during the Korean war, in charge of all movements across the 38th parallel and from the evidence indicates that he knew what the U.S. troops would do before MacArthur was given his orders by Zinchenko.

[8] Screened military directives to Gen. Douglas MacArthur during the Korean police action.

[9] Screened and ordered Congo-Katanga directives and had more to say than you did that American planes be used to destroy anti-Communists in the Congo.

> the U.N. by the President and Secretary McNamara, and airbases are frequently being dismantled. Law 87-297 makes Foster subject to no law, nor to any authoritative body.
>
> You will not have your job, nor your home, neither your self. If your Congress is not awakened and caused to repeal Public Law 87-297 soon. It must be repealed very soon.
>
> Let it be understood also, that there are deputy directors, and many more will be appointed. There will be these appointed officials over the entire country; and there will be no civil courts; neither any civil officers to appeal to: for these deputies' orders will supersede orders of all civil officers.
>
> Sounds fantastic. Then listen: The U.N. did not help the liberty-loving people of Hungary. The U.N. stood by and watched the savage Communist hordes massacre the people of Hungary. The U.N. has harassed and caused atrocities to be committed upon the best and only great people of the Congo. The U.N. has never helped any liberty-loving people. The U.N. despises God. What is fantastic truly is that you are a personality: yet you do not know when you began to be: yet you have a destiny—and do not know where you are headed.
>
> While you and I were overwhelmed with the many machinations of the modern era: the oneworlders, through their never-tiring kibitzers overwhelmed most of your Congress, and pressured them into surrendering your Government.
>
> And who is William C. Foster, Director of Disarmament who has this great power? He is not only a member of the ruling power, the Council on Foreign Relations, but a Director of this Council. And who is Col. Marshall Sanders, U.S. Air Force—on active duty in the Air Force? He is the colonel assigned by the Air Force to serve this Council on Foreign Relations for 1 year. He is listed in the annual report of the Council on Foreign Relations for 1962–63 as Air Force research fellow. This should convince anyone who rules the country today.
>
> (Send to the U.S. Flag Committee, Post Office Box 269, Jackson Heights, N.Y., for report on this Council on Foreign Relations, $1.)

Mr. KUCHEL. Observe, there is that Russian colonel again, ever ubiquitous in "running the U.N.'s military operations" and getting ready to take over our Armed Forces, plus our jobs, our homes and our very selves.

It is simply impossible to take the time and energy to prove demonstrably the outright falsehood of every zany claim alleged by this leaflet—from the giving of atomic submarines to the U.N., to William Foster's supposedly being subject to no law.

But consider the key and most frightening plank in these leaflets—the charge that a Russian colonel is commanding or will command all of our military. Can its origin be found?

Yes, it can. It can be found word for word in, of all things, a stage play written in the early 1950's by one Myron C. Fagan, the national director of something in Hollywood called the Cinema Educational Guild. The play, titled "Thieves' Paradise," purported to show, in Fagan's own words:

> Why we must get the United States out of the U.N.—and the U.N. out of the United States * * * (revealing) all the different phases of the diabolical plot—how the U.N. was a "Trojan Horse" sneaked into the United States to serve as a sanctuary for Red spies, saboteurs and American traitors * * * how it was to destroy our freedoms through "treaties" such as "genocide" and the "World Court" * * * to brainwash our youth through UNESCO and UNICEF, etc. * * * to drain us of our wealth through UNRRA, the Marshall plan, and our foreign aid giveaways * * * and finally to transform the United States into an enslaved unit of their Communist one-world government.

In a little green tract, titled "U.N. Tract No. 1," from which I just read, Fagan and the Cinema Educational Guild quotes the following dialog from his play:

> STEFAN. When they were setting up the U.N., Molotov and Alger Hiss made a secret agreement that the military chief of the U.N. was always to be a Russian, appointed by Moscow. The first such Chief was Arkady Sobelov.
>
> RITA. I know——
>
> STEFAN. But do you know why Moscow wanted that arrangement? (Rita shakes her head—Stefan explains gloatingly) To be prepared, if the U.N. would have to interfere in any Communist attempts to grab free states their man would have charge of that interference and——
>
> RITA. (Breaks in—suddenly understands) and their man would be able to keep the Red commanders fully informed of all the plans and movements of the U.N. forces?

There it is. The basis for the charge that a Russian colonel is going to command our military.

Now, first, who is Myron Fagan, who discovered this vile plot so many years ago?

I quote briefly from portions of the 11th report of the State Senate Fact-finding Subcommittee on Un-American Activities to the 1961 regular California Legislature:

> We do not wish to impugn the sincerity of Mr. Fagan, but we do wish to make public the facts about his Cinema Educational Guild, and our opinion concerning the erroneous nature of many of the statements contained in its publications * * *. There are heavy evidences of anti-Semitism throughout many of the booklets and in many of the Fagan speeches * * *. Mr. Fagan may well be one of the Nation's outstanding experts on matters theatrical, but that does not necessarily qualify him as an expert in the field of countersubversive intelligence.

So there we have it. The daisy chain is complete.

And what the fright peddlers have handed down to one another, over the years, is a daisy of a whopper, a puerile and evil package of fright calculated to "scare the daylights" out of decent Americans.

This whopper has been debunked thoroughly over the years. Yet, here it is again. And not only in letters and leaflets. Let me quote from an item in the April 1963, issue of the despicable The Cross and The Flag, the anti-Semitic hate sheet of Gerald L. K. Smith:

> U.N. MILITARY DICTATORSHIP
>
> The world police force of the United Nations is run by a Communist carrying the title "Secretary of the U.N. Security Council." Since the beginning of the United Nations a Russian Communist has held this authoritative position of top U.N. military authority.
>
> Below are the names of Soviet agents who have held this position to the exclusion of all other nations:
>
> 1946 to 1949: Arkady S. Sobelov, U.S.S.R.
>
> 1950 to 1953: Konstantine Zinchenko, U.S.S.R. Screened military directives to Gen. Douglas MacArthur during Korean police action.
>
> 1953 to 1957: Ilya Tchernyshev, U.S.S.R.
>
> 1957 to 1960: A. Dobrynin, U.S.S.R.
>
> 1960 to 1962: George P. Arkadev, U.S.S.R. Screened Congo-Katanga directives. Eugeny D. Kiselev, U.S.S.R.

Or let me quote just a few paragraphs from a news item in the Long Beach, Calif., Independent, a metropolitan daily newspaper, of March 15, 1963:

> The U.S. Government is trying to put all its Armed Forces under the command of a Russian general, John Rousselot told 600 persons in municipal auditorium Thursday night.
>
> Rousselot, John Birch Society district governor for six Western States and former Congressman from California's 25th District, spoke on "Disarmament—Blueprint for Surrender."
>
> This office (referring to Under Secretary for Security Council and Political Affairs) is held by a Russian general, he said, and if the United States turns over its armed forces to the U.N., the Russian general will command them.

Those fantastic charges, Mr. President, are false—completely false.

But when one, who was honored to be a Member of the Congress of the United States for 2 years—or even one who writes for an undisguised hatesheet, utters such a cry, there are Americans who listen and believe.

The facts are that our American Military Establishment is American and shall remain so. We joined the United Nations because we believe in and work for peace with justice in the world. Where the United Nations has sought to quell aggression, the United States has played its honorable role.

There is no Russian colonel, or general, or military or civilian individual who is "secretary of the United Nations" or "secretary of the U.N. Security Council."

Let the record be clear that there are 19 undersecretaries of the Security Council, of which 13 are filled by Americans or representatives of our allies and of which two are Soviet bloc nations.

None of them has anything to do with the command of any joint U.N. military operations. There is no world police force in the U.N. And, of course, no Soviet national ever gave Gen. Douglas MacArthur any orders.

How hysterical and idiotic can one get? I am afraid to answer, until I have seen tomorrow's mail.

Leaflets, of course, are not the only cause for hysteria.

Lunatic columnists, apostles of hate and fear on radio and television, and even loony letters to the editor provoke their share of fright mail.

The curious fact is that the fright peddlers, from the simple simpletons to the wretched racists, all claim to be conservatives.

They defile the honorable philosophy of conservatism with that claim as thoroughly as the Communists defile the honorable philosophy of liberalism.

I sympathize with some of my constituents who are honestly bewildered and confused by the trash of the rightwing extremists.

I even feel sympathetic with those who have been taken in as dupes.

But I have nothing but seething contempt for the originators of the hoaxes and swindles, from the ludicrous leaders of the Birch Society to the equally ludicrous director of the Cinema Educational Guild, including any and all of the several hundred similar self-styled patriotic groups.

They are anything but patriotic. Indeed, a good case can be made that they are unpatriotic, and downright un-American. For they are doing a devil's work far better than Communists themselves could do.

It is curious to me that they all have generally the same aims, issued in all-out, uncompromising, almost hysterical demands: Get the United States out of the U.N. Stop all foreign aid. Repeal the income tax. Abandon NATO and bring our troops home from Europe.

It is ironic that these very aims are very likely identical to the real hopes and aspirations of the Kremlin.

At any rate, I could not imagine a program that would delight Khrushchev more.

For we have a United Nations, with imperfections to be sure, but a U.N. in which the Soviet Union has had to resort to a veto on 100 occasions, while we have never had to resort to a veto at all. We have a United Nations which the Soviet Premier has bitterly attacked on numerous occasions as U.S. controlled. A United Nations the Communists have never been able to control or subvert to their own use.

Yet, say the extremists, abandon it to the Communists.

Stop all foreign aid, the self-styled patriots say. Not some, not most, but all: military and economic. Let us stop helping to maintain 2 million free world troops on the perimeter of the Soviet Union, the patriots are really demanding. Let us write off every nation of the world as unrestricted fair game for the Communists, they are really saying. And if these countries need help in establishing military, and political and economic stability, let the Communists, or somebody else, provide it, they are really saying.

Repeal the income tax, they say. Not cut taxes, repeal them. And repeal our national defense, in the process.

Abandon NATO, they say. For the Birch leader has said:

> With regard to that brainchild of Dean Acheson, godchild of Harry Truman, and eventual ward of Dwight Eisenhower, we have repeatedly insisted for years that it was probably the biggest—and certainly one of the most expensive—hoax in all human history.

Abandon NATO, they say—and leave Europe to the whim or mercy of the Soviet Union.

It is an amazing paradox that the rightwing extremists find the same programs and organizations to be subversive that the leftwing extremists find to be the "tools and weapons of the Wall Street imperialists," as witness Communist Party literature on our mutual security programs and NATO.

Of late I have been receiving letters from Birchers and their fellow travelers calling for removal of American troops in Vietnam. And I have also been receiving letters from Communists, leftwingers, and their fellow travelers calling for precisely the very same thing.

No, much as the fright peddlers, the rightwing extremists, and the Communists may desire such mutual goals, America is not going to bow to their dictates.

Let us, by all means, debate, as reasonable and rational and realistic people, the successes and failures of the United Nations and foreign aid.

But let us not do it on the basis of childish slogans or on the inane premise that they are Communist programs adopted by a Communist or pro-Communist Government in Washington.

Our policies—American policies—are open to question and debate—as they must always be.

I am a Republican—and I shall continue to question the cold-war policies of a Democratic administration and fight those I consider unwise.

But both political parties—Republicans and Democrats—have the best interests of the country we love in mind and heart.

I wonder, however, about the fright peddlers and the followers of an organization whose founder has declared: "Democracy is merely a deceptive phrase, a weapon of demagoguery and a perennial fraud."

Clutching at half-truths and downright falsehoods, the fright peddlers fabricate hoaxes, as we have seen, which frighten Americans and divert their attention from the real menace. They sow suspicion and hatred. They attempt to undermine faith in Government, its institutions, and its leaders. They preach resistance to the laws of our land. They degrade America and Americans, and do it as well as—or better than—the Communists do.

Yet, their followers—and even some honest conservatives—continually ask me: Why do I keep berating them, instead of the Communists?

I loathe and despise communism and Communists. By voice and by vote, all of my adult life I have attacked them and opposed.

I expect the hoaxes and the spreading of hysteria, the sowing of suspicion, and the denigration of our Government, institutions, and leaders from the camp of the enemy, communism, but not from fellow Americans.

I shall always fight the big lie, the smear, witch hunts, anti-Catholicism, anti-Semitism, racism of any kind—which are not the hallmarks of conservatism, but are the trademarks of communism and fascism.

I am concerned about rightwing extremists, not because of the noise they make, which, as with the vile Communists, is out of proportion to their size. I am concerned because they are, after all, Americans, not agents sworn to allegiance to a foreign power.

Astonishingly to me, I sometimes get letters from avowed Birchers who furiously deny their leader has ever charged the Central Intelligence Agency is Communist controlled, or that Dulles was a Communist, or that NATO is a Communist planned hoax.

And I find it equally hard to believe that the followers of the fright peddlers are all wholly oblivious to the anti-Semitism, anti-Catholicism, and outright racism of many of their "saviors."

I am going to read a letter of the kind which arrives now and again. I cite the letter not to "prove" that all rightwing extremists are bigots or that a majority are; I really do not know how many are, perhaps very few.

I cite it merely to show that this type of person, the follower of Myron Fagan and Gerald L. K. Smith, has often found a new, "respectable" home in an extremist rightwing group that denies being bigoted.

The letter, from Westminster, Calif., reads in part:

> Sirs: I am writing you again just to state that you can ignore me but you are sure not being ignored, your latest blast at Americans in the John Birch Society is just more evidence of your support of communism. I am a member of the Birch Society and I know many other members and every one of them are decent Americans who are interested in constitutional government and free enterprise and a real education for their children, and who mean to have it in spite of the grip that Jew communism that you support has on our country and Government. * * *
>
> On this law by superior force that is called integration what do you think is going to be gained by that, the Jew press, radio, TV, and papers all scream the law of the land, who do you think believes it * * *. If you want integration let's start with the Jew schools. And synagogues * * *.
>
> When are you going to stand up like a white man.

That is more than enough to illustrate my point—and to complete this autopsy.

My conclusion is simply this: Perhaps 10 percent of the 60,000 letters I receive each month fall into the category of fright mail.

This mail flies in the face of a clear, stern, and pertinent warning from a great and dedicated American, J. Edgar Hoover, in February 1962. Mr. Hoover then wrote in the Journal of the American Bar Association:

> Today, far too many self-styled experts on communism are plying the highways of America, giving erroneous and distorted information. This causes hysteria, false alarms, misplaced apprehension by many of our citizens. We need enlightenment about communism but this information must be factual, accurate and not tailored to echo personal idiosyncrasies. To quote an old aphorism: We need more light and less heat.

Can these cruelly swindled victims of the fright peddlers be shocked into a reappraisal of their swindlers and be reclaimed as valuable and effective contributors in the fight against the real enemy? I do not know. But I believe it is time such an attempt be made.

Perhaps I am naive about this. Yet I feel there must be some—and they belong to both political parties—who can be persuaded to join the ranks again of sensible and decent anti-Communist, pro-Americans devoted to defending our Nation against defilement of both the extreme left and extreme right, here and abroad.

America has enough immediate and deadly dangerous enemies, without manufacturing hobgoblins. America can use all the responsible help it can receive.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I should like to compliment the distinguished senior Senator from California on his statement. I believe that most people in America do not realize the extent to which the mail of Members of the Senate and the House reflects fear, frustration, and ignorance, with respect to what is going on in America.

If I may add to what the distinguished Senator has said, to me one of the most pathetic facts is that the extreme right wingers, if we may call them that—at least, the fear peddlers, and that is what they are, more than anything else—cause in the hearts and minds of many people a fear and frustration which are more dangerous to the morale and real interests of the United States than anything else. They are doing more damage to the morale of the United States than Mr. Khrushchev has been able to do to date. This damage constitutes a real hazard.

If I may relate one personal experience, last fall I was honored by being chosen to be a delegate of the United States to the United Nations. It was astounding and surprising the number of letters I received which were extremely vituperative and bitter, and which castigated me in the most severe terms for even consenting to serve my own country as a delegate to the United Nations. These letters are in my office. I say to the senior Senator from California that they constitute as big an indictment of what is happening as do some of the records and some of the letters he has read here.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I wish to say for the RECORD that the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado performed a high service to the American Government and the American people when he was one of our representatives in the United Nations. He is a patriot. He served this country in war, overseas. He serves his country in this Chamber. He served this country in what the late Arthur Vandenberg called the "Town Meeting of the World."

I speak on this with deep feeling, and can only pledge to my colleagues in the Senate my undying support in this struggle.

The Senator has done a great job. Yet he has taken abuse from people who were misinformed and who, if they had their own way, would isolate our country. In this new era in which we live, isolation is impossible.

Mr. ALLOTT. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator very much. He is absolutely correct, of course, that isolation is impossible. If we are ever to achieve a world of order and peace, we will have to do it through some organization. The world is too big and too complicated today to do it through unilateral treaties or even multilateral treaties.

What are we to do? Are we to destroy the United Nations and then build up another organization in trying to found a world of order and peace?

To me, that is unthinkable. I only wish it were possible for the ordinary American to have access to some of the letters the Senator has received and that I have received. Never a mail goes by that a letter of the type that he has read is not received by us.

As an illustration of how widespread this has become, I can only say that people will make the statement that they heard such and such said over the radio, or that they heard the Reverend So-and-So or Mr. So-and-So say this or that over the radio, and in that way it becomes gospel to them.

I know that some people will take the statements that the Senator from California has quoted, and will say, "This is what Senator KUCHEL said on the floor of the Senate. You will find it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Therefore, it is the truth."

They will quote it as the Senator's words even though the Senator quoted the remarks. They will say it must be the truth, because the Senator from California said it on the floor of the Senate. So much for that.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am sorry that I was not in the Chamber to listen to all of the remarkable speech made by the Senator from California. I congratulate him on his exposé of the kind of letters that he and the Senator from Colorado have mentioned. Those letters are not confined to Republicans alone. We too get them on this side of the aisle.

When an organization in this country brands as a Communist or as a Communist dupe a person of the stature of the former President, General Eisenhower, or the late Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, who I believe was one of our great Secretaries of State, or his brother, Allen Dulles, the former Director of CIA, Gen. George C. Marshall, or others in that category, every decent and right-thinking man should stand up and be counted against that kind of slander and that type of organization.

I have been receiving this type of mail. Sometimes it makes me quite angry. One can only hope that fairness, knowledge, and decency will prevail. I have an abiding faith in the great majority of the American people that commonsense, decency, and understanding will prevail with them.

These fringe groups are so dogmatic that would try to brand as Communist dupes the military genius of the Second World War, Gen. George Marshall; a former President, General Eisenhower; the brothers Dulles, and many other outstanding and patriotic Americans.

I congratulate the acting minority leader, the distinguished Senator from California and the distinguished Senator from Colorado for their remarks this afternoon.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, no one has greater respect for the majority leader than those of us who are on the floor now, particularly the Senator from Colorado. No one could ever doubt his great patriotic spirit, which he has demonstrated in every way whenever it was required to be demonstrated. His words are very much appreciated. They are evidence of our unity on this subject, and show that we are united on this subject, rather than divided.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to state again, as I have stated on many occasions, that the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], together with his colleague, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], served as delegates to the United Nations in an outstanding manner. The Senate is very proud of the many contributions which they have made to the welfare, the security, and the well-being of our country.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to add my congratulations to our distinguished friend from California. I have noted with special interest one sentence in his statement, which reads:

> It is disgusting to find self-appointed saviors, whether infantile or cunning preying profitably and psychotically on the fears of Americans in the name of anticommunism.

It should be pointed out that this danger is creeping up on the blind side of Americans. Almost every American is opposed to communism. However, it is important that we do what the Senator from California has done in speaking out against those who would spread hate and plant the seed of suspicion in the hearts of men. The thing to do is to take on the rascals frontally, as the Senator has done, and speak out against organizations like the Birch Society—and not every member of the Birch Society necessarily feels that way—and speak out, not only here on the floor of the Senate, unchallenged, but also in campaigns, as he has done, where it can be a political danger to do so. That is where it counts. The Senator from California has done that, as have the Senator from Colorado, the Senator from Minnesota, and others, including myself.

In speaking out in this way, we are ready to take the consequences. That is where it really counts. It is a dramatic demonstration of our unity in opposition to this kind of imposition on the feelings of the American people, by people who might just as well have as their goal the destruction of our society.

When this sort of thing begins, it does not stop. It goes on and on, and can be directed against Jews, Catholics, Negroes, Japanese, Mexicans, or anyone else.

I speak with deep feeling, and can only pledge to my colleagues in the Senate my undying alliance in this struggle.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator from New York. I am eternally grateful for his comments. We need to be united against the continuing menace and danger which communism poses to the freedom of this country and freedom all over the globe. But the time has come when we must demonstrate to the American people that the purveyors of hate, particularly the purveyors of hate for profit, need to have the finger pointed at them. That is the kind of record the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott] have made.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from California.

Mr. ALLOTT. I appreciate the statement of the Senator from California.

OPERATION MOHOLE

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I am about to speak on a subject to which I referred last week, and which I expect to explore in considerable detail during the following week. Last year I discussed at great length on the floor of the Senate and in the Committee on Appropriations particularly, a project of the National Science Foundation known as Mohole. This particular name derives from a Yugoslav whose name is Mohorovicic. He did some exploratory work with respect to the earth and the earth's mantle. Two or three years ago the National Science Foundation authorized preliminary work on a project which immediately became nicknamed Mohole.

What is the purpose of Project Mohole? Project Mohole is intended to pierce the earth's crust. By this operation, scientists hope to learn exactly how the earth was put together.

Huge sums of money have been spent in space exploration, and really the only justification that has ever been made for that work is that it is hoped that something will be learned about the structure of the universe.

If Project Mohole can be accomplished successfully, the chances are very great that our scientists will learn even more about the composition of the earth and how it came to be a part of the great universe than will ever be learned from one or two explorations in space. Perhaps this statement is a little too expansive, but the possibilities for extending our knowledge about the earth through Project Mohole are almost limitless.

In 1961, the National Science Foundation made a public pronouncement to various persons in the United States that it intended to start Project Mohole. In July the National Science Foundation called a meeting at which there was a large attendance. At the meeting, certain criteria were established for those who would participate in the project. Much of this information was placed in the Record last year with respect to discussions on Mohole. The offering that was made by the National Science Foundation is also in the Record.

What were the elements of the offering? First, it was desired to have some group which had scientific know-how make an offering to the National Science Foundation to take charge of the project, manage it, and accomplish it.

Second, the Foundation indicated that it would give preference to some company which did not want a management fee for its work.

Third, the Foundation said that those who undertook the project would have to demonstrate considerable experience in similar scientific work and have the capability of designing all tools and structures.

Lastly, the Foundation said it was interested in management.

The proposal was set forth in some 15 points.

As a result of the invitation, many persons attended the meeting. Nevertheless, one firm, Brown & Root, of Texas, did not appear, nor did any of its representatives attend the meeting. Not only did Brown & Root not appear at the meeting on July 27; it never had any contact with the National Science Foundation until September 5. Brown & Root was not on the original invitation list of the National Science Foundation and had no representative present. But many qualified representatives of other companies appeared and eventually submitted bids on the project.

Some time later a screening committee was appointed in the National Science Foundation. As a result, there were two screenings of all the contractors, from which Socony Mobil Oil Co. and a group associated with it, and Shell Oil Co. and a group associated with it, Global Marine Exploration, came out first. Brown & Root came out fifth one time, and third another time.

All this information has been ably documented by the senior Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel] and also by Mr. John Averill, of the Los Angeles Times, who dug into the subject at that time and discovered that a real mistake was being made under the guise of science. As a result of the two screenings, there was doubt for a long time as to just who would be awarded the contract.

The Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel] then sent a letter to the General Accounting Office. In effect, the GAO gave a clean bill of health to the final selection by the National Science Foundation. I questioned Dr. Waterman and various other members of the National Science Foundation at great length in the hearings on the Independent Offices Appropriation bill for fiscal 1963. I showed to my own satisfaction, and I am sure to the satisfaction of most people, that Brown & Root had not satisfied, except to a very small degree, any of the criteria established by the National Science Foundation for those who would perform the work of Mohole.

When we consider going down from a ship through 22,000 or 23,000 feet of water and planting a drill stem in a hole in the ocean, and drilling from there, some of the problems and complexities of the project can be understood.

It means, first of all, taking a ship to a certain position and maintaining it in that position. It means devising entirely new concepts of drill stems and bits. It means designing new drill stems, because present drill stems could not support such a weight. It means designing new drills. It means designing new ways of entering and reentering. So it can be seen that many new problems arise.

We would all have thought it would be natural that someone who had engaged in drilling deep wells would have been selected for Operation Mohole. I am not critical because one company or another company was selected; but one of the criteria was that whoever was selected must have in-house scientific capability. This is all documented in the hearings. Even then, Dr. Waterman was not satisfied that Brown & Root had such scientific capability.

At this time the facts are as follows: After some 9 or 10 months, Mohole has reached a point where I believe it can correctly be called a fiasco. It has been under review by a committee of the National Science Foundation and the Board of Directors of the Foundation. I do not know what the result of the review is, because, unfortunately, the National Science Foundation officials will not divulge to me—even though I am on the subcommittee which passes on the appropriation of funds for it, and even though its officials know of my interest in it—the results or the progress of the work in which it engages.

So a year later we find that the man who originally was designated by Brown & Root—and that was one of the original factors in the selection—has since been removed from the Mohole project, and has been moved, I believe, to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration construction near Houston, Tex.

Mr. President, it is not my purpose at this time to do as I will do next week and in the weeks to come—namely, point out, not 1, but 50 wrong roads taken with respect to this project. I believe I am justified in doing that. This project may not be the largest mistake the United States has ever made; but it was a $46 million mistake last year, when we appropriated the first funds which started the Brown and Root contract. Now it has increased to at least 50 percent more than that; and, in my opinion, and I made this statement last year—before we are through with it, it will cost the United States $100 million. $100 million is still a great deal of money—at least, in my opinion.

The opportunities arising from Mohole to obtain greater knowledge are almost limitless. That situation is what aroused my first interest in it, several years ago, and it is what sustains my interest in it now. I have talked with 9 or 10 prominent scientists in the United States, whose names I shall not divulge at this time, who feel unequivocally that this project is a fiasco. They laugh at the results obtained and they laugh at the direction in which it is going.

Mr. President, my purpose in discussing this matter today is twofold. First, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate and to the attention of the people of the United States the fact that this program has started in a wrong direction. We must pull it back, and begin again, even though $2 million or $3 million has been spent—and I believe that approximately that amount has been spent up to this time. Certainly it is better to lose that amount of money, and to start afresh in a direction which we know will give us a reasonable chance of success, rather than to pour more money on top of the money already spent.

My second reason for speaking of this matter today, in addition to calling the attention of the Senate and the attention of the American people to this fiasco, is that I fully believe the United States will advance in proportion to the extent to which it develops its basic research—not merely applied research, in which some principle already discovered is put to use. The American people have always adapted readily to applied research; but basic research is most important, for in that field it is possible to find new and most important scientific principles and facts. To the extent that we explore that area, our country will advance and will lead the world, particularly the Russians, in scientific achievement.

Because I feel so strongly that at the present time we are on entirely the wrong road, and because I feel that we have to make a success of this effort, and because I feel that the payoff in terms of knowledge for the benefit of man can be so great, I call this matter to the attention of the Senate; and I hope all Senators will give it some thought, so that later this spring, when it becomes an issue, they will be able to have the advantage of having thought about it and having some of the facts available to them.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ADVERSE EFFECTS OF IMPORTS OF MANUFACTURED WOOLEN GOODS

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, not only my own State of New Hampshire, but also many other States, have been adversely affected by the mounting pressure from imports of manufactured woolen goods. In January of this year, imports of wool manufactures from the United Kingdom were 768,000 square yards. The figures for March, which became known yesterday, show an increase to over 2 million square yards. Imports from Japan, which were 2.3 million square yards in January, rose to 4.2 million square yards in March. And imports from Italy have risen from 1.4 million square yards to the whopping total of 5.6 million for the month of March. I have prepared a table to show January, February, and March totals for 29 leading wool-exporting nations, as reported by the Bureau of the Census. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. Edmondson in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, this is extraordinary pressure, which reveals that the principal exporting nations have exercised not the slightest bit of restraint in seeking to stabilize the wool trade. Should woolen imports continue to double and redouble, they will provoke in this country a rash of protectionism which could jeopardize the entire round of negotiations under the 1962 Trade Expansion Act. It simply cannot be argued that strong executive action on behalf of our vital wool industry would cast doubt on our good faith in the coming negotiations. There are already several disturbing signs of a revival of protectionist sentiment on the part of Common Market countries. I strongly hope that we shall not sacrifice the interest of our domestic woolen industry in futile efforts to keep alive the buoyant optimism of 1962. The exclusion of Great Britain from the Common Market and the disastrous turn of European Economic Community agricultural tariff policy are portents of an attitude that cannot be appeased by refusing to act on wool. Strong representations about the increases in wool imports must be made, in order to show that the United States does not mean to neglect its basic interests when far-reaching decisions about the future of world trade are made.

EXHIBIT 1.—*U.S. general imports of wool manufactures except floor coverings, January, February, March 1963, Bureau of Census figures for selected countries*

[Quantity totals in square yards by country of origin]

Country	January	February	March
Canada	20,253	20,176	19,697
Mexico	6,080	4,211	2,949
Jamaica		8,970	5,892
Uruguay	246,449	1,294,148	848,759
Argentina	4,156	39,499	112,268
Sweden	11,075	5,971	10,683
Norway	8,025	7,953	7,154
Denmark	33,418	9,572	21,866
United Kingdom	768,520	1,953,289	2,168,719
Ireland	13,024	20,658	15,671
Netherlands	47,338	85,492	129,879
Belgium	220,480	318,014	493,338
France	347,893	459,300	284,915
West Germany	78,704	107,285	158,523
Austria	21,258	26,839	36,135
Switzerland	58,517	77,448	94,162
Poland	2,574	7,607	2,072
Spain	38,260	26,501	46,692
Portugal	47,711	13,063	11,023
Italy	1,364,519	2,362,339	5,559,829
Yugoslavia	21,536	33,459	20,880
Israel	43,126	70,938	39,597
India	5,299	3,394	30,642
Philippine Republic	12,716	9,427	16,057
Hong Kong	178,543	123,157	231,200
Taiwan	15,142	6,057	12,752
Japan	2,310,011	2,586,428	4,220,689
Australia	10,846	1,339,525	1,521,983
Union of South Africa	102,057	63,954	136,289

NEW HAMPSHIRE GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT OPPORTUNITIES CONFERENCE

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, many Senators are concerned about safeguarding the integrity of the Government procurement process. With Federal procurement awards running in excess of $25 billion a year, it is imperative that the Government receive the maximum return in goods and services. My own State of New Hampshire experienced a dramatic loss in Department of Defense prime contract awards, which fell from $104 million in the fiscal year 1961 to $59 million in the fiscal year 1962. It did not take me long to discover that business competition, rather than equity of distribution among the States, determines the allocation of Government procurement awards.

With the thought that New Hampshire's experience might benefit others concerned with their State's share in procurement, I should like to describe the Government Procurement Opportunities Conference held at the University of New Hampshire on March 29, 1963. One of the greatest problems faced by small business, and also by some large businesses, is the difficulty in securing information about Government contracts. It was to rectify this information gap that I sponsored a 1-day conference, in cooperation with the University of New Hampshire and an advisory committee of local industrialists. Many information problems were overcome; and, in addition, New Hampshire firms learned a great deal about the subcontracting programs of the leading New England prime contractors. Government agencies added numerous firms to their bidders lists, and prime contractors made dozens of worthwhile contacts with new sources of supply.

As a followup to the conference, the New Hampshire Department of Resources and Economic Development will serve as an information agency to distribute printed materials and news items about Federal Government procurement opportunity.

I would like at this time to acknowledge the help of the Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense Thomas D. Morris, and in particular Dr. Robert F. Steadman, the Economic Adjustment Adviser, and Mr. Richard W. Webb, principal adviser for small business. I am sure that Members of the Senate or the House of Representatives who would like to arrange similar conferences would find these men, and the representatives of all the agencies concerned with procurement, very helpful indeed.

In the long run, Mr. President, it is the development of educational institutions and research capability that determines a State's share, not only in procurement opportunity, but in the technological revolution that is transforming America's economic life. Our conference ended with an excellent address by Mr. John C. Green, Director of the Office of Technical Services in the Department of Commerce. He described the new Engineering Extension Service proposed as part of the President's Civilian Industrial Technology Program. I wholeheartedly support this significant effort to spur our faltering progress in the development of civilian technology and the other programs described by John Green.

I ask unanimous consent that a description of our conference organization and Mr. Green's address, "Government Programs in Support of Industrial Technology," be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the description and address were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PROCUREMENT CONFERENCE ORGANIZATION PLANS

1. PLANNING AND SPONSORSHIP

The small business advisers in the office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics) maintain useful historical files on past conferences which can be used to guide in conference planning.

The Department of Defense will designate a coordinating officer who can supply helpful advice to local sponsors. The more specialized the conference subject matter is, the more necessary it may become to invite government participants from Washington headquarters offices. For the New Hampshire conference, it was considered more desirable to invite local representatives from regional offices, to permit personal followup and take advantage of local knowledge.

Sponsorship may be assumed by the State government, a number of local industries and universities, industrial promotion authorities, or the Member of Congress most concerned. For our New Hampshire conference, after Federal participation has been arranged by Senator McIntyre's staff, the University of New Hampshire agreed to act as host to the conference through its extension service and a bipartisan advisory committee was appointed to foster interest among local industries, labor unions, industrial planning departments, chambers of commerce, and universities.

2. PUBLICITY

With several months' advance notice it becomes possible to use the industrial press to publicize the meeting. State industrial newsletters and the Department of Commerce's Commerce Business Daily are very helpful news media. The conference will be news for chambers of commerce, labor unions, mayors, a great variety of industrial associations, and regional associations. Prior to the New Hampshire conference an invitation from the advisory committee and a letter from Senator McIntyre were given wide distribution using the State's own list of industries. The Senator's State office worked almost full time for 2 weeks to make sure that all interested persons were aware of the conference.

3. PARTICIPATION AND PROGRAM

The New Hampshire conference served a varied group of attendees, numbering about 200. The program would be modified for a longer conference or if more were expected to attend.

Preliminaries: (1 p.m.): Gov. John W. King welcomed the participants and Mr. John F. Rowe, Commissioner of the New Hampshire Department of Resources and Economic Development explained the program. For an audience largely unfamiliar with the nature of government procurement, a 30 minute explanation of how to secure bid information, what makes for successful bidding, set-asides, and various aspects of performance, discharge, and payment would be useful. An industrial counselor, attorney, or corporate official familiar with government procurement would be a logical choice as a speaker.

Panels: (2 p.m.): The purpose of panel discussions is to convey more specialized information in a manner that will promote a sympathetic understanding of government requirements and the needs of industry. The New Hampshire conference provided panels for both research-intensive industries and conventional manufacturing, as the former experience special problems in inspection, procurement officer relations, and specifications.

The panel on research-intensive industries might cover the following topics: securing bid information, use of Defense Documentation Centers, the use of government-owned patents, security, patent, and technical know-how clauses, inspection and specification problems, charging research to the contract, and subcontracting. It is recommended that representatives of large contractors be named to the panel as well as the following agencies: National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Military Departments, Atomic Energy Commission.

The panel on conventional manufactures might cover the following topics: the Federal Supply Classification, sale of government surplus property, Federal and Military Qualified Products Lists, securing bid information, labor clauses, subcontracting, Small Business Administration programs, State procurement, and the selection of product areas where a firm can be competitive. The following agencies might be represented:

Defense Supply Agency, Quartermaster Corps, Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, Agency for International Development, General Services Administration, Federal Housing Administration, Area Redevelopment Administration, Small Business Administration, Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Division, Department of Labor.

A separate panel on research and development would not be concerned with research as a preliminary to product development, a subject covered by the other panels. A research panel can provide information for independent research firms, and university departments which may be interested in research grants and contracts. Among the subjects which might be covered are patents, security, and technical information clauses, consultants and sub-contracting, the duties of the scientific officer, salary charging practices, task orders and special contract clauses, and research proposals. Among the Government agencies that might be requested to participate are: the Department of the Interior, National Science Foundation, National Institutes of Health, the Military Departments, Atomic Energy Commission, Department of Commerce.

A question which arose in planning the New Hampshire conference was whether panelists should simply explain their agencies or, instead, proceed according to an outline of topics. The latter method was found to be far more satisfactory in sustaining interest and conveying information. The selection of a panel discussion leader for each group is of critical importance. He can develop an outline and discuss each panelist's presentation with him in advance. It is also desirable to prepare a report of each panel, to assist in evaluating the conference and to send to industries that were not represented.

The counseling period (3:30 to 5:30 p.m.): Each prime contractor, Government agency, and commercial buyer (e.g., Sears, Roebuck & Co.) was provided with a counseling table in a large hall where materials could be distributed and individual contracting difficulties explained. Two hours were allotted for these consulting sessions and they were a very worthwhile feature of the conference.

During the counseling period, a separate discussion was convened for local government officials, labor union representatives, the press, and those with a more general interest in the proceedings. A film describing the work of the Area Redevelopment Administration was shown, followed by a discussion of New Hampshire's plans for economic development. This discussion was led by Mr. John F. Rowe, commissioner of New Hampshire's Department of Resources and Economic Development. The following outline is suggested for a program of this kind:

History and characteristics of the State industrial community, State plans in education, local and State efforts on behalf of industry, how new industries seek locations. What are the State's advantages and disadvantages, export promotion, agriculture, special projects?

CONCLUSION

After an afternoon of discussion, a banquet was served, to which all participants were invited. As no charge may be made for attending a Government conference, the advisory committee decided to pay for overhead out of the dinner fees. The banquet provided a worthwhile opportunity to deepen acquaintances made during the day, and a welcome opportunity to entertain the Government participants as guests of the advisory committee and the University of New Hampshire. The president of the university, Dr. John McConnell, served as toastmaster. Senator McIntyre introduced the speaker, Mr. John C. Green, Director of the Office of Technical Services in the Department of Commerce. His address, "Government Programs in Support of Industrial Technology," served as an especially fitting conclusion to the day.

Government Programs in Support of Industrial Technology

(By John C. Green)

The first reaction of many to the title of my talk must be—why do we need any government programs beyond a quick reduction in taxes and Federal spending? Let me agree at once that a tax reduction can provide powerful support to improved technological practices in industry. I will cover this in some detail later. But first let me sketch in the impacts of science and technology upon our society. Then I hope to point out the need for positive efforts to encourage private industry to improve its productivity and to innovate because these are major ways by which additional plant investment is created, jobs are made, the gross national product is created, and the economy grows.

Let us consider the Federal investment in science and technology which since 1950 has grown from 1 billion to nearly 15 billions. It is estimated that next year this figure will rise further by at least a billion with no plateau in sight. This means that today about 15 cents on every tax dollar is going to support a scientist or an engineer, to construct scientific facilities, or to underwrite the performance of federally sponsored experiments. Science and technology are based upon the intellectual efforts of trained people, and it has been estimated that 3 out of 4 of the Nation's innovators are now working on projects chosen by Government agencies and directed to Government objectives.

Now it can be argued that this is good, since it contributes to increased efficiency of the Federal Establishment, helps us keep ahead of the Russians, creates many jobs, and pumps money into the economy. It is certainly true that parts of Florida. Texas, California, and your neighboring State, Massachusetts, are experiencing booms as engineering projects and scientific facilities are assigned to these locations. But what of large sections of the country which are not sharing in this scientific upsurge? Here we are finding serious dislocations as existing technical personnel migrate to the glamour areas on both coasts.

For example, how long can a State like Kansas maintain good schools and universities to educate their best young people when over 90 percent of the Ph. D.'s leave Kansas as soon as they get their diplomas in their hands. Recently there was an intellectual emigration from East to West Germany, and the Berlin wall was a result. The States of the Middle West are losing many of their trained people to other parts of the country, but they cannot take such stern measures.

Another facet of this problem is the relationship between military and civilian science within industry. We like to think of Government and private enterprise as operating in two parallel spheres with clear lines of separation; however, in many large, medium, and small companies today these lines are blurred or no longer exist. I am thinking of companies whose major, in fact sole customer, is a military procurement agency. These firms are particularly susceptible to the cold wind of technological change. If they fail to get an important research and development contract or if the military sponsor's interest shifts from their product to another, such as from bombers to guided missiles, they are in serious difficulty.

Every day the newspapers report the impact of Federal agency decisions on electronic and aviation companies which fall into this class. Then there are other companies, more fortunately placed, which have added a military technical capability to their normal civilian manufacturing organization.

These firms would appear to have the best of both worlds—the support of Government in probing the unknown and the civilian capability of transferring the new discoveries into commercially valuable products and processes. In fact, it has been argued that our whole effort in reaching the Moon may be justified in the amount of new civilian innovations which are created as byproducts. This may be true; the communications satellite, Telstar, and the improved weather forecasting by satellites are notable examples. However, I must point out that the transfer of a new scientific discovery from a noneconomic to an economic environment is not simple, quick, nor automatic. Let me illustrate by example. If we want to hit the Moon, Mars, or Venus, we need the most delicate, precise, and perfect guidance mechanism that the scientists and engineers can visualize and construct. Technical performance is the quality sought, price is secondary.

It makes little difference if the gyroscopes which stabilize the mechanism cost $1,200, $12,000, or even $120,000 since the entire success or failure of the space shot rests upon the accuracy of performance. Now let us try to transform this sophisticated, complex technology to a civilian environment—say stabilizing the spin of a commercial washing machine. Here the item must cost less than $12, and preferably $1.20 if its use in a marketable product can be justified. As you can see, a good deal of redesign, cost cutting, and performance compromise is essential in any such technological transfer. But this is not the whole story. Many of us tend to think that superior technology will reach the market automatically. This ignores the large number of practical management decisions and company actions which must take place before any new technology can be brought into commercial use.

Let us suppose that our new gyroscopic stabilizer is not going to be inserted as a substitute for a conventional stabilizer in an ordinary washing machine. Instead it is to be the nucleus of a new product put out by either a new or an existing company. What must management undertake? First, they must provide the engineering skills to determine the material specifications and to make the product. Then capital equipment must be purchased and installed in the necessary production facilities. Suppliers are required in order to procure materials. When these are accomplished, the firm is capable of production, but how about the customer? Here small scale sales under controlled conditions are often involved. These may include a number of marketing approaches and advertising methods. The results of these market surveys must be studied and then used to correct or modify the engineering, the production, the advertising campaign, and/or the distribution channels. At all times, management must face and answer the question—Will the introduction of the new product bring sufficient profits to justify the risk? It is only realistic to recognize that many times management will decide upon good grounds to reject the new technology in favor of the old and established product.

So far I have pointed out that the Federal support of science, while necessary in today's society is not completely beneficial. Further its benefits are not shared equally by all sizes of firms, nor all parts of the country. Now, the answer is not to throw numbers of scientists and engineers out of work by cutting out existing Federal programs. The international situation does not permit such drastic action; thus what we need is to design supporting programs which encourage private firms to accelerate their own scientific efforts and to take as much advantage as possible of the work performed by the many thousands of scientists and engineers who are working for the Government.

In preparing this talk I made three rough breakdowns of areas in which the Federal Government has, or is developing, such supporting efforts. The first is education since in the last analysis industry will not be able to take advantage of the new technology unless it has an ample supply of trained people. Next comes finance since the cost of introducing the new technology is often high and the profits postponed. This leaves a last group that I might call general or all others. This category is devoted to diffusing known technology through a number of cooperating services.

Back to breakdown No. 1—education. Recently the President's Science Advisory Committee, a group of internationally famous scientists and engineers, pointed out that the fields of engineering, mathematics, and the physical sciences are absorbing six out of seven research and development dollars and the services of at least three out of four of all the Nation's scientists and engineers. In addition, they observed that engineering, mathematics, and the physical sciences provide the technical basis for much of the industrial aspects of worldwide economic competition. This Committee then recommended four goals.

1. To increase the number of doctor's degrees awarded each year to reach 7,500 by 1970. (I should mention that in 1960, 3,000 such degrees were awarded.)

2. To increase the number of students who complete a full year of graduate training in these 3 sections of 30,000 by the same year. (I believe the number achieved in 1960 was 12,000.)

3. To develop new centers of educational excellence and to strengthen the existing centers. (The argument here is that if we reach the projected manpower goals, the existing institutions will not be able to absorb them.)

4. Last, to locate the new centers in a manner to serve all geographic areas more effectively. (This of course is to keep all sectors of the country intellectually and economically vigorous.)

The National Science Foundation of the Federal Government is moving fast to respond to this Committee's recommendations. For example, yesterday they announced over 2,200 new awards in 2 fellowship programs. For the 1963–64 academic year the Foundation is awarding 1,300 cooperative graduate fellowships; in addition they will provide over 900 summer fellowships for graduate teaching assistants which will permit them study and research.

About 170 colleges and universities presented applications for these awards. I looked over the list of recipients in the hope that I would find New Hampshire generously represented. Dartmouth has several; the University of New Hampshire has a smaller number, but other States have many more. When I mentioned this fact to Foundation personnel, they reminded me that a substantial number of research grants go to colleges in New Hampshire, and these also produce knowledge and help train personnel. For example, at Dartmouth, Dr. Inoue is doing pioneer work on living cells, and Dr. Heyl is investigating the spawning habits of Atlantic salmon and rainbow trout. At this university, the Foundation made a grant of $50,000 to help establish the computer center and recently an additional $20,000 to augment its facilities.

My next category is finance. The private inovator with an invention, with or without a patent, usually needs more money than he or his friends can raise. To some degree the small company suffers the same problems. As many of you know, the Small Business Administration has special lending authority designed to help out in these situations. Normally one has to apply first to a bank or other legally approved institution. If funds obtained this way do not fully meet the need, the Small Business Administration may join with the private agency in a participation loan providing the proposition looks good. If the bank declines the risk, S.B.A. may consider a direct loan providing the borrower can put up adequate collateral. These devices did not fully meet the need of fledgling companies seeking to grow, and in 1958 the Congress authorized the creation of the Small Business Investment Companies. These are licensed and regulated by the Small Business Administration. They get financial assistance from that agency and in turn provide either a straight loan, equity financing, or convertible debenture financing. The Small Business Administration and the Small Business Investment Companies are expected to take a particular interest in new companies which promise to bring new developments to the market.

That is one service; however solution of the financial problem is not simply a matter of loans. Often tax relief may be a more persuasive device. As you know, the tax bill which the President sent to the Congress this year is designed to provide additional incentives and investment by increasing the rate of return to a company after taxes. As I understand it, the President's proposals would reduce the normal rate of tax on the first $25,000 corporate income from a 30 percent to a 22 percent rate. It would also reduce corporate tax rates from 52 to 47 percent by 1965. In addition to this incentive which is planned for all firms, there are two specific provisions with respect to research and development. Section 174 of the Internal Revenue Code which now permits a taxpayer to deduct research and development expenditures when made or to capitalize them at his option would be liberalized to include expenditures for depreciable equipment used for research and development. The rules for claiming a deduction on this provision would require that the equipment be used exclusively in research and development and that it be specialized equipment, not assets for general purpose use. The second provision is especially designed to encourage research in small business. Here depreciable equipment which is used in research and development at least 50 percent of the time is eligible for deduction as a current expense.

Now let me inventory briefly the category of general governmental services. I have pointed out the difficulty of finding civilian products and processes in military and space research. To a degree I have exaggerated the problem. There are a number of instances in which the technological transfer has been successful and there are additional cases awaiting a successful entrepreneur who will take the discoveries and create the market. Here are a few simple examples:

One of the most effective fire extinguishing agents on the market today is a civilian byproduct of military research and development. It is Bromotrifluoromethane. This agent is used not only by the Army, but is carried by most commercial planes. It also can be used as an effective, safe, household fire extinguisher. The U.S. Army Mobility Command's Engineer Research and Development Laboratories, Fort Belvoir, Va., developed the agent to meet the military need for a more effective means of fighting petroleum fires in the Arctic as well as at normal temperatures. Essentially nontoxic and usable at temperatures of 65 degrees below zero, Bromotrifluoromethane is much more effective than methyl bromide for extinguishing fires.

It can be used also in other applications. When it is mixed with flammable anesthetic, such as cyclopropane, it can prevent deaths from explosion and allow more freedom in operating room techniques. It also can be mixed with oxygen or nitrogen or helium to produce an atmosphere which will support life satisfactorily, but not allow combustion of any type to take place and, thereby, enable many hazardous industrial operations to be performed safely. This item is now being manufactured by a number of companies.

Potable water, or rather the lack of it, is a problem of growing concern as the population increases and industrial water requirements expand rapidly. Along with conservation of natural resources, various means of obtaining potable water from sea water and inland brackish waters are being studied, investigated, and tested. One of the most common methods of obtaining potable water from saline sources is distillation, but one of the problems has been controlling scale deposits on heat exchange surfaces that reduce the heat transfer rates.

The U.S. Army and the Department of the Interior have developed a calcium sulfate seeding technique that has been found effective in the control of scale, and may be applicable to areas of the country which may have to rely on brackish surface or well water for its water supply. This technique has been referred to variously as the sludge method or internal stabilization technique for scale control. Basically, the theory of this calcium sulfate seeding technique is the affinity of the precipitating scale-forming compounds for a surface of a compound having a similar crystalline structure. In this technique, scale forms on the seed crystals in suspension and is blown down continuously from the plant. The calcium sulfate seeding technique is one of two methods recommended for scale control in a brackish water conversion plant at Roswell, N. Mex., and it also has been recommended for the control of scale in the sea water conversion plant at Freeport, Tex.

Removing old paint or enamel from furniture or other items, preparatory to repainting, is often a slow and tedious job even with the use of commercial products designed to help remove it in one easy application. Army research and development has developed an organic stripper that removes paint and enamel from any type surface within 4 to 5 minutes and leaves no residue.

Considered superior to any commercial product in numerous tests and applications, the stripper is so formulated that it softens and penetrates the paint or enamel and releases a gas which lifts the film from the substrata. The stripper contains detergent emulsifiers so that the loosened, partially dissolved, paint film can be flushed off with water to leave a clean, smooth surface. Nonflammable, it can be applied to any surface by either brushing or spraying. A specification has been prepared, and the organic stripper may now be prepared and offered for sale commercially.

My Department is concerned with providing a channel for information such as this to the industrial community, and each week we receive hundreds of new scientific discoveries which we pass on to business firms for their imaginative application. We also cooperate with the Space Agency in seeking to promote civilian applications of their findings. While we all perceive special problems in finding commercial counterparts for the complex and exotic devices needed in space, this has not deterred NASA from designing new communication mechanisms. For example, they have contracted recently with the A. D. Little Co. in Cambridge and a number of other capable research organizations to ferret out attractive inventions and communicate them to companies with the capability of civilian production.

I have referred earlier to the financial support provided by the Small Business Administration. In addition, they have a Products Service which is essentially a communication channel between inventors and manufacturers. The SBA "Products List Circular" lists and describes patents issued to private inventors or Government agencies which can be licensed by interested firms. The SBA office boasts that a number of new companies have been started by this device and that many established manufacturers have found new products.

My own Department, disturbed by the imbalance between military and civilian research, is proposing to the Congress a new approach generally termed civilian technology. This activity is headed by the Assistant Secretary for Science and Technology, Dr. Hollomon. He was until recently manager of engineering research at the General Electric Co. His plan has two prongs: It seeks to identify major industries where lagging technology is contributing to economic difficulties. Examples of such industries are textiles, machine tools, and foundry practices. Here the Department proposes to get the views of the industry itself on needed research and to place research contracts directed to the solution of these problems. The work will be carried out primarily at universities. It is thought that the university environment is preferable for this work, since at a university the training of future engineers is an essential component. Thus the projects will assist in developing trained specialists who will be capable of transferring to these industries and creating new applications in an industrial environment. Unfortunately, most of our scientists and engineers are now attracted to the glamorous fields of space and defense, thus indirectly contributing to the slowing down of technological innovation in the older and more conventional industries.

Next in Dr. Hollomon's bag is a program directed to the diffusion of known science and technology through the Nation's engineering schools and extension services. State universities, land-grant colleges, and private universities have the engineering talent, facilities, and reputation needed to bridge the gap between the great and growing reservoir of scientific knowledge and the small firms who find it difficult to identify and absorb those fractions which can improve their productivity and products. This program is still in the planning stage; the hope is to place several pilot contracts with State universities which would permit the Department to develop sound Federal-State mechanisms and channels of communication before attempting any national endeavors.

So far I have been describing Federal programs which cover a wide spectrum of science and technology. There are others, fairly limited in scope, which also make industrial contribution. For example, the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior works in close collaboration with the New England fishing industry. The Office of Coal Research is endeavoring to improve the competitive position of coal and thus help the economic life of such States as Pennsylvania and West Virginia. Then there is the Office of Saline Water which is tackling the very difficult problem of desalting water. Their headache is to bring the cost of the processes in line with the cost of obtaining water from reservoirs or wells. The importance of this job is dimly understood today, but it may be vital to industry success 25 years from now as our population grows, the urban spread continues, and industrial demands for water expand.

I cannot conclude my inventory of Federal efforts without reference to intangible efforts of Government in support of industrial technology. For example, the National Bureau of Standards, another division of the Commerce Department, is the world's foremost measurement laboratory. The whole concept of mass production is built on accurate measurement and precise reproduction. As industry works in new materials and demands closer and closer tolerances, the Bureau must keep in the forefront. In this connection the Bureau calibrates the instruments and measurement apparatus of industrial organizations. In general, NBS calibrates the master standards of a company, and these are used to check the working standards within the company. Last year, NBS performed almost 140,000 calibrations for Government and industry. These range from gage blocks, to thermometers, to radiation detection instruments, and a host of others.

Standard samples are also available from NBS. These are samples of chemicals, ores, metals, ceramics, radioactive nuclides, etc., certified as to chemical composition or properties. About 500 different standard samples are now available. Last year, NBS sold more than 66,000 samples to industry and Government. Such samples are valuable in quality control work, and in checking the accuracy of instruments and in verifying analytical techniques. The fees charged for standard samples and calibrations help support the cost of providing these services. This is by no means a description of the National Bureau of Standards' role in support of industry. It is merely a glimpse of how one quiet Government laboratory collaborates with private firms to improve the performance of products and increase consumer satisfaction.

And let us not forget the U.S. Patent Office, which is also attached to the Department of Commerce. It is the American patent system which to quote Abraham Lincoln—"The patent system added the fuel of interest to the fire of genius." Practically speaking, in our competitive society most firms are unwilling to risk the hazards of new product introduction without the limited statutory monopoly afforded by the patent grants. The U.S. Patent Office is striving to keep abreast of the heavy demands placed upon it by undertaking research and development directed to computer storage and retrieval of pertinent facts. The task of matching old knowledge to new ideas is extremely complex, and we do not anticipate short run accomplishments; however, the job is being attacked vigorously in tone with the capabilities of private electronic developments.

I should mention one last intangible that attracts a good deal of attention in the press, especially in Washington. This is the Government's attitude with respect to the division of patent rights between the private company contractor and the Government sponsor. One school of thought, led by Senator LONG of Louisiana, argues that since taxpayer dollars finance the research, the Government should take title and distribute the findings to all. Another, and equally vigorous group, claims that the Government should take only a license for Government purposes and leave the commercial rights with the organization best qualified to put them to use—the private contractor. Hearings on this topic have taken place at most of the recent sessions of Congress. Recently, the President's Science Advisor, Dr. Jerome Wiesner, proposed a middle ground which on balance favors the latter theory.

Dr. Wiesner observes that "there are many circumstances in which a strong case can be made to permit the contractor to retain exclusive rights for nongovernmental purposes." He then goes on to state that "such circumstances most clearly arise in the situation where the work is in an area where the contractor has an established nongovernmental commercial position and has demonstrated technical competence indicated by know-how, experience, and patent position. For example, consider the case of a pump manufacturer who has, over a period of years, invested considerable private resources in the development of new techniques for pumping fluids. In the course of research and development for the Federal Government in developing a pump for liquid fueled rockets, the contractor draws on his extensive background and know-how. Does the possibility that the improvement in the pump may have potential for commercial uses require the Government to obtain title to patents on the improvement?"

Dr. Wiesner's formula would permit the contractor to keep the rights in such cases. If the Congress accepts his views, I believe their action will provide needed reassurance to industry and will give industry an additional incentive to collaborate with the Government agencies.

This inventory of programs and policies covering such diverse agencies as the National Bureau of Standards, the Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Bureau of Internal Revenue may appear loose and disjointed. Frankly, this must be so because the missions of the agencies themselves are so distinctly different. Nevertheless there is a thread running through all of these efforts which may encourage those who feel that too often the units of the Federal Government operate at cross purposes. In this case, there is a clear recognition that in today's society, and increasing hereafter, that if we are to keep competitive with the Common Market countries and Japan, if we are to have the new products to satisfy consumer wants, if we are to have the necessary investments in new plants and facilities, and if we are going to get additional jobs our growing population needs, we must look to civilian innovation carried out by industry.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION HAS NO JURISDICTION OVER RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to take a few moments of the time of the Senate to comment on the activities of the Federal Power Commission relating to rural electric cooperatives.

I was astounded to learn that the Federal Power Commission recently has moved in the direction of exercising jurisdiction over the rural electric cooperatives. I am informed that 22 cooperatives have been identified by the Commission staff as subject to regulation by the Commission. There are indications that this is only a first step in the direction of applying the regulatory provisions of the Federal Power Act to the rural electric cooperatives.

I have watched with great interest the renaissance of the Federal Power Commission in the field of electric power. Chairman Swidler has called attention to the fact that the authority of the Commission in this field has long been dormant. He has stated that, upon taking office, he found the entire matter of power rate regulation was being handled by a staff of four employees tucked away in one of the agency's natural gas branches, and that administration of whole segments of the Commission's authority was in a state of suspense.

I commend him for his stated intention to breathe life into the regulatory functions of the Commission. I will support the appropriations needed to make the Commission's regulation of the electric power industry meaningful. The Federal Power Commission is an arm of the Congress, and I believe that this arm should be given the muscle it needs.

But I do not propose to stand by and see this muscle employed where it is not needed and where it was not intended to be used.

The REA program has produced as much real benefit for our Nation per dollar of investment as any other activity of the Government. But 4 years ago I was deeply involved in helping protect the REA, one of the most successful of our Federal programs, from people who were busy arranging for its extinction.

The attack came from a rather unusual quarter—the Cabinet official, who was in charge of it. If the then Secretary of Agriculture—Mr. Ezra Benson—had had his way, the Rural Electrification Administration would have passed into limbo. When Mr. Benson could find no one on either side of the aisle in either branch of the Congress who would even introduce the legislation he sent up here, legislation to raise the interest rate, he rigged up a regulatory apparatus. This apparatus superimposed upon the REA organization another layer of supervision or regulation within his own establishment. If this had gone unchallenged, the agency and its programs would have been suffocated.

I sponsored a bill with Representative MEL PRICE, of Illinois, which would have freed REA from the hands of its would-be regulators. The Humphrey-Price bill passed both Houses by very substantial margins. On April 29, 1959, the Senate overrode the President's veto of the bill by a 64 to 29 vote. It later failed to overcome the veto in the House by four votes. But REA survived and prospered. It continues today to perform admirably the job entrusted to it by the Congress.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I am very much interested in and very sympathetic with the view which my distinguished colleague from Minnesota is expressing. The REA is one of the most useful and important activities of our Government. As we know, its origin resulted from the imaginative and creative policies of President Roosevelt a little more than a quarter century ago.

In Alaska the REA's now number 12, and others are making applications. In Alaska the REA's have, as elsewhere, performed invaluable servce. They have brought electricity into regions which otherwise would not have it.

While this has been going on, there have been persistent efforts on the part of certain interests to try to cripple the REA's, to destroy them, to increase the interest rates they now enjoy, and otherwise to curtail their activities.

I wish to enlist my services with those of the Senator from Minnesota to prevent anything such as that from happening. In my judgment it would be a disaster for the American people.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank my good friend from Alaska. I know of his keen interest in the building of the REA's and what this now means to a growing economy, such as that in Alaska.

The Senator well states the necessity for our keeping a friendly and watchful eye on the activities of the REA's so that those activities are not restricted or crippled, in the light of the new demands being made upon the Rural Electrification System.

Mr. GRUENING. The Senator may recall, although I think it was somewhat prior to his public service, that in the 1920's a tremendous propaganda campaign was started by the Insull interests to subvert public opinion, to the effect that all public power was evil, socialistic, and un-American. The campaign engaged in a farflung subversion of newspapers, public forums, universities, text books, and public opinion sources of all kinds. Of course, it blew up with the collapse of the Insull and other utility empires as a result of their extravagant and unsound methods of financing characteristic of their day.

That was fully exposed in a major investigation by the Federal Trade Commission, the record of which comprised about 90 volumes. The investigation originated with such friends of public interest as Senators George Norris, Tom Walsh, Bob LaFollette, and others in the Senate at that time.

The same practices are now being renewed. Full page advertisements in various magazines, by the so-called investment utility companies, decry any efforts on the part of municipalities or States to indulge in public ownership, which is, of course, a free choice which they have a right to make. They likewise condemn the rural electric cooperatives.

We must be vigilant that this same campaign does not gather sufficient momentum to destroy the REA's, which is one of its objectives.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. The effort to limit the activities of REA continues year after year, but, fortunately, the experience and the record of the REA prevail as a counterbalancing force. Therefore, the support of the Congress for the REA continues. I have the privilege of serving on the Committee on Appropriations. I formerly served on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I intend to do all I can to see that this fine agency of our Government is given the means, the manpower, and the technicians to do this job for rural America for an agriculture which is changing every day and which requires greater amounts of power, and, indeed, for those areas of our Federal Republic where the extension of REA facilities and lines continues to be a pressing need.

Mr. GRUENING. Is the Senator from Minnesota aware whether or not the cost of full-page advertisements which now appear almost constantly in the magazines, decrying public power, is charged back to the consumers of the so-called investor-owned utilities through increased rates? That was the case with respect to the earlier activity. I remember that one of the propagandists for

Mr. Insull, addressing a group of fellow propagandists, said, "Never mind the expense. The public pays the expense"—meaning that the public pays for the advertising propaganda in the rates it pays for electricity.

I found that a very useful phrase to use as the title of a book I wrote on the subject, "The Public Pays," which summarized the facts in the 90 volumes of the Federal Trade Commission's findings showing how the public paid. If that is still so, it behooves those of us who want to preserve the REA's to be vigilant in this respect.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator recalls to my mind his book, which was an excellent one, and also recalls to my mind what he has referred to on the subject of advertising. I am happy to report to him that in the State of Minnesota a friendly, constructive, and cooperative relationship exists between the private utilities and the REA's, and our REA's continue to grow and expand. This has taken a good deal of time, and has required some enlightened business leadership on the part of a few of our business leaders in the field of private utilities, and a good deal of alertness and vigilance on the part of our REA leaders. I think the Senator knows what I mean.

Mr. GRUENING. Since the Senator from Minnesota has entered public life the State of Minnesota has been increasingly vigilant in behalf of the public interest. A similar situation of public versus private power conflict does not exist in Alaska, for the reason that the great majority of electricity in the municipalities is furnished by public power. In the one or two cities in which the utilities are privately owned, they serve satisfactorily, so there is no conflict such as has disturbed other sections of the Union.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. I want to direct attention to what is being undertaken by the Federal Power Commission in the effort to establish regulatory jurisdiction over the REA's.

Mr. President, when Congress established the regulatory powers of the Commission in 1935, it meant those powers to be used for the protection of the consumers of and the investors in the commercial power industry. These were legislative powers which were delegated to the Commission. For the purpose of protecting consumers, we gave the Commission jurisdiction to regulate the rates charged by public utilities for electric power moving in interstate commerce. For the purpose of protecting investors, we gave the Commission jurisdiction over securities issued by these public utilities. The Federal Power Act is silent as to consumer-owned, nonprofit, cooperative electric associations financed by a sister agency the Rural Electrification Administration.

The Rural Electrification Act makes no reference to the Federal Power Commission. I have researched the legislative history of that act and am convinced that it never was intended that the responsibilities entrusted to that agency in the executive department be shared with or reviewed by the Federal Power Commission.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt, in his 1935 Executive order establishing the Rural Electrification Administration, and the Congress, in its 1936 enactment giving REA its statutory existence, did not in any degree divide or water down the sole responsibility of that agency for fostering and financing the electrification of rural America.

The record shows the exact opposite. On March 5, 1936, when the Rural Electrification Act was being debated here in this Chamber, Senator George W. Norris, the sponsor and champion of the bill, stated:

> In this proposed legislation we are giving, and we necessarily must give, if we are going to make a success of the measure, in my opinion, almost unlimited discretion.

This statement followed an earlier one made by Senator Norris in discussing the assignment of responsibility for loan decisions as between the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Rural Electrification Administration, and again I quote:

> The judgment of the Rural Electrification Administrator is the judgment that would prevail.

But there is more direct and more persuasive evidence that the Congress did not intend that the responsibility be divided between the REA Administrator and the Federal Power Commission.

The rural electrification bill, as reported from the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, carried an amendment that would have required the REA Administrator to share with the Federal Power Commission the statutory function of making studies, investigations, and reports concerning the condition and progress of rural electrification. In the Senate debate on this amendment on February 26, 1936, Senator Norris stated this amendment was offered because a Federal Power Commission report which approved the bill called attention to the fact that the Commission had jurisdiction to do some of the things the bill proposed to have REA do. Objection was made to the amendment by Senator King of Utah as "an attempt to yoke together two unequal factors." Senator King stated:

> I do not understand it is their function to inquire into rural electrification or the benefits to be derived therefrom or how rural electrification may be effectuated in any of the States.

On March 4, 1936, the committee amendment was rejected.

The act establishing the Rural Electrification Administration was stripped of any reference to the Federal Power Commission. I see no reason why the Federal Power Commission should now seek jurisdiction under the Rural Electrification Act merely because the Federal Power Commission has jurisdiction over electric rates of the commercial utilities and has jurisdiction to protect the investors in those particular utilities. We are now discussing, in the field of the REA's, consumer-owned, nonprofit cooperatives. We are not talking about commercial, profitmaking operations in which there are bonds and securities held by private investors. The differences ought to be quite obvious.

I respectfully suggest to my friends on the Federal Power Commission that they cease this empire building and stop moving out their arms and hands to touch things that were not given to them by legislative enactment or Executive order under the Rural Electrification Act.

A careful review of the remainder of the debate, of the hearings, and of the committee report on the bill finds complete silence on the question of FPC jurisdiction over any other function of REA or over its borrowers.

Further exhaustive review of subsequent legislative proposals relative to regulation of the affairs of REA borrowers and to supervision over REA lending authority fully supports the conclusion that there is no evidence of intent on the part of the Congress to subject the REA Administrator's administrative discretion to review by another agency of REA borrowers to regulation by the Federal Power Commission.

On May 11, 1939, in the 76th Congress, 1st session, H.R. 6292 was introduced, a bill which would have provided for the review of REA loans for generating plants by an independently constituted body in those States where there was no State authority having jurisdiction thereon. It is crystal clear that if the Federal Power Commission was considered to have jurisdiction over the issuance by REA borrowers of securities for this purpose, this bill would not have been considered necessary or the jurisdiction of the FPC in this area would have been expressly confirmed. No action ever was taken on the bill. The Federal Power Commission did not exercise this jurisdiction.

On February 26, 1946, in the 79th Congress, 2d session, when a committee amendment prohibiting use of REA loan funds for generating plant loans "unless the Federal Power Commission shall first certify that there is not sufficient electric current available in the area concerned at reasonable rates" was defeated by a rollcall vote of 52 to 21.

In other words, the intrusion of the Federal Power Commission into REA matters was again rejected by the Congress of the United States.

The bill was H.R. 5458, the Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act of 1946. The floor debate on the committee amendment is replete with convincing arguments against the extension of FPC jurisdiction into this area.

Senator Shipstead from my own State of Minnesota stated in opposition to the amendment:

> The cooperatives should be permitted to do their own bargaining and be free. They should not be required to go to the Federal Power Commission and have it come between them and the power interests. They can get competent engineers to advise them regarding what is a just rate, based on the potential power required. The cost can be known. I think that so far the cooperatives have been very successful, generally speaking, in making satisfactory bargains with private industry, and it saves them a great deal of overhead, interest, and so forth. So far as I am concerned, I do not wish to have that

> program interfered with by turning it over to a commission in Washington, no matter what its name.

Senator MAGNUSON may recall his words when he spoke against the amendment:

> This amendment goes to the very heart of the rural electrification program. It means that all the rural communities that want cheap electricity for the farms would be deprived of their bargaining power with the private power companies.

I agree fully with my colleague's appraisal of the effect of FPC jurisdiction as opening up new channels of delay and obstruction by the interests which would use FPC jurisdiction this way.

I shall only allude to the comments of other Senators, some whom are still serving in the Senate.

Senator AIKEN, in discussing the delays entailed in the proposed amendment, said:

> In the meantime, the cooperatives would be absolutely at the mercy of the private utility companies and would have to pay whatever prices were charged them.

Senator LaFollette, a truly devoted supporter of the rural electrification movement, stated:

> This specific proposal * * * would amputate the right arm of the rural electric cooperatives.

Senator FULBRIGHT characterized the proposed FPC amendment as "crippling." Senator HILL spoke of it as "a hobble" which would impede and harass the cooperatives.

I am aware that the 1946 amendment under discussion involved a form of certificate jurisdiction. Some members of the Commission, in fact the majority including the chairman, now maintain that its statutory jurisdiction over securities does not include certificate authority. Others vigorously, and we need only read recent news reports to understand just how vehemently, claim that section 204(a) of the Federal Power Act does include the equivalent of certificate authority since that section requires consideration of public interest, necessity and appropriateness. This is precisely what the Senate voted down in 1946.

If we examine the differences between the electric cooperatives for which REA has responsibility and the commercial public utilities over which Congress has given the FPC jurisdiction, it becomes quite clear why the former were never intended to be placed under FPC regulation.

The cooperatives are owned by the consumers they serve and regulation of their rates is not necessary for the protection of these consumer-owners. They do not need protection from themselves. This cannot be said for the consumers of the commercial utilities.

The cooperatives do not issue securities to the investing public as do the commercial utilities. The Rural Electrification Administration which supplies virtually all of the capital needed by the cooperatives does not need protection from its borrowers. This cannot be said for investors in utility security issues. Review of REA loans by the FPC would be unnecessary and unwarranted duplication. It also would supply another forum and occasion for court review, with the delay and expense attendant upon both.

Who is it that the FPC is trying to protect—the investors? The REA is protecting the public interest diligently and well.

REA has advanced a little over $4 billion to its rural electrification borrowers. These borrowers have repaid almost $1½ billion on principal. In addition, more than $560 million has been paid as interest on their loans. The losses to investors, to the people of the United States, in more than 27 years amount to less than $47,500 on two small rural systems, one of which was the victim of a hurricane. Against this infinitesimal percentage of loss, we have a splendid record of repayment and the creation by rural people of assets now worth far more than their $3.8 billion book value. The rural people have built for themselves an equity of more than $858 million in these enterprises. Thus, REA and its borrowers together provide ample protection for the Government's interest, while strengthening and increasing the investment belonging to the local people.

It would be so easy to outline the great economic gain that REA has meant for the business community. For every dollar invested in REA, approximately $6 is represented in purchases of electrical equipment. The electrical equipment industry has grown strong in many areas, and even rich and profitable, because of the expansion of REA. REA has strengthened the entire economic fabric of the Nation.

Does the FPC propose to protect the interest of the consumer? Why does it seek to move in on cooperatives, which are—first, last, and always—consumer-owned and consumer-controlled organizations? Has there been a demand from cooperative members for regulation? Certainly not, for the members are the bosses. They are served as they wish to be served—with adequate power at the lowest possible rates, in terms of being able to pay back the principal and interest and maintain in good condition the distribution or generation facilities, or both.

REA itself has always moved in the direction of diminishing control and influence over the rural electric systems it finances. Each system is encouraged to do as much for itself as it can, with REA lending technical assistance in those areas where the local people do not have the experience or the resources to deal with complex matters. The extent and the limits of REA control are spelled out in a loan contract which is designed to insure that the loan will accomplish the objectives of the Rural Electrification Act—which are to bring electricity to the maximum number of rural people under the principle of area coverage—and to insure the repayment of the loan.

The principles of self-help and assumed responsibility have been priceless ingredients in the success which rural electrification has had. Thousands of rural people have given freely of their time to organize the cooperatives and to administer them after they began operation. The members read their own meters and, in some cases, figure their own bills, in order to hold down the costs of providing themselves with electric service. They participate in the management of their business affairs through attendance at annual meetings which are held—not in some far-off financial center—but close to their homes and farms, and in the election of representatives who serve on the cooperative board of directors without salary. This is responsible, and responsive, democracy at its best.

One of the great accomplishments of the REA system is that literally thousands of men and women obtain what might be called management experience by serving on boards of directors, so that they are much more able to judge the great economic and political issues of the day.

I suggest that anyone who has any doubt about the democracy of the rural electrification cooperatives should attend one of their membership meetings. I further suggest to my political friends that there are no better meetings for them to attend, because they will find people there who are interested in the improvement of their lives, their communities, and their economy. Those people, with their REA's, are a source of strength for this Nation. We want to protect the RFA's, and we will do so jealously. We do not need the assistance of the Federal Power Commission.

As consumer organizations, the cooperatives are not concerned about building up their rate bases to justify higher dividends for their stockholders. They are free to pass on savings to members in reduced rates or refunds of capital contributions. And the record shows that the cooperatives are doing this in increasing numbers. Thus, there is no need for Federal Power Commission regulation to make sure that consumers are not overcharged.

How ridiculous can one get? They need not worry about consumers overcharging themselves. The consumers are the members, and the members are not about to overcharge themselves.

As I have stated, I want to see the Federal Power Commission strengthened and furnished with all the funds it needs to do a real job of regulating the electric power companies over which it has been given jurisdiction. I also want to see REA and its rural electric systems continue their fine work, unhampered by unnecessary review and duplication of supervision.

I am putting the Commission on notice now that it will be expected, before taking any further steps in the direction of regulating the rural electric systems, to come to the Congress—the body of which it is an arm—for statutory authority to so move. I am confident that the Congress, as in the past, would reject any such proposal.

I do this because in the previous administration I stood in the same place in the Senate and argued against the efforts of the then Secretary of Agriculture to impose the authority of his office to meddle with REA. We beat him. He was taught a good lesson. I do this in the Kennedy administration, as one of the President's loyal supporters and, I hope, trusted lieutenants. I know that the President of the United States is not asking the Federal Power Commission to move into the area of tampering with the local activities of the REA.

So I say to my friends in the Federal Power Commission, "If you feel that it is necessary for the Federal Power Commission to exercise jurisdiction over certain activities of the Rural Electrification System, come to Congress and propose such a law, or have some Member of Congress introduce a bill. Hearings will be held on it."

I am willing to make the prediction that such hearings will result in our reaching the same conclusion that other hearings caused us to reach, namely, that there is no need for Federal Power Commission's jurisdiction over the REA; that the REA is doing well; that the REA is serving the consumers well, and serving the national interest well.

The Federal Power Commission has enough to do in regulating private utilities and gaslines and pipelines, all of which represent a tremendous job and which require the Commission's full attention.

I am confident that Congress, as it has done in the past, would reject any proposal in the form of statutory authority to extend the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission. There is no need for a "Parkinson's law" in the administration of the Rural Electrification program.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. First, I highly commend the Senator from Minnesota for his admirable presentation. I find myself in full accord with his point of view.

I wonder whether he feels that the warning he has served on the Federal Power Commission will be sufficient to estop them in the effort which he fears; because if it is not sufficient, we should certainly explore all means by which this threat on their part can be obviated.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The presence here today of the Senator from Alaska and his support of my interest in this endeavor will be very helpful. I am confident that our friends in the Federal Power Commission will take due notice of what has been said here today. I have attempted to outline some of the legislative record over the past 25 or 27 years relating to REA and the attempts which have been made in Congress to extend, by amendment, jurisdiction to the Federal Power Commission. Every one of those attempts has been defeated. I do not believe it is necessary to outline the situation in any greater detail. If the Federal Power Commission believes that the Senator from Minnesota is in error; if it feels that the Senator from Alaska is misinformed or wrong; it can come before the appropriate committees of this body and of the House of Representatives and present its case. It can have some Member of Congress introduce a bill—if it can find any who will do so—in an attempt to extend its jurisdiction. I am not opposed to the making of such an attempt; but I want it to be done only by statute, not by an extension of jurisdiction by some misinformed authority which the Federal Power Commission may think it has.

What concerns me about regulatory agencies is that they have plenty to do within their own jurisdictions. Almost all of them are understaffed. There is plenty to do in the field of regulation of utility rates, pipelines, gas production.

Mr. GRUENING. Telstar rates.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Telstar, yes. I recall that the Senator from Alaska is interested in that.

Mr. GRUENING. Yes, indeed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And other matters. I merely suggest that if they seek further jurisdiction, they should appear before the appropriate committees. I do not serve on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry or the Committee on Commerce; but the members of those committees are able—more able than the Senator from Minnesota. They will do a good job.

Mr. GRUENING. Does not the Senator from Minnesota agree that the REA under the leadership of Norman M. Clapp is one of the bright spots in our administrative establishment?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do. I think he is performing excellent service. Furthermore, I believe the Secretary of Agriculture is respecting the autonomy and independence of REA. There is no political tampering with it. It is being financed as a independent agency, an agency that provides technical assistance.

In my judgment, every time we increase the effectiveness of a self-governing body such as a rural electric cooperative, we make this a better country. We do not need to have the head of government on everything. Sometimes we can do things ourselves. When an entity is consumer owned, consumer controlled, membership owned, membership controlled, it seems to me there is plenty of control to protect the public interest.

Mr. GRUENING. I agree with the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Alaska.

MIAMI HERALD LAUDS AMBASSADOR DOHERTY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it was with great pleasure that I read in the Miami (Fla.) Herald of March 12 an incisive editorial lauding the performance of an old and respected friend, William C. Doherty, as our Ambassador to the new nation of Jamaica.

Bill Doherty was for 21 years the outstanding leader of the National Association of Letter Carriers. During that time he became a tremendous force in the international labor movement. His appointment marked the first time in history that a representative of organized labor had ever been elevated to the ambassadorial rank.

Events since that appointment was made have proved his appointment to have been an inspired choice. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the editorial from the Miami Herald concerning Mr. Doherty's remarkable success in the field of diplomacy.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR A STRONGER OAS: JAMAICA'S FIRM FIRST STEPS

Still several months away from it first birthday, the island nation of Jamaica is approaching full membership in the hemispheric family.

A Jamaican delegation was in Washington the other day to discuss joining the Organization of American States.

N. N. Ashenheim, Jamaica's first Ambassador to the United States, said his country is deeply interested in membership and a voice in important decisions affecting all the Americas.

The step has important implications. It marks an easing of Jamaica's traditional ties with the British Commonwealth in favor of closer cooperation with the United States and Latin America.

Once in the OAS, and particularly so if Trinidad-Tobago follows suit, Jamaica may jog Canada into filing its long-considered membership application. Then the OAS would be totally representative of the two western continents.

Jamaica's steady drift toward a stronger pro-American attitude is credited to the effective work of the first U.S. Ambassador, William C. Doherty.

No career diplomat, Mr. Doherty resigned as president of the National Association of Letters Carriers to accept his sensitive job.

In Kingston he has found ready acceptance and has won the respect of Government and people. A recent edition of Newday, a monthly magazine devoted to the West Indies, praised his accomplishments.

"Wherever he has spoken," said the magazine, "he has struck the same warm, inspiring note. Jamaica is a wonderful, hospitable little island on the threshold of great achievement as an independent nation, which the U.S. Government stands ready to assist in every way possible.

"Quicker than he probably thought or hoped he would, the ex-mailman from the United States has earned in Jamaica a new name that signifies acceptance—'Ambassador Bill.' "

A happy appointment is starting United States-Jamaican relations on a sound footing. Jamaica vies with Puerto Rico as a bright spot in that sea of trouble called the Caribbean.

FOOD FOR HUNGRY PEOPLE SHOULD TAKE PRECEDENCE OVER CATERING TO SPORTSMEN

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, back in 1916 a convention was signed with Canada relating to the protection of certain migratory birds which were not to be hunted between March 10 and September 12 in Canada and the United States. At the time this treaty was signed the agency of our Government entrusted with its enforcement was the Biological Survey of the Department of Agriculture. It was then headed by an internationally known naturalist, Edward William Nelson. Mr. Nelson had for many years been studying both the ornithology of Alaska and the Eskimo people and was an expert in both those fields. He was an author of a book on the birds of Alaska and he was the author of another book on the Eskimos of Alaska. No one could have been more knowledgeable. Indeed no one was more knowledgeable on both the need for protection of birds, migratory and others, or more knowledgeable on the needs and habits of the Eskimos than he. It never occurred to him that the convention applied to Eskimos taking ducks for food in the late spring as they had from time immemorial. At that season of the year the other foods needed by the Eskimos for their subsistence through hunting and fishing are not available.

The precedent established by Mr. Nelson was followed consistently by his successors in the Biological Survey and by his chiefs in the Department of Agriculture until 1940 when through a governmental reorganization the Biological Survey of the Department of Agriculture was merged with the Bureau of Fisheries of the Department of Commerce and reincarnated in the Department of the Interior as the Fish and Wildlife Service. The head of that new agency and his successors and their chiefs, the Secretaries of the Interior, never departed from the practice and policy established from the beginning. That is, until 1961.

In that year a local official of the Fish and Wildlife Service stationed in Alaska, indeed its chief official, possibly irked because many of the functions of the Fish and Wildlife Service had been taken over by the State of Alaska and possibly in the desire to show some activity, took it upon himself to interpret the Migratory Bird Treaty and through his subordinates caused the arrest of a number of Eskimos who were following their immemorial practices of taking ducks for food at a season when their other sources of food were not available. The matter was profoundly shocking to all those familiar with the facts and the history. The Alaska delegation protested to Secretary Udall, who at that time, taken unaware and perhaps not being fully informed, responded that he had no choice but to enforce the law. The question that the delegation raised in return was "Who interprets the law?" pointing out that it had been interpreted by the competent and authorized authorities for 45 years not to apply to individuals, whether Eskimos or others in the wilderness, without food, and obliged as a matter of self-preservation to take these ducks.

There the matter has rested for 2 years in an uneasy state of fear, anxiety, and hunger among the Eskimos in face of threats of renewed enforcement and arrest again being now made by the local Fish and Wildlife agents stationed in Alaska, and apparently without the knowledge of their chiefs in Washington.

This matter was called to my attention when I was in Alaska recently by Ray Christiansen of Bethel. Mr. Christiansen is a well-known airline pilot. He is an Eskimo and also a member of the Alaska House of Representatives, having been elected from the upper Kuskokwim area where he resides and which he serves most admirably. He told me that the Fish and Wildlife agents were again threatening the Eskimos with arrest if they were caught shooting ducks for food, and he followed this up with a telegram asking my assistance. I sent him the following telegram:

> It is my view, which I have publicly stated and now reaffirm, that there is no justification whatever for the local agents of the Fish and Wildlife Service to interpret the Migratory Bird Treaty as it has never been interpreted during the 45 years of its existence until they started to do so 2 years ago. Since all previous Secretaries of Agriculture and the Interior have made clear by their nonintervention their willingness to permit Eskimos needing ducks for food and taking them for that purpose only to do so, I consider any reversal of such action by local officials totally unjustified and see no reason why, until an official opinion by a high court rules otherwise, that they should not continue to do as they always have done.
>
> Should the Fish and Wildlife agents again assume the responsibility of attempting to interpret the treaty and to prosecute and arrest those following this historic practice, I am prepared to stand up beside the Eskimos in court and defend them.

I note that in the Federal Register of May 1, on page 4359, under the heading "Proposed Rule Making," is an insertion headed by the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior and signed by Assistant Secretary Frank P. Briggs that proposes some amendments to the existing regulations. It deals with shooting hours for doves and pigeons in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands and proposes amendments specifying open seasons, bag and possession limits, and shooting hours for doves, pigeons, rails—except coot—woodcock, Wilson's snipe, waterfowl and coot in Alaska, and certain sea ducks in coastal waters along certain Northeastern States. I would strongly urge that the Department of the Interior take cognizance of the situation in Alaska and appropriately amend its regulations to meet the problem I am discussing and particularly take cognizance of the opinion just rendered on this subject by a court in Canada, the other signatory to the Migratory Bird Convention. The facts thereof are highly pertinent and I herewith cite them.

In the Northwest Territories of Canada, an Indian named Michael Sikyea was arrested for shooting a duck. He was a hungry man, tuberculous, and long out of work. His wife and children were on relief. He was arrested by a constable of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and, unable to pay a fine, was imprisoned. His shotgun and the duck were confiscated. He appealed.

After an extensive hearing, Judge J. H. Sissons, of the Territorial Court of the Northwest Territories, rendered a lengthy opinion, the essence of which is found in the following sentence:

> I find that the Migratory Birds Convention Act has no application to Indians hunting for food and does not curtail their hunting rights.

The judge added:

> I find the accused not guilty. The appeal is allowed. The fine and cost paid by the accused shall be returned to him. The duck and the shotgun of the accused should be handed back to him.

In view of the great confusion, dismay, and damage caused, in my view, by the needless and unjustified performance by Fish and Wildlife personnel in Alaska and the failure of the Interior Department to meet this issue squarely and humanely as it was met by its predecessors for 45 years, I think the full opinion of Justice Sissons merits being printed in the RECORD; and I ask that it be included at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the opinion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE TERRITORIAL COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

Her Majesty the Queen, respondent, Michael Sikyea, appellant

(Reasons for judgment of the Honorable Mr. Justice J. H. Sissons)

This is an appeal against a certain conviction bearing date the 7th of May, A.D. 1962, and made by W. V. England, a justice of the peace in and for the Northwest Territories, at Yellowknife in the Northwest Territories, whereby Michael Sikyea was convicted and fined $10 plus costs of $4 and in default 3 days imprisonment, on the charge that he, the said Michael Sikyea of Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories—

"On the 7th day of May, A.D. 1962 at or near the municipal district of Yellowknife in the Northwest Territories did unlawfully kill a migratory bird in an area described in schedule A of the Migratory Bird Regulations at a time not during the open season for that bird in the area in the aforementioned schedule, in violation of section 5 (1)(a) of the Migratory Bird Regulations, thereby committing an offense contrary to section 12(1) of the Migratory Birds Convention Act, chapter 179 R.S.C., 1952."

The area referred to in the charge is described in schedule A of the Migratory Bird Regulations as follows:

PART XI

Open seasons in the Northwest Territories.

Section 5(1)(a) of the Migratory Bird Regulations reads as follows:

"5(1). Unless otherwise permitted under these regulations to do so, no person shall (a) in any area described in schedule A, kill, hunt, capture, injure, take or molest a migratory bird at any time except during an open season specified for that bird and that area in schedule A."

Section 12(1) of the Migratory Birds Convention Act, chapter 179, R.S.C. 1952, reads as follows:

"12(1). Every person who violates any provision of this act or any regulation is, for each offense, liable upon summary conviction to a fine of not more than $300 and not less than $10, or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding 6 months, or to both fine and imprisonment."

This case brings before the court an issue which has disturbed and aggrieved the Indians for some years. From time immemorial the Indians and Eskimos of the North and their wives and children have in the spring taken migratory birds for food and will continue to do so and this has been and is necessary for their survival and well-being. The effect on the bird population is negligible, particularly compared to the loss to predators, but it would not matter if it were otherwise.

It is notorious that a few years ago a Government official spoke to one of the local Indian chiefs and pointed out that shooting ducks in the spring was contrary to the Migratory Birds Convention. The chief asked what was this convention and was told it was a treaty between Canada and the United States. He then queried, "Did the Indians sign the treaty?" The reply was, "No." "Then" the chief declared, "We shoot the ducks."

The Indians have their constitutional rights and their own treaty preserving their ancient hunting rights.

The old chief was on sound ground. There is or should be as much or more sanctity to a treaty between Canada and its Indians as to a treaty between Canada and the United States.

Several witnesses gave evidence for the prosecution at the trial de nova.

Miss Marion Bjornson, a radiographer, gave evidence that X-ray plates she took showed two small metal objects in the duck in this case.

Constable Paul Robin, of the RCMP stated that on May 7, 1962 he was driving along the highway some 6 miles from Yellowknife and saw the accused who was carrying a 16-gage Stevens shotgun. The accused told him he had just shot a duck. He saw a duck in a small lake by the highway, wounded, and being driven by the wind toward the shore. He asked the accused if he was not aware he could not shoot ducks out of season. The accused told him he did not know this and that a game warden had told him it was all right for him to shoot ducks at any time of the year. He said this was about 2 years ago.

The constable seized the duck and the shotgun. The duck was a female mallard. The accused told him he always thought treaty Indians could shoot ducks at any time in any part of the Northwest Territories. He had been informed that the accused was a treaty Indian and he knew he was listed in the Band List.

Ronald Hugh MacKay, an official of the Dominion Wildlife Service, was called as an expert witness. He identified the bird as a female mallard. He said it was hard to tell a wild duck from a domestic duck and he could not say whether the duck produced was a wild duck or not.

Constable Robin, recalled, testified that he knew of no one in the area keeping domestic ducks except himself. He had some at Rae.

Kenneth Kerr, superintendent of the Indian Agency at Yellowknife, was called by the defense. He said the accused was registered as a treaty Indian. He contracted TB in 1959 and was sent to Camsell Hospital in Edmonton. He was returned in February 1961 as cured. While he was in the hospital, his wife and children were on relief. On his return the accused was unable to work and was put on relief. Before going to hospital the accused was a good hunter and trapper. Mr. Kerr said it was the policy to encourage Indians to hunt and trap. The relief given covered basic needs, he believed. The accused had been issued welfare meat.

The accused, Michael Sikyea, gave evidence on his own behalf. He had not worked since he had TB and hadn't earned a cent. He tried to look after his family by fishing and hunting. On the day in question he was going to mile 17 for rats, taking traps and a gun. He took no food with him, intending to live off the land from what he shot. He had left all the relief food and fish at home for the family. He needed food badly. This was the first time he had gone after rats since coming out of the hospital. He shot a duck. The constable confiscated the duck and his gun. He couldn't go then and went home. He couldn't do anything without his gun. He said he was at Fort Resolution and was an interpreter when treaty No. 11 was signed and the Indians were promised they would keep their hunting rights.

Article I of the Convention declares and enumerates the migratory birds included under the headings:

1. Migratory game birds.
2. Migratory insectivorous birds.
3. Other migratory nongame birds.

Article II provides for close seasons.

Article II, paragraph 1, relating to migratory game birds contains the following: "Indians may take at any time scoters for food but not for sale."

It is puzzling that the hunting rights of the Indians be preserved as to "scoters" particularly. It is not conceding the Indians very much, as "scoters" are not a very edible bird and are hard to take.

Paragraph 3 relates to migratory nongame birds and provides that Eskimos and Indians may take them at any time and their eggs for food and their skins for clothing but the birds and eggs shall not be sold.

The word "scoters" does not appear in the list of migratory game birds in article I and there is nothing to indicate what is meant by the word. The word used is "scoters" not "scoter duck." Does it mean genus, family, or subfamily?

The American College Dictionary gives the following definition of "scoter":

"Scoter: Any of the large diving ducks constituting the genera Melanitta and Oidemia, found in northern parts of the Northern Hemisphere."

The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary gives:

"Scoter 1674 (origin obsc.): A duck of the genus Oidemia, esp. ol, Nigra, a native of the Arctic regions and common in the seas of Northern Europe and America. Also s. duck."

The Britannica world language edition of Funk & Wagnall's Standard Dictionary gives:

"Scoter: A sea duck (genera Oidemia and Melanitta) of northern regions, having the bill gibbous or swollen at the base, especially the American scoter, also called coot, or scoter duck."

The American College Dictionary gives the following definition of coot:

"Coot (1) Any of the adequate birds constituting the genus fulica, characterized by lobate toes and short wings and tail, as the common coot of Europe, and (2) any of the various other swimming or diving birds, as the scoter."

The Shorter Oxford:

"Coot (1) A name originally given vaguely to various swimming or diving birds, often to the guillemont."

P. A. Taverner, the noted Canadian authority, in his "Birds of Western Canada," groups eiders and scoters with the subfamily—Fuligulinae, Bay, Sea or Diving Ducks; the Family—Anatidae, Ducks, Geese and Swans; the Order—Anseres. He says as to eider: "Though not forming a recognized subdivision of the ducks, the eiders are sufficiently similar to warrant special reference as a group in a popular work of this kind." He says as to scoters: "The scoters, comprising the genus oidemia, are large, heavily-built birds, and with the eiders the largest of our ducks. Scoters are expert divers and feed largely on shells and crustaceans."

It is possible that the work "scoters" as used in the convention means not only the genus but the subfamily or the family or the order. This would make sense and at least raises a reasonable doubt as to what ducks are included in the word "scoter," and whether the word as used here is synonymous with "ducks."

Section 5(2) of the Migratory Bird Regulations reads as follows:

"5(2) Indians and Eskimos may take auks, auklets, guillemots, murres, puffins and scoters and their eggs at any time for human food or clothing, but they shall not sell or trade or offer to sell or trade birds or eggs so taken and they shall not take such birds or eggs within a bird sanctuary."

It is noted that, unlike the Convention, the regulations group scoters with migratory nongame birds and that the migratory nongame birds which Indians and Eskimos may take are not all those mentioned in the Convention and in the Migratory Birds Convention Act.

The regulations do not contain any other reference to "scoters." The words "scoter ducks" do appear in schedule A in the Open Season Tables for Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Quebec.

Schedule B of the regulations refers to "daily bag and possession limits." It provides: "The words 'ducks' and 'geese' in this schedule include all species of ducks and geese respectively for which open seasons are provided, unless otherwise specified in footnotes." There is a footnote reading as follows: "(k) Except Indians, Eskimos, Metis and other persons living by trapping and hunting may take 25 daily with no possession limit." Strangely "k" appears only in the column, "Rails, coots and gallinules."

Assurances were given to the Indians when treaty No. 11 was entered into. Henry Anthony Conroy, the Commissioner of His Majesty the King, reported:

"The Indians seemed afraid, for one thing, that their liberty to hunt, trap and fish would be taken away or curtailed, but were advised by me that this would not be the case, and the Government will expect them to support themselves in their own way."

Treaty No. 11 itself provides:

"And His Majesty the King hereby agrees with the said Indians that they shall have the right to preserve their usual vocations of hunting, trapping and fishing throughout the tract surrendered as heretofore described, subject to such regulations as may from time to time be made by the government of the country under the authority of His Majesty, and saving and excepting such tracts as may be required or taken up, from time to time for settlement, mining, lumbering, trading or other purposes."

The Honourable Mr. Justice McGillivray, J.A., pointed out in *Rex* v. *Wesley,* (1932) 58 C.C.C. 269:

"It is true that Government regulations in respect of hunting are contemplated in the treaty but considering that treaty in its proper setting I do not think that any of the makers of it could by any stretch of the imagination be deemed to have contemplated a day when the Indians would be deprived of an unfettered right to hunt game of all kinds for food on unoccupied Crown land."

There was in the Game Ordinance, chapter 42 of the Revised Ordinances of the Northwest Territories 1956, the following provisions:

"3. (1) This ordinance; (a) does not apply in Wood Buffalo National Park, and (b) is subject to the provisions of the Migratory Birds Convention Act and the regulations thereunder.

(2) Nothing in this ordinance shall be deemed to prohibit an Indian, Eskimo, or the holder of a general hunting license; (a) from hunting nonmigratory birds and big game other than musk-ox for food for himself and dependents at any time of the year on; (1) all unoccupied Crown lands, or, (2) all occupied Crown lands with the consent of the occupier thereof; or (b) from giving such food or part thereof to others."

There is nothing in treaty 11 as to these limitations on the hunting rights of the Indians and they are of no effect.

This game ordinance was repealed by chapter 2 of the Ordinances of the Northwest Territories, 1960, second session, which came into force July 1, 1961. The new Game Ordinance does not contain the above provision.

By sections 1 and 2 of chapter 20 of the statutes of Canada, 1960, assented to June 9, 1960, the Northwest Territories Act was amended to provide that ordinances made by the Commissioner in Council in relation to the preservation of game in the territories are applicable to and in respect of Indians and Eskimos; that this should not be construed as authorizing the Commissioner in Council to make ordinances restricting or prohibiting Indians or Eskimos from hunting for food, on unoccupied Crown lands, other than game declared by the Governor in Council to be game in danger of becoming extinct, that from the day on which this act comes into force the provisions of the various game ordinances including Chapter 42 R.O. 1956 and chapter 2 of the ordinances of 1960, second session, have the same force and effect in relation to Indians and Eskimos as if on that day they had been reenacted in the same terms; that all laws of general application in force in the territories are, except where otherwise provided, applicable to and in respect of Eskimos in the territories.

Section 1 (3) of chapter 20 reads as follows:

"14(3). Nothing in subsection (2) shall be construed as authorizing the Commissioner in Council to make ordinances restricting or prohibiting Indians or Eskimos from hunting for food, on unoccupied Crown lands, game other than game declared by the Governor in Council to be game in danger of becoming extinct."

The following Order in Council, P.C. 1960–1256, was passed the 14th day of September, 1960:

"His Excellency the Governor General in Council, on the recommendation of the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources, pursuant to subsection (3) of section 14 of the Northwest Territories Act, is pleased hereby to declare musk-ox, barren ground caribou and polar bear as game in danger of becoming extinct."

It is only necessary for the Governor in Council to "declare" that game is in danger of becoming extinct. This may be fact or fiction, and may well be fiction.

There is here a recognition and a preservation by Parliament of the hunting rights of Indians and Eskimos, unrestricted except as to game in danger of becoming extinct. There is no mention of the Migratory Birds Convention Act or migratory birds.

This has the effect of nullifying any application of the Migratory Birds Convention Act to Indians and Eskimos.

Section 2 of chapter 20 reads:

"17(2). All laws of general application in force in the Territories are, except where otherwise provided applicable to and in respect of Eskimos in the Territories."

It is "otherwise provided", so far as Indians are concerned, by section 87 of the Indian Act.

"87. Subject to the terms of any treaty and any other act of the Parliament of Canada, all laws of general application from time to time in force in any province are applicable to and in respect of Indians in the province * * *."

I dealt with these amendments to the Northwest Territories Act in the case of Re Noah estate, (1961) 36 WWR 577:

"The remedy which these amendments to the Northwest Territories Act intended to apply was to make legislation of the Territorial Council of the Northwest Territories in relation to the preservation of game into Federal legislation relating to Indians and Eskimos and of general application.

"The obvious intent of these amendments to the Northwest Territories Act was to authorize the abrogation, abridgement or infringement of the hunting rights of the Eskimos and other rights of the Eskimos by the Territorial Government. The legislation is not effective. Eskimo rights could be extinguished by the Parliament of Canada. However, vested rights are not to be taken away without express words or necessary intendment or implication.

"The Canadian Bill of Rights, 1960, chapter 44 also stands in the way:

"Every law of Canada shall, unless it is expressly declared by an act of the Parliament of Canada that it shall operate notwithstanding the Canadian Bill of Rights, be so construed and applied as not to abrogate, abridge or infringe or to authorize the abrogation, abridgement or infringement of any of the rights or freedoms herein recognized and declared.

"If these amendments were to accomplish their purpose there should have been a provision that they would 'operate notwithstanding the Canadian Bill of Rights'.

"The argument submits that Parliament being the only body competent to legislate respecting Eskimos qua Eskimos has not legislated an exemption for them from the laws of general application. That is not the point. The point is whether Parliament has legislated so as to abrogate, abridge, or infringe the rights of the Eskimos. I find Parliament has not done so."

Mrs. Hagel raised the questions as to the present Federal powers to enact legislation implementing treaties which may conflict with any of the subjects over which the provinces have exclusive jurisdiction and the Migratory Birds Convention Act could be held to infringe on the exclusive provincial jurisdiction as to property and civil rights and to require provincial ratification.

Mr. de Weerdt disputed this and cited a number of authorities as to the validity of the act.

The point is interesting and intriguing and may have some merit but I do not think I need deal with it here. I can decide the case on other grounds.

It is clear that the evidence does not establish beyond a reasonable doubt that the female mallard which was shot was a wild duck. In spite of the argument of the Crown, I cannot draw from the circumstantial evidence the inference that it was a wild duck. The rule in Hodge's case is in the way. The accused therefore cannot be found guilty of the offense with which he is charged.

The real defense and the important issue in this case is that the Migratory Birds Convention Act has no application to Indians engaged in the pursuit of their ancient right to hunt, trap and fish game and fish for food at all seasons of the year, on all unoccupied Crown lands.

Reference was made to the Royal proclamation of October 7, 1763, cited in the revised statutes of Canada, volume VI, 6127, as the first of Canada's constitutional acts and documents, and commonly spoken of as the Charter of Indian Rights; and to treaty No. 11, made and concluded in 1921 between His Most Gracious Majesty George V, and the slave, Dogrib, Loucheux, Hare and other Indians, inhabitants of the Territory; and to *Rex.* v. *Wesley* (1932) 58 C. C. C. 269, *Regina* v. *Kogogoluk* (1959) 28 WWR 376 and other cases.

Indians still have their ancient hunting rights unless, adopting the words used by the Honorable Mr. Justice Gwynne of the Supreme Court of Canada, in *The Ontario Mining Co.* v. *Seybold* (1902) 32. S.C.R. 1, "unless the proclamation of 1763 and the pledge of the Crown therein are considered now to be a dead letter; and unless the grave and solemn proceedings which ever since the issue of the proclamation until the present time have been pursued in practice upon the Crown entering into treaties with the Indians are to be regarded now as a delusive mockery."

The solemn proceedings surrounding treaty No. 11 and the pledge given by the Crown and incorporated in the treaty would indeed be delusive mockeries and deceitful in the highest degree if the Migratory Bird Convention, made just 5 years previously, had curtailed the hunting rights of the Indians.

There are no express words or necessary intendment or implication in the Migratory Birds Convention Act abrogating, abridging, or infringing upon the hunting rights of the Indians.

The various references in the convention and in the Migratory Birds Convention Act and in the Regulations to Indians and Eskimos and their hunting rights indicate recognition of these hunting rights.

The fact that Indians and Eskimos are particularly entitled to take certain migratory game birds and migratory nongame birds does not indicate an intention to abrogate, abridge or infringe the hunting rights of these Indians and Eskimos.

I find that the Migratory Birds Convention Act has no application to Indians hunting for food, and does not curtail their hunting rights.

I find the accused not guilty. The appeal is allowed. The fine and costs paid by the accused shall be returned to him. The duck and the shotgun of the accused shall be handed back to him.

J. H. SISSONS,
Judge Territorial Court.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in order that the history of efforts to clarify this situation may be available, I also ask that there be printed in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, a statement of mine on this subject on September 6, 1961, in which I made clear my view that our Eskimos and Indians taking ducks for food were no more in violation of the Migratory Bird Treaty than was the Canadian Indian who has just been set free by Judge Sissons, and also the correspondence with the officials of our Government.

There being no objection, the statement and the correspondence were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 87th Cong., 1st sess., Sept. 6, 1961]

MIGRATORY BIRD TREATIES NOT VIOLATED BY ESKIMOS TAKING DUCKS FOR FOOD

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, 3 months ago, the people of Alaska were startled to hear over their radios and to read in their newspapers that the local agents of the Fish and Wildlife Service had arrested Eskimos in the far north and far west of the 49th State for shooting ducks and geese, and had confiscated their guns.

This has never happened before in the history of Alaska.

The Fish and Wildlife's agents justification for their unprecedented action was that the taking of these birds between March 10 and September 1 was in violation of a convention between the United States and Great Britain, adopted in 1916, for the protection of migratory waterfowl.

The convention makes exceptions in the case of Eskimos and Indians who, in the words of the convention, "may take at any season, auks, auklets, guillemots, murres, puffins, and their eggs, for food and their skins for clothing, but the birds and eggs so taken shall not be sold or offered for sale."

But the convention does not make exception for many other migratory game birds numbering more than two score, and including ducks and geese, for the taking of which the local Fish and Wildlife agents in Alaska arrested Eskimos in late May of 1961.

The news created a sensation. Two days after the arrests, the Associated Press reported that 100 Eskimos at Barrow, the northernmost community under the American flag, had gathered at a mass meeting, bringing the elder ducks they had killed, and had freely signed statements admitting their actions. At a subsequent mass meeting, 300 Barrow natives signed a petition asking President Kennedy to issue emergency regulations permitting them to hunt migratory waterfowl for food at any time of the year, and if enforcement against them to prevent this was to take place thereafter, to seek a change in the convention.

To those familiar with this long-established custom of the Eskimos, this unprecedented action caused surprise and indignation. This was the universal reaction in Alaska among natives and most whites. Governor Egan immediately wrote to Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall in protest. At a press conference, the Governor stated that it appeared to him that the treaty was flexible, and that the Secretary of the Interior had it within his power to permit such of the native population as had always taken ducks and geese for food at any time of the year to continue to do so. Governor Egan said:

"They have done so for generations, and the flocks have not diminished because of their activities. Commonsense and good judgment should prevail. We should not deprive these people of their very existence."

Welfare costs would jump $150,000 a year, the Governor further pointed out, if this always hitherto available food supply, on which the Eskimos had depended, were cut off.

Governor Egan also voiced a widely believed reason for the unprecedented action of the local Fish and Wildlife agents; namely, that "now that the State has taken over its own game and fisheries program, the Fish and Wildlife Service had to do something to justify its existence in Alaska."

In Alaska, the Fish and Wildlife agents demanded prompt prosecution of the Eskimos by the U.S. attorney at Fairbanks. However, Assistant U.S. Attorney Jerry Shortell referred the matter to the Department of Justice for guidance. The Associated Press reported Secretary Udall as saying at a press conference, "The law is the law," and indicating that he had no choice but to enforce it.

Being convinced that an error had been committed somewhere, or that at least an unfortunate situation had been needlessly created, the Alaska congressional delegation, Senator BARTLETT, Representative RALPH RIVERS, and I called on Secretary Udall to discuss the matter. The meeting took place in his office. The Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife, Mr. Frank P. Briggs, and other representatives of the Fish and Wildlife Service were present.

Secretary Udall's stated position at that time was again that "the law is the law" and that he had no choice but to enforce it.

The members of the Alaska delegation, however, expressed the opinion that there was substantial doubt in their minds just what "the law" in this case was. They voiced the view that it was difficult to reconcile the action taken by the Fish and Wildlife agents in Alaska in May 1961 with the fact that since 1916 no Secretary of the Interior or no Secretary of Agriculture had made any attempt to enforce what was now, for the first time, presumed to be "the law." From 1916 to 1940, the protection of birds and other wildlife was under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture through its agency, the Biological Survey, which in 1940 was merged with the Bureau of Fisheries of the Department of Commerce, and the resulting agency, the Fish and Wildlife Service, with jurisdiction over both marine and land animals, transferred to the Department of the Interior. But throughout this entire period of the convention between Canada and the United States to protect migratory birds, the responsibility for the Eskimos and Indians in Alaska had been vested in the Department of the Interior.

The delegation, therefore, expressed its dissent to Secretary Udall from the position he had taken at that time, shortly after arrests of Eskimos in Alaska.

The reason for that dissent is based on a number of factors.

The Eskimos are meat-eaters, for the obvious reason that vegetables do not grow naturally in the Arctic. Before the coming of the white man, so-called white man's food—flour, cereals, dried fruits, canned vegetables, coffee, tea, sugar—did not exist in the Eskimo world. In villages where they now exist, the Eskimo frequently has no money to buy them.

So, the Eskimo has depended on whale meat, seal, walrus, fish, caribou, and birds, particularly the eider duck. From time immemorial, the Eskimos have been taking eider ducks and geese, as well as other nonmigratory birds—taking them with slings and other implements of their own devising before the white man introduced firearms. In the late spring, and with time variations in different parts of farflung Eskimo Alaska, no other form of life-sustaining game is available. The nonavailability at such times of these other game foods is based on climatic conditions, such as the breaking up of the pack ice in the Arctic Ocean and Bering Sea and the inaccessibility or scarcity of certain food animals because of these seasonal conditions.

It seems clear to me that despite the inclusion in the Migratory Bird Convention—or treaty—of ducks and geese among the birds not to be taken from March 10 to September 1, the established habits of the Eskimos and their essential needs were considered by the Federal authorities after the convention was ratified in 1916. How otherwise explain the total absence of any effort at enforcement of the provisions of the treaty against the Eskimos of Alaska? A corresponding absence of enforcement against Canadian Eskimos appears to have characterized the corresponding Canadian authorities, including—and thus differing from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife agents in Alaska—the year 1961.

It should be especially noted that in transmitting the treaty to the Congress, neither the President nor the Secretary of State made mention of the fact that ratification of the treaty would involve substantial budgetary implications in welfare costs for natives who would be deprived of a vital food source. Can it be said that the President and the Secretary of State did not make full disclosure to the Senate as to the full implications of the requested ratification?

Such an interpretation, attributing, in effect, bad faith to the President and the Secretary of State must be rejected.

Instead it is more logical to interpret their actions as indicating that they did not believe that the ratification of the treaty would cause any change in the living habits of the natives and that hungry Eskimos could still hunt as they had done since time immemorial to keep themselves from starvation.

In 1916, Franklin Knight Lane was Secretary of the Interior in President Wilson's Cabinet, and continued in that post until 1920. He was, of course, fully aware of the provisions of the United States-Canada Migratory Bird Treaty, indeed perhaps peculiarly interested since he was born in Canada. Moroever, more than any previous Secretary of the Interior, he exhibited a deep interest in and concern for Alaska. On his motion, two Alaskan residents were successively appointed as Governors of Alaska. No previous Secretary of the Interior had so great a knowledge of Alaska's problems and needs. If enforcement of the Migratory Bird Treaty of 1916 had been of concern for its effects on the Eskimos of Alaska, Secretary Lane, vocal as no other Secretary had been on Alaskan matters, and particularly outspoken on the conflicting and overlapping of Federal bureaucracy in that territory, would certainly have asserted himself.

While at the time the Secretary of the Interior had jurisdiction over the natives of Alaska—Eskimos, Aleuts, and Indians—and, indeed, over all Alaskan matters not specifically assigned to some other Federal department, the responsibility for the management of wildlife was, as I have pointed out, lodged in the Department of Agriculture. The Secretary of Agriculture in President Wilson's Cabinet was David F. Houston. The special responsibility for wildlife was vested in one of the Department of Agriculture's agencies, the Biological Survey.

That bureau was headed by one of the Nation's foremost naturalists, Edward William Nelson. He had been with the Biological Survey since 1890, was promoted through its ranks, was made its chief in 1916, and continued as such throughout the Wilson administration and long thereafter. Now it happened that despite his nationwide jurisdiction, Nelson was one of the great specialists within his field on Alaska and particularly in what may be described as the Eskimo country—the littoral of the Arctic Ocean and the Bering Sea. He had engaged in extensive scientific explorations in these regions as far back as 1877, and had continued them throughout his long and distinguished public service. While his knowledge covered the broad field of biology, he was preeminently an ornithologist. In addition to other scientific distinctions, he was elected president of the American Ornithological Union. His published scientific writings included: "Birds of Bering Sea and the Arctic Ocean," as well as numerous other papers on birds and the need for their conservation. But his interest ranged beyond animal life, and in 1908 he had published his study entitled "The Eskimo About Bering Straits."

To that highly and uniquely informed public servant fell the responsibility for any action in Alaska involving the taking by Eskimos of the birds of the Bering Sea and the Arctic Ocean. He took no action. There is no evidence that he saw the need for any action. We shall see how 45 years later, another group of distinguished scientists located on the scene, and through personal observation highly knowledgeable, would register their views that the enforcement procedures of 1961 were harmful both to the Eskimo and to the ducks.

Thus, in the year of the Migratory Bird Convention, 1916, and in the years immediately following, neither Secretary of the Interior Franklin K. Lane, in whom was lodged the jurisdiction over the Eskimos and Indians of Alaska, and Edward W. Nelson, as the representative of the Secretary of Agriculture in his responsibility for the migratory and other birds of the territory of Alaska, saw any need for action in regard to the taking of ducks for food by the Eskimos.

If ever the issue was pertinent, it was then—in the year of the ratification of the Migratory Bird Treaty between the United States and Canada, and in the years immediately following.

And, understandably, with that precedent of no action established during the sequent 4 years in the Wilson administration by incumbents Lane and Houston, no action to prosecute the Eskimos for taking ducks was taken in the successive secretaryships of the Interior of John Barton Payne, of Albert B. Fall, of Hubert Work, of Roy O. West, of Ray Lyman Wilbur, or Harold L. Ickes, nor in the successive secretaryships of Agriculture of Henry T. Meredith, of Henry C. Wallace, of Howard M. Gore, of W. M. Jardine, of Arthur M. Hyde, of Henry A. Wallace.

In 1940, as I have pointed out, the functions of the Biological Survey were transferred from the Department of Agriculture and vested in the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior. This Department thereafter had responsibility for the Eskimos and Indians of Alaska, and, until statehood, for wildlife management and conservation, retaining the latter responsibility after statehood only in the case of previously established fish and wildlife game refuges or ranges, and for the enforcement of international treaties. Yet neither Secretary Ickes, after receiving this dual responsibility in his Department for the years 1940–45, nor his successors, Julius A. Krug, Oscar L. Chapman, Douglas McKay, and Fred A. Seaton felt impelled to order action such as was taken by the Alaska Fish and Wildlife agents in May of 1961.

While the negative action of nonenforcement, as far as the Eskimos and their taking of ducks was concerned in the first 43 years of the United States-Canadian Convention is impressively evidential, positive evidence that Eskimo birdtaking was not deemed within the purview of the convention is furnished by circular No. 10 of the Biological Survey issued in April 1933. In this pamphlet, which incorporates the Alaska game law of January 13, 1925, as amended on February 14, 1931, whose enforcement was the province of the Biological Survey, it is stated:

"Nor except as herein provided, shall (any regulation) prohibit any Indian or Eskimo, prospector or traveler, to take animals or birds during the close season when in absolute need of food and other food is not available * * * but the Secretary (of Agriculture) by regulation may prohibt such native Indians or Eskimos, prospectors or travelers from taking any species of animals or birds for food during the close season in any section of the territory (of Alaska) within which he shall determine that the supply of such species of animals or birds is in danger of extermination."

Clearly, it is here provided that Indians and Eskimos may take birds for food during the close season for food, when the need is there, and other food not available, and that a contrary regulation of the Secretary is required only if and when there appeared to be danger of extermination.

Let it be noted here that Fish and Wildlife officials have admitted to me in June of 1961 that the taking of ducks and geese by Eskimos during the years have in nowise depleted the supply.

Shortly thereafter, in 1936, a convention was negotiated between the United States and Mexico "* * * for the protection of migratory birds * * *." In transmitting the draft to the Senate, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt stated that it was a treaty similar to the one with Canada of 1916. Since some of the species of birds protected in the earlier convention migrated to Mexico, it was, he said, desirable to extend protection to them there, also.

There were some interesting differences in the texts of the letters of transmission from our Secretaries of State and in the texts of the two treaties, although both seemed designed for the same general purpose; namely, to save the migratory waterfowl from extinction.

In his letter of transmission of the Canadian treaty on August 17, 1916, Secretary of State Robert Lansing gave this justification for it:

"That a very great number of people in the United States are personally interested in the protection of our migratory wild birds is evidenced by the fact that there are about 5 million sportsmen in this country and their number is steadily increasing. These men are all dependent upon the continuance of our supply of wild fowl for their sport, and a very large number of them are in consequence taking an active interest in the present treaty. In addition, the value of the proper protection of our migratory insectivorous birds is of the deepest interest to farmers for the practical assistance they give in destroying insects injurious to crops. Furthermore, millions of people in the United States are deeply interested in the conservation and increase of bird life from an esthetic viewpoint, as well as on account of their practical utility."

Conservation of the birds, first, for sport; second, for the farmers' crops; third, for their esthetic value—these are the three and the only reasons alleged in Secretary Lansing's letter of transmittal.

It is a well-accepted principle of treaty interpretation that when a topic is not specifically covered by the written words of a treaty, then customs and usage prevailing at the time of ratification and drafting of the treaty, and continuing unabated thereafter, can be consulted in interpreting the treaty. Neither the Canadian nor the Mexican treaties provides specifically for situations where individuals were permitted to hunt for essential food. We must, therefore, go outside the written words of the treaties to determine the intent of the signatories to the treaties.

As already indicated, custom and usage when the treaties were negotiated, signed, and ratified, and subsequent thereto, permitted the taking of ducks and geese for food.

One may well ask: Was the most basic of all purposes to justify conservation of these migratory waterfowl—namely, their use as food for those who needed the food—considered insufficiently important to list, or was it taken for granted as one purpose of the treaty?

I prefer to assume the latter. That assumption is justified by the text of the convention. Indeed, its preamble lists the value of the birds for food first, their insectivorous service second, and says nothing about their use for sport.

The letters of transmission of the Mexican treaty, either by Secretary of State Cordell Hull to the President, or by the President of the Senate, contains no declaration of purpose, but the Mexican treaty, in its preamble, lists four values of the migratory birds in the following order: sport, food, commerce, and industry.

There are other differences: The Canadian treaty, in article VIII, provides:

"The high contracting powers agree themselves to take, or propose to their respective appropriate lawmaking bodies, the necessary measures for insuring the execution of the present convention."

The Mexican Convention, following article I, which declares its purpose to prevent the extinction of migratory agencies, provides, in article II:

"The high contracting parties agree to establish laws, regulations, and provisions to satisfy the need set forth in the preceding article."

And it lists five general provisions, one of which is modified by permitting the taking of birds in conformity with the laws of each contracting country.

This language is significant. In the preparatory work for the Mexican treaty are two memorandums prepared by the U.S. Chargé d'Affaires in Mexico City, stating that the Mexican Government intended that poor people might take such birds for food but not for sale. The Mexican authorities were desirous of including a specific exception for the indigent poor but were persuaded not to include this modification in the final treaty draft.

Yet article 857 of the Mexican Civil Code permits the indigent poor to take such migratory fowl at any time regardless of season. This provision continues in full effect.

Thus, the three nations, signatories to the treaties, achieved the same result until 1960: in the case of Canada as in the United States through nonapplication of its provisions to Eskimos taking ducks for food; in the case of Mexico, by excluding from possible prosecution, in its civil laws, the indigent poor. The United States alone, for the first time—in 1961—operated to prevent the greatest of all possible uses of migratory birds: their use for food by those needing the food.

These considerations prompted me to write Secretary of State Dean Rusk as follows:

JUNE 13, 1961.

Hon. DEAN RUSK,
The Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am greatly disturbed at the sudden prosecution of Eskimos and Indians in Alaska under the migratory bird laws for hunting ducks and geese which, since time immemorial, have formed an essential portion of their food supply. I am at a loss to explain this sudden zeal for law enforcement.

It is my understanding that this action is founded on an interpretation of the 1916 treaty with Great Britain and the 1936 treaty with Mexico. Since one treaty is 45 years old and the other is 25 years old and since the Eskimos and the Indians of Alaska have all during those years—and before—been hunting ducks and geese for food without prosecution, can it not be said that the proper interpretation of both these treaties is that the preexisting rights of Eskimos and Indians are not to be affected by their provisions?

If this interpretation is not possible, then I would suggest that the governments of Canada and Mexico be approached without delay and codicils adopted for both treaties exempting the hunting of geese and ducks by Eskimos and Indians where such hunting is for the purpose of securing food for themselves and their families.

I am writing the Secretary of the Interior requesting that enforcement measures against Indians and Eskimos hunting ducks and geese in Alaska for food be suspended until a ruling on this interpretation can be obtained or until the adoption of appropriate codicils to these treaties can be negotiated.

In any event, I would appreciate an opportunity of conferring with the appropriate officials of your Department and of the Department of the Interior at the earliest possible moment on this most pressing matter.

With all best wishes, I am,

Cordially yours,

ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator.

I sent a copy of the letter I had written to Secretary Rusk to Secretary Udall, as follows:

JUNE 13, 1961.

Hon. STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am enclosing a copy of a letter I have sent to the Secretary of State concerning the interpretation of the Migratory Bird Treaties with Great Britain and Mexico. I believe this letter is self-explanatory.

I believe that, in all fairness to the Indians and Eskimos of Alaska, this sudden reversal in enforcement procedures should be suspended until there has been ample opportunity either to explore fully the validity of the interpretation of the treaty which I have advanced or to negotiate protocols with the Governments of Mexico and Canada. I hope that you will follow this course of action.

In the meantime, as I suggested to the Secretary of State, I would welcome an opportunity in the immediate future of conferring with the appropriate officials of your Department and the Department of State.

With all best wishes, I am,

Cordially yours,

ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator.

Secretary of State Rusk replied as follows:

"DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Your letter of June 13 was the first indication to the Department that a problem exists in relation to enforcement of migratory bird regulations with respect to Eskimos and Indians in Alaska.

"The laws governing the taking of ducks and geese are formulated under applicable provisions of a treaty with Great Britain on behalf of Canada signed in 1916 and a treaty with Mexico signed in 1936. While these treaties provide sufficient latitude for regulations permitting the taking of certain migratory birds for food, a closed session is provided for between March 10 and September 1 of each year for conservation purposes. Certain exceptions are noted in the Canadian Treaty, but they are not in question here. The Department has no responsibility for enforcing these treaties.

"However, should it be determined that inequities do exist, the Department would interpose no objection to the correction of these inequities. It would be expected that any such measures would be based on scientific findings in respect to sound conservation principles.

"I should be happy to make representatives of the Department, knowledgeable in this field, available for discussion with you, at your convenience.

"Sincerely yours,

"DEAN RUSK."

I likewise sent a copy of my letter to Secretary Rusk to Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Frank P. Briggs, who is in charge of fish and wildlife. Assistant Secretary Briggs replied as follows:

"DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Thank you for your letter of June 19 transmitting a copy of your letter to Secretary Rusk regarding the Migratory Bird Treaty.

"As you will recall, during our recent meeting with the Alaskan congressional delegation, this subject was thoroughly discussed. I thought it was a fruitful session and trust we were able to clarify the Department's position on this matter.

"Sincerely yours,

"FRANK P. BRIGGS."

Since it was evident to me that the Department's position, as expressed by Assistant Secretary Briggs, did not afford any satisfactory solution, I replied as follows:

JULY 18, 1961.

Hon. FRANK P. BRIGGS,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Fish and Wildlife, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRIGGS: Replying to your letter of July 12, in which you say, concerning the Migratory Bird Treaty, that at the recent meeting with the congressional delegation, this subject—namely, the taking of birds by the Eskimos for food—was thoroughly discussed, and further, that you considered it a fruitful session, in the course of which you were able to clarify the Department's position on the matter.

My impression is that the Department's position, as stated at the meeting, was that the Eskimos were entitled to no special consideration; that although they had taken ducks for food since time immemorial without let or hindrance, the unprecedented strict enforcement this year, for the first time, by the Fish and Wildlife Service, had the Department's approval.

Speaking for myself, and I feel I likewise express the view of my two colleagues in the congressional delegation, I think this is a most regrettable attitude and one that needs further study and, we hope, revision. It is my belief that when the Migratory Bird Treaties with Mexico and Canada were enacted, the aboriginal rights of our natives in this field were either tacitly recognized by nonenforcement—and should continue to be—or that if that is not the case, those of us concerned with this human and vital problem should press for reinterpretation or modification of the treaties.

It does seem contrary, in my judgment at least, to the ideology of the "New Frontier" that these natives, who, in the great majority of cases are dependent on a supply of migratory birds during this session of the year (I am referring to those who still pursue a subsistence economy) should not have prior consideration over the interests of a few professional duck hunters for sport in the older 48 States. There is the further fact, which I think could be substantiated, that the taking of these ducks in the past by the Eskimos for food has not, in any sense, depleted the supply.

In the circumstances, I hope that the Department will not consider its position established as it appeared to be at our meeting, but that it will be prepared to approach this question from a standpoint of relative values and essential human rights.

Cordially yours,

ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator.

Secretary Briggs replied, more or less reaffirming his previous position. His letter follows:

"DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: This will acknowledge your letter of July 18. As indicated in our earlier correspondence and in conversation, we are much concerned about the welfare of the Eskimos. However, treaty provisions give the Department no recourse but to carry out a progressive program of enforcement.

"Our program continues to be one of information and education. It has not been one of sudden enforcement. Rather it has been in effect since the midforties with attention at first given to the more heavily populated settlements.

"We certainly intend to continue studying all possible solutions. Talks will be initiated with representatives of the Canadian Government in an attempt to secure treaty revisions. I am sure you recognize that there is no easy, equitable solution, particularly with respect to the enforcement of existing laws and regulations.

"Sincerely yours,

"FRANK P. BRIGGS,
"Assistant Secretary of the Interior."

Meanwhile, numerous letters had been received, not merely from Eskimos presenting their plight and requesting some remedy, but letters from others expressing their dismay at the unprecedented enforcement.

Typical of the Eskimos' plea was a petition sent by Paul Green and 133 others from Nome addressed to the Fish and Wildlife Service. It said:

"We, the people that live along the coast of the Bering Sea and the Arctic Ocean have always experienced a lot of trouble in obtaining enough to eat during the time of the spring breakup. At this time of year seals are scarce and hard to catch, the rivers have much ice, and the fish runs have not begun, nor have the greens appeared. In the past we have been able to get waterfowl for food during this time, but now you tell us that we cannot hunt them for food during the spring. We would like to have those laws changed, especially on eider ducks.

"Many waterfowl fly by the coast during the spring and many of them fly over to Siberia and are killed there. We have heard that very few of the eider ducks ever leave Alaska, and that we are the only people that hunt them. Thus we believe that we should be permitted to shoot eider ducks during the spring because there are many of them and we need them for food.

"We hope that you can change the regulations soon. We have always needed waterfowl during the spring, and we still need them for food. If you cannot change the laws for us, many of the families will be hungry and unhappy. We want to obey the laws but it is difficult to do so when the family is hungry and needs the food you say we cannot take."

Six residents of Anvik, an Eskimo village on the lower Yukon River, wrote as follows:

"We here in Anvik feel a real hardship because of this law. We find it impossible to obtain fresh meat of any kind. In the past we have always relied on what few geese and ducks we could get in the spring to tide us over until we could get fresh fish after the breakup. Those of us with big families could never afford to buy canned meat from the store, even if it was always available in the store. We don't even like to eat canned meat.

"We have always hunted ducks and geese in the spring and we can't see how the few ducks and geese we get each year are going to cut down the total number in the world. It seems that this problem might be caused by the many who just hunt for the sport of it.

"As it is now we are faced with two choices here. We can either go without meat for about 2 months, or we are forced to break the law in order to feed our families.

"As you know, legal bird-game hunting is from September 1 to December 3. We here in the interior only see ducks and geese for less than half of that time. If we could have some of this season in the springtime when we need it more, it would really help."

A letter from a clergyman, the Reverend Rene Astruc, S.J., from St. Michael, on the Bering Sea, to Senator BARTLETT, of which I received a copy, states:

"These parts of Alaska have been in quite an uproar recently: the sudden decision by the Fish and Wildlife to enforce the law of no hunting waterfowl at the spring of the year has taken everybody by surprise. This law is well known but has seldom been enforced on the native population for the simple reason that these birds are just about the only food these people have at this time of the year. Therefore 1961 has been a particularly bad year resourcewise.

"When there is no other food available at this time of the year, you cannot expect these people who have always depended on the waterfowl to stop hunting. I should add that they kill relatively little and that all is used for food. Very little seems to be done in these parts to destroy natural predators * * * and the damage caused by these far surpasses any other. The people are going to continue hunting for food * * *. It is my observation that the lack of wise rules is destroying, in the mind of the native people, the notion that such organization as the Fish and Wildlife is there to help them by protecting their resources. Neither can work well without the cooperation of the other. This, I am afraid, is not the way to obtain that of the native people."

Typical of another letter from other than Eskimos was one written from Minto, a native village on the Tanana River, by the Reverend Gordon Olson, whose experience, in addition to his missionary service, included the local postmastership and acting as a licensing agent and tagging officer for the Alaska State Department of Fish and Game. The Reverend Olson wrote as follows:

"DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: The news of the arrest of several hunters at Barrow and the confiscation of a large amount of ducks and geese from residents there by an agent or agents of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is a very disturbing matter to the people of the villages. To a person who is aware of the native dependence on wildlife, this episode borders on the ridiculous.

"In the past 9 years in serving as a missionary in villages and lately also as license agent and tagging officer for the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, I have come in close contact with the need of natives to hunt in order to provide for their families when there is a need. At times the shelves in the homes are bare. A meal may consist of coffee or tea and meat in some form. Then for someone to come along and say you can't hunt because the season is closed seems absolutely absurd. Should the Fish and Wildlife Service continue this harassment of the native way of providing for their families—carried on long before the coming of the white man—most villages would be nearly 100 percent dependent on welfare. Also the initiative of providing for their families would be lost. This whole matter is a very serious matter, for in effect, all the native people are on trial.

"You have been so helpful in the past in matters concerning the needs of villages. I know that the native people will deeply appreciate a strong effort to see that the people can continue their way of living in a way which is morally right.

"Sincerely yours,

"Rev. GORDON OLSON,

"*Postmaster.*"

A letter from another clergyman, the Reverend Norman Donohue, S.J., pastor of the Little Flower Mission at Hooper Bay, raised some additional points on related issues. Father Donohue wrote as follows:

"HONORABLE AND DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I suppose you have heard from many Alaskans regarding the "Battle of Barrow" between the Eskimos and Fish and Wildlife. I have been intending to write you, but it took a remark in your May 5 Newsletter to get me to the typewriter.

"In that letter it is stated that you were not opposing the appropriation for the Kuskokwim National Wildlife Range because State officials said it "may serve a useful purpose in the management of the waterfowl resources of the area." First of all, if the "State officials" are the State Division of Fish and Game, their attitude has been no better than that of the Federal Fish and Game. A year ago, when a bill was introduced in the State legislature to remove a discrimination against the people of this coast in the matter of seal bounties, the State Fish and Game Division fought it tooth and nail. After the bill was passed in spite of them they stalled for months before paying the bounty, and they are still making what I consider an illegal requirement for certification of bounties. I do not know about Mr. Anderson; he was on leave at the time of the bounty bill. But he is leaving the service, and quite likely one of his underlings who was guilty of fighting justice last year will take his place.

"Now about the Kuskokwim Range, I think Mr. Seaton's last-minute move to establish it was quite as blameworthy as in the case of the Arctic Range. When this withdrawal was first proposed, around 1955 or 1956, a public hearing was held in Bethel by the Bureau of Land Management, with speakers from the Fish and Wildlife. I was stationed in Bethel in those days, and I have never seen anything like the way in which the Eskimos threw off their usual lethargy to speak against the measure. They sent representatives from all the villages in and near the area. Everyone, white and Eskimo, opposed the measure, and none would believe the promises of the representatives of Fish and Wildlife. The whole proceedings were tape-recorded as well as transcribed, and they are probably still somewhere in the precincts of the Department of the Interior.

"According to Fish and Wildlife, the sole purpose of the reservation was to give the Department power to regulate oil drilling and mining so that the nesting areas would not be polluted. It seemed like using a cannon to kill a mosquito; surely some simpler expedient would have sufficed. Now the first step is to spend $120,000 for a base in Bethel. To make the occasional inspection that would be necessary to check on oil operations? More likely to provide a base for breathing down the necks of all the residents of the area.

"And that brings me back to my original remark about the 'Battle of Barrow.' As you must realize, the problem is not confined to Barrow, nor to the Arctic in a strict sense. The same conditions prevail at least far enough south to include the Kuskokwim Basin, and probably all the way to the Aleutians. Our people here at Hooper Bay, for instance, are probably more dependent on waterfowl than those of Barrow.

"And, of course, it is not just a question of eider ducks. The people of Barrow, and Governor Egan, have been making a fight on the eider duck question, probably because they feel they have a better case there. But what needs to be cleared up is the whole question of migratory birds. If Fish and Wildlife has suddenly developed a tender conscience concerning treaty violations, why it seems we shall just have to revise the treaty.

"It was perhaps humorous to make the magnanimous gesture of allowing Alaskans to hunt waterfowl until the 15th of December when the last birds had headed south in early October. It may have been funny when Fish and Wildlife was not paying much attention to the Eskimos, but it ceases to be funny now.

"Governor Egan put his finger on the trouble when he stated it looked as though Fish and Wildlife, now that the State had taken over many of their former duties, had nothing left now but to annoy the Eskimos. Branson practically admitted the same thing later, when he said that formerly they did not have enough money to provide operatives to police remote areas.

"Now, Senator, I think that is where you come in. With a battle for the world on our hands, we surely cannot afford to spend the taxpayers' money on paying Fish and Wildlife to harass the Eskimos. So they do not have so much work to do now that the State has taken over: Fine. Let's cut their budget accordingly. No need for them to look for new wildlife activities. If they have too many men, let them fire a few. Maybe they can find some useful work in another line; if not, they can go on relief, whither they are trying to force the rest of the Eskimos.

"If I sound a bit hot, you, as an Alaskan, will understand. You know how it has long been said it was safer to kill a man than a moose in Alaska. Again, honest law-enforcement officers cannot search without a warrant; why is the same not true of game wardens? It seems to me to be high time to get our scale of values back to order.

"Our high today is 42°; sorry I cannot send you a little to refresh you in a Washington summer. I hope you will be able to keep hitting hard for the rest of the session, and then get away for a good vacation.

"Sincerely yours,

"NORMAN DONOHUE, S.J."

Considering Father Donohue's views highly pertinent and valuable, I transmitted his letter to Secretary Udall, as follows:

"DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am enclosing copy of a very pertinent letter from Father Norman Donohue, a Jesuit priest stationed at Hooper Bay, Alaska, which bears on the sudden enforcement by the Fish and Wildlife Service against the Eskimos of the Migratory Bird Treaty provisions.

"As you know, it is my view that this treaty can properly be interpreted to permit natives to continue doing what they have always done—to take some of these ducks for food; and that is particularly true in the case of certain species of ducks.

"Likewise, you will notice Father Donohue's views on the action of former Secretary Seaton to have the Kuskokwim Range withdrawn after he had been notified by the American people that he would no longer continue to be Secretary of the Interior. You are familiar with the views of the Alaska congressional delegation, as well as the Governor and the State legislature, on this subject, and I trust you will give heed to this additional valuable testimony from one who knows the problems firsthand—Father Donohue.

"Cordially yours,

"ERNEST GRUENING,

"*U.S. Senator.*"

Secretary Udall answered my letter, transmitting Father Donohue's letter, replying to some of the criticism made by Father Donohue. Secretary Udall's letter follows:

"DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Father Norman Donohue quite apparently has had much experience with the Alaska Eskimos and we appreciate receiving a copy of his letter of June 21 which accompanied your letter of July 11.

"The dedication of the lands within the Clarence Rhode (Kuskokwim) National Wildlife Range for waterfowl management purposes has been applauded by conservationists of the Nation. The lands within the range comprise the most important waterfowl production habitat in all of Alaska. Important also is the waterfowl production contribution this area makes to the total waterfowl resource of North America.

"The management of the Clarence Rhode Range, by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife of this Department, will be directed at preserving and improving the ecology and waterfowl production capacity. Additionally, the Bureau will regulate those exploitive activities that if uncontrolled could permanently endanger and destroy this native waterfowl habitat. Experience has taught us that the very thing that Alaskans want, assured fish and wildlife populations for public enjoyment and use, can only be had through applied management.

"Father Donohue is correct in his statement that the conflict between the terms of the migratory bird treaties and the desires of native people of Alaska is not confined to Barrow or to the killing of eider ducks. Under the terms of the Treaties with Great Britain (Canada) and Mexico, ducks of all species are fully protected from March 10 to September 1. The Barrow people are particularly concerned with hunting eider ducks in the spring but Eskimos in other parts of Alaska do not want to confine their hunting to this species. This, of course, complicates our approach to solving some of the conflicts.

"In considering some of Father Donohue's remarks, it is noteworthy that of the 26,000 Eskimos in Alaska only 12 individuals were arrested in the spring of 1960 and 15 were apprehended this year for taking migratory waterfowl contrary to Federal and State regulations. This includes two men apprehended in the vicinity of Barrow, Alaska.

"These people were from established communities where ample food is available. The basic conflict is the desire of the natives to continue certain primitive customs and yet live in civilized communities. They have by choice given up many of their old customs but they want to cling to their assumed right to hunt in the spring.

"We are not unaware of the human emotions involving the Eskimo people in Alaska. We want to be fair with them and with all other citizens, but we must recognize that the settlement of the issues with which we are concerned in this instance cannot be reached quickly. Neither can the purposes of the treaties with Great Britain (Canada) and Mexico be ignored in reaching this settlement. All of us, including the Eskimos must realize that the development of any country in the world brings with it advantages and disadvantages, and one of the great disadvantages is the closer regulation of man's activities. This is true in any civilization; and it must have become obvious already to many of the native people of Alaska.

"Some of the publicity concerning U.S. game management agents in Alaska has been distorted. Prior to statehood these men were enforcing the terms of the migratory bird treaties and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act in addition to their other enforcement responsibilities. Enforcement activities in behalf of resident game and fish naturally occupied a part of the time of each agent in Alaska under territorial status, but in those days there were more than twice as many agents. With statehood, the number of agents was reduced, and only sufficient men were retained to meet the responsibilities of the Federal Government.

"One of these responsibilities is the enforcement of provisions of the conventions (treaties) with Great Britain (Canada) and Mexico, and no one has authority to set aside these provisions. U.S. game management agents are expected to use good judgment in the enforcement of these treaties and the Treaty Act regulations, but they cannot in good conscience overlook violations of these agreements and the regulations adopted pursuant to them.

"Sincerely yours,

"STEWART,
"Secretary of the Interior."

I acknowledged Secretary Udall's letter of July 27, and summarized my beliefs and purpose regarding this unfortunate situation by saying:

"I believe that we have not gotten to the bottom of this issue at all, and I am studying a two-way approach: one to determine whether it cannot be assumed that since the provisions of the treaty were never enforced against the Eskimos in the nearly half a century in which it has been in effect, it may be assumed that it was never intended to be enforced in the case of natives taking this supply for food. Apparently a similar tradition exists in Canada. A second approach would be a modification of the treaty, which, of course, would be more cumbersome and more difficult."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my letter to Secretary Udall of August 7 be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 7, 1961.

Hon. STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I acknowledged your letter of July 27, in reply to mine of July 11, which included the letter of Father Norman Donohue concerning the problems of the ducks and the Eskimos. I wish merely to acknowledge the letter at this time because I believe that we have not gotten to the bottom of this issue at all, and I am studying a two-way approach: one, to determine whether it cannot be assumed that since the provisions of the treaty were never enforced against the Eskimos in the nearly half a century in which it has been in effect, it may be assumed that it was never intended to be enforced in the case of natives taking this supply for food. Apparently, a similar situation exists in Canada. The situation is a pretty serious one, and the feeling among the Eskimos is far deeper than you are aware of. A second approach would be a modification of the treaty, which, of course, would be more cumbersome and more difficult.

In any event, I want you to know that most nearly everyone in Alaska is concerned with this issue, and that the sentiment is almost universal that the food needs of the Eskimos should be given a prior and sympathetic consideration rather than the possible additional availability of these birds for duck hunters.

At a meeting in my office with representatives of the Fish and Wildlife Service, they admitted that the taking of these birds by Eskimos had caused no appreciable depletion in the supply.

Cordially yours,

ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, meanwhile, new light on the ecological relations of Eskimos and the elder ducks came from the Arctic Research Laboratory at Point Barrow, where a distinguished group of scholars have been working under the auspices of the University of Alaska.

This important research laboratory on the shore of the Arctic Ocean, at the northernmost point under the American flag, was established in 1947 with funds from the Office of Naval Research. For years its scientists have been living in the very Eskimo community most deeply involved in the present conflict, and have had a unique and unequaled opportunity to observe all its aspects.

Their pertinent and important views on hitherto unappreciated biological factors are set forth in a letter dated August 1 from Max C. Brewer, Director of the Arctic Research Laboratory.

I ask unanimous consent that his letter, as well as my reply to Mr. Brewer, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARCTIC RESEARCH LABORATORY,
UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA,
Point Barrow, Alaska, August 1, 1961.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Recent publicity, both Alaskan and national, appears to disregard some very salient aspects of the existing relationship between the Eskimo and eider duck populations of northern Alaska. This relationship has existed for many hundreds of years and from the biological point has attained a natural predator-prey relationship.

Eskimos apparently have always taken eiders as soon as they arrived in the spring, usually early May, and have also taken both juvenile and adult birds migrating south in the early fall. These birds are an essential part of the Eskimo diet not only because these native people are predominantly meat eaters but also because their method of preparation provides certain necessary items of diet normally obtained through eating vegetables by more southerly located populations. To deprive the Eskimos of these very necessary items of diet could have far reaching undesirable effects on the already precarious health of these people.

It is the general consensus of the Arctic Research Laboratory and its associates that the population of eider ducks apparently is in ecological balance with the natural predators which include foxes, wolverines, bears, weasels, several species of predatory waterfowl, perhaps some fish, and the Eskimos. In fact, the urbanization of the Eskimos, particularly in the Point Barrow area, may tend to upset the ecological balance in favor of the ducks. The increase in the duck population would be expected to be offset by an increase in some faction of the small predator population, i.e., foxes, wolverines or weasels and thus maintain the ecologic balance of nature leaving a healthy and vigorous duck population. Since the maintenance of these vigorous populations as a result of ecological balance would fulfill the aims of good conservation practice it seems biologically irrelevant if the Eskimo or if the fox is the predator.

Elder ducks are not a sports duck inasmuch as they winter at sea, do not travel the great natural flyways, and because of their fishy flavor, are not eaten by nonnative populations. This factor has served to protect the eiders by restricting the hunting population to a constant group. Although no intensive population statistics are available, there appears to be little change other than cyclical, in the eider population.

The Eskimo people have a great respect for the law and their recent difficulty with the authorities is the result of their method of protest to a law which they regard as unrealistic and a very great threat to their health and economy. The most outstanding aspect of this unrealism is that the eider duck is not present in northern Alaska during the legal hunting season. For these reasons, we believe that it would be desirable to have a moratorium on enforcement, with respect to Eskimos, of the hunting provisions of the treaty of 1916 with Great Britain and the treaty of 1936 with Mexico and to endeavor to reinterpret these treaties with respect to the Eskimo. We believe that this would be advantageous to both the Eskimo and a healthy eider duck population.

We are happy that the Arctic Research Laboratory could be of service to you in forwarding this information. Please do not hesitate to call on us should you wish that we investigate this matter in greater detail.

Sincerely yours,

MAX C. BREWER,
Director.

AUGUST 4, 1961.

Mr. MAX C. BREWER,
Director, Arctic Research Laboratory,
Barrow, Alaska.

DEAR MAX: Thank you so much for that excellent letter on the subject of Eskimos and eiders.

I am anything but happy, as are many others, at what has taken place. There is a suspicion that the Fish and Wildlife Service, which never enforced its regulations about the taking of ducks by Eskimos out of season, is doing this in order to demonstrate that it is still around, its existence in Alaska is justified, and its role there essential, and that not all of its functions have been assumed by the State department of fish and game.

Since the treaty has never been enforced during the near half century of its existence in regard to Eskimos, and I am informed that a similar situation exists in Canada, it seems to me implicit that it was never intended to be enforced as far as natives taking ducks for food. Certainly it is more important that they should take these ducks for food than that the birds be saved for the use of sport hunters elsewhere. Actually, the Fish and Wildlife people have admitted that there has been no serious depletion as a result of the Eskimos' take.

I am making every effort to prevent similar Fish and Wildlife action in the future.

I am approaching the question in two ways: First, to see whether we cannot get an administrative decision to assume that the enforcement such as was practiced this spring was not called for—although, to date, I have made no progress with the Interior Department with that approach—and the second is to try to get a revision of the treaty. This will naturally be more cumbersome and perhaps more difficult, and it will take longer. I shall try both approaches.

Thanks so much for the helpful suggestions in your letter. I appreciate having them. They will, if agreeable to you, be included in a speech I expect to make in the Senate on this issue.

With best regards, I remain,

Cordially yours,

ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator.

Mr. Gruening. Mr. President, however, good news lay ahead. On August 25 I received a letter from Secretary Udall and was happy to detect in it a change in attitude and a consequent willingness to consider a solution by way of interpretation of the treaty, as I had hoped could and would be done.

I ask unanimous consent that Secretary Udall's letter of August 25 be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Department of the Interior,
Office of the Secretary,
Washington, D.C., August 25, 1961.

Hon. Ernest Gruening,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Gruening: Thank you for your letter of August 7. I share your deep concern for the welfare of the Eskimos, and I am continuing, as you are, to give careful study to ways and means of working out these problems.

I appreciate your thoughts in the interpretation of the treaty language, and I am having this matter looked into by the Solicitor. I am personally hopeful, Ernest, that it will not be necessary to reopen negotiations for revision of the treaty itself, for, as you point out, this procedure is cumbersome and difficult.

Sincerely yours,

Stewart,
Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. Gruening. Mr. President, I certainly appreciate the apparent modification in Secretary Udall's position and his hope, which my colleagues in Congress, Senator Bartlett and Representative Ralph Rivers, Governor Egan, and countless other Alaskans, share, that a way out may be found without the need of reopening negotiations for revision of the treaty itself, which Secretary Udall and I agree would be cumbersome and difficult.

The fact is that the local agents in Alaska of the Fish and Wildlife Service, while no doubt acting in the faith that they were authorized to act as they did, should, in view of the past history of the treaty in Alaska in its relation to the Eskimos' taking birds for food, as well as the similar situation in Canada, have laid the whole problem before the Secretary of the Interior before acting. By not doing so, they placed him in the embarrassing position of being obliged to say that he had no recourse but to enforce the law. By so acting, they were, in fact, making policy for the Department of the Interior and for the United States, which should have been left to the higher authority to which they are responsible—namely, Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall.

A great deal of other pertinent material—letters from Alaskans, Eskimo and non-Eskimo, and from interested non-Alaskans, and replies to them, memorandums of meeting with State and Interior Department officials, editorials and newspaper articles—is too voluminous to include here.

I do ask unanimous consent, however, that the full texts, to which previous reference has been made, of Executive Document E of the 64th Congress, 1st session—namely, the letters of transmission relating to the Migratory Bird Convention with Canada, and the text of the convention—as well as Executive A, 74th Congress, 2d session, dealing similarly with the Migratory Bird Convention with Mexico, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the documents and letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

"SENATE EXECUTIVE DOCUMENT E, 64TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, ON PROTECTION OF MIGRATORY BIRDS

"(Message from the President of the United States, transmitting convention between the United States and Great Britain for the protection of migratory birds in the United States and Canada)

"*To the Senate:*

"In pursuance of the resolution adopted by the Senate on July 7, 1913, requesting the President to propose to the governments of other countries the negotiation of a convention for the protection and preservation of birds, negotiations were by my direction initiated with the Government of Great Britain through the British Ambassador for the conclusion of a convention that would insure protection to migratory and insectivorous birds in the United States and Canada.

"These negotiations have resulted in the signature, on August 16, 1916, of a convention for this purpose between the United States and Great Britain, which I transmit herewith to receive the advice and consent of the Senate to its ratification.

"The attention of the Senate is invited to the accompanying report of the Secretary of State and to the views of the Department of Agriculture therein presented.

"Woodrow Wilson.

"The White House, *August 21, 1916.*"

Department of State,
Washington, August 17, 1916.

The President:

The undersigned, the Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President, with a view to its transmission to the Senate, if his judgment approve thereof, to receive the advice and consent of that body to its ratification, a convention between the United States and Great Britain for the protection of migratory birds in the United States and Canada, signed at Washington on August 16, 1916.

This convention is the result of negotiations initiated with the British Ambassador at Washington in pursuance of the resolution adopted by the Senate on July 7, 1913, "That the President be requested to propose to the Governments of other countries the negotiation of a convention for the protection and preservation of birds."

The Department of Agriculture has taken keen interest in the negotiations, and has been of great help in their final conclusion. The views of that Department regarding the negotiation of this treaty were expressed in a communication recently addressed to this Department, as follows:

"Not very many years ago vast numbers of waterfoul and shore birds nested within the limits of the United States, especially in the Far West, but the extension of agriculture, and particularly the draining on a large scale of swamps and meadows, together with improved firearms and a vast increase in the number of sportsmen, have so altered conditions that comparatively few migratory game birds nest within our limits. The greater part of the supply still remaining, the value of which must be estimated at many millions of dollars, breed largely in the Canadian Provinces and consist of birds that winter within or to the south of the United States and journey back and forth in autumn and spring across our territory.

"That a very great number of people in the United States are personally interested in the protection of our migratory wild birds is evidenced by the fact that there are about 5 million sportsmen in this country and their number is steadily increasing. These men are all dependent upon the continuance of our supply of wild fowl for their sport, and a very large number of them are in consequence taking an active interest in the present treaty. In addition the value of the proper protection of our migratory insectivorous birds is of the deepest interest to farmers for the practical assistance they give in destroying insects injurious to crops. Furthermore, millions of people in the United States are deeply interested in the conservation and increase of our bird life from an esthetic viewpoint, as well as on account of their practical utility. As a result the number of persons who approve and are deeply interested in the conclusion and enforcement of the present treaty includes many millions. There is no question but that the Federal migratory bird law and the present treaty for the protection of migratory wild fowl now being negotiated between the United States and Canada are conservation measures of prime importance."

Respectfully submitted.

Robert Lansing.

"CONVENTION

"Whereas many species of birds in the course of their annual migrations traverse certain parts of the United States and the Dominion of Canada; and

"Whereas many of these species are of great value as a source of food or in destroying insects which are injurious to forests and forage plants on the public domain, as well as to agricultural crops, in both the United States and Canada, but are nevertheless in danger of extermination through lack of adequate protection during the nesting season or while on their way to and from their breeding grounds;

"The United States of America and His Majesty the King of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and of the British dominions beyond the seas, Emperor of India, being desirous of saving from indiscriminate slaughter and of insuring the preservation of such migratory birds as are either useful to man or are harmless, have resolved to adopt some uniform system of protection which shall effectively accomplish such objects, and to the end of concluding a convention for this purpose have appointed as their respective plenipotentiaries:

"The President of the United States of America, Robert Lansing, Secretary of State of the United States; and

"His Britanic Majesty, the Right Honorable Sir Cecil Arthur Spring Rice, G.C.V.O., K.C.M.G., etc., His Majesty's ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary at Washington;

"Who, after having communicated to each other their respective full powers which were found to be in due and proper form, have agreed to and adopted the following articles:

"*Article I*

"The High Contracting Powers declare that the migratory birds included in the terms of this Convention shall be as follows:

"1. Migratory game birds;

"(a) Anatidae or waterfowl, including brant, wild ducks, geese, and swans.

"(b) Gruidae or cranes, including little brown, sandhill, and whooping cranes.

"(c) Rallidae or rails, including coots gallinules and sora and other rails.

"(d) Limicolae or shorebirds, including avocets, curlew, dowitchers, godwits, knots, oyster catchers, phalaropes, plovers, sandpipers, snipe, stilts, surf birds, turnstones, willet, woodcock, and yellowlegs.

"(e) Columbidae or pigeons, including doves and wild pigeons.

"2. Migratory Insectivorous Birds: Bobolinks, catbirds, chickadees, cuckoos, flickers, flycatchers, grosbeaks, humming birds, kinglets, martins, meadowlarks, nighthawks or bull bats, nut-hatches, orioles, robins, shrikes, swallows, swifts, tanagers, titmice, thrushes, vireos, warblers, wax-wings, whippoorwills, woodpeckers, and wrens, and all other perching birds which feed entirely or chiefly on insects.

"3. Other Migratory Nongame Birds: Auks, auklets, bitterns, fulmars, gannets, grebes, guillemots, gulls, herons, jaegers, loons, murres, petrels, puffins, shearwaters, and terns.

"Article II

"The High Contracting Powers agree that, as an effective means of preserving migratory birds there shall be established the following close seasons during which no hunting shall be done except for scientific or propagating purposes under permits issued by proper authorities.

"1. The close season on migratory game birds shall be between March 10 and September 1, except that the close season on the Limicolae or shorebirds in the Maritime Provinces of Canada and in those States of the United States bordering on the Atlantic Ocean which are situated wholly or in part north of Chesapeake Bay shall be between February 1 and August 15, and that Indians may take at any time scoters for food but not for sale. The season for hunting shall be further restricted to such period not exceeding three and one-half months as the High Contracting Powers may severally deem appropriate and define by law or regulation.

"2. The close season on migratory insectivorous birds shall continue throughout the year.

"3. The close season on other migratory nongame birds shall continue throughout the year, except that Eskimos and Indians may take at any season auks, auklets, guillemots, murres and puffins, and their eggs, for food and their skins for clothing, but the birds and eggs so taken shall not be sold or offered for sale.

"Article III

"The High Contracting Powers agree that during the period of ten years next following the going into effect of this Convention, there shall be a continuous close season on the following migratory game birds, to-wit:

"Band-tailed pigeons, little brown, sandhill and whooping cranes, swans, curlew and all shorebirds (except the black-breasted and golden plover, Wilson or jack snipe, woodcock, and the greater and lesser yellowlegs); provided that during such ten years the close seasons on cranes, swans, and curlew in the Province of British Columbia shall be made by the proper authorities of that Province within the general dates and limitations elsewhere prescribed in this Convention for the respective groups to which these birds belong.

"Article IV

"The High Contracting Powers agree that special protection shall be given the wood duck and the eider duck either (1) by a close season extending over a period of at least five years, or (2) by the establishment of refuges, or (3) by such other regulations as may be deemed appropriate.

"Article V

"The taking of nests or eggs of migratory game or insectivorous or nongame birds shall be prohibited, except for scientific or propagating purposes under such laws or regulations as the High Contracting Powers may severally deem appropriate.

"Article VI

"The High Contracting Powers agree that the shipment or export of migratory birds or their eggs from any State or Province, during the continuance of the close season in such State or Province, shall be prohibited except for scientific or propagating purposes, and the international traffic in any birds or eggs at such time captured, killed, taken, or shipped at any time contrary to the laws of the State or Province in which the same were captured, killed, taken, or shipped shall be likewise prohibited. Every package containing migratory birds or any parts thereof or any eggs of migratory birds transported, or offered for transportation from the Dominion of Canada into the United States or from the United States into the Dominion of Canada, shall have the name and address of the shipper and an accurate statement of the contents clearly marked on the outside of such package.

"Article VII

"Permits to kill any of the above-named birds which, under extraordinary conditions, may become seriously injurious to the agricultural or other interests in any particular community, may be issued by the proper authorities of the High Contracting Powers under suitable regulations prescribed therefor by them respectively, but such permits shall lapse, or may be canceled, at any time when, in the opinion of said authorities, the particular exigency has passed, and no birds killed under this article shall be shipped, sold, or offered for sale.

"Article VIII

"The High Contracting Powers agree themselves to take, or propose to their respective appropriate law-making bodies, the necessary measures for insuring the execution of the present Convention.

"Article IX

"The present Convention shall be ratified by the President of the United States of America by and with the advice and consent of the Senate thereof, and by His Britannic Majesty. The ratifications shall be exchanged at Washington as soon as possible and the Convention shall take effect on the date of the exchange of the ratifications. It shall remain in force for 15 years, and in the event of neither of the High Contracting Powers having given notification, 12 months before the expiration of said period of 15 years, of its intention of terminating its operation, the Convention shall continue to remain in force for one year and so on from year to year.

"In faith whereof, the respective Plenipotentiaries have signed the present Convention in duplicate and have hereunto affixed their seals.

"Done at Washington this 16th day of August 1916.

"ROBERT LANSING.
"CECIL SPRING RICE."

"SENATE EXECUTIVE DOCUMENT A ON A CONVENTION FOR THE PROTECTION OF MIGRATORY BIRDS AND GAME MAMMALS

"(Message from the President of the United States transmitting a convention between the United States of America and the United Mexican States for the protection of migratory birds and game mammals, signed at Mexico City, February 7, 1936)

"THE WHITE HOUSE,
March 5, 1936.

"To the Senate of the United States:

"With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a convention for the protection of migratory birds and game mammals, between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, signed at Mexico City February 7, 1936, and an exchange of notes expressing an understanding between the Governments of the two countries that ratifications are to be exchanged in Washington and the convention will come into force on the day on which ratifications are exchanged.

"The convention is similar to the treaty for the protection of migratory birds in the United States and Canada, signed August 16, 1916. That convention was unquestionably a great step forward toward the restoration and protection of our migratory birds. But inasmuch as numbers of species of the birds whose protection in the United States and Canada has long been provided for extend their migrations to Mexico and still farther south, and in order to protect other groups of birds which migrate between the United States and the United Mexican States, it is obvious that effective conservation requires further international cooperation. It is for these purposes that the convention with Mexico has been concluded.

"The attention of the Senate is invited to the accompanying report from the Secretary of State and the comment of the Secretary of Agriculture presented therein.

"FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

"(Accompaniments: Report of the Secretary of State. Convention. Exchange of notes.)"

"THE PRESIDENT:

"I have the honor to forward to you herewith a convention between the United States of America and the United Mexican States for the protection of migratory birds and game mammals, signed at Mexico City February 7, 1936, which is being brought to your attention for transmittal to the Senate, if you approve thereof, with a view to receiving the advice and consent of that body to its ratification.

"This convention, which represents the culmination of some years of negotiations, embodies the conservation principles contained in the well known migratory bird treaty, signed at Washington August 16, 1916, for the protection of migratory birds in the United States and Canada.

"The present convention limits, with certain exceptions, the taking, transportation, and sale of migratory birds and their products to a maximum period of 4 months annually in each country under a system of permits; provides for the establishment of refuge zones; prohibits hunting from aircraft; and specifically provides for a closed season for wild ducks extending from March 10 to September 1 of each year.

"Further, the present convention prohibits the transportation of migratory birds and game mammals, dead or alive, their parts or products, across the American-Mexican border without a permit of authorization provided by the Government of each country.

"Pursuant to an understanding between the governments of the two countries, expressed in an exchange of notes which accompanies the convention, ratifications are to be exchanged in Washington and the convention will come into force on the day on which ratifications are exchanged.

"The Department of Agriculture has taken an active interest in the negotiations and has greatly assisted in the conclusion of the convention. In a recent letter to me the Secretary of Agriculture made the following comments:

"'A vast stride toward the restoration and protection, indeed in some cases the rescue from extirpation, of our migratory game, and various groups of our insectivorous and other birds, was taken by the conclusion of the convention of August 16, 1916, with Great Britain, for the protection of birds migrating between Canada and the United States. But as numbers of species of these birds, both game and nongame, extend their migrations and winter dispersals to Mexico and beyond, it has been manifest that to insure their more effective conservation, as well as the conservation of other groups of birds migrating between Mexico and the United States, cooperation with the United Mexican States is not only desirable but also quite imperative, and to that end the Department of Agriculture has earnestly desired and for some years past has sought to bring about the negotiation of a convention with that Republic.

"'It is with genuine satisfaction and no little anticipation that we are now informed that the consummation of our hope shortly may be realized.

" 'Millions of our citizens, and their numbers are growing apace, whether they be tillers of the soil, nature lovers, sportsmen. or merely those esthetically inclined, are very earnestly interested in and concerned about the conservation of our birds, and it is not too much to say that they would heartily acclaim such a convention as this.

" 'With Canada, the United States, and Mexico cooperating in the conservation of migratory species of birds it confidently may be expected that the perpetuity of these birds is assured against all contingencies save the untoward operations of nature.'

"Respectfully submitted.

"Cordell Hull.

"Department of State, *Washington*.

"(Enclosures: Convention and exchange of notes.)"

"CONVENTION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE UNITED MEXICAN STATES FOR THE PROTECTION OF MIGRATORY BIRDS AND GAME MAMMALS

"Whereas some of the birds denominated migratory, in their movements cross the United States of America and the United Mexican States, in which countries they live temporarily;

"Whereas it is right and proper to protect the said migratory birds, whatever may be their origin, in the United States of America and the United Mexican States, in order that the species may not be exterminated;

"Whereas for this purpose it is necessary to employ adequate measures which will permit a rational utilization of migratory birds for the purposes of sport as well as for food, commerce, and industry;

"The Governments of the two countries have agreed to conclude a convention which will satisfy the above-mentioned need and to that end have appointed as their respective plenipotentiaries: The Honorable Josephus Daniels, representing the President of the United States of America, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and the Honorable Eduardo Hay, representing the President of the United Mexican States, General Lázaro Cárdenas, who, having exhibited to each other and found satisfactory their respective full powers, conclude the following convention:

"Article I

"In order that the species may not be exterminated, the high contracting parties declare that it is right and proper to protect birds denominated as migratory, whatever may be or origin, which in their movements live temporarily in the United States of America and the United Mexican States, by means of adequate methods which will permit, insofar as the respective high contracting parties may see fit, the utilization of said birds rationally for purposes of sport, food, commerce, and industry.

"Article II

"The high contracting parties agree to establish laws, regulations, and provisions to satisfy the need set forth in the preceding article, including:

"(A) The establishment of closed seasons, which will prohibit in certain periods of the year the taking of migratory birds, their nests or eggs, as well as their transportation or sale, alive or dead, their products or parts, except when proceeding, with appropriate authorization, from private game farms or when used for scientific purposes, for propagation, or for museums.

"(B) The establishment of refuge zones in which the taking of such birds will be prohibited.

"(C) The limitation of their hunting to 4 months in each year, as a maximum, under permits issued by the respective authorities in each case.

"(D) The establishment of a closed season for wild ducks from the 10th of March to the 1st of September.

"(E) The prohibition of the killing of migratory insectivorous birds, except when they become injurious to agriculture and constitute plagues, as well as when they come from reserves or game farms; provided however, that such birds may be captured alive and used in conformity with the laws of each contracting country.

"(F) The prohibition of hunting from aircraft.

"Article III

"The high contracting parties respectively agree, in addition, not to permit the transportation over the American-Mexican border of migratory birds, dead or alive, their parts or products, without a permit of authorization provided for that purpose by the government of each country, with the understanding that in the case that the said birds, their parts or products are transported from one country to the other without the stipulated authorization, they will be considered as contraband and treated accordingly.

"Article IV

"The high contracting parties declare that for the purposes of the present convention the following birds shall be considered migratory:

"Migratory game birds: Familia Anatidae, Familia Gruidae, Familia Rallidae, Familia Charadriidae, Familia Scolopacidae, Familia Recurvirostridae, Familia Phalaropodidae, Familia Columbidae.

"Migratory nongame birds: Familia Cuculidae, Familia Caprimulgidae, Familia Micropodidae, Familia Trochilidae, Familia Picidae, Familia Tyrannidae, Familia Alaudidae, Familia Hirundinidae, Familia Paridae, Familia Certhüdae, Familia Troglodytidae, Familia Turdidae, Familia Mimidae, Familia Sylviidae, Familia Motacillidae, Familia Bombycillidae, Familia Ptilogonatidae, Familia Laniidae, Familia Vireonidae, Familia Compsothlypidae, Familia Icteridae, Familia Thraupidae, Familia Fringilidae.

"Others which the Presidents of the United States of America and the United Mexican States may determine by common agreement.

"Article V

"The high contracting parties agree to apply the stipulations set forth in article III with respect to the game mammals which live in their respective countries.

"Article VI

"This convention shall be ratified by the high contracting parties in accordance with their constitutional methods and shall remain in force for fifteen years and shall be understood to be extended from year to year if the high contracting parties have not indicated twelve months in advance their intention to terminate it.

"The respective plenipotentiaries sign the present convention in duplicate in English and Spanish, affixing thereto their respective seals, in the city of Mexico, the 7th day of February of 1936.

"Josephus Daniels.
"Eduardo Hay."

Department of Foreign Relations, United Mexican States, Mexico.

Mexico, February 10, 1936.

Mr. Henry R. Norweb,
Chargé d'Affaires and Interim of the United States of America, City.

Mr. Chargé d'Affaires: I have the honor to state to you in relation to the convention between the United Mexican States and the United States of North America for the Protection of Migratory Birds and of Game Mammals, signed in this city the 7th date of the current month, that this Department takes the liberty of proposing the city of Washington for effecting the exchange of ratifications referred to by article VI of the said convention as soon as may be practicable.

I avail myself of the opportunity to renew to you the assurances of my respectful consideration.

Eduardo Hay.

Embassy of the
United States of America,
Mexico, February 11, 1936.

His Excellency Señor General Eduardo Hay,
Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mexico.

Excellency: I have the honor to acknowledge with appreciation Your Excellency's courteous note No. 3, Ref. III, of February 10, 1936, in which it is suggested with reference to the Convention between the United States of America and the United Mexican States for the Protection of Migratory Birds and Game Mammals signed in this city on the 7th of this month that the ratifications provided for in article VI of the above-mentioned convention be exchanged in Washington. It is understood that this proposal is satisfactory to my Government and that the treaty shall take effect on the date of the exchange of ratifications.

Please accept, Excellency, the renewed assurances of my highest and most distinguished consideration.

R. Henry Norweb,
Chargé d'Affairs ad interim.

Mr. Gruening. Mr. President, I have gotten to know the Eskimo through my quarter of a century association with Alaska. I came to appreciate them fully when, in the early days of World War II, I organized them in the Alaska Territorial Guard, later securing their inclusion in the Scout Battalions of the Alaska National Guard. No more loyal, brave, and patriotic Americans are to be found under the flag; no finer, more decent, more kindly people anywhere. Their generosity has been testified to innumerable times by those who have been its beneficiaries. But perhaps the best and most succinct appraisal of the Eskimo was given 13 years ago, before a Senate subcommittee, by Vilhjalmur Stafansson, the noted Arctic explorer, who spent years among the Eskimos. Said he:

"I have heard of the merits of the Golden Rule from my Sunday school days, but I have never seen it practiced as consistently as it is by the uncivilized and civilized Eskimos."

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the record is clear that the taking of ducks by the Eskimos has in no wise interfered with the conservation function for which the Migratory Bird Convention was designed. Fish and Wildlife officials have assured me that the number of ducks taken by the Eskimos in no wise jeopardizes the sport of the duck hunters in the 48 States, which appears to be the agency's principal concern in this matter.

I think it is time—indeed, it is past time—that the Interior Department show its real concern for the human aspects of this situation and demonstrate its interest in the vital needs of the Eskimos, who, despite the fact of their being citizens of the United States, historically have been, and still in some degree are, the wards and responsibility of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. President, I yield the floor; and at this time I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STATEMENT BY DR. WALTER MODELL ON HAZARDS OF NEW DRUGS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the April 29, 1963, issue of the Wall Street Journal contained an important article on the need for a truly scientific approach with respect to new drugs. The article is by one of the Nation's outstanding pharmacologists, Dr. Walter Modell, of Cornell University Medical College.

He had presented these views last December, at the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. Later, his statement was published in Science magazine; and now it has been helpfully brought to the attention of laymen generally.

On March 21, 1963, the Senate Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations questioned Dr. Modell on the very points which he made in this article. The full text of the article will appear in volume III of the subcommittee's hearings, along with other exhibits from professional sources.

However, in advance of that publication, and in light of the keen interest of the American people in the work of the Federal Food and Drug Administration, I believe that the Senate and the House will be interested in this distinguished physician's views. For that reason, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Wall Street Journal summary be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAZARDS OF NEW DRUGS: A MAJOR ONE IS INTERFERENCE WITH SCIENTIFIC APPROACH

(By Walter Modell)

No drug, no matter how thoroughly tested by time or trial, is absolutely safe.

The aim with all new therapies is to establish a more favorable ratio between probable adverse effect of treatment and probable adverse effect of untreated disease. Testing new drugs involves developing and pursuing the most effective methods for determining therapeutic effectiveness and reaction hazard.

If medicine is to progress, the determination of calculable risk and expectation for benefit from new drugs is of the first importance. Why, then, are these factors not always precisely determined before new drugs are used in clinical medicine?

The reaction of an animal to drugs may differ qualitatively as well as quantitatively from that of man. Therefore, although essential, animal experiments provide a limited view of the potential danger and usefulness of drugs in man. Much more can be learned from preclinical trials in man, and the more extensive these trials, the more informative they are.

This is the information that is largely depended on in introducing new drugs, but unfortunately it does not tell the whole story; at best it provides only the basis for a well-informed estimate of immediate effects. It tells little about what will happen after several years of use. It does not tell much about what has not been looked for, and since what we look for is determined by past experience, it is quite possible that entirely new relations to drugs will go undetected.

Obviously, testing should be conducted with minimum risk to the subject, but since there is no drug without hazard, there can be no testing of drugs without risk. The justification for taking this risk is that without it there can be no reasonable basis for introducing and using new drugs, and that the danger involved in using them clinically without such testing would be greater than the danger involved in preclinical testing.

Reactions to drugs are not the result of something strange and different in modern drugs. Disasters due to drugs are as old as the history of medicine. New drugs distributed solely on prescription do not often cause large numbers of reactions.

But Sir. William Osler once said, "The desire to take medicine is perhaps the greatest feature which distinguishes man from animals." So irresistible is this urge that man frequently takes medication without the advice or counsel of experts.

When a patient prescribes for himself, the possibilities for harm are incalculable. If a fad develops, as, for example, one did not long ago for the use of Miltown, it can cause extensive trouble. Addiction is a serious adverse result of the use of drugs. It becomes catastrophic only when the layman undertakes to use drugs without medical advice.

DISTURBING THE BALANCE

Society has charged the medical profession with control of the spread of disease, and it also demands that it discover cures for specific diseases. Enormous sums are available from the Government and through privately endowed research foundations for direct attack on birth injuries, poliomyelitis, multiple sclerosis, tuberculosis, cancer, cystic fibrosis, muscular dystrophy and other named diseases.

But society is not interested in, and has not provided a special foundation to examine the influence of these programs, should they be successful, on ecologic balance. Yet strange as it sounds, the attack on a specific disease may not always be for the ultimate good of the community.

About 15 years ago there was an epidemic of rickettsial pox in the New York area simply because a garbage dump was removed as a sanitary measure. Mice that bore the mites that carried the rickettsia had contentedly used the dump as a sort of ever-normal granary and had not strayed far from it. When the dump was removed, they were forced to seek sustenance elsewhere; they moved into nearby apartment houses, where they started and spread the epidemic.

Infections which were the important causes of serious disease have been reduced through the use of antibiotics to a less important status; pneumonia is an example. But the increased incidence of previously rare infections, little influenced by these drugs, and the reactions to the ecologic disturbance often more than offset the immediate benefits. Increasing longevity has created problems of dealing with the aged, and the decrease in the death rates in overcrowded parts of the world has resulted in food shortages and more starvation.

There also is always the chance of harm through the interaction of drugs. Because the possibilities are unlimited, in preclinical testing it is usually impractical to attempt to examine the effects of a new drug on all the other drugs patients may be taking at the same time.

Much has recently been said of the ethical obligations of both the experimenter and society to the subjects of experimentation with drugs, and of course the obligation is real. But there is a related ethical problem which is not commonly appreciated, even though it has more far-reaching significance, and that is our ethical obligation to the nonsubject, to the ultimate object of research, to the patient who will receive the new drugs.

If the trial on the experimental subject is not carefully planned and executed—if, because of concern over ethical obligations to the subject, the discipline of experimental research is not strictly adhered to in the investigation of drugs in man—many nonsubjects may suffer.

Nonsubjects may suffer because a toxic drug is unwittingly used in clinical medicine, and this, of course, is what excites all the attention, despite the fact that it does not occur very often. But what goes almost unremarked, and is even more important and not uncommon, is that the bad experiment may indicate that an ineffective drug is useful, with the result that a useless medicament is established in our therapy.

A related hazard in testing that does not excite the press is the loss of the good drug through inadequate testing or through improper, inexpert early use, so that its potential for adverse reaction in relation to its benefits is misjudged: It is thought to be less effective than it is, or more toxic. As with people we meet, bad first impressions are often hard to erase.

OUTSIDE PRESSURES

Interference with scientific procedure by outside pressure groups tends to keep any discipline from being truly scientific, tends to muddy both the aim and the validity of its research, and tends to keep society from looking upon it as an independent scientific discipline. This is, of course, true for medicine, and in the case of modern pharmacotherapeutics such interference can be dangerous as well.

A dramatic example of what happens because of interference with the scientific process is to be found in the Salk vaccine story. It was a strange coincidence that several manufacturers had sunk fortunes and incalculable effort into processes for the extensive production of vaccine and were busily stockpiling the Salk vaccine at a time when the Polio Foundation was claiming in the press that positive results with the vaccine in the field trials had not yet been established.

It was a curious coincidence that the public announcements that the Salk vaccine had been proved effective and that a large supply of commercial vaccine was ready for general use were made on the same day, April 12, date of the death of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt. Here was interference with scientific procedure in the interests of the dramatic gesture. What were the effects? A large number of cases of paralytic polio developed during the first days of use of the stockpiled vaccine. Modification in manufacture was instituted as quickly as possible, but not before the calamity was substantial.

The pharmaceutical industry finds the prompt establishment of its new drugs essential. It cannot afford to wait. These days, drugs are copied so easily by the astute synthetic organic chemist that rival concerns soon produce near duplicates of most successful drugs.

In this kind of rat race it is sound business practice for industry to attempt to recover a large portion of its investment in a drug immediately after the drug is introduced. To do this, it attempts to establish a new product so quickly that no Johnny-come-lately can seriously impinge on the firm market that it has created for itself. The pharmaceutical industry uses the same promotional devices that other businesses use to make sure that its new product is used as widely and as soon as possible.

Hasty publication of research results by scientists can also be dangerous. Knowledge of the extent of usefulness of a drug, of its specific advantages and limitations, of the rare as well as the common adverse reaction—in fine, knowledge of the art of using it—is gained slowly.

Here, then, is the pattern for disaster with new drugs: A shortsighted view of all effects; faulty experiments; premature publication; too vigorous promotion; exaggerated claims; and careless use—in brief, a break in the scientific approach somewhere along the line.

Safety with the new drugs, which are both potent and numerous, therefore demands the attitude and skill of the scientist; anything less is clearly dangerous. Events have proved it. I hope I have indicated why. I contend that the rules of safety demand that the healer be a scientist.

COMPASSION IS NEEDED

But there is more to the practice of medicine than dispassionate science. The physician can do much good with effective drugs, but even with ineffectual medication the compassionate physician did a great deal for his patient. We cannot disregard the beneficial effects of compassion, interest, good care, and the communication of hope to the patient. The effects are authentic.

But mankind would be still better off if the physician treated the products of modern science with due regard to the principles of science; if there were no pressures distracting him from these principles; and if, in attacking disease, he viewed the large problem, with its long-range implications, as well as the immediate effects on a number of dissociated diseases. I think also that the safe and effective clinical use of new drugs requires a new and acceptable image of the physician, one which combines the qualities of sympathy and dedication and the discipline and special skill and logic of the scientist.

Failing this, if new drugs continue to be marketed, we may have even more trouble. A negative attitude toward drugs may develop. There might have been some justification for such an attitude 50 years ago, but it would be an unforgiveable disaster today, for never before has our ecologic balance been so dependent on drugs; never before in its history has medicine had so many useful, effective drugs on hand; and never before has there been such promise of even better ones to come.

NEED FOR ADDITIONAL DRUG PROGRESS: SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE'S FUTURE PLANS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to note three points with respect to future drug progress. These points concern:

First. The study of drugs used in pregnancy.

Second. The proposed Drug Clearinghouse.

Third. The Senate Reorganization Subcommittee's plans for looking ahead.

Mr. President, as the Senate knows, we are conducting hearings and a study relative to the organizational structure of the Food and Drug Administration. I am happy to state that the study is coming on very well, and I am very much pleased to note that we are receiving fine cooperation from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, particularly from its Secretary, Mr. Celebrezze, and the Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, Mr. Larrick. I have been in close consultation with these gentlemen; and we are conducting some very extensive studies into the organizational structure of the Food and Drug Administration and in regard to how we can improve that structure, and also in regard to improvement of professional levels and the facilities and equipment which are required for the activities of the Food and Drug Administration.

In this connection, I call attention to the importance of the appropriations requested for the Food and Drug Administration, in order to enable it to do its job under the new Drug Act which Congress passed last year. It does little good to criticize this agency if it is not provided with the manpower, the equipment, the facilities, and the tools which it must have if it is to do its job. I have assured Mr. Larrick and the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that I will do all I can, as one Senator and as chairman of the subcommittee, to see to it that the Food and Drug Administration is given all the help which Congress can give to improve, strengthen, and upgrade the services and personnel of the Food and Drug Administration.

HOUSE COMMITTEE FOLLOWED UP ON AN EARLIER SUGGESTION

First. Mr. President, on April 25, the House of Representatives Appropriations Committee reported the 1964 Department of Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill, H.R. 5888. In so doing, the committee soundly emphasized a point which had, I believe, first been made by the Senate Reorganization Subcommittee at its hearings 7 months ago. Thus, on page 15 of House Report No. 246, the House committee urged that the National Institute for Neurological Diseases and Blindness "develop a coordinated program for the clinical evaluation of drugs used during pregnancy."

This was a subject of particularly deep interest and concern on the part of our subcommittee. We held hearings on the subject and made recommendations, which I am happy to know have now been incorporated in the report on the House appropriations for HEW.

I congratulate the House Appropriations Committee for this very important followup on Federal drug programs.

ACTION URGED ON DRUG CLEARINGHOUSE

Second. Coordinated evaluation will require coordinated information.

I trust that the U.S. Public Health Service will move rapidly ahead in its plans, therefore, for a National Drug Information Clearinghouse. It is not enough that there be a mere statement of the Service's interest in the subject. The Congress has a right to expect firm plans and action, including the necessary budgetary request.

I am confident that Dr. Terry is a most able and outstanding public servant and doctor, and will make the necessary request for the National Drug Information Clearinghouse. The project is much needed, and will bring a note of reassurance and confidence to the American people and to the professional community.

FIVE EXPORT GROUPS TO BE HEADED BY SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE

Third. When the Senate Reorganization Subcommittee resumes hearings, it will hear from spokesmen for five groups.

By the way, we intend to conclude the study about the first of July. So the months of May and June will be required to complete the hearings and the staff studies we are making. Then we will move into other endeavors, as I have outlined before, with particular reference to the activities of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] in the study of pesticides.

The spokesmen that we will hear from will be the chairman and the representatives of the Second Citizens Advisory Committee on the Food and Drug Administration, concerning their October 1962 report; the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association on the problems of the industry, generally, in relation to the new drug law and regulations; the American Medical Association, on future medical policy with respect to new drugs; the distinguished Commission on Drug Safety, comprising leading representatives of medical science and the drug industry; and, finally, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with respect to reorganizing and strengthening of the Food and Drug Administration and assuring intraagency and interagency coordination.

In reference to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, we hope to have testimony from Commissioner Larrick. He will outline to us the changes that are being made and his requests for additional personnel, equipment, and facilities, and discuss with us the reorganization plans that are now well underway. We will receive his comments about the Second Citizens Committee report on the Food and Drug Administration.

I should like very much to have the hearings concluded with either a statement or testimony from the Secretary of HEW, Mr. Celebrezze. I repeat that the Secretary has shown great interest in the subject. He has been most cooperative. I have discussed the subject matter with him within the past few days. I am happy to note that really constructive efforts are underway and substantial improvements have already been undertaken. So we feel that the hearings and the study have produced thus far really constructive results in terms of governmental reorganization, improvement of efficiency, elimination of duplication, and cooperation between agencies of Government, as well as cooperation between Government and industry.

PHILIPPINE WAR CLAIMS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I deeply regret that a commitment made almost a year ago prevented me from being in this Chamber yesterday when the Committee on Foreign Relations' amendment to the Philippines War Claims Act of 1962 was debated and approved.

I do wish at this time to make clear the record with regard to a statement made yesterday by the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY].

On page 7584 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD he is reported as saying:

> Finally, there is strong testimony that the proposal recommended here to change the method of payment will cost the United States from $5 to $25 million more than it would cost if the individual claims were paid directly.

Mr. President, I know of no such testimony. I do know that there has been some unfounded and therefore irresponsible speculation in the press to this effect. I further know that the staff of the Committee on Foreign Relations, following the publication of a story using the $25 million figure, checked with the responsible agency, the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, and was assured by the general counsel of that agency that at most a figure of from $2 to $4 million may be involved.

I stress "may," because there is no assurance whatever that even that amount may be involved.

I am sure this same information would have been made available to any Member of this body who desired to check the accuracy of this particular story.

In order to clarify this issue, I would like to show where this misleading figure came from.

Last Friday, I placed in the Congressional Record excerpts from the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, in 1952 and 1956, which authorized payments to certain Philippine religious claimants. I also included estimated figures which showed that under this act, some $29 million had been paid to these particular claimants.

It appears that some persons determined that since these particular Philippine claimants had already received $29 million under the War Claims Act, they would not be able to receive the same $29 million under the 1962-passed Philippine War Claims Act.

Mr. President, the truth of this matter is that these Philippine religious organizations have claims estimated at between $2 and $4 million in the 1962 act. If these claims have already been paid under the earlier War Claims Act, the most that could be saved is $2 million to $4 million. However, I should point out that, according to the Foreign Settlement Claims Commission, the 1946 Philippine War Damage Commission award upon which the 1962 act claim was determined included repayment for destruction of church edifices, payments which were not covered under the War Claims Act and which would be paid under the 1962 act. Therefore, it is the Commission's best estimate that the duplicate payments will run less than the $2 million to $4 million. There is no $25 million of duplicate religious payments in the 1962 bill, and I hope I have clarified why this is so.

There has also been some talk about the savings that could accrue to the Treasury since some of the individual Philippine claimants have died or cannot be located. Mr. President, the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, according to its Chairman, has received 15,000 returned claims applications marked deceased and 15,000 marked improper address. The Commission, however, cannot just drop the issue there. It must in the case of each change of address seek out the claimant's new address. In the case of each deceased claimant it must seek out his heir or heirs, even if the claimant died intestate.

Mr. President, for the most part these lost or deceased claimants were the small ones, persons whose claims were in the hundreds of dollars. I would hazard a guess that the costs involved in locating lost claimants and heirs to claimants to whoever administers this act will, in the end, come close to the amount of the claims to be paid those particular claimants and little if any savings will accrue.

There are two other points I would like to make. The first is to correct the impression that this payment of $73 million as set out in the 1962 act will be spread equally among 86,000 poor Philippine citizens. The records show that almost $50 million will go to but 3 percent of the total claimants. In fact, less than one-half of 1 percent of the claimants, 287 to be exact, will get over $30 million as the bill now stands. This act, as it now stands, is a large claimants bill, and a windfall for most of them. And I submit that among these larger claimants you will find those companies and individuals who provided Mr. O'Donnell with the $18,000 which he used for his 1960 political contributions.

Some question was raised yesterday as to why the committee had adopted this particular amendment. In answer to that question I can only restate what I said on the floor last Friday.

There has been some discussion as to what would be the best means of amending the act passed last year, so as to prevent those who have interfered with our legislative process from receiving benefits from that legislation. Two courses have been suggested: One would be to transfer full payment to the Government of the Philippines, which accepts funds "in full satisfaction and final settlement of any and all claims" arising out of the 1946 legislation and "insures that no part of such sum" goes to O'Donnell and his associates.

A second course would be to retain the present form of payment by our Government to individual claimants, and simply amend the current legislation so as to preclude the payment of compensation from awards to O'Donnell and his associates.

The Committee on Foreign Relations has studied closely both approaches. Neither provides an absolute guarantee that fees contracted for prior to 1962 will not eventually reach the lobbyists. However, a number of factors led the committee to choose the government-to-government payment route.

First, since almost all the claimants come under the legal jurisdiction of the Government of the Philippines, that government would be better able to enforce prohibitions of payments to O'Donnell. No matter what language is written into the current act, in the end it would be legally effective only against persons within the jurisdiction of the United States.

Second, the government-to-government payment is more in line with the economic development purposes of the Rehabilitation Act of 1946. I do not feel it necessary here to retrace the history of that act, but only point out that our Government, faced with the demand for repayment generated for the most part by O'Donnell, Delgado and their clients, proposed this form of payment in 1960.

There are suggestions that this money paid to the Philippine Government will not find its way down to the small claimant. I want to point out that such fears are usually voiced by the big claimants the less than 3 percent of the total number of claimants who stand to receive over $50 million of the $73 million contained in this bill.

If the Philippine Government decides to pay all the claimants, it can; if it decides to pay the small ones, it can; if it decides that such payments would not contribute to the economy, it can devote the money to public works. The choice will rest with the Philippine Government, although I note that in the last-mentioned case neither O'Donnell nor his associates would have any basis whatsoever to obtain any fees.

The Senate has the opportunity today to correct faulty legislation, return a law to its original intent and deny to those who tampered with the legislative process the financial benefits of their labors.

There is this one further benefit to be gained by our action of this bill. It will serve as notice to those who would attempt to promote similar self-serving legislation that the Senate is willing to admit its errors and take the necessary action.

Mr. President, to add further to this matter, I have today received a letter from Mr. Edward Re, Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States,
Washington, D.C., May 2, 1963.

Hon. J. W. Fulbright,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Fulbright: This is responsive to your request this date for a clarification of the Commission's estimate of the amount, in dollars, which may be expected to remain in the U.S. Treasury under the reverter clause prescribed in Public Law 87-616, in light of recent newspaper articles alluding to this subject.

Your attention is invited to a letter addressed to you by me, dated June 18, 1962, wherein I stated to you in part:

"The dubious factor here lies in the extent to which the losses covered by the respective acts was identical and this cannot be determined without a review of all claims concerned. This, I am advised, would be in a monumental task which the Commission could not undertake in the absence of a claims program.

"However, attention is invited to House Report No. 1042, 87th Congress, 1st session, to accompany H.R. 8617. At pages 11 through 14 a sampling of claims is set forth. It will be noted that certain of the claims are preceded by an asterisk. These constitute some of the claims which have been processed under each of the acts referred to and it appears that in these few instances alone that approximately $2.5 million would revert to the U.S. Treasury. How much more of the $25 million paid out of the proceeds of vested enemy assets under the War Claims Act is similarly duplicative it is impossible to state, although I am convinced the sum would be considerable.

"In addition, it should be noted that the mortality rate in the Philippines during the past 16 years has been relatively high. Accordingly, in those instance where no heirs or assigns can be located no payments will be made.

"Finally, on this point, failure to establish appropriate reinvestment in accordance with the terms of H.R. 11721, would mean that a proportionate amount would not be disbursed from the fund.

"Therefore, let me repeat that while no firm estimate in dollars and cents savings can be offered in the present state of the record, it follows that it could be quite substantial."

The letter to which reference is made was incorporated in full in the report published by your committee as Senate Report No. 1882, 87th Congress, 2d session. A copy of the complete letter is attached hereto.

The referenced letter constitutes the only statement on this question issued by the

Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. The estimates made by Secretary Harriman at the hearing conducted on the legislation by your committee on June 12, 1962, was based upon similar information furnished to the Department of State by the Commission.

The Foreign Claims Settlement Commission declines to accept responsibility for statements reported in the press or otherwise that $10 to $20 million, or even $25 million of the $73 million in question would ultimately revert to the U.S. Treasury. The estimate contained in my letter of June 18, 1962, is the best approximation that can be afforded by this Commission prior to December 15, 1963, which is the final date for filing claims under Public Law 87-616. Until that date the Commission has no means for knowing absolutely what valid claims will be filed.

On the question of effecting a compromise on overlapping awards, the Commission can only reiterate that the foregoing, as well as the statements contained in its letter of June 18, 1962, constitute an estimate only based upon lists published in the House Report No. 1042, and constitute neither a liquidated amount nor one which may be relied upon as an absolute for this purpose.

In summary, therefore, I can only repeat the statement which I made in my letter of June 18, 1962, that "I am convinced that the sum would be considerable."

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD D. RE,
Chairman.

JUNE 18, 1962.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: This refers to your informal inquiry of June 12, 1962, in which you requested the views of the Commission on (a) the total amount which may be expected to be required for payments on awards made under the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, in the event of enactment of S. 2380 or H.R. 11721, and (b) the anticipated cost of the administration of such a program.

With respect to item (a) above it would be quite unrealistic and presumptuous on my part to attempt to hazard anything which might be construed as a firm figure. Nevertheless, I am advised by the staff of the Commission that certainly a relatively substantial proportion of some $25 million paid to religious organizations in the Philippines under section 7 of the War Claims Act of 1948 for damage or destruction of educational, medical, or welfare units covered the identical losses for which compensation was also awarded under the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946. However, in all cases of awards made under the War Claims Act of 1948, payments received under the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 were deducted to assure that there was no duplication of payments. Moreover, since there was no 75-percent limitation on War Claims Act payments on awards, claimants may be deemed to have received 100 percent compensation in these instances where the losses covered were identical.

The dubious factor here lies in the extent to which the losses covered by the respective acts was identical and this cannot be determined without a review of all claims concerned. This, I am advised would be a monumental task which the Commission could not undertake in the absence of a claims program.

However, attention is invited to House Report No. 1042, 87th Congress, 1st session, to accompany H.R. 8617. At pages 11 through 14 a sampling of claims is set forth. It will be noted that certain of the claims are preceded by an asterisk. These constitute some of the claims which have been processed under each of the acts referred to and it appears that in these few instances alone that approximately $2.5 million would revert to the U.S. Treasury. How much more of the $25 million paid out of the proceeds of vested enemy assets under the War Claims Act is similarly duplicative it is impossible to state, although I am convinced the sum would be considerable.

In addition, it should be noted that the mortality rate in the Philippines during the past 16 years has been relatively high. Accordingly, in those instances where no heirs or assigns can be located no payments will be made.

Finally, on this point, failure to establish appropriate reinvestment in accordance with the terms of H.R. 11721, would mean that a proportionate amount would not be disbursed from the fund.

Therefore, let me repeat that while no firm estimate in dollars-and-cents savings can be offered in the present state of the record, it follows that it could be quite substantial.

As to item (b) above relative to administrative cost, the House Foreign Affairs Committee posed a similar question to the General Counsel of the Commission during the course of hearings on a predecessor bill in June 1961. While under the current bills the functions of the Commission would increase somewhat there are no present means for estimating the additional moderate cost factors. A copy of the Commission's letter of June 7, 1961 on this question is attached.

I regret the impossibility of being more specific in response to your inquiry.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD D. RE,
Chairman.

[From Hearings, Committee on Foreign Relations, June 12 and 21, 1962, on S. 2380 and S. 3329]

List of religious claimants on record as of January 1951, as compiled by the Treasury Department

1. CORPORATIONS OVER 200,000 PESOS

Claimant and address	*Amount*
The Roman Catholic Archbishop of Cebu, Manila	₱316,713.49
The Roman Catholic Bishop of Lipa, Manila	314,792.78
Ateneo De Manila, Inc., Manila	297,269.98
The Roman Catholic Bishop of Jaro, Manila	368,647.64
Congregacion de las Hijos, Manila	203,110.13
North Negros Sugar Co., Inc., Manila	469,198.71
Roman Catholic Archbishop of Manila	758,992.84
Total amount in pesos	₱2,728,725.57
Total amount in dollars	$1,364,362.79
The Community of Sisters of St. Paul de Chartres, Inc., Manila	137,903.26
International Committee of YMCA, Manila	136,635.39
Catholic Vicar Apostolic of the Mountain Province, Baguio City	136,151.11
Missionary Canonesses of St. Augustine, Inc., Manila	113,225.27
Community of Benedictine Sisters, Manila	125,400.90
Hospital de San Juan de Dios, Rizal City	184,889.11
Congregacion De La Mission, Manila	57,440.53
San Juan De Latran College, Manila	74,840.92
La Proviacia de San Nicolas, Manila	98,703.76
Congregacion de Religiosac, Manila	71,685.01
Real Monasteriod de la Purisima Conception, Manila	₱81,271.31
Colegio Santa Rosa De Manila University, Manila	70,536.93
La Corporacion Franciscana, Manila	90,163.74
American Baptist Foreign Mission Society, Hill City	63,970.44
University of Santo Tomas, Arroceros, Manila	93,256.29
Philippine Independent Church, Manila	81,584.06
Assumption Convent, Inc., Manila	67,599.60
Good Shepherd Convent, Caloogan Rizal	50,271.65

2. INDIVIDUALS OVER 100,000 PESOS

	Amount
The Roman Catholic Bishop of Tuguergarao, Cabayan	₱175,651.52
The Roman Catholic Bishop of Babayan, Cabayan	127,966.97
The Roman Catholic Bishop of Nueva Segovia, Vigan Ilocos Sur	174,109.87
The Roman Catholic Bishop of Bamboanga, Arroceros, Manila	106,506.56
The Roman Catholic Bishop of Lingayen, Pangasinan	113,883.10
Roman Catholic Bishop of Bacolod, Manila	95,319.64
Roman Catholic Apostolic Bishop of Leyte, Palo Leyte	84,881.05
Bishop of Nueva Caceres, Arroceros, Manila	91,754.55
Total amount for corporations in pesos	₱4,464,254.85
Total amount for corporations in dollars	$2,232,127.43
Total amount for individuals in pesos	₱970,073.26
Total amount for individuals in dollars	$485,036.63
Total in pesos	₱5,434,328.11
Total in dollars	$2,717,164.06

NOTE.—These claims have been settled almost in their entirety under legislation approved by the Congress subsequent to the compilation of this list, page 63.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I note that in his letter Mr. Re refers to a previous letter written to me on June 18, 1962, in response to an inquiry from the Committee on Foreign Relations for the total amount that would be required to meet the proposed Philippine War Claims legislation then under consideration. In that letter, Mr. Re stated:

> I am advised by the staff of the Commission that certainly a relatively substantial proportion of some $25 million paid to religious organizations in the Philippines under section 7 of the War Claims Act of 1948 for damage or destruction of educational, medical, or welfare units covered the identical losses for which compensation was also awarded under the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946.

Mr. Re, in his letter, then referred to a listing of the 287 largest claimants and noted that the religious organizations on that list had claims totaling $2.5 million due them under the proposed 1962 legislation. In his letter, Mr. Re then said that the list was only a "sampling" and that based on this he assumed there would be a substantial amount of duplicate payments.

Mr. President, the committee staff has been informed by the general counsel of the Commission that the list Mr. Re referred to in his June 18 letter as a "sample" is a "complete" list of the largest Philippine claimants and the religious claimants on that list total about $2.7 million. The claims of other smaller religious claimants who may have received payment under other laws will not, I understand, go above an additional $1.5 million in total.

Mr. President, the use of the $25 million figure by Mr. Re in his letter is misleading—had he used $10 or $50 million, it would have been just as misleading.

Again I say that I regret that I was not present yesterday. I have read the RECORD today. I wish to associate myself with the comments made by the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], who has attended the hearings of the Committee on Foreign Relations, both on this matter involving the Philippine War Damage claims and also the other matters, with great attention and fidelity. His comments disclose the background of the case and the testimony which persuaded the Committee on Foreign Relations that this would be wise and in the best interests of this country, and, we believe, in the long run, in the best interests of the Philippines, and the reasons he gives for the proposal to change the bill I think are entirely valid, and I approve of them completely.

I only regret that in the course of this debate some rather harsh words were said, which I believe were based upon a lack of information and a lack of thorough understanding of the testimony as it was developed in the committee.

The hearings have been made available to Senators, but I know that in the rush of business of the Senate, Senators are not always able to read hearings in detail and to get a complete understanding of exactly what is revealed in hearings before a committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SEVENTY-FIFTH BIRTHDAY OF TRENTON TRUST CO.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, May 1 marked the birthday anniversary of the Trenton Trust Co., a bank in the capital city of the State of New Jersey. A 75th birthday is a particularly important celebration, but the occasion is also heightened by the fact that the bank is operated by a distinguished lady, the No. 1 lady banker in the United States, Mrs. Mary Roebling.

The bank has made its most important progress under the leadership of Mrs. Roebling. At the age of 30, Mrs. Roebling became the first woman ever to head a major bank. This busy executive officer is a most charming and enterprising lady, and today is chairman of the board of trustees of the Trenton Trust and the first woman governor of the American Stock Exchange.

People do not fully appreciate all that banks do besides being repositories and lenders of money. They have a key role in shaping the economic destiny of our communities. Banks also play an important role in helping the U.S. Treasury on withholding taxes, savings bonds, and in housing and community development.

Our pride in the Trenton Trust is only equaled by our pride in the first lady of banking, Mrs. Mary Roebling, described by a New York Times portrait as possessing a dynamic and persuasive personality.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, and there appears to be none, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment, in accordance with the previous order, until 12 noon Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), under the order of yesterday, the Senate adjourned until Monday, May 6, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 2, 1963:

United Nations

The following-named persons to be Representatives of the United States of America to the fourth special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations:

Adai E. Stevenson, of Illinois.
Francis T. P. Plimpton, of New York.
Charles W. Yost, of New York.
Jonathan B. Bingham, of New York.
Sidney R. Yates, of Illinois.

Postmasters

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ARIZONA

Hettie M. Black, Hereford, Ariz., in place of D. H. Hill, resigned.

Vivian V. Kenemore, Kearny, Ariz. Office established March 16, 1959.

ARKANSAS

Henry W. Allen, Jr., Brinkley, Ark., in place of W. D. Fowler, retired.

Harry L. Smith, Elm Springs, Ark., in place of C. B. Delozier, retired.

Harry L. Bealer, Helena, Ark., in place of R. M. McCarty, deceased.

CALIFORNIA

John B. Klugiewicz, Costa Mesa, Calif., in place of H. E. Gill, deceased.

Ruth A. Winters, Loleta, Calif., in place of R. C. Yarger, retired.

Edward F. Austin, Moffett Field, Calif., in place of C. V. Schessler, resigned.

Beverly J. Clark, Occidental, Calif., in place of L. H. Blanchard, retired.

Dessa L. Pinkham, Pescadero, Calif., in place of L. B. Huglin, removed.

John T. Connolly, San Lorenzo, Calif., in place of Gertrude Mooney, retired.

Ralph B. Gump, Tarzana, Calif., in place of D. M. Benedict, retired.

Paul Medows, Woodland Hills, Calif., in place of R. F. Neely, resigned.

COLORADO

Marie P. Burg, Hideaway Park, Colo., in place of M. E. Hilbrand, resigned.

CONNECTICUT

Joseph A. Rajcula, Brookfield, Conn., in place of V. C. Geddes, resigned.

William F. Csere, Portland, Conn., in place of C. J. Seiferman, retired.

FLORIDA

Ralph D. Marshall, Estero, Fla., in place of Dosia Anderson, retired.

Luther W. Reel, Winter Haven, Fla., in place of A. W. Kelso, retired.

GEORGIA

Gladys A. Walker, Marshallville, Ga., in place of H. A. Lee, retired.

HAWAII

Donald Kimura, Waiakoa, Hawaii, in place of V. S. Mathias, deceased.

ILLINOIS

Edward M. Rohr, Newton, Ill., in place of J. E. Nichols, retired.

Elmer W. Heuerman, Teutopolis, Ill., in place of C. W. Thoele, retired.

INDIANA

Frederick R. Meier, Cross Plains, Ind., in place of Hazel Runner, retired.

Paul Davidson, Leiters Ford, Ind., in place of E. T. See, retired.

Marinus H. Brackman, Rockport, Ind., in place of C. H. Wetzel, retired.

IOWA

James A. Anderson, Casey, Iowa, in place of P. G. Thompson, retired.

Frederick W. Neumann, Fairfield, Iowa, in place of L. J. Roth, deceased.

Myrtle M. Hawbaker, Hillsboro, Iowa, in place of E. M. McCabe, retired.

Arthur G. Meyer, Holstein, Iowa, in place of H. O. Micheel, retired.

Daniel J. Gibbs, LaMotte, Iowa, in place of H. A. Nemmers, retired.

Marjorie I. Trusty, Oakdale, Iowa, in place of W. F. White, resigned.

Alwin M. Zwanziger, Strawberry Point, Iowa, in place of O. C. Gavins, retired.

KENTUCKY

Lee R. McNeely, Jr., Burlington, Ky., in place of Newton Sullivan, retired.

William E. Amyx, Jr., Shelbyville, Ky., in place of J. D. Buckner, retired.

Harry C. Wheeldon, South Carrollton, Ky., in place of H. C. Wheeldon, deceased.

LOUISIANA

Edward J. Hymel, Destrehan, La., in place of N. F. Zeringue, retired.

Irene T. Nash, Gibson, La., in place of M. E. Walther, retired.

Roma H. Williams, Many, La., in place of Charles Williams, retired.

Norman C. Terherst, Newllano, La., in place of J. H. Smith, transferred.

MAINE

David H. Hackett, South Harpswell, Maine, in place of M. M. Given, resigned.

Robert B. Kessell, South Paris, Maine, in place of E. P. Lowell, retired.

Fernald K. Linscott, Springfield, Maine, in place of C. B. Lewis, retired.

John R. McLean, Vassalboro, Maine, in place of W. P. MacDonald, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Charles P. Aspesi, Fayville, Mass., in place of J. J. Trioli, deceased.

John D. Foley, West Acton, Mass., in place of D. R. Kinsley, deceased.

Joseph M. Steinmann, West Concord, Mass., in place of M. E. Coughlin, retired.

MICHIGAN

Kathryn E. Warner, Bridgeport, Mich., in place of J. A. Bunyan, retired.

John P. Funkey, Hancock, Mich., in place of D. A. Holland, retired.

Thomas E. Wilhelm, Petoskey, Mich., in place of G. A. Malloy, deceased.

MINNESOTA

Gordon W. Van Den Einde, Blomkest, Minn., in place of Alger Erickson, retired.

LeRoy H. Grundei, Carlos, Minn., in place of P. L. Geris., retired.

Wilfred F. Greenheck, Pillager, Minn., in place of E. L. LaPorte, retired.

James L. Harlan, Plainview, Minn., in place of N. O. Lance, deceased.

Albert L. Gutzke, Waverly, Minn., in place of M. D. Stephens, resigned.

Francis R. Tangen, Winger, Minn., in place of R. S. Sorvig, deceased.

MISSISSIPPI

Felix L. Sweatt, Shaw, Miss., in place of L. M. Ferriss, retire.

MISSOURI

Erwin H. Schmidt, Barnhart, Mo., in place of B. W. Stites, resigned.

Bernetta L. Faulkner, Centerville, Mo., in place of R. W. Bounds, resigned.

Elmer C. Smith, Frohna, Mo., in place of A. E. G. Fassel, retired.

Lucille D. Howerton, Leonard, Mo., in place of P. T. Keith, retired.

Harold C. Jacobs, Palmyra, Mo., in place of D. H. Sosey, retired.

Leland S. Reid, Point Lookout, Mo., in place of E. E. Farrell, resigned.

Marvin L. Steele, Unionville, Mo., in place of W. S. Wiseman, retired.

MONTANA

Robert J. Williamson, Belt, Mont., in place of W. H. Fluhr, retired.

Una V. Hopkins, Custer, Mont., in place of R. F. Haurigan, deceased.

Alberta E. Harrington, Garrison, Mont., in place of A. E. Gerdts, transferred.

NEBRASKA

Richard L. Hart, Bridgeport, Nebr., in place of M. C. Jensen, retired.

Louis A. Piva, Chappell, Nebr., in place of E. D. Long, retired.

John C. Bounds, Grant, Nebr., in place of H. L. Dresslar, retired.

Ferol G. Carney, Lisco, Nebr., in place of J. M. Daly, retired.

Keith R. Carson, Pilger, Nebr., in place of C. J. Olk, transferred.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Royce C. Morse, Lebanon, N.H., in place of J. F. Cronin, retired.

Lorraine M. Callaghan, Rochester, N.H., in place of H. D. Foss, deceased.

Harold J. Wright, Twin Mountain, N.H., in place of C. M. McCauley, resigned.

NEW JERSEY

Robert G. Reeves, Sr., Mauricetown, N.J., in place of B. W. Robbins, retired.

John B. Gildawie, Pequannock, N.J., in place of E. A. Oakley, retired.

Raymond V. Lyons, Ridgewood, N.J., in place of W. A. Kearns, retired.

Jay H. Woolhiser, Three Bridges, N.J., in place of Eva Case, retired.

William E. Nagle, Vernon, N.J., in place of A. E. Baldwin, deceased.

NEW YORK

Everett H. Enstine, Calverton, N.Y., in place of A. M. Hackal, resigned.

James J. Connolly, Catskill, N.Y., in place of H. W. Becker, retired.

George T. O'Leary, Central Islip, N.Y., in place of J. J. McTiernan, removed.

Walter A. Glynn, Craryville, N.Y., in place of F. A. Glynn, retired.

Clifford J. Vincent, Jr., East Berne, N.Y., in place of Flavia O'Brien, retired.

Marian C. Laing, East Otto, N.Y., in place of G. M. Laing, retired.

Dominick D. Formisano, Gardiner, N.Y., in place of P. G. Donahue, removed.

Howard D. Holland, Hadley, N.Y., in place of V. B. Hawk, retired.

Alexander G. D'Imperio, Harrison, N.Y., in place of Loretta Patton, deceased.

William J. Holahan, Middleport, N.Y., in place of Edward Phillips, retired.

Michael J. Vickio, Montour Falls, N.Y., in place of E. M. Galley, retired.

Fraser Bushey, Mooers Forks, N.Y., in place of L. T. LeDuc, retired.

Walter J. Janik, Niagara Falls, N.Y., in place of A. J. Keller, resigned.

Samuel R. McKernan, Olcott, N.Y., in place of R. C. Rutland, Jr., resigned.

George W. Voorhis, Jr., Piermont, N.Y., in place of L. L. Hunt, resigned.

Margaret M. Vaughan, Rush, N.Y., in place of E. L. Quinn, retired.

Clarence M. Pulling, West Lebanon, N.Y., in place of R. E. Watkins, resigned.

Leo F. King, Woodbourne, N.Y., in place of N. B. King, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

Isabel H. Glover, Bailey, N.C., in place of J. S. Collie, retired.

Thomas E. Dixon, Benson, N.C., in place of J. J. Barbour, deceased.

Marvin N. Farmer, Blanch, N.C., in place of E. W. Walters, retired.

Louise N. Blankenship, Fairview, N.C., in place of C. N. Boykin, retired.

Louise C. Pittman, Gates, N.C., in place of C. V. Cross, retired.

Robert W. Phillips, Hudson, N.C., in place of Grace Pugh, retired.

Albert F. Waller, Kinston, N.C., in place of E. R. Wooten, resigned.

James Napier, New London, N.C., in place of E. B. Casper, retired.

R. Wayne Ward, Staley, N.C., in place of M. I. Siler, retired.

Charles R. Isgett, Winston-Salem, N.C., in place of W. B. Booe, resigned.

NORTH DAKOTA

Lyle M. Westemeier, Bisbee, N. Dak., in place of R. L. Peterson, retired.

Donald B. Tweten, Reynolds, N. Dak., in place of O. A. Lebacken, transferred.

William J. Gust, Jr., Saint Thomas, N. Dak., in place of W. J. Gust, retired.

Clifford R. Salzwedel, Sheldon, N. Dak., in place of M. G. Howell, retired.

OHIO

Robert J. Healea, Dennison, Ohio, in place of J. J. Gold, resigned.

William A. Beard, Eaton, Ohio, in place of R. C. Harris, retired.

Frank L. Biggs, Pataskala, Ohio, in place of M. N. Johnson, resigned.

Beatrice A. Shoemaker, Sedalia, Ohio, in place of P. T. Shepherd, retired.

OKLAHOMA

John H. Tynon, Wyandotte, Okla., in place of S. C. Ritter, retired.

OREGON

Halford A. Dudley, Rhododendron, Oreg., in place of Maud Krebs, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Charles H. Gough, Ashland, Pa., in place of H. J. Betz, deceased.

Margaret E. Richey, Carmichaels, Pa., in place of C. I. Donley, retired.

Edward M. Buckley, Dallas, Pa., in place of Joseph Polacky, deceased.

Marian A. MacDonough, Marshalls Creek, Pa., in place of E. N. Huffman, deceased.

Edward B. Henning, Mehoopany, Pa., in place of D. R. Sheehan, retired.

Roland E. Dunkelberger, New Bloomfield, Pa., in place of J. E. Sheaffer, retired.

Francis A. Keyack, Shamokin, Pa., in place of R. A. Pensyl, deceased.

M. Franklin Ward, Tioga, Pa., in place of R. S. Kayzer, retired.

Henry J. Schwalm, Valley View, Pa., in place of E. V. Zerbe, retired.

PUERTO RICO

Emilió A. Hernandez, Aguada, Puerto Rico in place of Emilio Hernandez, retired.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Robert A. Jolley, Jr., Greenville, S.C., in place of C. C. Withington, retired.

J. Ellison Deer, Ulmers, S.C., in place of L. V. McMillan, retired.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Lyle R. Haug, Brandt, S. Dak., in place of Harry Schnarr, retired.

Hugen M. Kelsey, Fedora, S. Dak., in place of R. H. Hubbart, transferred.

TENNESSEE

George R. Gunn, Jr., Springfield, Tenn., in place of J. C. Pope, retired.

TEXAS

Harry C. Rathjen, Canadian, Tex., in place of J. P. Hutton, retired.

S. Reese Upshaw, De Leon, Tex., in place of S. T. Counts, retired.

James H. Latimer, Olmito, Tex., in place of J. M. Latimer, retired.

Cecil W. James, Palestine, Tex., in place of E. M. Lockey, retired.

John R. Cullers, Shamrock, Tex., in place of Flake George, deceased.

L. V. Teston, South Houston, Tex., in place of P. T. Hoovestol, deceased.

James E. Scott, Wolfe City, Tex., in place of C. S. Engle, Jr., resigned.

UTAH

Earl T. James, Clearfield, Utah, in place of Pearl Wilcox, retired.

Harold P. Green, Grantsville, Utah, in place of LeRoy Soelberg, Jr., resigned.

Robert D. Nevin, Riverton, Utah, in place of J. M. Madsen, retired.

VERMONT

Collise A. Brown, Waterville, Vt., in place of O. P. Shattuck, deceased.

VIRGINIA

Charles H. Mason, Alexandria, Va., in place of R. D. Clark, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Norman Armstrong, Pickens, W. Va., in place of N. B. Armstrong, retired.

Carl R. Shaffer, Tunnelton, W. Va., in place of J. F. Graham, retired.

WISCONSIN

Mathew E. Lang, Gillett, Wis., in place of H. P. Klebenow, deceased.

James G. Omachinski, Menasha, Wis., in place of John Backes, retired.

Arden A. Johnson, Trempealeau, Wis., in place of E. E. Malles, transferred.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate, May 2, 1963:

U.S. ARMY

The Army National Guard of the United States officer named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officer of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3392:

To be a major general

Brig. Gen. Paul Leonard Kleiver, O397818.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 2, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Romans 8: 19: *For the whole creation waits with eager longing for the revealing of the sons of God.*

Almighty God, as we walk in these dark and dangerous days, carrying about in our hearts the marks of anxiety and apprehension, may we manifest ourselves to be the sons of God who are turning to Thee for light and leading.

God forbid that we should ever submit to the spirit of sullen and stoical resignation but may we bear our burdens bravely with an unconquerable faith and a hope that shines like a bright star amid the gathering clouds.

Grant that this may be a day of ardent and daring patriots who are eagerly seeking and obeying Thy will and ready to endure unto the bitter end.

Show us how we may take part in the noble adventure of bringing about not merely a reformation but a regeneration when men and nations shall come under the spell and sway of Thy redeeming love.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 199. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans having the service-connected disability of deafness of both ears;

H.R. 211. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide increases in rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to children and parents of deceased veterans; and

H.R. 214. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans suffering the loss or loss of use of both vocal cords, with resulting complete aphonia.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 5517. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. PASTORE, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HILL, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. MUNDT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1003. An act for the relief of the Middlesex Concrete Products & Excavating Corp.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 20) entitled "An act to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. JACKSON, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. KUCHEL, and Mr. ALLOTT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

THE LATE HON. JESSICA McCULLOUGH WEIS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON].

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, for the second time in as many weeks, it is my sad duty to report to my colleagues on the passing of a former Member of Congress. Mrs. Jessica McCullough Weis died last evening in her home community of Rochester, N.Y.

Judy Weis, as she was known to all, played a distinguished role in Government and public service. Her active life was an inspiration to women, for she proved that womanhood was no limitation to full participation in the important affairs of our times.

Mrs. Weis was the elected Representative from the New York State 38th Congressional District—now the 36th—for two terms. She served as a Member both of the 86th and 87th Congresses. Despite illness and until confinement to the hospital, she continued her active role in Congress almost to the conclusion of the 2d session of the 87th Congress, taking part in debate on the House floor, undertaking committee work and serving the needs of her constituents. On the recommendation of her physician, she did not seek reelection to the 88th Congress.

Her congressional service included membership on the Science and Astronautics Committee, the District of Columbia Committee and the Government Operations Committee. She was the first woman Member of Congress to be named to the Science and Astronautics Committee. As a measure of the Committee's respect for Mrs. Weis on her retirement, it passed a special resolution making her a permanent honorary member of the committee.

As the immediate successor to Judy Weis in Congress, I am strongly aware that her representation was always guided by an abiding interest in her constituents. Throughout the district she represented, people have spoken of her courage, her gentleness and her dedicated concern for every individual problem.

Her Government service extended beyond Congress. She was appointed by President Eisenhower as a member of the National Civil Defense Advisory Commission. She also served as an appointee on the Inter-American Commission of Women.

In the field of local and national politics, she rendered exemplary service to the Republican Party. She held the position of National Republican committeewoman and was a delegate to six national conventions. At the 1948 Republican Convention, she brought great honor to her home community and to women in politics when she made a speech seconding the nomination of Gov. Thomas E. Dewey for the Republican Presidential candidate. Mrs. Weis also served the Republican Party as President of the National Federation of Republican Women, as Vice-Chairman of the Monroe County Republican Committee as founder of the Susan B. Anthony Republican Club, and in many other volunteer assignments.

In Rochester, N.Y., she devoted her countless talents to civic betterment through service on a host of community organizations. She was a leader in volunteer hospital work and in securing for women their due recognition as equal partners in community life.

Her late husband, Charles W. Weis, Jr., was prominent in the commerce of Rochester, N.Y., and in civic development.

To her children, Charles McCullough Weis, Mrs. William C. Warren, III, and Mrs. Cameron C. W. Jameson, and other family members, we extend our sympathy and condolence.

The loss of Judy Weis is a heavy one for all of us. A touch of elegance has gone out of our lives.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORTON. I am very happy to yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, my personal friendship with Judy Weis goes back in my memory to at least 1940 when she and I were delegates to the Republican National Convention of that year. From that time on and through the years, both before she came to service here in the House of Representatives and after, by reason of various political interests we shared, I came to know Judy Weis as one of the finest women I have ever been privileged to meet. She was courageous, competent and well-informed, with an attractive personality that combined gentleness, courtesy and extreme kindness.

The gentleman from New York has spoken of being her immediate successor in the House of Representatives. May I say that he has a real job to uphold the level of the distinguished service she performed; and I know the gentleman will do that.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend him for his statement and join with him in what he has expressed as to our sorrow at her passing and our sympathy for the members of her bereaved family. Judy Weis was a truly wonderful person whom we shall all miss very, very much.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORTON. I am happy to yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman in this expression of sorrow over the death of our former colleague, Judy Weis. I was shocked this morning to get the news of her passing. During her two terms in the House, Mrs. Weis demonstrated qualities of intellect and personality that caused her to be loved and respected by every Member of this House. She was a woman of great accomplishment and charm. Her contributions to the House were outstanding. It was wonderful to have known her and to have been able to call her my friend. I extend my deepest sympathy to her family and loved ones.

Mr. HORTON. I certainly want to thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORTON. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I have indeed been saddened, as we all have, to hear of the loss of our former colleague and my very dear friend, Judy Weis. Judy Weis has been my friend for all my political life and even before. She was a great public servant. She was known all over the State of New York not only for her ability but for her wonderful personality.

Judy Weis had two great attributes of which she was an example. She believed first of all in truth and integrity, and after that she had courage. She showed that all through her life, both as a national committeewoman for our State, and in her many other capacities. She also showed it above all in her last illness, and she bore it with great courage, indeed, with cheerfulness. In her passing we have lost a gallant lady.

Mr. HORTON. I thank the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, as one of the women Members of this House I rise to express our separate and united sorrow in the death of our so lately colleague "Judy" Weis. Since last fall when illness forced her to leave her duties here she has been deeply missed. Just to look at her lifted ones heart. Her constant cheerfulness, her generous, kindly spirit radiated upon us all. Faced with the inevitable, she did not falter. Her gallant courage has been an example to everyone who knew her. She has been a fine Member of this House and over and above that she has been an example of womanhood at its best. For this we women of this House are deeply grateful.

May I add only my deep sympathy to her family who, I feel sure cannot but rejoice that her release has come.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join in expressing my deep sorrow at the news of the passing of our former colleague, Judy Weis, and to extend to her family and to her loved ones my deepest sympathy.

I had occasion first to become acquainted with Judy Weis when I lived in the city of Rochester and served one summer as a lifeguard at a swimming pool there. I can remember in those days Mrs. Weis as a devoted mother coming down to the pool with her two young daughters. I had occasion to help teach those two girls to dive. And I remember what a devoted mother Mrs. Weis was, and what a vivacious person.

I also had the privilege and pleasure then of knowing her late husband, Charlie. Even in those days Judy Weis had time and energy for civic affairs and for leadership in the city of Rochester.

Having been acquainted with her then, it was a thrill of course to be elected to this body and to come down here in 1959 and to join this body at the same time as Mrs. Weis, who was representing a district which included the city of Rochester. As a Member of this body I came to have an even greater appreciation of her ability, charm, warmth, energy, boundless good will, and devotion to duty. She had already been active for many years in political affairs, and although Judy Weis belonged to a different political party from mine, we in New York State had all come to respect her leadership and her vivacious activity. She represented certainly the finest type of individual active in political affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I know we all have benefitted from Mrs. Weis' service in this chamber. We have all benefited from the opportunity to know her and to catch some of her warmth, her grace, and her enthusiasm.

Of course, now those two young ladies that I had the privilege to know many years ago are themselves married with families of their own, for Mrs. Weis had six grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, we are all deeply saddened by the passing of our former colleague. To her family and her friends, Mrs. Stratton and I extend our deepest sympathy.

Mr. HORTON. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, I too, wish to pay tribute to our beloved former colleague, Jessica McCullough Weis, whose passing has just been announced.

Last year when she announced her decision to retire from the Congress at the end of the session, every Member of the House was deeply shocked. It was only when we learned that considerations of health had compelled her to do so that we accepted the announcement as final.

Judy Weis brought to the political arena outstanding qualities of leadership. Her charm, wit, and judgment enabled her to work effectively with all groups and at all levels. After appropriate seasoning in local politics, she moved into State and national councils and at the time of her death, she was continuing to serve her great State of New York as a member of the National Republican Committee where her counsel was sought and heeded.

Few speakers have been so widely sought to address important gatherings throughout our Nation. All admired her outstanding ability to speak forcefully, clearly, and entertainingly. I like to recall her delightful poem, humorously, and modestly reflecting her reactions during her initial weeks on the Space and Aeronautics Committee. It was clever and unassuming but no one on that important committee really believed Judy was as overwhelmed by the flood of technical terminology as the poem suggested. They knew her keen and intuitive mind was keeping pace with all the committee activity as she thrilled to the intimate contact with our national achievements in this spectacular field.

I entered the Congress with this great lady but I had been privileged to know her and her great value to her party and the Nation over 20 years prior to that time. All these many years I admired her character and ability, while prizing her friendship. Her keen interest in the welfare of our Nation and the political activity which gives vitality to its government never lagged. Even during her last illness she followed eagerly news of the Congress, sharing our accomplishments, and frustrations in her inimitable way. She loved this House and was proud to share in its work. We will long remember this outstanding woman who met life and now death with a courage and understanding we will do well to emulate.

To her fine family we extend our heartfelt sympathy. We know they are blessed with happy memories and a heritage of service.

Mr. HORTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues—and the people of the State of New York—in noting, with a deep sense of personal loss, the passing of the Honorable Jessica Weis.

Mrs. Weis was not only a gracious lady and an able legislator—she, above all, was a dedicated American, loyal and true to the best that is in our heritage. Her work for and in behalf of the women of our Nation, and her efforts—long years of effort—in behalf of the Republican Party are well known. For these services, we are grateful.

Yet I think, perhaps, we shall all remember Judy Weis best as a person who brought a daily measure of sunshine into our lives, relieving the somber nature of our duties with her innate cheerfulness, her sparkling sense of humor, and her quiet faith. These things, above all, we shall miss.

In recent months, Judy must surely have known that her days on this earth were numbered. Yet, her serene acceptance of that fact, and her ability to carry on in the face of pain and discomfort, with a total absence of fear, stands as a remarkable inspiration to us all.

Dorothy Thompson, commenting on the death of a friend, once wrote:

> For only when one is no longer afraid to die is one no longer afraid at all. And only when we are no longer afraid do we begin to live in every experience, painful or joyous, to live in gratitude for every moment, to live abundantly.

Jessica McCullough Weis truly lived the "abundant life"—she lived her life to the fullest, and, in so doing, added immeasurably to ours. For this, we shall remember her with grateful affection. In that spirit, I should like to extend my sympathy in their loss—which is also our loss—to her children and grandchildren.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am especially saddened this morning to hear of the passing of Judy Weis. The State of New York and the United States have lost a distinguished public servant.

Judy had a remarkable warmth of personality. She had an integrity of public concept that was outstanding. To the very end of her life she concerned herself with matters of direct concern to the American people. I believe that her service in the House and as a national committeewoman was unusual and important.

I extend my deepest sympathy to her family. I believe that our Nation has truly lost a public servant who was a constant inspiration to those who had the privilege of knowing her. We have lost a great and gallant woman.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORTON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my friends who are paying tribute to the memory of our former colleague, Jessica Weis.

I had the pleasure of serving with her on a subcommittee of the District of Columbia. I was chairman of this particular subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no Member of the House who was more diligent in accepting her committee responsibilities than was our departed colleague.

Mr. Speaker, it would be interesting if at some time we could have a little bit more emphasis on the service of our colleagues through their committee efforts. Someone has said that legislation in Congress is legislation by committee. We who are in the House realize the consecrated, dedicated, and capable work of the chairmen of our committees and Members of Congress who are diligent in attending to the arduous, rigorous, day-by-day demands of committee work. I think we should pay special tribute to the Committee on the District of Columbia, the work of which is often unnoticed, you might say often unrecognized, and I am quite sure often unappreciated. I know of no District committee meetings which were held when I was a member when Mrs. Weis was not present.

She was charming, she was courteous, she was intelligent, she was able, she was surely one of God's noblewomen. I pay tribute to her memory and I offer my sincere condolences to her loved ones who are left behind.

Mr. HORTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, Judy Weis' friends have paid eloquent tribute to her great character, intelligence, charm, and ability. I would like to add one other thing which I feel Judy would not mind having me say. She was the best bridge player in Congress.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORTON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with my colleagues from the State of New York and around the Nation in paying tribute to this very gracious and good woman. I am delighted that the gentleman from Florida pointed out her activity as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia. I serve on the Committee on Appropriations and have had the opportunity to listen to Jessica Weis with respect to matters affecting the District and with respect to matters affecting her own district in New York. I remember some of the projects and public works that she was interested in.

She was always gracious and reasonable all the time. She has left a mark in this Chamber. With the rest of my colleagues I express my very deep sympathy to her family and grandchildren in this hour of their sorrow.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORTON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened beyond comprehension to learn of the death of "Judy" Weis, a great American.

I believe there are few people who have commanded more respect for their ability and who have enjoyed greater appreciation of their unselfish public service than Judy Weis. Her personality and friendly spirit attracted everyone who came in contact with her, and as a result, in a quiet, persuasive, but compelling manner, she accomplished many things that were constructive and for the benefit of her community and the country. She was sociable and enjoyed a good party but was never frivolous, and yet her sincerity was not oppressive to anyone. In fact, it was part of her distinctive charm.

It was my privilege to serve with her on the District of Columbia Committee, and her penetrating mind was most helpful in meeting the problems that came before us. Her constituency placed their trust in her and were rewarded by the dedicated service which she rendered them. It is little wonder that the political party of her choice selected her time and again for responsible office, and she discharged her obligations with zeal and fidelity.

Those who knew her have lost a wonderful friend whose courage and indefatigable spirit will always remain as an inspiration to carry on their work with the same devotion that she did. The world was made a better place during her life, and many citizens of the world have stronger faith in all that is good because of her unselfish work.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, this is a very, very sad day. The death of Jessica Weis is a tragic loss, not only to her beloved family but to the Nation as well.

Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with all of the remarks made here this afternoon on this very sorrowful occasion.

Mr. HORTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORTON. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened almost beyond expression to learn last night of the passing of Judy Weis. I was one of those who came to this Congress as a new Member in January of 1959, and I had the good fortune to have as my classmate the distinguished lady from the 36th Congressional District of New York, Jessica McCullough Weis.

Almost from our first day here, Judy, as we soon came to know her, was a leader in knitting our group together. Judy and my wife and I soon became fast and close friends, as she was, how shall I put it, sort of our kind of people. From her long experience on the political scene, which has already been mentioned here, she had a world of knowledge to draw upon in offering us, who were freshmen in this 86th Congress, advice as to how we, as a group, could be more effective in representing our districts and in working as a group to achieve legislative objectives here in the Nation's Capitol.

Judy was not overawed by the complexity of the congressional scene, the Government scene, the Washington scene. She had been around. She knew what she was getting into. She could advise us on what we were getting into. Judy was one of those rare individuals who had a sense of humor and a faculty to make friends with everyone, and she projected those facilities to our 86th congressional delegation. We soon became well acquainted with each other and established a friendship which will last for the rest of our lives.

Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to find words to express our thoughts or to add to what someone has already said when a friend and associate such as Judy crosses the great divide. But, I know that Judy lived in the realization of the host of friends she had and which she so justly deserved. Those of us who were privileged to know her are richer for our experience.

As current president of the Republican 86th Congress group—Judy served as president during the 87th Congress—I want to extend on behalf of the entire membership of our club most sincere sympathy to Judy's son, to her two daughters, and to her grandchildren.

Mr. HORTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, further words at this time are probably useless. We all recognize that Judy Weis was one of the most respected and highly regarded Members of this great legislative body. I happen to be one of those who came to the 86th Congress with Mrs. Weis. I think probably the highest tribute that I can pay to her is to describe her as a true and great lady. I knew her in her legislative capacity; I knew her socially. One of our colleagues mentioned her great ability to play bridge. I know she tolerated me, among others, in this endeavor. But she was such a gracious lady; she was tolerant and very well respected, and we will all miss her sorely in the days to come.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORTON. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I heartily agree in all that has been said about our departed colleague, Judy Weis. Her passing was a great shock to me.

Mr. Speaker, very soon after Judy came to this House she was recognized as a great and wonderful lady. She was a friend to all and admired and respected by all her colleagues. I always enjoyed visiting with Judy Weis. She was so down to earth and so genuine in all her doings and in all the things that were important in this world of ours. She will be missed by a multitude of friends and especially by her relatives.

Mr. Speaker, I extend to them my deepest sympathy, Judy Weis played the game of life honorably and well. God rest her soul.

Mr. HORTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORTON. I would be very happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of coming to Congress with Judy Weis. I feel that I learned a lot from her. I was very happy and glad to be associated with her. She was one of the real ladies who passed through my life, and I want at this time to pay tribute along with my colleagues to a great lady, Judy Weis.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened to learn of the death of Judy Weis. When she was serving here in the House with us she not only was extremely intelligent on legislation but she added sparkle and wit to our existence.

Knowing her was a grand experience. I am proud that she was a friend of mine. My deepest sympathy goes to her children.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened to hear this morning of the passing of our former colleague, Jessica McC. Weis, who so ably represented the city of Rochester. I was privileged to serve with Judy Weis on the Committee on Science and Astronautics where she made a splendid contribution to the work of that committee. She was a warm person and possessed a delightful sense of humor and keen intellect. We have missed her on the committee and in the deliberations of the House. I want to take this occasion to extend my deepest sympathy to her family.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened, as indeed were all who knew her, to learn of the passing of our friend and former colleague, Judy Weis. During the year of her service here in Washington, she continued a career of notable distinction. She was a woman of intelligence and a diligent worker, with a ready wit and rare charm that endeared her to all.

It has been said, perhaps not frequently enough, that more women should participate actively in politics. Judy Weis set an example which I hope more of the quicker sex will follow. Her contributions to the work of Congress were truly substantial, but merely by her presence she made this a more pleasant place in which to work. She proved what we sometimes tend to overlook, that progress depends not only on program and parties but on people. Her passing represents a real loss, not only to her family but to us all.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, it was sad, indeed, to read in this morning's paper that our former colleague, Judy Weis, had died yesterday.

When Mrs. Weis announced her retirement last June, she gave her health as the reason, and from that as well as from reports of those who had seen her lately, I suppose we should have been prepared, because it was known that she had failed very rapidly recently. Perhaps we should even feel grateful that she is now at rest after, if not a long, at least a most active and useful career. At least we can feel glad that her problems are over and certainly those of us who knew her can cherish the memory of a most charming, able, and intelligent lady—a truly outstanding personality.

My seat was next to hers in the Science and Astronautics Committee of the House, and there, and often sitting beside her in this House Chamber, I learned to enjoy and admire Judy Weis. She was always interesting and also always had a kind word and always, too, a bit of humor. But as much as for anything, I will remember her for her conscientiousness and the diligence with which she performed her duties here as a Member of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, a very wonderful American and active citizen has departed this life. She accomplished much for good in her lifetime and will be greatly missed.

My wife and I extend our profound sympathy to her family.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, we are saddened by the death of the Honorable Jessica McCullough Weis, a former colleague who entered these Halls with me in January of 1959. All who knew her were impressed with her ability and energy, with her devotion to duty, and with her love for her country.

Jessica Weis earned the right to sit in this Congress through her many years of public service and a firm belief in the principles of political activity that saw her rise high on the ladder of Republican politics. She was chairman of the Monroe County, N.Y., Republican Committee from 1937 to 1952; was president of the National Federation of Republican Women in 1940–41; was a member of the Republican National Committee; was a delegate at large to the Republican National Conventions in 1940, 1944, 1948, 1952, and 1956. She lent dignity and charm to the profession of politics, an institution in which she deeply believed and helped mold into a driving force for freedom.

While politics was perhaps the public field where she made her greatest visible contributions, Jessica Weis also is remembered by many others for her generous service in civic affairs, having served on a number of boards for charitable organizations.

And last, but certainly not the least, Mrs. Weis was a devoted wife to the late Charles W. Weis, Jr., and a proud mother of three children.

Jessica Weis was many things: statesman, lawmaker, politician, humanitarian, wife and mother. All who knew her will remember her with affection. We have lost a close friend. The Nation has lost a favorite daughter.

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHARTON. The Congress pauses from time to time to bow its head in tribute to a departed colleague, who has answered the call from the Almighty. Jessica McCullough Weis has joined the ranks of our deceased Members and, I am certain, the province of mankind. No eulogy is really adequate in such a case. The principles which guided her life speak for themselves, and hers is the final reward to which we all aspire.

As a distinguished Representative and a patriot of all women in the political arena, Judy Weis is without peer. Her House service, while short in years, will extend long into the future of this body, and I am certain that Members from both sides the aisle who knew her will join me in this tribute. As an advocate of mankind, she demonstrated time and again a sagacious mind, which won the respect of all with whom she came in contact.

The State of New York and all of her friends will miss her greatly. This House has already noted the gap created by her absence, for she alone was able to establish the woman's viewpoint on matters relating to space. This human approach to the field of apogees and perigees was invaluable.

We extend sympathy and condolences to the family.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, we were saddened by the news this morning that a dear friend and former colleague had passed away. When Judy Weis decided not to seek reelection last year there was a general feeling of deep personal loss among her many friends in Congress, which is exceeded only by the knowledge that never again will we be able to participate in the contagious and effervescent enthusiasm which she generated wherever she went. Her beloved city of Rochester and the New York district which she represented during the 86th and 87th Congresses share in this great loss.

I learned to know Judy Weis very well during my second term in Congress when she was the popular president of our 86th Club. Her fine personality proved to be the proper catalyst in welding a strong group feeling, and as a result the 86th Club was an active, effective organization. Her sparkle was evident in the plans and efficient management of our group gatherings. Since her retirement, the Members constantly have asked Judy's closer friends here in Washington about her life in political retirement in Rochester, where her interest in the welfare of her State and country was evidence by the active role she maintained in her home city to the very end.

To Judy Weis' family we extend our deepest sympathy, and we want them to know that the Nation and her many friends in Congress share their grief and loss.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, this is a very sad occasion for me and all who knew our former colleague from New York. Jessica McCullough Weis passed away yesterday afternoon in Rochester, and Mrs. Ostertag and I want to express to her children our heartfelt sympathy and condolences on the loss of their mother.

Judy, as she was known to so many of us, lived a lifetime of public service seldom equaled. She served her community, the city of Rochester, her State of New York, and her country with a devotion and a selflessness that one finds only among the truly dedicated. She served the Republican Party with honor and distinction in her community, in New York State, and in the Nation. Judy was president of the National Federation of Republican Women, and served as vice chairman of our Monroe County Republican Committee for 15 years. At the time of her death, she still served as Republican national committeewoman for New York State. As a delegate-at-large to six Republican National Conventions, Judy played many significant roles.

Judy filled many other important civic responsibilities. At home in Rochester, she served on the Women's Board of Genesee Hospital and the board of the Rochester Convalescent Hospital for Children. President Eisenhower appointed her to the National Civil Defense Advisory Council and to the Inter-American Commission of Women.

In Congress, Judy served as a Member of the House for the 86th and 87th Congresses, and made important contributions as a member of the Science and Astronautics Committee, the District of Columbia Committee, and the Government Operations Committee. On the Science and Astronautics Committee, Congresswoman Weis charted a pioneer course in her own right, being the first woman member to serve on this committee.

Yet, with all her public service, Judy was also a devoted wife and mother. She raised three fine children, who, I am sure, are grateful for having had such a mother.

For many years of my public life, it was my privilege to be closely associated with Judy in many matters of mutual concern. And, when she came to the Congress in 1959 from the congressional district adjacent to my own, we became neighbors and teammates, working together on many matters in the interest of our area. I found then that Judy typified my conviction of earlier years—she was a natural. A natural lady, a natural leader, a natural Member of Congress—a naturally all-round good person. I was proud and glad to call her colleague and neighbor.

Judy's associates in the Congress found her to be a good and true friend. Though she was a stanch defender of her convictions, those who held opposite political views always found her to be an honest and fair opponent. Judy held the admiration and respect of her colleagues and all official Washington.

During her lifetime, Judy Weis made an immeasurable contribution to the cause of good government and to the fundamental principles on which our country has become great.

All of us have lost a good and true friend, and the Nation has lost a grand and great American.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, we were saddened today by the word of the untimely passing of our former colleague, Jessica Mc. Weis. Along with Mrs. Weis and many other Members, we came to Washington at the opening of the 86th Congress, early in 1959.

We first became friends with Mrs. Weis as office neighbors, on the ground floor of the New House Office Building, not far from the New Jersey Street entrance. During the 86th Congress we learned to know Mrs. Weis not only as a good Congresswoman but also as a good neighbor. We enjoyed her neighborly visits and remarked to others about the way she carried her name on the door of her office. We often wondered what the abbreviated middle name stood for but we knew it was a family name and she was proud of it. In all things, she was a proud woman and carried herself proudly.

While I do not know all of the details about her wide experience before entering Congress, I do know that she must have enjoyed varied experience in several fields of endeavor because she demonstrated she was a most knowledgeable person.

One of her fine characteristics was her continual attitude of cheerfulness and friendliness. We served as members together, during the 87th Congress, on the House Space Committee. That committee deals with scientific and very serious subject matter but she would quite frequently inject a word of optimism about our national space efforts during the hearings by a well-timed remark. Her ready wit always eased the tension of the moment.

Because of service together on this committee, we learned of another most commendable characteristic of our late colleague, that of always seeking to be a peacemaker. The Space Committee is not regarded as a political committee but, frequently, there are controversial discussions breaking along what seems to be party lines. But always Mrs. Weis would enter the discussions with an effort to be a peacemaker and seek to compose the conflicting points of view.

Still another facet to the character of this good woman was her ability to be patient under circumstances that would cause others to lose their calm and self-containment. It was our good fortune to be one of the committees that made field trips to space installations including the Nevada testing grounds and the Atlantic missile range. On these occasions, when there was day after day delay of a proposed launching or test, discontent would result and sometimes sharp criticism by fellow members of the committee. But not our departed friend. She exhibited the rare quality of abiding patience at all times.

More could be said of the good things about this woman but these have already been enumerated by members of the New York delegation but we could not restrain ourselves from mentioning a few of the many good things we know about her.

Our sympathy goes to her survivors and we pray they may find consolation to sustain them in the knowledge that she was respected by all of her colleagues.

May the good Lord have mercy upon her, and her soul be at peace and rest which she has earned and so deserves.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, Judy Weis was more than just a Congresswoman. She was every bit a lady and would have been a credit to her country in any capacity.

Her many contributions toward making America a better place in which to live will never be forgotten. Knowing Judy Weis was an inspiration to me. Those she leaves behind, her children, have been given a great heritage. May their efforts continue in the same vein as their mother's.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, the life of Judy Weis was a blessing on us all. When grief entwines one's being, it is difficult, yet in a strange way comforting, to verbalize a eulogy. I salute my colleagues for the stirring expressions they have managed under these most torturous circumstances. I was so moved by the eloquent tributes of my colleagues that I find it beyond my power at this time to add or detract from their expressions.

Judy Weis was loved and respected in the Congress of the United States. She lives in our hearts today, and will hereafter, as she did when we shared daily the benediction of her smile, her voice, her presence. May God bless her and the loved ones she leaves behind.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Horton], in expressing our deep sorrow at the death of Jessica Weis. It is hard for me to realize that Judy has passed on.

I think of her as a lively, fun-loving, bright, attractive person. She had wit and charm, but most of all a supreme dedication to public service and the people that she represented.

The 36th district of New York is most fortunate in the unusually high caliber of Representatives it has had. Since World War II there has been our colleague in the Senate, Kenneth B. Keating, then Jessica Weis, and now Frank Horton. All have lent strength and luster to the district and given great representation to the people of their district.

In Judy we have lost a person who gave standards to her party, loyalty to her friends, and devotion to the free enterprise system. She well understood the energy and effort that is required to keep democracy and freedom alive, and she applied her energies accordingly.

Judy will be missed. Most of all she will be missed by her wonderful family. To my friend and classmate, and Judy's son, Charles M. Weis, and his two sisters, Mrs. Lindsay and I extend our deepest sympathy. I am sure they will be comforted in the realization of the contribution their mother made to America's well-being.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, it was with a deep sense of sorrow that I learned of the passing of Judy Weis, my dear friend and former colleague.

It was a genuine pleasure to serve with her here in the House, and Mrs. Riehlman and I treasured her friendship. Last year when Mrs. Weis announced her retirement from Congress because of ill health, all of us who worked with her were saddened. I worked with her on both the Government Operations and the Science and Astronautics Committees and can testify to her significant contributions.

She was a devoted and conscientious servant of the people and gracious to all who knew her. She was a fine lady in every sense of the word and an outspoken advocate of women's role in government and politics.

Mrs. Weis spent many years of her life working for the high ideals in which she believed, and her service will not be forgotten.

My deepest sympathy goes out to her family in their bereavement.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sadness that I learned of the death of my friend of longest standing in the U.S. Congress, the Honorable Jessica McCullough Weis.

Judy was a dear friend, one for whom I had the greatest admiration. The Nation's loss probably can best be stated by others, but my personal loss is very great indeed. Our acquaintance and friendship began back in 1948, and in all of the years that I have known Judy, she has put forth her finest efforts to make this Nation a better place in which to live.

To those of us who have had the honor and privilege of knowing her and working with her over the years, Judy will be sorely missed—and never replaced.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I mourn today the tragic loss to this Nation that occurred yesterday when a distinguished former colleague and friend of mine died at the much too early age of 62. I refer to the passing of Jessica McCullough Weis, who served two distinguished terms in this House and who at all times was generous to me and to my colleagues. She added to this House the charm that was hers in great measure.

The charm that she possessed did not in anyway prevent her from being an outstanding public servant. This charm did not prevent her from seeking the active life. In fact, she decided early to make her influence felt in our national life. It would have been easy for her to simply watch the passing parade. She would not have had to give up countless hours to the political process. But she did, and in living her life, she exemplified the highest ideals of public service.

She will be particularly missed in her adopted State of New York. She will be missed in this Chamber, and she will be missed throughout the land.

To me, she was a dear and devoted friend. I will miss Judy a great deal, and I will never forget her. Her devotion to public life, her enthusiasm and good spirit, made a great impression on all of us. It is good that we pause in memory of this great and good lady.

This morning's edition of the New York Times reviewed Jessica McCullough Weis' career, and I would like to make this part of the body of the Record.

Jessica McCullough Weis Dead—GOP Committeewoman, 62—Two-Term U.S. Representative From Upstate Held Civil Defense Advisory Post

Rochester, May 1.—Mrs. Jessica McCullough Weis, a two-term U.S. Representative and a Republican national committeewoman, died of cancer this afternoon at her home. She was 62 years old.

Mrs. Weis was elected to the House of Representatives from the 36th District in 1958, succeeding Kenneth B. Keating, now U.S. Senator. She had served on the House Science and Astronautics Committee. She was reelected in 1960 but did not run last year because of illness.

Surviving are two daughters, Mrs. William C. Warren 3d and Mrs. Cameron Jameson; a son, Charles McCullough Weis, a professor at Ohio Wesleyan University, and six grandchildren.

ENTERED POLITICS IN 1935

Jessica McCullough Weis was a stranger to politics until 1935, long after she began rearing family of a boy and two girls. Her husband, Charles W. Weis, Jr., to whom she was married in 1921 and who died in 1958, was in business and had no political leanings.

In 1935, Thomas E. Broderick, the Monroe County Republican leader, was looking for party workers. He named Mrs. Weis vice chairman of the citizens' Republican finance committee. The taste for politics became a consuming interest and Mrs. Weis led a successful campaign to raise funds for GOP coffers.

The next year she organized motor caravans to boost the candidacy of Gov. Alfred M. Landon, of Kansas, when he ran against Franklin D. Roosevelt in the 1936 presidential campaign. The same year she was named an alternate delegate to the Republican State convention.

Through the years, the Chicago-born Mrs. Weis served in various capacities on county committees and later was appointed to the State executive committee. In 1940 she was a delegate-at-large to the Republican National Convention. In all, she was a delegate-at-large at six national conventions.

The same year she was elected president for a 2-year term of the National Federation of Republican Women's Clubs. Her duties carried her across the Nation, meeting with many of the group's 350,000 members in 38 States.

Former President Dwight D. Eisenhower appointed Mrs. Weis a member of the National Civil Defense Advisory Council in 1953 and reappointed her 3 years later.

Wearing her "lucky dress," a royal blue wool that she had worn at high spots in her 1958 congressional campaign, Mrs. Weis was sworn in as a Member in the 86th Congress. She was reelected in 1960.

Once asked why she had embarked on her career, she replied:

"I really went into politics because I got tired sitting around the sitting room and objecting to the way things were being run. I decided I ought to do something about it or stop objecting."

While in the House, Mrs. Weis conducted a personal poll to help select a national flower. She reported that the rose won by a count of 6 to 1. The rose is the New York State flower.

Active in Rochester civic affairs, she served on the women's board of the Genesee Hospital and the board of the Rochester Convalescent Hospital for Children. Mrs. Weis was a member of the Rochester Business and Professional Women's Club and founder and president of the Chatterbox Club there. She also was the author of "Politics—U. S. A."

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, it has saddened all of us who served in the House with Jessica Weis to learn of her passing. She was a distinguished member, a most competent legislator, and a delightful person to know.

I had the pleasure of appearing with Mrs. Weis several times on panels, where she was a very able and knowledgeable speaker.

The loss of her gracious presence is felt by all of us, I know. Her fine qualities have left a lasting mark in the memories of those of us who were her colleagues.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply grieved to learn of the passing of our friend and colleague, Mrs. Jessica Weis. Mrs. Weis came to the Congress in the same year that I was honored by election to this body. We served on the same committee. I grew to know her well, and to respect the gentle determination, the loyalty and the dedication with which she carried out her legislative responsibilities.

Early in our first term, we were selected to participate in a panel here in Washington to discuss the political scene and political life with college students. I recall her animated interest in the topic and the very real faith she had in the people and their Government. It was a great pleasure to have joined her on this program.

She was a charming, pleasant and able member of this institution. In the long hours which our committee has spent in reviewing facets of the space program, she was diligent and hardworking. I knew of her distinguished career in her home area of Rochester, N.Y., her strong belief in political principles, her sincere and warm interest in charitable works.

Not long ago, when she was in Washington, she took time to call Mrs. Daddario and myself and we welcomed her thoughtful remembrance. She has left her mark and her image upon this body, and we are sorrowed by her passing.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege, though a very sad one, to join my colleagues in paying tribute to our late colleague, Jessica McCullough Weis, one of America's outstanding women. I know she will be mourned by all who were privileged to know her.

Throughout her lifetime and as a distinguished Member of Congress, she merited the high respect and esteem of her colleagues for her devotion and unstinting efforts for her country, her State, and constituency. Judy Weis loved our country and the institutions which have made us a great Nation. She fought diligently to protect our constitutional Government and preserve our national heritage. During the 87th Congress, it was my good fortune to become acquainted with Judy Weis whom I found to be a kindly person, generous in her advice and counsel to freshmen Members of Congress. I valued her friendship just as I admired her fine work, her wonderful qualities, and the contributions she made as a Member of the House.

Mrs. Weis was truly a great person, a great legislator and an outstanding lady. Mrs. King joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to the members of her family. Their sense of loss must be lighter realizing that it is shared by so many of us.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened to learn upon reading in this morning's newspaper of the passing of our lovely former colleague, the Honorable Jessica McCullough Weis, of the 38th District of New York. Judy Weis was a charming lady and a highly competent and respected Member of this body. Her son and daughters have our deepest sympathy in their great loss.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, the late Honorable Jessica McCullough Weis was a colleague of mine in the House of Representatives of these United States.

Mrs. Weis also served as my counterpart in the Republican Party of the State of New York—that of national committeewoman. In these capacities, I learned to know and respect her as a friend and associate. Her capability, intelligence, and understanding achieved renown which will be unmatched for a long, long time.

I have missed her and I am sure she will be missed by her many friends. I express my sympathy to her family. I am sure they believe, as I do, that their Judy is truly rewarded in her eternal home for all the good she did for others in this world—our temporal home.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, the passing of Mrs. Jessica McCullough Weis brings sadness to her legion of friends and, especially, to the Members of Congress who were privileged to know her as a capable and distinguished legislator and a warm personality.

Her dedication to good government at the community, State, and National levels stands as an inspiration to all of us.

I shall treasure the memory of her friendship, and I join with her host of friends in extending sympathy to her family.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, it is written in the Book of Job:

> The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away; blessed be the name of the Lord.

Truly blessed were we with His gift to us of Jessica Weis. She enriched the lives of all of us who were privileged to know her and to serve with her in the Congress. She was a lady of great personal charm and unusual ability. Her accomplishments were many, extending beyond these Halls of Congress, for the advancement of the public good. They are a lasting monument to her.

But now, the Lord, in His wisdom, has taken her away. We miss her deeply. We find it difficult to understand why she is no longer with us. We grieve, not for her but for ourselves. We need not grieve for her, for it is she who is now blessed with the peace and the joys in the life hereafter promised to such as she.

Mr. Speaker, Judy Weis was one of the finest women I have known. Her departure is a personal loss. I extend my heartfelt sympathy to her children, her grandchildren and her loved ones.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I join the Members of this body in an expression of the deepest sorrow over the death of our friend, and former colleague, Jessica McCullough Weis.

I was privileged to know and work with Judy Weis for over 20 years and I can say without qualification that her record of service to this Nation is unsurpassed. Few persons—male or female—have contributed more than our beloved Judy to the good fight to maintain and strengthen the two-party system. Always the lady—an epitome of femininity—her public life was a credit to the women of the Nation. Her great accomplishments will serve as a lasting memorial to her cherished memory. Judy's sincere concern for the welfare of her fellow man and for the future of our Nation, which she loved dearly, led her to direct her many talents and expend her boundless energy along the many avenues of public service into which her wisdom and perceptiveness directed her. She possessed some inate grasp of problems in all their complexity. Her beauty, her charm, her smile seemed to light up a room when she entered to participate in the matter at hand, and, in her wisdom, lead those present directly to the heart of the matter, shedding away the superfluous as if by magic.

I am proud to have been privileged to enter the Congress with this great lady and to have served with her in the subsequent Congresses. I shall always cherish my years of friendship with Judy, and the privilege of serving as her classmate in this House.

It was with heavy heart that I learned last year that she planned to retire on her doctor's advice. Now we are indeed saddened to learn of her untimely passing, but we take hope in the knowledge that her unflagging spirit will be a guiding light for those who carry on her many endeavors and will remain as a lasting tribute to the memory of this wonderful lady.

To her family and friends, I extend my very deep sympathy in this hour of sorrow. Her loss is felt throughout the Nation and we shall always cherish the loving memory of this great lady and fine human being.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the passing of Mrs. Jessica McCullough Weis.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules have until midnight tonight to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1963, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 5517) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—as I understand it this appropriation bill contains a legislative rider put on by the other body dealing with the $73 million Philippine claims deal.

Now, I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas what his attitude may be toward the solution of this deal?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, may I say to my distinguished friend from Iowa what we are seeking to do now is to appoint conferees, and I have no idea that the House conferees will be able to digest what the gentlemen at the other end of the Capitol have done before Monday morning. I want to assemble with my friends. Frankly, I do not know what is in the bill, but I have been told that the basic philosophy as to what our friends at the other end of the Capitol did is totally opposed to the philosophy of the House when the bill left this body.

Mr. Speaker, I see our distinguished friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], is present, and I would say if a little guessing is in order, I imagine the House conferees will certainly have a leaning to go along with the original philosophy as expressed in the House bill.

Mr. GROSS. Now, the gentleman is well aware of the fact that there has been a good deal of publicity relating to the charges, the allegations—call them what you will—of some form of payola, attending the passage of the legislation last year. I would like to see a real discussion of this bill on the floor of the House. I would like to have some understanding, if it is possible to have it with the gentleman, that some Members who opposed this bill originally, and others, perhaps, if they care to do so, will have some time in which to express their opinion as to the results of the conference when this matter is reported back to the House.

Mr. THOMAS. Why, certainly we will.

Mr. GROSS. The time is going to be under the control of the gentleman from Texas, but there is one way of getting 30 minutes for the minority for a discussion and that is by an objection now which would send it to the Committee on Rules. I do not want to object if I can be assured that when the conference report comes to the House there will be time for some of us who would like to do so to express our opinions on what has been done.

Mr. THOMAS. May I say to my friend that a little guessing is in order but I doubt that there will be the slightest difference of opinion on the question of fees; and as far as time is concerned we make a commitment now that our friend from Iowa will have time to express his views.

Mr. GROSS. I am not speaking for myself alone; I am speaking for others who may be interested. I would dislike very much to agree to the unanimous-consent request made by the gentleman now, and then see others precluded within reasonable time limitations, from speaking on this subject. I think the $73 million payment to the Philippine was ill advised from the start. I think deception has been practiced upon the Congress, upon those who supported the bill as well as those who opposed it, and particularly those who opposed it. I want to see this forced out into the open. I want to see it discussed on the House floor. I want to see as much as possible of the full hour on the conference report used to tell us the story of what has transpired with respect to this mess.

Mr. THOMAS. I think we can assure the gentleman that ample time will be available to discuss this matter in its entirety; I assure the gentleman of that now.

Mr. GROSS. We are running into altogether too many allegations of payola with respect to the operations of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. THOMAS. I can assure the gentleman now there will be some limitation on that point in the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. Thomas, Kirwan, Cannon, Bow, and Wilson of Indiana.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

May 2, 1963.

Hon. John W. McCormack,
The Speaker,
U.S. House of Representatives.

Dear Mr. Speaker: I hereby advise you of my resignation from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Sincerely yours,
Everett G. Burkhalter,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO COMMITTEES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Mills], I offer a resolution (H. Res. 332) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Armed Services: Everett G. Burkhalter, of California.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: Edward R. Roybal, of California.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor may sit today while the House is in session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Mills], who advises me that he has cleared this matter with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Byrnes], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means have until midnight Monday to file a report, including minority and supplemental views, on the bill H.R. 6009, to provide for the period ending June 30, 1963, and August 31, 1963, temporary increases in the public debt limit.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Cooley], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture have until midnight tonight to file reports on the following bills: H.R. 101, H.R. 40, and H.R. 3742.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight May 4 to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

SPECIFIC PLAN FOR OAS ACTION AGAINST CUBA

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the past few weeks have shown that the Organization of American States can be highly effective. A special OAS committee headed by Ambassador deLavalle, of Peru, is now completing its recommendations for OAS action against Communist Cuba, and with remarkable speed the OAS dispatched an investigation of the current turmoil in Haiti.

Use of this effective Organization is our most immediate recourse in the Cuban problem short of a direct confrontation with Soviet Russia. We cannot continue at the present rate of inaction. "Peaceful coexistence" with Castro simply means piecemeal takeover in Latin America through Communist salami tactics.

For this reason, U.S. leadership in the OAS must be increased to the same pitch it reached last autumn when we won the entire support of Latin America during the October missile crisis. We can win that support again with the same firm spirit.

I, therefore, urge again that the United States propose the following five-point plan to the OAS Council for adoption by the nations of the hemisphere:

First. Curb movement of Castro agents and propaganda throughout the hemisphere.

Second. Freeze Cuban Government funds now on deposit in Latin American banking institutions.

Third. Close the seaports of the hemisphere to nations engaged in sea trade with Cuba.

Fourth. Close airports of the hemisphere to airlines with flights into Cuba.

Fifth. Ban relay of telecommunications messages to and from Cuba.

I am today introducing legislation to express the sense of the Congress that the above plan be proposed to the OAS and adopted. The application of these steps will halt communism in this hemisphere.

MEXICO'S "CINCO DE MAYO"

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, May 5 is the anniversary of the day in 1862 when Mexican forces at Puebla beat back French troops in their march to capture Mexico City.

The Battle of Puebla is a chapter in the attempt of Napoleon III to establish an empire in Mexico with Maximilian of Austria on the throne.

The initial excuse for the French intervention was the refusal or inability of Mexico to meet its financial obligations. Mexico had signed a convention with Great Britain in 1842, and later with Spain and France, recognizing its indebtedness and agreeing to set aside a percentage of the customs receipts at Vera Cruz and Tampico for the payment of interest and principal, but as a result of repeated revolutions had defaulted on payments.

In June 1861, the great reformer, Benito Juarez, became President of Mexico. Finding hemself financially unable to launch the progressive economic and educational problems he had planned and in need of money to suppress continuing guerrilla fighting, Juarez, in July 1861, suspended for 2 years payment on foreign debts. France, Spain, and England—Mexico's principal creditors—responded in October 1861 with a convention in which they agreed to occupy Mexican ports and collect the customs duties to secure payments of debts. At the same time they forswore any violation of Mexico's territorial integrity or its political autonomy.

Troops of the three European countries landed at Veracruz in early 1862. Dissension among the allies revealed that the French were using the scheme of debt collection as a pretext for imperial conquest. The British and Spanish Governments, convinced of the duplicity of France, ordered the withdrawal of their armed forces from Mexican soil. The United States, although alarmed by the French maneuvers, was reduced by the Civil War to helpless protestations.

The French troops began a march to the Mexican capital, apparently under the impression that the Mexican people would welcome their intervention—a view assiduously cultivated in Paris by defeated Mexican monarchists and clerical supporters. At Puebla on May 5 the French encountered their first resistance by the republican forces of Mexico.

Although the Mexican victory at Puebla was only a temporary setback for the invading French—a reinforced French Army occupied Mexico City on July 10, 1863—Mexicans regard the battle at Puebla with great sentiment. The fact that Mexicans, armed with ancient weapons and inexperienced in modern warfare, could defeat Napoleon III's well-equipped and renowned troops created a surge of national pride in Mexico, served as a unifying force in a nation rent by civil strife, and became a symbol of Mexico's resistance to foreign tyranny.

POLICY DECISIONS

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I was impressed when I read Lyle C. Wilson's column, "Who Knew About Castro?" which appeared in the press yesterday. I was impressed because of the manner in which Mr. Wilson raised a question which has been of great concern to me for some time, not simply because of the Cuban situation, but because it fits a pattern.

I remember back in 1960, on the occasion of the U–2 incident, when I spent considerable time and made a conscientious effort to learn the identity of the individual who made the original decision to make the false announcement concerning the nature of the flight on which Powers was forced down. It was most embarrassing and humiliating to me, as one American citizen, to be forced to admit that the United States had been caught in a lie. I did not make the speech that I had written and which I had intended making on the floor of this House, largely because I do not approve of speeches made by persons who are either uninformed, misinformed, or partially informed. But, I did go to Mr. Allen Dulles, then head of the CIA and conveyed to him my views on this matter, telling him that I believed this big lie had done more to destroy the confidence of our friends in many parts of the world than any other one thing which had been done in recent years.

I not only told Mr. Dulles that I believed someone had committed a grievous error, but I felt very strongly that the person who had made this decision, should be removed from any policymaking position in our Government. Mr. Dulles declined, possibly with very good reason, to identify the person who had made this decision, and furthermore declined to say whether the decision had been made by someone in CIA, State Department, Department of Defense, or the White House. President Eisenhower accepted the responsibility, just as he accepted the responsibility for backing the Castro government, but in both cases, I think most people would agree that the decisions were made by someone in a much lower echelon. I realize that hindsight is always much more accurate than foresight, but I still contend that those individuals who are responsible for making such tragic errors of judgment, should not be permitted to remain in positions where they can continue to do damage to this Nation.

The recent report of the Comptroller General has pointed up this weakness in our system of government where we continue to keep in positions of responsibility men who are incompetent and have proved this incompetence through decisions which have cost this Government billions of dollars.

Some weeks ago I called to the attention of this House, decisions of the GSA and the Post Office Department, to build federally owned buildings, the cost of which cannot be justified by any stretch of the imagination. When I questioned a proposal in a prospectus issued by GSA in December, and pointed out some of the locations where I felt the expenditures could not be justified, they brought out a revised list, which omitted some 50-odd projects, and reduced the proposed expenditure from $32 million down to $20 million. An official in the Post Office Department was frank enough to admit that mistakes had been made, and that some of the projects could not be justified. Who made the original decision that they were justified? I have not been able to learn the identity of the person, and I doubt, Mr. Speaker, if you can learn.

Administrations change, but the policy remains the same. The policymakers are not Republicans and they are not Democrats—they are bureaucrats, regardless of which administration is in power. Particularly is this true in the State Department, and you have heard me from time to time speak of the arrogance of some of these in these policymaking positions who have appeared before committees of Congress.

I realize that the President cannot, and even the members of the Cabinet cannot, be familiar with every detail of administration of this Government, but I do say that when errors of judgment are made, and after they have been called to the attention of those who have to accept the responsibility, that some action should be taken to see that these mistakes are not repeated—at least not by the same incompetent individuals.

In closing, I would like to be assured that the individual who cleared Castro in the first place, and the man who made the decision to tell the big lie, is not still in a position where he can do further damage to this country of ours. I do not know that I would be as charitable as Mr. Wilson was in his column of yesterday when he closed with this comment:

> This guy is no Communist. Just dumb.

The column to which I have referred reads as follows:

WHO KNEW ABOUT CASTRO?

(By Lyle C. Wilson)

The prevailing humiliation and confusion of the United States invites some smart politician to ask a sharp question and to press for a clean answer. The question would be:

"How did this fellow, Castro, grab Cuba in the first place?"

This question would not launch a witch hunt. Neither would it be asked in a maneuver to tag some witless State Department understrapper as a subversive character with Communist tendencies. But it just might provide some valuable guidance for the future.

Enough is known of the State Department's attitude toward Fidel Castro when his revolution was developing to assure that it was not Communist subversion in the Department that caused the United States to foster Castro's takeover of Cuba on January 1, 1959.

It appears to have been stupidity. The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee went through the motions of investigating the State Department and the events within it that led up to the tragedy of Castro's Cuban triumph.

Not much, if anything, came of that investigation, other than many thousands of words. No investigation was needed to establish that U.S. intelligence agencies had Castro's number long before his triumphal entry into Havana. Years before that our agents knew that the Beard was in cahoots with the Communists.

Intelligence reports on Castro's Communist sympathies were submitted in detail to the White House, to the State Department and to the Pentagon. Another question, therefore, arises: Did the President and top officials know of these intelligence reports or were the reports diverted or suppressed?

The answers to that doubletrack question would be interesting. If the reports were submitted and neither the President nor his top aids got them, who did get them? And why were they diverted from the top men? And, if so diverted, by whom?

Those are fair questions. They should have been asked and answered long since. But these questions seem not even to have been asked.

The word here in Washington is that intelligence reports on Castro's Communist affiliations were submitted regularly for the guidance of administration policymakers. All of this, of course, was during the Eisenhower administration.

The word is not so clear as to who actually received these reports. There is evidence, however, that these reports did not reach the top where the decision was made to encourage Castro and then to recognize him on his entry into Havana.

Taxpaying stockholders in the Government of the United States may not believe that such things can happen here. But they do happen. It is reasonable to believe that understrappers in Government cut off the Secretary of State, the President, and perhaps the Secretary of Defense, from information vital to them in judging Castro.

Somebody in Congress should have the gumption to get some simple understandable answers to all of the questions raised by the Castro goof.

If it happened the way it seems to have happened, the guy responsible probably still is in Washington somewhere with a desk, a title and a salary from the taxpayers—ready, willing and able to do it again. This guy is no Communist. Just dumb.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, a good many millions of Americans each year celebrate the 3d of May as an anniversary day of freedom. They are the sons and daughters of Americans of Polish ancestry and Polish pride, who are still aware that in a Polish Constitution of 1791 the great doctrines of human freedom and national sovereignty were proclaimed deep in the continent of Europe.

It has been 172 years since Poland's people set forth the constitutional declaration that the purpose of the state must be to serve the will of those it governed, with the civil liberty of the citizens guaranteed.

This was a revolutionary declaration at the time and at the place, and it cut away the outmoded traditions of feudalism. The anniversary is observed by people of Polish ancestry throughout the world as the moment in history when their fatherland moved into the main current of modern concepts of government and society.

We have a special reason this year to spend a few minutes in recognition of the standard of constitutional freedom raised in Poland so many generations ago.

This is the centennial year of a great uprising in Poland against the foreign domination of the Russian czar.

The Polish people had little time after their constitution of 1791 to rebuild their society; the land and the government were taken over in 2 short years in the notorious third partition of the country between imperial Prussia and imperial Russia. The bulk of Poland's birthright went to the czar.

The Poles rose again and again in the long course of history against the occupying forces—just as they rose in 1944 when the Warsaw patriots revolted against the Nazi armies. In the 19th century, the greatest uprising was the revolt of 1863.

That year was memorable in history, for us as well as the Poles. It was the year of our Emancipation Proclamation.

In Poland, it meant the rising of the people against foreign garrisons. It meant the capture of arms and the other means of resistance. It meant 2 years of bloody and hard-fought insurgency in the name of freedom before powerful masses of the czar's armies moved in to suppress the rebels and hang the patriots. A quarter of a million sons of Poland were lost in the struggle—slain in pitched battles, executed, or captured and exiled to Siberia.

The spirit that motivated the insurgents of 1863 came from the doctrines embedded in and symbolized by the Constitution of May 3. That same spirit, we may be sure, lives in Poland today and finds its means of expression in many ways. We honor the cause of freedom everywhere by joining in this dual observance here—the anniversary of the 1791 Constitution and the centennial of the uprising of 1863.

SALUTE TO ISRAEL

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, it is safe to say that no state in all human history has contributed to mankind in 15 short years anything comparable to the contributions of Israel as an example of democracy, tenacity, and vitality.

The Israeli people, on their shelf of land in the cradle of civilization, have lived a life that is more eloquent than any attempt at verbal tribute. They have built a nation that is strong if small in population and area. They have stood as a bulwark of the concept of national sovereignty as well as the doctrines of human freedom. They have welcomed their people returning from the ends of the earth and demonstrated the validity of a good society united by an ideal.

It is a privilege for the rest of us, who share the concepts of our common ancient culture, to salute the State which has built its new foundations well and created a house which all men must gaze at with respect.

AMENDMENTS TO ANTIDUMPING ACT

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5692, introduced by Congressman WALTER, proposes many beneficial amendments to the Anti-Dumping Act of 1921. H.R. 5693 to H.R. 5701 are nine identical bills introduced in the House. Although the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman WALTER, covers such worthwhile projects as preventing dumping from Communist countries, the bill is silent on the subject of the Tariff Commission's interpretation of the statutory requirement that there must be an affirmative finding of "injury to an industry." The Tariff Commission has ruled that dumping duties should apply to cement imported from the Dominican Republic. It should be noted that this is only the fourth injury-to-an-industry ruling by the Tariff Commission since 1958, although literally a hundred complaints have been filed during this period. The usually negative results have undoubtedly discouraged many U.S. manufacturers from filing complaints. In other words, the Tariff Commission's interpretation of "injury" has made the act generally ineffective.

If a U.S. manufacturer has a diversified line of products, it is practically impossible to find injury to the industry, although the market for one product may have been ruined by dumping. For example, if dolls are dumped by a foreign manufacturer into the U.S. market, it is most difficult to find injury to the toy industry with its diversified line of products. The same complaints have been voiced by the pottery industry, the electronic industry, and the fabricated steel products industry. Therefore, the Tariff Commission should be directed by legislation to interpret "injury to industry" to mean "an injury to a product of an industry or to an industry." Only if section 201(a) is so amended will the essential intent of the Anti-Dumping Act be made effective in blocking the importation of products made by cheap foreign labor and exported to this country by foreign producers who have surpluses to dispose of at any price.

Today, I have introduced a bill which would make effective the Anti-Dumping Act by providing that if the sales of a product by a member of an industry is being or is likely to be injured, the Tariff Commission should find that this is an injury which would justify application of the antidumping law. This is indispensable to making the present law effective.

PROPOSED MIDSESSION BUDGET UPDATING

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's press reports of Treasury Secretary Dillon's remarks to the annual meeting of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce here in Washington on the state of the economy and the outlook for its effect on Treasury revenues underscore precisely the kind of changing circumstances to which I called attention when I introduced House Joint Resolution 129 on the day the President submitted his 1964 budget to the House. The Secretary's public statement, 4 months after the budget came up, that the revenue outlook for fiscal 1964 is perhaps a billion dollars brighter than the President's January budget assumptions is precisely the kind of disclosure the President ought to make to Congress. And that is precisely what House Joint Resolution 129 is designed to require. It is well and good that the chamber in its deliberations, and others, should have authoritative, up-to-date information on the revenue, spending, and tax outlook, but, Mr. Speaker, the President's budget for 1964 is pending before the Congress, not the chamber of commerce. The President's January budget estimate of $86.9 billion of Treasury revenue for fiscal 1964, based on certain economic assumptions, is the last official word from the President, and if it is out of date, Congress ought to be told—and told in time to take the new outlook into account in considering spending and tax legislation.

As I say, Mr. Speaker, that is precisely the sort of budget updating I had in mind in introducing House Joint Resolution 129. You will recall that last year the President projected a small budget surplus of $458 million in his original January budget. Before summer arrived, virtually every competent authority was predicting a deficit instead of a surplus. And as we know, the latest official Presidential prediction is an $8.8 billion deficit estimate for the current fiscal year 1963. In the meantime, Congress proceeded with spending legislation under the official illusion of a budget surplus.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that Secretary Dillon's disclosure will impress upon the committee the merit of enacting House Joint Resolution 129 to require the President, at the midsession point, to update the annual January budget so that we will be in position to more intelligently process spending and revenue legislation.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader as to the legislative program for the balance of this week and also next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, we have finished the legislative business of this week and it will be my purpose to ask to adjourn over until Monday at the conclusion of this announcement.

Monday is Consent Calendar Day.

There are also three bills to be considered under suspension of the rules:

H.R. 3887, authorizing acceptance of a land donation in North Carolina for the construction of an entrance road at Great Smoky Mountains National Park.

H.R. 101, to extend for 2 years the definition of "peanuts" which is now in effect under the Agriculture Adjustment Act of 1938.

H.R. 40, to assist the States to provide additional facilities for research at the State agricultural experiment stations.

Tuesday is Private Calendar Day.

There will also be called up for consideration House Joint Resolution 245, providing that Members of Congress shall be limited to per diem allowances and necessary transportation costs in connection with travel outside the United States, and for other purposes, under an open rule with 1 hour of debate and waiving all points of order.

On Wednesday there will be called up for consideration H.R. 5555, military pay increase.

For Thursday and the balance of the week, H.R. 6009, to provide, for the periods ending June 30, 1963, and August 31, 1963, temporary increases in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act.

H.R. 950, amending the Internal Security Act of 1950 to provide for maximum personnel security in the National Security Agency.

This announcement, of course, is subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program or any change in the program may be announced later.

Mr. MacGREGOR. I thank the majority leader.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks in the body of the RECORD on Polish Constitution Day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL, NEUTRALITY, AND CUBA: UNEXPLAINED CONTRADICTIONS

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, recent actions being taken by the Justice Department, the Immigration Service, and the Coast Guard to harass, capture, and confine Cuban refugees in their attempt to carry on the fight against Fidel Castro and his Communist regime in Cuba appear to be clearly inconsistent with the Attorney General's own interpretation of the neutrality laws. Two years ago today, at the time of the unsuccessful Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba, Robert F. Kennedy stated to the press:

> Second, the neutrality laws were never designed to prevent individuals from leaving the United States to fight for a cause in which they believe. There is nothing in the neutrality laws which prevents refugees from Cuba from returning to that country to engage in the fight for freedom. Nor is an individual prohibited from departing from the United States, with others of like belief, to join still others in a second country for an expedition against a third country.

Since there have been no allegations or proof of any raids or supply activities originating on American soil, the effects of the Kennedy administration's present activities is to stop Cuban refugees from doing precisely what the Attorney General has said they have a right to do. No explanation has been given as to this complete reversal of policy and law. An explanation is long overdue. The law should not become a pawn of international politics. I would hate to see "managed justice" take a place beside "managed news" in the arsenal of Government control.

The closing down of Cuban exile bases in the Caribbean by combined British and American efforts is reported to have limited the movement of supplies to the anti-Castro underground on the island. It is ironic that on the second anniversary of the Bay of Pigs defeat, credited with destroying the organization and morale of the anti-Castro movement at that time, the administration should again be taking steps which may have similar results.

Administration leaders still talk of freeing Cuba. Only last Monday, April 15, Ambassador Stevenson told the Council of the Organization of American States that "Cuba's freedom will be restored." The President himself on February 7, 1963, told a news conference that the two ways of removing Castro would be "by the Cubans themselves" or "by external action." Reasonable men agree that external action on our part should be avoided if at all possible. I cannot understand, therefore, why the administration insists on taking steps, not required by law, to thwart its own desired method of eliminating communism in Cuba.

I am in complete agreement that the neutrality laws, as they stand, should be enforced, under the Attorney General's interpretation of 1961. This would mean continuing the vigilance that has already been effective in preventing any armed excursion launched directly from our shores. There is a need, however, to reexamine the neutrality laws to see if there is any way in which discretion would be appropriate in their administration for specific cases. As Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs, Edwin M. Martin, remarked on April 16:

> We must not allow ourselves to be paralyzed into immobility by inapplicable dogmas of yesterday.

Two years ago, the Attorney General, speaking of the neutrality laws, said:

> Clearly they were not designed for the kind of situation which exists in the world today.

Two years have gone by, and not one recommendation to bring these laws into harmony with today's world has been sent to Congress from the Justice Department.

If the present neutrality laws stand in the way of action to eliminate a regime that the Organization of American States has branded as "incompatible with the inter-American system" then change should be considered. There is precedent within the present law for making an exception where the Western Hemisphere is concerned. A change in the law does not necessarily mean that the United States would be used as a base of operations. However, a legal relaxation might make it possible for American citizens to volunteer contributions to the anti-Castro effort, or allow groups to recruit among the exiles within this country.

At the very least, a reaffirmation of the Attorney General's 1961 interpretation of the neutrality laws is called for, or else the American people should have the benefit of a full explanation and debate on the apparent sudden change of heart now evidenced by administration deeds, not words. I do not believe that our Government should hypocritically flout its own laws. The same applies, however, to interpretations from the highest legal office within our Government.

Now, a rift has developed between Dr. Jose Miro Cardona and the State Department which has culminated in the withdrawal by Dr. Cardona from leadership of the Cuban Revolutionary Council. I want to make it clear that my statement has no connection with this event. It is unfortunate to lose a man such as Dr. Cordona, yet I am sure that the exile movement would agree that no one man is indispensable. What is indispensable, however, is a consistent policy on the part of the United States toward the anti-Castro Cubans and the ultimate agreed-upon goal of eliminating communism in Cuba. Both consistency and policy have been sorely lacking on the part of the Kennedy administration.

KENNEDY AIM SEEMS TO BE COMPLETE CONTROL

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, if we listen carefully to the many speeches of President Kennedy we find a most ominous pattern developing. If the plans he outlines in carefully couched terms so as to make them palatable are carried through, the end will be complete Federal control over the lives of every individual citizen and local community. We are, indeed, moving very close to dictatorship in America.

In a recent speech, largely ignored in the news stories and completely overlooked by most of the people, President Kennedy talked about a mythical suburb, "Random Village." In this little analogy President Kennedy told how life would be under his programs and in glowing terms how hardly a single resident would escape being completely enveloped in the embrace of the Federal Government.

The many subtle changes President Kennedy is bringing about in free America are hardly noticeable in the present budget, but they are surely destined to grow into multibillion-dollar enterprises from which none of us escape.

Consider for a moment the wide range of human endeavor, once the prerogative of freemen, that is now being drawn into the Federal orbit at the insistence of President Kennedy—programs in education, mass transit, juvenile delinquency, employment training, hometown youth corps, National Service Corps, medical aid, food distribution, employment service. And these do not include the tightening controls around our once free farmers.

However sugar coated the presentation by President Kennedy is, there is no doubt of the final Kennedy aim. It is to expand the Federal Government's services to the individual, the family and the community. In short, to substitute for freedom the judgment and the dictation of John F. Kennedy. Now does it sound so fantastic when we say that the policies and programs being pushed by President Kennedy are bringing about a dictatorship here?

The trend must be reversed before the President's aims are realized. Congress must reassert the powers delegated to us by the Constitution. The people must be aroused to take whatever appropriate action possible under the Constitution to stop dictatorship before it is too late.

PROFILES IN COURAGE

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARSHA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to a recent article that appeared on April 14, 1963, in one of Ohio's leading newspapers.

This article and the courageous actions by its subject, Gov. James A. Rhodes, certainly are enlightening, to say the least, in contrast to the policies being advocated today in Washington.

As opposed to policies of increased Federal expenditures and increased Government employees, we find at least one man in these United States with enough commonsense to realize that government, to be successful, must live within its income.

Governor Rhodes obviously believes in the dignity and independence of the individual. He feels that most self-respecting Americans choose to do things for themselves, and that to tax and tax and spend is to deprive the individual not only of his livelihood but of his freedoms and self-respect.

Mr. Speaker, Governor Rhodes is a man who has the courage of his convictions and by his actions is demonstrating his statesmanship. Official Washington could well take a page from his "book."

Mr. Speaker, I include in my remarks the article to which I refer and commend it to my colleagues.

GOVERNOR RHODES IS SHAKING THINGS UP

(By Haskell Short)

COLUMBUS, OHIO.—Gov. James A. Rhodes, to use one of his favorite expressions, is "shaking things up" in national political circles by practicing the economy he believes politicians forget when they take office.

Ohio's new Republican Governor showed he meant business when he fired about 3,500 recently employed State employees his first day in office. By June 30, about 7,000, or most of those added to the payrolls in the past year, will be gone.

Among Rhodes' other shaking-them-up tactics are a 9.1 percent across-the-board cut in welfare spending, a balanced budget without new taxes, a planned reorganization of State government, and an ambitious program to get new industry for the State.

As Governor of a big State, Rhodes almost automatically becomes a major figure in next year's jockeying for the Republican presidential nomination—at least as top man in an important delegation to the Republican National Convention.

TALKS ABOUT PROBLEMS

In his austere office, which seems more like an echo chamber, he spoke of the problems and programs he sees for Ohio.

"Somewhere, sometime government must learn to live within its income," the 53-year-old Governor said. "It must learn that deficit spending does not provide jobs for the people. It must learn to allow people to do some things for themselves instead of taking their tax money and trying to do everything for them."

Rhodes said he found State finances "in a mess" when he became Governor January 14. A firm of certified accountants reported the State had an $80 million deficit, that many bills were unpaid, that 7,500 employees had been added within the past year, and that spending was about $5 million a month more than revenues.

"That meant that to keep spending at the current level and pay the debt we would need $200 million in new taxes in the 2 years beginning July 1," Rhodes said.

"I do not believe we needed new taxes which already are burdensome enough, so we had to cut spending and stop the drifting that was all too obvious in State government."

WANTS EXPENSES CUT

He told Finance Director Richard L. Krabach, who wears a miniature gold hatchet with a bloodstained blade as a tie clasp, to cut expenses and balance the budget.

Krabach ordered a 9.1-percent slash in spending. He scrapped budget requests totalling about $100 million left by the DiSalle administration.

Welfare payments were cut, most of them to what they were last October 1 when former Gov. Michael V. DiSalle raised them a month before election. Rhodes said the cut would force counties which run the program to improve their operations.

The Governor then gave the legislature an appropriations bill calling for $1.282 billion in the 2 years beginning July 1. It was $53 million above current spending, with 90 percent of the money earmarked for education, mental hygiene, and welfare programs. Highway programs are financed out of the gasoline tax and were not included in the budget.

Rhodes' top objective and No. 1 campaign plank was industrial development to get the State's economy moving. Ohio leads the country in the number of persons on relief and has fewer people productively employed than in 1957 although the population has increased.

HELPS INDUSTRY

He is creating an industrial development authority which will issue bonds to help finance plant construction. It also is telling the country about Ohio's resources and potential from offices being opened in major cities around the country.

Rhodes will not discuss the future, but his friends suggest that in 1968, when he will be in the middle of his second term and ineligible under the State constitution to seek reelection, he could be an impressive national figure.

But Rhodes, sitting there in a short-sleeve shirt in the big bare office, brushes off talk of presidential politics as easily and bluntly as he dismisses spending proposals.

"I spent 25 years getting here," Rhodes said. "I wanted to be Governor and that is the opportunity the people gave me. I want to do the best job I can in this office and that will take all of my time."

SURVEY SHOWS STRONG DESIRE FOR ACTION IN CUBA

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, most west central Illinois citizens want the United States to do whatever is necessary, even to the point of military action, to assure a non-Communist government in Cuba, according to the first tally in my annual survey of home district opinion. My staff is mailing questionnaires to names selected at random from telephone directories, and the first tally covers 5,899 replies.

Those expressing an opinion were 8 to 1 for action on Communist Cuba.

By about 4 to 1, they oppose $5 billion for foreign aid, the Domestic Peace Corps, compulsory acre-bushel control of farming, and cutting income taxes if spending is not cut.

By 22 to 1, they would require secret ballot approval by union members before a union can call a strike.

By 2 to 1, they oppose the $5.3 billion 5-year proposal for general school aid.

Here is the tally:

	Yes	No	No opinion
Should the United States do whatever is necessary (even to the point of military action) to assure a non-Communist government in Cuba?	4,840	580	479
Should income taxes be cut if Federal spending is not cut?	1,025	4,608	258
The new budget calls for about $5,000,000,000 for foreign aid. Do you approve?	656	4,896	340
The President proposes $5,300,000,000 (over 5 years) in new Federal spending for schools (including teacher salaries). Do you approve?	1,940	3,682	264
Should secret-ballot approval by union members be required before a union can call a strike?	5,423	235	228
The President proposed a 5,000-member corps (known as the Domestic Peace Corps) to work in community social problems. Estimated annual cost, $20,000,000 to $30,000,000. Do you approve?	1,057	4,449	385
Do you favor compulsory acre-and-bushel control of farm production (similar to that in the upcoming wheat referendum)?	1,076	4,351	468

Mailing of the questionnaires is not complete, and a final report will probably be made about June 1.

MAY 3: FREE POLAND'S NATIONAL HOLIDAY

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, May 3 represents the 172d anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution. This historic document symbolizes the spirit and hopes of the Polish people. All over the United States, in Cleveland, and New York, in every town and hamlet, wherever Americans of Polish descent reside, this holiday is observed with appropriate exercises thoughout the month of May, to pay tribute to the courageous people of Poland. It is also an excellent reminder lest we become too complacent about our own freedom.

But the year 1963 is of even greater significance because 100 years ago occurred the Polish January uprising. There have been many Polish uprisings against Russian tyranny, both before and since 1863. However, this one was the longest and bloodiest in history. During the night of January 22, 1863, units of Polish insurgents attacked Russian garrisons in many localities and captured considerable amounts of arms and ammunition. However, 350,000 seasoned troops of the regular Russian Army were rushed in and crushed the Polish insurgents. In our own lifetime we have witnessed similar Communist brutality, not only in Poland, but also in Hungary and East Germany.

Poland, whose history dates from 966, was once a free nation and we can be confident that a free nation in Poland will be born again. It is an honor and a privilege for me to join my colleagues in this occasion to salute the Polish people and pay tribute to the spirit of the May 3 constitution.

POLAND'S CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. **MILLER** of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is ironic that sadness and frustration must mark another observance of a great event in mankind's quest for freedom—the adoption of Poland's Constitution on May 3, 1791.

Elation should accompany this occasion. But any suggestion of joy is cruelly overshadowed by the grim fact that for 172 years an heroic, enlightened people have been forced to witness brutal rejection of their right of self-government.

Through the years the Polish people have suffered unbelievable tortures and setbacks, fighting in vain against the overwhelming odds of aggressive tyranny. What they have wanted—what they fought and died for—was not power reaching across the borders of neighbors, not fulfillment of dreams of grandeur. What they wanted was merely finalization of an assertion of democracy as expressed in the words of a constitution barely 2 years after our own.

It said:

> All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

Mr. Speaker, these are the Poles. These are the patriots we salute today. These are the millions who are enslaved by Communist Russia. These are the warriors of liberty who lost 250,000 of their sons 100 years ago when they resisted another form of Russian tyranny, these are the people who resisted the Nazi occupation in 1944. That spirit of resistance is alive today, and in its fire there is a prophecy of hope for the future. The Poles will not be denied, and it is up to their friends in the free world to see that they are not.

In the United States, Poles are wrapped up in our destiny. We are the adopted homeland of 7 million of them. We are the beneficiaries of their fighting spirit beginning with Kosciuszko and Pulaski, who volunteered their services when America fought for its independence. In World War I and World War II countless thousands served with our Armed Forces.

We are indebted to Polish-Americans for contributing to the growth and development of the United States. We owe them our gratitude as loyal American citizens.

So today we say to them, we remember 1791; remember it with reverence and a determination to do whatever we can to make sure future years will find them prospering as a partner in the free world, not suffering as captives of atheistic communism.

WOOL NUMBERS GAME—WHO'S NEXT?

Mr. **MacGREGOR.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. **CLEVELAND.** Mr. Speaker, on Monday and Tuesday of this week, I commented here on the shutdown of the Dartmouth Woolen Mills, Inc., in Claremont, N.H.

Now comes news of the closing of the Cyril Johnson Woolen Co. in Strafford Springs, Conn., another forward step toward the New Frontier.

Mr. Speaker, throughout New England, thousands of workers and countless communities are wondering, who will be next? How many jobs will be lost in New England's wool industry next week?

President Kennedy has promised action to aid the wool industry; he has been promising for 2 long years. The crisis deepens, but no help comes.

All wool asks is the same treatment which was given cotton in 1961. All wool asks is equal treatment and fairplay. New England woolworkers do not want handouts. All they want is their jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I have today received from the National Association of Wool Manufacturers the following grim account of what the administration's broken promises have done, so far, to the wool industry:

THE GRIM STORY OF GOVERNMENT INACTION, RISING IMPORTS, AND 13 WOOL TEXTILE MILL LIQUIDATIONS

The commitment: White House letter of August 7, 1962, to NAWM:

"Limitation of textile imports to prevent market disruption is an essential element of administration policy. We intend to implement this policy with regard to all textiles, and particularly to prevent market disruption such as would result from an increase over current levels of imports."

No action has been taken, however, and 1962 wool product imports reached a record high. The influx in 1963 exceeds that in the same 1962 period. Mill closings reported in the press since August 7, 1962, total 13, as follows:

YEAR 1962

October: Charlottesville Woolen Mills, Charlottesville, Va.; woolen cloth.

November: Grosvenordale Woolen Mills, North Grosvenordale, Conn.; woolen cloth.

December:

Bonin Spinning Co., Woonsocket, R.I.; woolen yarn.

French-American-British Woolens, Newburgh, N.Y.; woolen cloth.

YEAR 1963

January:

Mapleville plant, Stillwater Worsted Mills, Mapleville, R.I.; worsted cloth.

Yale Woolen Mills, Yale, Mich.; woolen cloth.

February:

Jonathan Ring & Co., Philadelphia, Pa.; woolen yarn.

Yorkshire Worsted Mills, Lenni, Pa.; worsted cloth.

Northfield Mills, Northfield, Vt.; woolen cloth.

March:

Shamokin Woolen Mills, Shamokin, Pa.; woolen cloth.

Marland plant, J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc., Andover, Mass.; woolen cloth.

Samuel Hird & Co., Clifton, N.J.; wool tops.

April: Cyril Johnson Woolen Co., Stafford Springs, Conn.; woolen cloth.

NEWS RELEASE CONCERNING PLIGHT OF WOOLEN INDUSTRY, APRIL 26, 1963

Mr. Ronald A. Mitchell, president of the Cyril Johnson Woolen Co., announced today the closing of the Stafford Springs, Conn., plant in its 75th continuous year of operation.

His announcement to the employees reads as follows:

"It is with great regret that we, today, announce the closing of the Cyril Johnson Woolen Co. Orders for our customers and commitments for fabric for our Government's military requirements will be completed during the next few months and then operations will be discontinued. The many improvements that we have made have still been insufficient to reverse the long downward trend of this company.

"The Cyril Johnson organization with its 250 employees has taken action in all phases of its business to improve its position and reverse the trend but without success.

"It looked for some action by our Government to control the imports of woolen fabrics and garments. Nothing has been done, and there seems to be little hope that effective action will be taken. In the meantime, the tremendous and uncontrolled increase in imports from low-wage countries has disrupted the markets for the high-quality fabrics produced by Cyril Johnson.

"The closing of this fine quality American mill is a great misfortune for its people and this community.

"We hope the administration will take some positive and prompt action to control imports within reasonable limits so that these liquidations will not continue."

FEDERAL AID HIGHWAY ACT

Mr. **MacGREGOR.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. **CLEVELAND.** Mr. Speaker, one of the major problems and costs of our present highway program is the acquisition of the necessary rights-of-way. It was estimated in 1960 that the cost of the necessary real property to complete the Interstate System would be approximately $4.6 billion, or nearly 15 percent of the total remaining cost of the Interstate System. In addition to the matter of cost, other aspects of right-of-way acquisition have proved troublesome. Because of inconvenience and hardships of persons and businesses displaced by highway construction, Congress enacted as a part of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1962, a provision providing for relocation advisory assistance and the payment of moving costs. Because of many questions as to the adequacy of the existing laws and regulations under which real property is acquired for all the various Federal and federally assisted programs, the Public Works Committee in 1961 created a Select Subcommittee on Real Property Acquisition to exhaustively research and analyze all existing laws and regulations and submit appropriate recommendations. The work of the select subcommittee is expected to be completed next year.

Regardless of what recommendations may be submitted by the select subcommittee, one fact is obvious: Costs can be greatly reduced and many other problems alleviated, if not entirely eliminated, by acquiring highway rights-of-way well in advance of actual construction. People living in the shadow of approaching highways have the right to know just what land the State is going to buy and to get their compensation as soon as possible so they can plan for the future.

The cost of property is constantly increasing. In addition, property which is vacant today may be improved with apartment buildings, supermarkets, or other expensive developments by the time the State highway departments are ready to proceed with highway construction. In order to conserve Federal and State funds to the greatest degree possible, it is essential that the States be enabled to acquire property needed for rights-of-way at an early time when it can be purchased at a comparatively low cost, rather than being forced to wait until the property has increased drastically in value.

The Congress recognized this at the time it enacted the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956. That act included a section making it possible for the States to use Federal aid highway funds apportioned to them to acquire rights-of-way in anticipation of construction, providing such rights-of-way were used for the actual construction of a road within a period not to exceed 5 years.

It soon became apparent that the 5-year period was probably not adequate. Accordingly, my good friend and able colleague, the gentleman from Florida, the Honorable WILLIAM C. CRAMER, introduced a bill, H.R. 4695, 86th Congress, to increase the period to 7 years. This bill was enacted as Public Law 86-35.

Despite this action, the States have not, to a satisfactory extent, taken advantage of this means of acquiring highway rights-of-way well in advance of actual highway construction. This is because the States are anxious to devote available State and Federal funds to actual construction rather than to tie up susbtantial amounts in rights-of-way which may not be used for highway construction for several years. Some of the States are having difficulty in meeting the matching requirements of the Federal aid highway program and simply do not have sufficient funds to undertake an orderly and thorough program of advance right-of-way acquisition.

To solve this problem, and to assist and encourage the States to proceed with advance right-of-way acquisition, it is necessary that a source of funds be made available. To accomplish that purpose I am introducing a bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to advance Federal aid highway funds to any State for early right-of-way acquisition. The funds would be advanced free of interest charges and would not be charged against current Federal aid apportionments, but would be repaid by the State when actual construction on the right-of-way is authorized, or at the expiration of a period not to exceed 7 years, or on September 30, 1972, whichever shall occur first. The total amount outstanding at any one time would not be permitted to exceed $200 million.

If this bill is enacted into law and the proposed source of funds made available, the States would be able to undertake comprehensive programs of advance right-of-way acquisition without delaying the construction program. The States would be able to purchase the necessary real property before it increases drastically in cost because of general economic conditions or because of the erection of valuable improvements. This would effect substantial savings of both State and Federal funds.

The few States which have undertaken advance right-of-way acquisition programs have demonstrated that phenomenal savings can be realized. For example, the State of California, in 1953, established a $30 million revolving fund known as the "right-of-way protection fund." In testimony before the special Subcommittee on the Federal Aid Highway Program during March of 1961, Mr. Frank Balfour, formerly chief right-of-way-agent for the California Department of Public Works, Division of Highways, testified that by using this fund for the advance acquisition of rights-of-way, the State had saved approximately $250 million during the 8 years since creation of the fund.

Mr. Speaker, my bill would permit other States to undertake a program similar to that of California. I sincerely hope that the Congress will give it early and favorable consideration.

EQUAL PAY FOR WOMEN LEGISLATION

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor this afternoon to announce to the House my gratification that it now appears likely that sound equal pay for women legislation will be enacted this year.

On March 25, 1963, I introduced H.R. 5110. This was the only bill in the Congress placing administration of equal pay for women under the Fair Labor Standards Act. It was a radical departure from the administration's proposal embodied in the Green bill, H.R. 3861, and the Thompson bill, H.R. 4269. On April 10, 1963, I introduced H.R. 5605, a slight modification of my original bill, but retaining the Fair Labor Standards Act approach.

It is my understanding that the administration has now endorsed my approach to this important legislation. The subcommittee has adopted that approach. I want to congratulate the subcommittee on its significant action in this respect. I am informed that the subcommittee bill, as amended, is identical to my bill in all major respects. The only variations are, in my opinion, of no great significance.

Aside from placing the enforcement of equal rights for women under the Fair Labor Standards Act, several other significant aspects of my bill, H.R. 5605, have been adopted in subcommittee:

First, the concept of equal pay for equal work has been expanded to include equal effort, responsibility, and working conditions in addition to equal skills.

Second, the common procedure of payment based on quantity or quality of production usually referred to as "piece work" is specifically excepted from the operation of the bill.

Third, reasonable differentials based on a factor or factors other than sex are excluded.

Fourth, the power of the Secretary to issue wide-ranging regulations is eliminated.

Fifth, a 1-year moratorium on enforcement of the act will give ample opportunity for voluntary compliance.

Sixth, and finally, recognition is given of the special problem created by existing collective bargaining agreements by providing that enforcement proceedings will be undertaken only at the expiration of such agreements or a maximum of 2 years after enactment.

I sincerely trust that this Congress will, on a bipartisan basis, enact sound and workable legislation to promote equal pay for women. I believe the action of the Special Subcommittee on Labor has taken a long stride toward accomplishment of this commendable objective. It now appears that the full Education and Labor Committee will report favorably on a good equal pay for women bill this afternoon.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I strongly believe that sanctions regarding conflicts of interest applicable to the executive branch of our Government should also apply to the legislative branch. To further this belief, I am pleased to state here the full nature of my financial interests and income.

My congressional salary provides more than 90 percent of my income.

I am an entirely inactive member of a law firm in Minneapolis and I have received no legal fees or other income earned from the practice of law since I was sworn in as a Member of Congress on January 3, 1961.

I hold an equity interest in a home in Minnesota and one in Bethesda, Md. I hold stock as follows: 200 shares, Search Investment Corp.; 111 shares, United Science Fund; 3 shares, Sinclair Oil Corp.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, the 88th Congress has before it many items of unfinished business. I rise at this time to speak about one unfulfilled responsibility that stands out from all the rest. We have a continuing obligation to enact legislation to guarantee the full rights of citizenship to all our citizens, regardless of race, creed or color.

At present these rights are not equally available to all Americans. Our Constitution knows no classes; yet, our daily experience reminds us that second-class citizenship is still the lot of millions of Americans. Our cities have their "sections"—sections determined not by the preference of the inhabitants but by discriminatory housing and lending practices. This same segregation is reflected in our schools. Negroes and other minority groups have learned through bitter experience that no amount of skill and training can qualify them for certain occupations. Even their right to vote is a controversial right. In a Nation that proclaims the inherent dignity of every individual and the equality of all men before the law, our practices do not square with our principles.

This central contradiction between practice and principle has never been easy to live with. It has been a source of shame throughout our history; of tortured legal argument; of elaborate rationalization; of unreasoning hatred and fear. At times the tensions it generates threaten to paralyze our capacity as a Nation to respond to the many other challenges of the industrial age. No feature of American life discredits our Nation more abroad than segregation, and none has been so persistently condemned at home.

Segregation is not only a moral dilemma—a conflict between constitutional precept and governmental practice, between democratic theory and local custom, but it has pervasive effects upon the entire fabric of society.

The strength of America lies in the opportunities our society provides for the maximum development of the individual. Our traditions of free enterprise, of universal public education, of unrestricted participation in politics recognize the enormous dividends accruing to society from the full realization of every individual's potential. The advantages of our system are now generally acknowledged.

Yet Negro citizens have been excluded from these opportunities. Conditioned from their earliest years in separate but not equal schools to accept a lesser role in life, their incentive to make the best of their abilities is blunted by the knowledge that, with few exceptions, the most challenging and rewarding positions in industry and the professions are closed to them. Effective disenfranchisement is no preparation for assuming the responsibilities of citizenship. And we are only beginning to count the costs in public welfare, delinquency, and crime that segregation has entailed.

Segregation has stifled the productive capacity of the Nation. The current 6-percent rate of unemployment is alarming enough; but, as of this February, 13 percent of the nonwhite labor force in this country were without jobs. In part these figures restate in statistical terms the well-known truism that Negroes are the last to be hired and the first to be fired in a period of overall economic slack; partly, too, they reflect the special vulnerability of Negroes, who comprise 10.5 percent of the total population but 30.5 percent of the unskilled farm and factory labor force, to the automation of routine work processes.

Displacement by urban renewal and highway projects likewise imposes unusual hardships on Negro families, who must seek new housing in a drastically limited market.

The overcrowding of our schools is still another familiar social evil with a special impact on Negroes. In a study of 17 counties in which all the schools were segregated the Commission on Civil Rights discovered that the pupil-to-teacher ratio was more unfavorable in Negro schools than in white schools in every case.

Thus the vicious circle continues. The rapid technological changes of our society affect with particular severity the members of minority groups; and the disadvantaged groups are by and large denied the opportunity to prepare themselves for coping with such changes.

The result is summarized in President Kennedy's recent message on civil rights—February 28, 1963:

> The Negro baby born in America today—regardless of the section or State in which he is born—has about one-half as much chance of completing high school as a white boy born in the same place on the same day, one-third as much chance of completing college, one-third as much chance of becoming a professional man, twice as much chance of becoming unemployed, about one-seventh as much chance of earning $10,000 per year, a life expectancy, which is 7 years less, and the prospects of earning only one-half as much.

This is indeed a grim prospect and it is made worse by the knowledge that many of the most crippling hindrances to self-development could be removed through governmental action.

How very deeply our governmental system has become enmeshed in the institutions of segregation is something that many men of good will have been slow to recognize. Segregation appears to many to be, in its essence, a way of life, a complex of social conventions and convictions that can only be changed over a long period with a change of heart by those who practice it. It is often argued that there is very little that government can properly do to change the prejudices of the people.

The victims of segregation know better.

They know that segregation has been powerfully reinforced by governmental action—or inaction. They know that, when police dogs are turned loose on would-be voting registrants, not social custom but agents of the State are attempting to prevent them from exercising their constitutional rights. They know that, when State police are under instructions to close their eyes while rioters seek to prevent the integration of a State university, the State again must bear responsibility. These are familiar and dramatic instances of governmental enforcement of segregation through deliberate intervention or abstention. But critically important support for the institutions of segregation also comes through less spectacular governmental action. Continued Federal grants for the construction of segregated hospitals and the construction and operation of segregated schools is, in effect, the use of governmental taxing power to entrench discriminatory practices in vital community facilities. Granting licenses to public accommodations that practice discrimination by race is likewise seen in this light.

This has been acknowledged by the courts and by the Federal and some State administrations. In refusing to place the power of the Government behind a restrictive housing covenant, the Supreme Court dramatically revealed the degree to which residential segregation had rested on governmental enforcement. By its effectiveness, the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity has shown how substantially administrative action can alter not only Federal personnel policy but also the hiring practices of Government contractors. New York, Pennsylvania, Michigan, and California have taken the initiative in breaking down de facto discrimination in housing, schools, employment, vocational training, and public accommodations, providing in this way still more evidence of the dependence of the institutions of segregation on tacit or positive support from government.

There can be no doubt about the matter. For better or for worse, our political system can function as a powerful instrument for social change—or for determined resistance to such change. The role of private individuals and groups in bringing about an end to segregation must never be underestimated. Indeed, their courage deserves greater recognition than has generally been accorded. But in the end, the prime opportunities for exercising initiative and power lie within the Government. And with such opportunities comes responsibility.

Congress, too, has played some part in the drive for equal citizenship that is now sweeping our land. In 1957, and again in 1960, it passed laws designed to protect the constitutional right to vote. These were the start of the exercise of responsibility. Measured by the demands of the present situation, however, they are inadequate. They deal with voting rights and the protection of property—vitally important laws, but only first steps. And within the scope of these laws much remains to be done. With the exception of the antipoll tax amendment and the extension of the term of the Civil Rights Commission for another 2 years, since 1960 Congress has passed no civil rights legislation. Congress has failed to do its part in protecting the constitutional rights of the citizens it represents.

For too long Congress has left the full task of establishing equal rights to the Executive, the courts, and dedicated private citizens. When the same constitutional right must be upheld in case after case in the courts, when Executive agencies must operate in an atmosphere of continuing uncertainty concerning their legal authority to protect the rights of minorities, the process is a slow one. What is needed is a legislative war on discrimination.

Mr. Speaker, with this objective in mind, I have introduced today a package of five civil rights bills.

My first bill, Mr. Speaker, is made necessary by the persistence of segregated public school systems in large areas of our Nation.

Almost 9 years ago the U.S. Supreme Court declared segregated schools to be inherently unequal and hence in violation of the Constitution. In some States this decision precipitated a substantial measure of desegregation. Isolated communities in other segregated States took the initiative in ending discrimination in the schools. However, this initial impulse was spent very soon. Little or no progress has been made in desegregating the public schools in the hard-core areas of segregation. The proportion of Negroes in schools with whites to total Negro school enrollment is, in some States, almost ludicrously small—0.230 percent in Arkansas; 0.532 percent in Florida; 0.013 percent in Georgia; 0.036 percent in Louisiana; 0.265 percent in North Carolina; 1.13 percent in Tennessee; 2.16 percent in Texas; and 0.556 percent in Virginia—Southern Education Reporting Service, November 1962—the latest figures available. Three States—Alabama, Mississippi, and South Carolina—have made no effort whatever to comply with the Supreme Court mandate. And we must remember that not only in the South but in the North and West as well, segregation has been maintained in the schools through drawing school districts to conform to the boundaries of de facto segregated residential districts.

Great harm results from this desegregation with all deliberate obstruction. Not only do individual Negroes continue to suffer from discrimination; but the entire Nation suffers when the Constitution is defied. Legislation is clearly needed to achieve what judicial rulings by themselves have not. This bill contains requirements, incentives, and provisions for assistance to provide for nationwide first-step compliance with the Supreme Court decision by the 1964–65 school year. It defines desegregation as the assignment of all students to public schools irrespective of their race or color; and it requires every school board in segregated school districts to file with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare a timetable for desegregating each class, grade, school, and district within the jurisdiction of the school board. Since school desegregation often requires expert advice and special preparations, the bill authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make technical and financial assistance available to the governmental units implementing approved desegregation plans.

Another title of the bill removes what must now be regarded as an anomaly of the law by striking out references to separate institutions for colored students in the second Morrill Land Grant College Act.

It is no accident that no claim for equal treatment under the law has aroused such controversy and such embittered resistance as the demand of minority groups for equal educational opportunities. Education offers the single greatest hope for gaining a place of economic and social equality in our society. Integrated schools will mean in time that ignorance and class bias will lose their present role of reinforcing racial prejudice. Conversely, we can no longer afford to deny these citizens the opportunity to contribute their best efforts to our increasingly specialized, increasingly automated economy.

Yet equal educational opportunities may not be enough unless every child has the same incentive to make use of his education. Turned away from the ballot box and systematically rejected for managerial and professional positions, it is the rare member of a racial or ethnic minority who can see the point in taking full advantage of his education. And the problem is even more fundamental, as the Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies suggests in a report summarized in the March 29, 1963, Washington Post. Top Negro high school students from stable homes were more likely than their white counterparts to flounder in college—largely, the report makes clear, because of uncertainty over career opportunities and because parents and relatives could offer little or no advice about job opportunities. Exhortations to stay in school ring very hollow for such children.

Mr. Speaker, my act against discrimination, which I introduced in the 87th Congress, has been filed again today. It strikes at the heart of the problem. This bill has two major objectives—to eliminate unfair discriminatory practices and to establish practical procedures for protecting voting rights.

To implement the first objective, the bill would make the Commission on Civil Rights permanent, give it jurisdiction over discriminatory practices and the power to issue court-enforceable cease-and-desist orders. Violators found guilty would be punishable by fine, imprisonment, or both.

Under the bill, it would be an unfair discriminatory practice:

For any employer in a business affecting commerce to discriminate against an employee because of race or color.

For a labor union affecting commerce to practice racial discrimination.

For an employer or labor organization affecting commerce to discharge, expel or discriminate against a person because he opposes unfair discriminatory practices or because he has filed a complaint, testified or assisted in any proceedings under the act.

For any publicly-assisted housing to practice discrimination in renting or leasing.

For any business affecting commerce to deny equal treatment in facilities, services or accommodations.

For any bank or credit institution insured by the Government or subject to Federal or State regulation to discriminate in granting loans or mortgages.

For any insurance company engaged in business affecting commerce to discriminate on terms or conditions of insurance.

For any real estate broker or agent operating in interstate commerce to practice racial discrimination.

And finally, the bill would outlaw economic sanctions, or other forms of discrimination, aimed at preventing or punishing anyone from voting.

Mr. Speaker, title II of the act against discrimination is designed to safeguard the voting rights of every citizen. Whenever the Civil Rights Commission or a court finds that a voting registrar or other State or local official has, under color of law or by State action, deprived persons in any locality of the opportunity to register because of their race or color, the President is authorized to establish a Federal enrollment office in each registration district in the locality. The Federal enrollment officers would judge the qualifications of the persons wanting to register and actually enroll them. The bill provides that people enrolled in this way shall have the right to cast a ballot and have it counted.

Mr. Speaker, voting rights are also the concern of the third bill in the package, which abolishes literacy tests as a qualification for voting in any election. Literacy tests, contrary to the explicit intent and command of the 15th amendment, have been openly used to deny the right to vote because of race or color. In many sections of the country literacy tests disenfranchise prospective voters who are not literate in the English language. The Spanish-speaking community in New York is directly affected by discriminatory literacy tests.

Mr. Speaker, probably no civil rights issue is of more immediate concern to racial and ethnic minorities than the inequitable administration of justice. Police brutality is an old story to minority groups, but familiarity with the experience has made it no easier to bear. No reader of newspaper accounts of recent events in Mississippi will regard the problem as a thing of the past. Also, police power has been abused by refusal to protect members of minority groups from unlawful violence at the hands of private persons. So the fourth bill I have introduced provides both criminal penalties and civil remedies for specified acts of violence under color of law or for refusals to act. The bill also authorizes the Attorney General to institute proceedings for preventive relief against any individual who, under color of law excludes any person or groups of persons from grand or petit jury service on account of their race, color, or national origin. This provision gives full meaning to the most ancient and honored right in our jurisprudence—the right of every man to be tried by a jury of his peers.

The fifth bill will be familiar to many Members of this House. It amends part III of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 to give the Attorney General the power to institute suits upon a finding that any person or group of persons is being deprived of, or is being threatened with the loss of, the right to the equal protection of the laws by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin. This would apply to cases involving racial segregation in public schools. The Attorney General is also authorized to institute proceedings against any two or more people who conspire to hinder duly constituted authorities in their efforts to secure any person's right to equal protection of the laws. A separate section specifically empowers the Attorney General to intervene in civil actions brought by individuals arising out of racial segregation in public schools. Where the Attorney General finds that any person or group of persons is being deprived of, or threatened with deprivation of, their constitutional rights for having opposed the denial of the equal protection of the laws to others, he may bring an action for preventive relief. This would protect those courageous individuals who are carrying on the civil rights battle. I believe all these measures are essential to the maintenance of ordered liberty in our society.

Mr. Speaker, these five bills, together with civil rights measures I have introduced previously, will provide an arsenal of legislative weapons for use in the war against discrimination. This kind of comprehensive approach is needed. Those who argue for a more gradual approach to the protection of civil rights—to secure voting rights before moving on to educational and economic rights, to win a court case here and to take administrative action elsewhere—overlook the basic interdependence of all civil rights. Such an attitude ignores the fact that equality of opportunity in education and employment are inextricably linked; that formal voting rights mean little in a climate of harassment and terror; that residential segregation can all but nullify the effects of formally desegregating the schools. It discounts, too, the human suffering that continues while fundamental rights are being denied in any area.

There is a historical parallel that can be drawn. In the early 1930's it was apparent that, if labor was to receive its constitutional rights, Federal legislation was absolutely necessary. It has long been the case that Negroes and other minority groups must have Federal legislation to guarantee their constitutional rights. I propose that legislation today. If equal rights for all, regardless of color or religion, is not to be just a slogan, my legislative package should be enacted promptly.

APPOINTMENT OF HON. J. WALTER KENNEDY AS PRESIDENT OF THE NATIONAL BASKETBALL ASSOCIATION

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Sibal] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to announce to the House the appointment of the Honorable J. Walter Kennedy, mayor of Stamford, Conn., as president of the National Basketball Association.

I have known Mayor Kennedy for many years, having grown up and entered politics in the neighboring city of Norwalk. Although we are on opposite sides of the political aisle, I know he will carry out his new and exacting job with the same high integrity and dedication that has characterized all his service to the community. I congratulate the National Basketball Association on its choice and predict that this President Kennedy will have a long and successful tenure, which will be of great benefit to the sport and its millions of fans across the country.

This morning's New York Times carries an interesting sketch of Mayor Kennedy's career and I offer it here for the Record:

Political Experience Expected To Help New Basketball Chief

(By Robert M. Lipsyte)

For James Walter Kennedy, election yesterday as the president of the National Basketball Association was the culmination of a lifetime of vicarious participation in sports.

"The job epitomizes everything I've been, or done, or wanted to do," he said. "To a kid who used to dream of being a great athlete, knowing he could never even be a good one, the opportunity to be one of the three top professional sports administrators * * *."

The other two top positions are commissioner of baseball and president of the National Football League. It was Judge Kenesaw Mountain Landis, one of baseball's strongest leaders, who made the strongest impression on young Walter Kennedy.

Kennedy recalls with a wry smile that he wrote an essay as a sixth-grader outlining his two life ambitions: one was to become mayor of Stamford, his hometown; the other was to be commissioner of baseball.

FATHER PHYSICALLY ACTIVE

Kennedy was born on June 8, 1913, of a family indigenous to the Connecticut city for several generations. His father, a salesman for the City Steam Laundry, was a physically active man. He was rather disappointed when a childhood attack of polio held back his son's athletic development.

An operation on a foot in adolescence helped young Walter greatly, but by this time he was too far behind for varsity-level competition.

Kennedy took another route toward sports participation. While in high school he became official scorer for the Stamford Pros, a touring basketball team, at $1 a game; managed his high school basketball team, and starred with the debating society and as a student. At Notre Dame, from which he was graduated in 1934, he spent 4 years working in the sports publicity office.

He returned to Stamford the following year, working with juvenile delinquents for the department of welfare and Catholic charities, and becoming the winning coach of the St. Basil's prep basketball team. He returned to Notre Dame in 1943 as director of sports publicity.

From 1946 until 1959, he ran his own public relations company; traveled around the world as press agent for the Harlem Globetrotters basketball team; broadcast college and professional football games with Ted Husing; was the first public relations director for the National Basketball Association, and served on Stamford's park commission, board of recreation, and board of education.

Four years ago he achieved his first goal when he won the mayoralty of Stamford, as a Democrat, by the city's largest plurality. Last year, in his second term of office, he successfully managed the senatorial campaign of Abraham Ribicoff.

Although he sleeps only 6 hours a night, Kennedy has little spare time for hobbies or diversions. His chief recreation includes an undemanding bestseller before lights out; "The Untouchables" on television; or a basketball, baseball, or football game. He still lives somewhat vicariously, exulting in the athletic activities of his two sons—21-year-old David, a senior at Notre Dame and a varsity trackman, and 20-year-old Robert, a junior at La Salle and a letter man in soccer and baseball.

Kennedy, 5 feet 7 inches tall, 170 pounds, with dark brown hair, lives in a four-level, eight-room house in Stamford with his wife and 16-year-old daughter Kathleen. He drives a Dodge convertible and wears button-down shirts.

AGGRAVATION DAY

The originator of Stamford's Aggravation Day—in which citizens may walk into the mayor's office once a week and talk—Kennedy feels that he will be sensitive to the public pulse. As basketball leader, he expects to sit in the stands, incognito, and listen to people.

Although his second goal probably will never come true, he feels that the basketball job is a worthy substitute. He hopes to bring his sports background and political experience to the job, as well as a credo that even Judge Landis could approve of:

"No commissioner can compromise with anyone—owners, players, fans—if it involves the integrity of the organization."

ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF THE POLISH CONSTITUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Nedzi] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker under a special order, today this great legislative body, the U.S. House of Representatives, observes a great day in the history of Poland. This is the 172d anniversary of the Polish Constitution, a document adopted on May 3, 1791. Today, we who live in freedom, take this opportunity to remind the world that Americans share the aspiration of the Polish people that their nation will again be free. In paying tribute to that small group of far-sighted men who produced the remarkable Constitution of 1791, we also express our appreciation for the contributions Poland has made to the development of Western civilization. Moreover, we are led to reflect on the plight of the Polish people as they suffer under a form of government imposed by the Soviet Union.

America's greatness is founded in large part on a great Constitution. As lawmakers, we are particularly conscious of the great strength of constitutionalism and what it has meant to our development as a nation. It is noteworthy, in the light of our tradition, that the Poles choose to elevate the Constitution of 1791 as the great moment of their history. It is a constitution rather than a great victory, or a revolution, which is most venerated in Polish tradition.

Judged by any yardstick, the Constitution of 1791 was an historic and a progressive document. It adopted the principle that all power in civil society is derived from the will of the people. The men who drafted this Constitution were greatly influenced by liberal movements in America, England, and France. Ancient class distinctions and privileges were eliminated, and the peasantry was brought under the protection of the law.

Unfortunately, the people of Poland never had the chance to live under this Constitution. The spirit in which the Constitution was developed alarmed the dictatorship in Russia, which saw on its doorstep the shadow of democracy. Russia and Prussia partitioned and occupied Poland, and destroyed the Polish Constitution. This dastardly act was repeated in 1939.

Throughout its history, Poland has been a victim of its geography. Ever since 966 A.D., nearly 1,000 years ago, when Poland accepted Christianity and joined her destiny to the West, she has lived at the crossroads of war. The spirit of freedom and their national continuity is so deeply ingrained in the Polish people that she is constantly a danger, by her attractive example, to the totalitarian societies which have so long bounded her on east and west.

The Congress of the United States is most encouraged by the Polish spirit of independence. This is the spirit which preserved a sense of nationalism for 123 years, from 1795 to 1918, when there was no Poland except in the memories of the people. This is the spirit which today has as its ally the Catholic Church and Poland led by Cardinal Wyszynski, and which is again the sanctuary of nationality and a guardian of Polish culture and tradition. And this is the spirit which in 1956 shook the Communist empire by showing the world that the Polish desire for freedom was not crushed. Although the hopes engendered by the demonstrations of 1956 have not been fulfilled, they serve as a reminder that 100 million restive, unhappy people in Eastern Europe are the Achilles heel of the Soviet Union in the ideological struggle between the East and the West. In our support of their aspirations and self-determination, we are doing what is morally right and what is politically right.

Americans of Polish origin are proud of their heritage. They are proud not only of their men of genius, but of the contributions of quiet and unsung Poles who have helped build America by working her mines and fields, building her roads and working her assembly lines. They have seen their sons off to war in the cause of freedom, and they have had the great pleasure of earning by their labors a better opportunity for their children and the children of their fellow Americans. My parents, like many of yours, were among those who made that long and perilous crossing to this land of opportunity. They adopted America with enthusiasm, without forgetting the history and culture of the land of their origin. Knowing this history, they take hope that Poland will regain her independence and follow her natural inclinations as a part of the free world.

Many of my colleagues join me in this observance today, and their remarks will be set forth in the RECORD as a permanent memorial of our convictions.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in times of misfortune, peoples' thoughts almost invariably turn back to happier and more inspiring days of the past. This is particularly true of the people of Poland, who, after all the sufferings they endured and the sacrifices they made for freedom, find themselves once again enslaved in their homeland by Soviet oppressors. Today, on the anniversary of the first democratic constitution, the Polish people, in and out of Poland, join in commemoration of this great national event.

The adoption of the Constitution of 1791 constitutes one of the brightest and most significant landmarks in Poland's political history. The event came at a time when nearly all of the nation was being parceled among the three greedy monarchs of Austria, Prussia and Russia. It was then that a small band of patriotic, farsighted and dauntless Poles drafted and presented to the country this document of freedom.

The Constitution made Poland a constitutional monarchy with a responsible cabinet form of government. Ancient class distinctions and privileges were wiped out, and the government was strengthened by bringing the peasantry under the protection of the law. What is perhaps even more significant for those days and for that part of the world, was the fact that this Constitution guaranteed religious freedom. In this and in many other ways, the Polish Constitution of May 1791, was in the vanguard of democracy's advance into central and eastern Europe.

In commemorating the 172d anniversary of the promulgation and adoption of this Constitution, we are paying our respects to the memory of its creators—some of the leading figures in Poland's history. In doing this we are also reaffirming our faith in the future of the Polish people, in a free and independent Poland.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure once again to speak a word of commemoration and dedication as the people dedicated to a free Poland observe their traditional day of independence, May 3.

This historic date marks Poland's Constitution Day, heralding the adoption of a Constitution only 2 years younger than our own. We adopted our Constitution in 1789; Poland adopted her on May 3, 1791. So this date in a very real sense is the Fourth of July for the sons and daughters of Poland.

Many of these people have built good lives for themselves in this country; many have contributed greatly to the strength and the success of our free land. All of them have been dedicated to the principles of our Constitution, because they found the same principles in their own Constitution in Poland in these words:

> All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

As early as our own Revolutionary War, immigrants from Poland distinguished themselves as industrious, honorable, idealistic and courageous. These qualities made them good soldiers in times of war and good citizens in times of peace. We salute them today for the rich contributions which they have made to American history and our way of life.

We join with them today in saluting Polish Constitution Day, and those enduring principles to which all free peoples must look in this troubled world, hoping that out of our rededication to such ideals may come a better way of life for all peoples and all nations.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEDZI. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from the State of Michigan for having taken this time today to pay tribute to the worthy Polish people of the New World and the Old. I know that the Polish people in my own district, of which there are a great number, have made their contribution to the life of Long Island, just as the gentleman from Michigan has made his contribution to the Congress of the United States. They have brought energy and vitality and a certain joy of life to the area.

No native-born American who has lived in this country all his life, even an American of sensitive mind and compassionate heart, can really appreciate what it is to live under tyranny. Only those who have felt the crushing heel of a totalitarian power can know what it means. All through our history we have welcomed to our shores freedom-loving peoples from every nation on earth, who have enriched our American tapestry with the warm, glowing threads of their own great national heritage. But their sufferings before they left their native land we can know only vicariously.

Today we pay tribute to a country and a people who have fought and endured foreign invaders throughout most of their history. I salute them with words they will immediately recognize—"Czećś wam bracia polacy"—and am proud to have in my own district many citizens of Polish origin who contribute to the life of Long Island the strength, vitality and joy of living so characteristic of their race.

Tomorrow is a very special day for people of Polish blood everywhere, for it marks the anniversary of the birth of the Polish Constitution of 1791—a document as inspired and as great as our own. Its high purpose is fully described in this quotation:

> All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

The tragedy is that although it lives in the hearts of the Polish people, it has never been fully realized. That small and gallant nation has been continually overrun by ruthless forces from the east and the west, and now lies under merciless Soviet domination.

The year 1963 marks the 100th anniversary of the Polish January uprising of 1863 against Russian enslavement, the longest and bloodiest rebellion in Polish history. After 2 terrible years of heroic fighting they were ruthlessly crushed, and 250,000 of her best sons lost—killed in battle, executed, or exiled to Siberia.

May 3 is a day for Polish people everywhere to remember their brave and proud history, and to look forward to the happy day when, God willing, they will once again be free.

"Niech zwyciezy Orzel Bialy"—"May the white eagle be victorious."

Mr. NEDZI. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEDZI. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate my distinguished colleague from Michigan [Mr. Nedzi], for having taken the floor to remind the House that tomorrow is Polish Constitution Day. The valiant Polish people have made a magnificent contribution to the development of America.

It is indeed fitting that we commemorate the adoption of the Polish Constitution 172 years ago, for it is a landmark in the modern history of Poland. By that important document the Poles effected a peaceful revolution in their form of government without resorting to the violence which characterized the French Revolution.

That historic document contained many provisions which still retain their philosophical validity today. The authority of the monarch was reduced, and ministerial responsibility was introduced. The intricate and obstructive features of the old system, including many class distinctions, were eliminated. The upper legislative chamber lost some of its preponderant powers and the second chamber, the elective and the representative body of the nation, was vested with genuine legislative authority. Economic barriers between the nobility and the bourgeoisie were broken down; the townsmen recovered their judicial autonomy and received a number of political rights, especially that of admission to many of the higher offices. The peasantry were taken under the protection of the law. Finally, religious freedom was guaranteed. The Constitution abolished the worst abuses from which Poland had been suffering for centuries. Through the abolition of the most crying political evils of the old regime, and by granting increased freedom of action to the middle and lower classes, the Constitution of 1791 marked a great advance over all previous attempts at reform in Poland. It was duly praised by all advocates of democratic government in Europe.

Unfortunately, before the benefits of this new Constitution was enjoyed, Poland was divided among the autocrats of Austria, Prussia, and Russia. Having lost their sovereign existence and national independence, the Poles for more than 120 years lived under oppressive foreign regimes. The rebirth of the Polish Republic in 1918 signified also the resurgence of the ideals embodied in the Polish Constitution of 1791.

Years before the partition of Poland in the late 18th century many Poles had left their homeland, and some of them came to the new world. It is definitely known that a group of Poles arrived in colonial America in 1608. In that year they were engaged as experts and instructors in the manufacture of glass and pitch, tar and other products, in Jamestown, Va. Polish immigration to this country grew by leaps and bounds, and today Polish-American citizens can be counted in the millions. They have always been among the most industrious, loyal, patriotic and brave citizens of this republic. Poles as a gifted people, many of them endowed with rare talents, have excelled in many fields of endeavors and many walks of life. They have always been in the forefront among peoples fighting for freedom and for other noble ideals of humanity.

They have amply proved this by their contribution to our wars, beginning with our War of Independence. No one in this country will ever forget the yeoman services which Kosciusko and Pulaski rendered for the cause of our national freedom. Nor have the Poles failed to keep up the fine tradition established by these two gallant sons of Poland. Here in this country, all Americans of Polish descent have always worked for the strengthening and preservation of our democratic institutions.

Mr. Speaker, on the anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791 let us consider the plight of the Polish people who had worked, hoped for, and dreamed of a liberated and free Poland. All vestiges of genuine democracy have been blotted out in Poland. But even under such restrictions and under unrelenting oppression, these brave and unsubdued people still cling to the fine ideals embodied in their Constitution of 1791.

Mr. NEDZI. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEDZI. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to congratulate my colleague from the State of Michigan for his excellent statement on this anniversary of Polish Constitution Day. It is indeed a pleasure in this body when members of both parties, sitting on opposite sides of the aisle, join together in the observance of one of the most historic days in man's struggle for the establishment of individual freedom. I think that in the consideration of our day-to-day work we should never lose sight of the fact that in Eastern Europe behind the Iron Curtain there are people, not only in Poland but in other captive countries, who long for the day when they may once again enjoy the realities of a self-governing system based upon the dignity of the individual and the equality of opportunity which we almost take for granted in our country.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. NEDZI. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for his fine remarks.

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEDZI. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to take this opportunity to thank my colleague from the great State of Michigan and who is also from the city of Detroit for making these timely remarks in commemoration of the anniversary of the Polish Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to associate myself with the remarks which have been made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Nedzi], because in so doing he is paying tribute to a fine race of people, a wonderful group of people, who have made many great contributions not only to the United States of America but to the entire world. The economc, political, the industrial, and the religious contributions that they have made to this country have gone far toward making this a better America for all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I am most hopeful of the day when the Poles in their own country of Poland will be able to overthrow the yoke of suppression which is now over them so that they may enjoy the merits of their fine document, the Constitution of Poland which was adopted in 1791.

This Constitution incorporates enduring precepts of public policy and democracy. Its principles were rooted in the Pole's love and attachment to freedom and independence. These principles lived in the hearts of many Polish generations. In times of national well-being as well as in times of misfortune, they represented the fountainhead of national consciousness, patriotism and ever-present readiness to make sacrifices for the common cause of freedom of all nations.

As we approach May the 3d, free Poland's national holiday, I am taking the liberty of reminding you that this year marks the 100th anniversary of the Polish January uprising of 1863. There were other Polish uprisings against the Russian rule. The Kosciuszko uprising in 1794, the November uprising in 1831, the Warsaw uprising in 1944 against the German occupation, but the 1863 uprising against the Russian tyranny was the greatest, longest, and bloodiest uprising in the Polish history. The Polish patriots fought the Russian occupation army for over 2 years.

During the night of January 22, 1863, units of Polish insurgents attacked Russian garrisons in many localities and captured considerable amounts of arms and ammunition. The movement spread to all parts of the country like a forest fire. In all Polish communities under Russian rule there were instantaneous uprisings.

In the beginning the Polish insurgents had some significant successes but when the Russians brought into Poland 350,000 seasoned troops of the regular Russian army—the fate of the uprising was sealed.

On one side were well-equipped regular army units—on the other the heroic insurgent army, poorly equipped, having insufficient supplies and inadequate training. Despite these handicaps the brave insurgents achieved many successes over Russian army regiments in over 1,000 battles and skirmishes all over Poland.

Over 20,000 Poles were killed in battles, thousands were captured, 600 leaders were executed by firing squads or hanged in public squares, the rest were sent to the mines in Siberia.

The last leader of the uprising, Romuald Traugutt, and 4 of his assistants were hanged in the public square in Warsaw in view of the kneeling, praying, and weeping crowd of 25,000.

The last detachment of Polish insurgents led by Reverend Brzoska was surrendered and wiped out in April 1865.

The Russian Government ordered the so-called military pacification of the country. Thousands of Poles were arrested and deported to Siberia. Their property was confiscated. Polish language was banned from offices and schools. The economy of Poland was destroyed. The sense of real mourning enveloped the entire nation.

The Polish nation lost 250,000 of its best sons, the flower of its manhood—killed in battles, executed, and exiled to Siberia.

The United States at that time was in the throes of civil war and Europe was deaf to the cries of the martyred nation.

The Polish people suffered a defeat in the fight for independence but the social reforms put through by its leaders gave the Poles a strength and cohesion against which all attempts at denationalization were shattered.

By paying tribute to the 100th anniversary of the Polish uprising of 1863 we are also paying tribute to Poland's defenders of freedom for the past thousand years.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the 3d of May is constitution day in the hearts and minds of Polish people everywhere, particularly in the United States where proud sons and daughters of this torn nation are ever mindful of Poland's pioneering in European liberalism.

Poland, the land whose stalwart offspring have helped sustain the American heritage through loyal devotion and sacrifice to their adoptive nation, reminds us on the third of May of its destiny in the history of mankind. Her people prophesy the ultimate triumph of freedom, as their predecessors have known these blessings.

For it was on May 3, 1791, barely 2 years after the United States adopted its Constitution, that Poland reformed her public life and eradicated her internal decline. And this without disorder or bloody revolution. The greatness of the May 3 Polish Constitution consisted in the fact that it eliminated the most fundamental weaknesses of the Polish parliamentary and social system.

The armed might of Russia and Prussia blighted Polish freedom in 1795, and in 1939, the same forces that earlier saw danger in the rise of true liberalism in Poland, again tarnished the soil of freedom with the totalitarianism systems of nazism and communism.

Reflection on these achievements and sacrifices and meditation on the anniversary of May 3, deepens the faith and heightens the courage of every Pole and of every American of Polish origin. We must continue to assist in the nourishment and encouragement of this faith, and in the courage of hope that Poland and the other captive nations of Europe will stand firm in the fight for freedom.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, we celebrate tomorrow, May 3, the 172d anniversary of Poland's first democratic Constitution.

The Polish Constitution of 1791 was approved without revolution or bloodshed during Europe's 18th century crusade for freedom. It was written in the spirit of the American Declaration of Independence and the French Proclamation of the Rights of Man. This historic document has particular significance at a time when the Polish people are unable to enjoy the freedom it guaranteed.

I would like to recall certain aspects of Polish history which offer lessons for our time. When the country was partitioned in 1772 the royal republic of Poland was overrun by foreign troops and the freedom of the Polish people was destroyed. On this occasion Russia and Prussia gained widespread control of Polish affairs. As the result of a change in the diplomatic relations among the European powers, Poland had an opportunity in 1788 to strengthen her government and increase her control over her own affairs. Polish statesmen convened in the Four-Year-Diet, which produced the Constitution of 1791. The Government of Poland was changed from an absolute monarchy to a hereditary monarchy, with regular meetings of the parliament, and responsible ministers. The 3d of May Constitution reorganized the life of Poland, providing for political, economic and social reforms. The power of king and nobility were reduced, and relations between peasants and landlords were placed under the rule of law. The schools were reformed, and the new organization of her society enabled Poland to develop and husband her resources and gain a new sense of democratic national consciousness. "The happiness of nations depends on just laws," the deputies proudly announced and "the effects of laws depend on their execution."

While the innovations were unfortunately revoked after the partition of 1795, the 3d of May Constitution remains a reminder and a symbol to all Poles and friends of Poland throughout the world that the principles of freedom and independence cannot be suppressed forever by foreign despots. After the First World War the Polish people were again given an opportunity to live according to their own system of government. But after a few short years of national independence, foreign armies once again invaded Poland and this tiny nation suffered the full brunt of 20th century dictatorships. Yet the spirit of 1791 survives. The Polish people have preserved their sense of nationality and love the liberties guaranteed them by the 3d of May Constitution.

On this solemn occasion we salute the Polish people and pay tribute to the Polish Constitution of 1791.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, it is doubly appropriate that in this year of 1963 we join with the other free nations of the world in paying tribute to the Polish patriots who for a thousand years have been their nation's defenders of freedom.

What a happy occasion it would be if we could say that in this year they were enjoying the fruits of their labors. It is not so, because, like so many of Europe's freedom-loving people, the Poles of today suffer the iron yoke of Russian tyranny.

I say this is a doubly appropriate time for us to pause in reflection on Poland's plight, because not only is May 3 the anniversary of the Polish Constitution, so much like our own, but it is the centennial of the most violent of Poland's freedom uprisings.

The Polish Constitution was adopted in 1791, just 2 years after our own. When, in January 1863, 250,000 Poles paid with their lives in a bloody freedom uprising, we were occupied with our own Civil War.

So, Mr. Speaker, we can only hope in this year of dual significance to the Polish people and the 7 million Americans of Polish descent that the day is not too far in the future when the shackles of communism can be cast off.

I trust my country will take every possible step to bring about the liberation of Poland.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILBERT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to join with my colleagues in the observance of Poland's national holiday, in commemoration of Poland's great Constitution of 1791, for Poland pioneered liberalism in Europe.

In the Polish 3d of May Constitution we find these words:

> All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

It is apparent from this that the Polish people and the American people share the same ideals of equality, freedom, and love of liberty, and democracy.

The history of the Polish people has been filled with tragedy. There have been numerous uprisings against Russian rule, but the 1863 uprising against Russian tyranny was the greatest, longest, and bloodiest uprising in Polish history; Polish patriots fought the Russian occupation army for over 2 years and more than 20,000 Poles were killed in battles, many more thousands were executed or sent to Siberian mines to live in slavery. Although the Polish people have suffered many defeats in their struggles for independence, the reforms put through by their leaders have given them strength and vision and a will to be free so that all attempts at denationalization have been shattered. Because of the tremendous sacrifices which have been made by the Polish people, it is fitting that we also commemorate the 100th anniversary of the Polish uprising of 1863 and pay tribute to all the Polish defenders of freedom who gave their all for their country.

We are grateful to the Polish-Americans who have contributed so much to the growth and strength of our Nation. Our hopes and prayers are joined with theirs on this occasion when we remember the brave patriots in Poland and laud them for their faith and courage; we look forward to the day when Poland will have her independence restored to her and her people released from the Soviet yoke of oppression.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SIBAL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, the 172d observance of Poland's Constitution of May 3 finds the Members of this House taking inventory once again of what the situation in Poland is today. We can also speculate and compare the present situation to what it might be had the historic provisions of the constitution been allowed to operate.

Fashioned after our own Constitution, which became a dynamic reality only 2 years previously, the Polish Constitution recognized the dignity of man. This day ought to be an occasion of national holiday and celebration in Poland, instead of this rather sombre commemoration in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Reflecting, briefly, on Poland's activities since 1939, when she was overrun by Nazi Germany, I want to take note of a particular victory by Polish troops which I feel was of more than military importance. This was the battle of Monte Cassino where there was also at stake a political objective of the highest significance to free Poland. In this battle, the courageous Poles ascended precipitous heights which were held by an entrenched enemy who had defied all other combined efforts to dislodge them. If the heroic Polish 2d Corps had been destroyed in this action, all they represented could well have died with them.

Their victory became instead a tremendous inspiration to all the Allies so that we can never forget the homeland of those who sacrificed their all in this terrible battle nor the hopes of those who were fortunate enough to survive and find haven in free lands after the war.

Many of these veterans of Monte Cassino, together with survivors of many other battles and survivors of concentration camps, now live in Connecticut. To them I offer a salute on this occasion and, as they and their families observe the May 3 anniversary, we join in their prayers. To paraphrase the lines of the National Anthem of free Poland, "Poland is not lost while they live."

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join the other Members of the House in commemoration of Polish Constitution Day which is free Poland's national holiday. This special observance dramatizes the interest and support which Members of Congress give the Polish nation and the other peoples who are the oppressed captives of communism.

It is especially important that support be given the hopes of the Polish people since it was the wartime agreement between Soviet Dictator Stalin and President Roosevelt that delivered the people of Poland and other Eastern European nations to communism. History points out our obligation to some day rectify that tragic agreement.

Despite 19 years of Soviet-imposed rule, the people of Poland are still vigorous in their personal opposition to the dogmas of communism and have demonstrated stamina by which they will eventually overcome the artificial Communist control of their country. As we in the Congress commemorate this great Polish national holiday, we pay tribute to the heroic past of the Polish people, and we give support to their future aspirations for legitimate independence.

Through the long years of the Polish partitions, the people of Poland maintained their national heritage and distinctive traditions. They are doing so today under as diabolical a domination as mankind has ever been subject. Their perseverence is strengthened by the knowledge that thousands of their countrymen thriving in Western countries stand ready to extend practical support to them, just as thousands of patriots from other oppressed nations now in free world areas work toward the goal of restoration of freedom to all the captive nations.

Therefore, in commemorating Polish Constitution Day, we rededicate ourselves to the philosophy of self-determination of people to the end that justice will certainly triumph over communism, and the principles of the Polish Constitution of 1791 will once again serve the people of Poland.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to join my colleagues in making free Poland's national holiday, May 3, and the great democratic Polish constitution of 1791. The tenets expressed in this document have been viciously suppressed over the years by the Russian empire, czarist, or Communist, with the present totalitarian Soviet regime exceeding all others in its tenacious drive against freedom.

The Polish people have translated their belief in the democratic faith expressed in the constitution into action on more than one occasion in the past. Each time they have been suppressed by the force of superior numbers and military hardware, yet the flame of freedom burns on. One hundred years ago, in January of 1863, the longest uprising against the Russians began. Lasting for 2 years, the Polish insurgents finally were defeated, losing an estimated 250,000 men in battle, executions, and to the cruel and lonely exile life in Siberia.

By honoring the freedom fighters of history, we give added strength of spirit to the freedom fighters of the present. Let us be ever mindful that no thaw in the cold war is likely to melt the bars of the prison surrounding the Polish nation today. I hope we will also remember that oratory however well-intentioned in this chamber today, may yet sound hollow in the ears of the victims of oppression in the Old World, if we fail to translate these words into actions within our own hemisphere.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, freedom's friends join in the celebration in the recognition of the Polish 3d of May Constitution Day. Because we are now engaged in a great struggle to preserve and extend freedom to all men, this day has a special significance. It not only commemorates Poland's great constitution of 1791, which embraced the concept of freedom, but also, this is the year which is the 100th anniversary of the Polish general uprising of 1863 against Russian rule.

The Constitution of 1791 stated:

> All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

These words sum up the age-old struggle of freedom versus tyranny but sum up, as well, the meaning of today's struggle. They recall our own history and the drafting of our own great Constitution. Such a bond is indissoluble. The will to be free cannot be subdued and freedom will once again triumph—so it has always been, so it will always be. Tyranny is like a black wave, it rises and engulfs but by the very laws of nature, recedes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend my colleague, Congressman NEDZI, of Michigan, for setting aside this time to pay tribute to the valiant Nation of Poland, who today is commemorating the 100th anniversary of the Polish general uprising of 1863. Although Poland in its long fight for liberty and self-government has rebelled against tyrannical oppressors many times the 1863 uprising against the Russian tyranny was the longest and most devastating in all Polish history. The battles during this rebellion extended over a period of 2 years. It did not confine itself to Warsaw or any special locality, but it was spread generally throughout the cities, towns, and hamlets of the Polish nation. Many valiant Poles were taken prisoners; leaders were executed by firing squads or hanged in the public squares. Thousands were sent to the prison camps in Siberia, and over 20,000 Polish heroes died in battle. Over a period of a century, Poland on five different occasions rose in bloody conflict against its powerful neighboring oppressors.

Unfortunately, the Polish nation geographically is located in the midst of powerful neighbors, and for centuries when these neighboring nations engaged in battle, Poland's territories were violated and its people were victimized by reason of the territorial greed for power of powerful tyrants which ruled nations close to its borders.

During the period of World Wars I and II when Poland enjoyed an independent and free government, no nation in history demonstrated its ability to establish and maintain national freedom and liberty for its people more than Poland. During this brief duration of political independence, its success in expanding industry, agriculture, transportation, churches, schools, welfare legislation, has never been equaled by any nation in such a short period of time.

In 1939 when the tyrant Hitler and his Nazi legions marched, Poland was again a victim of aggression, and in a short time, the Communist dictators from Russia closed in in another direction and against terrific odds, the people of Poland again fought for its liberty and independence. The deplorable results of this defensive battle is of too recent history for repetition here today. The Polish nation is again a victim of enslavement by a tyrannical Communist conspiracy to the north, but its people have not given up hope that someday which we trust is not in the too distant future—Poland will again enjoy freedom and self-government.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the centenary of a remarkable event in the long and turbulent history of the Polish people in their struggle for freedom. In January of 1863 the Poles had mobilized all their secretly organized forces and had readied themselves for an uprising against their more powerful and ruthless oppressors, the Russians. In a daring and gallant move most of the countryside rose in rebellion against czarist garrisons, and in defiance of czarist civilian authorities, unfurled the flag of rebellion against their hated oppressors. At first it seemed that the uprising would be successful and therefore worth all the sacrifices involved, but in the protracted fighting, which lasted for several months, the Polish rebels were crushed under the far superior force of the Russians. And by early May it was clear that the Polish cause was once more drowned in the blood bath of Poland's fighting sons.

Viewed as an act of violent fighting the uprising was a tragic failure, but when considered as a sign of the irrepressible Polish spirit of freedom and independence, the abortive uprising of 1863 serves as a fine example of gallantry and courage. Faced with an impossible situation, and against forbidding odds Poland's fighters for freedom fought and sacrificed their lives for a noble cause. God bless their memory.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, each year, on May 3, the Poles and those of Polish origin who live in the free world celebrate the promulgation of the Polish Constitution of 1791. On that day, 172 years ago, the King of Poland, Stanislaus Augustus, and his assembly, composed of the leading landholders, proclaimed as law this historic document, which was an attempt to do away with the feudalistic and obsolete system of government. By its provisions it established a constitutional monarchy and a parliament, giving the people the right to elect delegates to its lower chamber. The most important clauses gave the townspeople judicial autonomy and placed the peasants under the protection of the law rather than the arbitrary will of their overlords.

The Empress of Russia and her nobles, fearing that these reforms would spread into their autocratic provinces and would strengthen the Polish nation, attacked before the Government was given the chance to strengthen and solidify its position. Led by Kosciuszko and Poniatowski, the Polish Army inflicted several defeats upon the attacking forces. Yet, overwhelming odds proved too strong for the valiant defenders. The King and his Diet were compelled to abrogate the constitution and were further humiliated by the total partitioning of their country by its three neighbors.

When Poland, at the termination of World War I, regained its independence from Russian sovereignty, the world rejoiced that a democratic nation had once again appeared in the Polish homeland. Throughout its brief existence, the people lived up to these expectations, gaining the admiration of the members of the League of Nations for their judicious respect for the rights of mankind. War and the insatiable appetites of land-hungry Germany and Russia once more ended a democratic government for the people of Poland, left their countryside a desolate wasteland, and their cities rubble.

Today, ruled by a hard core of Communists who are in turn directed by Soviet policy, the workers of Poland are still making sporadic attempts to regain some of their privileges which the Constitution of 1791 gave to them by staging widespread riots and strikes. They are even denied the prerogative of participating in the celebration of their historic law. That is why we in the free world must honor May 3 for them, to keep alive the spirit of their constitution for which so many patriots through the years have died. On this day, let us express the hope that the Polish people will regain these inherent rights and will become independent in name as well as in deed.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, today in joining with my distinguished colleagues in remembering the anniversary date of the adoption of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, I should like to emphasize that the Polish national holiday this year is being celebrated with a double meaning for every Pole and every American of Polish descent. On this national holiday, the Polish people are also paying reverent tribute to the courageous sacrifice of 100 years ago when, on January 22, 1863, Poland began the most tragic of her many struggles against tyranny that resulted in the bloodiest uprising in her history. Two years and a thousand battles and skirmishes against a final total of 350,000 Russian troops brought 250,000 Polish patriots to death, execution, and exile.

The same love of freedom exists today in the Polish people as in that heroic year of 1863; and their national consciousness and patriotism is as strong as on the memorable day in 1791 when Poland's famed Constitution was adopted. The importance of this historic document, comparable to the Magna Carta and the American Declaration of Independence in asserting democratic principles of government, was eloquently testified to by Edmund Burke, when he wrote:

> We have seen anarchy and servitude at once removed; a throne strengthened for the protection of the people without trenching on their liberties; not one man incurred loss, or suffered degradation. All, from the king to the day laborer, were improved in their condition. Everything was kept in its place and order: but in that place and order, everything was bettered. To add to this happy wonder—this unheard of conjunction of wisdom and fortune—not one drop of blood was spilled; no treachery; no outrage; no system of slander more cruel than the sword; no studied insults on religion, morals or manners; no spoils; no confiscation; no citizen beggared; none imprisoned; none exiled. The whole was affected with a policy, a discretion, an unanimity such as have never been known before on any occasion; but such wonderful conduct was reserved for this glorious conspiracy in favor of the true and genuine rights and interests of men. Happy people, if they know how to proceed as they have begun. Happy prince, worthy to begin with splendor or to close with glory a race of patriots and of kings and to leave a name which every wind to heaven would bear.

On this Polish national holiday, I know that we speak for all Americans and freedom-loving people around the world in expressing a fervent hope that the great traditions of Poland will be given rebirth in the realizations of the noble promise of the May 3 Constitution that "All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty, and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation."

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, Poland at the end of the 18th century, was considered feudalistic. The populace was downtrodden, with little or no rights to protect them. The country was ruled by a king, Stanislaus Augustus, and a Diet, composed of the most powerful landholders. Internal strife was present among the nobility and Russia threatened from the east. Into this chaotic scene were thrown the principles of liberty, equality, and justice, propounded by the American and French Revolutions. The result was cataclysmic. Energized by these democratic principles, the few liberal leaders in the Government, pointing out the necessity for such action, began a campaign for reform.

Realizing that weakness in his country would not deter Russian expansion, the King quickly took up the challenge by proposing a document which would modernize Poland and give a semblance of liberty and justice to the common man. This Constitution was passed by the Diet on May 3, 1791, and became law.

Joy throughout Poland was instantaneous. The United States and France praised the King and his Government as liberators. Russia, though, discerned that the backing of the Government by the people would unite and strengthen the nation. Furthermore, if the reforms were to succeed, similar demands would then be brought against the Tsarina Catherine. With war concluded with Turkey, Russia turned its military might against the emancipated Polish nation and within a short time, forced the King to abrogate the Constitution.

One hundred and seventy-two years have elapsed since these events transpired. Conditions, though, have not changed too greatly. The Poles continue to have their rights denied by their Communist overlords, while Soviet Russia dominates the Government. Yet hope is ever present in this subjected state. Those who have escaped to freedom keep this hope by celebrating the Constitution of 1791, a document which first gave their ancestors common rights and for which their forefathers fought against Russian tyranny.

We in the United States honor this Constitution and extend the hope that the principles upon which it was based will soon be restored to the Polish people.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, today we once again commemorate the Polish Constitution of 1791.

It was on May 3 of that year that Poland, without a revolution or even a disorder, succeeded in reforming her public life and in eradicating her internal decline.

Even though the Nation was partitioned in 1795, and has many times since then had to fight attempts by other nations to impose their will upon it, the Polish spirit, as exemplified by the 1791 Constitution, has endured.

We in the United States, with our firm belief in the right of every individual to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, once more reaffirm our common bonds with the Polish people, and our determination that Poland will one day again be free.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker. In this period of history we are witnessing nation after nation shucking the bonds of colonialism and emerging as free and independent countries. On this day it is significant that we commemorate the anniversary of the Polish Constitution. This document, the culmination of many years of dedicated effort, has been described as, "an amazing blend of progressive political thought based on conservative traditions."

The significant thing is that the Polish Constitution which guaranteed social and religious equality and provided for only a limited monarchy, expressed the deep-rooted desire of the Polish people, but today Poland is not free. It is Communist dominated.

However, the spirit of freedom is so strong in the people of that great Nation that, though dominated they refuse to be subservient to the Communist rulers. I have been fortunate to have visited in Poland in recent years. I have come from there each time more impressed by the courage of the people and their desire to live as free men. What has worked in other Communist dominated countries does not work in Poland, for the Poles refuse to give up their God given rights.

The Poles established a democratic constitutional government in 1791, in the vanguard of liberal European movements. The democratic intentions of the Poles were soon shattered, however, when Russia and Prussia partitioned Poland in 1793. Except for a brief period of independence after World War I, Poland has remained under Russian domination.

That period of independence between the world wars was an important time for Poland. For it gave the Polish people a taste of the independence they had never known. It taught them to resent an infringement on their liberty and freedom of action. They harbor a determination to regain that independence they once knew. I am confident that with such strength and determination, the Polish people will once again know the freedom first guaranteed in the Polish Constitution of 1791.

When I visited Poland, I found no greater friends of America than the Polish people, this despite the fact that they are entirely surrounded by Russians and have a Communist government dedicated to wiping out the great spirit of freedom that has always existed in the heart of the Polish people.

Poland is the outstanding example of a spirit that cannot be conquered, of a people who require to yield their beliefs of a nation that has outlasted Hitler's Nazism and who will outlive Khrushchev's communism.

While Poland may not be free, she makes a great contribution to mold freedom by the evident determination of her people to be free, by the refusal to be subservient to a conqueror. The bravery we associate with their stand at Warsaw in 1939 lives on. They are a people who refuse to surrender. One day they will truly know the freedom guaranteed in this Constitution of 1791.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join my fellow citizens in commemorating the anniversary of Poland's Constitution Day. This observance serves to remind us once again of the deep and abiding bonds that exist between freedom-loving Americans and freedom-loving men in Poland.

In my city of Buffalo, as well as in many cities throughout the Nation, there are many distinguished Americans of Polish ancestry. They are Polish-Americans who appreciate freedom. We deeply and strongly feel all that freedom means in the struggle to live a normal and complete way of life. We know the tragic past through which our forebears had to struggle. Poland is a small nation, but a great one and a proud one.

Polish history is replete with records of passionate struggles to achieve freedom and to regain it after it had been denied to them.

In the 16th century and after, no speech was complete without the reference to "our golden freedom." Poland's political development was based on the firm belief that freedom was every Pole's sacred trust. Out of this tradition came a great document—the Constitution of May 3, 1791—which was adopted scarcely less than 2 years after our Constitution in 1789. Based on the principal that all power is derived from the people, this first written Constitution in Europe was a major step in European social and political evolution. And yet this Constitution really never had a chance to be put in effect because in 1793 and in 1795, Poland's autocratic neighbors wrenched her cherished independence away from her. The Poles have been forced to live under the rule of the two most ruthless forms of tyranny the world has ever known. Each of these has used all the power at its command to break the spirit of the Polish people, but the Poles have remained true to the principal expressed in the framework of the great May 3 Constitution—"free from the shameful commands of foreign violence, valuing dearer than life, than personal happiness, the political existence, the external independence, and internal freedom of the Nation."

It is impossible for us to fathom the courage and strength it has taken for the Polish people to remain a spiritually free and independent people in the years since 1939.

Today we express our deepest admiration to the Poles and pay them humble tribute for the way in which they have shouldered their terrible burden. But human courage, endurance, and fortitude have their limits.

It is my hope and prayer that the time is near when the millions of heroic Polish people will be able to lift up their hearts and spirits to cheer freedom and give thanks to Almighty God for being free once again to join together with other free nations of the world.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, each nation has 1 day which more than any other captures the national spirit. For the United States this day is July 4, Independence Day. For Poland it is May 3, Constitution Day.

This Polish holiday celebrates the proclamation of a new Constitution in 1791. That event culminated a long 4-year struggle to free the country from an outmoded political and social system, just as France had done 2 years earlier. Unlike the French Revolution, however, the great changes in Poland were wrought without bloodshed and violence, for the country was blessed with a liberal and farsighted ruler, Stanislas Augustus, who took part in the reform movement.

The new Constitution transformed Poland into a modern constitutional monarchy with ministerial responsibility and biennial parliaments. Class distinctions were abolished, and privileges formerly open only to the gentry, such as owning land or serving in the ranks of the state or church, were now open to the humble townsman.

In addition, the protection of the law was extended to the peasants for the first time, and a start was made toward the eventual abolition of serfdom. Absolute religious toleration was also proclaimed. Finally, the Constitution embodied provisions for periodical reform by subsequent parliaments.

Yet this great liberal document was not destined to become a political reality, for a handful of reactionary Polish dignitaries were unable to accept the new order and sought Russian assistance. Catherine the Great, who did not relish the idea of a strengthened Poland to the west, was eager to help overthrow the new system and sent troops into Poland in April 1792. Prussia, who had pledged to aid Poland in the event of a Russian attack, reneged on her promise. The small Polish Army put up a spirited resistance but eventually was overwhelmed by the superior Russian forces. This defeat forced King Stanislas to abandon the new Constitution and paved the way for the second and third partitions of Poland.

Despite this tragedy and Poland's subsequent troubled history, the spirit of liberty lives on in Polish hearts. Even the most modern and efficient form of totalitarianism in history—the Communist system—has proven unable to break this characteristic Polish love of freedom. It is fitting, therefore, that we in the United States should commemorate the 172d anniversary of the Polish Constitution and renew our faith that Poland will once again be free.

One of Poland's greatest patriots, Ignace Jan Paderewski, will be remembered by a grateful people when a memorial table identifying his resting place in Arlington National Cemetery is dedicated by top Government officials, including Secretary of State Dean Rusk, on May 9, this year.

I pointed out in a speech in this House last year that no word or symbol or marker indicates the crypt where the body of this great patriot lies, and I urged that a tablet or other marker be erected so that the millions of Americans who visit Arlington National Cemetery would be made aware of the temporary resting place of this leader of the Polish people.

A number of Members of this House have also indicated an interest in seeing that the crypt in which the body of this great Polish statesman has been resting since 1941 be adequately marked.

In response to this interest which we have expressed on numerous occasions the President last year instructed the Army to prepare a suitable marker, one which would make clear that the crypt was only a temporary resting place until such time as the remains of this distinguished friend of the American people could be returned to his own country.

The inscription will read:

> Ignace Jan Paderewski, Polish statesman and musician—His remains rest temporarily within the USS *Maine* Memorial.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, the Poland that we know today is only a shadow of its former greatness. Territorially dismembered, dominated by Communist forces, who in turn are controlled by the Soviet Union, it exists in name only. Yet, the people, the Poles who have suffered for centuries under Russian tyranny, have refused to deny themselves the hope of political freedom and independence. They have clung to their memories, when Poland was liberated after the First World War. They also recall the era when their country was an empire, respected by all, with one of the most enlightened governments on the European Continent.

The King and the Government Assembly, the Diet, on May 3, 1791, joined forces to proclaim a Constitution which would release their country from feudalism. The basic need for such action was to gain the support of the entire populace in order to strengthen the nation against Russian encroachments. The Constitution succeeded in rallying the people; but Russian troops, which attacked less than a year after the constitutional declaration was promulgated, proved too strong for the Polish Army. Although inflicting heavy losses and several defeats upon their enemies, the Government was forced to concede and to abandon the Constitution which would have freed the common man from serfdom.

However, this historic document continued to be cherished by the people of Poland. Since the partition of 1795 when Poland was divided between its neighbors, since the uprising of 1863, when 250,000 Polish insurgents lost their lives or were exiled in their fight for freedom, since World Wars I and II, when Poland was scorched by invading armies, has the Constitution burned brightly as a symbol of freedom, undiminished throughout the years of slavery and turmoil. As May 3 is celebrated in the free world by those Poles who escaped to freedom from the Communist tyranny and by those of Polish origin, let us hope that those remaining in the Polish homeland will soon be able to take part in the glorification of their past and will once again enjoy the principles for which the Constitution stood—nationalism, independence, and democracy.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, Polish Constitution Day, which is being celebrated on this May 3, commemorates a glorious landmark in Poland's political history, in European history, and in the history of the modern civilized world. The drafting and adoption of the Polish Constitution by the Great Diet 172 years ago was a real turning point in the national development of the Poles. By it they effected a peaceful revolution in their form of government without resorting to violent and bloody measures. The framers of the Polish Constitution of 1791 succeeded eminently well in their endeavors. By adopting that liberal and popular document they led their countrymen from the feudal paths of the Middle Ages to the broad and progressive highways of modern times.

That momentous and significant document circumscribed the authority of the monarch, and introduced ministerial responsibility. The intricate, obstructive features of the old system were eliminated. The upper legislative chamber also lost some of its preponderant powers and the second chamber, which was elective and represented the nation, was vested with genuine legislative authority. Economic barriers between the nobility and the bourgeoisie were broken down; the townsmen recovered their judicial autonomy, and received a number of political rights, especially that of admission to many of the higher offices. Finally the peasantry were taken under the protection of the law. The Constitution abolished the worst abuses from which Poland had been suffering for many centuries. As has been justly observed, "through the abolition of the most crying political evils of the old regime, and the granting of increased freedom of action to the middle and lower classes, the Constitution marked a great advance upon all previous attempts at reform in Poland." It was highly praised by one of the greatest advocates of democratic government, the great Edmund Burke.

But this democratic document also aroused the ire of Poland's three crafty and grasping neighbors, who, fearing that through this document Poland might regain her former strength, hastened the execution of their designs for the partitioning of Poland.

As we all know, before the unfortunate Poles had any time to enjoy the benefits of this new Constitution their country was attacked, overrun and then parcelled out among the autocrats of Austria, Prussia, and Russia. Having lost their national independence, all Poles became subjects of alien governments in their own homeland, and for about 120 years they lived under oppressive foreign rule. Nevertheless they managed to keep alive the spirit of national independence—drawing spiritual substenance from the cardinal aims and principles of the Constitution of 1791. Toward the close of the First World War the Poles happily witnessed the defeat of their oppressors, and they rejoiced at this opportunity to regain their freedom.

Before the end of that war Poland proclaimed her political independence. After the signature of the peace treaties, the government of the newly liberated country took its place among the free countries of Europe. The next 20 years were years of reconstruction and regeneration. Toward the end of the 1930's, Poland's neighbors on both east and west once more grew powerful and plotted against Poland's independence. The Communist-Nazi alliance of August 1939 again sounded the death knell of Poland's independence.

Poland's tragic history since September 1, 1939, is too well known to narrate in detail here. Outnumbered and outmaneuvered, the brave Poles fought valiantly against the ruthless invaders, but in the end their armed forces were completely vanquished. Their country was once more partitioned, this time by Hitler and Stalin, and millions of Poles were driven out of their historic homeland. Many of those who stayed behind carried on the underground struggle against the invaders. For more than 4 years they fought the battle for freedom behind the enemy lines. Toward the end of the Second World War the Poles were liberated by the forces of the Soviet Union. Then one-third of the country was annexed by the Soviet Union, and a Communist puppet regime was set up in the remaining part of the country. In short, it seems that all the sacrifices made by the Poles were in vain. Today some 25 million industrious and brave Poles work and live in their homeland, but they are not free, for freedom as we understand it in the West is denied to them. But even in such unenviable circumstances the spirit of the Constitution of 1791 is still with them, and there is no doubt that on the 172d anniversary of its adoption and promulgation all Poles everywhere feel proud of their great liberal heritage as embodied in that great Constitution.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues today in commemorating the 170th anniversary of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, and commend the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. NEDZI] for giving us an opportunity to make this observance.

History shows us that some of the greatest achievements of humanity were produced during times of crisis and stress. When challenged by fate, mankind has awakened from slumber, stood erect, and answered the challenge.

It was during such a time of stress, when the kingdom of Poland was plagued by the need for national uniity, for governmental and civil reforms, and beset by greedy neighbors, that its citizens produced one of the remarkable documents of our civilization; the Constitution of May 3, 1791.

This Constitution did not bring any startling innovations, since the principles on which it was based had already been put into effect here in our own country. But the peaceful manner in which it came to exist, and the manner in which it has survived to this day, are indeed remarkable, and set an example for the world to follow.

One of the very unusual occurrences in history—and a factor which we should bear in mind today—is the fact that, through the years which followed the adoption of their famous constitution, the people of Poland remained true to the principles which it embodied. Although their country was partitioned again and again by more powerful and aggressive neighboring nations, and although they were subjected, in the course of the century that followed, to constant attempts at forced russification, they abided by their heritage.

It was this tradition of freedom that inspired the people of Poland to be the first under Communist domination to throw off the oppressive Stalinist yoke. This was done without bloodshed just as the May 3 Constitution was implemented peacefully.

We would be seriously deluding ourselves, however, if we supposed that the people of Poland are free today. Their bonds appear still forged in Moscow; the ever-present threat of Russian armed might enforces obedience to the Kremlin.

The road to full freedom and democracy will be long and tortuous. But knowing the love of liberty that burns deep in the hearts of the people of Poland—the same love of liberty that created the May 3 Constitution—I am certain that someday Poland will be free again.

As we pay tribute to the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, let us reaffirm our friendship for the people of that noble country, and pledge our encouragement and assistance to them as they struggle to achieve more liberty by means of evolution.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a privilege for me to join with my colleagues here in the U.S. House of Representatives in paying tribute to the brave people of Poland on their Constitution Day.

Only 2 years after ratification of our own Constitution, the Polish Constitution of 1791 was adopted. This document, like our own, was born of a battle for independence fought against overwhelming odds. Unfortunately, Russian arms duplicity deferred the cherished hope that Poles might govern themselves as freemen. Today, it is a sad fact that Poland is forced to suffer under the yoke of the barbaric and tyrannical forces which rule all of Eastern Europe from behind the walls of the Kremlin. But despite constant Communist pressures and renewed efforts to re-Stalinize the Government, the faith of the People of Poland has not been shaken and I am confident that no amount of religious and political persecution will ever destroy the will of the Poles to be again free and independent.

Let us pray that the day will be soon when Poland will again enjoy the freedom for which they have fought for centuries and which they so richly and justly deserve. The Americans have not forgotten their pledge to assist Poland regain their freedom and I am happy to be a part of it.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, it is with a full sense of the solemnity of the occasion that I rise to join in this, our annual tribute to the brave people of Poland. It is now nearly a quarter century since that late summer of 1939 when, despite the dogged resistance of a heroic nation, the combined might of Nazi Germany and Stalinist Russia snuffed out the light of Polish independence. The Polish people are for the moment not free to determine their own national destiny. For the moment they live in the dark shadow of one of the greatest tyrannies the world has ever known. But does anyone suggest that the Poles have lost their love of liberty? Does anyone in his heart believe that the Polish people are doomed to an eternity of servitude? I do not believe these things, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure no one in this House does. The Polish people have not changed; they have not lost that love of liberty and abhorrence of tyranny for which they have long been renowned throughout Europe. Poland will one day be free.

And when that day comes the free citizens of Poland will owe a deep debt of gratitude to the men and women of Polish blood who—living in other, often far-distant lands—have never failed to remind the world of Poland's plight and of Poland's yearning for freedom. It has always been a source of great strength for this country that men and women could come to love America without ceasing to love their native lands. Today we salute the people of Poland. I should like to pay tribute also to the thousands of Polish-Americans who have done so much to keep alive the spirit of Polish freedom.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, once again this year I would like to pay tribute to freedom-loving Polish people everywhere on the anniversary of Constitution Day, May 3.

This momentous occasion in 1791, barely 2 years after the United States adopted her Constitution, was a joyous occasion indeed, but unfortunately the bright light of freedom was to glow only briefly for the courageous Poles.

For me there is sadness in the commemoration of an event based on a people's love of freedom when these people are under the domination of an alien and godless ideology. Those Poles in the homeland cannot celebrate the occasion themselves because they continue to be under oppressive rule.

It should not be overlooked at this time that the heroic Poles have valiantly fought for freedom beginning with the uprising in 1794 and continuing again in 1831 and 1863.

The 1863 uprising against Russian tyranny was the greatest, longest, and bloodiest event of its kind in Polish history. The Russians brought 350,000 veteran troops into Poland to quell the uprising.

This then, is a time for Americans to reaffirm our dedication to the cause of freedom for all people. We must let the people of Poland know, and the people everywhere who are under Communist domination, that our unceasing efforts will be devoted to the downfall of their oppressors.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join with my colleagues in the House of Representatives in paying tribute to the Polish people on the occasion of Polish Constitution Day.

It was on May 3, 1791, that Poland succeeded in reforming her public life and in eradicating her internal decline. But this great rebirth came to the Poles too late and did not forestall the third partition of Poland in 1795 by Russia, Prussia, and Austria. During the 19th century, despite heroic revolutions, Poland was kept under the yoke of alien autocracies. Regrettably, throughout the intervening years Poland has been under tyrannical rule with a resultant suppression of all civil and religious liberties.

Poland's will to regain its proper place in civilization is undaunted. Although submerged by the Soviet tide of colonialism, it is in its inner life more anti-Communist than almost any other nation on earth.

Today the Polish Nation, even though derived of freedom and forced to live under a totally alien system of communism belongs to the leading nations of Europe. Not only because of its historical heritage or its geopolitical position in the heart of east-central Europe, but because of its ceaseless fight for ideals of freedom.

Thousands of citizens of Polish descent live in the First Congressional District of New Jersey and I am proud of the contributions which they have made to the arts, sciences, religion, and industry of our area.

So, on their constitution day we join in renewing our fervent prayers that the day will soon dawn when Poland's independence is rightfully restored.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, 1791, 172 years ago tomorrow, the Polish Constitution was signed. This document gave the Polish people for the first time the principles of representative government.

We have watched with sadness how those principles have been trampled by the Soviet-Communist regime in the years since World War II. American hearts go out to the Polish people, who have so gallantly resisted the forces of tyranny and oppression in Poland, and to their compatriots here in our own Nation.

I hope the Members of the House will join with me in paying tribute to the Polish people on their Constitution Day. The spirit of that Constitution lives in Poland today and in the hearts of Americans of Polish descent and their friends. Let us hope that the principles that inspired the 1791 constitution will one day govern Poland again.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, we mark May 3 as an anniversary and as a memorial.

It is an anniversary of the adoption of Poland's Constitution in 1791, just 2 years after we in this new nation adopted our own Constitution.

This day is also revered as a memory of the days when there was a free Poland. Americans join the Polish people and people of Polish origin in many countries in renewing our dedication to the memory of free Poland and this Constitution.

That Constitution was a memorable document, a forward-looking document granting religious and personal freedoms and giving additional power to the people through elected representation. It came in an era when popular sovereignty was gaining strength around the world, and it advanced this cause in central Europe.

Now we find Poland without these freedoms. We find the continued rule of the Soviet Communists over the land. We join the Polish people in their prayers for deliverance from this oppressor.

It is most fitting that we in Congress mark this anniversary. The Polish people who have come to this country have made substantial contribution to our country. They have joined the great melting pot of America and worked for their new land, yet they retain the memory of the old country.

It gives me great pleasure to join in these remarks on this occasion. We all look forward to the day when a new Polish Constitution Day may be celebrated in Poland.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, we meet again to call attention to the great love of the Polish people for freedom, and to the present oppressive state of Soviet domination which makes Poland one of the captive nations.

There is much of Polish history which might be reviewed in these circumstances. I would like to point to one area of recent history, and I will present it as it is told in my recent book "Russian Frontiers."

Russia's rape of Poland was a source of discord at every conference throughout World War II. It was always the problem that was "swept under the rug."

Polish freedom was recognized by the Treaty of Riga, signed March 18, 1921. Lenin called it "a voluntary and just agreement to stand for all time."

Poland steadfastly refused to accept communism, prospered far more than her Russian neighbor, and although having been jammed between Germany and Russia by the misfortune of geography she retained friendly relations with each. At Russia's repeated insistence Poland signed a nonaggression pact on July 25, 1932, which was extended to December 31, 1945. In the spring of 1939, Soviet diplomats made efforts to induce Hitler to wage war against Poland, while at the same time encouraging Polish resistance to Germany by promising Russian assistance. On August 23, 1939, Russia made her infamous agreement with Germany whereby each was to seize and divide Poland. Pursuant to this agreement, Germany attacked Poland on September 1, 1939 with 87 divisions. Russia continued to promise Poland her friendship while massing troops on the Russo-Polish frontier. Seventeen days later, 100 Russian divisions moved across the Polish eastern frontier without opposition while the Polish troops were fighting the Germans on the other frontier.

Despite Russia's pretended friendship to Poland, her true attitude was expressed in Molotov's broadcast on October 8, 1939:

> One swift blow to Poland, first by the German Army and then by the Red Army and nothing was left of this ugly offspring of the Versailles Treaty.

In the German attack on Russia in 1941, Russia was forced out of Poland. She returned in 1944 and her military forces still remain there in great force.

Russia never intended that there should be a free Poland. She intended that Poland should remain a controlled, regimented satellite under Russia. Since Teheran it had been apparent that Russia intended to keep military control of East Germany. To accomplish this it was necessary for her to keep control of Poland—Poland was on Russia's road to the west through East Germany, West Germany, France, and the rest of Western Europe.

The postwar bitterness of the Polish and East German people toward Russia has demonstrated that only the presence of Russian armed forces will keep these countries in the Russian orbit. Russian strategy was directed toward only one goal, the enslavement of Poland, a country which Russia, in conjunction with other countries, had forcibly partitioned three times within two centuries and, as late as 1939, had invaded in conjunction with the armies of Hitler. Russia destroyed the cream of the crop of young, educated Poles who were capable and willing to fight for a free Poland, a crime that she would never have committed had she desired a free Poland. Two outstanding instances, although there were many more, will suffice to emphasize this point.

In April of 1943, a factor entered the Russo-Polish problem that still plagues Russia and is especially embarrassing to her "parlor pink" friends in the Western World. Thousands of Polish, officers, the elite of the educated young men of Poland, were missing, presumably killed in the war. However, evidence began to point out the fact that Russia had murdered them en masse. The Polish Government asked the International Red Cross to investigate. Russia pretended righteous indignation and loudly proclaimed her innocence, but bitterly refused even the thought of an investigation. Russia used this issue as an excuse for refusing to deal with the legal Polish Government.

In 1952 a select committee of the House of Representatives, after thorough investigation and a well-documented report, "The Katyn Forest Massacre"—House Report 2505—found that: "beyond any question of reasonable doubt, the Soviet NKVD—Peoples' Commissariat of Internal Affairs—committed the mass murders of the Polish officers and intellectual leaders in the Katyn Forest, near Smolensk, Russia."

These were the officers that had been fighting Germany for Polish freedom. Stalin was aware that although these officers were fighting Germany and assisting Russia, these same officers would fight any country that would attempt to enslave the Polish people; that they were first of all dedicated to freedom, a freedom that Russia was equally dedicated to destroying. As Stalin did not intend that there should ever be a free Poland he had these 15,000 officers, together with other leading Polish citizens, murdered in the Katyn Forest.

The second incident occurred as the Russians were advancing toward the capture of Warsaw. This incident should remove the slighest lingering doubt of Russia's intentions to take over Poland and reduce her to impotency.

The Polish Warsaw underground that had been bitterly and effectively fighting Germany was making preparations for a mass revolt to assist the oncoming Russian Army. At 8:15 p.m. on July 24, 1944, a radio station in Moscow named Kosciuszko called upon the Polish people to arise and assist in expelling the Germans:

> Poles, the time for liberation is at hand. Poles, to arms. There is not a moment to lose.

Two days later the Polish people in Warsaw arose and fought valiantly. But the Russian Army stopped its advance toward Warsaw in order to allow the Germany Army to massacre these poorly armed Poles. This tragic battle of the Polish people for freedom will go down in history as one of the great epics in courage of our age. The Russian plot to cause the most courageous of the Poles to be slaughtered should go down in history as one of the most vicious, blackest betrayals of all time. Russia would not even allow American planes to use Russian airfields to drop arms and supplies to the Poles. Many thousands of Poles were killed and Warsaw was destroyed while the Russian Army encamped 6 miles away. The Premier of Poland, Mikolajczyk, personally interceded with Stalin to save these Polish patriots who were fighting the Germany Army. Stalin said:

> I cannot trust the Poles; they suspect me of wanting to occupy Poland and are making a lot of trouble for me.

The Soviets wanted the Polish patriots destroyed. In the fall of 1961, I stood where the Soviet Army had been encamped on July 26, 1944. Across the Vistula I could plainly see Warsaw, where the Polish patriots were massacred by the Germans. It was clear that Russians could have easily moved in to assist the Polish underground, who had risen against the Germans at the direction of the Russian radio.

Mr. Speaker, we continue as a nation to "sweep under the rug" the problems of the captive nations. In fact many of us are concerned by recent indications that Cuba has become a captive nation, and that the administration is trying to sweep this one under the rug, too.

This annual reminder in the cause of freedom is very necessary to keep this matter before us. It is obvious that such situations do not just disappear, and that when nothing positive is done to counteract them they persist year after year. I trust that as the years go on we will not add the names of other nations to the list of those we honor in this unhappy manner. I hope that the May 3d may soon come when we can honor Polish freedom in fact and not just in desire.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, among the scores of nations involved in the last war, none suffered so much as Poland. The Polish people were the first to bear the brunt of brutal fighting, and today they remain the helpless victims of wartime and postwar international events. They are among the largest national groups in Europe, yet they are not masters of their destiny because they suffer under the heavy yoke of the mighty Soviet Union. Such national calamities often lead people from despondency to despair. But the Poles, the descendants of brave forebears, have never been deflected from the course they have followed in the hope of attaining their national goal. This was clearly illustrated in Polish history in the late 18th century.

After the partition of the country in 1772, when one-third of Poland was parceled out among her foes, Polish leaders worked hard to prevent such subsequent disasters, and the most important move they made was in the reorganization and strengthening of Poland's National Government. They were well aware of the Government's weaknesses and faults, and were determined to overhaul it by introducing liberal and democratic features into the Constitution. With that objective in mind a band of enlightened, patriotic and liberal members of the Diet—Parliament—constituted themselves a committee to draft a a new constitution. This was in 1788, and by early 1791 their Constitution was ready. When submitted to the whole Diet, it was approved by the Diet and adopted on May 3 of that year. This is known as the Constitution of May 3, and since then that date has become a national holiday in Poland.

This Constitution was remarkable in many ways. Its liberal and democratic provisions ushered in a new era in Poland. Poland became a limited constitutional monarchy. A liberal parliamentary system was introduced and ministerial responsibility was established. The electorate was enlarged and certain privileges formerly enjoyed by the few were made available to the many. The entire peasantry was brought under the protection of the law and the landlords' prerogatives were sharply curtailed. Religious tolerance was established. Most of these provisions represented sweeping political innovations in Central and Eastern Europe. The promulgation and adoption of this Constitution was a symbolic assertion of Poland's determination to link her fortunes with the West.

This annual commemoration of the Polish Constitution Day provides a way for all those who believe in freedom to pay tribute to the men who forged that inspiring document, and also to those brave souls who through the years have sacrificed their lives so the ideals embodied in the Constitution of May 3 might take root and live.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, once again we are assembled to commemorate the Constitution of Poland, written 172 years ago.

Comparisons between our own great constitution and that of Poland, adopted a scant 2 years apart, have often been drawn by succeeding generations. Each was written as a testament to liberty and the rights of man and each has been preserved, although one has survived solely in the hearts of men who yearn to be free and one has given other more fortunate men a foundation for the greatest democracy the world has ever seen.

The United States is strong because our constitution has become the bulwark of our society and a framework for emerging nations. Poland, although ruthlessly oppressed and overrun 4 short years after adopting its constitution, still retains the memory of this noble effort to liberate the country and its gallant people for all time.

We are engaged in a battle of wills and ideologies against the pervasive tyranny of those who would systematically drown the voices of freedom. The end of the struggle is not in sight. We must, if liberty and self-determination are to be preserved, commit every resource, every effort, every free human being to the task which confronts us.

Much of our courage and strength for this effort can be drawn from the great documents of our common human past, stretching back through 5,000 years of recorded time. Poland's Constitution was a gigantic tribute to independent thought. It must be preserved to give hope to all men who are unwillingly chained to a system of controlled thought.

Human history and tradition have brought much of the world to a recognition of certain universal and basic rights which apply to all men. By preserving these triumphant efforts of our ancestors, many of whom fought and died to preserve a dream of liberty, we are keeping faith with the future. By commemorating the nobility of human spirit which somehow has managed to survive all forms of political and religious persecution, we extend the encouragement of hope to those millions who must for a time continue to endure despotic captivity.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly join my colleagues and friends in this great deliberative body in commemorating the Constitution of Poland. I pray the day is not far distant when the rights of all men to live in peace and dignity will become a reality. With God's help, we may live to see it.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there is profound significance in these ceremonies today in the historic Chamber of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States. Similar ceremonies are being held in the other body. In every city in our country and in every hamlet the 172d anniversary of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, is being observed. I am sure the Kremlin will not escape the significance of the nationwide observance in the United States of the holiday of free Poland, not only officially in the Capital at Washington, but by the people of our country in all the States of the Union.

It is the writing on the wall. The day of doom is fast approaching for the ruthless and godless invaders from Communist Russia. There is no power on earth that can conquer the spirit of the Polish people. There is no force of arms strong enough to drive the people of Poland from their faith in God, the dignity of man, and in freedom.

The flag of free Poland soon again will wave. The blessing to mankind of Polish genius in statesmen, in music, in literature, art, industry and, over and above all, in clean and honest living, in neighborliness and in faith in God, soon again will flow from a Poland freed of its captor, a Poland restored to its place of eminence in the family of free nations.

That is the significance of these ceremonies that prove the common interest and the joint determination of the people of free Poland and the people of the United States.

From our earliest colonial days the sons and daughters of Poland have been a mightly force in the building of our United States to its position of world leadership. Polish blood has drenched every American battlefield, and Polish sweat has never been spared when there was work to be done to advance the growth of our nation and the happiness of its men, women, and children.

It is natural that the cause of free Poland should be the cause of the American people. It is natural because Polish blood flows in millions of American veins and not an American, regardless of the land of his family origin, has been untouched by enriching association with friends of Polish birth or blood.

It is natural because the spirit of freedom of Poland and the ceaseless rebellion of her people against oppression and injustice, are so akin to our own. In heart, in mind, in determination we are as one people.

Mr. Speaker, that is why all Americans today join in observance of the 172d anniversary of one of the most remarkable documents in the tradition of Western liberalism. On May 3, 1791, the Polish Diet passed a new constitution which heralded a thoroughgoing modernization of the Republic's archaic political and social system.

While the May 3 constitution is in part a product of the European revolutionary movement in the late 18th century, it represents a distinctly Polish achievement.

The ideas of the French Revolution, for example, were widely known in Poland during the 4 years that the new constitution was being worked out. There were fundamental differences, however, between the situations in France and Poland.

The great uprising in France swept away the old absolute monarchy with its excessive centralization and disregard for human rights. Poland's problem, on the other hand, was a weak and overly decentralized political system, and the 1791 constitution was designed to reform this structure.

The social changes wrought by the two movements were also different. The French Declaration of the Rights of Man abolished class distinctions, and the French Constitution of 1791 eliminated all the social institutions and titles which were based on these class inequalities.

The Polish Constitution, on the contrary, maintained the nobility and vested it with primary responsibility for defending the laws and liberties of the land. The remarkable thing about this aspect of the constitution was that the nobility freely extended the prerogatives of its class to a large number of the country's inhabitants. This type of social reform did not suddenly make everyone ordinary citizens as did the French Revolution, but the most oppressed classes were given the possibility of a better future.

There is no counterpart to the French Declaration of the Rights of Man or the American Bill of Rights in the Polish Constitution of 1791. But in the provisions of the charter none of the essential human rights is omitted. All citizens are guaranteed the right of personal safety and private property, and the freedoms of speech, of writing and printing, and of religious belief are insured.

One of the mainstays of these rights and liberties in the May 3 constitution is the principle of the separation of powers, which is one of the fundamental tenets of the American Constitution. In fact, these two great liberal documents both achieve the double requirement of any good political organization to create a strong authority while guaranteeing that this authority is not exercised arbitrarily at the expense of individual freedom.

It is thus a particular honor for an American to commemorate the 172d anniversary of the Polish Constitution, which represents one of the great achievements of Poland and Western civilization.

Mr. Speaker, I am closing my remarks by including excerpts of a letter from Charles Burke, the Washington representative of the Polish-American Congress. Three distinguished Chicagoans constitute the executive board of the congress: Charles Rozmarek, president; the Reverend Valerian S. Karcz, secretary; and Joseph Pranica, treasurer; and there are three Chicagoans among its vice presidents—Miss Adele Lagodzinska, Hon. Thaddeus V. Adisko, and Stanislaw Kaczor.

The excerpt from Mr. Burke's letter follow:

> As we approach May the 3d, free Poland's national holiday, I am taking the liberty of reminding you that this year marks the 100th anniversary of the Polish January uprising of 1863. There were other Polish uprisings against the Russian rule: The Kosciuszko uprising in 1794, the November uprising in 1831, the Warsaw uprising in 1944 against the German occupation, but the 1863 uprising against the Russian tyranny was the greatest, longest, and bloodiest uprising in the Polish history. The Polish patriots fought the Russian occupation army for over 2 years.
>
> During the night of January 22, 1863, units of Polish insurgents attacked Russian garrisons in many localities and captured considerable amounts of arms and ammunition. The movement spread to all parts of the country like a forest fire. In all Polish communities under Russian rule there were instantaneous uprisings.
>
> In the beginning the Polish insurgents had some significant successes but when the Russians brought into Poland 350,000 seasoned troops of the regular Russian Army—the fate of the uprising was sealed.
>
> On one side were well-equipped regular army units; on the other the heroic insurgent army poorly equipped, having insufficient supplies and inadequate training. Despite these handicaps the brave insurgents achieved many successes over Russian Army regiments in over 1,000 battles and skirmishes all over Poland.
>
> Over 20,000 Poles were killed in battles, thousands were captured, 600 leaders were executed by firing squads or hanged in public squares, the rest were sent to the mines in Siberia.
>
> The last leader of the uprising, Romuald Traugutt, and four of his assistants were hanged in the public square in Warsaw in view of the kneeling, praying, and weeping crowd of 25,000.
>
> The last detachment of Polish insurgents led by Rev. Dr. Brzoska was surrendered and wiped out in April 1865.
>
> The Russian Government ordered the so-called military pacification of the country. Thousands of Poles were arrested and deported to Siberia. Their property was confiscated. Polish language was banned from offices and schools. The economy of Poland was destroyed. The sense of real mourning enveloped the entire nation.
>
> The Polish nation lost 250,000 of its best sons—the flower of its manhood—killed in battles, executed, and exiled to Siberia.
>
> United States at that time was in the throes of civil war, and Europe was deaf to the cries of the martyred nation.
>
> The Polish people suffered a defeat in the fight for independence, but the social reforms put through by its leaders gave the Poles a strength and cohesion against which all attempts at denationalization were shattered.
>
> By paying tribute to the 100th anniversary of the Polish uprising of 1863 we are also paying tribute to Poland's defenders of freedom for the past thousand years.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in 1772, great areas of Poland were partitioned between Prussia, Austria, and Russia. In this partition she lost about one-third of her territory and half of her population. She was used as a pawn in the game of power politics, her land serving as compensation to Austria and Prussia for Russian gains in a war with the Turks. Austria had been so alarmed by the Russian victories that she was considering war. However, to keep the peace the Prussian Emperor worked out the dismemberment of Poland for the benefit of all—except the country divided.

At the time of the death of the Prussian Emperor, Frederick the Great, in 1786, the Russians were again at war with the Turks, and the Prussians saw a chance to aline, for their own eventual gain, with the Poles against their former friends, the Russians. They encouraged the Poles, now that Russia's attention was diverted elsewhere, to make a play for more freedom.

Progressive and enlightened political thought was a characteristic of Polish liberalism then much in evidence, and it was from a group of these advanced thinkers and patriots that impetus came to call a session of the Polish Parliament—the Diet—to consider, among other items, constitional reform. The Diet started meeting in 1788 with the progressive patriots taking the lead in work on the new constitution. However, their ideas were too radical and too advanced for the majority of the Diet members, who represented to a great extent the land-military aristocracy.

In spite of pressure from the King, Stanislas Augustus, and other liberal leaders, it was almost 3 years before the auspicious moment came to push the constitution through the Diet. The great day came on May 3, 1791, when conditions within the Diet and country were right, and the constitution was finally passed in which a hereditary monarchy was established, thus giving stability to the throne, with executive power being conferred upon the King and a council of state. A two-chamber legislature was established, and the liberum veto—whereby previously any one member of the Diet could veto any bill under discussion—was abolished. The spirit of political freedom that was launched by the American Declaration of Independence, the American Constitution, and by the French Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen, all had been caught up in this charter of freedom and responsible government granted to the Polish peoples. But too much time had been taken in getting this constitution out in the open. Russia had finished her war in Turkey, Catherine was Empress, and political freedom within Russia was unknown. A free, independent, and liberal Poland could not be tolerated by the Russian rulers. In 1792 Russia, again seeking friendship with Prussia by offering further Polish territory as bait, invaded Poland, ostensibly at the request of some Poles who were dissatisfied with the new reforms. Heroic resistance lasting over 3 months was made by the Polish patriots, but they were greatly outnumbered and, when Prussia, who had encouraged Polish resistance to Russia, also joined in the invasion, the hopes of the Polish liberals were finished. The constitution of 1791 was consigned, after a brief year of glory, to history. Poland was again partitioned and overt liberalism was at an end.

Yet, the spirit of resistance remained. A revolt led by that famous hero of Polish independence, Kosciuszko, in 1794, was brutally put down by the combined forces of Russia and Prussia. This resulted in even further partition of the country in 1795. Such repression could still not hold down the driving force of Polish nationalism and again in 1830–31 another attempt was made by the Polish nationalists to drive the Russians from their nation's soil. However, the nationalists were themselves torn by internal dissension between radicals and moderates, and this lack of unity gave strength to the Russian retaliation, and gave to the Russian forces eventual success in putting down the revolt. In retaliation for their drive for freedom the Poles were harshly treated by the Russians, the current constitution was abrogated and replaced by an organic statute, political rights were lost and only limited local administration was allowed freedom from outside control—Poland was almost made into an integral part of Russia.

When Alexander II became Emperor of Russia in 1853 the Poles hoped that his reputation for moderation would bring to them some lifting of Russian control, and in a few ways their hopes were granted. But in spite of Alexander's attempts at moderation in dealing with the Polish problem the situation had gone too far. To the more radical of the Polish nationalists it looked as if complete freedom was in sight if a positive policy of resistance were used. With this attitude the Polish national movement gained more support, and as it did so, Russian counterpressure against any liberalization of their Poland policy was intensified. There was a public hanging of certain leaders who were accused of trying to assassinate the czar's brother, and the youth of Poland who were agitating for their freedom were forcibly inducted into the army. This was too much to bear and so, again, just 100 years ago this past January 22, the Poles revolted against their Russian overlords. Again, too, this revolt was severely put down. The other nations of Europe who were a party to the Congress of Vienna, which in 1815 agreed to guarantee Polish integrity, did little or nothing to help the Polish patriots, the nationalists were defeated by superior forces—again Poland was back under the complete control of the czar.

The struggle continued, and continues today, for the Poles are a people who love liberty so much that they will fight to preserve it for all whenever it is endangered. We remember today her liberal background and heroic attempts to insure continuing freedom and salute their spirit, both past and now, assuring our Polish friends of support in their aims.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the Polish Constitution of 1791. Tomorrow we celebrate the 172d anniversary of that significant day in Polish history when the historic Constitution of May 3 was adopted. To the Polish people, this has become the most meaningful of all their national ceremonies and celebrations. This holiday has a national significance for the Poles similar to that which our own Constitution has for the American people. The Polish people cherish the fundamental liberties of the human spirit so beautifully expressed in the Constitution of 1791.

The anniversary of the Polish Constitution provides a proper occasion for us to rededicate ourselves to the cause of oppressed Poland. To a great extent this cause of Poland is our cause because it has its roots in a desire for freedom. The people of Poland have a right to know that we in America who owe so much to those of Polish birth, cherish the thought that a free and sovereign Poland will one day rise again.

Mr. Speaker, I include as a part of my remarks the text of a letter from Mr. Charles Burke, Washington representative of the Polish American Congress. Mr. Burke's letter contains a stirring and meaningful commentary on the significance of the Polish Constitution of 1791:

POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS, INC.,
Washington, D.C., April 20, 1963.

Hon. TORBERT H. MACDONALD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. MACDONALD: From the time, when first among the free nations of the world, Poland heroically responded to the challenge of the Soviet-Nazi totalitarianism, the Congress of the United States has been annually demonstrating its feelings of faithful friendship toward the Polish nation. Each year a special observance is being held in the House of Representatives and in the Senate on May 3, in commemoration of Poland's great Constitution of 1791.

This Constitution incorporates enduring precepts of public policy and democracy. Its principles were rooted in the Pole's love and attachment to freedom and independence. These principles lived in the hearts of many Polish generations. In times of national well-being as well as in times of misfortune, they represented fountainhead of national consciousness, patriotism and ever-present readiness to make sacrifices for the common cause of freedom of all nations.

As we approach May 3, free Poland's national holiday, I am taking the liberty of reminding you that this year marks the 100th anniversary of the Polish January uprising of 1863. There were other Polish uprisings against the Russian rule: The Kosciuszko uprising in 1794, the November uprising in 1831, the Warsaw uprising in 1944 against the German occupation; but the 1863 uprising against the Russian tyranny was the greatest, longest, and bloodiest uprising in the Polish history. The Polish patriots fought the Russian occupation army for over 2 years.

During the night of January 22, 1863, units of Polish insurgents attacked Russian garrisons in many localities and captured considerable amounts of arms and ammunition. The movement spread to all parts of the country like a forest fire. In all Polish communities under Russian rule there were instantaneous uprisings.

In the beginning, the Polish insurgents had some significant successes but when the Russians brought into Poland 350,000 seasoned troops of the regular Russian Army—the fate of the uprising was sealed.

On one side were well-equipped regular army units; on the other, the heroic insurgent army, poorly equipped, having insufficient supplies and inadequate training. Despite these handicaps the brave insurgents achieved many successes over Russian Army regiments in over 1,000 battles and skirmishes all over Poland.

Over 20,000 Poles were killed in battles, thousands were captured, 600 leaders were executed by firing squads or hanged in public squares, the rest were sent to the mines in Siberia.

The last leader of the uprising, Romuald Traugutt, and four of his assistants were hanged in the public square in Warsaw in view of the kneeling, praying, and weeping crowd of 25,000.

The last detachment of Polish insurgents led by Rev. Dr. Brzoska was surrendered and wiped out in April 1865.

The Russian Government ordered the so-called military pacification of the country. Thousands of Poles were arrested and deported to Siberia. Their property was confiscated. Polish language was banned from offices and schools. The economy of Poland was destroyed. The sense of real mourning enveloped the entire nation.

The Polish nation lost 250,000 of its best sons—the flower of its manhood—killed in battles, executed, and exiled to Siberia.

United States at that time was in the throes of civil war and Europe was deaf to the cries of the martyred nation.

The Polish people suffered a defeat in the fight for independence but the social reforms put through by its leaders gave the Poles a strength and cohesion against which all attempts at denationalization were shattered.

By paying tribute to the 100th anniversary of the Polish uprising of 1863 we are also paying tribute to Poland's defenders of freedom for the past 1,000 years.

The Polish American Congress representing over 7 million Americans of Polish ancestory expresses its fervent hope that you will see fit to participate in the observance scheduled to take place on the floor of both Chambers of the Congress on the 3d of May, which day since 1791 is observed by all free Poles as Poland's national holiday.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, the proud and stouthearted people of Poland have always been restive under alien rule in their homeland. This was particularly true when they were forcibly held down by callous and ruthless Russian governors for more than a full century. By the year 1863 they had already endured the heavy yoke of the czarist regime, and now they were prepared to challenge the authority of their overlords by staging open rebellion against it.

In January this momentous but abortive move started well and at first appeared going well for the Poles. As the rising spread to most of the country, Russians were caught unaware and thus seemed unable to bring matters under their control. At this stage of the fighting the Poles were certain of victory, but as the protracted fighting continued and as massive Russian reinforcements arrived in Poland, the Polish cause seemed doomed, for without effective and immediate outside aid the gallant and dauntless Poles could not withstand the full force of mighty Russia. Thus ended the most heroic attempt of the Polish people to get rid of their hated oppressors, 100 years ago. On the centenary observance of that important event all Poles can be proud of the fact that a century ago their forebears were as fully eager to regain their freedom and independence as the Polish people of today are praying for their freedom from Communist totalitarian tyranny.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, on May 3 we marked the 172d anniversary of one of the greatest events in the history of Poland, the proclamation of a new liberal constitution in 1791.

The last decades of the 18th century were revolutionary times when many of our present democratic principles and institutions gained their first triumphs over the old order of autocratic rule. To the older tradition of British constitutional monarchy were added the turbulent French Republic and the young American democracy. Reforms were badly needed in Poland at that time, particularly since the country's internal weaknesses made it vulnerable to the aggressive designs of Russia.

Over a 3-year period the constitutional reforms were hammered out of the conflicting interests and attitudes of the various social groups. The result was a great liberal document which met the demand for stable government as well as the need for basic human rights and broader political representation.

On May 3, 1791, King Stanislas Augustus, who had taken part in the secret negotiations, introduced the draft constitution in the Diet and urged its passage. Most of the deputies favored the document, but a handful of reactionaries staged a wild attempt to defeat it. After several tumultuous hours the constitution was passed amid great rejoicing.

This moment of triumph and its promise for Poland's future were both short lived. Catherine the Great, ruler of Imperial Russia, did not enjoy the prospect of a strengthened Poland and resolved to complete the partition of the country begun in 1772. Conspiring with three Polish dignitaries who opposed the new constitution, she ordered the Russian armies to invade Poland on April 8, 1792.

Deserted by the Prussians, who had promised to aid them, the small Polish army won three pitched battles but was nonetheless unable to stop the advance of the Russian forces. After 3 months of fighting, Poland was defeated and the King was forced to abandon the constitution. This led to the dismemberment of Poland by Russia, Austria, and Prussia in 1793 and 1795.

This great document was thus never given a chance to take root in the soil of political reality and grow into a living institution, as our American Constitution was able to do. Nevertheless, the Polish Constitution lives on as a testament to the Poles' longing for freedom and democracy, a desire which sadly today remains unfulfilled. On the occasion of Polish Constitution Day I join Poles everywhere in hoping that this inalienable right of self-government may be restored to their homeland.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, a spirit of liberalism in an otherwise dark period in the history of personal freedoms, that is represented by the Polish Constitution drawn up in 1791 and presented to the Polish people by an enlightened ruler.

The 18th century alliance of Russia and Prussia had kept Poland as a vassal nation to these greater powers, but with the death of Frederick the Great in 1786, a rift developed between Russia and Prussia which allowed Polish nationalists to seize more authority for themselves. The names of three men stand out at this time for vigorous and capable leadership: Stanislaw Malachowski, Hugo Kollontaj, and Ignacy Potocki. Their united efforts helped in the raising of an army and the organization of an independent government. Diplomats were sent abroad to represent the new Polish national movement, and a commission sat down to draft a new Constitution based on the liberal spirit prevailing among progressive political circles at that time.

It took a year for the new Constitution to be drafted. As its liberal nature became known, part of the landed classes, some looking more for personal power rather than the national good, tried by all possible means to subvert attempts at the passing of this Constitution through the national legislature—the Diet. For 2 years the proponents of this document waited for the opportunity to have it presented for approval and finally, on May 3, 1791, their chance came. The Constitution was quickly passed into law. The new Polish Constitution was inspired by the same current of 18th century liberalism that was behind our own Declaration of Independence and Constitution as well as the French Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen. This ray of liberalism in an otherwise benighted area found expression of a philosophy of government expressed in such terms as these:

> In human society all authority originates from the will of the Nation. In order therefore that the integrity of the country, civil liberties and the order of society may be forever equally maintained, three powers should, and by virtue of the present law shall forever constitute the Government of the Polish Nation: these are, the legislative power vested in the assembled estates, the supreme authority vested in the King and guardianship, and the judicial power vested in the jurisdictions established or to be established for that purpose."

This has the ring of our own Constitution.

It is futile to speculate as to how different the future would have been had the benefits of this constitution been granted to the people of Poland, and had such an enlightened government been allowed to grow. But the forces of reaction were too strong, both from without and within. Leaders of the dissident Polish faction joined forces with the new ruler of Russia, Catherine the Great; the czarist troops invaded Poland from the east. While after the breakup of the Russo-Prussian alliance Prussia had allied herself with Poland, this proved an unstable relationship. When Poland asked for aid from Prussia to fight off the Russians, the Prussian King reneged on his promises, and actually joined with the Russians in again trying to divide Poland. A gallant Polish army held out for 3 months, but defeat at the hands of stronger forces was inevitable.

When Poland fell victim to new partition between Prussia and Russia, the amazing documentation of Polish constitutional liberties was cast aside.

Yet the Polish people have always held out against foreign domination, keeping alive in their hearts that essential spark of liberty and national pride that always serves them so well. May it never be extinguished.

The many thousands of Polish-American citizens who reside in the Fifth Congressional District, the city of Philadelphia, and throughout the State of Pennsylvania, have an inborn spirit of independence and unity that have been handed down by their ancestors from previous national struggles.

They never have given up the fight for national independence for Poland; they never will until a free flag flies over her soil, free from domination by her communistic masters who hold only a temporary stewardship. Bound together with their people in the native land, the struggle for national independence will go on until the day when the leash will again be broken and the godless conquerers banished from the land.

On this Polish Constitution Day, let us remember the struggles of these brave people in both war and peace to maintain national integrity based on freedom and equal rule for all citizens. Our best wishes should go to them in their never-ending efforts.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, the history of Poland has been one of unceasing struggle by its people for freedom and self-determination. Unprotected by any natural boundaries, it has for centuries past served as a battleground for warring powers and a prize for the victors. But despite this adversity, Poland has seen its days of glory.

The 16th century saw the golden age of Poland when trade and education flourished; in 1791, its great constitution came into being; and the interim of the two World Wars saw it again as an independent state, willing and able to take its place among the proud nations of the world.

But, for each victory, there has been a corresponding period of despair as

Poland has been battered by the hammer of foreign oppression. And perhaps at no time has its plight been as severe as it has been since the last war. Poland, a once proud, vital, and ethnically strong nation, now lies pinned by the military heel of Russian communism.

So today, as on every May 3, free Poles across the world are joined by their many friends in the commemoration of one of Poland's most promising moments, the birth of its constitution in 1791.

Americans in particular can identify themselves with Poland's spirit of freedom. At the time of our War of Independence, two great Polish patriots fought for us on our soil; and 2 years after the signing of our Constitution, Poland's own came into being, as a beam of light in totalitarian darkness. Although almost immediately there followed recurring oppression and misery, that light has never been extinguished in the hearts of her people. And in her worst trials she now stands, her head is bloody, but unbowed, presenting a bewildering problem to the Russian empire. Her people, their spirit high and invincible, have forced concession after concession from her master, while her brothers and friends in the free world continue to press for her liberation. We do not doubt that the sun will again rise over a free Poland, when her people can once more practice the national traditions that their sacrifices have bought.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, in times of misfortune and misery, people's thoughts invariably turn back to the happier and hope-inspiring days of the past. This is particularly true of the people of Poland who, after all the sufferings they endured and untold sacrifices they made during the last war, find themselves today once again enslaved in their homeland by a government controlled from Moscow.

Today, on the 172d anniversary of the adoption of their first democratic Constitution, the Polish people turn their thoughts to those distant days, reflect upon the fine spirit embodied in that document, and commemorate its anniversary as a national holiday.

The adoption of that Constitution in 1791 constitutes one of the brightest and most significant landmarks in Poland's entire political history. The event occurred at a time when nearly all of the nation was being parceled out among the three monarchs of Austria, Prussia, and Russia. On the eve of such impending dangers a small band of Polish patriots drew up and presented the people of Poland a democratic and liberal document.

The Constitution made Poland a constitutional monarchy with a responsible cabinet form of government. Many old class distinctions and privileges were wiped out, and the government was strengthened by bringing the peasantry under the protection of the law. What is perhaps more significant for those days and for that part of the world was the fact that this Constitution guaranteed religious freedom.

In this and in many other ways, the Polish Constitution of May 3d was in the forefront of democracy's advance into central and eastern Europe.

In commemorating the 172d anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution, we are paying due respect to the memory of patriotic Polish leaders who drew up that Constitution, and we are also expressing our admiration for all Poles who hold high the liberal and democratic principles embodied in that Constitution.

At this time I insert into the RECORD a letter and an article pertaining to Polish Constitution Day, as follows:

POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS, INC.,
Washington, D.C., April 20, 1963.

Hon. ADAM C. POWELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. POWELL: From the time, when first among the free nations of the world Poland heroically responded to the challenge of the Soviet-Nazi totalitarianism, the Congress of the United States has been annually demonstrating its feeling of faithful friendship toward the Polish nation. Each year a special observance is being held in the House of Representatives and in the Senate on May 3, in commemoration of Poland's great constitution of 1791.

This constitution incorporates enduring precepts of public policy and democracy. Its principles were rooted in the Pole's love and attachment to freedom and independence. These principles lived in the hearts of many Polish generations. In times of national well-being as well as in times of misfortune, they represented fountainhead of national consciousness, patriotism, and everpresent readiness to make sacrifices for the common cause of freedom of all nations.

As we approach May 3d, free Poland's national holiday, I am taking the liberty of reminding you that this year mark's the 100th anniversary of the Polish January uprising of 1863. There were other Polish uprising against the Russian rule—the Kosciuszko uprising in 1794, the November uprising in 1831, the Warsaw uprising in 1944 against the German occupation, but the 1863 uprising against the Russian tyranny was the greatest, longest, and bloodiest uprising in the Polish history. The Polish patriots fought the Russian occupation army for over 2 years.

During the night of January 22, 1863, units of the Polish insurgents attacked Russian garrisons in many localities and captured considerable amounts of arms and ammunition. The movement spread to all parts of the country like a forest fire. In all Polish communities under Russian rule there were instantaneous uprisings.

In the beginning the Polish insurgents had some significant successes but when the Russians brought into Poland 350,000 seasoned troops of the Regular Russian Army, the fate of the uprising was sealed.

On one side were well equipped regular army units, on the other the heroic insurgent army poorly equipped, having insufficient supplies and inadequate training. Despite these handicaps the brave insurgents achieved many successes over Russian Army regiments in over 1,000 battles and skirmishes all over Poland.

Over 20,000 Poles were killed in battles, thousands were captured, 600 leaders were executed by firing squads or hanged in public squares, the rest were sent to the mines in Siberia.

The last leader of the uprising, Romuald Traugutt and four of his assistants were hanged in the public square in Warsaw in view of the kneeling, praying, and weeping crowd of 25,000.

The last detachment of Polish insurgents led by Reverend Brzoska was surrendered and wiped out in April 1865.

The Russian Government ordered the so-called military pacification of the country. Thousands of Poles were arrested and deported to Siberia. Their property was confiscated. Polish language was banned from offices and schools. The economy of Poland was destroyed. The sense of real mourning enveloped the entire nation.

The Polish nation lost 250 thousand of its best sons, the flower of its manhood, killed in battles, executed and exiled to Siberia.

United States at that time was in the throes of civil war and Europe was deaf to the cries of the martyred nation.

The Polish people suffered a defeat in the fight for independence but the social reforms put through by its leaders gave the Poles a strength and cohesion against which all attempts at denationalization were shattered.

By paying tribute to the 100th anniversary of the Polish uprising of 1863 we are also paying tribute to Poland's defenders of freedom for the past 1,000 years.

The Polish American Congress representing over 7 million Americans of Polish ancestry expresses its fervent hope that you will see fit to participate in the observance scheduled to take place on the floor of both chambers of the Congress on the 3d of May which day since 1791 is observed by all free Poles as Poland's national holiday.

I take the liberty to enclose for your attention a leaflet explaining in a few words the meaning of the Polish Constitution of 1791.

Respectfully yours,
CHARLES BURKE,
Washington Representative,
Polish American Congress, Inc.

MAY 3: THE POLISH NATIONAL HOLIDAY

On May 3, Poles everywhere and citizens of Polish origin in many countries celebrate a Polish national holiday, the Polish 3d of May Constitution Day.

In the United States, wherever Americans of Polish descent live, in cities and towns from coast to coast, this holiday is observed with appropriate exercises throughout the month of May, to pay tribute to the Polish nation and to remind fellow Americans that Poland was one of the first pioneers of liberalism in Europe.

It was on May 3 in 1791, barely 2 years after the adoption of its Constitution by the United States in 1789, that Poland, without a bloody revolution or even without a disorder, succeeded in reforming her public life and in eradicating her internal decline. But this great rebirth and assertion of democracy came to the Poles too late, and did not forestall the third partition of Poland in 1795 by Russia, Prussia, and Austria.

POLAND PIONEERED LIBERALISM IN EUROPE

The greatness of the May 3 Polish Constitution consisted in the fact that it eliminated with one stroke the most fundamental weaknesses of the Polish parliamentary and social system. The Poles raised this great moment in their history to the forefront of their tradition rather than any one of their anniversaries of glorious victories or heroic revolutions.

We Americans who have been reared in the principle given us as a birthright by the founders of our great Republic, the principle of the sovereignty of the people in the state, which is the primary postulate in the 1791 Polish Constitution, can see how this truism cut off the Poles and the Polish political tradition completely from both the Germans and the Russians, who have been reared in the principle of state, and not national sovereignty.

The light of liberalism coming from Poland was then as it has been throughout the years that followed and even onto today, a threat to tyranny and absolutism in Russia and Germany. In 1795, Russian and Prussian soldiers were sent to Poland to partition and rape her. In 1939, Russian and Prussian soldiers met again on Polish soil, as the absolute totalitarianism systems of nazism and communism again felt the danger of true liberalism coming from Poland just as in 1791.

In the Polish 3d of May Constitution this liberalism was formulated in these words: "All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation."

AMERICAN AND POLISH CONSTITUTIONS SIMILARLY INSPIRED

The philosophy of government discernible throughout the 3d of May Polish Constitution leads one to believe that the American people and the Polish people had each drawn inspiration for their respective constitutions from the same source.

Meditation on the anniversary of May 3 deepens the faith and heightens the courage of every Pole and of every American of Polish origin. It reminds all Americans of Poland's destiny in the history of mankind, and prophesies the ultimate triumph of justice, even though Poland once more has been deprived of her independence, sovereignty, and her territory by one of our victorious allies, Soviet Russia, with the consent of other United Nations.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with those who have paid tribute to the great Polish Constitution of 1791, Polish Constitution Day being properly observed on May 3, and to call attention once again to those enduring precepts of democracy that prompted the Polish Constitution, precepts which had just 2 years earlier prompted our own Constitution of the United States.

During the intervening years, Mr. Speaker, fate has not treated Poland and the United States with equal favor, and Poland has from time to time been and is now subjected to the tyrant's hand. Throughout, however, the spirit of liberty has remained alive in Poland, and is deeply instilled in the hearts and minds of Poles wherever they live.

I know that the occasion of Constitution Day heightens the courage of every Pole, and all freedom-loving people, to look to the ultimate triumph of freedom and justice, when, as the Polish Constitution of 1791 so aptly puts it:

> All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on a equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, this month marks the commemoration of a day sacred to the heart of every free Pole. This is the anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791; a constitution that incorporates enduring concepts of democracy, and principles rooted in the Polish love and attachment to freedom and independence.

These principles are still living in the hearts of Polish people wherever they may happen to be. In times of national well-being, as in times of crisis, these principles have served as the fountainhead of national consciousness and patriotism; as an ever-present readiness to make sacrifices to the common cause of freedom. We have only to look to recent times in the Nazi tyranny to witness the heroic defense of these high principles.

The year 1963 is doubly significant to every Pole. Not only is it the anniversary of the Polish constitution, it is also the 100th anniversary of the Polish January uprising of 1863. There were other Polish revolts against the Russian rule, such as the Kosciuszko revolt in 1794 and the Warsaw ghetto uprising against the Germans in 1944, but the 1863 rebellion against Russian tyranny was the greatest, longest, and bloodiest uprising in Polish history. For a period of 2 years, gallant, fearless, patriots fought the Russian occupation.

It began on the night of January 22, 1863 and spread over Poland with the rapidity of a raging forest fire. It was only when the ruthless Russians brought in 350,000 seasoned troops of the regular Russian Army that the fate of the uprising was sealed. Yet, these brave Poles fought on until they were literally ground to the earth.

In the course of the 2 bloody years, 20,000 Poles were killed in battle, thousands captured, and hundeds of their leaders executed or sent to Siberian salt mines. When the last leader of the revolt, Romuold Traugutt, and four assistants were hanged in the Warsaw public square, 25,000 of his fellow countrymen openly wept.

To the Poles, however, their cause was not defeated. Their fight against ruthless oppression continues to this day, for in the heart of every Pole is a spirit which cannot be bridled, a light which will not be put out. May it ever be so and may the bravery of the Polish people never be forgotten.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, we are today saluting Poland, and in so doing, we remember the efforts of her people throughout their country's history in its ceaseless fight for freedom and democratic government. That they are aware of every opportunity to strike a blow for freedom can be observed in reviewing briefly the events we are commemorating at this time.

Since the early 1700's Poland was only part of a nation—caught between Russia and Prussia. Her territory too strategic to be allowed much independence of action; she found herself a buffer between Russian and Prussian power. However, as will happen with allies, trouble developed between those two with the death of the Prussian Emperor, Frederick the Great. While Russia and Austria were busy fighting Turkey, Prussia wooed the Poles and gave them encouragement in breaking away from Russian control.

The ideological climate created by 18th century liberalism and especially by the American and French Revolutions was felt in Poland by her liberal King, Stanislas Augustus, and the other reformers. With lessened pressure from her stronger neighbors, the Polish Parliament was called together in 1788 and set about to institute, among other things, constitutional reform. It should have been a time of quick action, but the tempo of change was very slow because many of the new and liberal ideas which were put forth caused heated political argument, especially among the military landowning class. It was only after 3 years of debate and inaction that the reforming party finally pushed through a constitution that, when read even today, shows to be a masterful blend of liberalism and conservatism, in which the King was ruler, but the form of government was democratic.

What did this Constitution offer to the people of Poland? It offered them liberty and independence, with respect for the law, for the person, and for property. It was brought forth, not with the shedding of blood as in France, but through the courage, foresight, and patriotism of a few dedicated and persistent men. The Constitution of 1791 was, fundamentally, an attempt to do away with the medieval and outmoded system of government used by outside influences to keep the country weak and divided, and to replace it with a modern constitutional monarchy, somewhat like that in England. It was as President George Washington wrote to a friend:

> Poland appears to have made large and unexpected strides towards liberty, which if true, reflects great honor on the present King who seems to have been the principal promoter of the business.

But too much time was taken in the drafting and promulgating of this covenant of Polish liberty; there was too little time to gain the necessary internal political and economic stability to put the reforms into effect. Catherine the Great was now Empress of Russia, and to have Poland weak was important to her foreign policy. Furthermore, such liberalism as was now moving through that country could not be allowed into Russia. Once her war with the Turks was finished, Russia invaded, set on driving out the Polish reformers, the Jacobins of Warsaw, to destroy the Constitution of 1791, and, in league with some of the dissident elements of the landowning class in Poland, to break the new will for independence within the country. With a superior military force they were successful, especially when Prussia, who had pledged to defend Poland, backed down, sided again with Russia. The two of them set about to partition Poland anew, and the liberal Constitution and the personal freedoms of the Polish people were again thrown to the winds.

What the Constitution stood for has not been forgotten, however. We salute its spirit today, and we also salute the memory of those farsighted and clear-thinking men who sponsored that document of citizens' rights 172 years ago. What they initiated then captured a spirit inherent in the Polish people which cannot be driven out, a spirit of independence and freedom sought after and fought for so bravely and for so long, but enjoyed for such a short while.

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, on the 172d anniversary of Poland's first democratic and liberal constitution, I am happy to salute the Polish people in America and abroad. In 1791 the Polish Diet enacted this historic document by unanimous vote, thus bringing about basic political, social, and educational reforms, and strengthened the Polish state. That this constitution was approved without violence and without bloodshed is evidenced of the statesmanship of Polish leaders, who were inspired by the ideals of the American Declaration of Independence and the French Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen.

At a time when the Polish people are unable to enjoy the rights for which their ancestors struggled, it is particularly fitting that we pause to pay homage to this great symbol of 18th century liberalism. In so doing, we pay homage to the love for freedom and independence which the present Communist Government of Poland has been unable to eradicate. The spirit of the 3d of May Constitution lives on, and the whole free world is committed to its fulfillment.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in commemorating free Poland's national holiday. The 3d of May is comparable to our Fourth of July, and, like ourselves, the Poles on their greatest national holiday do not honor a single hero or a single victory but rather the spirit which has transcended all their glory and greatness. Names such as Kosciuszko, Pulaski, Chopin and Paderewski reflect this Polish spirit under which men freely abandon their personal careers, whether they be military or musical, and dedicate themselves completely to the battle for freedom.

The Polish spirit has moved the Polish people to valiant deeds in defense of their freedom and independence. One of the great wonders in the history of Western civilization is the durability of Poland for both man and Nature have seemed to militate against Poland's survival. Caught between Germany and Russia, Poland's territory has been a perennial battleground for envious armies and the Polish people have long been threatened with extinction. Nowhere in eastern Europe has nationalism been so cruelly and continually oppressed, yet nowhere in eastern Europe has the flame of liberty burned brighter.

We cannot help but admire and respect such a people and our admiration is constantly reaffirmed through our daily associations with the best of the Polish spirit among our own Americans. On this day especially we recall that the Polish Constitution followed our own by only a few years and that both were inspired by similar movements of liberalism designed to elevate man's position. Thus we read in article five of the Polish Constitution:

> All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty, and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on lasting foundation.

It is this very will of the Polish people that is being violated today in their homeland. It is this will of the Polish people that we commemorate today as we share in honoring Polish Constitution Day.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, May 3, was the national holiday of Poland. It is a day of which we should all take note, not only because of our Polish friends and neighbors, but because it is an important symbol for free men throughout the world. This year the celebration is particularly important because it marks the 100th anniversary of the Polish January uprising of 1863. On that occasion the Poles revolted against Russian tyranny in the greatest, longest and bloodiest uprising in the Polish history.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, and under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I would like to have included at this point in the RECORD a letter to me from Charles Burke of the Polish American Congress, Inc., and a leaflet explaining the significance of the Polish National Holiday.

The letter and article follows:

POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS, INC.,
Washington, D.C., April 20, 1963.

Hon. RICHARD E. LANKFORD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. LANKFORD: From the time, when first among the free nations of the world, Poland heroically responded to the challenge of the Soviet-Nazi totalitarianism, the Congress of the United States has been annually demonstrating its feelings of faithful friendship toward the Polish nation. Each year a special observance is being held in the House of Representatives and in the Senate on May 3, in commemoration of Poland's great constitution of 1791.

This constitution incorporates enduring precepts of public policy and democracy. Its principles were rooted in the Pole's love and attachment to freedom and independence. These principles lived in the hearts of many Polish generations. In times of national well-being as well as in times of misfortune, they represented fountainhead of national consciousness, patriotism and ever-present readiness to make sacrifices for the common cause of freedom of all nations.

As we approach May 3, free Poland's national holiday, I am taking the liberty of reminding you that this year marks the 100th anniversary of the Polish January uprising of 1863. There were other Polish uprisings against the Russian rule—the Kosciuszko uprising in 1794, the November uprising in 1831, the Warsaw uprising in 1944 against the German occupation, but the 1863 uprising against the Russian tyranny was the greatest, longest, and bloodiest uprising in the Polish history. The Polish patriots fought the Russian occupation army for over 2 years.

During the night of January 22, 1863, units of Polish insurgents attacked Russian garrisons in many localities and captured considerable amounts of arms and ammunition. The movement spread to all parts of the country like a forest fire. In all Polish communities under Russian rule there were instantaneous uprisings.

In the beginning the Polish insurgents had some significant successes but when the Russians brought into Poland 350,000 seasoned troops of the regular Russian Army, the fate of the uprising was sealed.

On one side were well-equipped regular army units, on the other the heroic insurgent army poorly equipped, having insufficient supplies and inadequate training. Despite these handicaps the brave insurgents achieved many successes over Russian army regiments in over 1,000 battles and skirmishes all over Poland.

Over 20,000 Poles were killed in battles, thousands were captured, 600 leaders were executed by firing squads or hanged in public squares, the rest were sent to the mines in Siberia.

The last leader of the uprising, Romuald Traugutt, and four of his assistants were hanged in the public square in Warsaw in view of the kneeling, praying, and weeping crowd of 25,000.

The last detachment of Polish insurgents led by Reverend Brzoska was surrendered and wiped out in April 1865.

The Russian Government ordered the so-called military pacification of the country. Thousands of Poles were arrested and deported to Siberia. Their property was confiscated. Polish language was banned from offices and schools. The economy of Poland was destroyed. The sense of real mourning enveloped the entire nation.

The Polish nation lost 250,000 of its best sons, the flower of its manhood, killed in battles, executed and exiled to Siberia.

United States at that time was in the throes of civil war and Europe was deaf to the cries of the martyred nation.

The Polish people suffered a defeat in the fight for independence but the social reform put through by its leaders gave the Poles a strength and cohesion against which all attempts at denationalization were shattered.

By paying tribute to the 100th anniversary of the Polish uprising of 1863 we are also paying tribute to Poland's defenders of freedom for the past 1,000 years.

The Polish American Congress representing over 7 million Americans of Polish ancestry expresses its fervent hope that you will see fit to participate in the observance scheduled to take place on the floor of both Chambers of the Congress on the 3d of May which day since 1791 is observed by all free Poles as Poland's national holiday.

I take the liberty to enclose for your attention a leaflet explaining in a few words the meaning of the Polish Constitution of 1791.

Respectfully yours,
CHARLES BURKE,
Washington Representative, Polish American Congress, Inc.

MAY 3: THE POLISH NATIONAL HOLIDAY

On May 3, Poles everywhere and citizens of Polish origin in many countries celebrate a Polish national holiday, the Polish 3d of May Constitution Day.

In the United States, wherever Americans of Polish descent live, in cities and towns from coast to coast, this holiday is observed with appropriate exercises throughout the month of May, to pay tribute to the Polish Nation and to remind fellow Americans that Poland was one of the first pioneers of liberalism in Europe.

It was on May 3 in 1791, barely 2 years after the adoption of its Constitution by the United States in 1789, that Poland without a bloody revolution or even without a disorder succeeded in reforming her public life and in eradicating her internal decline. But this great rebirth and assertion of democracy came to the Poles too late, and did not forestall the third partition of Poland in 1795 by Russia, Prussia, and Austria.

POLAND PIONEERED LIBERALISM IN EUROPE

The greatness of the May 3d Polish Constitution consisted in the fact that it eliminated with one stroke the most fundamental weaknesses of the Polish parliamentary and social system. The Poles raised this great moment in their history to the forefront of their tradition rather than any one of their anniversaries of glorious victories or heroic revolutions.

We Americans who have been reared in the principle given us as a birthright by the founders of our great Republic, the principle of the sovereignty of the people in the state, which is the primary postulate in the 1791 Polish Constitution, can see how this truism cut off the Poles and the Polish political tradition completely from both the Germans and the Russians, who have been reared in the principle of state, and not national, sovereignty.

The light of liberalism coming from Poland was then as it has been throughout the years that followed and even unto today, a threat to tyranny and absolutism in Russia and Germany. In 1795, Russian and Prussian soldiers were sent to Poland to partition and rape her. In 1939, Russian and Prussian soldiers met again on Polish soil, as the absolute totalitarianism systems of nazism and communism again felt the danger of true liberalism coming from Poland just as in 1791.

In the Polish 3d of May Constitution this liberalism was formulated in these words: "All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty, and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation."

AMERICAN AND POLISH CONSTITUTIONS SIMILARLY INSPIRED

The philosophy of government discernible throughout the 3d of May Polish Constitution leads one to believe that the American people and the Polish people had each drawn inspiration for their respective constitutions from the same source.

Mediation on the anniversary of May 3 depends the faith and heightens the courage of every Pole and of every American of Polish origin. It reminds all Americans of Poland's destiny in the history of mankind, and prophesies the ultimate triumph of justice, even though, Poland once more has been deprived of her independence, sovereignty, and her territory by one of our victorious allies, Soviet Russia, with the consent of other United Nations.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, recent and contemporary events often tend to obscure earlier ones, and, irrespective of the importance of the latter, relegate them to relative oblivion. This is true in the case of certain events in Polish history. We are so keenly concerned with the present unfortunate fate of the Polish people, that we sometimes think of Poland today only in terms of a large Communist concentration camp behind the Iron Curtain, almost sealed off from the free world.

But there were greater and brighter aspects in Polish history which should not be ignored and forgotten. Great names and lasting achievements abound in the annals of Poland. Poles made their signal contributions to our War of Independence through the distinguished services of Thaddeus Kosciusko and Casimir Pulaski. Besides being gallant and dauntless fighters for freedom, Poles have also shown great talents in many other walks of life. By their Constitution of May 3, 1791, they proved to be pioneers of political reform in eastern Europe. That Constitution became a great landmark in Poland's history, and tomorrow marks its 172d anniversary.

The significance of that document is sometimes overlooked because before it was put into full force, Poland was invaded and lost her independent existence. The real importance of that Constitution, however, lay in the attempt of its framers to introduce a responsible cabinet type of government in that part of Europe. Monarchical authority was considerably curtailed, and that of the peoples' representatives was enhanced. The Polish peasantry was relieved from the arbitrary authority of local landlords and was placed under the protection of the law. Even more significant than any of these changes was the guarantee of religious freedom. Unfortunately these rights and freedoms have been lost to the Poles since those distant days, except for the relatively happy period of Polish independence in the two decades following World War I.

On this 172d anniversary of the promulgation and adoption of that liberal and democratic Constitution, I gladly join all Americans of Polish ancestry and birth in hoping that soon the people of Poland will again regain freedom in their homeland.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, the 3d day of May is a date that lives in the hearts of Polish people everywhere. It is a date of reverence and of hope. It was on this date in 1791, just 2 months after the first Congress of the United States had adjourned sine die, that the people of Poland adopted their great constitution, transforming their country to a land of personal freedom under a constitutional monarch. This significant development gave to the people freedom to practice their own religion and did away with distinctions among the classes.

It is not difficult to visualize the sympathetic reaction accorded to this progressive step by the American Congress at that time. Today, we in the Congress are equally conscious of the eternal struggle for freedom. We also still remember the magnificent contributions to our cause made by Kosciuszko and Pulaski. Our hearts go out to those brave Poles who are today under the domination of Communist Russia. We join with the millions of Poles who have adopted our country and who have done so much to make the United States the great nation it is.

Mr. Speaker, it is our fervent hope that some day in the not too distant future these brave people, wherever they may be throughout the world, in their homeland or abroad, may once again celebrate without foreign restraint this cherished date in their long history.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, today we remember and do honor to a handful of liberal-minded, farsighted men, under the leadership of an enlightened King. One hundred and seventy-two years ago they brought forth a plan that had long received their attention, the drafting of a liberal constitution of citizens' rights for the people of Poland. This was a documentation of personal rights and obligations of the Polish people, sweeping in its reforms, democratic in its approach, but doomed to failure, not because of a lack of dedication to the cause of personal freedom among the majority of the Polish people, but due to the geographic location of the country and the conditions prevailing across her borders.

Long had Poland been the victim of her stronger neighbors, Russia and Prussia, both of whom used her as a buffer to their own military might, as well as a sphere of compensation for gains by the other on battlefields elsewhere. However, when Frederick the Great of Prussia died in 1786, relationships between Russia and Prussia deteriorated. Russia became involved in a war with Turkey. This involvement drew their attention from the Polish problem, giving the leaders of that country sufficient security to embark on a reform of the constitution, to bring it into line with the liberal thinking then current in western Europe as manifested in the American Declaration of Independence and Constitution, and the stirrings of the French Revolution. A meeting of the Polish Parliament was called in 1788 to set about drafting these constitutional reforms, and the patriotic liberals, with the encouragement of King Stanislas, were hopeful that their propositions would be given immediate and careful consideration.

However, as so often happens when the forces of change meet the forces of reaction, progress was considerably slowed. While Russian attention was diverted elsewhere, the urgency was immediate to set up, enact, and put into operation those political reforms necessary to stabilize the government and win united support for its policies. This was not the case, and the discussions dragged on with opposition to liberalism and moderation being led by the military and landowning aristocracy. Yet, with patience and awareness of every opportunity offered for progress, it still took until May 1791 before events were such that the proposed constitution was placed before the Parliament for ratification and, on May 4 of that year, was made the law of the land.

It was a great document and was received with much joy by the average citizen. It transformed Poland into a hereditary limited monarchy, with biennial parliaments and ministerial responsibility. The liberum veto, in which each member of the Parliament could veto any action individually and the so-called free election of kings, which had opened Poland to outside intrigue and pressure, were abolished. The executive was strengthened, class distinction curtailed, local community autonomy and representation allowed, land reform pressed for, religious toleration established, and the groundwork laid for the abolition of serfdom. Considering the time, and the outside pressures present, this constitution was, and still is when re-read today, a remarkable document in content and accomplishment.

Those outside pressures could not be denied, especially as the time of independent action for Poland had run out. Russia's war with Turkey had ended, Catherine the Great was Empress, and liberty and dignity for the average Russian was nonexistent. Neither could Russia allow the continued existence of a border country that was offering these very freedoms to their own people. Malcontents of the Polish aristocracy joined in an appeal to Catherine for aid in driving the reformers out and she accepted with alacrity. Poland was invaded and, within 3 months, due to far superior force and no outside help, the patriots were defeated, their constitutional dreams shattered, and their constitution abrogated.

Yet their spirit of defiance lived on, passed from patriot to patriot's son, and this spirit still lives today in Poland. As with ourselves, freedom of the individual under God and the rule of law are considered inalienable rights to be achieved at all costs by the Polish people. In remembering their manifesto to those liberties as framed in the constitutional reforms of 1791, let us salute all those who sacrificed so much for what all of us hold so dear.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, the unhappy Poles have had their ups and downs in their long and eventful history. Their annals are full of glorious deeds and sad tragedies. And the Constitution of May 3, 1791, marks a glorious day in Poland's political history.

Late in the 18th century Poland was prey to her greedy neighbors. In 1772 she had already lost considerable territory to Austria, Prussia, and Russia by the first partition. Poland herself was not strong enough to prevent that tragic event. Her weakness and helplessness had become too obvious to the Poles themselves, and many enlightened patriots among them had been trying to devise means whereby the country's governmental structure would be improved and strengthened by the solid support of the populace. As early as 1788 a committee was formed for the specific purpose of drafting a constitution. The completion of this exacting task took a long time, but when completed early in 1791, it was regarded as the crowning achievement of a band of liberal, wise, and patriotic statesmen.

That historic Constitution as adopted on May 3, 1791, was an epoch-making document, a great landmark in Poland's history. The governmental machinery was modernized and brought up to date by the inclusion of many liberal and progressive features. The King's authority was limited, though he still retained many of the prerogatives of his position. His executive power was to be shared with a council of six "guardians of the laws," made up of the primate and the heads of five departments. This council may be regarded as the forerunner of cabinet government in that country. Roman Catholicism remained the official religion of the country, but the regime was tolerant of other sects. The nobles lost some of these privileges formerly reserved to noblemen. Agreements signed between peasants and their landlords came within the purview of the law. In short, by the Constitution of May 3, Poland moved from unlimited autocracy to a limited monarchy. In its day this change was considered a startling and phenomenal advance, especially when accomplished without bloodshed. It was the most advanced governmental reform yet carried out in any country in central and eastern Europe.

We all know too well what followed the adoption of this liberal Constitution. Poland's enemies, fearing that the birth of her liberal ideas might spread to their lands, made war on Poland. Before the Constitution was put into force, Poland found herself under attack. Against the superior forces of her mortal enemies she could not long resist. In the end she lost out. The second partition followed in 1793. The Constitution of May became a dead, defunct document. Soon after that Poland was no more; she was again parceled out among her three powerful neighbors, and thenceforth for more than 100 years Poland lived only in the hearts and minds of suffering Poles. But they never gave up the hope of regaining their national independence and reviving the spirit of the Constitution of May. From then on, from the time of the adoption of that Constitution on May 3, that day has become a Polish national holiday. I am indeed happy to join all patriotic Poles in the observance of that great holiday, the Polish Constitution Day.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, from the time, when first among the free nations of the world, Poland heroically responded to the challenge of the Soviet-Nazi totalitarianism, the Congress of the United States has annually demonstrated its feelings of faithful friendship toward the Polish nation. It is appropriate indeed, that we should at this time take special note of the commemoration of Poland's great constitution of 1791. Representing a district that boasts of many American citizens of Polish descent, I am proud to join in this important observance.

This constitution incorporates enduring precepts of public policy and democracy. Its principles were rooted in the Pole's love and attachment to freedom and independence, and these principles lived in the hearts of many Polish generations. In times of national well-being as well as in times of misfortune, they represented fountainhead of national consciousness, patriotism and ever-present readiness to make sacrifices for the common cause of freedom of all nations.

It is fitting, indeed, that we should continue to pay warm tribute to Poland's defenders of freedom for the past thousand years and those who carry on the fight of today.

Meditation on the anniversary of May 3 deepens the faith and heightens the courage of every Pole and of every American of Polish origin. It reminds all Americans of Poland's destiny in the history of mankind, and prophesies the ultimate triumph of justice, even though Poland once more has been deprived of her independence, sovereignty, and her territory. Curtains, walls, and propaganda will never extinguish the light of freedom in Poland.

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, today is a day that all freedom-loving peoples take special note of—the Polish national holiday. This year, perhaps with even greater emphasis than in previous years, we are especially reminded of the bravery of the Polish people for this is the 100th anniversary of the Polish January uprising of 1863. There were other uprisings against the Russian rule, of course. The one most recently in our memories was the Warsaw uprising in 1944 against the German occupation. But the 1863 uprising against the Russian terror was the greatest, longest and bloodiest uprising in Poland's history. The Polish patriots fought the Russian occupation army for more than 2 years. Although in the beginning the Polish insurgents had some significant success, the uprising was doomed when the Russians brought into Poland 350,000 seasoned troops of the regular Russian army.

The brave insurgents fought Russian army regiments in more than 1,000 battles and skirmishes all over Poland. More than 20,000 Poles were killed in battles, thousands were captured, 600 leaders were executed by firing squads or hanged publicly. The rest were sent to Siberia.

The last detachment of Polish insurgents was surrendered and wiped out in April of 1865.

By paying tribute to the 100th anniversary of the uprising of 1863—on this day set aside for celebrating the Polish national holiday—we are also paying tribute to Poland's defenders of freedom for the past 1,000 years.

I join with the more than 7 million Americans of Polish ancestry in observing the Polish national holiday and taking note of the 3d of May constitution, a pioneering document of freedom and liberalism.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker in behalf of the residents of my district of Polish descent, as well as all freedom-loving Americans in the 12th Congressional District of Illinois, I rise in recognition of the Polish national holiday.

The Polish 3d of May Constitution Day, coming as it does immediately after the May 1 celebrations of international communism, serves to remind us again of the stark contrast between Soviet Communist claims to be champions of national independence, and the tragic reality of their continued suppression of Polish national freedom.

I join in this salute to the courageous contribution of the people of Poland to human liberty, and await the day of Polish independence from Communist imperialism.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is again my pleasure to join with many of my colleagues in paying tribute to the great Polish Constitution, which is a bare 2 years younger than our own U.S. Constitution. It is fitting that we in Congress recognize in this way the great Polish nation, its thousand-year history of struggle for independence, and the 7 million Americans of Polish ancestry who have contributed so much to America.

This year also is the 100th anniversary of the Polish uprising of 1863 against oppressive Russian rule. It was a war which cost the Poles dearly—250,000 lost in more than a thousand battles. It was fought under the banner of freedom.

Look at a map and see where this country is located. Look in a history book and read of the sturdy tide of independence which has flowed from the Polish people. Look at the Polish Constitution of 1791 and learn of the charter of political and civil liberties proclaimed.

Then you will know why America is proud of the Polish who have come to her shores, and proud to join in the celebration of free Poland's great holiday of May 3.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express a few words on the 172d anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791. This, Mr. Speaker, was a remarkable document, structured very much like our own great Constitution, in which the basic and inalienable rights of every citizen of the State were guaranteed and set forth for all to see.

Why are we noting today this Polish Constitution; because it has survived the test of time, and stands today as tried and true as when first promulgated? No. Unfortunately this is not the case. Were we referring to our own Constitution this would be true, but the people of Poland were living in a country surrounded by powerful neighbors such as Russia and Prussia whose illiberal and oppressive governments gave them no chance to enjoy the freedoms guaranteed in this covenant of enlightened government. These neighboring nations could not allow an island of hope to remain as a beacon of personal liberty to their own oppressed peoples. Thus the Polish Constitution of 1791 died in 1792, put down by force of arms from Russia with the Prussians as allies, and with the aid of reactionary forces from within Poland herself.

Yet we salute the spirit of those farsighted pioneers who grasped at the current of 18th century liberalism pulsating through the Western World, as seen in the American and French revolutions, and who tried to adopt this spirit as their own. That they failed against superior force of arms is no disgrace. All too often the brave and true fall against the forces of evil in this world. Failure did not lessen the indomitable spirit of these peoples to be masters of their own fate, and, through the years since 1791, this voice of liberty has not been killed by continued pressure and control from foreign powers. May it never be stilled and may we salute those people whose dreams and aspirations are so much in keeping with our own in their continued efforts to keep freedom as their own heritage.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, many years ago, in our Declaration of Independence, our Founding Fathers acknowledged the fact that all men are endowed by the Creator with certain unalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. And throughout our national existence, it has been the conscious policy of our Nation, executed by our Government, to make available and insure the exercise of these rights not only to our own people but to men and women everywhere.

A century ago, a great American President pointed out eloquently that no nation can survive half-slave and half-free. The same, of course, applies to the world at large. To conform to the natural order, to give each man the opportunity to exercise his unalienable rights, the world—all of the nations in it—must be free.

We know that this condition does not obtain today. We know that behind the Iron and the Bamboo Curtains, hundreds of millions of people live in slavery, in cruel bondage to their Communist masters.

One of those nations is Poland whose courageous people are this very day denied the exercise of their unalienable rights.

On the occasion of this anniversary of Poland's famous Constitution of May 3, I want to join with my colleagues in assuring the people of Poland that the American people will not rest until the right to self-determination is restored to them.

I know that words alone are not sufficient to convey our national determination on this score. We should, and we have, provided the people of Poland with more tangible evidence of our friendship, of our concern for their welfare, and our hope for their future.

One of these tangible gestures is a small research hospital for children which is being built today with American funds in Krakow. This is a fine humanitarian project, and it has received congressional support in the past. This support was warranted, and I hope that it will continue. The American Research Hospital for Children in Krakow should be completed as soon as possible to provide the people of Poland with concrete evidence of our continuing concern for their welfare.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I will continue to support this project and I look forward to the day when the people of Poland will once again be free to manage the affairs of their nation without interference from the big brother to the East.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, it is a source of great pride and privilege for me to join today once again in this most fitting celebration of Polish National Day.

I always eagerly embrace the opportunity on this occasion which the House has recognized now for some years to pay my warm tribute of honor, respect and congratulation to the noble Polish people and their government-in-exile, which is struggling bravely to redeem the freedoms of this great land and noble people.

I have been deeply impressed, in common with true freedom lovers all over the world, by the eloquent commemorative message of His Excellency, August Zaleski, President of the Republic of Poland.

Referring to the original adoption of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, as the "symbol of Poland's freedom and independence," President Zaleski hailed the new Constitution as ending the age-old monarchial dictatorship and removing the barriers to personal liberty which had afflicted the Polish nation and country for centuries prior to the adoption of the new Constitution.

This significant event, as he has so well said, demonstrated the force of a sublime idea inspiring the Polish people and illuminating for them the way to moral, political, and social advancement in their governmental affairs.

Like our own Constitution, the Polish Constitution was clear in its recognition of the divine nature of the moral law, the unalienable right of men and women to be free and to order their own self-government.

It is a curious and significant coincidence that before the original Polish Constitution could be implemented, the Russians invaded Poland on the spurious pretext of "restoring the rights and privileges of the famed Polish nation." It is well for us to note today that this so-called defense of freedom by Russia years ago bears an analogy to the present attitude, methods, and suppression by force and intimidation of Polish liberty by the Soviets in our time and generation.

One would have to be naive indeed to believe that the current dictatorship of Poland, engineered and directed by the Soviets, is designed for the defense of freedom of the Polish people. To the contrary, it is a calloused denial of the ordinary rights associated with freedom and autonomous, democratic government.

As President Zaleski notes in his able discourse, the present behavior of the Russian authorities and their Polish agents toward the free Poles brings to mind the methods used by the old czarist agents.

The Communist conspiracy is shortsighted and unrealistic indeed, if its leaders believe that unceasing oppression and tyranny can ever successfully undermine the lofty ideals of the Polish nation.

These ideals, predicated on firm belief in the Almighty, and a compelling resolute devotion to the principles of freedom, impregnate the very cells of the Polish people.

Liberty is part of their very being; faith in the Lord an indelible stamp of the Polish character.

No superstate, however powerful, and no tyranny, however oppressive, can ever eradicate these beliefs or grind the gallant Polish people into willing minions of the Marxist, slave state.

In Polish hearts, the concepts of liberty, freedom and belief in God will ever remain vibrant, strong and tenacious until the day when Poland shall be liberated from the cruel bondage which now holds them in its grip.

Gallant people, determined to be free under the Divine Master and in the beneficent shelter of free institutions, will never forfeit or give up their birthright, or cease their brave struggle, until their liberties, their rights and territorial integrity and political independence have been restored.

The whole free world deeply sympathizers with the gallant Polish people, and our own great Nation committed, as it is, to human liberty and the rights of man will never abandon the oppressed of Poland and other lands seeking their God-given moral rights to the free way of life.

In every way given to us, we will continue to extend to the Polish people every encouragement and assistance in pursuing their chosen ideals and finally realizing once again the fruits and blessings of freedom.

I am highly privileged, Mr. Speaker, to support my distinguished colleagues in this fitting tribute to mark the anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution and I want to compliment and commend the able gentleman from Michigan for his splendid presentation in behalf of the sacred cause of Poland.

Let me say that it is with great pleasure that I join with my friends and colleagues in the House in praising the loyalty and courage of a great people. The Polish people have been fighting the battle for freedom for centuries with a tenacity and courage that could never possibly be surpassed or exceeded. I am grateful for this opportunity to reiterate my unyielding and unceasing support of the Polish cause, to which I have been devoted since I first came to Congress. In this support of Polish freedom, I have simply followed the dictates of my own conscience because it has been clear to me from the very beginning of the unfortunate international situation which fastened tyranny upon the brave, noble and gallant people of Poland that this was perhaps the most unspeakable and brutal tyranny in all history as well as an unvarnished perfidy.

Peace seeking, liberty loving, devoted to the pursuits of peace and the worship of God, this noble people are the victims of unwarranted aggression and tyranny. First it was Hitler and then it was Stalin who terrorized and ravished this great Christian nation. The exploits of the Polish people against cruel, overwhelming enemies were and are among the brightest in the annals of mankind's age-old battle against tyranny, oppression and dictatorship.

The official deliberations and diplomatic surrenders at Yalta, Teheran and Potsdam, which consigned entire nations into the bondage and subjugation of Soviet communism, stand as a gross betrayal of Poland and other freedom loving nations.

What a great tragedy, what a crass violation of human decency and human rights to witness the great, proud, historic Polish nation shackled in Soviet bondage with the acquiescence and action of its own allies.

It is especially appropriate today that we should pledge to the Polish people, and to all small nations suffering under the yoke of tyranny and oppression, our unyielding determination to seek freedom for these unhappy lands. In these tributes by the House today, let it be made known to the great historic Polish people that their fight for freedom is our fight because it is the fight for liberty, democracy, justice, morality and human decency. It is the fight for every precious value of the free world and the free way of life.

It is to the everlasting credit and glory of the Polish people that they have never ceased their resistance to tyranny and are still ready to make continued sacrifices to recover the liberties which were stolen from them by shameless perfidy and armed might. So today in the name of freedom, let us reiterate our loyalty to the sacred cause of Polish liberty. Let us renew our pledge and our prayer that Poland will be liberated from the oppressor and restored to her high and rightful place among free nations.

May the day soon come, pray God, when Poland is free from the chains of slavery and restored to her status as a free and independent nation.

I ask that President Zaleski's message may be inserted as part of my speech.

The message follows:

Message of the President of the Republic of Poland to the Polish Nation on the Occasion of the Polish National Day, May 3, 1963

(H. E. August Zaleski, President of the Republic of Poland, has issued the following message to Poles all over the world on the occasion of the Polish National Day this year.)

At 6 o'clock in the afternoon on May 3, 1791, the Diet of the Polish Commonwealth virtually without dissent enacted a new Constitution law which, though never applied, has been accepted as a symbol of Poland's freedom and independence.

This was so because the new Constitution accomplished at one stroke all that had not been ventured even by gradual stages: it ended the system of electing the kings of Poland, abolished the institution of liberum veto, and took the lower estates under its protection. In such manner, it removed all the ailments which had afflicted the country for the last two centuries.

Many years later, on May 3, 1861, Prince Adam Czartoryski stressed the significance of this act, thus:

"Our nation, in 1 day at once rose to an elevation of spirit, to a moral power, theretofore unattained by any other one. * * * It is conceivable that an individual seized by a sublime idea may rise toward it, but when the whole mass of the people is suddenly illuminated by the power and light of moral excellence * * * such a singular fact cannot be otherwise explained than as due to the special grace of providence."

Unfortunately, despite the enthusiasm the May Constitution evoked amidst the Polish people and its favorable reception in all the countries of western Europe, it was fated never to enter into force.

Russia, who had been warring with Turkey, concluded peace at Jassy on January 9, 1792. Only a few months sufficed for her troops to be transferred to the Polish frontier. And in May of that year, Russian armies again invaded Poland—as the Russian Government announced, "to restore the rights and privileges of the famed Polish nation."

We all know how this defense of freedom by Russia ended. But we should ponder the very evident analogy between Russia's methods of action against Poland in those times and today.

Once again, the Russian Government strives to persuade the Poles and the whole world that she is "the defender of Poland's freedom," though now "against the machinations of imperialists and capitalists." As in 1792, so now are there Poles who either consider Russian intentions toward Poland to be sincere because these happen to coincide with their views on society, or pretend to consider them as such because they answer their personal interests.

Even the behavior of the Russian authorities and their Polish agents toward the free Poles brings to mind the methods used by the old tsarist agents. Their summons to "realism" is, practically speaking, tantamount to a call for resignation from the loftiest ideals of the Polish nation. It is understandable and even necessary that under the present conditions the people in Poland should devote themselves primarily to the reconstruction of their country. But the Poles in other countries must remember they have remained there to demand justice for Poland, not merely to restrict their activities to furthering the extension of economic aid or to enrich the museums of Poland, and so on.

Happily, the great majority of the free Poles maintain their standpoint of protest against the existing state of affairs in Poland under the Communist yoke. I am convinced that this majority will continue to struggle for the restoration of the complete freedom, territorial integrity, and independence of the Polish Republic, and that with divine help it will attain the unity necessary to bring this struggle to victory.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to rise to pay my tribute to the Polish Constitution of 1791 whose anniversary we celebrate on May 3 of this year, tomorrow.

In these days when so much of eastern Europe, including the Polish homeland itself, is under the dark tyranny of Soviet communism, we can well pay tribute again to this great document which shed an early light of liberalism and freedom through Europe.

Although the Polish people have since that time suffered tyranny, oppression and partition on many occasions, they still cherish the ideal of national freedom.

And so, on this great anniversary, Mr. Speaker, as we pay tribute to the great Polish Constitution let us pledge our efforts and our substance to the ultimate goal of wiping out Soviet tyranny and restoring once again the freedom of the great Polish people.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Poland's contribution to the cause of liberty and freedom throughout the world is second to none. The people of the United States will never forget Poland's sympathy, understanding, and contribution to the cause of the American Revolution. We will never forget her gallant fight on the continent of Europe for individual liberty. The people of Poland fought desperately and valiantly against the unprovoked aggression of the ruthless Nazi armies.

It is fitting and proper that we all pause to honor the great Polish people on the Polish national holiday. All freedom-loving people join in the earnest hope that Poland will soon be free from Communist oppression. We must never forget that when the Nazi armies under Hitler invaded Poland September 1, 1939, almost simultaneously Poland was stabbed in the back by a dastardly invasion from the East by the Red armies of Communist Russia.

Until the day of liberation from communism, the people of Poland will have the prayers and best wishes of the American people.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, Polish Constitution Day, observed widely throughout the free world on May 3 of each year, symbolizes the long struggle of the people of Poland to win and maintain their right to self-government and national independence. The epics of this long struggle are filled with acts of heroism and national dedication unsurpassed in the history of freedom's cause. Partitioned on three occasions by hostile neighbors, occupied by foreign forces for decades, Poland nevertheless rewon its national independence in the aftermath of World War I. That particular epic stands as a tribute to the unbreakable will and spirit of the Polish people. They refused to accept defeat in circumstances which would break the hopes of all but the stronghearted, they refused to knuckle under to enemy occupation despite the loss of thousands of patriots who openly resisted, they rose in rebellion against the alien tyranny of Russia and Prussia when the odds against them were overwhelming, and, they remained bold and proud of their faith when their future appeared to others as hopeless. And for this spirit, sacrifice and will to survive as a nation the people of Poland were rewarded with victory in 1918.

A people do not come by a national spirit such as Poland's by accident. One thousand years of existence as a state rests behind this spirit. In 1966 Poland will, at least the people of Poland, observe 1,000 years as a Christian nation. Over those centuries the people of Poland have developed a distinct and rich culture, taking the best features from the great European advances during and following the Renaissance, leading in the quest for higher and popular education, contributing immortals in the fields of science, art, law, literature and the professions. This millenium of Poland in history and Western culture holds an unbreakable bond with the founding of our Nation and the cause of representative self-government. Many outstanding Polish military leaders, most notably Kosciuszko and Pulaski, came to the New World to be companions in arms with George Washington in our fight for national independence. Pulaski gave his life for our national independence and Kosciuszko returned to his homeland after victory had been won in the Revolutionary War. It was natural that the leaders and people of Poland should associate their destiny with events taking place in our Thirteen Original Colonies and the founding of the United States of America. The ideals, hopes and aspirations of that struggle were the same which moved the Polish people toward their goal of self-government and national independence.

The Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, expresses the basic principles of popular government. That Constitution was adopted by the leaders of Poland a short two years after we adopted our Constitution in 1789. It was the first venture in Constitutional Government in Central-East Europe, defining the basic rights and duties of every citizen and establishing the foundations for the orderly growth of popular government. So powerful was the appeal of that venture in popular government among the people of the neighboring states that it was not long before the imperial Monarchs in Russia and Prussia became alarmed. That symbol of popular government threatened the "Divine Right of Kings" theory under which autocratic rulers and emperors determined the destiny of the old world. That threat to autocratic government brought about the third partition of Poland in 1795. But, as I have observed, those acts of autocracy did not lessen the aspirations of the Polish people for the blessings of self-government and national independence.

Poland today is passing through but another trial in her long struggle with despotism and foreign occupation. The record tells all who will take the time to study it that the commissars of Moscow who now seek to enslave the historic spirit of the Polish nation are doomed to defeat. Poland will emerge from her present trials stronger and more dedicated to the principles of individual liberty, self-government and the right of all nations to national independence. There is no power on earth which can deter or prevent the attainment of that ages-long goal of the people of Poland.

That is the real meaning of this May 3 observance which I am proud to take part in. It is my hope that Poland will soon again be free and self-governing and counted among the truly independent nations of the world.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, all Americans draw inspiration from the annual celebration of the Polish 3d of May Constitution Day. That constitution adopted on May 3, 1791, has been one of the documents in man's history that feeds the fires of freedom and liberty.

Americans of Polish descent—numbering more than 6 million—instill into our Nation's life firm beliefs based upon a great tradition.

The American scene is enriched by the contribution of Polish Americans. As Brown and Roucek tell the story in "One America," there are an estimated 10,000 Polish American societies and organizations in the United States. They are devoted to every imaginable activity: religious, cultural, social, beneficial, patriotic, civic, business, and scholarly. Some are purely local, others national in scope; many are affiliated with parish churches, others are wholly independent of religious ties.

Every Member of this House must be familiar with the Polish American Congress, the Polish National Alliance, and the Polish Women's Alliance of America. In my city of Minneapolis we are especially proud of the Polanie Club of St. Paul-Minneapolis which is devoted to the promotion of Polish art, music, and literature.

Today several hundred Polish-American publications—newspapers and periodicals—function for an estimated 2 million readers serving parishes, organizations and political and business interests. One of the outstanding ones is Nowiny Minnesokie published in St. Paul, Minn.

In the field of politics, of course, Americans of Polish descent have made a great contribution. Outstanding Members of Congress are Polish Americans. In municipal affairs, in political party affairs, in the day-to-day exchange of opinions and organizing to promote better government there are always warmhearted and alert Polish Americans in positions of leadership.

Yes, May 3, the Polish national holiday, brings to mind many contributions by this wonderful group of Americans. Their belief in the dignity of the individual has sturdy roots. We thank them for reminding us of the many struggles for human freedom and the unity of mankind throughout the world.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARDY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

END POLIO CAMPAIGN IN RHODE ISLAND

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, the Rhode Island Medical Society, in conjunction with the State department of health, and aided by the cooperation of hundreds of thousands of citizens, is presently engaged in an "End Polio" campaign in Rhode Island. The first salvo of the campaign was fired in March and another blast was detonated only a few days ago. A third time fuse is being readied for use this fall. As a result of the first two phases of this campaign, there is general agreement that Rhode Island may now be considered safe from epidemics of the two most common types of polio and it is anticipated that the State will be, in all probability, the first in the Nation to become a haven from poliomyelitis epidemics.

Even before the preliminary report on the Rhode Island poliomyelitis epidemic of 1960 was issued an informed medical consensus held that, despite a very wide distribution of the polio vaccine then used, a major effort was still needed—as confirmed by the ensuing report—"to fully immunize the susceptible population." Although a swiftly organized vaccination program preceding and during the epidemic had inoculated some 300,000 persons, assaying out at about 80 percent effectiveness and bringing about a dramatic decline in the numbers of those afflicted, progressive medical leaders immediately began to plan against recurrence of such a blight.

After the efficacy of the Sabin oral vaccine had been established to the satisfaction of the U.S. Public Health Service and the American Medical Association termed it "a simple tool with which to end polio," the State medical society made its move. In organizing the first statewide oral polio clinic in the country, it embarked upon the largest mass clinic project Rhode Island had ever attempted.

By mutual agreement with Dr. Joseph E. Cannon, the director of State department of health, a dynamic young physician, Dr. James E. Bowes, was assigned as campaign coordinator; the department's cooperation could not have been more complete.

To this assignment Dr. Bowes brought formidable credentials, as well as a personal history entwined with the problem of poliomyelitis. As a youngster, he had seen polio claim two of his companions at a Boy Scout encampment; he also had occasion to serve as a member of a special guard for the Nation's most famous polio victim, President Franklin D. Roosevelt. Later, as a practicing physician in Salt Lake City, although specializing in obstetrics and gynecology, he volunteered to help that city's polio program; upon acceptance, he directed the establishment of some 120 Salk vaccine clinics which inoculated 128,000 persons in a year's time.

Prior to entry upon his present duties—in the interim he had become a Rhode Island resident—he somehow found time to act as adviser to the Journal-Bulletin in the mass clinic that newspaper sponsored in the 1960 epidemic; when the clinics were closed, he was invited, again after volunteering for the post, to take over the direction of the State's antipolio program. Before coordinating the Sabin oral vaccine program, he spent a year at Yale, getting his master's degree in public health and, during that year, he managed to travel intermittently to Washington to help draft physical standards for Peace Corps applicants.

A prototype clinic was set up in February of this year for campaign workers and their families and everything went off without a hitch. The areawide clinics that opened a week later were initially victimized by human errors; campaign directors moved swiftly to shore up the operation, and by afternoon Rhode Islanders were receiving their oral vaccine at a 1,200-per-minute rate. Logistics of the type II antipolio clinics approached perfection, as each clinic was checked regularly, supply requirements were anticipated and communications were maintained with the help of ham radio operators in radio-equipped cars; a remarkably smooth operation resulted.

Altogether, 73 mass clinics for distributing the vaccine were opened in March; April's campaign had 82 such clinics in operation. Over 679,000 were inoculated in the first round; this figure apparently will be passed in the type II campaign. With shut-ins at various institutions throughout the State receiving the vaccine shortly, and considering the immunizations given by private physicians and through Armed Forces programs to military personnel, the grand total should easily exceed the 80 percent of the resident population established by experts as a safety limit for a given area.

In March of this year, the Rhode Island Medical Society and other health organizations in the State courageously seized "time by the forelock," gaining for the people of Rhode Island an extra hour to gain the extra ounce of prevention that means the difference between immunity and susceptibility. Its "end polio" campaign is advancing along a road that will end only when the signal is flashed back that its objective has been gained, its mission completed.

I would like to pay tribute to all the persons who contributed to the success of this campaign: the medical societies and the health officials who planned and coordinated the program; the 5,000 volunteers who toiled anonymously with unflagging energy; the more than 670,000 individuals who came to the clinics to be immunized.

But I hope that my few words here today in praise of the program will serve to reflect the deep and genuine sentiment of the people of Rhode Island.

All of them, I am certain, are as happy as I am to see once again among the Nation's leaders such a practical and humanitarian program.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an article from the Providence Sunday Journal of April 14, 1963, written by James N. Rhea which touches on the background of Dr. Bowes:

DR. BOWES SETTLING OLD SCORE

(By James N. Rhea)

A jolly warrior—one who likes to rest between battles by playing the bass fiddle and drums—is settling an old score with polio.

He is Dr. James E. Bowes, 42, coordinator of the End Polio Campaign currently sponsored by the Rhode Island Medical Society.

At the impressionable age of 16 he was an orderly in the hospital at Camp Roosevelt for Boy Scouts on Chesapeake Bay when a polio epidemic struck and two of the boys died.

A little later, as an Eagle Scout, he was a member of a special guard of honor for a courageous polio victim, the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

"Now, no one can say how much any of this has to do with my personal interest in ending polio. All I can say is that we have an opportunity to end it, and we must take advantage of this opportunity—now."

Dr. Bowes, an unassuming person who has to be coaxed into talking about himself, got into the fight against polio here through a fortunate coincidence of time.

He brought his wife and 10 children (now 12) to Rhode Island from Salt Lake City, Utah, in June 1960, just as a polio epidemic was taking a sharp upward trend.

"We came here because we liked the schools. Our oldest boy had been accepted at Portsmouth Priory. We liked Portsmouth, and decided to live there."

They live in a huge house at 548 Bristol Ferry Road, overlooking the bay.

"We miss the skiing we could do so conveniently in Utah, but the boating and the beaches here make up for that."

Fortunately, Dr. Bowes has an old habit of volunteering his services for good causes. In 1956, he telephoned the Salt Lake Medical Society and offered to help in its polio program.

"We don't have a polio program—but we're starting one this minute, and you are it," he was told.

At the time, he was engaged in private practice, specializing in obstetrics and gynecology, but he found time to direct the organization of 120 Salk vaccine clinics at which 128,000 persons were inoculated within a year.

In his early days in Rhode Island, while he waited for settlement of the details that attend the transfer of a medical practice, he was plagued by idleness.

He decided to use his time fighting the old enemy, polio, and offered to help the State department of health in its antipolio activity during the epidemic.

EAGERLY ACCEPTED

Dr. Jeremiah A. Dailey, then State director of health, was aware that the U.S. Public Health Service had rated Dr. Bowes' Salt Lake City clinics No. 1 in the Nation. He eagerly assigned the newcomer to act as adviser to the Journal-Bulletin in the mass Salk clinics the newspaper was sponsoring.

When the clinics were closed, Dr. Bowes was invited to take over direction of the State's antipolio program.

One day a visiting representative of the U.S. Public Health Service said to him:

"You ought to be a public health man. How'd you like to go to school for it—with a scholarship and family allowance?"

Dr. Bowes laughed.

"You'd better find out the size of my family before you make me an offer like that," he said.

MASTER'S FROM YALE

Apparently the size of his family didn't bother the Government at all. The State gave him a leave, and he went down to Yale University and got his master's degree in public health.

Back on the job, he started getting ready for the Sabin oral vaccine campaign. Dr. Joseph E. Cannon, State health director, and the medical society named him campaign coordinator.

He practically lives in campaign headquarters in the medical society building on Francis Street. From there he directed the highly successful type 1 mass clinics of March 3.

"The doctors and the lay people who work with us have been simply wonderful," he said. "We have had all along the kind of cooperation that leads to success. I'd like to list all the people who helped put this thing over so far, but there are too many of them. Give credit to newspapers, radio and television, too. They've been great."

SYSTEM HAS FLAWS

Dr. Bowes, who recently was named director of the State division of epidemiology, picked Salt Lake City as an ideal place to practice through his own scientific system, which turned out to have certain flaws in it.

He worked up the system over a 4-year period, gathering data on 760 towns with populations ranging from 20,000 to 200,000. He considered such things as rainfall, number of sunny days a year, humidity, availability of a commercial airport and recreational facilities.

When by a process of elimination he had gotten his list of towns down to 100, he started visiting them whenever it was convenient. When the list was down to 20, he began to take his wife on the visits.

"We picked Salt Lake City. That's a fine place, but we forgot to stress the most important thing—education. We thought our children would have better schools out this way."

HOSPITAL EXPERIENCE

A native of Washington, he is a graduate of Georgetown University there. He was graduated from New York Medical College, New York City, and interned at Mary Immaculate Hospital, Jamaica, Long Island. He was a resident at St. John's Hospital in Cleveland, Ohio, and Jefferson Medical College Hospital in Philadelphia. He did further study at the University of Pennsylvania Graduate School of Medicine.

While in school and in the Medical Corps at Fort Hood, Tex., he played drums and bass fiddle with popular orchestras, now and then filling in with such name bands as those of the Dorsey Brothers and Ted Weems.

Music is one of the main family hobbies now. His wife and some of the children play the piano, and other children the guitar.

"We get a real little orchestra going there sometimes."

The family also likes sports. They play touch football and softball and hold track meets. Those too young to participate serve as team managers.

HUMANITARIAN PHILOSOPHY

The doctor brings a strong humanitarian philosophy to his work. Some time ago, he volunteered to assist the Peace Corps in whatever way it could use him.

They got around to him while he was getting his master's at Yale. He made regular visits to Washington, helping to draft physical standards for Peace Corps applicants for a while.

Then he helped to prepare a team of medical and sanitation specialists to serve in Togo, Africa. He was especially proud of this because one of his classmates in medical school was from Togo.

He was asked if he had had much experience in the organization of mass projects before he got into polio work.

He thought for a moment.

"Well," he said laughingly, "I helped organize the annual mass carnival for the student loan fund when I was in medical school. That was a mass project if I ever saw one."

Mr. Speaker, again under leave to extend my remarks I should like to include several newspaper articles from the Rhode Island press covering various aspects of the End Polio Campaign:

[From the Providence Journal, Apr. 29, 1963]

NEARLY 13,600 TAKE VACCINE AT MOPUP CLINIC

Rhode Island moved a step closer to freedom from the polio epidemic threat yesterday with distribution of type II antipolio vaccine at a mopup clinic bringing the total immunized to about 75 percent of the State's population.

About 13,600 persons filed through the Cranston Street Armory yesterday raising the total to 636,617 persons who have consumed the vaccine-soaked sugar cubes in the second phase of the End Polio Campaign during the past two Sundays.

Results of the final clinic for type II vaccine compares to about 678,811 or 80 percent of the State's population immunized with type I vaccine in March. Type III vaccine will be distributed in clinics throughout the State on October 20.

Dr. James E. Bowes, coordinator of the campaign, urged any persons who have not received either type I or type II vaccines to make arrangements with family doctors to receive them since there will be no more clinics for these two types.

Dr. Bowes said that immunization with both types of vaccine protects persons against about 99 percent of the varieties of polio previously identified in this area. He said type III would be distributed in October because health authorities advise against taking oral vaccine on a mass basis during summer months.

A majority of the persons attending the mopup clinic between 10 a.m. and 6 p.m. yesterday were from Providence, Cranston, and Warwick, but persons came for the vaccine from neighboring communities in Massachusetts and Connecticut. There were registration blanks from Maine, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Nebraska, and California, presumably from persons visiting friends in the State, and one man listed his home as Milano, Italy.

Dr. Bowes said there were no complications in the mopup clinic and that ample supplies of vaccine were on hand. He praised the 82 workers and Providence Police Department for their efforts.

Figures on both clinics follow:

Type I clinics in March

Preview clinic	3,523
Statewide clinics on March 3	610,029
Shut-ins	7,877
Mopup clinics on March 10	57,382
Grand total	678,811

Type II clinics

Statewide clinics on April 21	612,817
Shut-ins (estimated)	9,200
Mopup clinics yesterday (estimated)	9,200
Tentative total	635,617

[From the Providence Journal, Apr. 23, 1963]

NEARLY 612,817 ATTENDED TYPE II POLIO CLINICS—SLIGHT RISE

Antipolio campaigners, announcing the official count, said yesterday that 612,817 Rhode Islanders were immunized on Sunday against type II polio.

Dr. James E. Bowes, director of the State division of epidemiology and coordinator of the End Polio Campaign, said the figure represented 72.2 percent of the population.

"That's a very high batting average for a 1-day program," Dr. Bowes said.

He noted that Rhode Island is the only State thus far to try a statewide 1-day program, although Utah, Delaware, and North Carolina have plans to follow Rhode Island's example.

The Sunday turnout was slightly—"but not substantially"—higher than the March 3 attendance at the type I clinics, with the exception of Providence, Dr. Bowes said.

In March, 610,000 Rhode Islanders received protection against type I polio, representing 71 percent of the population.

But in Providence only 55 percent of the population turned out in March, while 59.7 percent went to the clinics on Sunday.

Dr. Bowes said the increase in Providence attendance is even more marked if another measure is used, a comparison of the number turning out for type II as compared with the March type I drive. He said 123,954 Providence citizens came to the clinics on Sunday, which he called a gratifying increase of 18 percent over the number in March.

Dr. Bowes attributed the increase to the use of four additional clinics in Providence, which brought the campaign closer to individual neighborhoods, and to the intensive publicity leading up to Sunday.

The End Polio Campaign will stage its final statewide 1-day program on October 20 when type III vaccine, the last in the series, will be administered.

There still remains, however, some "mopping up" to be done on the type II drive. During this week the State Department of Health will visit State institutions to give the vaccine.

Next Sunday, type II vaccine will be available in Providence at a location yet to be determined and announced.

Dr. Bowes said this would be for families who were out of the State last Sunday, for example, and for children who had chicken pox, measles, mumps, or other communicable diseases last week and were housebound.

NOTES COMPOSITION

He said the composition of the crowds attending the 82 clinics on Sunday was about the same as in March. The largest group was in the 6- through 16-age-bracket and the second largest group the 1- through 4-year olds, he said. The thinnest response was from young adults, 20 through 39.

In tallying the percentage of the population attending the type II clinics in Rhode Island's towns and cities, Dr. Bowes noted that some showed a response greater than 100 percent.

Examples were West Greenwich, with 148.8 percent, East Greenwich with 126.1 percent, Richmond, with 111.5 percent, and Narragansett, with 103.3 percent.

Dr. Bowes had a number of explanations, all of which added up to the fact that out-of-towners visited the clinics in these areas.

He said that West Greenwich is a small town and "it wouldn't take much to increase the percentage," including people drifting over from Connecticut. "This happens," he said.

OTHER FACTORS

The fact that East Greenwich has a golf course may have had something to do with that town's success, he thought, and he speculated that a drag race on Sunday may have helped the Richmond total.

As for Narragansett, Dr. Bowes said that an Army Reserve unit was in the field there on type II day, and the commander made arrangements for his men to get their sugar cubes from the Narragansett clinic.

Dr. Bowes said the low percentage figure for Newport does not reflect on that town. He said the population includes the naval base, where Navy authorities conducted their own immunization program last week. Thus, the naval population got type II vaccine (as it did type I), but does not figure in the Newport clinic numbers.

The percentage of the population turning out for both the March and April clinics for each community follows:

Town	Population	Percentage of turnout	
		March	April
Barrington	13,826	85.0	85.5
Bristol	14,570	70.0	76.6
Burrillville	9,119	67.0	70.8
Central Falls	19,858	58.6	63.1
Charlestown	1,966	63.7	83.3
Cranston	66,766	72.1	76.8
Coventry	15,432	70.1	78.7
Cumberland	9,396	87.0	83.7
East Greenwich	6,100	120.0	126.1
East Providence	41,955	86.0	79.2
Exeter	2,298	49.8	47.9
Foster	2,097	84.3	88.7
Glocester	3,397	81.0	77.0
Hopkinton	4,174	60.4	58.9
Jamestown	2,267	64.2	67.6
Johnston	17,160	77.2	85.2
Lincoln	13,551	68.0	80.6
Little Compton	1,702	84.8	89.2
Middletown	12,675	62.4	59.2
Narragansett	3,444	89.5	103.3
Newport	47,049	35.4	46.4
New Shoreham	486	66.1	55.3
North Kingstown	18,977	36.1	68.1
North Providence	18,220	74.0	71.8
North Smithfield	7,632	80.0	80.5
Pawtucket	81,001	69.4	70.1
Portsmouth	8,251	67.7	70.7
Providence	207,498	55.0	59.7
Richmond	1,986	108.9	111.5
Scituate	5,210	79.4	83.8
Smithfield	9,442	98.0	88.7
South Kingstown	11,942	69.5	71.4
Tiverton	9,461	60.2	59.1
Warren	8,750	79.0	78.1
Warwick	68,504	68.6	80.7
Westerly	14,267	87.3	85.2
West Greenwich	1,169	129.7	148.8
West Warwick	21,414	69.2	85.6
Woonsocket	47,080	75.5	89.3

[From the Providence Journal, Apr. 22, 1963]

BIG TURNOUT FOR TYPE II VACCINE—MAY SURPASS MARCH RECORD; RESULTS HAILED

(By James N. Rhea)

Rhode Islanders attending type II antipolio clinics yesterday equaled—if not surpassed—their record turnout at the type I clinics held on March 3.

The tentative total of those immunized yesterday was set at 600,468 by End Polio Campaign officials last night at 9 o'clock, 3 hours after the official closing of the clinics. The corresponding figure on March 3 was 583,448.

Once again the Rhode Island Medical Society, sponsor of the project, and the State department of health praised citizens for their response and hailed the results as extremely successful.

"We may now consider ourselves safe from epidemics of the two most common types of polio here," said Dr. Arthur E. Hardy, president of the medical society and chairman of the campaign.

"Great cooperation from the people," said Dr. James E. Bowes, director of the State division of epidemiology and campaign coordinator.

Using the unofficial figures for the March 3 and yesterdays' clinics, 17,020 more persons took the oral type II vaccine than the total taking type I.

The March percentage of the State's population was 68. Yesterday's was 70.8.

No breakdown by cities and towns was available last night because statisticians were constantly making corrections.

They were certain, however, that the tentative overall total given last night will approximate the final total, because overcounts and undercounts usually tend to balance off.

But plans call for one big mop-up clinic conducted from a mobile unit at the statehouse in Providence next Sunday. Details will be announced early this week.

Officials said they believe that this mobile mopup clinic, plus shut-in clinics, will boost the total of type II immunizations to 80 percent.

Corrected counts brought the March 3 total to 613,552. Adding persons immunized at the advance, mopup and shut-in clinics, a total of 678,811 Rhode Islanders have been immunized against Type I polio.

Early estimates for yesterday's project show some improvement in the Providence record. By 5 p.m., the city's count was 118,829, as compared with a total of 104,829 at the close of the March 3 clinics.

Newport, with a March 3 total of 17,739 out of a civilian population of 36,049 appeared to be running slightly behind that figure yesterday.

With the weather smiling brightly upon the State, the clinics yesterday went swiftly and smoothly from the opening time at 10 a.m.

In contrast to March 3, when numerous things went wrong early, no significant flaws developed yesterday.

The people, who, for the most part, had been impressed with the March clinics after the early problems had been solved, moved with easy confidence toward the tables loaded with vaccine-impregnated sugar yesterday.

On March 3 there had been some angry telephone calls to newspapers from impatient persons waiting in lines. Yesterday there was no waiting.

All this reflected improved systems of transporting supplies, better communication, and volunteer worker rehearsals.

Yesterday, ham radio operators with radio sets in cars helped transport vaccine. They were kept informed about needs by operators at End Polio headquarters in the medical society building on Francis Street.

There were direct telephone links between the campaign headquarters and the vaccine stations in clinics.

As before, extra policemen kept traffic moving. There were some jams reported around the State, caused partly by the clinics and partly by motorists out to enjoy the good weather. "It was an all-around good performance," said Dr. Bowes. "The State should be proud of itself."

[From the Providence Journal, Apr. 20, 1963]

Ham Radio Operators To Aid in Polio Clinics

A number of ham radio operators whose radios are mounted in their cars will help see that supplies of Sabin oral antipolio vaccine remain plentiful at tomorrow's clinics.

These and other workers volunteered their services after End Polio headquarters had announced a need for additional helpers.

Dr. James E. Bowes, campaign coordinator, said the drive now has enough registered nurses and enough couriers to transport vaccine.

He still needs men to act as indoor traffic directors at some clinics.

"The operation should go smoothly tomorrow," he said. "The ham radio operators ought to be a big help."

One of the two-way radio cars will be stationed at headquarters at the medical society building on Francis Street. It will inform the other cars of vaccine needs of the various clinics. In this way, time will be saved because drivers will not have to report back to their stations to learn where to go next.

Yesterday all supplies except vaccine were distributed to the 82 clinics. The initial vaccine supply will be on hand well before the clinics open at 10 a.m.

A list of clinic sites and vaccine application forms will appear in tomorrow's Sunday Journal.

This time, to avoid delays such as occurred early at the March 3 clinics, a larger percentage of the total vaccine needed will be on hand at the outset.

As at the March clinics, people will be asked to donate 25 cents toward expenses. However, no one will be turned away if he does not donate.

Dr. Bowes urged the public to remember that the type I vaccine given in March is no protection against the type II polio for which the vaccine will be given tomorrow. Vaccine for type III will be given in the fall.

[From the Evening Bulletin, Apr. 19, 1963]

End Polio

(By James N. Rhea)

It's time for another short refresher course on Sabin oral polio vaccine, which will be given throughout the State for protection against type II polio this Sunday.

The first reminder is that the clinics will be held between 10 a.m. and 6 p.m. at locations listed on page 22. You'll find registration blanks on that same page.

Now here are some pertinent questions with answers supplied by the Rhode Island Medical Association, sponsor of the clinics, and the State department of health, which is giving full cooperation.

Question. If a person took the vaccine for type I polio in March, should he also take the type II vaccine Sunday?

Answer. By all means. There are three different types of polio, and there are vaccines for each type. Vaccine for one type will not protect against polio of a different type.

Question. Are some age groups secure from type II polio without the vaccine?

Answer. No age groups are entirely secure without it. Everyone except babies under 3 months old should take the vaccine.

Question. Are there conditions under which it is best not to take the vaccine?

Answer. A person with temperature above 102° or with severe diarrhea should not take it. Its effects, also, would be lost on persons who take a considerable quantity of alcohol a half-hour or so before or after a vaccine dose. But persons with chronic diseases and colds may take the oral vaccine without ill effects.

Question. What if a person missed taking type I vaccine? Should he take type II?

Answer. Yes. Then, after a minimum of 7 weeks, he should get type I vaccine from his private physician.

Question. How safe will I be after taking type II?

Answer. When you have had both types I and II, you will be safe from 99 percent of the kinds of polio that have hit Rhode Island hardest. However, remember that 1 percent, and don't take chances. Get type III vaccine in October.

Question. After taking type II, will I need a Salk booster shot this spring?

Answer. Yes. This is because you won't be protected fully by oral vaccine until you have had your type III dose in October. While the Salk shots don't afford you the long-range protection that the Sabin oral vaccine does, they give you temporary immunity against all three types of polio.

Question. Will the type II vaccine be administered the same way as type I?

Answer. Exactly the same, on lumps of sugar. It, too, is tasteless.

Question. What would happen if I should somehow get an overdose of vaccine?

Answer. It wouldn't harm you in any way.

[From the Providence Journal, Apr. 18, 1963]

End Polio Drive Asks Volunteers

(By James N. Rhea)

More End Polio volunteer workers are needed to make certain that Sunday's type II clinics move as swiftly and smoothly as the type I clinics in March.

"We are in good shape at most places but at others we are short," said Dr. James E. Bowes, campaign coordinator of the program sponsored by the Rhode Island Medical Society.

He said the campaign needs 6 couriers with cars to transport vaccine from hospital depots to clinics, about 30 registered nurses to give vaccine in eyedroppers to babies, and about 50 men to serve as indoor traffic directors.

The campaign also could use a few women to act as tally clerks, registrars, and telephone workers.

"We're going to put people through on schedule, all right, but if we get more workers it will take some of the weight off our current volunteers," he said.

He suggested that this would be a good project for college students.

Anyone who would like to help out may apply to End Polio campaign headquarters at JAckson 1-9500.

Some of the worker shortage reflects the fact that the campaign has added 9 new clinics, bringing the total to 82.

Also, there is a possibility that more people will turn out this time than did in March.

All who took type I are expected to return for type II because there is a different kind of vaccine for each of the three kinds of polio. In addition, Dr. Bowes said, some people who have not yet taken type I vaccine probably will come to take type II.

The workers aren't paid. Aside from public service, Dr. Bowes can offer one small inducement—a free sandwich and cup of coffee.

"For the first time we're going to give the volunteer workers a bite of lunch," he said.

The extra Providence clinics in part will make up for the loss of the two large armories to the campaign for Sunday. They are not available because drills will be going on.

There'll be curb service, too, he said. Infirm persons may remain in their autos and have the volunteer workers deliver the vaccine-impregnated sugar lumps to them.

The dose must be taken at once, though, for the vaccine loses its effectiveness within a few minutes after exposure to the air.

[From the Providence Sunday Journal, Apr. 7, 1963]

Rhode Island Likely To End Polio Threat First

(By James N. Rhea)

The Nation's first State to become safe from polio epidemics in all of its areas probably will be Rhode Island.

According to overwhelming medical opinion, this State already is free from the threat of a type I polio epidemic.

This is because nearly 80 percent of its population has taken Sabin oral vaccine for immunization against type I polio. Eighty percent is the safety limit experts have set for a given area.

If as many Rhode Islanders take the oral vaccine for type II polio April 21 and for type III early in the fall, then epidemic polio will be just about a matter of history in the State.

The fact that the State is so small has something to do with this happy prospect. Statewide plans can be made easily, and carried out from a single center. Continuity of communications can be maintained. Personnel and supplies can be transported quickly.

But the favorable size of the State is just one factor in the success—so far—of the effort to end polio here.

As in the rest of the Nation, the realistic hope for total protection against the disease surged up in 1954 with the dramatic introduction of the Salk injection vaccine.

However, not until 6 years later, when confronted with the worst epidemic on its record, did Rhode Island begin the mass immunization drives which approached perfection in the oral clinics of March 3 and March 10.

The State's people probably were no more, and no less, conscientious about getting their Salk shots than were the rest of the Nation's people before the toll of victims started rising steadily in that dreadful summer of 1960.

As the epidemic spread, beaches and parks were closed. Theaters and other public places were practically empty. There was no panic, but there was general fear.

State and local health authorities kept expanding their Salk injection programs. Newspapers and radio and television stations devoted more and more space to the situation. And polio kept striking.

Fifty persons had been stricken when Jack Grossman of 56 Lenox Avenue, Providence, suggested to the Journal-Bulletin that mass statewide clinics, popularly financed, be conducted.

The newspaper seized on the idea and decided to sponsor such clinics, with the cooperation of State and local health departments and the Rhode Island Medical Society. The first contribution, $25, came from Mr. Grossman. From then on, the money rolled in.

The passive role of the medical society as a body in this first mass project contrasted pointedly with its active leadership in the current Sabin vaccine program.

In 1960, the medical society as a unit did not officially sponsor mass clinics. Many of the society's members declared their flat opposition to the projects on the ground that private doctors should administer the vaccine.

One father complained that a doctor had refused to give shots to his children because he did not have the money to pay for them.

Some doctors were suspicious of the mass clinic, considering it nonprofessional and too much of a carnival-like venture.

However, individual medical society members worked diligently at the Journal-Bulletin clinics until Capt. Edward A. Anderson, chief medical officer at the Quonset Naval Air Station, and his team of technicians began to give vaccine with the hypospray jet injector.

A short time after Captain Anderson took to the field, the Providence Health Department started using the painless, rapidly working jet injectors. Thousands of people passed through clinics all around the State daily.

By the end of the epidemic in September, 300,000 persons had been inoculated at free clinics.

The Journal-Bulletin clinics alone had inoculated 56,456. The epidemic claimed 103 persons, 6 of whom died.

With the epidemic over, such officials as Dr. Joseph Smith, Providence health superintendent, and Dr. Jeremiah A. Dailey, then State health director, continued to urge citizens to take their Salk shots so that it would not happen again.

Meanwhile, the Rhode Island Medical Society was closely watching the results of immunization projects in this country and other lands with the oral vaccine developed by Dr. Albert B. Sabin in the middle 1950's.

In 1961, the American Medical Association pronounced the Sabin vaccine "a simple tool with which to end polio." The U.S. Public Health Service also approved this vaccine.

All along, in the local medical society there had been some feeling that the Salk vaccine was just a good "stopgap agent" to hold the line until the oral vaccine was proved safe.

With the efficacy of the Sabin vaccine established, the medical society decided to sponsor the largest mass clinic project ever undertaken in this State and the first statewide oral polio clinic in the country.

The State department of health announced its full cooperation. Then Dr. Joseph E. Cannon, health director, contributed what was perhaps the most important human factor behind the success of the campaign so far. He assigned Dr. James E. Bowes to act as campaign coordinator.

VETERAN CAMPAIGNER

Dr. Bowes was relatively a stranger in Rhode Island, but he was certainly no stranger in the mass fight against polio.

The 42-year-old physician had come to Rhode Island with his wife and 10 children in 1960 from Salt Lake City, Utah, where he had directed clinics at which 128,000 persons were immunized. He had been adviser to the Journal-Bulletin for its clinics in 1960.

He set up headquarters for the Sabin program in the medical society building on Francis Street, and brought to his command a capacity for detail and organization without which the campaign would surely have failed at the public clinics.

The advance clinic, held on February 24 for campaign workers and their families, went smoothly from the beginning. It looked as if months of preparation had left no flaws in the procedures.

ERRORS AT OUTSET

But the public clinics a week later opened with errors. There were shortages of equipment, breakdowns in communications, late openings. Early observers thought that Dr. Bowes and company had fallen flat on their faces.

But up at campaign headquarters Dr. Bowes was very much on his feet. By early afternoon, he and his volunteer workers had ironed out all the wrinkles and Rhode Islanders were taking lumps of vaccine-impregnated sugar at the rate of 1,200 persons a minute.

When the clinics closed, 613,552 persons had been immunized. At mopup clinics the following Sunday 57,382 more ate safety sugar.

During the following week, 7,877 shut-ins at various institutions throughout the State were given the vaccine. This brought the total to 678,811.

Dr. Bowes said that when immunizations by private physicians and at servicemen's centers are added in, the State's total should go beyond 80 percent.

In addition to Dr. Bowes, the following were factors in the success of the initial phase of the end polio campaign:

1. Influential group sponsorship (the medical society).
2. Thorough organization and planning.
3. The full support of communications media.
4. The psychological pull of sugar over needles.
5. Cooperation of public institutions, such as school committees which made premises available for clinics, and of business interests, such as public utilities which enclosed application blanks with monthly statements to customers.

[From the Providence Journal, Mar. 11, 1963]

TOTAL OF 57,382 MORE GIVEN SABIN ORAL VACCINE

(By James N. Rhea)

A total of 57,382 Rhode Islanders were immunized against type I polio yesterday at mop-up Sabin oral vaccine clinics throughout the State. The number brought the total percentage of immunized citizens to 78—just two points short of the Rhode Island Medical Society's goal of 80 percent.

Dr. James E. Bowes, campaign coordinator, said that when immunization by private physicians and special immunization projects for servicemen is figured in the total probably will go well beyond 80 percent.

The official number of citizens who took the vaccine now stands at 670,934. This represents the attendance at the preview clinic three Sundays ago, the 73 clinics held last Sunday and the 13 yesterday.

The final type I total represents corrections that brought last Sunday's total from the reported 583,450 to 613,552.

To get an accurate count for last Sunday, End Polio Campaign workers took an actual count of the lumps of sugar and the eyedropper dispensers used.

"Things were excellent all the way yesterday," Dr. Bowes said. "There was no waiting. There were no lags. There were no breakdowns in communications, and no shortages of supplies."

Campaign workers had made a thorough study of all that went wrong last Sunday and altered plans accordingly for yesterday.

For one thing, direct telephone lines were set up between all clinics and the headquarters in the medical society building on Francis Street.

CALLS INITIATED

Instead of waiting to be called by clinic workers, headquarters workers initiated the calls to check on clinic supplies.

"Clinic workers sometimes get busy and forget to check with us until something is too short to prevent a time delay in replenishing," Dr. Bowes said. "We eliminated potential trouble by making those regular checks with them."

The clinics also had more vaccine to start the day than they had last Sunday, he reported. Each site got an initial supply of 10,000 doses yesterday.

Last Sunday's initial supply, based on 40 percent of the total amount officials thought they would need at a clinic, ran low at some clinics. A few had to close before the scheduled time.

TOPS IN WARWICK

Yeterday's top turnout was 8,879 in Warwick, at Veterans Memorial High School. The low was in South Kingstown—2,455 at Keaney Gymnasium at the University of Rhode Island—although only 2,097 appeared at Esek Hopkins Junior High School, one of four Providence clinics.

The biggest surprise was at Thompson Junior High School in Newport, where 2,860 got the vaccine instead of the 500 expected.

Dr. Frederick A. Peirce, chairman of the polio committee of the Newport County Medical Society, termed the operation a success. Newport last week had one of the poorest turnouts.

The first person in the line at Newport was George A. Seaman of 49 West Broadway. He is 100 years old.

Dr. Bowes praised the approximately 5,000 volunteer workers in the end polio campaign. He and Dr. Arthur E. Hardy, chairman of the campaign, said efforts now will be turned toward preparation for the type II vaccine clinics April 21.

ASK SAME RESPONSE

"We urge the public to make the same response on April 21," they said. "If that goes well, along with the type III clinics in the fall, we'll be safe from any epidemics of polio in this State."

Yesterday's turnout was as follows:

Bristol, National Guard Armory	2,521
Central Falls High School	2,773
Cranston High School East	5,773
Newport, Thompson Junior High School	2,860
Pawtucket, J. C. Potter School	4,394
Providence—	
Mount Pleasant High School	8,568
Roger Williams Junior High School	3,400
Esek Hopkins Junior High School	2,097
Fox Point Elementary School	3,739
South Kingstown, Keaney Gymnasium at the University of Rhode Island	2,459
Warwick, Veterans Memorial High School	8,879
West Warwick, Quinn School	5,092
Woonsocket, Globe Park School	4,773

[From the Italian Echo, Mar. 8, 1963]

LET'S FINISH THE JOB

A howling success.

These three words, in the opinion of its sponsors, describe the first statewide clinic to end polio ever held within these Plantations on last Sunday. This feeling was shared by the more than a half million Rhode Islanders who literally "stormed" the 70-odd clinic sites throughout the State to receive their oral vaccine. The public responses exceeded the fondest expectations of the Rhode Island Medical Society, sponsors of the campaign. It demonstrated quite clearly what an enlightened community can accomplish when it sets its mind to it. It is estimated that approximately 583,000 people over 60 percent of the State's population received the vaccine.

Of course, as was to be expected in such an enormous project, the day was not devoid of its amusing, as well as its disturbing, incidents. At times tempers became short, as impatient citizens waited in long lines for their vaccine. Long before the clinics were opened for business, there were long lines of citizens, who decided to come early in order to "avoid the rush." By so doing, they created problems that were not anticipated. There were some mightly rough moments, before the program began to roll. However, once these rough edges were smoothed out, the program rolled smoothly throughout the entire day. The pleasant weather, which prevailed throughout the day, lent a festive air to the occasion.

Despite the most careful preparations, however, thousands of Rhode Islanders were for various reasons unable to receive their vaccine. In order to make the drive a complete success, by enabling these people to participate, nine "mop-up" clinics have been planned for next Sunday at various points throughout the State. It is hoped over 100,000 persons will avail themselves of this second opportunity to join the crowd and receive their "sugar." The clinics on next Sunday will be open from 11 to 4.

Congratulations for the success of the clinic of last Sunday must go to the large number of dedicated volunteer workers who braved the hordes throughout the day. Many of them worked longer than they had bargained for. They stayed on willingly many hours without relief in order that their fellow citizens might be served. Unfortunately they were the target of many ungrateful people, who vent their frustrations and disappointments on them. These, however, they took bravely. The vast majority of the people were considerate and appreciative of their efforts. For their efforts in keeping the lines moving they deserve our praise and commendation.

There is no doubt that many of the rough edges discovered in last Sunday's clinics will be avoided in future clinics. Mistakes which were made at that time will be avoided next time.

The job that was begun last Sunday must now be finished. Those of us who for some reason or other did not get the vaccine, must plan to go to one of the clinics which have been planned. The aim of the end polio campaign is complete victory. Nothing short of that should be contemplated, now that victory is in sight. If you have not received your vaccine make it a point to turn out.

[From the Providence (R.I.) Journal-Bulletin, Mar. 2, 1963]

END POLIO—RHODE ISLAND CAN MAKE CERTAIN EPIDEMIC OF 1960 WILL NOT HAPPEN AGAIN

(By James N. Rhea)

Remember the worst polio epidemic in recent Rhode Island history? It occurred in the summer of 1960 and when it was over 103 persons had been stricken. Six died.

To make certain such a thing does not happen again, the Rhode Island Medical Society is urging all citizens to attend the End Polio oral vaccine clinics being held throughout the State tomorrow. The hours are from 10 a.m. to 6 p.m.

Failure to seek the protection of the Salk injected vaccine was a great factor behind the 1960 epidemic. Eighty percent of those who contracted polio had not had any Salk shots.

And this leads to another reason why End Polio campaign officials urge even people who have had full Salk injections to get the extra protection of Sabin oral vaccine:

The other 20 percent of serious victims were persons who had received three Salk shots or more. A 2-year-old Warwick boy who had four Salk shots died. Another child who died had had three shots.

On June 15, the Providence Journal gave this report:

"Three more Rhode Island children have been stricken with poliomyelitis, bringing the total to seven."

On July 20, a news story began:

"As the number of Rhode Island polio cases rose to 62 today with two new cases, the State was beginning to show growing apprehension over the epidemic."

In a single location, the Prospect Heights low-income housing project in Pawtucket, 20 persons got the disease. However, none there died.

As the epidemic continued to spread, Salk vaccine clinics were hastily organized at convenient places all over the State. Frightened people lined up for the injections by the thousands.

The State was experiencing its worst polio epidemic since 1916.

Other sections of the country had had similar experiences, and public health officials noted that most of those who came down with the disease had not had Salk shots.

"And most of them were from certain low-income groups that are difficult to reach with our message," a State health official said.

"We hope to see that we have reached everybody this time, though," he said.

[From the Providence (R.I.) Journal-Bulletin, Mar. 1, 1963]

TOSS OUT THE POLIO NEEDLES

(By James N. Rhea)

Immunization needles are being thrown away for lumps of sugar as preparation for Sunday's mass End Polio clinics enters its final stages.

The Rhode Island Medical Society expects at least 700,000 persons here to join millions who have munched vaccine-impregnated sugar throughout the country.

Dr. Arthur E. Hardy, chairman of the campaign, and Dr. Joseph E. Cannon, State director of public health, said the record elsewhere has been highly successful.

They said that more than 1,500,000 persons took Sabin oral vaccine last June at clinics sponsored in Cleveland, Ohio, by the Cleveland Academy of Medicine.

"Another place where they got excellent participation was Denver, Colo.," said Dr. James E. Bowes, coordinator of the End Polio drive here. "They administered two million doses out there."

Dr. Bowes said that 250,000 residents of Hillsborough County, Fla., were successfully immunized. And the number in Dade County, Fla., was 500,000.

"Over in Massachusetts," he said, "they immunized 500,000 youngsters."

But, perhaps, this country's best effort was in San Francisco, where three million persons took the vaccine in one day.

"We have a small State here, and plenty of clinic sites set up all over it. We ought to set some kind of record here for participation," Dr. Bowes said.

The campaign coordinator said he expects the clinics to operate swiftly and smoothly Sunday. He based this opinion partly on the success of the advance clinic held last Sunday for campaign workers and their families.

Senator Claiborne Pell yesterday urged Rhode Islanders to take the oral vaccine.

"I strongly endorse the End Polio campaign, sponsored by the Rhode Island Medical Society, assisted by the State Department of Health, and urge my fellow Rhode Islanders to participtae in this most worthwhile endeavor, as I am urging my own children," the Senator said.

[From the Woonsocket Call, Mar. 1, 1963]

END POLIO—AN OPPORTUNITY AND A DUTY

On Sunday, the first statewide immunization program in the Nation's history will take place throughout Rhode Island. We are referring to the end polio campaign, a 1-day effort to to have at least 80 percent of the State's residents receive the Sabin oral antipolio vaccine.

Clinics have been scheduled Sunday from 10 a.m. to 6 p.m. in all of Rhode Island's 39 cities and towns. Everyone beyond the age of 3 months is asked to receive a lump of sugar impregnated with Sabin type I vaccine. Those who cannot take sugar will be given the vaccine in an eye dropper.

Thousands of communities throughout the Nation have held these clinics and the results have been most gratifying. But this State, under the sponsorship of the Rhode Island Medical Society, is attempting something new. It is conducting end polio clinics in 1 day in all cities and towns in a massive effort to wipe the dread disease off the medical map.

Authorities feel that a large majority of the populace must receive the vaccine if it is to be totally effective. These clinics provide an ideal opportunity. You will be helping yourself and your family as well as everyone else if you are immunized.

Actually, Sunday's clinics are but the first of a series of three. The Sabin vaccine comes in three types, with the first eliminating 76 percent of the varieties of polio. The remaining two types handle the others.

A second statewide clinic is scheduled April 21, with the third to be held at an unannounced date in the fall. Do not make the mistake of thinking that if you miss the Sunday clinic you can attend the next two and be as fully protected. Type I vaccine will be given at the initial clinic, type II on April 21, and type III in the fall.

Although you and your family may have received the recommended number of Salk shots, their usefulness has probably ended. The Sabin types are expected to provide immunity for at least 10 years—perhaps a lifetime.

Thus it behooves all of us to go to the clinic nearest our home. It will take no longer than 5 minutes from entrance to exit if you have filled out a form in advance. If you do not have a form, clip the one appearing on the back page of today's Woonsocket Call, complete it and take it with you Sunday. It will save much time.

Clinic locations also are listed next to the form and area Massachusetts residents may also avail themselves of their services.

The fee? There is none. However, everyone is requested to drop a quarter in jars to be placed at the end of the line. The money will go toward clinic expenses.

A pretty cheap price to pay to end polio.

[From the Providence Journal, Dec. 11, 1962]

RHODE ISLAND DOCTORS ACT

The Rhode Island Medical Sociey is to be commended for organizing two statewide free public oral vaccine clinics this winter. At 65 locations January 27 and March 17 next year, the society will try to immunize every man, woman, and child in Rhode

Island in the first campaign of its kind in State history.

The first two types of the Sabin oral vaccine will be given at the clinics. Even those persons who have had the Salk injected vaccine will be urged to go to the two clinics and get the added protection of the oral vaccine. Cooperating with the society in this venture will be the State health department.

It is perfectly true that thousands of Rhode Islanders already have received the Salk vaccine, but the society believes that the oral vaccine is the only means of reaching that hard core segment of the community which has been shown recently to represent the current reservoir of polio virus and which has a poor record of Salk immunization.

Other medical societies elsewhere in the country have run similar clinics, and in several major cities of the country, public response has been remarkable.

The two clinics here will be held on Sundays so that the greatest possible number of Rhode Islanders will be free to make arrangements for themselves and their families to go to clinics nearest their homes. Details of the program will be announced at a later date and deserve close statewide attention.

It is our hope that the program will receive full and constructive help from the State's 39 cities and towns as the society and the State health department go about the task of preparing for the clinics. It also is our hope that Rhode Islanders will respond en masse to this informed investment in public health.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is the 172d anniversary of the signing of the Polish National Constitution, under which the Polish Nation obtained the bill of rights that it is now denied.

It was barely 2 years after the birth of the Constitution in the United States that the Polish people adopted a constitution of their own. The Polish Constitution declared:

> All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty, and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting footing.

The light of liberalism which came from Poland in 1791 was then, as it has been through the years, a threat to tyranny and absolutism. This year, as freemen throughout the world commemorate the adoption of this historic document, we also remember that 1963 marks the 100th anniversary of the Polish uprising of 1863. This was an uprising carried on by the Poles for more than 2 years against the oppression and cruelty of Russian domination.

The uprising of 1863 against Russian tyranny was the greatest, longest, and bloodiest uprising in Polish history. In this long and heartbreaking struggle, the Polish Nation lost over 250,000 of its sons. Although the revolt met defeat, it laid the foundation for Poland's ultimate independence.

No celebration will be allowed in Poland on May 3 this year. But we in the Congress of the United States can and do give recognition to the valiant spirit of the Polish people. May the friendship between the American and the Polish people grow ever stronger.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, once again the world has completed another cycle around the sun, adding 1 more year to the 171 that have passed since the nation of Poland declared its independence. May 3, 1791, was Independence Day for the nation of Poland. The Poles followed the example of our young Nation at that time in wanting to live as free people—to govern themselves; to worship as they pleased; to speak their mind; to write what they felt; and to read what they desired. These were the principles they wish to follow. This was their strong desire and that yearning was so strong that it made its mark on the generations that followed, up till the present day, where the feeling has strengthened because tyranny rules their land.

The only reason they have not been able to prosper in the same manner that we have as a free nation can be attributed to their location. Poland is located in the center of turmoil, plunder, and tyranny. They are surrounded by strong nations, who, through the years, have been dominated by a minority group of power-crazed leaders who wish to rule the world. As a result, Poland has been the victim of invasion and oppression, so one can honestly say, they have never really enjoyed the fruits of their labor toward independence. However, the constitution they wrote has never been abandoned and remains today as the forefront of their tradition. It is a symbol for their young to follow so that one day they can turn to it as their mace for governing themselves. For as Thomas Jefferson had said, "The God who gave us life, gave us liberty at the same time."

On May 3 celebrations will take place in Poland to commemorate their Constitution Day. The celebrations will not be gay, open-aired parties, for the Soviet boot would stomp upon any such affairs, however, secretly in the minds and hearts of the masses, the Poles will reaffirm their desire for freedom, which will strengthen their spirit to regain their precious want.

As leaders of the free world, we, in the United States, must encourage and inspire the Poles behind the Iron Curtain to have faith in the principles of democracy. By continuing to encourage them, we can add strength to their souls to shake loose the bonds of tyranny which bind them now.

I am pleased to join their crusade and I am ever hopeful that we, in our generation, will see them enjoy life as a free nation, dedicated to the principles of democracy.

A MIDDECADE CENSUS IN 1965

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on May 1, I introduced a bill, H.R. 5993, to authorize a census of population, housing, and unemployment in the year 1965 and every subsequent 10 years. Similar bills have also been introduced in the 88th Congress by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN], the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT]. My bill is different, however, in that the census would be taken only in those States which agree to pay 50 percent of the total costs.

Mr. Speaker, during the 86th Congress I served as chairman of the Subcommittee on Census and Government Statistics of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Our subcommittee held a number of hearings on census matters, especially on the 1960 census. The members of our subcommittee were impressed with two important facts which came out of our studies and investigations: First, with all the facts and figures we have in this Nation, the census remains the principal basic source of our economic and social information, and second, the old decennial census, now over 170 years old, is just not frequent enough—we need more frequent and reliable measures of our population, housing, labor force, and similar matters covered by the census.

To explore these points further, our subcommittee held a series of investigative hearings in 1961–62 in New York City, Chicago, Los Angeles, and Washington, D.C. The Washington hearing was held under the chairmanship of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON] who became chairman of the subcommittee during the 87th Congress. All in all, our subcommittee took some 800 pages of testimony from over 200 public and private witnesses, including Members of Congress, State Governors, mayors of our largest cities, business executives, and many others. As would be expected, most State and local government officials strongly urged the subcommittee to sponsor middecade census legislation. They pointed out that States and local communities need reliable population and housing data more frequently than every 10 years. They need these data for all kinds of State and local government programs—budgeting and planning, urban development, public housing, slum clearance, unemployment relief, health-welfare services, and many, many other purposes. The fast growing communities need information to measure and keep up with their growth, and the depressed areas need these data for all kinds of emergency programs, many of them supported by Federal funds.

Because of this local need for population data, between the 1950 and 1960 censuses, over 2,000 communities paid the Census Bureau to take special censuses at their expense. In California, where population pressures are great, over 500 communities had special censuses. In most cases, the population increase from the last decennial census enabled the community to recover in 1 year more than the cost of the census from the State treasury in increased revenues and refunds.

There are those who say that these dynamic population problems are not the concern of the Federal Government, that the States and local communities can manage their affairs without calling on the Federal Government

Mr. Speaker, I wish that this was true, but it is not. The fact is that in fiscal year 1964, one-tenth of the Federal budget or $10 billion is budgeted for Federal assistance programs to States and local communities, for highways, roads, schools, housing, unemployment relief and retraining, public welfare and the rest. Only this week the Committee on Appropriations recommended almost $3 billion to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for grants to States for public assistance in 1964. It is estimated that by 1970 Federal assistance programs will total $20 billion a year. So, what are we going to do? Wait until 1970 to find out how much of this Federal assistance money is going to assist people who are no longer there, to build fancy roads to places which no longer need them, or worse, to shortchange those communities where population inmigration creates urgent needs for homes, schools, roads, water, health and sanitation facilities, and all the other needs of our people.

ESTIMATES

Mr. Speaker, in certain sophisticated circles, they will tell you that we do not need a census because reliable estimates can now be made of population trends. We do have good estimates of the population for the United States as a whole and even the State estimates are improving all the time. But, what about Detroit, Los Angeles, New York City, and our other large and smaller cities. I prefer to let Commissioner Walter Tobriner, of Washington, D.C., speak on this point.

(Middecade census hearing, pt. 4,
Washington, D.C., p. 700.)

> 1. It seems obvious that the most basic characteristic we must know about our community is its size. The mobility of urban areas is now so great that in 10 years, central cities entirely change their character, thus entirely changing the needs for schools, for old-age help, for economic improvement, and many other characteristics that correlate highly with age and color.
>
> In Washington, as elsewhere, efforts continually go on to estimate the size of the population during intercensal years, and to project the estimates into the future. But our population is so dynamic, the size of household, housing supply, age, and color distributions so changing, that current methods of population estimating and projecting have grown woefully inadequate.
>
> For example, there were several periodic estimates of District of Columbia population during the 1950–60 decade—by local government, by business and research organizations, and by the Census Bureau itself. All of them proved far too high. This was indeed a common experience in large cities throughout the country. The actual 1960 enumerations were greeted with dismay and disbelief.
>
> The clamor was so great that the Census Bureau spent millions of unforseen dollars checking its results, with little change in outcome. There had been little appreciation of indicators which unequivocally implied a total population much lower than the one in current use. The results of an income survey contracted for by the District of Columbia Government with the Census Bureau provided the strongest possible evidence that the population of the District was considerably lower than estimated by anyone. Like the special census taken of New York City in 1957, the evidence of this survey was greeted with disbelief. The results of the 1960 census, however, bore out the trend indicated by the income survey.
>
> The Census Bureau itself has been baffled by the tendency for its District of Columbia estimates to go astray. The method it applies to the other States (for District of Columbia is treated as a State in their estimating process) does not work well for the District. It is obvious that the District of Columbia does not have the attributes of a State, but more readily joins the cities and standard metropolitan areas and shares their problems. The Census Bureau experts have been compelled to treat the District as an exception to their uniform procedures in many respects, but are far from having solved the matter. The difficulties of grappling with dynamic, elusive, or merely unstable characteristics of a city which is the site of and which is in plain view of the Census Bureau are seized upon by estimators as the best possible example of the impossibility of fashioning an accurate estimate for a dynamic city.

Now, I do not mean to be unfair to well-intentioned experts who are making all kinds of estimates—good and bad. The Census Bureau itself does fine work in this field and should be commended for it. In proposing a middecade census in 1965, my colleagues and I are really doing the estimators and samplers a great service. They will be grateful to us later in the 1960's, as Mr. Richard M. Scammon, Census Director, testified before our subcommittee:

> There is no question about this, because any retaking of the benchmarks on which sampling is based, and this is true of market research, political research, any kind of sampling research, any improvement of the benchmarks is a tremendous improvement in the reliability of the sample which is drawn from those benchmarks. For example, if someone is trying to do a sample survey in the State of New York, in 1966, using 1960 census data, the reliability of any sample drawn from that 1960 census data is far less than it would be from a 1965 set of census data. It is true in increasing magnitude as you get further and further away from the original benchmark year, which in this case is 1960.

So let us not delude ourselves that later in the 1960's estimates of population, housing, unemployment will satisfy either Federal or State and local governments needs for accurate information for our cities, towns, school districts, water districts, and the rest. If there were any acceptable substitute for the census, we would not be introducing new legislation.

SHARING COST WITH STATES

Mr. Speaker, many people agree that a mid-decade census is necessary, but question whether the Federal Government can afford it. The 1960 census of population and housing cost approximately $97 million. Since this figure is less than 1 percent of the cost of Federal grants to States and local communities for only 1 year, I would consider such an expenditure to be a wise investment of Federal funds. But, since the States and local communities have, in the past, been willing to pay for special censuses, and since many of them would stand to gain financially from new census figures, my bill would authorize the census to be taken only in those States which would agree to pay one-half of the census costs.

It may come as a surprise to Members, but similar legislation to mine was passed in 1879. Legislation for the 1880 census provided that if any State or territory held a census in 1885, in accordance with Federal specifications, the Federal Government would reimburse the State or territory for one-half of its field costs. In 1885, three States and two Territories took advantage of this provision in the census law; nine other States and the District of Columbia took censuses entirely at their own expense.

SUPPORT OF BUSINESS

Mr. Speaker, in these remarks I have discussed principally the Federal-State-local government interest in censuses, but the business community will reap rich rewards from a 1965 census. The executive director of the American Marketing Association, whose 8,500 members influence many decisions in the fields of advertising, retailing, wholesaling, and market research, wrote to me:

> In view of (1) the many uses which scientific marketers make of census data, (2) the rapidly changing character of our population in terms of age distribution, household formation, geographic location, movement to the suburbs, etc., and (3) the effect which the business decisions based upon census data can have upon our economic health and growth, the association recommends that the census of population and housing be conducted every 5 years.

And the Research Director of the Ford Motor Co., basing his argument on family formation in the 1960's, testified before our subcommittee:

> It has been clear to me for some time that accurate, up-to-date detailed facts on the location of our population will be needed in mid-1965. The sharp increase (43 percent) in the number of individuals in the 20–29-year-old age group over the current decade suggests a rate of family information during this period that will have a major impact on marketing decisions.
>
> If we use the census series A estimates of household formation, the growth in households will approximate 5 million in the 5-year period 1960–65. I personally think this is a conservative forecast.
>
> But even this forecast exceeds the household information in the 10-year (not 5 year) period between 1890 and 1900 (3.3 million); 1900–10 (4.3 million); 1910–20 (4.2 million); and is about equal to the change in household information between 1920–30 (5.4 million); and 1930–40 (5.0 million).

> In other words, the change in household formation for the next 5 years will probably be equal in absolute magnitude to the change in household formation that has led to the need for a complete census throughout most of the past 10-year periods in our recent history.

Mr. Speaker, these eminent spokesmen for the business community know their statistics. They know that this Nation is growing at an unprecedented rate. They know also that like any other growing concern, Uncle Sam needs to take inventory more often than every 10 years.

CONCLUSION

From my brief remarks today my colleagues in the House will understand why I have introduced this new census legislation. Those of us who studied this matter carefully and discussed it with State governors, mayors of our largest cities and many others have come to the conclusion that this mid-decade census is needed and badly needed. My bill will give the States an opportunity to join the Federal Government in this history-making undertaking.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Shelley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, the revolutionary spirit of the 18th century had profound impact on many countries. New ideas, both progressive and liberal, were taking roots in the Western World, and were spreading in all directions. In the United States our revolution produced the Declaration of Independence and the constitutional form of government. In France, the cry for liberty, equality, and fraternity led to the French Revolution; and in isolated Poland the spirit of equality and tolerance, and also the urge to overhaul her governmental machinery, led to the adoption of the May Constitution in 1791.

That Constitution introduced a responsible cabinet type government in Poland. Monarchial authority was considerably curtailed, and that of the people's representative was enhanced. The Polish peasantry was relieved from arbitrary authority of local feudal landlords and placed under the protection of the law. The economic and social class barriers were practically eliminated, and the townspeople were given political rights. The powers of the upper house were drastically reduced and those of the lower, the elected, house considerably increased. Even more significant than these important changes was the guaranteeing of religious freedom to all citizens of the country. In short, Mr. Speaker, this was a liberal, democratic and popular Constitution, drafted by the Polish patriots and promulgated on May 3, 1791. But the unhappy people of Poland were never to live under its progressive provisions, for soon after its promulgation, Poland was attacked, overrun and then partitioned among her foes. Today in observing the 172d anniversary of the promulgation and adoption of that Constitution we pay tribute to Poland's liberal heritage.

Mr. Speaker, for two centuries our country has been enriched by the millions of Poles who have come to the United States. It is estimated that today there are more than 6½ million American citizens of Polish ancestry here, who have contributed immensely to our way of free and democratic life.

There is a large and very active Polish community in San Francisco, the city I have the honor and privilege to represent in the U.S. Congress.

The San Francisco Polish community is most active in the social, educational, political and religious life of San Francisco. It was shortly after 1860 that Polish residents came to San Francisco. One of the oldest Polish organizations in the United States was organized in San Francisco under the name of the Polish Society of San Francisco. It was formed in 1862.

San Francisco has never forgotten those great figures in Polish cultural history that have lived for a time in the San Francisco area. They include many refugees from the revolutions of 1848 and 1862, including the noted revolutionary leader, General Krzyzanowski and General Keller who fought with the majestic Louis Kossuth. Mme. Helene Modjeska, one of the greatest dramatic actresses in the history of the stage, lived in San Francisco, as did Sienkiewicz, author of "Quo Vadis."

Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to join with so many of our colleagues in paying tribute to Polish genius which has demonstrated its presence in almost every phase of human activity.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Boland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, Poland's modern history is marked with great deeds and achievements, as well as of suffering and sacrifices. And its more recent history may be summed up in two words: misery and misfortune. Through no fault of their own, the Polish people have suffered and endured more hardships than almost any other national group in Europe. Being smaller in numbers than their powerful neighbors both in the west and in the east, they have not been able to withstand the periodic onslaughts against them by their powerful foes. In 1772 when Austria, Prussia, and Russia robbed Poland of a large part of its territory in the first partition, the helpless Poles could not prevent that disaster. From then on, however, Poland's leaders restored to every means of strengthening the country so as to be able to meet future attacks adequately. They decided to overhaul Poland's governmental machinery, to make it liberal, democratic, and bring it up-to-date. With these ideals in mind the Constitution of 1791 was drafted and then adopted on May 3 of that year.

This document marks a new epoch in Poland's modern history. By its adoption Poland stepped out of the Middle Ages. The powers of the king were curtailed, and Poland became a constitutional monarchy. The monarch was to share his executive authority with a council and even in matters of personal prerogatives he could not act without the consent of that council. There was a legislature of two chambers, which was to meet regularly at stipulated times. The nobility lost most of its special privileges, and the townsmen were allowed to share certain privileges with the nobility. Peasants were protected against the arbitrary power of their landlords, and religious freedom was guaranteed. Judged even by today's liberal standard, the Constitution was a democratic document. Its adoption and promulgation was hailed in all parts of Europe, particularly by the prominent liberal leaders in the West. Of course it was bitterly denounced by Poland's inveterate enemies, and they saw to it that this Constitution did not go into full force. Unfortunately they succeeded in the execution of their evil designs. A few years after the adoption of this Constitution, Poland was parceled out among the three autocratic powers—Austria, Prussia, and Russia—and of course she ceased to exist as an independent state.

But the spirit of independence and freedom was not dead among the Poles. Nor was the spirit of the Constitution of May 3, 1791. At the end of the First World War when they regained their independence, the spirit of that Constitution was reinstated in Poland. And today, when Poland is robbed of genuine independence and freedom, Poles still cling firmly to their liberal spiritual heritage. In celebrating the 172d anniversary of the adoption of that Constitution, they affirm their undiminished and undying faith in their heritage. I am happy to join them in the celebration of this great anniversary, the Polish Constitution Day.

JOINT RESOLUTION PROPOSING A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT PROHIBITING STATES FROM TAXING CERTAIN INCOME OF A NONRESIDENT

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. St Germain] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, we Members of Congress are so preoccupied with the problems of Federal taxation that it is possible for us to forget that serious inequities sometimes exist in the structure and administration of State tax laws.

There is no more glaring inequity in this regard than the practice by some States of taxing the wages, salaries, professional fees, and other compensation for personal services received by those who are not residents of those States.

I am particularly concerned with this problem because many persons in my congressional district work in a nearby State which requires them to pay income taxes on amounts received for services. These individuals are subject to dual taxation. They pay State taxes in Rhode Island for the support of the governmental services they receive, and they must pay an income tax to the State in which they work even though they receive no real benefits or services from that State.

In addition to the financial inequity, there is also a political inequity since the Rhode Island residents have no voice in the expenditure of the tax money they pay to the State in which they work. This situation recalls the struggle of the American colonists against "taxation without representation." It seems ironic that the present difficulty should be located in the very area where this early cry against inequity arose.

The joint resolution I am introducing today proposes a constitutional amendment to correct the problem. It is my earnest hope that it will be adopted by Congress and the States.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Buckley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege and an honor to rise on the floor of the House this afternoon to pay tribute to one of the great peoples of the world and one of the great nations of the world—the people of Poland and the nation of Poland. May 3 commemorates the establishment and creation of Poland's great Constitution of 1791. This constitution which came into being over 150 years ago incorporates in its language the enduring precepts of public policy and democracy. It was written by the Polish people out of their own great love for freedom and independence. It beats as strongly today in the hearts of every Pole as it did when it was first enacted many years ago. In addition this year also is the 100th anniversary of the Polish January uprising of 1863. This 1863 uprising against Russian tyranny was the most bitterly fought and longest in Polish history. The gallant Polish patriots fought the Russian occupation army for 2 years. Eventually they were overcome and Russian tyranny once again prevailed in the homeland of Poland. Although the Poles were defeated on the field of battle they established within their own country social reforms that gave the Polish nation a strength and cohesion against which all attempts at denationalization have been shattered.

I pay sincere tribute today not only to those Poles who fought so gallantly in the uprising of 1863 but those countless thousands who have defended Poland's freedom for the past 1,000 years.

The contributions to this great Nation by Americans of Polish descent have been many and great. The history of Americans of Polish ancestry is woven into the history of this Nation from the early days of our own Revolution to the present day. There are over 7 million Americans of Polish ancestry in America today. They and their forefathers have added mightily to the development of this great Nation of ours.

As long as man exists upon this earth I am certain that the people of Poland and the Polish nation itself will continue to be an integral part of the ever-advancing march of freedom throughout the world. When the last vestige of all forms of tyranny has been wiped from the face of the earth the people of Polish descent in this country, those throughout the world, and in the homeland of Poland itself will be in the forefront of those who will be helping to develop a better world for generations yet to come.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. Anderson (at the request of Mr. Halleck), for the week of May 6, on account of official business as U.S. adviser at Vienna, Austria, on Minimum International Standards for Nuclear Damage.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Nedzi (at the request of Mr. Albert), for 1 hour, today, on the subject of Polish independence.

Mr. Rogers of Florida (at the request of Mr. Albert), for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. Reid of New York, for 1 hour, on May 6.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. McCormack (at the request of Mr. Albert) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Rogers of Texas (at the request of Mr. Albert) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Lankford in three instances and in each to include extraneous material.

Mr. Brademas.

Mr. St. Onge.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MacGregor) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Westland.

Mr. Pillion.

Mr. Anderson.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Haley) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Moorhead.

Mr. Karth.

Mr. Abbitt.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey.

Mr. Moss.

Mr. Weltner.

Mr. Leggett.

Mr. Randall.

Mr. Carey.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1003. An act for the relief of the Middlesex Concrete Products & Excavating Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 6, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

760. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of certain aspects of the program for stockpiling metallurgical-grade manganese ore acquired under the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act; to the Committee on Government Operations.

761. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to provide for the restriction of certain areas in the Outer Continental Shelf, known as the Corpus Christi Offshore Warning Area, for defense purposes and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

762. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended by Public Law 87–885; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

763. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended by Public Law 87–885; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

764. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to make certain changes in the functions of the Beach Erosion Board and the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and for other puropses"; to the Committee on Public Works.

765. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report pursuant to section 3 of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act for the fiscal year 1963 (76 Stat. 382, 383); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DANIELS: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 5569. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to permit the recovery by the Government of amounts due the Government in the settlement of claims under such act, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 269). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THORNBERRY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 331. Resolution for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 245, Joint resolution to provide that Members of Congress shall be limited to per diem allowances and necessary transportation costs in connection with travel outside the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 270). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 3742. A bill to amend the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to the transfer of producer rice acreage allotments; without amendments (Rept. No. 273). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 40. A bill to assist the States to provide additional facilities for research at the State agricultural experiment stations; without amendment (Rept. No. 271). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 101. A bill to extend for 2 years the definition of "peanuts" which is now in effect under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; without amendment (Rept. No. 272). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 6009. A bill to provide, for the periods ending June 30, 1963, and August 31, 1963, temporary increases in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

H.R. 6010. A bill to establish the Federal Housing Administration as an independent agency in the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BETTS:

H.R. 6011. A bill to continue for a temporary period the existing suspension of duty on certain istle or Tampico fiber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 6012. A bill to authorize the President to proclaim regulations for preventing collisions at sea; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 6013. A bill to improve the quality of elementary and secondary education through institutes for advanced study for teachers, teacher preparation programs, and programs of specialized training for teachers and related educational personnel; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 6014. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the first union health center in the United States by the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 6015. A bill to amend section 124 of title 23, United States Code, to provide for the financing of advance acquisition of rights-of-way for the Federal-aid highway systems; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H.R. 6016. A bill authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 6017. A bill to provide for the payment of royalties for the public performance of copyrighted musical compositions by means of coin-operated machines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 6018. A bill to amend section 203(a) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, with respect to the filing of schedules of charges by connecting carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6019. A bill to amend section 4(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, with respect to the applicability of the conflict-of-interest provisions to persons serving in the Federal Communications Commission unit of the National Defense Executive Reserve; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 6020. A bill to grant authority to the President to control the travel abroad of United States citizens in time of war or national emergency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Br. Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 6021. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce and to provide for the restitution of wages lost by employees by reason of any such discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 6022. A bill to authorize the payment to local governments of sums in lieu of taxes and special assessments with respect to certain Federal real property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H.R. 6023. A bill to provide that the unincorporated territory of Guam shall be represented in Congress by a Territorial Deputy to the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 6024. A bill to amend section 4 of the War Claims Act of 1948 to provide benefits to certain contractors' employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 6025. A bill to improve the quality of education by broadening the scope of the Cooperative Research Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RAINS:

H.R. 6026. A bill to authorize the coinage of commemorative 50-cent pieces; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 6027. A bill to provide for the desegregation of public schools, with all deliberate speed, including nationwide first-step compliance by 1964, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 6028. A bill to provide equal rights for all citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6029. A bill to amend section 2004 of the Revised Statutes of the United States to provide that all citizens of the United States may vote at all elections without being required to take literacy tests; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6030. A bill to protect civil rights by providing criminal and civil remedies for unlawful official violence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6031. A bill to amend part III of the Civil Rights Act of 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SECREST:

H.R. 6032. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 and the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 to reduce from 12 years to 6 years the Government service requirement for continuation of coverage under such acts after retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6033. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.J. Res. 394. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.J. Res. 395. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting a State from taxing certain income of a nonresident; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUPPER:

H.J. Res. 396. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. Con. Res. 146. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States should propose to the Council of the Organization of American States that certain economic sanctions be taken against the Communist Government of Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CASEY:

H.R. 6034. A bill for the relief of Robert L. Johnston; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 6035. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jadwiga (Ita) Lapides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 6036. A bill for the relief of Esther Rosenberg Birnbaum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 6037. A bill for the relief of Alberto Tang Lu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H.R. 6038. A bill for the relief of Mariano Carrese; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6039. A bill for the relief of Vincenzina Ciavattini Restuccia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of Michigan:

H.R. 6040. A bill for the relief of Chrisoula Baker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

101. By Mr. HANNA: Petition of the Orange County (Calif.) Education Committee relative to implementing article 1, section 8 of U.S. Constitution by making the Federal Reserve System and national banks the responsibility of the Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

102. Also, petition of the Los Alamitos School District relative to support for renewal of provisions of Public Law 874; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

103. Also, petition of the Orange County (Calif.) Pharmaceutical Association regarding voluntary restriction on sales of merchan-

dise from Communist countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

104. Also, petition of Anaheim Ikettes of Izaak Walton League of America relative to opposition to H.R. 3166 proposing to remove responsibility for water pollution from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Public Works.

105. Also, petition of the Joint Boards of Orange County Sanitation Districts relative to amendment to Federal Water Pollution Control Act (Public Law 660) to restrict use of funds to areas where there is finding of acute interstate water pollution; to the Committee on Public Works.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Government Subcontractor Gouges $2.6 Million in Excessive Profits on Alaskan Communications Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, time after time, the Comptroller General has reported to the Congress on situations wherein a combination of fraud, illegality, irresponsibility, and negligence in the administration of Government contracts, has resulted in the loss of millions of tax dollars.

I would like to call the attention of the Members of this House, to another glaring example of the appalling maladministration, inefficiency and collusion that exists in this field.

In his report to the Congress on April 24, the Comptroller General disclosed that the Morris-Knudsen Co., of Boise, Idaho, made more than $2.6 million in excess profits on a Department of the Air Force subcontract.

In November of 1955, the Air Force awarded a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract to Western Electric Co. for the construction of a communications system in Alaska known as the White Alice system.

Western Electric awarded a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee subcontract to Morris-Knudsen for the construction of the necessary communication stations. After one contract revision, the estimated cost to Morris-Knudsen was placed at $48,244,351, with a fixed fee of $1,224,974.

Western Electric advised the General Accounting Office that its selection of Morris-Knudsen as the subcontractor was based largely on the fact that Morris-Knudsen was the only construction company in Alaska with sufficient equipment to accomplish such large-scale construction.

Morris-Knudsen represented to Western Electric that the fixed rental rates proposed for the equipment it would furnish and operate to construct the White Alice stations under this subcontract would provide only sufficient revenues to balance Morris-Knudsen's equipment ownership expenses.

The Comptroller General charges, however, that at the time the contract was negotiated, Morris-Knudsen should have known that its rental rates were providing, and would continue to provide, revenues far in excess of related ownership expenses.

When, by subsequent amendments to the subcontract, equipment usage was extended far beyond the time period covered by the rental rates for full recovery of ownership expenses, Western Electric again failed to negotiate a reduction in rental rates.

It should have been readily apparent to Western Electric that the continued application of established rental rates for such an increase in equipment usage would provide for more revenue than Morris-Knudsen needed to balance its ownership expenses.

The GAO found no evidence whatever that Western Electric requested any adjustment in rental rates even though it had the contractual right to do so. Western Electric failed, therefore, to properly discharge its responsibilities as a prime contractor to the Government.

The use of rental rates that were excessive at the time they were established and the failure to adjust those rates when the subcontractor was amended has resulted in excess costs to the Government in the form of equipment rental profits to Morris-Knudsen, of at least $2.6 million.

Mr. Speaker, this unjust profit is more than twice the fixed fee Morris-Knudsen agreed to accept as complete compensation for its work and services.

Morris-Knudsen falsely represented to Western Electric and the Air Force that the equipment rental rates were only sufficient to cover their expenses. Morris-Knudsen's own records disclosed that the application of the rental policies and rental rates negotiated for the While Alice project had resulted in excessive profits to Morris-Knudsen.

The GAO revealed that the Air Force has instructed Western Electric to seek recovery of these excess profits from Morris-Knudsen.

In his report, the Comptroller General stated that—

> It is unreasonable and unjust for Morris-Knudsen to retain, at the expense of the Government, an excess of rental revenues over ownership expenses far beyond the intent of the parties.

The Comptroller General further cited Western Electric for its failure to appropriately protect the Government's interests when—

First. Western Electric did not avail itself of its contractual right to negotiate an equitable adjustment of the rental rates at the time the subcontract was amended; and

Second. Western Electric recommended a settlement of all rental claims against Morris-Knudsen in an amount far below the excess rental revenue Morris-Knudsen had realized under this subcontract.

Mr. Speaker, it is evident that collusion, connivance, and civil and criminal conspiracy flourishes in large segments of our governmental contract awards.

Incompetence, maladministration, malfeasance, and misfeasance of office exists in too many of our Federal procurement contracts.

I trust that the Air Force will make every effort not only to recover the excess profits which have inured to Morris-Knudsen, but also to take adequate measures to discipline those U.S. officials and employees who are responsible for this substantial loss to the U.S. Government.

Key to Livelier GOP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, on April 26, the New York Herald Tribune published in its columns a letter from JOHN V. LINDSAY of New York, which I believe is of interest to Members of the Congress on both sides of the aisle.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the letter in the RECORD:

THE KEY TO A LIVELIER GOP

To the HERALD TRIBUNE:

In Washington the Republican Party is united, if not comforted, by the constant reminder that it is a minority and out. In the States and communities across the Nation there gathers, with increasing momentum, a sense of unity based partly on dissatisfaction with the ins, and partly on a positive wish to govern and to demonstrate capacity to govern. There is concern over the administration's barrenness of ideas and thinness of production, and uneasiness over organized arrogance in high places. There is also the stirring of hope for real leadership in the Grand Old Party.

The future of the Republican Party depends on whether it really wishes to be the majority instead of the minority and demonstrates why. Government means programs, because government, like all affairs of men and nations, constantly is in change. What kind of government will the Republican Party offer? This depends upon its willingness to draw from its roots and learn from history.

The Republican Party was born in a log cabin in a simple and lovely American town. It was nourished and grew strong in the ruggedness of green, uncut country. It came to the crowded cities and awakened and inspired the new millions. These millions found in Abraham Lincoln the pride of personal identity and the inspiration of the offer of selfless service. To Lincoln the people were the only proper repositories of power, and the people sensed this in him. To many, this was their definition of freedom. They understood that Lincoln would give leadership, and he did—unshakable, powerful leadership—but they felt in him also a pervading sense that power cannot be taken by any political leader to be used as a sledgehammer in order to achieve a result.

The Republican Party must take on the special task of defining the role of the individual in the midst of the part-garrison, part-welfare state. It must establish guideposts for unfettered individual betterment, and open avenues for the pursuit of individual excellence.

The liberties we must protect include the right to speak freely and to be critical, to associate with anyone or any group, to travel, to take up unpopular causes, to be unafraid of "the possible tyranny of the majority" and to avoid the frustration and pettiness of weighty bureaucracy.

The Republican Party must demonstrate that a concentration of central power through a government-dominated industrial-military complex is just as limiting to steady economic growth and to individual freedoms as are all other undue power concentrations. It must argue that the proper role of Government is to create the framework around which free, nongovernment economic, social, and cultural institutions may flourish.

The Republican Party must understand also that safeguarding of individual worth includes the creation or maintaining of basic conditions of living that will not permit any person, who cannot help himself, to live below a minimum standard of decency in a civilized nation. And, finally, Republicans must attune themselves to world affairs with a far greater awareness and maturity than any party or President has done or is doing.

The Democratic Party is often demonstrated to be collections of factions and warring groups. It is a strange coalition of opposites. It happily at one and the same time embraces anticivil rights interests in some areas and anti-individual big city machine interests in other areas. In both cases the dignity and worth of the individual long since ceased to have any real meaning. For the most part, the Democratic Party is the very opposite of Lincolnian philosophy. Lincoln foreswore both power for its own sake and motion for its own sake. When he used Presidential power aggressively and bluntly he publicly acknowledged regret at having to do so.

The Republican Party should find common cause in its roots. It should reject the anti-individual, antilibertarian forces that stem from every organized power group, whether that power group be the Central Government, the industrial-military complex, the big city machine or the local constabulary.

The Republican Party should adjust the framework of the Government, Central and local, according to individual needs and strict priorities of importance within the bounds of power and money which the people are willing to give to Government.

JOHN V. LINDSAY.

"The Role of Cooperatives in U.S. Agriculture"—Address by Senator Humphrey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on the evening of Monday, April 29, it was my privilege to address the National Conference on Cooperatives, which had been arranged by the six members of the Advisory Committee on Cooperatives of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. This particular conference had been called in response to a challenge from the Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Orville Freeman, to come forward with proposals which would substantially extend the role of cooperatives in building marketing power for farmers and, in general, to seek to better conditions in our rural areas and increased use of consumer co-ops.

The conference included representatives of six national federations of cooperatives. It was well attended and devoted its attention to some of the basic problems facing our agricultural producers.

It was my privilege to share the platform with the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] delivered an outstanding address on the role of cooperatives today and in the future. His intimate knowledge of farm cooperatives brought forth an enthusiastic response from his audience.

It was my privilege to address the conference on the subject "The Role of Cooperatives in U.S. Agriculture." I attempted to emphasize in particular the importance of our farm cooperatives in increasing the bargaining power of our farmers in the marketplace and improving our export of markets.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROLE OF COOPERATIVES IN U.S. AGRICULTURE

(Speech of Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY before National Federation of Grain Cooperative, April 29, 1963)

Cooperatives are an accepted part of farming and business life of the Nation. In my own State of Minnesota it is so much so that it continues to lead the Nation in number of cooperatives and number of memberships and to stand second in dollar volume of business.

One of the country's leading grain cooperatives is located in Minnesota—the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association in St. Paul. A brief look at some comparative figures of that organization will show its progress and its accomplishments and what it means to farmers in our region.

In 1938 G.T.A. started business with only $30,000 member capital. By 1962 it had $42 million in member capital. It moved from assets of about $2 million in 1938 to assets of $106 million in 1962. And from 1938 through 1962 this cooperative marketed over 2 billion bushels of grain for farmer members.

Over the years, G.T.A. has averaged returning an extra 3 cents a bushel to members, or an estimated $60 million more than farmers would have gotten if they had not started their own cooperative business.

Or take the Farmers Union Central Exchange of South St. Paul. In 1961 its farmers made nearly $9 million added savings on $92 million worth of supply business. It is a growing, well managed, modern, successful cooperative.

This wide acceptance of cooperatives in Minnesota may stem from our Scandinavian forebears who helped settle this region. They brought with them a deep-rooted understanding of basic cooperative philosophy and a background of successful experience with cooperatives in their home countries.

But I think another ingredient, or trait, also entered into this acceptance. That was a willingness to venture boldly, to strike out on their own with their neighbors when there was a job to do.

This last trait was inherent in these people who had enough physical daring to leave their homes abroad and come to a strange and untried land. Thus, when the need arose, they had the business daring to strike out into cooperative development, even though it was as yet untried and unproven in their new land.

We make progress only because we are dissatisfied with things as they are, because we want things to be better. Certainly this applies to cooperatives.

All of you tonight can look back to the early days of the cooperatives you are here to speak for, back to the origins and why cooperatives were formed. These early pioneers found they had no power in the Nation's market places. To correct this wrong, they turned to cooperatives.

Perhaps they were getting paid the same for high quality cotton as for low grade. Maybe year after year they had watched wheat hit its lowest price for the year just when they had to sell at harvest time to pay interest and back debts.

Perhaps the seed they bought wouldn't grow, or the fertilizer had so much filler and so little nutrients that it didn't improve their crop yields or rejuvenate their soil.

These and many other serious buying and selling problems faced our sturdy cooperative pioneers.

I recall stories I have heard of the early stirrings of some of today's most successful cooperatives. One I'd like to recall is of a few Midwest farmers who met in a granary one fall day nearly 75 years ago to talk about the marketing vise they found themselves in—abundant crops but no good place to sell except at extremely low prices. From this small beginning has come a successful cooperative, one that had to fight bitter battles to get the first toehold on the terminal markets to sell their grain or to market their dairy products.

And I recall similar stories from my own State, tales of the fire and vision of one man who has been called the father of cooperative creameries—Prof. Theophilus Levi Haecker—of how he first visited Danish settlers at Clark's Grove, Minnesota, who were successful with their cooperative creamery, of how he then moved from community to community with evangelical fervor, talking to farmers everywhere and anywhere; sometimes in the community store where the potbellied stove would glow red behind him as he spoke.

He would ask how much farmers were getting for their butter. Often the answer was 10 to 12 cents a pound. Then he'd point out that the Clark's Grove Cooperative was getting farmers 22 cents a pound for quality butter.

After 5 years of stumping the State, with or without invitation, many cooperative creameries had sprung up. And more than once when Professor Haecker would hear rumors of trouble in one of them, he'd trudge all night on foot to reach the community to mend a quarrel and prevent a cooperative breakup.

There are many stories to tell of resolute cooperative men and early struggles of marketing cooperatives, and some more recent, as they move toward the main objective of giving the farmer member a greater say in the price for his product and the way he markets it.

The purchasing and service cooperatives also have in their histories the same story of struggle to prove their right to do business and of developing a base and form of operation that would best serve the farmers' needs.

Farmers have made great strides toward solving some of their problems through cooperatives. At the beginning they couldn't even be sure cooperatives would work, that they could get enough volume, money, and sustained courage to follow through on their plans.

From the past has come the inspiring heritage that is a built-in legacy of most of today's cooperatives; the heritage of free men freely working together to try to better their farming lot.

As we look to our accomplishments today and the firm place cooperatives have forged for themselves in our business economy, you can take a full measure of pride in the giant strides you have made.

One measure of success can be made by checking dollar value to farmers—more than $200 billion worth of business done by marketing, purchasing, and related service cooperatives since 1913, and a net volume of $12.4 billion in fiscal year 1961.

Another measure could be made by taking the proportion of total business cooperatives do. Figures collected by Farmer Cooperative Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture show that about two-thirds of the dairymen in this country belong to cooperatives; that dairy cooperatives handle three-fifths of the fluid milk, 60 percent of the butter, and 75 percent of the nonfat dry milk in this country. In Minnesota we have such outstanding cooperatives as the Land O' Lakes creameries, and hundreds of smaller ones.

A better measure of the importance of cooperatives can be taken by considering what services these farmer businesses perform.

Consider marketing first, for certainly the picture for marketing farm products shows some disarray, in spite of cooperative, Government, and other actions. We can take some comfort in the thought that things would be much worse if nothing at all had been done by all the people involved.

One of the great needs of farmers today is still to strengthen their bargaining position to give them muscle in the marketplace, as Secretary Freeman has so aptly expressed it. In the face of increased economic concentration of buyers and handlers of farm products, it is even more difficult than in the past for a farmer to market as one individual. By pooling both the volume of their products and their bargaining power through cooperatives, they have proved again and again that they can exert more influence in the marketplace.

Cooperatives help build markets and find outlets for farm products. The combined resources of many farmers often make it possible to process, package, and sell under a nationally known brand, thus creating a demand for the farmer's product and giving him a bigger share of returns in these added steps in handling his own raw product.

Cooperatives have helped farmers establish a reputation for good quality products by being leaders in adopting U.S. grades, by encouraging members to produce a better product on their farms, and by careful handling of a farm-fresh product on its way to the consumer.

Cooperatives have become a potent factor in the agricultural export trade, with some cooperatives being the biggest exporters of their respective commodities.

Groups of cooperatives also have joined together into larger cooperatives to go into the export trade. The Producers Export Co. has sold millions of bushels of co-op grain abroad since it organized a few years ago.

Right now, a group of soybean and cottonseed processing cooperatives are starting a new cooperative to sell abroad as well as at home. Its name is Boy-Cot Sales, with headquarters at Houston.

Purchasing cooperatives also exert a great force for the good of the farmer in the supply and distribution picture. Farmers obtain their supplies at reduced costs by volume buying, by operating for their own interests, and often by doing their own manufacturing and processing. In addition, they obtain the kind and quality of supplies specifically fitted to their farming needs, since they are both owners and users of the business and can make their wants and needs known.

Although cooperatives supply only about one-fifth of the farm market for the major supplies they handle, their influence on daily prices and quality result in savings to all farmers that amount to several times the dollar savings shown in their annual audits.

Another contribution cooperatives make is in helping farmers operate their farming enterprise more efficiently. They get advice that improves their operations from field men specifically trained to recommend improved production practices, better seeds, better harvesting methods, and the like. Farmers may read about an improved practice in their membership publication or hear about it in a meeting.

Cooperatives often prove the goad, the gadfly that stimulates other businesses to do a better job for farmers. This is no small contribution. Just recently the major grain company in the United States had offered a firm marketing agreement to growers in its area that guarantee paying them a cash price above that given by a cooperative in the region.

Cooperative spokesmen often refer to the yardstick or pacesetting influence of their businesses. You all know instances where the price of a product has shown an immediate increase when farmers first formed a cooperative to market it; or the price of farm supplies has dropped when farmers started manufacturing their own through a cooperative—at times as much as 30 to 40 percent on some supplies in some areas. This is a contribution to all farmers in those communities, not just to members of the particular cooperative.

The acceleration of change in farming and in the outside environments in which farmers operate is throwing out as big a challenge as our agriculture ever has faced. Corresponding challenges are being thrust upon cooperatives. Many of you are meeting these challenges in good fashion; others who are doing little or nothing to keep up and adapt are falling behind.

I'm thinking particularly of merging when merging is called for; of modernizing and streamlining operations; of adding farm services such as bulk delivery and spreading fertilizer when farmers need them; or of being flexible enough to adjust to serving the larger family farms with increased specializations.

It takes courage and spirit of daring to take these steps, and a lot more money.

There are times when conditions today may call for starting a new cooperative. A recent example of the formation of a new cooperative is a group of men with big orchards who had been their own packers and salesmen. They found the buyers wanting more of the product than they had as individuals, and also found themselves competing with each other on price with the same buyers.

So they stood around all one morning in an abandoned plant that was up for sale, discussing whether or not to form a cooperative, and finally how to go about it. From this has come a half-million dollar plant that built up good domestic and export markets in its first year of operation.

There are many men who dare, who can make bold ventures. These men had a solid backlog of experience to build on. They profited from mistakes other cooperatives had made and didn't repeat them in their organization and plans of operation.

Now, I would like to turn a somewhat broader look at the importance of cooperatives, to consider what they can contribute to maintaining the family farm and private ownership.

Our family farm pattern of agriculture has always been the basis of our agricultural progress and good community life, and I hope it always will be.

Cooperatives are the chief means of preserving this pattern that is so essential to a sound and progressive democracy.

The family farm today, however, must operate in an economic environment that is characterized by the bigness of the businesses in it. Here is where cooperatives have carved a firm hold. They have long since proved their ability to help farmers pool resources and volumes, and thus bargain on a better basis with the bigger businesses.

The cooperative may be the only answer in many cases as to whether family farming, which has been the bedrock of our agriculture, can continue to exist.

Family farmers, in the true democratic tradition of learning to work together, have developed their own extension of the free enterprise system in farmer cooperatives. These are a legitimate and desirable means of preserving individuality while allowing farmers to find a way to compete in an economy of bigness.

Who is more closely and clearly identified with free enterprise than a landowner, a farm operator, the family farmer, the American farmer? U.S. Department of Agriculture figures show he has about $4 billion of his own money invested in these cooperatives, with no Government money invested.

In addition, cooperators are in essence doing things for themselves, and therefore embody a spirit of self-reliance, of independence, and of initiative, all inherent in our system of free economic and political institutions.

They help us preserve our American heritage of a man with an independent spirit who is yet sensible enough to work together with others for his own and the common good.

I fail to understand why some people today seek to deny farmers and the cooperatives the same inalienable rights to do what others do without criticism. Other people, other businesses join together to do many things; small grocers and drugstores form buying cooperatives, to meet chainstores on a nearly equal basis; newspapers go together to hire reporters and collect news on a mutual basis; many businesses carry ownership of their product all the way from its raw state to the final consumer sale.

Often it is the very people who clamor the loudest about free enterprise who would deny the farmer the right to try to preserve his own private ownership of his farm by using cooperatives to help handle simply another stage or extension of his farming business.

Who has a better right and reason to market his own products than the farmer? Who has a better right and reason to get his supplies and services as economically and efficiently as possible?

This is only good business and good commonsense and an inherent right under our form of government.

Cooperatives seek to help man preserve his rights of individual ownership of land and farm, not deprive him of them. This is the opposite of the state ownership of productive capacity that is embodied in socialism.

Cooperatives help build better citizens in our democracy. Look around you here and you will see several hundred outstanding leaders from all parts of the country.

Many of you are or have been farmers who might never have had a chance to become the well-informed individuals with the breadth and depth of knowledge and experience you now have if it had not been for your cooperative.

This process of distilling leadership qualities and letting the men possessing them rise to positions of greater responsibilities is constantly going on in cooperatives throughout the country. At least 100,000 farmers are directors of cooperatives each year, with new members moving into these positions as the boards change. From this core come many of our best agricultural leaders and spokesmen, men who are better all-around citizens because of their cooperative experience.

Not the least of the cooperative contributions is their bestowal of dignity to the farmer. What man among us doesn't stand straighter if he feels pride in his work, confidence in his acomplishments?

The recent encyclical issued by Pope John XXIII considers this point of dignity. It says, "The right to private property, even of productive goods, also derives from the nature of man. This right, as we have elsewhere declared, is suitable means for safeguarding the dignity of the human person and for the exercise of responsibility in all fields; it strengthens and gives serenity to family life, thereby increasing the peace and prosperity of the state."

Cooperatives are helping safeguard human dignity of our rural communities by helping farmers retain their independent farming enterprise, "their right to private property, even of productive goods," as the encyclical phrases it.

Cooperatives help build better citizens under our system of government, by providing them the means to gain better standards of living, by increasing their knowledge, by encouraging initiative, and by making them feel more assurance of being a recognized and active element of our society.

For these reasons, the Government has for over half a century seen fit to give encouragement and assistance through research and educational programs for farmers and their cooperatives. Moreover, Government has assisted by providing loans to help improve and expand operations, as in the early days of the farm credit system and with the Rural Electric Cooperatives.

Farmers have proved the wisdom of this partnership between Government and agriculture by rapidly repaying the loans as they attained stature and maturity in handling their own businesses.

This is how we view cooperatives and their significant accomplishments in this country, and this is the same view held in many countries abroad. In Scandinavia, other European countries, and in most of the other democratic regions of the world, the right of farmers to own and operate their own farms and to then use cooperatives for needed services is fully recognized.

In other regions, behind the Iron Curtain primarily, almost the exactly opposite view is held of the way agriculture should be employed. Their state or collective farms in those countries are about as far as you could get from our free and independent associations of farmers.

Unfortunately, too many people try to lump our form of cooperatives into the same pot with the Communist collectives, and tar them with that brush. Nothing could be further from the truth. Our cooperatives help preserve independent action; collectives destroy it. Our cooperatives encourage enterprise; collectives stifle enterprise.

Our form of cooperatives are instruments of their owner-users, the farmers. The collectives are tools of the state.

In all fairness, however, there are less advanced countries today that are finding the government must take a hand in getting cooperatives started. But in most of these areas, the governments are trying to educate the farmers to the stage where they can take more of the responsibility for operating these cooperatives. This idea may not be as far removed from our early cooperative development as we sometimes think. Our own Government gave us a hand in the form of loans, in the form of Government-paid staffs of experts to help farmers, something still in effect, and in giving backing through congressional laws and support.

One other point I should like to make here is that of the importance of cooperatives in combating communism. Where true cooperatives are strong, communism is weak.

Let me cite a few examples. Right after World War II, the rural people in Japan were encouraged to form agricultural, credit, and fishery cooperatives. Today many people say this is one of the prime reasons the rural people stand with us and against communism in that country.

In one area of Italy, communism was gaining strength. American cooperative groups helped the people there get credit for the local cooperatives, with the result that as cooperatives gained in strength, communism was rolled back.

In many of the emerging countries of the world we find keen interest in cooperatives and hope that their use will turn the shape of their agriculture into a pattern that provides for the individuals rights to own and till their own land and to reap a better living from it. The primeval urge to own and cultivate his own land remains strong throughout the agricultural people of the world.

This urge has been a most effective roadblock to the success of communism in many areas.

But if a farmer, wherever he may be, cannot wrest a living from his land, then the danger is still there that he will turn to whoever and whatever seems to promise him better things.

I have just recently returned from Caracas, Venezuela. Here the Americas took another step toward greater use of cooperatives and toward strengthening those already in existence.

I would like again to say that cooperatives long ago proved their worth in this country, and continue to reiterate this worth every day, and that they now are one of the rays of hope to troubled lands in all parts of the globe.

Peace Corps volunteers, staffs of the Agency for International Development, and the other agencies and people moving about abroad bring us reports of the aroused interest in how our cooperatives have helped farmers make this a land of abundance.

The perimeters of our world are shrinking in upon us, and we must do our share of keeping this ray of hope from cooperatives bright, and this in spite of the problems of agriculture and cooperatives still confronting us here.

But we have the heritage, we have the vitality, we have many of the means to solve many of our problems represented in the combined strength in this room.

We may need to change our focus, to redouble our efforts. To see just what you need to do is why you are meeting here this week.

Here and in countless other formal and informal groupings, you are beginning to form your new cooperative future.

I am confident you can exert your united strengths for a better rural America and with your usual generosity to help make a better rural life for many other parts of the world.

Thus, you can surely make progress one of your most important cooperative products.

Thank You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, recently it was my great pleasure to present an American flag which had been flown over this Capitol Building to Brownie Troop 164, of Camp Springs, Prince Georges County, Md. It is often my pleasure to make presentations similar to this, as I know it is the pleasure of all Members of Congress, but never during the 8 years which I have been privileged to serve in this body have I received such a graceful note of appreciation as I did from an 8-year-old member of that troop on behalf of the entire group. The author is Sue Wade, of 6223 Nottingham Drive, Weschester Estates, and her note was in the form of a poem, which reads as follows:

> Thank you for the American flag,
> We shall never let it drag.
> My troop is so very proud,
> We'd like to tell all the crowd.
>
> We'll try to keep it very clean,
> So clean, no dirt or dust can be seen.
> We'll fold it right,
> If it takes all night.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> TROOP NO. 164.
>
> Yes, we really enjoy and honor our flag. Thank you again.

I know all Members share my pride in this poem, for it is a sincere reflection of the deep reverence and respect which all Americans hold for their country's flag.

Mr. Speaker, the membership of Troop 164 includes: Becky Barbour, Lynn Barbour, Nancie Beatee, Susan Belshaw, Denise DuBast, Margaret Ford, Margaret Foster, Janet Gahacian, Donna Hamann, Susan Lockwood, Grace Merrel, Patricia Randall, Carol Russell, Valerie Van Ness, Sue Wade, and Mrs. W. Barbour, leader of Troop 164.

John C. "Red" Morgan—Medal of Honor Recipient

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, recipients of the Congressional Medal of Honor are to be honored tonight at a White House reception. As a new expression of the Nation's gratitude to them comes from the highest level of our Government, let us all pause a moment to recall their contribution. In the relentless press of prosecuting the hot-and-cold battle against Communist tyranny, we must never forget these heroes and their millions of unsung comrades whose sacrifices helped to vanquish past enemies of our freedom.

One of these men to be honored at the White House tonight grew to manhood in the principal city of the district I represent, Amarillo, Tex. He is John C. "Red" Morgan, now of Littleton, Colo., whose mother, Mrs. S. A. L. Morgan, and sister, Mrs. David Rasco, still live in Amarillo. Colonel Morgan is well remembered; to a younger generation in the Texas Panhandle, he symbolizes the heroic heights to which Americans can rise when the Nation is endangered.

On July 28, 1943, Flight Officer Morgan was the copilot of a B-17 bomber heavily damaged by an attack of enemy fighters while en route to a target in Germany. The pilot was fatally wounded. Most other members of the crew were either wounded or rendered unconscious by lack of oxygen. With one hand, "Red" Morgan held the deliriously wounded pilot away from the controls while, with the other hand, he guided the damaged plane through a tortuous 2-hour flight to the successful completion of its mission and return to its base in England. "For conspicuous gallentry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty," "Red" Morgan was awarded the Medal of Honor. Less than a year later, his plane was shot down on a raid over Berlin and he was held prisoner to the end of the war. Today, Colonel Morgan is a legend in the Texas Panhandle—and I am most proud that he and other men of courage are being honored by our President tonight.

The 3d of May: The Polish National Holiday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, the 3d of May, we in the House of Representatives of the United States of America, traditionally pause to honor on behalf of the American people the national holiday of free Poland. This year, in addition to commemorating Poland's great liberal constitution of 1791, we pay tribute to the patriotism, sacrifice, and love of liberty shown by the Polish people during the longest and bloodiest of their many fights against foreign tyranny: the Polish January uprising of 1863.

In that uprising, poorly equipped and insufficiently supplied, Polish patriots fought an occupation army for over 2 years, bending only to defeat when 350,000 seasoned troops were brought in by the occupying power. Over 250,000 of Poland's best sons, the flower of its manhood, were killed in battles, executed or exiled to slave labor camps.

Ironically, the 100th anniversary of that struggle again finds the Polish people subjugated by the same occupying power—Russia. Once again, however, evidence indicates that the same spirit of freedom and desire for national independence which was important in the January uprising and in the earlier uprisings against Russian rule—the Kosciuszko uprising of 1794 and the November uprising in 1831—is in operation.

The Poznan riots, the refusal of Polish peasants to accept collectivism, and the move toward increased freedom from Soviet trade domination, all illustrate this spirit. Among young intellectuals throughout the Communist world, Poland enjoys the reputation of being the freest trading place of ideas. There one goes if one desires the stimulation of the latest Western literary and artistic movements—and less openly—political and economic ideas.

We Americans salute the Polish people on their national day and during the 100th anniversary of one of their many struggles for freedom and we hope that their present resistance to foreign control will continue to bring increased political, economic, and cultural independence.

We hope that once again soon the 3d of May will find the liberalism embodied in the constitution of 1791—so close in time and sentiment to our own Constitution—fully in operation:

> All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation of the State, the civil liberty and good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

Let it be known that the mass of American people, as opposed to a minority of boycotters, support the Polish people in their fight in this direction.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, 1791, Poland adopted a constitution which is still considered a milestone in the development of constitutional democracy as we know it today. This great liberal document provided for a sweeping governmental reform based on the principles of representative self-government and justice for all.

Poland was transformed into a hereditary constitutional monarchy, townspeople were given judicial autonomy and a degree of parliamentary representation, the peasantry was brought under the protection of the law, and religious toleration was established.

These progressive measures were joyously received by the Poles—from the enlightened King Stanislas Augustus to the humblest citizen. But they were not welcomed by Poland's neighbors, who were still in the grip of autocratic rulers.

Russia, fearing a strengthened Polish regime, invaded the country less than a year after the constitution had been proclaimed. Deserted by their Prussian allies, the Poles were defeated and forced to see their country completely dismembered by Austria, Prussia, and Russia in 1793 and 1795.

Despite this abrupt end to Poland's experiment in constitutional government, the principles of freedom and democracy embodied in the May 3 constitution have continued to serve as an inspiration to the Polish people in their troubled history. They have bolstered the Poles' spirit of resistance to the oppressive system under which they are forced to live at present.

The annual observance of Polish Constitution Day is thus a meaningful event for us all. It naturally has a particular significance for Poles and Americans of Polish descent. But all Americans share in the great hopes for liberty and self-government which this document symbolizes for the Polish people.

The 75th Anniversary of the International Association of Machinists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES L. WELTNER
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, May 5, 1963, is a day of special significance to nearly 1 million families throughout the United States and Canada. These families will celebrate the 75th anniversary of the International Association of Machinists, one of the continent's largest and most active trade unions.

We in the State of Georgia take special pride in the growth and the success of the International Association of Machinists. It was in our State, in the city of Atlanta, that the IAM was founded 75 years ago.

To commemorate the birth of this great organization, the Honorable Ivan Allen, Jr., mayor of Atlanta, has issued the following proclamation:

> Whereas the International Association of Machinists was founded in Atlanta, Ga., on May 5, 1888; and
>
> Whereas the International Association of Machinists has always been guided by principles of honesty and integrity exemplified by its founder and first president, Tom Talbot, whose monument stands in Atlanta's Grant Park; and
>
> Whereas the IAM began on the railroads like the city of Atlanta itself, and has grown to a membership of nearly 1 million in the United States and Canada; and
>
> Whereas the membership of the IAM includes thousands upon thousands of the most skilled employees in vital and essential industries, who are esteemed citizens who contribute much to Atlanta's economy and progress: Now, therefore, it is hereby
>
> *Proclaimed*, That as mayor of the city in which the International Association of Machinists was born and in fitting tribute and commemoration of the role its members have played in the progress and security of all America, that Sunday, May 5, 1963, marking the IAM's 75th anniversary, be and is hereby proclaimed Machinists Day in Atlanta.

The Honorable Carl E. Sanders, Governor of Georgia, also has proclaimed May 5, 1963, as Machinists Day throughout Georgia. Other Governors and mayors throughout the United States have issued similar proclamations to honor the IAM.

The IAM was started at a meeting of 19 machinists. They gathered in a locomotive pit on what is now the property of the Southern Railroad in Atlanta. The date was May 5, 1888.

Despite its modest beginning, the IAM survived and grew to become one of the nation's outstanding labor organizations, with nearly 2,000 locals operating in all 50 States and in the 10 Provinces of Canada.

The IAM now has a volunteer officer corps of more than 20,000 and full-time staffers of 840. It has regional offices in Seattle, Chicago, Cleveland, New York, Ottawa, Canada, and Atlanta. It owns its own 10-story headquarters building in Washington, D.C.

Sunday night, in Washington, President Kennedy will head a list of notables at the union's birthday party. It is safe to say that those 19 machinists who gathered in 1888 would be proud to know what has happened to their union.

I congratulate the International Association of Machinists and its members everywhere. In the years ahead, I know the members of this organization will continue to work for a stronger and better America.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, May 3 of each year marks the national holiday of the Polish people known as Constitution Day. It was on that date in 1791 that Poland adopted a constitution investing sovereignty in the people and a bicameral legislature very much like ours was set up. This was the era of the American and the French revolutions which had planted the seeds of democracy in many parts of the world, and the people of Poland were among the first to accept these ideals and to establish a new democratic order.

Since then 172 eventful years have passed and yet the high ideals and principles advocated in the Polish Constitution still retain their validity and vitality because they hold the promise of freedom, independence and human dignity for the Polish people. The years since 1791 have not been happy for Poland, which had been pillaged and partitioned unmercifully and its people suffered many indignities.

It is not surprising to learn from history that on several notable occasions the people of Poland rose in arms against their Russian oppressors, the most dramatic being the Polish uprising of 1863 which was the longest and bloodiest in Polish history. It lasted for over 2 years and some 250,000 Poles were either killed in battle, executed by firing squads, or deported to Siberian mines and prisons from which many never returned. There was wholesale confiscation of property and almost total destruction of the Polish economy. The Polish language was banned from the schools and public use in an effort by the Russians to destroy Polish culture.

Americans of Polish descent are this year observing the 100th anniversary of the uprising of 1863 and are utilizing this occasion to pay tribute to Polish patriots and fighters for freedom throughout the centuries of Poland's long history. Poland's lot under Communist oppression is not in the least better today, however, and once again the Polish nation is fighting for its freedom, its cultural and religious survival, and its way of life.

We in America are well aware of the deep anxiety in the hearts of our Polish friends and neighbors regarding their kinsmen who are suffering under the yoke of communism in Poland. They are suffering in that unhappy land today in grim silence, unable to speak their mind freely or even practice their religion openly. They are part of a vast prison of captive European nations which make up the Communist empire. Their masters sit in the Kremlin in Moscow, and from there they direct control of Poland and its people.

Americans of Polish descent have not forgotten their motherland nor the millions of their freedom-loving kinsmen there who have a profound attachment to Western culture, civilization, and ideals. Poles in this country have strong cultural and religious ties with Poland and its people. They are doing all in their power to encourage them, to keep their hopes for self-determination and their desire for freedom burning bright. In these efforts, we must assist them and give them all possible support.

We in Connecticut are particularly proud of our fellow citizens of Polish ancestry. They are a hard-working, sturdy and loyal element in the population. They retain the rich heritage of their culture and religion, as well as their passionate love for freedom. They have made great contributions to American civilization and have vastly enriched our way of life and our concept of democracy.

On this occasion of Polish Constitution Day we pay a well-deserved tribute to her national heroes who fought for Poland's independence in the past, and to her silent heroes of today who fight for her freedom in our day. We join with the Polish people abroad and in our own country in hope and prayer that Poland will once again attain its freedom in the near future.

Maryland University Given Data System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to announce that the University of Maryland Computer Science Center has recently acquired an IBM computer system valued commercially at $3 million. The computer system is described as an all-transistorized computer with a high speed memory capacity of 32,768 words. The on-line equipment consists of a card reader, a card punch, a printer and 10 magnetic tape drives attached to two input-output channels.

The installation, known as the IBM 7090/1401 computer system, was made available under the IBM educational allowance program. Part of the research of this outstanding center is supported by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Federal grants and contracts awarded to individual departments of the University for computer-related research provides other support.

Departments of the university who will utilize the new system include physics and astronomy, psychology, sociology, speech, animal and dairy sciences, and the school of medicine. The ultimate goal of the Science Center is to establish an educational program, with concepts and computer applications being integrated into existing courses.

This fine center, located in College Park, was established in February of 1962 and is under the direction of Werner C. Rheinboldt and his assistant director, John P. Menard. Twenty administrative programing and operating personnel complete the staff.

May 3: The Polish National Holiday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, it has been my custom each year to memorialize the great devotion to liberty of the Polish people by paying tribute to the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791.

The May 3 Polish Constitution when it was promulgated served as a beacon light for liberalism in Poland and in the world. But the existence of this threat to tyranny was so intolerable that in 1795 Russia, Prussia, and Austria moved to effect a third partition of Poland and crush its people.

But the Polish yearning for national freedom is indomitable as various of this brave people's jailers have always found, much to their sorrow. Just 100 years ago, in the uprising of 1863, thousands of Polish insurgents fought the might of the Tsarist armies in a series of actions which failed only after nearly 1,000 battles and skirmishes had taken their toll of Polish patriots. Over 250,000 liberty loving Poles are reputed to have given their lives in battles, on the gallows, before execution squads, or in Siberian exile.

Free people everywhere are indebted to the Polish martyrs who through the centuries have sacrificed themselves and made the tyrants pay dearly for their victories. We must cherish the trust of celebrating the Polish Constitution Day on each May 3 until that time when a free Polish Nation can itself once again commemorate its great, inspired charter.

Research Not Subsidization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, we are now spending better than $300 million annually to support the price of cotton at a competitive domestic and international level. Things may get worse before they get better. The one hope of economists is that cotton research will in the near future rid us of the expensive infectious boll weavil and as a result allow domestic producers to compete at world prices unassisted by the Federal Government.

It is no wonder that Secretary Orville Freeman last week appeared before the Agriculture Committee requesting a top policy position in his Department for research. He pointed up his case as follows:

RESEARCH NOT SUBSIDIZATION

I am grateful for this opportunity to appear before this committee. My purpose in being here is to ask your help in carrying out the responsibility which you and the Congress have placed upon the Department of Agriculture. The legislation on which I am testifying—H.R. 3850—proposes an additional top policy position in the Department. We need an additional top policy position in the Department. We need an additional Assistant Secretary. Behind the request is a story of a Department doing a job which has grown substantially in the past decade—a job which grows in response to a growing population with more people who need food to eat and clothing to wear, a place in which to relax, timber and material to build shelter, highly productive soil resources, and water to drink, to run factories, and for play and relaxation.

Since 1953, the demands made upon the policy staff in the Department of Agriculture have increased enormously. In the past 10 years, the Congress has authorized a food for peace program * * * a small watershed program * * * a rural areas development program * * * a series of programs to reduce the critical surplus of grain. It has extended consumer programs to insure quality and purity of meats to poultry. It has greatly expanded research activities in the production, processing, distribution and marketing of the products of the soil. It has recognized that forests produce more than timber, and has requested fuller use of the resources of our national forests.

As the Nation has changed, and as new needs develop, the Congress has responded to the people. The programs which have come into being in the past 10 years reflect the needs of the farmer and nonfarmer alike.

The Department has accepted these responsibilities willingly, and has carried out its task with diligence. However, it has been, and remains today, one of the toughest administrative jobs in the Government. Its operations are carried out in over 10,000 locations in more than 3,000 counties and in every major metropolitan center in the 50 States * * * and in 55 nations around the world.

The responsibilities of the Under Secretary and the Assistant Secretaries have expanded greatly and go far beyond an administrative and supervisory role. If the Government is to achieve maximum utility in providing public services, it will require close and frequent contact with the Members of Congress by the Department's top policymakers. I myself try to always be available for discussions with those who carry out legislative responsibilities—and who are properly concerned as to how congressional policy is being executed. This responsibility of the Department's policy staff extends to the other agencies of the Government as well. Where the functions of any of the several Departments and agencies coincide, progress can be maintained best by open and direct discussions to prevent misunderstandings which can grow into disagreements and to prevent duplication on the one hand and failure to act on the other. Too often, the mission assigned by the Congress is delayed because of no more than a lack of communication in the executive branch. It requires competent top policy staff to maintain effective coordination among the several Departments. And frequently only top policy people can adequately interpret programs to the many groups and organizations which represent individuals and firms with a direct interest in farm policies, programs, and decisions. Much time, therefore, is taken by conferences, public appearances and meeting with delegations to keep people informed of the attitudes and actions of the Department. All of this has meant that the time of the Secretary, Under Secretary and Assistant Secretaries—even at a 16-to-18 hour, 6-day-a-week rate—simply won't stretch to do all that needs to be done.

Further, in addition to these important responsibilities, the Department's policy staff must insure that the programs assigned by the Congress are being carried out effectively and efficiently. As an administrator myself, first as Governor of Minnesota and now as Secretary of Agriculture, I have kept in mind for years an admonition by a distinguished Member of this Congress which reads as follows:

"Every legislator grows weary with the awareness of great concepts which grow meager in execution, of noble ideas corrupted in administration."

In the last 2 years we have been carrying on an intensive program of management improvement to upgrade our administrative effectiveness so this won't happen in the Department of Agriculture. It is designed principally to reduce unit costs at a time when the volume of services has increased sharply * * * as we would expect in a nation which grows by some 2.7 million persons a year.

I would like to review with you briefly what has been done * * * first in terms of the new procedures which are geared to a constant, on-going process of internal examination, review and improvement * * * and second, to set down some specific examples of actions taken by the various agencies within the Department.

We make no claims of perfection, or any generalized professions of excellence. But I am proud to report on the tremendous, dedicated effort which Department employees are putting into this program and on the progress that has been made. It has laid the foundation for modern administrative programs as measured both by techniques and procedures and by employee morale.

Let me begin by describing some of the self-improvement procedures and the internal review machinery that has been developed as part of the Department-wide effort. We began early, in my first year as Secretary, a massive internal review of administrative procedures through a series of self-survey task forces. USDA employees manned these task forces and from them have come hundreds of administrative improvements and recommendations. Some 548 specific projects have been suggested by these employee task forces to improve administrative efficiency in the Department.

In 1961, I established the Office of Management Appraisal and Systems Development to conduct surveys of management techniques practiced by Department agencies and to plan conversion of many of the routine paper-consuming activities to automatic data processing.

One of the first tasks undertaken by this management group was a study of how electronic computers—with the ability to make 100,000 mathematical computations a second—could be adapted to streamlining the Department's administrative and management procedures. This study became the MODE project which found that by using electronic computers to assimilate vast quantities of data we could provide rapid up-to-date information necessary for management decisions * * * even with a widely dispersed system of operation.

One of the first results of this project is the complete automation of the Department's payroll. We expect this to be in effect by this fall. This action also will include the personnel and accounting operations related to payroll. We estimate that the annual savings from this conversion to modern administrative techniques will amount to $1.3 million a year—the 1964 budget already reflects this saving—and will allow us to handle in one place the personnel work previously done in 130 offices and the payrolling done in 87 offices.

Eventually the use of computers within the administrative area will help us measure how effectively expenditures and manpower are being used, the degree of progress—or lack of it—in programs assigned to us by the Congress, and provide greater opportunities for the exceptionally qualified person to advance to more challenging jobs within the Department.

We also have been very concerned with the need to break down the barriers of understanding which are barnacles on any bureaucratic structure, either public or private. Within the Department, top rank civil servants with administrative and management responsibilities in an agency often do not have personal contact with their counterparts in other agencies. They may know their name, but they are unfamiliar with their counterpart's administrative or management problems. In addition, many of these people are scientists or technical experts first, and have subsequently learned by experience the rules and practices of how to manage an agency. In many cases, this experience is limited to their particular field, although the problems of administration and management are universal. As a pilot project, we have established a series of executive seminars which expose these administrators to the national, local and international currents which affect the operation of the Department * * * and which give them an opportunity to discuss management within their respective agencies.

As an outgrowth of the recommendations of the employee self-survey task force recommendations, we began in 1961 to consolidate agency field offices at the State and county levels. The purpose here is to provide a one-stop service for persons doing business with several Department agencies as well as a centralized management service for such things as space needs, office supplies, personnel and other common housekeeping functions. Currently, offices in 26 States have been or are being consolidated under one roof, and offices in 1,273 counties—over 40 percent of those where USDA agencies operate—are in the same process.

Most recently, in respect to our departmentwide improvements, we have established an Office of Inspector General, responsible to the Secretary. All internal audit and investigation duties have been transferred to this Office to provide departmentwide flexibility and use of manpower. The consolidation of these functions also eliminates the need for cumbersome liaison arrangements essential when these functions were located in individual agencies.

These and other examples of broad administrative improvements, including the pioneering effort through the MODE project, are treated in greater detail in the attached report on "Progress in Management Improvement."

Let me turn now for a moment to some of the specific examples within the agencies where management reforms and advances have been and are being made.

Perhaps the most significant improvement has been made within the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service where a complete reorganization is nearly completed. It involves not only a realinement of functions within the Washington office but also a consolidation of commodity offices in the field.

In the reorganization we have sought to create a direct line of operating authority from the field to the Secretary's office. That line runs from the county ASC office to the Secretary through the ASCS administrator and the Assistant Secretary for Stabilization and Marketing. What was once confusion between staff and line responsibility is now clear. The number of operating divisions in ASCS has been reduced from 5 to 3 and the number of functioning units from 34 to 22. These changes have been completed.

While these changes were occurring here, there was even greater activity within the regional commodity offices. We established in November 1962 a data processing center in Kansas City where we will store in one computer all accounting data for grain under loan or in Government inventory. It is being put to profitable use for the taxpayers. It has greatly improved our ability to rapidly move or sell large amounts of grain, because we can maintain daily tallies of the more than 1 million grain-producer accounts under USDA management, together with records of 750,000 grain warehouse receipts.

With the application of computer technology to the recordkeeping needs of grain under loan or in Federal inventory, we have been able to consolidate the functions of the regional commodity offices at four locations rather than the seven required just 2 years ago. The closing of the three offices has not interrupted the high performance standard of our regional offices, and it has enabled us to revise downward by $2.2 million the CCC budget request for operating funds in 1964.

Another project here in Washington which we recently completed is the centralization of the management-support services for 17 of the Department's smaller offices and agencies under a single Office of Management Services. This has worked so successfully that we are in the process of applying the same principle to other agencies which maintain separate management service operations for individual divisions.

We also are in the process of modernizing our mailing operations to handle much of the detailed recordkeeping through automatic data processing. We now maintain 600,000 file cards of individuals and organizations requesting one or more of the Department's regular publications. It now requires over a month to change an address. This time will be cut to less than a week under the new system.

Automatic data processing also has been successfully applied to forest management operations and to forest research at a savings of over $1 million a year. We are now able to store voluminous quantities of forest survey data covering 186 million acres of national forests to maintain current information on timber that can be cut.

In the Soil Conservation Service, we have applied automatic data processing to maintain up-to-date information on the extent to which local soil conservationist work plans have been completed. This allows greater flexibility in the use of manpower, and provides annual savings of $500,000 in administrative costs.

These are only some of the major reforms and reorganizations and improvements the Department has made in the past 2 years to increase its effectiveness in serving the public and carrying out the duties which the Congress has assigned. There are many others which, though minor, are important. They add up to a steady and strong current of improved efficiency and economy.

It would be a mistake, however, to assume that these actions will necessarily mean fewer employees or lower budgets as a whole. Regardless of how high a level of efficiency is attained, more people will be necessary if the volume of services rendered increases. And, of course, the services we perform today are related—as they always have been—to the growing number of people living in the United States and to the nature and extent of the programs Congress gives the executive branch to perform.

Last year a proposal was made on the floor of the House that Congress limit the number of employees of the Department to the number of farmers. It highlighted the frustration of many Congressmen at the inability to keep the Federal agencies in general and the Department of Agriculture in particular from growing in total numbers of employees.

Many people chuckled about the proposal, but it would have been useful if the witty Congressman had asked and answered this question: Why does government at all levels—Federal, State, and local—whether under Republican or Democratic administrations—grow each year in total numbers?

With that question in mind let's take a look at the Department of Agriculture.

In the past decade, Department employment has increased by 32,473 man-years, but only 6 percent of that has come in ASCS, the agency which deals most directly with farmers, and that increase was due primarily to the staggering increase in the volume of commodities under CCC management. As we continue to administer the programs enacted by the Congress to reduce surpluses, we can anticipate a continued gradual reduction in manpower needs in this area.

Most of the remaining 94 percent of the increase has come in areas and programs where services benefit all Americans as consumers of food and fiber and as users of soil and water resources. These are services requested by the people and voted by the Congress.

In the last 2 years, employment in the packers and stockyards program, which protects producer and consumer alike, increased by about 34 persons, while at the same time the number of market dealers and agencies registered under the Packers and Stockyards Act increased by 5,700 * * * and the number of packers supervised increased by 700.

In poultry inspection services, the number of employees increased by 20 percent while the volume of poultry products increased by 38 percent.

By early 1963, the number of persons receiving food through the direct distribution program had more than doubled from 2 years earlier, but the increased workload is being handled with a 40 percent increase in employment.

In the past 10 years, the number of recreational visits to the national forests has increased by more than 218 percent. In 1962, total visits exceeded 113 million. This is only one of the increased pressures on the resources of our national forests. Each activity—whether it provides better recreation opportunities, more timber to supply the milk, or better rangeland or improved protection of water and timber resources—can be performed but it requires people to do the job. Forest roads and trails, picnic and camp grounds and firefighting can't be accomplished without bodies to do the work.

In 2 years, the number of small watershed programs authorized for construction has more than doubled and those authorized for planning have increased about 70 percent. In areas where such projects are being completed, new industries are developing, recreation opportunities are expanding and water supplies are becoming stabilized. During the same period, total paid USDA employment in soil conservation service has increased less than 3 percent.

Since 1960, the Farmers Home Administration has expanded its volume of dollars loaned by more than 160 percent, and is now providing housing credit services to the aged and to nonfarm rural residents where adequate private capital is not available. Rural community water systems are also being financed by the agency. FHA has shouldered the increased workload with a 4-percent increase in manpower, and last year actually did the equivalent work of 260 extra employees through overtime without compensation.

In the past 10 years the Congress has authorized 64 new research facilities under USDA supervision which require a combined staff of over 1,750 persons. The need for this is obvious since we live in an age where progress is determined by the level of scientific and technological achievement. And in agriculture and its related areas, as in few other industries, the basic and applied research which leads to improved efficiency on the farm and more effective distribution of our food abundance has been and is to a large extent dependent on research performed by the Department of Agriculture.

Agriculture exists today on a nervous balance between too much which could very quickly become not quite enough. Research helps to assure that we can avoid the human disaster of the latter, and intelligent legislation can help avoid the shattering economic consequences of the former.

But the role of research extends far beyond this. Only recently we successfully completed a test project—a research project—to determine if fresh fruits and vegetables could be shipped from this country to Europe with special constant temperature containers. Thus research helps open new markets abroad for our farm products. Not too long ago, USDA scientists perfected an apple juice concentrate. As a result, a new plant is being planned in a rural area near Yakima, Wash. Research provides new products which serve the consumer, create new markets for farmers, and provide jobs in the rural community.

Research also is required to help us live more safely with the products of the research lab. In the past 15 years, the growth in the use of pesticides has been enormous—not only in commercial agriculture but at the consumer level as well. We need to know more about the ultimate effects of these pesticides on plants and animals and humans. We also need to develop far more sophisticated pesticides and techniques of pest control. The field of biological controls is promising, as is the area of selective pesticides—chemicals that affect only one or two pests. Here, also, more extensive research is needed.

I have stressed the importance of research for two purposes. One is because I intend, if the Congress approves, to seek out the most competent person I can find as an Assistant Secretary for Research and Education. This office would give overall supervision to the research activities carried on now primarily in the Agricultural Research Service and would also have responsibility for the Federal Extension Service. It would maintain close and continuing relations with the Nation's land-grant colleges and universities.

The second purpose is to emphasize the changing nature of the Department's role in a rapidly changing society. We now have three Assistant Secretaries, the same as we had in 1960, but their function has changed markedly. Two years ago there was no Assistant Secretary for Rural Development and Conservation, but 2 years ago we were only vaguely aware that the farm problem is as essentially a rural community problem as it is a commodity problem. Two years ago we did not have an Assistant Secretary for International Affairs, but 2 years ago few people understood the basic importance of agriculture to international trade and to our responsibilities in the free world toward the developing nations. Our exports of farm products are increasing. The Department is cooperating today more fully than ever before with the State Department in planning and policy formation on farm policy in relation to the European Common Market. We are involved in a greatly expanded and more aggressive trade development program to expand oversea markets for U.S. farm products. And we are maintaining close liaison and are cooperating actively in foreign aid programs designed to assist the developing countries—agrarian nations which we must help to grow as free nations.

The three Assistant Secretaries and the Under Secretary, together with an Assistant Secretary for Administration and my close staff associates, are the key policy officials who serve with me in the Department. They are doing an extraordinary job, but it is increasingly clear that their talents are being spread too thinly. As their capacity is overtaxed, it leads to the kind of situation where my own ability to carry out my responsibilities to the Congress and to the people can be progressively weakened.

The supervision and direction of the very substantial research activities within the Department and those carried out in cooperation with the State experiment stations and the Extension Service as it now stands must be handled either by the Under Secretary or myself, and presently we are not able to give adequate time to an area which is of vital importance to farmers and nonfarmers alike.

The relationship between the Department and the land-grant colleges and universities has always been and must remain close and harmonious, and this need can only be filled with a top policymaker with direct access to the Secretary and the other staff people who help determine Department policy.

I believe that the enactment of H.R. 3850 will fill a gap which now exists in the top offices of the Department, and I urge this committee to give it full support.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, we are today saluting the Polish people in their never-ending quest for political freedom. This spirit is best represented by that documentation of political moderation and liberalism, the Polish Constitution of 1791. Though framed at a time when Poland was surrounded by political reaction in Russia, Prussia, and Austria, some of the breath of liberty sweeping western Europe as a result of the American and French Revolutions reached the eager leaders of Polish liberalism, led by an enlightened King.

In spite of intense opposition from the landed aristocracy, they drafted and put into law in the form of a Constitution, those basic liberties that should be enjoyed by all citizens in a democratic state. This Constitution was overthrown by force from a benighted Russia, abetted by Polish malcontents, yet defeat did not kill the spirit of Polish liberalism. The heroic patriots of Poland fought on, and still fight today against any form of oppression. Their liberalism and democratic spirit are admired by the free peoples of the world and, in our remembering the sacrifices made in the past to their dedication, may we assure them of our continued interest and support in their cause of liberty.

Praise for Junior Diplomats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the Hearst newspapers and Qantas Airways are joint sponsors of a contest among the newspaper boys of the Hearst newspapers throughout the country, known as the Junior Diplomat's contest for newspaper boys from 12 to 17½ years old to be given a good will and educational trip to Australia.

The boys selected will act as junior diplomats from our country to Australia.

The winners of the various Hearst papers throughout the country will assemble in and depart from New York City on July 1, 1963, leaving for Australia, stopping at Hawaii, in Nandi in the Fiji Islands, and arriving at Sydney, Australia on July 3, 1963, remaining in Australia until July 10 and returning to the United States and arriving in New York City on July 11, 1963.

In Boston the contest will be conducted by the Boston Record American and Advertiser, the Hearst newspapers in Boston with two of the Hearst newspaper boys from Greater Boston being selected to join with the others selected by other Hearst newspapers throughout the country.

The sponsors of this project are to be congratulated. This project is a constructive one.

The interest in this project is great and the competition among the eligible newsboys keen and active. The committee in various cities making the selection of the winners are outstanding citizens and educators.

For example, in Boston, the committee is Rev. Father Albert W. Low, superintendent of the archdiocese of Boston parochial school system; Dr. Dennis C. Haley, president of Suffolk University, and Dr. Frederick J. Gillis, superintendent of the Public Schools of Boston.

The boys selected will in sense be junior diplomats, ambassadors of good will, and will make a most favorable impression upon the people of Australia.

In my remarks, I include an article written by Tommy Shulman, appearing in the Boston Sunday Advertiser of April 21, 1963, which includes a recorded statement made by me, and also a commendatory resolution adopted by the Boston School Committee.

This fine action on the part of the Hearst organization might prompt other newspapers and organizations to conclude a similar project or competition for trips by American boys to other countries.

The material follows:

[From the Boston Sunday Advertiser, Apr. 21, 1963]

McCORMACK PRAISES JUNIOR DIPLOMATS

(By Tommy Shulman)

JOHN W. McCORMACK, Speaker of House of Representatives, Washington, D.C., has sent his congratulations to the Record American and Sunday Advertiser and Qantas Airlines on the up-and-coming Junior Diplomats trip to Australia.

In a recorded message, featured on the "Newspaperboys' Radio Show," Sunday morning, at 9:30, over radio station WEZE, McCORMACK said:

"It is a great pleasure for me to extend congratulations to the Hearst newspapers, the Boston Record American, and Sunday Advertiser and the Qantas Airlines for offering a program which will give boys 12 to 17½ years of age an opportunity to enjoy all-expense-paid Qantas V-Jet holiday trips to Australia in July.

"The Junior Diplomat trip and the entire program are the most wholesome, educational, and stimulating of youth activities.

"I am quite familiar with the Record American and Sunday Advertiser newspaperboys Sunday morning radio show over WEZE, for I have appeared as a guest on several occasions and have enjoyed the talent of the young salesmen. It was also my privilege to call to the attention of Congress this youth building project and I am happy to say that my comments were written into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I understand that the radio show is now observing its 25th year of broadcasting and I extend my heartiest best wishes for many more years of radio broadcasting.

"The world today is looking toward youth for ultimate leadership and the Junior Diplomats of today will be the senior statesmen of tomorrow.

"I congratulate the Hearst newspapers, the Record American and Sunday Advertiser for this wonderful project, which will mean so much in creating good will, not only between the people of America but the youth of America and the people and particularly the youth of Australia."

Newspaperboys David Humphrey, Joseph Saporito, Richard Murphy, Robert Baratta, and John Jones had their Junior Diplomats contest brochures autographed by McCORMACK and then presented their guest with an honorary membership card in the Newspaperboys Club.

[From the Boston Record American, Apr. 16, 1963]

RESOLUTION

Whereas the security of our country depends, in great measure, upon maintaining cordial relations with friendly nations throughout the world; and

Whereas the Hearst Corp. and the Qantas Airways have seen fit to promote the spirit of good will between our country and the Commonwealth of Australia: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Boston School Committee commends the Boston Record American, the Sunday Advertiser, the American Weekly, and Qantas Airways for their joint sponsorship of a contest among the newspaper boys of the Hearst newspapers which will allow two boys to be junior ambassadors of good will on a 2-week trip to the Commonwealth of Australia. This undertaking will be of great educational value to the winners of the contest and, through the exchange of ideas, will help to continue the already happy relationship we enjoy with that great nation down under; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be inscribed on the permanent records of the Boston School Committee and that a copy be sent to the Hearst Corp. and the Qantas Airways.

Law Day, U.S.A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, it is highly appropriate that we as a nation should set aside one day each year for observance as Law Day, for the rule of law is the embodiment of all the ideals, hopes, and aspiration of freemen everywhere. The rule of law forms the foundation of free societies, insures the right of individuals to live their own lives and pursue their own goals, and provide the impetus for the community of men to work peacefully for the solution of common problems.

Law Day is a reminder that as citizens we live under a government of laws, not men. It serves to reinforce our faith in the heritage of this Nation, and demonstrate the contrasts between our democracy and communism.

Therefore, I believe it is just and fitting that May 1 should be designated Law Day, because this is the day that the Communist countries throughout the world are displaying their military might and reasserting their intention to overwhelm the free world with force and despotism. Law Day, more than any other, emphasizes the contrast between the two principal forces in the world—that striving for a world of free and independent countries based on the integrity of the individual man, and that of communism striving for world domination and tyranny.

Just as today the Communist countries are reasserting their demonic goals, we in this country are once again expressing our desire for a world ruled by law, a peaceful world in which reason and right shall prevail.

This is the sixth year we have celebrated Law Day. It was inaugurated in 1958 by proclamation of President Eisenhower and has been observed each successive year with the full support of the Chief Executive and of Congress. I am happy to note that observance of Law Day is more and more widely celebrated each year—an indication, I believe, of the growing awareness and understanding of the need for a world ruled by law.

The objectives of Law Day are threefold: first, it is designed to foster a deeper respect for the law by teaching how laws serve all citizens; second, to encourage responsible citizenship by demonstrating that individual rights and freedoms involve individual obligations; and third, to promote national strength and unity by reaffirming faith in the rule of law, as the foundation stone of American life and government, and as an example to the world of what reliance upon the rule of law can mean to peoples of all nations.

In this connection, I would like to draw attention to the contents of the congressional resolution establishing May 1 as Law Day and to President Kennedy's comments earlier this year designating Law Day for 1963. The congressional resolution states that the first of May be "set aside as a special day of celebration by the American people in appreciation of their liberties and their reaffirmation of their loyalty to the United States of America; of their rededication to the ideals of equality and justice under law in their relations with each other as well as with other nations; and for the cultivation of that respect for law that is so vital to the democratic way of life."

And President Kennedy commented:

> The story of man's advance from savagery to civilization is the story of reason and morality displacing brutal force. While law is reason systematized, it is more than reason alone. A great Justice of our Supreme Court said long ago, "The law is the witness and external deposit of our moral life. Its history is the history of the moral development of the race." In a time when all men are properly concerned lest nations, forgetting law, reason and moral existence, turn to mutual destruction, we have all the more need to work for a day when law may govern nations as it does men within nations; when systematized reason may bring us a confident future; when the moral development of the human race may assure a peaceful and law-abiding world.

These comments, I believe, express the reasons for Law Day as adequately as any could.

I would only add further that on this day it is important to remember that our tradition of living under the rule of law has been called the greatest legacy of freedom in the history of civilized peoples. Our legal order has enabled our country to attain its present place of world leadership and has given Americans their unusual freedoms and opportunities for individual achievement.

Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD at this point editorials from the Evening Capital of April 30, 1963, and the Washington Post of May 1, 1963, commenting on Law Day.

The editorials follow:

[From the Annapolis (Md.) Evening Capital, Apr. 30, 1963]

LAW DAY, U.S.A.

The massed military might of Russia will parade in Moscow May 1 to show the world, and perhaps to reassure themselves, how invincible the workingman's paradise has become.

In America May 1 has a special significance, too, but in a less boastful and conspicuous way.

May 1 will be Law Day in the United States, sponsored by the American Bar Association and 1,400 State and local organizations of lawyers. Law Day calls attention to the contrast between freedom under law in the United States and governmental tyranny under communism.

The sponsors also hope the observance will foster respect for the law and increase the public's understanding of the place of law in the American way of life.

Law has made American freedom and progress possible. Our Nation has been devoted to it from its earliest beginnings. If it hadn't been, the history of the United States might have differed little from that of any of the less stable republics of the world, in which power is seized again and again by the momentarily strong.

The promoters of Law Day serve a useful purpose in pointing up the significance of this basic premise of our way of life.

[From the Washington Post, May 1, 1963]

LAW DAY

The 1st day of May, which used to be an occasion for social protest by struggling trade unions, is celebrated today by bar associations throughout the United States as an occasion for restating the American commitment to the concept of a government of laws functioning within the boundaries prescribed by a written Constitution. One wonders, however, if protest would not be more appropriate to such an occasion—and more genuinely American—than self-congratulation.

"If Law Day were only an occasion for laudatory remarks about the Constitution," Chief Judge David L. Bazelon of the U.S. Court of Appeals has written in a trenchant comment for the Daily Washington Law Reporter, "its chief value would not be achieved. It is also an occasion for deeper inquiry into the way we as a society abide by the spirit of the Constitution." The judge gave point to this prodding by reference to the contrast between our formal professions and our actual practice and by citation of the long continuance of arrests for investigation, a police practice which lawyers recognize as unconstitutional.

This is a tribute to the best tradition of the law in the United States. The real purpose of law is to set men free for the realization of their individual potentialities. The law—and lawyers—must, therefore, be consecrated to the protection of individuals against overbearing or arbitrary governmental action. Respect for the law means a recognition that it entails restraints on the public, on the majority—on ourselves. It entails recognition of the rights not alone of the respectable and the law abiding but of the most lowly and the most abhorred.

The Crippling Cut in the Post Office Budget Must Be Restored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WM. J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, not often does a display advertisement appear that we think is worth reference in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and thereby becomes preserved and perpetuated. We refer to a cooperative ad, appearing in the Washington Post for May 2, and sponsored by organizations of postal employees and organizations interested in direct mail advertising or mail order business.

The central theme of the advertisement attacks the recent cut, by the House, in the Post Office budget. As Members should so well recall, it was on April 4, 1963, that the House rejected amendments designed to restore $92 million that had been cut by the Appropriations Committee from the budget of the Post Office Department.

Following House action, the Post Office Department announced that because of this reduction there is no alternative but to reduce the extent of postal operations to absorb this cut of nearly $100 million. As we suggested, it is not the usual thing to quote from display advertisements in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD but, as this advertisement suggests, the ad itself is unique because organizations and groups that have signed this advertisement nearly always disagree. They are even vigorous competitors. Never before in the history have they ever sponsored anything together, let alone a paid advertisement. In stating they agree with each other, the various organizations emphasize that they are not only in agreement with each other but they think the American people agree they must have good postal service.

The content of the ad includes the following:

> The United States needs a better * * * not a worse * * * postal service. And, if we are going to get better postal service * * * **the crippling cut in the Post Office budget must be restored.**
>
> Consider these points. They affect everybody.
>
> 1. You are paying $600 million more for your postage this year because Congress has raised your rates. In exchange for this increase in rates, this slice in appropriations would cut the heart out of your postal service. (Remember, the money you pay for postage does not go to the Post Office Department; it goes to the U.S. Treasury. The Post Office must operate within the appropriations Congress votes it.)
>
> 2. The Post Office Department does not control its own growth. You and we—the American people—control the growth. The American people increase the mail volume by at least 2,300 million pieces every year. The American people move into new homes at the rate of 4,000 every day. The American population grows by 4 million every year. The American people are opening new housing developments, new office buildings, new apartment house complexes—and they are starting new businesses—every hour of every day. The cut in the budget would mean that the Post Office Department would be expected to handle this enormous extra mail burden with fewer employees than it has now. This simply cannot be done.
>
> 3. If the cut in Post Office appropriations remains, at least 4 million Americans will soon be denied postal service to which they are entitled. At least 2 million other Americans who are now receiving mail delivery will have it taken away from them. Thousands upon thousands of businesses located in new office buildings will be denied postal service. Tens of thousands of farmers will be isolated from the postal service.
>
> 4. The proposed cut in appropriations will result in primitive, uncertain, and slower postal service. This will be annoying to the average postal patron. It will be seriously damaging to the businessman. And, for the thousands of businessmen and the millions of their employees who depend for their living on the ability to send perishable goods through the mails swiftly, it will mean downright disaster. Just at a time when we are trying to rejuvenate the economy by increasing sales and decreasing unemployment, this proposed cut in appropriations would cause much commerce carried on by mail to grind to a halt, thereby decreasing sales and increasing unemployment.
>
> 5. The money that is needed cannot be squeezed out of the hides of the postal employees. This is demonstrable. The productivity of postal employees has been rising at the rate of 6 percent per year, ever since the end of World War II. This remarkable performance is unmatched in any other comparable industry. The only way the Department can squeeze out this $2 million is by cutting down postal service to the bone and throwing postal workers out of their jobs.
>
> 6. The traditional American flow of information—one of the basic supports of our democratic way of life—will be seriously impaired, as all classes of mail get slow service.
>
> Mr. and Mrs. America should have the greatest postal service in the world. They are paying higher postage rates to get it—the highest rates in the world. But, if this cut in appropriations is permitted to stand, the postal service tomorrow will be a national disgrace and an international laughing stock.
>
> The U.S. Congress is the key to this crisis. The Congress can restore the money that has been cut out of the postal budget. Write or wire your Senators and Congressmen today. Tell them that Mr. and Mrs. America want to preserve the U.S. postal service from degradation and disgrace. Ask them to fight and vote for the restoration of the $92 million to the postal appropriations.
>
> National Association of Letter Carriers; United Federation of Postal Clerks; Mail Order Association of America; Associated Third Class Mail Users, Inc.; Mail Advertising Service Association International; National Mail Order Nurserymen's Association; and Parcel Post Association, Inc.

There is little doubt in my mind that this 1st session of the 88th Congress will be remembered and applauded for its sincere and constant efforts to reduce Federal expenditures. A good start has already been made. To recapitulate some of these efforts, many of us voted against the amendment to increase funds for additional RS-70, which would have saved $363 million. The Interior appropriations bill saved $92 million from the budget estimate. Approximately $100 million was sliced from budget estimate by the House on the Labor-HEW appropriations bill. The Treasury-Post Office appropriations bill was approved in an amount by about $149 million less than the budget estimates. However, $92 million of this is the center of the present argument over whether a budget reduction should be a sort of percentage thing, or an across-the-board reduction without reference to what happens, or should there be selective, carefully considered, reductions so they will not affect everybody in these United States adversely.

The clear-cut conclusions to be drawn from the huge reduction of postal appropriations are as follows:

First. That the American people will be paying $600 million more this year for less or poorer postal service than they received last year.

Second. The House has implied by its reduction that notwithstanding the Nation's growth in population of 4 million persons a year, the Post Office Department must continue to handle the growing mail burden just as efficiently with fewer employees. Anyone who can think at all knows this is impossible.

Third. This reduction will adversely affect commerce served by mail, decreasing sales and increasing unemployment, at a time when we are seeking to rejuvenate our economy.

Fourth. The present reduction cannot be absorbed by accelerated efficiency but only through reducing service and throwing postal workers out of their jobs. Productivity of postal employees has increased at over 6 percent each year since World War II. This is unmatched in any other industry.

In conclusion I want to add my own emphasis to the importance of the well-chosen words of the ad "the crippling cut in the Post Office budget must be restored."

Secretary of the Interior Supports Moss-Engle Bill To Regulate High Voltage Electric Transmission Lines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, in his speech at the 20th annual convention of the American Public Power Association in Cleveland, Ohio, made some significant comments about the application of new technology in the electric power industry. He said in part:

> While the emphasis of our time is so heavily concentrated on the dramatic advances in technology, we must not lose sight of the fact that we will fail in our responsibilities if we do not apply our knowledge and use the tools available to bring lower cost power to consumers.

The Secretary's statement points up key questions about the magnitude and character of this Nation's future electric power supply. A national power survey is presently underway in the Federal Power Commission concerning the Nation's power requirements and supply arrangements, and is expected to set forth broad technical and economic guidelines for the future. FPC Chairman Joseph C. Swidler has said:

> Our goal is the development of a pattern of power supply in 1980 that will meet the Nation's electricity requirements at the lowest possible cost.

By 1980 it is estimated that the Nation will require about three times the amount of electricity used today. A 1-mill reduction in the cost of power could mean a $3 billion annual saving to consumers in 1980.

Prospects for new giant generating units and extra-high voltage, long-distance transmission pose new problems of concentration of economic power in the electric power industry. Technology may well speed up the historical trend toward increased power supply furnished by a decreasing number of power suppliers.

Private power companies now control 75 percent of the country's generating capacity and serve nearly 80 percent of the Nation's electric power consumers.

In 1917 there were 4,224 major private utility generating utilities. As recently as 1945 there were 1,060 such private power companies. By 1957 there were 465, and last year there were only 362. Thus, the number of such companies has declined in but 2 generations from 4,224 to 362.

Last year three private power companies—including the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. in the State of California—received from their customers nearly $2 billion. Fortune magazine recently listed 36 private power companies, representing about 10 percent of all privately owned utilities, whose 1961 income was about $8.5 billion or two-thirds of all the income received by the Nation's private power companies in that year.

The merger of these companies by consolidation or by acquisition has not prevented rate increases by the private power companies. FPC studies of typical monthly electric bills for the period 1952–62 show that the average price of electricity to residential, commercial, and industrial customers has increased, not decreased. FPC statistics show that residential customers, on the average, paid more in 1962 for 250 kilowatt-hours of electric service than they did in 1940.

A research study released this year by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association shows rate overcharges of $1.25 billion by 38 of the Nation's commercial electric utilities between 1956 and 1960. Arnold Hirsch, public utility consultant, reported last year in Public Power magazine that on the basis of Federal income taxes actually paid, the largest electric utility company in each of 46 out of 48 States, excluding Alaska and Hawaii, received a rate of return in 1958–60 in excess of the generally accepted reasonable figure of 6 percent.

The latest FPC figures indicate that in 1961 the net profits of the private power industry equaled 14.9 percent of revenues, while the profits of all industries in the United States equaled only 3 percent of sales. While private power companies had a 5.1-percent increase in net profits in 1961, all industries in the United States had only a 1.4 percent increase in net profits, and manufacturing industries had a decrease of 4 percent in net profits.

The trade publication Electrical World reported on April 8, 1963:

> Last year was the best ever for utility net incomes. Based on a sampling of 142 companies, representing roughly 95 percent of the total electric revenues for the utility industry, net incomes posted a 10.2-percent gain over 1961, as compared with a 5.4-percent gain in 1961 over 1960. The increase in 1962 got a boost from the new 3-percent investment tax credit, and the Internal Revenue Service's liberalized depreciation guidelines.

The concentration of control in the electric power industry is revealed in the pattern of ownership of private power companies. A study of the top stockholders of 143 operating power companies and 10 holding companies shows that 5 firms—4 stockbrokers or dealers and 1 insurance company—are among the top 10 holders of 22 or more power companies each. Together these 5 financial groups are listed a total of 171 times among the top 10 holders of power company stocks.

Seventeen other firms appear among the top 10 security holders of 10 or more power companies. Together they total 234 listings among the top 10. Thus, these 22 financial firms total 405 listings among the top 10 holders of power company stocks with total holdings of 48,574,153 shares. With two exceptions, they are headquartered in the eastern United States.

While a listing among the top 10 security holders of a private power company does not necessarily mean that the financial firm itself is the actual owner of the stock, it does mean that the top holder has the voting rights in the company—a key factor in corporation control.

These facts support several conclusions: First, there is increasing concentration of economic power in the electric industry; second, the reduction in the number of privately owned utilities may reduce costs to the companies but does not guarantee lower rates to consumers; and, third, new technology, to achieve large units and power pooling, can enhance monopoly by large combines without attendant benefits to power company customers.

We need new tools to insure that consumers obtain the advantages of technical advancement in the electric power industry. Secretary Udall named one of these new tools—that the FTC should have jurisdiction over construction and operation of interstate transmission lines, 230 kilovolts and above. Bills were introduced by Senator ENGLE and by me, to require that private power companies constructing such lines must obtain a certificate of public convenience and necessity from the FPC, agree to make excess capacity available on a common-carrier basis, and obtain FPC approval prior to abandonment or curtailment of service over the certified lines. Secretary Udall declared, in his recent speech at Cleveland:

> The Department of the Interior favors a strong Moss-Engle bill. We support a bill that would place mandatory requirements upon the FPC to make certain that those 230-kilovolt lines and over are constructed which are needed in the national interest—and are utilized to their fullest capacity.

Extra-high-voltage transmission lines represent superhighways for the movement of electricity. Their location and use is a matter of national interest, just as is our interstate Federal road program. The Nation cannot afford to let the special interests have unrestricted control over either the road highways or the electric transmission highway.

Electric power is a necessity of life in any modern industrial nation. It is not in the public interest to allow a private monopoly to have the sole power to decide the Nation's flow of electricity. State utility regulatory commissions cannot effectively or adequately deal with this question. The problem cuts across State borders. Only with a national approach can we expect to protect the public interest efficiently and fairly.

One of the most perceptive experts in this country, FPC Commissioner Howard Morgan, declared earlier this year:

> We now have a minimum of 50 years of abundantly documented history to show (1) that the electric industry is reasonably prompt in putting technological advances to use as soon as they have proved practical, feasible, and profitable, and is doing so now with respect to extra-high-voltage interconnections regardless of our national power survey; and (2) that in the absence of adequate public controls, some elements of the electric industry customarily employ technological advances to protect and maintain monopoly positions while isolating, restricting or strangling municipal or rural electric systems and publicly owned transmission lines.

I commend Secretary Udall for his forthright support of my bill, H.R. 2101. His speech at the Cleveland convention of the American Public Power Association contains much useful information for the Congress and the people of this country, and under unanimous consent, I include the complete text:

Remarks by Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall to a Luncheon of the American Public Power Association's 20th Annual Convention, Cleveland, Ohio, April 30, 1963

For two very good reasons I am pleased to be here in Cleveland. First, I value highly this opportunity to address the annual meeting of the American Public Power Association; and secondly, this is the home town of one of my colleagues for whom I have great respect, Anthony Celebrezze, former distinguished mayor of this city and now Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Cleveland's municipal electric system had its beginning some 60 years ago when the nearby villages of Collingwood and Brooklyn, in the years 1902 and 1906 respectively, decided to establish municipally owned electric systems. Just as the rural electric cooperatives throughout the Nation later on, these systems were born to fill a need that the local company refused to serve. Although considered too isolated for service at the time, a few years later they were annexed to Cleveland and the local municipal system began to grow.

The years 1902 and 1906 are significant for other reasons as well. They happen to be historical milestone of significant note in conservation history and the development of the West. In 1902 the Reclamation Act was passed and signed by President Theodore Roosevelt, the first great conservation President, thereby protecting the settlers against exploitation from unscrupulous land manipulators.

In 1906 Congress passed the Power Development Act which gave the Federal Government the right to develop and market hydropower in the public interest and established the all-important preference principle on the sale of this power. This also established the bedrock upon which many rural electric cooperatives, municipal systems, and other consumer utilities have built their existence.

The thousands of customers of the city of Cleveland's municipal system have benefited considerably from "Muny's" low-cost power. As other progressive municipal systems elsewhere, I am confident it will continue to meet the needs of these consumers.

Our modern electric age had its beginning in the 1800's with development of the first power system and incandescent lamp. Its status in man's life for a long time was mostly as a luxury. Now it is a vital necessity to each of us personally and to the future of this Nation. To keep pace with requirements presently, the industry is doubling every 10 years. But these needs are growing in accordance with our population demands and our international responsibilities.

The concern of your Federal Government is that the need for abundant low-cost power will be met in the seventies, the eighties, and the tomorrows beyond as well as today. Every municipal system, every public utilities district, every cooperative, every private utility bears an important responsibility in meeting these future needs.

The sustained demand for power, coupled with recent technologic developments, is creating a revolution in the making and marketing of electricity. Most spectacular have been the developments in extra-high-voltage movement of electricity over long distances with conventional alternating current and the interest in the potentialities of direct current; the much larger and more economical generating units of 500,000 to 1 million kilowatts, and more; mine-mouth generating plants; coal-slurry pipelines; hydroelectric pumped-back storage; and the advancements in the use of nuclear heat for civilian power production.

These advancements make possible potentially lower costs to consumers through accelerated interconnections of systems and regions, the tapping of low-cost fossil fuels, the use of nuclear fuels, and the naturally associated economies of large-scale operations.

In terms of history, we have moved almost overnight into a new era of technology and sustained demands for electricity, bringing new questions and new opportunity for the operations of the power industry. Along with this must come a reexamination and reorientation of the Nation's industry and power policy.

If America's economy is to expand as it must to provide new jobs and a rising standard of living, adequate power at reasonable rates for the benefit of consumers must be a basic and solemn responsibility of every utility. Many departments and agencies of the Federal Government have firmly established roles in the marketing, transmission, and regulation of electric power. All such programs are designed to provide the Nation with low-cost energy. Accordingly, we must not sidestep crucial issues.

One fundamental issue emerges from the fact that the industry setup, existing legislation, regulatory methods, and many of our pertinent Federal policies came about in an earlier period of our Nation's power development. Changing times demand a reexamination of the situation.

Many fundamental issues affecting the continuing development and long-range welfare of our Nation are involved and must be corrected and improved before we can begin to achieve national goals and aims. In all our considerations we must be concerned with the role of our Government in such fields as regulation, research and development, plans and programs, and legislation. We must properly consider the role of Government simultaneously with that of the industry as a whole, bearing in mind the needs and absolute dependence of the Nation's economy on an abundant of low-cost power.

We can properly consider the overall power problems of our Nation in four major categories: technological development, systems and facilities planning, organization and administration, and utilization and marketing.

Basically, assuring a continuing and ample supply of low-cost power depends first upon improvements in technology and proper planning, such as determining those fuels and other sources of energy which should be utilized, the kinds and locations of plants that should be built, the inter-connection of power regions, and major transmission facilities to be built. This should be accompanied by proper organization and management to plan proper designs, construction, and operation of the necessary facilities. As they come into existence we must have optimum arrangements for pooling and interconnecting to achieve the lowest practicable cost for all consumers.

To apply our developing technology to the Nation's energy and power needs, Congress and the executive branch constantly appraise and study our requirements for energy and manpower, particularly as they relate to the things which must be undertaken by the Government.

We in Interior have felt that far too little research and development effort has gone into the field of direct-current transmission, where the Swedes, the Russians, and the English have outstripped us. But we are trying to catch up. With significant consumer benefits at stake, Interior agencies are providing important leadership to the power industry. Our Bonneville Power Administration has well underway an intensive program of research in direct-current transmission. It has now reached the point where we will soon be testing a million-volt experimental line. New valves, new insulators, and new switchgear will be tested. We expect the result of this research to provide design and operating data to enable all utilities to deliver power at lower costs over far greater distances.

Interior's Bureau of Reclamation is also experimenting with new lightweight transmission towers, some of aluminum, some of latticed tubular steel. Cost of installation, durability, response to temperature variations and many other factors which will ultimately result in lower costs transmission of electric energy are entering into these studies. We are even considering the installation of lightweight towers by use of helicopters in places now inaccessible to conventional equipment.

Simultaneously, of course, continued development of nuclear power is under way by the Atomic Energy Commission, cooperating with American industry and our public and private utilities. Our energy study, sponsored by the President's Science Advisor, should enable us to balance better our energy research and development program. The important point is that we will go forward with a balanced and constantly expanding program.

At this point, let me remind you that Alex Radin plans on Thursday to show you a film depicting some of the advancements the Russians are making in the development and transmission of electric power. This film was given me on our inspection trip to Russia last fall. We recognize the propaganda element in this film but we saw enough of these installations and facilities to know that the Russians are in dead earnest about surpassing us in this field.

One of the important responsibilities of government is to lead where leadership is needed. We believe the public interest demands the coordination and integration of our Federal power system for which Interior has the marketing responsibility. In the early months of this administration we began directing our attention to this problem. A task force study was made, demonstrating to the world the desirability of building an extra-high-voltage direct-current transmission line or lines between the Columbia River power system in the Northwest, the Central Valley project in California, and extending to Los Angeles and perhaps even farther to our great Hoover Dam on the Colorado River and President Kennedy has sent to Congress a budget item that will enable us to begin construction.

We have already received approval of a 161,000-volt line connecting the Bureau of Reclamation's Missouri River Basin system with the Southwestern Power Administration's system, working with the local cooperative in northern Missouri.

These efforts on the part of the Government have helped to encourage such recent developments as the Keystone project in Pennsylvania and the Virginia Electric Power Co.'s extra-high-voltage transmission to the eastern seaboard. Simultaneously, the TVA has entered into an arrangement with a number of power companies in the southwest power pool to achieve the benefits of the 1½ million kilowatts of diversity between these great power systems. In the Midwest, 345-kilovolt lines have been proposed to interconnect Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Louis, Minneapolis, and other leading centers.

The Federal Power Commission's national power survey is a constructive effort to assess certain vital national needs and encourage necessary action. This should be a permanent and continuous activity to make the Nation aware of its needs.

Conserving and developing our natural resources is a task that not only requires long-range planning but across-the-board cooperation. I believe we are making great headway in our Government. Of considerable importance to the entire Nation is the works which the Department of the Interior and the Corps of Engineers are doing in comprehensive river basin development. This group will be interested to know that power planning is receiving the fullest consideration, as of course it should.

It is no secret that these agencies have differed in the past on the means and methods by which we make our plans and operate our projects. Happily these differences are being resolved to the benefit of the people. Clear-cut agreements have been worked out for water resource development in Alaska, the Columbia River Basin, and the Missouri River Basin.

We are also working more closely in our planning. Of particular interest to those in this area of the Nation are the studies we are making on installing low-head turbines of the axial flow type on the Ohio River where the Corps' locks are being rebuilt to improve navigation. It appears entirely feasible and highly desirable to modify these existing structures and make additions so that run-of-the-river power can be developed. This would be possible through turbines which operate economically and produce power at low-heads ranging from 26 feet or higher to as low as 6 feet. In addition to the Ohio, this offers possibilities for power development on such streams as the Mississippi, the Illinois, and the Arkansas Rivers, to mention a few. It offers America a greater opportunity to develop her precious water resources to meet the needs of future generations.

Our power marketing agencies have greatly intensified their work to realize the economies offered by applying the technique of pumped storage where the generator doubles as a pump, using off peak power to refill reservoirs and then releasing that water during peak periods to generate power.

Many other pumped-storage installations are being planned at existing and future Federal projects.

Pumped-back storage is another new frontier of technology. Taum Sauk, of the Union Electric Co. in Missouri, is rapidly being completed to develop about 400,000 kilowatts. Consolidated Edison has announced plans and has purchased equipment to construct over a million kilowatts of pumped storage on the Hudson River. The Niagara Mohawk Co. also plans another such million-kilowatt installation.

We commend these efforts, pointing out at the same time that the Federal Government must also put to use the pumped-storage technique if we are to properly conserve our power energy potential. We must improve power pooling methods as well, strengthening those that are inadequate and reflecting the technological advances of EHV transmission and large efficient turbines.

Organization and management techniques must be modernized—to plan, to build, to operate the major generating and transmission projects of the future. Your Government must continue to exercise leadership and influence to achieve these worthy objectives. We must bring our marketing and utilization of power into balance with other goals to achieve proper exchange agreements between systems and effect low rates for consumers.

But the best organization and management techniques and all our developing technology will be limited in benefits to American consumers, unless some segments of the power industry begin placing greater emphasis upon ultimate service to their consumers and less on defiling Government programs and consumer-owned systems of the power industry.

Conservation—the ideal, the principle, the practice—is the legitimate business of Government. Recently in carrying out our responsibilities to promote the conservation of resources, the Departments of Interior and Agriculture issued joint regulations governing applications for right-of-way over public lands by non-Federal utilities. We believe they will result in greater economies and efficiencies and at the same time minimize damage resulting from transmission lines crossing public lands and national forests. Briefly stated the policy requires that new lines crossing such lands must be available to carry Federal hydropower under certain circumstances as well as non-Federal power. In carrying out these regulations the Government would pay the cost of using the capacity and of building heavier towers or lines. Irrespective of the conservation aspects, it just makes good management sense to eliminate the possibility of parallel lines if one can do the job.

Congress has before it now a bill sponsored by Senator CLAIR ENGLE and Congressman JOHN E. MOSS, both of California. This legislation proposes an amendment to the Federal Power Act, which would require Federal Power Commission jurisdiction over the construction and operation of all transmission lines of 230 kilovolts and above. Further, the bill would require that these lines be made common carrier, and the FPC would have to issue a certificate of public convenience and necessity.

The Department of the Interior favors a strong Moss-Engle bill. We support a bill that would place mandatory requirements upon the FPC to make certain that those 230-kilovolt lines and over are constructed which are needed in the national interest—and are utilized to their fullest capacity.

While the emphasis of our time is so heavily concentrated on the dramatic advances in technology, we must not lose sight of the fact that we will fail in our responsibilities if we do not apply our knowledge and use the tools available to bring lower cost power to consumers. We in the Department are keenly aware of these responsibilities.

I believe the Kennedy power program is an exciting and vital program helping to pump new life into the economic mainstream of our Nation. A few days ago I participated in a ground breaking ceremony at a new steam plant at Hayden, Colo., to be built by the Colorado-Ute Electric Association and the Salt River Reclamation Project of Arizona. This is more than just a 150,000-kilowatt station. It is a new link in a chain that has been forged piece by piece. This small publicly owned station will tap Colorado coal reserves, increase employment and add $100 million to the Colorado Basin development funds because it will be tied in with a Federal transmission system, giving firm power when needed and sharing the use of Federal lines to serve its 42,000 rural customers.

We have spoken of the importance of power transmission. It is therefore timely to announce our intention to build new lines, more than 500 miles long, linking the Federal transmission systems of the eastern and western divisions of the Missouri River Basin project with the Colorado River storage project and the Parker-Davis project on the lower Colorado. This line will interconnect Federal power facilities covering a 15-State area of the Western United States—in Montana, North Dakota, Kansas, Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, New Mexico, and Arizona, and portions of the States of California, Nevada, Iowa, Minnesota, and Missouri. From the northernmost powerplant in the Federal system at Fort Peck, Mont., and Garrison in North Dakota, the interconnections will stretch 1,250 miles southward to Phoenix and Yuma in Arizona.

We are carrying out the directions President Kennedy gave to me shortly after taking office, to develop plans for the early interconnection of areas served by the Department's marketing agencies.

We believe there is a place in the sun for all elements in the power program—Federal, cooperative, municipal, private—each has a legitimate role to play. Interties, properly planned and executed, are an absolute essential if we are to have an efficient electric power system in this country.

This is sound conservation doctrine—and sound commonsense.

Evils of Federalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege on Wednesday, April 24, 1963, to attend the annual Shad Planking at Wakefield, Va., with my close friend and colleague, the Honorable WILLIAM M. TUCK. Representative TUCK is not only an outstanding Virginian, but he is a great American, as well as one of the most effective Members of the House of Representatives.

On this occasion, before about 2,000 persons, Representative TUCK delivered one of the finest addresses that it has been my privilege to hear in recent years. He pointed out the evils of federalism, the danger of looking to the Federal Government for help, and the great progress that Virginia is making today in solving her problems and building up her economy.

I am proud of Virginia, her people and her leaders. I deplore her detractors, particularly those living within her borders who publicly try to downgrade her in their efforts to mislead the people in an endeavor to take the reins of government from those outstanding Virginians who have charted her course these many years and helped keep her as one of the leading States in the Union, economically and morally, with one of the best governments in the Nation.

Congressman TUCK's address was so timely, so well received, and points up so cogently the situation in Virginia and the Nation, I desire to include with my remarks his address made on April 24, 1963, at the meeting of the Wakefield Ruritan Club.

The address follows:

REMARKS MADE BY REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM M. TUCK, DEMOCRAT OF VIRGINIA, AT WAKEFIELD, ON WEDNESDAY, APRIL 24, 1963, AT 4 P.M., AT A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE RURITAN CLUB

My friends, I appreciate the invitation to join with you on this occasion. It is a privilege for me to participate in the program, and of course to enjoy the plank shad. I am as fond of baked shad as some of the generals in the Confederate Army. In fact, I deserted a battlefield to be with you here today.

I am proud to be a member of the Ruritan International. I appreciate the fact that this organization was formed only a few years ago and was fostered and nurtured in nearby Nansemond County. It has grown to be one of the most useful and widely known service organizations in the country.

I am glad to be here in the district of my colleague and warm personal friend, WATT ABBITT. We have been friends for many years. The problems of our respective districts are common to us both and have thus drawn us closely together. Congressman ABBITT is faithful and diligent in his attention to the business of his office. He is alert and dependable and is one of the soundest and most useful Members, not only of the Virginia delegation but of the entire membership of Congress.

I am glad likewise to be in the district represented in the State Senate by my longtime friend, Senator Garland Gray. His friendship, which I value and prize highly, has meant much to me throughout the past 25 or 30 years. Senator Gray is one of our most outstanding Virginians and has rendered great service to our Commonwealth. I am glad likewise to be able to say that you have fine representation in the House of Delegates of Virginia, as well as in the Senate. I have known and worked with nearly all of the representatives in both branches of the general assembly for nearly 40 years. Thus, I believe I have some first-hand knowledge of the qualities that constitute a good representative.

We have come to you today directly from Washington. It is the so-called model city set up by several of our Presidents as an example for the rest of the Nation to follow. I hope that the States and other cities of the Nation will study this model city and take heed lest they likewise stumble and fall to disrepute.

In the establishment of this so-called model city, great assistance came from that modern-day Samson, Chief Justice Warren. He is not a synthetic Samson. He is genuine, for like Samson, he is not only blind, heedless, desperate and destructive, but he has also pulled down the temple, not only upon the people of Washington and America, but upon himself and his Court as well.

Still without apology for his utterly rash and senseless decisions, he is now appealing to Congress for the sum of $200,000 to acquire land for a parking lot adjacent to the Supreme Court Building. The basis for his appeal is on the grounds that the 35 or 40 ladies who work in the offices of the Supreme Court Justices must be spared the necessity of walking a half a block from the building to the present parking lot, because that area is crime infested and it is unsafe for them to do so. Numerous assaults, usually on females, have occurred in that area of our Capital.

His decisions, and I am speaking of several, not just the integration decisions, have resulted in an open reign of terror and horror in the District of Columbia. It is unsafe at night to walk unarmed on the streets of Washington. This is a fact well known to everyone who lives there, and no truthful person will deny it. The children and teachers in school are unsafe, so that the superintendent of schools has recently requested authority to impose corporal punishment. It is even dangerous to pray in open daylight in the synagogues and temples within two blocks from the U.S. Capitol itself. A lady secretary from a New York Congressman's office recently was attacked while kneeling in prayer in a church near her office.

Washington is a city also noted for its specious and spurious political doctrines and nostrums. There are people high up in government in Washington, I hope they are in the minority, who profess to believe that the genuine road to prosperity is to lower taxes and increase expenditures, although we are already running a deficit of several billions of dollars each year. If spending money and running deficits brings prosperity, we should certainly have a plethora of prosperity in this country today. According to the Economic Division of the Library of Congress, the Federal Government spent from 1789, the beginning of the administration of George Washington to June 30, 1945, through the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt, 487 and four-tenths billions of dollars. The same source discloses that from July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1961, through the administration of Truman and Eisenhower, we spent a total of 971 and seven-tenths billions, almost exactly twice as much as was spent for governmental services during all the administrations of all the other Presidents combined, from Washington through Franklin D. Roosevelt. I may add at this point that some of these Presidents who preceded Truman did not attain fame on account of their parsimonious conduct. I do not have the figures of the amount spent by the present administration, but I am sorry to have to say that the spending has been on the increase rather than on the decrease.

Much of these excessive expenditures have been worse than squandered for the result has been the destruction by the Federal Government of many of the historical rights and powers enjoyed by the people of the localities and the States.

The public debt in the last 25 years has grown to astronomical proportions. The annual interest alone on the public debt now is approximately twice as much as was spent by the Federal Government for all purposes in the year 1939. On December 31, 1962, the Nation's public debt amounted to $303.5 billion. The latest total figures on the debt of the "free world" countries was 201.5 billions. In other words, the public debt of the American Government exceeds those of all other "free world" countries by $102 billion, and yet we have given away to these so-called "free world" countries over a $100 billion. There has been very little appreciation on the part of many of these countries for what we have done. For instance in France, the greatest beneficiary of our governmental largess, where we have given away almost $10 billion, the present Government of France is uncooperative with the United States in international affairs. The public debt of America exceeds the debt of all other countries of the world, including Russia and others behind the Iron Curtain, by approximately $24 billion.

I could go on talking about Washington and the "new tragic era" which they are foisting upon the people of the South. I could compare our policies in Cuba 90 miles away, with the policies in vogue at Vietnam, but that would be useless. All those who are informed know that terrible mistakes have been made in respect to our international affairs. I hope that we may take a more firm and resolute stand against all Communist countries, and particularly Cuba. Although mistakes have been made we should do our best to repair the damage and to present a united front in fighting communism, whether the attack is from within or from without. We must face up to the danger of communism. The peril or threat is probably more from within than from without. The history of the advance of communism demonstrates this truth. Their method is to infiltrate and destroy from within. Let us never forget that communism must be eradicated from the Western Hemisphere for coexistence means nothing but gradual surrender.

Despite these baleful and pernicious conditions, at the national level fraught with so much evil, as well as many others not mentioned, we find some joining ill-advised and misguided persons as well as some power-hungry Virginia politicians, in with the tormentors and destructionists from the North advocating a new era in Virginia. They would demean and denigrate Virginia and her government by attacking the leaders responsible for the magnificent governmental conditions which now exist in our great Commonwealth. These same influences would enervate the Democratic Party by engaging in wholesale political funerals and driving from the ranks of democracy lifelong Democrats who have been faithful to the true principles upon which our party is based and who are its greatest exponents.

I am not in sympathy with those dissatisfied elements who wish to gain control of Virginia's government and subvert the pure Virginia government and democracy thus subjecting it to the control of scandalous and unscrupulous city machines. This gives offense to the conscience and moral feelings of all true Virginians and no doubt will receive their reprobation and condemnation. For my part, I hope the Democrats of Virginia will continue to harmonize their work together and fight for the sound principles of government which have made our State and Nation great.

I am opposed to making over the government of Virginia in the image of Washington, D.C.

I say, "Thank God for Virginia."

I have a notion that Sir Christopher Newport uttered those same words when he brought his little three-ship fleet into sight of American soil in 1607 and prepared to go up the James to start the first permanent English settlement at Jamestown.

They are significant words, for they refer to what I shall always consider the greatest State in the Union. Virginia is the Mother State. As such, I am glad to say it has set a fine example for the other States. It is a pity that more of them cannot be induced to follow those noble examples.

One of my greatest prides throughout life has been the knowledge that I was born on Virginia soil. Except for the short time I served in the Marines in World War I and my stay in Washington as a Congressman, I have lived on Virginia soil all of my life. When my public services have ended it is my firm purpose to spend the rest of my days on Virginia soil.

Virginia has much for which to be proud. Statisticians and economic experts, many of whom are not natives of the Old Dominion, but who recognize facts and comparisons as yardsticks, place Virginia at the top.

During the decade of the 1950's, Virginia, in her rate of growth, excelled the Nation as a whole and every State to the south of her and east of the Mississippi but one—Florida. Her 19.5-percent gain in population exceeded the national figure of 18.5. So was her 17.4-percent gain in labor force ahead of the Nation's 15.8 percent. And her 49-percent increase in personal income was 4 percent ahead of the figure for the entire country.

Virginia cannot be characterized as a typical State in the midst of a region. That's because she stands out as an important corridor for the north-south traffic. She is a transition State that shares common economic activities with each of the States around its periphery, but her economy is more diversified than that of any of the surrounding States.

She is populated by 4,177,000 persons, ranking her 14th among the States from the standpoint of population. Six important rivers course down from her mountain backbone toward the coast, giving her a tidal shoreline of 3,315 miles long, while three major rivers run across her alluvial soil and fields in the opposite direction.

Twenty operating railroads carry her commerce over 4,100 miles of railroad roadway, in addition to 2,750 miles of sidetrack. Supplementing these are the carriers running on 50,000 miles of highways, all built on a pay-as-you-go basis.

Our ports in the Hampton Roads are among the most important in the world. Ninety percent of the Nation's oceanborne exports of coal, 70 percent of its exports of tobacco, and a good portion of its exports of grain are shipped through these outlets.

Virginia's principal exports are coal, tobacco, grains, woods, fertilizers, paper products, food, iron, textiles—26,112,524 tons, according to the latest annual figure. Her imports, largely petroleum products, ores, and foods, amount to about a fourth of that.

For years now, the trend in Virginia has been away from agriculture and toward industrialization. But she still has 97,623 farms with a total farm population of 650,000. In 1961, she produced 10,500,000 bushels of apples, 192,400,000 pounds of peanuts, and 147,686,000 pounds of tobacco. She leads the Nation in the production of Beltsville white turkeys. She is successfully competing with the Midwest in the growth of soybeans, and with the Northeast and Northwest as a producer of apples.

Her oyster harvest is the largest in the Nation, representing one-fourth of all the yield along the Atlantic and Gulf coasts.

In recent years, manufacturing in Virginia has forged ahead, in both employment and value added, faster than it has in the Nation as a whole. She stands fourth among the 11 Southeastern States in expenditures for new plant and equipment and in manufacturing employment.

Textiles and chemicals lead among the industries. Next are food processing and lumber and wood products.

Virginia is noted for the fine furniture produced in our factories, many of which are based in the Fifth Congressional District.

Virginia ranks first in the Nation in production of synthetic fibers. Cotton also is an important part of her textiles. At Danville is located the world's largest single-unit textile mill.

Coal accounts for a major share of her mineral production. She is the sixth largest coal-producing State. In 1960 she produced 7 percent of the Nation's bituminous coal and lignite.

Since 1949 her nonagricultural employment has grown at an average annual rate of 1.1—a rate well above the eight-tenths percent recorded as the national average.

She has 301 commercial banks, according to the latest count, with total assets of nearly $4 billion and total deposits only a shade lower. During the last two census periods, the growth record of her retailers has surpassed those of the region and the Nation. Her travel trade went up 20 percent during the 1950's bringing in about $600 million annually.

Her labor force as of last October was 1,492,750.

Since 1929 Virginia's per capita income has grown 325 percent. After adjustment for price increases, the growth is still a respectable 146 percent—76 percent greater than the expansion of the national figure.

She has had a larger increase in personal income than any other State in the region. Her personal income per capita has gone up steadily from $990 in 1946 to $1,909 in 1961. Virginia is second in per capita income among the Southeastern States.

In Virginia labor-management relations have enjoyed peace and tranquility. We have had relatively few strikes and work stoppages compared with other States in the Nation. Working conditions are better in Virginia than many of our other sister States. This state of well-being is due largely to the leadership among our workers as well as our management, and also to the favorable, fair and impartial labor relations laws on the statute books. I am proud of the fact that our right-to-work law, as well as a number of other labor-management relations statutes were enacted during my term in Richmond and upon my recommendation.

The harmony enjoyed by industry and the workers in our State has undoubtedly done much to enhance the economy as well as to attract new industry to locate within our borders.

Virginia's future does look bright. In the 1960's we can look forward to an increase in labor supply of 2.3 percent a year compared with 1.7 percent in the 1950's. This means that it will be necessary to provide approximately 40,000 additional jobs a year.

The Governor's Industrial Committee established during the present administration has done much to enhance the industrial growth of Virginia. There is every prospect that much future goodwill result from the activities of this committee. In addition the present administration has accomplished a great deal toward increasing employment and working conditions in Virginia by its encouragement of tourism as well as other facets of our economy.

One of our most important resources is our history. It was on the soil of Virginia, not far from where we now stand, that our liberties were first proclaimed and established. Virginia furnished more than its share of the Founding Fathers of this Republic. Much of the system of government for which our country is famous was contributed by Virginians. Eight Presidents have been born on her soil, and we have produced other outstanding statesmen and men besides those who became President. At least one of them lives in this present generation and serves us now. He deserves to rank as one of the great Virginians of all time. I refer, as everyone knows, to none other than U.S. Senator H. F. BYRD.

Probably the brightest part of our picture in Virginia is the fine government which we have had here, at least since the "tragic era" of reconstruction. And much of the present-day progress is due to the leadership of Senator BYRD. Since 1928, under a pay-as-you-go fiscal policy, Virginia has increased her budget tenfold under moderate rates of taxation. The Commonwealth of Virginia operates with a surplus, is free of bonded debt, and its residents, unlike those of the Nation and many other States, are taxed to pay for current services only.

We have a fine system of highways, approximately 50,000 miles, much of which has been paved and hardsurfaced, and constitutes one of the best road system in the Nation, and for which Virginia and the people do not owe a cent.

But the greatest resource any State can have is her people. We are blessed with a wonderful citizenship who believe in responsible government. They believe in placing men in office such as our present Governor, Lieutenant Governor, and attorney general, who are capable and who are worthy, and who are dedicated to the highest public good.

Emerson, one of the greatest of our philosophers, in one of his essays said that the troubles of the world arise largely because the good and the better are forever in conflict, while the forces of evil are united. He said that if the good and the better would cease conflict and unite that triumph over evil could be easily secured. Let us hope that our Virginia people in the great dilemma and crisis which we now face may lay aside differences of an inconsequential nature which serve to divide us, and let us unite to strengthen our government and our State to the end that we may continue to enjoy the same happiness and prosperity which have blessed us for many past decades.

Yes, I say, "Thank God for Virginia." I think the entire Nation has a reason to say the same thing.

A Bill To Establish the Federal Housing Administration as an Independent Agency of the Executive Branch of the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish the Federal Housing Administration as an independent agency of the executive branch of the Federal Government.

The Federal Housing Administration was created by the President pursuant to the National Housing Act which was enacted as Public Law 479, 73d Congress, on June 27, 1934.

On May 27, 1947, the President submitted Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1947 creating the Housing and Home Finance Agency and transferring to the new agency the Federal Housing Administration, the Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and the Public Housing Administration. Of these, all except the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation were made constituent agencies of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. This reorganization plan became effective on July 27, 1947.

Under the Housing Amendments of 1955, approved August 11, 1955, the Home Loan Bank Board, including the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, was removed from the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Board, with its name changed to Federal Home Loan Bank Board, was established as a separate independent agency in the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. Speaker, the reasons which motivated the Congress to establish the Federal Home Loan Bank Board as an independent agency in the executive branch of the Government are applicable to the Federal Housing Administration. However, there are even more compelling reasons today why the Federal Housing Administration should be restored to the independent status.

During debate on the Housing Amendments of 1955 the question was raised as to the proposed separation of the Home Loan Bank Board from the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

In justification of such separation, the distinguished chairman of the Senate Housing Subcommittee, Mr. SPARKMAN, said, and I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 101, part 6, page 7725:

> The situation is that the home loan banks originally were made possible by the underwriting of their stock by the Federal Government, the idea being that they would gradually retire their stock. All of the stock has now been retired except about $66 million, and the home loan banks are ready, able, and willing to retire that amount now, and provision for this is made in the bill.
>
> If the stock is retired, why should not the Federal home loan banks have the same status as the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Federal Reserve System, which operate in the same manner? That is what is being provided for by the bill.

Mr. Speaker, the National Housing Act, enacted in June 1934, authorized $10 million to be made available to the FHA to create a mutual mortgage insurance fund. Whatever public moneys were made available to the FHA have long since been repaid.

The FHA has accumulated reserves aggregating approximately $1 billion from the premiums paid by home buyers whose mortgages are insured by FHA. These reserves belong to the participants in the mutual system. The expenses incurred by FHA in administering the insurance program are far below its earnings from fees and premiums. The FHA had total assets of $1.6 billion, as of June 30, 1962, and its principal liability on that date was $496 million in long-term debentures issued in exchange for properties acquired by foreclosure.

When the Congress in 1955 established the Home Loan Bank Board there was, as the chairman of the Senate Housing Subcommittee stated, $66 million in stock in the hands of the Federal Government which had not as yet been retired. If the retirement of all but $66 million in Government-held stock was suggested as an argument for independent status for the Home Loan Bank Board, certainly the same reasoning would be even more compelling with respect to the Federal Housing Administration which owes the Government not one cent, and which operates without cost to the taxpayers.

The Federal Housing Administration's primary purpose is to conduct an actuarially sound underwriting mutual mortgage insurance system. I emphasize the mutuality of this insurance system because this characteristic of the Federal Home Loan Bank System was advanced as one of the reasons for the transfer of the system from the jurisdiction of the Housing and Home Finance Agency in 1955.

As a mutual mortgage insurance system, operating without cost to the taxpayers, the Federal Housing Administration has made a tremendous contribution to the provision of housing for millions of American families as well as stimulating the home building and allied industries. It presents an excellent example of what I believe to be the Federal Government's proper role in the field of housing—to encourage rather than subsidize real estate and housing as an industry.

The Federal Housing Administration must remain deeply committed to a program of accurate underwriting based on adequate analysis and sound business judgment. On March 11, 1963, the FHA Commissioner in his first public address since his appointment was confirmed by the Senate, referred to the FHA's "paramount public service requirement to give the American people a mortgage insurance program consistent with sound underwriting principles."

However, the events of the past several years have served to reorient the Federal Housing Administration from the economically sound underwriting principles which have, until recent years, characterized its operations.

This reorientation is the result of trying to administer a sound underwriting system in conjunction with welfare subsidy programs. I believe, the Congress should consider the shifting of these welfare-type programs to the Housing and Home Finance Agency leaving to the FHA its independent jurisdiction over an actuarially sound mortgage insurance system.

Mr. Speaker, for several years, beginning in November 1947, the national conventions of the National Association of Real Estate Boards have adopted policy statements urging the Congress to enact the necessary legislation to establish the Federal Housing Administration as an independent agency of the executive branch of the Government. Under unanimous consent, I include the most recent of these—adopted in November 1962—to be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

Autonomy: The FHA has made a major contribution to the housing of American families and to the housing industry without expense to the public. However, political and social welfare considerations are eroding the economically sound underwriting standards which have been the hallmark of this agency since its inception. Therefore, we call upon the Congress to enact legislation granting independent status to the FHA under the direction and control of a board of directors appointed by the President, and to desist from adding responsibilities to the agency which are inconsistent with economically sound underwriting principles.

Mr. Speaker, the 1962 statement of public policy of the Mortgage Bankers Association recite some excellent criteria for a private national mortgage market mechanism such as the FHA. Under unanimous consent, I include appropriate excerpts from this policy statement, including endorsement of independent status for the Federal Housing Administration, also to be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks along with the full text of the bill.

The matter follows:

The Essentials of a National Mortgage Market

The ready acceptance of mortgages in a nationwide market requires a market mechanism that will serve the following purposes: (1) Provide a simple means for judging the quality of the mortgage security; (2) compensate for the special risks involved in high-percentage loans; and (3) minimize the task and the hazard of lending at long distances.

A quarter century of experience with the operation of the Federal Housing Administration has demonstrated that mortgage insurance can provide such a multi-purpose mechanism. The future usefulness of the FHA system, or any other similar system, as an instrument of a private national mortgage market depends upon the extent to which it will be able to meet the following requirements for a market-oriented system of mortgage insurance:

1. The system must have sufficient capital and reserves to warrant acceptance of its guarantee by mortgage investors.

2. It should be operative in all parts of the country; otherwise the purpose of broad geographic coverage cannot be served.

3. The procedures should be simple and of general applicability. The idea that there need be a special type of financing for every possible subdivision of housing demand is contrary to the concept of a free market. It also makes the system so complex and cumbersome to operate that its usefulnes becomes gravely imperiled.

4. The insurance premium should be variable according to the risk considered to be present in the particular class of transactions. If the principle of mutuality is maintained, better than expected experience may then produce a dividend for the borrower.

5. The interest rate charged on insured mortgages should be freely determined in the market.

6. The system should be completely supported by insurance premiums, examination fees and other charges for services rendered. There should be no quantitative limitation except that of prudent and efficient management on the use of income from these sources for necessary administrative purposes and the accumulation of reserves.

7. While the system should have some element of coinsurance, the method of paying claims should be prompt and involve a minimum of uncertainty.

8. The system must be subject to government supervision; but it should have continuity in direction and be removed from political influence that would impair adherence to the principles outlined above.

The Federal Housing Administration should be recognized as a federally chartered mutual insurance corporation administered through a board of trustees appointed, with staggered terms, by the President, and officers appointed by the trustees.

FHA should be made accountable for its operations directly to the President and to the Congress.

The Need for a Sound Mortgage Insurance System

(By Milford A. Vieser, chairman of the finance committee, the Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Co., Newark, N.J., March 1963)

In order that the mortgage market of the country be adequately supplied with funds to meet the future demands of the decade, it is vital to have a mechanism which will permit and encourage as free as possible a flow of investment across State lines and particularly from parts of the country having a surplus of capital to parts where the supply is insufficient for local needs. Such a mechanism is needed because of both the inadequacy of local funds in many communities and, in any case, the desirability of maintaining a healthy competitive situation among all types of lenders.

The essentials of a national market mechanism are: the provision of a simple means for judging the quality of the mortgage security; a method of compensating for the special risks involved in high-percentage mortgage loans; and a means for minimizing the task and the hazard of lending at long distance.

The Federal Housing Administration has demonstrated over more than a quarter century of operation that mortgage insurance can provide all these essentials. Moreover, no other type of mechanism of similar effectiveness has been devised; and it is doubtful even that an alternative system of mortgage insurance could serve the purpose to anywhere near the same degree.

The reasons why this is so are the following: FHA insurance is available in all parts of the country, while a substitute system would find the provision of equivalent coverage extremely costly and would require a very high initial capital outlay; State laws relating to loan-to-value ratios, maturities, etc., have been modified so that all types of institutions may compete in any locality on equal terms, while to obtain a similar dispensation for a completely private substitute would be most difficult; FHA's present reserve position, combined with the contingent liability of the Treasury on the debentures it issues in payment of foreclosed mortgages, gives it a prestige that could not be gained by a substitute system.

In view of these considerations, the more feasible course of action at the present time would appear to be to improve the functioning of the FHA system rather than to attempt to create a substitute system, and to transfer FHA from Government domination to private control.

The following difficulties have led to a decline in the use of the FHA system: an administered interest rate which has required market adjustments to be made through the unsatisfactory method of discounts on the mortgage amount, to be absorbed by the builder or other seller; inflexible limitations on the agency's use of its own earned funds for administrative purposes, resulting in repeated inability to provide prompt service to applicants; and an undesirable multiplicity of insuring methods and terms which, combined with an examination and rating procedure of unwarranted complexity, adds greatly to administrative cost and delay in handling applications.

While, in part, the procedural complexities can be and indeed are now being reduced by administrative action, the disabilities cited above can otherwise be fully corrected only by legislation. The problem, therefore, is that of persuading Congress not only of the desirability but also the propriety of making the satutory changes that are needed to give the FHA the market orientation and independence of action prerequisite to an effective mortgage insurance system.

In some degree this objective may be approached by creating a better understanding of what the FHA is and what its basic purposes are or should be. Because of the careless use of such phrases as "Government insurance," "FHA financing," and "FHA mortgages," and because also of the fact that authorization for the expenditure of FHA's income follows the same legislative procedure as does that for the appropriation of public money, the facts are often ignored that: FHA is completely privately financed by the users of the system; all Treasury advances made during its formative period have been repaid; and the remaining Treasury liability is now so remote as to have no practical fiscal significance. In short, aside from this remote contingency and from the fact that it is administered by Government-appointed officials, FHA is of a private character.

Moreover, because of the confusion as to its fiscal status and of a long sequence of socially directed legislation, the initial and essential function of FHA as a vital instrumentality of the private mortgage financing system has been submerged in a welter of aims other than those of facilitating a nationwide flow of mortgage funds, broadening competition among lending institutions, and hence contributing to the general improvement in the volume and quality of housing and the reduction and regional equalization in the cost of mortgage money.

It is probable, however, that more will be needed than a mere clarification of status and purpose—important as that is—if FHA is to be allowed to operate with the independence and the flexibility and the freedom from fixed interest rates that are essential to the fulfillment of its basic functions. In line with this view, statutory changes might be considered which would emphasize the presently strong private financial characteristics of the agency and assure its orientation toward the private mortgage market.

The following suggestions should be considered:

The reestablishment of FHA as an independent federally chartered mutual mortgage insurance corporation administered through a Board of Trustees appointed by the President and officers appointed by the trustees. Precedents for such action are the removal of the Federal Land Bank System from the Department of Agriculture and the Federal Home Loan Bank System from HHFA.

Elimination, in the reorganized agency, of all forms of special-purpose insurance, leaving three basic operations—one for one to four-family properties, including condominiums, one for rental housing property, and one for cooperatives. Special-purpose functions, if politically unavoidable, should be left in HHFA.

The reestablishment of an unrestricted interest rate structure that will respond to market forces. The rigid interest rate has been the main source of instability in mortgage and building activity since the end of the war.

The establishment of a simple method of issuing mortgage insurance by changing archaic documents and manual requirements to permit FHA to compete on a time basis with other financial institutions. The elimination of unwarranted complexity by the adoption of a system which would reduce administrative costs and greatly reduce delay in handling applications.

The transferring of FHA from Government domination to private control would contemplate, as at present, that the FHA pay for administrative expenses and make required additions to reserve out of premium income and other charges. Economies could be instituted and consideration would be given to adjusting the amount and method of payment of the FHA insurance premium.

The Federal Housing Administration is the finest example of cooperation between Government and private enterprise for the betterment of our people. In more than 25 years of its history it has not cost the taxpayers of our country $1 and the FHA has repaid to the Federal Treasury all advances made during its organization period. It has been a great force for good stimulating homeownership to the highest percentage ever attained by any country.

Now, for the reasons cited, it is no longer the dominant influence in housing as in the past. It needs change and rejuvenation. The wisdom and ingenuity which founded FHA must again be used in its rebirth.

In the past FHA has been tremendously successful in promoting homeownership in our new suburbs. While it must continue this role, it is absolutely essential that it be the vehicle which can expeditiously and effectively aid in the redevelopment of our American cities. It must once again take effective leadership if we are to meet successfully the housing problems of the future.

H.R. 6010

A bill to establish the Federal Housing Administration as an independent agency in the executive branch of the Government

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Federal Housing Administration, which was established pursuant to section 1 of the National Housing Act (48 Stat. 1246; 12 U.S.C. 1702) and made a constituent agency of the Housing and Home Finance Agency pursuant to Reorganization Plan Numbered 3 of 1947 (61 Stat. 954; 5 U.S.C. 133y–16), shall, from the effective date of this Act, cease to be such a constituent agency and shall be an independent agency in the executive branch of the Government.

SEC. 2. (a) The functions and powers vested in the Federal Housing Commissioner by the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), are hereby transferred to a Board of Directors of the Federal Housing Administration (hereinafter referred to as the "Board") which shall consist of three members to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than two members of the Board shall be of the same political party. The President shall designate the members of the Board first appointed hereunder to serve for terms expiring respectively one, two, and three years after the effective date of this Act, and thereafter the terms of members of the Board shall be four years. Whenever a vacancy shall occur on the Board the person appointed to fill such vacancy shall hold office for the unexpired term of the member whose place he is appointed to fill. Each of the members of the Board shall received compensation at the rate of $ per year.

(b) The President shall designate one of the members of the Board as Chairman. The Chairman shall (1) be the chief executive officer of the Board, (2) appoint and direct the personnel necessary for the performance of the functions of the Board, or of any office or agency under the Board, and (3) designate the order in which the other members of the Board shall, during the absence or disability of the Chairman, serve as Acting Chairman and perform the duties of the Chairman.

SEC. 3. (a) No suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against the Federal Housing Commissioner, in his official capacity or in relation to the discharge of his official duties, shall abate by reason of the taking effect of this Act, but the court may, on motion or supplemental petition filed at any time within 12 months after such taking effect, showing a necessity for the survival of such suit, action, or other proceeding to obtain a settlement of the questions involved, allow the same to be maintained by or against the Board.

(b) All rules, regulations, orders, authorizations, delegations, or other actions duly issued, made, or taken by or pursuant to applicable law, prior to the effective date of this Act, by the Federal Housing Commissioner shall continue in full force and effect after the effective date of this Act until modified or rescinded by the Board.

(c) Reference in any other Federal law to the Federal Housing Commissioner shall be deemed to mean the Board.

(d) The office of Federal Housing Commissioner is hereby abolished.

SEC. 4. The provisions of this Act shall take effect upon the expiration of the first period of ninety days following the date of enactment of this Act; except that the President may nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoint the members of the Board at any time after such date of enactment.

National Service Corps Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, there follows a section-by-section analysis of H.R. 5625, the National Service Corps bill, introduced by me and nearly two score of my colleagues.

This analysis is of the bill as introduced:

Section 1 provides that the bill may be cited as the "National Service Corps Act."

Section 2 states the purposes of the bill. These are to open new opportunities for full-time service working with those Americans in greatest need; to illuminate those needs, so as to expand the attack on deprivation in the United States; to motivate many more citizens to volunteer their services in their own communities, thus encouraging communities to help themselves; and to inspire more people to choose professions that serve their fellow citizens.

This section declares that it is the policy of the United States to carry out the purposes of this act through a National Service Corps, which will be composed of carefully selected men and women of all ages who shall be made available—upon local invitation and in cooperation with interested governmental and nongovernmental agencies—to serve for a limited time in projects directed toward the critical human needs of our countrymen. Projects may include projects designed to make corpsmen available for work with persons in institutions for the mentally ill and mentally retarded and during their return to normal living; in meeting the health and education needs of migratory workers and their families, Indians living on or off reservations, and residents of depressed areas and rural and urban slums; in care and rehabilitation of the elderly, the disabled, the delinquent young and dependent children; in improving standards of educational opportunity; and in other projects directed toward critical human needs. To the extent possible, each project carried out under this act shall provide for contributions by the cooperating agencies.

Section 3(a) authorizes the President to carry out projects in furtherance of the purposes stated in section 2 on such terms and conditions as he may determine. This bill, like the Peace Corps Act, provides for the granting of all authority and the appropriation of all funds to the President, with power to delegate any or all functions and to allocate any or all funds as he sees fit. See sections 4(b) and 7(c).

Section 3(b) provides that before undertaking a project, the President shall assure himself that it will not displace regular workers or duplicate or replace an existing service in the same locality.

Section 3(c) authorizes an appropriation to the President for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1963, of not to exceed $5 million to carry out the purposes of the bill. For each succeeding fiscal year this subsection authorizes appropriation of such amounts as Congress may determine to be necessary to carry out the purposes of the bill.

Section 4(a) authorizes the President to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a Director of the National Service Corps. The President may fix the salary of this officer at a rate not exceeding $20,000 per annum. This section authorizes the President to appoint a Deputy Director of the National Service Corps and to fix his salary at a rate not exceeding $19,500 per annum.

Section 4(b) authorizes the President to exercise any functions vested in him by the bill through such agency or officer of the Government as he shall direct. The head of any agency or any officer performing functions under the bill delegated by the President is authorized to promulgate rules and regulations and to delegate his functions under the bill. This subsection is identical to section 4(b) of the Peace Corps Act.

Section 5(a) authorizes the President to enroll in the National Service Corps for service in the United States, qualified citizens and nationals of the United States, to be known as corpsmen. It is intended that the terms and conditions of the service of National Service corpsmen be exclusively those stated in the bill and those consistent with the bill which the President prescribes. Because many of the statutory rules relating to persons regularly employed in Government agencies would be inappropriate or irrelevant to this type of temporary volunteer service, this subsection, patterned after the Peace Corps Act, provides that corpsmen are not to be deemed to be officers or employees of the United States for any purpose except as provided in the bill.

Section 5(b) provides that whenever the President determines that it is in the national interest, he may, under such terms and conditions as he may deem appropriate, enroll qualified foreign nationals in the Corps for service in the United States. It is intended that the authority granted in this subsection would be sparingly used to permit the enrollment, for example, of Cuban nationals resident in the United States for service on a project serving the needs of Cuban refugees or of Mexican nationals for service on a project serving the needs of migrant workers and their families.

Section 5(c) is similar to the comparable subsection in the Peace Corps Act and provides that corpsmen shall be furnished with such living, travel, and leave allowances and such housing, transportation, supplies, equipment, subsistence, and clothing as the President determines to be necessary for their maintenance and to insure health and effectiveness. It is intended that, as nearly as practicable, the corpsmen will live on the same level as their counterparts in the host community. This subsection also authorizes the furnishing of transportation and travel allowances to applicants for enrollment and former corpsmen en route to or from places of examinations, training, enrollment, and termination. The authority with respect to applicants is included because persons will not be enrolled in the National Service Corps until they are finally selected, following training, and actually report for service.

Section 5(d) is similar to the comparable subsection in the Peace Corps Act and provides for payment of an adjustment allowance to corpsmen at rates fixed by the President but not to exceed $75 for each month of satisfactory service as determined by the President. These payments would accumulate monthly but would normally not be paid until the termination of service, as they are intended primarily to assist corpsmen during the period of transition back to life at home. However, in order to enable the corpsman while in service to meet important obligations, such as contribution to the education of other members of his family, payment of life insurance premiums, or emergency expenses, the President could permit a portion or all of the accrued amount of the adjustment allowance to be disbursed while the corpsman was in service.

Section 5(e) authorizes the designation of corpsman leaders from among the corpsmen. Corpsman leaders would be persons, generally senior to corpsmen in age and experience, who were required for supervisory or other special duties or responsibilities in the field. All the provisions of the bill relating to corpsmen would apply to corpsman leaders, and the term "corpsmen" throughout the bill includes "corpsman leaders."

Section 5(f) provides that corpsmen shall be treated as Government employees for the purposes of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, which provides for disability compensation payments and medical care in the case of injury or disease arising out of Federal employment. For the purpose of fixing the level of disability benefits, which is related to earnings, corpsmen would be deemed to be receiving monthly pay at the lowest rate provided for GS-7 in the executive branch. Under this provision, at present GS rates, a corpsman who became permanently and totally disabled would receive approximately $300 per month.

As under the Peace Corps Act, where a corpsman suffered injury or illness while located in the United States, the rules applied in similar cases by the Federal Employees' Compensation Board would determine whether the illness or injury arose out of the corpsman's service. Although covered by FECA at all times, a corpsman would not begin to receive disability payments and other benefits so long as he was in service, since he would be receiving living expenses and full medical care during that time and would continue to accrue his adjustment allowance. This subsection also insures that the injured corpsman, or his dependents in the case of death, will not receive double benefits, by providing that any payment on account of the same injury or death received from the entity to which the corpsman was assigned shall be credited against any benefits payable under the FECA.

Section 5(g) provides that corpsmen shall be deemed to be employees of the United States for purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and of title II of the Social Security Act, and any service performed by an individual as a corpsman shall be deemed for such purposes to be performed in the employ of the United States. It is intended that corpsmen would be treated equally with other persons with respect to income and withholding taxes, social security taxes, and social security coverage. There are no provisions in the bill comparable to sections 201 and 202 of the Peace Corps Act which amended the Internal Revenue Code and the Social Security Act to provide for exemptions from gross income for certain allowances, and for special "backpay" treatment of termination or readjustment payments.

Section 5(h) is similar to the comparable provision in the Peace Corps Act and authorizes the President to make provision for health examinations and immunization of corpsmen preparatory to service and complete health care during service. Under regulations prescribed by the President, such examinations, immunization, and care could be provided through available medical facilities of other agencies and in such cases the agency operating the medical facility would be reimbursed from National Service Corps appropriations. Where examination, immunization, or care were not furnished through other Government facilities, other arrangements would be made either by the National Service Corps or, in the case of some projects administered through other agencies, by the administering agency pursuant to agreement with the National Service Corps.

Section 5(i) enables corpsmen to obtain credit for the period of their volunteer service for the purposes of retirement, and also generally for the purposes of seniority, reduction in force, leave accumulation, or other rights and privileges based on length of service, in the event they later became employed in any of the various Federal civilian employment systems.

Section 5(j) authorizes the President to detail or assign corpsmen or otherwise make them available to other agencies of the U.S. Government or any State or subdivision thereof, private nonprofit organization, or other organizations, individuals, and firms. Corpsmen so assigned or detailed would continue to be entitled to the benefits, allowances, and privileges provided for corpsmen.

Section 5(k) provides that corpsmen shall be deemed employees of the Government for the purposes of the Federal Tort Claims Act and other similar Federal claims statutes—such as the Suits in Admiralty Act—which waive the Government's immunity from suit. This means that the Government could be sued for damages for the negligent act or omission or certain other wrongful conduct of a corpsman under circumstances where the Government, if a private person, would be liable. Claims of this nature not in excess of $2,500 could be settled administratively under the Federal Tort Claims Act. This subsection also provides that corpsmen shall be subject to provisions of the Hatch Act which limit the political activities of employees of the United States.

Section 5(l) authorizes the President to terminate the service of a corpsman at any time at his pleasure.

Section 5(m) provides that upon enrollment every corpsman shall take the following oath prescribed for persons appointed to any office of honor or profit by section 1757 of the Revised Statutes of the United States:

> I, A. B., do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.

Section 5(n) authorizes the President to provide training for applicants for enrollment as corpsmen and for corpsmen following enrollment. It is intended that actual enrollment in the National Service Corps take place after the basic period of training and after final selection for service on a particular project. During training, however, applicants for enrollment would be treated in all respects as corpsmen and would be subject to the same conditions of service as corpsmen, except that their training period would not be credited toward retirement or other benefits in other Federal services in which they may subsequently be employed. See section 17(c).

Section 5(o) provides that the number of corpsmen enrolled in the National Service Corps shall not exceed 1,000 during the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1963, and shall not exceed 5,000 at any time thereafter, unless otherwise authorized by the Congress.

Section 6 authorizes the President to employ such personnel other than corpsmen as the President deems necessary to carry out the purposes and provisions of the bill. Such personnel, unlike corpsmen, would be subject to the usual rules of Government employment and to the provisions of the bill applicable to employees.

Section 7(a)(1) is similar to section 10(a)(1) of the Peace Corps Act, and authorizes the President, in furtherance of the purposes of the bill, to make contracts and agreements and otherwise cooperate with agencies of the U.S. Government or of any State or subdivision thereof, private nonprofit organizations, and other private organizations, individuals, and firms.

Section 7(a)(2) authorizes the President to accept voluntary services and gifts of money or property for the use of the National Service Corps in furtherance of the purposes of the bill. This provision is similar to one contained in section 10(a)(3) of the Peace Corps Act. It makes clear the National Service Corps' authority to accept gifts of money or equipment or to accept contributions, for example, to establish training or operating facilities which might provide the framework for National Service Corps projects. This subsection also authorizes the President to dispose of such donated property in furtherance of the purposes of the bill.

Section 7(b) provides that a contract or agreement for services of corpsmen may obligate current fiscal year funds available under the bill for a period of not more than 2 years, including funds for the purpose of paying or providing for the allowances and other benefits of corpsmen. Such contracts or agreements would be subject to termination if Congress terminated the program. This subsection is based upon section 10(c) of the Peace Corps Act which provided 3-year contract authority.

Section 7(c) is similar to section 10(e) of the Peace Corps Act, with minor modification. It permits funds available for the purposes of the bill to be allocated to any Government agency in connection with activities under the bill. Funds so allocated could be spent in accordance with the authority of the bill or in accordance with authority governing the activities of the agency to which the funds were allocated.

Section 7(d) is the same as section 10(f) of the Peace Corps Act. It authorizes any officer of the Government carrying out functions under the bill to utilize the services and facilities of other Government agencies or procure commodities from other government agencies.

Section 7(e) is the same as section 10(g) of the Peace Corps Act. It sets forth the manner in which reimbursement or payment, when required, is to be made to another agency furnishing facilities, services, or commodities to carry out the bill.

Section 8(a) is substantially identical to section 12(a) of the Peace Corps Act. It authorizes the President to appoint persons to membership on a National Service Corps Advisory Council to advise and consult with him with regard to general policies and programs designed to further the purposes of the bill. The members of this Council are to be broadly representative of various public and private organizations and groups as well as individuals interested in the programs and objectives of the National Service Corps.

Section 8(b) provides that members of the Council shall serve at the pleasure of the President and meet at his call. It further provides that members who are not employees of the Government may receive out of funds available for purposes of the bill compensation not exceeding $75 for each day, not to exceed 20 days in any fiscal year, spent away from their homes or regular places of business in connection with meetings or conferences of the Council, and while so engaged may receive travel expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence as authorized by law—5 U.S.C. 73b–2. This provision is similar to section 12(b) of the Peace Corps Act.

Section 9(a) is similar to section 13 of the Peace Corps Act. It authorizes the employment of experts and consultants and organizations thereof in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 55a, with compensation at rates not exceeding $75 per diem plus travel expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence as authorized by law—5 U.S.C. 73b–2. The proviso at the end of this subsection authorizes annual renewal of all contracts under this subsection.

Section 9(b) exempts experts and consultants appointed under section 9(a) from Federal laws governing reemployment of retired officers or employees and simultaneous receipt of compensation and retired pay or annuities. The same exemptions are provided for members—except regular Government employees—of the Council referred to in section 8. These exemptions are the same as those provided in section 13(b) of the Peace Corps Act for experts and consultants and members of the Peace Corps National Advisory Board.

Section 10 provides express authority for a number of specific kinds of expenditures. Most of these provisions are designed to provide the express authority to make specific uses of appropriated funds which is—or appears to be—required by various statutes and Comptroller General rulings, or to overcome or modify certain Government-wide restrictions which would inhibit effective and efficient National Service Corps operations. Each of these authorities is provided with respect to the Peace Corps program by section 15 of the Peace Corps Act. Specifically, this subsection authorizes:

First. Payment of rents in the United States, for which express authorization is required by the provisions of 40 U.S.C. 34, 40 U.S.C. 304c, and Reorganization Plan No. 18 of 1950. This would enable the National Service Corps to rent recruitment or training facilities outside of Washington as well or facilities in the District of Columbia, utilizing Service Corps appropriations. This paragraph also permits expenditures for repairs, alterations, and improvements to leased properties in excess of 25 percent of the first year's rent, the ceiling imposed by 40 U.S.C. 278a.

Second. Expenses of printing and binding without regard to the provisions of section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919—44 U.S.C. 111. This provision, similar to that contained in section 15 (a) of the Peace Corps Act, would be utilized sparingly as necessary to meet the needs of the National Service Corps for recruiting materials and for printed matter on a time schedule which cannot be met under existing regulations.

Third. Expenses in connection with meetings concerned with the purposes of the bill, including meetings of experts or consultants appointed under section 13(a). This paragraph has been included, as in section 15(d)(2) of the Peace Corps Act, in view of the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 551 and 31 U.S.C. 673.

Fourth. Expenses of preparing, transporting and disposing of remains of corpsmen dying while away from their homes participating in activities under the bill. This is similar to the provisions of section 15(d)(10) of the Peace Corps Act and to authority presently available for employees of the Government and their dependents under 5 U.S.C. 103a.

Section 11 requires the President to transmit reports to Congress on operations under the bill at least once in each fiscal year.

Section 12 provides that all persons employed or assigned to duties and all corpsmen enrolled under the bill shall be investigated to insure that the employment, assignment, or enrollment is consistent with the national interest in accordance with standards and procedures established by the President. It is anticipated that under this provision the same type of investigations would be provided for National Service Corps personnel and corpsmen as are presently provided for Federal employees.

Section 13 authorizes the President to adopt a seal or emblem for the National Service Corps.

Section 14 is the same as section 20 of the Peace Corps Act. It amends the student loan provisions of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to suspend principal and interest payments on such loans for student borrowers during the period of their National Service Corps service, as is now provided with respect to borrowers in military service. Because of possible constitutional objections to this amendment if applied mandatorily to loans outstanding on the date of enactment of the bill, a proviso has been added which would apply the amendments to loans outstanding on that date only with the consent of the lender.

Section 15 is the same as section 21 of the Peace Corps Act. It contains a technical amendment to the Civil Service Retirement Act to assure that a corpsman who later became a participant in the civil service retirement system would not receive both annuity payments under that system and social security benefits based upon his period of volunteer service.

Section 16 defines various terms used in the bill. In particular, subsection (d) defines the period of service of a corpsman so as to include the training period prior to enrollment, except for the purpose of accruing retirement or other credit in connection with subsequent Federal employment. These definitions are substantially the same as those in section 25 of the Peace Corps Act.

Section 17 is a standard separability provision.

Section 18 provides that the bill's effective date shall be the date of its enactment.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 6, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Rev. George Claude Baker, Jr., of Perkins School of Theology, Dallas, Tex., offered the following prayer:

Be pleased, O God, to accept the gratitude of our hearts for the renewed gifts of Thy mercy. Thou hast granted us the light of another day and strength for our tasks. Thou hast linked our lives with solemn responsibilities through which we may serve our fellow men and Thee. Grant us, O Lord, righteous motives for all we do. Guard us from selfish decisions, and guide us into wise choices.

Amid the debate of policies and the discussions of plans, so direct and bless the President, the Vice President, and all in authority, especially this body of Senators, that they may fashion a bold vision of Thy divine purposes for our Nation and for all lands, wherein earth shall be fair, men shall be free, justice shall obtain, and peace shall bless.

So may our destiny be shaped by Thee, Almighty God, that all men may know Thy law, walk in Thy ways, and make known Thy love, through the power of Thy Holy Spirit. In Jesus' name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 2, 1963, was dispensed with.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 11, 1963,

Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Appropriations, on May 3, 1963, reported favorably, with amendments, the bill (H.R. 5366) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, and submitted a report (No. 168) thereon.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the call of the Legislative Calendar was dispensed with.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS IN MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report by Office of Civil Defense on Property Acquisitions of Emergency Supplies and Equipment

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, reporting, pursuant to law, on property acquisitions of emergency supplies and equipment, for the quarter ended March 31, 1963; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Restriction of Certain Areas in the Outer Continental Shelf

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the restriction of certain areas in the Outer Continental Shelf, known as the Corpus Christi Offshore Warning Area, for defense purposes, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Chief M. Sgt. Samuel W. Smith

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Chief M. Sgt. Samuel W. Smith, U.S. Air Force (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Amendment of Section 753(b), Title 28, United States Code, To Provide for Electronic Sound Recording of Certain Proceedings

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 753(b) of title 28, United States Code, to provide for the recording of proceedings in the U.S. district courts by means of electronic sound recording as well as by shorthand or mechanical means (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Changes in Functions of the Beach Erosion Board and the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to make certain changes in the functions of the Beach Erosion Board and the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A certified engrossed copy of a legislative bill (No. 449) enacted by the Legislature of the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Engrossed Legislative Bill 449

"A bill for an act to ratify a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America relating to the poll tax or other tax as a qualification for voting

"Be it enacted by the people of the State of Nebraska,

"Section 1. That the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States, set forth in the resolution appearing in section 2 of this act, is hereby ratified by the Legislature of the State of Nebraska.

"Sec. 2. That the resolution mentioned in section 1 of this act was referred to this legislature for action thereon by the Governor of Nebraska, and reads as follows:

" 'POLL TAX AS A QUALIFICATION FOR VOTING

" '*Senate Joint Resolution 29*

" 'Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualifications of electors

" '*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

" ' "ARTICLE —

" ' "Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax.

" ' "Sec. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation." '

"Sec. 3. That copies of this act be duly certified by the Secretary of State and forwarded by the Governor to the Secretary of State of the United States and to the presiding Officer of each House of the Congress of the United States.

"Dwight W. Burney,
"*President of the Legislature.*
"Hugo F. Irb,
"*Clerk of the Legislature.*

"Approved April 8, 1963.

"Frank B. Morrison,
"*Governor.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Iowa; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Joint Resolution 16

"Joint resolution ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America relating to qualifications of electors

"Whereas both Houses of the 87th Congress of the United States of America by a constitutional majority thereof made the following proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States of America in the following words, to wit:

" 'Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualifications of electors

" '*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax.

" 'Sec. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation': Therefore, be it

"*Resolved and enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Iowa:*

"Section 1. Ratification. That the said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America as set forth herein be and the same is hereby ratified and consented to by the State of Iowa and by the General Assembly thereof.

"Sec. 2. Certification. That the certified copies of this enactment and resolution be forwarded by the Governor of this State to the Secretary of State of the United States and to the presiding officers of each House of the Congress of the United States.

"W. L. Mooty,
"*President of the Senate.*
"Robert W. Naden,
"*Speaker of the House.*

"Attest:

"Carroll A. Lane,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*

"Approved April 29, 1963.

"Harold E. Hughes,
"*Governor.*"

A telegram from the City Council of Gingoog City, the Philippines, signed by its secretary, remonstrating against an amendment of the war damage bill giving the money to the Philippine Government instead of the claimants; ordered to lie on the table.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 1451. A bill to amend section 41(a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Dirksen when he introduced the above bill, which appear ununder a separate heading.)

By Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself and Mr. Nelson):

S. 1452. A bill to donate to the Stockbridge-Munsee community some submarginal lands of the United States, and to make such lands parts of the reservation involved; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Proxmire when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PROUTY:

S. 1453. A bill authorizing an appropriation to provide for the expenses of a joint select committee of the Senate and House of Representatives to study the problem of local self-government for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1454. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction to a taxpayer who is a student at a college for certain expenses incurred in obtaining a higher education; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks by Mr. Prouty when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. PROUTY (for himself and Mr. Aiken):

S. 1455. A bill for the relief of the Shelburne Harbor Ship & Marine Construction Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DODD (for himself, Mr. Ribicoff, Mr. Pastore, and Mr. Pell):

S. 1456. A bill to provide for an addition to the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways from Hartford, Conn., to Providence, R.I.; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Dodd when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 1457. A bill to amend section 203(e) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to facilitate the procurement of certain surplus personal property by State agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

ALIEN PROPERTY UNDER THE TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I introduce a bill and ask that it be appropriately referred.

Mr. President, in the last session of the 87th Congress both House and Senate passed bills dealing with some aspects of our alien property problem under the Trading With the Enemy Act. Since there were divergent views on some matters contained in these bills a final conference between House and Senate took place on the last day of the 87th Congress in 1962. As a result of the conference a garbled language on one item developed which had failed to take into account a dictum in a U.S. Supreme Court decision on June 25, 1962, in the so-called Glidden case, which related to the general jurisdiction of the Court of Claims.

The Senate version of the bill was in compliance with the court decision but the conference language was something of a mixture which overlooked it. One of the results of the Glidden decision was to place about 35 cases referred to the Court of Claims by action of only one branch of Congress, in a state of suspension, and some effort has already been made to draft general legislation so that all doubts concerning congressional intent in the 35 cases referred to would be resolved.

At the moment general legislation on this subject does not seem practicable and in addition, the case involved in the Senate bill is such that it merits separate treatment. One reason for this view is that in the case referred to it was the only one considered by both branches of the Congress and was, therefore, incorporated in a bill which was signed by the President. The garbled language does, in fact, defeat the real intent of both Houses of the Congress and that intent was to give the U.S. stockholders of the General Dyestuff Corp. a trial in the Court of Claims on the basic merit of the respective claims. The measure I am introducing, therefore, undertakes to restore the Senate language and should, therefore, be approved by both the Senate and the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Jordan in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1451) to amend section 41(a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act, introduced by Mr. Dirksen, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RETURN OF CERTAIN LANDS TO STOCKBRIDGE-MUNSEE INDIAN COMMUNITY, SHAWANO COUNTY, WIS.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, last year I introduced a bill which provided for the return to the Stockbridge-Munsee Indian community, in Shawano County, Wis., of lands adjacent to their reservation which were taken over by the Federal Government in the 1930's. Unfortunately, that bill was not acted on last year.

I am introducing the bill again, this year; and my bill is being cosponsored by my distinguished junior colleague [Mr. NELSON].

The lands involved are considered submarginal. They were taken over by the Federal Government during the depression, under the national industrial recovery program and the Farm Security Administration.

For many years, the Department of Agriculture had jurisdiction over the lands. Recently, they were turned over to the Department of the Interior, to be administered for the benefit of the Stockbridge-Munsee community.

But many members of the tribe who live on the lands can get title only on a year-to-year basis. This uncertain tenure makes it very difficult to establish decent homes and farms, and to secure satisfactory mortgage financing.

The bill would promote this by donating the land to the tribe, and making it part of the reservation. Such action has been recommended by the Secretary of the Interior in both the Kennedy administration and the Eisenhower administration. This means that the bill has bipartisan support.

Mr. President, I introduce the bill, and request its appropriate reference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1452) to donate to the Stockbridge-Munsee community some submarginal lands of the United States, and to make such lands parts of the reservation involved; introduced by Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself and Mr. NELSON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AUTHORIZATION FOR STUDY OF LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BY THE JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill and ask that it be appropriately referred.

This bill provides an authorization of $50,000 for the operations of a joint select committee, composed of Members of both the Senate and the House, whose duty shall be to prepare a statement of conclusions, together with their reasons therefor, suggesting a proper form of local self-government for the District of Columbia.

The bill requires that the report of the committee must be submitted to the Congress not later than January 1 of 1964.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1453) authorizing an appropriation to provide for the expenses of a joint select committee of the Senate and House of Representatives to study the problem of local self-government for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. PROUTY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

DEDUCTION TO TAXPAYERS WHO ARE COLLEGE STUDENTS WORKING ALL OR SUBSTANTIALLY PART OF THEIR WAY THROUGH COLLEGE

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to aid students who are working all or a substantial part of their way through college.

These students have demonstrated their great desire to obtain more education and their willingness to labor for it.

How difficult it is for these thousands of youngsters who are trying to prepare for tough courses and at the same time must hold down a job to pay their tuition expenses.

A National Science Foundation study points out that a lack of money caused up to one-half of the male college dropouts, and one-third of the female dropouts quit college because they simply did not have adequate financial resources.

Members of Congress seem to recognize that education is important and we permit philanthropists and others tax deductions if they make charitable donations to educational institutions.

Yet when a poor boy or girl works full time during the summer and part time during the school year to pay for his or her books or tuition, the Federal Government taxes their meager income without regard to the fact that it is being used for education.

How inconsistent this is to allow a deduction to the rich man when he does something for education and to deny similar benefits to hard-pressed young men and women who are willing to work night and day to learn—to get ahead—to become better citizens.

One of the great questions facing this Nation is whether higher education should be limited to those who can afford it.

Many of the keenest students in the Nation come from the poorest families and it is said that one-third of these talented and needy youngsters are financially unable to attend college.

We shall need a million and one-half engineers and over half a million scientists by 1970.

To meet this need we should graduate about 80,000 engineers a year during the 1960's. Sad to say, however, current enrollments indicate that we will be graduating fewer than 40,000 per year through at least 1964.

Sure, scholarships are some help but studies show that the average scholarship award—whether from a corporation or a State program—is approximately $400 per year—less than one-quarter of the cost of attending college.

Loans are becoming more available, but the student who may have to help out at home after he graduates from college is not always eager to accept the prospect of total borrowing. He would much rather work as much as possible while he goes to college so that he will not be faced with huge obligations when he finishes his training.

Many Americans in the past have worked all or at least a part of their way through college and they have a right to be proud of it.

But times have changed. The cost of going to college was less then and taxes did not get into the picture.

Today educational costs are much higher and a student who works for his education does get into the tax picture and incurs a penalty, an extra charge for education, from the U.S. Government.

This very unfair situation exists notwithstanding the fact that we are more aware than we ever have been of the benefits of education to our national well-being and even more survival.

Let us reorient our thinking and be grateful that we have thousands of young boys and girls who have caught the spirit of our free society. Let us not dampen that spirit by taxing in a cold routine manner the nickels and dimes they have earned to pay their tuition and book expenses.

My bill does not give a complete tax-exempt status to students who work while they attend college, but it does allow them to deduct for tax purposes certain expenses incurred in obtaining a higher education.

The deduction allowed is this: up to $1,200 per taxable year for an undergraduate student and up to $1,500 per taxable year for a graduate student. The work must be toward a baccalaureate or graduate degree. The deduction is only for tuition, fees, and supplies. It does not apply to sustaining expenses of board and room.

The student may be going to school either full or part time, but he or she must be in a degree program from an institution which is accredited either nationally or regionally. Hobby courses, beauty culture or any program in any institution would not be accepted as legitimate degree work and will not be aided.

By putting a ceiling on deductions, an undue burden upon the tax structure is eliminated. This ceiling has been set carefully in terms of average costs in a private school as figured by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. A lower ceiling would discriminate against private institutions. A higher one would benefit unfairly the higher cost private schools and be a stimulus to them to raise fees.

A principal aim, of course, is to help the student taxpayer, and this it will. For example, if a student earned $2,000 in 1 year, took full advantage of the $1,200 deduction, plus his personal exemption and automatic 10 percent deduction, he would pay no tax at all.

Certain exemptions and special deductions are available under our tax laws because it is said that they serve national purposes which are more important than the mere raising of revenue.

What expenditure of money will bring greater returns for the public benefit than the expenditure of funds for education?

What greater purpose can a tax deduction serve than to stimulate an intelligent young boy or girl to prepare for teaching or science or engineering where they can make a lifetime contribution to their Nation?

I pay tribute to the hundreds of thousands of young men and women who are working their way through college, and I express the sincere hope that we will be able to tell them before this year is out that Congress recognizes their efforts and that help is on the way.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1454) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction to a taxpayer who is a student at a college for certain expenses incurred in obtaining a higher education, introduced by Mr. Prouty, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

INCLUSION OF ROUTE NO. 6 FROM HARTFORD TO PROVIDENCE INTO THE INTERSTATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself and Senators Ribicoff, Pastore, and Pell, a bill which would include an additional 75 miles between Hartford, Conn., and Providence, R.I., in the National System of Interstate and Defense highways.

A recent analysis udertaken by the Connecticut and Rhode Island Highway Departments indicates a serious need for a supplemental interstate highway in this area.

My colleagues and I are of the opinion that this addition to the Interstate System meets all the necessary criteria and would serve peacetime, wartime, and national defense interests.

The proposed route would be in a direct easterly direction from Hartford and would roughly follow the present U.S. Route No. 6.

The joint study done by the Connecticut and Rhode Island Highway Departments proves conclusively that the 12 standards of criteria for the selection of routes for interstate highways are completely met by the selection of this route.

Not only would the proposed route serve the maximum number of urban population centers in the area but it would also serve the needs of the rural population as well. Its location would take into consideration the requirements of manufacturing communities and also be of value to agriculture markets along its route.

The proposed route further meets the standards of serving Military and Naval Establishments as well as defense industries.

My colleagues and I feel there is much justification for including this additional 75 miles of highway in the Interstate System and we hope that early action will be possible to make this a reality.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1456) to provide for an addition to the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways from Hartford, Conn., to Providence, R.I., introduced by Mr. Dodd (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

AMENDMENT OF TARIFF ACT OF 1930—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre] be added as a cosponsor of S. 835, to amend the Tariff Act of 1930. We welcome Senator McIntyre's support for this bill and are pleased to have him as a cosponsor.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 301 OF TARIFF ACT OF 1930—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, on February 28 I, along with a number of other Senators introduced the bill (S. 941) which would amend section 301 of the Tariff Act of 1930. The junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre] desires to cosponsor this proposal and I ask unanimous consent that his name be added at this time.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DESIGNATION OF OCTOBER 9 IN EACH YEAR AS LEIF ERIKSON DAY—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 1, 1963, the name of Mr. Jackson was added as an additional cosponsor of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 76) to authorize the President to proclaim October 9 in each year as Leif Erikson Day, introduced by Mr. Humphrey (for himself and other Senators) on May 1, 1963.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. THURMOND:

Editorial entitled "Disarmament: The Grand Delusion," published in the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., on May 2, 1963; and his newsletter of May 6, 1963, entitled "Disarmament: Wishful Thinking."

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR HUMPHREY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the Washington Post of May 5 appears an article, by the able and highly knowledgeable Capitol correspondent, Robert C. Albright, which deals with the brilliant majority whip, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr Humphrey].

Mr. Albright, by the adept use of highlights and sidelights from the Senator's career, presents a very vivid profile of our distinguished colleague, who is noted for his honesty, his integrity, his knowhow, his understanding, and his tolerance. As a Senator, Hubert Humphrey is an outstanding example of the value of full debate in the Senate in clarifying the issues which confront us and in the creation and evolution of remedies for meeting these issues. As a leader in this body and in the Democratic Party, he personifies the dedication to public responsibility and the courageous approach to innovation which for so many years have kept Democrats closely attuned to the needs of the American people.

Mr. Albright, in his unique and exceptional fashion, has given the public a revealing glimpse of one of the most able of Senators. I am delighted to call his article to the attention of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Perpetual Motion Humphrey Has Soared in 15 Years

(By Robert C. Albright)

The U.S. Senate has many wonders, but only one challenge to natural law: For going on 15 years now, one of its Members has been in perpetual motion.

The bundle of energy is Minnesota's Hubert H. Humphrey, compulsive talker, walker, idea catalyst and wit. He can spout more words, put in more bills, whirl in and out of more meetings, race over more territory than any other politician in memory. He's all over the Senate's legislative spectrum.

Dazzled colleagues can't explain how he keeps up the pace. Contrary to legend, this sort of vitality doesn't come out of those vitamin bottles he always keeps handy around the office. Humphrey generates activity. When forced to lay off, he frets, wilts, and turns physically pale.

At 52, a comparative youth by Senate standards, he has mellowed slightly from the brash young Democrat of 39 who first came to the Chamber from Minnesota in January 1949. To the Senate, he has become a fact of political life. But the galleries rediscover him daily and reporters monitor him as they would a man in orbit.

He's been called everything from a windbag to a paragon of oratorical brilliance; from a meddler to a goal-scoring team player—depending on who's talking. The truth, as always, lies in between.

But however one rates him otherwise, he's a bright daub of color across the Senate's sepia landscape.

In two decades, he has clambered from defeated candidate for mayor of Minneapolis to No. 2 Democrat in the Senate. A fellow Senator he once tried to lick in the presidential primaries, John F. Kennedy, now sits in the White House but listens to his advice.

In a way, Humphrey has become a sort of idea factory for Kennedy administration bills. The Peace Corps, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and the Senate-phased youth opportunities and wilderness bills had their inception in Humphrey proposals.

The Chamber that once gawked at his flaming liberalism, and smiled at his boundless enthusiasms, long ago took him into its inner club. The liberalism is still there, tempered by experience, but even the southerners have learned to live with him.

Critics say he tries to do too much, puts in too many bills, fails to set priorities and ration his time. He has all the traits of the man in a hurry. Sometimes he even catches up with his appointments, but seldom on time.

Newsmen, the most critical of audiences, have grown used to cooling their heels while waiting for his scheduled press conferences. When he shows up, it's worth it. But often the time runs out and the conference is canceled.

HUMPHREY has been known to attend, even speak at, three or four luncheons in one day, but he generally returns to his office hungry and unfed. When he finds time, he drops by the Senate cafeteria for a sandwich and some soup.

He is likely to react to the challenge of the moment and respond to the stimulus of an immediate set of circumstances rather than plan ahead carefully. In many long-range fields, however, he has shown phenomenal perseverance.

He has been President Kennedy's strong right arm on disarmament policy. Under General Eisenhower as well as under Mr. Kennedy, in fact, he stoutly maintained that an effective nuclear test-ban treaty was in the national interest of the United States.

Among HUMPHREY's surprising number of legislative firsts was S. 3675, calling for establishment of a Peace Corps. He introduced it in the Senate June 15, 1960. Many others had supported the idea and called for a study, but HUMPHREY got there first with a bill. In 1961, HUMPHREY helped push Mr. Kennedy's own Peace Corps bill to enactment.

Two years before, during the Eisenhower administration, the Senate passed a Humphrey youth employment bill. It foundered in the House. This year, HUMPHREY urged the President to give the Kennedy youth bill No. 1 priority. During the pre-Easter rush, the Senate passed it, with Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, joining HUMPHREY in applying the spurs.

HUMPHREY was among the first to push the food for peace idea, and as long ago as 1960 he proposed an Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Eight years ago he scored another first, offering the original bill to preserve millions of acres of America's wilderness. The Senate recently passed it, for the second straight year.

Sometimes HUMPHREY improvises with the ideas of others to frame legislation aimed at pressing needs. Just now there's a gleam in his eye reflecting his concern for the problems of megalopolis and our overpopulated seaboard areas. Any day now there'll probably be a Humphrey bill on how best to assure for future generations adequate open space and recreational facilities.

During the 1960 presidential year, four full-fledged Democratic presidential candidates blossomed in the Senate. But it was HUMPHREY who directly challenged Mr. Kennedy in decisive primaries all the way from Wisconsin to HUMPHREY's West Virginia "Waterloo."

Few would have bet money on HUMPHREY's political future when Mr. Kennedy became the Nation's 34th President. But Mr. Kennedy welcomed HUMPHREY into the leadership fold. Today, there are few legislators closer to the White House.

In the Senate, his stature has grown as second in command to Democratic Leader MANSFIELD and heir apparent to the office if the Senate follows its recent tradition of promoting the majority whip.

Time was when the Senate's southern Democrats would not have stood still for any leadership role for the man who came to the Senate in the wake of the bruising civil rights fight he led on the 1948 Democratic convention floor. Barely had he taken his oath before he tangled with a leading southerner, Virginia's HARRY FLOOD BYRD. The Senate, which stands by its seniors, administered a merciless hazing.

But today HUMPHREY gets along reasonably well with the Dixie contingent. The fact is that he likes most of the southern Members and they respect him. They fall out during every civil rights ruckus, then make friends again.

HUMPHREY's own basic liberalism is not subject to challenge, but occasionally he is needled by some of the progressives for not playing a more militant role. In one instance, he was asked to join a picket line at the White House in support of a liberal cause. Said HUMPHREY:

"Why do that, when I can go in and have breakfast with the President?"

Today's Senate is not noted for its orators. The last golden-voiced speaker passed on with the retirement of the late Senator Walter F. George, Democrat, of Georgia. With a few notable exceptions, modern Senators speak their piece without rising to forensic heights, then call it a day.

HUMPHREY is one of the exceptions. On a moment's notice, he can delight the Senate with a sparkling flood of words and humor. Seldom if ever is there any prepared text. The day before his appearance as a featured Gridiron dinner speaker, aides were startled to learn that he had prepared nothing in advance. A text was rushed out on the eve of the dinner.

Whether on the stump or in the Senate, HUMPHREY has only one problem: How to turn off the torrent of talk. For the first 20 minutes, he's a charmer. Then the audience grows restless. For HUMPHREY doesn't know when to stop.

Recently he worked out a compromise. By sheer willpower he holds speeches short during the business start of the Senate's day. Then he compensates by delivering those long, long speeches after most of his colleagues have gone home.

One way or another, to an audience or without one, he has to talk.

LAOS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the press, this morning, carries reports that Prince Souvanna Phouma may withdraw as Prime Minister of Laos. These reports, Mr. President, are most disturbing. From the outset, he has been the one man in a position of leadership in Laos who has been fully and courageously dedicated to the concept of a peaceful, neutral, and unified Laos. His withdrawal at this time would spell the end of effective efforts to create, in that nation, conditions which would benefit all concerned and, most of all, the people of Laos. It would spell the end, for all practical purposes, of the attempt to apply the Geneva accords.

Mr. President, the cost of United States aid to Laos has been sharply reduced during the brief period in which Souvanna Phouma has been Prime Minister. If Souvanna Phouma is now compelled to withdraw, if circumstances are such that he feels that further efforts are fruitless, as it would seem to me that this Nation should give immediate consideration to the complete termination of all United States aid to Laos, pending a complete reexamination of our entire problem there.

So long as Souvanna Phouma remains, there is hope that a solution can be achieved which will salvage something worthwhile for peace and freedom in return for the approximately $500 million which, in a decade, we have poured into that remote land. If he goes, there is little prospect of anything but a prolonged blood bath, induced by rival war lords, supported by outside powers, which will devastate the remote and rustic villages and decimate the peaceful inhabitants of that unfortunate kingdom. It is doubtful, in my opinion, that it is in any way in the U.S. interest to subsidize any part of that revolting process.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, let me ask the distinguished majority leader whether I correctly interpret his statement on Laos to mean that if the efforts of Souvanna Phouma are not successful, and if he is forced to withdraw as Prime Minister, all our aid to Laos should stop immediately; or that our aid should continue until we reexamine our Laos policy after which our aid to that country might be stopped.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Let me repeat my statement: "If Souvanna Phouma is now compelled to withdraw, if circumstances are such that he feels that further efforts are fruitless, it would seem to me that this Nation should give immediate consideration to the complete termination of all U.S. aid to Laos, pending a complete reexamination of our entire position there."

That decision is not—of course, will not be—the decision of the Senator from Montana. It is the decision of the President of the United States which must prevail. He would have at his fingertips all the available information as to what the situation was there, and he would have to make the decision. But in view of the situation which has developed in that unhappy kingdom, I believe that the times may call for drastic action of the sort proposed. Souvanna Phouma, in my opinion, is the one man who can keep Laos together and bring about the creation of a buffer state, a neutral state, and a unified state.

We ought to keep that in mind.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Montana. I have been in Laos. The only question I raised about the Senator's statement is that if we should shut off all aid immediately, there would certaintly be great turmoil. On the other hand, I agree with the Senator that current events are fast bringing this matter to a conclusion unless the present government can be continued under the Geneva accord. If the Geneva agreement breaks down, our aid policy certainly should be reexamined, and we should come to some definite conclusion regarding our entire Laos policy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am delighted at the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts. I am glad to note that he is in accord with the suggestion—and it is only a suggestion—which I have made. I would point out that, once before, Souvanna Phouma was forced from the premiership, and on that occasion, following his withdrawal, the situation in Laos became worse and our aid was expanded enormously.

I should like to point out also that Souvanna Phouma is the one man in the present situation upon whom it seems possible to depend to bring about the type of agreement which was envisaged in the Geneva accord. This agreement was at best tenuous, a calculated risk. But I also point out that what happens in Laos, in view of its location, is very important in relation to the rest of southeast Asia.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is very true. If Laos goes, the whole situation over there will be very much changed. We must make sure that Laos does not go if we can possible prevent it, but certainly our aid should not be continued there indefinitely. We are really supporting the entire Government of Laos today, or at least 75 percent of it. If our aid were suddenly withdrawn, there would be no chance for a stable government in Laos in my opinion.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If Souvanna Phouma were to withdraw, the situation of Laos would become very much more difficult and would cause us to reexamine our whole policy because of the dangers which would come about because of such an action. If he were to withdraw, the dangerous situation in southeast Asia would become doubly dangerous as a result.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There is no question about that.

NATIONS OF THE PACIFIC—ARTICLES BY ROY A. ROBERTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President during the month of April, the Kansas City Star published a series of articles by the distinguished chairman of the board of this outstanding newspaper, Mr. Roy A. Roberts. Mr. Roberts toured the rim of the Western Pacific and the countries and islands of the South Pacific. He wrote vividly of his impressions, garnered, with a reporter's eye and ear, from New Zealand to Tokyo.

As I have noted on previous occasions, this is a region of the world of which our knowledge and understanding are only too sparse and limited. That is particularly the case with respect to the two great nations "down under" with whom we are allied—New Zealand and Australia. Mr. Roberts has performed a public service in reporting on his visits to those countries and to the other regions of the Far East. Let me say, too, that in his penetrating article on the new State of Hawaii he has illuminated not only the great addition which its admission to the Union has made, but also its high importance to the future of the United States in the Pacific.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the series of excellent articles by Mr. Roy Roberts be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Star, Apr. 12, 1963]

Peace Dagger by Red China—Mao's Forces Hold More Peril Than Russia, Roy Roberts Reports—Leadership at Stake—Edge Over Soviets Seen in Deep-Rooted Asia-for-Asians Bond

(Note.—Since early this year, Roy A. Roberts has been traveling in the Far East. This is the first of several articles written upon his return.)

Back home after a fascinating, nearly 3-month tour of the South Pacific and Orient, I find several impressions—just that, no more—stand out in my mind.

Communist Red China presents a far more dangerous threat to world peace and our own future security than Russia. Of that I am completely convinced.

Seeing, firsthand, the population explosion in the Orient—you saw it, felt it and it bore in on you in country after country—I brought home the feeling that this pressure of people is almost as dangerous as the nuclear threat itself. History tells us nothing has created more wars than this pressure of populations for survival.

The split between Mao, the Red Chinese boss, and Khrushchev, the Russian dictator, is far more serious and deep-rooted, and could have more far-reaching consequences, than we have recognized so far over here.

A TIME OF STRESS

But don't be too sanguine about it. Conceivably, in the long pull, it could work out to the advantage of the free world. On the other hand, as the two rival camps of communism pull and tug in a power struggle, it could make more difficult our immediate job of finding a way to live in the same world with Russia and Red China. And for the present, this latter result is more probable.

Of all the trouble and danger spots—and they're everywhere—in that vast, unfathomable Far East that we so little understand, Indonesia seemed to me, on a hunch, to be nearest the exploding point. This could create a situation even more dangerous than the tough, indecisive battle we now are waging to hold Vietnam, in southeast Asia, out from under Red domination.

I could go on and list many more impressions here, such as the fabulous story of Japan's comeback, but these are the vital ones concerning world peace which I picked up on an altogether-too-hasty survey.

A VACATION TRIP

I don't pretend to be any expert on the Far East; a vacation trip on a luxury ship is not a very good premise for any survey, and we left the ship frequently to fly, in order to cover more ground. Such a trip, in itself, would be no better background than that of someone who spends a few days in New York and Washington and then poses as an expert on America.

What I did do during the trip, however, was to meet newspapermen at every major port and pick their minds on how they saw conditions in the Far East. Most of them had been out there for years—this is certainly no field for the novice reporter. What follows, then, outside of certain personal reactions—such as the feeling of the sheer pressure of people, people, people—represents my sizeup of many views, some agreeing and some sharply in conflict, of those who are living through these thrilling days of an emerging Orient on the march.

OPINION OF THOSE THERE

I purposely did not seek out people in government, because I wanted to get more objective viewpoints, but I did occasionally run into some very well-informed people in both government and business. This report is based more on what the men on the job out there feel about the Far East.

Red China, of course, is the real enigma of that part of the world and, I might add, increasingly is becoming more of a factor in the future than is Russia. That despite the very serious, even critical, times they are having behind their Bamboo Curtain. You sense the danger specifically in every port and capital from Singapore to Tokyo.

Make no mistake about it, the Chinese brand of communism is a far greater threat to world peace than the Russian version, and there's certainly no reason to be lulled into security by the latter, either. They just operate differently. Always, and particularly in the Far East, you have to view everything in the perspective of history, because time is endless in the Orient. It might be added, so is their patience. They're not in a hurry as we are.

You sense, too, that in Russia, as history has always shown to be the case, the fires of revolution are beginning to burn out. They have begun to acquire some of the things that make life better. They have built up a giant industrial complex, have projected themselves into a world power and now they have learned enough to realize that nuclear war would mean total destruction. Hence, basically, they now seek to communize the world, as always, but short of total war.

In Red China, on the other hand, they don't have much to lose. A war of nuclear devastation, with their hundreds of millions of people, might possibly leave them in a relatively improved position with fewer mouths to feed. Thus their tough, uncompromising position in world affairs.

Let it be said, no one is fooled by Mr. K—he is no angel but he has shown that he doesn't want total war. The pressures of the struggle with China for leadership of the Communist world, however, in some respects make it more difficult for him to work out any kind of accommodation with the West.

A BUFFER STATE

Again, let's lug in what history has told us for hundreds of years, that Russia has always been more or less a buffer state between the East and West. Moscow, of course, vociferously denies and scorns any suggestion that a complete breach might occur between them and Peiping, with Russia turning toward the West. Nevertheless, unless somebody touches that fatal nuclear button in the next few years, its a fairly good guess that, as the Russian internal economy improves, they will again find themselves back in their historic role as the East-West buffer state. That's just a thought—not a prophecy.

At Hong Kong, especially, naturally asked everyone—newspapermen, educators and whomever—how really serious was this break between Moscow and Peiping? I was surprised at the unanimity with which they all took it seriously. I had expected to hear of some public, kiss-and-make-up type of meeting for the sake of giving the world a picture of Communist unity.

THE RIFT DEEPENS

Instead I found that most observers felt the split had only emphasized basic cleavages between Russia and China, and that as the years progress these will deepen and widen rather than heal.

One night in Hong Kong, sitting in a restaurant with a small group of Chinese and a delightful American couple who have dedicated much of their lives to China, I got this very succinct description of the situation from a very intelligent Chinese:

There are three angles, he explained.

First, the struggle between Khrushchev and Mao for personal leadership of world communism. Much of that is a matter of personalities, but it goes deeper, to the basic question of which way the leadership will go.

Secondly, there is a strong nationalistic clash between the two countries, along their borders and over the issue of which will dominate their satellite and neighboring countries. These differences will endure no matter what the next few years develop.

And thirdly, there is the ideological issue as to how Marxism and communism should be interpreted and applied. This is the one over which they quarrel publicly, but the first two factors are more important, and in the order listed.

That was about as clear a picture of the situation as I encountered, and as I tried it out on others there was general assent. Yet everywhere I was cautioned, "Don't expect too much." There is just as much chance that the split will make the free world situation more difficult instead of less so.

Another man who has lived for many years in Hong Kong told me:

"At first I thought it was a phony quarrel, just a bit of minor maneuvering, and I wasn't sure but what it was being done for deceptive purposes. Yet just when I expected it would be patched up with some sort of love feast, out of nowhere came the most bitter exchanges yet between Khrushchev and Mao, almost beyond the point of return.

A REAL DIVISION

"The longer I live out here, the less certain I am of anything they'll do. Despite any public making-up that may occur, the basic clash between two schools of communism as to which will continue to exist certainly has been dramatized. And we should never forget it."

At Singapore and all other stops, I heard varying opinions as to whether the other Communist or near-Communist nations of Asia would side with Peiping or Moscow in case of a showdown; countries, that is, such as Burma, Indonesia, and Mongolia. Except for North Korea and North Vietnam, most of them still give some public lipservice to Russia, because Russia can give them things they need.

I found, however, that most of those who have lived longest in the Orient believe that if those nations had to make a choice—and they don't want to—they probably would side with Peiking, for two reasons:

First, they're Asiatic, and Mao's revolution is more than just Communist. Underlying it is a philosophy of Asia for the Asians. It was even more a peasant uprising than was that in Russia.

USING RUSSIA'S PLOY

In the second place, there is a strange paradox. For years, in her efforts at international subversion and infiltration, Russia has used the technique of representing the have-nots against the haves in the Western bloc nations. In the Orient, now, China is using the same technique in her power struggle with Moscow, only Russia represents the haves and China the have-not countries. And it's just as effective as what the West has had to contend with.

All this points up the fact that when we believe we can make a deal with Russia on the Far East, it may be just a part of her devious strategy of deception. Russia may not be able to deliver any more, as she used to, now that China is prepared to ignore any Moscow decisions as not binding on her at all.

The very least China would accept, apparently, is equal partnership in communism with complete domination of Asia. But with the huge populations of the Orient which would fall into the Chinese orbit under such an arrangement, Khrushchev probably is no more anxious to see this happen than he would be to see China become a nuclear power.

Up to now, his ace in the hole in asserting world Communist leadership is that Russia is a nuclear power but little else.

A SHIFTING LEADERSHIP

Where is it all going to end? I can't pretend to have brought home any specific answer, but I would point out one highly significant factor for the future: Not only in the Far East but in Europe as well there is a period of waiting and drifting now for one vital reason—the world leaders there are growing old. Mao is aging; Chiang Kai-shek, on Formosa, is nearing the end of his string. Khrushchev himself is no youngster and is showing the strain. In West Germany, Adenauer will step down next fall, and in France, De Gaulle has reached the age where more and more people are asking, "What next? And who next?" Elections are in the offing in Britain with some new faces likely to come on the scene.

Of course, no one can predict, but I would suggest that barring the usual passing crises—and they'll always be with us in both the East and West—not until the old leaders pass on will it become clear how world trends and currents are going to run in the years ahead. I came home from the Far East with the feeling that this is how it will be out there, too.

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Star, Apr. 14, 1963]

CAN HOLD OFF CHINA DECISION—BUT EVENTUALLY THE UNITED STATES MUST DEAL WITH RED GIANT—NO RECOGNITION NOW—MOST OBSERVERS BELIEVE THERE WOULD BE NOTHING TO GAIN AT PRESENT

(By Roy A. Roberts)

When you're there, you find yourself caught up in the spirit of the Orient where time means little or nothing and history means much.

You come away from an entirely too brief look-see at the problems of the Bamboo Curtain and the massive Communist revolution behind it—but you come away without a feeling of red-hot urgency.

What's happening there is something that will be going on for a long time to come. So the threat to world peace and to our own security is not for now, but in the long years ahead. How many years is anybody's guess.

STILL FAR BEHIND

Today, the mighty giant of China with its 700 or 800 million people—even they don't know how many—is not industrialized. The Chinese are about where the Russians were three or four decades ago. The Chinese have a long way to go.

But all you have to do is take a look at Japan to see what the Oriental mind can do when given the opportunity. In the span of a few years Japan has become one of the industrial powers, not only of the Orient, but of the entire world.

True, the Japanese had several decades of industrial development, but look how fast they moved, given the time, money, and know-how. There is no reason in the world why the awakening giant of China, with its enormous population, can't do as well. The Chinese already have shown their ability to be the traders and bankers of the East.

ONLY A GUESS

It took Russia 40 years to do the job. How long will it take China? It's anybody's guess. But you can see the probable challenge to the Western world. The great move to industry away from a crude agricultural economy is under way.

Coming away from a brief and entirely too sketchy look at what's going on behind that Bamboo curtain, I find three questions are asked by nearly everyone. I wish I could give definite answers. I didn't find them. But I can suggest some of the possible answers from the thinking I picked up. The questions:

1. When will China become a nuclear power?

2. What are present conditions in China—as best known by constant observers?

3. Should we or should we not recognize the most populous nation in the world and should we continue to oppose its membership in the United Nations?

A GUARDED SECRET

As to that first question, no one knows, and nearly everyone is trying to find out, how far along Chinese scientists are in crashing into the nuclear club. This is a most carefully guarded secret and some say that even the Russians don't know. One thing is dead certain: Khrushchev is no more anxious to see Mao with the bomb than we are.

I asked over and over again the best judgment of those who might read the riddle of the bomb timetable. Some thought Red China might set off its first explosion within the year. But almost without exception they would add, "Don't panic when this happens."

It would be a far cry, they explain, from that explosion to actually putting working missiles on an operational basis. Of course the Chinese can do it and we can't discount the fact. But the industrial capacity simply isn't there for any quick transformation from an experimental explosion to an atomic arsenal.

A JUNIOR MEMBER

France, for instance, had its first explosion in February 1960. The French still are a long way even from junior membership in the nuclear club. And France is highly industrialized. You might as well make your own guess on Red China, but don't panic. It's coming, even though nobody on the outside knows when.

All this brings up a nagging question. To date, all our negotiations over control have been with Russia although the British more or less have been on the sidelines. But if we are going to have any real global restrictions on nuclear arms, some day Red China will have to be taken into consideration, whether we like it or not. That is one of the paradoxes in the world picture. Nearly everyone agrees that when China gets the bomb, the weapon will be in the hands of one of the most irresponsible powers, a great threat to peace.

If the world is to have enforceable curbs on atomic weapons, some day those curbs will have to apply to China—or they will be worthless.

NEWS LEAKS OUT

Now to the second question on present conditions in China. You get most of the information from across the border. The Communist radio beats waves of information into Hong Kong, Tokyo, and other spots. What they say officially is no secret. It's carefully monitored by many agents. Also, the press of Red China gets out in a steady flow. There is no effort to hold the newspapers in. This information is carefully studied.

Frankly, it seems that the situation is almost the same as in those days along the Russian border after World War I when the Baltic States were the listening posts.

You get a pretty fair and varied picture although the details aren't always adequate or necessarily accurate.

BETTER THAN IN PAST

No one disputes that conditions in Red China, with its huge population, are somewhat better than they were a year ago. That isn't saying too much. An almost unfailing barometer of conditions is the influx of refugees into Hong Kong and the Portuguese crown colonies. When starvation is the only alternative, even the police and the army can't keep down the rush to get out. When the food supply is better, the tide of refugees slows down. But it never stops entirely.

Statistically, I found from government people that, on the average, food production was up 20 percent this year. But that's a rise from an almost impossible starvation level. I doubt whether folks here at home realize how close Red China was to being on the ropes for a year or so. We knew that conditions were bad, but just how bad came out only later.

Some of the trouble was due to droughts, floods, and generally bad weather. But you learn now that much of the difficulty came from the collapse of the Central Government program of completely communizing farm production, and sacrificing everything for industry.

A TURNAROUND

So serious did the food crisis become that the great industrial push had to be stopped. Factories under construction were cut off short. Plants ready to go into production had to stand idle. The Government simply had to get back to food production and the major industrial effort is still suspended. Without wheat purchases from Canada and Australia, the central government might have had a hard time weathering the storm. But it did.

Perhaps it is significant that in various provinces farmers now are allowed to keep small plots and sell the produce. This information came from Chinese who had recently filtered out from behind the curtain. The free enterprise farming, plus better weather, has spurred production.

But many of us probably have missed the really significant event of those dark days of crop failures and starvation. That was the power struggle that set in between Russia and China. Khrushchev withdrew his vitally important technicians and he choked off the flow of aid. No doubt that added great bitterness to the ideological quarrel between the two leaders of the Communist world.

You heard in Hong Kong that Khrushchev was perfectly willing to see the Chinese regime go to pot rather than to face its challenge of leadership in the world and particularly Asia.

MADE THEM PAY

The Russians also made the Chinese pay through the nose for the aid they got. This information comes secondhand, but it is much discussed on the perimeter of Red China.

Summing up this point, you get the picture that conditions could get better, but that already the regime is getting somewhat cocky again. It still isn't strong enough to resume the massive drive toward industrialization.

But in the meantime the Chinese aren't averse to military adventures anywhere that would help politically or fan the spirit of the people. Excursions in India and Vietnam are examples. But they aren't ready yet for anything big.

Most observers say that while the Chinese people may not be happy, the regime is firmly entrenched and won't be upset. As for Chiang's invasion talk, it has propaganda value.

But that's about all it amounts to. Another food collapse could present a different picture. Food production is an internal problem that probably has kept Red China from far greater aggression. We can be absolutely sure that the ruthless program of the Government is to get what it wants, no matter what the cost. It's a different picture from Moscow and the wily Mr. K.

HARD TO ANSWER

Now for the big question. Should we or shouldn't we recognize China—and what about acceptance by the U.N.?

I'll be frank here. I had much more positive views on the subject and thought I knew more about it than before I visited the Orient. I wish I were as positive in my thinking now as I was then. It's one thing to sit at long range. It's another thing altogether to sit on the edge of that teeming, mysterious continent and try to give answers.

Offhand, I found that most of those I talked to gave the opinion that nothing was to be gained at this time by recognition—and that possibly, there was something to lose.

The same people also thought that U.N. membership and diplomatic recognition by the United States are inevitable—sometime. The veteran observers thought that these things would have to come after a gesture by Red China. Advances on our part would involve too much loss of face. After all, we have been their favorite whipping boys—the arch imperialists.

One mistake probably has been the American conception of what is constituted by diplomatic recognition. Certainly it doesn't mean approval. But that is what it seems to the American people. You simply don't condone sin—at least publicly. Yet this is not a realistic approach.

U.N. IS THE FOE

The situation is complicated. For instance, it's not ourselves but the U.N. that is at war with China. Although the truce in Korea has been in effect for years, the problem for the U.N. is to take in a country that fictionally is still at war with the U.N.

China is insisting that we abandon Taiwan (Formosa) and Chiang. Of course that's out of the question. Impossible and dictatorial as Chiang may be at times, we can't forget that several million Chinese followed him into exile. If we abandoned him the greatest blood bath the world has ever seen probably would follow. It would utterly destroy our position in the Far East.

Also, many overlook the sea and air defense line we've drawn to contain communism in the Pacific. It starts in Japan and runs through Okinawa, Formosa, the Philippines and ranges down to the two sturdy commonwealth nations, Australia and New Zealand. If we ever abandoned Formosa, the line would be disastrously pierced. Folks at home probably don't realize the extent of the enormous bases we've built up in the Pacific over the years. This is the line of containment far from our own shores.

WAIT AND SEE

So there you have just a few of the problems involved in recognition. When you find veteran and knowledgeable observers wary of such a move, certainly there seems to be no reason to hurry. Nor is any immediate change of policy called for. Maybe we'd better adopt the Chinese policy of letting things rock along for awhile.

On one phase related directly to my own business, I reversed my thinking. I admit to getting up before newspaper meetings in the past and urging that U.S. newsmen be permitted to go to China.

But when you get to the firing line of Hong Kong, Singapore, and Tokyo, you find that most of the news comes from sources outside the curtain. There are the radio monitoring, the publications and the people who have just left China.

This is better than getting news spoonfed to you on the inside. Sure, we should go when there is freedom to move about, ask questions and get information. But the correspondents in China now seem to be completely haltered. They get scooped every day by those on the outside. For the most part, in the Far East, you write what the government wants or you get arrested or kicked out.

ACTION SOMEDAY

But someday, sometime—already we're getting this oriental sense of patience and time—we will have to take China into the family of nations even if it is still Red. We will have to work with them somehow.

It won't be too long until this nation of 800 million is a nation of a billion people. You can't ignore them as if they don't exist, whether you like it or not.

As of today, I doubt whether we could get them to agree on anything—disarmament, trade or whatever. But someday they may recognize that their revolution—partly Communist, even more Asiatic—will have to be adapted to the existence of the rest of the world.

Someday—but when?

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Star of Apr. 15, 1963]

EAR TO THREAT IN HONG KONG—CROWN COLONY IN ORIENT SERVES AS MAJOR LISTENING POST ON RED CHINA—A CITY OF CONTRASTS—CLEAN AND WELL-GOVERNED, IT IS ALMOST CHOKED WITH REFUGEES FROM COMMUNISM

(By Roy A. Roberts)

Of all the places we visited in the South Pacific and the Orient, if I had to pick one to see again, it unquestionably would be Hong Kong.

Some other spots were more beautiful, Bangkok for example. Compared with Bangkok, with its huge temples, ageless shrines that are roots to the past, Hong Kong in terms of the Orient is a new and upstart city with little or no tradition.

I wasn't prepared for all we found in Hong Kong—its charming setting, its beautiful harbor, the flood of lights running up the mountainside by night, the myriad of shops and fine business blocks, the really good hotels with their excellent meals, the friendly people—and the pitiable poverty of its refugees.

EAR TO RED CHINA

But above all else Hong Kong today is the No. 1 listening post of the Orient, and that made it doubly fascinating to me. It's the major link between Red China, the most populous nation on earth, and the rest of the world.

The situation of this city is almost incredible. Much has been said of West Berlin as an indefensible island in a sea of communism.

Yet here is this tiny British crown colony, on the very edge of the land mass of Communist China, growing and expanding with the apparent acquiescence of the fiercely nationalistic Reds. From the city, you can drive out to the sealed-off border in less than an hour.

The commies could take over Hong Kong in a matter of hours, and everyone knows it. Yet millions of dollars are being poured into this exposed city and the tide of investment is rising, not dropping.

Obviously, the Reds don't move in because Hong Kong is more useful to them in its present status than it is even to the British and the West. It's their gateway to the Far Pacific and the Western world.

They need it as a trade, banking and shipping outlet. The Communists, loudly belligerent over Formosa and such fly specks as Quemoy and Matsu, nevertheless are content to let the status quo continue, seemingly for an indefinite time, on Hong Kong.

Even Khrushchev, in his recent bitter exchange with Mao over Cuba, twitted them about the contradiction of their position, pointing out they have never made a move on Hong Kong.

SEES A CONTINUANCE

Certainly this situation will continue until Red China opens some other major ports and establishes contact elsewhere with the outside.

In the meantime, hard-headed American businessmen, as well as British, are investing millions of dollars in Hong Kong. Typical is the Hilton chain, which will open a huge new hotel next month in a city where there are many fine hostelries already. Business and banking expansion continues at a feverish pace.

Before the Communist revolution in China, Hong Kong was merely an outpost of British trade, distinguished by its fine harbor and little else. The British have a knack for picking excellent seaports in this part of the world, Singapore on the Malayan peninsula, for example, and Suva in the Fiji islands, a crossroads of the Pacific.

The deep-water harbor of Hong Kong, surrounded by mountains, is a breathtakingly dramatic spectacle for the arriving traveler. It is jammed with literally thousands of vessels, giant Pacific tourist liners, countless freighters from all over the world, a continuous stream of ferry boats crossing from the island to the mainland and Chinese junks and sampans in uncounted thousands. For sheer interest, one could spend several days visiting this waterfront area alone.

In the city itself, public buildings and the banks are located on the island, with most of the main hotels and shops over on the Kowloon peninsula.

Hong Kong doesn't have big department stores, such as those in Tokyo which rival our own, but so many thousands of small shops that one wonders how they all survive. Tailor shops by the hundreds are found all the way from the brand new sea terminal to small, winding alleys. Jewelry shops offer jade and pearls, others have fine silks and art work.

With the great influx of tourists, tailors, and dressmakers work almost around the clock. You can get a suit made, not in a week or 10 days, but within 48 hours.

It is a shoppers' paradise, built on cheap labor and small margins. Hong Kong merchants even undersold the Japanese on their historic specialty, pearls, to the point where the Japanese had to take off the tax to hold the trade.

A shop with a small store front may have living quarters in the rear, where the family which operates it lives on slim rations, indeed.

A word of advice to American husbands: Don't take your wife to Hong Kong unless you're prepared to loosen your bank roll.

PROBLEM OF REFUGEES

In this colony the British have done their usual competent job. It's clean and well-governed, yet the British cannot cope with the seemingly endless flood of refugees from the interior of China.

The streets of Hong Kong are packed with their teeming masses—an American woman who lives there remarked that she felt safer in the streets than she would in Washington or Chicago.

For me, the people were the most interesting aspect. I like people, period. And I liked the Chinese especially. All through the Orient I found them friendly, intelligent, and appealing.

Of course, I didn't get behind the Bamboo Curtain, where 700 to 800 million of them have been subjected to a continuous brainwashing of hatred for the United States, to see what effect this is having. It certainly has had no effect outside of Red China.

Hong Kong, obviously, has its problems. The one that would disturb me is the constant threat of Red China taking it over, but over there they act as if the present arrangement would go on forever.

The gravest problem is that of absorbing, feeding and finding work for the many tens of thousands of refugees. Crown authorities try to hold them back, but it is like stopping the ocean tides. They slip in through every opening to join their relatives already in Hong Kong.

In this city you see the same story found everywhere in the Orient: The sumptuous quarters above the harbor of the wealthy merchants, bankers, and traders have as neighbors hundreds of squatters' huts built from tin oil cans and other scraps.

The heart aches to see any human being living in such abject poverty; existing, nothing more. It's a situation far beyond the capability of even this efficiently run crown colony.

MAJOR NEWS POST

For me, as a newspaperman, Hong Kong was especially interesting because of the news coverage there. Along with Tokyo and Singapore, it is a major world listening post for news.

The press services—Associated Press and United Press International—the news magazines and broadcasting networks all are making tremendous outlays to keep the world and especially the United States informed of this awakening Orient and its problems.

Out there you find real news veterans who have lived in the Far East for years.

Years ago the British news service, Reuter's, dominated this area, but today the American news services are doing the No. 1 job.

I was very proud of my profession, seeing how they are meeting the challenge of covering this increasingly important world crisis spot. The costs are tremendous and the difficulties many.

In Hong Kong, Tokyo, and Singapore the press enjoys the greatest freedom, but at the outposts, particularly in the new countries, coverage is almost indescribably difficult. A reporter who writes anything which displeases the government may be jailed or kicked out. The press services are busy constantly trying to get some staff member or some story released.

Most of the services have their headquarters in Tokyo, but now even some individual newspapers maintain correspondents in Hong Kong, from where they can fly to trouble spots—and there is always trouble somewhere.

Having been in this business more than half a century, I would be remiss if I did not comment that the newsgatherers in the Orient by and large are doing a splendidly competent job, probably a better one than we at home are doing in publishing their efforts. News from the Orient, except in times of crisis, seldom rates high in reader esteem.

DRIVE FOR EDUCATION

One other aspect of Hong Kong—and one with a Kansas City angle—rates mention: The great surge for education, more intensive than here at home, as seen in the many colleges and universities.

The Protestant missionaries, driven from Red China and forced to give up their schools there, are continuing their work here.

Among these educators are Dr. Andrew T. Roy and his wife, who is a sister-in-law of Homer C. Wadsworth of the Kansas City Board of Education. The Chung Chi College where Dr. Roy is a department chairman is a fascinating, people-to-people type of operation, training leaders from all over the Orient.

After graduation, when they return to their various countries, they are about as good ambassadors for American friendship as could be developed, and probably more effective than foreign aid.

The story of Hong Kong's problems and significance is almost endless. But its key role is that of a listening post pointing toward Red China from the free world. And it is a most interesting and comfortable spot in which to listen.

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Star, Apr. 16, 1963]

BIG IMPACT BY SURGING JAPAN—THE VIGOROUS ISLAND NATION MATCHES WEST GERMANY IN ITS COMEBACK—MUST HAVE U.S. TIES—ABSOLUTELY DEPENDENT ON TRADE, NATION LOOKS TO US FOR PROSPERITY

(By Roy A. Roberts)

The miracle story of the Orient is Japan. It's all that and more—make no mistake about it.

I'd never visited this fabulous, jampacked little island of 90 million people that soon will pass 100 million. So I had no background for comparison with the past.

But I had seen the comeback of West Germany—the great rebuilding of the Ruhr after the desolation of war. Now West Germany has one of the world's most potent industrial complexes. That story has been duplicated in Japan on the other side of the globe, perhaps over even greater obstacles. But there is so much similarity in the two comebacks that it strikes you in the face.

VARIETY OF FACTORS

Many factors contributed to the industrial recovery in Germany and Japan. But at the bottom, the basic causes were identical. These were the determination of the people to come back through sheer, hard work without thoughts of hours or wages.

West Germany saw much of its industry smashed in the war and the Russians dismantled a lot of what was left. But the Germans do have tremendous resources in coal, iron, and other raw material. Japan not only suffered comparable destruction, it never has had the natural resources. The Japanese have to ship in the materials, fabricate them and sell them back to the world as finished products.

You don't need statistics to see this tremendous comeback. You see it and feel it from the minute you hit Japan at Kobe. You are aware of it every minute. It's almost unbelievable.

GRIMY TOWNS THERE

Except for the signs, and a bit of difference in the construction of homes, it not hard to imagine yourself in Pittsburgh, Pa., Gary, Ind., or Youngstown, Ohio, instead of the mysterious East. As you cross Japan on the magnificent electric railway system, most drab, gray and grimy steel towns look like the steel cities of America. You ride through cities of more than a million people.

You've never heard of those cities, but there they are, pouring out smoke and steel and an amazing variety of manufactured products. From one end of the little island to the other you ride past miles of factories and shipyards. Even some of the ancient cities, like Kyoto, are thoroughly industrialized. The holy shrines are almost lost in the gray shadows of the factories.

What we must never forget is that this is an oriental nation making this great leap back to industrial leadership. And while we know that Red China is several decades behind Japan, especially in education, and still basically agricultural, we've got to look into the future. China's population is eight or nine times greater and it has immense natural resources.

You've got to ask yourself: "How soon will China build into a great industrial power as did the Russian Communists?" That's why, for the long pull in the future, the next generation will be worrying about China and the Far East. Europe is still pivotal today. But it seems inescapable that in the future Asia will be the danger.

BETTER PRODUCTS NOW

Don't think that Japan's industry turns out only shoddy, imitative goods. It's true, they do a lot of copying and they aren't always creative in manufacturing. But they turn out a lot of quality goods, too. Against the background of the recent past, the development is fantastic. More than 60 percent of Japanese industry was destroyed in the war and the residential ruin was even greater.

Yet, today, their steel plants are more modern than ours. And along with the dime-store toys, they're turning out items like 100,000-ton tankers.

So far they've been able to compete in most of the world markets. It's the United States that is having the major difficulties. As Japan and Western Europe have come back, our excessive production costs have begun to hurt. This emphasizes that the American people haven't awakened to an overriding fact: We're living in a global economy, not a national one as we used to.

PLACE OF BEAUTY

Somehow, the average newcomer to Japan generally thinks in terms of cherry blossoms, geisha girls, and mystic shrines. They've got those, of course.

The flowers were just beginning to bloom when we took our first look-see at Japan. And Mount Fuji remains one of the most spectacularly beautiful sights in the world. We had real luck on that score. Usually that majestic mountain is shrouded in clouds. We hit it at a time of bright sunshine. It's a rare, moving sight, and I looked at it by the hour from my hotel window at the foot of the mountain.

There are some wonderful hotels in Japan. The Tokyo hotels rival those of New York and so do the big stores. The contrast is great between Hong Kong, a city of small shops, and Tokyo. The big tourist palaces are run efficiently. But for me, the Japanese food couldn't come close to the Chinese with its variety of flavors and ingredients.

For the tourist, there is much beauty from the past to see in Japan. Fujiyama, of course, heads the list, and there are the ancient shrines. But right next to the temples, surprisingly, you find the rubble and debris of industry. And this brings us back to that dominating theme: You just can't ignore the drive, hustle, and bustle of the Japanese people or their will to build a vast industrial nation. You can feel it in the air and you sense a nation in motion.

A STABLE NATION

As a people, the Japanese have never had it so good. There's no question about that. Everybody I talked to said that the Government is stable and wouldn't swing left despite recurrent efforts of the Communists to stir up trouble. As long as the big industrial machine stays in high gear that stability should remain.

Japan is absolutely dependent on world trade and especially trade with the United States of America. It's strictly a matter of survival. Here in the United States, we could survive even a full-fledged depression. But Japan wouldn't survive. For Japan, an American economic debacle would be ruinous.

So you find the leaders of Japan keeping a very close eye on the state of the American economy, the tribulations of the dollar and deficit spending. If we think of these as purely American problems, the Japanese don't. They probably watch our stock market closer than we do.

There are some signs that the boom is beginning to slow up. The Japanese pointed with pride to their annual growth rate which they say still exceeds that of the Germans. Maybe so. You can see an enormous volume of construction going on everywhere. A new subway system in Tokyo is in the works and it's got the heart of the city torn up. Traffic is a mess.

ON CREDIT BASIS

You can sense, too, that a lot of this building is being done on credit. There is a close tie between government and industry with government helping a lot in the advances. It's a sort of state capitalism.

These days the Japanese have to import 20 percent of their foodstuffs just to maintain a subsistence level. The figure used to be 5 percent. They've become the world's greatest fishermen, way ahead of all other nations. They're fishing in the banks all over the world. It's an example of the almost frantic, continuous efforts to keep things in balance.

Recently they cut shipping rates to keep the maritime fleet busy. They must scramble to preserve the balance of trade. And you wonder how long the pace can be maintained and where it will end. Right now everything surges ahead. But you can't help but feel that a real bust might be in the offing.

The Japanese don't agree.

Politically, Japan seemed more stable than any place we visited. The paradox is that this great industrial giant of the Orient is not a military power. We wouldn't let them rearm and now the people don't want to. I asked again and again if there was sentiment for rearmament and I nearly always got the same answer. There might be a few stray politicians who would like an army to play with but the people wouldn't stand for it. They would overthrow any government that tried to get into an arms race.

FOR SINGLE GOAL

For years the Japanese people almost starved under a tremendous tax burden. They sacrificed and dedicated their lives for the military might of the war lords. Their gamble failed for overlordship of the Pacific. They gambled with their attack on us and lost the game.

Now the people like this idea of money being poured into the civilian economy instead of the military. That may be an oversimplification, but as a people, the Japanese have had it so much better since the war. It could be political suicide for leaders to drive for a change and rearm. This isn't my judgment but opinion I picked up in a good many talks around Tokyo. It may be a more Western attitude replacing, in part, the fatalistic, oriental approach to life.

As a matter of fact, you continually sensed the turn to the occidental world in Japan. You saw it in the clothes, the sports, the night clubs and the industrial technique.

Even the kimonos now are mostly reserved for ceremony. For example, I happened to stop at commencement exercises for a junior college. All the girls wore beautiful kimonos. But it turned out that most of these had been rented for the occasion. Nearly all the parents were in Western clothes.

SOME EXCEPTIONS

They have copied the West in so many things. I did, however, run into a taxi driver who refused a tip. That was an attitude he never picked up from either America or Europe. But it is indication of the restoration of Japanese pride and faith in their destiny after the sheer despair of crushing military defeat.

The bustle of people is perpetual. Everyday Japan looks like Broadway when the theaters let out or a big stadium after the game. You wonder how this small island can support them all.

There are colleges and schools everywhere. You couldn't turn around without bumping into a swarm of students. Japan is emphasizing education and that might be part of the answer to industrial success. We happened to be there during a school vacation and the uniformed youngsters were out by the tens of thousands—many of them on tours like us and most of them taking pictures.

If you think the Americans are camera fiends, you should see the Japanese. It seemed like everyone in Japan was snapping shutters. When I got off the boat, toting a long cigar in a holder, four or five amateur photographers materialized and started snapping pictures. Not many people smoke in Japan and fewer still smoke big cigars. This was a photographic opportunity they couldn't resist. When I got rid of the cigar they melted away.

BIGGEST IN WORLD

Naturally I was interested in my own profession and in Tokyo I visited Asahi Shumbun, their top newspaper with the biggest circulation of any in the world—some 6 million. I found that they had a huge plant—in some respects more advanced than any in America.

What a contrast it was to the paper I visited in Bangkok. There, they had a flatbed press and dozens of women sitting around folding papers—the most primitive mailroom I've ever seen. That wasn't the case in Japan. The big Tokyo paper was the most modern operation you can imagine. It typified what you found in almost every line of manufacturing.

In Tokyo they told you that the United States should give more concern to buying Japanese products and no thought at all about keeping their products out. They need the trade. This was their big worry. They said again and again that Japan was one of our biggest customers and that they couldn't buy from us unless we buy from them.

Naturally they're keeping an eye on Red China. But I didn't find the concern on that subject that we exhibit. And this is true even though the giant of Red China is only miles away across the East China Sea and Japan is unarmed.

NO TRADE DEALS

Not long ago we got excited in the States because Japan sent a trade mission to China. They signed a lot of big contracts. What came of it? Absolutely nothing. China wanted credit and Japan is working that same side of the street. The deal fell through.

An eventual reconciliation between Korea and Japan could help, because Korea has a surplus of food. But the Koreans despise the Japanese. The feeling is not unlike the old Irish hostility toward England.

Don't get the idea that Japan is sitting there defenseless and helpless. She isn't. We have forbidden her to have an army and navy, so we've had to establish great defense bases of our own. We shield Japan and we pay the bill.

As I said before, the great bulk of the people don't mind. They are quite happy to have the government invest their taxes in the domestic economy. And of course there are the terrible memories of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Any mention of the atomic bomb is almost as shocking to the Japanese as irreverence toward the Emperor. He still is the symbol of authority, by the way.

I came to Japan with the feeling that I wouldn't care much for the people. I'd never quite gotten over Pearl Harbor. But their polite little bows, courtesy and charming manners won me over. Of course, I guess I like all people everywhere.

I believe the Japanese have feelings of real good will toward the United States. It's my guess that beneath those occidental shirts their Oriental hearts are beating with genuine friendship for us.

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Star, Apr. 17, 1963]

Strong Ties in Far-Off Lands—Kinship of Australia and New Zealand Is Reassuring to Americans—Show a Zest for Life—People, Proud of Their Achievements, Find Satisfaction in Sports

(By Roy A. Roberts)

Somehow it was like meeting up with kinfolk when, after several weeks of cruising among the balmy, carefree Pacific islands we finally arrived in New Zealand and Australia—way down under.

These are not ancient countries but young ones, younger even than we are. Sturdy, self-reliant and confident of the destiny which lies ahead rather than behind them, they stand as isolated but dependable bastions of Anglo-Saxon civilization. You understand them, and feel a tug of warm kinship in your heart.

HAVE COMMON ORIGINS

This only points up our worst problem in dealing with the teeming millions of the Orient. The roots of Australia and New Zealand go back to Britain; our own origins go back not only to Britain but to all of Europe. But we have no such link to the Orient.

It is idle to believe that we can ever fully understand the Oriental mind, with its complex thinking, religions and philosophies, or that they can completely understand us and get a true image of America. As the Orient, with its huge populations, grows into a more controlling power position in the world, this problem of understanding will be our worst hurdle.

As a people, we were woefully ignorant of Europe as recently as just before World War I. But ties of bloodlines, religion and ethnic sameness made for early understanding. Our ties with the Orient must be built from the ground up.

DRAWING US CLOSER

Distance is another limitation. You cannot realize what a tremendous expanse the Pacific Ocean is, in distance and time, until you cross it on a ship. Yet the Orient need not be remote forever. Jet air travel has knit the world much closer, and when rocket travel eventually comes—as it will—spans between nations will become even narrower.

Even then, however, the bulk of the commerce between the Orient and the Western World will continue to move by sea. Admiral Mahon, the old prophet of seapower, is not obsolete in the vast area of the Pacific.

When I went on this trip I had no thought of inquiry or reporting; I went for a vacation and to get away. But, like the old firehorse, after getting through the tourism part of the trip and starting to bump into the fascinating problems of the Orient, it was just natural to start sticking my nose into finding out what was going on.

You couldn't find a better spot than the South Pacific to just sit and watch life go by. Most of those islands are out of this world and its troubles. If you want the simple life and little to worry about—taxes, deficit spending, Khrushchev, Mao, even Kennedy, nothing more serious than whether a coconut will drop on your head—this is the place.

SPOTS OF BEAUTY

Some of the islands are lovely, with the simple existence and the native dances. Tahiti was a disappointment, unless you want to join the beachcombers. Yet only 12 miles away, Moorea is exquisite and charming, one of the most breathtaking views of natural beauty anywhere.

Another lovely spot was Milford Sound, in southern New Zealand, a Norwegian-type fiord complete with glaciers and waterfalls. A little place in the Cook Islands, Rarotonga, was delightful because it was so primitive and the people so friendly. That and Bali, with its temples and quaint people, stand out in memory.

But when you pull into Auckland, New Zealand's busy port, you're back in the world streams with a bang. New Zealand is amazing, with just about everything in the way of scenery jamjacked into those two small islands.

PASTURES PREDOMINATE

Just average-sized cities, the largest about 400,000, but what a countryside. You can drive through miles and miles of rolling, pastoral landscapes, like a great park. Sheep by the millions—just thinking about them, let alone counting, would put you to sleep. And thousands of cattle, mostly Jerseys. New Zealand's economy is primarily agricultural, 90 to 95 percent of it, and what a job they do of it.

The view reminds you of the British Midlands, or the Pennsylvania Dutch farms, everything tidy. Something is missing, however—barns. The climate is such that livestock can be left outdoors the year round.

The farmers there have introduced the best blood lines into their livestock, and treated the soils with chemicals so the land can support twice or three times as many sheep. That farmland is not cheap, some of it has been in the same family for generations.

Seeing how dependent New Zealand is on agriculture, you realize just one of Prime Minister Macmillan's problems in trying to get Britain into the Common Market. He could ruin New Zealand and the Commonwealth with one misstep.

SOMETHING FOR ALL

The variety of the scenery is almost incredible: Strange regions of geysers and thermal springs, mountains, caves, glaciers, sandy beaches, great forests—largely built up with pine trees brought from California—and incomparable fishing lakes. Many on our tour took a day off to whip a line at those fabulous trout.

The people of New Zealand are delightful—independent and individualistic—and their newspapers reflect it. This is virtually the last bulwark of independent papers; each city has its own distinctive, locally owned paper, no chain publications, something almost unheard of in the world today.

Just a few hours away by jet but more than 2 days on a ship lies Australia, New Zealand's big brother—only they don't so regard each other, but rather with mutual, friendly independence.

Australia is another story entirely. It has its giant sheep ranches, or stations, but they also are doing a pretty good job of industrializing. Sydney, the largest city, has a magnificent harbor and scenery, and has been called the San Francisco of Australia.

ACROSS BY AIR

You must think of this country as being as large as the United States—minus Alaska, of course. When we left the tour, we had to fly 14 hours across it to reboard the ship at another port. You get the feel of a young nation, with most of its life story still ahead.

Sheep, wheat, and dairying are basic to the economy, but the volume of industry surprises the visitor. General Motors, for example, builds many of the cars for the Orient there and has become so large that even in Australia, where they welcome outside capital, they are beginning to wonder about the sheer size of General Motors. Chrysler, and Ford are there too. Mining and production of electricity—and Australia needs more power—are other key industries. Production costs are high.

As every schoolboy knows, most of Australia's development and population lie in a narrow fringe along the seacoast, with most of the interior a vast desert. By conserving their water resources, they are making good headway pushing the productive belt inland, but it is a slow and expensive process.

GO IN FOR SPORTS

You soon understand why this little country, with only about 10 million people, wins so many world tennis prizes, swimming championships and international cricket matches. Australians are tall and strong from their outdoor life—like Californians—and they love sports.

At the beaches you see the colorful volunteer lifesaving clubs, and for the children, learning to swim is as compulsory as taking arithmetic in school. Melbourne has a stadium that seats 120,000, larger than any of ours, and it is filled frequently. The race tracks are magnificent, and racing news and odds on the horses are features in the papers.

The Australians, and the New Zealanders, are pretty well satisfied with the life they lead and wouldn't swap it for that of any other country—including the United States.

Despite their nation's relatively brief existence, they are very patriotic, and you see many memorials to World War I and II, the biggest events in their history. Canberra, the new capital started some years ago and still building between the rival cites of Sydney and Melbourne, has the finest war memorial to be seen anywhere.

CITY OF BEAUTY

Melbourne is one of the most livable cities to be found, with its wide streets, beautiful buildings and landscape plantings, all capped by two great universities.

Australia is much more a welfare state than we are, and they like it. Yet the private-investment, profit motive is still in the picture. Tremendous amounts of American money—and much British—are pouring into their business life. The cities are modern and the transportation good, especially the air service which is essential in such a country.

Over the years, a system of industrial courts, which practicaly amounts to compulsory arbitration, has been built up. Both labor and management gripe a lot about it but neither would do away with it. The system hasn't worked perfectly, by any means, but major strikes are almost unheard of.

Australian labor, once violently leftist has become conservative because of the pressure of world communism—they certainly don't want to get into that category. For the most part, the country enjoys industrial peace, in sharp contrast to our recent needless strikes in the States, in which both sides as well as the public lost.

I frankly don't know if the Australian system would work in our country; I doubt it. We will just have to find our own remedy.

ALL FOR IT

I was interested also in their medical aid program, on which the doctors and everyone over there go along. It was not thrust on them but developed gradually. Patients are free to choose their own doctor and hospital in this state medicare plan.

Curiously, in Australia we were asked not so much about business, Wall Street or foreign policy as we were asked why all the fuss over medicare. You could explain that the American people are prepared to provide care for the aged but there is a wide divergence on how, yet they just couldn't see why there would be any debate. Australians accept the welfare state and just wonder why everyone else doesn't have it.

There is, of course, a catch to this apparent paradise—as always. You pay for everything you get, and their taxes would be considered staggering over here. Still the workers have become accustomed to paying out big amounts for various phases of security.

HAVE TIGHT CONTROLS

The handling of the immigration and racial problem in Australia and New Zealand is intriguing. Both set out to be Anglo-Saxon outposts with immigration strictly limited, yet over the years that policy has been relaxed because they needed people. They don't lay down sharp regulations which could become offensive and cause trouble. Both nations are essentially homogeneous.

Immigration bodies decide who can be admitted as a permanent citizen, and this may extend even to oriental students studying in their universities. But one sees few orientals or Negroes in either nation.

As much as Australia wants to expand, they limit immigration to what can be absorbed without undue burden on their job market, schools, and the like, hence the slow growth rate. They will take anyone who can contribute to their economy or culture, and they advertise widely those trades in which people are needed.

I doubt such a system would work in our melting pot Nation, but it does there, and with a minimum of friction. And they can't understand all the racial troubles in South Africa.

CLOSER TO IT

The overwhelming problem for Australia and New Zealand is the rising tide of nationalism in the oriental countries north of them. If all this ferment threatens world peace in the future, think what it means for these two isolated centers of Anglo-Saxon civilization down under.

The recent settlement by which the Dutch simply had to hand over Western New Guinea to Indonesia brings the Indonesians right up to the Australian mandate over the rest of the island, and a clash may be expected. It is a thinly populated and hard to defend territory.

The Australians are keeping up their armaments, especially their splendid air force. They were buying some French jets while we were there. And they are maintaining their ties with the motherland, as shown by the recent visit of Queen Elizabeth. Their bonds with the Commonwealth are strong, yet they remain fiercely independent—neither Britain nor the United States could tell them what to do and get very far.

They appreciate that the British navy and American nuclear might up to now have contained the march of communism. And we won't let them down; it wouldn't be to our interest to do so. In Australia and New Zealand, you seldom hear them speak of this rising tide of racism to the north. You get the feeling that here is a people confident of their strength and future, looking ahead to their destiny unafraid.

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Star, Apr. 18, 1963]

HOLDING ACTION IN THE ORIENT—UNITED STATES CAN EXPECT FEW REAL SUCCESSES AGAINST COMMUNISM IN FAR EAST—A MYRIAD OF PROBLEMS—OVERSHADOWING ALL OTHERS IS THE ECONOMIC DISTRESS FOUND EVERYWHERE

(By Roy A. Roberts)

Still unwritten and unresolved is the answer to an all-important question: Are we winning or losing the battle with communism for the Far East?

Obviously, we definitely are on the defensive. Possibly too much so.

Yet by the very nature of the situation, defense is the only realistic posture for the free world. The basic elements of the problem dictate a policy of containment. It's a holding action.

AT LOW POINT

In Asia, the tide ebbs and flows. Sometimes we appear to be making headway. Then success runs out. When I made my first odyssey to the Far East our fortunes definitely were at low tide.

Time was too limited on my trip to gather up many pieces of the picture puzzle. You can't make solid judgments on the basis of a visit that was all too sketchy.

But my impression was that our position in Asia adds up to a series of plus and minus factors—and right now the minus sign predominates. By no means is the situation hopeless. It isn't a debacle. But as the Communists peck away, first at this spot, then at another, we're losing ground, not gaining.

Yet I came back home thankful that it wasn't worse.

In military terms you call it logistics—the problems of supply complicated by time and distance. The Orient is mighty far away, thousands upon thousands of miles from home base. You can consider this problem of distance from the viewpoint of the other side. Mr. Khrushchev, for instance, quickly retreated from the confrontation in Cuba. He knew that the logistical factors were overwhelmingly against him for a showdown in the Caribbean.

RED CHINA SPHERE

Yet we are trying to contain communism in the distant Far East. And although that strategic area may be thousands of miles from Moscow, it's right in the back yard of Red China, a more ruthless, uncompromising and even tougher foe than the Kremlin.

Another fact that we mustn't forget is this, and it's an overriding fact: Everywhere—in Indonesia, Thailand, China, all through the Pacific—we are dealing, not with millions, but hundreds of millions of people. The sheer mass of humanity is almost overwhelming.

Moreover, the bulk of these people are just existing on the razor-edge of subsistence. Their great concern is not freedom or even ideologies. They just want enough food to stay alive. It's a naked matter of physical survival. The following observations are minor points, but they serve to illustrate: We saw practically no elderly people in the Orient.

You didn't pay much attention to this at first. But gradually it dawned on you: In Asia they don't have much of a problem of medical care for the aged simply because so few survive beyond the middle years. They just don't live very long. The life span is amazingly short.

Another thing. You see very few fat people in the Far East. There are exceptions, of course, but they are rare. There isn't enough food to go around. What there is generally consists of rice sweetened with a bit of fruit and fish. The national pastime of Americans is to go on diets, exercise and lose weight. In Asia they spend their waking moments trying to find enough to eat.

ON TINY PLOTS

You watch the patient peasants toiling in their tiny rice paddies and wonder what kind of approach you can make to those masses. The little rice plots that represent food for generations of a single family wouldn't be good enough for a flower garden over here. How can we find a common ground for communication, let alone understanding? Those peasants don't envy the American workingman with his home and car. They can't even imagine such an existence. And there are million upon million of them.

What a fertile field they are for the Communists to till. And what a difficult problem they are for us to reach. Then you can add the centuries of racial pride—"Asia for the Asiatics"—with thoughts of imperialism mixed up in simple minds. The difficulties are multiplied over and over.

Yet there can be absolutely no doubt that these hundreds of millions in the Orient are stirring.

Still another major and very basic element is the fact that many of these are new nations. There is no political entity, large or small, quite so truculent, belligerent or difficult as a new nation. As we'd say out on a Kansas farm, "They're feeling their oats." That's what is happening in the Orient.

JUST CAN'T PRODUCE

Independence, and throwing off the hated, so-called colonialism, sound wonderful in theory. But independence doesn't produce food. It doesn't necessarily make for wise government. It doesn't even mean that the masses are better off than they were before. The new Asian nations all want to take the quick short route to utopia without facing up to the fact that it's not a pathway strewn with roses, breadfruit or even coconuts.

Generally, it's sad but true: The newer the country and the more it desperately needs to build a stable economy, the greater the emphasis on arms and military trappings. You see gold braid and military toys everywhere.

One thing is certain. They may have thrown off their old masters, but they are quick to get a new bureaucracy and a new set of overlords. True, the new rulers may be their own. But they can be just as oppressive as the old, and sometimes they aren't as intelligent.

You can't deny that the masses of the East have been gouged and oppressed through the centuries by the foreign devils and by their own. But neither can anyone expect the bonds of the past to be snapped overnight and the new world to appear as if by magic.

SOME WERE GOOD

For that matter, I came home feeling that we have made too much a fetish of the word "colonialism." There have been brands of colonialism that actually benefited the masses at one time or another. And there has been the other kind that exploited and degraded them. Now we are paying for the bad kind in terms of latent distrust by millions in Asia.

The above observations on colonialism may be heresy and I certainly don't mean to imply that the aspirations of nationalism are bad or that all the new leaders are without ideals. Everywhere you heard of the great stress on education. That's fine, and there is a tremendous emphasis on it.

But with the exception of Japan, education hasn't trickled down to the teeming masses. I'm afraid it will be a long time before the schools can produce the educated classes that a broad industrial society demands. In the meantime, education at home and abroad is producing an elite that will be the leaders of tomorrow. These are the ones we should try to befriend and influence now.

It's easy to sit here at home and develop various themes on what ought to be done to save Asia. It's another thing entirely to come face to face with the stark reality of the other side of the world and realize how little you know about it.

For instance, it has been said, and I have agreed, that the U.N. ought to put new nations on probation for a few years before granting membership. Sort of let them get out of the tribal stage before they get a vote.

I advanced this theory at a dinner in Bangkok to a government official who had spent much time in the Orient. He shrugged his shoulders and said: "How long a period of probation do you have in mind? Thirty years? Forty years? Or maybe 50, 60, or 70 years?"

His point was plain. Obviously it would be better to take the new countries into the family of nations and try to work with them than to let them stay outside and go their own ways. In short, there is no quick trip to effective self-government. I imagine what is true in Asia is magnified in Africa. This is the background you must understand to talk of dealing with communism in the Orient.

VITAL TO POLICY

Take Indonesia as a classic example. Vietnam is vital to our prestige and containment policy in the Far East. In fact, observers told me that if we lose there we might as well pack up and go home. Yet for the long future, Indonesia is certainly as important and possibly much more explosive.

Indonesia ought to be the garden spot of southeast Asia. It has everything to make it a great nation. It is a rich country of more than 100 million right now. It has oil, minerals and the usual products of the tropics. Its soil is fertile and it should be a great reservoir of surplus food. In natural resources you might have to rate it third behind the United States and Russia in the entire world. Yet with all its blessings, this new nation isn't writing a very happy record.

From Singapore to Tokyo, a great many informed observers believe that Indonesia is headed for an awful blow-up. Already there have been more attempts on Sukarno's life than on De Gaulle's

From friendly sources I heard Sukarno described as the Wendell Willkie of the Orient—whatever that may mean. From others I heard that he was a sensuous playboy and exploiter of his people—and at the same time, one of the most dangerous and wily politicians in Asia.

Frankly, I don't know enough about him to reach a judgment. I did see one of his magnificent palaces in Bali. On the basis of that luxurious building, I would say that while he may sympathize with the masses, he certainly does live well.

PLACE OF BEAUTY

Bali, by the way, is a picture book island that lives up fully to tourist expectations. It is beautiful. But even there the poverty of the masses is a jarring note. And it is one of Sukarno's showplaces.

We've poured hundreds of millions into Indonesia to keep it from going Communist. Yet Sukarno continues to throw his weight around against the West—the United States, the Dutch, and now, against the proposed Maylasia Federation that could be a member of the British Commonwealth.

The Russians, too, have hauled rubles and aid, including weapons, to Sukarno. Their contributions amount to only slightly less than ours. It's no secret that Indonesia is a spot where the United States is coldly reviewing its aid policy. The Russians, in turn, aren't too happy with what they've gotten for their investment. Currently, the native Communists are demanding more representation in the government.

Again and again the situation in Indonesia has stopped just short of the exploding point. But the volcano hasn't gone up yet. Some think a push from the right by the army might succeed. Others think a Communist shove from the left might swing the country in that direction.

As adroit as Sukarno has been playing one off against the other, you suspect that he can't go on indefinitely. Some observers believe the country might wind up with a sort of Tito-brand communism—not under Moscow or Peiping, and certainly not under us. Yet the situation goes on.

HAS STRICT CURBS

As I said Indonesia ought to be the rice bowl of the East, but food is a problem. When we were there, for instance, we ran into the strict regulation of exchange. Everybody was warned not to take dollars or travelers checks ashore. You found the people ready to pay anything for goods—a shirt, even a lipstick. The official rate of exchange was 178 Indonesian units for a dollar. We found that the crew members, who ignored the warnings, were getting from 500 to 600. And at Singapore, we were told that the actual rate was about 1,500 to the dollar. That's a measure of the runaway inflation in Indonesia. Generally, it's a sure sign of blowup.

If Indonesia should swing violently to the extreme left—and it might—that would be a definite, positive loss, because it would sever our line to Australia and New Zealand, if nothing else.

So this potentially rich, powerful nation is a dangerous question mark. I'm afraid that its leaning toward Communist China is too obvious to be denied.

Burma, too, is full of unrest. In fact, you could hardly find a place in southeast Asia that wasn't in trouble now or facing tremendous difficulties.

CLAIMS ARE VARIED

I didn't get to South Vietnam, so I wouldn't attempt to discuss it in detail. But apparently it's a touch-and-go battle. From the outside I heard that our claims of progress are too optimistic and that our reports of failure are exaggerated. The final answer isn't written yet.

On the constructive side you can look at the very important effort to bring the Malay peninsula, Sarawak and North Borneo into existence as Malaysia and a Commonwealth nation under British tutelage. Sukarno is rattling the sword and making threats at the prospect.

But if the development does go through it would represent a very positive gain. Certainly Singapore and the peninsula are key crossroads of the Orient. Singapore is 85 percent Chinese and all of Malaysia about 50 percent. But unlike Indonesia, where the departed Dutch left a vacuum in know-how and technology, Malay is working closely with the British. It still is a bustling, prosperous spot, better off than most places in the Orient.

NOT VERY SMOOTH

In all these countries it was obvious that a gradual transition from the old colonial status to independence would have been beneficial. But that simply didn't happen in the great onrush of nationalism. In Singapore harbor you can see 60 or 70 abandoned freighters, just hulks and mostly Dutch. These ships used to carry most of the coastal cargo for Indonesia.

Thailand is a contrast. With its beautiful city of Bangkok it seemed to have a particular flavor of the Orient all its own. Certainly it seemed more tranquil and stable than other nations we visited. Unquestionably it is prosperous. We've done a good job there.

Without doubt, Thailand would like to cling to the West. But the constant pressure and pecking away by the Communists could bring battle to that peaceful land. Again, I'd say that Thailand—and Bangkok with its temples—is a tourist must. It's hot but colorful, romantic and with good food and hotels.

You'd have to catalog and assess each country separately—and there are a lot of new countries now in the wake of rising nationalism. Curiously, to me, India doesn't seem to be much of a factor. And this, despite her rank as the second most populous nation in the world and one of the great landmasses of the continent.

As a people and a nation, the Orientals seem to regard India as entirely apart from the rest. Because of that, I doubt that India ever could lead Asia. India is land and culture to itself.

CHINA THEIR FRIEND

The United States has placed its bets on India to demonstrate that freedom and a democratic system can bring better living standards than the Communist dictatorship of China. But until you're there, you don't realize that the kinship of southeast Asia is directed toward China, not India. To my intense surprise, I found strong anti-Communists who were somewhat delighted when Mao gave Nehru his comeuppance in the border invasion.

Everywhere you heard that we'd done a real job in making Formosa a showplace economically and in education. But we haven't gotten very far in spreading concepts of liberty in Formosa. Old Chiang is a dictator and probably will be as long as he lives.

We were told that South Vietnam and North Vietnam together would make a strong nation but that political division makes this impossible. By the same token, North and South Korea could make it if they were joined. In the meantime, South Korea will have to be supported. Right now, we're the ones who have to do the supporting. The job will go on for years.

HARD TO COMPREHEND

And so it went, Asia is complex, almost unfathomable. The economic distress, the differences of religion, the exploitation of the people, the caste systems—these are the problems not of years but of centuries. On top of these are piled the growing pains of the new nations.

And always there is that massive fact of enormous population, symbolized by the potential power of those 800 million people behind the Bamboo Curtain. And counting those on the outside, we're talking in terms of more than a billion human beings.

When you view all these imponderables and consider the ramifications in each country, you come home, not wondering why we are on the defensive, but how we've done as well as we have.

The problems of Asia are with us now and for the long pull ahead. They are ancient problems. The West will be living with them for decades, if not centuries. And the West, itself, will be ancient before they are resolved.

That's for certain.

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Star, Apr. 19, 1963]

CAN FIND PRIDE IN U.S. RECORD—HAWAII AND PHILIPPINES ARE BRIGHT SPOTS IN NATION'S FOREIGN POLICY—IMPACT ON FAR EAST—BUT BIGGEST AMERICAN CONTRIBUTION IS CONTINUATION OF STABLE ECONOMY

(By Roy A. Roberts)

As our odyssey to the Orient ends, a little flag waving may be pardonable. I came home deeply proud of my country and the leadership it is offering in these years of swift change and a new look in the world.

Mistakes and blunders—yes, waste and millions of dollars down the drain—yes, but overall a tremendous achievement. Personally I can't subscribe to the cult of the ugly American. It should be instead the magnificent American.

LOOK TO STABLE UNITED STATES

Here and now let me record not just an impression but a strong conviction I brought home: We might weather a pretty sizable military setback but the whole facade of a free world front which we have worked so hard to build in Europe and the Orient could crumble if we ever suffer a major economic bust at home.

Too much of our world position, strength and influence depends on a strong domestic economy, even granting the obvious, that our nuclear striking power today is the potent shield of the free world, in every part of the globe.

I wonder if we're paying enough attention here at home to the efficiency of our industrial complex and the soundness of our dollar. Both are just as vital, maybe more so, as more missiles, more Polaris submarines, more military bases. Don't ever forget that.

Several times now I have suggested that the basic problem of the Orient is not one of immediate urgency, but lies in the decades ahead. Our nuclear power, plus the costly chain of bases erected to contain communism in oriental waters, is strong enough to assure our national security against threats from that quarter for years to come.

Whether the billion and more people of the Far East can be galvanized into a future threat to us is unanswerable, but one thing is dead sure—you can't ignore it.

A BRIGHT SPOT

Naturally you notice the danger and trouble signs more than the plus values, because they hit you harder, but we have much to our credit in the Orient. The admission of Hawaii as a full-fledged, not a second-class member of our Union, is one of the smartest things we have ever done.

Its significance may not percolate down through the hundreds of millions of common people in the Orient, but it certainly has left an impression on the thinking of the leaders.

On the mainland we think largely of Hawaii in terms of a tropical paradise. Actually it represents our most definite and almost sole blood line to the Orient. The Japanese are the largest bloodstock there, the Chinese next and the native, or Polynesian, next before you encounter the Anglo-Saxon strain.

Now all this racial admixture has been accepted into our commonwealth of States. I wonder if we have made enough of this fact in trying to convey a better image of America in the Far East.

LED THEM ALONG

The Philippines, how we tutored them for generations—not only in education but in economics and government—until they were ready to govern themselves. And finally, without pressure, cutting the ties to give them complete independence. We can all take pride in that chapter of American world leadership.

Probably our biggest achievement in the Orient, since the war, has been our contribution in rebuilding Japan from the ashes of destruction, just as we picked up prostrate Germany in Europe.

History has recorded no such paradox: Vanquished nations, instead of being exploited and held in subjugation, restored through the assistance—and in Japan's case complete guidance—of the victor. True, we had a self-interest in both cases; the challenge of world communism now offered a greater menace than these two former foes. Helping them recover promoted world stability, and thereby, world peace.

CAN'T HELP US

All this struck you more forcibly in Japan than in Western Europe, because Japan is not a military ally, in any sense. We have been her shield and still are. Given the opportunity to rebuild along democratic lines, she has made the most of it, but Japan hasn't a ship or a soldier to add to our defense line in the Far East.

These are things which we Americans, pessimistically viewing our mistakes, too often overlook.

Here and there in the Orient, seething with nationalism and racism and hanging in the balance on communism, are spots such as Formosa, Thailand, and South Korea. Turbulent South Korea, independent and still groping toward its destiny, has been given that chance by our vital economic assistance.

Of course there have been mistakes and millions lost on bad bets. You could find enough examples to make a case for failure, yet you can't help feeling that we will realize something better than regrets from it all.

A TOUGH COMPETITOR

Another vivid impression from the Orient: Just as rebuilt Western Europe now challenges us in world markets, so is Japan becoming a tough competitor on the other side of the globe.

It makes you almost sick at heart to enter the fine big seaports of the Orient and see so few American flags on the many ships docked there. Our continuous wage and price spiral has reached a point of real concern about our ability to keep a place in world markets and industry. It has largely driven from the seas all except a few large shipping lines which keep going only on huge subsidies at taxpayer cost.

It used to be, also, that the United States had a virtual monopoly on airplane sales over the world. It gives you a jolt to learn how this has changed now. In Australia, for instance, you see the wide use of French—not American—commercial airliners. And you read headlines about Australian purchases of new French fighter-bombers.

You wonder where it will all end and when we will begin to pay more heed to our role in a global, and not just a national, economy.

MUST SPEED UP

Aside from peace itself, this stands as our foremost problem today—getting our economic growth rolling once more, and on a world-competitive basis.

Folks at home can properly ask if all our billions expended for bases, aid and containment in the Far East are worthwhile. You see and feel the obvious answer touring the fringe of the Orient: Can we afford to surrender more than 1½ billion people to communism, to be exploited and built into their machine, simply by default?

I doubt that a cruise such as ours made any votes for foreign aid, though. The American businessmen aboard, most of them retired, looked at the impressive new development out there and thought, "My tax money helped pay for that." And they were probably right.

Yet foreign aid is as definite a part of our foreign policy as nuclear and military strength, and we must continue it. It should, however, be restudied and revalued continuously for realism and results. Just cutting it back indiscriminately isn't the answer.

NEED TRUE PICTURE

I came home also with a very definite feeling that we're not getting across in the Orient a true picture of what we seek. Our sheer good will and exuberance make us suspect in this hemisphere where backslapping and fervent handshakes evoke mistrust. Conveying the idea that our intentions are not exploitation or imperialism is an almost insurmountable job among those great, inert masses of people. A correspondent, on leave from Vietnam, put his finger on one aspect of the problem at lunch in Tokyo:

"We'd win this thing easy if the soldiers we're training—they're not bad soldiers—had the heart and fighting spirit the Commies do. Our boys fight all right mechanically, but the unseen enemy who springs on them, usually from ambush, is a dedicated revolutionary."

Our position in the Orient is complicated by the fact that in several instances we have had to back regimes that are unpopular with their own people. It's a just criticism, but we didn't create these regimes; we have to do what we can with what we find. And this may not be our worst complication, that of being billed as new colonialists, moving in to oppress them as the French did. Bunk, of course, but it goes over in not too well informed minds.

KEY IN YOUTHS

It is obvious that our efforts must be directed at youth, especially the students, who are the catalyst of ferment in the East and will be the governing leaders of tomorrow. They are young and we must meet them with young people—that is why Bobby Kennedy's quick excursion through the Far East was good strategy, not so much for what he said but in the appeal to youth.

Americans have been visiting the Orient for a long time, but always cost, distance, and time have been limiting factors. Now the restless flood of American tourism, after wearing out the pathways of Europe, is veering to the Far East.

Jet travel helps this along, of course, but you are amazed, also, at the fine hotel accommodations in most of the Orient. Some of the new hotels, such as the Southern Cross in Melbourne with its fancy shopping arcade, match anything in the States. And even the most primitive ones we encountered on our trip were passable, and so interesting as to make up for any shortage of comforts.

There was one little place in Port Moresby, in the Australian part of New Guinea. It was located in a lush tropical setting, and the weather was stinking hot.

TO REBOARD SHIP

We had flown all night to Port Moresby to reboard the ship after leaving it in Sydney to spend more days in Australia. The waiters and other hotel help were bush boys from the interior, barefoot, wearing loin cloths, friendly grins and little else. Ordering a meal, you pointed to the number of your selection on the menu and they went after it. Yet even here they brought in pitchers of iced tea and ice water—they had dealt with our Air Force and Army boys and knew what Americans like.

As this tide of American tourists swings toward the Orient, it cannot help but cut down our long-range problem of understanding.

One other thought from that part of the world deserves mention. There is real concern over there as to how long the United States will maintain its present policy.

The anti-United Nations, anti-foreign-aid rantings of the John Birchers are creating fear that this country will retreat from its world leadership role. They point out that the U.N., which we no longer control, soon will take steps very unpopular in this country. Will we then abandon or scuttle the U.N.?

TAKE CALMER VIEW

You can explain that these rantings are a passing phenomenon, just like the occasional leftwing outbursts, and that the United States basically follows a middle-of-the-road policy supported by both parties.

Still it raises a question in your own mind. I can only give my personal conviction on this: After my look-see at the other side of the globe I feel more strongly than ever that, imperfect as it is and disappointing as it has been, the U.N. still is needed by the world as a meeting place and a buffer for quarrels, if nothing else. The only alternative offers a bleak prospect for peace, indeed.

Right now the United Nations carries more prestige in the Orient than ever before with U Thant, a Burmese, as Secretary General. His appointment, and his success in the job, have done more to give the Far East pride and hope than any single recent event.

A final word, on Hawaii, which was our last port of call. In my first visit since it became a State, I had heard that the influx from the States, the rapid growth, had turned it into a honky-tonk. Sheer rubbish. Hawaii is as lovely as ever. It has that beautiful tropical setting, without the picturesque temples and mosques of the Far East, but also without that awful heat.

It is certain to become one of our biggest States in both population and influence. I never saw a South Sea island I would trade it for.

In Los Angeles, our passage through immigration and customs was the most courteous ever encountered. Then, as we waited in the fine new air terminal to fly home to Kansas City, the loudspeaker buzzed and a voice said:

"Mr. Civella, paging Mr. Nick Civella."

Hearing the name of that North Side figure of considerable notoriety, I knew we were nearing home.

The biggest lesson I learned in the Orient was that we had better acquire some of their philosophy of patience—and then more understanding. Because the Orient, and the problems of its hundreds of millions of people, will be with us for a long, long time.

GORDON R. CLAPP, A FINE PUBLIC SERVANT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the most distinguished families in Wisconsin is the Clapp family. For many years members of this family have served the public interest in high public office.

Gordon Clapp, formerly head of the Tennessee Valley Authority, died a few days ago. His service in the Tennessee Valley Authority will always be an inspiration to anyone who is interested in clean, honorable, effective, and efficient administration.

But Gordon Clapp was more than merely a competent administrator. He believed deeply in what the TVA stands for.

The death of Gordon Clapp has been discussed editorially in some of the leading newspapers in the country, including those in Wisconsin. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a fine editorial entitled "Gordon R. Clapp," which was published in the Washington Post; an outstanding editorial entitled "Dreamer With a Shovel," which was published in the Washington Star; and an editorial entitled "Society Loses a Valuable Citizen in Death of Gordon Clapp," which was published in the Capital Times, of Madison, Wis.

I may say that Gordon Clapp is survived by Norman M. Clapp, the present Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, who also has a splendid record of public service.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 1, 1963]

GORDON R. CLAPP

Almost all of Gordon Clapp's crowded, productive life was devoted to public service in the areas of conservation and resource development. He was in the great tradition of the American pioneer—a pursuer of horizons and an opener of frontiers. For 20 years, from its very beginning, he played a vital role in the growth of the Tennessee Valley Authority, the last 8 of them as its chairman. His imagination and zeal contributed invaluably to the effectiveness of that beneficient agency in reinvigorating, enriching and democratizing a great region of the United States. When he left the TVA in 1954, he served for a short while as Deputy City Administrator of New York and then became president of the Development and Resources Corp., a private concern with wide interests in the promotion of progress in far parts of the earth.

Gordon Clapp combined the best qualities of the educator and the enterpreneur. He was a man of learning with much theoretical knowledge who had at the same time a knack for getting things done. He believed deeply in the best values of democracy and applied them wherever he worked so that individual freedom and improved race relations and social advancement were by-products of his efforts to promote economic development. His untimely death at 57 is a heavy loss to a Nation which has grown to greatness on the basis of just such qualities and capacities.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, May 1, 1963]

DREAMER WITH A SHOVEL

Gordon R. Clapp, dead now at 57, devoted over a third of his good and useful life to the Tennessee Valley Authority. He began working there in 1933, when it was one of the coming wonders of the world, and he did not leave it until 1954. Indeed, he probably would never have left it had not President Eisenhower, in keeping with the more or less inexorable laws of politics, decided to name somebody else as TVA's Chairman.

This was something that Mr. Clapp never resented, nor had he any reason to. As far as the political realities went, he knew what the score was, and he took it for granted. He understood the need for high-echelon personnel changes as part of the transition from one presidential administration to another. Certainly he was anything but a complainer in that sense. As he once told an interviewer, "When a public servant gets a martyr complex, chances are he has been working too hard, or his friends have been feeling too sorry for him."

Mr. Clapp was happily free of any such complex. In all the various posts he held at TVA, he liked to think of himself as one of those "dreamers with shovels" who converted the Tennessee River into a tool that gave the people "better farms, better homes, and better living." It did just that, and his role in the enterprise was big. He deserves to be remembered as one of our country's fine public servants.

[From the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times]

SOCIETY LOSES A VALUABLE CITIZEN IN DEATH OF GORDON CLAPP

Wisconsin feels keenly the death of Gordon Clapp, a member of a distinguished Wisconsin family who died in New York Sunday after a life of distinguished achievement in public and private pursuits.

The Clapp family is well and widely known in this State. Gordon was active in educational pursuits and was serving in a high administrative capacity when he went to the Tennesse Valley Authority with David Lilienthal, another distinguished Wisconsinite.

He rose to take Lilienthal's place at the head of this world-famed experiment in democratic planning and later became associated with Lilienthal in private business.

His brother, Norman, has also had a distinguished career. He was an aide to the late Senator Robert M. LaFollette, Jr., later became an editor and publisher in Lancaster, and is now the chief administrator of the rural electrification program in Washington.

It is a tragedy for the family, but it is a tragedy for society, too, to have a man whose talents are at their peak taken by death.

INFRINGEMENT ON THE RIGHT OF A STATE TO ACT AND ADMINISTER ITS OWN WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION LAW

Mr. **DIRKSEN.** Mr. President, on April 8, the Illinois State Senate passed a resolution in opposition to any legislation by the Congress which would infringe on the right of a State to enact and administer its own workmen's compensation law. I submit the resolution of the Illinois Senate and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE RESOLUTION 34 OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

Whereas the Congress of the United States by a series of amendments to the Social Security Act during the period 1956 to 1962, has extended and broadened the Social Security Act to provide disability and other benefits for work-connected injuries and disease; and

Whereas the State workmen's compensation laws were designed to be the basic and exclusive method and remedy providing benefits for work-connected injuries and diseases, and their administration has, for over 50 years, been the function of the several State industrial accident boards and commissions, based on the accepted principle that benefits for work-connected injuries and diseases be tailored to fit social and economic conditions at the local level; and

Whereas the extension of the Social Security Act to provide benefits for work-connected injuries and diseases has resulted in duplication of benefits; and

Whereas legislation resulting in further intrusion into the field of work-connected injuries and diseases constitute a severe threat to the survival of State-administered workmen's compensation programs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Illinois State Senate is opposed to any legislation by the U.S. Congress which would infringe on the right of this State to enact and administer its own workmen's compensation law, and to further Federal encroachment into the field of State-administered workmen's compensation programs and strongly urges that the U.S. Congress again affirm that the State workmen's compensation system is the basic program for compensating work-connected injuries and diseases; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent by the secretary of state to the President of the United States; Secretary of Labor of the United States; Senate minority leader, EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN; Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, and all Members of the U.S. House of Representatives from Illinois.

Adopted by the senate, April 8, 1963.

SAMUEL H. SHAPIRO,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD E. FERNANDES,
Secretary of the Senate.

DEATH OF MRS. H. D. BURROUGHS, JR.

Mr. **DIRKSEN.** Mr. President, I noted that on April 28, 1963, Mrs. H. D. Burroughs, Jr., the distinguished wife of Henry D. Burroughs, Jr., an Associated Press photographer, died at the Bethesda Hospital. She was a niece of the distinguished author, Sherwood Anderson, and achieved fame and distinction in her own right in many fields of activity.

She was on assignment to Berlin after World War II and while there organized the Ladies of the Press Corps to aid the children in a German orphanage with food, clothing, and entertainment.

She was so very well known to all members of the press photographers and her passing is noted with deep regret.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Mr. **DIRKSEN.** Mr. President, the budget for the fiscal year 1964 makes provision for implementing the Alliance for Progress for a total sum of $900 million and in due course this item will come to the Senate in the form of an appropriation bill from the House and will then be considered first by the Senate Committee on Appropriations and ultimately by the Senate itself.

I have devoted some time to this activity and to the progress or lack of progress made under this program. To say the least, a volatile and unstable condition has been developing in Latin America which inspires grave doubts that any progress is being made whatsoever in achieving social reforms and the investment of U.S. development capital in the Latin American Republics.

A great many speeches and articles have appeared during the last year indicating diverse points of view and since the amount of money involved and requested is very substantial indeed, it is appropriate that the Congress carefully reexamine the entire program and ascertain what course of action to pursue. The very fact that private capital is leaving rather than going to Latin American Republics in larger amounts is a cause for concern. It was the hope of the authors of the program that in due course private capital in sufficient quantities would move into these countries and make it possible ultimately for the U.S. Government to disengage itself from these activities and commitments.

The further fact that private Latin American capital is moving out of these countries to find safe haven elsewhere is in itself a cause for real concern.

In order to place the whole problem before the Congress and the country, I am submitting a number of items for inclusion with my remarks, all of which deal with the Alliance for Progress.

The first is an address delivered by Dr. William J. Kemnitzer, economic geologist and lecturer in Hispanic American Studies at Stanford University, at the second public affairs seminar at Elmhurst College in Elmhurst, Ill.

The second is an article by Dan Smoot, author of the Dan Smoot Report of Dallas, Tex., which appears in two parts.

The third is a specially prepared article by Mr. Simon G. Hanson, editor of Hanson's Latin American Letter, which was prepared at my request and which is a penetrating study of what is happening under the Alliance for Progress.

The fourth is another weekly letter by Mr. Simon Hanson, dated December 29, 1962.

The fifth is a column submitted to the Tampa Tribune and published on May 18, 1962, under the caption "Before Castro, Bolivia."

The sixth is still another of Hanson's Latin American Letters, dated February 2, 1963.

The seventh is an article from the Time magazine entitled "Alliance in Danger."

The eighth is another Hanson's Latin American Letter, dated March 23, 1963, in the nature of a response to the "Report on the Alliance for Progress" prepared by Senator Hubert Humphrey.

The ninth is still another of Mr. Hanson's Latin American Letters dated March 30, 1963.

The 10th is the Washington report of the American Security Council, edited by Frank J. Johnson, which was issued February 25, 1963, under the caption "Brazil: The Tottering Keystone."

The 11th is an article from the New Leader by Keith Botsford, under the title "Slide-Rule Failure in Brazil," which appeared in the April 15, 1963, issue of the New Leader.

The 12th is an abstract of a report made on February 2, 1963, by Mr. J. Peter Grace, Chairman of the Commerce Department Committee for the Alliance for Progress. The full memorandum is too long to be included in the Record but I believe the abstracts and clippings incorporated in this memorandum will do full justice to the findings of that committee.

I believe that the cost involved in inserting these exhibits for the Record is fully justified in view of the obligations we have assumed under the Alliance for Progress and because it represents a heavy burden upon the Federal Treasury whether the commitments are made in the form of long-term, low-interest-rate loans or in the form of grants.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the exhibits to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the sundry items were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Alliance for Progress Program—Its Objectives, Origin, Implementation, and Chances for Success

(Address by William J. Kemnitzer[1] at the Second Public Affairs Seminars, Elmhurst College, Elmhurst, Ill., November 5, 1962)

The Alliance for Progress is a joint program of action established by adoption of the Charter of Punta del Este by representatives of 20 of the member-nations of the Organization of American States, meeting on the ministerial level of Junta del Este, Uruguay, on August 17, 1961. Cuba did not sign the Charter.

The stated purpose of the Alliance for Progress is "* * * to enlist the full energies of the peoples and governments of the Latin American Republics in a great cooperative effort to accelerate the economic and social development of the participating countries of Latin America, so that they may achieve maximum levels of well-being, with equal opportunity for all, in democratic societies adapted to their own needs and desires."

The reasons for the Alliance are many but the main motive for it is, undoubtedly, the desire to combat communism and other social and political movements prejudicial to democratic forms of government and capitalistic systems of economy which movements have been gaining impetus throughout much of Latin America for some time.

Demagogic leaders in many parts of Latin America, many of them aided and abetted from outside Communist sources, have harangued the masses into believing that their poor plight has been due to the unequal distribution of wealth caused by "imperialists" from the United States together with their co-partners, the gringoized Latin American oligarchy.

This anti-United States propaganda poured out in an atmosphere of continuing destitution is most effective among the underprivileged which constitute the bulk of the Latin American populace. They readily believe capitalist democracy as applied to Latin America from the outside to be simply another form of colonialism, a system which exploited them for three centuries prior to their independence from the mother country.

They are told that this independence was not the result of a true revolution of the people; it was merely a transference of the same system for exploitation from one group to another. Now, with the powerful backing of the Sino-Soviet governments, they are told the time has come for the real social revolution.

The growing intensity and scope of these attacks upon democratic methods in Latin America has posed a serious problem for the Western Nations in general and for the United States in particular as virtual custodian of democracy in this hemisphere. To combat these attacks and prevent establishment of governments hostile to capitalist democracy, the Latin American Republics except for Cuba, under the leadership of the United States, hope by means of the program set up under the Alliance for Progress to create or modify conditions in Latin America which will motivate the masses to reject communism and other forms of socio-political economy alien to our desired way of life in the Americas.

The Charter of Punta del Este establishes the Alliance for Progress within the framework of Operation Pan America. Operation Pan America is a plan submitted by the Government of Brazil on August 19, 1958, to the governments of the other American Republics through their diplomatic representatives in Rio de Janeiro. It called for a reorientation of hemispheric policy intended to place Latin America in a position to participate more effectively in the defense of the West. It was, however, more than a program; it was a policy.

Operating within the framework of the Operation Pan America, the Alliance for Progress not only provides for a program designed to bring a better life to the peoples of Latin America, but it also involves actions fundamental to the defense of the West whether that defense be economic, social, political or military, against all of the forces threatening democracy.

Although it may seem that the main reason for the Alliance for Progress is to ward off the threats of communism in the Western Hemisphere, actually the origin of the basic ideas in the Alliance evolved from circumstances somewhat removed from the present communistic threat. To understand better what is taking place under the Alliance for Progress program, let us take a quick look at the highlights of its predecessors.

Prior to World War II, most cooperative hemispheric efforts were not made for the over-all economic and social benefit of the people. They were engaged in predominantly for the purpose of effecting trade and military agreements for commercial and political reasons or for dealing with problems relating to special private interests. These latter problems were generally dealt with by shows of force particularly on the part of the United States.

However, beginning with the expropriation of the properties of private oil companies in Mexico on March 18, 1938, three circumstances developed which were paramount in bringing about a change of U.S. policy toward Latin America. These circumstances were (1) the unwavering stand of the Mexican Government against all opposition to the expropriations and nationalization of the Mexican petroleum industry; (2) the desire on the part of the U.S. Government for inter-American cooperation in dealings with the world conflict now coming to a head; and (3) the activities of Nelson Rockefeller and his group in developing suggestions for inter-American economic and social improvement.

Among the largest operators in petroleum in Latin America are the Standard Oil companies in which the Rockefeller family hold substantial interests. Their operations in Argentina had been restricted for many years, their properties in Bolivia were expropriated in 1936 and as already stated in Mexico in 1938, and there was fear that their fast-developing holdings in Venezuela subsequent to 1938 could suffer the same fate.

As early as April 1937, Nelson Rockefeller, then 29 years old, made a trip to Venezuela where he observed the operations of the Creole Petroleum Corp., the Venezuelan subsidiary of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey. In 1939, Rockefeller went back to Venezuela. In that year, the Creole corporation hired a North American engineering firm to make a survey of the Venezuelan economy and to blueprint the bottlenecks which were stifling normal economic development of the country. The survey showed that while hundreds of millions of dollars had been pumped into the oil industry, little had been done about developing agriculture and other productive industries. Indeed, most of the food and supplies had to be imported. Wealth was concentrated in a few hands and the people were poor.

It was obvious that drastic measures were called for if the overall economy was to be developed in a manner which would benefit the entire populace instead of being concentrated principally in the hands of those exporting raw products and those importing manufactured goods. Creole management, mindful of the expropriation of oil properties in other Latin American countries was willing to do its part, but that had its limitations. Something much bigger than what could be accomplished by a single oil company or even a group of companies had to be done. This problem was one which occupied Nelson Rockefeller's intense interest for some time to come.

On return from his trip to South America in 1939, Rockefeller tried to work out terms for a settlement for the Standard Oil properties expropriated in Mexico. He arranged a meeting with President of Mexico Lázaro Cárdenas and was his house guest in Mexico. During this visit, Rockefeller apparently learned much from the man who had actually decreed the expropriations of the oil properties, and who is still Mexico's venerable liberal in political thought.

President Cárdenas told Rockefeller that the actions of foreigners in Mexico, while creating great bitterness, were not the reason for the expropriations. The real reason would not be easy for Rockefeller to understand. The Mexican President reminded Rockefeller that in the background is the seizure of Texas in 1836, the taking of New

---

[1] Economic geologist, and lecturer, Institute of Hispanic American and Luso-Brazilian Studies, Stanford University, Stanford, Calif.

Mexico and California in 1846, and the sending of the Army against Villa in 1916, by the U.S. Government.

Then, he continued, one had to remember that the Mexican War of Independence ended the domination of the Spanish ruling class and restored self-confidence in Mexico's people. That was the liberation from direct colonial domination in our own country. There remained, however, the economic domination of the United States. The expropriation of the oil properties was a symbol of Mexican liberation from domination from without. Expropriation restored a sense of dignity and self-respect and independence—and, he emphasized, "That is often more important to our people than is their physical and economic well-being."

Rockefeller returned to the United States deeply impressed with the importance of the human element in international relations, something with which few businessmen had heretofore been concerned. Indeed, the record is clear that the Mexican expropriations marked the turning point for the petroleum companies in their attitudes and actions in the foreign field, and in U.S. Government policy toward Latin America.

After this memorable meeting with President Cárdenas, Nelson Rockefeller undertook to do something about improving the relationships between private enterprise and public welfare. He gathered around him a group of businessmen, bankers, lawyers, economists, and sociologists to survey, study, consult, and report on this problem. The "group" as it became known, had in it men of wide differences of thought which made it difficult to reach a common opinion on all facets of the problem but, nevertheless, they showed the way to a better understanding of it, especially as related to the peoples of Latin America.

By early 1940, the Axis powers were very active in Latin America, especially in Argentina. United States prestige began to wane while that of the Nazi-Fascists began to rise. Rockefeller and his group were convinced that the United States must protect its international position through the use of economic measures that are competitively effective against totalitarian techniques. If the United States was to maintain its security and its political and economic hemispheric position it must take measures at once to secure economic prosperity in Latin America; and to establish this prosperity in the frame of hemispheric economic cooperation and dependence. It is pertinent to note that at this time, the threat to the hemisphere was Nazi-Fascism and not communism, although the two sometimes worked hand in hand.

Rockefeller and his group had prepared a 3-page memorandum entitled "Hemispheric Economic Policy." On June 14, 1940, Nelson Rockefeller went to the White House in Washington where he read his memorandum to Harry L. Hopkins, one of President Franklin D. Roosevelt's closest advisers. The memorandum outlined a broad program that included emergency measures to absorb surplus Latin American products and measures to encourage investment in Latin America by both private interests and the Government. In addition, the memorandum stated that a vigorous program to improve cultural, scientific, and educational relations in the Americas with the cooperation of private agencies was essential.

President Roosevelt had made it known, mainly as a consequence of the Mexican expropriations, that he considered our economic relations with Latin American countries as affecting adversely our political relations with them. He was afraid this situation would delay or even preclude effective Latin American cooperation with us in the impending war. Something had to be done and Nelson Rockefeller's ideas were accepted.

From this time on, the ideas developed by Nelson Rockefeller and his group form essentially the bases for all programs adopted for economic and social development in Latin America and our policy in relation thereto. We do not have time here to develop the details of this thesis from Rockefeller's memorandum on hemispheric economic policy, in 1940, to the Alliance for Progress in 1961, but the highlights of efforts to effect a cooperative economic and social program for Latin America will unfold as we proceed.

On August 16, 1940, President Roosevelt established by Executive order, the Office for the Coordination of Commercial and Cultural Relations between the American Republics, and he appointed Nelson Rockefeller the Coordinator. On July 30, 1941, this Office became the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs (CIAA). The Coordinator's Office was charged with the responsibility of building up a strong mutual respect and understanding among the nations of the Americas in order that they might be better prepared to meet jointly the emergency wartime demands and plan jointly for a sound postwar structure. It expressed what is known as Roosevelt's "Good Neighbor Policy."

The Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs lasted until May 20, 1946, but Rockefeller remained with it until late 1944, when on December 20, 1944, he was confirmed as Assistant Secretary of State in charge of relations with the American Republics. In this position, Rockefeller was better able to expound his ideas for improving United States-Latin American relations.

Early in 1945, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Mexico, Eziquel Padilla, proposed an Inter-American Conference on the Problems of War and Peace to deal with political and economic problems. The conference was called and met in Mexico City from February 21 through March 8, 1945. Assistant Secretary of State Nelson Rockefeller was designated alternate delegate by President Roosevelt and in this position Rockefeller played an important part in drawing up the agenda and negotiating resolutions.

As a result of this conference, 180 draft resolutions were drawn up, but the most important one relating to economic and social matters was the "Economic Charter of the Americas." In this and other resolutions a reaffirmation and extension was made of inter-American principles and aspirations which seek the general improvement and well-being of the peoples of Latin America.

On the death of President Roosevelt on April 12, 1945, Harry S. Truman became President of the United States and Nelson Rockefeller continued on as Assistant Secretary of State until August 24, 1945, when he resigned to go back to private business. However, before he resigned, Rockefeller participated actively in the Conference on International Organization in San Francisco at which the Charter of the United Nations was signed on June 26, 1945. At this Conference, Rockefeller was most active in bringing the Latin American nations into the new organization and in keeping them alined in a cooperative bloc to support U.S.-postwar policies.

During the war period, Latin American countries had received large payments from the sale of strategic materials while they could spend comparatively little for imports of capital and consumer goods which were then in short supply. Consequently, most of these countries accumulated large amounts of gold and foreign exchange. However, following the war years, the situation was reversed. The demand and prices for raw materials fell while the countries spent heavily for imported goods which had been unavailable to them during the war. As a result, of unfavorable payments balances, it was not long before most of these countries were in financial straits and were suffering considerable social unrest.

The failure of the U.S. Government to take effective action in efforts to ameliorate these adverse conditions in Latin America after the war prompted Rockefeller to consider what might be done by private capital to bolster Latin American economies and thus strengthen inter-American political and cultural ties. It was a matter of record that in the last century capital went where it could make the greatest profit. Now it was apparent in the defense of capitalism that it must go where it can render the greatest service to the general welfare, especially in Latin America.

In order to implement his ideas, Nelson Rockefeller, in conjunction with his four brothers, set up in 1946, a private philanthropic organization called the American International Association for Economic and Social Development (AIA). Shortly thereafter, they established the International Basic Economy Corp., a private company to conduct business mainly in Latin America. The reasons for establishing these privately-owned organizations were stated by Rockefeller to be that the hope for future peace and security in the world depends on closer relations and better understanding among the peoples of the world, coupled with a rising standard of living and a steady improvement of conditions.

The earliest attempt to formalize Rockefeller's basic ideas into inter-American action are expressed in the "Economic Agreement of Bogotá," an instrument fundamentally not much unlike the present Charter of Punta del Este. This agreement was signed by representatives of all the member nations of the Organization of American States on May 2, 1948, meeting in Bogotá, Colombia. In this document it is stated that the purposes of the cooperation and principles which inspire it are those set forth in the Economic Charter of the Americas (March 8, 1945), the Charter of the United Nations (June 26, 1945), and the Organization of American States (May 2, 1948) thus linking the present effort with its predecessors.

Rockefeller's endeavors did not stop here. He realized that private efforts alone could effect only a small part of the necessary objectives. He now proposed what soon became known as the point IV program. When material was being prepared for President-elect Harry Truman's inaugural address in January 1949, Rockefeller's idea got into the speech as Truman's point 4 program for technical assistance. On November 24, 1950, President Truman wrote to Nelson Rockefeller that "* * * any adequate and sound program for international economic development must * * * lend itself to realistic and continuing cooperation between private enterprise and government, here and abroad." In the same month, President Truman appointed Rockefeller chairman of the International Development Advisory Board to recommend policy in connection with the execution of the point IV program.

In 1952, Rockefeller resigned as chairman of the International Development Advisory Board and returned to New York City. However, early in 1953, President Eisenhower appointed Rockefeller chairman of the President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization; later he became Under Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. By December 1954, he resigned this position whence President Eisenhower asked him to become Special Assistant to the President on Foreign Affairs. Here his position was basically to assess the psychological aspects of U.S. foreign policy. Rockefeller not only believed in maintaining an adequate defense but also was convinced that money spent wisely on foreign economic cooperation would save the taxpayers huge sums of money in the future.

In December 1955 Rockefeller told President Eisenhower that personal affairs made it necessary that he resign as special assistant to the President. He returned to New

York in 1956. One of his ideas now was to make a private study of major problems that would confront the people of the United States in the next 10 or 20 years. He suggested to his brothers that they finance a special studies project under the title of America at Mid-Century. They agreed to do so through the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, a philanthropic organization they had set up in 1940 to make contributions to charities, civic organizations, educational and research endeavors.

In 1958 that part of the study dealing with the Western Hemisphere was published, and it is in this part of the report that the precepts for what became the Alliance for Progress are reiterated and amplified.

After the termination of the Korean war in July 1953, the period 1954–58 became one of almost dire neglect of our good neighbors in Latin America. The economies of most of the countries were becoming progressively worse, their governments unstable, and the populace increasingly restive. Latin leaders complained that the United States had not given them sufficient aid to ward off increasing attacks from leftist agitators. They complained that we had directed the bulk of our aid to Europe and Asia while they had received comparatively little.

Indeed, this contention was true. Of the world total obligations and loan authorizations by the U.S. Government for economic assistance for the period from fiscal year 1946 through fiscal year 1959, Latin America had received less than 7 percent; of the total military assistance slightly more than 1 percent; and for all assistance combined, a little more than 5 percent.

Something had to be done. Various emissaries were sent on trips to Latin America to ascertain the facts, to give assurance of aid, and spread good will. Among them were the President's brother Milton Eisenhower, Adlai Stevenson, and a number of Members of Congress. Although cognizant of the situation, apparently our Government did not realize its seriousness until Vice President Richard Nixon, while on a good will trip throughout South America was booed, pelted with various objects and otherwise ill-treated in some of the more distressed areas.

Indeed, it remained for President Kubitschek of Brazil to call attention to the seriousnes of the situation. After Vice President Nixon's trip President Kubitschek on May 28, 1958 wrote a letter to President Eisenhower in which he said:

"I want to convey to Your Excellency, on behalf of the Brazilian people as well as for myself, an expression of sentiments of solidarity and esteem, the affirmation of which is necessary in view of the aggression and vexations undergone by Vice President Nixon during his recent visit to countries in Latin America.

"It is hoped that the unpleasant memory of the ordeal undergone by Vice President Nixon will be effaced by the results of earnest efforts toward creating something deeper and more durable for the defense and preservation of our common destiny."

In reply, President Eisenhower wrote to President Kubitschek on June 5:

"To my mind you have described accurately both the existing situation and the desirability of corrective action. I am delighted, therefore, that you have taken the initiative in this matter."

By August 1958 President Eisenhower had sent a group headed by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles to Brazil to exchange views on how to promote the hemispheric solidarity of the 21 American Republics. On August 6, a joint communique was issued at Brasilia at the conclusion of talks between President Kubitschek and U.S. Secretary of State Dulles. The communique dealt with an exchange of views on the international situation but more specifically with those problems relating to the movement for hemispheric unity which President Kubitschek called "Operation Pan America" previously referred to.

Operation Pan America called for directing efforts toward increasing the average per capita income of Latin America from less than $300 per year to $500 per year by 1980. Brazilian planners spoke of a decade of dollar loans averaging $600 million annually. At first this proposal was considered fantastic and was not taken too seriously but as the communistic color of Cuba developed more intensely after 1959, Operation Pan America began to seem realistic.

After a number of meetings and discussions, the Council of the Organization of American States, on July 1, 1960, set September 5 as the date and Bogotá, Colombia, as the place for a meeting. By this time, Cuba was definitely in the Communist camp and was spreading its doctrine and gaining wide support among many of the left-wing groups in the economically depressed countries of Latin America.

On the afternoon of September 13, 1960, in a ceremonial session, final approval was given to a document called the Act of Bogotá. The vote was 19 for, with 1 against. The sole dissent came from Cuba; while the Dominican Republic was not present.

As finally approved, the Act of Bogotá is longer and more detailed than the original U.S. draft, but it is consistent with the spirit and objectives of the first draft and embodies essentially all of the provisions for economic and social development originally promulgated by Nelson Rockefeller's efforts as heretofore set forth.

Thus, the measure for social improvement and economic development within the framework of Operation Pan America were established. It remained now for the Organization of American States to formalize these measures into a charter which would bind the signatory member-nations in a common effort to bring their people accelerated economic progress and broader social justice within the framework of personal dignity and political liberty.

The Eisenhower administration at the instigation of and in collaboration with President Kubitschek of Brazil had laid the foundations for the economic and social development program in Latin America which was later to result in President Kennedy's Alliance for Progress. By now the Eisenhower administration was coming to an end and that of President Kennedy about to begin.

The Alliance for Progress was first used as a phrase by President Kennedy in his inaugural address in January 1961. On March 13, 1961, at a White House dinner for Latin American diplomats, selected Members of Congress and others, President Kennedy outlined his ideas for the program and said:

"If we are to meet a problem so staggering in its dimensions, our approach must itself be equally bold, an approach consistent with the majestic concept of Operation Pan America. Therefore I have called on all the people of the hemisphere to join in a new Alliance for Progress—a vast cooperative effort, unparalleled in magnitude and nobility of purpose, to satisfy the basic needs of the American people for homes, work, land, health, and schools."

On May 26, 1961, President Kennedy sent letters to the Speaker of the House and President of the Senate relating to a plan for reorganization of the mutual security program. Meanwhile, on May 27, an authorized $600 million fund for the Inter-American social and economic program had been appropriated by the Congress. On June 2, it was announced that the responsibility and authority for the formulation and execution of the foreign development aid programs would be assigned to a single new Agency for International Development within the Department of State. ICA was abolished by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and functions redelegated to Agency for International Development pursuant to President Kennedy's letter of September 30, 1961, and Executive order of November 3, 1961.

On June 19, 1961, with the funds originally requested by President Eisenhower now appropriated, a Social Progress Trust Fund Agreement was made by and between the U.S. Government and the Inter-American Development Bank to administer $394 million of the $500 million in the Special Inter-American Fund for Social Progress. Of the balance, $100 million went to the Agency for International Development and $6 million to the Organization of American States; while the $100 million additional went into the Chilean reconstruction program.

On August 5, 1961, at the ministerial level under the auspices of the OAS the special meeting of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council (IA–ECOSOC) convened at Punta del Este, Uruguay, for the purpose of formulating the Alliance for Progress. Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon headed the U.S. delegation while Senators WAYNE MORSE and BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER attended as observers.

By August 17, 1961, the special meeting of the IA–ECOSOC at Punta del Este, was concluded with the signing of the basic documents for the Alliance for Progress by 20 member nations of the OAS including the Dominican Republic which was now again in the good graces of the Organization but not by Cuba which did not choose to sign. These documents were: (1) A declaration to the peoples of America; and (2) the Charter of Punta del Este, establishing an Alliance for progress within the framework of Operation Pan America.

In addition, there were signed 16 resolutions pertaining to economic and social development, economic integration, basic export commodities, an annual review of economic and social progress and social meetings of the IA–ECOSOC at the ministerial level, and public opinion and the Alliance for Progress.

Broadly, the Alliance for Progress is a phrase which describes all of the economic and social programs through which the signers of the Charter of Punta del Este undertake on a government-to-government or government-to-private people basis in the Latin American area. Departments, agencies, offices, and organizations too numerous to set forth here, function within the program in one way or another. It is a vast setup which took AID administrators themselves some time to find out what they were doing and where they were going. Indeed, it is so vast and complicated in organization and administration that it is practically impossible to prepare a complete functional chart of the inter- and intra-workings showing all of the ramifications of the entire business.

Just where the central office of administration and implementation of the overall Alliance for Progress program lies is somewhat obscure. Much of the activity, and certainly that of the United States, is centered in the State Department's Agency for International Development where an Assistant Administrator of its Latin American Bureau functions as Coordinatory of the Alliance for Progress through a number of committees of which probably the most generic is the Alliance for Progress Committee.

The precise amount of money required for implementation of the Alliance for Progress program is not spelled out in the Charter of Punta del Este. In that document, it is written "that the supply of capital from all external sources during the coming 10 years of at least $20 million be made available to the Latin American countries, and the greater part of this sum should be in public funds."

At the meeting at Punta del Este, it was contemplated that the United States would endeavor to make available to the countries in the form of loans, credits, or grants about one-tenth of the total amount that Alliance program required to be invested in Latin America over a 10-year period. The United States would, subject to certain reform measures by the Latin American countries, help them get an additional 10th from other public sources while the countries themselves would be responsible for supplying the remaining 80 percent of the funds, either by increasing their taxes and collections, selling their securities, inducing savings and investment by their own people, and attracting investment from abroad. In other words, they were talking about an investment of $100 billion over a period of 10 years, 80 percent of which would come from the Latin American Republics themselves.

In light of the total U.S. direct capital investments in all of Latin America (including European dependencies) over the years to the end of 1961 of only slightly more than $10 billion, the figure of $100 billion for the next 10 years seems rather large. Yet this is the goal.

As for immediate and short-term emergency financing, the United States agreed to provide more than $1 billion in the year ending March 1962. A total of $1,030 million was committed to Latin American countries during this first year of operations ending February 28, 1962, but it is estimated that only about one-quarter of this sum was actually disbursed up to that time.

Alliance for Progress funds furnished by the U.S. Government are administered by a number of Government agencies of which the most important are the Agency for International Development (AID), the Export-Import Bank of Washington (Eximbank), the Social Progress Trust Fund administered by the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB), and Food for Peace under Public Law 480. For the fiscal year ended June 30, 1962, obligations and loans authorized (but not necessarily disbursed) totaled slightly more than $1,117 million in economic assistance. Of this total, AID administered $453 million or 41 percent; Eximbank $262 million or 24 percent; Social Progress Trust Fund $224 million or 20 percent; Food for Peace $147 million or 13 percent; and other unspecified agencies $30 million or less than 3 percent.

Recipients of most of these obligations and loan authorizations were Chile with $211 million or 20 percent of the total; Brazil with $202 million or 18 percent; Mexico with $150 million or 14 percent; Argentina with $79 million or 7 percent; and Peru, Venezuela, and Colombia $70-odd million or with about 7 percent each. These six countries combined received nearly $872 million or more than 78 percent of the total.

These figures in themselves may be impressive until one determines how and where the money was or is to be spent, and above all, whether much of it or any of it went or would go to the underprivileged classes causing most of our troubles and whose welfare is supposed to be the objective of our efforts. Actually very little of the funds obligated and authorized have been disbursed and of the total committed during the first year of operations ending February 28, 1962, nearly 60 percent went for such nonproductive categories as refinancing of purchases, balancing of payments, budget support, reconstruction and relief, industrial credit and capital goods financing, and national companies and banks; and little of the remaining 40 percent went directly into productive enterprise in which the masses of the populace could participate.

Funds to be administered by the various above-named agencies are first authorized and then appropriated by the Congress of the United States after due justification for them as advocated mostly by the officials of the agencies concerned. The origin and channeling of the appropriated funds into the several disbursing agencies is often involved but in the last analysis they are derived from the taxpayer. Thus, the taxpayers and the Congressmen who represent them have a tangible interest in seeing that these funds will accomplish the objectives for which they are solicited.

In their attempts to justify the appropriations, the administrators of these agencies argue that expenditure of them is not only straightening things out in Latin America but is of great benefit to our economy. They point out that between 80 and 85 percent of the money granted or loaned in Latin America never leaves this country but is spent here for machinery, equipment, supplies, and services which increase production and employment in, and exports from, the United States. But Representative Otto F. Passman, of Louisiana, chairman of the House of Representatives Subcommittee on Foreign Operations Appropriations, contends correctly that if the money so spent is derived from grants and long-term non-interest-bearing loans which probably never will be repaid, then the U.S. taxpayer is in reality picking up the tab for these goods and services.

Insofar as the Alliance for Progress funds are supplied by the U.S. taxpayer to enable Latin American governments to pay for purchases in this country, these governments can utilize their own foreign exchange derived from their exports either to purchase other goods elsewhere, accumulate foreign exchange, buy gold from us, or otherwise utilize money which in effect U.S. taxpayers give them.

If these contentions are true, and certainly insofar as they are true, our financial situation is frightening in light of the manner in which our foreign assistance program is functioning, especially under the Alliance for Progress program in Latin America. During the year 1961, while our gold supply decreased $857 million, that of Latin America increased by $55 million; and during the year 1962 while our gold supply decreased $304 million, that of Latin America decreased only $25 million. During fiscal year 1962, our Government committed more than $1,000 million in aid to Latin America of which more than $300 million was actually disbursed.

On the other hand, even if these facts are admitted, there is the defense-policy philosophy which considers that our so-called foreign assistance program is in reality economic warfare the cost of which should be borne by the taxpayer as unhesitatingly as he bears the cost of military warfare. Whatever the viewpoint or actual cost, foreign assistance or economic warfare, whichever one prefers to call it, is with us to stay at least until this world becomes one glorious federation of peaceful peoples—and that most likely is for a long time.

The charter of Punta del Este establishing an Alliance for Progress is complete with noble aims and objectives, but as the Honorable Otto E. Passman said in hearings before his subcommittee on appropriations, "We all have the same objectives. But saying it and doing it are two different things." That means that the benefits from the money spent under the program must reach the people who are disgruntled and are causing our trouble. In order to accomplish this objective we must build up productive programs in agriculture, processing, manufacturing, and distribution in which the people can participate, earn money, purchase domestic commodities, save and invest, and vitalize their own economies. Of course, these necessities are understood by those administering the Alliance program but certainly so far, they have not directed funds into channels leading to that end.

Most of the agitation against the United States in Latin America comes from student, labor, and peasant leaders who represent the great masses of the underprivileged. The record is clear that what we desire from the masses has not been attained over the past 16 years with money per se, threats, or force. As Nelson Rockefeller realized after his first visit into Latin America more than 25 years ago, our problem is not alone an economic one but fundamentally one of human relations.

What we should have done years ago and what we must do now without further delay is to get to the people. If we must spend the taxpayers' money, let us spend it where the results of that spending will get at the roots of our trouble; and to accomplish this basic objective, the following priority program of essentials is urged:

1. Review educational and labor systems; develop and coordinate them with the democratic, economic, social, and political planning of each country.

2. Enlist students, teachers, industrial and farmworkers in popular programs geared to their economic and social welfare.

3. Set up efficient student, teacher, labor and farmer training programs; interchange leaders for purposes of mutual understanding and appreciation in efforts to achieve democratic ends.

4. Assure every student, teacher, and worker a job commensurate with his or her training and ability; make a sense of participation, human dignity, and social security the prime incentives and rewards of the common effort.

5. Encourage and assist free enterprise in establishing privately owned and operated productive agricultural, processing, manufacturing, and distribution activities in which the people can function as both producers and consumers to create and sustain a viable domestic economy.

6. Direct the bulk of assistance funds into education, health and sanitation facilities, housing, and public welfare activities; do not expend such funds on public utilities, transportation facilities, heavy industry, and other "infrastructure" facilities except when and where absolutely necessary and feasible.

7. Eliminate entirely the expenditure of foreign assistance funds on such purely fiscal matters as balancing budgets, paying off trade deficits, lending to nationalized institutions, and the like.

It is evident that the administration of our foreign assistance programs over the years has been so disunified, complex, cumbersome, and misdirected that the objectives sought have not been attained. In particular, the Alliance for Progress program is so diversified in its aims, nebulous in its structure, and bureaucratic in its organization that it is practically unworkable.

It is also self-evident that no matter what we do on our side of the picture to encourage and protect private business in entering the Latin American field, if the investment atmosphere within the Latin American countries themselves is not favorable, our efforts to enlist the aid of private enterprise will be of little or no avail.

Furthermore, expropriations of privately owned public utilities and certain natural-resource and heavy industries are bound to continue in Latin American countries under the wave of nationalism which has swept most of them since the last World War.

In order to eliminate the organizational and administrative handicaps and to better the implementation of our foreign assistance programs for the preservation and protection of democratic ideals in the Americas, it is proposed:

I. That the U.S. Government create a Department of Foreign Economic and Social Operations in which to centralize, unify, control, coordinate, and direct all of our foreign economic, social, and technical assistance programs.

II. That the Organization of American States effect an Inter-American Treaty for Uniform Investment and Antimonopoly Laws designed to prevent the flight of private capital from Latin American countries, and to attract private capital into these countries.

III. That within the framework of the proposed Treaty for Uniform Investment and Antimonopoly Laws, there be set up an inter-American permanent expropriation review and settlement board designed to take the sting and stigma out of Government condemnations of private property.

[From the Dan Smoot Report, Feb. 18, 1963]

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS—PART I

Alliance for Progress—the current program of the U.S. aid to Latin American nations—was initiated by Eisenhower; but it has become the major feature of President Kennedy's foreign policy.

The President claims that Alliance for Progress is intended to save Latin America from communism. Actually, the program is using American tax money to finance, and force upon Latin American countries, a communist-socialist revolution.

Kennedy has never given any precise estimate of what he expects to spend on Alliance for Progress; but general estimates are that the program will cost U.S. taxpayers $20 billion in the first 10 years.[1]

ORIGINS

The origins of the Alliance for Progress program are almost as unsavory as its consequences.

On July 13, 1960, Fernando Berckemeyer (Peruvian Ambassador to the United States) and Roy R. Rubottom, Jr. (then Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs) discussed in Washington a suggestion by the Peruvian Government that foreign ministers of all 21 American republics meet to discuss the Soviet threat in the Americas.

A committee composed of representatives from seven Central and South American nations went to work on the Peruvian suggestion. The committee's biggest job was deciding upon an agenda and a meeting place that would be acceptable to Castro of Cuba. On July 26, 1960, the committee announced it had solved this major problem: the foreign ministers' conference of the Organization of American States could meet at San Jose, Costa Rica; and it would consider as its first order of business, not Communist control of Cuba or Communist infiltration of Latin America, but charges against Gen. Rafael Trujillo of the Dominican Republic. The Government of Venezuela had accused Trujillo of plotting to assassinate Romulo Betancourt, President of Venezuela.

On August 16, 1960, foreign ministers representing 21 American nations, began their conference at San Jose.

Christian Herter, Eisenhower's Secretary of State, took the lead in getting the Organization of American States to take action against the Dominican Republic.

On August 20, 1960, the Conference adopted a formal resolution recommending that all other American nations break diplomatic relations with the Dominican Republic and impose severe economic sanctions against her.

On August 22, 1960, Christian Herter initiated the second stage of the OAS meeting at San Jose, Costa Rica, by presenting a U.S. bill of particulars against Cuba.

On August 23, 1960, Julio Cesar Turbay Ayala (Colombian foreign minister) answered Herter's charges against Castro. Turbay reaffirmed his faith in the principles of Castro's revolution and denied that Castro was actually a Communist. Turbay reviewed, with interest, Castro's charges against the United States—and deplored the U.S. sugar restrictions against Cuba (that is, our cutting off the sugar subsidy).

On August 29, 1960, the foreign ministers proclaimed the Declaration of San Jose, written by Turbay of Colombia, in which the members of the Organization of American States pledged themselves to democratic principles; to the rejection of totalitarian regimes of the right or left; to nonintervention in each others' affairs; and to support of the Organization of American States. The declaration did not even mention Cuba.

Thus the San Jose Conference of the Organization of American States—originally proposed by Peru for the purpose of discussing the Soviet threat in Cuba—achieved the destruction of Trujillo, America's only strong anti-Communist friend in the Caribbean area; but did not even scold Castro.

Christian Herter came home from San Jose, boasting that the United States had achieved a great diplomatic triumph.

The first stage of the OAS Conference of 1960 was completed at San Jose on August 20, when the delegates voted to isolate Trujillo of the Dominican Republic. The second stage was completed on August 29, when the Declaration of San Jose was adopted.

The third stage of the conference was conducted not at San Jose, Costa Rica, but at Bogotá, Colombia. The third stage, beginning on September 6, 1960, was a meeting of the economic ministers of the American Republics. This Bogotá stage of the OAS Conference was, simply, our State Department's payoff to the Central and South American Republics for what they had done at San Jose.

Douglas Dillon (then Eisenhower's Under Secretary of State) went to the Bogotá Conference with an Eisenhower promise of $500 million of American tax money to be given Latin American nations.

Dillon began his speech to the conference by paying tribute to the role which Turbay of Colombia had played at the San Jose Conference. Remember, Turbay wrote the Declaration of San Jose, which turned out to be a victory for international communism. Turbay had praised the principles of Castro's revolution; he had viewed, with interest, Castro's charges against the United States; and he had denounced the U.S. sugar restrictions against Castro.

Before Dillon went to Bogotá, the whole world knew that Eisenhower was sending him with a promise of $500 million in aid to Latin America. But there had been grumbling throughout Latin America that this was not enough. Castro was demanding that the United States inaugurate a $30 billion aid program to Latin America. Brazil, and most other Latin American nations, were supporting the general tenor of Castro's demands, though the figures they named were somewhat less extravagant.

It looked as if our Latin American friends might not graciously accept Eisenhower's offer of $500 million.

Douglas Dillon was prepared. He made it clear that the $500 million which he had come to offer was a mere drop in the bucket—just a beginning. All of this was to be used only for social development. He promised bigger and more respectable U.S. aid to all of Latin America to continue economic development in that region.

"Social development," apparently, means schools, housing, hospitals—that sort of thing—to be built with money taken away from U.S. taxpayers. "Economic development" seems to mean the continuation of building, with U.S. tax money, roads, harbors, industrial plants (to compete with our own, of course), public buildings, and so on.

Douglas Dillon won another smashing diplomatic victory for the United States at Bogotá: the Latin American Republics agreed to accept our offer of $500 million for social development and our promise of billions for economic development.

On September 13, 1960, the economic ministers of the American Republics signed the act of Bogotá, authorizing a massive program of U.S. aid to Latin American countries.

In his first inaugural address (January 20, 1961) President Kennedy gave this new aid-to-Latin-America program its current name: Alliance for Progress. President Kennedy said:

"To our sister Republics south of our border, we offer a special pledge—to convert our good words into good deeds—in a new Alliance for Progress—to assist freemen and free governments in casting off the chains of poverty."

REVOLUTIONARY PURPOSE

On March 13, 1961, speaking to Latin American diplomats, and Members of the U.S. Congress, President Kennedy said:

"I have called on all the people of the hemisphere to join in a new Alliance for Progress. I have this evening signed a request to the Congress for $500 million as a first step in fulfilling the act of Bogotá. This is the first large-scale inter-American effort—instituted by my predecessor, President Eisenhower—to attack the social barriers which block economic progress.

"This political freedom must be accompanied by social change. For unless necessary social reforms, including land and tax reforms, are freely made * * * then our alliance, our revolution, our dream, and our freedom will fail."[2]

In his formal message to Congress (March 14, 1961) asking for the $500 million to initiate the Alliance for Progress (as authorized by the act of Bogotá) President Kennedy again stressed the revolutionary purpose of this program. Acknowledging that revolutionary new social institutions and patterns cannot be designed overnight, President Kennedy implied that we must nonetheless begin at once a crash program to overturn the existing way of life in Latin America—giving our aid not on the basis of need, but on the demonstrated readiness of each government to make the institutional improvements which we require.

This theme of total revolution in Latin America, financed and enforced by U.S. tax money under the label of "Alliance for Progress," was reemphasized at a special meeting of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council (held at Punta del Este, Uruguay) on August 16, 1961. In the formal declaration issued by the delegates at this meeting, the Latin American nations receiving American aid pledged themselves.

"To encourage * * * programs of integral agrarian reform.

"To assure to workers fair wages and satisfactory working conditions.

"To establish effective systems of labor-management relations and procedures.

"To reform tax laws, demanding more from those who have most, punishing tax evasion severely, and redistributing the national income."[3]

THE REVOLUTIONISTS

On November 6, 1961, President Kennedy announced appointment of Teodoro Moscoso as regional administrator for Latin America in the new Agency for International Development—that is, as head of the Alliance for Progress program. Moscoso is a Puerto Rican socialist, an early protege of Rexford Guy Tugwell, the braintruster whom Franklin D. Roosevelt made Governor of Puerto Rico. Moscoso is also an intimate friend of Romulo Betancourt, President of Venezuela, who is a Communist.

To understand the grim truth—that Alliance for Progress is a crash program with American tax money to tear Latin America apart and then reorganize it according to the Communist plan for a Marxist land—one needs a little background information on some of the principal actors in this revolutionary drama. At present, two of the principals are Teodoro Moscoso, Kennedy's Chief of the Alliance for Progress program; and Romulo Betancourt, Communist President of Venezuela.

---

[1] The New York Times magazine, Dec. 17, 1961.

[2] "President Kennedy Speaks on the Alliance for Progress," a booklet published recently by the Agency for International Development, U.S. Department of State.

[3] Department of State Publication No. 572, Aug. 16, 1961.

Former U.S. Representative John Rousselot, Republican, of California did a great deal of research on Betancourt, and put the results of his labors into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: volume 107, part 16, pages 20941–20946; volume 108, part 3, pages 2951–2956; volume 108, part 10, pages 13185–13191.

U.S. Representative WILLIAM C. CRAMER, Republican, of Florida, put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 108, part 17, pages 23552–23553; and February 7, 1963 (pp. 1978–1980), more revealing information about Betancourt.

Here, in brief, is the Betancourt story:

As a young man, Betancourt worked openly as a functionary of the Communist International in Venezuela. For this Communist activity, he was exiled from his homeland in 1928. During exile, Betancourt went to Costa Rica where, with Manuel Mora, he founded the Communist Party of Costa Rica and was, for 5 years (1930 to 1935) head of that party. Working openly for a Communist revolution throughout Latin America, Betancourt discovered that communism could not thus be sold to the people. It would have to be imposed upon them by deception. Betancourt devised a hoax. He would renounce his membership in the Communist Party and return to Venezuela as an anti-Communist, and work to impose communism on his homeland by calling his program anti-Communist.

He did return to Venezuela, gathered his old Communist cronies around him, and launched his new Communist program of deception. He had made the mistake, however, of explaining his scheme in letters to Communist friends. These letters fell into the hands of Venezuelan authorities; and Betancourt was again ordered into exile. He evaded this banishment and went underground. For 9 years he remained in hiding. During that time, he organized a powerful Communist front disguised as a political party, which he called Accion Democratica (Democratic Action).

In 1945, a military junta overthrew the legal Government of Venezuela, and turned to Betancourt for leadership. Betancourt became president of the junta. Using the established political machinery of Accion Democratica, and appointing Communist henchmen to key posts in government, Betancourt ruled Venezuela for 3 years.

His rule was so corrupt and tyrannical that, on November 24, 1948, an uprising of military officers, led by Marcos Perez Jimenez, overthrew Betancourt and his stooges; and Betancourt again went into exile.

For over 9 years, Betancourt remained in exile. He spent much of that time in New York City, where he became the darling of the ultraliberal, anti-anti-Communist crowd of Socialist intellectuals—a hero to the leading liberals of the Eisenhower, and later of the Kennedy, administration.

In 1956, Betancourt's Communist connections became so objectionable that he was arrested in New York City (on information supplied by the FBI), was expelled from the United States, and denied readmittance. He was, however, permitted to live in Puerto Rico. Here, he became an intimate of Munoz-Marin, Socialist Governor of Puerto Rico, and of Teodoro Moscoso.[4]

Leftist groups in Venezuela (widely believed to have been directed and encouraged by Betancourt's new friends in the American State Department) overthrew Marcos Perez Jimenez in January 1958. About June 1958, Betancourt returned to Venezuela, revived his Accion Democratica, and ran for President. Again with the undercover support of the American State Department (which included widely circulated rumors, in Venezuela, that if Betancourt's party won the election, Venezuela would receive mammoth amounts of aid from the United States), Betancourt was elected.

Jimenez (who had given Venezuela the best government and had brought the nation to the highest level of prosperity in its history) was exiled. He sought asylum in the United States. Betancourt wants him returned to Venezuela so that he can be executed. He has filed outrageous charges against Jimenez, who is now in a Miami jail awaiting extradition. The American State Department and the powerful leftwing propaganda forces in the United States (including, for example, such "respected" organs as the Christian Science Monitor) have for months been conducting a massive hate campaign against Jimenez, preparing public opinion for denying him asylum so that he can be turned over to Betancourt for liquidation.

In 1961, the law firm of Dean Acheson (who is a special adviser to President Kennedy) received $180,000 from Betancourt's government as a fee for representing Venezuela in the extradition proceedings against Jimenez.[4]

ALLIANCE SHOWPIECE

Meanwhile, Betancourt's regime in Venezuela has become a cesspool of corruption and tyranny. Despite Venezuela's enormous natural riches (and despite the hundreds of millions of dollars which Betancourt has obtained from the United States), grinding poverty, economic chaos, and wild disorder reign in Venezuela.

The reported Communist sabotage in Venezuela, and Betancourt's alleged crackdown on Communists, are merely part of a hoax—to justify Betancourt's seizure of absolute power, and to help the Kennedy administration justify more aid.

Communist Betancourt's Venezuela is the land which the Kennedy administration points to as the showpiece of the Alliance for Progress.[5]

Shortly after Kennedy was inaugurated, in January 1961, he appointed Teodoro Moscoso (Betancourt's old friend) to be Ambassador to Venezuela. In November 1961, Kennedy promoted Moscoso to the post of Chief of the Alliance for Progress. In December 1961, when it became apparent that Betancourt, despite his support from Washington, was in deep trouble in Venezuela, President and Mrs. Kennedy made a hastily planned visit to him, to help shore up his sagging regime. Here is an account of this disgraceful episode in American history, in the words of U.S. Representative John Rousselot (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 108, pt. 3, p. 2951):

"President Kennedy's trip to Venezuela was what was needed to bolster Betancourt's sinking Accion Democratica government. To the eternal humiliation of the American people, President Kennedy permitted himself to be used in this desperate Betancourt personal political maneuver. He permitted himself to be paraded through the streets of Caracas to impress upon the discontented Venezuelan populace that the United States is backing Betancourt. Before he departed, he was persuaded to deliver a series of speeches, obviously prepared for him by his collectivist aides, hailing the alleged progress of Venezuela under Betancourt and pledging generous American loans."

Mr. Rousselot's words do not adequately portray the shameful behavior of the American President while visiting Communist Betancourt.

President and Mrs. Kennedy arrived in Venezuela on December 16, 1961. In his welcoming speech, Betancourt (while praising Kennedy personally) insulted the United States with open arrogance. Betancourt praised Kennedy as a "U.S. President who is rectifying a long period of ignorance and lack of comprehension (in the United States)." Betancourt denounced the "arrogant belief (in the United States) that the friendship * * * (of Latin America) was guaranteed to the United States by the self-appointed rulers and their courts of small oligarchies." Betancourt criticized the "bad habits of bureaucratic routine" in the United States, which had slowed down the flow of U.S. aid to Latin America, and demanded speed in satisfying the economic, social and cultural underdevelopment of Latin America.

President Kennedy answered these insults to the United States by saying:

"Your distinguished President Romulo Betancourt, is demonstrating the capacity of freemen to realize their aspirations without sacrificing liberty or dignity.

"He has reestablished democratic government after a decade of dictatorship—and he has carried forward a solid and responsible program of economic progress.

"I come (to Venezuela) to take counsel with your leaders * * * to witness the magnificent example of vital democracy which is being carried forward in Venezuela."

In another speech at LaMorita, on December 17, President Kennedy said:

"Here in Venezuela the meaning of the new Alianza para el Progreso is being demonstrated, for you have made a tradition and transition from depressive dictatorship into a free life for the people of this country to progressive democratic rule under the grant of the great democratic statesman of the Western Hemisphere—your distinguished President Romulo Betancourt.

"Today 86 families will receive their titles to their own homes under a program which has already settled 38,000 families on 3,800,000 acres of land.

"This is your program—the program of your progressive far-seeing Government—and the people of my country will share in this program by making available more loans to build rural homes and more credits to finance your crops.

"This program is at the heart of the Alianza para el Progreso."[6]

AGRARIAN REFORMS

It is rumored in Venezuela that farmers who want to get a piece of land under Betancourt's "agrarian reform" must kick back 10 percent of the value to Betancourt's political party (Acción Democratica). But even if we ignore the graft (at our expense) what do we find, on close examination, in the agrarian reform which President Kennedy praises extravagantly, and which he says is the heart of our Alliance for Progress program for all of Latin America? Here is what U.S. Representative Rousselot found:

"The United States is the greatest example that could be cited of a nation which has enriched itself through a constructive agrarian program. Our program was inaugurated with the Homestead Act after the Civil War.

"Through this act, vast stretches of rich virgin land in the West were brought into cultivation. The act did not propose to take over the productive farms already in operation in New York, Pennsylvania, and Virginia, and cut them up into small uneconomic holdings. Instead, it directed the new farmers to uncultivated land on the frontier, which increased rather than decreased the Nation's crop production.

"Does Betancourt propose to do this in Venezuela with the aid of the agrarian reform millions which President Kennedy promised him? No indeed. Venezuela has enormous stretches of uncultivated and good government-owned land in the Provinces of Sucre, Monaga, Ansoategui, and Bolivar. They are served by convenient transportation facilities. For the more distant future, it has the empire sweep of the vast area beyond the Orinoco.

---

[4] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 7, 1963, pp. 1978–1980, remarks of WILLIAM C. CRAMER.

[5] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 108, pt. 17, pp. 23552–25553, remarks of WILLIAM C. CRAMER.

[6] The New York Times, Dec. 17, 1961, p. 37.

"Did Betancourt propose an agrarian plan, like that of the United States, which would open up this abundant government-owned land through an orderly, wealth-producing program? He did not. Instead, he launched a program to buy up land already in successful cultivation and cut it up into small, uneconomic plots. These plots were mostly near Caracas where they could be used as showcase exhibits for credulous visitors. President Kennedy was taken to one of these cut-up farms and induced to make a speech enthusiastically hailing the Betancourt land program, and promising far-reaching aid."[7]

The agrarian and other social reforms which our socialist planners are devising, and financing with our money, throughout Latin America, have sinister aspects.

A Mexican businessman, deeply disturbed about our Alliance for Progress program, sent me the following account of what is happening:

"In many Latin American countries the vast majority of the land areas taken away from the large landowners is reportedly divided up among peons or poor rural peasants. This sounds lovely to the people who read it and especially attractive to the American people who through their Government and Government banks finance with loans and grants these so-called agrarian reforms which appear to give the land to the peasants.

"However almost the exact reverse is the case. Most of the land taken away from the large landowners is not given to the peons or peasants, but the ownership is kept by the governments and only assigned year by year to the peons. Thereby the former landowner is replaced by a much bigger landowner whose local representative is a political appointee who is able to assign a small piece of land each year to each peon or refuse it to him or change him to another piece as he (the political appointee) sees fit.

"The result is, in practice, that the peon has lost his old patron, who in many cases was a humane sort of person, and generally lived on the property at least a part of the year, and whose ear could be reached by the peon, as those who have lived in Latin America in the past can testify. In exchange he has a new patron who is a 'faceless, cold, impersonal' government office represented by a frequently changing political appointee who has no direct interest in the productivity of the soil and frequently is principally interested in enriching himself while he holds on to his insecure job.

"The peon does not own any land, he has no feeling of ownership, does not know how long he may be permitted to work the same plot and hence can have no interest in improving the land, and does feel totally dependent on the whim of the politicians, which is just what the Communists desire and in this way attain. All the land belongs to the government

"The same is true of most of the government housing schemes. The houses are not sold to the people but are rented to them. All the houses belong to the government and this added to the government control of transportation, telegraphs, movies and the press, is perfect preparation for the establishment of the totalitarian state or communism. Government intervention is creeping forward all the time, and the money which the Alliance for Progress gives to these leftist governments only speeds up the march down to socialism and eventually communism.

"American citizens should give as much importance to stopping the socialistic policies of the Alliance for Progress as they do to impeding socialistic legislation in their own country. U.S. taxpayers have already spent many hundreds of millions of dollars on the Alliance for Progress, in promoting policies which are absolutely against the best interests of the Latin American countries concerned, against their economic and political freedom, and against the best interests of the United States into the bargain."

WHO IS DAN SMOOT?

Dan Smoot was born in Missouri. Reared in Texas, he attended SMU in Dallas taking BA and MA degrees from that university in 1938 and 1940.

In 1941 he joined the faculty at Harvard as a teaching fellow in English doing graduate work for the degree of doctor of philosophy in the field of American civilization.

In 1942, he took leave of absence from Harvard in order to join the FBI. At the close of the war, he stayed in the FBI, rather than return to Harvard.

He worked as an FBI agent in all parts of the Nation handling all kinds of assignments. But for 3½ years, he worked exclusively on Communist investigations in the industrial Midwest. For 2 years following that, he was on FBI headquarters staff in Washington, as an administrative assistant to J. Edgar Hoover.

After 9½ years in the FBI, Smoot resigned to help start the Facts Forum movement in Dallas. As the radio and television commentator for Facts Forum, Smoot, for almost 4 years spoke to a national audience giving both sides of great controversial issues.

In July 1955 he resigned and started his own independent program, in order to give only one side—the side that uses fundamental American principles as a yardstick for measuring all important issues.

If you believe that Dan Smoot is providing effective tools for those who want to think and talk and write on the side of freedom, you can help immensely by subscribing, and encouraging others to subscribe, to the Dan Smoot Report.

[From the Dan Smoot Report, Feb. 25, 1963]

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS—PART II

In 1950, an American dollar was worth 18.3 Brazilian cruzeiros. By January, 1962 (despite inflation of U.S. currency), the dollar would buy 350 cruzeiros.

In January 1963 (shortly after the United States had granted Brazil another special loan of $30 million to help stabilize the currency), I visited Brazil. The night I arrived, an American dollar would buy 600 cruzeiros. My guide advised me not to exchange any money that night, however, because, he said, I would probably get a better rate of exchange the next day. I did. The next morning, I bought 650 cruzeiros for 1 American dollar. When I left Brazil 8 days later, the rate was fluctuating between 750 and 800 cruzeiros to 1 American dollar.

During my stay in Brazil, I interviewed numerous people (middle-class Brazilians, resident Americans, an official of the U.S. Information Agency, and so on.) All of them cited the building of Brasilia as the primary reason for the inflation.

GOVERNMENT EXTRAVAGANCE

Brasilia is the new capital of Brazil, located in the wilds of Goias, on the Brazilian highlands, about 600 miles inland from Rio de Janeiro, the former capital. Construction on the city was begun in 1957, during the administration of President Juscelino Kubitschek. There were no inhabitants in the region and no roads to it. Construction steel and most of the heavy machinery were brought in from the United States. Highways were built through hundreds of miles of uninhabited country to the major coastal cities of Brazil. And Brasilia was dedicated as the new national capital in 1960.

I examined the city of Brasilia, closely and carefully, in January 1963, when it was less than 6 years old. Decay and dilapidation have already set in. It is probably the world's foremost contemporary monument to the folly of a politically motivated, socialistically planned economy.

Oscar Niemeyer, Brazilian architect who helped design the United Nations Building in New York, designed all buildings in Brasilia. Photographed from a distance, they make striking postcards and fine illustrations for an article in National Geographic; but, examined at close range, as places where people are supposed to live and work, they are ugly. Niemeyer himself apparently shares my opinion. He does not live among the modernistic oddities which he designed for other people to occupy: he built for himself and old-fashioned Brazilian colonial outside the city. The futuristic buildings, of spectacular design, reveal inferior construction. Most are still empty and unfinished. Some apartment houses that are occupied, already show signs of becoming slums.

Most of the people in the Federal District of Brasilia still live in the construction-camp slums that formed when workers were first brought in 6 years ago. The costly highways running to the coastal cities are, like the wide avenues of Brasilia, empty of traffic.

President Kubitschek, a leftwing socialist, practically bankrupted his nation to build this preposterous monument to himself. The political argument for his folly was that, by placing the national capital inland, the Government would spur migration from the crowded coastal cities to the vacant interior, where the climate is good, and fertile soil is abundant.

The scheme has failed miserably. Brasilia is a modernistic ghost town, where no one wants to live. Brazilians prefer the fleshpots of Rio.

Without exception, every Brazilian I talked to about Brasilia called it a white elephant. Yet the nation is now stuck with it. Although there is a vast quantity of unfinished construction in the city, there is little construction work presently being done. I doubt that it will ever be finished; and the cost of maintaining it as is, for a national capital, is quite enough to overburden the Brazilian economy.

It is impossible to say how much Brazilian tax money and how much American tax money went into the construction of Brasilia. During the 6 years of its existence, we have given the Brazilian Government more than enough to pay for the whole thing; but it is obvious that all of our foreign aid money was not diverted into this gigantic fiasco. Our money has been spread around a bit, to underwrite the activities of other leftwing Brazilian politicians, to line their pockets, and to encourage harmful extravagances on the part of government, and reckless spending on the part of the people.

PRIVATE EXTRAVAGANCE

Aided and encouraged by a foreign government to spend money it does not have, the Brazilian Government feeds the fire of inflation which is consuming the nation. Some of the consequences are obvious, despite thick layers of propaganda, which misrepresent them to the world. Look, for example, at São Paulo, largest city in Brazil, generally called the Chicago of South America, and frequently rhapsodized as a place which inspires awe, a very model of modern municipal grandeur, a vision of the 21st century.[1]

---

[7] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 108, pt. 3, p. 2954.

In fact, São Paulo is a grim, and dangerous, monument to reckless economic activity artificially stimulated by a socialistic government. From the downtown hotel room I occupied in São Paulo, I could count upward of 50 unfinished skyscrapers. A casual glance at such evidence of boom and bustle does inspire awe. But a closer look inspires something else.

Work has obviously been abandoned on most of these unfinished buildings. Some of them have been under construction for more than 10 years; and shabby masonry is already crumbling in many buildings which may never be finished and used. No structural steel is used in any of these new skyscrapers. They are built of reinforced concrete columns. The walls are made of a soft, cheap looking locally made brick, poorly laid by unskilled hands. The brick is covered with plaster, and the whole building (those, that is, which have reached this stage of completion) is faced over with a brilliant Brazilian tile which gives an appearance of solidity and beauty.

No one knows whether such buildings could stand a moderate earth tremor, or even a wind of hurricane proportions. An American engineer, who works in São Paulo, expressed to me the fear that one good shock would leave São Paulo a vast heap of broken concrete and shattered masonry. As to that, no one can definitely say; but the economic, social, and political consequences of such construction activity—throwing up, in reckless profusion, costly buildings which are abandoned, to decay and ruin before they are ever finished—are obvious.

Some of the unfinished buildings of São Paulo were built with Government money—that is, American tax money, given to the Brazilian Government as foreign aid, and then lent to private speculators. But, apparently, most of the buildings were privately financed.

Why would individuals put their money into such construction, much of which is never finished? Having lost confidence in their currency, they were trying to put it into real estate, something of permanent value. They could get enough money to start a building, from private syndicates which charged interest rates ranging as high as 48 percent per year. But often, before completion, interest and further currency depreciation had consumed all working capital—and no more was available.

AS BRAZIL GOES

Occupying about half of the land area of South America, Brazil dominates the continent. As Brazil goes, so may go the rest of Latin America. And Brazil, in the hands of pro-Communist politicians, whose policies are being financed by American tax money through Alliance for Progress, is headed straight for communism.

A look at recent Brazilian political history should make this clear.

From 1934 to 1945, Getulio Vargas ruled Brazil as a dictator, his administrative system patterned after the corporate state system of Fascist Italy. During his reign, he set up the Brazilian Labor Party, which continued to dominate Brazilian politics even after Vargas was overthrown by the Army in 1945.

Vargas returned to the Presidency in 1950, having won in the elections by an overwhelming majority. In the name of economic nationalism, he socialized the Brazilian petroleum industry and extended Government control over all other industries—even to the extent of limiting the amount of profit which foreign corporations could withdraw from Brazil.

Nonetheless, the U.S. Government set up, with Vargas, a joint commission for economic development in Brazil, and supported his schemes. Fear that Vargas (with U.S. aid) was restoring his dictatorship, caused criticism which grew until, in August 1954, Vargas' palace guard attempted to assassinate him. Vargas committed suicide on August 24, 1954.

Elections for a new President were held the following year, 1955. Two of Vargas' followers—Juscelino Kubitschek and Joao Goulart (who had been Secretary of Labor under Vargas)—won the offices of President and Vice President.

Kubitschek and Goulart were inaugurated in January 1956. During the elections of 1955, they had been formally supported by Communists. After their inauguration, they repudiated the Communists, and announced a policy of friendly cooperation with the United States.[2] This, of course, opened the sluice gates for a flood of American tax dollars which enabled Kubitschek to start the building of Brasilia—and to initiate other policies which sped the chaotic depreciation of Brazilian currency.

Under the Brazilian Constitution, Kubitschek could not succeed himself as president. In the elections of 1960, Janio Quadros was elected President, Joao Goulart was reelected Vice President. They were inaugurated in January 1961.

Quadros proclaimed a neutralist foreign policy. He resumed diplomatic relations with the Communist regimes of Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Rumania; he expressed support for the original aspirations of the Cuban revolution of Castro; he exchanged trade missions with Communist China and the Soviet Union—and sent financial envoys to the United States.

Quadros stirred up a storm of protest in Brazil by publicly decorating Che Guevara, Castro's Communist Minister of Finance. The storm never died; and on August 25, 1961—having been in office less than 7 months—President Quadros abruptly resigned and left the country.

The office of President fell to Vice President Goulart, who was on his way back to Brazil from a visit to Communist China.

Goulart's record of leftwing activities—of working with and through Communists and their sympathizers—aroused the fears of many Brazilians, including the military, who opposed his succession to the presidency.

Before Goulart was permitted to become President, the Brazilian Congress adopted a constitutional amendment which set up a parliamentary form of government, transferring principal executive authority from the President to a Council of Ministers.[3]

When finally inaugurated as President, Goulart surrounded himself with pro-Communist assistants, proclaimed his devotion to the neutralist foreign policy of Quadros—and then made a state visit to the United States. In Washington, he spoke to a joint session of Congress, scolding the American legislators for giving so little money to Brazil, and demanding a new and immediate gift of another $500 million.[4]

Returning to Brazil with almost groveling assurances, from the Kennedy administration, of increased Alliance for Progress aid, President Goulart, thus elevated in prestige, took immediate steps toward eliminating the parliamentary system so that he could become a virtual dictator.

His Communist and pro-Communist underlings, working through the Brazilian Labor Party and the unions, incited a series of riots and strikes throughout the nation.[5] The resulting chaos and economic stagnation created a demand (planted and nourished, of course, by Goulart's henchmen) for elimination of the cumbersome parliamentary system, and for restoration of a strong Presidency which could do something in the crisis.

The Brazilian Congress resisted, but eventually decided that the issue must be put to the people in a national plebiscite, to be held on January 6, 1963.

Goulart played his trump card just a short time before the voting occurred. In December, 1962, he proclaimed a law ordering all business firms operating in Brazil to pay an extra month's salary to all workers.

This fine bonus, for which Goulart got credit, did the job it was supposed to do: Goulart won by a 5 to 1 margin in the national plebiscite of January 6, 1963. All obstacles against Goulart becoming an elected pro-Communist dictator—with promises of American Alliance for Progress tax dollars to back him—are now removed.

I talked to responsible Brazilians, and to resident American businessmen, about the December bonus which Goulart ordered all business firms to pay. How could the firms stand such a blow? Simple. American firms (many of which are operating under guarantees-against-loss from the American Government) paid the bonus and took the loss, which would in due course be passed on to American taxpayers.

Brazilian firms which would not stand to pay the bonus were permitted to go under—if their management was not friendly to the Goulart regime, or if the administration wanted to gain control of their properties. Brazilian firms friendly to the Goulart administration were given Federal tax rebates large enough to cover the enforced bonus payments. The resultant loss to the Brazilian national treasury was covered by Alliance for Progress money from the United States, and by more worthless printing-press Brazilian currency.

ALLIANCE FOR POLITICIANS

American aid money enabled Kubitschek to build Brasilia, for the purpose of spurring Brazilians to migrate inland; and American aid money has helped guarantee the failure of the migration scheme.

With American aid money, Brazilian politicians periodically feed and entertain the lazy and illiterate thousands who crowd into the squatters camps of Rio and other large coastal cities. If they moved to the interior, they would have to work—and they would miss all the free fun.

With American aid money, the Brazilian Government also caters to the urban vote by subsidizing certain food costs for certain groups of city voters. Some low-rent Alliance for Progress housing (owned and controlled by the Brazilian Government) has already been completed in the big coastal cities; and vast quantities more are promised. Why should easy-going Brazilians give up the reality and prospects of such easy, American-subsidized living, to face the rigors of work and self-support in the undeveloped interior?

An article entitled "United States Betting on Mexico—But There's Trouble Ahead," in the February 25, 1963, issue of U.S. News & World Report, reveals that the same sort of thing is happening in Mexico. Indeed, it is happening all over Latin America.

ONLY LEFTWINGERS

The only Latin American politicians which the Kennedy administration will support with our Alliance for Progress tax dollars are the leftwingers—Socialists and pro-Communists. Note, for example, this significant item from the front page of the December 17, 1962, issue of the News, an English-language newspaper published in Mexico City:

---

[1] "Giant Brazil," National Geographic, September 1962, p. 306.

[2] Encyclopedia Americana, vol. 4, p. 451 c.

[3] This Changing World: For Commanders: Armed Forces Information and Education, published by the Department of Defense, vol. 1, No. 8, Nov. 1, 1961.

[4] Newsletter of U.S. Representative RICHARD H. POFF (Republican, Virginia), dated Apr. 16, 1962.

[5] "Toward a Soviet Brazil," by Robert Morris, "The Wanderer," Jan. 17, 1963.

"President Jorge Alessandri of Chile today wound up a week-long visit to the United States, which he is confident helped dispel impressions that his government is too conservative to lead in the drive to bring economic and social reform to Latin America.

"Chile and Colombia have been singled out by the Kennedy administration for large-scale aid under the Alliance for Progress."

These leftwing politicians use American money to create socialistic enterprises, thus destroying private enterprise. Note, for example, these passages from the U.S. News & World Report article on Mexico, mentioned above:

"Mexican businessmen and foreign investors are concerned * * * over steady and increasing inroads by the Government into industry and manufacturing * * * a gradual expansion of Government ownership of a vast network of businesses * * * (ranges) from railroads, electric power, petroleum and natural gas, steel mills, and airlines to automobile production and drug manufacture.

"As a result, a new class of public officials has developed in Mexico. These are the directors and administrators of the Government-run industries. They have all the prestige and power of business ownership, plus the power of Government—all without risk of their own money.

"To this new type of managers and administrators, it seems perfectly normal that the Government continues to expand its participation in the economy and to regulate that which it does not own. The result has been a marked increase in Government control of business through legislation, decrees, import controls, and licenses."

American tax money is financing this communizing of Mexico—and an even greater program is being planned. Note these passages from the same U.S. News & World Report article:

"Mexico, it now appears, is to be built up as a showplace of the Alliance for Progress in Latin America.

"Plans for injections of huge sums—up to $3 billion—into the Mexican economy are under study here by officials of the U.S.-sponsored Alliance and the World Bank."

RESULTS

And what are the results of these injections of huge amounts of American tax money, through the hands of leftwing politicians, into the economy of Mexico? From the U.S. News & World Report article on Mexico:

"Private businessmen, alarmed by this trend (toward Government ownership and control of business) have reacted by spurning new investments in Mexico and turning to less vulnerable investments abroad. Flight of capital from Mexico in 1961, mainly due to concern over this factor, is conservatively estimated at $150 million."

Private capital in Latin America is the only hope for gradual transformation of agrarian, semifeudalistic societies (through an orderly process of growth) to the point where the people can understand, sustain, and perpetuate modern industrialism.

Our Alliance for Progress money is rapidly driving out all of the private capital and encouraging governments to spend money they do not have. As we pour our tax money in, private investors pull theirs out and stash it away in Swiss banks, or invest it in European industry. At the same time, our aid money is financing the destruction of governmental systems and social arrangements which are the only protection against wild disorder and bloody violence.

And when blood runs in the streets, we will get the blame, because we are so closely identified with the policies producing the disorder. One by one, the Latin American nations (with Brazil, perhaps, in the vanguard) may turn to outright Communist dictatorships as the only way to restore "law and order."

THEY KNOW WHAT THEY ARE DOING

It cannot accurately be said that our governmental leaders do not understand what is happening in Latin America. In the latter part of 1961, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD (New Frontier Democrat from Montana, who is Senate majority leader) spent a few days in Brazil as a member of a Senate study mission. On January 22, 1962, he reported his observations on Brazil to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. Here are extracts from Senator MANSFIELD's report: [6]

"Inflation * * * discourages personal savings and impairs long-term investment in productive enterprise. It has pushed interest rates up to 3 and 4 percent a month. A great deal of capital has been diverted into speculative, if spectacular, real estate construction and other enterprises with low social value.

"It is impossible to form an estimate of the amount of indigenous capital that has fled the country and is now held in Europe and the United States. Nevertheless, in informed circles in Brazil, the belief is general that the amount is very great. At the same time, foreign capital is showing hesitancy in flowing into Brazil. It is not unreasonable to suppose that the hesitancy is likely to grow if financial chaos continues to threaten in Brazil and if the recent indications of political hostility to foreign business persist. Within Brazil, moreover, credit has flowed very loosely, encouraging speculation and profiteering. At the same time, there have been large deficits in the Government budgets, year after year.

"For the most part, the * * * poor have poured into and around the cities from rural areas, in the hope of finding living conditions which might be superior to those in the impoverished countryside.

"The northeast contains 25 million inhabitants, more than a third of Brazil's population. It is a region of immense stretches of empty lands, forests, and a few vast agricultural estates, and innumerable subsistence farms. The region has characteristics which are similar to those in impoverished agricultural sectors of the Mediterranean countries * * * and in some underdeveloped regions of Asia. Per capita income is in the neighborhood of $100 a year. Infant mortality rates are high and average life expectancies short. Illiteracy is widespread. There is a very limited availability of modern medical care and other social services.

"The planning agency for the development of the northeast * * * is known in Brazil as Sudene. The Sudene concept * * * will involve vast outlays of funds, Brazilian and foreign.

"Neither technical shortcomings nor financing, however, may be the major question mark as to the feasibility of the Sudene plan. The more fundamental difficulty may lie in Brazilian society."

There, Senator MANSFIELD puts his finger on one fatal flaw in all of our aid programs to underdeveloped countries. A nation of people who are incapable of producing a complex, modern industrial society are quite incapable of maintaining one. They have had enough contact with modern society to yearn for its material benefits; but, in this yearning, they are like small children who wish for a high-powered automobile to do with as they please. Outside efforts (such as we are making) to give the underdeveloped peoples an industrial economy (before they have gone through generations of slow self-development that is necessary to produce one) will be harmful to them and to others, just as giving the child an automobile would be.

Senator MANSFIELD touches on some of the dangers involved in our aid programs to Brazil (and, similarly, to other Latin American countries). He says:

"This Nation's policies with respect to Brazil tread a very delicate line, particularly as they pertain to the Alliance for Progress. What is not yet clear is whether aid can, in fact, contribute to evolutionary change. On the contrary, there is a strong presumption in present circumstances that significant assistance will not do much more than prolong and intensify the present unsatisfactory situation.

"Moreover, such assistance will link us very closely with that situation, and if it then collapses, all of our interests are likely to be more adversely affected than would otherwise have been the case."

Yet, Senator MANSFIELD continues among the foremost in supporting Kennedy's massive Alliance for Progress aid program.

WHAT SHOULD BE DONE?

I do not know—and, obviously, no one else knows—how to solve these critical problems in South America. Our Government has no constitutional right to try to solve them. We should, therefore, compel the Congress of the United States to stop the Alliance for Progress program abruptly.

Would not all the Latin American nations then turn to communism? Perhaps. But now we are speeding their march toward communism with our aid.

If we pauperized the United States by giving all of our wealth to the cause of promoting a prosperous, stable Latin America, we would still fail; and, by our effort, we would hurt the people of Latin America more than we would help them.

Even if the Latin American people were capable of absorbing and using constructively the help we give them, there is not enough wealth in the United States to raise a nation like Brazil to the level of educational, scientific, cultural, commercial, and industrial development that prevailed in Czechoslovakia in 1948. But even if our aid could uplift Brazil to that extent—would that keep the Communists from taking over, as they took over the advanced and highly developed nation of Czechoslovakia?

The fact is that the disease of communism does not breed in the bellies of men.

STATISTICS [7]

Direct U.S. aid to Alliance for Progress countries from 1946 to August 1962 is as follows:

Argentina	$1, 027, 300, 000
Bolivia	286, 400, 000
Brazil	3, 193, 400, 000
Chile	904, 700, 000
Colombia	576, 100, 000
Costa Rica	136, 700, 000
Dominican Republic	9, 400, 000
Ecuador	139, 000, 000
Guatemala	207, 900, 000
Haiti	127, 700, 000
Honduras	54, 300, 000
Mexico	1, 246, 500, 000
Nicaragua	$98, 400, 000
Panama	121, 100, 000
Paraguay	68, 600, 000
Peru	630, 600, 000
San Salvador	23, 400, 000
Uruguay	120, 400, 000
Venezuela	333, 600, 000
Total	9, 305, 500, 000

---

[6] Brazil and United States Policies: Report of Senator MIKE MANSFIELD to the Foreign Relations Committee, U.S. Senate," U.S. Government Printing Office, February 1962.

[7] "Our Crazy Foreign Giveaway Program;" extension of remarks of Hon. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, of Wisconsin, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 108, pt. 11, pp. 15511–15513.

On the Alliance for Progress

On December 30, 1962, Mr. Teodoro Moscoso, U.S. Coordinator for the Alliance for Progress, in his year-end report on progress of the Alliance, asserted that "we cannot afford to waste time by thinking about whether we shall succeed."[1]

I am of course delighted when any Government official decries the wasting of time.

But recent reports in the press and recent technical analyses would seem to indicate that the time spent on a reassessment of the objectives of the Alliance and a restatement into more realistic terms would be time well spent;[2] that a public appraisal of the lessons learned in the course of disbursing $1.3 billion, including perhaps expanded activity by the General Accounting Office to determine the efficacy of our policies and of their execution, would be time well spent.[3]

For, the Alliance is not a short-term program. In the Alliance, we are embarked on a program whose duration may be measured in decades rather than in single years, and whose ultimate cost may involve tens of billions of dollars. Under these conditions, it is time well spent to determine whether we are merely working with old disproved remedies in a new overpublicized wrapper, and it is time well spent to investigate the effects of the largesse which the American people increasingly view as indiscriminate, as the information agencies of the Government departments grind out the interminable announcements of the movement of U.S. taxpayers' funds southward. To operate in a climate of panic that does not permit public evaluation of the facts (or public disclosure, to be more exact), and constant reappraisal of the policies, would be to doom the program to inglorious failure.

This is the more true because the Alliance for Progress enjoys the sympathy and support of both parties. There is no political issue dividing us on the sympathy of this country for accelerated economic development in Latin America to the end that all Americans, South Central, and North alike, shall enjoy higher living standards commensurate with the resources with which a bountiful nature has endowed them.

But, I am disturbed by recent reports which picture inter-American relations, as one writer in the London Times recently put it, as "panting with gift-hardened arteries."

I am disturbed by the findings of one of our country's most honored specialists in inter-American relations who could write that the failure of our program in Bolivia "has fed skepticism in Latin America about the viability in Latin America of the whole system, both economic and political, represented by the United States. * * * This skepticism has in turn rendered Latin Americans more responsive to exaltation of the authoritarian nation-state which sacrifices freedom to forced drought economic development and social reform.[4]

I am disturbed when an experienced journalist on one of our finest papers can report from the field: "There is an alarming tendency (in Colombia anyway) to view the problems of the local economies as essentially a thing for the Alliance for Progress to deal with. Almost like: Thank God, the big brother has finally come to the rescue—let him handle it."[5]

I am disturbed when a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System returns from Latin America to report that "we may be mistaking the symptoms for the disease which is really more deep seated. If this is true, our prescribed remedies will be ineffective, and they may in some cases be harmful."[6]

And I am disturbed when, after an expenditure of around a quarter-billion dollars in a small country like Bolivia, Bolivian officials could accuse us of "ulterior imperialistic motives," and a Bolivian official on whom AID relies largely for implementing its program can charge that "the Alliance for Progress had evolved in response to the circumstances of the strategic expansion of U.S. capitalism," that it was essentially a method to unload surpluses for which our economic system had been unable to provide an outlet.

Since the Alliance is largely concerned with more effective mobilization of domestic resources in Latin America, the role of private U.S. investment, the establishment of suitable priorities in the expenditure of Government funds, the preparation of national plans, and integration through the Latin American Common Market, let us look at recent reports under these headings:

DOMESTIC CAPITAL: THE FLIGHT FROM LATIN AMERICA

One of the deficiencies in the Latin American economies which the Alliance purports to seek to correct is the shortage of developmental capital. But are we doing anything more than replacing domestic capital that is fleeing from the Latin American countries, or even facilitating that flight?

Early in January, an official of the International Monetary Fund reported that "in the 5 years ending 1961 private residents of Latin America, other than banks, increased their investments in the United States by approximately $1 billion."[7] Since this does not include the flight of capital to safe havens in Switzerland and other European safe havens, nor the variously concealed movement of hidden assets that is hard to identify statistically, we are clearly confronted with a major obstacle to any serious success from the flow of U.S. Government funds which is merely compensatory with this outflow. For, in the period cited, U.S. Government assistance to Latin America totaled around $1.3 billion, clearly not enough to balance the flight of domestic capital to Europe and the United States.

And since that time the flight of capital from Latin America has expanded.

Are the policies of the Alliance serving to generate a flight of capital or are they discouraging it?

Mr. James L. Robertson, a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, writes: "I suggest that the remedy for this does not lie in the substitution of government-provided capital for private capital. It does not lie in the attempts to locate and forcibly repatriate Latin American capital deposited in American or Swiss banks. It does not lie in exhortation or special tax measures designed to persuade Americans to step up their investments in the less-developed countries."[8]

Net assistance to Latin America by U.S. Government

[Millions of dollars]

	Economic	Military
1st quarter, 1961	90	31
2d quarter, 1961	83	17
3d quarter, 1961	252	57
4th quarter, 1961	277	18
1st quarter, 1962	162	26
2d quarter, 1962	190	16

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce.

In December, an economist associated with the National Planning Association estimated that the flight of capital from Latin America had been $700 million in 1961 and perhaps at the rate of $600 million per year in the first 6 months of 1962.[9] This estimated flight of $1 billion in 18 months compares with United States net assistance to Latin America during that period of $1.05 billion.

To view this situation with complacency, to conclude that AID's "accepted remedy" of infusion of still larger amounts of U.S. Treasury funds is unchallengeable, and to assert that there is no time to waste in considering whether the program thus conceived will succeed, is for me a bit too disdainful of the sweat and blood that go into the accumulation of money by our taxpayers.

ROLE OF U.S. PRIVATE CAPITAL

If there is one thesis which carries through virtually all congressional hearings on the Alliance for Progress, it is that which pertains to the vital and decisive role of private capital. Over and over, we have been told that unless private capital flows into direct investments at a sustained and significant pace, the Alliance must fail of its objectives. Most frequently, the administration has cited $300 million as its minimum expectation for the annual flow of private capital from the United States into direct investments in Latin America.

In the first 6 months of 1961, the net direct investment by private capital in Latin America was $143 million. In the 15 months ending September 30, 1962, not only has there been no direct investment, but actually there has been a net withdrawal of some $35 million.

Net direct investment in Latin America

[Millions of dollars]

1st quarter 1961	50
2d quarter 1961	93
3d quarter 1961	1
4th quarter 1961	3
1st quarter 1962, withdrawal	−29
2d quarter 1962	5
3d quarter 1962, withdrawal	−13

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce

In other words, while a flow of $300 million was labeled the decisive element for success of the Alliance for Progress, there has been instead a withdrawal rather than a net investment.

The response of the administration to this disastrous turn of events has been first, to substitute even more Government money for the flow of private capital which had failed to materialize, and second, to search out devices for guarantees, tax avoidance, etc., that would shift all the risks onto the U.S. Treasury and create a situation of private investment at public risk.

---

[1] AID press release No. A–112.

[2] Editorial in Business Week, Dec. 22, 1962: "The administration has clearly discovered from bitter experience, especially with the Alliance for Progress, that its original goals were unrealistic."

[3] Moscoso said that "since July 1961 the United States has committed $1.5 billion to the Alliance for Progress, and has disbursed $1.3 billion." That is, July 1961 to December 1962.

[4] Prof. Arthur Whitaker (University of Pennsylvania), "Nationalism in Latin America" (University of Florida Press, 1962).

[5] Hunter S. Thompson, the National Observer.

[6] James L. Robertson. His paper has been widely reprinted in Barrons, the National Observer, Banking magazine, etc.

[7] Graeme Dorrance, "The Effect of Inflation on Economic Development." He notes, surely with significance as to current trends in Latin America, that "a particularly unfortunate feature has been the large flow of private capital from those less-developed countries which have tolerated inflation to countries frequently wealthy which have maintained financial stability."

[8] Op. cit.

[9] Frank Brandenburg, National Planning Association, "Looking Ahead," December 1962. He puts the flight at $500 million annually from 1953–59, $750 million in 1960, $700 million in 1961. There are no reliable data on this subject.

I suggest to you that this approach neglects completely the underlying factors, that it is the bureaucrat's familiar device of seeking out the easiest remedy which is always deemed to be a fresh addition to the burden on the U.S. Treasury, and I suggest that it must ultimately prove ineffective.

For, this approach fails completely to attack the factors that discourage the flow of capital into Latin America. It is for the Latin American governments to comprehend which of their policies are responsible for the discouragement of investment and to act so as to correct them. If they are, instead, determined to prejudice their development by constant threat of expropriation and discrimination against private investment, they must accept the consequences of a slowdown in the pace of economic development.

Recently, a very experienced executive in oversea operations, who happens to work in my State of Illinois, commented that "the United States would not have to be offering insurance on investments abroad if it had done a proper job of protecting such investments earlier. If the United States really supported oversea investments other nations would be afraid to attempt expropriation." [10]

It is typical of the course of the Alliance for Progress that when the Congress passed the Hickenlooper amendment in order to discourage confiscation of U.S. investments, an attempt was made to avoid its implementation. As you will recall, or a reading of the Congressional Record for October 2, 1962, will refresh your memory, testimony was adduced by affected businessmen to the effect that our representatives were told that the U.S. Embassy had received instructions not to make representations to the Government based on the Hickenlooper amendment, and the senior Senator from Oregon was prompted to remark on the floor of the Senate that "the law is crystal clear. There is a deliberate attempt on the part of the State Department to ignore and evade the law. I consider the State Department to be guilty of malfeasance in office with regard to the situation in Honduras."

It may well be that we are on the way to finding out from the methods of the Alliance for Progress that giving makes beggars. It is certainly already clear that closing our eyes to the causes of the present impasse on private-capital flow and throwing onto the U.S. Treasury the burden thus created by economic ignorance and/or prejudice in Latin America can only bring about an even greater deterioration by encouraging the very prejudices and miscomprehension that have already gravely damaged the hopes for success of the Alliance.

To substitute U.S. Government funds for private investment on the theory that it is too difficult for Latin Americans to achieve an understanding of the requirements for economic development, and to insist that there is no time to evaluate whether this defiance of principle fatally prejudices our program, is a reckless abandonment of the pledges made to the Congress during the appropriations hearings and shows all too careless a spirit of "apres moi, le deluge."

THE ROLE OF THE LATIN AMERICAN COMMON MARKET

Already, the catering to this prejudice against private capital and the willingness to reward such prejudice with an expanded flow of U.S. Government money has contaminated still another phase of the Alliance that had been stressed by the administration as of decisive importance; namely, the role of the Latin American common market (LAFTA).

Mr. Moscoso has said that "the only reasonable hope of attaining what we desire (from the Alliance for Progress) depends upon the creation of a Latin American common market."

But the Latin American common market had hardly been conceived on paper, when prominent Latin American officials and technicians began to worry aloud about the potential beneficiaries of accelerated economic development, particularly about the possibility that foreign-owned ventures within the area might benefit from the reduction of tariff barriers within the Latin American common market.

Already, then, there is an extension of the violent and uneconomic nationalism that has continually frustrated Latin America's economic development. Even so widely respected an economist as Raul Prebisch, long the area's most distinguished economist, has written: "Some apprehension is felt lest the benefits of the common market be reaped mainly by foreign instead of domestic enterprises. I share these misgivings and I do so not merely in imagination." [11]

Now, the Latin Americans know that the proportion of U.S. employees to total employment provided by oversea investments of U.S. firms is very small and tends ever smaller. In 1962, it was reported that only one in every hundred oversea workers employed by U.S. firms (including the executive structure) were U.S. citizens, and the pressure of self-interest on the part of the companies is making for acceleration of reliance on nationals of the countries where the investments are located, as quickly as suitable training can be effected.[12] Thus, in terms of jobs which a foreign firm would provide within the Latin American common market, it is unlikely that anyone could support the contention that foreign firms frustrate economic development.

The Latin Americans know that in terms of wage policy, or the relationship of taxes-paid to profits or sales or investments, or the degree of abstention from corruption, it is unlikely that anyone could support the contention that foreign firms frustrate economic development.

They know that the area is deficient in capital, and it must long remain so if the challenges for a better life for more people in Latin America are to be met. Thus, in terms of drawing on the savings of the more industrialized nations, it is unlikely that anyone could support the contention that foreign firms contribute to a frustrating of economic development.

And in terms of technology, in a world where technology advances continuously and often at breathtaking speeds, the Latin Americans know that maximum mobilization of every technological advance that can be adapted to the needs of their area is vital to development. And that it is most likely to come in a climate of competitive pressure for productivity (and its source, technological advance), which means inviting production by companies with the skills and techniques most recently evolved.

Has development been frustrated by the fact that one-tenth of the gross product of the Latin American area is accounted for by sales of U.S. companies' direct-investment properties in Latin America? Has development been frustrated by the fact that roughly one-third of Latin America's exports originate with the direct-investment companies? Has the employment provided to roughly 1 million persons been prejudicial to them, as against alternative outlets for their talents? Is it likely that tax collections would have been greater if the area had been able to avoid the approximately one-fifth of its government revenues which come from these U.S. direct investments?

If, then, it is clear that foreign private investment is an immense accelerating force for development, the misgivings which already dominate Latin American technical thinking on the subject of the place of foreign investors in economic integration raise serious doubts as to the real objectives of the common-market movement.

Surely, it would be time well spent to determine whether the support that is to be given the common market by the United States is actually designed to provide the final blow to private-capital flow, not only in terms of the loss of opportunity for U.S. firms, but also and much more importantly because it might strike heavily at the hope for economic development at the pace which the Alliance purports to believe vital.

THE USE OF U.S. FUNDS

On January 12, the Economist (London) noted that "40 percent of the money that was provided for development in Latin America in the first year of the Alliance for Progress has been spent in propping up budgets and stopping up holes in the balance of payments * * *. How little permanent economic or political good is done by such help has just been demonstrated by the latest emergency in Brazil."

A study prepared for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee reported that the "misuse of our public assistance dollars" was such that we were bailing out European creditors who have gained markets in Latin America in competition with American firms, that we were providing loans to enable Latin American countries to meet their credit obligations to European creditors while at the same time we have no control over the original expenditures.[13]

A business newsletter notes that top priority in use of U.S. official donations to Bolivia has apparently been designated to the servicing of defaulted dollar bonds held by speculators either here or in Europe, bonds denounced from the White House as early as Franklin D. Roosevelt's early term. This, on condition that Bolivia would not be expected to service its obligations at the Export-Import Bank (some $35 million), and that it would be provided with the $929,000 for the purpose on top of the tens of millions of dollars being provided that country.[14]

A distinguished foreign correspondent of the Chicago Tribune and countless other reporters out of Argentina have referred to the quickness with which an official investigation into corruption in the use of public funds was terminated when suspicion began to attach to officials still in the government with respect to award of public contracts without open bidding which had resulted not only in discrimination against U.S. exporters but also in delivery by competitors of unsuitable and unusable goods. Yet, every such waste of foreign exchange serves only to enhance the dollar gap which AID is filling out of the U.S. Treasury without complaint against such practices.

If, indeed, there is no time to be spent on thinking about whether we shall succeed, shall we conclude that 10 cents on the dollar is the most that is needed for success in this program, that is to say, that we need spend effectively only 10 cents out of every dollar drawn from the U.S. Treasury to make the program successful? Is the financial requirement of the Alliance for Progress so small and the resources of the U.S. Treasury for the purpose so great that only 10 cents of every dollar needs to be expended efficiently?

Can we finance a mounting corruption in an area where corruption in the expenditure of public funds had long been a deterrent to development, and still achieve the aims of the Alliance? Can we finance the proliferation of the bureaucracy, national and international alike, in an area where the swollen bureaucracies had long taken their toll of the economic potential, and still achieve the aims of the Alliance? Can we finance our competitors in foreign trade at the expense of U.S. exporters, even where it involves simultaneously great waste of foreign exchange, and still achieve the aims of the Alliance? Can we meet local currency expenditures for purposes that properly fall within the ordinary budgets of these countries in order that the local citizenry may run free of taxes and even have a surplus of capital to hide abroad, and still achieve the aims of the Alliance?

---

[10] H. A. Davies, International Harvester Co., Chicago Daily News, Nov. 15, 1962.

[11] Raul Prebisch, "Economic Aspects of the Alliance," the Alliance for Progress (Johns Hopkins Press, 1962) p. 35.

[12] Congressional Record, volume 108, part 13, page 18174.

[13] Senate Foreign Relations Committee: United States-Latin American Relations: Some Observations on the Operation of the Alliance for Progress. Aug. 3, 1962.

[14] Hanson's Latin American letter, No. 930.

After a decade of such a program in Bolivia, we are defraying a large part of ordinary budgetary expenditures, we are paying wages directly to the swollen work force in government entities, we are underwriting the sale of German mining equipment, we are encouraging expropriation without compensation, we are swelling our donations in order that the international agencies should not have to suffer defaults on their loans, we have even bolstered the Communists' interest in delivering equipment by our promises of unlimited financing for the foreign-exchange gap which is created largely through the Bolivian official policies. (The Communists had lagged in negotiations because they wanted gold clauses and other assurances of payment, until the Bolivians were able to point to the certainty of U.S. funds in abundance). And after all this activity, we find that the standard of living in Bolivia has fallen steadily, we find ourselves profoundly disliked, and only last month, the press reported that some 29 organizations in Bolivia had petitioned the CIA to investigate the use of U.S. aid money to create the Marxist economy in Bolivia.

NATIONAL PLANNING

Nor does it suffice to justify such a performance by reference to national plans. Admittedly, the Alliance has stressed the making of national plans to assure maximum effectiveness in use of available resources.

Let us be frank. If conditions for an inflow of private capital are deliberately avoided, if conditions stimulating an outflow of capital are deliberately encouraged, if corruption is encouraged by the willingness of the United States to supply funds to cover any amount of waste, if government enterprises are to be encouraged to maximize their ineffectiveness by the availability of U.S. funds at virtually no cost, if trade competitors for the available foreign exchange are to be allowed to wrest the business away from lower-price offers (whether American or other) in order to provide a pork barrel for officials, what in the world is the sense of harping constantly on national plans as the key to accelerated economic development?

Recently, a Fulbright scholar in company with a member of the faculty of the University of Chile referred to the much-cited Chilean 10-year plan as a "book of prayers; it simply projects various quantities in various sectors to achieve a desired growth figure; there is no discussion of how the goal is to be reached."[15] And each recent announcement of additions to the donations to Bolivia have been identified as part of the national plan adopted by Bolivia, even though members of the U.S. aid team have long since ceased to come to the Hill with their reports of economic progress in Bolivia, after the long years of protesting that "just another year" would show the expected results.

SOME CONCLUSIONS

Some weeks ago it was announced that funds would be provided for a public-relations campaign for the Alliance for Progress to gain greater acceptability among Americans, North and South alike.

We need something far more than we need a public-relations campaign. This program needs a shakedown in objectives to realistic terms, it needs far greater honesty in presentation of the operational facts, and it needs acceptance by the administration that the taxpayers will not be satisfied with a 10 cents on the dollar performance not only because they resent the waste of funds but also because such a performance dooms the Alliance for Progress to failure.

Above all, in a program of such extended duration and of such heavy cost, let us have the truth. When we make a loan for 40 years, with a 10-year grace period, with interest at 1 percent, let the debtor know, as well as our own people, that this money is going to be costing us perhaps 4 percent per year, that it will involve an enormous cost to the American people. When we make a loan repayable in the currency of the borrower and with the understanding that the borrower will continue to use that local currency, let the debtor as well as the American people appreciate that we are making in effect concealed donations. Last year Mr. Fowler Hamilton, Administrator of AID, said that "we use the word 'loan' sometimes in a very Pickwickian sense." Perhaps it would help if we restored the old meanings to the words "loans," "donations," "economic progress," "economic retrogression." And above all, let us never get the idea that we lack the time to measure the progress of this program and the likelihood of its success.

[From Hanson's Latin American Letter, Dec. 29, 1962]

YEAR OF DECISION FOR PRIVATE INVESTMENT IN LATIN AMERICA—1963: END OF AN ERA

In the first 21 months of the Kennedy administration, net private direct investment in Latin America declined to $5 million per month. In the same period, the amount of short-term credit outstanding for Latin America expanded by some $5 million per month. But in the 9 months ending October 1, 1962, net private direct investment ceased, and there was instead a withdrawal of some $4 million per month. In the same period, the banks were shortening their credit lines by some $3 million per month. Under the cessation of the most effective form of developmental assistance, the Latin American economies stagnated.

U.S. direct investment in Latin America

[In millions of dollars]

	Net withdrawal of capital	Net capital flow to Latin America
9 months to Oct. 1, 1962	37	
9 months to Oct. 1, 1961		144

BASIS FOR ONLY CONCERN?

"There is a basis for concern but not for alarm," the head of the great international trading firm of Anderson Clayton & Co. was quoted in Daily News Record (Fairchild publications), "and our company has sought during the year to exercise particular care in hedging and safeguarding its operations in Latin America." The data on cessation of net investment as issued by the U.S. Government confirm the widespread "concern," but for the year 1963, it is the significance of the larger trends in investment climate that warrants alarm.

ISSUE SHIFTS TO EXISTING INVESTMENTS IN 1963

For new private direct investment in Latin America, an era ended in 1961–62. Now, in 1963, the capacity of existing captive investments to survive profitably will be tested in most strenuous fashion. The outlook is not bright. When the Kennedy administration took office, it was willing to forecast that unless private capital flowed into direct investments in Latin America at the rate of $25 million per month and was sustained for a decade at that level or higher, the Alliance for Progress was dead.

Now, the climate for direct investment having been destroyed partly by the fumbling of that very Alliance for Progress, the issue is being blanketed in meaningless rhetoric such as the President offered up on December 26; namely, that change in Latin America is going to come through either "revolution and communism or through peaceful democratic means."

VIABILITY OF ECONOMIC SYSTEM REPRESENTED BY UNITED STATES

As the great test moves from stagnation through cessation of new investment to retrogression through withdrawal or weakening of existing investment, there is basis not merely for concern but for alarm, because we are moving to the core of the problem. And we have already had a demonstration of what this means. Had the administration not limited itself to conduct of our Latin American policy by persons without experience in the field, it would know that the prospective retrogression stemming from discouragement of private investment has already been tested:

"The failure of the U.S. program in Bolivia," writes a former officer of the State Department who has been showered with countless academic honors here and abroad for his expertness in the field, "has fed skepticism in Latin America about the viability in Latin America of the whole system, both economic and political, represented by the United States. * * * This skepticism in turn has rendered Latin Americans more responsive to exaltation of the authoritarian nation-state which sacrifices freedom to forced draught economic development and social reform."

"Economically," writes this famed expert on Latin American affairs, "the (Bolivian) experiment has hardly justified itself, for despite a substantial and steady flow of aid from the United States, Bolivia is nevertheless today on the verge of bankruptcy, so that even politically its prospects are not promising."

Significantly, the Bolivian economy collapsed precisely because of the expropriation of the leading private industry. And it is precisely expropriation, though possibly in the form of silent (discouragement of effective operations) expropriation, which is in prospect elsewhere in Latin America now.

And it was the Kennedy-Eisenhower decision to solve the Bolivian situation with "a conciliatory policy which may be characterized as one of killing Marxism and Yankeephobia with kindness," to use Professor Whitaker's words, which fostered the skepticism about the viability of the system represented by the United States in Latin America. And it is precisely this policy which is about to spread its effects to the other countries.

THE KEY?

For Senator HUMPHREY, who sometimes seems to be trying to usurp the role exercised by the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Latin America, the success or failure of our Latin America program may rest with the experience in Mexico and Venezuela. But informed analysts continue to believe that Brazil is the key country. And, unfortunately, nowhere has the administration failed so badly as in the major decisions regarding Brazil.

WHY THE PUBLIC ATTACK ON BRAZIL?

On December 12, after almost 2 years of intervention by our Embassy in Brazilian politics in a manner that would once have led to expulsion of the Ambassador, the President of the United States chose to single out Brazil for a public branding as a country where now "there is nothing really that the United States can do that can possibly benefit the people of Brazil." Why Brazil? Was Brazil the only country in Latin America where "inflation eats up our aid," where there is a flight of capital, where inflation diminishes the stability of the state?

---

[15] Becket & Griffin, "Revolution in Chile?" New Republic, Dec. 29, 1962.

Only a few days before, the Agency for International Development had been compelled secretly to order Argentina to restore to it certain of the funds (from the $20 million balance-of-payments loan) that had been illegally and improperly used by the Argentines in willful disregard of the stipulations regarding the loan. Had the President publicized this? Instead, simultaneously the State Department had approved additional enormous concealed grants for Argentina.

Again, the flight of capital involving almost a tenth of receipts from export earnings in Argentina exceeded the flight from Brazil. Had this been regarded as a fit subject for White House propaganda?

Again, inflation in Argentina at a pace as meaningful as that of Brazil, had not been accompanied by the terrific economic growth seen in Brazil so that the decline in real wages had been much more acute. Had this been publicized?

Or, take the case of Chile. Only the day before the blast at Brazil, the President had lauded "the untiring effort of the Chilean Government to improve the life of the people of Chile." And he had personally furthered the negotiations for an immense flow of concealed donations to Chile.

How had the President reached his differentiation between Brazil and Chile? The Chilean economy was stagnating despite the fact that it had suffered no such adverse alteration in terms of trade as Brazil was struggling with. The flight of capital from Chile had been greater relatively than from Brazil and in no small part had involved a two-step maneuver involving the movement of U.S. aid money to Chile and thence to safe havens in Europe. Uncontrollable inflation had been virtually a Chilean characteristic for all the years of this century. And if there was stability politically, it remained true that informed analysts in Washington considered the prospect of a Communist-oriented regime taking office in Chile to be greater than the prospect of such a disaster in Brazil.

Again, Chilean trade with Castro had been greater than that of Brazil with Castro.

And what of the reforms that were used to justify the new inflated program of concealed donations for Chile? No one in Washington challenged the recently published view that "Chile's 10-year plan is just a book of prayers for which there is no discussion even of how the goal is to be reached * * * that the tax reform program does little more than restore the efficiency of a collection system that had already existed 5 years before and might in any case never be accepted in practice * * * that the agrarian reforms will not change the distribution of income and power nor increase investment and instead were more likely to benefit a very small minority at the expense of the great majority." Was it Brazil's failure to parallel this Chilean achievement that so disturbed the White House?

In Washington, reporters are given to understand that the President was speaking after a briefing by the U.S. Ambassadors and that in some mysterious way the blast at Brazil ties in with some political strategy devised by the American Embassy.

But to what end?

THE DEMANDS OF GOULART

A clue may have been provided in the subjects on which the younger Kennedy is alleged to have informed President Goulart that the White House wants action: a settlement on the expropriated properties and a promise to implement with compensation a scheme for the full withdrawal of U.S. interests from the utility field, discouragement of the expansion of trade with the Communist bloc, fiscal reforms, accelerated social reforms.

In themselves, these subjects reveal the confusion and ineptitude that is dooming both this relationship with Brazil and in the course of it the whole Latin American program. Some facts are clear:

1. For at least a decade and maybe more, Brazil will have no funds whatsoever to devote to disinvestment by foreign interests. If, then, there is a position to be agreed upon, it is that in the absence of capacity to compensate promptly and effectively, what is needed now is a deferral of the aspiration for nationalization of utilities. Instead, the Embassy and the President are putting the interests of the American Foreign Power Co. ahead of the interests of the United States in relations with Brazil, in anticipation of the fact that means can be found to have the U.S. Treasury indirectly pay off American Foreign Power Co. at the expense of genuine developmental assistance.

2. Since all of the major allies of the United States are engaged in shipping to the Communist bloc goods which would be considered of strategic assistance to the Communists if an American manufacturer wanted to ship them, it is rather childish to attempt to interfere with the movement of commodities having no strategic importance from Brazil to the Communist bloc. And since it is U.S. assistance to the Communist bloc countries that enables them to divert resources into exports to Brazil, it is rather ridiculous to attempt to interfere with Brazilian trade relations.

But above all, there is a need, first, to realize that the United States cannot set one standard for Brazil and another standard for all others. Sometime, somehow it is going to be necessary either to approach the Brazilian situation with the standards used in Argentina, and Chile, and Bolivia, or to bring our treatment of these other nations to the stern test which allegedly the administration proposes to use on Brazil.

As the year 1962 ends, the United States is so deeply embroiled by choice in internal politics in Argentina, in Brazil, in Chile (and not so long ago in Peru in that memorable fiasco of diplomacy) that every investor should realize that he now must expect to be confronted not only with the traditional and deepening displays of nationalism, but also with resistance stemming from the fumbling of the U.S. Government through our embassies. It is not only what the left is doing to the climate of investment that is a cause for alarm rather than mere concern, as the year 1963 opens. It is the total confusion regarding "specific and attainable goals" in Washington that should alarm and prompt caution on the part of the investor.

ARGENTINE TRADE

P.S.—We recommend to our Argentine readers that they study carefully a publication titled "Foot-and-Mouth Disease in U.S. Policy," published by the Food Research Institute of Stanford University. The report was written by an extremely able researcher, E. Louise Peffer, and reaches some very important conclusions for everyone interested in Argentine-American trade.

[From the Tampa (Fla.) Tribune, May 18, 1962]

BEFORE CASTRO, BOLIVIA

TAMPA.—Someone should tell Drew Pearson that Bolivia shows signs of distress, not progress.

It is true that on April 9 the Government and MNR Party of Bolivia celebrated the 10th anniversary of the revolution. This revolution plunged the entire country into misery and hunger, and into the hands of Communist followers, just as the Cuban revolution has done. Herein lies a lesson for those who did not believe Castro was a Communist and still think that you have to carry a card to prove it.

Bolivia illustrates this problem, and it had as many problems and handicaps. The MNR with the help of its members (among whom there are several that carry cards of the International Communist Party, including Vice President Juan Lechin), took over the Government after a bloody and long revolution.

What was their first step? You guessed it. Expatriate their opponents, and eliminate the most dangerous ones, including 200 cadets of the military academy. They established concentration camps and the infamous Gestapo-like milicia.

Later, they took over the mines from the famous tin barons, and did not pay them (in the Castro manner) 1 cent of indemnity. They took over the land from the so-called land barons, who in their immense wealth owned a few acres of land, cultivated this acreage and helped to give work and food to hundreds of thousands of the exploited Indians.

The United States of America under the Eisenhower administration poured millions of taxpayers' dollars into Bolivia. Where did it all go? Not to help the miners, because in spite of the money, production stopped and they had to pay salaries without producing an ounce of tin. The money did not help to improve the agriculture, import machinery, or build schools.

In fact, it helped no one. Hunger was soon felt and the monetary currency dropped from 120 bolivianos for each dollar to 4,000 bolivianos. A pound of meat was bought before the revolution at 21 bolivianos and after 2 years of progress at 4,000 bolivianos, so where did the money, your money, go? It went to banks in Switzerland to the accounts of members of the Government like Mr. Paz-Estenssoro and Juan Lechin. I knew for a fact the latter gave a party celebrating his first million dollars in the bank.

The U.S. dollars well intended no doubt, but badly managed, helped to strengthen the milicia, and sent thousands of party members on trips to Europe and the United States. It gave their children cars and money to spend on parties. It helped corrupt the morals of the hungry ones. This small party and its members have been in power for 10 years now. It is the same story as in Cuba. People are hungry, prices are exorbitant, and people are being killed without protest from anyone. Just now, the latest help from the American Government went to help strengthen the milicia, who in turn destroys homes and robs and kills.

How do I know these things? Because I am a Bolivian citizen, a refugee from the first Communist government in Latin America. I'm thankful now to be here enjoying the liberty that many take for granted in this wonderful land.

How does Mr. Pearson know the things he has recently written? Has he lived there year after year? Does he still have his family there like we do? Has he been informed of the wonderful progress of my poor country at a banquet given by their oppressors, or by Juan Lechin on his visit to New York? Answer please. I would like to know his erroneous source of information.

Mrs. G.S.S.

[From Hanson's Latin American Letter, Feb. 2, 1963]

AID SETS THE GUIDANCE FOR U.S. DONATIONS

The Agency for International Development (AID) has at long last provided Latin America with a definitive guideline for qualification for major Alliance for Progress assistance. On January 21, 1963, Teodoro Moscoso, U.S. Coordinator for the Alliance for Progress, asserted that "one of the most encouraging elements in the forward march of the Alliance for Progress" has been "Argentina's remarkable effort to develop her economy;" that is to say, "the dynamism of Argentina's efforts to tackle the difficult social and economic problems."

Thus, every country in Latin America is invited by AID to compare its economic achievements with those of Argentina, and to try if possible to match the record made in the Plate. Here is the Argentine achievement as outlined by reports from the American Embassy in Buenos Aires:

THE MODEL: ARGENTINE

1. The cost of living rose by more than 2.5 percent per month in 1962, but by the end of the year, as the momentum of the remarkable effort accelerated, the increase in cost of living rose to 3.7 percent per month; i.e., roughly 45 percent per year.

2. Unpaid bills of the Argentine Treasury have risen by 35 percent in the year 1962, the cash deficit of the Argentine Treasury is running double that of a year ago, Argentine tax revenues are failing to cover as much as two-thirds of public expenditures, the Government has consistently been in arrears on payment of salaries to public employees despite the fact that it used monkey money (the 9th-of-July bonds) to pay wages in some months. And just as importantly, as the remarkable effort continues, the deterioration in accelerating in all areas of public finance.

3. The tax reform and tax reorganization which were played up to the U.S. Congress during the 1962 hearings on foreign aid have turned out to be a hoax. On July 25, when the remarkable effort had brought Argentina to bankruptcy, Mr. Moscoso told the House Appropriations Subcommittee that "Argentina is in about the worst financial condition it has been in for some time," but that thanks to the tax reforms initiated in response to the Alliance for Progress, tax collections had risen from $800 million in 1959 to $1.8 billion in 1961. Now, the reforms in public finance, which were never as publicized, are in a state of open collapse.

4. No agricultural or land reforms of serious content have proven acceptable, and instead AID has now indicated that it is prepared to use U.S. dollars to buy land from the large landowners on behalf of tenant farmers, thereby providing a concealed subsidy on balance of payments, and providing ready cash for the wealthier elements of the community to accelerate their flight of capital from Argentina.

5. Both the short-term outlook for export earnings and the long-term outlook and deteriorating. With the grains and hides in trouble for 1963, the remarkable effort will find it difficult to maintain $1.2 billion of exports, of which some 8 percent is being lost to Argentina by a flight of capital which may accelerate as the elections approach.

It must be remembered, as the British financial weekly, the Statist, correctly warns, that it is nonsense to assert that "all will be well if there is a return to democratic government," for "Argentina was well within the grip of economic crisis before the end of 1961." This letter was among the "minority of observers" who rejected the bullish talk regarding the Argentine situation in the late Frondizi period, which we pointed out at the time stemmed largely from wishful thinking by the State Department and seemingly a collapse of technical analysis by the IMF.

(6) U.S. officials have been apprised by the bulk of the petroleum community in Argentina that an orderly revision of petroleum contracts held by the newcomers to Argentina is inevitable and even desirable in the interest of long-range stability for developmental activity. But the regime has chosen instead to reject the demands for concession revision and thus intensified the ultimate political explosion which may drive all companies from the country.

(7) Most important to the objectives of the Alliance for Progress, the Argentines by their "remarkable effort" have succeeded in reducing gross national product in a single year by 4 to 8 percent, which is a tremendous single year achievement, hardly surpassed by its previous "accomplishments" in lowering gross national product. In addition, since this has been accompanied by a decline in real wages, Argentina can correctly claim to have widened the disparity between the upper income groups and the lower income groups in 1962, which again is a tremendous achievement.

QUID PRO QUO: BRAZIL

The sarcasm, with which we outline the "achievement" which the State Department asserts to be the model that it will reward with disproportionate assistance, and is in fact already rewarding, is not diluted by consideration of the quid pro quo about which the press has been informed. Before the Argentine Foreign Minister reached Washington, a leak was planted with the press to the effect that the State Department planned to discuss with the foreign minister ways and means of dealing with the Brazilian situation "because of his intimate knowledge of the Brazilian situation."

After the talks with the Argentine Foreign Minister, it was revealed that Argentina had agreed to reorganize some of its army units so that a brigade would be available as a troubleshooting force to rush into Latin American countries when the extreme left threatened. Virtually all readers of this letter are experienced Latin Americanists. Despite the comedy of errors to which our Latin American policy has been reduced in the past 2 years, they will be amazed now to learn (if they have not already studied the story in the Washington newspapers) that the administration feels that an Argentine army brigade could be used, for instance, in Brazil should the extreme left threaten. Nothing could more quickly drive Brazil into the Communist camp than the use by Washington of Argentine troops on Brazilian soil.

Since the Congress is known to look with disfavor on ventures of the type involved in the Argentine brigade or brigades, initial press comment suggested that the administration feels it may be able to equip the brigade without going to the Congress for money and may thus escape the scrutiny of the Congress.

THE BRAZILIAN SITUATION

Our comments are not intended to minimize the importance of the administration's view of the Brazilian situation. Only last week, the Chicago Daily News quoted the Senate minority leader as saying that "it would not surprise me at all if within the next 60 to 90 days we had a crisis of major proportions in Brazil." And Senator DIRKSEN has a reputation for being well briefed by the White House.

SHOWDOWN SOUGHT BY WHITE HOUSE IN BRAZIL

There is every evidence that the White House is pushing for a showdown in Brazil. And success for the White House is by no means assured, for the Brazilian people, like most Latin Americans, may choose their own politicians in preference to U.S. politicians, if the showdown reduces to such a choice. As this letter is written, reports are reaching the United States of the latest participation by Brazil's new political party (the American Embassy) in internal debate of local issues. This time the American Embassy has gone out of its way to blast a paper drafted by a Brazilian diplomatic official who is definitely not anti-United States as a device for entering into local debate in the harshest manner. Oddly enough, the paper had been drafted only as a contribution to repair of the image of Brazil in the United States. Have we reached the point where the White House is opposed to efforts to restore the traditional relationship with Brazil?

It ill behooves the State Department to slap Brazil's face publicly for its failure to effect "complementary policies in the budgetary, monetary, and foreign exchange fields," at a time when it is setting up Argentina as a model to which disproportionate assistance is to be given as a reward for its success in steadily reducing its gross national product per capita, increasing the gap between the rich and the poor, displaying a collapse of public finance policies which makes the Brazilian public finances look good by comparison, increasing the rise in cost of living to a pace of 45 percent per year, taking measures in export production that reduce chances for expansion of exchange earnings.

It ill becomes the White House in an open press conference to slap down Brazil hard by saying that there is now nothing left that can be done for the Brazilian people, and a few weeks later, to say that "we are analyzing what we can most helpfully do to be of assistance to Argentina," when the Argentine economic and political collapse is if anything worse than that of Brazil.

It has become an imperative of U.S. policy that the American Ambassador to Brazil demit office now. Whatever his Embassy may have accomplished on behalf of I.T. & T. and the American Foreign Power Co., it has failed dismally in the central task of the American Embassy in Brazil.

INTEREST OF THE INVESTOR

Let no American investor think that he has been aided by the Embassy's pressure on Brazil to surrender in the case of I.T. & T. and the American Foreign Power Co. Every other investor in Brazil will pay through the nose for the manner in which these settlements are making Brazil the laughing stock of Washington. Barron's, the major U.S. financial weekly, did well this week to call the settlement on behalf of I.T. & T. a "sham settlement which will scarcely deceive the U.S. Congress, Members of which will know that ultimately the American taxpayer will pay the compensation, since the country is bankrupt."

The surrender of Brazil to Embassy pressure on behalf of the two companies means ultimately less developmental assistance for Brazil and it means ultimately vastly increased pressure upon every American legitimate investor remaining in Brazil.

FURTADO'S CALCULATIONS ON EXCHANGE EARNINGS

We are not offering you a detailed analysis this week of the Furtado plan for Brazilian development. But we do want to make one comment on a section that has apparently aroused some skepticism. Furtado believes that Brazilian exports can total $4.3 billion in the 3 years 1963–65. And this has been immediately greeted as "unrealistic." We believe there is every reason to anticipate, having regard for coffee prospects price and volumewise over this period, as well as other leading export commodities, that Brazil can exceed and will exceed this figure substantially, unless undervaluation of exports for reasons of flight of capital is permitted to expand from its present very sizable magnitude.

Again, in the case of imports, Brazilian minimum essential requirements could be compacted even more without reaching the degree of stagnation which the IMF achieved in Argentina and Chile.

There is some weakness and unrealism in the Furtado aspirations, but the export section is not the place to pick on.

INVESTMENT GUARANTEES: ARGENTINA

Agency for International Development reported last week that in the fourth quarter of 1962 it issued investment guarantees for $32.1 million of investments in Argentina.

This brings the total guarantees for investments in Argentina to $165 million.

	(Millions of dollars)
Cabot Corp	10.4
Eaton Mfg. Co	6.4
International Packers	13.0
Ramsey Corp	0.5
Thompson Ramo Woolridge	1.8

In previous quarters, guarantees had been issued as follows: American Motors $13 million; Ford Motor Co. $69.2 million, PASA $50 million.

TRACTOR BUSINESS IN ARGENTINA

Klockner-Humboldt-Deutz Agencies reports that in the year 1961–62 its associated company in Buenos Aires, Deutz-Cantabrica S.A. had a "satisfactory year." Its tractor output "rose according to plan and turnover increase from $11 to $17 millon, and a further increase in both production and turnover have been registered during the first few months of the present year." In Brazil, its Otto Deutz S.A. has raised its production of engines on schedule and its Demisa S.A. "continued with its preparations for the production of tractors and the first units were delivered in November 1961."

Agar, Cross & Co., has reported about its ACSA Agar Cross Tractors y Maquinaria Agricola S.A. that "the deteriorating conditions in Argentina have led to a radical reduction in the immediate profit expectations of ACSA. The local manufacture by John Deere of a medium-size tractor is expected to make up some of the lost ground later."

NEW FRONTIER NOTE

Dr. Jose Figueres, former President of Costa Rica and the most influential Latin American ever to advise on U.S. policy, will be a visiting professor of government at Harvard University for the fall term of 1963–64.

IMPORTANCE OF MILITARY

Here is a table of some interest showing relationship of military budget to gross domestic product and to gross domestic fixed capital formation: Base period is 1957–59.

	Military budget as percentage of—	
	Gross product	Fixed capital formation
Argentina	2.4	13.0
Brazil	2.8	22.4
Chile	2.6	25.6
Colombia	1.4	8.8
Mexico	.8	5.3
United States	9.8	58.3

Hanson's Latin American Letter,
Box 181, Benjamin Franklin Station,
Washington 4, D.C.

[From Time magazine]

The Americas: Alliance in Danger

In conceiving of the Alliance for Progress as a bold 10-year program to develop Latin America, planners counted on massive U.S. Government aid—but also on at least $300 million a year in direct U.S. private investment. Instead of plunging in, U.S. investors are pulling out of Latin America; in the first 9 months of 1962 brought home $37 million more than they invested. From three sources last week came ringing indictments of the Alliance and its failure to generate any enthusiasm among businessmen.

PROFITS LOW, RISKS HIGH

The first indictment came from the 26-man Commerce Committee for the Alliance for Progress (COMAP) appointed by Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges to make a businesslike appraisal of the program. Reported COMAP's Chairman J. Peter Grace, 49, international-minded president of W. R. Grace & Co.: the Alliance "in its present size and form cannot succeed." Investors are frightened away by the "unfavorable business climate" in Latin America. Profits are low, risks high. The United States, continued Grace, should adopt a "carrot and stick approach," with grants and loans to encourage Latin Americans to enact laws more hospitable to private investment. The committee recommended greater tax incentives and deductions as a cushion against heavy losses. Even then, concluded Grace, "it is unlikely that normal conditions attractive to foreign capital can be created for a number of years."

In a separate opinion—later endorsed by Grace—David Rockefeller, president of the Chase Manhattan Bank, and two other COMAP members argued that the incentives and grants are only "stopgap" remedies. In the long run, "encouragement of private enterprise, local and foreign, must become the main thrust of the Alliance." The United States, says the Rockefeller group, "should concentrate its economic aid program in countries that show the greatest inclination to adopt measures to improve the investment climate, and withhold aid from others until satisfactory performance has been demonstrated."

NO JOINT EFFORT

Still a third powerful criticism came from the Harvard study group of businessmen and intellectuals who in 1960 sounded the original call for a hemispherewide "alliance of progress." The study group complained that the Alliance "is not an alliance. It has lapsed into a unilateral U.S. checkwriting program." The solution, said the group, is for Latin Americans, like Europeans during Marshall plan days, to join in a regional organization to establish priorities for spending aid money.

In 18 months the United States has committed $1.6 billion to the Alliance. But the results so far, as COMAP's Grace says, indicate only that "we are in great danger of suffering a major defeat to our strategic interests in this hemisphere."

Hanson's Latin American Letter,
Washington, March 23, 1963.

Dear Sir: This week the Senate Appropriations Committee issued a report on the Alliance for Progress prepared by Senator Hubert Humphrey. Humphrey is rapidly outdistancing Senator Morse as the liberals' spokesman on Latin American policy, and already leads Morse in the support of policy positions that are causing the collapse of U.S. relations with Latin America. Two points in the new report merit consideration by the business community:

MORE EXPROPRIATIONS

(1) Humphrey predicts that the trend to expropriate public utilities and firms in the extractive industries will continue, and he approves the method adopted by the State Department in the American Foreign Power Co. case, wherein the U.S. Treasury is to provide the compensation for the company by means of concealed donations to the Brazilian Government, which are deducted from amounts that would otherwise be made available to Brazil for constructive purposes.

ALLENDE VIEW SUPPORTED

In effect, Humphrey accepts the view, of Presidential Candidate Allende in Chile that "since Cuba, the United States can no longer impose its will in the matter of expropriations." Allende points out that he "does not any longer anticipate any bitter dispute over expropriation" and he promises upon election to take over the American copper companies. Compensation would be for value of nondepreciated capital and since Chile is on the dole, the funds would come from the U.S. Treasury, that is, from the U.S. taxpayer. Again, the amounts thus awarded to American companies by the U.S. Treasury would be deducted from funds that might otherwise under the Alliance have gone to Chile for constructive purposes.

In the case of Chile, the effect of the Humphrey-Allende thesis is to make it impossible for any candidate in the election to refrain from expropriation of the American companies.

DEFEATS ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Two qualifications must be made immediately to the Humphrey thesis: First, the device is wholly improper as a subsidy by the U.S. taxpayer to selected stockholders in selected companies. And it is economically unsound and actually destructive of the objectives of the Alliance for Progress because it constitutes simply a substitution of public foreign for private foreign capital rather than meeting the deficiency in capital which is a prominent barrier to economic growth and social reform. This escapes Senator Humphrey completely.

NO FUNDS FOR COMPENSATION

The second qualification is a very practical matter: When Humphrey expresses his confidence that "the trend toward local ownership of utilities and extractive industries is likely to continue," he forgets the statistics of the problem. There is not now in the President's budget and there is not in the budget that the Congress is likely to approve anything like the magnitudes needed to pay off the owners of the utilities and the extractive industries in Latin America.

This accounts for the haste of some members of COMAP to demand a rise to $2.5 billion per year for the Alliance for Progress, lest the Treasury run out of money to pay for their particular foreign investments. What is important and what is not at all debatable is that such financing in such magnitudes is not going to be available.

We have, then, the evolution of the perfect device to destroy the objectives of the Alliance for Progress as far as Latin America is concerned, and also to accelerate confiscation without compensation as far as the bulk of U.S. investors is concerned.

DOOMING THE ALLIANCE

For Humphrey, the inconsistency in advocating the objectives of the Alliance and simultaneously supporting steps that will prevent economic growth and democratically achieved social reform is not at all unique. When, for instance, there occurred the Bolivian expropriations which touched off the present era of confiscation cum approval of the U.S. Treasury, Humphrey rejected the accepted dictates of international law, enthused at the challenge to the owners of the tin mines, and even wondered how they had avoided even worse punishment so long for their alleged errors of judgment and policy.

Yet now, a decade later, $250 million later in U.S. donations, with the confiscated properties a shambles, Humphrey does not oppose paying the owners of the Patino properties out of the U.S. Treasury and indeed he supports their desires for higher prices for minerals from their mines in other countries, even though it involves serious damage to U.S. balance of payments by preventing the orderly movement of suitable magnitudes of U.S. stockpiled minerals at a time when supply-demand conditions warrant such movement.

Humphrey has also failed to protest the millions of dollars committed from U.S. loan funds to service the defaulted Bolivian dollar bonds which have been the object of criticism since FDR sounded off on the Bolivian issues. He apparently considers this a proper use of taxpayers' funds perhaps on the theory that even speculators in defaulted bonds have one vote each.

THE FRUITS OF NATIONALIZING

The U.S. Government has reported after a year of the triangular operation to rehabilitate Comibol that the losses of the nationalized venture in 1962 mounted to $11.5 million, from $10 million in 1961. This makes a total of $33 million in losses of the venture in 3 years, to say nothing of the enormous losses of previous years, all of which have been paid for by the U.S. taxpayer. On March 16, 1962, the House Appropriations Committee was told that a 3 year program would put Comibol onto a profitmaking basis, and would total "something like $35 million." It was told that the first year's burden would be $16 million. On February 28, 1963, the Embassy reported that the first year program had run $22.8 million, that the second year would run $20.5 million and that the total would go well over $50 million.

The promise now is that the Comibol venture will become a profitmaker by 1964 early, but only if the United States promises to fix a price for tin, by the manipulation of its tin holdings, that will permit immense and excessive profits for all other producers of tin the world over, among whom would be the interests whom Humphrey once criticized and now is willing to have subsidized.

COMPETITION?

Meanwhile, Bolivia's Minister for Peasant Affairs, who had already denounced the U.S. purpose and execution in the Alliance for Progress, told the press in London that the U.S. aid was embarrassing to the Bolivian regime and that Bolivia and other Latin American nations were turning to Europe for aid in order to avoid too great a dependence on the United States. Nothing could please the U.S. taxpayer more than to be rid of the Bolivian burden and it is all too unfortunate that no European nation has risen to the call. (The German participation in the triangular operation merely consists of credits for exports underwritten and guaranteed by U.S. donations. In that sense, they are counter to the U.S. policy of promoting U.S. exports.)

THE COST OF EMOTIONAL HOSTILITY

(2) Senator Humphrey's second policy-finding or discovery was that "If our relationships with Brazil deteriorate to the point of emotional hostility, then whatever we seek to do in the Western Hemisphere will be endangered." It must be clear that direct intervention in the internal affairs of any Latin American country is the simplest way to create emotional hostility. Yet, in his curious inconsistency, Humphrey himself intervened in the Peruvian election with advice calculated to arouse hostility on the part of any independent minded Latin American. And he was curiously quiet when the State Department in an adventure of characteristic clumsiness last week staged the fiasco in Brazil:

Was this sequence calculated to prevent or to stimulate deterioration of our relations with Brazil to the point of emotional hostility?

(1) On the eve of the visit of the Brazilian Finance Minister, favored press leaks of the White House were given a briefing on the extent of Communist infiltration in the Goulart regime. Their published accounts follow closely the testimony of the American Ambassador before the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

(2) Although the State Department had full authority and opportunity to edit out or delay publication of any testimony the ambassador had given before the committee, it permitted publication during the visit of the finance minister of the charges of Communist infiltration.

(3) When even pro-U.S. newspapers in Brazil reacted by suggesting that it might be advisable not to allow Ambassador Gordon to return, the Department sought to "manage the news" by stating that the State Department and not the Ambassador had given the hostile testimony.

(4) A few hours after this attempt to manage the news failed, the Department said that the Ambassador and the Department held the same views.

(5) A day later, both the wire services and the Washington Post were attributing the statement to the Ambassador and not to the Department.

Emotional hostility? The new policy of intervention in Latin America is calculated to stimulate emotional hostility on a scale never before seen in this hemisphere. What does Senator Humphrey expect to happen when the Guatemalans learn that the White House is supporting Arevalo for the presidency in Guatemala? That the same Arevalo was even linked with protests by White House favorite, Figueres, and others against Peru holding an election without outside observers?

In an exclusive interview published March 17, Assistant Secretary of State Martin said that "there are Communist sympathizers in various places in the Brazilian [Government] structure, which is a matter which creates some difficulty for us."

BASIC ELEMENT IN BRAZILIAN NEGOTIATION

The fact which both the Brazilian press and the American press failed to cope with was that the visit of the Brazilian finance minister, in the minds of Amembassy Brazil and the State Department, has only one purpose and that is to button up the deal for American Foreign Power Co. And the price that will be paid by the United States for this perversion of American foreign policy, and the price to be paid by American firms in Brazil, is yet to unfold.

U.S. INVESTMENTS

Meanwhile, the State Department reported to the House Foreign Affairs Committee that in the first 9 months of 1962, American firms invested in Brazil at a pace almost 3 times as great as in the full year 1961. The pace was $2 million a month, compared with $0.7 million in 1961.

U.S. direct investments—9 months, 1960

	(Millions of dollars)
Argentina	77
Brazil	18
Colombia	18
Mexico	14
Venezuela (withdrew)	191
Chile (withdrew)	7
Panama (withdrew)	21
Guatemala (withdrew)	2

GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT

The State Department also reported last week that Brazil's gross national product had increased by 3.5 percent in 1962 while Argentina's gross national product decreased by 6 percent. It reported that Bolivia's gross national product increased by 5 percent, but the Embassy qualified this to point out that virtually all of the increase was made up of the increase in donations from Washington.

HUMPHREY'S OTHER VIEWS: OIL, ETC.

We have ignored some other recommendations of Senator Humphrey for obvious reasons. He is, for instance, disturbed at Brazil's purchase of Middle East oil and seems to be getting close in his thinking to hemisphere preferentials which would be a step backward in the administration's effort at freer world trade. Again, he is unhappy that U.S. firms with plants in Latin America and the United States have in some cases chosen to ship from the United States rather than from Latin America. Senator Humphrey's interest in Latin America may ultimately turn out to be a great disaster for Latin America as well as for the United States.

GOULART EVALUATION

Here is an odd note in a week in which the Communist infiltration in Brazil is a front page story across this country. The leading U.S. socialist magazine reported that the left has no confidence whatever in the Goulart regime.

Hanson's Latin American Letter,
Box 181, Benjamin Franklin Station,
Washington 4, D.C.

Hanson's Latin American Letter,
Washington, March 30, 1963.

Dear Sir: The U.S. Government reported this week that assistance to Latin America in the calendar year 1962 had been reduced by $170 million, as compared with calendar year 1961. It reported further that at the end of the year, the annual pace was running less than $600 million per year, as compared with $677 million in 1962 and $848 million in 1961. Again, whereas outright grants had constituted only 17 percent of assistance in 1961, they constituted 26 percent of assistance in 1962. It should immediately be noted also that a large proportion of the so-called credit assistance is merely in the form of concealed grants so that the proportion of donations is actually larger than these figures indicate.

U.S. relations with Latin America

[In millions of dollars]

	1961	1962
Net Government credit aid including concealed grants	701	501
Outright donations	147	176
Capital outflow to private direct investments	141	−18
Earnings remitted by direct investors	711	756

In addition to the reduction in assistance obtained from the U.S. Government, Latin America suffered a deterioration of $159 million in the matter of direct investments. For the calendar year 1962, U.S. companies reduced their investment by withdrawing $18 million net, whereas in 1961 they had increased their investments by sending down another $141 million.

At the same time, earnings remitted from Latin America were increasing substantially from $711 to $756 million. (In 1960, $641 million was remitted.)

All assistance data cited here refer to assistance actually rendered rather than to commitments entered into.

THE BRAZILIAN DEAL: BLACKMAIL

Some weeks ago, the Director of Studies of the Royal Institute of International Affairs warned that unless the West "is prepared to accept the risk of accident, namely, that some country may go Communist, the donor countries will be chronically vulnerable to blackmail from the least competent and most oppressive governments of the underdeveloped world." With official evidence published of Communist infiltration in Brazil, there was no effort in Washington this week to conceal the fact that the plan of financial aid represents precisely such a response to demands for blackmail. As an associate of the White House wrote: "The policy decision to negotiate the substantial loan (sic) is based largely upon the fact (sic) that no political alternative to President Goulart exists presently on the scene." The idea that there is an absence of a political alternative would be challenged vigorously by the pro-West political forces in Brazil who oppose Goulart.

The Brazilian Deal: The Cruzeiro

You will recall that in May 1961, when the administration was seeking to maximize the propaganda values of the so-called billion dollar bailout for Brazil, we pointed out that the facts did not jibe too well with the propaganda, and that reservations regarding the deal were every much in order, on the part of the business community. At the present time, a more precise appraisal of the new Brazilian deal is very much in order. What actually did Brazil get in the sense of impact on the deteriorating situation? After all, the $70 million in Public Law 480 is merely a continuation of policies existing even as the deterioration was making itself felt, so there is nothing new in that:

(1) Brazil got $84 million, part of it from a previous commitment to Brazil, and part of it replacing in effect an earlier $30 million commitment made to button up the I.T. & T. compensation arrangement.

But a large part of this $84 million is in fact mortgaged by the Brazilian commitment to provide the windfall for stockholders of American Foreign Power Co. which is extremely disadvantageous for Brazil and wholly out of order at a time like this. In other words, on the part of the United States, a large part of the assistance is in effect assistance to a particular group of U.S. stockholders which is a wholly improper use of foreign aid funds. And on the part of Brazil, the effect of the assistance is in large part nullified by the new mortgage on Brazilian legitimately earned exchange accepted thus by the Brazilian negotiators.

(2) The heart of the arrangement, then, rests with the $200 million in concealed donations from the Agency for International Development. But immediately note well that this part of the program depends on the wishes of the Congress and will depend on fresh appropriations from the Congress. And the Congress in the foreign aid bill may well introduce stipulations limiting the flow of such funds to Brazil.

For, politically, the Congress generally considers the Goulart regime to be untrustworthy and infiltrated with Communists at very high policymaking levels. Against this position, with which the executive branch actually agrees in private, the executive branch has argued that the very weapon poised over Goulart's head of the bribe if he acts as the American Ambassador dictates will cause Goulart to shake off his Communist advisers. At this stage it remains uncertain that Goulart wants to shake them off, and if he should want to, whether he can.

But this is not simply a matter of political speculation. The economic measures contemplated by the new program envisage a substantial economic slowdown in Brazil, a sloughing off to economic and business activity such as took place in Argentina and has quite demoralized Argentina. Should this happen in Brazil, public opinion would undoubtedly attribute it to the dictates of the American Embassy and act very unsympathetically toward the political aspirations of the arrangement. Perhaps Goulart's leftist advisers count on this.

Economically, the $200 million in concealed donations constitutes a new era in bailouts. Formerly, bailouts and balance-of-payments assistance were largely conceived on a commercial basis, i.e. as temporary assistance to tide over to corrections in the balance of payments and as such rendered in the form of repayable loans on commercial terms. This time there is the extended grace period, the lack of interest (the arrangement will cost the U.S. Treasury some $250 million in interest payments on the money it borrows to hand Brazil), and the 40-year term.

But this does not exhaust the analysis of the concealed donations of $200 million. U.S. officials readily concede that the $200 million will serve to bail out European creditors of Brazil and thus actually worsen the competitive position of U.S. exporters in the Brazilian market. Secondly, a large portion will be absorbed by oil company arrearages, in a form of retroactive insurance, without cost to the companies, which has never been formally approved by the Congress as an appropriate use of foreign aid.

You will recall that in 1961 the Treasury tried to soften the impact of the gigantic gouge on the U.S. Treasury by referring to expectations that $150 million of assistance would accompany the deal from Europe and Japan. This never materialized, and the Finance Minister revealed that only $23 million had been obtained from Europe, and even that on hard commercial terms. The Brazilian hope is that the $200 million in concealed donations from AID will underwrite the European credits and that thus there will be forthcoming from Europe and Japan $23 million in repayable credits at commercial interest rates in addition to the $77 million previously withheld. That is, that the Europeans will accept export business when it is underwritten and in effect financed by U.S. donations.

Again, the reaction of the Congress to this arrangement, economically, may well be as hostile as it is to the arrangement on political grounds.

THE SETTING OF THE BRAZILIAN DEAL

Meanwhile, it would be well for every business firm to remember the setting of the present arrangement in the historic words of the Finance Minister which have been published in so many major U.S. newspapers this week. "Foreign aid should be considered as a means of indemnity for damages caused by the exploitive process." The "exploiting" being a reference to the activities of foreign capital.

In a sense that is a more meaningful indicator of the setting of the U.S. relationship with Brazil currently than the whistling which one finds in the report to stockholders of Caterpillar Tractor Co.: "Business in Brazil continues to be fraught with the risks usually associated with rapid inflation in wages and prices, very substantial deficits in the national budget, unfavorable terms of trade, deficits on balance of payments, and general political instability. Caterpillar Brazil however has demonstrated that it is possible to conduct a business with a reasonable measure of success under these conditions. It has been able to protect itself so far against major loss as a result of foreign exchange devaluation, and to employ retained cruzeiro earnings for worthwhile expansion of the business. For this reason and with continuing faith that Brazil could become a very substantial market for its products, Caterpillar is undertaking further investment in and identification with that country."

MAXWELL HOUSE DRAWS FIRST BLOOD FROM COFFEE AGREEMENT

On March 20, Maxwell House announced increases in the price of coffee, effective March 22. It said that "the steady rise of green coffee prices over the last 5 months" made the increases necessary. The cost to the consumer of the price changes led by Maxwell House is put at $60 to $100 million per year. Inventory profits for the industry are put at $16 to $20 million.

Immediately, agencies of the U.S. Government noted that the allegations of green coffee price increases necessitating the price rise do not appear to be well founded. And they released official indexes of the movement of coffee prices as follows:

Indexes of prices

	Wholesale price, Colombian coffee	Wholesale price, Brazilian coffee	Retail price in United States
February 1963	73.1	70.4	77.1
January 1963	74.0	71.0	77.2
December 1962	74.0	71.0	77.1
July 1962	74.0	72.6	79.2
January 1962	79.1	72.0	79.3

And the Department of Commerce reported that the trend of coffee import prices from September through January 1963 (latest data available) has been downward. This was true for total coffee imports, as well as for Colombian and Brazilian imports.

It must be clear that the timing of the price rise on the eve of effective date for the International Coffee Agreement is suggestive in the extreme. If the path or procedure for price increases by the coffee countries under the price fixing mechanism to be run by the U.S. representative is thus being established, it is time that the Congress demanded an official investigation, regardless of the status of the International Coffee Agreement. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee failed dismally to hold proper and appropriate hearings on the coffee agreement, and if there is to be any protection for the consumer at all, and for the U.S. balance of payments, some agency of the Government must be brought in to hold hearings on the fixing of coffee prices in this country.

It will be recalled that during the hearings on the coffee agreement, with no doubts by anyone connected with the committee that prices were going to be raised, the National Coffee Association piously testified that "the responsibilities of our members as U.S. citizens transcend their personal interests. We are willing to make sacrifices." The first "sacrifice" contemplated was perhaps acceptance of the $60 million in inventory profits which is envisaged by the position taken by leading Latin American advisers to the administration as to the level at which coffee prices should be fixed.

The chairman of General Foods Corp. (Maxwell House) on March 27 said that he saw "signs of broader public understanding of the economic facts of life." It is time that public understanding made itself felt in the matter of coffee prices. It would appear as it did during the rape of the consumer in the two previous great upward movements of prices in the past 15 years that the coffee industry still relies on the inability of the consumer to make his voice heard.

Hanson's Latin American Letter,
Washington, D.C.

P.S.—Communist propagandists have found very useful for their purposes in Latin America a press release put out by the World Coffee Information Center alleging that the Central American countries suffered losses of $593 million since 1957 because of the drop in coffee prices. This thesis of losses has, of course, been totally rejected both by analysts of the U.S. Government, by the U.S. Ambassador to Brazil in a major address, and by one of the most prominent Latin American economists with an international reputation. It might be well for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to examine into the fountains of propaganda in the course of its current investigation of foreign agents and foreign propaganda in this country. The World Coffee Information Center is the information branch of the International Coffee Agreement.

P.S.—Here is Senator Humphrey's evaluation of the State Department's handling of the testimony on Communist infiltration in Brazil: "rather amateurish, unprecedented and unwarranted handling of very difficult and sensitive relationships between our country and Brazil."

Brazil—The Tottering Keystone

Washington, February 25, 1963.—"If the Alliance for Progress goes into operation fully, if reforms, social, economic, and political, are put into effect, then communism and Castroism will collapse in South America. However, if effort is not made and reforms are not forthcoming, we will have problems in South America even if there is no Cuba or Castro" (Robert Kennedy, interview in U.S. News & World Report, Jan. 28, 1963).

The above quotation from the Attorney General typifies the broad feeling within the U.S. Government that communism in Latin America is exclusively a product of economic and social discontent. According to this view, communism can be tolerated in Cuba because it is irrelevant to the final outcome of the Communist challenge in the Western Hemisphere. All will depend, in this view, on the success or failure of the Alliance for Progress.

Others feel, however, that the political warfare being waged by the Communists is far more important than social and economic discontent. For example, a little known drama is taking place which could, in a matter of months, render the entire Alliance for Progress irrelevant. This is the developing struggle for power in Brazil. If the pro-Communist and leftist forces should win, the largest and most powerful state in Latin America might soon be lost to the free world. With this keystone gone, nothing could prevent the loss of the entire continent. The issue may hinge on the political attitude of the United States toward the contending factions.

The Brazilian situation became critical after President Quadros resigned in August 1961. A civil war was nearly fought in Brazil after a number of military leaders attempted to prevent Vice President Goulart from taking power on his return from a visit to Communist China. While regarded in some circles as a mere opportunist, Goulart was and is deeply suspected by many others as a doctrinaire leftist who is opening the way toward a Communist takeover of Brazil.

The facts lean heavily toward this evaluation. The 1961 crisis was solved by a compromise which limited the presidential powers in favor of a "parliamentary" form of government. Economic and political chaos followed as Goulart set out to reacquire full power by proving the parliamentary system unworkable. He surrounded himself with pro-Communist or "neutralist" advisers, restored amicable relations with the Soviet Union, maintained friendly relations with Cuba (Brazil abstained on the Punta del Este resolution which barely got the two-thirds vote necessary to expel Cuba from the Organization of American States), and began to build his support within the all-important armed forces.

Last September the struggle between Goulart and the conservative-oriented Brazilian Congress came to a head over the question of a plebiscite to restore the full power of the President. Communist-infiltrated labor unions staged pro-Goulart strikes and riots. Pro-Goulart military commanders threatened a coup. Congress gave in and agreed to the plebiscite, which was held on January 6, 1963. The issue was not Goulart as such, but the form of government. With inflation mounting and matters generally going from bad to worse, Goulart shrewdly worded the question as "yes" or "no" to the existing parliamentary system. Brazilians voted 5 to 1 against it, and the new Brazilian Congress must now restore the full presidential system. Goulart has thus thrown off the shackles placed on him in 1961.

No one can know Goulart's innermost motivation. He says he has no intention of permitting a Communist Brazil, but the moderates who hoped he would rid himself of the Communists surrounding him and reverse the leftist trend have been disappointed. Goulart is moving to consolidate his power, crush his opposition, and make himself a dictator—already the Brazilian free press is virtually destroyed. There is still a chance that he can be blocked or overthrown before his victory is complete, but it will probably require unconstitutional means. The U.S. attitude could be critical to the success or failure of such an effort.

The lineup of forces now looks like this: Ranged on Goulart's side are many of the labor unions (two out of five of the labor confederations are controlled by Communists); the National Union of Students; Castro admirer Francisco Juliao, leader of the "peasant leagues" of impoverished northeastern Brazil (it has been announced that he will visit Cuba at Castro's invitation); some anti-U.S. Army officers; and of course Goulart's brother-in-law, Leonel Brizola, Governor of the State of Rio Grande Do Sul. It was Brizola who confiscated the southern Brazilian subsidiary of International Telephone & Telegraph in February 1962. He traces all of Brazil's problems to "the occupation of our nation by the United States," and recently booted a U.S. Peace Corps group out of his state.

Against Goulart are most of the senior military officers, much of the business community, the National Democratic Union (UDN) political party, and the middle classes which have been suffering so heavily under the runaway inflation. Also strongly anti-Goulart, and high on the Communist target list, is Carlos Lacerda, stanchly anti-Communist Governor of Guanabara State (which includes Rio de Janeiro). Early last year he warned Brazilians of the rise to power to Communists among Goulart's advisers. More recently, he declared on television that "It seems that the plan of the men in power is to hand Brazil over to Soviet Russia, with U.S. money, thus betraying the trust of the people who voted in the farcical January 6 plebiscite."

How much truth is there in this charge? There is ample reason, certainly to fear the rise of communism under a Goulart dictatorship even if he is not personally another Fidel Castro. If the Communists fail to take over the country from the top, there is always the chance that they will do so by revolution from below if there is not a strong anti-Communist leadership to oppose them. Brazil is a primary object of Cuba-originated subversion. Planeloads of Brazilians are taken to Havana on all-expense trips. Brazilian students are offered free scholarships provided they also take guerrilla-warfare training at Cuban universities.

Last November Cuban Raul Cepero Bonilla was killed in an air crash in Peru. Documents were found in his briefcase which were turned over to Brazil and never made public. The documents consisted of a report to his superior by a Cuban agent on the status of various guerrilla training camps in six Brazilian States, particularly in Goias. These camps were financed by Cuban money and were under overall Cuban military direction. To be sure, many problems were being encountered in organization and personnel. One problem concerned the fact that the location and purpose of the training camps was becoming obvious to too many people, including the police. But the police were doing little or nothing to crack down on the revolutionaries.

Such apathy by the Government bodes ill for the future. The Brazilian Communist Party itself is small, with an estimated 50,000 members, but its power is widespread. One of the two labor federations controlled by the party is that of the industrial workers with 5 million members. In the city of Rio alone, the Communists now control the metalworkers, bank clerks, tailors, textile workers, stevedores, teamsters and electrical workers. Party leaders in Sao Paulo were elated last October when all five politicians who had official Communist Party support were elected to office.

Under Goulart's policies of improved economic and political relations with the Soviet bloc (trade is to be increased substantially to lessen economic dependence on the United States), and the general tide of anti-American statements by demagogic politicians (and even some businessmen), the climate for communism is steadily improving. And now it appears that Goulart will get his money from the United States. Prodded by a quick trip of Robert Kennedy to Brazil last December—which reportedly produced a stormy interview—Goulart agreed to a tentative compensation plan for I.T. & T. and announced an austerity program to put Brazil's financial house in order. The United States promptly granted a short-term credit of $30 million. More will undoubtedly follow.

But, if the political situation is not changed, we may be pouring money into a future Communist state. Such a change could come soon by means of a military coup against Goulart. A good indication of the attitude in the military showed up recently when Governor Brizola and several other prominent leftists were awarded the naval merit medal. In the following weeks, 33 admirals and other officers turned back to the government their own merit medals.

Matters are building to a climax in which the U.S. attitude may be crucial. If they are to act at all, senior military leaders will have to act quickly, and they will probably need at least the tacit approval of the United States.

Goulart's plan is evidently to ease out officers opposed to him and replace them with his own men. In July 1963 many generals are due for retirement and the way will be open for the promotion of pro-Goulart colonels to general rank. A key indicator to Goulart's strategy may be the appointment of the leftist first army commander Gen. Osvino Alves, as Minister of War. This would alienate almost the entire general officer corps as well as the moderate and center political forces. If the appointment is made, it will be because Goulart feels strong enough to neutralize his military opposition.

This time, the U.S. Government is at least genuinely concerned with the developing situation in Brazil. The question is what to do. Do we steadfastly uphold "democratic" procedures which may be paving the way toward a very undemocratic accession to power of communism in Brazil—which will seal the doom of all Latin America; or do we encourage the only elements which may yet be able to stop the dangerous drift toward disaster? It is an old choice with which we seem congenitally unable to cope. In a world in which no government is perfect, we all too often sacrifice the substance of democracy in order to preserve or promote its form. In the end, both may be lost.

FRANK J. JOHNSON,
Editor.

Slide Rule Failure in Brazil

(By Keith Botsford)

RIO DE JANEIRO.—After an eventful week in Brazilian-American relations—during which the President was believed to have ordered the recall of his Finance Minister and the suspension of negotiations with the United States; the Nationalist bloc in Congress was hunting for Ambassador Lincoln Gordon's head, or at least his credentials; and the Salguiero sambistas held a silent parade of protest—all is now sweetness and light. The State Department, most sensibly, has assuaged Brazilian pride; the Washington Post has come out for Brazil; and Joao Goulart is trying to muzzle his brother-in-law, Leonel Brizola.

This typical profile of a Brazilian crisis—gloom and optimism, confusion, doubt and euphoria—began in a U.S. House subcommittee, where testimony had been taken to the effect that Communists had infiltrated Brazilian society and even branches of its Government. Now it is not exactly news that Brazilian Communists, thanks to the apathy and division of their opponents, are able to control the student movement or many of the unions with a tiny minority of activists. Nor is it surprising to learn that the armed forces of Brazil have been undergoing a process of renovation along Goulart-Labor Party-Nationalist lines. After all, the President's power has been challenged ever since he took office; he has always needed to find support. Likewise, no one denies that there are several Communists or useful fools in Goulart's immediate entourage. His press secretary, Raul Ryff, who was probably responsible for the fictitious breaking off of the talks in Washington, is an avowed and active Communist.

This is but a small part of the trouble, however. A proper panorama of the Brazilian situation cannot leave out dissension within the armed forces over promotions and pay; the navy's smuggling past Federal Customs planes with which to fit out its phantom aircraft carrier; and a crime wave in Rio which revealed that there are twice as many convicted criminals walking the streets as there are in the prisons. A continuing inflation, a sag in productivity and an enormous accumulated debt indicate that twice as much money is needed as is in the bank. To the public this means restricted credit, prices out of reach and development at a standstill: or, to make it clearer, no new car or TV, less food, and dipping into savings.

Until very recently, the Brazilian Government solved its economic problems by printing new money. Now the tendency is to plans. There is to be an anti-inflationary plan and a 3-year plan; Government expenses are to be cut nearly in half. Whether this resolves the problem is a matter of conjecture. Federal outlay in some fields, particularly education, is disastrously low; the great bulk of the deficit is due to an inflated bureaucracy. Recently I was privileged to observe that it took 21 employes 2½ hours to clear a package through customs. This labor netted 65 cents for the Federal Government, in itself an unusual amount, since the more general practice is to pay one of the employees and pay the Government nothing.

A thread runs through these apparently disparate reflections: the shapelessness of Brazilian society. It is simply impossible to judge this country according to European or North American standards. Everything here works by tangents and approximations. Subcommittees of the U.S. House of Representatives, with their slide rules and multiplication tables (x number of Communists equals subversion), are far out of the picture.

In defending its interests, the first thing the United States ought to know is who its real enemies are. The Communists in Brazil are few and infinitely less dangerous in the long run than the kind of wordy opportunists who have, in fact, taken up strong positions in the present administration. Professional Communists can be left to the Brazilians. But who is going to cover the great Brazilian blindspot, the incompetent get-ahead intellectual masquerading as a patriot?

If the subcommittee had had a potted biography of each so-called Communist, it would probably have approved of the type: corporation lawyers, journalists, professors, industrialists, and, in the northeast, overseers for the great fazendeiros. These men are radicals, nationalists, or what-have-you simply because they believe this will give them position, power, prestige, and money. Meanwhile, the center is firmly occupied by ripe old senatorial types with long locks and fine speeches—the traditional parties and the traditional elites.

Where is a young man to go? Latin American intellectuals are more prone than most to take the path of least resistance. If a few speeches, a badly written pamphlet, and a couple of heroic attitudes will obtain a department or a ministry or a reputation at the least, why waste time on honest work? The facility with which the young rise in Latin America is a symbol of intellectual corruption.

It has, for instance, cost Francisco San Tiago Dantas, the present Minister of Finance, no inner debate to alter his political position from that of the "brain" of the integralist dictatorship of Getulio Vargas to that of the theoretician of a sovereign Brazil: The two are not really so very different. But, at the same time, it bothers him little to follow a nationalist line when it suits him and yet continue his legal practice for the North American corporations his colleagues denounce.

Similarly, whenever Jango Goulart has met too much resistance to his tactics, when he has understood that he has gone too far, he has simply backtracked temporarily and reassured the country, which really profoundly dislikes radicalism of any kind. No assurance, however, is provided that after Brazil has been lulled, the cycle will not begin again.

On the other hand, no country today can demand of another unswerving support of its own foreign policy. Brazil, like Ghana or Burma, wants a policy of its own; indeed, often the policy's only justification is its independence. Nevertheless, it is time the United States recognized that Brazilian society is based on democratic principles. When North American demands do not violate or threaten Brazil's economy, its social structure or its longstanding political commitments (whatever the United States may think of these), the two countries will generally be in agreement. In the cold war, this agreement is a matter of where the United States lays its emphases, and how much it insists on areas of disagreement.

If Brazilian loyalty to the free world rests on taking up a firm position on the Cuban question, the United States is only providing ammunition for the nationalists, who see the U.S. challenge to Cuba not in terms of freedom and justice, but as a desire on the part of Washington to reaffirm its control over the island. In North American insistence on the "menace" of Cuba, they see only an irrational obsession with communism. As the United States has never stated what alternatives it backs, what people, what platforms, or what it will do about Cuban land reform, the expropriated companies, or the emigration, Brazilians, like Mexicans and many other Latin Americans, presume the worst. And the worst has a tangible form—the status quo ante represented by the redoubts of Miami.

Finally, U.S. insistence on internal "reform" verges on the impossible. The Brazilian Government constantly promises reforms—they now go by the name of "basic" reforms, in keeping with the new jargon—but the idea of reform remains more important than the practice. Reforms in Brazil are power plays, like everything else. They call forth predictable reactions from some sections of the voting public, which is what they are for.

Change and reform are by their nature slow processes. The one way to make sure they will not work is to put them in abstract, generalized terms and to prefer the vast, global plan to any kind of modest beginning. Words are the escape valve of progress. On this score, it is hard to see how the United States, which from the beginning has conceived of the Alliance for Progress in the vastest possible terms, and as a great "slogan" to prove its interest in Latin America, can criticize Brazil when it, too, thinks in terms of "bigness" and reforms that remain words. Nor is it easy to be told to put one's house in order when one of the advisers of the Alliance is Juscelino Kubitschek, who by ambition and greed, started the whole inflationary spiral in Brazil.

Failing the example of small successes that the "people" can see and benefit from, and put pressure on the Government to emulate, the result is likely to be big failures. Instead of trying to "solve" the problem of the Northeast, which may well be insoluble, why not make tangible progress—which is quite possible—on other problems, equally or more desperate? In many parts of Brazil, small, almost insignificant projects have gained public support and materially benefited the "people." Each of these is a resounding blow against the mainstream of empty talk that flows about the Brazilian "left"; and each is a proof that the United States need not preach "revolution."

"Revolution" is not a very safe word if you cannot provide the goods, and modesty in demands and plans—things that can be achieved—is always preferable to ambitious dreams that fail. Starting from this axiom, it should not be hard to see how Brazil can be linked to its sister-democracy, the United States. It cannot be done by ramming a Cuban position down its throat or by conjuring up menaces that do not exist and bypassing the very real dangers that abound.

MISCELLANEOUS STATEMENTS

On February 2, 1963, the chairman of the Commerce Department's Committee for the Alliance for Progress, J. Peter Grace, stated: "The program, in its present size and form, cannot succeed and we are in great danger of suffering a major defeat to our strategic interests in this hemisphere.

"The amount of aid which it proposed to provide is grossly inadequate and the manner in which the aid is to be made available, mainly on a Government to Government basis, raises extreme doubt as to the effectiveness of any amount of aid in attaining our objective."

In a news conference on March 18, 1963, in Mexico City, former Brazilian President Juscelino Kubitschek held that he found throughout the continent of Latin America "an absolute lack of faith in the Alliance and its results among the popular classes."

Labor leaders from 11 Latin American countries meeting in Mexico City for their third annual meeting sponsored by the Inter-American Regional Labor Organization, asserted that workers are not getting the benefits they expected from the Alliance for Progress program.

Delegates from Guatemala, the Dominican Republic, Costa Rica, Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Uruguay, El Salvador, Panama, Paraguay, and Honduras issued a statement saying, "the working class has been completely disregarded in the plans of the Alliance."

[From the Washington Daily News, Apr. 10 1963]

ALLIANCE IS RAPPED

NEW ORLEANS, April 10.—Top news executives of Latin America and the United States wind up a 3-day clinic today at the second annual Pan American press seminar.

A Chilean newspaper executive said yesterday the Alliance for Progress is dying in Latin America.

Raul Silva Castro, editor of El Mercurio in Santiago, questioned the fact that under the Alliance "underdeveloped countries must raise taxes to the same level as that in the United States" and predicted the Alliance will fall of its own weight.

Earlier, Senor Silva Castro had objected to a Bolivian editor's remarks about the free trade zone in South America.

Hugo Gonzalez Rioja, editor of La Nacion in La Paz, Bolivia, blamed the lack of television in his country on the fact "we are not allowed to participate in the free trade zone of South America." He added that Bolivia is underdeveloped and will remain so until it is allowed to participate in the free trade zone.

Senor Silva Castro jumped to his feet, pounded the table, and shouted, "No, no. It's a lie."

Joseph L. Jones, vice president and general foreign manager of United Press International, said the primary reason for the Alliance for Progress not developing to fullest expectations was that Latin American private investors are not investing as they should.

Vicente Machado Valle, of El Dia in Tegucigalpa, Honduras, praised the Peace Corps for reaching the rural people, but he said for many the Alliance for Progress was only "the change of the tax system."

[From the New York Journal-American, Oct. 6, 1962]

ALLIANCE CHIEF EGGED

BOGOTÁ, COLOMBIA, October 6.—Teodoro Moscoso, Alliance for Progress coordinator, and his party were hit by eggs hurled by six youths yesterday at a housing project being built with Alliance funds.

Shouting anti-American slogans, the youths let fly with eggs and rocks when the party emerged from inspecting a house in a Bogotá suburb. One egg hit Mr. Moscoso on the back of the head.

Five of the youths fled, but residents caught the sixth and beat him before police arrived.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, to liberty-loving and independent Poles their Constitution of 1791 is almost as important as their political independence. They have always attached extraordinary significance to this historic document because they felt, and still feel, that by the implementation of its liberal, sweeping provisions they were to be freed from the shackles and obstructive intricacies of their old, unwieldy, and inefficient regime. With that worthy goal in mind their leaders framed, adopted, and promulgated that Constitution, which by its democratic and progressive provisions was considered a moderate and model charter for the Poles.

The Constitution drastically limited the powers of the King and made Poland a constitutional monarchy. Responsible cabinet form of government was established; the old system of class distinctions was eliminated. The upper legislative chamber lost some of its powers, and the second chamber was vested with genuine legislative authority. Economic barriers existing between the nobility and the bourgeoisie were practically obliterated, and the peasantry was taken under the protection of the law. In many ways the Constitution abolished the worst abuses from which Poland had been suffering for centuries. Its promulgation was hailed not only by the Poles, but it was also acclaimed by liberals in other countries.

Unfortunately, the Poles were not given the chance to test the efficacy of this Constitution. Soon after its promulgation the country was overrun by its inveterate enemies; it was partitioned, and Poland's independence was no more. But the spirit of the Constitution of 1791 lived in the hearts of the Polish people, and today they celebrate the 172d anniversary of the Constitution's adoption and promulgation. I am indeed glad to join them in the anniversary of this truly epochmaking event.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, for almost 200 years American and Polish patriots have experienced a common bond in their love of freedom.

The spirit of comradeship was first initiated through the contributions to American independence by the 18th century Polish patriot, Count Casimir Pulaski. It was strengthened when, on May 3, 1791, Poland adopted its national Constitution only 2 years after the ratification of the U.S. Constitution. That the same spirit animates both of these great documents of liberty is evidenced by the following statement from the Polish Constitution:

> All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

One hundred years ago, Mr. President, when our own Nation was engaged in a dreadful contest of survival for the Union, Polish patriots staged their greatest and bloodiest uprising against Russian tyranny. As in other uprisings against foreign domination—German or Russian—the gallant Polish struggle was finally overwhelmed by superior forces. But as in the other insurgent efforts also, the spirit of Polish liberty remained unquelled.

Therefore, my colleagues, this day of May 3 has significance not only for those of Polish origin, it is an anniversary which provides another monument for all men in their quest for freedom and liberty of the human spirit.

WILLIAM R. McANDREW WINS VFW AWARD

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, just a few weeks ago the Veterans of Foreign Wars held their annual dinner in Washington honoring Members of Congress who served in the Armed Forces. It was my privilege to serve in the Armed Forces in World War II and now to be an active member of the VFW. Like so many Members of the Congress, I was once again deeply impressed by the entire program. Certainly, it is a fact that the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States has become one of the most influential and important veterans organizations in our country, and for that reason, I was especially impressed by the award which the VFW presented to Mr. William R. McAndrew, executive vice president in charge of news for the National Broadcasting Co. At this time I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD the introduction and citation of Mr. McAndrew by VFW Commander in Chief Byron B. Gentry, and Mr. McAndrew's acceptance remarks.

There being no objection, the introduction and citation were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRODUCTION FOR WILLIAM R. MCANDREW, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, NBC NEWS

Many of you may remember that at this congressional dinner 1 year ago our organization paid tribute to Mr. Robert Kintner, president of the National Broadcasting Co. At that time Mr. Kintner informed us that his organization was working on a series of programs to be called "Profile of Communism." As in all organizations, the boss makes the announcements but it is left to others to carry out the assignments. Tonight we honor the man who carried out Mr. Kintner's assignment to produce an interdepartment study of communism. How well he performed his task can be attested to by the fact that after the second of the "Profile of Communism" programs, the National Broadcasting Co. was asked to close its Moscow bureau and leave Russia. In other words, they hit the Russians where it hurts—with the truth. Our honored guest was also responsible for the remarkable program, "The Tunnel," which told with film the dramatic story of the people of East Berlin escaping to the West.

Mr. McAndrew has played a role at all levels of the continuing revolution in communications—as a Washington correspondent, as editor, bureau chief, and for the past 10 years as operating head of NBC News, which is widely regarded as the leading broadcast news operation.

Under Mr. McAndrew's guidance, NBC News has undergone a continuing expansion of staff and facilities that started 5 years ago. Its roster of correspondents and cameramen has grown from 400 to 700 and new foreign bureaus have been opened in Hong Kong, Buenos Aires, Rio de Janeiro, New Delhi, Leopoldville and Ottawa.

During this same period, NBC News programing has been expanded until today it accounts for 25 percent of the entire NBC–TV network schedule and amounts to some 100 hours a month. In a single year, from 1960 to 1961, the number of hours of nighttime news programing increased by 22 percent.

In spite of a heavy administrative schedule, working on budgetary, personnel and programing matters, Mr. McAndrew keeps a close, hour-by-hour watch on news developments around the world. For major news events, such as a national convention, election or manned space launching, he frequently supervises the coverage from inside the control room itself.

As private citizens all of us should feel extremely grateful that we have a man such as William R. McAndrew heading up one of the world's largest news networks. The programing of the National Broadcasting Co. leave no doubt in the mind of anyone about which side of the fence they are standing on. These are people whom we are proud to call fellow Americans.

The citation reads as follows:

"In recognition of his outstanding accomplishments in the field of news and informational programs for the National Broadcasting Co. and as exemplified by such series as 'Profile of Communism' and the special program, 'The Tunnel.'"

ACCEPTANCE BY MR. MCANDREW

Thank you for your warm and courteous welcome. It recalls a story that is told of the presidential campaign of 1928. Al Smith was making a paid political broadcast one night in Boston and was apparently all too conscious of the cost of the air time. As he began his remarks he held up a hand and told the studio audience:

"Save your applause until the end of the speech. It doesn't cost anything then."

In accepting this award from the Veterans of Foreign Wars, I want to express my personal appreciation and that of all of the NBC news staff, including those who spent several agonizing months under the wet earth of Berlin to film "The Tunnel," and those who also, in a sense, went underground to research the subterranean maneuvers recorded in the four programs of "Profile of Communism." You may recall some of the repercussions touched off by these programs: the protests from Berlin that preceded the showing of "The Tunnel" and the closing of our bureau in Moscow which followed the programs on Stalin and Khrushchev.

You may have noted some of our other oversea skirmishes during the past year or so—skirmishes, incidentally, which have prompted some at NBC News to consider founding our own "veterans of foreign news wars."

Its membership would include, of course, Piers Anderton and Gary Stindt, who headed our coverage in the tunnel, as well as Russ Jones and Frank Bourgholtzer who were expelled from Moscow.

I would also propose the names of Grant Wolfkill, who was captured by the Communists in Laos and held prisoner for 15 months; James Robinson, who was refused renewal of credentials in Vietnam; John Rich, temporarily labeled "persona non grata" in France; Welles Hangen, threatened with expulsion from Pakistan, and Richard Valeriani, John Hlavacek, and Robert MacNeil, each of whom was imprisoned by Castro and finally expelled from Cuba.

These incidents have caused some of our people to suggest that we may be running out of friendly countries. What will happen, they ask, if our president, Bob Kintner, sets out on his annual tour of our foreign news bureaus and finds that he can cover them all in 3 days?

Others at NBC have expressed concern over David Brinkley's plans for a program to be titled "Our Man in Washington." Brinkley will cover, in his own special way, the political and social life of the Nation's Capital. However, I am not suggesting that in the wake of this program NBC News will be doing business from Silver Springs, Md.

My outlook is more optimistic. I suspect we will continue to have our problems with any who would manage the news, whether abroad or here at home. But I am convinced that it would take an extraordinary amount of attempted news managing to stop, or even slow down, the expanding coverage of broadcast news.

At NBC News, for example, we doubled our staff within a period of 5 years—from 400 full- and part-time news gatherers to a total of 800 in all parts of the world. In the same 5 years, we have nearly doubled the number of our permanently staffed foreign offices opening new bureaus at locations ranging from Ottawa to Buenos Aires to Leopoldville.

This expansion has permitted steady and substantial increase in our programing, an increase of more than 70 percent in 5 years. We now produce and broadcast more than one-fourth of all programs on the NBC television network. We recently discovered, with some surprise, that NBC news is now the largest supplier of network television programs, larger than any network program department, larger indeed than any of the great television production companies in Hollywood.

What brings us the greatest satisfaction, however, is the accumulating evidence that our news and informational programs are reaching more and more viewers. A recent study shows that each of 8 special nighttime programs presented by NBC news in the fourth quarter of last year attracted an audience averaging some 22 million viewers. "The Tunnel," which was 1 of these 8 programs, did even better than the average and drew an audience of more than 28 million.

One reason for these growing audiences, I believe, is the increasing skill of our writers, correspondents, producers, directors, and cameramen. They have learned, for example, that one way to look at medicine is through the eyes of an intern during a night's work in the Bellevue emergency ward, that one way to see Elizabethan England is to let the camera roam through the countryside as Shakespeare might have done, that a way to show the oppressiveness of communism is to follow a handful of students as they burrow their way into East Berlin in an attempt to save their friends and relatives.

We have learned not only to vary our techniques, but to vary our approach, our attitudes. It is interesting that two of our programs, almost diametrically opposed in their approach, recently won honors from the same group, the Thomas Alva Edison Awards. One was "David Brinkley's Journal," which is noted for casting a bright light on America's flaws and imperfections. The other was "U.S. No. 1: American Profile," a poetic and admiring look at American history along Route 1 from Maine to Florida.

Finally, we have learned that news cannot be conveniently separated from history, or neatly compartmented into pigeonholes labeled "Politics," "Foreign Affairs," "Economics," "Science," and so on. We believe that past, present, and future are one continuous stream, that yesterday's politics in California can affect the economy of southern France tomorrow. We hold therefore that our province as newsmen embraces anything of significance that happens anywhere at any time.

Thus we are now working on special programs for next season on such diverse subjects as the French Army and its influence on French political life, the training of a professional football player, private art collections, the life and culture of modern India, the history of one of the world's great rivers, a train journey through the Iron Curtain, the way of life in modern Australia, and an examination of the progress being made toward the discovery of life in outer space.

We believe in sum that a society which is served by an instrument as powerful as television, one which reached tens of millions of people with a single program, and which looks with an unblinking gaze into the Kremlin, or under the Berlin wall or even into certain committee rooms of the Congress—that this society stands an excellent chance of remaining free.

WHATEVER HAPPENED TO THE PEACEFUL ATOM?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, earlier this year David E. Lilienthal, speaking at Princeton University in the Stafford Little Lecture series, delivered an address which merits high priority consideration as we study and develop a national fuels and energy policy and as we make allocation of our financial and technical resources in implementing such policy.

In his lecture entitled "Whatever Happened to the Peaceful Atom?" Mr. Lilienthal traces the development of atomic energy policy from the early postwar period of optimism and illusion to the present period which has been tempered by reality. The burden of his theme is, in Mr. Lilienthal's words, to bring "the atom, both peaceful and military, back into perspective in the light of the facts not of 1945 or of 1950 or 1960, but of today."

There are, in my opinion, Mr. President, few persons in America today who speak with greater knowledge or a wider background in the entire spectrum of energy resources. As a former Director of the Tennessee Valley Authority from its beginning in 1933 to 1946, and as Chairman from 1941 to 1946, Mr. Lilienthal exercised high authority and assumed heavy responsibility for the development of both hydro- and coal-generated electrical power. Then, as first Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission from 1946 to 1950, David Lilienthal was one of the chief architects of our national policy in the field of atomic energy and the peaceful development of the atom. No one familiar with the background and philosophy of this statesman can question his competency in the energy field or his commitment to the peaceful utilization of the atom.

It seems to me, therefore, that it is of the utmost importance that the Congress and the executive branch give serious consideration to the appraisals of Mr. Lilienthal, as when he stated:

> Today no one expects or even predicts that some magic of technology will be found whereby electricity from the atom can be produced so cheaply and abundantly as to cause profound changes in our way of life. Somewhere along the line the goal has shifted. Now the objective is a quite different one: To try to produce atomic electricity that is or will be just as good as electricity from coal, oil, or falling water; or to use more formal language, "competitive," meaning competitive in cost.

Mr. Lilienthal pointed out, however, that in view of the hazards of accident, human error or sabotage, and the "furiously radioactive" character of waste materials from atomic powerplants, the label of "just as good" is a misleading one, even if and when atomic power can be generated at a cost competitive with that of coal generated electricity.

In measuring the present level of achievement against the early dreams of unlimited optimism, Mr. Lilienthal observes:

> Everyone now knows there is no magic in uranium as a source of energy. The glamour, the excitement of the boundless possibilities of power from the peaceful atom is gone. The sooner we face up to this the better, for living in a world of unreality is as bad for technology and politics and to the peaceful atom as it is in the field of nuclear weapons.

But, as the former Chairman of the AEC comments:

> In 1963 we still have an organization—the AEC—that in magnitude of expenditures and personnel is geared to the objective of 1946: A revolution to bring this magic into reality, bring on a new world.

Mr. Lilienthal then poses the question of what the action of Congress would have been in 1946, if we had known then what we now know. Accepting the valid and constructive, but not revolutionary, achievements of atomic research in medicine and chemistry, and acknowledging that the reality of atomic power development has fallen far short of the dream, would we now authorize such a radical departure as the Atomic Energy Commission and the outlay of some $15 billion? That is, would we at that time have authorized such a massive outlay of financial and technical resources largely on the grounds of ultimately developing a fuel source competitive in cost with that of coal, oil, or falling water? Mr. Lilienthal doubts that Congress would have so acted, and he offers persuasive reasons in support of his opinion.

Mr. President, I do not presume to speak with any particular authority on matters regarding the development of the atom. There are other Members of this body, and particularly the distinguished senior Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], and the distinguished junior Senators from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]; they, as Senate members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, speak with greater understanding and authority in this field than I. However, I can confirm, on my personal knowledge, the statement of Mr. Lilienthal that—

> Improved technology and economics in the mining of coal and its transportation, greater efficiency in the transformation of coal's heat into electricity, and in long distance power transmission, have made coal in many parts of the country—including the Ohio Valley—by all odds the least costly source of energy except for some of the better water powersites. The U.S. supply of coal, with the new methods of mining and transportation of coal, and of electricity, seems at the moment to be more than adequate for decades at least—even in the face of the steeply mounting energy needs of this country.

In light of these facts regarding the adequacy and efficiency of coal as a major source of energy, Mr. Lilienthal then questioned whether the national interest justifies the current level of expenditure of funds for atomic power development.

In view of the extensive burden placed on our resources of both scientific manpower and money by space research, defense needs, and the development of the atom, I share in considerable degree Mr. Lilienthal's reservations about the wisdom of continuing to foster an atomic policy developed in the period from 1946 to 1950.

This certainly is not to say that our development of the atom has been a failure. On the contrary, as Mr. Lilienthal so properly stated:

> Nothing has changed the majesty of the basic discovery or its theoretical potential. The trouble is, rather, with ourselves for allowing our determination that the atom should have a peaceful use as a source of energy to so grossly inflate our hopes. There are some who would say that what we need is a revised timetable of when these hopes may be realized. But in the meantime—and it may be many years—several other potential sources of energy and the improvement of existing sources may, as a consequence of the imperative of change, relegate atomic energy as a cost-competitive source of power to only specialized and limited applications.

Mr. President, in his Princeton University lecture, "Whatever Happened to the Peaceful Atom?" Mr. Lilienthal has drawn from a deep reservoir of experience in the field of energy and power development. He has presented a closely reasoned argument in his eloquent appeal to American policymakers to cease thinking of the atom as opening the door to some magical transformation of our world, and to bring our atomic energy policy back into the mainstream of American scientific and technological development.

When the lecture—No. 3 in the Stafford Little Lecture series—was first brought to my attention, I addressed a communication to the President of Princeton University, requesting that the institution waive its copyrights to the extent of allowing the publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the complete text of the Lilienthal lecture. I stated in that communication my belief that it would be in furtherance of the national interest to have this material before the Congress as we study and debate our national fuels and energy requirements, and as we inquire into the possibilities of the development of a national fuels and energy policy. It is satisfying to report—and I am grateful for the opportunity to report—that Princeton University officials have been most cooperative in this matter and have authorized the publication of Mr. Lilienthal's text in the RECORD.

Shortly after this authorization message reached me, I received the following telegram from Mr. Lilienthal:

> I am happy to note that the Princeton Press has notified you that my lecture on the peaceful atom is one that you may insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I was gratified to note that as a Senator you regard the subjects discussed by me in this lecture as ones that should be discussed in the national interest.
>
> Respectfully,
>
> DAVID E. LILIENTHAL.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the complete text of Mr. Lilienthal's lecture on the subject "Whatever Happened to the Peaceful Atom?" And, Mr. President, consistent with the authorization I received from the Princeton University Press, I request that the printed RECORD shall indicate that the text of this third of Mr. Lilienthal's lectures in the Stafford Little Lecture series is copyright 1963 by Princeton University Press.

There being no objection, the text was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Copyright, Princeton University Press, 1963]

WHATEVER HAPPENED TO THE PEACEFUL ATOM?

(Stafford Little Lectures 1963, No. III, Princeton University, by David E. Lilienthal)

In my opening discussion I said that the one great overriding imperative of mankind is change. I recalled from my own observation some of the specific ways in which, in the 20 years since the towering achievement of the first controlled release of the energy in the atom, the world of men and their ideas have undergone and continue to undergo swift and sweeping change.

The world of 1963, I said, is a world in motion, fluid, moving and responsive to the passions, needs, desires, evil and good, that lie in the heart of man. In contrast to this world of change, I asserted that our outlook and perspective on the atom had not changed in any substantial degree; that it was still dealt with as a thing apart from the whole fabric of human affairs. It is my theme in these lectures that such an outlook needs changing. I hope I can contribute to a new perspective in which the atom would be made an integral part of the mainstream of men's affairs.

Earlier I proposed that where the facts of the world of 1963 are in conflict with the way in which we think and deal with the atom, we should jettison and junk those outmoded ideas.

The burden of my theme then, is that we should begin the process of bringing the atom, both peaceful and military, back into perspective in the light of the facts not of 1945 or of 1950 or 1960, but of today. This theme applies with particular force to the peaceful atom, the subject of this third and concluding discussion.

A few days before Christmas of 1945 a young Senator from Connecticut, Brian McMahon, introduced a bill which some 8 months later was enacted into law and is known as the McMahon Act. The introductory words of this bill expressed a common conviction: that a revolutionary period based upon the peaceful use of atomic discoveries lay just ahead. I quote from the congressional declaration of policy of the McMahon Act:

> "The effect of the use of atomic energy for civilian purposes upon the social, economic, and political structures of today cannot now be determined. It is reasonable to anticipate, however, that tapping this new source of energy will cause profound changes in our present way of life."

The declaration then concludes: "Accordingly it is hereby declared to be the policy of the people of the United States that the development and utilization of atomic energy shall be directed toward improving the public welfare, increasing the standard of living, strengthening free competition among private enterprises so far as is practicable, and cementing world peace."

A year later almost to the day, in the midafternoon of December 31, 1946, I was in President Truman's office in the White House with a group of my associates. I sat at the President's elbow as he signed a document that transferred from the Manhattan project, as it was called, the complex of wartime atomic energy facilities of factories, laboratories, and weapons to the five-man Atomic Energy Commission of civilians. At midnight on that same day, the forceful and dedicated Army officer, who had carried the responsibility for producing the first atomic bomb, issued a farewell message. This message included these words: "Five years ago the idea of atomic power was only a dream. You of the Army's Manhattan project have made that dream a reality." General Groves' statement then concluded: "With regard to peaceful applications, you have raised the curtain on vistas of a new world."

These declarations of the McMahon Act and of General Groves' farewell message reflected quite accurately the expectations widely held at the time they were made in 1945 and 1946. American domestic policy, and America's first efforts toward atomic disarmament, in which I participated, were erected on the foundation of just such expectations.

I fully shared these views, at that time, else I could not have with such conviction and intensity of effort joined in the work of trying to bring these expectations of a "new world" to reality, by the tapping of this new source of energy for civilian uses. More than once, as AEC chairman, in addressing an audience of fellow laymen, I began my remarks somewhat in this fashion: "This object that I hold in my hand," I used to say, holding up a short black cylinder, "is purified uranium metal. The energy in this handful of metal, when it has been converted through a controlled chain reaction in an atomic pile, is the equivalent," I used to say, "of umpteen train loads of coal." The actual number I forget, and it isn't important. This was a way of trying to bring home to my fellow citizens the high stakes in finding scientific, technical, and economic means of realizing the great discoveries that had produced the atomic bomb. That was in the period of the late forties.

More than 15 years and hundreds of millions of dollars later, in 1963, what is the state of affairs?

Today no one expects or even predicts that some magic of technology will be found whereby electricity from the atom can be produced so cheaply and abundantly as to "cause profound changes in our present way of life." Somewhere along the line the goal has shifted. Now the objective is a quite different one: to try to produce atomic electricity that is or will be just as good as electricity from coal, oil, or falling water; or to use more formal language, "competitive," meaning competitive in cost.

I have used the phrase "just as good." But the potential hazards to life and health, of hundreds of thousands of people in densely populated areas adjacent to powerplants (such as that projected in the New York City's Borough of Queens) make it inaccurate to label atomic powerplants as "just as good" as conventional powerplants, even where the cost is virtually the same. In the event of accidents, human error, or sabotage, such atomic plants certainly present greater hazards than conventional powerplants.

The insurance industry of the United States refused to write insurance against so widespread a potential peril to human life and property damage that an atomic powerplant presents. So the Federal Government, by special statute, now underwrites this hazard. No such insurance problem exists as to nonatomic powerplants, of course.

Moreover, the waste materials from atomic powerplants—the atomic ashes, so to speak—are furiously radioactive. After all these years no entirely satisfactory technical way has been found to treat them so they will be safe, or even for their safe transportation from powerplants to underground storage. The underground storage of these deadly and massive wastes continue to constitute a potential source of danger to the population, and a source of considerable expense, as compared to the ashes of a conventional thermal electricity plant.

So "just as good" is far from the whole story. But except for these greater perils of radioactivity, hard to measure precisely, atomic electricity may well prove in time to be "competitive," or nearly so, as to cost, with energy from other sources.

The preamble to the McMahon Act explicitly set the expectations and premises of 1946: we were on the threshold of a new source of energy believed to be revolutionary in its profound consequences. It is interesting to recall that the Russians expressed much the same euphoric expectations about atomic energy at that time.

On this explicit premise radical and unprecedented measures were adopted by the Congress and the people. It was because of these expectations that for the first time in our history a new technical development became a monopoly of Government, its future entrusted not to normal competitive forces but to a single Government agency—the Atomic Energy Commission—armed with billions of dollars and the broadest of powers. This was for America a radical step, and was recognized as such. Nothing of this nature had ever been resorted to in order to further other technical discoveries, discoveries or inventions that did in fact revolutionize our way of life: the dynamo, the electric light, the automotive engine, the aeroplane, the radio tube.

Why did we make this radical departure from our time-tested method of developing a new technology? Certainly not just to produce something just as good as we had before. No, it was because of a conviction that there was an overriding national interest in development of a new source of energy expected to have a profound effect on our way of life. This was the national interest that was thought to be at stake, that justified these extraordinary measures. It was this national interest that justified a prodigious scale of effort, unheard of expenditures of public money, fantastic absorption of a large portion of the scientific, and technical and industrial resources of the Nation.

The scale of effort today, in 1963, continues unabated. The AEC is actually pressing for a new program, to cost $2 billion over a decade. Not just improvements in existing reactors, but a whole new line of technology, the so-called breeder reactor, is now being boomed, with predictions ranging from nebulous to conservative. But the goal, the expectations that justified the earlier scale of effort, and our departure from our traditional ways of furthering technology has proved long since unattainable.

Does what made sense in 1946 still make sense in 1963? This is what I ask that we consider.

Suppose in 1946, when the McMahon Act was passed, Congress had been told what we now know but did not know then: that if you will vest great powers in a special and unique Government agency, the Atomic Energy Commission, if you build great research and development laboratories all over the country, explore for, find and buy uranium here and abroad, subsidize the costs of uranium fuel, bear large development costs and part of capital costs for manufacturers of electric equipment and utilities—if you do these things at the cost of billions of dollars for 20 or 30 years the country will have a new source of civilian electricity that is just as good and costs no more than what would be produced without the AEC, without these facilities and expenditures? What would Congress have said? My guess is that the Congress and the people would have gone any lengths for military objectives of the atom, such as weapons and the submarine, but would have said "nothing doing" on such a prospectus for peaceful civilian electricity. Of course, no one could confidently predict in 1946 that the revolutionary expectations would turn out not to be realizable. The effort was certainly one that well deserved a hard try. The quality of men and work has been superb. But it is relevant to ask how much longer is the Government justified in pursuing this will-o'-the-wisp of power so cheap that it will profoundly change our way of life?

There was and is a great national interest in a new source of energy that would be revolutionary. There is no such overriding national interest in the same kind of electricity even at the same cost, though with far greater risk to the population, since private and public power utilities, manufacturers and fuel producers are perfectly capable of meeting that need in the foreseeable future whether by conventional or atomic plants.

Everyone now knows there is no magic in uranium as a source of energy. The glamour, the excitement of the boundless possibilities of power from the peaceful atom is gone. The sooner we face up to this the better, for living in a world of unreality is as bad for technology and politics as to the peaceful atom as it is in the field of nuclear weapons, a subject discussed earlier in these lectures.

But we have failed as a nation to recognize and give effect to this realization that the profound changes, arising out of a revolution in atomic energy supply, just aren't in the cards. And yet in 1963 we still have an organization—the AEC—that in magnitude of expenditures and personnel is geared to the objective of 1946: a revolution to bring this magic into reality, to bring on a new world.

The facts of 1963, in my opinion, show that the time has come for drastic and perhaps painful reevaluation of the peaceful atom in two respects:

First, the concept of what the peaceful atom means to us today, and the realistic prospects in the immediate future.

Second, a reevaluation of the functions of the Atomic Energy Commission itself, the establishment we have built up to bring to reality the hopes and expectations we had a right to hold 15 years ago.

Where do we stand today?

Immediately President Truman had signed the Executive order transferring the wartime properties of the Manhattan District to the civilian Atomic Energy Commission, we proceeded to fortify and expand an already extensive atomic establishment. A good deal of this expansion and additional investment, indeed most of it, was attributable to reresearch and production plants in order that atomic bombs could be improved in design and their production speeded up.

But the nonmilitary Atomic Energy Commission program claimed a very great deal of attention and investment of many facilities and of human talents. The universities of the southeast were brought together in a great expansion of the Oak Ridge Institute, and of the nonmilitary facilities at Oak Ridge. A similar program bringing in universities but emphasizing national laboratories has been carried out at the Argonne National Laboratory near Chicago, the Brookhaven National Laboratory on Long Island, the laboratory at the University of Iowa at Ames, the scientific complex in New Mexico, the laboratory and facilities at Berkeley. One could continue this tabulation even further.

Never has there been, anywhere in the world, so broad and generously financed an attack on the technical and economic problems of bringing a new scientific discovery into the realm of reality and of widespread use. This prodigious effort was predicated on the belief and hope that this great new source of energy for mankind could produce results as dramatically and decisively beneficial to man as the bomb was dramatically destructive.

This vast establishment of laboratories and institutes, of scholarships, or huge atom-smashers—accelerators—and of nuclear power reactors—all these today we have. This program continues and, expands, the total sums spent being very great.

But there are differences. The difference is in goals and objectives I have mentioned. But there is also, significantly, a difference in mood. The enthusiasm, the sense of being in an heroic period, the sense of dealing with a benign force of revolutionary consequence, much of this has eroded. In contrast now we are told of possible savings of a mill or two a kilowatt-hour, in another 5 or 10 years, or of conserving our fuel resources in another fifty or a hundred years. Even those who laid their technical reputations on the line, and who made enthusiastic predictions of a few years ago are becoming disenchanted.

A newspaper story of May 18, 1962, sums up, in lay terms, the spirit of today. A great naval officer, noted for his achievements and self-confidence, was a witness before a congressional committee. Admiral Rickover "advised Congress to make an initial investment in a big 500,000 kilowatt nuclear powerplant—but not with the idea that it would produce economically competitive power." The witness' statement on the proposed plant's capability, the story commented, "was in contrast to glowing predictions given to the committee in the past about proposed powerplants.

In the 1940's it was reasonable to join in General Groves' and Senator McMahon's view of the possibility of a "new world" that peaceful applications of atomic energy might bring. Responsible men spoke of atomic power so cheap it wouldn't pay to meter it. Most of us were less exuberant by far. Yet even those with a less euphoric outlook had ample grounds to believe that the expectations of the 1940's and the early 1950's should be given a hard try, and that such an effort had a good chance of paying.

Even in those early days the AEC's general advisory committee, for example—a group of giants—uttered words of caution about this new world. Others, such as Philip Sporn, reminded the country and the scientific community that power from the atom is like any other power: that the atom is just another kind of fuel, not a magic short-cut to almost costless electricity. But for the most part these voices were not heeded.

A great satirist, Frank Sullivan, had himself a very good time kidding the cliches of exuberance of those days. Some of you will remember the testimony, in question and answer form, of Frank Sullivan's creation, the cliche expert, Mr. Arbuthnot. Here are a few excerpts from Mr. Sullivan's piece entitled "The Cliche Expert Testifies on the Atom," written in 1948.

From the witness stand Mr. Arbuthnot, the cliche expert, told his examiner that he'd better learn to use the words "harness" and "unleash" if he expected to talk about the atom. "They are two words frequently used. With pea, of course."

Question: "Why pea?"

Answer: "Our everything is in terms of the pea. You know how much U^{235} it would take to drive a car to the moon and back?"

Question: "No, sir. How much?"

Answer: "A lump the size of a pea."

Question: "You wouldn't settle for a lump the size of a radish or a bean?"

Answer: "Sorry. The pea is the accepted vegetable in these explanations."

Reading some current atomic power predictions, the colloquy with the cliche expert—if Mr. Sullivan will look the other way—might continue in this way:

Question: "After 17 years, where are we in 1963, Mr. Arbuthnot?"

Answer: "Threshold. That is the correct cliche today. We are on the threshold of cheap atomic power. You'll have to learn that word if you expect to be an atomic expert, my friend."

Question: "But didn't you, in 1954, testify that we were then on the 'threshold'. And then again in 1960, didn't you say the same thing?"

Answer: "Yes, of, course I did. Threshold it was and threshold is still the correct cliche."

Question: "And how high is that threshold in 1963?"

Answer: "High? Oh, the same height as in 1954. Hundreds of millions of dollars a year high. Breeder."

Question: "Breeder, Mr. Arbuthnot? This is a mixed audience and I'll ask you to watch your language."

Answer: "Take it easy. Breeder, that's the newest atomic cliche. When you get asked hard questions about the old-fashioned atomic powerplant, just say 'breeder' and you're off the hook, because a breeder atomic plant has never yet been built so who can dispute the lovely forecasts? You'll learn this atomic cliche thing yet, my friend."

The ease with which Mr. Sullivan made fun of the cliches of 1948 may have indicated that perhaps there was more than a little puffing in the buildup of atomic energy. Or perhaps it simply shows that even as to great scientific discoveries a little kidding now and then is healthy. It might be useful—and fun—if Mr. Sullivan turned his considerable talents for satire loose on some of the purple cliches about the space age, current successor to the atomic new world.

To recapitulate: what then is the record? In the effort to produce economic atomic power the U.S. Government in the past 20 years has invested great sums in plants, laboratories, reactors and in incentives. Note that incentives cost as much as subsidies but avoids that naughty word.

For the country as a whole, except where the costs of producing electricity from other sources of heat are high, atomic power is not cheaper but costlier than conventional power.

The main reasons for this, to oversimplify, appear to be three. First, the amount of investment in plant to produce atomic power turned out to be far greater than could have been anticipated. Second, problems of safety to the population are by no means solved, and require expense of considerable magnitude. But the third reason is probably as important as these two. To most everyone's surprise the cost of electricity from coal has been drastically reduced in recent years, and is continuing to be further reduced as the reserves of coal in locations that new technology makes economic, are ample for a considerable period.

The story of the second coming of coal as a source of energy in the past 10 years is a good illustration of how difficult it is to predict a specific change on a long-range basis.

The most recent report of the AEC on atomic power predicts the state of our coal and oil reserves in a century or less and also predicts the state of affairs two centuries hence. This is worth no more, I fear, than a prediction made in 1763 before the automobile, about what the highway system of America would be like in 1863 and 1963.

Coal is not glamorous, like the atom or waterpower. It is a very humble source of electricity. The coal industry for two generations was called a sick industry. For a long time technical advances in mining and transporting coal at lower cost and of producing electricity from the heat of burning coal advanced hardly at all in an economic sense. In the mysterious way by which changes take place at the most unexpected places, suddenly coal in the last decade has made enormous strides.

I recall the judgment on an atomic energy international ownership proposal, of the distinguished British physicist, Dr. P. M. S. Blackett. Writing in 1948 he said, "America's fuel reserves are only likely to be adequate in the future at steeply rising costs." This proved to be off the beam by 180 degrees. Actually the proven reserves have increased and electric generating costs have declined "steeply."

This is not the place to describe that progress toward lower and lower costs of coal-generated electricity. It is enough to say that improved technology and economics in the mining of coal and its transportation, greater efficiency in the transformation of coal's heat into electricity, and in long-distance power transmission have made coal in many parts of the country—including the Ohio Valley—by all odds the least costly source of energy except for some of the better waterpower sites. The U.S. supply of coal, with the new methods of mining and transportation of coal and of electricity seems at the moment to be more than adequate for decades at least, even in the face of the steeply mounting energy needs of this country.

But is the issue of 1963 whether uranium as a fuel is, or will be, less or more costly than coal by a mill or two per unit of electricity? This appears to be the current justification for expenditure of Government funds for atomic development. But if that is all that is presently at stake, I doubt whether the national interest justifies these expenditures. Certainly, the justification is a far cry from the initial prospectus for this extensive program.

A word about other fuels: gas and oil.

Natural gas prices have been rising, and its future as a boiler fuel is limited because of its higher value for other uses. Fuel oil is a byproduct of the oil industry's production of higher value products and, therefore, offers only limited competition to coal as a fuel for the rapidly expanding production of electric power, except in especially favorable locations.

But it was not only a major economic source of heat and power that those vast expenditures were intended to secure. It was believed that atomic discoveries would produce revolutionary advances not only in basic science but in their application in medicine and in the growing of food and fiber, a revolutionary contribution to the conquest of poverty and disease on a worldwide scale.

Turning now briefly to these other areas of the peaceful atom. The radioactive isotope has indeed been a great boon as a tool of science. Those who in the forties sensed that this might well be the greatest benign use of atomic energy have thus far been proven right. The radioactive isotope has had important, though still limited, applications, in medicine and in a few other areas, such as in chemical engineering. As to industrial applications though a new and realistic note of prudence is emerging. Dow Chemical Co., for example, recently announced its success in using a radioactive substance, cobalt 60, as a catalyst to produce small quantities of the organic compound, ethyl bromide. The headline was of the style of the old exuberant era: "The atom runs a chemical plant." But in the fine print, the company's chemist said, "It's just another type of catalyst, another tool to consider. Ultraviolet light and chemical agents may still be the best, most economical way to produce many chemicals." The atom in chemistry is now seen to be a part of the mainstream of chemistry, not a kind of magic.

There continues to be a very high level of intellectual excitement and progress in physics, following the path cut a generation ago by such giants as the late Niels Bohr and his younger creative counterparts, some of them in the very community where I am speaking to you tonight. The money and brains devoted to nuclear science apart from research and development for atomic power, have, I think, been well spent. I am, however, not the only one by any means who questions whether as large a part of our total resources of brains and money as is devoted to this area of science—the millions on accelerators for example—is justified compared with the opportunities in other fields such as biochemistry.

The problems of securing safe and competitively economic power from the atom have proved to be very considerable. Other sources of power are ample and are diminishing in cost.

If we accept these propositions, we will have a new perspective that can save vast sums of Government funds; a great deal of scientific and technical talent could be more beneficially used in other areas. For this I believe we can be sure: at the time and place the economics of power show need for atomic energy when compared with the costs and safety of power from other sources of energy the manufacturers of equipment and the utility industry, private and public, will supply that need without Government prodding.

Where there is no present or prospective economic need for a product or service, does it make sense for the Government of the United States to continue to spend as much as it does on civilian atomic energy? I strongly doubt this. Military applications, including the nuclear submarine powerplant, stand in a different category, of course.

Does it make sense for some of America's ablest technical men in the AEC, its contractors, and in industry to confront frustration after frustration for no presently foreseeable overriding public purpose, as things now stand? The question deserves an objective analysis, not served by another round of long-range predictions of what we shall need in 2063.

We can well be proud—I certainly am—of our great atomic laboratories in the establishment of several of which I had some direct responsibility. But should we assume they always expand, that they will never be cut back in favor of other kinds of research? A kind of Parkinson's law of research has developed: that research expands as fast as money for that work is made available. Fifteen billions of dollars of Federal funds for research could become 30 billions if we don't take a hard look at Parkinson's law of research soon.

In our constantly expanding research and development efforts should we not stop to question the effect on the scale of those efforts of the rise of new scientific areas of at least equal, perhaps greater, promise than that of the peaceful atom?

Another question: the Atomic Energy Commission continues to stockpile uranium. By 1966, we are told, there will be a surplus of uranium over needs for weapons and reactors of a value of a billion dollars. Do the prospects for atomic reactors in the coming decade justify such a surplus reserve? If not, can we afford to build a kind of atomic political pork barrel, or a uranium congressional bloc like the silver bloc?

The reasons we continue to do these things in the face of the changed prospects that atomic power will have a profound effect on American life are various.

Some are straight political ones. Some are the natural and justifiable pride of men whose technical careers have been given over to this goal and who have understandable difficulty being wholly objective about the results.

But deeper still, I think, are the remnants of a noble resolve that we must prove that the atom has a present peaceful nonweapons use of very great importance.

As first chairman of AEC and before that as one of those who helped draft a State Department proposal for international control of the atom I had a share in formulating and popularizing that hope of unlimited peaceful potentials. But in the intervening 17 years the hopes are considerably dimmed. The rhetoric and the emotion, however, linger on; the facts should be faced, for they will prevail.

Is the peaceful atom then a goldbrick, a fiasco, a flop? Not at all. Nothing has changed the majesty of the basic discovery of its theoretical potential. The trouble is rather with ourselves for allowing our determination that the atom should have a peaceful use as a source of energy to so grossly inflate our hopes. There are some who would say that what we need is a revised timetable of when these hopes may be realized. But in the meantime—and it may be many years—several other potential sources of energy and the improvement of existing sources may, as a consequence of the imperative of change, relegate atomic energy as a cost-competitive source of power to only specialized and limited applications.

Why were our hopes inflated?

The basic cause, I think, was a conviction, and one that I shared fully, and tried to inculcate in others, that somehow or other the discovery that had produced so terrible a weapon simply had to have an important peaceful use. Such a sentiment is far from ignoble. We are a peace-loving people. Everyone, our leaders and laymen and scientists and military men, wanted to establish that there is a beneficial use of this great discovery. We were grimly determined to prove that this discovery was not just a weapon. This led perhaps to wishful thinking, a wishful elevation of the "sunny side" of the atom. So we did not see atomic energy as just another form of heat, another fuel. We gave it a unique status. We took it out of the stream of life, made for it a place apart.

Now our emotional attitude has swung to the other extreme. We are disenchanted with the peaceful atom as if it were somehow human and had deliberately failed us.

The strong attraction of the peaceful atom as an offset to the terrors of the atom's destructiveness as a weapon have led to some strange results. A few words about them may illuminate the problem we face in getting the peaceful atom into perspective, of returning it to its place as one part of our scientific and technical development. And it is to seek a new perspective that is the theme of these discussions.

One or two illustrations will do for our purpose. Years ago the Russians announced that, unlike the bloodthirsty Americans who only thought of the atom in terms of destruction, they, the Russians, were developing this explosive for peaceful purposes, such as great excavation for ports and the like. Most knowledgeable people at that time thought this was a characteristic piece of Soviet cold war propaganda, and obvious nonsense. Yet the pressure on us to prove that atomic weapons were not the only product of these great scientific efforts was such that our own atomic energy program has gone in for this kind of thing: projects for blowing out harbors, making explosions underground to produce steam and so on. Without judging the details of these undertakings, the important thing is that it shows how far the desire of scientists and administrators will carry them when we try to establish a nonmilitary use when no substantial one of current importance has been proven.

For example, dramatic pictures of a great hole blasted out in the desert by a peaceful atomic explosion, in July 1962, were released to the press by AEC, for the first time, in November. The release was at a time when the AEC's budget for this kind of spectacular was before the Budget Bureau. Or to take another example: as a buildup for this peaceful use of the atom the amount of earth moved by this explosion in the desert was compared with the earth moved in digging a tunnel under New York's East River, where an atomic explosion would hardly be welcomed. This is just another of the many instances of the way in which public relations techniques—the not-so-hidden persuader—have been used to promote the appropriation of funds for the atom.

Another consequence of this same kind of effort to glamorize the atom is a foreign aid program within the Atomic Energy Commission, part of President Eisenhower's program in 1954 called atoms for peace. An elaborate ritual for providing atomic research and reactor equipment and technology to such countries as Thailand and Guatemala and other similar underdeveloped countries became an expensive showpiece of the AEC program. Much of this was as meaningless and wasteful an operation as could be imagined; for most of these countries had hardly a cadre of scientists, or the necessary facilities to put this exchange of atomic knowledge to any significant use. Even as a propaganda move it was self-defeating and naive. A great many of these countries need and could use doctors and medicine, storage batteries, plows and fertilizers and seed—and good elementary scientific instruction. Only the desire to prove somehow that atoms were for peace could justify the absurdity of a separate program, not in the foreign aid part of the State Department, but in the AEC.

Let me cite another consequence of the "come hither" of the peaceful atom, so that it overshadows other equally promising areas of science. From the very beginning of the AEC, it has always been easier to get Congress to appropriate funds for science and research if somehow the atom can be tacked on to the request. This is not to deprecate the importance of the huge accelerators running into the hundreds of millions of dollars that have been provided for, or the elaborate and even luxurious laboratories that have grown up at Oak Ridge, the Argonne, Brookhaven, and Berkeley. These vast and extensive scientific establishments at public expense are amply justified, even though the results for science would seem rather disappointing when compared with the possibilities and needs of alternative ways of furthering basic science. But there are other claimants for research funds, such as in medical research, particularly in the field of biology.

I submit that it will not be possible for Congress to allocate appropriately the total resources of the country to be expended on scientific research and development so long as the atom is thought of and dealt with not as one segment of scientific effort to be balanced against other segments, but as a thing apart. Until the atom is brought back fully into the mainstream of the scientific effort of the country, as an element of that mainstream, Congress will continue to be vulnerable to special pleading for funds for atomic research with little opportunity realistically to weigh that field against the needs and opportunities of other parts of science. Science is a single fabric. To separate out the atom may have seemed justified in 1946 or even 1956. One must seriously question whether this is any longer justified in the light of 1963.

Of all our national resources, minds are the most important. Two-thirds of the trained minds available for exploring our scientific and technical frontiers are absorbed by the atomic energy, space and defense activities of our country. Let me underline that: two-thirds.

As a consequence all the rest of America's needs are, relatively, impoverished, neglected and starved.

For the first time the country is beginning to realize that you cannot have a satisfactory economic growth rate we hear so much about but of which we see little, if this two-thirds allocation of our trained brains goes on much longer. President Kennedy's Economic Report to Congress of December 21, 1962, has this comment to make: "We have," he said of this two-thirds absorption of trained minds, "paid a price by sharply limiting the scarce scientific and engineering resources available to the civilian sectors of the American economy."

The civilian sectors is a colorless economist's term for what it is that keeps America going. Cut off the research and technical blood supply to the civilian sectors and the space, defense, and atomic energy programs will have no one left to pay their bills. Cutting back on this drain on scarce brains isn't proposed in the President's economic report. I suggest Congress consider the atomic energy program as one good place to begin to cut back sharply, to make more brains available to some of the presently starved civilian areas of science and technology.

Three propositions then need to be weighed, debated, and conclusions reached if we are to bring up to date our basic premise about the peaceful atom, vintage 1963.

I suggest the 1963 premises should be these:

1. Energy from the atom is not now needed for civilian purposes.

2. At the time and place where it is needed it will be forthcoming without governmental prodding. If there is a real need, it will be met by the utility and manufacturing industries, as it has been with the automobile, the diesel engine, the telephone, and so on, in response to proved economic need.

3. There is now no urgent fuels or power crisis and no prospect of one in the foreseeable future; when such a shortage looms, it will be taken care of by the atom if that is then the best alternative.

In short, then, we should stop trying to force feed atomic energy. Throw away the present discredited timetable. Don't abandon the hope, of course, but deal with it realistically.

The same approach should apply to the atom in basic science, in medicine, and agriculture, and industry; weigh these claims for funds for research and development efforts along with others, not give the atom a place apart.

If we are going to readjust our ideas about the emphasis we ought to place on the peaceful atom then perhaps some revision is in order as to the agency that has responsibility for it. This is said not because the AEC has not done a good job, but the contours of its job should conform to our 1963 picture of the atom, not that of 1946 when it was established.

Why did Congress, in 1946, with the country's general approval set up a wholly separate agency for the atom? This made good sense in 1946 for three chief reasons:

1. At that time, we alone had the bomb. We had committed ourselves to international control. We were sincerely attempting to prove to the world that our intentions were peaceful. Therefore, custody and control and development of this terrible new force were properly placed in the hands of a civilian agency—not the military.

2. Secrecy. Collecting all of the functions relating to the atom in a single huge agency seemed to be the best safeguard possible against the loss of the scientific and technical secrets we and the British together had in our possession.

3. Third, atomic energy was generally expected to transform the face of industrial society within a short space of time, and therefore a special new agency was clearly needed to prepare and plan for such a dynamic change.

These reasons were certainly valid in 1946 and 1947. But what about today? Let's look at them in the light of the facts of 1963.

1. First, the emphasis on a civilian agency.

The world is now and has been for some years in an atomic arms race. The hope of international control is dim. Not only does Russia have the bomb, but France will soon, and other nations as well in due course. The military facts of 1963 now have forced us to place large quantities of nuclear arms directly in the hands of our military—in the skies, in missiles, beneath the earth's surface, under the seas.

We still have civilian control in the sense that the President, as always, is responsible, but the role of the AEC as a special civilian custodian and watchdog is, of necessity, a fiction.

The AEC functions chiefly as a designer, developer, maker and tester of atomic weaponry. These are grave technical responsibilities, and have been carried with distinction by able men. But as the reason for a sharp separation between civilian and military roles has faded, so the distinctive role of the AEC has changed. The AEC as weaponeer has in fact become perforce very much a part of the Military Establishment of the Nation, serving the needs and goals of that Military Establishment as defined by the military. The spectrum of weapons and the range of war plans is now very broad indeed, from intercontinental missiles to conventional tools of the infantry or of guerrilla warfare. With so broad a context the AEC, expert in nuclear weaponry alone, can hardly provide an indispensable independent civilian judgment to the Chiefs of Staff. Realistically, isn't the AEC essentially not too different from any major technical contractor to the Defense Department in the area of missiles, say, or other new weapons?

2. As for the second reason, secrecy, the reasons for secrecy diminished in 1949, when Russia tested its first bomb. Atomic secrecy still has some value to us, but since 1949 it has become progressively less crucial. First, because we realized gradually that secrecy in basic science is a myth. Second, because the variety of secrets (that is, of temporary technological advantages) has multiplied—in rocketry, in submarines, etc.—and is very far from being preponderant in the atomic field, as once had been the case. The function of the AEC as a gigantic strongbox for all the major U.S. weapon secrets—the picture in 1946—just does not jibe with the facts of 1963.

3. The new world of atomic plenty, as reviewed earlier does not exist. Certainly the peaceful atom occupies a subordinate role in the development of the United States today and will continue thus for years to come.

In sum, the three chief reasons for the establishment of the AEC in 1946 are no longer wholly valid in the world of 1963. This is not to say that the AEC has failed. It certainly has not. But we ought to take a fresh look at the AEC and be sure that it is geared to the realities of today, and not to the exploded premises of 1946.

The reality is that the atom has not justified the separate and unique status which Congress understandedly assigned it in 1946. It has not been the ultimate weapon as once was said, not the single necessary weapon. It has not revolutionized industrial society. It has achieved good, heartwarming results, but no revolutionary advance in medicine. The peaceful atom has not ushered in a new world but has rather become a part, a minor part, of the old one. And yet the official sponsor and trustee of the atom in this country, the Atomic Energy Commission, has hardly changed at all.

A revision of the AEC so that its functions conform to the facts of 1963 would seem to be in order. To recommend the details of how such a reemphasis ought to be worked out in terms of transfer of functions and even loppings-off are not a responsibility of mine or any other private citizen. Whether the AEC has one administrator or its present five commissioners, or whether such-and-such a division ought to be reduced from 50 desks to 1 or 2 * * * these matters are of interest to me chiefly as a taxpayer.

What does concern me is that steps are taken to get the atom fully back into the stream of American life, and in a role of proper proportions. I want my government to continue to encourage, through every means, the broad growth of scientific research and development—and that means all of science not as in the past singling out the atom for preferential treatment. I do not want atomic science, because of the euphoria of the past, or present-day lobbying power, to secure more than its justifiable share of our research resources of money and brains. If the most efficient way of insuring a balanced scientific development means transferring from the AEC all of its grants or scholarships, and turning these over, say, to the National Science Foundation, then I would be heartily in favor of such a move. Similarly, I favor continuing technical and financial aid to underdeveloped countries and if in certain instances such aid would be wisely supplemented by an atomic power installation, well and good. But the idea of a separate atomic point 4 program, carried on almost as if the larger and more comprehensive scheme of foreign aid did not exist, makes no sense to me whatsoever.

This artificial apartness of the atom in areas where this is not justified has been and is not only wasteful but harmful. Let me cite but one example of many.

A few years ago almost by accident the public discovered that containers of low-level radioactive waste products were being dumped into the coastal waters of Massachusetts. In that area fishing is an important industry and a source of food for the whole Northeast. In the summer the beaches are used by millions of people for recreation. This dumping was done with the permission of the AEC, but apparently the marine biologists and the State and Federal agencies with responsibility for health did not supervise the dumping. The AEC suffered in prestige by this unfortunate assumption that because radiation was its field, they were also experts on public health. A more serious consequence: by this sense of atomic apartness the State and Federal public health services were deprived of the opportunity to become fully knowledgeable of the radiation hazards—or absence of hazards—in such wastes and how to protect against them. Today more and more the functions of AEC that involve existing technical agencies are being slowly transferred to those agencies. This is a move in the direction I urge: putting the atom into the mainstream of men's affairs, not artificially keeping it separate and apart.

What I have been trying to do in this discussion is:

To take a look at the peaceful atom and also at the executive establishment concerned with the atom, in the light of the facts of 1963. This has been an effort to see the peaceful atom not as it once was viewed, but as it really is today. On the basis of that examination I have suggested some changes are due, perhaps overdue. What I have said of the peaceful atom is based on the theme of these lectures; namely, that the atom is not something magic and separate and apart, but is an integral part of the whole fabric of life of which change is the basic imperative.

FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Honorable Howell Appling, Jr., secretary of state of the State of Oregon, has called to the attention of my colleague, Senator NEUBERGER, and myself the enrolled senate joint memorial 4 which was adopted recently by the 52d Legislative Assembly of Oregon.

I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of my colleague and myself, that this memorial, dealing with the importance of obtaining adequate funds for the water pollution control program at Oregon State University, be set forth at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the joint memorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 4

To His Excellency, John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, and to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress Assembled:

We, your memorialists, the 52d Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, is legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas under the 1961 amendments to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, Oregon State University at Corvallis has been selected as the site for the Pacific Northwest regional laboratory for the conduct of research, investigation, experiments, field demonstrations, and studies and training relating to the prevention and control of water pollution; and

Whereas the site has been etsablished on the campus and funds have been appropriated for the construction of this facility; and

Whereas there is need for programing and establishing research at an early date prior to the completion of the actual laboratory building scheduled for early 1965, staff must be recruited and research in its initial phases must be undertaken in order that the laboratory can be used to its utmost effectiveness as soon as it is available: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:

1. The Congress of the United States is memorialized to provide support for initiating and carrying out research relating to water pollution problems by introducing in

the fiscal year 1964 budget necessary funds for hiring staff and initiating research for the water pollution control program at Oregon State University.

2. The secretary of state shall send a copy of this memorial to the President of the United States, to each Member of the Oregon congressional delegation, and to each Member of the Washington, Idaho, and Montana delegations.

Adopted by senate March 5, 1963.

DALE A. HENDERSON,
Secretary of Senate.
BEN MUSA,
President of Senate.

Adopted by house April 20, 1963.

CLARENCE BARTON,
Speaker of House.

CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Nation and the world have been witness in recent days to a spectacle of racial bigotry in the United States that would disgrace a Union of South Africa or a Portuguese Angola.

It is no longer possible for decent citizens to sit in silence, whether they are public officials or not, and tolerate by that silence the massive and oppressive denial of constitutional rights that is occurring in several areas of the United States.

The conflict between peaceful Negro demonstrators and police in the cities of America brings to mind nothing so much as the assaults of the Nazi Party storm troopers against the Jews, and the unleashing of Communist soldiers against peaceful demonstrators in Eastern Europe.

Unless American citizens are willing to stand up and demand an end to these scenes of police brutality and disregard for civil rights, our constitutional guarantees will be no better than those of Hitler's Germany or Communist Russia.

Aside from the merely moral indecency of what has been transpiring, police authorities in certain southern communities are crushing the exercise of rights supposedly guaranteed to every American by nothing less basic than the Constitution.

The heroic Americans who are completing the march for equality begun by William Moore are doing no more than exercising their right to freedom of speech, and their right to petition their government for a redress of grievances. Under the Federal Constitution, they are guaranteed that right by the first article of the Bill of Rights. I would be surprised if they are not also supposed to be guaranteed that right by the constitution of the State which took it from them.

Moreover, they are exercising the right of all Americans to move freely from one State to another, a right recognized by the Supreme Court, and a right that was denied them when they were arrested not upon violation of law but merely upon their entry into one of our States. In my opinion, the local authorities responsible for the travesty should be prosecuted on both grounds.

Let us remember that we are long past the day when citizens were secure in their constitutional right only against the officers and action of the Federal Government. The executive officers of the Federal Government have the duty to protect Americans in the exercise of their constitutional rights against their infringement by State authority, as well.

I know it is said that the civil rights statutes are relatively weak. But some do exist. I know it is said that in the past the courts have limited their application. But even within those limitations, there is room for the Justice Department to make clear that the Federal Government is not entirely powerless to intervene.

Section 242 of title 18 of the United States Code makes it a punishable offense for anyone "under color of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, or custom, (to) willfully subject any inhabitant of any State, territory, or district to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States."

I can think of the Bill of Rights, with its supposed guarantee of free speech, petition, and peaceful assembly; I can think of the 14th amendment, with its supposed guarantee that no State shall make or enforce any law which abridges the privileges or immunities of American citizens and which also forbids a State to deny any person life, liberty, or equal protection of its laws.

The Supreme Court has indicated that for any local official to be brought to account under this section there must be shown an intent upon his part to deny a Federal right. Surely there is evidence that there was such intent in the case of the memorial marchers.

There is also evidence that there is an intent to deny the right of peaceful assembly and freedom of speech to the demonstrators in Birmingham, Ala. The use of hoses and dogs upon peaceful demonstrators is such evidence, in my opinion.

I hope the Department of Justice will reexamine its legal weapons in these cases. I hope it will recognize that the courts will never tell it when to move in to protect American rights; it is up to the Justice Department to act within the rules already laid down by the courts and proceed to test by action whether or not the courts agree with its interpretation of its powers.

For this enforcement arm of the National Government to do nothing, except to send mediators and await reports from the combat zone, is a shameful commentary on American democracy. If indeed, the Justice Department does act in defense of American rights and is not upheld by the Federal courts, than it should seek whatever new legislation is necessary to empower it to act.

It will never be good enough for this, or any administration of the Federal Government, to wring its hands over the inadequacy of legislation in this field. The test of this administration is whether it is willing to exercise its existing authority to the full, and then seek from Congress whatever additional authority is needed to put an end to the police atrocities which have been occurring.

To the extent that these demonstrations are against segregation of public facilities in Alabama, and the denial of the right to vote in Mississippi, they are against something already known to be illegal. The demonstrators are asking that the law simply be upheld, but they are not even being accorded that right by the legal authorities of those States.

Aside from the legal side of this issue, there is the even more urgent moral side of it. I can think of no action anywhere in these United States that is a more completely un-American activity than that of the Alabama police in arresting the Moore marchers and in attacking the Birmingham demonstrators. Such spectacles must bring great joy to the hearts of Communists everywhere, as they see American law officers putting down peaceful demonstrations in the same fashion as the Communist police put them down. Arrests, imprisonment, and brutality are the methods of totalitarianism everywhere, in Cuba, East Germany, in Red China, and apparently, in certain parts of the American South.

No conscientious American can continue to remain silent. This is not a matter that can be met with passivity on the part of the majority, and left to the Negroes and whites of the South to fight it out among themselves. What is going on down there today is an infinitely greater threat to American freedom than Cuba, for indeed, if we cannot and do not protect America freedom in southern America, then where can we and where will we protect it?

I made the foregoing remarks because I think they are a deserving and fitting tribute to a magnificent article written by Joel J. Sprayregen, general counsel, Illinois division, American Civil Liberties Union, entitled, "Of Dogs and Freedom—Under the Law." This inspiring article of Joel Sprayregen's is published in the April 26, 1963, Chicago Daily Law Bulletin. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Daily Law Bulletin, Apr. 26, 1963]

OF DOGS AND FREEDOM—UNDER THE LAW

(By Joel J. Sprayregen)

Law Day came a little early in front of the Leflore County Courthouse in Greenwood, Miss., last month. The principal celebrant was a giant police dog who left an enduring impression on the leg of a minister and, incidentally, on the minds of millions of people throughout the world.

It is regrettable that the pressure of his official duties will keep this dog from appearing with eminent jurists and leaders of the bar at Law Day observances throughout the Nation. The President's proclamation says that we need a Law Day for "our people to rededicate themselves to ideals of equality and justice in relations with one another." The amount of rededication necessary may be measured by the distance between the upper and lower jaws of the police dog.

As has always been customary in cases where a citizen is oppressed, the dog can plead that he was merely following orders. His master—a policeman sworn himself to follow orders and, if possible to enforce the laws of the land—ordered the dog to bite the leg of a minister who was peacefully demonstrating in the cause of securing the right to vote for his fellow citizens. In Greenwood, apparently, clergymen had better preach only where no one can hear them; as earlier authorities have noted, the Gospel can be a disturbing thing if only men will open their hearts and minds to hear it.

The President's proclamation tells us that Law Day records "man's advance from savagery to civilization (with) reason and morality displacing brutal force." We may ponder that—although it is not recorded that dogs have an official "Law Day" of their own—the attack on the minister was not something that came naturally to the animal. Only after intensive training—presumably by human beings—is a dog sufficiently "educated" to attack instantly a man who has not threatened to do him wrong. This is certainly a significant accomplishment for higher education in Mississippi. But on Law Day, can we ask for something a little higher? Can we ask for education to ensure the prevalence of reason and morality over brute force?

Greenwood's premature Law Day festivities may remind us of more than the peril of the preacher who ventures into the gray pastures of public morality. As lawyers, it should remind us that when we take the case of the afflicted and oppressed—in Greenwood or Chicago—we act in the noblest of traditions. As a leading contemporary theologian says:

"The concern for justice is delegated to the judges, as if it were a matter for professionals or specialists. But to do justice is what God demands of every man: it is the supreme commandment and one that cannot be fulfilled vicariously. The calling of the prophet may be described as that of an advocate or champion, speaking for those who are too weak to plead their own cause. Indeed, the major activity of the prophets was interference, remonstrating about wrongs inflicted on other people. * * * The prophet is a person who is not tolerant of wrongs done to others."

We are not the first generation of lawyers called on to employ our ingenuity and courage in defense of the rule of law. St. Thomas More lost first his judgeship, and then his life, because he would not swear to an act which he believed was beyond the power of Parliament and the King. Lord Coke lost his judgeship by insisting that even kings are subject to the law. Have any lawyers ever drafted a more persuasive brief in defense of political freedom than the one in which Madison and Jefferson pledged for themselves and their colleagues, "our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor"?

In Illinois, Governor Altgeld lost his office because he believed that political passion was no ground on which to keep men in prison. A downstate Illinois lawyer shepherded his countrymen through a fratricidal bloodletting so that our best traditions of self-government "shall not perish from this earth." In 1910, the justices of our State supreme court (prophesying a case that 52 years later was to bring down grossly undeserved wrath on the U.S. Supreme Court) ruled that a Catholic schoolchild could not be compelled to recite from the Protestant Bible. And in Cook County, how many times has Clarence Darrow or the public defender or a member of the Defense of Prisoners Committee stepped to the bar in defense of, among other things, the finest traditions of the profession?

Almost half the world today celebrates a May Day whose heroes are, not lawyers dedicated to a rule of reason, but rather trained assassins and embittered theorists who never knew the responsibility and art of self-government under a rule of law. But our own traditions warn us not to be complacent about our achievements because the supreme commandment of justice "cannot be fulfilled vicariously." To each generation of American lawyers—and laymen—is given the responsibility of preserving freedom under law against the faint-hearted who would trade it for the illusory "security" of increased governmental power over the conscience and conduct of the individual citizen. The responsibility must be met both inside and outside of courthouses in Mississippi, as well as in the North. It can be met not by quoting dead men, but only by taking risks to protect the liberty of living men.

Is there a despicable defendant who cannot secure a fair trial? Is there a schoolchild segregated because of his race or compelled by the State to recite a prayer in which he does not believe? Is there a policeman who tortures prisoners whom he believes guilty? Is there a judge who thinks contempt of court means any disagreement with him? Is there a mayor who thinks he can break up a peaceful demonstration for civil rights or peace or John Birch? Is there an American citizen who is not allowed to vote because his skin is black? Can a police dog's bark drown out, or his teeth crush, a plea for human dignity under law? Such cases are the crucibles in which are tested daily our faithfulness to the great tradition, and our right to have a Law Day.

Man, having subjected all the other animals on earth to his rule, now stands on the eve of conquering the infinite spaces of the universe. But can man subject himself to the rule of law? If he can, we can excuse police dogs from participation in our ceremonials, and let them have their own day. Man himself will then be worthy to proclaim Law Day throughout the universe.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM AND ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. WEDNESDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of Senators, there will be no business considered today.

It is anticipated that on Wednesday next the Senate will consider the conference report on the supplemental appropriation bill; the Treasury, Post Office, and Executive offices appropriation bill; and also the unfinished business, S. 537, to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its deliberations today it stand in adjournment to meet at 11 o'clock on Wednesday morning next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none. and it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 537) to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States.

ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF THE 1963 FEED GRAIN PROGRAM AND PROPOSED FEED GRAIN LEGISLATION FOR 1964–65

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, last year when the administration's proposal for a mandatory feed grain bill—a bill which would have provided for a mandatory limitation on feed grain production—came before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I opposed it and I offered an amendment to knock out the mandatory provision. My amendment succeeded in the committee by one vote. I opposed the mandatory provision again on the floor, but it passed the Senate by a very close vote. But it failed in the House, and was never enacted into law.

Now, the administration has had second thoughts on the kind of feed grain bill it feels would be best for the country. I commend the Secretary of Agriculture and the President of the United States for recognizing that a mandatory program would not be desirable. I feel that it would not work, that it is not a practical approach. I think it would be most unfortunate for our agricultural economy.

Preliminary reports indicate that 25.8 million feed grain base acres will be diverted under the 1963 program as compared with a diversion of 28.6 million in 1962 and 25.2 million acres in 1961. For the entire United States feed grain acres intended for diversion in 1963 are only 90 percent of those diverted in 1962.

The central Corn Belt States of Iowa, Missouri, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, and Ohio all reported fewer than 90 percent as many feed grain acres intended for diversion in 1963 as in 1962. Iowa, Illinois, and Ohio, for example, will divert only 80 percent as many acres as in 1962. Indiana, Missouri, and Michigan will divert only 85 percent as many acres as in 1962. Other States which reported a greater than national average decline in acres intended for diversion in 1963 were Arizona, Delaware, Louisiana, Maryland, North Carolina, North Dakota, and Texas.

There were 20 States, however, mostly in the Northeast, West, and South which reported more feed-grain acres intended for diversion in 1963 than in 1962. They are: Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island, Vermont, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming, Washington, Utah, Nevada, Idaho, Montana, Oklahoma, Tennessee, and Georgia.

The number of farms participating in the 1963 program is slightly higher than in 1962 and about 10 percent higher than in 1961. Only nine States have fewer farms enrolled in the 1963 than in the 1961 program. The nine States are: Arizona, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Maryland, Missouri, Nebraska, and Ohio.

Small farms appear to be participating in larger numbers in 1963 and some large farms may have dropped out. In spite of the 10-percent increase in the number of farms participating in the program, the percentage of the total feed-grain acreage on farms participating in the 1963 program is lower than it was in 1961; and is only slightly higher than in 1962. In 1961, 59 percent of the base acreage of feed grains was on farms which participated in the program. In 1962 barley was also included in the program and the percentage of the total feed-grain acreage on the farms participating in the program dropped to 55.3. Preliminary estimates indicate that 56.7 of the feed grain base acreage is on the farms which are participating in the 1963 program.

The smaller acreage of corn, grain sorghum and barley intended for diversion in 1963 as compared with 1962 is the result of a higher proportion of small farms participating in 1963 and of less diversion per farm cooperating. The portion of the base diverted for payment on participating farms dropped from an average of 39.6 percent in 1961 and 42 percent in 1962 to 34.4 percent intended for 1963. In Iowa and Illinois the percentage diversion on the participating farms dropped from 34.7 percent in 1962 to 27 percent in 1963—a reduction of almost 20 percent in the proportion of the bases diverted on the participating farms. This is in line with the changed economic incentives in the 1963 program which provides less incentive for diverting more than 20 percent of the base acreage than was provided in the 1961 and 1962 programs.

One of the reasons why I opposed the program last year was that I thought the taxpayer would not get as much for his money, inasmuch as the incentive for the farmers to cut down on production was reduced, while the payments were increased.

COST COMPARISONS

Acreage diversion payments in 1961 were $782 million; in 1962, $842 million; and acreage diversion plus price support payments for the 1963 program are now estimated at $872 million, which will be the highest to date. In addition to the payments to producers in 1961 and 1962 the Government took over 500 to 600 million bushels of corn at $1.20 per bushel and substantial amounts of other feed grains at comparable loan values after selling certificated grain at $1 to $1.08 per bushel. Its losses on these feed grains probably amounted to $100 to $150 million each year. Under the 1963 program with the loan value of $1.07 per bushel for corn—and other loan values in proportion—and a prohibition against selling certificated grain at less than the loan values, little if any 1963 feed grains are expected to be delivered to the Commodity Credit Corporation under the price-support program.

Taking into account both the payments for diversion and the CCC losses on the new grains acquired under the 1961 and 1962 loans, it appears that the cost per acre diverted in 1963 will be about the same as the total cost per acre diverted in 1961 but 5 to 10 percent higher than in 1962.

As compared with the 1961 and 1962 programs, in 1963 the Secretary of Agriculture reduced acreage diversion payments from 50 to 20 percent of the value of the crop grown, raised the price-support level from $1.20 to $1.25 per bushel for corn, and made similar increases in the price-support level for the other feed grains. These changes were made to keep the total cost of the 1963 program in line with the cost of the 1961 and 1962 programs in view of the change in the legislation requiring compensatory price-support payments of 18 cents per bushel for corn, and for other feed grains in proportion.

Although the Government costs per acre diverted for the 1963 program will probably be 5 to 10 percent higher than total costs per diverted acre for the 1962 program, the market price of corn will be stabilized at a level 5 to 10 percent higher than in 1961 and 1962. The legislative authorization for the 1963 feed grains program provides that no certificated grains can be sold at less than the loan value, $1.07 per bushel for corn, plus carrying charges. For this reason the market prices for the 1963 feed grain crops is expected to average higher than the equivalent of $1.07 per bushel for corn. Most of the certificated grains from the 1961 program were sold on the basis of about $1.02 per bushel for corn and most of those from the 1962 program have been sold for about $1.07 per bushel for corn and market prices approximated these levels.

SOME UNCERTAINTIES

On the basis of the sharp reduction in feed grain carryover stocks achieved during 1961–62 and 1962–63, there has been widespread expectation that carryover stocks would be reduced to desired levels of about 45 million tons at the close of the 1963 feed grain marketing year, October 1, 1964. Even though farmers intend to plant 2.6 million acres more feed grains in 1963 than in 1962, if acre yields are lower as a result of less favorable weather, the desired reduction in stocks may be achieved. If, however, an upward trend in yields continues as in recent years, feed grain production in 1963, according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture technicians, may be 8.5 million tons larger than in 1962. This is equivalent to over three-fourths the reduction in carryover stocks expected in 1962–63. In other words, it may take one or two more years of diversion programs similar to the 1963 program before stocks are reduced to desired levels.

If 1963 feed grain production is 8.5 million tons larger than in 1962, as now projected by USDA, it is improbable that the Commodity Credit Corporation will be able to sell all of its certified grain at the equivalent of $1.07 per bushel plus carrying charges for corn. The Commodity Credit Corporation will have between 800 and 900 million bushels of grain covered by 1963 certificates to sell; yet, if 1963 feed grain production is as high as now projected, much less than this would be needed from CCC stocks to supplement current production in the 1963–64 marketing year. Under such conditions it is doubtful that market prices would be high enough to permit CCC to dispose of all its grains covered by certificates.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION FOR 1964 AND 1965

This background indicates one of the reasons why I support the feed grain bill, now having hearings before our Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee. We expect to report it this week, and take it up next week—and I refer to H.R. 4997—as passed by the House of Representatives. It provides for the continuation of a voluntary feed grains program for the 2 crop years 1964 and 1965. In this bill the Secretary of Agriculture is given sufficient authority to carry on programs combining the best features of the 1961, 1962, and 1963 programs. He also is given authority to grant bases to new feed grain producers and to allow county committees to take into account factors in addition to 1959–60 feed grain acreage history in setting individual farm bases.

This proposal has been criticized by some persons, including myself, as providing too much discretion for the Secretary of Agriculture. I do think, however, in view of the background I have just discussed and the fact that no one can predict what kind of weather we are going to have, it is well to have considerable flexibility of action in the Secretary of Agriculture, so he can make payments in accordance with the crops which will develop and the weather which we will have.

Criticism of H.R. 4997, as amended, centers on two points. It is alleged, first, that it gives too much discretion to the Secretary of Agriculture, and second, if enacted and the wheat marketing quota referendum carries, wheat producers will be permitted to produce wheat on feed grain base acres to the disadvantage of established feed grain producers.

It is true that substantial discretion would be granted the Secretary of Agriculture. If it were desired, the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry might provide additional legislative history guidelines, without opening the bill for amendments, either in their committee report or in debate on the floor of the Senate. Generally acceptable guidelines might be to the effect that the Secretary should offer a program each year which would be expected to maintain or increase producers incomes, cost no more per acre of feed grains diverted than the average of the 1961, 1962, and 1963 programs, and make as rapid progress as possible in reducing feed grain stocks to desired levels. The desired level might be specified at 40 to 45 million tons if desired.

The criticism that passage of H.R. 4997 would result in the production of wheat on feed grain base acres overlooks the fact that, if wheat is grown on feed grain base acres, the producer first must have diverted a part of his feed grain base acres to conservation uses, as specified by the Secretary of Agriculture. Also, the wheat grown on feed grain base acres, on the average, will produce no more feed than if the land were planted to a feed grain. The adverse effects on feed grain and livestock producers of the wheat-feed grain substitution clause in the 1962 Agricultural Act appear to be less than the probable adverse effects resulting from a defeat of wheat marketing quotas.

Another criticism of the passage of feed grain legislation at this time is the belief that it would be inadequate or ineffective if the wheat marketing quota referendum for the 1964 crop were defeated on May 21. Under H.R. 4997, as amended, the Secretary of Agriculture could offer feed grain producers a program in 1964 which would assure all cooperators the announced price support level for their feed grains produced in 1964 at no greater total cost or cost per acre diverted than the average of the 1961–63 programs.

If the wheat marketing quota referendum is defeated, however, 200 million or more bushels of wheat may be produced in 1964 in excess of amounts that can be marketed through usual channels at home and abroad. This wheat in effect would be added to feed grain supplies and might result in little or no reduction in total grain stocks, even though 25 million feed grain acres or more were diverted to conservation uses under a 1964 feed grain program.

To sum up, I favor the proposal because, in the first place, it is voluntary. I think it is extremely important that it be a voluntary feed grain bill. I recognize that there may be too much discretion allowed the Secretary of Agriculture, and for that reason I would favor guidelines in the committee report so that there will be some restraint on the Secretary of Agriculture, particularly as to the payments he makes. In the second place, I think this bill contains provisions, in effect in 1961, 1962, and this year, which will provide for higher farm income. Finally, I think the bill will provide lower costs for the taxpayers.

I think any fair, dispassionate, and objective analysis will show that this program has cost about $1 billion annually for the past 3 years. If we had not had provisions in the program for reducing production and if we had tried to maintain farm income anywhere near where it is, the cost would have been a great deal higher than it was, and would be higher in the future, than it will be if we pass this bill.

I am happy, as one who opposed the mandatory feed grain program proposed last year, to favor this bill. I am glad that compulsory proposal is out of the way this year and we can know what to expect in the coming 2 years, if this bill is passed.

SURE RISE IN INTEREST RATES DESTROYS ARGUMENT FOR TAX CUTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, recently the distinguished financial commentator, Sylvia Porter, discussed the inevitable fact that interest rates are going to rise continually, and probably very sharply, during this year and next year. Her analysis is as cogent and concise as any I have seen. She gives not one reason, but six for her statement: The economy is perking up. The Treasury is financing a huge deficit, and therefore is going to borrow larger sums of money. The Federal Treasury and the Federal Reserve is determined to finance the effort without inflation which means to them with higher interest rates. The administration and the Federal Reserve System also feel that we must increase our interest rates, at least on Government operations, to keep money from flowing out of the country. Also the proposed tax cut is likely to put even more pressure on interest rates and drive them even higher.

I think this analysis is excellent. I happen to disagree with Sylvia Porter on the necessity for higher interest rates. I think a fair appraisal will show that we should make every effort to stop any rise in present interest rates. Also, this analysis establishes the fact that in addition to its other unfortunate consequencies, a tax cut will shove interest rates up, faster and farther. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTEREST RATE RISE MAY BE ON WAY

(By Sylvia Porter)

Every important financial-economic force in this country is now working to push interest rates up gradually in 1963–64.

This will mean that borrowers will pay a higher price for cash. The increases may be measured only in fractions, but on large sums borrowed for prolonged periods even a rise of one-fourth percent can run into big money.

This will mean that an investor in new bonds or mortgages will get a higher price for the cash he lends. Again, the increases may be measured only in fractions, but fractions can make an impressive difference in what you earn over a long period of time.

The chances that interest rates will go down in the months ahead are next to zero. At best they'll hold within this year's range. The greater probability is that they'll climb gradually from today's levels because:

1. The economy is perking up and this indicates a rising demand from private and public sources for funds to finance business expansion and modernization, homebuilding and home buying, installment purchases and a vast variety of other projects. There's plenty of credit available in our commercial banking system and in savings institutions now to meet foreseeable demands. There's no doubt that credit will be available for legitimate projects. But as the demand for money climbs to meet the supply, the pressure will be for a rise in the price of money. This always has been the pattern.

2. The Treasury will have to finance a huge deficit in the Federal budget in coming months. Just in July–December 1963, it will have to borrow between $11 and $13 billion. As the Treasury taps the market with its borrowings, it obviously will absorb an immense amount of money and this factor will help tilt interest rates upward.

3. While the Federal Reserve System will continue to supply funds to the banking system in order to avoid braking the economic advance, it will not "oversupply" the system. Flooding the money market with funds in a cycle of expanding business could lay the base for another inflationary spurt and this the Central Bank will fight.

4. Both the administration and the Federal Reserve System agree the deficits of this period should be financed in the least inflationary way possible—which means borrowing as much of the money as is feasible outside the banking system. To appeal to nonbank investors, the Treasury well may have to pay gradually higher rates on the securities it offers. It already is paying close to 3 percent for 90-day loans, over 4 percent on its long-term I.O.U.'s. It is a distinct possibility that in the future it will increase the rate it pays on its savings bonds from today's maximum of 3¾ percent to, say, 4 percent, in order to attract more funds from little investors.

5. The administration and the Federal Reserve System also agree that our interest rate level is a crucial weapon in trying to curb the outflow of gold. Because for years we have been spending so much more abroad than we have been earning abroad, our foreign creditors have built up tremendous short-term balances here which they can send abroad at will and turn into gold. To keep our creditors willing to maintain their balances in short-term U.S. securities, the interest rates on those securities must be high enough to appeal to our creditors, and Washington recognizes this.

6. Assuming substantial tax cuts are voted and these add new vigor to our economy, the Federal Reserve System will have much more freedom to act to control the money supply in order to combat inflationary tendencies and to nudge interest rates toward levels deemed desirable to protect our gold supply and dollar.

But not one force is operating now to push interest rates down. Rather, all appear to be moving in the opposite direction.

PAYOFF AID TO TITO: YUGOSLAVIA AND RUMANIA TO BUILD DAM TOGETHER

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, it has been announced in the past few days that Yugoslavia and Rumania are going to build a huge dam, at enormous cost, for the benefit of both economies; and that construction will start this year.

This is another indication of the fact that Yugoslavia is moving closer and closer to the Communist bloc, moving closer and closer to Moscow orientation, and is adapting its economy to fit into the economy of other Iron Curtain countries.

In the article by Hans Benedict, of the Associated Press, I came across the following statement:

> Details of the financing have not been disclosed. The Soviet Union may be a silent partner in the project. Russian ships transport 37 percent of tonnage in the Romanian-Yugoslav section of the Danube.

Mr. President, there have been debates in the past, and there will be again, over whether we should continue to give the large amount of foreign aid to Yugoslavia in the future that we have given to it in the past. We have given Yugoslavia more than $2 billion in foreign aid. I understand we have given more aid to this country than to any other so-called neutral country in the world.

On the basis of the recent record of Yugoslavia, it is not a neutral country. It is a Communist country. Tito says so. I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Yugoslavia, Rumania To Build Dam Together" be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YUGOSLAVIA, RUMANIA TO BUILD DAM TOGETHER

(By Hans Benedict)

VIENNA, AUSTRIA.—A gorge of torrential Danube waters between Yugoslavia and Rumania will be turned into a giant lake to help shipping and give the two countries the second biggest powerplant in Europe.

Under an agreement expected to be concluded next month, Yugoslav and Rumanian experts will start a joint $300 million project in the Iron Gate Strait within 7 years. It calls for a dam and power station with an annual output of 10.7 billion kilowatt-hours, nearly as much as Russia's Volga River plant.

The dam will raise the level of the Danube upstream for about 75 miles, flooding the Rumanian town of Orsova and a dozen villages on both sides of the border. The population of 25,000 will be resettled.

The Danube, blue in the Johann Strauss waltz, is gray to most beholders. It rises in Germany and runs 1,750 miles, touching the capital cities of Vienna, Budapest, and Belgrade.

At the Iron Gate the river foams into whitecaps as it whirls over jagged rocks between cliffs 120 yards apart. Parts of old shipwrecks are still in the rocks.

The artificial lake is to hold more than 35 billion cubic feet of water. While the hydroelectric plant is to be financed by the two governments, another $100 million will be contributed by other Danubian countries for a system of locks. The entire project is to be completed by 1972.

The feud between Yugoslavia and the Soviet bloc in the Stalinist era stalled cooperation. In early 1956, when Moscow-Belgrade relations were thawing again, Rumanian-Yugoslav talks began. The Hungarian revolution interrupted the talks again. They were eventually resumed in 1960.

Details of the financing have not been disclosed. The Soviet Union may be a silent partner in the project. Russian ships transport 37 percent of tonnage in the Rumanian-Yugoslav section of the Danube.

The raising of the water level will make Belgrade accessible to ships of up to 5,000 tons. The dam, 1,300 yards long and 160 feet high, also will serve as a road and railway bridge, cutting the distance between Belgrade and Bucharest.

Two other international Danube power projects have been shelved due to financial difficulties. One was a joint Austrian-Czecho-Slovak dam across the river between Wolfsthal and Bratislava. A Czecho-Slovak-Hungarian project of four dams also has been waiting since 1956 to be realized.

BIRMINGHAM CIVIL RIGHTS SITUATION

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the unhappy events of the last few days in Birmingham should shake the conscience and sense of justice of the American people. And when I speak of the American people, I do so not to isolate the people of Alabama for, although their officials may be supported by many of their people, I am sure that there are many Alabamans who do not support their extreme action.

The use of dogs against human beings—fellow citizens not charged with any serious crime against the government or their fellow man, but simply seeking their constitutional rights as citizens, and desiring equal treatment under the law as human beings—is reprehensible. Today the administration is seeking a truce, and a truce is needed to avoid further injury to life. But the sad point is that the administration must seek a truce, and cannot fully enforce the substantive rights for which Negro citizens are marching and demonstrating, because the administration has failed to seek legislative action which would give it the statutory authority and means to support and enforce the rights that the Negroes claim and to which they are entitled.

These fellow citizens claim the equal right of voting guaranteed by the 15th amendment to the Constitution; they claim the right for their children to attend desegrated schools, held by the Supreme Court of the United States almost 10 years ago in the case of Brown against Board of Education of Topeka to be their right under the 14th amendment; they claim the equal right to use public facilities, whether in control of the Federal, State, or local government, and to the use of facilities in all forms of interstate commerce, all of which rights have been upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States. They claim also the right to equal use of public businesses, licensed by the State and held out by their owners as available for public use.

We know that every municipality has the authority to prescribe limitations on parades and demonstrations, and it may be true that the Negroes who have been parading are in violation of these municipal ordinances. But it can hardly be argued that the purpose of these ordinances is to prevent fellow citizens from asking for their fundamental constitutional rights. And even though a truce may be secured, we cannot believe that these demonstrations will be ended until these constitutional rights are recognized.

This administration has at its disposal a voting rights law enacted under the administration of President Eisenhower. But the Civil Rights Commission has reported that the provision which enables referees to enroll Negro voters has been very little used.

Although President Eisenhower and Attorney General Brownell asked for authority to enable the Attorney General to intervene in the name of the United States in school desegregation cases to secure a speedier acceptance of the Brown case, this administration has not and apparently will not ask for this power. Such legislation would lift the unbearable financial burden of prosecuting suits from the backs of individuals and transfer it to the United States, where it belongs.

The right of access to private businesses has not yet been clarified. The issue is in the courts and in justice, I must say that I understand the administration supports this right. Nevertheless, the administration has taken no action in the Congress, as I believe it could, to secure the enactment of legislation holding—as Justice Harlan did in his dissenting opinion in the civil rights cases many years ago—that these businesses, being licensed by the States, come within the purview of the 14th amendment.

In that great civil rights case in 1883, Justice Harlan, the grandfather of the present Justice, wrote a dissenting opinion in which he advanced the position that, because the State licensed businesses that held themselves out for use by the public, they fell within the purview of the 14th amendment. I believe legislation to this effect would be constitutional. I believe that the Supreme Court, when it again comes to this issue, will support the position taken by Justice Harlan.

The net result of the failure of the administration to seek statutory authority is that it is today prevented from taking timely and positive action, within the framework of law, to secure the rights for which these citizens strive.

The need for the Federal Government to have statutory authority to deal with this type situation can be applied to the progress of school desegregation in individual school districts. If the administration had statutory authority, and if there were a refusal to obey the mandate of the Court to desegregate, our Government would intervene. If the administration would seek, as President Eisenhower sought, authority for the Attorney General to intervene in school desegregation cases, it would be acting before the fact—instead of after the fact, as it is compelled to do today.

I apply this reasoning also to the use of public businesses. Today, because Negroes are insisting upon their right—as they believe it to be—to use public businesses, and because there is a local ordinance against parading, the Federal Government finds itself sitting on the outside and must ask for a truce. If there had been a finding by the Supreme Court—or if legislation had been enacted by Congress that the States come under the 14th amendment with respect to businesses licensed for public use—then today the Federal Government would be acting in support of the right of access of these individuals, instead of being forced to seek a truce with the Alabama officials who are using force and coercion, water hoses and dogs against human beings.

I realize that enforcement of the law is difficult when it is opposed by many citizens of a community, for consent is an element in our system of law. But consent will not come easily unless there is enforcement of the law by the Federal Government, against officials as well as private citizens. This administration has rendered itself unable to intercede fully and effectively in the enforcement of the law because it has not sought statutory authority from Congress in school desegregation and public business cases.

I must say that this indictment lies not only against the administration but also against the Congress. While many civil rights bills have been introduced in Congress, the effort has not been made on the part of Members of either the House or Senate—and I include myself as one of them—to at least bring up for consideration those bills and take whatever time is necessary for their perfection and passage.

The two great parties, with the exception of some leaders, are paying lip service to the cause of civil rights. Under the administration of President Eisenhower, two civil rights bills were passed—and they were passed because his administration and the Republican leadership of the Congress, aided by Democrats deeply interested in civil rights, did not weaken in their efforts to secure their passage.

I dislike doing so, but I am sorry to say that I believe the purpose of the

Republican Party in the field of civil rights has deteriorated since President Eisenhower's administration. If there is any party which should be united on civil rights, it is the Republican Party. We are not split sectionally, and it cannot be charged of our party as it can of the Democratic Party, that it does not want to offend its southern wing. Yet, whether it is for the hope by candidates of gaining votes in a convention, or for the hope of electoral votes from the South in 1964, we are compromising the issue which brought the Republican Party into being.

Some in our party, in spite of such outrages as have occurred in Birmingham, and in other places in the country even outside the South, still maintain that the issues of civil rights are local ones to be resolved by the States. Such an argument would lead one to believe that Lincoln never argued that human rights and human dignity were national issues; that he never fought the same argument of Douglas that these issues could be determined locally—and on this argument made the Republican Party a national party, a party which moved the conscience of the country and the world.

I believe the South will have a two-party system, and a growing Republican Party, because its people know that will be best for their section and for the country. If our party uses the expedient argument of States' rights with respect to constitutional and human rights—in an effort to secure convention or electoral votes—it is possible we might win a few Southern States in 1964. But in the long run, such a position will destroy the Republican Party, and worse, it will do a great wrong because it will be supporting the denial of the constitutional and human rights of our citizens.

Mr. President, there are many civil rights bills before the Senate which could be acted upon. In what I have said, I do not wish to draw attention to any bills which I have introduced or intend to introduce. But I do intend to implement what I have said today by the introduction of proposed legislation which will meet some of the specific issues which I believe have played a part in the great drive of our fellow citizens to secure their constitutional and human rights.

ARBOR DAY COMMEMORATIVE STAMP

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, one of the most important events on the spring calendar in Nebraska each year is the observance of Arbor Day at the home of J. Sterling Morton, the holiday's founder.

This year's observance on April 21 was no exception. The speaker was John Rees, a Lithuanian refugee who has become widely known for his fight against communism.

Reflecting on the decades throughout which Arbor Day has been marked at Nebraska City's beautiful Arbor Lodge, Mr. Morton's home which has for many years been a State park, I recalled the efforts in 1932 to obtain a commemorative stamp to mark the 60th anniversary of Arbor Day and the 100th anniversary of the birth of J. Sterling Morton, one of the most distinguished Secretaries of Ariculture in our history.

Mr. Frank A. Bartling, longtime postmaster at Nebraska City, and one of the most ardent supporters of Arbor Day, conceived the idea for the stamp. He has favored me with his account of Nebraska City's efforts to obtain the commemorative stamp and the results thereof.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Bartling's history of the Arbor Day commemorative stamp printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the history was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARBOR DAY COMMEMORATIVE 2-CENT POSTAGE STAMP ISSUE, NEBRASKA CITY, NEBR., APRIL 22, 1932

(History by Frank A. Bartling, postmaster, 1932)

New Year's Day, 1932, as I was finishing some routine postal work at my office and thinking of the postal business for the past year which revealed a falling off in business in this city, thoughts came to mind as to stimulating interest in Nebraska City. My thoughts drifted to the dilemma of the chamber of commerce committee on Arbor Day in finding some new ideas on celebrating the 100th anniversary of the birth of J. Sterling Morton and the 60th anniversary of the founding of Arbor Day. The idea flashed to my mind that this town should secure a commemorative postage stamp issue for Arbor Day. On the spur of the moment, I hastily typed a brief note to Mr. J. H. Sweet, editor of the News-Press, suggesting that if his paper and the chamber of commerce would back the idea, this city could have a stamp issue for Arbor Day, April 22, 1932. I delivered the note with other news items of the post office that morning and received no response immediately. However, I had conveyed my ideas to Mr. M. R. Thorp, assistant postmaster, who at that time was chairman of the chamber of commerce and soon a small news item appeared in the News-Press mentioning the idea.

However, several prominent Nebraska Citians, Mr. J. W. Steinhart and Mr. N. C. Abbott, became enthusiastic over the plan and letters were written by the chamber of commerce and other citizens to the Post Office Department and the U.S. Senator R.B. Howell and Congressman John H. Morehead asking that this anniversary be given a commemorative stamp issue.

The Postmaster General replied that owing to other commemorative issues in 1932, especially the Washington Bicentennial, no Arbor Day 2-cent stamp could be issued. (This exchange of correspondence is in the files.)

Not willing to be defeated in such an historic cause, the chamber of commerce enlisted the support of Lincoln and Omaha chambers, in presenting strong pressure to bear on the Post Office Department, and on Senator Howell, Congressmen Morehead and Baldridge to get the issue. Several businessmen and myself sent letters to our Nebraska representatives. Senator Howell partially declined to assist because he had applied for a "Buffalo Bill" W. F. Cody commemorative stamp for North Platte, Nebr. On the other hand, Congressman Morehead became very interested in the issue and worked hard and with perseverance. He was given valuable help by Congressman Malcolm Baldridge, of Omaha. (Letters from Mr. Morehead from the files give evidence of his efforts.) After the first efforts from Nebraska City, Omaha, and Lincoln, the status of the stamp issue remained quiet and dormant for about 4 weeks. I became restless and uneasy, so on Friday, March 11, I telegraphed Mr. Morehead advising him that Nebraska City was urging progress and asked him to report status of the matter. The next morning, I received a reply by telegraph stating that the stamp issue was approved by the Postmaster General. (This correspondence is also in files.)

Then detailed instructions from the Third Assistant Postmaster General, Division of Stamps Office, began to be received at our office. Preparations were made at the local office for a heavy business. I had very much to do and worked hard for 6 weeks previous to the holiday and for several weeks following it, in order that the handling of such a large volume of business at our office would be taken care of with the least possible errors. Incoming letters inclosing coins, checks, drafts, and thousands of money orders, accompanied with letters of instructions accumulated. I soon realized that our regular force could not do the work alone and after exchange of correspondence with Post Office Department officials in Washington, I was assured that they would give us help and ample expense money to carry out the task.

Department officials had experience handling other commemorative stamp issues, so their letters gave me plain instructions how to proceed. Also experienced supervisors to help us were sent here from Washington, April 11. Mrs. Myrtle C. Shaughnessy (widow of former Second Assistant Postmaster General) and Charles Anderson, traveling mechanic of the Fourth Assistant Post Master General Office, arrived. Mr. Anderson brought a special canceling machine equipped with a cast-die, worded "Nebraska City, Nebr., April 22, 1932." Within a few days after the arrival of these two officials, came Mrs. L. P. Shawen from the office of M. L. Eideness, Jr., Chief, Division of Stamps. Mr. Eideness, Jr., was to be here for the holiday but was unable to attend and so sent his representative, Richard Breaden, for that day. The last week before the holiday was an exceedingly busy one. Temporary postal workrooms were set up in three rooms on the second floor of the post office building, April 12, 10 days prior to the holiday. Then the entire Arbor Day stamp business was handled upstairs. Incoming mail was sorted downstairs and all Arbor mail taken upstairs. Mrs. Shaughnessy had charge of issuing stamps to extra clerks and had supervision of sales and cash. She bought stamps from the wholesale stock downstairs, sorted and reissued the stock to clerks engaged in affixing them to envelopes. Mr. Anderson took charge of the canceling machine and the dispatching and Mrs. Shawen handled correspondence and special business. Three hundred thousand Arbor Day 2-cent commemorative stamps were in the first shipment received here from Washington.

All during the Arbor Day stamp business, I worked long hours, including Sundays and was very tired out at the close. Extra clerks received 65 cents per hour and their pay for the time during this rush of business was from $35 to $101, and regular clerks received overtime pay. Assistant Postmaster Thorp and myself received no extra pay for our overtime and even the large increase in receipts failed to give us an increase in annual pay.

Stamp affixing to first day covers was not confined to post office or entirely to post office employees. Individuals had advertised in stamp magazines that orders would be taken for souvenir envelopes and mailing thereof, so several types of souvenirs were on sale. Some local dealers booked large orders and early on Arbor Day were at the stamp window when I opened the window at 5 o'clock in the morning on April 22, 1932, Arbor Day.

A number of stamp dealers came to the city and others in the East has engaged people in Nebraska City to take their orders to buy stamps here and affix them to souvenir envelopes which they shipped here for cancellation as first day covers.

The commemorative issue was authorized by Postmaster General Walter F. Brown on March 12, 1932, and Arbor Day came on Friday, April 22. Orders for stamps enclosing first day covers were first received in Nebraska City on March 20, and continued to come until April 22; the peak of the load was about April 14.

As temporary employees for this stamp issue, 22 persons were employed as extra help, the total payroll for these employees was $1,499. First day sales in Nebraska City, 540,000 2-cent stamps; 279,409 pieces of mail matter went through the special canceling machine; 1,151 pieces special delivery mail; 51,000 airmail letters, and 610 pieces registered mail. All this required 59 pouches, these being dispatched on the holiday, April 22. Total money orders paid, 8,150, in amounts from 2 cents up. Our money order acounts were not completed until May 30. The total number of Arbor Day 2-cent commemorative stamps printed was 66,182,900, being sold over the United States the day after the issue in Nebraska City.

The Arbor Day stamp bears the picture of Ruth and Alvin Hall, Jr., children of Alvin Hall, employed in the U.S. Bureau of Engraving and Printing, Washington, D.C. When it was necessary to furnish subject matter for the Arbor Day stamp, Hall's children consented to pose for it. It portrays the children planting a Japanese cherry tree in front of their Washington home. The engraver slightly altered the original photograph in order to make the picture suitable for stamp engraving.

On the day of the celebration, members of the Morton family came to Nebraska City as the honored guests. First guest to call at the post office, of the Morton family, were Mrs. Carl Morton, city, and her daughter, Mrs. Martha Morton Lattner, and daughter, Dubuque, Iowa. Mr. and Mrs. Joy Morton, his son, J. Sterling Morton and his son, Joy Morton 2d, and Betty Morton, granddaughter, all from Chicago, came to the office later in the morning. I escorted all the guests through the post office and explained to them the handling of mail. Mr. Joy Morton displayed a keen interest in the affair and he and his son asked questions and commented on the large amount of foreign mail. The party spent about an hour around the office and on leaving, Mr. Joy Morton complimented me on the success of the event.

Weather conditions were very favorable on the holiday. A large crowd came to the city and attended the tree planting ceremonies at Arbor Lodge and visited scenes of interest in the city. Many visitors from over the State were here.

The day closed with a banquet at Memorial Building attended by about 500 people.

The Morton family being guests of honor and naturally the center of interest, with Mr. T. W. McCullough, editor of the Omaha Bee-News, as speaker of the evening. His address was long, of the formal type, so a little tiresome to some listeners.

The interesting talk of the evening was by Mr. Joy Morton, who spoke reminiscently of the family during their residence here and some events of his boyhood days here. His son, J. Sterling Morton 2d, followed with a brief address.

ALBUMS OF RECORDS MADE BY FOUR U.S. MILITARY BANDS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, in the May 1963 issue of Footlight, the National Cultural Center's newsletter. attention is drawn to the record albums recently made by the four U.S. military bands. The proceeds from the sale of these records will go to benefit the National Cultural Center.

As Roger L. Stevens, Chairman of the Board of the Cultural Center, pointed out in Footlight, the pressing of these records represents unique cooperation among widely diverse groups, including the RCA Victor Record Division of the Radio Corp. of America, the Department of Defense, the American Federation of Musicians, the American Federation of Television Artists, leading music composers, arrangers and publishers, the personnel of the military bands, and the people associated with the Cultural Center.

The selections included in the albums represent the standard songs which have become integral parts of our American musical heritage. The records will be a worthwhile addition to any music lover's collection, and the sale of the records will give every American the opportunity to make his or her contribution toward making the National Cultural Center a reality.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the May 1963 edition of Footlight, including the remarks of President Kennedy, recipient of the first pressings of the albums.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Service Band Recordings

On May 1, recordings made by the four U.S. military bands—Army, Marine Corps, Navy, and Air Force—went on sale to the public. This is the first time such recordings have been commercially available. On April 23, the first pressings of the albums were presented to President Kennedy in his office at the White House. Making the presentation were George R. Marek, vice president of RCA Victor Records, Roger L. Stevens, Chairman of the Board of Trustees, National Cultural Center, and the four conductors; Lt. Col. Hugh Curry, U.S. Army; Lt. Col. Albert Schoepper, U.S. Marine Corps; Lt. Anthony Mitchell, U.S. Navy; and Capt. Harry H. Meuser, U.S. Air Force, for Col. George S. Howard, who was ill.

In accepting the records, the President said, "I want to express my appreciation to RCA for having made these recordings which, I understand, are unusually well done. I understand that the National Cultural Center will receive 95 cents on each album, and it will be a great help to the Center.

"In addition, I am very grateful to the Musicians' Union, which has waived all its interests and rights in this matter. This is the first time that the American military bands have gone into this area, and it has been done because of the strong feeling by the industry and by the union that the Cultural Center will serve the country as well as the performing arts.

"Most of all we are grateful to our country's military bands—the Army, Marine Corps, Navy, and Air Force—for recording the albums. I hope that everyone buys them. It will give people a chance to hear great band music and to make a contribution to the development of the Cultural Center, which belongs to Washington, which is part of the Nation. I will enjoy playing the records myself."

DESIGN AND PROGRAM OF NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, imagine the following situation:

Robert S. McNamara points his pencil at the man across the desk. "What does the program definition study indicate?" he asks. "The project is certain to succeed, Mr. McNamara," the man replies. "We have been studying it for 5 years. The design studies show that all phases of the program are within the state of the art. Cost effectiveness has been thoroughly analyzed. The computer studies show that we should meet the target date with no significant cost overruns. There is no question that this project meets all the required specifications. We recommend we go ahead with this one and that the alternative projects be canceled."

"Splendid," says Mr. McNamara. "Cancel all the other cars; we'll just build the Edsel."

That conversation, of course, never took place. But it is used as the lead of a thoughtful editorial in the April 29 issue of Missiles and Rockets to make the point that as the president of the Ford Motor Co., Mr. McNamara would never have committed that company to a single design, no matter how well studied.

Yet, as William J. Coughlin points out in the editorial aptly titled, "The Fallible Man," as Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara seems to have no qualms about committing this Nation's future to a single design concept.

The editorial asks the question of what would have happened in World War II "if we had canceled the B-17 and built only the B-24; if we had canceled the P-51 and built only the P-47."

Mr. Coughlin writes:

> We will always have with us the fallible man. The man who might cancel the F-86 in favor of the F-84 and never find out about his mistake until the Russian Migs swept down across the Yalu.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the editorial entitled "The Fallible Man," published in the April 29, 1963, issue of Missiles and Rockets.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Fallible Man

Robert S. McNamara pointed his pencil at the man across the desk. "What does the program definition study indicate?" he asked. "The project is certain to succeed, Mr. McNamara," the man replied. "We have been studying it for 5 years. The design studies show that all phases of the program are within the state of the art. Cost effectiveness has been thoroughly analyzed. The computer studies show that we should meet the target date with no significant cost overruns. There is no question that this project meets all the required specifications. We recommend we go ahead with this one and that the alternative projects be canceled."

"Splendid," said McNamara. "Cancel all the other cars; we'll just build the Edsel."

Secretary of Defense McNamara will be the first to assure you that no such conversation ever took place. If it had, the Ford Motor Co. today would be a financial shambles. Edsel was a dismal failure. Yet the project had been thoroughly analyzed by some of the finest minds in the automotive business and given the go-ahead by the management of one of the most successful firms in the industry. These experienced businessmen, operating in a familiar environment, were whipped by the unknowns.

Why do we bring up the Edsel?

Because we are certain that Mr. McNamara, if he had been Ford president at that time, never would have committed his company's future to a single design, no matter how well studied.

Yet, as Secretary of Defense, he apparently has no qualms about committing his Nation's future to a single design concept.

As we study the philosophy of Defense Research and Engineering, we find men of high intelligence taking a highly unintelligent approach to the weapon systems which this Nation will need in the future. They seem convinced that until it can be proven absolutely that a total system will work, until all question-marks are answered, until all risks are eliminated, no go-ahead should be given for development of a given project. Once committed to that philosophy of certainty, it is only a brief step to the belief that you need only one design. If you are so certain the first will work, why build two?

Show paper proposals to a scientist and he can assure you, after study, that one is more likely to succeed than another. Show them to an engineer and he'll tell you that the best way to find out is to build both of them and test them.

The dangers in our defense organization today lie in the fact that the heavily scientific organization of Defense Research and Engineering is making decisions that more practical engineers would decline to make without testing of hardware.

Today, as we have pointed out before, three-fourths of the new projects under study by the Joint Chiefs of Staff come down from D.D.R. & E.—a complete reversal of previous years when proposals flowed largely from the more practical minds of men in the military and industry.

We are told that the new single-design approach is necessary because weapon systems today are so costly that we cannot afford to embark on two parallel projects. We say the reverse is true; we cannot afford to abandon dual approaches—due to the simple fact that once wholly committed to the wrong road it becomes impossible to turn back because of the sheer size of the financial outlay already made. The cost of today's projects makes it imperative that dual approaches be explored before commitment to the entire weapons system.

Why not explore both Gemini and Dyna-Soar technology? Why not explore two TFX prototypes? No one can say now that one approach or another will be the successful one—paper studies just won't do the job.

There would be no problem, of course, if we had an infallible man as Secretary of Defense, one who could count on his advisers always to give him the correct advice and one who could always make the right decision.

Let's turn back the pages of recent aviation history and muse on what a single design approach might have done for the Nation's well-being.

Turn back to the days just before World War II. Paper proposals for two fighter planes are being studied by Defense Research and Engineering.

"It is quite apparent," says a high Defense official, "that we don't need both these fighter aircraft. One will do. Cancel the P-38. We'll build only the P-39."

A few weeks later, more proposals are laid on his desk.

"Why should we go into two costly bomber programs?" he asks. "Cancel the B-17. We'll build only the B-24."

Months pass.

"Cancel the P-51," he says. "We'll build only the P-47."

We leave to those with more imagination the ruminations on what course World War II might have taken if we had been forced to fight it without the P-38, P-51, and B-17. The Nation certainly might have saved a great deal of money and won the war quite handily, of course, if we had possessed a high Defense official who unerringly could have selected the P-38, P-51, and B-17 and canceled the less successful alternatives. No such man existed then and none exists today.

We always will have with us the fallible man. The man who might cancel the F-86 in favor of the F-84 and never find out about his mistake until the Russian Migs swept down across the Yalu.

When it comes to military weapons, this Nation cannot afford to guess. We must explore all alternative approaches to the furthest point in hardware that we possibly can afford. We must not let fallible man make irrevocable decisions.

We hope Mr. McNamara remembers the Edsel.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the pending business before the Senate, S. 537, will provide for a more effective evaluation of budget requirements of executive agencies of the Federal Government.

Both historically and legally, one of the major functions of Congress—if not our most important single one—is that of controlling Federal spending and taxing, and the financial policies of the Government.

Yet I do not believe we are performing that function adequately today. In passing on Federal appropriations, we proceed primarily on the basis of the proposals made to us by the President, rather than creating our own policy guides. The initiative is left with the President, although theoretically Congress has the power to control. Furthermore, even when it comes to passing on the details of appropriations for each program and bureau, we rely largely on the analysis and data presented to us by the agency itself and by the administration's Budget Bureau, rather than developing our own material.

The bill S. 537, which would establish a joint congressional Committee on the Budget, is intended to repair that situation by providing us with the means for doing our own analysis of requested appropriations, of preparing our own material on the budget, and developing our own policies to control Federal financial policies. The proposed joint committee would have a small staff to carry on the kind of study and analysis to which reference is made. As I envisage it, this joint committee would operate in a manner similar to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, which provides expert technical assistance to both the Senate Finance and the House Ways and Means Committees.

It is recognized that at present both the Senate and the House Appropriations Committees have highly efficient staffs, but in practice the men on those staffs must necessarily devote full time to the processing of the particular appropriation bills to which they are assigned. The staff of the proposed new joint committee would have time to carry on studies of longer range and broader scope, including those which cut across individual appropriation bills.

Creation of this new joint committee would not be a radical departure from the kind of arrangement Congress has already created with respect to other matters. Furthermore, it would not infringe on the prerogatives of either House, since the joint committee and its staff would remain firmly under the control of members of the Appropriations Committees of the two Houses.

Spending has skyrocketed in the last few years. For fiscal year 1962, President Eisenhower requested new obligational authority of about $81 billion. For fiscal year 1964, we have been asked to approve new obligational authority amounting to $108 billion. This is an increase of $27 billion or 33⅓ percent in the short span of 2 calendar years.

I submit that Congress is obligated to improve its machinery for coping with administration requests for appropriations, if we are seriously to claim that we control the purse strings of the Government. Enactment of Senate bill 537 will be an effective step for improvement in this regard.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I should like to join in the comments made by the senior Senator from Nebraska concerning Senate bill 537. I wish to associate myself with his views, and to make a comment on that subject.

Mr. President, the cosponsorships of Senate bill 537 by 77 Members of the Senate indicates that the merits of this bill are generally recognized. A long discussion of it by a new cosponsor is, therefore, unnecessary. Nevertheless, I wish to take the occasion to comment on the chief sponsor of the bill and to make a brief observation on the proposition before us.

I am persuaded that the Senate and the Nation owe the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] a vote of deep appreciation for his constant and consistent support of the cause of an effective Congress. His efforts since 1950 to secure the enactment of this particular bill typify his determination to accomplish that which he believes is right and necessary.

Mr. President, regardless of whether our colleagues at the south end of the Capitol see fit to pass this measure this year or in a subsequent year, we have a clear obligation again to make an expression on this matter.

On the bill itself, I should like to make one point which in my judgment justifies enactment of the bill: If Congress is to remain a constructive, effective, and coequal branch of our National Government, Congress must exercise an informed and independent judgment concerning the volume, the direction, and the priority of our national efforts. The most effective participation this branch possesses is in connection with its ability and its duty to control the flow of money to the administrative agencies. Our best intentions will not be satisfied, nor will the Nation's interests be served, if we cannot assure proper utilization of the vast financial resources which we siphon from the pocketbooks of the citizens and redirect through Government programs.

I have heard it said that the best way to learn one's way around a strange city is to drive a taxicab. In similar manner, I suggest the best way to learn one's way around Government is to try to trace what happens to the tax dollars. There is no better way to know and to understand the Government than to know where its money comes from and where it is spent.

All Members of this body have a sincere desire to act from an informed position upon the many issues which confront us. As I seek to understand the budget, I must say that the one-way streets and dead end streets, the detours, and the stop lights make the task far from easy. The budget document, while neatly assembled, is not always a helpful roadmap. I am sure the frustration I have experienced in this area is shared by many of my colleagues.

This condition—the size and the complexity of our Government and the size and complexity of our national budget—is worthy of our serious attention.

I would hope that as a result of the work of the proposed joint committee, we would have available data compiled independently of that furnished by witnesses and administering agencies. Often we are in the position of having to judge an issue based upon the evidence and the case submitted only by the proponents. Honorable as their intentions may be, we should not be compelled to rely upon only such evidence.

I would anticipate frequent evaluations of continuing programs. Very frequently we direct our analysis to programs which are new or call for increased funds, whereas programs with fairly constant fiscal demands are not as carefully scrutinized for value received or for their need to exist at all.

Certainly we need more realistic projections of the future cost of new programs. We are in the habit of starting a new program of nominal cost, only to find that the first appropriation is just "seed" money. These programs later return to us, and demand more support. We should know what we are getting into, and we should be in a position to provide to the administration guidance regarding our future intentions. This can be done by having available to the Congress and to the administration detailed projections, as part of our legislative record.

We should have available a realistic view of authorized spending. Each year we authorize vast programs. It may be that these authorizations are easily passed because it is understood that the actual appropriation of money is not involved. We assume that the appropriations process will protect the taxpayers. We need to have a better understanding of what we are committed to and of how real these obligations are.

Mr. President, in my opinion, these are a few of the very real needs which a joint committee on the budget and a competent staff will satisfy.

U.S. POLICY TOWARD AFRICA AND THE EMERGING NATIONS—ARTICLE BY SENATOR GOLDWATER

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, one of the most thoughtful analyses of the shortcomings of our current policy toward Africa and the emerging nations is contained in a recent article written by the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER].

In the blunt terms which are characteristic of the Senator, he maintains that "as things now stand, we are not helping the African masses very much, and we are not helping ourselves at all."

No one can quarrel with that statement. Clearly, as Senator GOLDWATER suggests, now is the time for a fresh approach to the problem, and a rethinking, and perhaps discarding, of some of our outmoded notions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Senator GOLDWATER's "How Do You Stand, Sir?" column, distributed by the Los Angeles Times Syndicate for April 11.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW DO YOU STAND, SIR?

(By U.S. Senator BARRY GOLDWATER)

Our entire African foreign policy needs a careful reexamination. For, as things now stand, we are not helping the African masses very much, and we are not helping ourselves at all.

The United States opposes colonialism in Africa. Unquestionably, this is right in theory. But in practice, some unpleasant developments have arisen.

Since 1956, 27 new African countries have been admitted to the United Nations. Most of these are in economic trouble, despite aid from the European countries which formerly ruled them. Almost without exception, the economic situation in the new states has deteriorated. Moreover, the trend toward dictatorship and personal rule is marked, as the personal extravagance and inflationary policies of many of the rulers and their entourages have been.

Equally disturbing is the nationalism and extremism in most of the new states. Anti-European sentiment is strong and seems to be rising all over Africa.

Kenya, the British colony, is not yet free, but already the white farmers are leaving. The chances are heavy that their property will be expropriated.

Freedom for the Belgian Congo was followed by outbreaks of violence which resulted in atrocities and murders and destruction of property. The exodus of the Europeans which followed that declaration of independence is one reason for the sorry state in which the Congo finds itself today.

There is such a thing as freedom too soon. This is exemplified in the Belgian Congo and in some other states as well. The Belgians claim we put pressure on them to get out of the Congo, and now it is fully apparent that the Congo was not ready to run its own affairs. Informed leaders claim the chaos there is likely to continue for a number of years.

Meanwhile, the United States has committed itself to back the Congo Government. Already we have put many millions of dollars into the country, one way or another. The total sum in 1962 was over $200 million. We will, of course, give the Congo much more before we are through.

Cyrille Adoula, Premier of the Congo, is openly supporting a movement to drive the Portuguese out of the nearby Province of Angola. He has donated land for a camp which is training troops for an invasion of Angola. The men are being supplied with arms by Ben Bella, the Algerian leader who pledged his support to Castro right after he visited the United States to engage in foreign aid talks.

If we permit Adoula to carry out his plans, it will amount to our assisting an attack on the Portuguese, since we are Adoula's principal backer. And because Angola is no more ready for self-government than was the Congo, the eviction of the Portuguese from that Province will simply give us one more country to support.

Many of the new African States are too small to be viable. Others lack the necessary resources. Experts say there are only about five states with the area and resources required to permit them to take care of themselves. These are Nigeria, the Congo, Ghana, Tanganyika, and the Sudan. But these sorely need the technical and administrative skills of the whites, as do the other new African nations.

Today, the drive against colonialism in Africa continues unabated. As it moves into South Africa, it encounters increasing resistance. The problems multiply and increase in size.

So, I suggest, the time has come for us to take stock of our policies. Perhaps the time has come to try out some basis for cooperation between whites and natives before we insist that the whites abdicate entirely, for it has become obvious that a satisfactory working relationship between the races is necessary for any real African progress. Our present policy is not providing such a relationship.

How do you stand, sir?

THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in these days when big government seems to be steadily growing bigger, many of us are concerned to know just how the role of government in our life is to be defined. There would appear to be no better definition than that given by Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON in his speech before the "Forum of the Future," at Charleston, W. Va., on Thursday, April 25, 1963.

Taking his cue from the West Virginia State motto, "Mountaineers Are Always Free," the Vice President described government as mankind's most powerful—and most fallible—creation. As developed by freemen, it is and must always remain a servant of the people. Better government, he pointed out, not simply more government, is our aim. The success of our Union is due, Vice President JOHNSON said, to the fact that it has never attempted to exert any power other than that granted to it freely at the polls.

Reviewing the jealous guarding of freedom in the Mountain State's first 100 years, the Vice President boldly envisioned the role of government in the next 100 years as a four-pronged instrument for achieving social progress by means of education, exploration of space, expansion of our economy, and conservation of natural resources.

Because the role of government is such an important question in all of our minds today, I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President's speech be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT

(By LYNDON B. JOHNSON)

One hundred years ago—on June 20, 1863—the State of West Virginia was admitted to the Union. In that year, the soil of our land ran with tragic blood as American fought American as an outgrowth of their differences over what the role of government should be.

The topic assigned to me for this "Forum of the Future" has been—and continues to be—the most controversial, the most divisive, and the most nearly continuous issue of our national life from the Continental Congress to the present.

Whether we speak of the Nation, of an individual State, or of any of the local areas served by the 91,000 constituted governments of our land, we cannot look into the future and say with confidence what the role of government will be 100 years, 10 years or even 1 year hence. This question is answered anew each time the people vote. This process is one of the great sources of strength of our system—and of our freedoms.

Government is mankind's most powerful invention. It is also among the least perfect and most fallible of his works. Many more governments have failed than have succeeded. Our own—still less than 200 years old—has outlived virtually every government which existed at the time of its formation, largely because of the constant scrutiny it received—at all levels—by people jealous of their liberties.

This spirit has a long history in West Virginia. Inhabitants of these mountains petitioned the British Crown for self-government long before the Colonies declared their independence. West Virginians have given more than lipservice to the slogan, "Mountaineers Are Always Free."

The American view toward government was well expressed more than 100 years ago in a story related by the writer and philosopher, Henry Thoreau. In his Journal, Thoreau related this personal experience: "I went to the store the other day to buy a bolt for our front door, for as I told the storekeeper, the Governor was coming here. 'Aye,' said he, 'And the legislature, too.' 'Then, I will take two bolts,' said I. He said that there had been a steady demand for bolts and locks of late, for our protectors were coming."

(Of course, I trust the Governor and the members of the legislature who are present will bear in mind that Thoreau did not have the privilege of living in West Virginia.)

I believe the point is made. When we consider the question of the role of government, we consider the question which has provoked the strongest feelings of Americans through the years—and we establish the one fact which underlies our discussion here. That is the fact that for the next 100 years, the role of government in West Virginia—and in the Nation—will be determined by the will of the people themselves.

As Governor of the State of New York, a very great American, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, said more than 30 years ago: "The duty of the state toward its citizens is the duty of the servant to its master."

Our present debates on the role of government are obsessed with issues of size and cost. Some regard big government as an end in itself. Others believe big government is an evil in itself. The many details of these debates are unlikely soon to be settled. If we have settled on any national consensus about the role of government, however, it is upon the concept of government as servant—rather than as master.

Government is not made benevolent or tyrannical by its smallness or its bigness. The decisive test is performance. Government is good—or it is not good—in proportion as it performs what the people need it to perform: neither less nor more, neither too little nor too much.

In the earlier years of this century, Samuel Gompers, when asked what labor wanted, answered with a single word: "More." If many Americans today were asked what they wanted of government, their instinct might be to answer: "Less."

But big government is a fact of our national life. In 1929, the transactions of government—Federal, State, and local—represented less than 10 percent of our gross national product. At the start of this decade, such transactions accounted for nearly 30 percent. We cannot dismiss this size, the rate of growth, or the broad implications of the relationship of governmental policies to our whole economy and society. But we can insist—we must insist—that the very dimensions of government's present role be accompanied by better performance as our servant.

In the century of West Virginia's statehood, we have evolved the concept that if government is to be the faithful and effective servant of the people, its first—and foremost—service must be to the people's future. A responsible concern for the future has been a distinguishing characteristic of government in America. This concern has been expressed in four principal areas of activity: exploration, expansion, education, and conservation.

From the expedition of Lewis and Clark to the orbital flight of John Glenn, American government has been distinguished by an intelligent willingness to support and encourage exploration and discovery.

From the Homestead Act of 1862 to the incentives of the Revenue Act of 1962, American Government has concerned itself with stimulating expansion for both individuals and businesses. As early as 1787, when John Adams and Thomas Jefferson set aside 1 lot in every 10 in the Northwest Territory for the support of education, American Government has honored a commitment to the future through a commitment to the education of our young.

Since the earliest years of this century, American Government—both Federal and State—has prudently assumed responsibility for conservation of our endowment of natural resources—and, in this prudent tradition, Government has undertaken a parallel responsibility to conserve and utilize more fully our human resources.

While we cannot prophesy far into the future what future generations will want the role of Government to be, I believe we can expect—and predict—continuation of these principal directions of public policy and governmental responsibility.

What will be the meaning for West Virginia?

The Mountain State, 100 years ago, elected to cast its lot with the Union. That decision then is symbolic for today. The future of West Virginia is inseparable from the future of the Union as a whole. Yet, in saying this, I realize that West Virginians may justifiably ask if this is so of the future, why has it not been so of the present and the immediate past.

In times of virtually universal American prosperity and growth, West Virginia has not shared equally in the national advance. The number of jobs has dwindled. Farm income has declined for your 43,000 farms. The number of businesses has decreased to 25,000. Income per capita has fallen to less than 80 percent of the national average.

In this regard, I was interested to find—to my surprise—that despite these trends, there are twice as many persons in West Virginia owning and holding stocks on the New York Stock Exchange than in my own State of Texas.

The experiences of recent years might justify West Virginians adopting the philosophy of Mr. Dooley, who said: "Anyhow, there is always one ray of light ahead—we're sure to have hard times."

While such a philosophy might seem justified, at this start of West Virginia's centennial observance, we neither accept such an attitude nor believe it. On the contrary, we view the future from an exactly opposite perspective. As a nation, we accept as our responsibility the proposition that Americans of every State must be sure of good times ahead.

The fate which has befallen West Virginia in recent years was not determined within the borders of your State. It was determined by events and forces in other States, in the entire Nation, and even in the world.

Developments in our own Southwest and the distant Middle East—developments as near as the coal markets of the mid-Atlantic and as far as the Common Market of Europe—had their consequences and effect upon the enterprise, the jobs, the homes and, finally, even the food on the plates of West Virginians.

The people of the United States have, through the policies of their Government, made a commitment to the individual and his well being. In the lesson of West Virginia, we have learned that Government cannot meet this commitment merely by being ready to write a check. Government must perform more than the role of an automated charity.

In this interdependent world, good times for the individual American can only be assured as individual human beings throughout the world enjoy better times for themselves.

West Virginia's per capita income is, as I have mentioned, below the average of all States. But at the level of about $1,800 annually, the income of West Virginians compares as the wealth of millionaires to the income of most of the earth's population.

In only six nations, including our own, is the income level over $1,000 a year. In only a few others does it exceed $500 a year. Most of the world's population lives for a year on no more than a single weekly paycheck of an American industrial worker.

We have learned in this 20th century that we could not isolate ourselves from military aggressors of the world. Today, we are learning—or ought to be learning—that we cannot isolate ourselves or the domestic economy from the aggressors of poverty or privation in the world. Either the living standards of the world must rise toward ours or our own standards will fall toward those of the world.

One of the lessons we have learned in West Virginia applies also to the world. We have learned that America cannot assure better times for the world merely through the use of our checkbook.

Vastly more is required of responsible government than that it be a checkwriting machine. The standards of government—whether its relative size be large or small—demand able and courageous performance in the four realms I have mentioned: exploration, expansion, education and conservation.

In the next 100 years, government's role in these areas will be active and important. The objective of all that is done will be to improve life for the individual here on earth.

We explore space. Our objective is far more than to reach the moon. Our space effort will require the fullest use of our resources, bringing new and higher uses for the natural wealth of West Virginia, creating better jobs and higher paying jobs for your people and the people of all the States. But the fruits of our space technology will open opportunity worldwide.

We seek to foster expansion—expansion of industry, the building of plants, the expansion of research and distribution. But even more, we seek expansion of the good life for all our people—the building of better homes, increasing profitability of farms, opening new doors of opportunity to all people regardless of race, religion or national origin.

We seek to foster conservation. We must continue the prudent preservation of our natural resources and achieve the fuller development of our inland rivers, our water power, our timberlands and our soil. We must keep the air we breathe and the water we drink clean and healthful. But we must also conserve the great wealth of our human resources—eliminating the scrapping of human talents because of age or illness or mental retardation or lack of skills.

Above all, we must continue the American commitment to education. What we are as a nation, and what we have been able to achieve as a people, is the dividend of our investment in the minds of our youth. Our leadership in the world—the fate of freedom itself—will be determined by how we honor our commitment to education. But even more, the kind of life our people know will flow from our investment in education the next 10 years and the next 100 years.

In the first years after World War II, we in America permitted and even encouraged our government—at all levels—to limit its role to the service of the present. The consequences have been many. West Virginia is case example No. 1. We know now—better than we have known before—that government must fill the role of serving the future or else its burden becomes oppressive and the opportunities of the people decline.

In these next 100 years, government must assume a much more vigorous role in the level-headed pursuit of peace.

Government must open wider the door of choice for individuals.

Government must help the people to marshall to the fullest their resources of earth and spirit.

The role of government must in this next century be more than ever the role of faithful servant faithfully serving the future. We must measure its performance less by its costs than by its accomplishments in supporting the greater liberty of all the people.

The traditional American view that government requires constant scrutiny remains a healthy view but we must not lose sight of one thing.

The tyranny of communism has not been able to extend its reach beyond the march of its foot soldiers. Yet, the idea born on these shores—the idea of servant government serving the people—has leaped oceans, swept continents, inspired millions to seek independence and has been the great moving force of this century.

We are creators and possessors of an instrument of infinite good in the role of government we have conceived in America. While we remain vigilant against its abuses, exacting in our standards for its performance, we should, at the same time, respect it and work with it, realizing that its success alone will be our salvation. The fundamental role of our Government these next 100 years—in West Virginia, in the Nation, and in the world, must be to achieve progress for all the people, greater prosperity for all humankind, and, finally, to achieve peace among men forevermore.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. WEDNESDAY, MAY 8

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate adjourn until 11 o'clock a.m. Wednesday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Wednesday, May 8, 1963, at 11 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 6, 1963:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

Edmond T. Daly, of the District of Columbia, to be associate judge of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions for the term of 10 years vice Randolph C. Richardson, deceased.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, U.S. Air Force, to be reappointed as Chief of Staff of the Air Force for a term of 1 year.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Adm. David Lamar McDonald, U.S. Navy, to be appointed as Chief of Naval Operations in the Department of the Navy for a term of 2 years.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

I nominate Lt. Gen. Robert B. Luckey, U.S. Marine Corps, when retired, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general in accordance with the provisions of title 10, U.S. Code, section 5233.

Having designated, in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5232, Maj. Gen. James P. Berkeley, U.S. Marine Corps, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general while so serving.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3299:

To be major, Medical Corps

Fichtner, John Z., O93401.

To be captain

Abene, Gasper V., O84931.
Abrahams, Edwin G., O89023.
Abramoski, Leo B., O89656.
Abt, Irwin E., O89024.
Adams, George B., O74038.
Adams, Jack E., O75478.
Adams, James E., O75330.
Adcock, Thomas G., O75479.
Addicott, Charles W., O75451.
Aicken, Larry B., O74042.
Ainsworth, Robert L., O75454.
Akin, George H., O89404.
Akiyama, Frank M., O91736.
Albright, Anthony F., O75480.
Alexander, Joseph E., Jr., O79545.
Alford, John R., O88546.
Allen, Boyd W., Jr., O92956.
Allen, Robert C., O75481.
Allison, Robert H., O81573.
Alsheimer, Robert H., O75483.
Alston, Pontha D., O75462.
Alton, Gary O., O96663.
Amerson, Hinton S., O74623.
Amos, Julian E., O74047.
Anderson, Curtis E., Jr., O75466.
Anderson, David P., O85476.
Anderson, Joseph L., O84938.
Andreacchio, Nicholas A., O91741.
Apperson, Jack A., O75484.
Archer, James H., O74052.
Areheart, Henry W., Jr., O85400.
Argo, James W., O87995.
Armstrong, Hart R., O81575.
Armstrong, James S., Jr., O75485.
Arnold, John M., O74056.
Arnold, Robert W., O75486.
Aschettino, Richard F., O78208.
Bachmann, Robert R., O75475.
Baeb, David E., O75476.
Bagnaschi, Albert L., Jr., O75477.
Bailey, Clarence A., O78212.
Bailey, George W., 3d, O75487.
Baird, Richard J., O78215.
Bakeman, Charles D., O85719.
Baker, Robert M., Sr., O92158.
Baldwin, Richard B., O75894.
Baldwin, Robert C., O74630.
Balint, Barry T. J., O74631.
Bane, Wista F., Jr., O88001.
Banks, James C., O92160.
Banner, Thomas A., O75333.
Barbazette, John H., O75489.
Barber, James J., O84944.
Barborak, Franklin D., O85401.
Barisano, Louis, O75490.
Barker, Harold S., Jr., O74066.
Barker, Rex N., O90013.
Barlow, Donald J., O75491.
Barnard, Roy S., O96943.
Barnum, Robert C., O78219.
Barrett, Jonathan R., 3d, O83636.
Barrett, William T., O85289.
Barry, Arthur A., O78221.
Bartlett, Gerald T., O75902.
Bassett, Gordon C., O85290.
Baumeister, Harold J., O79553.
Baun, Richard A., O85402.
Bayruns, Paul C., O93023.
Beasley, Benjamin B., O75494.
Beaulieu, Gary P., O85875.
Beaver, Joseph M., O94043.
Beavers, Guy M., O89177.
Beben, Joseph A., O75495.
Beck, Frederick S., O78226.
Beckwith, Robert E., O75496.
Beckwith, Robert B., O75912.
Beitz, Charles A., Jr., O75915.
Bell, Raymond E., Jr., O75498.
Bell, William E., O75917.
Bennett, Ferrell R., O75919.
Bennett, Lester E., O75499.
Berg, George A., O75335.
Bergson, Richard W., O75920.
Berner, John J., O75921.
Berry, William W., O88571.
Bethke, Gerald H., O75927.
Bezemek, Ludwig A., O96734.
Biberstein, Billy J., O85126.
Bickley, James B., O87476.
Bieri, Leon D., O75501.
Billey, John J., O87677.
Binder, Fremont E., O85403.
Bingham, Ellis D., O89030.
Bird, Max R., O74077.
Bishop, Donald E., O92161.
Bishop, Joseph A., O75502.
Bisping, Jack F., O75933.
Bizzell, Word G., O77804.
Blakeley, David C., O85482.
Blaker, William J., O74082.
Blanck, John E., O75504.
Blank, James N., O81587.
Blank, Lyle E., O96669.
Blascak, Donald W., O94991.
Bledsoe, Edward P., O87681.
Bloomfield, John E., O75506.
Boiani, Peter J., O74085.
Boivin, Arcade G., O75508.
Bokovoy, Jon E., O75509.
Boll, Albert F., O74902.
Bolt, Richard R., O85907.
Bomar, Hobby J., Jr., O78231.
Bone, Aubra N., O75510.
Bonilla-Acevedo, Tomas, O92241.
Bonner, Benjamin J., 3d, O74088.
Bonta, Stanley G., O75938.
Booth, John P., 3d, O74642.
Borer, Robert S., O91556.
Borgstror ., Richard O., O75940.

Bostancic, James F., O88243.
Boswell, Leonard LeR., O78572.
Bourland, James M., O75942.
Bowden, John J., O84953.
Bowen, Cecil R., O94275.
Bower, George L., O78234.
Bowman, Donald C., O75512.
Boyanowski, John G., O75945.
Boyle, Ernest W., O75946.
Boyle, James A., O96741.
Braa, Emery W., O89184.
Bradley, Robert E., O85920.
Brann, Travis L., O94914.
Brannen, Barney L., Jr., O93362.
Breckheimer, Donald G., O85729.
Breitenberg, Edward P., O75953.
Brickhouse, Willie T., Jr., O75955.
Briggs, Charles F., O85297.
Briggs, Thomas J., O85299.
Brill, James H., O94277.
Brister, Delano R., O74646.
Britt, Albert S., 3d, O75513.
Brittain, Richard T., O75959.
Britton, James H., O75514.
Britton, John A., O74967.
Brock, Jeffrey D., O75960.
Brockway, Lawrence N., Jr., O87482.
Bronson, Richard M., O85129.
Broome, James R., O87691.
Brown, Fred D., O74648.
Brown, Lee D., O91315.
Brown, Leonard T., O85935.
Brown, Richard W., O75968.
Brown, Robert M., O74649.
Brown, Roy A., O74104.
Brown, Terry W., O93028.
Brudvig, Dale K., O75969.
Bruner, Robert J., O81595.
Bruskiewicz, Glenn L., O78248.
Bryan, Richard L., O88597.
Bryant, James W., O85404.
Bryant, Thomas E., Jr., O85301.
Bryant, William L., O93026.
Bryden, John M., O94997.
Brylla, Charles W., O74107.
Buchan, Alan B., O75976.
Buck, Champlin F., 3d, O75515.
Buckner, David L., O83110.
Buckner, Donald A., O75516.
Budd, Alexander S., Jr., O89427.
Buddo, James S., Jr., O75978.
Bue, Paul A. J., O78251.
Buel, Charles J., O83639.
Burbery, John W., Jr., O83640.
Burgdorf, Carl F., 2d, O75518.
Burke, Francis J., Jr., O85132.
Burke, Richard A., Jr., O75984.
Burke, Sib H., O88598.
Burke, William M., Jr., O75519.
Burt, John C., O75520.
Burton, Dawson L., O88601.
Burton, Donald L., O85133.
Bush, Emory W., O79560.
Bushyhead, Edward R., O75992.
Buswell, Arthur T., O92632.
Buttermore, Charles W., 3d, O84706.
Buxton, John L., O78253.
Byers, Robert D., O93031.
Bynam, Holland E., O75994.
Byrd, Doxey, Jr., O75995.
Caldwell, Richard G., O75521.
Calhoun, Charles C., O85405.
Calhoun, Creighton L., Jr., O95000.
Calvert, George H., O77812.
Camp, Dave E., O75999.
Campbell, Charles B., O83643.
Campbell, Donald A., O74118.
Campbell, Joseph R., O74657.
Campbell, Richard E., O76002.
Campbell, William R., O93372.
Campion, William W., O75523.
Cann, Donald C., O74120.
Cannefax, Robert W., O76003.
Carmody, Robert W., O79564.
Carrier, Billy C., O76006.
Carroll, William F., O75524.
Carruth, George A., O88246.
Carson, Martin B., O75525.
Carter, Harold M., O75526.
Carucci, Raymond A., O74969.
Caruso, Michael L., O94195.
Casey, Franklin J., O89895.
Cass, Stanley D., O75527.
Castelli, Joseph G., O74970.
Castle, Edward R., Jr., O74971.
Cawley, John H., Jr., O89188.
Cei, Peter G., Jr., O74906.
Cento, Dahl J., O85307.
Chandler, Richard L., O74972.
Chaney, Arlen L., O76010.
Chaney, Bobby J., O77813.
Chapman, Paul P., O76011.
Charles, George H., Jr., O91566.
Chase, Edward L., O75528.
Chase, Gerald W., O75529.
Chenoweth, Robert T., 085500.
Chernault, James A., O75530.
Chesley, Arthur P., O74128.
Chittick, Peter J., O75531.
Christensen, Eric M., O75532.
Christenson, Willard M., O75533.
Christy, Bobby G., O75534.
Circeo, Louis J., Jr., O75535.
Clark, Davis, O94058.
Clark, Donald P., O88624.
Clark, Gary L., O81601.
Clark, Jon M., O88625.
Clark, Joseph E., O76012.
Clarke, Charles C., Jr., O78260.
Clarke, Edward F., O77816.
Clay, Clifford D., O76013.
Cleaver, George A., Jr., O83644.
Clelan, Joseph R., O89368.
Cline, Donald H., O75537.
Clites, James E., Jr., O79566.
Clowe, John F., Jr., O74661.
Coates, Charles H., Jr., O75538.
Cochran, James O., O80220.
Cockrell, William F., Jr., O81602.
Codd, Nicholas J., Jr., O74129.
Coffee, Edwin F., Jr., O74130.
Coffman, Richard L., O74664.
Cofoni, Peter J., O85308.
Colket, Charles H., 085309.
Collier, William T., O86002.
Collings, J. Elmer, O94060.
Collins, David G., O76019.
Comeau, Robert F., O75539.
Conklin, Willard D., O79567.
Conley, James A., O77819.
Conrad, Hawkins M., O75540.
Conroy, Arthur T., Jr., O85510.
Conroy, Robert E., O78265.
Conway, James B., O94578.
Cook, James H., O80221.
Cook, John J., O89977.
Coon, Robert L., O87495.
Cooper, Albert C., O94579.
Cooper, Charles H., O75541.
Cooper, Jack B., O75542.
Cooper, Robert A., O76029.
Cooper, Robert T., O85142.
Cooper, Willis M., O85143.
Cordell, Ralph D., O76030.
Correll, Ralph T., O74667.
Cortez, James J., O75543.
Cothran, Paul E., O75342.
Cotter, Paul L., O76034.
Coughlin, James L., O83647.
Cover, John P., O74137.
Cowles, Phillip R., O74977.
Cox, Randall S., O74138.
Cox, Sammy T., O94850.
Craddock, Nicholas J., Jr., O76037.
Crater, John F., O75544.
Crawford, Jack F., O75344.
Crider, Terence A., O95269.
Crittenden, Robert N., O76042.
Crofford, Clifford D., O76043.
Croft, John A., O74142.
Cross, Freeman G., Jr., O75545.
Crowl, Gilbert W., O88036.
Culbertson, Jerome B., O76046.
Cullins, Robert B., 3d, O76047.
Cummins, William, Jr., O78046.
Cunniff, Roy A., O76048.
Cunningham, Cleve, O94452.
Cunningham, James G., O88639.
Curran, Francis R., O85516.
Curran, Jan D., O74670.
Currier, Roger M., 4th, O75546.
Custer, Philip E., O86036.
Cutler, Edward J., O75547.
Cyr, Charles W., Jr., O87498.
Dahl, John F., O76052.
Daluga, Richard B., O75550.
Damme, Richard J., O76056.
Daugherty, John M. Jr., O94454.
Davenport, Charles L., O84522.
Davenport, Theodore G., O76059.
Davies, Peter G., O75345.
Davies, William A., O75551.
Davis, Harold M., Jr., O79570.
Dawes, Robert C., O74980.
Dawson, Jon C., O76062.
Day, Herman E., Jr., O75553.
DeGraw, Allen C., O85411.
DeLany, Daniel J., O75554.
DeSimone, Frank P., Jr., O75555.
DeWitt, Calvin, 3d, O75556.
Dean, Richard C., O75557.
Dearden, Sheldon W., O76063.
Deel, Arlin, O79571.
DelVecchio, William P., O85412.
Delandro, Donald J., O74942.
Denmark, Sumner J., Jr., O74982.
Dennison, Gary V., O77828.
Deshler, Robert C., O76071.
Devereaux, Raymond A., O84975.
DiValentino, Leo E., O74164.
Dick, William W., 3d, O76074.
Dickson, Rodney, O94455.
Dillon, Gregory P., O87731.
Dilyard, Rex E., O83648.
Dion, George J., O79572.
Doar, James M., O74675.
Dodge, Rodney E., O76079.
Dodson, John P., O75558.
Doneski, Bernard J., 3d, O76081.
Donker, Leo M., O85314.
Dooling, Stephen V., O93390.
Doolittle, Lloyd W., O85525.
Dorough, Aaron G., O76082.
Dorward, Neil L., O94070.
Dougherty, James E., O76084.
Dougherty, Maurice F., O74676.
Dow, Richard A., O74169.
Dowds, James B., O85413.
Dross, Allen E., O89677.
Dross, David D., O74173.
Drudik, Robert L., O75559.
Druit, Clifford A., O74678.
Drummond, Louis A., O85414.
DuBois, Donald A., O76088.
Dubbelde, John B., O75560.
Dubose, Perryman F., O74175.
Dudzik, Joseph A., Jr., O91839.
Duhon, Ben E., O85315.
Duncan, Wayne M., O76093.
Duncan, William A., Jr., O75562.
Dunn, James E., O74177.
Dunn, James W., O75563.
Durbin, William B., O76096.
Durr, Donald D., O85528.
Dvorak, Philip J., O74178.
Dwayer, William M., O78290.
Dyer, Howard B., O85415.
Dyke, Charles W., O85316.
Dyson, Harold B., O75565.
East, Kenneth E., O94291.
Easterling, Ned H., Jr., O91364.
Easterwood, John L., Jr., O75566.
Easton, Donald G., O87506.
Eastwood, Clifford A., Jr., O74180.
Echevarria, William, O75567.
Edgar, James S. V., O75568.
Edwards, Emmet D., Jr., O81630.
Edwards, Richard I., O75569.
Elder, John F., 3d, O75570.
Ellis, Gary L., O84981.
Ellis, William R., O75571.
Ely, Sumner R., O78283.
Emery, Richard F., O75572.
Emrick, Charles W., O78294.
Engle, Phillip D., O85319.
English, Don C., O76106.
Ensign, Allyn B., O75573.
Eperson, Thomas A., O78295.
Erickson, Darrold J., O75576:
Erminger, Lee E., O91819.
Eure, Samuel L., O90032.
Evans, Walter C., O81632.
Everett, James W., O95317.
Ewanus, Milton D., O75577.

Fadel, Richard A., O75578.
Fader, Jerome H., O85531.
Fairchild, Robert L., Jr., O85161.
Fancher, Louis C., Jr., O90184.
Faulkender, Robert W., O75579.
Feaster, Lewis L., O78298.
Feeney, Richard L., O74687.
Fekete, Alexander J., Jr., O96759.
Felber, Theodore D., O75581.
Feld, Philip, O91582.
Fennell, George R., Jr., O74192.
Fenton, Donald F., O76115.
Fentress, Harry B., O76116.
Finch, Arthur L., Jr., O87515.
Finch, Kenneth W., O92654.
Fingles, Douglas O., O76121.
Finlay, John C., O96966.
Fiorentino, William J., O74909.
Fisher, Paul D., O85535.
Fiske, John R., O77838.
Fiske, William S., O78302.
Flanagan, Carl P., Jr., O81636.
Flanders, Norwood S., O76126.
Fleming, Jerry L., O75355.
Focer, Samuel W., Jr., O75583.
Follansbee, John N., O75584.
Fong, Joseph Y. K., O76127.
Fontanella, David A., O76128.
Ford, Wilbur E., Jr., O74202.
Forgy, Jack O., O75358.
Foster, Andrew R., Jr., O75585.
Foster, Robert G., O86154.
Fournier, Joseph J., O85538.
Fox, Barry P., O75586.
Fraker, John R., O91588.
Franklin, Bobby G., O91828.
Freeman, Carl F., O76136.
Freitas, Louis H., O83651.
Freyder, James G., O87518.
Friedman, Fred L., O92323.
Friend, William N., O75587.
Frisbie, James G., O74689.
Fritz, Richard L., O83652.
Froebel, Martin C., O78310.
Frost, Henry R., O91989.
Fugitt, Billy W., O76138.
Fulton, Lawrence P., Jr., O87748.
Gagliardone, John L., O94457.
Gaines, Merrel E., O85543.
Gale, Edward W., O75588.
Gallagher, Joseph P., O86167.
Galloway, Gerald E., O75589.
Gann, Charles E., O76143.
Garigan, Thomas P., O75590.
Garner, John J., Jr., O83653.
Gaspard, Glaudis P., Jr., O75591.
Gasper, John M., Jr., O77851.
Gately, Michael P., O74691.
Gates, Kermit H., Jr., O75592.
Gaustad, Peter J., O76146.
Gaw, Stephen T., O76147.
Gayler, Earl D., O74692.
Gebhardt, William A., Jr., O76148.
Geczy, George, Jr., O86175.
Gentry, Paul E., O92331.
Gentry, Roy C., O74989.
George, Dannie E., O76151.
George, Edward H., III, O75362.
Giles, George E., O74213.
Gilmore, Joseph R., O74215.
Ginter, Duane L., O76155.
Glasgow, William L., O88074.
Glasker, Samuel J., O74218.
Glen, George W. B., O75593.
Glover, Richard R., O74219.
Goetz, George W., O74699.
Goetz, John A., O88076.
Goldberg, William, O76160.
Golden, William L., O75595.
Gomon, Charles W., O74991.
Gonzalez, Alvaro R., O74701.
Goode, David E., O92196.
Gooding, Ronald S., O75596.
Goodson, Harry C., O75597.
Gordon, Charles L., O90121.
Gordon, Dudley J., O88702.
Gordon, Walter C., O75598.
Govatos, John N., O87524.
Graham, Joseph E., O91847.
Grant, Michael E., O76171.
Gray, Frank M., Jr., O90050.
Gray, Joseph M., O92353.
Green, James L., O93418.
Green, Robert E., Jr., O88712.
Green, Thomas E., O76173.
Greene, Earl M., O74228.
Greenway, John R., O84994.
Greenwood, Walter A., O85757.
Grim, Charles D., O95028.
Grimes, Dan S., O75365.
Griswold, Edward C., O76179.
Groetken, David L., O85175.
Gross, Franklyn W., O75599.
Gross, Woolf P., O74706.
Groves, John E., Jr., O87766.
Grubbs, William F., 2d, O90071.
Gruber, Robert E., O90010.
Gruhn, Thomas S., O75600.
Guba, Howard J., O85552.
Guillory, Larry G., O85553.
Guldner, Francis J., O76183.
Gullen, John P., Jr., O74707.
Hagyard, Warren A., O92376.
Haldane, Douglas W., O85759.
Hale, Charles A., O93002.
Hall, Clarence E., Jr., O75601.
Hall, Francis W., Jr., O75602.
Hall, George W., Jr., O79578.
Hall, William E., O79579.
Hallinan, James M., Jr., O74709.
Hallmark, Billy J., O88718.
Hallock, Donald V., O76188.
Halloway, Kenneth E., Jr., O75604.
Halpern, Wayne J., O86216.
Hammond, Leroy D., O76191.
Hammond, Robert D., O90026.
Hamner, Richard S., O75606.
Hampton, Emery W., O85760.
Hanawald, Len M., O75607.
Hancock, James H., O76192.
Handback, Henry C., O89067.
Handley, Charles B., O85328.
Hanigan, Francis L., O75608.
Hanlin, Richard W., O85329.
Hannen, William M., O88087.
Hannon, Murray W., O95032.
Harbuck, Eugene L., O74710.
Hardegree, Bobby, L., O74711.
Hardy, Robert M., Jr., O91859
Harring, Anthony U., O76193.
Harris, Bruce R., O74239.
Harris, Robert E., O76197.
Harris, Robert W., O86230.
Harris, Thomas L., Jr., O75369.
Harrison, Henry L., O85557.
Harrison, William H., O77432.
Hartmann, Frederick D., O78342.
Harvard, Thomas P., Jr., O75370.
Harwig, Donald H., O74240.
Harwood, Michael S., O88725.
Hatch, Henry J., O75610.
Hatch, John F., Jr., O76205.
Hatch, Vernon L., O74242.
Hatcher, Robert T., O85180.
Hawkins, Richard S., O79582.
Hawley, Gerald S., O75611.
Hays, Paul A., O76208.
Hearne, William D., O74996.
Hedgcock, Robert E., O91513.
Heggen, Larry E., O74246.
Heidecker, Duane E., O87784.
Henry, Ronald W., O75062.
Henson, Hugh E., Jr., O89222.
Herbert, Anthony B., O78348.
Herbst, William R., O94933.
Herring, Bernard M., Jr., O76214.
Hertz, Sanford G., O88734.
Hess, Carl E., O87788.
Hettinger, John R., O75063.
Heverly, Charles S., O76217.
Hickerson, Arville L., O74249.
Hickey, Edward I., O75614.
Hicklin, Thomas R., O75615.
Hickman, Jere L., O86254.
Hicks, Frederick G., O76218.
Hicks, Gerald F., Jr., O76219.
Higgins, James M., O79583.
Higgins, Michael S., O75616.
High, Charles S., O74723.
Higman, James H., O76221.
Hildreth, Edward E., Jr., O75617.
Hill, James L. E., O77860.
Hill, John L., Jr., O75618.
Hill, Robert G., O82275.
Hill, Theron H., O74724.
Hilmo, Orin R., O83655.
Hinds, William L., O76224.
Hines, Joseph E., 3d, O77995.
Hinspeter, William L., O74253.
Hoagland, Merton B., O76227.
Hobin, Raymond M., O85001.
Hocker, John R., O75619.
Hodges, Charles E., O74254.
Hoff, Rodger L., O93432.
Hoffman, Robert F., O76230.
Hogan, Thomas J., O95041.
Holladay, Van D., O75065.
Hollenbeck, Elmer W., O74260.
Holmes, David R., O85332.
Holmes, James R., O89340.
Holmes, Jasper F., O76234.
Holmstrom, Ronald J., O97133.
Holt, Bill V., O88742.
Honsinger, Larry E., O85185.
Hood, George E., O87797.
Hopkins, James R., O91277.
Horn, Robert C., O86277.
Hornstein, Edmund H., O94467.
Horton, Floyd W., O74268.
Houlis, Harry S., O74269.
House, Joseph W., O75620.
Houser, George M., O75621.
Houser, Houston P., 3d, O75622.
Howard, James W., O91801.
Howe, Robert H., O77462.
Howerton, William B., O95340.
Howes, Richard H., O75623.
Hoyt, Richard E., O79585.
Huddle, Charles E., Jr., O74999.
Huff, Donald W, O74273.
Hughes, Jimmie T., O76250.
Hull, Michael H., O89762.
Hummel, Richard H., O85420.
Humphrey, Paul W., O79586.
Humphrey, Raymond F., O76252.
Humphreys, George D., O85421.
Hunt, Byron W., O74275.
Hunt, Gordon M., O76253.
Hunt, Wallace G., O96988.
Hunter, Robert E., O94936.
Hylbert, Samuel L., O75626.
Ilsemann, Michael J., O75627.
Ingman, John F., O75000.
Irwin, Carl H., Junior, O85774.
Irwin, James T., O74732.
Isbell, James C., O75376.
Isham, James A., O86308.
Israel, Glenn A., O74283.
Iverson, George D., 5th, O75628.
Izatt, James, O85579.
Jackson, James W., O94592.
Jacobs, Irwin M., O78364.
Jacobs, Marvin, O97138.
James, Jesse H., O75629.
James, William N., O74285.
Jameson, James J., Jr., O75630.
Janert, Alfred C., Jr., O77479.
Jenis, Donald S., O75631.
Jenkins, James R., O75632.
Jenks, George V., Jr., O81668.
Jennings, Curtis A., O91883.
Jeter, Munford S., O81670.
Jewett, Richard E., O85335.
Johanknecht, George P., O74734.
Johns, Robert N., O75633.
Johnson, Andrew C., O75634.
Johnson, Arthur D., O75635.
Johnson, Chester F., O76269.
Johnson, Clifton R., O77868.
Johnson, Donald K., O85776.
Johnson, Ernest D., O92435.
Johnson, James C., O78370.
Johnson, Stanley T., O75636.
Johnstone, Homer J., Jr., O75637.
Joiner, Carey P., Jr., O81674.
Jones, Gilbert E., Jr., O76272.
Jones, Luther E., O92681.
Jones, Ronald A., O89230.
Jones, Walter R., O75379.
Jordan, Howell H., Jr., O75638.
Judson, Alan L., O87539.
Judy, Jerry E., O79589.
Kaeo, Peter K., O76277.

Kaiser, James B., O75639.
Kaiser, Philip E., O85584.
Karalekas, Charles J., O76279.
Karr, Don E., O89852.
Kastner, George D., O76280.
Katz, Charles M., O74297.
Kaufman, Raymond, Jr., O85585.
Kawabata, Kazuto, O76283.
Keefe, John L., Jr., O75641.
Keefe, Victor F., O94475.
Keel, Frank W., O92566.
Kegelman, Theodore J., Jr., O85191.
Kehoe, Thomas P., O75643.
Keith, Donald M., O78379.
Kelley, James F., O76287.
Kelley, John W., Jr., O85588.
Kelly, Edward V., O78382.
Kelly, Ted W., O85426.
Kelly, Thomas A., Jr., O96993.
Kelly, Thomas W., O85427.
Keneipp, George E., Jr., O76292.
Kennedy, Irvin D., O74302.
Kennett, Walter H., Jr., O75646.
Kensler, Jesse W., O77872.
Kenyon, Richard D., O75647.
Keogh, John J., O76293.
Kerver, Thomas J., O85192.
Kessinger, John M., O75008.
Kester, William R., O87819.
Ketchum, Raymond E. V., 2d, O75648.
Keville, Clarence H., Jr., O88767.
Keys, Robert W., Jr., O92209.
Kielkopf, Edward C., Jr., 075650.
Kilpe, Gunars, O74305.
Kimura, Kay S., O76298.
King, Charles M., O84089.
King, Donald P., O76299.
King, William T., O76301.
King, William T., O75654.
Kirk, John G., O85470.
Kirk, Louis D., O96834.
Kirkwood, John H., O79592.
Kirshman, Norman H., O92081.
Kite, John C., O74310.
Kleypas, Kenneth A., O79593.
Knakal, Joseph C., Jr., O88769.
Knapper, Aubrey L., O74312.
Knieriem, Matthew E., O91901.
Knipp, James D., O78391.
Koehnke, Joseph A., O87825.
Kovel, Maxim I., O75659.
Koford, Joel L., O85591.
Kolb, Carter M., Jr., O75658.
Kramer, Bryce R., O74314.
Krapf, Albert H., 2d, O75660.
Kreitzer, John C., O85431.
Krome, Alan, O74317.
Kubas, Michael J., O74751.
Kunard, Donald D., O94098.
Kuykendall, George B., Jr., O89532.
Kysar, Alverado F., Jr., O83656.
LaPorte, Justin G., O75666.
Lackey, Lyman A., O74321.
Ladd, John P., O74322.
Lain, John C., O91438.
Lakics, Robert J., O76319.
Lane, Ralph B., O76320.
Langer, Joseph A., Jr., O89286.
Langworthy, Robert A., O75665.
Lanham, Michael C., O75012.
Laningham, William O., O76321.
Lanzillo, Eugene R., O88780.
Large, Darrell R., O94102.
Larimer, Charles L., O74755.
Laseau, Joseph N., O94606.
Latturner, George J., O85601.
Laughbon, Richard W., O74328.
Lawson, Robert A., 094607.
Lawton, Johnnie, Jr., O76323.
Lea, Charles E., O75667.
Leach, Robert A., O90280.
Leard, Robert E., O75668.
Leckinger, Paul A., O74332.
Lecrone, Donald, O95351.
Lee, James R., 091818.
Lee, Walter T., O91908.
Lee, William E., O88784.
Leger, Jean C., O81685.
Lehner, Scott J., 082282.
Lehner, William J., Jr., 074335.
Leitzy, John D., O76332.
Lemes, Ralph V., O87544.
Lenderman, William R., O79596.
Lenoci, Joseph V., O76334.
Lesko, Charles J., O84712.
Lespasio, Neal A., O88123.
Leuer, Kenneth C., O90224.
Lewers, Sam, O76338.
Lewis, John C., O78402.
Lewis, Robert C., 085604.
Ley, Donald R., O75671.
Liakos, William G., O75672.
Ligon, Claude M., O77884.
Ligon, Robert E., Jr., O85026.
Liles, Michael S., O85344.
Lindholm, Tom L., 075673.
Lindsey, Jerry N., O76342.
Lingaitis, Francis V., O74339.
Link, Elbert W., 091912.
Lippe, Lawrence., O91316.
Little, John A., O75674.
Little, Ronald E., O94483.
Littlejohn, Thomas W., 074340.
Loberg, John C., O75675.
Lockaby, Jesse S., Jr., O85608.
Lockwood, Willard E., O74342.
Loeffke, Bernardo, O78088.
Lofton, Marvin, 075013.
Logan, Laddie B., 075390.
Logan, Rodney W., 074343.
Lollis, James A., 091689.
Lomax, Rhoss C., Jr., 091935.
London, William G., 075391.
Long, John E., 078405.
Long, Kenneth D., 089093.
Loomis, Robert W., 076351.
Loop, James W., 079599.
Lopes, Francis J., O90210.
Lorms, John L., O76352.
Losik, Robert C., O74344.
Lott, Kirby J., O92089.
Loudermilk, Roy L., Jr., O86427.
Love, Harold M., O85790.
Lucas, Dale A., O79600.
Lucas, Ronald M., O85203.
Luck, Bennie E., Jr., O85611.
Luke, Dawson B., O87550.
Luke, John B., O89544.
Luna, Raymundo R., O76356.
Lusk, James A., O76358.
Lustig, Jacob E., O75678.
Luther, Ralph A., O75679.
Luther, William H., O92218.
Lyle, John A., O90222.
Lyons, Calvin G., O74349.
MacGill, James F., O75680.
MacHatton, Joseph G., O78411.
MacKusick, Arthur L., Jr., O75681.
Machen, Bobby, O76359.
Madsen, Arlyn R., O75682.
Maffett, Fletcher H., O88803.
Maguire, James E., O74351.
Malone, K. H., Jr., O85617.
Maloney, James E., 3d, O75684.
Manahan, Richard R., O75685.
Mangum, Robin, O75686.
Manner, Eugene L., O76369.
Manning, Albert E., O76370.
Mapes, John B., Jr., O77556.
Marmaras, Ernest, O85207.
Marmor, John W., O83657.
Marrella, Leonard S., O75687.
Marsh, Elgin R., Jr., O74360.
Marsh, Robert, O89547.
Martin, Alfred L., Jr., O88809.
Martin, Ernest H., O79601.
Martin, Mason E., O76374.
Martin, Yancey F., O76377.
Martinez, Howard M., Jr., O75689.
Mascia, Donald J., O94317.
Mason, Arther W., O86467.
Mason, John, O74363.
Massey, Oran A., O74365.
Mastro, Franklin D., O75690.
Matheson, Edgar M., O88141.
Mathis, Milton H., O76378.
Matsuo, Herbert T., O87846.
Matthews, Church M., Jr., O75691.
Mattison, Charles H., O83658.
May, Elmer C., O90444.
May, Francis B., O83113.
May, Richard L., O84092.
McAfee, Floyd H., O75017.
McBride, Eugene R., O76398.
McBride, Morris R., O75692.
McCall, Gerald T., O75693.
McCarthy, Edward W., Jr., O92483.
McCarthy, Fox, O75694.
McCarthy, John M., O75695.
McClain, Charles S., O91761.
McClain, Terrence W., O74370.
McCleave, Robert E., O87557.
McConkey, Rodney F., O85434.
McConnell, Bruce D., O76404.
McConnell, Rodney D., O75696.
McCoy, George V., O92486.
McCrary, Thomas D., O75698.
McCullom, Cornell, Jr., O75699.
McDonald, John M., O75701.
McDonald, Thomas B., 3d, O75702.
McDonough, Bruce B., O75703.
McDowell, Richard L., O76410.
McGivern, Parlan L., O88822.
McGovern, George W., Jr., O75705.
McGowan, Paul A., O74379.
McGowan, Richard M., O90273.
McHugh, Thomas P., O76412.
McKay, Michael J., O96699.
McKie, Robert H., Jr., O96777.
McKinley, Martin E., O90278.
McKinney, Horatio W., O74384.
McKinstry, Thomas I., O76418.
McLaughlin, James J., O74387.
McLaughlin, John O., O75706.
McNulty, William B., O76422.
McWhirter, Julian H., Jr., O76425.
Mead, Dana G., O75707.
Mead, Warne D., O75708.
Meaney, Edward J., Jr., O82287.
Medford, Dillard E., O88151.
Meehan, John J. P., Jr., O75709.
Menefee, William P., O87564.
Meredith, James M., O87565.
Merrick, Robert L., O75712.
Merritt, Hubert D., O78432.
Metalios, James Z., O74615.
Mettam, Richard E., O75398.
Meyer, Conan G., O87567.
Michel, Thomas E., O76391.
Mielke, Karl A., Jr., O78435.
Miklinski, Anthony R., O75713.
Mikuta, Joel J., O74394.
Miler, Edward H., O77899.
Miles, Ralph E., O75714.
Miller, Austin E., O75715.
Miller, Donald L., O84225.
Miller, Robert F., O85215.
Miller, Roger E., O97013.
Miller, Royce D., O87855.
Miller, Spencer R., O74782.
Milliron, Joseph F., O74395.
Mills, Charles S., Jr., O76428.
Mills, Lawrence L., O74396.
Mills, Robert R., Jr., O87568.
Mitchell, John H., O94622.
Mitchell, John S., O97235.
Mittelstaedt, Robert N., O91608.
Mixter, Wilbur R., O88841.
Modica, Giac P., O85216.
Molinelli, Robert F., O79604.
Monaco, Nicholas, Jr., O75716.
Monahan, Edward J., O74399.
Montalvo, Martin T., O79605.
Montgomery, James D., Jr., O93477.
Montgomery, Ross D., O85217.
Moore, Marshall L., O75717.
Moore, Robert D., O91945.
Moran, Hugh F., Jr., O89110.
Morey, William S., O74401.
Morgan, Jack E., O8846.
Morrison, Kenneth L., O76444.
Morrow, Cecil R., Jr., O87571.
Mortensen, Theodore J., Jr., O85626.
Morton, Richard H., O75720.
Mosco, Richard A., O85628.
Moser, William R., O76447.
Moses, Charles C., O75721.
Moses, Laurence G., O76448.
Moxley, Thomas T., O75024.
Mudd, William C., Jr., O88161.
Mudgett, John S., O84714.
Muenter, William T., O91952.
Mullen, David A., O87861.

Mullins, Donald G., O85224.
Mungovan, Robert W., O81706.
Murchison, John T., Jr., O75722.
Murphy, Clifton M., O74407.
Murphy, John A., O75723.
Murphy, John E., O75724.
Murphy, William E., 3d, O75725.
Murray, Jackson S., O74787.
Musial, Walter F., O85355.
Myers, John T., O76455.
Nack, John M., O81709.
Nader, Walter E., O76456.
Nagel, Joseph L., O90551.
Nash, Harold F., Jr., O86568.
Nash, John N., O88295.
Nash, Tom P., Jr., O77909.
Naumann, Ralph E., O76459.
Negaard, Carman D., O75727.
Nelson, Clifford R., O75401.
Nelson, Maynard L., O95222.
Nelson, Theodore R., Jr., O76462.
Nelson, William J., O85794.
Nemeth, Philip K., O75402.
Neukamm, Bruno J., Jr., O75728.
Newlin, Edgar C., 3d, O91476.
Newman, Erman M., Jr., O75729.
Newman, Joe B., O75883.
Newman, Robert C., O76465.
Newsom, Samuel J., Jr., O75730.
Newton, George F., O85440.
Nicholas, Talbot J., O92230.
Nicks, John G., O84528.
Nicoll, Wayne B., O75731.
Niemczyk, Theodore T., Jr., O91958.
Niles, Gary W., O76468.
Noakes, Edmund D., O85225.
Nobriga, Gordon H., O74415.
Nock, Carleton C., O74416.
Nock, Jean A., Jr., O96328.
Norris, James B., O81711.
Nottingham, Jonathan D., O75733.
Oakes, Leslie C., O85226.
Oaks, Clarence B., Jr., O77913.
O'Brien, Robert A., Jr., O76477.
O'Connor, John H., O86585.
Offan, Kenneth J., O85357.
Ogden, Leigh M., O75737.
O'Grady, George L., Jr., O75735.
Okita, Harold K., Jr., O88867.
Olsmith, Edwin S., Jr., O75740.
Olson, Hardin L., Jr., O75741.
Olson, Martin G., O76480.
Olson, Thomas E., O75742.
Onellion, Willard M., Jr., O87868.
Oneto, John B., O87576.
O'Rourke, Lewis C., O74424.
Otto, Robert W., O91346.
Owen, Thomas D., Jr., O74797.
Owens, Sherrill, O76485.
Paas, Alfred O., O74798.
Pack, Kenneth L., O88871.
Padgett, Lary W., O88171.
Padilla, Ramon, O81819.
Pagel, John A., O85443.
Palmer, Arthur N., O76487.
Palmer, William T., O76488.
Palmertree, Tommy R., O85230.
Palmieri, Guy J., O75743.
Paradiso, Richard A., O89124.
Pare, Harold J., O85064.
Parham, Byron A. P., O74433.
Parke, Walter M., O85358.
Parker, Murry E., O76493.
Parker, Richard G., O74801.
Parks, Donald, O74434.
Parr, Ivan W., 3d, O83660.
Parrack, Jim M., Jr., O75408.
Passamaneck, David J., O92110.
Pastore, Richard M., O75745.
Pataro, Rudolph N., Jr., O75746.
Patrick, Burton D., O76495.
Patte, Chris, O75121.
Patterson, Jerry K., O75747.
Patterson, John T., O91351.
Patterson, Raydean H., O76497.
Patterson, Willard L., O76498.
Peach, James G., O76500.
Pearlman, James T., O81715.
Pearson, Theodore J., Jr., O75748.
Peckham, John H., O75749.
Peden, Ronald L., O89275.
Penrose, Newton B., O75750.
Penzler, Harry D., O80226.
Perrine, David P., O75751.
Perry, James R., O74804.
Perry, Mervin E., O85234.
Person, John L., Jr., A75752.
Peterson, Harlan F., O85444.
Peterson, Walter R., Jr., O74808.
Pettersen, Clifford D., O85359.
Pfeil, Henry, Jr., O91976.
Philipp, Ronald E., O94634.
Philpott, Lawrence D., O75412.
Phipps, Donald E., O86631.
Pianka, Thomas A., O94637.
Pickens, Homer C., Jr., O85361.
Pierce, Isaiah B., Jr., O74812.
Piner, James, Jr., O85235.
Pinkston, William R., Jr., O74813.
Pipes, Jack R., Jr., O88472.
Pipkin, John R., O79610.
Place, Berwyn L., O85236.
Pocock, James A., O75755.
Polczynski, Albert R., O91981.
Pope, Donald R., O75757.
Porter, Bobby B., O75417.
Porter, Royce L., O76520.
Porter, Thomas A., O95084.
Portier, Gerald C., O88179.
Potamos, Christ F., O76521.
Powe, Carl M., Jr., O86660.
Powell, James D., O75759.
Powell, Raymond G., O85237.
Powell, Richard E., O89576.
Powell, Walter W., 2d, O86661.
Powell, William S., O76523.
Powers, Max L., O74448.
Press, Donald E., O75760.
Prewitt, Herbert F., O76526.
Price, George W., Jr., O87588.
Price, Roger J., O74815.
Price, Roy C., O76528.
Pritchard, Donald H., O88884.
Pritchard, Walter L., Jr., O75761.
Proctor, Marvin P., O79613.
Prossor, John E., O84717.
Proulx, Clovis B., O87890.
Provine, Carl R., O88540.
Puett, Joseph F., O76531.
Pugh, John W., O86665.
Pullin, James R., O91358.
Puttkammer, Paul D., O87891.
Quatannens, Louis S., O75763.
Quintard, Jerry L., O76535.
Radcliff, William A., O88889.
Radler, Charles M., O75764.
Rafferty, James E., O75419.
Rahn, William E., O77924.
Raines, Fred B., O74451.
Rakowitz, James A., O79614.
Ramsden, John J., O75765.
Ramsey, Russell W., O75766.
Randolph, William M., O73517.
Rawls, Paul L., O85365.
Rawls, Robert E., O75767.
Ray, James W., O75768.
Ray, Robert L., O74456.
Raymond, Charles L., O75769.
Raynes, Troyce L., O87894.
Reagan, Jerry E., O88892.
Reedy, Henry J., O74459.
Reel, Ralph E., O95089.
Reeves, Donald W., O85240.
Reget, Gene R., O75770.
Reichel, James E., O74824.
Reichelt, Eric F., O94886.
Reid, Wilbur E., O91496.
Reidy, William D., O88483.
Remington, Allen K., Jr., O85649.
Reue, David N., O76547.
Reynolds, George P., O85076.
Reynolds, Robert M., O75771.
Rhichard, Clinton P., O76548.
Rhoades, Glen L., O75772.
Rhodes, Howard E., O75029.
Rich, Arthur L,. Jr., O75420.
Richardson, George L., O75773.
Richardson, James O., O90000.
Riedl, William H., O76555.
Riley, John G., O76556.
Ring, Taft C., O76557.
Rink, James H., O94953.
Riovo, Jose A., Jr., O92767.
Ritchey, John P., O75774.
Riviere, Francis, O85242.
Robbins, Grant C., O75421.
Roberts, Charles W., O74467.
Roberts, Donald A., O75030.
Roberts, Donald M., O84532.
Roberts, Norman L., O92119.
Roberts, Roy A., O85653.
Robinson, Bobby C., O85797.
Robinson, Charles W., O96585.
Robinson, James B., O89283.
Robinson, Nicholas J., O75775.
Robinson, Thonius, Jr., O74468.
Rock, Thomas L., O75422.
Roddy, Robert E., O74470.
Rodenmayer, John P., O74825.
Rodgers, Robert J., O78611.
Rodriguez, Cesar A., O97026.
Roebuck, Thomas W., O75776.
Rogers, George V., O75777.
Rogers, Gordon B., Jr., O75778.
Rogers, William H., O93076.
Rogers, William R., O76565.
Roller, Robin J., O75779.
Roman, Theodore, O82919.
Rose, Barnes W., Jr., O75780.
Rose, Buel T., O75781.
Roth, Morton F., O75783.
Roth, Thomas J., O93496.
Rowinski, Thomas H., O78484.
Rowlands, David L., O90264.
Rubin, David B., O76574.
Rudrow, Robert G., Jr., O85657.
Runyan, Thomas E., O75786.
Rupp, James E., O74831.
Ruppe, Jake M., O95385.
Russell, Beryl D., O85246.
Russell, George G., O78486.
Russo, Joseph S., O75787.
Rutter, Leo F., Jr., O94498.
Ryan, James T., 3d, O85247.
Sadler, Clyde D., O75788.
Salmonsen, Peter C., O76581.
Salzman, James D., O75789.
Sanches, Manuel L., O74483.
Sanchez, James, O85450.
Sanders, Reuben L., O88194.
Sanford, Thomas H., O76587.
Santa Barbara, Joseph R., O85249.
Santilli, Joseph F., Jr., O91376.
Sapp, Clarence D., O79616.
Saunders, Don M., O85372.
Saunders, Donald S., O94888.
Schaefer, John E., O75791.
Scheff, Richard P., O94785.
Schessler, Donald R., O74488.
Schiefer, Henry J., O85661.
Schiesser, Charles W., O89868.
Schmidt, Guy L., O86730.
Schneble, Elmer J., O94644.
Schneeman, Douglas, O90461.
Schober, Frank J., Jr., O74492.
Schofield, David G., O74493.
Scholtes, Richard A., O75793.
Schorr, David E., O75794.
Schroeder, Eldon K., O85663.
Schubert, John E., Jr., O76597.
Schuler, James D., O74495.
Schulze, Howard D., O84266.
Schumacher, Henry J., O75795.
Schwoppe, Edwin G., Jr., O81735.
Scott, Jerry C., O75796.
Scott, John R., O83663.
Scudder, Charles P., 3d, O75797.
Sedgwick, Clyde N., O76605.
Seely, William B., O75798.
Seitz, Donald E., O75799.
Serna, Albert I., 3d, O88924.
Serpico, Frank L., Jr., O80228.
Serrin, Phillip A., 2d, O76611.
Sexton, Herman L., O87611.
Seybold, Lawrence C., O85253.
Shaddock, Carroll W., Jr., O75801.
Shannon, Douglas, O84719.
Sharp, Charles W., O76617.
Shaw, Robert L., O97200.
Shellabarger, Harold L., O87912.
Shimek, E. Joe, 2d, O75802.
Shoptaugh, Leland D., O76623.
Shuman, John N., O74843.

Shumway, James D., O78503.
Siegel, James L., O75804.
Silnes, Sigvart R., O76626.
Simila, Kenneth R., O75805.
Simmons, Cecil K., O76627.
Simons, Robert J., O87616.
Simons, Simon I., O79619.
Simpson, Robert B., O95751.
Simpson, William, O75429.
Sims, Charles O., 3d, O88936.
Sims, John C., Jr., O85665.
Sims, Wesley N., O76632.
Sindoni, Samuel S., O76634.
Skahan, Michael N., O83664.
Skelton, Robert C., O85258.
Skinner, Gary N., Sr., O89663.
Sloan, Charles W., O89381.
Smith, Albert J., O78507.
Smith, David L., O75806.
Smith, Derald H., O78508.
Smith, Donald R., O88208.
Smith, George O., O85670.
Smith, James D., O75807.
Smith, Jimmy W., O76643.
Smith, John D., O79620.
Smith, Raymond G., O74518.
Smith, Samuel E., O86786.
Smith, Walter D., O76649.
Smith, William L., O75809.
Smolenyak, George C., O76650.
Snyder, Harold B., Jr., O74522.
Snyder, James E., O88949.
Snyder, Ronald E., O78511.
Sobraske, John E., O75810.
Solberg, Anthony M., O75811.
Solley, Charles W., O74850.
Solomon, Jack M., O75812.
Somerville, Paul F., O76654.
Sones, Vernon B., O75430.
Sowers, William R., Jr., O75813.
Soyster, Harry E., O75814.
Spears, Joseph M., Jr., O75034.
Spector, Joseph H., O75815.
Spence, Ray L., O92905.
Speth, Gerald L., O85671.
Spodobalski, Anthony C., O76658.
Sprague, Charles R., O75816.
Sprague, James D., O87925.
Spurgers, Roy K., O76660.
Squires, Myron E., O74525.
Staggs, Leon D., O76663.
Stamps, John R., O75035.
Stasky, Gail V., O95107.
Stearns, Peter D., O91693.
Steed, Dale C., O94965.
Steel, Richard E., O87931.
Steffen, Albert J., O82299.
Steffen, William E., O97043.
Steger, George F., O76667.
Steimle, Carl R., O88500.
Stein, Edward J., Jr., O85265.
Stein, Michael K., O75818.
Stemley, Gary A., O75820.
Stephenson, Richard E., O75821.
Stern, Allan R., O85266.
Stevens, Francis R., Jr., O75822.
Stevens, Ronald B., O94138.
Stewart, John P., O75038.
Stewart, Kelly E., O93515.
Stewart, Robert C., O74857.
Stewart, Ronald B., O94896.
Stewart, William R., O74858.
Stinson, Kenneth B., O76669.
Stipe, Aquila E., O76670.
Stipe, John W. M., Jr., O78518.
Stockhammer, Gordon F., O79621.
Stockhausen, William T., O85803.
Stoddard, Timothy D., O75039.
Stokes, John H., 3d, O75823.
Stone, Charles B., 4th, O75824.
Stone, Gordon L., O79622.
Storms, Robert N. Jr., O80230.
Stotser, George R., O74540.
Stout, Bruce F., O75825.
Stout, Thomas E., O97209.
Stuart, James R., O74545.
Stycos, John S., O75041.
Summers, Wallen M., O75827.
Swann, Roscoe A., Jr., O77946.
Swayne, Charles J., O75042.
Swenson, James A., O75828.
Swindler, Murray G., O75829.
Szendrey, Charles P., O93087.
Szvetecz, Edward, O75830.
Takenaka, Harold H., O76685.
Talbot, George T., Jr., O89369.
Tamminen, David L., O85676.
Taylor, Billy H., O86843.
Taylor, Harry S., O85677.
Taylor, Henry S., 3d, O74557.
Taylor, James V., O75832.
Teale, Willis E., Jr., O75833.
Teasley, Harry N., Jr., O88971.
Tedeschi, Joseph R., O75834.
Tener, Robert K., O75835.
Tengan, James T., O76690.
Tengler, John A., O74867.
Terrana, Vincent, O77950.
Terry, Clifford F., O91705.
Tettelbach, Donald C., O75043.
Theroux, Gilbert L., O87638.
Thomas, Harry L., O74868.
Thomas, Robert W., O87640.
Thompson, Chadwick C., O76695.
Thompson, Ross E. G., Jr., O87946.
Thompson, Thomas G., O75837.
Thompson, William R., O75838.
Thomson, Robert W., O85272.
Tieken, Richard V., O74564.
Tilly, Clyde C., Jr., O75044.
Tilton, Robert C., O75839.
Timlin, Jerome P., O90553.
Timmons, Robert W., O76698.
Tindall, Asa W., Jr., O81752.
Todd, Carmen D., O85680.
Tomaka, Karl S., O87950.
Toole, Jay C., O75842.
Toolson, John M., Jr., O75308.
Torf, Arthur S., O85682.
Townsend, Merton L., O74570.
Townsend, Robert F., O96923.
Traficante, Anthony J., O76703.
Trdla, Joseph R., O75435.
Treat, Robert B., Jr., O78527.
Treece, Ausby J., O89156.
Tribe, Donald S., O75844.
Tucker, Andrew L., O79623.
Tucker, James M., O87646.
Tucker, Lee W., O92264.
Tullington, Bernard J., Jr., O75845.
Turk, Roy M., O74574.
Turnbull, Robert B., O75846.
Turner, Donald E., O92140.
Turner, Thomas E., 3d, O85684.
Tussing, James T., O89629.
Tweddell, Johnny B., O76711.
Undercoffer, John T., O78530.
Vail, Robert B., O76714.
Valle, John D., O76715.
Van Buskirk, Kenneth C., Jr., O76717.
Van Cleave, Henry D., Jr., O78141.
Van Herpe, William H., O85456.
Van Houten, Peter F., O75048.
Van Winkle, Daniel G., O89393.
Vandergrift, Kennard S., Jr., O82301.
Vardamis, Alexander A., Jr., O75847.
Vargo, John J., Jr., O95112.
Varner, VeLoy J., O75848.
Vaughn, Norman M., Jr., O75849.
Ventzek, Robert E., O74877.
Vermillion, Robert V., O75850.
Vickers, John H., O75851.
Vicknair, Darrell H., O92598.
Vockery, William L., O76722.
Voorhees, Theodore B., O78582.
Vossen, Francis C., O96810.
Vuono, Carl E., O75853.
Wade, Merle L., O78143.
Wadhams, Bruce M., O87652.
Wagner, Stanley G., O83668.
Waite, Richard D., O78624.
Wakefield, Donald Y., O74583.
Walker, Harry D., O76725.
Walker, Jack E., O76726.
Walker, Orien J., Jr. O93536.
Walker, Peter H., O74586.
Walker, Prosper N., O89633.
Walker, Robert E., Jr., O85460.
Wall, Walter F., O85096.
Walters, Charles O., O85691.
Ward, Jerry E., O74883.
Ward, William A., O77958.
Waring, Mowton LeC., Jr., O89308.
Waters, John L., O75857.
Watke, Frederic W., O74588.
Watkins, Edward A., Jr., O89161.
Watson, Gerald G., O76734.
Watson, James H., O83669.
Wattelet, Ronald R., O97051.
Watts, Ronald L., O74589.
Weber, Andrew M., Jr., O75858.
Webster, Howard E., Jr., O75859.
Weeks, Jimmy D., O92039.
Weeks, Leon R., O89637.
Weeks, Richard G., O76735.
Weinert, Phillip D., O77769.
Welch, Charles W., O87966.
Welch, Larry L., O74936.
Wells, David K., O85697.
Wells, Donald G., O75860.
West, Louis, O78544.
Westerfeldt, Robert C., O75861.
Westhoff, William J., O94801.
Weston, Ray D., O76741.
Wetherington, Bernard J., O74885.
Whalen, Donald P., O75862.
Wharton, Walter N., O75438.
Whatley, Howard G., O75439.
Whiddon, Orren R., O85386.
White, Billy T., O85281.
White, Jewel G., O89008.
White, Stanley Z., O76748.
Whitmire, James D., O87666.
Whitt, Lawrence H., O74888.
Whittle, William E., O94904.
Wiersema, Kenneth E., O74594.
Wilder, Allen S., Jr., O83670.
Wiley, Chester J., O74890.
Wilhelm, Edmund A., O75865.
Wilkinson, John C., O75866.
Willett, Frank W., O75867.
Willey, John L., O85462.
Williams, Charles L., 3d, O75868.
Williams, Donald E., Jr., O79628.
Wililams, Edward H., O75441.
Williams, Graybill E., O76753.
Williams, Jerry A., O92272.
Williams, Jerry R., O77964.
Williams, Richard R., Jr., O85463.
Williams, Ross S., O87972.
Williams, William J., Jr., O75442.
Williams, William S., O88230.
Williamson, James C., O76757.
Willies, Edward J., O85464.
Wilson, Albert H., 3d, O76759.
Wilson, Daniel M., O78552.
Wilson, Gordon E., O76760.
Wilson, Nicholas B., O75869.
Windsor, James A., O91427.
Winkler, Carl G., O85705.
Winne, Ross W., Jr., O92048.
Winters, Donald L., O75870.
Winters, Robert E., O75871.
Wise, Harry L., Jr., O85707.
Wise, Joseph R., O88233.
Wiser, Robert M., O74895.
Wishart, Leonard P., 3d, O75872.
Witbrodt, Donald J., O76762.
Witt, Everett L., O85286.
Witt, Jerry V., O97221.
Wittman, Clarence E., O75875.
Wold, Pedar C., O89313.
Wolfe, Robert A., O74605.
Wolfe, William D., O86952.
Wolfe, William M., O74606.
Wood, Billy B., O76764.
Wood, Peter W., O76765.
Woods, Robert D., O74608.
Woods, Robert P., O90626.
Woods, Roger B., O89826.
Woolnough, James P., O75877.
Wray, Donald E., O97223.
Wright, Stuart E., O75878.
Wright, William K., O75879.
Yates, William E., O75880.
Yeary, Ira W., O85709.
Yoos, Robert E., O86968.
Young, Charles D., O74610.
Young, Lawrence B. H., Jr., O89019.
Yuhn, John T., O76777.
Yuill, Stuart J., O85710.
Zabriskie, Cedric J., O75881.
Zachgo, Durl D., O75882.

Zarch, Alan R., O93546.
Zickel, Raymond E., O74614.
Zirkle, Michael N., O77966.
Zitz, Joseph S., O85713.
Zoeller, Robert J., O88236.
Zychowski, Edward F., O79629.

To be captain, chaplain

Beaver, Reinard W., O93129.
Clark, Donald D., O94550.
Day, Roland F., O95008.
Hilton, Gerald K., O94117.
Howerton, Robert B., O94470.
Jett, Mace T., Jr., O95047.
Kieschnick, Alton R., O95632.
Lindenauer, Jon M., O94611.
Matthias, Charles B., O95210.
Moore, Willard P., O95071.

To be captain, Women's Army Corps

Caldwell, Doris L., L596.
Clifford, Margaret, L570.
Cooper, Alice E., L594.
Hallman, Jane I., L577.
Herms, Frances K., L525.
Hess, Anne M., L524.
Homeyer, Anne W., L560.
Mastropool, Gladys N., L586.
Raines, Ruth D., L573.
Shelton, Ellen J., L505.
Sylvester, Suzanne E., L506.

To be captain, Medical Corps

Agee, Robert E., O97229.
Allen, Bohn D., O92704.
Allen, Harold J., Jr., O94793.
Annable, Charles R., O95145.
Arthur, James D., O96665.
Bean, Stuart K., O96729.
Becker, Arthur A., O96667.
Bolick, Larry E., O96670.
Bourgeois, Curtis H., Jr., O95191.
Brainard, William C., O94819.
Brougher, Robert H., O96950.
Browning, Donald G., O95211.
Burton, Thomas H., O93204.
Cason, William P., O95238.
Cocke, Joseph G., Jr., O95151.
Cohen, Richard J., O96674.
Cooper, Edgar L., O96468.
Cornell, Paul J., O95293.
Dickerson, Alfred G., O95302.
Edmonds, Paul B., O95305.
Ellison, Norig, O95480.
Evans, Richard, 3d, O95314.
Felger, Charles E., O96450.
Fuqua, William B., O96760.
Gates, Francis K., Jr., O96677.
Gerhard, Clyde, O95324.
Guiton, Carl R., O95331.
Hano, Jessie E., O96761.
Harris, Charles H., O95332.
Haymond, David R., O95333.
Helmus, Wilbert F., Jr., O95424.
Hemingway, Dennis L., O95336.
Heymann, Robert L., O95338.
Hughes, Robert P., Jr., O96325.
Hutchison, William A., O96486.
Jensen, Walter L., Jr., O96248.
Jones, Charles B., Jr., O93266.
Ladner, Calvin N., O95519.
Lawrence, Donald J., O95641.
Leary, John B., O96999.
Lett, Charles R., O97001.
Levy, Morris S., 095597.
Madison, David S., O97007.
Magoline, Alfred J., Jr., O97154.
Martin, Jerry R., O95287.
McLean, Robert B., O95759.
Miller, Donald F., O96700.
Monzingo, George F., O96703.
O'Rourke, George W., O96708.
Painter, Milford R., Jr., O96324.
Perito, John E., O97019.
Pitkethly, David T., O96419.
Quarantilo, Edward P., Jr., O93528.
Rainville, Thomas J., O96712.
Sauer, Gerald F., O92788.
Sheaffer, Harold C., O95389.
Shown, Thomas E., O96717.
Soha, Albert J., O97259.
Sprengelmeyer, James T., O95442.
Strickland, Alva L., O95398.
Terrell, Dudley J., O96805.
Thuss, Charles J., Jr., O92827.
Veatch, William M., O97048.
Wagner, Clyde W., Jr., O94534.
Washburn, Kenneth B., O95729.

To be captain, Dental Corps

Balaban, Bernard, O97084.
Bohanan, Jack R., O95593.
Cheney, Daniel K., O96749.
DuPont, Albert A., O96756.
Hirsch, Edward H., O96637.
Huget, Eugene F., O97136.
Morgan, James K., O96781.
Nelson, Robert N., O94494.
Rodenburg, Carl E., O95542.
Schwartz, Roy S., O96796.

To be captain, Veterinary Corps

Bucci, Thomas J., O92168.
Edwards, George C., O97109.
Farris, Richard D., O96964.
Ferrell, John F., O94076.
Hunt, Ronald D., O91609.
Jorgensen, Robert R., O94767.
Spertzel, Richard O., O91391.
Voelker, Richard W., Jr., O94353.

To be captain, Medical Service Corps

Allgood, Gerald D., O79546.
Amidon, Charles D., Jr., O80340.
Barber, Leroy M., Jr., O88560.
Bayne, Calvin, O85722.
Bissell, Donald F., O83558.
Bowes, Donald J., Jr., O75511.
Broadfoot, Bobby E., O89956.
Brown, George L., O79558.
Browning, Robert D., O75336.
Bryant, Robert J., O85946.
Bunce, George E., O78163.
Burris, Norman L., O91560.
Casasanta, John J., O85736.
Cedola, Vincent J., O78678.
Charlton, John L., Jr., O85499.
Clark, Harry H., Jr., O87491.
Clegg, George J., O87708.
Cooper, James D., O85740.
Cornwall, Ralph W., O86014.
Crawford, John C., O92176.
Crenshaw, William A., O79568.
Crosley, John K., O89858.
Dacus, Lester H., O74149.
Danielson, John J., O85742.
Darnauer, Paul F., O80341.
Dawson, William J., O84973.
Eberwine, James A., O88667.
Eldridge, Bruce F., O89926.
Fisher, George A., O76124.
Geringer, Gerald G., O86179.
Gossage, Donald R., O84338.
Gourley, John H., O85754.
Gulevich, Wladimir, O79677.
Harding, Clarence E., Jr., O84339.
Harris, Davis P., O88268.
Haswell, Edward A., O78681.
Heldmyer, Harry F., O78682.
Heriot, Richard M., O86250.
Herndon, Joseph E., Jr., O85765.
Hickey, George J., Jr., O85766.
Hill, William D., O92202.
Hudson, James F., O88748.
Hull, Donald R., O86288.
Inge, Bobby M., O84784.
Jordan, France F., O81875.
La Luzerne, Ronald J., O85784.
Levy, Louis B., O88786.
Liedtka, Frederick A., O88789.
Linder, William W., O94768.
Lupien, Earle E., O85205.
Maeder, Donald F., O81876.
McGinnis, John W., O78684.
McKain, Jerry L., O91641.
Mealey, John J., Jr., O88444.
Mills, Freddie J., O76430.
Moran, Homer B., O86542.
Muglia, Joseph R., O84234.
Murphy, John W., O94774.
Murray, Ernest C., O89566.
Murrell, Dan S., O80348.
Naylor, Donald L., O76460.
Neitzel, Richard F., O80349.
Oswalt, Harris G., 075407.
Otterstedt, Charles C., Junior, O86601.
Pantalone, Julius D., O86605.
Phillips, Finos J., O91353.
Piercy, John P., O91354.
Pitchford, Thomas L., O86647.
Pitts, William P., O86649.
Powell, Harold W., O88881.
Pulcini, Dino J., O92116.
Romero, Daniel J., O87600.
Sande, Sigvart, O94958.
Santori, Luis A., O76588.
Seeley, Sam T., O78169.
Shaw, Dale L., O86751.
Snell, John T., O95395.
Steinberg, Marshall C., O83846.
Stevenson, Wilbert, O90425.
Stowe, Charles L., O85107.
Stubblefield, James B., Jr., O83562.
Sutton, Mark R., O94653.
Thornburg, Lamonte F., O92576.
Timmens, James M., O91709.
Turner, James G., O76708.
Upham, Robert W., Jr., O88218.
Van Nus, Frederick, O86889.
Van Straten, James G., O88987.
Van Wyck, William E., O89305.
Villanueva, Teodoro, Jr., O88989.
Vining, John F., 3d, O88515.
Walls, Neal H., O89159.
Wangemann, Robert T., O86909.
Wilburn, James H., O89010.
Wilson, Robert G., O90613.
Wood, Malcolm H., Jr., O89015.

To be captain, Army Nurse Corps

Anderson, Helen G., N3005.
Farrell, Joanne T., N2988.
Garmon, Betty L., N3048.
Gilbrech, Carmen E., N3105.
Gregory, Barbara A., N2814.
Hanson, Carol L N2865.
Jaskoski, Margaret L., N3021.
Johnson, Hazel W., N2981.
O'Rourke, Gwendolyn L., N2915.
Sandness, Elizabeth A., N2954.
Sullivan, Elenore F., N3013.
Tauscher, Etta R., N3061.
Yoder, Ann E., N2957.

To be captain, Army Medical Specialist Corps

Brown, Eloise A., J95.
Dobbs, Eunice R., M10182.
Fritsch, Ann D., M10190.
Hyde, Patricia L., M10187.
McDowell, Joyce, M10192.
Pause, Barbara E., M10188.
Thompson, Margaret B., M10191.
Yeakel, Mary H., J92.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3298:

To be first lieutenant

Adair, Robert B., O89657.
Adams, Frank S., O89658.
Adams, Glen T., O89659.
Adams, Ralph E., Jr., O90035.
Adams, Robert T., O91733.
Adams, Wilsie H., Jr., O90638.
Adderley, David L., O89662.
Aikman, Larry P., O89664.
Alban, John H., Jr., O90639.
Aldridge, Jesse C., O89665.
Alexander, Don R., O91545.
Alexander, Joseph D., O89666.
Alguire, Robert T., O89667.
Allen, Alex L., O91737.
Allen, Donald K., O90640.
Allen, Lee, O90641.
Amirault, Robert J., O89674.
Ammerman, Robert H., Jr., O90642.
Anchors, Donald A., O89676.
Anderson, Powell R., O89680.
Anderson, Robert A., O89681.
Anderson, Warren H., O89682.
Andrews, Raymond S., Jr., O90644.
Andrews, William C., O89683.
Appell, Michael N., O89684.
Applegarth, Donald L., O89685.
Arthur, Warren A., O89689.

Ash, Hughes L., Jr., O90646.
Ax, George R., O89694.
Bailey, William N., Jr., O90647.
Baker, Anthony D., O90648.
Baker, Charles R., O90649.
Baldwin, Edward R., Jr., O90650.
Baldwin, Richard A., O89696.
Balfanz, William F., O91154.
Bara, Thaddeus J., Jr., O90651.
Bare, George P., O90652.
Barone, Ercole M., O90653.
Barr, Allyn J., O90654.
Barrell, Donald H., O90655.
Barrows, Raymond R., Jr., O90656.
Bartelt, Roger L., O91155.
Bauer, David W., O90657.
Baur, James F., O89702.
Baxter, George J., O89703.
Beaudin, Lawrence A., Jr., O89708.
Beavers, Leslie E., O90658.
Beck, William F., O90586.
Belan, Charles G., O90659.
Belanger, David P., O89713.
Belisle, Philip R., O89716.
Bellis, Edward A., 3d, O90660.
Beltz, Ronald A., O90661.
Bennett, James L., O89721.
Bennett, Thomas R., O90662.
Berstein, Joel E., O90663.
Berry, John A., 3d, O90664.
Berti, John R., O90665.
Bertocci, David I., O89722.
Bibb, Randolph T., Jr., O89726.
Bidgood, Ferdinand C., O90666.
Bierly, Robert N., Jr., O90667.
Bingham, James W., O89730.
Biondi, Richard M., O91759.
Bireley, Judson L., O90668.
Blackstone, Anthony H., O90669.
Blake, Phillip L., O90670.
Blanton, John R., Jr., O90671.
Blewett, John H., O89735.
Blitch, William T., O90672.
Bloch, Arthur LeR., O90673.
Bochnowski, Frank J., O90675.
Bogart, William V., O89738.
Bohn, Joseph P., O89739.
Bomersheim, Phil K., O89740.
Bonifay, Issaac F., Jr., O90676.
Booker, James A., Jr., O90677.
Borg, Charles T., O89844.
Boucher, Arthur G., O96739.
Bowden, John T., Jr., O91166.
Bowden, Kenneth C., O89744.
Bowers, Joseph M., Jr., O89745.
Bowersox, Wilbur G., O89747.
Boyd, Richard K., Jr., O90678.
Boyd, William L., O96740.
Boyles, Harry W., Jr., O89750.
Bradford, Larry N., O89752.
Bradley, Robert N., O94166.
Bradley, William A., Jr., O96742.
Brady, Edward J., O90679.
Brand, Harold J., Jr., O89755.
Bratz, Gordon T., O89756.
Brennan, Ambrose W., O90680.
Brett, William W., O89757.
Brickey, William E., O89423.
Brindley, Peter, O90681.
Brisach, Eugene M., O90682.
Britz, Ronald J., O92281.
Brown, Charles C., Jr., O89761.
Brown, James H., O89764.
Brown, Jay S., O90683.
Brownfield, Harold A., Jr., O90684.
Brugh, Larry D., O89773.
Brumblay, Robert H., O89774.
Brux, Gary H., O89878.
Bryant, Robert L., O89776.
Buchanan, Frank B., 3d, O91777.
Bullock, Thomas L., O90685.
Bumgardner, William H., O89778.
Bunten, Ralph T., Jr., O89779.
Bunting, Bertram A., O90686.
Burden, John R., O90687.
Burnell, Robert W., O90688.
Burns, Robert E., O90689.
Burns, Timothy F., O89783.
Bury, Robert H., O91781.
Busch, John M., O90610.
Butler, David H., O94998.
Byrnes, David F., O90690.
Cabaniss, William J., Jr., O91782.
Cafky, James W., O89791.
Caldwell, Joseph G., O90691.
Caldwell, Ora O., O90692.
Caldwell, Robert C., O89545.
Caldwell, Robert W., O89707.
Callahan, Joseph C., O89796.
Calverase, Francis J., O90693.
Calvin, Harry C., O90694.
Campbell, Charles L., O91564.
Campbell, Dan H., O90695.
Campbell, Jack A., O89798.
Campbell, Richard J., O90696.
Canant, Raymond G., O90697.
Cannon, Joe M., O90698.
Caraballo, Julian T., O90699.
Carey, Arthur T., O90700.
Carlile, Donald E., O91178.
Carlton, Terry M., O89801.
Carmean, Clayton H., Jr., O90701.
Carnaghi, Richard A., O90702.
Carpenter, William S., Jr., O90703.
Carr, John M., O89803.
Carter, Kevin R., O90705.
Carville, Louis A., 3d, O89806.
Cary, John B., Jr., O89807.
Cary, Martin W., Jr., O90706.
Casey, John L., O90707.
Castleman, Robert J., Jr., O90708.
Cato, Richard W., O90709.
Cavender, Jerry W., O91790.
Celichowski, Richard J., O91184.
Cerjan, Paul G., O90710.
Chabot, Brion V., O90711.
Chader, Gordon H., O89811.
Chaffin, Harry J., O89812.
Chamberlain, William F., Jr., O90712.
Champ, Alan D., O90713.
Chapman, Don C., O90715.
Chapman, Gerald, Jr., O90716.
Chappell, Phillip E., O90717.
Chase, William C., Jr., O90718.
Chitren, Vincent R., O90719.
Choplick, James R., O89817.
Clancy, Robert F., O90720.
Clark, Claude L., O90721.
Clark, Daniel R., O91190.
Clark, Herbert N., O89821.
Clark, Jack L., O89822.
Clay, Wayne, O90722.
Cleale, Conrad S., O89824.
Cleaver, Donald E., O89825.
Clement, Gregory C., Jr., O90723.
Click, David L., O90441.
Coffey, Lawrence R., Jr., O90724.
Cole, Robert H., O89832.
Cole, Theodore R., O89833.
Collins, Charles D., 3d, O90725.
Comfort, Gary L., O91193.
Cook, Clyde L., Jr., O91194.
Cooper, Milton E., Jr., O90727.
Coose, Alonzo, Jr., O90728.
Copeland, Clinso, Jr., O89842.
Costa, Joseph, Jr., O89846.
Costa, Louis P., O89847.
Cote, Joseph R., O90729.
Court, Reginald D., O89732.
Covan, James E., O89850.
Covell, Stilman D., Jr., O90730.
Cox, Richard L., Jr., O90731.
Creighton, William S., Jr., O89853.
Cremer, Frank N., O90733.
Cressall, William F., O89854.
Croel, Philip M., O90734.
Croll, Gerald F., O91201.
Crosby, George T., O90735.
Crossley, Ross W., O89859.
Crowley, Edward M., O90736.
Crum, Edward W., O90737.
Crump, John C., O90738.
Crutchfield, Ralph LeR., Jr., O89860.
Cruz-Casado, Hector, O91202.
Cullins, Ross H., O90739.
Cully, William J., O89862.
Culp, Richard B., O89864.
Cummings, Edward H., O90244.
Cummings, Patrick W., O91570.
Cushman, James McR., O89677.
Danforth, William W., O90740.
Daniel, James P., O89855.
Daniel, Richard A., O90741.
Danielsen, Theodore S., O90742.
Darden, Harold W., Jr., O89872.
Darling, Dean H., O90743.
Darling, Merlin D., O90744.
Dascanio, John L., O91808.
Daum, Richard S., O90745.
Davidson, Robert B., Jr., O90746.
Davis, Joal LeR., O90747.
Davis, Lynn E., O89879.
Day, Richard J., O89882.
Dawdy, William F., O90748.
Deagle, Edwin A., Jr., O90752.
Dean, Arthur J., Jr., O90753.
Dearing, David P., O89883.
Deaton, Jones T., Jr., O89885.
DeBolt, Harold F., O91206.
Decker, Roger B., O89886.
Decko, Charles C., Jr., O90754.
Del Favero, Robert V., O91573.
DeLoach, Javan M., O89889.
DelPonti, John D., O90749.
Denton, John R., Jr., O90755.
DePew, John C., O90750.
Desgroseilliers, Ronald P., O90756.
DeWitt, John L., 3d., O90751.
Dice, Denis C., O90757.
Dice, Jack W., O90758.
Diebold, Jerome A., O89406.
Dieker, Lawrence L., O91577.
Dinsmore, Paul F., Jr., O91810.
Dlugopolski, Donald J., O89465.
Donahue, Daniel J., O90759.
Donahue, Thomas J., O90760.
Donaldson, Benjamin L., O89899.
Dorf, Daniel J., O89900.
Dorsey, Ira, O90761.
Dougalas, James A., O90762.
Downey, John T., O90763.
Doyle, William J., O89903.
Drake, Earle A., O89904.
Drake, Edmond H., O90764.
Dreibelbis, Harold N., Jr., O90765.
Drewfs, Henry F., Jr., O90766.
Drisko, Richard W., O91579.
Driver, Lewis F., 3d., O89906.
Drollinger, William O., O90767.
Drumheller, Ronald E., O89907.
Dubov, Bruce J., O95011.
Duncan, Wallace H., O90769.
Dunham, Rockwood S., O89913.
Dunlap, Albert J., O90770.
DuPont, Arnold R., O90768.
Durham, John W., O90771.
Duryea, Lyman C., Jr., O90772.
Dwyre, Charles M., O90773.
Dyer, Robert E., O89917.
Dynes, John H., O89918.
Eckert, Robert D., O90774.
Eckmann, Michael R., O90775.
Edelstein, Rand, O90776.
Edgette, Charles W., O89921.
Edwards, Robert H., O89923.
Elder, Cecil W., O91220.
Elder, Jack E., O90777.
Ellis, David E., O89928.
Endicott, James A., Jr., O89678.
Endy, Clarence E., Jr., O90778.
Epley, Gerald G., Jr., O90779.
Erickson, William C., O89932.
Estes, Robert F., Jr., O90780.
Eubanks, Earl W., Jr., O90781.
Eubanks, Herman T., Jr., O90782.
Evans, Benjamin F., 3d., O90783.
Everbach, Otto G., O90784.
Eynon, Thomas F., 3d, O90785.
Faery, Henry F., Jr., O90786.
Fairchild, James B., O90787.
Fairweather, Robert S., Jr., O90788.
Fanning, John J., 3d, O91227.
Fanning, John P., O90789.
Farrell, Francis W., Jr., O90790.
Fasching, George H., O90286.
Fay, William P., O90791.
Fecht, Jack A., O89937.
Federico, Robert J., O89938.
Fedynak, Raymond E., O89939.
Fegan, Charles B., O90792.
Felber, Joseph G., Jr., O90793.
Fenton, Roland D., O90794.
Ferguson, George A., Jr., O89942.

Ferguson, Jack H., O90795.
Ferguson, Michael L., O90796.
Fero, James P., O90797.
Ferrence, Paul F., O89944.
Field, Michael F., O90798.
Fields, Harold T., Jr., O91583.
Fields, James C., O89945.
Fiero, Robert S., O91231.
Finley, George A., Jr., O90799.
Finn, Frank D., O90800.
Fioravanti, Domenic A., O89820.
Flaenery, Eugene P., O90801.
Flanagan, Thomas P., Jr., O89948.
Flint, Walker H., O90802.
Florence, William E., O90803.
Floyd, Howard J., O89952.
Flynn, Dennis J., O91824.
Forbus, Jere K., O90804.
Forster, Franz J., O89958.
Fortier, Joseph E., 3d., O90805.
Fourson, George R., Jr., O91586.
Fowler, Donald E., O89961.
Fox, Nathaniel S., O90806.
Foye, Robert, Jr., O90807.
Francis, Robert G., O89963.
Frank, John J., O91827.
Frankenberger, Charles E., Jr., O89965.
Frasche, Louis D. F., O89967.
Fraser, Howard D., O89968.
Freitag, William W., O89969.
French, William C., O89970.
Frigard, George C., O89972.
Fritts, Courtney R., O91235.
Fritts, William D., O95322.
Fritz, James E., O91236.
Frost, Dean R., O92655.
Furey, Bartley W., O90808.
Fyfe, John C., O90809.
Gabrysiak, Walter J., O91238.
Gagliano, Ross A., O90810.
Gallo, Charles L., O90811.
Gannett, Robert W., O91239.
Garcia, Jose, O91240.
Garcia, Miguel A., O91241.
Garner, George K., O90812.
Garrity, John J., Jr., O90813.
Garton, Edward R., Jr., O90814.
Garvey, James G., O90815.
Gates, Richard H., O90816.
Geehr, Richard S., O89981.
Geiger, John F., O90817.
Geisinger, John L., O91243.
German, Abraham L., Jr., O90818.
Germann, Anthony C., O91151.
Getgood, John H., O90819.
Giacoppe, George N., O90820.
Gianelloni, Sabin J., 3d, O89984.
Gibbs, Homer J., O91590.
Gibbs, John J., O89986.
Gibbs, John S., O90821.
Gick, George P., O89987.
Giese, Arthur M., O90822.
Gigicos, Chris G., O90823.
Gililland, Jerrold L., O89988.
Gill, Terrance M., O90824.
Gillespie, Richard H., O90825.
Gillespie, Wayne G., O90826.
Gilmartin, Michael W., O90827.
Glaser, Kenneth R., O89990.
Gledhill, David W., O89734.
Godwin, James S., O90828.
Good, Walter R., O90829.
Goodman, Michael L., O91843.
Goto, Arthur K., O89996.
Graham, Leonard T., O89976.
Grande, Vincent G., Jr., O90830.
Grattan, Brian T., O89998.
Gratzer, Bernard W., 3d, O89999.
Graves, Forrest V., O90831.
Green, Edward R., O90001.
Greene, Richard McD., O90832.
Greenhaw, Thomas W., O91851.
Greif, William J., O90006.
Grier, Edward G., Jr., O92060.
Griffis, Fletcher H., Jr., O90833.
Griffith, Eugene D., Jr., O90834.
Griffith, Fenton H., O90835.
Griggs, Joe H., O91258.
Guest, James A., O90012.
Guggenheimer, Max, Jr., O90015.
Guindon, Richard G., O90017.
Gulla, John F., O90836.
Gunter, William J., O91593.
Hackett, Robert T. G., O90837.
Hagan, Carig A., O90838.
Hagen, Lars B., Jr., O90019.
Hall, Frederic B., 3d, O90839.
Halley, Fred N., O90840.
Hallihan, James J., Jr., O90022.
Halsall, Ronald W., O90841.
Hamilton, George A., O90023.
Hanne, William G., O90843.
Hapeman, Elmer R., O90844.
Harcke, Howard T., Jr., O90845.
Hardenburg, William J., O90846.
Harder, Frederick R., O90027.
Hardin, Alva V., Jr., O90028.
Hardy, Albert S., 3d, O90029.
Harmon, William E., O90031.
Harnagel, William R., O90847.
Harris, Martin J., Jr., O90467.
Harrison, Kent E., O90037.
Hart, Edward D., O90040.
Hasenei, Gordon J., O91598.
Hastings, Walter D., Jr., O90848.
Hatcher, Michael J., O90849.
Haycraft, Thomas J., O90850.
Hays, Loyd J., O91264.
Healy, Richard W., Jr., O90851.
Hebert, John M., O91865.
Heckman, George M., O90852.
Helbock, Richard W., O90853.
Henderson, Arthur L., O90053.
Hendrickson, Christopher P., O90055.
Henigsman, David N., O90056.
Henry, Charles W., O90057.
Henry, George E., Jr., O90058.
Henry, Larry F., O94465.
Herman, Dean A., Jr., O90854.
Hernaiz, Alfonso M., O90062.
Herrick, Curtis J., Jr., O90064.
Herrling, John P., O90065.
Herrmann, Gerald E., O90066.
Hervert, Richard J., O90855.
Herzig, Charles W., O90067.
Hesford, John P., O90856.
Hickey, John F., O90275.
Hickman, Stanford W., O90857.
Hidalgo, Manuel A., Jr., O90858.
Hill, Kenneth R., O90859.
Hindman, John E., O94934.
Hinds, Jim E., O90098.
Hittner, Anthony L., O91271.
Hixson, John A., O90860.
Hoaas, John G., O90861.
Hodel, Gerhardt W., O91272.
Hodge, David L., O90862.
Hoffman, Robert E., O90074.
Hogan, Donal D., O90076.
Hogarth, John D., O90863.
Hohman, Roger D., O90077.
Holland, James C., O90081.
Holland, Patrick J., O90864.
Holleman, Richard J., O90865.
Holmes, Allen E., O90086.
Holmes, Simon H., O90088.
Honda, Harry T., O90090.
Hooverson, Richard L., O91276.
Hoppe, Howard J., O91345.
Hopper, James A., O90866.
Horton, Leland H., O90093.
Hourihan, William J., Jr., O90867.
House, John C., O90868.
Householder, James C., O90869.
Houston, Darrell G., O90870.
Howell, Eugene A., O90871.
Hubard, John B., O90872.
Hubbard, Donald A., O90873.
Hubbard, Johnny R., O90874.
Huber, Thomas H., O90875.
Huffine, Melvin T., O90590.
Hug, Jack P., O90876.
Hughes, Patrick R., O92663.
Humes, Jack T., O90877.
Humphrey, Theodore R., O91877.
Humphreys, James E., Jr., O90878.
Hunter, Robert L., O90107.
Hutcheson, John D., O91280.
Hutchison, Joseph W., O90879.
Hynd, John W., O90880.
Ichiyama, Ronald S., O90110.
Isham, George F., O91411.
Jackson, Charles H., Sr., O90113.
Jacques, Joseph N., Jr., O90116.
Jaeckel, Richard A., O90881.
Janszen, James H., O90882.
Jarrett, Jay H., O90122.
Jarvis, Charles W., O90123.
Jascewsky, Joseph A., Jr., O90883.
Jenrette, Albert W., O91612.
Jensen, Marvin R., O89940.
Jeszenszky, John F., O91225.
Jezior, Michael A., O90884.
Jhung, Grafton, O90885.
Jilbert, Gerald R., O90886.
Johnson, Alan E., O90887.
Johnson, Anthony, O89989.
Johnson, Frederick A., O90888.
Johnson, James B., O91287.
Johnson, James H., Jr., O90889.
Johnson, Robert C., O90890.
Johnson, Robert N., O90891.
Johnson, Thomas M., O90129.
Johnson, Thomas W., O91289.
Johnson, William LeR., O90892.
Johnston, Frederick E., 3d, O91890.
Johnston, Joseph W., II, O89688.
Jones, Arland A., O90131.
Jones, Homer W., Jr., O90893.
Jordan, Paul G., Jr., O90135.
Jordan, William J., O90136.
Joyce, Larry E., O89871.
Judson, Arthur E., O90894.
Kaiser, George F., O90895.
Kaiser, Harold F., Jr., O90139.
Kane, George R., O90140.
Kane, James R., O90896.
Kane, John J., O91291.
Kane, John P., O90897.
Kane, John R., O91292.
Kanemori, Claude H., O91293.
Karaman, James W., O90142.
Keane, John K., Jr., O90899.
Keating, Albert C., O90900.
Keene, Jack R., O91295.
Kelley, Samuel P., Jr., O90901.
Kelly, Robert R., O90148.
Kelly, William F., O95345.
Kiernan, Thomas J., O91296.
Killingstad, Karl P., O89526.
King, Jack J., O90153.
King, James R., O90154.
King, Kenneth L., O90902.
King, Lyell F., O90903.
Kinkade, David R., O95753.
Kirchner, Kenneth R., O90904.
Klein, Robert E., O90905.
Kleinstiver, Lloyd W., O91298.
Kling, Larry V., O90906.
Klosek, James W., O90907.
Klosen, Douglas F., O90158.
Kniskern, Bruce E., O90160.
Kobayashi, Norman T., O90162.
Kobza, Gene R., O91299.
Koehler, Douglas T., O90127.
Kolodziejski, Anthony J., Jr., O90166.
Kopecky, Robert J., O90168.
Kopp, Thomas E., O90909.
Kouns, Darryle L., O90910.
Krahe, Francis X., O90171.
Krape, Darryl S., O90911.
Kuhn, Wayne B., O90173.
Kuklinski, Norman J., O90912.
Kulish, Jon N., O90174.
Kuypers, Thomas O., O91306.
Kwasny, Philip M., O90334.
Labat, Roger J., O91307.
LaBlonde, George T., Jr., O90177.
Lacey, William G., O91308.
Ladehoff, Harold L., O90913.
LaForgia, Salvatore F., O95057.
Lagasse, Peter F., O90914.
Laird, William R., O90180.
Lambert, Joseph R., O90181.
Lang, William A., O91310.
Langseth, Leslie G., O90916.
Laurence, Edward J., O90917.
Lawson, Edward K., 3d., O90189.
Leamy, Charles D., O91626.
Learned, Samuel M., Jr., O90190.
Lee, Gene H., O90192.
Lee, Henry, O90919.
Lee, Stanley M., O90193.

Leech, Robert L., O90920.
Leedy, Eugene B., O91312.
LeFebvre, John A., O90918.
Le Gath, Joseph S., O91313.
Lehrer, Glenn H., O90921.
Lemmer, John F., O96431.
Lenti, John M., O90922.
Leonard, Charles F., 3d., O90195.
Leonard, James E., O91442.
Lerch, Irving A., O90923.
Letonoff, Victor T., O90924.
Leuty, Ray S., O90197.
Lewis, Jerome X., 2d., O90925.
Lewis, Sterling M., Jr., O91443.
Lincoln, James B., O90926.
Linebaugh, John M., O90202.
Linton, James E., O90203.
Littlewood, Arthur R., 3d., O90204.
Livingston, Gordon S., O90927.
Logsdon, Lawrence J., O91631.
Lohr, Richard A., O90207.
Loomis, Leonard J., O91446.
Lopez-Sanchez, Andres, O91318.
Loscuito, Ned N., Jr., O90928.
Lott, George B., Jr., O90212.
Lotz, Reinhard M., O90213.
Loundenslager, Max J., O90214.
Lovsnes, Neal W., Jr., O90216.
Lowrey, Mark P., O90929.
Lowry, Mark, 2d, O90931.
Lucas, Joseph C., O90932.
Ludovici, Kenneth R., O90933.
Lusky, Harold H., O90934.
Luster, Ira T., Jr., O90220.
Luton, Charles G., O90935.
Lynch, David F., O90223.
Lynch, Michael J., O91632.
Lynn, Frederick J., O90936.
MacAulay, David J., O90937.
Macinko, James A., O90227.
Mackin, John P., Jr., O91320.
MacLachlan, Peter, O90938.
Maddox, Edward R., Jr., O90229.
Madison, Richard J., O90245.
Maginnis, Thomas P., O90939.
Maguire, Michael E., O91450.
Maksimowski, Ferdinand, Jr., O90232.
Mallardi, Robert N., O91451.
Maloney, William H., O90940.
Mandelbaum, Charles R., O90941.
Mandry, Paul W., O90942.
Manley, Edward J., Jr., O90234.
Marcinkowski, Robert D., O90943.
Marcy, Spencer D., O90944.
Marks, Samuel L., O91452.
Marmon, Herman S., O90945.
Marotta, Joseph R., O90236.
Marshall, Dahl, O90237.
Marshall, Marion H., O90238.
Martin, John A., O90946.
Martin, Stanley J., O90239.
Martin, Williams S., O90947.
Martone, Patrick N., O90240.
Martz, John R., O90948.
Mason, John T., 3d, O90242.
Mason, Leslie P., Jr., O90949.
Maurer, Raymond W., O91453.
Mawhorter, T. J., Jr., O89881.
Mayo, John O., Jr., O90248.
McCahan, Alan R., O90253.
McCarthy, Daniel J., O90256.
McCollum, James K., O90950.
McCormick, James P., O91638.
McCormick, Michael H., O90262.
McElroy, George J., O90951.
McFaul, William N., 3d, O90952.
McGance, Philip V., O90953.
McGeary, Martin N., Jr., O90271.
McGough, James B., Jr., O90272.
McGushin, Edward F., O90274.
McInerney, Richard N., O90954.
McKee, Michael R., O90276.
McKinney, John J., O90955.
McLaughlin, Eugene J., O90956.
McManus, George H., O90957.
McNamara, William T., O90958.
McPherson, Thomas H., O91456.
McQuillen, George P., O90959.
McWain, James T., O90282.
Meany, George E., O91644.
Mease, Jennings H., O90960.
Medenbach, Philip C., O90287.
Melcher, John F., Jr., O90288.
Menzner, Robert J., O90962.
Mercado, Robert K., O90963.
Meriaux, Richard D., O90293.
Merlick, Carroll W., O90294.
Merrill, Sherburn W., Jr., O91933.
Meyers, Robert W., Jr., O90298.
Michels, Raymond D., O90299.
Mierau, Michael D., O90964.
Miles, John L., Jr., O90301.
Miles, Paul L., Jr., O90965.
Miller, Bill E., O91459.
Miller, Carl D., O90966.
Miller, Dyson R. C., O90967.
Miller, George P., O90303.
Miller, Gerald C., O90304.
Miller, John Z., Jr., O90968.
Miller, Richard S., O90305.
Mills, Robert H., O90969.
Minick, John M., O90307.
Miser, Robert S., Jr., O90970.
Misura, John P., O90971.
Mitchell, Edwin A., O91461.
Mitchell, Stuart G., O91462.
Mitchell, Tilden A., 3d, O91463.
Mollohan, Keith C., O90308.
Molskow, Thomas S., O90309.
Montgomery, John P., O90311.
Montgomery, Robert E., Jr., O90972.
Mooney, Michael J., O90973.
Moore, Frederick T., 3d, O90312.
Moore, Thomas P., Jr., O90313.
Morabit, Joseph L., O91466.
Morgan, Charles H., O91334.
Morgan, Douglas S., O90974.
Morgan, Kearney H., Jr., O90315.
Morin, Reynold, O90975.
Morse, Thomas McN., O90318.
Morrison, Robert G., O90976.
Morton, John A., O90319.
Mosbrooker, Michael L., O91467.
Mostek, Donald S., O91336.
Mowery, Hartman B., Jr., O90977.
Muck, Jack LeR., O91951.
Muehlberger, Albert A., O90321.
Mulholland, Robert B., Jr., O90322.
Munson, Don B., O90328.
Murphy, Robert C., O91468.
Murphy, William F., O90978.
Murray, Marvin R., Jr., O91469.
Murrill, Fredrik H., O90329.
Myers, Robert M., O90979.
Myers, William N., Jr., O90980.
Naatjes, Clarence S., O90331.
Nadeau, Joseph E., O90332.
Naftzinger, Joseph E., O90981.
Napier, Brian T., O90333.
Neely, Charles R., O90982.
NeeSmith, Delmus M., O90337.
Nehammer, Karl F., O90339.
Nelson, Charles R., O90983.
Nelson, George W., Jr., O91654.
Nelson, Landy T., O91655.
Nevins, Bruce S., O90984.
Newman, John R., O90341.
Nichols, John W., O91341.
Noble, George P., 3d, O90345.
Nobles, Charles S., O90986.
Noel, Thomas E., 3d, O90987.
Nolan, Howard J., O90346.
Norman, William L., O95369.
Norton, Dale F., O90347.
O'Brey, Earman D., O91478.
O'Brien, Joel T., O90349.
O'Brien, Richard J., O90350.
O'Brien, Thomas F., 3d, O90351.
O'Connell, James T., Jr., O90988.
O'Connor, Roy J., Jr., O90989.
Oerding, James B., O90993.
O'Keefe, Joseph D., O90990.
O'Leary, Daniel L., O90991.
Oliver, John H., O91482.
O'Malley, Thomas K., O90992.
Orr, Danford M., O90994.
Oswandel, Robert E., O90995.
Otstott, Charles P., O90996.
Overholser, William H., O91968.
Owens, Bobby L., O90997.
Paaso, Thomas H., O91969.
Pachosa, Matthew H., O90361.
Painter, Donald E., O90362.
Painter, William L., Jr., O90363.
Palm, Larry B., O90365.
Parent, Joseph W., O91348.
Parker, Eliot V., Jr., O90999.
Parker, Frank W., O90367.
Parker, Henry B., O90368.
Parker, Neal G., O91000.
Partlow, Frank A., Jr., O91001.
Patch, Robert W., O94631.
Patterson, Robert G., O91002.
Paulsen, Hans W., O90372.
Pearce, David L., O90376.
Pearl, James H., 2d, O91003.
Pellicci, Jack A., O91004.
Pepe, Michael J., O90379.
Perham, Whitman C., 2d, O90380.
Perkins, Randall A., Jr., O91005.
Peterson, Levi A., O90383.
Petter, David T., O91975.
Pitcher, Thomas B., O90387.
Pitts, Larry W., O91007.
Plummer, Frederick B., Jr., O91009.
Plummer, Michael T., O91010.
Pope, Fred R., O90390.
Post, Elwyn D., Jr., O91011.
Powers, James A., O91012.
Powers, Sidney H., O90392.
Prall, Eric L., O90393.
Presley, John R., O91014.
Prosser, Donald W., O91015.
Pyle, Richard G., O90399.
Queeney, Richard K., O91016.
Quinlan, John G., O91487.
Radike, David N., O90401.
Rains, Franklin D., O90404.
Ramos, James R., O91017.
Ramsey, Edward L., 3d, O90405.
Rapp, Charles G., O90406.
Rappaport, Arthur N., O90408.
Rau, Raymond R., O91491.
Raymond, Charles W., 3d, O90410.
Raymond, William M., O91018.
Reber, John L., O91019.
Redemann, David H., O91493.
Reece, Frank S., O90413.
Reed, Henry McD., 2d, O90415.
Ready, Clyde M., O90416.
Reese, Eugene P., Jr., O91020.
Reese, Robert W., O90417.
Reichard, Birge D., Jr., O90419.
Reid, John C., O91021.
Reiff, Jonathan D., O90420.
Remus, Ernest A., O91022.
Reynolds, Harry L., O91987.
Rice, Frederick C., O91023.
Rich, Terrence LaV., O91024.
Richards, David J., O91500.
Richeson, Alfred K., O91025.
Rider, Frank W., O91990.
Riley, Paul K., 090427.
Ritchie, William L., 2d, O91026.
Rivell, Gerard J., O91027.
Robbins, Chandler P., 3d, O91028.
Roberts, Paul A., O91029.
Robertson, Edward H., Jr., O90429.
Robinson, Tom A., O91030.
Robocker, William W., O91031.
Rollins, Melvin W., Jr., O91032.
Rose, Louis, O90433.
Rose, Richard G., O90434.
Ross, Kenneth L., O90438.
Rossman, Jack, O97029.
Roth, Howard W., Jr., O91503.
Rouse, Richard F., O91677.
Rowe, James N., O91033.
Rucker, Richmond W., O91995.
Rudesill, Robert S., O91034.
Ruedel, William P., O91035.
Rumbaugh, Max E., Jr., O91036.
Ruppert, James D., O91037.
Rux, William A., 2d, O91038.
Ryan, Joseph E., O90448.
Ryan, Michael F., O90449.
Ryan, Michael T., O91039.
Ryan, Roger McK., O91040.
Saalfrank, David C., O91375.
Safford, Donald B., O90451.
Sartoris, William W., O91042.
Saum, Clyde F., O90453.
Savio, Paul J., O91043.

Scanlon, Shaun J., O91680.
Schaaf, James C., Jr., O90455.
Schaefer, Grant A., O91044.
Schatzman, Thomas F., O91045.
Schiemann, Robert J., O91046.
Schmidt, Leroy A., O91047.
Schmidtman, Michael C., O90460.
Schmitt, Charles T., O91048.
Schofield, Richard T., Jr., O91050.
Schrankel, Charles R., O91051.
Schreiber, John H., Jr., O90466.
Schroeder, Fredrick U., O91052.
Schuler, David B., O90468.
Schumann, Lawrence J., O90471.
Schweickert, William J., Jr., O90476.
Schwoob, James F., O91053.
Scott, Stephen H., O91054.
Scudder, William I., O91055.
Seagren, Eric H., O90477.
Searles, Jonathan W., O91056.
Seaward, Richard S., O91057.
Seely, John B., O91058.
Sexton, William T., Jr., O91059.
Seymour, Roger G., O91060.
Shepherd, Billy J., O90481.
Sheppeck, Michael L., Jr., O91062.
Shevlin, George L., Jr., O90482.
Shimek, Daniel W., O91064.
Shost, Alan T., O91065.
Shuey, Richard P., O91066.
Shumway, Richard S., O90484.
Sills, Edward G., O90485.
Simmons, Denis L., O90487.
Simpson, Andrew R., O90488.
Simpson, William C., O90489.
Skinner, William J., O91067.
Slattery, Stephen McL., O90493.
Slovacek, Anthony S., O90494.
Smilikis, Peter J., O90496.
Smith, Daniel A., O91068.
Smith, Donald E., O91511.
Smith, Harold B., O91069.
Smith, Irving B., O90498.
Snyder, Stephen J., O91385.
Sorensen, Ralph L., O91386.
Spain, William H., Jr., O90508.
Spangler, Robert LaV., O91387.
Spigarelli, Raymond F., O90511.
Spigelmire, Michael F., O90512.
Spin, William A., O90513.
Spivy, Berton E., 3d, O91070.
Sprengeler, Ronald J., O91517.
Sprinsky, William H., O91518.
Squire, Joseph W., O91071.
Stacy, Tommy J., O91691.
Stanfill, James H., O97042.
Stanley, George R., Jr., O91072.
Starling, James D., O91073.
Stauber, Jerome E., O91519.
Steele, John S., O91074.
Stehling, Joseph M., Jr., O91075.
Stem, David H., O91076.
Stephens, William J., O91695.
Stilwell, Joseph W., 3d, O91077.
Stockman, William L., 3d, O90522.
Stovall, Rayburn C., O90524.
Straetz, Donald F., O91078.
Strasbourger, Edward, O91079.
Strother, William M., Jr., O90526.
Strzelecki, Leonard S., O90528.
Stulga, Charles A., O91396.
Sturgeon, Charles E., O91080.
Sugdinis, Joel E., O91081.
Sugg, Barney A., O90531.
Sullivan, Anthony D., O90532.
Sullivan, James A., Jr., O90533.
Summers, Don A., O91082.
Sutton, Adolph, Jr., O91083.
Sutton, David J., O91398.
Sutton, Richard O., Jr., O91084.
Swain, Paul C., O91085.
Swedberg, Robert C., O90535.
Symonds, Paul S., O91086.
Taggart, Homer G., O90537.
Tamplin, William F., Jr., O91087.
Tancreti, Roger J., Jr., O90539.
Taylor, Hurl R., Jr., O90543.
Taylor, John N., O91088.
Taylor, Thomas H., O91089.
Ten, Brook, James J., O91090.
Terry, Frederick G., Jr., 091091.
Thacker, James F., O90544.
Thompson, Francis J., O91092.
Thompson, Olin R., Jr., O91093.
Thorne, Tommy L., O90548.
Thornton, William F., O90549.
Throckmorton, Thomas B., O91094.
Tichenor, James R., 3d, O91095.
Tillman, Clifford R., O90552.
Timmerman, Benjamin R., O91528.
Titmas, James A., O91404.
Titus, Charles M., O91096.
Totten, Robert G., O91097.
Tousey, Walter C., O91098.
Tozer, William S., O91099.
Trauner, Ronald F., O91100.
Trautmann, Eugene O., O90557.
Trickett, Frederick R., O91101.
Tripician, Philip A., O91102.
Tripp, Robert H., O91103.
Trodella, Robert A., O91104.
Trunk, dePaul R., O90560.
Tuxill, Richard W., O90563.
Tyre, David H., O90564.
Tyson, Richard L., O90565.
Valente, Thomas E., Jr., O91106.
Valliant, Charles M., O91107.
Vanderslice, Gary E., O91529.
Van Riper, Thomas P., O91105.
Varnon, Jerry R., O92266.
Vaughan, Herbert E., O90571.
Veal, William T., Jr., O91108.
Vencill, William A., O91109.
Vermilyea, Carl P., O90572.
Vickers, Anthony M., O90573.
Waddell, Ralph L., O90576.
Wade, Milledge E., Jr., O91110.
Wagner, Richard W., O90577.
Walczak, Edward J., O91111.
Waldhour, Louis G., O90578.
Waldrop, Stephen P., O91112.
Waldrop, William R., O90579.
Walker, Clifford C., O91410.
Walker, Philip A., Jr., O91113.
Waller, Bobbie J., O90583.
Walter, Richard E., O91114.
Waters, Russell A., O91115.
Watkins, Charlie C., O91116.
Watson, Henry C., 3d, O91117.
Watts, Pitt M., 3d, O90587.
Webb, Gerald E., O90589.
Wecker, David D., O91530.
Weiler, John E., Jr., O91118.
Weinhold, Robert W., O91532.
Welch, Michael N., O90594.
Wentworth, David B., O91119.
Whaples, Gene C., O90598.
Wharton, Gerald M., O96569.
Wheeler, Mason W., O91535.
White, Harry N., O91120.
White, James McR., O91121.
Whitehead, Floyd D., O91122.
Whitmore, Thomas N., O91123.
Wienser, Neil R., O89642.
Wild, Allen R., O95636.
Wildenthaler, Leo E., O91536.
Wiley, Joseph P., O91124.
Wiley, Noble J., 3d, O91125.
Wilhelm, Robert S., O91422.
Wilkes, John S., 3d, O91126.
Wilkie, David G., O91127.
Willauer, John H., O91128.
Williams, Charles E., O90609.
Williams, Larry M., O91129.
Williams, Lonnie B., Jr., O91424.
Willoughby, William H., Jr., O91130.
Wilson, Cyrus C., O92038.
Wilson, Daniel H., O91132.
Wilson, Gene R., O91133.
Wilson, James R., Jr., O91537.
Wilson, John H., O91426.
Wilson, Walter K., 3d, O91134.
Winchester, Wayne, O92047.
Windsor, Humphrey F., O91135.
Winston, Lawrence J., O90617.
Winters, Gerald F., O91136.
Wisby, James M., O90619.
Witcher, Robert A., O91539.
Witherspoon, Jerry W., O91137.
Witschard, Walter A., O92049.
Wolfarth, William M., Jr., O93345.
Wolff, James W., O91429.
Wollmering, Lawrence E., O91430.
Wood, Anthony B., O91138.
Wood, Charles H., Jr., O91139.
Wood, John W., Jr., O91140.
Woodbeck, Charles A., O91542.
Wrockloff, George E., 3d, O91141.
Yamaguchi, Phillip T., O90628.
Yeager, William E., O91142.
Yeagley, John P., O91143.
York, James J., O91144.

To be first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps

Barnes, Perry A., O96666.
Shannon, Sam Jr., O97258.

The following-named person for appointment in the Regular Army by transfer in the grade specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

To be first lieutenant

Taylor, Horace G. (MSC), O90542.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

To be captains

Clark, Richard W., Jr., O4010936.
Grasbner, Siegfried L., O2284992.
Heller, John M., O4074392.
Keller, William K., O4040532.
McKnight, Robert W., O4074412.
Tambling, Robert F., O4027748.
Temperley, Nicholas R., O4074430.
Webster, William L., O4074435.

To be first lieutenants

DelRosso, Louis J., O2309918.
Dierickx, James E., O5208511.
Hall, John F., O5404372.
Massabni, Fadlo M., O5200338.
Schimming, James L., O5403609.
Stewart, James T., O5200267.
Williams, Richard L., O5301722.

To be second lieutenants

Anderson, Charles, Jr., O5410791.
Brooks, William A., Jr., ER14679757.
Click, Ira N., O5411935.
Henry, Patrick J., O95209115.
Mathews, Kenneth J., O5007273.
Sewell, Gerald L., O5412141.
Volta, Donald H., O5707373.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, 3289, 3290, 3291, 3292, 3293 and 3294:

To be major, Medical Corps

Frankel, Alan L., O1745897.

To be major, Medical Service Corps

Archer, Donald E., O1545976.

To be captain, Army Nurse Corps

Johnson, Lois V., N900419.

To be captain, chaplain

Moore, Jesse W., O5301257.

To be captains, Dental Corps

Bleich, Charles A., O5206887.
Chinn, Clarence Y. L., O5202689.
Connelly, Mark E., O5213577.
Decker, Richard M., O5701377.
Dusterwinkle, Sherwood A., O5501627.
Filler, William H., O5306877.
Houston, James E., O5213576.
Karas, Richard P., O5213571.
Singdahleen, Donald A., O5004056.
Strock, Richard G., O5500839.
Watts, Thomas R., O5518082.

To be captain, Judge Advocate General's Office

Taylor, Arthur H., O4014920.

To be captains, Medical Corps

Angello, Anthony L., O5217691.
Anthony, Courtney L., Jr., O2300451.

Arzola, Ivan F., O5004974.
Blount, Robert E., Jr., O2309290.
Brandel, George P., O73619
Feltis, James M., Jr., O469568.
Figlock, Thaddeus A., O5013111.
Hager, Harry G., O5217324.
Jones, Robert E., Jr., O5312734
Keller, Howard I., O5217665.
Kimball, Frank B., O2298403.
Konzen, Jon L., O4059898.
Halloy, John P., O2298153.
Manson, Richard A., O5215471.
Martens, Thomas J., O5518346.
Mayson, Preston B., Jr. O72144.
Morel, Donald E., O5213997.
Mortenson, Francis N., O5703578.
Omer, Lewis M., 3d., O2305004.
Pollard, William R., O2300489.
Rivera-Betancourt, Rafael A., O5826366.
Schneider, Robert D., O5518360.
Smith, Richard S., O5706111.
Stambaugh, Roy A., O5501070.
Sube, Janis, O5216707.
Sullivan, James A., O5012555.
Swanson, David L., Jr., O5701663.
Thomas, James A., Jr., O5219881.
Thompson, Robert L., O5206004.
Walter, John D., O5518415.
Webster, Stephen B., O5518385.
Weeldreyer, Robert L., O4060482.
Wimsett, Willard B.
Zeigler, Michael G., O73943.

To be captain, Medical Service Corps

Loy, Vance A., 04012722.

To be captain, Veterinary Corps

Whitney, Robert A., Jr., O2298182.

To be first lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps

LaMontagne, Mary E., N2305970.

To be first lieutenants, Judge Advocate General's Office

Heath, Stratton R., Jr., O5509875.
Lavine, Sanford V., O2308020.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Corps

Bacon, William L., O5306856.
Hutchison, James R., O2309218.
Lillie, Homer J., Jr., O5216800.
Manuel, Wilbert J., O5408309.
Nilges, Thomas C., O2305703.
Phillips, Wesley F., O5306934.
Robinson, Frederick C., O2309170.
Schaaf, Daniel J., O5518990.
Schults, Boyd L., O2309243.
Segal, Avron C., O5210990.
Simmons, James W., Jr., O2309490.
Stoller, Jerry J., O5506978.

To be first lieutenant, Veterinary Corps

Walker, Jerry S., O5518611.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3290:

Fahle, Leroy D.
Grosshans, John H.
Mace, James E.
Jones, Lewis M.
Megehee, Jacob H.
Wichelt, Roger H.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287 and 3288:

Adamick, Donald H.
Anderson, Aggrey V.
Au, Larry W.
Baird, Edmund C., Jr.
Balady, Salim J.
Banta, Theodore S., Jr.
Barber, Victor C.
Barovetto, John L.
Battilega, John A.
Benson, Richard W.
Black, John R.
Bolme, Bruce M.
Bradford, John D.
Brake, Perry F.
Brassfield, Wallace W.
Brewer, Thomas A.
Brinkley, Harley L.
Brookshire, Carl W.
Brown, Gerald M.
Brown, Ruel R.
Brunner, Harry J., Jr.
Butler, Johnny M.
Byard, Johnny R.
Cady, Donald F.
Carletti, Stephen J.
Carlson, Albert E.
Carmouche, Joseph M.
Carroll, Bartlett J., Jr.
Charles, Doran W.
Cheal, Arnold E.
Church, Billy R.
Colavita, Henry J., Jr.
Coley, John H., III
Cook, Alan W.
Cook, John R.
Cory, Mark E., III
Crouch, William W.
Curtis, Wayne C.
Cutler, Richard A.
Dansby, James C.
Davidson, Joe W.
Diehl, Richard P.
DiFranco, Salvatore J.
Domingos, Manuel P., III
Draughn, James B., Jr.
Dunn, Thomas P.
Eaglin, Fulton B.
Ecclestone, John S., II
Elliott, Dick D., Jr.
Engle, Benjamin J.
Falkenrath, James H.
Feliciano, Jose R.
Freck, William B.
Glover, Alan F.
Goldstein, Ronald J.
Grady, Bernard E.
Graham, Bobby L.
Graham, John F., Jr.
Graham, Thomas A., III
Graves, Billy D.
Gunn, Walter E.
Haines, John L., Jr.
Hannah, Douglas W.
Hansard, James B.
Harrell, George L., II
Hart, Stacy L.
Hartjen, Raymond C., Jr.
Haught, Jacob R.
Hawken, Harvey H.
Haywood, Charles E.
Higgins, James E.
Hinshaw, William L., II
Hoefer, George M., Jr.
Hohers, Melvin A.
House, Ronald L.
Hudson, McKinley
Hughes, Joe H., Jr.
Hurst, Bobby R.
Jones, Tommy M.
Jung, Leon
Justis, James C.
Kayes, Joseph E.
Kennard, Robert B.
Kidd, John C., II
Kieft, Lewis D.
Kitchens, Larry J.
Kopcsak, Arpad A., Jr.
La Greca, John S.
Langston, Jerry W.
Leavitt, Thomas P.
Ledbetter, Charles T.
Litton, James L.
Logan, Lamar B.
Lollar, Howard W., Jr.
Long, George L.
Long, John A.
Long, Wendel L.
Lowrie, Michael A. M.
Lupardus, Carl R.
Mathewes, Paul H., Jr.
Maylie, Joseph W.
McDonald, Benjamin H., Jr.
McLain, Paul X.
Mellon, Joe S., Jr.
Melton, Stephen A.
Mennella, Kenneth R.
Mensch, Raymond G.
Miles, Wilson D.
Miller, James W.
Mooney, David J.
Morris, Charles T.
Mowery, Ralph B.
Mulcahy, Charles J.
Mullen, William A., Jr.
Mulvihill, Lee P.
Neil, Donald L.
Ogasaware, Roy M.
Onufer, Barry R.
Pancoast, Henry M.
Parks, Robert R.
Partridge, Peter E.
Pendleton, Richard F.
Pettyjohn, Charles S.
Phillips, Jeffrey T.
Phillips, Keith J.
Pohlman, Dolpyh O., Jr.
Powers, Jerry H.
Quinones, Joseph M.
Ragsdale, Jack D., Jr.
Reed, Charles W., Jr.
Reed, Donald J.
Reed, George B., Jr.
Renwick, Harold M., Jr.
Reynolds, Howard I.
Reynolds, Irvins, H.
Rhodes, Dennis D.
Robinson, Paul J.
Rochon, Everette C.
Rogers, Don E.
Rush, Wayne A.
Sadler, Orin W., IV
Sarratt, Robert R.
Scott, William A.
Sedlock, Michael E.
Shell, William L.
Sivells, James B.
Skilton, Robert H., III
Smith, Nathaniel E.
Smith, Vernon L.
Sollinger, Jerry M.
Sowers, Errol G.
Stallwitz, John F.
Steadman, Robert P.
Stemler, Orrin A.
Stiner, Tommy C.
Stotski, Chester J.
Streetmaker, John I.
Strenn, Carl L.
Sullivan, Bloomer D.
Swan, Alfred W., Jr.
Tagliaferi, Frederick L.
Tanis, Glenn R.
Thomson, Richard W.
Tilson, James G.
Tyner, Harris W.
Vaughn, Robert H.
Vesey, Joseph T.
Walker, John J.
Walter, David P.
Ward, Richard F.
Watson, Jerry L.
Way, David E.
Whiting, William B.
Wilkinson, John H.
Williams, Freddie W.
Williams, Robert G.
Williams, William J.
Willman, Landon P.
Wilson, Virgil L.
Winder, Gordon L.
Wishowski, Thomas M.
Wood, Blair C., Jr.
Yearout, Paul H.
Zalaha, John W.
Zimmerman, James E.

The following-named cadets, graduating class of 1963, U.S. Military Academy, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 4353:

Adams, Jack E.
Adams, Peter D.
Alakulppi, Vesa J.
Alexander, William H.
Alger, Terrence F.
Allen, Jonathan W.
Allen, Michael B.
Almaguer, Joseph A.
Andersen, Jerome R.
Anderson, Lawrence V., Jr.
Arbogast, Cordon W.
Armogida, James A.
Armstrong, Donald G.
Asbury, Lloyd T.
Bagby, Durwood R.
Ballard, Clark T., Jr.
Banks, Edgar, Jr.
Barron, Max R.
Barry, Michael J.
Bassett, Byron E.
Baucum, William N.
Beach, Karl L.
Beatty, Norman E.
Bell, John P.
Bentson, Peter M.
Bentz, George H.
Best, Stephen J.
Betaque, Norman E., Jr.
Bivens, Rodger M.
Blackgrove, Joseph F., IV
Blackwell, Eugene B., Jr.
Blackwell, James L., Jr.
Boehlke, Robert J.
Boice, William M.
Bollinger, Eugene R., Jr.
Bosma, Phillip H.
Bowes, Robert S., III
Boyle, Michael J.
Brendle, Thomas M.
Brennan, Thomas R.
Brightman, Austin C., Jr.
Britten, Lawrence A.
Brown, Noel A.
Brown, Ralph P.
Brown, Robert E., Jr.
Brown, William R., Jr.
Brownback, Paul T.
Bruce, Robert
Buchheim, Steven O.
Buckley, Peter J.
Byrne, Donald G.
Byrnes, John W.
Caldwell, Harold E.
Capps, Larry R.
Cargile, Eugene D.
Carney, Thomas P.
Carns, Edwin H. J., Jr.
Casey, Thomas E.
Caywood, James R.
Chapman, Alan A.
Chase, Jack S.
Chickedantz, Carl E.
Childers, Stephen A.
Chrisman, Ronald G.
Christensen, Allen R.
Clark, Allen B., Jr.
Clark, William N.
Clay, Michael A.
Clinton, Roy J.
Coe, Gary Q.
Cole, David L.
Cole, Richard B.
Coleman, Donald H.
Conlon, Arthur F.
Conrad, Donald H.
Cook, Lyndel L.
Cooke, William J., Jr.
Coomer, William O.
Cornfoot, James L.
Coulson, Robert T., Jr.
Counts, John E.
Cowgill, Parker J.
Crumpler, William B.
Cummings, Frederick B.
Cunningham, Alden M.
Cunnginham, Michael J.
Curtis, Charles C.
Dalia, Jeffrey L.
Daniels, James E.
Davenport, George W., Jr.
Davidson, Sam R.
Davis, Jack S., Jr.
Davis, Robert J.
De Graff, George C., Jr.
De Maret, Will E.
De Smet, Dennis A.
De Wire, James E.
Demchuk, Daniel
Dickey, James S.
Dickson, Harry R.
Doherty, James E., III
Dolighan, Thomas A.
Donovan, Robert E.
Dorland, John H.
Douglas, Fred R., Jr.
Dowling, Dean E.
Downey, Walter D., Jr.
Drain, Robert W.
Drewfs, Ralph M.
Drewry, Arthur C., Jr.
Dunn, John A.
Dusenbury, Donald S.
Dwyer, John A.
Dwyer, John R., Jr.
Earnest, Olen L.
Eberts, Miles M.
Eckert, Richard E.
Ehrenberg, Rudolph, H., Jr.
Ellerson, Geoffrey D., Jr.
Ellerson, John C.
Ellis, Bruce H., Jr.
Embree, Howard D.
Emerick, Michael L.
Empson, A. Holmes, IV
Entlich, Richard E.
Esposito, Curtis V.
Fairbanks, Leigh C., III
Farris, Ivan R.
Fletter, Wolfgang A.
Foley, Robert F.
Folsom, Spencer A., Jr.
Ford, John N.
Forsythe, Thomas K.
Fuller, George D.
Gallagher, Thomas F.
Gallaher, Richard C.
Galle, Joe F.
Gantzler, Fred E., Jr.
Garvey, Dale M., Jr.
Genetti, Albert J., Jr.
George, William H., Jr.
Gibbs, Frank C., III
Gideon, Wendell R.
Gilbert, Michael V.
Gladfelter, Douglas M.
Goldsmith, Richard H.
Goodnow, Walter L., Jr.
Goorley, John T.
Goth, Stephen C.
Gothreau, Andrew F.
Grabner, William J.
Graham, Kenneth R., Jr.
Green, James A., III
Gregorczyk, Leonard C.
Greybeck, Edward M.
Griffin, Donald K.
Griffin, Thomas H.

Griffith, Paul D.
Griffith, Thomas R.
Grogan, Timothy J.
Grolemund, William J.
Guilhaus, Howard H.
Guthrie, Richard P.
Hable, Paul R., Jr.
Haines, Palmer S.
Halgus, Joseph D.
Hall, Francis G., Jr.
Hall, Garrett S.
Hall, Peter M.
Hamilton, George T.
Handcox, Robert C.
Hannigan, James R.
Hanson, Russell V., Jr.
Harman, Thomas E.
Harrington, John M.
Harrison, Jerry C.
Hartman, Charles D., III
Hawkins, William C.
Heiden, Heidi B.
Heim, Bruce K.
Henderson, Frederick H.
Henning, Paul H., III
Hewette, James B., Jr.
Higgins, Richard G.
Hill, Edward F.
Hingston, William E., Jr.
Hogg, Charles C., II
Holland, Homer J.
Hollander, Kenneth N.
Holterman, Gordon C.
Hotman, Clyde W., Jr.
Hudson, Roland B., III
Hughes, James S.
Hustead, Stephen C.
Ingram, Lionel R., Jr.
Ischinger, Martin M.
Jackson, David S.
James, Richard D.
Janof, Lawrence S.
Jaworowski, Joseph J., Jr.
Jenison, Raymond L.
Jenks, Michael M.
Johnson, Douglas V., II
Johnston, Reynold A.
Jones, Alan F.
Jones, Bradley K.
Jones, James A., Jr.
Karoly, Frank J.
Karr, Thomas W.
Kauza, John J., Jr.
Keaveney, Michael W.
Kelley, William T.
Kelly, Colin P., III
Kelly, Peter A.
Kelly, Peter M., III
Kelly, Thomas J.
Keteltas, Gilbert C.
Kilroy, Michael W.
Kingry, Roy L., Jr.
Kinsey, Charles H., Jr.
Knowlton, David W., III
Kosevich, Richard S.
Kunzig, Louis A., III
La Fond, Clovis O.
Lang, Stephen A.
Lawn, Michael J., Jr.
Leach, Dennis A.
Lee, Edward M., Jr.
Lengyel, Joseph W., Jr.
Lennon, Francis L.
Lewis, Arthur C.
Lewsen, Robert F.
Little, David R.
Little, William W.
Loden, George I. P.
Lujan, Armando
Lundin, Jon E.
Lutz, Ward A.
Lutz, William G.
Mabardy, David M.
Mallison, Thomas C.
Manning, Roger D.
Marchand, Gary J.
Mari, Louis A.
Marrow, Alvin J.
Marrs, Glenn R.
Mataranglo, Francis T.
Matteson, Richard J.
Maxwell, Paul F.
Mayer, Haldane R.
McCabe, Robert L.
McCarver, James M.
McClatchey, Jay J.
McCord, Burton K.
McCormack, Michael S.
McCrary, Wiley W.
McGarity, Robert L., Jr.
McIntyre, Michael J.
McKinnon, Richard A.
McNeill, Robert H., II
McQuary, Ray J.
Means, Dale F.
Medlin, Laurence R.
Meier, Arthur C., II
Malanson, Ronald A.
Mercer, Carl W.
Merrill, Robert K.
Merritt, William P.
Metzger, Robert S., Jr.
Miller, Bruce F.
Miller, George M., Jr.
Miller, Michael D.
Millerlile, William M.
Mitchell, Kenny D.
Mitchell, Ralph M., II
Mock, Phillip W.
Moose, Raymond R.
Morehead, Wayne E.
Morgan, John F.
Morris, Henry
Moses, George L.
Mosier, Douglas K.
Murff, James D.
Murphy, Dennis C.
Myers, Douglas V.
Myers, Duane H.
Nahlik, Charles V.
Nakashima, Gerald N.
Natvig, Cliff M., Jr.
Nelander, James C.
Nelson, Harold W.
Nicholas, Walter D.
Nolan, James T.
O'Connor, James M.
O'Donnell, John R.
O'Sullivan, Kenneth E.
O'Toole, Robert H.
Odland, Robert O.
Oliver, John F., III
Olsen, Alexander K.
Orlicki, George A.
Orndorf, Harvey W.
Otis, Malcolm D.
Owen, William J.
Palmer, Robert C.
Pappas, George
Parker, John E.
Patten, Lynne M.
Perry, George E., III
Pierson, Rex F.
Pogorzelski, Jerome A.
Popielarski, Stephen J., Jr.
Porper, Henry H., Jr.
Prutow, Dennis J.
Quinlan, Michael M.
Rasmussen, Ralph J.
Reh, Paul A., Jr.
Reilly, Iain
Reinholtz, Richard K.
Rice, Lewis A.
Riceman, John P.
Robbins, John R., II
Robbins, William Y.
Robert, Emile A., Jr.
Roberts, James F., Jr.
Roberts, Richard H.
Robertson, Joe B.
Robey, Lyle G.
Robinson, William A.
Rolfe, Charles O., Jr.
Roth, John C. C.
Rowan, Edmond M., Jr.
Russell, Thomas A.
Ruth, James M., Jr.
Ryan, Arthur J., III
Sage, Terence F.
Sallee, David K.
Sanchez, Luis T., Jr.
Sarn, James E.
Sartor, William M., Jr.
Sausser, Robert G.
Sawin, Peter L.
Scharf, Richard D.
Schaum, Fred W.
Scheidig, Robert E.
Scherrer, George M., Jr.
Schmidt, Charles L., Jr.
Schott, Charles R.
Schwartz, Karl O.
Scott, Alan H.
Seidel, Andrew B.
Seiwert, Anthony J., Jr.
Senecal, Jan L.
Shepard, John T.
Shine, Alexander P.
Shotwell, James H.
Siebenaler, Donald L.
Silberstein, Kenneth R.
Sill, Louis F., Jr.
Silvasy, Stephen, Jr.
Silvay, William J.
Simmons, Michael D.
Simonetta, Russell S., Jr.
Sloane, Robert L.
Smith, Donald J.
Smith, Emmette W.
Smith, Glenn N.
Smith, Patrick R.
Smith, Roger M.
Smith, William D., Jr.
Solenberger, Thomas M.
Sorensen, James E.
Soth, Michael J.
Speed, James W.
Spohn, Larry L.
Stacy, William A., Jr.
St. Amant, Philemon A., II
Stahl, Steven P.
Stanley, Paul D.
Steele, Robert M.
Steinig, Ronald D.
Stennis, William H.
Stevens, Pat M., IV
Stewart, Charles W., III
Stidham, Robert J.
Stonehouse, Gerald F.
Stribling, Roger W., Jr.
Struble, Daniel O.
Stryker, James W.
Sturbois, Louis J., III
Summers, Michael H.
Sutton, Paul D.
Swisher, Arthur H.
Taillie, Dennis K.
Tate, Christopher P.
Tezak, Edward G.
Thompson, Leon G.
Thompson, Tommy R.
Thomson, Alexander J.
Trucksa, Robert C.
Turpin, William C.
Tyler, Tyron S.
Vanneman, Robert G.
Varnell, Allan K.
Vaughan, Curry N., Jr.
Vaughn, Tom J., Jr.
Venes, Richard A.
Virant, Leo B., II
Vogel, Robert A.
Vopatek, Michael J.
Voss, Didrik A.
Vote, Gary F.
Walker, John S., Jr.
Walker, Ralph B., III
Wall, Kenneth E., Jr.
Wall, Sandy K.
Waller, John S.
Walsh, Michael E.
Walsh, Richard R.
Wangsgard, Chris P. L.
Warder, Hiram W., II
Weber, Richard E., III
Westbrook, Joseph A.
Westermeier, John T., Jr.
Weyrauch, Paul T.
Wheeler, John B.
Whidden, David L., Jr.
White, Charles T., Jr.
Whitehead, William J.
Wildrick, Edward W., III
Williams, Douglas T.
Willson, Daniel A.
Wilson, John W., III
Wilson, Norton B., Jr.
Wilson, Richard A.
Wilson, Thomas A., II
Wilson, William L.
Winters, Robert F.
Witt, William W.
Wolz, Donald J.
Wood, Robert H.
Woods, John M., Jr.
Woods, Luther L.
Wyrwas, John A.
Yamashita, Ted K.
Yanagihara, Galen H.
Young, Richard G., Jr.
Young, Timothy R.
Zelley, Robert A.

The following-named midshipmen, graduating class of 1963, U.S. Naval Academy, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 541, 3284, and 3287:

Brady, Edward C.
Eckland, James D.
Eichorst, Bradley D.
Farrington, Reed M.
Gowens, John W., II
Hecht, Robert G.
Jacoby, Stephen A.
McCracken, Robert E.
McLaury, Jeffrey B.
Mullen, George M.
Orlowski, Randolph F.
Polonis, Lawrence L.
Potter, Jerome W.
Prangley, Robert E.
Reid, Tilden R.
Sim, Alan R.
Smart, Neil A.
Thorlin, Philip S.
Wall, John C.
Yeager, Frederick J.

The following-named cadet, graduating class of 1963, U.S. Air Force Academy, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 541, 3284, and 3287:

Wilson, Joe H. R.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 6, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. Arthur Lee Kinsolving, St. James' Episcopal Church, New York City, offered the following prayer:

Lord of all, whose balance trieth the nations to lift up or to cast down, we bless Thee for the great heritage of freedom and of faith conveyed to us by the courage, dedication, and sacrifice of unnumbered predecessors.

We implore anew Thy continuing grace and guidance to all who are charged with important trusts of leadership in this era of critical issues and anxious circumstances.

In giving Americans the spirit to claim their rights Thou hast called them to the dignity of accepting their obligations. Believing that the sovereignty of this people derives from Thee, may we exercise it, not only in obedience to the laws which we enact but to Thy moral law. Grant to us each today absolute loyalty to the absolute end and wisdom to discern the measure of our loyalty to all relative ends.

We entrust to Thee again our Nation and our hopes for the fulfillment of Thy will among all nations upon earth and for the realization of the great peace. And not unto us but unto Thee, O God, be the glory from generation to generation, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 2, 1963, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 762. An act to provide for increased wheat acreage allotments in the Tule Lake area of California.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the supplemental appropriation bill, 1963—H.R. 5517.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks, and I further ask unanimous consent that all Members who may so desire may extend their remarks on the subject of my speech.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay deep and abiding respect to a great American who, incidentally, is a New Yorker, and perhaps more importantly, coincidentally, is a great Brooklynite, for on this day, 75 years ago, there was born in Brooklyn a man who has been among us for many, many distinguished years and who now is the great chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, Representative EMANUEL CELLER.

His many monuments are enshrined permanently in the statute books of this country. His memory will long remain among us who have been privileged to serve him. I commend him, Mr. Speaker, today on this great occasion. I extend to him my warm and respectful regards and I expressly wish, in which I am sure I am joined by all his colleagues, that he will be among us for many, many fruitful years and will enjoy the loving and devoted companionship of his charming and beautiful wife and family for a great many, many more years.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEOGH. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma, the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy that the distinguished gentleman from New York has taken this time for this purpose. I desire to associate myself with his remarks. I join him in wishing MANNY CELLER many happy returns of the day and many, many more years of the brilliant and useful service which have characterized his tenure in the House of Representatives.

Mr. KEOGH. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEOGH. I will be delighted to yield to the majority whip, the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. I should like to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished gentleman from New York and the distinguished majority leader. The great chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary has distinguished himself over the years. He is not only chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, but he has a judicial temperament, and as a result of that he is admired and respected by every Member of this body on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. KEOGH. With all the gentleman from Louisiana has said I am in complete agreement. I wish I could have said it as well.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to join my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH], in saluting the respected dean of the New York delegation, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], on the occasion of his 75th birthday.

During the 40 years that MANNY CELLER has been a Member of this body, he has been an outstanding leader and one of the great legislators of our time. He is and always has been a foe of injustice, a champion of the people, with a genuine love for his fellow man. I am indeed fortunate to have him as a personal friend. On this occasion, MANNY CELLER has my congratulations on his birthday and my best wishes for many, many more years of good health, great happiness with his lovely wife and family and blessings so well earned.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEOGH. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, I want to commend the gentleman from New York for directing attention to the birthday of our great chairman. He has served in Congress well for many years. His kindness and ability to understand problems make him an unusual and outstanding American. It is my hope that he will serve for many years in the future—happy birthday, MANNY."

Mr. KEOGH. I appreciate very much what the gentleman from Colorado has said.

Mr. Speaker, I suspect some would have hoped that this privilege would have been extended to that great Committee on the Judiciary, but I do remind the membership that we from Brooklyn are a provincial lot.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEOGH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BECKER. I should like to associate myself with the gentleman from Brooklyn [Mr. KEOGH], in his remarks about our distinguished colleague on the anniversary of his 75th birthday, MANNY CELLER of Brooklyn. I have known MANNY CELLER for at least 35 years and more. Despite the fact that we may not always agree politically, I think he is one of the finest men I have known. I consider him one of my best friends. I hope that he lives many more years to serve his constituents in this House.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, permit me to thank the gentleman from New York and to say to him that his contribution obviously adds great depth to this tribute.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEOGH. I yield to the gentleman from New York, a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, this is the 5th year I have had the privilege to serve on the minority side of the Committee on the Judiciary. I should like to join my colleague, the gentleman from New York, in paying tribute to the chairman of that great committee on this happy occasion. Our senior colleague from New York [Mr. CELLER] has served that committee, the Congress and the Nation with distinction over the years. It is a great privilege for those of us on the minority side of the House Committee on the Judiciary to serve with him under his leadership.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from New York adding to this tribute, and I would only say, I hope he has the great and good fortune for many years to come to serve on the same committee and under the same chairman.

Mr. BOLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEOGH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, today is the 75th birthday of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York, EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. For more than half his lifetime, MANNY CELLER has served his constituents, his State, and his country in the House of Representatives. MANNY CELLER came to Congress in March of 1923 and uninterruptedly, for over 40 years, has engaged in every major issue that has come before this body. The marvel of his energy, his grasp of all the intricate problems Congress has had to cope with, together with his kindness and his unlimited patience, have been admitted by all who have had the privilege to serve with him. He has never abused the special privileges that come with senior service nor the power that comes with chairmanship.

I have never known MANNY CELLER to give up a good fight. In antitrust legislation, in immigration, in civil rights, he stands among the foremost in his knowledge and understanding of the subjects and in his persistent pursuit of legislative achievement.

I know of few men who are as free from rancor as is MANNY. The members of his committee have told me how much free give and take there is in discussion and how much he has achieved as a political realist.

Congress after Congress MANNY has been reelected by increasing majorities and there are few, indeed, who can equal his record in the ability to receive among the highest plurality election returns for membership in the House.

I am happy to join my colleagues in wishing him well and in expressing the hope that he will be with us for many, many years to come for there is no doubt that we appreciate him in the same fashion as his constituents do—for his integrity, his intelligence and his humanitarianism.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, Congressman EMANUEL CELLER is a great American, an outstanding legislator, honorable and trustworthy in every respect. On this, his birthday anniversary, I extend to him my hearty congratulations and my very best wishes for countless of similar anniversaries.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in wishing our distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. CELLER] a happy birthday. I have greatly enjoyed our friendship over the years. It gives me great pleasure to extend my personal greetings and best wishes on this happy occasion. I wish him many more of these anniversaries, and much happiness for many years to come.

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the other Members in recognition of the birthday of the distinguished chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER. I have the good fortune to be a member of the House Judiciary Committee and also a member of Subcommittee No. 5 which is the so-called blue ribbon Celler subcommittee. For the past 5 years I served on this subcommittee and had a chance to work closely with the distinguished chairman and observe his manner, attitude, philosophy, patience, and temperament. I can honestly say, Mr. Speaker, that he is the most remarkable chairman under whom I have served in two legislative bodies in the past 13 years. He is very able, very persistent, very tolerant, very learned and is undoubtedly one of the best legislators that I have ever met.

I believe that he has contributed considerably to the high reputation which the House Judiciary Committee enjoys. His fairness to all members, his consideration of all positions, his calmness and diplomacy make him well respected and admired by all members of the committee, the House of Representatives, the Congress of the United States and the people of our country.

I salute the chairman on his 75th birthday and I hope that he enjoys many more birthdays as a Member of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the "Legal Sage" of Brooklyn, our colleague EMANUEL CELLER, has reached his 75th birthday. We greet the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee with admiration and respect. As an authority in legalistic doctrines, he has been the sponsor of hundreds of laws throughout his 19 terms in the Congress of the United States, 1923–64. He personifies in character and intellectual attainment the true advocate. He is practical in his approach to legal problems and thoroughly prepared to sustain his legalistic concepts with facts sustaining his analysis of each principle involved. MANNY CELLER is loved and respected by the members of his committee. He is understanding and considerate of other people's feelings and attitudes in debate, but in his analytical mental determination he is cold in his reasoning and direct in his attack. MANNY is a true and loyal friend.

In the history of the Congress the measure of his work will undoubtedly reflect the high purposes of his legislation in all fields and the importance of these laws to insure a free society as well as a free economy.

May God bless him and his family for many years to come to so continue his great work dedicated to the people of a grateful Republic.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, since 1922 this House has been graced with the presence of our dear friend and colleague, the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER. Today it is my distinct pleasure to join with our colleagues in honoring a man who has served with and guided us for so many fruitful years of service.

MANNY CELLER has actively participated in public life since the First World War; he has been chairman of our Judiciary Committee continuously since 1949 with the exception of the 83d Congress when the other party won control of the House; he has served with distinction as the chairman of that committee and much of the enlightened legislation adopted in the last decade is attributable to his leadership.

All of Brooklyn, as well as the city and State of New York, have gloried in the honor he has brought to us in serving his city, State, and Nation in every worthwhile activity. He is truly a great scholar and a fine gentleman.

Today is his 75th birthday. I am happy to extend to him the traditional Hebrew wish that he be with us "until 120."

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, today is the 75th birthday of the venerable, vigorous and astute chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives. It gives me great pleasure and satisfaction to be able to join with my colleagues in saluting him.

His life is truly a Horatio Alger story. Born in poverty yet by dint of his personal drive and ambition, he rose to become one of the most knowledgeable and respected Members of Congress.

It is my fond hope that this House shall be graced for many years with his presence and that we may have the benefit of his advice, of his experience, his knowledge, and his intelligence to help guide us in directing the affairs of this Nation.

I know of no one who is more representative of those ideals which constitute a true American.

It has indeed been a privilege to have served with him in this august body.

I wish him and his family continued happiness and long life.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, a child was born in the city of Brooklyn on May 6, 1888. Few people realized at that time that he would be, on his 75th birthday, the dean of the New York congressional delegation. I refer to the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, a man who has served his city, State, and Nation with honor.

EMANUEL CELLER, our colleague in the House of Representatives, attended the public schools and the public high schools of the city of New York. He was graduated from Columbia College and in 1912 from Columbia Law School. He practiced law for about 10 years, and then was elected to the 68th Congress in 1922. He has served in this body in all succeeding Congresses. There is one man in the House of Representatives who has served longer than he, the Honorable CARL VINSON.

It has been an honor for me to know and to serve as a colleague in the House of Representatives with EMANUEL CELLER. In that period of time I have developed a deep respect for him as a colleague and as a personal friend. His integrity, his ability, and his wit have added much to the deliberations of the House of Representatives.

During his 40 years of service, EMANUEL CELLER has sponsored and had enacted into law more than 100 bills. He has been a leader in the fight for civil rights and he has shown courage in his fight in the antimonopoly field. He is presently the chairman of that important Committee on Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

The fact that the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER has been returned to the House of Representatives for these many years shows the high esteem in which he is held by his constituents and by those who know him.

On this occasion of EMANUEL CELLER's 75th birthday, I wish him the best of health and God's blessings for the remainder of his years.

ADDITIONAL 2,000 MILES OF INTERSTATE AND DEFENSE HIGHWAYS

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation which would authorize the designation of an additional 2,000 miles for the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways. This increased mileage would be located in those areas designated as redevelopment areas by the Secretary of Commerce under section 5 of the Area Redevelopment Act.

The benefits of my bill would be twofold. First, the construction of this additional mileage on projects of the magnitude of Interstate System highway would immediately help those areas suffering from chronic unemployment, and second, many economic and other permanent benefits would result from these highway transportation improvements.

I am convinced that a major factor in causing an area to be economically depressed is inaccessibility in the case of rural areas, and inefficient existing highway systems in the case of urban areas. A pleasant and trouble-free route of travel is essential to the tourist business, and transportation costs are major elements to be considered by a manufacturer or merchant seeking a suitable location for his plant.

This bill, of course, could benefit the Allegheny Highlands area, which is particularly deserving of special attention. However, the application of this bill would be fully nationwide in scope, and would assist every part of the country wherein economic recovery is being hindered by the lack of a first rate highway system.

CRIME IN WASHINGTON

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, a week ago I called the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that there seems to be a blackout on crime news in the newspapers of the District of Columbia. I know that Members have been reading the news avidly and agree with me now that there seems to be a complete blackout with respect to crime in the District of Columbia.

I know there is crime going on and so do you know it. I am informed by an official source, since I made that statement, that crime statistics in the District for the month of April are going to show a decrease. I am sure we will all be happy to hear that. But I am wondering if the decrease ought to be predicated on the enforcement of a rule that went into effect against investigative arrests in the District of Columbia, and whether it is going to be a statistical decrease in crime caused by the fact that the police are prevented from doing the job they are capable of doing.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that crime is decreasing, but it is unfortunate for the thousands of visitors who come to Washington and feel they can walk the streets freely and go about their business, as they rightfully should, without any warning as to what is transpiring here in the District.

I have asked the Committee on the District of Columbia to investigate what is causing this complete blackout of the news respecting crime in the District of Columbia, and I would hope we will get some information on that subject.

SECRETARY FREEMAN NOT RELIABLE SOURCE OF INFORMATION

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I urged the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to get the facts straight before giving the feed grains program a new 2-year lease on life. My experience indicates that Agriculture Secretary Orville L. Freeman is not a reliable source of information. I therefore urged the committee to get professional witnesses from the U.S. Department of Agriculture to clarify what the taxpayers got for their money under the 1961, 1962, and 1963 programs.

Mr. Freeman has used unrelated and inaccurate statistics. He has repeatedly exaggerated stockpile reductions and has used phony and misleading guesswork to create the illusion that the feed grain programs have cut tax costs and improved farm income. Actually, costs go up and results go down. The financial plight of the farmer is worse than when the program began.

This year we are spending about $140 million more than last year, but getting 3 million acres less land retired.

In 3 years we have spent about $3 billion. Despite this outlay, feed grain production this year will nearly equal the base years before the programs began.

Congress has the responsibility to taxpayers to come up with a less expensive program.

THE INCREASE IN THE PRICE OF SUGAR

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, although the Department of Agriculture reports that the U.S. wholesalers, retailers, and industrial users have taken a healthy hedge against increasing prices in sugar by buying and stockpiling since late 1962, they have not permitted the benefits of their prudence to "trickle down" to the American consumer. As a matter of fact, they have joined to participate in "bilking" the American sugar consumer.

At local retail outlets, the price of a 5-pound bag of granulated sugar has jumped from 55 cents to 66 cents within the last 10 days—a price increase of 20 percent. When this 20 percent increase is tagged onto every spoonful of sugar consumed every day by 180 million Americans, the conclusion is that someone is getting loaded on sweet profits.

There is absolutely no need for the consumer to pay a 2- to 3-cent-a-pound tribute to the sugar overlords. Under the sugar bill passed by Congress, the fancy prices are effectively pegged by the quota system. If the beneficiaries of the sugar-rigging law betray their trust to the American people by putting artificial upward pressure on prices, our Government should take prompt action to stifle profiteering by suspending the U.S. duty on sugar and making it possible for the American consumer to purchase sugar at lower world prices.

When the price of sugar leaps 20 percent within 10 days, the consumer's "peril point" has been reached and the Government should suspend its protection of the sugar "Shylocks" who are endeavoring to manipulate lush profits into their pockets.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight tonight, May 6, to file a report on the bill H.R. 4996.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

ADDITIONAL PAY FOR DIRECTORS AT VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION INSTALLATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 228) to amend section 4111 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the salary of directors and chiefs of staff of Veterans' Administration hospitals, domiciliaries, and centers.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL HEALTH BENEFIT PLANS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1819) to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to provide additional choice of health benefits plans, and for other purposes.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXPENSES OF RETIRED EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3517) to amend the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act with respect to Government contribution for expenses incurred in the administration of such act.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

COMPENSATION FOR USE OF KWAJALEIN AND DALAP ISLANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2072 to assure payment of just compensation for the use and occupancy of certain lands on Kwajalein and Dalap Islands, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to make inquiry of a member of the committee regarding this bill. As I understand it, Mr. ASPINALL is the author of the bill. Could the gentleman tell me whether or not there is any possibility that these claims will exceed the $1 million prohibition under our rules? I notice the report says it will amount to at least $600,000, but these are not all of the claims that are possible for presentation.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, it is our understanding that the appropriation available will be adequate to cover any claims that might arise, and that a number of these claims will be adjudicated by the Court of Claims. This is sort of a second string of the ball proposition.

Mr. HARSHA. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That any person from whom the United States, on or before April 1, 1946, took rights of possession, use, occupancy, or usufruct of lands on Kwajalein Atoll or Dalap Island within the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands to which he or his predecessor in interest was entitled under the traditions and customs of the Marshallese people and to whom or whose representative compensation in full satisfaction for all of his claims against the United States and the government of said trust territory arising out of said taking has not been paid may, within one year from the date of this Act, file a petition for the determination by the United States Court of Claims of his claim for just compensation. Upon the timely filing of such petition the said court shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine the value of the rights taken in the same manner and under the same rules as any other cause before it, or as near thereto as is feasible in the circumstances, and in the light of such principles of equity, justice, and fair dealing as are pertinent to the cause. Any such claim may be heard and determined notwithstanding laches or the expiration of any period of limitations which would be applicable thereto in the absence of this Act. The judgment of the Court of Claims may provide for payment of a lump sum for the possession, use, and occupancy (including indefinite possession, use, and occupancy) by the United States and the government of the trust territory of the lands subject thereto and/or for the payment of an annual sum for such possession, use, and occupancy, but shall not include compensation for any period prior to that date during or after World War II on which the island where the land in question is located was finally determined by competent military authority to be secure. If the judgment includes provision for payment of an annual sum, the court shall retain jurisdiction of the cause and may, on motion of either party, redetermine the amount thereafter payable from time to time, but no such redetermination shall be sought or made more often than once every ten years. Any judgment of the Court of Claims shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States on writ of certiorari and shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of title 28, United States Code, section 2517, and of section 1302 of the Act of July 27, 1956 (70 Stat. 694), as amended (31 U.S.C. 724a). The payment of any claim, after its determination in accordance with this section, shall be a full discharge of the United States and the government of the trust territory of all claims and demands touching any of the matters involved in the controversy. No claim which could be prosecuted as hereinbefore provided but is not so prosecuted may thereafter be entertained by any court of the United States or the trust territory or, except as provided in section 6 of this Act, by any administrative agency thereof.

SEC. 2. It is the purpose of this Act to assure every person who or whose representative has not been compensated for deprivation of rights of possession, use, occupancy, or usufruct, as described in section 1 of this Act, of an opportunity to have his claim judicially determined. To this end, the interests of any such person who is not himself a party to a suit instituted under this Act shall be represented by the persons named in Marshall Islands Congress Resolution Numbered 16 of 1956. Any dispute with respect to distribution of sums paid to parties under any judgment in their favor or under any compromise settlement made as provided in section 4 of this Act which cannot be resolved otherwise than by litigation shall be determined by the courts of the trust territory in accordance with the laws of the trust territory and the traditions and customs of the Marshallese people.

SEC. 3. Any judge or commissioner of the Court of Claims may, for the purposes of this Act, sit at a convenient place or places in the United States or the trust territory to take evidence. Subpenas issued out of said court upon persons residing in the trust territory shall be served by the sheriff of the Marshall Islands district or his deputy, and a failure to comply therewith shall be punishable by the High Court of the Trust Territory in accordance with the laws thereof in the same manner as if said subpena had issued out of said high court. The government of the trust territory shall, for the purposes of this Act, be deemed an agency of the United States within the purview of section 2507 of title 28 of the United States Code.

SEC. 4. The Attorney General of the United States or his assistant shall represent the United States and the government of the trust territory in all cases arising under this Act and may call upon the attorney general of the trust territory for such assistance as he is able to render, and shall have authority, with the approval of the Court of Claims, to compromise any such case. Any such compromise settlement shall be reported to the Congress by the Attorney General, stating the name of each claimant, the amount claimed, and the amount awarded.

SEC. 5. The fees of any attorney or attorneys representing Marshallese claimants in any action brought pursuant to this Act shall be fixed by the Court of Claims at such amount as the court, in accordance with standards obtaining for prosecuting similar contingent claims, finds to be adequate compensation for services rendered and results obtained, plus reasonable expenses incurred in the prosecution of the claim.

SEC. 6. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to forbid the payment by the high commissioner of the trust territory from funds heretofore appropriated and made available for this purpose of approximately $500 per acre in full satisfaction of all claims relating to any specified tract of land or of not more than $250 per acre in partial satisfaction of such claims, but neither the appropriation and availability of the first of said amounts nor any other offer by an officer of the United States or of the government of the trust territory shall be construed as an admission by the United States or the government of the trust territory that the same is the value of the rights of possession, use, occupancy, and usufruct taken or be admitted as evidence to prove the same. Any claimant by whom or on whose behalf suit could be but is not instituted within one year, as provided in this Act, shall thereafter be paid a proper portion of such appropriated funds and such payment shall constitute full satisfaction of all of his claims and demands with respect to the land to which it pertains.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELATING TO CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2073) to place certain submerged lands within the jurisdiction of the governments of Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) whatever right, title, or interest the United States has in lands permanently or periodically covered by tidal waters up to but not above the line of mean high tide and seaward to a line three geographical miles distant from the coastlines of Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa, as heretofore or hereafter modified by accretion, erosion, and reliction, including filled in, made, or reclaimed lands which were formerly, permanently, or periodically covered by tidal waters is hereby conveyed to the government of Guam, the Virgin Islands, or American Samoa, as the case may be, to be administered in trust for the benefit of the people thereof.

(b) There are excepted from the transfer made by subsection (a) hereof—

(i) all deposits of oil, gas, and other minerals, but the term "minerals" shall not include sand and gravel;

(ii) all lands adjacent to property owned by the United States above the line of mean high tide;

(iii) all lands acquired by the United States by eminent domain proceedings, purchase, exchange, or gift;

(iv) all lands filled in, built up, or otherwise reclaimed by the United States for its own use;

(v) all lands containing structures and improvements constructed by the United States;

(vi) all lands that have heretofore been determined by the President or the Congress to be of such scientific, scenic, or historic character as to warrant preservation and administration under the provisions of the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended and supplemented; and

(vii) all lands designated by the President within one hundred twenty days after the date of enactment of this Act:

Provided, That upon request of the Governor of Guam, the Virgin Islands, or American Samoa, the President may, without reimbursement or with such reimbursement as he may deem appropriate, convey all right, title, and interest of the United States in any of the lands described in subparagraphs (ii), (iii), (iv), (v), (vi), and (vii) of this subsection to the government of Guam, the Virgin Islands, or American Samoa, as the case may be, if such land is no longer needed by the United States.

SEC. 2. (a) Nothing in this Act shall affect the right of the President to establish naval defensive sea areas and naval airspace reservations around and over the island of Guam when deemed necessary for national defense.

(b) Nothing in this Act shall affect the use, development, improvement, or control by or under the constitutional authority of the United States of the lands transferred by section 1 hereof, and the navigable waters overlying such lands, for the purposes of navigation or flood control or the production of power, or be construed as the release or relinquishment of any rights of the United States arising under the constitutional authority of Congress to regulate or improve navigation, or to provide for flood control, or the production of power.

(c) The United States retains all its navigational servitude and rights in and powers of regulation and control of the lands conveyed by section 1 hereof, and the navigable waters overlying such lands, for the constitutional purposes of commerce, navigation, national defense, and international affairs, all of which shall be paramount to, but shall not be deemed to include, proprietary rights of ownership, or the rights of management, administration, leasing, use, and development of the lands and natural resources which are specifically conveyed to the governments of Guam, the Virgin Islands, or American Samoa, as the case may be, by section 1 of this Act.

SEC. 3. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this section, the governments of Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa, as the case may be, shall have concurrent jurisdiction with the United States over parties found, acts performed, and offenses committed on property owned, reserved, or controlled by the United States in Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa. A judgment of conviction or acquittal on the merits under the laws of Guam, the Virgin Islands, or American Samoa shall be a bar to any prosecution under the criminal laws of the United States for the same act or acts, and a judgment of conviction or acquittal on the merits under the laws of the United States shall be a bar to any prosecution under the laws of Guam, the Virgin Islands, or American Samoa for the same act or acts.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, the President may from time to time exclude from the concurrent jurisdiction of the government of Guam persons found, acts performed, and offenses committed on the property of the United States which is under the control of the Secretary of Defense to such extent and in such circumstances as he finds required in the interest of the national defense.

(c) The government of Guam shall exercise its concurrent jurisdiction over persons to whom the Uniform Code of Military Justice is applicable subject to such limitations thereon as may be agreed to by the Governor of Guam and the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 4. Subsection (b) of section 31 of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands (68 Stat. 497, 510), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(b) All right, title, and interest of the United States in the property placed under the control of the government of the Virgin Islands by section 4 of the Act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1807, 1808), is hereby conveyed to such government: *Provided*, That with respect to lands and other properties which on the date of this Act are designated pursuant to law for administration by the Secretary of the Interior under the provisions of the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended and supplemented, such lands and properties shall retain the legal status accorded them immediately prior to the enactment of this Act."

SEC. 5. Subsection (b) of section 28 of the Organic Act of Guam (64 Stat. 384, 392) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(b) All other property, real and personal, owned by the United States in Guam, not reserved by the President of the United States within ninety days after the date of enactment of this Act, is hereby conveyed to the government of Guam, to be administered for the benefit of the people of Guam, and the legislature shall have authority, subject to such limitations as may be imposed upon its acts by this Act or subsequent Acts of the Congress, to legislate with respect to such property, real and personal, in such manner as it may deem desirable."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "including filled-in, made," and insert "artificially made, filled-in,".

Page 2, line 16 and 17, strike out all of paragraph (v) and insert the following:

(v) all tracts or parcels of land containing on any part thereof any structures or improvements constructed by the United States;

Page 3, line 14, strike out "island of Guam" and insert "islands of Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands".

Page 4, line 11, after the word "resources" add "not in derogation of United States navigational servitude and rights".

Page 5, lines 12 through 16, strike out all of subsection (c).

Page 6, strike out all of lines 9 through 17 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(b) All other property, real and personal, owned by the United States in Guam, not reserved by the President of the United States prior to November 1, 1950, is hereby conveyed to the government of Guam, to be administered for the benefit of the people of Guam, and the legislature shall have authority, subject to such limitations as may be imposed upon its acts by this Act or subsequent Acts of the Congress, to legislate with respect to such property, real and personal, in such manner as it may deem desirable.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMISSION ON THE DISPOSITION OF ALCATRAZ ISLAND

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1709) to establish a Federal Commission on the Disposition of Alcatraz Island.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) there is hereby established a commission to be known as the Commission on the Disposition of Alcatraz Island (in this Act referred to as "the Commission") which shall consist of five members, one of whom shall be appointed by the President, one by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, one by the President pro tempore of the Senate, one by the Governor of the State of California, and one by the mayor of San Francisco.

(b) A vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

SEC. 2. (a) The Commission shall elect a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

(b) Three members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

SEC. 3. (a) The Commission shall make an investigation and study of possible uses for Alcatraz Island when it is no longer used as a Federal prison.

(b) The Commission shall recommend the use or uses which it regards as most appropriate, shall make an estimate of the cost thereof, and shall recommend how such cost should be borne.

SEC. 4. The Commission shall transmit the results of its investigation and study, and its recommendations, in a report to the Congress submitted not later than December 31, 1963. In the event that such report is made when the Congress is not in session, it shall be transmitted to the Clerk of the House of Representatives. Six months after the submission of such report, the Commission shall cease to exist.

SEC. 5. Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (5 U.S.C. 99).

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the sponsor of this legislation, the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY], what if any costs would be involved in the administration activities or in the study activities by this Commission?

Mr. SHELLEY. No costs whatsoever, are provided for in this bill. Section 5 of this measure contains the following proviso:

> Members of the Commission appointed under authority of this act shall serve without compensation.

Also, there is no request contained in the bill for any money for payment of any staff whatsoever.

Mr. HARSHA. Will it be necessary to employ a staff?

Mr. SHELLEY. It should not be necessary to employ a staff. Five people will be appointed. They can hold the hearings and evaluate the suggestions that have already come in. There are various and sundry suggestions regarding the future use of Alcatraz Island, ranging all the way from a Statue of St. Francis to a suggestion that the prison should be used as a wax museum with the figures of Al Capone and some of the other notorious characters that have been incarcerated in it. May I say that I am violently against that type of use of the property.

The Commission, upon completion of its investigation and study, would make recommendations as to the proper use of the island. It is the hope of the people of San Francisco and the hope of the General Services Administration, which will have the responsibility for disposing of the island, that something of a symbolic nature in the form of a statue would be recommended after a study by the Commission.

Mr. HARSHA. As the gentleman from California points out, it is my understanding that the General Services Administration has the responsibility of disposing of Federal property and public property not otherwise retained for governmental use. Is there objection to the General Services Administration disposing of this property in its normal fashion?

Mr. SHELLEY. There is no objection whatsoever. The Federal Government at the present time retains the title to the property. Representatives of the General Services Administration testified before the committee. Mr. Bernard Boutin, the Administrator of the General Services Administration, made clear they welcome the idea of a commission which would help them come to some conclusion on a proper and beneficial use of the property. Whether it would be retained under Federal title or whether it would be transferred to the State for a historical monument use of it, or what use will be made of it.

Mr. HARSHA. I see.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARSHA. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I think it might be pointed out that the Island of Alcatraz unfortunately, or fortunately, belongs to practically the entire world. It sits right in our front yard. It is legally a part of the city and county of San Francisco, and of the congressional district which the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY] represents. He and I and others, I am sure, are receiving literally hundreds—some sensible and some crazy—suggestions. But there is not any doubt there is going to be tremendous public interest in assuring that whatever use this property will be put to, since the Federal Government is no longer going to use it for its present purposes, is a sensible one and one that protects the public interest. For that reason we felt that a representative group of people, representing the purely public interest, ought to examine the various proposals plus the possibility that there might be some requirement in the future development of the bay area; that whatever use is made of it for the development of that area we certainly did not intend to change the usual disposal provisions that would be under the jurisdiction of the General Services Administration—we felt that this kind of advice would be most helpful in seeing that a decent job was done.

Mr. HARSHA. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object I wonder if we could have some idea from the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY] as to what kind of monument might be erected on Alcatraz?

Mr. SHELLEY. That is exactly why the commission is being proposed. Some people have written in suggesting a large statue of St. Francis, with his arms out toward the Golden Gate. Others have written in and stated that to erect a statue of St. Francis would be injecting the religious issue. Another suggestion that came to me and has been proposed to the General Services Administration is a statue of a western type male standing with a composite type of Asiatic, symbolizing the joining of East and West at the entrance to San Francisco Harbor.

The commission would have the responsibility of studying these suggestions, evaluating costs and finding the best public use that could be made of the island.

Mr. GROSS. If the commission does recommend a monument, then will there be a demand on Congress asking for money to build it?

Mr. SHELLEY. I am sure that the erection of such a monument would be by public subscription.

Mr. GROSS. That is fine; let it be kept that way.

Mr. SHELLEY. This is not the time to do that. The bill simply sets up the commission.

Mr. GROSS. Let us briefly discuss the commission. I notice on page 5 of the report a letter from the Attorney General's Office which states as follows:

> The granting to non-Federal officers, such as the Governor of California and the mayor of San Francisco, the power to appoint members to a Federal body would be an undesirable departure from customary practice.

I understand that the bill has been amended to provide that the Governor of California and the mayor of San Francisco will nominate appointees to the commission which, in my opinion, is something in the nature of a subterfuge. Why did you not just go ahead and let the Governor of California and mayor of San Francisco appoint somebody instead of this "around the barn" method of nominating? The President is almost bound to take the nominations made by the Governor and the mayor, is he not? Is not this something of a precedent for the Governor and the mayor to nominate candidates to a Federal commission?

Mr. SHELLEY. May I say to my friend from Iowa that he is imputing a motivation that is not here at all.

Mr. GROSS. Just a minute. I do not impute anything and I do not impugn anybody.

Mr. SHELLEY. The gentleman asked the question, Is not this a subterfuge? My direct answer to that is "No," it is not a subterfuge.

It is a correction very properly made by the committee. The original draft provided that one member be appointed by the Governor and one by the mayor of San Francisco because of the local interest. This is wrong; and when the committee had a hearing on it and pointed that out, based upon the objections raised by the Attorney General, both my colleague from San Francisco and I and the Administrator of General Services Administration agreed that the committee's suggestion would be more appropriate. That is, that the President shall appoint three, and that the Governor and mayor of San Francisco can nominate. There is no requirement that the President even accept those nominations.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that.

Mr. SHELLEY. This takes into account some of the local interests. Since the President appoints them, the responsibility is on the President, and the report will be made through the Federal machinery.

Mr. GROSS. But did you get from the Justice Department a letter saying that this met their objection to the original bill?

Mr. SHELLEY. At the hearing before the committee a representative of the Justice Department was present and said this removed their objection and satisfied them.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

With the following committee amendments:

> Page 1, line 6, strike "one" and insert "three."
>
> Page 1, line 7, after "President" insert "of the United States".
>
> Page 1, lines 8, 9, and 10, strike "one by the President pro tempore of the Senate, one by the Governor of the State of California, and one by the mayor of San Francisco," and insert "and one by the President of the Senate. The three members appointed by the President of the United States shall include a member nominated by the Governor of the State of California and a member nominated by the Mayor of San Francisco."
>
> Page 2, lines 22 through 25 and page 3, lines 1 through 5, strike all of section 5 of the bill and insert a new section 5 as follows:
>
> SEC. 5. Members of the commission appointed under the authority of this Act shall serve without compensation.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF FOR CERTAIN NAVAL OFFICERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5042) for the relief of certain officers of the naval service erroneously in receipt of compensation based upon an incorrect computation of service for basic pay.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PELLY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention to the fact that similar legislation, which would relieve certain officers of a liability, has been strenuously objected to on the Consent Calendar before because there was no indication as to who was responsible. One of our colleagues time and again has asked that this legislation specifically state who is responsible for the errors.

Likewise, I think it should be pointed out that the military often is prone to forgive officers for their errors, whereas they are not so free to relieve noncommissioned officers of their liability, and ask these latter individuals to make repayment.

Because of former objections by our colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], because of the failure of the committee to indicate exactly who is responsible, I intend to ask that the bill be passed over without prejudice, but I will be glad to invite any comment by someone from the committee who can clear up this point.

Mr. ASHMORE. I do not know about the objections in the past to this bill's being considered on the Consent Calendar. It might have been during the 1962 session, and probably was. But I should like to remind the gentleman that the matter was evidently cleared up during the past session because it passed this House during the last session of Congress. The errors of incorrect computation were made by officials in the Navy based upon records of inactive enlisted Naval Reserve service. They have recommended that the bill be brought before the House so that these things may be corrected and all of these men may be treated in the same manner.

Mr. PELLY. Would the gentleman indicate as to whether the committee has interested itself in placing responsibility on the individuals who made the error? That is the point that has been raised when previous legislation of this kind has come up on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. ASHMORE. This legislation is an outgrowth of this situation that existed for some 15 years. It has come about due to the fact that the Comptroller General made his ruling in 1961 which placed these men in this position. The longevity payments involved were made over a 15-year period on the basis of Navy records of enlisted inactive reserve service which was, in effect, deleted in 1961, when this ruling was made by the Comptroller General.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. GROSS. Without regard to this specific legislation, early last year I tried to point out on several occasions to the House that more and more bills were coming in, claims bills, to compensate people and forgive payments because of errors that had been made. I am sure that is what the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] is referring to; the overall situation with regard to claims bills.

Last year I urged the committees handling these bills to point out those responsible for the increasing number of errors. The Comptroller General of the United States, Mr. Campbell, in testifying before our committee the other day cited the shocking figure of over $100 million in overpayments to servicemen during the period of 1957–61. What I am trying to get at is the fact that no committee is holding anyone responsible for these errors in the reports accompanying the bills.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I am happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. ASHMORE. This bill does not involve exactly the same kind of situation that my friend, the gentleman from Iowa, and I believe my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Washington have in mind. The matter dealt with in this bill arose at the end of World War II and the entire situation came about at that time. This kind of thing has not happened and has not been reoccurring since that time, but it has been in existence since then. It relieves them from liability for funds that they received as a result of these errors during World War II. As a matter of fact, it would not now cost the Government anything for the amounts were paid out over the 15-year period.

Mr. PELLY. I think there is a question of the overall policy and it is not simply a question of the merits of any one bill as against any other bill. For that reason, and particularly since our colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], who raised these questions before is unavoidably absent today, I intend to ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over, and I would like him to have the opportunity to discuss it with the gentleman and satisfy himself.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARSHA. I would like to inquire further as to the cost of this bill. As I understand it, the bill provides for refunds of amounts paid by or withheld from such individuals and applied to such indebtedness. This could very readily run into the millions of dollars. There is no estimate here in the report stating how much has been withheld or how much has already been refunded.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, there is a statement on the bottom of page 3 of the committee report under "Cost and budget data," as follows:

> Other than the possibility of a refund in the event a repayment has been made by any person, there will be no additional cost to the Government.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to indicate to the gentleman, it is my information, the Navy says, there are only 40 men involved.

Mr. ASHMORE. That is correct.

Mr. PELLY. The average cost per individual is said to be $1,285 so the total cost to the Government could amount to $50,000 and could not run up to the figure that the gentleman has suggested.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection, and ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE ADDITION OF CERTAIN DONATED LANDS TO THE ADMINISTRATIVE HEADQUARTERS SITE, ISLE ROYALE NATIONAL PARK

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4152) to authorize the addition of certain donated lands to the administrative headquarters site, Isle Royale National Park.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Secretary of the Interior may acquire by donation a tract of land, or interests therein, located in Houghton, Michigan, comprising 6.07 acres, more or less, bounded on the west by Portage Street, on the south by Seventh Avenue East, on the east by the First Shelden-Columbian Addition and on the north, in part by lands depicted on the supervisor's plat numbered 4 of the village of Houghton. The land acquired by the Secretary shall be added to and administered as part of the administrative headquarters site of Isle Royale National Park.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING ISSUANCE OF CERTIFICATES OF CITIZENSHIP IN THE CANAL ZONE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5175) to authorize the issuance of certificates of citizenship in the Canal Zone.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have someone state in behalf of this legislation that it is not the intention to go down to the Panama Canal and establish a new bureau with additional Federal personnel sent there to issue the certificates that are involved.

I would like to have the legislative intent brought out. I am not opposed to the purposes of the bill, but I do not want to see a new staff set up down in the Panama Canal Zone to issue certificates of citizenship.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FEIGHAN. The committee agrees thoroughly with the gentleman. It is contemplated there shall be no permanent officer down there for this purpose. The committee has been informed that an officer of the Immigration and Naturalization Service goes down to the Panama Canal Zone two or three times a year, during which time he would be able to take care of the issuance of these certificates.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is speaking of one individual who would go down there and issue the certificates?

Mr. FEIGHAN. That is exactly what is contemplated, nothing further.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 101(a)(38) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 171; 8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(38)), is amended by adding thereto the following sentence: "For the purpose of issuing certificates of citizenship to persons who are citizens of the United States, the term 'United States' as used in section 341 of this Act includes the Canal Zone."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ACCEPTING STATUE OF THE LATE JOHN BURKE, OF NORTH DAKOTA

The Clerk called Senate Concurrent Resolution 6.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

> *Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the statue of the late John Burke, presented by the State of North Dakota, is accepted in the name of the United States, and that the thanks of Congress be tendered to the State for the contribution of the statue of one of its most eminent citizens, illustrious for his historic renown and distinguished civic services; and be it further
>
> *Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions, suitably engrossed and duly authenticated, be transmitted to the Governor of North Dakota.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING TEMPORARY PLACEMENT IN THE ROTUNDA OF THE CAPITOL OF A STATUE OF THE LATE JOHN BURKE, OF NORTH DAKOTA

The Clerk called Senate Concurrent Resolution 7.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the North Dakota National Statuary Hall Commission is hereby authorized to place temporarily in the rotunda of the Capitol a statue of the late John Burke, of North Dakota, and to hold ceremonies in the rotunda on said occasion; and the Architect of the Capitol is hereby authorized to make the necessary arrangements therefor.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING PROCEEDINGS IN CONNECTION WITH ACCEPTANCE OF THE STATUE OF THE LATE JOHN BURKE, OF NORTH DAKOTA

The Clerk called Senate Concurrent Resolution 8.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the proceedings at the presentation, dedication, and acceptance of the statue of John Burke, to be presented by the State of North Dakota in the rotunda of the Capitol, together with appropriate illustrations and other pertinent matter, shall be printed as a Senate document. The copy for such Senate document shall be prepared under the supervision of the Joint Committee on Printing.

SEC. 2. There shall be printed five thousand additional copies of such Senate document, which shall be bound in such style as the Joint Committee on Printing shall direct, and of which one hundred copies shall be for the use of the Senate and one thousand six hundred copies shall be for the use of the Members of the Senate from the State of North Dakota, and five hundred copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and two thousand eight hundred copies shall be for the use of the Members of the House of Representatives from the State of North Dakota.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CEREMONIES IN THE ROTUNDA IN CONNECTION WITH THE STATUE OF THE LATE JOSEPH WARD OF SOUTH DAKOTA

The Clerk called Senate Concurrent Resolution 9.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the South Dakota State Historical Society of South Dakota is hereby authorized to place temporarily in the rotunda of the Capitol a statue of the late Joseph Ward, of South Dakota, and to hold ceremonies in the rotunda on said occasion; and the Architect of the Capitol is hereby authorized to make the necessary arrangements therefor.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TENDERING THANKS OF CONGRESS TO SOUTH DAKOTA FOR THE STATUE OF JOSEPH WARD, TO BE PLACED IN STATUARY HALL

The Clerk called Senate Concurrent Resolution 10.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the statue of Joseph Ward, presented by the State of South Dakota, to be placed in the Statuary Hall collection, is accepted in the name of the United States, and that the thanks of the Congress be tendered said State for the contribution of the statue of one of its most eminent citizens, illustrious for his leadership as author of the State's motto, framer of the Territorial school law, founder of the first college, and outstanding churchman in the founding of Christian churches among whites and Indians: And be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions, suitably engrossed and duly authenticated, be transmitted to the Governor of South Dakota.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT THE PROCEEDINGS AT THE ACCEPTANCE OF THE STATUE OF JOSEPH WARD, TO BE PLACED IN STATUARY HALL

The Clerk called Senate Concurrent Resolution 11.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the proceedings at the presentation, dedication, and acceptance of the statue of Joseph Ward, to be presented by the State of South Dakota in the rotunda of the Capitol, together with appropriate illustrations and other pertinent matter, shall be printed as a Senate document. The copy for such Senate document shall be prepared under the supervision of the Joint Committee on Printing.

SEC. 2. There shall be printed three thousand additional copies of such Senate document, which shall be bound in such style as the Joint Committee on Printing shall direct, and of which one hundred copies shall be for the use of the Senate and one thousand two hundred copies shall be for the use of the Members of the Senate from the State of South Dakota, and five hundred copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and one thousand two hundred copies shall be for the use of the Members of the House of Representatives from the State of South Dakota.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DESIGNATING SHORT MOUNTAIN LOCK AND DAM AND RESERVOIR, OKLAHOMA, AS THE ROBERT S. KERR LOCK AND DAM AND RESERVOIR

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 82 designating the navigation channel and canal portion of the Arkansas River navigation and multiple-purpose project as the "Robert S. Kerr Seaway."

There being no objection, the Clerk read the House joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the navigation channel and canal authorized as a portion of the Arkansas River navigation and multiple-purpose project authorized by the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1946, as amended, shall be known and designated hereafter as the "Robert S. Kerr Seaway". Any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States in which such navigation channel and canal is referred to shall be held and considered to refer to such navigation channel and canal as the "Robert S. Kerr Seaway".

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That the Short Mountain Lock and Dam and Reservoir on the Arkansas River in the State of Oklahoma shall be known as Robert S. Kerr Lock and Dam and Reservoir in honor of the late Senator Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma. Any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which such project is referred to by any other name shall be held and considered to refer to such project by the name of Robert S. Kerr Lock and Dam and Reservoir.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution to change the name of Short Mountain Lock and Dam and Reservoir in the State of Oklahoma to Robert S. Kerr Lock and Dam and Reservoir."

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud that the House of Representatives has taken such quick action in passing House Joint Resolution 82 to change the name of Short Mountain Lock and Dam and Reservoir in Oklahome to the Robert S. Kerr Lock and Dam and Reservoir.

This is a measure based on a resolution which I introduced on the first day of this session of Congress, and which has received the enthusiastic support of every Member of the Oklahoma congressional delegation, as well as the approval of the family of the late Senator Kerr, and of many others who are familiar with the great work in water development which was initiated and carried on by Oklahoma's late senior Senator.

This proposal is a fitting tribute to this great man who captured the imagination of every Oklahoman and made our State conscious of the great need for water conservation and of the vast potential of water resource development.

The project, which will be located entirely in Oklahoma, will be the first large multiple-purpose structure to be encountered in Oklahoma by vessels moving upstream on the Arkansas navigation channel.

This multiple-purpose water resource development will be a living monument to the man who worked and fought his way from his log cabin heritage to become one of our State's most loved sons and one of our Nation's most progressive-minded statesmen.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly proud of the language in the committee report regarding our late Senator, and have obtained unanimous consent that it may appear at this point in the Record:

SENATOR ROBERT S. KERR

Senator Kerr's family settled in Oklahoma Territory where the Senator was born 11 years before Oklahoma was granted statehood. He was a son of a self-taught, scholarly father. In his youth he fought diligently for the benefits of a formal education under the most difficult circumstances. Like many another pioneer boy before him, he walked many miles to and from a small schoolhouse. Unable to afford the full college course, the future Senator interrupted his studies at the age of 17 to become a teacher in a one-room school. He enlisted in the Army and saw duty in France as a field artillery lieutenant in World War I. Later, he gained knowledge of the law during an apprenticeship in the office of one of the great early-day Oklahoma attorneys. He worked his way through courses at East Central State College in Ada, Okla., and at the University of Oklahoma.

His natural leadership abilities came to statewide attention when at the age of 28 he was elected State commander of the American Legion. He later ventured into the field of oil and became the principal organizer of the greatest industry ever founded in Oklahoma.

In 1925 Robert S. Kerr married Grayce Breene, the talented daughter of a pioneer Oklahoma oil drilling contractor. Their three boys and one girl have now established families of their own and the love and affection that Oklahoma felt for Senator Kerr was reflected in outpouring of sympathy for his immediate family when he passed away.

Robert S. Kerr's work in civic affairs and as a lay leader of his church brought him recognition rapidly after he moved to Oklahoma City in 1931. He rose quickly to leadership in the Democratic Party in his State, was elected national committeeman in 1940, and became the first native Oklahoman to be elected Governor 2 years later. He became vitally interested in water resources development after a series of devastating floods in Oklahoma combined with drought and depression conditions to produce great economic difficulties. One of his first acts when he came to the U.S. Senate in 1949 was to introduce a bill to create the Arkansas, White, and Red River Study Commission. This resulted in a completely coordinated plan for the development of the soil and water resources of the area. This study set a pattern for many similar ones throughout the country. As the years passed he became an expert in many fields, but his interests in the conservation and use of our water resources increased rather than decreased. He was chairman of the Select Committee on National Water Resources which made one of the most comprehensive studies ever undertaken.

Because of Senator Kerr's longstanding interest, his many and great contributions, and his unflagging zeal in the field of public works, the Committee on Public Works endorses wholeheartedly the naming of this public works project for a most distinguished statesman.

The Department of the Army endorses this proposal and its views are set forth in the following letter:

April 1, 1963.

Hon. Charles A. Buckley,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives.

Dear Mr. Chairman: Reference is made to your request for the views of the Department of the Army with respect to House Joint Resolution 82, 88th Congress, a resolution designating the navigation channel and canal portion of the Arkansas River navigation and multiple-purpose project as the Robert S. Kerr Seaway.

This resolution would designate the navigation portion of the comprehensive project for the Arkansas River and tributaries, Oklahoma and Arkansas, as the Robert S. Kerr Seaway in honor of the late Senator from Oklahoma.

This Department recognizes the great contributions made by Senator Kerr toward water resources development. Therefore, it is considered entirely appropriate that one of the projects near his home be named after him.

Accordingly, the Department of the Army would have no objection to House Joint Resolution 82. On the other hand, the committee might wish to consider (as possibly more appropriate than naming for Senator Kerr a navigation channel extending through Arkansas as well as a portion of Oklahoma, as contemplated in H.J. Res. 82) designating in the Senator's honor a single water resource unit lying entirely within his home State of Oklahoma, for example, the Short Mountain lock, dam, and reservoir project. The Department of the Army would favor this latter course of action, which could be accomplished through appropriate revision of House Joint Resolution 82.

Since the committee has specifically requested that this report be furnished as expeditiously as possible, the views of the Bureau of the Budget have not been obtained with respect thereto. As soon as those views have been received, the committee will be notified.

Sincerely yours,

Cyrus R. Vance,
Secretary of the Army.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include a portion of the committee report at this point in the Record and that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

REDESIGNATING THE BIG HOLE BATTLEFIELD NATIONAL MONUMENT, REVISING THE BOUNDARIES THEREOF

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3200) to redesignate the Big Hole Battlefield National Monument, to revise the boundaries thereof, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask why the Federal Government, if I understand the legislation correctly, buys 306 acres of land then retrocedes jurisdiction to the State of Montana?

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government does not retrocede the land to the State of Montana. The Federal Government retrocedes some jurisdiction it has—law enforcement, primarily—and the object of the language which the gentleman refers to is to let the State of Montana be the law-enforcement agency instead of the Federal Government.

Mr. GROSS. It then retrocedes jurisdiction to the State of Montana and does not retrocede the land already existing in the park or the 306 acres that would be purchased under the terms of this legislation; is that correct?

Mr. MORRIS. That is correct.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire of the gentleman further about the legislation. As I understand, this bill authorizes an appropriation of not to exceed $20,000 for land acquisition. Now, is there any further land acquisition contemplated in the future?

Mr. MORRIS. No. This is the only land that is contemplated in the future, and we are authorizing $20,000 to purchase the land.

Mr. HARSHA. I thank the gentleman. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Big Hole Battlefield National Monument, established by Executive Order Numbered 1216 of June 23, 1910, and enlarged by Proclamation Numbered 2339 of June 29, 1939, is hereby redesignated as the Big Hole National Battlefield.

Sec. 2. In order to preserve historic features and sites associated with the Battle of the Big Hole and to facilitate their administration and interpretation, the boundaries of the Big Hole National Battlefield are hereby revised to include the following described lands:

MONTANA PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN

Township 2 south, range 17, west: Section 13, southwest quarter southeast quarter, southeast quarter southwest quarter, east half southwest quarter southwest quarter; section 23, east half northeast quarter southeast quarter; section 24, west half east half, north half southwest quarter, southeast quarter southwest quarter, east half southwest quarter southwest quarter; section 25, those portions of the northeast quarter northwest quarter and the northwest quarter northeast quarter lying north of the north right-of-way line of relocated Montana State Route 43; consisting of approximately 466 acres.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Interior may acquire by donation, purchase, exchange, or otherwise, lands and interests in lands within the area described in section 2 of this Act.

(b) Any lands described in section 2 of this Act that are a part of the Beaverhead National Forest when this Act takes effect are hereby excluded from the forest and added to the Big Hole National Battlefield.

(c) Lands included in the Big Hole National Battlefield pursuant to this Act shall be administered in accordance with the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes," approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1-3), as amended and supplemented.

SEC. 4. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, after line 3, add a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. There is hereby retroceded to the State of Montana, effective when accepted by said State in accordance with its laws, such jurisdiction as has been ceded by such State to the United States over any lands within the boundaries of the Big Hole National Battlefield reserving in the United States, however, concurrent legislative jurisdiction over such lands."

Page 3, strike out all of lines 4 and 5 and insert in lieu thereof:

"SEC. 5. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums not exceeding $20,000 as are necessary for the acquisition of lands and interests in land pursuant to this Act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 138) to redesignate the Big Hole Battlefield National Monument, to revise the boundaries thereof, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Big Hole Battlefield National Monument, established by Executive Order Numbered 1216 of June 23, 1910, and enlarged by Proclamation Numbered 2339 of June 29, 1939, is hereby redesignated as the Big Hole National Battlefield.

SEC. 2. In order to preserve historic features and sites associated with the Battle of the Big Hole and to facilitate their administration and interpretation, the boundaries of the Big Hole National Battlefield are hereby revised to include the following described lands:

MONTANA PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN

Township 2 south, range 17 west: section 13, southwest quarter southeast quarter, southeast quarter southwest quarter, east half southwest quarter southwest quarter; section 23, east half northeast quarter southeast quarter; section 24, west half east half, north half southwest quarter, southeast quarter southwest quarter, east half southwest quarter southwest quarter; section 25, those portions of the northeast quarter northwest quarter and the northwest quarter northeast quarter lying north of the north right-of-way line of relocated Montana State Route 43; consisting of approximately 466 acres.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Interior may acquire by donation, purchase, exchange, or otherwise, lands and interests in lands within the area described in section 2 of this Act.

(b) Any lands described in section 2 of this Act that are a part of the Beaverhead National Forest when this Act takes effect are hereby excluded from the forest and added to the Big Hole National Battlefield.

(c) Lands included in the Big Hole National Battlefield pursuant to this Act shall be administered in accordance with the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes", approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1-3), as amended and supplemented.

SEC. 4. There is hereby retroceded to the State of Montana such jurisdiction as has been ceded by such State to the United States over any lands within the boundaries of the Big Hole National Battlefield reserving in the United States, however, concurred legislative jurisdiction over such lands.

SEC. 5. There are authorized to be appropriated no more than $20,000 to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'BRIEN of New York: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 138 and insert the provisions of H.R. 3200 as passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

GREAT SMOKY MOUNTAINS NATIONAL PARK, N.C.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3887) to authorize the acceptance of donations of land in the State of North Carolina for the construction of an entrance road at Great Smoky Mountains National Park, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is my understanding that this legislation entails a cost in excess of $1 million. Furthermore, it is scheduled for consideration under suspension of the rules. Therefore, I withdraw my reservation of objection and ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

AGE LIMITS—APPOINTMENT TO U.S. PARK POLICE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4893) relating to age limits in connection with appointments to the U.S. Park Police.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 932, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this bill the same as the House bill?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Yes; the gentleman is correct. It is the same.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from from Oregon?

There was no objection.

CONVEY CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS TO COUNTY OF LINCOLN, NEV.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4151) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in the State of Nevada to the county of Lincoln, State of Nevada.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior shall issue to the county of Lincoln, State of Nevada, upon the payment of the purchase price by the county into the Treasury of the United States, not more than five years after the Secretary has notified the county of such price, which shall be an amount equal to the sum of the costs of extinguishing any adverse claims to the lands to be patented, the costs of any necessary survey, and the fair market value of the lands as determined by the Secretary after the appraisal of the lands by contract appraisal or otherwise, a patent for the following-described lands, situated in the State of Nevada and comprising approximately 2,920 acres (all range references are to the Mount Diablo base and meridian):

Range 67 east, township 3 south, northwest quarter of section 2; west half, southwest quarter section 2; all of section 3; northeast quarter and northwest quarter and southwest quarter and northeast quarter of southeast quarter and northwest quarter of southeast quarter and southwest quarter of southeast quarter of section 10. Northeast quarter and northwest quarter and southwest quarter of section 15. Also northeast quarter of southeast quarter of the northwest quarter of southeast quarter and southeast quarter of southeast quarter of section 15. All of section 14. All of southeast quarter of section 11 and southeast quarter of northeast quarter of section 11, and northwest quarter of northwest quarter of section 11.

SEC. 2. The conveyance authorized by this Act shall be made subject to any existing valid claims against the lands described in the first section of this Act, and to any reservations necessary to protect continuing uses of those lands by the United States.

SEC. 3. Nothing contained in the preceding provisions of this Act shall be construed to preclude the county of Lincoln, State of Nevada, from purchasing, in accordance with such preceding provisions, only such portion or portions, by legal subdivision of the public land surveys, of the above-described lands as such county elects, nor shall the purchase by such county of only a portion or portions of such lands be construed to constitute a waiver or relinquishment of any of its rights under this Act to purchase, in accordance with such preceding provisions and by legal subdivisions of the public land surveys, the remainder of such lands, or any portion thereof.

Sec. 4. All moneys received from the conveyance of lands under the terms of this Act shall be disposed of in the same manner as moneys received from the sale of public lands, except that moneys received as reimbursement for costs of appraisal, surveys, and extinguishing adverse claims may be used by the Secretary for said purposes without appropriation.

Sec. 5. The lands described in section 1 of this Act shall be segregated from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws, including the mining and mineral leasing laws, from the date of approval of this Act until the Secretary shall provide otherwise by publication of an order in the Federal Register.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, strike out all of lines 8, 9, and 10, and insert in lieu thereof: "the fair market value plus the cost of any appraisal of the lands as of the effective date of this Act as determined by the".

Page 2, line 4, strike out "2,920 acres" and insert "2,844 acres".

Page 2, strike out all of lines 6 through 18 and insert in lieu thereof: "The northwest quarter, west half of southwest quarter section 2; all section 3; north half, southwest quarter, west half of southeast quarter, northeast quarter of southeast quarter section 10; southeast quarter of northeast quarter, northwest quarter of northwest quarter, southeast quarter section 11; all section 14; north half, southwest quarter, northeast quarter of southeast quarter of northwest quarter of southeast quarter, southeast quarter of southeast quarter section 15, all in township 3 south, range 67 east, Mount Diablo meridian, Nevada."

Add a new section 6 to read as follows:

"Sec. 6. This Act shall not preclude the County of Lincoln from acquiring title for leases to any lands described in this Act for public or recreational purposes under the Act of June 14, 1926 (44 Stat. 741), as amended (43 U.S.C. 869, et seq.)."

Add a new section 7 to read as follows:

"Sec. 7. Any patent issued under this Act shall contain a reservation to the United States of any of the following named minerals for which the land is deemed valuable or prospectively valuable; coal, native asphalt, solid and semisolid bitumen, and bituminous rock (including oil-impregnated rock or sands from which oil is recoverable only by special treatment after the deposit is mined or quarried), oil, gas, oil shale, phosphate, sodium, and potassium, together with the right of the United States, its lessees, permittees, or licensees to prospect for, mine, and remove them under applicable provisions of law."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 873) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in the State of Nevada to the county of Lincoln, State of Nevada.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Nevada about the price of this land. As I understand it, this legislation establishes the purchase price as the fair market value as of the effective date of the legislation. I wonder why that wording is used rather than "as the effective date of the taking"?

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARSHA. Certainly.

Mr. BARING. This is a depressed area in particular, and there is a great demand for land. The State is growing out there, and we figured we would peg it at this particular time of the passing of the act in order to prevent land grabbers and have to pay a higher price for the land at a later date.

Mr. HARSHA. I see.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior shall issue to the county of Lincoln, State of Nevada, upon the payment of the purchase price by the county into the Treasury of the United States, not more than five years after the Secretary has notified the county of such price, which shall be an amount equal to the sum of the costs of extinguishing any adverse claims to the lands to be patented, the costs of any necessary survey, and the fair market value of the lands as determined by the Secretary after the appraisal of the lands by contract appraisal or otherwise, a patent for the following-described lands, situated in the State of Nevada and comprising approximately 2,844 acres (all range references are to the Mount Diablo base and meridian):

The northwest quarter, west half of southwest quarter section 2; all section 3; north half, southwest quarter, west half of southeast quarter, northeast quarter of southeast quarter section 10; southeast quarter of northeast quarter, northwest quarter of northwest quarter, southeast quarter, section 11; all section 14; north half, southwest quarter, northeast quarter of southeast quarter of northwest quarter of southeast quarter, southeast quarter of southeast quarter section 15, all in township 3 south, range 67 east, Mount Diablo meridian, Nevada.

Sec. 2. The conveyance authorized by this Act shall be made subject to any existing valid claims against the lands described in the first section of this Act, and to any reservations necessary to protect continuing uses of those lands by the United States.

Sec. 3. Nothing contained in the preceding provisions of this Act shall be construed to preclude the county of Lincoln, State of Nevada, from purchasing, in accordance with such preceding provisions, only such portion or portions, by legal subdivision of the public land surveys, of the above-described lands as such county elects, nor shall the purchase by such county of only a portion or portions of such lands be construed to constitute a waiver or relinquishment of any of its rights under this Act to purchase, in accordance with such preceding provisions and by legal subdivisions of the public land surveys, the remainder of such lands, or any portion thereof.

Sec. 4. All moneys received from the conveyance of lands under the terms of this Act shall be disposed of in the same manner as moneys received from the sale of public lands, except that moneys received as reimbursement for costs of appraisal, surveys, and extinguishing adverse claims may be used by the Secretary for said purposes without appropriation.

Sec. 5. The lands described in section 1 of this Act shall be segregated from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws, including the mining and mineral leasing laws, from the date of approval of this Act until the Secretary shall provide otherwise by publication of an order in the Federal Register.

Sec. 6. This Act shall not preclude the county of Lincoln from acquiring title or leases to any lands described in this Act for public or recreational purposes under the Act of June 14, 1926 (44 Stat. 741), as amended (43 U.S.C. 869, et seq.).

Sec. 7. Any patent issued under this Act shall contain a reservation to the United States of any of the following named minerals for which the land is deemed valuable or prospectively valuable: coal, native asphalt, solid and semisolid bitumen, and bituminous rock (including oil-impregnated rock or sands from which oil is recoverable only by special treatment after the deposit is mined or quarried), oil, gas, oil shale, phosphate, sodium, and potassium, together with the right of the United States its lessees, permittees, or licensees to prospect for, mine, and remove them under applicable provisions of law.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'Brien of New York: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 873 and insert the provisions of H.R. 4151, as passed.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill, H.R. 4151, was laid on the table.

PUBLIC LANDS AT MOJAVE B. AERIAL GUNNERY RANGE, SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY, CALIF.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4588) to provide for the withdrawal and reservation for the Department of the Navy of certain public lands of the United States at Mojave B Aerial Gunnery Range, San Bernardino County, Calif., for defense purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subject to valid existing rights the public lands, and the minerals therein, within the area described in section 2 of this Act are hereby withdrawn from all appropriations and other forms of disposition under the public land laws including the mining and mineral leasing laws and disposals of materials under the Act of July 31, 1947, as amended (61 Stat. 681; 30 U.S.C. 601–604), except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, and reserved for use of the Department of the Navy, subject to the condition that part or all of the reservation may be terminated at any time by the Secretary of the Navy upon notice to the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior may, with the concurrence of the Secretary of the Navy, authorize use or disposition of any of the lands or resources withdrawn and reserved by subsection (a) of this section.

(c) Upon request of the Secretary of the Interior at the time of termination of the reservation effected by this Act as provided in subsection (a) of this section, the Department of the Navy shall make safe for nonmilitary uses the land withdrawn and reserved or such portions thereof as may be specified by the Secretary of the Interior, by neutralizing unexploded ammunition, bombs, artillery projectiles, or other explosive objects and chemical agents. Thereafter, the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to law shall provide for the appropriate use or disposition of all or any part of the land withdrawn and reserved under provisions of this Act.

SEC. 2. The lands withdrawn and reserved by this Act are those that are now or may hereafter become subject to the public land laws within the area described as follows:

Approximately 312,659 acres, more or less, within the Mojave "B" Aerial Gunnery Range, San Bernardino County, California, and more fully described as follows:

township 25 south, range 44 east, sections 1 to 4 inclusive, sections 9 to 16 inclusive, sections 21 to 28 inclusive, and sections 33 to 36 inclusive;

township 26 south, range 44 east, sections 1 to 4 inclusive, sections 9 to 16 inclusive, sections 21 to 28 inclusive, and sections 33 to 36 inclusive;

township 27 south, range 44 east, sections 1 to 4 inclusive, and sections 9 to 12 inclusive;

township 29 south, range 44 east, sections 1 to 3 inclusive, sections 10 to 15 inclusive, sections 22 to 27 inclusive, and sections 34 to 36 inclusive;

township 30 south, range 44 east, sections 1 to 3 inclusive, sections 10 to 15 inclusive, sections 22 to 27 inclusive, and sections 34 to 36 inclusive;

township 25 south, range 45 east, sections 1 to 36 inclusive;

township 26 south, range 45 east, sections 1 to 36 inclusive;

township 27 south, range 45 east, sections 1 to 6 inclusive;

township 28 south, range 45 east, sections 31 to 36 inclusive;

township 29 south, range 45 east, sections 1 to 36 inclusive;

township 30 south, range 45 east, sections 1 to 34 inclusive, all of section 35 except south half of southwest quarter, and section 36;

township 25 south, range 46 east, sections 1 to 35 inclusive, and all of section 36 except east half of east half of northeast quarter;

township 26 south, range 46 east, sections 1 to 36 inclusive;

township 27 south, range 46 east, sections 1 to 6 inclusive;

township 28 south, range 46 east, sections 25 to 36 inclusive;

township 29 south, range 46 east, sections 1 to 36 inclusive;

township 30 south, range 46 east, sections 1 to 36 inclusive;

township 25 south, range 47 east, sections 5 to 8 inclusive, sections 17 to 20 inclusive, north half of section 29, north half of section 30, south half of section 31, and southwest quarter of section 32;

township 26 south, range 47 east, sections 4 to 9 inclusive, sections 16 to 21 inclusive, and sections 28 to 33 inclusive;

township 28 south, range 47 east, sections 19 to 21 inclusive; and sections 28 to 33 inclusive;

township 29 south, range 47 east, sections 3 to 10 inclusive, sections 15 to 22 inclusive, and sections 27 to 34 inclusive;

township 30 south, range 47 east, sections 3 to 10 inclusive; sections 15 to 22 inclusive; and sections 27 to 34 inclusive; Mount Diablo meridian.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 2, after the word "Navy" strike out the comma and insert "for a period of ten years with an option to renew the withdrawal and reservation for a period of five years upon notice to the Secretary of the Interior, and".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the consideration of all eligible bills on the Consent Calendar.

RE-REFERRAL OF THE BILL, H.R. 5342

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the Judiciary, I ask unanimous consent to rerefer the bill, H.R. 5342, to authorize the Association of Universalist Women to consolidate with the Alliance of Unitarian Women, and for other purposes, from the Committee on the Judiciary to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

GREAT SMOKY MOUNTAINS NATIONAL PARK, N.C.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3887) to authorize the acceptance of donations of land in the State of North Carolina for the construction of an entrance road at Great Smoky Mountains National Park, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to provide suitable access to the Cataloochee section of Great Smoky Mountains National Park, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to select the location of an entrance road from a point on North Carolina Highway Numbered 107 close to its point of interchange with Interstate Route Numbered 40, near Hepco, North Carolina, to the eastern boundary of the park in the vicinity of the Cataloochee section, and to accept, on behalf of the United States, donations of land and interests in land for the construction of the entrance road, and to construct the entrance road on the donated land: *Provided,* That the right-of-way to be acquired, by donation, for the entrance road shall be of such width as to comprise not more than an average of one hundred and twenty-five acres per mile for its entire length of about four and two-tenths miles, constituting in the aggregate about five hundred and twenty-five acres of land.

All property acquired pursuant to this Act shall become a part of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park upon acceptance of title thereto by the Secretary, and shall be subject to all laws, rules, and regulations applicable thereto.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for construction of an entrance road on land acquired pursuant to this Act not more than $1,160,000.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina, the sponsor of the bill [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3887 authorizes the acceptance of a donation of land in the State of North Carolina for the construction of an entrance road to the Smoky Mountains National Park leading into the Cataloochee area, and authorizes the construction of a road on the land accepted. The land acquired will become a part of the park and be subject to park control, but it will be used entirely as a right-of-way for the entrance road to be constructed. The State of North Carolina will acquire land and deed it to the Federal Government.

Cataloochee is a large and beautiful section of the park. Over 30 years ago this land was taken by the State of North Carolina from the many owners and given to the Federal Government to become part of the park. It is mostly cut over, contains farmhouses and barns and is not wilderness territory. However, it is located near a beautiful stand of virgin timber and contains a mountain stream comparable to Merced River in Yosemite National Park.

This section of the park is very remote and inaccessible, however, at present Interstate 40, going from Knoxville, Tenn., to Asheville is under construction and will pass 8 miles from Cataloochee Valley and only 4.2 miles from the edge of the Smoky Mountains National Park, giving us the first real opportunity to construct an access road at a reasonable cost into this beautiful scenic valley.

Under the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1962, $25 million is authorized for national park road construction in 1965. I have been assured by the National Park Service that the cost of this road construction can be handled within the limits of that authorization. Therefore, the approving of this bill would not necessitate an appropriation increase above that already authorized.

Last year the Smoky Mountains National Park had 5,200,000 visitors, making it the first national park in American history to have more than 5 million visitors in a single season. There was an 8-percent increase over the preceding year. Most of these visitors entered the park over one road going from Gatlinburg to Cherokee which has been subjected to some of the worst traffic jams found on any scenic road in the Nation. The proposed new road would open up a new section of the park which could be reached on an interstate road in 45 minutes from Asheville or 1 hour and 15 minutes from Knoxville. It will be the most accessible section of the park and will be one of the finest spots in America for picnicking and camping. More such facilities are needed because 50,000 cars of campers were turned away from the

Smoky Mountains Park and surrounding national forests last summer because there was no place to put them. I am familiar with this territory and have visited it often. If we are going to continue developing the Smoky Mountains National Park, and I know that we are and must, this section should be made accessible and should be utilized, and this access road is necessary. It will be of value to people from all over America.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. First, I should like to compliment the gentleman for bringing this bill to the attention of the Congress of the United States. His own great State of North Carolina over a long period has done much to bring about recreation in the areas of that great State. It has done a tremendous job in roadbuilding and in other sectors of recreation. I think this bill should pass unanimously, because with over 5 million people visiting this great section of our Nation and some of the scenic beauties that are there, they certainly deserve legislation of this kind to make it more accessible to the general public of the United States.

Mr. TAYLOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the gentleman from Florida in his remarks. During my years on the Committee on Interior I have been constantly edified by the efforts made by the great State of North Carolina to solve its own park problems. I can assure the Members of this House that when North Carolina comes to the Federal Government for any form of assistance in this direction that North Carolina has really exhausted every effort that it could make. I think that North Carolina in the matter of parks could very well serve as an example to every State in the Union.

Mr. TAYLOR. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill, H.R. 3887. I know of no opposition on this side. This measure had the unanimous support of the Subcommittee on National Parks and also the full Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The purpose of the bill has been fully explained by the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, I urge favorable action on this bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 3887?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture be given until midnight tonight to file a report on H.R. 5497.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

PEANUTS FOR BOILING

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 101) to extend for 2 years the definition of "peanuts" which is now in effect under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the last paragraph of the Act entitled "An Act to amend the peanut marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938", approved August 13, 1957, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1359 note), is amended by striking out "and 1963" and inserting in lieu thereof "1963, 1964, and 1965".

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the bill which we are now discussing is one that I introduced to extend for 2 years the definition of peanuts which is now in effect under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. The purpose of this legislation is to permit farmers who want to plant peanuts for boiling purposes to do so, without coming under the provisions of acreage allotments. To give the technical definition of this exemption, let me say that this definiton of peanuts excludes from the provisions of acreage allotments and marketing quotas any peanuts which are marketed before drying or removal of moisture—either by natural or by artificial means—for consumption exclusively, as boiled peanuts.

We have had this legislation in effect since 1957. I introduced the first legislation in this regard and similar legislation was introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER]. An exemption for boiled peanuts was first enacted in 1957 and was applicable to the 1957, 1958, and 1959 crops. Subsequently, the exemption was extended for the 1960 and 1961 crops. More recently, the exemption was continued for the 1962 and 1963 crops of peanuts. The Department of Agriculture reported favorably on this legislation, and recommended that the exemption be made permanent. I am in thorough agreement with the Department of Agriculture, but our committee felt that to extend the exemption for another 2-year period would be more desirable so we could constantly be on the alert to see if the program were in any way harmful to the regular peanut program.

In this connection, may I point out that last year there were planted for boiling, approximately 3,000 acres of peanuts, primarily concentrated in five States: Alabama, Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, and Mississippi. There is a total acreage of peanuts of approximately 1,560,000 acres. It can be seen from this insignificant amount of peanuts planted for boiling compared to the total acreage that there has not developed any great program for boiling peanuts—but let me say that it is a healthful little industry. There are dozens of farmers who plant peanuts for boiling purposes in my district, and in other areas of the Peanut Belt. In Florida, I know of several little factories that can these peanuts for boiling—one in Belleview; one in Live Oak, and I believe one in either Tampa or Jacksonville. The boiled peanut, Mr. Speaker, is a vegetable, and has an entirely different taste from peanuts used for other purposes. It has proved not to be a competitor for the markets of other peanuts. We are hoping that we can continue to establish a definite market for boiled peanuts, and I believe that passage of this legislation will help this small, but healthy, industry continue to have a modest growth.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Family Farms of our House Committee on Agriculture, I feel that the little industry that has been developed as a result of this boiled peanut legislation, is an interesting factor in showing what can be done by private initiative. Here is a program that supplements other income of the small farmer, and it does not impose upon the farmer the regulations of some of the other farming programs. I sincerely believe that this legislation should get the unanimous support of the House.

May I point out this bill was unanimously reported by the subcommittee and unanimously reported by the full committee.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am delighted to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. So we have arrived at the time when a peanut is not a peanut; is that correct?

Mr. MATTHEWS. This kind of peanut is a vegetable.

Mr. GROSS. What does it taste like when it is boiled?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I would be delighted to have the gentleman taste some, but I am sorry I do not have this can opened at the moment. But, immediately after this discussion, and I mean this quite sincerely, if we can find a can opener, we will open up this can of boiled peanuts. I know my colleague will enjoy the taste of them. They taste entirely different from peanuts that are salted.

Mr. GROSS. What does a peanut look like when it is boiled?

Mr. MATTHEWS. It is boiled in the hull in a salty solution. If we can get a can opener, we will open the can now and show the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Can they be used for fishbait? Would they make good fishbait or something like that?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I have not tried that, I do not know, sir. But let me emphasize the fact that this peanut program has no support price and is entirely out of the Government regulations. I feel sure it has been a very helpful little program for many of our farmers.

Mr. GROSS. Then this is one bill dealing with agricultural products in the South that did not take a trip through the rose garden? Can we rely on that?

Mr. MATTHEWS. No, sir, it did not take a trip through the rose garden.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am delighted to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. The boiled peanut is one product that is quite different, delicious, and nutritious. I should like to satisfy the curiosity of our friend, the gentleman from Iowa, and any others who want to know what a fine product we offer in these boiled peanuts.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Will they grow hair?

Mr. MATTHEWS. They have not grown hair yet.

Mr. SIKES. The answer should be obvious. I was raised on them. That is the only thing I can say boiled peanuts are deficient in. They will not grow hair.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Let me say to the gentleman from Iowa, if it were not in violation of the good conscience, that I know we all have, I might even be tempted to say that it would grow hair, but I do not think it will.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, speaking more seriously, the gentleman from Florida is rendering a fine service in bringing this bill to the floor. The legislation is needed. It interferes with no marketing program. In fact the acreage is so small that an attempt to provide controls would be a costly and ludicrous thing. The bill helps the little grower who is producing just a few peanuts for a specialty product; is that not correct?

Mr. MATTHEWS. The gentleman is absolutely right. I might point out that many of our farmers, our colored citizens, especially, take advantage of this legislation. Here is a chance to pass a bill—and I know it is not of earth-shaking importance—to help a lot of little people make a living.

Mr. SIKES. That is the whole purpose of the bill. It does not interfere with any marketing program. The volume is not sufficient to justify inclusion in such a program. The boiled peanut is a very fine product and the bill helps the little people who produce this product, and help to make a livelihood for themselves by so doing.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am delighted to yield to my beloved colleague.

Mr. HAYS. I want to help the gentleman all I can, but you should have kept that can closed.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Oh, if we could but undo some of the things we have done, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, the able chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries whose people plant some of these peanuts, and I am sure enjoy them.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I am very much interested in the peanut program. I notice in the report that these peanuts are grown in the States of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, South Carolina and Mississippi.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, while they may be grown primarily in those States, this product is not confined exclusively to those areas.

Mr. BONNER. Yes, that is what I wanted to ask the gentleman. Can any State that desires to plant as many of these peanuts as they desire to plant do so?

Mr. MATTHEWS. The answer is yes, but, of course, in two years if the program gets out of hand, the legislation may not be extended.

Mr. BONNER. May I say to my colleague, the gentleman from Florida of whom I am very fond and for whom I have the highest respect, when the peanut program was lifted during World War II for the purpose of producing oil for the war effort, the States of North Carolina and Virginia had an understanding that should quotas be reinvoked that Virginia would not get less than so many acres nor would North Carolina get less than so many acres. But in the interim there was a vast acreage of peanuts planted in certain States, and when the program came back in these peanuts planted in the war effort were given credit for the reallotments of acreage. The State of Virginia lost a tremendous amount of acreage, likewise the State of North Carolina. That is why I rise here to ask and be certain about this matter. These peanuts, I understand, move in interstate commerce. It is not localized at all. It would be an interstate product.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It has been, I will say to the gentleman, for years, and I want to assure him this has nothing to do with acreage allotments. Let me emphasize again there are 1,560,000 acres under acreage allotment. There are 3,000 acres planted for boiling peanuts.

Mr. BONNER. I remember a distinguished gentleman in this House, who was very active on the Agriculture Committee, when we lifted acreage allotments on peanuts, he said on the floor of the House:

Listen to me, boys; listen to me; we want to get all the gadgets out of the peanut program.

I objected at that time to giving that gadget protecting certain acreage for North Carolina and Virginia.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Does the gentleman want North Carolina excluded from the bill?

Mr. BONNER. Let me finish my statement to show you why I am interested. We cut that gadget out. As I say, and as I said before, Virginia lost a lot of acreage, and so did North Carolina. I wanted this to be a matter of record, whether North Carolina plants them, Virginia, or Mississippi, or who else plants them, this will not eventually come in as a recognized acreage that is setting up quotas in the various States.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I agree with the gentleman, and I appreciate his interest in that point. It will not have anything to do with acreage allotments.

Mr. BONNER. There are plants in Virginia and North Carolina that can peanuts at the present time?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am not sure.

Mr. BONNER. In your own State you can grow all of the peanuts you want to and send them to a factory to be put into cans of this type?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am sorry I cannot yield to the gentleman much longer because I have only a short time and there are five or six more Members who want to speak.

Let me say to the gentleman, during the life of this legislation of course that can happen. There is no limitation on acreage for boiled peanuts. If this legislation is not good legislation, in 2 years, I will not offer it, and the gentleman can help to defeat it, if it is offered.

Mr. BONNER. I will say to the gentleman it is good legislation. I would like to know what supervision there is and how these peanuts are harvested, if they are machine harvested, and how quickly they are taken to the processing plants.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The best definition of the way they are harvested is pointed out in the record, which says that the peanuts are marketed before drying or removal of moisture by natural or artificial means. They pull up the vines and they handpick the peanuts. That is the way they are handled.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Dole].

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, this may seem like a very insignificant bill; in fact, perhaps in some aspects it is. But, let me point out that there are minority views filed by myself and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley].

I want to point out, too, that last week on the floor of this House the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Matthews] made this statement:

> Mr. Chairman, I want to thank our friends from the city for helping us pass the farm legislation, and I want particularly—and I mean this very sincerely, indeed—to plead with them again this afternoon to help these wonderful Congressmen who represent the farmers do what is best for the farmers, even though they do not want to do it themselves—some of them.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that perhaps this is true, but, now, what do we have here? The same gentleman from Florida is trying to exempt certain farmers from the supply-management program.

Well, if this is good enough for the peanut farmer, it should be good enough for the wheat farmer, and, it seems highly inconsistent for the gentleman, in a week's time, to take two completely different positions on agricultural programs. Either a supply-management program is good for every peanut grower or not, regardless of the type or size, and, it occurs to me it is rather strange indeed that we can now say a peanut is not a peanut because they are to be sold as boiled peanuts. Therefore, we should be advocating not just a 3,000-acre exemption but freedom for all peanuts, and all peanut producers, and it is on this basis that I think it is bad legislation. It should be subjected to amendment, and perhaps include not only peanuts but the wheat and grain producers and everyone else who does not want supply management.

I wonder if the gentleman from Florida would yield for a question.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I would be delighted to yield to my friend.

Mr. DOLE. On the basis of this legislation, when does a peanut become a vegetable?

Mr. MATTHEWS. When it is put into a can or boiled for use as boiled peanuts.

Mr. DOLE. And there are no limitations on how many acres might be involved?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Just as there is a difference between corn and roasting ears. We have always made a difference in the definition for corn on acreage allotment and corn used as roasting ears.

Mr. DOLE. Would it be possible that all of the surplus wheat could be considered peanuts so surpluses of that commodity could be eliminated?

Mr. MATTHEWS. The answer of course is "No."

Mr. DOLE. Do you really think this is consistent and fair to the other peanut producers?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I think it is consistent with my own philosophy in trying to help the farmers in every way possible.

Mr. DOLE. It occurs to me, by legislative magic here, we are exempting peanuts from supply management. If we can do this for boiled peanuts, why can we not do it for every other commodity. Certainly, as stated in the minority views, it is simply a program to protect you from government, from the same supply management the gentleman so heartily endorsed last week, and on the basis of this principle, it is wrong.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that I speak for the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Dole], as well as myself, when I say that we are heartily in sympathy with the objective of protecting farmers from governmental control. Of course, that is exactly what is proposed here. Our objective in the bill is too restrictive. The same blessings of freedom from governmental control should be extended to all peanut producers and not just that small group of peanut producers which may be producing peanuts for boiling.

Mr. Speaker, we are in a rather restricted parliamentary situation today. I checked with the Parliamentarian on the possibility of amending the bill. Not even under a unanimous consent request can the bill be amended.

There is no course for us who believe in a marketplace system and would like to extend the same blessings of freedom to all peanut producers but to oppose suspending the rules. In that way the bill likely would stay on the Union Calendar, and, we may hope, would be scheduled by the House Rules Committee under an open rule so the House could then work its will and make a determination by a vote here on the floor of the House as to whether or not all peanut farmers should be set free.

The effect of H.R. 101 is to protect part of the peanut crop—that intended for use as boiled peanuts—from supply management.

It is a milestone of some sort that the Committee on Agriculture finds it necessary, and wise, occasionally to pass a bill to protect American farmers from Government control—the plain-language term for supply management.

It is even more noteworthy that the Secretary of Agriculture, Orville L. Freeman, America's foremost advocate of supply management, favors this protection for the producers of peanuts for boiling. His only criticism of the bill is that it does not provide permanent protection from Government control. He recommends that this protection be permanent.

This same protection should be extended to all peanut farmers, and, indeed, to all farmers and all farm commodities.

Meanwhile, congratulations to this small but happy group of farmers who have been able to get Government protection from Government itself.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Florida that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present, and object to the vote on the ground that no quorum is present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 37]

Addabbo
Alger
Anderson
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Ayres
Barrett
Beermann
Belcher
Berry
Blatnik
Bolling
Bolton,
  Frances P.
Brademas
Bromwell
Brown, Calif.
Buckley
Cahill
Carey
Celler
Chamberlain
Chelf
Collier
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Cramer
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Derounian
Diggs
Downing
Dulski
Elliott
Farbstein
Finnegan
Fino
Fisher
Fogarty
Ford
Forrester
Fountain
Friedel
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Giaimo
Gilbert
Goodell
Goodling
Grabowski
Grant
Gray
Grover
Hagan, Ga.
Halleck
Halpern
Hanna
Hawkins
Healey
Hébert
Hemphill
Hoffman
Holifield
Hull
Jarman
Jennings
Karth
Kee
Keith
Kirwan
Knox
Kornegay
Lloyd
Long, La.
Macdonald
Madden
Martin, Mass.
Michel
Miller, N.Y.
Minish
Monagan
Moorhead
Morrison
Morton
Multer
Nedzi
Nix
O'Konski
O'Neill
Osmers
Patten
Pepper
Philbin
Powell
Purcell
Quillen
Rains
Reid, Ill.
Rhodes, Pa.
Roberts, Ala.
Rodino
Roosevelt
Rostenkowski
Roush
Ryan, Mich.
St. George
St Germain
Saylor
Scott
Shelley
Sheppard
Shriver
Sibal
Smith, Iowa
Staggers
Steed
Stratton
Utt
Walter
Watson
Whalley
Widnall
Wilson,
  Charles H.
Wyman

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 303 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PEANUTS FOR BOILING

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to suspend the rules and call up the bill under consideration be withdrawn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Subcommittee on Education be allowed to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

EXPERIMENT STATION RESEARCH FACILITIES

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 40) to assist the States to provide additional facilities for research at the State agricultural experiment stations.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to continue its support of agricultural research at the State agricultural experiment stations through Federal-grant funds, on a matching basis, to help finance physical facilities as required for the effective conduct of an adequate research program.

Sec. 2. The purpose of this Act is to assist the State agricultural experiment stations in the construction, acquisition, and remodeling of buildings, laboratories, and other capital facilities (including the acquisition of fixtures and equipment which are to become a

part of such buildings) which are necessary to more effectively conduct research in agriculture and sciences related thereto through means of grants from the Federal Government.

SEC. 3. As used in sections 2 to 11, inclusive, of this Act—

(1) the term "State" shall include Puerto Rico;

(2) the term "State agricultural experiment station" means a department established under the direction of a college or university in any State in accordance with the Act entitled "An Act donating public lands to the several States and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and mechanic arts", approved July 2, 1862 (7 U.S.C. 301); or a department otherwise established pursuant to standards prescribed by the State the purpose of which is to conduct agricultural research; and

(3) the term "Secretary" shall mean the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 4. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for allocation to the States for the purposes of section 2 such sums as the Congress deems advisable.

(b)(1) One-third of the funds appropriated pursuant to this section for any fiscal year shall be allotted equally among the States.

(2) Two-thirds of the funds appropriated pursuant to this section for any fiscal year shall be allocated among the States as follows: One-half in an amount which bears the same ratio to the total amount to be allotted as the rural population of the State bears to the total rural population of all the States as determined by the last preceding decennial census current at the time each such sum is first appropriated; and one-half in an amount which bears the same ratio to the total amount to be allotted as the farm population of the State bears to the total farm population of all the States as determined by the last preceding decennial census current at the time such sum is first appropriated.

(c) It shall be the duty and responsibility of the Secretary to administer the provisions of section 4 of this Act under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe as necessary therefor.

SEC. 5. Any State in order to be eligible for payments from funds allocated pursuant to section 4 shall submit, in such form as the Secretary may require, specific proposals for acquisition or construction of physical facilities defined in section 2 of this Act. No State shall receive any payment for any such proposal unless such proposal is approved by the Secretary.

SEC. 6. (a) No payment shall be made to any State under the provisions of section 4 of this Act in any amount greater than the amount made available by such State from non-Federal funds for purposes for which payments are made under section 4 of this Act.

(b) Any unused portion of the allotment of any State for any fiscal year shall remain available, at the option of such State, for payment to such State for a period of not more than two fiscal years following the fiscal year in which such allotment is first made available.

SEC. 7. With respect to multiple-purpose physical facilities, the segment or portion thereof which is to be utilized for agricultural research shall be the basis for determination of fund support under this Act.

SEC. 8. For each fiscal year that funds are made available for allocation to States under the provisions of section 4 and section 6 of this Act, the Secretary shall ascertain, at the earliest practicable date during such year, the amount of the allocation to which each State is entitled, and shall notify each State in writing promptly thereafter as to the amount of such allocation.

SEC. 9. (a) Any State agricultural experiment station authorized to receive payments under the provisions of section 4 of this Act shall have a chief administrative officer, to be know as a director, and a treasurer or other officer appointed by the governing board of such station. Such treasurer or other officer shall receive and account for all funds paid to such station pursuant to the provisions of this Act, and shall submit a report, approved by the director of such station, to the Secretary on or before the first day of September of each year. Such report shall contain a detailed statement of the amount received under the provisions of this Act during the preceding fiscal year, and of its disbursements on schedules prescribed by the Secretary.

(b) If any portion of the allotted funds received by the authorized receiving officer of any State agricultural experiment station shall by any action or contingency be diminished, lost, or misapplied, it shall be repaid by the State concerned, and until repaid no part of any subsequent appropriation shall be allocated or paid to such State.

SEC. 10. The Secretary shall make an annual report to the Congress during the first regular session of each year with respect to (1) payments made under this Act, (2) the facilities, by States, for which such payments were made, and (3) whether any portion of the appropriation available for allotment to any State has been withheld and, if so, the reasons therefor.

SEC. 11. (a) Any agricultural experiment station established by State law shall be eligible for benefits under this Act.

(b) With respect to any State in which more than one agricultural experiment station has been established, any appropriations allocated for the use of such State pursuant to the provisions of this Act shall be divided between or among such institutions as the legislature of such State shall direct.

SEC. 12. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for proper administration of this Act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, H.R. 40, comes to the House with the unanimous endorsement of the Committee on Agriculture. This is the second time that the Committee on Agriculture has reported this legislation. It was first reported in the last Congress and passed on the 30th day of August 1962, without any objection whatsoever from the floor. It reached the Senate too late for consideration over there.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bipartisan measure. It has had the endorsement of the previous Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, as well as Secretary Freeman.

Companion bills have been introduced by various Members of the House. Authors of companion bills are the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. REIFEL], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY], and probably others.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to assist the States in the construction, acquisition, and remodeling of their agricultural experiment stations. Actually, this is not a new program. I will say to the Members of the House that there is already authority for Federal grants to State experiment stations but there is no particular formula under which the funds are to be distributed.

The principal objective of the bill is to provide an equitable formula for the distribution of grants among the States, which formula will be more or less comparable to that under which funds are now distributed to the Extension Service in the various States.

Mr. Speaker, the formula specifically provides that one-third of the funds shall be allocated to the States on an equal basis, another one-third on the basis of the rural population of each State, and the remaining one-third on the basis of farm population.

Mr. Speaker, may I say that many of the facilities of our agricultural experiment stations are now quite old and very antiquated. They do not fit into the need of a modern, scientific research operation. Agriculture is now faced with many new plant and animal diseases, blights, insects, pests, and so on. Improvement in existing experiment and laboratory facilities is quite essential to meet this threat and to advance new uses and better marketing of agricultural commodities.

Mr. Speaker, I think this covers the high points of the bill. I shall be glad to yield to any Member who desires to propound a question.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that I think the bill is a good one and I am in favor of it. Fine work has been done by the experiment stations. May I inquire of the gentleman whether there is any estimate as to the amount of funds that would be needed under this program? There is nothing in the bill itself that gives any estimate as to what we may be entering into in the way of funding.

Mr. ABERNETHY. This bill simply authorizes that the moneys be distributed to the States under the formula that I have just mentioned. To be a little more specific, the directors of the experiment stations, under the leadership of Dr. Hawkins, of Oklahoma State University, as well as witnesses from the Department of Agriculture, testified that there was now a need for about $12 million of Federal funds for this purpose.

Mr. BOW. Do I understand the gentleman estimates that about $12 million will be used and will cover the experiment stations in the various States?

Mr. ABERNETHY. That covers current needs according to the testimony brought to us by the people who operate these stations and by the people in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. BOW. On the question of the financing program, section 12 authorizes appropriated sums that may be necessary for the proper administration of the act. Will the gentleman give us some idea what the cost of the administration of the act will be.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I should not think there would be an additional dime of administrative cost. I do not see how there could be because already we have people in the Department of Agriculture who are administering an almost identical program, except that the distribution of funds is not made under the formula to which I have referred.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman feels that the adoption of this legislation would not mean that we are creating any more positions?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I certainly would not think so; no, sir.

Mr. BOW. And that the appropriation for administration would be about the same as it has been in the past?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Exactly.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi for yielding to me because I do serve on the committee that will have to fund any result of this action. I am happy to see—and I read at this time from the report:

> The purpose of this bill is to authorize appropriation of Federal funds, on a matching basis, specifically for the purpose of assisting in the construction, acquisition, and remodeling of buildings, laboratories, and other physical facilities for agricultural research in the State agricultural experiment stations.

I make note of the word "specifically" and I assume my colleague from Mississippi intends that to mean exactly the way it sounds; that is true, is it not?

Mr. ABERNETHY. That is not my word; that is what the gentleman finds in the report. I might say to my friend from Washington that this bill sets up the ground rules for the distribution of Federal grants among the States for the erection, repair or construction of experiment stations and facilities, which incidentally are now authorized by law.

Mr. HORAN. I understand, I think, and when the agriculture appropriations bill is on the floor I will be specific myself in informing the House of Representatives that our State agricultural experiment stations in 1962 spent $15.5 million of Federal funds that were not budgeted or, if they were, it did not come to the attention of the Bureau of the Budget, and it did not come to the attention of our subcommittee; and in 1963, and I have the list here, transfers from other departments to State experiment stations totaled $16,581,181 that was not budgeted per se, did not come to us in the justifications, and was not handled through the Bureau of the Budget. They were funds that we had appropriated here to other departments and agencies, who in turn transferred this Federal money to State experiment stations without informing the Congress, our subcommittee, the Department, or the Bureau of the Budget of these transfers. It is reasonable to assume that this further $1 million that I am talking about as between 1962 and 1963, the current year, has helped to build up the stature of our State experiment stations to the point where it would be an additional argument for your bill here. But I do contend that it undermines the principle of appropriation of Federal moneys, and some stop has to be put to it.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I think the gentleman has rendered a real service in calling these points to the attention of the House. Of course, the gentleman is not making a point on this particular bill. What he is saying is that certain other funds have been made available to the experiment stations and that his subcommittee was not accorded the information.

Mr. HORAN. We have no control over nor are we interested in the funds that go to the State experiment stations, and I am one of the advocates of the State experiment stations. We have no control over the contributions of individuals or the States. But as members of the Appropriations Committee we are charged with the responsibility of looking into the funds that are included in the regular appropriation.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I strongly favor the purposes of H.R. 40, to assist the States to provide additional facilities for research at the State agricultural experiment stations. I support heartily the declaration that it is the policy of the U.S. Congress to continue its support of agricultural research at the State agricultural experiment stations through Federal-grant funds, on a matching basis, to help finance physical facilities as required for the effective conduct of an adequate research program.

I believe it should be pointed out that these State agricultural experiment stations are performing a fine function in the research and development of agriculture in this country, as well as in improving the quality of products and bettering distribution and marketing procedures.

One of the best provisions of this type of approach is that the States provide matching funds, so that there is obtained local responsibility and local contribution as well as Federal grants and responsibility in order to insure the good use of the moneys appropriated. As a Congressman representing an industrial area, I believe that this U.S. agriculture policy is good, not only for the farmers, the processors, distributors, and the business community, but also for the consumers. This is a type of agriculture and farm policy of the Federal Government which I strongly favor, and recommend that it continue, especially on the basis of having the individual States participate.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. I want to ask the distinguished gentleman whether or not this is a new expenditure or bricks and mortar rather than an operational expenditure.

Mr. ABERNETHY. No, it is not a new expenditure. There is already authority in law for making grants to the States for these purposes. Grants up to $90,000 can be made without any matching at all. The grants referred to in this bill are to be made under a matching formula, dollar for dollar, under a formula which would afford each State a fair share.

Mr. HOSMER. However, the authority for matching in amounts in excess of $20,000 under the Hatch Act of 1955 has not been exercised; is that correct?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I just do not have sufficient information on that point to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. HOSMER. According to the report of the gentleman's committee, this is the case and as a consequence I think this is, in effect, a new spending program. I direct the gentleman's attention to the estimate of cost of some $12 million annually.

Mr. ABERNETHY. That is not an annual cost. An estimate was made that they now have a need of only $12 million of Federal funds. That may not be the situation 5 years or 10 years from now. All of these programs are on a continuing basis. Taking the Extension Service, for example, there is no way anyone can estimate what the eventual overall cost of the extension program would be.

Mr. HOSMER. There are at least 100 of these State extension services facilities that would be involved; are there not?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I do not know how many would be involved. I do not think there would be too many. I think the testimony shows that only about 20 States have plans now for expanding their facilities. There may be more, I just do not know.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I think this program is a poor one and should be defeated at this time.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I regret the gentleman feels as he does and I respectfully disagree with him. This is a good program. Through our experiment stations American Agriculture has moved toward heights unexcelled anywhere in the world. Through this program and particularly the authority in this bill, we hope to provide more markets and more uses for our farm commodities. This is a good bill. It is good legislation. It is a good program. I sincerely hope this House will pass this bill.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation. I think we have shown in the past that the really effective assistance the Federal Government gives to American agriculture is through research. This bill provides the formula whereby each State will be able to construct the buildings needed for research. The peculiar problems of agriculture in a particular State can only be handled by the State itself. In this bill, each State receives money according to a formula. I think H.R. 40 is an improvement to make the present law workable and in view of the purposes of the bill, I give it my wholehearted support.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Reifel].

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill. And I want to commend the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Abernethy] for his continued efforts and leadership on this legislation.

It was unfortunate that this bill came up too late in the last session to receive the concurrence of the other body. With the overwhelmingly bipartisan support that has been given this approach by the House in years past, and again this year, it is to be hoped that the other body will see fit to give it its prompt endorsement.

Certainly the work of our State agricultural experiment stations has been among the most fruitful research which has contributed to the emergence of the American farmer as the most efficient and technically advanced in the world. It can do the same in the field of utilization research.

It is fitting that we continue to rely upon and strengthen the efforts of the existing experiment facilities in the historic pattern of State-Federal cooperative effort.

As sponsor of a similar measure, H.R. 7064, I urge passage of this measure to bring about much needed modernization and improvement of the physical facilities for research at State experiment stations. It will fill a basic need in my own agricultural State and across the Nation.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Hoeven].

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I favor this legislation. A similar bill passed the House unanimously last year. It got bogged down in the other body in the closing days of the session, and hence was not enacted into law. This bill has the support of every land-grant college in the United States and has the general support of all the farm organizations as far as I know. I think it is highly essential in these days when we are confronted with surplus agricultural commodities that we have more research in new uses for agricultural commodities. We should also give more attention to problems of transportation, distribution, and related problems. This is a bill in the right direction and I urge its passage.

The bill will be financed through the regular appropriations process and not through the back-door spending technique which has been proposed in cotton legislation now pending in the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Harvey].

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I am in support of this legislation. I think it is rather unique in the fact that although it does provide under this formula for a revised distribution, all of the experiment stations are in accord with it. They feel it is a more equitable and desirable distribution of such moneys as are available. I am particularly interested and would like to bring to the attention of the House the fact that this money which is to go for bricks and mortar or physical plant facilities is more necessary probably than it has been in the past. The reason is that many of our experimental stations and land grant colleges have available, particularly in the field of graduate study, fellowships and scholarships, which today they are unable to utilize properly because they do not have the facilities to use them. So this, in my opinion, is the right way, the best way, if we are going to assist in the field of higher education.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. McIntire].

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation. I think it is particularly significant that the legislation has a formula of distribution and that no funds will be paid any State except through actual performance under the act. In addition, it requires matching funds of equal amount at the State level, which permits the States to play an important part in the practical application and use of these funds.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Short].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, in reading the bill H.R. 40 I notice there is nothing in it to identify any specific purpose of the research authorized. It directs itself toward expansion of facilities in the field of agricultural research. Those of us who are on the Committee on Agriculture can appreciate the need for agricultural research, but we think we must also recognize that there is a need for agricultural research in a certain field or a new field; namely, finding, if possible, new markets, new uses, and new crops.

In the Committee on Agriculture we deal continually with the simple fact that research has possibly been too successful and we are able to produce too much. As I read the bill, it seems to me there *is* no provision in the bill, no reference, no language that indicates the purpose of the bill is anything more than to expand our present type of agricultural research.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The gentleman makes a good point. It is a point that was considered by the subcommittee. We held hearings on this matter last year, and also 3 years ago, I believe. To attempt to limit the bill to specific and particular types of research meant that we would lose the benefit of additional research services of which the station may be capable. Reference was often made to this particular point throughout the hearings. We put emphasis on it. We also made reference to it in the report. However, we felt that if we attempted to confine the stations to a particular type of research, it would be making a mistake.

Mr. SHORT. I agree that the use of these facilities should not be tied to any particular purpose for an indefinite time in the future. I cannot help thinking, however, that in some way, somehow or other there should be identification of the direction we want agricultural research to go. As the gentleman knows, I am not a member of the subcommittee and I am not as knowledgeable perhaps as I should be about this bill—there is some language in the committee report that attempts to indicate that utilization of these additional facilities shall be directed in the field I have just mentioned.

Mr. ABERNETHY. All of the emphasis in the last 2 or 3 years on the part of our agricultural leaders in and out of Congress has been in that direction. I am quite sure that the agricultural scientists are familiar with that situation, and they themselves have been moving more in that direction than before.

Mr. SHORT. The only point I make is this: I would like to have the record on this bill, the committee report, and the record of debate here on the floor of the House indicate that we who are interested in agriculture are interested in emphasizing at this time this field of new utilization, new crops, new markets, and that sort of thing.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I might say to the gentleman that actually that was the inspiration for this particular legislation. This grew out of an investigation made some years ago by a commission appointed by President Eisenhower. Two pieces of legislation came from that report. This is one. The other passed the House during the 86th Congress but failed to pass the other body.

Mr. SHORT. Being aware of this, as I read the bill, that is why I raised this point. The reason as the gentleman says, which inspired this legislation is not identified in the bill.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I think the gentleman has made a good point, and I am glad he has made a record of such.

Mr. SHORT. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. If I might have the attention of the gentleman from Mississippi, I would like to go one step further. If we are going to expand research facilities at the agricultural colleges of the country, let a substantial part of it be used to determine why the farmer is not paid a price commensurate with costs for what he produces rather than research for more production.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I do not disagree with the gentleman at all. I am 100 percent with the gentleman on that particular point.

Mr. GROSS. I notice in the morning paper that 2 dozen eggs can be bought in the District of Columbia, U.S. inspected, supposedly large eggs, for 77 cents. That is less than 40 cents a dozen at retail in the stores of the District of Columbia, one of the highest living cost areas of the country. Farmers must be getting less than 20 cents a dozen for these eggs. No Iowa farmer could survive on that kind of a price.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I agree with the gentleman, as I usually do.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to section 4 of the bill. Subsection (c) gives the power to the Secretary to prescribe rules and regulations in regard to the formula involved. It seems to me that earlier in this section the formula is very specifically set out, and I wonder what the meaning of this section might be and why this rulemaking power is necessary. I would direct a question to the gentleman from Mississippi, if he would be so kind as to answer, whether or not the rulemaking power of this section would, under any circumstances, give the Secretary the power to prescribe conditions, such as the type of construction or the particular kind of program involved.

Mr. ABERNETHY. There was evidence of a tremendous lack of facilities. The hearings developed that fact. I am not sure, but I think some reference was made in the report to that effect. Each State under the bill will submit its program to the Department. The Secretary was given this power in order that he could specifically eliminate the overlapping of research. Then there is a certain amount of housekeeping incidental to the program. There will be forms upon which applications will be made. There will be forms upon which programs will be submitted. Each State will be called upon to submit its program to the Department. So, we just thought the rulesmaking section was essential. The Secretary did not write this bill. He had nothing to do with it. This bill was submitted to the members of our committee by the people who operate this program back in the States. The bill was never seen in the Department of Agriculture until long after it was submitted to us. So there was no effort on the part of the Secretary to grab up any special power.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I understand, then, from the gentleman's remarks it is intended by the committee and the language of the bill that the Secretary shall have power to decide what particular program the State agricultural institutions are carrying on. He can determine whether they are duplicating or not and whether it is wise or not. This implies that he can control all the work being done by the individual States under the program.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I do not think he could control it any more than he controls it at this time. But certainly someone in the Department should review and evaluate, if not approve, the projects and programs.

Both the State and the Federal Government have an equal voice in this program. There is nothing incumbent on the part of any State to participate in the program. They can get in or stay out, just as they choose.

Mr. TAFT. Would I be correct in the opinion that if a State accepts the money that under this provision the Secretary can prescribe rules and regulations?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Not after they have accepted it.

Mr. TAFT. Which must be complied with in order to participate in the program?

Mr. ABERNETHY. No, sir; not after they have accepted it, but before, and there must be a meeting of the minds as to the kind, type, and character of the research to be carried on.

Mr. TAFT. This does not amount to control, then?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I would say that one has no more control than the other. It is a matter of mutual effort and understanding.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 40 is a bill which has considerable merit except for the fact that it appears to delegate to the Secretary of Agriculture the right, duty, and responsibility to administer this act and to disburse any funds which may hereinafter be appropriated as he may deem necessary and proper pursuant to such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, subject to the limitation of section 4. I would be strongly inclined to support this legislation if anyone here on the floor could or would assure me that the operation of this act would be such as to allow the Congress or some appropriate committee thereof, to determine the projects which are to be built and developed. Agricultural research is very important to the economy of our country but to allow the Secretary of Agriculture to have the authority to, in effect, distribute whatever funds may be appropriated pursuant to this legislation is not only improper but is in effect making a political football out of this legislation which should be a vital, nonpartisan operation.

My own State of Kentucky has a National Tobacco Research Center. During 1960 and 1961 the General Assembly of Kentucky appropriated $1 million for an agricultural science center and for tobacco research at such center. Subsequently the Governor made available an additional $1 million for construction and research at such center. Thereafter, in 1962, there was appropriated and allocated by the general assembly more than $2 million for construction and research at this center. Since 1960 the Congress has appropriated more than $200,000 each year to the Agricultural Research Service for tobacco research, a large portion of which has been allocated to the agricultural research center of the University of Kentucky for this project.

Kentucky has led the way and pointed out that the States can and will do for themselves. It appears to me that under this legislation that Kentucky could well be penalized for its hard work and initiative in appropriating some $4 million for this tobacco research center out of its own funds. It could well be that the Secretary of Agriculture will determine another research center as the proper forum for research in the tobacco industry and make available Federal funds, some of which will come from Kentucky, on a matching-funds basis to another research center and thereby bypass the usual and customary procedure of a specific authorization for a specific project because I have been given to understand that appropriations for H.R. 40 will be in the nature of a package appropriation and not specifically designated for any specific projects.

I cannot conscientiously support H.R. 40 in its present form. I will shortly find myself among a very few who will vote against this proposed bill and I would like to vote for it—and would vote for it—if the authority for the selection of the projects rested with the Congress or if the Congress would include in the legislation guidelines whereby the Secretary of Agriculture would be required to follow certain criteria and if the appropriations authorized by this bill would be in a sum certain rather than in an unknown amount. I am advised on the floor today that this bill will involve $12 million which is unbudgeted for the coming fiscal year.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, no doubt the cooperative efforts of the Agriculture Department with the various State agriculture experiment stations has aided immeasurably in the tremendous progress which has helped make American agriculture the most efficient in the world. This is one program of the Federal Government that can show some good and positive results.

However, insofar as this bill (H.R. 40) is concerned, I question provisions set forth in this bill that would turn even more power and control of this program over to the Secretary of Agriculture and further, authorize limitless sums as deemed necessary for the administration of this act.

This Nation and our people are not in a good enough financial condition that we can continue to expand existing programs and provide no limit on the spending and funding of such programs.

On page 3, line 16, the bill states:

> It shall be the duty and responsibility of the Secretary to administer the provisions of section 4 of this act under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe as necessary therefor.

On page 6, line 12, of this bill is stated:

> There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for proper administration of this act.

While I can, in the reason of continued agricultural progress, support the good and sound advances brought about by previous related programs, I find it difficult indeed to support a bill that provides such limitless control and cost as H.R. 40 authorizes.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 40.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. **HOSMER**. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 275, nays 30, not voting 128, as follows:

[Roll No. 38]

YEAS—275

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Albert
Andrews
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Avery
Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Barry
Bass
Battin
Beckworth
Bennett, Fla.
Betts
Blatnik
Boland
Bolton,
  Oliver P.
Bonner
Bow
Bray
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Bruce
Burke
Burkhalter
Burleson
Byrnes, Wis.
Cameron
Cannon
Casey
Cederberg
Chenoweth
Clark
Clausen
Cleveland
Cohelan
Colmer
Corman
Cunningham
Curtin
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Denton
Derwinski
Dingell
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Duncan
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards
Ellsworth
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Flood
Flynt
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gathings
Gavin
Gill
Glenn
Gonzalez
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Gubser
Gurney
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hanna
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hays
Hechler
Henderson
Herlong
Hoeven
Holifield
Holland
Horan
Horton
Huddleston
Ichord
Jensen
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kelly
Keogh
Kilburn
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Knox
Kunkel
Kyl
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Lankford
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Libonati
Lindsay
Long, Md.
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McIntire
McLoskey
McMillan
MacGregor
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Meader
Miller, Calif.
Milliken
Mills
Montoya
Moore
Morgan
Morris
Morse
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nelsen
Norblad
Nygaard
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olson, Minn.
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Pelly
Perkins
Pike
Pilcher
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Quie
Randall
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rich
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roudebush
Roybal
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shipley
Short
Sickles
Sikes
Siler
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Va.
Springer
Staebler
Stafford
Stephens
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Thornberry
Toll
Tollefson
Trimble
Tuck
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Van Pelt
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watts
Weaver
Weltner
Westland
Wharton
White
Whitener
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson,
  Charles H.
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wright
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—30

Abele
Bates
Becker
Bell
Broyhill, Va.
Clancy
Curtis
Devine
Foreman
Goodell
Gross
Hall
Hosmer
Hutchinson
Johansen
King, N.Y.
Lipscomb
McClory
Mailliard
Martin, Calif.
Minshall
Pillion
Pool
Rumsfeld
Smith, Calif.
Snyder
Stinson
Taft
Wydler
Younger

NOT VOTING—128

Addabbo
Alger
Anderson
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Ayres
Barrett
Beermann
Belcher
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Boggs
Bolling
Bolton,
  Frances P.
Brademas
Bromwell
Buckley
Burton
Byrne, Pa.
Cahill
Carey
Celler
Chamberlain
Chelf
Collier
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Cramer
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Derounian
Diggs
Donohue
Downing
Dulski
Elliott
Farbstein
Finnegan
Fino
Fisher
Fogarty
Ford
Forrester
Fountain
Friedel
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Goodling
Grabowski
Grant
Gray
Grover
Hagan, Ga.
Halleck
Halpern
Hawkins
Healey
Hébert
Hemphill
Hoffman
Hull
Jarman
Jennings
Kee
Keith
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Lesinski
Lloyd
Long, La.
Macdonald
Madden
Martin, Mass.
Michel
Miller, N.Y.
Minish
Monagan
Moorhead
Morrison
Morton
Multer
Nedzi
Nix
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
O'Neill
Osmers
Patten
Pepper
Philbin
Purcell
Quillen
Rains
Reid, Ill.
Rhodes, Pa.
Roberts, Ala.
Rodino
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
St. George
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Scott
Shelley
Sheppard
Shriver
Sibal
Smith, Iowa
Staggers
Steed
Stratton
Thompson, N.J.
Utt
Vinson
Walter
Watson
Whalley
Wyman

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Auchincloss and Mr. Walter for, with Mr. Alger against.

Mr. Hébert and Mr. Cramer for, with Mr. Utt against.

Mr. St. Onge and Mr. Cahill for, with Mr. Derounian against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Celler with Mr. Anderson.
Mr. Multer with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Dulski with Mr. Hoffman.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Bromwell.
Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Conte.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Rosenthal with Mr. Goodling.
Mr. Jennings with Mrs. Frances P. Bolton.
Mr. Gary with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Shriver.
Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mrs. Reid of Illinois.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Corbett.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Chamberlain.
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Ford.
Mr. Finnegan with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Friedel with Mr. Floyd.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Burton.
Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Sibal.
Mr. Donohue with Mrs. St. George.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Quillen.
Mr. Giaimo with Mr. Keith.
Mr. Hagan of Georgia, with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Grover.
Mr. Hemphill with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Hull with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Shelley with Mr. Wyman.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Beermann.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Ayres.

GENERAL PAIRS

Mr. Steed with Mr. Roosevelt.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Rostenkowski.
Mr. Stratton with Mr. St Germain.
Mr. Rodino with Mr. Gallagher.
Mr. Minish with Mrs. Kee.
Mr. Nix with Mr. Long of Louisiana.
Mr. Fountain with Mr. Madden.
Mr. Monagan with Mr. Chelf.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Macdonald.
Mr. Forrester with Mr. Nedzi.
Mr. Elliott with Mr. Olsen.
Mr. Downing with Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Roush.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Kornegay with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Roberts of Alabama with Mr. Pepper.
Mr. Scott with Mr. Patman.
Mr. Healey with Mr. Grant.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, 80 years ago when the civil service law was first passed, and called the Pendleton Act, there were very few thousand employees under the act. Today there are more than 2½ million. And so it is necessary that we have representative organizations of the many groups that make up the Federal employment.

Last year there was organized a new organization, the Federal Professional Association, which is recognized, and its purpose is to organize professional employees and to aid them in appearing before the Congress and the many administrative departments of the Government concerning these employees.

I make available to my colleagues in the following statement the aspirations of this organization:

SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS OF THE FOUNDING CONFERENCE, THE FEDERAL PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION, NOVEMBER 28, 1962, DEPARTMENTAL AUDITORIUM, CONSTITUTION AVENUE BETWEEN 12TH AND 14TH STREETS N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C.

The Federal Professional Association is a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization engaged in research, education, and representation to enhance the value of the Federal career services to the Nation; foster high standards of professional work in the Government; and generally promote the welfare of professional personnel in the Government.

THE FEDERAL PROFESSIONAL
ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C.

FOUNDING COMMITTEE

Vincent J. Brown, Ph. D., political science, Howard University.

Charles E. Burkhead, statistics, Department of Agriculture.

Roy W. Crawley, Ph. D., psychology, public administration, Agency for International Development.

Leonard T. Crook, P.E., civil engineering, Army Engineers.

Albert M. Dickson, economics, Department of Agriculture (retired).

Herbert P. Dunning, Public Health Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

W. Brooke Graves, Ph. D., American Government, Public Administration, Library of Congress.

Gregory K. Hartmann, Ph. D., Research and Development Management, Naval Ordnance Laboratory.

Vincent E. Jay, management analysis, General Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Lewis P. McCann, Ph. D., cytogenetics, Science Administration, Department of Agriculture.

Lionel V. Murphy, personnel administration, Brooking Institution.

Emmett Sheehan, Jr., law, labor relations, National Labor Relations Board.

Harold A. Stone, P.E., management engineering, Department of the Army.

Denver W. Warnock, general administration, District of Columbia government.

C. Packard Wolle, Ph. D., administration and management, Federal Aviation Agency.

The founding conference met at 9:30 a.m., pursuant to notice provided for in article X, section 1002 of the constitution. Dr. Gregory K. Hartmann, chairman of the program committee, presiding. Dr. Hartmann introduced the Honorable Robert Ramspeck, as master of ceremonies.

Mr. Ramspeck, now retired, has been a Congressman from Georgia for over 30 years, and has also served as Chairman of the Civil Service Commission. He is known and respected by literally millions of employees of the Federal Government. It is indeed fitting that he should preside over this first public meeting of the Federal Professional Association. Mr. Ramspeck.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I should like to read some communications which have been received.

(Mr. Ramspeck read letters of best wishes from Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York; Mr. Rocco C. Siciliano, formerly an assistant to President Eisenhower; Mr. Clarence B. Randall, who has been in and out of government for many years and who is well-known in the field of business; the Honorable Marion B. Folsom, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, an executive of the Eastman Kodak Co. for many years; and a telegram from a member of the Senate Post Office and Civil Services Committee, Senator FRANK CARLSON.)

Mr. RAMSPECK (continuing). It is my hope that as the years pass we will celebrate the founding of the Federal Professional Association as a landmark in the progress of better government, just as we will mark the 80th anniversary of the Civil Service Act next month.

When the Civil Service Act was passed almost 80 years ago, we had a Federal Government small in numbers and very limited in its activities. That is no longer true. Today we find our Government greatly expanded in numbers and even more in the scope of its activities. Whether we like it or not, the hope of the free peoples of the world depends upon the success or failure of the activities of the United States.

The citizens of our country will not hold our public servants in high esteem unless they know what is being done and understand the results being obtained.

Recently when I was in a meeting with Congressman MAHON, chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Defense Department, he pointed out that today we are trying to run the United States, the rest of the world and outer space. Certainly we need many competent people to meet this challenge.

There are many fine organizations of Federal employees. Most of them are not in a position to do the job which the Federal Professional Association is being organized to do. They must, and do, represent the wishes of the majority of their members whose interests are primarily in salaries, wages, and working conditions. The Federal Professional Association will cooperate with them in these matters, but will also go further and endeavor to improve the management area of Government and the understanding of the public, so as to achieve that esteem so necessary to success in meeting the complex problems facing our Nation.

I hope each of you here will support the association by joining and by urging others to do so. You will be making a real contribution to better government, to your own security and to more satisfaction for your services. You will have made more certain our success in the battle for freedom in the world.

It is now my privilege to present to you a gentleman you have already seen, Dr. Gregory K. Hartmann, nominee for the office of president-elect. A native of New York State, he was graduated from California Institute of Technology, with a B.S. in physics. A Rhodes Scholar, he received a B.A. in mathematics with a special subject in relativity from Queens College, Oxford University, England. He also holds the degree of M.A. Oxon. His Ph. D. in acoustics is from Brown University.

Since 1955, Dr. Hartmann has been technical director of the U.S. Naval Ordnance Laboratory at White Oak, Md.

Dr. HARTMANN. Ladies and gentlemen, I am going to talk about the evolution of the Federal Professional Association to date and about the reasons back of the choices made in arriving at the constitution and bylaws, which really summarize the principal part of the work of the founding committee for the past 2 years.

It was in December of 1960 that a small group of professional people from various government agencies met for the first time to discuss ways of improving the Federal service and the role of Federal professional employees. These meetings, with ever-growing interest, have continued at monthly intervals since that time. We have met with many Government officials, with Members of Congress, and with representatives of professional societies and employee organizations.

By May of 1961 we had created a document which discussed the need for a professional association of the Federal service, outlined its objectives and considered a possible organizational structure.

It has taken the founding committee over a year to create the constitution and bylaws. They are not perfect; they will be improved; but the principles have been repeatedly discussed, debated, and resolved, and I believe we have a sound foundation on which to build.

Some historical points should be mentioned: Representatives of the founding committee appeared before the President's Task Force on Employee Relations, the so-called Goldberg Committee, in September 1961. We made the plea that the way should be left open for the formation of a professional association if professionals so desire. The following points were made which outlined our views:

1. There is no means today for the formulation of the opinions of Federal professional employees with regard to their own welfare or to improvements in the Federal service.

2. There are no means today for the representation of such a professional viewpoint before either the executive or legislative branches of Government.

3. Existing employee organizations which are Government wide are not professionally oriented and therefore do not attract professional employees to their membership.

4. There is therefore a need for a Federal Professional Association.

5. It remains to be seen whether a sufficient number of professional employees of the Government have the same opinion and are willing to join, pay dues, assist in the organization or make other sacrifices, however small, of time or money, to promote this cause.

It still remains to be seen, but today we are a lot closer to seeing it. Our charter membership, generated by personal contacts, without benefit of publicity or founding conference, has grown to about 400 members distributed over many states and overseas, and a very fine list it is, too, of influential and, in many cases, highly placed individuals who have come to the same conclusions the founding committee did.

The public view of Government service must be improved. This is a prime responsibility of the professional man in Government. It is his responsibility because he himself is tarred by the same brush that touches any dark spot of incompetence or inefficiency in that Government, whether he likes it or not. He also has the responsibility for recruiting competent people into the Government to work with him. He must be sure that his subordinates are good, or else his own effectiveness will dwindle. Conditions of work, recognition and pay are all parts of the "competition for quality" in our Nation today. We are now more firmly convinced than ever that the enormously expanded Federal role in research and development must be operated by creative and competent professional people who must be in the Government service. How do we get them in? The recent Pay Act takes a significant initial step toward the persuasion of the best professional graduates to choose the Government as a career. There is, however, much more to be done.

In summary, the professional in Government has an obligation to improve the Government as a place for professional work. No one else is so directly concerned, nor so able clearly to see the needs, the problems, and the solutions. And no one else is going to do it anyway. The Federal Professional Association offers a splendid possibility for improving the essential service of Government to the taxpayer. If the professional workers in Government are interested in improving the Government and themselves, now is the time for them to come forward. I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Our next speaker has had a distinguished career in the military service of our country. He entered the U.S. Military Academy in 1933 and graduated in June 1937 as a second lieutenant in the Corps of Engineers of the Regular Army.

In July 1959, he was appointed Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army Training Station for Engineers at Fort Leonard Wood.

In 1960, he was appointed Engineering Commissioner for the District of Columbia, in which capacity he is still serving. Brig. Gen. F. J. Clarke.

General CLARKE. It is a real pleasure to talk to this group from several points of view. First, as a District Commissioner, I am glad that the Federal Professional Association is allowing the employees of the District to become members of the organization. Most of you are aware that District employees are governed almost entirely by the same rules governing regular civil service employees, and they have civil service status as well.

Second, as a professional engineer, I am glad to see that professional engineers are listed among your founding fathers. I think you will find them to be active, vociferous and argumentative members of the organization.

Third, although I have spent my life in the Army, as I look back over some 25 years of service, I find that about 18 years of that service were what I would call nonmilitary assignments; 5 years with the Atomic Energy Commission, 5 years in the Pentagon in a position associated with civil service employees of professional stature, 4 years working overseas on construction in connection with military aid projects, and 2 years in the District Government.

The Government needs people in all of the major professions—in the social, biological, physical, and veterinary sciences; in the fields of medicine, law, engineering, mathematics, accounting, architecture, patent work, education, and vocational training.

The ratio of professional employees to nonprofessional is rising and will continue to rise as we mechanize the more routine, repetitive, and clerical functions. This very process of automation, as well as space exploration, highlights the need for first-class employees. Government must have the scientific and technical competence among its employees to plan, program, evaluate, inspect, and review the services and equipment contracted for and supplied by American industry.

I am glad to see the wage structure being improved and made equivalent to that in private industry.

I find a tendency among the public to equate competence with salary. In my 18 years of association with the professional people of the Federal Government, I have always been astounded at the ability of the Government to keep the people it has managed to keep in the face of competition from private industry to take these people and put them elsewhere at higher salaries.

I know the Atomic Energy Commission has difficulty in recruiting professionals. Yet it needs the best scientific research personnel for this highly specialized nuclear field.

The Federal Government is the only institution in this Nation sufficiently large and publicly oriented to provide the resources for certain of our pioneering exploitations. What private industrial organization could have and would have put a man in orbit around the earth? What corporation would have been able to establish a satellite for weather observation, or more commercially oriented, a communications satellite?

The point I wish to emphasize here is that in our technological evolutionary explosion in the future, more and more tasks will be of sufficient magnitude to require Government sponsorship if not actual execution. Therefore, Government must have the professional know-how in its employees to plan and execute these programs. The Federal Government needs professionals with the creative, imaginative abilities and the managerial competency to keep abreast of the technological advancements.

Another related area of Government where we sorely need more expert performance is in the behavioral sciences to assist us in urban renewal, juvenile delinquency, crime, welfare, etc.

In the first two centuries of our Nation's growth and development, the Federal Government played quite a different role than it will during the next two centuries. Yes, even up to the middle of this century, the Federal Government's role was primarily protective on a national basis and regulatory on an interstate basis. The role I see in the future, as we live at a more accelerated pace in a more confined geographical area, is one of dynamic leadership both in the world and at home, a leadership which only first-class professionals in the Federal service can provide. Many thanks, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Our next speaker, Dr. F. P. Kilpatrick, has, since January 1959, been associated with the Brookings Institution. Graduated from the University of Washington with an M.S. in psychology, he later received an M.A. and Ph. D. in psychology from Princeton University. Before joining Brookings, he was head of the consumer research division of National Analysts, Inc., of Philadelphia. I am very much pleased to present him to you.

Dr. KILPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, as we add up the kind of information that is available from each agency, or what is published periodically by the Civil Service Commission or in testimony before Congress, it adds up to the presumptive case at least that the Federal Government is not doing as well as it should in the competition for first-class professional and technical personnel.

People at all levels are equally interested in the paycheck but interest in financial reward tends to decline as you go up the ladder. Declining very sharply also is interest in occupational security, physical working conditions and nature of supervision. Climbing sharply is interest in the opportunity to be of service to society, challenge, creativity, and self-development.

We found a common pattern of occupational values among all classes of professional employees—physicists, engineers, and executives are substantially the same. They share an interest in such things as creativity, challenge, and opportunity for self-development. It seems to me they probably should have a common interest in improving their lot, and I would think they would have a common interest in the abandonment of the Federal personnel philosophy of benefits of pay and working conditions trickling upward instead of down.

At this point I should like to offer a few suggestions:

1. That this organization at a relatively early date encourage the development of a permanent interprofessional council associated with this organization.

2. That this organization become a source of and channel for accurate and relevant information. This group can furnish this knowledge, not only to Congress, but also to professionals in and out of Government and to the general public.

3. That this organization encourage research and experimentation. I hope it could encourage the transformation of Federal personnel administration from its original negative regulatory role into a far more positive role, which does not depart from equality of opportunity, but which also does not ignore current patterns of differential treatment of personnel designed to enhance quality, creativity, and productivity.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Our next speaker, Dr. Wilson Elkins, is president of the University of Maryland. He is an outstanding man and a little unusual as university presidents go. Not only is he a member of Phi Beta Kappa and a Rhodes Scholar but he also was the winner of eight varsity letters in football, basketball and track. Many honors have come to him. I am delighted to present him to you this morning.

Dr. ELKINS. Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I appreciate the importance of this step you are taking and want to express satisfaction with it, not because you have formed another organization which "joiners" can join, but because of the stated purpose of the association.

It seems to me it is important that you provide a means for public recognition and understanding and that you have some means for expressing your views before legislative bodies. But of much more fundamental importance is that the association have as its main purpose the rendering of the highest kind of service that the Federal professional employee can render to the country, and to encourage continual improvement on the part of the professional employee. If this is done, I think you certainly will have justified your existence.

As I see it, the universities have a tremendous responsibility here to meet the requests and needs of these professional groups.

There is need for better communication between the professional employee and the universities so that there may be a better understanding. This, I think, can be one of the very important contributions of an association of this kind.

It is encouraging to all of us that this association has been formed for the purpose of improving yourselves. This association can contribute a great deal to the improvement and broadening of the program of additional education. In the process you can set and maintain higher professional standards, strengthen the Federal service, and, more important and above all, derive immense personal satisfaction from knowing that you have done your best to strengthen the society in which all of us live.

Mr. RAMSPECK. It is now my pleasure to present a gentleman from the business area who has also had Government experience—Dr. R. D. Bennett, general manager of the nuclear division of the Martin Co. Dr. Bennett received a B.S. and M.S. in electrical engineering from Union College. Later he was awarded a Ph. D. in physics by the University of Chicago, and subsequently an honorary doctor of science degree from Union College. Until 1954 he was technical director of the Naval Ordnance Laboratory. He has been awarded the U.S. Legion of Merit. I present Dr. Bennett, vice president of the Martin Co.

Dr. BENNETT. Greetings. An alternative title to my remarks today might be "The Grass Is Not Really Greener on the Other Side of the Fence."

I am fortunate in having had a wide variety of experience in universities, in the Federal Government, in the Navy, and now in industry. This enables me to make some comments for you on how we are doing in these various spheres as I see it.

The most important thing from your point of view is that the Federal service offer a satisfactory professional career for current and prospective employees. This is essential, of course, as a means of getting competent people.

The first need for establishing a base for a satisfactory professional career is the opportunity for advanced education.

Here in the Washington area, there are unusually fine facilities for advanced education for professional people in the Federal Government. The local universities are slanted toward meeting this need. Maryland has done national pioneering in making advanced education of this sort available either part or full time. Elsewhere, local universities are becoming active in meeting this need, for example, in California and Tennessee.

The second need in developing a satisfactory professional career is the need to pursue a professional program in a live field along the lines of the individual's interest.

The third need in a professional career is the need for an opportunity to do effective administration.

What can the Federal Professional Association do with regard to the problem of administration? It can continue in its efforts to make a Federal career more attractive, sustain and enhance opportunities for educational development and use its freedom to choose its own work, insofar as free money permits it. This association can also work to set high standards for admission to Government and promotion therein, set high standards for the performance of individuals, strive to improve the administration of Government agencies by sharpening up authority and responsibility whenever possible.

The organization can speak for the professionals in Government in a way in which they cannot speak at the present time. There is no mechanism through which they can make their peculiar knowledge and ability effective in improving the operation of the Federal Government.

I feel this organization can have an important bearing on the future of the Federal service if you will always keep in mind that you are an important factor in the cast of the "greatest show on earth," the U.S. Federal Government; and if you continue to be guided by President Kennedy's words—not what our country can do for us but what we can do for our country. I thank you.

Mr. Ramspeck. Our next speaker this morning is the Honorable Arnold Olsen, Congressman from Montana. He serves as a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

Mr. Olsen. I have yet to be contacted by any of my constituents in the western district of Montana who are professional employees concerning pay or conditions of employment.

How much importance should be placed on pay and conditions of employment? In my travels through my district, I have some opportunity to learn of the technical needs of professional people, but only to a very limited extent. Certainly, Congress is willing and able to provide the needs of the professionals to do their research jobs or the application of their research. The function of Congress is to provide the means; your function is administration. However, I think Congress must be called upon by professional people to do something more about their group than that, more in this field of pay and working conditions.

I want to do these things but don't know exactly how. The best way for me, or any Member of Congress, to get information on any subject is to have spokesmen for the various interested groups talk. So far as professional employees are concerned, the spokesman has been the Civil Service Commission and this is not sufficient.

The Civil Service Commission cannot do its job well in this respect unless it hears from people concerned. The Commission is busy with many activities and therefore hears mainly from groups.

As you probably know, the postal organizations carried the ball for the pay increase legislation and they did not stop with the individual members of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. They went to their own Congressmen. But when you pass above GS–5 or GS–6, there are no spokesmen for Federal employees carrying the ball with the Congress. There is not enough genuine, responsible, political activity among professional employees reporting their particular cases to the Congressmen from their respective districts, so that they will have a sympathetic knowledge of the problem when it comes up on the floor of the House.

Certainly, there is nothing wrong with saying what you should have for yourselves as compensation for your ability, training and experience, and also what the Federal Government must have in order to attract the best qualified personnel in the country.

As an organization, you can finance your activities better. This provides the medium and the means for qualified members to speak to the Congress, which must be educated by the leaders of these Federal employee groups. The Federal service will attract the best as it pays the best. I don't know why we could not pay the best in dollars. Some argue that permanence and good conditions of employment enable the United States to pay less. I am inclined to believe that unless we keep abreast of the pay for professional employees in private employment, we won't have the best kind of leadership and the best kind of program, and therefore we won't be doing the best service for our country.

The need of Congress from your organization is somewhat political but also is all practical; it is a question of selling a program of high pay and high standards of employment to the Congress. I think you ought to sell it by explaining that it would not make many millions of dollars of difference. The Members haven't time to sit down to figure it out; your organization should figure it out to show the effect on the Federal budget. This is a program I hope you will embrace in your overall organization. Thank you.

Mr. Ramspeck. And now, ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Leonard T. Crook, of the Army Engineers, who is a member of our founding committee, will give us a report on the results of the mail ballot to charter subscribers. Mr. Crook.

Mr. Crook. Over 400 ballots were mailed to our charter subscribers. There were 146 votes cast on the constitution; there were 142 for, 1 against with a detailed explanation of why, and 3 not voting.

In the vote for the officers, the count was as follows:

C. E. Burkhead, treasurer, 146 for.

Harold A. Stone, secretary, 145 for.

Lewis P. McCann, vice president, 144 for.

Gregory K. Hartmann, president-elect, 143 for.

Vincent E. Jay, president, 145 for.

In this same ballot we were adopting a constitution, voting for officers, and asking for a program.

Mr. Ramspeck. Our final speaker this morning is our newly elected president, Mr. Vincent E. Jay, of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. A native of Ohio, Mr. Jay received his education in personnel management and public administration at Rutgers and American Universities. He is assistant to the executive officer, Division of Water Supply and Pollution Control of the Public Health Service. He has been a management analyst in the management division of the Department of Administration in the District government and several Federal departments and agencies.

He established and served as chairman of the founding committee of this association. I am very pleased to present your newly elected president, Mr. Jay.

Mr. Jay. Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I am greatly honored by the action of the founding committee and the charter subscribers in electing me as the first president of the Federal Professional Association and I shall do the very best that I can on behalf of all professionals. It is with the greatest humility that I accept this high office. I find great comfort in the very fine slate of officers whom you have elected to serve with me. I look forward with confidence to our continued association, and to meeting with other association officials yet to be selected, including the many members who will provide guidance and support.

Together, all of us will look to existing professional associations and societies for cooperative relationships and support. The FPA is designed to complement and strengthen existing professional organizations in their quest to advance their particular professions. The nascent professions in the administrative field particularly need aid in establishing themselves in the area of public administration. There must be a mutuality of concern, a cooperative quest for quality, and a sustained striving for public recognition and acceptance if we are to advance and strengthen professionalism in the Federal service.

The ability and talent that exist among professionals in the Federal service are tremendous. Put to work within the framework of the FPA, this vast resource can revolutionize the Federal service to the end that it will advance and strengthen the economic and scientific position of our Nation. There are great possibilities existing for work of this sort to bring about better management of the Nation's resources and to make them more effective.

The objectives, listed in the order of the greatest number of votes received are: (1) Improve the public image, (2) increase membership, (3) reestablish a separate and distinct classification category for professionals, and (4) inform Congress as to the need for and benefits of differential treatment for professional employees.

To meet the objectives of this association effectively will require considerable time and effort by the association's officers, committees, consultants, and employees. Their duties will involve conferences with department and agency heads and other high officials in the executive branch of the Government; conferences with and hearings before Senators, Representatives, and congressional committees; research, surveys, and studies affecting professional career personnel; representation of Federal career professionals before civic bodies, fraternal, and service organizations, and other groups whose understanding and good will are vitally important to us.

We should reflect on this:

This administration and the Congress have adopted a policy of comparability between Federal and private industry salaries. This is different from Government leadership which existed 30 years ago, but it is a step in the right direction. We have not yet achieved comparability and there is no assurance that we will. No future Congress is beholden unto a predecessor Congress. It may well be that the effective establishment of the FPA may considerably accelerate the necessary future steps toward this desirable goal. This requires from each of us—in fact, from every administrative, professional, and technical employee in the Federal service—the kind of financial and personal support, and even self-sacrifice, that our professional colleagues in private industry willingly give to the organizations that represent them.

CONCLUSION

Questioner (Mr. Moulton): Is there anyone the committee has in mind for carrying the message forward?

Mr. Jay. We are delighted to make this a separate item to be announced now. We are very indebted to this dedicated public servant of many years, and we are privileged and pleased now to announce the appointment of the Honorable Robert Ramspeck as principal legislative consultant for the Federal Professional Association.

Mr. Ramspeck. If anyone is going to represent you professional people, I want to emphasize again what Congressman Olsen said: Members of Congress don't pay much attention to people in the District of Columbia unless they are backed up by the people back home. This is the down-to-earth truth about the life of our Government. I think every Member of Congress feels happy to see the representatives of organizations and get information from them. He also wants to know, however, whether you represent anyone who votes in his district or State and whether or not you are expressing his views.

Our conference stands adjourned. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

GOVERNMENT BUREAUCRACY HINDERS DISASTER RELIEF

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, in recent years when local governments have had great difficulty as a result of flood or other disastrous occurrences, an S O S has come to Washington for hurry-up relief. More and more when the effort is made to grant the relief sought by such local governments, we find overlapping efforts by various agencies in the Government which only serves to emphasize the trouble that the people back home experience with bureaucracy. Recently in Georgia we had some heavy rainfalls in 10 northeast Georgia counties which were declared eligible to receive disaster relief. The President allocated about $375,000 to assist them.

The editor of the Dahlonega Nugget, Dahlonega, Ga., has included in his editorial comments a description of how these various agencies came in; and after they were paid, according to his best figures, left about 25 cents for the county.

I include as part of my remarks the editorial by Mr. Jack Parks, of the Dahlonega Nugget.

The editorial follows:

> The President some time ago set aside $375,000 for emergency disaster relief in 10 northeast Georgia counties following the recent flooding rains.
>
> This program looked good. An emergency planner came in next day after the big rain (9.53 inches in some places within 24 hours). It was still raining, however, and this fellow floated around over the county and got a little wet. He estimated the damage to be at least $60,000 on public roads.
>
> Civil defense then sent in their men. By this time the sun was shining and a whole bunch came.
>
> After hearing about this Federal expenditure, the Bureau of Public Roads sent in its men.
>
> Now the woods are full of emergency planners, advisors, inspectors, coordinators, district men, area men, State men, and Federal men. All of them have different ground rules, plans and recommendations.
>
> After spending several days with various and separate groups of experts, County Commissioner Y. D. Jones is trying to organize them into a brigade, hoping that he can take all together on one tour to see if they can agree on how many nails and planks the Government will pay for.
>
> Then he'll attempt to get agreement among the emergency planners, the civil defenders and the bureau men as to whether they will pay for bridge repairs and/or just culverts plus or minus gravel washed away.
>
> Close as the Nugget editor can count on his fingers, it will take $274,499.75 to pay these speckled-bow-tie boys (if the sun continues to shine) and the several counties involved will have to split the remaining 25 cents among themselves as best they can in a coordinated effort. Only way we see to get any more money is to take it from salaries and/or expenses of the experts.
>
> Please, Mr. President, don't send us any more disaster men! They're trampling down our young timber and mountain wildflowers. This only will bring on more flooding, plus another deluge of experts.

U.N. PROGRAM TO AID CUBAN AGRICULTURE PROTESTED

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, again I rise to raise my voice in angry protest against the U.N. Special Fund project to aid Communist Cuba with an agricultural program.

I was again shocked to read that an agreement had been signed wherein the U.N. Special Fund and Cuba would share the cost of a project to aid Cuban agriculture, and the U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization would carry it out.

It is reported that the project calls for the Fund and Cuba together to spend $3 million to set up an agricultural research institute in Cuba. A spokesman for the Fund is reportedly to have said that Leonardo Fernandez Sanchez, Cuban Ambassador to Italy, and Jan Huyser, an official of the FAO, signed the so-called plan of operation at FAO headquarters in Rome, April 10, and Paul G. Hoffman, managing director of the Fund, signed it at the United Nations headquarters on April 15.

In my opinion, this one program has done more to damage the United Nations in the eyes of the American people than any other.

Today I wrote a letter to American U.N. Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson in which I stated that the unfortunate events in Katanga, coupled with other events, in my opinion, have lowered the prestige of the United Nations in this country to a dangerous level.

I had objected to this program when it was first announced and in a letter to me on March 8, 1963, Mr. Stevenson informed me that he had also objected to this program and "has no hesitancy in vigorously opposing an unsound, ill-timed project." I applaud him for objecting, but this is not enough.

Personally I am not convinced that Mr. Hoffman is doing a first-rate job of directing the Special Fund if this is any indication. Here we find a Communist government having ruined the Cuban economy, and then find the United Nations approving a $3 million project to aid that faltering Communist economy.

Here we find this Nation, indirectly, in my opinion, giving aid and support to a sworn and deadly enemy, as serious as we have ever faced. To say that no U.S. funds are going to be used in this project is ridiculous on the face of it. Here we find this Nation carrying a disproportionate share of the cost of the United Nations, and then having that organization giving aid to a dictatorial Communist nation is irresponsible at best.

We cannot allow the U.N. to subvert the foreign policies of this Nation in this fashion, because it is the United States that bears the brunt of financing the United Nations.

I have asked Ambassador Stevenson one pointed question. Is Cuba paid up in its dues and assessments to the United Nations?

I think the answer to this question is important. Has this nation that the U.N. now seeks to aid paid its so-called share of operating the United Nations?

This program, in my opinion, has dealt a severe blow to the prestige of the United Nations.

I cannot support the U.N. Special Fund or the U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization if this is any example of the work they are doing. The foreign aid that this Nation gives to other nations is the province of the Congress, and I think it is time that all such activity of the United Nations was halted. I do not intend to vote for funds to be given to the United Nations that will wind up in the hands of a Communist nation, to help sustain a dictatorial scourge like Castro of Cuba.

It seems to me that the Congress should fully investigate this matter.

WEST VIRGINIA: STILL SHORTCHANGED IN SPACE

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include some tables and statistical matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, there recently came to my attention the Annual Procurement Report of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year 1962.

In glancing through this report, I was very much disturbed to note the facts revealed in several of the tables. National Aeronautics and Space Administration has made a great deal of its contention that the space program has provided widely distributed benefits to the American economy. Yet a State-by-State breakdown of NASA procurement for the fiscal year 1962 reveals that not a single contract and not a single dollar went to the State of West Virginia in direct awards of $25,000 and over.

National Aeronautics and Space Administration has also made much of the fact that the space program is benefiting labor surplus areas. The same procurement report gives a State-by-State and city-by-city breakdown of direct awards of $25,000 and over to cities in labor surplus areas. Not a single dollar of this amount went to any labor surplus area in West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, of course, some subcontracts were awarded in West Virginia, but I submit that any program claiming to assist labor surplus areas and which grants not a single dollar in prime contracts to the State of West Virginia is misleading.

I would like to underline, Mr. Speaker, that since 1961 the State of West Vir-

ginia has advanced from the bottom of the heap up to 30th place in the Nation in the per capita amount of defense contracts awarded. Yet in the space program no similar progress has been recorded. I would be the first to protest if political or geographical favoritism were the rule for awarding any Government contract. But I wish to state that if all other factors are equal then some preference should be given in establishing installations in those areas where an excessive trained or trainable labor supply will insure that adequate manpower is available to carry out the mission.

U.S. geographical distribution of NASA procurement direct awards of $25,000 and over,[1] fiscal year 1962

State	Actions		Obligations	
	Number	Percent of total	Amount (thousands)	Percent of total
Total	2,707	100.0	$939,143	100.0
Alabama	220	8.1	81,264	8.7
Alaska	11	.4	4,227	.5
Arizona	18	.7	5,583	.6
Arkansas	1	(2)	37	(2)
California	784	29.0	441,179	47.0
Colorado	27	1.0	3,622	.4
Connecticut	45	1.7	3,796	.4
Delaware	1	(2)	34	(2)
Florida	85	3.1	50,925	5.4
Georgia	24	.9	3,352	.4
Illinois	63	2.3	8,403	.9
Indiana	23	.8	1,646	.2
Iowa	14	.5	1,898	.2
Louisiana	19	.7	18,534	2.0
Maryland	154	5.7	26,773	2.9
Massachusetts	141	5.2	19,737	2.1
Michigan	64	2.4	5,644	.6
Minnesota	31	1.1	2,927	.3
Mississippi	1	(2)	93	(2)
Missouri	40	1.5	$70,600	7.5
Nevada	3	.1	435	(2)
New Hampshire	7	.3	320	(2)
New Jersey	130	4.8	26,980	2.9
New Mexico	9	.3	1,606	.2
New York	200	7.4	55,301	5.9
North Carolina	10	.4	1,695	.2
Ohio	114	4.2	11,320	1.2
Oklahoma	11	.4	687	(2)
Oregon	1	(2)	33	(2)
Pennsylvania	105	3.9	25,291	2.7
Rhode Island	3	.1	243	(2)
South Dakota	1	(1)	98	(2)
Tennessee	19	.7	2,163	.2
Texas	146	5.4	32,755	3.5
Utah	1	(2)	37	(2)
Vermont	3	.1	112	(2)
Virginia	91	3.4	13,785	1.5
Washington	4	.1	325	(2)
Wisconsin	23	.8	4,618	.5
District of Columbia	60	2.2	10,975	1.1

[1] Excludes awards placed with or through other Government agencies, awards outside the United States and actions on the Jet Propulsion Laboratory contract.

[2] Less than 0.1 percent.

AWARDS PLACED IN LABOR SURPLUS AREAS

Of NASA's direct awards of $25,000 and over, $371 million or 40 percent was placed in areas which, at the time of award, were designated by the Department of Labor as substantial labor surplus areas. Awards by city within each labor surplus area are shown in appendix III.

The categorization by labor surplus area is based on the location where the items are to be produced or supplied from stock; where the services will be performed; or with respect to construction contracts, the construction site.

ACTIVITY BY PROCUREMENT OFFICE

Most of NASA's purchases and contracts are made by the procurement offices of its field installations. During fiscal year 1962 these offices accounted for 96 percent of the procurement dollars and 95 percent of the procurement actions.

In terms of dollars, Marshall and Western Operations accomplished the highest placements. Together, these offices accounted for 56 percent of the total procurement. In terms of actions, Marshall and Langley were most active. These offices accounted for 37 percent of the actions accomplished.

Procurement responsibility and fiscal responsibility for an action are frequently at different installations. Consequently the dollar values of the actions shown for each installation in figure 10 are not necessarily in agreement with the fiscal records of the respective installation.

APPENDIX III

Awards placed in labor surplus areas direct actions of $25,000 and over[1] by city, fiscal year 1962

	Thousands of dollars
Alabama: Birmingham	**2,499**
Alaska: Fairbanks	**972**
California:	
Anaheim	**1,716**
Arcadia	**99**
Azusa	**40,220**
Banning	**32**
California—Continued	
Bell	**52**
Burbank	**384**
Canoga Park	**100,370**
Chula Vista	**1,190**
Costa Mesa	**26**
Covina	**106**
Culver City	**3,990**
Downey	**43,357**
El Cajon	**129**
El Monte	**144**
El Segundo	**509**
Fontana	**1,125**
Fullerton	**316**
Gardena	**123**
Glendale	**91**
Hawthorne	**430**
Inglewood	**96**
Lancaster	**36**
Long Beach	**499**
Los Alamitos	**341**
Los Angeles	**20,049**
Malibu	**1,941**
Manhattan Beach	**25**
Monrovia	**1,325**
Mountain View	**539**
Newport Beach	**109**
Oxnard	**31**
Palo Alto	**103**
Pasadena	**1,864**
Redlands	**152**
Redondo Beach	**109**
Riverside	**70**
San Diego	**28,044**
San Gabriel	**27**
Santa Ana	**1,437**
Santa Monica	**37,418**
South Pasadena	**29**
Sunnyvale	**79**
Torrance	**294**
Van Nuys	**2,142**
Vernon	**289**
Connecticut: Middletown	**485**
Florida:	
Fort Lauderdale	**956**
Miami	**210**
St. Petersburg	**470**
Sarasota	**182**
Indiana:	
Michigan City	**33**
South Bend	**46**
Louisiana: New Orleans	**14,534**
Maryland:	
Baltimore	**2,398**
Cockeysville	**70**
Elkton	**130**
Hagerstown	**96**
Shadyside	**25**
Timonium	**60**
Massachusetts:	
Lowell	**146**
North Andover	**64**
Michigan:	
Caro	**48**
Detroit	**1,145**
Highland Park	**620**
Holland	**33**
Jackson	**33**
Pontiac	**1,438**
Southfield	**32**
Warren	**274**
Weston	**64**
Wyandotte	**61**
Missouri:	
Joplin	**27**
Kansas City	**663**
St. Louis	**1,472**
New Jersey:	
Belleville	**47**
Bloomfield	**26**
Boonton	**92**
Bound Brook	**60**
Camden	**1,281**
Clifton	**38**
Denville	**425**
Little Falls	**44**
Long Branch	**1,153**
Metuchen	**709**
Morristown	**45**
Murray Hill	**34**
Newark	**123**
Nutley	**382**
Paramus	**74**
Patterson	**32**
Princeton	**10,892**
Somerville	**30**
Teterboro	**1,497**

[1] **Excludes awards placed with or through other Government agencies, awards outside the United States, and actions on the JPL contract.**

Awards placed in labor surplus areas direct actions of $25,000 and over by city, fiscal year 1962—Continued

	Thousands of dollars
New Jersey—Continued	
Trenton	30
Union	366
West Caldwell	97
New York:	
Buffalo	1,367
Dunkirk	124
East Aurora	483
Elmira	27
Hudson Falls	309
North Tonawanda	27
Schenectady	317
Silver Creek	45
Syracuse	30
Utica	62
North Carolina:	
Corolla	33
Durham	346
Ohio:	
Akron	94
Athens	43
Cleveland	2,670
East Palestine	43
Mount Vernon	177
Sandusky	1,333
Pennsylvania:	
Allentown	477
Ambridge	78
Blue Bell	92
Bradford	153
Callery	319
Chester	480
Conshohocken	38
East Pittsburgh	1,678
Erie	89
Hatboro	1,242
Jeannette	34
Lester	63
Philadelphia	16,002
Pittsburgh	1,669
Pottstown	88
Scranton	93
South Hampton	583
State College	150
Swarthmore	45
Warren	121
Willow Grove	27
Yardley	100
Rhode Island:	
Bristol	50
Cumberland	148
Warwick	45
Tennessee:	
Bristol	1,469
Knoxville	30
Washington: Spokane	36
Wisconsin: Milwaukee	195

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to commend the gentleman for this message and for calling this to the attention of the House. I think there are other States similarly situated that feel very strongly the same way.

Mr. HECHLER. I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma.

THE NEAR EAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise again out of concern for peace in the Near East. In a speech on the floor of the House on March 12, I called attention to the then emerging political and military pattern in the Near East which could be a matter for serious concern. I noted that the Secretary of State's restatement of March 8 of our concern for the independence and security of Jordan and Saudi Arabia was pertinent and timely. I expressed the hope that the President would instruct our Ambassadors as may be appropriate in the relevant countries to reaffirm that our policy embraced peaceful and friendly relations with all countries in the Near East and that any threat to the peace will result in prompt action by the United States consistent with the U.N. Charter.

Since then the United Arab Republic, Syria, and Iraq have signed an Arab unity proclamation on April 17 calling for a tripartite United Arab Republic to be decided by plebiscite on September 27. The agreement and proclamation calls for the establishment of a joint military command "capable of liberating the Arab homeland from the dangers of Zionism and imperialism."

Mr. Speaker, the document is a rather extraordinary state paper. It was signed in Cairo on the 17th of April by President Jamal Abdan-Nasir on behalf of the United Arab Republic, Lt. Gen. Luay al-Atasi, head of the Syrian delegation, and by Ahmad Hasan al-Bakr, head of the Iraqi delegation.

Specifically I wish to quote from this official proclamation.

Under the general heading "The Structure of the State," this proclamation made clear the purpose of a joint or unified military command, and here I quote from the exact text of the proclamation:

> The establishment of a military unity capable of liberating the Arab homeland from the dangers of Zionism and imperialism, realizing the Arab homeland's aspiration for stability and order, and mobilizing its efforts for the establishment of justice, right, and peace.

Mr. Speaker, both prior to and subsequent to the signing of this proclamation, the radios in the several countries in the Near East have been indeed active. I think, Mr. Speaker, it is not an understatement to point out that certain radios in the area have been clearly inflammatory, and before quoting just a few of these excerpts from the radios, let me talk briefly about the policy of the United States in the Near East.

The United States has always believed in friendly relations—close and friendly relations—with all nations in the Near East. Secretary Dulles on February 6, 1956, said:

> The foreign policy of the United States embraces the preservation of the State of Israel. It also embraces the principle of maintaining our friendship with Israel and the Arab States.

Mr. Speaker, quite obviously the situation in the Near East today is sensitive. I believe there is a need for the U.S. policy to be clear. Admittedly, there are no simple answers. This is an extraordinary complex subject; but I believe that the statements of several radios in the area and certain other actions that have taken place call at this time for a broadgaged, bipartisan, concurrent resolution of the Congress bespeaking the will of the people of the United States and the united sense of the Congress and the Executive. I believe that such a concurrent resolution could make a significant difference before events in the Near East deteriorate and we are faced with armed hostilities.

Mr. Speaker, before introducing this resolution I would like to quote a few of the statements—the inflammatory statements—of the radios in the area which have had some impact already in Jordan and elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, I quote first from the Voice of the Arab Nation, which is a clandestine radio station in the United Arab Republic. It broadcast on March 19, 1963, in Arabic to the Middle East:

> Free Arab soldiers and officers: The people call on you to shoulder your full responsibilities in the forthcoming battle for the liberation of Palestine. * * * Free officers, come forward and set the zero hour; surge like flames to the palaces in Riyadh and Amman and destroy the hireling traitors, enemies of God and of the people. We will then march together to our dear usurped land, Jerusalem, Jaffa, and Haifa, and the crime of Israel will no longer exist. We call the army and the people in the Arabian Peninsula and Jordan to quick action and to the bloody revolution. Death to the enemies of God and of the people.

There were subsequent statements on the radio after that, but the one I would like to call to the attention of the House today is the one which occurred on April 21, 1963. This was after there had been some disturbances in the old city of Jerusalem in Jordan. I quote again from the broadcast of the Voice of the Arab Nation:

> Free valiant men in Arab Jordan: The Voice of the Arab Nation greets your heroic struggle, your admirable demonstrations, and your bloody revolution to deliver Jordan from traitorous lackeys who have sold the country to the enemies of the Arabs and Islam.
>
> The Arab people, who know that many thousands of your heroic officers and men and fedayeen are surging toward unity, freedom, and socialism, support your present struggle and stand by your fight to destroy the throne of traitor Husayn and the head of his uncle, Nasir Ibn Jamil, people's enemy No. 1, to demonstrate and rebel until our common aspirations to make Jordan the fourth region of the U.A.R. are achieved and consequently with all Arab revolutionary energies, governmental and popular, to eliminate Israel, return to Arab Palestine, and restore Palestine to the entire Arab Nation. * * *
>
> Our valiant Arab army in Arab Jordan and along the front lines: These are your glorious days, as the Arab Nation watches with the hope of delivering Arab Jordan from Husayn's rule and imperialist agents. * * *
>
> Death is the fate of Husayn—the traitor king and hangman of the people. His fate rests in your hands. March toward the royal palaces and purge yourselves of the dynasty of treason to join the revolutionary Arab caravan in its surge toward the great Arab objectives. Allah is great and long live the struggle of the Arab Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I would have supposed that our Government, following this particular inflammatory broadcast, would have considered making appropriate representations to the United Arab Republic.

Because I do not believe that the United Arab Republic can claim indifference or lack of knowledge or more particularly lack of responsibility for this radio station within its territory—I refrained on the floor of the House from talking in the hopes that such representations had been made; that they would have been heeded; and that the radios in the Near East would have been less inflammatory. But I regret to report to the House that the radio warfare has continued.

On the 25th of April 1963, this same station, Voice of the Arab Nation, broadcast in Arabic to the Middle East:

> Free officers and soldiers in the Jordanian Army: The time has come to liberate Jordan from Husayn. * * * Bedouin officers and soldiers: How long will some of you continue to be deceived by the falsehoods uttered by Husayn? * * * Bedouin soldiers you must realize that Israel will not dare fire one shot on the Jordanian borders after the strong Arab state declared that if Israel does so it will meet its fate in hours. * * * You are capable of crushing all the traitors in Amman in a few hours. After that Israel will not stay on one inch of our holy land.

I could go on and read a number of additional ones including a broadcast on the 29th of April from Cairo MENA in Arabic to the Middle East, which pointed out that "leaflets are still being circulated in Jordanian towns and within the various army units, urging them to support the revolution and to overthrow the collapsing throne of Husayn."

And just on May 1 the Voice of the Arab Nation, broadcast:

> Husayn, the 900,000 Palestinian refugees on the western bank will tear you to pieces and each of them will take a piece of your rotten body and throw it in the face of Israel to repay the Jews for the price of treason which your grandfather Abdullah received for Palestine. Indeed Husayn you will go first and the Saudi throne will follow.

And in another broadcast on May 1, 1963, this same station said in Arabic:

> Let the bullets whiz; let the guns roar and declare a raging revolution. Masses of our people: Voice the cries of the revolution and rush to the guns with hearts which are not afraid to die. Our masses: March and take the Nabulus mountains as the headquarters of your revolution; the Jerusalem hills as your battlefield. Brothers on the borders, in Ramtha and Irbid: Take up your arms, heedless of the curfew or their martial law. Our people want it to be a violent, popular revolution. * * *
>
> Our brothers in Jordan: from the Voice of the Arab Nation, we call upon you to look to Palestine whose mountains, Carmel, orchards, and yellow sands are calling you. Look to our Palestine and surge with your revolution. Husayn: You shall see our masses on the hilltops and plateaus unterrorized by your guns or the planes of the English and not afraid of the movements of the 6th Fleet or the 10th Fleet. We are carrying on and we are confident that your life will be a short one. As for your traitors, members of the cabinet, we have an account to settle with you. You will either resign or meet your fate shortly. It will be a black fate.

There are other excerpts that could be quoted from radio Baghdad, from radio Cairo, from radio Damascus, but I shall not presume on the time of the House to do so.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BARRY. It is true, is it not, that the gentleman from New York for many years was in this area as Ambassador to Israel?

Mr. REID of New York. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BARRY. And that was in the years 1959 to 1961?

Mr. REID of New York. 1959 to 1961.

Mr. BARRY. During that time the gentleman made a constant study of the situation in the Near East and associated that study with travel to these various areas; is not that true?

Mr. REID of New York. I tried to study the situation as much as I could and visited Amman and Beirut.

Mr. BARRY. After the gentleman left that post, with the change of administration, he continued to act in behalf of the people of the Near East.

Mr. REID of New York. I have long believed that the United States should do everything possible to contribute to peace in the Near East. I think this requires a skillful and creative diplomacy. I have talked with regard to the need to develop peace in the Near East and I think that there is an opportunity for this to become a reality; and conversely I have tried to indicate that the situation, in the absence of a clear and affirmative policy could gradually deteriorate and we could be faced with serious hostilities; that the situation could become sensitive, as I believe it is now.

Mr. BARRY. The gentleman was a member of the Atlantic Council.

Mr. REID of New York. Yes, I am presently a member of the Atlantic Council; that is true.

Mr. BARRY. The perimeter of that is certainly in that direction.

Mr. REID of New York. The Council is essentially concerned with Atlantic unity, but it is obviously concerned with anything that touches on maintaining peace.

Mr. BARRY. We cannot maintain peace for the Atlantic nations unless we do have peace in the Near East?

Mr. REID of New York. I think the point the gentleman is making is quite obvious. If the situation deteriorates in the Near East, a number of governments could be drawn into it. There is presently the possibility of 300,000 to 500,000 men being under arms in that area in a relatively short time. This I think could constitute a danger to peace that would affect the entire world.

Mr. BARRY. I think the gentleman has made a fine contribution, in introducing this resolution today and I fully support him in this demonstration of U.S. intentions. This is within the field of his experience. We in the Congress need today to take greater interest in the field of foreign policy and act affirmatively. I thank the gentleman for taking this time and I hope the House will act favorably on this resolution.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MORSE. Does the gentleman agree that the administration does not have a clearly definied policy for the Middle East at the present time?

Mr. REID of New York. I think there is a clear need to have a clearer policy and a policy that is more affirmatively stated; hence the pertinency, I hope, of a concurrent resolution today.

Mr. MORSE. Did the gentleman happen to read the column in the Washington Post on Saturday, May 4, by Eldon Griffiths, the distinguished commentator on international affairs, in which he describes the lack of a coherent policy for the Middle East?

Mr. REID of New York. I have had the article called to my attention.

Mr. MORSE. With the gentleman's permission I should like to read a couple of paragraphs from this article.

> It is clear that American diplomacy cannot make up its mind what to do about the Middle East. Returning to Washington last weekend, one of the shrewdest operators the United States has ever stationed in the Arab lands, confided his opinion that American policy in the area is in an unholy mess.

Does the gentleman agree with that statement?

Mr. REID of New York. I feel that the policy is far from ideal. I think the test of a policy is whether we are moving toward peace or toward war. I think the situation today clearly shows a deteriorating situation in the Near East, the attempt of several countries in that area indirectly to utilize what appears to be outside intervention hoping for the overthrow of one or more legitimate governments. Should this occur, should something happen to the legitimate Government of Saudi Arabia or, particularly, Jordan, this would be a matter of very pressing, serious concern to Israel. I believe our commitments to Israel are clear and must be fully maintained. There should be no doubt on the part of any country in the Near East that we would respond very promptly to any threat to peace.

Mr. MORSE. Has the gentleman from New York as yet submitted his resolution?

Mr. REID of New York. No, I have not as yet read the resolution. Perhaps it will be pertinent to do so at this point in the proceedings.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. STINSON. Could the distinguished gentleman from New York tell me approximately the amount of U.S. aid that has gone to Israel in the years past?

Mr. REID of New York. Approximately $800 million; something in excess of that.

Mr. STINSON. It seems extremely inconsistent to me that this year we are in the process of phasing out our foreign aid to Israel but at the same time in the process of building up our foreign aid program to Nasser and the United Arab Republic. If I am not mistaken, I believe we are going to give Colonel Nasser this year approximately $220 million of the American taxpayers' money. This is a rather strange situation. It seems inconsistent with our policy of the past of helping to build up Israel that now we appear to be in the process of building up the United Arab Republic so that they can carry on aggression against Israel and other Near East countries. I think we would be extremely naive if we came to the conclusion that this $220 million that we are giving to Mr. Nasser is not going to end up, indirectly, perhaps, paying for some Communist-manufactured arms.

We are well aware of the fact that Mr. Nasser is getting most of his armaments from the Communist governments. He has to pay for them through some process. Whenever we put our foreign aid money into Mr. Nasser's treasury, this releases some of his funds to buy these Communist arms. I think this is wrong. I think we should make it very evident to Mr. Nasser that we are not going to tolerate any kind of aggressive act on his part. We should either demand that Nasser stop his military buildup or withdraw our foreign aid from him.

Mr. REID of New York. I thank the gentleman for his comments. I believe they do have a measure of relevance, particularly if the Government of the United Arab Republic and the President of the United Arab Republic do not respect the right of freedom of transit in the Suez Canal and do not respect the six principles adopted unanimously by the Security Council on October 13, 1956, with regard to free and open transit through the canal and, particularly as the Government of the United Arab Republic directly or indirectly may be taking responsibility for certain of the actions as represented in radio broadcasts. I would also refer to the story in the Los Angeles Times datelined Algiers on May 4 which deals with "Nasser Gets Big Algiers Welcome. Ben Bella Talks of Joining United Arab Republic." The report from Algiers by Don Shannon said this:

> The crowd, reduced by a thunderstorm that delayed the rally an hour, booed lustily when both Ben Bella and Nasser declared Israel their common enemy.

Clearly, any nation that is a member of the U.N. must uphold, in my opinion, the principles of the charter and the principles of the charter do not condone continuing belligerency or continuing in a state of war or apparent state of war. Therefore, to the extent that this Government—the United Arab Republic—does not wish to live within the precepts and principles of the charter of the United Nations, I believe that is a matter for concern of the Congress and the President of the United States.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, first, I would like to commend the gentleman from New York for bringing this matter before the House. I think also it should be underscored, as was done earlier, that the gentleman in bringing this matter to the floor brings a great deal of personal experience not only because he has served as Ambassador to Israel, but also in view of the fact that he has done a great deal of work and has devoted himself personally to these problems. I think it is very important for the Congress to have men who can lead the way and point the way not only for the Congress, but for America in setting forth these problems with which we are involved from day to day in our life, as we know it.

I think it is also important, first, to recognize that this is a very sensitive area. Sometimes I think we overlook the sensitivity of the Middle East and the problems that are involved there. I think in view of the fact that the gentleman was Ambassador for some 2 years to Israel, certainly, he can give us the benefit of the knowledge which he has acquired as a result of that service and his contact with the heads of the government in this area. I think it is a sensitive area today, particularly in view of this compact that has been executed. I think it is very important that America, as the gentleman stated earlier, take a very clear position in advance of something happening. We do not want something to happen and then to have America react to the situation as it may exist at that time. I think it is also important for us to recognize that America has many interests in this area, particularly in Israel, a country that has been free and a country that is one of the freedom-loving countries in the world today, represented by people who are doing their best to promote freedom in the world. I think it is very important for us as Americans to let the people in Israel know that we are going to stand in back of them and that we are concerned over what happens in that area. It is important for the Congress and the executive branch of the Government to speak as one and to make clear our American policy.

That policy should be we will not tolerate any interference with sovereign nations in that area.

I want to associate myself with the gentleman from New York in the resolution that he will present a little bit later and say I subscribe to that wholeheartedly. I have had the opportunity of reading the resolution and consulting with the gentleman before he took the floor of the House, and I subscribe in toto to the proposals he is presenting in this resolution.

In closing, I would like to say it is very important for us to let the people in that part of the world know that America will not tolerate aggression, and that we are going to protect and we will stand behind the country of Israel, and we will not permit any aggression against them and against their country.

So I want to again commend the gentleman for bringing this to the floor and pointing out the problems that exist, and suggest that this Government take a very firm and strong position at this time before something can happen which would indicate, what the gentleman has presented the infammatory remarks made by radio and otherwise, that this situation could result in a very difficult propositon within a matter of hours.

Mr. REID of New York. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate the gentleman from New York for his remarks here today, particularly in view of his wide experience in this field and on this subject. I think all of us in the Congress, on both sides of the aisle, can benefit from his observations because of the firsthand experience the gentleman has had in dealing with this problem as U.S. Ambassador to Israel.

I am particularly impressed with the observation the gentleman made that this is a difficult problem, not one of easy solution. Statements have been made that we ought to have a definite and firm policy. I am under the impression that our Government—the U.S. Government—from the very day that Israel was formally established, has been unequivocally on record that we will not tolerate any diminution of the liberties and sovereignty of that great democracy in the Middle East. I do not know of any change that has occurred over the last 15 years under either administration, Democratic or Republican, which would in anyway alter our basic fundamental, unequivocal position that this Nation will not tolerate any interference with the basic freedom, territorial rights, boundaries, and sovereignty of Israel.

I would like to ask the gentleman, Has there been any appreciable or substantive change in that position, or am I correct in understanding that we are today as firmly committed as ever to the fact that we will not tolerate any action which would in any way hamper or endanger the sovereignty of Israel?

Mr. REID of New York. I thank the gentleman for his remarks. I will try to respond to his question, and I think the easiest way to do so is to read the concurrent resolution which I am offering. I would like to say at the outset I am offering this in the broadest bipartisan spirit to reemphasize and clarify that it is a policy which started in the Truman administration and has been continued under the Eisenhower administration, and now under the present administration. I do feel, however, there are certain developments that have occurred, particularly the possibility of outside intervention with regard to the Government of Jordan and the Government of Saudi Arabia which could be sensitive and which could prompt a very rapid response from Israel.

Mr. PUCINSKI. If the gentleman will yield further, I certainly would like to congratulate the gentleman for bringing this resolution before the House. I think any action taken at this time to reaffirm the fundamental determination of this country that we are not going to tolerate interference with the sovereignty of Israel serves both the best interests of the United States and peace in the world.

I am sure many of us on this side would join in supporting any effort in that direction, as last year many Members on the other side joined in our similar action.

Since the gentleman has had this wide experience in this particular field, I am particularly grateful that he has taken the time today to tell us about the damaging broadcasts which certainly must be curtailed, and to give us the benefit of his experience and knowledge on this subject. I would like to hear the gentleman's proposal.

Mr. REID of New York. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, in reply to the gentleman's last remark I just want to make it clear that the thing I was speaking about, which the gentleman just presented is that it is important, as I see it, because of the sensitiveness in this area, that we reaffirm our policy. And, it seems to me that the time has come, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. Reid] has indicated, for us to reaffirm and that the Congress, with bipartisan support, should, along with the Executive, indicate to the people in the Middle East exactly what the position of the United States is today so that there can be no question about it, and I would be hopeful that the clear announcement from this Congress and from the Executive can avert, perhaps, the type of thing that might get out of hand.

Mr. REID of New York. I would like to read the resolution and just one brief statement or two before I yield further, and I would like to recall the statement I made on the House floor on March 12, wherein I said:

> The House will recall that the formation on October 23, 1956, of the last joint command of Egypt, Syria, and Jordan, with the stated purpose of "the liquidation of Israel" in large measure triggered action by the Government of Israel in Sinai—as Israel believed its security was threatened and that its survival was at stake; thereby requiring action in self defense.

Now we are having the beginning here of a pattern that could cause concern, the initial statement of the desire to form a joint military command. The official statement in the Arab unity proclamation that there would be such a joint military command—although I note that conversations looking to the formation of that command, which were to have started May 13, have been postponed—but nevertheless a clear statement of an intention to form a unified military command and the statement of the purpose, that is, the liberation of the Arab homeland from the dangers of Zionism and imperialism. This is a pattern, when put alongside of the various radio broadcasts, gives reason for increased concern. It could trigger an action wherein military forces could be involved, and it could quite clearly threaten the security and the integrity of Israel, to which we are committed, and it is against this background that I would like to read this resolution. This is a concurrent resolution:

> Whereas on May 25, 1950, the United States, the United Kingdom, and France issued a tripartite declaration pledging themselves to prevent the violation of frontiers, or armistice lines in the general area of the Middle East; and
>
> Whereas on April 9, 1956, the United States Government "in accordance with its responsibilities under the Charter of the United Nations" declared its intention "within constitutional means to oppose any aggression in the area" and its determination "to support and assist any nation which might be subjected to such aggression"; and
>
> Whereas the Congress, on March 9, 1957, adopted a joint resolution authorizing the President to "cooperate with and assist any nation or group of nations in the general area of the Middle East desiring such assistance in the development of economic strength dedicated to the maintenance of national independence," and to undertake in such area "military assistance programs with any nation or group of nations of that area desiring such assistance" against armed aggression from any country controlled by international communism, including, in the discretion of the President, the use of United States Armed Forces to assist any such nation or group of nations; and
>
> Whereas the outbreak of armed conflict in the Middle East would be likely to spread to other areas: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That the President is urged—
>
> to reaffirm the deep interest of the United States Government in the peace and stability of the Middle East area, and in the realization of the legitimate aspirations of all the peoples of the area;
>
> to reiterate the unalterable opposition of the United States Government to the use of force or the threat of force among any of the states in that area, for the purpose of violating or altering frontiers or armistice lines, or for any other purposes which would threaten the peace and stability of the area;
>
> to make clear that the United States Government includes in its definition of such actions, subversive activities of all types undertaken by any state against the established government or governmental institutions of any state in the area, including the use of clandestine agents, the clandestine introduction of arms, and so forth, into any state in the area, or the making, or permitting to be made, of inflammatory statements directed against any state in the area by any other state or by its leaders or recognized spokesmen, or by radio or television from the territory of any other state directed toward the overthrow of the legitimate government of any other state;
>
> to state that the United States Government considers such activities to be violations of both the spirit and the provisions of the United Nations Charter, which the United States Government is committed to uphold; and
>
> to declare the intention of the United States Government, upon the request of any state in the area which considers itself threatened by any such action by or from the territory of any other state, and consistent with its obligations as a member of the United Nations, immediately to take action, both within and outside the United Nations, to prevent such violation and to preserve the peace and stability of the area.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I will be delighted to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the gentleman from New York, whose knowledge and experience in this field is unparalleled by anyone in this body, deserves the congratulations and the thanks of all of us for bringing this matter to our attention.

Mr. Speaker, this is an area in which the executive has the principal responsibility and to which it must direct its attention. I think that the gentleman's resolution will help focus the administration's attention on a most critical problem. I trust the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the near future and I certainly hope and will do everything in my power to persuade the chairman of that committee to hold hearings on the gentleman's resolution as soon as possible.

Mr. REID of New York. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I would be happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. Lindsay].

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I should like first to draw to the attention of the Members of the House the qualifications of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Reid], to speak on this subject. I do not suppose that the United States has ever in modern times had a more beloved ambassador in a foreign country than was our friend and colleague from New York who was for a number of years Ambassador to the State of Israel.

Mr. Speaker, based upon my personal visits to the State of Israel and in talking with knowledgeable men in the field of diplomacy, I know something of the statesmanship that the gentleman brought to this area on behalf of the United States and on behalf of all nations and persons who are concerned with the preservation of stability and peace in that area.

Mr. Speaker, our colleague from New York brings balanced judgment on this subject too. He is not a crusader in the wrong sense. He is a statesman in the right sense who knows the differences between right and wrong and the difference between principle and expediency.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has performed a service in introducing this resolution in the House of Representatives today and in taking the floor to speak on this subject. There is no question in my own mind but what the executive branch and the Department of State is often assisted by Members of Congress who know what they are talking about and who have had experience in the field speaking honestly and forthrightly on subjects of immediate concern.

Unfortunately, too often the executive branch and the Department of State allows itself to become so torn between various pressures and so ensnared in splits between divisions and levels within itself that it freezes at the control stick. There is a good deal of indecision and ambivalence on the question of what is our policy in the Middle East.

To some extent our policy in the Middle East has been controlled by pragmatic considerations first and foremost. There is some reason for this. Our Government is sensitive to the fact that all of the land in the Middle East is constantly under the probing, searching attack of the giant to the north and east, the Soviet Union. But our Government must understand also that our country has always stood for principle, for freedom and for the independence and individual rights and liberties of all people. And I do not think that there can be any compromise with principle insofar as the integrity of the State of Israel is concerned. We will not see it traded away. Nor can we be a party to a breach of a contract entered into freely, as was done in the case of the tripartite agreement that the gentleman from New York refers to in his talk and his resolution. Nor can there be any misunderstanding about the position of the member nations of the United Nations in this regard. So what the distinguished gentleman from New York has done is to remind Members that there is a contract outstanding which obligates the United States to preserve the integrity of independent nations in the Middle East; and that we are on record in the United Nations to see to it that aggression is not committed by any means or fashion against free peoples and independent nations in that part of the world.

I hope that the gentleman's resolution and the words he has spoken on the floor of the House today will be broadcast far and wide and that they will serve the very useful purpose of getting our friends downtown in the State Department off center; of helping them clarify policy which at the moment is unclear.

I think that it would be a very useful thing if, in response to what the gentleman has stated, the Secretary of State would issue a very clear statement defining what U.S. policy is in the Middle East. They should have no fear of doing this for the very simple reason that, as I said, principle cannot be disregarded and the world will respect a principle fairly and squarely stated.

We will not lose any friends by doing this. We will be preparing for the future by doing it. As the gentleman well knows, in the event there should be some kind of an accident in the Middle East, any kind at all, whether an assassin's bullet should find a target, or whether there should be an explosion in the streets or a rising of some kind, it could set off a chain reaction of the most fearful kind.

It behooves us to plan for this, to be ready for it, to understand that if such a chain reaction should set in, the integrity of free countries, and particularly the integrity of the free nation of Israel would be under dire and severe attack. It would be a convulsion that might engulf the world.

It is not easy to make plans for the future. It is not easy to plan for contingencies, because part of that planning means making decisions and clear policy which is publicly and openly stated. I do not think we have that clear policy today.

I should like to thank our colleague from New York for his remarks today, and for his carefully worded, statesmanlike resolution. I am delighted to cosponsor it with him and am today introducing it alongside of his.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. REID of New York. I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] for his eloquent, pertinent, forceful, and thoughtful remarks, because indeed we do have a contract outstanding, a contract outstanding since the formation of the State of Israel, a contract honored by every President of the United States. I believe it is essential that we do those things, as the gentleman from New York just pointed out, that would represent taking action now before accidents might occur that could set off a conflagration—the implications and the scope of which no Member here today could foresee. The danger, I believe, and I used to talk with former Secretary of State Dulles on this subject, is that frequently when the position of the U.S. Government has become unclear, it is not because documents have not been clear but because our willingness to act has been questioned. Secretary Dulles felt the greatest danger in foreign relations is miscalculation of the intentions of any state and particularly those of the most powerful state in the world today—the United States. Hence, we have an obligation to make crystal clear the main elements and intentions of our foreign policy and our willingness to act in accordance with these policies.

I think we have a situation in the Near East today where we have something that we can honor. We can honor peaceful relations with peaceful nations in the area. We can honor the integrity of Israel. We believe deeply in this. The relations between the United States and Israel are basic in the free world. But we would not be honoring that if at this juncture, in the light of the statements our Government has already made in the diplomatic channels, the United States did not speak more clearly at the same time and with one voice.

It would be my hope that at this time we approve a bipartisan resolution that would express the will of the Congress, of the American people, and of the Government. It is my belief that in so doing, were this Congress so to act, the President could reaffirm that this resolution would be understood by those who appreciate human liberty and human dignity, and by all who oppose outside intervention. Our purpose must be to see that peace in our time is a reality, and to do those things that would keep the peace before any dangers can come along that would disturb the peace and would violate the border or territory of any country in the area, and quite obviously and most particularly Israel in this instance.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the gentleman for reading the resolution. It certainly answers all the questions that have been raised here earlier.

I agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY], that it is important for the legislative branch of the Government to reaffirm these principles. This resolution certainly does set out the position that has been stated by President Roosevelt, by President Truman, by President Eisenhower, and, yes, frequently, by President Kennedy. It also reaffirms what Mr. Stevenson, our Ambassador to the United Nations, has said repeatedly in the United Nations. It is my hope we will be able to join together in getting this resolution approved so that the legislative branch of the Government can serve notice on those who would violate peace in the Near East.

As the gentleman said earlier in his remarks, the language of the military agreement signed by the Arab States should be most disturbing to all of us who are determined to preserve a just peace in the Middle East.

Therefore, I would like to congratulate the gentleman for bringing the resolution to this body today. It is my hope it will get joint bipartisan support. It will certainly help President Kennedy make it clear to those in the Middle East what our intentions have been and what they are now, and that is that we unequivocally stand behind the principle that the sovereignty of Israel must not be violated. So I congratulate the gentleman for bringing to this Chamber his great experience and wisdom, and I am particularly grateful to him for bringing this matter to our attention because of the experience he has had in this area.

Mr. REID of New York. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, it is my very earnest hope that it would be possible not only to have a bipartisan resolution passed by the Congress, but for the President to speak so that the United States will speak with one voice. I think this is a situation where clearly there are enough indications on the record to cause concern. There reportedly have been representations by our Government that have not been wholly heeded by some of the governments in the area. I would think that the Congress speaking as one voice and the President speaking with the Congress would in no uncertain terms indicate our clear determination to preserve the peace and to oppose aggression and to do those things that would further the legitimate aspirations of peoples of the area for life and liberty and human dignity and which would preserve our desire to have friendly relations with all nations in the Near East and to have a clear relationship that would protect the sovereignty and integrity and security of the State of Israel.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I am happy to yield to the very distinguished gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to compliment the gentleman for a very thoughtful and provocative presentation today. I, too, share the gentleman's concern over the recent developments in the Near East. I am not sure how often the legislative branch of our Government is able to speak with one voice, but I do think it is entirely appropriate and timely that the Congress at this time do take a look at the situation and, perhaps, come up with a resolution of the kind the gentleman is proposing. I want to congratulate the gentleman for the discussion he has made here today.

Mr. REID of New York. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I would only like to add in conclusion, before yielding the floor, that I think the United States bears a particular and special responsibility. As the leader of the free world we have an opportunity to creatively work with all the nations in the Near East so that peace becomes a true reality. It has been my observation that unless we speak clearly, unless our foreign policy is based on respect and unless the foundation and the heart and mind of our foreign policy is clearly understood then we may have friends but not respect. It is only when we speak firmly and clearly and with one voice that the United States can be truly effective and can be said to have a truly effective foreign policy.

So it is my hope that the Congress will take note of the events that have occurred in the Near East and the formulation of the referendum leading to a tripartite United Arab Republic with Egypt, Syria, and Iraq and the full statement in the Arab unity proclamation which states without any question that a unified military command is being established and I quote:

> For the establishment of a military unity capable of liberating the Arab homeland from the dangers of Zionism and imperialism.

I would hope that that would register clearly on the U.S. Government. I would hope we would take more urgent measures to deal with the radio warfare that is going on that is inflammatory and I hope, above all, we will do everything possible to work out peaceful relations with all the states in the area, to respect the close relations that we have with Israel and the commitments we have with regard to the integrity and sovereignty of Israel and to see to it that through the announcement of such a concurrent resolution and its passage by the Congress and a restatement of these matters by the President that nothing will happen in the Near East that will seriously disturb the peace and threaten Israel or bring on hostilities that could lead to a very serious conflagration and to a major war.

It is my belief that this resolution and the action of the Congress can here today and in the days ahead make a significant contribution to the cause of peace.

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have received expressions of grave concern regarding the security of Israel in the face of the latest alliances and consolidations in the Near East today. This is a matter which, I believe, should be of concern to us all, for Israel is one of our most trusted friends in that strategic area. For this reason, I should like to include for the Record my remarks to the members of the Connecticut Zionist Region on this timely subject.

Mr. Speaker, my remarks follow:

For the Security of Israel in the Near East Today

I am grateful for your invitation to express my views regarding the importance to the United States of the security of Israel in view of the turbulent conditions in the Near East today. May I take this opportunity to extend my greetings and best wishes to all of you on the occasion of the Annual Midyear Conference of the Connecticut Zionist Region. This matter is such an important one to the people of the Nation as well as to those of Connecticut, that I have requested that these remarks be made a part of the Congressional Record of Monday, May 6, 1963.

The United States has traditionally expressed its sympathetic understanding of the yearnings of the Jewish people for a restoration of their homeland. This expression has gone far beyond moral support alone and taken the form of direct financial, cultural, economic and technical cooperation. It is presently embodied in more than 47 treaties with amendments and extensions between the two nations. Ranging all the way from agricultural commodities and atomic energy to defense and mutual security to a treaty of friendship in trade and commerce. The ties between the United States and Israel are firmly forged and I hope and trust that as the years go by, they will grow even stronger.

Conditions in the Near East today are a cause of serious concern to the United States. The spirit of nationalism of the Near Eastern peoples, compressed by centuries of frustration, has finally sprung with an almost unbridled passion upon a world divided by two bitterly antagonistic ideologies. More than a rivalry between East and West, this conflict is a four-dimensional war for annihilation, not restricted to men or nations, but for the annihilation of the entire Judeo-Christian civilization itself. To rip its very roots from the minds and hearts of our peoples.

It is being waged at every level with all the might of the most fearsome barbarism, oriented in atheism, that the modern world has ever seen. By persuasive control of the minds of the simple and unsuspecting, by the threat of force and the use of naked brutality upon the weaker peoples who oppose; and by subversion and the fermentation of civil strife within the nations of those strong enough to resist. By sociological and economic warfare upon the whole world outside of the Communist conspiracy, they are determined to divide and conquer. This is one of the most vicious onslaughts of a combined ethnic and ideological imperialism in recorded history. Worse even than the overt Nazi German nationalism, this is a conquest by subterfuge, propounded as being purely ideological rather than the Sino-Russian Communist aggression that it is.

The United States leads the nations of the West and the free world against this darkness today. Nurtured in Jewish and Near Eastern culture, the Western nations grew after many centuries of costly trial and error through the age of the enlightenment to the dawn of a bright and hopeful era when they declared, after World War II, their dedication to keeping the world safe for democracy; and security and self-determination for the peoples of every nation in the preservation of their ethnic cultures and social and economic ways of life.

While the foregoing would seem to belabor the obvious, I stress it by repetition here, because it was within the context of this portentous confrontation that the new State of Israel emerged and struggles for existence today. It is within this context that the new nationalism of the Near East is developing. And because of which there are indeed grave implications for all concerned. But the State of Israel has proven herself to be a faithful and trustworthy friend to our cause despite the difficult conditions with which she is surrounded. She has withstood the threats of Soviet Russia despite her tiny size. And, unlike some of those who would imperil her, she has not tried her hand at the dangerous game of trying to play both sides for advantage in the cold war. Let me assure you that this country's vows of lasting friendship and support for the independence of Israel, as of all States of the Near East, is inherent in our policies. We have repeatedly made clear our concern for Israel's security. We have adopted this policy faithfully, leaving no doubts about our position. And I hereby pledge my full support to the continuation of that policy, and will do all in my power to urge my colleagues in the Congress to the support of that policy.

We cannot but deplore the sad condition and plight of the Jews inside Russia today. We are all familiar with the continuing reports of their oppression and religious curtailment at the hands of the Communists. From all indications these outrages are increasing rather than decreasing. We can only hope that that unbreakable faith and inner courage which led the Jews through centuries of persecution and even through the death camps of Nazi Germany will somehow preserve them now, through these new tribulations.

And we are all well aware that should this sinister plague spread to and engulf the lands wherein other Asian Jews live, they, too, would fare no better. And we are dedicated as well to the preservation of the independence of those Asian countries.

This transcendant conflict underlies, I believe, the realities of life today, both for Israel and the United States, and Jews everywhere. And so it is urgent for us all to understand our common purpose with our stanch friend in the Near East and maintain that unity of strength and purpose. For anything that tends to divide, weaken, or undermine our inner strength in these particularly perilous times, whether at internal issues or international zones of contact, tends to gnaw away at the very keystone of the ramparts of Judeo-Christian civilization today. If this mighty dam should ever be weakened and so give way; in the deluge that would follow, there can be little doubt, there would be no return for us to civilization as we know and enjoy it today, ever. For upon Jews and Christians everywhere alike, the bondage of an alien tyranny would fall so heavily that the realization of the message of the Passover would lay many centuries hence in a very dark and uncertain future. With the help of God, we are joined and pledged that this shall not happen. And I am sure that it will not.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask that any Member who participated in the debate may have 5 legislative days in which to extend his remarks in the Record and include material relevant to the resolution I have introduced and to the subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

FREEDOM RIDERS' BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, the increasing strength of the civil rights movement and the gains which have been achieved in many areas are the result in large measure of the courage and dedication of private individuals and organizations which are willing to fight for civil rights with direct nonviolent action. Freedom rides, freedom walks, sit-ins, boycotts, and peaceful picketing are expressions of protest against the persistent evils of segregation and discrimination.

There are many examples. Freedom riders suffered violence and jail sentences before the Interstate Commerce Commission promulgated regulations banning racial discrimination in interstate terminal facilities. Sit-ins have continued to face violence and arrest in their efforts to desegregate chain stores and restaurants. And in Mississippi, a concerted voter registration drive is being conducted by the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, the Congress of Racial Equality, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, acting together.

In all of these activities civil rights workers are constantly subjected to the danger of arrest and conviction. Negroes, who have participated in the Mississippi registration drive, have been arrested on various charges ranging from having a car painted the wrong color to bigamy—Washington Post, September 10, 1962, page A10. For daring to uphold the Constitution individuals have been arrested on the grounds of "trespass," "breach of the peace," and "criminal anarchy." Although the Supreme Court has reversed convictions in cases of this nature, the stigma of arrest still remains. Of course, because of the expense involved, not every case can be appealed to the Supreme Court. Appeals take a long time. Today there are almost 3,000 Negro and white student sit-ins, who demonstrated peacefully against segregated cafeterias and restaurants in the South as long ago as the spring of 1960, whose cases are still pending in the courts.

It is sad testimony to our success in fulfilling the noble goals of our democracy that Americans who strive to uphold the Constitution are penalized. These citizens are acting in the best interests and traditions of our country and deserve our highest praise and encouragement.

To protect our citizens who are engaged in the civil rights movement I have again introduced a bill which provides:

Notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary, no person shall be denied any license, right, benefit, or privilege under any law of the United States, or incur any other disability or disqualification under any such law, or be denied the right of employment by the Government of the United States or the Government of the District of Columbia, or, if so employed, be subject to dismissal, solely because of his participation in any peaceful demonstration or other peaceful activity, the object of which is to achieve equal rights for all persons regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin or to resist discriminatory treatment and segregation in any public facility or place of public accommodation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge immediate consideration of this measure and hope that it will receive a favorable response by the Congress.

DEFENSE AGREEMENT WITH ISRAEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN], is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution urging the President to invite the United Kingdom, France, and any other interested nation to join with this country in a collective defense agreement with Israel.

This resolution in effect is a restatement of the principles of the tripartite agreement entered into between England, France and the United States; and the mere restatement by the President at this time of that resolution to the effect that it is still the policy of this Government should dispel the fears of Israel as to possible acts of aggression on the part of its Arab neighbors.

Following is the text of the resolution:

Whereas, on May 25, 1950, the United States, the United Kingdom, and France issued a three-party declaration pledging themselves to hold inviolate the borders between Israel and the Arab States and to assure and guarantee those borders;

Whereas the Congress, on March 9, 1957, adopted a joint resolution authorizing the President to "cooperate with and assist any nation or group of nations in the general area of the Middle East desiring such assistance in the development of economic strength dedicated to the maintenance of national independence," and to undertake in such area military assistance programs with any nation or group of nations desiring such assistance against armed aggression from any country controlled by international communism;

Whereas the outbreak of armed conflict in the Middle East would be likely to spread to other areas;

Whereas recent events in the Middle East, including an arms buildup by the Arab States with the encouragement and support of the Soviet Union, constitute a serious threat to international peace: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the President is urged to invite the United Kingdom, France, and any other interested nations to join with the United States in a collective defense agreement with Israel, and any other Middle East State which is willing to join and carry out its obligations under such an agreement, and to provide such military and other assistance and cooperation as may be necessary to protect the territorial integrity and political independence of any nation in the Middle East which is a party to the agreement against armed attack by any other nation.

A collective defense agreement with Israel and any other country which will accept these recommendations should go far in strengthening the cause of international peace and make this a better world for future generations of all nations.

THE MORE REHABILITATION THE LESS PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, on February 21, I introduced into the Congress H.R. 4027, entitled the "Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments of 1963." The general purpose of this bill is to expand and improve the vocational rehabilitation programs throughout the country. The bill was referred to the House Committee on Education and Labor. Hearings on the legislation have not been announced.

When the Labor-HEW appropriations bill was being considered on the floor of the House last week, I called attention to the fact that over 100,000 handicapped individuals were rehabilitated into employment through the State-Federal program of rehabilitation in 1962. It is estimated that the number will rise to 125,000 for the 1964 fiscal year. We have been encouraged by the fact that State legislatures are recognizing the potentialities of vocational rehabilitation by appropriating ever increasing sums to match the Federal funds available for vocational rehabilitation services. With alert and efficient administration at both the Federal and State levels, this program offers one of the best examples we have of a truly effective Federal-State partnership in the provision of an essential service to our citizens.

Significant as the progress has been in recent years, it remains a tragic fact that not over one-third of the handicapped individuals needing rehabilitation services in any given year are being served. There are a number of reasons for this. The program is still not well enough known to the general public. Physicians and others who have first access to handicapped individuals are slow to recognize the potentials of vocational rehabilitation for the restoration of their patients or clients to maximum usefulness in their communities. Some of the problems are legal, and it is to correct some of the legal inadequacies that I introduced H.R. 4027.

The rigid requirement that handicapped individuals are not eligible to receive rehabilitation service unless there is a reasonable expectation that they may become employable serves as a barrier to the acceptance of many of the most severely handicapped individuals. In the bill I introduced, it is provided that the State rehabilitation agencies, with the use of Federal funds, may provide any rehabilitation services up to 18 months for the mentally retarded and up to 6 months for any other groups during which time rehabilitation potential is being determined. This will have the practical effect of enabling State rehabilitation agencies which now feel the necessity of passing judgment upon the employability of applicants very early in their contact with the agency to expend more time and more money in making this important determination. It has been demonstrated time after time that, in the case of many severely handicapped individuals, particularly the mentally retarded, it is impossible to pass judgment on the employability of such individuals until they have been given an opportunity over an extended period of time.

In another section of the bill, provision is made for Federal assistance to the States to help them establish rehabilitation facilities, including workshops for the very severely disabled. It has been thoroughly demonstrated that many of the most severely disabled people, including the mentally retarded, must have a transitional experience of work before they can be expected to compete with others in open employment. Under this legislation, we hope to construct the specific types of vocational rehabilitation facilities which will help obtain this objective.

In other sections of the bill, it is provided that private funds may be used to match Federal funds for the construction of rehabilitation facilities under section 2 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act. In still another section, it is provided that local taxing units may participate in the program by financing rehabilitation services above the State level for their own communities. Both of these provisions will result in far greater general local community activity in the rehabilitation field.

The improvement and expansion of rehabilitation services, while primarily developed for the benefits such services can be to individual handicapped persons, is clearly in the national interest. The more rehabilitation we have the less dependency we have. The less dependency we have the less call for public assistance in other forms of relief. Every year we delay the needed reforms in vocational rehabilitation legislation, we are losing ground that can never be regained. It has been a disappointment to me that 4 months of this session have passed without hearings on this legislation being announced. In the light of comprehensive hearings conducted by the House Committee on Education and Labor during the previous Congress, it is felt that a minimum of hearings will be necessary in order to report a good bill. We sincerely hope that committee action will come before long and that a bill can be passed by the House of Representatives and accepted by the Senate during this session.

WE HAD BETTER CHANGE OUR STRATEGY FOR THE UPCOMING TRADE NEGOTIATIONS

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about the Kennedy round-of-trade negotiations under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. The negotiations start with a ministerial meeting of the 44 countries of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade at Geneva on May 16.

Already, we who believe in the principle of an expanding free world trade open to all have been disappointed at the course of the Trade Expansion Act. The act was designed to permit down-to-zero bargaining on many of the major groups of commodities produced in the leading industrial countries. Second, it was designed to get into operation fast, so as to provide the maximum help for our lagging employment and growth, and for our chronically imbalanced international payments. Third, it was designed to aid all the countries of the free world on a multilateral, nondiscriminatory basis.

As I have pointed out many times, our State Department's obsession with the Common Market at the expense of the rest of the free world has prevented our attaining the first two objectives.

ZERO BARGAINING FALLS BY THE WAYSIDE

The clause of the Trade Expansion Act allowing down-to-zero bargaining was conditioned on Britain's joining the Common Market. With Britain and other members of the European Free Trade Association in the Common Market, the down-to-zero clause would have affected some 26 major commodity groups. Without them in the Common Market, the clause evaporates into thin air, since with one or two exceptions there are simply no commodity groups which qualify. With Britain out by De Gaulle's veto of last January 14, the zero-bargaining clause of the Trade Expansion Act has become a nullity. Through using the Trade Expansion Act as a bludgeon to obtain British entry into the Common Market, we have rendered useless the principal bargaining power of the act.

The same distortion of emphasis has resulted in a lamentable slowdown in carrying out the act. The act became law in October 1962. Had we started the day after the act was signed to go through its procedural exercises, we would have been ready to negotiate today. Instead, we waited, hoping against hope that Britain would join the Common Market. As a result, we are only now pulling ourselves together, and it looks as if negotiations cannot even start until about this time in 1964—at least a year later.

"IF THE COMMON MARKET WON'T PLAY, ALL IS LOST"

Now our Common Market fixation is about to lead us into a third and most distressing distortion of the Trade Expansion Act. The act, as I have said, was designed to enable us to bargain down tariffs not just with the Six of the Common Market—to whom we sell one-fifth of our exports, some $4 billion annually—but with the whole free world membership of the rest of GATT—to whom we sell four-fifths of our exports, some $16 billion annually.

But our apparent policy for the upcoming preliminary GATT meeting in Geneva is to say, "We are going to negotiate mainly with the Common Market; and if the Common Market proves difficult, we are going to punish ourselves and the rest of the free world by calling off the whole negotiations."

"If the Common Market won't play, all is lost" appears to be the U.S. official bargaining attitude. If the Common Market sticks to its proposed protective farm policy on wheat, corn, feed grains, rice, and poultry; or if it refuses to make adequate concessions to the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Denmark, and the other countries hurt by its farm policy; or if it refuses to bargain in good faith by substantially lowering tariffs on industrial products—if any of these things happen, we will end the Kennedy round of tariff negotiations, and leave ourselves and the rest of the free world high and dry. No use bargaining with the rest of the 44-member GATT, so the argument runs, because tariffs lowered by such bargaining would simply result in the unjust enrichment of the Common Market through most-favored-nation treatment.

OUR PRESENT BARGAINING STRATEGY

This bargaining strategy has been extensively reported in the press recently.

For example, on April 29, 1963, Special Trade Negotiator Christian A. Herter told the U.S. Chamber of Commerce that the United States would end the Kennedy round unless the Common Market rids itself of its agricultural protectionism.

> Before we engage in far-ranging tariff reductions on industrial products—

Said Mr. Herter—

> we feel that we must have indications that the Common Market is not adopting a restrictive trade policy on agriculture.

The press has for some weeks been saying the same thing.

March 21, 1963, Associated Press story from Washington:

> Perhaps the greatest U.S. apprehension * * * is the possibility that France and perhaps one or more of the other market nations may insist on exempting their farm products from tariff cuts to protect their agricultural economies. In such a case, Washington sources said, the United States would be extremely reluctant to bargain for tariff reductions on industrial goods. The clear implication was that a protectionist stand by President de Gaulle on agricultural commodities might bring GATT talks to a premature stalemate.

March 29, 1963, Paul Cremona, correspondent in Geneva, reporting to the Christian Science Monitor:

> In the Kennedy round [the Americans] add, industrial tariff cuts can only be negotiated after the agricultural issue has been cleared up.

April 1, 1963, comment in U.S. News & World Report:

> New round of GATT sessions won't get off the ground, U.S. officials warn, if the six Common Market nations retain stiff farm-import curbs. United States, in the past,

> has been willing to pass over the touchy agriculture issue. But now farm tariffs will have to be put on the bargaining table. The position to be taken by U.S. negotiators: No bargaining by you on agriculture, no bargaining by us on industrial products.

April 13, 1963, article on "Getting Set for Kennedy Round," Business Week:

> Washington's hope is that enough will be known about ECC's farm policy and the feasibility of global commodity agreements by next year, so that the United States can go ahead with the bargaining on industrial tariffs. * * * The French Government is telling its partners in EEC that it will refuse to have farm products included in the Kennedy round unless real progress is made first on the common agricultural policy. With EEC's farm program as badly bogged down as it is today, this almost amounts to a French veto of the Kennedy round in advance.

April 28, 1963, New York Times article by Brendan M. Jones:

> Should the Common Market be willing to negotiate only a limited number of tariff reductions with this country in the coming discussions an awkward problem would arise. The effect would be to stymie special negotiations with Britain or Japan, for example.
>
> Tariff cuts made to either of these countries would, under most-favored-nation policy, have to be extended to the Common Market. Thus, the Common Market would gain the benefit of an extra tariff concession without making a compensating one of its own to this country.
>
> Such unrequited benefits to the Common Market would go very much against the grain for the United States, especially after limited bargaining by the European bloc. It is probable they would also limit new agreements with other countries.
>
> Consequently, the negotiations with the Common Market are being approached by administration officials as the key to a general lowering of world trade barriers.
>
> To recapitulate, then, our bargaining strategy seems to be this: Bargain only with the Common Market; and if the Common Market will not give on either agricultural or industrial products, end the ball game.

THE COMMON MARKET'S POSITION

> What makes our bargaining position a strategy headed for almost certain failure is that the conditions of failure—Common Market intransigence—are highly likely to come to pass. True, a number of members of the Six undoubtedly want to be reasonable about the upcoming negotiations. But any one member can transform the Six into an unreasonable roadblock. France proved that by its January 14 veto of Britain's entry.
>
> The blunt fact is that strong elements exist in the Common Market which are quite content with its proposed agricultural protectionism.
>
> Strong elements exist also which find its relatively high external tariff on industrial goods, coupled with the increasingly free exchange of goods between members of the Six, an economic advantage beyond compare. Here are six mighty industrial countries of Europe, invited to form a bloc which gives them a tremendous internal market, and the right to discriminate in their tariffs against the rest of the world—all with the cheers of the free world ringing in their ears. Who would not be happy at being granted a special license to discriminate, while at the same time receiving the applause of those discriminated against?

So the likelihood of intransigence by the Six is very real. A discerning article in the Economist for April 13, 1963, discusses the French attitude toward tariff reductions:

> Not only would a massive incursion of American goods menace several French industries; too radical a reduction in the common external tariff of the Six would jeopardize the cohesion of the Common Market. Paris has not gone to so much trouble to exclude Britain only to let in the United States by the back door. Wholesale concessions to the United States would also be detrimental to the agricultural policy of the Six, as well as to their relations with Africa; this, in the eyes of Paris, weighs as heavily as the threat to France's metallurgical, chemical, coal, and textile industries.
>
> French industrialists go even further than the Government and * * * in their view a straightforward application of the same rules to the enormous American trusts and to even the largest European undertakings resembles a struggle between a mouse and an elephant * * * "How can there be real competition with General Motors," M. Villiers, president of the French employers, recently asked "so long as its enormous powers, its fabulous capital resources, its considerable profits, enable it to have recourse to a range of marketing and publicity techniques unattainable in Europe?" According to the industrialists, true equality would therefore demand concessions from the United States double or treble those required of Europe.

All this is a gloomy prospect. If the Common Market is intransigent, if the Six says "Stop the world, we want to get off," we are apparently about to punish ourselves and the rest of the free world by calling off the negotiations for expanding trade then and there.

NEED FOR A NEW STRATEGY

Mr. Speaker, this need not be. We should jettison our apparent present strategy, and instead adopt a strategy directed at the whole free world, rather than one in which the Common Market can all by itself call the tune.

Specifically, we should announce at Geneva on May 16 that we hope that the Common Market will join us at the negotiations in working for restrictions on agricultural and industrial products that are low, low, low, and that apply on a nondiscriminatory basis through the whole free world. Better still, the administration should announce its intention of asking Congress to amend the Trade Expansion Act, so as to permit down-to-zero bargaining rather than the 50-percent tariff cuts permissible under the act as it now stands.

But, above all, we should make clear to the Common Market right at the start that our aim is free worldwide tariff bargaining, with the help of the Common Market, if we can; without it if we must.

All is not lost. We are by no means helpless if the Common Market decides on intransigence at Geneva, either now or late in the negotiating game, as in the case of the veto of Britain. We have some excellent legal weapons, and we would be poor bargainers indeed if we failed to point out what they are:

AGRICULTURAL PROTECTIONISM

First. Possible action against protectionism on agricultural products.

The Common Market is in the process of adopting a protectionist policy on wheat, corn, feed grains, rice, and poultry. We exported $483 million of these to the Common Market in fiscal 1962, about 40 percent of our total agricultural exports to the Common Market. The proposed Common Market policy would kill off a large part of these U.S. exports.

We have two remedies. We should use both of them.

On a unilateral basis, we can invoke section 252 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. Under section 252:

> Whenever unjustifiable foreign import restrictions * * * oppress the commerce of the United States * * * the President shall take all appropriate and feasible steps within his power to eliminate such restrictions.

Included within the "steps" which the President may take are to "suspend, withdraw, or prevent the application of benefits of trade agreement concessions to products" of the country imposing the unjustifiable restriction.

On a multilateral basis, we should take advantage of the provisions of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade which protect countries against the nullification or impairment of benefits accruing to them under that agreement.

When countries join in forming a customs union, they must adopt common tariff rates for products on which each country may initially have applied different rates. The new common tariff for a given product is likely to be some average of the rates previously applied by the various member countries, which implies that some will lower and others will raise their tariffs to this level. Under article XXIV of GATT, the customs union may not adopt "duties and other regulations of commerce on the whole higher or more restrictive than the general incidence of the duties and general regulations of commerce applicable in the constitutent territories prior to the formation of such union." If some customs union members raise duties on products on which they made concessions in earlier trade negotiations to a greater extent than other members lower their duties on such products, they may be called upon to compensate injured countries by making equivalent tariff reductions on other products.

It is hardly likely that the Common Market can offer the United States adequate compensation for agricultural restrictions through reductions of the Common Market tariffs on industrial goods. It is impossible for the Common Market to make adequate compensation to countries like Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Argentina, and Denmark, since their exports of industrial goods to the Common Market are insignificant compared to their exports of agricultural products.

Accordingly, if the Common Market adopts its announced agricultural policy, it would violate article XXIV of GATT, and the Common Market would be "nullifying and impairing" concessions previously made by its member countries, within the meaning of article XXIII of GATT. Under article XXIII, a country which is injured by the Common Market's agricultural policy is authorized to withdraw previous concessions to the Common Market's member countries,

and may also be released from any obligation to the Common Market member countries.

SOME PRECEDENTS FOR RETALIATION

Such retaliatory action under GATT was in fact employed in a 1953 GATT decision on 1951 U.S. import restrictions on dairy products. Dr. Howard Piquet, of the Library of Congress, has prepared the following report for me on this decision:

> At the sixth session of the contracting parties to the GATT the representatives of Denmark and the Netherlands, supported by the delegates of Australia, Canada, France, Italy, New Zealand, and Norway, complained that the restrictions on imports of dairy products introduced by the United States on August 9, 1951, under section 104 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, had nullified, or impaired, within the meaning of article XXIII of the GATT, concessions granted by the United States. They also maintained that the restrictions constituted an infringement of article XI, which provides for the elimination of quantitative import restrictions. In view of the efforts of the executive branch of the U.S. Government to have section 104 repealed by Congress, however, the contracting parties agreed to leave the matter on the agenda.
>
> At the seventh session of the GATT (after Congress had decided not to discontinue the so-called cheese amendment) Canada, Denmark, the Netherlands, and New Zealand stated that their export trade in dairy products continued to be adversely affected by U.S. import quotas and stated that maintenance of the restrictions by the United States under section 104 of the Defense Production Act constituted an infringement of the GATT.
>
> The Netherlands Government asked that the contracting parties permit it to restrict imports of wheat flour from the United States during 1953 in order to compensate for the damage suffered by Netherlands exports as a result of the restrictions imposed by the United States under section 104.
>
> Contracting parties authorized the Netherlands to reduce its imports of wheat flour from the United States in 1953 from 72,000 to 60,000 metric tons. The Netherlands representative gave assurance that this retaliatory measure would be applied only so long as U.S. restrictions continued in force. Section 104 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 expired on June 30, 1953.

More recently, we ourselves had occasion to apply to GATT under article XXIII. In November 1962, we informed GATT that France, by maintaining quota restrictions on the import of fresh and processed fruit and vegetables, was impairing concessions that this country had given. The members of GATT found that France was in violation of article XXIII and that it was impairing U.S. concessions granted during the 1960–61 Dillon round. We were, therefore, given permission to work out a withdrawal of concessions to France.

There is nothing illiberal about the U.S. retaliating against the Common Market, either under section 252 of the Trade Expansion Act or under article XXIII of GATT, if the Common Market persists in its agricultural protectionism. We would be guilty of far greater disservice to the cause of liberal trade if by our inaction we condoned trade discrimination by six of the most prosperous countries in the world.

INDUSTRIAL PROTECTIONISM

Second. Possible action against protectionism on industrial products.

If the Common Market is unyielding in its agricultural protectionism, or fails to make adequate compensation for its agricultural protectionism, or fails seriously to bargain down industrial tariffs, we should not sulk and retire from the negotiating table.

Instead, we should vigorously bargain with the United Kingdom, Sweden, Denmark, Norway, Austria, Switzerland, and Portugal—the European Free Trade Association—with Canada, New Zealand, Australia, Japan, and the rest of the members of GATT. It is particularly important that we bargain with the EFTA countries, since by the end of 1966 these countries will have eliminated all tariffs between them on industrial products. This discrimination could seriously harm our U.S. exports for such products as paper products, machinery, vehicles, instruments, and consumer durables. The only way to eliminate the discrimination is to bargain down tariffs of the individual EFTA countries.

Certainly we should not be deterred from vigorous bargaining with all GATT members except an intransigent Common Market by the notion that the benefits of such negotiations would have to be passed on to the Common Market through the most-favored-nation clause contained in article I of GATT. This is absurd. Trade negotiations are not required to give the dog in the manger the biggest bone. Such a conclusion is required neither by the American history of the most-favored-nation clause, nor by the spirit of GATT itself.

WE CAN DISREGARD MOST FAVORED NATION IF NECESSARY

The unconditional most-favored-nation principle was first announced for the United States by Secretary of State Charles Evans Hughes back in 1923. Its purpose was and is an entirely valid one: To protect us and the rest of the free world against special deals whereby the party which has just given a trade concession wipes it out by giving somebody else a still more favorable concession.

In the past we have not hesitated to disregard the most-favored-nation principle where it collided with our national interests. In 1939, for example, the United States found that Nazi Germany was discriminating against U.S. commerce by the use of various export subsidy devices. We, therefore, increased tariffs on imports from Germany without also increasing them on the same commodities from other countries. Similarly, we have long refused most-favored-nation treatment to Communist-bloc countries.

If the Common Market, accordingly, does not comply with the reciprocal spirit of the upcoming GATT negotiations to the same extent as do other countries, either of the following alternatives could be used to prevent automatic extension of new benefits to the Common Market:

GETTING RID OF MOST-FAVORED-NATION

First. Amend article I of GATT, which now provides for general unconditional most-favored-nation treatment for all contracting parties, so that such treatment shall not be accorded to any country or group of countries which are important suppliers of a product and which refuse to lower tariffs to the same extent as other important suppliers of the product. Under the provisions of GATT, such an amendment would require unanimous approval of the membership. If any country chooses to exercise its veto power over amending article I, other alternatives are available.

For example, the United States could request the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development to invite all interested countries to participate in drafting a new trade instrument, which would be very much like GATT except that it would qualify the most-favored-nation clause. This instrument could then be the basis for new trade negotiations.

Such a new method to cope with emerging trade problems has its most famous precedent in United Nations history. When the power of the Soviet veto threatened paralysis in the Security Council, the United States initiated the uniting-for-peace action in the veto-proof Assembly. Similarly, if the threat of veto in GATT of an appropriate amendment of article I prevents the United States and other countries from entering into trade negotiations, we should unite with other countries in the veto threatened paralysis in the Secu-Cooperation and Development to make negotiations possible.

FORMING A FREE TRADE AREA

Second. Under the provisions of article XXIV, join with all GATT members, other than the countries of the Common Market, to form a free trade area under which participating countries would agree to percentage cuts in their entire tariff structure and would work out plans for additional percentage reductions in the future.

The benefits of the tariff cuts would not have to be extended to the Six—or to any other country which refused to go along. The door would be open to such countries to enter whenever they desired. While it is true that under article XXIV, a free trade area must eliminate tariffs on substantially all of the trade of its constituent territories, it is not required to do this at once. For example, GATT has not disapproved of the European Free Trade Association because it has not begun to reduce agricultural tariffs within the area, nor agreed on a specific plan for such reductions. The wider free trade area, including most of the major trading countries of the free world, should probably have actual free trade on all commodities only as an ultimate objective. If the present provisions of article XXIV prove too restrictive and do not permit this kind of free trade area, they could be amended under the procedure provided in paragraph 10 of article XXIV.

A strategy such as that here proposed may well produce a reasonable attitude on the part of the Common Market. Our present strategy merely rewards the Common Market for being intrasigent.

Right now, before we get off to a false start, is a good time to change strategies. We should promptly announce our intention to bargain immediately for lower tariffs on a basis as wide as the whole free world—with the Common Market if we can, without it if we must.

THE LATE HONORABLE JESSICA McCULLOUGH WEIS

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Derounian] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, long before I had the honor of being able to say I was a friend of hers, I admired Judy Weis. She has always been, to me, one of the shining lights of the Republican Party, and her passing is a great personal loss.

Jessica McCullough Weis served her country well, first in her community, then as national Republican committeewoman, a member of the National Civil Defense Advisory Commission, and lastly as Representative in Congress from the State of New York. She was both a paragon and an incentive for all women. The memory of her accomplishments and the knowledge that she was so loved by so many people will bring comfort, now, to her children. To them I extend my deepest sympathy.

HOW SINCERE IS THE NEW FRONTIER?

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Harsha] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, one of the Nation's most pressing problems is unemployment. Over 4 million persons are listed as unemployed; the unemployment rate in March was higher than it was a year ago. The administration wants to spend more money, establish new corps, build more public works, make more loans, establish more Federal agencies, add to Federal payroll—all in the hope of cutting the unemployment rate. Everyone shares in that hope. But much of the New Frontier's program will not create lasting jobs because it ignores the basic process by which jobs are made, and when the New Frontier pushes some programs, you wonder about the sincerity of its efforts to cut unemployment.

As an example of what I mean, I have been leading the opposition to the construction of a Federal power project called Trotters Shoals on the Savannah River. The New Frontier has been pressing very hard for its approval through the voice of the Secretary of Interior who made a rather unprecedented appearance before the committee in support of the project.

Completely aside from the issue of public versus private power, I want to deal with the economics of this project as it applies to total capital investment, taxes, community economic enhancement, and jobs.

If Trotters Shoals is constructed by the Federal Government, it would cost an estimated $78,700,000. It would flood in excess of 22,000 acres and remove them from the tax duplicate and inundate an estimated eight major industrial sites. The hydroelectric plant would produce over 471 million kilowatt-hours of power per year, and have an estimated maintenance and operation cost of $483,000 annually.

The Corps of Engineers did not state how many persons would be employed in constructing the project or in permanent employment. The corps did estimate that some $394,000 annually in benefits would be derived from recreation, fish and wildlife.

If Trotters Shoals is not built, Mead Paper Corp. plans to build a $40-million plant at this site. In 1956, Mead purchased 1,000 acres in this area and since then has spent $1 million for timberlands and has entered into leaseholds amounting to an additional $2 million.

If permitted to build, the construction of the mill, paper machine, and powerplant to produce 800 tons of product daily will require an initial investment of $40 million; 1,400 men would be employed for 2 years in construction, earning $10 million. New capital investment, creating new construction jobs, would be required every year thereafter at an estimated figure of $1 million plus annually. When finished, the plant would employ 600 to 650 people, at an annual payroll of close to $5 million. In addition, the mill would consume 400,000 to 450,000 cords of pulpwood annually, valued at $8 to $9 million, putting to work some 2,500 men annually on farms and woodlots nearby. Freight movements from the plant, averaging 18,000 carloads a year, would create other jobs.

If Trotters Shoals is not built, Duke Power Co. would build a steamplant at this site at an estimated cost of $210 million; this is private capital, not tax dollars, and about three times the Federal Governments' investment.

During the height of construction, over 1,000 men would be employed. It takes approximately 3 years to construct one unit of the plant and several units are planned. New capital investment creating additional construction jobs would be required every year thereafter at an estimated figure of $2 million annually. When finished, the plant would employ 135 in permanent jobs. Annual payroll costs would amount to $825,000. In addition, Duke Power would spend $24 million per year for coal. This would be purchased from the coal fields of Virginia, West Virginia, and eastern Kentucky. It would require the use of some 38,000 railroad cars per year. The Duke plant would produce 11.4 billion kilowatt-hours of energy per year as opposed to the Federal project of 471.4 million. The lake required by Duke would submerge some 1,500 acres of land all owned by the company and would not interfere with the Mead plant. This is 7 percent of the land required by Trotters Shoals, and the balance of the land remains on the tax books by Duke's development. The smaller lake required by Duke would be available for recreation, but, of course, not to the extent of the larger one. However, there are two large Federal reservoirs in the immediate area, costing approximately $100 million each with a storage capacity of 2.8 million acre-feet each.

The Mead plant would pay into the coffers of local, State, and Federal agencies some $3.8 million annually in taxes over and above what it now pays. Duke Power would pay an additional $13.3 million in taxes, making a total of over $17 million annually paid in as taxes. The benefit-cost ratio of the Federal project was figured on a 50-year basis. If Trotters Shoals is not built, instead of spending some $78 million of tax money, the governments would receive over the 50 years some $850 million in taxes, besides about three times as much electric energy would be provided annually.

But this is only the beginning. Experience has taught us that as these plants are constructed, allied services and industries move into the area providing further investment and more permanent jobs. The additional payrolls are inducements to new industry. Land and property values around these developments increase, adding more revenues. To feed, house, clothe, educate, transport, provide medical care, hospitalization, and hundreds of other services humans need, would employ additional hundreds of people.

But, if Trotters Shoals is built, neither the Mead plant nor Duke powerplant will be constructed with the resulting loss of thousands of jobs, industrial sites, and taxes. Yet, Secretary Udall continues to push the construction by the Federal Government of Trotters Shoals. Trotters Shoals is not the kind of sound economic growth which produces lasting jobs, but to the contrary.

When these companies appeared before the Public Works Subcommittee on Flood Control, they were not asking for Federal handouts. They were not asking for a public works project, or more Federal bureaus or another corps of some type, they merely wanted the opportunity to invest private capital for the expansion of their industries, thereby providing many thousands of jobs at no expense to the taxpayer.

INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION CONFERENCE

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. St. George] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I received the following letter from Sir Cyril Osborne, J.P., M.P., the other day. The honorable Member enclosed a copy of a speech from Hansard's, which he made recently in the House of Commons.

I was deeply gratified that Sir Cyril thought highly enough of the memorandum presented by the U.S. delegation to the Inter-Parliamentary Union Conference at Lausanne to place a portion of it in the permanent record of the House of Commons, the mother of parliaments.

APRIL 30, 1963.

Congresswoman Mrs. K. ST. GEORGE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MRS. ST. GEORGE: I enclose herewith copy of a speech I made in the House of Commons last Friday, in which I referred to our discussions at Lausanne during the Inter-Parliamentary Union Conference. You will see that I took the liberty of quoting from the memorandum which your delegation produced, and also quoted from your President.

I hope you had a pleasant trip home, and I send my warmest regards to all the members of your delegation.

Yours sincerely,

CYRIL OSBORNE.

It has been said that we should look at the Commonwealth problem as a whole. It is true that, from the point of view of both density of population and wealth, the older dominions are in a better position to give great help, but we cannot tell them what they should do. Australia has 10 million people, a density of only 3 per square mile, and a per head income of £434 a year. New Zealand has a population of 2 million, with a density of 23 and an annual income of £472 per annum. Canada has a population of 18 million, a density of 5 to the square mile, and the highest per capita income in the Commonwealth, £544—but we cannot tell them that they themselves must go to help others.

We can set an example if we are prepared to do so, but it would mean very savagely cutting our social services, our welfare state. I ask honorable Members on both sides to be honest with themselves and with the people to whom they make these high promises. Are they prepared to pay the price of their promises? It is when the United Kingdom is faced with these enormous problems that I wonder whether we would not be wiser to talk more cautiously about the Commonwealth, and what we can and will do for it.

Last week, I attended the Inter-Parliamentary Union Conference in Lausanne, where this matter was discussed as part of the world problem—because our relationship with the poorer parts of the Commonwealth is but one sector of the greater problem facing the Western wealth world and the poorer Eastern and African world. At the end of the Conference we said that the only way to increase the standard of living of the underdeveloped peoples is to increase the prices of the raw materials they produce, and then stabilize world prices. We cannot do that ourselves; it will require international action. Next year, the United Nations is to hold an economic conference, and I want our Government to do all it can to support it.

I want to draw the attention of honorable Members to statements contained in three memorandums presented to the Inter-Parliamentary Union Conference at Lausanne. The U.S. memorandum stated:

"The average annual per capita gross national product of the less developed countries amounts to only $130, compared with an average of $1,470 for the developed countries, and with $2,700 for the United States."

As the average in the poorer countries is only $130, there are places with far less than that. The Americans also stated:

"In the less developed countries the illiteracy rate is 67 percent."

They added this personal note. President Kennedy said this to his people, and it could well be said to us:

"If a free society cannot help the many who are poor, it cannot save the few who are rich."

It is our own interests that we should do something for the poorer sections of the Commonwealth, but we should face the price.

WELCOME; BUT OVERDUE CHANGE IN PROCUREMENT

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, 6 months ago I recommended what I considered an important change in the armed services procurement regulations, the rules under which all of our military equipment is bought. Today I can report that the Secretary of Defense has seen fit to make the very change I suggested, and for that he should be congratulated.

At the same time I think it only fitting that he should be warned that what he decides as policy and what is carried out at lower levels of command often differ greatly. That was true last year when he established his new freedom of information policy in the Department of Defense, making it possible for industry to get the technical materials it needs to bid on Government purchases. That policy has been ignored, subverted and prostituted since the day the papers were signed. It was also true last year when he changed another ASPR regulation. That change made it mandatory that American industry be given bidding information whenever it requested it. That change was being shoved under the rug by procurement agencies before the ink was dry on the signature.

This latest change can mean little to those unacquainted with the intricacies of military procurement. For those who do business with Uncle Sam, however, it is a policy change that will do much to induce more light and air into defense purchasing. It could have major consequences—if—what the Secretary has decided to do is implemented at lower levels of command.

On October 1, 1962, my suggestion was made. On March 1, 1963, it was carried out, but I did not know about it until April 18, 1963. That matters little. What does matter is that this policy—together with the other changes—should be carried out in the spirit in which the changes were made. In short, Secretary McNamara's desire for more economical procurement should be honored by the people who work for him. That has not been the case in the Defense Department for many years—under various Secretaries.

To justify my concern over the way this latest change will be carried out, I must state that I already have evidence the new policy is being either ignored or subverted in various agencies. Shortly, I will forward to the Secretary of Defense several examples of such subversion. I trust he will find time to have them investigated and to take corrective measures if they are indicated.

Mr. Speaker, the change I speak of was referred to by me in a letter dated October 1, 1962, to Brig. Gen. C. R. Roderick, Director of Legislative Liaison for the Secretary of Defense. It deals with what is called a two-step procurement action. The first step of such a purchase is to issue a request for technical proposals that are unpriced. These proposals are then evaluated and in a second step those firms considered competent are asked to bid competitively on the equipment needed. Under the old armed services procurement regulations rules the second step was hidden from the public. No advertisement was made in the Commerce Business Daily, and bid sets were issued only to those firms surviving step one of the procurement.

It was my feeling that the second step should be advertised in the Commerce Business Daily and that any firm desiring bid sets should be given them. This would allow subcontractors to participate directly with those firms included in the second step of the procurement and would also put the full force and light of public disclosure on information and competition on the procurement.

That is the gist of my comments to General Roderick. On October 3, 1963, the general assured me every consideration would be given my suggestions when ASPR changes were considered. Imagine my pleasure when I saw in the Commerce Business Daily of April 12, 1963, that procurement officers at L. G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Mass., were doing exactly what I recommended in a purchase of an equipment known as AN/TMQ–14—Cloud Height Set. The Hanscom officers advertised the second step of this procurement as I had recommended to General Roderick.

Since I feel that good procurement should be lauded just as poor procurement is chastised, I wrote the Secretary of Defense on April 15, 1963, and stated in part:

This is excellent procurement policy and follows exactly along the lines I suggested in my letter of October 1, 1962, to Brig. Gen. C. R. Roderick.

Is it possible now to get the regulation amended so that all agencies must follow Hanscom's lead? I feel that good procurement practice such as this should certainly be brought to the attention of Congress.

On April 18, 1963, I received an answer from Charles N. Gregg, Jr., Special Assistant to the Assistant to the Secretary of Defense in charge of legislative affairs. It said in part:

You will be interested to know that ASPR 1–1003.3(a)(2), as it appears in the edition of the the Armed Services Procurement Regulations issued March 1, 1963, requires that the names and addresses of firms which have submitted technical proposals in the first step of two-step formal advertising be synopsized in the Commerce Business Daily.

Thus, I learned that my suggestion of 6 months ago had found its way into ASPR, even as my earlier suggestion had been included in the regulations. This one required the Navy to get in step with the other services and issue bid sets on procurements to firms requesting them even if a negotiated or sole-source purchase was contemplated. I called that change "a step in the best interests of good government and competitive bidding." I refer to ASPR 1–1002(b).

Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to know that some of my procurement suggestions are found to be desirable by the Department of Defense. I only wish more changes could be effected to get more competition into the manufacture of defense equipment. Until it is, "The Billion-Dollar-A-Week Club" in the Pentagon will go on wasting tax dollars indiscriminately through bureaucratic bungling, incompetency and inefficiency if not through outright duplicity.

LOREN GAJEWSKI

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SNYDER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the body of the RECORD today for the sole purpose of bringing to the attention of the Congress and the Nation the enclosed article from the May 1963 issue of Farm and Ranch about Loren Gajewski, a North Dakota farmer now apparently under sentence because the court feels itself legally barred from ruling on the legality of ASCS findings.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress is responsible for the laws under which action of this type takes place. Will we stand idly by and surrender our people's freedom to bureaus and agencies?

BEFORE I GO TO JAIL

(By H. F. McQueen)

"Why not execute 10 percent of American farmers each year—and continue this slaughter until crop production is reduced to the desired level? This process would be as constitutional as the present allotment programs—and besides it would save taxpayers $6 billion a year."

These are strong words by Loren Gajewski, an Alexander, N. Dak., wheat farmer. He said them while on trial before a Federal court in Minot, N. Dak. Gajewski, another farmer fighting for freedom to farm at the risk of losing everything, has already received a 2-year prison sentence for what Federal attorneys and USDA call, "attempting to impede and defeat the Agricultural Adjustment Act." Out now on $5,000 bond, Gajewski, and farmers like him across the Nation, are making their voices heard in opposition to any more control programs—particularly wheat, since a do-or-die referendum is pending.

His fight is unusual for several reasons. Most important: The prison sentence looming over his wary head is the first we know of handed down for violations of governmental farm programs. Legislation hasn't yet been passed by Congress making it a criminal offense to disregard acreage allotments. (The 1964 wheat program, if the referendum passes, provides for penalties of up to $10,000 and up to 10 years in prison for wheat allotment violations.)

Furthermore, Gajewski maintains the original family land patents grant the owner the "right to do with, as he sees fit" his acreage—and that the owner is responsible to no one for the use he makes of his land.

Gajewski angrily denies USDA charges that he has overseeded his wheatlands since 1954—a charge which resulted in the prison sentence. "Impossible," he declares, "The farm in question has been growing wheat since the early 1900's. And the people who farmed the land before we bought it in 1948 gave us signed affidavits to this effect."

"Each year I planted about the same acreage to wheat as had the previous operators—yet in 1957 the McKenzie County ASCS office decided this farm had no wheat history. They said it was virgin sod up to 1954—that not one grain of wheat had ever been produced on this farm.

"But remember, all this took place in 1957 after I had grown four consecutive crops. And during the period 1954–57, never had ASCS sent out any notice saying my acreage seeded was in excess. In fact, ASCS never said a word about my plantings and never even came out to measure the acreage. And they waited another 2 years before making an issue of their charges."

It wasn't 'til January 1959 that Loren Gajewski and his brother Mervin received allotment notices through the mail for wheat grown in 1954 through 1957—and at the same time, were assessed penalties of over $5,000 for violations of allotments during the past 6 years.

The court refused to admit mitigating testimony involving the local ASCS office activities under command of Office Manager Marvin Thill.

At the trial over this unheard-of assessment by an ASCS committee, U.S. Attorney John Garass said, for the record, "The Gajewski land has never been measured, nor have any excess allotment notices been sent out prior to 1959." But, added Garass, "The court has no jurisdiction over ASCS determinations and therefore the question of legality of their determinations is immaterial."

Garass, representing the district of North Dakota, told Gajewski after the trial, "This office has no control provided by law over the various ASCS committees of the Department of Agriculture. If you are dissatisfied with their rulings, I suggest you take whatever steps are provided by law for appeal or rehearings."

If the Justice Department has no control over what ASCS committees and office managers decide to do—right or wrong—who does? Gajewski counters. (And it is a good question. Do you know what court would hear your plea since Federal courts refuse to admit evidence that might show ASCS in error?)

"Of course," says Gajewski, "I had a trial by jury. But the constitutional right of every American of a trial by jury was denied by the simple expedient of the court's refusing to charge the jury with any question which might enable them to recognize the historic wheat base of a farm."

A longtime friend and Government-in-agriculture fighter, Lawrence Naaden, claims: "ASCS thus broke its own regulations in establishing farm allotments, quotas, and farm marketing excesses years after they should have been issued. Those charges against ASCS were spelled out in Gajewski's appeal, but were denied by the court on the same grounds—that it could not rule on whether ASCS had made these determinations legally or illegally.

"In other words, if ASCS were as corrupt as sin—which it is—none of their proven illegal acts could be told to the jury. Of what value is a court that cannot, or will not, hear both sides of a case—especially when fraud on the part of the plaintiff (ASCS in this case) is admitted and stipulated as a matter of court record? If Gajewski's shoddy treatment at the hands of Federal courts is any indication of what is in store for other American farmers—and nonfarmers—we surely have lost all our freedoms," says Naaden.

"In observing this case," says Dr. Robert Morris, president of Defenders of American Liberties, "it is most important that Americans everywhere realize and recognize the fact that the courts say they cannot rule on decisions made by ASCS, regardless of how fraudulent such determinations may be."

"In essence this whole thing is rotten," says another of Gajewski's farmer-friend, Leo Landsberger, of Hazelton, N. Dak. "I fully believe that if ASCS ruled the moon is made of green cheese the court would have to rule that, as a matter of law, the ASCS committee was right—even though the evidence to support their findings was arrived at from the back steps of the ASCS office."

GOV. NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER OF NEW YORK SEES ADEQUATE MINORITY STAFFS AS NECESSARY TO THE RESPONSIBLE AND EFFECTIVE FUNCTIONING OF REPUBLICANS IN CONGRESS

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller of New York has watched for some time, with deep concern and interest, the activities of Republican Members of the House and Senate to increase the number of minority staff members on congressional committees.

Governor Rockefeller served as a member of the Governors' conference subcommittee on minority staffing which last summer issued one of the first hard-hitting and constructive statements about the need for adequate minority staffing on congressional committees, especially as it relates to Federal-State relationships.

It is, therefore, with considerable satisfaction that the subcommittee on minority staffing of the Republican conference calls attention to the following letter on this issue which New York's distinguished Governor wrote:

STATE OF NEW YORK,
Albany, April 22, 1963.

The Honorable FRED SCHWENGEL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRED: For some time I have followed with great interest the efforts which you and other Republicans in Congress have been making to correct the serious imbalance which exists with respect to minority staffing on congressional committees. I was particularly pleased to note in January the appointment by GERRY FORD, the chairman of the Republican conference, of a special conference subcommittee on minority staffing with you as chairman.

This is an issue which transcends partisan politics and goes to the very roots of our political system. An informed and articulate opposition party is essential to the proper functioning of our democratic form of government, and only with adequate staffing can the opposition perform its role in a responsible and effective way.

Not only must the Republican Party be prepared to offer sound criticism and constructive alternatives to the programs and policies of the administration and the Democratic Congress, it must also be in a position to provide independent analysis of the wide range of complex problems which exist today, with a view to developing and initiating uniquely Republican solutions.

Such an effort requires continuing long-range research of a high order. The efforts which you in the Congress are making to rectify the present unfortunate situation regarding minority staffing and to promote this type of research effort are highly commendable. All of you have my full support and best wishes for success in this endeavor.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

NELSON.

RETRAINING—A GOOD INVESTMENT

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, although the Federal Government in recent years has embarked upon a program for retraining unemployed workers, it is well to recall that some of our States have pioneered in this important work. A recent series of articles in the New England Business Review, which is published monthly by the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, describes the experience of some of the New England States with training and retraining programs. Besides discussing the New England experience, the series covers the subject of interest in training among the unemployed and concludes with a discussion of "Retraining—A Good Investment."

In many respects, this final article in the series is especially interesting. It points out that careful studies by the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston and the Massachusetts Division of Employment Security showed that savings in unemployment compensation after retraining were large enough to pay off the entire investment in retraining in about 5 years.

These articles do not try to sugar-coat retraining and make it appear simple and without problems. Problems exist and they are discussed candidly. But the promise and the opportunities of retraining are also made evident, and the conclusion is that retraining can provide an inexpensive method for helping a significant number of the unemployed to help themselves. Under permission granted, I include the series of articles in the RECORD at this point:

[From New England Business Review, August 1962]

RETRAINING THE UNEMPLOYED—PART I: THE NEW ENGLAND EXPERIENCE

Retraining the unemployed is to be vastly increased by the Federal Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. However, the practice of retraining the unemployed is relatively new and very little actual experience has been obtained.

Two New England States have had pioneering programs in retraining the unemployed, one of which anticipated by several years the first pilot Federal program under the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961. New England has also participated fully in the Area Redevelopment Act program. It is therefore possible to gain some valuable information by looking at the first experiences of retraining in New England.

Seventy-seven percent of the 638 New England trainees of the Area Redevelopment Act have been placed in jobs related to their training with another 5 percent being placed in other jobs after training. Some of the placements have been outside the redevelopment area. This program has had from the start a handicap in that a redevelopment area by definition does not have a normal demand for labor. It should be noted that 100 percent placement is not necessary for retraining to be considered a success.

The significance of the Connecticut and Massachusetts State programs initiated before Area Redevelopment Act is that they are not confined to but include "depressed areas," and therefore provide a better test of the effectiveness of retraining than the Area Redevelopment Act program.[1]

CONNECTICUT RETRAINING

Early in 1961, the State of Connecticut instituted the community action program training course for the unemployed. The combined efforts of the vocational, apprentice training, and research staff of the State set up a program which was first instituted in Bridgeport on May 15, 1961. Seventeen machine tool operator trainees started a course in the local high school. Since then 660 unemployed workers have been trained in skills including welding, machine tool operation, and power sewing machine operation. In each case the job openings were identified and assurances were obtained from employers who said that they could absorb any trainee graduated from the course. Comprehensive testing and interviewing was done for the selection of the trainees. A curriculum was developed and classes scheduled to be taught at the local technical high schools with no charge for tuition. The unemployed were able to continue receiving unemployment compensation during training. Almost all the trainees participating in the community action program have been placed in jobs which will give them on-the-job experience in their new skills.

The Connecticut program was similar to the area redevelopment program in that extensive screening of applicants was done, and only specific programs were offered to the unemployed.

MASSACHUSETTS RETRAINING

The Massachusetts program is an older and far different type of retraining program. A series of amendments to the unemployment compensation benefit law were made starting in 1956 so that an unemployed person taking a vocational training course could be considered as available for work and therefore eligible to receive unemployment compensation benefits while training. In fact, an 18-week extension of the benefits was provided if this extension were necessary to complete the approved course providing potential benefits of 48 weeks.

Each course was selected by the trainee and approved by the appropriate State agency, division of vocational education or division of employment security, if it would serve as a means of realizing employment. The student paid tuition, if any.

Although no major advertising of this program has been done, approximately 1,300 individuals have taken advantage of the program since the first active year (1958) with approximately 300 having had a year's work experience since their retraining. This latter group does represent one of the largest groups of unemployed who (1) have had retraining, (2) have re-entered the labor market, and (3) have a year's work experience since retraining.

A joint research project was undertaken by the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston and the Massachusetts Division of Employment Security in order to evaluate the success of the retrainees under this program. A questionnaire was sent to the 900 who had participated in approved programs by the end of 1961, for most of 1962 applicants were still in school. More than three-fourths of all those surveyed responded. In addition, a survey of other claimants who were similar in age, sex, previous occupation,, geographic region, and date of compensation was made to establish a control group, i.e., a group of people with similar backgrounds, who had not had retraining. The purpose of this control group was to establish whether the change in income and steadiness of employment was due to retraining or to some other factors such as a better business climate which would affect all such individuals.

IMPROVED ANNUAL INCOME

Initial placement is just one test of the effectiveness of retraining. A more difficult and perhaps more important question is: Does retraining improve income and job stability?

The survey of the retrainees of the Massachusetts program has yielded some impressive results as to the effectiveness of retraining. Those people in this program who (1) were laid off, (2) took some form of vocational retraining, and (3) have been out working for more than 1 year, on the average, increased their yearly income by almost $1,000, or 35 percent.[2] The increase in yearly income for people who were similar to the retrainees but who did not have the advantage of retraining was $250, or 10 percent in the same time period. Retraining did pay off for the typical trainee in the Massachusetts program, although more of the improvement in their annual income came from increased steadiness of employment, rather than an increase in weekly wage. The increase in weeks worked per year was 7 weeks, providing almost steady employment (48.7 weeks per year) while the $8.50 increase in weekly wage was not much greater than the control groups.

The courses taken by the retrainees were determined by individual choice, limited only by the available institutions with courses that would be approved by the respective State agencies. As it developed, the courses taken were mainly in preparation for entrance in the service or clerical field. In fact, half of the whole group was studying to be barbers and beauticians. Six percent of the group were studying to become IBM office machine operators. A substantial number of women took a course to qualify as a registered practical nurse. Other women were taking courses in stenography and typing. Technicians, mainly electrical, accounted for 9 percent.

---

[1] The area redevelopment program in New England was described in the April 1962 issue of the New England Business Review. Since that date four additional courses have been approved for 355 unemployed individuals in New England redevelopment areas.

[2] It was possible to quit a job to go to vocational school, serve the required 10-week disqualification period for quitting, and then apply for benefits. About 20 percent of the applicants were of this type. The results of the voluntary quit group were separated from the involuntary separation group for the above statistics. In general, the voluntary quit group did significantly better than the control group, but not quite as well as the involuntary separation group.

One of the advantages of this type of training program was that there were more than 72 types of training courses offered by both public and private institutions taken by these trainees ranging from training to be hospital attendants to a 6-week course in teacher training.

Because there were so many different courses with relatively few in each course—except for the barbers and beauticians—it was possible to compare meaningfully the results of the various types of training for only a few categories. The group taking IBM machine courses did fare better than the barbers and beauticians (at least during their apprenticeships). The practical nurses increased their weekly wage by $8, to $57, and the IBM operators by $10, to $75. The barbers and beauticians actually suffered a loss in weekly wage of $10, to $65. But the latter group still managed to increase its annual income by a one-fourth increase in employment time.

If the experience of the barbers is excluded from the experience of the other retrainees, the results of the remaining trainees are even more impressive. There is a 16 percent increase in weekly wage and an increase in average annual income of 50 percent.

Trainee characteristics

Age group	Massachusetts trainees (percent)	Massachusetts unemployed (percent)	U.S. unemployed (percent)	Years of school completed	Massachusetts trainees (percent)	Massachusetts unemployed (percent)
Under 25	51.8	14.9	33.2	8 and under	12.4	31.2
25 to 34	25.6	17.6	19.6	9 and 10	18.7	21.1
35 to 44	12.5	21.6	17.1	11 and 12	58.0	39.7
45 to 54	8.1	21.3	15.7	1 or 2 (college)	7.1	4.9
55 to 64	1.5	13.7	10.6	More than 2 (college)	3.8	3.1
65 and over	.5	11.7	3.8	Average education	10.9	10.0
Average age	28.4	43	35			

Source: U.S. Department of Labor and Massachusetts Division of Employment Security.

Perhaps the greatest testimony of the effectiveness of the program itself is from the many comments which were written on the questionnaire by the retrainees.

There is a statement of this success from a 23-year-old male from Somerville who had taken a course in the operation and wiring of I.B.M. machines. His testimony follows:

"The training I was able to receive made it possible for me to obtain a good position with great opportunity for advancement. I certainly feel that many good workers can be retrained and helped to find steady employment."

This particular individual had worked for 36 weeks in the previous year at $50 a week. He is now working with I.B.M. equipment at $90 a week and working steadily. Another man who was successful in electronics had this reply to the question: Would you have taken this course without unemployment compensation benefits?

"I would have continued to try and complete my desired education, but I must not minimize that help that I received through the unemployment office. It gave me a feeling that, because I was trying to improve myself, they were willing to help me financially."

Receiving unemployment compensation while they were learning did provide strong motivation for self-improvement for other individuals as well. From a woman taking a secretarial course came this quotation:

"It is very satisfying to know that you can receive an income while learning. More of an incentive to improve your position."

Many of these individuals, particularly those who had quit their jobs, were highly motivated and would have taken training without the aid. However, almost 60 percent of those who were laid off would not have taken the course had it not been for the program. With the aid of the program, 90 percent of the entire group finished their course work successfully.

Many of these workers were motivated by the drive to obtain steady employment as evidenced by this quotation from a 41-year-old housewife now making $40 a week as a beautician:

"Two years ago I came over here from England. It was quite easy to find a job, but not a steady one. After a few weeks there was always the inevitable layoff. That is why I took the course (beautician). Since finishing school I have had steady employment. If it had not been for help I received from the Division of Employment Security, I doubt if I ever could have finished the course."

The attempt of the individuals to get a defense against the irregular employment opportunities in many of the industrial shops is illustrated graphically by this quotation from a 51-year-old female from Worcester:

"I love taking up hairdressing. There is a good future in it. When I complete my course I won't have to worry about layoff from the shop."

Many of the voluntary quits were people who were "underemployed," i.e., those who did not work full time either because of seasonal patterns or because they could only obtain work 2 or 3 days a week. A 30-year-old truckdriver in Springfield decided to go to barbering school and quit his union truckdriving job partially because he could only obtain work 2 or 3 days a week.

Not all the courses that were taken were satisfactory, nor was employment obtained by all, although 93 percent of those who had made a concerted effort to find a job in their new skill were able to find one.[3]

A person who was dissatisfied with a business course taken in air passenger sales and ground services gave this comment:

"Out of 26 people who finished school only 2 are working. I am now unemployed and would appreciate anything you could do for me."

Though the success of retraining was not as graphic for the old people, there were many cases of individual triumphs through training in the older worker. One was a 65-year-old lady who at the age of 62 had been retired from her $40 a week typing job. After a period of several months when she was unemployed for personal reasons she decided to take a 10-week course in typing. This lady was very hapy with her new job and her $58-a-week pay which she considered to be a big improvement.

Some of the individuals who took advantage of this program were referred to the employment office by the Massachusetts Rehabilitation Commission. One man who had suffered and was recovering from a nervous breakdown took a course in electronic mechanical drafting. This man obtained a job as a senior draftsman and has been working steadily ever since.

This program was instrumental in enabling a 38-year-old male from Worcester to finally realize an 11-year-old ambition to become a teacher. This individual was a machinist and during a period of layoff took the vocational teacher training course at one of the Massachusetts State colleges during which he was allowed unemployment benefits. After a year of training he was employed as a machinist again and took the second year of teacher training 2 nights a week. He is now qualified and has been hired to teach at a vocational school.

Even college graduates have benefited from this program when they were laid off:

"Although I had a B.A. degree in economics, I had to start in all over again to gain the necessary credits to enter the teaching field. Being able to attend the intensive teacher training program offered at one of the State teaching colleges was certainly a great boon to me. This is my first year teaching and I like it very much."

Many individuals who did not receive a job directly as a result of training did not feel any regret as to their taking such training:

"I did not receive a job utilizing the knowledge that I have received in school. However, the fact that I have furthered my education helped me to acquire my present job."

Some individuals took a course which would give them a higher skill in the same industry. One individual said in describing his experience:

"I have been working in shoe factories for 10 to 12 years, always having my pay vary from $3,000 to $4,500 a year with seasonal layoffs. I decided to learn a good trade at shoemaking that would keep me busy all year round. That I did at the * * * shoemaking school under wonderful guidance and I now have a future to look forward to."

The man is now making $100 weekly plus overtime and working steadily.

If future retraining experience lives up to the potential shown in the New England experience, it might solve the employment problem for many individuals who have found or will find that there is little demand for their particular talents, unless further developed.

However, initial success in the first New England retraining programs does not necessarily mean that retraining will provide an answer for finding employment for a substantial number of the unemployed. As illustrated in the table, the person who elected to take advantage of the program is significantly younger and better educated than the unemployed taken as a whole. Thus it cannot be assumed that all unemployed would derive comparable benefits from retraining.

A more thorough discussion of the general application of retraining to the unemployed will be deferred to part II of this series.

[From New England Business Review, September 1962]

RETRAINING THE UNEMPLOYED—PART II, INTEREST IN TRAINING

In part I of this article, apparent success was recorded for the initial retraining experience in New England. Nevertheless, there are formidable obstacles to retraining many of the unemployed. The advanced age and general lack of education of many such people are major barriers to both the interest in training and the ability to benefit by it. These and other problems (noted later) will limit the general applicability of retraining.

---

[3] Quite a few barbers and beauticians (15 percent) did not remain in their apprenticeship because of low salary prospects for at least 18 months.

However, it is quite possible that the attitudes of the unemployed toward retraining might not be as serious a handicap as many have imagined.

As a part of the joint research project with the Massachusetts Division of Employment Security, a questionnaire—designed to find out how the unemployed felt toward retraining—was sent to 1 percent (randomly selected) of 1961 unemployment compensation claimants. A 45-percent response was obtained.

Almost two-thirds of the 1,450 respondents felt that vocational training could aid them in improving their weekly wage and steadiness of employment, and only one-third of those surveyed said they would not consider taking such training if they were faced with unemployment. The principal reason given for not considering such training was advanced years. The combination of advanced age and lack of education discouraged many of the unemployed considering training even though they were favorably disposed to it. A Lynn woman with a seventh grade education wrote:

"As much as I'd like to change I feel that at 57 years I am no longer fit for any other kind of work. I've been a shoe worker for the past 28 years and it is a little too late to change."

Another major reason for not considering training was satisfaction with present employment (despite seasonal or sporadic layoff).

WILLING TO TRAIN

Most of the unemployed who were willing to take training felt that they could take such training only if it were free and available near their homes. However, 1 in 4 of those interested expressed a willingness to live away from home while training (with free schooling and a subsistence allowance) while only 1 in 10 felt that he would be able to take training if he had to pay a tuition cost of $20 a week.[1]

A typical comment on the possibility of paying tuition of $20 a week while taking retraining was:

"If I was unemployed it would probably be impossible to pay as much as $20 a week for schooling."

It should be noted that a typical unemployed person, even when retrained, cannot be expected to command a large weekly salary if only because he has less formal education. Massachusetts retrainees averaged $74 a week after training. Area Redevelopment trained machinist apprentices started in Massachusetts at $68 to $75 a week. Many are being trained for skills in which the entry wage is considerably lower than the average production worker salary which is $89 in Massachusetts and $97 in the United States.

Many of the unemployed did not expect extremely high salaries after retraining. In response to the question asking how large a weekly salary would be expected in order to make training worth while (assuming steady employment), the response was divided approximately equally between less than $80, requirements of $80 to $99 and requirements of over $100 a week. Very few (5 percent) were willing to train for jobs paying less than $60 a week. These attitudes toward salary opportunities are extremely important since many of the jobs for which retraining might be feasible are not likely to yield a particularly high weekly salary.

In table I there is a listing of courses which the unemployed would consider taking. The most popular future vocations among the unemployed men were electronics technicians and machinist apprentices. Many of the women wanted to become computer equipment workers. These choices were listed on the questionnaire and each interested unemployed person was asked to check one or more of these job categories. The percentage represents the proportion of those interested who would consider training for this type of work.

TABLE 1.—*Interest in training course*

Course	Percentage of males interested in retraining [1]	Course	Percentage of females interested in retraining [1]
Electronic technician	40.9	Computer equipment	53.4
Machinist's appentice	36.8	Practical nursing	23.7
Office work	12.9	Secretarial skills	22.5
Barbering	10.3	Typists	19.9
Bookkeeping	8.9	Bookkeeping	18.1
Beautician	3.8	Beautician	17.8

[1] Many unemployed considered taking more than 1 course, therefore total equals more than 100 percent.

When the 900 respondents who were interested in retraining were asked to name some other type of training which they would like to have, there was a great diversity of response. Many indicated that they would like to be trained in the industries with which they had experience. Others wanted to retrain primarily for income purposes and asked hopefully for guidance as to what particular field of training to enter. Over 100 different categories of training were mentioned, but only three—welding, carpentry and cabinet making, and mechanics—were mentioned 10 or more times. Vocational interest was diversified, and many of those surveyed were realistic in judging their own limitations.

EAGER FOR TRAINING

There are people eager for training, so eager in fact, that they wanted to make immediate application. This eagerness is illustrated by the young (21) sheet metalworker:

"I am very interested in receiving training in the field of designing. I took a test from your office and it shows I am very adept to this type of vocation."

Another enthusiastic individual said:

"I would really like to do as this questionnaire says. It's just what I was waiting for."

But the eager are not exclusively among the young. For example, this seventh grade educated male who is 61 years old from Fall River:

"Would like to take any type of training that would give me year-round work at a decent wage. Makes no difference where I have to go to get it."

The desire to obtain steady employment is an extremely strong motivating force as witnessed by this man from Springfield:

"I have been working at the building trade for 12 years and the last few years I have had an average of 2 or 3 months unemployment every year around January to March. The reason I would be willing to accept a lower wage is if it were steady work. But if my own job were more steady, I would much prefer my own trade."

Desperation is part of the motivation of some of the long-term unemployed. For instance this 53-year-old man who lives in New Bedford:

"I would take any vocational training * * * I need a job badly. I do not have any benefits to collect this year.

BACKGROUND EDUCATION

Finding employment for the unemployed with or without retraining is a multiple problem. For example, it is harder to find employment for older workers or for minority groups who are subject to discrimination. This problem is compounded by the fact that typically both groups have less formal education. Consequently, the frequent job requirement of a high school education excludes many in these groups.

Although an individual cannot be made younger, he can be given more education—if he is willing. Over half of the people surveyed who were willing to take training indicated that they would also be willing to take a course to improve their skills in reading or writing. A course in arithmetic seemed to be very popular with 70 percent. Here is a recognition on the part of the unemployed themselves of the lack of basic education which is considered essential for most types of vocational education in the United States today. They are correct: in three New England areas 48, 55, and 65 percent of those who were tested at State employment offices for an area redevelopment training course could not pass the course qualification examination. This testing took place after the elimination of more than twice as many candidates through preliminary screening.

The unresolved question is not whether vocational education will make an unemployed person more employable, but is: "How many of the unemployed can qualify for vocational education?" If attempts are to be made to retrain many of the unemployed it will be necessary to provide some concentrated basic education in order to prepare many of these individuals for formal vocational education.

It will also be necessary to accept the idea that training is necessary in basic habits and skills which are rudimentary to a large part of the adult population. Basic cleanliness standards may have to be taught to women so that they may become adequate hotel maids, or domestic servants. Competence in arithmetic is an essential prerequisite for many waiters' or waitresses' jobs. Although these jobs usually pay low wages, the steadiness of employment would provide a substantial improvement for many of the "hard to employ."

SUCCESSFUL STITCHERS

Questions are sometimes raised about the need for giving relatively elementary courses such as food handling or the running of a sewing machine because such skills are often acquired at home. However, a 3-week course designed to teach women how to be stitchers for the needle trade in Biddeford-Sanford, Maine, had remarkable success. Before this course there were both a shortage of stitchers and a large group of unemployed women, but the two had not been brought together. The course was so successful that it was possible to train and place more trainees than the 22 officially authorized. This was possible because many trainees did not need a full 3 weeks training before they became acceptable producers. When unemployed workers can be trained for unfilled jobs after a brief course, such training, however elementary, seems quite worthwhile.

---

[1] A fee paid by many of the retrainees under the existing Massachusetts program even though free vocational education in certain courses is available at night from the Massachusetts Department of Vocational Education.

NO PANACEA

Retraining cannot be thought of as a panacea for unemployment. The sheer magnitude of the unemployed (over 230,000 in New England and about 4.4 million in the United States) precludes this. There will always be particular job openings which will be unfilled despite substantial numbers of unemplayed. As illustrated by table II skills in demand are heavily weighted toward the professional, managerial and skilled categories, while the unemployed are concentrated in unskilled and semiskilled categories.

TABLE II.—*Job skill requirements*[1] *and skills of U.S. unemployed, March 1962*

[In percent]

	Skill requirements	Skills of unemployed
Total	100.0	100.0
Clerical and sales	11.4	12.9
Professional and managerial	59.0	3.2
Service	2.9	8.0
Skilled	19.8	20.7
Semiskilled	6.7	24.8
Unskilled and unreported	.2	30.4

[1] Requirements are for interoffice requests. All local job listings are not included.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, The Labor Market and Employment Security, April 1962.

Even when skills have been achieved these cannot alway sbe readily transferred to skills in demand. Retraining the unemployed cannot be expected to fill the shortages of engineers, scientists, statisticians, and accountants. These and other shortage occupations will have to be relieved by changes in the educational system and adjustments in relative wage rates.

Retraining some unemployed will help fill the needs of other occupations. Certainly, some machinists will be developed from the various retraining programs. The widespread demand for other skilled craftsmen such as automobile mechanics could be partially met through retraining. The shortage of clerical help can also be met in part by retraining unemployed females who previously had only factory experience.

GEOGRAPHIC MOBILITY

More employment opportunities might be found by increasing the geographic mobility of displaced workers. Geographic mobility is considerable among employed males and even more pronounced among the unemployed.[2] In fact, 9 percent of the respondents indicated that they moved to find new employment. However, it is unrealistic to expect all the unemployed to be capable of moving themselves, especially those with families since they will often deplete all personal resources before considering a move. Another factor inhibiting geographic mobility among the unemployed is the general lack of demand even in the more prosperous labor markets for unskilled or semiskilled work, typically the only type of job the unemployed can fill. Retraining combined with relocation might be a useful combination of remedies.

ADAPTABILITY NEEDED

Subsistence payments while retraining under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 can be for 52 weeks. However, even with courses designed for the maximum time, it is never possible to prepare a person fully for a particular job; in a broad sense most training is on the job. Retraining for the unemployed is not designed to relieve employers of their function (generated by necessity) of continued worker education, but will eliminate some handicaps of the unemployed which in the past have prevented them from obtaining steady employment.

The problem of making our labor force more adaptable to the demands of our complex and changing economy is a difficult one. To illustrate: New England employment in general increased 7 percent between 1950 and 1960, but the employment of laborers decreased 24 percent in the same time period. In contrast, the employment of professionals has increased 40 percent.

Continued efforts to improve formal education will have salutary long-term effects. Since working years, from entry into the work force until retirement, range to 50 years or more, most of the work force of the next few decades has already had its formal education. Skills of the existing work force therefore must be upgraded. The chief burden for this will be borne by employers: they will be forced to absorb the cost of training personnel simply because it will be necessary to get the job done. Retraining some unemployed for skills in current and future demand will help to fill new labor needs. Better educated graduates who enter the labor market each June will also help satisfy some of these future demands.

Many jobs that exist today and will exist tomorrow cannot be filled by retraining the unemployed directly. As more and more upgrading is achieved, some unemployed can be absorbed where vacancies are created at unskilled or semiskilled levels.

The practice of upgrading the employed through training is not new. It occurs through the use of both formal and vocational adult education courses, both in cooperation with employing firms and independent of such firms. Perhaps the expansion of adult education facilities would help more workers use leisure to increase their vocational skills. Such action would also enhance the productive potential of the country.

The Manpower Development and Training Act which was passed this year will provide for tuition-free training for the unemployed, the underemployed, and farmers with low family incomes. The training will include vocational courses, on-the-job training, or a combination of the two. To receive payment equal to unemployment compensation, the person must be head of a household and must have had 3 years of gainful employment. Unemployed youths not qualifying for regular benefits may receive a weekly payment of up to $20.

Under this act $435 million has been authorized for a 3-year program. About 1 million retrainees will be trained with the authorized funds. If 1 million unemployed can be authorized, given the major obstacles of advanced years and low educational levels, the country will have taken a significant step in increasing the adaptability of its labor force.

[From New England Business Review, April 1963]

RETRAINING THE UNEMPLOYED—PART III, RETRAINING: A GOOD INVESTMENT

Man versus the machine—that old conflict continues to plague our society. It was an important issue in the recent New York newspaper strike. For years it has been a problem to the railroads as well as to countless other industries. The possibility of being displaced strikes fear in the heart of the worker—and not without cause. Yet if displaced workers can find other productive employment, then both society and labor will gain through the production of additional goods and services.

One recent legislative measure passed by Congress to meet the perplexing problem of reemploying displaced labor is the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. The act provides for retraining unemployed workers and for paying them subsistence allowances in lieu of unemployment compensation during the retraining period. In the third year of the program (1964–65) each State will be forced to decide whether to continue this program by matching Federal funds. The administration and Congress also must decide whether to extend the program beyond the originally authorized 3 years.

Some insights can be gained from the Massachusetts experience in retraining during 1960–61. The results of a special survey in this State indicate that retraining expenditures not only serve a justifiable goal but can be also a self-liquidating investment.

SAVINGS THROUGH RETRAINING

The Massachusetts State training program, which is independent of Federal funds, provides for continuing unemployment compensation to workers during retraining.

As part of a joint research project by the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston and the Massachusetts Division of Employment Security, a search was made for unemployment claims filed before, after, and during training by 204 unemployed individuals who took advantage of this program in 1960. The survey showed that until retraining, these workers as a group had become increasingly dependent on unemployment compensation. In 1959, they collected $24,000 in benefits, 3½ times more than they received in 1956. By 1962, however—after retraining—these workers received only $8,000 in unemployment compensation.

To be sure that this improvement was not just the result of changing business conditions, the increasing maturity of these workers, or other factors unrelated to retraining, a control group was selected, i.e., a group with similar characteristics but without retraining. This group of identical size was comparable in age, sex, geographic region, previous skill level, and year of unemployment compensation claim.

Although the control group had similar compensation costs in 1959, its cost by 1962 had increased 28 percent. On this basis the retrainees' unemployment costs would probably have amounted to about $31,000 in 1962 in the absence of retraining. Actually unemployment payments to this group in 1962 were only $8,000. Thus, for that 1 year, a saving in unemployment compensation of $23,000 can be attributed to the retraining program.

The outlay on retraining was $121,000 (net above unemployment compensation which otherwise would have been paid during the retraining period). This experience indicates that the savings in unemployment compensation after retraining were large enough to pay off the entire investment in about 5 years. In business jargon this might be called a payout period.

This estimate ($121,000 divided by 23,000 equals 5.3 years) does not take account of additional taxes paid by retrained persons after they get new jobs. In the Massachusetts training program, increased tax receipts are estimated to be about as large as the savings in unemployment compensation.

A necessary qualification is the possible displacement of other workers by retrainees. If workers are displaced and collect unemployment compensation, no net savings result. As a safeguard, however, Federal programs require proof of unfilled labor demands in a specific skill before approving such retraining courses.

If this experience is at all representative of the returns on retraining expenditures, it would follow that unemployment compensation funds could pay for the cost of retraining. This is especially true if no other sources of funds were available and if the alternative were no retraining.

---

[2] Nineteen percent of employed males as opposed to 29 percent of unemployed moved between March 1959 and March 1960 (U.S. Census).

PROGRAMS IN NEW ENGLAND

Retraining programs are being developed in communities throughout New England. The courses which predominate in the region are machine-tool operators for men and office skills and garment worker skills for women. The region, however, has lost part of its initial retraining lead gained in the first months of the Area Redevelopment Act, which provided training only for depressed areas. New England has 11.6 percent of the retrainees in the two Federal programs—considerable less than the proportion of the Area Redevelpoment Act program it had last April (19 percent). In fact, only Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Maine have a proportion of total retrainees greater than their proportion of the U.S. unemployed. As can be seen below, the overall U.S. performance leaves a great deal to be desired.

Cost of unemployment compensation in Massachusetts

[Approximate figures]

Untrained group:	
1959	$21,000
1962	27,000
Retrained group:	
1959	25,000
1962	9,000

Source: Massachusetts Division of Employment Security.

SLOW START

As shown by the Massachusetts experience retraining is an effective and self-liquidating way of restoring some unemployed to productive activity. How much initial progress has been made with the Federal programs and what are the chances for future expansion? When measured against the volume of unemployment, initial progress in retraining hardly seems impressive. In the United States in 1961, 5.8 million were unemployed 15 weeks or more, with almost 3 million of these out of work more than 6 months. In 1962, the annual average unemployment was about 4 million.

A year after the enactment of the Manpower Act and 7 months after appropriations were approved, only 723 proposals for training 29,300 unemployed had been made throughout the Nation. Of this number plans covering about 24,000 workers have been given final approval. Of course, new programs always start slowly. But with the present rate of proposals covering 3,000 to 4,000 retrainees a month from the 50 States, the current national target of 400,000 retrainees in 3 years hardly seems feasible. Even this target is less than half the original estimate made at the passage of the act.

OBSTACLES TO EXPANSION

Despite signs of promise, general public support, and adequate financing, it will be a long time before a significant part of the program's potential can be developed. There are many obstacles to effective retraining programs.

Facilities: Most retraining is conducted in existing public facilities for vocational education. These facilities are already under pressure from increased population and must expand rapidly just to service daytime high school students. For example, if vocational education is to do its primary job of preparing tomorrow's labor force—as opposed to repairing today's—a 50-percent expansion in vocational high school enrollment in New England might be necessary before 1970.

For retraining purposes, these buildings can be used only at night at least during the school year. If the retraining load is to be expanded, it may prove necessary to find other facilities independent of existing vocational schools. Here full-time instruction would allow more comprehensive training in a shorter time. Combined effort among smaller labor markets in a region might be necessary to fill classes.

Faculty: Increases in vocational education enrollment will put an additional strain on the already overburdened faculty in this field. Competent craftsmen have many attractive alternatives for employment. Not many have had or are willing to obtain teacher training in vocational education, especially for the privilege of earning considerably less than they could earn at their trades. Many vocational schools have found it necessary to hire daytime teachers for a second shift or go directly to industry for instructors for these special retraining programs. Understandably, industry cannot always give up its men for teaching purposes.

The unemployed: Traditional vocational education will meet the needs of only a portion of the unemployed. In Boston recently, an attempt was made by the Massachusetts Division of Employment Security to establish a class for clerk-typists. Letters were sent to 3,500 people who had been seeking jobs in the clerical and sales field within the last year. All these people were under 50 years of age, high school graduates, and at a job skill level below clerk-typist. A substantial number, but not all, were currently unemployed. Only 233 responded to the letter. Of this number, 114 actually appeared for testing, and 77 qualified. But only 35 actually signed up for the course. In other instances, responses to retraining were just as limited. In New Bedford, Mass., 2,000 unemployed had to be screened before 118 interested and suitable candidates for a machine tool operation course could be found. In Detroit, Mich., files of 8,000 women were scanned to find 28 candidates for a course in selling quality ready-to-wear clothing.

It is not surprising that some unemployed are unwilling to take advantage of retraining. Many are merely subject to seasonal layoff, and earn enough while working to be satisfied with their occupations. Others expect to return to their old jobs after business picks up. In some industries undergoing automation, these workers may never be called back, but many are unwilling to recognize this fact even after it is distressingly obvious. Many older workers feel unable to take retraining, or fear going back to school. The U.S. census defines an unemployed person as anyone seeking any type of work, including part-time work. Almost by definition therefore, some unemployed are not seeking work seriously enough to undertake retraining.

There still remains the substantial challenge of retraining those interested and needing such training. This is especially true of the long-term unemployed. Most screening and testing procedures would tend to have a built-in bias against the long-term unemployed. If so, can the problem of the hard-core unemployed be resolved without resorting to a complete rehabilitation program in terms of fundamental education and psychological counseling? Current testing methods classify applicants as eligible or ineligible. The results show that far too many unemployed interested in retraining are not qualified for traditional vocational education. Until retraining programs are well enough developed to offer a comprehensive set of job training alternatives consistent with an individual's potential and interest, a significant dent in the hard-core unemployment problem cannot be made.

There is a conflict between the individual retraining needs of the unemployed and the administrative desire for a few large, well attended courses. Until the administrative problems are solved so that very small groups and even individuals can readily take on-the-job training or training in public and private vocational institutions, the necessary depth and breadth in retraining cannot be provided. The attitude survey reported in the September 1962 issue of the New England Business Review indicates that a broad spectrum of retraining courses will be necessary to tap the latent interest in retraining among the unemployed.

Preliminary programs including the fundamentals of verbal and arithmetic skills, and special courses designed for semiskilled service occupations (waitress skills, etc.) may have to be instituted for many long-term unemployed. Developing such a program will take time, concern, and imagination at every level of government.

The significant advantage of the Massachusetts program over the Federal programs is that it offers each individual several retraining alternatives. If the Federal programs could adapt the techniques devised for vocational education under the GI bill of rights, this needed individual career counseling might be achieved.

Inertia: Relatively few areas in the United States are really wrestling with this difficult problem. The proposals approved for the two Federal programs have been concentrated in a few States: 42 percent of the retrainees are in 6 States which have only 23 percent of the population. Proposals covering only 3,000 retrainees were submitted to officials of the manpower development program in a recent month by all 50 States.

Training will probably be most fully developed in healthier areas of low unemployment. This will be true for two reasons. First, there are likely to be more job openings to be filled with a retrained person. Second, those regions tend to have better developed vocational education facilities upon which to build a retraining program. In addition, such areas tend to have larger State administrative units and better research facilities to help develop programs. This trend is evident in New England: Connecticut has more than half of all approved New England retrainees under the Manpower Development and Training Act and Area Redevelopment Act. Nationally, nearly half of all authorized Federal retrainees to date are in areas with less than 6 percent unemployment even though the depressed area retraining program was initiated almost a year before the manpower development program. Retraining efforts in depressed areas will be handicapped unless relocation for those unable to find local jobs is encouraged. In these places, many retraining courses cannot be justified unless job openings outside the area are considered.

NEEDED: A BROADER APPROACH

Retraining cannot be expanded enough to provide employment for everyone. This program cannot be the Government's only weapon in its war on unemployment. The proposed Federal income tax cut is an example of a more comprehensive approach. Efforts to increase aggregate demand should provide opportunities for many unemployed without retraining. In a faster growing economy, management would have to be less selective in its hiring practices.

Nevertheless, retraining can provide an inexpensive method for helping a significant number of the unemployed help themselves. It is a partial answer to a perplexing problem which has no easy solution.

U.S.-FINANCED MOTELS

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HARVEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the Banking and Currency Committee on which I serve just recently passed out of committee H.R.

4996 which increases authorizations to the area redevelopment administration in the amount of $455 million. I do not approve of the manner in which this program is being administered, at least not in the State of Michigan. The Activity Summary Report, dated Monday, March 25, 1963, covering operations in fiscal 1963 to that date, published by the U.S. Department of Commerce, indicates that seven so-called industrial loans have been made in Michigan in the total amount of $4.4 million. I point out, however, that a reading of the report indicates that 86 percent of this money, or $3.8 million went to finance new motels. I do not believe this was the intent of Congress. To supplement these remarks, I call to the attention of all Members the story appearing in the Sunday, May 5, 1963, issue of the Detroit Free Press, by Frank Beckman, entitled "Motel Man Rips Competition From U.S. Aided Inns," set forth below:

MOTEL MAN RIPS COMPETITION FROM U.S.-AIDED INNS

(By Frank Beckman)

A Detroit motel operator has protested to Congress that Area Redevelopment Act loans are being issued for construction of hotels and motels which compete with establishments built without Federal aid.

Peter Solomon said this has the effect of using tax money paid by hostelry owners to subsidize "unfair competition."

He said owners who have their own capital invested in their businesses should not be confronted by competition made possible by Area Redevelopment Act loans.

Solomon's protest was made to Michigan Senators PHILIP A. HART and PATRICK V. McNAMARA and to Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat of Illinois, and Senator MILWARD SIMPSON, Republican of Wyoming.

DOUGLAS is chairman of the manpower stabilization subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, which is considering expansion of the Area Redevelopment Act program. SIMPSON is a subcommittee member.

Solomon, operator and part owner of the Diplomat Motel, 5801 Woodward, and the Goldenaire Motel, 18650 Woodward, asked to appear before the committee to state his protest.

According to Solomon, the Area Redevelopment Act program makes it possible for persons to go into the hotel and motel business at no risk of their own capital.

"It is not right that the Government should be supplying money while other hotel and motel owners arranged their own financing and now have to put up with new competition," he said.

Area Redevelopment Act loans have been approved for the Pontchartrain Hotel, West Jefferson and Washington Boulevard; the London Inn Motel, Woodward and Stimson; and a proposed motel on West Grand Boulevard across from the General Motors Building.

Area Redevelopment Act loans also have been approved for numerous other private, commercial and industrial projects in the Detroit area.

Under the area redevelopment law, enacted 2 years ago, investors can qualify for Federal loans of as much as 65 percent of project cost.

To do so, 10 percent of the needed capital must be obtained from a local citizens' corporation. The remainder would come from other lending sources or the developers' capital.

The local citizens' corporation is the Detroit Metropolitan Industrial Development Corp., known as Demico, which was established so Detroit could qualify for Area Redevelopment Act benefits.

Last Wednesday, Mayor Cavanagh appeared before the Douglas subcommittee to urge expansion of the Area Redevelopment Act program.

Since the program was established, loans of about $2.5 million in Detroit have stimulated $13 million in new projects, he said.

LABOR PROBLEMS

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago there was inserted in one of the daily newspapers here in Washington a public announcement by a long-established and respected labor union in the State of Texas.

The public announcement was carried in the press as an advertisement, and in a sense it was one, for it called attention to the peculiar jungle of legalisms and contradictory policies that are set aside in our country to regulate that area generally referred to as labor problems.

There was something plaintive about this notice or advertisement. It should be listened to by this Congress.

Does it not strike one as strange that, with all the machinery of government we have in this land, with all the agencies and bureaus and proliferation of personnel with hands on the pulse of the citizenry, here is a Texas local union that feels compelled to buy commercial space in a Washington newspaper in order to get the ear of this Government?

This local union, Local 4-367 of the Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Workers, which has a membership scattered over the face of our State, was endeavoring to recite a grievance 2,200 of its refinery worker members have against a foreign corporation doing business in our country, the Royal Dutch/Shell combine, second largest oil company in the world.

I have made it my business to learn something about this situation. I feel that it underscores some of the inadequacies and confusions that pass for labor law and labor policies in this country.

I know little about the Shell Oil Co. I do know that it has had a paid lobbyist who has dutifully filed a report after interceding with the Congress on some matters. I know very little of what this foreign combine has petitioned the Congress to consider, and I do not know what consideration was given. But I do know something about the plight of 2,200 of our citizens who are in their eighth month of a strike against this company. I know something of this because I went to Texas and found out for myself.

What I learned is an old story in my State. I say in my State, for the situation for labor unions there is considerably different from that of other industrial States.

Labor unions in Texas have had many odds weighed against them. They must organize and operate in a legal and governmental climate that militates against their every move. In the rash of antilabor passions after the last war, Texas, which had only begun its rapid urbanization, led the Nation in the passage of legislation calculated to make the growth and effectiveness of unions as difficult as possible. These laws have had their effect. Today less than 19 percent of Texas nonfarm workers are engaged in collective bargaining with their employees. And today is almost 30 years after a previous Congress established the certification of collective bargaining as the public policy and the law of the land.

But 30 years ago the members of the local union I discuss today did succeed in laying hold to their right to bargain with the foreign interests for whom they worked. Today, they are utterly frustrated in that effort, and I see no law or policy of this Government moving to restore sense to the situation.

It is a mystery to me how a group of workers can succeed in attracting governmental concern. By what formula should they proceed?

If they harbor crooks or racketeers in their midst, there is an agency that registers its concern.

If they shut down the world's largest harbor, they attract attention.

If they play second fiddle in a symphony, they get the personalized attention of the Secretary of Labor.

If they put out important newspapers, the Government moves so quickly as to be precipitous.

If they sell peanuts at a ball park they get every facility of Government opened quickly to effect a settlement.

But suppose they are merely 2,200 highly skilled oil refinery workers who have this bear of automation breathing down their necks? What do they do?

For 8½ months they have struck saying they want this corporation to sit down and bargain in good faith. Who is listening?

The NLRB? Yes, it is listening, but what has been forthcoming? Charges have been filed and one would think there might be some urgency to dispose of those charges, except that under our laws the problems of 2,200 workers without income get no priority.

I have seen more efforts at unionization die in Texas while the formal charges and complaints involved were hanging upon the NLRB drying rack awaiting that justice that so often is delayed to the point of denial.

A labor dispute is a volatile situation for both management and labor. But no attention is being given to perfecting means for their early resolution. Such a dispute is not like other civil matters in which a citizen can get damages along with redress when he eventually has his day in court. There is nothing to be done to rectify a lost bargaining position or a destroyed organization when complaints are not handled in a timely manner. Things cannot be put back like they were, and hence delay becomes a partisan of one side at the bargaining table.

This is what is happening to these oil workers in Texas. If they sound plaintive, it is because they should be confused, and they must be uncertain when their own job security is the issue in this strike. They are confronted by a confusion and an uncertainty in the Government's own policies that affect their situation.

Months ago I wrote the then Secretary of Labor, Arthur Goldberg, to inquire what was the Government's policy about purchasing from plants involved in labor dispute. I pointed out that Federal law prohibits a State employment commission from referring a job applicant to a plant involved in a labor dispute, but it does not keep a Government purchasing agent from going behind a picket line to contract for such supplies as it wishes. Secretary Goldberg told me he had appointed a task force to study this matter and to recommend a policy.

After Secretary Wirtz assumed the duties of that Department, I inquired of him as to the work of this task force. He assured me the matter was being pursued but no report has been forthcoming. This has been a year. Before too long, the Shell employees will have been out a year. How much longer will they have to wait to learn if the Government has a fixed policy to guide the Secretary of the Navy in the purchase of petroleum products from this or any other struck plants where unresolved charges of law violations are pending while workers go without pay.

We are considering here only one strike that involves perhaps 10,000 workers and their families. This is of no small consequence. I know few things that should be more demanding on the time of the administration, its Department of Labor, and this Congress. This contest between American workers and this foreign corporation turns on the question of job security.

No one here can blame this corporation for wanting to improve its competitive position, if that is its purpose in this strike; no one can blame these workers for resisting what amounts to a sudden-death blow to many of their futures. The corporation, which must under law guarantee lifetime security to its employees in some of the lands where it operates, is telling some 400 of these Texas workers that "after 10 or more years of your labor, we have no place for you, we owe you nothing further."

This is a grim situation, surely as grim as that of the peanut vendors at the Washington ball park, where the Secretary of Labor offered his good offices with such dispatch. This Department of Labor and the administration have many resources and contain many thoughtful persons. This corporation and these employees are locked in a struggle that may well extend into areas where the customary rituals of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service are of little help in affecting a settlement.

The New York Times last month printed a thoughtful article on the transitions and changes that are developing in the processes of labor negotiations. Secretary Willard Wirtz was quoted as saying that creative bargaining was replacing the more primitive kind of labor-management relations. One of the elements of this emerging process was suggested as the new role of Government, "with the Labor Department working with the negotiators to provide studies of complicated problems and retraining programs to help workers faced with displacement to obtain new jobs."

I am glad the Times finds this trend, but we have not seen it in Texas. We have not seen it in any of the responses from this Department on the Shell dispute. If there are thoughts or resources available in this emerging role from the Department, or in the newly created Office of Manpower, Automation and Training, why have they not been offered to this company and its employees? Whatever talents they may have beyond that of simply measuring the damage and displacements of this thing we call automation could never be better applied than right now in Texas where for over 8 months this impasse has existed on this very issue.

If the Government has no role in this dispute or nothing to offer to these adversaries, then you can be confident that it really has nothing to meet these same challenges when they wrack the economy of your own State. If this be so, we can ask if we have really done anything meaningful to prepare for the impact of those technological changes that have already transformed the oil refining industry.

I raise these matters as a question. If it is not answered in the instant case you can be sure you will be on this floor at some future point raising the same questions. At such time you, too, will be wondering about any indifference to these growing problems. Should your situation be similar to the one I describe, you might even wish to inquire of the Secretary of State if his good offices could be utilized to assist American citizens who try to exercise their right to bargain with the foreign and artificial corporate persons doing business in our country, such as Royal Dutch/Shell.

EXPLANATION OF THE PROPOSED SERVICE CONTRACTS ACT OF 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which would provide labor standards protection for the employees of contractors and subcontractors furnishing services or maintenance work to the Federal agencies. The service contract is the only major category of Federal contracts to which labor standards are not generally applicable.

While no precise estimate of the number or dollar volume of service contracts entered into by the Federal agencies is available, they account for a substantial part of Federal contracting activity. They cover a large variety of common needs, including such services as custodial or maintenance, elevator, refuse collection, exterminating, cooking, waiter or dishwashing, laundry, clerical, installation and repair of mechanical and electrical equipment, transporting and printing.

Many of the employees engaged in performing these services are poorly paid. Their wages generally do not compare favorably with the rates paid in other industries. A recent occupational earnings study of the contract cleaning services industry, conducted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, shows that the average earnings for men and women engaged in these services are as low as $1.07 and $1.13 an hour in some metropolitan areas. Consequently, the need for minimum wage standards protection for this group is particularly acute.

This need is especially apparent when the earnings of persons employed on service contracts are compared with the wages and benefits which had been paid Federal employees who formerly performed the same services. There has been vehement criticism not only of decreased wage rates but also of the reduction in fringe benefits which have become of major importance in the earnings structure.

The basic objective of my bill is to place the employees of service contractors in the same position with respect to wages as they would be if they were employees of the Government. Substantively, it provides that certain stipulations regarding wages and working conditions shall be included in both negotiated and advertised contracts in excess of $2,000 providing for the furnishing of services or maintenance work to a Federal agency. The requirements are not applicable, however, to certain types of contracts, including contracts subject to either the Davis-Bacon Act or the Walsh-Healey Act, contracts of certain common carriers, communications companies, and public utilities, and employment contracts of Federal employees.

The requirements are applicable only to employees in positions of the type covered by the Wage Board procedure; that is, those in trades or crafts or in manual labor occupations, including supervisory positions in which trade, craft, or laboring experience is the paramount requirement. They also apply only to services performed within the United States.

The stipulations to be incorporated in the contracts require that persons engaged to furnish services or maintenance work be paid no less than the contracting agency pays its own employees under the Wage Board procedures applicable to blue collar workers. In addition, the contractor must provide his employees with fringe benefits equivalent to those received by Government employees or pay them the cash equivalent of these fringe benefits. This assures that employees furnishing services by contract with the United States shall be in the same position as they would be if they were directly hired by the United States to perform these services.

Additional stipulations require that services or maintenance work shall not be performed under unsafe or unsanitary working conditions where those working conditions are under the control of the contractor. The contractor is also required to notify the employees of the benefits due them under the act, either by written notices or by posting in the place where the work is to be performed.

For the purpose of administration and enforcement, the stipulations authorize the withholding from the contractor of accrued payments necessary to pay covered workers the differences between the wages and value of benefits required by the contract and those actually paid. The contracting officer's decision to withhold payments may be appealed to the head of the agency whose decision is conclusive upon all Federal agencies and, if supported by substantial evidence, conclusive in any court in the United States. In the event of violation, the contract may be terminated and the contractor held liable for any resulting cost to the Government.

The bill authorizes and directs the Comptroller General to pay directly to the persons underpaid the wages and value of benefits which the contracting agencies have found to be due under the act. If the withheld sums are not sufficient to make the employees whole, the United States may bring an action against the contractor or any sureties to recover the remaining amount of underpayments. The bill also provides a procedure for blacklisting for a period of 3 years those contractors who violate the act.

The Secretary of Labor is given authority to assure coordination of the administration of the provisions of the act and to make reasonable limitations and exceptions.

The Secretary is also authorized to make exceptions with respect to specific contracts and to modify existing contracts when such action is in the public interest. In addition, the Secretary may provide reasonable limitations and make regulations allowing variations and exemptions to the act.

NORTHROP CORP. RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT IN THE FIELD OF LAMINAR FLOW CONTROL

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Charles H. Wilson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I believe it would be of interest to my distinguished colleagues to provide them with some information on the latest research and development being conducted by the Northrop Corp., of Hawthorne, Calif.

Among many other projects now under study and test by the Norair Division of Northrop Corp. is the development of the U.S. Air Force X-21A aircraft.

This revolutionary research plane may well be the greatest advance in aerodynamic flight since the jet engine. Strictly a military project now, the experiment has enormous commercial possibilities particularly on transcontinental and intercontinental flights, and in the supersonic-transport field.

Two demonstration aircraft, former Air Force Douglas WB-66's have been extensively modified and designated as experimental X-21A aircraft.

They are designed to test the feasibility of a suction system to maintain laminar air flow over the wings. This is the first large scale attempt to reduce friction drag by this method.

I do not wish to confuse my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, with complicated and abstract engineering terms. As simply as possible this concept, laminar flow control—LFC—seeks to eliminate friction drag resulting from turbulent airflow over aircraft surfaces. This friction drag has robbed airplanes of speed and range since the dawn of aviation. On modern jetliners it accounts for about half the total drag experienced in flight.

To reduce this drag, X-21A wings will "inhale" surface air through tiny slots and expel the air to the rear. This prevents the buildup of turbulence and allows a smooth, friction free flow of air adjacent to the wings. A pumping system mounted inside the wings is used to suck air through the slots.

X-21A flight tests are expected to prove that up to 80 percent of airplane friction drag can be eliminated with a corresponding increase in range, endurance or payload of more than 50 percent.

Northrop's laminar flow control program is being conducted under contract with the U.S. Air Force Systems Command. This program includes research in supersonic laminar flow control techniques as well as subsonic applications to shapes other than wings.

Interestingly enough, Northrop began its pioneer work in this area as far back as 1949 when Dr. Werner Pfenninger, a Swiss scientist known internationally for his studies in this field, joined the company staff. Today, Northrop is the only company in this country conducting research into laminar flow control.

Mr. Speaker, the end product of all this experimental and scientific development will be a vastly improved military capacity for our Air Force. Laminar flow control transport planes will be able to fly much longer distances overseas without refueling. More troops and supplies could be carried than the conventional aircraft in use today can handle. Dependence on oversea bases would be decreased.

Laminar flow control aircraft could cruise outside the limits and interceptor range of a potential aggressor, ready to launch a missile counterstrike the instant the United States or its allies were attacked. Equipped with submarine detection equipment and air-to-sub surface missiles, long range laminar flow control aircraft could increase aircraft participation in antisubmarine defense at low cost to the taxpayer.

I would like to commend both the U.S. Air Force and the Northrop Corp. for their work in the field of laminar flow control. Our citizens can be assured that the brilliant scientists of Northrop, and the dedicated career officers of the U.S. Air Force are maintaining a close and continuing interest in the field of research and development. Our Nation's security and safety is clearly in good hands. Mr. Speaker, a resounding "well done" is due to all those persons participating in this program.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5 OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to sit during general debate on Wednesday, May 8, and Thursday, May 9, 1963.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Watson (at the request of Mr. Dorn), for May 6, 1963, on account of illness of staff member.

Mr. Conte, until May 13, on account of official business (travel with Treasury and Post Office Committee).

Mr. Gary (at the request of Mr. Smith of Virginia), for the week of May 6, 1963, on account of official business.

Mr. Fino (at the request of Mr. Arends), for the balance of this week on account of death in the family.

Mr. Cooley (at the request of Mr. Rivers of South Carolina), for May 6, 1963, on account of official business.

Mr. Fountain (at the request of Mr. Henderson), on account of illness in the family.

Mr. Steed (at the request of Mr. Edmondson), from today, May 6, through Monday, May 13, on account of official business (Treasury and Post Office subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee).

Mr. Forrester (at the request of Mr. Weltner), for today, May 6, through Saturday, May 11, on account of illness.

Mr. Dent (at the request of Mr. Libonati), for Monday, May 6, 1963, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Edmondson, for 30 minutes, on Wednesday next, May 8, 1963.

Mr. Ryan of New York, for 5 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. Fogarty (at the request of Mr. Albert), for 15 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. FARBSTEIN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 15 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. REUSS, for 30 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BENNETT of Florida, in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CURTIS.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana.

Mr. ALGER.

Mr. SHELLEY.

Mr. McCORMACK (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include an address by the President of the United States, notwithstanding the fact it exceeds the limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $240.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MCLOSKEY.

Mr. MACGREGOR.

Mr. SHORT.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. REUSS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. REUSS.

Mr. FLOOD.

Mrs. KELLY.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas in three instances.

Mr. ST. ONGE.

Mr. PUCINSKI in two instances.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 762. An act to provide for increased wheat acreage allotments in the Tulelake area of California; to the Committee on Agriculture.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 199. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans having the service-connected disability of deafness of both ears;

H.R. 211. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide increases in rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to children and parents of deceased veterans; and

H.R. 214. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans suffering the loss or loss of use of both vocal cords with resulting complete aphonia.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 59 minutes, p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 7, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

766. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the excessive cost of leasing compared with buying certain electronic data processing equipment by the Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Government Operations.

767. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 857, 25 U.S.C. 406, 407), with respect to the sale of Indian timber"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

768. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill for the relief of Maj. Warren G. Ward, Capt. Paul H. Beck, and 1st Lt. Russell K. Hansen, U.S. Air Force"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

769. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office, U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 753(b) of title 28, United States Code, to provide for the recording of proceedings in the U.S. district courts by means of electronic sound recording as well as by shorthand or mechanical means"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

770. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions which this Service has approved according the beneficiaries of such petitions first preference classification, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 5497. A bill to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 274). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMAS: Committee of Conference. H.R. 5517. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes; (Rept. No. 275). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 4996. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act; with amendment (Rept. No. 276). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 6009. A bill to provide, for the periods ending June 3, 1963, and August 31, 1963, temporary increases in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 277). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 6041. A bill to amend the prevailing wage section of the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended; and related sections of the Federal Airport Act, as amended; and the National Housing Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROCK:

H.R. 6042. A bill to repeal certain manufacturers' excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUCKLEY (by request):

H.R. 6043. A bill to authorize reimbursement to owners and tenants of certain lands or interests therein acquired by the United States for certain moving expenses and losses and damages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 6044. A bill to amend section 104(b)(5) of title 23, United States Code, to provide for the submission of certain cost estimates for the completion of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 6045. A bill to authorize the construction and equipping of buildings required in connection with the operations of the Bureau of the Mint; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 6046. A bill to make certain changes in the functions of the Beach Erosion Board and the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 6047. A bill to establish a procedure for the prompt settlement, in a democratic manner, of the political status of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 6048. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code relating to practice of law and participation in enterprise by justices or judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS:

H.R. 6049. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 6050. A bill to provide for the designation of that portion of U.S. Highway No. 6 between Hartford, Conn., and Providence, R.I., as a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 6051. A bill to provide for the designation of that portion of U.S. Highway No. 6 between Hartford, Conn., and Providence, R.I., as a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 6052. A bill to provide for the designation of that portion of U.S. Highway No. 6 between Hartford, Conn., and Providence, R.I., as a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 6053. A bill to provide for the designation of that portion of U.S. Highway No. 6 between Hartford, Conn., and Providence, R.I., as a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 6054. A bill to provide for the designation of that portion of U.S. Highway No. 6 between Hartford, Conn., and Providence, R.I., as a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GRABOWSKI:

H.R. 6055. A bill to provide for the designation of that portion of U.S. Highway No. 6 between Hartford, Conn., and Providence, R.I., as a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 6056. A bill to provide for the designation of that portion of U.S. Highway No. 6 between Hartford, Conn., and Providence, R.I., as a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 6057. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide that members of the Armed Forces shall be retired in the highest grade satisfactorily held in any Armed Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 6058. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

H.R. 6059. A bill to exempt from compulsory coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program self-employed individuals who hold certain religious beliefs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 6060. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 6061. A bill to extend and improve the provisions of the National Defense Education Act of 1958; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 6062. A bill to amend Public Law 87-276, so as to extend its provisions for three additional years, to expand the program under that act to provide for the training of teachers of all exceptional children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 6063. A bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 to remove the 5 percent limitation on expenditures for youth training programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 6064. A bill to amend section 102 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 to provide for a study by the Secretary of Labor of the military manpower needs of the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H.R. 6065. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to the hours of operation of certain broadcasting stations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 6066. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1920 with respect to the rates of duty on brooms made of broomcorn; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6067. A bill to equalize the pay of retired members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 6068. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide annuities for dependent parents of deceased unmarried employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 6069. A bill to amend the act of June 12, 1960, for the correction of inequities in the construction of fishing vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 6070. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer to deduct for income tax purposes certain special assessments and other charges made against him or his property under local law without regard to whether they tend to increase the value of such property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6071. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to prevent the use of stopwatches or other measuring devices to measure the work of an individual employee in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6072. A bill to amend section 17 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act and to amend section 5 of the Home Owners Loan Act of 1933; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 6073. A bill to amend section 103(d) of title 23 of the United States Code, to authorize the designation of an additional 2,000 miles of interstate highways in redevelopment areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 6074. A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to provide Federal assistance for projects for the acquisition of equipment to be used for shared-time secondary educational programs in science, mathematics, and modern foreign language, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 6075. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to give its protection to employees of certain large hotels, motels, restaurants, and launderies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 6076. A bill to establish a procedure for the prompt settlement, in a democratic manner, of the political status of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 6077. A bill to protect the constitutional rights of individuals irrespective of race, creed, color, or national origin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 6078. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication service or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 6079. A bill to amend section 503 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the determination of annual income for the year in which initial entitlement of pension occurs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 6080. A bill to provide penalties for certain offenses committed in connection with highway construction; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY:

H.R. 6081. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code to require that postage stamps in the Canal Zone shall bear no legend other than the words "Canal Zone," and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 6082. A bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase the authorization for appropriations and to modify the personnel security procedures for contractor employees; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 6083. A bill to establish a procedure for the prompt settlement, in a democratic manner, of the political status of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 6084. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to maintain records of fraudulent and other unethical business practices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 6085. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the District of Columbia to enter into a compact on the taxation of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses and to enter into an agreement concerning bus taxation proration and reciprocity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.R. 6086. A bill to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish the St. Augustine Quadricentennial Commission, and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1962 (76 Stat. 386), to provide that eight members of such Commission shall be appointed by the President and to authorize appropriations for carrying out the provisions of such joint resolution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 6087. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 6088. A bill to provide wage standards for persons engaged by Federal contractors or subcontractors to furnish services or maintenance work to Federal agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 6089. A bill to extend for 4 years the Commission on Civil Rights as an agency in the executive branch of the Government, to broaden the scope of the duties of the Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6090. A bill to enforce constitutional rights and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.J. Res. 397. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to eligibility to the Office of President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.J. Res. 398. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHORT:

H.J. Res. 399. Joint resolution to direct the Interstate Commerce Commission to investigate the rate structure applicable to the shipment by railroad of grain in carload lots from the upper Midwest region of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H. Con. Res. 147. Concurrent resolution reaffirming deep interest of the United States in preserving the peace, stability and freedom of the independent nations and peoples in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H. Con Res. 148. Concurrent resolution reaffirming deep interest of the United States in preserving the peace, stability and freedom of the independent nations and peoples in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H. Res. 333. Resolution concerning collective defense agreements with Israel; to be Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. SENNER: Memorial of the Arizona House of Representatives requesting the establishment of a national cemetery in

Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to Morro Bay Rock; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting the appropriation of sufficient funds to the U.S. Public Health Service to enable the Federal Government to match available local funds to the maximum extent possible under the provisions of the Hill-Burton Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting the additional appropriation necessary to complete the Federal accelerated public works program for the restoration of the City of Refuge National Historical Park on the Island of Hawaii; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relating to the establishment of military bases and units on the neighbor islands; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America relating to qualifications of electors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to grant Federal aid or assistance to urban and metropolitan mass transportation facilities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to being in favor of the establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs in the President's Cabinet; to the Committee on Government Operations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States permitting the recital of voluntary prayers in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to increase allowable earnings of persons receiving social security benefits from $1,200 to $2,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for public assistance for mental and tubercular patients in public institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to ratification of a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualifications of electors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting favorable action upon pending legislation exempting certain carriers from minimum rate regulation in the transportation of bulk commodities, agricultural and fishery products and passengers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 6091. A bill for the relief of Chief M. Sgt. Samuel W. Smith, U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 6092. A bill for the relief of Alexander Haytko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6093. A bill for the relief of Lee Chung Woo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 6094. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Amato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 6095. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Conti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H.R. 6096. A bill for the relief of Royce C. Plume, a member of the Arapahoe Tribe of Indians; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 6097. A bill for the relief of Dr. Pedro B. Montemayor, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.R. 6098. A bill for the relief of Lino Tuomaz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 6099. A bill for the relief of Shirley Shapiro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H.R. 6100. A bill for the relief of Kenneth Laing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 6101. A bill for the relief of Arminda P. Viseu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 6102. A bill for the relief of CWO Christian J. Klett; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 6103. A bill for the relief of Helene Auguste Marie Niesel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHORT:

H.R. 6104. A bill for the relief of Markos J. Janavaras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 6105. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marija Justinich and her minor daughter, Bozica Justinich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 6106. A bill for the relief of James S. Hall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

106. By Mr. NORBLAD: Petition of Elmer L. Sharp of Forest Grove, and others, urging the preservation of the Monroe Doctrine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

107. By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of Hume Logan and other citizens of Louisville, Ky., relative to the preservation of the Monroe Doctrine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

108. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Maurine Koltugin and others, San Francisco, Calif., relative to preservation of the Monroe Doctrine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

109. Also, petition of Allen J. Packer and others, Redwood City, Calif., relative to preservation of the Monroe Doctrine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

110. Also, petition of W. R. Amidon, president, New England Standardbred Breeders Association, Inc., Salem Depot, N.H., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting that the Congressmen of the six New England States be urged to seek the repeal of the proposal ruling of the Federal Communications Commission banning the broadcasting and televising of horseracing; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

111. Also, petition of John J. Shaughnessy, Brooklyn, N.Y., calling attention to his "open letter to President Kennedy" which was published in the April 10, 1963 daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on pages A2193–A2194, relating to his allegations that the President is apathetic and indifferent; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

112. Also, petition of William Newel, post commander, Marathon Memorial Post No. 154, Marathon, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting the enactment of legislation which would name the veterans' hospital to be built in Miami, Dade County, Fla., as the Joe H. Adams Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

May 3: Polish National Holiday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, just about 15 years after our Declaration of Independence, and not quite 2 years after the United States of America adopted our first Constitution, Poland signed its Constitution, on May 3, 1791.

In its Constitution, Poland incorporated enduring precepts of public policy and democracy. The Polish people thus demonstrated their love and attachment to freedom and independence—just as we, the American people did when we declared our independence from a mother country who practiced tyranny, and signed our famous Constitution "to promote the lasting welfare of that country so dear to us all, and secure her freedom and happiness."

We, therefore, can fully appreciate and sympathize with the great longing of the peoples of Poland for freedom and independence, to live and to worship their God as they choose.

We, therefore, are honored and happy to join the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the Polish January uprising of 1863. This marks a time in the history of that great country when subservience to a foreign rule became unbearable. Poland had attempted several times before that to break the yoke of oppression placed upon her shoulders by Russia. In

1794 the Kosciuszko uprising took place; in 1831, the November uprising took place; then in 1944 the Warsaw uprising against German occupation took place—but of all these, the 1863 uprising against Russian tyranny was the greatest, longest, and bloodiest uprising in Polish history, spanning over 2 years.

This was one of the most costly uprisings—in terms of Polish people killed, captured, or deported to cruel Siberian mines. It brought about a ruthless and continuing attempt by the Russians to completely remove all traces of the hated Polish national spirit; by confiscation of private property; by destroying the Polish economy; by arresting and deporting many of its most influential citizens; and even by banning the Polish language from offices and schools.

We know this type of tyranny over a nation cannot possibly be successful as long as its citizens can recall days of freedom, days of independence of heart and spirit, days of honor, and days of happiness. In joining with Polish people everywhere in celebration of her national holiday, we are thus helping her remember a glorious past—and helping her cherish the hope that one day there will be a ceasing of tyranny, and Poland will rise again as a free and independent nation.

When Poland adopted its Constitution on May 3, 1791—this was during a time in history when representative self-government, justice for all, freedom to worship, and freedom to live without fear was unheard of in European countries—who were still in the grip of autocratic rulers. Many of those countries are still in the grip of a ruthless and autocratic ruler—and we join with the Polish, and with other nations, in believing that ultimately justice will prevail and the pitiless grip of a godless communism will be loosened and completely removed.

A famous Chief Justice of our Supreme Court, John Jay, once spoke words which I feel should offer comfort and hope, and give courage to the Polish people:

> God is great, and therefore He will be sought; He is good, and therefore He will be found.
>
> If in the day of sorrow we own God's presence in the cloud, we shall find Him also in the pillar of fire, brightening and cheering our way as the night comes on.
>
> In all his dispensations God is at work for our good. In prosperity, He tries our gratitude; in mediocrity, our contentment; in misfortune, our submission; in darkness, our faith; under temptation, our steadfastness; and at all times, our obedience and trust in Him.
>
> God governs the world, and we have only to do our duty wisely, and leave the issue to Him.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, for many years the U.S. Congress has annually demonstrated the feeling of faithful friendship on the part of the American people toward the Polish nation and people through special commemoration of Poland's great Constitution of 1791.

Beginning on May 3, and continuing throughout the month, Poles and citizens of Polish origin in America celebrate their Polish 3d of May Constitution holiday. Wherever Americans of Polish extraction live, this event is marked with special exercises to pay tribute to the Polish nation and to remind fellow Americans that Poland was one of the first pioneers of liberalism and freedom in Europe.

It was on May 3, 1791, barely 2 years after the adoption of our own Constitution in 1789, that Poland, without a bloody revolution or even without disorder, succeeded in reforming her public life and in eradicating her internal decline. But following the unfortunate path down which history has led the Polish people for so long, this great rebirth and assertion of the rights of man came too late to forestall the third partition of Poland in 1795 by Russia, Prussia, and Austria.

The greatness of the May 3 Constitution consisted in the fact that it eliminated with one stroke the most fundamental weaknesses of the Polish parliamentary and social system. The Poles have raised this great moment in their history to the forefront of their tradition rather than any one of their other glorious victories in their centuries-old struggle for freedom.

The right of man to freedom was formulated in these words in the 3d of May Constitution:

> All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

Meditation on the words of that Constitution reminds all Americans of Poland's destiny in the history of mankind, and prophesies the ultimate triumph of justice and freedom for the Polish people even though their nation has since World War II been deprived of her independence, sovereignty, and territory by Soviet Russia.

Exchange of Letters on the Balance of Payments With Secretary of the Treasury Dillon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on April 2 I addressed a letter to Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon, making certain observations about special transactions devised by the administration in order to show an apparent improvement in the balance of payments in 1962, as well as to ease the immediate problem of the outflow of gold. It was my conclusion that without the use of these new and unique transactions—which in my opinion constitute a form of borrowing from the future—the balance of payments in 1962 might have shown a deficit of from $3 to $3.6 billion, instead of the $2.2 billion deficit actually recorded. I am not condemning the use of these techniques, but I hope that complete information about them can be put on the record so that the Congress can judge their usefulness as well as what real improvement in our balance of payments may have taken place over the past several years.

Secretary Dillon has now responded to my letter and affirmed that my understanding of these transactions is correct. However, because the Secretary's letter sheds little light on these transactions, I have written to him again, asking for additional information. In order that those who are interested in this problem have the benefit of the information and comments contained in the correspondence, I have asked unanimous consent that the exchange of letters between myself and the Secretary be included in the RECORD at this point:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
U.S. CONGRESS,
Washington, D.C., April 2, 1963.

HON. C. DOUGLAS DILLON,
Secretary, U.S. Treasury Department,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Part of the reason for the apparent improvement in the U.S. balance of payments over the past 2 years has been advance debt repayments by foreign governments of about $700 million in both 1961 and 1962. To the extent that advance repayments improve our current payments position, they eliminate a source of balance-of-payments credits in future years when the debts normally would have been paid. In this sense, foreign debt prepayments represent borrowing from the future.

It is my understanding that in 1962 the administration began using a number of additional techniques based upon the same principle of borrowing from the future in order to improve the current balance-of-payments position. Without the use of these new techniques, excluding debt prepayments, it is my impression that the balance-of-payments deficit in 1962 would have been as much as $3 billion, instead of the $2.2 billion reported. If debt prepayments also are considered, the deficit would have been over $3.6 billion or about as much as the average in the 1958–60 period.

Since these techniques have received little or no public attention, there is a widespread impression that our balance-of-payments position is steadily improving. In order that the Congress and the public have a clear idea of what progress actually is being made, I wish to set forth my understanding of these techniques and to ask for your comment.

One of the new techniques being employed is the sale to foreign governments of nonmarketable U.S. Government obligations denominated in foreign currencies. This technique accounted for an improvement in the balance-of-payments last year of $250 million. In 1963, an additional $279 million of these obligations have been sold. When these obligations are finally paid off, there will be an equivalent debit item in our balance-of-payments.

Another new technique which temporarily improved the balance-of-payments in 1962 by as much as $460 million, was the firm commitment of foreign funds for military purchases in the United States. This was achieved when the German Government, on January 1, 1962, deposited this amount to the credit of the U.S. Government. These funds, which were set aside for the eventual purchase of military supplies and equipment, thus showed up as a credit in the U.S. balance-of-payments in advance of firm orders for the equipment and supplies. Normally the German payments would have appeared as a credit only after the equipment and supplies had been actually ordered or delivered. To the extent that this is the case, any improvement in the balance-of-payments in 1962 from this source was at the expense of the balance-of-payments in a later year.

Finally, the balance of payments appears improved by about $100 million because the United States has paid its subscriptions to certain international organizations as they came due, not in dollars, but in non-interest-bearing, nonmarketable securities. Sometime in the future, the international organizations will exchange these for dollars. In other words, the debit in our international payments represented by these subscriptions has been postponed from 1962 until a subsequent year.

I will appreciate having your comments on these observations.

Respectfully yours,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

WASHINGTON, *D.C.*,
April 11, 1963.

The Honorable THOMAS B. CURTIS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR TOM: I am happy to reply to your letter of April 2.

The data on special transactions as given in your letter are of course correct. As you may know, the March 1963 issue of the Commerce Department's Survey of Current Business, published in the past few days, notes these various factors and discusses their effect on our balance of payments. Through this and other means we would hope that such information is receiving wide circulation, and thus helping to bring to the public generally a full appreciation of our balance-of-payments problem.

The receipt items you mentioned in your letter reduced our liquid liabilities to foreigners. The overall balance-of-payments deficit, measuring our gold losses and the changes in our liquid liabilities to foreigners, reflected this situation accordingly. The $100 million outpayments item, representing certain subscriptions to international organizations in the form of non-interest-bearing notes, appears as a capital outflow in the balance of payments but will affect the deficit or change our liquid liabilities only when and as it is converted to dollars and spent abroad rather than in the United States.

There are, of course, special factors of this or other kinds almost every year. Very often, as you know, the comments that accompany publication of the balance-of-payments schedule call special attention to these items affecting individual categories or the payments schedule as a whole. You will recall the large amount of sales of jet aircraft and cotton sales in 1960 which was noted, at that time, as giving exports an unusual boost over the previous year. In 1959, a number of special factors were noted and included in the $435 million of debt prepayments which helped reduce the deficit that year.

In my view, these special transactions should not be considered as borrowing from the future. There are a number of contingent items which, in some sense, relate to the future both on the assets and on the liabilities side. For example, our balance-of-payments deficit does not take into account the claims we are accumulating from the large outflows of U.S. capital, and such claims on the asset side are not stressed. Insofar as military offset arrangements are concerned, including advanced military payments, they do reduce the liquid liabilities of the United States since the funds are earmarked mainly against firm orders and are solely for military purchases in the United States. They represent, of course, the result of our efforts to offset our military expenditures abroad by specific arrangements for increased sales to those countries of U.S. military equipment.

But, in my view, the important and significant question deserving particular attention involves the amount of our payments balance that must be financed in one way or another over a given period. This question of financing seems to me to focus attention on the present problem and to center concern properly on the need to effect those correctives which alone can provide real and lasting improvement.

As you are aware, we are pressing forward on all fronts to gain those correctives; we shall, indeed we must, gain them. But the process will take time and the objective of a balanced payments position cannot be predated in any precise sense. This is so because we rely on the operation of free markets. The program we follow includes such fundamental factors as responsible public and private effort to restrain wage and price levels, the appropriate influence of interest rate levels, export expansion and the fostering of an increasingly favorable investment climate at home.

While these forces continue to work to correct the situation, we have taken various measures both to curb Government spending of dollars abroad and to meet financing needs. In bridging the gap before balance is attained in ways consistent with a free trade and payments system, a whole complex of arrangements has been devised to assure that confidence in the payments system and in the U.S. dollar are maintained. I think that our efforts along this line have been quite successful in preventing speculative outbursts and in avoiding any disorderly exchange markets. This was the experience at the time of the stock market disturbances last spring, during the Canadian exchange crisis, and again during the Cuban showdown last year. In the process, the payments system has been buttressed by a series of financial arrangements designed to forestall or cope with any such pressures.

We must, of course, continue every urgent effort to overcome our balance-of-payments problem and thus, to bring to a halt the persistent deficits that have characterized our payments position for too many years. With this thought that your letter conveys, I most heartily agree.

With best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS DILLON,
Secretary of the Treasury.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
U.S. CONGRESS,
Washington, D.C., April 29, 1963.

Hon. C. DOUGLAS DILLON,
Secretary, U.S. Treasury Department,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Thank you for your letter of April 11 in which you comment on questions about certain special transactions in our balance of payments which I raised in a letter to you of April 2.

I have noted the article in the March issue of the Survey of Current Business to which you referred. While passing reference was made to the special transactions in which I am interested, both the article and your letter do little more than arouse in me a desire to know much more about them.

I am, of course, pleased to know that my general understanding of these transactions is correct, but I would appreciate it if you could send me detailed information about them and the underlying circumstances. The specific transactions in which I am interested include:

1. The sale to foreign governments of nonmarketable U.S. Government obligations denominated in foreign currencies;

2. The advance commitment of foreign funds for military purchases in the United States; and

3. The net transfer of non-interest-bearing, nonmarketable securities to certain international organizations as part of our capital subscriptions pending their need for cash.

Besides detailed information on these transactions, I would like the Treasury's estimate of what the balance-of-payments deficit would have been in 1962 without the use of these techniques as well as without the use of foreign debt prepayments.

In addition, I would like to know how the use of each of these techniques in 1962 will affect our balance of payments in later years.

Finally, with regard to (1) above, I would appreciate knowing the authority under which the Treasury is incurring nondollar debt and how this nondollar debt relates to the debt ceiling.

You make the point in your letter that "a whole complex of arrangements has been devised to assure that confidence in the payments system and in the U.S. dollar are maintained." It is precisely this "complex of arrangements" that interests me and that prompted my earlier letter.

It strikes me that unlike other special factors which affect the balance of payments almost every year, to which you referred, the special transactions about which I asked were devised by the administration in order to create an apparent improvement in the balance of payments in 1962 as well as to ease the immediate problem of the outflow of gold.

It is my impression, therefore, that the conscious use by the administration of these special transactions reduced our balance-of-payments deficit significantly below what it would have otherwise been. Because of the nature of these transactions, it is also my impression that—like foreign debt prepayments—they represent a form of borrowing from the future.

I do not say that these transactions are undesirable. But I do believe that much more needs to be known about them before a judgment can be made and before it is clear what real improvement, if any, has been made in solving our balance-of-payments problem.

In view of the national interest in maintaining confidence in the dollar, I understand that this may be a sensitive area. At the same time, however, I believe that a clearer understanding of these transactions and their effects is important for the development of sound public policy.

As you know, the Joint Economic Committee is scheduling full committee hearings on the balance of payments next month or early in June. Your response to this letter and the testimony which will be given at these hearings should serve the highly useful function of shedding some needed light on these subjects.

With best wishes,

Respectfully yours,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, Friday last, observance was made that this date marked the 172d year the

Constitution of Poland has been in existence.

The Polish Constitution was adopted in 1791, just 2 years after our own. Throughout these many years our two countries have had much in common and so, Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to join with many Members on both sides of the aisle in paying honor to a gallant nation.

The Polish people, time and time again, have translated their belief in the democratic faith expressed in their Constitution.

In honoring freedom fighters of the past we wish to convey added strength to freedom fighters of the present. Today the people of Poland are still the oppressed captives of communism, but their hopes, their dreams, their courage has never faltered and we commend them for this spirit.

Hope is ever present in their hearts and we join with them in the fervent wish that the principles upon which their Constitution was based will soon be restored to the Polish people.

As we pay tribute to the people of Poland and commemorate Polish Constitution Day, let us all rededicate ourselves to the principles of freedom and to the philosophy of self-determination for all people.

Combat Pay Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, together with a substantial number of Congressmen who have already indicated their active support, others may wish to join in coauthoring a combat pay amendment proposed to H.R. 5555, the military pay raise bill. The suggested amendment was requested by the Department of Defense, the Department of the Army, and the Bureau of the Budget, and was approved by the subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee which held exhaustive hearings in studying and recommending this proposal.

The subcommittee proposal was not as broad as the Department of Defense, Army, and Bureau of the Budget proposal in that it did not cover times of actual declared war, being restricted to the present undeclared military combat operations in southeast Asia and any similar situation determined by the Department of Defense. The full committee struck the entire proposal from the subcommittee recommendations. The following amendment is the language approved by the subcommittee, being not quite as generous as the administration proposal. The amount of $55 was set because of this being the minimum amount of any unusual pay given for the many other things that have unusual pay added to basic pay.

The amendment which is expected to be offered on the floor is, therefore, no more generous than requested by the administration and is substantially in the exact terms of the administration proposal, being identically the language approved by the subcommittee which studied the matter. The precise language is as follows:

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF H.R. 5555

Insert the following new section at the end of the bill:

"SPECIAL PAY FOR DUTY SUBJECT TO HOSTILE FIRE

"SEC. 14. (a) Chapter 5 of title 37, United States Code, is amended as follows:

"(1) The following new section is added after section 399:

"'§ 310 Special pay; duty subject to hostile fire

"'(a) Except in time of war declared by Congress, and under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, a member of a uniformed service may be paid special pay at the rate of $55 a month for any month in which he was entitled to basic pay and in which he—

"'(1) was subject to hostile fire or explosion of hostile mines;

"'(2) was on duty in an area in which he was in imminent danger of being exposed to hostile fire or explosion of hostile mines and in which, during the period he was on duty in that area, other members of the uniformed services were subject to hostile fire or explosion of hostile mines; or

"'(3) was killed, injured, or wounded by hostile fire, explosion of a hostile mine, or any other hostile action.

"'A member covered by clause (3) who is hospitalized for the treatment of his injury or wound may be paid special pay under this section for not more than three additional months during which he is so hospitalized.

"'(b) A member may not be paid more than one special pay under this section for any month. A member may be paid special pay under this section in addition to any other pay and allowances to which he may be entitled.

"'(c) Any determination of fact that is made in administering this section is conclusive. Such a determination may not be reviewed by any other officer or agency of the United States unless there has been fraud or gross negligence. However, the determination may be changed on the basis of new evidence or for other good cause.

"'(d) The Secretary of Defense shall report to Congress by March 1 of each year on the administration of this section during the preceding calendar year.'

"(2) The following new item is inserted in the analysis: '310. Special pay: duty subject to hostile fire.'

"(b) The Combat Duty Pay Act of 1952 (50 App. U.S.C. 2351 et seq.) is repealed."

The Need for the Captive Nations Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, my House Resolution 14 calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations had received tremendous bipartisan endorsement. I am happy to report today that the active and well-organized American-Lithuanian community swung behind the resolution. The leading figures in American-Lithuanian political activities, meeting in a conference in Chicago, Ill., on April 19–20, voted unanimously to support, by all means at their disposal, the establishment of such a committee.

I would like to quote at this point from an editorial that appeared on April 26, 1963, in Draugas, the largest American-Lithuanian daily and one of the largest nationality papers in this country:

> It would be very good if the U.S. House of Representatives established a Special Captive Nations Committee without delay. Should this undertaking fail to materialize in the immediate future, the House Rules Committee ought to be requested to give its consent to the establishment of the committee so that the House could vote on the resolution.
>
> "Appropriate resolutions to this effect have been introduced in the House by two Congressmen, DANIEL FLOOD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, and EDWARD DERWINSKI, Republican from Illinois, both of whom are energetic fighters for the liberation of captive peoples. This means that the resolution has bipartisan support. The resolution failed to pass the House in the last session. It became stuck in the committee, mostly due to the State Department's lack of endorsement of the whole idea. This session has a much higher potential for the passage of the resolution."

There are dozens of supporting resolutions introduced in this session. But the editors of Draugas are correct in another respect—if one can speak of bipartisan support of the resolution, this is a case at its best.

Mr. Speaker, I also would like to quote from Draugas, on the subject of our State Department's opposition to the Captive Nations Committee. The paper said editorially on April 29, 1963:

> We live in a free country. The fact that the State Department does not endorse the resolution 100 percent * * * does not mean we must throw in the sponge and wait until somebody else resolves our freedom problem. We did not receive the right to live free from the State Department * * * and in a democratic country even the State Department must pay attention to public opinion. America's democratic government is from the people and for the people.

Mr. Speaker, the same conference further resolved to work toward the commemoration of the Captive Nations Week this coming July, barely 2 months from this date. I understand that some Senators and Congressmen have already written the White House reminding the President not to forget the date and to issue an appropriate proclamation as provided for in Public Law 86–90. Perhaps more of us should follow this example and write the President without delay.

"Draugas," which claims to speak on behalf of 1 million American Lithuanians, also suggested that the resolution establishing House Special Committee on Captive Nations should be passed before the Captive Nations Week. The paper even urged its readers to write the members of the Rules Committee as well as individual Congressmen urging the passage of the resolution. I quote again:

> There are quite a few Congressmen, friends of the captive nations, who support the res-

olution and are good friends of the Lithuanians. We must appropriately remind them of the need for action. Let us do it.

Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly join in the American Lithuanian appeal: Let us do it. Let us pass House Resolution 14 establishing the Special Committee on Captive Nations before this year's Captive Nations Week. What could be more fitting than a Presidential proclamation and congressional action aiming at the same ultimate noble goal—liberation of captive peoples?

Let us do it, Mr. Speaker.

Vice President Johnson Describes the Positive Policy of the Democratic Party in Milwaukee Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, May 4, 1963, Wisconsin Democrats gathered in Milwaukee for the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner had the great privilege of welcoming Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON to our State.

This was a day to remember for the Democratic Party in Wisconsin and for Democrats everywhere. Vice President JOHNSON, in an inspiring speech that gave new strength and spirit to its hearers, set forth the positive policy of the Democratic Party in meeting the great needs of our times.

The faith of the Vice President in the triumph of our free democratic society, which was so eloquently evidenced in his speech in Milwaukee, should reinforce and enhance the faith of Democrats and all Americans in the world struggle against communism.

Vice President JOHNSON's speech follows:

VICE PRESIDENT JOHNSON DESCRIBES THE POSITIVE POLICY OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY IN MILWAUKEE SPEECH

A $100 a plate dinner often consists of a $2 steak, a two-bit salad—and a 2-hour nap.

Your good Milwaukee food has already upset that formula. And after that introduction by BILL PROXMIRE, I feel like making a wide-awake $97.75 speech—because this is no time for Democrats anywhere to be asleep.

You did not pay your $100 to see—and be seen—at a party gathering. You made the contribution—and, in many instances, the sacrifice—because there are values for which you stand, ideals in which you believe, and goals toward which you aspire as free men and women and as responsible Americans.

I know what is in your hearts because I know the Democrats you have sent to Washington.

You have an independent, courageous, vigorous team in the Senate—BILL PROXMIRE and GAYLORD NELSON. I can say on personal authority that they are not afraid to speak out against anything or anybody when they disagree. But it is even more important that they are always ready to speak up any time for the people.

In the House, your Democratic delegation has no peer. Call the roll of Wisconsin Democrats and you call the names of some of the most valuable Members of the Congress—a leader in the fight for peace, BOB KASTENMEIER; a fighter for the farmer, LESTER JOHNSON; a hero of the battlefield fighting today on the battlefield of human rights and justice, HENRY REUSS; a man taken away tonight for the proudest of family reasons, but a man always present and accounted for when the people need him on the job, CLEM ZABLOCKI.

You have sent great Americans and good Democrats to Washington. I am proud that at Madison this year you have another distinguished Democrat who is getting your Wisconsin's economy moving again—my good friend and your Governor, John Reynolds.

The party may have two wings in Wisconsin. But nearly everything that flies has to have two wings. I would only worry about Wisconsin if I were told the party was trying to fly on only one wing and a prayer. I can be sympathetic with his problems, but I am unreserved in my congratulations on the zeal and effort being offered by the leadership of your State Chairman, Pat Lucey.

As Americans, we are interested vitally in our Government today—because we know that there is a great overriding issue before all humanity—whether the future belongs to freedom or slavery.

We believe the cause of freedom must, can, and shall prevail. We have faith in the basic values of our system, in our country's future, and in the people. We are drawn together as Democrats by our faith—not by our fears.

That is the basic distinction between the two political parties.

Both parties are loyal. Both are patriotic. Both are composed of honorable men and women. Both parties are determined America shall succeed and that communism shall be vanquished.

Loyalty is not the issue—and it has never been.

The issue between the parties is the kind of leadership offered for the people.

Let me say that in the great struggle between the philosophies of freedom and of communism, the issue of the kind of leadership is all important. We must understand that if we just call the roll on the differences between our country and the Soviet Union, the balance sheet in terms of resources and population does not guarantee success.

Here are a few examples:

1. In terms of population, the Soviet Union has a distinct edge—221 million people to our 187 million people.

2. In terms of arable land, the Soviet Union again has a distinct edge—585 million acres compared to our 188 million acres.

3. In energy fuels—oil and coal—Soviet reserves are definitely larger than ours, even though our production is more efficient and we make better use of our resources.

4. In many vital minerals—perhaps the best example is manganese—the Soviet Union has far larger reserves than do we.

5. In overall food supplies, we are far ahead—but this is efficiency of production and not resources, and we could be overtaken.

6. In housing our people, we take the lead—in 1960 we constructed 1½ times as much.

7. Soviet steel production is below ours, but at present rates of growth, we could be overtaken by the end of the decade.

8. In the field of space, the Soviets took an early lead in constructing big booster rockets, and we have not caught up to them yet—and they are also ahead of us in experience gained from manned space flights.

9. In electric power we are far ahead of the Soviets.

10. But in one vital field there is a disturbing trend which could be decisive—the field of education. In 1950 we graduated 52,000 scientists and technicians while the Russians graduated only 36,000. Ten years later, in 1960, we graduated only 38,000 and the Russians graduated 111,000.

When we look at these trends, I think it is apparent to all of us that—we cannot sustain freedom merely by satistical superiority. What counts—what can and must make the difference—is the superiority of freedom as a way of life and the willingness of people to work and to sacrifice for it.

This they will do only if we make our system work.

And it is in this field—making our system work—that we must really choose between the two parties.

One party has a program of action. The other party has only a habit of opposition. One party moves—the other holds back. One party lives with hope—the other lives with doubt. One party says "Yes" to the people—the other says "No."

Today, these distinctions are being clearly drawn—more clearly than in 30 years.

Out from under the comfortable shade of the canopy of plenty which has been raised during these abundant years, there are growing new needs among the people. Answers—affirmative answers—are demanded from the political parties of America.

The Democratic Party knows what it stands for. We believe in affirmative answers. We believe in moving—and facing up to the issues. We also know who we are for—our President, John F. Kennedy.

Let us look at the record of America's problems for every one of which our administration offers a program.

On the issue of Cuba last October our administration united all the people to prove American strength up to the hilt.

The strong young man in the White House stood up to the aggressor and drew the fangs of aggression. No one can rewrite that fact of history.

Today we have one national purpose and policy toward Cuba. That is to get rid of communism and Castro.

We are working every day toward that goal.

We are succeeding.

We are not dropping bombs, we are not attacking ships, we are not plunging the world into nuclear war.

But we have warned the world that we will not tolerate Castro's subversive activities through the use or threat of force. At the March meeting of President Kennedy and Central American Presidents in San Jose, measures were agreed upon to thwart Castro-Communist efforts at indirect subversion anywhere in the hemisphere.

Further because of our efforts—because of the respect and support and unity of our allies—Cuba is a showcase of Communist failure that is costing the Soviet Union more than $1 million a day to prevent complete and final collapse.

Cuba's gross national product has fallen 25 percent.

Agriculture is failing under communism there as everywhere else.

Food consumption is down 15 percent. The 1963 sugar crop is the smallest since World War II.

A quarter-million Cubans have left Cuba—and we have received 300,000 individual Cuban requests for visa waivers to come to this country.

Free world trade with Cuba last year was one-tenth what it was before Castro—and it will be only a trickle this year. Trade between Cuba and Latin America will virtually disappear in 1963.

The unity of the hemisphere has never been greater.

This is not failure. This is not a record of compromise. This is a record of proud American responsibility.

We are determined that communism in Cuba must go—and shall go.

We will not be satisfied until the Cuban people have been assured the opportunity of freely choosing their own government.

If anyone has more information than the Commander in Chief, more than the Joint Chiefs, more than the Secretary of State or the CIA, more than our patrol missions, we will welcome it and put it to use. And if anyone can offer a positive program that is not now being carried out, we will welcome any suggestions.

And I would like to add that no responsible leader of either party has come forward with such a program yet. We have heard words but no proposals for action.

We can have affirmative answers in the international field only if we have affirmative answers at home. And the Democratic Party is aware of the problems of our times.

When the 20th century began, only 1 out of 25 Americans was over the age of 65. Now, it is 1 out of 10. There are 1,000 more Americans past 65 tonight than there were at this hour last night.

At the other end of the spectrum, 40-percent of our population today is under the age of 21. We have 1 million more 16-year-olds alone this year than last year. Our country is growing—30 million more people during the 1960's, 40 million more to come during the 1970's.

Fifty-six percent of the aged couples live on less than $2,000 a year. Eighty percent suffer chronic diseases. One in five aged couples have hospital bills each year and half the time the bills exceed $700—one-third or more of their total income.

There is a need. There must be an answer.

The Democratic Party says "Yes."

The Republican Party says "No."

For our youth, we must in this decade provide 26 million new jobs—but we are running far behind. Unemployment among young workers is 2½ times higher than the national average—and it will grow worse if we don't act.

Seven and one-half million pupils will drop out of our schools during the 1960's without a high school diploma—and enter the job market as unskilled labor.

Four out of ten fifth-graders today will never finish high school.

There must be an answer.

The Democratic Party says "Yes."

The Republican Party says "No."

Our cities must have efficient and economical mass transit. We must keep our air pure, our water clean, our drugs safe. Our agriculture must be strengthened. Small businessmen must have a chance to succeed. Prosperity and good times must not be allowed to pass by any region or any State.

No group of Americans among us must be forced to sit at the second table because of their race, religion, region, or national origin.

These problems—and all the rest—are not political issues, contrived by parties. These are problems in the lives of our people which the people expect the parties to help them solve.

The Democratic Party says "Yes."

The Republican Party says "No."

When I speak to you of these things America must do, I speak with the strongest of personal feelings. I hate poverty. I hate it because, like many of you, I have known it too well as boy and man. I say it is not enough for our generation of Americans to be the vigilant and uncompromising foes of communism abroad if we are to be indifferent companions and associates of poverty and waste and neglect among our own people at home.

America is not a declining and waning country. It is not second best. It is just the opposite—strong, vigorous, and healthy. While we have that strength and vigor and health, we must meet our people's needs for that will make us stronger.

The negative failure to come to grips with the people's problems is costing us far more than would affirmative answers. Underuse of our manpower costs our economy more than $30 billion a year. Racial and religious discrimination loses us $15 billion a year in productivity. Even the pollution of our air costs $11 billion annually. These are the costs we cannot afford.

Thirty years ago in the fateful year of 1933, the Republican Party began to tell the American people that they could never afford the cost of their own relief from economic depression. They were proven wrong, wrong beyond all doubt; and yet today we still hear the same song, America cannot do it.

Yesterday's programs will not meet today's needs—and today's Democratic Party is not attempting to reapply those programs. Today's Democratic leadership responsibly recognizes the burdens upon the people of tax rates adopted in other times for other needs, and proposes to reduce these tax burdens for our families and for our private enterprise. But it has become so inherent in the Republican Party to oppose that after decades of opposition to high taxes, Republicans today are even resisting the reduction of taxes because the reduction is proposed by a Democratic President—John F. Kennedy.

This issue of obstruction—this issue of the Republican "No" to the needs of the people—has become the central issue of American political life today, and we must carry that case to the people.

In 1935, only 1 Republican joined 253 Democrats to defeat a motion which would have killed the Social Security Act in the House.

In 1936, only nine Republican Senators voted for creation of the REA to bring electricity to our farm families.

In 1938, only two lone Republican Senators voted to establish the first minimum wage.

Today, the margins of opposition and obstruction have returned to the pattern of 30 years ago. Eighty percent of Republican Senators voted against the urban mass transit bill. Eighty-eight percent voted to cut funds for America's water resources. Eighty-six percent of the Republican Senators voted to defeat and succeeded in killing medical care for the aged. Twenty Republicans voted against—and only seven voted for—the youth opportunity bill.

No man can answer—not Rockefeller, not Romney, not even Barry Goldwater—what the Republican Party is for. A negative party, a party without a program, a party without a leader, a party without an apparent and consistent purpose is not a party which serves the needs of America's people at home today.

America stands as a leader of a hopeful world. America stands as the leader of the hopes and faith of men everywhere who would be free. American strength is helping to keep peace for all mankind.

Only a few months ago in Greece and Turkey, I stood at the line that was drawn against Communist aggression 15 years ago by an American President, a Democratic President, Harry S. Truman. That line has never been crossed. I have seen the effort the people at Vietnam are making to keep their freedom against Communist subversion. I have seen the effort being made by people in Asia and Africa and Latin America to build for themselves the strong base on which freedom can stand and the people can prosper.

I live with faith that the tide runs with us. Fifty new nations have come into being since World War II—more than at any other such time in history. Not one of them has chosen the way of communism. But many of them have written their constitutions after the model of our own and look to us and to our system for guidance and inspiration in their own efforts now to remain free and grow strong and prosperous.

If we are to meet our responsibilities, if we are to fulfill this moment of opportunity for American greatness, we must have in our national leadership members of that party which answers "Yes" to the people's needs—answers "Yes" to the future of freedom—answers "Yes" to the hopes of mankind.

Shoe Industry Suffering From Foreign Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I attended a breakfast with leaders of the shoe industry at which we were familiarized with the current situation of this industry, particularly the disastrous effects upon it due to the large imports of shoes from abroad.

The shoe industry is of vital interest to the economy of New England, which leads the entire Nation in the production of shoes. Figures available for the year 1962 show that the United States as a whole produced a total of 619,407,000 pairs of shoes, and of these 203,395,000 pairs were produced in the New England States. This amounts to 32.8 percent of the total production of shoes in the country.

The shoe industry in the United States employs some 240,000 people, of whom 79,000 are employed in shoe manufacturing in New England. The total annual wages paid to all employees in the New England shoe factories in 1962 is estimated at over $258 million. This constitutes a very sizable segment of the economy of our region, and if this industry should be hurt the way textiles and others have been hurt, New England may find itself in a very difficult economic situation.

In my own district, the Second Congressional District of Connecticut, there are 7 factories producing nearly 4 million pairs of shoes per year. In one of these, located at North Grosvenordale, Conn., where there are employed from 200 to 235 persons, sales in the past year have fallen off by nearly 20 percent. The same is true at the other shoe factories. This is due primarily to the large imports of shoes from abroad which are competing with our own products.

The volume of shoe imports has grown phenomenally in recent years. In 1955 we imported less than 8 million pairs of shoes, but by 1961 shoe imports had grown to nearly 37 million pairs and in 1962 it had reached more than 55 million pairs. This is an increase of 605 percent within 7 years. At the same time we used to export about 5 million pairs of shoes a year, but last year our exports were less than 3 million pairs.

In all, we have some 1,300 shoe factories in the country located in about 600 communities, most of them being small towns where this industry constitutes their major and often only source of income. This means that every factory affected by the competition from abroad and forced to close down or curtail activities will at the same time affect the local community and its economy.

Of the 55 million pairs of shoes imported last year, nearly 28 million pairs, or about half of the total, came from Japan where the average wage is 36 cents per hour for shoeworkers. Smaller quantities of shoes are imported from Western European countries, which also pay their workers considerably less than we do in this country. This makes the shoe industry not only highly competitive, but also a low-profit industry, ranking among the lowest of all industries recorded in 1961.

Mr. Speaker, I can well appreciate the need for expanding our international commerce on which the jobs of several million Americans depend, including many in the New England States. I believe, however, that the shoe industry constitutes a specific problem and deserves fuller attention to enable this industry to maintain its place in the Nation's economy. It has been suggested that a voluntary quota system be established in certain industries suffering from extreme foreign competition, and I can think of no better place to start with such a system than the shoe industry.

At any rate, speedy action is necessary for the survival of this industry because of its importance to the American economy, and also to protect the interests of American consumers who seek quality products. I urge the Congress and the administration to look into the possibility of setting up a voluntary quota arrangement which would restrict imports by category and also by country. This is fair and just.

Why Leave Out the Fighting Soldier?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the bill, H.R. 5555, which provides increases in pay for members of the Armed Forces, includes provisions for special and incentive pay for hazardous duty for hundreds of thousands of individuals at an annual cost of $632,486,960. Despite the fact that the subcommittee which held hearings on this bill included extra pay for duty subject to hostile fire, this provision has been dropped from the reported bill.

I am including with these remarks a list of the types of duty which receive extra pay, the amount of the pay is shown, and a comparison of the Department of Defense proposal, H.R. 4696—the bill reported by the Rivers subcommittee, and H.R. 5555—the bill reported by the Armed Services Committee, is included. It is incredible that all of the special and hazardous duty pay categories were retained in H.R. 5555 except the small group of men subjected to hostile fire currently serving in southeast Asia.

An amendment is to be offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT] to correct this inequitable situation and I believe that Members can readily see the extent of this gross injustice by reviewing the comparative chart which appears below:

INCENTIVE PAY FOR HAZARDOUS DUTY[1]

Entitlement	Current (dollars per monthly)	DOD proposal (H.R. 3006)	H.R. 4696	H.R. 5555
a. Parachute duty:				
Officer	110	Retain	Retain	Retain.
Enlisted	55	do	do	Do.
b. Demolition duty:				
Officer	110	do	do	Do.
Enlisted	55	do	do	Do.
c. Flight duty (see enclosure): Crew member.		do	do	Do.
d. Flight duty (noncrew):				
Officer	110	do	do	Do.
Enlisted	55	do	do	Do.
e. Thermal stress duty:				
Officer	110	do	do	Do.
Enlisted	55	do	do	Do.
f. Low pressure:				
Officer	110	Retain and add "high" pressure.	Retain and add "high" pressure.	Retain and add "high" pressure.
Enlisted	55	do	do	Do.
g. Submarine duty (see enclosure 1)		Retain	Retain	Retain.
h. Leprosy:				
Officer	110	do	do	Do.
Enlisted	55	do	do	Do.
i. Glider flight duty:				
Officer	110	do	do	Do.
Enlisted	55	do	do	Do.
j. Human acceleration:				
Officer	110	do	do	Do.
Enlisted	110	do	do	Do.
SPECIAL PAY				
a. Sea and foreign duty (enlisted only):				
E-9	$22.50	Eliminate	$22.50	$22.50.
E-8	22.50	do	$22.50	$22.50.
E-7	22.50	do	$22.50	$22.50.
E-6	20.00	do	$20	$20.
E-5	16.00	do	$16	$16.
E-4	13.00	do	$13	$13.
E-3	9.00	do	$9	$9.
E-2	8.00	do	$8	$8.
E-1	8.00	do	$8	$8.
b. Medical and dental (officer):				
(1) Less than 2 years active duty.	100	Retain	Retain	Retain.
(2) 2 to 6 years active duty	150	do	do	Do.
(3) 6 to 10 years active duty	200	do	do	Do.
(4) Over 10 years active duty	250	do	do	Do.
c. Veterinarians (officers)	100	do	do	Do.
d. Diving duty:				
Officer	100	do	do	Do.
Enlisted:				
Master diver	100	do	do	Do.
1st class diver	80	do	do	Do.
Salvage diver	65	do	do	Do.
2d class diver	55	do	do	Do.
e. Proficiency pay (enlisted only):				
P-1	30	do	do	Do.
P-2	60	do	do	Do.
f. Unusual responsibility:[2]				
Colonel	150	Eliminate	Eliminate	Eliminate.
Lieutenant colonel	100	do	do	Do.
Major	50	do	do	Do.
Captain	50	do	do	Do.
g. Reenlistment bonus		do	Retain	Retain.
h. Career incentive	None	$500 to $2,400 dependent upon criticality of skill and as determined by Secretary of Defense.	Eliminate	Eliminate.
i. Duty subject to hostile fire	[3] None	$55	Retain	Do.

[1] Currently, a member is entitled, if otherwise qualified, to only one incentive pay for hazardous duty; H.R. 3006 and H.R. 4696 will authorize a maximum of two incentive pays for hazardous duty.
[2] Not implemented.
[3] Combat Duty Pay Act of 1952 authorized $45 per month for service in Korea.

San Francisco Warsaw Ghetto Memorial Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to your attention and to our colleagues attention the fact that the San Francisco Warsaw Ghetto Memorial Committee met on April 21, 1963. At that gathering over 1,000 San Franciscans met to observe the 20th anniversary of the Warsaw ghetto uprising. They met so that we would not forget "a chapter in the annals of human heroism."

From mid-April through the first week in May in 1943 the Jews of the Warsaw ghetto carried on a heroic and hopeless fight against the overwhelming power of the Nazi troops bent upon their extermination. As President Kennedy stated in his proclamation of March 8, 1963:

> The result was known by the Jews to be foredoomed. Yet, though they lacked both military resources and military tradition,

> they were able to conduct their struggle against the overwhelming forces of the Nazi occupiers for more than 3 weeks, thereby providing a chapter in the annals of human heroism, an inspiration to the peace-loving people of the world and a warning to would-be oppressors which will long be remembered.

In my mind, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be best, as a general rule, to not remind ourselves of such inhuman conduct. Such is not the case here, for reflection on the Warsaw uprising demonstrates the valor of the human spirit and more importantly the need to prevent such recurrence of the depravity of which some men have been capable.

Rabbi Saul E. White, chairman, Warsaw Ghetto Memorial Committee and the organizations comprising the Warsaw Ghetto Memorial Committee, including the San Francisco Council of Rabbis, the Board of Cantors of Northern California, the Associated Jewish Organizations of San Francisco, the Bay Area Zionist Council, the B'nai B'rith Lodges of San Francisco, the Workmen's Circle, and the Jewish Labor Committee are to be commended for their task. We must never forget this most tragic and brutal historical fact. The generation grown up since 1943 and succeeding generations must know of this brutal extermination and must know of the human spirit and will of these valorous people.

The San Francisco committee has done much to keep alive our knowledge of the great human spirit and great will of those heroic men, women, and children who perished 20 years ago.

Combat Pay Is Right in Principle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, from a marine I received this morning the following brief but eloquent note:

> Combat pay should not be taken away from the infantryman. Fliers get extra pay for doing their duty—other servicemen get hazardous duty pay for doing their job. I think sitting in a foxhole and being shot at is just as hazardous, don't you?

In a more formal manner I heard yesterday from the Department of Maryland Veterans of Foreign Wars as follows:

> DEAR CONGRESSMAN BENNETT: On behalf of our department officers, and 14,000 members in the Department of Maryland, Veterans of Foreign Wars, we wish to inform you that we are very much in support of additional combat pay for the military forces.
>
> It is respectfully requested that when H.R. 5555 is brought up for consideration in the House, that you support an amendment that is expected to be offered to have combat pay be restored to this bill.
>
> This is a "key objective" in the Department of Maryland, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and we sincerely hope that you will give assistance to having this amendment restored, as we know it will benefit our comrades-in-arms who are maintaining the peace in this 17th year of the cold war.
>
> Respectfully,
>
> CHARLES A. KREATCHMAN,
> *Quartermaster/Adjutant.*

Hostile fire pay, otherwise called combat pay, was paid to personnel in front line combat units in World War II and in the Korean war as a result of congressional action. Men in the U.S. armed services are dying and being wounded today in combat for our country. When the Department of Defense asked Congress this year to put combat pay in the pay bill now before us it said:

> While combat is, of course, the basic purpose of a military establishment, the fact remains that the actual hazards and hardships of combat are currently experienced by a small percentage of the Armed Forces.

In approving $55 per month to be paid, under strict regulations, the Department said:

> It is, of course, impossible for the Government to compensate adequately for this kind of sacrifice or potential sacrifice, but it would give a token recognition of the special role being played by such personnel.

The Bureau of the Budget and the Special Subcommittee on Military Pay of the House Armed Services Committee approved this request.

The total annual extra pay for specified performances in the Military Establishment in addition to usual duty totals $632,486,960, as shown in the report of the committee on H.R. 5555. The record shows that the cost of combat pay is estimated to be in the neighborhood only of $1 or $2 million annually, depending on the tightness of the regulations.

The committee in the Department of Defense which did the basic studies for this proposal made these conclusions:

> (a) To provide special pay to individuals assigned to duties in which they are subject to the hazards and discomforts of combat is feasible, desirable, and consistent with the policy in the military service of awarding extra compensation for extra hazardous duties.
>
> (b) Combat duty pay should be both an award for performing a hazardous and disagreeable duty and tangible recognition of performance of a necessary and sometimes heroic service. As such, payment should be rigidly administered and restricted to those individuals normally subjected to the hazards and discomforts of combat. Properly administered, it would improve the morale and effectiveness of the individuals assigned to duties in combat or quasi-combat conditions.
>
> (c) It is impossible to assay the degree of risk one assumes when in a combat situation, or to equate the risk with monetary compensation. However, considering that Congress evaluated and approved $45 per month 10 years ago, and that other hazardous duties authorize minimum payments of $55 per month, that $55 would be a proper amount.
>
> (d) There is no discernible difference in the exposure to hazard and hardship experienced by officers and enlisted men, and therefore the additional pay awarded for combat duty should be equal.
>
> (e) We have in the military service today, have had for most of the time since the Korean war, and will likely continue to have individuals performing duty under combat conditions suffering all the hazards and discomforts of such duty.
>
> (f) The combat pay bill of 1952, while still on the statutes, is not operative because it applies only to units engaged in the Korean war.

Although this hostile fire pay is not restricted to infantry this is where the chief impact will be felt. And so it should be. When the infantryman is committed to action he knows that he will be there until the issue is decided one way or another or until he is killed, seriously wounded, or breaks mentally from the strain. Casualty data indicates that at the end of the first 100 days in combat—not necessarily consecutive—one-half of his friends with whom he entered combat will be missing in action, in a hospital, or dead. At the end of 200 days in combat, 93 percent of his buddies will be gone. For all practical purposes, 200 days in front line combat as an infantryman amounts to either a death sentence or a future as a mentally or physically handicapped man.

The Little Girl at the Berlin Wall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, last fall, while serving as chairman of a special study mission to Europe composed of members of my subcommittee, I visited Berlin.

Our study mission conferred on the problems of that divided city with Gen. Albert Watson, the then U.S. Military Commandant of Berlin; with the head of the State Department mission in Berlin, Ambassador E. Allan Lightner, Jr.; and with other United States and city of Berlin officials.

And then we visited the wall. It is impossible to describe the feeling of physical revulsion produced by the sight of the wall. The wall is an ugly, monstrous thing— a cruel barrier which divides brother from brother, parents from their children, and freedom from tyranny.

I have searched for words to describe my reaction to the Berlin wall—and I found them the other day in a very brief article written by my colleague from New York the Honorable OTIS PIKE.

The article, entitled "Pike's Peek at Capitol," can be read in a minute. It tells a simple, yet a heart-rending, story of a little girl who wanted to show off her new Easter dress to her grandmother in the eastern zone of Berlin. It is a story which, once read, will never be forgotten.

Under unanimous consent I place Congressman PIKE's story in the RECORD, and I commend it to the attention of the membership of the House:

PIKE'S PEEK AT CAPITOL

(By Congressman OTIS PIKE)

Sometimes the smallest and apparently least significant episodes can have the greatest impact on the viewer. I expect that for the rest of my life I will always associate the difference between the free world and the Communist world with a little girl in a red dress.

On Easter Sunday I was in the divided city of Berlin. In the early morning I had the opportunity to attend one of the many outdoor sunrise services which were held all over West Berlin. It was a lovely day; the joyous and bustling crowds on the west side of the ugly little wall were in sharp contrast to the somber and stagnant atmosphere on the east side.

The small congressional delegation of which I was a member had Easter dinner with some of the troops of our Berlin garrison, and we were all once again impressed with the calm dedication of this small detachment of Americans. The greatest impression, however, came later.

In the company of an Army captain I was viewing the wall from an observation post on the roof of a building. A German border policeman brought a lovely 8-year-old girl up the stairway to the roof.

She was all shined up in her holiday best—a bright red dress and immaculate white shoes and socks.

The guard told me she had come to wave to her grandmother who lived in East Berlin. He said, "Watch the window on the third floor of the fourth building on the right side of the street."

The little girl in the red dress took out a spotless white handkerchief and waved it. There was a single answering flash of white from the window. The little girl saw it and laughed. She kept on waving for 5 minutes, although there was no other answering wave. In East Berlin they keep track of who waves.

Freedom is where grandparents love and play with their grandchildren. Communism is where they don't even dare wave to a little 8-year-old girl in her best red Easter dress.

Members of the Armed Forces Subject to Hostile Fire Are Entitled to Combat Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Florida, the Honorable CHARLES E. BENNETT, has announced he expects to offer an amendment to restore the combat pay provision to H.R. 5555. I expect to support this amendment and believe that in the interest of fairness and equity my colleagues will also wish to support it.

H.R. 5555, as it will come before the House, provides for an annual expenditure of $632,486,960 in extra pay for specified performances in addition to usual duty pay. Individuals performing the following types of service would receive extra pay in addition to usual duty pay:

Parachute duty; demolition duty; flight duty, crew member; flight duty, noncrew; thermal stress duty; low pressure and high pressure duty; submarine duty; leprosy assignment; glider flight duty; human acceleration; diving duty; proficiency pay for P-1 and P-2 enlisted men; and extra pay for medical, dental and veterinary officers.

The military pay bill, as recommended by the Department of Defense, included combat duty pay. This was defined as duty subject to hostile fire. It was estimated that under present circumstances its annual cost would be about $2 million annually. I have checked with appropriate officials of the Department of Defense and they advise that considerable experience was gained in administering a pay provision of this type in the Korean War and little difficulty is anticipated in administering this feature under current conditions. It seems to me the height of unfairness to propose expenditures of more than one-half billion dollars for various types of extra-hazardous and specified performance pay and leaving out the small group of individuals being subjected to hostile fire.

American fighting men are not mercenaries. I think there is little doubt that those men and units assigned by the Armed Forces, subjecting themselves to hostile fire, will carry out their assignments with dignity and honor regardless of whether we pass this amendment or not. This has been the history and tradition of the American Armed Forces. On the other hand, it must be understood that these men are not naive or uninformed and they can look about them and see their colleagues receiving extra pay in situations far less hazardous and it is only natural that they should wonder about the justice of such a situation.

The administration favored this proposal, it was retained by the subcommittee which held hearings on the bill, and I am confident that my colleagues will wish to support the amendment to assure that those members of the armed forces, subject to hostile fire, will be accorded fair and equitable treatment.

Disarmament: Wishful Thinking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have been very pleased to read in the Evening Star of May 2, 1963, an excellent editorial on the subject of disarmament. It is entitled "Disarmament: The Grand Delusion." When I read this editorial, Mr. President, I had just finished preparing my weekly newsletter which is being made public today. It is also on the subject of disarmament and is entitled "Disarmament: Wishful Thinking." I ask unanimous consent that the Evening Star editorial and my newsletter to be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and newsletter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Evening Star, May 2, 1963]

DISARMAMENT: THE GRAND DELUSION

The Soviet delegate says the Geneva test-ban talks are a waste of time. He is right. These talks are not leading anywhere, and they should not.

The test-ban concept, so far as we can see, has no meaning except as a step toward nuclear disarmament. The proposal was first put forward out of fear that tests would poison the atmosphere. That danger has been pretty well discounted by the experts; it makes more sense for us to worry about how often our children take on radiation by having their teeth X-rayed than about how they will be affected by reasonable levels of atomic testing, especially underground testing. The argument nowadays centers mainly on the notion that if we and the British and Russians renounce further testing, we will somehow inhibit proliferation of nuclear weapons to other nations. The French do not seem very much impressed with this logic—the Chinese, hardly at all. There is no reason why they should be.

No, the serious significance of a test ban must surely be that it would serve as a first step back from commitment to an atomic arms race—a psychological break in the cold war that might lead eventually to disarmament. The serious question about the test ban is whether it makes sense in this context.

We think not. We do not believe disarmament will be a practical possibility in the foreseeable future—certainly not until solutions are found for political issues such as Berlin. It seems to us silly to fiddle around with wishful steps in that direction.

Of course it is dangerous for the world to keep piling up atomic armaments. But if in fact that is what the world is going to do, it is more dangerous to tranquilize ourselves with delusions of safety. This is a dangerous world. It will become more dangerous. And much as we yearn for relaxation—much as we would like to feel we have everything under control—we are not going to enjoy that sensation in our time.

Our situation might be likened to that of a not very bright man in a room which is filling up with explosive gas. He can breathe it safely, but if he ignites it it will blow him to kingdom come. What do we worry about here—what do we want the man to do? Eventually, if possible, he should of course shut off the gas and clear it out of the room. For the present he does not know how to accomplish this. His chance of survival lies in a recognition of his limitations and his danger. He must understand that the room is charged with sudden death; that the slightest mistake on his part will set it off. The worst mistake we could make would be to lead him to believe things might not, after all, be as dangerous as they seem. Would we be doing him a favor if we suggested that by tinkering with the valves he might slow down the inflow? Might we not be encouraging him to test his new-found relative safely by lighting a match?

Like the man in the room, we are endangered most in this age of overkill by failure to apprehend the true extent of our danger. We will not be making things a little safer for ourselves by clutching at the straw of a little disarmament. Fifty superbombs are not necessarily safer than a hundred. If 50 less superbombs makes us feel safer, that in itself makes our situation more dangerous. The biggest thing we have to fear is lack of fear itself.

This is not to say, either, that hydrogen weapons necessarily have made war obsolete. The inventor of dynamite thought he had done that. Peace through mutual terror, in Churchill's phrase, may well be as precarious today as it always has proved.

But we hold this gloomy view of the alternatives: If there is any chance that man will be restrained from war by the horror at his disposal, no good end is served by trying to pretend against our better judgment that the situation can be tamed.

And if on the other hand man is not going to be restrained, then we will, like our cave man ancestor, want all the weapons we can lay our hands on.

Disarmament: Wishful Thinking

The cost of liberty is high, and there is no such thing as a deferred payment plan to live free now and pay later. When a challenge to freedom arises, there is a great temptation to look for an easy way out and to avoid facing up to the challenge and the hard, often risky decisions which an effective defense of liberty requires.

The free world is now confronted with the most serious challenge to liberty in history, for the Communists are relentlessly waging war against freedom. The defense of freedom falls primarily on the United States. The United States together with its allies, has the strength to defeat the war against freedom, but we have failed so far, simply because we have sought an easy way out. Instead of resolving to win the war being waged against freedom, we have sought to "liquidate" it, or make it go away.

Many "easy ways out," separately and in combination, have been tried unsuccessfully—such as containment, foreign aid, cultural exchanges and "the spirit of Camp David," to name a few. In the past few years, a new "easy way out" formula has been expensively prepared, enticingly packaged and boastingly advertised. Early delivery has been promised, so the time has arrived when Americans had better take a long, hard look at the product—disarmament.

Disarmament is not a new product, but the latest model prepared by U.S. policymakers has a new name and several attachments. The new name is arms control. The principal new attachments are mutual deterrence and test ban.

The United States has proposed to the Communists a treaty for "general and total disarmament." This proposal provides for creation by stages of an "international peace force" and the reduction and elimination of all national armaments except those necessary for maintaining internal order. Even the U.S. policymakers correctly recognize, however, that the Communists, with all their devious practices of cheating on agreements, are not likely to agree to a stage reduction proposal while at the starting point the United States has a clearly evidenced superiority in nuclear weaponry. That is where the theory of mutual deterrence or nuclear stalemate comes in.

Mutual deterrence will come into being, according to "arms controllers," when both sides develop a "creditable second strike capability," or in other words, have the ability to strike back effectively even after receiving the first blow. At this point, our policymakers reason, neither side will have to fear the other, and the reduction in arms by stages can then begin. There can be no "mutual deterrence" stability, however, as long as weapons development continues, for one side might possibly achieve a weapons breakthrough and upset the balance. The first step, our policymakers therefore say, must be a nuclear test ban so that new weapons cannot be developed.

Like other "easy ways out," this attractive package will work only in an idealist's mind—never in practice. Consider a few of the defects:

1. The Soviets secretly prepared for a nuclear test series while we refrained from testing during negotiations. Then they surprised us with a series of tests. They would have everything to gain by another secret preparation under cover of a test ban and another surprise testing program.

2. The Soviets are not working toward "mutual deterrence," or a parity with U.S. strike forces. They are straining every resource to obtain a breakthrough in new weaponry that will give them nuclear superiority.

3. The disarmament idea is based on the presumption that both sides want "peace," as we understand the term. The Communists have repeatedly said—and proved—that their goal is world domination, not peace.

4. Armaments do not cause wars. It is the lust of men for power that causes wars; and military weakness, not strength, invites attack.

5. Disarmament proposals are directed at conventional and nuclear weapons. By far worse to contemplate than nuclear attacks are the attacks which can be waged with chemical and bacteriological weapons—small in size, easily concealed and deliverable to targets by human vehicles. What type of inspections will guarantee against use of CBR warfare?

The only sure road to peace is superior military strength. The only hope for freedom lies in total victory over communism. There is no "easy way out."

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following Newsletter of May 4, 1963:

The People Misled on Spending in Labor-HEW Appropriation Bill

(Washington Report by Congressman Bruce Alger, 5th District, Texas, May 4, 1963)

Example of how the people are misled on Federal spending: The appropriation bill for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, which passed the House this week. The bill as presented called for appropriations of $5.4 billion. It was claimed this was a reduction of $309,501,000 from the budget request and $118,810,000 below the amount appropriated last year. So it would seem Congress is actually saving the taxpayers some $300 million. The facts tell a far different story. A thoughtful analysis of the book juggling in this appropriation was made by Congressman Melvin Laird, of Wisconsin, during debate. A few excerpts from his study show how much effort goes into fooling the taxpayers when it comes to spending their money.

Congressman Laird pointed out the Labor-HEW bill contains $5.4 billion in direct appropriations, but completely overlook the other public funds these Departments are authorized to spend—the so-called trust funds. In addition to the $5.4 billion authorized in this bill for expenditure during fiscal 1964, these two agencies will spend $22,132 million from the trust funds account so the actual spending figure we are dealing with is $28 billion of the peoples' money. This is the largest appropriation bill the House will consider with the exception of the defense appropriation bill. (Trust funds include such things as the social security trust fund, railroad retirement fund, and the unemployment compensation fund, among others.)

Additional discrepancies in what the House did and what we said we did are pointed out by Congressman Laird. The total new obligational requests for the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare and Labor and related agencies in the President's overall budget is over $7.7 billion. The reason the higher expenditures do not show up in the Labor-HEW bill is that some of the programs administered by these Departments come under the jurisdiction of other committees and authorization and appropriation will be called for in later bills to be presented to the Congress. Congressman Gene Snyder, of Kentucky, reminded the House of one example of what he called "one of the poorest jobs of book juggling we have seen." He pointed out the appropiration bill showed $217,802,500 for aid to impacted areas school bill as being deleted. The impacted areas school bill has not yet been authorized but it is going to be and the $217,802,500 will be contained in that bill and you may be sure it will be expanded.

In my own statement during debate I objected to the new programs called for and the increase of 3,700 Federal employees in these two Departments alone. There is absolutely no need for further expansion of Federal programs and personnel beyond last year's highest peacetime budget in history. We are acting as though there were no limit to money. Who is going to pay for these programs? We are in a period of deficit financing. The budget of each Department of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare should be cut at least 10 percent below last year's budget. There are many activities in these Departments that are not the province of Federal Government. Many such activities must be terminated and the way to start in this direction is to reduce spending.

GOVERNMENT EXPANDS CONTROL IN OUTDOOR RECREATION

The Kennedy administration seeks to increase its control over our individual lives in another bill which passed the House this week—H.R. 1762, to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation. In simple terms this bill sets up a new Bureau for Recreation to coordinate 18 existing Government agencies now dealing with outdoor recreation. The Federal Government does not trust the people to know how to play, so we have over 22,500 Federal employees already on the payroll to direct your leisure activities and the administration is asking for a new Bureau with an initial appropriation of some $2,460,000.

In speaking against the bill in the House, I said in part: "The Federal Government has no business in such wholesale activities in recreation. It does no good to say that we need a new Bureau of Recreation to coordinate present activities in 18 Federal agencies. Admittedly overlapping and duplication are wrong, but I do not intend to approve such Government participation in recreation as this bill carries. This is a good example of Parkinson's first law that more and more Government and employees are needed to do less and less. The seven reasons for this legislation effectively inject the Government into areas where Government has no place. Such activities are not constitutional. The Government has no constitutional right to encourage and promote recreational activities, individually or collectively. Swimming, skiing, fishing, golfing are all fine recreations. I enjoy them. Some do, some do not. But it isn't a matter of Federal subsidy. It does not follow that money should be taken in taxes to subsidize these and other recreations. The answer is not to coordinate and expand Government recreational activities. The answer is to get the Government gradually out of this field so far as possible. I refuse to approve such use of the taxpayers' money." It is my firm conviction the people know how to provide their own recreation, nor should they be forced to support through their taxes, other peoples' recreational activities.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK ACT

Republicans dedicated to fiscal responsibility scored a major victory in the House this week in an amendment to the Export-Import Bank Act Extension, H.R. 3872. The amendment provides for financing the bank through direct appropriations instead of backdoor financing. In the minority report on the bill Republican members pointed out that the Kennedy administration is responsible for a $27 billion deficit for the 3 budget years it has been in office. Much of this deficit can be traced to backdoor spending carried to record extremes by President Kennedy. The amendment to H.R. 3872 is designed to stop the loose financial practice of authorizing $2 billion of backdoor financing of the Export-Import Bank. In its report the minority on the Banking and Currency Committee said in part: "As a matter of policy we believe backdoor financing is wrong. * * * We think it should be brought to an end, not alone for this program but for every other program that comes before our committee and the Congress for either new or additional fund authorizations. For approximately 150 years the Congress operated without engaging in backdoor financing. Furthermore, paragraph 7 of section 9 of article 1 of our Constitution in relevant part states, "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law." I heartily agree with the minority view and have never supported the expenditure of the taxpayers' money except where it is authorized by action of Congress. I am opposed to backdoor financing as morally and constitutionally wrong and believe, if the practice is not curtailed, the economy of this Nation will be completely wrecked.

ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES THIS WEEK

Among other duties this week: A speech to delegates to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce in which I urged the Nation's businessmen to fight for capitalism and the threat to it from the social and welfare programs being initiated by the present administration. Thusday evening, a speech in New York at a dinner honoring former Governor Edison, of New Jersey. I reminded those present, "The America of tomorrow, the free world of tomorrow, the continued existence of the freedom of mankind depends upon the strength and determination of the conservatives. To this generation is given the challenge of keeping America and the world free. We can sum up the challenge in three words: capitalism, sovereignty, the Republic. I believe in all three and I shall do my best to revitalize the enthusiasm of the people for preserving capitalism, the sovereignty of America, and the Republic for which, I hope for all time, we will stand."

Centennial Celebration of Boston College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding institutions of higher learning in our country is Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Mass. From its rooms of education and learning during the decades of its existence have gone graduates engaging in all walks of human activity, who, in peace and war, have played an important part in our Nation's history.

On April 1, 1863, Gov. John A. Andrew of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts signed the University Charter which brought Boston College into being.

This year, 1963, is the centennial celebration of Boston College, a historic event in the life of Boston College, and of institutions of higher learning throughout the country.

The university charter was delivered in 1863 to the Very Reverend Father John McElroy, S.J., founder of the university.

The first president, the Very Reverend Father John Bapst, S.J., presided over a faculty of 6 and an initial enrollment of 22 students in a red brick building in the South End of Boston.

For the first 50 years, Boston College grew steadily as a small liberal arts college.

In 1913, Boston College moved to Chestnut Hill, then a rural area.

Still keeping at the core of the university a strong liberal arts college, it gradually filled out the dimensions of its university charter.

In 1925, the graduate School of Arts and Sciences was founded; in 1929, the Law School and Evening College; in 1936, the School of Social Work; in 1938, the College of Business Administration, and since World War II, the School of Nursing, the School of Education, and the Graduate School of Business Administration were inaugurated.

From the original faculty of 6 and the initial enrollment of 22 students, Boston College, on its centennial anniversary, under the leadership of its president and recognized outstanding educator and administrator, Very Rev. Father Michael P. Walsh, S.J.—at the beginning of its second century—comprises 12 colleges with a faculty of 700 and a total enrollment of 10,500 students.

Boston College under the leadership and guidance of its centennial president, Very Rev. Father Michael P. Walsh, S.J., envisions at the beginning of its second century, and in the near future, the construction of a science building, research library, a behavioral sciences building, a university theater and dormitories. It is only within the past few weeks that ground was broken for Carney Faculty Center.

On April 20, 1963, Boston College held its centennial convocation; a distinguished gathering from all walks of life was present.

On this occasion the degree of doctor of law was conferred upon Very Rev. Father Edward B. Bunn, S.J., president of Georgetown University; the degree of doctor of letters upon Lady Barbara Ward Jackson; and the degree of doctor of humane letters upon Dr. Nathan Pusey, president of Harvard University.

This historic occasion was graced by the presence of our beloved and distinguished President of the United States, Hon. John F. Kennedy, and by the great churchman, His Eminence, Richard Cardinal Cushing, Archbishop of Boston.

In my remarks, I include the address delivered by President Kennedy.

The address of welcome was delivered by Father Walsh, which I include in my remarks.

Greetings from the church were delivered by His Eminence Richard Cardinal Cushing, which I include in my remarks.

From the colleges and universities greetings which I herewith include, were delivered by Dr. Nathan M. Pusey, president of Harvard University, and from the Commonwealth, included in my remarks, greetings were delivered by the Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, his excellency, Hon. Endicott Peabody.

As its second century starts, Boston College looks forward to the future with faith and confidence, its students and graduates serving God, country, and mankind.

As was well stated by Father Walsh, S.J., the centennial president:

> We begin the second century as the first century was begun with a faith that has not failed us, with a hope that has been fulfilled and forever in this university's bright future, with thanksgiving to God.

The addresses follow:

President Kennedy's Address

Father Walsh, your eminence, Governor Peabody, members of the faculty, ladies and gentlemen; it is a great pleasure to come back to a city where my accent is considered normal, and where they pronounce the words the way they are spelled.

I take especial satisfaction in this day as the recipient of an honorary degree in 1956 from Boston College, and, therefore, an instant alumnus, I am particularly pleased to be with all of you on this most felicitous occasion.

This university, or college, as Father Walsh has described, was founded in the darkest days of the Civil War, when this Nation was engaged in a climactic struggle to determine whether it would be half slave and half free or all free. And now, 100 years later, after the most intense century perhaps in human history, we are faced with the great question of whether this world will be half slave and half free, or whether it will be all one or the other. And on this occasion, as in 1863, the services of Boston College are still greatly needed.

It is good also to participate in this ceremony which has honored three distinguished citizens of the free world—President Pusey, Father Bunn, and our friend from the world of freedom, Lady Jackson.

Boston College is a hundred years old—old by the lifespan of man, but young by that of universities. In this week of observance, you have rightly celebrated the achievements of the past, and equally rightly you have turned in a series of discussions by outstanding scholars to the problems of the present and the future. Learned men have been talking here of the knowledge explosion, and in all that they have said I am sure they have implied the heavy present responsibility of institutions like this one. Yet today I want to say a word on the same theme, to impress upon you as urgently as I can the growing and insistent importance of universities in our national life.

I speak of universities because that is what Boston College has long since become. But most of what I say applies to liberal arts colleges as well. My theme is not limited to any one class of universities, public or private, religious or secular. Our national tradition of variety in higher education shows no sign of weakening, and it remains the task of each of our institutions to shape its own role among its differing sisters. In this hope I am much encouraged by a reading in this last week of the remarkable encyclical, Pacem in Terris.

In its penetrating analysis of today's great problems, of social welfare and human rights, of disarmament and international order and peace, that document surely shows that on the basis of one great faith and its traditions there can be developed counsel on public affairs that is of value to all men and women of good will. As a Catholic, I am proud of it;

and as an American, I have learned from it. It only adds to the impact of this message that it closely matches notable expressions of conviction and aspiration from churchmen of other faiths, and in recent documents of the World Council of Churches, and from outstanding world citizens with no ecclesiastical standing. We are learning to talk the language of progress and peace across the barriers of sect and creed. It seems reasonable to hope that a similiar process may be taking place across the quite different barriers of higher learning.

From the office that I hold, in any case, there can be no doubt today of the growing meaning of universities in America. That, of course, is one basic reason for the increasing urgency with which those who care most for the progress of our society are pressing for more adequate programs in higher education and in education generally. It is for this reason that I urge upon everyone here and in this country the pressing need for national attention and a national decision in the national interest upon the national question of education. In at least four ways, the new realities of our day have combined to intensify the focal role of the university in our Nation's life.

First, and perhaps most obvious, the whole world has come to our doorstep and the universities, must be its student. In the strange geometry of modern politics, the distant Congo can be close to us as Canada, and Canada, itself, is worth more attention than we have sometimes given. Cultures not our own press for understanding. Crises we did not create require our participation. Accelerating change is the one universal human prospect.

Second, there is indeed an explosion of knowledge and its outward limits are not yet in sight. In some fields, progress seems very fast; in others, distressingly slow. It is no tribute to modern science to jump lightly to the conclusion that all its secrets of particle physics, or molecular life, or heredity, of outer space, are now within easy reach. The truth is more massive and less magical. It is that wherever we turn, in defense, on space, in medicine, in industry, in agriculture, and most of all in basic science, itself, the requirement is for better work, deeper understanding, higher education. While I have framed this comment in the terms of the natural sciences, I insist, as do all those who live in this field, that at every level of learning there must be an equal concern for history, for letters and the arts, and for man as a social being in the widest meaning of Aristotle's phrase. This also is the work of the university.

And third, as the world presses in and knowledge presses out, the role of the interpreter grows. Men can no longer know everything themselves; the 20th century has no universal man. All men today must learn to know through one another to judge across their own ignorance—to comprehend at second hand. These arts are not easily learned. Those who would practice them must develop intensity of perception, variety of mental activity, and the habit of open concern for truth in all its forms. Where can we expect to find a training ground for this modern maturity, if not in our universities?

Fourth and finally, these new requirements strengthen still further what has always been a fundamental element in the life of American colleges and universities—that they should be dedicated to "the Nation's service." The phrase is Woodrow Wilson's, and no one has discussed its meaning better. What he said in 1896 is more relevant today than ever before, and I close with a quotation from him.

I offer it to you with renewed congratulations, and in the confident hope that as her second century opens, Boston College will continue to respond, as she did in her beginnings, to the new needs of the age:

"It is not learning," said President Wilson, "but the spirit of service that will give a college place in the public annals of the Nation. It is indispensable," he said, "if it is to do its right service, that the air of affairs should be admitted to all its classrooms * * * the air of the world's transactions, the consciousness of the solidarity of the race, the sense of the duty of man toward man * * * the promise and the hope that shone in the face of all knowledge. * * * The days of glad expansion are gone, our life grows tense and difficult; our resource for the future lies in careful thought, providence, and a wise economy; and the school must be of the Nation."

Boston College for 100 years has been of the Nation and so it will be for the next hundred.

Thank you.

REMARKS OF VERY REV. FATHER MICHAEL P. WALSH, S.J., PRESIDENT OF BOSTON COLLEGE

One hundred years ago, Americans were girding themselves for what would be, until our time, the most massive single battle in military history, Gettysburg, when, with a magnificent act of faith on our Nation's future, and anxious to contribute what it could to the shaping of that future, Boston College began. Now after a hundred years, we pause to look back in a spirit of humble gratitude to God for the achievements of a century. Joining us in this spirit of joy are leaders of religion, education, and government.

To our faculty, students, alumni, and friends who have come in such impressive numbers to celebrate with us, it is enough to say that our happiness today is theirs.

Since Boston College has never failed to link its destiny with that of our beloved country, it is inspiring to observe that our Government, represented by its leaders in city, State, and Nation, has shown such gracious readiness to be with us today.

Represented here today are colleges and universities of this continent and Europe. To them, our confreres, we extend a most grateful welcome. They have come here with the most congenial and fraternal understanding of what their presence means to us, sensing as few others could, our pride in a century of achievement in higher education.

To Cardinal Cushing, at once our most benevolent father and devoted son, our welcome is what it has always been, one of gratitude and deepest affection.

Mr. President, I speak for all the men and women of Boston College, for all our faculty and friends. We bless you and offer our profound gratitude for your bringing the splendor of the Presidency to ennoble our centennial convocation. The words of our charter are bright again upon the ancient parchment because you came to be with us on our day of jubilee. You came because you understood the meaning of this day not only in the life of this university but in the history of the city whose name it bears. You came, in a word, for Boston.

A university must span many centuries before it can be said to be old; and so, after only one century, it would be more fitting to say that Boston College is still young. That is true of the spirit with which we celebrate today's anniversary. While we pay grateful and most respectful tribute to our past, our energies and our interest are directed to our future. We are impatient to move on with greater and firmer strides into our second century. This distinguished assemblage of friends of our university is witness most of all to a work which is beginning; for no growth is really vital which is not always just beginning. This solemn duty of the university's perpetual beginning we take up again as it was taken up with such courage and with such undaunted faith 100 years ago.

REMARKS OF RICHARD CARDINAL CUSHING AT BOSTON COLLEGE CONVOCATION

Mr. President, Very Rev. Father Walsh, rector of Boston College, members of the faculty, members of the student body, and guests, it is my pleasant duty to express on this occasion the congratulations and gratitude of the church in honor of the centennial of Boston College.

The college has grown with the archdiocese of Boston and it has contributed enormously and indispensably to the growth of the church in this area. It was Boston College that encouraged throughout the years the vocations to the priesthood and the religious life that were necessary for the expansion of the church as the numbers of its faithful began to increase. For over 50 years the students in our diocesan seminary, founded in 1884, came almost entirely from this institution and from its sister College of the Holy Cross in Worcester. Today it is Boston College that provides educational formation and training for hundreds of teachers and administrators in our diocesan schools, so important for the healthy and normal functioning of the church.

There is another reason for our gratitude to Boston College and the Jesuits under whose direction it has grown to its present state of academic efficiency. The church has a part to play within the larger community in which its freedom of functioning is constitutionally guaranteed. It is erroneous to conclude from the concern of Catholics for the expansion of their ecclesiastical structure that their interests are exclusively sectarian, or that they evaluate their achievements in the field of education entirely from the supernatural point of view of revealed religion. Ultimately the church directs the minds of men toward the eternal happiness of the world to come. More immediately, however, the church is concerned with developing the highest ideals of personal integrity and public service. To be genuinely religious means to be conscientious and upright as a citizen, no less than to be loyal and unswerving in the fulfillment of religious duties.

As we find proof in our own day of the relevance of religious beliefs for the strengthening of our Nation against moral decay, we have reason to be thankful that institutions like Boston College are preparing young people for positions of responsibility, and bringing the highest standards of academic excellence into harmonious integration with the ideals of Christian tradition.

For what Boston College has done, is doing and will continue to do for God and for country, for the church and for the state, for the educational world and for the common good, we are thankful today. We pray that He who is infinitely wise and provident, infinitely good and merciful, may enable this institution to fulfill in years to come its divinely ordained purpose of keeping sound minds in sound bodies, of drawing from human powers their greatest measure of scholarly effort and of elevating the human personality to its rightful dignity of sonship with God through Christ our Lord.

GREETINGS FROM THE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES OF DR. NATHAN M. PUSEY, PRESIDENT OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY

The 1860's were a period of intense ferment in higher education in this country. This ferment was occasioned by two kinds of discontent. One, that the attention of our colleges was directed so exclusively toward literary studies, and these not even modern literary studies, that the colleges were making virtually no contribution toward meeting the practical problems of a rapidly developing society. Scorning the agricultural and mechanical arts they were, it was held by these of their critics using a kind of smear word, "irrelevant." Times have changed.

The other main criticism came from those who had caught a glimpse abroad, chiefly in Germany, of what a university as contrasted with a college could be. There has been a good deal of confusion on this subject ever since. There are many colleges in this country which grandiloquently call themselves universities. There are few universities which, like yours, are content to call themselves colleges. But in any event, in the past 100 years we are in a new period of ferment. Higher education has become extraordinarily almost too relevant. Witness the way President Kennedy has taken and needs a considerable piece of higher education to help him in Washington. Witness the way his Science Advisory Board tells him that certain agencies of Government basically dependent upon the research activities of highly trained engineers, mathematicians, and physical scientists will not be able to do their work a decade hence if the rate of producing these kinds of scientists is not quickly stepped up to 7,000 Ph. D.'s a year. Many other interests and concerns seem to me and to others to have equally good claims for this kind of scarce talent. It was only yesterday that the number of Ph. D.'s given annually by all universities in all subjects passed the level of 7,000. It is now about 10,000 per year. The Space Agency itself would like to have about 10,000. Clearly we have a great deal to do.

May I interrupt my remarks just to say about space that today is the day to test the aerodynamic properties of the mortar board. I hope if mine takes off into space I don't go with it.

We have much to do and we are not in the best shape to do it. We have all been struggling to make good the deficiencies which accumulated in our plants during the long, lean years of depression and war and to raise the funds to attract, to hold, and adequately recompense our faculties. Even more difficult have been the pressures for new programs, plants, and equipment originating in the marvelous burgeoning of knowledge. In the midst of this we are confronted with a shortage and therefore a fierce competition for first-rate teachers. And truly frightening is the prospect now breaking over us of soon having such numbers to cope with that we shall have in a decade virtually to double the whole enterprise of higher education in this country which it has taken more than 300 years of patient, devoted effort to bring to its present estate. Mr. President, may I say parenthetically it is our hope that you will be able to help us to get the legislators in the Capitol to see the implication of this remark.

Meanwhile it is a joy to see Boston College forging ahead through its own and its friends' efforts. Deep in the center of the present responsibility of higher education is the need to find ways to adapt to present circumstances the old basic learning with its concern for the development of persons and its own unremitting attention to questions of value. The institutions of higher learning entrusted to the Jesuits have an honorable record in this regard. It is to be hoped among all the other things we have to do that these and other institutions can work together to accomplish this task. May I, as the president of an institution more than 300 years old, say this discouraging word to Father Walsh and his associates, that the common task we share does not get easier with the passing centuries. But may I also for the colleges and universities of the United States felicitate Boston College on the achievements of its first century and of the great development and growth you have experienced in that time.

We welcome the advent of strong Catholic colleges and universities of which surely this is one of the chief, into the advance ranks of our institutions of higher learning. Together these institutions have already done much to build value into our common life and on them our hopes for a worthy future in large measure must surely now depend. The colleges and universities, and among them, I should like to say personally, Harvard, congratulate Boston College on the accomplishments of her first century. We salute her on this happy day for her achievement. We would speak of our pride in our association with her and we wish for her long life and a continuation of that strong forward surge with which she now so clearly and so creatively is moving ahead.

GREETINGS FROM THE HONORABLE ENDICOTT PEABODY, GOVERNOR OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

Your Eminence, Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, Father Walsh, Father Bunn, Lady Jackson, Dr. Pusey, Senator Saltonstall, Senator Kennedy, Mayor Collins, members of the Board of Regents of Boston College, distinguished guests, and friends of Boston College, in 1847, Father John McElroy, S.J., arrived in Boston and planted the first seeds that have grown and flourished and produced the magnificent bounty we know today as Boston College, one of the great institutions of learning in the free world.

My presence here, today, as Governor of the Commonwealth, is symbolic of the continuing harmonious relationship between town and gown that was begun on that day in April 1863, 100 years ago, when my predecessor, Gov. John Andrews, signed into law the act of the Massachusetts Legislature granting your charter.

Fourteen years later, under the inspired leadership of the Reverend John Bapst, S.J., the first president of the college and corporation, the first commencement was held. Nine young men graduated. And again, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts was present to bestow her congratulations in the person of my predecessor, Gov. Alexander H. Rice.

Now, on another day in April, in the year of our Lord, 1963, the Governor of the Commonwealth again comes to Boston College to join in this well-deserved and joyous celebration.

To the many devoted priests and laypeople who labored so humbly and faithfully for so noble a purpose, every citizen of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts owes a debt of gratitude.

For education is one of this Commonwealth's most precious assets. We are indeed proud of the tradition of excellence in education which is so well represented here. All of us who are working for better educational opportunity in Massachusetts can draw inspiration from the story of the birth and growth of Boston College. From humble beginnings in the South End of Boston, you have matured into the magnificent institution of learning which stands before us today.

Sitting among you now, there must be some who were present at the laying of the cornerstone of B.C. at this site on June 15, 1913. One among them was the mayor of the city of Boston, John F. Fitzgerald. Now, 50 years later, on an equally proud occasion in the history of Boston College, how fitting it is that we are honored by the presence of that man's grandson, the President of the United States of America, John F. Kennedy.

Certainly our Commonwealth would be something less than what it is today were it not for the men and women of Boston College. Her contribution has been vast and varied. Doctors, alumni of Boston College, have exercised their merciful calling throughout the Commonwealth. In our classrooms, sons and daughters of Boston College have been astonishingly active.

The clergy who minister to the Catholic archdiocese of Boston have been predominantly men of Boston College. B.C. has given to the church such eminent men of God as William Cardinal O'Connell and our beloved friend and spiritual leader, Richard Cardinal Cushing.

In the courts of our Commonwealth, countless lawyers, men of Boston College, have pleaded and fought for justice. Just recently I had the pleasure of appointing as a superior court judge one of your law school's most distinguished professors. I am delighted that this appointment has been greeted as one of the finest of this generation.

I cannot resist noting with partisan pride that the first site of Boston College Law School, 11 Beacon Street, today houses my political alma mater, the Massachusetts Democratic State Committee.

The law school forums, the Boston College citizen seminars, the lectures on public affairs have in an extraordinary way blended the dedicated efforts of the good citizens of our community.

Here at Boston College you have achieved an inspiring blend of faith and reason. You have exalted the mind and soul of man. Your proud past is exceeded only by your bright future.

I can think of no more fitting tribute than to quote from a letter sent in 1934 by William Lawrence, the Episcopal bishop of Boston, to your then president, Father Gallagher. Bishop Lawrence explained that the land on which Boston College now stands, was owned by his father. He wrote: "Boston College, with its beautiful group of buildings, has given a grace and benediction to my boyhood haunts."

For me, for all of us, the presence of Boston College is indeed a grace and benediction for which we are most grateful. From your modest beginnings, you truly have earned your name, you have reached "the heights." As Boston College begins its second century of life, let it take with it our best wishes and Godspeed.

Law Day Address by Hon. Hale Boggs, of Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GILLIS W. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress a recent speech given on Law Day, May 1, to students and alumni of the Georgetown University Law School by the majority whip of the House, the Honorable HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana. In this very fine speech, Congressman BOGGS points up incisively the vast differences between the philosophy of law of our American democratic system, and the philosophy of the Communist system; and I commend his address to my fellow members and include it in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY HON. HALE BOGGS, OF LOUISIANA, BEFORE THE GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY LAW SCHOOL, MAY 1, 1963

It is most fitting that the United States should celebrate a law day on May 1 in order to contrast American fundamental values with those of the Communist system.

The contrast is most vivid in the view of justice held in the two societies.

The American belief is that justice is ultimately based on the people themselves.

The Soviet belief, on the other hand, is that justice can be imposed on a people by the government.

It is this contrasting view of justice and law's relation to justice that I want to explore with you today.

Both the American and the Soviet systems of law aim at creating and maintaining order. Order means more than just a lack of violence, although a lack of violence is essential to both systems. What is central in the concept of order is the element of purpose. Order in a society is an arrangement for obtaining specified purposes or goals or ends. These ends can be the status quo in which case order implies stagnant self-satisfaction. The ends can also involve various degrees of change—from slight or incremental change at one end to violent revolution at the other.

It seems to me that it is this element of purpose which must be isolated in a comparison of the American and Soviet systems of law, order, and justice.

AMERICAN PURPOSE

What, then, is the central purpose in the American legal system? What kind of justice is the United States striving for?

The American view of its law and justice is, of course, based on the whole Western tradition—both its Graeco-Roman and its Judeo-Christian elements.

As Oliver Wendell Holmes put it: "The law is the witness and external deposit of our moral life. Its history is the history of the moral development of the race." I would also add that law is the external deposit of our political life.

Thus, the moral and political history of the Western World is also the history of the American view of law and justice.

The most important product of this long evolution is the conception of justice as based on the people. Lincoln epitomized this view: "Why should there not be a patient confidence in the ultimate justice of the people? Is there any better or equal hope in the world?"

This view of justice is seen throughout American legal history and practice. Several different elements of American justice reflect this concern with the justice of the people.

One element is the concern for justice in the sense of fair legal procedures. Most of the Founding Fathers were lawyers who had a great concern for such procedures. They had all had some direct experience with what it was like to be deprived of these guarantees. Their reverence for such fair play was, of course, expressed in capsule form in the Bill of Rights.

By these amendments the framers guaranteed that the Government they were creating could be kept within bounds by its citizens. The Government was not free to dispense justice as it saw fit but was limited by the definite standards which were established.

There were to be no unreasonable searches and seizures. A grand jury procedure was guaranteed. The Government could not try a person more than once for the same crime. The Government could not force a man to incriminate himself. Jury trial was guaranteed in all criminal cases and in most civil cases. These trials were to be public and the accused had to understand the charge against him and be aided by an attorney. Witnesses for both sides were to testify publicly. There were to be no cruel and unusual punishments. There would be no ex post facto laws.

An equal element in the American view of justice is the attempt to provide justice through legislation. The entire legislative process is based on the popular political will in the United States, thus assuring a popular base for such laws.

Most importantly, the entire constitutional system of restraints of the exercise of governmental power in the United States is based on the common concern of the American people. The constitutional order in this country exists to provide the arena for the attainment of both legal and political justice. This arena rests on a complex series of restraints of power, restraints which are effective and which are dependable. These restraints are based on a widely shared view of what government should do and what it should not do.

SOVIET PURPOSE

Now, what motion of justice is prevalent in the Soviet Union? What is the central purpose of its legal system?

Just as the American legal system and views of justice are descended from the whole Western tradition the Soviet legal system and view of justice are also descended from history. In this case, however, there are two traditions which must be mentioned: first, the specifically Russian tradition of law and of justice, much of which has been retained by the present Communist regime; and second, the Marxist view of law and justice.

Pre-1917 Russia used Western forms in its legal system but this law did not have truly Western contents—with its stress on rights of individuals, procedural safeguards, and the rule of law. The motion of stare decisis and the tremendous weight attached to precedent in the West were missing in czarist Russia, just as they are missing in the Soviet Union. The Western conception that law is a specialized extension of reason and that a rule of law must be a rule of reason was missing in Russia then as now.

Another pillar of Western law missing in Russia is our well known concept of equity.

What was unique about Russian czarist law from the Western viewpoint is that it allowed an alleged conception of justice to be developed by the rulers of the country and then imposed on the people of that country.

The Marxist view and practice of law has an interesting and varied history. But I think that its impact today in the Soviet Union is to reinforce the peculiarly non-Western elements of the Russian legal tradition.

Marx and Engels themselves viewed law as a superstructure, an unconscious reflection of economic relations in a society. Classical Marxism contented itself with exposing what it thought to be the ultimate sources of law: Law was another name for politics and justice was a euphemism for the predominance of the strongest class and its interests.

Until 1935 or 1936 in the Soviet Union there was a general attack on all law as a bourgeois product. Any kind of traditional law was under particularly strong attack in the early Stalin years, from 1928 to about 1936.

But, beginning roughly with the Constitution of 1936, the stress in the Soviet Union began to change. The new elements which were sought were stability, orthodoxy, and legality as means of consolidating the strength of the Stalinist regime. Law returned and was declared to be in accord with Communist purposes. Since that time law in the Soviet Union has developed particularly as another teaching device controlled by the regime. In short, law and legality are stressed specifically as entities to be used by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in its rule of its subjects in their own supposed best interests. Justice does not emerge from the people but is imposed upon them.

Thus when Soviet law is shown to be primarily another tool in the hands of the regime, and when Soviet justice is understood as being essentially what the leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union proclaim to be just, then the nature of the Soviet totalitarian state is clear. If the law is the shaper of persons and is not shaped by them, a totalitarian result is inevitable.

CONFRONTATION

These conflicting views of law held in the United States and the Soviet Union have a real impact on the world order and on the prospects for world peace. The understanding of law and the purpose of law in the two countries is radically different.

Because of this, one of the major difficulties in dealing with the Soviets is the lack of communication between the two sides. I am suggesting that one crucial element preventing better communication is the difference in views of law. This lack of communication is one root of the struggle which daily threatens world peace and it is at the same time a complicating factor in any attempt to improve relations between the two nations.

Treaties are also a form of law. Americans believe that treaties made in the name of the United States must ultimately reflect the values of the U.S. citizenry and therefore must be respected and kept.

The negotiators of the Soviet Union, on the contrary, see no particular relation between what goes into a treaty and law which must be obeyed. Treaties, like all Soviet laws, are to be manipulated by the rulers of the party and state for the ends decreed by the party and state. This helps explain why the Soviet Union's record of keeping its word as given in treaties is so dismal.

SUMMARY

In summary, the worth of a given philosophy of law is best measured by the kind of society that it produces.

Throughout the centuries men everywhere have yearned for what Franklin D. Roosevelt called the four freedoms:

Freedom of speech and expression.
Freedom of worship.
Freedom from fear.
Freedom from want.

We will all agree that our American society had come near to the ideal in providing freedom of speech and expression, freedom of worship, and freedom from fear. We have not reached perfection, for here and there we still have blotches upon these freedoms, but the common conscience of our land impels us constantly to strive to eliminate entirely such infringements on these freedoms as still remain.

We can also agree that in the Soviet society, these three freedoms are almost nonexistent.

Now let's look at freedom from want. The U.S.S.R. and the United States have populations roughly comparable. They have natural resources of like magnitude. Both nations have made enormous industrial strides in this century. Both countries maintain comparable military forces.

There the comparability stops.

Under our concept of law—our framework of a free society—we have produced the highest standard of living for our people that the world has ever seen. No people before us ever had such a bounty of food and fiber, industrial products, and labor-saving devices. To be sure, we still have too much poverty, too much unemployment, too many poorly educated people, but the average American enjoys freedom from want plus many luxuries.

Now what of the society which has resulted from the Soviet concept of law?

We cannot deny that Russia has made material progress in this century, but her society is beset with illnesses which become more aggravated with the passage of time. In a crash program such as building missiles, the Soviets do very well, but in the day-to-day effort to provide freedom from want, her society is lagging.

A recent report of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe reveals that both production and investment are slowing down everywhere in the Soviet world. Labor discipline is weakening. Inferior goods are piling up. Unhappy farmworkers are crowding into cities. Industry is beset with shortages of raw materials and manpower.

Agricultural production has lagged badly for decades in spite of the most forceful efforts on the part of the Soviet leaders.

In industry, the Soviet system simply fails to provide the incentive necessary for good workmanship. Those of us who have traveled behind the Iron Curtain are uniformly impressed by the shoddy workmanship which we witnessed on every hand. In 1961, for example, 60 percent of all television sets manufactured failed to operate for the guarantee period of 6 months—this is an official government report.

Some tractor operators made the statement that they "spend more time under the tractor repairing it than behind the steering wheel." This lack of quality—this tendency toward careless workmanship—which is so widespread in the Soviet society is not the result of incompetent workers; it is the result of a social system—a philosophy of law, if you please—which does not give the individual the incentive to do his best. As a result, the Soviet world is far from its goal of freedom from want.

To sum it up, we in America have approached the four freedoms because of the philosophy of law upon which our society is grounded. Conversely, the Soviets have not because their philosophy of law cannot—and does not—call forth the best efforts of their citizens.

What I have been trying to say was better said by that eminent lawyer and jurist, the late Learned Hand: "Two conditions are essential to the realization of justice according to law. The law must have an authority supreme over the will of the individual, and such an authority can arise only from a background of social acquiescence, which gives it the voice of indefinitely greater numbers than those of its expositors."

On this Law Day we should be thankful that we have what Jefferson called "A government of laws addressed to the reason of the people and not to their weaknesses." A Law Day celebrating law of any other kind would be an unhappy event. A Law Day celebrating what we do have is a valuable reminder of the ultimate strength of the American system.

One Hundred Thousand People Hear Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson's Tribute to the Polish Constitution, Delivered in Chicago May 5, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, May 5, the people of Chicago had the great privilege of hearing Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson join in a tribute to the Polish Constitution of 1791.

Vice President Johnson was the principal speaker in an impressive ceremony sponsored by the Polish National Alliance in Humboldt Park to mark the 172d anniversary of the Polish Constitution.

An estimated crowd of 100,000 people heard Vice President Johnson introduced by Mr. Charles Rozmarek, president of the Polish National Alliance, as the "greatest Vice President the United States has ever had."

The huge throng repeatedly interrupted Vice President Johnson's remarks with enthusiastic applause. The Vice President's firm reaffirmation of President Kennedy's principle that "while Poland may be a satellite government, the Poles are not a satellite people," brought a thundering ovation.

Mr. Speaker, the Vice President's speech follows:

The Battle for Freedom

(Remarks by Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson, before the Polish National Alliance, Polish Constitution Day observance, Chicago, Ill., May 5, 1963)

On the 3d of May, in the year 1791, the patriots of Poland adopted the Constitution of Poland which we meet to honor and commemorate today.

In the preamble of that Constitution, there were these heroic and historic words: "Free from the disgraceful shackles of foreign influence; prizing more than life, and every personal consideration, the political existence, external independence and internal liberty of the nation whose care is entrusted to us * * * we do solemnly establish the present Constitution."

No one who has read that Constitution, no one who knows the history of Poland, no one privileged to know the Polish people wherever they may live would doubt for one moment that if the "shackles of foreign influence" were removed today, that same flame of liberty would burn more brightly than ever in a free and independent Poland.

As President Kennedy has said, "Poland may be a satellite government, but the Poles are not a satellite people."

Barriers separate us temporarily from one another now. Those barriers must some day come down. But barriers cannot separate the American and Polish peoples from their common heritage as friends in freedom's cause. That common heritage is nowhere better expressed than in the common nature, common objectives, and even the common language of our two Constitutions. The Polish Constitution of 1791 brought to the continent of Europe an expression of those principles of justice and self-rule which the American Constitution of 1789 had brought to the continent of North America.

Both were revolutionary documents.

Both eliminated distinctions of class.

Both guaranteed freedom of speech and conscience.

As it is fundamental to our American system that all power derives from the people themselves, so the Polish Constitution of 1791 declares: "All power in civic society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation."

SIDE BY SIDE

It was because Americans and Poles thought alike that when Americans fought for their independence, heroes from Poland fought at their side. In 1772 a 29-year-old Polish officer decided to come to America during our Revolution because, as Pulaski himself said, "Wherever on the globe men are fighting for liberty, it is as if it were our own affair."

Along with Pulaski came the hero of two continents, Thaddeus Kosciuszko. This immortal hero was hailed by Thomas Jefferson as "the purest son of liberty I have ever known."

Kosciuszko—as Chief of Engineers—fortified some of the most vital points of American defense, led America cavalry through the Carolinas, and played a major role of command in driving the Red Coats from Charleston. Pulaski stood with Washington through the winter of Valley Forge and gave his life for the freedom of America on the ramparts at Savannah.

Today, throughout America, there are monuments and memorials to these great Polish heroes. Statues of both stand in our Nation's Capital. Streets and squares and counties are named for them all across the United States. Ten States have cities named in honor of Pulaski. At West Point—as well as here in this park—there is a statue honoring Kosciuszko.

By such monuments, America honors not these two men alone. America honors all those brave young men—bearing proud Polish names—who have given their lives in battle under the flag of the United States so that freedom shall not perish from this earth.

But to honor them and to honor our heritage requires more than statues of stone. As the words of the national anthem of Poland expressed it more than a century ago:

> "Long as Poles remain,
> Chains the foe bound on her, never
> Shall the foe retain."

A DETERMINED PEOPLE

The objective of the United States is—and shall continue to be—to see freedom returned to Poland and the other nations of Eastern Europe.

We know the years of darkness have not extinguished the light of freedom in Poland. And the masters of the darkness know that, too.

Today, the world watches with keen interest the divisions appearing within the Communist bloc between the Communist rulers of Russia and the Communist rulers of China. This is important. The significance is very great. But we must not—and we shall not—forget that 7 years ago the unvanquished spirit of the Polish people forced Moscow to grant to Poland a new measure of national autonomy.

Poland is a much smaller country than China. There is no comparison in size of population or potential strength. Yet the Polish people—by the sheer strength of their unconquered will—succeeded in forcing the first major change of historical Soviet policy toward the captive nations.

The United States did not ignore the significance of that development. We supported and encouraged the greater autonomy for Poland by increasing our agricultural aid, expanding trade, and instituting programs of exchange in every major field of human endeavor.

Since 1956 well over 1,000 Poles have come to the United States under scientific and cultural exchange programs. More than 400 Polish students are enrolled in our universities now. We have welcomed many Polish groups—from jazz musicians to the Warsaw Philharmonic and the Poznan Choir, from athletic trainees to outstanding scholars.

In turn, many Americans have gone to Poland—some to lecture on cancer research, some to present artificial heart-lung machines to the Polish people, others to teach and train. It is very significant that the single most successful mission last year was the visit of an American professor helping set up courses for teaching English—a language the Polish people are most anxious to learn.

For the most part, these programs are not Government programs, but are being sponsored privately by our own citizens, foundations, and universities. Americans of Polish ancestry voluntarily send more than $10 million of food to relatives and friends in Poland each year. I believe you will agree it would be good if more Americans were going to Poland under these exchange programs. I believe you would also agree it would be good if Poles in Poland could receive as much literature in their language from the United States, including the Polish language newspapers published in American, as Polish families in this country are receiving unsolicited from Poland.

These efforts—private and public—are valuable because these exchanges serve to keep the Iron Curtain parted and open to let inside the truth about America and the West.

CHANNELS KEPT OPEN

We believe the channels between our peoples must be kept open.

We believe that people punished enough by their Communist captors should not be—and must not be—punished still more by freemen merely because they are involuntary victims of communism's tyranny.

Fight communism, yes—and fight all its works. But in this land of the brave and free, it is not bravery to strike back at those already struck down by communism by engaging in hit-and-run raids among the shelves of supermarkets against the goods produced by the Polish people.

Our policy has been expressed by President Kennedy in these words:

"Our task is to encourage and pursue a policy of patiently encouraging freedom and carefully pressuring tyranny."

We are not pressuring tyranny either by boycotting Polish-made goods or by imposing discriminatory tariffs—tariffs which only discriminate against the people of Poland and increase the pressure upon them to follow the puppet leaders, who would have them turn eastward rather than westward for the future.

Your administration opposed enactment of the discriminatory tariff amendment in the Congress, and your administration today advocates repeal of that amendment.

Out of our nearly $40 billion of imports annually from all countries, the total imports from Poland have amounted to only three-tenths of 1 percent. Those canned hams, fox furs, feathers, and Christmas-tree ornaments are not going to taint the freedom of America. But by maintaining the channels of trade to the West we can keep communism from completing its contamination of Poland and the lives of the Polish people.

The ties between our people are old and honorable. We must work to strengthen those ties—not to sever them. Isolation and reprisal should not be the reward for those whose courage and resistance and independence were the first to force the Communist slavemasters to relax their hold.

In 1772—4 years before our own colonies declared their independence—Poland was divided among Austria, Prussia, and Russia. Almost immediately, efforts began to unite all Polish people to stand against Poland's foes. Demands for great sacrifice were made—sacrifice of titles, positions, vested interests, ancient traditions. For nearly 20 years, that effort went on. The determination to win freedom never died.

In 1791—two full decades after the first partition of Poland—the Constitution of Poland was brought forth. A major revolution was accomplished peacefully—without bloodshed or disorder. The people of Poland brought into being a constitutional government closely paralleling that which had been established and was in operation on these shores. In the next year, Poland was invaded once more, by Russia. Kosciuszko returned home from the United States to organize the uprising against the enemy invaders. History tells that the most brutal means were used to crush the resistance of the Polish people and to accomplish the final tragic partitioning of Poland.

But where great and brave leaders had fallen, others rose up, and the determined fight for Polish independence went on. Poland won its freedom again, until the armies of Russia and Prussia invaded two decades ago.

We of the United States can never afford to forget this. Poland has known invaders and conquerors before. But the Polish people have never accepted any foreign yoke. The people of Poland could give lessons to some of their misguided critics about what it means to resist and stand up to tyranny.

We must keep the channels open.

We must preserve in our policy—and in our national attitude—a vital flexibility of maneuver and the inherent honor of an old ally so that the people of Poland may always know that we of the United States are with them and working always for the day when they can be free and independent once more.

H.R. 2332 Urged on Erroneous Pretext That It Helps Low Income Veterans and Widows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, recently the Legislature of the State of New Mexico adopted Senate Joint Memorial 11 urging the Congress of the United States to enact H.R. 2332, a pension bill advocated by one of the veterans' organizations.

The joint memorial apparently was based on the erroneous concept that H.R. 2332 is designed to benefit low income veterans and widows. This is not true. There follows a copy of a letter which I have written to the President of the Senate of the New Mexico Legislature regarding Senate Joint Memorial 11:

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C., April 9, 1963.

Hon. MACK EASLEY,
President, Senate,
State of New Mexico,
Santa Fe, N. Mex.

DEAR MR. EASLEY: This acknowledges receipt of Senate Joint Memorial 11, "a joint memorial to the Congress of the United States on behalf of the veterans of World War I."

This memorial referred to H.R. 2332, pending before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs and urged consideration of the measure as follows:

"Whereas the Veterans of World War I in New Mexico consider that passage of H.R. 2332 by the Congress will favorably benefit the low-income veterans of World War I and their widows: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico*, That the Congress of the United States be respectfully urged to give all due consideration to the passage of H.R. 2332."

It is noted that passage of H.R. 2332 is urged on the pretext that "it will favorably benefit the low-income veterans of World War I and their widows." This is incorrect. H.R. 2332 is a bill designed primarily to pay substantially increased non-service-connected benefits to World War I veterans and widows in the higher income brackets and provides relatively little benefit to low income veterans and widows.

Veterans' Administration has estimated that the additional first year cost of H.R. 2332 would be $1,266,247,000. The cumulative 5-year additional cost is $6,048,136,000, with a total cumulative additional cost to the year 2000 of $19,574,821,000. It should be emphasized that these costs are in addition to the $1.8 billion being spent on non-service-connected pensions this year, a figure which will rise in the future.

There are now approximately 1,862,965 World War I veterans and widows receiving a non-service-connected pension. These individuals qualify for a pension because they have met certain requirements in regard to disability, unemployability, and have met the established income limits of the law. These limits are $3,000 for the veteran with dependents and $1,800 for the single veteran or widow. Enactment of H.R. 2332 does very little for this low income group most in need of help. This becomes apparent through an examination of the cost estimates of the bill. Of the $1,266,247,000 proposed to be spent for increased pensions the first year of enactment, only $453,818,000 would go to increase pensions for the 1,862,965 low income veterans and widows now on the rolls. Eight hundred and twelve million, four hundred and twenty-nine thousand dollars would go to add 713,100 new cases from the upper income groups to the rolls. In other words, 27 percent of the veterans and widows from the upper income groups would receive 67 percent of the benefits.

The inequitable treatment, which would result from the enactment of H.R. 2332, can be demonstrated by examining specific cases. Under existing law, a veteran with two dependents now receives $95 per month if he is in the lowest income bracket—0 to $1,000. If H.R. 2332 were enacted, he would receive an increase of only $5 per month. On the other hand, a veteran with substantial income well above the national average for his age group, who cannot now qualify for a non-service-connected pension, would receive a tax free pension of $100 per month in addition to this other income.

Under H.R. 2332, individuals could have a combined income of up to at least $6,000 per year, including a tax free pension of $100 per month. Yet according to data from the Bureau of the Census, the medium income for all families headed by a 65-year-old individual is only $2,897 per year. Half the male population of this country has an income of only $4,081 or less per year. This serves to show that the income limits set by H.R. 2332 are totally unrealistic and are calculated to add veterans and widows fortunate enough to be in the upper income brackets, thus resulting in substantial expenditures for that group and very little for the very low income group who are now receiving a pension in ranges varying from $85 to $100 per month, depending on dependency status. The gross inequity of H.R. 2332 is further demonstrated by the fact that it would require the payment of pension to certain veterans from the upper income groups based on 90 days service and unrealistic income limits, and require 23 million taxpayers to contribute to a tax-free pension for veterans with incomes higher than their own.

H.R. 2332 would eliminate the present requirement of law that the spouse's income be considered in computing the veteran's income level. This would open the way to return to the practice of veterans shifting income producing assets to their wife in order to qualify for a pension when little need actually existed. H.R. 2332 would not require the counting of the estate of the veteran or widow in determining eligibility for a pension as is now required by law. This would result in the payment of pensions, presumably based on need, to thousands of veterans and widows who have substantial holdings in the form of real estate and other income-producing assets and who are well able to care for themselves.

It should be noted that practically all of the representations made through individual letters and made by spokesmen for the groups advocating passage of this legislation are similar to the representation being advanced by Senate Joint Memorial 11. These are based on the erroneous contention that H.R. 2332 is intended to help the needy low income veteran and widow when, in fact, this is not true.

The Congress of the United States has shown great sympathy and consideration for the needs of low-income veterans and widows as demonstrated by the present program, which allows payments of a pension to elderly veterans or widows whose income falls in the bottom 50 percent of the income pattern for the elderly age group. On the other hand, the Congress has not been disposed to providing tax-free pensions to veterans and widows in the upper income brackets, thus guaranteeing those individuals annual incomes far in excess of the national average for their age group, while at the same time paying the 100-percent disabled veteran only $250 per month. Action of the type advocated by Senate Joint Memorial 11 would result in hundreds of thousands of non-service-connected pensioners, with short periods of service and substantial resources of their own, being accorded better treatment than most seriously disabled veterans who received service-connected disabilities during a war.

Sincerely yours,

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman.

Chicago-Kent College of Law Observes Its 75th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on May 8 the Chicago-Kent College of Law will celebrate its 75th anniversary with a dinner in Chicago honoring its present dean, William F. Zacharias. Supreme Court Justice Arthur J. Goldberg will be the speaker.

All of the people in Chicago, as well as scholars throughout our Nation, join in wishing this institution continued success. I am sure that in its 75 years of existence, it has helped develop legal talent which has made a lasting impression upon every single one of our Nation's endeavors. Today, Chicago-Kent College of Law stands out as one of the great legal institutions of our Nation.

It was my good fortune to start my legal training at the Chicago-Kent College of Law. I can personally testify to the high standards this fine institution has developed—standards which have brought it nationwide and international recognition.

I am sure my colleagues will join me in wishing the best of success to those responsible for arranging this 75th anniversary observance and the tribute being paid to Dean Zacharias.

Second oldest college of law in Illinois, Chicago-Kent has trained lawyers who have become judges in every Illinois court and most Federal courts.

The dinner, arranged by the Chicago-Kent Alumni Association, will see a convocation of some of the most distinguished legal talents in the country as well as a representation of industrial, civic, and cultural leadership. Louis L. Spear, Chicago-Kent 1938, vice president of the Newspaper Division of Field Enterprises, and Roy H. Olson, senior partner of Olson, Trexler, Wolters & Bushnell, will serve as cochairmen.

Chicago-Kent has always been known as a school for ambitious young men and women who had to support themselves while preparing legal careers. It was founded, in fact, at the behest of law clerks who "read law" in a lawyer's office and did not consider this method sufficiently professional to assure them of the background they would need.

The young clerks met in the chambers of Illinois Supreme Court Justice Joseph M. Bailey and Appellate Court Justice Thomas A. Moran to ask formal instruction, and after a brief period of "classes" in the judges' chambers the college was established in 1888. Judge Bailey became the first dean.

A nonsectarian, co-ed professional school in the heart of the city, it has served the commuting student, the employed student, the talented student of limited means. Over the years the college has helped launch many such students into great careers. It also continues to help the employed student reach his goal.

Chicago-Kent College of Law alumni include such noted figures as Judge Elmer Schnackenberg, Court of Appeals, Seventh Circuit; Judge Henry L. Burman, Illinois Appellate Court; Judge Abraham L. Marovitz, Superior Court of Cook; Judge Walter J. Kowalski, Municipal Court of Chicago; William J. Scott, Illinois State Treasurer; Helen W. Munsert, Examiner, Illinois Commerce Commission; E. Douglas Schwantes, former president of Chicago Bar Association; Paul W. Goodrich, president of Chicago Title and Trust; and many others. The late Judge Julius H. Miner, U.S. District Court, was also a graduate.

The goal of the college, according to Dean Zacharias, is to provide sound training in legal principles at lowest possible cost.

Over 92 percent of the students entering Chicago-Kent have already achieved their undergraduate degree at an undergraduate school in Illinois or out of State. Completing their education they either must attend the college for 4 years in the evening, or for 3 years in day session to earn a law degree. Day students, who comprise 40 percent of the student body, are permitted to accept only limited employment.

Situated in the heart of the city near all court facilities, the college enjoys the cooperation of the Chicago courts in its teaching program. Senior students try hypothetical cases before circuit court judges.

Most Chicago-Kent alumni practice in Illinois. They enter the college, however, from undergraduate institutions throughout the Nation and an appreciable number of Chicago-Kent graduates practice in other States. Chicago-Kent has alumni branches in most States.

Chicago-Kent College of Law has been fortunate indeed to have such an outstanding educator as Dean Zacharias head the college.

Dean Zacharias has been associated with the college since he entered it as a student in 1931 to complete his legal education.

Coming from the University of Chicago Law School, where he had earned the degree of Ph. B. he turned to Kent where the flexible program permitted him to conduct his business while he studied law. He earned the degree of LL.B. in 1933 and was admitted to practice in the State of Illinois that same year. Private practice, largely in real estate and real estate mortgage field, followed, along with graduate work at Chicago-Kent under a scholarship.

In 1934 he was awarded the LL.M. degree by Chicago-Kent. He received his J.S.D. in 1949.

Appointed to the faculty by the late Dean Webster H. Burke, while a graduate student, Dean Zacharias found that his growing interest in teaching and writing began to shape his career.

He has held the following posts at Chicago-Kent: 1934, assistant professor of law; 1935, professor of law; 1942–55, chairman of the editorial board of the Chicago-Kent Law Review; 1948–56, secretary of the faculty; 1951–56, assistant dean; 1956–59, acting dean.

In 1959, a quarter century of distinguished teaching and research was climaxed by action of the Chicago-Kent College of Law board of trustees which named Mr. Zacharias dean of the college.

During the years since he has been dean, Chicago-Kent College of Law has carried out a major rebuilding program.

The enrollment of the college has nearly doubled within the past 2 years.

William F. Zacharias was born in London, England, in 1905, fifth in a family of seven sons. When, at the age of 14, he set out to find his first job in London, he found a clerkship with the London solicitors firm of Pyke, Franklin & Gould, Lincoln's Inn Fields.

In 1920 Mr. Zacharias and his family moved to Chicago. His first employer in the new country, Mr. Henry Utpatel, a 1900 Chicago-Kent graduate, was master in chancery for the circuit court of Cook County and tried to interest him in a career in law.

Working full time for Mr. Utpatel, Mr. Zacharias attended the evening sessions of Central YMCA High School and compressed 4 years of work into 1½ years. He helped found that school's first newspaper and served as its editor.

He was the first graduate of the Central YMCA High School to win a competitive scholarship to the University of Chicago. Working in an insurance and real estate business and studying over the next 3 years he achieved A grades in all of his 27 courses. At the end of his junior year he was elected to membership in Phi Beta Kappa and became president of his local chapter.

His education in law was formally launched the following year when he entered the University of Chicago Law School where he earned his Ph. B. in 1931.

The author of numerous articles on important legal subjects, Dean Zacharias is a member of the American Bar Association, the Illinois State Bar Association and the Chicago Bar Association. He is also affiliated with the American Law Institute, the American Judicature Society, the American Legal History Association, the American Foreign Law Association, and the American Association of University Professors.

He has served many professional societies in special capacity. For example, he has been a member of the Committee of 1,000 of the American Bar Association working to increase its membership; a member of the council of the section of legal education of the Illinois State Bar Association; a member of the executive committee of that organization's affiliate, the Institute on Continuing Legal Education; second chairman of the committee on development of law of the Chicago Bar Association.

Dean Zacharias is a member of Sigma Chi and a trustee of Chicago Barrister Inn of Phi Delta Phi, his own legal fraternity.

Dean Zacharias and his wife, Lenore, have one daughter, Diane, who is Mrs. James Manzelmann and the mother of their seven grandchildren.

Among the distinguished alumni of the Chicago-Kent College of Law are:

Catherine D. Agar, partner, McDermott, Will & Emery.

Bertha Bauer, former Republican national committeewoman of Illinois.

Judge Henry L. Burman, Illinois Appellate Court.

The Reverend Archbald Carey.

Cyrus J. Colter, member of Illinois Commerce Commission.

Judge Thomas J. Courtney, circuit court of Cook.

Peter Fitzpatrick, vice president, Illinois State Bar Association.

Clair W. Furlong, vice president, Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co.

Paul W. Goodrich, president, Chicago Title & Trust.

Clarence K. Graves, president of Lutheran Bar Association.

Sue Brown Hasselle, founder, Kappa Beta Pi, International Legal Sorority.

Judge Harry G. Hershenson, superior court of Cook.

Carlton Hill, senior partner, Hill, Sherman, Meroni, Gross & Simpson.

Axel A. Hofgren, past president of Patent Law Association of Chicago.

Judge Elmer N. Holmgren, superior court of Cook.

Reginald J. Holzer, president of Decalogue Society of Lawyers.

David O. Jacker, past president, Covenent Club.

Weymouth Kirkland, senior partner, Kirkland, Ellis, Hodson, Chaffetz & Masters.

Marshall Korshak, trustee of Sanitary District of Metropolitan Chicago, and former Illinois State senator.

Judge Walter J. Kowalski, municipal court of Chicago.

John E. MacLeish, senior partner, MacLeish, Spray, Price & Underwood.

Judge Abraham L. Marovitz, superior court of Cook.

George W. McGurn, Illinois State Toll Highway Commission executive secretary.

Judge Donald S. McKinlay, superior court of Cook.

Foorman L. Mueller, past president, American Patent Law Association.

Helen W. Munsert, examiner, Illinois Commerce Commission.

Sidney Neuman, past president of the Seventh Circuit Bar Association.

Richard B. Ogilvie, sheriff of Cook County.

James L. O'Keefe, public administrator of Cook County.

Arthur A. Olson, senior partner, Olson, Mecklenburger, Von Holst, Pendleton & Neuman.

Roy H. Olson, senior partner, Olson, Trexler, Wolters & Bushnell.

Abe R. Peterson, senior partner, Peterson, Lowry, Rall, Barber & Ross.

Theodore G. Remer, attorney with Union Carbide Corp.

Judge Daniel A. Roberts, Circuit Court of Cook County.

Judge Daniel J. Ryan, Municipal Court of Chicago.

Judge Elmer Schnackenberg, Court of Appeals, Seventh Circuit.

E. Douglas Schwantes, former president of Chicago Bar Association.

William J. Scott, Illinois State treasurer.

Louis Spear, vice president, Newspaper Division, Field Enterprises.

Lawrence J. West, senior partner, West & Egan.

Austin L. Wyman, Illinois State Toll Highway Commissioner.

William F. Zacharias, dean of Chicago-Kent College of Law.

Lowell Thomas, former Chicago-Kent instructor, internationally recognized broadcaster and world lecturer.

The late Judge Julius H. Miner, U.S. District Court.

The late Holman D. Pettibone, chairman of the board, Chicago Title & Trust Co.

Governor Henry Horner was a member of the Chicago-Kent College of Law faculty.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 7, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Isaiah 40: 1: *Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God.*

O Thou Father of all mercies and God of all comfort, in these times, which try men's souls, we know that there are vast multitudes whose daily human march is a requiem and that the sounds which go out to the very ends of the earth are the cries of sorrow and suffering.

We earnestly beseech Thee that our capacities of understanding and sympathy may be enlarged and expanded as we look about upon confused and baffled humanity with all its tragedy and agony.

Inspire us to be more eager to share our blessings with the needy and to impart unto them that abundant measure of heroic and triumphant faith which will support and sustain them in their trials and tribulations.

Hear us in our Saviour's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PUBLIC WORKS SUBCOMMITTEE ON SPECIAL HIGHWAY INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Public Works Subcommittee on Special Highway Investigations have permission to sit today and the rest of the week during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

EXPRESSION OF APPRECIATION FOR BIRTHDAY CONGRATULATIONS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful indeed to the Members for the tribute they paid to me on yesterday, my 75th anniversary. I want to say that although I am chronologically 75 I am still young. I feel that I may have an old head but I have a young heart.

Somebody said that one is as young as his faith, as old as his doubts, as young as his self-confidence, as old as his fears, as young as his hopes, as old as his despair.

Well, I have faith in the future, I have confidence in myself, I have hopes for the fulfillment of many aspirations, I have no doubt, I have no fears, I have no despair. I am still young.

Furthermore I wish to make an announcement. I wish to advise the House that the Committee on the Judiciary will initiate hearings tomorrow, May 8, on all legislative proposals before it relating to civil rights.

These hearings will be continued on the following dates: May 9, 15, 16, 23, 24, 28, and 29.

I make this announcement in order that any Member who may wish to testify or who may have a witness who wishes to testify should notify the Committee on the Judiciary as soon as possible in order that the proper schedule may be completed for the convenience of all concerned.

PER JACOBSSON WAS A GREAT PUBLIC SERVANT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. **PATMAN**. Mr. Speaker, Per Jacobsson's death on Sunday is a great loss to the whole free world.

He was an economic and monetary conservative, of course, but a constructive conservative. He believed that manmade institutions and customs could be improved, and he was willing to make improvements.

Being the head of an international agency—the International Monetary Fund—he was not, of course, accountable to any of the member countries of the Fund. Such an arrangement could have led to secrecy, or incomplete public reporting of the policies of the agency, but it did not. It is true that Per Jacobsson felt it inappropriate to come before the committees of the legislative bodies of the member countries of the International Monetary Fund. Yet he always made himself available to any interested officials for informal discussions, not only of his policies but his current views and recommendations on monetary matters. In addition, he made his policies and views freely available to the general public through the press, through frequent speeches, and even through cross-examination, as on the "Meet the Press" television program.

Per Jacobsson long enjoyed a reputation for exceptionally accurate economic analyses and forecasts. This could have led to arrogance, but it did not. It could have led to a tendency to retire on one's laurels and to avoid the risk of spoiling that reputation by offering new judgments on current economic trends, but it did not. Per Jacobsson was always a diplomat. He put forward his views and analyses persuasively but with deference and humility. Throughout the mature years of his life, from the days of the old League of Nations, he devoted himself to being an international public servant. He was a very great one and the whole free world owes him a debt of gratitude.

AMENDMENT TO ANTIDUMPING ACT OF 1921

Mr. **McMILLAN**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. **McMILLAN**. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a proposed amendment to the Antidumping Act of 1921. A number of my colleagues had already introduced similar legislation, and I hope that we can persuade the Ways and Means Committee to take immediate action on this proposed legislation.

We all realize that it is unnecessary to have the Antidumping Act as it was when Congress passed the original Antidumping Act.

However, we all are of the opinion that this act should be amended during the present session of Congress. I am certain that during the hearings on this proposed legislation facts may be presented to the Ways and Means Committee fully explaining why this act should be amended.

SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Mr. **ROOSEVELT**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 4 of the Select Committee on Small Business be permitted to sit during general debate on the afternoons of May 8 and 9, Wednesday and Thursday, of this week.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

THE PORTSMOUTH NAVAL SHIPYARD

Mr. **WYMAN**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. **WYMAN**. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the people of this country and the Government officials of this country, including the Navy Department, hold off on attaching any blame to the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard for the tragic loss of the *Thresher*.

The Portsmouth Naval Shipyard is a first-class, high quality naval shipyard whose personnel are devoted to the country's best interests and whose products over the years have proven themselves in performance for the United States, time and time again. Just the other day at this great shipyard the SSN 605, *Jack*, was launched, another attack submarine of the same type as the *Thresher*. This was the 130th submarine from this great shipyard.

There is no evidence that Portsmouth Naval Shipyard was in any way responsible for the loss of the *Thresher*. Rumors, speculation, individual sour grapes, and outright slander by headline seekers are contributing to give the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, its officers, and its workers an undeserved and unwarranted public black eye. Because the loss was so awful it sometimes seems that since there must be a scapegoat, people would make it this fine shipyard.

Let us quit blaming Portsmouth for this loss. It is entirely probable that the loss had nothing whatever to do with the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard or with any structural failure within the submarine itself. It is entirely possible that the loss was deliberately brought about. We do not know. We will not know until we find and examine the *Thresher*, and we may not even know then since it apparently cannot be raised at the depth involved.

In the meantime, there are a few questions that ought to be asked—questions that are crucial. What are some of these questions?

First. Why was the *Thresher* radio contact with the surface vessel cut off so abruptly without warning from the submarine that anything major was wrong?

Second. If the deep-dive test was so hazardous, why was there only one U.S. surface vessel in the vicinity?

Third. If there were other unidentified vessels in the vicinity, what were they doing there and did they have anything to do with the *Thresher* loss or did they have anything to do with the situation?

Fourth. Why was the *Thresher* test diving in over 8,000 feet of water where if anything went wrong it would be almost impossible to salvage the vessel?

Fifth. What of the remainder of our attack submarine program? Have we sufficiently proven the Polaris?

Sixth. Taking missiles out of Turkey, relying less and less on land installation—are we safe in relying so heavily on Polaris in putting so many of our defense deterrent eggs in one basket?

Mr. Speaker, let us stop blaming Portsmouth until we know the facts of life in this awful incident. Portsmouth is a good navy yard with a fine record of public service. It is important to the Navy Department. It will continue its fine work for the good of the Nation. There is no basis whatsoever for any lack of public confidence in the performance, personnel, or the accomplishments of Portsmouth Naval Shipyard.

COL. CHARLES ELWOOD "CHUCK" YEAGER

Mr. **BARRY**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House at this point and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. **BARRY**. Mr. Speaker, this is "Chuck" Yeager Day at the Capitol. In the Capitol, as I address you now, we have one of the outstanding heroes of the hour. He is Col. Charles Elwood Yeager, chief of the U.S. Air Force Aerospace Research Pilot School, Edwards Air Force Base, Calif.

"Chuck" Yeager is one of the Nation's greatest combat veterans, astronauts and master of the action and the science of space flight.

"Chuck" first achieved fame as a combat fighter in World War II, having flown 64 missions and having destroyed 12 enemy aircraft. On his eighth mission over enemy-occupied France, he was shot down. Within 4 months he made his way back to American lines and was again in the thick of action.

Having distinguished himself as one of America's greatest combat fliers in World War II, "Chuck" returned to the States where he married Glennis Faye Dickhouse. He held a temporary assignment as basic flying instructor, and then was back in action again, participating in test projects on the P-80 Shooting Star and P-84 Thunderjet.

Thereafter, "Chuck" achieved the most notable of his peacetime feats—when on October 14, 1947, as the project pilot on the XS-1 he flew past the sound barrier becoming the world's first supersonic pilot.

Subsequently, "Chuck" flew the X-1 more than 40 flights, exceeded 1,000 miles per hour and 70,000 feet. He was the first American to take a rocket powered aircraft off from the ground. In

December 1953 he flew the Bell X–1A 1,650 miles per hour or 2½ times the speed of sound.

Having completed 9 years and 3 months of flight test work, "Chuck" was assigned to Europe as a fighter squadron commander where, in 1956, he took first place honors in the fighter weapons gunnery meet.

Upon his return to the States, "Chuck" commanded an F–100 Super Sabre squadron for 3 years during which time he and his squadron participated in TAC strike force exercises, and crossed the Atlantic nonstop two times using inflight refueling.

From 1959 to the present "Chuck" flew a Lockheed Lodestar to the Federal Aeronautique International Conference in Moscow; attended the War College, Maxwell AFB, Ala.; and returned to the Air Force Flight Test Center, Edwards AFB, where in July 1962 he was assigned as commandant, U.S. Air Force Aerospace Research Pilot School.

Mr. Speaker, following a few addresses by other Members on the floor today, it will be possible for all Members to meet Col. "Chuck" Yeager in the Speaker's office. Accompanying him will be Miss Jacqueline Cochran and several generals from the Air Force.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRY. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from New York and to pay tribute and to salute one of the greatest Americans in our age and generation. I am certain that this great Nation feels a debt of gratitude to him, and I compliment the gentleman for bringing to the attention of the Congress and the country the heroism of this great American.

All of us who are actively interested in aviation recognize the leadership, the courage, the patriotism exhibited to the world by the feats of this great aviator. Colonel Yeager has not only advanced the cause of aviation in his own country; he has enlarged and enhanced the image of America before the entire world. Every American can point to him as living proof that Americans are equal to the challenges of the times.

During World War II, I was privileged to serve in the Air Force. At first we served in the Air Force as a part of the U.S. Army; later we had a separate Air Force. I can think of many wonderful men, living and dead, who would and do take pride in Colonel Yeager as an Air Force officer. He consistently exhibits the finest traits, and is true to the highest traditions, of the Air Force.

Today he is accompanied by the first lady of American aviation, Jacqueline Cochran. It is fitting that we pay tribute to them both. Also with him is his lovely wife, who, like the wives of all great men, share not only the limelights, but the burdens and publicity, of his high place in American estimation and appreciation. We pause to salute her bravery, knowing that she is a sustaining helpmate, an inspiring teammate.

I would hush the critics of our way of life, our free enterprise system by pointing with understandable pride to a civilization, a form of society that produces a man such as "Chuck" Yeager. As long as we have men like him—and surely others will follow in the paths of high example he has pioneered—we shall have a great, a free, a lasting Nation.

In the future I wish for him every success—and happy landings.

Mr. BARRY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to join in thanking the gentleman from New York for bringing to the floor the history of Colonel Yeager and the very distinguished lady who accompanies him, Miss Jacqueline Cochran. These are the people who have made a great contribution to flight, a great contribution to the space effort, and I think it fitting that we take notice of them here. I congratulate the gentleman for taking the initiative in this matter.

Mr. BARRY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRY. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for calling our attention to the outstanding accomplishments of a great American, Colonel Yeager. West Virginia, the Nation, and the free world are proud of Colonel Yeager. He was born in Lincoln County, W. Va., in my district, 1 day after Lincoln's Birthday, 1923. At the age of 24, as has been described, he was the first man to break the sound barrier by flying the Bell X–1 faster than the speed of sound. He went on to many, many more accomplishments in the development of aircraft and is now exerting outstanding leadership as head of the Aerospace Research Pilot School at Edwards Air Force Base, Calif.

Mr. Speaker, you really have to know Col. "Chuck" Yeager to appreciate the rare human qualities of this wonderful West Virginian. Of course I am proud that he was born and brought up in Lincoln County, W. Va., in my district. I am even prouder that he was the first man to break the sound barrier. But I am proudest of all when I reflect on "Chuck" Yeager's great qualities as a human being.

Last weekend, I had a long talk with one of the new Air Force astronaut trainees, Capt. Tom Bell, a new student at the Aerospace Research Pilot School at Edwards Air Force Base which Col. Charles E. Yeager commands. Naturally, I asked him about Colonel Yeager, and his face lit up like a Christmas tree. "There's a real man, who knows more about airplanes and how to fly them—and knows more about human beings, too," Captain Bell said.

The records show that Charles Elwood Yeager was born in the town of Myra, Lincoln County, W. Va. He was born in a big white farmhouse up Mud River a few miles from the county seat of Hamlin, the son of Mr. and Mrs. A. Hal Yeager. His father was a drilling contractor in Lincoln County.

"Chuck" was an easygoing boy at Hamlin High School—good at geometry, but just about average in most subjects. He could hardly wait until school was out to get down to Mud River with his fishing pole, or out to the woods with his .22 to do some hunting. From the commencement platform at Hamlin High School in 1941, "Chuck" rushed out to enlist in the Air Corps.

They trained young Yeager as an airplane mechanic, but by 1943 he had entered flight school and won his wings at Luke Field, Phoenix, Ariz. Then he went overseas to England as a flight officer. On his ninth mission over occupied France, his P–51 was shot down. He disguised himself as a Frenchman with a beret and made his way to the Spanish border, only to be arrested by the Spanish police. After he sawed his way out of jail, he lived off the country until a British contingent found him and shipped him back to England. He wanted to fly in combat again, but this was against regulations.

He was supposed to be sent home, for fear that if he were shot down again, the Nazis would torture him to learn something of the secrets of the underground. But he and a group of other pilots carried their appeals directly to General Eisenhower and received permission to fly again in combat.

September 12, 1944, on an escort mission over Bremen, Yeager shot down five ME–109's.

November 27, 1944, escorting bombers over Magdeburg, Germany, Yeager was 1 of 30 U.S. fighters that tangled with 150 Focke-Wulfs, Yeager shooting down 4 more German planes.

After the war, with 13 German planes to his credit, 64 missions, and a chestful of medals, he came home to Lincoln County on the Mud River.

What was it like to come home to West Virginia? One of his friends said of "Chuck" Yeager:

> Why, you'd never know he had been away from Hamlin. When he comes back he doesn't talk any more than he did before he left, and you'd never know he was in town if you just didn't happen to bump into him. He's still the nice kid that was so easy to get along with in school.

Remaining in the Air Force, he was assigned as a test pilot at Wright Field in Dayton. When he was only 24 years old, 2 days after Columbus Day in 1947 came a big break for Capt. Charles Yeager, assigned to test the Bell X–1 plane. Other test pilots had asked for big bonuses to fly on that speed test. But "Chuck" Yeager volunteered on a captain's regular flight pay.

Aviation Week termed it "the greatest achievement in aviation since the Wrights' first flight" when Captain Yeager rocketed faster than the speed of sound on October 14, 1947. They asked Orville Wright in 1903 if the first flight thrilled him, and he answered:

> Not as much as lying in bed, thinking how much fun it would be to fly.

They asked "Chuck" Yeager about breaking the sound barrier, and he answered with an even shorter statement:

> It gave me a pretty good feeling.

December 12, 1953, Edwards Air Force Base, Calif.: Maj. Charles E. Yeager piloted the Bell X-1A rocket-powered research aircraft to a world's speed record of 1,650 miles per hour.

November 17, 1954, the White House, Washington, D.C.: President Dwight D. Eisenhower presents the Harmon International Trophies to Major Yeager for breaking the world's aviation speed record, and to Jacqueline Cochran, the first woman to break the sound barrier. The Harmon award committee stated that Yeager's flight and the work leading up to it "have enabled the U.S. aircraft industry to take giant steps toward designing airplanes for regular supersonic operations." Yeager's wonderful father and mother, Mr. and Mrs. Hal Yeager, came up to the White House to witness the ceremony.

And now, today, Colonel Yeager is commandant of the U.S. Air Force Aerospace Research Pilot School at Edwards Air Force Base.

A couple of weeks ago, I got a notice from the Post Office Department that it was costing them some $2,000 a year to keep up the post office at Myra, and since the receipts were only $300 annually, could not they please close the post office. I went down to the Myra area along Mud River during the Easter recess and did a house-to-house canvass to determine whether the people there wanted to go on rural delivery. Quite naturally, they all in their courteous but firm way put forward the arguments to keep the post office. Maybe I cannot do much to honor "Chuck" Yeager, but at least I was able to do one thing—I saved the post office designation in the town where he was born: Myra in Lincoln County, and kept "Chuck" Yeager's birthplace on the map.

Mr. Speaker, people like "Chuck" Yeager convince me that if we can mobilize and train our human and other resources, America will remain preeminent as a leader of the free world. Not only through his brilliant technical accomplishments, but by the great inspiration he is providing for the young people of this Nation also, "Chuck" Yeager has proved over and over that he is an ace among men.

West Virginia, the Nation, and the free world are indeed proud of Col. Charles Elwood Yeager.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRY. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to have a share in paying honor to a distinguished fellow mountaineer. Adventure, daring, and achievement are traditional in the annals of my native State. There is something in the air of West Virginia that can take a boy from an obscure country village and raise him to the ranks of the great in the Nation. We are happy to contribute the skill and the valor of such men to the service of the Republic. Colonel Yeager's exploits during the late war are enough to entitle him to the grateful thanks of all Americans who love their country. But his devotion to his chosen branch of the service did not come to a halt with the war. Instead, he has become our foremost pioneer in developing sophisticated modern aircraft, a task requiring more courage, judgment, and skill than any other assigned to mortals. The Distinguished Service Medal, highest of the Nation's honors for achievement, which he wears so modestly on his chest, along with some 16 other decorations, attest the widespread recognition of his ability and his mettle. We do well today to accord him what little honor we can add to deeds far beyond our power to emulate. To paraphrase the Preacher, "Such men are the glory of their times, and their works do follow them."

Mr. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BARRY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride and a personal privilege that I am able to join my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY], here today in paying tribute to one of the greater men in history.

Mr. Speaker, "Chuck" Yeager and I met a few years ago at the Edwards Air Force Base in California when I initiated my aviation education program in Crescent City, Calif. It was my pleasure to visit him there. As I recall, at that time Colonel Yeager was driving a model A Ford and someone said "There goes the fastest man in history."

Mr. Speaker, I am an aviator myself, and have pushed an F-4-U Corsair up to 550 knots in a dive. I have felt that buffeting and some of the other pressures which "Chuck" has gone through. All of us were concerned about that point of compressability just prior to the speed of sound and I think we share with "Chuck" some of these memorable experiences.

Mr. Speaker, I shall be looking forward to joining with Colonel Yeager and Jacqueline Cochran during the luncheon hour and to discuss some of my ideas with them, in particular how we can make the aircraft a more effective tool in peace than it was ever used as a tool of war. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the horizons are unlimited.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from New York for leading this salute to a great American and the great team which he represents. Anyone who has visited Edwards Air Force Base and who has seen in operation the great scientific flight team which we have there will certainly leave that place with an eminent pride in his Nation and in its manhood.

Mr. Speaker, I think that Colonel Yeager typifies the spirit of the American Air Force and the spirit of the intrepid men and women of our Armed Forces who are risking their lives daily to preserve America's preeminence in space.

Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY] I want to extend my heartfelt thanks for this opportunity to participate in a tribute not only to this great American but to the men and women who have pioneered with him in the effort to keep America first in the world in which we live today.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I am both proud and happy to join in paying a deserved tribute to a great American hero and intrepid airman, Colonel Yeager. Colonel Yeager has certainly made tremendous contributions to the science of aeronautics, and particularly as a pioneer in supersonic flight.

Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to say, as a member of the newly organized Congressional Flying Club——

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman will permit me to interrupt to say that he is modest; he is the president of the newly organized Flight Club of the U.S. Congress.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think it is significant that our first official function as a club will be to have the privilege of honoring America's top aviator, Colonel Yeager and our first lady of flight, Miss Jacqueline Cochran, at lunch today.

Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks a resolution adopted unanimously by the Congressional Flying Club at its last meeting:

> The Congressional Flying Club salutes Col. Charles "Chuck" Yeager, of Hamlin, W. Va., whose first flight beyond the speed of sound opened the door for aeronautical progress in supersonic flight and to man's exploration of the space beyond the earth. Since October 14, 1947, and that historic flight in the Bell X-1 research, rocket-powered aircraft named "Glamorous Glennis," Colonel Yeager has continued to distinguish himself as an officer in the U.S. Air Force; as an air combat research pilot in Korea; as squadron commander of Tactical Air Force jetwing in Europe and the United States; and as a graduate of the U.S. Air Force War College at Maxwell Air Force Base, Ala. Members of the Congressional Flying Club today wish to honor him for his present important assignment as head of the U.S. Air Force Aerospace Research Pilot School, Edwards Air Force Base, Calif., where American space and hypersonic aircraft research test pilot-engineers are being trained to explore and establish new realms of flight for tomorrow.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it was a personal pleasure for me, prior to the meeting of the House today, to meet Colonel and Mrs. Yeager and to welcome Mrs. Odlum—Miss Jacqueline Cochran—who, with her husband, I have known for many years, to the House side of the Capitol. Also it was a pleasure for me to cooperate with my distinguished friend from New York [Mr. BARRY] on the occasion of Colonel and Mrs. Yeager's visit to Washington and make possible the opportunity for Members to make the remarks they have made about this outstanding American, a man who has added luster and glory to the history of our country.

It augurs well for the country and for the future of flight in the United States—especially military flight—that Colonel Yeager is now, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY] said, the Chief of the U.S. Air Force Aerospace Research Pilot School at Edwards Air Force Base, Calif.

If any man in America understands flight from the standpoint of its needs and demands on the human system, and from the standpoint of its science, that man is, of course, Colonel Yeager.

Colonel Yeager belongs to the elite company of space pioneers, among whom we list the most dramatic names of the moment: John H. Glenn, Donald K. Slayton, Scott Carpenter, Alan Shepard, and a whole galaxy of unsung heroes at the drawing board and in the research laboratories.

Many more are now in training under the tutorship of just such men as Colonel Yeager. Both the imponderables of American prestige and the practical and perhaps mighty advances inherent in space flight rest upon their relatively young shoulders.

Colonel Yeager, by daring, skill, superb training, raw heroism and dedication—has kept aloft the banner of American prestige in the progress of our conquest of space.

To paraphrase a famous utterance: Rarely in the history of space flight have so many Americans owed so much to this one remarkable flyer.

It is not enough for this Congress to say that we are proud of men like Yeager. We do not stop there. For this Congress and preceding Congresses have given and will give the Nation's wholehearted support to their endeavors, morally and—I may add—in practical budgetary terms. With men like Colonel Yeager and others whom I have mentioned and those he is training, America will not take second place to any other nation.

Mr. BARRY. I thank the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to add to this RECORD any remarks they care to make on this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, a little more than 19 years ago, on the 25th of March 1944, Charles Elwood Yeager engaged the enemy in mortal combat in the skies over Germany. As a result of that action he received wounds which resulted in the award to him of the Purple Heart, and of the Bronze Star for gallantry in action.

Those awards were but the first of many that were to bring an acknowledgment of the debt owed this gallant man by a grateful country.

The Silver Star, and then an Oak Leaf Cluster, the Distinguished Flying Cross and another Oak Leaf Cluster, the Air Medal and six Oak Leaf Clusters, the Distinguished Service Medal and an Oak Leaf Cluster—all these and more signify the dedication of Charles Yeager to his country.

It is supremely fitting that this outstanding airman should on the 14th of October 1947 become the first man to fly faster than the speed of sound.

Mr. Chairman, I join a grateful nation in paying tribute to Col. Charles Elwood Yeager, U.S. Air Force.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, as our forefathers were attracted by the romance and adventure of the old West, we of this generation look to those pioneers of air and space who are blazing trails into the unknown. This period of history commenced at Kitty Hawk and where it shall end—on the moon, or beyond, is any man's guess. There is not alone adventure and exploration, but a military necessity for the United States, in the interest of security, must be a leader in flight, the development of ever more efficient aircraft and in space exploration.

The heroes of this air age are truly a new breed. They have the same adventurous spirit as those who discovered the West and they have tremendous scientific knowledge.

We are honored to have one of the great airmen of our time in the Chamber today, Col. Charles E. Yeager. He typifies the splendid men of our Air Force. Although he may be best known for being the first man to fly faster than sound, and this may appeal to adventure in our hearts, he has made other significant contributions to the science of flight and continues to do so as director of U.S. Air Force Aerospace Research Pilot School. Like so many of his colleagues in flight and space research, and training, he is not content to rest on his laurels, he continues to make a real contribution to science and to our national defense.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON BANK SUPERVISION OF COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER], I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Bank Supervision of the Committee on Banking and Currency have permission to sit today and the rest of the week during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar Day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

OUTLET STORES, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2300) for the relief of Outlet Stores, Inc.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

DR. AND MRS. ABEL GORFAIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2706) for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Abel Gorfain.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

CHARLES WAVERLY WATSON, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2728) for the relief of Charles Waverly Watson, Jr.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4965) for the relief of certain employees of the Foreign Service of the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to each of the following employees of the Foreign Service of the United States, the sum designated in full satisfaction of their claims against the United States for compensation for personal property lost while performing their official duties: Slator C. Blackiston, Junior, $50; Robert W. Chase, $92; William J. Murray, Junior, $1,448; Francoise G. Queneau, $535; Philip F. Snare, $59; Gerald J. Steiner, $600; Peter Zrowka, $1,950; William D. Wolle, $50.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CATALINA PROPERTIES, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2262) for the relief of Catalina Properties, Inc.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

JOHN F. WOOD

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2726) for the relief of John F. Wood of Newport News, Va.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim against the United States, described in this Act, of John F. Wood of Newport News, Virginia. Such claim arises out of severe personal injuries sustained on January 22, 1958, by the said John F. Wood of Newport News, Virginia, who was then aged six, as a result of his coming in contact with an allegedly unprotected automatic compressing door on a federally owned and operated sanitary truck at the Transportation Training Command, Fort Eustis, Virginia.

SEC. 2. Suit upon the claim referred to in the first section of this Act may be instituted at any time within the one-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, notwithstanding the lapse of time, any statute of limitations or any other provision of law. Proceedings for the determination of such claim, appeals therefrom, and payment of any judgments thereon, shall be in the same manner as in cases over which such court has jurisdiction under chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as an admission of liability on the part of the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That notwithstanding lapse of time, any statute of limitations, or any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, and settle the claim of John F. Wood of Newport News, Virginia, for money damages of $2,500 or less against the United States, based upon the injuries he sustained on January 22, 1958, as a result of his coming in contact with an allegedly unprotected automatic compressing door on a federally owned and operated sanitary truck at the Transportation Training Command, Fort Eustis, Virginia. The claim provided for in this Act shall be filed within one year of the effective date of this Act. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, the claim of the said John F. Wood shall be considered and settled in accordance with the procedures applicable to claims cognizable under section 2672 of title 28 of the United States Code."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MODOC COUNTY, CALIF.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2753) to authorize suits against the United States to quiet title of certain real property in Modoc County, Calif.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That any person claiming any right, title, or interest in or to real property situated in the bed or former bed of Pelican Lake, also known as Cowhead Lake, in township 47, range 17, Modoc County, California, is hereby authorized to bring a suit against the United States in the United States District Court for the Northern Division of the Northern District of California or in the Superior Court of the State of California in and for the county of Modoc, to quiet title to such real property. Any suit authorized by this Act must be commenced within one year after the date of enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That the United States disclaims any right, title, or interest it may have, derived from its original ownership of the land as acquired by the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, including without limitation, any right, title, or interest stemming from the doctrines of accretion, reliction, or lands omitted from survey, in or to real property situated in the bed or former bed of Pelican Lake, also known as Cowhead Lake, in township 47 north, range 17 east, Mount Diablo Meridian, Modoc County, Calif."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed. The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to disclaim any title of the United States to certain real property in Modoc County, Calif."

REAR ADM. WALTER B. DAVIDSON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1395) for the relief of Rear Adm. Walter B. Davidson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Rear Admiral Walter B. Davidson, United States Navy, retired, is relieved of liability to pay to the United States the sum of $21,475.17, which amount represents the total of overpayments of retired pay during the period beginning November 13, 1958, and ending August 21, 1961, while the said Walter B. Davidson was employed by the Western Contract Furnishers of San Francisco, California, and that concern was engaged in certain contract work for the United States. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for any amount for which liability is relieved by this section.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Rear Admiral Walter B. Davidson, United States Navy, retired, the amount certified to him by the Secretary of the Navy as the sum of the amounts withheld from him by the United States on account of the liability referred to in the first section of this Act, and in addition such amounts as represent the balance of retired pay otherwise due for the above period. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Walter B. Davidson against the United States for amounts withheld from his retired pay on account of the liability referred to in the first section of this Act: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this section in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. GENEVA H. TRISLER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2268) for the relief of Mrs. Geneva H. Trisler.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act providing for the barring of claims against the United States", approved October 9, 1940 (31 U.S.C. 71a, 237), are waived with respect to the claim of Mrs. Geneva H. Trisler of Baton Rouge, Louisiana, for additional compensation due as a salary adjustment for service performed as a clerk at the Baton Rouge, Louisiana, post office during the period November 1, 1949, through May 7, 1952, if such claim is received in the General Accounting Office within the one-year period which begins on the date of enactment of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. JESSE FRANKLIN WHITE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2751) for the relief of Mrs. Jesse Franklin White.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act are hereby waived in favor of Mrs. Jesse Franklin White, of Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, and her claim for compensation for the death of her husband, Jesse Franklin White, a former employee of the Department of Agriculture, who died on August 28, 1932, shall be acted upon under the remaining provisions of such Act, as amended, if she files such claim with the Department of Labor (Bureau of Employees' Compensation) within six months after the enactment of this Act: *Provided,* That no benefits shall accrue by reason of this Act for any period prior to the date of enactment.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEROY SMALLENBERGER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4773) for the relief of referee in bankruptcy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall pay, out of any appropriation available for payment of salaries of referees in bankruptcy of the district courts of the United States to Leroy Smallenberger, a referee in bankruptcy for the United States District Court, Western District of Louisiana, a retroactive increase in salary from $7,500 per year for service as a part-time referee to $15,000 a year for service as a full-time referee for the period July 1, 1962, through October 17, 1962, inclusive.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Leroy Smallenberger, a referee in bankruptcy."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MARJORIE CURTIS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4811) for the relief of Mrs. Marjorie Curtis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Marjorie Curtis, of La Monte, Missouri, the sum of $1,000 in full settlement of her claims against the United States for inconvenience and disruption incident to the crash of a B-47 aircraft of the United States Air Force on her farm on February 27, 1956, and in further settlement of all her claims for personal injuries, pain, and suffering traceable to that crash. These claims are not cognizable under the provisions of law commonly referred to as the Federal Tort Claims Act: *Provided,* That no part of either of the sums appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with the claim settled by the payment of such sum, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEO F. REEVES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2293) to validate the homestead entries of Leo F. Reeves.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 394, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the status of lots 3 and 4, section 1, township 4 north, range 11 west and lot 12 and the south twenty acres of lot 13, section 31, township 5 north, range 10 west, Seward meridian, Alaska, and the requirements of the homestead laws relating to settlement on entered lands, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to consider that the homestead entries of Leo F. Reeves of Soldatna, Alaska, Anchorage 031423 and 034503 became valid and subsisting as to the above-described lands as of the date of said Reeves' actual settlement on any portion thereof and to issue patent for the lands to the entryman upon the entryman's compliance with, and subject to, the homestead laws applicable to public lands in Alaska, and upon the entryman's payment to the Secretary of the Interior of the fair market value of lot 12 and the south twenty acres of lot 13, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior as of the date approval of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 2293) was laid on the table.

KAZIMIERZ KRUPINSKI

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1206) for the relief of Kazimierz Krupinski.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212(a)(9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Kazimierz Krupinski may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLARA G. MAGGIORA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1237) for the relief of Clara G. Maggiora.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

MISS ANN SUPER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1275) for the relief of Miss Ann Super.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ann Super shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien minor child of Mr. and Mrs. Steve Super, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ann Super may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in her behalf by Mr. and Mrs. Steve Super, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 205(b) of the Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIO RODRIGUES FONSECA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1332) for the relief of Mario Rodrigues Fonseca.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Mario Rodrigues Fonseca, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mario Rodrigues Fonseca, a citizen of the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mario Rodrigues Fonseca may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in his behalf by Mr. and Mrs. Mario Goncalves Fonseca, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 205(b) of the Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VAGHARSHAG O. DANIELIAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1366) for the relief of Vagharshag O. Danielian.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Vagharshag O. Danielian shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, for the purposes of the Act of July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 504), Vagharshag Hovannes Danielian shall be held and considered to have been paroled into the United States on the date of the enactment of this Act, as provided for in the said Act of July 14, 1960."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Vagharshag Hovannes Danielian."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JANET LUNDIE FARMER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1393) for the relief of Janet Lundie Farmer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212(a)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Janet Lundie Farmer may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act, under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose: *Provided,* That, unless the beneficiary is entitled to care under chapter 55 of title 10 of the United States Code, a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act: *Provided further,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BARBARA THERESA LAZARUS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1518) for the relief of Mazine Angela Lazarus Provost and Barbara Theresa Lazarus.

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 203(a)(3) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the children, Maxine Angela Lazarus Provost and Barbara Theresa Lazarus, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien children of Hazel and Dudley Lazarus, lawfully resident aliens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the beneficiaries shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, lines 4 and 5, strike out the language "the children, Maxine Angela Lazarus Provost and" and substitute "the minor child,".

On page 1, line 7, strike out the word "children" and substitute the word "child".

On page 1, line 9, strike out the word "beneficiaries" and substitute the word "beneficiary".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title of the bill was amended to read: "A bill for the relief of Barbara Theresa Lazarus."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LUBA SIEDLECKI SIMON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1734) for the relief of Luba Siedlecki Simon.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Luba Siedlecki Simon shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence of such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, for the purposes of sections 203(a)(2) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Luba Siedlecki Simon shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Dave Simon, citizens of the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ASSUNTA DILELLA CODELLA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1736) for the relief of Assunta DiLella Codella.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Assunta DiLella Codella shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph A. Codella, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Assunta DiLella Codella may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in her behalf by Mr. and Mrs. Joseph A. Codella, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 205(b) of the Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PONG YONG JIN (ALSO KNOWN AS PANG YONG CHIN)

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3629) for the relief of Pong Yong Jin (also known as Pang Yong Chin).

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Pong Yong Jin (also known as Pang Yong Chin) may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the said Act and a petition may be filed by Mr. and Mrs. Donald A. Markham, citizens of the United States, in behalf of the said Pong Yong Jin (also known as Pang Yong Chin) pursuant to section 205(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 6, after the language "section 101(b)(1)(F) of the" strike out the remainder of the bill and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Act, upon approval of a petition filed in his behalf by Mr. and Mrs. Donald A. Markham, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 205(b) of the Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. OLGA MARIE FERRER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 74) for the relief of Dr. Olga Marie Ferrer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of title III of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Olga Marie Ferrer (A12539965) shall be held and considered to have been admitted to the United States for permanent residence on May 17, 1947, and to have complied with the residential and physical presence requirements of section 316 of the said Act.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Feighan: Add the following at the end of the bill:

"Sec. 2. Section 2 of Private Law 87–673 is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'For the purposes of section 316 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Mehmet Vecihi Kalaycioglu shall be held and considered to have complied with the residential and physical presence requirements of that section of the said Act.' "

Amend the title to read: "A bill for the relief of certain aliens."

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to inquire of the gentleman from Ohio if this has been cleared with the Members on this side of the aisle and members of the Committee on the Judiciary on this side.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Yes, it has been cleared.

Mr. AVERY. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of certain aliens."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further call of bills on the Private Calendar be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING THAT MEMBERS OF CONGRESS BE LIMITED TO PER DIEM ALLOWANCES AND NECESSARY TRANSPORTATION COSTS

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 331 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

> *Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the House Joint Resolution (H.J. Res. 245) to provide that Members of Congress shall be limited to per diem allowances and necessary transportation costs in connection with travel outside the United States, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the amendments recommended by the Committee on House Administration now printed in the bill. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 39]

Adair
Alger
Anderson
Aspinall
Ayres
Beermann
Bennett, Fla.
Bolton,
Frances P.
Bruce
Buckley
Collier
Conte
Dawson
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Finnegan
Fino
Fogarty
Forrester
Gary
Hagan, Ga.
Halleck
Hansen
Harris
Harvey, Ind.
Healey
Hoeven
Jensen
Kee
Macdonald
Madden
Morrison
Morton
Pirnie
Powell
Roush
St. George
Scott
Shelley
Short
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Steed
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Utt
Walter

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). On this rollcall 382 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PROVIDING THAT MEMBERS OF CONGRESS BE LIMITED TO PER DIEM ALLOWANCES AND NECESSARY TRANSPORTATION COSTS

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, in the consideration of this resolution, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], pending which I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 245) providing that Members of Congress shall be limited to per diem allowances and necessary transportation costs in connection with travel outside the United States, and for other purposes.

The resolution provides an open rule, waiving points of order against the resolution, and committee amendments, with 1 hour of general debate.

Members of the House will recall that at the beginning of the 1st session of the 88th Congress the Committee on Rules in considering certain authorizing resolutions for committees of the House to conduct investigations provided certain limitations on the committees. In some instances those committees which did not have jurisdiction over matters requiring foreign travel and the expenditure of what are known as counterpart funds. In other instances those committees which did have jurisdiction over matters requiring foreign travel, the committee provided that such committees would have to use counterpart funds; the expenses involved in such foreign travel would be reported and the committee would be limited to actual costs and the expenses of the members of a committee authorized to travel abroad could not be more than the regular per diem allowance rates established or authorized by the standardized Government travel regulations.

The provision of the Committee on Rules did not apply to all of the committees of the House nor to committees in the other body. According to the testimony presented to the Committee on Rules by the chairman of the House Committee on Administration and the ranking member the objective of the pending resolution, House Joint Resolution 245, is to provide a realistic and orderly procedure in the expenditure of funds by committees engaged in foreign travel and to provide for the reporting of those expenditures to the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to the rule on this side of the House. I urge its adoption so that the resolution can be fully discussed on the floor of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THORNBERRY], has explained this rule very ably and well.

This rule makes in order the consideration of House Joint Resolution 245 with 1 hour of general debate, and waives all points of order.

The joint resolution would control to a certain extent, or regulate I might say, travel allowances granted to Members of Congress who may be traveling abroad, and to require Members of Congress directly or through their committees, or otherwise, to make full and complete reports as to expenditures they make in connection with such travel and for lodging, housing, and so forth.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution in my opinion is a very reasonable one. Whether or not it will correct some of the situations that have been the cause of, or the reasons for, complaints that have come to the attention of the House as to some abuses that may or may not have taken place, I do not know. I am not at all certain this joint resolution, which of course is the same as a bill, will have the effect of law—will receive the approval of another body. But I do believe it should receive the approval of both branches of the Congress.

I am certain it should and will receive the approval of the House of Representatives because it is, in my opinion, an honest endeavor, and a real effort, by the House Committee on Administration, and the author of this legislation, to prevent any such future abuses, so far as travel allowances and other travel expenses, are concerned by those who may visit foreign shores as representatives of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add, if I may, this legislation would supplement to a great extent the rules adopted by this House several weeks ago as to foreign travel, which requires the various committees of the House to come before the Rules Committee, and to justify any requests they may make to travel abroad, whether the authority and privilege is to be extended to a full committee or a subcommittee. The House Committee on Rules has been rather penurious, I might say, in giving authority for foreign travel to some of the committees that have applied therefor, and has limited the number of trips or the number of Members of Congress who may travel abroad during the present Congress.

This resolution will, as I said a moment ago, supplement and strengthen these rules and give further control over official travel so not only Members of Congress, but the public as well, can know just what any individual Member of Congress may have spent on any trip he may make outside the United States, if authorized by the Rules of the House to make such a trip or to engage in such travel.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. If this resolution is passed, will it lend encouragement to the gentleman from Ohio to take a junket abroad?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman from Ohio has not taken a junket, that he knows of, at any time since he has been in Congress, some 25 years. But if the gentleman from Iowa should decide to break his own rule and go on a long junket, as I have heard whispered he may, I might be inclined to join him in looking over the world situation. Otherwise, I would not. If I did join the gentleman from Iowa, I would do so only to be certain that the rules as adopted by the Rules Committee, reported to the House and adopted by the House, and as this particular joint resolution provides, be observed strictly by the gentleman from Iowa, as I am sure they would be, for he is a very conscientious public servant as well as a delightful companion and an able legislator.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 245, to provide that Members of Congress shall be limited to per diem allowances and necessary transportation costs in connection with travel outside the United States, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 245, with Mr. Roberts of Alabama in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the resolution was dispensed with.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, it is with considerable satisfaction that I present to you this legislation unanimously approved by the Committee on House Administration.

House Joint Resolution 245 has been studied long and carefully in an effort to meet every conceivable situation which might arise in connection with expenditures for foreign travel by Members of Congress and employees in order that accurate accounting may result. Every effort has been made to guarantee that the provisions of this resolution be applicable, uniformly, to each individual authorized to travel outside the 50 States of the United States.

It may be helpful to call attention to the present provision of law, including reporting and accounting procedures, which I think will point up the necessity for a better system. May I say here, Mr. Chairman, that consideration has been given to this matter over a considerable period of time before this legislation was introduced. It was discussed in the last session of the Congress, and even in the session before, it being realized by many that present provisions are inadequate for a full system of reporting. This measure is for the protection of the individual Member of Congress and employee who wants to be certain a full accounting is provided under a system adequate for the purpose.

Section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, provides that local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to appropriate committees of the Congress engaged in carrying out their duties when traveling overseas.

The various committees are required to file consolidated, itemized reports with the Committee on House Administration or the Senate Committee on Appropriations, as the case may be, which, in turn, prints the reports in the Congressional Record within 10 days after receipt of such reports.

The Legislative Branch Appropriations Act of 1961 requires each Member of Congress and employee of the several interparliamentary groups, of which the United States is a member, to report to the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, as the case may be, their expenditures in attending such conferences. These chairmen, in turn, report as they do at present to the Committee on House Administration, in the case of House Members and Committee on Appropriations in the Senate.

Under the present provision of law, individuals or groups are authorized to travel on the basis of broad language, which provides little control over who may travel or the purpose of such travel. There is no specific ceiling or limitation on the amount of funds available for expenses of travel overseas. The reporting requirements do not specify the length of time spent in any given country or supporting documentation of expenditures. Transportation is not controlled and there is no check or audit available in connection with reported expenditures.

Mr. Chairman, at this point may I make clear that the Committee on House Administration receives the consolidated reports from the chairman of the committee authorizing Members, and employees, travel, and under the law, our only duty and authority is to place such reports in the Congressional Record. The House Administration Committee receives no supporting receipts or vouchers, and nothing is withheld from the public, as alleged by some newspaper reporters and columnists.

In brief, Mr. Chairman, what this legislation does is to carry forward, in what we believe to be to completion, earlier action of the Congress in this session which amended resolutions from those committees requesting authorization to conduct studies and investigations in such a way as to provide greater control of foreign travel and expenditures of funds. Appropriated funds of some committees were specifically limited to payment of expenses within the United States, and these committees were precluded from using local currencies owned by the United States in foreign countries. In other words, they were expressly prohibited by amendment placed in the authorizing resolution for funds to travel abroad.

A second provision in House Joint Resolution 245 places each Member of Congress or employee on a per diem basis, traveling outside the United States, within the maximum limits as set by the Standardized Government Travel Regulations established by the Bureau of the Budget. As you know, the per diem varies from country to country in accordance with the cost of living. Transportation charges may not be in excess of actual costs, and no appropriated funds may be expended to defray travel expenses if local currencies owned by the United States are available.

A Member or employee traveling abroad must, under this measure, show the number of days spent in each country visited and the amount of per diem furnished or actual cost of food and lodging. It also requires the identification of any agency of the Government which furnished transportation. Existing law now requires the traveler to report the amount spent for transportation, meals, lodging and other items to his committee.

Since some committees of the House of Representatives do not require specific authorization by the House Rules Committee to conduct studies and investigations and since some committees do not plan to conduct studies abroad, they are not required to go before the House Rules Committee for authorization. This measure includes such committees, the same as all others.

The restrictions on travel and the expenditure of local currencies owned by the United States abroad, as accomplished by the action of the Rules Committee, do not, of course, extend to Members and employees of the other body. House Joint Resolution 245 obviously includes the other body, since it is a joint resolution and since it deals with organic law, a joint resolution to be submitted to the President of the United States is necessary.

Another significant requirement in this legislation provides the direct reporting of expenditures abroad where local currency or appropriated funds are utilized by the State Department or any other branch of the Government which either clears the expenditure of such local currencies or which draw them for the expenses of Members or employees so traveling. Not only will the chairman of the various committees be required to report to the Committee on House Administration in detail, but also the executive departments involved, and in most instances it will be the State Department, reports directly to the Committee on House Administration and both reports filed simultaneously in the Congressional Record.

The Committee on House Administration, let me repeat and to perhaps be helpful in correcting some misapprehensions of certain newspaper writers and columnists, receives nothing in the way of reports of expenditures in connection with foreign travel it does not put in the Congressional Record. We become a collection agency, so to speak, for them. That is just about it. We get no supporting documentation of expenses. That is the point.

Now, what this resolution proposes to do is to require the chairman to make the same report to the Committee on House Administration. But in addition—which would be the unusual thing—the State Department which in the first instance issues counterpart funds to the Member, reports to the Committee on House Administration and those reports go in the Congressional Record simultaneously. Each department or agency in the executive branch of the Government which furnishes or uses local currencies or appropriated funds for or in connection with travel outside the United States must report.

Mr. Chairman, one of the main provisions in this measure is that a Member or an employee may travel on a per diem basis. As the Members know, that varies from country to country. But the standardized Government travel rate is set by the Bureau of the Budget, depending on the cost of living from country to country. This provides that a Member or an employee may travel on a per diem allowance, plus the actual costs of transportation, and simply report the number of days he spent in country X. Of course we know what the per diem would be and that would come through the State Department. That is all there is to it. It simplifies it.

Mr. Chairman, in the event it is determined this is, we will say, an impossibility—I doubt if that is ever the case—but if it works a hardship and the Member or the employee can justify it he may pay the actual cost of food and lodging supported by proper documentation showing for what the expense was made. In other words, he must submit the hotel receipts or some proof of whatever the expenditure may be and this must accompany the report which he makes to the chairman and to the Committee on House Administration.

Likewise, and correspondingly, he must show the amount of local currency or appropriated funds expended which is reported by the State Department or what other agency of the executive department may be involved. The reason I say that is that in case the Defense Department, for instance, wishes to show Members of Congress certain installations around the world and they put them on a special mission plane and they take the trip, they pick up the tab and the Member of Congress may not have anything to do with the expenses. But the Defense Department would be required to report to the Committee on House Administration as to the cost. If there were five Members on the trip and they were together all the time, the actual cost would be divided by five, and the estimated cost of the operation of an airplane would also be figured. That is the way it is intended to work.

Mr. Chairman, permit me to say that we have spent long and rather arduous hours on this matter. Many of us have been discussing it since the last session of Congress and for months in this session. It may not be perfect. I do not know. But we have tried to cover every loophole and everything else involved in order to simplify the procedures and at the same time allow fair treatment to anyone who has legitimate business to travel outside this country.

Mr. Chairman, it is, I repeat, intended to be applicable to everybody and everything alike. We have tried to look at it from all sides and from bottom to top. We think we have it in such shape as to be worthy and important legislation.

Mr. Chairman, even though the actual bill is rather wordy, one must bear in mind that we have to attempt to take care of every situation we can possibly conceive. For instance, in the matter of the Interparliamentary Group, we know, of course, that those are unusual in that they are not the usual investigative committees or the usual study groups which go abroad. There are times when I think that in order to show comity and to show courtesy—they are authorized to do so now, and I take no great issue with it at all—they may have to make extra expenditures from the funds which are appropriated to those various groups. One may call these expenditures expenses for public relations or entertainment. But there is provision made here for it when it is properly supported by receipts and when it is reported to show how every nickel is spent. That is permitted. We did not have this in the bill at first and I think the point is well made. I have never been on one of these Interparliamentary Group trips, but I can well understand that there it is a matter of conferences; those conferences do not run 24 hours a day, the Members are there in a more or less compact group, and some of these expenses may be necessary.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman and his committee for bringing this legislation to the Congress. I am certainly in favor of it. I would like to ask this one specific question. As I understand it now, if a Member of Congress takes a trip to a foreign country he would be given, let us say at the request of the chairman of his committee, certain counterpart funds or local currencies by, let us say, a representative of the Department of State. At the present time is the amount of money that the State Department gives the Representative given any publicity?

Mr. BURLESON. Only the publicity that is available from the report which we put in the Record. But we have no way of knowing the reports are accurate; and when I say that I am not casting aspersions upon any Member of the House who has traveled or who seeks to travel. These things can be complicated. I well know, as does anybody who has been outside the country, that you do not have a "man Friday" at your elbow all the time to keep books for you. I can see where mistakes can easily be made. But it becomes the business of the people who keep account of these counterpart funds overseas, in our embassies; that is their business, and as I said before, they report to the State Department which reports directly to the House Administration Committee.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In other words, if this bill passes, a report will be made directly to the House Administration Committee.

Mr. BURLESON. That is true.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I think that is a very good feature of this bill. I think the disposition of that money should be given to the gentleman's committee and, as I understand it, that will be included in the Record as a matter of information.

Mr. BURLESON. That is correct.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I am happy to yield to our colleague on the committee.

Mr. CORBETT. Does not the great desirability of this joint resolution, as we worked on it, come from the fact that we establish here a firm set of ground rules that everybody will have to live up to and that we provide for a full disclosure. If those two things are true, then automatically if somebody violates them the spotlight is on them. But, on the other hand, it would not then reflect on the other Members who may have used these funds because they will have complied with the rules of Congress. Is not that all we are attempting to do here?

Mr. BURLESON. The gentleman has stated the case succinctly. That is the goal and purpose, yes.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield.

Mr. MONAGAN. I would like to ask the gentleman about the authorization for travel under the proposed legislation. In other words, at the present time the authorization for travel is given by the chairman of the particular committee. Is that correct?

Mr. BURLESON. That is correct.

Mr. MONAGAN. Are there any changes proposed in this legislation as to such authorization for travel?

Mr. BURLESON. There are no changes in that respect. The chairmen of the various committees would continue to authorize travel for members of the committee when the committee itself is authorized to conduct studies and investigations overseas. The authorization would still come from the chairman of the particular committee just as it does at the present time.

Mr. MONAGAN. In other words then, it would not be necessary to have a resolution of the House of Representatives to authorize such travel.

Mr. BURLESON. Not if the committee itself has been authorized to travel outside the 50 States of the United States by the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MONAGAN. And there would be no need for a specific resolution for any particular trip?

Mr. BURLESON. There may be situations where if a committee is not authorized to travel outside the 50 States, then it would simply be a matter of bringing a resolution before the Committee on Rules to authorize a member or members of such a committee to travel outside, and that has been done in this session of the Congress. Of course, in that event the purpose of the travel and the names of the Members and people involved, and so forth, would be submitted and it would be a matter then for the Committee on Rules to decide.

Mr. MONAGAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield.

Mr. WRIGHT. I would like to congratulate my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] for having drafted and brought to the floor of the House this piece of legislation. This is a needed piece of legislation. Certainly it is the responsibility of the Congress to keep its own house clean. Surely I am confident the gentleman from Texas would agree with me that the vast majority of the Members of this body need no such restrictions for them to maintain the self-restraint and responsible position that they should maintain. However, the House of Representatives cannot afford even a few illustrations of irresponsible conduct, as they do reflect on the integrity of this great institution of the House of Representatives. So far as it goes I think the bill that has been brought before the House today is a fine and well-drafted piece of legislation. The gentleman from Texas will recall I had the opportunity to introduce a bill which contained some of the same provisions and I commend the chairman on the good job he has done in drafting the bill. I believe insofar as the joint resolution relates to foreign travel it provides a systematic means whereby the public may have the spotlight focused on activities of Members of Congress. It does no good to complain about "living in a goldfish bowl." That is what it is supposed to be and we knew it when we entered it.

Mr. Chairman, again I congratulate the gentleman from Texas for bringing this bill to the floor of the House.

Mr. BURLESON. I thank my colleague.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Is it true that a Member of Congress traveling in another country may, if he so wishes, take the per diem allowance in lieu of the actual subsistence?

Mr. BURLESON. That is correct.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. That is based on the Bureau of the Budget per diem rates for Executive employees?

Mr. BURLESON. That is correct.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. And if he chooses not to accept per diem, he will be reimbursed for the actual cost of lodging, food, and so forth, so long as he accounts for such expenditures?

Mr. BURLESON. That is correct, and receipts showing such expenditures must accompany the Member's report.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Will there be any review of the legitimacy of these expenditures if the Member chooses not to use the per diem allowance? That is, would there be any review of the propriety of the amount he might spend on food and lodging?

Mr. BURLESON. If the gentleman means whether there would be any review, whether there would be an audit, of course an audit of the amount would come through our State Department.

But there would be no review as such. The joint resolution gives the Committee on House Administration no authority to pass upon whether an expenditure is legitimate or not. We would propose—I cannot speak for my committee on this—that in the case the gentleman mentions the expenditures for actual subsistence allowance and actual transportation costs would be supported by receipts that would be made public. That would be the ultimate, at any rate.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I wish to commend the gentleman for bringing up the bill from his committee. I think it represents a real step forward. I would like to have it go further however and provide with greater certainty that there can be no lavish spending.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may advise the gentleman that he has used 25 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I would hope that subsequent legislation, based on experience under this bill, will permit us to establish ironclad, but workable, guarantees that there will be no possibility of extravagance, no possibility that the Congress will be embarrassed in the future. Again, I compliment the gentleman for bringing out this bill.

Mr. BURLESON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand this provides for a breakdown of miscellaneous spending or miscellaneous expense items?

Mr. BURLESON. There will be no miscellaneous items, if the intent of this measure is carried out. That is not an item under this bill. A traveler may take his per diem or actual subsistence costs and transportation costs, there is no miscellaneous.

Mr. GROSS. We are now spending miscellaneous funds. These are not broken down as to what they are spent for. This bill does not deal with miscellaneous spending?

Mr. BURLESON. We are trying to get away from miscellaneous spending.

Mr. CORBETT. Does not this bill eliminate such an item?

Mr. BURLESON. That is what we intend it should do.

Mr. GROSS. But the bill provides they must state the number of days in each country; is that correct?

Mr. BURLESON. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman this question:

As of now, these reports must be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD within 60 days after the convening of a session. Why the extension to 90 days?

Mr. BURLESON. The State Department tells us it takes considerable time to get these reports together. They suggest they should have a 3-months' period to collect all of the figures and make a recapitulation. One thing, they have to translate the dollar equivalent in foreign currency, and it takes some time to convert values of foreign currencies into dollars. That is one of the reasons they give for asking to have this period of time in which to report.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman have any knowledge of this State Department special account under 19-FT-561?

Mr. BURLESON. I do not.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I would like to compliment the chairman of the committee for having brought this legislation to the floor. The subcommittee and the full committee have acted in good faith on what I think is workable, forward-looking legislation. I hope the House will be in complete accord and support the position of the committee and our able chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON], and pass this legislation today.

Mr. BURLESON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. The gentleman is aware that the Appropriations Committee travels on appropriated funds rather than using counterpart funds in some of the countries where we have a balance. The reason for this was that our chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has laid down certain conditions. Does it mean, by the passage of this joint resolution, notwithstanding his views, if members of the Appropriations Committee travel in a country in which we have a balance or counterpart funds, those funds are to be used rather than dollars in those countries?

Mr. BURLESON. The answer is "Yes," except you use the word "balance." There is another reference to "excess." In the bill we use the word "available." Now, we do have counterpart funds in places where they say they need a certain backlog for their day-to-day operations. If there are counterpart funds sufficient to do that but not sufficient for the expenditures which we are dealing with here, then they say they are not available; in other words, they are not available for this purpose.

But, to get back specifically to your question, it does require that where counterpart funds are available, they shall be used in lieu of appropriated funds.

Mr. MICHEL. And the State Department would make that decision?

Mr. BURLESON. That is correct.

Mr. MICHEL. One further point. You mentioned the utilization of military aircraft and prorating that over the expenses of a Member of Congress. Does that mean if a Member of either body takes a trip, for example, to Africa and only one Member utilizes a military plane, that the cost of that entire trip would be charged to that Member of Congress?

Mr. BURLESON. The cost would be charged to him as based on a rate chart prepared by MATS which lists an average cost figure for flights from the United States to various foreign countries. The transportation cost would be taken from this rate chart and would be the same regardless of the number of passengers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas, our distinguished chairman, has explained this bill very well. Now, it just further refines the system of accounting, the expenditure of public funds that are used by Members of the House, the Senate, and employees of the House in traveling outside the United States. The Committee on House Administration now does place in the RECORD, as the chairman has said, all the information we receive. This is an effort to get additional information which will further explain and document the expenditures.

Mr. Chairman, we have a member of our committee, the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL], who has worked very hard on this legislation, and as the result of his work and understanding, has been able to have a committee amendment included which would prevent travel outside the United States of Members of either body who are traveling after the November election in any one case and who will not be back in the succeeding Congress so that we can take advantage of his or her observation, a so-called lame duck amendment, which I think is extremely worthwhile and good. I want to commend our colleague from Iowa.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHENCK. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. KELLY. Will the gentleman tell me if this bill covers all committees of the House, including the Committee on Appropriations and the employees of the committee?

Mr. SCHENCK. It is my understanding, I will say to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York, that it covers each and every committee and each and every employee of both the House and the Senate.

Mrs. KELLY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK].

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding. I would like to direct a question to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON].

I think possibly it would be easier to understand the implications of this bill if specific instances were cited rather than talking in generalities. On March 11 of this year our committee, the Committee on Education and Labor, filed a report which many of us did not feel was correct in all of its details. In fact I have outlined specific errors to this body but no correction has been made. The main roadblock I found in checking through these accounts was the fact that although the State Department, in its report to the chairman of my committee on February 28 gave in detail an accounting of the counterpart funds which were expended by our committee, this report was not available to myself as a member of the committee or to any Member of the Congress, it is my understanding, except to the chairman. The problem here, as I see it, can be met by this bill, I believe, and I would ask the chairman to elucidate a little bit on one point that he made.

It seems to me that there is no check on the actual expenditure of counterpart funds at the present time. If the report is not correctly filed, little can be done. The State Department takes the very proper position, I believe, that they report to the person whom the Congress designates them to report to and, therefore, they will not give me any report on funds expended.

Would the chairman of the Committee on House Administration, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON], tell me if under this bill the reports that are made, for example, the report of February 28 from the State Department to the Committee on Education and Labor, would henceforth also be made to the Committee of which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON], is chairman, and then go into the RECORD as reported?

Mr. BURLESON. The answer is "Yes." The same reporting by the chairman of the committee who authorizes the traveling in the first instance will continue as a requirement. But in addition and at the same time, under this measure the State Department will also report directly to the Committee on House Administration and both will be placed in the RECORD.

The reason for this is that one can verify the other. There will be, in a sense, a duplication, although the rules must be promulgated to carry out this act if and when it is finally enacted.

I think it is important that we are sure the committee records and those of the State Department are in harmony. Duplicating these records may appear a bit ridiculous but I believe it desirable and necessary for the double check.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Permit me to say to the chairman of the committee that it does not sound too ridiculous to me, having labored for 2 months to do this very thing and I certainly shall look forward to having the duplicate reporting. Moreover, I want to commend the gentleman for his handling of this bill. I know that we would not have this legislation before us today except for the diligent efforts of the gentleman from Texas. The American people will appreciate the step we are taking today to show we are not interested in perpetrating practices which may be abused by a very few Members of this body.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make sure that the same travel and expense rule is going to apply to each body of the Congress. Is it the intent of the people who will serve on the committee on the disagreeing votes between the two Houses, the ranking committee members of the majority and of the minority, to assure us that there will be no distinguishing or difference between the procedures of the two bodies on our rights or our obligations in respect to travel?

Mr. BURLESON. If the gentleman will yield, I shall be glad to reply to the gentleman's question. The provisions of the resolution definitely apply to both Houses of the Congress. It is anticipated and designed to apply to everyone just exactly in the same way regardless of who it is, what he does, or what committee he serves on.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I want to assure the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] that it is the intention of the committee that this shall apply equally to Members of the House, the Senate, and all employees of the entire Congress and all committees of the entire Congress.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I have another question.

I notice the bill specifically mentions, "within the 50 States," and "without the 50 States," all expenses must be reported. But it does not in any respect say anything about the colonies or possessions or, might I say, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

How are those U.S. dependencies and the Commonwealth under this bill handled? Is it intended to exclude Puerto Rico?

Mr. BURLESON. If the gentleman will yield, the provisions of the resolution apply to anything outside the 50 States of the United States. In other words, it would include Puerto Rico.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. A trip to Puerto Rico by any Member of the House or the Senate will require specific authorization?

Mr. BURLESON. If the gentleman will yield, I want to make the point that the resolution provides that travel outside the 50 States of the United States must be authorized by resolution of the House of Representatives or the Senate, as the case may be, and this would, of course, apply to a trip to Puerto Rico.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. One further question on the sending out of the committees that can travel abroad: It would seem to me that it is to the benefit of every member of every committee of Congress to obtain firsthand knowledge of problems facing our country at home and abroad. Every Member of Congress has national jurisdiction and has not only the jurisdictional work on his committee but has to vote on everything that every committee of the House reports to the House for action. I think it is good for Members to know what is going on in the world, firsthand, and I am sorry to see this limitation to travel by only certain congressional committees, because if somebody has a question on a foreign policy matter the Member should have the duty and obligation to study and investigate, to be prepared to vote, possibly on a space matter, we may even want to send them into orbit.

One point I make is this: Why is the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, of which I had the honor of being a member at one time, restricted from making investigations abroad? In my opinion, as soon as you mention U.S. civil service, it is obvious that civil service and Government employee operations are certainly scattered all over the world.

Mr. BURLESON. This bill which has been reported out by the Committee on House Administration does not have anything to do with the authorization of any particular committee to travel abroad. The resolution simply establishes controls over travel expenses and reporting requirements applicable to those committees which have been authorized to travel outside the 50 States of the United States by resolution of the House or the Senate.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD].

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, I have a question of the chairman of the committee. There has been some talk about miscellaneous expenses. From my reading and study of the report and the bill I see no provision for this. I would like the RECORD to show, if I am correct, that the only provision is for transportation, per diem, lodging and food and for no miscellaneous expenses; is that correct?

Mr. BURLESON. That is correct.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I thank the chairman and congratulate him and his committee on his work. While this bill will not solve the broader question of congressional ethics, it is at least a step in the right direction and I am pleased to support this legislation.

Mr. BURLESON. That question was raised earlier by the gentleman from Ohio. "Miscellaneous" expenditure is something we have been trying to get away from.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, I feel that this bill is an excellent bill and should receive wholehearted support.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, this resolution, House Joint Resolution 245, is almost identical to that portion of House Joint Resolution 356 which I introduced dealing with foreign travel.

I commend the distinguished and able chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON], and his great committee for promptly bringing this resolution to the House and I urge its adoption by the membership.

Mr. Chairman, this is a businesslike approach to foreign travel by Members of Congress. All expenditures of these funds should be subject to proper auditing. Expenditures for foreign travel by Members of Congress and its employees should be made available for public inspection to the taxpayers and to all of the Members of Congress. We should exercise the same care in spending taxpayers' funds abroad as we do when we spend our own personal funds; and I might say, Mr. Chairman, the overwhelming majority of the Members of Congress do handle public funds with the utmost care.

I have every confidence in the good faith and integrity of this House, and I believe this timely resolution will pass almost unanimously.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I first want to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON], chairman of the Committee on House Administration, for bringing this bill up for consideration today. As one who has long advocated more orderly and stringent requirements with respect to the reporting of expenditures, I am pleased to see the committee take this action. The pending bill is designed to require every Member of the Congress who travels abroad on official business, to spend only the statutory amount, on a per diem basis, for his travel and sustenance. It further requires that a detailed report of such expenditures be made to the Committee on House Administration and that such reports be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In view of the repeated reports of abuses by some Members in the use of counterpart funds abroad, this legislation has become highly necessary. The public interest will be served by the enactment of this bill.

There is one other abuse, Mr. Chairman, to which I wish to refer, which is not covered by this legislation. I am informed that an amendment which would correct the abuse I have in mind would be out of order if offered as an amendment to the pending bill. I have in mind the reports that some Members employ aids who do not actually work in their offices in Washington or in the offices they establish and maintain in their districts. It is conceivable that there might be an extraordinary situation when such employment might be justified. That could be the case where a Member finds it necessary to employ someone to do fieldwork or conduct an investigation that is not related to the Member's office. It is also possible that some Members in the cities maintain offices over the line in an adjoining district, for their convenience. It seems to me that in cases where there is legitimate employment, in good faith, under such conditions, there should be no objection raised to that practice.

I am thinking, however, of situations where the employed person does not actually function as a regular employee, and does not reside in the district represented by the Member, and who does not actually perform regular services.

Since any employment of this nature, where the employee does not work out of a Member's office, either in Washington or in the Member's district, creates an extraordinary situation, it seems to me that it is the obligation of the Congress to provide some protection against abuses that may result from such situations. Therefore, I have introduced H.R. 4334 which requires a Member, who employs someone to work outside of his district office, and outside of his Washington office, to first make application to the Committee on House Administration for permission to employ such a person. The committee could then listen to the Member's justification for such extraordinary employment, and if it was felt justified, the committee would, of course, give its approval; otherwise, it would deny the request.

That seems to me to be fair and reasonable. All legitimate employment would be protected, and at the same time, protection would be provided against abuses of the employment privilege granted by the Congress. I do hope that the committee to which this bill was referred will give it careful consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further requests for time? If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, no part of any appropriation shall be available for payment of any expenses in connection with travel outside the fifty States (including the District of Columbia) of the United States of any standing, select, or special committee of either House of Congress, or any joint committee of Congress, or any Member or employee of any such committee or joint committee, or by any Member or employee of either House of Congress acting as a member or employee of the United States group or delegation to the Interparliamentary Union, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Parliamentary Conference, the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group, the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group, or any similar interparliamentary group of which the United States is or becomes a member, or by any Member or employee of either House of Congress acting as a member or employee of any other group or delegation now or hereafter established or acting in any other capacity requiring or permitting travel outside the fifty States (including the District of Columbia), except in accordance with the following conditions:

(1) Such travel must be authorized by resolution of the House of Representatives in the case of any committee of the House of Representatives, any joint committee whose funds are disbursed by the Clerk of the House and any Member or employee of the House of Representatives serving on any interparliamentary or other group or delegation or in any other capacity.

(2) Such travel must be authorized by resolution of the Senate in the case of any committee of the Senate, any joint committee whose funds are disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate and any Member or employee of the Senate serving on any interparliamentary or other group or delegation or in any other capacity.

(3) No appropriation shall be available for payment of expenses in connection with such travel, other than transportation costs, if local currencies owned by the United States are available to such committee, joint committee, Member, or employee for payment of such expenses in accordance with section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954.

(4) Such appropriation shall be available only for payment of actual reasonable transportation costs and for the payment of per diem allowances in lieu of subsistence at rates not greater than the maximum daily

reimbursement for actual subsistence expenses permitted by the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and shall not be available for payment of any other expense in connection with such travel.

Each Member or employee expending any appropriated funds in connection with travel outside the 50 States (including the District of Columbia) of the United States shall report to the chairman of the committee authorizing the expenditure the amount of such expenditure for actual transportation costs and for per diem allowances and such report shall include dates the length of time spent in each territory, possession, and Commonwealth of the United States and in each foreign country. For the purpose of this report a statement of the total amount of the per diem allowance shall be considered a sufficient itemization of any expenditures made from such allowance. If transportation was furnished by a department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States the cost of such transportation shall be included in such report at the value assigned it by such department, agency, or instrumentality. Within the first 60 days the Congress is in session in each calendar year, the chairman of each such committee shall submit to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, as the case may be, a report which shall include each report submitted to him by a Member or employee under this section detailing expenditures of such Member or employee during the preceding calendar year together with consolidated totals of expenditures and such other information as the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives (if the committee be a committee of the House of Representatives or a joint committee whose funds are disbursed by the Clerk of the House) or as the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate (if the committee be a Senate committee or a joint committee whose funds are disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate) may require. Each such report submitted by a committee shall be published in the Congressional Record within 10 legislative days after it is received by the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, as the case may be. If any such report is not submitted by a committee within the period prescribed by this section, the chairman of the Committee on House Administration or Appropriations, as the case may be, shall have a statement published in the Congressional Record that such report has not been so submitted, in order that the House of Representatives or Senate, as the case may be, may take such action as it deems appropriate.

SEC. 2. Subsection (b) of section 105 of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1961 (22 U.S.C., sec. 276c–1), is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Each member of the United States group or delegation to the Interparliamentary Union, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Parliamentary Conference, the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group, the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group, or any similar interparliamentary group of which the United States is or becomes a member, each Member of either House of Congress acting as a member of any other group or delegation now or hereafter established or acting in any other capacity requiring or permitting travel outside the 50 States (including the District of Columbia), and each employee of the Senate or House of Representatives, by whom or on whose behalf expenditures are made from funds appropriated for the expenses of any such group or delegation, shall file with the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate in the case of Members or employees of the Senate, or with the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives in the case of Members or employees of the House, a report showing all amounts expended for actual transportation costs and for per diem allowances including by dates the length of time spent in each territory, possession, and Commonwealth of the United States and in each foreign country. For the purpose of this report a statement of the total amount of the per diem allowance shall be considered a sufficient itemization of any expenditures made from such allowance. If transportation was furnished by a department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States the cost of such transportation shall be included in such report at the value assigned it by such department, agency, or instrumentality. Within sixty days after the beginning of each regular session of Congress, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs shall each prepare a report which shall include each report submitted to him by a Member or employee under this subsection detailing the expenditures of such Member or employee during the preceding calendar year, together with consolidated totals of expenditures and such other information as the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives (in the case of the report required to be filed by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives) or the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate (in the case of the report required to be filed by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate) may require. The reports prepared by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate shall be filed with the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the reports prepared by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives shall be filed with the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives. Each such report shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD within ten legislative days after receipt by the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate or the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives. If any such report is not filed with the Committee on House Administration or Appropriations as the case may be, within the period prescribed by this subsection, the chairman of that committee shall have a statement published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that such report has not been so filed, in order that the House of Representatives or the Senate, as the case may be, may take such action as it deems appropriate.

SEC. 3. Subsection (b) of section 502 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 (22 U.S.C. 1754(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Notwithstanding section 1415 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1953, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to committees of Congress engaged in carrying out their duties under section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the Joint Economic Committee, and the Select Committees on Small Business of the Senate and the House of Representatives, for their local currency expenses subject to the following limitations:

"(1) Such currencies shall not be available for any standing, select, or special committee unless such committee is authorized by resolution of the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be, to sit and act outside of the fifty States (including the District of Columbia) of the United States. In the case of any joint committee whose funds are disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate such authorization shall be by resolution of the Senate and in the case of a joint committee whose funds are disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives such authorization shall be by resolution of the House of Representatives.

"(2) Such currencies shall be available only for payment of actual reasonable transportation costs and for payment of per diem allowances in lieu of subsistence at rates not greater than the maximum daily reimbursement for actual subsistence expenses permitted by the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and shall not be available for payment of any other expense in connection with such travel. Each Member or employee of any committee expending such foreign currencies shall report to the chairman of the committee authorizing the expenditure the amounts and dollar equivalent value of each such foreign currency expended for actual transportation costs and for per diem allowances and such report shall include by dates the length of time spent in each territory, possession, and Commonwealth of the United States and in each foreign country. For the purpose of this report a statement of the total amount of the per diem allowance shall be considered a sufficient itemization of any expenditures made from such allowance. If transportation was furnished by a department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States the cost of such transportation shall be included in such report at the value assigned it by such department, agency, or instrumentality. Within the first sixty days the Congress is in session in each calendar year, the chairman of each such committee shall submit to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, as the case may be, a report which shall include each report submitted to him by a Member or employee under this subsection detailing expenditures during the preceding calendar year, together with consolidated totals of expenditures and such other information as the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives (if the committee be a committee of the House of Representatives or a joint committee whose funds are disbursed by the Clerk of the House), or as the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate (if the committee be a Senate committee or a joint committee whose funds are disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate) may require. Each such report submitted by a committee shall be published in the Congressional Record within ten legislative days after it is received by the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, as the case may be. Where any such report has not been received by the Committee on House Administration or Appropriations, as the case may be, within the period prescribed in this subsection, the chairman of that committee shall have a statement published in the Congressional Record that such report has not been so received, in order that the House of Representatives or Senate as the case may be, may take such action as it deems appropriate.

SEC. 4. Within the first one hundred and eighty days the Congress is in session in each calendar year the head of each department or agency in the executive branch of the Government which furnishes or uses local currencies or appropriated funds for or in connection with travel outside the fifty States (including the District of Columbia) by any Member or employee of the Senate or House of Representatives shall submit to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives a report which shall contain the total amount of local currencies furnished the committees and joint committees of Congress during the preceding calendar year under authority of section 502 (b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 or any other provision of law and the total amount of appropriated funds which he furnished the committees and joint committees of Congress in connection with travel outside the fifty States (including the District of Columbia) of the United States during the preceding calendar year and the total amount of such funds which he used in furnishing such travel. Each such report shall specify the amount furnished each Member and employee of Congress, by name, for expenditure in each territory, possession, and commonwealth of the United States and in each foreign country visited, the dates of such visit, and the dollar equivalent value of each such local currency. Each report submitted under this section shall be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD within ten legislative days after it is received by the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, as the case may be.

Mr. BURLESON (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open for amendment at any point.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all committee amendments be considered en bloc.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments: Page 2, line 10, strike out "of" and insert "or".

Page 3, line 12, strike out "Such" and insert "Except as provided in paragraph (5), such".

Page 3, line 14, strike out "costs and" and insert "costs, actual food and lodging expenses, and".

Page 3, line 16, strike out "subsistence" and insert "actual food and lodging expenses".

Page 3, after line 22, insert a new paragraph as follows:

"(5) In the case of a Member of either House of Congress serving on any interparliamentary group or delegation such appropriation shall be available for expenses incurred in the entertainment of members and employees of such group or delegation."

Page 4, line 9, strike out "costs and" and insert "costs, for actual food and lodging expenses, and".

Page 4, line 11, after "include" insert "proper documentation for each such expenditure, and".

Page 4, line 15, strike out "a statement of the total amount of the" and insert "the statement of a".

Page 4, line 22, strike out "60" and insert "ninety".

Page 5, line 14, after "Record" strike out "within 10 legislative days after it is received".

Page 5, line 20, after "or" insert "the Committee on" and after "Appropriations" insert "of the Senate,".

Page 6, line 1, after the period insert: "Each such report and statement required to be published by this section shall not be published before the ninetieth day of that session of Congress but shall be published within ten legislative days after the ninetieth day.".

Page 6, line 21, after "funds" strike out "appropriated for" and insert "appropriated, or from foreign currencies made available under section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 (22 U.S.C. 1754(b)), for".

Page 7, line 6, strike out "costs and for per diem allowances including" and insert "costs, for actual food and lodging expenses, for per diem allowances, and for entertainment expenses, including proper documentation for each such expenditure, and".

Page 7, line 11, after the period insert "In the case of foreign currencies made available under section 502 (b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 (22 U.S.C. 1754 (b)) such amount shall be shown in their dollar equivalent value."

Page 7, line 15, after "report" strike out "a statement of the total amount of the" and insert "the statement of a".

Page 7, line 22, after "Within" strike out "sixty" and insert "ninety".

Page 8, line 19, after "Record" strike out "within ten legislative days after receipt".

Page 8, line 24 after "or" insert "the Committee on" and after "Appropriations" insert "of the Senate,".

Page 9, line 5, after the period insert: "Each such report and statement required to be published by this subsection shall not be published before the ninetieth day of that session of Congress but shall be published within ten legislative days after such ninetieth day.".

Page 9, line 21, after "Representatives," insert: "and to Members and employees of either House of Congress acting as members or employees of the United States group or delegation to the Interparliamentary Union, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Parliamentary Conference, the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group, the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group, and any similar interparliamentary group of which the United States is or becomes a member,".

Page 10, line 13, strike out "Senate such" and insert "Senate, and any Member or employee of the Senate serving on any interparliamentary group or delegation, such".

Page 10, line 18, strike out "Representatives such" and insert "Representatives, and any Member or employee of the House serving on any interparliamentary group or delegation, such".

Page 10, line 22, strike out "Such" and insert "Except as provided in paragraph (3), such".

Page 10, line 24, after "transportation" strike out "costs and" and insert "costs, actual food and lodging expenses, and".

Page 11, line 1, strike out "subsistence" and insert "actual food and lodging expenses".

Page 11, line 7, insert: "(3) In the case of a Member of either House of Congress serving on any interparliamentary group or delegation such currencies shall be available for expenses incurred in the entertainment of members and employees of such group or delegation."

Page 11, line 16, strike out "costs and" and insert "costs, for actual food and lodging expenses, and".

Page 11, line 18, after "include" insert "proper documentation for each such expenditure, and".

Page 11, line 22, strike out "a statement of the total amount of the" and insert "the statement of a".

Page 12, line 5, strike out "sixty" and insert "ninety".

Page 12, line 22, strike out "within ten legislative days after it is received".

Page 13, line 1, after "or" insert "the Committee on" and after "Appropriations" insert "of the Senate,".

Page 13, line 8, after the period insert: "Each such report and statement required to be published by this section shall not be published before the ninetieth day of that session of Congress but shall be published within ten legislative days after such ninetieth day.'"

Page 13, line 12, after "first" strike out "one hundred and eighty" and insert "ninety".

Page 13, line 22, strike out "committees and joint committees of Congress" and insert "committees, joint committees of Congress, and Members and employees of either House of Congress serving on any interparliamentary group or delegation".

Page 14, line 4, strike out "committees and joint committees of Congress" and insert "committees, joint committees of Congress, and Members and employees of either House of Congress serving on an interparliamentary group or delegation".

Page 14, line 18, strike out "within ten legislative days after it is received".

Page 14, line 21, after the period insert: Each such report required to be published by this section shall not be published before the ninetieth day of that session of Congress but shall be published within ten legislative days after such ninetieth day.

SEC. 5. (a) Notwithstanding the first section of this Act, section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, or any other provision of law, no part of any appropriation and no local currency owned by the United States shall be available for payment of any expenses in connection with travel outside the fifty States (including the District of Columbia) of the United States of—

(1) any Member of either House of Congress after he has been defeated as a candidate for election to a seat in the House of Representatives or the Senate of the United States in any regular election until such time as he shall thereafter become a Member of Congress; or

(2) any Member of either House of Congress after the adjournment sine die of the last session of a Congress if he is not a candidate for reelection to the next Congress.

(b) Subsection (a) of this section shall not apply in the case of any Member of Congress authorized to travel outside the fifty States (including the District of Columbia) of the United States as a member of the United States group or delegation to the Interparliamentary Union, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Parliamentary Conference, the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group, the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group, and any similar interparliamentary group of which the United States is or becomes a member, if his appointment to such group or delegation was made before the adjournment sine die of the last session of a Congress.

Mr. SCHENCK (interrupting the reporting of the committee amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered as read.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON], and those on his committee who supported him bringing this resolution to the House floor.

There are provisions in the resolution which plug the loopholes in existing law on this subject—loopholes which I sought to close in legislation which I introduced earlier this year and is now pending before the House Foreign Affairs Committee. I support this legislation although I do not think it is as tough in some respects as it should be. I would hope that the other body of Congress will not let it die on the vine when it gets over there. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question as to when the reports will become available for public scrutiny.

Mr. BURLESON. The gentleman has reference to the reports which come from the Department of State and from the committees. They have a 90-day period from the convening of the Congress to make the report. The House Administration Committee has 10 days in which to insert them in the Record.

As a practical matter, as we have always done, immediately upon receipt of these reports we put them in the Congressional Record. In this way it gives newspaper reporters equal opportunity to see them.

Mr. GROSS. When will they be open to public scrutiny?

Mr. BURLESON. When they are put in the Congressional Record.

Mr. GROSS. After they are in the Record or prior thereto?

Mr. BURLESON. When they are in the Record. Understand, the committee has not promulgated all these rules as yet. I am speaking as an individual. That would be my idea, that as soon as the reports are received from the chairmen of the standing committees and from the State Department they immediately go right into the Record. I think in those cases, where receipts or supporting data are furnished, if the Member of Congress or employee has not used per diem, it should be spread out so that everybody can see. I do not know where we can do that. I do not know whether we have nails to hang it on or a big table to spread it out on. I think it should be done, however. I shall recommend to my committee that such procedure should be adopted.

Mr. GROSS. This will be after they are published in the Congressional Record or prior thereto?

Mr. BURLESON. It will be at the same time.

Mr. GROSS. Then they will be available to the public?

Mr. BURLESON. That is right. It is for my committee to decide otherwise, but I think that my committee would not decide otherwise.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as one who has done quite a bit of traveling and as one who will probably do more traveling, as one who believes in the desirability of congressional travel at home and abroad, I want to point out that there never have been the kind of rules a good many Members seem to think there had. Maybe some Members have not followed the rules but the existing rules do require an accounting. I have thought that requirement was a good thing. I have always filed such accounts. I think it is a desirable thing. I think this requirement is fair. I think it is a desirable thing to require the additional reporting which is provided in the terms of this joint resolution.

I think that probably the most objectionable feature to our travel procedure in the past has been the fact that there was not complete understanding of what was required. I am certain that the great majority of the Members of Congress have handled their travel accounts just as fairly and as openly as any other accounts in or out of Congress. But since some accounts have not reflected in detail what was actually expended, I think the provisions of this joint resolution are sound, that they should be adopted, and that the passage of this bill will have a very splendid effect all over the country. It should help to restore confidence which has been impaired, often without justification. Actually there are those who are trying to destroy our form of government by discrediting the legislative branch. They have often been able to do so by citing what seemed to be improper use of counterpart funds. Indeed this has been done in cases where full accounts were on file. As for my personal travel expenses, I have attended several of the meetings of the Interparliamentary Union. That organization for the last several years has operated with a bonded fiscal officer making the expenditures and preparing expense accounts. The Members do not make major personal expenditures. I think that that fact has been widely misunderstood. In fact, there have been those who have said that members of the Interparliamentary Union have carried their wives along at Government expense. It is true that as in most international meetings the presence of Members' wives is quite important, and the President himself has authorized their transportation on the Government plane which is normally available, there is no extra cost to the Government and the Members have paid their wives' hotel and similar expenses. In fact where the fiscal officer has paid Members' bill which contained an item of expense attributable to the Member's wife that much has been charged back to the Member and I hold canceled check evidencing my reimbursement of the Government. I am certain that other I.P.U. delegates have also made similar payments. Therefore, the oft repeated charge that Members have taken their wives to I.P.U. meetings, Mr. Chairman, simply is not true and anyone who has taken the reports now on file knows it.

The other type of travel in which I have engaged has been on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture. Where I have made such trips I have filed itemized expense accounts, and several other Members have done likewise, although some have not availed themselves of that privilege. Anyone who wants to see those accounts has my permission to look at them. This bill will simply see that everybody follows this course. I do not think there is any hardship about it. I do not think there is anything unfair about it. I think that it will tend to give a much clearer understanding to those who have had the opinion that all of those who have traveled outside the United States have been doing so without any accounting whatsoever.

Of course, unfortunately most of those who have engaged in this criticism of the Congress have not bothered to look at the record, which is now available to see what accounts were filed. The passage of this resolution cannot make anybody look at the record. Those who do not want to see the accounts that are on file obviously will never see them, no matter what kind of legislation we pass. But if we pass this legislation, accounts from all who travel will be available for everybody, and I think it will afford a great degree of protection of the great majority of the Members of Congress who always have carried on their travels on a proper and legitimate basis.

I congratulate the committee and I congratulate the chairman for the good work they have done in bringing this much-needed legislation before us. I join with the gentleman from Iowa in hoping that the other body will see fit to act on this and act favorably rather than simply to pigeonhole it. This bill would treat the Members of each House just the same. It would treat the members of all committees just alike. I think we need the same rules across-the-board. This bill provides such impartial justice.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Roberts of Alabama, Chairman of the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 245) to provide that Members of Congress shall be limited to per diem allowances and necessary transportation costs in connection with travel outside the United States, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 331, he reported the joint resolution back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 387, nays 2, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 40]

YEAS—387

Abbitt
Abele
Abernethy
Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Andrews
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Auchincloss
Avery
Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Barry
Bass
Bates
Battin
Becker
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonner

Bow
Brademas
Bray
Bromwell
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke
Burkhalter
Burleson
Burton
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cannon
Carey
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clark
Clausen
Cleveland
Cohelan
Colmer
Corbett
Corman
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Diggs
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards
Elliott
Ellsworth
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Ford
Foreman
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Gathings
Gavin
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gill
Glenn
Gonzalez
Goodell
Goodling
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halpern
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Hechler
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Hoffman
Holifield
Holland
Horan
Horton
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Jensen
Joelson
Johansen
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
Kilburn
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Knox
Kornegay
Kunkel
Kyl
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Lankford
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lesinski
Lindsay
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McIntire
McLoskey
McMillan
MacGregor
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Meader
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Mills
Minish
Minshall
Monagan
Montoya
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
Norblad
Nygaard
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pilcher
Pillion
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Rains
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rich
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. George
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Sheppard
Shipley
Shriver
Sibal
Sickles
Sikes
Siler
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Snyder
Springer
Staebler
Stafford
Staggers
Stephens
Stinson
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Thornberry
Toll
Tollefson
Trimble
Tuck
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Van Pelt
Vinson
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watson
Watts
Weaver
Weltner
Westland
Whalley
Wharton
White
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wydler
Wyman
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—2

Cameron
Libonati

NOT VOTING—44

Alger
Anderson
Ashley
Aspinall
Ayres
Barrett
Beermann
Brock
Bruce
Buckley
Collier
Conte
Cooley
Finnegan
Fino
Fogarty
Forrester
Garmatz
Gary
Grant
Hagan, Ga.
Halleck
Hanna
Healey
Hoeven
Kee
Lipscomb
Macdonald
Madden
Morton
Pepper
Powell
Rosenthal
Roush
Scott
Shelley
Short
Smith, Iowa
Steed
Thompson, N.J.
Utt
Walter
Wickersham
Wright

So the joint resolution was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Walker with Mr. Beermann.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Short.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Bruce.
Mr. Rosenthal with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Hoeven.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Anderson.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Conte.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Alger.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Steed with Mr. Lipscomb.
Mr. Shelley with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Scott with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Wright with Mrs. Kee.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Cooley.
Mr. Gary with Mr. Finnegan.
Mr. Forrester with Mr. Grant.
Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Healey.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. **BURLESON**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the joint resolution just passed.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PANAMA CANAL ZONE STAMPS

Mr. **CASEY**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. **CASEY**. Mr. Speaker, in 1960, in defiance of a 382-to-12 vote of this House, President Eisenhower by Executive order gave permission for the flying of the Panamanian flag in the Canal Zone. We were told then that the flag would only fly in one place a symbol of friendship.

Today, the Panamanian flag flies at numerous locations, including the Canal Zone administration buildings and the Thatcher Ferry Bridge. Had not a patriotic American citizen working in the zone filed a lawsuit in an endeavor to stop the flying of the Panamanian flag, it would be flying in 12 additional places, according to the Governor of the zone. With this movement, the camel got his head under the tent, and little by little there is an effort to shove hump and all into the tent by those who would gradually relinquish control of the zone.

Today, I address the House about a little thing—as small as a postage stamp—and it involves the Panama Canal Zone. But as small as it is, the principle involved is as big as our Nation. And I, for one, am getting a bit weary of seeing the interests and sovereignty of this country placed second to the rest of the world by those who would continue to appease.

The current move is to stop the issuance of Panama Canal Zone stamps. These would be replaced by Republic of Panama stamps overprinted with the phrase "Canal Zone." Coupled with this demand from Panama is one asking the right to represent the Canal Zone at the International Postal Convention.

Today, I introduced a bill which would prohibit the Governor of the Canal Zone from taking such action. If you feel as I do, that it is time to call a halt to continual giving in, I ask your support.

There will be some who will argue that this small issue is within the province of the executive branch to decide. This is not true.

A few short months ago—October 18, 1962—the Canal Zone Code passed by this House was approved. In section 1132(a)(4), Congress gave to the Governor of the Canal Zone the authority to "prescribe the postage stamps and other stamped paper which shall be used in the (postal) service."

Congress did not give to the Governor or the State Department the authority to further erode the jurisdiction we hold over the Canal Zone, in perpetuity, by treaty.

To the people of the Republic of Panama, I say that you have no greater friends than the Members of this House, and the members of the Panama Canal Subcommittee of the Merchant Marine Committee. As a member of this subcommittee, like my colleagues, I am aware of your problems and your aspirations. We respect you as friends and as a nation. In turn, we have a right to expect you to respect the treaty rights of the United States.

I urge the Members of the House to join with me in stopping this sellout of our sovereignty and to put some backbone into our operation of the canal.

WATER RIGHTS AND RECLAMATION PROJECTS

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, there has been in the West and in Montana a stimulation of fear as against the Bureau of Reclamation, alleging in this fear that the Bureau of Reclamation is taking water rights away from the people settled in the West, especially in Montana. The important source of this fear is ignorance of the Bureau of Reclamation's claims for water rights and ignorance of the law of water rights of the West and of Montana particularly.

Recently a teacher of law at Montana State University, the Honorable Albert W. Stone, prepared a paper which is based on an investigation of the law of water rights of Montana and the law of water rights as it pertains to the Bureau of Reclamation. I include that as part of my remarks, to help to alleviate and dismiss the ignorance which has been the basis for this false fear about the Bureau of Reclamation:

STATEMENT OF ALBERT W. STONE ON MONTANA WATER RIGHTS AND RECLAMATION PROJECTS

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Albert W. Stone, a teacher of law at Montana State University and particularly interested in water resources and water law. I organized and directed the annual Water Resources Conferences in Montana, am a member of the American Bar Association's Committee on Water Resources, and have published on water resources in both national and local professional journals. I am not a member of any pressure group which either supports or opposes the Knowles Dam. I speak only for myself, and I do favor the construction of the Knowles Dam.

Increasingly in recent years, many Montanans have opposed Federal projects because they feared that the Bureau of Reclamation would take our water rights. This fear has been made plausible by the practice of the Bureau of filing a claim to all of the unappropriated water in the river system upstream from a reclamation project, pursuant to section 8 of the Reclamation Act. But a more important source of this fear has been a general ignorance of the nature of Bureau of Reclamation water rights and Montana water law. Fears can be easily exploited and even promoted where there is a lack of public information: fear feeds on ignorance.

I. INTRODUCTION

In the years from the middle of the last century until the turn of the century, the Federal Government entered upon large scale plans to regulate and dispose of its vast ownership of land and waters in the Western territories. Under the Desert Land Act of 1877 and in other legislation, the Federal Government granted permission to westerners to homestead the lands, and to appropriate the waters in nonnavigable streams on the lands open to settlement. As new States were formed in the West, these States undertook the administration of these water rights on those streams. The Federal Government still retained rights to water on Federal reservations which were not open to settlement, as well as control, perhaps ownership too, of navigable waters. These elements of Federal rights need to be defined and integrated with the system of State-administered rights, but they are not within the scope of this discussion because they do not involve the future acquisition of new rights to water by the Federal Government.

The Federal Government also has the power of eminent domain, just as our State government has, and just as private utilities exercising governmental functions have. Although this power is one whereby new rights may be acquired, it is not unique to the Federal Government. Moreover, it is not normally used by the Bureau of Reclamation in its acquisition of water rights. Far more frequently the Bureau of Reclamation proceeds to acquire its water rights under section 8 of the Reclamation Act. Since that is the method most often exercised by the Bureau of Reclamation, and this discussion is directed at reclamation water rights, the remainder of this statement relates to the Bureau of Reclamation's acquisition of Montana water rights under section 8 of the Reclamation Act.

II. RIGHTS UNDER SECTION 8 OF THE RECLAMATION ACT

Section 8 of the Reclamation Act directs the Secretary of the Interior to proceed in conformity with the laws of the State where the project is, with the further limitations that the water rights so acquired shall be appurtenant to the land irrigated and measured by beneficial use. Thus, commencing with the Reclamation Act in 1902, water rights for Bureau of Reclamation projects in Montana under section 8 of that act, became completely dependent upon our own Montana law of water rights. So, 3 years later, in 1905, Montana authorized the Secretary of the Interior to appropriate water in Montana "in the same manner and subject to the general conditions application to the appropriation of the waters of the State by private individuals." (RCM (1947) sec. 89–808). Thenceforth, under section 8 of the Reclamation Act, the Bureau has proceeded just like anybody else in Montana to appropriate water.

Under these provisions of law, the Bureau of Reclamation does not act any differently, nor under any different rules than other Montana water users. Our fundamental law of priority in water rights is "first in time, first in right." Under that law, whatever rights the Bureau obtains are subsequent and inferior to any and all prior appropriations of water. And of course, like any other appropriator, the Bureau's rights will be ahead of and superior to any later appropriator.

Moreover, the Bureau does not propose to ship the water off in freight cars to its offices in Washington, D.C. Rather, it proposes to develop reclamation programs here in Montana, as it has done through the West, claiming water rights which become "appurtenant to the land irrigated" (sec. 8, Reclamation Act). The irrigators and owners of that land are Montana citizens organized into water users' associations and irrigation districts in order to receive the benefits of the reclamation program under Montana law. The program is one of cooperation between Federal, State, and local agencies for the development and local use of water on Montana land for Montana people.

III. CLAIMS TO WATER ARE NOT RIGHTS TO WATER: MONTANA LAW

As our water resources become more fully utilized, our need becomes greater for a modern water law code which will permit the State engineer to determine in advance how much water a person needs, and how much unappropriated water, if any, is still available for appropriation in a stream system. In Montana, the filing for a water right resembles a child's Christmas list. A child's list always asks for much more than the child ultimately receives, and you cannot tell what a child got for Christmas by looking at the list of what he hoped to get. Typically, Montana appropriators file claims to much more water than they need or can use; indeed, to more water than is available in the stream from which they appropriate. Our State has no law which limits an appropriator's claim; we have no State officer who can determine in advance how much water a person needs, nor how much unappropriated water may still be available for appropriation in a stream system.

But the filing by an appropriator of an excessive claim to water does not lead to a water right greater than he puts to a beneficial use. No matter what his water right claim is, his right is limited to his beneficial use. And this is so for the Bureau of Reclamation too, under Montana water law and section 8 of the Reclamation Act. The trouble is that under our law, in order for a person to find out whether there is any remaining water available for a new appropriation, he has to go through a needlessly costly and complicated water rights suit. We should have a modern water law code such as other Western States have, providing for a simple administrative determination of the needs of prior appropriators and the volume of water still remaining available for others.

IV. EFFECT OF LIMITED WATER RESOURCES

Ultimately, as we develop our use of our waters, our streams will become fully appropriated. Some already have been. For example, the Bureau's principal opponent in Montana, the Montana Power Co., "asserted the right by prior appropriation to the use of all the waters of the Missouri River and its tributaries for the purpose of operating certain hydroelectric plants—seven in number—located on the upper reaches of that stream" (*Broadwater-Missouri Water Users' Assn.* v. *Montana Power Co.*, 139 F. 2d 998 (1944)). The Bureau's appropriations are also large appropriations for the use of many, many Montana water and electricity users. In some instances it is undoubtedly true that the Bureau's filed claim for all of the water upstream from a particular project is supported by a need for all of that water for beneficial uses under our law. In such cases there is simply insufficient water to supply additional appropriations, and our law of first in time, first in right favors the prior appropriators.

V. BUREAU OF RECLAMATION USES OF OUR WATER

East of the Continental Divide the large Bureau water storage projects irrigate our farmlands long after the streamflow drops off in the summer. Local citizen-farmers, members of irrigation districts and water users' associations irrigate hundreds of thousands of acres of land which produce millions of dollars worth of crops each year. Towns and communities have developed and prospered where our farmers have received the benefits of this cooperative program of Federal, State and local organizations for the development of our Western lands.

West of the divide, a storage project such as the Knowles Dam would provide lesser irrigation benefits than the Eastern projects, but the power and industrial benefits would be greater. To obtain year-round dependable power generation it is necessary to store the spring runoff which now leaves our State without being used, and run that water through the generators at Knowles, Thompson Falls, and Noxon Rapids Dams during the lowflow period of the year. The power which would be produced at the Knowles Dam, if safeguarded by law with a reservation of priority for Montana uses, would be marketed in and for Montana by private power companies, by local and regional public agencies, and by our rural electric cooperatives. The additional power resulting from water stored at Knowles, which could be generated at the Thompson Falls and Noxon Rapids Dams would be marketed by private power companies in Montana and eastern Washington.

But there is an even more important long-term benefit to Montana which is generally overlooked. That is the use of regulated streamflows in attracting industry. It must be remembered that there are approximately 100 miles of the river in Montana, below the

Knowles damsite. Industries throughout the United States are seeking locations where large quantities of fresh water for industrial use are available on a reliable basis. But neither the maximum nor the average flow of a river is reliable throughout the year. So industries must look to the minimum flow, for that is all that is available during a substantial part of each year. The storage of the maximum flow during the spring runoff, and the release of that water during the minimum flow season increases those minimum flows and therefore increases the attractiveness of the river for industrial location. In the long run, a storage project such as Knowles Dam can contribute even more to Montana by regulating the flow of the Clark Fork for 100 miles in Montana, than through the generation of electric power.

Such uses of Montana water in Montana under Montana law are made possible by the reclamation program.

WHO DETERMINES U.S. DEFENSE STRATEGY?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an article.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, how long is it going to take for the Congress to awaken to what has been taking place in our Department of Defense under Secretary McNamara and his "whiz kids" of the slide rule?

We are confronted with a question that must be resolved before it is too late. The question is this: Is our military defense strategy, our defense plans, and our future defense posture, to be entrusted to civilian theorists, with no military training or experience; or, is our defense strategy, plans, and posture to be entrusted to the experienced military judgment of our Joint Chiefs of Staff?

Not today, not tomorrow, but in the not too distant future—unless we awaken before it is too late—we could find ourselves a second-rate military power, with neither the military plans nor equipment necessary to deal decisively with a determined enemy who is daily planning and preparing for our destruction.

I have many times called attention to the alarming extent to which the Secretary of Defense and his civilian aides are substituting their theoretical judgment for the experienced judgment of our Joint Chiefs of Staff on matters strictly military. It should be obvious to all of us from the TFX controversy and the RS-70 controversy, and a number of other matters involving our defense plans and posture, that military judgment and military experience is being minimized at the Pentagon.

Hanson W. Baldwin, the military expert of the New York Times, has called public attention to this development in our defense planning. Stewart Alsop in his Saturday Evening Post article, entitled "Our New Strategy—The Alternative to Total War," has also called public attention to this dangerous development at the Pentagon.

And now former Chief of Staff of the Air Force, Gen. Thomas D. White, a military veteran of 35 years' experience, writes to the same effect in a Saturday Evening Post article, entitled "Strategy and the Defense Intellectuals."

Today, under Secretary McNamara, we have these so-called defense intellectuals running cards through a machine and presuming to get all the answers to the kind of a military defense we should have. Many of us are coming to the inescapable conclusion that some of these answers to our defense needs are wrong.

I still hold to the fact that long years of military experience has real value. I hold to the view that when there is a military decision to be made that will determine our defense posture in the days ahead we should rely on the judgment of those who by training and years of experience are equipped to make such decisions.

I commend to your careful reading the articles by General White, which I am making a part of these remarks:

STRATEGY AND THE DEFENSE INTELLECTUALS

(By Gen. Thomas D. White)

(A military expert says the academic theorists in charge of our defense lack understanding of war and the enemy.)

In common with many other military men, active and retired, I am profoundly apprehensive of the pipe-smoking, tree-full-of-owls type of so-called professional "defense intellectuals" who have been brought into this Nation's capital. I don't believe a lot of these often overconfident, sometimes arrogant young professors, mathematicians and other theorists have sufficient worldliness or motivation to stand up to the kind of enemy we face. War is a brutal, dirty, deadly affair. Our enemy is a coarse, crooked megalomaniac who aims to kill us. Exceptions to the thesis that brute force, not theory, wins wars are so rare that every schoolboy can go back 3,000 years to David and Goliath.

Stewart Alsop's recent look at "Our New Strategy—The Alternatives to Total War" (Saturday Evening Post, Dec. 1, 1962) and his exposition of the defense intellectuals and their viewpoint form the basis of my commentary. It is perfectly clear to me from Mr. Alsop's context that by "defense intellectuals" he means civilians and not military officials.

Stewart Alsop is too experienced a reporter to intrude his own views into the type of article cited. I accept what he has written, therefore, as an accurate picture of how some of our strategymakers see themselves and our strategy. My comments, therefore, are on these images reflected in Mr. Alsop's mirror.

The term "defense intellectual" conveys a nice, cozy, unwarlike, and nonmilitary feeling, as though modern war could be settled on a chessboard in an ivy-covered great hall. Couple it with such relatively reassuring terms as "mutual deterrence," "stability," "no-cities response," "second-strike counterforce capability," and other quasi-military shibboleths, and we have created an atmosphere and mislanguage which to my mind is dangerously deceptive. Alsop wrote, "The jargon has an unreal and academic ring 'at first,' like the debates of medieval theologians." The quotes are mine, for I must add that even after a lifetime in the military service I consider most of these terms as recent inventions, as nontechnical and unprofessional. They smack of "status words" used by amateurs to impress their listeners.

I am quite sure that few of the terms and none of the so-called strategy behind these terms intended to deliberately mislead the public. But it is exactly this fuzziness, the innocence and naivete which worry me. The very fact that some of the strategymakers refer to their jobs as "thinking about the unthinkable" is in itself a revelation of the weightless dreamland in which they move and have their influence.

BLEATING AND BOUQUETS

Because of their lack of experience and their muddled reasoning, these modern strategymakers failed to evaluate properly Washington's actions in getting Soviet missiles removed from Cuba. The U.S. Government was courageous in the recent Cuban crisis. Yet it seems to me we had little choice. Here was our sworn enemy in our own front yard with a dagger about to be pointed at our heart. If we had not been decisive we surely could never have stood up to Khrushchev anywhere else in the world. Nevertheless all over this country there was a great pounding of our chests and loud bleating about the great American victory.

It has been my observation that these bouquets aimed at ourselves came from three sources: those with understandable political motivation, the ignorant, and the defense intellectuals.

Perhaps the most dangerous aspect of American strategymaking today is that military influence apparently is so disparaged by the so-called intellectuals. The Alsop article makes one single reference to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. An extended interview with Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara on the new strategy never mentions the Joint Chiefs, the Nation's highest military authorities designated by law as the principal military advisers to the President.

To be sure, Gen. Maxwell Taylor, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, stands high in the echelons of the defense intellectuals. But it is worth noting that many military men look upon General Taylor as a political appointee and not a purely military strategist.

Perhaps the most striking oversimplification of the present-day defense dilemma was given a few months ago by Under Secretary of State George Ball when he said, "In the field of modern defense there is no received wisdom, no tablets of the law, no copybooks, not even any demonstrated military precepts." And it is indeed true that only two atomic weapons have been used in all warfare—and these, most significantly, by the United States of America.

Certainly things have changed. The stakes are far higher, the mechanisms more complex, and the margins for error finer. In my opinion the change is greatest at the politico-military level. In war our military have always gambled with literal life or death. They realize their decisions are measured in casualties; sometimes their own lives are at stake. Our politicians and diplomats in the past have played only with personal careers and relatively minor national stakes. Today the civil authorities deal with national existence and in atomic war risk as much personally as a military man at the front.

The range of maneuver in the nuclear arena requires that every possible civil and military tool be at hand. But it seems to me the old strengths still apply. In my opinion the two that count for most in the nuclear space age, regardless of academic cerebrations, are national determination and military forces designed to achieve victory, not tailored to obtain compromise. Professional military training teaches the philosophy of victory, whereas politics is based on compromise.

If "thinking men in and out of the Pentagon are beginning to question the value of the nuclear weapon as the chief military instrument of national policy," as Mr. Alsop wrote, then I know that the gremlins of wishful thinking and fear are afoot. I recall my tourist's view of the crumbled vestiges of long forgotten civilizations which failed to grasp the significance of a decisive new tool of war.

Certain scientists, having harnessed the atom, today are consciously or unconsciously influenced by guilt and wish to derogate their profession's role in war. In misguided idealism they find secret hope that an out-of-sight, out-of-mind policy will preserve the peace or at least turn the clock backward and save civilization from the specters of nuclear and space warfare.

Overconfidence, derived perhaps from hope, seems to be another image of unreality glimpsed in some corridors of the National Capital. When I read that "very soon now our defense combination will be unbreakable," I am certain amateurs are at large. In this age when technology moves ahead every 4 years as much as in the 100 years prior to 1945 it is utterly unsafe to consider any military situation will stay put more than briefly.

Stability of military power has always been subject to sudden upset, but in these decades the balance is particularly precarious. At the very time we claimed vast superiority over the Soviet Union Mr. K.'s missiles in Cuba came perilously close to turning some tables. Yet this was only a shift in deployment. What makes the blood of military realists run cold is that a technological breakthrough (for example, a positive defense against ICBM's and Polaris missiles, or space weapons, or a doomsday bomb with adequate booster) by the U.S.S.R. could challenge our freedom. We could find ourselves helpless because the lead time of modern weapons—that is, the time from concept until they are operational—runs from 5 to 10 years.

It is well to recall that the Russians produced an atom bomb and a hydrogen bomb long before the date our national intelligence had forecast; they orbited a military man in space, and we were helpless to match the feat for 10 months. And we still have not equaled their man-in-space projects.

SCIENTISTS BELIEVE U.S. ACTIVE SPACE EFFORT DOES NOT REQUIRE CRASH MAN-ON-THE-MOON PROJECT

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, more than a score of American winners of past Nobel Prizes gathered in St. Peter, Minn., last weekend to dedicate a new science hall at Gustavus Adolphus College.

Yesterday's Washington Post carried a story by Albert Eisele which reveals the consensus of the scientists' thinking on this Government's engaging in a crash program to land a man on the moon by or before 1970.

The majority opinion disfavored such a crash effort, on the grounds chiefly that enormous waste would attend such a speeded-up schedule.

The prizewinners deplored the race aspects of the moon program, holding that only the political factors involved demand a race for the moon. Certainly science itself cannot and should not be hurried.

All of this squares essentially with what I learned on a recent trip I made to Cape Canaveral, where I visited both the military and NASA space complexes.

No one there in a position of authority—civilian or uniformed—would advocate a crash project. They are prepared to implement such a program if it is ordered by our Space Policy Council, but none of them preferred it to a careful well-conceived step-by-step staging of space exploration.

I recognize our world leadership requires us to maintain an active space effort, and I am willing to support adequate appropriations for orderly progress in this field. However, I want to urge this House at this time to take note of these comments from lustrous members of the thinking and scientific community.

There will be moments in the future when the passions of patriotism and the emotions of competition may seduce your commonsense. I plead with you now to remember, when such a day comes, that there is nothing more patriotic than a solvent Treasury, and it is my consistent hope that this Congress will strive to achive that happy state.

The Washington Post story follows:

NOBEL WINNERS CRITICIZE MOON PROJECT

(Albert Eisele)

ST. PETER, MINN.—The proposed $20 billion crash program to land an American on the moon in this decade would make more sense if removed from the "crash" category.

That was majority opinion expressed by 25 of America's 55 living Nobel Prizewinners who gathered in this small southern Minnesota college town over the weekend for the dedication of the first American memorial to Alfred Nobel. Specifically, the Nobel Prizewinners were here to dedicate the $1.5 million Alfred Nobel Hall of Science at Gustavus Adolphus College.

Several in the group, including Atomic Energy Commission Chairman Glenn T. Seaborg, said they would like to see America land men on the moon by 1970, but most had serious reservations about a crash program because of waste involved.

Seaborg said he feels the proposed program should be carried out because "We're in the 20th century—the goal has been set. It's a far-out intellectual endeavor and an exploration of nature."

TREMENDOUS WASTE

"I'll go along with what seems to be the majority opinion that there would be a tremendous amount of waste involved in a crash program," commented Dr. Edward L. Tatum, of New York City's Rockefeller Institute. "It would be much less efficient and much more costly to embark on a crash program, even if not doing so means we would fall behind Russia."

United Nations Under Secretary Ralph J. Bunche, another Nobel winner, declined to comment on the U.S. proposed program, but did come out against any kind of a race for space between countries.

"The exploration and conquest of outer space is certainly justifiable and exciting pioneering and that effort must go on," he said. "But there would be less justification I think, for conducting such efforts as a race, particularly when there is a crying need for the intensive application of science and funds to problems like food and water supply, overpopulation, mental health, and control of cancer and heart disease."

Both governments and people, Bunche said, "need to comprehend that development is more exciting and more imperative than rocketry."

PAULING ASSAILS PLAN

Linus Pauling expressed emphatic opposition to the U.S. moon program.

"I am opposed to these expenditures by both the United States and the Soviet Union," he said. "I think that while it will contribute something in the way of scientific discovery, the contribution will be very small compared to putting that money into several other fields such as medical research or other basic scientific research * * * or in using the funds in underdeveloped countries."

Three of the laureates declined to make any comment regarding the U.S. moon program, saying they did not have enough data on it or that the political and scientific aspects of such a program cannot be separated.

One of those calling for a noncrash program using instruments to probe the moon was Columbia University Physicist Polycarp Kusch.

"The question is a bit sharp and deserves better than a yes-no answer," he replied when asked if he thought the United States should spend $20 billion, as is now proposed, to land men on the moon in this decade.

"I'd rather see us explore space in a more temperate and well-thought-out way," he said. "Instrument exploration is almost certainly more effective and cheaper, and in the face of pressing natural needs, I take a dim view to spending $20 billion in a relatively short time in exploring the moon."

The job can be done by instruments better and more cheaply, agreed Peter J. W. Debye, Dutch chemist now at Cornell University, and 80-year-old James Franck, principal author of the 1945 Frank report that warned of atomic dangers and proposed a peaceful international demonstration before the atomic bombing of Japan.

"I have nothing against our going to the moon as long as it's not a race—you can't speed up science," commented St. Louis medical researcher, Dr. Carl F. Cori. "I think you'll find among most scientists that they think the idea of a race is unfortunate."

FIVE-YEAR TARIFF MORATORIUM

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, this morning we were greeted by an announcement by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] that a cartel was being arranged by those in the production of steel in Japan and in the Western European countries, and that they had cut up the American market and had allotted certain areas of the steel market in this Nation among their individual members. All this goes on while the State Department is in its customary world free trade fog. This brings more emphasis to what I say today.

Mr. Speaker, when the Trade Expansion Act was passed last year much was made of the assistance that would be given to industry and labor should injury result from tariff reductions.

I was opposed to the bill. It appeared to me to be a great weakening of the escape clause, and to elimination of the peril point.

It is an indefensible policy to beset our industries and their workers with conditions consciously created to injure them. It seems incredible that the Congress should be called on by the executive branch or more specifically the State Department while we appropriate billions of dollars for foreign economic aid to handicap and smite our own industries. It seems more incredible that Congress should have supported the Executive; for Congress represents the people more directly than the executive branch.

It was said that since industries would no doubt be hurt by the new Trade Act in behalf of the Nation as a whole, the beleaguered industries and their deprived workers should be compensated through adjustment assistance. This was on the untenable theory that any industry or company that cannot compete with imports is ipso facto inefficient and not deserving of continuation as a manufacturer of the particular products in which it cannot compete.

This is a pernicious doctrine since it rests on assumptions that are contrary to fact. Nearly everyone knows that inability of American industry to compete with imports arises not from relative inefficiency but almost wholly from the higher wage standards of this country. If our industry and agriculture were inefficient we would not today be producing a greater output year after year with annually fewer production workers employed. It is estimated that automation is displacing over a million workers per year in this country. We do not need the help of imports to displace still more workers so that we may have the pleasure of retraining and relocating them.

Our agriculture is easily the most efficient in the world. Yet we cannot export wheat and cotton, two of our leading crops, without subsidization to the extent of about 30 percent. Our coal industry doubled its output per manhour since 1950 and is the most productive in the world but employment of mine workers has been cut in half in the past 10 or 12 years. Meantime our coal cannot compete with imported residual fuel oil. This inability to compete cannot be blamed on inefficiency of our coal-mining industry. Nor can our inability to meet world wheat and cotton prices be laid to inefficiency. Efficiency of itself does not guarantee an export market nor does it assure ability to compete with imports.

Scores of thousands of coal miners are out of work. How many have been retrained and relocated in other industries? Is this not difficult enough a task without adding to unemployment by relaxing the import quota on residual oil?

The policy of afflicting our industries with sharper and sharper import competition in pursuit of some frayed academic economic theory and to satisfy the diplomatic inadequacies of the State Department, should be unacceptable as a guide to legislative action. Not only is the doctrine on which the policy is based false by almost any test; it poses mounting injury to our economy and intensification of the unemployment problem.

The notion that it is incumbent on this country to open its doors still wider to imports even though we have already reduced our tariffs an average of 80 percent in the past 29 years under the trade program flies in the face of hard and visible facts. Those who insist on this are courting the economic breakdown of this country through mounting unemployment year after year.

The purpose of the further profligate tariff reductions is to enable us to export more and to buy more goods from abroad. I can tell you that it is clearly demonstrable that our economic interests are not best served by this policy. Quite the contrary. More and more of our imports are coming to consist of finished goods and manufactured foodstuffs. The trend in our exports on the other hand is in the opposite direction. More of our exports are taking the form of farm products and raw materials.

This sort of trade is wholly self-defeating so far as creation of employment is concerned. We import more and more of the labor-intensive products, such as pottery and handmade glassware, and export more of the products that are labor-sparse, such as unmanufactured foodstuffs, unmanufactured fibers, and other raw materials. Thus other countries are doing more manufacturing for us and employing the workers that we otherwise would employ, while we ship abroad more and more unmanufactured goods. In turning these exports into finished goods, it is the other countries, instead of this country, that gain more jobs for their workers.

To speak of expanded trade under these circumstances as offering a remedy to unemployment in this country is to run away from reality and to be rushed into a disastrous course.

Then to say that we should set up adjustment assistance to repair the damage adds up to something much worse than Alice in Wonderland ever came upon.

We are the big brother to the world, evidently. We flex our muscles and beat our chest. We can cut off our fingers and hands and then somehow grow new ones and still continue to take care of ourselves and help the world. We must be the great invulnerable giant indeed, so powerful that we can mutilate ourselves and never give it a thought; for after all, so rich and strong are we that we only have to reach into the Treasury and buy our way through all our difficulties.

Mr. Speaker, the theories and doctrines that guide our trade policy have been accepted blindly and uncritically too long.

If we cannot export many of our leading farm products to world markets without paving the way with 30 percent subsidies despite our high yields per acre, achieved with application of modern technology; if our coal, which is produced under the most advanced technology, unmatched elsewhere in the world, cannot compete with imported fuel, then let me ask, How efficient must we become in order to compete? How many more farmworkers must be displaced by tractors, fertilizers, et cetera, and how many more mineworkers must be driven out of our mines before we can compete?

Is it not ridiculous to insist that it is we who must be chased from pillar to post, out of this industry and that, and we who must make the adjustments—even if it was this country that provided the world with the industrial and technological equipment that underlies mass production? What manner of equity is this? Why should this country be penalized by exposure to low-wage competition from abroad when we pioneered the system that other countries are now copying and turning against us?

There would be no problem if these other countries that have so eagerly embraced our system also accepted the high wage standards that prevail in this country; but they have not done so and the gap between our wages and foreign wages will be slow to close. Meantime we will be under severe pressure and our industry will be discouraged. Hundreds of our larger companies, generators of much employment, are setting up overseas and exporting their employment expansion there when we should be encouraging such expansion here in the United States.

And now that the Trade Expansion Act is half a year old what has it done by way of assisting beleaguered industries and workers?

Seven cases have been completed under the new law. All seven have been turned down unanimously. This represents a record of exactly zero. Undoubtedly the State Department is most happy, elated and delighted. This fits very well its idea of an escape clause remedy. No industry has been helped; no union has been helped; no company has been extended a helping hand and no worker has been retrained, relocated or guided to another job.

Thus stands the great trade victory of 1962. The State Department has had its day. It is now guiding the hand of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, Mr. Herter; and we may be sure that further deep tariff slashes are being readied for our industries and their workers.

It would be much better, considering the great unemployment problem in this country and the wide disagreement on the trade question in Europe if a tariff standstill so far as further tariff reductions are concerned, were proclaimed. A 5-year moratorium on tariff cuts would do more than a tax reduction to bring confidence and a new day to scores of our industries that employ millions of people.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the trade bill last year was passed under unusual circumstances and that the results did not represent the unfettered sentiment of Congress or the country. The great damage that lies in store if the 50-percent authority to reduce tariffs is exercised can be forestalled and instead our industry can be given an incentive and a freer rein to make its own way back uphill, to the top where it belongs.

I therefore call for a 5-year tariff-cutting moratorium.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. The distinguished gentleman from West Virginia is rendering a distinct service to the Congress and to the Nation when he expresses his concern about the Trade Act of 1962 and to the way in which the terms of that act are being carried out. I share his concern. I opposed passage of the bill. I felt it offered a bleak prospect for American industry and for American workmen. I deplore many of its provisions, in particular the transfer to the executive almost the last remaining vestige of authority held by the Congress in dealing with tariff matters.

I call your attention to the fact that it is the duty of the Congress, under the Constitution, to deal with these matters but we have given away our right to do so. I am concerned with the welfare provisions of this act because I fear that there will be those who are not sufficiently zealous in protecting the interests of this country in negotiations with foreign nations and who will instead fall back on those welfare provisions as a means of keeping American industry in business and American workmen employed.

There are other features of this measure and of the way it has been handled which disturb me. I see tariff walls being raised against us all over the world, and I see but little in the way of vigorous steps to defend our producers and to fight for their interests. I fear that we have steadily gone downhill in our ability to hold our own in competition with foreign producers—in part because of a lack of firmness by our own Government—and I am not at all sure that the picture will brighten as programed trade negotiations are entered into between representatives of our Government and representatives of other governments. Therefore, I think it imperative that the Congress assert its strong interests in seeing that stronger steps be taken, that if necessary new legislation be enacted, and that firmer policies be adopted to insure that American industry will be allowed to compete on a fair and equitable basis with foreign industry and that American workmen have a better chance to keep their jobs.

Mr. MOORE. May I say to the gentleman from Florida that it is my intention here this afternoon to call for a 5-year moratorium on further tariff reductions. But, would not the gentleman from Florida agree with me in this one respect, that notwithstanding the points he has just made, one of the big selling points of the tariff program of 1962 was the fact that there was embodied in the legislation the financial assistance provision that would provide help to any industry that was forced to the wall or any employee that became unemployed as the result of foreign imports, but to now find that in the seven cases brought before the Tariff Commission under the terms of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 the Tariff Commission, in which financial assistance was asked, that the Commission has ruled unanimously against every one of those industries and their employees. Is that not a shocking revelation to the gentleman?

Mr. SIKES. It is a disturbing revelation. It is part of the entire picture, all of which concerns me greatly.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me, and I would say to my colleague, the gentleman from Florida. [Mr. SIKES], that the inclusion in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 of these so-called relief provisions was one of the reasons that I voted against the legislation. It seemed to me that the Congress of the United States, representing the people of the United States, can ill afford at any time, and certainly it could ill afford doing so at the time we had that legislation before us, placing upon the books legislation which by its own language anticipated that it was going to do damage to American workers. That was one of the reasons that I felt it was not wise legislation. I think, as the gentleman from West Virginia has also pointed out, we had a history of unfortunate decisions by the Tariff Commission which should have warned a reasonable and prudent person that we would get very little consideration for American industry and the American worker through administrative proceedings in that group.

So, this legislation which we have placed upon the books, unless a moratorium is had or unless a wiser policy is adopted by those having the responsibility under the act to make decisions—unless they do adopt a wiser policy—I think we will all have to agree that we were on a misadventure when that legislation was passed.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my appreciation to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] for what he has said here today. This is not the first time that I have spoken from this floor against the trade policy pursued by the State Department. This policy, in my judgment, offers the dimmest future to many American industries and workers, and, in fact, confronts them with economic strangulation.

My special interest is in the textile industry but the principles are the same and the policy that will so surely ruin this great industry, which, as has been said here many times, is one of the leading employers in this country, will affect many other industries with equal adversity.

It is not necessary for me to address myself to the new Trade Act to oppose the policy. The operation of the trade policy of the past was sufficient to bring the textile industry to the doors of catastrophe. The new act would, of course, aggravate the situation by affirming the same policy for the future and this might mean misfortune for other industries that have yet to feel the lethal breath of low-cost import competition; but the textile industry can stand no more than what already confronts it. I fully realize that this industry is not alone. Other industries will surely join the ranks of those that are already deeply beset. The situation is deadly serious and I do not feel that we should be content until a better future is opened to the textile and other industries.

There are those who think that the textile industry has been given special treatment and has nothing further to worry about so far as imports are concerned. While it is true that an international agreement that limits foreign exports of cotton textiles to this country, has been negotiated, the terms are not watertight and the practices under it are not reassuring to date. In any event the agreement is only for 5 years from last October and the cotton textile industry, we hope, has a longer lease on life than that.

The pressures under the agreement are great. Japan in particular wants a larger share of our market and I cannot feel comfortable when I reflect on the fact that the fortunes of the industry in this respect have come to rest in the State Department. This fact, that is, the increasing voice of the State Department in the regulation of our foreign commerce, to the point, indeed, where Congress has virtually nothing to say about it, is the most disquieting trend so far as the future economic health of industry in this country is concerned.

Some day, and I hope before it is too late, it will be learned that no economy such as our free enterprise system can prosper and grow in an atmosphere as uncertain and beset with such unforeseeable changes as have confronted and continue to beset the textile industry and all other industries in a like situation. If their future is to be entrusted to the twists and turns of international relations they will be afflicted with a deep blight. Yet it is precisely this blighting condition of instability and uncertainty that has been visited upon American industry in the past few decades.

That this is a ruinous policy and one under which our economy cannot prosper should be clear to anyone who bothers to consider the nature of our system. Its health and prosperity depend above all on confidence in the future. No other economic element is more important than the market outlook for domestic output, not only now but next year and the succeeding years. It is not possible to have expansion and growth of the kind that generates employment rather than mere automation and displacement of workers when the future does not look good; and let me tell you, the future cannot possibly look good to any industry that faces the likely outbreak of a particularly virulent type of import competition; or the continuation of such competition if it already exists, into indefinite future time.

To be sure, we may get automation and plant modernization. We may replace obsolete or obsolescent equipment with modern machinery; but if this is accomplished simply as a means of competing with imports it will contribute nothing to employment. Already the textile industry has fallen far behind in contributing its share to employment in this country. It not only has not maintained the level of employment previously enjoyed; it has contributed nothing to absorption of the newcomers into the labor market.

While the population of this country increased 20.5 percent from 1950 to 1961 the textile industry—including synthetic and woolen textiles in addition to cotton—dropped from employment of 1,169,000 production workers to 793,000. This was a loss of 376,000. Source, Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1962, table 291. Had the industry's employment kept pace with population growth it would have added about 240,000. The industry therefore fell some 600,000 jobs behind its share of the total employment of the country—that is, 376,000 plus 240,000. This is a very serious lag. It is not hard to understand the employment problem in this country when we look at it from this angle.

It will be said that the industry should become more efficient. This is the same as saying that it should introduce still more modern machinery.

Here is the crux of the trouble. There are those who believe that simply cutting the cost of production and offering lower prices to the consumers will solve our problem. Of course, it would do nothing of the kind. This is one of the biggest illusions haunting this country today.

Several factors stand in the way. One is the nature of the import competition. It is nothing if not price competition. This, let me point out, is very significant.

Let us not lose the point. It has been too long overlooked by economists through the length and breadth of this land.

This point is that the domestic industry does not get the benefit of reduced production costs when imported goods have already invaded the market extensively with low-priced goods and gained an ever-increasing share of the market. The domestic producer then struggles to hold his own; and may find it very difficult even to survive. While a few companies may gain ground others will stand still or fall back.

In the absence of import competition based on low prices, reduction of productions costs, and the passing of the reductions on to the consumers in the form of lower prices could be expected to increase consumption. The workers who had been displaced by labor-saving machinery might then in time be rehired because of the rising sales volume. Unemployment would be overcome.

When, however, imports fill the market for lower priced goods, the reduced costs of domestic manufacturers, gained by installation of labor-saving machinery, will not increase sales or at least not in sufficient volume to lead to rehiring of the displaced workers. The result will then be net unemployment. This will be aggravated by the addition of new workers supplied by the growing population.

This is exactly what has happened in the textile industry. All improvement efforts are handicapped or nullified because they still do not overcome the competition from other countries. The process adds up to attrition of the domestic industry in a relentless struggle in which the advantages under present circumstances reside irretrievably with the other side.

Mr. Speaker, so far as the cotton textile industry is concerned the situation is fast reaching a desperate point. On one side the industry is pressed by the synthetic textiles such as rayon while from the other side imports are harassing it without mercy. At the same time the domestic mills labor under a severe handicap in the cost of their raw material, that is, raw cotton. I need hardly repeat what has been said many times on this floor. The 8½ cent per pound differential enjoyed by the foreign mills hangs like a millstone around the neck of the domestic manufacturers. I cannot urge my colleagues too strongly to help us remove this millstone.

Mr. Speaker, much has been said this afternoon about the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. I voted against it and I may say that subsequent events have confirmed my misgivings.

First, the bill sounded the death knell on the peril point; second, it vastly weakened the escape clause; third, it offered a spurious adjustment assistance provision; fourth, it virtually divested Congress of the last vestige of its constitutional authority to regulate foreign commerce; fifth, it offered entirely too drastic tariff-cutting authority to the executive department among other things, and, sixth, it extended this authority over a 5-year period, thus skipping over two full Congresses.

Already the new act is revealed as impossible of administration so far as any relief to domestic industry is concerned. The Tariff Commission, as has been repeated here this afternoon, has processed seven cases under the new escape clause with a 7-to-0 batting average against domestic industry and labor.

I think that we should consider a 5-year halt on further tariff cuts. This would produce an atmosphere of confidence where it is now lacking; but we need a better remedy against past injury. This would open the road to the kind of expansion needed in this country, namely, expansion undertaken to increase production with confidence that the increased output can be sold at a reasonable profit. It is this sort of expansion that creates jobs, as contrasted with the kind of modernization and automation that are instituted as a means of staying in business.

I thank my good friend for this opportunity to speak on this vital subject.

Mr. MOORE. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from West Virginia in bringing this most important matter before us.

One does not have to have such a remarkable memory to recall the grand promises which were made last year to push through the so-called Trade Expansion Act. As the administration spokesmen painted the picture one could easily suppose that the millenium would be here once this legislation was enacted.

As we all know, and to the anguish of some of us, it was approved. A scant 11 months later the word is already being let out that the Trade Expansion Act is not living up to the dreams of its sponsors. I say dreams advisedly for many of us pointed out at that time that the assumptions on which it was based were unreal.

Before even the first negotiations of the so-called Kennedy round—that is negotiated tariff cuts under the new trade law—the administration is letting it be known that not too much should be expected. It now appears evident that several of our European nations are not anxious to make further tariff reductions in concert with the United States. It appears that they want to receive concessions much greater than they are willing to give. It appears that they will insist upon retaining protections for certain of their products, while endeavoring to get us to remove the last vestiges of protection of our own industry.

In other words these nations are driving a hard bargain. Their idea of "reciprocal" may seem like "one for you, two for me." But can we blame them for realistically looking to their own interests?

Western Europe has made a remarkable recovery since its destitute days following World War II. It received much aid from this country, but it is fair to say that generally they pitched in, worked hard, denied themselves luxuries for a while, and regained the economic strength they lost. In doing so they quite naturally applied a hard, determined attitude of self-interest in their trade negotiations.

As part of our assistance we made trade concessions to help them grow. But they have outgrown this dependence now. They know, but we seem slow to realize it.

Our Government and our trade negotiators simply are not doing their job in pushing American products and protecting the interests of American labor and business. The United States today can deliver coal to any country cheaper than they can mine it. But what is our Government doing to sell American coal? But we are importing increasing amounts of residual fuel which destroys the jobs of the American miners.

It is perhaps a comment on our trade policies of the past that a hard, determined policy of self-interest on the part of another nation should strike us as unique, abnormal, or in some sense unfair.

The time has come for the United States to be just as practical, just as hardheaded, just as devoted to the interests of our own workers, farmers, and businessmen as the representatives of other countries.

Last year we were told that the new Trade Expansion Act would increase our exports, which would stop the critical flow of gold from the United States, and also increase employment. It is sad that such has not been the case.

On the contrary, trade conditions are becoming worse. While we have in the past been selling a great deal of grain, poultry, and meat to the Common Market countries, there is every evidence that this trade will be gradually decreased.

In spite of all of the claims for this act, a good example of how this agreement is working out is the fact that if an automobile made in France is sent to the United States it is subject to an 8-percent tariff, but if the United States exports an automobile we pay 26-percent tariff to get that car into France.

Conditions have become critical in the shoe industry. About 60 Congressmen had a meeting a few mornings ago and were told that the importation of shoes into this country has increased 600 percent from 1955 to 1962. In 1955, the United States imported 8 million pairs of shoes; in 1962, 55 million pairs. If the present trend continues, the United States will be importing 20 percent of all shoes purchased in America by 1965. In the past 7 years, U.S. shoe exports have decreased 38 percent.

Where are these shoes coming from? Between 1955 and 1962 importation of shoes from Italy has increased 1,100 percent. In Italy the shoeworker gets 49 cents an hour. In America shoeworkers get $1.95 an hour. Thousands of jobs are being lost to America by these tremendous shoe imports.

Italy is one of the nations with which we have an unfavorable balance of payments—in other words, our expenditures in Italy are greater than their purchases from us.

I was invited to the meeting concerning shoes because the Brown Shoe Co. has a factory in Vincennes. I was told by the president of this company he was desirous of greatly expanding the plant in Vincennes, if the future of the American shoe industry were brighter. The United States already owes Italy more than $1¼ billion, and owes more than Italy owes us.

The situation in the glass industry is just as bad. The same applies to veneers, other hardwood products, and scores of other industries. The limestone industry has been hurt by Italian imports, too.

The theory of reciprocal trade is fine if the officials of our Government will negotiate with the same ability, with the same national self-interest as do the other countries. But that certainly is not the spirit in which negotiations are being carried out today.

At the present time, the President and his appointees have nearly absolute power to negotiate trade treaties. I voted against this tremendous transfer of power to the President, but in spite of my opposition this power was given to him.

The trade agreements are principally controlled by the State Department, but the American people have a right to ask our governmental representatives to represent them with the same efficiency and dedication that the representatives of other countries represent their people.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KING].

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I should like to associate myself with his remarks, as well as with the remarks of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to what has been said on the Trade Expansion Act and I will say that I am in accord with the sentiments expressed.

The Trade Expansion Act, as has been said here, did not represent a true reflection of the sentiment of this body. It is well known that its passage was the result of a deal whereby some particularly strong interests were accommodated in return for their support of the trade bill. That is why the bill rolled through as it did.

It is unfortunate that the deal was made because the merits of the legislation were not such that Congress should have passed it. It was a bill so severe in its treatment of American domestic industry hurt by unfair import competition that it should not have been passed.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation marked the abandonment of the no-injury principle that had been the guide of all trade legislation from the beginning in 1934. This departure actually meant breaking faith with the history and the character of the trade program.

It is true that the administration of the trade program itself had fallen short of all the Presidential promises since 1934, echoed by every Secretary of State, beginning with Cordell Hull; but the way to redress this failure was not to make it worse but to see to it that the administration was brought into conformity with the promises.

Let me quote from some of the statements that were made with respect to the program from the beginning and on down to the present administration.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt in his message to Congress recommending the trade agreements legislation gave "assurance that no sound and important American interest will be injuriously disturbed. The adjustment of our foreign-trade relations," he added, "must rest on the premise of undertaking to benefit and not to injure such interests."

President Harry S. Truman was equally positive when on May 22, 1945 he addressed a letter to Speaker Sam Rayburn, asking for further tariff-reducing authority. This is what he said:

> I have had drawn to my attention statements to the effect that this increased authority might be used in such a way as to endanger or "trade out" segments of American industry, American agriculture, or American labor. No such action was taken under President Roosevelt and Cordell Hull, and no such action will take place under my Presidency.

On March 1, 1948 on recommending a further renewal of the trade agreements legislation, Mr. Truman continued along the same vein. He said:

> Furthermore, we need have no fear of serious harm to any domestic producer * * *
>
> Finally, each agreement will permit withdrawal or modification of concessions if * * * imports increase to such an extent as to cause or threaten serious injury to domestic producers.

President Dwight D. Eisenhower continued the policy. In a letter to the Speaker, Joseph W. Martin, Jr., on the occasion of action on H.R. 1, the trade bill, February 18, 1955, he expressed himself as follows:

> No American industry will be placed in jeopardy by the administration of this measure.

On April 25 of the same year, addressing the Associated Press in New York City, he spoke as follows:

> Reductions in tariffs * * * must be gradual, selective, reciprocal. Changes which would result in the threat of serious injury * * * would not strengthen the economy of this country or the free world.

On April 4, 1958, Mr. Eisenhower said:

> We should first hammer home the fact that safeguards in the law are being strengthened to cope with uneven impact of import competition.

Secretary of State Cordell Hull in 1934 before the House Ways and Means Committee about the trade agreements said the Government would see to it "that they are not negotiated in a way that would result in injury or hurt to our own country." He told the Senate Finance Committee, also in 1934:

> That is the point I want to make about it, and the last thing that the President would want to do would be to injure business.

Mr. William L. Clayton, former Under Secretary of State, told the Senate Finance Committee June 1, 1948, in a hearing:

> Designed to be operated by the Tariff Commission reporting directly to the President it (the escape clause) offers a prompt and sure remedy always available when needed.

The same attitude toward the escape clause was continued by Secretary John Foster Dulles, as reflected by his testimony before the Senate Finance Committee in 1955. He said:

> We have gotten the agreement of all countries to the effect that when we give them a tariff concession we can always get out of it through the operation of the escape clause; we have made the escape clause a multilateral undertaking instead of just a unilateral undertaking.

In 1958, which marked the last previous extension of the Trade Agreements Act, Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks continued in the same tone. This is what he said:

> I think that industry should be protected against severe injury, and the President (Mr. Eisenhower) has so stated in the last 4 or 5 years, several times to the Congress, in letters to individuals, that he does not intend to see any industry in jeopardy or severely injured.

Mr. Speaker, numerous quotations in the same vein could be provided; but these are enough to show what was the outward policy. I repeat that these promises were not well kept because of the continuous advice of the State Department in the course of the administration of the escape clause. Generally the advice of that Department prevailed at the White House and the policy, so roundly affirmed and repeated, was virtually nullified.

It would have been much better had the policy been continued in 1962 with a strong resolution to enforce it. Instead the no-injury principle was all but abandoned and an "adjustment assistance" program substituted for it. In other words, henceforward trade agreements are to be made without the care previously exercised and if injury occurs to our industry and workers they are to be helped at the Federal expense. In fact, the previous caution is to be abandoned. To this end the peril point system was abolished.

Tariff cuts up to 50 percent are to be made right across the board, no matter what the consequences, with perhaps a few exceptions.

Yet, no doubt because of fear of abandoning the escape clause completely, it was maintained but rewritten in terms that have thus far completely destroyed it.

The applicant from industry or labor must now prove that the past duty reduction was responsible in "major part" for the increase in imports that has occurred and, secondly, that the injury complained of also resulted in "major part" from the increase in imports.

To date, Mr. Speaker, of seven cases that have been completed by the Tariff Commission all seven have been rejected unanimously. In other words, the escape clause, with its adjustment assistance provision and its authority to raise the tariff, has been reduced to a farce.

There is no remedy today against serious injury from imports. There is no remedy against State Department errors in using the knife unwisely in reducing tariffs. American industry is to be bulldozed out of the way in favor of imports, no matter what the consequences in terms of unemployment, ruin of business or loss of capital.

Thus is to be fulfilled what has been the State Department philosophy since 1945. The Department has consistently reflected a lack of sympathy for domestic industry. For the sake of its diplomatic gyrations it has not hesitated to use our industry as a pawn.

It is time in my judgment that this sort of treatment of our economy be disavowed by the Congress. I doubt that despite the deal that was made whereby the Trade Act was passed last year, Congress is willing to accept the new act as it has turned out. I cannot believe that it can be allowed to go much longer.

I agree with the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] that it is time to call a halt and to reassess the whole situation. In view of the present unsettled conditions in Europe in addition to the effect produced at home, a 5-year suspension of further tariff reductions would go a long way toward restoration of the kind of confidence in the future that a great many of our industries need.

I commend the gentleman from West Virginia for proposing it. It goes to the very heart of our economic need today.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from West Virginia. I think a very interesting study should be made of the Trade Expansion Act of last year to determine how much is in this year's budget to take care of those who have been hurt by reason of that act. As I have looked through the budget, and the gentleman knows I have looked through this budget pretty carefully this year, in practically every agency of the Government there are requests for appropriations in order to take care of people who have been hurt, not helped, but hurt by this act—Agriculture, Treasury, small business, State Department, Commerce, you ask it, it will be there—to try to take more of the American taxpayers' funds, the American workingman's funds that he pays into the Treasury, to subsidize, to take care of the injury, and you cannot find a balance sheet where you can find the good that may have come or any increase that may have come to the Treasury by this to offset that damage that has been done by the passage of the act.

The gentleman has just said that the Tariff Commission has been acting on this. I think I can say that the gentleman is there anticipating perhaps two cases to take care of this situation, and the amount of money that is being requested to put into this to send a big team to Geneva for the tariff negotiations. Then you look at the damage that has been done, the amount of money to try to take care of those that have been hurt. It seems to me a study should be made. I could not possibly give you the figures, but somebody who made a real study could come up with the figures of the actual cost of the damages to American industry and the American workingman, but nobody can give you any estimate as to how the Treasury of the United States has been affected by the loss of income.

Mr. MOORE. May I say to the gentleman from Ohio, I am sure he recalls the debate on the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 wherein emphasis was placed on the financial assistance which was to be available in the event that an industry was driven to the wall and workers became unemployed as a result of foreign imports. Did the gentleman not get the impression at that time that the sales pitch was so great and so forceful that one was led to believe that all the industry had to do, and the worker had to do, was to make a nominal showing that his industry was taken away from him by the flood of imports? But now that industry and worker have the responsibility of making a case under the old escape-clause provisions of the law in order to get benefit supposed to be contained in the law.

Mr. BOW. I think the gentleman is exactly right. They never brought to the floor of the House during that debate any estimate of what it was going to cost in the way of damages to American industry and the American workingman today. I think it has simply added to the unemployment we have. It is going to get worse before it is going to get better. I think the suggestion of the gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in support of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE], in a call for a 5-year tariff standstill, so far as any further tariff cutting is concerned.

I feel very strongly that this suggestion has the highest merit. I am in full agreement with the statement that the so-called Trade Expansion Act of 1962 was passed under unusual circumstances and that the vote did not represent the untrammeled sentiment of the House. Some of the strongest protectionists of this body voted for this bill under conditions that were not of their making and that, let us hope, will be nonrecurring.

Furthermore, the act of 1962 fails to hit at two basic considerations:

First. Other nations with whom we most compete—and whom we have reconstituted—use many other devices to control imports from us, such as currency regulation, sanitary laws, quotas, and so forth, to mention a few.

Second. The basic and real problem of our own high production costs—labor.

The fact is that the American economy, on the uptrend as I hope it may be at the present time, is in no condition to face the tariff treatment that appears to be in store for it. If the President's authority to cut the existing tariff rates in half and to weaken or eliminate import quotas is carried out, many industries will be deeply discouraged and some will be put on the road to liquidation.

What industry and agriculture need in this country is not a bleak prospect from the marketplace; not a gloomy profit outlook or a market that shrinks before their eyes as imports rise, but rather market conditions that breed confidence and assurance that expanded output can be sold at a profit rather than stocked in the warehouse. The Trade Act does the opposite. And let no one think that it is only the small and so-called marginal industries that are confronted with the dismal prospect. Far from it. That is what the State Department would like to have us believe. Some of our greatest industries such as steel and automobiles have found that their mass production is no sure protection. But for the limited steel capacity of Europe and Japan today our steel industry would be hard pressed. This limitation will not last forever. The same goes for other large industries, such as furnishings, electrical equipment and appliances, and so forth.

The hopes engendered by the new Trade Act were nearly all based on illusory notions about the Common Market and other foreign trade outlets. In the first place the State Department allowed itself to believe that Britain would enter the Common Market. The actual event was quite different, thus reflecting the Department's lack of sense of reality.

I would like to believe and know, Mr. Speaker, that our Cabinet, United States of America, had met and dealt with these problems after due process and coordination of the Department of Labor, Department of Commerce, and Department of State after Tariff Commission hearings and recommendations; instead of some young, untried and unknown chairman of a study group, State Department employee on this or that desk, or a family hunch.

Then there is the notion that all we need do is to reduce our tariffs and Europe will open her markets to us. This is even more naive than was the belief that Britain would be accepted into the Common Market. Europe will not open her market to anything that she does not regard as beneficial to Europe. We may be quite sure that all those washing machines, refrigerators, dishwashers, TV sets, electric fans, and so forth, that it was said we would ship to Europe in great shipfuls will not be flowing as visualized. I have been both East and West recently and took the trouble to check their stores and supplies.

Why do we not ship hundreds of thousands of automobiles to Europe? The automobile industry in this country had a vast lead over its European counterpart. Yet, we export very few cars to Europe. Why? Europe has an automotive industry of her own; and is protecting it. Also it is much cheaper to produce cars in Europe. They have not doubled in price since 1949 and hence with transportation costs and tariffs are still cheaper than our own. Having learned this, our leading manufacturers such as General Motors, Ford, and Chrysler undertook to invest in Europe and they are participating extensively in the European market, but from within. It is estimated that American capital accounts for 20 to 25 percent of automobiles made in Europe. Is this not the vital portion of our gold outflow problem? What a paradox when we create such a climate, tax and tariff wise, in our own country and in-being industry.

Can anyone seriously maintain that it will be any different with respect to other consumer goods? Scores of our companies have already made manufacturing arrangements in Europe, including the Common Market. Some have established branch plants; others have bought out—or into—going European concerns; and yet others have licensed European manufacturers to produce their products on a royalty or fee basis. It seems ridiculous to expect American companies that have disposable capital to invest in Europe; to manufacture here, under conditions of relatively high costs and then ship the finished goods 3,000 or 4,000 miles overseas into a lower cost market and pay customs duty on the way in. We have about "come a full circle" when these oversea investments of our own rise up against duties and tariffs or restrictive tax legislation.

Oh, we will be shipping parts for some time and this will swell our exports. Also we will sell machinery and equipment for a few years, especially to equip some of our new factories over there; but all of this will catch up with us and three things will happen: First, we will ship less of the finished products into Europe because we will be manufacturing there and enjoying the tariff protection provided by the market; second, we will export more from there to Latin America, Africa, Asia, and so forth, and less from here; and third, in many instances we will export from Europe to the United States. This is planned chaos of world markets, to which we have added the coup de grace for our own.

All of this will have an adverse effect on employment in this country. We will be helping employment abroad and retarding it at home. Then if you tax more to retrain, extend welfare, and do not lower production costs we have indeed come a full and paradoxical circle, if for no other reason than that we tax more and more on less and less.

The program of the State Department has not changed. It remains one of controlling our trade, regulating it, channeling it and with it much of the American economy. The Department well knows that it is the constitutional function of Congress to regulate our foreign commerce; but in its ethereal haze of "one worldism" is no more concerned over the constitutional question than it is over the welfare of domestic industries. For the latter it has two tests: First, can the industry compete with imports? If not, it should be phased out of existence without bothering to look at the material facts; second, will it help our foreign relations? If the President of Venezuela, for example, seems to be anti-Castro today, we should do nothing by way of restricting the imports of residual fuel oil from Venezuela lest Mr. Betancourt walk into Castro's arms. Again, we must not protect our woolen industry no matter if the industry is being driven to the wall because Britain has made it clear that she would not like it; and it is up to us to rub balm on that country's wounds—received from France on the Continent. Moreover, Japan and Italy, two other sources of woolen imports would not like our restrictions. As for the woolen industry: "Let it shrink and succumb if it cannot meet the competition. Let's not upset the world market here again as we did for the Argentine with surplus wheat."

All such international considerations may change from year to year, from one area of the world to the other according to the political winds that happen to blow in particular countries. Our industries must then dance to the tune of the vicissitudes of international political fortunes, our one worldly State Department.

In such a policy, no economic stability can reside. It strikes me as being just as important as political and social stability in this world. Our industries are to be helpless pawns of international diplomacy. This is what the State Department policy means.

Of one thing we can be sure: We will never achieve the industrial expansion that will be necessary to employ our workers in such an atmosphere. Our official policy is indeed, internally, at odds with itself. On the one hand, this policy promotes higher wages, expanding social security coverage, high farm prices, and full employment; while the policy of tariff dismantlement counteracts these endeavors. We have worked ourselves up on a plateau of high costs and then insist on exposing ourselves to competition from the outside, of a kind that we do not tolerate in this country; and that indeed, would be illegal under the Fair Labor Standards Act. We establish minimum wages and insist on obligatory collective bargaining and then expose the very industries to which we look for production, employment, and tax revenues, to a withering import fire from abroad. Consider the impact of the shoe imports, or watches, for example. It seems incredible; but it is the official policy; and in the last Congress the principal legislative undertaking consisted not only of perpetuating the policy but increasing the exposure.

Mr. Speaker, the Trade Expansion Act, according to its first 6-month record, has scuttled all remedial action available to industry and labor against injury from imports. Up to now the Commission, as already mentioned here, has turned down all seven cases that it has decided under the new act. The cautions that were urged against just such an outcome, during the trade bill debate last year, as this body made its record, were brushed aside. In answer, it was said that industry and workers who were hurt by imports would be given adjustment assistance, or retrained more handsomely than by any of the various States. I did not then think that such assistance was good policy. Why deliberately hurt industry and labor so that they would be driven into the arms of the Government? This would only increase the growing dependence on Government. Why muddle existing State unemployment compensation laws? Nevertheless, the bill was voted. Well, so far as the much-touted remedy is concerned, it is a complete sham as a 7-to-0 negative record demonstrates. It was probably so intended by those who wrote the bill. It lays down impossible conditions for administration and there can be no surprise that the Tariff Commission has come up with a 100 percent negative record under the new act as far as escape-clause action is concerned.

I wish to thank the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Moore] for the opportunity to take part in this discussion. I commend him for his stand and his call for a standstill on further tariff cuts until such time as we can see more clearly ahead, and until the European situation is clarified. I would like to add, until we get at the roots of the problem, it is high time that we became concerned with the homefront, so far as trade legislation is concerned, or we will have little to offer on the foreign front in years to come. At least a protective tariff is fair in the sense that it is there for all to see; and, therefore, at least calculate cost of production, plus delivery expense, which equals cost. To this, one can add modest profit and then decide whether or not to invest and proceed.

Mr. MOORE. May I ask the gentleman this question? Actually, in the area which the gentleman has mentioned; namely, the notion that all we need to do is to reduce our tariffs and Europe will open her markets to us, is it not true that a number of our American industries today are setting up European manufacturing facilities to meet the market demand there without the necessity of utilization of one American worker?

Mr. HALL. That is exactly the point. I have touched on that in my previous statement and I think the gentleman makes a beautiful point in that respect. Some of our people have subsidiaries in other countries so that we have come full circle in this matter and we are actually voting against and lobbying against the imposition of protective tariffs, because of their oversea holdings. Of course, that is not true in all cases, but it is true in the case of some manufacturers to a considerable degree.

Mr. FISHER. Mr Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Moore] has hit the nail on the head. It seems to be generally agreed now that under the Trade Expansion Act disaster may befall many of our industries. Let us hope that the State Department in its negotiations will not put these industries on the sacrificial heap and offer them up to a dubious diplomacy. After all the prime objective should be to administer the law in a way that will promote an economically healthy and strong United States.

It is now feared by many that the administration of the Trade Act may lead, indirectly, to unemployment. Moreover, there is the matter of the economic and business atmosphere to be considered: the outlook for growth and expansion, the prospects for the market of a great variety of products. If this atmosphere is gloomy, if the market outlook is clouded or downright discouraging, business will not venture. This could result in fewer new plants, no additions to existing plants, if the outlook for sale of additional output at a profit appears negative. In other words, if the prospects are that imports will get more and more of the market because of their lower prices, there will be no increase in employment in companies and industries engaged in producing the competing products in this country. Quite the contrary.

The strongest efforts, under these circumstances, will be made to reduce costs and this may indeed mean reequipment of many plants with modern and more productive machinery; but not under conditions that will spell growth. It would become a question of holding their own. It seems to me that by bringing down production costs the manufacturers and producers will have a chance to stay in business; but they can hardly be expected to drive imports back, and they will not help the employment problem. It often happens that the foreign exporters who ship in here respond to our cost reductions by dropping their own prices. Domestic competitors then become hard pressed and their reserves for advertising, research, development of new products, and so forth, begin to shrink.

Thus, while our manufacturers may indeed succeed in reducing their costs, they will face the discouraging fact that imports will deprive them of much of the expanding market that so often greets lower costs of production. These industries will then have little to show for their strenuous efforts to maintain a share of the domestic market but a contribution to unemployment. Instead of absorbing a fair share of the new workers who annually crowd on the labor market, these industries, in efforts to hold their ground, actually add to the unemployment list.

Mr. Speaker, industry after industry has had this experience. Our woolen industry has made strenuous efforts to meet low-cost import competition; but imports have risen from less than 5 percent of our market to something like 20 percent of it. This unfortunate development came at the very time that our industry was already hard pressed by synthetics and, therefore, greatly aggravated its distress.

Woolgrowers who supply wool to the domestic industry naturally also suffer from the imports of woolen fabrics. Instead of keeping pace with population growth, wool consumption per capita has been on the decline. Instead of helping to absorb the unemployed workers and putting to work its share of the new workers who arrive on the scene each year, at the rate of more than a million annually, the woolen industry has added thousands to the ranks of the unemployed.

This fact does not mean that our woolen industry is inefficient. It does mean that in addition to being in competition with synthetic fiber it must compete with woolens imported from countries where wages are far below those prevailing in this country. This is something the industry can do nothing about. There is not a woolen mill in this country that could not compete with imported goods if it paid wages commensurate with those paid in Britain, Japan, or Italy, the principal sources of imports.

The governmental policy, largely shaped by the State Department as a support of its diplomacy, is highly detrimental to both woolgrowing and to the woolen-manufacturing industry. There is a direct contradiction between the State Department policy and the national economic policy of high wages, high employment, and growth.

The policy to cut away what tariff is left and to weaken the Buy American Act and the antidumping laws, work in exactly the opposite direction to that taken by our labor laws, minimum wage requirements, and full employment.

If the real intent of the State Department is to be grasped we have but to read some of the speeches made by its officials and the report of GATT—the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

The Director of the Office of International Trade of the State Department, Mr. Leonard Weiss, on April 5, 1963, reiterated the Department's trade policy in a speech released to the press. This includes further tariff reductions and elimination of quantitative barriers to trade, that is, import quotas. He said:

> Through the years quantitative restrictions have been viewed as the most undesirable possible method of limiting trade.

He neglected to say that this is the view of the State Department but not of everyone else. Other countries have relied heavily on import quotas; and some of our industries cannot be properly protected by a tariff. Quotas fill a need where the tariff fails.

The State Department, wedded to free trade, of course, wants to eliminate both the tariff and quotas. What this would do to scores of our industries seems to be a matter of supreme indifference to that Department. The sacrifice of any industry that cannot compete with imports is something that the Department not only implicity but explicitly advocates.

As the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Moore] has said, this policy is incomprehensible when we consider the burdens that our industries bear compared with those borne by industries of other countries. Our inability to compete has no necessary relationship to relative efficiency.

Under the new Trade Act the State Department policy will be to cut our tariffs 50 percent across the board and then to make certain exceptions. This prospect of itself would be enough to throw a chill into our economy once the implementation of the act becomes a looming prospect.

There is a false notion that we will be able to expand sales of so-called durable consumer goods to the Common Market countries if only we can bring their tariffs down.

I would like to ask why, after 29 years of the trade program, we still face a tariff wall in Europe when their tariffs were so much lower than ours when we started. Evidently we were outtraded coming and going or our boy scouts were so anxious to give our tariffs away that they exacted nothing in return. This hardly added up to the vaunted "shrewd Yankee horse trading" we heard so much about.

The European countries will bring their tariffs down only as it pleases them and not for the purpose of seeing us exploit their market. The very idea is phenomenally naive. I think we are slowly beginning to see this. Our participation in the Common Market will mostly take the form of investments there by our companies. They have already funneled in over a billion dollars. This does not help employment in this country. And even now France is becoming restive over these investments. One of these days our State Department may possibly take off its blinders and see the world as it is.

Meantime, our industry and agriculture should prepare for a shock. The Department is ready to lower the barriers and will then again be duly surprised to see what happens; or, will it be what they actually wish to see, while merely pretending surprise?

I agree wholeheartedly with the gentleman from West Virginia that we need at least 5 years to digest what has already been done and to await the outcome of the European maneuvers. A 5-year tariff-cutting moratorium would be a great relief to many of our industries that are already struggling and hardly knowing which way to turn.

The peril point has been eliminated and the escape clause destroyed. As my colleague has said, the Tariff Commission has had before it seven cases under the new act and it has turned down all seven unanimously. The Commission could not find injury under the conditions laid down in the law. The State Department has finally achieved its wish; and it is a dark day for our economy.

Let us call a 5-year halt.

Mr. MOORE. I thank the gentleman very much for his fine contribution.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues in commending the gentleman from West Virginia for bringing the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that the seven cases that have been presented to the Board for relief of American industries have been turned down unanimously. In my opinion, it is one of the outstanding examples of failure of legislation. The people who have charge of relief of American industry, governed by the State Department, have absolutely no concern with the people who work in this country. I am firmly convinced that we are faced with a worse situation in this country rather than a bettering situation, unless some moratorium, such as has been requested and suggested by the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia is agreed to.

Mr. MOORE. I thank the gentleman.

Most of us in this Nation will recall the hysteria that broke loose in this country when Charles de Gaulle vetoed, so to say, the entrance into the European Common Market of Great Britain. They wondered what all of the fuss was about. There was some suggestion that De Gaulle had entered into an arrangement with the Russians and was going to side with the Communists in the future. Every way was utilized to gather public opinion in this Nation in opposition to General de Gaulle. In addition to that, there was a further suggestion that by these actions the President of the French Republic had ruined the grand design that had been so masterfully put together to save the nation and the world, when in truth and in fact the only thing the people in the State Department and the executive branch of this Government of ours were worrying about was that the action of Charles de Gaulle upset their little arrangement that they had in mind at the time the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 was enacted. Their blank check was gone. The Tariff Act provided that where the sum total of the trade between Great Britain and the United States and the Common Market equaled 80 percent of the amount of world trade in a given item, then the State Department and the executive were free to reduce our tariff 50 percent and in some instances to zero. When the British did not go into the Common Market, this left the State Department with something less than the blank check that they desired, and therefore the massive assault through the news media was summoned in order to attack this show of independence on the part of Mr. de Gaulle.

I would conclude today, Mr. Speaker, by reiterating that which has been stated here today, that the Trade Act of 1962 was passed under very unusual circumstances, and I daresay, without question, it did not represent the unfettered sentiment of the Congress nor did it represent the unfettered sentiment of this country, and I believe there is great damage to this Nation in that act. If those in charge of trade negotiations put into operation the 50-percent provision to reduce tariffs, that we will see further troubles for our industries and our workers, and our unemployment problems are going to be increased rather than decreased.

Therefore I, at this time, Mr. Speaker call for a 5-year tariff-cutting moratorium, a 5-year moratorium in consideration of any further tariff reductions which would further multiply the many problems here in America which exist as the result of these trade practices.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia for the statement he is making on the floor of the House this afternoon. I, like the gentleman from West Virginia, voted against the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. I thought it was a tremendous mistake, and in view of the developments which the gentleman from West Virginia has so aptly pointed out today, I think the statement which I made that this Congress would rue the day it passed the act is going to come quicker than I realized. I commend the gentleman for his statement, but I wonder if the gentleman would shed some light upon the number of reductions that have actually been made in tariffs under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

Mr. MOORE. Well, at this time there are a number of goods and products in the stage of negotiation. Mr. Herter has been creating his staff. There is no longer the provision in the law that the items that are going to be negotiated and the tariffs suggested to be reduced, be tested under the peril-point provisions of previous law. We do not know exactly what concessions have already been agreed to administratively. It is not too unreasonable to assume that in the not too distant future we will get a large group of suggested reductions on a number of different items.

Mr. ICHORD. I agree with the gentleman that there will probably be future reductions under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, but have there been any reductions to date?

Mr. MOORE. As of this date, no.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from West Virginia for bringing to the attention of the House this problem that affects every area in America. For a long time an industry that is vital to my district, the lead and zinc industry, has been suffering because of the imports of lead and zinc. The miners are losing their positions.

When the administration brought forth the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, they said "You have no need to worry, because the major provision in this act is to compensate the employees who lose their jobs as a result of imports."

Mr. Speaker, one of the first cases brought before the Tariff Commission was a group of lead and zinc workers. The Tariff Commission found against them. So, they have no benefits from the Trade Expansion Act. But this Congress was forced to pass a law providing subsidies to compensate the people, to keep them in business, in spite of the competition of foreign imports.

Mr. Speaker, this does not alone affect lead and zinc. The manufacturers of woolen goods are suffering because of the importation of woolen textiles. The cotton textile industry is in dire trouble today. This Congress is now considering paying a subsidy to domestic textile plants in order to protect them against the competition from foreign imports of cotton textiles.

Mr. Speaker, in the field of rubber footwear manufacturers, the rubber footwear foreign manufacturers are increasing their percent of the American market every month this year over every month of last year. The employees in that industry are in dire fear of losing their jobs because of these imports. But the massive propaganda machine that was put into operation in 1962 to make this Congress believe that if it would only pass this law, unemployment would be eliminated, jobs would be created, prosperity may be returned to this country.

Mr. Speaker, now that this act has failed as it was predicted by so many on this floor, the propaganda machine is cranking again to say that we must have a $12-billion deficit in this country, if we give a minimum of tax relief unemployment will be eliminated, jobs will be created, prosperity will be returned.

So, year after year we have got a new program to do the same thing as the previous year's program that failed.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Moore], for bringing this to the attention of the Members of this body and I hope that this record will be read in the State Department and other executive offices down the street from the Capitol.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for a very, very fine statement.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. McIntire] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to say that foreign imports are hurting our American industries and that evidence of this damage to these domestic industries is all about us.

It is strikingly apparent, for instance, that our domestic wool industries are being pressed to the wall by low-cost wool imports manufactured by low-cost foreign labor. Our plants in New England are suffering in this respect.

On March 28 the J. P. Stevens & Co. announced the closing of its Marland textile plant in Andover, Mass. More recently—on April 26—Mr. Ronald A. Mitchell, president of the Cyril Johnson Woolen Co., announced the closing of the Stafford Spring textile plant in Connecticut, an establishment that had been in its 75th continuous year of operation. Somewhere in the vicinity of 450 people were put out of work by these plant closings.

Here is what Mr. Mitchell said in making the announcement on the closing of the Stafford Springs plant:

> It is with great regret that we, today, announce the closing of the Cyril Johnson Woolen Co. Orders for our customers and commitments for fabric for our Government's military clothing requirements will be completed during the next few months and then operations will be discontinued. The many improvements that we have made have still been insufficient to reverse the long downward trend of this company.
>
> The Cyril Johnson organization with its 250 employees has taken action in all phases of its business to improve its position and reverse the trend but without success.
>
> It looked for some action by our Government to control the imports of woolen fabrics and garments. Nothing has been done, and there seems to be little hope that effective action will be taken. In the meantime, the tremendous and uncontrolled increase in imports from low-wage countries has disrupted the markets for the high quality fabrics produced by Cyril Johnson.
>
> The closing of this fine quality American mill is a great misfortune for its people and this community.
>
> We hope the administration will take some positive and prompt action to control imports within reasonable limits so that these liquidations will not continue.

Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that this is only the beginning of a still sadder story that will unfold unless President Kennedy moves to provide protection against wool imports. Unless the President takes some positive action in this regard, plants in Maine—which employ about 14,000 persons—and other New England States will be driven out of business; textile businesses will go out of business and textile workers out of work.

I have, Mr. Speaker, been petitioning the President to use the authority he now has under law to enter into international negotiations in order to bring about import controls on wool. I have urged him to implement for wool the import protection provisions contained in the seven-point program he devised in the past to strengthen and aid the domestic textile industry.

I was a member of the Vinson committee—a Special Textile Committee that functioned in the House of Representatives last year—and this committee urged the President to institute import controls for wool. It should be noted that although administrative authorities gave assurance that such protection would be provided in due course, no such protective action has been forthcoming.

Still, there is a desperate need for such protection, and this is further pointed up by an editorial appearing in the April 30 issue of the Bangor Daily News, which said in part:

> A woolen mill employing 300 at Claremont, N.H., also announced a shutdown last week, blaming foreign imports. A mill in Newport, N.H., also closed for lack of business.
>
> It is a sad but familiar story. Low-wage countries operating modern mills, very likely built with U.S. assistance and know-how, are able to undersell the products of American textile plants.
>
> The Federal Government plays a two-faced and ridiculous role in the situation. It spends money on various programs to aid depressed areas on the one hand; on the other, its do-nothing policy about ruinous imports creates new depressed areas. It's a vicious circle, costly to the American economy and to the Government.

And, Mr. Speaker, as the story is sad for wool, so is it equally gloomy for cotton. The manufacturer who buys cotton is caught in a double dilemma. Not only is he confronted with relatively high cotton prices as a result of price supports for agricultural cotton, but he is also faced with rugged competition from foreign manufacturers.

This comes about because the domestic manufacturer has to buy his cotton at the American price-supported figure, which is 8½ cents higher than the world price at which his foreign competitor buys his cotton. Under this kind of arrangement, the foreign buyer takes American cotton in the low-price world market, manufactures it into a finished product with low-cost labor, and then sends it back into our domestic markets to sell at a low price in competition with American-made cotton fabrics.

Our domestic cotton industry has for long protested this inequity, and has appealed to the U.S. Tariff Commission for relief. It has recommended that in order to offset this obvious advantage to foreign buyers of American cotton, a duty of 8½ cents be imposed on the cotton content of all imported fabrics. Unfortunately, however, our home manufacturers were denied this equalizing adjustment.

Mr. Speaker, our Maine wood-turning products are also suffering from the impact of foreign imports. Clothespins, for instance, have been having a hard time of it, with manufacturers of this commodity engaged in a day-to-day struggle to stay in business.

Clothespins have sought relief under the escape-clause provisions of our tariff laws, but their efforts have been in vain. In addition, I have introduced legislation to the Congress providing quota protection for the domestic clothespin industry, but these bills have made no progress.

This reaching out for our domestic clothespin market takes on some odd and apparently illegal proportions. For instance, it has recently been reported to me that there are currently appearing on the market a large number of samples of imported clothespins deceptively labeled to lead consumers into believing that such pins are manufactured in the United States.

I have been incensed by this development, and under date of May 2, 1963, I directed a letter to the Federal Trade Commission and registered a complaint. In this communication I pointed out that this kind of exercise was obviously in violation of section 304 of the Tariff Act of 1930 and section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act. The former authority requires that all imported articles be legibly and conspicuously marked to indicate the country of origin, while the latter prohibits unfair trade practices in interstate commerce and misrepresentation of the country of origin.

In my complaint filed with the Federal Trade Commission, I urged that an immediate investigation be made into this instant matter and that whatever action is justified be promptly taken.

And, as the clothespin industry has been negatively affected by foreign imports, so has the plywood industry. I have tried, through legislation, to effect import controls on plywood, but as was the case with clothespins, all of my efforts have been in vain.

We are all only too familiar with the fact that early this year the Tariff Commission denied the American lumber industry protection against constantly expanding imports of softwoods from Canada. In making its recommendations against such relief, the Commission recognized that these increased imports of softwoods from Canada were causing considerable discomfort for our American lumber industry. It ruled, however, that this grief was attributable to certain economic factors and not to the function of the Trade Expansion Act; hence, no relief was justified. Mr. Speaker, it is quite apparent that the so-called escape clause of our present tariff laws is a misnomer, for as this clause is written it is just about impossible for any injured American industry to obtain any relief from imports.

Mr. Speaker, poultry is another matter upon which I would like to make some comments, for poultry is probably the first domestically produced agricultural commodity to be adversely affected by the provisions of the Trade Expansion Act approved by the Congress last year.

Through communications with the executive department and public statements, I have urged that action be taken to correct our sagging poultry export situation. This condition has come about because the member countries of the European Common Market are imposing high tariff rates on American poultry exports, thereby hoping to give protection to their own poultry industries.

And although it is understood that only about one-half of Maine's poultry exports—by value—has gone into European Common Market countries, the Maine poultry industry is nonetheless affected by these barriers to European trade. This is so because the poultry that would otherwise go into the Common Market will remain in the United States to compete with domestically produced poultry, including that which is produced in Maine. This backwash of what was once exportable poultry has a demoralizing effect on the poultry markets throughout the Nation.

What is happening to poultry can very well happen to other agricultural commodities that have been used in export. And our agricultural exports are no insignificant matter, for in 1962 they amounted to $5 billion.

Mr. Speaker, much of our trade trouble on agricultural commodities emerges from the fact that the United States has not established a firm policy position with respect to agricultural trade. Much of this condition could be corrected were agriculture properly represented at high levels of trade negotiations. Toward this end I joined in January of this year with Republican members of the House Agriculture Committee in sending a letter to the chairman of our Agriculture Committee. In this letter we urged that agriculture be given a prominent place at the conference table in trade negotiations concerned with agricultural matters.

If agriculture were given adequate representation in trade matters, negotiations could then proceed toward the end of ironing out the difficulties that now exist between the United States and the Common Market.

If these negotiations failed, America could try to produce the desired results by using the retaliatory provisions of existing law, quotas or tariffs.

Mr. Speaker, I would finally like to make reference to some aspects as related to the shoe industry and imports.

It should be noted that shoe imports have been increasing steadily over the last 7 years. In 1955, 8 million pairs of shoes were imported into the United States, and in 1962 this figure had leaped to 55 million pairs—an increase of over 600 percent.

My State of Maine is greatly concerned over this shoe import problem, for in 1962 she produced 53,521,000 pairs of leather shoes, prompting her to rank fifth as a shoe-producing State. There are 21,000 Maine citizens working at shoe production.

It is a sobering realization that the amount of shoes being imported into this country today slightly exceeds the total shoe production in the State of Maine. The fact of the matter is that if shoe imports continue to increase at their present rate, they will, in all probability, double Maine's shoe production by 1965.

Mr. Speaker, all of this sums up to say that many of our American industries are desperately in need of protection against foreign imports. Industries in Maine are particularly vulnerable to these imports, for a large percentage of the industrial establishments in my State produce goods for consumption in our American markets. These products run head on into competition with low-priced imports that are produced in low-wage foreign countries.

There just simply is no magic formula that will permit us to maintain a high standard of living, all the while admitting a flood of low-priced imports. Low-priced goods made by low-cost labor will have the effect of forcing American-made goods off the market.

President Kennedy has it in his power—under the Trade Expansion Act and other authorities—to correct this adverse trade situation. And if he is serious in his many-times pronounced interests in a growing and dynamic American economy, he will promptly move to take some corrective action against foreign imports. If he does not take such action, the only aspect of growth that will be evidenced in our economy will be that of unemployment.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my comments to those of the gentleman from West Virginia in connection with the so-called Trade Expansion Act of 1962 and the hoax that was perpetrated upon the American public as the administration attempted to sell this program to the American public.

During the propaganda barrage that was laid down by the administration prior to the passage of this act, the American farmer was given the full propaganda treatment. He was told how his exports would double; he was told how the Trade Expansion Act would practically solve the farm problem; and reams of propaganda were fed to the newspapers on what a terrific thing it would be for the American farmer because his farm exports would double.

The truth is that exactly the opposite situation has occurred. The truth is that instead of doubling our exports to the Common Market countries as Mr. Freeman said we would, our exports have more than been cut in half. On March 16, 1962, Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, testifying before the Ways and Means Committee on the Trade Expansion Act, among other things said:

> We, in Agriculture, therefore, emphasize our support of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 because it will both enhance the security of the United States and promote the best economic interest of this Nation as a whole.

Again he said:

> We see in it an opportunity to help maintain and expand our agricultural markets abroad.

He said:

> It will assist us materially in finding solutions to some of the basic problems of American agriculture. There is no segment of our economy that will benefit more from this act than agriculture, because export markets are of vital importance to American farmers and this legislation would give us an effective kit of bargaining tools to expand those export markets.

Mr. Freeman went on and on with this kind of language. His Department sent out story after story to the press, propagandizing the American farmer as to what he could expect if the Trade Expansion Act were passed.

Poor Mr. Freeman was apparently as badly propagandized by the Harvard crowd as was the American farmer because on January 8, 1963, speaking at the National Council of Farm Cooperatives in Miami Beach, Fla., Mr. Freeman was crying great copious tears about the Common Market countries doubling and tripling their tariff walls. He referred to them as "protective devices adopted or proposed by the Common Market center around the use of a variable levy fee" and he had this to say:

> These and other protective devices are a serious threat to as much as $600 million in our annual agricultural exports to present and prospective members of the Common Market.

When he was trying to get the Trade Expansion Act passed he said that our exports to the Common Market countries in 1961 came to $1.1 billion. In other words, poor Mr. Freeman found out that instead of doubling our exports to the Common Market countries that within 6 months our exports had more than been cut in half.

This is pretty bitter medicine for the American farmer to be required to swallow when this administration, the Tariff Commission, and everyone connected with the executive branch are sending emissaries all over the world trying to make friends by telling the people of every foreign country that they can ship their agricultural commodities into the United States where there is a ready market.

Last year your beef imports into this country jumped to 2¾ million head; and lamb, mutton, and pork followed suit. Thousands and thousands of farmers were put out of business because our exports were cut in two and our imports practically doubled and the American farmer was required to cut down his production to make room for the foreign farmer who has taken over 10 percent of our market.

It is time the President uses the authority given to him by Congress under this mislabeled "Trade Expansion Act of 1962" to protect American agriculture. It is time the Tariff Commission takes sensible action to protect American agriculture through tariffs and quotas or, if you please, by variable levies as is used by the Common Market countries who are interested in doing something for their farmers.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to observe that I was presiding over the Special Highway Investigative Subcommittee when the vote was taken on House Joint Resolution 245 earlier this afternoon, and miscalculated the time it would require to call the roll. I barely missed being present when my name was called.

Mr. Speaker, I take this time simply to announce that had I been present I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I answered the quorum call earlier in the afternoon, but when the vote was taken on House Joint Resolution 245, to provide that Members of Congress shall be limited to per diem allowances and necessary transportation costs in connection with travel outside the United States, and for other purposes, I was in conference with some governmental officials and Dr. Irving G. Muskat, chairman of the Interama Authority, which is a most important project dealing with unemployment in my district. Accordingly, I did not get back to the House Chamber until about 5 minutes after the rollcall was completed and hence missed it.

Mr. Speaker, had I been present I would have voted "aye" on the measure.

CIVIL RIGHTS PROVISIONS OF THE CONTRACT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND WASHINGTON PUBLIC POWER SUPPLY SYSTEM AND PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC CO.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GONZALEZ). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, ever since the Kennedy administration came into power the press has been full of accounts of the administration's program for civil rights. We have been told that the full power of the Federal Government was to be used to assure early achievement of the civil rights program.

One of the first acts of President Kennedy with regard to civil rights was the issuance on March 6, 1961, of Executive Order 10925 establishing the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity for the purpose of assuring equal employment opportunity in Federal Government on Federal contracts for all qualified persons, without regard to race, creed, color, or national origin. Executive Order 10925 was filed with the Office of the Federal Register on March 7, 1961, at 10:06 a.m. Section 301 of Executive Order 10925 provides as follows:

> SEC. 301. Except in contracts exempted in accordance with section 303 of this order, all Government contracting agencies shall include in every Government contract hereafter entered into the following provisions:
>
> "In connection with the performance of work under this contract, the contractor agrees as follows:
>
> "1. The contractor will not discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, creed, color, or national origin. The contractor will take affirmative action to insure that applicants are employed, and that employees are treated during employment, without regard to their race, creed, color, or national origin. Such action shall include, but not be limited to, the following: employment, upgrading, demotion or transfer; recruitment or recruitment advertising; layoff or termination; rates of pay or other forms of compensation; and selection for training, including apprenticeship. The contractor agrees to post in conspicuous places, available to employees and applicants for employment, notices to be provided by the contracting officer setting forth the provisions of this nondiscrimination clause.
>
> "2. The contractor will, in all solicitations or advertisements for employees placed by or on behalf of the contractor, state that all qualified applicants will receive consideration for employment without regard to race, creed, color, or national origin.
>
> "3. The contractor will send to each labor union or representative of workers with which he has a collective bargaining agreement or other contract or understanding, a notice, to be provided by the agency contracting officer, advising the said labor union or workers' representative of the contractor's commitments under this section, and shall post copies of the notice in conspicuous places available to employees and applicants for employment.
>
> "4. The contractor will comply with all provisions of Executive Order No. 10925 of March 6, 1961, and of the rules, regulations, and relevant orders of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity created thereby.
>
> "5. The contractor will furnish all information and reports required by Executive Order No. 10925 of March 6, 1961, and by the rules, regulations, and orders of the said Committee or pursuant thereto, and will permit access to his books, records, and accounts by the contracting agency and the Committee for purposes of investigation to ascertain compliance with such rules, regulations, and orders.
>
> "6. In the event of the contractor's noncompliance with the nondiscrimination clauses of this contract or with any of the said rules, regulations, or orders, this contract may be canceled in whole or in part and the contractor may be declared ineligible for further Government contracts in accordance with procedures authorized in Executive Order No. 10925 of March 6, 1961, and such other sanctions may be imposed and remedies invoked as provided in the said Executive order or by rule, regulation, or order of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, or as otherwise provided by law.
>
> "7. The contractor will include the provisions of the foregoing paragraphs '1' through '6' in every subcontract or purchase order unless exempted by rules, regulations, or orders of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity issued pursuant to section 303 of Executive Order No. 10925 of March 6, 1961, so that such provisions will be binding upon each subcontractor or vendor. The contractor will take such action with respect to any subcontract or purchase order as the contracting agency may direct as a means of enforcing such provisions, including sanctions for noncompliance: *Provided, however,* That in the event the contractor becomes involved in, or is threatened with, litigation with a subcontractor or vendor as a result of such direction by the contracting agency, the contractor may request the United States to enter into such litigation to protect the interests of the United States."

I want to specifically direct your attention to the requirement in the first paragraph of section 301 which states that:

> Except in contracts exempted in accordance with section 303 of this order, all Government contracting agencies shall include in every Government contract hereafter entered into the following provisions.

These provisions are the balance of section 301 which I have just read.

Again, I want to emphasize that this Executive Order 10925, which has had the full force of law since its publication in the Federal Register on March 7, 1961, at 10:06 a.m., is to apply to all Federal contracts entered into after that time unless exempted in accordance with section 303 of the order.

Section 303 reads as follows:

> SEC. 303. The Committee may, when it deems that special circumstances in the national interest so require, exempt a contracting agency from the requirement of including the provisions of section 301 of this order in any specific contract, subcontract, or purchase order. The Committee may, by rule or regulation, also exempt certain classes of contracts, subcontracts, or purchase orders (a) where work is to be or has been performed outside the United States and no recruitment of workers within the limits of the United States is involved; (b) for standard commercial supplies or raw materials; or (c) involving less than specified amounts of money or specified numbers of workers.

In the second session of the 87th Congress, authority was granted to the Atomic Energy Commission to enter into a contract with the Washington Public Power Supply System for the construction of a nonfederally financed powerplant on Federal lands near the new production reactor at Hanford, Wash. Such powerplant was to be operated by steam produced by the new production reactor. In the same act, authority was given to the Bonneville Power Authority to enter into exchange agreements that would provide for disposition of the electric power generated at such new production reactor powerplant. Copies of such contracts were referred to in the House debate on the fiscal year 1963 authorization for Atomic Energy Commission, and thus became a part of the legislative history of the act.

In order to lay the groundwork for my charge that for political expediency the Kennedy administration has deliberately violated a provision of Federal law which it had sworn to uphold, I specifically call attention to that fact that section 303 only provides for the exemption—under four specified conditions—from the requirements of section 301 of Executive Order 10925. Nowhere in the order is there any provision for modification of any of the sections of such order. Nor is any authority granted the President's Committee to authorize any Federal agency to make any such modification.

Draft. No. 5 of the proposed new production reactor power contract between Bonneville and the Washington Public Power Supply System was printed in part 3 of the House hearings on the public works appropriation bill for fiscal year 1963, page 616. Draft No. 8 of such proposed contract dated June 19, 1962, was printed on page 41 of a committee print of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy dated July 1962.

In these proposed contracts which were the basis for congressional debate on the required authorization, the requirements of section 301 of Executive Order 10925 were included in full.

Here is the reason for the Kennedy administration's failure to live up to its own Executive Order 10925. When the Washington public power supply system approached the bankers with regard to disposing of the $130 million-plus of bonds to provide the necessary financing, they were told that with the provisions of the Executive Order 10925 included in all contracts, there were serious questions whether the bonds could be sold, and if they could be sold it would be only at extremely high discount rates. I am reliably told that the matter was then taken up with Vice President JOHNSON, who is the Chairman of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity. As I understand it, the Vice President would not agree to an exemption from Executive Order 10925.

Little did anyone dream that the Kennedy administration would sacrifice full and equal application of the equal employment opportunity portion of its civil rights program on the altar of political expediency, to prevent any adverse effect on its program for bureaucratic expansion in America.

With the wide publicity given the Kennedy administration program for promoting and assuring civil rights, it is astounding to find the Kennedy administration has no hesitancy in ignoring the purported legal requirement of an Executive order that it had previously issued about 2 years earlier. When faced with the possible loss of non-Federal financing for the powerplant at the Hanford new production reactor, or the possible excessive cost of such financing, the Kennedy administration provided for the violation of the provisions contained in its own Executive Order 10925. It is my understanding that after Vice President JOHNSON refused to agree to an exemption from Executive Order 10925, further discussions were had which included various Federal officials and possibly the President himself. I was not given the whole story from this point on, but the end result is available for all to see in the 70 or 80 Federal contracts which were signed on April 11 and 12, 1963. Here is the payoff, the sacrifice of civil rights on the altar of political expediency. The penalty teeth in the Executive Order 10925—which were relied upon to achieve compliance with that order—have been pulled in all these 70 or 80 contracts, by the insertion of an additional subsection to the requirements of section 301 which reads as follows:

> 8. Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph 6 hereof, in the event of the supply system's noncompliance with the nondiscrimination clauses of this agreement or with any of the said rules, regulations, or orders, this agreement will not be canceled in whole or in part so long as such cancellation would impair the security of the revenue bonds issued by the supply system. The contracting parties agree that compliance with this section is of the essence, and in the event of a violation all other remedies, including injunctive relief and specific performance, shall remain available to the United States.

I understand that some 12 or more drafts were made before the final draft was agreed upon. At just what point the provision for violating the law was added to the contract, I do not know. There must have been a lot of soul searching and midnight oil burned before they decided to sacrifice the equal employment opportunity portion of the Kennedy civil rights program on the altar of a greedy centralized government.

Let us examine how this provision of the Kennedy administration for deliberate violation of a civil rights law it had promulgated compares to the treatment accorded private industry, under such law.

Company "X" who has a contract with some Federal agency can have its contract canceled and be prevented from obtaining any future Federal contracts, if it does not comply with Executive Order 10925. The insertion of the provisions of section 301 of Executive Order 10925 into company "X's" contract could result in failure to obtain the required financing to build a new plant or expand an old plant, or, at best, could result in obtaining such financing at exorbitant cost. It is hypocrisy in the extreme for the Kennedy administration to require full and complete compliance with the equal employment opportunity law by a private contractor with a Federal contract, while it provides for noncompliance in Federal contracts executed with public utilities. Why should company "X" or companies "A" to "Z" be discriminated against? Why can not this Kennedy administration's deliberate violation of the law through failure to insist on full compliance with its own Executive order, be extended to any company which would be faced with inability to finance or with excessive cost of financing any required new plant or new additions to an existing plant to fulfill its Federal contract?

The answer is that they were faced with the possibility of being unable to obtain financing for this bureaucratic power project which had been hailed as a great Kennedy achievement when the contract providing for its construction was authorized by Congress during the last session.

Of course, the new production reactor contract between the Atomic Energy Commission and the Washington Public Power supply system still has a cancellation clause, but the joker in that cancellation clause is the fact that taxpayers of the Nation could be required to pick up the tab for any cost incurred prior to completion of the powerplant.

Under this provision, the bankers or the Washington Public Power supply system would not lose a cent by such cancellation. It would be the taxpayers who could lose up to $120 million or more.

Faced with a contract cancellation provision relative to fair employment practices, for which the taxpayers of the Nation would not be liable or which would prevent or make extremely costly the financing of the Kennedy administration's pet atomic energy powerplant project, what does the administration do? It promptly sacrifices its holy attitude on civil rights and discrimination, through the insertion of a saving clause to invalidate the penalty provisions of its own Executive order.

I question the propriety and the legality for extending this preferential treatment so that the New Frontier program for the extension of big government in the United States will not be delayed. It is a little difficult for me to believe that the Kennedy administration, when faced with a serious blow to a portion of its program to extend centralized power in America, is willing to violate a provision of a civil rights law which it promulgated and which it inferentially has sworn to uphold.

It is my opinion that these contracts are illegal. Certainly, they are not in accord with the legislative intent expressed by the Congress. The question now is whether Congress, and particularly the House, is going to ignore this flagrant violation of an Executive order that after its publication in the Federal Register has the full force of Federal law. A full investigation of this matter should be made at once, with instructions to the Federal agencies involved to hold up implementation of the contracts, even though signed, until the matter can be adjudicated by Congress or, if need be, by the courts.

I have been advised that the Washington Public Power Supply System intends to ask for bids on $122 million of revenue bonds on Wednesday, May 8, 1963. I am sure that every effort will be made to obtain injunctive relief against the issuance of such bonds on the grounds that the contracts under which they are to be issued contain provisions contrary to law. Following or failing such injunctive relief, I am sure every effort will be made to obtain a judicial determination of the legality of the Federal contracts involved.

If I were a banker, I would hesitate to make a bid for the proposed bond issue on May 8, 1963.

One might ask whether a charge of malfeasance in office could be lodged against those Federal officers who have been a party to the insertion in the contracts in question of a subsection whose purpose appears to be a deliberate attempt to circumvent existing law. It is doubtful, of course, as to whether the New Frontier would take action to convict itself.

If the administration can change the law to suit itself in this instance, how far will it go or has it gone in other instances to change the law to suit itself? I think a congressional inquiry should be made to determine if numerous other Federal contracts have been changed with respect to the equal employment opportunity act.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MATHIAS. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has a note of surprise in his voice, a note of amazement. I am just wondering why the gentleman should feel amazed at the events he is recounting. I admit they are shocking; I do not concede that they are surprising. After all, we have had the experience in this House within the past 2 weeks of seeing two examples of hypocrisy in dealing with civil rights. It was about 2 weeks ago that the House was considering a bill for aid for medical education. An amendment providing for observance of civil rights was offered at that time. Not only was the amendment turned down upon the urging of the majority leaders of this House but debate on a civil rights amendment was actually foreclosed by a vote in this House upon motion of the majority leadership. On that occasion debate was limited to 5 minutes.

Less than a week later we had a similar amendment before the House in connection with the impacted area program of aid to schools. When a similar civil rights amendment was offered, debate was again limited; in this case, if my memory serves me right, to 10 minutes.

I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania today is making a very valid point, and I thank him for bringing these matters to the attention of the Congress and the country. I think he has contributed to the whole story of the treatment of civil rights by the administration and this Congress by telling the country and the Congress what has happened in connection with these contracts.

I personally want to express my appreciation to him for completing this story that is so important to all the people of America.

Mr. SAYLOR. I thank the gentleman from Maryland for his contribution, because I can say I am still surprised, I am astounded to find such things are going on.

MINE SAFETY BILL

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, for some peculiar reason there is a tendency amongst Government officials in all areas and branches of Government to await the occurrence of a catastrophe or major crisis before taking steps to avert such occurrences. This is true in the field of coal mining; more so probably than any other.

The United Mine Workers, as well as reasonable coal operators, this Member of Congress and others have been trying for years to pass a second mine safety bill that would put under Federal inspection all coal mines not now covered by existing law approved July 16, 1952, known as the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act. When this legislation was passed, all mines with 14 employees or more were covered by Federal inspection.

The history of mining from that date has proven beyond a doubt the wisdom of the Congress in providing mine safety inspection by the Federal Government. By the same token, however, history has also proven that to have exempted mines under 14 employees, although expedient at the time, was a grievous mistake insofar as the lives and safety of the coal miners in this type of mining are concerned. I have therefore introduced again House Resolution 23, which will give to all coal miners the safety features embodied in the Mine Safety Act, regardless of the size of the mine in which they may be employed.

Recently the President of the United States, to his everlasting credit, spoke sharply in behalf of legislation and other executive and administrative action in an attempt to curtail the coal mine disasters which have taken 59 lives in the past 5 months. It is conceivable and logical that from the mere fact that certain mines, because of their size, are exempted from Federal inspection, a laxity in the administration of the present act follows.

Any person interested in the industry knows full well that there has been a growing tendency on the part of large mine operators and coal land holders to divide up large areas of coal lands into small contract mining operations to circumvent the mine safety law.

The President of the United States had this to say, and I quote the entire news release:

> President Kennedy ordered an intensive review of mine safety practices today in an attempt to prevent mishaps such as two explosions that killed 59 coal miners in the last 5 months.
>
> Kennedy sent the order to Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall. It followed the death of 22 men April 25 in a mine blast near Clarksburg, W. Va., and 37 others last December 6 in a mine near Carmichaels, Pa.
>
> "I also request your views promptly;" Kennedy said in a letter to the Secretary, "on the need for further or improved legislation which would enable us to prevent such accidents in the future.
>
> "I know you share my concern over these disasters and the deep sympathy for the family and friends of those who perished. It is imperative that we take every necessary step to avoid such accidents in the future."
>
> Kennedy said he considered the "loss of life unacceptable" in view of the accident-prevention measures available to industry and the inspection and compliance powers available to State and Federal agencies.

At the same time, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall had this to say:

> Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall said today steps already are being taken to carry out President Kennedy's directive of yesterday asking action to improve safety in coal mines.
>
> "It appears obvious to me from preliminary reports of the recent West Virginia disaster that some careless habits have developed," Udall told a news conference.
>
> "It appears we have got to have rigorous enforcement and laws."
>
> He said that within 2 weeks a 1-day conference will be held here attended by Federal and State safety people from the States concerned.
>
> Udall added that a task force is already at work to determine what additional new powers, including possible new laws, are needed to strengthen safety enforcement.

On Saturday, May 4, the Washington Post took cognizance of the seriousness of the matter by printing the following editorial which again highlights the necessity for extreme and eternal vigilance in this area of our economy. The editorial follows:

> ### MATTER OF LIFE AND DEATH
>
> President Kennedy's call for "an intensive review of present mine safety regulations and practices" is double-barreled. He wants to know whether the Bureau of Mines is doing all that it should be doing to require the safe operation of coal mines, and he wants to know whether new legislation is needed. In the light of the two recent disasters, which claimed 59 lives, both requests are matters of life and death.
>
> The safety record of American coal mines has greatly improved under Federal inspection, as the President indicated. But the system still has its defects. Mines to which the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act is applicable are usually inspected three times a year. If dangerous conditions are found, the inspector can order all workers out of the mine, or if the danger is not imminent, he can give the operator a reasonable time to make the necessary adjustments. But operators who go through the motions of compliance while the inspector is around have been known to revert to more careless practices between visits from the inspector.
>
> In one of the recent disasters, moreover, there are indications of sloppy inspection. An explosion apparently due to ventilation defects occurred just after an inspection had been made without uncovering the potential danger. Under the President's instructions to Secretary Udall, the latter will certainly need to scrutinize the efficiency of the inspections that are being made.
>
> Tightening of the law also seems to be in order. Experts say that an operator can run a rather sloppy mine and still remain within the letter of the law. There are no penalties in the Federal act for failure to comply with safety requirements. Although an inspector may close the mine when he finds serious hazards, the operator may not be penalized for permitting unsafe conditions which the inspectors fail to see or which develop between inspections. In our opinion, operators should be held responsible for keeping their mines safe, without waiting for a Federal inspector to point out potential dangers.

In working for the passage of H.R. 23, I have attempted to get together statistics and arguments to give to Congress a complete and I pray, successful, argument for the passage of such legislation. In working with many agencies I have been able to get together the following information which I believe is apropos at this time.

The U.S. Bureau of Mines reports that 289 men were killed in accidents in the U.S. bituminous, lignite and anthracite coal mines during 1962. These fatalities occurred at a frequency rate of 1.20 per million man-hours of exposure, the same as last year which was the second worst year since World War II.

Safety Director Charles Ferguson of the United Mine Workers of America in commenting on mine safety has said:

> At least 95 percent of all injuries and fatalities in coal mines are preventable and only occur because of the failure of all concerned to apply the knowledge they possess and have not used.

The year 1962 began and ended with tragic major disaster—the Bureau of Mines classifies "major disasters" as those mining accidents which take five or more lives. In January, 11 men died in a methane-dust explosion at the Blue Blaze Mine, Carterville, Ill. On December 6, 37 men were killed in a methane-dust explosion at the Frosty Run Shaft, Robena Mine No. 3, United States Steel Corp.

Of this second disaster, UMWA president W. A. "Tony" Boyle said in the Mine Workers' Journal:

> This disaster has confirmed the belief I have held for some time—that we may be mechanizing the coal industry past the point of safety. Concern for production should not outweigh the industry's protection of the precious human lives in its custody.

Of the 1962 fatalities, 263 took place in bituminous and lignite coal operations. These deaths occurred at frequency rates of 1.18 per million man-hours of exposure. Compared with 1961 this frequency rate dropped 6 percent per million man-hours of exposure. Bituminous and lignite coal production in 1962 rose 4 percent and man-hours 1 percent.

The Pennsylvania anthracite industry reported 26 deaths in 1962 at a frequency rate of 1.43 per million man-hours of exposure. Seven more fatalities occurred in 1962 than in 1961 and the frequency rate increased 68 percent per million man-hours of exposure. Production of anthracite in 1962 dropped 4 percent and man-hours dropped 19 percent.

Of the deaths in the bituminous and lignite coal mines, 225 occurred underground, 20 on the surface, 17 at strip mines, and one at an augur mine. Of the underground fatalities, falls of roof, face, or rib, accounted for 105—47 percent of the total—compared with 135—56 percent—in 1961. Underground haulage accidents represented 16 percent of the total in both 1962 and 1961. Gas or dust explosions killed 52 men in 1962, and 26 in 1961. No fatalities resulted from mine fires in 1962 as contrasted with seven in 1961.

In the anthracite industry the number of fatal injuries from falls of roof, face, or rib, in 1962 was eight. This is one less than the 1961 figure. Miscellaneous accidents underground took seven lives in 1962, while in 1961 no fatalities occurred from miscellaneous causes. The number of fatalities underground in the anthracite industry increased from 14 to 18 and at surface operations from 2 to 5. Strip mines reported three fatalities in each year.

Fifteen coal-producing States reported fatalities in 1962. Fatality-free States which reported fatalities during the previous year were Alaska, Missouri, Montana, and Wyoming.

By States, deaths occurred as follows: West Virginia 75; Pennsylvania—bituminous—61; Kentucky 43; Virginia 22; Illinois 21; Ohio 13; Alabama 7; Indiana 6; Tennesse 5; Colorado 3; New Mexico 2; Utah 2; North Dakota 1; Oklahoma 1; and Maryland 1.

In an analysis of coal mine roof, face, and rib falls, fatalities by size of mine and district, the Bureau of Mines shows 47 men were killed in title I mines—those employing 14 or less underground—against 66 killed in title II mines—those employing 15 or more men underground. Nearly half such deaths occurred in the so-called small mines in spite of the fact that they produce less than 14 percent of the coal mined in the United States. Many of these deaths might have been prevented had the 87th Congress passed my bill, H.R. 5741, which gave Federal inspectors the right to close down any mine found in a dangerous condition.

I am the sponsor of H.R. 23, a bill to amend Public Law 552, known as the mine safety bill. I have given this bill a good deal of consideration and have been the recipient of much information about it both pro and con.

Ever since I have been in Congress I have been a strong advocate of mine safety. I have never regretted my activity in support of that legislation. I have lived to see an industry that once counted its injuries in 5 figures and its fatalities run to more than 2,500 men in 1 year's time, drop to a low of 251 in 1959; 274 in 1960; 256 in 1961; and 289 in 1962. It is still far too many and I hope to see the day when there are no fatalities. But mining is a hazardous occupation and mine safety is a battle that must be fought constantly by all concerned: miners, operators, mine bureaus, State legislatures, and the Congress of the United States. I feel that every man who goes into a hole in the ground is entitled to every protection, from every source he can get it.

I remember well the arguments used against the passage of the original mine safety bill. I am hearing them again today. It is too costly. We cannot afford to do all the things the Federal law requires. We will have to shut down operations and throw men out of work. Our State examinations are enough. Federal examination is an unnecessary duplication. Yet, we all know that mines did not shut down then. That State examinations were not enough. That Federal examiners with power to close down unsafe mines did bring more safety to every mining State in the Union. The figures speak for themselves. The very idea that a Federal inspector might be making an appearance at any mine, anywhere, anytime, tends to keep State inspectors on their toes and alert for violations. We were not unaware of laxness and neglect in State inspections in the old days. It was the willful and open violation of State laws, the wanton killing of coal miners by the thousands that brought about the passage of the mine safety bill. I think it is well that we have our Federal inspection if only for a check and a counterbalance to State inspection and I cannot for the life of me see how a Government can extend protection to men who accept employment in mines employing more than 14 men and withhold the same protection in the same mines, in the same neighborhood and community that employ 14 men or less.

It would seem to me that every man who employs men to go down into the ground to work for him owes it to those men to make their work as safe as it is possible for him so to do. I am aware that men seeking employment are not free agents. They must work for a living. They cannot remain idle and must accept offered employment even at the risk of their lives. They have families to feed, responsibilities to meet and meet them they do even if it means taking a chance in an unventilated, untimbered, gassy, and dusty hole in the ground.

I am not an expert on mining but I do know something about it from personal observation and conversation with men who make a livelihood mining coal. I cannot visualize any great expense required to keep a small mine properly timbered, properly ventilated, properly clean, under State and Federal law. State and Federal laws parallel each other in most instances and it seems to me that every man who goes underground should be entitled to such protection. Why should any coal miner or coal operator fear the advent of a Federal inspector more than the appearance of a State inspector enforcing practically the same law? It would seem to me that a doublecheck would be preferred by all concerned. Surely, for the most part they are part and parcel, all concerned with saving and protecting life regardless of the size of a mine, the number of employed, and whether union or nonunion. Why should a mine on one side of the road employing 15 or more men have to be kept in a safe condition under Federal and State law while a mine across the way employing 14 or less can go its way without fear of having the same Federal law enforced in its workings? There is an appeal section in the mining law that sets forth a method by which all coal-mine operators can appeal any and all arbitrary or illegal orders issued by any Federal inspector or the U.S. Bureau of Mines. What is there about a Federal inspector that makes him so fearsome? I have found them dedicated men, just as honest, just as sincere in their devotion to their duty as any State inspector. What is there that makes two men trained in the same way, in the same work, so different? Why is one to be trusted and acceptable while the other is mistrusted and undesirable?

I fear that the opponents of H.R. 23 are treading the same path as did their predecessors in opposing the original mine safety bill. It is my thought that they will find they, too, have been tilting at windmills and seeing bogeymen where none exists. I honestly believe that this law should be amended as suggested in H.R. 23. I believe coal mining will be made a safer occupation by the passage of this amendment. I prefer to err if err I must upon the side of better conditions and more safety in the mining of coal.

I have been told by men who oppose this mine safety amendment that they cannot afford to live up to the Federal Mine Safety Act, Public Law 552. In many instances they have this act confused with the Mine Safety Code which is only applicable to signatories to the contract between the United Mine Workers of America and the coal operators. In any other mine the only enforceable law is Public Law 552 and the only authority a Federal mine inspector possesses stems from that law. We are told that the law that applies to large mines is not applicable to small mines and that the operators cannot live under it. That there may be some difference between large mines and small mines is probably true and conditions in large mines may require more drastic remedies than they do in small mines. But a mine employing 15 to 16, 17 to 20, and up to 50 men is not a large mine. They, too, are small mines with the same conditions that exist in mines which employ less than 14 men. Identical conditions and problems face these small mineowners and yet hundreds of them are operating under the mandatory provisions of the act and the mining code without suffering any undue hardship. To say a mine employing less than 14 men is a small mine while one employing 15 is a large mine, is completely unrealistic.

There cannot be too much mine inspection. I feel that there is plenty of room for both State and Federal bureaus to operate without jealousy or rancor.

The Federal Bureau of Mines testified before the Senate Subcommittee on Labor and Public Welfare that 9 out of 10 violations cited by their inspectors were violations of State law. They testified that they found many violations of State and Federal law that brought on imminent danger conditions. Director Ankeny of the Bureau of Mines, in 1958, testified that since 1952 the number of title II mines decreased from 2,233 to 1,338—40 percent—whereas the number of title I mines have increased from 5,281 to 7,511—42 percent. From these data it is evident that limiting the enforcement powers of the act has resulted in an increase in hazardous conditions in hundreds of mines because many coal operators have slipped behind the "14-man curtain" by keeping their working force under 15 persons and thus avoided the mandatory provisions of title II. More alarming is the knowledge that many new mines are being opened and operated as title I mines. The act should not provide such an inviting loophole to escape compliance with reasonable safety precautions.

I hope this Congress will vote out H.R. 23 or a similar bill without amendment. I want to see inspection under Public Law 552 apply to every coal mine in this country, large and small. I want every inspector, State and Federal, to be able to close down a mine where dangerous conditions exist. I doubt if giving Federal inspectors this power will cause any great hardship to small mines.

THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES URGENTLY NEED SUPPORT

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues in the House of Representatives are well aware of my deep interest in legislation on behalf of the arts and humanities. I introduced in the last Congress, and I again in this Congress, a bill (H.R. 324) to establish a National Institute of the Arts and Humanities.

Recent events and developments compel me to speak out once again to urge the Congress to take prompt action on this measure. Let me state briefly my reasons for urging such action by the Congress at this time.

First, I believe that the clear and compelling need for Federal legislation on behalf of the arts and humanities was never more apparent than at the present moment in our history and development. Such Federal support of the arts and humanities as I have proposed is needed to accomplish several goals to which, I feel sure, we can all subscribe.

It is needed to give direction and unity to the Federal role in these vital areas of our culture. Our artistic and humanistic policies are fully as important to our national well-being as our fiscal or our political policies.

Federal action is needed to supplement and reinforce the present and potential programs of the States, municipalities, private foundations and associations. It is not intended now or at any future time to replace these initiatives with Federal programs.

Federal action is needed if we are to realize our fullest potential as a people in the many fields embraced by the arts and humanities. President Kennedy, speaking on behalf of the National Cultural Center, has summarized the important effect which great achievements by nations in the arts and humanities has had on succeeding nations:

> Genius can speak at any time and the entire world will hear it and listen. Behind the storm of daily conflict and crisis, the dramatic confrontations, the tumult of political struggle, the poet, the artist, the musician, continues the quiet work of centuries, building bridges of experience between peoples, reminding man of the universality of his feelings and desire and despairs, and reminding him that the forces that unite are deeper than those that divide.
>
> Thus, art and the encouragement of art is political in the most profound sense not as a weapon in the struggle, but as an instrument of understanding of the futility of struggle between those who share man's faith. Aeschylus and Plato are remembered today long after the triumphs of imperial Athens are gone. Dante outlived the ambitions of 13th century Florence. Goethe stands serenely above the politics of Germany, and I am certain that after the dust of centuries has passed over our cities, we, too, will be remembered not for victories or defeats in battle or in politics, but for our contribution to the human spirit.[1]

We need action now to assure that the artistic and humanistic brainpower of our Nation is not diverted into other more lucrative but, for them, less challenging and suitable fields of study and practice. This means that our potential practitioners, researchers and teachers of the arts and humanities must have available to them the needed fellowships and traineeships. Without this support, many will have no choice but to pursue other fields of endeavor for which they are perhaps less well qualified. The Congress can ill afford to stand idly to one side while such misuse of our national talents takes place.

Last, and most compelling, is the need for Federal legislation to help redress the imbalance between the arts and humanities on one hand, and the sciences on the other. I need not remind you that this imbalance is one which the Congress has largely created through its vast programs of support for science, as important as these are. This is the primary need which countless leaders from all fields have voiced in their reactions to this bill.

In addition to this evidence of need on all sides for such legislation as I have proposed, there is at present, I believe, the most favorable climate in our national development and posture for the approval and support of such legislation by our constituents. Apparently many of my colleagues in both Houses agree with me, judging from the number of legislative proposals in support of the arts and humanities which have been introduced in the present session. The receptivity to the arts and humanities as an increasingly important aspect of our national life is everywhere apparent. The signs are clear beyond dispute. A recent Gallup poll estimates that during the past year, 18 million adults visited an art museum or gallery, the same number attended a stage production, 14 million went to a concert. Other surveys estimate that 150 cultural centers are planned or are being built across the land; 40 cities in the United States have arts councils with an additional 100 cities considering the organization of arts councils; 11 million adults play a musical instrument; 10 million adults paint in oils or watercolors. The list could go on. We are all aware of this great upsurge of interest in the arts and humanities.

However, in spite of this great quantity of interest and participation by our adult population, the quality of much of our training and support for the arts and humanities by our education institutions is suffering through lack of adequate support.

Our Federal programs to date have been aimed almost exclusively toward the natural sciences.

In closing, let me speak to the principal objection voiced by opponents to Federal legislation in behalf of the arts and humanities, namely, the specter of Federal control. My bill contains a specific provision of assurance against Federal control over "policy determination, personnel, curriculum, or the administration or operation of any school or other non-Federal agency, institution, organization, or association"—section 102. In addition, we can point to the experience of other governments which have supported the arts and humanities, and of our own Government in its support of the natural sciences. Any impartial observer will have to agree that these national level programs of financial aid have not curtailed the freedom of the scholar or artist, but have in fact enhanced it. The scientist in this country has enjoyed an unprecedented freedom for research under our Federal science programs. The artist and humanist will enjoy an equal freedom to develop to his fullest potential and contribute his best creative and scholarly work to mankind if—and it is a big if—we provide the necessary financial support through appropriate Federal legislation. But time is running out and our society is moving at an accelerating pace. Therefore, I respectfully urge the Committee on Education and Labor to take early action on this legislation which I believe to be as important as any other matter of national concern which is facing us.

LEADING EPISCOPAL CHURCHMAN OF THE DIOCESE OF DELAWARE RETURNS HOME AFTER SOJOURN IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDowell] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend Dr. Walden Pell II, an Episcopal churchman, long active in the Episcopal diocese of Delaware, has returned home from several years' work in southeast Asia. He and Mrs. Pell are friends of mine, and neighbors, in Delaware, and I had the opportunity, during an overseas inspection for the House Foreign Affairs Committee, to visit with them in their southeast Asia parish which embraced South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos. His congregation there comprised mostly American and British citizens, but included Indians and Canadians with the International Control Commission, as well as some Burmese, Australians and Chinese, and Vietnamese converts.

A member of an illustrious American family, he is a distant relative of Senator Claiborne Pell of Rhode Island.

---

[1] Excerpts from President Kennedy's remarks at the November 29 closed circuit television broadcast on behalf of the National Cultural Center as released from the Office of the White House Press Secretary.

He was a student at Princeton University, and a Rhodes scholar, a member of the board of directors of the Religious Education Association, according to Who's Who in America, and, in addition, was coauthor of "The Religion of the Prayer Book."

I am pleased to include two articles from the Wilmington, Del., Evening Journal on this distinguished churchman who has contributed so much to better relations with our Asian neighbors. I am confident that these articles give a much more honest picture of Americans abroad than the distortions peddled by the book "The Ugly American," which was a patent attempt to discredit Americans overseas, in an attempt to increase sales for this book.

It is a sad commentary on much of our so-called popular entertainment that it finds lurid charges an easy means to a mass market. Unfortunately, the truth has a hard time to overtake distortions, but the career of the Reverend Dr. Walden Pell demonstrates that we have much more to be proud of than we do to be ashamed of. How fortunate it would be for our country if we could always send men of the high moral character of Walden Pell to represent the United States in all the nations overseas.

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Evening Journal, Apr. 30, 1963]

RETIRED PRIEST BLAZED CHURCH TRAIL IN SAIGON

(By Bob Ingersoll)

PERCH CREEK, MD.—A plea in a church newsletter caught the eye of an Elkton, Md., priest, set him to wondering, and prompted a 2-year visit to southeast Asia.

The Reverend Dr. Walden Pell II, a priest of the Episcopal diocese of Delaware, and his wife, Edith, are home in Perch Creek after the assimilation of a new culture, a smattering of political intrigue, but more, the satisfaction of a job well done.

In 1957 Dr. Pell resigned as headmaster of St. Andrew's School in Middletown, a post he'd held since the school's founding in 1930. He had "no plans" but the ex-Princeton athlete, whose ruddy complexion and 6-foot frame belie his 60 years, was not destined to inactivity.

The newsletter, from the Right Reverend Roland Koh of the diocese of Singapore and Malaya, touched on the need for an Anglican priest in Saigon, South Vietnam.

Two years later Dr. Pell was priest in charge of a parish embracing not only South Vietnam, but bordering Cambodia to the west and Laos to the north. His congregations—mostly Americans and British—included Indians and Canadians with the International Control Commission, Burmese, Australians, and Chinese, and a handful of Vietnamese converts.

They dubbed themselves the Anglican Episcopal Congregation of the Mekong, after the Mekong River which twists its way from northern Thailand to a delta on the South China Sea below Saigon.

Before assuming his duties, Dr. Pell studied the history, culture, and politics of the area and tackled the basics of the language during a year at Columbia University and the Union Theological Seminary. Late in 1959 he took a parish in Singapore, giving him opportunity to scout his farflung diocese.

"I soon knew I was wanted," said Dr. Pell after trips to priestless congregations in Saigon and Phnom Penh, Cambodia. These congregations, including another in Vientiane, Laos, which he was to acquire, were held together by a dedicated band of American and British lay readers.

Dr. and Mrs. Pell moved into a house in Saigon, adopting an Episcopal congregation of about 150. His following in Cambodia was about 60 and in Laos 40.

During his stay, a vicious guerrilla battle was being fought between South Vietnam and the Communist Vietcong, while civil war smouldered and flared in Laos. Dr. Pell's contact between congregations was made solely by planes, the only way out of the beleaguered city for Americans and the only feasible transportation in the almost impenetrable terrain of jungles and mountains.

"People are apt to think of that part of the world as being rather insignificant in terms of distance," said Dr. Pell. "Actually Laos is about the size of Great Britain and North and South Vietnam is 1,000 miles long.

Communist guerrillas were active in the marshy Mekong delta south of Saigon and all Americans were restricted to the heart of the city. Even so, grenades were tossed into cafes frequented by Americans. During Dr. Pell's stay, a grenade was flipped into the car of American Ambassador Frederick E. Nolting, Jr.

"It didn't explode," said Pell—"too rusty."

Coupled with the Communist war was a sticky counterrevolutionary movement against the South Vietnam regime of President Diem. Dr. Pell was reported by a misguided American press to have been involved.

The threads of that tale became entwined shortly after Dr. Pell's arrival in the city. He received a letter from the dean of the American Cathedral in Paris stating that a Vietnamese, Hai Nam Van, had been baptized and confirmed in the Episcopal Church.

"I looked him up and employed him to translate classes in Vietnamese," said Dr. Pell. "He was a conscientious worker."

Van was sharing an apartment with Dr. Stanley Millet, an American political science professor, teaching for a year at the University of Saigon under the visiting Smith-Mundt program.

In February of 1962, a pair of dissident South Vietnamese pilots forewent a bombing mission against Vietcong south of Saigon and jettisoned their explosives on the royal palace—a dramatic but unsuccessful political coup.

The pair knew Van, who was interrogated. In a face-saving prefabrication, police said that Van named both Dr. Millet and Dr. Pell as collaborators in a plot to take over the government. Dr. Pell wasn't questioned, but Dr. Millet was bound over 40 days in Saigon and described the episode in an article, "Terror in Vietnam," in the September issue of Harper's magazine.

Van is still held incommunicado with one of the pilots. The other crashlanded in Cambodia where longtime hatreds between the two countries has made him somewhat of a national hero.

When Dr. Pell arrived in Saigon, the British and American population numbered about 3,000. The coalition government in Laos was in existence and the Military Assistance Advisory Group had pulled out 6 months earlier.

But within the first 18 months, American advisers numbering about 10,000 were called to help train the South Vietnamese army.

Dr. Pell's congregations were transient as embassy personnel and VIP's were rotated, but services went on schedule and a handful of Vietnamese converts were baptized and confirmed.

In Vientiane, Laos, Dr. Pell's congregation resembled a gathering at an all-male college. The Vietcong had attacked the city a year before his arrival, blowing up a wing of the American Embassy, and all dependents were shuffled to Bangkok.

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Evening Journal, May 1, 1963]

DR. PELL TELLS OF PROBLEMS IN ASIA

(By Bob Ingersoll)

PERCH CREEK, MD.—Despite war, civil strife and the aura of tension that gripped his southeast Asian diocese, how was daily living for Rev. Dr. Walden Pell II and his wife, Edith?

Dr. Pell, 60, has returned from a 2-year tour as priest in charge of a parish embracing the three countries of South Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos.

"The Vietnamese were an immensely curious people," said Dr. Pell. "French was the second language, but thousands were learning English."

Before the 1954 showdown in Dien Bien Phu, Indo-China was a French colony. It is now divided into Laos, Cambodia, and North and South Vietnam.

The Pells describe Saigon—South Vietnam capital where Dr. Pell was priest of an Episcopal congregation numbering 150—as "a sophisticated, cosmopolitan city."

It was a fusion of many races and cultures with French dominant.

"Even the movies were in French," said Mrs. Pell. "You ought to hear Huck Finn speak Parisian French."

The Pells did all of their commuting by taxi.

"Americans were restricted to the heart of the city," said Dr. Pell "and the taxis were so numerous and inexpensive it made better sense. They were mostly Renaults and cost about 13 cents a mile. A Chevrolet in Saigon would have looked like an aircraft carrier."

Surpassing taxis, the most popular mode of transportation was by bicycle of which there were an estimated 500,000 in the city of 2 million.

"And motor scooters," said Mrs. Pell. "We'd sometimes see family groups of five precariously balanced on one scooter. You could never quite predict what a driver might do although no one went much over 25 miles per hour."

Whereas 5 p.m. is the time of the American traffic jam, noon produces similar problems in Saigon.

"Everyone leaves for a 2-hour break," said Dr. Pell, "because of the heat. Actually there is little range in temperature around the clock although it was usually 90 at midday. All Americans have air conditioners or overhead fans."

The city was a gourmet's paradise with the best in French, American, Chinese and Vietnamese cuisine. Chinese influence was strong but somewhat confined as the Chinese stayed close to Saigon's sister city of Cholon.

When not dining out, the Pells ate Vietnamese food purchased and prepared by native servants who received the "high American wages" of $32 a month.

Table tennis and badminton were the city's most popular sports although Dr. Pell—who rowed at Princeton University—drew good response coaching an eight-man Vietnamese crew.

Unemployment, Dr. Pell learned, was prevalent among the Vietnamese in their early twenties.

"There were numerous students," he said, "but they didn't take more than one course a day. It was considered a worst fate than not working, though, to be drafted into the Army."

Mrs. Pell commented on the strictness of morals, especially among those in their late teens. A national law prohibited all dancing, but the Vietnamese were appreciative of almost any type of music.

Language was somewhat of a barrier to the Pells, although they picked up the colloquialisms. "It's a singsong language," said Dr. Pell, "and there is little correspondence between the written words and the sound their letters represent in English."

Another complication was the money exchange as currency from a dozen countries sought a common denominator. The clergy and a handful of U.S. businessmen were the only Americans in Saigon not of the "official American community" referring to everyone paid by the Government. Consequently the Pells were restricted from Government commissary privileges and often went bargaining in the native markets.

Although restricted to the city in South Vietnam, Dr. Pell, a weekend naturalist, got away on a bird-watching junket in Cambodia. He'll never have an opportunity like that in Elkton. Many of the 1,000 species of birds that live in Indo-China can be seen in Cambodia.

Dr. Pell both supported and denied the validity of "The Ugly American."

He denied any pulling of wool over the eyes of visiting statesmen and factfinders, but told one story of propaganda unbelievable to those who didn't live it.

It seems the Vietcong were using the high grass and underbrush along the roads outside of Saigon as cover for ambushes. The South Vietnamese retaliated by spraying the roadways with a chemical poison to kill the brush. But out of this seeming setback the Communists wrung a measure of anti-American propaganda, accusing the Americans of poisoning native crops so the Vietnamese would have to buy surplus food from the United States.

"The Vietnamese are gentle Buddhists," said Dr. Pell, "not strong nationalists. Eighty percent of the population live in semi-isolated villages and only want to be left alone to cultivate their rice.

"It's hard to anticipate a quick end in the struggle against the Vietcong. Remember it wasn't until 1960 that Communist guerrillas in Malaya were put down. They fought superior arms and numbers for 13 years and didn't have a common border with a Communist country.

"I felt a great loss in leaving my congregations," said Dr. Pell. "We had a fine relationship with all Christians and there were several joint services on holy days.

"There was good-natured kidding between Americans and English concerning the correct tunes for the hymns, but everyone worked his heart out. We have a great team over there and it's up to us to keep it that way."

CONSOLIDATED BADGER COOPERATIVE ANNUAL MEETING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the over 3,000 farmer members of the Consolidated Badger Cooperative, of Shawano, Wis., held their annual meeting on April 20, 1963. At the annual meeting the membership of this cooperative, the largest in the Seventh Congressional District, adopted 14 resolutions.

Under unanimous consent, I include these resolutions in their entirety at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It has been my privilege over the years to work closely with the membership, board of directors, and management of this cooperative. I commend these resolutions to the attention of the entire House of Representatives.

The resolutions follow:

RESOLUTIONS: CONSOLIDATED BADGER COOPERATIVE, APRIL 20, 1963

RESOLUTION 1 (LEGISLATION)

We believe that fair and equitable national legislation is necessary for the strengthening and the preservation of the Wisconsin dairy industry. We support the 75–90 percent parity principle in the 1949 Agricultural Act until a more acceptable program is developed, and we are opposed to legislation which would allow for deficit areas or exemptions. We favor the "free flow of milk" principle and oppose barriers designed to thwart the movement of milk in interstate commerce.

RESOLUTION 2 (DAIRYMEN'S CLASS I BASE PLAN)

We support voluntary programs designed to enhance producer income. The dairymen's base plan might be advantageous to producers limiting their production for the class I and class II market. We support the principles of such a program.

RESOLUTION 3 (FEDERAL ORDERS)

We believe that the Federal order program has contributed significantly to stability in the dairy industry. Changes and trends in marketing conditions and transportation make it possible for fewer Federal orders to serve greater areas and we recommend that consolidations of Federal orders be accomplished in the interest of more orderly marketing.

RESOLUTION 4 (BUTTER SUBSIDY)

It is evident that a reduced retail price for butter would increase demand for this dairy product. Increased demand would reduce the quantity of butter in Government storage and reduce the costs of storage.

The retail price spread between butter and imitation products might be narrowed if price-support moneys were paid directly to butter plants for distribution to farmers.

We join with other organizations in asking Congress to amend price-support legislation so that direct payments may be made to manufacturers of butter, thereby benefiting butter consumers and reducing Government costs.

RESOLUTION 5 (MARKET DEVELOPMENT)

During the last year considerable progress has been made in developing a unified position to represent the Midwest at Federal order hearings, to USDA and other agencies. This has resulted in a strengthening of the position of Wisconsin producers in their long-term development of markets.

We commend the dairy section of the Wisconsin council, the State department of agriculture, and the college of agriculture for their cooperation in developing such a program.

RESOLUTION 6 (IMPORTS)

The importation of cream from New Zealand threatens domestic markets at a time U.S. produced dairy products are in surplus stocks and being sold under Government programs. We object to the new inspection programs approved by the Food and Drug Administration which have had the net effect of reducing our markets.

We recommend that action be taken to tighten inspections of imports under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

RESOLUTION 7 (DELEGATE SYSTEM)

Our cooperative has grown on a sound and realistic basis in milk volume, sales and membership. We believe our organization will continue to grow in service to producers in our area.

In order to assure broad membership activity and interest and to assure proper geographic representation at annual meetings, we recommend that our resolutions committee act as a study committee to investigate the feasibility of a delegate system for Consolidated Badger. We further recommend that this committee make recommendations and report to the board within the next 4 months. The president shall serve on this committee in an advisory capacity.

RESOLUTION 8 (PRESERVATION OF BUTTER'S COLOR)

The color yellow historically is related to butter and we favor the preservation of this color for butter. We oppose its use by imitation products. We commend the Wisconsin Council of Agriculture Cooperative and the Wisconsin Creameries Association for their efforts to preserve butter's exclusive right to the color yellow.

RESOLUTION 9 (PROTEIN TESTING)

The testing of milk for protein content may have certain consumer and sales advantages. There is much still to be finally established on this subject. We approve continued study by our research people and call for the introduction of this factor in testing when research and evidence justifies its use.

RESOLUTION 10 (HAULERS)

Private contract haulers have played an important part in the growth and development of our cooperative. We commend our contract haulers for their good work in helping build Badger and we support the present private contract hauling relationship.

RESOLUTION 11 (AMERICAN DAIRY ASSOCIATION)

The American Dairy Association carries out effective programs designed to increase the consumption of dairy foods. Such programs are all the more necessary today because of intensified competition. We commend the A.D.A. for its efforts and encourage support for this organization.

RESOLUTION 12 (PRESS, RADIO, TV)

Our cooperative enjoys an excellent working relationship with representatives of the newspapers, radio, and television professions. We express our gratitude to these friends of the Consolidated Badger for their fine cooperation and their helpfulness over the past year.

RESOLUTION 13 (BOARD COMMENDATION)

We commend our board of directors for their intelligent leadership and the programs they have developed over the last year. We commend them for policies which have assured Badger's sound financial condition. We hereby ratify all actions taken by the board since our last annual meeting and we empower the board to adopt new policies in the light of previously approved resolutions and programs.

RESOLUTION 14 (THANK YOU)

We extend our thanks to the city of Shawano, the board of education, Badger employees and their wives and to all others who contributed to the success of this meeting.

THE FEDERAL IMPACTED SCHOOL AID PROGRAM SHOULD BE EXTENDED AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN ITS PROVISIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the Republican State Committee for the District of Columbia, and the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade are firmly on record in support of legislation before the Congress to extend for at least 1 additional year the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress—the Federal impacted school aid program—and to extend their application to the District of Columbia.

The chairman of the Republican State Committee for the District of Columbia, Carl L. Shipley, has written to me in support of my own bill, H.R. 11631, to extend the temporary provisions of these important laws, and to include the District of Columbia in their application.

Mr. Shipley pointed out:

> There is no question that the District of Columbia should be included within the law granting aid to schools located within federally impacted areas. A recent survey of District of Columbia schoolchildren indicates that 30 percent would be classified as federally connected children as within the purview of the law. Applying the method of imputing Federal entitlement, the estimated grant to the District of Columbia would be in the neighborhood of $4 million for 1963. There is a vital need for additional funds for our schools, buildings are overcrowded and many are obsolete or in poor condition; many textbooks are out of date; pupil-teacher ratios are too high. Extension of impacted area aid to the District would provide a useful temporary supplement to the current lump-sum payment, pending the time when Congress establishes a permanent formula for a basis of determining an adequate Federal payment to the District budget.

Charles E. Phillips, president, the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, recently declared, in a letter to the chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL], that in the judgment of the board of directors the District of Columbia clearly qualifies for payment under the provisions of the impacted aid legislation which provides financial assistance for schools in areas affected by Federal activities. The board of directors of this influential body of businessmen, after careful study, approved a policy in support of H.R. 3335, a bill sponsored by our colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA], which is similar to my own H.R. 11631.

Federal aid now goes to some 4,100 school districts represented by more than 300 Members of Congress.

The board of trade states:

> Public Law 874, when enacted, was applicable to the territories of Alaska and Hawaii and to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. It has twice been amended to include Wake and Guam.

Here, then, is a case where the Federal taxing power is unjust in its application, because the District of Columbia is denied any of the benefits of a program which it helps pay for and for which it clearly qualifies. It has been excluded from this program during the decade or more of its application. It would seem that the Congress finds it easier to vote funds to send a man to the moon than to provide adequately for education needs of the citizens of the Nation's Capital.

I include several related items as part of my remarks:

THE METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON
BOARD OF TRADE,
Washington, D.C., May 2, 1963.

Hon. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WIDNALL: We are very pleased to comply with your request for a copy of the board of trade's letter to the chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee endorsing H.R. 3335, which would include the District of Columbia as a federally impacted area and extend Federal funds for school needs.

If we can be of further assistance to you please do not hesitate to call on us.

Sincerely,
CHARLES E. PHILLIPS,
President.

THE METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON
BOARD OF TRADE,
Washington, D.C., April 19, 1963.

Hon. ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. POWELL: The board of directors of the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade after careful study has approved a policy in support of H.R. 3335, a bill to extend for 1 additional year the temporary provisions of Public Law 815 and 874, 81st Congress, and to extend their application to the District of Columbia.

In our judgment the District of Columbia clearly qualifies for payment under the provisions of Public Law 874 which provides financial assistance for schools in areas affected by Federal activities. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have advised the committee that their survey indicated that about 30 percent of District of Columbia public school pupils come within the purview of the act. They have also estimated that the District of Columbia would be entitled to a grant of approximately $4 million in 1963.

The District of Columbia, as I believe the committee knows, has great difficulty meeting school needs because of the significant increases in school population which have taken place and which are projected for the future. During the current school year there has been an increase of 6,000 students, and we expect almost a 30-percent increase during the period 1962–69.

The board of education has estimated building requirements during this period of approximately $120 million, and very significant additional annual operating costs.

The District of Columbia shares in the benefits of Federal vocational education laws, the School Lunch Act, and the National Defense Education Act. The District also receives Federal grants through the highway and public welfare programs. In all of these cases and in many others the District of Columbia is treated as a State.

Public Law 874, when enacted, was applicable to the territories of Alaska and Hawaii and to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. It has twice been amended to include Wake and Guam.

We urge the committee to report favorably H.R. 3335.

Sincerely,
CHARLES E. PHILLIPS,
President.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 10, 1963]

DISTRICT SEEN LOSING OUT ON IMPACTED AID

Washington probably will not be included in the Federal aid to impacted areas program this year and may not next year unless it alters its system of school financing.

This prediction was made yesterday by Representative JOHN H. DENT, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, Chairman of a House education subcommittee after his group concluded hearings on the 13-year-old program aiding nearly 4,100 school districts impacted with children of Federal installation employees.

DENT said during the hearing he could not "in good conscience" recommend inclusion of Washington in the program unless the House District Committee agrees that the city should have a specific real estate tax for education.

DENT's point was that the District Committee, not the Education Committee, is the House group responsible for Washington finances. He noted that $19.4 million of the $30 million Federal payment to the District goes to schools. Under the impact aid program, Washington would get about $4.5 million.

Helen Samuels, executive secretary of the D.C. Education Association, presented a study showing local school needs. About 30 percent of District school students are children of Federal employees.

"Your fight is really with the House and Senate Committees on District Affairs," DENT said, "If they haven't provided enough money to run this city, it must reflect on their judgment."

DENT said later he does not doubt that District schools need more money, "But if the District had a special tax for school purposes, school officials could then come to us and say, "This is what our local effort is, and this is how much we would like to be reimbursed in impact aid funds.' "

President Kennedy has recommended that the program be extended 1 year without change and for 3 more years with some changes. He also recommended that Washington be included in the program in fiscal 1965.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 12, 1963]

SHIPLEY ATTACKS SCHOOL AID VOTE

District Republican leader Carl L. Shipley charged yesterday that nonleadership by President Kennedy and the Democratic majority on the House Education and Labor Committee cost the District $4.5 million in impacted school area aid.

Shipley deplored the failure by the committee to include the District in the Federal aid program despite the fact that it meets all qualifications.

The amount lost to the city "is one-thousandth of the amount" the President would dispense through foreign aid, Shipley said, adding that "our school needs are most urgent and mean more to the national welfare than many of President Kennedy's foreign-aid programs."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 4, 1963]

CAPITOL EYEING DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SCHOOL AID

(By Gerald Grant)

House Education and Labor subcommittee members yesterday hinted that the District is not doing enough for its schools.

Representative JOHN H. DENT, Democrat of Pennsylvania, chairman of the subcommittee, which is conducting hearings on Federal aid for impacted school systems, said that before the District can qualify for funds it must establish a tax base for school purposes.

Whereas real estate taxes are generally the base elsewhere, this was not so in Washington, said DENT. Local taxes and the Federal payment are mixed in "one pot," out of which the city's expenses are paid, including those for education.

As a result, Congress is confused about how great a local effort is being made to support the schools, DENT commented. He said it would be difficult for the subcommittee to compute an impacted aid payment without a "tax base earmarked specifically for school purposes."

Arnold C. Sternberg, member of the Democratic Central Committee for the District, testified that his organization had gone on record favoring higher taxes.

Sternberg asserted that it was possible to figure a school tax base by subtracting the Federal percentage share of the District budget—12 percent—from the per pupil cost of educating a child here.

He added that regardless of what local school effort the District was currently making, and in his opinion it was as great as or greater than in most of the States, the city "in equity and fairness" deserved to share in any impacted aid program.

William A. Rich, representing the District Congress of Parents and Teachers, replied to members of the subcommittee who said that whatever the District gained from impacted aid via the Education Committee might be cut from the Federal payment to the city by the District Committee.

Rich said that he did not think this would happen and that the Education Committee must provide "what in justice" is owed District schoolchildren.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 29, 1963]

District of Columbia Still Hopes To Get Impacted School Aid

(By Grace Bassett)

The District still is in the running for "Federally impacted" school aid, despite the restraining hand of a House Education Subcommittee chairman.

The chairman, Representative Dent, Democrat of Pennsylvania, doesn't think Washington can qualify for inclusion in the program.

City officials feel they can meet his objections statistically. More to the point, the conditions he says the city fails to meet may themselves be junked by Congress in an overhaul of impacted aid standards.

JUDGMENT REJECTED

Mr. Dent's doubts about the District reject the judgment of President Kennedy, Health, Education and Welfare Secretaries Ribicoff and Celebrezze, the full Senate, District Commissioners, the District Board of Education and School Superintendent Carl Hansen, as well as many members of Mr. Dent's own House Education Committee.

The Dent view also disregards the growing conviction among school officials from all parts of the country that the District has been shortchanged by exclusion.

Here is what has happened.

At House subcommittee hearings on impacted aid this month, Chairman Dent waved aside District officials seeking about $4 million in Federal grants for schools overcrowded with children of Government workers here. Maryland suburbs get about $10 million a year and neighboring towns and counties of Virginia, $6 million.

The District is on the wrong track when it asks congressional education committees to write the city into the national program, Mr. Dent suggested.

He said the District should take its case to District committees. These committees could recommend, and Congress accept, separation of the city's school budget from its general budget, in Mr. Dent's view. Only then, he thinks, could the District qualify for impacted aid.

SCHOOL SPENDING

Federal grants now are measured, in part, by what local taxpayers spend for their own schools. Mr. Dent reasoned the District could not measure its "local contribution rate" because some $221 million in local taxes and $30 million in a Federal payment are pooled for all activities, without earmarking for schools.

There are, however, ways of measuring District taxpayers' contributions to schools. There is the school budget, for example. Tax payments could be apportioned to 88 percent of it and Federal contributions to 12 percent, the same proportion as tax and Federal revenues make up the total general fund.

GRANT BASE

Or the comparable general and school percentages of yield by property taxes could be figured, if Mr. Dent wants a real estate revenue figure to be the grant base, as in the States.

Such computations, however, may turn out to be dry exercises by the time Congress revamps the program.

One scheme likely to be advanced by a House Education Study Committee would grant Federal funds on a straight cost-per-pupil basis.

Each federally connected pupil would entitle his school to funds equal to, say 70 or 80 percent, of what his school spends on each of his classmates whose parents are privately employed.

The idea that youngsters of Federal workers cost a community less than children from its private sector is based on the theory that any locality benefits in business, as well as suffers in tax losses, from a Federal plant located there.

SENSIBLE FORMULA

The House will look as much to the study committee as to the Dent subcommittee for a sensible aid formula. And study committeemen—Representatives O'Hara of Michigan and Brademas, of Indiana, both Democrats, and Republican Quie, of Minnesota—all recognize the District's school needs.

Changes may come along after Congress simply extends for 1 year the current program, which expires June 30.

President Kennedy has asked for major revisions and a 4-year extension. He wants the District added the second year.

In the Senate, administration supporters prefer to wrap revisions up in one big education bill. The District would be part of the package. This strategy wouldn't harm schools drawing budgets for next year. The extension section could be retroactive if the program expired before action on the omnibus bill.

MORSE HEARINGS

Senate Subcommittee Chairman Morse, Democrat of Oregon, began hearings today.

He probably is the stanchest congressional champion of the District's right to impacted aid. Twice before, he steered through the Senate bills to pay the "impact" on schools of Federal families here. His aids are ready to counter Mr. Dent's position should it prevail in the House.

In pursuing his course, Mr. Dent may arm local Republicans. District GOP leaders already are drafting legislation to order District officials to prepare separate school budgets each year. Their intention was to focus public attention on school needs. Their product could satisfy Mr. Dent's condition for the District's eligibility for impacted aid.

It is not inconceivable that the Dent demand, if he persists, will cast local Republicans into the role of saviors of $4 million for the city in a Democratic Congress and Democratic administration.

FIDEL CASTRO'S CUBA

Mr. **MARTIN** of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Wyman] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. **WYMAN**. Mr. Speaker, I observed the other day on the floor of the House that the only thing Mr. Harriman did not take with him to Moscow on his recent trip to beg Khrushchev's indulgence on Laos was his umbrella. Jack Gore, in Sunday's Fort Lauderdale News, pointed out so well that this kind softness with Khrushchev only helps strengthen Castro's hold on Cuba.

I commend the reading of Mr. Gore's remarks to all those who are deeply concerned by the indecision and timidity of U.S. policy in respect to the Cuban situation.

I continue to believe that we should insist on our inspection of the island of Cuba on a continuing basis, and if this is denied that we should assure inspection by the use of force if necessary. Beyond this immediate essential, I agree with Mr. Gore that getting Soviet troops out of Cuba is not a solution to the problem of communism in this hemisphere. It should be crystal clear in American foreign policy that we will not tolerate Communist governments in this hemisphere unless they are voted into office in a free election, which never happens.

Mr. Gore wrote:

[From the Fort Lauderdale (Fla.) News and Sun-Sentinel, May 5, 1963]

Soft-Line Diplomacy Strengthens Red Lifeline to Fidel Castro's Cuba

When Averell Harriman came back from Russia last week he apparently brought some good news for those who have been advocating our soft-line approach to the problem of getting Russian troops out of Cuba.

Harriman was sent to Moscow to talk to Premier Nikita Khrushchev about the critical situation in Laos. He got no promises from the Soviet leader in regard to Laos, but during their talks Khrushchev and Harriman got around to the subject of Cuba.

Harriman, we presume, was under instructions to remind Khrushchev that the presence of Soviet troops in Cuba was exercising a disturbing influence on the American people and that it would further the cause of peace and help the Kennedy administration out of an embarrassing situation if the Russian leader would bring his armed forces back home.

Khrushchev is reported to have informed Mr. Harriman that he appreciated Mr. Kennedy's efforts to halt the exile raids on Cuba and to tone down the war threat in the Caribbean. In return, he was reported to have told Harriman he was willing to withdraw Russian troops just as soon as he could do so without losing face or having it appear he was forced into such an action by American pressure.

Thus, according to Mr. Harriman's report, if we wait long enough and don't do anything to offend Khrushchev in the meantime, eventually he will do us a great big favor by withdrawing his troops from Cuba and leaving Castro to manage things on his own.

That is just ducky. If this is really what Khrushchev said it can now be inferred that our do nothing policy with regard to Cuba is going to be continued ad infinitum while we wait for the Soviet Premier to decide when the time is ripe for him to bring his troops back home.

This may be 6 months or a year or more. But, since Khrushchev and President Kennedy apparently have their own little secret about Cuba, it doesn't take any crystal ball expert to hazard the guess that Russian troops could well stay in Cuba until just prior to next year's election when their removal could be trumpeted by the Kennedy administration as another great victory for its soft-line diplomacy.

In the meantime, however, the Commies in Cuba will have tightened their grip on that island to the point where it will be almost unbreakable and they will have spread their evil tentacles into dozens of other places in the Caribbean where they hope to emulate their Cuban success.

This is something our soft-line diplomats don't seem to understand. To them it is a great victory to have forced Russian missiles out of Cuba even though the island, itself, has been surrendered to the Communists as a direct result. And, while we talk about building a wall around Cuba composed of dedicated, freedom-loving people, about the only wall we have built so far is one that keeps these dedicated and freedom-loving people from striking any new blows against an enemy who has taken over their homeland.

Now, those who don't like this policy are told to just be patient and don't rock the boat for Khrushchev appreciates what we are trying to do and will cooperate when he can do so without embarrassing himself.

But what about our embarrassment? Can Americans be anything but red-faced today over the manner in which our longstanding Monroe Doctrine has been trampled underfoot by the Communists? Can they be proud of the way we paid blackmail to a Communist dictator when our whole history shouts against such a precedent? Can they remain tranquil and undisturbed about a Soviet military base right in their own backyard which is now being protected by our own Navy and Air Force? Are we supposed to believe that Nikita Khrushchev is now dealing from the top of the deck and can be trusted when the whole strategy of communism is based upon deceit and deception?

Our people may be naive at times but they are not so naive that they can swallow this Cuban debacle as a great victory for our soft-line diplomacy. It has been no victory in any sense of the word. It has been one of the most humiliating diplomatic defeats this Nation has ever suffered and the magnitude of the defeat gets greater with each day that the Communists are permitted to strengthen their beachhead in this hemisphere.

Getting Soviet troops out of Cuba, if that ever is accomplished, isn't going to settle this Cuban question. It will be a step forward but our responsibility won't end and our self-respect won't be restored until Cuba, itself, is freed from the grip of the Communists and is brought back into the fold of free, democratic nations.

That isn't going to be an easy thing to do at this late date. And if we wait for Nikita Khrushchev to make it easier for us, we're doomed for a long, long wait and in the meantime we'll probably have several more Cubas spawned at our doorstep.

JACK W. GORE.

SEPARATE BUDGET FOR THE SCHOOL SYSTEM OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that would provide for a separate budget for the school system of the District of Columbia. This legislation and report is the result of some discussions that I have had with political leaders and others vitally interested in the school system and in solving the problems in the schools here in the District. I am in substantial agreement with the findings and recommendations of these interested citizens.

Because the fiscal problem of the District—and this is the major problem of the school system—needs immediate consideration I am introducing this bill today to provide for a separate school budget. This bill will also provide that before the budget is presented to the Bureau of the Budget the people who live here and pay taxes locally may have the right to have a hearing and have a chance to counsel with the school authorities who are presenting the budget. I have been making some special studies of the problems in the schools here myself, spending many hours visiting schools, considering school problems, looking at budget recommendations, interviewing students, teachers, and principals. This special project has been quite revealing to me and I will be presenting a detailed report of these school visits in the near future. I have visited 10 schools in the District of Columbia and will be visiting more in the future.

A major step in working out the educational problems of the District will be the enactment of a law establishing an elected school board. Until an elected school board is provided for, this proposal will give some say to the local citizens and will work into the establishment of an elected school board very well.

Mr. Speaker, the following analysis and information is very revealing—it is correct and it needs the sincere consideration of every Member of this House:

CONSIDERATIONS IN FAVOR OF A SEPARATE SCHOOL BUDGET FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS

(A report prepared by a special subcommittee of the D.C. Republican State Committee for the District of Columbia, on a separate school budget for the District of Columbia.)

A PICTURE OF OUR SCHOOL SYSTEM

The Washington, D.C., public school system is today the result of years of neglect in the face of a rapidly growing school population. A city that is plagued with a growing crime rate, a critical juvenile delinquency problem, an overburdened public welfare problem and an increasing sense of frustration and demoralization had better do something about its schools.

In 1948 the school population in Washington public schools was 88,243. In 1963 the school population has risen to 131,814 and it is anticipated that it will increase by 1968 to 163,000.

In 1948, the schools were overcrowded by about 4½ percent. That is to say, there were about 4½ percent more pupils than there were existing school buildings designed to house them. This year, 1963, there are 25½ percent more pupils than there are existing school buildings designed to house them. By 1968, overcrowding will be increased to nearly 57 percent of capacity if no school buildings are being built.

At the elementary school level 73 percent of the children attend overcrowded schools; 25 percent of them are in schools overcrowded by 25 percent or more. At the junior high school level, 96½ percent of the children are in overcrowded schools; 37 percent are in junior high schools overcrowded by more than 25 percent; and 2,800 junior high school students have to be housed in senior high school buildings.

This year some 2,600 students have had to go to school only one-half day because of classroom shortages. Over the past 7 years over 22,000 students have been put on part-time schedules. If 2,800 junior high school students had not been housed in available senior high school buildings, over 9,000 junior high school students at 6 schools would have had to go to junior high school part time.

Beginning students cannot get into kindergartens. This year almost 800 were turned away; and many others simply did not apply, because of the problem. Over the last 7 years nearly 5,000 students have had to be turned away from kindergarten.

There are 171 school buildings of all kinds in Washington. By October 1968, 58 of these buildings or more than one-third will, unless replaced or modernized, be 60 or more years of age. Some 31,000 of the city's 131,000 children are housed in these buildings. At the elementary school level, this accounts for 40 percent of the school population.

Anyone who has taken the trouble to look at the old schools can see their condition. From "Horrible Hine" on down the list, they have inadequate toilets, broken windows, broken water fountains, inadequate equipment, lack of playgrounds, dingy halls. The list goes on.

Under a title headed "Studied Neglect," Time magazine on March 22, 1963, made this comment about Washington schools: "At Pierce School, a 69-year-old brick building with patched walls, peeling paint, and wrapping paper for window shades, nearly 400 students go to school in the classrooms built for 200. On the third floor of Hine School (nicknamed "Horrible Hine") the litter and debris from a 1959 fire have yet to be cleaned up. The city's school dropout rate is 39 percent; discipline is so precarious that school officials have been forced to call for police aid nearly 300 times so far this school-year."

While teaching salaries can always be higher, and have risen more slowly than is the case in comparable school systems, school salary levels in the District schools are good in comparison with the 20 largest cities in the country and with teaching salaries in the surrounding counties. Yet it continues to be difficult to attract teachers here. Approximately 35 percent of all teachers are temporary. This is twice what the rate should be. Recently, 315 openings were available for teachers, and only 224 reported to take the examination. Past experience indicates that one-half of these will not prove qualified. Results of recruitment in colleges this spring were that more than one-half of the graduates to whom offers were made, declined to come here to teach.

Classes are overcrowded, and there is a woeful inadequacy in the special service programs, libraries, text books, physical education, languages, shop, science, counseling, shortage of principals, and aids of all kinds.

Even the period in which the District of Columbia is able to make commitments to hire teachers works against the teacher employment problem. Because of the present system of handling the budget, our schools are unable to contract for the services of experienced teachers in May, when most of them prefer to complete plans for the succeeding school year. Normally commitments cannot be made until almost the end of August, because of the budget procedures, for the school year commencing in September.

HOW DID IT GET THIS WAY—WHAT'S BEING DONE ABOUT IT?

The Board of Education has proposed over the past 6 years, 1958–63, for buildings and equipment, a total of $90 million, an average of $15 million each year, for new schools, replacements, and additions to schools. Over the same period, the Commissioners cut these requests down to a total of $52 million, almost $40 million less than was requested. When these budgets were presented to Congress, Congress approved nearly the amount that the Commissioners requested, about $50 million.

Currently, the Board of Education has proposed a program of $120 million over the next 6 years for schools, buildings, and equipment, approximately $20 million a year, to take up the results of neglect of past years and to anticipate the accelerating growth of school population.

In October 1962, the Board of Education asked for $23 million for schools, buildings, and equipment, for the 1963-64 year. The President's final budget, as approved by the Commissioners, asks only $2.3 million for schools, buildings, and equipment; although $14.7 million is asked conditionally, "provided additional funds are made available to the District."

Some 54 building programs are asked for in the 6-year program. This year's unconditional request, provides for actual construction of three school buildings.

WHAT'S THE MATTER WITH THIS?

Bearing in mind the prime importance that public schools have to all of us, as compared with everything else in our community, it appears that the school budget suffers because it is considered "as just another item" in the whole budget that the Commissioners have to deal with. One wonders whether some of the programs that the taxpayers pay for have quite the importance to our city that sound school buildings do—such as a $19 million stadium on which the city had to pay $460,000 in interest, or bridges and highways costing hundreds of millions.

Almost without exception, school budgets in other communities are handled separate and apart from every other item of Government business. The school budget is handled, in other communities, by the school board, separate taxes are levied for schools, the budget hearings are held separately, and the school board in those communities has the complete control and responsibility for it.

The District of Columbia Board of Education loses any control over its budget from the time it leaves their hands in October of each year, and from that time on, has next to nothing to say about the dispensation of the funds.

Considering that Congress has over the past 6 years given the Commissioners nearly every dollar that they asked for for school buildings and equipment, it may be reasonably inferred that the fault, at least in the first instance, in the $40-million cut in the building program over that period may be laid to the Commissioners and the $20 million or $9 million cut proposed in the program for next year may be placed there, as well.

Whatever may be argued (whether the competing demands of all other city items make it necessary to cut the school budget, or whether the Commissioners are only asking what they believe will be appropriated by Congress), it would seem better to ask Congress for the actual needs of our schools. If the vitally important school budget is permitted to stand on its own merits without suffering from the competing demands of other city services, it is believed that the school needs presented in a separate school budget would focus the attention of the President, Congress, and the community on school needs. And, this is not being done now.

WHAT IS THE PRESENT BUDGET PROCEDURE?

The existing law requires the Board of Education to make up its budget request for all items by the first of October and to submit the same to the Commissioners. It is then submitted to the District Budget Office which makes its cuts and then submitted to the Commissioners for further cutting, before the school budget, along with everything else in the city budget, is submitted to Congress. Congress normally passes the final city (including the school) budget by August of the following year.

WHAT DOES THE PROPOSED LEGISLATION FOR A SEPARATE SCHOOL BUDGET DO?

First, the proposed legislation bypasses the Commissioners and the rest of the city budget, so that a school budget can be presented directly to the Congress.

Second, the proposed legislation puts the school budget on an April 1 fiscal year so that hopefully the separate appropriation for it will be passed not later than May, and prior to the rest of the city budget.

Third, the proposed legislation calls for the transmission of the school budget to Congress in January, so that there is a compressed period during which public attention can be focused on the budget and school needs. Also, this will bring the period between the original proposal and action by Congress down from almost 10 months to 4 months.

We think this legislation will do the following important things:

1. It will separate the school needs and the school budget from all other consideration in the city.

2. It will focus direct attention on school needs.

3. It will keep the school budget from passing through undesirable administrative reducing steps, before presentation to Congress.

4. It will give to the Board of Education the direct responsibility to Congress and the community for the budget and its administration, and relieve the Commissioners of the problem.

5. It will give a chance to hire teachers in May instead of August readying the budget 4 months before school opening rather than a few weeks.

It seems reasonable to suppose that over the years, the money appropriated for schools will increase to meet school needs.

We hope this will be one important step in resurrecting the Washington school system.

Submitted and prepared by the special subcommittee of the Republican State Committee for the District of Columbia on a separate school budget for the District of Columbia.

Gilbert Hahn, Jr., *Chairman.*
Mrs. Ruth B. Spencer.
Mrs. Josephine Pendleton.
Miss Kathryn E. Bowers.
Miss Ruth M. Brown.
Col. Robert L. Pollard.
Dr. Henry S. Robinson, Jr.
Mr. Clarence E. Shaw.

Table 10.—*Amounts requested by the Board of Education for capital outlay and permanent improvements, the amounts approved by the Commissioners, and the sums actually appropriated by Congress, by fiscal year*

Year	Board of Education request	Approved by Commissioners	Percentage	Appropriated by Congress	Percentage
1958	$14,963,000	$8,904,500	59.5	$10,642,722	71.1
1959	14,033,125	9,748,000	69.5	8,920,300	63.6
1960	15,596,389	9,522,000	61.1	6,911,000	44.3
1961	14,397,497	7,194,000	50.0	6,944,000	48.2
1962	12,316,366	9,229,000	74.9	8,886,000	72.1
1963	18,388,110	7,951,000	43.2	7,693,000	41.8
1964	23,085,200	[1] 14,725,600	63.4		

[1] In the President's District of Columbia budget, 1964, only $2,309,000 (10 percent of the amount requested by the Board of Education) was approved by the Commissioners and the White House unless additional revenue is made available to the District. The amount shown is the total recommended by the President if his proposals regarding sources of income are approved by Congress.

Table 6.—*List of capital outlay items included in the unconditional and contingent proposals in the President's budget message, 1964*

School	Purpose	A. Unconditional	B. Contingent	Total
Garrison Elementary Replacement	Equipment	$61,000		
Evans Junior High	do	187,000		
Harris Elementary	do	71,000		
Green Elementary	do	65,000		
Hart Junior High addition	do	132,000		
Rudolph Elementary addition	Plans and specifications, construction, and equipment.	194,000		
Hendley Elementary addition	do	299,000		
Rabaut Junior High	Construction		$3,200,000	
Roper Junior High	do		3,350,000	
Kimball Elementary addition	Plans and specifications, and construction.	615,000		
Hine Junior High replacement	Construction		2,340,000	
Raymond Elementary addition	Plans and specifications	55,000		
17th and E Sts. NE., elementary	do	98,000		
Powell Elementary addition	Plans and specifications, construction, and equipment.		453,000	
16th and Irving Sts. NW., junior high.	Site and plans and specifications		1,548,000	
13th and Alabama Ave. SE., junior high.	Plans and specifications		268,000	
55th and Eads St. NE., senior high	Site		830,600	
Benning Elementary replacement	do	17,800		
Permanent improvements		514,200	427,000	$941,200
Total		2,309,000	12,416,600	14,725,600

YOUNG AMERICAN MEDAL FOR BRAVERY AWARDED TO PARENTS OF JOHN NICHOLAS ARAMINO OF LE ROY, N.Y.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ostertag] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, I have earlier today attended a moving ceremony at the White House to honor posthumously a teen-aged young man from Le Roy, N.Y., who heroically sacrificed his life to save a young companion from almost certain death under the wheels of an onrushing locomotive. The occasion was the award by the President of the United States of the Young American Medal for Bravery to the parents of John Nicholas Aramino, Jr., for his ultimate sacrifice in May of 1961. The youth, only 17 years of age, was the son of Mr. and Mrs. John J. Aramino, of Le Roy, in Genesee County, State of New York.

This marked the first posthumous award in the 11-year history of the Young American Medals program, which was established by Congress to provide recognition for boys and girls under 19 who perform outstanding acts of bravery or service each year. These awards are recommended by the Young American Medals Committee, headed by Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Two other bravery medals and two service medals were also awarded today.

In presenting the medal for John Nicholas Aramino, President Kennedy awarded the following citation:

> Whereas the Young American Medals Committee, with the approval of the Attorney General of the United States, has determined that the Young American Medal for Bravery should be awarded to Mr. and Mrs. John J. Aramino in posthumous recognition of the exceptional courage, extraordinary decision, presence of mind, and swiftness of action of their son, John, who on the 30th day of May 1961 at the cost of his own life rescued Louis Peter Brady in actual imminent danger in the path of a railroad train on a trestle near Le Roy, N.Y.
>
> Now therefore, I, John F. Kennedy, President of the United States of America, by the virtue of the authority invested in me by the act of August 3, 1950 (64 Stat. 397–398), do hereby certify that the Young American Medal for Bravery has been awarded posthumously to Mr. and Mrs. John J. Aramino on this 7th day of May, 1963, and has been presented to them by me personally for and in behalf of and in the name of the President and the Congress of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to know this fine family for a number of years. During his senior year at Le Roy Central School, John Nicholas Aramino applied to me for nomination to the U.S. Air Force Academy and I was proud to nominate him for appointment to the academy. He was an honor student at school and a member of the National Honor Society. John was cocaptain of the high school football team and an outstanding performer on the school's track team. He was a fine American boy.

His heroic action was described in the following manner by the Medals Committee:

> On the afternoon of May 30, 1961, John and a companion were on a railroad trestle, 80 feet above Oatka Creek, near Le Roy, target shooting at tin cans in the creek. Louis Peter Brady III, then 9, was standing nearby watching.
>
> At about 2:40 p.m., a freight train rounded a curve and entered the trestle. The engineer immediately sounded the train whistle. The train was about 80 feet from the boys at that time and was traveling about 45 miles per hour.
>
> At the sound of the whistle, the Brady youth began running toward the end of the trestle. John shouted a warning to him which Brady apparently did not hear. John then raced to the youth, caught him by the waist, with the train only about 25 feet away, and pushed him to a prone position on the ties, which extend about 40 inches beyond the rails to the edge of the trestle. John shielded the younger boy with his own body, but a steel protrusion on the locomotive's cowcatcher struck John's head, causing instant death.
>
> The Brady youth recovered after treatment for shock and multiple bruises.

Mr. Speaker, it was an honor to be present today to participate in the ceremony for this young man from the congressional district which I am privileged to represent in the House of Representatives. In addition to the youth's parents, his two younger brothers, Nicholas and Arthur, were also at the White House today. Along with them were an aunt and uncle, Mr. and Mrs. Anthony Serusa of Le Roy, and their two daughters, Lynn and Jean; an aunt, Miss Mayme Mangefrida of Le Roy; and two of his cousins, Miss Joanne Mangefrida and Mr. Raymond Briggs. They all have great reason to be proud.

In closing I would like to submit a newspaper article from the Batavia Daily News of April 10, 1963, presenting an account of the heroism of John Nicholas Aramino:

PRESIDENT WILL AWARD MEDAL TO PARENTS OF LE ROY YOUTH WHO GAVE HIS LIFE IN RESCUE—POSTHUMOUS PRESENTATION FIRST OF KIND

A Young American Medal for Bravery, one of five awarded for deeds of bravery and service in 1961, will be presented by President Kennedy to the parents of a Le Roy honor student who gave his life nearly 2 years ago in saving a younger boy from the path of a train.

Posthumous award of the medal to John Nicholas Aramino Jr. was announced in Washington by Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy. It is the first posthumous medal in the 11-year history of the Young American Medals program.

The young hero's parents, Mr. and Mrs. John N. Aramino of Robbins Road, Le Roy, will receive the medal from the President at a special White House ceremony to be arranged later this Spring. The Young Americans Medal program was established by Congress in 1950.

RECEIVED CARNEGIE MEDAL

The Aramino boy, then 18, died when struck by a train on a railroad trestle at Buttermilk Falls, north of Le Roy, May 30, 1961, after he had pushed Louis P. Brady III, then 9, from the path of the train. He previously was posthumously awarded a bronze medal for heroism by the Carnegie Hero Fund Commission.

Congress set up the program to provide recognition for boys and girls under 19 years of age who perform outstanding acts of bravery or service each year. This year's medals will raise the total awarded to 19 for bravery and seven for service.

NOMINATED BY GOVERNOR

The Attorney General approves the selections after they are made by a committee headed by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover and including Solicitor General Archibald Cox and Edwin O. Guthman, special assistant to the attorney general for public information. Nominations are made by Governors of each State.

"These young people have earned the gratitude and respect not only of those they have so greatly benefited, but also of the Nation," Attorney General Kennedy commented in making the announcement. The circumstances of the Aramino boy's heroism and death, as outlined in the citation reported by the attorney general:

ON A TRESTLE

"On the afternoon of May 30, 1961, John and a companion were on a railroad trestle, 80 feet above Oatka Creek, near Le Roy, target shooting at tin cans in the creek. Louis Peter Brady III, then 9, was standing nearby watching.

"At about 2:40 p.m., a freight train rounded a curve and entered the trestle. The engineer immediately sounded the train whistle. The train was about 80 feet from the boys at that time and was traveling about 45 miles an hour."

SHOUTED WARNING

"At the sound of the whistle, the Brady youth began running toward the end of the trestle. John shouted a warning to him which Brady apparently did not hear.

"John then raced to the youth, caught him by the waist, with the train only 25 feet away, and pushed him to a prone position on the ties, which extend about 40 inches beyond the rails to the edge of the trestle."

SHIELDED BOY

"John shielded the younger boy with his own body, but a steel protrusion on the locomotive's cowcatcher struck John's head, causing instant death. The Brady youth recovered after treatment for shock and multiple bruises."

Young Aramino and Richard Fore, then 16, of Randall Rd. were shooting from the trestle and the Brady boy had come up to watch when his sister and friends had gone on a bicycle trip to Buttermilk Falls. The Fore youth jumped to safety on the eastbound tracks as the train approached.

HONOR STUDENT

The Aramino youth, an honor student, would have graduated from Le Roy Central School the month following the accident. He was an alternate appointee to the U.S. Air Force Academy at Colorado Springs. A member of the National Honor Society, he had been cocaptain of the 1960 Le Roy Central football team and was a star of the school's track team.

The boy's father is an employee of the Alliance Mold Co., of Rochester. The family formerly lived in Batavia.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HEALEY (at the request of Mr. KEOGH), for Tuesday, May 7, 1963, on account of illness.

Mrs. KEE (at the request of Mr. SLACK), for 10 days, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. SAYLOR, today, for 1 hour.

Mr. DENT (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FOGARTY (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. McDOWELL (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RANDALL, for 30 minutes, on May 8.

Mr. Laird (at the request of Mr. Martin of Nebraska), for 5 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Widnall (at the request of Mr. Martin of Nebraska), for 15 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Sikes (at the request of Mr. Libonati), for 30 minutes, on May 9.

Mr. Hemphill (at the request of Mr. Libonati), for 60 minutes, on May 13.

Mr. Landrum (at the request of Mr. Libonati), for 60 minutes, on May 14.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. McLoskey and to include the results of a public opinion poll.

Mr. Celler.

Mr. Gilbert.

Mr. Bennett of Florida.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Martin of Nebraska) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Conte.

Mr. Wyman.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Libonati) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Dent.

Mr. Hemphill.

Mrs. Sullivan.

Mr. Roosevelt.

Mr. Dorn.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 8, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

771. A letter from the secretary to the Board of Visitors, U.S. Naval Academy, transmitting the Report of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Naval Academy for 1963; to the Committee on Armed Services.

772. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a copy of the report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of March 31, 1963, pursuant to Public Law 554, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

773. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, relative to reporting a violation of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), and Bureau of the Budget Circular A-34, relating to "Administrative Control of Appropriations and Funds", pertaining to the Administration's Goddard Space Flight Center (GSFC), Greenbelt, Md.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

774. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners, of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act of July 24, 1956, granting a franchise to D.C. Transit System, Inc."; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

775. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, relative to a project proposal relating to the Hooper Irrigation Co. in Weber and Davis Counties, Utah, having applied for a loan, pursuant to the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LINDSAY: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Joint Resolution 39. Joint resolution designating the week of May 20–26, 1963, as National Actors' Equity Week; with amendment (Rept. No. 278). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 334. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 950, a bill to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950; without amendment (Rept. No. 279). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 335. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 5555, a bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 280). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 6107. A bill to extend to clam planters the benefits of the provisions of the present law which provide for production disaster loans for farmers, stockmen, and oyster planters; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 6108. A bill relating to the application of the dual-compensation laws to certain retired officers of the Army or Air Force of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 6109. A bill to amend section 131 of title 23 of the United States Code to extend for an additional 2 years the period during which certain agreements can be entered into relating to the regulation of advertising along rights-of-way on the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 6110. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted without deductions from benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GROVER:

H.R. 6111. A bill to establish the Fire Island National Seashore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 6112. A bill to add a new title XI to the National Defense Education Act of 1958; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H.R. 6113. A bill to repeal the excise taxes on amounts paid for communication service or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ICHORD:

H.R. 6114. A bill to amend Public Law 87–563, H.R. 10618 of the 87th Congress (76 Stat. 249), an act granting consent of Congress to the southern interstate nuclear compact, by amending paragraph (a) of article VIII as consented to in section 2 of said act, to include the State of Missouri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H.R. 6115. A bill to amend section 1034 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that where the taxpayer or his spouse has attained the age of 65 no gain on the sale or exchange of the taxpayer's home will be taxed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 6116. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 6117. A bill to prohibit the use of stopwatches or other measuring devices to measure the work of an individual employee in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 6118. A bill to amend the act providing for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union with respect to the selection of public lands for the development and expansion of communities; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 6119. A bill to provide for the desegregation of public schools, with all deliberate speed, including nationwide first-step compliance by 1963, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 6120. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 6121. A bill to make the Commission on Civil Rights a permanent agency in the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6122. A bill to enforce constitutional rights and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 6123. A bill to amend section 2(2) of the National Labor Relations Act to provide that the definition of "employer" therein shall include certain corporations or associations operating a hospital; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 6124. A bill to provide for the publication of the Official Register of the U.S. Civil Service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 6125. A bill to amend the act of June 20, 1906, to provide that the Board of Education of the District of Columbia shall submit to the Congress a budget for its operations separate from the budget submitted for the remainder of the municipal government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 6126. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to promote the welfare of the Indian tribes by making available to them surplus personal property; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 6127. A bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 to prohibit discrimination on account of race, creed, or color in training programs carried on under such act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 6128. A bill to amend section 15 of the Life Insurance Act to permit any stock life insurance company in the District of Columbia to maintain its record of stockholders at its principal place of business in the District of Columbia or at the office of its designated stock transfer agent in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 6129. A bill to amend section 1391 of title 28 of the United States Code to define residence of a corporation which is a plaintiff for purposes of venue in certain suits involving the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 6130. A bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase the authorization for appropriations and to modify the personnel security procedures for contractor employees; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 6131. A bill relating to membership in Indian tribal organizations; to the Committe on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. NYGAARD:

H.J. Res. 400. Joint resolution to direct the Interstate Commerce Commission to investigate the rate structure applicable to the shipment by railroad of grain in carload lots from the upper Midwest region of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DENT:

H. Con. Res. 149. Concurrent resolution expressing the determination of the United States with respect to the matter of general disarmament and arms control; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H. Res. 336. Resolution creating a select committee on congressional ethics to study complaints concerning the conduct of Members of the House of Representatives and make recommendations thereon; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting that grain price levels be kept under constant scrutiny, and that proper measures be taken to establish and maintain stable and equitable price relationships among the various grains; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States that the State Department request of the Soviet Union that it grant to its Jewish citizens the right to freedom of worship; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 6132. A bill for the relief of Rodolfo Spagnolo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 6133. A bill for the relief of Miss Carmen Rioja and child, Paloma Menchaca Rioja; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6134. A bill for the relief of James C. Gilmore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H.R. 6135. A bill for the relief of Despina Kouloumoundras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 6136. A bill for the relief of CWO Elden R. Comer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 6137. A bill for the relief of Stamatios Coutsoumbaris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

113. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Stanley Molik, city clerk, Buffalo, N.Y., relative to going on record as favoring the institution of a city bell ringing tradition for Independence Day, July 4th; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

114. Also, petition of Clyde Thompson and others, Southern Pine Lumber Co., Diboll, Tex., relative to requesting relief from foreign imports of lumber, particularly from Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Challenges of the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the Senator from Indiana, the Honorable BIRCH BAYH, addressed the annual convention of the California Federation of Young Democrats in San Francisco. His remarks indicate a clear insight to the challenges of the future, and are so noteworthy I recommend them to my colleagues:

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS BY U.S. SENATOR BIRCH BAYH, OF INDIANA, AT ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE CALIFORNIA FEDERATION OF YOUNG DEMOCRATS, SAN FRANCISCO, MAY 4, 1963

I am happy to have been invited to join you tonight at this annual convention of the California Young Democrats. I am proud to be a young Democrat and prouder still of the work our organization is doing in support of the programs of the Democratic Party and of the administration of John F. Kennedy. The work of the Young Democrats in the State of Indiana during the past year contributed greatly to the success we had at the polls last fall and in my election to the U.S. Senate. We can be proud and we can be thankful that the Democratic Party has always looked to the young people in our party and asked them to join in the programs of progress for the country. I believe the reason our party has become the oldest political party in the world is the fact that it has had the courage and the wisdom to look to its younger members for new ideas, new ways of solving the problems of each day.

In his inaugural address in 1961, President Kennedy accepted for our generation the torch of freedom and pledged that we would carry it proudly, successfully in the challenging days that lie ahead. In the days which have followed that ceremony he has certainly carried the torch high and led our country and the free world well. He needs our support, he needs the support of all the people in this Nation in order to bring the progress that is needed to keep America strong and free and to develop a world in which freedom can flourish.

As a nation we are moving into a period of unprecedented challenge and one of unprecedented opportunity. We, as younger people, must share the challenge just as we will benefit from the opportunities which will be provided.

The challenge is simple to define. We are faced simply with the problem of providing the benefits of our prosperous society and our way of life for the ever-increasing numbers of citizens in America. We must do this in a time when science and technology is rapidly displacing the need for human skills and human energy. Those most severely affected by this problem are the young people and we as young people must do our part in providing the answers and solutions which will be necessary.

Before the end of this decade we will become a country of more than 200 million inhabitants, and by the end of the century we will be a country of nearly 300 million inhabitants. We must provide the homes, schools, and most importantly the jobs to keep pace with this dynamic growth in population. The statistics of growth are staggering. During the next 8 years 26 million new young workers will come into the labor market. At the same time, machines are replacing people at a fantastic rate. To provide employment for both new and displaced workers and to solve the unemployment problems by 1970, we must create 250,000 new jobs each month during this period.

The need for unskilled labor has reached a minimum level and we cannot expect any rise in this demand in the future. Additional skills and training will be needed by anyone who seeks employment. Yet during the decade ahead, we can expect that 3 out of every 10 schoolchildren will not finish high school. Only 2 out of 10 now in grade school will finish college. Employment projections on the other hand indicate that the best job opportunities will occur in professional and technical areas that require post-high-school training.

In education we must seek to improve the quality of instruction—cope with the tremendous problem of additional numbers of children coming into the schools in the future. We must increase the opportunities and incentives for all Americans to develop talents, complete their education, and continue self-development through life.

The quality of education is determined primarily by the quality of the teacher. We are fortunate in having thousands of well-trained and dedicated teachers in this country today. Yet one out of every five teachers in the United States has either not been certified by the State as qualified to teach or has failed to complete 4 years of college study. In the field of English, between 40 and 60 percent of the secondary schoolteachers lack the minimum requirement of a college major in that subject. Thus it is not surprising that, largely because of unsatisfactory elementary and secondary school instruction, our colleges and universities are now required to devote a great amount of their resources on remedial English courses.

Good teachers, moreover, need good schools in which to teach. Last year over 1,500,000 children were in overcrowded classrooms and an estimated 2 million others were studying amid grossly substandard health and safety conditions.

In many areas the education of the economically disadvantaged, the culturally deprived, the physically or mentally handicapped and the gifted required specially designed programs which simply are not available at all.

The value of a proper education cannot be overstated. President Kennedy summarized distinctly the value of education in his message to Congress on education earlier this year. Education, he said, is the keystone in the arch of freedom and progress. Nothing has contributed more to the enlargement of this Nation's strength and opportunities than our traditional system of free, universal elementary and secondary education coupled with the widespread availability of college education.

In order to maintain the arch of freedom, we must be prepared today to move forward to more aggressive programs of education. The President has presented a comprehensive national education program.

This is not a Federal thought control program. It is rather a program designed to enable the U.S. Government to assist State and local school units to meet the serious problem which is of great national interest. State and local school units will still control their own programs. However, more overall resources will be utilized in the vital area of education.

During my tenure in the State legislature, I did everything I could to increase the emphasis on education in the State of Indiana. Yet we were almost universally opposed by those Republicans who would pinch pennies and sacrifice a first-class educational system. If State governments and local communities will not meet the needs of educating their young, then we must move forward and move forward rapidly to provide the type of comprehensive educational program presented by the President.

In addition to this increased emphasis on our educational system, we must provide opportunity for those people now in the labor market who have not had the advantages of proper vocational training and we must also provide for those people who will not secure adequate training from high school either because of poor counseling or dropping from school prior to graduation. To do this the President has presented a program for youth opportunities. We in the Senate have passed the Youth Employment Opportunities bill which will provide more job training opportunities for young people. This program is designed for those young people who are in need of help * * * the unemployed * * * the unskilled * * * the unwanted. It is intended to boost the economy, reduce unemployment, reduce juvenile delinquency and train more young people who would otherwise be idle.

The Youth Conservation Corps will employ 15,000 young men in forest recreation areas. Federal funds will be provided for half the wages and related costs for young people employed on local projects offering useful working experience in nonprofit community services. This program is modest and it is essential. It is a cooperative, local-Federal approach. I am hopeful that the House of Representatives will act and act favorably on this program during the next few weeks.

In addition to those programs to train and retrain the youth of America, let us not overlook the program which has been initiated by the administration to rehabilitate those older workers who are presently unemployed because they do not possess the skills needed by space age industry. The manpower training program, although still in its infancy, is designed to take idle workers out of the unemployment line and return them to the production line. This is another effort presently being made under President Kennedy's leadership to provide a work force which is sufficiently skilled and trained to meet the challenge of the future.

We as Democrats, to be worthy of our tradition as a party of the people, must remain dedicated to these and other important programs which are essential not only to the strength of our great Nation but also to the future of each individual American.

Public Opinion Poll of Hon. Robert T. McLoskey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am privileged to report to my colleagues in the House of Representatives the results of a public opinion poll recently completed in the 19th Congressional District of Illinois which I have the honor of representing.

The response to this poll indicates the people in this district have more than an average interest in national and world affairs.

Twenty-five thousand questionnaires were mailed out and approximately 12 percent responded. I feel this is a splendid return and I am most grateful to those who took the time and trouble, not only to return their answers, but who commented in detail on the issues and problems involved.

In general, I am pleased to report the views of the majority who answered parallel my own thinking on most major issues of the day.

I am pleased to include in the RECORD the detailed results. The figures used here represent percentages and not the number of persons who answered each question.

The table follows:

	Percent		
	Yes	No	Undecided
I. Tax reduction and national debt:			
A. Essential to reduce expenditures before tax cuts are made	89.5	7.5	3.0
B. Taxes cut even if it increases national debt	9.0	85.0	6.0
C. Existing tax rates and expenditure patterns maintained	12.0	73.0	15.0
II. Medical care for aged:			
A. Medicare managed by privately owned insurance companies with Government paying premiums of those who could not pay themselves	43.0	40.0	17.0
B. Medicare managed by Government and financed by greater social security taxes	11.5	80.0	8.5
C. Kerr-Mills Act for medical assistance amended to correct any deficiencies or inequities	45.0	18.5	36.5
III. Labor-management relations:			
A. Labor unions subjected to antitrust laws on same bases as corporations	76.0	22.0	2.0
B. Compelled Government arbitration with decision binding to both parties in disputes declared by President to endanger national welfare	64.5	29.5	6.0
C. Favor increasing Federal minimum wage rate	16.0	68.0	16.0
IV. Agriculture:			
A. Satisfied with present feed grain program	11.5	58.0	30.5
B. Believe in controlled supply management	13.0	65.5	21.5
C. Price supports geared to mandatory allotment controls	15.5	43.5	41.0
V. Foreign affairs:			
A. Foreign aid should be— *Percent*			
Continued at present levels			
Expanded 1			
Cut sharply 81			
Ended 12			
B. Foreign aid given to Communist-dominated countries	3.5	92.5	4.0
C. Approve of overall foreign policy	9.5	79.0	11.5
VI. Domestic and welfare programs:			
A. Favor Federal aid to college and postgraduate education	32.0	57.5	10.5
1. Student loans	65.0	30.0	5.0
2. Outright grants	11.0	76.0	13.0
B Favor Federal aid to grade and high school education	21.0	74.5	4.5
1. General operation including teachers' salaries	10.0	84.0	6.0
2. Classrooms and equipment only	22.0	70.0	8.0
C. Establish domestic peace corps	19.0	65.5	15.5
D. Federal Government supply funds for mass transportation	9.0	80.5	10.5
E. Feel we are spending too much for public works, welfare benefits and low-income housing	67.0	28.0	5.0

The Polish Constitution of 1791

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, Poland today has become only a name on a map. Its people have few rights and no freedom. Dominated by the Soviet Union, they live out their bleak lives in fear and under tyrannical conditions. Yet, there remains the hope that one day Poland will take its place among the nations of the world, free from the stigma of being called a Soviet satellite.

The Polish people, to keep alive the spirit of freedom, recall their glorious past, when Poland was an independent Republic. They also recall the Constitution of 1791 which gave the first rights to the common man, a document embodying the principles of democracy and nationalism. Although Poland was dismembered by its neighbors soon after the Constitution was promulgated, May 3 became a recognized anniversary, to be regarded with reverence.

Since those remaining in Poland are unable to commemorate this important day, and since this Constitution is based partly on our American Constitution, it is only right that we, too, should honor this anniversary. Let us extend the heartfelt hope that the Polish people will soon be able to enjoy once more the democratic principles which, since 1791, have become their inherent right.

It was a sad day for the United States when, instead of going on into Berlin we backtracked and ultimately surrendered huge chunks of territory and free peoples to F.D.R.'s "Uncle Joe." Poland should be free. We should help it to become free. I hope that the day will come within my lifetime when there once again will be free and independent Poland at the council tables of the world.

Trotting Backwards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the economy in my area of the country would really trot forward if we would reject a Government dam at Trotters Shoals.

The urgent need now is for jobs, payrolls, and opportunity; free enterprise taxes for hospitals, schools, teachers salaries and not additional tax burdens. Let us get the economy moving with the most dynamic economic force the world has ever known—free enterprise Americanism.

The following newsletter by my distinguished and able colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, JOHN BYRNES, to his constituents, points out the utter absurdity of a Government dam at Trotters Shoals:

TROTTING BACKWARDS

JOBS

One of the Nation's most pressing problems is unemployment. Over 4 million persons are listed as unemployed; the unemployment rate in March was higher than it was a year ago. The administration wants to spend more money, establish new crops, build more public works, make more loans, establish more Federal agencies—all in the hope of cutting the unemployment rate. Everyone shares in that hope. But, much of the New Frontier's program will not create lasting jobs because it ignores the basic process by which jobs are made.

STORY

The story of job creation—the process through which this country has prospered and grown—was graphically told to a congressional committee by a businessman last week. He was an executive of Mead Paper Corp., an old and respected Ohio paper manufacturer, which has 40 operations in 17 States, employing 17,000 men and women. Here is a condensed version of his testimony.

HISTORY

Mead is a successful papermaker. It got that way through risk-taking investment, skilled workers, aggressive management and the long and hard development of a market for its products. It is in business for profit; it is on the alert for expansion opportunities whenever it feels market conditions warrant such expansion.

PLANS

Looking ahead, Mead, after careful investigation, in 1956 bought 1,000 acres for a new plant site on the Savannah River in South Carolina. Since then, it has spent $1 million for timberlands and has committed an additional $2 million in leaseholds. It hopes soon to build a plant on the site.

EFFECT

If it does, the construction of the mill, paper machine and power plant to produce 800 tons of product daily will require an initial investment of $40 million. For 2 years 1,400 men would be employed in construction, earning $10 million. New capital investment, creating new construction jobs, would be required every year thereafter at an estimated figure of $10 million annually. When finished, the plant would employ 600 to 650 people, at an annual payroll of close to $5 million. In addition, the mill would consume 400,000 to 450,000 cords of pulpwood annually, putting to work some 2,500 men on farms and woodlots nearby.

OTHER

But this is only the beginning. To feed, house, clothe, educate, transport, and provide medical care, haircuts, legal advice, trash collection and the hundreds of other services humans need would employ additional hundreds of people. Freight movements from the plant, averaging 18,000 carloads a year, would create other jobs. State and local tax collectors would receive an estimated $500,000 a year, and the Federal Government would collect about $3,300,000. Moreover, since the plant would use local, renewable resources, the value of land and property around the mill would increase in value.

REQUEST

This is the kind of sound economic growth which produces lasting jobs, and you may wonder why this man was appearing before Congress. Was he asking for a Federal grant or loan? Was he supporting a new bureau or corps? Did he want a public project? No, none of these. He simply told the committee that the plant couldn't be built in South Carolina if the Federal Government went ahead with its plan to spend $78 million to build a power dam which would flood out the company's plant site.

New Wheat Allotments Depreciate Pennsylvania's Farm Income

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, there is no mystery in my opposition to certain phases of the so-called farm programs.

My State agricultural economy is made up of family-type farms. As such, the State of Pennsylvania sometimes suffers more by so-called farm aid legislation than it benefits.

Such appears to be the case in feed grains and now we find again a depreciation in Pennsylvania farm income by the new wheat allotments.

Farmers in Pennsylvania have just taken another reduction in their wheat allotments, even though the Soft Red Winter wheat grown here remains in demand.

Figures recently released by the USDA show that Pennsylvania wheat acreage allotment has been reduced 64,872 acres for the 1964 crop to 458,368 acres. This is a 12.4-percent reduction while the national average reduction is 10 percent and wheat States such as Kansas, Nebraska, Colorado, Montana, Oregon, and Washington were reduced less than 10 percent. These are the States that contribute largely to the national wheat surplus.

Pennsylvania has had its acreage allotment cut by 32 percent—249,401 acres—between 1939 and 1963 while the national allotment remained the same.

If the 1964 wheat program should pass in the May 21 referendum, this will mean a decrease in farmer income of approximately $10,500,000 and at the same time cause wheat to be imported into Pennsylvania for our bakeries. Pennsylvania ranks first in the number of bakeries in the United States and first in the manufacture of pretzels. Soft Red Winter wheat is in demand for this local industry.

Recently Pennsylvania farmers asked a number of questions relative to the wheat certificate program. They have provided answers and I believe it will give their side of the picture if printed for general use:

1. Is it the job of ASC committees to take part in determining farm programs?

Answer. No. ASC committees were established to administer farm programs; not to sell a Government program to farmers.

2. Will I be prevented from growing up to 15 acres, like I do now, if I have an allotment of less than 15 acres?

Answer. Yes. The 15-acre exemption is eliminated under the certificate program. Your allotment is your absolute maximum.

3. If I do not have an allotment and want to grow wheat for sale, feed, or straw in 1965, will I be permitted?

Answer. No, unless you can obtain another farmer's allotment.

4. Every few years I raise up to 30 acres of wheat to feed my chickens. Can I do this under the certificate plan?

Answer. No. You will be given a base but it will not be as much as 30 acres.

5. With over 80 percent of the wheat surplus in the Western States, why are we in Pennsylvania being cut the same percentage as those with the surplus?

Answer. This is the politics of it.

6. We market our wheat with a local miller and he wants all the wheat I can grow. Why should I be prevented from growing all the wheat I can market?

Answer. This is a good question. Your miller is now buying wheat from Pennsylvania farmers and if the supply is cut he will buy wheat from Canada or elsewhere.

7. It looks to me as if the higher my yield the lower my blend price because I must sell a greater amount at $1.30.

Answer. True. A farmer with the county normal yield will receive $2 per bushel for about 80 percent of his wheat. A farmer who is 15–20 bushels per acre above the county average will receive $2 per bushel for only 60 to 65 percent of his wheat.

8. Is it true that the certificate plan will control both the acres I plant and the bushels I may sell for domestic purposes?

Answer. Yes.

9. Is there any other Government program that controls the amount a farmer may sell?

Answer. No.

10. If all of my wheat is of a high quality may I sell it at the $2 price?

Answer. No; only the amount for which you have certificates.

11. If the certificate program reduces the amount sold below the demand won't I receive more than $2 per bushel for my certificate wheat?

> Answer. Unlikely. Millers may use the $1.30 feed wheat for milling purposes providing they pay the Government 70 cents (the difference between $1.30 and $2).
>
> 12. I have done some figuring and it looks to me as if I will have less income from my wheat in 1964 from what I had in 1962.
>
> Answer. True. There is no possible way for a Pennsylvania farmer to receive as much income in 1964 as he did in 1962, even if the referendum passes.
>
> 13. Is the normal yield my average yield or based on the average yield of all wheat growers in my county?
>
> Answer. Normal yield is based on average yield of all wheat growers in your county.
>
> 14. What happens if I do not sign up for the program and it passes?
>
> Answer. You will have a marketing quota and must sell all of your wheat at $1.30.
>
> 15. I understand that the law permits the Secretary to cut my acreage by as much as 30 percent. Is this true?
>
> Answer. Yes. For 1964 the cut will be 10 percent but the law permits a cut of up to 30 percent which could happen to you in 1965.
>
> 16. Explain how my income will be cut.
>
> Answer. The amount sold times price minus expenses equals your net income. Under the certificate plan, the amount you can sell is cut; the average price you will receive is cut; and your per unit cost of production and harvest are increased. The result is less net farm income.

Mr. Speaker, in May 21, the U.S. Department of Agriculture will conduct a most important referendum among the Nation's wheat farmers. This referendum provides wheat producers with responsibility for making one of the most important decisions ever made by a group of agricultural producers with respect to the future direction of American agriculture.

While one does not think of Pennsylvania as being an important wheat-producing State, this referendum has serious implications, not only to wheat people, but to all the farmers in my State and in other areas. The real issue in this referendum is not the phony one of "$2 versus $1" wheat, but rather whether Government supply-management is going to be the future way of life for the American farmer.

Only wheat is directly involved in this particular referendum and only wheat producers can vote, but all farmers, consumers, and taxpayers will be affected by the outcome.

Wheat producers have been voting for Government programs in a more or less routine fashion for several years. Past programs have carried controls of a sort, but there were numerous exceptions and limitations. So, wheat producers have not really had to face up to the full implications of going down the supply-management road to a licensed and regimented agriculture. But the situation is different this year.

The multiple-price certificate plan being submitted to producers this year includes the tightest, most binding Government controls ever seriously considered for any farm commodity. In addition to providing much stricter acreage allotments than growers have experienced over recent years and a new type of marketing quota, the administration's plan provides for diverted-acre controls and cross compliance. It also would give the Secretary of Agriculture vast powers to regulate all handlers, processors, and distributors of wheat from the farm to the ultimate consumer.

How Pennsylvania farmers vote may decide the referendum in the United States. All wheat farmers with an allotment of 15 acres or more are automatically eligible to vote. In the past there has been an exemption of 15 acres for those who wanted to plant that much and not receive price supports. In addition, a farmer could grow 30 acres providing he used it all for feed on his own farm. Under the 1962 act these exemptions have been eliminated. As a result, for the first time the farmers with less than 15 acres can vote if they agree to participate in the program. In 1961 there were 79,000 Pennsylvania farms with wheat allotments of less than 15 acres. This large potential number of voters could well be the deciding factor in the referendum.

One of my reasons for discussing this question is due to the fact that the 15-acre wheat farmers will have the opportunity to vote for the first time. Under the proposed provisions of the referendum any of these small wheat farmers who want to vote in the referendum must indicate their desire to do so 7 days prior to the referendum date. They must register at the county ASC office before May 14. This means if one of the 15-acre wheat farmers wants to vote "no" in the referendum and therefore preserve his right to grow whatever amount of wheat he chooses, it will be necessary for him to sign up to participate.

I recognize among some wheat farmers the requirement that they sign up to participate in order to vote may cause some of them to be reluctant to vote. However, I hope that all these small wheat growers will sign up to participate and vote in the referendum since every vote will be important.

In recent weeks letters and conversations with farmers from Pennsylvania indicate that the Secretary of Agriculture, who is responsible for conducting the referendum, has thrown the full resources of his Department into a large campaign for a "yes" vote. The Secretary claims that the referendum offers producers a choice between $1 and $2 per bushel for their wheat; that defeat of his control scheme would lead to trade wars and chaos in the international market. These claims are serious exaggerations designed to panic wheat producers rather than an objective analysis of the situation.

Defeat of the wheat certificate plan would not terminate all Government wheat programs. Furthermore, the Congress would still have both the power and the responsibility to deal with any problems that might arise. The Secretary's claim that Congress would not act is nothing more than a scare tactic. There is no reason to believe that the Congress would abdicate its responsibility. Defeat of the Secretary's control scheme would open the way for the enactment of a sound and constructive solution to the surplus wheat problem.

I have also been very much concerned about the role of the Agricultural Stabilization committeemen in this referendum. The Agricultural Stabilization committeemen, according to the law, have the responsibility to assist in carrying out the administration of any agricultural laws that might be enacted. Their role is essentially one of administering and seeing that the agricultural laws passed by the Congress are carried out and properly understood by farmers. Theirs is not the role of a propaganda or a sales agency. I have been very much distressed by reports that indicate that the Agricultural Stabilization committeemen have become propaganda agents for the Secretary of Agriculture in the forthcoming wheat referendum.

I urge that the Agricultural Stabilization committeemen return to their historic role as the people who must administer the various farm programs rather than that of being active propaganda salesmen for Secretary Freeman. Unless this is done, they will have lost the confidence of farmers and the general public as to what their real responsibility is in agriculture.

One of my reasons for discussing this wheat referendum is that most of the agricultural producers in my district whether they grow wheat or other commodities have felt rather strongly for some time that the Government should reduce its role in agriculture. The wheat referendum to be held in May provides not only the farmers in my district, but farmers all over the country who produce wheat, the opportunity to express their point of view on this important question. I am hopeful that the referendum will be defeated so that we avoid the spreading of supply-management to other agricultural commodities such as dairy, poultry, and livestock.

Opposition to IATA Transatlantic Fare Rises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, May 1, 1963, I issued a statement supporting the Civil Aeronautics Board's opposition to the attempt by the International Air Transport Association—IATA—to impose a 5-percent increase on jet economy round-trip fares for transatlantic air passengers and all Pacific services. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this statement, which follows:

> I heartily endorse the Civil Aeronautics Board's determination that the 5-percent transatlantic round-trip fare increase now sought by IATA is not in the public interest. I support the CAB's steadfast opposition to the efforts of IATA to force such an increase upon transatlantic air passengers.
>
> The proposed fare increase does not make business sense with transatlantic jets flying half empty.
>
> Furthermore, American citizens form a majority of the transatlantic air passengers, although U.S.-flag airlines now carry only

about one-third of this traffic. Accordingly, such a transatlantic fare increase would take money from the pockets of American passengers and place the lion's share in the hands of foreign airlines.

I am fortified in this view by the statement, reported in today's New York Times, of Sir William Hildred, director general of IATA, who called for lower airline fares, which, he emphasized, would bring more passengers flocking to the jet airliners and make the operation of these planes profitable.

I welcome Sir William's latest statement, which is a far cry from the position he took during the 1956 hearings on the airlines industry before the Antitrust Subcommittee.

"The Antitrust Subcommittee's report of April 5, 1957, chronicles the struggles of the CAB to obtain reasonable, cost-justified international airline fares against the stubborn opposition of IATA. The subcommittee's report concluded:

"From the Board's own description of its experience over a decade of IATA ratemaking it is manifest that resulting rates are * * * unwarrantedly high."

The Antitrust Subcommittee's 1957 report on the airlines industry further concluded that Congress should empower the CAB to regulate international airline fares to the same extent as domestic fares.

I am gratified to note that the statement on international air transport policy approved by President Kennedy only last week, likewise endorsed such legislation. The White House statement on international air transport policy expressly states:

"To provide for more effective governmental influence on rates, Congress should adopt legislation which would give the Civil Aeronautics Board authority, subject to approval by the President, to control rates in international air transport to and from the United States."

This recommendation mirrors the proposals of the Antitrust Subcommittee's 1957 airlines industry report which concluded:

"The committee accordingly joins with the Board, the Comptroller General of the United States, and the Air Coordinating Committee in endorsing the grant of legislative authority to the CAB to control the fares, rates, rules, and practices of U.S. carriers applicable to the transportation to and from the United States to the same extent that the Board now has power to act with respect to fares, rates, rules and practices in domestic transportation. The committee also endorses their recommendation that the Board receive greater legislative authorization to control the fares, rates, rules and practices of foreign air carriers applicable to transportation to and from the United States."

It is gratifying, therefore, to find the CAB protecting the public interest and forfending against the imposition by IATA, an international airline cartel, of air-fare increases which make no sense economically at a time of overcapacity, and which would in effect tax American transatlantic air passengers largely for the benefit of foreign airlines.

How the Combat Pay Amendment Will Be Implemented by Department Regulations; and the Cost Compared With Other Special Pay Provisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page 7852 there is a discussion of the combat pay amendment which will be submitted on H.R. 5555, the military pay bill. The amendment properly leaves some details for departmental regulations, as has been the case in World War II and Korean war provisions for such pay.

Anyone who urges that administrative difficulties create an obstacle to combat or hostile fire pay is simply misinformed. There are no administrative difficulties; and the best proof of that is that, despite years of experience with such legislation in World War II and the Korean war, there have been no administrative difficulties at all. The broad grant of administrative regulation could correct any that might arise; but in view of past extended experience there is no reason to anticipate any difficulties at all.

The Army, which has requested combat—or hostile fire—pay would be chiefly concerned with the benefits involved in this legislation; and under date of March 19, Secretary of the Army Cyrus Vance has written as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D.C., March 19, 1963.

Hon. CHARLES E. BENNETT,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BENNETT: The following information regarding the provisions of H.R. 4696, authorizing pay for members of a uniformed service who are subject to hostile fire, is submitted in accordance with our conversation of March 18.

In the event of enactment, regulations governing this type of pay will be promulgated by the Secretary of Defense, the purpose of which will be to control the entitlement. The Department of Defense presently contemplates that such regulations will require that a member must be assigned to and physically present with his unit not less than 6 days of the month in order to qualify; that the mission of the unit itself must be such that it is subject to hostile fire, or the member must be acting as an adviser with an allied unit subject to such fire. Such unit will be not larger than a brigade, combat command, regiment, group or other similar organization of comparable level. These are similar to the limitations imposed by regulations during the Korean war.

Administration of implementing regulations will be closely supervised by the Army to prevent abuses.

It is estimated that under existing conditions between 1,500 and 2,000 Army personnel would qualify for this pay under the criteria outlined above at an annual cost of about $1 million.

Sincerely,

CYRUS R. VANCE,
Secretary of the Army.

Also on March 29 Assistant Secretary of Defense—for Manpower—Norman Paul wrote as follows concerning the annual cost under regulations which now only await the passage of this legislation to be established:

In reply to your letter of March 25, 1963, the following information is submitted regarding the annual cost of special pay for duty subject to hostile fire contained in H.R. 4696.

The Department of Defense would delegate to the unified commanders the authority to designate the units whose members will be entitled to the special pay. However, based on the criteria tentatively established by the Department of Defense and the conditions of cold war existing today, the services have estimated that the number of men qualifying and the annual cost would be as follows:

	Number of men	Annual cost
Army	1,500-2,000	$990,000-$1,320,000
Navy	52	34,320
Marine Corps	538	355,080
Air Force	150	99,000
Total		1,478,400- 1,808,400

Mr. Speaker, I include here the policies which have been established by the Department of Defense for hostile fire pay:

PROPOSED POLICY GUIDANCE TO ADMINISTER SPECIAL PAY FOR DUTY SUBJECT TO HOSTILE FIRE

(1) This special pay is to be authorized during periods of (formal hostilities or) "cold war" in which the United States may be engaged, and to members who are serving with units of the U.S. uniformed services; and also under "cold war" conditions to members who are assigned, attached, supporting, or serving with units of friendly foreign forces that are engaged in armed conflict.

(2) Entitlement will be limited to members of the U.S. forces serving in Vietnam, and to such other places as may later be designated by the Secretary of Defense.

(3) Personnel must be assigned duty: (a) subject to hostile fire or explosion of hostile mines, or (b) in an area in which they are in imminent danger of being exposed to hostile fire or explosion of hostile mines. Personnel entitled to this special pay must be physically present and a member of, attached to, supporting, advising or assisting a combat unit not larger than a brigade, combat command, regiment, group or other similar organization of comparable level. Entitlement also includes personnel assigned or attached to: an aircraft including reconnaissance aircrews subjected to imminent danger of hostile fire in the course of an operation; a vessel including a minesweeper while in imminent danger of being subjected to hostile fire or explosion of hostile mines, or a minesweeper while actually engaged in sweeping enemy mines.

(4) A member is entitled to this special pay at the rate of $55 per month if associated as a regular member with a combat unit under the conditions stated in (3) above for a period of not less than 6 days of the month, not necessarily consecutive; or 1 or more days during the month included within a period of not less than 6 consecutive days beginning in the preceding month.

(5) Notwithstanding the conditions in (4) above, a member is entitled to this special pay for any month in which he is entitled to basic pay and in which he was killed, injured, or wounded by hostile fire, explosion of a hostile mine, or any other hostile action.

(6) Entitlement to this special pay will continue for not more than 3 additional months in the cases of personnel hospitalized because of a wound or injury received by hostile fire, explosion of a hostile mine or other hostile action.

(7) A member may not be paid more than one special pay for duty subject to hostile fire for any month. A member may be paid this special pay in addition to any other pay and allowances to which he may be entitled.

(8) Any determination of fact that is made in administering this section is conclusive. Such a determination may not be reviewed by any other officer or agency of the United States unless there has been fraud or gross negligence. However, the determination may be changed on the basis of new evidence or for other good cause.

(9) The unified commander will designate units and detachments entitled to this special pay and review entitlements authorized to insure that such authorizations for all services are in keeping with restrictive policies stated herein.

Just today there was received the following letter from Col. Leo E. Benade, Task Force on Military Compensation, Department of Defense, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT
SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., May 7, 1963.

Hon. CHARLES E. BENNETT,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BENNETT: The following information regarding special pay for duty subject to hostile fire is furnished in response to your telephone call of May 6, 1963.

The manner in which the Department of Defense intends to implement the legislation, if passed, was generally outlined in the letter to you from the Secretary of the Army dated March 19, 1963. I would add that in addition the Department of Defense would include as eligible for the special pay those members assigned or attached to an aircraft, including helicopters, subject to imminent danger of hostile fire in the course of an operation; and to a vessel in imminent danger of being subjected to hostile fire or explosion of hostile mines. Under this criteria, at the present time, only members of units supporting the forces in Vietnam would qualify.

At the present time there are approximately 12,000 U.S. troops assigned to Vietnam, or about 5 percent of the Armed Forces strength. It is estimated that between 2,200 and 2,800 might qualify for this special pay. This estimate includes Air Force and Navy troops which were not included in the figures furnished you by the Secretary of the Army in his letter of March 19, 1963.

Helicopter pilots and other personnel authorized to receive flight pay might qualify for special pay for duty subject to hostile fire in addition to their flight pay. We believe such dual payments would be consistent with the purpose for which each payment was proposed. Flight pay is awarded both as an incentive pay to attract and retain high quality volunteers and as added compensation for the inherent risk of flying irrespective of where the flying is done. Hostile fire pay recognizes the additional hazard aircrew members are exposed to when flying over enemy-held territory. Passengers in the aircraft, of course, would be eligible only for hostile duty pay.

Since January 1, 1961, 82 U.S. military personnel have lost their lives in Vietnam, 33 by hostile fire and 49 by accidents and other causes. As a matter of information, the numbers of deaths in other hazardous duties are as follows:

(a) Pilots: 358 pilots were killed in aircraft accidents (including helicopters) in 1961; 362 in 1962.

(b) Submarines: The *Thresher* accident accounted for the only multiple loss of life in a submarine since the end of World War II.

(c) Parachute pay: The injury rate in parachute jumping ranges between 2 and 3 per 1,000 jumps; however, the Armed Forces experienced only 1 fatality in fiscal year 1960 and 1 fatality in fiscal year 1961.

(d) Other: Between the period 1951 and 1961 diving accidents accounted for 18 deaths. Altitude chambers accounted for 12 deaths in the same 10-year period.

The Army has suffered the greatest number of deaths and injuries in the Vietnam conflict just as in World War II and Korea. Of the 82 fatalities in Vietnam, 51 were Army troops, 22 Air Force, 6 Marine Corps, and 3 Navy.

Although no figures are available as to the number of men who received combat pay in the Korean war, at the time of passage of the Combat Duty Pay Act of 1952 it was estimated that 160,000 would qualify.

As a matter of additional information, the number of battle deaths and other deaths in World War II and Korea, by service, are shown in the attached table.

I hope that this information will be useful to you. Your interest is deeply appreciated.

Sincerely,

LEO E. BENADE,
Colonel, U.S. Army, Director, Task Force on Military Compensation.

World War II

	Battle deaths		Other deaths		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Army [1]	234,874	80	83,400	73	318,274	79
Navy	36,950	13	25,664	23	62,614	15
Marine Corps	19,733	7	4,778	4	24,511	6
Total	291,557	....	113,842	....	405,399	....

[1] Includes Army Air Corps.

Korea

	Battle deaths		Other deaths		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Army	27,704	82	9,429	46	37,133	69
Navy	458	1	4,043	20	4,501	8
Marine Corps	4,267	13	1,261	6	5,528	10
Air Force	1,200	4	5,884	28	7,084	13
Total	33,629	....	20,617	....	54,246	....

Mr. Speaker, this matter is small in dollars, small in numbers of men involved but large in the moral responsibilities of our country—and large to the individuals involved and to their families. There are existing special pay programs which we already have which are tremendous in the amount of dollars involved and very substantial in the numbers of persons involved but which in no instance have a greater moral significance in the responsibilities of our country and in no way are more important to the individuals and families involved.

Under these other programs there have assuredly been administrative difficulties but these have not prevented us continuing such programs. For instance, in the case of flight pay we actually discourage and even prohibit some of the flight pay recipients from further performance of their original flight duties, on the theory that they will not ever have another military assignment in which their flight performance will be used and that qualifying flights are wasteful of the taxpayers' money. So administrative problems have certainly been met in some of these other pays but no one has suggested ending them. The proposed amendment does not allow permanent combat or hostile fire pay unless the hostile fire is actually experienced and unlike flight pay is not a status maintained after performance or ability to perform has ceased.

Please consider the following table which shows that these other pays now total annually $632,486,960. Contrast this with the only $1 or $2 million contemplated for the hostile fire amendment—and consider carefully what is actually required of the recipients:

Extra pay for certain performances in Department of Defense

Item	Criteria	Grade	Rate	Fiscal year 1964, DOD
1. INCENTIVE FOR HAZARDOUS DUTY				
(a) Parachute duty	1 jump qualifies for 3 months	Officers	$110.00	$32,334,000
	do	Enlisted men	55.00	
(b) Demolition duty	Actually perform such duty each month to qualify for that month.	Officers	110.00	1,457,660
	do	Enlisted men	55.00	
(c) Flight duty	4 hours each calendar month; 8 hours 2d month if requirement not met 1st month; 12 hours 3d month if requirement 1st and 2d month not met.	Crew: Officers and enlisted men.	....	295,342,340
	do	Noncrew:		
		Officers	110.00	
		Enlisted men	55.00	
(d) Thermal stress duty	Exposed as human test subjects in 1 or more experiments for that month.	Officers	110.00	9,736,000
	do	Enlisted men	55.00	

Extra pay for certain performances in Department of Defense—Continued

Item	Criteria	Grade	Rate	Fiscal year 1964, DOD
(e) High/low pressure				$788,000
(f) Submarine duty				20,846,000
2. SPECIAL PAY				
(a) Foreign and sea duty	Enlisted men only; for duty outside continental United States; no entitlement for duty in Hawaii or Alaska if resident. Includes temporary duty of 8 days or more.	E-9	$22.50	130,000,000
	do	E-8	22.50	
	do	E-7	22.50	
	do	E-6	20.00	
	do	E-5	16.00	
	do	E-4	13.00	
	do	E-3	9.00	
	do	E-2	8.00	
	do	E-1	8.00	
(b) Medical, dental, and veterinarians	Medical and dental: Regular Army on active duty before July 1, 1963; non-Regular Army who before July 1, 1963 enter on active duty for 1 year or more receive special pay as follows:			32,925,400
	(a) Completed less than 2 years' active duty		100	
	(b) Completed 2 or more years but less than 6 years' active duty.		150	
	(c) Completed 6 or more years but less than 10 years' active duty.		200	
	(d) Completed 10 or more years' active duty		250	
	Veterinarians: Regular Army and non-Regular Army who enter on active duty for 1 year or more prior to July 1, 1963.		100	
(c) Diving duty	Perform diving duty each month	Officers	110	2,911,200
	do	Enlisted men		
	do	Master	100	
	do	1st class	80	
	do	Salvage	65	
	do	2d class	55	
(d) Proficiency pay	Enlisted men only; when designated as possessing special proficiency in a military skill.	Private, 1st class	30	106,146,360
	do	Private, 2d class	60	
Total, special pay				271,982,960
Total, hazardous duty pay				360,504,000
Total				632,486,960

Mr. Speaker, there is one glaring omission that should be corrected in H.R. 5555. This is the fact that the bill excludes hostile fire pay or combat pay. Such pay was requested by the Army and by the Department of Defense and approved by the administration and the Bureau of the Budget. It was also approved by the subcommittee which actually studied this legislation, but it was removed by a close vote in the full committee. We should restore it to this legislation before it becomes law.

Kerr-Mills Is Welfare Case Factory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an article written by our beloved and distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina, the Honorable OLIN D. JOHNSTON, for the Senior Citizens News, entitled "Kerr-Mills Is Welfare Case Factory."

Mr. JOHNSTON's comments appeared in the April 1963, issue.

The article follows:

KERR-MILLS IS WELFARE CASE FACTORY

(By Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, South Carolina)

No domestic issue arose in the last election which caused more confusion for voters than did hospital insurance for the aged under social security. The hospital insurance program was maligned, attacked, distorted, and misrepresented as no other issue has ever been. Charges were made that the hospital insurance proposal would dictate to the patient what doctor he could use. This is not true. There are no provisions in the bill providing funds for payment of doctors nor is there any language telling a patient what doctor to use. The proposal merely provides insurance for people 65 and older which pays for hospital and nursing type care.

In South Carolina there are about 150,000 people 65 years of age and over. Under the Kerr-Mills law, two-thirds of the aged in South Carolina are indigent. Others are merely poor. Indigents include couples with under $2,000 a year income and people living alone with under $1,200 a year income. It is because the aged have such small incomes and such large medical costs that the King-Anderson bill is needed, and would more adequately meet the needs of our people.

Some of the literature put out by Scalpel (the South Carolina affiliate of the American Medical Political Action Committee) charged that the cost of the hospital insurance proposal would double social security taxes. The truth is the social security taxes from employee and employer would be raised only one-fourth of 1 percent each, and the base on which he would pay the tax would be increased from $4,800 to $5,200. This increase in earnings base would not only pay toward hospital insurance but also would provide a very important increase in cash monthly benefits for many of today's workers. In dollars and cents the increase to pay for health insurance in taxes proposed would be $12 a year for an employee earning $4,800 and less on smaller earnings. The contributions for health insurance can be kept so small because employers match the employee contributions and because the contributions are made over the 40 or so years of a working lifetime with benefits being paid only during the many fewer years of old age.

The King-Anderson proposal would pay for good care for everyone over 65 participating, as compared to the Kerr-Mills program in South Carolina which provided benefits for only 587 people last December. Under Kerr-Mills someone who works and saves a little is told to go elsewhere for medical assistance. An aged person with life insurance worth $1,500 gets no help. A person with savings of $600 gets no help. If a man cashes in his insurance and spends his savings to the point where he can get help under Kerr-Mills, how long will it be before he is knocking on the door for every type of welfare relief?

The Kerr-Mills bill is a factory for welfare cases and the King-Anderson bill is a preventive for welfare cases. The King-Anderson bill encourages people to build up their savings and pensions and attempt to work a little after retirement if they can. As with any insurance plan, an insured aged person would automatically be qualified for benefits if he got sick, even if he had some resources. Working and saving is what our system depends upon and the King-Anderson bill works well with this system.

It has been charged that hospital insurance is socialism and that supporters of medicare want socialism instead of democracy. I take a back seat to no one when it comes to supporting our free enterprise system. However, I can say that there are some who are so short-sighted as to place our free enterprise system in jeopardy by refusing to meet the challenge of the times with sensible legislation. The hospital insurance program meets this challenge by paying for the care of our aged without making welfare cases out of them. The quickest way to a welfare state is putting people on the welfare rolls, and this is what Kerr-Mills bill will do to our old people. The King-Anderson bill on the other hand asks people to contribute, to pay toward and to earn their benefits. That's the American way.

Supporters of the Kerr-Mills bill should admit that recipients cannot go to their own doctor but have to go to a clinic to get care. They should admit that no care at all is provided for a sick person at home, and that not over forty days a year of hospital care or ninety days of nursing home care is provided. They should also admit the aged have to be investigated practically like a police state where bank accounts are checked, deposit boxes opened, life insurance examined, possibilities of employment looked into. They should also admit thousands and thousands of dollars are wasted on these investigations, $202,000 in fiscal year 1962—$37 a case.

In contrast, the King-Anderson bill is insurance. It would spend only 3 percent of benefits on administration. If you are a member of the program and 65 you get the benefits. Under this bill a person applying for hospital insurance under social security knows he has participated and paid from his earnings and is entitled to the benefits. The only examination he will have to meet is the medical one when he enters the hospital.

I intend to do as I said in my campaign for reelection, and throughout my political career—to do and to vote to do what is best for our State, our people, and our Nation. On the issue of hospital insurance for the aged under social security versus the Kerr-Mills bill, I intend, as in the past, to support and work toward a hospital insurance program for the aged such as that contained in the King-Anderson bill.

Federal Equality of Opportunity in Employment Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my statement to the General Subcommittee on Labor, on the vital problem of discrimination in employment, in which I urged the committee to take favorable action on legislation under consideration which would provide complete coverage and assure equal employment opportunity to all citizens of our country. My statement follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the General Subcommittee on Labor, you have under consideration legislation to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry. I am gratified to have the opportunity to speak on this legislation; in January of this year, I reintroduced my bill—H.R. 330—a "Federal Equality of Opportunity in Employment Act" and I have introduced such legislation ever since coming to Congress.

In my opinion, civil rights and equality of opportunity in employment are the most vital issues which we face on the homefront today, and inasmuch as the Emancipation Proclamation was signed 100 years ago, it is high time that we stop being laggards and that we proceed, with alacrity, to do the job that should have been done generations ago.

The malicious, destructive, discriminatory practices which now abound in all fields of employment throughout our country, affecting millions of our people, must be brought to an abrupt halt. We must not continue to ignore the terrible degradation suffered by those who are victims of discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national ancestry, for this angush is visited upon their children and continues on and on. All hope is killed in the very young; they know that although they have a high degree of intelligence, are ambitious and industrious, there is no point in pursuing higher education or looking for jobs which we commensurate with their abilities; they are not given such jobs, they know that they will be denied advancements to which they are entitled in any jobs they hold, because they are of a minority group. We must also keep in mind that discrimination is directed against not only Negroes, but against Puerto Ricans, Mexicans, Orientals, American Indians, as well as others, in our land.

The problems of joblessness and juvenile delinquency go hand in hand, and the evils of discrimination are major factors in minority group joblessness. In one of our most sadly blighted areas in New York which has a predominantly nonwhite population, the percentage of high school dropouts by graduation time runs from 33 to 60 percent. These young children leave school, in most instances, not because their parents wish them to go to work, but because their motives have been destroyed and the will to advance deadened by the malignancy of discrimination; the denial of hope for equality, for advancement, and for equality of opportunity has taken its toll.

When discrimination in employment is prevalent, the blight spreads to all other facets of the community; increased juvenile delinquency and crime result. Ever-increasing taxes are imposed to meet ever-increasing welfare assistance costs.

This is a national problem and it must be solved by national policies and laws. Many States have already enacted fair employment practices and laws, the great State of New York among them. However, the problem is so complex and overwhelming that Federal action is necessary in order to help the 100 million people not now protected by State laws, and to meet other complexities of the situation.

We owe it to ourselves and to our Nation to eliminate the treacherous practices of discrimination in employment and other fields; the prestige of our Nation is at stake. How can we, in good conscience, promote the ideals of democracy throughout the world, when such evil conditions flourish here at home and when so many of our people are denied the rights guaranteed them under our Constitution? How can we close our eyes to the sickness of despair suffered by millions of the youth of our Nation? How long will we continue to allow discrimination to undermine the foundations of our Government and the economic structure of our country? Those who would continue to impose discrimination and foster cruel prejudices must be saved from their sins against humanity; we must halt their evil ways which are having such a dastardly effect upon our entire Nation and which cause grave concern to all right-thinking Americans who deplore the cruelties inflicted upon their fellow man.

Congress must discharge its responsibility and pass strong, effective legislation which will provide complete coverage and assure equal employment opportunity to all citizens of our country.

Gaps in Postal Fraud Laws?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, apparently when the Post Office Department moves administratively against a firm or individual accused of using the mails for fraudulent purposes, it can obtain a court order detaining, for at least a temporary period, all mail addressed to that business. But if a criminal action is instituted instead of an administrative one, the firm can meanwhile go right on with the same racket, fleecing new victims, until the criminal case is finally disposed of.

Mr. Speaker, a resident of Missouri recently complained to me that a New Jersey firm offering to sell a variety of products by mail at substantial discount, was continuing to solicit him for further business after he had previously been defrauded by the firm's failure to ship the goods he had ordered and paid for, and after the firm had already been indicted.

The firm was later convicted and apparently is in bankruptcy. But, according to a report I have on this matter from the Post Office Department, it had continued its operations for some months after its indictment and during that period "losses were incurred by other victims of the scheme."

AFTER AN INDICTMENT FOR POSTAL FRAUD

The Missourian who called this matter to my attention wrote to me as follows:

FEBRUARY 21, 1963.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN SULLIVAN: I would like to call to your attention a major loophole in the postal laws relating to the use of the mails to defraud. Because of this loophole, many consumers, including myself, have been defrauded by a corporation in New Jersey. The Factory Supply Co. sent ——— catalogs showing merchandise which would be sold at approximately wholesale prices. They insisted on payment in advance. The company, however, did not deliver the merchandise which was ordered and paid for. It has been indicted for using the mails to defraud and its trial, once postponed, is now coming up.

The most amazing thing is that the company still continues in business, still continues to defraud the consumers, and is trying to expand its operations. I have been told that the postal authorities are powerless under existing laws to stop this firm or its officers from using the mails. A short time ago I received another mailing from the company. They asked me to help them get more customers for a fee.

I suggest that the postal laws be amended so that once a company is indicted for using the mails to defraud, it and its officers are denied the use of the mails, unless all funds are impounded by a Federal officer or court-appointed receiver.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———.

COMPANY SUBSEQUENTLY CONVICTED

Mr. Speaker, because this gentleman does not live in my district, or in the St. Louis area, but resides many miles away in a different part of the State, I had to put his letter aside for a week or so until the press of work for my own district eased a bit and I had the time to pursue the point he raised about the need for additional legislation. Subsequently, I wrote to the Postmaster General for comments on the gentleman's suggestion, and received the following reply from the Department:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D.C., March 13, 1963.

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN: The Postmaster General has asked me to reply to your letter of March 7, 1963, concerning the complaint of ——— against Factory Supply Co., of Paterson, N.J. (19630–F and 22815–F).

We have had previous correspondence from ——— and he has been advised of the status of the case and of our position in the matter. In the investigation of alleged fraudulent use of the mails, our primary purpose is to determine the facts and present them to U.S. attorneys for consideration of prosecution. In certain instances, where prosecution is not feasible, action is recommended to deprive offenders further use of the mails. This is the extent of our authority.

The evidence concerning Factory Supply Co. was turned over to the U.S. attorney in the usual manner. Naturally, as the prosecutor, any further proceedings are in his hands and he decides what course of action should be pursued. In this particular case he obtained a grand jury indictment charging mail fraud, fraud by wire, illegal use of fictitious names, and conspiracy. Trial began at Burlington, Vt., on February 12, 1963, and we have just received word that the jury returned a guilty verdict today. Sentencing has been deferred to a later date.

You may be assured that every possible effort is made by the Post Office Department to rid the mails of all unlawful activity, and your interest in submitting this matter for our attention is very much appreciated.

Sincerely yours,
H. B. Montague,
Chief Inspector.

IS LEGISLATION NEEDED?

Mr. Speaker, I then sent the following inquiry to the Postmaster General:

March 19, 1963.

Hon. J. Edward Day,
Postmaster General, Post Office Department,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Day: Recently I sent you a copy of a letter from ——— commenting on his experience with the Factory Supply Company and making a suggestion for a change in the law to close what he said was a loophole.

I have now received a reply from the Chief Postal Inspector, Mr. H. B. Montague, reporting on some of the facts in the Factory Supply Co. case. I had read about the guilty verdict in this case and I congratulate the department but I am still interested in the proposal ——— made that companies which have been indicted or convicted for using the mails to defraud, be denied further use of the mails "unless all funds received are impounded by a Federal officer or court-appointed receiver."

——— was, of course, incensed over being victimized by this company but the point he raised in writing to me was that even after the firm was indicted it continued to send out mailings in pursuit of the same conspiracy for which they were indicted. Since this is a question of whether changes are needed in the postal laws, I am writing to you rather than to the Chief Inspector.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,
Leonor K. (Mrs. John B.) Sullivan,
Member of Congress,
Third District, Missouri.

POST OFFICE CONSIDERING ASKING FOR STRONGER LAWS

Mr. Speaker, I received a further report from the Post Office Department on this matter, dated April 9, 1963, from the General Counsel, Louis J. Doyle, indicating that stronger laws may be requested. After forwarding this information to the Missourian who had written to me originally about this case, I requested his permission to place all of this material before the Congress through the Congressional Record. He has asked that I do not divulge his name, and I am complying with that request. The General Counsel wrote me as follows:

Post Office Department,
Washington, D.C., April 9, 1963.

Hon. Leonor K. Sullivan,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congresswoman: Your letter of March 19, 1963, addressed to the Postmaster General, concerning the complaint of ———, ——— Missouri, respecting an unsatisfactory transaction had by him through the mails with the Factory Supply Co., Bloomfield, N.J., has been referred to me for attention.

——— has indicated to you that legislation should be enacted which would require the impounding of all funds sent through the mails to concerns whose promoters are indicted for mail fraud.

It appears that ——— is aware that the promoters of the Factory Supply Co. were recently convicted of fraudulent use of the mails in connection with the scheme in which he was one of the victims. Despite the fact that the indictment in this case was returned on June 27, 1962, the mail order business continued for some months thereafter and losses were incurred by other victims of the scheme. Between the date of the indictment and the date of conviction, however, the business was placed in bankruptcy; its mail order activities were discontinued at the time the bankruptcy proceedings were initiated.

An indictment is not a final adjudication of the charges therein but constitutes simply a charge that the grand jury believes probable cause exists that the law has been violated. A person indicted for mail fraud is presumed to be innocent until convicted after a trial. In many instances charges of fraud are not established upon a trial. If funds being sent to such a business were impounded during the time between indictment and acquittal, which often runs for many months and in some instances over a year, a legitimate business could be completely destroyed by the suggested legislation.

Under 39 U.S.C. 4007 provision is made for application to the appropriate U.S. District Court for an order detaining for a temporary period mail addressed to business houses against which administrative action under 39 U.S.C. 4005 has been instituted. However, this remedy may be followed only in preparation for or during the pendency of administrative postal fraud proceedings under 39 U.S.C. 4005. In the Factory Supply Co. case the decision was reached by responsible officials of the department that the evidence in this matter appropriately should be presented for action under relevant penal statutes rather than for consideration of possible action under the administrative remedy provided in 39 U.S.C. 4005. At the present time this department is studying the possibility of increasing the effectiveness of its administrative remedy in the suppression of fraudulent enterprises. As you are perhaps aware, the department does not have power to subpena witnesses in this type of proceeding, and is often faced with a difficult burden growing out of the necessity of establishing an intent to deceive upon the part of the promoter of a particular enterprise. It is anticipated that the department's studies will lead to the formulation of recommendations in the near future for legislative amendment which will strengthen administrative remedies for the suppression of fraudulent enterprises.

This Department appreciates very much the interest expressed by you and ——— in this matter. I can assure you that the department will continue to exert every effort to protect patrons of this service from being victimized by the operation of illegal schemes through the mails.

Sincerely yours,
Louis J. Doyle,
General Counsel.

Mr. Speaker, whether this incident indicates the need for further legislation to tighten our postal laws to protect the public from continuing frauds committed by persons or firms even while they are already being prosecuted is a question I would ask the appropriate committees of the Congress to consider.

It was my feeling that the exchange of correspondence in this particular case would be helpful to the committees having jurisdiction over such legislation, and for that reason I have received permission to place this material in the Congressional Record.

Forge of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague from New York, John Lindsay, has written an excellent review of Neil MacNeil's "Forge of Democracy: the House of Representatives," a highly regarded study of this body.

Indicative of the tremendous respect for the opinion of Mr. Lindsay is the fact that the New York Herald Tribune and their board of editors placed his review on the front page of their recent Sunday edition. This respect, Mr. Speaker, so pronounced throughout the United States, is a great tribute to our Member and it is also a tribute to the "Trib" that they decided to place his review in such an auspicious position.

In this harried world of bombastic best sellers and fragmented reviews, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Lindsay] has managed to catch the flavor of the MacNeil book.

According to the gentleman from New York, John Lindsay:

> The constant problem of representative government is to find the middle ground between chaos at one extreme and tyranny at the other. To the freeman, extremes offer little choice. The paralysis of an uncontrollable factionalism is no more palatable than the conformity imposed by an unrestrained majority.

No one, Mr. Speaker, has said more in shorter space, and we can be proud that the gentleman from New York, John Lindsay, is a Member of this body at the present time. He can articulate the great issues that confront us, and he can lead by word and example. Let us hope that someday the gentleman from New York [Mr. Lindsay] will bring his considerable talent to the task of a book on the House. In the meantime, I am honored to place his review in the Record. In fact, it is more than a review, it is an excellent essay in itself. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include his review from the New York Herald Tribune, Sunday, May 5.

The article follows:

Between Chaos and Tyranny, The House
("Forge of Democracy: The House of Representatives," by Neil MacNeil. 496 pp. New York: David McKay Co. $6.75)

(By John V. Lindsay)

"No one pretends that democracy is perfect or allwise," Winston Churchill once remarked. "Indeed it has been said that democracy is the worst form of government except all other forms that have been tried from time to time."

The average visitor to the galleries of the U.S. House of Representatives is appalled at its appearance of disorganized trivia, irrelevance, "bunk" (the word was coined in the House), and at the endless and aimless comings and goings. To the average political scientist, the imperfections of the institution are manifest. They stick out like bumps. In fact, they are democracy's imperfections.

Congress, particularly the House of Representatives, takes on different shapes and colors according to the viewpoint. To the executive branch, from the single purpose movers in the political echelons, convinced of the rectitude of their own course, to the streams of careerists who fill to brimming the Federal Establishment from 9 to 5 the house on the hill is a brooding omnipresence, hostile, immovable, incomprehensive—half asleep, yet ready to spring. The executive branch spends 10 months of the year looking forward to the 2 when Congress is out of town, and yet neither branch can function without the other. They move in relation to each other; they learn to measure the distance between themselves and to respect each other's powers. The separation of these powers becomes very real and very important to the practitioner.

To political scientists and columnists, the House is a slow crawling crustacean, encumbered by fossils, feuds and bad habits. But to the late Sam Rayburn, member of the House for half a century and Speaker for 2 decades, the House was "the highest theater that anyone plays in upon this earth today."

In the midst of the current spate of verbiage about the Congress, about its role in a modern world society, about its habits and practices, Neil MacNeil's book on the House of Representatives is as welcome as spring after winter. Thoroughly researched, with bibliography and index, MacNeil's study of this enormously complex institution is a good journalist's accurate report of what the House is really all about. The author, for all his familiarity with the House's imperfections, has a high regard, even an affection, for the institution. While he knows that real power in the House is in the hands of a small group of party elders, he is optimistic about the House's ability to adjust itself to the times. He understands Congress' antennae, which are more sensitive than many people and most political scientists think. He is aware that, for all its sluggishness and faults, Congress for almost two centuries has made those delicate adjustments that have enabled all Americans to live together under its rule. It is indeed remarkable that a country so young, diverse and energetic could have progressed so far with only one violent upheaval.

The constant problem of representative government is to find the middle ground between chaos at one extreme and tyranny at the other. To the free man, extremes offer little choice. The paralysis of an uncontrollable factionalism is no more palatable than the conformity imposed by an unrestrained majority. MacNeil sees the role of the House in holding the middle ground. "The genius * * * of the men who established the American system of government," he writes, "was to devise * * * government in which democracy was restrained from its own excesses. Here, singularly, the House of Representatives has played a unique and extraordinary role."

By connecting events to personalities, the author has captured the high drama of the House, the moments when great issues have given rise to violent passions. For a good part of the 19th century, there was more than one way of settling the matter at hand. Members speaking on the floor under the cloak of constitutional immunity frequently announced that they were prepared to back their words "here and elsewhere,"—that is, with pistols. MacNeil gives a vivid account of House bloodshed and of lesser forms of brawling both on and off the floor.

In more recent years, the weapons have been confined to verbal assaults and tactical use of the parliamentary rules. We are reminded that the rules are not to be slighted. They are foil, mace, and cannon in the hands of experts. Based largely on Jefferson's manual, which in turn was based on the rules of the British House of Commons, the rules have been used by skillful Parliamentarians to alter the course of history. It is small wonder that some of the greatest House clashes have been brought on by changes in the rules themselves. The names of the antagonists in these encounters are recorded in history: Henry Clay, John Quincy Adams, Thomas Reed, Joe Cannon, George Norris, Howard W. Smith, Sam Rayburn, Charles Halleck. The author takes us through the back rooms during some of these struggles; he concludes with an invaluable reconstruction of the monumental Rules Committee battle of 1961 in which Rayburn staked both his reputation and his final mark in history. The author translates history into living people in his account of the two hundred years' war between House and Senate, a battle for supremacy that saw one of its fiercest skirmishes in the 87th Congress, 1961–62.

If the book is a bit disjointed and repetitious, so is the House. The works of George Galloway apart, no outside account of Congress till now has touched the pulse of the House. Through long personal contact in the corridors, speakers' lounge and press gallery, Neil MacNeil has measured the heartbeat of the place. He takes the reader through the back rooms—Rayburn's "Board of Education," Halleck's "clinic"—which are pulse points of the inner life, points of interest not usually mentioned by the guide services. Repeatedly, he refers to "the mood of the House," its "temper," "the mystique of the House's inner life." As the author clearly had the respect of Rayburn, Speaker Sam's recorded observations ring true. "You can't really say how you lead," said the man who was Speaker twice as long as any one else in history. "You feel your way, receptive to those rolling waves of sentiment. And if a man can't see and hear and feel, why then, of course, he's lost."

The study of parliamentary institutions is the study of man's unending struggle to attain freedom. Neil MacNeil's book on the U.S. House of Representatives is a solid contribution to that study. It is good to have it from a man who knows what he is talking about.

SENATE

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by Hon. Lee Metcalf, a Senator from the State of Montana.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, beyond the circle of whose brooding love we cannot drift in this or any other world: In the glory and vigor of yet a new morning we lift our heavy-laden hearts to Thee, as once more we set our faces toward waiting tasks and toils.

Through countless channels Thou dost seek our lives. At many a door Thou dost stand and knock, and call, if we would but heed the gentle accents of Thy voice. Give us to know that to that patient knocking on the outside, the door can be opened only from the inside by our own hand. Among all the strident voices of this tumultuous day may we not miss the still small voice which alone—even in this Chamber, as we listen to it—can change our fear to faith and our cowardice to courage. Above our deliberations here, and in them, hearken to the prayers of our hearts, when in our highest moments we forget ourselves, and think of Thee. And in the name of Him who strengthens us by His grace shall be the power and the glory. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. Senate,
President pro tempore,
Washington, D.C., May 8, 1963.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. Lee Metcalf, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

Carl Hayden,
President pro tempore.

Mr. **METCALF** thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 6, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For the nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 394) to validate the homestead entries of Leo F. Reeves.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 138. An act to redesignate the Big Hole Battlefield National Monument, to revise the boundaries thereof, and for other purposes; and

S. 873. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in the State of Nevada to the county of Lincoln, State of Nevada.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 74) for the relief of Dr. Olga Marie Ferrer, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions:

S. Con. Res. 6. Concurrent resolution accepting the statue of the late John Burke, of North Dakota, and tendering thanks of Congress therefor;

S. Con. Res. 7. Concurrent resolution authorizing the temporary placement in the rotunda of the Capitol of a statue of the late John Burke, of North Dakota, and the holding of ceremonies incident thereto;

S. Con. Res. 8. Concurrent resolution to print the proceedings in connection with the acceptance of the statue of the late John Burke, of North Dakota;

S. Con. Res. 9. Concurrent resolution for ceremonies in the rotunda in connection with the statue of the late Joseph Ward, of South Dakota;

S. Con. Res. 10. Concurrent resolution to tender thanks of Congress to South Dakota for the statue of Joseph Ward, to be placed in Statuary Hall; and

S. Con. Res. 11. Concurrent resolution to print as a Senate document the proceedings at the acceptance of the statue of Joseph Ward, to be placed in Statuary Hall.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 40. An act to assist the States to provide additional facilities for research at the State agricultural experiment stations;

H.R. 1206. An act for the relief of Kazimierz Krupinski;

H.R. 1275. An act for the relief of Miss Ann Super;

H.R. 1332. An act for the relief of Mario Rodrigues Fonseca;

H.R. 1366. An act for the relief of Vagharshag Hovannes Danielian;

H.R. 1393. An act for the relief of Janet Lundie Farmer;

H.R. 1395. An act for the relief of Rear Adm. Walter B. Davidson;

H.R. 1518. An act for the relief of Barbara Theresa Lazarus;

H.R. 1709. An act to establish a Federal Commission on the disposition of Alcatraz Island;

H.R. 1734. An act for the relief of Luba Siedlecki Simon;

H.R. 1736. An act for the relief of Assunta DiLella Codella;

H.R. 2072. An act to assure payment of just compensation for the use and occupancy of certain lands on Kwajalein and Dalap Islands, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2073. An act to place certain submerged lands within the jurisdiction of the governments of Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2726. An act for the relief of John F. Wood, of Newport News, Va.;

H.R. 2751. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jesse Franklin White;

H.R. 2753. An act to disclaim any title of the United States to certain real property in Modoc County, Calif.;

H.R. 3629. An act for the relief of Pong Yong Jin (also known as Pang Yong Chin);

H.R. 3887. An act to authorize the acceptance of donations of land in the State of North Carolina for the construction of an entrance road at Great Smoky Mountains National Park, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4152. An act to authorize the addition of certain donated lands to the administrative headquarters site, Isle Royale National Park;

H.R. 4588. An act to provide for the withdrawal and reservation for the Department of the Navy of certain public lands of the United States at Mojave B Aerial Gunnery Range, San Bernardino County, Calif., for defense purposes;

H.R. 4773. An act for the relief of Leroy Smallenberger, a referee in bankruptcy;

H.R. 4965. An act for the relief of certain employees of the Foreign Service of the United States;

H.R. 5175. An act to authorize the issuance of certificates of citizenship in the Canal Zone;

H.J. Res. 82. Joint resolution to change the name of Short Mountain lock and dam and reservoir in the State of Oklahoma to Robert S. Kerr lock and dam and reservoir; and

H.J. Res. 245. Joint resolution to provide that Members of Congress shall be limited to per diem allowances and necessary transportation costs in connection with travel outside the United States, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

H.R. 199. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans having the service-connected disability of deafness of both ears;

H.R. 211. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide increases in rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to children and parents of deceased veterans; and

H.R. 214. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans suffering the loss or loss of use of both vocal cords with resulting complete aphonia.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 40. An act to assist the States to provide additional facilities for research at the State agricultural experiment stations; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H.R. 1206. An act for the relief of Kazimierz Krupinski;

H.R. 1275. An act for the relief of Miss Ann Super;

H.R. 1332. An act for the relief of Mario Rodrigues Fonseca;

H.R. 1366. An act for the relief of Vagharshag Hovannes Danielian;

H.R. 1393. An act for the relief of Janet Lundie Farmer;

H.R. 1395. An act for the relief of Rear Adm. Walter B. Davidson;

H.R. 1518. An act for the relief of Barbara Theresa Lazarus;

H.R. 1709. An act to establish a Federal commission on the disposition of Alcatraz Island;

H.R. 1734. An act for the relief of Luba Siedlecki Simon;

H.R. 1736. An act for the relief of Assunta DiLella Codella;

H.R. 2726. An act for the relief of John F. Wood of Newport News, Va.;

H.R. 2751. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jesse Franklin White;

H.R. 2753. An act to disclaim any title of the United States to certain real property in Modoc County, Calif.;

H.R. 3629. An act for the relief of Pong Yong Jin (also known as Pang Yong Chin);

H.R. 4773. An act for the relief of Leroy Smallenberger, a referee in bankruptcy;

H.R. 4965. An act for the relief of certain employees of the Foreign Service of the United States; and

H.R. 5175. An act to authorize the issuance of certificates of citizenship in the Canal Zone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2072. An act to assure payment of just compensation for the use and occupancy of certain lands on Kwajalein and Dalap Islands, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2073. An act to place certain submerged lands within the jurisdiction of the Governments of Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3887. An act to authorize the acceptance of donations of land in the State of North Carolina for the construction of an entrance road at Great Smoky Mountains National Park, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4152. An act to authorize the addition of certain donated lands to the administrative headquarters site, Isle Royale National Park; and

H.R. 4588. An act to provide for the withdrawal and reservation for the Department of the Navy of certain public lands of the United States at Mojave B Aerial Gunnery Range, San Bernardino County, Calif., for defense purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.J. Res. 82. Joint resolution to change the name of Short Mountain lock and dam and reservoir in the State of Oklahoma to Robert S. Kerr lock and dam and reservoir; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.J. Res. 245. Joint resolution to provide that Members of Congress shall be limited to per diem allowances and necessary transportation costs in connection with travel outside the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS IN MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the following committee and subcommittees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Special Committee on Aging;

The Small Business Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency;

The Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations; and

The Constitutional Rights Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 4 additional minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CRITICISM OF CONGRESS—REPLY TO LETTER FROM MISS SUSAN SLOAN, OF HICKSVILLE, N.Y.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is not very often that I answer correspondence coming from outside of my own State of Montana; but not too long ago a young lady in grade school on Long Island, in the State of New York, wrote me about a problem which deeply troubled her. She and her classmates were concerned about the nature and the extent of the criticism of Congress which had come to their attention. She asked for my comments on this situation.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, after preparing my reply to this intelligent young lady, I found that her letter had been misplaced, for which I was quite sorry as it had made a deep impression on me. However, with the kind help of the office of Representative OTIS G. PIKE, in whose district I recalled the young lady lived, I was put in touch with Mr. W. S. Phelan, superintendent of schools in the Islip, Long Island, area. This most sympathetic gentleman graciously undertook the herculean task of finding the young lady who had written the letter, which I am happy to say he successfully accomplished. She is Miss Susan Sloan, of 11 Atlas Lane, in Hicksville, Nassau County, N.Y. I might add that Miss Sloan was attending a school entirely outside of Mr. Phelan's district, which made his success all the more remarkable.

I, therefore, offer my greatest thanks both to Mr. Phelan, for his kind assistance, and to Miss Sloan, for her thoughtful and intelligent letter; and I ask that my reply may be included at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAR SUSAN: The criticism of Congress is generally directed toward two areas. The first is directed toward the individual Member; the second toward Congress as a lawmaking institution. The question that is implicit in all of it is whether Congress is capable in our times of continuing as one of the Nation's vital policymaking bodies.

Such criticism is not new. As Senator Walter George wrote 20 years ago, "Castigating Congress seems to have developed, of late, into a pernicious national pastime. To my mind, the thoughtless disparagement of Congress is part of the whole pattern of cynicism that many people have adopted toward the Legislature. The tendency is alarming * * *. Now is the time for Americans to value, rather than abuse, their democratic heritage."

Fortunately, there are those associated with the Congress, as Members and observers, who have felt the need for something beyond clever satire and nonconstructive complaint. One of these is David Broder who recognized in a New York Times article last fall the factor that is most responsible for the deterioration, if indeed there is such, in the lawmaking performance of the legislature. That factor is in Mr. Broder's words, "simply that most Congressmen can no longer afford to regard legislation as the most important part of their jobs." This surprising and disturbing development has come about as each Congress Member is called upon more and more to help his home people exist with, benefit from, comply with, or confront, the governmental "colossus."

"This function," Mr. Broder emphasizes, "is consistently undervalued by critics of Congress * * * who fail to comprehend the gulf between the constituencies and the Capitol. To the average citizen preoccupied with his own affairs the Central Government is a remote colossus, incomprehensible, almost unapproachable, but not safely ignored. His link—his sole link—with it is his Congressman. The Congressman must protect his district and its people from the mischance and mischief that almost inevitably accompany bureaucracy's rather rigid way of doing its work. He must do it, for his people have no one else to look to."

In the course of his excellent article, the author mentions the book "Member of the House," written by the late Clem Miller, Representative from California, until his death last fall. I know of no better description of the life of a legislator than that found in this simple little volume. His story is of 12- and 15-hour days, hard work, and unassuming dedication to the people of his district and Nation. It is, I believe, a book which every person concerned about our Government should read, particularly those who find little good in Congress or in Congressmen. It is enjoyable and instructive, and cannot help but persuade the reader to a new and deserved respect for his Representatives and for the good practical sense of his form of government.

As should be expected of any 180-year-old institution, however, certain customs and procedures, born of a long-forgotten need, and grown inflexible with time, now threaten to strangle the legislative processes which gave them life. There are undoubtedly changes that should be made in the rules and procedures that govern both Houses.

Many of these changes might be effected without unbalancing the political forces that would otherwise work to prevent their alteration. The type of suggestions made by Senator HUMPHREY in an article which I am placing in the RECORD, should receive serious consideration because they might very well add a great deal to the productivity of all.

Other alterations that would affect the present power of the minority in Congress will be harder to come by. Minority views and interests must be absolutely potent to inflict a fully proportionate view upon the legislative product, but our organizational structure should allow, after extended consideration, the broad consensus of the Nation to be enacted into law. I am not sure that it always does this now.

These problems are especially complex and touch every nerve end of democratic government. There is not always an obvious right and wrong, or a clearly defined solution that can be applied in every case without misgivings. For this reason I support the creation of a Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress such as has been suggested by distinguished Members of both Houses.

I would hope these efforts could take place in a more positive atmosphere. Criticism of Congress is a well-loved national pastime, as is criticism of almost all our institutions of authority. No one would have this otherwise, but along with the demands for change should go a realization of what must be kept. It has been accurately remarked that "the great executives have given inspiration and push to the advancement of human society, but it is the legislators who have given stability and continuity to that slow and painful process." It is the legislator who institutionalizes in the form of law, "those measures which mark the slow lifting of mankind up from the rule of tooth and claw."

The years have seen the bulk of legislative creativity shift to the executive, and with it a substantial increase in executory power. In the large this is unavoidable, for the problems of the Nation have increased in number and complexity, and our security often depends on the speed of our response. These conditions outline the task that remains to us in this century; to construct a government more powerful than all the forces of the world alined against it, yet no greater in dignity than the single individual.

This is a task that will consume our greatest devotion and our energies. The continued maintenance of our free State is not the result of chance circumstance. It is the product of intricate and sophisticated political balance, contrived by men of great wisdom in human affairs, and borne along by men devoted to its preservation above their own ambitions.

In this governmental mix, it is the legislator who is in daily conversation with the people of his district and State. He reads their papers, he knows their problems; his political existence depends upon his understanding of their life. All this is brought together in making the Nation's law. This process is the essence of democratic government.

These questions require consideration in a discussion of the role of Congress. I have faith they will receive the examination and the tending-to that they deserve. Concerned young people such as yourself will see to that for us.

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the article by Mr. David S. Broder.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 7, 1963]

TO MOVE CONGRESS OUT OF ITS RUTS: AMERICANS KNOW THAT THAT BODY COULD DO A BETTER JOB THAN IT DOES; A SENATOR OFFERS HIS VIEW OF WHAT IS WRONG AND HOW LEGISLATORS COULD BE MADE MORE EFFECTIVE

(By HUBERT H. HUMPHREY)

(HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, the senior Senator from Minnesota, serves on four committees, including one on reorganization of Government.)

WASHINGTON.—Sixteen years ago, the United States held a monopoly of atomic weapons. Jet aircraft were barely operational. The space age could be found only in science fiction magazines. Television was an 8-inch infant in electronics laboratories. The Nation's elementary schools had classrooms to spare. The cold war could be seen on the horizon only by a handful of political wise men. Europe was near economic collapse, Africa was still a continent of colonies and Chiang Kai-shek still ruled the Chinese mainland. Cuba, to most Americans, was a plush and pleasant vacation spot. Fidel Castro was a teenager.

It was 16 years ago when the U.S. Congress last turned to the tedious task of self-criticism and produced a major legislative reform. Since the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Congress has changed little. The structure is the same. The committee lineups are almost identical. The traditions are preserved. And the basic attitudes of Congress toward its own prerogatives and centers of power are still tuned to 1946 or the more distant past.

But the needs of the Nation and the demands on Congress have multiplied.

Since 1946 the Nation's population has increased 33 percent, its Government has grown to include many more services and duties, its problems are infinitely more complex, and its involvement in world affairs is no longer fractional and irregular but rather total and constant.

The essential problem of Congress today is simply that there is more to do but only the same number of men to do it. The Members of Congress have to find enough time to fulfill their thousands of obligations and to develop a congressional system in which they can use their time most effectively.

The most pressing day-to-day demands for the time of Senators and Congressmen are not directly linked to legislative tasks. They come from constituents. And the constituency of a Member of Congress is not limited to his home State or district. He gives priority attention to the people back home, but as a U.S. Senator or Representative, his constituency is the whole Nation.

The image of a Member of Congress engaged in debate of issues or in study and reflection on the problems of the Nation and freedom is accurate for only a fraction of his time. At any point in his workday, the Congressman is more likely to be talking about a housing development with municipal officials, or phoning an executive agency for an answer to a constituent complaint, or dictating a letter to a citizen who wants some information for his son's term paper for a school civics class.

Speedy air travel, the low cost of telegrams, or long-distance telephone calls and campaigns to encourage citizens to "write your Congressman" have turned most congressional offices into operations resembling a complex of train station, post office, airline terminal, and communications center. My own experience may or may not be typical, but it is significant of the increased personal workload for Members of Congress.

In 1949, I moved into an office of four rooms. My staff and I had the use of two telephone lines. An average of 50 letters a day were received. Thirty telephone calls a day were considered heavy. A personal visit to the office by a constituent on any day was a special event.

In 1962, my office had doubled to eight rooms. Now, 12 telephone lines funnel an average of 500 calls into the office each day, and I keep two private lines just to be sure I will be able to get through the crowded switchboard to reach my staff. One hundred and twenty personal visitors, not counting large groups of students or tourists, come into the office each day, about half of them constituents from my home State.

How does the Member of Congress handle this workload? He has a staff to help, and he and his assistants work long hours at a fast pace. Any citizen who doubts that he is getting an honest day of work for the salary he pays his Congressman need only walk by the Senate or House office buildings late at night or on weekends. Most of the lights are burning through the evening hours, and many still shine after midnight on any night of the week.

Congressmen do not complain about the demands on their time for service to constituents. They perform that service because it is their job, because it is vital for their political survival, and because they know that the individual citizen with a need, complaint or idea cannot even hope to dent the surface of big government unless he works through his elected representative.

But Members of Congress do complain often that they have little time to perform their duties as legislators. This is perhaps the central, general problem and defect of Congress today: The inability of Congressmen to find the time to inform themselves of the issues they face, to give their best talents to committee assignments, and to legislate responsibly.

The day is long gone when a Member of Congress could be satisfied with mastery over two or three limited, precise subjects and follow a policy of voting the party line on other issues. Today, the Senator or Congressman is expected to be thoroughly informed on hundreds of different subjects and issues, from agricultural economics in Minnesota to the administration of foreign aid in Boliva, from Federal housing needs in New York to Soviet strategy in the Middle East, from a flood control project in California to the merits of a man-on-the-moon spaceship projects.

The complexities and variety of issues which Members of Congress must master will continue to increase in an age of nuclear power, scientific advances, fast-changing social patterns, and international involvement and leadership by the United States.

The pattern is already evident: At the time of the last Legislative Reorganization Act, the 79th Congress (1945 and 1946) initiated 12,656 bills or resolutions. The 87th Congress (1961 and 1962) initiated 20,316 bills or resolutions, a 60-percent increase in the congressional workload.

Most of these measures were relatively routine, but each took some time from Congress in general and individual Members in particular.

There has been a comparable increase in the flow of major, controversial, and thus time-consuming legislative proposals. Traditionally, the average congressional session has seriously considered and attempted to hammer out one major new program or reform in a single year. The 2d session of the 87th Congress last year made a serious effort on many major legislative programs, including the trade bill, tax reform, social security financing of health insurance, authorization to purchase United Nations bonds, and the Communications Satellite Act.

A realistic accounting by the White House concluded that the 87th Congress approved, and the President signed into law, 73 major legislative proposals. The 83d Congress, representing the first 2 years of the Eisenhower administration, approved 29 major legislative proposals. The 87th Congress of 1961 and 1962 approved a total of more than 1,000 public bills. The 83d Congress of 1953 and 1954 approved about half that number.

These figures are not mentioned to play a sort of partisan numbers game, but rather to emphasize the increased legislative workload of Congress and its Members.

The result of that heavy workload, in 1962, was one of the longest peacetime sessions of Congress in history. Congress met continually from early January to mid-October. In the final month, a few old-timers on Capitol Hill grew frustrated enough to look back fondly on the year 1923, when Warren Harding was President and the Congress convened in March just long enough to recess until December.

But even 9- or 10-month congressional sessions do not solve the problem of the individual Senator or Congressman who must find the time to inform himself about the legislative issues he faces.

Most Members of Congress are dedicated and conscientious legislators and public servants, aware of the power they hold over the dollars and destiny of the American people and so many others throughout the world. If they are given extra time, or rather freed from unnecessarily time-consuming duties, they will spend most of it tackling the huge task of informing themselves.

Several steps can be taken to give them that extra time. These are not the final answers to the time problem of Members of Congress, but they would help.

First, more joint meetings of congressional committees. A legislative question involving disarmament and arms control, for example, normally requires consideration by the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Joint meetings would save the time of Members serving on more than one of these committees.

Second, more standing joint committees including Members of both the House and the Senate. Such committees would save time, particularly toward the end of each congressional session, by paving the way to speedier conference agreements between the Senate and the House on controversial issues.

Third, more efficient scheduling of the workdays of Congress. Certain days could be scheduled specifically for floor debate and action by the full House or Senate. Other days could be restricted exclusively for hearings and action by the congressional committees.

In the early months of the session, the full House or Senate would meet only a few days each week. As committees completed their action in the later months of the session, the Senate and House would meet more often. This pattern would save time for Members, and end the absurd necessity of Members literally running from committee room to Senate or House Chamber when issues in which they are involved are up for action at different places at the same time.

Fourth, modification of the morning hour in the Senate, in which Members read miscellaneous speeches of marginal or undated importance and insert various articles into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Instead, Members would be permitted to send their morning hour speeches and articles to the clerk for insertion in the RECORD, without taking their own time and the time of other Senators to read them word for word.

Fifth, a requirement in the Senate that Members restrict their remarks to the issue formally listed as the business of the Senate. In a debate over agricultural programs, for example, a Senator would not be able to spend an hour discussing a totally unrelated subject. This rule of germaneness now applies only to debate in the House of Representatives.

Sixth, a summer recess of Congress of at least 3 weeks. This would take time away from legislative duties, but ultimately, I am convinced, would save time. The immediate value would be the opportunity for Members of Congress to spend some time with families and constituents in a period (June or July) when schools are closed and citizens are not tied at home because of weather.

The indirect value would be the change of pace and rest such a recess would give to each Member. He would return for the final busy weeks of the session refreshed for more efficient performance of his legislative duties. Congressmen are human beings; they get tired and their nerves can become frayed from long months of pressure and hard work. A summer recess would probably reduce the inevitable tensions and bickering so common in the final weeks of congressional sessions.

Seventh, modification and adoption of the British question period, in which administration leaders would report on and answer questions of general importance before the full Senate and House. This would save time, help to keep Members of Congress better informed on administration programs and policy and sustain the necessary frequent contact between the executive and legislative branches of Government.

This final suggestion, and some of the others, would have a valuable side effect; it would save the time of high administration leaders who have their own crucial problems of too many duties for too few hours.

It is not unusual for the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense and other Cabinet officers to give basically the same testimony and answer basically the same questions for several different congressional committees. The Secretary of State, for example, might be called early in the session to outline the foreign aid program, including military aid, to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. He will then repeat the same testimony to the Senate Armed Services Committee, and again to the House Armed Services Committee.

The result, I believe, is an excessive demand on the time of these officials. Secretary of State Dean Rusk made 54 personal appearances before congressional committees during the 87th Congress, 29 in 1961 and 25 in 1962. Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara spent a total of 203 hours before congressional committees during the 87th Congress, 88.74 in 1961 and 114.25 in 1962.

Standing joint committees, more joint meetings of committees, and a question period for the full House or Senate would save the time of Congressmen and these high officials, and serve to inform all Members of Congress more thoroughly.

Another congressional defect which tends to waste time, and to cause confusion and occasional conflict between Members, rests with the lineup of Senate and House committees. New problems and programs created by a world transformed by nuclear power and the space age are being handled by a congressional committee system which has changed little in 50 years.

There were 2 weeks of confusion following introduction of my bill in 1961 to establish a U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. This measure was first assigned to the Foreign Relations Committee, then switched to the Government Operations Committee, then back to the Foreign Relations Committee. At one point, it almost went to the Armed Services Committee. (The bill finally remained with Foreign Relations, was approved, and signed into law.)

The Communications Satellite Act bounced from committee to committee before it was finally processed and sent to the floor last year. At one time or another, this bill involved the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the Foreign Relations Committee, the Government Operations Committee, the Space and Astronautics Committee, and, of course, the Appropriations Committee.

Is a more up-to-date committee lineup, responsive to modern problems and modern opportunities, needed? I believe it is, and that a thorough review of the present committee and subcommittee lineups and jurisdictions is necessary.

That review would be one of the prime responsibilities of a Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, which would be established by a resolution sponsored by Senator Joseph S. Clark, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, and 31 other Senators representing both parties. A companion measure in the House agrees that this committee of seven Senators and seven Representatives should conduct a complete review, the first since 1946, of Congress and produce recommendations for its improvement.

I expect this Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress to be established. Its work will be one of the most significant efforts of the 88th Congress. And its task will be difficult, because there is little popular interest or direct political advantage in the tedious effort for procedural reform within Congress.

But the American people want good government, and sense that the legislative branch has not been performing its functions with the order and effectiveness the Nation deserves. The waning weeks of the 87th Congress included fights over such petty issues as what room the Appropriations Conference Committee should meet in, and long delays over minor details of legislation.

Displays of bickering and pettiness tend to obscure the real record of achievement written by recent Congresses and to diminish the respect and confidence of the people in their own representative government. Perhaps the greatest need in Congress today is not so much for studies, procedural changes, and committee modernization. It may rather be a more thoroughly responsive attitude by Members of Congress, who need to realize that the rules and traditions of Capitol Hill are not sacred, and that the national interest and public service are more important than individual or committee powers and prerogatives.

PORTRAIT OF A TYPICAL CONGRESSMAN

(By David S. Broder)

Washington.—If Congress is, as its critics say, a sickly institution, then those who run for Congress presumably have no objections to catching some sort of Capitol fever. About 900 of our fellow citizens are seeking the 435 House and 39 Senate seats available this November—a record number. And for what? For the honor of serving in a body whose reputation with its critics has rarely been lower?

In order to know what lures these men and women to Congressional service—why an institution that has been pronounced a failure by its critics should exert such magnetism across the land—we must understand the nature of the office itself.

What is a Congressman, really? Is he legislator or errand boy, an ambassador from his State or district or an officer of the National Government? By what standards should he be judged? The chances are these questions will be raised in few of the current campaigns. And yet one cannot shake the suspicion that they are overdue for discussion.

The burden of this article is that the Congressman is a most misunderstood creature. He is not one man, as the critics would have it, but three. He is a legislator for the Nation; he is a mediator between his district and the Central Government; and he is a teacher of his people. His performance in his three roles varies. In the first, he is adequate; in the second, excellent; and in the third, deficient.

But before pulling him apart this way, let us see him whole, as he is in life.

The typical Congressman is an unbashful, churchgoing fellow of 52, a veteran and a college graduate. He has made his living as a lawyer or businessman and has learned something of the management of human affairs. He also has behind him some years in public office—as a prosecutor perhaps, or as a mayor or a State assemblyman. He is, in all likelihood, a man of above-average sensitivity, stamina, ambition, and acumen.

This bears importantly on the Congressman's performance in his first role, as a national legislator. The critics of Congress sometimes talk as though ignorance, indifference and ineritia are so inbred in Senators and Representatives that they are literally incapable of writing good legislation.

The contrary seems closer to the truth. Most Congressmen are far ahead of their constituencies, both in sensing national problems as they arise and in understanding the strengths and weaknesses of proposed solutions.

It is not just accident that the average Congressman is better informed than almost any of his voters. He has to be, for in the Washington arena knowledge is power, whether the struggle concerns the tax code, the merits of rival weapons systems or the mechanisms of the farm program.

Because he is a decisionmaker, the Congressman is the beneficiary of a constant flow of information and instruction from committee staff members, from his colleagues, from the administration and from representatives of interest groups. Even the dullest Senator or Representative cannot fail to learn something from this process and most of them learn a great deal more than a little.

Is the problem, then, that the mechanisms of Congress will not enable its Members to put their knowledge to work? Lately, it has become fashionable to suggest that this is the answer. The seniority system must be abolished, it is said. Committees must be curbed, or perhaps strengthened. Debate must be curtailed, or perhaps extended. The leadership must be broadened, or made more responsive, or something.

The pertinent point about these criticisms is not that they are irrelevant but that they are not new. The conflict-of-interest problem, so much discussed recently, was not unfamiliar to Daniel Webster. The struggle between the party leadership in each House and the committee chairmen is routine, not novel. Congress operates now very much as it has throughout its history.

What has changed is the amount of time, energy, and brains Congressmen can devote to the tasks of devising legislation and overcoming the built-in obstacles to its enactment. The main reason, I suggest, that Congress does not legislate better is simply that most Congressmen can no longer afford to regard legislation as the most important part of their jobs.

Indeed, many of them find it very difficult to sandwich legislative work into the busy schedule of what they describe—correctly—as their more important functions. These functions relate to their second role, as mediators between their districts and the Central Government, and we will examine in a moment why the burdens they carry in this area have increased so in recent years.

But first it is important to understand that the conflict between the Congressman as national legislator and the Congressman as agent for his district is not just a theoretical struggle.

The practical problem the Congressman faces is well described by Representative Clem Miller, a California Democrat, in his revealing little book about the realities of congressional life, just published under the title, "Member of the House."

In one of the letters comprising the volume, he explains to his friends at home that most of the vital decisions on the floor of the House are made on teller votes, with the opponents and supporters of the bill or amendment passing up the aisle between counters to indicate their stand. Mr. Miller reports, accurately, that "at least 150 Members can be counted on to be absent from any teller vote.

"What is it that happens to these Members of Congress?" he asks. "Presumably they were elected for this very task above all others: to be in the Chamber, to vote.

"The fact is that this objective is blurred with time and circumstance. What is of overriding significance gives way to what is immediate. The competing interests, the endless details of congressional routine, take hold.

"Members are called to the floor * * * as the afternoon's debate begins * * *. Most stay for awhile listening and chatting. Then, inevitably, the drift begins. Pages hurry up and down the aisles with sheaves of messages.

"Gradually [the Congressman] is caught up in the inescapable workaday world of Congress. Almost without volition, he finds himself back in his office, trying to keep up with the mail, interviewing and being interviewed by streams of callers. Now he is too far away to get back to the floor for a teller vote.

"Once away from the Chamber, he is far away. The urgency, the insistence, is gone. A million words of testimony, the results of a thousand patient meetings may be going down the drain. But it is another world from the congressional office."

The conflict between these two worlds has another dimension, because it is also a conflict between pleasure and duty. Most Congressmen find the pleasures of their work lie mainly in the legislative world, in the personal relationships between competitors and cohorts in the insiders' world of Washington influentials, a world where strength and shrewdness, wit and will are savored as much as wealth in Dallas.

But pleasurable as his life in the insiders' world may be for the Congressman, his job security and his political future depend chiefly on how well he serves the residents of the outsiders' world—the people of his State or district. Cultivating his relationship with them must be given first priority, no matter what his personal tastes dictate and no matter what the critics of Congress may think.

The plain fact is that a man's legislative work is commonly a matter of indifference—if not outright suspicion—for his constituents. What can hurt politically is the charge that he has failed to look after his district. Neglect of correspondence, of constituent services or of vital local needs lies behind the defeat of a vast majority of those few in Congress who fail of reelection.

No wonder, then, that the first move the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, made in preparation for his current campaign in Arkansas was to turn over leadership of his committee for the year to the next senior Democrat, Senator JOHN SPARKMAN of Alabama (whose term does not expire until 1967). Rice, cotton, and flood control projects are safer concerns for a man seeking reelection than U.N. bonds or foreign aid.

There is no sense mourning the fact that the Congressman's constituent-service role is interfering ever increasingly with his work as a legislator. It is the inevitable result of the changes that have taken place in our society and Government in the past 175 years.

The Founding Fathers knew the conflict would exist, but they misjudged the dimensions of the problem. In Federalist Paper No. 56, Madison recognized that the Congressman "ought to be acquainted with the interests and circumstances of his constituents." But in a simple society under a government of limited powers, this requirement, he believed, could easily be met.

"This principle," he argued, "can extend no further than to those circumstances and interests to which the authority and care of the Representative relate. An ignorance of a variety of minute and particular objects, which do not lie within the compass of legislation, is consistent with every attribute necessary to a due performance of the legislative trust."

The increase in our population, the growing complexity of our economy and the proliferation of government functions have made it far more burdensome than Madison ever dreamed for the Congressman to define and defend "the interests and circumstances of his constituents"—to serve as a mediator between them and their Government. This function is consistently undervalued by critics of Congress, particularly those who are Washington-based, who fail to comprehend the gulf between the constituencies and the Capital.

To the average citizen preoccupied with his own affairs, the Central Government is a remote colossus, incomprehensible, almost unapproachable, but not safely ignored. His link—his sole link—with it is his Congressman.

The Congressman must protect his district and its people from the mischance and mischief that almost inevitably accompany bureaucracy's rather rigid way of doing its work. He must do it, for his people have no one else to look to. Because the work is essential and unavoidable, most Congressmen have become very proficient at the task. And that is the main reason why, in recent elections, less than 1 incumbent in 10 seeking reelection has been denied another term.

But the Congressman's position as the middleman between his district and the central Government imposes another duty on him—one which he meets less adequately. I refer now to his third major role—not as legislator, not as a broker—but as a teacher, an educator and a shaper of opinion back home.

To some it will seem strange to charge the Congressman with this responsibility. It has become customary to say that the President has the job of telling the people where the country stands and what it needs to do. He does. President Kennedy has been criticized for failing to do this sufficiently, and so were his predecessors. The inescapable fact is that all our Presidents for the last quarter century have been preoccupied with foreign affairs. Most of their speeches have sought public understanding of our responsibilities in that area.

Domestic affairs have been left largely to Congress. If domestic needs are unmet—as many believe—the blame must rest on the Congressmen for failing to bring their people to an understanding of the programs required.

How can Congress do this job? One of the most effective devices is the public hearing. Look, for example, at the way in which the 1959–60 revision of the labor law came about.

A Senate committee held a series of hearings that gave the public dramatic evidence of the extent of criminal infiltration into labor unions. Another committee drafted remedial legislation. The topic was discussed in the districts by virtually every member of Congress. Only in the final stages of the debate did the President join the dialog, and then his intervention was of marginal influence. It was a congressional project.

"The job of a Congressman," Representative MILLER says in his book, "in major degree is communicating—making our political world understandable."

Congressmen communicate through their newsletters and radio and television reports to their districts; through the frequent speeches they make to civic and political groups at home; and through their innumerable conversations with individual constituents.

But how well do they communicate? Too often, I am afraid, the same Congressman who will tell a bureaucrat bluntly and honestly how a proposed policy would affect his constituents will equivocate and hesitate before giving his constituents the blunt truth about what can and cannot be done in the national interest.

Nothing is more important to our democracy than the kind of information our Congressmen spread. The operations of the representative system enable the vast majority of these men to stay in office as long as they wish. Do they use their time preparing their constituents to cope with the world as it is, or do they conceal the world from them? That is the crucial question about this year's election, as about every congressional election.

Will the midwestern conservative who is certain to be back for another term give his constituents the old line about balancing the budget first and then cutting taxes? Or will he help them try to understand that our present tax structure is keeping us from balancing the budget and achieving a lot of other economic goals as well?

Will the eastern liberal from a safely gerrymandered district go back to his voters with the same shopworn promise about passing a massive aid-to-education bill? Or will he tell them what he knows to be true: that those sincerely interested in helping education must define the goals and limit the scope of the program much more strictly than they have in the past in order to meet the legitimate objections of those who, for a variety of reasons, fear the impact of massive Federal aid?

Too frequently in Washington one hears a Congressman say, "I understand the need for this, but my people back home don't, so I won't vote for it." That may be acceptable as an excuse on that particular day, but it ought to oblige that Congressman to spend a good many days helping his people grasp the situation as well as he does.

By way of summary, then, our scorecard on Congress looks something like this:

As the agent for his constituents in protecting their interests in Washington, the average Congressman does an excellent job. The role is a vital one from his district's point of view and, if the critics of Congress want to be fair, they should give him high marks for the quality of his performance in this field.

As a national legislator, the Congressman is at least adequate. Men will disagree on how many desirable bills are left unpassed, on how many bad ones become law, and on what provisions any particular measure should contain. But it seems fair to say that most of the bills Congress does approve are well designed for their purpose, are drawn with some attention to the technical, legal, and political niceties of the problem and generally emerge in a more satisfactory form than they began.

As a teacher of his people, the average Congressman leaves much to be desired. The gap between the reality of the situation the Nation faces and the public's understanding of it seems to be growing, not shrinking. This trend must be reversed if our Government is going to remain both representative and effective.

By now it must be obvious why so many men and women this fall are seeking to gain or retain membership in Congress.

The power and the pleasures of a Congressman's job are unique in the structure of American public offices. He is a key member of the small world of Washington influentials, sharing in the secrets and satisfactions that attend the management of the world's most powerful Nation.

He is also the protector of his people in their dealings with the Central Government and, frequently, the dispensing angel through whom that Government lavishes its gifts upon the land. He is able, in other words, to perform a great many services of great importance for people who are of personal concern to him.

Finally, he is, or can be if he wishes, a great source of wisdom to his people—an influence upon their thinking and upon their lives.

Because he is all of these things, he is also a very busy man—so busy, often, that he cannot do any of these jobs as well as he would like.

The second commonest remark on Capitol Hill is, "I don't know why I put up with this rat race." But the commonest one is: "I don't know anything I would rather be doing."

Mr. SCOTT subsequently said: Mr. President, in commentary upon the very interesting statement read by the distinguished majority leader, I note that he refers to the importance of moving forward with proposals for legislative reorganization pertaining, I assume, to the proposal, among others, to establish a congressional committee along the lines of the La Follette-Monroney Commission of 1945 and 1946.

I applaud the sentiment of the majority leader, and would like to add that this morning, in the Committee on Rules and Administration, attempts to secure hearings on that very bill and on others by myself and other members of the Committee on Rules and Administration were unsuccessful. Therefore I appeal to the majority leader to give us all the help he can in obtaining action on those measures, which he does well indeed to praise.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report of Overobligation of an Appropriation

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the overobligation of an appropriation in that Administration (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

Report of Board of Visitors to the U.S. Naval Academy

A letter from the Secretary to the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Naval Academy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, for the year 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Backlog of Pending Applications and Hearing Cases in Federal Communications Commission

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on backlog of pending applications and hearings cases in that Commission, as of March 31, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Amendment of Act Granting a Franchise to D.C. Transit System, Inc.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of July 24, 1956, granting a franchise to D.C. Transit System, Inc. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Project Proposal Under Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that the Hooper Irrigation Co. in Weber and Davis Counties, Utah, has applied for a loan under the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Amendment of Act Relating to Sale of Indian Timber

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 857, 25 U.S.C. 406, 407), with respect to the sale of Indian timber (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Maj. Warren G. Ward, Capt. Paul H. Beck, and 1st Lt. Russell K. Hansen

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Maj. Warren G. Ward, Capt. Paul H. Beck, and 1st Lt. Russell K. Hansen, U.S. Air Force (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Petitions To Classify Status of Certain Aliens for First Preference

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, petitions to classify status of certain aliens for first preference under the quota (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Concurrent Resolution 30

"Resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to appropriate sufficient funds to the U.S. Public Health Service to enable the Federal Government to match available local funds to the maximum extent possible under the provisions of the Hill-Burton Act

"Whereas one of America's greatest assets is the health of her people; and

"Whereas adequate hospital facilities are an essential prerequisite to the maintenance of a high level of health; and

"Whereas there is a shortage of hospital facilities and many existing hospital facilities are outmoded, poorly designed, and expensive to operate; and

"Whereas the Hill-Burton Act authorizes Federal grants for up to 50 percent of the cost of construction of hospital facilities; and

"Whereas congressional appropriations to carry out the purposes of the Hill-Burton Act have not been sufficient to meet the needs of those who qualify for Federal grants and, therefore, such grants are often less than the maximum allowed under the provisions of the Hill-Burton Act. Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Second Legislature of the State of Hawaii, general session of 1963, the House of Representatives concurring, That the Congress of the United States be, and is hereby requested to appropriate sufficient funds to the U.S. Public Health Service to enable maximum Federal grants under the provisions of the Hill-Burton Act; and be it further

"Resolved, That should the Hill-Burton Act be amended to cover alteration and modernization of existing hospital facilities, that the Congress of the United States be, and is hereby further requested to appropriate sufficient funds to enable maximum Federal grants for alteration and modernization of hospital facilities; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to Hawaii's delegation to the Congress of the United States.

"Nelson K. Doi,
"President of the Senate.
"Elmer Cravalho,
"Speaker, House of Representatives."

"Concurrent Resolution 32

"Whereas the Congress of the United States appropriated $175,000 through its accelerated public works program for the restoration of the City of Refuge National Historical Park on the island of Hawaii; and

"Whereas, pursuant to said appropriation, the Department of Interior through its National Park Services has begun the restoration of the historic trails and general area abounding the City of Refuge; and

"Whereas the appropriation is not sufficient to complete this important project which will preserve in living form a part of the history of these isles for the enlightenment and education of our citizens as well as visitors; and

"Whereas this project has also aided the economy of Kona and the State of Hawaii by providing employment to a great number of its citizens; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Second Legislature of the State of Hawaii, general session of 1963, the House of Representatives concurring, That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby respectfully requested to provide the additional appropriation necessary to complete the Federal accelerated public works program for the restoration of the City of Refuge National Historical Park on the island of Hawaii; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be sent to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the U.S. Senate, the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, and to the Senators from the State of Hawaii, the Honorable Hiram L. Fong and the Honorable Daniel K. Inouye, and to the Representatives from the State of Hawaii, the Honorable Thomas P. Gill and the Honorable Spark M. Matsunaga.

"Nelson K. Doi,
"President of the Senate.
"Elmer Cravalho,
"Speaker, House of Representatives."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Concurrent Resolution 26

"Resolution relating to the establishment of military bases and units on the neighbor islands

"Whereas the State of Hawaii has a major role in the economy and military strength of the United States; and

"Whereas there has tended to be a concentration of military bases and units on the island of Oahu, resulting in a potentially dangerous military situation and an imbalance in the overall economy of the State; and

"Whereas the continuing development of America as a Pacific power will require the growth of America's military power in Hawaii: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Second Legislature of the State of Hawaii, regular session of 1963 (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of Defense be, and are hereby respectfully requested to consider the establishment of appropriate defense installations on the islands of the State outside of Oahu, as such become feasible under general military planning; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate of the United States, to the Secretary of Defense, and to the Members of Hawaii's delegation to Congress of the United States.

"Nelson K. Doi,
"President of the Senate.
"Elmer C. Cravalho,
"Speaker of House of Representatives."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Senate of Pennsylvania Resolution 44

"Whereas the persistent enmity to religion of the Government of the Soviet Union is a matter of historical record; and

"Whereas within the narrow framework of permissible religious practices, discrimination against synagogues and against Jewish worshippers afflicts the devout Jews of Russia; and

"Whereas Jewish congregations of the U.S.S.R. are forbidden to organize a central body and are not allowed contacts with Jewish religious groups elsewhere; and

"Whereas Yiddish language institutions and the other instruments of Yiddish culture which were destroyed in the Stalin era have not been restored; and

"Whereas 46 leading Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, and Greek Orthodox clergymen of the United States have appealed to Chairman Nikita S. Khrushchev to end discriminations against Jews, their religion, and their culture; and

"Whereas both the United States and the Soviet Union have subscribed to the universal declaration of human rights; and

"Whereas article 18 of that declaration declares that, 'Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience, and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship, and observance;' and

"Whereas the State Department of the United States has on other occasions protested the infliction of such injustices upon minority groups in Russia and other lands: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Department of State be hereby respectfully memorialized to request of the Soviet Union that it grant to its Jewish citizens the right to freedom of worship; and be it further

"Resolved, That the President of the United States restate the position of the United States in opposition to these acts of discrimination against Jewish citizens and that he instruct the U.S. delegation to the United Nations to make known the sentiments expressed in this resolution in every possible manner; and be it further

"Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of the senate of the Commonwealth, to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Member of Congress from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and to the legislatures of the States of the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Chairman Nikita S. Khrushchev to indicate that the people of the United States deplore the antireligious attitude of the Soviet Union and the mistreatment of its Jewish subjects.

"MARK GRUELL, Jr.,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Public Works:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 12

"Resolution relative to Morro Bay Rock

"Whereas while title to Morro Bay Rock has been conveyed to the State by the Federal Government, the grant deed reserved to the United States the right to resume ownership, possession, and control, for Government purposes, of any of the property, at any time, without the consent of the State; and

"Whereas in view of this reservation of interest by the Federal Government, the State now has little control over Morro Bay Rock; and

"Whereas the U.S. Corps of Engineers is presently removing 80,000 tons of material from Morro Bay Rock for repair to a harbor jetty which is causing the disfiguration of its natural value; and

"Whereas in order that Morro Bay Rock can be preserved and protected as a point of scenic interest for all peoples it is imperative that the Federal Government convey its remaining interest to the State: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the Congress of the United States is respectfully requested to enact such legislation as may be necessary to convey the remaining interest of the United States in Morro Bay Rock to the State of California; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A letter from the city clerk of the city of Buffalo, N.Y., enclosing a resolution relating to the Fourth of July program in that city; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Harvey W. Seeds Post No. 29, Department of Florida, the American Legion, relative to the naming of the new Veterans' Hospital to be built in Miami, the Joe H. Adams Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A telegram in the nature of a petition, signed by D. R. Welch, of Roswell, N. Mex., relating to the location of the statue of Sequoyah; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. SYMINGTON (for himself and Mr. LONG of Missouri):

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Missouri; to the Committee on Finance:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 121

"Whereas the forests of this State constitute one of our most valuable and productive resources; and

"Whereas much of the progress in the development and utilization of this important resource in recent years has resulted directly from the capital gains treatment of timber under the Internal Revenue Code of the United States; and

"Whereas the substantial elimination of capital gains treatment for the owners of forest lands, in the manner now before the Congress of the United States, would seriously hamper the continued development of Missouri's timber industry; and

"Whereas the jobs of thousands of our citizens who depend directly or indirectly on our timber industry would be jeopardized: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the House of Representatives of the 72d Missouri General Assembly, That the Congress of the United States be respectfully petitioned and requested to consider the possible effects upon the economy and progress of a great segment of the State of Missouri in enacting any legislation affecting the tax treatment of timber; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the house send suitably prepared copies of this resolution to the Members of the Congress of the United States from Missouri."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Missouri; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 155

"Whereas Friday, May 3, 1963, has been designated Dr. Harlow Shapley Day in Carthage, a homecoming sponsored by the Carthage Evening Press and the Carthage Chamber of Commerce for Dr. Harlow Shapley, Paine professor emeritus, Harvard University; and

"Whereas Dr. Shapley was born November 2, 1885, on a farm in Barton County, Mo., and was graduated in 1907 from the Carthage Collegiate Institute, Carthage, Mo., and in 1910 from the University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.; and

"Whereas in the succeeding years, Dr. Shapley has conducted research into and otherwise probed the mysteries of space and time with such skill and devotion that he has earned the respect and admiration of men of science and letters throughout the world, having identified Shapley Center, the heart of the galaxy of which the planet earth is a part; and

"Whereas Dr. Shapley is among the first to offer logical reasons for belief that there is life elsewhere in the boundless universe; and

"Whereas Dr. Shapley has been titled with honorary degrees by 16 leading universities and otherwise lauded by institutions of higher learning throughout the world; and

"Whereas Dr. Shapley is an author and lecturer of note and an educator of the highest order, whose superior mind has delved into the realm of philosophy and theology with illuminating results; and

"Whereas Dr. Shapley is widely recognized as one of the great scientists of the ages; and

"Whereas Dr. Shapley is a member of a distinguished family of learned persons who have combined to bring honor, dignity and stature to their native State of Missouri through dedication to truth: Now, therefore be it

"Resolved, by the House of Representatives of the 72d General Assembly of Missouri, That Dr. Harlow Shapley be commended with deepest respect and most profound admiration as a native Missourian of the highest order, who has improved both the condition and stature of man and figuratively engraved the name of the State of Missouri upon the face of the heavens; and be it further

"Resolved, That the people of Carthage and of Jasper and Barton Counties be heartily commended for remembering this distinguished Missourian, this leading American, this inspiring citizen of earth, with a homecoming at the place of his origin; and that appropriately inscribed copies of this resolution be forwarded to President John F. Kennedy; to Missouri Members of the House and Senate of the 88th Congress of the United States; and to Dr. and Mrs. Harlow Shapley, Peterborough, N.H."

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] I ask unanimous consent that a concurrent resolution from the South Carolina Legislature memorializing the Congress of the United States to act favorably upon legislation exempting certain carriers from minimum rate regulation in the transportation of bulk commodities, agricultural and fishery products, and passengers, be printed in the RECORD and be referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Commerce as follows:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to act favorably upon legislation now before that body exempting certain carriers from minimum rate regulation in the transportation of bulk commodities, agricultural and fishery products, and passengers

Whereas the general assembly has been informed that legislation is now before the Congress of the United States which exempts certain carriers from minimum rate regulation in the transportation of bulk commodities, agricultural and fishery products and passengers; and

Whereas the enacting of this proposed legislation into law will serve as a tremendous stimulus to the agriculture of the State of South Carolina; and

Whereas the general assembly has learned that the Interstate Commerce Commission has alleviated the situation partially by allowing railroads to reduce rates on feed grains being shipped into the southeast under certain conditions; and

Whereas while the general assembly appreciates that the action of the Interstate Commerce Commission has gone a long way in correcting the situation, it believes that a truly satisfactory solution can only be reached by allowing the railroads, on a basis of free competition, to effect the lowest practicable freight on bulk shipments of feed grains to any part of the country; and

Whereas the general assembly believes that the proposals embodied in S. 1061 and H.R. 4700 will bring about the desired result and if enacted into law the sagging economy of the farmer will be rejuvenated: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate, the house of representatives concurring: That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to give favorable consideration to legislation now pending before that body which proposes to exempt certain carriers from minimum rate regulation in the transportation of bulk commodities, agricultural and fishery products, and passengers; and the general assembly has been informed that this legislation was introduced in the 1st session of the 88th Congress as S. 1061 and H.R. 4700; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the presiding officer of each House of the Congress, and to the two U.S. Senators and each Member of the House of Representatives of the Congress from South Carolina.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. **JORDAN** of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 30. Concurrent resolution to reprint copies of the committee print, 87th Congress, entitled "Part 1 of Concentration Ratios on Manufacturing Industry, 1958" (Rept. No. 169);

S. Con. Res. 37. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary of additional copies of a report and hearings on "State Department Security" issued by its Internal Security Subcommittee during the 87th Congress (Rept. No. 170); and

S. Res. 128. Resolution to provide additional funds for the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. **JORDAN** of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment:

S. Res. 131. Resolution to provide for "Documents on International Aspects of Exploration and Use of Outer Space" to be printed as Senate document (Rept. No. 171).

RETTA P. REYNOLDS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. **JORDAN** of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 139) to pay a gratuity to Retta P. Reynolds, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Retta P. Reynolds, widow of Clifford P. Reynolds, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to one year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

AUTHORITY FOR AN EMPLOYEE OF COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS TO COMPLY WITH A SUBPENA FOR DELIVERY OF CERTAIN DOCUMENTS TO U.S. ATTORNEY AT NEWARK, N.J.—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. **McCLELLAN**. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Government Operations, I report a resolution, which I send to the desk, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. Inouye in the chair). The resolution of the Senator from Arkansas will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 137) as follows:

Whereas the case of the *United States of America* v. *Anthony Provenzano,* criminal action numbered 429–60, is pending in the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey; and

Whereas the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations has in its possession, by virtue of Senate Resolution 255, section 5, 86th Congress, the records of the former Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field; and

Whereas the chief clerk, Ruth Young Watt, has received a subpena duces tecum from the U.S. attorney for the district of New Jersey for documents of the said former Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field to be used in connection with the aforementioned criminal proceedings; and

Whereas, by the privileges of the Senate of the United States, no document under the control and in the possession of the Senate of the United States can, by the mandate of processes of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession but by its permission; and

Whereas, by the privilege of the Senate and by rule XXX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no document shall be withdrawn from its files except by the order of the Senate: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the chief clerk, Ruth Young Watt, of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, is authorized to comply with the aforementioned subpena duces tecum for documents and shall deliver these documents in the possession of the said subcommittee to the U.S. attorney at Newark, N.J.

Mr. **McCLELLAN**. Mr. President, under rule XXX, the resolution would authorize the committee to make available to the U.S. attorney of New Jersey certain documents that we have in our files which are required by the U.S. attorney in the prosecution of a criminal case. It is a routine resolution, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

The resolution was considered and agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. **ELLENDER** (by request):

S. 1458. A bill to establish price supports and acreage allotments for cotton, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. **MAGNUSON** (by request):

S. 1459. A bill to authorize the President to proclaim regulations for preventing collisions at sea;

S. 1460. A bill to amend the provisions of title 14, United States Code, relating to the appointment, promotion, separation, and retirement of officers of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes;

S. 1461. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the President to take possession and assume control of transportation systems in time of national emergency;

S. 1462. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to strengthen and improve the national transportation system, by removal of the exemption applicable to forwarding of "used household goods";

S. 1463. A bill to amend section 14 of the Natural Gas Act in order to give the Federal Power Commission certain investigation authority with respect to the natural and artificial gas industry; and

S. 1464. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449), as amended, to incorporate in the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards the authority to make certain improvements of fiscal and administrative practices for more effective conduct of its research and development activities; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. **MUNDT**:

S. 1465. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from the manufacturers' excise tax certain automobiles furnished without charge to schools for use in driver training programs; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Mundt when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. **LONG** of Missouri (for himself, Mr. Kefauver, Mr. Dirksen, Mr. Ervin, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Hart, Mr. Scott, and Mr. Bayh):

S. 1466. A bill to provide for the right of persons to be represented by attorneys in matters before Federal agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Long of Missouri when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. **CARLSON**:

S. 1467. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the Hi–Y Movement of the Young Men's Christian Association; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service;

S. 1468. A bill for the relief of Balbir Singh Mathur; and

S. 1469. A bill for the relief of Gerald J. O'Connor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See remarks of Mr. Carlson when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 1470. A bill to amend section 409 of title 37 of the United States Code, to provide for payment for the costs of commercial transportation of trailers or mobile dwellings owned by members of the Armed Forces on the same basis as now authorized by law in the case of trailers or mobile dwellings owned by civilian Government officers and employees; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PEARSON:

S. 1471. A bill for the relief of Violeta V. Ortega, M.D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Missouri:

S. 1472. A bill to prohibit the manufacture for distribution in commerce or the importation into the United States of any motor vehicle which discharges substances into the air in amounts found by the Surgeon General to be dangerous to public health; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG of Missouri when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1473. A bill to amend section 8(b)(4) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 1474. A bill to prescribe administrative procedure for the government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and Mr. SMATHERS):

S. 1475. A bill to provide for the disposition of certain surplus real property situated in Dade County, Florida; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. HOLLAND when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HARTKE (for himself and Mr. BAYH):

S. 1476. A bill to provide for the establishment and administration of the Lincoln Trail Memorial Parkway in the States of Kentucky, Indiana, and Illinois, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. HARTKE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 1477. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain public lands in the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself and Mr. MOSS):

S. 1478. A bill to authorize the conveyance of two tracts of land situated in Salt Lake City, Utah, to the Board of Education of Salt Lake City; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CASE:

S. 1479. A bill for the relief of Dr. Demetrios Flessas and Dr. Eugenia Flessas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUCHEL:

S. 1480. A bill to provide credit or refund of self-employment tax in certain cases; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HRUSKA (for himself, Mr. CURTIS, and Mr. SIMPSON):

S. 1481. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Agate Fossil Beds National Monument in the State of Nebraska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. HRUSKA when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McGEE:

S. 1482. A bill to amend section 407 of the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. McGEE (for himself and Mr. SIMPSON):

S. 1483. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey certain lands in the State of Wyoming to the County of Laramie, Wyo.; to the Committee on Government Operations; and

S. 1484. A bill for the relief of Royce C. Plume, a member of the Arapahoe Tribe of Indians; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 1485. A bill for the relief of Brig. Gen. Fred C. Gray;

S. 1486. A bill for the relief of Capt. Terrell R. Woodmansee, U.S. Air Force;

S. 1487. A bill for the relief of Loong Ting;

S. 1488. A bill for the relief of Alessandro A. R. Cacace; and

S. 1489. A bill for the relief of J. Arthur Fields; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 1490. A bill to amend section 407 of the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. ELLENDER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 1491. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for certain expenses incurred by an individual in maintaining a foreign student as a member of his household; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ENGLE:

S. 1492. A bill for the relief of Adem Dukovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FONG:

S. 1493. A bill for the relief of Elma Joan Saunders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 1494. A bill to protect the rights secured to individuals under the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

PROTECTION OF SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS IN COOPERATIVE ADVERTISING

Mr. McGEE (for himself, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. CANNON, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. PROUTY, and Mr. BEALL) submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 39) relating to the protection of small business concerns in cooperative advertising, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. McGEE, which appears under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

INTEGRITY OF NATIONS OF THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Senators CASE, DOUGLAS, KEATING, KUCHEL, PASTORE, PROUTY, SALTONSTALL, SCOTT, ALLOTT, DOMINICK, and WILLIAMS of New Jersey) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 134) favoring agreements with certain foreign governments looking to the independence and integrity of nations of the Middle East, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. JAVITS, which appears under a separate heading.)

FAVORING AN AGREEMENT AMONG STATES OF THE NEAR EAST PROHIBITING THE PRODUCTION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS AND OFFENSIVE MISSILES

Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HART, Mr. CLARK, Mr. McCARTHY, and Mr. MORSE) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 135) favoring an agreement among States of the Near East prohibiting the production of nuclear weapons and offensive missiles, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. HUMPHREY, which appears under a separate heading.)

ESTABLISHMENT OF A SELECT COMMITTEE TO STUDY RAILROAD FINANCING

Mr. HARTKE (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. GRUENING) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 136) establishing a select committee to study railroad financing, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. HARTKE, which appears under a separate heading.)

AUTHORITY FOR AN EMPLOYEE OF COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS TO COMPLY WITH A SUBPENA FOR DELIVERY OF CERTAIN DOCUMENTS TO U.S. ATTORNEY AT NEWARK, N.J.

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 137) to authorize an employee of the Committee on Government Operations' subcommittee to comply with a subpena for delivery of certain documents to U.S. attorney at Newark, N.J., which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. McCLELLAN, which appears under a separate heading.)

SMALL BUSINESS AND THE EFFECTS OF ANTITRUST LAWS

Mr. HUMPHREY submitted a resolution (S. Res. 138) relative to small business and the effects of antitrust laws, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. HUMPHREY, which appears under a separate heading.)

RETTA P. REYNOLDS

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 139) to pay a gratuity to Retta

P. Reynolds, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

PROCLAMATION RELATING TO REGULATIONS FOR PREVENTING COLLISIONS AT SEA

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the President to proclaim regulations for preventing collisions at sea. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, requesting the proposed legislation, together with a rule-by-rule analysis, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1459) to authorize the President to proclaim regulations for preventing collisions at sea, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and analysis presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, April 8, 1963.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is enclosed a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the President to proclaim regulations for preventing collisions at sea."

The purpose of the proposed bill is to authorize the President to proclaim the international regulations for preventing collisions at sea, 1960, on or after a date established by the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization.

The proposed regulations were formulated at the Fourth International Conference on Safety of Life at Sea, 1960, which met under the auspices of the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization at London, England, from May 17 to June 17, 1960. This Conference was held with the objective of drafting a convention which would reflect the technical progress in navigation and shipbuilding since 1948, particularly as regards radar and nuclear vessels, and to consider needed changes to existing rules. The Conference decided not to annex to the Convention the revised international regulations for preventing collisions at sea. Instead, the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization (IMCO) was invited to forward the international regulations for preventing collisions at sea, 1960, to the governments which have accepted the present regulations. The Conference also invited IMCO, when substantial unanimity has been reached as to the acceptance of the revised regulations, to fix a date on and after which they shall be applied by the governments which have agreed to accept them. IMCO was requested to give not less than 1 year's notice of this date to the governments of all States. (Final Act of the International Conference on Safety of Life at Sea, 1960; S. Doc. Ex. K, 87th Cong., 1st sess., pp. 9–11.)

Pursuant to the proposed bill the President would be authorized to accept, on behalf of the United States, the revised international regulations and to proclaim an effective date, so far as the United States is concerned, consistent with that established by the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization. Existing regulations for preventing collisions involving watercraft upon the high seas, and in all waters connected therewith would be repealed upon the coming into effect of the international regulations for preventing collisions at sea, 1960, when proclaimed by the President. However, the proposed bill would not repeal or otherwise change existing navigation rules applicable to harbors, rivers, inland waters of the United States, the Great Lakes of North America, or the Red River of the North and the rivers emptying into the Gulf of Mexico.

Section 1 of the proposed bill would authorize the President, on behalf of the United States, to proclaim the international regulations for preventing collisions at sea, 1960, on or after the date fixed by the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization for application of such regulations by governments which have agreed to accept them. Such regulations shall thereafter have effect as if enacted by statute, and shall be followed by all public and private vessels of the United States and by all aircraft of U.S. registry to the extent therein made applicable. However, they shall not apply to waters of the United States governed by the inland rules, the Great Lakes rules, or the western rivers rules, nor shall they apply to aircraft on any territorial waters of the United States.

Section 2 of the proposed bill would reenact the provisions of section 2 of the act of October 11, 1951, 65 Stat. 406, in order to retain the authority of the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Treasury to exempt vessels of the Navy and Coast Guard, respectively, from application of regulations pertaining to the number, position, range of visibility, or arc of visibility of navigational lights, whenever the special construction of such vessels makes it impossible to comply with such regulations.

Section 3 of the proposed bill provides for the repeal of the act of October 11, 1951, on the date the regulations authorized to be proclaimed by the present bill become effective. In effect this would repeal the existing international rules for preventing collisions at sea, 1948, as of that date.

Section 4 of the proposed bill sets forth verbatim the international regulations for preventing collisions at sea, 1960 (annex E to the final act of the International Conference on Safety of Life at Sea, 1960).

It may be noted in passing that the revised regulations as a substantial improvement in many respects over those now in force, and that no changes were made which may be considered as degrading any rule from the standpoint of safety of navigation. The most significant change made concerned conduct in restricted visibility. A new rule 16(c) was adopted to provide for safe navigation by a vessel which detects another vessel outside of visual or audible range. Though not mentioning radar specifically, this rule—when considered together with the preliminary paragraphs to part C and the annex to the entitled "Recommendations on the Use of Radar Information as an Aid to Avoiding Collisions at Sea"—resolves several important questions which presently exist concerning a vessel navigating with the aid of radar.

Other changes of interest are: Vessels are defined by their length rather than by tonnage; the use of a white light synchronized with the prescribed whistle signals is permitted; requirements for special lights for ships unable to get out of the way of approaching vessels because of the nature of their work were extended to ships replenishing at sea and ships engaged in the launching or recovery of aircraft; a new provision was added concerning lights and shapes for minesweeping vessels; rule 17, the sailing rule, was rewritten so as to cover two instead of three situations, as follows: (a) When each vessel has the wind on a different side, the one which has the wind on the port side shall keep out of the way of the other and (b) when both vessels have the wind on the same side, the one which is to windward shall keep out of the way of the one which is to leeward; rule 22 was strengthened to require that a vessel which is directed by these rules to keep out of the way of another vessel shall, so far as possible, take positive early action to comply with this obligation; a new rule was added requiring that in a narrow channel a power-driven vessel of less than 65 feet in length shall not hamper the safe passage of a vessel which can navigate only inside such channel; a requirement that a tug and tow carry a prescribed shape in daylight was adopted; specific authorization was provided for the permissive use of navigation lights in daylight in restricted visibility; a definition of "engaged in fishing" was added to include fishing with nets, lines, or trawls but not fishing with trolling lines; and the permissive use of colored masthead identity lights by sailing vessels was authorized.

A rule-by-rule analysis of those rules in which the 1960 conference made changes and a parallel-column print of the present rules and the revised international rules are attached.

It would be appreciated if you would lay the proposed bill before the Senate. A similar proposed bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

RULE-BY-RULE ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED CHANGES OF THE INTERNATIONAL REGULATIONS FOR PREVENTING COLLISIONS AT SEA

The parts of the rules were reclassified from the present parts A–D to parts A–F. Part A—Preliminary and Definitions (rule 1); part B—Lights and Shapes (rule 2–14); part C—Sound Signals and Conduct in Restricted Visibility (rules 15 and 16); part D—Steering and Sailing Rules (rules 17–27); part E—Sound Signals for Vessels in Sight of One Another (rule 28); and part F—Miscellaneous (rules 29–31).

Rule 1: Subsection (b) makes provision for the optional display of lights prescribed by the rules during daylight hours in restricted visibility and in all circumstances when deemed necessary. Subsection (c) (vii) redefines "length and breadth of a vessel" and the use of tonnage as an admeasurement was eliminated. Accordingly, the definition of "tons" was deleted. This effected changes in rules 7, 9, and 15, in addition to the definitions found in this rule. Subsection (c) (ix) adds a definition of "in sight" and provides that the term means visual observation. Subsection (c) (xiv) defines "engaged in fishing" and specifies that the term does not include vessels fishing with trolling lines.

Rule 2: This rule is unchanged except that the term "white light" replaces "bright white light," and to accord with present-day practice the rule refers to degrees with reference to points of the compass.

Rule 3: This rule has been rewritten to eliminate the exemption of towing vessels from the requirements of carrying the range light specified in rule 2(a) (ii) and to provide that length of tow will be the only criterion for the carriage of the third white light specified by the rule. A new provision concerning the display of day signals by tug and tow when the length of the tow exceeds 600 feet has been added.

Rule 4: This rule has been amplified and prescribes special lights and day signals for a vessel engaged in replenishment at sea or in launching or recovering aircraft. A provision prescribing lights and day signals and providing danger area for a vessel engaged in minesweeping operations has been added.

Rule 5: Sections (b) and (d) of this rule are new. Section (b) authorizes the display of special lights by a sailing vessel and section (d) requires a towed vessel to carry a day signal.

Rule 6: This rule has been changed slightly by the deletion of the phrase "in small vessels" to provide that all vessels unable to fix the green or red sidelights due to bad weather or other cause shall exhibit portable lights.

Rule 7: This rule has been rewritten to define vessel categories by length rather than tonnage. A provision prescribing lights for power-driven vessels under 65 feet in length when towing has been added. Provision has been for the display of smaller day signals by vessels and boats referred to in this rule.

Rule 8: This rule was revised and simplified and is substantially the same as the existing rule 8.

Rule 9: This rule has been completely rewritten to require vessels engaged in trawling to show a distinctive signal consisting of a green light over white visible all round the horizon and vessels engaged in other types of fishing to show a red light over white and to require the showing of a stern light. A new provision concerning lights on vessels with outlying gear extending more than 500 feet has been added. A new provision has been added permitting the use of the searchlight beam to warn approaching vessels as well as a flare-up light or working lights as now provided and a new day signal has been provided for vessels engaged in fishing. Attention is directed to the note that vessels fishing with trolling lines are not "engaged in fishing" as defined in rule 1(c)(xiv).

Rule 10: This rule has been changed slightly to eliminate the requirement that the stern light be carried as nearly as practicable on the same level as the sidelights.

Rule 11: This rule changes the existing rule to permit vessels of less than 150 feet in length to show a second white anchor light in the position prescribed in section (b).

Rule 12: No changes have been introduced into this rule.

Rule 13: The discretionary powers authorized under the existing rule in respect to rules made by governments have been amplified to include "fishing vessels engaged in fishing as a fleet." The provision for "recognition signals adopted by shipowners, which have been authorized by their respective governments" has been deleted.

Rule 14: This rule changes the existing rule by providing that the day signal for a vessel proceding under sail when also being propelled by machinery shall be displayed "point downwards" instead of "point upwards."

Rules 15 and 16 were made a separate part of the rules and denominated as "Part C—Sound Signals and Conduct in Restricted Visibility." Attention is drawn to the preliminary paragraphs to part C in regard to the obligation of a vessel possessing radar information to conform strictly with the rules and the use of radar as an aid to avoiding collisions.

Rule 15: The substance of existing rule 15 has been retained but the rule was rewritten to define vessel categories by length rather than tonnage. Subsection (b)(viii) of this rule is new and provides signals to be given by a vessel engaged in fishing when underway or at anchor and when fishing with trolling lines and underway. A new provision has been added permitting a power-driven pilot vessel to sound an identity signal.

Rule 16: This rule is unchanged except that a new provision has been added prescribing that "a power-driven vessel which detects the presence of another vessel forward of her beam before hearing her fog signal or sighting her visually may take early and substantial action to avoid a close-quarters situation but, if this cannot be avoided, she shall, so far as the circumstances of the case admit, stop her engines in proper time to avoid collision and then navigate with caution until danger of collision is over."

The existing preliminary to the steering and sailing rules have been retained and an important new provision has been added as paragraph 4. This provides that rules 17 to 24 apply only to vessels in sight of one another.

Rule 17: This rule, the sailing rule, has been rewritten to give recognition to the fact that most sailing vessels today are fore and aft rigged. The rule provides that when each has the wind on a different side, the vessel which has the wind on the port side shall keep out of the way of the other and, when both have the wind on the same side, the vessel which is to windward shall keep out of the way of the vessel which is to leeward.

Rule 18: No changes have been introduced into this rule.

Rule 19: No changes have been introduced into this rule.

Rule 20: Rule 20(b) has been renumbered as 20(c). A new rule 20(b) has been inserted to limit in narrow channels the right of way given to sailing vessels under rule 20(a).

Rule 21: No changes have been introduced into this rule.

Rule 22: This rule has been amplified and prescribes that "every vessel which is directed to keep out of the way of another vessel shall, so far as possible, take positive early action to comply with this obligation, * * *."

Rule 23: No changes have been introduced into this rule.

Rule 24: No important changes have been introduced into this rule.

Rule 25: This rule has been changed slightly for purposes of clarity. A new provision has been added to require that "power-driven vessels of less than 65 feet in length in a narrow channel shall not hamper the safe passage of a vessel which can navigate only inside such channel."

Rule 26: This rule changes the existing rule by exempting vessels to which the provisions of rule 4 apply.

Rule 27: No changes have been introduced into this rule.

Rule 28: This rule has been changed to permit the use of a light synchronized with the whistle signals prescribed or permitted by the rule.

Rule 29: No changes have been introduced into this rule.

Rule 30: No changes have been introduced into this rule.

Rule 31: The substance of the existing rule has been retained and three new distress signals have been authorized. Attention is drawn to the note in regard to the radio telegraph alarm which has been changed to authorize the use of the radio telegraph alarm to secure attention to distress calls and messages.

Rule 32: The existing rule was deleted as having served its purpose.

Annex to the rules: The annex is attached to the rules immediately following rule 31 and contains eight recommendations as a guide to the mariner on the use of radar information as an aid to avoiding collisions at sea.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 14, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO OFFICERS OF THE COAST GUARD

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the provisions of title 14, United States Code, relating to the appointment, promotion, separation, and retirement of officers of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, requesting the proposed legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1460) to amend the provisions of title 14, United States Code, relating to the appointment, promotion, separation, and retirement of officers of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter presented to Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, April 5, 1963.

The Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is submitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill to amend the provisions of title 14, United States Code, relating to the appointment, promotion, separation, and retirement of officers of the Coast Guard.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to establish a new officer promotion system in the Coast Guard and to alleviate the present stagnation in promotion in certain grades.

The immediate necessity for the proposed legislation is caused by the present severe stagnation in promotion to the grade of commander. Promotions to that grade have already been retarded to almost the 19th year of service. A similar retardation in the time of promotion is now starting in the grade of captain. It will soon extend to other grades.

The immediate cause of this promotion stagnation is the wartime created hump, consisting of the large group of officers who entered the service during World War II. The passage of this group into the grade of commander has been the apparent cause of the slowing of promotions. The basic cause, however, is the fact that present Coast Guard laws provide no effective means of forcing attrition. Because of this it has not been possible to take corrective action to reduce the size of the hump and speed up promotions. Without means of forcing attrition, the stagnation caused by the hump is expected shortly to result in a severe morale problem, ineffective utilization of manpower, and reduction in the efficiency of the service.

The proposed legislation is necessary not only to prevent such results and solve this immediate problem but also to prevent similar situations in the future. With the increasing complexity of Coast Guard duties and the expanding emphasis on science and technology, it is imperative that the service have a more flexible and capable officer career management program. The promotion system contained in this legislation will be the foundation for such a program. It will enable the Coast Guard to establish and maintain a career promotion pattern which will attract and retain the officers of high quality needed to carry out the service's varied duties. It will result in a more dynamic officer corps and a more efficient service.

Briefly, the proposal provides for the adoption by the Coast Guard of a promotion system similar to the one presently in use by the Navy and Marine Corps. It is also comparable to the uniform system being proposed for the Department of Defense.

The proposal would substitute selection and promotion of only the best-qualified officers for the present modified seniority system under which all qualified officers are promoted. Officers who are not selected for promotion would be separated from the service. Control of attrition and promotion flow would be accomplished by control of the size of the promotion zones in relation to expected vacancies and by the use of boards to screen officers of certain categories for continuation on active duty.

The proposal provides for retirement of captains upon completion of 30 years service, elimination of the present dual temporary-permanent promotion system, simplification of the appointment procedures, and adoption of new methods for separating officers who are below standard or otherwise unfit. Additionally, temporary authority is provided to selectively retire some officers now serving in the grade of commander and captain in order to reduce the size of the hump and facilitate the transition to the proposed promotion system.

There is attached a memorandum explaining in more detail the need for and nature of this proposal. A detailed sectional analysis of the proposed bill is also attached.

The enactment of this proposed legislation would involve an additional expenditure of funds in an amount of less than one-half of 1 percent of present Coast Guard funding requirements.

It would be appreciated if you would lay the proposed bill before the Senate. A similar bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

CONTROL BY THE PRESIDENT OF TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS IN TIME OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the President to take possession and assume control of transportation systems in time of national emergency. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, requesting the proposed legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1461) to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the President to take possession and assume control of transportation systems in time of national emergency, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, April 12, 1963.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation "To amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the President to take possession and assume control of transportation systems in time of national emergency."

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for the 88th Congress. The Bureau of the Budget advises that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Air Force has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

Sections 4742 and 9742 of title 10, United States Code, now provide as follows:

"SEC. 4742. CONTROL OF TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS IN TIME OF WAR

"In time of war, the President, through the Secretary of the Army, may take possession and assume control of all or part of any system of transportation to transport troops, war material, and equipment, or for other purposes related to the emergency. So far as necessary, he may use the system to the exclusion of other traffic."

Section 9742 is identical to section 4742, except that the President will take the action "through the Secretary of the Air Force."

The purpose of the proposed legislation, as attached hereto, is to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to the authorities contained in these two sections. The amendment would simplify the code in relation thereto and expand the discretionary power now contained in sections 4742 and 9742 to include times of "national emergency." To that end, the proposed legislation would repeal sections 4742 and 9742 of title 10, United States Code, and add a section 2634 to chapter 157 of title 10.

This legislative proposal is needed to fill a gap in the present statutory authority available to the President for taking possession or assuming control of any system of transportation, or any part thereof, for military purposes. Sections 4742 and 9742 of title 10 vest this authority in the President only in time of war. The need for such authority may be as great or greater in conditions of national emergency short of war. It is apparent that extremely grave military situations could arise in a matter of hours which would require the exercise of this authority to muster surface transportation and to augment the military airlift with civil airlift without regard to whether a state of war exists. In fact, prompt action in conditions short of war may act to avert a state of war.

Submission of this proposal at this time is not related to any existing transportation systems dispute and in no way signifies any intention of taking over transportation systems under present conditions. As in the case of an identical proposal submitted last year, it is designed merely to modernize existing authority and make it operative during a period of national emergency should future circumstances so require.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

It is not possible to estimate the additional costs which may result from the enactment of the proposed legislation. It is conceivable that international incidents may occur in the future with the resultant additional costs to the Government.

Sincerely,

NEIL E. HARLAN,
Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

STRENGTHENING AND IMPROVEMENT OF NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, by request, a bill which would remove the exemption applicable to freight forwarders of used household goods.

I ask unanimous consent that the memorandums in support of it, prepared by the American Movers Conference, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the memorandums will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1462) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to strengthen and improve the national transportation system, by removal of the exemption applicable to forwarding of used household goods, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The memorandum presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

BILL TO REMOVE THE EXEMPTION OF USED HOUSEHOLD GOODS FROM THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 402(b) OF THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

MEMORANDUM EXPLAINING PROPOSED BILL

Explanation of need for the proposed bill

The transportation by motor vehicle of used household goods in interstate commerce has been regulated since 1935. When the Freight Forwarder Act was passed in 1942, the preponderance of household goods shipments moved by motor common carrier. The volume of household goods forwarding at that time was too inconsequential to warrant legislation. In recent years, the development of containerization and its application to the transportation of used household goods has had a vast impact upon both the manner of shipment and competitive relationships within the industry. Today, a substantial volume of household goods shipments are handled by forwarders in so-called door-to-door container service. Instead of loading individual articles of furniture into a motorvan, transporting the shipment by motorvan to destination (or to a port in the case of an oversea shipment where the goods are packed into a sea van for water transportation), household goods shipments moving by this mode are packed in containers in the home, shipments are consolidated, forwarded by rail, motor, or water carrier to destination, then unpacked from the same container at destination. Use of the container mode has grown to the point where the preponderance of oversea shipments of used household goods are handled in this manner.

With the advent of containerization, there has developed an industry of freight forwarders of used household goods who specialize in this mode and who have been successful in diverting considerable traffic from certificated motor common carriers of household goods. Such forwarders employ the services of regulated rail, motor, and water carriers and compete with motor common carriers of household goods with respect to rates and service. Regulation of this activity, therefore, is needed in the public interest.

In addition to persons who engage exclusively in forwarding of used household goods, motor common carriers of household goods also function as forwarders of such shipments. Many motor common carriers of household goods provide door-to-door container service as a part of their carrier operations.

It is believed that the scheme of regulation to be imposed, particularly as regards entry into this business, should not impede its natural growth and development. The regulation proposed by this activity would take account of the special nature of household goods shipments and existing competitive relationships.

Repeal of this 402(b)(2) exemption was recommended in the annual reports of the Interstate Commerce Commission for the years 1951 through 1955, and supported in principle by the Interstate Commerce Commission in testimony presented on S. 2560 to the Senate Surface Transportation Subcommittee on April 24, 1962.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE PROPOSED BILL

Section 1 of the bill would remove the exemption of "used household goods" from the provisions of section 402(b) of the Interstate Commerce Act. In consequence of the removal of this exemption, the provisions of part IV of the Interstate Commerce Act become applicable to freight forwarders of used household goods, except as otherwise provided in the bill.

Section 2 of the bill would amend section 406(g) of the Interstate Commerce Act to direct the Commission in prescribing regulations and practices of household goods forwarders to consider the similarities of service provided by motor carriers of household goods. This direction recognizes the close relationship between these two activities.

Section 3 of the bill would amend section 410 of the act to provide for the issuance of a permit to operate as a freight forwarder of used household goods to any person found by the Commission to be fit, willing, and able properly to perform the service proposed. Subparagraph (c)(1) would be amended to enable a motor common carrier of household goods to qualify as a freight forwarder of used household goods. Since many such carriers are now functioning as forwarders, this provision is required to enable them to perform the same service they have in the past.

Under the proposed new subparagraph (c)(2), permits for fowarders of used household goods are to be of a 3-year duration and renewable every third year. Both original and renewal applications must be accompanied by a fee of $50. Neither a "grandfather" clause nor a finding of public need is deemed necessary for the effective regulation of this activity. More stringent entry control would tend to prefer those who have initiated token operations. Many persons have operated as freight forwarders of used household goods only sporadically, but unless they are allowed to qualify for a permit upon a showing of fitness, they will lose business to competitors and be unable to serve their customers as they have in the past. Such a loss or redistribution of business is not intended. A "savings clause" is included for the interim operations of those forwarders of used household goods who are engaged in operations on the effective date of enactment of this legislation and who make application for permit within 120 days after date of such enactment.

Section 4 of the bill would amend section 410(e) of the act to make the provisions of that section inapplicable to freight forwarders of used household goods. In order to afford forwarders of used household goods the flexibility which their operations require, permits to be issued would contain no territorial restrictions. This provision is intended to effectuate this objective.

Section 5 of the bill would amend section 411(c) of the Interstate Commerce Act to enable a motor common carrier or a director, officer, employee or agent of such carrier to control, acquire control, or hold stock in a freight forwarder of used household goods. Again, this provision is needed to protect the position of carriers or carrier personnel who have acquired a stock interest in a freight forwarder of used household goods.

INVESTIGATIVE AUTHORITY FOR FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION WITH RESPECT TO THE NATURAL AND ARTIFICIAL GAS INDUSTRY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 14 of the Natural Gas Act in order to give the Federal Power Commission certain investigation authority with respect to the natural and artificial gas industry. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, requesting the proposed legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1463) to amend section 14 of the Natural Gas Act in order to give the Federal Power Commission certain investigation authority with respect to the natural and artificial gas industry, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am transmitting herewith for the consideration of the appropriate committee of the Senate 20 copies of a draft bill to amend section 14(a) of the Natural Gas Act so as to give the Commission broad powers to conduct investigations and collect information with respect to the gas industry similar to those now conferred upon it with respect to the electric industry by section 311 of the Federal Power Act. This proposal was included among those advocated by the President in his special message to the Congress of March 14, 1962, on protecting consumer interest. Bills identical to our present proposal (S. 3343 and H.R. 12011) were introduced into the 87th Congress to accomplish this purpose.

While the Federal Power Act gives this Commission direct regulatory authority only over the transmission or sale for resale of electric power or energy in interstate commerce (an authority analogous to that afforded the Commission over the interstate transportation and sale of gas for resale by the Natural Gas Act), the Federal Power Act in section 311 gives the Commission the additional responsibility for collecting and publishing comprehensive factual information as to all facets of the power industry. This authority, not expressly provided in the Natural Gas Act, has permitted the Commission, without encroaching upon the jurisdiction of any other Federal or State agency responsibility in the area, to gather and publish valuable statistical data, not otherwise freely available, of interest alike to the industry, interested Federal or State agencies, and the consumers of the Nation. Thus we have long published an annual compilation of typical bills for household electric rates, as well as statistics as to the relative efficiency of steam-electric plants. These publications have aroused considerable general interest, and have served as a most effective instrument in spotlighting out-of-line rates and stimulating better technical performance by the power industry with resulting benefits to the consumers. We believe that a similar program could be equally effective in encouraging progress at all levels of the natural gas industry.

The Commission's existing authority under the Natural Gas Act to secure information directly related to the performance of its duties under the act is quite extensive. However, in the absence of any provision in the Natural Gas Act paralleling that provided in section 311 of the Federal Power Act, we have not felt free to engage in any general program for the collection and publication of statistical information of the sort presently undertaken in the power field. Nor, in the absence of such a program, is there any other convenient public source of such information. Thus we have found that there is little available information as to the gas prices paid nationally by the various types of consumers or even as to the extent to which the refunds we have directed interstate pipelines subject to our jurisdiction to pass on to their distributor customers have in turn been passed on to the ultimate consumers. Ad hoc efforts to secure this information in connection with our activities or in response to inquiries by the public, including the Congress and the courts, has, in the absence of established techniques for gathering and reporting data, proven to be time-consuming and inadequate.

The Commission is aware that any such informational program, if not carefully developed and operated, might involve the expenditure of effort and expense on the part of the reporting entities and the Commission, itself, not commensurate with the end results. We believe, however, that it is generally recognized that our efforts in the power field have been of great value to all elements of the industry as well as the public. And, to insure against unnecessary duplication of effort, we have specifically provided in our proposed legislation that, insofar as practicable, the Commission shall utilize the services, studies, reports, and investigational programs of existing agencies of the Federal and State governments, and of the natural gas industry. Moreover, the bill expressly provides that nothing contained therein should be construed as affecting the investigatory or regulatory activities of any other agency of the Federal Government and it goes without saying that the grant of this additional informational responsibility to the Commission would no more extend its regulatory authority over the natural gas industry to areas beyond that which presently exists than does the existing informational authority of the Federal Power Act.

We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that the enactment of this proposal would be in accord with the program of the President.

Respectfully,
JOSEPH C. SWIDLER,
Chairman.

IMPROVEMENT OF FISCAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICES OF THE NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449), as amended, to incorporate in the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards the authority to make certain improvements of fiscal and administrative practices for more effective conduct of its research and development activities. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, requesting the proposed legislation, together with a statement of the purpose and need for the legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1464) to amend the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449), as amended, to incorporate in the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards the authority to make certain improvements of fiscal and administrative practices for more effective conduct of its research and development activities introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and statement, presented by Mr. MAGNUSON, are as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., April 4, 1963.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There are enclosed four copies of a proposed bill "To amend the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449) as amended, to incorporate in the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards the authority to make certain improvements of fiscal and administrative practices for more effective conduct of its research and development activities.

There are also enclosed four copies of a statement of purpose and need for the proposed bill.

We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

C. D. MARTIN, Jr.
(For Luther H. Hodges, Secretary of Commerce).

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED

The proposed amendments to the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards would permit the following:

1. Appropriation of funds to remain available beyond 1 fiscal year.

2. Transfer of appropriations from other agencies and merger with appropriations of the National Bureau of Standards.

3. Discretionary expenditure from undesignated gifts and bequests to aid and facilitate the work of the Bureau.

4. Performing services for international organizations and governments of friendly countries and their national laboratories.

The Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards is the act of March 3, 1901, as amended (31 Stat. 1449; 15 U.S.C. 271–278e). The functions and authorities of that act are lodged in the Secretary of Commerce by the act of July 22, 1950 (64 Stat. 371). The bill proposes to add new sections 16 and 17, as well as paragraphs (c) and (d) to section 11 and a new sentence to section 3. The intent of and need for each amendment are explained in the following paragraphs.

SECTION 16. APPROPRIATION AVAILABILITY

The proposed section 16 would provide statutory authorizations for appropriations for the Bureau to be on a multiple year basis or to be without fiscal year limitation. The final determination whether to limit the availability of an appropriation is made when the Congress acts on the appropriation bill, but an appropriation bill providing for a departure from single-year availability would be subject to a point of order if an authorizing statute had not previously been enacted. The proposed legislation is, therefore, merely a first step that must be taken before the question of extended appropriation availability can be raised with the appropriations committees.

Almost all research and development appropriations for other agencies are provided as "no year" funds, available until expended. Their justification is found in the uncertainties inherent in research programs, the high incidence of unpredictable factors that compel readjustment of program activity, and the need for flexibility to permit prompt response to changed circumstances. It is probably not necessary to present a detailed discussion of the reasons for appropriating research funds on a no-year basis, but a summary of some of the pertinent NBS situations may be helpful.

1. Problems of obtaining or developing essential equipment or recruiting essential scientists will often delay implementation of an initial stage of a research project. If the funds budgeted for that first stage are available only for one fiscal year and cannot be used that year, they are lost to the project and must be replaced in the succeeding year by all or part of the funds programed for the second stage of the project. If the funds could be carried over from the first year, at least some of the lost time might be made up by a doubling up of effort during the second year.

2. The opportunities to hire high-potential scientists and engineers frequently arise at the most inopportune time in the budget cycle. Because the academic year closes at about the same time as the fiscal year, recruitment commitments are often needed just at the time when appropriation requests are being considered by the Congress. The uncertainty about appropriation levels frequently prevents timely recruitment commitments. If appropriations could be carried forward to the succeeding year, funds could be set aside to assure the financing of the new staff members long enough to permit other adjustments in the succeeding appropriation if that becomes necessary.

3. The rigid deadline on availability of funds often induces a premature decision concerning initiation of a task or purchase of equipment because postponement of the decision means the loss of the funds and thus elimination of the task or purchase.

4. Program expansions, especially in times of recruiting difficulty, involve problems of budgeting that are aggravated by the single-year availability of funds. It would be much more efficient and desirable to budget for the first 12 months or first full stage of a research project, even though this would cross over into a second fiscal year.

It is also very desirable to have appropriations for construction, plant improvement, and major equipment items available without fiscal year limitation. Many such projects are carried out by Bureau personnel and it is quite important that the funds be available for the entire cost of a project before it is initiated.

SECTION 17. FUND TRANSFERS

Section 17 would permit the transfer into National Bureau of Standards appropriations of research and development funds appropriated for other agencies, when the Secretary of Commerce determines that the purpose of the other agency's appropriation can best be achieved by the National Bureau of Standards. The concurrence of the head of the other agency and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget would be required.

The need for a contingency fund for research and development programs has long been evident. Scientific activities involve an exploration for new ideas, a seeking for new solutions, a search for new understanding of physical laws. The new ideas, the radical innovations, the scientific or engineering breakthroughs do not appear in a steady stream. They occur intermittently, often without warning, and they usually carry with them a large price tag for adequate exploitation or application. Experience has shown, therefore, that prompt and full use of the results of research cannot be achieved by waiting for the next regular cycle of the budget process.

In order to be able to take advantage of new ideas or developments as quickly as possible, the Department of Defense has had for a number of years an emergency fund which may be transferred into research and development appropriations. On several occasions the Department of Defense has recognized that a research success at the National Bureau of Standards should be exploited promptly or that the Bureau could best undertake to explore the application of new knowledge in a particular field. These were precisely the sort of emergency needs that the emergency fund was set up to cover, but that fund is available for transfer only among Defense appropriations. The result was that emergency funds were provided to one of the Defense agencies who then contracted with the National Bureau of Standards to initiate the work. Since such tasks are rarely completed in 1 year, the Bureau in turn was faced with the task of budgeting for succeeding years, usually as a major increase within a minor total increase.

The proposed legislation would parallel the present arrangement for the use of the emergency fund within the Department of Defense. It would permit any research and development appropriation, or any procurement or production appropriation involving research, to be the source of transfers to the National Bureau of Standards appropriation. It is based on two premises:

1. The ready exploitation of research results is as desirable in a civilian agency as in the military.

2. The National Bureau of Standards must improve its ability to respond to the needs of the major beneficiaries of its research and technical services.

One of the most troublesome problems facing the Bureau is the problem of closer coupling with the major Federal programs that are so closely tied to an advancing technology. The content of the Bureau's work is closely related to the programs of the Defense agencies, the civilian space agency, the Atomic Energy Commission, and such other users of technology as the Federal Aviation Agency. But the Bureau's resources are so inadequate with regard to the modern demands upon the Bureau that none of the necessary flexibility of programing is possible.

The Bureau is a primary producer of the basic physical data which the major Federal programs devour. The Bureau is the keystone in the structure of a technological economy, a technological military machine, and a technological society. We cannot expect the large Federal agencies to do their jobs efficiently and effectively if they must rely on an undermanned National Bureau of Standards for essential data and services. We cannot continue to pour hundreds of millions of dollars into major national technological programs without either providing comparable support for the National Bureau of Standards programs on which they are dependent or providing a mechanism to make a portion of the large resources available to National Bureau of Standards when needed.

The proposed legislation would serve the latter purpose. It would not automatically affect any agency, but it would provide authority to solve problems which the agencies themselves recognize. It would not provide a unique authority for transfers between appropriations; it would merely recognize that the need for such authority is not limited to the Defense Establishment. It would provide a means through which new research programs which are basically the responsibility of the National Bureau of Standards, but which become urgent because of an unforeseen development in the program of another agency, can be accommodated in the Bureau's fiscal program.

If this legislation is enacted it is the intent of the Bureau to attempt to use it in any case where a project is requested by another agency which is (1) significant in financial impact (approximately $100,000 per year or more), (2) represents a need which is likely to continue for several years, and (3) falls within the scope of the Bureau's statutory mission. Subsequent to the transfer the Bureau would budget to carry the project with its own direct appropriations. If a transfer between appropriations cannot be arranged in such a case the Bureau intends either to reprogram within available appropriated funds or postpone action until the project can be covered in a future budget.

AMENDMENT TO SECTION 11. GIFTS AND BEQUESTS

The proposed legislation would amend the existing authorization to allow the acceptance of gifts and bequests to aid the work of the Bureau, permitting the use of certain gifts for purposes for which appropriated funds may not be used. It would also clarify the status of royalties and honoraria received by the Bureau.

At the present time, when gifts and bequests from private citizens or organizations are deposited in a trust account, they take on the character of appropriated funds and can be used only for the same type of expenditure for which appropriated funds may be used. In most cases this limitation does not interfere with the accomplishment of the purpose of the donor, but occasionally it will. If certain types of otherwise prohibited expenditures would be of benefit to the Bureau, the use of nonappropriated funds would appear to be quite reasonable, especially if adequate safeguards against abuse are provided.

The Bureau is a research institution that, in many ways, is comparable to a university laboratory, a reserach foundation, or a Government contract laboratory. In many of its relationships with scientists and scientific societies in particular, the Bureau is a research institution. The informal relationship thus derived is of great benefit to the Bureau's performance of its mission through the ready exchange of ideas and the better understanding of the needs of the scientific community.

This informal relationship, however, is hampered and restricted by some of the normal restrictions on Government expenditures. The Bureau believes that those restrictions are, by and large, appropriate, but it would welcome some relief from their rigid application. Recognizing that Government funds cannot be used to provide refreshments, for example, when the Bureau is host to scientific meetings, it does not provide them although this is a failure to reciprocate in such amenities received by Bureau representatives at meetings elsewhere. A moderate relaxation of the restriction would serve an extremely valuable purpose, promoting informal interchange and cooperative activities.

Occasionally, this function is served through contributions by Bureau employees or the Employees' Association. For many years, for example, the Bureau has entertained at a tea for the members of the American Physical Society during their annual Washington meeting. This affair must be financed by employee contributions although the real benefit is to the Bureau, and the Government, not the employees. Similarly, senior staff members who have been entertained officially by foreign scientists or American institutions cannot reciprocate, except out of their own pocket and that is often embarrassing.

The proposed legislation would permit this sort of expenditure from funds contributed to the Bureau from private sources. If such funds were not otherwise designated for particular purposes, they would be included in a discretionary fund to be disbursed upon certification and approval by the Director. Expenditures for the purpose of entertainment, however, would be limited to $1,000 per year.

Although the explanation of the purpose of the legislation has dwelt upon entertainment cost, the legislative language has been broadly drawn to cover all items of expenditure otherwise prohibited by law or Comptroller General ruling. It would not, however, waive prohibitions or restrictions that are not tied to expenditure restrictions. Thus it would not permit the consumption of alcoholic beverages in public buildings, nor the employment of persons at unusual salary rates or outside prescribed conditions.

The authority would be used in those areas where the Director determines that an expenditure is desirable but where it cannot be found to be a necessary expense in the rigid sense prescribed for appropriated funds. In certain circumstances, for example, laboratory costs might be provided despite the failure to meet the rigorous criteria currently enforced by the Comptroller General. Similarly, certain desirable but not necessarily essential equipment or furnishing items might be purchased.

The proposed bill would also provide that payments to the Bureau as honoraria or royalties for papers, books, articles, and speeches prepared or delivered by employees of the Bureau may be deposited in the discretionary fund. Such receipts are more in the nature of gifts than payments because they usually are of nominal value compared to the cost of the service provided. Because they do not represent the full cost of the service, or even an identifiable element of cost, and because they are often paid after the fact with no prior advice to the Bureau, it is difficult and expensive to try to set these receipts up as partial reimbursements for the costs of the services rendered. Depositing them in the discretionary fund seems to be the most appropriate way to carry out the wishes of the donor to aid the Bureau.

AMENDMENT TO SECTION 3

The objective of the addition to this section is to clarify the authority to encourage international standardization of science and technology by providing certain assistance to international organizations of which the United States is a member, to friendly countries and to institutions in those countries. At present the NBS has authority to furnish services only to the U.S. Government, to State and local governments, and to institutions and firms within the United States. Under delegation of such authority, the National Bureau of Standards has furnished indirect services abroad in connection with international cooperation.

The increasing complexity of modern measurement techniques combined with the increasing cost of facilities required to calibrate and standardize measurement instruments which are a vital part of international scientific, technological and defense activities has created a growing need for the National Bureau of Standards under direction from the Department of Commerce to provide calibration, measurement, and other specialized services to friendly countries on a worldwide basis. Moreover, the position of the United States as a leader in the international community in science and technology requires it to take an active part in encouraging international standardization.

For many years the National Bureau of Standards has cooperated with the national standards laboratories of other nations, both directly through the cooperation of the Department of State and through the International Bureau of Weights and Measures. The Bureau also has cooperated with foreign scientific institutions which are engaged in studies of interest to the National Bureau of Standards or other agencies of the U.S. Government. These exchanges of information and special measurement services have been encouraged as an essential part of the responsibilities of the National Bureau of Standards and the Department for the correlation of our national measurement system with those of other nations and for the precise determination of important physical constants. In recent years, however, there have been increasing requests for limited National Bureau of Standards service from a variety of sources in other countries including laboratories, as well as government and academic institutions. In particular, foreign laboratories now purchase about $100,000 worth of standard samples per year from National Bureau of Standards. These are samples of highly characterized materials prepared and sold by the Bureau for use in a variety of scientific operations such as checking chemical analysis, temperature, color, viscosity, heat of combustion, and various basic properties of materials. The sale of these samples to foreign countries now amounts to about 30 percent of the Bureau's total activity in this area.

The current practice of cooperation can produce only limited assistance from the Bureau to friendly countries. It is, therefore, necessary to have authority to furnish direct service to other countries and their institutions if we are to exert more active leadership in promoting scientific and technical standards throughout the world.

The services of the National Bureau of Standards are provided on a reimbursable basis. The proposed legislation would not alter this procedure. The technical assistance provided to the laboratories of other nations under the proposed authority will be at no additional cost to the United States. It does to a limited extent, however, provide foreign exchange. It is clearly consistent with the many governmental policies and practices aimed at increasing U.S. leadership in science and technology. The authority would be subject to existing rules and regulations and to such others as the Secretary of Commerce may publish.

EXEMPT FROM MANUFACTURERS' EXCISE TAX CERTAIN AUTOMOBILES FURNISHED TO SCHOOLS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I am today introducing a measure which I think is noteworthy in that it would provide tax relief to automobile manufacturers and dealers who provide automobiles to our schools for driver training programs.

There can be no doubt that the driver training programs which are now a part of the curriculum of a majority of the high schools of America today have made a significant contribution to highway safety by training our young people in good driving habits. This worthwhile program has been made possible to a large degree by the automobile dealers of America in a manner which has been largely overlooked. These dealers have for a number of years made available new automobiles without charge for driving instruction classes.

My bill would simply encourage and stimulate this good cause by authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate to promulgate regulations exempting automobile dealers from the manufacturers' excise taxes on automobiles donated for driving instruction when these vehicles are returned to the dealer or manufacturer within a 1-year period.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1465) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from the manufacturers' excise tax certain automobiles furnished without charge to schools for use in driver training programs, introduced by Mr. MUNDT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

TO AUTHORIZE LAWYERS TO PRACTICE BEFORE FEDERAL AGENCIES WITHOUT SPECIAL ADMISSION TO AGENCY BARS

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators KEFAUVER, DIRKSEN, ERVIN, DODD, HART, SCOTT, and BAYH, I introduce a bill to permit members of the bar of the highest court of a State to practice before administrative agencies of the United States.

The history of the regulatory agencies shows that since their coming to national prominence the various agencies have imposed a bewildering array of regulations restricting attorneys from practicing before them. Students and various organizations, such as the American Bar Association, criticized this multiple admission arrangement and the refusal to recognize the right of persons who are members of the bar in their States to represent others before Federal agencies. I hope that through the passage of this bill these cumbersome admission requirements for attorneys will be swept away, returning the general practitioner in this area to his traditional role as a recognized officer of the forum before which he appears as an advocate.

Needless to say, the ultimate benefit of the legislation will redound primarily to the client whose legal problems in Washington could be handled by his local attorney.

The American Bar Association has endorsed the principle that these admission procedures are unnecessary and therefore wrong.

In 1957, the Office of Legal Counsel in the Department of Justice recommended that all agencies discontinue individual admission regulations, and instead permit attorneys in good standing in the various jurisdictions to represent others before agencies. A number of agencies, I understand, accepted this recommendation. A few agencies have persisted in separate admissions, specialized bars or selective enrollment. Unfortunately, they are agencies of great importance and there is no sign that they shall change their policy without a legislative directive.

The purpose of this bill is not only to recognize the right of persons and concerns to be represented by counsel of their choice, but to provide for its implementation by practical procedures which will safeguard the agencies and the public.

Section (a) of the bill gives recognition to the basic principles which I have stated. This would supersede contrary regulations of any agency. But this by itself would not be sufficient. It would leave unresolved how an agency determines who is a member in good standing in any of the jurisdictions. Section (b) of the bill meets this problem, without giving rise to a variety of the agency rules. It imposes upon an attorney the responsibility of asserting his qualifications under this act, subject to appropriate penalties for misrepresentation. This will adequately assure the protection of the public and integrity of practice before any agency.

Section (c) of the bill makes it clear that this legislation would not in any way change the existing status of practice before agencies by nonlawyers. Also, it would neither add nor subtract anything from an agency's existing authority to discipline persons who appear in a representative capacity before it. These matters are left exactly where they are, and this intent is made completely clear by the provisions of the bill.

Some agency regulations and even some provisions of statute deal with the problem of practice by former officers and employees of an agency. Section 3 of this bill makes it clear that those provisions of law or agency rules are not disturbed by this legislation. In other words, the enactment of this bill would not authorize an attorney who was formerly an employee of an agency to represent others before it where such is prohibited by provision of statute or regulation.

One other provision is needed to make this legislation effective, and that is covered in section 2 of the bill. It is implicit in its purpose that the agency recognize and deal with the attorney who is qualified to appear in a representative capacity before it, otherwise the basic right of a person to be represented by counsel of his own choice could be defeated. It is indispensable that the agency recognize and deal with the person who appears in a representative capacity where his appearance is a matter of record before the agency. This recognition would include conferences, correspondence and service of documents or notices.

This bill would remove any ambiguity as to this practice and make it clear that service upon the attorney of record would constitute a valid service. A similar recommendation was made by the recent administrative conference by the conference's recommendation No. 26.

I would mention one other principle which would be given effect by this bill, namely that the District of Columbia is a Federal city. Most, but not all, of the agencies are located in this jurisdiction, but a Federal city belongs to all of the citizens. This bill makes it clear that persons who have been determined qualified to represent others in the various States and other jurisdictions shall be accepted as qualified to represent others before any of the Federal agencies.

This will give full faith and credit to the actions of the several States and territories in their determination of those persons who are found qualified to represent others. Implementation of this principle requires legislation.

Let me illustrate how this bill would operate in practice. Assume that a person in St. Louis has a matter pending before a Federal agency in Washington. Under the bill that person would be free to determine whether that matter should be handled by his local attorney in Missouri or by an attorney in Washington, D.C.

If the person elects to be represented by his Missouri attorney, the agency would recognize that representation without the imposition of any qualifying procedures, admissions, enrollments, and the like. The attorney's representation to the agency that he is handling that matter for the party in interest would constitute under the bill a representation that he is a person qualified to represent others under the laws of the State of Missouri, and subject to the sanctions stated in the bill the agency would be authorized and required to recognize that representation.

If, however, the client in St. Louis chose to be represented by an attorney in Washington, the agency similarly would be required to recognize that representation. Implicit in this is the obligation that the agency deal with the person selected to appear in a representative capacity. Without this the whole purpose of the bill could be frustrated by a maze of rules and regulations.

Numerous statutes provide that papers or notices must be served on the party in interest. Sometimes this is read literally to the inconvenience and detriment of everyone concerned. If the person in St. Louis is served with notices or papers, rather than his Washington attorney, valuable time is lost and the person is deprived of the ready advice and counsel of his chosen representative.

The circuit court of appeals in this jurisdiction has condemned that practice and has held that it amounts to a lack of due process. *Unity School of Christianity* v. *F.R.C.*, 64 F. 2d 550 (1933). This is not only bad practice, but it defeats the right of a person to be represented by counsel of his choice. The bill would clarify that problem and remove any question as to the right and obligation of the agency to deal with the representative selected by the person in interest. Most agencies on most occasions, I believe, follow what is recognized as good practice, but there is enough inconsistency and contrary practice to require a resolution of the express provision of statute providing that service upon the attorney of record constitutes valid service.

The right of a person to be represented by counsel of his own choice, which is universally recognized, would be uniformly implemented by this legislation. This would contribute to the orderly process of government and would expedite and make more convenient the handling of matters before Federal agencies.

The principles in this bill have been approved by the American Bar Association and the text has been approved by the chairman of the American Bar Association's Committee on Federal Administrative Practice Act. I am sure that it will also have the wide general support of lawyers throughout the country.

In introducing this bill I am honored to have the cosponship of Senators Kefauver, Dirksen, Ervin, Dodd, Hart, Scott, and Bayh. Their support will add great impetus to the legislation.

I would also like to pay tribute to the junior Senator from New York and the senior Senator from Nebraska who have worked long and hard to achieve the ends sought here. Their bill—S. 318—varies considerably in detail, but certainly their objective is very similar.

Mr. President, I introduce the bill which I have described and ask that it be referred to the appropriate committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1466) to provide for the right of persons to be represented by attorneys in matters before Federal agencies, introduced by Mr. Long of Missouri (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SPECIAL POSTAGE STAMP IN COMMEMORATION OF THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE HI-Y MOVEMENT

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, 75 years ago the Hi-Y movement of the Young Men's Christian Association was born in Chapman, Kans.

This very worthy organization, whose membership is composed primarily of high school students, during this 75-year period, has become an international organization.

The purpose of the Hi-Y is to create and extend throughout the home, school, and community, high standards of Christian character. Surely all Americans can be justly proud of an organization which has done so much for the youth of our country and the world.

It is with a great deal of pride and satisfaction I have watched the Hi-Y function in my home State of Kansas. Working with the YMCA as a sponsor, these two great organizations help to prepare young men and women for moral and political leadership in our American way of life. Certainly the Hi-Y is to be commended for the role it has taken in helping young people of the world become good men and women.

Mr. President, in recognition of the work this organization has done with the young people, and in gratitude for its services, I introduce a bill for appropriate reference directing the Postmaster General to issue a commemorative stamp commemorating the 75th anniversary of the Hi-Y Movement of the Young Men's Christian Association.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1467) to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the Hi-Y Movement of the Young Men's Christian Association, introduced by Mr. Carlson, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PROHIBITION OF MANUFACTURE OR IMPORTATION OF MOTOR VEHICLES WHICH DISCHARGE CERTAIN DANGEROUS EXHAUST SUBSTANCES

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to prohibit the manufacture for distribution in commerce or the importation into the United States of any motor vehicle which discharges substances into the air in amounts found by the Surgeon General to be dangerous to public health.

Air pollution is not a new problem, but has long been recognized as a nuisance and the cause of economic waste. It has only been recently, however, that any specific attempts have been made to link air pollution with adverse effects to human health. We know today that polluted air is not only damaging to vegetation and livestock but to our very health and lives.

Studies to determine how polluted air affects human health, until the last decade, were based primarily on sources such as waste discharged from fuel used for heating or generating energy. The tremendous growth in the number of automobiles in this country over the past several years has focused attention on the need to study vehicular emissions as a contributing factor to air pollution. Federal, State, and local government agencies, as well as independent organizations, are presently engaged in extensive research in this field. Such studies have, thus far, definitely established the presence in the air of pollutants originating from motor vehicles. Further, that the components of automobile emissions produce harmful effects on human beings. Air pollution today can be translated into losses, both to our health and to our economy. The motor vehicle is contributing to this problem.

The future holds even greater hazards unless corrective action is taken soon. The rapid shift of our population to urban areas, with the prospect of a great expansion in our total population and the increasing number of vehicles which our society is becoming more and more dependent upon, demonstrate the need for solutions.

It is my belief that the situation described demands action by the Federal Government. True, air pollution is primarily a State and local problem. But the automobile knows no boundaries. It is a highly mobile instrument. The air into which it discharges its waste knows no boundaries. The frequency with which automobiles cross State boundaries today—and because, in the years ahead the situation will be compounded—raises serious questions about the ability of the States to effectively deal with this problem.

The Federal Government should require that all motor vehicles manufactured or imported meet a single standard with respect to the waste they discharge into the air. This would mean that the control device would be incorporated in the vehicle at the plant thus reducing the cost to the consumer. This would prevent the individual from being subjected to varying standards which may be set up in the jurisdiction where he resides and those to which he may travel. In my opinion, enactment of this bill will eliminate the growing threat to our Nation's health from one significant source of air pollution—motor vehicle exhaust.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1472) to prohibit the manufacture for distribution in commerce or the importation into the United States of any motor vehicle which discharges substances into the air in amounts found by the Surgeon General to be dangerous to public health, introduced by Mr. Long of Missouri, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

COMMON-SITUS PICKETING

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, last week I joined with the distinguished assistant minority leader [Mr. Kuchel] in introducing S. 1437, to amend section 8(b)4 of the National Labor Relations Act, the so-called common-situs picketing bill.

I fully support the principle that the Supreme Court's decision in the Denver Building Trades case—namely, that common-situs picketing constituted an illegal secondary boycott—must be reversed by appropriate legislation.

However, there has existed some difference of opinion within the labor movement itself as to the specific provisions of this remedial legislation. Recently the Industrial Union Department and the Building and Construction Trades Department of the AFL-CIO resolved another area of disagreement, the question of fringe benefits granted under the Davis-Bacon Act. When I introduced S. 1437, I was under the erroneous impression that this agreement in regard to Davis-Bacon also included agreement on the matter of common-situs picketing.

I have since learned that certain areas of disagreement still exist in regard to this legislation. I certainly do not wish to prejudge the question as to the specific provisions of this legislation. I believe it is only equitable that a bill embodying the position supported by the Industrial Union Department in regard to common-situs picketing should also be introduced and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. It is my understanding that committee action will probably await some unified position from the affected unions.

Therefore, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 8(b)(4) of the National Labor Relations Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1473) to amend section 8(b)(4) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN SURPLUS REAL PROPERTY IN DADE COUNTY, FLA.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my distinguished colleague [Mr. SMATHERS], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the disposition of certain surplus property, situated in Dade County, Fla., for permanent park purposes.

Mr. President, without any criticism, either real or implied, of the General Services Administration, this bill simply requires the disposition of approximately 600 acres of property within the Opaloka complex—that is to say, constituting part of what formerly was a great airbase there—for park purposes, and under the general law applicable to park purposes, which means for one-half of the appraised value, and with the proper reservations, and so forth.

The reason for our introduction of the bill is simply that the General Services Administration has been trying—and I understand and approve and appreciate its desire—to obtain the largest possible amount for the disposition of this property. However, recently it has been shown, by the affirmative course of asking for public bids, nationwide, and getting such bids, that the appraised valuation placed on the property by the General Services Administration apparently is not in accord with any market value obtaining, because no bids at all near the appraised value have been received. On the contrary, the bid made by the public unit of government which needs this park so badly has happened to be the largest bid submitted.

Therefore, we are asking that the matter be considered as against the general background policy of the country already existing in the general law applicable to situations of this sort.

I ask that the bill be referred, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. SMATHERS] and myself, to the appropriate committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1475) to provide for the disposition of certain surplus real property situated in Dade County, Fla., introduced by Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and Mr. SMATHERS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

ESTABLISHMENT OF LINCOLN TRAIL MEMORIAL PARKWAY

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague [Mr. BAYH], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the establishment and administration of the Lincoln Trail Memorial Parkway in the States of Kentucky, Indiana, and Illinois.

It was to my great personal satisfaction that last year the Congress approved my bill establishing the Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial in Spencer County, Ind. This monument, nestled among the gentle, wooded hills of southern Indiana, is a great and lasting tribute to the man who sprang from humble beginnings to become our Nation's leader in an hour of crises.

Countless historians have written about this man, about his birth in a cabin in northern Kentucky, about his family's migration to Indiana where Lincoln spent his formative years, and about his early adulthood in Springfield, Ill., where he entered the practice of law and the public service. Young and old alike look to the trail Lincoln followed as a source of inspiration.

Mr. President, I believe we should memorialize the storied route of the Great Emancipator with a national parkway. It would be a majestic route, beginning at Lincoln's birthplace in Kentucky, winding through the scenic hills and valleys of my home State, and then traveling over the rolling prairies of Illinois to Springfield. The Lincoln Parkway would be a monument to our 16th President and, at the same time, it would provide Americans with the opportunity to travel the path that Lincoln took.

Mr. President, I hope my colleagues will look upon this proposal with favor and that someday soon the Lincoln Parkway will be a reality.

I ask unanimous consent that the measure may lie on the table for 3 days for additional sponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and without objection, the bill will remain at the table as requested by the Senator from Indiana.

The bill (S. 1476) to provide for the establishment and administration of the Lincoln Trail Memorial Parkway in the States of Kentucky, Indiana, and Illinois, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HARTKE (for himself and Mr. BAYH), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AGATE FOSSIL BEDS NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Wyoming, the junior Senator from Nebraska, and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the establishment of the Agate Fossil Beds National Monument at Agate, Nebr.

As I was preparing to introduce this bill, I was reminded that thousands of visitors pass through this Capitol each day, not only for the purpose of seeing the Capitol itself and observing the Nation's lawmakers in action, but so they may link themselves with the great moments of history which have occurred within these Chambers. The entire Washington area is rich in historical sites and monuments to the men who charted the course of our Nation.

It is a good thing to witness the interest of these citizens because it shows a pride in their past, a pride in their Government, and pride in what it has stood for through the years.

This sense of history and its importance is, of course, not limited to the Capitol or to the Washington area. It is shared by Americans everywhere.

The opportunities to preserve and restore historical sites for the enjoyment and education of our children and future generations, unfortunately, present themselves all too infrequently. This is particularly true in the case of natural monuments. In the establishment of the Agate Fossil Beds National Monument, we have the unusual opportunity to preserve a living link with the Old West, and at the same time present to all America one of the most important prehistoric fossil beds ever discovered.

The Agate Springs fossil quarries are located in three hills overlooking the Niobrara River in Sioux County, about 45 miles north of Scottsbluff, Nebr. This is a classic paleontological site well-known for its wealth of Miocene fossil mammal bones. The great paleontologist, the late Henry Fairfield Osborn, has called it the most remarkable deposit of mammalian remains of the Tertiary age ever found in any part of the world. The fossils are not only abundant and comprise a wide variety of species, but are remarkably well preserved. The area has been the scene of scientific research since 1871.

The quarries are located on the Agate Springs Ranch which was owned by the late Dr. Harold J. Cook. The area is richly endowed with the story of the Old West, and is doubly significant because it was here the early pioneers of scientific research in the West centered many of their activities.

It might be said that the story of Agate Springs had its beginning in 1728 with the birth of James Cook, the famous English explorer, who circumnavigated the globe from 1768 to 1771, explored New Zealand and east Australian coasts and led the search for a Pacific-Atlantic passage through North America. James Cook was the great-great grandfather of Dr. Harold J. Cook.

Dr. Cook's father, Capt. James H. Cook, was a noted Indian scout who after 20 years of herding, hunting, scouting and trailing from Mexico to Montana, settled in the heart of what had been the Sioux country. By that time he had served with distinction as a scout attached to the 8th Cavalry in its campaign against the Apache chieftain, Geronimo. In 1887 he purchased Agate Springs Ranch. He tells of the first discovery of fossil material at the site in "50 Years on the Old Frontier," published by the Yale University Press:

> Riding one day along the picturesque buttes which skirt the beautiful valley of the Niobrara, we came to two high conical hills about 3 miles from the ranch house. From the tops of these hills there was an unobstructed view of the country for miles up and down the valley. Dismounting, we climbed the steep side of one of the hills. About halfway to the summit we noticed many fragments of bones scattered about on

> the ground. I at once concluded that at some period, perhaps years back, an Indian brave had been laid to his last long rest under one of the shelving rocks near the summit of the hills, and that, as was the custom among some tribes of Indians at one time, a number of his ponies had been killed near his body. Happening to notice a peculiar glitter on one of the bone fragments, I picked it up and I then discovered that it was a beautifully petrified piece of the shaft of some creature's leg bone. The marrow cavity was filled with tiny calcite crystals, enough of which were exposed to cause the glitter which had attracted my attention. Upon our return to the ranch we carried with us what was doubtless the first fossil material ever secured from what are now known to men of science as the Agate Springs fossil quarries.

Since that time scientists from the Smithsonian Institution, Carnegie Institute of Pittsburgh, the American Museum of Natural History, the Field Museum of Natural History, the Colorado Museum of Natural History, Princeton University, Yale University, the Universities of Chicago, Nebraska, Michigan, and Kansas, Amherst College and many other museums, universities, and colleges have made field trips to the Agate Springs fossil quarries. Fossils from the quarries are on display throughout the world. Captain Cook, and after him his son, Harold, made the Agate Springs Ranch a headquarters for paleontologists and acquired an excellent fossil collection.

Capt. James H. Cook was a friend and confidant of the Sioux Indians. His friendship with Red Cloud began in the autumn of 1875 and continued until Red Cloud's death. Through this association he acquired a collection of Indian artifacts and wearing apparel which is of unique historical interest. These important relics, together with his collection of western guns, became the property of his son, Dr. Harold J. Cook, upon his death.

With the exception of those few years devoted to his professional training and professional work in other localities, Dr. Cook, who died in 1962, spent his entire life on Agate Springs Ranch devoting full time to the family tradition of scientific interest and enthusiasm. Harold J. Cook won an international reputation as a scholar of distinction in the field of paleontology. He was the author of many scientific articles in professional journals. He delivered numerous papers before scientific groups here and abroad. He collected and left a paleontological library of continuing interest and value to scholars throughout the world.

Dr. Cook added to his father's collection, and on March 4, 1963, his widow, Margaret C. Cook, entered into an agreement with the United States whereby she agreed to donate or bequeath the Indian artifacts and wearing apparel, the paleontological library and the western gun collection to the United States for exhibit and reference purposes at Agate Fossil Beds National Monument if the establishment of the monument in the vicinity of Agate, Nebr., is assured before January 1, 1967.

Mrs. Cook has also expressed the desire to donate sufficient land for the establishment of the National Park Service headquarters near the site of the monument.

This legislation will serve a most beneficial purpose. Although the site has been explored, off and on, by scientists, for many years, excellent remains can still be found within the large untouched portions of the hills containing the quarries. It is estimated that at least 75 percent of the fossil-bearing portions of these hills is undisturbed. In addition to serving as a place for exploration, research, and scholarship, the monument will provide visitors with visible evidence of the fossil skeletons of many creatures as they were over 15 million years ago. Furthermore, the monument, through the use of interpretative display techniques, will enable the visitors to associate themselves closely with the Old West and the prehistoric past.

Something of this nature was foreseen by Captain Cook in "50 Years on the Old Frontier," page 282:

> The frontiersmen of the type who used the flintlock and percussion-cap rifles, carrying bullets that ran from 60 to 120 to the pound, and whose headgear and clothing were made almost entirely of the skins of animals, have practically all journeyed ahead with the innumerable caravan. The ox team and stage drivers, also the cowboys of yesterday, are following closely after them. Were not the early pioneers of scientific research in the West also worthy of suitable monuments erected in their honor somewhere in or about the center of their activities? If so, is not the erection of such monuments a thing worth our doing at this time?

Mr. President, Dr. Cook has asked a challenging question. The answer must be, "Yes, there is indeed." And we honor the memory of these pioneer scientists with the introduction of this bill.

Recently, I was afforded the opportunity to tour the fossil beds, examine the Indian artifacts and the famous gun collection and to have lunch in the old rambling ranchhouse with Mrs. Cook, who charmingly and graciously entertains so well in the tradition of hospitality for which the early and true West is so noted.

This was a memorable experience. It impressed upon me the value and importance of establishing a national monument on the site while there is still time. Who knows how many such opportunities have been overlooked or wasted in this country? It is our purpose to see that we meet Dr. Cook's challenge and preserve for future generations the natural marvel of Agate Springs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of this bill be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the desk for 6 days so that other of our colleagues who wish to sponsor it may have opportunity to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record, and will lie on the desk as requested by the Senator from Nebraska.

The bill (S. 1481) to provide for the establishment of the Agate Fossil Beds National Monument in the State of Nebraska, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Hruska (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to preserve for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations the outstanding paleontological sites known as the Agate Springs Fossil Quarries, and nearby related geological phenomena, to provide a center for continuing paleontological research and for the display and interpretation of the scientific specimens uncovered at such sites, and to facilitate the protection and exhibition of a valuable collection of Indian artifacts and relics that are representative of an important phase of Indian history, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire by donation, or by purchase with donated or appropriated funds, not more than 3,150 acres of land or interests in lands in township 28 north, range 55 west, Sioux County, Nebraska, for inclusion in the Agate Fossil Beds National Monument in accordance with the boundary designation made pursuant to section 3 hereof, and any rights-of-way and easements needed for connecting roads.

Sec. 2. Within the acreage limitation of section 1, the Secretary may designate and adjust the boundaries of Agate Fossil Beds National Monument. Establishment of the national monument and any adjustment of its boundaries shall be effectuated by publication of notice thereof in the Federal Register when the Secretary finds that lands constituting an initially administrable unit are in Federal ownership.

Sec. 3. The Agate Fossil Beds National Monument shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to the Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes", approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), as amended and supplemented.

Sec. 4. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 407 OF PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 407 of the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, as amended. I ask that the bill be held at the desk for 1 week so that other Senators may join in sponsoring the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Louisiana.

The bill (S. 1490) to amend section 407 of the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, as amended, introduced by Mr. Ellender, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PROTECTION OF RIGHTS SECURED TO INDIVIDUALS UNDER THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to protect the rights secured to individuals under the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. President, in its simplest sense our Government is the means whereby our citizens can in a peaceful and orderly manner express their will as to how they will be governed. The wishes of our citizens are expressed through election of public officials, through a free press, through peaceable assembly and petition, and through the courts. Our system of government has created the greatest free nation in the world and brought us to the pinnacle of world leadership. Perhaps our very success has made us forget what a fragile and delicate thing our system of government really is, and that when it ceases to function in one of its parts, this great system may be jeopardized in its entirety. At this very moment, the Nation is watching a tragic illustration of how thin the line is between orderly constitutional government and chaotic anarchy.

Birmingham, Ala., one of our great industrial cities, is on the brink of this chaos. All the ghastly apparatus of civil disturbance has been brought into play—clubs, fire hoses, dogs, mass arrests, even, if one can believe it, an armored car. Two thousand five hundred people are under detention. We read of cities torn by riot in our papers almost daily, but usually they are in some faraway land. For this violent outburst is not going on in some tumultuous foreign capital. It is going on in the midst of our country; these are American citizens set against American citizens in deepening bitterness and hatred.

The fog of charge and countercharge is already obscuring the simple and fundamental reason behind this civil disorder. Let us put aside accusations of police brutality and outside agitators and see this situation in its true essence. The orderly means of expression of the public will has been already thwarted. A fundamental right has been denied American citizens in Birmingham. They have been forcibly prevented from exercising their right "peaceably to assemble and to petition the government for a redress of grievances." And let me say that the grievances of Birmingham's Negroes are very genuine. It is shocking that Americans should have peaceably to assemble and to petition their government to treat them as human beings. It was only a short step from the denial of this one basic right of all Americans to the state of tragic civil strife that exists today. Once a single right is taken away, all are threatened. If one part of the Constitution does not function, orderly government cannot carry on.

The constitutional rights of Americans are the concern of every single individual American. We cannot dodge our responsibilities as citizens. If 2,500 Americans were deprived of their rights and tossed into a foreign jail, there would be a national uproar and a call for action. Well, 2,500 citizens are in jail—not a foreign but an American jail. Twenty-five hundred citizens have been denied their rights. In demanding a just trial, St. Paul once said with pride, "I am a Roman citizen." Even under the Caesars, Roman citizenship and Roman justice were the pride of the civilized world. How much more proud we must be to say: I am an American citizen, a member of a great commonwealth whose Constitution guarantees equal justice under law, a republic where the rights of the individual are regarded with almost sacred awe.

But the words "American citizens" will become only a newspaper description, and a worthless adjective, if any one of us is denied the rights which belong to a citizen. We cannot stand aside and watch while one man's rights are denied, for what he looses today, we may all lose tomorrow.

Mr. President, I have stated the case strongly; but it cannot be made too clear that the question here is one of fundamental human rights. If we allow ourselves to be distracted by pettifogging ordinances, quibbles, and technicalities, we will not be able to protect the Constitution, we, as Members of this body, are sworn to uphold. If we do not take positive action now, incident will follow incident. The fiery passions of citizens demanding their basic rights, once extinguished in one place, will only break out in another. The Nation breathed a sigh of relief when calm was restored to Jackson, Miss. But no sooner was an uneasy peace achieved there than the determination of the Negro to gain his rights again clashed with the irrational determination of a small group of men to preserve an unjust and outmoded way of life.

Despite all our hopes, Birmingham has made it bitterly apparent that these situations will arise again and again in the years ahead. In fact, in Birmingham, it is a small group of local officials, repudiated by their own electorate, who must bear the primary responsibility for the breakdown of peace and order in the very city they claim to govern.

Here is a clear-cut case where local officials have failed to protect the constitutional process at the local level, the National Government, which represents all the people, must be empowered to step in, however reluctantly it will do so. Where the democratic process has broken down and a willful minority can threaten the constitutional rights of a majority unable to express their will, the Government must be able to act, positively and practically, to restore order and justice.

This bill directs the Attorney General to initiate a court action, including a permanent or temporary injunction whenever any person engages in or initiates any act involving mass arrest, force or violence, or interference with travel within a State or from one State to another, and such act deprives any other person of any right or privilege secured to him under the Constitution of the United States.

This measure is not a radical proposal; it does not alter the basic relationship between the States and the Federal Government. It merely provides the Attorney General with an effective legal means by which he could step into a situation before it had deteriorated to a point where unreason and human passion were beyond control.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1494) to protect the rights secured to individuals under the Constitution of the United States, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROTECTION OF SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS IN COOPERATIVE ADVERTISING

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, on March 29 the Federal Trade Commission issued an advisory opinion stating in effect that small business concerns engaged in cooperative advertising would violate the antitrust laws should this advertising contain prices. It should be noted that in this advisory opinion there is a very vigorous dissent by Commissioner Elman, as well as individual views and statements by Commissioners Anderson, MacIntyre, and Higginbotham. These were in addition to the so-called advisory opinion itself. Therefore, we can reasonably assume that on this very vital subject, each of the five Commissioners has expressed an independent view not necessarily in accord with that of his fellow Commissioners.

I say that this is a vital subject, since cooperative advertising is one of the very few means through which the small independent merchant is able to compete with the large and wealthy chainstores and giant enterprises.

Cooperative advertising enables a number of small grocery stores, or hardware stores, or druggists, to group together and jointly buy advertising comparable to that purchased by the competitive chain. These small independent businessmen thereby make use of advertising allowances provided by manufacturers—since it is obviously impossible for such a single merchant to otherwise contract for full-page advertising and the like.

The advisory opinion does not prohibit joint or cooperative advertising, but it states that such advertising cannot contain prices for the goods involved. The rationale is that including prices demonstrates an agreement among the merchants joining in this advertising to charge the same price, in other words a conspiracy to fix prices. However, it is obvious, or at least it should be to those whose business it is to regulate advertising, that such advertising without including prices would be virtually worthless. Of course, the chainstores are not restricted from using prices in their ads, and the apparent result of the FTC opinion is to give one further advantage to the chains and provide the small merchant with yet another obstacle.

Mr. President, I do not believe that it is necessary today for me to expound upon the legislative intent and purpose of the Federal Trade Commission Act or of the antitrust laws themselves. It should suffice to say that they were designed to prevent monopoly and not to foster it. I believe that the advisory opinion of the Federal Trade Commission leaves much to be desired. It is very likely that legislative action will have to be taken to correct the inequities which may result from the interpretation given to the law by the Federal Trade Commission.

The distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has already introduced a bill, S. 1320, designed to deal with this problem. S. 1320 has been referred to the Senate Committee on Commerce, on which I am privileged to serve. Normally, the best course of action would be for my committee to begin hearings on this bill in order to report to the Senate such legislation as is required.

I say that would be the normal course of action. However, the Small Business Committee of the House of Representatives has already begun a series of hearings on this problem, and I have been informed that the Select Committee on Small Business of the Senate will shortly begin hearings concerning this advisory opinion. As neither the Senate nor the House Small Business Committee can report legislation, their function would be limited to factual studies and recommendations.

Therefore, I believe that the Committee on Commerce should await the reports of these committees before embarking on its own investigation. Yet the hue and cry of the small merchants is for immediate action, in order that they may continue to conduct business without fear of violating Federal law and possible criminal prosecution.

In order to protect these small merchants, and at the same time provide adequate opportunity for the consideration of remedial legislation, I intend to introduce at the conclusion of my remarks a concurrent resolution stating that it is the sense of the Congress that the doctrine advocated in the advisory opinion of the Federal Trade Commission not be put into effect before June 30, 1964. Since I have been informed that prosecution of such cooperative advertising ventures is not common, and that each requires a thorough investigation as to the facts involved, it is my belief that this 1-year grace period would not adversely affect businesses, large or small. If this concurrent resolution is given expeditious handling, and I hope quick action will result, then the Committee on Commerce will have a reasonable opportunity to thoroughly investigate various ramifications emanating from this advisory opinion. I sincerely believe that this would be the best course of action for the Senate to follow in acting upon a subject vital to the preservation of small business concerns throughout this Nation.

Mr. President, on behalf of myself, Senators YARBOROUGH, ENGLE, HARTKE, CANNON, SCOTT, PROUTY, and BEALL, I submit, for appropriate reference, this concurrent resolution.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 39) submitted by Mr. McGEE (for himself and other Senators), was referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That in order to provide adequate time for the consideration of and action upon pending proposals for remedial legislation, it is the sense of the Congress that no action should be taken before June 30, 1964, by any agency or officer of the Government to carry into effect the doctrine set forth by a majority of the members of the Federal Trade Commission, in its advisory opinion of March 29, 1963, announced April 16, 1963, to the effect that the use by small business concerns of certain cooperative advertising programs may be unlawful.

AGREEMENT FOR MUTUAL DEFENSE OF MIDDLE EAST

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators CASE, DOUGLAS, KEATING, KUCHEL, PASTORE, PROUTY, SALTONSTALL, SCOTT, DOMINICK, and WILLIAMS of New Jersey, I submit for appropriate reference, a resolution calling for a mutual defense agreement by the United States, Israel, the United Kingdom, France, and any Middle East state willing to join and carry out its obligations under such an agreement.

The concern which I have expressed over the mounting threat of a sudden explosion of violence in the Middle East is based in large measure on the new political alinement of Egypt, Syria, and Iraq, and the threats backed by military power to the independence of other nations in the region made by this new group against Israel, Jordan, and other Middle East states.

This new political union combined with the massive Soviet bloc rearming of the United Arab Republic Army and the United Arab Republic's rocket-weapons program carried on by German scientists and technicians has now upset the equilibrium which helped maintain the armed truce and a measure of stability existing in the region. President Kennedy, in effect, recognized and sought to correct this unbalance, when he agreed to permit Israel to buy American Hawk antiaircraft missiles, but events renewing the danger of war have moved swiftly since that decision.

An outbreak of hostilities in the Middle East is also likely to mean the involvement of the great powers, and, therefore, it is a direct threat to international peace. We cannot be complacent in the face of the United Arab Republic's threats to liberate Israel by driving its people into the sea, and its violent appeals to the people of Jordan to revolt and to, in effect, assassinate King Hussein. Nor can we take the position of some observers that Israel has enough weapons—and trained and courageous defense forces—to withstand any attack by the Arabs now, for that is begging the question, upon the answer to which so much is at stake.

War means destruction, and Israel's Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion has said very bluntly that war does not solve any problems. In an interview with Mr. Don Kellermann of CBS, which will be televised over the CBS network tonight, the Israel leader has made it very clear that his nation does not want war now or at any time. Asked what he thought could be done to assure peace and stability between Israel and the Arab States, he replied, and I quote from a transcript of this important interview:

> If America and her friends would have a treaty, a bilateral treaty with Israel, that an attack on her means an attack on one of the signatory governments—this, I believe can have an effect to preserve peace in the Middle East.

There can be no question about the contribution to peace and stability that Israel is making now in the tense Middle East. I believe the region would now be in active conflict if there were no democratic state there strong enough to act as a deterrent to hostilities. The United States bears a heavy responsibility for the new surge of Egyptian power and influence, because our massive aid program rescued Egypt from economic collapse. We bear an equally heavy responsibility to other Middle East states to eliminate any doubts and uncertainties about our determination to help to preserve their independence and integrity from armed attack. I believe that one of the best and surest ways to do this is by acting positively on the resolution which I have submitted, and by negotiating the mutual defense agreement which the resolution calls for.

Mr. President, I also pay my respects to those of my colleagues who believe that it might be better or more desirable to have the United States enter into a collective defense agreement pledging the United States, the United Kingdom, and France to take action if any state in the Middle East is "preparing to violate the frontiers" between Israel and the Arab States. However, with the model of the Philippines treaty before us, I believe that a mutual-defense agreement is much more apposite to the present situation. So, although I respect the other proposed solution, I urge this one upon the President.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 134), submitted by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and other Senators), was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas, on May 25, 1950, the United States, the United Kingdom, and France issued a three-party declaration pledging themselves to take action if any state "was preparing to violate the frontiers" between Israel and the Arab States and to assure and guarantee those borders; and

Whereas the Congress, on March 9, 1957, adopted a joint resolution authorizing the President to "cooperate with and assist any nation or group of nations in the general area of the Middle East desiring such assistance in the development of economic strength dedicated to the maintenance of national independence," and to undertake in such area military assistance programs with any nation or group of nations desiring such assistance against armed aggression from any country controlled by international communism; and

Whereas the United States regards as vital to the national interest and world peace the preservation of the independence and integrity of the nations of the Middle East; and

Whereas the outbreak of armed conflict in the Middle East would be likely to spread to other areas; and

Whereas recent events in the Middle East, including an arms buildup by the Arab States with the encouragement and support of the Soviet Union, constitute a serious threat to international peace: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the President is urged to invite the United Kingdom, France, and any other interested nations to join with the United States in a mutual defense agreement or agreements, with Israel, and any other Middle East state which is willing to join and carry out its obligations under such an agreement, and to provide such military and other assistance and cooperation as may be necessary to protect the territorial integrity and political independence of any nation in the Middle East which is a party to such an agreement against armed attack by any other nation.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President——

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my distinguished colleague [Mr. JAVITS] and other Senators in sponsoring this important resolution regarding a collective defense agreement for the Middle East. The mere fact that this resolution has to be submitted at all is a grave reflection on the failure in recent years of American policy in that area, and is a true indication of the tense state of affairs today in the Near East.

In recent months, it has become increasingly apparent that the Arab nations, under the leadership of President Nasser, of Egypt, are mounting a new drive to destroy our only true friends in the Middle East—in Israel. A new Arab union, including at this stage Egypt, Iraq, and Syria, is being formed, with the expressed intent of wiping Israel off the map.

Outside rocket experts in Egypt are working feverishly to develop ground-to-ground missiles which threaten to rain destruction on Israel, and thus upset the delicate balance of forces in the area. In the meantime, President Nasser, and his followers continue the Arab boycott, the blockade of the Suez Canal, and other discriminatory practices which are repugnant to principles of international law.

These increasingly aggressive moves by the Arab nations have naturally raised concern in Israel about her ability to maintain her integrity and sovereignty. These courageous people have every right to expect that the United States would speak out, to reaffirm its interest in Israel's security and our dedication to her continued freedom. The Israeli have every right to expect that this country would exert strong pressures on the nations involved to withdraw the outside scientists who are building Egypt's offensive missile capacity.

Unfortunately, the United States has not taken any such action. Our Government has continued to pursue—as my colleague [Mr. JAVITS] has referred to—what it regards as an "even-handed" policy regarding all parties to Middle East tension.

The result has been that things have gone from bad to worse. And as a matter of fact, we have in effect encouraged Arab unity on a theory that this is a means to promote Middle East stability, and squabbling among Arab nations, and strengthen anti-Communist forces.

The situation today in the Middle East demonstrates the shortsightedness of those views. By encouraging the Arab union, by failing to act decisively to discourage the arms buildup in the Arab world, the Middle East is on the verge of an explosion which could engulf the whole world.

Jordan has become a key pawn in this power struggle, and is an important reason for the submission of this resolution today. In recent weeks, this little kingdom has been rocked by a violent internal struggle involving the effort of pro-Nasser forces to depose the moderate ruler, King Hussein.

Every evidence points to the fact that the strong demonstrations against the King have been fomented by outside agitators loyal to President Nasser. This points up the serious implications of the conflict inside Jordan today.

The fact is that in order for Jordan to join the Arab Union, the King must be unseated, since Nasser has declared that the United Arab Republic is open only to republics. There is every indication that King Hussein's downfall could set off the Middle East powder keg and bring the Israeli and Arabs into open conflict.

The broader aspect of the Jordan situation lies in Jordan's long border with Israel and the threat posed to the latter country by a Jordan under the control of powers loyal to Nasser. Should the King be deposed and Israel and the Arab nations erupt into open hostility, there is a clear and present danger that the big powers might feel the need to step in—with all the dangers of incalculable magnitude that implies.

Thus, recent American policy, which has failed to face up to the threat to Middle Eastern stability posed by the Arab union may well backfire in our faces.

To put more backbone into our policies and to make explicitly clear to the Arab leaders where we stand, we should formulate with Israel a collective defense agreement embracing the United Kingdom, France and other interested nations. Such a step would be in keeping with past actions by the United States in the Middle East, and would serve as an affirmative warning to the Arab world to keep hands off our friends in Israel.

I regard the defense pact contemplated by this resolution to be a realistic and sound move to promote security and stability in this troubled area of the world. It would also be in keeping with traditional American policies of aiding those who pursue a peaceful and nonaggressive course.

Mr. President, I regret that it has become necessary for this resolution to be submitted. I had hoped the President would issue a strong reaffirmation of America's allegiance to a free and secure Israel. I still entertain that hope, and have urged such a course for some time.

Such a statement would command respect in the Arab world, and could well help head off any aggressive moves against Israel. But such a statement has not been forthcoming; and it would be foolhardy to delay any longer in expressing to Israel our determination to protect her interests and integrity.

The resolution we are submitting today will show the world where Congress stands; and I hope it will receive prompt and favorable consideration.

At the same time, I again urge our Government to take the lead in bringing the Arabs and Israel together for direct negotiations—under the aegis of the United Nations—leading to an arms-control agreement for the area. Such a peace conference, bolstered by the tremendous force of world opinion which is provided by United Nations auspices, could well serve as a model for the world's great powers in their search for an agreement on global disarmament and nuclear testing. This could be a minor league arms-control conference, perhaps leading to some help in the major league arms-control conference.

Unfortunately, in the past, Government officials have chosen to oppose efforts along these lines. The so-called Brazzaville resolution in the United Nations offered a good opportunity for progress, but we turned our back on it.

As recently as last month, I urged the Secretary of State to explore means for bringing about direct Arab-Israel negotiations. In reply, I received what seems to me an unnecessarily defeatist, unimaginative reply which indicates that there is no intention to move along these lines.

The pertinent part of this letter, dated April 18, from Assistant Secretary Frederick G. Dutton, reads as follows:

> On the subject of direct negotiations, the United States would very much like to see Israel and its neighbors come together for a resolution of their differences, in questions of armament as in other fields. We favor this means of settling disputes whenever there is a promise of a constructive outcome. When there is no such promise, as must regretfully be concluded in the case of the Arab-Israel dispute, an attempt to force such negotiations would heighten the very tensions which the quiet diplomacy of the United States in that area seeks to ease. It is by this path, by whittling away at specific issues, that U.S. influence can most effectively be used to create conditions that will offer the possibility of a constructive advance ultimately to a negotiated just Arab-Israel peace.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, the entire letter from Assistant Secretary Dutton.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., April 18, 1963.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR KEATING: This is in reply to your letter of April 6, 1963, addressed to the Secretary of State, regarding aspects of the Arab-Israel dispute and the participation of West German scientists in United Arab Republic arms development.

I believe that, with the exception of the matter of direct Arab-Israel negotiations, the concerns you express in your letter have been treated in Under Secretary W. Averell Harriman's April 12 reply to a letter cosigned by five of your colleagues. On the subject of direct negotiations, the United States would very much like to see Israel and its neighbors come together for a resolution of their differences, in questions of armament as in other fields. We favor this means of settling disputes whenever there is a promise of a constructive outcome. When there is no such promise, as must regretfully be concluded in the case of the Arab-Israel dispute, an attempt to force such negotiations would heighten the very tensions which the quiet diplomacy of the United States in that

> area seeks to ease. It is by this path, by whittling away at specific issues, that U.S. influence can most effectively be used to create conditions that will offer the possibility of a constructive advance ultimately to a negotiated just Arab-Israel peace.
>
> I am pleased to have had the opportunity of writing to you on this matter. If I can be of further assistance, please let me know.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> Frederick G. Dutton,
> *Assistant Secretary.*

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am simply not willing to admit defeat so easily, when the stakes are so high. In my view, the need for a disarmament agreement in the Middle East is so great that we should not just throw up our hands and refuse to make the effort.

It would seem to me that a regional defense agreement, such as is envisioned by the resolution, which has been submitted today by my colleague [Mr. Javits], and which I am cosponsoring, followed by high-level, direct negotiations between the Arabs and Israelis leading to a disarmament compact, offers a sound one-two punch against warfare in the Middle East. The two go hand in hand.

I am hopeful that our policymakers will take the cue offered by this resolution and will follow through in the interests of restoring peace to the troubled Middle East.

I thank my colleague.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I join the distinguished Senator from New York and others in the presentation of the resolution which is now at the desk. I do so because I believe a constructive purpose toward peace will be served when the Senate and the House of Representatives indicate with clarity that they desire the American Government to pursue a vigorous policy looking toward peace in the Middle East.

The Middle East is seething. All of us have read with extreme regret about the arms buildup by the United Arab Republic. For what purpose? For purposes of defense? That cannot be. For purposes of aggression? It appears so.

Mr. President, I wish to recall that for years the policy of the American Government has been a policy by which we, together with the United Kingdom and France, have said to the world that we would keep the peace in the earth's crossroads where, paradoxically enough, were born three great religions to guide men to better days.

Were the lights of freedom in the one democracy in the Middle East to flicker and fail, were conflict to erupt anew on that ancient soil, our world would inch along toward the abyss.

I hope that the Senate will shortly, with the approval of the Committee on Foreign Relations, agree to the resolution and send it on its way.

STUDY OF FINANCIAL STRUCTURE OF THE RAILROAD INDUSTRY

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I submit a resolution to establish a Select Committee of the Senate to undertake a thorough, complete, and impartial study of the financial structure of the railroad industry.

Such a study is very greatly needed. I request that the resolution be held at the desk for 10 days, in order that Senators who may wish to add their names as cosponsors of the resolution may have an opportunity to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I have taken this step with deliberation, consideration, and reluctance. But I have done so because I am fully cognizant of the overwhelming controversies stirred by moves within the transportation industry, especially within the railroad segment.

On the one hand, we hear of such financial plight that further concessions are needed by the carriers and further mergers are considered essential to maintenance of rail service. On the other, railroad labor contends that talk of financial plight is a myth.

Competing modes of transportation hammer at each other with the vengeance usually reserved for national enemies.

The more I look into these claims and counterclaims, the more I examine the herculean job being undertaken by the Interstate Commerce Commission in trying to determine how far to allow mergers to go, the more I become convinced that a thorough investigation is needed before anyone can act any further with knowledge and impartiality. It is, therefore, in the national interest that such an investigation be undertaken as soon as possible. Certainly such a study must be made before Congress makes any step toward revising national transportation policy.

It has been almost a quarter of a century since the financial structure and control of railroads were studied by an arm of Congress. The information obtained by the Truman-Wheeler investigation led to corrective legislation which was embodied in the Transportation Act of 1940.

In the intervening years, the entire transportation system of America has changed. Control of railroads has shifted. Airlines and highway carriers have expanded. Top railroad officials themselves have stated in sworn testimony that they do not know many of those who control the finances of some of the Nation's rail carriers. The names of Wall Street brokerage houses and the account numbers of Swiss banks are included in the lists of the financial interests controlling these carriers. But who hides behind these screens, we do not know.

We are, therefore, unable to judge equitably whether the railroads are truly in a position to compete with motor carriers and airlines and bargelines. We are unable to judge accurately the motives of those who control these railroads, because we do not know what ends they would serve. It is possible that some foreign interest may want to weaken American railroads.

This information is essential to a Congress which is to consider transportation policy. It is equally essential to an Interstate Commerce Commission which considers exemptions of railroads from certain monopoly legislation. It is also essential to the management of railroads, which has stated it does not always know the answers as to who controls what in the industry.

It may well be that mergers are the answer; or it may be that these are clearly not in the national best interest. One way in which these proposals can be judged is with the evidence of a thorough check into the financial status, ownership, financing, reorganization, intercorporate relations, and all the other aspects of economics and financing.

I know of only one way all this information can be obtained, examined, sifted, and tested. Only Congress can bring together all the facts of financial status and ownership of railroads. Only Congress has the subpena power needed to bring out this information.

It is, of course, true that the Interstate Commerce Commission receives financial reports from rail carriers, and that these include the list of the 30 largest stockholders of each rail line. But these do not tell the story with the kind of clarity needed when stockholders such as Wall Street brokers and foreign banks are listed. This is of no real value in providing the needed information. It also is clear that the Interstate Commerce Commission's accounting methods, developed many years ago, do not produce the information that should be forthcoming.

The railroad industry is telling the public that the financial state of the carriers is near crisis. Last week in the railroad publication, a Review of Railroad Operations in 1962, the Association of American Railroads reported "net railway operating income in 1962 amounted to $726 million." This recovery from what had been considered deep crisis is described as "quite limited and disappointing." Earnings, according to the review, represent a return of 2.67 percent on estimated net investment.

The January 1963 issue of Reader's Digest contains an article by David Mackie, chairman of the Eastern Railroad Presidents' Conference. He stated that:

> Last year the railroads earned only two-tenths of a percent more on their investment than they earned during the depression. The first 4 months of this year, they took a net loss. We are face to face with the bankruptcy of our railroads and with it of our common carrier system.

I pray this is not true. If the railroads are in this deep plight, the country needs to know it from an impartial source. I would think that the railroads would welcome the kind of study I foresee from the Senate Select Committee.

Railroad labor organizations have spent thousands in public advertisements claiming that such statements as those I have just quoted are myths designed only to mislead Congress and State legislatures.

Frankly, I do not know. I doubt that anyone in this Chamber knows.

I do know that in 1958, Congress was of the opinion that railroads of this country were on the verge of bankruptcy. In that year, special benefits were voted, including the virtual power of self-regulation on passenger rail service.

We now know that 1958 was a good year. It is, at least, included in one of the two most prosperous 5-year periods in the history of railroading. Net profits of 1951–55 and 1954–58 were the largest in history. This seems to indicate that Congress was mistaken in 1958 in thinking that railroads were near financial disaster.

If the railroads today are as poor as we have been told, they may need more help. Their concept seems to be that mergers and curtailment of service are the way to build up strength in what remains. I have had occasion to question this, but I would think that it would be worthwhile to explore the whole idea with railroad management.

If it is not true that railroads are poor and are growing poorer, then Congress, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the general public should know it. I doubt whether any, except possibly a few in close railroad management circles, know these answers.

My resolution is being offered with an open mind and without prejudice. I foresee a study, in the same tone, which would bring out basic facts on railroad finances and control which seem to me to be essential for intelligent congressional action on the proposed revision of our national transportation policies.

I request, Mr. President, that the text of my resolution be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks and I ask that the resolution be referred directly to the Committee on Rules and Administration for its action.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 136) establishing a select committee to study railroad financing, submitted by Mr. HARTKE (for himself and other Senators) was received and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That there is hereby established a select committee which is authorized and directed to make, and to report to the Senate with recommendations the results of, a thorough and complete investigation of (1) the financial condition, reorganization requirements, corporate policies, and intercorporate relationships of interstate railroads, railroad holding companies, and railroad affiliates and subsidiaries, (2) the economic effects of mergers and corporate acquisitions affecting such railroads, companies, affiliates, and subsidiaries, (3) the extent to which corporations or persons having a fiduciary or contractual relationship with such railroads, companies, affiliates, or subsidiaries exercise control over the financial policies and business practices of the Nation's railroads, and (4) the identity of those persons or corporations which have, through stockownership or otherwise, a controlling interest in the Nation's railroads.

SEC. 2. (a) The select committee shall consist of nine members to be appointed by the Vice President, and not more than six members shall be members of the majority. The committee shall, at its first meeting, to be called by the Vice President, select a chairman and vice chairman and adopt rules of procedure not inconsistent with the rules of the Senate.

(b) Vacancies in the membership of the select committee shall not affect the authority of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as original appointments thereto are made.

(c) A majority of the members of the select committee shall constitute a quorum thereof for the transaction of business, except that the committee may fix a lesser number as a quorum for the purpose of taking sworn testimony.

SEC. 3. (a) The select committee shall report to the Senate not later than February 15, 1964, and shall, if deemed appropriate, include in its report specific legislative recommendations.

(b) Upon the filing of its final report the select committee shall cease to exist.

SEC. 4. For the purpose of this resolution the select committee is authorized to (1) make such expenditures; (2) hold such hearings; (3) sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate; (4) require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; (5) administer such oaths; (6) take such testimony, either orally or by deposition; (7) employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (8), with the prior consent of the executive department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, employ on a reimbursable basis such executive branch personnel as it deems advisable. With the consent of other committees or subcommittees of the Senate, the select committee is authorized to work in conjunction with and utilize the staffs of such committees or subcommittees to the extent deemed necessary and appropriate in the judgment of the chairman of the select committee.

SEC. 5. The expenditures authorized by this resolution shall not exceed $100,000, and shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers signed by the chairman of the select committee.

Mr. **HUMPHREY**. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me?

Mr. **HARTKE**. I yield.

Mr. **HUMPHREY**. Mr. President, I merely wish to compliment the Senator from Indiana, and I desire to be privileged to associate myself with the sponsorship of his resolution. I believe the initiative he has taken is entirely worthwhile, and I hope it will have a salutary effect in terms of other transportation problems.

Mr. **MAGNUSON**. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me?

Mr. **HARTKE**. Mr. President, I am glad to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. **MAGNUSON**. Of course, Mr. President, the resolution submitted by the Senator from Indiana comes within the jurisdiction of the Commerce Committee, which now is holding hearings on the entire transportation problem. However, I fully understand what the Senator from Indiana is suggesting when he asks that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, which is the Senate committee which will determine whether a select committee should be chosen to do this particular job.

I am sure that the Senator from Indiana realizes that if the committee should make the investigation it would be in the nature of a request that the Senate Committee on Commerce take such action as it may deem fit.

Mr. **HARTKE**. The Senator is correct. There is no intention that the committee be an action committee, but that it make a study and report.

Mr. **GRUENING**. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Indiana on his resolution. While it is true that in Alaska we have only one government-owned railroad and a small part—some 20 miles—of a British-Canadian owned railroad that runs into Canada from Skagway, Alaska, to Whitehorse, Yukon Territory, I believe that we in Alaska are as much concerned with the solution of our national problems as anyone else, even though they may not as directly affect our State as they do some others.

I am hopeful that the investigation which the Senator proposes will prove successful and fruitful. I know that our railroads have serious problems. Although we may seem not directly connected with those problems, we are indirectly connected, because transportation rates to the ports from which goods to Alaska are transported by sea are ultimately reflected in the costs of living in Alaska. Actually, we have an issue now with the railroads over export-import rates which Alaska uniquely among the areas in the Pacific have been denied us. So, I applaud the resolution of the Senator and hope that it will be agreed to.

SENATOR HARTKE'S RESOLUTION NEEDED

Mr. **YARBOROUGH**. Mr. President, I am one of those who support the resolution just introduced by Senator HARTKE. I am in full accord with his recommendations that we make a thorough study of the claims that the railroad industry is in financial distress.

A great deal of the transportation legislation before the Commerce Committee is predicated on the assumption that the railroads are in deep financial trouble, and that bankruptcy will result unless we take legislative action to improve their competitive position. Through the mass transportation bill recently before us, we are legislating on the assumption that large subsidies are necessary to get railroads back in the passenger business.

It may be true that the railroads are in real financial trouble, but this assertion has been vigorously controverted by others who are in a position to know something of the industry. It seems to me that we must have some more specific facts as to the actual state of affairs if we are to act intelligently on the legislation before us which seems to be based on an assumption of financial distress in the railroad industry.

I congratulate the senior Senator from Indiana for his initiative and leadership in introducing this measure; I am hopeful it will lead to our finding the full facts, and legislating accordingly.

Mr. **DOUGLAS** subsequently said: Mr. President, I believe that the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] has submitted a very important resolution, asking that a select committee be appointed to study the financial structure of the railroad industry. This is very badly needed, and ordinarily it would be the task of the Interstate Commerce Commission. Unfortunately, it appears that the Interstate Commerce

Commission, with certain honorable exceptions, has gone the way of virtually all the so-called independent regulatory bodies. It has lost a great deal of its old zeal to protect the public. It is now more than three-quarters of a century since the Interstate Commerce Commission was created, and more than 40 years have passed since the great battles which took place in the period of Theodore Roosevelt.

In a sense the public has lost interest in the matter, while the railroads have been very active in appearing before the Commission and in influencing it, with the result that it now appears that the Commission is coming to be more or less regulated by the industry which it is supposed to control.

This is the sad experience of almost all the regulatory bodies. Of course, this does not necessarily hold true of each and every individual member of the Interstate Commerce Commission. In some recent dissents, I have noticed a great deal of public spirit. But, in the main, this has become a quiescent Commission; a Commission which does not launch deep investigations on its own account; a Commission which takes a very protective attitude toward the management of the railroads; a Commission which is relatively less interested in the welfare of those who work on the railroads and of the areas and the general public served by the railroads.

Therefore, I believe this task is too important to be left with the Interstate Commerce Commission. A select committee of the Senate should consider this subject, just as did the Wheeler-Truman committee, which laid the basis for the Transportation Act of 1940.

I am very happy to join with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] in sponsoring the resolution. I hope very much that it will be passed.

STUDY TO DETERMINE EFFECTS OF ANTITRUST LAWS ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the President of the United States should conduct, through the agency of the White House Committee on Small Business, a study to determine the effects of the antitrust laws on small business concerns and to determine whether, and in what respects, these laws should be amended for the benefit of small businesses.

All friends of small business recognize the value of the antitrust laws as a means of promoting equality of opportunity in the marketplace. These statutes have been rightly hailed as the bulwark of our free enterprise system and as a charter of economic liberty. In fact, the small business community would long since have disappeared or have dwindled to insignificance without the protection afforded antitrust statutes.

Nevertheless, there are some aspects of the antitrust laws, as construed by the enforcement agencies and by the courts, which are questionable from the viewpoint of the small businessman. The basic purpose of these laws is to foster healthy competitive conditions in every industry. But has this objective of healthy competition been achieved through recent case law that has developed in the antitrust field? Let me emphasize that I am speaking purely in the spirit of inquiry.

My comments are motivated by my long service on the Select Committee on Small Business of the Senate, on which I am privileged to serve as chairman of one of the subcommittees. I do not pretend to have the answers to the problems I am about to describe. Indeed, it is precisely because of the complexities and uncertainties involved, that I am recommending the initiation of the study.

The antitrust laws, as their name indicates, were directed against big business. In a landmark decision, exploring the reasons for the enactment of the Sherman Act in 1890, the Supreme Court of the United States made this observation:

> The debates show * * * conclusively * * * that the main cause which led to the legislation was the thought that it was required by the economic conditions of the times, that is, the vast accumulation of wealth in the hands of corporations and individuals, the enormous development of corporate organization, the facility for combination which such organizations afforded, the fact that the facility was being used, and that combinations known as trusts were being multiplied, and the widespread impression that their power had been and would be exerted to oppress individuals and injure the public generally—*Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey* v. *United States,* 221 U.S. 1, 50.

And yet today we find the Sherman Act and the other antitrust laws being invoked against small concerns as well as large ones. I would not be surprised to learn that a very substantial number of the businesses currently charged with violations, perhaps even a majority of them, are small concerns within the meaning of the Small Business Act. In any case we ought to have the facts on this vitally important matter. One of the purposes of the study I am proposing is to obtain the facts.

The vulnerability of small business concerns to antitrust charges stems mostly, if not entirely, from the so-called per se rules. Over the years the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission have obtained court approval for the principle that the necessary effect of certain forms of conduct is to bring about competitive conditions which the antitrust laws were designed to prevent. Included among these condemned practices are agreements to fix prices, to establish production or sales quotas, to allocate territories or customers, or to refuse to do business with a particular person or persons.

Where such an agreement is shown to have existed among competitors, no further evidence is needed to demonstrate that it imposed a restraint on trade, that it lessened competition substantially, or that it produced any of the other effects prohibited by the antitrust laws. A conclusive presumption arises from the mere existence of one of these outlawed practices that it was followed by one or more of the forbidden results. When all or most of the participants in the practice are large concerns, this presumption makes sense.

But does it make sense when the participants are all small business concerns? Let us consider a typical situation. Here is an industry dominated by four or five large companies which, among them, enjoy 90 percent of the market. The remaining 10 percent is scattered among, say, 25 small firms. Suppose now that these small firms decide to strengthen their position by means of an agreement which includes price-fixing features. And suppose, further, that as a result of their combined efforts these small firms increase their share of the market from 10 to 20 percent.

Depending upon one's point of view, the agreement can be said to have decreased competition or it can be said to have increased competition. If one looks solely to the competitive situation among the small participants to the agreement, one will see a decrease. On the other hand, if one looks beyond that narrow situation and considers the problems of the industry as a whole, one will see that the agreement increased competition in such degree as to break the grip of the leading companies on a substantial share of the market. It seems to me that the latter view, the broad view, is essential for the purposes of a wise antitrust program.

However, there is nothing broad in the outlook of existing law on the subject. Under the per se rules a conclusive presumption arises that the agreement I have described produced undesirable effects on competition. Any attempt on the part of the small business participants to show that it actually strengthened competition, instead of weakening it, would be disallowed by the courts or the Federal Trade Commission.

The extremes to which the per se rules have carried us were further illustrated by an advisory opinion recently rendered by the Federal Trade Commission. This opinion dealt with the practice commonly followed by small retailers of pooling their resources and purchasing joint advertisements in the newspapers, listing the names and addresses of the participants and describing the products they have for sale. In substance, the Commission took the position that such a cooperative advertisement is open to challenge under the antitrust laws if each product is offered for sale at the same price in all of the participating stores. It is widely recognized that, without such a common price, cooperative advertising by small retailers would not be feasible.

I introduced appropriate legislation on this particular matter. I must say that the opinion of the Federal Trade Commission represents the most nebulous theory and the most incomprehensible practicality. I cannot understand how the Federal Trade Commission came to any understanding that what we call cooperative advertising on the part of members represents a restraint of trade. Apparently, no single member of the Federal Trade Commission has ever worked behind a counter. If he has, he has forgotten that experience. Apparently no single member has ever worked in an independent business establishment. If he has, he has forgotten that experience. Of all the ridiculous rulings I have ever read, this takes the prize.

In effect, therefore, the Commission has questioned the validity of one of the most effective instruments available to small stores in meeting the competition of chains and discount houses. This result, absurd as it is, nevertheless may represent a correct application of the per se rule on price fixing. Here again we find a situation in which existing law seems to disregard the facts of economic life. It compels us to presume injury to competition even where we know that the device in question is a healthy stimulant to competition.

Time and again instances have come to my attention in which the per se rules have been invoked against small business concerns seeking to take joint action which would enable them to compete more effectively against the leaders of their respective industries. One of the principal purposes of the study I am proposing is to evaluate the merits of these rules and to determine whether they can be modified in a manner which, without impairing enforcement procedures, will bring them closer to reality and thereby provide small business concerns with more freedom in developing cooperative techniques essential to their survival.

Mr. President, I ask that this bill, which I now offer, may lie on the table for 1 week in order that other interested Senators may have an opportunity to add their names to it as cosponsors.

I also ask unanimous consent that the full text of the resolution be printed at this point in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; will be printed in the Record under the rule; and, without objection, will lie on the desk as requested.

The resolution (S. Res. 138) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the President should take such action as he may deem appropriate to provide for the conduct, by a conference including representatives of small business organizations, of a comprehensive study and investigation to determine (1) the economic effect of the antitrust laws of the United States upon the operations of small business organizations, (2) the respects in which such laws are advantageous, and the respects in which such laws may be disadvantageous, to the economic success of small business organizations, and (3) the nature and extent of any revision of such laws which may be necessary or appropriate to facilitate effective competition by small business organizations with business organizations having greater economic resources.

INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT REGARDING THE MAINTENANCE OF CERTAIN LIGHTS IN THE RED SEA—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the President of the United States transmitted to the Senate today Executive F, 88th Congress, 1st session, the international agreement regarding the maintenance of certain lights in the Red Sea. I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the agreement, and that the agreement, together with the President's message be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the President's message be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to acceptance, I transmit herewith a certified copy of the international agreement regarding the maintenance of certain lights in the Red Sea, which was open for signature from February 20, 1962 to August 19, 1962, and during that period was signed on behalf of the United States of America and seven other countries.

The agreement primarily concerns the sharing of the costs of maintaining the lights as aids to navigation, and is further explained in the report of the Secretary of State, which is transmitted herewith for the information of the Senate.

John F. Kennedy.

Enclosures:

1. Report of the Secretary of State.
2. International agreement on maintenance of certain lights in the Red Sea, opened for signature February 20, 1962.

The White House, *May 8, 1963.*

ESTABLISHMENT OF FORT UNION TRADING POST NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE, NORTH DAKOTA—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on subsequent printings of Senate bill 187 to authorize establishment of the Fort Union Trading Post National Historic Site, North Dakota, and for other purposes, the name of the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield] appear as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONSTRUCTION OF TRAWLERS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing the name of the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 744) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct two modern sternramp trawlers to be used for experimental commercial fishing, research, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Byrd] be listed as an additional cosponsor of S. 1163, the Area Redevelopment Act amendments which I and other Senators introduced on March 21, 1963, and that his name be added to the bill at the next printing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN SHIPPING CONTAINERS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill (S. 1342) to prohibit the introduction into interstate commerce of any shipping container manufactured in the United States from imported steel unless the container is marked so as to indicate the country of origin of the steel, that the name of the senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett] be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON H.R. 3872—EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to announce that the Subcommittee on International Finance of the Banking and Currency Committee plans to hold a hearing on the bill H.R. 3872, to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, to extend the period within which the Export-Import Bank of Washington may exercise its functions, and for other purposes.

The hearing will be held on May 17, 1963, at 10 a.m., in room 5302, New Senate Office Building. All persons who wish to appear and testify on the bill are requested to notify Mr. Matthew Hale, chief of staff, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5300, New Senate Office Building, telephone CApitol 4-3121, extension 3921.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON SENATE BILL 176

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, as chairman of the Retirement Subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I wish to announce that public hearings on S. 176 have been scheduled to begin at 10 a.m., on May 14, 1963, in room 6202 of the New Senate Office Building.

S. 176 would amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to provide for retirement from the Federal service at age 55 after 30 years of service. Representatives of the Bureau of the Budget and the Civil Service Commission will be heard first. Then others interested in the measure will be given an opportunity to testify.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON S. 855 AND S. 915, DEALING WITH METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and other interested persons that the Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations has scheduled a hearing on S. 855 and S. 915, both of which deal with metropolitan area planning. The hearing will be held at 10:30 a.m. beginning on May 21.

Any Senator or other person wishing to testify at the hearing should notify the subcommittee, room 357, Senate Office Building, extension 4718, in order that he might be scheduled as a witness.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, and so forth, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Remarks before the first plenary session of the Ninth Pan American Highway Congress, Washington, D.C., May 7, 1963.

V–E DAY—UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have conferred with the majority leader. I indicated that today was the 18th anniversary of V–E Day. It is a day suitably to be observed. A number of speeches will be delivered on this side of the aisle, and perhaps on the other side of the aisle, in commemoration of that event. I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the 3-minute rule, I may be recognized so that I may recognize other Senators for that purpose.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I recognize the distinguished Senator from Texas.

CUBA

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, on V–E Day, the United States stood on a pinnacle, universally respected and triumphant. Today our international standing has slipped low indeed. The primary reason can be summed up in one short word—Cuba.

Every American knows what Cuba means, hard as that little group of theorists clustered around 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue try to twist it. Cuba means that an enemy, intent upon our destruction, is based 90 miles away. Cuba means that we have endangered our children's future by forgetting that vigilance is the eternal price of freedom. Cuba means we have abandoned our Christian neighbors next door to atheistic terrorists.

Worldwide, Cuba invokes an image of a weak and wavering United States.

In permitting what has happened in Cuba, we have cast aside the traditions of this Nation as embodied in the Monroe Doctrine and have reneged on carrying out our solemn obligation under the Rio, Caracas, and Bogotá Treaties. We have done violence to the charter of the Organization of American States, which binds member states to assist each other "to defend their sovereignty, their territorial integrity, and their independence."

We have demoralized and discouraged those Latin American Republics who, threatened by Communist subversion, have urged us to take tough and decisive steps to purge Soviet colonialism from this hemisphere.

This, I may comment, is quite different from the speed with which the late, great John Foster Dulles had the Red regime broken in Guatamala.

It seems worthy to note that, a decade and a half before the Monroe Doctrine, Jefferson's Cabinet put itself on record as against the acquisition of Cuba by Britain or France, the world powers then. President Polk tried to buy Cuba for $120 million and President Pierce for $120 million. Down through our history we have recognized that, because of proximity, the Cuban-American relations were special.

After the Cubans rose in revolt in 1895, we went to war with Spain to aid them. The Organic Act of Cuba—her first constitution—declared that no foreign power was to secure partial or complete control of the island and authorized the United States to intervene in Cuba, if necessary, to prevent this.

President Kennedy himself stood in 1960 upon a Democratic Party platform which unequivocally declared:

> The new Democratic administration will also reaffirm our historic policy of opposition to the establishment anywhere in the Americas of governments dominated by foreign powers, a policy now being undermined by Soviet threats to the freedom and independence of Cuba.

Nevertheless, we have followed a policy more fit for a Byzantine emperor than a great modern world power, and straightforward world power like the United States. We denied at the time we had anything to do with participation in the U.S. conceived, U.S. prepared, and U.S. directed Cuban landing force at the Bay of Pigs. One result of this hypocritical policy was that the landing was made without adequate air cover or support.

Three days after that disaster, President Kennedy appeared before the Nation's editors here and said:

> If the nations of this hemisphere should fail to meet their commitments against outside Communist penetration, then I want it clearly understood that this Government would not hesitate in meeting its primary obligations which are the security of the Nation.

Mr. Kennedy made a similar statement to the released Cuban prisoners he saw fit to address in Miami despite the fact he had repudiated them on landing day. Both statements were widely interpreted to mean Mr. Kennedy would help liberate Cuba.

Instead, he has repudiated the Cubans he once induced to risk their lives and the leader he selected for them.

On this V–E Day, I would recall to the President's mind the further pledge of his platform:

> The Government of the United States under a Democratic administration will not be deterred from fulfilling its obligations and solemn responsibilities under its treaties and agreements with the nations of the Western Hemisphere.
>
> Nor will the United States, in conformity with its treaty obligations, permit the establishment of a regime dominated by international atheistic communism in the Western Hemisphere.

I ask, along with the American people, why this pledge has not been kept.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I recognize the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is the Senate operating under the 3-minute rule?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is operating under a unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That agreement does not violate the 3-minute rule, does it?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It does.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on V–E Day, just 18 years ago today, we stood with trusted friends and allies, triumphant over the totalitarians who had laid waste much of the world in their attempt to dominate it.

When the Soviet Union reverted to its Marxist-Leninist policy of world conquest, we strengthened the old friendships and forged new ones, first under the Democratic administration of President Truman, and then under the Republican administration of President Eisenhower.

Many Americans had misjudged Soviet intentions during and immediately after the war, but through aid to and alliance with our friends abroad, we restored economic stability, built the NATO shield, and brought the Red bandwagon in Europe to a decisive halt.

Indeed, on the 15th anniversary of NATO, in 1960, we stood at a pinnacle of power and prestige. We were preeminent in the field of nuclear weapons—the myth of the missile gap did not even survive the present administration's first months. Our space effort, which had been ignored during the Truman administration, was beginning to make up the lost time. A series of alliances, supported by both of our great national parties, ringed our cold war enemies. We dealt with the Soviets, but in concert with our friends. And, our unyielding opposition to Communist oppression was clear.

In spite of this, there was a great deal of talk during the 1960 campaign about prestige and polls. A so-called decline in American prestige was made a prime issue by Democratic candidates. The then junior Senator from Massachusetts exhibited great concern when he told a Portland, Oreg., audience:

> To rebuild American prestige will not be easy. It cannot be done overnight by a new administration. But I can assure you that a new administration will make the effort.

He told a Kansas City audience that the great challenge of "rebuilding our prestige" would require us to "understand the needs of other nations as well as our own."

He painted a grim picture. And it was all backed up by talk of mysterious and secret Government polls which purportedly indicated declining American prestige abroad.

Well, those and other polls are being used now, though under odd ground rules—one uses them when they prove his point, and abuses them when they do not.

As for our prestige, after 2 years of "rebuilding" the Russians are now in Cuba, where we have gone from eyeballs to elbows with them. This is the first time in modern history that an enemy of the United States has succeeded in establishing a beachhead in the Western Hemisphere. The creeping communization of Laos, otherwise known as Harriman's folly, is opening a brand new door into Vietnam, where we are heavily committed. The policy of watchful waiting in the Middle East amounts to watching a tinder box that is already burning at one end and waiting for it to ignite at the other. And Indonesia's playboy potentate, Sukarno, goes his merry, extravagant, and anti-American way with our support. Such policies and events have not increased our prestige.

Even freedom's shield, NATO, is today, to use the currently fashionable phrase, "in disarray." One recent sequence in what the New Frontier describes as diplomacy illustrates this massive understatement of our European dilemma.

The administration's shock tactics with the British in abruptly canceling construction of the Skybolt missile, on which Britain has based her future nuclear deterrent, led to the hastily improvised Nassau agreement providing for British Polaris submarines. This confirmed General de Gaulle's suspicions about an Anglo-American "special relationship" and served as a trigger for his rejection of British entry into the Common Market. De Gaulle reportedly had hoped that Britain would pool her nuclear know-how with France.

And what was the administration's response to this ferment and confusion in the "New Europe" which it had done so much to jog into being? A missile-carrying freighter to be financed by all, and with mixed NATO crews, but with the U.S. finger on the firing button. Such a scheme is not what the Europeans really want; for, despite their participation, they will still have no control. It will add little to their defense or to ours. And yet these ships will be very expensive—estimates run as high as $6 billion, a large portion to be paid by the German Federal Republic.

Former NATO Commander General Lauris Norstad has pointedly observed that "no matter how you tinker with the gadgetry of weapons" the heart of the problem "is the question of control."

It is time, I believe, that, in the President's words of 1960, we began to "understand the needs of other nations as well as our own." And, the best place to start would be with those nations who are our proven friends and allies. In short, we should recall that the NATO Alliance is just that, an alliance, and that we should treat it as such.

General Norstad has termed the European desire for a nuclear capability a "very legitimate desire." It seems to me that instead of deploring the fruits of our own successful investment—Europe's economic miracle—we should seek to help and influence those who, as committed Allies, should be in our corner if the horrible necessity for a resort to nuclear weapons should ever arise.

France's desire for an independent deterrent is a natural one, and one which will spread to other European nations in a disorderly and dangerous way if we do not move to influence, rather than to obstruct, the normal reach for security, nation by nation.

We already support a British deterrent.

Concern is sometimes voiced, by NATO countries and others, over West Germany's potential for a nuclear capability. Their scientists in this field are among the very best. To quote Harvard's Henry Kissinger, a noted expert on these matters who is frequently consulted by New Frontiersmen:

> If West Germany is seriously interested in acquiring strategic weapons, the multilateral force (missile-carrying freighters) is apt only to prove an interim step and may turn out to be the easiest way of getting Germany into the nuclear business.

Is that what we want? Indeed, is that what the Germans want, a backdoor into potential disaster?

But this missile freighter idea is the closest discernible thing to a policy on this problem to emerge from that New Frontier combination of computer-managed-military-hardware-thinkers, abstract theorists, and spenders.

There is an alternative to this stopgap gimmick, a constructive alternative. Instead of futile and negative efforts to discourage any European nuclear defense initiative outside of Britain, we could encourage an integrated, overall European force as a vital part of the drive toward unity and true Atlantic partnership.

I share the concern of those who are continuously vocal about the dangers of nuclear proliferation; of too many hands on too many nuclear triggers. But certainly a joint force combining the efforts, assets, and aims of the British, French, and other Europeans would be preferable to many separate independent nuclear forces. If we cannot relate our nuclear needs and strategies with theirs now, how can we expect to do so when the present seeds of nuclear proliferation really begin to sprout?

Looking back on V–E Day, of which this is the anniversary—looking back on the great prestige of the United States then—looking back on the grief and the breast beating, the public categorizing of our status in the world as sadly low and declining, during the last Presidential campaign, one finds now the true situation to be that a great leap backward in American prestige has taken place over the past 2 years. It will continue unless we face up to the difficult challenge of exercising positive and coherent leadership among equals, unless we recognize that the era which began on VE Day is closing, that great changes have been and are being wrought. We ought to move with the course of history, attempting to influence and mold it, rather than standing against it.

In Cuba, for example, in Laos, and elsewhere, a policy of wait and see usually ends up as wait and be shown.

Hanson W. Baldwin, the distinguished military affairs expert of the New York Times, summed it up, I believe, when he wrote:

> No alliance has room for second-best allies or discriminatory practices. A really coordinated multinational European nuclear deterrent, keyed to the two principles of collective European control without an American veto and a minimum deterrence, probably offers the best hope for tomorrow. It is time to recognize that President de Gaulle has a point, to shift our emphasis to coordination rather than integration, and to attempt to influence, rather than to control, Europe's nuclear future.

Mr. President, we are now confronted with a Russian military presence in Cuba. An international brigade is being organized there—with the exporting of revolution from Castro Cuba presently and overtly underway, after the training of numerous cadres. And we are confronted by an administration which has deplored the very existence of any form of communism 90 miles from our shore and yet has complacently accepted not mere existence, not even mere coexistence, but the actual, thundering, ominous menace of foreign Communist armies, the very introduction of European systems condemned by the Monroe Doctrine. If the Monroe Doctrine is dead, in the administration's judgment, they should say so.

In my judgment, the answer is to assert our rights under the Monroe Doctrine, under the various declarations of Rio and Caracas, and under the statement of the Organization of American States of October 23, 1962.

Let us again, as Americans, be proud of and assert the facts that we know how to defend ourselves against communism, and against all other enemies, foreign or domestic; that we are prepared to defend ourselves; and substitute a policy which makes sense, that is in keeping with the desires of the American people, for the sad lack today of any foreign policy in relation to Cuba.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I recognize the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, on this anniversary of V–E Day, I think we should look south of the border to the rest of Latin America, outside Cuba. Latin America was the one major part of the world that was not involved in or engulfed by World War II. But it has not escaped the tidal wave of the war's consequences. We thought that V–E Day marked the end of both the forces and philosophies of totalitarianism, but we were wrong. A particularly evil germ lay dormant, protected by a nominal participation in the forces of freedom; and since V–E Day, it has infected the bodies politic of many of the nations to the south of us. Unfortunately, we have not yet found the antibiotic that promises a cure.

We have tried words and phrases like "good neighbor policy" and "Alliance for Progress," as substitutes for the old homely remedy of the Monroe Doctrine. But the infection continues to spread. We know where the source is. It is in Castro's Cuba, and we have made several apparent attempts to eliminate it—notably at the Bay of Pigs and, last fall, on the "day of the missiles."

Both times when we prepared our friends to see surgery, they enthusiastically approved and supported us, and then we ended with aspirin. No wonder their faith in us is wavering.

In such a situation—and to change my metaphor—I am reminded of the lines of the poet, Pope:

> Vice is a monster of so fierce a mien
> That to be hated needs but to be seen
> But seen too oft, familiar with its face
> We first endure, then pity, then embrace.

For the word "vice" in the poem, read the word "communism."

South American leaders live in a world of political insecurity. Their history, with its pattern of revolution, tells us that. They also live in an economic world whose pattern resembles pre-1917 Russia more than it does ours, an economic world with little or no middle class, and no widespread base of private capital available for investment in homes and jobs. The phoney promises of communism—the lure that hides the hook—sound good to them.

And yet they are proud, as we are, to be Americans. Those of their citizens who are not native are descendents of men who fled Europe, as our Founding Fathers did. Their tradition of law and government, with its roots in Rome, is different than ours, whose roots are in England, but the difference is less than between Europe and Asiatic Russia. I believe they want most of all to be like us, in personal opportunity and well-being. I think they would turn to communism only as a second choice, and in despair.

And yet they seem to be turning in that direction, or at least to be hedging their bets on American leadership—and increasingly so since 1961. Even the President of Mexico, who may not leave the country for more than 2 days without Mexican congressional permission, has made the pilgrimage to Moscow.

Where is the fault? With them? I think not. It must be with us. We must look within for the causes of failure. When we do we may discover these among others:

First. We have not tried to understand them, but rather to assume the arrogant posture of prescribing without diagnosis. The Great White Father knows best.

We went into Latin America with the Alliance for Progress before its details had been presented to the Congress.

Second. We have satisfied ourselves with catch phrases and Washington-centered programs, hoping that they would take the word for the deed—and when deeds have been inevitable, they have been weaker than the words that promised them.

Third. In the typical pattern of the New Frontier, every idea we come up with is based on the spending of money, including the ransom of the Cuban prisoners. Money is always a completely inadequate substitute for understanding and solutions based on human values.

Fourth. We never seem to be able to establish a satisfactory system of communication. Not only do we face a difference in language, but a difference in the meaning of words that are basic to an understanding of our goals. To them free enterprise is an evil concept, with the meanings of exploitation Marx attached to it over 100 years ago. To them social justice is the ultimate good, and Communists, not we, call themselves socialists.

V-E Day found us with the greatest power in the world, military as well as economic. Since then we have failed in courage to use both. So, who can blame the South Americans if they begin to shop around and take a look at communism? Unfortunately, that is exactly what they are now doing.

In the American tradition, the customer is always right. We must present the American system to our friends in Latin America more realistically, as though we were dealing in their interest, and not our own, and we must begin to live up to the promises we have so glibly made, realizing that time and confidence are slipping away from us very rapidly.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I recognize the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, 18 years ago today at 2:41 a.m., the German armies surrendered unconditionally at Rheims, France.

It was a day for rejoicing. It was also a day of great sorrow for the cost in lives—for the suffering of men and women wounded and crippled from the fray. It was a day of mourning for those whose lives were laid down for liberty and for their families whose losses could never be repaid.

Out of this holocaust we emerged the mightiest Nation in the world. Our power and prestige were at a peak. The United States was looked upon not only as the savior of the free world, but as the protector and helper of all freedom-loving nations.

Now, 18 years later, where do we stand?

Mr. President, our foreign relations all over the world are in disarray. Our prestige is at a low ebb. Today we find Castro "home free" as puppet ruler of his apparently permanent Moscow supported Western Hemisphere Communist base. In Laos our situation is deteriorating every day, as a result of our agreement to accept a governing body that should be neutral, but is actually Communist.

In Berlin, in Latin America, in Korea, and in Africa—no matter where you go—our efforts have not made us friends, nor built our prestige.

In the continent of Africa, the political situation is most unstable. In many countries of Africa, our own money is supporting individuals and organizations that are bringing about chaos and instability.

President Kennedy, in seeking the Presidency, declared in a speech at Bowling Green, Ky., October 8, 1960:

> First, we must ally ourselves with the rising tide of nationalism in Africa.
>
> Second, we must make the United Nations the central instrument of our energies and policies in Africa.

Today, in the United Nations, we are barely holding our own against a burgeoning of new little African nations being born almost daily, many of which are smaller than our smallest states and with less population than some of our middle-size cities.

In Africa, many of these emerging nations are neither emerged nor are they nations. If we count Egypt and the Malagasy Republic among those African nations, there are 32 of them in the United Nations at present. Yet their influence is as great as the number of votes they have.

Out of the 111 member nations in the United Nations, we, who shoulder the greatest burden, have but 1 vote. We find ourselves weighted in African votes 32 to 1 with even little Togo having the same vote as the United States.

Because Soviet Russia finds its greatest advantage by fishing in troubled waters, and because of the diversity of languages, tribes, and economies, we find that Africa is seething with all sorts of Communist activities and subversion. They are carrying on a campaign of hate, not only against each other, but also against the United States.

Despite official U.S. claims that "no new nation has gone Communist" both Mali and Ghana have declared their governments as the Soviet-type "socialist."

Guinea is cooperating with Soviet-bloc nations; and Ethiopia has been a center for Soviet espionage in Africa.

Mr. President, in making the United Nations the central instrument of our energies and policies in Africa, we found ourselves embroiled in a bloody civil war in the Congo. The list could go on and on.

We find ourselves called "imperialists" and worse by many of these tiny so-called African nations still engaged in bloody tribal warfare and drifting into the Communist orbit.

Today, in commemorating this anniversary of V-E Day, instead of a world in which we had the opportunity to lead to strength and freedom, and in which we did lead so that Europe is strong and prosperous in a world in which we freed of Japanese aggression those countries in the Far East who are now their own people, we find we have fewer friends than we ever had.

On V-E Day we realized that major problems can never be solved by appeasement. It is hoped that this principle is realized in the future.

Only by a firm and clear foreign policy can we hope to regain the prestige and respect which we had on that fateful day in Rheims when the once powerful German Army capitulated and the world dared to dream of a bright future.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I now yield to the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have been listening to the remarks of the eloquent and patriotic speakers who have preceded me. I must confess that, so far as Cuba is concerned, I cannot understand the shift of position in our policy. Last October I do not believe any of us would have believed that 6 months later the U.S. Navy and Air Force would be used for the protection of the Russian occupant of that island or the puppet government of Mr. Castro.

It is also beyond my understanding to fathom the purpose of our own Government, not only to use our own Armed

Forces to protect the Russians, but also to send shiploads of food to feed them.

We have contributed 15 million pounds of Government-owned powdered milk for this purpose. We have also contributed 20 million pounds of vegetable oil. I understand that other articles of food, which figured in the ransom deal, such as wheat, flour, potatoes, and possibly also a few luxury items, have been purchased with private or semiprivate funds.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I recognize the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). The Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, we are, in a way, taking inventory of the foreign policy of our Nation with respect to VE Day. This is certainly a deeply moving day for all of us in the United States and, if we may be forgiven a little particularization, especially for those of us who served in the Armed Forces of our country.

I should like to say a word about a particular area of the world, to which I have addressed myself recently.

I am as devoted to a bipartisan foreign policy affecting the Middle East, about which I would like to say a word today, as I am with respect to every other area of the world, and I trust that nothing which I shall say, even in the context of these remarks, will betray my deep devotion to that fundamental approach.

However, I believe that it is the function of the opposition or the minority in respect to questions of foreign policy not merely to be quiet and close ranks, but to be fully informed about the facts upon which foreign policy decisions are made, and also to make its contribution—and often it could be a very marked and strong one—to the way in which that policy is administered and decisions are made, so that the impact may be had before grave damage is done to the national interests, rather than to seek political advantage after it is done.

It is in that spirit that I speak with respect to the Middle East. I think it is fair to say that this is one of the areas of the world which has caused considerable difficulty since V–E Day. It has been suggested that, perhaps, the letters "VE" might be reversed so as to be "EV"—"eternal vigilance"—the price of the security of our Nation and our Nation's future.

In the Middle East I see certain directions of policy being pursued by the administration against which I called out the other day in a speech. I should like very much to include that speech within the context of constructive criticism; if you will, within the context of constructive criticism of the bipartisan policy on which I believe we are basing our action in the Middle East. I am not directing my criticism exclusively at this administration. I have had my difficulties in this regard with previous administrations, both Democratic and Republican. But, after all, the President is the President. He administers our foriegn policy, and we must deal with the President who is presently in office. That is the sense in which I wish to be understood.

I believe we make a grave mistake in thinking that we can be "even-handed." Those are the words used by the Under Secretary of State in a letter sent to me and other Senators, explaining the position of the administration with respect to the Middle East at this time and the grave dangers that amount to a war threat, including the accelerated arms race which it poses. I do not believe we can be even-handed in the Middle East between the aggressors and the defenders, between the oppressors and the oppressed. I do not believe we can be even-handed concerning an aggression of power under the leadership of President Nasser. Nasser threatens to use his power to destroy a state to whose preservation we are pledged—pledged by President Truman in his recognition of that state; by President Eisenhower in his support of that state; by Secretary Dulles in his declaration that our support of the State of Israel constitutes one of the tenets of American policy; and by the campaign pledge which President Kennedy undertook. I believe we are confronted with a fundamental mistake. When such a mistake is made, it manifests itself in ways which are most unwise. For example, we made a very great mistake in standing athwart a group of Arab-Asian nations which were seeking to have adopted in the United Nations a resolution calling for direct peace negotiations between Israel and the Arab States. I can hardly see how we could have taken that attitude in view of the policy of the President of the United States, who, when he was a candidate, speaking before a convention of the Zionists in New York City, said:

> I propose that all the authority and prestige of the White House be used to call into conference the leaders of Israel and the Arab States.

Certainly, there was a chance to move to do that, but we did not do it; again, I believe, because of the mistaken idea that we can be even-handed between those who threaten aggression and liquidation and those who are defending themselves.

I think we see the same thing happening now in the way that foreign aid from the United States to President Nasser is being used to assist in the economics of the situation, and which unfortunately enables him to use Egypt's cotton crop for the purpose of buying Soviet-bloc arms, thereby jeopardizing peace and security in the area of the world especially secured to the State of Israel.

I believe we did the same thing again when we moved rather precipitately, in my judgment, to recognize the new regime in the Yemen. Incidentally, recognition was withheld by our great ally, the United Kingdom. But the United States recognized Yemen, notwithstanding the fact that the new government was maintained essentially by Egyptian troops shipped there by United Arab Republic President Nasser.

Again, enough problems have been raised for us by Syria and Iraq with the United Arab Republic, whose declared intention is the liquidation of Israel, and, therefore, with the consequence of bringing war to the Midle East, a war which would be bound to involve the great powers, as well.

So on the anniversary of the great V–E Day, as it focuses on the Middle East, I again pledge myself to a bipartisan foreign policy. I have laid on with equal candor with respect to the administration in power, whatever may be its political obligation. The President has very heavy responsibilities. He is the man in authority. He is the man who is doing the work. Nevertheless, I believe we have made and are making some extremely grave mistakes in respect to our Mideast policy, and I believe it is my duty to point out, as well, what I consider to be appropriate solutions for them. I am trying to be true to that duty in the effort which I have described to call the attention of our people to what are the dangers—and I believe they are real dangers, as I have described them—amounting to a threat of war and, in my judgment, what needs to be done in order to avoid war.

In this connection I ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks an editorial entitled "Our Mideast Policy Under Fire," which appeared in the New York Post, May 2, 1963.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR MIDEAST POLICY UNDER FIRE

The Kennedy administration is smarting under the harsh criticism of its Mideast policies voiced by a dozen Senators last Tuesday. The Senators, of both parties, assailed the administration for building up President Nasser while he continues to threaten the peace and stability of the Middle East.

In an indirect answer to its critics, the administration has let it be known that it recently took precautionary military measures and warned Nasser that we would intervene if there were a coup against King Hussein of Jordan. Washington also disclosed that it has been pressing the United Arab Republic, Iraq, and Syria to call off their propaganda war against Hussein.

But these disclosures only underline the contradictions in our policy. Who threatens Hussein? Who denounces Hussein as a U.S. puppet? It is President Nasser—the same Nasser who is a substantial beneficiary of U.S. aid and support.

It is a policy that makes little sense. Republican and Democratic Senators warned the administration that events in the area were now moving in a direction that can only end in war, a war that would endanger the peace of the world.

To halt this trend, they urged revival of the United States-British-French guarantees of the region's peace and stability, coupled with initiative to end the arms race.

If Nasser is unwilling to cooperate with a peace and stabilization program at a time when he is soliciting our help, what makes us think he will be more amenable later, when our help is less important?

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is the Senate now operating in the morning hour, or under the dispensation granted to the minority leader?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is now operating in the morning hour.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Five additional minutes in which the Senator from New York will speak?

Mr. JAVITS. I wish to yield on this subject, and then to submit certain other matters.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, inasmuch as there has been a concerted attack on the administration and on the Government over the past 18 years, I believe some Senator should respond to that criticism; and I hope that I may do so.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I had thought the Senator from Montana would take the floor when the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] concluded. I shall be glad to have the Senator from Montana proceed now.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No, Mr. President; I should like to have all the diatribes and criticisms presented first.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I should like to add to these remarks.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is what I understood.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK].

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. HARTKE in the chair). The Senate is now proceeding in the morning hour; and the Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, it seems to me that 18 years after V–E Day we have had clear expositions in the Senate today of some of the problems that we are facing on a nationwide and worldwide basis.

LATIN AMERICA

The threat to the internal security of Latin America, and hence the entire Western Hemisphere, is greater today than at any time in history. Overlooking this fact, or pretending it will go away if ignored, is a policy fraught with danger which is doomed to absolute and final failure. As the most powerful nation in the hemisphere it is our responsibility to assume the lead of eradicating this menace. We have done this in the past and are expected by our Latin American friends to do it again.

During World War II, the United States, along with the Latin American nations, cooperated to prevent Axis penetration of the Western Hemisphere. In 1954, under the Eisenhower administration, a Communist-dominated government in Guatemala was overthrown with encouragement from the United States and the Central American nations after it began to receive heavy arms shipments from the Soviet Union. Firm action by the United States during the October Cuban crisis received unanimous and unqualified support from all members of the Organization of American States. The will is there. The need is there. The leadership of the United States cannot fail to be there.

The policy of the present administration on Latin America defies description. We are unable to see through the series of State Department smokescreens long enough to determine what, if anything, our Government is doing, or plans to do, with regard to Cuban exported subversion. That such subversion is going on, that saboteurs are being trained, equipped and sent to Latin American countries from Cuba is irrefutable. The testimony of John A. McCone, Director of the CIA, makes this point clear.

Mr. McCone's testimony showed that between 1,000 and 1,500 Latin Americans received guerrilla and sabotage training in Cuba last year, and more have arrived this year. The CIA Director testified:

> The Cuban effort at present is far more serious than the hastily organized and ill-conceived raids that the bearded veterans of Sierra Maestra led into such Central American countries as Panama, Haiti, Nicaragua, and the Dominican Republic during the first 8 or 9 months Castro was in power.
>
> Today the Cuban effort is far more sophisticated, more covert, and more deadly. In its professional tradecraft, it shows guidance and training by experienced Communist advisers from the Soviet bloc, including veteran Spanish Communists.

Mr. McCone has stated clearly that the nations of Venezuela, Peru, Ecuador, and Panama are marked targets for this subversion by the Communists. Mr. McCone also indicated that Cuba furnishes money to buy weapons and other items necessary to conduct subversive activities.

By the end of March 1963, the President had both the proof of extensive Communist penetration in Latin America beyond Cuba, and evidence of growing alarm among our Latin American friends.

On April 15, 1963, President Kennedy attended a meeting of Central American Presidents in San José, Costa Rica. In spite of pressures by Central American Presidents, Mr. Kennedy did nothing to clear the issue of our policy toward subversion in Latin America.

In line with the strange things that are happening in Latin America are the questions being raised regarding the possible evacuation of the U.S. forces from Guantánamo Naval Base. Is the administration searching for a naval site in Puerto Rico as a prelude to such an evacuation? The Congress, the American people, and the freedom-loving Latin Americans have a right to know just what is being planned for Guantánamo.

The Latin Americans as well as citizens of the United States cannot help but be concerned over this administration's policy regarding Cuba. They cannot help but wonder whether the administration has a policy of assistance to Cubans to regain control of their own government or whether it intends to try to coexist with communism in this hemisphere while subversion and infiltration continue from Castro's Communist government in Cuba.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I compliment my distinguished colleague from Colorado on the remarks he has made, and I join in them wholeheartedly. The Senator has performed a very valuable service in pointing out that all of us, as Americans, desire to support the President's policies in Latin America if we can. But first we need to know what those policies are. As Members of the Senate we have a right to have those policies defined for us. In that respect, the remarks of my colleague from Colorado have been very helpful. It is my hope that he will continue, as I hope others will continue, to discuss that subject until we find out whether we have a policy and, if we do not have a policy, that we will start defining a policy for Cuba and Latin America.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank my colleague.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I recognize the distinguished Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, on the 18th anniversary of V–E Day, it is very appropriate that we turn our thoughts to that day 18 years ago when the great conflict in Europe ended. It marked the end of a 12-month campaign in which American soldiers and other members of the armed services, in conjunction with our allies, liberated Europe. These forces moved into Germany and Czechoslovakia and defeated the Nazi totalitarian regime.

There is much to consider today, as we still struggle with the consequences of that great war. We remind ourselves of history to afford light for today and the future.

I think that the judgment of history will be that the agreements which were made during that war—agreements which permited the division in Berlin, which permitted the Soviet Union to move into Manchuria and ports along the Pacific—brought about the unhappy consequences with which we still must deal.

Despite the promises made by the Soviet Union, it broke them callously and fastened its control on every country it entered, except Austria and Iran. The Soviets agreed to the establishment of democratic governments in Poland and the Eastern European states, but proceeded to deny any democratic choice to the people of those countries.

That denial was followed by the blockade of Berlin, by the coup d'etat in Czechoslovakia, and later by its open domination of Eastern Germany.

These events provided us with lessons which, unhappily, we have not recalled often enough. The Soviet Union has established its presence in Cuba and the Western Hemisphere, and I am fearful that, despite whatever promises the Soviet Union made last year, it will not withdraw its forces.

The question of Cuba troubles the country. What kind of policy shall we pursue, and what can be done? It is a difficult question to answer for the administration and for those who criticize its policy.

I believe that it ought to be our declared policy that the Soviet presence in Cuba and the Western Hemisphere cannot be accepted. I say quite honestly, it is difficult to implement this policy, but at least there should be a declaration that the ending of this presence is our policy—a declaration which will have meaning in our country, and which will have meaning in Latin America.

I believe the President should continue to insist that Khrushchev keep the promises he is said to have made last fall, at the time of the crisis, that Soviet troops would be removed. And if there should be any attempt by the Soviet Union to take advantage of other situations which develop in Latin America—such as might develop in Haiti—our country should prevent, promptly, any further intrusion by Soviet forces.

I believe that the establishment of such a policy would clarify our purposes. It might not be possible to achieve its objectives immediately, but the establishment of the policy and the determination to continue to insist upon withdrawal of troops accompanied by other measures, even the resumption of the quarantine, in time, would I hope bring results.

I close by saying that on this anniversary of V-E Day it is best to remember the thousands who gave their lives during World War II.

It would be presumptuous for any of us, to recall our own experiences, but it is especially appropriate for all of us who had the opportunity to serve in World War II, and in Europe, to remember today the sacrifices of those who died, of those who were wounded, of those who suffered, and the sacrifices of their families.

I close my remarks by paying tribute to those who fought in World War II and who gave all that was asked of them, and more, for our country and for the preservation of freedom.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, an anniversary occasion is rather high ground in what can otherwise be a drab and routine existence. It gives one an opportunity to stand up a little higher, to look back to see from whence he came, and then to look ahead in the hope that the road is clearly demarked.

Today is the 18th anniversary of V-E Day.

Sometimes a journey can be described as a tour from one epochal event to another. Certainly the cessation of conflict and killing in a great sector of the world is an epochal event. I lived through it once, Mr. President. I lived through it on a battlefield on the Western Front in World War I.

People used to say about Lexington and Concord that the shot fired at the bridge was heard round the world. I can tell Senators that the stillness which comes in such sharp contrast can fairly be heard around the world.

So there was something eerie about the situation on the 8th of May, 18 years ago.

What a ghastly business it was, with the damage which was done to the ancient churches and cathedrals; to buildings and housing equipment, where men found a livelihood; to homes of all kinds; and, of course, the scars on the earth. All that suddenly came to an end. It was a bloody business, to say the least.

So when we stand on the pinnacle of an anniversary and look back and look around, we look forward, to try to assess the future and come to some kind of conclusion. Then one is lost in puzzlement and wonderment as to whether mankind learned a lesson or not.

I think of a great minister of the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church named Dr. Joseph Sizoo. It is worth recounting that his father came from Norway. He went to work for the Pullman Co. in South Chicago, when Abraham Lincoln's son was the president of the company. When the elder Sizoo got his first raise he put the money into a sequestered account for the education of his son, and that son was Dr. Joseph Sizoo, who long presided as the minister of the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church.

I always thought it was one of the interesting postscripts of history that that is a church in which Lincoln attended prayer meetings—where, almost stealthily, he went on Wednesday nights through a side door, there to engage in the fellowship of prayer.

Dr. Joseph Sizoo found a larger ministry in New York. On Saturdays he used to go to the Veterans Hospital. One Saturday afternoon he was talking to a youngster there. He found that the patients had been "washed up" by the backlash of war. They were the wrecks, in large part.

He was talking about responsibility and social obligation, which come later, and in the middle of his discourse one particular youngster stood up. He had one arm shot off. The other arm was in a sling. He had a steel girdle around his middle, because a Japanese sniper had shot him in the spine on one of the islands of the Pacific. He would never walk again under his own power.

As he listened to Dr. Joseph Sizoo, he suddenly stood up, with agony on his face as if the chisel of Phideas himself had put it there, and said, "Padre, Padre, will anything come of it?"

That is a good question, Mr. President, 18 years after this deafening silence on the battlefields of Europe.

I was in Paris that day. I asked the commander of the Paris quarter to give me a car and a doughboy, and I went to Versailles, that great garden built by Louis XIV. The place was locked, and I wandered around, and I finally found a poilu with only one arm. We had something in common. He also had served in World War II.

In my limited French, I asked him how I could get in. Then I asked him, "Where is the Salle de la Guerre?"—the Salon of War, with all the magnificent oil paintings. Then I said to him, as we went into that room, "Where did Clemenceau sit?" He said, "Voila." I asked, "Where did President Wilson sit?" "Voila."

And then, at the end of one component of World War II, I was standing where the peace treaty was signed. I allowed myself to fall into something of a reverie. I thought, "Had we learned anything?" It seemed not, because more men were under arms. The methods and devices for killing were more efficient and expeditious. And a rather peculiar feeling possessed me.

Four months after V-E Day came V-J Day. A bomb brought a new age and a new era and the end of a war. Then we had an opportunity to think a little about what was taking place.

It is an astounding thing, Mr. President, that one of God's greatest blessings to mankind is grass, because it heals and covers the scars of the earth. How quickly the rubble is gone. Go out to the Ruhr or any place else in Germany or Austria. New buildings have risen, and the rubble has disappeared. Man's ingenuity and imagination have encompassed all that.

But, singularly enough, a nation, like Phoenix, can rise from the ashes of war and fairly rehabilitate its great physical plant, its shattered earth, and everything else; but, somehow, that healing has not reached the hearts and minds of mankind.

I had a very quaint experience the other day. I went to address a mass meeting of Republican women. My speech was taken down by a reporter using shorthand, and when she transcribed her notes, where I had spoken about the "balm of Gilead," she put in the words "bomb of Gilead." What an amazing thing, then, that, somehow, the very atmosphere in which we live impresses itself in little ways, and the balm of Gilead seemed to be pretty far away.

I asked the distinguished majority leader to let us have this time, and he graciously consented, because I thought we ought to look back and observe this day and think a little about the problems of today, and also the circumstances and conditions that have evolved since that day 18 years ago when, in a delirium of jubilation, I thought I saw a million people in downtown Paris as the lights came on for the first time in years.

So we stand here on this pinnacle, and we look back, and then we look down, and then hopefully we look ahead. But as we look around, what do we see? Name any continent. Name any great area, and, Mr. President, you will see it on the front page.

If you name me Asia, Mr. President, I name you a divided Korea that cost us nearly $20 billion a year, and is costing us every year. A parallel of latitude divides North Korea from South Korea.

Mr. President, you name me China, and I name you a great, hulking country, with perhaps 600 million people, under the tyranny of dictatorship driving their people down the Red road of communism.

Mr. President, you name me Thailand, once known as Siam, and I name you a country that is under the dynamics of fear. A part of our 7th Fleet is standing at the Gulf of Siam.

Mr. President, you name me Laos, where we finally assented to a troika government—Communist, neutral, and one for their own country—and I name you a country that is in grave jeopardy today of being overwhelmed and taken over by the Red ideological scourge.

Mr. President, you name me Burma, and I can recite you the agony of the acting Prime Minister when I was in Rangoon.

Mr. President, you name me Indonesia, which has been referred to on the floor today, and I name you a country which is seething with difficulty and which itself could become a victim of this virus.

This is 18 years after V–E Day and after men surrendered the ghost in the islands of the Pacific.

Mr. President, you name me Europe, and I name you a stone wall that separates East from West Berlin.

I name you France, which vetoed Britain's entry into the Common Market, and which evidently is seeking to develop a third force. I name you all the countries in Eastern Europe that are under the Red heel, and particularly a great country like Poland, which produced so much in culture, so many great musicians, artists, and the like. Today, for practical purposes, it is the victim of the virus that is in the atmosphere of the world today.

Mr. President, if you name me the Middle East, which has been discussed here today, one wonders if all the countries of Moslem extraction and Moslem base will finally consummate what they have in mind, and what will happen to the Republic of Israel, which was born and recognized in the Truman administration.

Mr. President, you name me Latin America, with its poverty and its wretchedness, and I name you a continent were the peasant league, evidently 2 million strong in the largest country there, is seeking, by might and main, to overwhelm the constituted authority and impose the imprimatur of communism.

Mr. President, you name me Cuba, and I name you a country that was liberated by American arms, sustained, and taken by the hand, until it obtained its own independence; and today it is under the heel of communism, and is the stooge of Khrushchev, 18 years after V–E Day.

So, Mr. President, you can name any hemisphere, any continent, most countries, and it will be seen that we are confronted with problems seemingly greater than those that were on our doorstep when we summoned the youth of America and our ingenuity to stop the rising tide of dictatorship. It is a tragic business, one that can bring only distress to human hearts.

One thing that bothers me more than anything else is the phrase that is creeping into our conversation. We no longer talk of the cold war. We seem to talk of a permanent cold war. That phrase recurs so many times that it insinuates itself into the thinking of the people, 18 years after the deafening silence brought the delirium of joy to millions of people in all corners of the world.

It is a day to be remembered. It is a day for rededication. It is a day for reconsecration to the purpose that makes this Republic the greatest country on the face of the earth, and sets in motion those divine forces in the mind and in the heart of the individual which are the great swelling motive power for American achievement and accomplishment.

How quickly we forget. The Senate has not observed the anniversary of this day during my service in this body. However, I think it is time to take account of some of the ancient landmarks that those before us have set, and to take account of the sacrifices they have made.

The word "sacrifice" has in it the connotation of something sacred. When a young man forfeits his life for his country, and when a million casualties—our casualties—are the result of conflict, we can afford in this deliberative body to take a little time to go into communion with ourselves and measure the cost of what we enjoy today.

One of the most pathetic and touching stories that I have ever heard was that of a young GI who, when last seen, was getting on a transport to go to one of the Pacific islands. His commanding officer noted that when he last saw him alive he had in his breast pocket a little paperbacked book, the outside cover of which displayed the title "Our Hearts Were Young and Gay."

When his commanding officer saw him the next time he was upside down and covered with blood, and his blond hair was out over the sand. But the book was still in his pocket: "Our Hearts Were Young and Gay."

I helped to send these young men over there, by my vote, and I mean to remember it. I believe that Members of this exclusive legislative body, to which was committed the purse, while the Constitution was committing to the Commander in Chief the sword, must always remember that we cannot get into formal conflict without a vote of this body, and no dollars can be spent unless we appropriate them to send the flower of America out into the far reaches of the earth, to do battle—yes, and for what?

Sometimes we forget; but I have talked with many of them, in Germany, France, the Middle East, India, and the Far East. I have said to each of them, "Soldier, what do you think about? What is this all about? Why are you here?"

Almost invariably they become inarticulate and tonguetied. Then I would get a kind of halting answer, which came not so much from the lips as from the heart, "Well, I guess it's for freedom."

What blessed beneficiaries we are of the great hordes who have gone before us. May we never cast aside one of the greatest attributes that God has conferred upon mankind, the attribute to remember.

This day, Mr. President, we remember.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I have been listening for at least an hour and a half to a series of speeches by my Republican colleagues in the Senate on a number of subjects which had very little, if any, relation to the observance of the 18th anniversary of V–E Day, marking the end of World War II in Europe.

During the course of these remarks, some of which were quite statesmanlike, such as that of the distinguished minority leader and that of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and others, I thought that due honor was being paid to the subject under consideration. However, some of my other Republican colleagues in the Senate mentioned V–E Day at the beginning of their remarks, and that was the last reference made to that historic occasion.

It seems to me that while this was a well-led and well-directed brigade, the arguments which were advanced to show that this country has enjoyed 18 years of misrule were very poorly documented. I heard such words as "inventory of our foreign policy" over the past 18 years. I heard such descriptions as "clear expositions" concerning foreign policy and our lack of it over the past 18 years. I heard references to Cuba, with Latin America thrown in incidentally. I heard fleeting references to Africa. I heard references to the Middle East, which I do not believe should be considered within the context of the "Charge of the Light Brigade" today, because they had to do with a resolution which was submitted.

Until the minority leader spoke, I heard no reference to the situation in southeast Asia; no reference to Formosa; no reference to Korea; no reference to Thailand; and I believe no reference to Laos. A good deal was overlooked in the course of these discussions, and much was left unsaid. Criticism was leveled against the policy of this Government over the past 18 years.

I did not hear mentioned once the name of General Eisenhower, the military leader of the Allied Forces on V–E Day. I did not hear mentioned once the name of former President Truman, who was in office at that time. I did not hear mentioned the name of the present President of the United States, who at that time was, I believe, a lieutenant, junior grade, in the Navy, and who was fighting in the Pacific, doing what he could through personal courage to advance the security, welfare, and well-being of his country.

But I heard much criticism without any names being mentioned; and evidently it was criticism of the Government over the past 18 years. I should have hoped that our Republican colleagues would have given their own administration and our own country a better mark for what has occurred over the past 18 years than was given on the floor of the Senate today.

Who halted and reversed the Soviet threat in Iran? The U.S. Government. Who inaugurated the Greek-Turkish aid program and the Marshall plan? This Government—and, incidentally, in the Republican-controlled 80th Congress. Who was responsible for lifting the Berlin blockade? This Government. Who instituted the Marshall plan, which renewed Europe and commenced the building of a powerful, friendly, democratic Germany? This Government. Even the power of President de Gaulle in Western affairs is a testimonial to a strong and vigorous France, a nation which was assisted from near ruin by our aid within the past 18 years. Who resisted communism successfully in Korea?

In all that time, our country has remained strong and able to meet such emergencies. Russia has added nothing to her direct territorial control since 1945, while our power has maintained a nuclear standoff.

Great problems still remain, but they are not solely the responsibility of either Democrats or Republicans; they are the responsibility of all Americans, regardless of party.

In accepting our responsibilities, however, we must recognize the limits of our ability to affect events around the globe. I think it is important that we avoid what D. W. Brogan calls "the illusion of omnipotence"—that American policy and power can reverse any unfortunate trend or repair any difficulty that occurs anywhere in the world.

President Truman, President Eisenhower, and President Kennedy have all learned, if they did not already know, the truth of this situation.

I wonder why it is that on this sad and happy occasion—sad because of the lives lost; happy because of the end of a war—it has been necessary for the Republican light brigade to launch a series of attacks against what has occurred in our own country over the past 18 years.

What do they mean when they speak of "surgery" as being needed? I do not know. Are we being accused of "losing" Cuba and possibly Haiti? Are we being accused of, or commended for, "saving" the Dominican Republic and Guatemala?

Are we Republicans and Democrats first, and Americans last? Or are we Americans first and members of two great political parties second? Are we politicians first and Americans last? I urge Senators to consider some of the statements which we make.

Over the years since V-E Day, the United States, under Republican and Democratic administrations, have been accused on the floor of the Senate of continual failure. I have heard no alternatives offered; but I have listened to criticisms of what was being done and of what was not being done. I have heard no Senator advocate that an embargo be imposed on Cuba. An embargo is an act of war. I have heard no Senator urge today that the United States should invade Cuba. I have heard much criticism, generally speaking, but I have heard nothing in the way of specifics. The easiest thing a politician can do is to find fault, without offering constructive alternatives. Not one constructive alternative or suggestion has been made on the floor of the Senate today.

I have heard criticism of our Government and of our policies over the past 18 years; criticism of our sacrifices over the past 18 years; criticism of our leadership over the past 18 years.

All of us, regardless of party, should examine a map of the world. Look at Vietnam, where today we have 12,000 men stationed—"advisers," as they are called. Recall that the 7th Fleet is in not only the Straits of Taiwan but in the South China Sea and the Gulf of Siam, as well. Look at Korea, where two American divisions are still stationed, and where I am afraid they will be stationed for a long time to come, because there is no peace in Korea—only a continuation of an uneasy truce.

When we look at the rest of Latin America outside the Caribbean we can hardly find a single country which is stable today. Consider Cuba and Haiti, where anything may happen. Consider the Dominican Republic. What do we see? We see trouble, real or potential.

What about our relations with Western Europe? What about our relations with the newly emerging countries in Africa? What about the situation in the Middle East, where the perennial Israeli-Arab conflict is blossoming again, potentially dangerous?

I suggest that Senators ask themselves one question about the man and the Government whom they so freely criticize: What would I do if I were in his shoes and had to make the decisions which only he can make?"

If we ask ourselves that question, we will have a pretty good idea of the great responsibility which is his, and his alone, not because he is the head of the Democratic Party, but because he is the President of the United States, and as such represents all the people of this country.

REDESIGNATION OF BIG HOLE BATTLEFIELD NATIONAL MONUMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Bayh in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 138) to redesignate the Big Hole Battlefield National Monument, to revise the boundaries thereof, and for other purposes, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Big Hole Battlefield National Monument, established by Executive Order Numbered 1216 of June 23, 1910, and enlarged by Proclamation Numbered 2339 of June 29, 1939, is hereby redesignated as the Big Hole National Battlefield.

Sec. 2. In order to preserve historic features and sites associated with the Battle of the Big Hole and to facilitate their administration and interpretation, the boundaries of the Big Hole National Battlefield are hereby revised to include the following described lands:

MONTANA PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN

Township 2 south, range 17, west: Section 13, southwest quarter southeast quarter, southeast quarter southwest quarter, east half southwest quarter southwest quarter; section 23, east half northeast quarter southeast quarter; section 24, west half east half, north half southwest quarter, southeast quarter southwest quarter, east half southwest quarter southwest quarter; section 25, those portions of the northeast quarter northwest quarter and the northwest quarter northeast quarter lying north of the north right-of-way line of relocated Montana State Route 43; consisting of approximately 466 acres.

Sec. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Interior may acquire by donation, purchase, exchange, or otherwise, lands and interests in lands within the area described in section 2 of this Act.

(b) Any lands described in section 2 of this Act that are a part of the Beaverhead National Forest when this Act takes effect are hereby excluded from the forest and added to the Big Hole National Battlefield.

(c) Lands included in the Big Hole National Battlefield pursuant to this Act shall be administered in accordance with the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes", approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1–3), as amended and supplemented.

Sec. 4. There is hereby retroceded to the State of Montana, effective when accepted by said State in accordance with its laws, such jurisdiction as has been ceded by such State to the United States over any lands within the boundaries of the Big Hole National Battlefield reserving in the United States, however, concurrent legislative jurisdiction over such lands.

Sec. 5. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums not exceeding $20,000 as are necessary for the acquisition of lands and interests in land pursuant to this Act.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Bayh in the chair). Is there further morning business?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the morning hour be continued for the next 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE WHEAT REFERENDUM

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to speak on a matter, which may have almost as important a bearing on the welfare of the country as the solution—if we find one—to some of our foreign entanglements.

On May 21 a vote will be taken by the wheat growers of this country as to whether they will accept a program, and the controls connected with it, which were promoted last year and approved last year, for future application, or whether they will reject the program.

A vigorous controversy is now in progress as to whether the Department of Agriculture is putting forth an intensive propaganda effort to secure a "yes" vote in the referendum. Probably the methods used by the administration may be of as much concern to us as the outcome of the wheat referendum itself. I believe that we had better let the facts speak for themselves. Therefore, I shall ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at the close of my remarks a document which has been sent out to wheat growers. The one I have comes to me from the Labette ASCS county office, at Altamont, Kans. I understand that documents similar to this one have been sent out to wheat growers all over the United States.

The document purports to show that if the wheat grower who is raising 40 acres of wheat votes "yes," he will receive $1,805.06 for his crop; whereas, if he votes "no," he will receive $1,014.20 for his crop.

It seems to me that the administration is proceeding on three or four false assumptions in regard to the forthcoming wheat referendum vote.

First. It seems to assume that the American farmer, particularly the wheat farmer, is gullible, and will believe almost anything that the Department of Agriculture sends to him through the mails.

Second. It seems to assume that the American farmer is a greedy person who will gladly give up controls over his own business in order to have a temporary increase in income.

Third. The administration assumes that the American farmer is a timid person, who will fall on his face if he is threatened with any loss of income.

The fourth assumption seems to be that if the wheat farmer votes against a program desired by the administration, the President and Congress will punish him by not enacting legislation which will give a fair recompense for his crop.

I believe that the administration in this case would do much better if it were to busy itself with studying the real character of the American farmer, rather than proceeding under these several false assumptions.

Besides receiving copies of this document from Kansas, I have received them also from Colorado and other States.

There is no question about the fact that at least 1 million copies of the document have been distributed to the wheat growers of the country. I believe all of them have received copies of this document. We know that the Department of Agriculture is very busy trying to pick up new votes. That might be very helpful in the forthcoming referendum. Also, there have been some very interesting meetings throughout the country for the purpose of explaining the new wheat program. If it were explained impartially, I would have no objection, but I will leave it to the readers of this document to decide for themselves whether the administration is impartial in this matter.

I ask unanimous consent that the document be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND
CONSERVATION SERVICE, LABETTE
ASCS COUNTY OFFICE,
Altamont, Kans., May 3, 1963.

DEAR MR. AND MRS. FARMER: Are you ready to decide on 1964 wheat? Yes, $1.90;[1] no, $1.10.[2]

May 21 is coming soon.

Producers who have an interest in a 1964 farm wheat acreage allotment are eligible to vote. This includes:

1. Landowners who receive all or a share of the wheat crop or proceeds thereof. Both husband and wife can vote if both names are on the farm deed.

2. Tenants or sharecroppers who receive a share of the wheat crop or proceeds thereof. Both husband and wife can vote if—

(a) Both names are on the lease; or

(b) A verbal lease applies and the county committee determines that both are responsible for carrying out the tenant obligations under the lease.

The eligibility of the wife to vote should be established with the ASC County Committee before May 21.

If you live outside the county, or you will be out of the county on May 21, you can secure the ballot by signing and returning the enclosed request for an absentee ballot.

Special step to take by May 13:

1. If your farm acreage allotment is 14.9 acres or less, the operator must sign on the back of the allotment notice by May 13 and get this to the ASCS office. This signature will make landowner and tenant eligible to vote and eligible to participate and obtain price support, wheat certificate, and diversion payments.

TIME IS SHORT

Are you in favor of marketing quotas for wheat for the 1964 crop? Yes —. No —.

What a "yes" or a "no" vote can mean to you based on estimated 1964 wheat loan rates for warehouse stored grain:

LABETTE COUNTY

A "yes" vote means:

1. $2.03 per bushel price support warehouse stored rate on certificate wheat—80 percent of normal production—$1.33 on noncertificate wheat.

2. Assuming a 40-acre 1963 allotment and 36 acres for 1964: 36 acres times 25.6 bushels normal yield equals 922 bushels.

3. Eighty percent certificate wheat equals 737.6 bushels at $2.03 per bushel equals $1,497.33.

4. Other sale or use: 184.4 bushels feed, seed, or price support of $1.33 equals $245.25.

5. Four acres diverted at $15.62 per acre equals $62.48 diversion payment.

6. Total $1,497.33 plus $245.25 plus $62.48 equal $1,805.06.

You can substitute date for your own farm.

A "no" vote means:

1. About $1.10 per bushel price support warehouse stored rate if within allotment. Market price estimated $1 per bushel or —.

2. Assuming a 40-acre 1963 allotment and 36 acres for 1964: 36 acres times 25.6 bushels normal yield equals 922 bushels.

3. $0 certificate wheat.

4. Other sale or use: 922 bushels at $1.10 price support equals $1,014.20. If seeded above allotment like 50 acres times 25.6 bushels equals 1,280 bushels at $1 equals $1,280.

5. $0 diversion payment.

6. Total $1,014.20 or $1,280.00?[3]

GEO. W. MARVELE,
Labette ASC County Committee.

Postage and fees paid U.S. Department of Agriculture.

DAR GOOD CITIZENSHIP AWARD TO MISS KATHLEEN BARDEN OF LITTLE ROCK

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on April 18 at Constitution Hall here in Washington, a very talented and extremely capable young lady from Little Rock, Ark., Miss Kathleen Barden, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. S. J. Barden of 8 Kavanaugh Place, was awarded the National DAR Good Citizenship Award for 1963, together with the $1,000 scholarship that accompanies the award.

Miss Barden achieved this high honor in competition with 10,869 senior girls in accredited high schools throughout the Nation. Judging for the award was based on outstanding qualities of dependability, service, leadership, and patriotism.

The Arkansas award winner will use her $1,000 scholarship to attend the University of Arkansas, where she plans to study either to become a teacher or to pursue some other vocation in the field of Christian education. Miss Barden is an outstanding example of the fine young people in our State and of the high caliber of students produced by our public school system. All of Arkansas is proud of her record of attainment and wish her well in whatever vocation she may choose to follow.

Interestingly enough, Mr. President, there were six girls who tied for the Arkansas State DAR Good Citizenship title, six girls who were ranked equally with Miss Barden in the four qualities on which all competitors were judged; and Miss Barden was acclaimed the State winner on the basis of an essay on "Prove All Things" which each of the girls was required to write in order to break the tie.

THE EUROPEAN SQUEEZE ON INTERNATIONAL AIR FARES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on April 24, 1963, the President issued a major report setting forth U.S. policy with respect to international air transportation. The report was of particular significance in that it recognized, at the White House level, the importance of maintaining a strong U.S. air carrier system. Departing from the past attitude of either indifference or quiet acquiescence on the grounds of abstruse foreign policy considerations, the report expresses U.S. determination to pursue aggressively and vigorously our legitimate interests. It makes clear that we bargain from a position of strength and that the results of our negotiations should reflect this fact. We are now confronted with our first test as to whether this report is one of shallow words or an expression of firm determination.

The adoption by the International Air Transport Association of a 5.5-percent increase on round-trip fares on most international air routes has led to a heated rate controversy. The not-too-subtle threats, one of which can only be termed an abusive affront to this Nation's legitimate exercise of its sovereign power, to curtail or deny operating rights to U.S. carriers, could, if executed precipitate an international air crisis of no mean consequence. The chronology of developments in this case are, briefly, as follows:

During the months of September and October, 1962, the International Air

---

[1] Warehouse stored, $1,90; $2 farm stored.

[2] Warehouse stored, $1.10; $1.20 farm stored.

[3] Cost of production would increase due to planting additional 14 acres.

Transport Association traffic conference was held in Chandler, Ariz., the purpose of which was to discuss and determine whether various changes should be made in the international rate structure. Prior to the commencement of this conference the Civil Aeronautics Board, by letter dated September 21, advised U.S. carrier members that it would not approve any rate increases. On November 23, the Chandler resolutions were filed and on December 3 the International Air Transport Association fare tables were filed. On December 10, members of the Civil Aeronautics Board staff met with U.S. carriers to request basis and support for fare increases. Statements were received by Pan American and Northwest, respectively, on January 14 and 25, 1963. On February 12, the Board issued a tentative order disapproving transatlantic and transpacific round trip fare increases. The order allowed 30 days for the submission of additional comments. International Air Transport Association submitted a brief statement but by no means submitted all the information requested and refused to make available the minutes of the Chandler meeting. On March 18, the Board issued its final order approving certain Chandler proposals but disapproving the proposed 5.5 percent round trip fare increase. Canada adopted a position similar to that of the United States while European governments approved the Chandler increase. Mexico, Japan and Chile deferred action. Although the rates had been proposed for an April 1 effectiveness, they were postponed until April 29 pending further discussions. On April 8 through 10, informal discussions were conducted with the British aeronautical authorities in Washington. On April 24 through 26, further meetings with European and Canadian aeronautical authorities were held in London but the fare dispute was not resolved. The April 29 date was once again postponed and is now set for a May 12 effectiveness.

The issue is not whether international air fares should be lowered, increased or otherwise modified, but rather whether this country will withstand pressure to compromise its position and in so doing, principle. Our Government, through its properly delegated agency, the Civil Aeronautics Board, has determined that a fare increase is not warranted and is contrary to the public interest. In this connection it might be well to point out that American citizens represent the primary source of the international air travel market. It will be American citizens who must bear the major burden of any fare increase. My personal concern is not whether foreign carriers raise their rates, but rather that foreign governments do not dictate fares to our carriers contrary to the expressed mandate of our Government. Our carriers operate efficiently and profitably at current fares. If foreign carriers cannot compete at these levels, perhaps some soul searching as to the need for their continued existence would be in order. In any event, American citizens are not to be denied the choice of lower fares which our carriers are willing and able to provide.

There are apparently some who, perhaps with some justification when reviewing negotiations of the past, hold to the conviction the United States will at the last minute acquiesce. This conviction has been nurtured by certain individuals, although fortunately very few, who have publicly supported the U.S. position and privately sought its retrenchment. To those few I seriously commend a studious review of our criminal statutes. Additionally, the conviction may in part stem from a narrow construction of the scope of CAB powers. To those legal constructionists, and particularly those who rely on their interpretation, I suggest caution. But even if the Board's powers were limited, in contrast to their foreign counterparts, the sovereign powers of this Nation to take effective action are not confined to the procedural niceties of the Federal Aviation Act.

To those who have elevated International Air Transport Association to some reverent and unreachable pedestal, I would remind you that it is nothing more than an overglamorous trade association whose essential objective is international price fixing. It functions because our Government permits it to function by granting it a unique privilege—exemption from the antitrust laws. This privilege is granted at pleasure and can be withdrawn at pleasure and will be withdrawn if the public interest so requires. I am reminded of the remarks by one of the great men of aviation, Lord Brabazon of Tara, who, in addressing the 18th annual general meeting of the International Air Transport Association last fall in Dublin, commented:

> The fact is that there are a number of the world's peoples who are not completely convinced that all the decisions of International Air Transport Association are in the best interests of the people. Here I cannot help digressing to state that we hope, and have so far believed, that legislation by separate States was to see that nothing immoral or to the disadvantage of the people concerned was indulged in, and for this reason various acts have been passed in various countries to stop what was considered an immoral practice on ethical grounds. Restrictive practices were condemned by the Sherman Act, but such practices relative to operatives such as the fixing of prices was condoned by abrogation of the Sherman Act by the Civil Aeronautical Act of 1938 as reenacted by the Federal Aviation Act III of 1958.
>
> Section 414 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 should be emblazoned on the arms of all international companies for if it were not for this the whole lot of you now earning American dollars would either be fined substantial sums or you would be in gaol. It is strange and a little cynical and sinister how expediency where it affects governments overrides basic commercial morality.

The Board's authority in the antitrust field by virtue of section 414 of the Aviation Act of 1958 is far from impotent. I will not dwell on its implications since they are, I am sure, apparent to even the most novice student of air law.

The Board has wide latitude in the application of section 414, which provides that:

> The Board may, upon its own initiative or upon complaint by any air carrier, foreign air carrier, or ticket agent, if it considers that such action by it would be in the interest of the public, investigate and determine whether any air carrier, foreign air carrier, or ticket agent has been or is engaged in unfair or deceptive practices or unfair methods of competition in air transportation or the sale thereof. If the Board shall find, after notice and hearing, that such air carrier, foreign air carrier, or ticket agent is engaged in such unfair or deceptive practices or unfair methods of competition, it shall order such air carrier, foreign air carrier, or ticket agent to cease and desist fom such practices or methods of competition.

Section 402 of the act provides, among other things, that "no foreign air carrier shall engage in foreign air transportation unless there is in force a permit issued by the Board authorizing such carrier so to engage." There is no question in my mind that the Board has the power and indeed the duty to condition foreign air carrier permits so as to prevent foreign carriers from operating to and from points within the United States at rates which the Board determines as being adverse to the public interest.

I might point out that Public Law 87–528, July 10, 1962, amended section 901 (a) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize the Civil Aeronautics Board to impose civil penalties for violations of any of the economic provisions under title IV in an amount not to exceed $1,000 per violation. The Board, either through application of its authority in the antitrust field or separately, or in combination, with a determination that rates charged were adverse to the public interest, might find it necessary to invoke its civil penalty authority. It is quite conceivable that each sale of a ticket in this country by a foreign carrier or by its agent could be subject to a $1,000 fine.

Under the provisions of the Bermuda-type bilateral air agreements, the Civil Aeronautics Board can express its dissatisfaction with rates proposed by foreign carriers and request bilateral consultations with the foreign governments concerned. It is my understanding that consultations as contemplated in the bilaterals have not yet taken place. If the consultations do not resolve the matter, it is then referred to a third party for an advisory report. However, pending this report, the Board may take such steps as it may consider necessary to prevent inauguration or continuation of the service in question at the rate complained of. In addition, other courses of action are available to the Board including, but not limited to, its powers under section 402.

There are many avenues of approach available to this country. I have cited but a few. I have not even touched upon the vast residue of power which has been vested in the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Attorney General, and others. If the need should arise to vest additional procedural authority in one agency or another, I am confident that Congress is prepared to move swiftly.

Before concluding, however, I observe that the British have apparently expressed particular determination, through word and act, to prevail in this matter. If I were a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, I might seriously consider whether the public interest would best be served by, among other things, deferring proceedings in the matter of BOAC-Cunard Ltd. regarding the application for a foreign air carrier permit—CAB Docket 14183—and whether it might not be wise to set down for an immediate hearing the petition for enforcement in the matter of British Overseas Airways Corp.—CAB Docket 14010.

The United States has made clear its position in this matter and its determination to take whatever action may be appropriate to maintain it. If, as a consequence, inconvenience or hardships are imposed upon some of our citizens, I think they all would nevertheless urge that we stand firm in what we think is right. If, in the past, this country has been too modest to show others that it has more backbone than they might suspect, today and tomorrow may shock them. Theodore Roosevelt's big stick has been taken out of storage.

Mr. President, fortunately for U.S. purposes in these international negotiations, it has been the record that Pan American Airways, pioneer across the Atlantic, has likewise pioneered always for lower fares. I would also like to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement from the Pan American annual report and a letter written to Mr. Lipscomb of the Pan American Airways by Mr. Irving Roth of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT FROM PAN AMERICAN AIRWAYS ANNUAL REPORT

If a reasonable reduction in transatlantic tariffs were acceptable to European air carriers and their governments, everybody would gain. Trade between free world nations will gain. Tourist and business travel will gain. Airline employees will gain. Airline owners will gain—private shareholders in America, government owners in Europe. Many more pay passengers will fill empty seats although each will have paid less for his transatlantic flight—an objective long sought by your company.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD,
WASHINGTON, D.C., *April 29, 1963.*

WILLIS G. LIPSCOMB,
Vice President, Traffic/Sales,
Pan American World Airways,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. LIPSCOMB: Since Chairman Alan S. Boyd does not expect to return from Europe before the end of next week, he requests me to prepare a personal note to you on his behalf.

The chairman wishes to express his appreciation for the wholehearted cooperation and the highly effective technical assistance which you furnished to the U.S. delegation at the London talks on North Atlantic fares last week. The chairman was, of course, aware of the fact that the U.S. carriers were parties to the unanimous Chandler fare agreements and that the carriers had sought Board approval of the Chandler agreements as submitted. In these circumstances, your cooperation and assistance were all the more appreciated.

Although I have written this letter on the chairman's behalf, I wish to assure you that I wholeheartedly endorse the sentiments expressed by the chairman.

Sincerely yours,
IRVING ROTH,
Director,
Bureau of Economic Regulations.

OVERSEA PRIVATE DIRECT INVESTMENTS SUPPORT A FAVORABLE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, about this time last year the administration was seeking drastic legislation to curtail the investment of American funds overseas by subsidiaries of domestic corporations. At that time, I pointed out the grave danger to our economy in the event that this proposal was enacted. The administration wished us to believe that our balance-of-payments position would be jeopardized unless steps were taken to prevent continued direct private investments.

Mr. President, the dissenting views accompanying the report of the Committee on Finance on H.R. 10650, the Revenue Act of 1962, in which I was joined by my distinguished colleagues, the senior Senator from Kansas, Mr. Carlson, the senior Senator from Utah, Mr. Bennett, the former Senator from Maryland, Mr. Butler, and the senior Senator from Kentucky, Mr. Cooper, said that contrary to the administration's contention that oversea investments have had an adverse effect on our trade balance, they had served to prevent a far more drastic loss of gold. Mr. President, I shall quote directly from our report. We said:

> U.S. direct foreign investments total more than $50 billion. They constitute one of the Nation's most valued assets. If, as a result of the enactment of this measure, foreign investments by American firms are discouraged, the economy of this country will be adversely affected.
>
> The testimony presented before the House Ways and Means Committee clearly showed that over the 15-year period ending in 1960, receipts from direct investment exceeded current outflows by nearly $10 billion. Certainly this data does not support the contention that foreign direct investments adversely affect our balance of payments. (Report of the Committee on Finance, U.S. Senate, to accompany H.R. 10650, Revenue Act of 1962, 87th Cong., 2d sess., pp. 358–359.)

Now that the administration has secured the enactment of the legislation it sought, we find that our dissenting views are supported by no less an authority than the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Dillon. In an address to the 10th Annual Monetary Conference of the American Bankers Association at Princeton on March 7, 1963, Secretary Dillon said:

> Other factors of basic, long-run strength became more apparent during 1962. For instance, the flow of earnings from our $60 billion of private foreign investment rose by almost 10 percent to a new record of more than $3.5 billion—a figure that will continue mounting in the years ahead. (Treasury Department release March 7, 1963, remarks by the Honorable Secretary Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury, "Our Unfinished Task of Improving the U.S. Balance of Payments," pp. 3–4.)

In the last analysis, if we are to be competitive in world markets, oversea subsidiaries of American firms must not be required to assume obligations and incur costs that are not required of firms domiciled in other countries, which are not subject to U.S. taxes imposed on American oversea operations.

Although the Congress did not fully accept the President's proposals of 1961, and some relief was granted, we still have a long way to go before our citizens are accorded an equal opportunity to compete in world markets, thus earning foreign exchange which will halt the outflow of gold.

Mr. President, a year ago I cautioned the Senate that countries within the European Economic Community might welcome the Congress accepting the recommendations of the President, inasmuch as American subsidiaries competing with their own industries would be placed at a disadvantage. This position was well stated by Mr. Harold D. Arneson, president and general manager of Abbott Laboratories International Co., in his appearance before the House Committee on Ways and Means when he stated that:

> The suggested taxation would place our company at a distinct disadvantage in competing for business in Western Europe as well as in the developing areas of the world. Our foreign competitors are increasing the use of base company operations. For instance the OTC in England. They would be pleased to see U.S. private investments overseas shrink and withdraw from world markets. This is just what would happen if our Government is allowed to penalize American industry overseas by taxing unremitted earnings. (Tax Recommendations, 1961 Committee on Ways and Means, vol. 4 1961, p. 2856.)

Mr. President, unfortunately, the warnings that were voiced by some of us have now become a cause for considerable concern. I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from the Foreign Report of the London Economist dated February 21, 1963, concerning France's attitude with respect to American investments, may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> France's threat to limit the flow of American private capital into the Common Market area. Here again, the Kennedy administration seems to underestimate France's capacity to influence its partners. The prevailing Washington view is there is nothing positive the United States needs to do, on the

> ground that France is unlikely to get the support of the other five for an attempt to keep further American investments out. This underestimates the French Government's bargaining power.
>
> In fact, the strength of the French position is, as always, that while France might be prepared at a pinch to do without EEC, the Community is not prepared to do without France. This remains true until and unless the five partners see an alternative course to follow. So long as it is the position, Paris can reasonably expect to be able to go on exacting a price from the other five for French cooperation in developing the Community, or even in permitting it to remain alive.
>
> The French Government can perfectly well argue that, if it wants to control foreign investment in France the rest of the Common Market ought to impose similar controls. For, it can say, if the others did not follow suit, the result would merely be that American investment would flow into the Low Countries, Germany and Italy instead of into France; and France's frontiers would be open to the resultant flow of goods. In short, a common market requires a common investment policy.
>
> One suggestion is, however, under discussion in Washington: that in certain circumstances, the United States might try to persuade the Germans to reduce the flow of German capital to France and the French-speaking African associates of the EEC. Such a suggestion would be difficult to reconcile with Mr. Kennedy's undertaking not to seek reprisals against France. (The Economist Newspaper Ltd., Foreign Report, Feb. 21, 1963.)

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, Secretary Dillon appeared before the Senate Finance Committee with respect to the Revenue Act of 1962, on April 2, 1962. During his appearance, our distinguished chairman, the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], raised a number of basic questions with the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Dillon. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from a colloquy between the Secretary of the Treasury and the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia be printed at this point in the RECORD:

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> The CHAIRMAN. Now, Mr. Secretary, I am going to ask you about one more situation. Do you think there is any connection between a deficit and the seeping away of our gold? I understand your imbalance of payments is improving, but you are still losing the gold.
>
> Secretary DILLON. Well, the reason for that loss in this particular quarter, Mr. Chairman, is that the dollar holdings abroad have been shifting from countries which hold dollars traditionally to countries which make a practice of holding all their reserves in gold, particularly the United Kingdom. In other words, funds have been flowing from the continent of Europe to the United Kingdom, and when they get there the United Kingdom transfers them into gold, and the place they get gold is from us.
>
> So that is the reason largely for the substantial gold outflow in this first quarter that was so——
>
> The CHAIRMAN. We have the lowest gold supply for how many years?
>
> Secretary DILLON. We have the lowest gold supply for some 22, 23 years. During the war——
>
> The CHAIRMAN. You remember when I met you over in Geneva?
>
> Secretary DILLON. Yes, I do.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. That was shortly after that big drain on gold began in 1958, I think, was it not?
>
> Secretary DILLON. I think it was a little later than that. It was probably in the summer of 1960, maybe; or 1959.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. Well, I asked the Ambassador there if he would arrange a meeting for me with Swiss bankers so that I could ask them why it was that they called for the gold in large quantities, beginning in the year 1958. They told me that they themselves did not do it. I talked to you at the time.
>
> They said they did not do it, but we had a deficit here of more than $12 billion which they could not comprehend, they could not comprehend why we had such a deficit. There was no great depression, they thought we were entering into a heavy inflation, and they started to take gold, as you know, and it has not stopped yet, has it? How much free gold have we got left?
>
> Secretary DILLON. We have $16,600 million.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. Free?
>
> Secretary DILLON. Free? $5 billion.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. Suppose that goes and we cannot give gold in our settlements that we make abroad, we cannot give to those central banks the choice of gold or dollars. What will happen?
>
> Secretary DILLON. We still give them their choice.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. I did not ask that. I said suppose when the time comes that our free gold is gone, what will happen when we make the settlements and some foreign nation demands gold and we have not got the gold?
>
> Secretary DILLON. If we have not got the gold and do not give them the gold, we would then be off the gold standard and our dollar would depreciate in value.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. That would be a great catastrophe, would it not?
>
> Secretary DILLON. It certainly would. I cannot imagine a greater one.[1]

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, it now appears that there is little likelihood of an equilibrium in our balance of payments before at least 1968.

Because of the continued drain on our gold reserves, foreign central banks have suggested that the United States guarantee them against any loss should the dollar be devalued. This position was also taken by Sir Reginald Maudling, the British Chancellor of the Excequer, at the 1962 meeting of the International Monetary Fund in Washington last fall.

President Kennedy also assured the assembled finance ministers and central bankers that the United States, "as a matter of first priority"—Monthly Economic Letter, First National Bank, New York, October 1962, page 114—will work on the problem until the payments deficit is eliminated.

Mr. Robert V. Roosa, Under Secretary of the Treasury, contended that other nations would accept or renew guarantees only if they had confidence in our internal and external economic performance. He said:

> Those in the position of accepting guarantees are able to dictate their terms. (Ibid., p. 116.)

President Kennedy, in his Economic Report transmitted to the Congress in January 1963, stated:

> If our public debt were owned by foreigners, it would be a deduction from our national wealth and would place a direct burden on our economy by requiring us to export part of our total output to cover interest and amortization.—Economic Report of the President, January 1963, page 81.

Nevertheless, the U.S. Treasury is now selling securities denominated in Swiss francs, Italian lire, and German deutsche marks. The first of these Treasury borrowings was announced on October 23, 1962.

More recently on March 4, it was announced in Paris that Mr. Roosa was seeking financial aid from France and proposed that France might purchase Treasury bonds denominated in French francs in the amount of $100 million to $150 million.

The authority for such transactions stems from the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended. It is ironic that the United States should be providing loans at very low rates of interest throughout the world while we find it necessary to borrow capital from European countries in order to maintain our solvency. Furthermore, it appears that President de Gaulle will attempt to impose restrictive conditions on the French loan we are seeking. This reinforces the warning by Secretary Roosa that "those in the position of accepting guarantees are able to dictate their terms."

Although we have refused a direct guarantee of gold convertibility, we have provided a back-door guarantee through the issuance of Treasury bonds denominated in foreign currencies. The adoption of this program clearly shows that foreign central banks do not have confidence in our ability to maintain convertibility of the dollar. From the end of 1955 to the end of 1962, U.S. gold reserves declined by $5,696 million—Federal Reserve Bulletin, February 1963, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington, page 278. During the same period, the reserves of Switzerland, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, and Italy, the countries from whom we are seeking funds, have increased by $7,365 million—Federal Reserve Bulletin, February 1963, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington, page 278. These facts must be faced and we can no longer attempt to establish domestic fiscal policies without regard to their consequences in terms of our world leadership.

Mr. President, we have already issued $530 million in bonds payable in Swiss francs, Italian lire, and West German deutsche marks. There have been intimations that efforts will be made to sell additional bonds to other countries.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table which shows the outstanding Treasury obligations denominated in foreign currencies at the end of March 1963.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

---

[1] Op. Cit. pp. 385-386.

The Treasury's backdoor gold guarantee—Outstanding Treasury obligations denominated in foreign currencies

Currency	Dollar equivalent	Interest rate	Date issued	Duration
	Millions	*Percent*	*1962*	*Months*
Swiss francs	$23	2.75	Oct. 18	15
Do	22	2.00	Oct. 22	[1] 5
Do	25	2.00	do	[1] 8
Italian lire	25	3.00	Oct. 26	15
Do	75	3.00	Nov. 7	15
Swiss francs	28	2.75	Nov. 8	16
Italian lire	50	3.00	Nov. 30	15
Do	50	3.00	Dec. 7	15
			1963	
Swiss francs	30	2.82	Jan. 24	16
Deutsche marks	50	3.13	do	[1] 15
Do	50	3.18	do	[1] 18
Do	50	3.09	Feb. 14	[1] 21
Do	50	3.14	do	[1] 24

[1] Convertible on 2 days' notice into 90-day obligations.

Data: Treasury Department.

Mr. CURTIS. The Federal Republic of Germany has purchased 800 million marks of these bonds. Ostensibly the U.S. Government received deutsche marks for these bonds from the German central bank, the Bundesbank. However, we immediately converted the marks we acquired into their dollar equivalent. The effect of this transaction was to maintain a claim of $200 million by Germany against the United States. This claim, however, is now denominated in marks rather than in dollars. In the event that we are ever forced to raise the gold price above $35 per ounce, the Treasury would have to purchase 800 million-plus marks to repay the German loan. In effect, we have provided a complete guarantee against devaluation for foreigners, which is denied to our own citizens.

It is difficult, in view of these transactions, to properly appraise the validity of our balance of payments statistics.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the initial release of October 23, 1962, by the U.S. Treasury, with reference to the issuance of bonds denominated in foreign currencies, as well as a news article which appeared in the Washington Post dated March 5, 1963, may be printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibits 1 and 2.)

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, unless prompt and drastic steps are taken by the Congress to reduce Government expenditures, and prevent the growth of deficits and our own national debt, international confidence in the dollar will be destroyed.

Mr. President, the report by the Clay Committee on foreign aid, which was released by the White House March 22, 1963, emphasizes the key role of the dollar. It states:

> There has been increasing concern as well over the contribution of foreign aid to the persistent deficits in our international balance of payments—12 in the last 13 years. These deficits have produced a sustained decline in our gold stock and a marked increase in foreign-owned dollar balances, with a resulting loss in our international liquidity. Upon international dollar convertibility at the existing gold parity rest the international payments mechanism which has evolved since the war, the economic health and prosperity of the United States and its friends, and our role of political, economic, and financial leadership in the free world. Our commitment to the convertibility of the dollar is essential to the accomplishment of the objectives we properly seek abroad, including those of our foreign assistance programs.

The gifts, grants, loans and other assistance we have provided other nations represent approximately one-third of our national debt. As responsible legislators we cannot permit our country's financial stability to be further threatened by continuing lavish grants and loans, while we ourselves are seeking aid from others to maintain convertibility of the dollar.

Mr. President, unless we meet this grave responsibility during this session of the Congress we may yet be confronted with the catastrophe which Secretary Dillon said would be far greater than any he could imagine; namely, our forced devaluation of the dollar. If this occurs, it will be too late for us to take positive action to stem international fiscal chaos. The Kremlin has long realized that inflation and the destruction of free world currencies would be the surest way to secure its goal of world communism.

We cannot meet the challenge of our times by continuing to implement discredited economic policies of the 1930's. They did not correct unemployment; they did not produce economic growth then, and they cannot now.

EXHIBIT 1

TREASURY DEPARTMENT
Washington, D.C., October 23, 1962.

TREASURY ISSUES SECURITIES IN SWISS FRANCS

The Treasury announced today that it is issuing during October $23 million equivalent of bonds denominated in Swiss francs as well as about $50 million equivalent of certificates of indebtedness denominated in Swiss francs. These transactions represent the first Treasury foreign currency borrowings at terms longer than 3 months—the bonds carry a 15-month maturity and the certificates of indebtedness maturities of 5 and 8 months. This new type of public debt operation is authorized by the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended—the same authority under which 3-month foreign currency-denominated certificates of indebtedness were issued beginning in October 1961. Previous borrowings of $46 million of Swiss francs undertaken at that time were repaid in the spring of 1962.

The longer term borrowings of Swiss francs now undertaken are to be to the mutual advantage of Switzerland and the United States. They afford the Treasury an opportunity to tap at a very reasonable cost a large pool of capital funds arising from Swiss Government surpluses and other fiscal measures designed to mop up excess liquidity in the Swiss money and capital markets. At the same time, the Treasury's borrowing transactions will assist the Swiss authorities in dealing with Switzerland's problems of fiscal and monetary management, particularly by providing a desired investment outlet for capital funds which might otherwise be sterilized.

Borrowings of this kind can also provide a convenient means of strengthening the Treasury's Swiss franc resources available for exchange operations, although the present borrowing is not needed for this purpose. Large-scale flows of funds to Switzerland at times have had destabilizing effects in the exchange markets. Such effects have been and will continue to be counteracted through official transactions, undertaken in full consultation and cooperation between the Swiss and United States authorities. Actually, the flow of funds to Switzerland has ceased since July and official U.S. commitments have been reduced in an orderly manner since that time. The new arrangements will provide useful flexibility, however, not only for Treasury operations in Swiss francs but also for bringing about a flow of capital into the United States.

EXHIBIT 2

DE GAULLE CONSIDERING PURCHASE OF U.S. BONDS

PARIS, March 4.—President Charles de Gaulle is considering whether to authorize the purchase of U.S. Treasury Bonds to support the dollar, it is reported here tonight.

The result may be made known after Tuesday's weekly Cabinet meeting.

France's decision may depend on whether the American Government is willing or able, to curb American investments in key sectors of the European economy. Officials here fear control of these sectors may be purchased by foreign capital.

America's request for financial aid from France was formally presented last Thursday to Finance Minister Valery Giscard d'Estaing by Robert Roosa, American Under Secretary of the Treasury. Roosa is understood to have asked for the purchase, in francs, of $100 million to $150 million worth of short term (15-month) Treasury bonds. Switzerland, Italy and Germany have all bought bonds in their own currencies under similar arrangements.

Financial circles here interpret the offering of these short-term bonds as an indication that the American Government anticipates possible difficulty in defending the dollar toward the end of 1963 or the beginning of 1964.

It is felt here that the request may give de Gaulle a good opportunity to bring pressure on the United States to restrict investment in French fields where American capital has recently become unwelcome—oil, real estate, automobiles and the food industry.

It seems paradoxical, French experts are remarking, that the U.S. Government should be obliged to seek foreign support for its currency at the same time that private companies in America are exporting large sums, thus aggravating the balance of payments situation for the United States.

Not only are these American companies exporting funds for new investments, these observers say; they are also holding in Europe profits made on previous investments, placing them chiefly in Swiss holding companies, instead of repatriating them to the United States.

The question is raised here whether present American legislation permits the U.S. Government to curb foreign investment. Present French legislation in most cases does not enable the French Government to bar it directly.

An organization just set up may be regarded by the French as a possible channel for regulating a flow of funds that for the moment neither country seems able to control. This is Eurofinance, a group of five European banks, including the French Société Generale, and five American banks, ostensibly simply a research center to provide information to Americans or Europeans desirous of investments in Europe.

PRIORITIES IN SPACE EXPLORATION

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, Monday I made a videotape for a future program on NBC on the subject of our space program. One of the questions about the space program is whether we are placing too much emphasis and money in getting to the moon in view of other areas that science should also be working in.

My answer to that question is that we may be. I have some serious questions in my mind. I think we should stand back a little and do some serious thinking about just what should be our objectives.

If it is prestige and power—then is putting a man on the moon ahead of Russia that important—or is something else more important?

We have too much of a tendency to let the Russians select the priorities and the fields in which we should concentrate our competition—fields in which Russians excel.

Perhaps we should decide priorities ourselves instead of letting Russians control the decisions.

On the other hand, the "fall out" of valuable scientific knowledge that we gain on the way to putting a man on the moon could very well be far more significant than the end objective.

Yesterday's Washington Post's lead editorial of "Man of the Moon" gives excellent perspective on this subject and I commend it to the attention of all Members of this body and ask unanimous consent that it be placed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Man on the Moon

Comment of 25 of America's 55 living Nobel Prize winners on the feasibility and desirability of a crash program to land a man on the moon reflects a division in the scientific community over the wisdom of the $20 billion moon program of the National Aeronautics and Space Agency.

Most of the Nobel Prize winners thought the effort ought to be dropped as a race and allowed to proceed at a more deliberate rate. Some of the scientists wisely acknowledged that the decision has political connotation. Many of them disapprove because of competing claims on the Nation's financial resources.

The dissent is not the first to come from the scientific community as a whole. Misgivings about the moon probe have been heard ever since the project was put on the track. These misgivings spring from diverse sources and causes, all the way from doubts about the general structure of NASA to reservations about the scientific utility of the probe.

The scientific community, clearly enough, is not a conformist society throughout which a single opinion prevails. Those who have the fullest technical information may differ, along with others who have no better criteria than laymen. In fact, there often is a kind of layman's naive assumption that scientists ought to agree; that they are the oracles of the New World. It is no reproach to the scientists that, outside the disciplines of their own specialties, they are no more competent to decide all questions of policy than the businessmen of the twenties who were often consulted on questions of war and peace beyond the range of their wisdom. Each generation has its own Delphic oracles.

Politicians may yearn for a panel of scientists to put an end to these misgivings, hoping for some sort of board of umpires or referees capable of saying how much of the Nation's expenditures on scientific projects should go to each particular endeavor. But in the end, it is not the scientists or the specialists who have to decide first on how much the Nation can spend on scientific development and second how much of that total should be allocated to each project. These decisions have to be made by generalists of whom politicians are among the last survivors. And the scientists can give the politicians no infallible guidance. Such giant enterprises as NASA inevitably arouse concern. We are bound to worry about its claims on national resources, its absorption of scientific and engineering talent, its diversion of productive resources and facilities to a single purpose. We attribute Soviet space triumphs to the Soviet ability to compel the focus of national power on narrow objectives, but we do not necessarily wish to imitate this concentration.

NASA's great moon probe, however, is not as narrow a purpose as imagined. We may not get to the moon first, or we may not get to it at all—but that will not mean all has been in vain. In trying to reach such a spectacular goal, we are developing the rockets that will place us in the forefront of the space age, and in developing the scientific and engineering skills required to achieve this purpose we are enormously expanding the country's capacity to achieve scientific goals as yet unspecified. The skills and talents nurtured at NASA will be making their contribution to the knowledge, the comfort, the convenience and the survival of the United States long after moon landings have been accepted as a commonplace or abandoned as an impossibility. The world was altered by the voyages of Columbus, even though they failed of their planned objectives. And the world is being altered before our very eyes by a new struggle to master man's environment. Enterprises such as this are not to be judged by the ordinary criteria of scientists, economists or sociologists. They are not to be weighed on the balance against some other more practical and more appropriate or more feasible endeavor. Such heroic enterprises move by their own laws, abide by their own rules and set their own precedents and when they are over, leave humanity with its knowledge multiplied, its future expanded, its horizons widened, its outlook sharpened and its hopes uplifted by a new sense of man's unending and unlimited possibilities.

DIFFICULTIES IN ADMINISTRATION OF AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT AND MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I have received a letter from the Chief of the Bureau of Vocational Education of the Maine Department of Education informing me of difficulties experienced with Federal agencies administering the Area Redevelopment Act and the Manpower Development and Training Act.

Because of such difficulties, he has requested action be taken to make it mandatory to leave the approval of the individual Area Redevelopment Act and Manpower Development and Training Act projects to the appropriate State officials. He observes that while recognition is made of the necessity of the Federal agencies involved to assure themselves that programs are conducted in accordance with the law, Maine officials do not believe that it is necessary to carry control to the extent now practiced and feel that it is contrary to all the principles to which they have been committed.

Since I am sure that similar difficulty has been experienced in other States, I call this matter to the attention of the Members of this body and I ask unanimous consent that his letter be placed in the body of the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

State of Maine,
Department of Education,
Augusta, Maine, April 30, 1963.

Hon. Margaret Chase Smith,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Smith: It is my belief that Maine has been benefited substantially by the training and retraining provided under the Area Redevelopment Act and the Manpower Development and Training Act. We feel that it is significant that of 415 trained to date, 375 (90 percent) have obtained employment. This means increased payrolls of over $20,000 per week, and a reduction in the number of unemployed.

However, we have been concerned with the unnecessarily involved procedures for securing approval of Area Redevelopment Act and Manpower Development and Training Act projects. Traditionally, the State education agency has accepted the responsibility of approving programs of vocational education which are partially financed by Federal vocational education funds. This has been done in accordance with accepted standards and it has worked very well. There has been a minimum of paperwork involved and the procedure has never resulted in delay.

It is our feeling that the State education agency and the State employment agency are fully competent to jointly review and pass on the approvability of Area Redevelopment Act and Manpower Development and Training Act projects and that there should be no need for the prior review and approval by Federal representatives.

There has been considerable delay in the past (as much as 6 months in one case) in securing approval of Area Redevelopment Act projects. There have also been cases of arbitrary revision in the proposed training program when, in our opinion, the proposal was sound and carefully planned. In one case at least, we have been required to increase the length and cost of the training program, even though we felt it unnecessary.

Our experience with Manpower Development and Training Act has been somewhat more satisfactory since a task force comes into the State to review and pass on proposals, yet we feel that this is entirely unnecessary and involves unnecessary expense.

We have a written agreement with the U.S. Commissioner of Education for the conduct of Manpower Development and Training Act projects and the employment service has a similar agreement with the Department of Labor. We have detailed instructions, and make detailed reports. Records are to be audited.

Again, let me say that we feel we and our counterparts in the State employment service are fully competent to conduct these programs with the safeguards and checks indicated above. Efficiency would be greatly increased if we were free to proceed on that basis.

Since you are a member of the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations, may I ask that you give consideration to the possibility of including in the appropriation bill a rider which would make it mandatory to leave the approval of the individual Area Redevelopment Act and Manpower Development and Training Act projects to the appropriate State officials. If that is not feasible, perhaps you would at least make a strong statement to that effect.

We recognize the necessity for the Federal agencies involved to assure themselves that programs are conducted in accordance with the law. We do not believe that it is necessary to carry control to the extent now practiced, and feel that it is contrary to all the principles to which we have been committed.

Your interest in this matter will be greatly appreciated I can assure you.

Sincerely yours,

John A. Snell,
Chief, Bureau of Vocational Education.

STANDARD TIME

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, on April 26 I introduced S. 1394, a bill which would establish daylight saving time uniformly throughout the United States during the months of June, July, and August of each year.

The response which I have received from the general public indicates that the objective of my bill has broad acceptance. The response from the transportation and communications industries has also been very favorable. These industries have indicated that they prefer the uniformity of this bill to the patchwork of time which S. 1033, introduced at the request of the Interstate Commerce Commission, would prolong through the establishment of sub-zones in each of the eight standard time zones.

This multiplicity of time is a source of irritation and inconvenience to the general public and a matter of considerable expense to the transportation and communications industries. It has been estimated that my bill would save these industries in excess of $1 million annually. I am advised also that it would simplify the problem which radio stations have in conforming to certain daylight hours.

Mr. President, although the ICC and I have common objectives—that is, to establish time uniformity and to do so in such a way as to compromise between those who would wish 6 months of daylight saving time and those who wish none at all—I submit that my proposal is simpler and substantially less difficult to administer.

Personally, I prefer the time observed by our Founding Fathers, that is, "sun time," or apparent solar time, which is based directly on the sun's position in the sky. The fact remains, however, that to get uniformity we must compromise between the wishes of office workers and industrial workers in the metropolitan areas, who, on the one hand, would prefer to have an additional hour in the evening for recreational activities and farmers in the main, who, on the other hand, would find any time change an unnecessary nuisance.

Early next week I expect to introduce a revised version of S. 1394, my uniform daylight saving time bill. The original bill left some question as to whether a uniform time standard would be extended to all persons and operations throughout the United States. It would expressly have applied only to interstate carriers, to the operation of Federal offices, and to the performance of acts subject to the jurisdiction of the United States. In addition, S. 1394 did not repeal the act permitting the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight saving time in the District. The bill which I will introduce next week should make it clear beyond a doubt that Congress intends to preempt the field in its establishment of daylight saving time across the board during the 3 summer months.

Second, the new bill will provide that daylight saving time will go into effect at 2 o'clock antemeridian on the last Sunday of May and end at 2 o'clock antemeridian on the first Sunday after Labor Day in September. By making the change to and from daylight saving time on a Sunday, my bill, like the ICC bill, would avoid unnecessary dislocations in the workweek. Furthermore, by providing that daylight saving time is to end on the first Sunday after Labor Day, the forthcoming bill would insulate that long weekend, which traditionally ends the summer season, from the consequences of the time change.

Third, I have added provisions to my revised bill which would establish new time zones for the States of Alaska and Hawaii. Finally, in order to assist the ICC in the performance of its administrative duties, I have incorporated the enforcement provisions of S. 1033.

When I introduce this bill next week, I shall speak at some length on the history of time measurements, on the desirability of uniform standards of time, on the advantages of the 3-month daylight time compromise, and on the constitutional power of Congress with respect to standards of time.

THE INCARNATE EASTER

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, on Lake Virginia, in my State of Florida, a group of students and faculty members of Rollins College gathered for an Easter morning of fellowship. The life-practical message was given by Dr. Paul Douglass, professor of government, a member of the bar here in the District of Columbia, and for a dozen years the distinguished president of the American University. Over the years he has been a close friend of Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, the beloved Chaplain of this Senate. I ask unanimous consent that a summary of the talk be printed in the body of the Record because it is so concisely done and brings into focus ideas which should concern us in these days.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Incarnate Easter

By the best evidence rule, the most authentic document reporting the record of the incarnate Easter is contained in a holographic letter written by Paul to the Corinthians (I Corinthians 15: 1–10). He reports an experience which was personal to him. From the very first Easter it was this kind of personal witness of the Risen Lord that gave power to the Christian church. That experience remains its energizing factor. In testimony Paul says:

"And last of all he was seen of me also, as one born out of due time."

Let us examine Paul's witness as it has meaning for us today.

I

We experience the Risen Lord in the everyday routine. The Damascus Road was the interstate highway of Paul's day. It is the symbol of the routine, the streets on which we commute, the offices where we earn our living. The Risen Lord appeared to Paul when he was at work. He was cloistered in no sacred place. His sanctuary had no sacred hour. He engaged no special posture. Paul experienced the superlative encounter in the commonplace. The commonplace became the dwelling place of the Divine.

II

Easter equips us with a restructured map for living. Augustine was baptized on Easter Sunday in the year 387 A.D. In his "Confessions" he tells of an incident which occurred when he was conversing with a friend at a gaming table. The "Book," which happened to be there, opened to an Epistle of Paul. "Tell me," asked the young friend, "what aim we at?" In Paul, Augustine found the model of a man with a mission, with an aim. The experience on the Damascus Road gave to Paul a vocation. Easter gives us goals for living.

III

Easter broadens the time dimensions of life.

A college coed received an official notification from the Pentagon that her father was among the missing in a submarine disaster. In an English theme, which the young woman wrote that day, she said: "My world has broadened. Heretofore I have been living in the events of today and in the expectation of tomorrow. This morning my life took on new dimensions. I now live also in the warm and vivid memories of the past. This morning I knew for the first time that I am of the mature generation." Easter adds a fuller dimension to living.

IV

Easter stands as a symbol of the durability of the good over the bad.

Easter blots out Good Friday. Martyrdom is transformed into immortality. Difficulties become doors. Catastrophe disappears in emergent hope and fellowship as a new era with the new day begins in history. Here is an inspectable, recurring logic of living, experienced by every man who assumes responsibilities and stands ready to bear the consequence of leadership. The universe is so constructed that it ultimately enhances decency rather than extinguishing it. Easter says that value is indestructable. The crucifixion of Golgotha in the everyday world is prologue to achievement of purpose.

V

Easter confronts us with the meaning of time.

Augustine made his great contribution to philosophy in his discussion of time in the 11th book of the "Confessions." He classifies time as (1) past, (2) present, and (3) future; but he says that all three times are really in the present. The present of things past is memory. The present of things present is sight. The present of things future is expectation. Augustine found time in its full dimension—"the most entangled enigma"—as having its unity on God. What aim we at in time in its full dimensions? With the experience of the Risen Lord the commonplace becomes alive with purpose. Memory, sight, and expectation join together in a vocation. Easter gives life purpose and direction. It gives action meaning in time.

VI

Easter makes mankind one.

The experience of the Risen Lord can come to any human being. "God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that feareth Him and worketh righteousness is accepted of Him." Easter is the solvent of the cold war; the common denominator of men of every race where awareness of responsibility creates fellowship through sacrifice for the achievement of purpose.

VII

Easter provides the spiritual charter of freedom.

Above the affairs of man stands the incarnate presence of God. Above the temporal city arches the eternal city where a higher law holds earth responsible. "We cannot but speak the things which we have heard and seen." "We must obey God rather than man." The values of justice and peace summon us to duty as the ought-to-be stands over against the is and will not let it rest until it finds its home in God and the righteous brotherhood of man.

VIII

Easter refuels us with spiritual energy.

Dean Inge once said that modern man is living on the spiritual capital of the 19th century. In an age of prodigious peripheral richness we need a core of spiritual conviction. Otherwise the pressures of our secular world press upon a central vacuum and our culture collapses. The personal experience of the Risen Lord as He appears in our routines enkindles a spiritual force and tells us "what aim we at." As Paul says: "And last of all He was seen of me also, as one born out of due time."

The incarnate Easter gives us skyhooks, roadmaps, consuming vocations, spiritual power, and a companionship on the way with the indwelling spirit of the Risen Lord.

Easter is the heroic drama of life—the lives of us all—as we pursue unselfish purpose in the full dimensions of time.

THE FUTURE OF THE DUAL BANKING SYSTEM

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, in the light of the fact that there is considerable discussion with respect to the dual banking system, policies and programs of Mr. James J. Saxon, Comptroller of the Currency, and the various committee actions of the Congress, I believe it would be appropriate and beneficial to have placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information of Members of Congress, two articles which appeared in the Bank Stock Quarterly of December 1962 and March 1963, published by M. A. Schapiro & Co., of New York.

The December 1962 article is entitled "The Future of the Dual Banking System."

The second article in the March 1963 issue is entitled "The Patman Report."

Both of these articles are very informative and can lead to very useful future discussion of this entire subject matter.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these two articles be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Bank Stock Quarterly, December 1962]

THE FUTURE OF THE DUAL BANKING SYSTEM

(In all of the abundant debate and analysis of the dual banking system one feature of that system is central. That feature is the dual regulation of banking growth. The foundation of the dual banking system, now in its 100th year, is the fact that each of 50 State governments and the Federal Government charter banks and in consequence both State governments and the Federal Government have supervisory authority regulating banks in the public interest. In recent discussions the distribution of chartering powers is not questioned, nor is the principle of supervision by the chartering government challenged. Present difficulties and disagreements stem entirely from the mutual interpenetration of the authority of the Federal Government and the authority of the States in the regulation of expansion.)

When the implications of the dual banking system are debated, the very same facts are regularly introduced as evidence for quite opposite conclusions. Thus, arguing from the point of view of the smaller banks in States where State regulations under the dual banking system prohibit or confine branching, it is urged that these regulations guard against undue concentration in the hands of large and remote city banks. In fact, arguing in this vein, one Midwestern banker speaking at the American Bankers Association convention in September, equated branch banking with monopoly banking and portrayed his State's total prohibition of branching as a needed defense against monopoly. But looking at the very same regulations from the viewpoint of a growing bank, eager to extend the area in which it does business and willing to meet the competition of other banks in an extended area, those very same restrictive regulations do not protect against monopoly but rather protect monopoly itself by closing the domain of existing banks to significant competition.

The pattern of proof of divergent conclusions from the same premises appears in the arguments of spokesmen for the State and Federal authorities themselves. James J. Saxon, Comptroller of the Currency, contends that the dual banking system as presently organized subordinates Federal authority to the States. And the Comptroller has in mind authority in the field of bank expansion. He finds the distribution of authority inequitable because State regulations on branching and merging are binding on National as well as on State banks. But appealing to the very same present organization of the dual banking system and to the very same question of bank expansion, New York State legislators have repeatedly urged the opposite conclusion: that State initiative is frustrated and State authority subordinated and vetoed because the Federal supervisory agencies must pass not only on the expansion of national banks but on proposals which have received approval from State authorities and which involve only State banks.

THE INVESTOR'S POINT OF VIEW

These contradictory estimates of the implications, needs, virtues, shortcomings and prospects for the future arise from the divergent points of view from which growth under the dual banking system is considered. The points of view of big bankers and small bankers, of legislators and supervisors, of the States and of the Federal Government are presented articulately and often. But one point of view, one interested party, is seldom represented in the growing volume of discussion. That is the point of view of the investor. And it is from the investor's point of view that the incompatibilities of other viewpoints should be reconciled.

The point of view of present and potential investors in banks is fundamental because ours is a private-capital banking system before it is a dual banking system. This system does not require that the interests of the public at large, or the welfare of the economy, or of the depositor or borrower, be subordinated to the interests of the stockholder. The interest of investors in banks, while not always the same as that of bank managements, should always be compatible with the public interest.

What is the investor's interest, in concrete terms? Twenty-three billion dollars, that is the total of capital funds of the 13,462 commercial banks in the United States. Twenty-three billion dollars represents hundreds of thousands of voluntary decisions, choices to commit money to commercial bank capital. It has grown to that figure from $2 billion in 1900 and from $9 billion in 1945.

In the next decade, if banking is to keep pace with needs of the economy, the capital of all commercial banks will have to grow by $12 billion. This is a moderate estimate. The future success of the commercial banking system is dependent upon the willingness of countless investors, large and small, individual and institutional, to invest their money in banks. Commercial banks compete with one another for the investor's dollar; they compete for this capital with other businesses, with the Federal, State, and municipal governments, with savings institutions and with foreign investment opportunities. This, the widest of all fields of competition, is not the one that comes to mind at the mention of competition in banking but it is not less important for that. Public policy under the dual banking system must not put commercial banking at a disadvantage in the competition for the investor's dollar.

To the extent that the prospect for growth in any field is inhibited, the willingness of investors in that field is inhibited. And if public policy itself should permit the curtailment of growth in banking then public policy itself would deter investment in banks.

Under the dual banking system, banks are chartered, regulated, examined, and supervised by the State and Federal Governments in the interest of the public, but they are owned by private investors.

The commercial banking industry provides an indispensable public service for the whole of our society, but commercial banks are privately owned and thus the public is dependent upon the willingness of private owners to provide that service. Stockholders' money, the capital of commercial banks, defends the integrity of all of the deposits against all of the risks which banks are in the business of taking. Therefore, insofar as legitimate and equitable opportunity for growth can be given, public policy under the dual banking system should give that opportunity.

When the investor examines the implications of public policy for future bank growth and expansion in the United States, when he examines, that is, the legal framework for growth under the dual banking system, this is what he finds: There are States, such as California and Maryland, which permit banks to operate branches anywhere within the State's borders. In such States no limit is placed on the number of branches a bank can operate, and in California two of the branches of a single bank are separated by 800 miles. In contrast, New York State confines expansion through branching within banking districts; other States, like Pennsylvania and Kentucky, limit branching to the main-office county and contiguous counties; while still others, like New Jersey and Massachusetts, permit branching only within counties. But in Illinois, Florida, and Texas a bank is not allowed even one branch anywhere in the State.

The investor or stockholder, attentive to the possibility of merger as a route to expanded operations, finds of course that such States as Illinois, Florida, and Texas allow mergers only if the merging bank will close its banking office. New York permits merging, like branching, within district lines, while Virginia, which confines branching, now allows merging on a statewide basis.

Similarly, the bank holding company, often a means to expansion beyond branching areas, is allowed to operate on a statewide basis in New York but is illegal in New Jersey. Forbidden in Illinois, bank holding companies flourish in Ohio. Banned in Pennsylvania and Kansas, they are recognized in Massachusetts and Montana.

CAN THEY ALL BE RIGHT?

For the investor, banking law concerning growth is a jumble of different State formulas. The following table summarizes the striking variety of legal structures to be found in the 50 States. The investor is not insensitive to the need for supervision of bank growth when he asks if all of these different State regulations are required in the interests of banking and in the interests of the residents of the 50 States. Is it possible that all of these drastically different policies can be appropriate to current economic realities pertaining to banking in the different States? Can economic conditions and needs vary this much? Is it plausible that bank holding companies can be good for New York but bad for New Jersey? What analysis can reconcile the confinement of banks to counties in Massachusetts with statewide banking in adjacent Connecticut? What peculiar features of the Illinois and Florida economies could be cited in order to justify policies permitting no branches for banks, while banking needs in California are best served by allowing individual banks scores of branches across a wide area? And can it be shown that Texas really has no economic space for a single branch, while Rhode Island, the smallest State, has room for statewide branching?

Whatever else the investor thinks about the policies of the various States under the dual banking system, he must conclude that they cannot all be best for banking, best for the economy, and best for the people.

RESTRICTIVE POLICIES DOMINATE

The investor is naturally interested in the Federal Government's role with respect to bank expansion under the dual banking system. Where does public policy at the Federal level fit into this miscellany of growth regulations? Under present Federal law branches, mergers and bank holding companies are all recognized forms for bank growth. But the expansion of all of the banks of each State, whether nationally chartered or State chartered, must conform to the policy of the State. In this respect, the State's contribution to the dual banking system is supreme.

But the supremacy of the State works in only one direction. A State—Illinois, for example—can enforce restrictive, or inhibiting, or confining policies whatever the views of national banking authorities. But if a State—New York, for example—wishes to pursue a liberal policy toward branching or merging or the formation of bank holding companies, then under existing Federal law its authority is far from being supreme. Rather, the Federal policy subordinates that of the State. In accordance with Federal banking law, the Federal authorities have the last word on branch applications of virtually all banks, State or National, on virtually all proposed mergers involving either National or State banks or both, and on all proposals to form or expand bank holding companies.

Thus, as matters stand, the Federal Government and the States are each supreme in their own way. But both forms of supremacy are negative. The States and the Federal Government can each override the efforts of the other party to the dual banking system if those efforts involve the liberalization of expansion policies. But the States cannot override restrictive decisions of the national agencies, nor can the national authorities act to counter restrictive policies of the States. This system of false doors is no recommendation to the investor.

Policies of the States on banking growth

State	Branching policy [1]	Protective rules [1] [2]	Holding company policy	Number of bank holding companies operating on Dec. 31, 1961
1. Alabama	Prohibited, with many exceptions	Yes	No prohibition	
2. Alaska	No legislation. 100-mile radius limitation repealed in 1959.		do	
3. Arizona	Statewide		do	1
4. Arkansas	Prohibited with exceptions		do	
5. California	Statewide		do	4
6. Colorado	Prohibited		do	1
7. Connecticut	Statewide	Yes	do	
8. Delaware	do		do	
9. Florida	Prohibited		do	3
10. Georgia	New branches prohibited since 1960		Prohibited	6
11. Hawaii	Statewide		No prohibition	
12. Idaho	do	Yes	do	2
13. Illinois	Prohibited		Prohibited	2
14. Indiana	Confined to counties	Yes	do	2
15. Iowa	Prohibited	Yes [3]	No prohibition	2
16. Kansas	do		Prohibited	
17. Kentucky	Confined to county of the main office and contiguous counties.	Yes	Restricted	1
18. Louisiana	Statewide with limitations		Prohibited	
19. Maine	Statewide	Yes	No prohibition	1
20. Maryland	do		do	
21. Massachusetts	Confined to counties		State approval required.	3
22. Michigan	Confined to counties or areas of contiguous counties within 25 miles of main office.	Yes	Prohibited	
23. Minnesota	Prohibited		No prohibition	4
24. Mississippi	Confined to radius of 100 miles from main office, maximum number of branches: 15.	Yes	Prohibited	
25. Missouri	Prohibited		No prohibition	2
26. Montana	Prohibited except as resulting from consolidation.		do	4
27. Nebraska	Prohibited		do	1
28. Nevada	Statewide		do	1
29. New Hampshire	Prohibited with a single exception		do	1
30. New Jersey	Confined to counties	Yes	Prohibited	
31. New Mexico	Confined to county of main office and contiguous counties and other areas within 100 miles of main office.	Yes	No prohibition	1
32. New York	Confined to banking districts	Yes	State approval required.	9
33. North Carolina	Statewide		No prohibition	
34. North Dakota	Prohibited	Yes [3]	do	3
35. Ohio	Confined to county of main office and contiguous counties.		do	2
36. Oklahoma	Prohibited		do	
37. Oregon	Statewide	Yes	do	1
38. Pennsylvania	Confined to county of main office and contiguous counties.		Prohibited	
39. Rhode Island	Statewide		No prohibition	
40. South Carolina	do		Restricted	
41. South Dakota	do	Yes	No prohibition	2
42. Tennessee	Confined to counties		do	3
43. Texas	Prohibited		do	2
44. Utah	Statewide	Yes	do	2
45. Vermont	do		Prohibited	
46. Virginia	Statewide through merger, otherwise limited to county of main office and contiguous counties.		No prohibition	1
47. Washington	Statewide	Yes	Prohibited	3
48. West Virginia	Prohibited		do	
49. Wisconsin	do		No prohibition	6
50. Wyoming	No legislation, unit banking prevails.		do	2
51. District of Columbia	District-wide		do	

---

[1] Source: "Paton's Digest Supplement," 1961.

[2] "Protective rules" include any regulations which prevent or tend to prevent the establishment of branches or offices of other banks in some or all of the area in which an existing bank does business. An example is sec. 105 of the New York State banking law which closes communities in which the home office of an existing bank is located to de novo branching by outside banks.

[3] Although Iowa and North Dakota prohibit branch banks, both States permit the establishment of branch offices at which some, but not all, banking functions may be performed. These States have protective rules pertaining to the establishment of such offices. Many States distinguish "branch bank" from "banking office" or other "banking facility." Generally only banks and branch banks can make loans.

40 selected commercial banks listed in order of capital accounts on Sept. 28, 1962, showing domestic deposits (time and demand), critical yields, profit margins, earning power, and current per share data

Bank	Average loans and investments [1]					Profit margin per $1,000 of loans and investments			Net operating earnings		Deposits at domestic offices			Capital accounts			Net operating earnings per share				Current cash dividend		Market data, Nov. 29, 1962			
	12 months ended Sept. 28, 1962	Yield realized			Yield required to break even	Pretax	Applicable tax rate	After tax	12 months ended Sept. 28, 1962	As percent of average capital accounts [1]	Total Sept. 28, 1962	As percent of total		Sept. 28, 1962	Percent of domestic deposits	Per share (book value)	1960 [2]	1961 [2]	12 months ended Sept. 30, 1962 [2]	Change from full year 1961	Per share	Percent of NOE [3] for 12 months ended Sept. 30, 1962	Bid price	Times NOE [3] 12 months ended Sept. 30, 1962	Yield	Percent of book value
			On loans	On investments								Demand	Time													
	Millions	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*		*Percent*		*Thousands*	*Percent*	*Millions*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Thousands*	*Percent*					*Percent*		*Percent*			*Percent*	*Percent*
1. First National City Bank [4]	$6,155.1	4.42	5.26	3.19	2.41	$20.10	40.97	$11.87	$73,119	9.1	$6,860.6	73.0	27.0	$819.9	12.0	$64.39	$5.83	$5.72	$5.74	+0.3	$3.00	52.3	$89.25	15.5	3.4	138.6
2. Chase Manhattan Bank	6,661.8	4.31	4.90	3.06	2.35	19.60	44.88	10.80	72,004	9.5	7,329.3	76.1	23.9	779.0	10.6	55.77	5.32	5.05	5.16	+2.2	2.60	50.4	75.50	14.6	3.4	135.4
3. Morgan Guaranty Trust Co.	3,555.9	3.91	4.57	2.76	1.33	25.80	45.26	14.12	50,200	8.7	3,647.5	73.3	26.7	585.6	16.1	77.67	6.91	6.53	6.66	+2.0	4.00	60.1	122.75	18.4	3.3	158.0
4. Manufacturers Hanover Trust Co.	3,966.0	4.27	5.11	3.01	2.50	17.70	44.33	9.85	39,121	8.4	4,818.9	76.5	23.5	469.5	9.7	40.06	[5] 3.80	[5] 3.55	3.34	−5.9	2.00	59.9	53.00	15.9	3.8	132.3
5. Chemical Bank New York Trust Co.	3,564.5	4.34	5.00	3.04	2.28	20.60	38.66	12.64	44,970	10.1	3,871.0	75.4	24.6	455.8	11.8	53.77	4.83	5.18	5.31	+2.5	2.80	52.7	83.00	15.6	3.4	154.4
6. First National Bank of Chicago	2,732.8	4.18	4.96	2.92	1.98	22.00	44.52	12.21	33,273	9.8	2,991.9	65.2	34.8	350.7	11.7	46.76	4.86	4.68	4.44	−5.1	1.60	36.0	73.00	16.4	2.2	156.1
7. Bankers Trust Co.	2,432.1	4.35	5.05	3.02	1.91	24.40	47.45	12.82	31,133	9.9	2,934.9	80.6	19.4	320.9	10.9	35.76	3.60	3.43	3.47	+1.2	1.80	51.9	53.25	15.3	3.4	148.9
8. Mellon National Bank & Trust Co.	1,948.0	4.09	5.11	3.17	2.08	20.10	35.17	13.03	25,384	8.1	2,069.9	64.4	35.6	319.7	15.4	48.05	3.72	3.65	3.81	+4.4	2.00	52.5	63.25	16.6	3.2	131.6
9. Security First National Bank, Los Angeles	3,264.4	4.68	6.06	3.10	3.20	14.80	44.93	8.15	26,750	9.8	3,737.4	53.3	46.7	281.7	7.5	39.31	4.06	3.87	3.73	−3.6	1.60	42.9	72.00	19.3	2.2	183.2
10. First National Bank of Boston [6]	1,416.5	4.74	5.43	3.23	1.40	33.40	53.15	15.65	22,217	10.1	1,474.4	82.7	17.3	223.7	15.2	55.93	5.52	5.49	5.55	+1.1	3.00	54.1	85.00	15.3	3.5	152.0
11. Wells Fargo Bank, San Francisco	2,409.2	4.84	5.90	3.12	3.49	13.50	47.32	7.11	17,149	8.4	2,734.7	46.0	54.0	208.3	7.6	41.85	[5, 7] 4.08	[7] 3.81	[7] 3.45	−9.5	1.60	46.4	58.50	17.0	2.7	139.8
12. National Bank of Detroit	1,695.1	4.26	5.32	3.25	2.83	14.30	31.48	9.80	16,561	9.5	1,999.4	66.5	33.5	178.1	8.9	49.47	5.05	4.79	4.60	−4.0	2.00	43.5	61.50	13.4	3.3	124.3
13. Irving Trust Co.	1,699.0	4.08	4.57	3.08	2.29	17.90	46.23	9.62	16,376	10.3	2,079.5	74.3	25.7	161.6	7.8	29.28	3.30	2.97	2.97	0	1.60	53.9	44.75	15.1	3.6	152.8
14. Cleveland Trust Co.	1,309.2	4.44	4.98	3.25	2.83	16.10	40.66	9.55	12,556	8.9	1,421.2	46.4	53.6	145.4	10.2	290.73	28.46	28.34	25.11	−11.4	6.00	23.9	335.00	13.3	1.8	115.2
15. Crocker-Anglo National Bank	1,769.1	5.20	6.41	3.19	3.57	16.30	43.40	9.23	16,301	11.4	2,005.8	48.4	51.6	144.2	7.2	21.85	2.55	[7] 2.57	2.47	−3.9	1.40	56.7	49.00	19.8	2.9	224.3
16. Republic National Bank of Dallas [8]	850.5	4.92	5.59	3.09	2.67	22.50	49.78	11.30	9,598	8.4	1,006.5	71.0	29.0	115.3	11.5	28.08	2.44	2.45	2.34	−4.5	1.68	71.8	60.75	26.0	2.8	216.3
17. First Pennsylvania Banking & Trust Co.	882.7	5.11	5.76	3.08	2.83	22.80	49.36	11.55	10,184	9.2	1,097.7	82.9	17.1	114.9	10.5	22.37	2.10	1.95	1.98	+1.5	1.20	60.0	31.00	15.7	3.9	138.6
18. Philadelphia National Bank	816.1	4.66	5.25	3.44	2.46	22.00	46.53	11.76	9,596	9.7	969.5	77.7	22.3	100.7	10.4	38.03	3.77	3.72	3.62	−2.7	[9] 2.15	59.4	52.75	14.6	4.1	138.7
19. Pittsburgh National Bank	850.7	4.49	5.96	2.99	2.95	15.40	33.39	10.26	8,754	9.2	932.5	60.9	39.1	97.1	10.4	32.09	3.11	2.87	2.89	+.7	1.52	52.6	37.25	12.9	4.1	116.1
20. Detroit Bank & Trust Co.	859.9	4.50	5.36	3.49	3.06	14.40	30.78	9.97	8,543	9.4	949.5	49.4	50.6	93.2	9.8	48.29	5.42	[5] 5.05	4.43	−12.3	2.20	49.7	51.75	11.7	4.3	107.2
21. First National Bank in Dallas	734.5	4.45	5.11	2.70	2.24	22.10	47.54	11.59	8,258	10.8	928.2	73.2	26.8	84.7	9.1	26.47	2.29	2.63	2.67	+1.5	1.36	50.9	56.50	21.2	2.4	213.4
22. Girard Trust Corn Exchange Bank	627.3	4.95	5.63	3.55	2.33	26.20	47.85	13.66	8,565	10.9	712.9	74.1	25.9	80.7	11.3	47.68	4.96	5.03	5.06	+.6	[9] 2.75	54.3	66.50	13.1	4.1	139.5
23. National City Bank of Cleveland	684.3	4.35	5.23	3.15	2.22	21.30	37.88	13.23	9.040	11.6	810.0	66.2	33.8	79.8	9.9	29.99	3.52	3.35	3.40	+1.5	1.60	47.1	52.50	15.4	3.0	175.1
24. United States Nat'l Bank, Portland	799.9	4.65	6.17	2.83	3.20	14.50	48.77	7.43	5,964	7.5	937.2	54.5	45.5	79.6	8.5	58.97	4.92	4.53	4.42	−2.4	2.60	58.8	66.00	14.9	3.9	111.9
25. Bank of New York	428.1	4.51	5.04	3.31	1.46	30.50	52.28	14.55	6,238	9.7	500.7	85.7	14.3	65.5	13.1	242.68	23.19	22.96	23.10	+.6	[9] 13.00	56.3	351.00	15.2	3.7	144.6
26. Franklin National Bank	826.1	4.93	6.04	2.97	2.99	19.40	40.88	11.47	9,462	16.7	958.4	34.6	65.4	63.4	6.6	18.03	2.53	2.69	2.69	0	1.00	37.2	46.00	17.1	2.2	255.1
27. Manufacturers National Bank of Detroit	756.9	4.47	5.75	2.96	3.34	11.30	20.18	9.02	6,822	11.1	908.3	54.8	45.2	62.6	6.9	44.44	5.16	4.54	4.84	+6.6	2.00	41.3	51.50	10.6	3.9	115.9
28. Wachovia Bank & Trust Co.	602.7	4.78	5.54	3.03	2.46	23.20	48.86	11.86	7,151	11.9	687.5	75.7	24.3	61.8	9.0	14.68	[7] 1.58	[7] 1.60	1.70	+6.3	.60	35.3	34.25	20.1	1.8	233.3
29. Valley National Bank of Arizona	597.4	5.56	6.08	3.86	3.82	17.40	47.03	9.22	5,478	10.4	659.1	55.4	44.6	55.1	8.4	23.21	2.40	2.28	2.31	+1.3	1.00	43.3	50.50	21.9	2.0	217.6

See footnotes at end of table.

40 selected commercial banks listed in order of capital accounts on Sept. 28, 1962, showing domestic deposits (time and demand), critical yields, profit margins, earning power, and current per share data—Continued

Bank	Average loans and investments [1]					Profit margin per $1,000 of loans and investments			Net operating earnings		Deposits at domestic offices			Capital accounts			Net operating earnings per share				Current cash dividend		Market data, Nov. 29, 1962			
	12 months ended Sept. 28, 1962	Yield realized			Yield required to break even	Pretax	Applicable tax rate	After tax	12 months ended Sept. 28, 1962	As percent of average capital accounts [1]	Total Sept. 28, 1962	As percent of total		Sept. 28, 1962	Percent of domestic deposits	Per share (book value)	1960 [2]	1961 [2]	12 months ended Sept. 30, 1962 [2]	Change from full year 1961	Per share	Percent of NOE [3] for 12 months ended Sept. 30, 1962	Bid price	Times NOE [3] 12 months ended Sept. 30, 1962	Yield	Percent of book value
			On loans	On investments								Demand	Time													
	Millions	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent		Percent		Thousands	Percent	Millions	Percent	Percent	Thousands	Percent					Percent		Percent			Percent	Percent
30. Citizens & Southern National Bank [8]	$450.3	5.43	6.15	3.26	3.33	$21.00	43.34	$11.90	$5,350	10.0	$558.6	77.3	22.7	$54.5	9.8	$36.36	$3.35	$3.38	$3.57	+5.6	[9] $1.70	47.6	$78.00	21.8	2.2	214.5
31. Bank of California, Los Angeles	584.9	4.66	5.64	3.33	3.26	14.00	42.58	8.04	4,721	8.9	701 4	57.7	42.3	54.2	7.7	35.15	3.17	3.00	3.06	+2.0	1.60	52.3	51.50	16.8	3.1	146.5
32. Union Bank, Los Angeles	665.1	5.57	6.58	3.42	3.14	24.30	51.48	11.79	7,865	15.4	844.2	62.7	37.3	53.9	6.4	22.14	[10] 2.49	2.83	3.23	+14.1	1.28	39.6	80.00	24.8	1.6	361.3
33. Central National Bank, Cleveland	569.0	4.59	5.28	3.58	3.23	13.60	44.44	7.56	4,300	8.6	662.8	54.2	45.8	50.7	7.6	46.73	4.25	4.50	3.96	−12.0	2.00	50.5	53.50	13.5	3.7	114.5
34. Indiana National Bank	390.3	4.60	5.61	2.98	2.58	20.20	44.19	11.27	4,402	9.0	459.9	76.6	23.4	49.5	10.8	70.59	6.23	6.00	6.27	+4.5	3.00	47.8	82.00	13.1	3.7	116.2
35. Fidelity-Philadelphia Trust Co.	438.2	4.91	5.79	3.33	3.00	19.10	41.76	11.12	4,865	10.2	516.0	68.3	31.7	48.9	9.5	50.96	4.78	5.13	5.07	−1.2	[9] 2.75	54.2	70.00	13.8	3.9	137.4
36. Citizens National Bank, Los Angeles	569.3	5.03	6.18	3.43	3.55	14.80	43.28	8.39	4,776	10.6	685.6	53.8	46.2	46.1	6.7	31.45	2.71	3.10	3.26	+5.2	1.60	49.1	61.00	18.7	2.6	194.0
37. Industrial National Bank of Providence	487.6	4.63	5.50	3.07	3.04	15.90	40.02	9.54	4,649	10.6	494.9	46.1	53.9	44.9	9.1	37.42	3.66	3.68	3.87	+4.0	2.00	51.7	50.00	12.9	4.0	133.6
38. County Trust Co., White Plains	508.5	4.53	5.47	3.19	3.06	14.70	27.27	10.69	5,450	15.7	555.7	48.2	51.8	36.7	6.6	20.55	2.76	2.99	3.06	+2.3	.50	16.3	54.00	17.6	.9	262.8
39. Fifth-Third Union Trust, Cincinnati	291.6	4.48	5.09	3.42	2.44	20.40	44.87	11.25	3,279	9.4	346.9	75.3	24.7	35.6	10.3	59.33	5.50	5.32	5.47	+2.8	2.50	45.7	65.00	11.9	3.8	109.6
40. American National Bank & Trust, Chicago	374.7	4.35	5.42	3.15	2.46	18.90	46.76	10.06	3,784	13.1	466.4	80.7	19.3	30.2	6.5	301.91	33.80	37.50	37.84	+.9	6.00	15.9	515.00	13.6	1.2	170.6
Total 40 banks	60,225.3	[11] 4.48	[11] 5.31	[11] 3.11	[11] 2.52	[11] 19.60	[11] 43.66	[11] 11.04	664,478	[11] 9.6	68,326.8	[11] 67.7	[11] 32.3	7,103.7	[11] 10.4					[11] −.3		[11] 50.4		[11] 16.2	[11] 3.1	[11] 151.8

---

[1] Based on call reports at beginning and end of period plus interim calls.
[2] Adjusted for stock dividends and splits.
[3] Net operating earnings.
[4] Balance sheet items are for the First National City Bank only, with the exception of capital accounts which include First National City Trust Company.
[5] Pro forma.
[6] Includes trust affiliate.
[7] Based on average shares outstanding, in lieu of pro forma data.
[8] Excludes affiliates.
[9] Includes extra.
[10] Restated to reflect accounting change instituted in 1961.
[11] Composite.

NOTE.—Selection has been made on the basis of size and the availability of data. Balance sheet items are based on statements published in response to official calls.

It is this mutual veto power that explains why Mr. Saxon maintains that the present organization of the dual banking system inequitably favors the States, while State authorities hold that the same arrangement inequitably favors the Federal authorities, including Mr. Saxon's Office.

AUTHORITIES IN CONFLICT

All this has led to conflicts that might well have been predicted. State legislatures, like that of New York, and State bank authorities have been quick to resent the authority of Federal supervisors when these supervisors have blocked efforts to modernize expansion policies authorized by the State legislature. In New York State little has been accomplished so far under the omnibus banking law of 1960, which authorized the formation of new statewide holding companies and expanded the areas for branching and merging downstate. This slowness is not traceable to the reluctance of banks but to the negative actions of the Federal Reserve Board and the Comptroller of the Currency, who disapproved and hence vetoed applications which had been authorized or approved by the State.

New York State authorities have been among the most outspoken critics of the Federal banking authorities on this score. They have pointed out the inconsistent interpretations, duplications, and obscurities of Federal supervision and tend to think of the Federal Government as obstructive to bank expansion. And so it appears to the investor as well.

But just as the State authorities are chafing under the negative supremacy of Federal bank supervision, so the Federal authorities are chafing under the yoke of State supremacy. And from the national level, it is State policies that frequently appear outmoded and obstructive. For example, the Commission on Money and Credit, in its report to President Kennedy, advocated:

1. The provisions of the National Banking Act should be revised so as to enable national banks to establish branches within trading areas irrespective of State laws, and State laws should be revised to provide corresponding privileges to State-chartered banks.

A trading area is defined as a geographical area that embraces the natural flow of trade from an outlying geographical territory to and from a metropolitan center. It may be statewide, less than statewide, or more than statewide. The task of drawing boundaries should be delegated to an appropriate governmental agency as was done in establishing Federal Reserve districts.

2. In exercising this power to grant branches, the chartering authority should adopt the following practices:

(a) It should avoid undue concentration of the local market.

(b) It should give new entrants a chance to compete even if their business must be partially bid away from existing competitors, and should place considerable reliance on the applicant's integrity, managerial competence, and his judgment in regard to the earning prospects of the new branch.

(c) It should treat the applications for new branches on a par with new unit bank applications.

(d) It should treat applications for new branches of nonlocal banks on a par with applications for new branches of local banks.[1]

The report of the Advisory Committee on Banking to the Comptroller of the Currency, "National Banks and the Future," reflects the same sentiment in its recommendation that initially branching within a fixed radius of 25 miles from the principal office should be authorized for national banks, State restrictions notwithstanding. This Committee did not advocate the crossing of State lines and recommended that branching of national banks beyond State-imposed limitations be implemented only after a 2-year period during which States wishing to alter rules for the branching of their own State banks could do so.

From whatever side it is examined, the present distribution of authority in banking favors restrictive and inhibiting policies at the expense of liberal policies toward growth. The present distribution has built-in sources of friction that lead to mutual recriminations on the part of the State and Federal participants in the dual banking system. Consequently for the investor in banks, the present form of the dual banking system means a dual threat to the prospect of bank growth.

AN UNSUCCESSFUL ARRANGEMENT

And from the investor's point of view, the Federal administrative apparatus for banking growth is at best complicated and cumbersome, and at worst incredibly time consuming, arbitrary and inconsistent. Banks wanting to put into effect a plan for expansion are often obliged to spend many months and even years waiting while the various agencies that judge applications, in turn, wait for the reports and recommendations of their staffs, and then offer each other advice, and at last make up their minds. The difficulty is not simply that banks may be disappointed after a long wait. Even if their proposals are ultimately approved, they must go through these months or years operating under a cloud of doubt. Of course, throughout these months and years, the status of the stockholder's investment bears a question mark, too.

Perhaps the single greatest need in banking today is the need for simplification of the administrative arrangements for supervising bank growth. Fortunately, this need is widely recognized. As matters stand, Federal agencies, like the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, created to perform other important functions, have been conscripted to perform as expansion supervisors as well. That these agencies are inappropriate for the task of growth supervision is symptomatic. For these agencies were brought into the field of growth supervision by the bank merger control law of 1960, the legislation that made it possible for restrictive attitudes at the Federal level to frustrate growth encouragement from the States. These agencies were called upon in order to extend Federal authority over State banks. The Office of the Comptroller of the Currency continued to be the chartering agency for national banks and the growth supervisor of national banks.

The Federal Reserve Board, whose primary function is central banking, was given authority to decide merger applications of State banks that are members of the Federal Reserve System. Of course, where a bank keeps its reserves should have nothing to do with branching or merging. The same consideration explains why the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation became an expansion supervisor for non-Federal-Reserve-System, insured, State banks. This was a device to bring State banks under a measure of Federal control. This arbitrary and, as it has turned out, unsuccessful arrangement was introduced as an aspect of the law that made possible the subordination of State authority in the dual banking system.

The need for simplification of administrative procedures dealing with bank expansion has been most articulately expressed by the administrators themselves. Those representatives of State banking departments who have been critical of the existing framework have been joined by the Comptroller of the Currency and by one of the Governors of the Federal Reserve Board. All emphasize the unnecessary complexities of the present system and all agree that the Federal Reserve Board in particular should be relieved of the burden of growth supervision which has been added to its primary task of central banking.

TRUE DUALITY

Can a solution be found both for the problems of banking law and for the problems of banking supervision which will resolve the paradoxes of the dual banking system? Can a solution be found with advantages for all parties, including investors? The basis for such a happy solution is the concept of a dual banking system itself.

Consider this statement made by the Comptroller of the Currency before the National Association of Supervisors of State Banks on September 18, 1962. Mr. Saxon said, "The only sense in which the duality of a banking system can be made truly meaningful is to regard the authority of each segment as distinctive, and not subordinate one to the other." In the context in which he offered this as the fundamental characteristic of a true dual banking system, the Comptroller was concerned to support that recommendation of the Advisory Committee which would liberate his authority over the branching of national banks from State restrictions. This liberalization would, of course, remove the State's control over expansion by national banks, but that in itself would not result in a dual banking system fitting Mr. Saxon's description. For his concept of duality would only be achieved if Federal supervisory agencies were also to relinquish their control over State banking growth. If the subordination of one member by the other is to be eliminated, then subordination must be eliminated in both directions.

Such realinement of State and Federal authority would require special legislative steps and many problems of detail would be generated. But the pressure for such realinement is clear, the major legal requirements are clear and the overall results of such a change are also clear.

If the Federal Government is to retrieve authority over the branching of national banks, the McFadden Act of 1927, which subordinated such power to the States, will have to be modified. And if the States are to retrieve their authority over the growth of State banks, then the bank merger control law of 1960 will have to be repealed, and provisions of the Federal Reserve Act and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act will have to be amended to end Federal control over the branching of State banks. What would be the consequences of such action?

WHEN PROHIBITIONS ARE REPEALED

State and Federal friction would be eased. The supremacy of repressive and inhibiting policies would end. In fact, the advent of a true dual banking system, with State and Federal authorities independent of each other, would make dominant those policies that permit or encourage growth. With the two component authorities independent, if the national authority encourages growth and expansion, no State will allow its banks to be put at a competitive disadvantage. And of course States that themselves favor liberal policies create a pressure for similar policies for their national banks.

These results would be forthcoming only after a period of adjustment. It must be conceded that for a time and in some States the immediate effect of the change would be to give leverage to the Federal Government and little compensating advantage to State authority. This follows from the fact that liberal policies would be made dominant. Those States whose policies are most restrictive would, in effect, be forced to revise them.

By the same token, those States in which statewide banking is already a fact would retrieve the powers lost under the bank merger control law, while the Federal Government would gain no compensating powers since the McFadden Act has no practical consequences except in those States that restrict bank expansion geographically.

---

[1] Report of the Commission on Money and Credit, Prentice-Hall, 1961, p. 166.

The advantage to Federal authority would be temporary. It would end whenever and wherever statewide banking is instituted. Because the rules of certain States would have to be adjusted, it would be reasonable that the States be given a period of time following the institution of independent dual banking during which the Federal authorities would refrain from approving expansion plans that do not conform to State rules. In this transition period, the States could adjust banking laws to the needs of their State banks under the new system. That period of adjustment would end when a policy of statewide branch banking is established in all of the States.

From the investor's point of view, all of this change would be good because it would end public prohibitions on growth and offer encouragement instead. Investors know that growth is difficult, that it requires effort, intelligence, planning, and skill, that given all of these growth may still be thwarted without some measure of good fortune. Investors know that growth is hard enough without making it illegal. That is the investor's view and it is reflected in the discriminations he makes when he evaluates the shares of different banks in different States. Since World War II, market quotations for bank stocks across the Nation have moved from well below book value to well above. Prominent among issues that have resisted this trend are those of smaller banks in areas inhibiting branching.

The benefits of independent authority for State and National Governments in the field of banking would not be limited to the investor. Branch banking provides more service to more people at lower cost. The factors that can be cited in support of this conclusion are numerous and familiar.

Whatever arguments are advanced showing that it is inadvisable to prohibit branching or to compress a bank and its branches in a small area, there will be resistance and criticism. Such resistance and criticism persist despite reasonable arguments and in the face of the testimony of success of branch banking and statewide banking.

BANKS AND BANKING ALTERNATIVES

This persistent criticism of branch banking and statewide banking hinges on the concept of competition. The negative view of branch banking, the new characteristic of independent bankers' associations in States restricting or prohibiting branching, emphasizes the number of independent banks as a measure of competition in banking. The number of independent banks is equated with the number of alternatives available to the public. Branch banking is described as tending to reduce by merger this number with the result that banking resources are concentrated in the hands of fewer banks.

This is the support advanced for the claim that branch banking is, or promotes, or can lead to, monopoly. Is this a solid support? Can alternatives to the public be identified with the total number of banks in a State? In some States this identification, while not perfect, would be good enough. It would be good enough in those States which have statewide branching. For it is in States where a bank may do business wherever it believes it can compete successfully that every bank could be called a real alternative to the whole public. But it is in precisely those States that confine branching or prohibit branching that the number of banks is not the number of bank alternatives. Many independent bankers who extoll homeownership and community spirit do not want branching just because they do not want residents in their communities to have another convenient banking alternative.

Similarly, it is urged that when the number of banks shrinks, concentration increases. But concentration is only significant relative to a given market. If a State which now prohibits or confines branching were to introduce statewide branch banking, markets in which a single bank can compete would expand. And branch systems could have shares of these expanded markets representing less concentration than those of banks in the fragmented market that would be replaced. Independent bankers who conjure up the specter of a financial octopus do not want branches because they want to retain their share, sometimes the whole, of their local shielded market.

The location of offices makes more difference for some banks than for others. The large banks of financial centers compete for the business of large industrial and institutional customers wherever those banks and wherever those customers happen to be located. In the competition for large loans and deposits thousands of miles are no obstacle. But in the market for consumer banking needs, especially outside cities, there is no competition at a distance and in this market a distance of 10 miles from the nearest competitor can be decisive. It is in this, the consumer market, that many independent bankers want to keep competition at a distance.

The claim that the restriction of branching is required to prevent monopoly is mistaken. Nonetheless, States which have prohibited or confined branching in the past would have to provide protection for their smaller banks during a transition to statewide operation. This year, the independent bankers of Virginia supported enactment of statewide merging in Virginia as a step toward orderly liberalization of expansion policies which provides protection for small banks. And in New York the joint legislative committee to revise the banking law is now contemplating a similar measure. Although protection for small banks is desirable, it does not follow that barriers to expansion must always exist wherever they exist today. In this respect the vision of the small banker is often not very keen. His nearsightedness is illustrated by the experience of the 1930's. In the epidemic of bank failures, the small country banks were the hardest hit. In Iowa alone, 1,000 of 1,600 banks failed. Following the disaster there was much pressure for branch banking in the interest of protecting the depositor, since larger banks proved more resistant to economic crisis. Objections and criticisms and lobbying and obstruction to branch banking at that time came primarily from the areas that were most restrictive to branching, the same areas in which failures had been heaviest. It is clear that many small bankers are prepared to ask for a protective shield for themselves notwithstanding the risks to which their depositors and stockholders might be exposed as a consequence.

GROWING SPACE UNDER ANTITRUST LAW

The question of competition in banking brings to mind an implement of public policy that has not been mentioned: the Department of Justice. Until recent years the Justice Department seemed an indulgent spectator to all banking growth. But that has changed and the Justice Department now takes a great interest in bank expansion plans, especially mergers, and has instituted antitrust suits against several banks. The status of banks under the antitrust laws will soon be clarified by the Supreme Court. However the Court decides, one cannot suppose that Congress will allow banks exemption from antitrust law. Whether under the Sherman Act, or the Clayton Act, or both, the Department of Justice will surely have a voice in bank expansion. (See "Brown Shoe and Bank Mergers," Bank Stock Quarterly, September 1962.)

How would the new dual banking system affect banking in the eyes of the Justice Department? All banks, State and national, would be subject to the antitrust law of the country. But the pressures which thrust banks into conflict with antitrust law would be greatly eased. It is the containment of expansion within geographical barriers that now forces growing banks to acquire a larger and larger market share in their legally circumscribed operating area. But statewide branching would release competition and simultaneously reduce concentration by enlarging the market area in which banks compete.

From the investor's point of view, antitrust law is advantageous. Enlightened investors do not hope for, nor do they want, a banking system in which there is no control on expansion, any more than they want a system with no reserve requirements or no deposit insurance. But the investor will be sure to take heart at a change in the dual banking system which gives banks growing space under Government supervision and antitrust law.

The Patman Report

"There is a paucity of data on the extent of chain banking," says Congressman Wright Patman, Texas Democrat and chairman of the House Committee on Small Business. He has sought to repair the deficiency. Patman has submitted a 541-page compilation of facts and figures to his committee. The title of the report is "Chain Banking, Stockholder and Loan Links of 200 Largest Member Banks." [1]

What does the data show? What is the extent of chain banking? Among the 200 largest member banks of the Federal Reserve System there is no chain banking at all. That is the inescapable conclusion of the facts and figures in the report if one means by "chain banking" what is ordinarily meant. Representative Patman is aware of the customary meaning of "chain banking" but gives a different meaning to the term in his report and it is only in virtue of this special meaning that the report deserves its title.

SEMANTIC DIFFICULTY

This semantic difficulty crops up on page 6 of the report. The ordinary sense of chain banking is given as "an individual or group of individuals controlling two or more banks," and is contrasted with "holding company banking: two or more banks controlled by a single corporation." And on the same page the ordinary sense of control is given as ownership of 25 percent or more of outstanding stock. All this is entirely correct, reflecting the usage of Federal banking law and banking supervisory authorities. And in keeping with this meaning, the report provides conclusive evidence that there is not a single banking chain among the 200 largest member banks.

Congressman Patman does not record this as one of the results of his investigation and that is because he finds that the ordinary "definition of chain banking is quite restrictive" and therefore adopts "a broad definition," to wit: "any link among banks reflected in (a) stockholdings among the 20 largest stockholders of record in any 2 or more banks, and (b) any bank loans secured by 10 percent or more of the stock in any other bank. In a word, 'chain banking' in this study is construed as any community of interest among banks arising directly or indirectly from ownership ties." [2]

One might feel that, having got the burdensome "restrictive" definition out of the way, Patman's replacement is too "broad." In any case, looking through Patman's investigating spectacles we see quite a lot of chain banking.

---

[1] U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., January 1963.

[2] Ibid., p. 6.

"LINKS" AND "CHAINS"

Most of chain banking is composed of appended lists: lists of leading stockholders and their holdings, lists of directors and officers and their holdings, and lists of loans secured by 10 percent or more of the stock of a bank. In the first 2 categories there are 200 lists, 1 for each of the 200 largest banks in the Federal Reserve System.

These lists are the raw material. From the first list the report abstracts and analyzes "links" and "chains" and summarizes aspects of ownership concentration in these banks. Here the scope of the revised definition of "chain banking" can be seen: a simple enumeration of bank chains now fills 32 pages and contains over 400 entries.[3]

The Congressman may be right. Perhaps the customary sense of the term does overlook some chain banking. However, PATMAN's new definition finds too much: 400 chains involving 200 banks. How can there be more chains of banks than there are banks? And there would be more save the fact that "links through individuals are not tabulated because of the difficulty of matching names."[4]

The superabundance of links and chains is created by the broad definition. Most of the thousands of owners listed in the basic tables have holdings representing small fractions of 1 percent, and a close look at the chain banks reveals that their links are largely composed of such minor holdings. Thus the two most extensive chains, one led by a New York broker, the other by a Hartford insurance company, contain 37 and 30 banks respectively. But the broker owns less than 1 percent in 33 of the 37 issues and neither the broker nor the insurance company holds more than 3 percent of a single bank. Furthermore, it is certain that most of the broker's shares are his in name only and actually represent holdings of many customers.

The broad definition unearths even the University of Cincinnati and the Seventh-day Adventists in the role of chain banker. The trouble with the definition is that it substitutes for degree of control, rank among stockholders. Rank is a useless measure because in large banks, and these are the 200 largest member banks, high rank does not imply control.

The largest number of links among the 200 banks are holdings in the names of bank nominees. The use of nominees conceals ownership and in recognition of this fact Congressman PATMAN says, "the exact significance of many nominee links is not clear." Nonetheless, PATMAN correctly implies, since owners are concealed ownership links may be concealed as well. But the nature of nominee holdings and the small size of the nominee holdings listed should go a long way toward allaying suspicion of concealed chain banking.

CHAINS THAT CANNOT BIND

A great many stockholders use nominees. The resulting convenience of stock transfer is ordinarily the motive rather than concealment. The holdings of one nominee often represent many real owners and similarly the same real owner may have stock in the name of many nominees. One thing is not concealed. It is certain that nominee holdings taken as a group represent a very large number of owners. The tables in Representative PATMAN's report, however, show that in only 3 of the 200 banks do holdings of all nominees put together account for more than 25 percent of outstanding stock. The aggregate nominee holdings in the remaining 197 banks total less than 25 percent of outstanding stock, and very much less in most cases.

One can be sure that the stock in the name of bank nominees represents many owners. Therefore, the links concealed by nominee holdings and the chains composed of these links must be of the same slender construction as those listed by known owners. These are chains that cannot bind.

It seems likely that Congressman PATMAN himself does not regard all of these systems of links as real chain banks, and it may be that he does not intend that his definition be literally applied. Another standard is implied, for example, in one of the recommendations PATMAN makes on the basis of his findings. The Congressman urges that the criterion for being a holding company "be reduced to at least 5 percent."[5] To be fair to his report, then, perhaps one should take 5 percent ownership in two or more banks as the intended criterion for a "chain."

PATMAN'S QUESTIONS

Many would resist the implication that 5 percent constitutes a controlling position. The figure is at least a better standard than stockholder rank and is presently in use in some State banking laws concerning holding companies. But measuring the 400-odd systems of links against this yardstick only one chain is revealed[6]: a fire insurance company that would barely qualify, owning just over 5 percent of two banks. Does Representative PATMAN mean that the Federal Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 should be amended to meet this situation? If the insurance company should sell a few shares of just one of the two banks the only chain in the list would be gone.

In sum, even if this rigorous criterion is used, the report does not give any evidence for the existence of chain banking among the 200 largest member banks. In fact, the report contains evidence virtually proving that there is no chain banking among these banks.[7] The facts of his report do not raise the questions PATMAN says they raise. Representative PATMAN describes his results as follows:

"A whole network of links among the top stockholders of the largest member banks is revealed. Links are found in such financial centers as Hartford, Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, Detroit, and Cleveland."

And:

"Such stockholder links raise a number of questions. Do the holdings of insurance companies eliminate competition between commercial banks as well as between the banks and insurance companies? Do stockholdings in the commercial banks held by leading mutual savings banks curtail competition between the commercial banks as well as between the commercial banks and the savings banks?"[8]

And:

"The question arises whether the bank nominee is a centralizing agent in determining bank policy, say, in regard to fixing of interest rates, promotion of mergers, and other policy determinations."

The answer to all these questions can be found in the report itself. The answer is "No."

The actual revelations of the report concern only the 200 largest member banks. As the title shows, it is these that the report is about, it is these for which statistics have been collected and it is these of which one can assert that among them there are no chains. Obviously, in the typical smaller bank the largest stockholders will have more control or influence since their shares will more often constitute a significant percentage of outstanding stock. A second report would be needed to answer questions about chains among smaller banks. The report that has been issued cannot be represented except as evidence against significant common ownership in the 200 banks which it studies. The Congressman's statement that the links constitute a revelation and raise questions about curtailment of competition is untendable.

LOAN LINKS

PATMAN's second area of investigation, loans secured by 10 percent or more of the stock of another bank, certainly does raise questions. And the Congressman is on firmer ground in characterizing this part of his work as a major revelation. Once again, however, much of the meaning of the information gathered may have eluded the investigator. The basic facts are "111 of the 200 largest member banks have made 1,242 loans, amounting in the aggregate to $191 million, secured by 10 percent or more of the stock of other banks. No less than 29 loans of a million dollars or more—and reaching up to as high as nearly $14 million in one instance—were reported."[9] The report recognizes that this loan activity is concentrated in States which prohibit branching and therefore conjectures that the loans may represent an effort to outflank branching laws. Furthermore, the loans prompt Congressman PATMAN's suspicions concerning arrangements, reciprocal favors, sub rosa control and so on, all to the detriment of competition in banking and the public interest.

Possibly some of the 1,242 loans do represent just the activities suspected. The existence of the loans, per se, however, is no indication of evildoing. The extent to which this loan activity represents a tendency or type of practice harmful to the public is not indicated by merely listing loans.

The interpretation of statistical findings is notoriously difficult. The following considerations are not brought out in the report and help to shed light on the number and distribution of these loans:

1. The high percentage of these loans in States prohibiting branching does not by itself show that there is more total borrowing secured by bank stocks in those States. There are many more very small banks in unit-banking States and as the size of many of the loans indicates they are made on stock in small banks. Loans of similar size secured by stock in large banks would not be on this list since the collateral would represent less than 10 percent of outstanding stock of a large bank.

2. Given a structure of small unit banks, there are many more president-owners and directors with significant ownership positions. On the one hand, it is much easier to own 10 percent of a small bank while, on the other, stock in a rural unit bank cannot find wide acceptance in the securities market and hence attain diversified ownership.

3. Therefore, State laws which prohibit branching tend to insure the existence of a rather large group of individuals owning 10 percent of a bank. This is the group of potential borrowers whose loans would be listed in the report. At the other extreme, statewide branching tends to reduce the number of 10 percent owners by fostering a structure of larger banks with much more stock and more readily marketable stock.

4. Common stock is natural, correct, and accepted collateral. Bank stock, in general, is thought less speculative. Bank assets are liquid and banking practices are supervised

---

[3] Pp. 20–52.

[4] Ibid., n., p. 19.

[5] Letter of transmittal, p. v.

[6] Excepting bank holding companies which are already registered under the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956.

[7] Ibid.

[8] Letter of transmittal, p. iv.

[9] Letter of transmittal, p. iv.

by government. And finally, a bank is a natural place to obtain a loan secured by stock, even bank stock. Hence, it is likely that many or most of these loan "links" do not represent anything conspiratorial.

5. The distribution of the loans is remarkable. More than half of the 1,242 loans are held by a handful of banks in 4 States: Illinois, Minnesota, Missouri, and Texas. Of the 29 loans exceeding $1 million, 18 are secured by stock in Texas and Illinois banks and 22 held by banks in these 2 States. Only 5 percent of the loans are held by banks in all of the 17 statewide-branching States. This uneven distribution is recognized in the report but it is so marked that one cannot properly present the holding of these loans as characteristic of the 200 largest member banks as a group. Of the 200, 89 have no such loans and 115 have at most 1. At the same time just 2 banks, both in Minneapolis, hold 203 of the loans. The 11 banks with the most loans have 556 of them, while 22 banks hold more than 800 loans, or nearly two-thirds of all those listed.

BRANCHING LAWS AND BANK SIZE

The report suspects that a motive for the loans is the desire to avoid branch restrictions. This could be a factor in some. But, as suggested above, many may be caused though not motivated by State laws. The table below illuminates the issue by comparing bank sizes and number of banks in States with differing branch regulations. Even in Illinois, which contains some of the Nation's largest banks, unit banking keeps the average size, as measured by total assets, down to $22 million, half the average in Connecticut which has no giants but does have statewide branching.

Now the average size of the loans listed in the Patman report and held by banks in Minnesota, for example, is less than $50,000. Since most of the loans are smaller than this and many are secured by much more than 10 percent of the stock of banks, we may assume that the banks involved are predominantly smaller than the Minnesota average size of $7 million. The importance of all of this is clear if one realizes that had Minnesota the average bank size of Connecticut or New York, most of these loans would be eliminated from the list, since the stock required to secure them would not amount to 10 percent of a bank. And if all the 233 loans held by Minnesota banks were added together, the resulting loan could be secured by much less than 10 percent of the stock of a big California or New York City bank.

This explains why we do not find many of these loans secured by stock in a bank located in a State that permits branching. It also explains why there are so many of these loans in the branch-prohibiting States. One cannot, of course, discover the motives of particular borrowers and lenders by examining the State banking structures and statistical averages. In the absence of information about particular cases of a sort that Congressman Patman's report does not include one cannot further evaluate what the Congressman calls loan links.

In the final analysis Representative Patman's report is better understood by its presuppositions than by its findings. The latter are unimpressive when the inflated claims and rhetorical questions are checked against the facts presented.

Representative Patman is against big banks and big business, and for little banks and little business. In fact, the relevance of his report to the House Committee on Small Business is his claim that small businesses may be harmed by growing concentration in banking. At the beginning of this article the reader is cautioned with a quote from Senator Douglas, of Illinois, who in turn is agreeing with a Mrs. Griffiths, that Britain and Canada have in effect only five and two banks respectively and that this works out ill for small business. We in the United States are presumably placed on guard lest the same fate ever overtake us since we are now down to 13,400 banks, counting only commercial ones. Besides, says Patman, we can already see the pattern in the fact that large businesses tend to have large customers and small businesses depend on the special willingness of small banks to deal with them.

Bank stock collateral [1] and branching laws

	4 States in which more than ½ of $1,242 listed loans are held				4 States in which few or no listed loans are held			
	Minnesota	Missouri	Illinois	Texas	New York	Connecticut	Arizona	California
Number of commercial banks [2]	689	626	976	1,011	384	66	12	122
Aggregate assets [2] (in billions)	$5	$7.2	$21.1	$14.8	$57.1	$2.9	$1.6	$29.8
Number of banks among largest 200 members	3	6	8	11	28	6	2	12
Average bank size (in millions)	$7	$12	$22	$14	$149	$44	$135	$245
Number of banks whose stock is pledged [1]	213	133	145	201	24	0	0	18
Branching policy	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(5)	(5)

[1] Pledged to secure 1,242 loans held by the 200 largest Federal Reserve member banks, as listed in "Chain Banking."
[2] Compiled from 99th Annual Report of the Comptroller of the Currency, 1961, Washington, D.C., 1962.
[3] Prohibited.
[4] Limited.
[5] Statewide.

Congressman Patman goes to some statistical pains to back up this last claim. He seeks to demonstrate the small-business orientation of small banks as if this were a virtue of those banks. Several pages of data, including tables from the Federal Reserve Bulletin for August 1947, are adduced as evidence for the loyalty of small banks to small business. But if this be a virtue of the small banks, it is a virtue of necessity. Control of lending limits renders these banks (under $10 million in assets) legally incapable of making loans of the size needed by middle-sized or larger customers. Larger borrowers must go to larger banks.

Even the old Federal Reserve publication does not manage to support the view that large banks are indifferent to the requirements of little businesses. In fact, the 1947 table shows that the 25 largest banks in the country made almost as many loans to small businesses as the 1,870 smallest banks, while the largest 25 lent four times the amount of the 1,870 smallest to these small customers. This is hardly rejection of the small business borrower. And large borrowers cannot be expected to distribute their business over squadrons of small banks and thus, a little here and a little there, piece together the sums they require.

Mr. Patman has an aversion to branch banking. After a cursory repudiation of arguments in favor of branching the report says:

"The number of commercial banks in the United States has fallen sharply during the past 40 years despite a marked expansion in population and in the level of national production. Thus in 1920 there were nearly 31,000 banks in the United States. Today there are less than 13,500."

WHERE ARE THE MISSING BANKS?

How do large and small banks, and concentration and consolidation fit into these overall figures? Since the context is discussion of concentration, mergers, and branch banking, one might get the impression that consolidations and the growth of the giant banks are responsible for the decline in the number of banks. That may be Congressman Patman's view also. It is not correct. Perhaps this is an appropriate time to remind ourselves of the real reason.

This month is the 30th anniversary of the bank holiday of March 1933. Let us recall this time of troubles. In the 13 years, 1920 to 1933, 14,808 banks were suspended. There were 4,000 suspensions in 1933 alone. This is where most of the missing banks went. In 1934, after the bank holiday, a total of 15,353 commercial banks were in operation.[10]

The failures were heaviest in rural areas and among small independent banks. Most resistant were the larger banks. It was not a time when the virtues of small banks showed to best advantage. Thousands upon thousands of small businessmen were affected. Still, opposition to branching, to a structure of larger banks, prevails today in just those areas that have most disappointing histories of bank failure.

His presuppositions incline Congressman Patman to see evils and dangers in bigness and branch banking per se. His views on large banks, their behavior toward small business, their impact on the total number of banks operating, and the links between these banks are not substantiated by the evidence he has assembled.

RIGHT TO REPRESENTATION BY ATTORNEYS BEFORE FEDERAL AGENCIES AND DEPARTMENTS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I join my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Missouri, in urging the adoption of the measure he introduced earlier today which would authorize attorneys, licensed to practice law in their home States, to practice before Federal administrative agencies and departments without separate admission by the agency involved.

I have long been interested in the adequacy of the right to counsel afforded to our citizens in administrative proceedings; and, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, I have been concerned about our citizens being deprived of due process where the Federal Government exercises considerable control over their choice of counsel. Accordingly, it gives me great pleasure to join my colleagues in cosponsoring this bill which will enlarge the right of persons to be represented by attorneys of their choice in matters before Federal agencies.

The right to counsel in criminal cases has long been protected by the courts of our country and the several States.

This session, I have cosponsored legislation which would provide compensated counsel for indigent defendants in Federal courts in criminal cases. Passage of legislation embodying this principle will, I believe, further implement the Constitution's mandate of the right to counsel in criminal cases.

---

[10] Source: Federal Reserve.

The studies of the subcommittee have shown that the right to counsel in administrative proceedings is often less highly regarded than it is in criminal cases. In fact, there have been instances wherein the right has been qualified to such an extent by rules promulgated by the agencies that the individual is denied effective representation. For example, in the past such rules have provided that counsel may accompany the individual only for the purpose of whispering legal advice to him and have precluded counsel's taking an active part in the discussion. Thus, the individual was not afforded the right to have his lawyer cross-examine witnesses or conduct other necessary aspects of his case.

Fortunately such restrictive rules have practically disappeared. Only last December the Federal Trade Commission changed its rules to allow an individual to be fully represented by counsel in both investigative and adjudicative proceedings. Prior to that time, the FTC had ruled that the latitude accorded counsel in representing the client varied with the nature of the proceeding. Thus, where proceedings were considered adjudicative, the individual was afforded the right to be represented by counsel who would be able to actively conduct the defense of the case by cross-examination, presentation of witnesses, and other facets of successful defense.

However, where the proceedings were investigative in nature, the individual was merely permitted to be accompanied and advised by his lawyer. Counsel could accompany the individual, but take no active part in the defense of the case or its presentation before the tribunal.

The Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights had investigated this aspect of the right to counsel, since infringement of constitutional rights was clearly involved. Whether a hearing is investigative or adjudicative, certain of the individual's property rights are necessarily involved and accordingly the due process clause of the fifth amendment would require legal counsel.

The subcommittee has studied infringement of the right to counsel in other areas as well. In the subcommittee's study of the Constitutional Rights of the American Indian attention was called to the fact that the Secretary of the Interior had to approve any attorney before he could serve as counsel for an Indian tribe. The long delay in securing such approval often results in a situation whereby the tribes effectively are deprived of representation by counsel.

Similarly, the subcommittee has looked into the question of whether a serviceman's rights are infringed if legally trained counsel is denied him in military courts and administrative proceedings.

In proposed legislation to protect the constitutional rights of the mentally ill, attention has been directed to insuring that the individual receive benefit of counsel during the commitment process.

It is with an extensive background and study of the many aspects of the right to counsel that I support this legislation which would greatly facilitate the ability of individuals to obtain counsel of their choice in administrative proceedings. I congratulate Senator Long on introducing legislation which advances a constitutional right, which is such an elementary facet of our legal system.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 3238 OF TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on April 26 I entered a motion to reconsider H.R. 2842, to amend section 3238 of title 18, United States Code. The bill had passed the House and was passed by the Senate on April 25. There was sufficient time in which to offer the motion, and it is at present on the table.

Since then I have had a conference with the Deputy Attorney General and other persons interested. The statement they have supplied seems to satisfy everyone concerned. The bill relates to the payment of income taxes by persons who are outside the United States.

Since everyone is now satisfied, I ask unanimous consent that I may withdraw my motion to reconsider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in connection with my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record, a letter and a statement from the Department of Justice dated May 8, 1963.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Department of Justice,
Office of the Deputy
Attorney General,
Washington, D.C., May 8, 1963.

Hon. Everett McKinley Dirksen,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: Thank you very much for having afforded me and my associates the opportunity to discuss with you H.R. 2842, one of the Department's legislative proposals which has passed both the House and the Senate.

In line with our conversation I enclose a statement for your use in withdrawing your motion for reconsideration of the bill.

Again, many thanks for your courtesy in this matter.

Sincerely yours,
Nicholas deB. Katzenbach,
Deputy Attorney General.

Statement

On April 25, the Senate passed H.R. 2842, a bill to amend section 3238 of title 18, of the United States Code. That section establishes venue for the institution of a criminal prosecution for the violation of a Federal law committed out of the jurisdiction of any judicial district.

On April 26, I entered a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill passed the Senate. I did this, because an eminent member of the bar posed the possibility that H.R. 2842 might extend to tax offenses begun overseas and consummated in the United States, thereby multiplying the venue possibilities open to the Government in such cases. The Department of Justice has advised me that the venue provisions of the bill would not and could not apply to Internal Revenue Code offenses begun out of the United States and completed in the United States. It is the Department's position that the constitutional provisions respecting the place where a defendant may be brought to trial apply to tax offenses begun out of the United States and consummated in the United States.

Since under existing law, the place of consummation of a tax offense in the United States would dictate proper venue, and I am now satisfied that this legislation in no way affects existing law in this regard, I withdraw my motion to reconsider.

DEATH OF CARL B. BROWN

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I, along with the other Members of the Senate, was saddened to learn of the untimely death of Mr. Carl B. Brown of the Soil Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Mr. Brown died Sunday at George Washington University Hospital after suffering a heart attack.

Carl Brown's passing is a personal loss to me and a loss to the Nation as well. He was one of the foremost authorities in the United States on watershed development and soil conservation, and he had a long and distinguished career as a top official in the Department of Agriculture.

I had the pleasure of working closely with Carl Brown on numerous watershed and conservation projects in North Carolina and throughout the Nation. I always found him to be a firm believer in the cause he represented. He was at all times gentle, courteous, and most effective in his work as a dedicated conservationist.

I am proud of the fact that Carl Brown was a North Carolinian and a product of the University of North Carolina. He was graduated from the university in 1929 and went on to earn his master's degree from the University of Cincinnati in 1931. He then returned to his native State and worked as a geologist for the State of North Carolina until he joined the Soil Erosion Service, which later became the Soil Conservation Service, in 1934.

Much of the credit can be given to Carl Brown for a great part of the small watershed flood prevention program that is in existence today. He was in on the ground floor of the Watershed Protection Flood Prevention Act from the beginning, and he nursed the watershed program through its infancy and to the high place it holds today in our total flood prevention work.

In 1959, he was presented the Superior Service Award of the Department of Agriculture in recognition of his outstanding work in this field.

The soil conservation movement in America has lost one of its most effective leaders in the death of Carl Brown, but the unselfish work he did for so many years will live on for many, many years to come.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the cause of conservation, the Department of Agriculture, and the United States have lost a great servant in the sudden and untimely death of Carl Brown.

To us in Oklahoma he was considered an outstanding authority and advocate for upstream flood control and soil conservation. He was constantly working to improve the programs under Public Law 566 and the Flood Prevention Watersheds Act. Frequently he was called upon by my office for assistance, and he always willingly and helpfully responded. In a great measure he is responsible for making it possible to secure the optimum benefits from this great water and soil development program—an outstanding example of local people voluntarily working together with their government to improve the community.

Mr. Brown died at the age of 52, but he had served in the Department of Agriculture for 29 years with outstanding distinction, thus growing up with the Soil Conservation Service. His outstanding achievements included his work in 1953 on the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act. He had been honored by being the recipient of the Department's Superior Service Award for this service.

I join with the hundreds of Carl Brown's personal friends in Oklahoma in extending our heartfelt sympathy to his family.

ARRIVAL OF KAZIMIERA KARPINSKA IN ROCHESTER, N.Y.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, a heartwarming and joyous event took place in my home city of Rochester, N.Y., on April 27. Miss Kazimiera Karpinska, of Lodz, Poland, arrived in Rochester after a long journey from Warsaw. How she came to this land, and the reason for her trip, is a tale which I believe will be of great interest to the Senate.

On February 4 of this year, one of my constituents, Mr. Felix Novosielski, of Irondequoit, N.Y., lost his wife, Mary, in childbirth. The child was to have been the couple's fifth. It was a terrible personal tragedy and loss. Mr. Novosielski, who is an electrical worker at the Xerox Corp., and who sells real estate on a part-time basis in order to be the good provider for his family, was now left with his four children: George, 13, Christine, 8, Lydia, 5, and the baby, Debby, 2. His plight was an awful one. But with the help and counsel of his family and literally hundreds of friends in the Rochester community, Mr. Novosielski set about to find someone to help him care for his children in their hour of grief and need. Mary's mother, Mrs. Karpinska, was ready and willing to come to the family rescue, but misfortune struck again when she became ill and unable to take on this humane mission. The only remaining possibility was to bring Mary's surviving sister, Kazimiera, to Rochester. This would not be easy. For Kazimiera was in Poland. Would she be willing to come? And, if she were, would she be able to get both an American visa and a Polish passport in order to leave Poland? These were the problems, then, for the Novosielski family early in February of this year.

The first hurdle was cleared when Kazimiera willingly volunteered to come to America. The biggest problems remained. First, there was the matter of an American visa. I am sure every Senator is aware of the fact that, even under the most favorable circumstances, where eligibility for a visa is clear and there is no quota problem, the processing and issuance of a visa can take months. And, secondly, there was the matter of a Polish passport. For years, Americans of Polish extraction have been experiencing great difficulties in getting the permission of the Polish Government for relatives of theirs to leave that country. Could Mr. Novosielski and his friends surmount these delays and obstacles where others before them had failed?

What followed was one of the most amazing and most gratifying demonstrations of community cooperation that I have ever been privileged to know or hear of. Now, I know my home city of Rochester very well. We have a long tradition of great community spirit. It comes to the fore again and again, in charity drives, in all sorts of civic and cultural endeavors, in every variety of humanitarian cause. But I really believe Rochester outdid itself here. Under the initiative and leadership of Mr. Leopold Lorentz, and also area churchmen of all faiths, more than a thousand Rochesterians flooded the Polish Embassy here in Washington with personal letters and group petitions imploring the Government of Poland to grant Kazimiera Karpinska the necessary permission for her to leave Poland. And at the same time, I received in my own office the appeal of these same thousand and more friends of Mr. Novosielski to do everything in my power to hasten the issuance of a visa to Kazimiera Karpinska. While these letters and petitions were still pouring in by the bundle, I contacted the Director of the Visa Office, Mr. Moreland, on February 18, asking the assistance and cooperation of the Department to expedite and process Kazimiera's application as promptly as possible. Soon after, Mr. Moreland courteously advised me he had taken the matter up directly with our Embassy at Warsaw.

On March 4, I was informed, Kazimiera Karpinska appeared at our Embassy in Warsaw and was found qualified for a visitor's visa at that time. However, as is the procedure in these cases, no visa will actually issue until a passport is obtained from the Polish authorities. According to the Department, this usually takes about 2 months.

It was therefore a wholly unprecedented and unexpected happening that Kazimiera was issued a Polish passport within fairly short order. I might add that, even here, the Novosielski family was aided by their friends at home. Mr. Adam Wysocki, an employee of KLM Royal Dutch Airlines in Buffalo, had heard of Mr. Novosielski's plight and asked a fellow KLM employee in Warsaw to help. The Warsaw man personally visited the Polish Ministry of Foreign Affairs requesting their prompt action on the passport application of Kazimiera Karpinska. And, as we now know, all the efforts I have mentioned proved successful beyond everyone's reasonable expectations.

And so it was, Mr. President, that on the evening of April 27, Kazimiera Karpinska descended from a plane at the Rochester-Monroe County Airport, into the waiting embraces of the four Novosielski children. The rest of the family, and a large group of their friends who had been so instrumental in getting action in this case, were also there waiting for her. I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle of April 28, describing the scene at the airport, be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

Thus, a family tragedy, which will surely remain a tragedy for the lifetime of Mr. Novosielski and his children, has nevertheless been softened by the blessed and happy arrival of Kazimiera Karpinska. I am personally gratified by the outcome. And I cannot too deeply express my appreciation to all of the hundreds and hundreds of Rochesterians—not only friends and fellow employees of Mr. Novosielski, but also complete strangers whose hearts were touched by the anguish and sorrow of a fellow man in distress—for their shining efforts in behalf of him and his children. Lastly, I wish to commend, with gratitude, the State Department officials both here and in Warsaw for their sympathetic response and favorable action in this case. The heart they have shown should set an example for every Government official whose tasks deeply affect the lives of human beings.

I know, Mr. President, that Members of the Senate will share with me the satisfaction of learning that, despite roadblocks, another family has been reunited on our shores.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WELCOME, CIOTKA KAZIMIERA

(By Lynne Watson)

Bewildered, excited, the thin dark-haired Polish woman hurried down the ramp from her plane at Rochester-Monroe County Airport last night and wordlessly embraced the four children of her dead sister.

It was almost 10 minutes before Kazimiera Karpinska, 42, of Lodz, Poland, could speak to the family of her late sister, Mary—relatives she never had seen.

Friends of Felix Novosielski, who has spent nearly 3 months petitioning the Polish Government to send his sister-in-law over here, stood with him and the children waiting for Kazimiera to come down the ramp.

Nearly the last person to leave the airplane, she walked quickly to the elated group. Their first few words were lost in the wind and the noise of nearby planes.

Inside the terminal, Kazimiera's first words, in her native Polish, were regrets that her sister Mary was not there. However, she probably never would have come to America if her sister were alive.

When Mrs. Novosielski died February 4 of complications arising from the birth of what would have been her fifth child, her husband asked his mother-in-law to come and help care for his four children.

She suffered a slight stroke, however, and Miss Karpinska volunteered to leave Lodz.

There followed a campaign of petitions and letter writing to the Polish Embassy in Washington, Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, the U.S. State Department. Private individuals in Warsaw and this country intervened to persuade the Polish Government to grant her a passport.

The Polish Government assented so quickly it amazed the Rochester Polish community, which has become accustomed to years of dead-end legalisms and unanswered requests in attempts to get friends and relatives from behind the Iron Curtain.

"Pieknie, pieknie," said Kazimiera of Felix's children, describing them with a Polish word for "beautiful," at their first meeting. Overcome by her reception and thrust into an unfamiliar language, she could only reply "tak" (yes) to questions on her willingness to stay and happiness at being here.

Home is now 325 Miller Lane, Irondequoit, where she will care for George, 13; Christine, 8; Lydia, 5; and Debby, 2. Felix, 37, is an electrical worker at Xerox Corp. who sells real estate on a part-time basis.

From 1939 until the end of the war he was a forced laborer on a German farm. His wife Mary had been in a concentration camp. They were married in 1949 and moved here in 1951.

He had never met any of the members of his wife's family and Kazimiera had not seen her sister Mary for nearly 20 years.

POLAND'S CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, Americans throughout the country observed May 3 as Poland's Constitution Day. On this sobering yet inspiring occasion, we are reminded that the people of Poland were once free—that they once enjoyed the ideals of personal liberty that we as Americans so highly cherish.

Yet today, these people are caught up in the web of Communist tyranny. Their Soviet masters continually seek to silence this dedication to freedom but the spirit remains very much alive in the hearts of the Polish people—people who have experienced the cherished liberties of a free society and who will never be fully satisfied until foreign domination is cast aside and Poland's independence is once again restored.

Mr. President, the Constitution adopted by the Polish Diet on the third of May in 1791 is an important milestone in the history of human freedom. Poland was the first nation in central and eastern Europe to adopt a guarantee of human rights for all its citizens.

At a time when absolute monarchy was the prevailing form of government on the European continent, the courageous Polish people instituted this constitution, which drastically curtailed the powers of the monarch and made him more responsive to the needs of the people. The rigid class distinctions of the Middle Ages were set aside, religious freedom was guaranteed and principles of equality were clearly enunciated in this historic document. That is why on this day we pay tribute to this Constitution and to the noble Polish leaders whose progressive ideas and ideals of justice and liberty made this Constitution possible.

Mr. President, Poland's life story has been a magnificent yet tragic one. The Polish people have been conquered and their country has been partitioned six times during their 1,000-year history. Their homeland has been the scene of many brutal battles, and they have suffered the agonies of foreign powers aligned against them. Yet, these people, so dedicated to the ideals of liberty and justice, have clung stubbornly to a determination to be free.

Mr. President, through our history, we Americans have enjoyed the friendship of the Polish people. We have profited from their many fine contributions to American life and culture.

The names of Pulaski and Kosciusko are familiar ones in our history. Both generals distinguished themselves in our struggle for independence. Pulaski died for our cause; Kosciusko returned to Poland to fight for Polish freedom in 1794.

Mr. President, the destinies of Poland and the United States are closely intertwined. Both nations hold freedom as their highest aspiration and both nations would struggle to the death to retain it.

Mr. President, as we mark Polish Constitution Day, let us remind the people of Poland that we share their noble aspirations for freedom, that we have not forgotten our solemn obligation to support them in their desire to cast away their chains of bondage, and that we are working and praying for the day when Poland will be free from the stranglehold of Communist tyranny.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, May 3, 1963, marked the 172d anniversary of the adoption of the great Polish Constitution of 1791. This Constitution was promulgated only 4 years after the establishment of our own Government, and it proclaimed the attachment of the Nation of Poland to the idea that government should be restrained by law and that all power should be derived from the will of the people. Government by the whim and pleasure of an all-powerful monarchy was replaced by constitutional government. It is indeed fitting that we in the Senate should commemorate this important anniversary, and I would like to take this opportunity to pay well-deserved tribute to the brave Polish people who have endured so much and to Americans of Polish descent who are among our finest citizens and who have made outstanding contributions to this country.

Living dangerously on the edge of the dictatorship of Catherine II, of Russia, and Frederick William, of Prussia, Poland had suffered onslaughts on her territorial rights in 1772 and 1788. King Stanislaw August Poniatowski recognized the need for a free constitution to assist the people in the great project of maintaining liberty and for this reason the Constitution was drawn up, adopted, and promulgated on May 3, 1791. Parliamentary representation was expanded and the peasantry was placed under the protection of the law. The privileges of the nobility were reduced, and the townsmen were given certain political rights. Freedom of conscience and religious toleration were guaranteed. Liberty was proclaimed for everyone living in the Republic.

In 1795 when the new Government was only 4 years old, Poland's larger neighbors, deeply fearful of such radical innovations, partitioned Poland, added her territory to their own, and thus terminated her independent existence. For 123 years Poland was not a nation on the map of Europe; but in spite of partition, slavery, and repression, Poland lived in the hearts of brave men. One hundred years ago, in January of 1863, a small but heroic group of Polish insurgents attacked Russian garrisons in many localities and captured considerable amounts of arms and ammunition. The movement spread to all parts of the country and despite great odds was not finally extinguished until the last detachment of insurgents led by Reverend Brzoska was wiped out in April of 1865. After World War I Poland again rose as an independent state out of the ashes of tsarist Russia and Prussian Germany. But at the outbreak of World War II Germany and Russia again overran Poland and now Russia occupies and dominates Polish affairs once more.

Today there are again those within Poland who seek to replace the arbitrary rule of the Communist Party. The Poznan revolts of 1956 demonstrated the unrest that simmers beneath the surface.

There is no tyranny on earth—none is possible—that can permanently destroy the great principles of the Polish constitution of May 3, 1791. Let us pray that the day will soon come when the Communist tyranny that now rules Poland will be overwhelmed and destroyed.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, since the Senate was not in session on Friday, May 3, I want to take this opportunity to commemorate Polish Constitution Day. The Polish Constitution was drafted in 1791, only a few years after the adoption of the American Constitution, and both express philosophies of government which have a common source. The Polish Constitution states:

> All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

These words contain principles of a tradition common to both the Polish and American peoples—the Western tradition of freedom and democracy.

The Polish Constitution of 1791 incorporates enduring precepts of public policy and democracy. Its principles were rooted in the Polish love of and attachment to freedom and independence. These principles have kept alive in the hearts of many Polish generations. In times of national well-being as well as in times of misfortune, they have represented fountainheads of national consciousness, patriotism, and the ever-present readiness to make sacrifices for the common cause of freedom of all nations.

Mr. President, the year 1963 also marks the 100th anniversary of the Polish January Uprising of 1863. This revolt against Russian tyranny was the longest and bloodiest in Polish history. The Polish patriots fought the Russian occupation army for over 2 years. Almost 250,000 Poles were killed in battles, executed, or exiled to Siberia. Unfortunately, as it often happens in struggles for independence, the force of idealism was not strong enough to triumph over the force of numbers. The Polish people suffered defeat, but they did not lose their dream of becoming free.

In the 20th century, the Polish people were free for many decades, but lost their independence again when the Communist regime was established. I hope that the continuing desire for freedom will once again become reality for Poland.

My warmest greetings to all the people who are celebrating the Polish Constitution Day. My deep sympathy goes to those who remember the victims of tyranny who were killed in the uprising of 1863.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on the third of May we commemorate Polish Constitution Day, the day on which the Polish people drew up their first Constitution as a free nation in 1791.

The people of Poland have known very few years of freedom and self-rule. For centuries they were overrun, first from the West and then from the East. Since World War II, they have suffered under a Communist rule, which has stifled their expression and bled their land economically for the benefit of the Soviet Union.

It is ironic that a nation that has known so little freedom for itself has become over the years such an important symbol for the cause of freedom. I think we can best understand this if we look to the Poles—the bravery, the determination, the eternal optimism, and the deep religious faith which has always marked the Polish people.

May 3 is also significant because on that day, in 1656, John Casimir proclaimed the Madonna of Czestochowa as Patroness of Poland. Two years ago, I had the privilege of going to Jasna Gora, where the historic painting of the Madonna stands, guarded by the Pauline Fathers. I saw the inspiration this painting gave to the Polish people and realized then why the Poles will never abandon their fight for national sovereignty.

The people of Poland will fulfill their obligations. We in the United States should fulfill ours, by keeping open the channels of trade and tourism and making it clear that our best efforts will be used to increase freedom among the Polish people.

I do not believe that those who boycott Polish products in American markets are serving the anti-Communist cause. I think it is more important to realize that our quarrel is not with the Polish people but with their Government, imposed on them by foreign armed forces. And whatever we can do to improve the well-being of the Polish people will in fact hasten the day when that nation can throw off its chains and walk once more in dignity with the free nations of the world.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, last Friday, May 3, we commemorated Polish Constitution Day, a day held sacred by Poles and people of Polish descent around the world.

Coming, as I do, from a State with a large number of men and women of Polish descent, I am well aware of the Polish people's love of freedom and democracy.

Through the centuries Poland has been occupied and reoccupied by tyrannical forces around her borders. Time and again heroic bands of Polish insurgents, poorly armed and untrained, have mounted uprisings against large professional armies, spurred on by a burning desire for independence.

Always in the hearts and minds of the fighters for freedom were the precepts established in the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791. We Americans find much in the Polish Constitution that is familiar to us—equality, civil liberty, all power in civil society derived from the will of the people.

Today, the Polish Nation is again under the yoke of foreign authority. But in the people's spirits remains a desire for freedom, as expressed in the Polish Constitution—a desire that will never be extinguished.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, 1963 marks the 100th anniversary of the Polish uprising.

The 1863 uprising against the Russian tyranny was the greatest, longest, and bloodiest uprising in the Polish history. The Polish patriots fought the Russian occupation army for over 2 years.

Units of Polish insurgents attacked Russian garrisons in many localities and captured considerable amounts of arms and ammunition. The movement spread to all parts of the country like a forest fire. In all Polish communities under Russian rule there were instantaneous uprisings.

In the beginning, the Polish insurgents had some significant successes, but when the Russians brought into Poland 350,000 seasoned troops of the regular Russian Army—the fate of the uprising was sealed, as was the fate of the more recent Hungarian uprising which we all remember with sadness.

The Russian Government ordered the so-called military pacification of the country. Thousands of Poles were arrested and deported to Siberia. Their property was confiscated. Polish language was banned from offices and schools. The economy of Poland was destroyed. The sense of real mourning enveloped the entire nation.

The Polish Nation lost 250,000 of its best sons, the flower of its manhood—killed in battles, executed, and exiled to Siberia.

By paying tribute to the 100th anniversary of the Polish uprising of 1863, we are also paying tribute to Poland's defenders of freedom for the past thousand years.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a further statement citing the anniversary of the Polish Third of May Constitution printed in the RECORD at this point to call attention to free Poland's national holiday.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 3: THE POLISH NATIONAL HOLIDAY

On May 3, Poles everywhere and citizens of Polish origin in many countries celebrate a Polish national holiday—the Polish 3d of May Constitution Day.

In the United States, wherever Americans of Polish descent live, in cities and towns from coast to coast, this holiday is observed with appropriate exercises throughout the month of May, to pay tribute to the Polish Nation and to remind fellow Americans that Poland was one of the first pioneers of liberalism in Europe.

It was on May 3 in 1791, barely 2 years after the adoption of its Constitution by the United States in 1789, that Poland without a bloody revolution or even without a disorder succeeded in reforming her public life and in eradicating her internal decline. But this great rebirth and assertion of democracy came to the Poles too late, and did not forestall the third partition of Poland in 1795 by Russia, Prussia, and Austria.

POLAND PIONEERED LIBERALISM IN EUROPE

The greatness of the May 3 Polish Constitution consisted in the fact that it eliminated with one stroke the most fundamental weaknesses of the Polish parliamentary and social system. The Poles raised this great moment in their history to the forefront of their tradition rather than any one of their anniversaries of glorious victories or heroic revolutions.

We Americans who have been reared in the principle given us as a birthright by the Founders of our great Republic, the principle of the sovereignty of the people in the state, which is the primary postulate in the 1791 Polish Constitution, can see how this truism cut off the Poles and the Polish political tradition completely from both the Germans and the Russians, who have been reared in the principle of state, and not national sovereignty.

The light of liberalism coming from Poland was then as it has been throughout the years that followed and even onto today, a threat to tyranny and absolutism in Russia and Germany. In 1795, Russian and Prussian soldiers were sent to Poland to partition and rape her. In 1939, Russian and Prussian soldiers met again on Polish soil, as the absolute totalitarianism systems of nazism and communism again felt the danger of true liberalism coming from Poland just as in 1791.

In the Polish Third of May Constitution this liberalism was formulated in these words:

"All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation."

AMERICAN AND POLISH CONSTITUTIONS SIMILARLY INSPIRED

The philosophy of government discernable throughout the Third of May Polish Constitution leads one to believe that the American people and the Polish people had each drawn inspiration for their respective constitutions from the same source.

Meditation on the anniversary of May 3d deepens the faith and heightens the courage of every Pole and of every American of Polish origin. It reminds all Americans of Poland's destiny in the history of mankind, and prophesies the ultimate triumph of justice, even though, Poland once more has been deprived of her independence, sovereignty and her territory by one of our victorious allies, Soviet Russia, with the consent of other United Nations.

POI RESEARCH

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues and the American public to a University of Rochester research project on Hawaiian poi, looking to its nationwide use as a cereal substitute for infants and children.

As described in one of the Hawaii daily newspapers, the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of April 17, 1963, the study has already shown that some infants and children who are allergic to customary grain cereals can tolerate poi.

Poi is a food made from the taro plant. It is a unique product of Hawaii. The taro of Hawaii—Colocasia spp—is a tuberous plant with large, pendant, heart-shaped leaves, borne on leafstalks about

1 to 2 feet long, widely cultivated in warm, humid areas of the tropics and subtropics for its edible tubers. It requires 8 to 16 months to mature, according to the variety.

In the making of poi, the tubers are steamed or cooked and then pounded or mashed. Sufficient water is then added to give it the consistency desired. It then becomes sticky and paste like. This is poi. Freshly made, it tastes bland and slightly sweet. Allowed to stand for 2 or more days, it ferments and the taste sharpens with a tinge of sourness. The Hawaiians prefer this to the freshly made poi.

For centuries, poi was a staple food of the Hawaiians. It was eaten from calabashes—wooden bowls—with the fingers—one, two, or three, depending on the consistency.

As it supplies the minerals, calcium, and phosphorus and vitamins A and B, it made the Hawaiians one of the tallest, strongest, and healthiest people on earth.

Poi has achieved national fame as an essential part of the Hawaiian luau—feast—but now, as a result of research, it may prove to be Hawaii's latest contribution to America's family diet as food for infants and young children.

Should it win acceptance on the mainland as a substitute for cereals, it would certainly stimulate Hawaii's dwindling taro industry, while at the same time contribute a wholesome addition to family menus.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be reprinted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POI MAY ACHIEVE NATIONAL PROMINENCE SOON

(By Joe Arakaki)

LIHUE, KAUAI, April 17.—A research project on the nationwide use of poi as a cereal substitute for infants and children has just gotten off the ground at the University of Rochester in New York.

Dr. Jerome Glaser, clinical professor of pediatrics at the university, has submitted a preliminary report on the research project to the county economic development office.

The economic development office hopes that the research project will popularize poi on the Mainland and possibly lead to a huge expansion of taro farming and poi manufacturing in Hawaii.

The study is being made possible through a $10,000 grant by the State.

Dr. Glaser's study will also consider the nationwide use of poi as a substitute for cereals in infants allergic to the customary cereal grains.

In his report, he states that "after a long delay, we are just beginning to get a nice start on the problem."

There are 35 babies on poi, but eventually a minimum of 50 babies is expected to be placed on the poi research study, the doctor reports.

Here are the highlights of the research so far:

Three weeks ago, the research clinic started the first premature infant on poi.

The poi was well tolerated after 5 days of feeding.

Poi was also sampled on 19 allergic infants and children, but the results are not yet completed.

However, on one child, who was severely allergic to all cereals and a large number of other foods, the poi was lifesaving.

Another exceedingly ill child with a very rare disease (generalized lymphagiectasis) who was extremely difficult to feed, took the poi very well and with much benefit.

Dr. Glaser said they have encountered some significant resistance in getting mothers into the baby clinic to accept the poi instead of the usual cereals.

He said that with more explanation on the Hawaiian food, there should be better response.

Consequently the clinic has printed additional explanatory cards which state:

"Poi is a food which is and has been used for many centuries instead of ordinary cereals in the islands of the Pacific and elsewhere.

"It is particularly used in quantity by the Hawaiians and is believed to be largely responsible for their extraordinary fine physique.

"We are trying it with the hope that it will cause better growth and development than customary cereals."

Dr. Glaser adds that a study in making poi more palatable is also being conducted.

He said it is highly desirable to make the taste of poi acceptable, if possible, by the addition of some flavoring material.

This is now under study by Dr. L. M. Wheeler, director of product development, Parke, Davis & Co.

Dr. Glaser pointed out the need for more up-to-date analysis of poi than that published in the University of Hawaii Agricultural Bulletin of July 1952.

He wants information on the quantity of iron, if any, the quantitative vitamin content as well as whether or not the product contains gluten or gliadin.

Dr. Glaser said, "I have never before been engaged in a problem which has received such widespread publicity as this one or which evoked so much interest in the public."

He adds, "It seems to me that if the poi proves successful, there will be a good market alone in the feeding of infants with cereal allergies.

"It is, however, too early to be sure about this."

MILITARY PAY RAISE

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, a fine editorial in a recent New York Times issue called attention to the need for military pay scales comparable to pay for similar work in private industry. I believe this is long overdue.

Last year, for the first time, Congress approved the principle of comparability of pay for Federal classified workers in the pay increase law enacted in October—Public Law 87-793. As second-ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I was proud to have a part in drafting this measure. Great progress was made toward providing pay for Federal classified employees comparable to pay scales of workers in private industry.

Last week the administration sent a message asking Congress again to raise Federal classified workers' pay so as to more nearly approach pay of their counterparts in private industry. Now we hear the administration is considering a sliding scale of pay raises for classified workers which would move up or down as the cost of living moves up or down.

Meantime, military pay has not been increased since 1958, although the cost of living has risen 5½ percent. At the very least, Congress ought to remedy that inequity. But I believe Congress should do more. Military pay scales should be based on the principle of comparability with private employees and Federal classified workers.

In an article published in Hawaii's excellent newspaper, the Honolulu Sunday Star-Bulletin & Advertiser, my views are spelled out in greater detail. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this article, as well as the text of the New York Times editorial, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin & Advertiser, May 5, 1963]

WASHINGTON REPORT ON MILITARY PAY RAISE

(By U.S. Senator HIRAM L. FONG)

A pay raise for America's men and women in our Armed Forces is a must in my judgment. Even with allowances for dependents, subsistence quarters, and the like, military pay lags far behind that of Federal civilian and private industrial workers doing similar tasks.

Pay scales for military personnel have not been increased since 1958, although the cost of living has gone up 5½ percent.

As I stated more than 3 weeks ago in Honolulu, Congress, in all fairness and justice to those in uniform, should take prompt action to increase their pay.

It is not enough merely to make cost-of-living adjustments, for present pay scales contain built-in inequities. What is needed is a thorough overhaul of military pay in line with the principle of a living wage, rather than a bare subsistence wage; the principle of recognition of the increased skills and responsibilities of today's military personnel; and the principle of comparability with pay in industry and in Federal civilian agencies.

Many enlisted men and officers in the lower ranks today receive pay that is near subsistence level. Our Nation should treat its guardians of freedom better than that.

Pay scales today fail to compensate our uniformed personnel for the greatly increased skills and responsibilities entailed in our modern Defense Establishment. The level of competence required and the level of responsibilities imposed have risen markedly as compared with pre-Korean war, for example. We should pay accordingly.

Now that the principle of comparability has been established for Federal classified workers, it should be extended to military personnel as well. Last year, the big breakthrough for classified workers came when Congress adopted a pay increase law to bring their pay in line with pay in private industry for similar work. As second-ranking minority member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I helped to draft this landmark legislation.

Last Monday the administration asked Congress to raise Federal classified pay again to bring it even closer to average pay in private jobs.

We have only to look at some examples to be convinced that military pay is far out of line with comparable work for other Federal employees and for private workers. Some Pentagon messengers, whose only responsibility is to pedal three-wheeled bikes and deliver messages, now make more money than young officers flying jet planes and standing watches on multimillion-dollar Navy vessels.

A reactor operator on the nuclear-powered cruiser *Long Beach*, a second-class petty officer, receives $397 a month. But the civilian doing the same job on the U.S. Maritime Commission's nucleur-powered ship *Savannah* receives more than $1,200 a month with overtime.

Low pay is one reason for the great personnel turnover in our Armed Forces. The reenlistment rate for first termers is only 25 percent. Every year one-fifth of all our enlisted men leave the service. This high turnover is expensive to the Government. It costs a great deal to train new men who must replace those trained men who leave.

For technical training alone, the cost to the Government is $1 billion each year. Half of this is for training in electronics. But since trained electronics personnel can earn higher pay in industry, many leave the service. So the Government loses trained people and must train new people.

There is no question in my mind that we could save significant amounts in training costs and personnel administration if we paid our servicemen and women fairly. Then they would stay in the service, in turn giving us more experienced and capable forces.

Status of military pay legislation at the moment is that a bill (H.R. 5555) has been reported by the House Armed Services Committee. It may be cleared by the Rules Committee for House action next Thursday or Friday.

The Senate Armed Services Committee is not scheduled to hold hearings until after the House passes the bill.

I believe the House committee bill has serious shortcomings, which I shall try to remedy when the bill comes to the Senate. I shall urge among other things:

1. Adoption of the principle of comparability.

2. Fifty-five-dollar-a-month combat pay for military personnel serving in areas of hostility. Proposed by the Defense Department, this was rejected by the House committee. I believe $55 is small compensation for the risks undertaken by these men, such as those from Hawaii who must serve in Vietnam.

3. Oversea pay for enlisted men in Hawaii, including Hawaii residents who are enlisted men stationed in the islands. The committee bill excludes oversea pay for enlisted men in Hawaii, but continues it for Alaska.

4. Pay increases for officers and enlisted men serving their first 2 years. The House committee bill gives them no increase.

Basic pay for young second lieutenants starts at $222.30 per month. Including subsistence-and-quarters allowances, they might receive about $338 to $355 per month. Their college classmates in private industry receive from $100 to $200 a month more. No wonder it is difficult to recruit and retain men.

5. Granting military retirees the right to recompute their retirement pay so as to benefit from this and future military pay increases.

In June 1962, there were more than 41,000 military personnel in Hawaii with nearly 68,000 dependents. The 1962 military payroll in the islands totaled $152,769,000.

Today there are more than 2,680,000 military personnel on active duty in our Armed Forces. We depend on them to defend us. The least we can do is give them fair and decent pay on a par with civilian Government workers and employees in private industry.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 30, 1963]

HIGHER MILITARY PAY

Legislation of key importance to service morale—the military pay bill—will be debated in the House soon.

The bill, as reported out by the House Armed Services Committee provides an average 14.3 percent increase for officers and 12.6 percent for enlisted men, with the exact percentages varying by rank and grade.

The legislation is much needed and long overdue; yet it is a sad disappointment to the men in uniform. It does not meet the recommendations of an experienced committee that studied service pay; it carries increases far less than those proposed by a House subcommittee after careful evaluation; it fails even to achieve the very modest goals recommended by the Secretary of Defense.

The pay bill, as the Army-Navy-Air Force Journal has noted, "got caught in a political crossfire between the tax-cutting objectives of the Democratic leadership and the budget-cutting aims of the Republican leadership." In its present form, the bill provides pay raises substantially less than those obtained in the last 10 years by workers in the private economy and in the civil services. Thus the goal of military pay "comparability," stressed by the President in the past, has been abandoned.

The glaring deficiencies in the current legislation must be corrected if service careers are to be made attractive enough to encourage long-term professionalism.

ADMINISTRATION'S OIL INDUSTRY TAX PROPOSALS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the Texas House of Representatives has adopted a resolution concerning the Kennedy administration's oil industry tax proposals. As stated in the resolution, the impact of these proposals on an already weakened industry would seriously damage this industry and thereby a significant portion of the economy of the State of Texas. I ask unanimous consent to place the full text of the resolution in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 235

Whereas the petroleum industry is an outstanding example of free enterprise, both in Texas and in the world at large; and

Whereas the petroleum industry is one of the major bulwarks of the Texas economy; and

Whereas the petroleum industry has contributed heavily to the finances of State government by paying 27 percent of all local property taxes and 30.2 percent of all State taxes collected in Texas during the year 1961; and

Whereas such taxes collected amounted to 42 percent of the cost of public education maintained in Texas; and

Whereas the Texas petroleum industry has borne the largest proportion of loss of markets suffered during recent years by the petroleum industry as a whole; and

Whereas the tax program of the present national administration proposes additional Federal tax burdens on the already overburdened petroleum industry: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this house respectfully requests that these tax proposals affecting the petroleum industry be withdrawn, and that copies of this resolution be sent to the President, Vice President, Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, and to all Members of the Congress of the United States.

BYRON TUNNELL,
Speaker of the House.

RIGHT-TO-WORK LAWS

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, in connection with the attempts in some States to pressure enactment of so-called right-to-work laws, even in the face of overwhelming public opposition to such restrictive legislation, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that this anticollective bargaining proposal has been rejected once again by the legislature of the State of Maine.

Earlier this year, supporters of this restrictive legislation in Maine failed to obtain sufficient signatures for a referendum on the issue. Subsequently, the joint senate-house labor committee voted 9 to 1 that the bill ought not to pass. The house of representatives upheld this record by 111 to 32, and the senate concurred by a vote of 28 to 3.

One of the reasons for this clear-cut victory for responsible collective bargaining was the vigorous opposition by industrial management in Maine.

This opposition by management to the so-called right-to-work laws was expressed by the Bates Manufacturing Co., of Lewiston, Maine, one of the Nation's outstanding textile manufacturing firms, to the Maine Legislature, in a letter to Chairman Harvey Johnson, of the joint senate-house labor committee.

Mr. H. L. Gosselin, an official of the textile manufacturing firm, informed this legislative committee on March 28, 1963, that the large majority of Maine management opposes the so-called right-to-work law, that the legislation is undesired and that it would jeopardize the excellent relations that exist between management and labor in the State of Maine. Mr. Gosselin states that continuance of such excellent labor-management relations, without interference from right-to-work legislation, is of paramount importance to the future of Maine and its industrial development.

I regard the viewpoint of Maine management, as expressed by the Bates Manufacturing Co., as an important contribution to the continually mounting opposition in most areas of our society to the attempt to weaken our longstanding national policy in support of the collective bargaining process, and ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Gosselin's communication to the Maine labor committee printed in the RECORD:

There being no objection, the communication was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BATES MANUFACTURING CO.,
Lewiston, Maine, March 27, 1962.

Hon. HARVEY JOHNSON,
Chairman, Labor Committee, Maine Legislature, Augusta, Maine.

DEAR SIR: I had planned to be in Augusta for the March 28 public hearing regarding the so-called right-to-work legislation, but a previous commitment involving Business-Education Day in the city of Lewiston prevents me from attending the hearing. I trust, therefore, that this letter will substitute for the testimony I would have offered in person.

As our State's top political leaders have stated, Maine enjoys excellent labor-management relations. I am sure that your committee will agree that the continuation of such an asset is of paramount importance to the future of Maine and to our industrial development efforts.

I have given considerable and careful study to the so-called right-to-work proposal which is presently before your committee and being heard today. It is my conviction that this legislation is unnecessary in Maine at this time. If enacted, I believe that it could jeopardize the relationship which exists between labor and management. I believe also that it could well lead to labor unrest in Maine and impede progress in the large, already unionized industrial plants of the State.

Maine workers are honest and productive. On the whole labor leaders are responsible leaders. The large majority of Maine management have admiration for the people of the State and seek to do all in their power to be successful here. On numerous occasions, these three groups have demonstrated that, by working together instead of against one another, mutually beneficial results follow. It is this atmosphere of understanding and cooperative spirit which has safeguarded many Maine jobs and which spells well for future successes. I honestly hope that this atmosphere will not be jeopardized and, therefore, urge your committee to report this legislation ought not to pass.

Sincerely,

H. L. Gosselin,
Assistant to the President.

PRESIDENT'S TAX CUT PROPOSALS ESTIMATED TO INCREASE STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT TAX REVENUES BY $2.9 BILLION

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the economic effects of the President's tax program should increase State and local government tax revenues by $2.9 billion a year when its impact is fully felt. This estimate, made by the Treasury Department at my request, indicates that State tax revenues would increase by about $1.5 billion and local revenues by $1.4 billion.

As chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, I requested the Treasury to estimate the increases in State and local revenue on the basis of a joint committee staff computation that a $10 billion Federal tax reduction would result in an increase of approximately $40 billion in the gross national product.

Using this estimate, the Treasury Department calculated that the expanded economic activity anticipated from the full impact of the President's tax program should increase personal income by about $30 billion. This, in turn, should increase State and local revenues—from their presently existing tax structures—by about $2.9 billion.

The estimate is heartening news for State and local taxpayers. The burgeoning needs for State and local revenue have required continual tax increases at the State and local levels in the postwar era, he pointed out.

I am also giving the Treasury estimates of the anticipated increase in revenue in the individual States from present major State sources of tax revenue and from local taxes. The estimates were based on the Joint Economic Committee estimate of the effect of a Federal tax cut on the gross national product—the total value of goods produced and services performed in the Nation in 1 year.

The additional revenue which should come to the States and to their local governments when the President's program is fully in effect, the Senator said, would provide substantial relief from the critical financial problems which State and local governments are now facing.

According to the Treasury's estimates, State tax revenues would be about $1.5 billion higher when the full impact of the President's program is felt than they would be without the program. This equals 7 percent of the $20.6 billion total of taxes the 50 States collected in 1962.

Local government revenues would be approximately $1.4 billion higher than they would be without the program, he said. This is 7 percent of the total local revenues of $19.8 billion collected in 1961, the latest year for which figures are available.

The President's program, now under consideration by the House Ways and Means Committee, would be in full effect in 1965. Its full impact would be felt soon thereafter.

The estimated increases in State and local tax revenues were based on relationships between tax revenues and personal income in the individual States over a period of years with adjustments for anticipated population changes and other factors.

State and local taxes doubled in the decade from 1952 to 1961. Their rate of increase averaged 7 percent per year—well in excess of the national average annual rate of economic growth. Gross State and local debt has more than tripled since 1950, and all indications are that current tax and debt trends will continue in the future.

These trends underscore the importance to State and local governments and taxpayers of the substantial rise in the level of economic activity which may be expected from enactment of the President's program.

The Treasury estimates indicate that State and local governments would be able to meet the future needs of their citizens with lower tax rates than would otherwise have to be imposed. A reduced pressure on State and local governments to raise tax rates or impose new taxes would grant an additional benefit to taxpayers.

I ask unanimous consent that the exchange of correspondence between Secretary Dillon and myself in this matter, along with a table giving the Treasury Department's estimates in detail, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letters and table were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

April 2, 1963.

Hon. C. Douglas Dillon,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: As you know, the 1963 joint economic report contained supplemental staff materials estimating the stimulative effects that might occur from tax reduction through the multiplier and accelerator effects. It is extremely important to analyze these effects as thoroughly as possible in connection with the present discussion of tax reduction.

One of the consequences of Federal tax reduction should be to increase State and local tax revenues through the increase in general economic activity. I would like to request, therefore, that you provide me with estimates, based upon the staff materials in our report, of the effects on State and local revenues stemming from the proposed Federal tax reduction.

Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Faithfully yours,

Paul H. Douglas,
Chairman.

The Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, May 7, 1963.

Hon. Paul H. Douglas,
Chairman, Joint Economic Committee,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Douglas: In reply to your request of April 2, I am pleased to submit the enclosed estimates of increases in State and local tax revenues which might be expected to result from a Federal tax reduction in the amount postulated by the Joint Economic Committee staff.

The total national effect on State and local revenues and the gain by individual States from major tax revenue sources and from local taxes have been estimated on the basis of staff materials in the Joint Economic Committee report, as you requested. Tables on the effect of the tax program by States and by revenue sources are enclosed.

The gratifying concern of your committee over the frequently overlooked State and local aspects of our tax structure parallels that of the President, who said in his tax message to Congress:

"State and local governments, hard pressed by a considerably faster rise in expenditures and indebtedness than that experienced at the Federal level, will also gain additional revenues without increasing their own tax rates as national income and production expand."

I appreciate the interest your committee has shown in the President's tax program. I hope the information submitted proves useful to the committee in its work.

Sincerely,

Douglas Dillon.

Effect of a $10 Billion Federal Tax Reduction on State and Local Tax Revenues (Based on Joint Economic Committee Staff Projections of Increases in Gross National Product)

A reduction in Federal taxes will result in substantial increases in State and local tax revenues without changes in existing tax rates or the introduction of new taxes.

The Joint Economic Committee staff has estimated that a $10 billion reduction in taxes, somewhat less than the net reduction recommended by the President, would result in an increase of close to $40 billion in gross national product. This implies a $30 billion increase in personal income for the Nation as a whole. The attached table presents estimates of the gain in State and local tax revenues based upon the Joint Committee's projections. These estimates, which are broken down by States and by broad revenue sources, are necessarily rough approximations suggestive of the general order of magnitude rather than precise forecasts. They are based upon the historical relationship between changes in State and local tax receipts, adjusted for major revisions in tax laws, and changes in State personal income.

It is estimated that Federal tax reduction, when fully in effect, would result in the addition of $2.9 billion to the tax revenues of State and local governments. This increase would be over and above the increase in tax revenues which these governments would realize in the absence of Federal tax reductions. Of this increase, an estimated $1.5 billion would accrue to the States and $1.4 billion to local units of government. In 1962, total State tax revenues were $20.6 billion. Total local tax revenues were $19.8 billion in 1961, the most recent year for which data are available.

The estimated increases resulting from Federal tax reduction thus represent 7 percent of total State and local tax revenues, 7 percent of total State tax revenues, and 7 percent of total local tax revenues.

A brief description of the general methodology employed follows:

1. Consistent with the Joint Economic Committee's projection of the increase in

GNP resulting from a $10 billion tax reduction, the increase in personal income for the Nation as a whole was taken to be $30 billion.

2. To obtain the increase in personal income in a given State, it was assumed that the ratio of that State's personal income to the national total that prevailed in 1962, after adjustment for relative shifts in population expected between 1962 and 1965 (census estimates), will be maintained.

3. The change in revenues from each major State tax source was estimated on the basis of historical relationships between those revenues and personal income. Wherever possible, periods in which there were no major changes in the tax laws were used for the computations. In the case of local property taxes, the most recent ratio of property tax revenues to personal income was used because reliance upon the historical series would have given an unreasonably high projection (since effective property tax rates have been rising steadily and tax revenues have been strongly influenced by the postwar increase in property values).

4. For the 16 States which allow the deductibility of Federal income tax liability in the computation of the State income tax base, the revenue increases due to this feature were calculated and included in the "total" figure for those States. The State's average effective income tax rate was applied to the decrease in Federal tax liability within the State.

Effect of a $10,000,000,000 Federal tax reduction on State and local tax revenues (based on Joint Economic Committee staff projections of increases in gross national product)

[Amounts in millions]

State	Increase in total State and local tax revenues		Increase in State tax revenues										Increase in local tax revenues	
			Total		Sales and gross receipts		Individual income		License		Other			
	Amount	Percent of 1962 revenues [1]	Amount	Percent of 1962 revenues	Amount	Percent of 1962 revenues	Amount	Percent of 1962 revenues	Amount	Percent of 1962 revenues	Amount	Percent of 1962 revenues	Amount	Percent of 1961 revenues
Alabama	$32	8	$24	8	$16	7	[2] $4	14	$2	9	$2	7	$8	7
Alaska	4	8	3	8	1	9	[3] 1	8	(4)	----------	1	8	1	7
Arizona	23	7	14	7	9	7	[2] 2	13	1	7	2	6	9	8
Arkansas	19	8	15	8	11	9	1	8	2	9	1	6	4	6
California	404	8	198	8	104	8	32	11	14	7	48	10	206	8
Colorado	35	8	19	8	7	6	[2] 9	14	2	7	1	3	16	7
Connecticut	45	7	21	7	15	7	----------	----------	1	5	5	8	24	7
Delaware	7	6	6	7	2	9	2	6	1	5	1	7	1	5
Florida	79	8	42	7	31	7	----------	----------	7	8	4	9	37	8
Georgia	42	7	29	7	23	8	5	11	(4)	----------	1	4	13	6
Hawaii	10	6	8	6	5	5	[6] 2	7	(5)	----------	1	12	2	6
Idaho	10	8	6	8	1	4	[2, 6] 3	14	2	12	(5)	----------	4	7
Illinois	161	7	65	7	54	7	----------	----------	9	7	2	6	96	7
Indiana	64	7	29	7	25	7	----------	----------	4	7	(5)	----------	35	7
Iowa	47	7	22	8	12	7	[2, 6] 5	12	4	8	1	6	25	7
Kansas	37	7	15	7	9	6	[2] 3	11	2	6	1	4	22	7
Kentucky	29	6	19	6	10	5	[2, 6] 4	11	2	9	3	7	10	7
Louisiana	43	7	31	6	12	6	[2] 2	11	3	7	14	7	12	7
Maine	13	7	7	8	6	8	----------	----------	1	6	(5)	----------	6	7
Maryland	48	7	27	7	16	7	7	7	2	6	2	5	21	7
Massachusetts	95	7	42	8	15	8	[2] 20	11	5	4	2	4	53	7
Michigan	158	8	94	9	73	10	----------	----------	12	8	9	6	64	7
Minnesota	62	7	32	8	8	6	[2, 6] 16	13	4	7	4	5	30	7
Mississippi	19	6	12	6	8	5	1	13	1	6	2	7	7	7
Missouri	57	7	28	7	17	7	[2] 6	8	4	7	1	4	29	7
Montana	13	8	8	11	4	12	[2] 2	13	1	11	1	6	5	6
Nebraska	18	7	7	7	4	8	----------	----------	1	8	2	7	11	6
Nevada	7	8	4	8	3	8	----------	----------	(4)	----------	1	8	3	8
New Hampshire	8	7	3	7	2	7	----------	----------	(4)	----------	1	6	5	7
New Jersey	116	8	36	8	23	9	----------	----------	10	8	3	5	80	7
New Mexico	13	7	9	7	5	7	[2, 6] 1	8	1	6	2	6	4	8
New York	410	8	201	9	62	9	[6] 102	10	14	7	23	5	209	7
North Carolina	52	7	37	7	22	7	7	7	5	8	3	4	15	8
North Dakota	9	7	4	6	2	6	(4)	----------	(4)	----------	2	7	5	8
Ohio	137	7	61	7	46	7	----------	----------	12	7	3	6	76	7
Oklahoma	29	6	20	6	11	6	[2] 3	10	3	6	3	5	9	6
Oregon	34	8	21	10	3	6	[2] 13	14	3	7	2	7	13	7
Pennsylvania	136	6	75	6	54	6	----------	----------	10	5	11	5	61	6
Rhode Island	13	7	7	7	5	7	----------	----------	1	8	1	8	6	7
South Carolina	22	7	17	7	14	8	1	4	1	5	1	5	5	6
South Dakota	11	7	4	7	3	7	----------	----------	(4)	----------	1	8	7	8
Tennessee	35	7	20	6	13	6	----------	----------	4	7	3	8	15	8
Texas	126	7	66	7	36	7	----------	----------	22	13	8	3	60	8
Utah	16	8	9	8	5	8	[2] 2	12	1	9	1	5	7	8
Vermont	6	7	4	8	2	9	1	8	1	10	(5)	----------	2	5
Virginia	43	7	24	7	14	9	6	7	3	6	1	2	19	8
Washington	48	6	34	7	29	7	----------	----------	2	5	3	6	14	6
West Virginia	17	6	12	6	10	6	[3] 1	5	1	5	(5)	----------	5	6
Wisconsin	68	7	35	8	11	7	13	9	4	7	7	7	33	7
Wyoming	5	6	3	7	2	8	----------	----------	1	9	(5)	----------	2	6
Total	2,935	7	1,529	7	875	7	277	10	186	7	191	6	1,406	7

[1] The increase in local tax revenues is based on data for 1961 which is the latest year available.

[2] Includes revenue increase resulting from deductibility of Federal income tax liability in the computation of the State income tax.

[3] The individual income tax in Alaska and West Virginia is imposed as a percentage of the Federal income tax. West Virginia has fixed its rates as a percentage of the present Federal rates (1962). It is assumed that Alaska will increase its percentage so that, in effect, the present level of rates is maintained.

[4] Included in "other" State tax revenues.

[5] Less than $500,000.

[6] Uses the Federal tax base (adjusted gross income or taxable income), with modifications, in the computation of the State individual income tax. The base-broadening features of the President's tax program may be expected to expand the State income tax base and result in an increase in revenues of $47,000,000 for these States. This increase, which would be in addition to the gain resulting from the $10,000,000,000 tax reduction, is not included in the estimates presented here.

Source: Office of the Secretary of the Treasury, Office of Tax Analysis, May 7, 1963.

TRIBUTE TO EUGENE C. EPPLEY

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, one of the great success stories of our day is the story of Eugene C. Eppley.

This story of a man who started an illustrious career in the hotel business at the salary of 12 cents an hour and rose to head the largest individually owned hotel empire in America is in the Horatio Alger tradition.

But the most significant fact about Mr. Eppley's life is that the philanthropy he practiced in his lifetime lives after him.

The Eugene C. Eppley Foundation, Inc., of Omaha, has just published a brief profile of the foundation's creator. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the RECORD this inspiring account of a man who was responsible for $15 million in benevolences, which impart life and meaning to the epitaph carved on his tombstone:

> He climbed rugged ways to gain a hotel empire, wealth, power, and national fame.
>
> Achieving these, he turned to build a bridge for those who follow.

There being no objection, the profile was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EUGENE C. EPPLEY

Eugene C. Eppley was one of the last of the great personal innkeepers, a colorful character, a sturdy individualist, a bachelor married to the hotel business. His dominant personality, industry, imagination, courage and determination would have taken him far in any field. These qualities, along with a flair for the dramatic and the knack of cultivating people, enabled him to climb from a lowly beginning to the heights of a glamorous hotel world.

Born in a small hostelery operated by his parents in Akron, Ohio, he left Stanford University and took off for himself at the age of 19. His first job was unpacking furniture in a new hotel. The pay was 12 cents an hour. With tremendous energy he pushed up the employee ladder, adventured into business for himself and over arduous years built up the largest individually owned hotel empire in America. At different times, on two continents, he owned and operated over 50 hotels, large and small. The great depression left 85 percent of all hotels insolvent. That Gene Eppley managed to survive the catastrophe was a tribute to his dogged determination and prodigious capacity for work.

Mr. Eppley was a man who thought big, dreamed big things and made many of them come true. Unlike most dreamers, however, he was a careful planner, a demon for details, a practical perfectionist. Some 10 years prior to his death he created the Eugene C. Eppley Foundation to which he gave the greater part of his wealth including control of his vast hotel empire. He planned that the foundation would dispose of the hotels at a favorable time.

In 1955, at the peak of his financial fortunes, Mr. Eppley was stricken in health but lived to direct the foundation in negotiating the sale of his former properties to the Sheraton Corp. of America. Upon his death in 1958, Omaha and the hotel industry became fully aware of both his financial accomplishments and his extensive philanthropy. In addition to the establishment of a charitable foundation with assets of over $25 million, he remembered many of his longtime associates with substantial bequests. The disposition of his estate stamped him as a man of long foresight and thoughtful generosity.

Gene Eppley was a personage of many facets. In business he was shrewd, tough and aggressive. He loved competition and fought for the fun of winning. He found zest in playing a hard game. Cultured and personable, he could be courtly and captivating or rough and rugged as occasion required. Paradoxically, he was both acquisitive and altruistic, proud and modest, but beneath it all humble and compassionate. At times it seemed an effort for him to keep his soft side from showing.

Along the way he helped many in many ways. He was never too busy to assist a deserving employee who found himself in difficulty. He taught, inspired, disciplined and ruled his coworkers with an iron hand. He recognized no substitute for honest effort. Working for Eppley was an educational experience. It was the employee's ill luck if he did not take advantage of the opportunity to improve himself.

Never one to shirk any task he undertook, Mr. Eppley earned many rewards and honors. To name a few: At the age of 33, he was elected president of what is now the American Hotel Association. Three governments awarded him decorations for his civilian efforts during the two great wars. In 1933, he was crowned King of Ak-Sar-Ben, Nebraska's highest civic accolade.

Mr. Eppley gave lifelong credit to Culver Military Academy for the training, inspiration and character shaping he received during his formative years. A long time later his gratitude to Culver was demonstrated by very substantial gifts made through the Eppley Foundation.

For the last half of his life, Mr. Eppley's home was the Fontenelle Hotel in Omaha where he died in 1958. Because of this geographical circumstance the good causes of Omaha and the Midlands have benefited exceedingly.

A model Salvation Army camp for the underprivileged; an impressive civic library at the University of Omaha; an edifice dedicated to business education at Creighton University; the modern Omaha municipal airport made possible by a matching grant; a workshop and rehabilitation center for the handicapped; a Children's Hospital surgical pavilion; the Gene Eppley Boys' Club in the heart of an Omaha juvenile problem area; the Eugene C. Eppley Institute for Research of Cancer and Allied Diseases; and farther afield an auditorium at Morningside College and a Graduate Hotel School at Michigan State University; these and countless lesser philanthropies summarized elsewhere, endure as monuments to Mr. Eppley's memory.

Having no close relatives, Mr. Eppley expressed the wish that his remains be laid to rest at Culver, Ind., close to the boyhood school he loved so much. His career is epitomized in this simple epitaph carved on his tombstone in Culver Cemetery:

"He climbed rugged ways to gain a hotel empire, wealth, power and national fame.

"Achieving these, he turned to build a bridge for those who follow."

Major grants and summary of Eppley Foundation benevolences (inception to 1963)

Culver Military Academy	$3, 655, 000
University of Omaha	1, 140, 000
Creighton University	1, 286, 000
Omaha Airport Authority	1, 000, 000
University of Nebraska Cancer Research Institute	2, 500, 000
Michigan State University	1, 550, 000
Nebraska Goodwill Industries	375, 000
Morningside College	250, 000
Gene Eppley Boys' Club	527, 000
Children's Memorial Hospital	641, 000
Gene Eppley Camp for Underprivileged Mothers and Children	316, 000
Omaha area colleges and schools	439, 000
Various hospitals	211, 000
Scholarships, Nebraska independent colleges	$128, 000
Youth camps	106, 000
Community chests	165, 000
Religious organizations and homes	190, 000
Miscellaneous small grants	245, 000
Total	14, 724, 000

LAW DAY IN NEBRASKA

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, Nebraska was proud to be host to the British Ambassador to the United States, Sir David Ormsby Gore, in its observance of Law Day this year. Sir David addressed a luncheon sponsored jointly by the Omaha Bar Association, the chamber of commerce and Rotary International; met with members of our judiciary; visited with business and civic leaders, and appeared before the Nebraska Legislature.

The observance of Law Day each May 1 has become a popular practice among bar associations across the country. It seems particularly appropriate to celebrate our honored tradition of rule of law on the same day that Communist-dominated countries parade their military might. The foundations of the two systems of government could not be more vividly contrasted.

Sir David's remarks at the luncheon emphasize that the free world's ultimate weapon in the global struggle with communism is our common law tradition with the concepts of freedom and justice that inhere in this system. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Ambassador's speech, together with my remarks on introduction, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks and speech were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR ROMAN L. HRUSKA INTRODUCTION OF RT. HON. SIR DAVID ORMSBY GORE, K.C.M.G., LAW DAY, OMAHA, NEBR.

My 25 years in the general practice of law prior to becoming a member of the U.S. Senate and my close association during that period with many of my brothers-in-the-law who are here today, serve as foundation for my keen appreciation and deep gratification at the progress and the high place which have been achieved by Law Day. Nationally and locally it has come to be an annual observance which is noteworthy and highly desirable.

My compliments and my commendations to the Omaha Bar Association through its president, Leo Eisenstatt, and the other sponsoring organizations, Rotary International and the chamber of commerce, for their making possible the splendid occasion we witness here right now.

Law Day has many purposes to be sure. Among them is the reminder that freedom as we enjoy it in this Republic is of three kinds: personal, political, and economic. These are all interdependent. The impairment or loss of any one of them is quickly and inevitably followed by loss or impairment of each of the others. All of them are based on law. All of them are made possible by law.

The resultant is liberty which is much coveted by man and for which he will fiercely fight. When he does so, it is in the realization that the objective of government is not more and stronger government, but rather liberty and peace, and in that order. Law makes this possible.

The Federal Bar Association in Washington has chosen as its theme for Law Day the role of law in a totalitarian society. Speaking to the group in the Senate Caucus Room at this same hour are several lawyers who have fled their enslaved homelands and who, from tragic personal experiences, are giving testimony that totalitarianism utilizes law as a means to maintain complete control over society. Behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains laws exist primarily to compel obedience to a social order and to exact performance to such norms as are set by the State.

What a startling contrast with the common law tradition, perhaps our greatest heritage from England. Lord Coke, the Lord Chief Justice of England in the early 17th century, proclaimed the strength of the common law even at the peril of the Tower of London and the headsman's axe, stating boldly to King James I: "The King ought to be under no man but under God and the law."

The heritage of English common law molded the character of the new Colonies and, with increasing frequency, influenced the actions of the early legislative bodies and courts. In this manner, the first American lawyers developed considerable mastery of the common law. Nowhere was it studied to a greater effect.

The nobility of the common law has been testified to by many, but never perhaps as well as by a great Englishman and more recently a new citizen of the United States of America, Sir Winston Churchill, who said:

"We must never cease to proclaim, in fearless tone, the great principles of freedom and the rights of man which are the joint inheritance of the English-speaking world, and which, through Magna Charta, the Bill of Rights, habeas corpus, trial by jury and the English common law, find their most famous expression in the American Declaration of Independence."

It is particularly fortunate and exceedingly appropriate that on Law Day the Omaha Bar and this assembly have the opportunity of hearing Sir David Ormsby Gore, the British Ambassador to the United States. The mind of our guest was sharpened on the famed playing fields of Eton, and at New College, Oxford, where he studied history. He was reared to diplomacy as the son of Lord Harlech, onetime secretary of state for the colonies and a member of Parliament for 28 years.

Following World War II, in which he served as an air observation pilot, Ormsby Gore became managing director of lands given him by his father, and began personally to farm 400 acres in Shropshire.

He assumed his Washington post in 1961, after serving as Joint Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs from 1956 to 1957, when he was promoted to Minister of State for Foreign Affairs, and created a Privy Councilor. From 1950 to 1961, he was a Conservative member of Parliament, and was an alternate British delegate at the U.N. General Assembly in Paris in 1951–52 and in New York in 1954.

Our country is fortunate to have such a seasoned and astute diplomat. Our city and our State are privileged to have him as our guest this Law Day.

Ladies and gentlemen: the Right Honorable Sir David Ormsby Gore—His Excellency, the British Ambassador to the United States.

ADDRESS BY H.M. AMBASSADOR, THE RIGHT HONORABLE SIR DAVID ORMSBY GORE, K.C. M.G., FOR THE CELEBRATION OF LAW DAY IN OMAHA, NEBR., ON WEDNESDAY, MAY 1, 1963

INTRODUCTION

May I say first how deeply I appreciate the honor of being invited to give the address on this truly civic occasion when you are paying tribute to your most cherished possession: freedom under the rule of law. When Dr. Erickson wrote to me about your plans last November, he referred eloquently to the common legal heritage of our two countries and to the fact that the State of Nebraska had, from its inception, adopted the common law of England, modified, he was careful to state, by your various statutes and case decisions.

THE COMMON LAW

This common legal heritage has, of course, provided one of the strongest and most ancient bonds between the British and the American peoples. It has endured for more than 350 years, from that day in May 1607 when the first settlers landed in Virginia with a charter from King James I declaring that they should "have and enjoy all the liberties, franchises, and immunities as if they had been abiding and born within this our realm of England." This link between us was not broken but in some ways strengthened by the Revolution which ended in the separation of the American Colonies from the motherland. For that Revolution did not begin as a fight for independence but as a struggle in defense of rights and freedoms guaranteed to the colonists under the English common law. It was an assertion and not a rejection of the English way of life, to use the modern phrase. Only as a last resort and owing to the intransigence of a foolish and stubborn monarch did they decide to take the road of independence from Britain because King George III left them no choice. After the war they naturally devised a form of government for themselves which would prevent any ruler again threatening their rights. At the same time they carefully and logically preserved the common law in defense of which they had started the Revolution. In the years which followed this system of law prevailed over all others that had been brought to the continent. It was accepted by millions of newcomers from continental Europe who had had no experience of it. It was carried across the continent by the pioneers and incorporated in the laws and constitution of your State and of other new States as they were formed.

The final result is that whilst we have different systems of government, different political institutions—though both are firmly based on the democratic principle—we have a remarkably similar system of law. It is, of course, easy to exaggerate the similarities and overlook the differences which have grown up over the years. There is no real parallel in Britain to the U.S Supreme Court or to the way in which its rulings directly affect the way of life of your citizens. We abandoned the grand jury system 30 years ago. Many of your judges are elected; ours are all appointed from the ranks of practicing barristers on the advice of the Lord Chancellor, himself the head of the judiciary regardless of political considerations. We make distinctions between solicitors and barristers which Americans sometimes regard as slightly archaic.

But basic to both our systems are certain concepts which reflect the age-old attachment of our two peoples to fairplay, commonsense, and honest dealing and their desire that legal systems should be flexible and adaptable to political and social changes. I hesitate in this company to select and define these concepts but I will name four because I want in a moment to compare them with the basic Communist concepts. These are, first, the rule that anyone however important the office he holds or the institution which he represents, must answer in the ordinary courts of the land if it is complained that he has infringed the rights of another; second, that judges must be independent of the Government or Executive; third, that the standard of the conduct of the law should not be set by a political dogma or a political party, but by the conscience and beliefs of the ordinary reasonable man about what is right and what is wrong; and fourth, the concept that the state is made for man not man for the state which results in a determination to insure that the rights of the individual human being are safeguarded.

COMMUNISM AND THE LAW

Meanwhile since 1917 an entirely different system of law has been developed by the Soviet Union which rejects these concepts and this system has now, of course, been imposed on the satellite states of Eastern Europe. Far from preserving the rights of the individual, this system openly and deliberately subordinates the rights of the individual to those of the state and regards the law as an instrument of the dictatorship of a political party interested only in the preserving of the existing political regime. Let us then look in more detail at this system. This is the system which, according to Mr. Khrushchev, your children and grandchildren will enjoy—if that is the right word.

According to Lenin and and Stalin, the non-Communist state was an instrument in the hands of the ruling class for the suppression of its class enemies. Law in all pre-Communist societies was, again according to Lenin and Stalin, the means by which the ruling class kept itself in power and exploited the rest of society. With the establishment of Communist rule in the Soviet Union, the purpose of the new Bolshevik government was utterly to destroy the old machinery of government and to eradicate all the roots and traditions of the old society. Lenin and Stalin realized how desperate a struggle this involved, and they stated clearly and unequivocally that their own actions in this struggle would be based on force and would be unrestricted by law. True, they issued laws and ukases and edicts and decrees and regulations. But under Lenin and Stalin the essence of the concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat was that it was a radical and implacable revolutionary class struggle, and so-called law would be used on one side and specifically against the other side in this struggle.

The whole world now knows to what abysmal depths of injustice this system led. The arbitrary and morbid despotism of Stalin was one aspect of this. Another aspect was presented by the false denunciations, the unfounded accusations, the concocted "evidence," the travesties of trials, the indefensible sentences, the executions and deportations of millions of innocent victims. Yet a third aspect is presented by the sickening sophistry of the arguments by which Vyshinsky, the prosecutor in the great purge trials, sought to give a spurious appearance of legality to the calculated intimidation of Stalin's rule.

Now some of this has changed. Stalin and Vyshinsky are disavowed; most of the concentration camps have been closed, and their surviving inmates freed; many of the dead have been rehabilitated. The old, clear, harsh objective of using law as the servant of the state has been abandoned, and nothing of comparable clarity has yet come to take its place. The new textbooks, lacking precise guidance from the top are vague and fuzzy. The new program of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union claims that the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat is now at an end, and that the Soviet Union has now become a state of the whole people. According to the same program, the role of the police in the maintenance of law and order is to dwindle, and the role of people themselves is to increase. The press assures the people that things have changed radically for the better. And on balance so they have, to some extent, since Stalin died.

Yet every now and then one reads of incidents which throw a sudden and shocking light on what a dreadful legacy the Stalinist conception of law has left to the Soviet Union. Let us look at one of these in detail. A few weeks ago, in the Soviet satirical magazine Krokodil, there was a full-page story about the illegal arrest and attempted deportation of an elderly grandmother. Her daughter had to be away from home for a few days, and the grandmother was cooking lunch for her grandson, a schoolboy. She went out to buy some tomatoes, and did not come back. She had been stopped on the street by a policeman, who said that she had been denounced as a "parasite," and after a summary hearing, in which all the "evidence" against her was accepted as true, and in which she was not allowed to call witnesses in her own defense, she was taken down to the railway station to await deportation. The following day the daughter returned home, to find her son unfed and uncared for, and her mother missing. She went to the police station, where she was told that her mother had been sentenced to deportation, and that she herself would have to watch her step, as there were adverse reports on her too. Fortunately the daughter was not intimidated. She appealed to the highest authorities of the Moscow province and got the case reviewed. It transpired that the accusations against the grandmother had been put forward, for reasons of personal animosity, by the deputy director of a local factory, whose word had been accepted on the grounds that "he was not the kind of man to tell lies." And on his say-so the old woman had been condemned to deportation to Siberia, without ever being allowed to go home to pack some warm clothing. And that in the allegedly reformed Russia of Mr. Khrushchev.

The moral drawn by the Communist magazine was that times have changed, and that the procedures of Soviet justice could no longer be used to pay off personal scores. But the simple moral I would draw is that, in a country where the English common law is the basis of the rights of the individual, such incidents simply do not occur; whereas, in countries which have lived under Communist law, the individual may find himself unexpectedly exposed to risks of this kind long after the processes of reform are supposed to have been completed.

ECONOMIC OFFENSES

Then there is the role now played in Communist law by so-called economic offenses, some of which were in 1961 and 1962 made punishable by death. There have always been articles concerning economic offenses in the various criminal codes of the Soviet Union. The last major overhaul took place on Christmas Day 1958. The list of counterrevolutionary crimes which had made the previous criminal codes so pernicious was cut down to practically nothing; but economic offenses were dealt with in considerable detail. Now for some grave economic offenses—large scale bribery and corruption being one, large scale embezzlement another—the death penalty can be and is imposed. The number of death sentences for economic offenses so far announced in the Soviet press is already approaching 200 and, of course, there may be many more of which we hear nothing. The proportion of Jews amongst those sentenced to death is higher than the proportion of Jews in the total population; but quite a number of fairly highly placed officials who are not Jews have also been shot. The trouble is that the opportunities for making money "on the left," as they say in Russia, are so great, and the difficulty of living comfortably if you are honest is so formidable, that corruption has become all-pervading. Some of those sentenced would, no doubt, be regarded in the West as fulfilling a genuine economic need—that is to say they are people who go in for private enterprise without corruption. Some are victimized as scapegoats for the failure of the system. But most of those sentenced seem, from the charges, to be crooks who would be charged in a free country. Whether they were forced into crime by the Soviet economic system itself is another question, but the harshness of the punishment imposed is, I think, significant. We have here the spectacle of a regime which claims to be the champion of progressive forces in the world resorting to capital punishment on an increasing scale and for crimes not so punishable in civilized countries for a century or more. In this respect the Soviet Union is marching resolutely back into the Middle Ages. It is an interesting commentary on the state of affairs in the economy when the Russians have to resort to such brutal and archaic practices in order to deter their countrymen from economic crimes.

This then is the system of law which the Communists seek to impose upon the world. I think it is worthwhile examining it objectively and in detail from time to time. Throughout history rival and competing nations have lauded their own systems of law and accused each other of tyranny, injustice, and repression, not always with justification. We should not make such charges about Communist States without making certain that we can document them.

In both our countries we acknowledge that there are sometimes imperfections in the working of our legal systems and that the preservation of our liberties requires eternal vigilance within the boundaries of our own countries as well as in defense against evil external influences. Neither Britain nor the United States seeks to interfere with the legal systems of other countries or to impose the Anglo-American ideas of freedom and law upon the rest of the world. We know that there are other systems of law in which freedom can flourish. There is the Roman Law which forms the basis of law in a large part of Western Europe. There is the Sacred Law of Islam in the Mohammedan world.

The common law of England has, however, shown a remarkable capacity for growth in other lands than ours and even amongst races and cultures very different from ours. British settlers, of course, took the common law, English statutes, and British conceptions of the rights of the individual with them not only to North America but to Africa, Australia, New Zealand, and the Provinces of Canada with the exception of Quebec where the civil law of France has been retained. The self-governing members of the Commonwealth thus became additional centers of separate growth of the common law. This system of law has also made great contributions toward the development of the legal systems of countries like India, Pakistan, and others in West Africa.

In this way English law has played and can continue to play a vital role in the development of the new and emerging nations provided that they are permitted to build free societies without being subjected to external political pressures and subversion. No nation in history has ever freely voted a Communist regime into power, and we need not fear that these peoples will voluntarily choose the Communist system of law or the Communist way of life if they are permitted to retain a free choice. The retention of the right to make such a choice requires the maintenance of political and economic stability.

That stability itself is a practical necessity for freedom. There is a world of wisdom in Sir Lewis Namier's unsentimental, commonsense description of liberty as the "fruit of slow growth in a stable society." Conversely he might have added that repression was the fruit of rapid change in an unstable society. We may fight wars to defend our liberties from external threat or engage in revolutions to throw off internal dictatorship but when the war is won or the revolution over, the real task of building free institutions begins. We defended our liberties in World War II against one form of dictatorship but when it was over, the Eastern half of Europe succumbed to another and it needed the stabilizing influence of the Marshall plan and NATO to prevent the Western half from succumbing too.

That is why today we are both endeavoring through similar foreign aid and investment programs to promote and maintain stability in Latin America and in the new nations of Asia and Africa. We do not do this because we want to bribe them to be on our side in the cold war or because we are willing to be blackmailed by them to be on their side. The kind of people who can be bribed don't stay bribed. What we are trying to do is to create in these countries the kind of stable societies in which free institutions are bound to grow naturally, whether under our system of law or another free system.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion let me say this. At the present time we are pouring out vast proportions of our national wealth in the creation of terrible weapons of destruction to defend our countries from attack and to deter any potential aggressor. This is, of course, necessary for the preservation of peace in present world conditions but the trouble about these new weapons of mass destruction, is that if we ever had to use them not only the enemy but the greater part of human civilization would be annihilated. Therefore, in the great global struggle for the hearts and minds of men in which we are now engaged military force can only play a limited role. The really decisive weapons will be our basic concepts of a free society, of justice and freedom under the rule of law, and our ability to convince the peoples of the world including ultimately the peoples of the Communist world, that it is only through the creation of institutions expressing these concepts, that they can build the "good society" in which their highest human aspirations can be fulfilled.

That is why in the words of a new but distinguished citizen of Nebraska, in the words of Sir Winston Churchill, speaking in Fulton, Mo., 17 years ago, "We must never cease to proclaim in fearless tones the great principles of freedom and the rights of man, which are the joint inheritance of the English-speaking world and which, through Magna Carta, the Bill of Rights, the habeas corpus, trial by jury, and the English Common Law, find their most famous expression in the Declaration of Independence."

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, following the Omaha luncheon, the Ambassador went to Lincoln to address our State legislature which recently had made Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of Nebraska. At this session I had the privilege of presenting to Lt. Gov. Dwight Burney, the president of our unicameral legislature, one of the pens used by President Kennedy in signing the document proclaiming honorary U.S. citizenship for Sir Winston just 3 weeks ago. It was my privilege to be personally present on that historic occasion on the White House lawn.

Accompanying Sir David to Nebraska was the charming Lady Ormsby Gore. She was introduced to the legislature by Senator Fern Hubbard Orme, the only woman member of our legislature.

I ask unanimous consent that the Ambassador's remarks before the legislature be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks by H.M. Ambassador, the Right Honorable Sir David Ormsby Gore, K.C.M.G., to the Legislature of the State of Nebraska on Wednesday, May 1, 1963

It is a high privilege and a great pleasure for me to appear before the legislature of the great State of Nebraska. I am conscious that in honoring me in this way, you are paying a tribute to the country which I am proud to represent here in the United States. It is also a personal pleasure for me to take a brief part in some of your proceedings because I was for more than 11 years a Member of a sister legislature, the British House of Commons. Though some of our constitutional forms differ, I am sure that if I were to stay here a short time I should find much to remind me of my life in Westminster and that I should soon feel very much at home.

My purpose in coming to the State capitol today is to convey to you the thanks and gratitude of my countrymen for a historic enactment by this legislature. In particular I have come to tell you how deeply one of the greatest Members of the House of Commons appreciated the measure which was passed by you last February granting him "full citizenship in the great State of Nebraska, with all rights and privileges appertaining thereto." I was present 3 weeks ago, on April 9 when the President of the United States formally proclaimed Sir Winston Churchill on honorary American citizen. It was a moving ceremony in the garden of the White House attended by members of the Cabinet, the Supreme Court, and the

Congress of the United States and a number of old wartime comrades of Sir Winston. In addition there were Sir Winston's son, Randolph, and his grandson, Winston Churchill. Mr. Randolph Churchill read to us, and through television and radio to the world, a letter from Sir Winston to the President couched in eloquent phrases which brought back nostalgic memories to the many of his old colleagues present.

My thoughts turned to this legislature, when Sir Winston at the outset said how sensible he was of the "warmhearted action of the individual States who accorded him the great compliment of their own—honorary—citizenship as a prelude to this act of Congress."

There was a very important reason for this reference which I shall explain. As you know, the proposal to make Sir Winston an honorary citizen of the United States was first put forward 5 years ago, in 1958. At first he said that he would have to decline it. He pointed out that he was already half American by blood and that he would prefer to leave the matter thus. And there it rested until a few months ago when it was revived in the U.S. Congress. Then, after the initiative by Nebraska and some other States in formally granting him citizenship, a new approach was made to Sir Winston. This time he replied that your action had radically changed the situation from what it was in 1958 and that he would be delighted to receive the honorary citizenship of the United States, although it was not possible for him to come to the United States for the ceremonies. Thus your action was an important factor which cleared the way for this unprecedented tribute to Sir Winston.

For both our peoples he is a living symbol of unity and friendship between Britain and the United States, and of the part they have played and are playing in the defense and promotion of freedom in war and now in peace. The gesture of making him an American citizen has fired the imagination of the world. That is why I have come today, to thank you for a truly noble and affectionate act by this legislature.

RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, 18 years ago, a valiant people became subjugated to the aggressive, ruthless forces of Soviet Russia. These were the Rumanians, a sturdy, hard-working, freedom-loving people; in that respect, much like Americans.

It is difficult for us to imagine the frustration we would feel should despotism from a foreign land absolutely prohibit any notice of the date or celebration on the Fourth of July. Such a situation is practically unthinkable.

Yet each May 10 since their infamous enslavement by the Communists, Rumanians have been subjected to just this treatment. It is on May 10 that Rumanians, wherever they may be, feel that special surge of patriotism that Americans feel on the Fourth of July.

It was on this day in 1877 that Rumania severed the last link which had bound her to the Ottoman Empire for so many decades. This was the fulfillment of a perpetual dream. Because their liberty had been won, because so much of each Rumanian had gone into the fight for freedom, Rumanians molded a special place in their hearts for the 10th of May.

Not even an 18-year period of cruel oppression could break the attachment of these people to their day of national celebration. Even as we meet, the people who cannot openly celebrate are thinking special thoughts and are silently communicating their burning desire to once again be free. For today is Rumanian Independence Day.

It is most appropriate that we join Rumanians and Rumanian descendants throughout the world in celebrating their national holiday, and that we feel especially thankful that we can do so openly.

ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES NOT SUBJECT TO FPC JURISDICTION

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, it has recently come to my attention that the Federal Power Commission is attempting to extend its jurisdiction to include REA financed electric cooperatives.

Senators will recall that the Federal Power Act of 1935 was included in the same bill which contained the Public Utility Holding Company Act. The purpose of the entire bill was to avoid recurrence of certain problems which arose in the electric utility business which was then dominated by eastern based holding companies. The Federal Power Act must be viewed in the light of this fact.

The purpose of the entire act was to govern and balance the conflicting interests inherent in the investor-owned type utility; where there is substantial diversity of interest between owner and consumer. It was to protect the public interest that FPC was and is charged with responsibility to regulate the sale of "energy for ultimate distribution to the public," under section 201(a) of the act. There was no intent whatsoever to confer on FPC carte blanche authority to control the operation of consumer owned membership organizations.

In a cooperative there is no diversity of interest between owner and consumer. Consumers and owners have a unity of interest and control. If rates are too high the surplus which accumulates is returned to the member consumers. It has been aptly put that in a cooperative "all sell to each." In addition, the REA Administrator has full authority and legal responsibility, under the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, to assert and exercise whatever control is necessary to assure that the systems for which he loans funds operate in the public interest. There is no need and no basis for Federal Power Commission regulation of electric cooperatives.

The resources of the FPC and its staff are already loaded to the extent that there exists a backlog of 23 area gas rate proceedings, involving major suppliers, the disposition of each of which could take from 4 to 14 years, by the Commission's own estimates. In addition, matters relating to the rate schedules, accounting practices and licensed project applications of major electric utility companies are under scrutiny by FPC.

By contrast, the REA financed electric systems are so small that all of them together own less than 1 percent of the installed generating capacity of the United States and serve less than 8 percent of all consumers. The public interest to be served by FPC control of REA financed systems is, therefore, small even conceding such control to be in the public interest.

The Federal Power Act does not include authority for FPC to regulate organizations which sell only to members. The Congress, in enacting the Rural Electrification Act, which came after the Federal Power Act, never once mentioned the possibility of cooperatives being regulated by the FPC. In fact, the concept of Congress setting up the REA Administrator to supervise loans under the act, and then requiring the borrowers, after they had obtained a loan from the Administrator, to seek FPC approval just does not make sense. It does not make sense because it was never intended to be.

FPC, until now, has never asserted jurisdiction over electric cooperatives and, Congress has, on at least one occasion, involving the urgent deficiency appropriations bill of 1946, defeated by a record vote of the Senate a proposal to place REA cooperatives under FPC jurisdiction. Bills to confer such jurisdiction on FPC have been repeatedly introduced and have repeatedly died. It appears clear, therefore, that even those who advocate such jurisdiction are firmly convinced that it does not exist under present law.

REA-financed systems do not hold themselves out to serve the public, nor are they generally required to serve the public. A private business cannot be converted into a public utility by merely calling it such.

REA systems are not public utilities, and, in my opinion not subject to FPC jurisdiction. There is no purpose to be served by allowing FPC to second-guess the REA Administrator and by subjecting REA financed systems to the delay inherent in FPC proceedings and judicial appeals from such proceedings.

ALASKA REVERSED BY FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the people of the State of Alaska were rudely shocked day before yesterday when the Federal Maritime Commission reversed an earlier decision of a Commission examiner and in so doing upheld the 1959 10 percent rate increase in regard to one Alaska water carrier and remanded the case for the taking of further evidence in regard to the several other carriers. I do not believe anyone in Alaska, anyone who has followed this action, including myself, suspected that the Commission would turn its back on the position taken by its own hearing counsel and Commission examiner who had so intimately and exhaustively considered this case. After approximately 3½ years, we did not expect that in one instance an increase would be allowed and the remainder of the case would be returned for further evidence.

The rate increase was initially filed in December 1959, and the then Federal Maritime Board allowed the rates to become effective without even a suspension, yet over the dismayed protest of all Alaskans, again including myself. During the following 2 years and 4 months, extensive and expensive hearings were conducted. The hearing counsels, who are employed by the Commission to represent the public interest as they independently see it, joined the State of Alaska and argued against granting the proposed rate increases. Later the Commission examiner wrote an extensive and clear decision in general following the position of the State and hearing counsel in holding the rates were in violation of law, at least as far as the future was concerned. We in Alaska, and in fact all offshore areas, were hopeful.

In the face of strong industry opposition, Congress had, only a few months before the examiner's decision, accepted the President's reorganization plan which created the new Federal Maritime Commission, and transferred all promotion functions to the Department of Commerce. This was to strengthen the regulatory functions of the Commission. To say this was needed is to understate grossly the conclusion reached by extensive congressional hearings regarding the old Board. This was imperative. I understand that during the entire history of the old Board, no water carrier had ever, according to Board decisions, requested a general rate increase that was investigated and found unreasonable. This despite the fact that most offshore trades then were monopolistically dominated by single carriers in each trade and repeated protests were filed by the public. To hold consistently that no proposed rate increase was unreasonable was more than disturbing; it did discredit to the imagination of a monopolist.

The old Federal Maritime Board was abolished. The new five-member Federal Maritime Commission was created. Many of us thought we were on our way, and the April 1962, examiner's report in the Alaska case gave lift to our hopes.

The May 6 decision by the Commission dashed these hopes. The report indicates that the Commission did not restrict its consideration to the years 1958, 1959, and 1960, which represented the period of time for which evidence was properly submitted and subjected to examination. Forecasts based on unweighted generalities gathered beyond the record were part of the basis of overturning the examiner's decision. But the equally surprising turn was the order to remand a part of the case for further evidence because the other carriers had not fully afforded themselves an opportunity to carry their burden of proof.

Careful thought must now be given, Mr. President, as to what steps the State should next take in its attempt to protect the public in Alaska. The high freight rates which we have experienced have tended not only to increase the cost of living in Alaska but have placed the State in a disadvantageous position in developing and marketing its resources. Alaska suffered long under this condition as a territory; the Commission's action day before yesterday suggests that we have yet to find relief through Federal regulation.

"MARINE HIGHWAY" LINKS ALASKA CITIES

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, Alaska's "marine highway" is now serving the southeastern part of our State. The first of three new ferry boats is in operation carrying passengers and vehicles between Prince Rupert, British Columbia, Ketchikan, Wrangell, Petersburg, Sitka, Juneau, Haines, and Skagway on regular schedule.

There are no railroads in this part of the State; there are no highways. Until now these Alaska cities were dependent upon air or irregular shipping service. Our new "marine highway" ferry service will serve to link these cities in a growing exchange of goods and passengers and will act as healthy stimulus to our tourist industry.

I ask unanimous consent that an excellent article describing Alaska's ferry system, written by Ray Schrick, and published in the Wall Street Journal, May 7, 1963, may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALASKA GETS INTO FERRY BUSINESS, LINKS TOWNS ON ISOLATED PANHANDLE

(By Ray Schrick)

PRINCE RUPERT, BRITISH COLUMBIA.—After nearly a 1,000-mile bicycle ride from Seattle, 22-year-old Lewis Nelson recently pedaled aboard a ferryboat here en route to an Alaska vacation.

Aboard the same comfortable, 500-passenger vessel, Banker Frank T. Calvin and his wife parked the new Chevrolet they had purchased in Seattle for the trip home to Sitka, in southeast Alaska.

Neither Mr. Nelson nor the Calvins would have been able to make this voyage before Feb. 1 when the State of Alaska inaugurated its ferry line between Prince Rupert and seven cities in southeast Alaska. They are among several thousand tourists and Alaskans who already have taken advantage of this year-round service to the 49th State's relatively isolated panhandle. And officials figure that traffic will climb sharply with the onset of warm weather.

To accommodate this hoped-for influx, two more vessels are scheduled to join the ferry *Malaspina* on the line—one next week and the other in June. It's planned that each of the three ferries will make two round trips a week between Prince Rupert and Skagway, the line's Alaskan terminus, 490 miles to the north.

Their route follows the inland passage that runs between the mountain-ringed fiords of the Pacific coast and thousands of islands that break the ocean's waves. The ferry line is helping unify an elongated area, about the size of Maine, where the lack of connecting rail lines and highways has forced 35,000 residents to depend mainly on airplanes for travel between cities.

MARINE HIGHWAY

The State-owned system was financed by a $15 million general obligation bond issue. "We couldn't dream of a land highway in 50 years in southeast Alaska," says Gov. William A. Egan. "It would cost $400 million. For $15 million we created a ferry marine highway."

"Alaskans are using the ferry like a streetcar," declares Richard Downing, commissioner of the State public works department. A wedding party of 40 took the ferry from Juneau, the State capital, to Haines. A Petersburg lady heard spring dresses had arrived in Juneau, so she ferried 135 miles north to look them over. Wrangell School seniors took an excursion nearly 200 miles to Juneau. And the National Guard uses the vessels for troop movements.

Officials say the service will boost tourism, too. Morris Ford, head of the Alaska Travel Division, says his agency has been receiving about 750 tourist queries a week related to the ferry. Mr. Ford thinks that 1963's tourist totals may top 1962 when the Seattle World's Fair helped attract about 128,000 visitors to Alaska.

The ferry service is featured on a package trip offered by Alaska Airlines, Inc., of Seattle. "The ferries will help the airlines," says Robert Giersdorf, general sales manager of Alaska Airlines. "Tourists taking the ferry cruise can be induced to fly into the interior of the State."

MISS ALASKA RIDES THE FERRY

While intended primarily for passengers and their autos, the ferries also carry freight, provided it is loaded in trailers or vans that can be rolled on and off at terminals. "Miss Alaska," a new brand of bread baked here in Prince Rupert by Van's Bakery, Ltd., recently appeared on grocery shelves in Ketchikan, about 90 miles away. The 39-cent price of a 1½-pound loaf compares favorably with other brands in Ketchikan. Van's Bakery ferries 1,000 to 2,000 loaves a week into Ketchikan.

Alaska Carriers Association, Inc., a trucking group, recently published rates for freight ferried into southeastern Alaska towns in trailers. In some cases these rates are lower than charges for shipping in freight by steamer and barge. But a trucking industry spokesman claims lower ferry tariffs on trailers will be necessary to make the ferry system generally competitive for freight.

Despite the advantages of the ferry service, some Alaskans take a dim view of the operation because of its cost. "The boats should be named after elephants," the Anchorage Times suggested in an editorial. "One could be 'White Elephant' and the other could be 'White Elephant, Two.' The names would then conform to what the boats are going to be as far as the Alaskan taxpayers are concerned."

In an advance study for the State, W. C. Gilman & Co., a New York consulting firm, estimated that the ferries would lose nearly $2 million in the first 3 years before breaking into the black. But Public Works Commissioner Downing points out that the *Malaspina* brought in about $50,000 in its first 2 months. While this figure was below the estimated $90,000-a-month breakeven point, it was above the Gilman forecasts for a winter operation, Mr. Downing says.

Says Governor Egan: "It would cost us up to $1 million a year to maintain a highway. We will use the equivalent of highway maintenance funds, if necessary until the ferry pays for itself."

Passengers traveling all the way to Skagway from Prince Rupert pay $30. A berth in a stateroom for the 30-hour trip costs an extra $7.50. The *Malaspina* has only 14 staterooms with 28 berths but more sleeping accommodations will be installed next year under a recent $300,000 appropriation.

Passengers who want to drive into the Alaskan interior pay $118 to ferry normal-size autos from Prince Rupert to Haines, where a road leads to the Alaskan Highway. The *Malaspina* can carry 109 autos.

Some choose to leave their cars behind in Prince Rupert, where Lindsay's Cartage & Storage, Ltd., reports it is picking up business from tourists who pay $1.25 a day or $7 a week to store their autos. Prince Rupert's Crest Motor Hotel, Ltd., also anticipates more customers as a result of the ferry service. Under a $400,000 expansion program the motel is adding a new restaurant and bar and increasing the number of its units to 87 from 46. "We're a happy geographic accident," declares William Murray, president.

Prince Rupert, a town of about 12,000, can be reached by Canadian National Railway Co., by highway, by airplane from Vancouver, British Columbia, and by water. Northland Navigation Co., Ltd., will begin service May 31 with a new $3.5 million, 110-passenger, 45-car vessel on a 3-day run from Vancouver to Prince Rupert.

A BALANCED BUDGET

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article written by Mr. Henry J. Taylor, the very able and well-known columnist, which was published on May 6 in a large number of newspapers.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Our President must turn against every normal, selfish impulse and return to his spoken guarantees.

It was on these that he was entrusted with the care of our Nation and, indeed, of our very lives.

Many of the guarantees remain unredeemed in both the foreign policy area and economic area. But a start is timely regarding the budget, now under debate in Congress.

Our President is deliberately demanding, promoting and fighting for an unbalanced budget. His arguments supporting this theory are currently famous. And he is swinging, full-punch, at the congressional resistance.

Yet, it is morally and intellectually impossible for our President to unsay his own guarantees:

September 26, 1960: "I believe in the balanced budget."

October 7, 1960: "I said last week I believed in a balanced budget. We can balance the budget unless we have a national emergency or a severe depression."

October 13, 1960: "I state again that I believe in a balanced budget and have supported that concept during my 14 years in Congress. Here is where I stand and I just want to have it on the public record."

October 27, 1960: "Statements have been made that I am in favor of unbalancing the budget. That is wholly wrong, wholly in error. That is not my view and I think it ought to be stated very clearly in the record."

November 2, 1960: "To hold down the cost of living we must strike at inflation on all fronts. To do this we should balance the budget."

November 7, 1960: "I believe in a balanced budget."

Additional dates could go on and on.

Now, this conflict—100 percent—between expressed convictions makes it impossible to know what Mr. Kennedy believes. Does a broken conviction give strength to a second conviction, which is the reverse? Do two broken convictions add up to the truth? Where do we go in the face of a situation like this?

We seek, we need, we must have guidance from our President. Congress seeks guidance. In fact, the whole free world seeks guidance from the President of the United States.

We cannot be told one thing on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays and another thing on Tuesdays, Thursdays and Saturdays. Neither can the world. And neither can this practice be permitted among responsible subordinates.

When Treasury Secretary C. Douglas Dillon sought confirmation of his appointment before the Senate Finance Committee he stated: "Everything we do depends on having a sound fiscal system." He called a balanced budget "essential for national security." Within 90 days he was calling deficits "not a cause for alarm." And to this very day Mr. Dillon is calling the continuing deficits "entirely appropriate."

Name this performance anything you wish, it does not contain convictions. For convictions cannot be manufactured to suit a moment, a purpose or a person. Convictions can be right. They can be wrong. But they have to be convictions.

A great storm cloud mounts and darkens, and its crimson rim reaches out to suck down the sun. The whole, round earth watches the fire-fighting monsters of the Kremlin, wondering where trouble will come and when.

Instead of the four freedoms we have the four fears: Fear of war, fear of inflation, fear of bankruptcy, fear of defeat. It will take much careful performance and a great deal of personal carrying power in the President's great name to carry us through these.

The two indispensable ingredients—absolutely indispensable—are convictions and integrity. The heart these can sing to is the heart of America and the heart of the free world.

In press conferences, on TV, in all media reaching our people, if the President has changed his mind on repeatedly stated fundamentals we need to be told this. It is not enough, and certainly not permissible, merely to rely on the public's forgetfulness—as about budget convictions, convictions prohibiting the Soviet lodgement in Cuba, etc.—and then break off on a completely reverse course.

If credence goes, everything goes. Nothing is so costly to our authority in the world and, therefore, to peace.

TRIBUTE TO FORMER PRESIDENT HARRY S. TRUMAN

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, I am sure that all our colleagues would join today in sending our most sincere and fondest best wishes to the man who, in my opinion, has done more to design and build a United States of America that today has the self-assured determination, along with the respect and confidence of the free nations of the world who are our partners in peace, that makes our Nation today the free world leader and gives us the capability to fulfill such an awesome responsibility—our dedicated friend, and my fellow Missourian Harry S. Truman, today celebrating his 79th birthday.

A tradition in our country—"Mr. America" in the world—and surely a legend in the history of the future to which he has contributed so much—President Truman will, I am sure, spend this day as he has spent his life—working for a better world through devotion to God and to his fellow man. To a man such as Harry Truman, the causes of God and man are inseparable. Free men everywhere are united in the prayerful hope that President Truman will continue to serve that cause for many more years.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE GORDON R. CLAPP

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I am sure that many Members of the Senate were shocked to learn the sad news of the death of Gordon Clapp.

Gordon Clapp was not only a loyal and devoted friend, but he was one of the finest, ablest, and most dedicated public servants I have been privileged to know in my long years in the Congress.

As one visits the Tennessee Valley, one sees on all sides Gordon Clapp's magnificent contributions to the Tennessee Valley Authority and one beholds the many eloquent evidences of the benefits and the blessings that his labors, his courage, his inspiring leadership and his faith brought to the people of the Tennessee Valley and to the Nation.

Mr. President, I would pay my heartfelt tribute to the memory of Gordon Clapp, and I ask consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD two richly deserved tributes from the Washington Post and the Washington Star.

There being no objection, the tributes were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 1, 1963]

GORDON R. CLAPP

Almost all of Gordon Clapp's crowded, productive life was devoted to public service in the areas of conservation and resource development. He was in the great tradition of the American pioneer—a pursuer of horizons and an opener of frontiers. For 20 years, from its very beginning he played a vital role in the growth of the Tennessee Valley Authority, the last 8 of them as its chairman. His imagination and zeal contributed invaluably to the effectiveness of that beneficient agency in reinvigorating, enriching and democratizing a great region of the United States. When he left the TVA in 1954, he served for a short while as Deputy City Administrator of New York and then became president of the Development and Resources Corp., a private concern with wide interests in the promotion of progress in far parts of the earth.

Gordon Clapp combined the best qualities of the educator and the entrepreneur. He was a man of learning with much theoretical knowledge who had at the same time a knack for getting things done. He believed deeply in the best values of democracy and applied them wherever he worked so that individual freedom and improved race relations, and social advancement were byproducts of his efforts to promote economic development. His untimely death at 57 is a heavy loss to a nation which has grown to greatness on the basis of just such qualities and capacities.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, May 1, 1963]

DREAMER WITH A SHOVEL

Gordon R. Clapp, dead now at 57, devoted over a third of his good and useful life to the Tennessee Valley Authority. He began working there in 1933, when it was one of the coming wonders of the world, and he did not leave it until 1954. Indeed, he probably would never have left it had not President Eisenhower, in keeping with the more or less inexorable laws of politics, decided to name somebody else as TVA's chairman.

This was something that Mr. Clapp never resented, nor had he any reason to. As far as the political realities went, he knew what the score was, and he took it for granted. He understood the need for high-echelon personnel changes as part of the transition from one presidential administration to another. Certainly he was anything but a complainer in that sense. As he once told an interviewer, "When a public servant gets a martyr complex, chances are he has been working too hard, or his friends have been feeling too sorry for him."

Mr. Clapp was happily free of any such complex. In all the various posts he held at TVA, he liked to think of himself as one of those "dreamers with shovels" who converted the Tennessee River into a tool that gave the people "better farms, better homes, and better living." It did just that, and his role in the enterprise was big. He deserves to be remembered as one of our country's fine public servants.

POSTCAREER EDUCATION

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, to go on living one must go on learning. Indeed, one of the problems that this Nation faces today is the continuing education of those who must keep pace with progress. Others continue their education, in one form or another, in the pursuit of "learning for learning's sake."

An article in the New York Times for April 28 contains an excellent article on education for those outside the normal school years. As a former professor, I was especially pleased to note the formation of the Oliver Wendell Holmes Association, made up of retired, or semiretired, professors and distinguished laymen to provide continued use of our intellectual resources.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Midcareer and Postcareer Study Are Extended in Two Programs

(By Fred M. Hechinger)

"Lifelong learning" used to be a favorite bromide in the exhortations handed down by commencement speakers. Now, it has suddenly become the most essential ingredient of the educational revolution. Last week, the search for lifelong learning was reflected in news about two entirely different stages of modern man's effort to cope with a world in upheaval.

The first was a historic attempt to put the brakes on the menace of obsolescence among those trained for engineering and science. The second was an effort to give intellectual content to the lives of highly educated men and women who are being pushed into retirement at an ever younger age.

Briefly, these were the events which dealt with those two phases of lifelong education:

First, the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation gave $5 million to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology for the establishment of a Center for Advanced Engineering Study—the first of its kind. Its purpose will be to bring back to formal study, in the environment of the university, men who are already experienced practitioners of engineering—either in industry or as professors—to let them catch up with the sciences. In addition, the center will be concerned with a third category: the engineering industry's managers who are in danger of losing intellectual contact with the experts whom they are supposed to recruit, assign and manage.

Second, yesterday, a group of eminent retired teachers from American universities and schools, together with eminent retired leaders in the professions and industry, announced the formation of the Oliver Wendell Holmes Association to initiate a nationwide program of "learning for learning's sake" for the large and restless retired segment of the population. Chartered by the New York Board of Regents, the association—381 Park Avenue South, New York 16—will be under the presidency of Dr. Kirtley F. Mather, retired geologist of Harvard University, with Harry A. Bullis, retired board chairman of General Mills, assuming the chairmanship.

HUMAN OBSOLESCENCE

What has led to these steps of lifelong learning?

Midcareer education: The demand for a way to halt human obsolescence on the level of the most highly educated, most critically needed manpower was first catapulted into the headlines 2 years ago, when Princeton was given $35 million by a small group of anonymous donors to establish a special training center for persons in the public service.

The Sloan grant to MIT applies the same principle to engineering. Dr. Gordon S. Brown, who is dean of the MIT school of engineering, admitted that word has gotten around to many high school students that some of the most able experts with engineering degrees—right up to the doctorate—are in danger of being outstripped by young recruits within 10 years of graduation.

The MIT-Sloan project, as a signpost to the future, is intended to tell young people interested in engineering that it will be possible for them to return periodically to school. In the future, professional careers will be weaving their way in and out of practical and academic environment.

Dr. Julius A. Stratton, president of MIT, compared the process to the chain reaction in fission: the professors must return to midcareer training because they, in turn, must set off the vast and constant educational changes with which undergraduates are prepared for their future professions.

INDUSTRY EXPENSE

By the same token, industry must build into its budget the considerable expense of sending highly paid experts and managers back to school periodically and pay not only their salaries and their moving expenses but also the salaries of their replacements. In short, it may in the future be almost as costly to maintain men as it has been in the past to maintain machines.

Perhaps the best indication of the novelty of the concept was in a question by a reporter, "What kind of degree will the MIT center offer?"

The idea of education without a label might go against the grain of a diploma-happy age, but it leads directly to the second, equally status-divorced move toward true education:

Postcareer: Dr. Mather, speaking for the Oliver Wendell Holmes Association said he was confident the resources of men and women who have retired from business and professional careers can be brought together with the resources of "emeriti professors of universities and colleges who continue to possess intellectual vigor and pedagogical skill."

He pointed out that science, engineering, and machines are releasing Americans from routine jobs earlier in life than ever before. Yet, science also offers them a longer and more alert old age.

LOCAL INSTITUTES

But this does not solve the problem of many of the approximately 1,000 Americans who every day reach the age of 65.

The association will begin its postcareer education with a series of pilot projects for communities and industrial companies. It proposes nationwide local institutes which will not require funds for permanent campuses, dormitories or laboratories—or even high faculty costs. Using the retired professors as faculty, the institutes will be planned near existing colleges.

Each community would provide the facilities, transportation and fees for the faculty during sessions scheduled for from 5 to 14 weeks. At the same time, the professors will work with industries and labor organizations to help provide refresher courses for executives who have been away from college for a generation or more. At that point, the postcareer and midcareer movements by coincidence and pressure of the times, appear to meet.

The first of the institutes, to be held at Rensselaerville, N.Y., from July 8 to August 30, will deal with "Man and Science."

The two steps to lifelong education ironically come at the very moment when elementary and high schools are trying to curb dropouts at the lowest rung of the ladder. Possibly, word will trickle down that, in a world where the highly educated never finish their studies, the uneducated are cutting themselves off from their own tomorrow.

STUDY OF INSECTICIDES AND PESTICIDES

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, on April 4, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the able Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] announced the intentions of the Government Operations Subcommittee on Reorganization to launch a study in the field of the use of insecticides and pesticides.

I commend the subcommittee's leadership in this field and wish to add my concern to that which is growing across the Nation as a result of people becoming aware of the widespread uses of insecticide and pesticide sprays and chemicals and the undesirable results that often occur because of improper use, improper application which can lead to dangerous drift of aerial sprays, or outright improper selection of chemicals by uninformed personnel.

It is my understanding, Mr. President, that the subcommittee intends to hold extensive hearings in the near future on this problem, and I am hopeful that the problem of drift control in aerial and other spraying will be an area of prime discussion and study.

While many persons may disagree with the overall observations or the seriousness of them as contained in the book "Silent Spring," written by Rachel Carson, or the recent CBS television report on the same subject, I think most will agree that the problem of indiscriminate use and haphazard application of deadly chemicals is something to be guarded against whether it is a current, serious problem or not; and I think it is.

It is my opinion that the problem of drift control is one of the most serious we face today, and I hope the subcommittee will take a hard look at this aspect of current insecticide and herbicide control operations.

Mr. President, it is my information that most conventional spraying operations and systems are performed in the past, and even today, result in an extremely high rate of drift. Deadly chemicals designed for specific target areas often miss completely or drift so far off target that thousands of acres of crops, forests, and streams—not to mention wildlife—are unintentionally and often harmfully treated. Damaged resources, spoiled crops, and who knows what damage to wildlife can be the result. And sometimes this happens with the original target area being missed completely.

The tragedy of this situation is that it need not happen. There are in existence today chemicals and chemical application processes for aerial and ground spraying that can control this harmful drift up to 98 percent. I am personally aware of them, and I am sure that many of the agencies of the Government that use aerial and ground spraying control programs are aware of them also. There is one process with which I am acquainted that uses a technique of application by aerial or ground vehicles of a thick oil-water-chemical mixture that resists drift almost entirely—certainly the type of process we should be looking for if we hope to avoid the hazards enunciated by Rachel Carson.

I know that private industry is attempting to meet the challenge posed by drift control, and I am mindful of the studies being conducted by the President's adviser, Mr. Jerome Wiesner, and those of the Department of Agriculture. But I am concerned that we might not be moving rapidly enough in our attempts to come to grips with the drift control program.

With the approach of warm weather and a summer ahead, spraying operations will increase accordingly. And unless appropriate regulations and restrictions are promulgated and enforced, or unless those who find spraying operations necessary begin to adopt methods and processes such as the one I have alluded to earlier, we will again find ourselves burdened with the problem of unintentional damage.

Mr. President, I do not pretend to have the technical knowledge and information necessary to make a judgment or suggest specific rules and regulations to control drift of aerial and ground spraying. But I am informed by authoritative sources that certain precautions can be taken that would greatly minimize present dangers. These include the insistence that all biocides should have a low or negligible volatility; that all spray equipment and biocide spray mixtures should be of such nature that, when properly used by the operator, the spray pattern produced would consist of droplets of uniform composition and predetermined limited size range sufficient so that at least 98 percent of the total spray volume would be deposited within the intended spray area; and that in order to avoid overconcentration of the active ingredient, the biocide should be mixed with a diluent in the spray apparatus in such a manner that the biocide would be uniformly distributed throughout the spray mixture as it is being discharged from the spraying apparatus.

With the knowledge that drift can be controlled—and extremely effectively—I certainly hope the subcommittee will thoroughly look into this area and these suggestions in their deliberations.

THE DIXIE PROJECT, UTAH

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, yesterday the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation opened public hearings on my bill to authorize a $45-million reclamation project proposed for southwestern Utah—the Dixie project.

The opening of congressional consideration of the Dixie project brings closer to fulfillment a dream of almost 25 years for the citizens of my State who reside in Washington County and surrounding areas.

So significant is this water storage development to this colorful region that I ask your indulgence while I make a brief statement on the history of this land known as "Utah's Dixie."

The story of the Dixie cotton mission is one of the most fascinating in all the pioneer history of Utah. In its memory, and as a souvenir of the opening of hearings on the Dixie project, I am sending to each of the Members of the Senate one of these miniature bales of cotton. And I am presenting the Members a copy of a publication of the Utah Historical Society, "Utah's Dixie, the Cotton Mission." Most of this material was compiled or written by a distinguished author of Utah's Dixie, Juanita Brooks.

Now let me assure my colleagues of the South that Utah's Dixie is not to have another go at cotton culture. That was tried—with limited success—in the latter part of the last century. The lands to be irrigated by the Dixie project will not grow cotton. What they will do is nourish the area's economy—thus making it a better customer for cotton as well as many other products.

Today, the capital of Washington County, St. George, is a tourist oasis on the principal highway which spans mountain and desert between central Utah and southern California.

It is the site of the first completed Mormon Temple in Utah, and the location of Dixie College. It accommodates the numerous visitors who come to view the massive scenery of Zion National Park.

Before the arrival of the Mormons in 1850, however, only a few white men had ever seen this land. Two of these were the Spanish padres, Father Escalante and Father Dominguez, who were on the Virgin River in October of 1776 on their journey to find a land route from Santa Fe, N. Mex., to Monterey, Calif.

When the Mormons came to the West, they intended to establish a settlement in which they could build Zion in peace. They aimed to make their community self-sustaining. They expected to produce all their own necessities of food, clothing and shelter.

With this in mind, Brigham Young planted colonies wherever there was water, and sometimes very little water; he fostered production of food, fiber and metals; he brought in machinery for all the basic trades.

As early as 1850 it was proposed at the general conference of the church in Salt Lake City that a settlement be formed "at the junction of the Rio Virgin and the Santa Clara Creek, where grapes, cotton, figs, raisins, and so forth can be raised."

I digress to say that—112 years later—the principal works of the Dixie project will be dams built on the Virgin and the Santa Clara Rivers.

To continue—it was 1854 before a Washington County pioneer named Jacob Hardy returned from a trip north bringing about a quart of cottonseed tied to his belt, the gift of Sister Nancy Anderson, a Mormon convert from Tennessee.

The seed was carefully planted on a small piece of virgin land. It produced beyond belief, and when the first pods exploded into a handful of snowy fluff, they were sent to Brother Brigham and put on display in his Salt Lake City office.

Other families were sent to pioneer the land. By 1860, there were in Washington County eight small settlements. In 1861, Brigham Young inspected the region.

The outbreak of the Civil War gave impetus to the plan for southern Utah colonization, for with the supply from the Southern States cut off, Utah desperately needed to produce cotton for cloth.

Preceding the October semiannual conference of the church in 1861, articles in the Deseret News extolled the possibilities of Utah's Dixie and encouraged all the saints who could to move in that direction. And, at conference, a list of 300 names, all heads of families, was read with the announcement that they had been selected to go south on a "cotton mission." Besides farmers they included blacksmiths, coopers, carpenters, and two surveyors, as well as the practitioners of many other trades.

The cotton harvest of 1863 produced full bins for the settlements, plus 74,000 pounds that were hauled back to the Mississippi River.

By 1870, the Washington cotton factory for weaving cotton cloth was the largest west of the Mississippi, and, in 1871, the Rio Virgin Manufacturing Co. was organized with capital stock of $100,000.

But the close of the Civil War and the coming of the railroad had changed economic conditions. Utah's Dixie could not compete with the large cotton fields and the mills of the Southern States. Cotton business limped along until 1910. Then the factory was closed, bringing an end to the Dixie cotton mission, a unique page in the colorful history of the American frontier.

The greatest need of the modern West is for water to nourish an expanding population for our cities, for industry, for fruit orchards, and garden plots. Utah's Dixie never again will grow cotton, but we do need water for our growing population. The Dixie project—which I hope to see the 88th Congress authorize—will take a long step in putting the waters of the Virgin River Basin to maximum beneficial use.

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION ARTICLE—COMMISSIONER KEPPEL: MAN WITH A MISSION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Commissioner of Education, the Honorable Francis Keppel, in the time he has served in that important office, has impressed the public and many legislators with his sincerity and dedication.

As the head of the major governmental activity concerned with education at all levels, he has necessarily been in the center of the news. His views and his activities on behalf of the President's comprehensive education program are of widespread interest, particularly in the educational world.

One indication of that is the fact that the May 2 issue of Education, U.S.A., a special weekly report on educational affairs, which is published by the National Education Association is devoted to a most informative article about him.

Because I believe that many Senators would wish to know more about Dean Keppel, his ideas and his aspirations for our schoolchildren and their college and university counterparts, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have alluded be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. President, I should like to express my personal thanks to the National Education Association for having published this timely and informative article on Dean Keppel. To them and to him, go my thanks for the wonderful help they are giving me as Chairman of the Education Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in my work and that of the subcommittee.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Commissioner Keppel: Man With A Mission

In the early days of this 88th Congress, Capitol Hill bore no resemblance whatever to a colony of industrious ants or a hive of busy bees. It was not until the cherry blossoms brought the annual horde of tourists to the Nation's Capital that the Halls and lobbies of the Capitol and its adjacent office buildings presented a scene of bustling activity. Conspicuous in those early days of easygoing tranquility was one figure often seen loping down the long corridors to the committee rooms or the offices of individual legislators, buttonholing and earnestly conversing with them. This was the new U.S. Commissioner of Education, Francis Keppel.

When he is on one of these errands—for they have continued to be his practice—and when he cannot latch on to the Member of Congress he set out to do business with, Keppel is not above taking on administrative assistants and other senior staff members who have much to do with how a Congressman makes up his mind. He is often seen in one of the House dining rooms, bending the ear of a Congressman or a staff member.

Keppel is acting like a man with a mission. He is preaching, day in and day out, to Members of Congress and to anyone else who will listen to him, the urgent need for the program of Federal aid to education which President Kennedy submitted to Congress as the proposed National Education Improvement Act of 1963.

Wherever he goes he is stressing the urgency of the situation. He holds with Emerson that "Our chief want in life is someone who will make us do what we can" and he operates as though he has assumed personal responsibility for getting action in this matter. He quotes Thornton Wilder's "Every good and excellent thing stands moment by moment on the razor edge of danger and must be fought for."

"This good and excellent thing," he is apt to add, "this quality in the educational enterprise, stands on the razor edge of danger from apathy and inadequate finance and must be fought for. There is the challenge to you—to act and to inspire others to action."

The new Commissioner is a bit puzzled that anyone should consider his activities newsworthy. "I haven't done anything," he told Education U.S.A. "Oh, I talk to a lot of people, sure. If you believe in something, as I believe in this program, you just don't talk to yourself about it. You have to tell somebody about it."

Keppel does not mind referring to what he is doing as an old-fashioned sales pitch. "We have to persuade the American people," he adds (with that "we" adroitly lining up whomever he is addressing on his side of the counter). "We have to persuade the American people that the time has come to take a national position on the educational problem. We have talked long enough. We have evaded too long. We need a sense of urgency. Without it, we will not persuade ourselves that education is a matter so vital that solutions must be found to the factors that have blocked a legislative decision." It is because "nobody ever died of a split infinitive" that we have not had the necessary sense of urgency, Keppel says.

NEW BOY IN WASHINGTON

Deft in use of the language, Keppel is not addicted to high-flown phrases of pedagese and has a positive aversion to such talk so that legislators have no difficulty in understanding the points he is trying to make. For all his persistence, he is modest and unpretentious in manner. He takes on the role of "just a new boy in Washington" trying to help with a problem he happened to have some special knowledge of because of his experience as an educator. He does look younger than his 47 years. Tennis helps him keep the trim 155-pound figure he carries on a frame just short of 6 feet tall.

When he came to Washington as Commissioner-designate one of the first things he told his staff was that he preferred to be called Mr. Keppel, for the very good reason that his only earned degree is an A.B. from Harvard. And, with the impish humor that often shows up in his relaxed conversation, he added that there were those who questioned his right to use that verb "earned."

Educators are fond of referring to the teaching profession, but Keppel chose a different word to describe his experience. "After 15 years in the trade," he told his staff, "I have yet to understand what some of the words in pedagogical language mean. My former colleagues at Harvard put this down to a mixture of obstinacy and native ability at slow learning. Whatever the cause, the result is a fixed prejudice in favor of simple English."

Keppel came to Washington well recommended. School and society called him "The Pied Piper of American education." The Christian Science Monitor called him "a ball of fire." Paul Woodring, in the Saturday Review, called him "youthful, vigorous, imaginative, and thoroughly conversant with the educational innovations and reforms that promise to transform our schools."

WAS HARVARD DEAN

After graduating from Harvard in 1938, Keppel studied sculpture in Italy for a year and returned to Harvard as assistant dean of freshmen. During the war he was secretary of the Joint Army and Navy Committee on Welfare and Recreation in Washington and later served as an enlisted man in the Army's Information and Education Division. He returned to Harvard after the war as assistant to the provost and in 1948 James B. Conant, then Harvard president, made him dean of the graduate school of education. There he developed the masters of arts in teaching program and other innovations which have moved the Harvard school to a strong leadership position in the preparation of teachers. During his regime enrollment quadrupled and applications for admissions increased tenfold. The faculty was increased by four times, the endowment was doubled, and he wangled a number of substantial grants from foundations. Reflecting his concern for a reconciliation between the scholars and the educationists, half of the faculty increment during his years as dean of Harvard's education school was drawn from the learned discipline.

Nominated as Commissioner of Education by President Kennedy late in November, Keppel came on to Washington the following month and got to work in the final stages of drafting the omnibus education bill which the White House sent to Congress January 29. The Senate, following the leisurely pace mentioned previously, didn't get around to confirming him until early March after Keppel had been engaged in his "sales pitch" for about 3 months. A month before confirmation, while his status was still that of Commissioner-designate, he had testified before the House Education and Labor Committee in support of the bill.

"These programs," he told the committee, "are addressed to genuine educational needs and the means proposed for meeting these needs are reasonable, prudent, and appropriate for Federal action. They are interrelated and each depends, in greater or lesser degree, on the other for its success."

This observation touched a sensitive nerve for some members of the committee. In this year's approach to meeting the problems of education, President Kennedy had given instructions that a program should be drafted which would "unite the friends of education, instead of its enemies" and out of this came the omnibus bill, combining various proposals for aid to elementary and secondary education and to colleges and universities, all in one package of legislation.

FOR ONE-PACKAGE BILL

So far the approach has worked. The bill is still in one package, and spokesmen both for higher education and for the elementary and secondary schools have given it their endorsement. But various Members of Congress have varying degrees of interest or lack of interest in some parts of the package and there have been gestures toward breaking it down into its components. So far these efforts have been resisted.

Persistently some members of the committee harried Keppel, seeking an expression of preference for one or another feature of the bill, or a list of priorities for use in meeting the needs of education piece by piece. "I would strongly urge," Keppel replied firmly, "that the committee look at the whole enterprise, because it is interrelated. I think it is essential to know that the bill is based on some fundamental lines of reasoning on the appropriate relationship between the Federal Government and education from the elementary schools through the graduate schools."

On another occasion, Keppel put it more bluntly. After describing the separate provisions of the bill and expressing confidence that there is a far greater consensus on need for these steps than one would ever gather from listening to talk about education in general, he added: "The time is past to debate the method of packaging. Let me remind you of President Kennedy's words in his message on education," Keppel added, going on to quote: "For education cannot easily or wisely be divided into separate parts. Each part is linked to the other. The colleges depend on the work of the schools, the schools depend on the colleges for teachers; vocational and technical education is not separate from general education."

IMPACT ON NATIONAL SECURITY

Keppel likes to remind a listener that the road to universal free public education in the United States has not been easy. He quotes one of the pre-Revolutionary Colonial Governors as having thanked God that there were "no free schools or printing" in the

Colonies. "Learning has brought disobedience, and heresy, and sects into the world, and printing has divulged them, and libels against the best government," this early Governor said. "God keep us from both." Things are different now, Keppel adds. "We have recently learned to measure the national strength not alone in military or economic terms, but also in intellectual terms. The national security is inextricably linked to national intellectual power. This is true not alone with regard to science and its applications, but also with regard to knowledge about other societies. What once may have been a scholar's specialty now becomes a national need. We are therefore forced to assess our public education in terms of the national security." Keppel goes on to discuss the relatively recent awareness that there is a relationship between education and economic development. Learned analyses have attributed the growth of this Nation's economy even more to investment in education than to the accumulation of capital.

In the face of these urgent needs, Keppel points out, elementary and secondary schools are up against a taxpayers' revolt. "At just the time that we have come to see the need of raising national standards," he says, "we find ourselves without the local or State ability to do alone what has to be done. The time has come to recognize that the Federal Government has the duty in the national interest to finance specific programs in the schools, on the basis of plans of the States themselves.

"It is argued that the local communities have done a good job already and that there is therefore no need of a Federal program. It is true that in thousands of communities they have done a good job, and that in thousands of others they have done as well as local circumstances will permit. But the sad fact remains that for thousands of young people educational opportunity is on short ration. Furthermore, even our best efforts assume that past standards will be good enough for the future. They will not be, and every indication we have points to the need for improvement."

THE SCHOOLS WE NEED

What kind of schools do we want to meet these new needs, superimposed on the tradition that every American has the right to equal opportunity in education and that our kind of government cannot operate successfully without a well-educated citizenry?

"First we want our schools to be characterized by a restless, compelling urge to improve," says Keppel. "Some, but not enough, of our schools are aware of the urgent need, as never before in history, to improve their educational efforts.

"A second desirable characteristic in our public schools is a climate for learning. Easy to recognize, but hard to pin down to the factors that give rise to it, this does not merely contribute to learning in sufficient amounts, but stimulates the best kinds of learning—those that generate an incurable and permanent zest for learning in the pupil.

"No one can talk for long about the kind of schools we want without giving attention to the kind of teachers we want. Here we want the best, but we have not yet demonstrated that we are willing to pay for the best."

When he gets on the subject of teachers, Keppel is apt to point out that teaching today is much more demanding occupation than it ever was before and that the crying need is for teachers who make a career out of teaching. He mentions that within the next 5 years the Nation will require, in its public elementary and secondary schools, 300,000 more teachers than the 1.5 million now teaching—and the 300,000 figure is the net increase, taking no account of the high turnover rate. The average length of service in the classroom today, Keppel notes, is only 10 years.

"If the present average length of service could be extended," he told the House Education Committee, "it is obvious that the number of new teachers to be recruited each year would be reduced. One teacher on the job for 40 years is the equivalent of eight teachers who serve for only 5 years. This ratio is a main consideration in personnel policy for the schools." The administration's program, Keppel points out, deals directly with this problem in provisions which would assist those States which have low starting salaries and low salary ceilings.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

Keppel is satisfied that the proposed National Education Improvement Act spells out the best practical way in which the Federal Government can help the States to achieve necessary improvement.

"It is a program to meet selected and urgent needs of education at all levels," he says. "To enhance the quality of instruction, and hence the ability to capitalize on individual differences, the program is concerned with preparation and continued improvement of teachers. It also seeks to speed up and expand educational research and demonstration efforts, which are vitally important in coping with our twin problems of explosion of knowledge and rapid increase in enrollment.

"The bill includes provision for a cooperative approach to assist the States in undertaking their own selective and urgent improvements, especially in slums and depressed rural and urban areas. It goes to the heart of the salary problem by proposing to aid in raising top salaries for career teachers and lifting the lowest salaries to a level at which they are truly competitive for recruiting first-rate faculty.

"It provides funds for preparing teachers of the handicapped and for research projects in the special education of such children.

"In vocational education, the legislation is designed to help alleviate and anticipate some of the situations arising from the changes in our industry and technology. The relation of man, training, and job needs attention today as it has never needed it before.

"The bill also proposes to provide library services for those who seek or require educational training beyond the regular formal years of schooling. In order to help provide much greater opportunities for learning by adults, the legislation would authorize grants to States for the expansion of university extension centers, adult basic education programs, and facilities and services in both urban and rural libraries.

"The President also proposes new opportunities for individuals in higher education by expanding and extending the student loan and graduate fellowship programs of the National Defense Education Act.

"The National Education Improvement Act would help colleges and universities to expand and improve their total programs through loans for academic facility construction and grants for libraries, graduate school development, programs of technical education. Aid for construction of public community and junior colleges would bring opportunity for higher education within commuting distance of a growing number of young people."

The present status of the legislation is that the House Education and Labor Committee has completed overall hearings on the bill and various subcommittees are now considering separate aspects of it as they are presented under the various titles of the bill. In the Senate hearings began this week before the Education Subcommittee headed by Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon.

Skeptics abound in Washington. They have seen education bills go down to defeat year after year. But Keppel maintains an air of optimism. "You can find plenty of people who will tell you that we don't have the chance of a snowball in hell," he told Education U.S.A., "but I've been trying to get some of my friends in the press corps to test out how Members of Congress feel about the particular things in this bill. You'd never guess it by listening to people tell you an education bill can't be passed, but there is an amazing amount of agreement on specific provisions contained in this bill. This is truly one case where the sum of the parts is greater than the whole."

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE FRANCIS KEPPEL, U.S. COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Education Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare plans to take testimony upon title IV of S. 580, the administration's comprehensive education bill on May 28, 1963.

It occurs to me that many Senators may wish to present testimony to the subcommittee in connection with this important segment of the President's education program. A recent speech delivered by the U.S. Commissioner of Education, the Honorable Francis Keppel, before the first national conference of the National Committee for Support of the Public Schools, contains factual information which, in my judgment, might be helpful to them.

I ask unanimous consent that Commissioner Keppel's address be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE KIND OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS WE WANT

(By Francis Keppel, U.S. Commissioner of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare)

As Commissioner of Education, I am delighted to be asked to speak to the National Committee for Support of the Public Schools and to have an opportunity to express my thanks for your leadership in focusing attention on our public schools. It is only through wide appeal to public support that substantial improvement can be effected in our educational system.

In the subject given me today, "The Kind of Public Schools We Want," one word gives me pause—the word "we." Is the we for whom I am supposed to speak just you and I? If so, my task is simplified, for you and I might agree on many of the basic issues at stake in public education today. But it occurs to me that you may expect me to try to speak for a broader segment of our population. Perhaps you would want me to include a sizable segment of the educational community: teachers, school administrators, college and university professors and others. Or perhaps I should try to express also the views of parents—parents ranging from those who expect their children to attend Ivy League colleges, parents whose main concern about the education of their children is that they be qualified to get a "good" job when they finish high school, or parents who just do not seem to care at all. You would certainly not want me to speak for just the Office of Education.

I am convinced that a sense of urgency must be created on the need for improvement and strengthening of our public school system. We must do more than preserve hard-won gains. It is for those who share this view that I venture to speak today.

May I remind you that the road to universal free public education in the United States has not been easy. In 1671 a Colonial Governor was able to observe: "I thank God there are no free schools or printing, and I hope we shall not have them these hundred years, for learning has brought disobedience, and heresy, and sects into the world, and printing has divulged them, and libels against the best government. God keep us from both." Only a little more than a century later the leaders of a new Nation "conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal" were identifying universal education as essential to that Nation's future. It was in Virginia, in 1779, that the idea of universal education as a duty of the State was first expressed—by Thomas Jefferson. Had his "bill for the more general diffusion of knowledge" been adopted at that time by the Virginia Legislature, the movement toward universal education might well have been advanced by half a century. Universal elementary education was first practiced in New England, but the idea of universal education as a duty of the State was as distinctly Jeffersonian as the basic framework of the Constitution itself.

The second quarter of the 19th century brought about the establishment of the free public elementary school throughout the North, both in the minds of the people and in the laws of the State. In the South there were substantial beginnings in several States, notably in North Carolina. The Civil War checked educational progress in the North, but it was resumed soon after hostilities ceased. When Lee surrendered at Appomattox 98 years ago today, however, the South had lost virtually its entire educational enterprise. Recovery was painfully slow. As late as 1900 no southern State had a compulsory school attendance law. Only about two-thirds of the school age population was enrolled, and the educational attainment level was relatively low. We do well to remember that, whereas public education in the North is the product of a century and a half of progress interrupted only briefly, in the South it represents an advance achieved in only a little more than half a century, in the face of difficulties compounded by a multitude of economic and social problems.

Today we may be justly proud of our accomplishments in education in the United States. Over 96 percent of the total population aged 6 through 17 is enrolled in public or nonpublic schools. Eighty percent of the children 16 and 17 years of age are enrolled in school. Below the college level, then, education in the United States can best be described as free, compulsory, and nearly universal. More than 65 percent of the secondary school-age group graduates from secondary school. Moreover, about half the graduates of American high schools enter college, and many others enroll in commercial, trade, and technical schools not associated with colleges and universities. This quantitative growth has been accompanied by substantial qualitative gains. But we cannot afford the luxury of judging our schools by the past, however much progress has been made. The question is not whether our schools are better—they are—but whether they are good enough for the day in which we live.

The potential teachers, doctors, scientists—indeed both the leaders and the followers in all professions—of the 1970's and the years immediately beyond are already moving through our secondary schools.

As we think about the kind of public schools we want, it seems to me important to assess first the reasons we want them. Two arguments have such long standing in our history that they have become accepted, I believe, by all the people. The first is that in our society every child has the right to an equal opportunity to make his own way, and it has become recognized that the schools are an essential ingredient in this process. No man or woman can compete successfully in modern society without, at the very least, an education through the secondary school. As I will note later, this fact is becoming clearer every day as we try to solve our problems of unemployment.

Since the founding of the Republic, the American citizen has always known that our kind of government cannot operate unless the individual citizen is able to understand the issues on which we must vote. This obviously requires more than the ability alone to read and write: It requires an understanding of historical forces and increasingly of the effect of science on society.

Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, in an address at the opening general session, National Conference on Higher Education, Association for Higher Education, Chicago, March 3, 1963, noted a drastic change in the relationship between science and economic creativity and between science and society as a whole during the last quarter of a century. The enormous explosion of fundamental knowledge and the growing consciousness of the power and potential of that knowledge has brought about a sort of marriage of economic creativity and science which combine to demand more from our public schools. The laws of science span all national and ideological boundaries. This makes science a universal language, a link between nations and a real potential force for progress and peace. Understanding of science, therefore, is coming to be a part of life.

I need not, I am sure, emphasize these points to this audience. But it does seem necessary to make it clear that these responsibilities of public education must never be forgotten as we consider the new demands placed upon it in the middle of this century. New demands do not replace the old: They rather add to them and give them profounder meaning.

The first of these considerations is the role that education plays in the position of the United States in the world today. We have recently learned to measure the national strength not alone in military or economic terms, but also in intellectual terms. The national security is inextricably linked to national intellectual power. This is not alone true with regard to science and its applications, but also to knowledge about other societies. What may once have been a scholar's specialty now becomes a national need. We are therefore forced to assess our public education in terms of the national security.

A second new consideration grows from recent analyses of the relation of education to economic development.

A growing body of evidence indicates that the development of human capital—particularly investment in education—has actually been more important as a source of economic growth than has the accumulation of physical capital. Education contributes directly to economic growth because it improves the quality of the labor force; it contributes indirectly but significantly because it is the source of the research scientists and engineers responsible for much of our technological advance.

It has been estimated, in fact, that in recent years our investment in education has been responsible for up to 40 percent of the Nation's growth and productivity. It is an investment which results in higher wages and greater purchasing power for the worker and in the new products and techniques which come from trained minds.

In the light of these assessments we may turn to the kind of public schools we want. First, we want our schools to be characterized by a restless, compelling urge to improve. "The greatest of faults," wrote Carlyle, "is to be conscious of none." I have the impression that some—though not enough—of our schools are aware of the urgent need, as never before in history, to improve their educational efforts. One cannot visit our classrooms and talk with our teachers without realizing that American education is in ferment and that winds of change are being generated by unprecedented problems. This is an exciting—as well as dangerous—time to be alive, no less in education than in politics, international relations, or nuclear science.

The second characteristic I should like to identify as desirable in our public schools is a climate for learning. Easy to recognize, but hard to pin down to the factors that give rise to it, this does not merely contribute to learning in sufficient amounts, but stimulates the best kinds of learning—those that generate an incurable and permanent zest for learning in the pupil. There is a question of balance at this point. The teacher who generates the right climate for learning steers a precarious course between the Scylla of overemphasis on mastery of fundamentals and the Charybdis of excessive permissiveness. The history of the educational process is one which reflects alternate periods of overemphasis of the one and the other of the two essential activities of acquiring and inquiring. If I may compound metaphors, may I observe that today there seems to be some evidence that we are, hopefully, at least reducing the range of the oscillations of our educational pendulum.

No one can talk for long about the kind of schools we want without giving attention to the kind of teachers we want. Here we want the best, but we have not yet demonstrated that we are willing to pay for the best. It seems to me that we give too little attention to the fact that teaching is a far more demanding, far more complex task than it used to be. Not too many years ago—perhaps when our fathers were in grade school the world of learning was a much neater, more compact, confining, and even cozier, place. The classroom, with its master, was often relatively isolated from the mainstream of world progress. The teacher, backed by the few texts he selected, was considered a source of information without peer—or at least without contradiction. In the business of cultivating the mind, the average teacher a generation ago had little competition from newspapers or magazines, and not much more from books.

Contemplate for a moment what changes have been wrought within a generation or two. Today's teacher may be as dedicated as his predecessor and is probably better prepared in many instances. But what forces of sight and sound assail him and his pupils at every turn? His interpretations of political events are overshadowed by hosts of experts on radio and television; his discussions of geography and foreign customs pale before the wonders of 16 mm. technicolor; his readings of Shakespeare or Shaw must compete with films or records of Evans and Olivier. The modern teacher is not defeated, dismayed, or overwhelmed by these innovations. On the other hand he makes use of them eagerly, effectively. But in order to do so he must operate at an entirely different level of educational sophistication than his predecessors.

As I see the situation, this means that the personnel problem lies at the heart of achieving the kind of public school we want. As we consider the very large numbers of teachers that will be required, and the increasing need for specialization, we must, I believe, face up to the need for personnel reorganization. We must find ways to ensure that a higher proportion of our staff become "careerists." To accomplish this we need substantially to raise the top salaries for those whose larger responsibilities or greater degree of specialization justify such higher pay. I hope that public education will continue and extend its present experimentation with such methods as team teaching, at both the elementary and secondary level, and other ways of achieving the goal.

We cannot bring about schooling that is effective in individual cases without more internal flexibility, and greater specialization and stronger direction within the individual school.

Yet the kind of public school we want cannot be the result of pedagogical policy or techniques alone.

There is little doubt that pupils bring into the classroom with them more attitudes drawn from their homes and neighborhoods than they learn in school. Those attitudes toward life and learning probably do more toward setting academic standards than the combined efforts of teachers, testing organizations, and publishers, or actions by regional or national educational agencies.

There is an extreme variety of attitudes, ranging from those of the underprivileged urban centers to those of the wealthy suburban compounds. There is the sheer preoccupation with survival in sections of the big cities. There is the tenseness and the drive for status among the professional families. And there are all the shades of attitudes and pressures in between.

Unfortunately, despite these variances, there is still a widespread tendency to think of our schools as more or less interchangeable from one community to the next and to feel that they can be measured by a fixed standard—like the percentage who go on to college, for instance. Rather, we should be seeking a moving standard of progress toward goals set by the needs of the individual, the domestic economy, and international demands facing the Nation—a standard moving toward even higher goals of quality.

From this consideration I draw the conclusion that we must face the fact that under some circumstances, perhaps particularly in the great cities, society must provide services for disadvantaged children that are not the normal responsibility of the school. If we really mean what we say in wanting equal opportunity for every child, we will probably need to help these children and their families to understand the role of education both in their lives and in the society as a whole and to give them services that are not otherwise necessary.

Please do not misunderstand me: I regard the primary task of the schools as that of teaching and not of becoming a substitute for other social services. But in the public schools we want, there must be an eager desire to cooperate with other agencies of the society, both public and private, to accomplish the goal.

The public schools we want must of course be designed to prepare young people for a broad variety of college programs. It is a matter of equal urgency that they provide adequate training opportunities for the 21 million young people now in elementary and secondary schools who will enter the labor market without a college degree in the 1960's. These young people must receive the kind of education and training opportunities suited to the changing times. We must also be planning for the training and retraining of additional millions of workers whose skills and technical knowledge must be updated, as well as those whose jobs may well disappear because of automation and economic change.

Public schools of the kind we want cost money, a lot of money. In the foreseeable future, this cost will continue to rise even if we merely accommodate sheer numbers and do nothing at all to improve the quality. For a long time, there have been vast gaps between needs and resources, not only among the separate States but often among the school districts of some of the richer States.

Even though poorer States often make a greater tax effort for education than the richer ones, the level of their educational support is often far short of what is customarily regarded as adequate. Much has been said about the need to improve equality of opportunity, to remove disparities of slums and suburbs, to maximize our potentialities for national growth through trained human capital. Several years ago, James B. Conant estimated that by 1958 the "educational deficit," the difference between what was spent and what should have been spent, for the public schools was between $7 and $8 billion per year. The Achilles heel of education is that it goes on, in one form or another, despite all obstacles, these serving only to sap its quality. Sometimes I wish neglect of education could cause it to come to a halt. Perhaps then our concern would become commensurate with the need.

The need is for a kind of public school in which:

1. The staff is rigorously prepared in the subject they teach, and in which it is a matter of routine for career teachers to return to the university to keep up to date with the latest advances in knowledge and techniques.

2. There is available a variety of equipment, including television, films, and programed instruction, which will make possible that combination of large group, small class, and individual instruction which will allow the school to adjust its instruction to the individual student. What has long been an aim of educators, whether conservative or progressive, is now possible if we can reorganize our allocation of staff and pupil time. This means that the public school we want is one which is as eager to be informed of the results of educational research and development as it is cautious of fads that have not been tested.

3. There is available a detailed diagnosis of each pupil's educational health, his strengths and weaknesses, in a form so compact as to be useful to each teacher. This goal too has long been sought, and modern data-processing methods and ways of storing and finding information now make it a possibility. The school we want must combine the efficiency of the modern factory with the warmth of the tutor's study.

4. The atmosphere is one of constant self-analysis and comparison. The public school we want is one that enjoys competition. It will have the courage to want to test itself against standards that it sets for itself as well as standards that the society sets for all. It must have that freedom and security from external domination that allows it to develop its own style, yet does not permit the lowering of standards. Only quality in staff and proper financing can bring us to this goal.

We are far from reaching these goals. Our needs are far from our present resources.

As we go forward along this path, we must be prepared for vigorous criticism. It is always easier to accept arguments for the status quo. Only a sense of urgency, based on the considerations that I have ventured to bring to your attention, will bring about the changes that we need. I am convinced that all children, whatever their so-called native ability, can learn far more than they now learn. We have in recent years moved ahead in increasing the pace of those with marked academic abilities—though not enough. We are, I think, doing better with those who suffer from learning disabilities—though not well enough. Anyone who has ever seen a boy, regardless of IQ, come alive in wanting to learn something knows the miracles of the human mind. The kind of public school we want is the kind of school in which such miracles are as natural an event as the school bus or the lunch hour. This is a typically American goal. It is an ideal that must be carried out despite a host of difficulties. Surely the result will justify all our efforts.

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE IVAN A. NESTINGEN, UNDER SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on April 3, 1963, the Honorable Ivan A. Nestingen, Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, spoke before a forum on Federal Aid to Education at the University of Illinois in Urbana, Ill., on the general subject of the case for Federal aid to education.

Because of the timeliness of this statement, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CASE FOR FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

(by Ivan A. Nestingen, Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare)

Just a little over 2 months ago, President Kennedy sent to the Congress a message on education together with his legislative proposals for a comprehensive program of Federal aid entitled the "National Education Improvement Act of 1963."

This is not the first Presidential message on education. It is President Kennedy's third successive annual appeal to the Congress for legislation which would come to the aid of American education. It does not make any shattering new revelations concerning the condition of American education. It tells the Congress what responsible citizens in and out of Government have been saying year after year for more than a decade: That education is in crisis and that the Federal Government shares responsibility for meeting this crisis.

What is new in the President's message this year is the urgency surrounding our efforts to find solutions to education's many problems. Public debate on vital national issues is an integral part of the democratic process, but this debate, to be fruitful, must lead to a resolution of the differences that tend to divide and immobilize us. It has not done so on the matter of Federal assistance to education, with the result that with each year of inaction the problems of education have grown deeper and more difficult to solve. President Kennedy has declared that endless debate over all these complicated and sensitive questions is a luxury that we can no longer afford. We are at a point in history when we can put off facing and resolving these problems only at our peril as a free society.

The foremost problem facing American education today is a problem of financing. Education is expensive. No one disputes that. The cost of education has risen spectacularly, and the end is not in sight.

A number of complex, interrelated factors have contributed to the rising costs of education. First, there is the growth of our population, the sheer numbers of students who fill our schools and colleges. There is, second, the rapid expansion of knowledge, the birth of a new age of science which has profoundly affected the substance of education and has established a climate of change to which education must be alert and responsive.

And there is the promise of democracy itself, the rising expectations of millions of individuals for higher personal achievement through broadened educational opportunities.

Let us look first at the quantitative dimensions of American education.

In respect to size, we can say that education is this Nation's biggest business. More than 50 million individuals are directly involved in the teaching and learning process. More than one-fourth of our population is enrolled this year in our schools and colleges. But this is not a static figure. Enrollments have increased by more than 50 percent since 1950 and are expected to skyrocket during the sixties. During the sixties college enrollments will nearly double, and the number of high school students will increase by 50 percent.

The physical plant needed to accommodate this huge and rising number of students is no less than gigantic. For the elementary and secondary schools alone, we need more than 1½ million classrooms. We were short 121,000 classrooms at the beginning of the school year, and current construction will amount to only half that. Meanwhile, the numerical needs continue to grow. A concerted effort to speed up construction is quite evidently needed, and needed now. We cannot wait indefinitely to provide adequate educational facilities to the millions of school children who otherwise are forced to attend school in double shifts or overcrowded classrooms or in dangerous and unhealthy surroundings.

I have mentioned only the grade schools. The situation facing our colleges and universities is equally critical. The Nation's 2,000 institutions of higher education today are serving more than 4 million students. By 1970 at least 7 million students will be knocking at their gates. Who will teach them? And where will they be taught?

It takes about 2 years to build a campus building from the time of contracting to its completion for student use. Two years from now the first large wave of college applicants will hit our institutions across the country. This is the bumper crop of babies born in 1946, just after World War II. They will be succeeded by other large waves of students seeking college entrance. You can visualize the size of the problem when you realize that the college age population in the United States in the 1950's increased 335,000 or 3.8 percent. In this present decade it will increase 5,216,000 or 56.5 percent. So when people mention the tidal wave of students headed toward our colleges, they are using an accurate figure of speech. It is no exaggeration. Clearly, we must expand our facilities for higher education, and we cannot afford to wait another year.

The pressure of quantity inevitably is reflected in the impaired quality of American education. The best teacher in the world cannot do effective work in overcrowded classrooms and outmoded facilities. But these are not education's only shortcomings. Just as we have neglected education's physical needs, we have paid too little heed to the quality of instruction.

We have been wringing our hands for years over the plight of the teaching profession, but we have done far too little to improve it. While the salaries of teachers have risen considerably in some parts of the country, their improved financial status is by no means universal or commensurate with the responsibility they bear educating the Nation's youth.

Too many teachers are not adequately prepared to teach the subjects assigned to them. This year about 83,000 fulltime teachers failed to meet full State certification standards. Few teachers have the opportunity to repair their shortcomings or to refresh and update their knowledge. Graduate study is often out of reach geographically as well as financially.

And the incentive for professional improvement is not very great. Why should teachers be asked to make substantial personal sacrifices when the rewards are so limited? No other professional group is treated quite so shabbily, and the result of this attitude is evident in the weakened quality of American education. A massive effort to raise the status of teachers and to improve their training is imperative if we expect our schools and colleges to do their assigned work.

And what is that task? Is education just a private affair, a matter of concern only to the individual, his community, and his State? Or is it not also a public affair, a matter of deep and unending concern to the Federal Government as well as to the States and the private sectors of our society?

The answer to that question was settled early in our Nation's history. Education has always been the concern of the Federal Government, and the Federal Government has long been involved in the support of education. This has continued from the time of the Northwest Ordinances of 1785 and 1787 to the present day. Federal participation in education at all levels of instruction is and has long been an established and respected tradition.

Under the Morrill Act, enacted a century ago, the Federal Government aided in the creation of our land-grant colleges. Later, the Federal Government stimulated the development of vocational education. The Federal Government now provides loans for college dormitories. It supports the training of science, math, and foreign language teachers. It helps to support rural libraries, counseling and guidance programs, cooperative educational research, and the development of new educational media. Only last year the Congress authorized Federal participation in the construction of new educational television facilities across the country.

In these and many other programs, the Federal Government has acted as a partner with the States and local communities and private institutions of higher education in the development and strengthening of American education.

It has never been the dominant, controlling partner in education, and no one is suggesting that it should be. Throughout the history of American education, the role of the Federal Government has been selective and stimulative, and we are proposing that it continue to fulfill that historic role.

The argument that "Federal money means Federal control" is nonsense. It has no basis in fact. Not a single shred of evidence has been brought forward to substantiate that charge. On the contrary, the evidence showed clearly that there has been no Federal control in any Federal education program.

The possibility of Federal control in the future is so remote that it cannot fairly be called a threat. The careful manner in which the laws are written and their careful administration by conscientious civil servants who themselves are opposed to Federal control are powerful guarantees against the invasion by the Central Government of local rights and responsibilities.

Let me put this matter of Federal participation in education into more meaningful perspective. The total national expenditure for education today is somewhere in the neighborhood of $30 billion. The Federal outlay for education is about $3 billion, but less than half that sum is spent in direct grants to schools and colleges. The remainder goes out in the form of loans, which will be returned to the Treasury with interest, and in payment for educational services which the Federal Government purchases from educational institutions, research and training which are necessary for the national defense and the national welfare.

The fact is that the Federal Government's expenditures in direct aid to education represent only 4 percent of the total national expenditure for education. This cannot be fairly judged as vast and threatening. The Federal Government is in no way a major partner in financing the Nation's biggest business, the business of education.

Nor is anyone suggesting that the Federal Government should assume a dominant role in education. We are suggesting, however, that the Federal Government take up a larger share of the cost of supporting American education. We are suggesting that the Federal Government increase its expenditures in direct aid to education from the present 4 percent to 6 or 8 percent. Surely this does not imply that the Federal Government is taking over education.

What this money would mean to the States and higher education is that they would be able to carry out more effectively their own responsibilities for educating the people of this Nation. The margin of expenditure represented by our proposals for Federal aid would mean the difference between the uneven quality and opportunity for education that now exists among the separate States and a strong system of education where excellence would be universal and every individual would enjoy equal opportunity to develop his talents to the fullest.

The States and private institutions of higher education cannot afford the entire load of this extra financial effort which spells the difference between excellence and mediocrity. No one knows better than the members of the school boards and college trustees what is needed today to bring education up to the highest standards of excellence.

The fact is that traditional resources for the support of education are not adequate today to meet our expanded needs. The dependence of many communities on property taxes alone to provide revenues for the schools is not realistic. The burden of the regressive property tax is becoming too heavy on the homeowner and small businessman. Supplemental financial aid from other sources is essential to meet our bourgeoning school costs at all levels of education.

Where a community is fortunate enough to have adequate resources, usually industrial property or residential property of high value, its schools are usually excellent. But local school revenues vary consideraby from district to district and from State to State with the result that the quality of education throughout our land is very uneven.

The migration from farm to city and from city to suburb that has been going on for some decades has compounded even further the problems of the schools and has made the uneven quality of education among our States a matter of national concern.

Residents of high income States with better than average schools must often move and enroll their children in less than average schools in low income States. And children from impoverished schools, moving to other communities, carry their educational handicaps with them. The burden of repairing these handicaps falls heavily on a relatively small proportion of the Nation, especially on our largest cities.

Federal aid to education would help to equalize the quality of education and the cost of education by selective and stimulative support from the general public purse to those areas of education where such aid will benefit all.

Most of our proposals are not new. They have been put before the public year after year by both Republican and Democratic administrations. Yet, year after year they have failed to pass.

One reason for this, we believe, is that these measures have always been treated piecemeal when they are, in fact, vitally dependent on each other and need to be viewed as a whole, just as education needs to be viewed as an integral force within the whole structure of our society.

For the first time now, the Congress has been presented in a single, comprehensive measure a full and detailed proposal for Federal action in support of education.

The National Education Improvement Act would enable the Federal Government to assume its proper share of responsibility for education within the legal framework established by the Constitution and reinforced by years of active, effective partnership in the progress and growth of the American educational system.

It would not, in any way, usurp the rights of the States and local communities or infringe on their responsibilities for education.

Its goals fall into three basic categories:

First, the improvement of the quality of education in the schools and colleges.

Second, an increase in the capacity of our institutions to receive and educate an increasing number of students.

Third, the expansion of opportunities for education for both young people and adults.

The bill contains 24 distinct components which pinpoint those areas of need where Federal aid is both appropriate and necessary. Specific aid programs now in force would be continued and, in some cases, expanded. In addition, the bill would authorize construction loans to public and private colleges. It would establish a new program of grants to public and private institutions for building and expanding graduate schools, libraries, and technical education facilities. It would help the States to establish a much larger number of public junior colleges.

The bill would aid elementary and secondary education by grants to the States for increasing maximum and beginning teachers' salaries, for emergency school construction, and for special projects to improve educational quality and opportunity, particularly in slums and other depressed areas.

It would improve the quality of education throughout the Nation by helping to strengthen teacher training programs in colleges and universities and by expanding educational research and demonstration programs.

It would expand opportunities for education by enlarging the scope of the college student loan and graduate fellowship programs, by instituting a new work-study program which would give college students more opportunity to work their way through school, and by offering financially pressed middle-income families increased private credit for long-term student loans backed up by a Federal insurance fund.

It would expand both the quality and quantity of education available to millions of handicapped children, the blind and deaf and crippled, the mentally retarded and emotionally disturbed. Less than one-third of the Nation's handicapped children now have access to the special education they need.

Finally, the bill would open up new educational opportunities for all adult Americans. It would provide much needed help to the States for the expansion of adult basic education programs to eliminate illiteracy that now blights the lives of some 8 million Americans over the age of 25. It would expand university extension centers and support urban as well as rural library services so that all adult Americans can continue their education beyond the formal years of schooling.

The Federal Government cannot and should not attempt to solve all education's many complex problems. It cannot and should not take over responsibility for education. But the Federal Government can and should step forward to shoulder those responsibilities which lie clearly within the scope of its constitutional limitations and which it is already carrying to a lesser degree.

Education is of paramount concern to the Federal Government because it is fundamental to the well-being of this Nation. President Kennedy, aptly and eloquently, has called education "the keystone in the arch of freedom and progress."

It is just that, and this Nation cannot afford to allow education to weaken. It is a primary factor in our national economic growth and essential to our national security. It is the means to personal achievement and a significant element in personal happiness. It is the bedrock of this free and open society.

The responsibility of the Federal Government clearly involves promoting the cause of education. For in so doing it promotes the general welfare and helps to secure the blessings of liberty for this generation and the generations to follow.

We are asking that the Federal Government take up its responsibilities for education without further delay.

HOOSIER PHYSICIAN HONORED BY JAPANESE GOVERNMENT

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I rise to call attention to my distinguished colleagues that one of Indiana's foremost physicians, Dr. Walter A. Compton, who also is executive vice president of Miles Laboratories, Inc., at Elkhart, Ind., has been decorated with Japan's Order of the Rising Sun as well as being made honorary member of the Society for Preservation of Japanese Art Swords.

On February 23, 1963, I had the pleasure of visiting in the office of Dr. Compton and admiring many of his prized sword treasures, which number somewhere between 350 and 400 swords along with his valuable library on the subject.

Dr. Compton recently went to Japan to attend the Japanese Medical Association Congress, and with him he carried an unobtrusive shotgun case in which was an externally nondescript-appearing sword, slightly curved and about 3 feet in length. The shotgun case carried one of the Japanese people's most important cultural art properties, a blade identified by them with the spirit, or "kami," of one of the country's foremost national shrines.

Dr. Compton returned to Japan the 700-year-old samurai sword, which he has identified as a Bizen Saburo Kunimune, one of the three most valuable Japanese swords among that nation's national treasures.

The story of Dr. Compton's discovery of the valuable art treasure has been told in the Elkhart Truth by Bettie East. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that Miss East's story appear at the close of my remarks so that my distinguished colleagues can learn how this physician gave up a rare treasure for himself and returned to the Japanese people a piece of art highly prized by them—an act which I believe clearly demonstrates the American people's love of art and their respect for the culture and traditions of her neighbors throughout the world.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Elkhart (Ind.) Truth, Apr. 29, 1963]

ELKHARTAN RETURNS NATIONAL TREASURE TO JAPAN—FIND BY DR. COMPTON BRINGS DECORATION

(By Bettie East)

Dr. Walter A. Compton, executive vice president of Miles Laboratories, Inc., was carrying a shotgun case when he departed for Japan late in March to attend a Japanese Medical Association Congress.

In the case was an externally nondescript-appearing sword, slightly curved and about 3 feet in length, which, to the uninformed, would appear to be of no particular value.

Dr. Compton returned here about a week ago, without the blade, but decorated with Japan's Order of the Rising Sun and bearing the distinction of an honorary member of the Society For Preservation of Japanese Art Swords.

The shotgun case which Dr. Compton guarded so closely on his jet flight to Tokyo was used to return to the Japanese people one of their most important cultural art properties, a blade identified by them with the spirit, or "kami," of one of that country's foremost national shrines.

Dr. Compton returned to Japan the 700-year-old Samurai sword which he had identified as a Bizen Saburo Kunimune, one of the three most valuable Japanese swords among that nation's national treasures.

The Kunimune (the name identifies it as the product of its 13th century smith, Saburo Kunimune of Bizen) is the first sword designated a national treasure to be returned to Japan after World War II. There were 42 blades considered national treasures or important art objects lost in the confusion of the war's ending.

How the blade traveled from a national shrine in the southern Kyushu Province of Japan to a souvenir collection in eastern United States is not known, and, as Dr. Compton said, is immaterial. At the end of the war Gen. Douglas MacArthur directed that all Japanese national monuments, including such swords, should be respected by occupying forces.

The Kunimune, which Dr. Compton presented to the Society for the Preservation of Japanese Art Swords for display in the National Museum at Tokyo, is the hereditary treasure, or kami, of the Satsuma clan, one of the great clans of Kyushu, the southernmost island of Japan. The warlike clan, founded in about A.D. 1200, contributed many military leaders to Japan's history.

The sword had been continually in Shimazu (Satsuma clan) family possession since the beginning of the 13th century. In the 1920's it was dedicated to the national shrine in the Satsuma Province—the Terukuni Jinja, at Kagoshima—by a descendant of the former feudal lords of Shimazu, to mark the 700th anniversary of the family's founding.

Dr. Compton considers his identification of the sword as the Kunimune a connecting link in a chain of coincidence. But one of Japan's top ranking authorities on the art of blades said, "I choose to agree with you—but, I call it providential."

The many coincidences, or, if you will, acts of providence, which led to the sword's recognition are evident in Dr. Compton's account of his discovery. Contrary to earlier national press service reports that Dr. Compton had purchased the sword from a west coast dealer, the sword was shrouded in anonymity in the weapons collection of a Pennsylvania resident, and actual identification was made in Dr. Compton's study at his home here.

A collector for 30 years, Dr. Compton is constantly searching for Japanese artifacts, swords in particular, and in his travels makes it a point to contact other blade collectors and antique dealers. Four years ago on a personal jaunt to Pennsylvania, he stopped at Hagerstown, Md. While there he became acquainted with a gun collector, and asked the man to contact him if ever he ran into any blades in which he thought Dr. Compton might be interested.

The man telephoned Dr. Compton late in February and said he was traveling from Pittsburgh, Pa., to Chicago the first week in March and had a few things to show him.

PURCHASES TWO OF COLLECTION

Upon the collector's arrival in Elkhart, Dr. Compton examined the proffered items and found all but two of little consequence. He purchased the two which had aroused his interest, and explained to the dealer that the one, he felt sure, was of "great importance." Just how important he did not realize at cursory examination.

The pair talked until midnight. The collector told Dr. Compton he had had the blade several years, and, to his recollection, had picked it up in a collection of souvenirs. On several occasions he had considered giving the blade, and its simple wooden sheath, to a clergyman friend in view of the fact that markings on the blade appeared to be of religious significance.

IDENTIFIES SWORD FROM PHOTOGRAPH

After his visitor left, Dr. Compton browsed through his vast library of books and photographs of Japanese sword art. At 2:30 in the morning he identified the Kunimune from a photograph.

On March 25 Dr. Compton wrote the Tokyo National Museum. "After careful consideration, it is my determination that this blade should be returned to Japan," he wrote. "It is additionally my hope that it can be retained with other great masterpieces of this art in the custody of the Tokyo National Museum where students can have ready access to it.

"It is a great pleasure to donate it to the Japanese nation," he concluded.

Acknowledgment of his offer came promptly from Nagatake Asano, director of the Tokyo National Museum, and Moritatsu Hosokawa, president of the Society for Preservation of Japanese Art Swords.

On his first day in Tokyo Dr. Compton turned the sword over to society members at the museum. Honorary membership in the society also was conferred on the Elkhart physician, and he was given two rare short swords as gifts.

NOTES MEMBERSHIP CERTIFICATE

Dr. Compton's membership certificate hails his "distinguished contribution over the years for the cause of preservation and artistic appreciation of Japanese swords."

The next morning the museum displayed 25 of its most important blades for Dr. Compton's examination. This was followed by the ceremony at which the Fourth Cross of the Rising Sun was conferred on the Elkhartan. The ceremony took place in the office of Shunsaku Kawahara, chairman of the Cultural Assets Protection Commission.

He called attention to the coincidence that in an "area of more than 3,000 square miles and among 200 million people where the artistic character and importance of these swords remains almost wholly unknown, one of the few individual students of that art capable of recognizing it would chance to encounter and identify it."

Many years of study have brought his knowledge of the subject, collection of blades and library to the point of today. His current collection numbers 350 to 400 blades.

He considers his library of some 300 or more volumes as important as his blades.

UNRECOGNIZED ART FORM

Dr. Compton explained that his interest lies in his belief that these swords represent an unrecognized art form which he believes comparable to Grecian architecture and Italian painting. He said he also is interested in steel as differentiated from iron. Steel is man-made, it doesn't exist in nature, and he considers it one of man's most important discoveries in material form. In blademaking the great art represented in steelmaking is controlled to the point where it becomes a thing of beauty, he said.

AMERICAN VETERINARY MEDICAL ASSOCIATION CENTENNIAL

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, it is indeed a pleasure and an honor to congratulate the American Veterinary Medical Association on the occasion of its centennial celebration.

The veterinarian is a friend who helps a child's pet when it is sick or injured. To the dog and cat owners, he is the man who immunizes their pets.

To the farmer, he is important in preventing economic loss from sick or dead livestock. He vaccinates the pigs, tends to a sick cow, or helps a mare to foal.

In addition to his contributions to the health and welfare of domestic pets and livestock, this highly skilled professional man has an equally important role in the fields of meat inspections, disease prevention, disease control and research.

Through meat inspection, the American farmer is assured of a continuing market for his livestock, and the consumer is assured of wholesomeness, freedom from disease, and cleanliness of meat and meat food products.

The purity of America's milk supply is guaranteed through the milk and dairy inspection work carried on by the veterinarian.

Bovine tuberculosis, once responsible for the high mortality rate among infants, has been practically eradicated in the United States. Also well on the way to eradication, through the efforts of veterinarians, is brucellosis, which can be transmitted to humans who drink unpasteurized milk, or who handle meat from infected cattle and swine.

Through their work with animals, veterinarians have laid the foundation for controlling diseases communicable to man. This is evidenced by progress toward the eradication of rabies, as well as in the fields of meat and milk inspection. Control of parasites transmitted to humans by animals has been another field in which veterinarians have led the way to better health for both animals and humans. Some of the medicines developed with the help of veterinarians to prevent diseases in livestock have been found to be effective for use in man.

Research is carried on by veterinarians in a continuous effort to learn how infectious diseases and harmful parasites are transmitted to domestic animals and livestock. This research develops and improves methods for diagnosis, control, or prevention of diseases and eradication of conditions which contribute to them.

Veterinarians safeguard the health and comfort of our ever-increasing numbers of pet animals. They have a key responsibility in the fur industry since more and more pelts are produced on fur farms. They have a responsibility for the health of the animals in our zoos. They are constantly on the alert to prevent deadly foreign animal diseases from entering the United States. They have been leaders in the campaign for more humane treatment.

In this centennial year of 1963, it is also of special significance that the recently established School of Veterinary Science and Medicine at Purdue University will graduate its first class of doctors of veterinary medicine.

The profession of veterinary medicine is worthy of the admiration and the appreciation of the people of the United States and of other nations. It is characterized by high ideals. Its professional societies have made constant efforts to improve their service to man through advancing the health and development of the animal population.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. HUMPHREY obtained the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend the time for my remarks 5 minutes.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President——

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, a point of order. The morning business has been concluded. I do not believe it is necessary for the Senator to obtain permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President——

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall be brief.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I rise to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ALLOTT. I do not oppose the request by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. As I read the time from the clock, the morning hour expired at 1:20. Therefore, if the senior Senator from Minnesota wishes to extend his time for 5 minutes, he may extend his time to approximately 1:27 p.m.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It will not be necessary, now that the morning business has been concluded. However, I shall be brief.

Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the morning business has been concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business has been concluded, pursuant to the extension requested by the majority leader.

AMENDMENT OF LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 537) to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill, S. 537, to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to express thanks to the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] who has been most patient. I understand that he has an important message to deliver today. I shall not take much time. I assure the Senator that we will cooperate with him.

TENSIONS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, last week several Senators focused our attention on the extremely ominous developments in the Middle East. The distinguished senior Senator from New

York [Mr. JAVITS] and other Senators alerted us to the growing tensions in the area, and dramatized the serious threat to the continued existence of Israel. Over and above these facts the Senators made it clear to us that tension and instability in the Middle East confront the whole world with a clear and present danger. The current troubles in the Middle East cannot be swept under the rug; they exist and in their possible ramifications they involve the most serious implications for our national security.

Indeed, it is almost superfluous to point out that the Middle East is now, has been since the 1940's, and conceivably will continue to be one of those areas in the world which could spawn world war III in a matter of hours. Our national interest and the interests of the whole free world are closely bound to what happens in the Middle East. If the area falls under the domination of international communism, the forces of freedom will have suffered a grave setback. If the commercial lifeline of some of our European allies is cut at its weakest point, namely, in the Middle East, the results could be catastrophic. Finally, if the freest and most progressive state in the area—the Republic of Israel—is snuffed out, our words in support of democracy will sound hollow indeed. We cannot afford to sacrifice the independence of Israel under any circumstances. Equally, we cannot stand by idly while the Middle East becomes a sanctuary for the gathering forces of world conflict.

Time after time, Mr. President, world peace has been placed in extreme jeopardy by events in the Middle East. Recall the Arab-Israeli warfare which erupted with the declaration of Israeli independence 15 years ago. The conclusion of an armistice bottled up the tensions for a while but did not dissolve them. Since that time, the Arab States—whatever their internal bickerings and feuds—have been committed to one unalterable aim: the physical destruction of the independent State of Israel. The United States, Britain, and France—in the Tripartite Declaration of May 1950—have gone on record as guaranteeing the status quo in the Middle East as far as frontiers, lines of demarcation, and armed forces were concerned. Nevertheless, we all remember the Egyptian fedayeen attacks on Israel which led to the Sinai campaign of 1956 and the British-French invasion of Suez. We recall Nasser's seizure of the Suez Canal and the subsequent arms buildup, which could not have taken place without the irresponsible assistance of the Soviet Union. We remember the Iraqi revolution of 1958, the internal difficulties of the free Government of Lebanon, and the timely move of the 6th Fleet to Lebanon in the summer of 1958. Just to highlight subsequent developments, let us recall the Royalist versus Republican conflict in Yemen, which started last summer, the danger of full-scale warfare between Saudi Arabia and the U.A.R., the unceasing propaganda emanating from Radio Cairo, the second Iraqi revolution early this year, and finally the proclamation—on paper—of steps designed to end in the formation of a new United Arab Republic. The last-named event is ominous primarily to the extent that it threatens Israel with military encirclement and annihilation. Suffice it to say that the "liberation of Palestine" is one of the expressed aims of the Arab unity proclamation; one of the first steps designed to bring about this goal apparently is to foment revolution in the Kingdom of Jordan.

The danger to the peace of the world is obvious. The danger to the stability of the Middle East is obvious. The danger to Israel is obvious.

Moreover, Mr. President, the whole free world has been rocked by the incipient escalation of the arms race in the Middle East. There are indications that some antagonists in the area are contemplating, if not actually developing, a nuclear weapons capability and the means to deliver such offensive weapons from their territory. The Members of Congress will be understandably appalled if the aid which we have supplied certain countries of the Middle East has freed their resources for the development of weapons which are not only criminally wasteful in terms of the human needs in the area but which are fraught with the most serious dangers to world peace.

Mr. President, the Senators who spoke last week—and I refer in good measure to the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]—know that I share their heartfelt concern for the peace of the Middle East and for the territorial integrity of our stanch friend and partner, the Republic of Israel. Likewise, I am sure that the Senator from New York will understand why I have not accepted his invitation to join him in cosponsoring the resolution he has offered today. I diverge from him not in principle, not in the desired effect of our action, not in his assessment of the dangers of the situation, but rather in his prescription for dealing with the Middle East crisis. Our disagreement, slight as it is—and it is very slight—is one of tactics.

In the first place, Mr. President, I believe that the worst danger confronting us in the Middle East consists in the escalation of the arms race and the possible introduction into the area of nuclear weapons and the means of relatively long-range delivery of nuclear weapons.

For this reason, Mr. President, along with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], I submit a resolution which stresses our concern over the current direction of the Middle East arms race and which will call for the creation of a denuclearized, missile free zone in this most strategic area. Further, I should like to see this regional arms control agreement enforced by an international policing system—a system which would call upon the great moral and human resources of the United Nations. Finally, I stress the need for a positive, unambiguous reaffirmation of the Tripartite Declaration of May 1950. This declaration commits us, together with France and Britain, to taking action "both within and outside the United Nations" if any state in the area should use force or threaten the use of force in violation of the Arab-Israel armistice agreement. Further, the declaration proclaims our opposition to an arms race in the Near East and announces that no arms applications will be favorably received if the arms are to be used for aggression against any other state in the area.

The principles of the Tripartite Declaration have never been renounced by any party to the act.

It is an existing declaration. It is an existing policy of this Government. As far as the United States is concerned, the declaration should take on added significance in view of current developments. With our mighty 6th Fleet in the area, there should be no doubt about our readiness or willingness to move with lightning speed should any violation of the existing frontiers or armistice lines in the area take place or appear to be imminent.

Our policy, therefore, must continue to be one of reconciliation and peace between the Arabs and Israel. We must use our good offices, wherever possible, to achieve that goal.

I doubt that a new pact or treaty would add to the guarantees which we have already given Israel and all other states in the area which are subject to aggression.

But it ought to be unmistakably clear that we view the tripartite declaration as a living document to be enforced.

In conclusion, I favor the isolation of the Middle East from a ruinous and wasteful arms race. I favor the strengthening of the United Nations presence—the UNEF—and its constructive role in the Middle East.

I want to make sure that organization is kept there as a strong and active force. This means proper financing of the police-keeping arm of the U.N.

I favor cooperation with all men and all nations of demonstrated good will. I do not now and never will acquiesce to a policy of drift and appeasement. My goal and that of the U.S. Government remains that of Middle East reconciliation—a reconciliation which meets the true national, racial, religious, and economic interests of every resident of the area.

Some attempt in that direction was made in the recent session of the United Nations. I regret that our Government did not give it more impetus, because that attempt was made by certain African and European states, and it needed the wholehearted support of the Government of the United States.

The Government of the United States recognizes and gives firm friendly support to the State of Israel. It recognizes and gives friendly cooperation to all states in the Middle East—our goal for these countries and all peoples is freedom and peace.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my resolution be printed at this point in my remarks, and that the resolution may lie on the desk for the remainder of the week, to give an opportunity to other Senators to cosponsor it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 135) is as follows:

Whereas tensions in the Near East are steadily mounting;

Whereas the stability and peace of the Near East are vital to the well-being of the peoples of the Near East and to the world at large;

Whereas the continuing arms race in the Near East threatens to enter a new stage of development of nuclear weapons and offensive missiles;

Whereas the policy of the United States is to discourage an arms race in the Near East;

Whereas the United States has contributed generously and impartially to promote the economic development of the states of the Near East and to raise the standard of living of their peoples;

Whereas several of the states are wasting precious resources in order to acquire ever greater quantities and ever more sophisticated types of weapons, thus partially offsetting the effects and aims of United States foreign economic and technical assistance programs;

Whereas the acquisition of such arms serves further to heighten the tensions in the Near East and to enhance the risk of hostilities;

Whereas the interests of the States and peoples of the area, of the United States, and of the world in general would be served by a reduction of tensions, by an end to belligerency and by a termination of the arms race: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate of the United States of America that the President of the United States use his good offices with the States of the area to negotiate with them either through the United Nations, or directly, an agreement that nuclear weapons will neither be produced in the area nor be introduced into the area; that missiles of a mass-destruction nature will neither be produced nor be introduced into the area; that an international policing system will be adopted to enforce such agreement; and that the United States continue, in accordance with the Tripartite Declaration of May 1950, to take all necessary and appropriate actions both within and outside the United Nations to prevent any violation of existing frontiers or armistice lines in the Near East; and that the United States, either through the United Nations, or directly with other nations in the area, devise means to bring to an end the recriminations and incitements to violence which are contributing to tension and instability in the Near East.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall be extremely brief.

I point out that there is no basic difference between the Senator from Minnesota and his colleagues on the one hand, and me and my colleagues on the other. I count the number of Senators who sponsor both resolutions as being united on the fundamental point covered in the resolutions, on the concept that there is a war threat in the Middle East and that constructive action should be taken with respect to it.

The Foreign Relations Committee, which will have this subject under consideration, will have an opportunity to judge as to the most effective course of action which should be taken.

I like the idea that UNEF will no longer be necessary. We know that UNEF cannot remain there forever. I like the idea of an end to the arms race, and whether or not I like the idea of a neutral zone, the idea of ending the arms race is an extremely sound one.

So, Mr. President, in connection with these resolutions, we find ourselves to be men of a common purpose, though we may have some differences as to techniques, as has been stated. The fact is that we are together. So I say that Senators who sponsor both resolutions favor the basic concept that the Senate shall declare itself on this urgent subject, in which the State Department and the President have not adequately declared our policy, so as to give the lead to the policy of the United States.

Mr. CLARK subsequently said: Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Minnesota for the resolution he has offered and of which I am happy to be a cosponsor. I noted with interest the colloquy which took place on the floor of the Senate last week criticizing our foreign policy in the Middle East. I found myself in accord with what many Senators said at that time. I believe that the resolution which the Senator from Minnesota has offered is most timely. I should like to emphasize one part of it, which I believe is of paramount importance to all of us, and that is that we must be sure that there is no spread to the Middle East of nuclear weapons, either with respect to the capacity for producing them or with respect to their use. I believe our country should go promptly, first to the Security Council in the United Nations and then to the Disarmament Conference at Geneva, to see whether we cannot now get an agreement from all the nuclear powers, including Russia, which will be ironclad and will unconditionally guarantee that under no circumstances will nuclear weapons or warheads or, indeed, nuclear knowhow, which might result in any nation acquiring nuclear capability in the East, be permitted.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DOUGLAS subsequently said: Mr. President, I do not regard the resolution sponsored by the Senator from New York and the resolution sponsored by the Senator from Minnesota as being in any sense competing resolutions. We do need to stop the arms race in the Middle East. We also need to cement a firm agreement among the three major powers, France, the United Kingdom, and the United States, to guarantee existing boundaries in the Middle East against aggression or attack from any source.

As I have often said, it is too large a task for the United States to assume alone, and involves too great a danger for us to make it our sole responsibility. If the three great powers, which unfortunately split asunder in 1956, can again unite, I believe our combined strength will be sufficient to deter aggression on the part of Mr. Nasser and the United Arab Republic.

Therefore I hope very much that we may pursue the same end, even if by different means. I hope that the Humphrey resolution will not be used as an excuse to prevent action on the Javits resolution.

THE UNITED STATES MUST ACT NOW TO PRESERVE PEACE AND TO PREVENT WAR IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, 3 years ago, on August 26, I—along with millions of my fellow Americans—was thrilled by the clarion call sounded by the then presidential nominee, John F. Kennedy, for a revitalized policy in the Near East.

Speaking in New York, Mr. Kennedy stated, in part:

> First. I propose that the new President reaffirm our sincere friendship for all the peoples of the Middle East, whatever their religion or race or politics;
>
> Second. I propose that we make it crystal clear that the United States means what it said in the tripartite declaration of 1950—that we will act promptly and decisively against any nation in the Middle East which attacks its neighbor. * * *
>
> Third. I propose that all the authority and prestige of the White House be used to call into conference the leaders of Israel and Arab States to consider privately their common problems, assuring them that we support in full their aspirations for peace, unity, independence, and a better life—and that we are prepared to back up this moral support with economic and technical assistance. * * *
>
> The Middle East needs water, not war; tractors, not tanks; bread, not bombs.

In the intervening years, Mr. President, I have seen nothing which would cause me to believe that the then speaker and now President, John F. Kennedy, has swerved from his original prescription of what is needed in the Middle East. But there is considerable question in my mind whether his pronouncements and declared policies are being carried out by the State Department and in our AID programs.

To strengthen his hand in putting into effect what he said was needed in the Middle East, I have today joined my able colleague Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, the majority whip, and others, in cosponsoring a resolution indicating that the Senate of the United States is behind him in his endeavors and urging him forward with the utmost speed.

The situation in the Middle East is fraught with grave dangers. We must act—and we must act with the greatest possible speed.

I wish to commend the able and distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] for the resolution which he and a number of other Senators have joined in introducing today on the same subject. I appreciate his asking me to join in the introduction of that resolution. However, I think his resolution, by requiring the adherence of the United Kingdom and France, while recalling and indeed invoking the tripartite agreement, may delay the action that I feel it imperative for the United States to take. I feel the White House should act in accord with President Kennedy's afore-cited pronouncements of August 26, 1960, and that we would be better advised to strengthen the hand of the President by indicating that we in the Senate, who are constitutionally authorized to advise and consent on many foreign policy matters, are fully behind him in his endeavors to carry out the program he outlined 3 years ago.

The resolution introduced by Senator Humphrey, which with other Senators I have cosponsored, takes explicit cognizance of the need for lending the great dignity and prestige of the office of the President of the United States to the task of getting the parties in the Middle East to sit down together across a conference table to talk peace and disarmament.

This disastrous arms race in the Middle East cannot go on. Russia, in selling arms to the Egyptians and other Arab countries in the Middle East, is encouraging this arms race. More than that, it is contributing to the continued impoverishment of the peoples of those countries so that our economic assistance goes for naught. More than that, it is causing Israel to take of its meager resources to buy arms to keep up in the race. It is being burdened by the need of buying Hawk missiles to counter Nasser's new Russian supplied rockets, supplied with the scientific aid of ex-Nazis in Egypt.

This is a treadmill that can lead only to disaster.

In addition, my resolution would ask the executive branch to take positive steps to curb the excesses in the controlled radio broadcasts from Egypt, Iraq, and Syria directed at the violent destruction of the Governments of Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and Israel. These are nations with which we maintain friendly relations. We should not stand idly by while the radios of these countries constantly blast to the peoples of Jordan and Saudi Arabia that their rulers should be killed and that then it will be time for violent destruction of the State of Israel and for driving its inhabitants into the sea.

Mr. President, I am amazed that so many of my colleagues are unaware that these broadcasts are going on and that they occasionally are aimed at the United States. It is indeed ironical that the Cairo broadcasts have been made possible through the generous use of U.S. funds. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks typical excerpts from these broadcasts and some information concerning our AID radio assistance program in Egypt.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. **GRUENING**. I want to read now some typical extracts. This is from the "Voice of Arab Nation," of November 16, 1962:

> Arabs, kill Sa'ud, kill his clique today. Arabs of Jordan, kill Husayn today and do not postpone today's work until tomorrow. Do not allow them to rob the people's money, because the triumph of the republic of the Arabian Peninsula and the Republic of Jordan is certain and will need the people's money for development. The people have condemned the traitors to death. The army must implement the will of this people. God is great. Long live unity, the greater Arab unity. Long live the Arab Nation.

And on February 5, the Cairo Voice of the Arabs in Arabic to the Arab world:

> Have you heard the news about the participation of U.S. paratroops with the Saudi paratroops in maneuvers over Jidda? And also over Riyadh? This was broadcast by the Saudi authorities. This means that the U.S. aircraft carrying destructive weapons and the U.S. paratroops have been flying over the house of God and the tomb of the Prophet. Do you know that the house of God and the tomb of the Prophet have been violated? The Saudi authorities have exposed themselves without shame. It has openly sought refuge with imperialism and Zionism.
>
> Imperialism does not know anything except force; it does not respect anything except force.

And on the 6th of February, the next day:

> America encourages the aggressors and aggression. This is manifested in all its behavior.

And so forth. Mr. President, it seems to me it is time that we acted. The time to act, Mr. President, is now. Tomorrow may be too late.

The nations in the Middle East are running on a collision course. Unless we act now, there will be a collision which will see the world destroyed by a nuclear war.

In this connection, and pertinent to this discussion, I recall that last Sunday a luncheon meeting took place in Washington to celebrate and hail the 15th anniversary of the founding of Israel, a gallant little country inhabited in considerable part by the survivors of the most ruthless, savage, and inhuman policies of extermination in the history of mankind, who, having founded a new nation in the historic land of their forefathers, are again threatened with annihilation.

The people of Israel represent an oasis of liberty and democracy in the Middle East. They not only profess but make real the principles of freedom, of government by consent of the governed, which we in the United States proclaimed over a century and three-quarters ago. In this respect Israel is unique in the Middle East. It is surrounded by other nations in varying degrees not imbued with the principles of democracy and freedom, and some of which are outright police states with no basic freedoms, whose leaders have never ceased to announce their determination to destroy Israel, to drive its people into the sea, and in the meanwhile are pursuing policies of boycott and discrimination, some of which are clearly in violation of international law and international agreements, such as the exclusion not only of Israeli ships from the Suez Canal, but of ships flying the flags of other nations, including our own, which carry cargo to or from Israel.

Exhibit 1

Appeals Broadcast by the Cairo "Voice of Arab Nation" (Nov. 16, 1962)

PRECIS OF APPEALS

(1) Officers in the Arab Peninsula, rise in a decisive revolution and destroy the palaces of reaction in the Arabian Peninsula. Officers in Jordan, proceed with your heavy weapons to the palaces of Basman and Raghdan, and destroy them over the heads of the traitors. Free officers in Arab Syria; the Arab people in Arab Syria regard Arab Syria as part of the United Arab Republic. Liberate Arab Syria from the agents and opportunists and rise against feudalism and corruption. Officers in Arab Iraq, the principles of July 14 urge you to take vengeance for them on Quasim and his treachery. Arab officers in all the Arab countries, this is the revolution, and this is the decisive battle. Get your arms ready to destroy reaction and the palaces of treason and to exterminate secession. Get ready, for the hour of action has struck.

(2) Arabs of the Arabian Pennisula, free air force officers, officers and soldiers, the "Voice of the Arab Nation" salutes the people of the Arabian Peninsula for the dignified and nationalist attitude they adopted when they expressed their indignation at Sa'ud's and Faysal's criminal policy, and salutes the army's refusal to fight for reaction against the freemen of Yemen. From here, from the land of Arabism, we call upon the freemen of the Arabian Peninsula, upon the officers, soldiers, teachers, youth, employees, peasants, workers, and tribes to rise in a final and decisive revolution against the despotic and feudal regime, which depends upon foreign protection.

Arabs, kill Sa'ud, kill his clique today. Arabs of Jordan, kill Husayn today and do not postpone todays' work until tomorrow. Do not allow them to rob the people's money, because the triumph of the Republic of the Arabian Peninsula and the Republic of Jordan is certain and will need the people's money for development. The people have condemned the traitors to death. The army must implement the will of this people. God is great. Long live unity, the greater Arab unity. Long live the Arab nation.

Voice of Arabs Comment

(Cairo Voice of the Arabs in Arabic to the Arab world, Feb. 4, 1963.)

Have you heard the news about the participation of U.S. paratroops with the Saudi paratroops in maneuvers over Jidda? And also over Riyadh? This was broadcast by the Saudi authorities. This means that the U.S. aircraft carrying destructive weapons and the U.S. paratroops have been flying over the house of God and the tomb of the Prophet. Do you know that the house of God and the tomb of the Prophet have been violated? The Saudi authorities have exposed themselves without shame. It has openly sought refuge with imperialism and Zionism.

Imperialism does not know anything except force; it does not respect anything except force.

U.S. Aids Saudi Aggression in Yemen

(Cairo Voice of the Arabs in Arabic to the Arab world, Feb. 5, 1963.)

America is now encouraging the Saudi aggression on Yemen and is participating in it. It is thus committing the ugliest of crimes against the principles of freedom, civilization, and peace. America lies in order to conceal its crime and then is exposed by the one for whom it committed the crime; it is exposed by Faysal himself, and by the scandalous Mecca radio.

No sooner was the news announced of America's third and latest military demonstration to protect the Saudi throne—intervention in encouraging the Saudi aggression against the Yemeni people and in supplying it with arms, planes, and men—than a State Department official statement revealed that these American paratroop maneuvers in Jidda and Riyadh are only part of America's regular training program.

America encourages the aggressors and aggression. This is manifested in all its behavior. America sends to Saudi Arabia arms, men, fleets, planes, pilots, and paratroops. No one can believe that America is far from the aggression against the Yemeni people or that it does not encourage it.

ARAB NATION APPEALS TO JORDAN OFFICERS

(Voice of the Arab Nation (clandestine) in Arabic to the Middle East, Apr. 25, 1963.)

Free officers and soldiers in the Jordanian Army, the time has come to liberate Jordan from Husayn, the husband of the British Antoinette, and his traitor group, particularly his Uncle Nasir and his Turkish relative Husayn Ibn Nasir. Arabs in Jordan, the time has come to erase the shame of Israel and to stand on the side of the Arab free men in one rank in the battle for the liberation of Palestine from imperialism and the Jews. Bedouin officers and soldiers, how long will some of you continue to be deceived by the falsehoods uttered by Husayn? When will you learn the bright truth that Husayn and his family are using you to guard the state of the Jews, the first enemy of the Arabs? The demonstrators are equally the sons of Bedouins and city dwellers. They are demonstrating to claim a dignified and free life for all sons of the Jordanian Arab people. They are asking the Jordanian Army to join in the battle for the liberation of Palestine. They are demanding implementation of social justice in Jordan to insure food, water, clothing, and education for every person.

Understand this, Bedouin officers and soldiers. You are part of the people. You will have the major part of the happiness which the people will enjoy. The members of the miserable tribes—who live without drinking water in many instances, who do not find schools for their children, who do not find clothing—these Bedouins are the ones in direst need of socialism, which was applied by our noble and holy prophet Muhammad, may God bless him, and by his noble colleagues, Abu Bakr as-Siddiq, Umar Ibn al-Khattab, and others.

Bedouin soldiers, you must realize that Israel will not dare fire one shot on the Jordanian borders after the strong Arab state declared that if Israel does so it will meet its fate in hours. The Arab rockets will destroy it and the Arab armies will overrun it. Respond to the appeal of the free revolutionary people. Defend your dignity. Do not allow any ignorant person to fire one shot on the students. You are capable of crushing all the traitors in Amman in a few hours. After that Israel will not stay on one inch of our holy land.

CAIRO REPORTS ON HUSAYN PRESS CONFERENCE

(Cairo Voice of the Arabs in Arabic to the Arab world, Apr. 25, 1963.)

At his press conference yesterday, Husayn was unable to deny the existence of a people's revolt in our Arab Jordan. The Arab masses in the Arab homeland feel that Husayn is living his last days of black rule. "We would not be exaggerating if we said that the Arab masses believe that Husayn is living the final days of his life.

"At his press conference Husayn, the hireling king, tried to appear as the defender and supporter of Arab unity. He said that demonstrations which have taken place were an expression of the joy felt by Arabs, and that he is with them, as he alleges, in supporting the appearance of unity between Cairo, Damascus, and Baghdad, the nuclei for greater and comprehensive unity. Husayn declared his joy over this unity, claiming to be an Arab who senses the aspirations of the Arabs and their aims. Thus Husayn tried to appear as a true patriot who seeks unity. In actual fact, he is disowned by this very unity. Who is he attempting to ridicule?"

The Arab people know of Husayn's love for unity. He gave refuge to the Syrian Qawmiyin, attacked the United Arab Republic in the United Nations, handed over complete Arab villages to Israel. The people know the truth about the agents and traitors.

FIFTEENTH ANNIVERSARY OF ISRAEL

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the principal speaker at the luncheon last Sunday was the distinguished minority whip, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], who made a moving and eloquent address. It was free from partisanship in terms that find responsiveness in the hearts of all Americans who are concerned about peace, freedom, and justice. It merits perpetuation.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARTIAL TEXT OF ADDRESS BY U.S. SENATOR THOMAS H. KUCHEL ON THE 15TH ANNIVERSARY OF ISRAEL, MAY 5, 1963

We meet not only to celebrate the fact that Israel has been in existence for 15 years. We meet to celebrate the birthday of a dream, realized 15 years ago, conceived 2,000 years ago.

In modern politics, the dreamer is too often discounted as a worthless visionary with his head and his feet in the clouds. Some would have him subjugate his ideals to the world of practical affairs. Others would have him dream empty dreams which never influence the course of events. Both are wrong. One can dream dreams and maintain fundamental principle and still, I suggest, shape great events.

Long after other nations have become embittered by the ugly face of war, the people of the United States continue to demand honor from all of us who lead them. They have no patience with cynics who reject honor as sweet but simple, and irrelevant.

When our Government answered the idealism of the people, and assisted at the birth of Israel, there were some who feared that the United States was providing new opportunities for Soviet penetration into the Arab East.

They felt, and some still feel, that we collaborated in what they termed the humiliation of the Arabs, and they have been apologizing ever since.

Because they had no faith in justice back in 1948, they live in fear of justice now.

But the American people had—and have—faith in justice. They demanded it. To them, the restoration of Israel was not wrong, but right. Today as a result of their faith, they reap not fear—but confirmation that dreams are still possible of attainment, even for a sleepless, and at times, a melancholy world.

I have no intention of reviewing the history of the last 15 years—especially before an audience which knows it far better than I.

But I am moved to comment that all through this period, we have witnessed a clash between the faith of the people in eternal values of freedom and of justice and the fear of some tacticians who seek temporary nostrums with no regard for principles at all.

And, parenthetically, I want to emphasize that my comments are nonpartisan. What I shall say to you in criticism of tacticians applies equally to those who have malfunctioned under Republican administrations as well as those who malfunction under this and other Democratic administrations.

Practically every American child learns the principle of freedom of the seas when he reads of Stephen Decatur and the Barbary pirates and the War of 1812 with England. They know that adherence to this principle has speeded our own worldwide influence and has contributed to our own stature among nations.

Yet some of these children, now grown, seem to forget the history which they learned in their youth. Consequently, when President Nasser seized the Suez Canal, an international waterway, we failed to uphold this age-old and time-tested principle.

Now our policymakers who have presumably studied American history should realize that freedom of these seas is as vital to Israel—to any land—as it has been to us.

Why then did we back away from the challenge? Because of the same fear that has immobilized Western leadership since World War I—beginning with the failure to carry out the Balfour Declaration. It was argued that a move to defend free passage of all cargoes through the Suez Canal would antagonize the Arabs, and that, therefore, it should not be undertaken.

Throughout our history, America has labored to insure peaceful relations with our immediate neighbors north and south. Today, the United States defends its Canadian and Mexican borders against plant diseases and poppies—but not against military attack.

The young democracy of Israel is not so fortunate.

If an Israeli farmer takes a piece of desert and turns it over into a garden, he cannot take time to congratulate himself.

He must stand firm against the counterattack of the desert, but he must remain vigilant, also, against the counterattack of Israel's enemies, to insure that she will continue to flourish.

Our basic American goal is the maintenance of our own security—our own freedom—in a world of peace with justice. One of our basic policies is to render assistance to free countries who desire to continue to be free. We have been, and we are, by solemn pronouncement and by agreement, committed to the existence of Israel, and to her viability. To live, to maintain the integrity of her western-oriented self-government, she needs to grow. And to grow, to expand, she needs what any free nation needs: freedom of movement and a just peace. War and aggression are the tools of the dictator. They are not, and never can be, the methods for free peoples to follow.

These days there are two ways to attempt to achieve peace.

You can build up your arsenal and confront your enemy so that you make him consider the cost of his intended aggression as unacceptable and prohibitive.

Or you can sit down with him in reason and try honorably to settle your difference peacefully.

The United States does both of these things. Israel does not have a choice.

Israel is allowed only to live in a state of siege.

It is frightfully expensive to maintain a fortress, too expensive for a young country with better things to think about than war.

I deeply believe that the United States cannot stand on the sidelines while Israel wrestles with this single alternative. No one knows better than we how really insecure is the security of a mutual balance of terror, at any level.

Over the years, some of my colleagues in the Senate and I, both Democrats and Republicans, have earnestly urged our Government to assume the lead in a drive for direct Arab-Israel peace negotiations. If you cannot see your enemy's military installations, you are in danger. But if you cannot see his face, your peril is compounded.

The Government of the United States has failed to use its good offices to the fullest degree in encouraging an expansion of such policy alternatives.

Late in 1961, 16 of the smaller nations joined together and proposed a resolution in the U.N. Special Political Committee calling on Israel and the Arab States to settle questions in dispute by direct negotiations, with the assistance of the Palestine Conciliation Commission.

This proposal by several African and Latin American nations met with violent objection and attack from the Arab delegates. They seemed more interested in dissolving Israel than in peacefully solving the sad plight of a million refugees.

The Arab delegates attacked both the Palestine Conciliation Commission composed of the United States, France, and Turkey, and Dr. Joseph E. Johnson who had been attempting to resolve the issues in dispute.

Unfortunately, the Arab denunciation seemed to have its effect, and when the United States offered its own resolution, it merely urged an intensification of effort by the Palestine Conciliation Commission, but avoided calling on the parties to negotiate a settlement in accordance with paragraph 5 of the 1948 U.N. resolution.

When the 16-nation resolution came to a vote, the United States voted against it. On this painfully regrettable roll call, our country was in the same corner as a unanimous Arab and Soviet bloc. The only nation to side with the United States and with the Arab and Soviet bloc in the Western Hemisphere was Castro's Cuba—think of it.

The New York Herald-Tribune appropriately decried the weakness of the American version of international practical politics when it editorialized: "If there's any more 'practical' way of settling a problem than of having the two disputants talk about it, we wish our delegation would let us in on the secret."

The result was that the U.S. proposal continuing Palestine Conciliation Commission mediation was adopted by a vote of 62 to 0 with 37 abstentions; while the 16-nation peace initiative, because in great part of the failure of the American Government to support it, lacked a majority in committee. It received 34 votes, while 44 were opposed and 20 abstained.

Late in March 1962, the United Nations Security Council again had this question before it as a result of Israelian-Syrian border incidents. I was proud to join with several of my colleagues in the Senate urging once again the Secretary of State and the U.S. Representative to the United Nations to favor direct peace negotiations between Israel and the Arab States.

In 1960, both political parties pledged exactly that. The Democratic platform said: "We will encourage direct Arab-Israel peace negotiations." The Republican platform stated: "With specific reference to Israel and the Arab nations, we urge them to undertake negotiations for a mutually acceptable settlement of the causes of tension between them."

Once again the Department of State and the U.S. Government in the United Nations failed to assert this principle and failed to use its powers of persuasion and its energies to achieve this goal, which is the precise and solemn pledge of both American political parties.

We cannot and must not be indifferent to mounting dangers as they begin clearly to manifest themselves at the earth's crossroads. For if the lights in Israel began to flicker and to fail, if bloody conflict erupted anew on this ancient soil, the whole world would inch along toward the abyss.

In 1950, the ferment of the Middle East prompted the United States to join with the United Kingdom and France in the Tripartite Agreement that action, within, and outside the United Nations, would be taken if any Middle East frontier became violated. That agreement continues in force.

In 1957, Congress adopted, at President Eisenhower's request, the Middle East resolution and stipulated that "the United States regards as vital to the national interest and world peace the preservation of the independence and integrity of the nations of the Middle East." That is still the law of this land.

Mutual security continues to be a basic American policy. We seek to assist "free, friendly nations" who want to remain free. We have undertaken a massive aid program to Egypt over the years. It was our humanitarian desire to feed its hungry, and to improve the lot and the future of the Arab people. Meanwhile, Nasser has begun the accumulation of a massive war-making machine whose submarines and planes and tanks and motor torpedo boats and guided missiles all come from the Soviet Union and her Communist satellites. Since 1955 the Soviet Union has contributed over $615 million to Egypt.

It is in the interest of peace that we and our allies ought now urgently to appeal to Nasser to desist in his arms buildup, and failing that, to give Israel the means by which to defend herself. And beyond all this frightful arms escalation, we and our allies ought to make it abundantly clear that we intend to fulfill our honorable commitments, for peace, and that we are not going to permit the eruption of war involving the United Arab Republic and Israel or Jordan or anybody else, which could spread with sudden fury across the globe.

There are some who feel that the desert is worth no more than the oil beneath its surface. But what about the people who subsist on the surface of the desert?

If people are oppressed by malignant, autocratic rules, forbidden the right of free expression, afflicted with poverty, disease and ignorance, all the petroleum in the world will not lift them to a position of dignity among men.

The Arabs are beginning to know these things. They are beginning to cry out for freedom, and very often, the cry for freedom is heard as a call to revolution. Such ferment could be cause for hope rather than for alarm.

We Americans have become used to associating the word "revolution" with a Communist offensive. This could be the case in Arabia. But it does not have to be the case. The Arab struggle for dignity does not have to end in war with Israel and the hegemony of President Nasser. It could end in integrity for Israel, integrity for every Arab State, and peace in the Middle East.

The United States and our free allies have the power to influence the outcome of the events which now inflame the Arab world. We together have the obligation to use that power. It is a solemn obligation as old as the principles that have made this constitutional Republic great. We should have acted on it long ago.

It is perfectly reasonable to assume that the Soviet Union will try to utilize Arab ferment for the purposes of international communism.

To the contrary, we should try to use it as a force for peace in the Near East.

America has the responsibility of leadership in the cause of freedom. We cannot be blind to conflict—or potential conflict—anywhere around this globe. When a dictator threatens a neighbor, it is, it ought to be, of the gravest concern to our country. When Radio Cairo belligerently announces that the Arabs will drive the Israelis into the sea, and will "liberate" other Arab lands, it is, it ought to be, of direct concern to America and to free people in every land.

Principle and integrity were violated at Suez. Principle and integrity were violated when we accepted the Saudi demand that American soldiers of Jewish faith be barred from serving at the Dharan base.

Israel began by rescuing thousands of Jews who survived genocide. You in this room and our fellow Americans across the land worried about these immigrants. You worked for them in a partnership with Israel unprecedented in the history of American philanthropy. You gave deeply of your energy and love to help the homeless find peace and dignity in their homes.

You and the vast majority of Americans would not be quieted, when men without faith declared that your dreams and your hopes for justice were inconsistent with the 20th century and the cold war.

Today, Israel is returning to you and to all of us who had faith in that dream, a gift of generosity and human brotherhood which has now spread through 83 nations. The little democracy needs her manpower for her own development. Why then does she willingly lend her manpower, her brains and muscle, to the new nations of Africa, Asia and Latin America? Because she knows what it is to battle for human dignity. And that battle—no matter who is waging it—is dear to her above everything, as it must be to every society which cherishes the concept of freemen.

Israel is using her technical aid program to make friends—to share her experience and know-how with nations who have similar problems—to share her faith with nations that need faith as much as they need railroads.

The unhappiness of this happy day is that Israel should have to reach so far to extend the hand of generosity. She should be free to offer the hand of friendship across the barbed wire fence of hostility that seals off Jordan, Lebanon, Syria and Egypt.

There are lessons to be learned from the experience of Israel. But if we look closely, we will see that they are American lessons. We should know them well.

A great frontier, be it the Pacific Ocean or the Negev, excites the imagination of a people. If the people have moral fiber and faith, they will conquer that frontier as certainly as the future awaits us.

Israel's security challenges American idealism. And let me add here—lest there be any misunderstanding—that there is nothing unrealistic about idealism. The defense of principle is as pragmatic as the fight for oil. And I have a feeling that it will pay off with far more sturdy results for American foreign policy.

To the disbeliever who tells me that I am being unrealistic, I retort that we have underestimated and overestimated human nature in the Near East for 15 years. And that is unrealistic.

The truth is that Israel, her continued success and the dynamism of her people, is the most exciting reality in the Near East today.

I can hardly say in these troubled times that the future for Israel during the coming year is warm and promising. But it is no less warm and promising than threatening.

The possibility for peace in the Near East is still better than the danger of war.

The possibility for peace will, we pray, become a probability, as long as our fight for peace continues unabated, and our faith in a just peace is maintained.

Continue in your efforts to secure peace for Israel. Keep your dedication to the great dream which she represents. You are the veterans in this long struggle. But you are not alone. You are trustees for all of us. The future peace of free, democratic Israel is a dream shared by myriad Americans, Christians as well as Jews.

But we look to you for leadership and encouragement in our efforts to fight for principle in American policy.

As a fellow American, I have been inspired by your faith in the future of Israel. I share that faith entirely, and on this day of celebration, I salute you.

Let the free peoples of the United States, and of the free world, undertake such necessary arrangements that the lights of freedom, which burn in Israel, shall continue, bright and shining, in the years, the centuries, and the eons ahead.

TRIBUTE TO PER JACOBSSON—MANAGING DIRECTOR OF THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the death of Per Jacobsson, Managing Director of the International Monetary Fund, on May 5, represents a grave loss to the Western World. Per Jacobsson was one of the major architects of the intricate monetary system set up after World War II. He dedicated most of his life to helping rebuild the currencies destroyed by two world wars. While with the Bank for International Settlements, he devised measures in the early 1950's which set the stage for West Germany's brilliant economic achievements of succeeding years. His efforts resulted in the successful stabilization of the French franc in 1958. Under his leadership, the International Monetary Fund stemmed the run on sterling which followed Egypt's seizure of the Suez Canal. As head of the Fund he went to the assistance at various times of Denmark, Holland, Japan, Turkey, Spain, Peru, and Argentina.

More recently his advice has been called upon by the United States with regard to our balance-of-payments problems.

Under his leadership, the International Monetary Fund has grown from a relatively little known specialized agency of the United Nations in 1948 to a keystone of the western monetary system, which it is today, with assets equal to $15 billion.

The essence of Per Jacobsson's policy was a combination of financial orthodoxy and caution with a willingness to experiment to meet new problems. While the Fund has been unwilling to support the currencies of Latin American countries due to ineffective fiscal policies, it has been ready to assist those whose difficulties were largely outside their control, such as a country which experienced an unexpected sharp decline in the price of its main exports. The Fund is today, ready to support the currencies of the leading industrialized countries, acting on the belief that a financial crisis in any leading country could bring a downfall of others in its wake.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Record, the New York Times article of Monday, May 6, 1963, referring to the untimely death of Per Jacobsson.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Per Jacobsson, Economist, Dead

London, May 5.—Per Jacobsson, Managing Director of the International Monetary Fund since 1956, died in a hospital here today following a heart attack. He was 69 years old.

Mr. Jacobsson, who was Swedish, entered Middlesex Hospital a week ago for a checkup and suffered the heart attack after admission. He had come to Britain on business.

Mr. Jacobsson left his post as a lecturer in economics in Stockholm in 1920 to become a member of the economic and financial section of the League of Nations, where he stayed for 8 years.

In 1931 he joined the Bank for International Settlements in Basel, Switzerland, as head of the economic department.

He moved to the International Monetary Fund in 1956.

Mr. Jacobsson leaves his wife, the former Violet Mary Nye, and three daughters. The eldest daughter, Moyra, is married to Dr. Roger Bannister, the first man to run a mile in under 4 minutes.

Mr. Jacobsson was one of the major architects of the intricate monetary network set up after World War II to replace the outmoded discipline of the international gold standard. He became the third managing director of the International Monetary Fund in December 1956, succeeding Ivar Rooth, but he had long been prominent in international monetary affairs.

The Swedish economist, in fact, devoted most of his life to helping rebuild currencies shattered by the two world wars. He joined the economic and financial section of the League of Nations in 1920 and served there for 8 years.

From 1931 to 1956 Mr. Jacobsson headed the monetary and economic section of the Bank for International Settlements, which had been first set up to facilitate the payment of World War I reparations by Germany. While there he was largely responsible for the measures taken to relieve the "currency gap" from which Germany suffered in 1950, setting the stage for the Federal Republic's economic achievement of succeeding years.

When he moved in 1956 to the International Monetary Fund, it was to confront the financial difficulties brought on in Britain by the Suez crisis. Two years later he arranged the credit that stabilized the franc.

More recently, his advice had been called upon as the United States felt it faced balance-of-payments difficulties. Mr. Jacobsson called these relatively minor, saying that the problem of a possible sharp drop in the world price level was of more concern.

EDUCATED AT UPSALA

Son of Carl Jay and Emma Christina Mellander Jacobsson, Mr. Jacobsson was born in February 1894, in Tanum, a village on Sweden's west coast. He studied law and economics at the University of Uppsala. In 1918 he lectured in economics at a Stockholm high school and a year later taught at an engineering school in the capital.

With the League of Nations he took part in financial rehabilitation work in Austria, Bulgaria, Hungary, Greece, and Danzig. In 1928 he went to work for 2 years with the Kreuger & Toll Match Co. Then for 2 years was secretary of the Swedish Economic Defense Council.

The Bank of International Settlements was established to facilitate payment of World War I reparations by Germany. Its annual reports, written by Mr. Jacobsson, are considered classics in their field. Long after the reparations question passed into history, the Bank remained as a sort of clearinghouse for Europe's central banks. Mr. Jacobsson was its top man.

The International Monetary Fund was established in 1944. In 1948 it became in effect a specialized agency of the United Nations. While its task was the important one of shoring up the currency of its members, its influence was negligible for a decade.

FIRST CHALLENGE FROM SUEZ

But in 1956, the year Mr. Jacobsson took over, the Fund met its first big challenge. Egypt seized the Suez Canal. France and Britain prepared to retaliate and were dissuaded. The episode touched off a run on sterling. The Fund lent Britain $561,500,000. This, plus severe cuts in the British budget, returned the pound to stability.

Two years later France faced financial collapse as a result of the lost war in Indochina, and the continued drain of the Algerian conflict. Mr. Jacobsson arranged for a package credit of $655 million from the fund, the European Payments Union and the United States. With this sum in hand, President de Gaulle was able to carry through the austerity measures proposed by Finance Minister Antoine Pinay and stabilize the currency by revaluation into the new franc.

As head of the Fund, which gave him effective command of assets equal to $15 billion, Mr. Jacobsson also went to the rescue at various times of Denmark, the Netherlands, Japan, Turkey, Spain, Peru, and Argentina.

OPPONENT OF DIRECT CONTROLS

Listing some of Mr. Jacobsson's definite convictions, a financial writer said in 1959:

"He dislikes all direct government controls over business, favors only indirect measures such as regulation of credit and tax incentives. At the same time, he wants nothing of the old gold standard, beloved by many classicists who would like the world to adopt it again.

"He distrusts the arbitrary external discipline of the gold standard. It is far better he believes, for countries to discipline themselves."

Since 1957, Mr. Jacobsson had lived in Washington. His daughters are Mrs. Bannister, Mrs. Birgit Bjornson, of Minneapolis, and Mrs. Erin E. Jucker-Fleetwood.

Mrs. Jacobsson's writings included books on economics and two mystery novels, "Death of a Diplomat," and "The Alchemy Murder Case." These were written with a friend, Vernon Bartlett. They used the pseudonym Peter Oldfield. Both stories were made into motion pictures.

Mr. Jacobsson won many honors. These included the World Trade Award of the Washington Board of Trade in 1960. He held honorary degrees from his Swedish alma mater and from the University of Basel, Gettysburg College, and Columbia University. He was a member of the American Philosophical Society.

PROJECT MOHOLE

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I speak today about one of the projects of the Government which could be, and many of us hope will be, one of the greatest scientific projects and achievements of this century. I refer to Project Mohole.

Many of us who are interested in this great project have seen it become transformed from one of possible great scientific achievement into a great boondoggle—in fact, what promises to be a $100 million boondoggle. I do not know the exact derivation of the word "boondoggle," but I should say that Project Mohole will be a multimillion-dollar boon to some people, while the results will merely "doggle" because there will not be any accomplishment in the present direction of this project.

I realize that with the TFX and other projects of that nature occupying the attention of the public, and resulting in the expenditure of some $5 billion to $7 billion, a mere $100 million is hardly worthy of the time of the Senate. But at least to this particular Senator, $100 million is still a huge sum of money, an amount about which I have much concern as it affects my constituents and my responsibility to the Senate and the country.

I spoke briefly last week about Project Mohole. I said then that I would explore the subject at greater depth this week, and that is what I intend to do now.

Project Mohole is under the charge of the National Science Foundation, more generally called NSF. NSF is a Government agency, supported by funds appropriated by Congress, and responsible to Congress for the use of those funds. If my recollection is correct, our appropriations to that organization last year were about $322.5 million. So the responsibility of the National Science Foundation to the country and to the Congress is of great importance.

The National Science Foundation was formed in 1950, by congressional authorization. It was inspired by Dr. Vannevar Bush, one of the truly great scientists of our day. NSF was established primarily to strengthen and encourage basic research and education in the sciences, including independent research by individuals, and to that end was authorized and directed at its inception by the Congress to "develop and encourage the pursuit of a national policy for the promotion of basic research and education in the sciences; initiate and support basic scientific research and programs to strengthen scientific research potential in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences" and to coordinate the exchange and dissemination of scientific information. It has, in large measure, carried out its objectives in exemplary fashion, and I believe has contributed substantially to the strengthening of basic research in this country. I have supported the whole concept of NSF, and I shall continue to support the encouragement of basic research. It is, in my opinion, the vital area in which the United States must concentrate its effort and must excel.

While it is very difficult to draw a line between basic research and developmental research, it is important to an understanding of this subject that a line be drawn. The purpose of the National Science Foundation, as I have just quoted from the law, is to promote basic research. Basic research tries to find the fundamental principles of scientific truth, whether they be with relation to the earth or the cosmos, with relation to atoms or electricity. No matter what the purpose be, basic research is connected with the finding of basic, ultimate, scientific facts and truths.

The developmental part of such research eventually brings scientific truths to the use of man. But without basic research, no new advances can be made in science. Therefore, the intended function of the National Science Foundation, to foster and assist in developmental and basic research, is one of the most vital functions of that particular organization and should be one of the most vital concerns of the people of the United States.

In line with my interest in fostering basic research, I believe that Project Mohole is worth doing, not only because the prestige of America is at stake; but also because the rewards in terms of unlocking the secrets of the very foundations of the earth may be incalculable. Project Mohole is, I repeat, worth doing. But if it is to be done, it must be done well, and carried to a successful conclusion. It is my firm belief that it is not being done well, and that if allowed to continue on its present course it will not be done successfully; it cannot be done successfully. It is to that point that I speak today.

Project Mohole is without question one of the most complicated, difficult, and grandiose scientific projects ever undertaken. The technological problems involved are staggering. They require drilling at an ocean depth of from 2 to 3 miles, through probably 3 miles of the earth's surface, depending on the drilling site chosen. This will entail the use of a drill string about 35,000 feet long, or almost twice as long as anything used heretofore.

The drill string will have to be specially designed for the job. In fact, everything connected with this project must be specially designed. Those who perform this task cannot "go to the shelf" and obtain any item now in common production. The drill string, the equipment which will hold it, the ships, the bits, the reentry system—whatever it is, the electronics system which will be used—everything will have to be designed specially, and it will not be possible to obtain "from the shelf" any item used in connection with the work. It will entail new techniques in positioning a free-floating ship or drilling platform, and keeping it within a very small area, without actually anchoring it to the bottom. It will require finding some way to reenter a small hole in the bottom of the ocean. It may require the development of new drilling equipment to cope with the problems of the type of rock which must be drilled and the expected temperatures which will be encountered in the hole.

In fact, Mr. President, I would say, although perhaps this is a humble analogy, that the problems involved in reentry from a floating ship into a hole at the bottom of the ocean—which is what will have to be done—could be compared somewhat with the problems involved in dangling a piece of macaroni from the top of the Chrysler Building, in New York, and trying to put it into the hole of a Lifesaver placed down on the sidewalk.

Yet, Mr. President, this work is worth doing, as I have said, quite aside from the prestige of the United States which is involved. If we are able to drill to the Mohorovicic discontinuity, and on into the mantle of the earth, new information may be found from the ocean sediment, the igneous crust, and the mantle itself. Information of the mineralogical composition of the mantle, and of its radioactivity and chemical and physical qualities, may be greatly helpful in solving the mystery of the history of our earth and the forces which have shaped the earth, and which continue to do so today. The Mohorovicic discontinuity is presumed to be the point at which the mantle and the crust of the earth join. Its presence was first postulated by Andrija Mohorovicic, and it is named for him. Drilling through that area may provide answers as to why seismic velocity changes radically at that point, and may open the way for significant new lines of inquiry. The drilling will afford an opportunity to take many and varied measurements which up to now have been impossible, and which may confirm or disprove present postulates, or may suggest new answers about the formation of the earth.

The project was originally the brainchild of a group of very fine scientists known as Amsoc—the American Miscellaneous Society. Amsoc is a committee of the National Academy of Sciences, another private group composed of leading scientists interested in basic science. Amsoc conceived Project Mohole, presented the idea to NSF, and was granted funds to carry out phase I of the project, which involved a relatively shallow series of holes drilled off Lower California, near Guadalupe and near La Jolla. The drilling was carried on from a barge called Cuss I, donated by an oil company, in water 3,111 feet deep off La Jolla and 11,672 feet deep off Guadalupe. The feasibility of deepwater drilling was proved in this phase of the project, and a great deal of experience was gained, and should be invaluable in solving some of the problems involved in the drilling of Mohole itself. This phase of the project was carried to a very successful conclusion under the leadership of a member of Amsoc named Willard Bascom, a young oceanic engineer.

Phase I was completed in April of 1961. In July 1961 the National Science Foundation sent out a letter announcing a briefing session to be held July 27, to inform companies which might be interested of the requirements of the National Science Foundation in selecting a prime contractor for Mohole. At the briefing session the factors to be considered in selection of the prime contractor were set out. These included experience in the field of management of experimental projects or projects of a research engineering and developmental nature of comparable magnitude and complexity; qualifications of staff that would be assigned to the project; experience in marine operations, deep-drilling projects, and capabilities for designing experiments and equipment; facilities available and sources for obtaining other required facilities; financial resources; willingness to contribute of the contractor's own knowledge and to permit publication of methods and results; and fees to be charged. Some 200 persons, representing 84 different organizations, attended that meeting, which was an all-day session.

At the briefing meeting, it was announced that proposals would be due August 26, 1961. This deadline date was extended to September 11, 1961; and on September 11 proposals from 12 interested groups were on hand. On December 20, 1961, it was announced that the original 12 proposals had been screened to 5. The reason why the deadline was extended from August 26 to September 11 has never been stated. The National Science Foundation itself has offered several different reasons. My personal belief is that it was extended in order to give Brown & Root, of Houston, Tex., an opportunity to appear and to present its proposal at that time.

This original screening process was accomplished by a group of National Science Foundation people which was called a preliminary evaluation panel. The five proposals selected for further consideration had been submitted by the following groups:

Brown & Root, with Minneapolis-Honeywell, Western Geophysical Co., and Rice University;

General Electric, with Kerr-McGee Oil, Youngstown Sheet & Tube, Petty Geophysical Engineering Co., and Lamont Geological Observatory, associated with Columbia University;

Global Marine Exploration, with Aerojet-General and Shell Oil;

Socony Mobil Oil, with General Motors, Texas Instruments, and Standard Oil of California; and

Zapata Off-Shore, with Continental Oil, General Dynamics, and Dresser Industries.

It is to be noted that of the first five selected by the preliminary evaluation panel, only Brown & Root had failed to associate with themselves at that time other people with the necessary potential and ability in large scientific projects and in design development to do the job. Only Brown & Root had failed to do it. All of the other firms, well known to all of us, had gone out into our great country and drawn into association with themselves, in these various groups, men with the highest technological and scientific ability that they could attract.

Of the five, Brown & Root was rated lowest by the preliminary evaluation panel. Socony Mobil and its affiliates scored 936 of a possible 1,000 points, Global Marine scored 902, and Brown & Root scored 801.

I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that in the first evaluation Brown & Root was rated by the National Science Foundation itself as in excess of 10 percent less qualified than the top ranking, Socony Mobil, to do the job.

The Socony Mobil proposal was reported by the evaluation panel to be in a class by itself—outstanding. At that stage Brown & Root did not have associates; those were added after the announcement of December 20, 1961. The announcement invited the five groups to make presentations to National Science Foundation during January 1962.

All five did so, and thereafter another review was made, this time by a group of three members of National Science Foundation. On this screening, Brown & Root ranked third, with the Global Marine group first, and Socony Mobil second.

In other words, that time the Global Marine group ranked before Socony and Brown & Root ranked third. Whatever they had done to bring themselves up from fifth place no one has ever been able to explain. In fact, the National Science Foundation has failed and refused to explain.

Now, Global Marine was associated with phase I of the project. I have mentioned *Cuss I*, the ship that was used in the first phase of the project. They had built and operated the *Cuss I*, used for drilling in phase I. Brown & Root had no experience at this time in deepwater or deep-well drilling. This was one of the factors that National Science Foundation said would be important in the selection of a prime contractor. Further, Brown & Root had little or no experience in experimental projects or projects of a research engineering nature—another of the factors to be considered by National Science Foundation in their selection of prime contractor. Brown & Root had practically no in-house capability of the type required for the Mohole project. I do not believe there is today a scientist of note in the United States who would dispute that statement.

Brown & Root is charging a management fee of $1.8 million. We have the situation—and there is no dispute about it—that on July 27, at the first meeting, the question as to whether the company that bid would undertake the project without a fee was one of the main items discussed. As a result of the first five selections all except one agreed to do so without a fee. That one was the company which ended up No. 5 in the first evaluation—Brown & Root. They eventually bid and got the project for a fee of $1.8 million plus certain overriding fees which will accrue as the project goes on. All the other top groups agreed to perform the project for no fee at all, and that was in accordance with the clear implication of the National Science Foundation that a no-fee proposition would be most favorably regarded.

And yet, on February 28, 1962, National Science Foundation announced that Brown & Root had been selected as prime contractor for Project Mohole, phase II.

One of the more recent remarks of the former head of the National Science Foundation seeks to justify that by saying, "We decided it might be unfair to the others to ask them to do it without a fee." Yet I ask Senators to bear in mind that those people bid upon the project. Some of them spent as much as $150,000 merely to prepare their presentations to the National Science Foundation.

After spending their own money in an effort to qualify to do that great scientific project, they were turned down, and a company which was awarded a $1.8 million fee—which I believe can very easily increase to $3 million or $4 million before they are through with the project—was given the contract.

It came as a source of particular surprise that a project calling for technical know-how in drilling, not only offshore but to unusual depths, should be awarded to a company, acting as prime contractor, which has heretofore confined its activities to the engineering, design, fabrication, and management of large construction projects.

In all fairness, I must say, since I am being very critical of Brown & Root in my remarks, that Brown & Root is a great construction and engineering firm. They have accomplished many great things. But I am talking about their capability, experience, know-how, and scientific ability for designing, planning, and developing experiments of that kind, and for developing tools, machinery, and equipment with which to do it.

Brown & Root, the recipient of the contract, has done diversified construction work all over the world, including marine construction of all types; pipelines, inland and offshore; a missile base; highways and roads; dams and hydroelectric plants; design and engineering specifications for NASA Space Center—the firm has just finished the $500 million NASA Space Center in Houston, Tex., or is finishing it—and the engineering contract for Standard Oil of New Jersey's pipeline and dock facilities in Libya; to mention but a few. Its project portfolio speaks well for building but not for deep scientific drilling.

So far as I am able to ascertain, the deepest well ever drilled, not by them but under their direction, was one drilled by Mr. George Brown, somewhere around 15,000 feet, which is only scratching the surface for a project of this kind.

So it came as a source of particular surprise that a project calling for a probe of the earth's surface, crust and mantle, as well as a probe into unknown problems, heretofore unexplored, should be awarded to a company whose technical staff is made up almost exclusively, if not entirely, of construction engineering personnel such as civil engineers, mechanical engineers, architectural engineers, naval architectural engineers; a company which at the time probably did not employ any fundamental scientists or any drilling engineering personnel.

It came as a surprise that the selection committee and ultimately the National Science Foundation should have made the choice it did, particularly when there were available offers from organizations whose competence and experience in the general field of drilling activity far surpassed that of the Foundation's ultimate selection. In order to have a firm grasp of the status of applicants and their ratings, it would be useful to retrace the selection process which the National Science Foundation traveled in reaching its ultimate and, in my mind, bad decision.

Last week my friend the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case] introduced into the Congressional Record an article written by Mr. Herbert Solow, one of the editors of Fortune magazine, relative to this problem.

I ask unanimous consent that certain portions of that article which deal with the selection process alone be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> The first step was to get a prime contractor. On July 13, 1961, NSF announced in the Department of Commerce synopsis that it would brief those interested in its Mohole requirements on July 27. It also sent individual letters to twoscore organizations, including some that had on their own initiative expressed interest in being the prime contractor. When these special approaches were followed by rumors that one company or another had an inside track, Socony Mobil, which was especially eager to do the Mohole job, sent a scout to sound out NSF. Everything seemed to be on the up and up. On the designated day some 200 people appeared in the NSF auditorium to represent

94 interested companies. After the scientific nature and prestigiousness of the project had been explained, NSF officials passed out a formal invitation to submit proposals. This called for:

A management plan, which would be evaluated on the basis of comprehension of Moholes problems and an engineering approach thereto.

Information as to experience with experimental or research engineering projects "of comparable magnitude and complexity" and capabilities for experiment design.

Information as to what personnel would be assigned to the project, and the rate of fee for prime-contractor effort, subcontracting, overhead, and general and administrative expenses.

Some company representatives say that pronouncements by NSF officials on July 27 left them with two other impressions. One was that, in Dr. Benson's words, "any good bidder will want the AMSOC staff." There seemed to be no objection to that. The other impression was that NSF would give preference to no-fee, all-for-science proposals. At this point, some profit-motivated listeners shut their notebooks and retired from the field.

THE UNEXPECTED PROPOSAL

By the time of the deadline—September 11—responsive proposals had come in from 10 competitors, some with teammates, that had attended the July 27 session:

Socony Mobil, with General Motors, Texas Instruments, and Standard Oil of California.

Global Marine Exploration, Aerojet-General, and Shell Oil, in a joint venture.

Zapata Off-Shore, with the Electric Boat Division of General Dynamics and Dresser Industries (later, Continental Oil joined this team).

General Electric, with Kerr-McGee Oil, Youngstown Sheet & Tube, Petty Geophysical Engineering Co., Waldemar S. Nelson & Co., and Lamont Geological Observatory of Columbia University.

Westinghouse Air Brake's Melpar, with Bethlehem Steel, Geonautics Inc., and four drilling companies.

Litton Systems.

System Development, a nonprofit corporation, with Offshore Co., a drilling company.

National Engineering Science Co.

The University of California's Scripps Institution of Oceanography.

Battelle Memorial Institute (nonprofit), with Scripps, Texas Instruments, Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory, and Ocean Drilling & Exploration.

In four of these proposals, it will be noted, oil companies were involved. Indeed, the oil industry had shown lively interest ever since the project was conceived, and for a time it was widely thought that nobody but an oil company would want or stand a chance of getting this job. Of course, the oil companies had their motives. There was great attraction to the chance to do the development of the required equipment and techniques and to gather the scientific data, rather than to read about it later. Another motive, shared by nonoil companies, was prestige—to capture the headlines for bringing up the first certified sample of the earth's mantle. The package stimulated some companies to major efforts. The Socony Mobil team, for example, made original technical studies and spent some $150,000 on its Mohole proposal.

The design or the criteria of selection took until late September, and then the proposals were opened. There, along with those of the oil and the other industrial companies, and those of the nonprofit R. & D. companies, and those of the academic institutions, was a bid from a big engineer-construction firm: Brown & Root of Houston, Tex.

Brown & Root had never communicated with NSF until it sent in its proposal around September 5. It had not been on NSF's invitation list and had not been present on July 27. But there was a proposal. "It's quite true," Dr. Benson has vouchsafed, "that Brown & Root came as a surprise to us." But what was more of a surprise to the other proposers, 6 months later, was NSF's announcement of its choice—Brown & Root.

Brown & Root recently became a subsidiary of Halliburton Co., a big Dallas oilfield service outfit. It continues operating, however, under the name it used for 43 years while rising to be one of the world's largest engineering-construction firms (annual revenues have recently averaged about $250 million). It employs over 600 engineers. Brown & Root's boss is George Brown, 64 years old, who succeeded to the presidency after the death of his brother, Herman, last November. George Brown is also chairman of Texas Eastern Transmission Corp., and a director of Halliburton, International Telephone & Telegraph, Lone Star Steel, Trans World Airlines, Southland Paper Mills, and many smaller companies.

Brown & Root has engaged chiefly in two types of work. It has an international reputation for building many kinds of industrial plants, efficiently and economically, Second, it has creditably handled many public works contracts—for highways, dams, wartime naval shipbuilding, military bases, and so on. Recently, it had part of the Houston NASA Manned Spacecraft Center job. Brown & Root has done some drilling from floating vessels but these were anchored in shallow water, and even of this it did far less than any major oil company. It has had no experience in scientific work, employs only one Ph. D.—a paper chemist—and holds few patents.

OPPORTUNITY IN REOPENED DOORS

Brown & Root's unexpected Mohole proposal hardly differed from one for a standard industrial or public works competition. Of its 190 pages, all but 20 consisted of off-the-shelf promotional material. It was in marked contrast to some proposals that elaborated on possible solutions of Mohole's technical problems.

The proposals were rated on October 20 by NSF's preliminary evaluation panel on the basis of 50 or so criteria. These reflected in part AMSOC's recommendations. Two proposals scored over 900 out of a possible 1,000 points. Socony Mobil's team stood in first place and the Global-Aerojet Shell joint ventue (GAS Co.) in second. Three teams scored in the low 800's: Zapata Off-Shore, General Electric, and Brown & Root. The last was fifth, with 801 points. The others were strung out behind. The panel reported to Dr. Waterman that Socony Mobil's proposal was "in a class by itself—outstanding as to every important aspect," and recommended that preliminary negotiations for contract be begun with Socony Mobil.

Dr. Waterman, instead, turned loose on the proposals and criteria a review panel of four NSF officials. This group confirmed the preliminary panel's ranking and got that panel to join it in a new recommendation: drop the low-ranking proposers and hold discussions with the remainder. The Director concurred, and on December 20, NSF wrote to the top five, advising them that they would be considered further, and "should feel free to explore the possible participation in the Mohole project" of any of those that had just been dropped. This opened a door to Brown & Root.

The Scherer letter, despite the fact that the July 27 invitation to submit stated that each proposal must be "complete, self-sufficient, and be able to stand on its own merits during subsequent evaluation," opened another door to Brown & Root by inviting amplification of any facets of the proposals.

In addition, the letter instructed each recipient that, if it had not earlier told how it would use the AMSOC staff, it should now do so. Socony Mobil and GAS had done so, but Brown & Root had not.

Having opened these doors, NSF invited the five remaining competitors to come through and make presentations in Washington on various dates in January.

Although George Brown had signed the early September letter covering his company's proposal, he says that it was only after December 20 that he personally became acutely aware of Mohole. The doors that NSF had opened could lead to the realization of an old dream. As a member, in 1951–52, of the President's Materials Policy Commission, Brown had become aware of industry's mounting problems in dealing with heat, pressure, and corrosion. Brown, a benefactor of Houston's Rice University, would like to see it become the country's greatest center of chemistry research, advancing man's mastery of heat, pressure, and corrosion. Experience on Project Mohole could contribute to this objective, and George Brown became much interested.

Brown & Root, the only one of the five survivors without teammates or impressive in-house technical capabilities, went through the newly opened door to line up for employment as subcontractors Minneapolis-Honeywell, Litton Industries' Western Geophysical Co., and A. H. Glenn & Associates. It added Rice University as a scientific associate. Brown & Root also went through the amplification door, telling NSF somewhat ambiguously that it "could certainly adapt" to putting the phase I technical group, headed by Bascom, in "an ad hoc advisory position."

After the five presentations called for by NSF, the preliminary evaluation panel rated the proposers anew. Brown & Root was moved up to third place with 899, or 98 points more than in the first go-round. GAS Co. gained 66, while Socony Mobil gained only 28, so that GAS now topped Socony, 968 to 964. The panel pointed out that while these two leaders had more in-house capability than Brown & Root, the latter had "an impressive record of major engineering undertakings, particularly marine engineering," and the panel recommended that further competition be confined to these three. On February 5, Zapata and General Electric were eliminated.

THE LAST HEAT

Following visits to the home offices of the three, the preliminary and review panels made a joint report to the director that did not recommend a company. What it said as summarized later by the Comptroller General of the United States, was that the joint panel members were equally divided between Brown & Root and an oil company, with Global-Aerojet-Shell favored "if an oil company was to be selected." Thus NSF's elaborate criteria became as weightless as a man in space. The decision now rested on quite different considerations. These had been worked up over the months of the evaluation procedure in informal discussions, which Dr. Benson describes as follows:

"A major company of any sort versus a smaller company versus a nonprofit company versus a petroleum company—these questions pervaded the discussions all the way through. I really can't assess how much it was the fact of being oil companies or the fact of being large that we were considering. Talk about oil companies grew like Topsy. We early discussed whether an oil company would deflect the project from its scientific objectives."

Preferences began shifting to what NSF calls a management company, that is, one that may lack relevant in-house capabilities but is experienced in recruiting special skills as required, project by project, as any profes-

> sional contractor does. And, Dr. Benson recounts, as early as October some of those engaged in evaluating the proposals became enthusiastic for Brown & Root.
>
> The decision, which finally became a policy question, as to the general class of company to be desired, had to be made by Dr. Waterman, to whom NSF's board had, months before, delegated the authority.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I should like to make a comment or two about Mr. Solow and his article. Mr. Solow first became interested in this project during the hearings before the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations of the Committee on Appropriations of the U.S. Senate last year. At that time our committee explored the problem in some depth with the National Science Foundation. I shall read, at a subsequent time, considerable portions of that testimony, to show the deviousness of, as well as the misinformation and the misleading answers supplied to the U.S. Senate by the National Science Foundation.

Mr. Solow is interested primarily in the fact that Mohole should become an actual, realistic, scientific project of major proportions. There is no question that that is his goal. I do not know how, if this had not been his goal, he could have dealt so kindly with the various officials of the National Science Foundation in his article.

I commend the entire article to my colleagues. It was printed in the RECORD on May 2. The whole article literally shrieks about mismanagement and the disregard of the proper use of public funds.

When I say "proper use," I do not mean that somebody stole something. I merely say that this whole project was handled with a vacant-headedness characteristic of a child rather than an adult.

Mr. Solow spent a great deal of his time from August of last year until his article appeared in the May issue of Fortune investigating this subject. Mr. President, if I had had an investigator available to me, as a Member of the Senate and as a member of the Appropriations Committee, I am sure we could have added much to what is available, especially if we had been able to call in witnesses and put them under oath. Unfortunately, we do not have—at least the minority Members of the Senate do not have—such investigators available.

It might be well to repeat at this time that twice last year we tried, from this side of the aisle, to obtain 1 staff member for every 10 the Democrats have, and twice we were defeated roundly on a straight party vote. If we had had available personnel to investigate this problem last year, both before and after the hearing, I am satisfied we could have avoided what is going to be a catastrophe in the field of science.

But I pay my tribute to Mr. Solow, because his only interest is to see the success of this project. He realizes that out of it may come more basic scientific knowledge than we will obtain from a shot to the moon. This is fully possible, because if we can get through the earth's crust or mantle we can gain more knowledge about the formation of the earth, of what it consists, and what happens in the earth, than from many other scientific experiments. Therefore, it is significant.

Mr. Solow in his article said:

> Some company representatives say that pronouncements by NSF officials on July 27—

That is 1961, of course—

> left them with two other impressions. One was that, in Dr. Benson's words, "any good bidder will want the AMSOC staff." There seemed to be no objection to that.

Who were the Amsoc staff? The part of the Amsoc staff referred to here is with a group now known as O.S. & E.—Ocean Science and Engineering, Inc.—headed by Mr. Willard Bascom. This is the group especially referred to as the "Amsoc staff" because they carried on phase I of Mohole off of La Jolla and Guadalupe, about which I previously spoke.

I refer again to the article:

> The other impression was that NSF would give preference to no-fee, all-for-science proposals. At this point, some profit-motivated listeners shut their notebooks and retired from the field.

This points up what I have already discussed and stressed.

By the time of the deadline, August 26, 1961, most proposals had come in. Brown & Root did not come in with a proposal until after the deadline, namely September 11. At that time they did not have the people they expected to be associated with. Those did not become known until some time later in the year.

On February 28, 1962, Dr. Waterman made public the selection of Brown & Root for negotiations looking toward a contract for phase II of Project Mohole. This announcement said:

> The award of the Mohole contract will signal the start of work on man's greatest single geological exploration project. Selection of Brown & Root, Inc. as a prospective prime contractor caps months of proposal solicitation, review and analysis, briefings and selection. Of 12 proposals received, most were very good and some were excellent. The degree of interest, imagination and capability shown by U.S. industry in drawing up these proposals is most gratifying. We are confident, however, that the resources and capabilities of Brown & Root, Inc., together with the plan it has presented for going ahead with the work, will give us the best approach to achieve our scientific and engineering goals. Under terms of the forthcoming contract, Brown & Root will plan, manage, and furnish or procure all services, material and facilities necessary for drilling a hole through the crust of the earth, and for sampling, logging, and coring it for scientific data. No definitive cost or time estimates are presently available on phase II of Project Mohole. Rough estimates in proposals have ranged from about $35 million to about $50 million, with time estimates of from 3 to as much as 7 years. These factors will largely be determined by the particular techniques and facilities to be utilized and by the scientific priorities that may be assigned.

I wish to comment for a moment about the $35 to $50 million figure. Nobody knows what the project is going to cost. The National Science Foundation has repeatedly withheld information as to the speculative figures of the bidders on these projects. Last year, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], had to direct letters, not only to the National Science Foundation but to the General Accounting Office, asking them to go into this question and attempt to ascertain what the anticipated cost of the project was.

Mr. President, we have reached a rather peculiar pass in government when an auxiliary branch of the Government, the National Science Foundation, an independent agency of government, regards itself in such a sanctimonious, sacrosanct, and holy light that it feels it does not have to divulge to Congress, and particularly a member of the Appropriations Committee in the Senate which handles the matter, the cost of the project. Yet there will be found in the RECORD, spread there by the senior Senator from California and by the senior Senator from Colorado, the fact that these figures were not available. Everything was shrouded in secrecy. I propose to show that at great length before I am through this afternoon.

The screening of applicants was undertaken in two steps. The first was called a preliminary evaluation panel, and the second, consisting of senior people in the Foundation, was called the NSF review panel. Through these two separate evaluations the 10 or 12 serious contenders were studied, measured, scrutinized, and weighed on the basis of criteria and standards developed by the Foundation itself. During the hearings on Independent Offices appropriations last year, I interrogated Dr. Waterman and his associates at some length concerning most phases of Project Mohole. The question of evaluation was specifically raised and according to Dr. Waterman and his assistant, Mr. Scherer, Brown & Root ranked fifth among the applicants in the preliminary evaluation and third in the final review. A point score index was assigned to each, and the ultimate contract recipient, Brown & Root, scored lower by a margin of over 10 percent on each occasion. In the preliminary evaluation the scores were:

1. Socony Mobil Oil Co	936
2. Global-Aerojet-Shell Marine Co	902
3. Zapata Off-Shore Co	812
4. General Electric Co	811
5. Brown & Root, Inc	801
6. University of California	787
7. Melpar, Inc	780
8. Litten Systems, Inc	780
9. System Development Corp	756
10. Battelle Memorial Institute	753
11. National Engineering Science Co	729

In the final evaluation the scores were:

1. Global-Aerojet-Shell Marine Co	968
2. Socony Mobil Oil Co	964
3. Brown & Root, Inc	899
4. Zapata Off-Shore Co	890
5. General Electric Co	846

Here again we approach an evaluation which generally puts Brown & Root about 10 percent below the leader.

In a letter to the senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] the Comptroller General of the United States outlined its review of the award to Brown & Root. This letter details the criteria which NSF used in its screening and evaluation studies of applicants. Quoting in part from this letter of June 18, 1962:

> Five broad categories of criteria for the evaluation of proposals were approved by the Director of the National Science Foundation with weights and points assigned to each.

This is one of the basic errors that was made from the beginning. I think it was so great an error that I cannot help but wonder, as many others do, if Brown & Root did not have their foot in the door when the project was first opened and discussed.

I give the weights that were assigned to the various items:

First. The weight that is given to financial capability is 8 percent, which would give 80 points if they were perfect.

Comprehension and soundness of approach, 8 percent.

Management and policy considerations, 39 percent.

Support facilities available or readily obtainable, 14 percent.

Technical and scientific experience and capability, 31 percent.

Upon a weighted basis, which is the way this question was determined, we have the most important thing of all weighted less than management. Management is weighted at 39 percent, and technical and scientific experience and capability are rated at 31 percent.

What else is needed in a scientific project? Of course, one needs the kind of facilities that can plan such a scientific experiment. One needs the kind of support facilities which are capable of designing the tools and equipment needed.

Yet the kind of facilities which had been asked for in the first demand of NSF was reduced to 14 percent. Mr. President, 14 percent of the weight assigned was given to one of the most important factors in this entire consideration.

Therefore, we start out on a completely unsound basis.

The Comptroller goes on to point out his inability to conclude that the award to Brown & Root was not in the public interest.

I do not know what kind of decision one can call this. I have never read such a letter as this from any similar group. My respect for the head of GAO, the Comptroller of the United States, is probably as high as the respect I have for anyone else in Government. I have great respect for him personally and for his integrity and for the kind of organization he heads. I realize that it is not possible for him to do himself the individual tasks we assign to him. On the other hand, it is his responsibility ultimately to sign the letter that his staff has prepared, based upon the work it has done.

However, even with that consideration, I find it very hard to understand how the Comptroller could sign a letter which concludes with these words:

> In view of the foregoing, we are unable to conclude that the award to Brown & Root was not in the public interest. Further, we do not believe that our review has disclosed evidence of abuse or misuse of the Foundation's contracting authority which would require or justify recommendations for legislation placing additional requirements or restrictions on the procurement functions of the Foundation.

It is very significant that he carefully avoids saying that the decision which the National Science Foundation reached was sound or that it was in the public interest.

The first sentence states that they are unable to conclude that the award to Brown & Root was not in the public interest. If that is not talking out of both sides of the mouth at the same time, I do not know what is. If it was not in the public interest, what was it? If it cannot be concluded that it was not in the public interest, do they conclude that it was in the public interest? The answer is obvious. If they had found it was in the public interest, they would have said so. If they had found this was a good award, they would have said so.

It is very noticeable that they refrain from doing so. The last sentence of their letter is just as significant. They do not say that this was a good award. They merely say:

> Our review did not disclose an abuse of their contracting authority.

In other words, it was within their discretion to select anyone of the bidders. However, again they completely fail to say that they believe that the National Science Foundation used its best discretion, or that the party selected was the best one to do the job.

There is a factor which has not been emphasized in the consideration of this contract, and its manifest import comes to the fore in the numerical scores received by each of the applicants for the Mohole project.

Based on the erroneous weighting in the first instance, and based upon the meticulous criteria, detailed in scope, comprehensive and technical in their import, designed by NSF itself, the finalist fails to stand out. It fails to stand out anywhere along the long, tortuous path that the Brown & Root people pursued to bid on this project.

We must keep in mind that most of the bidders are bidding on a no-fee basis, merely in order to advance the cause of science.

Of course, the one which was capable of doing the work would also benefit in prestige.

In this respect I believe that the finalist fails to stand out, and that the National Science Foundation has been singularly deficient. I am deeply disturbed by the failure of NSF to abide by the guidelines which it had established in July of 1961. I charge the NSF with an irresponsible assessment of the proposals. In this regard, I call attention again to the Comptroller's letter dealing with the criteria used:

> We believe that such criteria and weights are basically sound and proper for application in a procurement of this nature. However, because of the scientific, technical, and engineering judgments necessarily involved in such application, we are unable to state whether the criteria are adequately applied in evaluating the proposals.

I hold NSF responsible, not for an error in judgment, but for the failure to follow through to the ultimate and logical conclusion and reach a decision which its very own criteria dictated. There is no useful purpose to be served in evaluating prospects in numerical and ascending order of priority—if this priority is then to be totally disregarded. Why did Dr. Waterman turn to the third ranked applicant—only he can answer that—and he did, in his announcement of the award to Brown & Root that it is the best qualified, based on: First, Brown & Root's strong management capabilities; second, demonstrated capability in successfully completing complex projects; third, their experience in dealing with the oil industry and other industries with capabilities that could be used in Mohole; fourth, and the conclusion that the plan it has presented for going ahead with the work will give the Government the best approach to achieve the scientific and engineering goals.

With respect to its "demonstrated capability in successfully completing complex projects," Dr. Waterman, supposedly an eminent scientist, had become completely lost in the use of words because dealing with complex projects is a far, far cry from dealing with a very complex scientific exploration in a basic field.

The reversal in attitude and in direction between NSF's original invitation for submission of proposals for phase II of Mohole and this final announcement of the successful application is both astounding and complete. On July 27, 1961, the original invitation listed as the first factor to be considered:

> Experience in the field of management of experimental projects—

Nowhere in the whole record can a single line be found concerning the experience of Brown & Root in the management of experimental projects. I continue—

> or projects of a research engineering and developmental nature of comparable magnitude and complexity.

Granted that Brown & Root have engaged in many big and wonderful projects in the world; still the projects in which they have engaged cannot possibly be made to fulfill the criteria which NSF itself established.

However, by February 28, 1962, these had been watered down, and the applicant was declared to be successful on:

> 1. Brown & Root's strong management capabilities.

Obviously, it was more difficult to qualify as an applicant than as the final recipient.

So there were 10 criteria which had been established and recited in the letter of July 27; but by the time of the announcement they had all been watered down to a mere statement that Brown & Root had strong management capabilities. Upon this factor Dr. Waterman justified his award of the contract to Brown & Root.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of a letter dated July 27, 1961, from National Science Foundation and distributed to those who were interested in bidding on the project. The letter sets forth specifically the 10 criteria which would be used in evaluating the proposals for this project.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION,
Washington, D.C., July 27, 1961.

INVITATION TO SUBMIT PROPOSAL FOR PHASE II OF MOHOLE PROJECT

The National Science Foundation invites you to submit a management proposal for consideration as the prime contractor who would ultimately provide the necessary services, facilities, materials, and equipment for the Mohole Project as generally described in the attached material and as outlined in the briefing meeting.

Proposals will be evaluated on the basis of engineering approach, skills, experience, and your independent appraisal as to how you would manage the entire program. You should set forth clearly how you propose to handle the project if awarded the contract. Your submission showing your comprehension of and response to the problem, the feasibility of your approach and your demonstrated capabilities will be among the key factors in selection of the prime contractor. The information must be complete, self-sufficient, and be able to stand on its own merits during subsequent evaluation.

In order that the Foundation may give full consideration to your proposal and capabilities, there should be included, as a supplement to your proposal for management of the project, information of the following nature: (These factors are suggestive of some of the topics required to be included with your submission and are not to be considered all-inclusive).

1. Experience in the field of management of experimental projects or projects of a research engineering and developmental nature of comparable magnitude and complexity.

2. Names and qualifications of the staff that would be assigned to the project. (Appropriate organization charts showing departmental lines of responsibility and duties.)

3. Experience in marine operations, deep-drilling projects, and other fields relating to the project including capabilities for designing experiments and equipment.

4. Facilities available and sources for obtaining other required facilities and previous history in subcontracting effort.

5. A brief statement of your financial resources.

6. Expressed willingness to contribute freely of your own knowledge and to permit publication of all methods and results.

7. A statement of your methods of handling major subcontracts and any surcharges or rate of fee thereon.

8. The rate of fee that would be charged prime contractor effort, overhead, and general and administrative rates that would be charged to this project during the next 12 months.

9. Any other statements of special skills and facilities or other information you feel pertinent for the proper evaluation of your capabilities.

10. Set forth past record in performing highly complex management and engineering work.

If selected for further consideration, the Foundation may request that you furnish additional information relating to your financial resources, equipment, salary scales of key technical personnel that would be assigned to the project, etc.

Award of the contract will be on a phase basis, dependent in part on the successful proposal and availability of funds to the Foundation. However, one prime contractor will be selected for the entire project.

It is to be noted that cost estimates are not required to be submitted in response to this invitation. This letter is not to be construed as a contract or commitment of any kind.

Your proposal should be received not later than August 26, 1961, by the National Science Foundation, Washington 25, D.C. Attention: Earth Sciences Program Office.

Sincerely yours,
RANDALL M. ROBERTSON,
Assistant Director for Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences.

Mr. ALLOTT. The requirement of "experience in marine operations, deep-drilling projects, and other fields relating to the project including capabilities for designing experiments and equipment" gave way to: "their experience in dealing with the oil industry and other industries with capabilities that could be used in Mohole."

So we sacrificed, at some time between July 27, 1961, and the time the contract was let, February 28, 1962, all of the 10 criteria to which the first applicants were held so rigidly.

The fact that the top two finalists expressly waived any fee for the project evidently was not a factor, because the recipient, Brown & Root, included $1.8 million as a management fee; despite the fact that the original invitation specifically inquired as to: "the rate of fee that would be charged prime contractor efforts, overhead, and general and administrative rates that would be charged to this project during the next 12 months." I call particular attention to the fact that the $1.8 million is not the only fee that Brown & Root will receive.

The fourth of Dr. Waterman's reasons for selecting Brown & Root, namely, "the conclusion that the plan it has presented for going ahead with the work will give the Government the best approach to achieve the scientific and engineering goals," is in a category all by itself and deserves separate treatment. But before doing so, I should like to discuss another factor. I must preface my remarks with a statement about the relationship that has existed between the senior Senator from Colorado and the National Science Foundation and Dr. Waterman.

Up to the time the contract was awarded, the relationship had been very fine. In fact, during the years 1959, 1960, and the early part of 1961, Dr. Waterman felt enough confidence in the senior Senator from Colorado to come to my office and discuss what the appropriations and needs of the National Science Foundation would be and what he was trying to accomplish in the Foundation. He did this on a friendly basis. Therefore, it was with the greatest of chagrin that I found, early in the committee hearings on Project Mohole, that I was receiving from Dr. Waterman devious and evasive replies. His entire attitude could not help but put me on guard as to the complete reliability of Dr. Waterman's replies.

In order that I may take this phase of events out of personal context, I should like to read from the open hearings in August of last year before the Committee on Appropriations. I shall read replies which Dr. Waterman gave to me during these hearings. They are not replies that someone would give on the street; they are replies that Dr. Waterman made in open committee hearings. They continue for some 50 or 60 pages of fine print and indicate indefiniteness, vagueness, and an unwillingness to be specific. This occurred on August 16, 1962, and appears at page 1371 of the hearings on the independent offices appropriation bill. On that day I said to Dr. Waterman:

On July 10, 1961, Dr. Waterman, you sent out a letter to various people in the United States announcing the Mohole project.

Mr. WATERMAN. I haven't the date here.

Senator ALLOTT. I will check that—in which you announced the briefing session in Washington on July 27, 1961.

Mr. WATERMAN. Yes, sir.

Senator ALLOTT. And you have been handed a copy of that letter. Is that a copy of it?

Mr. WATERMAN. I haven't the original with me. Mr. Scherer has been responsible for the details of this.

Senator ALLOTT. If you deny that it is a true copy you can deny it in the record subsequently. It will be included in the record.

Mr. WATERMAN. I just don't have the original with me.

The letter is then set forth in the hearings.

Then the following colloquy took place:

Senator ALLOTT. At a subsequent time you sent out what was termed an "Advance Announcement of Briefing Session for Prospective Prime Contractors on the Mohole Project." I hand you a copy of that. Do you recognize it?

Mr. WATERMAN. This appears to be a copy of the letter we sent; yes.

Senator ALLOTT. If it is not a true copy you may also deny that.

And a copy of this will be included in the record.

That letter in included in the record of hearings.

Then we discussed the meeting, and I asked:

Did you hold that meeting?

Mr. WATERMAN. This meeting was held; yes, sir.

Senator ALLOTT. And how many people attended?

Mr. WATERMAN. Mr. Scherer.

Mr. SCHERER. Eighty-four.

Senator ALLOTT. And how many organizations did that represent, Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. Those were 84 organizations, Senator. Those were representatives of 84 organizations.

Then I returned to my questioning of Dr. Waterman regarding the qualification regarding financial resources. I said:

I will ask you now, did you eliminate any bidders or proposals upon this basis?

Mr. WATERMAN. After that first hearing?

Senator ALLOTT. At any time.

Mr. WATERMAN. No.

Mr. SCHERER. We did not, no.

Then I quoted from the announcement of the initial meeting. Following that, I said:

I want to ask you, in view of the fact that a letter contract has subsequently been made to Brown & Root, did Brown & Root have a representative at that meeting?

Mr. WATERMAN. Mr. Scherer.

Mr. SCHERER. No, not at that meeting.

Senator ALLOTT. Now, you prepared, as a result of that, a list of "interested" parties.

Again Mr. Scherer, not Dr. Waterman, answered:

Then I asked him:

> Just wait a moment and you will get an opportunity to answer anything that doesn't present your side of the case.
>
> I will ask you again if the Brown & Root Co. was on the list of "interested" people which was prepared as a result of that meeting?
>
> Mr. SCHERER. No.

Then I asked Dr. Waterman:

> What was the nature of that proposal?

He replied:

> We can look that up for you, Mr. Chairman.

At another point I again asked him:

> Is it not true that at the July 27 meeting you indicated that you were going to select a prime contractor within 1 month after August 26?

He replied:

> Was that the understanding at that time, Mr. Scherer?

And I asked:

> Now let's find out what the Global Marine group consisted of.

Dr. Waterman said:

> Do you have that answer, Mr. Scherer?

And so it went.

I also asked:

> Didn't you also inform me that it was still under consideration by the evaluation board, and it was not before you yet at that time?

Dr. Waterman said:

> I can't recall that, sir. I just don't remember.

So we find that 50 or 60 pages of the hearings demonstrate continued unwillingness to answer, evasiveness, or that if the witness did attempt to answer at all, he referred the question to others. Yet we must remember that Dr. Waterman said that he, himself, had made the final decision which resulted in taking Brown & Root from fifth place to third place, and later to first place, and then giving them the contract.

But that witness' testimony was pervaded with evasiveness all the way through. He could answer only the simplest questions which were propounded to him at that time. Yet he made the final decision to bring Brown & Root from fifth place to third place, and subsequently to first place, and to ignore, in any strict sense, all the criteria which the National Science Foundation had established, and to award the contract basically on the conclusion that Brown & Root was a pretty good management company.

Mr. President, I shall not deal at this time with many other things which I might now discuss; but I wish to say that I have evaluated this matter very thoroughly. In addition to evaluating Brown & Root, I have evaluated the other companies, as regards the criteria they could meet, on the basis of meeting the 10 requirements which the National Science Foundation set forth at its July 27 meeting. I have some of that material here.

I shall say unequivocally that of the first five organizations which were selected on the basis of the criteria which the National Science Foundation itself had established, and upon the basis of the weighing of their capabilities, any one of the other four was more capable than the one finally selected; and in connection with the selection from the three, any of the other two was more capable than the eventual winner.

Mr. President, no doubt many persons who saw the Kentucky Derby last week wish that the third place winner could be changed to the first place winner. But I stress the point that in connection with this contract, and based upon all the criteria which were established, any of the other firms which were being considered was more capable than the group which was finally selected.

Mr. President, what have the recent developments been? First of all, I wish to say it is almost impossible to find out the facts from anyone at NSF. From another quarter, I have had one talk with Dr. Wiesner, special assistant to the President. He was very cooperative in telling me that the matter was under consideration.

The performance of Brown & Root was so unsatisfactory that a committee has been appointed by the National Science Foundation, chiefly by Dr. Bronk, of the Foundation, under the chairmanship of Mr. Piore, a rather prominent scientist.

The Amsoc committee itself has apparently retained some connection with the project. At least, some 2 weeks ago it was able to come to the National Science Foundation and listen to the report which Brown & Root furnished in regard to its first 14 months of operation. However, it is very interesting to note at this point what has happened to O.S. & E., the Ocean Science and Engineering group, the Willard Bascom group, which I mentioned earlier in my remarks. It is the group which essentially did the Phase I operation in connection with Mohole.

When we set the date of hearings for the Senate Appropriations subcommittee, last year, we were forced, because of circumstances, to postpone the hearings for several days. But when we were holding the hearings, I asked Dr. Waterman what he was going to do with this great scientific capability—a particular and peculiar scientific ability applicable to this field—the O.S. & E. group, which at one time was part of the staff of Amsoc. At the hearing he said to me, "Oh, we have them under contract. They are our scientific advisers." That was all he said on that point.

I had occasion to look up that matter; and I found that Dr. Waterman had gone out, the afternoon before we were originally to hold the hearing, and had signed a contract with this group, so that he could come to the hearing and could cloak himself, for this project, with some sort of scientific respectability.

What has happened since then? We have had a year of fumbling. The O.S. & E. group was taken to Brown & Root, at first; and they copied all the material that the O.S. & E. group had. In fact Brown & Root even copied a mistake, in one instance; and that was the basis on which Brown & Root made its report to the National Science Foundation.

The O.S. & E. group went to Brown & Root, and very carefully evaluated everything which had been done, and then prepared its findings in Technical Report No. 5 entitled, "Review of Brown & Root Technical Report, Project Mohole, Phase II, Drilling Vessel Recommendation." I have it before me at this time.

However, the O.S. & E. group, which was to provide the scientific know-how for Brown & Root, was not even permitted to take its own evaluation out of the Brown & Root office, in Houston, Tex., when they parted company. But I have that report before me at this time; and one does not have to examine it very far to find out how critical the O.S. & E. group was of the performance of Brown & Root. The summary introduction of the O.S. & E. report indicates this:

> SUMMARY
>
> The recommendation by Brown & Root that a four-column stabilized platform be chosen as the ultimate drilling vessel for Project Mohole, phase II, is premature because they have not established the complete project requirements. Until all of the project requirements are clearly defined, there are no valid standards against which the capabilities of any vessel can be compared. Omission of certain criteria or the relegation of others to secondary importance will "load" the analysis in one direction or another.
>
> In our opinion this has been done in the subject report. We feel it presents questionable comparisons primarily because it leaves the impression of presenting data to support a conclusion already drawn.
>
> We do not necessarily disagree with the conclusion that a platform is a worthier vessel for phase II than any of the ships considered. Rather we note the absence of proper criteria and take issue with the completeness of the analysis, the rather summary dismissal of ship-type hulls, and the failure to consider certain vital aspects of using the platform for an extended drilling program. This difficulty stems partly from the work statement in the contract which requires the contractor "to drill a hole at a site," which shows a fundamental misunderstanding of the objectives of the project. On the other hand, if the report had properly appraised the difficulties of drilling that hole, it would have approached the problem of developing the proper equipment in a more logical fashion.
>
> It is our opinion that until such time as the contractor evolves complete operational plan criteria any comparison, analysis or recommendation is superfluous, premature and, in the end, very costly.

There then follows a report consisting of approximately 31 pages filled with specific criticisms of the work of Brown & Root.

What has happened to O.S. & E.? One would think that we would approach one of the most staggering and challenging scientific projects ever conceived by man, on which we will expend $100 million, with an air of idealism.

After the publication of the article by Mr. Solow in Fortune on May 1, something must have occurred, because yesterday the O.S. & E. group received a letter from the National Science Foundation stating that their contract would be canceled. Their contract expires on July 1 anyway, I believe. There are certain 60-day termination requirements in the contract. So an announcement now that the contract is terminated may be of no significance at all. But a logical thinker could, if he wished, somehow connect the cancellation with the fact that within a day or two after the article appeared in Fortune magazine, O.S. & E. was terminated.

Does that action mean that the arm of Brown & Root is so long and so powerful that because of the criticisms directed against it by the Fortune article, it can reach into the National Science Foundation and say to them, "You must cancel this contract with the people who are the scientific advisers to the Mohole project"?

There is no question that this particular group has within it more scientific know-how in this specialized area than any like group in the United States. If the arm of anyone is so long that it can reach into the National Science Foundation and cause the termination of a contract, we had better look into the fundamental processes of our Government.

We must recall that Dr. Waterman associated this scientific O.S. & E. group with him in the first place in order to provide a cloak of scientific respectability to the contracts that he had awarded.

Brown & Root still has no plan. The Amsoc committee is evaluating the situation. I do not know what their decision will be. It seems impossible to find out anything about it. The Amsoc committee, I understand—and I did not obtain this information through regular channels; I have had to pick it up here and there—is to meet in Houston with Brown & Root sometime during this week. I understand the date is the 9th. The Amsoc committee will then and there tell Brown & Root what they think about this subject.

I may have misstated the fact slightly. It may be the Piore committee that will meet in Houston, Tex., and give their evaluation to what Brown & Root has accomplished to date.

I only hope that we Americans who will pay approximately $100 million for the project might have some slight opportunity to find out what this evaluation produces.

Mr. President, I could discuss the subject for several more hours and still not cover all of the unusual facets—the unfortunate, uneconomic, unsound policies—that have been uncovered with respect to Project Mohole.

I wish to conclude with what I said last week. According to our best estimates, we must have something between $3 and $4 million in the project as of the present time. Brown & Root must have started working on the project somewhere around February, 1962, which means they have now been working on it for a period of more than 14 months, and they should be able to show specific, concrete advances.

Not only the Congress, but the American people also, are entitled to know what has been done, and to have the project evaluated by a team of scientists who are not connected with the National Science Foundation. I understand that would be difficult because the Foundation donates money to almost every educational institution in the United States. It would be quite difficult to find someone who is not tied in some way with the Foundation. But we American people are entitled to find out what has become of the $100 million boondoggle. I am sure it is a "boon" to the people who receive the fee. What I want to get rid of is the "doggle."

It seems to me that, if need be, we ought to begin anew. I would not be afraid to set the project back 2 years. I do not desire to get rid of it. I am as interested as anyone else in the world in the accomplishment of this particular scientific project, because I believe I have some small idea of what it can mean in terms of basic knowledge. But if we must throw away the $3 or $4 million that we have put into it, let us throw it away. But let us have a new evaluation. Let us pick somebody that we know can do it. Let us establish criteria for the people who can accomplish it. Let us hold the selection to those criteria, and then let us select the people to move on from there. I would rather lose $3 or $4 million, whatever it is, and unfortunate as it may be, than to have to face the prospect of seeing the United States throw $100 or $75 million, or whatever the amount turns out to be, down the hole without accomplishing our basic purpose.

The Russians are moving fast and hard in this field. Do we wish to permit them to be first again? I do not think so. That would be tough. It would be hard for all Americans to swallow. It would be much harder if, in doing so, we spent $100 million and did not accomplish the purpose we intended to accomplish.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. DOMINICK. I wish to express my personal gratitude—and I believe the gratitude of most Senators—for an extremely able presentation of a very difficult problem. The Senator has brought to public attention something which is of growing concern, not only in respect to the particular project of which he speaks, but also in respect to many other governmental projects of one form or another.

As the Senator knows, recently the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case] introduced a resolution in connection with defense contracts and space contracts. It seems to me, in the light of what my colleague has said in connection with the Mohole contract, that perhaps we ought to extend the resolution to cover other governmental agencies. The purpose of the resolution, which so many Senators cosponsored, was to put the light of publicity on the question of how a contract is negotiated and the conversations which go into it, with the necessity for memorandums on all executive communications with the contractor or other representatives who are trying to influence the selection of a contractor, and a variety of things of that kind, which I think might be extremely helpful to my colleague in respect to the particular instance of which he speaks, and in respect to other instances which may occur in the future.

Again I wish to say that I think this is of extreme importance to the Senate, and I congratulate my colleague.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for his kind remarks.

In all fairness, I should say that, with the rather limited means available to me to investigate this problem, I have not found anything which would be described as dishonesty. I owe it to Brown & Root, which is a great construction firm, to say that.

I am somewhat aghast at the apparent power of somebody to fire the O.S. & E. group, but I think probably that was because of an ability to pursue an advantage more ably than others.

I have been asked many times if I am against the Mohole project. I think it is apparent from what I have said that I am not. When asked, I merely reply, "No. It is very obvious that I am not. With all my heart and my soul I should like to see it succeed."

Mr. President, I observe that the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey] is in the Chamber. I had promised the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] that I would suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall do so in a moment, if the Senator will permit.

TREASURY, POST OFFICE, AND EXECUTIVE OFFICE APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 148, House bill 5366.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (H.R. 5366) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. ROBERTSON obtained the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I yield, without losing the floor, in order that a point of no quorum may be made.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche] wishes me to yield to him for a few moments, and I do so with the understanding that I do not lose the floor.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be placed in the Record an article written by Thomas Talburt, of the Scripps-Howard newspapers, pointing out that the Rural Electrification Administration will lend $2,200,000 to a rural electrification company to set up transmission lines to carry out a contract. This rural electrification company has underbid a private electric company in supplying power to a Federal military agency. I have asked that the article be included in the Record because the loan will be made to the rural electrification company at an interest rate of 2 percent, when our Government, in borrowing the money to make the loan, will be paying about 4 percent for the money.

I further ask that there be placed in the Record an article carried by the Cincinnati Post and Times Star, dealing with the identical subject of the rural electric co-op of Hamilton, Ohio, borrowing money from the Rural Electrification Administration at 2 percent interest, while it is investing its own money in a private utility in Cincinnati.

The record shows that this rural electrification cooperative of Hamilton, Ohio, owns about 1,000 shares of the Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co., a private utility. The value of this stock is about $55,000.

In asking unanimous consent that both these articles be printed in the Record, I state that I contemplate introducing a bill requiring the Rural Electrification Administration, whenever it makes a loan, to charge a rate of interest equal to that which the Government has to pay for borrowing money, and not to continue these loans at 2 percent a year, except in those instances where the loans are made clearly and unequivocally to provide electrical power to farmers living in areas in which private companies are not supplying the service.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Cleveland Press, May 6, 1963]

Co-op Wins Contract; Private Utility Claims Taxpayer Is Loser

(By Thomas Talburt)

Washington.—A Government-subsidized Rural Electrification Administration cooperative in Florida has won an Air Force contract by underbidding a private utility company.

Over the long haul, the contract probably will cost taxpayers more than it would have in the hands of the private company.

The REA cooperative has received approval of a $2,200,000 Federal loan to set up transmission lines to carry out the contract.

The private utility that lost the contract, Gulf Power Co., of Pensacola, already has the needed powerlines strung. REA lines will run parallel to the existing power company lines.

The subsidized cooperative at Defuniak Springs, Fla., is getting the $2,200,000 REA loan at the 2 percent interest rate approved by Congress.

The Government will pay about 5 percent interest on the money it is lending at 2 percent.

The contract to supply power to a new space project at Eglin Air Force Base, Fla., was awarded in February. Although the Government loan had not been approved then, the cooperative counted on getting it to submit the low bid.

The power rates submitted by the two bidders reflected their different financial positions.

The REA cooperative will pay no Federal income tax on its income from the project. The Gulf Power Co. would have paid regular corporation taxes up to a maximum of 52 percent of profit.

The cooperative was in a position to borrow from REA at 2 percent. Gulf Power faced a 5- to 6-percent interest rate on any money it borrowed.

Revenue from the Eglin Base project is estimated by REA at $275,000 a year. Gulf Power Co. would have paid the Government at least $43,500 of this in taxes. The REA cooperative will pay nothing except the low interest on its loan.

The cooperative's winning bid called for a power rate of 7.555 mills per kilowatt-hour. Gulf Power Co.'s bid was 8.74 mills.

Gulf Power Co. claimed that by subtracting the amount the company would have paid in taxes, net cost to the Government for power from the private utility would have been 7.44 mills per kilowatt-hour.

But Air Force officials, in a letter received by Representative Robert H. Michel, Republican, of Illinois, admit no consideration was given to tax revenue the Government would have gotten from Gulf Power. Also forgotten was the cost to the Government of the REA cooperative's 2 percent subsidized loan.

[From the Cincinnati Post Times Star, May 1, 1963]

Co-ops Borrow From the United States at 2 Percent, Lend Out at 4 and 5

Washington.—Rural cooperatives subsidized by Government loans from the Rural Electrification Administration (REA) are investing income in private utilities and other businesses.

The co-ops are making money by borrowing taxpayers' dollars from REA at a 2-percent interest, and then lending or investing earnings at rates bearing higher interest.

Profits and dividends do not go back to the Government. They go to the member-owned co-ops.

The General Accounting Office, a congressional watchdog agency, is winding up a year-long audit of REA's electric loan program. Findings, which one source predicts will be "very interesting," should be made public in June or July.

It is understood the Butler Rural Electric Cooperative, Inc., of Hamilton, Ohio, owns about 1,000 shares of stock in the Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co., a private utility. Market value of this stock is about $55,000.

Everett S. Hoy, manager of the 3,000-member Butler co-op, declined to confirm it has invested in Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co., but added: "To operate a business we have to have reserve funds and to maintain these funds we do make certain investments."

This is perfectly legal. REA officials say it would be illegal only if the Government loans were invested.

Since 1936, the Butler co-op has borrowed $1,912,805 from REA to string power lines and electrify farms. It had repaid $458,183 plus 2 percent interest in regular payments as of December 31, 1961.

It also paid $157,570 in advance payments on its 35-year loans, thereby cutting down the length of time it had to pay REA's low interest rate.

The co-op's total assets were $1,767,086 as of December 31, 1961. Its net worth was $497,504.

The net margin—or profit—earned by the Butler co-op or any other cooperative can be invested in any way its directors decide, REA officials say.

"We don't know much about these investments because they are the co-op's business," explained one official. "They cannot use REA loans for anything that isn't approved in their applications—construction of lines, certain buildings, payment of attorneys' fees."

There's an exception to this rule which permits co-ops to borrow from REA at the same 2-percent interest rate and lend the money out directly to their own consumers at up to 5 percent interest.

A co-op in Elizabeth, Ill., borrowed $22,068 from REA to finance outdoor lighting, electric motors for a ski lift and snowmaking equipment for a resort.

The co-op will earn $10,000 a year from sale of electricity to this consumer, and it is charging 4 percent interest on the loan with REA's blessing.

This type of operation is being studied by Congressman Jamie Whitten, Democrat, of Mississippi, chairman of a House Appropriations subcommittee checking REA's budget requests for the coming year, who says:

"I can't see why an REA co-op should be allowed to borrow at 2 percent interest and lend it out at 4 or 5 percent, therefore showing a profit.

"I don't see any reason to give a local co-op the difference between what it pays in interest rates and what it charges."

REA is the only Government lending agency authorized by law to lend money at a 2-percent interest rate. Over the years it has borrowed $4.8 billion from the Federal Treasury in behalf of rural electric co-ops.

About $2.8 billion of this debt still was outstanding on June 30, 1961.

REA got authority to borrow $400 million from the Treasury at 2 percent this year. It wants to borrow up to $516 million in the upcoming fiscal year.

The surge is largely because co-ops are borrowing more and more money to supply power to industrial and commercial firms, rather than farms. Nearly 25 percent of power distributed by co-ops goes to industries and businesses.

To some extent, this is hurting cities. Industries are being attracted to rural areas by lower electricity rates provided by federally subsidized co-ops.

PHILIPPINE WAR CLAIMS AMENDMENT OF 1963

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, with the understanding that I do not lose the floor, I yield to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright].

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, 3 weeks ago, the Committee on Foreign Relations made public certain facts relative to the passage by the Congress last year of the Philippine War Claims Act of 1962. On the basis of these facts, the Committee on Foreign Relations approved an amendment to that act which, we believed, would best correct the situation that had been uncovered by the committee.

The course the committee approved—direct payment of the $73 million to the Philippine Government—had two main aims:

First. With insurance by the Philippine Government, it would provide the best legal guarantee that no fees would be paid to any former member or employee of the Philippine War Damage Commission.

Second. By transferring the funds directly to the Philippine Government, it would place the 1962 act more in line with the original act of 1946—a rehabilitation, not a war claims act which had as its purpose the economic development of the Philippine Republic.

The Senate Committee on Appropriations agreed with the Committee on Foreign Relations as to the course to be followed and inserted an amendment in the supplemental appropriations bill.

Last week, the Senate voted its approval of the committee's proposal by a two-thirds vote when it defeated 56 to 28 an attempt to substitute language similar to the language that we have before us today.

Mr. President, I understand the difficulties in legislating in this fashion and the problems that faced our Senate conferees on this matter. I think, however, the Senate's position is clear.

The conference amendment, it seems to me, departs from both objectives of the amendment adopted by the Senate. With respect to the payment of fees, the Senate amendment was designed to assure that officials of the U.S. Government who had participated directly in processing the Philippine claims would not benefit from their special status in lobbying the bill and processing claims they had passed on in their roles as Government officials.

The effect of the conference amendment is to discourage anyone, apart from the Claims Commission, from aiding claimants in processing their claims. Agents and attorneys of claimants, other than those who served on the Philippine War Damage Commission, may materially aid both the claimants and this Government in administering the provisions of the act.

The economic rehabilitation envisaged by the Senate's amendment and the original 1946 legislation seems to me largely ignored by the conference amendment. The compromise appears to be still based on the misunderstanding concerning the purpose of this legislation—a misunderstanding which was in the main created and promoted by the lobbyists whose activities were disclosed by the Committee on Foreign Relations investigation.

The original 1946 act was not, I repeat, designed to make whole, individuals and associations who lost property during World War II. It was designed to aid the economy of the entire Philippine community. What can aid the Philippine economy at this time and under these circumstances is best determined by the Philippine Government. It must be obvious, however, that payment of almost 50 percent of this $73 million to less than 1 percent of the more than 100,000 claimants, many of whom are not even located in the Philippines at this time, will not materially improve the economy of the Philippine nation.

Yet, even assuming that the ends envisaged by the Senate amendment are incorporated in the decision of the conference, the conference report is ineffective in achieving those ends.

Not only is no penalty spelled out in the amendment as a sanction for ignoring the certificates provided for in the legislation, but obviously in many cases the enforcement of any penalty at all will be beyond the jurisdiction of our courts.

Finally, the conference amendment raises constitutional questions with respect to the contracts and work already performed or to be performed by agents and attorneys of claimants in processing of claims—questions which were avoided by the amendment passed by the Senate.

I do not approve the language of the conference. It poses impossible legal problems for those charged with administering its provisions—perhaps this is why it contains no penalty or recapture provision to go into effect against those claimants who, despite their certification at the time they receive their money, pay fees to O'Donnell, Delgado, Schein, or others at a later date.

Mr. President, I shall watch with interest how this program is implemented.

In one respect, this present effort to prevent fees from accruing to lobbyists is too late. Two sets of claimants have established 5-year trusts for Mr. O'Donnell out of claims funds already received through his efforts. The trusts, however, which pay Mr. O'Donnell $17,000 yearly over a 5-year period in one case and $12,000 in each of 5 years in the other, were established also to remunerate him for his efforts on behalf of the bill which passed the Congress last year. The annual payments under one trust began in 1958. The second trust commenced in 1960 and will run through 1964. The founders of the second trust estimated that it would take Mr. O'Donnell that amount of time to get the Philippine claims bill through the Congress. He, however, took only 3 years, rather than 5 to do the job.

I would like to note for the record that the O'Donnell case has provided the Committee on Foreign Relations with valuable information to be used at the time we discuss revision and amendment of the Foreign Agents Registration Act. I have already indicated my intention of offering an amendment to prohibit political contributions from foreign sources. I also intend to propose language that would require a foreign agent appearing before a congressional committee to state fully his personal interest in the matters under discussion and supply for the record copies both of his contract with his foreign principal and his last previous foreign agent registration statement. In this way, I believe the committees and the Congress will be in a better position to judge the material presented to them by such agents.

In conclusion, I note that this case, I believe, will provide some guidance to the executive branch in the potential usefulness to all branches of our Government to be derived from able administration and energetic enforcement of statutes like the Foreign Agents Registration Act.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a letter I received today from Leo M. Gardner, of Indianapolis, Ind., relating to a claim under the Philippine War Claims Act.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.,
May 6, 1963.

Hon. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
U.S. Senator, Chairman, Foreign Relations Committee, Senate Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: I represent Wilson A. Blossom of this city and am authorized by him to write this letter. He is the sole heir of his brother Dallas E. Blossom. The latter resided in the Philippines until his death about 1951. The War Damage Commission approved a claim of Dallas E. Blossom for 102,478.30 pesos, and paid him during his life two partial payments of 31,443.48 pesos and 22,832.62 pesos. The balance is unpaid.

My client desires that you be advised that he is in sympathy with the proposals, as we read them in the press, to preserve the supplemental appropriation for war damage for the benefit of the people and Republic of the Philippines, to the greatest extent possible.

Accordingly, my client will not assert a right to recover any balance due to the estate of Dallas E. Blossom, under any supplemental appropriation made by Congress even if he is eligible to recover such balance under the terms of the legislation. The Philippine Trust Co., Manila, to which we addressed an inquiry on October of 1962 asking it to represent my client in respect to such claim (it having administered the estate of Dallas E. Blossom) will be advised of the decision of my client, and will be given a copy of this letter. It will be asked also to advise the Department of Justice of the Philippines of this decision.

Respectfully,

LEO M. GARDNER.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the House today returned to the conference committee the supplemental appropriation bill in which the appropriation item relating to the Philippine Government is included. It is my understanding also that the action throws back into the conference this question. I wish to express my hope that the conferees will give further consideration to this item in their forthcoming conference, and that they will accept the Senate language which was inserted after a vote that was two-thirds in favor of the Senate's position and contrary to the general position taken by the conference.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD at this point an excerpt from the weekly bulletin of the Philippine-American Chamber of Commerce, dealing with this subject.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MACAPAGAL'S VIEW

In Manila, President Macapagal delayed making a statement until fully apprised of the facts. Then he told a press conference he was concerned only with full payment to authorized claimants, and the mode of payment was an American responsibility.

"We are confident that this commitment will be fulfilled," he said. "The fact and mode of payment are the sole responsibility of the United States. What concerns me as the representative of our people is that payments be made.

"We express the hope that the amount will be devoted faithfully to the economic rehabilitation and development of the Philippines, which is the underlying basis of the war damage claims."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, during the debate last week on the Philippine Rehabilitation Act amendment to the Supplemental Appropriations bill there were some references made to the ability of the Philippine Government to distribute the $73 million contained in the amendment in the best interests of the Philippine people.

I ask unanimous consent to place in the Record at this point an article from the April 1963 Readers Digest by William J. Lederer entitled "Democracy Triumphs in the Philippines." The article concerns itself with President Diosdado Macapagal of the Philippines, the man who would have had the responsibility for distribution of the funds under the Senate's amendment.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DEMOCRACY TRIUMPHS IN THE PHILIPPINES

(By William J. Lederer)

To most Filipinos the election of Diosdado Macapagal as their President on November 14, 1961, symbolized the triumph of the common man. It was certainly a demonstration of democracy in action. For Macapagal, who was born in a peasant hut more humble than Lincoln's log cabin and had to struggle desperately for an education, came to power against heavy handicaps, vested interests and government habits of corruption—in a free and fair election. And this in a part of the world where such elections are rare.

Philippine political commentators, including some who had labored to defeat him, hailed the outcome as proof of the islands' political maturity. To millions of Asians, Africans, and others in new and developing nations, the inauguration of Macapagal demonstrated that, although democracy at times moves clumsily, it will survive as long as free men have the courage and energy to fight for it.

The victory followed an uphill fight. In the final days of the campaign the betting still favored incumbent President Carlos P. Garcia, the Nationalist Party candidate, 7 to 5. And why not? The regime had control of the election machinery and police, and had few scruples in exploiting its monopoly of patronage and pork barrel. Moreover, willingly or otherwise, big business was contributing heavily to the Garcia war chest.

Garcia had the support of most leftist intellectuals, too. They didn't like Macapagal's emphasis on restoring a free economy and his warnings about the Communist danger at home and abroad. The isolationist and neutralists elements were also on the President's side. And, in case of a close vote, everyone thought that the real decision might be reached via the old devices of violence and fraud.

Yet the election turned out to be one of the most orderly and bloodless in Philippine history. For this, much of the credit goes to President Garcia. He had said that he didn't want a "dishonest victory," and proved it with a show of constabulary force to discourage cheating.

So positive was the belief that Macapagal, Vice President since 1957 and head of the Liberal Party, could not win the presidency that one bigtime professional gambler assured me: "D. M. (the nickname generally used to refer to him) hasn't a chance. He's too honest to win."

Though he has been in public service since the Philippines became an independent Republic, July 4, 1946, Macapagal is still a poor man—an almost incredible situation among successful Philippine politicians. His insistence throughout the campaign that public officials should live within their means and make a public accounting of income beyond salaries was novel, but few doubted that he meant it.

Soon after he took office, the country was convinced that D. M. would make heroic efforts to carry out his pledges to stamp out graft and corruption. Now, over a year later, that conviction has been justified, and there is general agreement that his efforts are succeeding.

His sweeping purges of officialdom and his vigorous crackdown on some prominent businessmen—among them Americans and other foreigners—have drawn charges of "dictatorial" conduct. But, as Robert Trumbull of the New York Times recently reported from Manila, "Official corruption has been halted, at least in the upper levels of the government" and "a healthy resurgence of patriotism and pride in country can be discerned among the people."

During the campaign I visited Macapagal in Manila. I had known him 10 years before, when he was a young Congressman from Pampanga Province. Now he was Vice President, but his mode of life hadn't altered. His home was a middle-class frame house on an unfashionable street, his car of ancient vintage. Obviously, he was living within his means, and proud of it.

"The corrupt interests have forgotten that the Philippines, despite many failings, still is a living democracy," he told me. "Millions of us are penniless, uneducated, sick, and abused. But freedom, thank God, is in our blood."

For 3 years before election day, Macapagal was engaged in the greatest "sweat, walk, and talk" campaign in any country's history. Month after month this soft-spoken ex-professor of law and economics barnstormed through jungles, mountain ranges, swamps, villages, and cities. He ate the simple food of the poor folk, slept in their thatched huts. "Freedom is available to you," he told them, "yet you live like slaves." He showed them that millions of pesos that should have gone to improve their lives were going into the pockets of thieving officials.

Why should the vice president of the country have to operate on a shoestring, and why did he have so much spare time? A mixed presidential ticket had come into office in 1957, and Macapagal, the Liberal Party candidate for vice president, had won with a plurality bigger than that of Garcia, the victorious National Party candidate for president. Thus, from the outset, Garcia looked upon Macapagal as the man to beat in the elections of 1961. So he gave the vice president no duties. The day before being elected president, D. M. smiled and said, "Garcia must be sorry he didn't give me any work to do. It left me plenty of time to go to the people."

Diosdado Macapagal was born in 1910 in Lubao, Pampanga, on the route that 31 years later would become known as part of the Bataan Death March. The midwife was his own maternal grandmother, Escolástica Romero. "By the calendar," she told her daughter, "your son's name is Wenceslao. But I sense destinies for him for some design of God. Let us call him Diosdado [God-given]."

The Macapagals were among the most destitute peasants in their wretched barrio of farmers. But the boy's father was a sort of provincial intellectual, and his grandfather composed church music.

The future president's boyhood was grim. During the day he pastured carabao; at night he would go out to catch frogs for food. His mother raised pigs to pay for his schooling.

Determined to go to college and study law, he walked from his lodging in the Tondo section of Manila to his downtown school in all weather—the 30 pesos a month he earned as a part-time clerk could not cover busfares. He completed his law course and was graduated from the University of Santo Tomas. Then he came out No. 1 in the nationwide bar examinations. For 4 years he worked in an American law firm, then started his own practice.

All this time his mind was set on a career in public service. "When I grow up," he had told his mother, "I will be a politician, but I will remain so poor that the poor will have a genuine friend and protector."

During World War II Macapagal raised money in Central Luzon to support the guerrillas. He had to solicit openly in communities occupied by the enemy. Thousands were supported by his activities, and every peso went to the fighting men, even though no books were kept. It was during these days that he began to be known as the incorruptible one and the most honest man in public service.

Macapagal's first wife was the beautiful sister of a popular Philippine movie star, Rogelio de la Rosa, later a senator. They had two children, a girl and a boy. The boy was born in 1942, during the oppressions of the Japanese occupation. D. M. named him Arturo, in honor of Gen. Douglas MacArthur—a privately cherished gesture of defiance. His first wife died in 1943. In 1946 D. M. married Evangelina Macaraeg, a physician. She bore him a daughter in 1947 and a son 2 years later.

Soon after the Philippines gained independence, D. M. entered the service of the Department of Foreign Affairs. He traveled to many countries. In 1949 he lived in Washington briefly as second secretary of the Philippine Embassy. On returning home, he was twice elected to congress by big majorities.

In 1950 he was sent as a delegate to a session of the United Nations Assembly. He caused a furor in Central Bank and government circles by returning $1,600 given to him by the house of representatives for out-of-pocket expenses on the trip. It was an all but unprecedented act. Questioned by a reporter on the episode, Macapagal said, "There are no shades of honesty. One is either honest or dishonest."

Audiences sitting on dirt floors clenched their fists in anger during the 1961 campaign when they learned from Macapagal how the fine political and economic system initiated by the United States in the Philippines was deteriorating. He told them that the conditions of their lives didn't have to be so pitiful. Ten percent of the population suffered from tuberculosis, he said, yet medical help was neglected, especially in rural areas. A handful of landlords lived high while the farmers, 70 percent of the population, remained in medieval serfdom. Meanwhile, two-thirds of the taxes and customs receipts never reached the treasury. He declared that corruption was the basic cause of many evils. He gave names, dates, places.

The economic doctrine he preached was that of private enterprise. He explained that big government—through onerous controls, licenses, foreign-exchange allocations, a complicated customs system—had made graft a way of economic survival. "Government must get out of business," Macapagal said repeatedly. "Private enterprise can do it more efficiently and with great benefits to the nation."

Many listeners asked what they could do about such things. His answers were the very heart of his message: that an informed and aroused citizenry must elect honest men pledged to clean house. As long as they were apathetic and connived with vote buying, corruption would get worse. He appealed to their patriotism and self-respect, reminding them of Philippine traditions of individualism. The precious spark of freedom had remained in Filipino hearts through long centuries of Spanish colonialism and nearly 3 years of Japanese occupation. Had not the Philippines, though small and weak, vigorously opposed communism on issues where many powerful nations wavered?

Juan de la Cruz (the common man) listened intently and, come election day, confounded most of the political prophets.

Though the Liberal Party won six of the eight senate seats at stake in the 1961 election, that still left the Nationalists with a majority of two. In the house the opposition party retained a substantial majority. Macapagal was thus far from having effective control of the machinery of government. Party allegiances, however, are not too deep. Having persuaded enough Nationalists to switch sides, Macapagal now has a Liberal majority in the lower house and an even split in the senate.

D. M.'s influence is making itself felt. A new austerity has come to official life in Manila. There was no inaugural ball; there will be no more gala dances at the taxpayers' expense. "Our acts must be not only legal but moral as well," Macapagal declared in his inaugural address.

"The primary function of the government is not to dispense favors but to dispense justice. I shall endeavor to set the tone not only for integrity but also for simple living, hard work and dedication to the national well-being."

His first official order forbade financial transactions between members of the government and their immediate families—a blow at widespread nepotism. On the day the Macapagals moved into the Philippine White House, he ordered the sale at auction of a $2,500,000 luxury yacht, ostensibly the flagship of the Navy but in fact used personally by the preceding President and his associates.

Three weeks after he assumed office, Macapagal took drastic steps to restore a free economy. He canceled restrictions on foreign exchange and freed the peso from unrealistic controls. The peso, formerly pegged at two to the dollar, is now about four to the dollar. Private business is no longer obliged to bribe officials to obtain exchange and import licenses.

D. M. has acted to transfer many powers from the central government to provinces and localities. Among those prosecuted for alleged corruption have been at least one of his own friends and many men prominent in his own party. The "moral regeneration" to which he is dedicated is, of course, in its early stages; but the public complacency which had made corruption almost a way of life has already been profoundly shaken.

On the economic side, little significant progress has as yet been made. Unemployment and outmoded system of land tenure in agriculture remain as key problems. D. M.'s 5-year program for social and economic development offers hope in both respects, however.

In foreign policy, few major changes have been made or can be expected. A minor rift of long standing in Philippine relations with the United States was recently closed. Last May the U.S. Congress again defeated a bill to pay a $73 million balance still due to the Philippines for damages suffered in the war with Japan. As a protest, Macapagal thereupon postponed his scheduled 12-day visit to the United States. The Kennedy administration pressed for the passage of a new bill, which was signed by the President in August. This episode notwithstanding, friendly relations with the United States, as well as support for anti-Communist alliances and for the United Nations, are at the core of Philippine foreign policy.

New nations have reason to draw encouragement from the maturing Filipino democracy. They note that the changes now underway in the 16-year-old Philippine Republic are being brought about by peaceful and democratic methods. There has been no seizure of power by an angry clique, no matter how valid its anger. The citizens elected a president who had spelled out his intentions through 3 years of unique person-to-person campaigning. In the triumph of the man "too poor and too honest to win," democracy made a signal gain.

TREASURY, POST OFFICE, AND EXECUTIVE OFFICE APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5366) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments to the pending bill be considered and agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as thus amended be regarded for the purpose of amendment as original text, provided that no point of order shall be considered to have been waived by reason of agreement to the order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendments, agreed to en bloc, are as follows:

On page 3, line 8, after "(22 U.S.C. 401)", to strike out "$72,000,000" and insert "$72,670,000".

On page 3, line 17, to strike out "$7,300,000" and insert "$7,629,000".

On page 3, line 23, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$5,250,000" and insert "$5,450,000".

On page 4, line 15, after "(5 U.S.C. 2131)", to strike out "$248,000,000" and insert "$250,000,000".

On page 5, line 20, after "(5 U.S.C. 55a)", to strike out "$51,000,000" and insert "$54,750,000".

On page 7, line 12, after the word "employment", to strike out "$546,000,000" and insert "$555,200,000".

On page 7, line 20, after the word "exceed", to strike out "seventy-five" and insert "eighty-four", and on page 8, line 2, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$6,760,000" and insert "$6,901,250".

On page 11, line 19, after the word "program", to strike out "$11,500,000" and insert "$12,000,000".

On page 12, line 5, after the word "law", to strike out "$3,890,000,000" and insert "$3,940,000,000".

On page 13, line 11, after the word "Government", to strike out "$185,000,000" and insert "$195,000,000".

On page 16, line 6, after the word "individuals", to strike out "$6,300,000" and insert "$6,700,000".

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the Committee on Appropriations has authorized me to present to the Senate its report on the pending bill, H.R. 5366, making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for fiscal year 1964.

Members will find on their desks printed copies of the committee report, and I will now present to the Senate a brief summary of what is in the bill.

The agencies covered by this bill have the responsibility of administering a total of $16.2 billion, of which more than $10 billion is for definite and indefinite permanent appropriations which are not included in the pending bill. The 1964 estimates in this category total $10,143,802,000. Of this amount, $10,020 million is for interest on the public debt, an increase of $320 million over the 1963 estimate.

The bill which is recommended to the Senate provides total appropriations of $6,074,216,250. This amount is an increase of $77,190,250 over the House allowance, $412,702,080 over the appropriations for 1963, but $72,625,750 under the estimates for 1964.

I repeat that statement. The amount is nearly $73 million under the estimates for 1964.

Increases over the House figures were approved by the committee on the basis of what it regarded as convincing testimony presented by competent departmental witnesses in support of their requests and in the belief that failure to appropriate the additional funds would seriously impair the capabilities of the agencies to perform their missions effectively and economically.

TITLE I—TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Appropriations totaling $1,112,200,250 are recommended in the accompanying bill for the regular annual requirements of the Treasury Department for fiscal year 1964. This is a decrease of $41 million in the estimates and an increase of $16.2 million over the House bill. The amount recommended is $115 million more than the 1963 allowance.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

A large part of the increase mentioned was applied to the Internal Revenue Service. The committee recommended an appropriation of $555.2 million for salaries and expenses of the Internal Revenue Service. As is indicated in the report, the committee recommends a $52.1 million increase over 1963, consisting of $9.2 million in additional funds included in the bill by the committee and a $42.9 million increase over 1963 made by the House. However, of the $52.1 million increase allowed over 1963, $36.3 million is to cover items beyond administrative control, $15.7 million is for additional personnel, of which $10.5 million is required for continuing the implementation of the ADP system—644 additional positions added to the 1,917 now employed—and leaving $5.2 million for enforcement and related personnel—540 additional positions out of 2,705 requested. Thus the amount recommended by the Senate will provide for 1,184 additional man-years of employment in 1964 over 1963.

Testimony presented at the hearings amply supported, in the opinion of the committee, the request for restoration of almost one-third of the funds appealed. The House had based its reduction on the premise that utilization of high-speed automatic data processing equipment should permit the Service to handle a greatly increased workload with fewer personnel. The reverse is true, according to information supplied at the hearings, indicating that automatic data processing will increase—not decrease—staffing requirements due to the vast quantity of information processed by the machine which, in turn, will require more auditing and enforcement personnel. But more revenue will be collected.

COAST GUARD

Another major increase was contained in the Coast Guard appropriation for "Acquisition, construction, and improvements." The committee recommended $54.7 million, or an increase of $3.7 million over the House allowance of $51 million. The House bill allowed virtually all of the requests under this head. In restoring $3.7 million, the committee allowed additional funds specifically for the construction of an additional general duty, high endurance cutter over the two provided in the House bill. It was the committee's judgment that the Coast Guard witnesses factually documented the agency's request for restoration of funds for the vessel replacement program, and the committee's action follows the Secretary's recommendations, contained in the report on Roles and Missions of the Coast Guard, stressing the necessity for establishing as soon as possible an adequate long-range program for vessel replacement and modernization.

With respect to the operating expenses of the Coast Guard, the committee approved a $2 million increase over the House bill. This sum will provide for additional positions requested for the improvement of operational capabilities.

BUREAU OF NARCOTICS

For the Bureau of Narcotics, the committee restored $200,000, allowing the full budget estimate of $5,450,000.

BUREAU OF THE MINT

For the Bureau of the Mint, the committee restored $329,000, the amount appealed, to enable the Mint to cope with the ever increasing demand for additional coins. The committee recommends an appropriation of $7.6 million, an increase of $604,100 over 1963.

BUREAU OF CUSTOMS

With respect to the Bureau of Customs, the committee recommended $72,670,000. This is an increase of $670,000 over the House and $4.7 million over 1963. The committee disallowed $1,500,000 requested to pay for rental space used by Customs agents at international airports. This request was part of a four-agency project involving Immigration, Public Health, Agriculture, as well as Customs. The overall cost would be approximately $3 million for all four agencies. However, the committee has allowed $70,000 for space at airports to be used for other than inspectional purposes and for functions normally carried on in Government owned or leased space. The remaining $600,000 of the increase will provide for 11 additional positions for the statistical verification program; 26 additional man-years for the statistical verification program, and 32 additional man-years to cope with the workload, for a total of 69 average positions over 1963.

SECRET SERVICE

For the Secret Service, "Salaries and expenses," the committee has allowed $6,901,250, an increase of $1,117,250 over 1963 and $141,250 over the House. The House had allowed 30 of the 50 additional positions requested and the committee has added 10 more, thus allowing 40 of the 50 requested, to strengthen the Service's capability to curb the increase in counterfeiting and to reduce the growing backlog of check and bond forgery investigations. The allowance also provides funds for 10 agents for the protection of the Vice President.

SAVINGS THROUGH MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENTS

Before turning to title II for the Post Office Department, I would like to commend certain agencies of the Treasury Department for reductions in personnel effected through their management improvement programs. Despite the substantial increases in workload over the years—and this workload is not controllable—the Division of Disbursement has only 1,559 average positions projected for 1964 as compared to 3,013 in 1949—a reduction of nearly 50 percent in manpower; there is a reduction in employment at the Bureau of Engraving and Printing from 6,600 in 1951 to 2,937 average positions projected for 1964, a reduction of 55 percent in manpower while continuing to handle a prodigious workload; a reduction in personnel in the Bureau of Public Debt from 7,774 in 1947 to 2,644 in 1964, a reduction of over 65 percent during a period of fairly constant workload volumes; a reduction in the unit cost of coins by the Bureau of the Mint by more than 50 percent over a 16-year period despite rising manpower costs, which represented 80 percent or more of the costs of manufacturing coins; and a reduction in personnel in the Treasurer's Office from 1,982 average positions in 1947 to a projected 844 in 1964, a reduction of over 55 percent. There was a 50 percent increase in tangible dollar savings reported under the management improvement program in fiscal 1962 as compared with the previous year. These savings have amounted to over $12 million, the second highest total ever reported under this program.

TITLE II—POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The committee recommends appropriations for the Post Office Department totaling $4,945,500,000. This is an increase of $296.5 million over 1936, $60.5 million over the House amount, and $31.4 million under the estimates for 1964.

ADMINISTRATION

For "Administration and regional operations," the committee recommends $83.5 million, an increase of $7.9 million over the amount appropriated for 1963; $2.2 million under the estimate and the same as the House allowance. The committee does not feel that the small reduction of approximately 2 percent in this item should have any effect on the level of service presently rendered as the increases requested were for activities unrelated to the actual handling and delivery of the mails. The committee feels that regional offices should not be expanded at this time but should be maintained at the same personnel level.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For "Research, development, and engineering," the committee approved $12 million, $0.5 million over the House allowance, and the same amount as 1963. The committee is of the opinion that this amount is sufficient to implement a sound and well-balanced research program to develop new methods and equipment for the postal service. The reduction of $1.7 million in the estimate will not cut out any programs but merely defers them to a later date.

OPERATIONS

For "Operations," the committee approved an additional $50 million over the House allowance of $3,890 million, thus providing a total of $3,940 million for this item for fiscal 1964. The amount recommended is $260.1 million over 1963 and $19.3 million under the estimate.

While the House bill provided for only 863 additional man-years of employment for "Operations" over 1963, according to Post Office Department calculations, the Senate bill provides for an additional 8,915 man-years over the House, or a grand total of 9,788 additional man-years of employment over 1963 to meet the anticipated increase in mail volume. The committee feels that in view of this modest reduction of approximately one-half of 1 percent, plus the 5 percent transfer authority between appropriations available to the Postal Department, the amount provided is not only sufficient to maintain service at its present level but also provides ample funds for improved service.

TRANSPORTATION

For "Transportation," the committee concurred with the House figure in allowing $611 million, a reduction of $750,000 or one-tenth of 1 percent in the estimate. The amount allowed is $16.5 million over 1963, which should be more than sufficient to meet the requirements.

FACILITIES

For "Facilities," the committee recommends the estimate of $195 million, an increase of $10 million over the House allowance and $28 million over 1963. This appropriation provides for expenses of building occupancy, supplies, and certain types of contractual services. Included also is the sum of $13 million for acquisition of building sites. The authority for continuation of this program expires on July 22, 1964—Public Law 83–519.

PLANT AND EQUIPMENT

For "Plant and equipment," the committee recommends $104 million, the House allowance. While this amount is $7 million under the estimate, it is $5 million over the estimated obligations for the 1963 program of $99 million.

TITLE III—EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

The total appropriations recommended for title III of the bill for the Executive Office of the President amount to $14,041,000. This is $964,600 over that appropriated in 1963 and $400,000 over the House bill.

The latter sum of $400,000 was restored by the committee to the Bureau of the Budget in approving the full budget request of $6,700,000 for salaries and expenses of the Bureau. This restoration provides funds for the hiring of 25 additional personnel needed to strengthen the Bureau's operation and for the higher costs in 1964 of the present staff.

Amounts appropriated for title IV—Independent Agencies, including the Tax Court of the United States—are detailed in the committee report which is before the Senate.

That is a brief summary of what the bill contains. A more detailed explanation will be found in the committee report, which is on the desks of Senators.

The committee realizes that the Post Office Department did not get all it wanted; but we believe that if we can hold in the bill—and I have been instructed not to yield on that one point—the increase that has been made for Operations—and that is for salaries—the Department cannot only maintain present service but can extend service to new office buildings and to the urban areas which are developing around metropolitan centers.

I understand that an amendment will be offered to increase by a very large number the employees of the Internal Revenue Service. We shall, of course, discuss the details of that subject after that amendment has been offered. So far as I am now advised, that will be the main, if not the sole, attack upon the committee report: That is, more people are wanted to collect the revenue. But that question will be discussed when it is reached.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 13, line 11, in lieu of "$195,000,000" it is proposed to insert "$185,500,000."

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the amendment I have offered would reduce the amount appropriated for post office facilities by $9,500,000. This represents the entire amount requested under the category of "Building Occupancy" for reimbursable site acquisition. These funds would be used to hire architects who would design post office buildings and to purchase real property on which to build the post office buildings. The land and architectural designs would then be sold to a successful bidder who would agree to construct a building in return for an agreement by the Post Office Department to lease the building. In other words, the Government would be reimbursed for the architectural and site acquisition expenses. The money would then go into a revolving fund for future architectural plans and site acquisitions. There is presently approximately $25 million invested in sites and engineering, including architectural contracts; $22 million of this amount is invested in sites. It is estimated that reimbursements will provide $10.3 million for further site acquisition and architectural expenses in fiscal year 1964.

In view of the availability of these funds, and in view of the fact that there is already a very large deficit, it seems to me that this amendment, which is a modest one, reducing the amount of the bill by $9,500,000, makes sense. Therefore, I hope that the distinguished Senator from Virginia, who is in charge of the bill, will give it consideration. I know he is a strong, effective, and sincere advocate of economy.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I recognize that the amount now in the bill is perhaps not an imperative amount, not a firm amount. There could be reasonable disagreement as to the amount which is actually needed.

If the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin would provide for a cut in the amount in the bill of one-half the amount he has proposed in his amendment, I would be willing, on behalf of the committee, to take the amendment to conference.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am happy to modify my amendment and reduce the amount by precisely half. That would make the amount $4,750,000.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I have no objection.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia state what he has agreed to?

Mr. ROBERTSON. This is an item under facilities and deals specifically with the request related to reimbursable site acquisitions in the amount of $9.5 million. The Senator from Wisconsin has agreed to modify his amendment by reducing this amount by half.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The $10 million?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator is not a member of the subcommittee. The subcommittee's recommendation was about the same as the amendment offered. The full amount was restored in the full committee. Now we have a proposed compromise between the House allowance and that of the full committee, which the Senator from Virginia feels is fair to those on both sides of the question and is a reasonable settlement.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Virginia agrees to cut how much?

Mr. PROXMIRE. $4,750,000, which is one-half the amount involved in my amendment. I proposed a reduction of $9,500,000. The Senator from Virginia has suggested, and I have agreed to his suggestion, that the amount be cut in half, to $4,750,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, of the Senator from Wisconsin.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

PRESIDENT'S PROPOSED TAX CUT BENEFITS TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT REVENUE QUESTIONED

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, it is common knowledge that there is a complete lack of public enthusiasm over the President's tax cut proposal. Spokesmen for the administration have uniformly tried to generate support for it with a noticeable lack of success. When the people did not respond to assertions that we could have a tax cut and increased Federal spending at the same time, they were then ridiculed by disdainful references to those who adhere to a Puritan ethic. When this did not work, the President himself resorted to the scare technique by claiming that if Federal spending was cut back, we would have a more serious unemployment problem than already exists. The mythology of this claim was completely demolished by Dr. Raymond Saulnier, professor of economics at Barnard College, Columbia University, New York City, in a splendid address at Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, on April 29. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, now, in a frantic last ditch effort to stir public enthusiasm, the Secretary of the Treasury has claimed that the President's tax cut program would ease the revenue-raising problem of State and local governments. We shall trust that the response will be as poor as it has been in the case of the other so-called sophisticated economic arguments which have thus far been advanced.

We are told that if Congress enacts the President's tax cut program and does not reduce Federal spending to make room for it, by 1966 State and local governments will get an annual $2.9 billion revenue bonanza. I refer to an article appearing in this morning's Washington Post, and I ask unanimous consent it be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 8, 1963]

U.S. TAX CUT SEEN AIDING CITIES, STATES

State and local governments will get an annual $2.9 billion revenue bonanza without raising taxes if Congress enacts an economy boosting $10 billion Federal tax cut, Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon estimated yesterday.

Senator Paul H. Douglas (Democrat of Illinois), chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, who had requested Dillon's report, called it "heartening news" for hard-pressed taxpayers who have seen State and local taxes doubled in the 1952–61 decade alone.

The Treasury estimates gave State governments a total $1,529 million annual increase in revenues if there is a Federal tax cut. This would be 7 percent of the $20.6 billion the 50 States collected in taxes in 1962.

Local governments would get about $1,406 million more a year, also a 7 percent increase in the $19.8 billion they raised in 1961, the latest year for which figures were available.

The Treasury estimates gave Maryland increases of $27 million in State taxes and $21 million in local taxes. Virginia would gain $24 million in State taxes and $19 million locally.

The Treasury projections were based on the Douglas committee's estimate that a $10 billion Federal tax cut would increase personal income by $30 billion and the gross national product by $40 billion.

The GNP is the total value of goods produced and services performed in the Nation in 1 year.

Douglas said the President's tax program, now before the House Ways and Means Committee, would be in full effect in 1965.

States and localities could expect to feel the "full impact" of the reduction in the years immediately following 1965, Douglas said.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I also request unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the article by Will Lissner appearing in this morning's edition of the New York Times, which reports on Secretary Dillon's speech before the New York Chamber of Commerce yesterday, in which the Secretary predicted that enactment of the President's tax cut program would ease New York City's revenue problem.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 8, 1963]

DILLON SAYS FEDERAL TAX CUT WOULD INCREASE CITY'S REVENUE—TREASURY SECRETARY PREDICTS STIMULUS TO ECONOMY FROM WHITE HOUSE PROGRAM

(By Will Lissner)

Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon predicted yesterday that President Kennedy's tax program would ease New York City's revenue problem.

Mr. Dillon told the New York Chamber of Commerce that, according to estimates by the Treasury, an increase in economic activity resulting from the President's program would increase the yield of the city's present taxes at current rates by $209 million a year.

Mayor Wagner's administration has estimated that $236,100,000 is needed to balance the city's record budget of $3,093,641,582.

Mr. Dillon, addressing the chamber's annual membership meeting at 65 Liberty Street, also estimated the impact the proposed White House tax program would have on State revenue. The Secretary said that under the Treasury's calculations the yield of present State taxes would increase by $201 million a year if the President achieved his goal of a substantial, meaningful Federal tax reduction this year.

Mr. Dillon, a former New York investment banker, was a member of the 195-year-old trade organization when he was in business here. He made his address after Walter Pease, chairman of the chamber's executive committee, presented a report on the city's fiscal situation.

Mr. Pease told of the chamber's fight on Mayor Wagner's proposals for a 4-percent sales tax and an occupancy tax of 2½ to 5 percent. He said the organization had been heartened by the mayor's abandonment of efforts to tax purchases sent out of town and pledged to continue the fight against other elements of the Wagner tax program.

COMMISSION PROPOSED

Mr. Pease renewed the chamber's proposal that the city enact an emergency, 1-year payroll tax of one-half percent, payable equally by employer and employee. He said it should be supplemented if necessary by a 1-year commercial occupancy tax of 2½ percent.

The chamber's proposal also calls for the city and State to appoint a commission of experts to study the city's tax structure and to recommend revisions in the city's tax policy. Only such a program, Mr. Pease said, would offer an opportunity to put the city's finances in order.

Mr. Dillon said the President's program for the reduction and revision of Federal taxes would be of particular interest in view of the Pease report.

Treasury estimates indicate that New York City and New York State would experience a $400 million increase in present tax yields, he said. State and local tax revenues in the country as a whole would increase by $2,900 million, he said.

LOWER RATES FORESEEN

"It should enable State and local governments to meet the needs of their citizens with lower tax rates than would otherwise be feasible," he asserted.

"And it should lessen the pressures upon the Federal Government to meet the many critical needs of our citizens which State and local governments have become increasingly unable to finance."

The Secretary of the Treasury said the present business upswing "shows every promise" of continuing. But this does not lessen the need for Federal tax reductions this year, he said.

George Campion, board chairman of the Chase Manhattan Bank, was elected to a second term as president of the chamber.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, it should be noted that these claims by Secretary Dillon and other administration spokesmen all rest on what is known as the "multiplier theory." According to the theory, if a consumer saves $1 from a tax cut, he will spend most of it. This, in turn, will generate some profit in the hands of the recipient who, in turn, will spend most of his profit. The end result will be an increase in economic activity ranging from $2 for each $1 of additional consumer dollars to $4 for each $1 of additional consumer spending. It is noteworthy that the administration spokesmen have used the highly optimistic figures of $4 for each $1 of additional consumer spending as a basis for their computations under the multiplier theory.

It is regrettable that these spokesmen have not seen fit to give the American people all of the facts about their estimates. First, they should tell the people that the multiplier theory is only a theory, and that the degree to which it operates is dependent upon the psychology of the American people. No one can measure this psychology with any degree of accuracy. The psychology of the consumer may be to save the extra dollar he keeps as a result of a tax cut, rather than spend it; or he may save more of it than the multiplier theorists forecast, and this would naturally cut down the amount of increased economic activity it would generate.

Another fact which should be emphasized is that assuming that the psychology of the American people is favorable to operation of the multiplier theory, it will not be meaningful unless we preserve the purchasing power of the dollar. It will do no good to give a consumer one more dollar of purchasing power through a tax cut if the rest of his dollars are shrunk $1 by inflation. It will do no good to give a consumer $50 more of purchasing power if the rest of his dollars are shrunk by $50 by inflation. The tragedy is that this is precisely what will happen if we have a tax cut in a setting of more billion dollar Federal deficits.

The administration, and I may add, the press, have been strangely silent over the fact that during 1961 and 1962, we added almost $14 billion to the national debt as a result of the failure of a majority of the Members of both Houses of Congress to match Federal spending with Federal revenue; and during the same period of time inflation subtracted over $14 billion in purchasing power from the American people. The Consumer Price Index has surged steadily upward, and the purchasing power of the dollar has moved steadily downward, so that today it has reached an alltime low of 45.6 cents—compared to a 1939 value of 100 cents.

The President's tax-cut program calls for a tax cut amounting to $2.8 billion for the fiscal year 1964, accompanied by a deficit of almost $12 billion. That deficit will result, as night follows day, in more inflation and more shrinkage in the purchasing power of our money. No one can predict accurately or precisely how much this inflation will be; but if a deficit of almost $14 billion during 1961 and 1962 produced inflation of over $14 billion, it is clear that a deficit of $12 billion for the fiscal year 1964 will produce inflation of at least $2.8 billion—thus wiping out the purchasing power of $2.8 billion proposed by the tax cut—and probably considerably more. Add to this the fact that State and local governments are estimated to increase their taxes some $2 billion during the fiscal year 1964, and it is even more evident that the basis for the multiplier theory—actual increased consumer purchasing power in terms of stable dollars—is nonexistent.

If, indeed, the multiplier theory goes into operation as a result of the President's tax-cut program, we can naturally expect an increase in consumer spending. This will naturally mean more sales tax for States which have a sales tax. Also, in States which have an income tax and which permit a deduction for Federal income taxes, a Federal tax cut will mean lower deductions for State income-tax purposes, and this will mean more State income-tax revenue. These are basic tax realities, and Secretary Dillon and other administration spokesmen do not have to call anyone's attention to them. But what good will it do, Mr. President, if State and local revenues are thus increased and if at the same time inflation boosts the costs of State and local government? The continued inflation which this administration and the Congress it controls is promoting through billion dollar Federal deficits is going to force State and local government employees not to mention Federal employees to ask for higher wages and salaries, because the purchasing power of their present wages and salaries is steadily going down. Construction costs and the cost of various goods and equipment for State and local governments will also go up. One cannot blame wage earners in private industry for demanding an increase in wages when the purchasing power of their present wages is being shrunk steadily by inflation. And, in turn, one cannot blame management for increasing its prices for construction and goods purchased by State and local governments.

Now I should like to say a word about an estimate I have received from the Office of Tax Analysis of the Treasury Department, issued under date of May 7, estimating that when the President's tax-cut program amounting to $10 billion a year becomes fully operative in 1966, it should produce an addition to the total State and local revenues of my State of Iowa of approximately $47 million.

Before the people of my State have their hopes raised over the prospect of having $47 million flowing into our State and local treasuries in 1966, as a result of the President's tax cut deficit spending program, it should be made clear that the $47 million figure is only an "estimate," and the estimate is premised on a multiplier theory effect of $4 of additional gross national product for each $1 of additional consumer spending flowing from a tax cut. Estimates received before our Joint Economic Committee indicate that an increase in gross national product, rather than a $4 increase, would be most likely—if, indeed, the psychology of the American people enabled the multiplier theory to work. Accordingly, it is more likely that additional State and local revenue for Iowa would be half that estimated by the Treasury Department—or $23.5 million.

It should also be made clear that, under the inflationary deficit spending policies of this administration and the Congress which it controls, there will be a price which the Iowa people will pay for this increased State and local revenue. That price will be continued inflation, eating up the purchasing power of our money and causing the cost of State and local governments to go up. For example, the Treasury Department indicates that its estimate of Iowa's share of the increased gross national product which would allegedly arise from the President's tax-cut program is based on the percentage that the total personal income of Iowans bears to the total personal income throughout the United States, or 1.397 percent. By the same token, Iowa's share of inflation which shows up in the gross national product would be 1.397 percent. This means that during the first 2 years of the Kennedy administration and the Congress which it controls, inflation has cost the people of the State of Iowa 1.397 percent of over $14 billion of total inflation throughout the United States, or $195 million. If deficit Federal spending of $14 billion during 1961 and 1962 was accompanied by inflation of over $14 billion, it is reasonable to conclude that the President's proposed deficit budget for the fiscal year 1964, amounting to $12 billion, will, sooner or later, have a similar impact.

So, Mr. President, when the Treasury Department estimates that Iowans will enjoy a $47 million a year increase in State and local revenues when and if the President's tax cut is fully effective, let it be understood that first, the likelihood is more in the neighborhood of one-half that amount, and second, the price Iowans will pay through inflation will be too much.

Like everyone else, we would like to get something for nothing, but we know that this will not happen, even on the New Frontier.

I ask unanimous consent that the Treasury Department's analysis showing the basis for arriving at its estimate with respect to the State of Iowa be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EFFECT OF FEDERAL TAX REDUCTION ON STATE AND LOCAL TAX REVENUES IN IOWA

Enactment of the President's tax program will result in substantial increases in State and local tax revenues without changes in existing tax rates or the introduction of new taxes.

The Joint Economic Committee staff has estimated that a $10 billion reduction in taxes, somewhat less than the net reduction recommended by the President, would result in an increase of close to $40 billion in gross national product. This implies a $30 billion increase in personal income for the Nation as a whole. On the basis of Iowa's expected share of this increase in personal income, the estimated effects on its State and local tax revenues have been computed. Historical relationships between State and local tax revenues and personal income in Iowa, with adjustments for major changes in tax laws, were used in calculating these effects.

STATE AND LOCAL TAX REVENUES

The addition to Iowa's total State and local tax revenues should be approximately $47 million. Total State tax revenues in Iowa in 1962 were $276 million, and local tax revenues (in 1961) were $364 million. The $47 million represents an increase of 7 percent in total State and local tax revenues, an increase over and above that which may be expected in the absence of tax reduction. Of the total, $22 million (an increase of 8 percent) should accrue to the State, and $25 million (an increase of 7 percent) to the local governments.

STATE TAX REVENUES

A reduction in the Federal income tax would add immediately to funds available for consumption and investment and would increase incentives to invest. Rising output and employment to meet these consumer and investment demands will create new incomes which are in turn available to be spent, or saved and invested.

State and local tax collections will reflect these increases in income and in consumer and investment spending. In Iowa, State tax revenues should be increased by about $22 million. Approximately 84 percent of the State's total tax revenues are derived from individual income, sales and gross receipts, and license taxes. The increases in income, consumption, and investment should add $3 million to income tax revenues, $12 million to sales tax revenues, $4 million to license tax revenues, and $1 million to other revenues.[1]

In addition to the gain in revenues from the expansionary effects of the reduction in Federal taxes, the decrease in Federal tax liabilities would have the further effect of expanding the State income tax base since Iowa permits the deduction of Federal income taxes in computing the State income tax. The resulting gain of $2 million is included in the estimates presented in the attached table and in the $22 million total noted above.

LOCAL TAX REVENUES

Local governments in Iowa rely upon the property tax for over 99 percent of their total tax revenues. The economic expansion resulting from the tax reduction would have a significant effect on the local property tax base as a consequence of new business and residential construction and from increased investment in other types of taxable property. Available data suggest that Iowa's local governments should realize an additional $25 million in property tax receipts.

Effect of Federal tax reduction on State and local tax revenues in Iowa

[Dollar amounts in millions]

	1962 tax revenues [1]	Revenue increases due to Federal tax reduction	
		Amounts	Increase as a percent of 1962 revenues [1]
Total State and local taxes	$640	$47	7
Total State tax revenues	276	22	8
Sales and gross receipts [2]	166	12	7
Individual income [3]	42	5	12
Licenses	52	4	8
Other [4]	17	1	6
Total local tax revenues	364	25	7
Property	359	25	7
Other	5	(5)	----------

[1] Local tax revenue data are for 1961 which is the latest year available.

[2] Includes general sales tax, selective sales taxes (motor fuel, alcohol, and tobacco), and gross receipts taxes on insurance companies, etc.

[3] Iowa uses the Federal definition of "adjusted gross income," with modifications, in the computation of the State individual income tax. The base-broadening features of the President's tax program may be expected to expand the State income tax base and result in an increase in revenues of $1,000,000. This increase which would be in addition to the gain resulting from the $10,000,000,000 tax reduction is not included in the estimates presented here.

[4] Includes corporation net income, State property, and death and gift taxes.

[5] Less than $500,000.

Source: Office of the Secretary of the Treasury, Office of Tax Analysis.

EXHIBIT 1

THE DIALOG ON GROWTH CONTINUED

(The W A Hammond Lecture at Miami University, Oxford Ohio, Monday, Apr. 29, 1963, by Dr. Raymond J. Saulnier, professor of Economics, Barnard College, Columbia University, New York City)

Speaking a little less than a year ago at Yale University, President Kennedy invited discussion, a serious dialog he termed it, on ways and means for promoting a higher rate of growth. He called in particular for a "cleaning up" of the area of discourse having to do with the impact of Federal expenditures on the growth performance of our economy and for discussion of budgetary questions in general.

It is hard for me to believe that the President could be greatly disappointed in the results of his Yale initiative. The dialog he wisely called for has gone forward at a fair pace. And it has been no mere academic discussion, to use an expression about which, as a longtime academician myself, I have personal reservations. On the contrary, public debate on the matters in which he expressed special interest has taken a very practical turn as a result of his having put forward a highly controversial budget plan for the fiscal year 1964.

---

[1] Iowa uses the Federal definition of adjusted gross income, with modifications, in the computation of the State individual income tax. The base-broadening features of the President's tax program may be expected to expand the State income tax base and result in an increase in revenues of $1 million.

The administration's fiscal plan may be summarized as follows: with official estimates as of January 1963 stating that the administrative budget will show a deficit of close to $9 billion in fiscal 1963, the plan calls for (i) an increase in Federal spending of $4.5 billion in fiscal 1964, following a $6.5 billion increase the year before and bringing the total to $98.8 billion; (ii) an increase in spending authority (new obligational authority) of $4.7 billion in fiscal 1964, following a $10.3 billion increase the year before and bringing the total to $107.9 billion; (iii) a reduction of taxes which, over a period of 3 years, and net of the direct revenue effects of asked-for structural reforms, would come to $10.3 billion; and (iv) a planned deficit of $11.9 billion in fiscal 1964.

Few budgets in recent years, perhaps in the entire history of our country, have been of a nature more likely to raise controversy and it is not surprising that public discussion of it has been spirited. And I think it is correct to say that the discussion has been conducted on a fairly respectable level of sophistication. There has been recourse to a certain amount of what has been called "mythology" but it would be a mistake to believe that this has been exclusively on one side of the argument. We were warned at Yale last June against "traditional labels" "worn-out slogans" "ancient cliches" and "myths." These are things to be avoided, to be sure, but we must remember that the expression "ancient cliche" for example, can become a cliche, too. And the amount of mischief that such a cliche can do as an obstacle to our being able to discuss policy problems logically and objectively and to our ability to learn what there is to learn from experience is not one bit less for the fact that it is a modern rather than an ancient substitute for thought.

Indeed, we must be careful that the debate doesn't result in the construction of a new mythology. But I think there is precisely such a danger. The new mythology would run something like this: it would be a grave mistake and a threat to our economic security to cut Federal expenditures, or even to prevent their increase, because this would be followed inevitably by a reduction in employment, by a rise in unemployment, and by an assortment of other economic ills. Conversely, the new mythology would tell us that an increase in Federal expenditures will increase employment as nothing else will, and has a capability that is absolutely unique for the promotion of the Nation's prosperity.

The launching of a new mythology of this type is no fancied danger. Indeed, I must say, most respectfully, that I believe President Kennedy came very close to doing so when, in speaking on April 19 last to the American Society of Newspaper Editors in Washington, D.C., he asserted that "a cut of $5 billion now from the proposed Federal budget * * * would cause 1 million fewer jobs by the end of the fiscal year." In the same address, and by way of illustrating this same fiscal point of view, the President assigned a great part of the responsibility for the 1957–58 recession to what he described as the "tremendous drop" in 1957 in Federal purchases, in the defense area particularly, and credited it with having added to the miseries caused by what he apparently believes to have been a generally mistaken fiscal and monetary policy, namely, "a $12.5 billion deficit in 1959, the largest outflow in a period of 3 years of gold and dollars amounting to nearly $12 billion and a recession in 1960."

These are important questions. We want to be quite sure that we have a balanced picture in mind of what happened in 1957. In particular, we want to be sure that we don't attribute an undue role in the 1957–58 recession to changes in the level of Federal expenditures. This is not just a question of keeping our history straight. It is also a question of drawing the right conclusions from history. And right conclusions in these matters are important not only for guidance in current policy matters but for our understanding of the proper and most constructive role of Government in our economic life.

We may begin by asking what actually did happen to Federal expenditures in 1957. There was a small and shortlived decline that can be seen in quarterly data only but the fact is that on an annual basis Federal spending did not decline at all. On the contrary, Federal spending went up by several billion dollars in 1957. And it went up again in 1958. This is true whether we measure spending by the administrative (conventional) budget, by the consolidated cash statement of the Federal Government, or by the national income accounts. And it is true whether we speak of calendar years or fiscal years.

It would burden these remarks unduly to cite the figures for each of these accounts but to use the administrative budget as an example, spending was $4.4 billion higher in 1957 (calendar) than in 1956. It went up by another $4.1 billion in 1958, and by another $4.5 billion in 1959. There was a drop in 1960, but only in the administrative and cash budgets; in the national income accounts, a style of budget accounting which the President singled out at Yale for special commendation, there was an increase in Federal spending in 1960, also.

The same is true of Federal purchases of goods and services, as registered in the gross national product accounts, a measure of Federal spending activity to which special attention was given in the President's address to the editors. Total Federal purchases (in current prices) rose by $4 billion in 1957 and by another $2.9 billion in 1958. In constant (1954) prices the year-to-year increases were $1.5 and $1.3 billion, respectively.

What about Federal purchases of goods and services for national defense, on which the President's major interest was concentrated? These rose by $4 billion in 1957, after having risen by $1.3 billion in 1956, and then went up by another $400 million in 1958.

In short, the expenditure declines to which the President refers were so short lived they can't be found in annual figures. They can be found only in quarterly data. And when you find them, as you will see, they are small in amount.

Let us look at these quarterly data first in terms of the amounts spent by the Federal Government in the purchase of goods and services. The expenditure reduction is greatest when purchases are expressed in constant prices, so let me cite these figures first. What we find is that the 1957 expenditure decline lasted for only two quarters and involved a drop from an annual rate of $44 billion (1954 prices) in the second quarter of 1957 to $42.3 billion in the fourth quarter. Purchases rose again, by nearly a billion dollars on an annual rate base, in the first quarter of 1958.

In current prices the decline in Federal purchases was smaller and shorter lived, lasting only 3 months. There was a drop from an annual rate of $50 billion in the third quarter of 1957 (the amount had held steady between the second and third quarters) to $49.4 billion in the fourth quarter.

What about expenditures on defense goods? Again, one has to use quarterly data to find a decline. And again, it was short lived and was small in amount. On a current price basis, which is the only basis for which data are readily available for quarterly analysis, there was a decline from a seasonally adjusted annual rate of $45 billion in the third quarter of 1957 to $44 billion in the fourth quarter. The figure was back to $44.4 billion in the first quarter of 1958.

Now, purchases of goods and services constitute a large part of the Federal Government's spending activity, but not all of it. In fact, figures on purchases miss about one-third of the budget total in the period we are discussing. In order to get a complete picture of the Federal Government's spending in 1957 we should, therefore, look not just at purchases of goods and services but at all Federal Government expenditures. If we do this, again using the income and product accounts, we see that the decline lasted for 3 months only, in this case from the second to the third quarter of 1957, that the drop was from an annual rate of $80.3 billion (current prices) to $79.9 billion, only $400 million on a seasonally adjusted annual rate basis, and that there was an increase to $80.6 billion in the fourth quarter.

The President's argument was concisely summarized in the label of the chart used on the occasion of his talk to the newspaper editors. It read: "Growing Unemployment Followed Budget Cuts in 1957." Now if this is read to mean that unemployment in 1958 and subsequently was caused by budget cuts in 1957, which is not an unlikely reading, then we must load onto small, short-lived declines in Federal expenditures or in Federal purchases of goods and services a responsibility that is far heavier than I believe we have any ground for expecting them to carry. And I believe it would be a great mistake to conclude from this experience that any effort at expenditure control in 1963 should be ruled out of bounds. All the more so, incidentally, when the 1963 question is not whether expenditures should be cut or not over the previous year, but whether expenditures should go up by $4.5 billion or not.

Let us pursue this matter a bit further. As we have seen, Federal expenditure reductions in 1957 were not large and did not last long. Indeed, the more closely you look at them the smaller they become. Clearly, one must take a good many other factors into consideration to reach a correct understanding of the 1957–58 recession. Accordingly, let me enumerate, with a minimum of comment, some major factors antecedent to the 1957–58 downturn that, in my judgment, had an important bearing on it.

First, 1955 and 1956 were years of very rapid increase in the production and sale of consumer goods, especially consumer durable goods, reflecting in good part the release of demands that had been built up, and pent up, in the Korean conflict period. These were unusually heavy and urgent demands and it is very unlikely that they could have been extended without diminution much beyond 1956 or mid-1957. Specifically, there was an exceptionally heavy surge of automobile production and sales in 1955; and high levels of auto sales continued in 1956 and 1957.

By and large, these increases in demand reflected economic considerations such as employment income and price. But it would be a mistake to ignore, for one thing, the effect of changes in automobile styling in this period. For reasons you must not ask me to explain, the American people rushed to the dealers' showrooms to buy the multicolored cars with wraparound windshields and modest tailfins that became available in the fall of 1954. Their enthusiasm reached an unprecedented pitch in 1955. It continued in 1956 and in 1957, too, but by that time the cars had evolved in design to an unbelievable length, width, and weight. And the modest little tailfins of the 1955 model had become very large, indeed, and to me, and I believe to a great many others, were by this time not very attractive at all. To some people they were the sign of an irretrievable national decadence, though happily this was mainly a case of some people's ability to write getting the better of them. In any case, auto dealers' showrooms in 1958 were shunned by vast numbers of Americans and sales of domestically produced cars dropped in 1958 by nearly 2 million, or to very little more than 50 percent of what they had been in 1955. If you are looking for shocks to our economy in this period, this was certainly a leading one. And the rate of Federal spending had very little to do with it. The drop in sales could not have been due entirely to a disenchantment with automobiles per se or to consumer income because at the same time that the demand for domestically produced cars was collapsing we were importing more and more of the smaller, more compact and less expensive, cars produced abroad. To remind ourselves of the extent of this shift in demand, let me recall that new passenger car imports rose from a value of $69 million in 1955 to a value of $735 million in 1959.

Another factor contributed to the essentially unsustainable increase in car sales that began in 1955 and for which we paid heavily in 1958. Consumer installment credit terms were greatly liberalized, both as regards the minimum downpayments required and the number of months allowed for repayment. Indeed, the liberalization of terms was so notorious that there was widespread advocacy in 1956 and in 1957 for the enactment of standby authority which would permit the Federal Government, presumably acting through the Federal Reserve System, to reimpose controls on the use of consumer installment credit. To all intents and purposes this expansionary factor had spent its force by 1957.

Second, we reached by mid-1957 the climax of a boom in business fixed investment expenditures that had lifted spending by American business on plant and equipment from a seasonally adjusted annual rate of about $26 billion in early 1955 to a rate of about $37 billion in mid-1957, an increase of 50 percent in 2½ years. Obviously, this was too sharp a rate of increase to be continued for very long, and it wasn't. A sharp decline in plant and equipment expenditures began in mid-1957 and continued for a year; at its low point, in mid-1958, it had reduced activity in the investment goods sector of our economy by about 25 percent.

Third, homebuilding had spurted in 1954 to levels that, unless some future revision of housing statistics tells us otherwise, have never since been exceeded. Then, in 1955, long before the shortlived and small 1957 reduction in the rate of Federal expenditures occurred, a decline in housing starts began which lasted for about 2 years, exerting a more or less continuously deflationary effect on the economy.

Fourth, and on a point to which I will refer again in a moment, the years immediately preceding 1957 were marked by sharp increases in labor compensation rates, far in excess of the productivity improvements achieved in those years. The facts on this point are by now reasonably well-known and acknowledged. As was pointed out in the President's Economic Report for January 1962, average hourly compensation in manufacturing industries rose by 6 percent or more in 1955 and again in 1956, very much in excess of normal productivity gains. And over the period 1953–57 as a whole, average hourly compensation rates in all private nonagricultural industries rose twice as fast as output per man-hour.

As reflected in data on manufacturing industries, the result of this inflation of labor costs, along with other cost factors having a similar effect, was a decline in the ratio of profits per dollar of sales in 1956 and 1957. And in data covering all corporate enterprise in the United States we see that there was a parallel decline in the volume of corporate profits after taxes. I am sure there is no need at this point in the dialog to say that this steady attrition of corporate profits had a deflationary effect on the investment expenditures of business and that this, in turn, had a deflationary effect on economic activity generally.

Fifth, inventories were being accumulated in 1955 at rates that were exceeded in the immediately preceding years only during the Korean conflict period, and the buildup was almost as high in 1956 as in 1955. This, also, was an invitation to downturn at a later date, and come it did. The buildup dropped from a rate of $4.7 billion in 1956 to $1.6 billion in 1957. Starting well before and far exceeding in size the drop in Federal expenditures to which such a long list of mischievous results has been attributed.

Sixth, our merchandise trade balance, which reflects the balance between goods exported to the rest of the world and goods imported from other countries, and which then as now showed an excess of exports over imports, rose sharply in 1956 and experienced an exceptional spurt in the winter of 1956–57 when the Suez crisis disrupted world trade.

The effect of this unfortunate international incident on the foreign trade of the United States was greatly to increase the demand for our exports, notably oil, and thus to give a powerfully accelerating impulse to our economy. But the stimulus did not last, and no one would have wanted it to. When the letdown came, as it did in the second quarter of 1957, it inevitably exerted a deflationary pressure on our economy. Indeed, the drop in net exports between the first quarter of 1957 and the first quarter of 1958, measured in current prices, came to $4.3 billion, on an annual rate basis. As an influence on the economy, therefore, net exports antedated and far outweighed changes in Federal expenditures or purchases. Indeed, even between the second and fourth quarters of 1957, which is the particular period to which the President has referred, the decline in net exports was actually greater than in the decline in Federal purchases of goods and services.

So, you see, there were many factors conspiring together in 1957 to complicate the task of holding our economy stable and achieving the measure of sustainable growth of which our economy was capable. What a setback to our understanding of the business cycle it would be if we were to fall into the error of thinking that the whole experience was due to a cut in expenditures by the Federal Government. Even more serious, what a misfortune it would be if, based on an analysis of the 1957–58 recession that is oversimplified to say the least, any resistance to the continuous rise of Federal spending were to be discredited as ancient thinking and rooted in mythology.

While I am on this subject of the 1957–58 recession I should like to comment on the interpretation of this event, and of the period 1957–62 as a whole, expounded by the Council of Economic Advisers in its January 1963 Economic Report to the President.

The council's interpretation may be summarized as follows: In its view, the United States economy has lagged continuously since 1957 and this lag, which by exerting itself again in the second-half of 1962 seriously upset the council's forecasts for that year, has been due to a "suspicion," to use the council's word, on the part of American businessmen that "underutilization was to be the normal state of the American economy." In an interesting venture in lay psychoanalysis, the council concludes that the downcast spirits of businessmen derive from "(the) unemployment of manpower and machines (that has) persisted for nearly 5 years." Not unexpectedly, the council finds this unhappy state of affairs to be due to the needlessly restrictive monetary and fiscal policy pursued by the Eisenhower administration in the years 1957–60.

There is by no means enough time at my disposal tonight to address myself as fully as I should like to this interpretation of the 1957–61 period, which I believe to be mistaken. But that opportunity may present itself at some other time. Let me say only that the council's interpretation ignores major forces that were at work in the economy in 1957–60 in favor of a fascination with fiscal and monetary policy. It gives no attention at all to the 1957 and pre-1957 developments which I have just sketched. And among the post-1957 developments which it ignores is the steel strike of 1959, which completely blocked the normal course of recovery and growth in that year and in 1960 and had the impact on our economy of a minor recession.

And I reject the council's criticism of fiscal and monetary policy in the 1957–60 episode as having been needlessly restrictive. I believe that their point of view is based on an underestimation of the inflationary developments, actual as well as threatened, that featured that period. We must not forget that those were years of considerable price and cost inflation. I have already commented on the cost and particularly on the wage inflation that was occurring especially in 1955 and 1956. Beginning in 1956, after 4 years of comparative stability, the index of consumer prices began a rise which lasted for about 2½ years and which averaged about 3¼ percent a year. This is a rate of price increase sufficient to cut the purchasing power of the dollar by over 25 percent in just about one decade. There was a sharp rise, also, in common stock prices and in land values. Is there anyone who would seriously maintain that this was a situation that a responsible government should have ignored?

It was no accident that this was the age, fortunately not a long one, of articles on "The Age of Inflation." I would maintain that it is a serious deficiency in any interpretation of the period, and certainly of any interpretation that is intended to clarify policy problems, to overlook the inflation psychology which these writings commented on month after month and which did indeed take hold in those years and spread through the economy and through financial markets especially. The spread of this psychology would have been all the greater and would have left marks on the economy all the deeper if it had not been resisted by fiscal and monetary policy. Under the circumstances, any deviation from monetary and fiscal restraint would have aggravated the inflationary psychology which already existed and would have given encouragement to every inflationary force, whether from the side of cost or of demand, that was then active in our economy. And it would have complicated today's problems of achieving growth and stability and of holding prices reasonably steady. If you will forgive a semifacetious remark, let us say that although I would not claim that the monetary and fiscal policies pursued in the years prior to 1961 were intended to ease the path of my friends on the present Council of Economic Advisers, I hope that some day these policies will receive at least part of the credit due them for having had some such effect.

As I have said in talking about these matters on another occasion, we are not speaking here of an imaginary inflation problem but a very real one with which we had a major encounter. Currently, it is fashionable to disparage the policies which were adopted to meet it, but I assure that if we ever encounter it again we will find ourselves in the position of having to do precisely the same thing over again. And let us not think that this is a total impossibility. Indeed, it was envisaged by the President in his remarks to the Society of Newspaper Editors on April 19 when he said, "If we get again in this country strong inflationary pressure there are obvious monetary restraints which * * * would prevent us from going into an abnormal period."

So much for the business cycle theory implied in the caption "Unemployment Followed Budget Cuts in 1957" that topped the President's statistical exhibit when he spoke to the news editors and for the more elaborate excursion into business cycle history by the Council of Economic Advisers. Let me invite you to consider from another angle the relationship between budget cuts and budget increases, on the one hand, and employment and unemployment, on the other. We can throw some light, I think, on this relationship by comparing what happened to jobs in 1953–55, when Federal spending was reduced sharply, with a roughly comparable reduction in taxes, with what happened in 1960–62, when Federal expenditures were increased by an even larger amount, with no significant change in taxes. Both periods were marked by recession: 1953–54, when the Korean conflict was being ended; and 1960–61, which was much less severe and which can be accounted for entirely by inventory adjustment. But for purposes of testing relationships between budget changes and changes in employment and unemployment it is changes between the terminal years of the two periods which we should compare.

The salient facts are these. Between 1953 and 1955, incident to the liquidation of the Korean conflict, Federal administrative budget expenditures were reduced by $6.9 billion and Federal purchases of national defense goods and services in the GNP accounts, on which the President places particular emphasis, were reduced by $10.2 billion. These figures are in current prices and refer to calendar years. Between 1960 and 1962, on the other hand, Federal budget expenditures rose by $14.3 billion and defense purchases increased by $7.7 billion. One could hardly ask for two more sharply contrasting periods on the basis of which to test a theory that employment will fall if the budget is cut, with or without a reduction in taxes.

What does the comparison show? The fact is that employment increased between 1953 and 1955 while the budget and taxes were being reduced by almost as much as it increased between 1960 and 1962 when expenditures were being raised. The civilian employment increase in the first period was 1 million; in the second period it was 1,318,000.

If one examines the employment figures, however, it will be seen that the increase that took place between 1960 and 1962 consisted in the main of a rise in Government jobs, Federal, State and local. Government employment increased by 665,000 and accounted for more than 50 percent of the total employment increase. There was an increase in Government jobs between 1953 and 1955, too, again counting Federal, State and local employment, but it was much smaller, amounting to 269,000 or only about 25 percent of the total gain.

And what about unemployment in these two periods? The fact is that it increased in both periods: just over 1 million between 1953 and 1955 and 76,000 between 1960 and 1962. But two factors were at work in the economy in these years that together more than account for this difference.

In the first place, our Armed Forces were reduced by 500,000 between 1953 and 1955, as we demobilized following the Korean conflict, whereas they were increased by 314,000 between 1960 and 1962 as our military commitments and involvements around the world tended to become more numerous and to deepen.

Second, labor force participation rates were rising between 1953 and 1955 (from 58.5 to 58.7 percent), which made the task of preventing a rise in unemployment in that period more difficult; they were declining between 1960 and 1962 (from 58.3 to 57.4 percent), which simplified the task of holding unemployment down. We may ask what would have been the result as regards changes in unemployment if these rates had remained unchanged over the two periods. Interestingly enough, if this had been the case unemployment would have increased by half again as much in 1960–62, when Federal expenditures were being increased by nearly $15 billion, as it did in 1953–55, when Federal expenditures were being reduced by around $7 billion. In short, the apparently better unemployment record of 1960–62 was due not to a difference in Federal expenditure policy, but to the simple fact that in those years there was an appreciable drop in the percentage of American people going into the labor market in search of work.

I am sure you understand that the dialog on the relation of budget cuts to employment and to unemployment and on the causes and consequences of the 1957–58 recession are inspired by more than an academic interest in clarifying a few points in business cycle theory or annals, though we may hope for some byproducts of this character.

On the contrary, the dialog is inspired by a very practical policy question. But if I may so so, quite respectfully, the question is not, as the President suggested in his speech to the newspaper editors, whether we shall at this time have wholesale budget cuts of $5, $10, or $15 billion. The question is whether, with the economy rising at a good rate, and I would judge at a good bit faster rate than was officially expected when the budget was put together, but with a large budgetary deficit in prospect, it is sound fiscal policy to increase Federal spending by $5 billion at the same time that we are reducing taxes, over a 3-year period by some $10 billion. The question is whether in this context of economic conditions and with our long-term interests prominently in mind we would not be better advised to exercise a closer control over Federal spending increases and possibly to hold spending levels unchanged as between fiscal 1963 and fiscal 1964.

This is the practical question, and the purpose of this paper is to show that as we seek an answer to it efforts at expenditure control should not be blocked by a general proposition to the effect that "unemployment follows budget cuts" or by assertions that there is a necessary connection between budget cuts (if we were in fact talking about budget cuts) and unemployment such that a $5 billion cut, which the President has cited, would necessarily produce a loss of 1 million jobs. Nor should we be dissuaded from a sensible program of expenditure containment and control, and by this I do not mean just turning down preliminary agency and department requests from the inflated figures which they normally put forward, but by holding actual budget expenditures to a level which, consistent with our wish to reduce taxes, is within our fiscal capability, by a theory to the effect that a reduction in the rate of Federal purchases of defense goods and services in 1957 which occurred within the limits of a single quarter, and which came to $1 billion on a seasonally adjusted annual rate basis but followed an annual rate increase of $1.3 billion in the first 6 months of the year and was followed by a $400 million increase in the first quarter of 1958, should be assigned major responsibility for two recessions, a $12½ billion budget deficit and a very large outflow of gold.

If we accept this version of history and this line of argument we will have committed ourselves to a policy that is not only inflationary in its direct effects, even if we have to wait a bit for the inflationary effects to show themselves, but which will support and amplify all independent inflationary forces at work in our economy.

What is more, we will have committed ourselves to a fiscal policy which implies the steady growth of government, and in particular of the Federal Government, relative to the private sector of the economy. And we will have invited a basic restructuring of our traditional institutions.

The fact is, however, that there are checks and balances in our economy and in our political system that can prevent such processes from getting out of hand. As a practical matter, you can't cut taxes and raise expenditures simultaneously without at some point getting into a frightful fiscal mess and I expect this fact of life to be recognized before too long. Rightly or wrongly we are going to cut taxes and cut them substantially. All the best people are for it, though there must be at least a dozen different formulas on how it should be done. Even those who not so long ago were complaining of "public squalor and private affluence" are now vying with one another to reduce our revenue gathering capability. You can be assured that this frame of mind will not last long because it supports a strategy which is essentially nonviable.

I like to say that I do not make many forecasts, and actually I do not. But I am prepared to make one for you tonight. My forecast is that you will hear a lot more about Federal expenditure control before you hear less. And there is more than an even chance that the idea, ancient as it is, will win a new respectability when it is adopted, as I expect it will be, by the President's own administration, an event to which I look forward eagerly.

And when this piece of ancient thinking has been lifted, as the saying goes, into the 20th century, and put into practical effect, I do not expect it to be followed by unemployment. Nor do I expect it to cause a recession, let alone two recessions. And I do not expect it to promote an accelerated outflow of gold. On the contrary, I would expect it to bring benefits not just to us but to all our friends around the world who look to us, more than to anyone else, to maintain a sturdy, unimpeachable fiscal position and a free society.

DEATH OF EARL C. FISHBAUGH, LEADING CITIZEN OF IOWA

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, one of Iowa's leading citizens, Earl C. Fishbaugh, a resident for many years of Shenandoah, Iowa, passed away recently. I ask unanimous consent that some excerpts from the local newspaper with respect to one of Iowa's great citizens be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EARL C. FISHBAUGH, MARCH 7, 1880–APRIL 27, 1963

"Every man according as he purposeth in his heart, so let him give; not grudgingly, or of necessity; for God loveth a cheerful giver." II Cor. 9: 7.

Earl C. Fishbaugh, the younger son of Christian W. and Malinda Angene Fishbaugh, was born at Tiffin, Ohio, March 7, 1880. His parents moved to Shenandoah when he was 2 years old. He attended the Shenandoah public schools graduating in 1898 and then attended Western Normal College. His first banking position was with the old Commercial Savings Bank; later he was with the First National Bank. In 1909, with his father, he founded the Security Trust & Savings Bank, which was opened for business January 9, 1909.

He was married December 15, 1908, to Irene Estelle Fender. He is survived by his wife, two sons, Earl C., Jr., attorney, and Robert, banker, and a grandson, John, a college student. A brother, Warren, preceded him in death in 1950.

He was a farm operator and banker. His great love aside from his family, to which he was devoted, was his bank. His ability as a banker was recognized in 1928 when he was appointed to the State banking board where he served until 1932.

He was generous with both his talents and his worldly goods. A member of the Presbyterian Church he did not hesitate to support other churches and most of the churches have at one time or another benefited by his gifts.

He was never too busy to give his time to a worthy cause and for 20 years had been on the local Salvation Army board. For over 40 years he served as school treasurer. He was a member of the Shenandoah Library Board where his great interest in books permitted him to serve with distinction.

He was a student of the Battle of Gettysburg and of Abraham Lincoln, being an authority on both.

Mr. Fishbaugh had a poet's heart and the ease and grace of expression to transfer his love of poetry to thoughts of his own. During the past years many of his friends have been rewarded with a poem of congratulation or acknowledgment. The poems which follow are among the many such poems he wrote and they show something of the ready wit and keen interest he had in his fellow men, and reflect his kindly philosophy toward all mankind.

To a banker in a neighboring town who had mentioned he might be growing old:

Perhaps you're right good friend of mine
(You say I'm growing old)
I much prefer the fireside
Than venture in the cold.

I find I am more tolerant
And far far less inclined
To speak right up and say my piece
To those of different mind.

But 'tis the season of good cheer,
Of giving and forgiving,
For thankfulness for folks like yours,
The bank for better living.

So many, many are the folks
To whom I am indebted
That I can't thank them one and all.
I'm disappointed, fretted.

To a young businessman recovering from a serious illness:

I hate to see a good man down
But boy what a joy it is
To see that same man getting up
And going after biz.

I hear that you are doing fine,
I trust the days are few
Till you'll be champin' at the bit
And feeling good as new.

To an Irish friend with a winning smile:

Congratulations, friend of mine,
I wish I had a smile like thine,
Such warming smiles are far too few
In these tough times of fret and stew

Friend Jack, there really are some folk
Who seldom smile and never joke
And then they see your smiling phiz.
That smile an inspiration is.

A smile is a constructive thing;
It puts old dull care on the wing;
It gives a lift to all you meet;
You're welcome up and down the street.

I really think some minor ills
Have need of smiles as well as pills,
The smile that drives away the gloom
For grim despair will leave no room.

And though one's cares may heavy weigh
Tomorrow'l be a better day.

—*Uncle Earl.*

ARMENIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY—MAY 28

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, although the Armenian nation remains under the yoke of Communist tyranny, the voices of its people in exile have not been stilled. This is reflected in the fact that Armenian Americans throughout the United States on May 28 will observe the 45th anniversary of Armenian Independence Day, a reminder of the courage of their forebears, and to instill in their captive compatriots the knowledge that they have not been forgotten nor will ever be forgotten. It is fitting that we in Congress also bring to the attention of others the plight of such nations as the Armenian Republic.

THE SS "HOPE"

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on March 11 the white hospital ship SS *Hope* returned to New York from Peru after a successful 10-month teaching-healing mission. *Hope* has brought healthier, happier and more productive life to thousands in Indonesia, Vietnam, and, more recently, South America.

Forty-five thousand patients have been treated; 4,000 major operations have been performed; 2,000 medical and paramedical personnel have worked and learned with *Hope's* dedicated medical staff; and 500,000 people on two continents have benefited by immunization, examination and other *Hope* services.

More than statistics, these represent lives saved, eyesights restored, relief from pain. Above all, they represent hope for a better tomorrow for the people of newly developing countries where new therapies, new medical texts and equipment were not available, and where not infrequently there was only one doctor for every 250,000 persons. And everywhere the ship visited, its personnel demonstrated the warm heart and deep concern of good Americans.

Mr. President, I am pleased to learn that on this most recent mission, 21 Ohioans served aboard this ship. I ask unanimous consent that the names of these individuals, together with an article which appeared in the Youngstown, Ohio, Vindicator describing this most recent mission, be printed at this point in the Record as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the names and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The 21 Ohioans serving aboard the most recent mission of SS *Hope* to Peru are as follows:

From Akron, Dr. Everett F. Hurteau; from Cleveland, Dr. Bernard S. Abrams, Dr. Alexander Miller, Margaret Sherwood, Nick Sperelakis (Ph. D.); from Columbus, Dr. Harold A. Decker, Joan M. Donley, Dr. Edwin B. Hamilton, Jacqueline Harris, Dr. Walter M. Haynes, Dr. Brooks Hurd, Dr. John L. Terry, Dr. Jack Tetirick; from Dayton, Dr. Richard J. Ireton, Irene E. Tegenkamp; from Lima, Nancy Savage; from Napoleon, Joan Austermiller; from Portsmouth, Othnile R. Clifford; from Trotwood, Velma Lutz; from Urbana, Vivian Crosswhite; and from Youngstown, Dr. John McDonough.

[From the Youngstown (Ohio) Vindicator, Feb. 10, 1963]

"Greatest Experience of My Life"; Grateful Peruvians Hail Gringos

(By Jane Lamb)

"Hi ya Gringo."

In Peru, this greeting has an affectionate ring, says Dr. John J. McDonough, who has returned home aglow with enthusiasm over "the greatest experience of my life."

For 2 months, the Youngstown physician and surgeon was one of the 25 volunteer medical men aboard the SS *Hope*, a unique hospital ship stationed this year along the coast of Peru, off Trujillo. Once a U.S. Navy vessel, the *Hope* is supported by dollars given by the American people, and it makes good its name, Health Opportunity for People Everywhere.

The staff practiced medicine aboard ship, in slum clinics at Trujillo and in Belin, the city's public hospital. They formed a teaching institute for Peruvian doctors, made fast friends for this country and learned to love the people whom they found to be warm and friendly.

Although they had not thought of it at first, they found themselves in the role of good will ambassadors. Misconceptions about the Yankee disappeared in an atmosphere of man helping his fellowman. The doctors were not there for money or glory, but only to practice medicine.

GET DIFFERENT VIEW OF NORTH AMERICANS

"Peruvians learned that North Americans did not have horns sticking out of their heads," says Dr. McDonough.

Dr. McDonough believes this is the most important thing *Hope* has accomplished. His experience has proved to him the value of living with the people in a country, helping them solve their problems, teaching them if possible, rather than flooding them with money or telling them what to do. People have pride in what they can do for themselves, he observes. It has convinced him that the Peace Corps is a sound idea, although he would add mature and more skilled persons.

The doctors found appalling need in Peru. Dr. McDonough says he has never seen such poverty, even in Europe. Many people live in adobe huts, with or without roofs, no light, no gas, no running water, dirt floors.

"If it gets cold at night, and it does in the mountains, they cuddle up to a goat," he says. They have no sanitary facilities. But most of all they lack know-how.

ONE HUNDRED FAMILIES GET WATER FROM SPIGOT

In the slums of Trujillo, one spigot may supply the water for 100 families, and Dr. McDonough doesn't even guess where the water comes from.

Pioneering in public health has been an important function of *Hope*, or "Oppeh ship," as it is called by the grateful Peruvian people. The staff has set up immunization centers, most of them around Trujillo. Some physicians have decided to stay on to see if they can keep the program going.

"The people are so grateful and the need is so great," Dr. McDonough explains.

Tuberculosis is rampant. Tuberculosis meningitis in children is commonplace. So are malnutrition, congenital deformities, smallpox, diphtheria, polio, and their effects.

"You see the ravages of all the infectious diseases in children," he says, "and you take every child you can get hold of for immunization."

WORKED ON SHORE AND ABOARD SHIP

Dr. McDonough, assigned to surgery, had a retinue of students with him most of the time. For 1 month he operated aboard ship, the other month in Trujillo. Every *Hope* doctor has his Peruvian counterpart, an English-speaking physician who works with him every day of the 2-month rotation period. Dr. McDonough's counterpart was head of the gynecology department at the medical school in Trujillo. The Trujillo physician had two associates, each with four to six students. This made some 18 doctors for whom Dr. McDonough was responsible. Teaching is fully as important as treating in the *Hope* project.

Dr. McDonough believes he was able to teach several of them to do much better surgery, and knows they, in turn, will teach others. At first he was overwhelmed by the deluge of patients.

"Some were so sick and so desperately in need," he says. The *Hope* staff came to understand that the best they could do was leave know-how behind them.

The result was that a relaxed atmosphere and a wonderful esprit de corps developed. Each physician assisted the other. Everyone was in the same spot. Deep friendships were formed that probably will last a lifetime.

Physicians came to the ship as to a postgraduate institute. Among them was a Welsh nurse who had lived in the Amazon River jungle 15 years. Under pressure of circumstances, she had been pushed into operating and was doing cataracts, abdominal surgery, pelvic surgery, and fractures, and making a creditable job, the Youngstown surgeon adds.

Another observed was a young physician whose father heads the department of gynecology at San Marko, one of the oldest universities in this part of the world. He had heard of the great things aboard the *Hope* and came to observe for a week. When Dr. McDonough was assigned to lecture and operate in Lima for a week, his newfound friend showed him the wonders of the capital city.

LIMA HAS BEAUTIFUL HOMES AND GARDENS

Here was tremendous contrast to conditions in the outer areas. Lima is a great metropolitan center with beautiful homes and gardens. Dr. McDonough saw in one private residence the most magnificent collection of art he has seen outside a museum. It included paintings by such masters as Goya and Tintoretto.

Dr. McDonough also described Trujillo as a progressive city of some 75,000, bustling with activities. The Grace Line, which operated the ship, plays an important part in the economy as does Standard Oil of New Jersey and copper companies.

Language is no problem because there are many interpreters and the counterparts all speak English. Dr. McDonough almost wishes interpreters had not been so omnipresent, in order that he might have learned more Spanish.

The *Hope* was anchored some 100 yards offshore as a protection against throngs of curious people. Each day there was a milk run from the ship into the slum areas. Milk was made in the ship's milk machine which produced fresh water from the sea and then mixed it with dry milk components.

LIFE EXPECTANCY IS ONLY 45 YEARS

If poverty and filth were appalling, so was the extent of disease. Of every 10 children, not more than 6 go to school, Dr. McDonough relates. Average life expectancy is 45 years. He performed an operation for one woman who had had 23 pregancies, 9 living children, 7 miscarriages and 7 children who died before the age of 7. Babies stop nursing when the next one arrives. Midwives deliver most babies and infant mortality is high.

There are few medical specialists. One eye surgeon in Trujillo serves the entire northern area of Peru, probably a million people. *Hope* surgeons removed eye cataracts at the rate of three or four an hour on an outpatient basis. Dr. McDonough says he has never seen so many harelips or cleft palates.

NEW VOLUNTEERS COME ABOARD IN 2 MONTHS

The *Hope* staff consisted of 24 to 30 physicians. They serve 2 months and are then replaced by new volunteers. Dr. McDonough's group included 13 surgeons, 6 internists, 1 pathologist, 2 radiologists, and 2 pediatricians. Dr. William Walsh of Washington, a key figure in the *Hope* project, said that application for the Peru tour came from 3,000 doctors. From this number 200 were selected. Dr. McDonough signed up 2 years ago in response to an American Medical Association appeal.

Nurses are part of the more permanent staff, without whom the project would be impossible, Dr. McDonough says. Two Ohioans aboard are Peggy Sherwood, 107 Chestnut Street, Leetonia, a pharmacist; and Lee Harrison, R.N., from the Cleveland area. The *Hope* will dock in New York March 1 after its year in Peru. Last year's tour was to Indonesia.

Facilities aboard the ship were excellent, contrasting with the somewhat antique facilities in Belin.

A popular fellow aboard the *Hope* was the ham radio operator. Through him, Dr. McDonough and his wife frequently were able to talk by telephone. The operator would contact another ham in Jackson, Mich., and long distance telephone covered the rest of the distance.

One of the treasured mementos from Dr. McDonough's experience is a beautiful silver platter inscribed with a message from the grateful people of Peru.

TREASURY, POST OFFICE, AND EXECUTIVE OFFICE APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5366) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Edmondson in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 7, line 12, it is proposed to strike out "$555,200,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$576,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] there be a limitation of 40 minutes debate, to be equally divided between the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] and the majority leader, and that a quorum call shall precede debate thereon.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, do I correctly understand that there will be a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment?

Mr. CLARK. I shall ask for the yeas and nays after a live quorum has been developed.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 68 Leg.]

Allott
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Edmondson
Ellender
Engle
Ervin
Fong
Goldwater
Gore
Gruening
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kennedy
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Mechem
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Tower
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], are absent on official business.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. President, under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into a few moments ago, 20 minutes are allotted to each side on my amendment.

The purpose of my amendment is to restore to the bill $20,800,000 for additional Internal Revenue agents. The amount requested to be restored has been requested by the President, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Collector of Internal Revenue. This amendment is, therefore, a Kennedy administration amendment.

The need for these Internal Revenue agents was well pointed out in a letter written to my dear friend the able chairman of the subcommittee who is handling this bill, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson], on April 26. That letter was signed by Senators Church, Morse, Stephen Young, and myself.

We pointed out that in cutting out $30 million from the administration's budget request for the Internal Revenue Service, the House of Representatives had practiced false economy. Failure to provide these funds would cost the Treasury many millions of dollars and contribute substantially to the Federal deficit. There will be 2 million additional tax returns filed in fiscal 1964. Tax collections should be $9 billion more this year than last. The President's budget request will permit continuation of the present level of enforcement activities at the Internal Revenue Service, taking into account the increase in workload generated by an expanding economy and a growing population, and also the fact that 20 million new returns were required by the tax action we took last year when we refused to impose the withholding provision on dividends and interest, but nevertheless required a vast amount of paperwork to be filed to permit the Treasury Department to collect those taxes.

One thousand five hundred and ninety-one new positions will be required to handle the 1964 taxload. The investment will have a high rate of return. The audits carried out by Internal Revenue Service personnel would increase the anticipated tax revenues in 1964 by over $143 million more than in 1963. This sum alone exceeds by 3½ times the cut recommended by the House.

The Senate Appropriations Committee restored $9 million of the $30 million or more cut made by the House. The purpose of this amendment is to restore the $20,800,000, as requested by the Secretary of the Treasury.

If we had before us today a bill which directed the Internal Revenue Service to reduce its cooperation with the Department of Justice in ferreting out hoodlums and racketeers; to go easy on taxpayers who withhold taxes from their employees but do not pay them over to the Treasury; to slow them down in their efforts to find and prosecute tax evaders; to cut down on their audit programs in areas where known abuses exist; in short, a bill which in effect declared a holiday for fiscal year 1964 as far as vigorous, efficient tax enforcement is concerned, how would we vote on such a proposal?

Obviously, no Member of this body would support such a bill. Yet, unless the administration's budget request is restored, the effect would be the same as if we had passed such a bill.

I was very much impressed by the speech made by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] last week in which he reported the remarkable progress made by Internal Revenue Service in reducing the delinquent tax accounts on its books by half a billion dollars. This is the kind of program in which a reduction in personnel is folly instead of economy.

Mr. President, we have the best Internal Revenue Service in the world. During 1962, 146 officials from 41 countries came to this country to study our Internal Revenue Service and observe its operations in order to improve tax administration in their own countries. At a time when Senators say much about the size of the Federal deficit, it seems strange, in the name of economy, to sacrifice anywhere between $100 and $150 million to save less than $21 million in Government expenditures. Yet that is exactly what we shall do if we accept the bill as it came from the Appropriations Subcommittee.

I want to stress for a minute the crime prevention and antiracketeering activities of the Internal Revenue Service. I am sure the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is not very different from any other State. We are, on the whole, a law-abiding people, but in our Commonwealth there are constant efforts by interstate racketeers, interstate gamblers, and people like those who met in Appalachia some years ago. They were always trying to infiltrate into our urban, and even our rural, communities. One of the very best ways to stop them is by requiring them to buy a $50 gambling stamp which the law requires to be placed prominently in the window of the place of business of the admitted gambler. Once that is done, an honest district attorney, an honest chief of police, a mayor, or the county commissioners know where the gambler and thieves in their communities are.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. CLARK. I yield myself 2 minutes more.

Under those circumstances, our local law enforcement agents can take over. Yet I know, because of the shortage of personnel in the Internal Revenue Service, in county after county in Pennsylvania those local law enforcement agencies cannot easily run down and determine who the racketeers and gamblers in their areas are. Therefore, unless the local district attorneys, chiefs of police, and mayors are unduly vigilant, we do not get the kind of law enforcement we need.

I know of no better way to combat sleazy law enforcement at the local level than by requiring disclosure of the identity of racketeers, pool players, and gamblers, so they can be located. Let those people pay the gambling tax stamp and thus be marked in the community as being so identified, so that the law can be enforced. I am now engaged in a strong effort in my State to support local law enforcement. The administration has been doing a magnificent job in connection with Federal grand juries in prosecuting violations of the tax laws by gamblers. The administration needs these additional funds to carry on that work.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask the majority leader to yield me 5 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I am against sin, and I am sorry to hear about the situation in Pennsylvania. I am also against a proposal to borrow, at over 4 percent, $20,800,000 in order to add 2,592 more employees to the Federal Government.

The bill before the Senate would appropriate $52.1 million more than was appropriated in 1963 for the Internal Revenue Service. It provides for an increase of 1,184 man-years. This is an addition of one-third of what was asked for by the Treasury Department. Last year we were told that they were going to go broke, and that Uncle Sam would be cheated if we did not give them all they asked for at that time. We gave them a third of what they appealed.

They come back now and ask for an increase of $75 million over 1963. They say that they cannot do the job unless we give them this additional amount in toto less a couple of million dollars.

In the meantime, Mr. President, we have passed a law which requires everyone who pays interest or dividends above $10 to report that payment to the Treasury Department. We have a law which requires everyone to carry what I call a dog tag. Of course, it is known as a social security number, but it is one way of identifying a person and catching him if he cheats the Government. We have put millions of dollars into automatic processing machines.

It is significant that we have a debt of more than $300 billion. We have in these two Departments covered in the bill more employees than the entire Government had when I came to Congress 30 years ago, which totaled 603,587 civilian employees. Think of that, Mr. President. These two Departments alone will have on June 30, 1963, 681,169 workers. We recommend that they be given over 12,000 more for next year. Yet these two Departments have more employees than the entire Government had when I came to Congress.

We have included in the bill over $10 billion for interest on our tremendous debt. When I came to Congress the entire expenses of the Government were less than $4 billion.

Why do we have to spend $10 billion-plus for interest? It will soon be a billion dollars a month. We must spend that amount because in the past 30 years in every year, except in 3 years, we spent more than we took in.

We have brought a bill to the Senate that we believe will take care of the collection of our internal revenue. We assume that the average American man, who reports his own tax income, is honest, and that it is unfair to assume that everyone is a crook.

We have given this Bureau a tremendous increase year after year. Now we are asked, on top of that, to give it 2,500 more workers, and to borrow $20,800,000 for that purpose. No one knows when it will be repaid.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I hope the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania will be rejected, and that the recommendation of the committee, of which the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] is chairman, will be accepted. The situation, as I see it, is that the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania recommends that the Senate add $30 million to the bill.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. That is an incorrect statement. My amendment would add $20,800,000.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am in error. It is $30 million over the House figure. The Bureau estimate was $578,300,000, or additional manpower of 3,776. The House gave the Internal Revenue Service $546 million, or a cut of $32,300,000, and the Senator from Pennsylvania requests an additional $30 million over the House figure.

The House would give the Bureau 358 additional employees. The Senate committee recommends that the Internal Revenue Service be given $555.2 million, or 1,184 additional personnel, or about a third of what the budget estimate is.

The estimate is for 3,776 additional employees. The House allowed 358 additional employees. The Senate recommendation would be for 1,184 additional personnel, or about a third of what was requested by the Internal Revenue Service. These are all in addition to what the Service had for 1963.

In 1963 Congress gave the Internal Revenue Service about a third of the requested increase in that year. Today the Internal Revenue Service has approximately 62,000 personnel, of which approximately 26,000 are enforcement officers. In 1961 the enforcement officers were 22,500, in round figures. In 1962 there was an increase of almost 2,000, to 24,364 men. In 1963 the enforcement officers numbered 25,618. In 1964 they requested 27,378. The bill, if the figures are correct, would give them, instead of an increase of approximately 1,700, additional personnel of 1,184.

I believe the committee's recommendations, under all the circumstances, are reasonable recommendations. We have increased the appropriation for the Internal Revenue Service each year for the past 2 or 3 years. We have increased the number of enforcement officers. While we do not give all the increases asked for, we are giving them about a third of the increase that the Service has asked for; we gave them a third last year, and, between 1961 and 1962, almost 2,000 additional men.

I hope that the committee report will be accepted. So far as I know, it was the unanimous report of the committee, at least of all Senators present. Therefore I hope that the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania will be defeated and the committee sustained.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I am very familiar with the fact that down through the years it has been possible to show by statistics that the average revenue agent will produce for the Treasury many times the money that is needed to pay his salary and expenses. However, I must say, with all due deference to my friend from Pennsylvania, that I am not very much impressed by the argument that he has advanced for adding additional revenue agents.

For example, he referred to the requirement for information returns that was added to the tax law by Congress last year. I point out that that does not necessarily mean that additional revenue agents will be required.

It does not mean that at all. What it does mean is that some clerical help may be required to process those returns, and that possibly some technical help will be needed to run the computors. But it is only after the clerical employees have isolated discrepancies that a revenue agent is called in. I cannot see any justification, on the basis of information returns, for employing more revenue agents.

My friend from Pennsylvania spoke about racketeers. It has been my observation that the policy of the Internal Revenue Service has been to assign special agents, not revenue agents, to audit the accounts. I would feel more impressed if my friend from Pennsylvania had talked about employing additional special agents, who, after all, are the ones charged with developing cases involving tax evasion, rather than Internal Revenue agents, who are assigned to tax deficiency cases, primarily.

It seems to me that the committee has done excellent work in trying to meet the requirements of the Internal Revenue Service.

I believe that the information the Senator from Massachusetts has given us, showing a substantial increase in personnel in the Internal Revenue Service in the past 2 or 3 years, indicates that we have cooperated very well in trying to meet the requirements.

I also point out that early this year we were assured by the President of the United States that there would not be any more expenditures for such agencies as the Treasury Department, the Department of Justice, and others, than there were for fiscal 1963. Certainly this statement was made after receiving estimates from the Internal Revenue Service and the Treasury Department. I see no reason for going outside the President's commitment to the American people.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I have just been reading the testimony taken on the proposal to create a Joint Committee on the Budget. In stating the purposes of the bill, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] said, among other things:

> One of the most serious problems confronting our Nation today is the maintenance of national solvency in the face of ever-growing demands on the Federal Government for programs and services, coupled with the necessity of meeting the national defense requirements of the cold war and the atomic and space age.
>
> Our national expenditures budget has grown from $66 billion in fiscal year 1956 to an estimated $94.3 billion for 1963, and a requested $98.8 billion for fiscal year 1964.

This means that in 6 years the Federal expenditures have grown by $32 billion. My suggestion is that instead of adding to the number of agents who are sent out of Washington to check individuals, grind them down, and impute dishonesty to them, we attack the problem on the basis of quitting the spending program. If we continue to spend, the inevitable result will be that the tax burden will grow worse.

When people are taxed too much, they are driven by compulsion and necessity to try to avoid the hugeness of the tax burden. I can visualize, if we go forward in the manner that we have, swarms of agents leaving the tax collector's office in Washington and the various regional offices, tracking down the individual taxpayer, and, as I said a moment ago, imputing dishonesty to him.

When Congress passed the tax measure about a year ago, it required corporations, banking institutions, and building and loan associations to report to the Government dividend and interest payments disbursed in excess of specific amounts. In Covington, Ky., across the Ohio River from Cincinnati, one of the processing centers was established. It is represented to be able to ferret out through the machine the dishonest citizen. Tags have been placed, as described by the Senator from Virginia, by way of a social security or identification number for each taxpayer. I think we should have some confidence in the integrity of the American taxpayer. We should not send word from Congress that all taxpayers are crooked and dishonest. I do not believe that to be so.

I conclude by saying that it will not be necessary to increase the number of agents if judgment and prudence are exercised in the spending of money.

I will vote with the Senator from Virginia on this item.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. CLARK. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I had not intended to speak in favor of the amendment, although I shall vote for it. What I have to say does not indicate any confidence that the amendment will be adopted, though I believe it should be adopted. However, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] has made some arguments which I believe should be answered.

The Senator from Ohio said that the problem is the amount of money the Government is spending, that it is to this we should address ourselves; and that if we reduce the amount of spending, the problem of tax evasion will be solved. I suggest that the level of Government spending cannot be settled by a vote either for or against the pending amendment. It is an entirely different question, although a very important one. It is hardly relevant to the merits of the amendment now before the Senate.

Second, the Senator from Ohio has said that we propose to send swarms of tax agents out to impute dishonesty to taxpayers. I think this statement does not properly characterize the amendment. Those who honestly pay their taxes need not fear investigation. It is only those who engage in dishonesty that need to fear investigation. The honest taxpayers are the ones who are penalized by the swindlers, by the cheats, by those who refuse to do what the great majority of the American people willingly do, namely, honestly pay the taxes they owe under the laws of the country.

It is not alone the Government the cheaters victimize; it is the honest taxpayers who must bear a bigger burden to make up for those who cheat.

So I say, first, that the amendment is in the best interest of those who honestly pay their taxes. On that account alone it is worthy of the support of the Senate.

Second, if we are interested in the just, vigorous, and efficient collection of taxes, we ought to be mindful of what the President of the United States, the Treasury Department, and those who are charged with the responsibility of collecting taxes say, namely, that the Government needs the extra agents the amendment would furnish. They say, further, that if the extra money is provided for tax collection, $6 will be collected from the cheaters for every extra dollar spent.

Therefore, I say it is in the interest of prudent economy to adopt the amendment. No matter how we look at it, I think the arguments for the amendment are quite irrefutable. So I hope the Senate will support the Senator from Pennsylvania and adopt his amendment.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield for a question?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa has no time left. I ask unanimous consent that he may be given back as much time as he desires, but not on my time.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I object to additional time being yielded.

Mr. MANSFIELD. My time has been yielded back.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I support the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania. All of us would agree that soundly based efforts to hold Federal expenditures to essential minimums deserve our full support. However, when an agency performing vital services for the country has submitted a budget request already trimmed to essential items, to the bone, it is difficult to understand reasons for substantial reductions in such a request. Such is the case in the action taken by the House in cutting $32 million from the Internal Revenue Service budget request. Equally puzzling is why our own Senate committee has recommended restoration of only $9.2 million of the House cut.

We are dealing here with the budget of the agency we hold responsible for collecting all the money needed for Government operations in these costly, critical times. This job must be done; and doing it requires adequate manpower.

The estimate, as large as it is, is still conservative for the size of the job. For fiscal 1964 the Service has asked for only enough money to continue enforcement at the same level maintained in 1963. This cannot be done, and still move ahead with conversion to the automatic data processing master file operation, without additional employees. The reason is simply that the country's population is growing, thus adding some 2 million tax returns to the workload in 1964. This also means more delinquencies, more evaders to be tracked down, more audits—in fact more of everything, including the workload brought on by new tax laws. Here I should like to stress that the Service has asked for only the money it will need to hire the employees required to simply keep up with the workload. Nothing has been requested to move forward into narrowing the estimated $5 billion tax gap or to otherwise increase the level of enforcement activity. This should be done. In fact, Congress should insist that it be done and should appropriate the money needed for this purpose. But the point is that the request of the Internal Revenue Service is held to the minimum amount needed to stay even. For us to cut that request would mean that they would unavoidably fall behind, thus causing a serious loss in revenue.

It is all well and good to say that the increased costs of staying even with the workload should be funded out of savings from management improvements, absorptions of pay increases, and other actions which we properly can expect of any well-managed Federal agency. The point I would make is that the Internal Revenue Service is a well-managed agency and has taken impressive steps to cut costs before asking Congress for additional budgetary requirements. To cite one example: In 1962, 280 positions, worth about $2.5 million, were diverted from regional and national office staff into direct field operations. Pending now with the Secretary of the Treasury are recommendations for organizational and other changes which are calculated to make available another $5 million for frontline enforcement, without lowering the quality or extent of the service we expect the Internal Revenue Service to provide to taxpayers. Again, in 1962 Internal Revenue Service received the Secretary's award for having the best incentive awards program in the Treasury Department.

Over the past 8 years the salaries of thousands of support and clerical positions have been channeled into frontline work as the Service has expanded its automation process. These savings have been used, and cannot be used over again to provide for more enforcement jobs. It is, of course, reasonable to expect that additional savings will be made as more Service centers are established and further clerical and support work is shifted to them. However, this lies in the future and cannot be used as an offset against the 1964 appropriation request.

This amendment, if adopted, would authorize an additional $20 million for additional agents and would bring in at least an additional $120 million in revenue.

Each of us is, I know, deeply interested in seeing that the Revenue Service properly and vigorously enforces all the many laws and programs for which it is responsible. We want to feel sure tax abuses will be curbed; evaders caught and prosecuted; convenient, courteous, and efficient taxpayer services rendered; and our voluntary compliance system protected and strengthened. We want our tax agency to be operated in a way which earns the approval and respect of all taxpayers.

It does not make sense to cut the revenue budget to save $21 million when, according to estimates based on returns filed and enforcement actions taken, this cut, translated into enforcement positions lost, will cost the Government $150 million to $200 million in additional revenues. I submit that this is economy of the most imprudent kind, false economy at its most obvious.

I strongly urge full restoration of the $30 million additional funds requested by the revenue service. This is imperative if their operations are to continue in 1964 at the same levels maintained in 1963. As the tax workload increases, it must be processed. To let it fall behind would soon seriously impair the enforcement capacity of the service and weaken confidence in the administration of the tax system. We have a responsibility to ourselves and to the country to see that this does not happen.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. CLARK. I yield myself such amount of the remaining time as I may require.

I should like to make three points in connection with the amendment. To Senators on the Democratic side of the aisle, I say that this money has been requested by the President in his message. The money was requested on his behalf by the Secretary of the Treasury and by the Director of the Internal Revenue Service in what, to me, was compelling, convincing testimony before the Appropriations subcommittee.

Mr. President, I say to my friends on the other side of the aisle that this is the Eisenhower amendment, for this is the 5th year in which I have made a fight on the floor of the Senate to have restored to the Treasury Department appropriation bill the amounts requested by whoever happened to be Chief of the Internal Revenue Service and whoever happened to be Secretary of the Treasury; and in the Eisenhower administration I fought just as hard to get this money restored to the bill as I am fighting now. The reason why this money was needed and was requested by President Eisenhower and the reason why the money is needed now and is requested by President Kennedy, is very clear, indeed. It is that the workload of the Internal Revenue Service so greatly exceeds the capacity of the present number of agents to handle it that there is no possibility of their giving the adequate spot-check survey of tax evasion which is essential in order to keep our country honest, as the Senator from Idaho so eloquently stated a few minutes ago.

From the testimony of the Secretary of the Treasury which appears on page 259 of the printed hearing it is clear that every one of these individuals who is put on the payroll will collect at least $6 for every dollar paid to him in salary; and I think this is the compelling answer to the argument of the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] that we should cut this budget and thus make it impossible to collect money justly due the Government of the United States.

But there is another point in this regard, and I do not believe it has been adequately stressed. If we had before us today a bill which required the Internal Revenue Service to reduce its cooperation with the Department of Justice in ferreting out hoodlums and racketeers, I believe that bill would be almost unanimously—in fact, unanimously, I hope—rejected by this body. But if this amendment is rejected, the result will be the same as the enactment of such a bill. Personally, I am very well aware of the very helpful work of the Attorney General and the Internal Revenue Service in requiring that racketeers, hoodlums, and gangsters in Pennsylvania—I regret that there are some in Pennsylvania, and I suspect that every Senator would have to admit that there are at least a few, and perhaps many, in his State—purchase $50 Federal gaming stamps. Without these additional Revenue agents, it will be impossible to ferret out those gamblers and racketeers who should be buying the $50 Federal gaming stamps and prosecute those who do not. When they buy them, they have to post them on their local places of business, and that marks them for the local law enforcement officers as violators of the State antigambling laws, and thus provides an opportunity for adequate law enforcement, and also points the finger of sleazy law enforcement at the local law enforcement officers if they do not properly and adequately enforce the law. So from the point of view of morality, as well as from the point of view of good Government and the point of view of sustaining the demands of President Eisenhower and President Kennedy, I urge the Senate to adopt this amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield for a question?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it a mere coincidence that each department of the Government has appreciably increased the number of its employees? If the Senator's amendment, which calls for increasing the number of the employees of the Internal Revenue Service, is a valid one, what justification is there for not increasing the number of employees of the other departments of the Government?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I prefer to stand on the merits of this particular amendment, rather than engage in a generalized colloquy in regard to a matter which is completely irrelevant to the subject now before the Senate.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me for a few questions?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MILLER. As I have stated, I know that historically the Government has had a considerably better return from the appropriations which have resulted in the hiring of additional revenue agents. The Senator from Pennsylvania stated that the ratio is $6 for every $1 of salary paid. However, the question is, Where are we to stop? After all, if that argument is valid, there will be no point in increasing this amount by $21 million; instead, perhaps it should be increased by twice or three times that amount, in order to employ even more revenue agents. In short, once we embark on that course, where are we to stop?

Mr. CLARK. I say we should stop with the President's recommendation—regardless of whether it be made by President Eisenhower or by President Kennedy. It is a responsible recommendation. So there is no valid point to the argument of the Senator.

Mr. MILLER. How many additional revenue agents has the Internal Revenue Service employed during the past 2 years?

Mr. CLARK. Far fewer than the additional tax revenues which could be obtained would warrant.

Mr. MILLER. But I should like to have a definite figure stated. The Senator from Pennsylvania has made a generalized statement; but we do not know how many returns are being audited. However, I understand that Congress has provided the Internal Revenue Service with a substantial increase in the number of revenue agents, in line with the recommendation of President Eisenhower and in line with the recommendation of President Kennedy. The question is, Where are we to draw the line?

Mr. CLARK. I say we should draw it where both President Eisenhower and President Kennedy drew it, which is to restore this amount to the bill.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania permit me to answer the question?

Mr. CLARK. Certainly, Mr. President; I am glad to permit the Senator from Virginia to answer the question asked by the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Even though during the current year we increased 1962 by about 3,600, the Internal Revenue Service would be given 1,184 additional man-years under the provisions of this bill for fiscal 1964.

Mr. CLARK. That is a correct statement, but it is not complete. What we are doing is refusing to the Treasury Department 1,277 man-years of work which it definitely needs. The House cut the request to one-fourth, by allowing the Treasury only 358 man-years. The Senate voted to increase that figure to 555 man-years. I am asking that we return to the amount the President requested. This is a very modest increase in the number of man-years, in view of the requirements of the Internal Revenue Service.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time available to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] is paired with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay" and the Senator from Illinois would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 57, as follows:

[No. 69 Leg.]

YEAS—29

Bayh
Church
Clark
Gore
Hartke
Humphrey
Inouye
Kennedy
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Morse
Moss
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Symington
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NAYS—57

Allott
Bartlett
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Edmondson
Ellender
Engle
Ervin
Fong
Goldwater
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kuchel
Lausche
Mansfield
McClellan
Mechem
Miller
Monroney
Morton
Mundt
Muskie
Pearson
Prouty
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Stennis
Talmadge
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—14

Aiken
Anderson
Byrd, Va.
Case
Dodd
Douglas
Eastland
Fulbright
Gruening
Hart
Kefauver
Ribicoff
Sparkman
Thurmond

So Mr. CLARK's amendment was rejected.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I send to the desk, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] a motion, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], for himself and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], proposes the following motion:

> I move that the bill (H.R. 5366) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to amend title I of the bill so that the total amount appropriated therein (exclusive of appropriations for expenses of administering the public debt) will not exceed the total amount of corresponding appropriations contained in the Treasury-Post Office Departments and Executive Office Appropriation Act, 1963, and to report such bill, as so amended, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I am sure this will not take long. I shall want a yea-and-nay vote.

I cannot conceive that there would be any objection, because this motion is one which surely would have the strong support of the President of the United States. I quote from the President's state of the Union message of January 14, 1963, at which time he said:

> I will shortly submit a fiscal 1964 administrative budget which, while allowing for needed rises in defense, space, and fixed interest charges, holds total expenditures for all other purposes below this year's level.
>
> This requires the reduction or postponement of many desirable programs, the absorption of a large part of last year's Federal pay raise through personnel and other economies, the termination of certain installations and projects, and the substitution in several programs of private for public credit.

I am certainly not questioning the sincerity of the President. He said he intended to hold domestic levels of expenditures down to, if not below, last year's expenditures.

Yet I notice that in title I of the appropriation bill for the Treasury Department, as reported by the committee it would provide for increased appropriations of $115,164,780 over and above the amount appropriated for the same agency last year. Now this is not what the President promised.

There are other titles of this bill dealing with other agencies which will be dealt with separately. All four titles of this bill will increase appropriations $412 million over last year. Since so much has been said by many Members of Congress and since it was mentioned by the President of the United States at the time of his state of the Union message that in order to provide for a tax cut he intended to hold expenditures at least down to last year's level, I believe we should do so.

That is all the proposed amendment provides. It would allow the Appropriations Committee to make such changes wherever they would be most appropriate. It would give instructions to report the bill back at the earliest practicable date with title I reduced by $115,164,780.

Unless there is opposition to this motion, I see no need for discussing it further. I am sure the Senate certainly wishes to support the President of the United States in his statement of January 14, 1963, unless it be that they considered the President's promise of economy as merely being more Frontier political propaganda.

I repeat—this proposed amendment merely supports the President's promise of January 14, 1963.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I rise in opposition. The proposal ignores the fact that, over the protest of the Senator from Delaware and over my protest, the Congress voted to raise salaries of employees in these two departments 7½ percent. Now we must pay the bill.

It would be fine to be able to say, "You cannot get any more than you got last year." But we cannot operate in that manner.

It is estimated there will be a 3½ percent increase in the volume of mail. All of us hope there may be a $570 billion GNP, whatever that may mean. The economists say that means great prosperity. With prosperity, there will be more mail. Are we going to pay the railroads, the trucks, and the airplanes to haul it, or will we say to them, "You must haul it for what you were paid last year"?

Shall we give to these new office buildings, to be built with the great expansion, some mail service?

Shall we give the communities, which are rapidly expanding, mail service?

Shall we say, "No; we will cut you back to what you had last year"?

That is a fine concept, but it would not work.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I respect the Senator from Virginia as highly as I respect any other Member of this body. I have a high regard for him. In this instance, however, we differ; this proposal would not at all touch the appropriations for the Post Office Department. That portion of the Senator's argument does not apply.

This proposal would apply only to title I, which deals with the Treasury Department appropriations. It would then only reduce its appropriations to the level of last year's expenditures.

In the President's message to the Congress he referred to the salary increase, and he said that he was going to absorb that salary increase through increased efficiency and other economies. If he meant it—and I certainly do not for one moment question the sincerity of the President—let us hold the line, and let him absorb that salary increase. That is what he said he was going to do.

However, if he is going to ask for appropriations over and above last year's let us tell the country what we are doing. Let us tell the country that the President's statement of January 14 was just political propaganda.

The President recommended a tax cut in his message. He promised that in order to finance some of the tax cut he would submit to the Congress a budget which would hold domestic expenditures down to or below last year's expenditures. This was not done, but this amendment will help him carry out his promise.

It will save $115 million.

All I ask is that we take the President at his word. When he spoke to the Congress on January 14 he said that the domestic agencies could absorb the salary increase through greater efficiency and that he could hold the level of expenditures at last year's level.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I move to lay the motion on the table.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will withhold that motion temporarily.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Does the Senator mean to carry it over until tomorrow, or what?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not care. I am willing to vote tonight, but I had the floor. I desire to say a little more.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, if the leadership wishes to carry the bill over until tomorrow, that is quite agreeable with me. If the Senate wants to finish consideration of the bill, I shall insist on laying the motion on the table, and then we can try to get a vote on everything else that comes up as fast as it comes up. It suits me to have the bill go over until tomorrow.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Under the rules of the Senate further debate on a motion to table would not be in order, but I will say that we will make greater progress if we do not proceed too hurriedly.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to table, but I am sure that we will not get through quite as fast that way.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No Senator has the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Who had the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At the particular time that the yeas and nays were requested the Senator from Delaware had the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I understood that the Senator from Virginia made a motion to table, and I understood that that was recognized by the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair never said so.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Then the Senator from Delaware still has the floor?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from Virginia was not recognized for the purpose of making the motion to table?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair had never recognized the Senator from Virginia. The Senator from Delaware still had the floor at that time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Then, of course, asking for the yeas and nays on the motion to table would likewise be out of order. The yeas and nays could not be ordered on the motion to table if no such motion were pending.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion itself.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I now understand the yeas and nays are on the motion to recommit.

I shall delay the Senate but a few moments. Again I should like to read what the President said in his state of the Union message to the Congress. I read what the President said:

> I will shortly submit a fiscal 1964 administrative budget which, while allowing for needed rises in defense, space, and fixed interest charges, holds total expenditures for all other purposes below this year's level. This requires the reduction or postponement of many desirable programs, the absorption of a large part of last year's Federal pay raise through personnel and other economies, the termination of certain installations and projects, and the substitution in several programs of private for public credit.

The fact is that the budget later submitted by the President did not hold the recommended expenditures for fiscal 1964 anywhere near last year's level—not in a single category. He did not carry out his promise.

For example, in the budget submitted to Congress the Commerce Department appropriation request is for $895 million for this year as against $745 million last year, or an increase of $150 million. It provides for 3,497 extra employees for the Department of Commerce.

In the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare he has asked Congress to appropriate $5,742 million. Last year's expenditures were $5,048 million. This represents an increase this year of $694 million over and above what was spent in fiscal 1963. He also asks for 5,931 extra employees to be added to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare next year.

In the Department of Justice he is asking for $337 million in the budget. Last year there was appropriated only $317 million. So he is asking for an increase of $20 million and permission to add 765 extra employees in the Department of Justice.

In the Labor Department, he is asking for an increase from an appropriation of $239 million in 1963 to $433 million this year, or an increase of $194 million over and above last year. Again, he wants to add 1,293 extra employees in the Labor Department.

In the Post Office Department he is asking for money to add 9,650 extra employees.

In the General Services Administration he is asking to add sufficient money to employ 3,208 more employees, with an increase in appropriations of from $532 million for last year to $594 million for fiscal 1964.

In various miscellaneous smaller agencies a request is being made to add 1,324 employees.

In the Treasury Department 4,149 additional employees are asked for, at a cost of $421 million for this year over what it cost last year; all but $115 million of this amount is to pay increased interest charges. My amendment would not affect those fixed charges.

In the Interior Department he is asking for an increase of $111 million in appropriations, or $1,165 million against $1,054 million last year. Here again we find he wants to add 3,999 employees.

Altogether, he is asking for extra appropriations to add next year 36,492 more employees to the Federal payroll.

The fact that next year when all these extra employees are proposed to be added is a presidential election year is not without significance.

Certainly no one will argue that we need all of these extra employees or that the agencies need the extra millions for which they are asking.

Furthermore, unless the Congress doubts the sincerity of the President's statement of January 14 we should adopt my motion here today.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON. Does not the Senator from Delaware believe the Executive was sincere in his statement?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am willing to accept that the President was sincere. I do not question his sincerity. I hope the Senate, by this vote, will not question his sincerity. However, if he were sincere the Bureau of the Budget must have doublecrossed him, because it asked for much more money for every single agency.

They must have considered his promise as political propaganda, and if the Senate rejects this motion to cut this appropriation back to last year's level I shall conclude that they too doubt his sincerity.

Generally speaking, we know the Budget Bureau speaks for the President. However, if it does so in this particular case, we would have two conflicting requests from the administration. I am supporting the President's own message to the Congress when he said he was going to hold down the budget requests to last year's. Let us all do so by our vote.

Mr. SIMPSON. Will the Senator from Delaware indicate where he thinks we have gone astray?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I think we will be going astray if we permit extra money to be appropriated over and above last year's budget. The President said he wanted a tax cut, and at the same time he said he could justify the tax cut by holding domestic expenditures down to last year's level. The only way to hold domestic expenditures down to last year's level is by not voting for increased appropriations over last year's. It is just that simple.

I just pointed out that if we approve all the Budget Bureau is asking for, we would add 36,492 extra employees to the payroll next year. That amounts to 3,000 a month for every month in fiscal 1964. Counting 30 days to a month, which includes Sundays, that is 100 every day, or 4 employees every hour, or 1 additional employee every 15 minutes. That is how new employees would be added next year which, by the way, is a presidential election year. Yet the request comes from an administration which promised to hold all domestic expenditures down to last year's level.

I say, let them stop talking out of both sides of their mouths. If the President means what he said about holding this year's expenditures down to last year's level, let us hold them down. If his promise is merely to be regarded as a speech for campaign purposes and if he had no intention of living up to it, then the country has the right to know the truth.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Am I to understand, from the figures the Senator from Delaware has recited, that most, if not all, of the major agencies have deliberately violated the President's stated policy that their expenditures would be held to the level of the previous fiscal year?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I will put it this way: The recommendation of the Budget Bureau for the appropriation for each agency is not in line with what the President told Congress he intended to do. They have asked for an increase in every single category.

Mr. MILLER. Would the figures presented to the Budget by the respective agency heads violate the President's promise?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. They do unless we assume that the President was just making a campaign speech when he spoke to the Houses of Congress in joint session. I will not so presume. I hope the Senate will accept his statement in good faith.

Mr. MILLER. No one is questioning the sincerity of the President of the United States. This appears to be a clear case of insubordination on the part of the agency heads in refusing to follow the President's policy.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Senators should credit him with good faith. I was one who attended the joint session, and I joined in the applause for the President in that joint session when he made his promise to hold the line on domestic expenditures, and I intend to help him remember and keep that promise.

I believe he made an excellent statement when he said that he would hold total expenditures for all domestic purposes below last year's level. He did not even say at last year's level. He said below the level. All I am asking is that we roll back the amount provided in this bill to last year's level and thereby take the President's word in good faith. Let us not assume that what he was doing was merely making a promise in a campaign speech which promise he did not intend to keep. However, if we accept the budget recommendation as being the President's intention that is the only explanation I can see for the contradiction.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I should like to ask the Senator from Delaware if he does not agree with me that the President does not have time to sit down and go through all the items in the budget. What normally happens is that the President states his policy before a joint session of Congress, which he did. The Senator from Delaware has quoted that statement. We must assume that the President expects his subordinates, the heads of the agencies, to follow his policy.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Oh, yes, I believe that the President was sincere when he made that statement. I accept the sincerity of the President's statement, and that is why I am here trying to support him. I am trying hard to help him keep that promise, and if the Senate will back my motion with their votes he will be keeping that promise.

As one who has great confidence in the President's sincerity and as one who is accepting his statement in good faith I offer the pending motion. Not for one moment should we question his sincerity, but rather the Senate should vote for the amendment. This same action should be taken on all the domestic proposals. Surely the President has not reversed himself in that connection because he repeated the same promise at press conferences since that time.

We are not justified in adding a new employee every 15 minutes every day of the year, when the President has said that the additional employees are not needed.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, it seems to me that this is a clear case of insubordination on the part of subordinate officers in the administration. It seems also that where there is a clear-cut case of a refusal to follow the President's clearly stated policy, possibly some changes ought to be made in the agencies. After all, the heads of the agencies are responsible for the budget requests. If they deliberately violate the President's policy, it seems to me that perhaps the President should get himself other Cabinet officers.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. An excellent way to discipline those who are asking for too much money is to support the pending amendment.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON. Undoubtedly the distinguished Senator from Delaware recalls the statement of the Secretary of Commerce, when he said in 1960 that he had approximately 28,000 employees in his Department, and that he could get along with more than 10 percent fewer employees without hurting his Department.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes; I recall that statement.

Mr. SIMPSON. In 1962 they had increased the number of employees to more than 31,000. Does the Senator from Delaware know what the increase is for this year?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I recall the statement of the Secretary of Commerce. He said he had far too many employees and that he wished he could reduce the number by at least 10 percent because they were getting in each other's way.

Since that time they have actually added more employees. If we approve the budget request as has been submitted to Congress we will be increasing the appropriations for the Department of Commerce from $745 to $895 million, an increase of about $150 million.

This would give him money to hire 3,497 additional employees. Yet the Secretary of Commerce has said that he already has more employees than he knows what to do with. Why should we now add 3,497 more employees to a Department when the head of that Department has said that he already has more employees than he needs?

If they are going to use the taxpayers' money to buy an election let them tell the American people what they are doing.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In the presentation of the figures which the Senator from Delaware has recited, does he have a tabulation of what the aggregate number of the increase in employees is in the several departments?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It is 36,492 employees, additional, over and above the number on the payroll in 1963; that is, if we approve the budget as it has been submitted to Congress.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is that figure?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It is 36,492.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is the Senator able to tell by what number the employees have been increased since 1961?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not have the exact figure before me, but it is about 137,000. That is the number by which the employees have been increased between January 1961 and the present date. The budget for fiscal 1964 would add another 36,000, approximately.

As the Senator from Wyoming has pointed out, Secretary Hodges, the present Secretary of the Department of Commerce, said that there were already more employees in his Department than he knew what to do with, that he could not find jobs for all of them. Yet in the budget that was submitted it is proposed to give him an additional 3,497 employees.

One suggested explanation for this is that they are proposing to give him 3,497 additional employees and that they will be assigned the job of finding work for the 3,000 employees who are now sitting around. It may be that they will all end up in one big game of touch football.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It has been argued, with respect to the request for additional Internal Revenue Service employees, that for every dollar spent there would be earned $6. My question is: What justification is given for the increase in the number of employees, if any?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have not been able to find any justification whereby I can subscribe to that argument. I should like to make a comment in connection with the Treasury Department's employees. I have been just as much interested as anyone else in seeing to it that an adequate number of agents are hired in the Treasury Department. I have taken an active interest in supporting the necessary number. I point out, however, that, as most of us know, we can prove anything by figures, and the same is true with respect to what has been said about the increased revenue that is produced every time that we add more Treasury agents. That can be argued.

Our revenues have been increasing largely because our gross national product and our national income have been increasing. It is not realistic to say that all of that increase results because additional Treasury employees have been added. If we want to argue that way we must also consider the fact that refunds to taxpayers have also increased every year in about the same percentage that we have added new employees to the Treasury Department. I recognize that that is because wages and personal incomes are higher and payroll taxes have increased. Naturally more refunds are being made. This is no reflection on the employees that were added but one could argue that point just as well as one could argue that an increase in revenue results because of added employees.

A point of diminishing return is reached. If that were not true we could add 150,000 employees and in that way pay off the national debt. That cannot be done, of course. There is a point beyond which additional employees cannot be used.

The adoption of this motion would still leave all the money in the bill for which the President had promised he would ask.

The President did not except this agency when he made that statement.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator summarize his argument? Until now, the increase in the number of employees since 1961 has been 133,000. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Approximately 130,000.

Mr. LAUSCHE. This year the number is to be increased by 37,000 more?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Approximately 36,000 more.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON. Does the Senator have the figure for the total number of employees in the Federal Government?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not have that figure before me. Yes, I have found it here. In March 1963, there were 2,485,738 employees on the Federal payroll. That represented an increase of 2,227 for that one month.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Virginia is in favor of economy. I can point with pride to 30 years of fighting consistently for economy. I challenge any Member of the Senate to show a more consistent record for economy. On March 7th I presented an economy program recommending that the spending budget be reduced by $6 billion, which would result in a reduction of between $2 billion and $3 billion in the actual spending for fiscal year 1964.

Mr. President, there are two kinds of economy. One is real economy; the other is false economy. This amendment would be false economy.

In addition, under the guise of economy, it is not intellectually honest. Congress voted to pay the employees of the Treasury Department approximately $50 million more than the amendment would provide them. Would it be honest to deprive them of that amount? What Senator wants to go before his constituents and claim that he had saved the taxpayers $50 million by voting against a promise to pay employees? I say that that is not an intellectually honest approach to the question of economy.

The distinguished Senator from Delaware asked, Why give the President this money when he did not ask for it? The President took credit when he said that the amount of spending this year would be the same as or below last year's, including the $2 billion cut in farm price supports and other items; but he did not ask that the amount for this item be reduced below that for 1963. On the contrary, the President asked that this Department be given $156 million more than this amendment would allow it.

The House really put the pruning axe to this appropriation bill. But the amendment of the Senator from Delaware would reduce the House figure by $98 million. The Treasury is one of the most vital Departments of the Government. All of the anticipated $90 billion-plus of revenue rides on what the Treasury can do toward collecting all of that amount. All Government checks are disbursed by the Treasury. All tax bills are administered by that Department and are framed by that Department. The Treasury is one of the most vital Departments of the executive branch of the Government.

The amendment of the Senator from Delaware, in the name of economy, would place the Treasury in a position where it could not function properly. That is all the amendment would accomplish. It would not be possible to pay the $50 million which is owed to the employees of that Department and for increased postage rates. I say that that is not an honest approach to economy. It is false economy, because the Department would be placed in such a position that it could not function properly.

Early in the afternoon I called attention to the fact that the bill provides more than $10 billion for interest. That is more than twice the entire cost of the Government when I came to Congress 30 years ago. I stated that in the Treasury and Post Office Departments alone there are today more employees than were in all branches of the Government when I came to Congress in 1933.

I deplore and regret that the 2½ million Government workers now cost so much money; but consider what Congress has done. The year before last, when the cost of living had risen less than 3 percent, Congress increased the pay of Government employees by 7½ percent. Every 1 percent cost $100 million.

Last year, when the cost of living had risen less than 1 percent, Congress, in order to get votes, increased the pay of Federal employees another 7½ percent. Now we must pay the bill. There is no use arguing that we should go back to what was paid in previous years. I do not know how far it is desired to go back; but the amendment of the Senator from Delaware would take us back to the past year, and that cannot be done.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield for a question?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield briefly for a question.

Mr. MILLER. I should like to ask the Senator about the $50 million as it refers to the increased cost of salaries. Does the statement refer only to title I of the bill or to the bill as a whole?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Post Office has a greater increase than that. The $50 million increase applies only to the Treasury Department for pay and postal rate increases. The $156 million below the budget applies only to the Treasury Department. The amount of $98 million below the House bill applies only to the Treasury Department. My first impression was that it applied to the whole bill. As I later read it, it applied only to title I, which relates to the Treasury Department.

But again, I say that it is false economy. It would place the Department in such a position that it could not function adequately, and Congress would be deliberately reneging on its moral obligation to be just, to meet our just debts, and to pay those who are working, with the understanding that when we promise them a salary increase we will pay it.

In view of the fact that this issue is almost impossible to explain adequately from the standpoint of its not being true economy, but being false economy, I am forced to renew my motion that the motion of the Senator from Delaware be laid on the table.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his motion briefly?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I withhold my motion.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield for a moment?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from Virginia should be commended instead of criticized, because he has cut $41 million below the President's budget in the bill that was laid before the Senate today.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The total recommended is $72.6 million below the budget estimates for the four titles. Again, the Senator from Oklahoma is talking about title I, which is, as he has stated, a reduction of $41 million.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am talking about title I. The amount has been reduced by $41 million, which is a considerable reduction.

The Senator is absolutely correct in saying that the Internal Revenue Service employees are entitled to a pay increase. We faced a terrific impact because of the pay increase which was voted. We defeated a motion to restore 3,000 jobs, to which the Senator keeps referring, and allowed only $10 million instead of $30 million.

The $52 million on page 18 is the increase in title I above the 1963 appropriations for the Internal Revenue Service. Above that, on line 18 of the report, a $52,400,000 increase is provided for the Coast Guard. The Coast Guard must be maintained. We have provided only $25 million to replace ships which are over 25 years of age, ships necessary to guard the coastline and to stop smuggling, and to pay the salaries of the men who guard us against efforts to smuggle narcotics and things of that kind into this country.

Taking those two items alone—the $52 million for the Coast Guard and the $52 million for the Internal Revenue Service—we have a total increase of $104 million above the 1963 appropriation. So it is false economy to reduce these two items, which are so necessary a part of the bill.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, last Saturday night I was highly honored to be on a program with the distinguished Senator from Delaware when the Good Government Society presented both of us with scrolls to the effect that we had accomplished something worthwhile in behalf of good government. I assure the Senator from Delaware that I feel certain that, in spirit, we are still for good government. We merely have a misunderstanding concerning the facts. However, I will yield 1 more minute to him before I make my motion.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I appreciate the Senator's statement. I repeat what I said earlier. I would not for a moment question the sincerity of the Senator from Virginia. He has done a great job in trying to hold down these appropriations. I recognize the fact that last year Congress passed a salary increase bill. But I remind the Senate that that bill was passed in 1962. It was the law long before the President gave his state of the Union message to Congress. It was in January 1963, long after the salary bill had been passed, that the President said he would hold the domestic 1964 budget requests at or below last year's expenditures.

It was the President who promised that the salary increase would be taken care of by attrition; that is, by not replacing employees who retired. With the adoption of my amendment there would still be $5,950 million left in the appropriation bill. We would still be providing exactly the same amount for the Treasury Department as was appropriated last year. No other agency, including the Post Office Department, would be affected by this amendment. Any action on other agencies would have to be dealt with separately.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Delaware to recommit the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on that motion I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Virginia to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Delaware to recommit the bill.

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "yea," and the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] is paired with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay," and the Senator from Michigan would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] are detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] is paired with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay," and the Senator from Illinois would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 60, nays 23, as follows:

[No. 70 Leg.]

YEAS—60

Allott
Bartlett
Bayh
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Church
Clark
Cooper
Edmondson
Ellender
Engle
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Gruening
Hartke
Hill
Holland
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Keating
Kennedy
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Randolph
Robertson
Saltonstall
Smathers
Smith
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—23

Bennett
Boggs
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Goldwater
Hickenlooper
Hruska
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Lausche
Mechem
Miller
Morton
Mundt
Neuberger
Pearson
Proxmire
Scott
Simpson
Tower
Williams, Del.

NOT VOTING—17

Aiken
Anderson
Beall
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Case
Dodd
Douglas
Eastland
Gore
Hart
Hayden
Kefauver
Ribicoff
Russell
Sparkman
Thurmond

So the motion to lay on the table the motion to recommit, with instructions, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, with regard to the Post Office Department appropriation, it is my strong conviction that the $55,750,000 which the Senate is considering restoring of the $92 million cut by the House of Representatives be supported.

Of this amount, $500,000 is earmarked for research, development, and engineering; $50 million for operations; and $5,250,000 for facilities.

I urge that these figures be held to, and that the Senate conferees be asked to do all within their power to prevent cuts of any kind in conference.

I have discussed this matter at some length with officials of the Post Office Department, and it is my understanding that if the full $50 million for operations are provided, it will not be necessary for the Post Office Department to make major curtailments in service to the Nation's postal patrons.

Should the conference sustain the $55,750,000 agreed upon, even then the Department will be operating upon a narrow margin requiring strict economies.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, an amendment which would provide in that part of the bill which relates to appropriations for the Internal Revenue Service that the money appropriated may not be used to move the New York regional office to Boston or make other moves contemplated in the so-called reorganization announced by the Internal Revenue Service would be in order.

I have decided that it would be inappropriate to submit such an amendment. I should like to state my reasons to the Senate.

First, I believe that wherever possible such decisions should be made on a business and administrative basis in the best interests of governmental service and service to the public.

I am much indebted to the Committee on Finance, which held a special hearing on this subject in executive session on April 5, and then released the transcript of the hearing on April 11, 1963, for its time and work on that subject. In my opinion, and I believe in the opinion of many others, the transcript shows so irrefutably that to make moves such as those contemplated and, in particular to put through the proposed change of the regional office from New York to Boston, would be so much against the public interest and would not really accomplish in any material way any of the things claimed for it, that we are better advised to rely upon that record. It is a very strong record. We are better advised to rely upon the approach to the question taken by the Senate Finance Committee, which should be very gratifying to every Government agency, because the decision proceeds from a business and public interest point of view, and does not attempt to approach the question on the floor of the Senate, as I could do if I offered the amendment.

What I have said does not mean that it can be done in this way in every case, nor does it necessarily mean that the amendment would carry. I am speaking on a question of principle. The principle is that in a case in which a major committee of the Senate interests itself enough in a situation of this character to hold a hearing on it, and where the case made is, in my view and, as I have said, in the view of many others, so strong as to dictate a lack of wisdom in the proposed reorganization, it would be very interesting to see whether the proper response would be forthcoming from the Internal Revenue Service without the need for exercising the congressional power in respect to appropriations. I think this would be a far more statesmanlike approach by all concerned.

All of the main points which were relied upon in respect of the reorganization fell upon analysis and upon debate.

What I have said is not necessarily any complaint against the Internal Revenue Service. Other facts which were developed by reason of the announcement and the preliminary discussions which preceded it indicated that the proposed change would be very unwise. That evidence was contributed to by the legal profession of New York, the taxpayers of New York, and, very importantly, in the debate and discussion which took place at the hearing before the Committee on Finance.

At that hearing I submitted certain statements and questions through the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], who graciously answered them. My colleague [Mr. KEATING] was present. About a week ago my colleague made a magnificent speech in the Senate, analyzing in the greatest detail the reasons why the contemplated move should not be made.

I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed at this point in the RECORD an analysis of the statements made in favor of the move and of the reorganization which I described, and the answers, literally, from the Commissioner himself as the situation was developed before the committee, which strike down the argument that the regional office needs to be near the service center, which is located at Lawrence, Mass. On the contrary, apparently that is not the practice nor is it particularly dictated in respect of this subject.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATEMENT

Page 6, Commissioner Caplin: "The decisive factor was the existence, in the Boston area of a going service center at Lawrence, Mass., which is to be converted to our newer automatic data processing techniques, and will serve all of the present Boston and New York regions."

The answer

Page 24, Commissioner Caplin: "It has been determined that it is not feasible to enlarge the present building. Accordingly a new and larger facility will be required for the ADP regional service center."

Page 33, Commissioner Caplin: "The present installation in Lawrence, Mass., is not equipped to operate as an ADP regional service center as it is not large enough to house the total work force that will be required."

THE STATEMENT

Page 6, Commissioner Caplin: "It is advantageous, if other factors permit, to have the regional headquarters nearby in order to provide rapid, day-to-day supervision and communications."

The answer

Page 47, Commissioner Caplin: "The Service Center for the San Francisco region should be in San Francisco or in Los Angeles." (Comment: Los Angeles is 400 miles from the regional headquarters, while New York is only 210 miles from Boston.)

Page 20, Commissioner Caplin: "In Texas, the staff had wanted to locate the center close to the regional office, but, on balance, the decision was ultimately for Austin, Tex." (Comment: Austin is 200 miles from Dallas.)

THE STATEMENT

Page 22, Commissioner Caplin: "In New York, there has been tremendous achievement made."

The answer

Page 22, Commissioner Caplin: "I am hoping that the Boston record will become an outstanding one." (Promise versus actual performance.)

Page 22, Senator WILLIAMS: "I cannot understand why you selected Boston for expansion. It is one of our worst managed offices at this time."

THE STATEMENT

Page 23, Commissioner Caplin (discussing location either in Boston or in New York): "The saving is estimated at 102 positions. It would be more expensive and upsetting to transfer 126 positions to New York than to transfer 76 positions to Boston."

The answer

Page 23 (source, Commissioner's statistics): "If the move is to Boston, that office would be increased by 298 (222 remaining in New York) to carry out managerial and support work for the new region. This represents a managerial and support increase to the present Boston staff of 70 percent. If the move is to New York, that office would be increased by 126 positions, a managerial and support increase of only 16 percent.

THE STATEMENT

Page 2, Commissioner Caplin: "The sole purpose of the proposed realinement is to save on our executive and administrative overhead.

The answer

Page 20, Commissioner Caplin (in giving the reason for selecting Boston as the site): "It would be a terrible blow to move the Lawrence service center and the people there. These are not high-salaried people. It is a depressed area." (Comment: There is no relationship between this statement and the "sole purpose" of the realinement.)

THE STATEMENT

Page 32, Commissioner Caplin (discussing the problems of visiting the districts and the comparative distances): "Six offices are closer to Boston, one is about equidistant, and three (all large) are closer to New York. As we see it, this just about balances out to an even choice with the possibility that a precise analysis would weigh the scale in favor of Boston on travel and time costs."

The answer

Comment: Four of the six offices closer to Boston are Augusta, Burlington, Providence, and Portsmouth. These will require few visits as the supervision of their activities will be either in Boston or in Hartford. Thus, it would be proper to say that only two offices are closer to Boston, while three are closer to New York. Also, as stated by the Commissioner on page 55: "The larger offices will have more repeated visits. They have more problems."

THE STATEMENT

Page 54, Commissioner Caplin concurred in Senator Curtis' statement that, if the regional office is going to do a good job, it must go out and see the district offices.

Page 55, Commissioner Caplin: "Remember, the larger offices will have more repeated visits. They have more problems."

The answer

Page 32, Commissioner Caplin: "These dollar and time costs of travel from Boston to the Brooklyn and Manhattan districts will be more than if New York had been selected."

THE STATEMENT

Page 8, Commissioner Caplin: "I hope this committee will understand our goals of administrative economy and efficiency."

The answer

Pages 23, 32 (source, Commissioner's statistics): "New York requires 785 regional employees to supervise collection of $18.95 billion while Boston requires 425 for $5.53 billion. The operating costs of the New York region are $7358 per employee as compared to $8120 per employee in Boston." (Comment: The efficiency appears to be in New York, not in Boston.)

THE STATEMENT

Page 10, Commissioner Caplin: "There will be a rent savings related to the number of positions saved."

The answer

Comment: The New York regional office occupies a Federal building on which no rent is paid. The Boston regional office is presently renting space for some of its activities because it does not have adequate room in rent-free space.

THE STATEMENT

Page 21, Commissioner Caplin: "Do you move them (the service centers) to the regional offices, or, if possible, can you move the regional offices to them?"

The answer

Comment: To date, no regional office has been moved to the location of a service center. In the case of the Omaha-Chicago merger, the regional office is being located at the city which is farthest from the service center. (Omaha is 212 miles from Kansas City, and Chicago is 518 miles from Kansas City.)

THE STATEMENT

Page 4, Commissioner Caplin: "I should like to be clear about our thoughts on the employees affected by the proposed plan, and our concern over their welfare and proper utilization. We intend to place virtually every one of them either in his own locality or elsewhere."

The answer

Page 11, Commissioner Caplin: "The amount of money paid to an employee for his moving costs is not always sufficient to reimburse him for his actual out-of-pocket costs even under the most conservative situations."

THE STATEMENT

Page 2, Commissioner Caplin (discussing the Smith committee report): "Its findings and conclusions are penetrating and imaginative. They cover many vital areas of operations, including a close examination of our field organization. As a result of this study, we are now proposing realinement of our district and regional offices as well as our regional service centers."

The answer

Page 60, Commissioner Caplin concurred in Senator CURTIS' statement that, in the Smith report, "no mention is made of eliminating the Omaha regional office."

Page 62, Commissioner Caplin (in reply to Senator CURTIS' question on "What did the Smith studies say about Boston?"): "The Smith committee said it could go either way, Boston or New York, and left the decision to the Commissioner."

THE STATEMENT

Page 33, Commissioner Caplin: "Physical nearness of the regional headquarters and its service center will facilitate rapid, day-to-day supervision and communication."

The answer

Comment: The April 1962 issue of Internal Revenue's ADP News contains a chart which shows that a service center derives its work, not from the regional office, but from the district offices. It shows that documents, records, reports, special surveys, etc., are funneled to the regional office both from district offices and from service centers. It would follow, therefore, that the service center should be located in close proximity, not to the regional office, but to district offices.

THE STATEMENT

Page 47, Commissioner Caplin: "The regional commissioner and his staff are in close contact with a service center."

The answer

Page 51, Commissioner Caplin: "I think that the availability of regional commissioners with staffs at reasonable distances to be able to go out and have contact with the districts is an important aspect." (Comment: It appears equally important for the regional staff to have ready accessibility to both the district offices and to the service center. Both require supervision.)

THE STATEMENT

Page 73, Commissioner Caplin: "If we had a supervisor for every 10 men, we might get efficiency but it would be extremely costly." (He then told Senator DOUGLAS that there has been no increase in the ratio of supervisors to rank-and-file personnel during his administration.)

The answer

Comment (source, New York Times, February 11, 1962): "The Internal Revenue Service decided to reduce the size of the tax agent groups so that supervisory personnel can better evaluate the agents. The size of the field audit groups in Manhattan has been reduced to 12–14 instead of 18–20. Office audit groups have been reduced to 10 instead of 15. These changes have been made in accordance with Commissioner Caplin's new direction program."

THE STATEMENT

Page 58, Commissioner Caplin (when asked whether there are long-distance calls used in communicating between regional and district offices): "I believe there are some."

The answer

Comment: Communications between the Brooklyn and Manhattan districts and the New York regional office are now accomplished with local calls. The move of the regional headquarters to Boston would cause this communication to be by long-distance toll calls, thus generating a cost that must be counted as an offset alleged savings.

THE STATEMENT

Page 64, Commissioner Caplin (quoting Secretary Dillon): "None of the changes are scheduled to become effective before January 1, 1964."

The answer

Page 63, Commissioner Caplin: "Although January 1, 1964, is the official legal date for the change in region and district lines, there was a broad delegation to the Commissioner to implement the plan almost immediately."

THE STATEMENT

Page 68, Commissioner Caplin stated that, if "the service center weren't in the picture," he would have no doubt that the regional headquarters should be in New York.

The answer

Page 33, Commissioner Caplin: "The present installation in Lawrence, Mass., is not equipped to operate as an ADP regional service center."

Mr. JAVITS. On the other hand, Mr. President, the great preponderance of returns received in the New York area, the involvement of the bar of New York and vicinity with the problems of the regional office, the great amount of travel which would be required from the regional office back to the place from which it would be moved, if it should be moved out of New York, and the fact that no real savings would be effected in respect of the number of employees were conconcerned, were clear factors to be considered.

Employees would be dislocated. New personnel would have to be trained. No saving in any material sense, in an end way, would result.

All those arguments were developed because of the great storm which had been aroused among the bar of New York, the accountants of New York, many taxpayers in New York, and especially in view of the impressive figures showing the number of returns and the amounts involved in the way of taxation. They were in the magnitude of two and three times what was involved in the Boston area. All those factors indicated the complete lack of wisdom in the proposed move once the questions had been debated and tested in the public forum.

So I shall not offer the amendment. Rather I prefer to rely, since the evidence is so clear, upon the very statesmanlike inquiry which was undertaken by the Committee on Finance, and which, I deeply believe, conclusively demonstrated the fact that the regional office should stay exactly where it is. When the arguments for and the arguments against were considered, it was very clear that the reasons for the move fell.

In the most simple approach—that is, in the approach of the number of taxpayers concerned and the number of their representatives concerned—the overwhelming volume of taxation which is involved—approximately $18 billion in the New York area as compared to $5 billion in the Boston area—it is very clear in the record that the situation should remain exactly as it is.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I am happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. KEATING. I think the distinguished Senator has demonstrated his usual good judgment in not pressing the amendment. I too came to the conclusion that no useful purpose would be served by it. Because of the rather hectic way in which we sometimes deal summarily with amendments of this nature, a motion to table might well carry even though Senators realized they were not actually voting on the merits. And such a tabling action might be used as an argument that the Senate had implicitly ratified the proposed transfer of the New York City regional office to Boston, Mass.

I was present at the Finance Committee hearings. It is my firm judgment that the hearings, primarily in the answers to the questions which our colleague from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] propounded at the request of the senior Senator from New York and myself, proved conclusively that the proposed move was unwise, was not justified, would not save money, and would disrupt unduly a large number of people by moving a larger office into a smaller one, and a demonstrably well-run office into a poorly run office.

It is my general impression that a great many members of the Finance Committee were convinced that the contemplated move—and, indeed, some others—were unwise. I hope the question will be explored further by the Finance Committee when officials of the Treasury Department and other witnesses appear before the committee.

I desire to express gratification that the Secretary of the Treasury has demonstrated a willingness to reconsider the proposed change.

I am confident that careful reconsideration will result in a decision that this is an unwise move and that it would not serve the national interest and would not serve the interests of the taxpayers in the northeastern part of the Nation.

So I concur in the decision reached by the Senator, but I am reasonably certain that if this subject could be debated at length and there could be a decision on the merits, a majority of the Members of the Senate would agree that this move—as is probably true of some others—would not be wise.

If, as we have decided, an appropriate amendment will not be pressed, I trust that the probable sense of the Senate will nevertheless be borne in mind by the Secretary of the Treasury and others who are charged with responsibility for making the decision when they come to decide where the merits lie.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague. I join him in the commendation of Secretary Dillon for his approach, which was to freeze this effort when the debate on the part of taxpayers, accountants, lawyers, and the community of New York itself developed real substance.

I think that in staying our hands with respect to a struggle on the appropriation bill itself, we are expressing our confidence in the machinery which has been established for the purpose of helping to come to a fair determination.

In closing, Mr. President, I feel we have a real test to see whether that machinery works in terms of a Government department, once it says something, not being so opinionated that, evidence to the contrary, it goes ahead notwithstanding. Secretary Dillon has shown exactly the contrary attitude. I hope that is persevered in as the final decision is made with respect to this matter.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am sure the Senator is aware of the fact that during the hearings I asked Commissioner Caplin about the two offices to be closed which Secretary Dillon said were not included in the bill. I was confident New York was one. On page 445 Commissioner Caplin said he was not willing to identify those two offices, but that his final decision had not been made.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator for his helpfulness, and I appreciate it very much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill (H.R. 5366) was ordered to a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have spoken to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, who has done such an admirable job on the bill, with respect to an item in which I have great interest. We all owe the Senator from Virginia a debt of gratitude and appreciation.

I discussed with the Senator, as chairman of the subcommittee, and with the ranking Republican member of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], a proposed amendment to increase funds for the Secret Service. After discussion, it was determined that it would be better to leave this matter until some future time, when possibly a supplemental appropriation bill will be before us.

I had intended to propose an amendment to provide an additional 10 positions for the Secret Service to enable the Service to meet its investigative responsibilities, particularly in controlling the flow of counterfeit money, and to augment protective details for the Vice President whenever required.

My proposed amendment called for a restoration of $141,250 over an equal amount of $141,250 restored by the Senate Appropriations Committee from the $500,000 cut made by the House. As I noted, these 10 positions would enable the Secret Service to meet its vital investigative responsibilities. Currently the Service is faced with a heavy caseload, which includes a backlog of more than 30,000 cases on hand for investigation as of March 31, 1963, and increased activity in counterfeiting offenses and the forgery of Government checks and bonds. Statistics for fiscal year 1962 reflected the largest amount of counterfeit currency ever produced in the history of the Service as occurring within this period. In all, more than $4 million in counterfeit money was produced, of which amount over $3,500,000 was seized before it could be passed on an unsuspecting public. Arrests were made of 737 persons and 44 counterfeiting plants were seized.

To clarify the record and in keeping with the responsibilities of the Service as were defined by the passage of Public Law 87-829 on October 15, 1962, a blueprint of protective requirements were outlined to the House Subcommittee on Appropriations in the budget request for fiscal year 1964, in which the Service requested 36 positions to provide effective security for the Vice President. This request was reduced to 10 positions with the recommendation that the entire resources of the field be drawn upon as needed to augment such security. The Service, therefore, did not appeal for the restoration of the 26 positions for Vice Presidential protection in the amount of $217,500.

The restoration of funds for additional personnel and related costs is needed to enable the Service to meet its investigative responsibilities and to augment protective details whenever required.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Our committee has always tried to provide what the Secret Service needs. This year we restored some funds which the House had eliminated. If the Secret Service should find that even more money is necessary—and we hope it will not—by the time the supplemental bill comes along we will be receptive to the request.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the House cut $500,000 from this vital service, which not only protects the President and the Vice President but also has other functions under the Treasury Department. The Senate restored $141,250. I felt this was inadequate. I believe that the Secret Service does a stupendous job. It has very heavy responsibilities. It is very important that the service be kept at maximum efficiency.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I know other Senators feel as I do. I shall not press the amendment. I merely mention it now because at a later time it may be required. It may be necessary for us to provide additional funds.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I assure the Senator that I share the sentiments of the Senator from Minnesota as to the high excellence of service of this Government agency. It not only protects the President and foreign visitors, but also enforces the law against counterfeiting. There has been an increase in counterfeiting both with respect to bonds and money.

The House cut $500,000, and there was a request to restore $282,500. As the Senator from Massachusetts has said, we thought to ourselves, "Let us see if they can get by. If they cannot, we know the importance of the work. They can come before us and justify a supplemental appropriation, and we will be very sympathetic."

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am most grateful to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, considering what happened on the preceding vote on my proposal, I shall not offer further amendments to this bill. However, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD a summary of the appropriations as provided for in H.R. 5366 and as contained on page 1 of the committee report. This summary shows that, while the committee did reduce appropriations by $72 million below the budget request, the appropriations provided in the bill are still $412,702,080 above the amount appropriated for the same agencies in fiscal year 1963, and the bill would provide for over 13,000 additional employees.

Immediately following this insertion, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the statement made by the President of the United States in his state of the Union message delivered to the Congress on January 14, concerning his promise to hold the line on spending by domestic agencies.

There being no objection, the summary and excerpt were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPROPRIATIONS RECOMMENDED IN H.R. 5366

Amount of bill as passed House	$5,997,026,000
Amount of increase by Senate	+77,190,250
Amount of bill as reported to Senate	6,074,216,250
Amount of estimates, 1964	6,146,842,000
Amount of appropriations, 1963 (including supplementals)	5,661,514,170
The bill as reported to the Senate:	
Under the estimates for 1964	72,625,750
Over the appropriations for 1963	412,702,080

EXCERPT FROM THE STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE TO CONGRESS, JANUARY 14, 1963

I will shortly submit a fiscal 1964 administrative budget which, while allowing for needed rises in defense, space, and fixed interest charges, holds total expenditures for all other purposes below this year's level.

This requires the reduction or postponement of many desirable programs, the absorption of a large part of last year's Federal pay raise through personnel and other economies, the termination of certain installations and projects, and the substitution in several programs of private for public credit.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, this statement, made by the President, clearly shows that he did promise that in order to support his tax program he would submit to the Congress a budget which would hold expenditures for domestic agencies either at or below the level of the preceding year. This promise also called attention to the fact that this would require a reduction of or postponement of many desirable programs, along with the absorption of a large part of last year's Federal pay increase through personnel and other economies, and a substitution in several programs of private for public credit.

In the light of the requests that later were sent to the Congress from the Bureau of the Budget asking for substantial increases in the budget for every single domestic department, and in the light of the fact that the Congress is sustaining those increases, I have come to the conclusion that we have no alternative but to accept the January 1963 statement by the President of the United States as purely political propaganda intended to get a few votes. Apparently the administration had no intention of living up to the promises made and presumably his party in the Congress realizes this point.

Let all of those who have been hoping for a tax reduction take note.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I merely wish to invite attention to the fact that in the report we called upon the Bureau of the Budget to reexamine the employment situation and tell us about the annual increases, which in themselves not only add up to a large sum of money, but also involve pay raises. One third of the increase requested above last year's budget in title I, to which the Senator referred, results from the pay raise. In all it cost approximately $750 million.

There is a large percentage of the Government workers in these two departments.

There will be another pay raise bill before the Congress this year, so the Senator should not exhaust all his ammunition this evening. He can save it, because there will be another time to express his interest in economy.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator from Virginia, and I assure the Senator that I shall be here later to discuss the other appropriations.

I certainly have great respect for the Senator from Virginia. I know he has been trying to hold down the appropriations. In this instance, under his leadership, they have been reduced by $72 million below the budget estimates.

But the point I am making is that the Bureau of the Budget, which officially speaks for the President of the United States, is asking for substantial increases over and above last year's requests. There is not one single agency recommending a cut. No department that I know of downtown has cut any budget recommendation, and these larger requests are in direct contradiction to what the President had promised the country he would do.

Therefore, I merely go back to what I said before: that we should all recognize, and I want the country to recognize, that the President on January 14 was making a political speech and apparently had no intention of living up to what he was promising.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H.R. 5366) was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr.

McGee, Mr. Hayden, Mr. Johnston, Mr. Case, Mr. Allott, and Mr. Cotton conferees on the part of the Senate.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns tonight, it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BUILDINGS FOR THE BUREAU OF THE MINT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is the intention of the Senate to consider tomorrow Calendar No. 146, Senate bill 874, which I now ask unanimous consent to have laid before the Senate and made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 874) to authorize the construction and equipping of buildings required in connection with the operations of the Bureau of the Mint.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

EXPECTED ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY TO MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, after conferring with the distinguished minority leader, it is the anticipation of the leadership, at a reasonable hour tomorrow, that the Senate will adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry may meet until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I express the hope that it will be possible to extend that permission at about 12 o'clock.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the leadership allow the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare the same latitude, to meet until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow?

Mr. MANSFIELD. On behalf of the leadership, I make a similar request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that for the remainder of the session my legislative assistant, Tom van der Voort, have access to the Senate floor so that he can assist me during debate. I make this request since Mr. Van der Voort does not have floor privileges because he is not on the Senate payroll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, this is a highly unusual request.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I discussed this matter with the Assistant Parliamentarian, Mr. Riddick. He said it has been done before. Mr. Van der Voort is an intern and has worked on legislative matters. He is very competent. It would be helpful to me to have him in the Chamber.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But he is not on the Senate payroll?

Mr. PROXMIRE. No. He is an intern.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If there is a precedent for it, I will not interpose an objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on the same basis, I interpose no objection, because heretofore it has been the custom that no intern in any capacity has been allowed on the Senate floor. I have on many occasions turned down requests of Senators who wanted to bring interns to the floor. I shall not object this time, but I want it clearly understood that this does not set a precedent.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is this request for the remainder of the 1st session of the 88th Congress?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct. It is for the remainder of the session, until this session adjourns next fall.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Then, Mr. President, I would have to reserve the right to object and ask to discuss this request with the Senator from Wisconsin, because if an intern is to be given the right to the floor, when our own staff members do not have that right, we would create a precedent. If the request were made for 1 day or during the consideration of one bill, it would be different. I request the Senator from Wisconsin to reconsider his request. I shall be glad to discuss it with him, because it would establish a precedent.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I will do whatever the leadership wishes, but I would have to ask consent virtually every day, whenever any bill was under consideration which involved legislative action.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I reluctantly will have to serve notice, if the Senator will yield, that I will object, and I will have a standing objection, because I do not believe we should create a situation which would allow other Members of the Senate to do the same thing, and not allow some of our own assistants to have access to the floor.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Many interns are on Senators' payrolls.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Under those circumstances I understand there has never been an objection. Last year interns from universities were on my payroll for modest amounts. They came on the Senate floor without any Senator objecting, because they were on the payroll. Mr. Van der Voort has had a great deal of experience. He served in the House for a number of months before he came to the Senate. He is a full-time employee of an agency downtown. That is the reason why I cannot put him on the Senate payroll. An employee cannot be on the payroll of two Government agencies at the same time. This is an unusual situation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. When does the Senator from Wisconsin want him on the Senate floor?

Mr. PROXMIRE. For example, it would have been helpful if he could have been on the floor today. I would want him on the floor when appropriation measures, for example, as well as other measures, were under consideration.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the Senator withhold his request and let us get together tomorrow and see if we can arrive at some reasonable arrangement? I would be very much opposed to anyone being given a permanent right to come on the floor on the basis of his being an intern when so many interns, just as able, I presume, have not been able to do so heretofore. Furthermore, we ought to face the fact that on too many occasions the floor of the Senate is crowded too much with attachés who really have no right to be here, and who create a situation which is embarrassing, and which does not comport with the dignity of this body.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I agree wholeheartedly. I hope the Senator will accept my statement that my staff members are not on the floor unless they are urgently needed by me. I want them here only when I must consult with them.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Wisconsin has acted correctly in that regard. I did not have him in mind when I made that statement. But I think the Senate had better observe the rules of this body a little more carefully and see to it that the Senate Chamber is reserved primarily for Senators and attachés who are here on proper business, and not as spectators or loungers, as so many are.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I agree.

NEW STRIDES TOWARD THE GENERAL WELFARE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on May 3, Wilbur J. Cohen, Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and a native of Milwaukee, made a very fine speech on the welfare program of the administration in the city of Milwaukee. In that speech he pointed out the welfare philosophy of the New Frontier in a very eloquent way.

He said, in part:

> We are going through a period of seemingly intense attack upon welfare operations and the recipients of public aid. When you consider how many recipients of welfare endure urban poverty, social isolation, and racial discrimination, it should not be surprising to find among them families whose behavior does not fit accepted community standards. The marvel is that so many of these deprived families manage their small resources so well. At no time should criticism of the program or of persons receiving assistance be allowed to develop into a disregard for the rights of needy persons to justice and fair treatment, particularly where dependent children are involved.

Mr. Cohen concludes by saying:

> Let me remind you, in summary, that for years we have been saying that, with the necessary legislation, money, time, and manpower, public welfare could become one of the Nation's strongest positive forces in

creating and strengthening family life, economic independence, and the individual well-being of the old, the young, and the disabled.

Now that we are being encouraged to move along these lines and have received new support and legislation, we must turn our words into deeds.

Finally, in showing what he means by this statement, he refers to how public welfare should fit into social orientation, putting emphasis on legislation which is socially oriented. I think it is an extraordinarily able and unusual statement, because it involves the question of rehabilitation and the economizing of our human resources, as well as recognizing the need for humanity in our welfare programs.

I ask unanimous consent that the speech of Mr. Cohen be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW STRIDES TOWARD THE GENERAL WELFARE

(By Wilbur J. Cohen, Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare)

Today many new challenging problems confront all of us. There are new scientific inventions each day which bring with them new demands on all of us. The stark realities of the thermonuclear world are vastly different from the world of 35 to 40 years ago when I grew up as a boy some eight or nine blocks from where I am now speaking.

I am glad I grew up in the "gemuetlichkeit" Milwaukee world of the twenties. I am glad I shared in the melting pot atmosphere of the Prairie Street, Vliet Street, and Jefferson Street elementary schools and Lincoln High School. This experience helped me in my understanding of the aspirations of people—people in politics, people on welfare, all kinds of people—and, most of all, how to work with and even understand Congress and Congressmen and our American political system.

When I left Milwaukee to go to the University of Wisconsin at Madison in 1930—and that was a pretty big journey for my family and me in those days—I absorbed from the great teachers I had there something the board of regents of the university had said in 1894: "We cannot for a moment believe that knowledge has reached its final goal, or that the present condition of society is perfect. We must therefore welcome from our teachers such discussions as shall suggest the means and prepare the way by which knowledge may be extended, present evils be removed, and others prevented. We feel that we would be unworthy of the position we hold if we did not believe in progress in all departments of knowledge. In all lines of academic investigation it is of the utmost importance that the investigator should be absolutely free to follow the indications of truth wherever they may lead."

What the University of Wisconsin board of regents said nearly 70 years ago is still good today.

We have a great country, but it is not perfect. We have great knowledge, but we need to know more. We have made great progress, but we can make more.

That is why I am proud in my small way to be helping President Kennedy and my country in the new strides we are making to improve the health, education, and welfare of all the American people.

This year the President of the United States has sent to the Congress five special messages outlining his recommendations for improving the health, education, and welfare of all the people of our Nation.

Three of these messages are especially significant because they represent subjects on which for the first time a President has sent a special message to the Congress. These three messages deal with mental health and mental retardation, youth, and aging. In addition, the President sent special messages on education and health, as he had done in each of the 2 previous years.

The President's special messages on health, education, and welfare represent, in my opinion, a progressive and fiscally responsible program for strengthening the general welfare of all Americans. It is in harmony with the constitutional authority for the Congress "to provide for the common defense and promote the general welfare of the United States."

These messages set forth both general goals and specific priorities. For probably the first time in our history, a President has announced both a broad and a specific program for meeting the Nation's urgent health, education, and welfare needs. Appropriate bills have been introduced in the Congress to carry out the general recommendations. Thus, it is possible for you to support, oppose, analyze, criticize, or suggest amendments to the general concepts, the financing, or substantive provisions of any proposal of the administration.

I want to touch briefly upon the proposals to meet needs in health and education before discussing with you in somewhat more detail the tasks ahead in public welfare.

HEALTH LEGISLATION

All of you are well aware of this administration's profound commitment to the health of the Nation. In his special health messages to the Congress this year and last, President Kennedy stressed that progress must be made in strengthening all elements of a sound health program—"people, knowledge, services, facilities, and the means to pay for them."

This is an exciting challenge to all welfare and health agencies. They have participated in the dramatic advances in medical care which have characterized our recent past. They will participate in the broader and deeper application of medical knowledge which will, I believe, characterize the near future.

Medical science exists to serve people. As long as the products of medical science are not available to the people who need them because they cannot afford to pay for them or because we lack professional personnel or because our patterns of delivery are outmoded, we are failing in our central purpose.

We hope for prompt and favorable action in the current session of Congress on a carefully developed program of Federal assistance for the education of more physicians, dentists, nurses, and public health personnel. A bill to carry out this program (H.R. 12) has already passed the House of Representatives and is pending in the Senate. Legislation providing for Federal grants for the construction of community mental health centers and community mental retardation centers has been considered in committees in both the House and the Senate.

We also look forward to favorable action on a broad program to improve maternal and child health and crippled children's services. This would include a doubling of the annual authorizations for grants for maternal and child health and crippled children's programs and the provision of project grants to stimulate public awareness of the problem and the development of comprehensive plans for dealing with it.

As I look back over the almost 30 years since I began studying medical economics at the University of Wisconsin, it seems to me that we are beginning to see fundamental changes in attitudes. We are due for some important changes in the financing, organization, and availability of medical services if the powerful potential of American medical services is to be realized in benefits for all our people. Public welfare personnel can be followers or leaders in this effort. I feel sure that you can and you will be leaders in both thought and action in this important task.

We made a good start in health legislation in 1961 when the Community Health Services and Facilities Act was passed. The additional Federal funds authorized by this legislation are helping States and communities to develop new and improved community health services, to build more nursing homes, and to provide better care in the homes of patients, as well as in nursing homes.

HOSPITAL INSURANCE FOR THE AGED

But this is only a start. We are still sadly lacking a satisfactory means whereby older people can purchase the basic hospital services essential to their health. People over 65 have medical costs twice as high as those of younger people, yet their annual incomes, on the average, are only half as large. During any year they can expect to spend between 3 times as many days in the hospital as younger people. One-half of all the aged do not have any kind of hospitalization insurance, and a high proportion of those who have it receive only small benefits under limited conditions.

These facts are not news—least of all to people like you who daily see the neglect and deficiencies. And the corollaries of these facts are clear—that prolonged illness can wipe out an elderly couple's lifetime savings, that enormous financial burdens are transferred to their children or to welfare agencies, that the tragedy of ill health is often accompanied by sacrifices of dignity.

Older people need protection against the costs of hospitalization and related health services. They want this protection, not as a gift or as charity or public assistance but as a statutory right, earned and established by their own efforts during their productive years. Therefore, to make this possible, the President, in his special message on elderly citizens, asked the Congress to add a hospital insurance program for aged persons to the social security system. For those now over 65 who have not had an opportunity to participate in the social security program, the President has recommended that the cost of coverage be paid from general tax revenues. The coverage of all the aged for hospital insurance should reduce the longrun cost to the States for medical assistance to the needy.

The President has stressed that his insurance program is not a program of socialized medicine. Every person will choose his own doctor, his own hospital. The proposed insurance program would simply be a means of paying for health services, not a means of providing them.

The need is clear and present. The instrument is at hand, designed not to threaten but to protect fully the essential elements of high-quality medical care. From my personal contacts over several years, I strongly suspect that a majority of hospital administrators favor the use of the social security mechanism to pay some of the hospital costs for the aged. I am confident that our older people soon will enjoy more and better health protection earned as an insurance right. In my opinion, it will help preserve the voluntary system of hospitals in this country.

Occasionally, the Department is accused of not showing sufficient leadership in urging the States to adopt the program of medical assistance for the aged which was authorized by the Kerr-Mills Act of 1960. I can state unequivocally that we hope every State will adopt the medical aid to the aged program, including every State in this region. That is part of our program for 1963, as it has been part of our program in each year since the legislation was passed by the Congress.

We recognize the financial difficulties which the States face in taking advantage of this legislation in a broad and comprehensive manner. But it should be noted that there is no dollar ceiling on the amount for which States may claim matching, as there is in old-age assistance, for example. There is no limit on the quantity of medical care, such as days of hospital care or number of physicians' visits. No State receives less than 50 percent from the Federal Government for its medical aid to the aged program. And the Federal share can go up to 80 percent, depending upon State per capita income.

We do not regard the proposed hospital insurance program as a substitute for medical services for the needy under public assistance. The two programs supplement one another. At present 25 States and 3 territories have medical aid to the aged programs in action. Three more States will start programs July 1. Legislative proposals are under consideration in 17 other States, several of them in this region. The Department encourages and welcomes this interest and activity. We provide consultation and planning help to States at every opportunity.

But we cannot agree with critics of the social security approach that the problem of costs of medical care in old age will be solved solely by medical aid to the aged or through private health insurance plans.

Senator GAYLORD NELSON, of Wisconsin, is one of the sponsors of the Anderson-King bill. I am sure that he as well as the other sponsors of the hospital insurance proposal agree with what President Kennedy has said, "Health insurance for our senior citizens is the most important health proposal pending before the Congress. We urgently need this legislation—and we need it now."

FINANCING SOCIAL INSURANCE

One important task before all of us is to organize our facts to combat the attacks on the financial soundness of the social security system. These attacks seek to discredit this Nation's basic social insurance system as part of their campaign to defeat health insurance for the aged through social security.

These groups have a right to oppose the addition of hospital insurance for the aged through social security, but we should not permit them to tear down existing institutions so necessary to our free society in their attacks on the financial integrity of our social security system.

No aspect of the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program has received more careful consideration by Congress than the financing of the system. Mr. R. A. Hohaus, the vice president and actuary of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., has said: "This financing method has proven sound because government has been alert to the need for constant vigilance, due to the very nature of social insurance itself and the dynamic character of our society and our economy."

The old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program has always been fully supported by the social security contributions paid by covered employees and their employers; it has never received a subsidy from general revenues.

The most recent advisory council on social security financing, established under the 1956 amendments to the Social Security Act, "for the purpose of reviewing the status of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and of the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund in relation to the long-term commitments of the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program," issued a report of its finding on January 1, 1959. The Council's major finding was as follows: "The Council finds that the present method of financing the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program is sound, practical, and appropriate for this program. It is our judgment, based on the best available cost estimates, that the contribution schedule enacted into law in the last session of Congress makes adequate provisions for financing the program on a sound actuarial basis."

The availability of adequate health services and facilities is another problem troubling many welfare officials. Today, when hospitals have more to offer people than ever before, when lifesaving miracles are commonplace, hospitals are beset by soaring operating and construction costs, obsolescence, personnel shortages, and—perhaps most distressing of all—an audible undertone of public discontent with hospitals and hospital practices.

A considerable part of this discontent is directly traceable to the swift upward spiral of hospital expense for the consumer. In 1946, at the end of World War II, the average cost of hospital care per patient-day was $9.39. In just 5 years, it had climbed to $16.67. Since 1950 it has more than doubled that figure—rising to $32.23 per patient-day in 1960 and $34.98 in 1961. If this rate were to continue, the average daily hospital costs would be $60 to $65 a day by 1970.

To what extent this rise, which has far outstripped the general rise in consumer prices, is preventable or reversible, you are in as good a position to judge as I am. In some areas, we find hospitals are filled and there are waiting lists, while in others, we have too many empty beds. For certain facilities, such as long-term care and community-based mental health centers, we continue to be plagued by critical shortages.

Some of these problems can be traced directly to the haphazard growth and placement of facilities in many of our cities. Others spring from phenomena in our society over which hospitals have little or no control. In any case, I believe we must reexamine our total hospital needs, resources, and objectives for the coming decade. To encourage such appraisals, the President has recommended legislation to authorize grants to public and other nonprofit organizations to assist in developing comprehensive, areawide plans for the construction and operation of all types of health facilities.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUTH

One of the areas in which the Kennedy administration is giving continued emphasis this year is the expansion of opportunities for youth—in the field of employment, training, education, and for their more effective participation in our national destiny.

It is difficult to see how a high school student can begin to gain a sense of responsibility and participation in this Nation's economy when he is so frequently and consistently denied jobs on account of his youth. The problem is the more acute for minority youth who encounter discrimination on account of race as well as because of their age. And the situation becomes all the more critical when teenagers, tempted to drop out of high school, feel an understandable futility about staying in school in the face of such widespread unemployment among their peers.

The administration has already begun an intensive effort to see that jobs are available to young people. The U.S. Employment Service is giving special attention to counseling services in urban areas of high youth unemployment. The Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 provides for the training or retraining of workers whose skills are obsolete because of shifts in the economy or technological advances.

A singularly important part of the President's youth program is the youth employment bill of 1963. One of the provisions of this bill would give employment opportunities to some 60,000 youths in their home communities, with Federal funds financing half their wages. Another provision—for a Youth Conservation Corps—would take about 15,000 jobless youths off the streets and give them work in our national parks and other places where their services are needed.

Finally we come to the third portion of the President's program, a portion which has enormous symbolic significance because it challenges youth to join actively and with dedication in this Nation's mission as leader of the free world.

The best known aspect of this part of the program is the Peace Corps. Although it has been operating just 2 years, it has won world renown. Now, the administration is urging a National Service Corps whose members—senior citizens as well as young people—will work with those Americans in greatest need, help expand the attack on poverty here at home, stimulate volunteer services, and inspire more people to make a career in the helping professions.

EDUCATION

In the area of education, the President has outlined a bold and realistic program for American education. In his message to the Congress, the President pointed out: "Education is the keystone in the arch of freedom and progress. Nothing has contributed more to the enlargement of this Nation's strength and opportunities than our traditional system of free, universal elementary and secondary education, coupled with widespread availability of college education."

It is the belief of this administration that the doors to the schoolhouse, to the library, and to the college lead to the richest treasures of our open society: To the power of knowledge—to the training and skills necessary for productive employment—to the wisdom, the ideals, and the culture which enrich life—and to the creative, self-disciplined understanding of society needed for good citizenship in today's changing and challenging world.

The administration's program includes Federal aid for elementary, secondary, and higher education. It emphasizes improvements in both the quality and quantity of education.

A free nation can rise no higher than the standard of excellence set in its schools and colleges. Ignorance and illiteracy, unskilled workers and school dropouts—these and other failures of our educational system breed failures in our social and economic system: Delinquency, unemployment, chronic dependence, a waste of human resources, a loss of productive power and purchasing power, and an increase in tax-supported benefits. The loss of only 1 year's income because of unemployment is more than the total cost of 12 years of education through high school. Failure to improve educational performance is thus not only poor social policy; it is poor economics.

Only 10 percent of our adults had a high school or college education at the turn of the century. Today, such an education has become a requirement for an increasing number of jobs.

Yet, nearly 40 percent of our youths are dropping out before graduating from high school, only 43 percent of our adults have completed high school, only 8 percent of our adults have completed college, and only 16 percent of our young people are completing college.

The twisting course of the cold war requires a citizenry that understands democratic principles and problems. It requires skilled manpower and brainpower. It requires a scientific effort which demonstrates the superiority of freedom. And it requires an electorate with sufficiently broad horizons and maturity of judgment to guide this Nation safely through whatever lies ahead.

From every point of view, education is of paramount concern to the national interest as well as to each individual. Our Nation requires a new standard of excellence in education, matched by the fullest possible access to educational opportunities, enabling each and every citizen to develop his talents to the maximum possible extent.

It is our conviction that education should be a local responsibility. The participation of the Federal Government should be selective, stimulative, and, where possible, transitional.

The program proposed by President Kennedy offers Federal assistance without Federal control. It provides for economic growth, manpower development, and progress toward our educational and humanitarian objectives. It encourages the increase of the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and critical intelligence necessary for the preservation of our society. The President hopes for your active support for this vital measure.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE ELDERLY

We have almost 18 million senior citizens for whom the President also has proposed a dynamic program.

In addition to hospital insurance for the aged, the President has called for a new grant program to assist State and local agencies and voluntary organizations in planning and developing various services for older people which cannot be financed by any of the existing grant programs. Grants also would be authorized for research, demonstration, and training projects leading to new or improved programs to aid older people, and for the construction, renovation, and equipment of public and nonprofit multipurpose activity centers for the elderly.

Other measures proposed include tax reforms which would lower the Federal income tax liabilities of older people by about $790 million; changes in the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program which would raise the maximum earnings base from the present $4,800 to $5,200 and thus bring slightly higher benefit payments to those who retire in the future; measures to increase employment opportunities for older people; more support for senior citizens' housing and for the construction of nursing homes; and improvements in the programs of medical assistance for the aged and old-age assistance.

PUBLIC WELFARE

Public welfare turned toward hope-filled new directions with the Public Welfare Amendments of 1961 and especially of 1962. I hope all States will take appropriate action to carry out the new provisions.

In formulating its welfare proposals, this administration is guided by certain general principles. They are:

1. Public welfare must become more service-oriented. It must put a new emphasis on social rehabilitation and the prevention of dependency.

2. Public welfare must provide services, not only to persons receiving assistance but to persons who are potentially dependent or former recipients when they seek help.

3. Public welfare must coordinate its services more effectively. An important step in this direction was taken at the Federal level in January when, as you know, the Welfare Administration was created as a major operating unit of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. All the Department's programs that have a major welfare component are now brought together as an operating entity so that there will be greater coordination of the services of the Bureau of Family Services, the Children's Bureau, the Office of Aging, the Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development, and the Cuban Refugee program. Dr. Ellen Winston, an outstanding leader in APWA and former public welfare commissioner of North Carolina, is the Nation's first Commissioner of Welfare.

4. Public welfare must be more community conscious. It must explain more effectively to the general public what it is doing and why—and why it is not doing many things that are necessary. It must explain to welfare recipients what welfare is and what it is trying to do.

5. Public welfare must reexamine its operations and methods to make sure that administrative procedures do not limit its response to the service needs of recipients.

6. Public welfare must be more experimental, more creative, more research minded.

Goals for public welfare which seemed visionary only a few years ago have been brought within reach through passage of the Public Welfare Amendments of 1962. This legislation is a new landmark in the history of public welfare. Much has been said about its potentials for greatly strengthened and improved welfare operations.

States are moving to carry out the new provisions and to take advantage of the greater financial incentives and more flexible policies now available.

We will be seeing the results of this legislation for many years to come. In a number of key areas—such as the provision of social services to welfare recipients and those likely to become dependent, in the training of welfare staff members in the skills needed to provide these services, and in the extension of child welfare services throughout each State—the development will come over a period of several years.

All persons engaged in the field of welfare services and all citizens interested in more effective and efficient public welfare operations should be working for the full implementation of these amendments in their States and home communities. We are engaged in an attack upon poverty and dependency. While we are pressing to reduce the need for assistance among those already receiving public aid, we are also seeking actively to prevent future dependency. This is in the American tradition of helping people to help themselves.

Among all recipients of public assistance—it must be remembered—only a small minority can be considered employable. For them, our task is to marshal helpful counseling services and appropriate community resources to overcome personal, social, or vocational handicaps, to equip them with skills which have value in today's job market, and to help them find employment.

For those who have skills which have become obsolete, this will mean retraining. For many who are unqualified for anything but unskilled labor, it will mean fundamental education so that they can fill out application blanks, find their way about a city, follow instructions, and learn a trade.

But the vast majority of recipients will continue to be too old or too young for work or blind or disabled or needed at home for the care of young children. They will continue to need financial assistance as well as services.

The new amendments stress the provision of social services by able workers with reasonable caseloads to reduce and prevent dependency. Self-support is one but not the only goal. Services can make existence less restricted and more useful for those whose poverty or disability may have isolated them from the normal life of the community.

The inducement to States to step up services is very great. The Federal Government may now pay 75 percent of the cost of providing services which have been identified by the Secretary as necessary or desirable for constructive help. The Federal Government has been investing in such administrative costs on a dollar-for-dollar basis with the States. The legislation makes it possible for a State to receive $3 for each dollar it invests in this area.

Similarly, the costs of training to equip staff with the knowledge needed to deal successfully with complex individual and family problems can now be matched at the higher level. After July 1, however, these extra funds will be available only if the States are providing the minimum package of services prescribed by the Secretary.

Many States are exhibiting new interest this year in the expansion of their programs of aid to families with dependent children to include needy children of the unemployed.

This expansion is urgently recommended by this administration. It was first authorized by the Congress in 1961 as a temporary 1-year provision. Last year, the Congress extended the authority for 5 years. There seems to us no reason why the Federal-State program of assistance to needy children should reach youngsters whose fathers are dead or disabled or absent from the home but reject children equally needy but with an unemployed father in the family.

In the 15 States where children of the unemployed are receiving AFDC financial assistance and services, the program has been of great value in stabilizing family life and easing the hardships of economic dislocation.

I would like to say a few words about the issue which has arisen over the definition of unemployment used by the State of Michigan in enacting legislation to expand its AFDC program. The Michigan definition limited eligibility to children of unemployed persons who had worked in jobs covered by unemployment compensation.

The General Counsel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare advised us that while a State is not required to accept the broad definition of eligibility possible under the language of the Federal law, any restrictive classification of potential recipients must be reasonably related to the objectives of the program; namely, aid to needy families with dependent children—and that the latitude given the States by Congress to define unemployment did not justify occupational exclusions even when presented under the guise of a definition of unemployment.

Other States affected by this Federal policy are North Carolina and Oklahoma. Administrative changes in its program are being undertaken in Oklahoma, and North Carolina is considering new legislation.

We are extremely hopeful that States will take advantage of still another feature in the new legislation. This is the community work and training program for employable adults receiving AFDC. Federal support is now available for assistance payments for persons assigned to these programs, which are intended to provide constructive experience in training and retraining.

As a group, assistance recipients are more severely handicapped by lack of education and training than others in the population. Therefore, many are not able to meet the qualifications for such other programs as manpower development and training. Community work and training programs can give them a foundation for acquiring a marketable skill.

We are going through a period of seemingly intense attack upon welfare operations and the recipients of public aid. When you consider how many recipients of welfare endure urban poverty, social isolation, and racial discrimination it should not be surprising to find among them families whose behavior does not fit accepted community standards. The marvel is that so many of these deprived families manage their small resources so well. At no time should criticism of the program or of persons receiving assistance be allowed to develop into a disregard for the rights of needy persons to justice and fair treatment, particularly where dependent children are involved.

The Federal Government and the States are now engaged in a carefully designed review of eligibility in the AFDC program, a review undertaken at the request of the Senate Appropriations Committee. Both State and Federal personnel have worked conscientiously and diligently in this endeavor. We have no information yet on what the results of this very thorough study will be. Other studies of AFDC are also underway. The Welfare Administration is now assembling data on the most recent survey of the circumstances and characteristics of AFDC recipients. The American Public Welfare Association will soon release its new report on the program.

Out of this increased and detailed knowledge of dependent persons and the social and economic forces which affect them should come constructive new proposals for meeting their need.

If this program—which serves more children than all other child welfare programs combined—is to become an even greater force in the lives of the children it supports, we must not accept the easy answers for solutions to the problems recipients suffer. There are no easy answers. And many so-called solutions might only intensify the hardships of recipient families, destroy natural family ties, and deprive the victims of repressive measures of any hope for restoration to self-sufficiency.

As public welfare agencies throughout the country and all the related professions and organizations interested in the basic assistance programs increase their efforts to combat the stubborn social and economic problems our society suffers, we will need the support and understanding of the general public.

Naturally, the public will expect welfare agencies to make prompt and effective use of the new legislative measures and the additional funds which have been voted. Results will be expected. It may be that too much will be expected too soon. The goal that we seek, however, is the rehabilitation of every person for whom such an objective is feasible. I am certain that our achievement would be far less if we underestimated the potentials of the social rehabilitation approach. And if we should fall short of our goal, we will at least have made a better attempt than if we had set our sights too low.

At every step along this difficult and challenging road, I hope that you will make sure that the public is fully informed of what you are doing and why you are doing it. There should be a clear realization of the problems that need to be conquered as well as of the means employed to deal with them.

Public welfare has suffered from too little constructive attention and understanding. Busy with the thousand demands to operate programs with limited funds and staff shortages, welfare workers have tended to give low priority to the necessity for enlisting public advice and community interest and support.

Public assistance is far more than billions of dollars and millions of recipients. It is a program which has met family and individual crises, kept families intact, guided children and adults to independence, and alleviated the hardships and loneliness of old age and disability. The success public welfare has realized should be reported to the community just as fully as the costs and the problems it involves.

Let me remind you, in summary, that for years we have been saying that, with the necessary legislation, money, time, and manpower, public welfare could become one of the Nation's strongest positive forces in creating and strengthening family life, economic independence, and the individual well-being of the old, the young, and the disabled.

Now that we are being encouraged to move along these lines and have received new support and legislation, we must turn our words into deeds.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I share my colleague's views of the services of Wilbur Cohen.

This reminds me of the measure that has been enacted by Congress, and which has just received its appropriations, the Migratory Health Service Act. The need for this act has been tragically demonstrated in this country. The staff of the Migratory Labor Subcommittee at this hour, about a quarter to 7, are trying desperately to get help to a family of migratory workers who have been hit by polio while on the road. The information that we get is that there are seven youngsters in this family, that two of them have polio, and that a third is suspected of having polio.

To show the Senate how desperately we needed the National Health Act for Migratory Labor, Father John Wagner, of San Antonio, Tex., got in touch with our subcommittee to see if we could bring help to this family on the road in Missouri. That is how far they are removed from the health care in the community. This is not a condemnation of any State. It is a fact of life. It has been necessary to come to a Senate committee for what should be a routine matter. In this case, the care should have been unnecessary if these youngsters had gotten what we consider to be routine immunization shots.

This is a most dramatic but tragic example of the work we are doing here with the help of Mr. Wilbur Cohen.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Jersey, who is making a magnificent fight for the migratory workers. I have been happy to follow his leadership.

BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF FORMER PRESIDENT HARRY S. TRUMAN

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I understand that today the President of the United States has taken note of the birthday anniversary of a former President of the United States, Hon. Harry S. Truman. President Kennedy, at his press conference, made one of his perceptive observations which, of course, reveal him to be a profound student of human events and national politics.

The President, in speaking of the former President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, said that "Mr. Truman could walk longer than Bobby and talk faster than HUBERT."

I do not know whether the Attorney General is going to admit that he does not have the "vigah" that the former President has, but I readily admit that Harry S. Truman can talk faster than I can.

What is more, what he says is right to the point, and his statements have made great copy and outstanding history. A few minutes ago I sent to former President Truman a telegram, in which I said:

> Congratulations to America's foremost statesman, who is young of heart and who has plenty of "vigah."

I believe that former President Truman qualifies as the senior standard bearer of the New Frontier. I congratulate former President Truman, who served with such honor and distinction as a Member of the U.S. Senate, on his 79th birthday anniversary. I say, with all reverence, that we are eternally grateful to divine providence for the good health of this man and for the fact that he is with us as a distinguished American, as a distinguished citizen, and is always making his own distinct contribution to the life of this Nation.

I hope and pray that Harry S. Truman, great American and great citizen and great leader of the free world, will continue to be blessed with good health, with his good sense of humor, with that quality of good sense that is so characteristic of him, and with his fighting spirit, at times partisan but always patriotic.

ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF UNION GROVE, WIS.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the village of Union Grove, Wis., came into being in 1838, 10 years before Wisconsin was admitted to the Union. It has flourished in the succeeding years and today is a thriving, bustling community, typical of the fine villages that are the heart of Wisconsin.

It is with great pride that I announce that Union Grove will celebrate its 125th anniversary this September. It can be justly proud of its history over the past century and a quarter and as the senior Senator from Wisconsin, I salute its people for their many accomplishments.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 394) to validate the homestead entries of Leo F. Reeves, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, under the order previously entered, I move that the Senate adjourn until 11 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, May 9, 1963, at 11 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 8, 1963:

U.S. PATENT OFFICE

Herbert J. Lidoff, of the District of Columbia, to be an Examiner-in-Chief, U.S. Patent Office.

IN THE NAVY

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, Rear Adm. John T. Hayward, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 8, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Romans 12: 9: *Let love be without dissimulation; abhor that which is evil; cleave to that which is good.*

Eternal God, our Father, fill us now with a deep yearning to enter into a closer fellowship with Thee and with a passionate longing to minister to all who are struggling in a welter of misery and distress.

We are commending unto Thee our beloved country and the great causes of truth, liberty, and righteousness for which so many, in years gone by, gave the "last full measure of devotion."

Grant that in these dark days when the whole world is shaken with strife we may, as citizens of this great Republic, join hands and hearts in a new covenant of love and loyalty, of friendship and fraternity.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF MAY 20-26, 1963, AS NATIONAL ACTORS' EQUITY WEEK

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 39, designating the week of May 20-26, 1963, as National Actors' Equity Week, with amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this going to cost the overburdened taxpayers of the United States any money?

Mr. CELLER. It will not.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, but I would like to ask my good colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], who brings out a resolution here to designate a week National Actors' Equity Week, how soon the gentleman is going to hold hearings on my resolution for a constitutional amendment to permit prayer in the public schools and all public places. I think this is of great importance to the people of this Nation. Many people are waiting for hearings on this so that we may bring it before the House. I ask this question of my colleague now.

Mr. CELLER. This is a matter of weighty importance and is occupying the attention not only of myself as chairman but of other members of the Committee on the Judiciary. Very shortly there will be an announcement.

Mr. BECKER. I sincerely hope so; and I thank the gentleman. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas Actors' Equity Association was founded on May 26, 1913, by distinguished members of the American theatrical profession; and

Whereas Actors' Equity Association now represents approximately thirteen thousand professional actors who reside and perform in the United States and Canada; and

Whereas Actors' Equity Association was formed in order to "advance, promote, foster, and benefit all those connected with the 'art of the theatre' "; and

Whereas Actors' Equity Association has provided responsible and creative leadersip in the field of the performing arts while it has encouraged and reflected the artistic ideals of our country; and

Whereas, in fulfilling its function of protecting and securing the rights of actors and performers in the legitimate theater, Actors' Equity Association has materially enhanced and inspired the cultural life of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week of May 20-26, 1963, is hereby designated as National Actors' Equity Week, in recognition of the outstanding contribution which Actors' Equity Association has made to the cultural life of our Nation.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the preamble.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, MR. TRUMAN

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, it is with pride and pleasure that I rise today to pay tribute to our beloved former President, Harry S. Truman. Today is his 79th birthday. This day is a very special day in my home city of Independence, Mo. It is also a special day across our land. For Harry Truman, at 79, stands at the summit as one of the greatest Presidents our Nation has ever had. At the same time he is one of America's best loved citizens.

Few periods in American history were of more momentous consequence to all mankind than the years that Harry Truman led our Nation. On his shoulders fell some of the gravest responsibilities in the history of civilization.

I shall not call the roll today on all of Harry Truman's brilliant accomplishments. The successful conclusion of World War II, the Marshall plan, the North Atlantic Treaty, the Truman doctrine, the Atomic Energy Act, the point-4 program, his prompt response to aggression in Korea—these are only a few of the lasting monuments he built.

It must be a deep and abiding satisfaction for Harry Truman on his 79th birthday to know that he enjoys, as former President of the United States, the admiration and respect of the free world for his lasting contributions to the progress of freemen. And it must be equally satisfying to him to know that for his courageous and unfaltering dedication to the cause of the freedom and dignity of all men, he is one of America's best loved citizens.

I am sure that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle join me in saying happy birthday, Mr. Truman, God bless you, and may you and your loved ones enjoy many more years of health and happiness together.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I am very happy that our distinguished colleague, who has the honor of representing in Congress the district in which former President Truman lives, has taken this time to wish the President a happy birthday. As the history of President Truman's administration unfolds in the light of subsequent developments, the character of the service of the great man from Independence, Mo., as a leader of this country continues to grow with each passing year. I join the gentleman in wishing President Truman a happy birthday.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, the National Council of the League of Women Voters is meeting today in Washington.

I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to this great nonpartisan organization. The League of Women Voters in Idaho and nationally renders a real service to the voters of America in allowing a platform for the candidates of both political parties to explain their stand on issues. They promote candidate meetings, television debates, and even print platforms on an equal time and equal space basis to allow Americans to know their candidates better. We should all be grateful for the efforts of the league in informing the public. Recently a distinguished Member of the other body told of the letters received from people who are writing letters of fear, based on misinformation and false alarm. This could never be said of the members of the League of Women Voters. They write positive letters supporting such meritorious programs as home rule for the District of Columbia, a United Nations, dedicated to peace, prosperity, and progress throughout the world, but at the same time a strong and powerful America. The League of Women Voters have gone on record as supporting a progressive program to eliminate water pollution in the rivers and streams that flow throughout this great Nation.

I think it is fitting that there are two representatives from each of our States visiting with their congressional delegations today and encouraging them to support good and progressive legislation. I am very proud of the work that this great nonpartisan organization has done and today I want to pay tribute to these fine women who give generously of their time, talents, and energy in behalf of our great Nation.

I was privileged to meet this morning with other members of the Idaho congressional delegation and Mrs. Eugene Smith, of Idaho Falls, and Mrs. Ervin Sage, of Nampa, who ably represented the Idaho League of Women Voters. They along with league members in Idaho and throughout the Nation are rendering a very valuable service.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, Khrushchev is notifying the world that Cuba is branded, packaged, and delivered to Russia as a full-fledged Communist satellite—and he does not expect the United States to do anything about it. That is the meaning of Castro's mission to Moscow. It is a real victory for Khrushchev, even though he is paying quite a price for it.

Of course, the United States, the leader of the free world, is paying the highest price of all. We are assisting Khrushchev in his announced goal of burying us. Mr. President, do we have a foreign policy, and if so, what is it? What is wrong with reimposing the Monroe Doctrine?

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT, SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 5517) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 275)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5517) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 4, 23, 29, 31, 37, 74, 75, 77, 78, and 79.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 26, 32, 33, 35, 38, 40, 45, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, and 73, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"RURAL HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY REVOLVING FUND

"For loans pursuant to section 515(a) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1484; 76 Stat. 671), including advances pursuant to section 335(a) of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 (7 U.S.C. 1985), in connection with security for such loans, $1,000,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$625,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"STUDY OF HIGHWAY PROGRAM FOR ALASKA

"For expenses necessary to make engineering studies and estimates and planning surveys relative to a highway construction program for Alaska, as authorized by section 13 of the Act of October 23, 1962 (76 Stat. 1149), $400,000, to remain available until expended."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert "Congress: *Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used for any Federal project that does not require a financial contribution from State or local sources except projects dealing with preservation of forests in the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior."; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$8,830,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$8,700,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25; That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$966,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION

"*Salaries and expenses*

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses', $37,500."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,082,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,150,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,338,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "including expenses of organizing and holding the World Food Congress in the United States, as authorized by the Act of October 18, 1962 (Public Law 87-841), $400,000, of which $65,000 shall be available for the United States contribution to the International Peace Corps Secretariat"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 10, 11, 12, 27, 30, 34, 41, 42, 43, 44, 56, and 76.

ALBERT THOMAS,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
CLARENCE CANNON,
FRANK T. BOW
(except as to No. 47),
EARL WILSON
(except as to No. 47),
Managers on the Part of the House.
JOHN O. PASTORE,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
LISTER HILL,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
KARL E. MUNDT,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5517), making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I

Department of Agriculture

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $2,000,000 for the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service land-use adjustment program as proposed by the Senate instead of $150,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 2: Authorizes $1,222,900 for salaries and expenses of the Farmers Home Administration by transfer as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,122,900 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates $1,000,000 for the Farmers Home Administration for the rural housing for the elderly revolving fund instead of $2,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Department of Commerce

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates $25,000 for the Office of Trade Adjustment for trade adjustment assistance as proposed by the House instead of deleting the item as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates $625,000 for civilian industrial technology instead of $500,000 as proposed by the House and $750,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6: Inserts language proposed by the Senate and appropriates $400,000 for a study of a highway program for Alaska instead of $800,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Department of Defense

Amendment No. 7: Inserts heading as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8: Appropriates $15,000 for the Department of the Army for rivers and harbors and flood control, general investigations, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates $25,000 for the Department of the Army for construction, general, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 11: Reported in disagreement.

Funds Appropriated to the President

Public Works Acceleration

Amendment No. 12: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 13: Restores House language amended to require a financial contribution from State or local sources for any Federal project except projects dealing with preservation of forests in the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior. The exception for forests is intended to cover national parks, forests, and Indians.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Amendments Nos. 14 and 15: Appropriate $8,830,000 for the Public Health Service for communicable disease activities instead of $5,430,000 as proposed by the House and $12,230,000 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize $8,700,000 to remain available until June 30, 1964, instead of $5,300,000 as proposed by the House and $12,100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates $750,000 for community health practice and research instead of $500,000 as proposed by the House and $1,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates $290,000 for hospitals and medical care as proposed by the Senate instead of $315,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates $175,000 for salaries and expenses, Bureau of Family Services, as proposed by the Senate instead of $288,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 19, 20, and 21: Appropriate $1,000,000 for grants for maternal and child welfare as proposed by the Senate instead of $3,500,000 as proposed by the House; and designate $800,000 for child welfare services and $200,000 for research, training, or demonstration projects in child welfare as proposed by the Senate instead of $3,000,000 and $500,000 for such purposes as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates $90,000 for salaries and expenses of the Children's Bureau as proposed by the Senate instead of $102,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 23: Appropriates $443,000 for salaries and expenses of Howard University as proposed by the House instead of $425,850 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 24: Authorizes $40,000 for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Secretary as proposed by the Senate instead of $75,000 as proposed by the House.

Independent offices

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates $966,000 for the Civil Service Commission for the Government payment for annuitants, employees health benefits fund instead of $955,000 as proposed by the House and $977,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 26: Inserts heading as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 27: Reported in disagreement. The amount to be proposed for the Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure is to be the final appropriation to be provided. The conferees expect the Commission to terminate its affairs with the amount approved.

Amendment No. 28: Appropriates $37,500 for salaries and expenses of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission instead of $75,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 29: Deletes language proposed by the Senate.

Department of the Interior

Amendment No. 30: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 31: Restores language proposed by the House to transfer $1,000,000 to the Upper Colorado River storage project.

Amendment No. 32: Strikes out language proposed by the House to appropriate $3,350,000 for the revolving fund, Virgin Islands Corporation, as provided by the Senate.

Amendment No. 33: Appropriates $100,000 for the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation as proposed by the Senate instead of $200,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 34: Reported in disagreement.

The judiciary

Amendment No. 35: Appropriates $70,000 for travel and miscellaneous expenses of courts of appeals, district courts, and other judicial services as proposed by the Senate instead of $130,000 as proposed by the House.

Department of Justice

Amendment No. 36: Appropriates $1,082,000 for salaries and expenses, U.S. attorneys and marshals, instead of $1,110,000 as proposed by the House and $1,054,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Department of Labor

Amendment No. 37: Appropriates $100,000 for trade adjustment activities as proposed by the House; the Senate had deleted the entire amount.

Amendment No. 38: Appropriates $22,000,000 for unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen as proposed by the Senate instead of $20,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 39: Appropriates $3,150,000 for employees' compensation claims and expenses, instead of $3,000,000 as proposed by the House and $3,300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Legislative branch

Senate

Amendment No. 40: Inserts heading, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 41–44: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 45: Appropriates $5,000 for contingent expenses, as proposed by the Senate.

Department of State

Amendment No. 46: Appropriates $6,338,500 for salaries and expenses, administration of foreign affairs, instead of $6,588,500 as proposed by the House and $6,088,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 47: Appropriates $400,000 for international conferences and contingencies instead of $250,000 as proposed by the House and $615,000 as proposed by the Senate; deletes $18,000 for representation; and allows $65,000 for the U.S. contribution to the International Peace Corps Secretariat.

District of Columbia

Amendment No. 48: Appropriates $413,500 for general operating expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $441,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 49: Appropriates $2,902,800 for public safety as proposed by the Senate instead of $3,170,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 50: Appropriates $526,601 for health and welfare as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,300,000 as proposed by the House.

TITLE II—INCREASED PAY COSTS

Amendment No. 51: Corrects printing error, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 52: Deletes the House proposal to appropriate $4,750 to the President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy.

Amendments Nos. 53–55: Insert Senate items to meet increased pay costs.

Amendment No. 56: Reported in disagreement.

Amendments Nos. 57–67: Insert Senate items to meet increased pay costs.

Amendment No. 68: Appropriates $35,775 for highways and traffic (District of Columbia) as proposed by the Senate instead of $125,970 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 69–71: Appropriate $289,738 for sanitary engineering (District of Columbia) as proposed by the Senate instead of $315,020 as proposed by the House; and make corresponding adjustments as to the source of funds.

TITLE III—CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS

Amendments Nos. 72 and 73: Appropriate for claims and judgments as set forth in Senate Document No. 14; total of $20,567,545 as proposed by the Senate instead of $16,993,400 as proposed by the House.

TITLE IV

Amendments Nos. 74 and 75: Deletes headings proposed by Senate.

Amendment No. 76: Reported in disagreement.

Amendments Nos. 77, 78, and 79: Delete language proposed by the Senate.

ALBERT THOMAS,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
CLARENCE CANNON,
FRANK T. BOW
(except as to No. 47),
EARL WILSON
(except as to No. 47),
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. THOMAS (during the reading of the statement of the managers on the part of the House). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement be dispensed with, and I will try to explain it to my colleagues.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, the membership will recall when this bill left the House, it carried in round figures about $1,400 million, which represented a reduction of 12.4 percent in the budget estimates. It went to the other body, and may I say I think the other body showed more restraint in approving increases that were requested over the House amounts than I have witnessed in my few years of experience. I believe our able and genial friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] will agree with us on that point.

As a matter of fact, there are only 79 Senate amendments. In round figures, the increase amounts to $49 or $50 million, involving only about four major items. One item itself involves $30 million of that amount. Several items put in by the other body involve annuities to widows of distinguished Members of the other body who have passed on.

In conference we came out 11.2 percent below the budget estimates. So as the bill stands, the percentage reduction is only 1.2 percent less than when it left the House.

All in all, I think the other body did the best job it has done in a long time. We ought to commend them for it. We bring back actually 67 items in the conference report. There is only one reservation, and my able friend from Ohio will explain that. There are 12 items we bring back to you in technical disagreement, but in truth and in fact there is not one item in true disagreement.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I hope I will live to see the day when just one bill comes back from conference with the other body in which the total appropriation is not raised.

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman's point is well taken, but the other body did a fine job.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to our beloved chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations [Mr. CANNON] 5 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly concerned and deeply dismayed to read in last night's paper that our beloved colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] has announced his intention to retire from Congress at the close of his present term.

Mr. THOMAS is one of the ablest and most efficient, and most indispensable Members of the House. He has had long and eminent service on the Committee on Appropriations, and it would be impossible to replace him on the committee, and especially on the important subcommittees to which he is assigned, without serious disadvantage to the country for some sessions to come.

It is true he is a man of advanced age, and worn down by long hours of unremitting toil. But he is also a Jeffersonian Democrat of the old school, and it is fundamental tradition, hallowed by long and immemorial usage that a Democrat, especially a Texas Democrat, while he may sometimes be defeated, never resigns.

So, Mr. Speaker, on second thought, we inevitably realize, as everyone interested in the many problems confronting us in the immediate future must realize, that Mr. THOMAS is not necessarily the captain of his own fate, that he is not necessarily the master of his own destiny.

He desires to retire. He is entitled to retire after more than a quarter of a century of useful service here.

He undoubtedly wants to retire and expects to retire, but he reckons without his host.

The leadership of the House needs him here, the administration requires his exceedingly valuable service here, and his constituency at home especially cannot be expected to accept the retirement of a Representative who has brought such prosperity to his district, and State, and the country at large.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am joined, I am certain, by other Members of the House on both sides of the aisle when I propose to report to the people of his district and State the unanimous recommendation of his colleagues here on the floor that he be drafted for membership in the 89th Congress and for many succeeding Congresses thereafter.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to our beloved friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join the young man from Missouri in the things that he has said about my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS]. But, I am sure we cannot take the time today to pay the respects that we have for my distinguished friend. I am sure that the entire membership would want plenty of time to tell the gentleman from Texas what we think of him. And, they would all be good. So, I am going to refrain at this time from paying my tributes to the gentleman from Texas and wait until that day when so many others can join us.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations never spoke truer words when he said the leadership of the House needs the gentleman from Texas; all Members of the House need the gentleman from Texas, that peerless debater, that great Congressman, that great Texan, and great American. I hope that a draft starts this way from Houston that will engulf the gentleman from Texas and carry him back to us, during the 89th Congress and many Congresses thereafter. ALBERT THOMAS is an indispensable Member of the House. He lends luster to this great body. Every Member of the House wants him to change his mind.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. Briefly.

Mr. FLOOD. I appreciate the gentleman yielding, and I will be brief. I construe this as a national emergency, and I think that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW], a distinguished lawyer, will join me in presenting a petition to the Supreme Court of the United States to sit as a court of original jurisdiction to consider a petition for injunction to prevent this disaster.

Mr. BOW. I might say to my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] and I have been discussing this matter, and we will talk to you privately about it.

Now let us go back to the supplemental report. It will be noted that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] and I did not agree to the report in its entirety. We excepted as to one amendment, and that is amendment No. 47.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out why we did not agree to amendment No. 47. The budget request as contained in House Document No. 61 was for an additional $755,000. There was already appropriated in the present budget $2,792,000 for the current fiscal year for this item, which is the item of "International conferences and contingencies." The bill as reported by the House Committee on Appropriations, the supplemental bill, contains the sum of $315,000 for this item, a reduction of $440,000 in the budget estimate. A further reduction of $65,000 was made here on the floor of the House, making a total for this item in the bill as it passed the House of $250,000. This was an amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB], which cut out that amount which was earmarked for the "International Secretariat of the Middle Level Manpower."

We have never yet found out just what "Middle Level Manpower" means. But it actually is the secretariat for the Peace Corps in which the United States is paying the expenses of a number of nationals of other countries to go to a meeting of the Peace Corps.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate Committee on Appropriations recommended the sum of $550,000 but did not include in the recommendation of the Senate committee the $65,000. The $65,000 was put in by an amendment on the floor of the Senate. I attempted to have this stricken in the conference. The conference did not go along with it. The action taken by a majority of the conference is to accept the amendment inserted on the Senate floor as to this item and to do the exact opposite of what we agreed to on the floor of the House.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me we should have maintained the position of the

House on this matter rather than to just yield as we did. As a matter of fact, the proposal that has come before you in this conference report not only contains the additional $65,000 for the secretariat, but $85,000 over and above the $65,000, an increase of $150,000 over the House figures for this item.

Mr. Speaker, mind you, we had already appropriated $2,792,000 for the current year. There was one item that we were able to strike out, however, that was an item for $18,000 for entertainment; that is, $18,000 over the $75,000 already allowed for representation allowances.

Mr. Speaker, while we made some progress, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] and I felt that this was too much.

Now this bill has been reported to the Members of the House, and it comes back from a conference with a total of $1,467 million which actually is $28 million over the House figure, but $21 million under the Senate figure.

One item that has been increased here—and some Members of the House were for this increase—as you recall when the bill passed the House, there was no money included in the bill for civil defense. The Senate put in the sum of $30 million for civil defense. In the conference we were able to have them take out $15 million so, we have made a savings of $15 million.

Mr. Speaker, the other item is the one in the Bureau of Reclamation. I should like to point this out to the Members of the House, because although I went along with it, I think it is a poor way in which to appropriate funds. I have reference to the $6 million in the Bureau of Reclamation which was put in the bill in the Senate and was never presented to the House. There was no testimony in the House at all on this item. The distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] who is chairman of the Interior Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, had no information on this item. They did not have the courtesy to consult him about it. When I say this I am talking about the representatives of the Bureau of Reclamation and not the other body.

Mr. Speaker, this $6 million is put in here because the President, when he was in Mexico City, told them we would try to get some fresh water from the Rio Grande River into Mexico. So the $6 million is put in to permit the people in Arizona to drill fresh water holes in order to get fresh water into Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, it has been my opinion during the 13 years I have been here that I have heard from time to time that Arizona did not have enough water and that they wanted to build huge dams in order to bring fresh water into Arizona. But here we are now tapping the underground water of that area in order to send it to Mexico. There were no hearings held on this matter in the House. It was never presented to us.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me this is a bad way to present a supplemental. I would like to impress upon the Members of the House again that in my opinion we should be very careful about all new starts in supplemental appropriation bills. The supplemental appropriations process should be followed, when they have run out of money in the programs which have already been started. We make a mistake in bringing in large sums for new starts.

Mr. Speaker, there is just one other item, and it is controversial I am sure, and will be discussed further, and that is the way in which we settled the Philippines claim bill. I think the position of the House on this was much better than the Senate position. I think we have locked the door, perhaps, after the horse has gotten out, but it is locked for future horses not to get out. I think it is a good amendment. I think it will protect against the abuses that have gone on. I hope the House will go along with the acceptance of it.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I would like to commend the gentleman from Ohio on the position which the gentleman takes on the amendment No. 47 pertaining to the International Peace Corps Secretariat. This is an amendment that the House should view with great concern. This is a case where the State Department and the International Peace Corps Secretariat are using flagrant budgetary procedures in order to obtain this money.

Here is a case of an international organization set up at a international conference and got the U.S. Government to pay $150,000 of the expenses of this organization, and now they come to Congress and expect us to pick up the tab. If you will check the testimony during the hearings before Mr. Thomas' subcommittee on March 26, and check the record of the other body on this bill when it came up for debate, and check the press releases now on the streets you will see that there is no relationship at all to what the House heard and what is taking place today. For example, this organization testified before the Deficiency Subcommittee that they needed this money for a European conference to begin May 6. This conference is taking place now in the United States, in Washington, D.C., not in Europe. This is the way this organization is using its budgetary privileges to violate the intent of Congress. I suggest that we send this conference report back to the committee with instructions to disagree on amendment No. 47.

Mr. BOW. May I ask the gentleman from California if it is not a fact that this travel money, $65,000, is not travel money for the Americans who are attending this conference, but is to be used to pay the expenses of delegates of other nations to this conference?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. That is true. We are paying the expenses right now of delegates from 12 nations to come to Washington, D.C., to participate in the conference.

Mr. BOW. This is what disturbs me; if we were paying the expenses of our own delegates, that would be one thing. But it seems to me that we should not be embarking upon the job of bringing delegates of other nations to these conferences. Some of these countries are better off than we are financially. May I ask the gentleman what countries are attending?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. There are 12 countries; they are from Argentina, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Israel, Japan, Netherlands, West Germany, Switzerland, and others.

Mr. BOW. We are picking up the tab to bring these delegates from these countries to this meeting, is that right?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Yes.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. Is either the majority or the minority prepared to discuss the Philippine war claims amendment? I would like to be enlightened concerning what provision is in the bill for that purpose.

Mr. BOW. I will say that that will come in as a separate part of the conference report, as an amendment, and we will have time to debate that separate amendment. I think it would be better to have the debate on it at the time that amendment is offered rather than in this general discussion.

Mr. AVERY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. These foreigners, or those who are sponsoring them, will they file expense accounts as Members of Congress are required to do?

Mr. BOW. No; only Members of Congress are checked on things of that kind. We spend more money on these other people. May I say that when the bill comes up for the Department of State I hope the gentleman will ask the same question. There are some things there I should like to point out.

Mr. GROSS. I will be glad to do that.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY].

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, there has been so much said about the Philippine war claims bill that at this late hour, with an appropriation bill for other branches of the executive department it seems somewhat futile to say anything in opposition to what the conferees have agreed upon. But I could not let this opportunity pass without bringing to the attention of this body that what we will be doing in effect is to stop any infringement through the front door, but allow the possibility of claims being made for services rendered in the processing of these claims, through the back door.

If the Government of the United States were to pay the claims directly we would be paying people who are under a commitment to various associates who have processed these claims.

From a legal standpoint, an amendment to the present act which is under consideration permitting payments to Mr. O'Donnell would not be enforcible. Even if the claimant signed a letter saying he would not pay Mr. O'Donnell and associates, the claimants for the most part are Philippine nationals, and the claimant could be sued in the Philippine courts for collection and could be forced under Philippine law to pay Mr. O'Donnell and associates. The U.S. Government would then have to sue the claimant not in the U.S. courts but in the Philippine courts, and there is a question as to whether or not the United States could sue a Philippine national in his own country and come out the winner.

It seems to me the only practical way is for the U.S. Government to turn this money over to the Philippine Government as provided in the Senate amendment which passed the Senate by an overwhelming vote of more than 2 to 1, or, if this was feared for some reason not to be wise, or for various reasons which the conferees are aware of, then they could act on a bill that has been in the House of Representatives since last year, introduced by me, and again introduced this year, which would make these payments to the Philippine Government under the protection of our grant-aid program, with the safeguards that are in that type of grant aid.

The question has arisen, where will this money go with giving of $73 million to individual claimants. Will this money remain in the Philippines? Since the original intent of the Philippine Claims Act was to rehabilitate the economy of the Philippine Government and the economy of the Philippine people, I say to you that 3 percent of the recipients under the Philippine Claims Act will receive more than $50 million. These corporations and individuals have for the most part completed their rehabilitation activity in the Philippine Islands. Therefore this new money undoubtedly will not inure to the best interests of the Philippine people and indeed may not remain in the Philippine economy at all.

Why do I say that? Because our Government has persuaded the Philippine Government in the last few years to go on a convertible basis, to have a free exchange. If one examines carefully the 1964 balance-of-payments schedule for the Philippine Government he will find on the income side an expectancy by the Philippine Government to receive 73 million of U.S. dollars. I think it is reasonably clear that this money may not remain in the Philippine Government. With a convertible currency, the people who receive this money and especially those who receive the greater amount of it will redirect this money wherever in the world they wish to use it.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. I have asked the gentleman to yield in order to advise the House that the gentleman from New York now addressing the House took the floor to plead with the House to accept his original amendment to the Philippine war claims bill. His amendment would have paid this money at that time directly to the Philippine Government rather than to the individuals that were named in line items in the bill. I voted against the bill, but I am here to advise the House that had it not been for the rejection of the amendment of the gentleman from New York we would not be in this dilemma we are in now. He is to be commended for his position at that time. I hope the amendment to be agreed to today will follow along that same general line.

Mr. BARRY. I wish I could assure the gentleman from Kansas that this was so, but I must say I feel certain that we are letting people in through the back door that we would not let in through the front door.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Avery] suggested it was my position that this money be paid to the Government of the Philippines. Let me assure this body it was the Eisenhower position that this money be paid to the Government of the Philippines. There were negotiations between the Philippine Government and the United States that this money would be paid to the Government of the Philippines and it was only because it was blocked in the House of Representatives by those who controlled the legislation that this was changed to make payment directly to the claimants. I would like the record to read, and it certainly is well documented, that the position I took a year ago and the position which I take now is the agreement made by and between the Eisenhower administration and the Philippine Government. I have seen the communique between the two countries myself.

I have examined it and I have read it and I know it to be a fact.

On motion to recommit this bill should be returned to the conference committee for a remedy already approved by the other body which is the nearest method devised to carry out the present intentions of the Congress consistent with the memoire handed to the Philippine Ambassador which created the present obligation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Hays], 5 minutes.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I just want to talk a minute about this Philippine war claims amendment. I differ with the gentleman from New York [Mr. Barry] in one respect. As to the payment, I did not think we should pay any of it to anybody. But since the decision was made to pay some, I then thought that we should pay to the Government of the Philippines.

But let me go back to 1952 and show you what has come out in recent hearings in the other body and show you just how this thing generated. You know, there were two members on that commission—Delgado and Mr. O'Donnell who have profited along with a third fellow to the tune already of about $1 million in this deal. I want to read to you from a letter from Mr. Delgado to Mr. O'Donnell in 1952. He says:

> Your letter of December 23, 1952, was duly received and have noted its contents with great interest. I believe you are quite right in your appraisal of the situation there but I am afraid that enthusiasm on the part of the interested parties and the Government here have cooled off. Nothing has been done and no one seems to be interested enough to take the initiative in having some action by the Government on the matter of additional war damage compensation. However, I am writing today to Mr. Lino Gutierrez, president of the Private Claimants Association, and other interested parties on the subject. In addition, in the broadcast which I am scheduled to make on the 18th of this month over the station DEBB, I will discuss the subject in an effort to arouse enthusiasm and start the ball rolling.
>
> I am of the considered opinion—

And I am leaving out something here that is not pertinent in order to save time. The letter reads further:

> I am of the considered opinion that even if the chances of obtaining the $200 million are not rosy this year, something must be done there to keep up the interest of the administration on the same, as otherwise our probabilities of obtaining additional money next year would be much less.

Then they go on with another interchange of correspondence and at the end of one letter, he says:

> It is regrettable that we did not make up this list before we left the Commission, but this is little solace now.

That referred to a list of all the claimants. I agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. Barry] that this provision, and I am sure the committee accepted it in good faith because it was kicked in their laps at the last minute, does not really do the job because it is unenforceable. As he pointed out, the money can be collected in the Philippines and can be paid to anybody. I think that with 1 percent of the claimants getting more than 50 percent of the money, that some of these lobbyists are still going to profit.

I would hope that later on in proper legislation, if we cannot come out with some bill from the Committee on Foreign Affairs where it is appropriate, that an amendment can still be put on to pay this money directly to the Philippine Government because if the avowed purpose, as the proponents of the legislation said, was to help the economy of the Philippines, you are not going to help it by paying huge sums of money to many corporations that are not even in the Philippines. I think probably the House regrets its action of last year, and if it is given the chance to vote clearly and make a decision on whether to give the money to these lobbyists and their associates or to give the money to the Philippines, I think I know how the House would vote. I hope the House will get that chance later on in this session.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. It is my understanding that a couple of trust funds have been set up in this country from money allegedly flowing at least in part from this Philippine war claims matter. Does the gentleman know anything about that; would he care to comment on it?

Mr. HAYS. All I know is what I read in the late edition of the New York Times. There were two trust funds set up for Mr. O'Donnell in a Scranton, Pa., bank; one in the amount of $85,000, to be paid out at the rate of $17,000 per year for 5 years. Another was in the amount of $60,000, to be paid out in 5 years at the rate of $12,000 a year.

There seems to be some doubt as to who set them up, but I am sure it has something to do with the Philippine war damage claims bill.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to commend the gentleman for his action in regard to the accelerated public works projects.

Mr. Speaker, many of America's Indians are confronted today with a sort of creeping unemployment which has been coming on and has affected the Indians even more than non-Indians since the peak employment days of World War II. For whatever the cause, automation or whatnot, the technological displacement or disqualification of Indians is comparatively more serious. What is called structural unemployment is, for Indians, a longstanding condition. Whereas this condition has a growing effect on people in areas like West Virginia, it tends to harden, continue, and preserve Indian unemployment.

In contrast to a national unemployment average that has ranged during recent years between 5 and 7 percent, Indian unemployment has been much more general and has ranged from area to area and from time to time from 20 to 90 percent of the labor force with an average of more than 40 percent. In some reservations practically the only employed people work for the agency or the local Indian service representative. Many of the others, and this certainly holds true in Oklahoma, are on relief.

I would hasten to add that there is, operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, a very excellent program of relocation and employment assistance which has been helpful in promoting out-migration and adjustment of Indians to employment opportunities. These Indians have, to the extent of their ability and insofar as they can, gone to cities and other places to seek employment. Many industries have been brought to sites on or near reservations. Nevertheless, some 45,000 Indians still remain unemployed out of a total work force which at present slightly exceeds 100,000. It is this 45,000 Indians who primarily can be benefited by the public works program.

I am delighted to know that the conference report insures the continuation of accelerated works projects to aid our Indian people, and feel certain it will prove to be a wise investment.

I trust the ARA will also move aggressively in this area of need.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our beloved colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross], 4 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that a motion to recommit this conference report, with instructions to the managers on the part of the House will be offered. It deals with the $65,000 for the International Secretariat Peace Corps.

The Members of the House will recall that the $65,000 was stricken from the bill when it was before the House originally.

I hope the House will sustain the motion to recommit, for the reason that although there is some authority in law for the use of $65,000—and this is not an enormous amount of money, as money goes around here these days—there is an important principle involved in the expenditure of the $65,000 to finance an International Secretariat that has never been authorized by Congress. There was a meeting in Washington, D.C., and another in Puerto Rico on so-called Middle Level Manpower as the preliminary for this proposition and for which American taxpayers paid all the bills. I asked the question when the bill was originally before the House for someone to define Middle Level Manpower? Nothing but copious silence has been the answer.

Let us support the motion to recommit and get the $65,000 out of this bill. Let us say to the executive branch of Government: When you propose to create an International Secretariat for the Peace Corps, come to Congress and get your authority for it.

As the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] has said, let us put a stop to these new programs begun under circumstances of this kind.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to our beloved colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. Zablocki].

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the conferees on the supplemental appropriations legislation before us have agreed to sustain the judgment of the Congress, and leave unchanged the present U.S. policy of paying off the balance due on the Philippine war damage claims directly to the individual claimants.

I am equally happy that the conferees have agreed on an amendment along the lines I favored, to prevent any former officials or employees of the U.S. Philippine War Damage Commission from benefiting, directly or indirectly, under this legislation.

The decision of the conferees in both instances was sound, sensible, and fully justified. It provides a remedy for an irregularity of which the Congress has only lately learned. But it also sustains a decision which the Congress made last year after thorough and meticulous consideration.

I fully support the conference report on this issue. I support it because it is equitable, because it is practical and because—unlike the amendment hastily approved by the other body—it is in the interest of the American taxpayer.

The decision made by the conferees is equitable because it will enable the U.S. Foreign Claims Commission to complete its work on the Philippine war damage claims, and give each qualified claimant the final payment under an obligation made by the United States back in 1946.

It is practical because there is no way to discharge our national commitment to the Filipino people, and to prevent abuses of the type brought recently to light, unless the United States itself administers this program.

And it is in the interests of the American taxpayers because only in this way—only by paying the claimants directly—can we hope to eliminate duplication and to save millions of dollars which will revert to the U.S. Treasury.

This saving has been estimated at between $5 and $25 million, and very likely will be at least $12 million. But whatever amount our Nation saves, it is reason enough for supporting the course which Congress approved last year and which the conference committee has sustained.

Mr. Speaker, last week on April 30, 1963, I took the floor of this House to review the entire background of the Philippine war damage claims legislation. That full story appears in the Congressional Record of April 30 on pages 7456 to 7463. Therefore, I will not repeat it. I simply want to take this opportunity to commend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Thomas], and the House conferees for the agreement they have obtained on this legislation before us.

I am gratified by the decision of the conferees and fully support the conference report as presented to the House.

Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity also to join with my colleagues in urging the distinguished and able gentleman from Texas [Mr. Thomas], to reconsider his decision to retire from the Congress. My good friend, the gentleman from Texas, is one of the most valuable Members of this Congress. In his long years of service in this body he has established an enviable record in working for the interests of his district, of his State, and of our whole Nation. His work on the House Appropriations Committee has been particularly outstanding. He has saved the taxpayers millions of dollars while, at the same time, never stinting in his support for projects necessary for the economic growth of our country and for our national security.

I earnestly urge my distinguished colleague from Texas not to deprive the House of his wise counsel and his able leadership. I hope that we will find him here for many years to come.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am about to move the previous question, but before I do may I respectfully ask my colleagues not to send this conference report back to conference? I hope you will adopt it. By and large it is good. There is not a man in this House that I have a higher regard for than my beloved and distinguished friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow]. He tends to his business and works for his people; he works for the Nation. By any yardstick you want to measure him by, he is certainly one of the big, fine, grand men in this House. But, reasonable people can reasonably disagree.

Now, this item was submitted to the Speaker when it was before the House, and the Speaker ruled that it was authorized. I am not going to take the time of the House to read the ruling of the Speaker. I have read the argument. It is all in the Congressional Record, so that is a matter that is not properly before the House.

There are seven items in the one amendment for conference and contingencies. The budget request was $755,000. The Senate allowed $615,000 and we reduced the amount to $400,000 in conference with the other body. As far as this one item is concerned they wanted $80,000 for the International Peace Corps Secretariat and we gave them $65,000. Now, this is saving money, gentlemen. If we can get all of these other nations to set up Peace Corps all over the world, it is going to take that load off our backs. Do not swap a cake for a biscuit.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. It is recognized that the point of order was overruled during the debate, but it is a fact that the House deleted the $65,000 when they voted on the bill.

Mr. THOMAS. That is right. We do not argue about that. That is factual.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. LIPSCOMB moves to recommit the conference report on H.R. 5517 to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to insist upon disagreement to amendment No. 47.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 207, nays 190, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 41]

YEAS—207

Abbitt
Abele
Abernethy
Alger
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Auchincloss
Avery
Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Barry
Bates
Battin
Becker
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bow
Bray
Brock
Bromwell
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Bruce
Burleson
Burton
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cannon
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clausen
Cleveland
Colmer
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Dwyer
Ellsworth
Findley
Fisher
Flynt
Ford
Foreman
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Gavin
Gibbons
Glenn
Goodell
Goodling
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Harrison
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Henderson
Herlong
Hoffman
Horan
Horton
Huddleston
Hutchinson
Jensen
Johansen
Jonas
Keith
Kilburn
Kilgore
King, N.Y.
Knox
Kornegay
Kunkel
Kyl
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Lloyd
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McIntire
McLoskey
McMillan
MacGregor
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
May
Meader
Michel
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Minshall
Moore
Morris
Morse
Mosher
Murray
Nelsen
Norblad
Nygaard
O'Konski
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Pelly
Pillion
Pirnie
Poff
Pool
Quie
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rich
Riehlman
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
St. George
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Short
Shriver
Sibal
Siler
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Stinson
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson
Tuck
Tupper
Utt
Van Pelt
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watson
Weaver
Westland
Whalley
Wharton
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wydler
Wyman
Younger

NAYS—190

Addabbo
Albert
Andrews
Ashley
Barrett
Bass
Beckworth
Bennett, Fla.
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bonner
Brademas
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Burke
Burkhalter
Byrne, Pa.
Cameron
Carey
Chelf
Clark
Cohelan
Corman
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dulski
Duncan
Edmondson
Edwards
Elliott
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Finnegan
Flood
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Giaimo
Gilbert
Gill
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Griffiths
Hagen, Calif.
Hanna
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Hechler
Hemphill
Holifield
Holland
Hull
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kelly
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Landrum
Lankford
Leggett
Lesinski
Libonati
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McDowell
McFall
Macdonald
Madden
Mahon
Matsunaga
Matthews
Mills
Minish
Monagan
Montoya
Moorhead
Morgan
Morrison
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pilcher
Poage
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Randall
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rooney
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St Germain
St. Onge
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Sheppard
Shipley
Sickles
Sikes
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Staebler
Staggers
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Toll
Trimble
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vinson
Watts
Weltner
White
Wickersham
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Young
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—36

Adair
Anderson
Aspinall
Ayres
Beermann
Bolling
Buckley
Celler
Collier
Conte
Cooley
Fino
Fogarty
Forrester
Gary
Grant
Green, Pa.
Hagan, Ga.
Halpern
Harris
Harsha
Healey
Hoeven
Hosmer
Ichord
Kee
Keogh
Miller, Calif.
Morton
Rains
Roosevelt
Scott
Shelley
Sisk
Steed
Walter

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hoeven for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Beermann for, with Mr. Walter against.

Mr. Fino for, with Mr. Green of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Conte for, with Mr. Celler against.

Mr. Morton of Maryland for, with Mr. Fogarty against.

Mr. Adair for, with Mr. Aspinall against.

Mr. Halpern for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Collier for, with Mr. Rains against.

Mr. Ayres for, with Mr. Roosevelt against.

Mr. Harsha for, with Mr. Shelley against.

Mr. Anderson for, with Mr. Cooley against.

Mr. Hosmer for, with Mr. Sisk against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Miller of California, with Mr. Hagan of Georgia.

Mr. Steed with Mrs. Kee.

Mr. Scott with Mr. Ichord.

Mr. Gary with Mr. Grant.

Mr. Harris with Mr. Forrester.

Messrs. ROBERTS of Texas, PASSMAN, WAGGONNER, and ROGERS of Texas changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Subcommittee on Education have permission to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

MILITARY PAY INCREASE

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 335 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5555) to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 335 provides for consideration of H.R. 5555, a bill to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes. The resolution provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

The purpose of H.R. 5555 is to provide increases in basic pay and subsistence allowances; to establish a new method of adjusting retirement pay; and to provide other benefits, for members of the uniformed services.

The last basic pay increase for members of the uniformed services became effective on June 1, 1958. Classified employees of the Federal Government received pay increases in 1958, 1960, 1962, and will receive another increase on January 1, 1964.

The average earnings of manufacturing—production workers, a group usually associated with enlisted personnel—has increase by 44.8 percent since 1952. The cumulative average increase for classified civil service employees in the past 10 years totals 39.8 percent. For members of the uniformed services, the overall average increase in compensation since 1952, including the recent increase in basic allowance for quarters, is 16.2 percent. Even with the increases recommended in H.R. 5555, the average increase in total compensation for members of the uniformed services since 1952 will still be substantially less than the increases obtained by workers in private industry and civil service employees.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 335.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY], a member of the Committee on Rules, has explained this resolution which makes in order the consideration of H.R. 5555, under 2 hours of general debate and an open rule, for the purpose of increasing the base pay of those in the armed services of the United States, for making adjustments in the subsistence allowances and adjustments in some other benefits and allowances due those in the armed services, or who have retired therefrom.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion this legislation is long overdue. There have been several increases in pay granted to the classified employees of this Government, and many increases in pay to the various workers and employees in private industry, since Congress last adjusted the pay of those who bear the arms of the United States in defense of this Republic. In my opinion this action is not only long overdue, but is very, very meager as far as the total pay increase is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, the average increase in base pay, as provided under this bill for all those in the armed services is about 12.6 percent. In addition, of course, there is some increase provided for the subsistence pay allowances given to enlisted men, and some to officers. In addition, as I said a moment ago, there are other adjustments being made by this legislation in connection with retirement benefits.

Mr. Speaker, the total cost of this legislation will be a little under $1 billion for the first fiscal year, and the increases over the next 5-year period will bring the average cost up to about $1¼ billion annually, which is somewhat less than originally estimated when the legislation was first proposed by the President of the United States, whose message was sent to Congress on the subject.

But in considering this bill, it is my understanding there will be, after general debate is concluded, and the 5-minute rule is put into effect, several important amendments offered which may be far reaching in their effect. Frankly, I have endeavored to study some of the proposed amendments and am somewhat perplexed in my own mind as to just what they may do or may not do if they become a part of the law, as a part of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest very respectfully to my colleagues that they pay close attention to the explanations and to the debate on these particular amendments as the discussion proceeds during the afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further request for time.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

CONGRESSIONAL WEEKEND

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to speak about the forthcoming congressional weekend. Therefore, I apologize to the Members of the House for taking this time on a matter of minor importance when we are about to consider a bill of such major importance.

I would like to direct the attention of the House to the fact that this year the congressional weekend will start on Friday, May 17, and continue through Sunday, May 19.

Mr. Speaker, this year, unlike prior years, the New York City congressional delegation will play the part of the host.

I want to emphasize that this costs no money to the Congress or the Government. Members pay their own way as well as that of their families and friends.

Mr. Speaker, we have a full and interesting program arranged for all those who plan to go on the tour.

We will leave here Friday morning at 9:45 and the Members will return Sunday night by train. There is some confusion about reservations because some Members have already contacted members of the New York delegation or myself, as I have been acting as chairman of the group, indicating a desire to go. Others have written directly to the mayor of the city of New York accepting his invitation to be there. That, however, does not make their reservations firm.

In order to make firm reservations and to get their railroad tickets and their hotel reservations, it is important that Members immediately send in their checks for themselves and as many members of their family and friends as will attend. No reservations can be made except upon payment. Checks should be made payable to "Congressional Weekend" and sent to my office.

I thank the House for its attention.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time and I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The **SPEAKER.** The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5555) to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 5555, with Mr. BOGGS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, I am honored today to begin debate on the bill H.R. 5555, a bill to increase the basic pay of the uniformed services, and for other purposes.

This bill increases the basic pay of the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marines, the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service—all of the uniformed services.

I do not think it is necessary for me to remind this committee that the military pay has not been increased since 1958, nor is it necessary for me to remind this committee that the Civil Service pay was increased in 1958, 1960, 1962, and will be increased again in 1964.

In that regard I would like to remind the committee that the Congress last year, when it passed the Postal and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1962, revised the salary schedule and the effective dates proposed by the President.

I recognize this is not very dramatic, talking about pay. But somebody has to do it, so I am the one, and I will do the very best I can. I am not much to look at but I have a pretty good story for you to listen to. Furthermore, these people of whom I speak have done a pretty good job for your country and mine. So I hope you will listen. I want you to listen.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. My distinguished friend has stated that his remarks are not dramatic. What the gentleman is saying is dramatic, highly dramatic. He is discussing something essential to the defense of this Nation, and I do not know of any subject more dramatic than the successful defense of America and the free world. The gentleman's committee has brought to the floor a measure which will help to insure that those who wear the uniform of the Nation will be able to keep their heads above water financially, will be able to live as we want Americans to live, to be able to live as other Americans live. Now assuredly this is something they are entitled to, something they have long been entitled to. This bill should have been enacted a year ago, when civilian personnel were given a pay raise. I want to commend the gentleman, who is one of the great leaders of this Congress, for his important work in the field of defense and I commend the Committee on Armed Services for their work in bringing this needed measure to the floor. There is much to be said on the need for a military pay raise—the best way to say it is by a solid vote for passage of the bill.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. When these other pay bills came up they contained an effective date recommended by the President. The House of Representatives paid no attention to that recommendation. They suggested the first day of the month after the bill was passed. We did the same, in the subcommittee, but the full committee decided otherwise, and we have gone along with the full committee, naturally, and made the effective date October 1, 1963, the one suggested by the President.

But listen to the increases they made on civil service pay increases. We went $280 million over what was suggested by the administration for fiscal 1963, $227 million over what the administration asked for 1964, and $111 million over what the administration asked for in 1965, and nobody blinked an eye.

I should also emphasize the fact that the civil service increase last year went to 1,550,000 Federal employees with an eventual cost of $1 billion annually, whereas our proposal of $1,191,694,000 annual increase applies not only to 1,868,000 of the 2,700,000 active members of the armed services but also includes pay for 900,000 members of the Reserve components and 411,000 retired personnel. I know we will not now become economy minded to those who maintain our National Guard, particularly since we did not have the same concern last year over another piece of legislation.

The total cost of this bill is $1,191,694,000. This is $46,832,000 under the proposal submitted by the administration and the Department of Defense. The President in his budget message requested $900 million for the remainder of this year for the proposed increase. That was based upon the assumption that the pay increase would take effect on October 1, 1963. We have reluctantly accepted this proposed effective date, and as a result of the reduction we have made in the proposed legislation, the cost for the remainder of 1964, starting October 1, will be $892 million or $8 million under what the Department of Defense requested for the remainder of this year.

I would be less than candid, however, if I did not say this to you. The subcommittee of which I have the great honor to be chairman contemplated an effective date of July 1, and an annual expenditure of $1,547 million for all the uniformed services. This was $278 million over the budget. We figured that the military should be paid with the same spoon that the other of our children we have created are paid; namely, the civil service and postal employees. But in the wisdom of the full committee, we decided on another course. Our subcommittee felt that our proposal would come closer to resolving a vital question, that of the retention of the quality problems that exist today in the military of our country. However, I do recognize the facts of life and I am practical enough to realize that this bill does involve an increase in pay and allowances for military personnel of almost $1,200 million annually and this represents a very substantial increase in the total cost of pay and allowances for all of our uniformed services. As a matter of fact, the present cost of basic pay and allowances for members of the armed services today is $9,952 million and an additional $900 million is spent on subsistence for enlisted personnel. To this total, we seek to add $1,200. Thus, the amounts that are recommended in this bill are less than the amounts that many of us felt were very, very necessary. Nevertheless we realize that they are substantial and will, of course, go a long ways toward solving some of the problems that confront very materially the military today.

The bill originally submitted by the Department of Defense was complex.

When I say "complex," that is an understatement. It contained many provisions which we not only did not approve but we felt did not belong in the bill and we cut them out.

We are concerned with two problems, and keep this uppermost in your minds. The first is the problem of retention. We want to retain these highly trained technical people on active duty. The second is quality. First, retention and second, quality. These are the things we want to accomplish.

Our training costs for the Armed Forces last year was $2½ billion, just to train these people. A billion dollars of this was in the technical area alone.

Our retention rates; that is, our reenlistment rates, are considerably under what they should be if we are to reduce those training costs and at the same time improve the combat efficiency of the armed services. We have an overall enlistment rate of only 53 percent. In the first term reenlistment grades, 24.1 percent. But in some of the most difficult skills our reenlistments are only 15 percent. This is also true among our officers. Only about 35 percent of the officers who enter on active duty remain at the end of their obligated period. The services today have to accept beween 95 and 98 percent of all of the officers who apply for retention on active duty. It is obvious to me, and it should be to you, that if 95 to 98 percent of every 100 officers who apply for extended duty, active duty, must be accepted in order to provide the necessary officers for leadership and management in our armed services, then there will be a gap in the future, and no degree of selectivity whatsoever. If this is to continue, it is equally obvious that in the years ahead we will have many mediocre officers and we will not have the kind of leadership and management that all of us realize is not only vital but is necessary in the maintenance of a good military regime.

We are spending $50 to $60 billion a year, on our defense budget. In many areas we would have a quality of management that is not good for the country or the military.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I agree with the gentleman from South Carolina. I am in favor of the bill, including the Rivers amendment.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. Chairman, what does this bill do? The bill is not very long. This is what it does:

First of all, it provides basic pay for all members of the armed services who have completed more than 2 years of active duty for pay purposes. The bill submitted by the Department of Defense proposes increases for all members of the armed service. This action of the committee reduced the cost $134,226,000.

The Department of Defense proposed elimination of foreign duty and sea pay which has been in effect for over 20 years. Of course we did not accept that. If you abolish foreign duty and sea pay, you would not have any Navy to start with. We did not buy that. Bear in mind that foreign duty and sea pay applies only to enlisted men. No officers get this. We do not pay foreign duty and sea pay to officers. We refused to repeal the law on foreign duty and sea pay. This immediately added $127 million to the bill.

Another major item in the bill was in the area of subsistence allowance. The Department of Defense recommended that we increase the subsistence allowance for officers from $47.88 a month to $77 a month.

However, the Department of Defense did not recommend any increase in subsistence allowances for enlisted personnel. The increase from $47.88 to $77 recommended by the Department of Defense for officers amounted to $120 million a year. We could not approve this approach to the problem. Instead, we increased the subsistence allowances for officers by the amount of the increase in the cost of food since 1952, namely, 6.6 percent, and this suggests an increase in subsistence allowances for officers of $3.12 a month.

Now I want to make it clear that as a result of what we propose as an increase in subsistence allowances for officers we have reduced the take-home pay of officers by $26 a month below that which the Department of Defense recommended. At the same time we have increased the take-home pay of enlisted personnel in subsistence allowances by $77 million a year. The Department of Defense did not have anything for these people, so we increased it $77 million, which was the only honorable and just thing to do.

We have also made some slight modification in submarine pay to take care of the crewmembers of conventional submarines who go to nuclear training schools to learn the complexities of nuclear submarines.

We have also added a new type of hazardous incentive pay for those who work in high-pressure chambers.

In addition, we allow an individual to draw two incentive pays if he is performing two hazardous duties on a full-time basis. The amounts of money involved in these last three changes are very small compared to the total cost of the bill. For example, the double incentive payment provision involves a cost of $1,941,000 annually; the submarine pay for training duty involves $2,065,000 annually, and the high-pressure chamber incentive pay adds a cost of $145,000 a year. Now, if you do not know what double incentive pay is, let's say a man is a paratrooper and he has to jump out of a plane and when he hits the ground he has to perform some other duty. We take care of the entire mission. That is what this means.

Now, the committee has also provided a new allowance for members of the uniformed services who are permitted by law to transport their dependents and household effects to new duty assignments, but are precluded from having their dependents with them. This is known as the family separation allowance. The reason for doing this is fairly simple and it is based on pure economics. When the head of a household is away from his family for long periods of time it is obvious that the cost of maintaining the household increases. In other words, when the head of the household is not there to shovel snow or cut the grass or to repair leaky faucets or to do the multitude of chores that fall upon every head of a household, then his wife usually must hire someone to do these jobs. These are the people who do not occupy Government quarters.

In addition, in the cold war situation which has faced us in the past—do you know how long it will go? I do not—and will undoubtedly continue to face us, there are more and more cases of men being separated from their families for long periods of time. This is having a serious effect upon our retention rates. Some of these people are away 50 percent of the time and others are away 326 days out of 365. These things are having a serious repercussion on the retention rates in the military.

We are trying to do something about it, because these men require terrific training. As I told you, $2,500 million is for training. We have many areas where the head of the household is separated from his family in remote areas, when they are on duty at sea or when they are assigned to areas where their families cannot handle these conditions. I might say that of all the provisions in this bill this is the most exciting and enthusiastic provision other than the increase in basic pay, as far as the dependents and the military generally are concerned. The total cost of this provision is estimated to be $41,979,000 for a full fiscal year, of which $37,658,000 will be paid to enlisted personnel and $4,331,000 to officers.

Mr. Chairman, the bill contains other sections which I might mention briefly. One of them is the repeal of the authority to provide responsibility payments. This type of pay was authorized for captains, majors, lieutenant colonels, and for colonels back in 1958. It has never been implemented. So we repeal it.

In addition, we have eliminated the State of Hawaii as an area in which foreign duty pay would be authorized. By doing this we need a savings clause so that some of these enlisted men who are there now would not be deprived of this benefit. This was the honorable thing to do.

We also have a provision in the bill that permits anyone who retires during this fiscal year, 1963, to be affected under the provisions of this bill. We did that for this reason. Many people when they know the effective date is coming, for some reason or other will try to stay on until the effective date. We have cured all of this jumping around and trying to stay on active duty. Therefore, anyone who retires in 1963 will come under the provisions of this bill. I think that is the only way to do it.

There is another technical provision in the bill which protects the widows and dependents of service personnel who have died on active duty or who die as the result of a service-connected disability. This is also necessary because in the past we have eliminated certain increments in basic pay, and we have done this in the proposed legislation. Without this savings provision, some individuals might take a reduction in their dependency and indemnity compensation.

These increments and provisions of law are very difficult to explain. But they have gone on over the years and we have had to protect these people, certainly the widows and orphans are protected. Without a savings clause, a retired second lieutenant in this category would have taken a reduction in pay and as a result his widow would suffer this reduction.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I come to the last and probably the most controversial part of the bill, this question of retirement pay. I hope the Members of the House will listen to this explanation.

Back in 1958 when we enacted the Pay Act of 1958, we decided that we would depart from the traditional concept of applying retirement pay to existing pay scales.

I am sure that each Member of the House has received a lot of correspondence on this and I shall try to explain it.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I would be delighted to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GUBSER. I would merely like to emphasize at this point that the gentleman from South Carolina is making a very important statement at this time, which has to do with an important amendment that will be offered later in the debate. I sincerely hope that the gentleman will have the undivided attention of the Members of the House because of the importance of his statement, and it certainly merits it.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Back in 1958—and I have sat on all the pay bills for 23 years—we passed the 1958 act. At that time there was a law on the books which gave every man on active duty, officer and enlisted man, the right to recompute his pay if he was retired, on the pay scales of any new legislation. You may say, "Well, he went from one to the other," but he did not. They do not live between these pay scales too long, I can tell you that.

This law, with the exception of a brief period in the 1920's has been on the books for 100 years and every man, upon retirement, was not only led to believe that he was going to have his retirement pay recomputed, but it was the law. But the Congress in its wisdom abruptly cut this off and denied this to them in 1958, without any notice whatever. As a matter of fact the law even stated that the retirement pay would be based on whatever pay scales were in effect.

The reason the Congress gave in 1958 was that the rising cost of military retirement was becoming very noticeable and they wanted to do something about it; so—bam—went the law, without notice.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, it happens that I served on the Committee on Armed Services at that time.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. And let me state that no more distinguished Member ever served on this committee than the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. The gentleman will remember that at that time there had been the Cordiner report which never had been officially presented to the Congress but had been allowed to leak. This was part of the Cordiner report recommendation to reduce the retirement pay and take it away from the active scale, the one that had been in effect for 100 years. And it was only after a fight that we got a 6 percent limitation on it. This has not been to the credit of this Congress since, that we have allowed this condition to continue.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I agree with the gentleman and I thank him.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. GUBSER. A moment ago the gentleman was quoting, I believe, title X, section 6149, of the United States Code and cited the law, that new basic rates would be taken into consideration in a recomputation of retired pay. Is this statement not true, that in 1958 Congress did not bother to repeal that law and it is still on the books? It only denied the beneficiaries of retirement pay prior to 1958 the right of applying this law to the new pay scale?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I would say the gentleman is substantially correct.

Mr. GUBSER. It is still on the books and is still the law; we did not repeal it.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. The Department of Defense recognized this inequity, this miserable inequity, if you will permit me to say so. They recommended that those persons who retired prior to June 1, 1958, the effective date of the 1958 Pay Act, be permitted to recompute under the 1958 pay scales.

In addition, they were to also receive a 5-percent cost-of-living increase. The cost of recomputing for those retired prior to June 1958, and the fiscal year 1964 would have been $30 million.

Mr. Chairman, all of you have undoubtedly received extensive correspondence from retired personnel who urged the Congress to go back to the traditional concept of recomputing, or computing, retired pay. The committee, after careful consideration of this problem, came to the conclusion that it should adhere to the 1958 act. I would be less than candid with you and positively not fair to myself if I did not say this to you, that the committee, in my opinion, made a mistake. I had an amendment in the committee and it was defeated in committee, but when this amendment is offered you will be able to express your will today to right this wrong. I propose to offer an amendment that will give you the right and the opportunity, with us who are similarly minded, to right this wrong, with the understanding, as the Department of Defense has urged us to do, that this is the end; give them notice that in the future there will be no recomputing. Instead, we will give them notice, under the cost-of-living index section when it amounts to 3 percent, that it will be automatically adjusted.

President Eisenhower suggested this, President Kennedy both as Senator and as President, Secretary McNamara, the Bureau of the Budget, all people have recommended it. Further, back in 1960 the House Armed Services Committee recommended it. You who were here then helped us pass this recomputation. I know that many of you would prefer to continue the traditional method of recomputation, but since this matter of retirement is getting so large I am willing now to accept the fact that we should change the law and right this wrong today.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman has made a significant statement here. Can the gentleman tell the House whether or not workers in industry who have retired can recompute their pensions? Can they recompute their pay when they retire, and their factories work under new scales?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. The whole concept of military pay is below that of civilians, even including the so-called fringe benefits. I may say this to the gentleman since he has brought that up, and I am glad he has, that the taxpayers of America also pay the civil service increases. There was a time when we had comparability between the military and industry. We tried to keep our military salaries at a level where industry would not take our best trained people. There was what was called comparability. That is gone. But we always had a comparability, we thought, by these things the gentleman mentions, between the military and the civil servants, and that is even gone. We have had cases of colonels with over 25 years of service having civil service men employed under them making more than they.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Can civil service employees under the Government Pay Acts recompute?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I do not know.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I think there is a great deal of merit to the gentleman's argument, but I am at a loss to understand how I can explain to the working people of my district that we permit the military people to recompute when we cannot permit the working people, who pay the taxes, to recompute their pensions to meet the rising cost of living. How can I explain that to the workingman who has retired and is also faced with the increased cost of living?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Because the civil service employees get about five times faster increases in their salaries. Since 1958 they have had four increases and the military none. For between 40 and 50 years flag officers in this country did not get any increase in salaries. Everything went to the lower echelons. The civil service employees are way ahead of the military, and in the gentleman's lifetime the military will never catch up with the civil service. So recomputation cannot be compared. You cannot do that. It is a theoretical question.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Is it not true that the military men were promised this by law when they went on active duty?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. This was the law then, and military pay scales have always been made low because of these benefits. For instance, in industry there was a time when there might have been a disparity when the military had all these hospital rights and everything, but industry has 10 times the rights that military people have in this hospitalization area and with this "space available" concept and all these things that exist today. We have this industrial management concept today, and when you compare that with the matter of military dependents riding on planes and such things as that, the rights of the military have been whittled away and whittled away and whittled away until today they do not even exist.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I am delighted to yield to my colleague.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Is it not accurate to say that those who are on the retired rolls today are still subject to recall to active duty at any time? Also, is it not true that the Federal judges are also subject to recall and, thus, they have their retirement pay adjusted according to the pay of active duty judges?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I think that is correct.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. GUBSER. I would like to make one point in answer to a question raised by the gentleman from Illinois. From 1908 to 1946, a span of 38 years, commissioned officers in the U.S. Army and Navy did not get a single increase, yet, at the same time the national wage index rose from 100 in 1908 as a base to 581.1.

I might also point out, according to the comparability tables which exist today, after allowing a weight for noncontributory retirements and other fringe benefits, a colonel gets $200 less than his civil service counterpart. That is the situation that exists today.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I would also like to say we are not the only taxpayers. The military pays some taxes too. They are not exempt from the income tax.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I promised to yield to our colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], then, of course, I shall be delighted to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I wanted to ask the gentleman a question not pertaining to this matter or recomputation. I would be glad to wait until the gentleman is finished with that subject before asking the question I have in mind. If the gentleman from New York has a question on the subject of recomputation, I would ask my colleague from South Carolina to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Does the gentleman from New York have a question on the subject of recomputation?

Mr. BECKER. Yes, I do. You were talking a few minutes ago about how a man could go back home and explain to the people, civil service people and others why they could not recompute their pay the same as the military. I would say very simply and certainly not at all facetiously that if it were not for the dedicated military leaders who remain in the service for 20 years or more, we would not have any kind of homefront or any kind of retirement to be worried about.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I heard a distinguished American one time say something about this situation where people are worried about the budget, but this distinguished American in speaking about this concern that our expenditures of $54 billion a year for the military might bankrupt this country said, he would rather be a live American with an empty pocketbook rather than be a dead American with a full pocketbook. Those are my sentiments.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at this point?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman spoke about hazardous duty pay and work in decompression chambers and so on. But the gentleman did not mention what to me is the most hazardous duty of all, and that is serving under enemy shell fire. Would the gentleman tell the committee what happened as far as this provision is concerned, with reference to extra pay for combat missions?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. My colleague knows as well as I do that that was not accepted by the full committee.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I know, but I am not sure all the Members of the House know that. I understand an amendment will be offered to put that provision back in the bill providing for extra duty pay for the most hazardous duty that there is. I might say it amazed me that the committee would take that out.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I would like to summarize what we have done. We have provided basic increases in pay for 1,868,000 of the personnel of the uniformed services. There are 812,000 people with under 2 years of service for pay purposes who will not receive any increase.

Typical increases are as follows: A 5-percent cost-of-living increase for generals and other flag officers running from $60 a month for a brigadier general to $95 a month for a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

A 10-percent increase for colonels, an average of $92 a month.

A 15-percent increase for majors, an average of $93 a month.

A 17.8-percent increase for captains, an average of $85 a month.

A 16.4-percent increase for first lieutenants, an average of $50 a month.

A 5.4-percent increase for second lieutenants, an average of $14 a month.

The percentage increases for second lieutenants apparently are low because 35,000 of these are with less than 2 years of service, and they do not receive any increase in basic pay because they have an obligated service. The service may want them and may not. But the average increase, roughly, for the rest is $43 a month. The great percentage increases are in the grades of first lieutenants, captains, and majors.

There is the point where we are getting hurt. We want these officers. We want them to make a decision as to whether they are going to make the service a career or not. These boys are needed badly. We have spent an awful lot of money on them.

The average increase for warrant officers, one, two, three, and four, is roughly 15 percent, running from $49 a month for a W-1 to $97 a month for a W-4. The overall increase for officers is 14.3 percent, an average of $71 a month.

Among the enlisted personnel the increases run from 14 percent a month for E-9's, an average of $63 a month, to a maximum of $120; 16 percent for E-8's, averaging $60 a month, with a maximum of $120. The E-9's and E-8's are very special people. They have done a very outstanding service. There are not too many of those.

It is 15 percent for an E-4, an average of $25 a month, and a maximum of $30 a month; 10.7 percent for the E-3's, averaging $12 a month, with a maximum of $24 a month, and one-half of 1 percent in the E-1's, an average of 42 cents a month, with a maximum of $5 a month.

Almost all of these E-1's have less than 2 years of service. They are of an unknown quantity. They are required to serve, and when they get 2 years of service they get the increase.

We have captains with less than 2 years that get nothing. For instance, doctors coming in with less than 2 years' service, receive no increases.

The total increase in the basic pay is $847,498,000.

Where is the rest of the money in the bill? The family separation allowance will cost approximately $42 million a year. Increases in subsistence allowance for enlisted personnel, will cost $77 million.

As I told you, the Department of Defense did not have anything for the enlisted men. We put in $77 million a year. There is a small increase in subsistence allowance for officers, only $13 million a year. There is a 5-percent increase in retirement pay, $52 million a year; increased retirement costs to those who retire in the calendar year 1963 will roughly be $9 million for 1964.

The increase for submarine pay, high pressure chamber duty, and double incentive payments amounts to $4 million.

Terminal leave payments, social security, death gratuities, and re-enlistment bonuses, all of which are affected by the changes in basic pay, involve an additional $75 million annually.

This gives us a grand total of $1,191,694,000 which would be the full 1964 fiscal year cost for the Department of Defense.

As a result, however, of the proposed effective date of October 1, 1963, the fiscal 1964 cost for the Department of Defense will be $892 million, which is $8 million below the amount requested by the President for the Department of Defense, and $46,832,000 below the full fiscal year cost proposed by the Department of Defense.

Finally, I would like to tell you how these increases will be distributed between officers and enlisted personnel.

On the basis of a full fiscal year, involving an annual cost of $1,191,694,000 for the Department of Defense, $383 million will be paid to officers and $808.6 million will be paid to enlisted personnel. This is the bill.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I will be delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I have several questions. I am only going to ask one; I will ask the others during general debate. Will the gentleman tell me how he arrived at this family separation pay of $30 a month for the enlisted man and $53 a month for the officer, based on the fact that the man is away from home and she has to hire somebody to cut the grass and fix the leaks and so forth? Do you think that there would be any more occasion for that to happen in the officer's family than in the enlisted man's family?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I think it will happen to anybody away from home. I know I am away from home a good deal and I do not have the luxury of living with my family.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Why do you make a distinction between $30 a month for the enlisted man and $53 a month for the officer, when the officer has the higher pay?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. It works out on the quarters allowance. It is one-third of the quarters allowances paid to bachelor officers. That is the way we arrive at it. Now, repairing a leaky faucet or mowing the grass or something of that sort requires money, but these people do not live in Government quarters, and these are the people we are trying to take care of. This is a retention bill. If you have a highly technical and accomplished officer or enlisted man, he is the one we want to keep in the service.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I am talking about the difference in pay. You are not touching on the difference at all between $30 and $53.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. That is the minimum. It is based on the minimum cost of the bachelor officer's allowance.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. A bachelor officer would not have any family separation, would he?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. We use the smallest amount.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. You are not going to have family separations with bachelor officers, I hope.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I am trying to show you the yardstick we used. If you want to have it for some officer with eight dependents, put in the amendment. We tried to save as much as we could, and we adjusted it. That is my answer.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. Would not the gentleman agree with me that the expenses of repairs and obsolescence around the home when an officer is absent on duty would be more expensive in more expensive quarters than in less expensive quarters? Therefore, there is a basic reason for having a percentage figure of the quarters allowances. I will ask the gentleman from South Carolina is that not the reasonable explanation?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from South Carolina yield to me in order to permit me to answer that argument?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Why, certainly I will yield to the gentleman from Missouri for anything

Mr. JONES of Missouri. In the first place, this staff officer will have servants to do this job. He would not be doing the job himself. There is not money for it. The enlisted man does that work, and that is why.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I assume that there are people around who do not agree with you. We are trying to keep these people on active duty.

We are checking that figure to try to keep this cost down.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I certainly yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina on his clear analysis of a very, very complicated bill. I want to compliment not only the gentleman from South Carolina but his subcommittee for the hard work and the weeks and months which they have devoted to this bill. The gentleman deserves the thanks not only of the Armed Services Committee but of the House itself.

Now, then, the question I want to ask the gentleman is this——

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I thank the chairman very much.

Mr. VINSON. As I understood it, the gentleman said concerning recomputation that he was going to offer an amendment to extend recomputation to those who retired prior to 1958 and that that would be the end of the recomputation, as I understood the gentleman. Is that correct?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Well, if the——

Mr. VINSON. The question I would like to ask the gentleman——

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Let me answer the chairman. If the amendment carries.

Mr. VINSON. I understand.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. But as long as it is a law on the books I am dedicated to following it.

Mr. VINSON. If the gentleman will yield further, then he proposes after 1958 to stop the recomputation? Would it not merely magnify and create more inequities than already exist today? What about the man who retired in 1959? What about the man who retired in 1962, or 1961? Is he not entitled to the same principle being applied to him that you apply to the man who retired prior to 1958? I want to be logical, and my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina is very, very logical ordinarily. But I do not think he was quite as logical in that statement as he was in other statements which he has made on this bill.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Does the chairman want me to answer his question?

Mr. VINSON. Yes, please.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Why, positively not, positively not. We are giving him notice today. You did not give him any notice in 1958. We lowered the boom on him in 1958.

Mr. VINSON. We gave him notice.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. And the law was on the books in 1958 and except for just a brief period in the 1920's it had been on the books for 100 long years.

Mr. VINSON. We stopped it in 1958.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. We stopped it in the most outrageous manner, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VINSON. But you propose to continue this.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. That is why I am sure the chairman voted with us in that unanimous report from the committee and the unanimous decision of the House to right it, and the bill was passed in 1960.

Mr. VINSON. You propose to give to this group who retired prior to 1958 the right to recompute, but you do not propose to give those who retire after 1958 this recomputation in the 1963 bill. Why should you make fish of one and fowl of the other? If we are on sound ground in one instance why not extend it on to those who retire after 1958?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Let me respond to my distinguished chairman. I said awhile ago it does not take me long to understand when I walk into a stone wall. I recognize the wall is there after awhile. But we face the facts of life, and I am willing, despite the fact that I do not agree that we should not give them that right, because age catches up with them.

Mr. VINSON. Will we not have just as much justification——

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I am willing to accept it now even though I think they should have it.

Mr. VINSON. Do they not have just as much justification, those who retire under the new pay bill, the 1963 pay bill, to claim the same rights as you are giving those under the amendment with reference to the pre-1958 retirees?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. If the gentleman agrees that the basic law was wrong in its inception. I do not agree.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is trying to make the point that we did not know it. It has been on the books for 5 years. We stopped it and denied it in 1958. If we are going to open it up, open it up in its entirety. Is the reason why he wants to stop it in the future because he is apprehensive about the rising cost of retired pay? Was he worried in 1958 when we cut it off?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. However, we did not have too much concern for that in 1958 when the House unanimously passed the bill trying to right this terrible law. I know you agree with me that it is a terrible law. We are not putting them under this act. We are putting them under the act on the books in 1958. For the future we have an escalator clause, when the cost of living goes up 3 percent; and we give them notice. It becomes effective automatically.

William Jennings Bryan once said this—if he did not he should have said it—

> The humblest citizen in the land clad in the armor of right can prevail against a whole host of error.

I would rather be wrong on the right side than right on the wrong side.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **CHAIRMAN.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I certainly approve of recomputation, as the gentleman from South Carolina has outlined, and I feel certain that most Members of the House will look sympathetically upon that question.

Mr. Chairman, the most attractive financial inducement for the services of military personnel is the liberal retirement pattern. A part of this pattern has been for many years the privilege of having retirement benefits tied to the pay of personnel on active duty. It has become usual to say that this principle is so expensive that it will eventually jeopardize the entire retirement program. I think this is a misleading statement; for the only thing that can imperil the retirement program is Congress itself. The principle is a generous one but I think it should be maintained not only for those who retired in 1958 but also for subsequent retirees as well. It is a necessary part of our national defense to have a liberal retirement program as this is the method we chiefly use to give adequate financial incentive for military service. I sincerely hope that Congress will approve continuing this principle of computation on the basis of current active duty pay scales.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my endorsement of the bill H.R. 5555, the proposed military pay increase for members of the uniformed services.

The proposal has been thoroughly discussed by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Honorable MENDEL RIVERS of South Carolina, and I will not attempt to add to the detailed explanation.

I would like to point out that in my opinion this bill, if enacted, should go a long way toward solving the serious retention problem in our uniformed services, particularly for those who have acquired skills that are vital to our national defense.

There has been much criticism of some of the actions taken by the committee and much of it concerns the cost of the proposed measure.

Some persons feel that the bill is inadequate; others are concerned about the increased cost to the Government.

First, I think I should mention that today the cost of pay and allowances for the armed services, exclusive of subsistence allowances for enlisted personnel, on an annual basis involves an expenditure in excess of $9,952 million.

The proposal before us would increase the cost of basic pay alone by $847,498,000 on a full fiscal year basis. It will also increase subsistence allowances by about $13 million a year for officers and $77 million a year for enlisted personnel.

You will recall that the President recommended enactment of legislation which would have involved an annual expenditure of $1,238,526,000 for the Department of Defense.

The bill before us involves a cost of $1,191,694,000.

The subcommittee that considered the proposal under the distinguished chairman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], reported a bill to the full committee that would have involved an annual expenditure for the Department of Defense of $1,517 million, which was substantially above that recommended by the Department of Defense.

But in addition, it must be remembered that in the President's military budget message he requested only $900 million for the proposed pay increase for fiscal 1964, since he recommended an October 1, 1963, effective date.

In simple mathematics, the President's budget contained only $900 million, but the subcommittee's recommendation contemplated a fiscal 1964 expenditure of $1,517 million, because it contemplated a July 1, 1963, effective date.

We are all concerned, of course, with the cost of Government and deficit financing, and the pay increase recommended by the subcommittee exceeded the President's budget for military pay by some $617 million for fiscal 1964.

At this point, the committee realized that a $600 million increase in the President's budget might seriously jeopardize the favorable consideration of this very important pay increase.

As a result, the committee made several substantial changes in the subcommittee proposal.

By eliminating increases for those with under 2 years of service, the subcommittee proposal was reduced by almost $136 million.

By eliminating a $30 additional increase across the board for all officers, over and above that recommended by the Department of Defense, another $111,495,000 was removed from the subcommittee proposal.

Another substantial savings of some $32 million came about by committee action providing a straight 5 percent increase in retirement pay, and eliminating the recomputation proposal suggested by the Department of Defense.

All together, the actions of the full committee reduced the subcommittee proposal by $325,489,000 and reduced the overall cost of the bill, on an annual basis, from $1,517 million to $1,191,694,000.

Since the Department proposal originally contemplated an annual expenditure of $1,238 million, you can see that the committee proposal is $46,832,000 under the cost of the Department's proposal.

Finally, because the President had only requested $900 million for the remainder of fiscal 1964, the committee adopted an October 1, 1963 effective date, at a cost of $891,521,000 for the remainder of fiscal 1964, which is $8 million under the President's budget for fiscal 1964.

I think we must bear in mind that while there are some persons who feel that this pay proposal is inadequate, nevertheless it is substantial. It is particularly substantial at the important retention points in our armed services.

You might be interested to know something about the cost of the bill by grade distribution.

For example, the entire cost of the proposed increase for four-star generals and admirals involves an increased expenditure of $32,000.

The cost of the proposed pay increase for three-star admirals and generals is $95,000 annually.

For major generals it is $406,000 annually.

For brigadier generals it is $474,000 annually.

For colonels and Navy captains it is $16,815,000 annually.

For lieutenant colonels and commanders, $40,934,000.

At the important retention grade of major, the cost goes to $63,280,000 annually.

For captains and lieutenants, which is one of the most serious retention points, the cost goes to $92,319,000, and for first lieutenants and lieutenants, junior grade, the cost is $31,424,000.

Among the enlisted personnel, you will be interested to learn that the increase for E–9's, that is the sergeant majors and master chief petty officers, involves an annual expenditure of $10,317,000.

For master sergeants and senior chief petty officers, the E–8's, the annual increased cost is $24,367,000.

For E–7's it is $43 million.

For E–6's, the staff sergeants, the cost is $101,563,000.

For the very important retention points of E–5 and E–4, the cost is $146,953,000 and $135,582,000, respectively.

For E–3's, the cost is $87,791,000.

Whenever we increase military pay scales, we must consider where the individuals are distributed by grade.

For example, there are 269,772 privates with under 2 years of service, and only 35,000 with over 2 and under 3 years of service.

On the other hand, there are only 42,000 E–4's with under 2 years of service, but there are 110,000 with over 2 years of service, 60,000 with over 3 years of service, and 89,000 with over 4 years of service. All together, there are 451,000 E–4's.

As you can see, when you increase pay scales by even $1 a month in these grades, the cost goes up quite rapidly.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to also mention another very important feature of the proposal and that is the proposed family separation allowance.

The cost involved here is relatively small, $42 million a year. Of this amount, it is estimated that enlisted personnel will receive $37,678,000 annually, while officers will receive only $4,301,000.

This is a vital part of the bill before us, for it recognizes, for the first time, the costs involved to the family when the breadwinner is away from home for extended periods of time.

We know, and particularly Members of Congress should know, that maintaining two homes, or maintaining a home where the father is away, can be a very expensive proposition.

Today if you call a plumber to fix a leaky faucet, the cost can be rather substantial.

Most fathers when they are home can do minor repairs around the house, but whenever the father is away from home for a long period of time, one of two things happens: the repairs go unattended or the wife must pay for the cost of the repairs.

I sincerely hope that this new benefit which the committee recommends, will be overwhelmingly approved by the House.

The amount is not large, but it is at least a recognition on the part of the Congress that we sympathize with the wives of our service personnel who are faced with long separations from their husbands.

It has a double significance for it is not only a recognition of long separation, but also an allowance which will permit the service wife to maintain the household for her husband the way it would be maintained if he were home.

Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly support H.R. 5555 and hope that it will receive the overwhelming approval of the House.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I support this pay increase. It is long overdue. We must bear one thing in mind, we get what we pay for.

The last increase in basic pay for members of the uniformed services became effective June 1, 1958. Approximately 5 years have elapsed since this last increase in basic pay was enacted for members of the uniformed services.

Classified employees of the Federal Government, on the other hand, after receiving a pay increase in 1958, received additional increases in 1960 and 1962, and will receive another increase on January 1, 1964. Without question, the hearings conducted by the Armed Services Committee on the proposed legislation established an overwhelming need for an adjustment to the existing rates of compensation for members of the uniformed services. Committee deliberations were almost exclusively concerned with the amount of increase which could logically be proposed and where the distribution of this increase would do the greatest good.

The purpose of H.R. 5555 is to provide increases in basic pay and subsistence allowances; to establish a new method of adjusting retired pay; and to provide other benefits for members of the uniformed services.

The most important single effect of H.R. 5555 is the general increase in basic rates of pay. This statement in no way depreciates the importance of other provisions of the bill but rather reflects the fact that the increases in basic pay apply to the greatest number of people and accounts for the major cost of the proposed bill.

These selective pay increases which would be provided by the bill are expressly designed to alleviate the enlisted and junior officer retention problems existing in the armed services today.

The critical enlisted retention problem in all the services is associated with retaining individuals in most of the technical occupations upon completion of their initial term of service.

The retention of officers beyond their obligated period of service also poses a serious problem for the services. Here the problem facing the Armed Forces is strictly a question of quality. Unless they can attract and retain more officer personnel with the necessary high degree of competence and dedication required, they are faced with a force structure of steadily declining quality completely incompatible with the increased technological and combat leadership demands being placed upon the Armed Forces.

Consequently, for enlisted members the largest percentage increases are provided at the critical retention points in pay grades E-3 and E-4. Substantial increases are also provided for enlisted members in pay grades E-8 and E-9 at the "over 22" and "over 26" years of service point as an incentive for longer career enlisted service.

For officers the largest percentage increases are in the lower grades of first lieutenant through major. The percentage increases are progressively smaller for the higher ranks, so that the percentage increase for flag and general officers is only 5 percent.

The increases in basic pay recommended in H.R. 5555 were originally contained in the proposal of the Department of Defense. However, the increases in basic pay for members with under 2 years of service proposed by the Department of Defense were not concurred in. As I have stated this pay proposal is a career proposal designed to encourage individuals to undertake or continue in a career status beyond the periods of obligated service required by law. Career service in the past, when the services were entirely manned by volunteers, commenced with an individual's initial entry into the Armed Forces. At the present time, and for the foreseeable future, the large numbers of young men who are required to man our Armed Forces cannot be obtained solely from volunteers without the compulsion of selective service laws. Therefore, a dividing line between career service and non-career service has been drawn at the end of the 2-year obligated service period required by law. The action to limit increases in basic pay to those with 2 years and over reduced the total cost of the basic pay increase proposed by the Department of Defense for active duty personnel by $134,226,000.

Aside from the selective increases which are calculated to improve retention there is a general increase in basic pay for all personnel with over 2 years' service. Since 1952 there has been a steady deterioration of the compensation provided members of the uniformed services. Between 1952 and 1962, the median earnings of professional, scientific, technical, and kindred workers, a group generally comparable to officer personnel has increased by 49 percent. During the same period the average earnings of manufacturing-production workers, a group usually associated with enlisted personnel, has increased by 44.8 percent. The cumulative average increase for classified civil service employees in the past 10 years totals 39.8 percent. For members of the uniformed services, on the other hand, the overall average increase in compensation since 1952, including the recent increase in basic allowance for quarters which became effective January 1, 1963, is 16.2 percent. Even with the increases recommended in the proposed legislation, the average increase in total compensation for members of the uniformed services since 1952 will be substantially less than the increases obtained by workers in the private economy and civil service employees.

Up to this point I have been discussing the details of the recommended increases in basic pay as well as the amounts attached thereto. But this pay increase involves more than just dollars and numbers of people. There is a principle which we should bear in mind.

There is no open market in most military skills, where they can be hired on an as-needed basis. Furthermore, a good many of the special burdens of military life are acceptable only to dedicated people and not subject to direct compensation. Nevertheless, we would be sadly mistaken if we concluded that military compensation is somehow immune from competition.

It takes cash income to support and rear a family. Every person in the Armed Forces knows whether he is living better or poorer than his friends in civil life.

We face two realities. First, there has been and it seems likely there will continue to be, a trend to increase individual compensation in both private and public employment; second, we consistently lag this trend in setting military pay scales.

We could, if we liked, let the gap grow wider. Underpaying military personnel saves money—at the moment. At a given moment, the military force is a captive population, bound by terms of enlistment or, in the case of officers, by less specific but still effective commitments. But we can impose this burden only temporarily. We would soon begin paying for it. Some of the payment would be in partially obscured but quite tangible costs—training, for instance. The most serious costs would be in the effectiveness of the Armed Forces, and here the cost could be disastrous.

The pay scale we are here considering provides an average increase of 12.5 percent. This average is significant only as an index of cost in relation to the cost of the current pay scale. Within this overall amount the scale purposefully allocates bigger increases in the most critical segments of the career population, goes down to as little as 5 percent in other areas, and in the case of beginners provides no increase.

Immediate needs have been the principal concern of the Committee on Armed Services in making the recommendations contained in H.R. 5555. Considered solely as a pay matter the proposed scale is probably less than is justified and desirable.

Its limitations obviously are dictated in some measure by the budgetary situation in which we find ourselves, and I wish it were possible to meet this problem more adequately.

But it should be understood clearly that the proposed bill will not be permanently valid. We should be aware that under present trends military pay needs to be adjusted more frequently than at 5-year intervals. Unintentionally, but actually, the Federal Government in its lag in adjusting military pay much of the time has effectively loaded a disproportionate share of the defense costs on the people who man the establishment. This is neither a fair nor a sound policy.

The details on other aspects of the bill will be covered by several of my colleagues. I would like to conclude my statement with a few words about the overall cost and the effective date.

Enactment of this proposed legislation will require additional annual appropriations to the Department of Defense in the approximate amount of $1.2 billion. For fiscal year 1964 the increase would be slightly less than $900 million since the proposed legislation submitted to the Congress by the Department of Defense contained an effective date of October 1, 1963.

The President, in his budget submission to the Congress for fiscal year 1964, included only $900 million to cover the cost of the proposed legislation on the basis of an October 1, 1963, effective date.

The committee recognizes that in the Military Pay Acts of 1949, 1952, 1955, and 1958, the Congress established a pattern of providing that pay increases for members of the Armed Forces would become effective on the first day of the first month after enactment. In addition, testimony before the committee during the course of the hearings on the proposed legislation established beyond question that the proposed pay increase for members of the uniformed services is long overdue.

Nonetheless, in view of the practical limitations imposed by the President's budget for fiscal year 1964, the committee has reluctantly acceded to the recommendations of the Department of Defense. Accordingly, the proposed legislation provides for an effective date of October 1, 1963, or the first day of the first month after enactment, whichever is later. The fiscal cost for 1964, assuming an October 1, 1963, effective date, is $891,521,000, or $8,479,000 less than the President's budget proposal.

We believe that H.R. 5555, as it stands, is an urgent need—no less urgent than the dollars we shall appropriate for the most critical of our weapons programs. The Committee on Armed Services strongly endorses enactment of the proposed legislation.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER].

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, I concur in a great deal of the remarks of my distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS]. As a member of the committee I think we all feel that we would like very much, because of the dedication of our military personnel, to double the amount of this bill and give all we believe they need and deserve. I think we are restricted in our thinking a great deal in trying to justify what we are doing because of the vast billions of dollars that are voted by the Congress for every type of boondoggling project you can imagine, except for those dedicated people who preserve the security of this Nation and the free world.

I have said on the floor of the House before and I have been challenged for this, perhaps facetiously or cynically, but I have said time and again that our military leaders of this Nation have won every war in our history. Every war in our history has been won because of our military leaders and our fighting youth of this Nation, but it has been our civilian leaders that have lost every peace and put the world in the mess it is in today.

I only wish we could do more than we are doing now. But what I have in mind distinctly is what I would call the dedication of the men in our military service. Yet I read yesterday of the disgraceful action taken by the Secretary of Defense against one of the greatest naval officers, one of the greatest military officers we have ever had, one of the finest men it has ever been my privilege to know, Admiral George Anderson, being retired as Chief of Naval Operations. There were some very flowery statements about his fine service, and intimations that he might be kicked upstairs to an ambassadorship. This is a disgraceful action.

We passed in 1958, a pay bill so that we might retain military personnel and not spend billions of dollars for retraining new men all the time. This did not have its desired effect, nor will this bill have its desired effect. What will have the desired effect is the recognition of the motivation and dedication of those men who give their lives for the security of this Nation. We are not going to do this with pay bills alone. We are not going to do it on this floor today. We can only hope we will alleviate their financial condition and the housing and other conditions under which they have to live in many trying situations over the world.

I would like to quote for a moment an editorial, and I am not addicted to editorial writers because there is one editorial on the same page of today's Evening Star criticizing me. In the bottom editorial they have, "Mr. BECKER's Blackout." Above, they say in this editorial in the Evening Star:

> We think that Admiral Anderson was denied another term as Chief of Naval Operations, or at least a 1-year extension, for two principal reasons. One was his plain-spoken opposition, when called to testify by the McClellan committee, to Mr. McNamara's TFX project. The other, and perhaps lesser reason, was his criticism of the military pay bill. But the two statements, read together, do not make sense. They are an affront to the intelligence of a child.

Then they go on further to say:

> If, as we believe, TFX was an important if not a dominant factor in what has happened to Admiral Anderson, doubts are raised in our mind as to whether Mr. McNamara is a "big" man as well as a competent man.

Further:

> Mr. McNamara should be the boss, but it does not follow that he should be a czar and absolute master in his own domain.

Mr. Chairman, the editorial in full is as follows:

> THE FIRING OF ADMIRAL ANDERSON
>
> Adm. George W. Anderson's distinguished career in the Navy has been torpedoed by Defense Secretary McNamara. Those who are willing to buy one or both of the official explanations which have been offered are welcome to do so. We do not buy either.
>
> We think that Admiral Anderson was denied another term as Chief of Naval Operations, or at least a 1-year extension, for two principal reasons. One was his plain-spoken opposition, when called to testify by the McClellan committee, to Mr. McNamara's TFX project. The other, and perhaps lesser reason, was his criticism of the military pay bill.
>
> In this connection we make one point. The official spokesman at the Pentagon says Mr. McNamara and the President believe that 2 years should be a normal tour as service chief except in extraordinary circumstances. Well and good. But the President, in announcing that Admiral Anderson was being dumped overboard, also said that "he has served with great distinction during a critical period in this Nation's history." We realize that praise of this sort has become more or less the conventional thing when the executioner is getting set for his task. But the two statements, read together, do not make sense. They are an affront to the intelligence of a child.
>
> Our concern, however, runs to more than the injustice which, as we see it, has been done to Admiral Anderson. He had reached the top in the Navy, and this denial of a second term as Chief of Naval Operations does not necessarily mean a blighted career for the future. But what about the Secretary of Defense? And what about those other service people who, one day, will find themselves in Admiral Anderson's position?
>
> As for the Secretary, we have already made plain our belief that his decision on the TFX was the right one. We haxe expressed our respect for his competence and stated in addition that the Pentagon should and must be run by a strong civilian. The Secretary of Defense ought to be just that—the Secretary of Defense. He should not allow himself to be pushed around by generals or admirals. But this affair shakes us up a bit. If, as we believe, TFX was an important if not a dominant factor in what has happened to Admiral Anderson, doubts are raised in our mind as to whether Mr. McNamara is a "big" man as well as a competent man.
>
> Of possibly greater importance is the effect that the timing of the Anderson ouster can be expected to have on other service officers when called in the future to testify before congressional committees.
>
> Mr. McNamara, or so we are told, doesn't care much what people say or think about him. He is too busy running the Defense Department. But he ought to care—especially when he is trying both to install new management techniques in the Pentagon and to shake up the services a bit. Mr. McNamara should be the boss. But it doesn't follow that he should be a czar—an absolute master in his own domain.
>
> For, whether he realizes it or not, he has a partner in this defense enterprise—and it will never be a silent partner. This partner is the Congress, representing the people of the United States. We do not think that Congress should conduct nit-picking harassments of the Secretary of Defense. But we do believe, and very strongly, that the appropriate committees of Congress are entitled to know what is going on in the Pentagon and that they should be able to call the service chiefs, or other officers, before them and have the benefit of their uninhibited, unintimidated, and completely honest opinions on matters affecting the security of the United States.
>
> It is not our intention to say that Mr. McNamara is deliberately trying to gag the service people. But we think that is the effect of what he has done in the case of Admiral Anderson and, to a lesser extent, in the case of General LeMay. Unless the atmosphere in this respect is cleared, and convincingly cleared, we fear that many officers in the future will hesitate to give testimony to ar.y congressional committee which brings them into conflict with a strong-willed Secretary of Defense. Surely it is not necessary to argue the point that this is potentially dangerous for the people of the United States—dangerous both to their security and, someday perhaps, to their freedom.

Mr. Chairman, let me remind you of this. We appoint young men, the finest young men, the cream of the crop from our district to the Naval Academy at Annapolis, the Air Force Academy at Denver, and to the Military Academy at West Point. Why do we appoint them? What do we do in our investigation and in our efforts? We try to get the best men we can get because we want motivated, dedicated young men who will be the military leaders of this Nation and who will continue, God willing, when we are in trouble, so that we will be able to win not only the battle but the war.

I say what has happened to George Anderson is a disgrace to this Nation. It is not the first time it has happened. But as one American, and as one Member of this House, I say to you, while we are discussing a pay bill, providing for pay increase and other emoluments, let us not forget that this is not going to pay for the dedication of these men, but we do want to show respect for their service and their intelligence and their ability and an appreciation of their willingness to serve and to give advice to our civilian leaders. They must also be heard and recognized because of their experience and ability.

Mr. Chairman, I wish I had the time to say more not only about George Anderson, but I would mention Gen. Curtis LeMay, Adm. Arleigh Burke, General MacArthur and many others. There was Billy Mitchell in the First World War. The way we have treated some of these men by our civilian leaders is a disgrace to this Nation, and God knows we need these men.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 27 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as the chairman of the subcommittee has indicated, this is not a dramatic bill, it is not a glamorous presentation that we are making before you today, and we purposely approach it in that way. There is no need for us to talk about the *Thresher* or the men who gave their lives on that ship; or the accounts in the newspapers about the widows of those men and the talk about the small pittance that they received after their husbands had lost their lives. We are not talking about those who only last week in California went down on the *Andrew Jackson* on its first trial run—another Polaris submarine. We are all old enough to understand the facts without having recourse to that emotional kind of discussion.

Mr. Chairman, the basic purpose of H.R. 5555, the proposed Uniformed Services Pay Act of 1963 is threefold:

First. It would provide selective increases in basic pay and subsistence allowances.

Second. It would establish a new method for adjusting retirement or retainer pay in the future based on increases in the cost of living.

Third. It would correct certain inequities in the present compensation system for service members.

Mr. Chairman, the overall increase which would be made by this bill in the present level of expenditures for basic pay and allowances for military personnel of our Active Forces is approximately 10 percent.

A comparison between increases in the pay of military personnel and increases in the pay of civilian employees of the Government for the past 10 years shows that the pending bill gives only a very modest increase in the compensation of military personnel.

For example, in 1955, classified civil service employees received a 7.5-percent increase in compensation; in 1958 they received a 10-percent increase; in 1960 they received a 7.7-percent increase; in 1962 they received a 5.5-percent increase, and will receive a further increase of 4.1 percent on January 1, 1964.

In contrast, the basic pay scales for members of the uniformed services have been increased only twice in the past 10 years.

In the case of military personnel, Congress in 1955 provided an average increase in basic compensation of 6.7 percent. In 1958 military personnel received an average increase in basic compensation of 6.2 percent. Thus, the last time that the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services were increased was some 5 years ago.

In 1962 Congress, for the first time in 10 years, authorized a sorely needed increase in the basic allowance for quarters for members of the uniformed services. The effective date of the increase, however, was delayed until January 1, 1963.

For military personnel this increase in the quarters allowance represented an average increase of 2.5 percent in basic compensation. All the percentages I have stated represent percentage increases in the budget estimates for basic pay, quarters and subsistence allowances for personnel on active duty.

Expressed another way, the cumulative percentage of pay increases provided by Congress since 1952 for classified civil service employees is 39.8 percent. For military personnel over the same period, Congress has provided a cumulative increase of 16.2 percent including the recent increase in the basic allowance for quarters.

It has been said before and it is just as true today, that pay alone is not, and never has been, the primary motivation for a career in the armed services.

We could never compensate in dollars for the hazards and privations that members of the armed services must be prepared to accept, and do accept, in wearing the uniform of their country. But, what Congress can do, and in simple justice ought to do, is to extend to our service men and women the same consideration that we have consistently demonstrated in providing pay increases for civilian employees of the Government.

I believe, particularly in the case of members of the uniformed services who have no unions to bargain for them, that the Congress has a duty to see to it that the rates of pay for service members are regularly adjusted to conform to the pattern of steadily increasing earnings in the United States.

Such a policy is in the national interest and is the only sound one in the long run. It is the only policy which can make it possible for the armed services to attract and retain their fair share of our best young men for career service.

THE PROBLEM—INADEQUATE RETENTION

Mr. Chairman, our national commitments require military personnel to serve in many locations where their dependents cannot accompany them. Our troops, ships, and aircraft squadrons are deployed in instant readiness for combat, and personnel so deployed must undergo considerable hardship, including long separations from their homes and families. The combination of inadequate pay and personal hardship is effectively preventing the Armed Forces from attracting sufficient young candidates for career military service, while at the same time, personnel with substantial investments of service are quitting the Armed Forces.

The loss of highly trained personnel, particularly in the enlisted technician category, and the loss of young officers, especially flying and submarine officers, is very expensive in terms of the money required for their training. More important, it is damaging to the combat efficiency of the Armed Forces.

In order to maintain the required force structure, the military services must recruit or draft annually about 450,000 men to replace an equivalent number leaving the service. Thus, the total administrative load, or the in-and-out problem generated by such turnover, is more than 900,000 men a year. Training costs of the military services total about $2,500 million a year.

Mr. Chairman, increased retention of skilled manpower not only means increased operational efficiency, but also that a substantial investment in technical training costs would be preserved. For example, it costs $8,530 to train an Army electronic guidance systems repairman; $12,550 to train an Air Force nuclear weapons specialist.

All of the services are short of the desired number of careerists in the electronics and other technical career fields. The Army is short 19,100 careerists in electronics, and another 10,200 in other technical specialties. The Navy is short 34,000 careerists in electronics, and 18,600 career mechanics and repairmen.

The services are procuring and training sufficient numbers to have the desired 60 to 65 percent career force in electronics, but too few are reenlisting for the career force. In 1962, out of 39,000 fully trained electronics specialists who were eligible to reenlist, only 9,936 reenlisted. The 29,000 who did not reenlist represented a training loss of $135 million, and an experience loss that is impossible to estimate.

I could cite many other examples but I will mention only a few more for illustration of the problem.

To train an aviation fire control technician for the Navy costs $7,580. The desired career ratio for this skill is over 50 percent; the actual career ratio is 34 percent. Similarly, it costs $6,660 to train a Navy aviation electronics technician but only one out of three men in this skill is a career man.

The Army spends $8,530 to train an electronics guidance repairman for surface-to-surface missiles. Only 15 percent trained in this field are reenlisted for a second term; 85 percent leave the service.

Not all the problems are in the electronics field. It costs $8,000 to train a teletypewriter maintenance man, and the Army needs 60 percent of these men to be careerists. It has only 40 percent who are careerists.

It costs $5,300 to train a specialist in the communications security field and it takes a full enlistment to reach acceptable proficiency. Yet, the Army has only 18 percent careerists in this field.

The problems of inadequate retention and associated high replacement training costs are not limited to enlisted personnel.

When officers leave after serving a minimum tour of duty—and approximately two out of three do leave—the cost of procuring and training replacements must also be repeated.

In particular, pilots leaving the service represent a large investment. It costs a minimum of $75,000 to put an Air Force pilot through pilot training; and an additional $200,000 to qualify him in a fighter aircraft such as the F-102, for a total cost of $275,000.

During the next fiscal year, it is estimated that some 525 Air Force pilots alone will voluntarily leave the service, representing an investment cost of $130 million.

Retention rates of officers in other fields are equally disturbing. The Air Force, with a critical need for officers in the scientific and engineering skills is retaining only about 15 percent of such officers upon completion of their obligated service. In some research and development specialties, the retention rate is as low as 7 percent. The Army is retaining only 16 percent of its Judge Advocate General officers, and 19 percent of its engineers. The Navy experience is equally poor.

These are the facts, among others, which principally determined the pattern of the proposed basic pay increases which I will now discuss.

BASIC PAY INCREASE

Mr. Chairman, no Member of the House should let the cost of the bill mislead him into thinking that the selective increases in basic pay which the bill would provide are generous in any respect.

The plain and simple fact is that the sheer size of the Armed Forces which our national security requires makes even a modest pay increase for service members bulk large in terms of total cost.

For example, to increase the pay of all members of the Armed Forces by even $10 a month would mean a total annual increased cost of $382 million. The fact of force size alone, and the fact that some 5 years have elapsed since the last increase in basic pay for service members, make self-evident the reasons for the cost of the bill.

Let me tell you, generally, what we have done with reference to the increase in basic pay.

With one major exception the rates of basic pay in this bill correspond to rates originally recommended by the Department of Defense. The major exception is that the Department of Defense had proposed increases in basic pay for all members irrespective of length of service. The committee rejected this proposal. Under this bill before you, no increase is provided for members with less than 2 years of service for pay purposes. For members with more than 2 years of service for pay purposes, the average increase is 14.7 percent.

The pattern of selective pay increases which would be provided by this bill has been expressly designed to alleviate the enlisted and junior officer retention problems I have described.

For officers, the highest percentage increase, about 18 percent, is provided at the critical retention points in the grades of first lieutenant and captain. The amount of the increase is progressively less for each higher grade. The average increase for majors is 15.1 percent; for lieutenant colonels, 12.1 percent; for colonels, 10 percent; and for flag and general officers, 5 percent.

For enlisted members the largest percentage increases, in general, go to members in pay grade E–3, 18 percent; and in pay grade E–4, 16 percent. The smallest increase, 4.8 percent, would be provided for members in pay grade E–1 with more than 2 years of service.

The critical point in the career decision for most enlisted members is at the 3- to 4-year service point. By that time the average enlisted man has advanced to the grade of E–4 and is seriously eyeing the pay rates for the E–5. Accordingly, this bill provides a basic pay increase of $30 a month to the E–4 with over 4 years of service, and a $30 increase to the E–5 with over 6 years of service. This amounts to a 17.6-percent increase in basic pay for the E–4, and a 14.3-percent increase for the E–5. We hope that these increases will prove sufficient to encourage a significant number of enlisted men to seek career status at this critical decision point.

The largest increases, dollarwise, would go to enlisted members in the three highest enlisted pay grade, E–7, E–8, and E–9. Under the present pay scale, enlisted members in pay grades E–8 and E–9 receive only one longevity increase of $10 a month between 20 and 30 years of service, and the E–7 receives no longevity increases. As a result, most of these highly skilled noncommissioned officers leave the service at the 20- or 22-year point.

The bill would correct this deficiency in the present pay scale by providing significant incentive increases for all three senior enlisted grades at the 22- and 26-year service points. At the 22-year point, the increase for the E–7 will be $50 a month; for the E–8 and E–9, $70. At the 26-year point, the E–7 will receive a $100 a month increase, and the E–8 and E–9 will each receive a $120 a month more.

At present, the maximum basic pay an E–7, master sergeant, can receive is $350, after 20 years' service. This bill will increase that to $450. For an E–9, the present maximum is $440 after 22 years of service. Under this bill he would receive $560 a month in basic pay after 26 years' service.

JUSTIFICATION FOR PROPOSED PAY RATES

Mr. Chairman, the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services were last increased in 1958. Since that time, increases in earnings of workers in private industry, and of civilian employees of the Federal Government have created a substantial disparity between service pay and the compensation available elsewhere for comparable skills and responsibilities.

For example, the indexes of earnings in private industry show that the average pay of officers has lagged substantially behind increases in earnings elsewhere in the economy. Since 1958, the median earnings of full-time employed, professional, scientific, and technical workers, a group generally comparable to officer personnel, has been increasing about 3 percent a year.

For classified civil service employees in grades GS–8 through GS–12, which in general are related, paywise, to the commissioned officer grades of first lieutenant through major, Congress, since 1958, has provided cumulative pay increases—including phase 2 of the 1962 increase—ranging from 19 to 23 percent.

It can be seen, therefore, that even the maximum increase of 18 percent in basic pay which this bill would provide for first lieutenants and captains is not excessive when compared to the pay increases achieved by the other groups I have mentioned.

The 5-percent increase which this bill would provide for flag and general officers is based on the increase in the cost of living since 1958 as reflected in the Consumer Price Index. In other words, for the most senior officers, this bill does no more than maintain the purchasing power of their basic pay at the 1958 level.

With respect to enlisted members, the bill now before the House would provide an average increase of 14.5 percent in basic pay. Since 1958 the average hourly earnings, excluding overtime, of production workers in manufacturing has increased 15.1 percent. The average earnings of Army-Air Force wage board blue collar workers, a group generally comparable to enlisted personnel, has increased by 20 percent since 1958.

The proposed average increase in basic pay for enlisted members is therefore fairly close to the average increase in hourly earnings of production workers in industry, but less than the average increase in earnings since 1958 for blue collar workers of the Department of Defense.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is clear from the facts I have cited that the proposed average increase in basic pay for both officers and enlisted members is in no way excessive and will do no more than narrow the gap which has developed between service pay and the earnings of workers elsewhere in the economy.

INCENTIVE HAZARDOUS-DUTY PAY

The bill now before the House would also amend existing law governing entitlement to incentive hazardous-duty pay. Although these changes are minimal from a cost standpoint, they would correct certain deficiencies and inequities in existing law. The amendments that would be made pertain to submarine pay, incentive pay for high-pressure chamber duty, and multiple payments of incentive pay.

SUBMARINE PAY

We all know and realize the importance of our submarine fleet. This essential element of our defense posture is being expanded, and conventional submarines are giving way to vastly more complicated, nuclear-powered, missile-firing submarines. The conversion and strengthening of our submarine fleet requires extensive retraining of individuals now qualified in and assigned to conventional submarines, as well as thousands of new volunteers. However, existing law does not authorize submarine pay during time spent in training as a prospective member of a submarine being constructed, or during periods of instruction to prepare for assignment to a submarine of advanced design. Yet, when these multi-million-dollar submarines slide into the water, their crews are expected to be fully qualified to operate them as fighting units of the fleet.

The limitations of existing law have seriously hampered the Navy in obtaining sufficient volunteers from personnel qualified in submarines. The reason is one of pure economics. Officers and men already qualified in submarines and receiving submarine pay, cannot afford to voluntarily give up their submarine pay while undergoing training for assignment to submarines of advanced design.

The bill now before the House will correct this inequity by authorizing, in the case of personnel already qualified in submarines, the payment of submarine pay during periods of instruction to prepare for assignment to a submarine of advanced design, or a position of increased responsibility on a submarine. The annual cost of this provision would be $2,065,000.

HIGH-PRESSURE-CHAMBER DUTY

The second change in incentive pay for hazardous duty concerns those officers and enlisted members performing duty as an observer or in any other capacity "inside a high- or low-pressure chamber." The present law authorizes monthly hazardous-duty payments of $110 for officers and $55 for enlisted members on duty as a "low-pressure chamber inside observer" only. The present bill would merely extend the special pay to include duty in a high-pressure chamber as well as a low-pressure chamber, regardless of whether or not the individual is an observer.

The risks taken and the training required to work in a high-pressure environment are similar to those in a low-pressure environment and should be equally compensated. The annual cost of this provision would be $145,000.

MULTIPLE HAZARDS

In the Military Establishment today the mission of certain units requires members to expose themselves concurrently to two or more hazards, any one of which would qualify them to receive incentive-hazardous duty pay. For example, certain demolition experts are required to train as parachutists and to jump into areas to neutralize explosives. This bill would duly recognize the multiple hazard involved in such duties by providing that members required to regularly perform two or more hazardous duties be authorized to receive not more than two incentive pays a month. The annual cost of this provision would be $1,941,000.

INCREASE IN SUBSISTENCE ALLOWANCES

Mr. Chairman, this bill would also increase, for the first time in 11 years, the basic allowances for subsistence for officers and enlisted members. It is an adjustment that is obviously long overdue if this element of basic compensation for service members is to continue to fulfill its intended function.

OFFICERS

For officers, the present rate of $47.88 a month would be increased to $51 a month or, in other words, an increase of $3.12 a month. This is a 6.6-percent increase over the present rate and is based on the increase in the cost of food since 1952 as reflected in the Consumer Price Index.

I wish to point out, Mr. Chairman, that the Department of Defense recommended that the subsistence allowance for officers be increased from $47.88 a month to $77 a month. Under the Department of Defense proposal, the increased cost in subsistence allowance for officers would have been $122 million annually. The Department of Defense, however, did not recommend any increase in the subsistence allowances for enlisted members.

The Committee on Armed Services did not accept the recommendation of the Department of Defense. Under the lesser amount recommended by the committee, the increased annual cost for subsistence for officers would be $13 million, or $109 million less than the cost that would have resulted from the Defense proposal. This means that under the bill now before the House, each officer would receive $26 a month less in basic compensation than was recommended by the Department of Defense. At the same time, however, the increase in subsistence allowances which this bill would provide for enlisted members will increase the take-home pay of enlisted members by $77,549,000 a year.

ENLISTED MEMBERS

You will recall that under existing law three different subsistence allowances are prescribed for enlisted members depending upon the conditions applicable. Two of the rates are prescribed by statute. The third rate is established administratively by the Secretary of Defense and is applicable to enlisted members authorized to ration separately.

The number of enlisted men presently authorized to ration separately is about 800,000. Generally, these are career enlisted men who are married and subsist with their families. Under existing law these enlisted members are entitled to an amount equivalent to the actual cost of the ration as determined by the Secretary of Defense. At present this amount is $1.03 a day, or about $31 a month. It reflects only the cost of the food to the Government to feed the member if he were subsisting in the mess hall.

Under this bill, for the first time in the history of the military pay system, enlisted members authorized to ration separately will be entitled to a statutory monthly amount. The amount prescribed in the bill is $37.50 a month, or the equivalent of $1.25 a day on a 30-day month.

The Committee on Armed Services believes that the proposed amount of $37.50 a month for an enlisted member to subsist separately is an eminently reasonable and modest one in light of its intended function. Certainly, it more nearly approximates the cost of meals served in the mess hall since the present amount of $1.03 a day does not recognize the added cost to the Government of procuring, shipping, storing, and issuing the raw food to the mess halls, nor the cost of preparing and serving it.

At the same time, by placing the subsistence allowance for enlisted members on a monthly basis, the bill would effect a highly desirable simplification and modernization of the present system.

The increased annual cost resulting from this proposed increase in the amount of the subsistence allowance for enlisted members who ration separately would be $54 million.

The other changes in rates for subsistence allowance which would be made by the bill would affect relatively few members.

The first of these changes would increase from $2.57 a day to $97.50 a month—equivalent to $3.25 a day—the subsistence allowance for enlisted members who do not have a field ration mess available, and whose duty assignment requires them to incur subsistence expenses substantially in excess of those incurred by other members authorized to ration separately.

At present, there are approximately 63,000 enlisted members who receive the $2.57-a-day subsistence allowance. However, from testimony developed during the course of hearings on this provision, it was ascertained that some of these men are assigned to areas where messing facilities or commissaries are available, although not at the installation to which they actually report. Obviously, for these men the cost of subsisting is not substantially greater than for the enlisted man assigned to a base where messing facilities or a commissary are available, but who is authorized to mess separately. Therefore, under the language of this bill, some enlisted members now receiving the $2.57 daily subsistence allowance would only be entitled to receive the lower $1.25-a-day rate. Others now receiving $2.57 a day and performing duties which actually require them to incur substantially increased subsistence would receive $97.50 a month—$3.25 a day equivalent.

The change represents an increase of 26 percent and is based on the increase in the cost of meals served in restaurants since 1952 when the last previous adjustment to this rate was made. The annual increased cost of this provision in the bill would be $15 million.

The third rate which would be changed by the bill is the rate presently authorized for enlisted personnel assigned to duty under emergency conditions where no messing facilities of the United States are available. Under existing law this rate is $3.42 a day. The number of enlisted men—about 800 a year—who receive this amount is extremely small and such assignments invariably are of short duration. Under the bill the new rate would be $129.30 a month. This is equivalent to $4.31 a day on a 30-day month, or a 26-percent increase. It, too, is based on the increased cost since 1952 of eating in restaurants, as reflected in the Consumer Price Index. The annual increased cost of this provision in the bill would be $274,000.

NEW FAMILY SEPARATION ALLOWANCE

Mr. Chairman, one of the most acute problems confronting service members is the lack of any reimbursement to them for the additional expenses caused by lengthy, enforced separation of service families.

To correct this inequity and to alleviate the financial hardships caused by the added expenses which result from such enforced separations, the bill now before the House would establish a new allowance to be known as a family separation allowance.

Briefly, this provision of the bill will do two things:

First, it provides an additional quarter allowance to members with dependents who are assigned to an oversea station without their dependents and where bachelor quarters are not available for the service members.

Under such circumstances, the effect of existing law is that the service member is required to find quarters on the local economy and pay for such quarters out of his own pocket. This inequity would be corrected by the bill in that it would authorize, in effect, reimbursement to the member for this additional, necessary expense.

Second, it provides to all eligible members—pay grade E-4 with 4 years of service and all pay grades above—when separated from their families for a period of 30 consecutive days or longer, an allowance of $30 a month or one-third the amount of the basic allowance for quarters of a member of the same grade without dependents, whichever is greater. This means that the range of this allowance would be a minimum of $30 to a maximum of $53 a month. To qualify for this allowance, the family separation must be involuntary; that is, due to exigencies of the service, and the dependents of the service member must not be occupying Government quarters during the absence of the service member.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the need and justification for the proposed family separation allowance are all too evident to require extended discussion.

It must be recognized that as a result of the continuing tensions of cold war, more and more members of the uniformed services are being separated from their families for longer periods of time, and on a recurring basis.

For example, in the Tactical Air Command, 49 percent of all personnel assigned to that command were away from their home bases without their families for more than 6 months out of each of the last two preceding fiscal years.

During calendar year 1962, the 14 carriers of the U.S. fleet were absent from home ports for an average of 329 days out of the 366 of the year.

Many of our service personnel are assigned to isolated points where their families cannot join them, such as radar sites and duty in the Antarctic. It is obvious that when the breadwinner of a family is away from home for extended periods of time, the cost of maintaining the household increases. This includes the expense of hiring help to do the various handyman jobs that are normally taken care of by the husband when the family is together, such as home and automobile maintenance and repair, yard maintenance, and increased child care expenses.

Mr. Chairman, it is too much to ask of our service members that they not only undergo enforced separations from their families for extended periods, but also pay out of their pockets all the extra expenses to their families which result from these separations. The assistance which this proposed allowance would provide will do a great deal to ease the present burden on our serivcemen and their families.

The estimated annual cost of this section of the bill for the Department of Defense is approximately $42 million.

EXCLUDING HAWAII AS FOREIGN-DUTY STATION

Among the proposals made by the Department of Defense to the Committee on Armed Services was the elimination of sea- and foreign-duty pay for enlisted personnel. The committee rejected this proposal.

Under existing law only enlisted members receive sea- and foreign-duty pay. Such pay was eliminated for officers in 1949. The amounts of sea- and foreign-duty pay today for enlisted members range from $8 a month to $22.50 a month, depending on the grade of the enlisted member concerned.

We believe that the present system of sea- and foreign-duty pay is essential for morale purposes and in recognition of the many unpleasant aspects of such duty. Enlisted members at sea for long periods of time most often live under crowded, cramped conditions. Enlisted members on foreign duty and in Alaska must often serve in undesirable areas for extended periods of time.

The committee does believe, however, that existing law should be amended so that entitlement to foreign duty pay shall not include duty in the State of Hawaii, and the bill would so provide.

PROPOSED CHANGES AFFECTING RETIREMENT PAY

Mr. Chairman, this bill also contains three major provisions affecting retirement pay for members of the uniformed services. In effect, these provisions would accomplish the following:

NEW METHOD FOR FUTURE ADJUSTMENTS OF RETIRED PAY

To replace the former system of recomputation of retired pay based on changes in active duty pay rates and which was in effect prior to June 1, 1958, a new statutory method is provided for adjustment of retirement or retainer pay in the future.

The proposed new system is essentially the same as the system prescribed by the Congress in the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962 for adjustment of annuities of civil service retirees. Future adjustments of retired pay for members of the uniformed services would be based on increases in the cost of living as reflected in the Consumer Price Index. Whenever the increase is equal to or greater than 3 percent since the last adjustment of retirement pay or retainer pay, then all retired pay rates would be increased by the same percentage.

APPLICATION OF PROPOSED PAY SCALES TO PERSONNEL WHO RETIRE IN 1963

The proposed legislation provides that personnel who became entitled to retired or retainer pay during calendar year 1963 will be paid retired or retainer pay on the new rates contained in the bill. The committee considers this provision to be fully justified in fairness to the many retirees who have no control over their separation date during this calendar year. This situation has become accentuated by the fact that the proposed effective date for the proposed legislation is October 1, 1963 or the first day of the first month after enactment, whichever is later.

The services all have programs to reduce the World War II hump in certain grades and to revitalize the force. Many members also face mandatory retirement due to physical disability, age, and completion of certain mandatory years of service.

Recommendations of the Department of Defense for increases in the basic pay scales were submitted to the Congress on the 25th day of January 1963. Almost without exception, therefore, the service members who retired, or will be retired, during this calendar year were still on active duty when the proposed new rates of basic pay were submitted to the Congress. The Committee on Armed Services believes that these service members have rightfully earned the extension to them of the proposed new rates of basic pay.

Accordingly, the bill would authorize the retired pay of members retired at any time during 1963, and before the effective date of the bill, to be computed on the proposed new rates of basic pay.

FIVE-PERCENT INCREASE IN RETIREMENT PAY

Mr. Chairman, the third important provision affecting retired personnel would provide a 5-percent increase in present rates of retirement pay or retainer pay for all other retired personnel.

The proposed increase of 5 percent is based on the increase in the cost of living between 1958 and 1962 as reflected in the Consumer Price Index.

None of the provisions that I have mentioned affecting the rates of retired pay are retroactive. The new rates would be payable only from and after the effective date of this bill.

ANNUAL COST—SUMMARY

Mr. Chairman, in view of the various provisions contained in the bill now under consideration, and the importance of this bill to all members of the uniformed services, I believe it would be helpful to the Members of the House for me to summarize at this point the cost aspects of the bill as a whole.

Under this bill, the total annual cost of the proposed increases in pay and allowance for military personnel will be $1,191,694,000. Of this total, $1,052,630,000 is for active personnel, $68,845,000 for Reserves in a drill pay status, and $70,219,000 for retired personnel—$383,005,000 will go to officers, $808,633,000 to enlisted personnel, and $56,000 to officer candidates and cadets.

The proposed increase in basic pay for active and reserve personnel accounts for $915,156,000 and the increase in subsistence, $90,560,000. These will have the further effect of increasing other items linked to either or both of these, such as reenlistment bonus, terminal leave pay, severance pay, reserve readjustment, social security, and death gratuity, by $75,114,000. Nearly all of the remainder for active and reserve personnel results from the proposed family separation allowance when exigencies of the service prevent families from living at or near the duty station. The annual cost of the family separation allowance will be $41,979,000.

The annual cost of H.R. 5555 is $46,832,000 below the cost of the Defense Department proposal. This reduction was accomplished even though the committee refused the Department's proposals, to abolish sea and foreign duty pay—which is only paid to enlisted personnel—and to deny any increase in basic pay for drills attended by Reserve members in an obligatory status. Also, the committee added $77,549,000 for an increase in subsistence allowances for enlisted personnel, who had received no increase in this item since 1952. The reduction in the total cost was accomplished by eliminating any increases in basic pay for members with less than 2 years of service and by reducing the proposed increase in the subsistence allowance for officers.

The total cost includes the extension of the scope of submarine pay to include time devoted to certain types of training, at a cost of $2,065,000. Also, it is proposed to allow the concurrent payment of two types of hazardous duty incentive pay in appropriate circumstances, at a cost of $1,979,000.

All of the costs I have stated are on an annual basis. However, it is proposed to have the increases become effective on October 1, 1963, or on the first day of the month following enactment, whichever is later. If the effective date is October 1, 1963, the increase in cost for fiscal year 1964 will be $891,521,000.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, I have covered the major provisions of the bill. I believe the bill provides, at minimum cost, a sorely needed and long overdue pay increase for members of the uniformed services. I believe the selective pay increases which are provided by the bill have been placed where they are most needed and will be the most effective in attracting and retaining trained personnel for career service.

I cannot overemphasize the fact that without trained and experienced personnel, the effort and billions of dollars we spend on weapons, ships, planes and submarines could be wasted.

The Armed Forces are responsible for the security of the United States. They must be ready and effective. To be ready and effective they must be able to attract and retain adequate numbers of our best people.

I have high hopes for the results which may be achieved by the enactment of this bill. I believe that the reduced training costs made possible by improved retention of highly trained officers and enlisted members will offset in substantial part the cost of the bill.

I know that increased retention of our skilled officers and enlisted members will be reflected in increased combat capability, making this bill an essential and worthwhile investment in our national security.

I sincerely trust the bill will be favorably received by the House and that it will be adopted.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, last week end when I was home a number of servicemen engaged in recruiting duty and who, therefore, live off the post where no rations are available, called on me and expressed concern that their allowance of $2.57 a day would be cut to $1.25 by the passage of this bill. On page 23 of the committee report the language regarding subsistence allowances indicates to me that their fears were unfounded. In fact, their $2.57 will be increased to $3.25 a day. May I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts or the chairman of the subcommittee whether I am correct in that?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. We have gotten out a letter on this subject. This idea that the ration allowance for enlisted personnel will be reduced is entirely in error.

There is no intention on the part of the committee to reduce the present allowance now paid to personnel on civilian component duty, such as ROTC, Reserve, and National Guard duty, recruiting duty, or other similar duty, where the enlisted personnel involved are not assigned to a military installation or a Government mess is not available.

All allowances for enlisted personnel will be increased under the pay increase now under consideration.

The subsistence allowances, when rations in kind are not available—and this is the case the gentleman refers to—are to be increased from $2.57 to $3.25 per day. The $3.25 a day will be payable when the member's duty assignment requires him to incur subsistence expenses substantially in excess of members permitted to mess separately. He gets the $3.25 and the $1.25 figure does not apply to him. Many of them have told me of their worry about this, but their concern is not well founded. We would not do this under any circumstances.

Mr. MacGREGOR. I thank the gentleman. I think these recruiters are doing an excellent job. I think they ought to be encouraged to continue their efforts. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I should like to compliment the gentleman from Massachusetts on the fine way he has presented the facts on this difficult problem.

Mr. Chairman, I support the passage of H.R. 5555. Between 1952 and 1962, the average earnings of professional, scientific, technical workers, and others in categories generally similar to military officer personnel have increased by 49 percent. At the same time the average earnings of manufacturing-production workers, a group which might be considered analogous to enlisted personnel, has gone up 44.8 percent over the 10 years in question. The civil service employees, as the result of numerous pay raises over the past 10 years have gone up a total of 39.8 percent. The uniformed personnel of the Armed Forces have received pay raises over the 10-year time period totaling but 16.2 percent.

The pending bill will raise pay for uniformed personnel of the Department of Defense by about 12.6 percent. The bill substantially follows the recommendations of the administration. It will cost slightly less in fiscal 1964 than budgetary provisions suggested for this purpose by the President.

Classified employees of the Federal Government have received raises in 1958, 1960, 1962, and will receive another in 1964. It has been 5 years since there has been a pay raise for the members of the uniformed services. It is time Congress began the task of equalizing the existing disparity in compensation.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. May I compliment the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, who was an outstanding officer of the Navy. I think the gentleman knows as much about this subject, if not more, than any other Member. He is a tower of strength on our subcommittee. Without his fine contribution I doubt if we would have gotten this bill out at all. His knowledge on this subject is extraordinary.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. I, too, want to join our colleagues in complimenting the gentleman from Massachusetts for the admirable manner in which he has explained a complicated bill.

I want to say this. It has been my privilege over the years to participate in a great many pay bills. There can be no doubt that this pay bill is the most equitable and fairest pay bill that has been submitted to the Congress during the time I have had the honor to serve here. I certainly trust that this bill will receive the overwhelming support of every Member of this House. It is fair and equitable to the Active Forces and it is fair and equitable to those in the Reserves. I hope this committee bill will receive the approval of the House.

Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Rivers] for his excellent and clear statement concerning the proposed legislation.

I also want to compliment all members of the subcommittee of which he is chairman for the fine work they did in the recommendations submitted to the full committee.

I think most of us will agree that because of rising costs, and the substantial increases that have been enacted for civil service employees, as well as the fact that wages and salaries have been increased in all segments of American industry, that a pay increase for members of the uniformed services is not only fully justified, but absolutely necessary if we are to retain the trained personnel we need so badly.

It is also essential if we are to obtain, on a career basis, the type of men we must have in our Armed Forces in order to maintain our combat efficiency, and to utilize the highly complicated weapons systems that we are now producing.

Now the Department of Defense submitted a pay proposal to the Congress which recommended an annual increase of $1,238,526,000, for 2,710,000 members of the armed services on a full fiscal year basis.

But the President only requested $900 million for 9 months of fiscal year 1964 to pay for the proposed pay increase for members of the armed services.

After carefully analyzing the Department proposal, we have reported a bill to the House involving a full fiscal year cost of $1,191,694,000, or $46,832,000 under the President's proposal.

And with an effective date of October 1, 1963, the committee proposal involves a cost of $896,521,000, or $8,479,000 less than the amount requested by the President for the remainder of fiscal 1964.

Now I would like to tell you briefly where this $1,191,694,000 will go if we enact the proposed legislation.

On a full fiscal year basis, the proposed legislation increases the basic pay scales for 1,890,000 members of the armed services by $847,498,000.

The increase in subsistence allowances for officers accounts for approximately $13 million.

The increase in subsistence allowances for enlisted personnel is approximately $77 million.

Retaining sea and foreign duty pay, which the Department of Defense wanted to eliminate, accounts for $127,675,000.

We have also recommended a new benefit to be known as a family separation allowance, at an annual cost of $41 million.

Now I think the first thing the House would like to know is how we were able to bring the cost of this bill under the amount suggested by the President.

First of all, we reduced the cost by $135 million by eliminating any increase in basic pay for those with under 2 years of service.

Our major problem is in retaining enlisted personnel and officers after they have been trained.

So long as we have a Selective Service System, we will not have any difficulty in obtaining the numbers of men that are needed.

The problem comes up when we try to encourage these men to reenlist or to continue on as officers after they have been trained.

We spend more than $2½ billion a year training our military personnel. Over $1 billion a year goes into technical training alone. And yet our first-term reenlistment rates in some of the critical skills is as low as 15 percent.

The overall reenlistment rate for those who complete their obligated service or their first enlistment is only 24 percent.

After the first reenlistment, the retention rates increase since these people then have an investment in retirement.

But we still lose far too many men at the end of their obligated service, and even after their first reenlistment, and this is reflected in high training costs and reduced combat efficiency.

If we can increase our reenlistment rates substantially we can reduce our training costs, because we can assign fewer people as trainers, and at the same time we can assign those trainers to our combat units.

And if we can increase our retention rate for officers, we will not only reduce training costs, which in some areas are fantastically high, but at the same time we will provide the services with a higher number of applicants from which to choose those who express a desire to make a career of the services and eventually become our military leaders.

Today we have to accept 98 percent of those officers who apply for extended tours of duty; as a result, there is no degree of selectivity.

Since the basic problem is the retention of persons who have completed their obligated service, we decided to eliminate any pay increase for those with under 2 years of service. This resulted in our first substantial savings of $135 million.

I might say that this is the same policy we adopted in the 1955 and 1958 military pay increases.

Now the Department of Defense wanted to repeal sea- and foreign-duty pay. As you know, this money is paid in amounts ranging from $8 a month for a private, up to $22.50 a month for master sergeants. It is paid only to enlisted personnel. Officers do not get this pay.

The Department of Defense wanted to substitute a remote and isolated duty allowance to be paid to officers and enlisted personnel at a cost of $30 million and repeal sea- and foreign-duty pay at a savings of $134 million.

Obviously, many of our enlisted personnel would suffer a substantial loss of pay if we repealed sea- and foreign-duty pay.

Thus we refused to repeal this present benefit, although we did eliminate the State of Hawaii as an area in which an individual can qualify for foreign-duty pay.

Because we did not repeal sea- and foreign-duty pay, we added $127,675,000 to the cost of the bill.

The next item of consequence involved subsistence allowances for officers.

The Department of Defense wanted to increase the subsistence allowance for all officers by $29 a month, at a cost of $120 million a year. At the same time, the Department recommended no increase in subsistence allowances for enlisted personnel.

We did not believe this was a proper approach.

As a result, we increased the subsistence allowance for officers by only $3 a month, at a cost of $13 million. We also increased subsistence allowances for enlisted personnel by $77 million a year.

We did this by increasing the average enlisted man's commuted ration allowance by about $7 a month.

As a result, we took $77 million from the officers and gave that money to enlisted personnel. This still gave us a savings of $30 million.

As I have already indicated, the Department of Defense recommended a remote and isolated duty station allowance which would have been applicable to officers and enlisted personnel in amounts equal to 15 or 25 percent of basic pay. They had allocated $30 million for this proposal.

We rejected this proposal not only because we retained sea and foreign duty pay, but also because we adopted a family separation allowance to compensate those enlisted personnel and officers who are entitled to transport their dependents and household effects to their duty stations at Government expense but who are denied the right to have their dependents with them, for various reasons.

We also found that many of our service personnel are ordered to temporary duty assignments for long periods of time. These individuals likewise cannot transport their dependents at Government expense because they are on temporary duty.

Whenever the head of a household is away from his family for long periods of time the cost of maintaining the household is increased since there is no man to do the many chores that have to be done around the house.

This added $40 million to the cost of the proposal, which was $10 million more than the Department recommended for remote and isolated duty.

We also provide in the proposed legislation that anyone who retires during calendar year 1963 may compute his retirement pay under the proposed pay scales.

We did this because the effective date has been put off until October 1, 1963.

This has brought about many efforts on the part of officers and enlisted personnel to postpone their retirement and as a result it has practically eliminated many deserving promotions that would otherwise take place.

In many cases, Reserve officers in the Army and Air Force who must go off active duty as officers will seek to enlist and wait until the effective date of the act before applying for retirement as an officer in their Reserve grades.

All this can be obviated by adopting the provision to which I have referred, namely that anyone who retires during this calendar year can compute his retirement pay under the new pay scales. This will do a great deal for morale and, in my opinion, it is fully justified. This action adds $9 million to the cost of the bill.

The next proposal that faced the Committee was the question of retirement pay.

In 1958, the Congress decided not to apply the new pay scales to those already retired. The Department of Defense recommended that those retired prior to June 1, 1958, who are paid under the Career Compensation Act, be allowed to recompute their retirement pay under the 1958 pay scales, and, in addition, receive a 5-percent cost of living increase.

The committee rejected this proposal, and instead approved a straight 5-percent increase in all retired pay.

As a result of the committee's action in adhering to the decision we made in 1958 not to permit recomputation, we reduced the cost of the proposal by an additional $30 million.

Another large cost involved our reservists.

The Department of Defense recommended that all reservists who are required to participate in inactive duty training with pay be entitled to draw their pay under existing pay scales, and not qualify for the proposed new increases.

We did not believe it was right to discriminate between obligated and unobligated reservists.

By refusing to accept this recommendation of the Department of Defense we added $19 million to the cost of the proposal.

Now the major costs in the proposed legislation, therefore, are in these areas: $847,500,000 in basic pay for all officers and enlisted personnel with over 2 years of service; $13 million in subsistence allowances for officers; $77 million in subsistence allowances for enlisted personnel; $41,979,000 for separation allowances; $68 million for increases in basic pay for reserve personnel; $52 million for the 5-percent cost of living increase for retired personnel; and $9 million for those who retire during calendar year 1963.

The remaining $74 million will be found in such items as reenlistment bonuses, terminal leave payments, and social security, all of which are tied in with basic pay scales, and in submarine pay for training duty, high- and low-pressure chamber incentive pay, and multiple hazard duty payments.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me give you a few examples of the pay increases provided in the proposed legislation:

The maximum increase for members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is $95 a month, which amounts to a 5-percent increase, or a straight cost of living increase.

Four-star generals and admirals will receive a $85 a month increase, which is a 5-percent cost of living increase.

A lieutenant general or vice admiral will receive an increase of $75 a month, which is a straight 5 percent cost of living increase.

Major generals and rear admirals will receive an increase of $70 a month, which is a straight 5 percent cost of living increase.

Brigadier generals and rear admirals will receive $60 a month, which is a straight cost of living increase.

The average colonel or Navy captain will receive about a $90 a month increase, which is 10 percent above their present pay.

The average lieutenant colonel and commander will receive a $91 a month increase, which is 12 percent above their present pay.

The average major or lieutenant commander will receive a $93 a month increase, which is 15 percent over their present basic pay.

The average captain or Navy lieutenant will receive an $85 a month increase which is 17.8 percent above their present basic pay.

A first lieutenant or Navy lieutenant, junior grade, will receive a $56 a month increase, which is 16.4 percent above their present pay.

You will note, therefore, that among the officers, the largest percentage increase is in the grades of lieutenants, captains, and majors, right at the critical retention points.

Among enlisted personnel, we give chief master sergeants as much as $120 a month increase, but the average E–9 will receive an increase of $63 a month, or 14.7 percent above his present basic pay.

The average E–7 will receive a 10-percent increase, or $33 a month.

The average E–6 will receive a 13.7-percent increase, or $37 a month.

The average E–5 will receive a 13.7-percent increase, or $31 a month.

The average E–4 will receive a 15.2-percent increase, or $25 a month.

An E–3 will receive a 10.7-percent increase, or $12 a month.

You will note that we provide substantial percentage increases in practically all of the enlisted grades, and particularly at the reenlistment points.

Now let me summarize by telling you where the money goes as between officers and enlisted personnel.

You will recall that the Department of Defense wanted to take away $134 million from the enlisted personnel by eliminating sea and foreign duty pay. We refused to do this.

You will recall that the Department of Defense wanted to increase subsistence allowances for officers by $120 million, and we refused to do this.

Instead, we took $26 away from each officer and gave $77 million of that money to enlisted personnel.

So of the $1,191,600,000 contained in this bill, $383 million is for officers, and $808 million is for enlisted personnel.

Stated another way, we have reduced all officers by $26 a month under the amounts recommended by the Department of Defense for subsistence allowances; we have given enlisted personnel with over 2 years of service the basic pay scales recommended by the Department of Defense, and in addition, have given enlisted personnel $77 million more in subsistence allowances than the Department recommended.

In addition, we saved $127 million in sea and foreign duty pay which the Department of Defense wanted to take away from enlisted personnel.

We are presenting to you a bill within the dollar framework prepared by the Department, but $46 million under the total amount recommended by the Department.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that we have presented a fair and equitable pay bill.

The Department recommended an annual expenditure of $1,238 million. Our proposal involves $1,191,694,000.

We have reduced the overall fiscal cost of the bill by $46 million, and we have reduced the cost for the remainder of fiscal year 1964 by $8 million.

I hope that the House will overwhelmingly support the bill recommended by the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON].

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I opposed this bill in the Armed Services Committee because it had one glaring weakness, the failure to include recomputation for those officers and enlisted personnel who retired prior to 1958.

I am hopeful the committee will restore the recomputation provision. When Congress passed the 1958 Pay Act, we gingerly put one foot into the cold water of retired pay reform. The water at that time was obviously too cold for comfort, so rather than taking the plunge, Congress proceeded to let one foot freeze while we debated the merits of diving in. It is obvious that we were not ready at that time to go all the way, and it is equally obvious that with this pay bill Congress will finally take the plunge that has concerned us for so long.

Before we do that, let us correct the situation that created a glaring inequity, not only in law but in moral obligation.

By not taking the complete plunge in 1958, we created an impression that we were merely experimenting with the idea that retired pay should not be tied to active duty pay.

For example, when the act of May 20, 1958, was enacted, there were several provisions of law relating to a substantial number of members and former members of the uniformed services that provided, in effect, that their retired pay would be recomputed to reflect increases in the basic pay of members on active duty. These provisions of law were not repealed by the act of May 20, 1958, and are still "on the books" although section 3(a) of that act prevented their application in the case of the increases provided by that act.

We have given aid and comfort to those who were unfairly treated. And now we change the sequels and say our past sympathies were synthetic. The House in passing the 1960 amendment, and also failing to remove the provisions of law allowing recomputation, indicated that it was sympathetic to those who had been unfairly treated in 1958.

The original pay proposal submitted to the Congress by the Department of Defense in January of this year provided for recomputation on the 1958 pay rates. In making this recommendation, the Department of Defense stressed the need for correcting the inequities that now exist among retired members. This is necessary also to provide a more equitable basis for transition to the proposed new system for adjusting retired pay in the future, based on increases in the cost of living. The bill reported out by the subcommittee which I supported likewise provided for recomputation; but the bill now before us makes no provision for such adjustment.

Mr. Chairman, the gross inequity that has resulted from the denial of recomputation in 1958 has been the subject of numerous resolutions from State legislatures urging the Congress to pass legislation to end the inferior status of service members retired prior to June 1, 1958. Editorial comment from many newspapers all over the country has been to the same effect.

Mr. Chairman, there was only one reason for the denial of recomputation in 1958. The action had nothing to do with the merits of recomputation on the 1958 pay scales. It saved money primarily at the expense of the dedicated officers and men who struggled through the lean years of the twenties and thirties and then emerged in the forties to assume the brunt of responsibility for fashioning together and leading the world's greatest military machine.

The Department of Defense, in 1958, ignored the recommendations of the Cordiner committee with respect to recomputation of retirement pay and recommended no increase to members on the retired rolls. Congress, primarily under the leadership of the House, insisted on a 6-percent increase for retirees and wrote that into the bill.

In 1960 the Department of Defense acknowledged its mistake and proposed the Retired Pay Recomputation Act of 1960, which this House passed by an overwhelming vote.

Defense Secretary Gates, in his testimony at that time before the House Committee on Armed Services, said:

> We urge Congress to pass this bill which is now before this committee for consideration. In doing so, we will be keeping faith with those who kept faith with their country, particularly during the dark and dangerous days of World War II, and to all who have given the best years of their life in loyal, honorable service in our Armed Forces.

Mr. Chairman, it was not just generals and admirals who were harmed by the 1958 action. The records of the Department of Defense indicate that approximately 112,000 members have been made to suffer a loss in retired pay by the radical departure in 1958 from the historical method of recomputation for retired personnel. True, officers in the grades of lieutenant colonel and higher and the sergeants and warrant officers would receive more than the lower ranks from recomputation on the 1958 rates but this is largely because they are the ones who had suffered the greatest erosion in income during their active duty days. They are the ones who had been the most underpaid in relation to their responsibilities while they were on active duty. The correction of this serious deficiency was the principal objective of the 1958 Military Pay Act. That act was expressly designed to relieve some of the compression in service pay that had developed over a period of many years. The pay compression developed not as a result of increasing the lower rates too much; it developed because the rates of pay for the higher grades were too long held down.

Therefore, in 1958 we approved a military pay bill which gave the upper ranks a long overdue, proportionately larger increase. But when, at the same time, we denied retired members the time-honored right of recomputing retired pay at the current rate, we said, in effect, to the pre-1958 retirees, "We recognize that you were underpaid while serving on active duty and now we are changing the rules so that this underpayment will continue throughout your retirement years." Of course, no one told them that, but by our action in 1958 that is exactly what we did.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is generally not known, or has been forgotten, that between 1908 and 1946, a period of 38 years, no pay increases whatsoever were given to flag and general officers on active duty and therefore no increase in retired pay. During this same period the cost of living more than doubled.

Every Member of this House should also be aware of the fact that if retired pay for members on the retired rolls had been adjusted during the period 1943 to 1961 to keep pace with the increases in the cost-of-living, the cost to the Government would have been $130 million more than the cost of recomputation over the same period, including recomputation on the 1958 pay scales.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, when it was cheaper to use recomputation rather than cost-of-living increases to adjust retired pay, we did so. Now that it appears that it will be cheaper to give cost-of-living increases in the future rather than recomputation, it is proposed to change the rules at the expense of some of our retired service members.

Mr. Chairman, let there be no mistake about this fact: there is more than 100 years of tradition involved here. Existing law specifically provides for recomputation. Our action in 1958 denying recomputation did not change the law, but only prevented its application. For example, section 6149, title 10, United States Code, reads as follows:

> The retired pay of each retired officer of the Navy or the Marine Corps shall be computed on the basis of rates of pay provided by law, at the time of his retirement, for officers on the active list. If after the retirement of any such officer, the rates of pay for officers on the active list are changed, the retired pay to which the officer is entitled shall be recomputed on the basis of the new rates.

Other provisions of law provide the same right to enlisted members and to members of the other uniformed services.

The question has been asked: "What other retirement system allows its retired people to recompute retired pay on rates revised after retirement?" I answer: "Federal judges—because judges, like military personnel, are also subject to recall to duty." But the real question should be this: What other retirement system has promised its members that their retired pay will be adjusted in accordance with current rates?

Mr. Chairman, I urge the inclusion of the Rivers-Gubser amendment to restore recomputation.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that time is so limited that a thorough discussion of this most important bill is impossible. Because of this limitation I must confine my remarks to the recomputation amendment which I had originally planned to introduce but which I am most pleased to say will now be introduced by the distinguished and knowledgeable chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

There are many points of confusion about the recomputation amendment that perhaps I might be able to clear up.

First of all, the distinguished chairman of the full committee indicated that fair warning was given to retirees because of the action of the House in 1958 in allowing only a cost-of-living increase. If I quote him correctly, he said "it has been on the books since 1958."

I must point out to the House that the basic law which states that recomputation shall be allowed on the basis of pay increases subsequent to retirement is still on the books as of this day. It was not repealed in 1958, and the Comptroller General has repeatedly ruled that unless there is legislative intent to the contrary recomputation shall be allowed. All we did in 1958 was express legislative intent to the contrary and say that the benefits of the law shall be denied those who retired prior to June 1, 1958. The Congress itself held out hope to these retirees when, in this very chamber in 1960, after a unanimous recommendation of the House Armed Services Committee, the House unanimously said to the retirees of this Nation: "We did wrong, we will correct that wrong and allow you your right to recompute."

Now, some will say that even if the recomputation amendment carries in this bill, that a built-in future injustice will still remain. They will say that in the future there will be a disparity between retirees. But let me point out that there is a difference between the 1958 law and the bill which is before you. The 1958 law said not one single word about future treatment of retirees. This bill does. It says that in the future they will be allowed increases in increments of 3 percent as the cost of living increases. So the cost of living formula for the future is in this bill, and in that respect it differs from the 1958 law.

The chairman made some statement about being fish and fowl, that there is a difference between those who would retire in 1959 and those who would retire after the passage of this bill. If we want to make all fish or all fowl, then why does someone not suggest that we go back and say to those who retired after 1958, "you can only get what those who retired prior to 1958 are getting." Obviously there will be no takers for this offer.

The first meaningful pay increase occurred in 1958. For 38 years there was not a single pay increase for flag officers or general officers. The raises for 50 years were less 10 percent of the national wage index.

In 1958 the Congress corrected its neglect of 50 years. So the 1958 pay raise was the first meaningful increase for those who recompute. Future raises will not be picking up the lost ground of 50 years and will be less dramatic. Therefore not much of a question will be raised about a cost of living increase versus traditional recomputation.

Make no mistake about it. The real injustice, the real mistake was made in 1958 when we created a situation where a colonel with 30 years of service could retire on May 31, 1958, and would receive $93.75 per month less than his West Point classmate who retired on June 1, 1958, with the same length of service, with equal distinction and equal rank. The future is provided for in this bill. The amendment will correct the mistakes of the past.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE].

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of H.R. 5555 is to provide a long delayed and much deserved pay increase for members of our Armed Forces. A detailed study made by the subcommittee found the morale and effectiveness of our servicemen to be closely identified with this move. Fortunately we do have in uniform those who are dedicated to their tasks and are bound to the service by other than monetary considerations. They represent a standard of courage and competency that throughout our history has kept this Nation secure. I do not believe this standard is in danger but I do wish to point out that the military strength of this Nation depends today upon not only the valor of our forces but their individual capacity to employ intricate and rapidly changing weapon systems.

In passing upon this legislation, we should be mindful of the changed conditions now surrounding our Armed Forces. Modern warfare employs techniques and weapons which require skills never before contemplated. Months and more often years are necessary to train for these skills, many of which have applications in civilian life. Therefore, if we lose these trained personnel to more attractive jobs in industry we are robbed, not only of their skills but we also have to expend excessive time and money to obtain replacements. Accordingly, a proper pay bill is more than fair treatment to the serviceman, it is also a real bargain for us all, economically and securitywise.

While we can rely upon many to be career motivated, we should not penalize such spirit by being unappreciative and unfair with respect to compensation. It is significant to point out that military pay has risen only 16.2 percent since 1952, in comparison to increases of 49 percent for professional workers, 44.8 percent for production workers, and 34.3 percent for civil service employees in the same period. Nevertheless, the proposed increase in this bill will still leave military compensation substantially below other pay levels.

The details of the bill have been carefully outlined. I am confident it has been demonstrated that the adjustments have been carefully selected and will correct a substantial number of admitted deficiencies.

Disappointment has been expressed in many circles that the bill does not permit personnel retired prior to June 1, 1958, to recompute their pay on 1958 pay scales as had previously been voted by this House. Having indicated our belief that this recomputation was necessary and proper, our present proposal seems inconsistent. Although it can be argued with much validity that most retirement plans carry no such recomputation possibilities, we have recognized this procedure in the past and the personnel affected may well feel singled out for what seems to them unfair treatment. I, therefore, feel that the purposes of this bill and the best interests of the Nation will be better served if the recomputation provision is restored.

In conclusion, let me point out that the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], and the entire committee did a magnificent job in formulating proposals for committee action. Our full committee responded to the forceful and objective leadership of our able chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], in reporting a bill which provides relief in many sensitive areas.

However, in bringing this bill to the floor, our committee does not claim that it is a complete answer to a critical need. We do, however, view it as a constructive step forward which is urgently required. The proposed effective date is a concession to the President's budget but delay beyond that date is unthinkable. Favorable action on this bill to meet the objectives I have mentioned is clearly in the interest of our defense program.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIRNIE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the gentleman for his very fine statement and for his support of this bill.

I would also like to join with the gentleman in the position which he has taken to permit recomputation of retired pay of those who retired prior to June 1, 1958. Likewise I join with the other Members of this House, particularly the gentlemen from California [Mr. BOB WILSON and Mr. GUBSER], in their position favoring this recomputation provision for retired members of the Armed Forces. I certainly subscribe to the same position as they do and want to take this opportunity to join with the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE] and aline myself with the position which he has taken. It is important these inequities be corrected.

Mr. PIRNIE. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROBISON].

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, I am not at all sure that the provisions of H.R. 5555—the military pay bill—are adequate and fair to those who have accepted, normally out of patriotic reasons, the economic disadvantages as well as the hazards of peacetime military service.

My adherence to the principle of economy in Government has, I hope, been well demonstrated. I suppose the customary thing to say, here, would be that: "I yield to no man in my support of the concept of 'fiscal responsibility.'" However, neither do I think that this concept should be applied with such broad strokes, or in such a shortsighted fashion that the equally important principle of equity is violated.

There is a temptation, always present, to do this when Congress is relatively free—as it is, here, in view of the almost total absence of any organized voice in behalf of the armed services—from political pressures.

It also seems to me—and I say this in all kindness—that the Committee on Armed Services has swung from one extreme of generosity, with the authorization bill for military hardware, to an extreme of fiscal caution, with this, the pay bill. This has left those of us who do not serve on this committee, but who must to a great degree rely on the judgment and advice of those who do, facing a considerable dilemma. And, in view of the way the committee system works during floor debate, there is not a great deal that the rest of us can do about resolving our individual doubts.

I have been substantially impressed by the morale problem we face, first in interesting and then in retaining competent personnel in military-career status. I have been equally impressed by the ever-growing technical competence demanded of our Armed Forces, and by the great disparity in pay for comparable civilian work. I am also aware of the lack of comparability between the pay of those who serve our Government in uniform, and those who serve it in corresponding capacities, insofar as training, experience, and responsibility are concerned, but as civilians, and it seems to me that we are guilty of discrimination here.

I intend, therefore, to support H.R. 5555—as being worthy of my support insofar as it goes toward improving the present situation, and I also intend to support the amendments to be offered by Representative WILSON, of California, or by others, to correct the patent inequity worked on our military retirees by the abandonment, in H.R. 5555, of the principle of recomputation of retired pay.

At this time, I do not know what other amendments may be offered but I assure you I shall give them my serious consideration, and I wish to close by expressing the hope that further improvements in this measure may be given serious consideration in the other body.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON].

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the quality of the country's defense is the quality of its armed services and the men and women in uniform.

Every year we spend billions of dollars to purchase or develop the most modern and technically perfect military equipment known to science. However, it is equally important that we have in service people with the skills to handle this complex equipment.

The defense of our Nation demands that those who are in the armed services be the very best. Yet, if we are unwilling to pay them adequately, to pay them in accordance with what their abilities would command in civilian life, then we jeopardize our security.

I believe the United States has the moral obligation to adequately compensate its service men and women and to adopt a sufficiently realistic military pay scale that will attract others into service.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. CLAUSEN].

Mr. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to add my comments to what has already been said here on the floor of the House with reference to the military pay bill H.R. 5555 and the so-called theory of recomputation of pensions.

National defense is big business and should be recognized and treated as such. It is the primary responsibility of this Federal level of Government. It is quite evident to me that we will have a continuing responsibility for some time to come—at least until a positive program of winning the cold war is advocated and adopted. Meanwhile many individuals and families are affected by the action of this body. Where I was formerly a member of the Naval Air Arm during World War II, I severed my association with the naval military organization after my terminal leave expired in 1945 and up until now have not participated in any of their activities.

I feel that salaries of members of our armed services should be adequate to attract desirable personnel and keep them, thereby minimizing the turnover and the mandatory draft calls. This, in my judgment, will reflect in economy over a long period of time and minimize the inconveniences to personnel and families affected.

This position, of course, applies to the military pay bill, H.R. 5555. I also plan to support the "theory of recomputation" of pensions for those military men who retired before 1958 so that such pensions will be based on current salary levels as they were for more than 100 years before the law was changed in 1959. Recognition of this inequity will rectify an existing problem in keeping with every rule of fairness and satisfy my conscience for having met a responsibility that is truly ours.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Joelson].

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I intend to support the military pay raise bill which I believe will be passed by the House by a sizable margin. I support the measure because it is necessary if we are to do justice to our servicemen. However, we should not overlook the fact that by passing this bill, we are adding approximately a billion and one-half dollars to the national budget.

I predict that tomorrow or later in the week when we take up the debt increase bill, many of my colleagues who supported this military pay raise legislation will engage in a clamorous chorus against the debt increase. I am simply intrigued by the fact that although two-thirds of our budget comprising the defense, space, and veterans appropriations are supported by almost every Member of the House, many of the biggest spenders bewail our high national debt the loudest.

Maybe due to the springtime season, I am moved to offer a rhyme from a not-so-bashful poet. I have titled this epic "Paradox," and it reads as follows:

> One day we favor spending.
> The next—of debt we prate.
> Although it's irresponsible,
> Politically it's great.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining time on our side to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Bennett].

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I likewise yield the remainder of our time to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. Bennett].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. Bennett] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, some 35 or more Members of Congress have indicated that they would like to join with me as coauthors on the amendment on combat pay.

They are as follows: Representatives Joseph P. Addabbo, Thomas L. Ashley, Oliver P. Bolton, Frank T. Bow, W. E. (Bill) Brock, Joel T. Broyhill, James C. Cleveland, Jeffrey Cohelan, James C. Corman, Edward J. Derwinski, William Jennings Bryan Dorn, Thaddeus J. Dulski, Carl Elliott, Dante B. Fascell, Sam Gibbons, Henry B. Gonzalez, George A. Goodling, Charles S. Gubser, Seymour Halpern, Chet Holifield, Charles S. Joelson, Edna F. Kelly, Robert L. Leggett, Torbert H. Macdonald, William S. Mailliard, Spark M. Matsunaga, D. R. (Billy) Matthews, Harris B. McDowell, Jr., Robert H. Michel, Arnold Olsen, Claude Pepper, Otis G. Pike, Ralph J. Rivers, Ralph J. Scott, Don L. Short, Olin E. Teague, Lionel Van Deerlin, and Bob Wilson.

This is a measure which is approved by the Department of Defense, is requested by the Army, and has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. Chairman, the exact provisions of the measure which I hope to introduce as an amendment to this bill are to be found at page 7852 of the Congressional Record of May 6. This is a modest proposal, Mr. Chairman. It provides that the men who are serving in Laos, Vietnam, and places where we are actually engaged in combat duty receive a maximum of $55 a month when they are under actual hostile firing.

This pay is sometimes called hostile fire pay, sometimes called combat pay. This amount of $55 was arrived at by simply taking the lowest amount of special pay or extra pay under other legislation for people serving on active duty.

You may not realize just how much we pay for other types of pay. We pay $632,486,960 a year for various types of special pay. And if you will look at the tables which I have set out in the Congressional Record on pages 7914–7916 of today you will see that many people who serve and obtain special kinds of pay are not doing anything that is very difficult.

Paratroopers receive their special pay for making one jump in every 3 months. They obtain parachute pay for the entire period. And people with flight pay are required to fly only 1 day out of every 3 months to obtain flight pay. In Congress we have actually encouraged, and at times even prohibited some men drawing flight pay from flying because we know that they are too old to fly and we do not wish to bear the cost of the airplane and the gasoline, and so forth. And we pay them these very substantial amounts of pay far in excess of the $55 a month which I am proposing for this. I am not asking that any of that be stricken, but I am asking that this Congress consider what I would call the tragic and inconsiderate approach which is about to be made on this bill unless we amend it.

There is no administrative problem involved in combat pay. We had combat pay in World War II; we had combat pay in the Korean war. There were not any administrative difficulties raised with respect to combat pay.

Certainly there are administrative difficulties about these other types of pay. Some of these other types of pay are fantastic. We pay many millions of dollars per year to people who we know will never serve again in the particular field in which they are being paid these large sums. There are many administrative responsibilities and difficulties with respect to some of these other types of pay, but we do not blink an eye about that, not a bit. We say we will go ahead and pay it. But here we are only talking about something that involves perhaps only $1 million or $2 million a year.

If you will look at page 7914 of the Congressional Record you will see set out the costs. The Army, which is the chief service involved, would have about $1 million a year. In the next column you will see the total of such pay for all services, which is estimated at from $1,400,000 to $1,800,000. That is for all types that might be involved in this particular kind of pay. Compare that, if you will, with the $632 million that we spend for these other types of pay. Look and see what we are paying this money for and contrast it with what is involved here. Then note the regulations which are set out. These are very simple regulations. This man must serve 6 days a month as compared with parachute pay, where the regulation is one jump in 3 months. This man, as I said, has to serve 6 days a month in that sort of situation before he is allowed to have this type of pay.

So I would like to stress that there is no administrative difficulty about this at all. I would like to stress that the cost here is very slight indeed. I would like to stress finally that it is the right thing to do.

Mr. Chairman, this is a small matter in dollars.

It is a small thing in the number of people involved. It is a big thing in the moral responsibility of our country. I do not think anybody could better say it than the Department of Defense did when it asked for this amendment be to approved. At page 7856 of the Congressional Record you will find they said:

> While combat is, of course, the basic purpose of a military establishment, the fact remains that the actual hazards and hardships of combat are currently experienced by a small percentage of the Armed Forces.

In approving $55 per month to be paid, under strict regulations, the Department said:

> It is, of course, impossible for the Government to compensate adequately for this kind of sacrifice or potential sacrifice, but it would give a token recognition of the special role being played by such personnel.

Casualty data indicate that at the end of the first 100 days in combat—not necessarily consecutive—one-half of his friends with whom he entered combat will be missing in action, in a hospital, or dead. At the end of 200 days in combat, 93 percent of his buddies will be gone. For all practical purposes, 200 days in frontline combat as an infantryman amounts to either a death sentence or a future as a mentally or physically handicapped man.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Florida on a very splendid presentation and statesmanlike approach to this subject and will support the amendment. I congratulate him also on being the proud father today of a new baby girl, and wish the best to the new daughter and her lovely mother.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. I, too, should like to congratulate the gentleman on the very excellent statement he has made and his very excellent work on our Committee on Armed Services. It was my privilege to support him in committee, and I only hope that when he presents his amendment at the appropriate time it will receive overwhelming support.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. In conclusion, I should like to say that of course you can draft men. Of course you can tell men on the frontlines in combat that if they do not fulfill their purpose they can be lined up against the barracks or the bunkers or whatever you may have, and shot. That is the law, that is true. You can compel these men to go into this kind of combat. You can compel them without paying any money. So there is no incentive required as far as that is concerned to have anybody up in the frontlines.

You cannot pay a man to be a frontline soldier. We compel them to do that. There are many benefits paid and people serving in the Armed Forces, many veterans' benefits to former servicemen. There is the 20-year retirement privilege. Some of the other benefits are quite generous. But every one of these benefits, everybody knows, is based upon the man who is out there compelled to take the life of another man, perhaps against his ethics, against his morals, against his emotions, against his basic feelings. He takes the lives of other people for the protection, for the security, and for the continuation of his beloved land. He does this endangering his own life. There is nobody else in the world that does the sort of thing he does. Are we so niggardly as to deny $2 million annually for that kind of service?

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Are there any retroactive provisions in the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. There are no retroactive provisions in the amendment.

Mr. CLEVELAND. There are several people that have already been killed in this combat the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. If the gentleman would like to add the retroactive amendment, I would be glad to support it.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, and certainly, as a very strong believer in, and supporter of our Armed Forces, and our dedicated and patriotic military personnel, I am proud, indeed, to support, and to urge the Members of this body to support this bill for the military pay increase (H.R. 5555). Although this bill does not perfectly suit all the demands or meet all the needs of our military personnel, it does encompass a good many long-needed changes and improvements in our military compensation program. I have endeavored, along with many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle today, to attempt to rectify some of the inequities existing in the bill. Some have been improved, some have not, but I stand in support of the bill as it is reported and urge its approval and passage.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that in deciding whether the Government of the United States should or should not provide for the recomputation of military retired pay in accordance with the fluctuations of active duty pay, the decision should be based on the answers to three basic questions. These are:

First. Is the procedure morally right?

Second. Is it legally permissible or required?

Third. Is it financially feasible?

To every question, the answer is "Yes."

The procedure is unquestionably morally right. Since the inception of the military pay and retirement system, it has been practically the undeviating policy of our Government that the pay of a retired officer is to be geared directly to the active duty pay of an officer of the same rank and length of service. When this policy was deviated from in 1922, the next Congress acted swiftly to correct the error.

On April 12, 1926, House Report No. 857 of the 69th Congress pointed out that, and I quote:

> The pay of retired officers is not a fixed sum nor is it a specified sum, but it is 75 percent of the pay of the rank upon which they are retired; that is, three-fourths of the pay of officers of similar rank still on the active list, and not three-fourths of the pay at the time of retirement.

This indicates that the policy is legally permissible. That the policy may not only be legally permissible but legally required is indicated by section 6149, United States Code, title 10. This section reads as follows:

> The retired pay of each retired officer of the Navy or Marine Corps should be computed on the basis of rates of pay provided by law, at the time of retirement, for officers on the active list. If after the retirement of any such officer the rates of pay for officers on the active list are changed the retired pay to which the officer is entitled shall be recomputed on the basis of the new rates.

Clearly, then, the policy of recomputation is so hallowed by tradition as to be morally right, and so outlined by United States Codes as to be not only legally permissible but perhaps required.

It remains then to consider the third question, Is it financially feasible? I say to you that this question must be answered with an unqualified "Yes." For if the Government of this Nation is faced with a course of action that is both morally and legally right, then that course must be followed. If, in the following, financial adjustments are necessary, then those adjustments must be made, whatever the cost. Fortunately, in following this path of moral and legal obligation, the cost is not such as to destroy our economy. I am informed that the beginning cost, under the proposed pay scales, would be $33 million annually, and that this amount would decrease each year as recipients passed to a greater reward.

I am aware that the ranks of the retired will be swelled enormously in years to come and that if the principle of recomputation is followed in the case of future pay raises, that the cost will rise.

The question before us now, however, should not be answered on a basis of what might or might not happen in the future, but what is happening in this, the present. Stated bluntly, it is that this Congress is faced with a choice of keeping faith with the men and women who gave the best portion of their lives to the service of their country in the Armed Forces, or of repudiating its moral and legal obligation to these men and women.

In honor there can be but one answer—we must keep faith by providing for recomputation of retired pay.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the military pay bill, H.R. 5555, not because I am under any illusion about our Nation's ability to adequately remunerate our military servants, commensurate with the value of their service, but because I feel we have an obligation to recognize their contribution to the stature and strength of our Nation.

These dedicated men and women who serve in uniform will not be less vigilant or alert, nor will they be less willing to give their last full measure of devotion if we do not provide them with a pay increase. I do feel, however, that we who are recipients of the sacrifices they make in peace, as well as war, could not in conscience look a new day squarely in the face if we did not make this small measure of effort to indicate our appreciation of their talents and selfless devotion.

The bare, bold fact of life is this: When diplomacy breaks down we must depend upon our career military men, who are trained in their respective specialties, for life itself. I, for one, want to be assured that my life, the lives of the members of my family, the future of freedom itself are indeed in the hands and care of America's best. We cannot hope to keep this assurance unless we are realistic and fair in our responsibilities to give adequate material support to those upon whom our own future and the future of freedom is so dependent.

I share with all peace-loving people the hope that someday, somehow, we can "beat our swords into plowshares"—use our nuclear abilities for constructive purposes instead of potentially destructive purposes. But wishing does not make it so. We must face the facts as they are. We are compelled by circumstance to be adequately armed. It is of little avail to be adequately armed with expensive and complicated equipment if we do not have the trained personnel to use it. It is poor economy to spend literally billions to buy this equipment and to train men to use it if because of an unrealistic pay scale they are not encouraged to make the maximum use of their training in continued service. While the bill calls for an increase in spending, this is one situation in which we find an increase in spending responsible for the saving of the taxpayer's dollar.

In most of the bills before the House dealing with the military we are concerned with things. In this bill we are concerned with persons.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, we have deprived our military personnel of the right to strike, bargain, picket, arbitrate, or even mediate for better hours, wages, and working conditions. There is no such thing as an 8-hour-a-day soldier or sailor and, therefore, hours are no subject for consideration. Our Navy, Army, Air Force, and Marine personnel are working or available for work on an around the clock basis. These men are given consideration for job assignment and duty location, but any Congressman can testify from his mailbag that this is not an entirely enjoyable and voluntary proposition.

We are living in a land with more freedom than any other people on the face of the globe at any time in history, but we must remember that there is a group which has no right to speak publicly at all unless censored prior to speaking, a group which has no degree of freedom of press, a group which only recently was given the right to write their Congressmen on compensation matters, a group which is constantly mobile, therefore ineffective in utilizing the elective franchise, a group which is constantly under totalitarian control due to its very nature and which group has the power through simple order in battle or through the process of court-martial, to effectively take the lives of its members.

This is our military. This is not a time of war and it is amazing to me that there are patriotic Americans who are constantly coming forward and voluntarily exposing themselves to the semi-irrevocable membership in this system.

In short, when it comes to civil rights, which the American people have come to enjoy, our soldiers and sailors just do not have any. No rights to even determine what they will eat, where they will sleep, or what they will wear.

At one time a swabie would earn his military keep by learning the manual of arms with an M-1 rifle. Today it is interesting to note that first-class seaman sailors attending the nuclear power schools at Mare Island, Calif., and throughout the country, must know chemistry, physics, analytics, and calculus before they get into the school, only to graduate as an enlisted third-class petty officer.

Yes, today we demand a lot of our people as we are engaged in an effort to cut military expenditures such that fewer people more ably prepared can do a better job of defense with fewer bombs, missiles, and armaments.

We question intraspectively among the Congress the necessity of the American people to have forced conscription for an uncertain 10-year period of jeopardy at a time when we have not declared a war in 22 years.

Surely if the future of the American defense is going to rest on the shoulders of a relatively few highly trained professional defenders who are in a sense rightless, certainly they should be compensated.

The problem presented to this Congress therefore is an adequate wage scale. We are bargaining with ourselves with some of us representing the public purse and some of us the silenced defenders.

Are new concepts involved in this bargaining? I do not think so. Nobody asks to pay us what we are worth or pay us on the basis of our relative technical know-how, or pay us on the basis of our ability to produce firepower or defensive power.

The only thing asked is to place us in the same parity position we maintained 10 years ago.

In 1952, officers between the rank of second lieutenant to colonel earned on the average each of $300 per year more than their corresponding GS–7 to GS–14 civil servant counterparts. Today those same civil servants earn from $2,100 to $3,300 per year more than each of their military counterparts. Enlisted rates are similarly comparable. Is it no wonder that 20 years after the last war we must continue forced conscription?

Every Member of Congress has correspondence from service people claiming that they have been kicked in the teeth by Uncle Sam. I think they have—I think we can forsake the pocketbook for today and stand up to our responsibility to a voiceless people who form the backbone of our protectorate of democracy.

With respect to a second matter it is my feeling that a retired second lieutenant is the same whether he has retired this year or 10 years ago. They both are entitled to parity irrespective of the hand fate deals in the date service is terminated.

Likewise this is a multimillion dollar decision to make, but decisions somehow are easy when right is evident.

It is the feeling of the members of our great Army and Navy and special corps that there is something sacred in the idea of consistency and fairness. They are disciplined, of course, to accept dogmatic instruction and not too severely complain but occasionally every 5 years or so when the merits of their service is drawn in question, there is a way in which the Congress can say "job well done." I think there is a way we can say this without our voices but from the heart of the Congress.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, in the complexities of modern-day military armament, the Army, the Navy, the Air Force must carry out widely diversified research and development responsibilities. In order to continue research on and the development of the Nike-X, the Minuteman and Titan missiles, and the nuclear-powered submarine, the military services must have personnel of the highest competence.

On examining H.R. 5555 and comparing it to the upper level pay increases authorized under the Federal Salary Reform Act, I find that similar pay increases have not been provided for the upper grades of the uniformed services. It is my firm conviction that some attempt must be made to establish a pay relationship between the various pay systems of the Government. If this is not done, the pay system of the uniformed services will continue to deteriorate in relation to other Federal pay systems. When this happens, the services will be unable to retain the qualified and experienced personnel so vitally needed to carry out their programs.

Further, the health of the Nation stands to suffer if the work of the Commissioned Corps of the Public Health Service and its National Institutes of Health continues to be limited in scope and quality because of the inability of that Service to attract and retain needed personnel. The Secretary of HEW, referring to NIH personnel recently, stated he has never before found so many people willing to devote so much time for so little money. He said: "It is because they are dedicated." But how long can this dedication last? Secretary Celebrezze admitted he is losing scientists because of the pay scale and stated that "NIH is not matching private industry in salaries and is hardly matching the universities." There has been a steady erosion of the scientific staff at NIH in recent years. Many of its key staff members have left for higher paying positions in universities, other centers for biomedical research, and in private industry. Unless salaries for leading scientists are improved to a marked degree, medical and scientific research programs will be seriously impaired.

The Congress has placed increasing emphasis on public health programs such as water pollution control, air pollution control, and radiological health. There is a serious shortage of the experienced public health leaders such programs demand and the Public Health Service must be able to compete for these people. Again, a marked improvement in salary and incentive pay is necessary.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, it is apparent to me that a pay boost is needed for the members of our Armed Forces. We need to attract and keep the best possible manpower in our military forces. Normally I oppose Federal spending bills when the Federal Government is deficit financing. That is, borrowing to spend, instead of making both ends meet.

My approval of the military pay boost is a worthy exception to the rule, as I see it.

I assume, of course, that the very military officers and men who will benefit from the pay increase are aware of the dangers of deficit financing and the threat to the value of our currency by such action. It is incumbent on them, Members of Congress, and all responsible citizens to so revise Federal expenditures as to return to a balanced budget.

It is far more costly to our taxpayers to pay for turnover of military personnel than to pay this pay increase. However, the President, Secretary McNamara, and Members of Congress owe a responsibility to taxpayers today, and those of the future to whom we shift the debt, to curtail nonessential expenditures to balance the budget.

For my part, I shall oppose spending in public works, welfare and social measures, foreign aid, and other nondefense expenditures. Further, I believe we should demand of the military that wasteful procurement practices and other unnecessary expenditures be eliminated so that this pay bill can be absorbed.

A $52 billion defense budget has enough waste, duplication, and uneconomic practices in it, such as occur in sole-source procurement and surplus disposal, that more than enough can be saved to pay for the pay boost.

I have no patience nor defense for those who vote for all appropriations, all tax cuts, and no balancing of the budget.

While I vote for economy and the balanced budget at every opportunity, I am happy in the knowledge that I can indicate my approval of increased pay for our military personnel.

However, pay boosts do not go to the heart of the matter of retention of men in the Armed Forces. The President, our military leaders, the Members of Congress, have a responsibility to improve the career aspects of military service. The draft should not be used as a crutch by the military, so that men serve because they have to do so. We should seek to improve the quality of our military personnel, on a career basis, so that the rapid turnover will be reduced. I believe this pay bill is part of that effort, but only a part.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5555, the military pay increase bill, a measure which has been long overdue.

As stated in the committee report, the purpose of the proposed legislation is to provide increases in basic pay and subsistence allowances; to establish a new method of adjusting retirement pay; and to provide other benefits for members of our uniformed services.

There appears to be a general agreement here that our military personnel on active duty are grossly underpaid as compared to employees in our civil service. For example, a colonel is paid about $200 a month less than his civil service counterpart. Such a differential certainly is not conducive to enlistment in our armed services. Yet I note with deep concern that the full Committee on Armed Services has deleted two provisions from the bill as originally introduced which would have provided some incentive fringe benefits. These are: first, the recomputation provision; and second, the combat pay provision.

I am firmly of the position that these two provisions should be restored. As stated in the additional views of the report, the bill as reported by the full committe contains a major inconsistency. While purporting to encourage competent members of our armed services to make lifetime careers of the military service, it breaks faith with those who have already devoted their lives to such service.

It has been traditional for more than 100 years that retired military pay be computed on active duty pay. Secretary McNamara has submitted a memorandum to the Senate Armed Services Committee expressing beyond doubt that the authority for recomputation of pay is based on clear provisions of the law rather than on mere practice. He disclosed that the Comptroller General has consistently held that section 6149, United States Code, title 10, and other laws established this right. This section reads in part:

> The retired pay to which the officer is entitled shall be recomputed on the basis of the new rates.

The traditional principle of recomputation prevailed until 1958 when in a drastic and sudden action with no warning to retired personnel, Congress provided that all officers who retired prior to June 1, 1958 would receive instead only a 6-percent cost-of-living increase.

It is a well-known fact that fringe benefits including retired pay have always been offered as an inducement for servicemen to accept less money in the military than they would receive in comparable civilian positions. At the hearings on this measure an experienced recruiting officer now retired testified at page 1577 as follows:

> Every man on the retired rolls and on active duty has been told by the recruiting officers that his retired pay would be based upon the active duty pay scales.

The opposition to the restoration of the two deleted provisions is based upon budgetary considerations. I believe that as Members of Congress representing the greatest democratic government in mankind's history, we ought to keep a promise in line with our world image. We ought not to replace morality with budgetary considerations.

Restoration of the recomputation provisions would mean that we shall keep faith with those citizens of ours who, by the nature of their work must sacrifice their lives, if need be, upon call.

The deletion of the combat pay benefits as contained in the original bill as introduced must have come to many of us as a great surprise. The bill as amended provides for hazardous pay for parachute duty, demolition duty, flight duty, thermal stress duty, high and low pressure duty, and submarine duty, yet fails to provide for combat duty pay. What could be more hazardous than combat with an enemy determined to kill you? Certainly, in the name of equity, we ought to restore and provide for additional compensation for those who place their lives in jeopardy in our Nation's behalf. Seventy-three Americans have already given up their lives in Vietnam in our present struggle against communism. Four of these brave men were citizens of my great State of Hawaii. There will no doubt be others who must make the supreme sacrifice before freedom prevails. While the additional compensation proposed in the original bill and deleted by the committee is certainly only a token of our concern and wholly insufficient by way of compensation, I am sure that the practicalities of life will bring forth an appreciation from its recipients and members of their families.

Both of these deleted provisions were approved by the subcommittee which studied this legislation for weeks. They were requested by the Army and by the Department of Defense and approved by the Bureau of the Budget and the President. Certainly, there can be no real reason why these two provisions cannot be restored. I urge the restoration of these two provisions and passage of the bill with such amendments as will do the job as we ought to do it.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT]. I agree, there is a moral obligation on the part of this Congress to continue combat pay for those gentlemen who have volunteered to advise, on a military level, the actions in Vietnam.

I visited Vietnam in December of last year and witnessed the extreme difficulties that our advisory group endure in the defense of South Vietnam's democracy. Although these special forces volunteer for these assignments, there is no reason why we should not compensate them for the extreme dangers that they face, day in and day out. Jungle warfare, as many of my colleagues know, is most difficult as you are fighting the hazards of nature as well as the enemy.

I believe that these volunteer forces, who are willing to endanger their lives, and sacrifice them if need be, are entitled to the same extra compensation that is presently being awarded to our Air Force personnel as well as the airborne infantry. In my opinion, those that are actually facing the danger of a hidden enemy 24 hours a day, are more deserving of extra compensation for their dedication to the cause of freedom.

Let us acknowledge their courageous stand in the face of tyranny by giving full support to the amendment before us.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5555, a bill to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services.

President Kennedy pointed out in his message to the Congress:

> In this era of increasingly complex weapons and military systems, a large part of the effectiveness of our Defense Establishment depends on the retention of well-trained and devoted personnel in the Armed Forces. General military pay was last increased 4½ years ago. Since then, higher wages and salaries in private industry have provided strong inducement for highly trained military personnel to leave the service for better paying jobs in civilian life.

I have known many members of the military service who could be making much more in civilian life in the way of salaries and wages; however, they are devoted to the concept of maintaining the freedom of our great Nation. I am convinced that it is in the national interest for us to pass H.R. 5555 with the amendments that have been adopted here today to partially relieve the financial sacrifices that our servicemen must make. I believe that it is incumbent upon the Congress to do everything possible to make the military an attractive career for the young men who have chosen to defend our way of life.

The salary increases in this bill are at a minimum and in many instances they should be even higher. I receive many letters from career servicemen who are having a difficult time making ends meet financially. Several of them have applied for hardship discharges rather than continue to face financial difficulties caused in part by inadequate military pay.

When we consider the great cost of training our servicemen and getting them to the state of combat readiness in this day of nuclear and technological warfare, I am sure that it would be cheaper for the Government to pay these men on a basis equivalent with the pay scales of private industry rather than have them leave the service and be faced with the cost of retraining replacements.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I was proud to support the amendments offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] and also the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT]. I believe that these two amendments have strengthened the bill in that they are correcting inequalities that existed prior to their adoption. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, as a matter of honor and justice, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5555 that we may not only show our appreciation to the members of the military service who are contributing so much to our national defense but also that we may pay them wages and salaries that are more nearly equal with those being paid for comparable work outside the military service.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and nineteen Members are present, a quorum.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Uniformed Services Pay Act of 1963".

BASIC PAY

SEC. 2. Section 203 of title 37, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 203. Rates

"The rates of monthly basic pay for members of the uniformed services within each pay grade are set forth in the following tables:

"COMMISSIONED OFFICERS

"Pay grade	Years of service computed under sec. 205														
	2 or less	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
O-10 [1]	$1,200.00	$1,315	$1,315	$1,315	$1,315	$1,365	$1,365	$1,470	$1,470	$1,575	$1,575	$1,680	$1,680	$1,785	$1,785
O-9	1,063.30	1,155	1,180	1,180	1,180	1,210	1,210	1,260	1,260	1,365	1,365	1,470	1,470	1,575	1,575
O-8	963.30	1,050	1,075	1,075	1,075	1,155	1,155	1,210	1,210	1,260	1,315	1,365	1,420	1,420	1,420
O-7	800.28	905	905	905	945	945	1,000	1,000	1,050	1,155	1,235	1,235	1,235	1,235	1,235
O-6	592.80	690	735	735	735	735	735	735	760	880	925	945	1,000	1,085	[2] 1,085
O-5	474.24	565	605	605	605	605	625	660	705	760	805	835	870	870	870
O-4	400.14	490	525	525	525	560	600	635	665	695	725	725	725	725	725
O-3	326.04	410	440	490	535	540	570	600	630	630	630	630	630	630	630
O-2	259.36	345	420	435	450	465	490	510	530	530	530	530	530	530	530
O-1	222.30	280	355	365	380	395	410	430	450	450	450	450	450	450	450

"WARRANT OFFICERS

"Pay grade	Years of service computed under sec. 205														
	2 or less	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
W-4	$332.90	$430	$430	$440	$460	$480	$500	$535	$560	$580	$595	$615	$635	$685	$685
W-3	302.64	395	395	400	405	435	460	475	490	505	520	540	560	580	580
W-2	264.82	345	345	355	375	395	410	425	440	455	470	485	505	505	505
W-1	219.42	305	305	330	345	360	375	390	405	420	435	450	450	450	450

"ENLISTED MEMBERS

"Pay grade	Years of service computed under sec. 205														
	2 or less	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
E-9							$435	$445	$455	$465	$475	$485	$510	$560	$560
E-8						$365	375	385	395	405	415	425	450	500	500
E-7	$206.39	$275	$285	$295	$305	315	325	335	345	355	365	375	400	450	450
E-6	175.81	240	250	260	270	280	290	300	310	320	330	330	330	330	330
E-5	145.24	210	220	230	240	250	260	270	280	280	280	280	280	280	280
E-4	122.30	180	190	200	210	210	210	210	210	210	210	210	210	210	210
E-3	99.37	145	155	165	165	165	165	165	165	165	165	165	165	165	165
E-2	85.80	120	120	120	120	120	120	120	120	120	120	120	120	120	120
E-1	83.20	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	110"
E-1 (under 4 months)	78.00														

"[1] While serving as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Chief of Staff of the Army, Chief of Naval Operations, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, Commandant of the Marine Corps, or Commandant of the Coast Guard, basic pay for this grade is $1,970 regardless of years of service computed under sec. 205 of this title.

"[2] While serving as a permanent professor at the U.S. Military Academy or the U.S. Air Force Academy, basic pay for this grade is $1,165, if the officer has over 31 years of service computed under sec. 205 of this title, and $1,235, if the officer has over 36 years of that service.

BASIC PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF CONTRACT SURGEONS

SEC. 3. (a) Section 201(b) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words "O-2 with two or less" and inserting in place thereof the words "O-3 with over four, but not more than six,".

(b) Section 421(a) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words "O-2 with less than two" and inserting in place thereof the words "O-3 with over four, but not more than six,".

RETIRED PAY AND RETAINER PAY

SEC. 4. (a) Except as provided in section 1402 of title 10, United States Code, the changes made by this Act in the rates of basic pay of members of the uniformed services do not increase the retired pay or retainer pay to which a member or former member of the uniformed services was entitled on the day before the effective date of this Act.

(b) A member or former member of a uniformed service who was entitled to retired pay or retainer pay on the day before the effective date of this Act is entitled to an increase of 5 percent in that retired pay or retainer pay.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a member of an armed force who was entitled to pay and allowances under any of the following provisions of law on the day before the effective date of this Act shall continue to receive the pay and allowances to which he was entitled on that day:

(1) The Act of March 23, 1946, chapter 112 (60 Stat. 59).

(2) The Act of June 26, 1948, chapter 677 (62 Stat. 1052).

(3) The Act of September 18, 1950, chapter 952 (64 Stat. A224).

(d) Chapter 71 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by adding the following new section after section 1401:

"§ 1401a. Adjustment of retired pay and retainer pay to reflect changes in Consumer Price Index

"(a) Unless otherwise specifically provided by law, the retired pay or retainer pay of a member or former member of an armed force shall be computed at the rate of basic pay applicable to him when he was retired, was granted retired pay, or became entitled to retainer pay, as the case may be.

"(b) In January of each calendar year after 1963, the Secretary of Defense shall determine the percent that the annual average of the Consumer Price Index (all items—United States city average) published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics for the preceding calendar year has increased over that for 1962 or, if later, for the calendar year preceding that in which the most recent adjustment in retired pay and retainer pay has been made under this subsection. If the Secretary determines the percent of that increase to be 3 or more, the retired pay or retainer pay of a member or former member of an armed force who became entitled to that pay before January 2 of the year in which the Secretary makes that determination shall, as of April 1 of that year, be increased by that percent, adjusted to the nearest one-tenth of 1 percent."; and

(2) by inserting the following new item in the analysis:

"1401a. Adjustment of retired pay and retainer pay to reflect changes in Consumer Price Index."

(e) Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 1401 is amended by striking out the words ", and adjust to reflect later changes in applicable permanent rates" in footnote 1 to the table;

(2) Sections 3991 and 8991 are each amended—

(A) by amending column 1 of formula A in the table to read as follows:

"Monthly basic pay[2] of member's retired grade.[1]"; and

(B) by amending footnote 2 to the table to read as follows:

"[2] Compute at rates applicable on date of retirement."

(3) Chapter 561 is amended by repealing section 6149 and striking out the following item in the analysis:

"6149. Retired pay: computed on basis of rates of pay for officers on the active list.""

(4) Sections 6151(b), 6323(e), 6325 (a)(2) and (b)(2), 6326(c)(2), 6381(a)(2), 6389(c)(2), 6390(b)(2), and 6394(h) are each amended by striking out the words "to which he would be entitled if serving on active duty in" and inserting in place thereof the word "of".

(5) Section 6327(b) is amended by striking out the words "to which he would be entitled if on active duty" and inserting in place thereof the words "of the grade in which retired".

(6) Section 6396(c)(2), 6398(b)(2), 6399(c)(2), and 6400(b)(2) are each amended by striking out the words "to which she would be entitled if serving on active duty in" and inserting in place thereof the word "of".

(f) A member or former member of a uniformed service is not entitled to an increase in his retired pay or retainer pay because of the enactment of this Act for any period before the effective date of this Act.

(g) Section 3(b) of the Act of August 10, 1956, ch. 1041 (33 U.S.C. 857a(b)), and section 221(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 213a(b)) are each amended by striking out the words "or 'the Secretary concerned'" and inserting in place thereof the words ", 'the Secretary concerned', or 'the Secretary of Defense'".

(h) Section 1402(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting the words, "at any time for a continuous period of at least one year" immediately after the words "serves on active duty" in the first sentence and by striking out the words "on the basis of any period of active duty that was of less than six consecutive months' duration or" in the second sentence.

SUBMARINE PAY FOR MEMBERS TRAINING FOR DUTY ON NUCLEAR-POWERED SUBMARINES

SEC. 5. Section 301(a)(2) of title 37, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(2) as determined by the Secretary concerned, on a submarine (including, in the case of nuclear-powered submarines, periods of training and rehabilitation after assignment thereto), or, in the case of personnel qualified in submarines, as a prospective crewmember of a submarine being constructed, and during periods of instruction to prepare for assignment to a submarine of advanced design or a position of increased responsibility on a submarine;".

INCENTIVE PAY FOR DUTY INSIDE A HIGH- OR LOW-PRESSURE CHAMBER

SEC. 6. Section 301(a)(9) of title 37, United States Code, is amedned to read as follows:

"(9) inside a high- or low-pressure chamber;".

MULTIPLE PAYMENTS OF INCENTIVE PAY

SEC. 7. Section 301(e) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words "only one payment" and inserting in place thereof the words "not more than two payments".

REPEAL OF AUTHORITY FOR RESPONSIBILITY PAY

SEC. 8. Chapter 5 of title 37, United States Code, is amended by repealing section 306 and striking out the following item in the analysis:

"306. Special pay: officers holding positions of unusul responsibility and of critical nature."

INCREASE IN BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE

SEC. 9. Section 402 of title 37, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (b) is amended by striking out the words ", on a daily basis," and the fourth sentence.

(2) Subsection (d) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The basic allowance for subsistence for members of the uniformed services is as follows:

(1) Officers	$51.00 a month.
(2) Enlisted members when rations in kind are not available and their duty assignment requires them to incur subsistence expenses substantially in excess of those incurred by members covered by clause (3).	$97.50 a month.
(3) Enlisted members on leave, when permission to mess separately is granted, or when rations in kind are not available and the members are not otherwise qualified under clause (2).	$37.50 a month.
(4) Enlisted members when assigned to duty under emergency conditions where no messing facilities of the United States are available and they are required to incur subsistence expenses substantially in excess of those incurred by members covered by clause (2).	Not more than $129.30 a month."

FAMILY SEPARATION ALLOWANCE

SEC. 10. Chapter 7 of title 37, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) The following new section is inserted after section 426:

"§ 427. Family separation allowance

"(a) In addition to any allowance or per diem to which he otherwise may be entitled under this title, a member of a uniformed service with dependents who is on permanent duty outside of the United States, or in Alaska, is entitled to a monthly allowance equal to the basic allowance for quarters payable to a member without dependents in the same pay grade if—

"(1) the movement of his dependents to his permanent station or a place near that station is not authorized at the expense of the United States under section 406 of this title and his dependents do not reside at or near that station; and

"(2) quarters of the United States or a housing facility under the jurisdiction of a uniformed service are not available for assignment to him.

"(b) Except in time of war or of national emergency hereafter declared by Congress, and in addition to any allowance or per diem to which he otherwise may be entitled under this title, including subsection (a) of this section, a member of a uniformed service who is entitled to a basic allowance for quarters as a member with dependents under section 403 of this title is entitled to a monthly allowance equal to $30 or one-third of the basic allowance for quarters payable to a member without dependents in the same pay grade, whichever amount is the greater, if—

"(1) the movement of his dependents to his permanent station or a place near that station is not authorized at the expense of the United States under section 406 of this title and his dependents do not reside at or near the station;

"(2) he is on duty on board a ship away from the home port of the ship for a continuous period of more than 30 days; or

"(3) he is on temporary duty away from his permanent station for a continuous period of more than 30 days and his dependents do not reside at or near his temporary duty station."

(2) The analysis is amended by inserting the following item:

"427. Family separation allowance."

FOREIGN DUTY PAY

SEC. 11. (a) Section 305 of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words "or Hawaii" in subsection (a) and the word "Hawaii," wherever it appears in subsection (b).

(b) Notwithstanding subsection (a) an enlisted member who, on the day before the effective date of this Act, is permanently assigned to duty in Hawaii, shall, during the remaining period of that assignment, be paid the basic pay to which he was entitled on that date plus special pay under section 305 of title 37, United States Code, whenever qualified thereunder, if the total of that basic pay and that special pay is more than the basic pay to which he would otherwise be entitled during that period under section 2 of this Act.

SAVINGS PROVISIONS

Sec. 12. (a) Any member of the uniformed services who becomes entitled to retired or retainer pay during calendar year 1963 but prior to the effective date of this Act, may compute his retirement or retainer pay on or after the effective date of this Act under the rates established by section 2 of this Act unless entitled to a higher rate under some other provision of law.

(b) The enactment of this Act does not reduce the rate of dependency and indemnity compensation under section 411 of title 38, United States Code, that any person was receiving on the day before the effective date of this Act or which thereafter becomes payable for that day by reason of a subsequent determination.

EFFECTIVE DATE

Sec. 13. This Act becomes effective on October 1, 1963 or on the first day of the first month after enactment, whichever is later.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Rivers of South Carolina: On page 4, strike out lines 8 through 11 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) A member or former member of a uniformed service who, in accordance with section 511 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 829), is entitled to retired pay or retainer pay computed by 'method' (a) of that section using rates of basic pay that were in effect before October 1, 1949, is entitled—

"(1) to have that pay recomputed by 'method' (b) of that section using the rates of basic pay that were in effect under that Act on the day before the effective date of this Act; or

"(2) to continue to have that pay computed by 'method' (a) using rates of basic pay that were in effect before October 1, 1949, plus any applicable percentage increases;

whichever pay is the greater.

"(c) A member or former member of a uniformed service who is entitled to retired pay or retainer pay computed under the rates of basic pay that were in effect under the Career Compensation Act of 1949 before June 1, 1958, is entitled—

"(1) to have that pay recomputed under the rates of basic pay that were in effect under that Act on the day before the effective date of this Act; or

"(2) to continue to have that pay computed under the rates of basic pay that were in effect under that Act before June 1, 1958, plus any applicable percentage increases;

whichever pay is the greater.

"(d) A member or former member of a uniformed service who was entitled to retired pay on the day before the effective date of this Act and who served as Chief of Staff of the Army, Chief of Naval Operations, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, or Commandant of the Marine Corps is entitled—

"(1) to have his retired pay recomputed under the formula for computing retired pay applicable to him—

"(A) when he retired; or

"(B) if he served on active duty after he retired and his retired pay was recomputed by reason of that service, when his retired pay was so recomputed;

using as his rate of basic pay the rate of basic pay prescribed for officers serving on active duty in those positions on June 1, 1958, by footnote 1 to the table for commissioned officers in section 201(a) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended (72 Stat. 122); or

"(2) to continue to receive the retired pay to which he was entitled on the day before the effective date of this Act;

whichever pay is the greater.

"(e) A member or former member of a uniformed service who was entitled to retired pay or retainer pay on the day before the effective date of this Act is entitled to an increase of 5 per centum in—

"(1) the retired pay or retainer pay to which he was entitled on that day; or

"(2) the pay to which he is entitled under subsection (b), (c), or (d) of this section, in the case of a member or former member who is entitled to have the retired pay or retainer pay to which he was entitled on that day recomputed under that subsection."

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina (during the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, this is the recomputation amendment, and I think everybody understands it. I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, we have already discussed the provisions and the intent of this amendment. It is to right a wrong that was committed in 1958 when we denied those who retired prior to June 1, 1958, the right to compute. They had had this right by law with the exception of a brief period in the 1920's purely for economic reasons, and they were denied this right. This applies to enlisted as well as officer personnel and anybody who retired prior to 1958. We have agreed that this is the last time this sort of situation will arise. When this amendment is disposed of, in the future there will be an escalation clause and we are giving notice. In 1958 we did not do that. We have the most distinguished heroes of World War II in the history of America out of the 11 million or 12 million, or 14 million service men and women who served their country, the greatest array of heroes since the founding of this Republic—one retired one day and one retired the next day. One was denied and one was given the right. This is not right. It is to right this wrong that I offer this amendment, Mr. Chairman. I know it is right. If we can afford a hundred billion dollars in foreign aid, military assistance, and Alliance for Progress, we can afford this measly $30 million for the greatest array there is since you were born.

As one poet said:

> I have never had the privilege of tasting the ardor of conflict, I have never been on a battlefield.

Some of you may have. I do not know what it is like, but I know this is my day, this is my time to do something, and I am trying, because in my heart I know it is right.

Once a lineal descendant, a person from whom Winston Churchill came, said:

> God and the soldier we adore
> In time of danger—not before—
> Danger passed and all things righted,
> God forgotten and the soldier slighted.

I recall when we passed a bill to give special consideration to five-star men. I recall when MacArthur, Nimitz, and all of these great heroes appeared, how high the enthusiasm was to give them something for what they had done.

How many do you think ought to have the Legion of Merit or the Distinguished Service Cross? How many do you know of your acquaintances who never got the decoration? This is your time to reward these men and women who have given so generously to their country.

I recognize, as you do, this retirement problem. I recognize, as you do, that in the future we may have to give consideration to it. But I want to remind you that this is your time to right a wrong, and I will leave it there.

I thank you very much.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Rivers] and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, on April 9, the Committee on Armed Services voted on two motions which dealt directly with the question of recomputation. The first motion was to grant recomputation, plus a 5 percent cost of living increase. That motion was defeated by a vote of 19 to 13. The second motion was to permit those retired prior to June 1, 1958, to be given a choice of recomputation or a 5 percent of cost of living increase. That motion was defeated by a vote of 18 to 23.

Therefore, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, speaking for a majority of the members of that committee, is asking the House to support the committee's position. I think I can demonstrate to you by facts and figures the soundness of the position of the majority of the Committee on Armed Services.

Here is what the issue boils down to.

The Pay Act of May 20, 1958, which went into effect on June 1, 1958, provided that no one retired prior to June 1, 1958, could compute his retirement pay under the new pay scales contained in the 1958 Pay Act. However, these people did receive a 6-percent cost-of-living increase.

The issue before the House today is whether we will permit all persons who are paid under the Career Compensation Act, and who retired prior to June 1, 1958, to recompute their retirement pay under the existing 1958 pay scales, plus a 5-percent cost-of-living increase, or whether we will adhere to the decision we made in 1958 not to permit recomputation.

If recomputation is authorized by this proposed law, then any person who retired prior to June 1, 1958, who draws his retirement pay under the Career Compensation Act will be able to recompute his retirement pay under the 1958 pay scales and this could include persons who served in the Spanish American War, if they are still alive.

Bear in mind now, in 1948, when the distinguished gentleman from Texas, Mr. Kilday, on behalf of the Committee on Armed Services, presented that bill after a long hearing, we wrote in that all those distinguished officers who retired prior to that date, June 1, 1958, were not permitted to recompute their retirement upon the scale of pay given in the 1958 act. Now, that is the whole issue.

One step further. Recomputation is authorized by the proposed law, and any person who retired prior to June 1, 1958, and draws his retirement under the Career Compensation Act will be able to recompute his retirement pay under the 1958 pay scale, and this will include persons who even served in the Spanish-American War, if they are living.

We tried to bring about a cutoff period. The Congress cut it off in 1958. From 1958 down to this very hour an effort has been made to set aside that cutoff date. The distinguished gentleman from South Carolina in his amendment says that it only applies to those who retired before June 1, 1958. Now, I say to you if it is fair to that group, why is it not equally fair to the man who retired in 1959, 1960, 1961, or 1962 down to this present time? Are you going to make fish of one and fowl of another? As I pointed out when he was speaking, the logical conclusion is if you are going to give it to him, do not stop it. That is the logical thing to do. If those who retired before 1958 are entitled to recompute, why is not the man who retires after 1958 entitled to the same thing? Yet this amendment does not do it.

Now, we tried to stop it, and the reason we had to stop it was because of the enormous cost. And no man fought more vigorously on the floor of this House for the retired officers and the other officers of the armed services than I have. For 48 years I have been fighting their fights here. But I see the danger of what will happen.

Now, here is what is going to happen. Just listen to this: You are sowing the seed that is going to destroy the retirement system. You cannot continue to have this retirement cost going up billions of dollars year after year.

Mr. Chairman, in the next 10 years, without any recomputation, it will be in the neighborhood of $3 billion annually. Here is what is going to happen: If we continue this then we have got to change the retirement system. When you change your retirement system then you are forcing people to stay in the service longer than their military physical qualifications would warrant them to stay there. Then, what happens? Then you slow down promotions. Then a man says "Why should I stay in the service? I have no opportunity to go forward."

If you adopt this amendment, I venture the prediction here today that in less than 5 years an effort will be made on the floor of this House to completely change the retirement system, because this country cannot stand this retirement pay as it is going along now. That is the reason why in 1958 we had to do it. Today what does the appropriation bill carry for this purpose? $1,029 million for retired pay. It will be $3 billion in 1980.

Without any retired pay increases our annual retirement costs will exceed $3 billion in 1980.

If we assume a 6-percent cost of living increase every 4 years, those retirement costs will go to $4,135 million by 1980.

And if we take the average increases in military pay since the end of World War II, which approximates an 11-percent increase every 3 years, and project that in the future on the basis of recomputation, then retirement costs for military personnel in 1980 would exceed $6,415 million annually, and by 1983 would exceed $7,800 million a year.

I might add that a study prepared by the University of Michigan for the Senate Armed Services Committee came up with this conclusion:

> The cost of living method of increasing retired pay is not only the most equitable, but more closely will achieve the objectives of the retirement system. * * * The committee concludes after a thorough study of all the evidence that the cost of living method of increasing retired pay should be retained and that this policy should be continued in the future.

Mr. Chairman, I want to preserve the retirement system. These distinguished men who have defended the country and have given their lives are entitled to a fair and an equitable bill. We have given it to them. We have given them a 6-percent, cost-of-living increase. Let me show you this. Do you know what? I ask my learned friend here, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], does he know what is involved in this? They talk about $32 million. That is the first payment. If you adopt this amendment, for the life of this amendment you will put a cost of $600 million on the American taxpayer. That is exactly it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, of course my life has been enriched by my association for all these years with these admirals and these generals, great men. I regret that my conscience will not permit me to go along with them. But I cannot do it under these facts and figures.

Mr. Chairman, what does the law give them today? The former Chief of Staff under the law receives retirement at the rate of $12,180 a year. If you vote for the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] you will give him $17,712. Generals and admirals get $12,180, in addition to the privileges, and they are entitled to them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to complain about the fringe benefits which these people receive. They are entitled to them. However, generals and admirals get $12,180 today. Under this amendment they would get $16,068. Lieutenant generals and vice admirals get, when they retire, $11,220. Under this amendment they would get $14,172.

Now, he had to retire before June 1. It is proposed that we vote these increases merely because of the fact that he had been in the service and was retired. It is wrong in principle to say that because an officer on active duty gets a certain amount then a retired officer is entitled to base his retirement pay upon the pay of the officer on active duty.

Let me continue to show what some of these increases are. Major generals and rear admirals of the upper half get today $10,272. Under this amendment they would receive $12,768.

Brigadier generals and rear admirals who today get $9,228, under this amendment would get $11,100.

Here is the list; I am going to put it in the RECORD:

Annual retirement pay

Grade	Present pay	Recomputation and 5 percent	5-percent increase only
Former Chiefs of Staff	$12,180	$17,712	$12,792
Generals and admirals	12,180	16,068	12,792
Lieutenant generals and vice admirals	11,220	14,172	11,784
Major generals and rear admirals (upper half)	10,272	12,768	10,788
Brigadier generals and rear admirals (lower half)	9,228	11,100	9,684
Colonels and captains (30)	7,740	9,312	8,124
Lieutenant colonels and commanders (27)	5,760	6,588	6,048
Majors and lieutenant commanders (26)	4,896	5,172	5,136
Captains and lieutenants (25)	4,092	4,296	4,296
1st lieutenants and lieutenants (25)	3,288	3,456	3,456
2d lieutenants and ensigns (27)	3,216	3,372	3,372
E-7's (23 years)	2,340	2,532	2,460
E-6's (23 years)	2,112	2,220	2,220
E-5's (24 years)	1,968	2,064	2,064
E-4's (25 years)	1,740	1,824	1,824

I made this statement before the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Armed Services concluded that the facts did not warrant this increase.

Mr. Chairman, what has happened? You saw here this morning by a rollcall vote a bill from the Committee on Appropriations recommitted because of an item of $65,000. And yet on the next matter before the House, they are asking us to saddle upon the American taxpayer at least $600 million.

Mr. Chairman, I want to raise this question. I am disturbed about it and I think you had better be disturbed about it. In my opinion, if the amendment is adopted, section 4(a) of this bill would be completely ineffective in preventing a demand for increased retirement pay for the entire period 1958 to 1963. I take the position that under the language of this amendment there are 5 years when he has not received this money, and in my opinion he would have the opportunity to file a claim in the Court of Claims for every one of those years, that he would be entitled to recompute for those years. He would be entitled under this amendment to start in 1958 and recompute down to October 1963. He has not received that pay, and therefore he would be entitled to recompute for each of those years.

Who knows what that will cost? Mr. Chairman, we have a good bill here. We have given them 6 percent. If you want to give these distinguished gentlemen these enormous increases—$4,000, $2,000, $1,000, whatever the amount is—that is your privilege. I have done my duty because I am afraid; I see the danger—mark my word, and I repeat it here—the day will come in this House, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] will be here probably, but I will not because I am an old man—but he will be here and will see an effort made to change the entire retirement system if you continue to permit these things to happen.

Mr. Chairman, I am trying to save the retirement system.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] has expired.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished gentleman from Georgia be permitted to continue an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, but I have concluded my statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia says that he has finished his statement.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I would be less than frank and candid if I did not say to you that I do not quite relish being in this particular position at this time. You have just heard the man who has done more for the armed services of the United States than any other man who lives or ever will live. But I should like to point out that deep convictions can be held by younger men as well as those who are more experienced. I rise here, not in disrespect of my chairman, who is one of the greatest men I will ever know, but out of a deep sense of conviction that a wrong has been done and that this Congress must correct it.

It is true, Mr. Chairman, that by a vote of 19 to 13 the Rivers amendment which is before you was rejected in the House Committee on Armed Services. But since that time, I may say, there have been a great many second thoughts, much additional thinking, and soul searching, and the unofficial count today is that somewhere between 22 and 25 of that 37-man committee are going to support this amendment.

The distinguished chairman has said that this recomputation amendment is "sowing the seeds that will destroy the retirement system." I respectfully disagree. I cannot say that correcting a wrong, an injustice, at a cost of $30 million a year, and that is all that is at stake here, is going to bankrupt the retirement system. Thirty million dollars a year is the most this amendment could cost, and as each year goes by it will cost less.

I do not believe we are ready to say that the U.S. Government is going bankrupt because from time to time we improve the Civil Service Retirement System. Yet the deficit in this system increased from June 30, 1960, to June 30, 1961, by $1,117 million despite a Federal contribution of $896 million. My mathematics indicates that in the fiscal year 1961 the cost of the Federal share of the Civil Service Retirement System was therefore $2,013 million. We know it will increase in the future. None of us will say that this is going to bankrupt the country. Why is it that $30 million a year spent in the interests of right and fairness will bankrupt the country?

To say that the total cost of the amendment is $600 million is to use the technique of shock. The amendment will cost that much over more than 20 years. Had this fact been stated the amount would not have been shocking. I should like to point out that at the rate of $2,013 million annual Federal cost for Civil Service Retirement over the same period of time would amount to more than $50 billion.

Our respected chairman has said that if we permit recomputation for those who retired prior to 1958, why not do the same for those who retired after 1958? The thing the chairman did not tell you is that those who have been retired since the 1st of June 1958 do get to compute their pay on the basis of the 1958 pay scale, and they are getting the increased payment today. You do not have to allow it. They are getting it now.

This amendment is a pure and simple bit of fairness. We did not provide in 1958 for the future as we are doing in this bill. This amendment is only correcting the wrong of 1958. We are wiping the slate clean and starting a new system. Let me make this perfectly clear. This is the end of recomputation for the future.

This amendment is not retroactive in the sense that there will be retroactive payments.

Let me make it clear that this amendment will still keep the cost of the bill under the President's budget for fiscal year 1964.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COHELAN. Will not the gentleman agree with me on the very point that he is developing, the very thing we are suggesting today is merely what the Secretary of Defense has recognized as a gross inequity and, therefore, in his report on the pay bill that came up from the Department of Defense this was provided for; is this not correct?

Mr. GUBSER. That is correct. The gentleman raises a very significant point. This was proposed by former President Eisenhower. He is in favor of it today, I understand. This was proposed by President Kennedy in his successful campaign. This is the position of the Department of Defense because this was in the bill that they sent to us. This is the unanimous position of the Rivers subcommittee which worked 2 weeks on pay legislation. Everybody is in favor of this.

I do not see why we do not get it over with and do what is basically fair.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I would like to say this. I do not think it is a crime to be an admiral or a general. For 40 years we did not give them anything. In every statute, and I have them listed here, they refer since 1920 only to officers below brigadier general. In 1922 or 1942 it refers only to the lowest commissioned grade. For over 40 years, from 1908 to 1946, which is roughly 40 years, they got nothing. Now what is wrong with correcting that inequity? My distinguished chairman said, in his opinion, they could go to the court of claims and sue for this. I happen to be a member of the bar just as a lot of you—not very distinguished but where I come from, I do not do so bad. We put this in the bill. It is the bill. There is no fanciful thinking here. It says:

> SEC. 4. (a) Except as provided in section 1402 of title 10, United States Code, the changes made by this Act in the rates of basic pay of members of the uniformed services do not increase the retired pay or retainer pay to which a member or former member of the uniformed services was entitled on the day before the effective date of this Act.

Now I respectfully reserve the right to disagree with my chairman. I do not think it can happen. This, of course, is my opinion. I think I have a lot of people who know something about the law on my side. So this is not a one-way decision. I do not think many of them would go into the court of claims because this act speaks pretty plainly. We have a chance to do the right thing and we have a distinguished array of people who feel the same way about it.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALGER. Do I understand that this will bring all of the officers up to date on a recomputed basis or give them the right to recompute but stops it for the future?

Mr. GUBSER. That is exactly right.

Mr. ALGER. In other words, this is a provision that makes the law consistent and puts all retired officers on the same basis. We assume that there will be no further recomputation in the future.

Mr. GUBSER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. Chairman, I have one more point I would like to make and since I have yielded so much time, may I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I have several examples of the four star generals who would benefit from this amendment. These examples expose the specious argument which implies that this amendment would favor only the high-ranking officers. Unfortunately time does not permit me to relate all of them.

Let us consider a distinguished officer like Admiral Kinkaid, with 45 years in the military service. Many of the officers who were junior to him are today retired on the $16,000 a year that this bill would give to Admiral Kinkaid. If it is right for his junior officers to have it, what is wrong with giving it to him? The same is true of General Clark. Some of his junior officers were made generals and because they retired after 1958 are getting $16,000 a year. But their commanding officer who directed them in World War II is getting $4,000 less. Is this right? Is this proper?

Don't make the mistake of concluding that this amendment benefits only high-ranking officers. The truth of the matter is there are only 50 four-star generals and chiefs of staff involved.

There are only 1,852 general officers. There are 33,000 majors, lieutenant colonels and colonels, and 5,000 company grade officers.

There are 45,000 chief petty officers and sergeants who would benefit from this amendment. They get an increase of only $130 a year, but that $130 to the sergeant and chief means more than the $4,000 increase to the retired member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. There are four or five thousand other noncommissioned officers, or a total of 50,000 noncommissioned officers, who would benefit from this amendment.

The Fleet Reserve Association, composed entirely of enlisted men, is wholeheartedly on record in favor of this recomputation amendment. So are the Army Sergeants Association and the Naval Enlisted Reserve Association.

The American Legion, AMVETS, DAV, Jewish War Veterans, Catholic War Veterans, Military Order of Purple Heart, VFW, and Veterans of World War I have also gone on record as favoring the principle of this amendment.

I conclude by saying this amendment officially ends recomputation for the future. We correct the injustice of 1958 and the situation where one man retires and gets more than another man of equal rank and equal service of equal distinction.

This amendment will not bankrupt the country. It was in the President's budget for 1964; it is in the Department of Defense recommendation; it was a basic part of President Kennedy's campaign speeches. It is the subcommittee's position. We should respect this great weight of authority and accept the Rivers amendment.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHADEBERG] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment because it recognizes that the insidious ills of inflation fastened upon our Nation of which the retired and pensioned are the firstline victims cannot be placed at the feet of those who questioned not the cost to person when the time of crisis bid them rise to the occasion.

At $30 million a year it would take 15 years to spend the same amount this House voted a few days ago for the politically inspired $450 million so-called emergency public works bill—a total authorized expenditure approaching $1 billion.

I voted against the emergency public works bill because it deals with politics. I vote for this amendment because it deals with the welfare of persons who deserve our gratitude. I trust that those why cry crocodile tears over our national spending will remember those tears when they are faced with the necessity of voting on the multiplicity of fantastic programs to add agencies and bureaus to an already towering bureaucracy to say nothing of the aid to foreign governments to keep their leaders on an economic level to which kings are accustomed.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is a difficult issue, as are many of the issues that are before the committees and before the House.

A few weeks ago, some of us in the Armed Services Committee came before the House and appealed for some recognition of the problem of financing and costs with regard to our defense program. We did not win that fight on the B–70, but although we lost the battle we may have won the war, because since that time there has been a great deal more recognition of the fact that even in our defense expenditures there must be some recognition of the ultimate cost, and that maximum effort must be made to hold the line.

That is the spirit in which this bill has come from the committee. That is the issue under which this Rivers amendment must be argued.

It is true that the recommendation offered by the gentleman from South Carolina was in the original submission from the Defense Department, but let me point out, Mr. Chairman, that the committee in its wisdom added some costs to the bill.

We retained sea pay and overseas pay, which the Department sought to strike out. We added a family separation allowance, and to balance off these increases we have made some reductions.

There has been a certain amount of confusion about this matter of recomputation. This is a somewhat complicated issue and sometimes even some of us on the committee are perplexed over some of the details.

I would like to try, if possible, to throw a little light on some of the points on this particular legislation and this particular amendment. In the first place, the purpose of this bill, the central purpose, is to bring the pay of active duty personnel somewhat more into line with that of those in private industry, and to retain active duty personnel in the service, to make a career out of the service. We are concerned about retired personnel too, of course. We certainly have to be fair to them, but I think we have also got to recognize that when a pay bill comes along, the central and important question is the pay given to those on active duty who are immediately charged with the defense of our country.

Now, two points have been involved in this particular issue, and both of those points were made eloquently to the committee by the Department of Defense. The first point is that we simply cannot provide the increases in active duty pay that have got to be made if we are going to have a highly trained professional armed force, if at the same time all of these changes in active duty pay must also be translated into the vastly growing amount of money that is paid out to our retired personnel. If we are going to be restricted in the improvements that we can give to our active duty personnel because all such increases must also be passed along to our growing body of retired personnel, then the result may likely be that we will have to skimp on what we do for our active duty people.

The second point was made by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, namely, the vast increase in retirement pay that we are running into. By 1980, without any recomputation, retired pay will cost $4.1 billion a year. If recomputation goes through today and if it were to continue in the future—and I do not see how in view of the eloquent argument given by the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER], that we will ever be able to cut off recomputation for good—if we have recomputation all the way through, then the entire cost of retired pay will rise in 1980 to $6.4 billion or, in other words, almost 6 percent of the budget, assuming that the 1980 budget is of the same size as the present one.

Now the issue has been raised, Mr. Chairman, that we are breaking faith with our retired service personnel.

Well, Mr. Chairman, the decision on that matter was made back in 1958. I did not happen to be a Member of the Congress at that time, but what is being proposed now in the Rivers amendment is that we revoke that decision back in 1958, which has now been recognized and has become accepted, and provide a recomputation for people in that particular period but then cut it off for all time in the future, and for all personnel retired after 1958.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GUBSER. Did the gentleman vote for the recomputation bill which was unanimously passed by this House in 1960?

Mr. STRATTON. I believe I did, but it is possible for a Member to change his mind. And, I have been impressed, as the gentleman knows, by the tremendous fiscal and economic problem facing this country. I voted for the B-70 a year ago too, but I opposed it, as the gentleman knows, the other day, because of the seriousness of our fiscal situation. Yes, we are told that we are breaking faith with these people, but we did that, if we did it, back in 1958. And if we adopt the Rivers amendment we will still be breaking faith, but only with a 5-year gap.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that we are being fair to our retired personnel. In the first place, many of them are able to get jobs in private industry after they retire. In the second place we are giving them a 5 percent increase in this bill. I may say that this 5 percent in many cases is larger than what they would get if they had recomputed their pay on 1958 pay scales. In addition to that, we are guaranteeing them now in this bill for all time to come an automatic cost of living increase of 3 percent every time the cost of living goes up by 3 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that there is not a single other private retirement system that does the same thing. This is an eminently fair arrangement. We are guaranteeing that these honored people who have served our Nation can, when they retire, continue to live on the same standard of living that prevailed when they retired.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think in fairness to the needs of our active services and in recognition of our budget limitations that we can be expected to do any more.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to reincorporate into the military pay bill—H.R. 5555—the provision which would permit Armed Forces personnel retired before July 1958 to recompute their retirement pay on the basis of current pay rates.

In this connection I wish to associate myself with the views of those members of the Armed Services Committee who filed additional views on H.R. 5555 when it was approved by our committee. I believe the first sentence of the additional views is particularly pertinent:

> This bill contains a major inconsistency.

It does indeed, Mr. Chairman. It not only contains a major inconsistency, it contains a major breach of trust with a group of the most devoted and patriotic citizens of this great country of ours—that group made up of individuals who have dedicated their lives to defending and preserving the security of our Nation.

I am privileged to have in my congressional district the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis, Md., and from my former membership on the Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy, I am acutely aware of the need for continuing to make service careers as attractive as possible in order to retain the Academy's highly trained graduates as career officers. In addition, many retired officers of all services have chosen to make Annapolis their home. Among them are some of our finest combat leaders of two World Wars and the Korean conflict. I appreciate intimately their concern over the arbitrary system of two classes of retirees which the violation of the recomputation tradition has created.

The inequity, if not corrected, will continue to be very upsetting to morale among those on active duty today. The active duty personnel believe they have lost a most valuable and traditional right—real security for the future—in that heretofore they had a retirement system which was geared to the existing pay scales.

We all know the history of the recomputation provision so there is no need to repeat it here. There are, however, a few points—major points—which I would like to emphasize at this time for fear that they might be lost in the clouds created by irrelevant debate.

The first is that when Congress in 1958 violated the longstanding tradition of recomputation for retired pay, the injustice and error of the decision was soon recognized and attempts were started to rectify the situation. The House in 1960 passed a bill to reinstitute recomputation, but the measure died with adjournment before final action could be completed.

The Kennedy administration, like its predecessor, has supported recomputation not only because of the tradition but because it is provided for in existing law. Secretary McNamara last year submitted a memorandum to the Senate Armed Services Committee which showed that the Comptroller General has consistently held that section 6149 of title 10 of the United States Code and other laws establish this right.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I would like to quote an excerpt from the remarks Mr. McNamara recently presented to the House Armed Services Subcommittee which originally considered the pay proposals. This part of the statement clearly indicates the administration's support for recomputation:

> Apart from the historical precedent, recomputation has certain advantages. Since retirement pay is based on active duty, disparities in rates of retirement pay between members of the same grade and length of service were avoided. Moreover, a member retired either involuntarily or voluntarily, whether for age, physical disability or length of service had no reason to seek a delay in his retirement. He knew that his retirement or his retainer pay would be the same whether he retired before or after a pending pay increase. Under recomputation the retirement date as such was not crucial since the level of retirement pay always bore the same relationship to active duty basic pay.

Another point which I would like to emphasize, Mr. Chairman, is that recomputation is a two-way street. Under this tradition, retired military personnel get their share of the harvest in bad years as well as good. In four separate instances retired personnel have taken a cut in their annuities when the active duty pay has been reduced.

Furthermore, Congress, when setting active duty pay rates, traditionally has taken into consideration the retirement equity officers are accruing—that retired pay for military personnel is not completely gratuity but earned through contributions by each individual in uniform. In other retirement systems the annuity is based on the total salary of the individual while in the military it is based only on the person's basic salary without taking into account his allowance for quarters and subsistence.

It is important to note in this connection that over the past 10 years the median earnings have gone up 49 percent for groups comparable to military officers and 44.8 percent for groups comparable to enlisted personnel, while during the same period military compensation rose by only 16.2 percent.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, there is one point on which this whole argument, I believe, hinges, and that is that when we talk about retirement pay for military personnel we are not describing the problem properly. This in reality is not retirement pay at all. It is, in fact, retainer pay.

The military servant, in comparison to most of us, spends a relatively short portion of his working life in his chosen career. More often than not he retires after 20 years, but his association with the military does not stop there. In addition to being eligible to receive an annuity, he assumes certain obligations. For instance, he must keep his service chief informed of his whereabouts and get permission to travel outside the country. He carries these burdens because he is on call by his former boss—he can be recalled to active duty when his services are needed. In this sense, then, his so-called retirement is a retainer. It is to keep him ready and available so that he can again serve his country if needed.

In closing let me quote a very pertinent section of the 1957 report of the Cordiner Committee, that group established to study all aspects of the military pay problem. The report said:

> The inclusion of retired personnel within the new compensation system is considered

> by the Committee to be a mandatory and essential feature fully in consonance with the long-established principle that retired compensation must always remain closely related to current active duty pay. To depart from this principle would not only break faith with the individual currently retired, but would have a most serious adverse effect upon the retention rates of personnel currently on active duty.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I urge my collagues to vote for this amendment and thus for recomputation.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANKFORD. I will be very happy to yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. And the Committee on Armed Services then reported this thing out unanimously and the House passed it unanimously. On the subcommittee of which I have the distinct honor to be chairman, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] was a member of that subcommittee, and I do not recall his raising a point of order to this provision when we reported it out. The point at which the gentleman got religion I am not certain. But I am sorry to see such a great concern for the budget now and his colleagues in arms. We want to take care of them. This disturbs me, this disturbs me.

Mr. VINSON. Mr Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANKFORD. I would be happy to yield to my distinguished chairman of the full committee.

Mr. VINSON. So the committee can clearly understand, in 1960, by direction of the Armed Services Committee, I presented to the House a bill permitting recomputation or computation. It passed unanimously. It went to the other body. It was referred to a subcommittee. It stayed in the subcommittee. After awhile a decision was made to have a staff study by the great University of Michigan. That university held that they were not entitled to recomputation but they were entitled to cost-of-living increases.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The time of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LANKFORD] has expired.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The **CHAIRMAN.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to my respected chairman that I am speaking of the actions of the House of Representatives, not of the other body.

Mr. VINSON. I was just telling the complete story.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. LANKFORD. Briefly.

Mr. STRATTON. Will the gentleman permit me to point out that this proposal which the gentleman from South Carolina is now advocating so strongly is a proposal which, when it was first presented to the subcommittee, by the Department of Defense, was bitterly opposed by all of the representatives of the retired associations as itself constituting a breach of faith. Now we have the gentleman and these representatives coming in and telling us that this proposal they opposed so strongly before our subcommittee was just what the doctor ordered.

Mr. LANKFORD. In my opinion, and in the opinion of a great many others, it is a breach of faith.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANKFORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. The reason they opposed it is it did not go far enough. Mention was made of the University of Michigan, that great university. Their decision was based on compression. Their report to the chairman was compressed from the top. Remember that high-ranking officer never even got a pay increase for 40 years.

Mr. LANKFORD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I realize, as pointed out by the gentleman from California, that since the action of the full committee there has been a lot of reflection, a lot of thought and much soul searching, and I might also add there has been a lot of letter writing.

For that reason, I am reluctant to rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina, but I do not feel that I can responsibly pursue any other course.

This bill, may I point out to the Members of the House, carries a cost tag of $12 billion a year. The committee has acted with some responsibility. We have brought this bill into the House better than $46 million under the recommendations of the Department of Defense. Here in one fast move of noneconomy you are going to remove better than two-thirds of those reductions which we brought to the House.

The most discussed action of the committee has been the rejection of this amendment, the recommendation to permit military personnel who retired prior to 1958 to recompute their retired pay by using the 1958 pay scale. Recomputation will cost us an additional $31 million a year. I voted for the elimination of recomputation in the committee. I shall of course, adhere to that position in the House, even though I have been swamped by requests, as have all of the Members, to change my position.

I have the greatest appreciation for the service which our retired personnel have rendered to this country, but I cannot in good conscience, in the light of our national debt of $306 billion and our perennial deficits, vote for the right to recompute, which is a feature not contained in any other retirement plan.

I think it should be emphasized to all the Members of the House that all retired personnel are receiving under the bill a 5-percent cost-of-living increase, which seems to have been forgotten during the discussion on this amendment. I did not feel that we could afford, in view of our budgetary problem, to grant both a cost-of-living increase and recomputation.

Let me point out to the Members of the House again the words of the great chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, when he pointed out that without any increase in retirement pay whatsoever the cost to the American taxpayer in 1980 for military retirement pay is going to be $3 billion a year, and if you project the cost of military retirement in the future and have these same increases as we have had in the past, by 1983 military retirement pay is going to cost this Nation $7,800 million.

I further point out to the House the words of the chairman when he stated to the House that 11 generals and admirals are going to get an annual increase of $4,586 a year under this recomputation amendment which they ask you to adopt. I do not think that you can justify an increase of $4,586. For that reason I side with the chairman and believe that the action asked by the gentleman from South Carolina will jeopardize the entire military retirement system.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote for this legislation, but I also intend to support the chairman of the committee, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], in reference to this particular amendment.

I suspect the same question could be asked me: How did I vote in 1960 on similar legislation that included a recomputation feature? My answer to that question, if it were asked me, would be that I have seen some financial figures that have given me a little religion about this serious problem.

Let me quote some of those startling figures. As has been indicated here several times this afternoon, in 1971 the cost of military retirement will be over $2 billion a year.

In 1980 it will be over $3 billion a year. But let us go back and take a look at history to give us a better perspective for the future.

In 1954, the first year that I went on the Military Appropriations Subcommittee, the mililtary retirement expenditure was $386 million a year. The military budget for fiscal 1964, the budget we have before us—this year the cost will be $1,163 million. In other words, going up from almost $400 million to over $1 billion in 11 appropriation bills.

There is one other factor that I have not heard mentioned here.

In 1954 the total military expenditures were $40,386 million and the retirement cost or expenditure in that year was $386 million. In other words, the percentage of retirement cost to total military expenditure was 0.96 percent or slightly less than 1 percent of the total military expenditure.

Now we turn to fiscal year 1964. We have before us in the committee, and you will shortly in the Congress, a military expenditure figure of $51 billion. The retirement cost is $1,163 million. But the percentage of retirement to the total expenditure will go up to 2.28 percent. In other words, in 11 appropriation bills your overall military expenditures will have gone up 25 percent, but your retirement costs will have gone up 130 percent.

This is only with reference to the past. Now let us look at the future. Mr. McNamara tells us that he hopes in the future, by good management and by being very selective on weapons systems, he can more or less hold the line on military expenditures. I hope he can without any degradation of our military capabilities. But nobody here this afternoon can say our retirement costs will not go up and will not skyrocket. As they go up, and if you hold the line on military spending, the percentage of retirement costs annually to the total cost of the military program will likewise skyrocket. So in 10 years instead of being 2.28 percent of your military cost as it will be in fiscal year 1964, it will be 3 percent or 4 percent or 5 percent of every dollar that is spent annually in the future for military protection.

Ladies and gentlemen, I do not think we can maintain a military system in the future for the protection and the security of the United States paying 5 percent, or 6 percent, or 7 percent of the cost on an annual basis for retirements of the past.

Let me add this point. Many people have said that if we do not recompute, it will be a breach of faith.

I think there might be an argument on either side of that question. But let me assume for a moment it would be a violation of a previous contract. I will assume that for argument.

Every lawyer in this Chamber has from time to time represented clients who had a contract with another party but the other party was in some fiscal or financial jeopardy. So the two lawyers and the two parties involved sit down to try to work out a new contract so that the man who has a claim against the other party will get paid something so that his whole contract claim will not be destroyed or wiped out.

I want to say to my friends in the military, and I cherish and relish that relationship, I hope and trust that their attitude on this item on this program will not cast in serious jeopardy a whole retirement system for some 400,000 retired military today who are getting benefits, and a very substantial number who will retire in the future. If they are not sensible today about this whole matter, I predict they will place the entire system in serious jeopardy, and I do not want that to happen. I urge you to support the gentleman from Georgia, [Mr. Vinson] on this amendment.

May I add one footnote to my remarks. If the Rivers amendment is approved it is still my intention to support the bill on final passage.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, it is very interesting to note that our good, genial chairman, with whom we have had occasion to disagree recently, has managed to divide us. You have seen how the "fearless five" are pretty well split. However, as a divided young Turk, I rise in support of the amendment.

I would first like to comment on some of the remarks made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] and also one of the points made by our distinguished chairman, Mr. Vinson.

I do not think there is any doubt but what any retirement system we develop is going to cost lots of money. What we must do is begin to take a look at what we are comparing these cost figures with. I can think of some programs around here I would like to talk about that will cost and do cost more. If you are talking about $3 or $4 billion in terms of possible projected requirements, that we are committed to, I could compare this with some other items we are voting on around here where we have obligated ourselves in excess of this amount.

What are we talking about? The distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford], a member of the Committee on Appropriations, who is very knowledgeable in this area, neglected to point out as he was giving us the cost progression certain things that I hope he gets into the Record.

These are the realities. What we are talking today about is a Military Establishment, the like of which this country has never known before in peacetime. We have gone from a "Here to Eternity" establishment prior to World War II of some 200,000 to an establishment composed of Army, Navy, and Air Force, the best in the world, with a manpower requirement of 2.7 million. If you are going to maintain the quality of this force structure, you are going to have to take a look at what we call the labor supply price curve. You have to tell the House what we require quantitatively in order to maintain the kind of establishment we presently have. The cold war does not come cheap, but it is far less expensive than at hot one. We cannot have it both ways.

I am on a research and development subcommittee. I have been in the field investigating activities in this field. We are looking at scientists, engineers, and other professionals who are working alongside of every grade of military men and officers. There is a tremendous gap in their incomes.

At the present time, for example, I am interested in attrition rates of the graduates of our Military Academies. It is too high, in my opinion. We are not considering just the men we are producing at the Military Academy. But, clearly, we are not holding enough of our highly trained men, and it is not hard to understand why.

What does this have to do with the recomputation bill? Let me tell you something. A good society is a society that takes care of its retired people. It is reflected in all its institutions, military included. If you want the young career men in the service to feel that we will keep faith, I urge you to adopt this amendment.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHELAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BOB WILSON. I think the gentleman is making a very significant statement. We have heard a great deal about the total cost of retirement, but that is not the point at issue in connection with this particular Rivers amendment. We are talking about a total cost of $30 million a year which over the years will decrease each year. It is not a continuing cost, it is not a cost that increases. It is a decreased cost, and we should not get confused with the total retirement situation.

Mr. COHELAN. The gentleman is correct. This is a declining amount every day, but since the general problem of retirement has been raised, I want us to bear the total problem in mind. It does not make any difference whether this amendment passes at all, if the truth were known. The problems that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] and the rest of you are talking about are going to be with us. What are you going to do? Are you going to pay these people? Are you going to rescind retirements? You know that you are going to do just like you did when you voted for domestic and foreign aid and other programs. You are going to pay the necessary costs of the cold war.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHELAN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. In response to the answer and the question by the gentleman from California [Mr. Bob Wilson] of the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. Cohelan], the gentleman from California [Mr. Bob Wilson] was trying to demonstrate that all the cost is only $32 million a year and each year will go down. Now, it has been figured mathematically by the people involved that the ultimate cost to administer this program is $600 million.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, on any question of fact you know I will not quarrel with you. However, you also know my great admiration for Secretary McNamara, and my position on this question is equivalent to his.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment to allow those who retired prior to June 1, 1958, to recompute their retired pay on the basis of the 1958 act.

I would like to make it clear initially that I do not believe this bill accomplishes all it should or could. Recognizing the very serious problems we face in attracting and retaining qualified personnel, though, I believe it should be supported and approved.

I am deeply disturbed, however, by the glaring inequity in this bill which allows retirees with equal rank and equal length of service to receive unequal pay—an inequity initially brought about by the abandonment, without warning, of recomputation in 1958.

Prior to this date, recomputation, or the adjustment of retirement pay in accordance with changes in active duty pay, had been followed for more than 100 years, both as a matter of practice and legal right. The Comptroller General, as a matter of fact, has consistently held that section 6149, United States Code, title 10, establishes this right beyond doubt.

As Secretary of Defense McNamara made clear in his statement to the Committee on Armed Services, inequities are entailed in the recomputation system. Primarily, with selected pay increases to meet specific active duty force needs, it is inevitable that some groups on the retired list would suffer real income erosion if strict adherence to recomputation were practiced.

The Defense Department proposed substituting for recomputation an adjustment of retirement pay on the basis of increases in the Consumer Price Index.

But as Secretary McNamara's statement emphasizes:

> Acceptance of this principle, however, does not reconcile the Government's obligation with respect to those members now on the retired lists who were denied recomputation in 1958. The question is whether they should be allowed to recompute on the 1958 pay rates with the explicit understanding that henceforth, all personnel retired, or to be retired, will have periodic adjustments to retired pay made on recognized changes in the cost of living. The alternative would be to apply the straight cost of living adjustment to all persons now retired, irrespective of the base upon which their present retirement pay was computed.
>
> For two reasons the Department of Defense has concluded that the first course of action should be taken and we recommend it to this committee: First, those who were in the active duty force prior to 1958 and were retired prior to June 1, 1958, had every reason to expect that their retirement pay would be based on active duty pay scales at the time of retirement and thereafter * * *; second, the objective of the 1958 pay adjustments was to correct "compression" which had occurred since 1942.

Mr. Chairman, it is important to make clear that this amendment does not ask for a permanent continuation of recomputation. Rather it makes the modest request that before a retirement pay system based on the cost of living index is adopted, that the inconsistencies resulting from the 1958 act be corrected; that equity in basic pay scales be established with fair warning.

This, I believe, is a reasonable amendment which would enable us to keep faith with those who have served in our country's defense, and I urge that it be accepted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN].

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending recomputation amendment which would correct a major inconsistency contained in this bill. As set forth in the additional views included in the report, beginning on page 69, while purporting to encourage competent members of our armed services to make lifetime careers of the military service, this bill breaks faith with those who have already devoted their lives to the service.

Mr. Chairman, there is a good and simple reason for the military retirement system to be different from other retirement systems. It is because the status of the military retired member is unique. Even with a full career of 30 years, the great majority of military men are likely to be between 52 and 55 years of age when they are mandatorily retired. In almost any other occupation, an individual at that age could look forward to additional years of full or even increased earnings instead of the sharply reduced income of retirement.

It is apparent to anyone who will take the time to check that the total career earnings, including their retirement pay, of military men who are forced into retirement after 30 years of service, is substantially less than their counterparts in other occupations who are permitted to work until age 60 or 65.

Mr. Chairman, we must never forget that the Government demands the best years of life from a military member, but reserves the right to dismiss the individual when his most useful years are past. This is imperative since, if a military force is to be maintained at a high standard of efficiency, its personnel must be composed of men in the prime of life.

While in the service, the individual, theoretically at least, is under orders constantly, not 8 hours a day, but 24, except when granted definite leave of absence from duty. His personal liberty is constantly curtailed, even his apparel, speech, and manners are subject to scrutiny and criticism such as would not be endured by civilian employees. His pay is supposed to be sufficient for his needs, but in the case of neither officer nor private is it sufficient in itself to be an inducement to enter the military service. The attraction is supposed to be the honor and dignity attached to the service, and the opportunity for distinction in service to our country. In peacetime, as well as war, he must go wherever and whenever he is ordered, whether it is with or without his family. The civilian employee, on the other hand, makes no agreement when accepting employment to be subject to military discipline or to risk his life if necessary in carrying out his duties. The duties of the civilian employee are seldom of a hazardous nature. The regulations to which he is obliged to conform are usually what would be customary in an ordinary business office and no more.

In addition, even after retirement the military officer continues to hold a Government office within the meaning of the law and because of existing dual office and dual compensation laws cannot avail himself of certain types of employment for which he is often suited.

And finally, he remains subject to the Uniform Code of Military Justice and to recall to active duty. As such the retired member continues to be an important part of our national defense team. This vast reservoir of experience and mature judgment of our retired military people is relied upon heavily in times of emergency.

For these and other reasons we must never regard military retirement pay merely as a pension for long and honorable service. It is partly for that; partly as a retainer pay; and partly reduced pay for the completion of a career, the active part of which had to be terminated at a relatively early age cause of the character of the service.

Mr. Chairman, it is not worthy of the dignity of the Congress of the United States to allow the inequities which now exist among our retired members to continue. Nothing that we could say here today can justify the sharp disparity that now exists in rates of retired pay for service members retired under the same laws, with the same rank, and the same period of service. Today, for example, a colonel who retired on May 1, 1958, receives approximately $1,000 a year less in retired pay than a colonel who retired on June 1, 1958.

Mr. Chairman, let us act now as we did in 1960 when we voted overwhelmingly to end the injustice which now exists and thus make it possible to effect an equitable, orderly transition to the proposed new system of adjusting retired pay in the future, as provided in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I think all the figures that have been quoted here this afternoon have been correct, but they have been mishandled in such a way that I think by this time the House is completely confused.

I would like to point out that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] said that by 1980 the possible cost of military retirement will be around $3 billion. I would also like to point out that the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON] was entirely correct in pointing out that the total cost of this amendment, which in my opinion does not in any way jeopardize the retirement system, will amount to a maximum of about $32 million a year and will be going down each year so that by the time you hit 1980 it will contribute less than one percent to this total of $3 billion cost of military retirement. The chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], was entirely correct when he used the figure of $600 million, but that is the total figure for all the years that this amendment will have effect on retirement pay.

This amendment has but one purpose, not to jeopardize the retirement system but to correct an injustice to retired personnel who retired before June 1, 1958.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to take a great deal of time of the House today on this particular bill. I am certainly in support of any assistance we can render to our military who are the defenders of this great country of ours and who, throughout the years, have shown their devotion to our Nation, not by words but by action.

Mr. Chairman, I know that every Member of this House is aware of the wonderful job that the Commissioned Corps of the Public Health Service has been performing over the years. As chairman of the Public Health and Safety Subcommittee of the parent Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I have personally had the opportunity to see the results of this distinguished group of dedicated people. As a matter of fact, in the 86th Congress, the subcommittee of which I was chairman reported the legislation known as the Public Health Service Commissioned Corps Personnel Act of 1960 without a dissenting vote and without having anyone appear before the subcommittee in opposition to the legislation. Later, after this legislation passed the House, I had the privilege of serving on the conference committee with my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Arkansas, the Honorable Oren Harris.

I realize full well, Mr. Chairman, that the Commissioned Corps of the Public Health Service is being considered in this legislation we have before us today, as its members hold the rank of their counterparts in the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

Mr. Chairman, on February 22, 1962, President Kennedy called for a new study of military pay. He stated that one of the important objectives would be to achieve comparability of service pay with that of industry and civilian Federal employment.

While I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the Armed Services Committee, under the distinguished leadership of the gentleman from Georgia, the Honorable Carl Vinson, has done a very good job in reporting this bill out of committee, I do feel that the present pay bill for the uniformed services falls far short in achieving the comparability the President called for last year. As a result of the last of three civil service pay raises since 1958, the final step of which goes into effect in 1964, previous levels of comparability between the two systems have substantially deteriorated. This lack of comparability jeopardizes the essential career system of the uniformed services and presents a serious recruitment and retention problem.

There has been a uniform lack of success in retaining engineers, scientists, physicians, and research and development specialists. The Public Health Service has reported a very serious problem in the recruitment and retention in its Commissioned Corps of experienced scientific and professional personnel to provide leadership for major research and national health programs. It serves no useful purpose to place increasing emphasis on important public health programs, such as water pollution control, air pollution control, and radiological health, if adequate compensation is not provided to attract and retain the type of professional and technical personnel needed for these programs.

Comparability studies show that in 1958 the maximum statutory pay of a colonel, navy captain, or director in the Commissioned Corps of the Public Health Service was only $654 less than a GS–15. In 1964, it will be $3,285 less and comparable to the pay of a GS–14. This steady deterioration in the comparability concept creates a serious effect on the morale of our uniformed services personnel and on the quality of our research and development and public health programs.

Mr. Chairman, the report itself which accompanied H.R. 5555 clearly supports my point. I quote:

> Since 1952 there has been a steady deterioration of the compensation provided members of the uniformed services compared to the compensation payments in private industry and to civilian employees of the Federal Government. Between 1952 and 1962, the median earnings of professional, scientific, technical, and kindred workers, a group generally comparable to officer personnel, has increased by 49 percent. The average earnings of manufacturing—production workers, a group usually associated with enlisted personnel—has increased by 44.8 percent since 1952. The cumulative average increase for classified civil service employees in the past 10 years totals 39.8 percent. For members of the uniformed services, the overall average increase in compensation since 1952, including the recent increase in basic allowance for quarters which became effective January 1, 1963, is 16.2 percent. This is slightly more than the increase in the cost of living since 1952, 13.9 percent. Even with the increases recommended in the proposed legislation, the average increase in total compensation for members of the uniformed services since 1952 will still be substantially less than the increases obtained by workers in the private economy and civil service employees.

As I stated in the beginning, Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to belabor the point at this time but I would like very much to express our appreciation for the Commissioned Corps of the Public Health Service as I believe they, in their field, are just as devoted and serve in the protection of our Nation as those of the military be they Army, Navy, or Air Force officers.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Keith].

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, I asked for this time in order to ask a question of the gentleman from California [Mr. Cohelan]. In simple justice, if the Congress should approve this kind of increase for presently retired armed services personnel, must we not also approve similar increases for the civil service, for the Foreign Service, the social security recipients, and railroad retirement beneficiaries?

Mr. COHELAN. Well, the gentleman is asking me my opinion, and in my opinion I believe the military pay structures historically in this country have been on an entirely different basis.

Mr. KEITH. I would ask the gentleman the further question, if he knows the cost of, for example, a pension of $100 per month at age 50?

Mr. COHELAN. You are asking me? I did not get the question.

Mr. KEITH. The cost of a pension of $100 per month for a person at age 50 would be about $20,000. That is the single premium required at age 50 for $100 per month.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, with the gentleman from Massachusetts who just preceded me, I am greatly disturbed about what will happen one of these days when the retired civilian civil service employees come in and ask for a recomputation of their retirement pay based upon one of the numerous pay increases, such as, perhaps, the one which has been proposed for this year.

Let me say to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson], I am going to walk with him through his rose garden this afternoon in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. VINSON. Thank you.

Mr. GROSS. But let me say this to the gentleman that when the multibillion-dollar annual foreign giveaway bill comes up I hope that he will walk down the sawdust trail with me to chop off enough money from that program to take care of all the spending measures he has been supporting.

Can I depend upon the gentleman to walk the sawdust trail with me, come that day when the foreign giveaway program comes up?

Mr. VINSON. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that as long as the light burns the vilest sinner may return.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. Roosevelt].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Rivers]. I believe that we must approve this amendment as a matter of elementary justice. The money proposed to be saved by not approving this amendment seems of little consolation if at the same time and by the same action we fail to honor our commitments to the courageous men who have constituted our Armed Forces in times of crisis in this century.

There is no reason why our retired military personnel should be considered pensioners for they are still part of our national defense structure, subject to recall to active duty in time of need. This being so, their payments should be computed on the same scale as that used for those on active duty.

The departure from the traditional policy of one pay scale was first made in 1958, on the same grounds used for justification today—it would cost too much. If we accept this argument, we will deprive those already retired—those who fought so valiantly in the three wars of this century—of the compensation which, under the old policy, they had every right to expect. We must remedy the defect in the 1958 legislation and in the bill before us today by voting favorably for the recomputation amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I merely seek to ask the distinguished chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Georgia, whether he would explain how he arrived at the figure of $600 million as the cost of administering this particular program?

Mr. VINSON. Well, I will say to the gentleman that those figures are from the computers down in the Department. They advised, based upon the likelihood of the number and the longevity and all of that, that this amendment will cost the American taxpayers for all the benefits paid out, $600 million.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GUBSER. That is an unfair figure to use in the argument. One could say that this bill is going to cost the American taxpayer $35 billion or $40 billion. If we want to calculate it that way, let us do it that way.

Mr. VINSON. If the gentleman will yield further, this is going to cost that. I am not trying to deceive anyone. I am telling the truth. This amendment will ultimately cost $600 million.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, in response to an inquiry from a constituent, I have written him as follows:

> I don't know of a more complex problem that has ever been presented to our subcommittee than this question of retired pay. I concur in your observation that if we are not careful we could kill this entire bill if we persisted in attempting to put retirement pay back on the traditional basis. It would not only add $87 million to the fiscal 1964 costs and jeopardize the retirement system, if enacted, but might kill the bill now under consideration. I far prefer to pass a bill that has a chance of becoming law, rather than pass a bill that could die in the Senate. In a previous Congress we passed a recomputation bill which the Senate would not consider. Now, if the Senate wouldn't even consider the recomputation bill we passed in the 86th Congress, I wonder what chance we would have if we attempted to pass a recomputation bill for the proposed new pay scales?

The **CHAIRMAN.** The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, every person in this House who has been here for more than the current term was a Member of the House in 1960 when a similar bill to this amendment passed the House without a single person raising a dissenting voice. This record started in the Armed Services Committee where there was a unanimous vote and on the House floor—I remember it clearly—there was not a single voice raised in opposition to the bill. So if you have constituents who are interested in this bill, your constituents certainly were led to believe in 1960 that you were in favor of the bill on recomputation. The only way, therefore, for this House to be consistent with its position, upon which it went on record in 1960, is to pass this amendment today to do the thing we attempted to do in 1960 but were blocked from doing by failure of action of the other body.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **CHAIRMAN.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. It corrects a grave injustice and inconsistency in this legislation. The law as it now stands purports to encourage competent members of our armed services to make lifetime careers of the military service, but it breaks faith with those who have already devoted their lives to the service.

For over a century it has been traditional that retired military pay be based on active duty pay. This right to recompute retired pay on the basis of active duty pay is not only a moral obligation but has a firm basis in law.

In 1958, in a drastic and rather unprecedented move and without adequate warning to retired personnel, Congress created this situation with which we are now faced. It is up to Congress to correct it. We all know that every man on the retired rolls and on active duty has been told by recruiting officials that his retired pay would be based on active duty. We know that fringe benefits, including retired pay, have always been offered as inducements for servicemen to accept less money in the military than in civilian life. I believe it is out of character for the U.S. Government to make a promise and then refuse to keep it. Mr. Chairman, this country gives billions away in foreign aid, presumably to halt communism and raise the standard of living of other nations. But when it comes time to grant a few dollars to our own military who have done more to halt the flow of communism than any other group, and when an effort is made to raise their standard of living, a great furor is heard. I cannot follow the thinking of those who vote for foreign aid on one hand, yet oppose this effort at fair play to our own veterans on the other.

Mr. Chairman, I could continue on this debate, but I think the issue is clear. I urge my colleagues to keep faith with our military and support this amendment.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN].

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I am about to make as well as the remarks I made earlier.

The **CHAIRMAN.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I am taking this time merely to get over what I failed to get over the last time; and that is in connection with the statement made by Secretary of Defense McNamara. The Secretary made it clear in his statement to the Committee on Armed Services that inequities are entailed in the recomputation system primarily with selected pay increases to meet specific active-duty-force needs. It is inevitable that some groups on the retired list would suffer real income erosion if strict adherence to recomputation were practiced.

And he goes on: The Defense Department proposed a substitute for recomputation and adjustment of retirement pay on the basis of increases in the Consumer Price Index. But as the Secretary emphasized, acceptance of this principle does not reconcile the Government's obligation with respect to members now on the retired list who were denied recomputation in 1958.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

I would like to put myself firmly on the side of equity and justice by advocating the military pay bill be amended to rectify a longstanding breach of faith and reestablish the confidence of our military men and women in the word of the U.S. Government, a confidence that has been shaken by the failure to fulfill an obligation.

There are today 108,412 veterans who retired prior to June 1, 1958, who will receive no increase of pension from the pay bill reported out—H.R. 5555. Throughout their service and subsequent retirement they were given to believe that they would receive increases in their pensions proportionate to increases in active duty pay for the rank in which they retired. They had entered the service with this understanding. But the pay bill that was passed in 1958 ended this practice, which had been followed since 1861. Instead, those who had retired prior to 1958 got a flat 6-percent increase. Those who happened to be lucky enough to retire after June 1, 1958, had their pensions based on the new 1958 rates which were increased anywhere from 6 to 25 percent.

When this happened it met immediate opposition from the services, the retired people, and from Congress. In the 86th Congress alone a total of 45 House bills and 2 Senate bills were introduced to let those who retired before 1958 recompute their pay on the new rates. Seeing the mistake that had been made, the administration, including the President, the Department of Defense, and the Bureau of the Budget favored a bill to allow recomputation.

This bill—H.R. 11318—was passed unanimously by the House in May 1960. But the Senate never acted on it.

The new pay legislation requested by the Department of Defense and worked out by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] and his subcommittee would allow these 108,412 retired people to receive an increase in their pensions—not based on the new 1963 rates, but merely on the present 1958 scale. It would accomplish what was unanimously desired by the House in 1960.

Whereas this subcommittee bill falls short, in my opinion, of what I would consider a truly satisfactory pay bill for the active and retired members of the uniformed services, it is a vastly superior measure to H.R. 5555. In all areas concerned the bill reported by Congressman RIVERS' subcommittee is a better approach to this matter and I would hope the House of Representatives will accept the provisions of H.R. 4696 in preference to the provisions of the bill we now have before us.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS].

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Enactment of this recomputation provision would rectify a past wrong, would eliminate an inconsistency in our military pay scales, and would erase a glaring inequity in retirement computations now applicable to former members of our armed services.

In 1958 the Congress passed a military pay bill which provided for only a 6-percent cost-of-living increase for all officers who retired before June 1, 1958, but retained the traditional and higher active duty rate of compensation for all officers retiring after that date. Thus, there arose an injustice—an inequity visited upon many thousands of career officers who bravely sought to preserve this Republic in times of crisis and national emergency.

The Congress now has an opportunity to correct the inequitable treatment accorded pre-1958 retired career officers by amending the military pay bill now before us so as to permit the pre-1958 retirees to recompute their retirement benefits on the basis of the present active duty pay scales.

It is fair and necessary for the Congress to eliminate senseless inconsistencies occasioned by date and ill-conceived provisions of law. It is furthermore a matter of practical sense to correct these deficiencies so as to accord proper equality in retirement provisions applicable to all military officers.

If inequalities such as this computation provision are allowed to stand then indeed it is hollow rhetoric to call this bill before us today a career incentive bill. While purporting to encourage qualified Americans to pursue careers in the military service, the bill in effect punctures the morale of those who have already devoted their lives to the service. This unfairness will be of no little concern to the present members of our Armed Forces and to those prospective applicants to the military service. These men and women can only be adversely impressed by a policy of inequality and unconcern for corrective measures. In a sense, a disparity of values exists today—a disparity having no moral justification. It is fortunate, however, that we in this Chamber now have an opportunity to rectify a past wrong, and to give evidence of our concern and awareness that all the officers of our armed services can be treated with a similar degree of equality and recognition for the many years they have spent in defense of their Nation. I commend to my colleagues the wisdom and tenor of the amendment now before us, and I voice my wholehearted support in favor of its passage.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. Miller].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I have here a copy of a report by Dr. James R. Killian, Jr., "Can Government Maintain Vital Scientific Leadership?" In this report Dr. Killian says that one of our least recognized but most critical national problems is the recruitment and retention of top scientific and engineering talent in Government. This problem is particularly acute in our uniformed services.

All agencies have reported lack of success in recruiting and retaining engineers, scientists, physicians, and research and development specialists. These people are highly sought after by universities, industry, and nongovernmental research organizations.

As a graduate engineer, I am particularly conscious of the fact that the services are experiencing great difficulty in their attempts to attract young graduate engineers from California colleges and universities to careers as engineer officers because of a salary differential. For example, the entrance salary for an engineer with a bachelor's degree under the State merit system of California begins at $562 per month. Within 6 months, the individual is eligible for a promotion to a salary of $590 a month. The same engineer under the Federal civil service compensation plan would qualify for a GS-7, with a starting salary of $538. Under H.R. 5555, however, an unmarried engineer with a bachelor's degree commissioned in the "O-1" grade of the uniformed services would receive $358.50 per month. Even taking into account the tax advantages enjoyed by commissioned officers, there still is a serious disparity in these pay scales.

But it is not in the entering grades that the greatest disparity exists. As I understand the situation, the bill before us still leaves officers in the grade of colonel with a ceiling on their pay and allowances about $1,500 less than the ceiling for GS-15 civil service employees.

The disparity between the ceiling for officers in the grade of lieutenant colonel and civil service employees in grade GS-14 is well over $2,000.

While I intend to vote for this bill, Mr. Chairman, it seems clear to me that we are doing far too little in our efforts to provide attractive careers in the uniformed services, especially for the kinds of leadership necessary in an era when science is on the ascendancy. The Armed Forces who need more and more technically trained personnel, and the Commissioned Corps of the Public Health Service, which utilizes only manpower trained in the sciences, will be severely disadvantaged in trying to maintain adequate staffs of officers in the higher grades.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Rivers].

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, Secretary McNamara said this:

> For two reasons the Department of Defense has concluded that the first course of action should be taken—

That is the 3-percent escalator clause:

> First, those who are on active-duty force prior to 1958 and retired prior to June 1 had every reason to expect that their retirement pay would be based on active-duty scales, which was the law for 100 years.

And it is the law today. We are repealing it by this Act. This is the law now. We suspended it in 1958. What is wrong with being an admiral or a general? For 40 years a four-star general did not have a pay raise.

For 40 years at least a three-star general was paid by the same scale as a two-star general. Only in 1958 did we have a pay raise for these men. What is wrong with that?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I trust the House will support the committee's position.

You should know before you vote for this amendment where the money goes. It goes to 23,000 officers: 11 Chiefs of Staff get an increase of $4,586; 39 generals and admirals get an increase of $2,957; 139 lieutenant generals and vice admirals get an increase of $2,359; 729 major generals and rear admirals get an increase of $1,928; 934 brigadier generals and admirals get an increase of $1,345; 753 colonels and captains get an increase of $1,070; 5,000 lieutenant colonels and commanders will get an increase of $561; 7,000 majors and lieutenant commanders will get an increase of $87.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Rivers].

The question was taken; and the Chairman being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 126, noes 110.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Rivers of South Carolina and Mr. Hébert.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 152, noes 126.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, may I say that I supported the Rivers amendment that was just adopted by the Committee. It is my intention to support the bill on final passage if there is a rollcall vote.

However, I think an interesting observation may be had within a few days when we have a rollcall vote to increase the debt limit.

It is going to be rather interesting to see how many people, notwithstanding the Rivers amendment—those who have supported the Rivers amendment today and those who will support this bill, which as the gentleman from Georgia, the distinguished chairman of the committee says will eventually generate a cost in the area of $35 billion—who will vote to saddle the responsibility of paying this obligation on the Treasury Department, yet they will not vote to give it the authority to raise the money with which to pay the obligations that they require him to meet.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. Bennett of Florida:
>
> Insert the following new section at the end of the bill:
>
> "SPECIAL PAY FOR DUTY SUBJECT TO HOSTILE FIRE
>
> "SEC. 14. (a) Chapter 5 of title 37, United States Code, is amended as follows:
>
> "(1) The following new section is added after section 309:
>
> "'§ 310. Special pay: duty subject to hostile fire

"'(a) Except in time of war declared by Congress, and under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, a member of a uniformed service may be paid special pay at the rate of $55 a month for any month in which he was entitled to basic pay and in which he—

"'(1) was subject to hostile fire or explosion of hostile mines;

"'(2) was on duty in an area in which he was in imminent danger of being exposed to hostile fire or explosion of hostile mines and in which, during the period he was on duty in that area, other members of the uniformed services were subject to hostile fire or explosion of hostile mines; or

"'(3) was killed, injured, or wounded by hostile fire, explosion of a hostile mine, or any other hostile action.

A member covered by clause (3) who is hospitalized for the treatment of his injury or wound may be paid special pay under this section for not more than three additional months during which he is so hospitalized.

"'(b) A member may not be paid more than one special pay under this section for any month. A member may be paid special pay under this section in addition to any other pay and allowances to which he may be entitled.

"'(c) Any determination of fact that is made in administering this section is conclusive. Such a determination may not be reviewed by any other officer or agency of the United States unless there has been fraud or gross negligence. However, the determination may be changed on the basis of new evidence or for other good cause.

"'(d) The Secretary of Defense shall report to Congress by March 1 of each year on the administration of this section during the preceding calendar year.'

"(2) The following new item is inserted in the analysis:

"'310. Special pay: duty subject to hostile fire.'

"(b) The Combat Duty Pay Act of 1952 (50 App. U.S.C. 2351 et seq.) is repealed."

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, this amendment puts into this bill what has already been the law with regard to combat or hostile fire pay, with certain modifications in World War II and the Korean war. There are improvements on it that have been made in this, but these improvements that have been made come from the requests of the administration, they are approved by the Bureau of the Budget, they were requested by the Department of Defense. Administration approval was full. Although it has been said that the Committee on Armed Services turned down this proposal, the special subcommittee which held hearings on this legislation—and they were quite extensive and quite full—approved this provision, as has been requested by the Bureau of the Budget, the Department of Defense, and others.

In a very brief manner, in hearings not before you today, except in typewritten form, the committee did reverse this position of the subcommittee by a close vote. Now, you say the Committee on Armed Services turned this down. The truth of the matter is that the committee that actually studied this legislation and heard witnesses on this legislation approved the legislation which I am asking you to put into this bill. It has departmental approval; it has Bureau of the Budget approval; it is at the request of the administration. It will cost between $1 million and $2 million a year. It is for the men who are actually fighting in Vietnam. How anybody can turn down these men for $55 a month, payable only in accordance with the strict regulations set out in the Congressional Record, I cannot understand. There is no administrative difficulty about it. We have had this matter up before. We have administered it before. There is no administrative difficulty about it. There is certainly no moral objection to this, because upon this rests all the benefits which are peculiar to the military. Who would be eligible for retirement, who would be eligible for these generous veterans benefits we have, if the frontline soldier was not the reason for doing it? So, on the basis of these frontline soldiers—actually they are few in number—who are required to take the lives of other men, at the same time protecting their own, these are the men who give the justification for all these other multitudes of programs. Now, we have this group which says we are not going to give them the benefit. How ridiculous, how absurd, how cold, how cruel can we get? Is it possible that anybody here could say that this amendment is not right, is not proper, is not justified, is not the moral responsibility of our country?

Mr. Chairman, I hope that you will overwhelmingly vote for this amendment. This amendment is approved by all the people I have referred to. It has ever moral justification behind it. If it fails, this whole bill ought to fail.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Assuring the gentleman I am not being facetious, would this apply to troops, including National Guard troops, called out in situations like the Mississippi and Little Rock cases?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. It would not.

Mr. VINSON. If federalized, it would.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Well, since we are making a little history, like you do so often on the floor, there is nothing in the amendment that says that. Since I am the man that offered it, as a matter of legislative history, I would say it would not apply to Little Rock, and if it does, I say it should.

OVERDUE RAISE

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Cleveland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, I wish to concur with the remarks of my distinguished colleagues on the Committee on Armed Services. An overdue pay raise for the Armed Forces appears at long last assured. I applaud the additional provisions for a family separation allowance. It is regrettable that the committee has not adopted recomputation features and I shall support an amendment to that end. I shall also support Mr. Bennett's hostile fire amendment with the suggestion that its provisions should be made retroactive, as a small tribute, pitifully small, to the brave men who have already died in South Vietnam. Two of these brave men have left proud but grieving families in my district. I refer to the parents of Sgt. Robert Gardiner of Nashua, N.H., and the mother of Maj. David Webster of New London, N.H.

Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Cleveland to the amendment offered by Mr. Bennett of Florida: Add a new subsection to section 310, as follows:

"(c) This section shall be effective from January 1, 1961."

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is simple. It makes provision that the amendment of the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. Bennett], with which I am in favor, be retroactive to January 1, 1961. I concur with his remarks. However, it seems to me that if what he says is correct, then it should be just as correct that those people who have already lost their lives and who have already risked their lives in Vietnam, be entitled to the provisions for special combat pay. There have been two brave men killed in action in South Vietnam who have left parents residing in my district. I refer to the parents of Sgt. Robert Gardiner, of Nashua, N.H., and to the mother of Maj. David Webster, of New London, N.H.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important, to the extent possible, to have fairness apply in all matters of military pay. In all fairness the gallant men who have already risked their lives and lost their lives in South Vietnam should be entitled to special combat pay. We can never repay our debt of gratitude to them. We can at least attempt in a small way to pay them.

Mr. Chairman, I hope my amendment to the amendment will be adopted. It is my understanding that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Bennett], has no objection to my amendment making his hostile pay provision retroactive.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Cleveland].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Bennett].

Mr. Chairman, anybody who follows my lead on any military bill is in serious trouble. I marched against the chairman on the subject of the B-70 and I was wrong or at least was outvoted. I marched with the chairman today on the subject of recomputation and I was wrong again. Now I understand——

Mr. VINSON. Yes; and you are about to be wrong again.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I did not expect any other remark from you than just exactly that. But I am prepared to be wrong in this instance if you so deem it to be, because if we were doing an injustice to those affected by the recomputation provision I say we are doing a tragic injustice to those affected by this combat pay provision.

Mr. Chairman, we are going to spend in this bill that we are about to approve $632½ million for incentive pay for different kinds of hazardous duty. We are going to pay people extra money for parachute jumping and for flight training, for thermal stress duty, and submarine duty, and for glider training, as well as for human acceleration duty. We are going to pay them for low-pressure duty, and for the first time we are going to pay them for high-pressure duty.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the members of the committee that there is not any higher pressure duty that any serviceman serving his country can ever perform than to be on the receiving end of a bullet or shell. This particular amendment which has been offered by the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT], will not cost anything like $632½ million. It will cost $2 million.

Mr. Chairman, there are those who say that we should not support this amendment because everybody in the service is supposed to be ready for combat duty. Well, certainly they are. But everyone who volunteers for flight duty is supposed to be ready for flight duty and they volunteer for flight duty, by the way, but we pay them extra for it. They volunteer also for submarine duty, but we pay them extra for that too.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest however that nobody ever volunteers essentially for the privilege of being shot at. When we can take care of these people involved in these undeclared wars, in these dirty little wars, who are carrying the real brunt of the cold war, and can take care of them for $2 million I think it is incumbent upon us to do so.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Bennett amendment to provide extra pay for our men serving in combat areas. I particularly want to join with my colleague from New York [Mr. PIKE], in his remarks.

Additionally, I would note that men do not fight, risk death and die for their country because of the pay which they receive. Performance of this duty is dependent on individual courage and a high sense of loyalty to this Nation and the freedoms which it provides for all of us.

Combat pay is not incentive pay in any sense of the word. Rather, it is a small gesture, but a gesture still, on the part of this Congress and the people we represent to our servicemen who are fighting and dying in the cold war. It is a small but I hope significant expression of the deep gratitude every American feels for the sacrifices and dedication of these few men.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

In my opinion this amendment is the most deserving, the most honest, and the finest part or will be the finest part of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, during World War II approximately 15 percent of all the troops serving their military establishments suffered approximately 80 or 90 percent of all the casualties. That group of men involved the men who faced hostile fire. I was in a group of about 1,000 American soldiers who went ashore at Utah Beach. Six months later 300 of those men had been killed and about 500 wounded.

Mr. Chairman, to say that parachute duty, that submarine duty, that demolition duty, that flight duty, thermal stress duty, and lower-pressure duty is more hazardous than that duty which is being faced by the men in Vietnam who are facing hostile fire in my opinion is an insult to our men who suffer these losses and who are serving under the most hazardous duty of all duty we have in our services.

Mr. Chairman, we have just voted on an amendment on which no doubt every Member of this House has had a number of communications urging them to support that amendment. Yet I would venture to say that not a single Member of the House has had one letter, one telegram in behalf of combat pay. Why have you not received any such communications? Because those men who have faced hostile fire are so very glad to get home and get out alive that they are not interested in combat pay. However, that does not detract from the fairness and justice of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the members of the committee will vote for this amendment.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am not a member of the Committee on Armed Services nor do I serve on the Veterans' Affairs Committee, but I do think I know something about this matter, since I believe I am the only Member of the House who has been with our Special Forces troops in Vietnam. I went out into the so-called strategic area with these troops and saw how they work, saw how they live there during the day, and saw them under attack at night.

I question what the gentleman from New York who preceded me said, that these men are not volunteers. The special forces are volunteers. They are so-called instructors, but they are mainly instructing in killing and being killed. So far 73 of them have been killed. Unlike those of us who served in World War II and got combat pay, these people do not even have the chance that we had, because if we were wounded or captured at least we were given some niceties. Under civilized rules of war if captured you would have spent time in a prison camp. But if you are wounded or captured in Vietnam, the Viet Cong, the Communist Army, are under orders to shoot, torture and kill every wounded American soldier they take. And they have been so doing.

I think not to pass this amendment today would be an affront to our Armed Forces who have done such a great job. I urge that it be passed.

The Secretary of the Army estimates that under existing conditions between 1,500 and 2,000 Army personnel would qualify for "hostile fire" pay at an annual cost of about $1 million. This is a comparatively small price to provide hot war benefits to those serving on the frontlines of the cold war.

Mr. Chairman, we may call our military personnel in South Vietnam special forces advisers but the casualty lists and the helicopters shot down by the Communists are factual testimony that our Armed Forces are engaged in a shooting war. Perhaps a parent of a young man who lost his life on the frontlines of this so-called cold war expresses the problem more eloquently. Maj. Gen. William F. Train, commandant of the U.S. Army War Office College at Carlisle Barracks, Pa., is the father of Lt. William F. Train III, who was killed in South Vietnam in June 1962, while traveling with a Vietnamese Army convoy. Major General Train said:

> The desirable thing would be to have everyone fully understand the term "cold war." Insofar as the Vietnamese are concerned, their nation is a battleground and the shooting makes it a hot war for them.
>
> Lives are frequently lost in the periphery of the Nation's interest, whether it be the opening of the West in the 1870's or stemming the flow of communism in Vietnam.
>
> I think my son's loss of life in the service of his country is similar to the loss of life in any operation providing the freedom we know—in war or peace.

This amendment would permit greater recognition of the hardships and sacrifices of our Armed Forces who are working under hazardous conditions which differ little from conditions of actual warfare. These members of our military are doing a job for our country of which our country should be very proud. I urge my colleagues to recognize their contribution by voting for the "hostile fire" amendment.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Bennett amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I subscribe to all that has been said in favor of combat pay. I hope we do not delay long this vote. However, at this time I want to emphasize another issue in this bill. On February 20, 1962, the President sent to the Congress a civil service salary reform bill. In the message transmitting this bill, the President said:

> These are the very levels—upper levels—in the career service in which our need for quality is most acute—in which keen judgment, experience, and competence are at a premium. It is here that we face our most difficult personnel problem. It is at these grades that we employ our top scientists, doctors, engineers, experts, and managers. As a practical matter, the full principle of comparability cannot be applied to the higher salary levels of Government; but I consider adequate adjustment in our top executive and professional positions to be the most vital single element of correction in this entire proposal.

As a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I supported the President's bill for salary reform in civil service. I felt the principle of comparability he expressed was a true and necessary one. However, on examining H.R. 5555 and comparing the upper level pay increases with those authorized for similar grade levels under the Federal Salary Reform Act, I find that little comparability exists. This point is recognized in the report of the Armed Services Committee. On page 3 there is a most interesting chart which shows that the average uniformed services pay, including that which would be authorized under H.R. 5555, would still be over 11 percent less than the second step increase which is provided for civil service personnel under the Federal Salary Reform Act.

I feel strongly that there must be some relationship between the pay system of the uniformed services and the other pay systems of the Federal Government. If there is none, there will be continued loss of personnel, continued loss of morale, and there can only be a deterioration in our military might and in our research and development programs.

Our uniformed services are losing experienced and competent people just as they reach their years of full experience and productivity. The Government must help the uniformed services to retain these people by providing adequate salaries which are at least comparable to those provided other Federal officers and employees. If the Government cannot, the services will suffer, and, in turn, the Nation will suffer.

I submit we have been paying too little to professional classifications in the uniformed services. I hope this body will have another chance to provide greater increases in this area. I hope the other body will provide such greater increases and that we will conference the items and concur.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have probably had the doubtful privilege of drawing more parachute pay than anybody else in this Chamber. Having drawn that pay I certainly would not vote to take it away from those who now earn it, but I would say also, if you are going to pay a man on the basis of risk involved, hazard involved, on the basis of real danger, there is no comparison between parachute pay and combat pay for men who are under fire. Having experienced both I would urge you very sincerely to vote for the Bennett amendment for combat pay.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT], as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANGEN: On page 8, immediately below line 3 insert the following:

"(i) Section 1210(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: ': *Provided*, That an officer heretofore or hereafter retired or granted retired pay for disability rated 80 per centum or more shall be considered, for purposes of computation of retired pay, to have not less than six years of service'."

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, in the interest of time I shall be very brief for I present to you an amendment that is rather simple compared with those we have just been considering. This amendment merely provides that officers who are retired or granted retired pay for disability of 80 percent or more shall be considered to have had a minimum of 6 years of service.

On April 4 of this year I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an itemized account of what was involved in the retirement provisions that has been available to officers who have had this disability experience during the course of their service.

Let me point out that this involves a group of officers who literally made every sacrifice but that of life itself during the course of their service to their country. Consequently, because of the limited period of their service, the retirement provided to them has certainly not been commensurate with the degree to which they have served their country.

In these instances, the best example of the inequity that exists is possibly the fact that under certain circumstances these officers by a process of demotion and application to the Veterans' Administration can actually receive more money than they are entitled to in their own retirement.

I have listened to the gentlemen here this afternoon who have so eloquently proclaimed the need for equity in the veterans' retirement program. Here is an opportunity to provide that kind of equity, an amendment I think you all can vote for, that will provide a just consideration for a group of people that have made a great sacrifice in the defense of their country.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would have to be for this amendment but I am compelled to oppose it for these reasons.

The gentleman's amendment seeks to change the disability retirement system. Our bill under consideration today has to do with compensation. His section applies to disability retirement. This is a complex matter and should not be considered in a pay bill, and this is a pay bill. The amendment seeks in so many words to distinguish between two groups of officers by providing one with a high retirement pay simply because his disability rating is, say, 5 percent higher than that of a man with a 75-percent disability rating.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment does not have a place in this bill. This is a very complicated thing, this disability section of the compensation law. I ask that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is a step in the right direction to compensate those who are making maximum contributions to the national security. But it is by no means adequate, nor is it comparable in all respects to that which is being done by the Government in terms of pay and benefits for employees of our civilian branches.

I will support the bill, however, as a measure of equity and justice for the armed services, and I will also support the pending amendment for recomputation for combat pay and perhaps some other amendments designed to strengthen the bill.

It is clear that with but short interruption retired military pay has been based on active duty pay for the past 100 years or more.

That fact is known to the military, to the Department of Defense, to the Comptroller of the United States, to the courts and everyone else who is familiar with this question.

In 1958, we departed from that tradition and that practice and by that act the Congress has perpetrated a grave injustice upon some of the most outstanding leaders of our armed services—those who in many instances served gallantly in bloody battles of World War II and the Korean war.

We must redress that wrong. President Eisenhower said so; President Kennedy says so, Secretary McNamara said so, and the very able chairman of the House Armed Services said so, when this provision was pending here before.

Many leading military, civic, labor, veteran, patriotic, and business groups favor this recomputation proposal. The House has previously unanimously voted for it. The country has approved it and the country wants it.

As a matter of simple equity and justice to those who have rendered the Nation such peerless service in time of peace and unrest as well as in time of war, Congress should repair the damage to morale and the breach of faith that failure to provide recomputation has imposed upon our armed services.

I urge that the House may overwhelmingly rectify the wrong that has been done and vote in favor of this amendment and also the bill.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have here a letter from a sergeant in my district, and I should like to ask whether or not the statement he makes is correct. His letter reads as follows:

> As the bill stands as reported in the Air Force Times (which is the only way we have of knowing what's going on) a staff sergeant (E–5) with over 12 years' service will receive a $30-per-month raise, which isn't enough by a long shot if Congress hopes to keep well-trained men in uniform, but at the same time the bill proposes to cut the subsistence allowance for men on this type of duty where messing facilities are not available from $2.57 per day to $1.25 per day or a loss of $39.60 per month. It doesn't take much knowledge of math to see where this raise as proposed will cost $9.60 plus paying income taxes on the raise. If Congress cannot give a raise without cutting our pay somewhere else, I say leave it alone.

I asked the Department of Defense for an explanation of this, and if that letter is correct. I had a reply from the Defense Department which indicates there may be some merit to the statement. I wonder if the chairman would be good enough to clarify the record at this point.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I would like to answer the gentleman in this way. To begin with, whoever wrote that letter in the Defense Department is wrong. They did not write this bill, we wrote it, and I can state to you categorically it is not true. Where rations are not in kind, he gets $3.25 and I would like to get the defense official who said this is not true.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I have the letter here if the gentleman wants to see it.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I will get him. You need not worry about this because this is absolutely wrong and they do get $3.25 and I do not care what the official says.

Mr. PUCINSKI. We are correct then and the conclusion drawn in the Air Force Times is not correct and these men are not suffering a reduction in subsistence; is that correct?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. My able assistant on my right here, our distinguished clerk of the committee, Mr. Blandford, who is familiar with all this and who has forgotten more than any Defense Department official ever learned advises me that the man is wrong. We will change him if he continues to be wrong.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the distinguished chairman for setting the record straight.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, now that this bill has been busted wide open, I wonder if the House could not remain in session tonight long enough to settle the TFX controversy, or should that be referred to the United Nations?

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to reaffirm my belief that our country's two most fundamental national goals are the maintenance of a strong national defense and the promotion of an honorable peace. Accordingly, I supported the military pay bill (H.R. 5555) with full confidence that this measure is a necessary step toward the attainment of these vital objectives. Certainly, the surest way to guarantee to all Americans a sound, safe, proud, and free country is to insist that this Nation be as militarily strong as it is economically virile.

Most military men and women, instilled with a deep love for their country, desire unselfishly to serve as its protectors at any sacrifice. Nonetheless, it is important that their monetary compensation should be on a scale commensurate with the great worth of their service.

Having studied the various percentage increases, as they relate to the serious retention problems faced by our uniformed services, as well as other important military considerations, I am fully convinced of the need for H.R. 5555, including the equitable recomputation feature. Therefore, I cast my vote for this vital piece of legislation, proud to be counted among the overwhelming majority of my colleagues in the 88th Congress to whom this enactment is simple justice, long overdue.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Chairman, today the House of Representatives has the opportunity to rectify an unfair provision of the Military Pay Act of 1958 and, thus, repair a breach of trust with a group of the most dedicated citizens of this great country.

The military pay bill of May 20, 1958, which went into effect on June 1, 1958, provided that no one retired prior to June 1, 1958, could compute his retirement pay under the new pay scales contained in the 1958 Pay Act.

It seems to me that if those who retired before 1958 are entitled to recompute, a man who retires after 1958 should be entitled to recompute also. I support the recomputation amendment because it avoids disparities in rates of retirement pay between retirees having the same grade and length of service.

This amendment relieves the individual of the burden of extending his term of service to assure himself of an increase in retirement pay. Under the proposed amendment an individual knows that his retirement pay would be the same whether he retired before or after a pending pay increase.

The amendment also serves as a desirable incentive to retain the mature and experienced men needed during this period of crisis and cold war. It should be passed by the House and enacted into law.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. Boggs, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5555) to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 335 he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] rise?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CURTIS. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Curtis moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 5555, to the Committee on Armed Services.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER (after counting). The yeas and nays are refused.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Speaker appointed as tellers Mr. Rivers of South Carolina and Mr. Curtis.

The House divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 293, noes 10.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 41, I was unavoidably detained in talking with a constituent. Had I been present I would have voted against recommittal of the conference report.

COLLECTIVE DEFENSE AGREEMENT WITH ISRAEL

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution identical to one being introduced today in the other body by Senator Javits which, if adopted, would urge that the President invite the United Kingdom, France, and any other interested nations to join with the United States in a collective defense agreement with Israel, and any other Middle East State which is willing to join and carry out its obligations under such an agreement, and to provide such military and other assistance and cooperation as may be necessary to protect the territorial integrity and political independence of any nation in the Middle East which is a party to the agreement against armed attack by any other nation. I should like to take this opportunity to explain to my colleagues why I have introduced this resolution.

The situation in the Middle East, as we all know, has been progressively deteriorating. Arab States, particularly the United Arab Republic, have been stepping up their arms buildup, conducted with the encouragement and support of the Soviet Union, as well as stepping up their verbal attacks on Israel. The head of the United Arab Republic recently made a statement that his country was developing missiles which could strike "just south of Beirut," obviously referring to Israel. It has long been the policy of the United States that we must act to prevent flareups in the Middle East. This is a particularly volatile and unsettled area, and any wars of any size can easily spread to involve nations outside the Middle East. This was the principle behind the joint resolution of Congress adopted on March 9, 1957, committing the United States to help any nation in the Middle East to maintain its national independence. Yet another example is the declaration we issued in 1950 together with the United Kingdom and France pledging ourselves to hold inviolate the borders between Israel and the Arab States.

Thus the precedent for involving ourselves in the present situation is clear. We cannot stand idly by and watch a situation develop unchecked which could lead to a Middle Eastern war. It must be made clear once again to the United Arab Republic and to any other nation with aggressive intentions in the Middle East that we will not tolerate any attempt to compromise the national independence or territorial integrity of the State of Israel, and furthermore, that the national independence and territorial integrity of all the nations of the Middle East must be maintained. Peace in that area is essential to peace in the world.

A collective defense agreement would be a particularly appropriate way of indicating our firm intention to maintain peace in the Middle East. It would both reassert the principles of the declarations of 1950 and 1957 as well as provide a new tool with which to carry them out. It would specifically commit the United States, as we must be committed, to action in the event that any nation within the Middle East, or outside it, attempts to deprive any Middle East nation of its territory, its independence, or the right to choose its own government.

Along the above lines, I plan to cosponsor Representative HALPERN's proposed amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act, which would mandate the severance of U.S. assistance to any country receiving our aid which diverts its own economic resources for the purchase of military equipment from the Sino-Soviet bloc or engages in the proliferation of missile weapons systems menacing the world peace in a manner contrary to the expressed policy of the United States. This amendment would force any Middle Eastern country to think twice about aggressive acts or the expression of aggressive intentions, since most of the nations of the Middle East receive considerable amounts of U.S. foreign aid, either economic or military.

If the United States—hopefully joined by the United Kingdom and France—is willing to guarantee all the nations of the Middle East against loss of territory or independence, as provided in this resolution, there should be no reason for the nations of that area to engage in arms buildups. Under these circumstances, the Middle East would be an excellent proving ground for disarmament, and I would hope that the President would explore ways by which the United Nations might be able to take charge of a program for bringing about meaningful disarmament in this area.

REPORT OF GENERAL LEGISLATIVE INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE OF THE MISSISSIPPI STATE LEGISLATURE

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, on April 24 I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a preliminary report of the General Legislative Investigating Committee of the Mississippi State Legislature dealing with the disgraceful occupation of the University of Mississippi campus by the Justice Department. That report contained shocking documented accounts of atrocities committed against defenseless American citizens, including university students, by official agents of the Justice Department in their vendetta against the white people of our State.

Mr. Speaker, this committee has just released its final report this morning. As part of my remarks and on behalf of my colleagues from Mississippi, Messrs. COLMER, WHITTEN, ABERNETHY, and WINSTEAD, I include a copy of the press release issued this morning accompanying the committee's report. I hope that the Members of this body will take the time to read this document when it appears in the RECORD so they will have the true facts as to what actually happened at Oxford—facts which have been carefully censored from most of the Nation's press, television, and radio.

For example, I just noticed the Associated Press ticker located in the Speakers lobby relative to this matter. It contained one paragraph relating to the committee report and several items devoted to the Justice Department's denial.

Despite false propaganda put out by administration press agents, the atrocities committed by the Department of Justice at Oxford will never be erased from the hearts and minds of decent, freedom-loving Americans.

Attorney General Robert Kennedy, our civil riots chief, who is responsible for the bloodshed at Oxford, consistently refused to cooperate with the investigating committees' efforts to ascertain the truth. However, the committee did find out the truth and has reported its findings. This was accomplished by sworn testimony from scores of witnesses.

The Attorney General has been challenged to make his agents available to the committee so their sworn testimony can be taken. Thus far, he has refused to cooperate. If Mr. Kennedy does not do so, he should keep quiet and accept the committee's judgment—which is undoubtedly accurate.

The matter referred to follows:

COMMITTEE RELEASE

"The blundering of inexperienced Federal personnel, hastily deputized as U.S. marshals and the total disorganization of the entire Federal operation at the University of Mississippi on September 30, 1962," was blamed by the General Legislative Investigating Committee Chairman, Russell Fox, in a statement released today, "as inciting the rioting there and in permitting it to continue unabated for more than 8 hours." This charge was contained in the final report of the committee's investigation of the occupation of the campus of the University of Mississippi last September 30.

The committee report also stated that Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy violated every basic practical measure for the control of "crowds and demonstrations" as laid down in the Federal Bureau of Investigation's Law Enforcement Bulletin of October 1, 1962.

The committee quoted a statement by President John F. Kennedy (appearing in the Allen-Scott Report of October 9, 1962, covering the incident) as saying in response to an inquiry from a Member of the U.S. Senate, "What About Oxford?":

"It was a tragic chain of events and errors," replied the President. "The U.S. marshals were inexperienced and blundered in their use of tear gas. It was a very sad day."

The committee stated that it agreed with President Kennedy that "the U.S. marshals were inexperienced and blundered in their use of tear gas."

The committee also charged that the Deputy Attorney General, Nicholas deB. Katzenbach and the Publicity Director of the Department of Justice, Ed Guthman, set up a spectacular display of 200 deputized marshals (gradually increased to 400) dressed in orange vests and white helmets with tear gas guns, gas masks, and side arms around the Lyceum Building which is the "heart of the traditions of the university," thereby attracting crowds of students, and that they maintained this display for 4 hours before the firing of the tear gas.

The committee further charged that tear gas was fired without justification and without warning when the crowd was quieting down and drawing back, with the result that resentment flared out of control and the riot was incited.

The committee stated that although it does not condone the use of the deputy marshals as a military unit to occupy the campus, it is forced to conclude that if Attorney General Kennedy and his chain of command had followed the practical measures as laid down by the Federal Bureau of Investigation's Law Enforcement Bulletin quoted in the report, the rioting would not have occurred.

"No marshal had been injured at any time prior to the firing of the gas," stated the committee. "The marshals were posted in and around the Lyceum Building in plain sight of those in the immediate vicinity and no injuries were observed. If any injuries were sustained, they were deliberately concealed by Mr. Katzenbach, Deputy Attorney General, and his assistants, Mr. John Doar and Mr. James McShane from Col. S. E. Birdsong (head of Mississippi Highway Patrol), Senator George Yarbrough (personal representative of Governor Barnett), and other State and university officials who were on the scene and in constant conference with them prior to the firing of the gas. The committee finds that any statement that injuries were sustained by marshals prior to the firing of the gas is false, and a deliberate ruse subsequently conceived to attempt to justify the firing of the gas."

The committee stated that it found from the evidence submitted to it by Mr. Cyrus Vance, Secretary of the Army, that Governor Barnett was removed as commander in chief and Maj. William P. Wilson was removed as commander in the field of the 10,000 members of the Mississippi National Guard at 1 minute past midnight on September 30 by Presidential Executive Order No. 11053. There was thus removed from the control of Governor Barnett the only substantial forces available to him for the maintenance of order.

The committee recapitulated the forces available to Attorney General Kennedy and ultimately used by him as 556 Federal "deputy marshals" (consisting of 97 penitentiary guards, 336 border patrolmen, and 123 deputy marshals), 10,000 members of the federalized Mississippi National Guard, and 12,000 Federal troops. The forces available to the State of Mississippi and Governor Barnett for the maintenance of order, according to the committee, were 200 officers of the State highway patrol (out of a total State highway patrol force of 225) and 6 members of the University of Mississippi campus police. In consideration of these circumstances, the committee stated, "If this matter were not of such tremendous importance to the people of the entire United States, the committee would find it ludicrous that Attorney General Kennedy has led the people of the United States to believe that full responsibility for the maintenance of order on the campus of the university rested upon the State of Mississippi after the campus was occupied and controlled by his marshals."

The committee stated today that its investigation and report "demonstrates that the sole reason the rioting was permitted to continue for more than 8 hours (killing two persons, injuring students, citizens, members of the federalized National Guard, and the marshals and destroying thousands of dollars worth of property), was that the entire operation was a tragedy of Federal blundering, disorganization, and total disregard for human safety and human lives.

More than 2,000 of the federalized Mississippi National Guard could have been made available on short notice from 8 armories located within 49 miles of Oxford. Nevertheless, they were not ordered from their home bases until 2 hours after rioting began, which was more than 9 hours after the marshals were dispatched to the campus and more than 19 hours after the National Guard had been mobilized and ordered to their home bases.

In fact, at 8 o'clock p.m., at about the time the rioting began, orders were issued for the release of 75 percent of the personnel of all units of the 108th Armored Cavalry Regiment (composed of 1,400 men), the regiment located in north Mississippi in the Oxford area. They were not ordered back to their home bases until an hour after the rioting began.

At 10 o'clock p.m. when the order was given by President Kennedy for the federalized National Guard to move to the campus to control the rioting and support the marshals, the Mississippi Highway Patrol, and the campus police, the rioting had already been permitted to continue for 2 hours. Because of the lag in time resulting from the necessity of alerting, reassembling and transporting, substantial numbers of the National Guard did not reach the campus until about 6 hours after the rioting was incited by the massive firing of gas. No active units of the U.S. Army reached the campus of the university until more than 25 hours after Operation Rapid Road was commenced, more than 13 hours after the marshals were dispatched to the campus, more than 11 hours after the marshals occupied the campus and more than 7 hours after rioting began. The committee stated that, "We do not condone the illegal federalization of the Mississippi National Guard and the illegal use of troops, but find that when the President and Attorney General determined to carry out this operation and assumed full responsibility for the carrying out of it, they became responsible for the lives and safety of all citizens and particularly of the students at the University of Mississippi."

The report recited that, "Because of the pendency of the criminal contempt proceedings against the Governor and Lieutenant Governor of Mississippi, the committee will not discuss in this report the allegations by Federal officials and news periodicals of 'secret deals' and alleged conversations between State and Federal officials. The committee finds, however, that on September 30 the U.S. marshals, representatives of the Department of Justice, and Meredith were escorted upon the campus as they were on September 20; that the escort highway patrolmen provided on September 30 was for the same purpose as the escorts provided at the university on September 20, at Jackson on September 25, and at the university on September 26, i.e. to assure that no violence occurred and that no citizen (including the marshals, representatives of the Department of Justice, and Meredith) was injured.

The committee found that on September 20 when the attempt was made to register Meredith on the campus, that on September 25 when registration was attempted in the State office building in Jackson, and on September 26 when Meredith was denied entrance to the campus, the Mississippi highway patrolmen, the Mississippi officials, the marshals and the representatives of the Department of Justice were unarmed. The report recounts an incident at the State office building, "When the marshals came into the State office building one of them, in greeting Colonel Birdsong, opened his coat and said, 'See, no guns,' and Colonel Birdsong assured him that his officers were also unarmed."

The report continued, "The committee further finds that the action taken on September 30 was in accordance with the policy of the State of Mississippi mentioned above, that Armed Forces of the United States (whether marshals or military) would never be met with armed law enforcement officers of Mississippi. When the Mississippi officials were advised through public statements, through the press and otherwise that armed force would be used, the same procedure was followed on that date as had been followed on the three previous occasions, i.e., the highway patrolmen who were in contact with Federal officers were unarmed. One fact that stands out above all others is that so long as the Governor of the State of Mississippi was permitted to be responsible for the enforcement of law and maintenance of peace, there was no violence or injury of any kind."

The committee discussed in detail the actions of the officials of the State of Mississippi, the Mississippi Highway Patrol and the 6-man university campus police in assisting the more than 500 marshals, the 2,000 federalized National Guardsmen and the 12,000 Active Army troops in maintaining order after the Department of Justice and the marshals had occupied and taken complete control of the campus of the University of Mississippi. It found that all of the highway patrolmen who could be spared from their traffic safety duties (about 200 out of the total Mississippi force of 225) were rushed to the campus as soon as it was learned that Meredith and an escort of marshals might be sent Sunday; that roadblocks were set up and maintained from 3 o'clock in the afternoon of Sunday until the patrolmen were relieved (some at bayonet point) by military units on Monday morning; that the patrolmen were never withdrawn and remained on duty all night; that 52 patrolmen were on duty around the Lyceum Building just before the marshals fired massive rounds of gas at the students. The report recites that, "The committee finds that the instance to which reference was made in the public press concerning the highway patrol cars moving to the edge of the campus was when the gymnasium (which had been set up as the highway patrol headquarters) was so badly gassed by the marshals that it was rendered unusable and orders were given to transfer headquarters to the bowling alley on the edge of the campus.

As the highway patrolmen were not equipped with gas masks effective in the gas that was utilized by the marshals and the marshals were roaming the campus gassing all persons regardless of their capacity, it was determined that the best service the patrolmen could render would be to act outside the gassed area and to maintain the existing roadblocks and set up additional blocks and patrol the roads. This was done. Hundreds of cars and several thousand persons were turned away by the patrolmen at these roadblocks during the night and early morning. There were two instances in which the area of roadblocks was so badly gassed by the marshals that the patrolmen had to withdraw temporarily from the block, but they returned as soon as it was possible to remain in the vicinity and reestablished each of the blocks.

The committee concludes that "the officials and representatives of the State of Mississippi, the officials and administrative staff of the University of Mississippi and the Mississippi Highway Patrol conscientiously and continuously rendered every possible assistance to the Justice Department to prevent violence and to maintain and to restore order, in spite of the extreme handicaps arising from the wholly disorganized handling of Operation Rapid Road by untrained and inexperienced Federal personnel, without planning, equipment, or proper procedures, and in spite of flagrant mistreatment by the marshals." The committee expressly finds "that the statement of President Kennedy that 'Governor Barnett did not keep his word to help us maintain order' is not supported by the facts and is incorrect."

The committee charged that the Department of Justice, its marshals, and the military units employed in Operation Rapid Road were guilty of "hundreds of violations of civil rights of citizens" not only on the campus, in the detention stockade in the garage of the soil sedimentation building, but for days thereafter. The committee found that, "Order was restored upon the campus of the University of Mississippi during the early morning of Monday, October 1, and in Oxford by the early afternoon of that day. Martial law was not declared. Yet for many days after order was restored the Department of Justice caused the civil rights of citizens to be continuously and repeatedly violated on the highways for miles around Oxford.

"Without warrants or reasonable cause, hundreds of searches and seizures of citizens were carried out. State officials, county officials, law enforcement officers, men and women were halted at gunpoint. Their automobiles and persons were searched. Many were seized and taken into custody without warrants and without just cause. Thousands of Federal Armed Forces were quartered and maintained in Mississippi for weeks after

October 1, when no reasonable cause existed therefor; 10,000 federalized Mississippi National Guardsmen were held on active duty in 92 communities in Mississippi for from 5 to 10 days. The 108th Armored Cavalry Regiment of more than 1,000 men was held on active duty in the Oxford area for 24 days. Federal power was spectacularly demonstrated to the people of Mississippi, and nationwide publicity was obtained by the Department of Justice."

Chairman Russell Fox stated that only part of the picture was included in the portion of the report filed last week which revealed "systematic brutalities inflicted upon prisoners for many hours in the garage near the soil conservation laboratory used as a detention stockade, the deliberate gassing of seven dormitories by the marshals during the riot, driving the students out into the violence on the campus, and the disorganized bands of marshals which roamed the campus, shooting gas projectiles at students, members of the university staff, including Dean L. L. Love, university police, and highway patrolmen."

"The nature of the course of action by the marshals was revealed by their original firing of tear gas," said Chairman Fox. The report states that, "All the highway patrolmen in front of the Lyceum Building under direction of Colonel Birdsong, Chief Gayden, and others (at the request of the marshals) were moving the students back across the far curb. Their backs were to the marshals when the gas projectiles were fired without warning directly into their backs pointblank range. Several of the patrolmen were hit in the back or on the hip by gas projectiles, one was struck in the kidney and seriously injured another in the back of the head and another in the face. Several girls were hit by gas projectiles fired at pointblank range directly at them, one being hit in the stomach and knocked down, one being hit in the back and knocked down, and others were overcome by gas.

"Highway Patrolman Brunt, in uniform, was standing directly in front of the marshals, facing the students whom he had helped move across the street. His back was to the marshals and when the gas was fired without warning he was first hit on the left side of the back of his head and knocked down. As he got up and tried to stagger away, another gas projectile hit him behind the right eye and gas spewed over him and into his lungs so that he became unconscious and did not recover consciousness for several hours. His life was barely saved after he was flown to a hospital in Jackson. The deputy sheriff of Lafayette County saw a marshal lower his gun and fire the second projectile directly at Patrolman Brunt as he staggered to his feet after the first hit. As the deputy sheriff rushed into the gas to drag Patrolman Brunt out, marshals threw two tear gas canisters at him."

The committee charged in the letter of transmittal of its report that the abandonment of pending judicial processes and the illegal use of overwhelming military forces at the University of Mississippi on September 30 is not an isolated incident, but part of "a pattern of government which is evolving upon the American scene." It cited as an exercise of "raw political power" by the Federal Government actions taken against the steel industry in April 1962, when the President became angered by the proposed increase in steel prices. The committee stated, "At that time the announcement was made that defense contracts might be withheld and the Federal Government might use its investigative powers to bring about prosecution for violations of antitrust laws, that governmental investigative agents woke citizens at 2 to 3 o'clock in the morning, and that thereafter threats were made to use the process of citations for contempt against officials of the steel companies." "However," said the committee, "in that instance hundreds of marshals and thousands of troops were not used because it was not necessary to attain the end sought, in the manner and within the time desired."

The committee pointed out that when judicial processes were abandoned and overwhelming military forces used in haste in the Meredith case, the national elections were to be held within 5 weeks (prior to the time a final determination of such proceedings could be expected), and that numerous Democratic candidates for the Senate and House of Representatives were up for election, including a brother of the Attorney General and the President, who was a candidate for the Senate in Massachusetts. It stated that the only hardship which would have been suffered by James H. Meredith was that if the proceedings had not been terminated in time for him to attend the fall semester at the University of Mississippi, it would have been necessary for him to continue as a student at Jackson State College, the Mississippi-maintained State College in Jackson at which he was then a student, until the next semester.

THE TRUE FACTS OF THE BIRMINGHAM SITUATION

Mr. **HUDDLESTON**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. **HUDDLESTON**. Mr. Speaker, in this land of peace-loving people, disturbances of the peace are always dismaying and lamentable. Sometimes, however, the lamentations and cries of dismay seem not to have any relation to the situation in question.

This seems to be true as regards the unfortunate situation which has been caused in Birmingham, for, in the past several days, cries of alarm and shaming taunts have been heard from certain quarters, including those in and around these hallowed Halls. I think it well, therefore, to try to give the Members of this House a résumé of events as they have transpired in Birmingham. Needless to say, I have been deeply concerned about the situation and I have been in close touch with those who are on the scene. I thus feel I have a better picture of what has been taking place than those who have had only sketchy and sometimes not too accurate accounts from the news media.

First of all, let us consider how the present tensions came about. They were brought about when a small group of professional agitators came into the city of Birmingham, having decided that our community was an appropriate next target in the chain of disorder in which they hope to bind the South. Skilled, as they are, in inciting hatred and rebellion, while preaching peace, they persuaded a small group of Negroes, some from the Birmingham community and others not, to enter white churches some weeks ago. When this occurred, some of those who sought to enter white churches, being given the benefit of the doubt as to whether they were interested in worshiping, or gaining publicity, were admitted. In other instances they were not. In no case was there any reaction of strong hostility and, therefore, the publicity gained by the professional rabble rousers did not satisfy them and so they continued in their notorious efforts to arouse the Negro citizens of the Birmingham community.

The next thing we knew throngs of shouting, hostile Negroes were marching through the streets of Birmingham, creating disorder and threatening institutions and individuals as well as threatening the peace generally. This brings us to one of the lamentations we have heard in the past several days from pious men, holier than we, who have cried "foul" and "shame" when those charged with keeping peace and order in the city of Birmingham did so, necessarily using, against a gigantic and unruly mob, the strong but not by any means lethal weapons available to them.

Mr. Speaker, it is a disturbing thing to see a picture of dogs being used to restrain people. However, a good many cities in our country have found it necessary to acquire police dogs to help insure safety and peace. Everyone I know is especially glad that the city of Washington, D.C., has these dogs. They are felt to be necessary here, and they are felt to be necessary in other cities in both North and South, including Birmingham.

But, perhaps it is a normal thing—just par for the course—that when the Birmingham police used what means they had to prevent further breaches of the peace by wild mobs, those who sit on high judgment seats and pronounce verdicts—mainly guilty verdicts—adjudged the Birmingham police guilty of brutality. The high judges could not understand why peaceful demonstrations were not permitted.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure there are a good many definitions of the term "peaceful demonstration" but how any reasonable man could consider the unruly, inflammatory, riotous actions of the mobs in Birmingham to be classified as peaceful demonstrations is quite beyond my comprehension. In this situation, one is reminded of words of the late Chief Justice Fred Vinson, who, in a decision on a case relating to the question of freedom of action and the keeping of the peace, said:

> When the ingredients of the reaction are present, we cannot expect the Government to wait until the catalyst is added.

I respectfully submit that the measures taken to prevent a total breakdown of law and a completely chaotic situation are no more than could and should be expected of any authority charged with maintaining law and order.

And it should be emphasized, for the record, that the only injury of any consequence to be sustained by any individual in Birmingham during the last several days was sustained by a policeman who was hit in the head by a brick thrown by one of the peaceful demonstrators.

The Attorney General himself has questioned the timing of these demonstrations. A new body of city officials has just been elected in Birmingham though, due to the fact that an unscheduled change in the form of the city government was involved, the validity of these elections has been challenged and the matter is currently pending before the Alabama Supreme Court. In any event, at no time did the professional agitators, whose preachings of peace are drowned out by the savage shouts and ugly epithets of the mobs they lead, petition anyone in authority in the city of Birmingham for a hearing or a conference or any other sort of reasonable confrontation which one might expect.

In fact, it was not until several days after these demonstrations were commenced that one of the leaders got around to drawing up a list of the supposed grievances and announced them to the press. Meanwhile, no one knew what the purpose of the incited mob action was.

In my view, Mr. Speaker, to question the timing of these unfortunate incidents is to question the motive of them, and that gets right to the heart of the matter. If other evidence, already mentioned, as to why professional agitators wanted to create a dramatic situation of unrest has not answered the question, let us consider the most shameful aspect of their actions. They took little children from their schools and their homes and, after subjecting them to the same professional propaganda that had beguiled some of their parents, sent them out to demonstrate, sent them out as a shield for the lawbreaking adults, used them, in short, as pawns in an explosive situation. This sort of thing is indeed shameful. It is intolerable.

During all of this activity, Mr. Speaker, the white citizens of the Birmingham community, and many of the Negro citizens as well, have been greatly restrained. Indeed, if anyone had been so naive as to believe the shallow-based predictions of such publications as the Washington Post, and other superficial reports being published some months ago, he would have expected the city of Birmingham, even then said to be gripped by fear and violence, to be in flames and blood at this time. I personally feel that the majority of the citizens of our Birmingham community have acted with admirable restraint in the face of unprecedented provocations and I especially feel that this is true as regards the Birmingham police force. What you have not read in the press is that Birmingham policemen, throughout these demonstrations, have been taunted, threatened, cursed, and, worst of all, spat upon by those who are called peaceful demonstrators.

Mr. Speaker, I do not by any means want to minimize the gravity of the situation in Birmingham. It is a serious situation and whether it can be solved before real violence occurs is something I would not presume to predict. I do feel, however, the situation can be solved and I am quite confident the way to solve it is to remove immediately from the scene those outside, professional propagandists and agitators, who feed both their stomachs and their egos on the type of situation they have now created in Birmingham. I have asked the Attorney General and the White House to use their influence to see that those who foisted this situation on the citizens of Birmingham be removed from the scene. Their influence, of course, is not inconsiderable.

The Birmingham News, through its publisher, Mr. Clarence B. Hanson, Jr., has also appealed to the President to use his office to encourage maintenance of law and order in Birmingham at this time, and everywhere in the land at all times. I would like to include in my remarks a telegram sent to the President by Mr. Hanson:

[From the New York Times, May 8, 1963]

TEXT OF APPEAL TO PRESIDENT BY THE BIRMINGHAM NEWS

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Birmingham expects that you as President of all the people will use your Office to encourage maintenance of law and order at all times.

Demonstrations have been unleashed in Birmingham by an organization which seems deliberately intent, having created open turmoil, on continuing it indefinitely.

Mr. President, if these were white marches, demonstrations, open defiance of uniformed law officers, we believe your administration would have taken vigorous action to discourage them.

Law and order, Mr. President, have been kept by local police and sheriff's departments. It is our expectation that this can be continued. But the strain is great daily. The way to eliminate such threat of violence is to prevent large crowds gathering. Police may contain the crowd, and have contained it. But the source of the demonstrations needs attention.

Mr. President, daily we risk peril of grave injury or even death.

The white community and Negro community do not want this to happen. Citizens of Birmingham believe it would grieve you deeply if injury or death should result—particularly to Negro schoolchildren who are being cynically used in this needless day-after-day provocation.

But, Mr. President, Negroes are gathered, are excited by speeches, and then are sent boldly into the streets where they openly taunt police and provoke not only the white community but the very law itself.

If serious injury or death should result, Mr. President, you would certainly then ask yourself whether everything had been done, in advance, to have prevented it.

USE OF INFLUENCE ASKED

We ask you, sir, to use the influence of your Office to end this open law violation and provocation.

The Attorney General of the United States himself has said that these demonstrations are ill timed. He has said repeatedly that law, that court orders, must be sustained. Responsible citizens here share that feeling. * * * They believe law should apply equally to white and Negro.

Attorney General [Robert F.] Kennedy has said that questions of justice should be settled in court, not in the streets. We agree. We are sure you do also.

We ask only that in Birmingham the same rule be applied equally to Negro and white. On that all men of honor profitably may stand. White respect for law, however, is assuredly damaged when Negroes seem with relative impunity to be able to foster open law defiance.

Mr. President, responsible whites of Birmingham understand that the other side of this coin is that they shall, themselves, take action to redress complaints of Negroes.

The U.S. Attorney General has noted publicly that such action now is in motion. He acknowledged publicly that "the elected Mayor Mr. [Albert] Boutwell, already has made clear his intention to resolve the difficulties facing this community."

Mayor Boutwell is now awaiting only a final State Supreme Court decree to settle a legal issue as to when the newly elected city government will be seated. You will understand, Mr. President, his necessary desire to be certain, through the courts, as to his full authority before taking action.

MAYOR'S PLEDGE CITED

On a television broadcast, Mayor Boutwell said, "When we are in undisputed authority we will give immediate and determined attention to resolving the difficulties that face us." He said local white and Negro leaders "can establish understanding, communication and actual results."

"Actual results," Mr. President—isn't that what you as Chief Executive and what responsible Negroes want, "actual results?"

Father Albert S. Foley, chairman of the Alabama Advisory Committee of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, has said without qualification that demonstrations impede sincere effort toward solution. He has said:

"Mayor Boutwell has made his move. I now call on Dr. [Martin Luther] King again, in the name of properly, peacefully achieved civil rights for all citizens, Negro and white, to do his part to bring about an end to disorder in the streets and give Birmingham citizens, Negro and white, their opportunity to achieve the ends that Mr. Kennedy has set forth."

That is the "picture" today, Mr. President. But apparently if there is to be order, and respect for law, and proper procedure through the courts as well as sincere white effort to meet this problem cooperatively, you, sir, must be the one to bring it.

Those who cause these demonstrations have ignored everyone else.

The basis for a solution already exists. This condition can only be jeopardized by continued open-street tumult.

Mr. President, it is our sincere belief that you, too, have a responsibility for this crisis. We recall that in the past some of these same demonstration leaders have met with you, presumably to discuss their problems and their goals.

Sir, what further you may do necessarily is the private judgment of the President of the United States. But may we now, most respectfully, ask that you consider whether your further counsel with Negro leaders of such demonstrations could serve a vital national and Birmingham objective.

Mr. President, our aim is the restoration of domestic tranquillity, cessation of open disruption, and provision of a basis for calm negotiation toward concrete results which will answer legitimate complaints of Birmingham Negroes.

That is an honorable objective—for us, and for you.

Respectfully,

CLARENCE B. HANSON, Jr.,
Publisher, the Birmingham News.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that one day soon the city of Birmingham which is, in fact, a progressive city with great potential and good people, will be making headlines she deserves and will be spared those horrible headlines she has recently gained through the unwanted, unpeaceful, unadmirable, thoroughly unacceptable activities of professional peace leaders whose purpose is violence for others and glory for themselves.

THE HONORABLE CHARLES EDWARD CREAGER, OF MUSKOGEE, OKLA.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. **BELCHER.** Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, April 28, a great American and a fine Oklahoman proved that time only richly endows man, ripening experience into full fruitage, for on that day, the Honorable Charles Edward Creager, of Muskogee, Okla., actively celebrated his 90th birthday.

Family and friends of this intensely alert and ever active citizen—who so devotely served his country as a loyal soldier, an outstanding journalist, a successful businessman, and an excellent Congressman—had their hearts warmed by happy memories as they shared this pleasant occasion with Mr. Creager.

Here is a man who has fondly viewed life's varied experiences, whether sweet or bitter, as an open door to further public service.

Born near Dayton, Ohio, in 1873, where he attended public schools, he moved on to Indiana University for his advanced education, and then engaged in the newspaper business prior to enlisting as sergeant major in the Fourth Ohio Volunteer Infantry during the Spanish-American War.

On returning to the journalistic world, he became city editor of the Columbus Press-Post until 1902, when he accepted the position of editor of the Marietta Daily Leader. Then in 1904 he moved to Muskogee, Indian territory—or as we know it, Oklahoma—where he became publisher and editor of several Oklahoman papers.

He soon found, however, that his keen interest in people and his hunger to contribute to society must have greater expression, and he sought and won election as a Republican Representative from the grand State of Oklahoma, serving as a member of the 61st Congress, March 4, 1909 to March 3, 1911.

And I might say at this point that as far as I know today, he and former Vice President John Nance Garner are the only living members of that Congress.

But Oklahoma was growing, and with it came the growing pains of census taking and redistricting to allow all the people fair representation. Also, the year 1912 found a new Governor—the second Governor of Oklahoma—who was faced with this problem and must make a choice of calling a special session of the State legislature to redistrict the State, or ordering the now three allowed Representatives to run at large. He chose the latter, and the end result was one of the bitter experiences for Citizen Creager. But he proved and is proving everyday that the door of opportunity to benefit mankind is never shut, but only opened wider, for Mr. Creager has continued to contribute through research, writing and good business practices to the great cause of good government.

It is indeed an honor and a privilege to be a fellow Oklahoman with Mr. Creager, and to see this wonderfully healthy, alert, and active American continue to labor in his vineyard.

CRIME NEWS BLACKOUT IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. **BECKER.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. **BECKER.** Mr. Speaker, for the past 2 weeks I have said on the floor of the House that there was a news blackout in the Washington newspapers—of crime news in the District of Columbia. Since I called this to the attention of the Members, they realize this is quite evident, even though the newspapers are protesting that this is not so.

Anyone who read the Washington dailies just prior to Easter realizes that there was, and still is, a great deal of crime in Washington and that it is not safe to walk the streets.

Why this news is now deleted is a grave question. All the denials in the world will not change the fact that the dailies yesterday and in the past few weeks, do not contain any such news.

My point is that this is a disservice to the hundreds of thousands of visitors coming to Washington who are unaware of their danger, because they are unable to read of this in the press.

I am inserting herewith a full-page advertisement which appeared in the Washington Post under date of April 30, and again in the Evening Star of May 7. This is self-explanatory. It is a sad commentary on the fact that Plain Old Pearson's liquor annex had to pay a large sum of money to bring this information to the people.

I am also inserting herewith an editorial in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of April 18, 1963. This speaks for itself.

My point is simply that, as the press always states, the people should get the facts and the news. Something has happened to stop this. Just what it is I do not know. But I have never said this was the fault of the police or police department, because the information is available and we all know, that when the press wants to dig out information, it can. The news media render a valuable service in a free society.

I am certain we would all like to know that crime in the District and elsewhere was so light that it did not warrant much space. However, I believe the people should be made aware of what is happening and all join together to bring about a real reduction in crime.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Apri. 18, 1963]

WASHINGTON'S CRIME WAVE

In the Nation's Capital it is not safe to walk abroad at night.

The succession of beatings, rapes, robberies, is a national disgrace.

Groups of male and female thugs roam the streets after dark.

Citizens have been advised to carry canes to protect themselves.

A wise man, going to a hotel, takes the cab to the very door.

The White House plugs culture—but it isn't safe to attend a concert or visit an art gallery of an evening. Indeed, a State Department official's home was robbed recently in broad daylight.

"Justice in the Capital is considered the easiest in the land," wrote Walter Trohan in the Chicago Tribune. "If the defendant isn't judged insane, it is found that he is misunderstood, or suffers from an unhappy childhood * * *"

Congress is responsible for the safety of those who live in Washington.

The same Congress which sends aid to nations throughout the world; which approved a yacht for the Emperor of Ethiopia, a nation without a seaport; which dispatches its Peace Corps hither and yon.

One would think that Congress would be able to come up with enough money to provide a police force large enough and tough enough to handle an intolerable situation.

It's certainly time to crack down on the hoodlums, the rapists, the robbers, the muggers—and crack down hard. It's time for an adequate police force, even if this involves giving the rest of the world a little less.

If it's impossible to find police who can cope with the situation, perhaps the Marine Band could take a few nights off from pursuing cultural matters—and show them how.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 30, 1963]

IS THIS MY CITY?

Is this really my city?

A pregnant woman assaulted in her home?

A police officer gunned down in the streets?

Workmen robbed of their wages daily?

Riots and assaults at D.C. Stadium?

Is this my city?

Where the coming of darkness signals the start of violence?

Where women walk with fear and terror?

Where tension explodes without even a spark?

Where decent people reside and work in constant anxiety?

Is this really my city?

And the voices cry, "Protect the criminal."

Why aren't these same voices raised in horror and protest at the senseless brutality of these crimes?

Why aren't tears shed for the victims of these vicious attacks?

Who can help my city?

The police department? They claim their hands are tied.

The Commissioners? They look to Congress.

The Congress? They sit, but they don't stir.

The courts? They administer "justice."

The official organizations and "spokesmen"? They're so busy arguing for special interest and special privilege that the means destroy the ends.

Who can help my city?

This city of trees and parks, magnificent monuments, and broad avenues.

This city of culture and citizenship.

This city where doors and hearts used to be unlocked.

Today, this city is the most dangerous of its size in the Nation.

First in criminal assaults.

Second in robberies.

Fourth in murders.

Is this my city?

P.S. We speak with special concern. Within the past 60 days two of our hard-working employees were attacked by juvenile hoodlums. One was with his pregnant wife, who was knocked down and injured to such an extent that she was required to spend 3 days in the hospital.

We heard no one speak out against this despicable act. We saw no sympathy expressed for her.

Answers? We don't have them. But if all of the groups involved stopped working for the Negro community or the white community, and became concerned instead with the Washington community—we believe progress can be made.

(Published in the public interest by Plain Old Pearson's Liquor Annex.)

RADIATION STANDARDS AND NUCLEAR TESTING

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, on April 13, 2 days after this House recessed for Easter, the Washington Post reported that nuclear fallout is expected to reach record levels across the United States in the coming weeks. It appears probable that fallout from the Soviet tests of late 1961 will be added to that from the Soviet and American atmospheric tests of last year. "The best estimate," the report states, "is that more strontium 90 and other radioactive debris will wash down upon the Nation this month and in May than during any previous spring."

Beyond any doubt reports of this sort will circulate widely during the coming weeks; and beyond any doubt they will cause much anxiety in the minds of Americans all across the country, and particularly in the minds of parents of young children. There can be no doubt about these facts. But what there can be, and is, doubt about is whether the administration is equipped to deal with this problem, to assure the American people clearly and honestly that their health and the health of their children will be adequately safeguarded.

Last September I addressed the House at some length on the question of nuclear fallout. At that time I made four points: First, that no radiation protection standards had been developed to deal specifically with fallout from nuclear tests; second, that the Government had been laggard in developing adequate countermeasures; third, that responsibility for the problem had not been clearly assigned within the executive branch; and finally, that neither the Public Health Service nor any other agency had seen to it that the public was kept clearly and fully informed. I rise today because, as far as I have been able to discover, substantial progress has been made in none of these four areas.

Clearly the question of radiation protection standards is central: without such standards, clearly defined and explicitly related to the problem of fallout, State and local officials and members of the general public are inevitably left in the dark as to when levels of radiation are reaching the danger point. There exists, of course, a set of Federal radiation protection guides; but, as public officials have often been at pains to point out, these guides—involving, as they do, a balancing of specific benefits against specific risks—were developed for ordinary industrial and peacetime purposes. Dr. Gordon Dunning of the Atomic Energy Commission, testifying last summer before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, remarked:

> This balancing has to be done in a definite context. The context used by the Federal Radiation Council was normal peacetime operations. When they got through with this kind of balancing for normal peacetime operations they came up with these guides. But these guides then are being used in a different context and in a different type of balancing. Not but what this other kind of balancing can and perhaps should be done. I am saying as of today those are the improper uses of those guides.

The chairman of the committee, the distinguished gentleman from California, asked Dr. Dunning, "Do you foresee the danger of using these guides and applying them as long as we do not have the other guides?" to which Dr. Dunning replied, "Yes, sir; I do."

Nevertheless, these ordinary peacetime guides continue to be used in connection with fallout. A statement issued by the Federal Radiation Council last September admitted that the guides were not "a dividing line between safety and danger in actual radiation situations." It added, however, that they could be used as an "indication" of when a detailed evaluation of possible exposure risks was called for. Moreover, the Public Health Service uses these same guides in its press releases on fallout. Each month the Service issues a statement on the fallout levels of the previous month but one. It accompanies this statement with background information in the course of which the reader is positively invited to make comparisons between the estimated fallout levels and the regular radiation guides. Admittedly, it is stated that the guides were formulated with reference to "normal peacetime nuclear-industry operations"; but what is the average reader to make of the following facts?

According to the Public Health Service, a daily intake of 100 micromicrocuries of iodine 131, averaged over a year, is considered "an acceptable health risk." This comes to a 12-month total of 36,500. The figures are set, the Service says, for the most susceptible portion of the population—infants and very young children. With this for background, the reader turns to the tables. What does he find? He finds that in Palmer, Alaska, last September the average daily amount of iodine 131 found in a liter of milk was not 100 micromicrocuries but 730; that in New York City in October it was not 100 but 130; that in Pittsburgh in November it was not 100 but 170. He finds, too, that from the fall of 1961 to the fall of 1962 the level in Salt Lake City fell short of the annual maximum of 36,500 micromicrocuries by only 2,260. It is scarcely any wonder that ordinary citizens, reading these figures in their newspapers, become alarmed.

I do not wish to suggest that the existing radiation protection guides are wholly irrelevant to the problem of fallout. Clearly, within limits, they are relevant. Nor do I want to imply that the administration is deliberately deceiving the public. I do not believe it is. But I do believe that the administration must make a choice. It must either abandon the practice of using the industrial guides to assess levels of fallout resulting from nuclear tests, or develop entirely new radiation protection guides to deal with the problem of fallout. So far, although the problem has been before it for many months, the administration has refused to make this choice. If it continues to refuse, it should not be surprised if during the coming weeks and months very large numbers of Americans become seriously alarmed by reports of radioactive fallout appearing in the press. The administration owes it to the public to make its position on this question absolutely clear and unambiguous.

So far I have talked about radiation protection guides. These guides are intended to indicate to the proper authorities when they should begin to consider seriously taking countermeasures. The mere existence of the guides implies, at least, that such countermeasures have been developed and are available for use. What is the position here?

Last May—that is, almost a year ago—the National Advisory Committee on Radiation, in a report to the Surgeon General, pointed out that "countermeasures to control environmental contamination are in a relatively early stage of development." It recommended that a markedly intensified research effort be instituted to develop safe and effective countermeasures. "Unless this effort is undertaken now," the report went on, "the Nation may well be faced in a few years with contamination problems which cannot easily be solved." The following month Dr. James G. Terrill, Jr., of the Public Health Service, reported that the Service was intensifying research and development of countermeasures so that effective public health action could be taken promptly, if the need should arise. And last September the Federal Radiation Council, the chief agency in this field, announced that it would prepare a report discussing the applicability of possible countermeasures. That, Mr. Speaker, was a full 7 months ago. The report has not appeared. As far as the public can tell, the Nation is no better equipped to deal with emergencies arising out of unexpectedly high levels of fallout than it was a year ago. Probably no emergency will arise; but, at the very least, it would be comforting to the public to know that the Government was prepared to cope with one if it did.

In the course of my remarks last September, I asked why the U.S. Government had not established a countermeasure program. I suggested that it was possibly because of the lack of properly constituted lines of authority:

> Not only are we without a clear definition of countermeasure policy in this country, but we are not even sure who would be responsible for instituting a countermeasure policy if we had one.

This is a serious matter. Let us suppose that for some reason, say because the fallout from last year's tests occurred more rapidly than predicted, there were to be an emergency this summer. I am not predicting an emergency, merely discussing what the position would be if there were one.

Presumably reports of a sudden increase in the level of radioactive fallout would first reach the Public Health Service, or perhaps the Public Health Service and the Atomic Energy Commission simultaneously. In the absence of adequate protection guides, it would not be entirely clear when the point had been reached when action should be taken, but probably it would be apparent fairly quickly that controls and countermeasures should be instituted. Who then would institute them? I am afraid I cannot answer that question. No one can. At the moment there is no answer. Legal powers in this field are incredibly widely dispersed. The Federal Drug Administration has certain powers under the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. The Public Health Service has certain other powers under the Water Pollution Act. The States themselves ultimately have the power to control distribution and sale of contaminated products within their own boundaries. In a sense it is everybody's problem. But just because it is everbody's problem, in a crisis it might turn out to be nobody's problem.

I am not going to delve deeply into this problem here: it has already been the subject of serious study by the Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. But I ought to make it clear that my concern with the lack of definite lines of authority is not mine alone. Last summer, for example, Dr. Russell H. Morgan, Chairman of the National Advisory Committee on Radiation, appeared before the Joint Committee. One of the points he made was this:

> It is important that responsibility for countermeasure application be well defined. If one is well prepared to face a radiocontamination incident, regardless of causes, public concern over the hazards of radiation may be expected to diminish substantially. There is no program like a strong program to meet the needs of the public in the field of radiation control and the identification of responsibility is one of the first steps in the formulation of such a program.

The distinguished gentleman from California asked Dr. Morgan whether he felt responsibility was adequately defined at the present time. Dr. Morgan replied bluntly, he did "not think that it is well defined at the present time." And subsequently the committee in its own report asserted that adequate control provisions should "include organization and staffing for making the necessary determinations and decisions competently and promptly." The committee stressed also the need for "clarification and delegation of authority for carrying out such control measures as may be necessary."

Once again, I have to point out that all this was last summer—many months ago. Have the urgent recommendations of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy been carried out? Have lines of authority been more clearly defined since that time? If they have, the secret has been very well kept indeed.

I have already alluded to several ways in which the executive branch has failed to keep the public fully informed. I want finally, to point to what seems to me to be a quite spectacular failure in public relations—one that has undoubtedly caused a vast amount of unnecessary anxiety and alarm.

I have already referred to the Federal radiation protection guides. These guides must, of course, be related to the periods of time over which individuals absorb radiation. To what period of time are they related? Ultimately they are concerned with the amount of radiation a person absorbs over his entire lifetime. The second report of the Federal Radiation Council makes this clear. It notes that the upper limit of range II—that is, the point at which control actions should be undertaken—is based on an annual protection guide considered as an acceptable risk "for a lifetime." In other words, if a person absorbed over his whole life, year after year, more than the stated amount of radiation he would be running a serious health risk.

But clearly the concept of a "lifetime" is not much use for practical purposes: some people live longer than others; some are first exposed to radiation at an earlier age than others; and of course it is impossible to predict levels of radiation over long and indeterminate periods. Accordingly, in the words of the Federal Radiation Council report, "it is necessary to use averages over periods much shorter than a lifetime for administrative purposes." The Federal Radiation Council recommends that such periods should be of the order of 1 year. Thus, the official protection guides are stated in terms of an annual dose. But obviously it is impossible to know, or even predict, what the annual dose is going to be unless one keeps track of the daily or possibly weekly doses. For this reason, the Federal Radiation Council has established for each radioactive material a daily intake which would, if reached or exceeded over a sufficient period of time, reach or exceed the annual radiation protection guide. This daily intake for iodine 131, for example, is 100 micromicrocuries. It is this daily intake to which the Public Health Service refers in its monthly press releases.

But it is perfectly clear that the actual daily intake of a radioactive material might—as the Federal Radiation Council itself put it—"fluctuate very widely around the average and still result in an annual dose which would not exceed the associated RPG." In the case of iodine 131 the annual protection guide is 36,500 micromicrocuries. If the actual daily intake ran at a rate of 100, this limit would be reached. On the other hand, the intake might be 150 on half the days of the year without the limit being reached if on the other half it were 50 or less. That much is a simple matter of arithmetic. For the responsible public official, however, the problem is more complicated. Confronted with a daily dosage of radioactivity above the official guide, he must, first, take note of the levels of radioactivity during the previous few months; and second, try to make some estimate of the position in the coming months. What is involved here is a matter of judgment—when is the daily rate of intake running at a high enough level to make precautionary measures seem desirable? The responsible official may, of course, assess the situation correctly or they may make mistakes; but they at least understand the nature of the problem.

I wish the same could be said of the general public. The ordinary citizen of Des Moines or New York reads in his newspaper that the daily RPG for radioactive iodine is 100. He then notes that during the previous month in his city the average daily level was 130 or 160 or 190. And he becomes alarmed. Who wouldn't? No one has bothered to explain to him that the operative index is not the daily limit but the annual limit. Instead, these apparently alarming figures in the newspapers are accompanied by vague official assurances that—all appearances to the contrary—there is nothing really the matter. If all this sounds farfetched, if it seems incredible that such misunderstandings could be perpetrated, I can only recommend a glance at any of the relevant press releases of the Public Health Service. I submit that few ordinary laymen, reading those press releases, would appreciate the distinction between the daily and annual guides that I have been making. Surely it is not too much to ask of the responsible Federal agencies that they devise a clear, less ambiguous, less alarming way of presenting their regular fallout statistics.

Altogether, Mr. Speaker, it is hard to be impressed by the way the executive branch has handled this whole matter of fallout. Here we have four areas of vital concern to everyone in this country—the development of radiation standards specifically designed to cover fallout, the development of a full range of adequate countermeasures, the allocation of governmental responsibility for dealing with emergencies, and the prompt, regular, and clear provision of all necessary information to the public. Here are four areas whose importance is fully recognized—or so they claim—by the public officials concerned. Yet in the 7 months since I last addressed the House on this subject, and despite the fact that unusually high levels of fallout could have been predicted for this spring, no progress on any of these questions appears to have been made by the executive branch. The Federal Radiation Council has not issued the reports it promised. New radiation guides have not been developed. New countermeasures have not been developed. Lines of responsibility for the problem are not any clearer. And the Public Health Service continues to issue statements which can only have the effect of confusing and alarming the general public.

I call upon the Federal Radiation Council and the Public Health Service to report to the public what progress they have made in these areas, or to explain fully why they have failed to make progress. In particular, I call upon the President of the United States to make it clear to the Nation now—not in several months' time, when it will be too late, but now—what the position with respect to fallout is and what steps are being taken to meet it.

A few final remarks, Mr. Speaker. So far I have said nothing directly about nuclear testing. But I think all Members of the House will agree that to discuss fallout without saying at least a few words about testing would be very much like staging "Hamlet" without the prince. If there had been no tests in the past, there would be no fallout now.

No atmospheric tests have, of course, been conducted during the past few months. Most of us hope there will be no atmospheric testing in the future. But we are all too well aware of the dangers and pitfalls of an informal, unpoliced moratorium. If nuclear testing of all kinds is to be halted, we must have a formal test ban treaty with inspection provisions adequate to insure, beyond any reasonable doubt, that the terms of the treaty are being observed. I want today to repeat what I have said many times before: that I believe that a fully inspected test ban treaty would be in the national interest of the United States—as well as in the interest of all mankind—and that I give my full support to the efforts of the U.S. Disarmament Agency in working toward such a treaty.

Inspection we must have. We cannot allow the Soviet Union to take the lead in nuclear technology by conducting illicit tests. But, in our proper zeal for foolproof inspection, let us never lose sight of the advantages a properly inspected test ban would bring—a slowing down of the arms race, a possible deterrent to the spreading of nuclear weapons to other countries, a first step toward more general arms control and reduction, the total elimination of nuclear fallout. When balanced against the benefits which signing a properly inspected test ban treaty would bring, the risks seem small. Such eminent servants of our country as John J. McCloy and Robert A. Lovett have joined the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission in asserting that the risks of secret evasion or of surprise abrogation of such a treaty are undoubtedly outweighed by the risks of continued testing.

Mr. Speaker, I, for one, strongly support the efforts of William C. Foster, Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, to bring about a properly inspected treaty and I urge Members on both sides of the aisle to adopt a bipartisan, even a nonpartisan approach to this difficult but enormously important problem.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I will be happy to yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] and commend him for the forcefulness and obvious integrity of concern with which they were presented.

I, for one, feel all of us—in this great House and throughout the Nation—should be thankful for the service to mankind which is being rendered by our colleague. He has alerted us to a policy of indecision and confusion which has characterized this administration's inability to deal with the present danger of nuclear fallout.

There is an abundance of scientific evidence, from both public and private agencies, to support the need for the adoption of radiation protection standards to deal directly with fallout from atmospheric tests of nuclear weapons. Yet, the only guide our Government now offers was developed for industrial and peacetime purposes.

Mr. Speaker, many of my constituents—particularly, mothers who are deeply aware of the danger to their children which is posed by the mounting level of radioactivity around them—have expressed concern with the failure of the administration to act positively in this field. They fear, as do I, in the absence of information to the contrary, that little, if anything, is being done to develop countermeasures to this human problem.

The radiation danger which plagues us today should be a warning that continued nuclear testing will only aggravate an already serious situation.

I firmly believe that all citizens would approve an effective test ban pact between the United States and Russia that provided sufficient assurances against the continuation of testing on either side. Such a treaty, while not easy of accomplishment, is eminently worthy of our best and united efforts.

If nuclear testing is to be halted, a formal test ban treaty with proper and effective inspection provisions to insure beyond any question that the terms of the treaty are being observed is absolutely essential.

I, too, believe a fully inspected test ban treaty is in the national interest of the United States.

But in the interim, until such an effective test ban treaty is in effect, the problems as outlined by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] demand answers and actions to safeguard our citizens and protect future generations.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my thanks to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] for this contribution that he has just made to this complex and highly technical and much overlooked subject.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York, I think, has rendered a distinct contribution to the cause of the peaceful uses of atomic energy and the safety of mankind. I thank the gentleman for his attention to the problem and for his willingness to stay late on the floor today to participate in this dialog.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that other Members of the House in the months to come will do as the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] has done and join in this all-important discussion.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the hour is late, but I would like for the record to associate myself with the remarks which have been made by both distinguished gentlemen from New York. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentleman from New Hampshire.

THE TRUE MEANING OF PATRIOTISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to speak for a few minutes today on a subject often discussed and always in fashion in this venerable Chamber—the subject of patriotism.

Webster has defined this honored word as "love for country" and "devotion to country," and a "patriot" is defined as "a person who loves his country and defends its interests."

In this great legislative hall in which we meet today, as Members of a Congress we proudly call "the greatest legislative body in the world," I am even prouder of the fact that I do not know a man or woman who is not a patriot.

By the standard of "love of country," I have never known a Member of this body who failed to convince me of his patriotism.

This does not mean, of course, that I have never differed with other Members of Congress on the issues of what our country's interests are, and how they best may be defended. On this score we frequently differ, and always will. But on the issue of "love of country," there is no difference in these halls, and all Members meet in trust as brothers.

Many years ago, there was a great and much-loved American from the State I have the honor to represent, who is best remembered for the famous words, "I never met a man I didn't like."

In my own lifetime, and during the period I have had the opportunity and privilege to represent nearly 400,000 people in the Congress, I believe I have been even more fortunate in one sense than my fellow Oklahoman, Will Rogers.

For during that entire period, Mr. Speaker, I can honestly say that I have never met a man who did not love his country.

In the course of a lifetime in politics, including service in the FBI, in the Armed Forces, as a practicing lawyer, as a public prosecutor, and as a Member of the Congress, a man cannot avoid meeting a good many types and varieties of American citizens.

I have known more than one man who was bitter with his lot in life—men who were "born with the breaks against them"—men who have been the cruel victims of misfortune and disaster in their family and personal life.

As an FBI agent in my youth and as a county attorney in later years, I had the duty of questioning more than one man who had been brought to justice for the violation of law, faced with charges ranging from petty larceny to bank robbery and murder.

Never, in the course of meeting hundreds of men and women in the toils of the law, did I talk with one who convinced me that he did not love his country.

On the contrary, it has been my good fortune in life to observe, on more than one occasion, that men and women behind bars, and serving long sentences in prison, will respond with courage and enthusiasm to the call of their country in times of need.

The records of the State penitentiary in Oklahoma support this experience, and tell the story of more than one long-term prisoner who has given of his blood, his savings, and even his life when given the opportunity, in the wartime service of our country.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, every schoolboy knows of the black pages in history which tell the story of treason and of Benedict Arnold, and more than one American President has paid with his life by traitorous assassination.

In our own time, we have known and read with shame of the betrayal of our country by some who call themselves Americans, and these have been black pages for all of us, and times of bitterness.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, how many names can you recall of those who have been proven, in American history, to be men without patriotism?

THE RECORD OF HISTORY

I have been a student of history all of my life, and I can count, on the fingers of one hand, the names of the men and women that come to my mind as proven traitors to our country.

The list may indeed be a longer one, and careful research may document that fact, but I can honestly say today that I know of only one disgraceful handful, and am proud of that fact.

For the truth of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that this great Nation of ours has been blessed, from the day our Constitution came into being, with a loyal and patriotic people whose love of country—and willingness to serve it well and die for it when necessary—have been the solid and enduring foundation of our liberty and our freedom.

From the bloody field of Sarotoga to the killing winter of Valley Forge, from San Juan Hill to the Argonne, from Guadalcanal to the beaches of Normandy, from Pork Chop Hill to the jungles of Laos and Vietnam, there have always been American men ready and willing, with bravery and devotion, to meet the challenge to freedom.

During the 10 years and 5 months that I have had the honor of serving in this Congress, I have had the opportunity to visit with American fighting men in almost every corner of the globe—along the armed frontier divided by the demilitarized zone in Korea, where we face Red guns in the Far East, at the Brandenberg Gate in West Berlin, where we face Red guns in Central Europe, at Guantanamo Bay, in Cuba, where we face Red guns in our own Western Hemisphere.

Without exception, I have found the men who stand guard at these ramparts of freedom to be men of high morale and resolution, dedicated to their country and its great responsibility, and worthy sons of the men who fought for independence.

THE PICTURE AT HOME

And what is the situation on the homefront, here in America?

What is the spirit of the people here, in this land of riches, and power, and industrial might, and great opportunity?

Almost without exception, the spirit of the people is good.

There is impatience, of course. There is impatience among some of our people over the slowness of our Nation in ending old problems like unemployment and discrimination. There is impatience of others over the continued burden of high taxes and public debt. There is impatience, too, for most Americans, over the growing realization that the cold war may continue for a long time to come, and there is no quick and easy victory for freedom in this age of nuclear weapons.

With this impatience, unfortunately and almost tragically, there has come a sense of desperation and near panic among some patriotic Americans.

Distressed by the gains which the forces of communism have made in some quarters of the world, and completely blind to the gains of the forces of freedom, some of our fellow citizens have become full-time disciples of doubt and distrust.

In the race for control of space, they can see only the shadows of Sputnik I and Sputnik II, and completely forget the splendid achievements of Carpenter, Shepard, and Glenn.

On the international front, they see only the tragedy of Katanga, and completely overlook the fact that every new nation in Africa has rejected communism as a form of government.

In the United Nations, they see only the operating deficit and the danger of Red China's admission, and choose to ignore the fact that the United States has never had to use the veto to win its point in that organization, while the Soviet Union has met defeat and been forced to use its veto on more than 100 separate occasions.

Belabored by fear-mongering writers who speak of our great country as a "second rate power," shaken and beset by personal fear, an unhappy minority of these fellow Americans have themselves become full-time prophets of doom and despair.

In the words of an able Senator from California, a member of the Republican Party, we are under attack by "fright peddlers" who "frighten Americans and divert their attention from the real menace. They sow suspicion and hatred. They attempt to undermine faith in Government, its institutions and its leaders. They degrade America and Americans, and do it as well as—or better than—the Communists do."

Within the past week, Mr. Speaker, I sat in a community meeting in my own State and listened with disappointment as a prominent business man attempted to indoctrinate a group of fellow-Oklahomans with the fright peddler's brand of panic patriotism.

In the view of this speaker, Americans are the victims of a disastrous foreign policy at the hands of "the politicians in Washington."

These same "politicians in Washington," in his words, "are trying to take from the people their constitutional right to keep and bear arms."

After this misleading reference to a gun registration bill that is introduced annually and annually gets nowhere, the speaker continued to blast our "politicians' policies" on Cuba and proclaimed:

> Now you hear, "I would rather be Red than dead."

What a shameful charge, Mr. Speaker, to come from American lips, with the unmistakable insinuation that men responsible for our Government today subscribe to such a treasonable doctrine.

I do not know an American today who would "rather be Red than dead"—in Government or out of Government—and I do not believe the Speaker does either.

THE SLANDER OF PATRIOTS

Other fright peddlers have been more specific and directly slanderous.

The open accusation has been made by one salesman of fear and distrust that John Foster Dulles, the distinguished Statesman and Secretary of State under President Eisenhower "is a Communist agent."

The same source is responsible for the incredible canard that President Eisenhower himself "is a mere stooge, or he is a Communist assigned the specific job of being a political front man."

It is almost impossible to believe, Mr. Speaker, that Americans could be responsible for this brand of irresponsible libel upon the patriotism of the man who led the forces of freedom in the titanic struggle of World War II in Europe.

It is equally impossible to understand the reasoning of Americans who would make the charge of Communist agent against a Secretary of State who toiled and labored his life away in the struggle to strengthen the North Atlantic Treaty Organization as a powerful bulwark against communism in Europe.

Neither the late Mr. Dulles nor former President Eisenhower was a member of my political party, but I resent these baseless charges against them as bitterly as any Republican, and deplore the spirit of fear and distrust responsible for their utterance.

The suggestion that Americans endorse today the spirit of "better Red than dead" is a gratuitous insult to the patriotism of our country.

It is an insult to the men who fly our B–52's in the never-ending vigil of the Strategic Air Command.

It is an insult to the sailors who man our Polaris submarines, in still and dangerous depths of the Atlantic and the Mediterranean.

It is an insult to the soldiers who man the demilitarized zone in Korea, and to the Marines who stand by their guns at Guantanamo.

It is equally an insult to the men and women responsible for authorizing in the Congress the construction of the mighty weapons which are manned by our fighting forces today, and to the men and women at home, in the 50 States of this Union, who have selected the Members of this Congress.

Finally, it is an insult to the President of the United States, the man responsible under our Constitution for foreign policy and the command of our Armed Forces.

Our President today, like the President who preceded him, is a man who has risked his life in the service of his country. Indeed, he has stood in the shadows of death itself, and suffered a grievous wound in his country's service.

In the course of his brief tenure, he has already demonstrated in a time of terrible emergency and danger to our country his steel resolve and courage, even to the point of risking the holocaust of nuclear war to rid our hemisphere of the threat of missile attack from Cuba.

It is one thing, Mr. Speaker, to differ with the Chief Executive of our Nation on a question of judgment or policy. All of us have found it necessary to do this on specific issues, and will find it necessary to do it again.

It is another thing entirely, and a sad, sick thing on the American scene, to question the patriotism or love of country of a man chosen by our people to be our Chief Executive.

THE NEED TODAY

In the final analysis, it is a sad and sick thing to question the patriotism of any American, in the absence of clear and convincing proof that he is a traitor to his country.

It is not my purpose, in these remarks, to question either the sincerity or the patriotism of any American.

It is my purpose, Mr. Speaker, to appeal to all who enjoy the blessings of life under our flag, to put an early end to this destructive traffic in fear and distrust.

I do not question the critical nature of the danger our country faces, or the deadly and sinister purpose of the Communist conspiracy.

I do question, with all of my being, the wisdom of those who promote and advance a climate of fear in the face of that danger.

The order of the day, for all Americans who are not "sunshine patriots and summer soldiers," should be "courage for tomorrow."

This Nation of ours has met and dealt with tyranny before, and fought its way to victory against forces and powers just as deadly in their day.

The true meaning of patriotism today is found in the immortal song which reminds us that we live not only in the land of the free, but also in the home of the brave.

That meaning is also found in the ringing words of a great President who led our Nation from the dismal days of a great depression and through the terrible carnage of World War II:

> We have nothing to fear but fear itself.

In that spirit, courageously advanced by a patriotic citizenry, rejecting firmly the doctrine of fear and distrust of our fellow Americans, the United States of America will live forever as a land of the free and a home of the brave.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am glad to yield to my good friend from Texas.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the gentleman from Oklahoma on his thought-provoking and constructive remarks. As always, the gentleman from Oklahoma has made a well reasoned, logical statement and, as always, has made a constructive contribution to the thinking of our times.

Patriotism surely cannot be equated with the fear of something. Patriotism, on the other hand, is the love of something. Patriotism is not engendered in hatred nor in false rumors which tend to divide our country, class against class, or race against race, or religion against religion, or section against section. The country is not served by those who seek to undermine public confidence in the institutions of the country.

There is a story about a gossipy woman in an Italian village who suddenly became conscience stricken. Going to her priest, she confessed she had been spreading malicious rumors about her neighbors.

The priest did a strange thing. He handed her a big bag of goose feathers and directed her to drop a handful at every spot where she had repeated any such ugly untruth.

Once she had done this, the woman returned to the priest, looking very much relieved. "Thank you, Father," she sighed. "It is a great comfort to have this burden lifted from me."

"Oh, but you have not completed your penance," the priest said. "Now you must go and gather up all those feathers and return them to me."

Astonishment crossed the woman's face. "But Father, that is completely impossible," she protested. "The wind has surely scattered the feathers by now, all over the village and beyond, and I would never be able to find them."

The priest nodded knowingly. "And now can't you see," he asked, "how utterly impossible it will ever be to undo the damage performed by your wagging tongue, or ever to recompense your friends and neighbors for the harm you have inflicted?"

Today the rumor mills in the United States seem to be working overtime. Irresponsible and vicious tales are damaging not only countless individuals, but our Nation itself. Let me give you one recent example.

A few weeks ago an extremist group began circulating the tale that 3,500 Congolese troops were being brought into Georgia, to be followed this summer by 17,000 United Nations troops. Some people who wrote to me about this actually feared it was some sort of "plot" for the UN, or somebody, to take over our country.

Although patently ridiculous, this story was dutifully checked with both the State Department and the White House. Both expressed amazement at the tale and assured me it was absolutely untrue.

A few days later, Jim Lucas, a Pulitzer Prize-winning military reporter for Scripps-Howard Newspapers, came up with the apparent basis for this wild rumor.

What had really happened, Lucas reported, is that the U.S. Army had brought in 124 foreign students from 17 friendly nations to Fort Stewart, Ga., for counterinsurgency training.

So it turns out that instead of 20,500 soldiers coming to our country as a part of some sinister plot to take us over, we have a total of 124 friendly foreigners here to learn to beat the Communists at their own game. There is quite a difference.

This sort of thing reminds me of the warnings posted back in World War II days:

> Beware! Rumor mongers at work!

In those days our intelligence people had determined that a favorite technique of Nazi agents was the deliberate planting of false rumors to confuse and upset the public, and to undermine confidence in this Nation's Government and institutions.

Now, once again, wild and unsupported tales are circulating. Most of them are utterly detached from reality. Whether or not they have their origin with deliberate saboteurs is a question that must be answered by our counterespionage agents. But one thing is sure: repeating these irresponsible stories hinders rather than helps all responsible efforts to combat world communism.

J. Edgar Hoover recently had some stern words of warning about those who set themselves up as the only true patriots, who impugn the patriotism, the motives, the honesty of our responsible public officials, and of all Americans in fact who do not happen to agree with their own pet ideas.

> The confusion which is thereby created helps the Communists—

The head of the our FBI said—

> by diffusing the forces of their opponents.

Let us have faith in this country and its institutions. With all their human imperfections, they are the very best that man has ever devised.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

BIRTHDAY TRIBUTE TO MR. TRUMAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, earlier today preceding legislative business we very briefly said, "Happy Birthday, Mr. Truman." In the very limited time then permitted it was not possible to pay fitting tribute to our beloved former President and fellow townsman Harry S. Truman. As we said then, May 8 is a very special day in our home city in Independence, Mo. It has come to be a special day across our entire land for only this morning the CBS-TV network devoted liberal time to commendation of his 79th birthday. Truly he is one of the greatest Presidents this Nation has ever had and is one of America's most respected citizens.

As I have repeated on four previous occasions on this floor, it is a source of particular pride and continuing inspiration to me that I should have had the good fortune to represent the fine people of Missouri's Fourth District—the longtime home of Mr. Truman. His friendship has been our valued possession for many years.

Harry Truman—the Man from Missouri—is the man without whom the world today would not be as we know it, because of the many monumental achievements made possible only because of him. There is no question that his role in shaping the future of civilization is without parallel.

President Truman was catapulted into office at a time when the entire world was at a dangerous crossroad. When he took the solemn oath of the highest office in our land, he was confronted with staggering problems inherited from his predecessor.

Many decisions had to be made almost immediately. At the time, it may have seemed to some as though these decisions related to problems of immediate relevancy, rather than embarking upon the future. But Harry Truman knew how far reaching his decisions would be. When he wrote Winston Churchill in May 1945, only a month after assuming the Presidency, he said:

> I am fully in agreement that the next few months will decide questions of the greatest consequences to the whole world.

And Mr. Truman knew, also, that every decision he made, every action he set in motion, would create precedents for future Presidents.

When he took office, there was the war against Germany to bring to completion. Japan was not nearly defeated. There was the problem of the military occupations after surrender and their implications for the future peace of the world. There were the related problems of the war criminals and the responsibility for rescuing millions of starving, sick, and homeless victims of aggression. There were the problems of financial aid to Britain, the use of the atom bomb, Poland, East Germany, Trieste, the Dardenelles, north Africa, reparations, France, and De Gaulle—yes, even in those days—Chiang Kai-shek and China, the problem of the redeployment of American forces, demobilization, lend lease, and many similar issues. All these issues, as one of our noted American historians so well said, constituted the watershed of the 20th century.

Historians have said that Franklin Roosevelt brought a strength to the Presidency that it had not known since Woodrow Wilson. History may well judge that Harry Truman carried the process of Executive leadership and control as far as any President since Lincoln.

And like Lincoln, President Truman saw that the world could not exist half slave and half free. Today, the free world stands in Harry Truman's everlasting debt for his courageous and firm policy of containment of Soviet imperialism.

Mr. Truman wielded tremendous power and yet succeeded in dispersing it, adding a new dimension to democratic and orderly processes of government at a time of grave national crisis. He had the great wisdom to place responsibility on some of the ablest men who have ever served our Nation. His appointments, his sense of timing, his own individual style of Executive leadership were hallmarks of statesmanship at its best.

One of his unique triumphs as Chief Executive was his conviction, based on his own meticulous study of history, that the Executive should lead but not dominate the Federal Government. He held firm to the philosophy of our Founding Fathers that the balance of power written into the Constitution must be vigorously maintained.

Under Harry Truman, the State and Defense Departments worked out techniques of liaison and coordination which they had not previously attained. The National Security Council came into being, providing the Government with machinery for keeping diplomatic and military commitments in balance with military power, and with economic power through the participation of the National Resources Planning Board. In the Council of Economic Advisers and the Central Intelligence Agency, future Presidents were to have the means for getting orderly, systematic appraisals of the facts of national and international life.

Mr. Truman returned to his home city of Independence, Mo., after he left the White House in January 1953, but he did not go into retirement. As all of us so very well know, he has continued to play an important role in the American scene. The best proof of this is that since the beginning of this calendar year he has written three very important copyrighted articles that have been carried here in the Capitol by the Washington Post.

On February 23, he spoke out saying the United States must find a way to liberate the Cubans. To put the problem in perspective, he said the United States should not and just cannot abandon Cuba to become a colony of communistic Russia, but he was high in his praise in the way the Cuban crisis had been handled and said that it had served the very useful purpose of smoking out the Russian capacity for bluff and their hit-and-run type of international piracy. The crisis, he said, gave the United States an opportunity to make clear to the communistic aggressors that once the line is drawn, we stand firm.

Some weeks later on March 16, Mr. Truman wrote in a copyrighted article appearing in the Washington Post about our present troubles with Charles de Gaulle. The former President recalled some of the postwar troubles he had with the General, and in particular that there were times when he realized he had a prima donna on his hands just as is true with the present administration of today. But with his characteristic spirit of confidence, Mr. Truman recognized that now that France has regained full restoration, it is hoped that it will be only a matter of time until she will recapture her sense of proportion as well as her perspective of history.

Mr. Truman has found that a former President, much as he might try, cannot detach himself from events even long after he is out of office. Just a short time ago, on April 27, our former President wrote his third syndicated article urging that the time has come to take a searching look at our foreign policy.

While Mr. Truman himself frequently writes about problems of the day, he is still the subject of other writers. The latest is a book entitled, "Truman and the Pendergasts," by Frank Mason, who describes himself as a Kansas City reporter. This book, printed in April of 1963, covered those years in Mr. Truman's life when he lived in eastern Jackson County, Mo. But contrary to the expectations of some of Mr. Truman's enemies, the author time and time again sets out facts to show that as presiding judge of the county court he turned a $1,200,000 deficit into a $500,000 surplus in the county treasury. He always invited people to come in and look over and audit the county's bookkeeping.

The author, Mr. Mason, was very high in his praise for Mr. Truman as an honest, efficient, and popular county administrative official and this high reputation for honesty and integrity as a local official enabled him to carry the State of Missouri when he ran for the Senate in 1934, and then again for the second term in 1940.

Oh, there is so much that could be said in praise of our former President. He was always and ever a hard worker. At 38 he had to start a new career. Some of his most effective work is to be found in terms of the savings of millions of dollars to the taxpayers of this country as chairman of the Truman War Expenditures Committee. It was this work during his second term in the Senate that gained him a national reputation. Perhaps the greatest challenge of his life came on April 12, 1945, when almost overnight he had to learn how to become President. In less than a month Germany surrendered. Mr. Truman has said that of all his birthday presents, the greatest was on May 8, 1945. Because although surrender had begun on May 4 and signed on May 7, actually, cessation of operations was at 11:01 European time, or 5:01 eastern standard time on May 8, 1945.

The greatest responsibility ever to come to rest upon the shoulders of our former President was on August 9, 1945, when the bombing of Nagasaki and Hiroshima was ordered. This order subsequently became controversial, but it is estimated that by this action over 1 million American casualties were averted. Such action simply proved again that Mr. Truman was not afraid to make decisions that might not be popular at the moment. Time and time again his decisions which seemed unpopular at the moment have proved subsequently to be right. The Berlin airlift is an instance which commenced in 1948 and lasted about a year until 1949, and proved to be a most wise decision. The Korean action is yet another instance which will most likely be rated by historians as one of Mr. Truman's most important decisions—his forceful response to aggression in Korea.

On this, Mr. Truman's 79th birthday, it must be with a feeling of satisfaction when he realizes he enjoys the admiration and respect of all the free world for his many accomplishments to the lasting benefit of free man. It is because of his courage as President that the cause of freedom and the dignity of mankind has been advanced throughout the world. For this very same reason, he is one of America's best loved citizens.

I feel certain that today those on the other side of the center aisle are pleased to join us to say, "Happy birthday, Mr. Truman, and may you experience in the years ahead good health and happiness."

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may have until midnight, Saturday, May 11, to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Libonati). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

DO THE LEADERS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DEMOCRATIC CENTRAL COMMITTEE REALLY BELIEVE IN HOME RULE?—THE EVIDENCE SHOWS THAT THEY DO NOT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Kyl] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, it is high time, I think, that the leaders in the District of Columbia Democratic Central Committee at the present time explain why they are so fearful of, seem not to believe in, and, indeed, actively oppose real home rule and all those measures which would increase the control of the District's citizens over those agencies which deeply affect their lives.

Their home rule bill provides a kind of self-government akin to a secondary school student council going through the motions of self-government which they do not have. They believe and act as if the residents of the District of Columbia were not citizens of the United States who should have the right to local self-government in the city, and at the county, State, and National levels. They seem quite willing to settle for much less, and to settle for less is politically fraudulent.

Having taken the fatal step of settling, in the name of expediency, for a fraudulent home rule bill, the leaders of the District of Columbia Democratic Central Committee go all the way and oppose other plans which would give the citizens of the District of Columbia a greater voice in the management of their own affairs and greater control of the decisions of powerful agencies which deeply affect their lives.

The District of Columbia Democratic Central Committee has gone on record as opposing a highly important plan to give the District's citizens a greater voice in urban renewal which, according to such well-informed observers as Robert J. Lewis, of the Evening Star newspaper, is "being clandestinely used to dispossess one person of land for the benefit of another person."

Just this week the Most Reverend Patrick A. O'Boyle, Catholic archbishop of Washington, asked the people of the city to "act quickly and decisively to root out from our midst the social evils that blight our Nation's Capital. It is hardly necessary to state that we gain nothing by tearing down slum housing if we force the residents to create new slums elsewhere by overcrowding."

The Democratic Central Committee voted without dissent to support the views of two Federal officials, Redevelopment Land Agency Chairman Neville Miller, and National Capital Planning Commission Chairman Mrs. James H. Rowe, Jr., and to oppose a thoughtful plan which would benefit the citizens of Washington.

Under the plan, the Redevelopment Land Agency would lose its autonomous status and become a part of the District's government, and the National Capital Planning Commission would be relegated to an advisory role.

The Washington, D.C., Evening Star newspaper declared on May 3 that a majority of the District's Commissioners declared that the National Capital Planning Commission's veto power over urban renewal projects should be eliminated.

The President of the Board of Commissioners, Walter N. Tobriner, summed up his position this way:

> Any divided authority slows the urban renewal program. It is like having an army with two generals.

Engineer Commissioner Brigadier General Clarke said:

> If you have two people who can say no, this is not desirable. We have pretty good control of all other municipal functions, where the National Capital Planning Commission has only an advisory role now * * * in the long run, it would be better not to have the RLA in the chain of command. I supported the reorganization order because it has administrative simplicity.

According to the Evening Star, the reorganization order was proposed by the District government's administrative and urban renewal staff, given general approval by the Board of Commissioners, the District of Columbia, and sent to the Bureau of the Budget.

I happen to think that this reorganization order is a good one, and that it is a long step toward breathing life into the present moribund city government of Washington. It would put the important urban renewal functions under the city government where it belongs, and where it is in other cities.

I do not suppose that anyone who was the least bit familiar with the politics of the District of Columbia would have any doubt about where the Democratic Central Committee of the District of Columbia would take its stand on this matter. It has taken its stand with the Federal Government and against the District Government and the local citizens. It has taken its stand against increasing the power, authority, and prestige of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia. In doing so, it has taken its stand against yet another aspect of home rule, and one which would be a long and important step toward real control by local citizens of the present vast and impersonal powers of government.

I hope that the House Committee on the District of Columbia will support this reorganization plan which, as I pointed out earlier, was proposed by the District government's administrative and urban renewal staff, given general approval by the Board of Commissioners, the District of Columbia, and is now under consideration by the Bureau of the Budget. I am confident that this reorganization plan has overwhelming support among the citizens and homeowners and businessmen of the District of Columbia, an increasing number of whom have become disenchanted by the present urban renewal programs of the city.

The Washington Post declared editorially on May 8, 1963 that "urban renewal in Washington stands in genuine jeopardy" and added:

> If this crisis were a matter of money alone, it could be solved without great trouble. But in our urban renewal program the want of dollars is hardly more than the superficial and symbolic reflection of the deeper want of purpose and resolution. The great dream of the Capital built anew has been eroded by a decade of administrative harassments and intramural politicking. The men running the renewal plans have grown stale and frustrated.

As the Washington Post points out, the Southwest urban renewal program is taking vastly longer than "anyone guessed 15 years ago" and the "public sees only the vacant land collecting trash and complaints. Relocating the displaced families becomes increasingly difficult, for the city has been very slow to realize the effect of redevelopment upon the city's housing market."

Writing in the Evening Star of May 5, Robert J. Lewis, an honest and impartial observer of urban renewal in the District of Columbia, said:

> Major problems involved in renewal have to do with its amorphous nature, the truly awesome powers it wields, the policies needed to protect the public interest in buying, selling, and leasing of land, the means needed to prevent its being clandestinely used to dispossess one person of land for the benefit of another person, and the limits beyond which it should not be permitted to operate as a freewheeling instrument of social change.

The people of Washington are going to have to fight every inch of the way for their rights—and genuine home rule with a genuine franchise would help—as was dramatically shown last week when the National Capital Planning Commission teamed up with the Department of State and attempted, in the words of a front-page report in the Evening Star newspaper "to grab power from the people of Washington by dictating the location of foreign government offices."

Senator Wayne Morse told the State Department, and other officials present:

> You are not going to destroy the right of petition. This happens to be a democracy in Washington as well as in Podunk, Oreg., and I don't intend to give the State Department a veto power.

I am happy to say that the Republican State Committee of the District of Columbia strongly supported Senator Fulbright, Senator Saltonstall, Senator Beall, and Senator Morse in this matter, and Carl L. Shipley, chairman, testified in favor of the bill sponsored by Senator Fulbright. Again, the leaders of the Democratic Central Committee of the District of Columbia were most notable by their absence and apparent lack of concern in this matter.

Apparently, the leaders of the Democratic Central Committee, like those people who elected to remain in Egypt rather than follow Moses, are happy in their bondage.

However, it is becoming increasingly clear, that all of the District's citizens are not as enthusiastic about this bondage to Federal agencies, and Federal control, as are the leaders of the Democratic Central Committee and more and more of them are being heard from on urban renewal, home rule, and other matters.

The Washington Post published on May 5 a letter by Alphons J. Hackl, entitled "Adams-Morgan Disunity" which showed extreme unhappiness about the urban renewal plan developed by the Redevelopment Land Agency and the National Capital Planning Commission.

Mr. Hackl wrote in part:

> The economic damage to the service commerical businesses, to be displaced under the Planning Commission's plan, employing approximately 1,000 people with an annual payroll of $5½ million should be self-apparent. The total annual sales volume of these businesses is approximately $35 million.
>
> According to the Redevelopment Agency's own and other Government agency figures, in excess of 40 percent of such displaced businesses never reopen and are permanently removed from the business scene.
>
> The Businessmen's Association, while not disapproving the plan, did insist on the retention of service commercial businesses in the area.

Certainly any urban renewal program which results in the permanent removal from the business scene of 40 percent of those businesses which are displaced by it deserves the deepest and most serious study by the District of Columbia Committees of the Senate and House.

I am pleased to note that the Federation of Citizens Associations unanimously approved on April 25, 1963, a resolution presented by its city planning and zoning committee headed by Mrs. John F. Snyder and Peter Glickert which said in part:

> *Be it resolved,* That the Federation of Citizens Associations of the District of Columbia express appreciation to Congressman McMillan, chairman of the Committee on District Affairs, and to Congressman Dowdy, subcommittee chairman, for the businesslike investigation of urban renewal operations in the District of Columbia which have brought to light the gross inequities and the destructive powers of urban renewal as practiced in this city; and be it further
>
> *Resolved,* That the Congress of the United States be urged to examine the record of these hearings as indicative of the imperative needs for overhauling urban renewal legislation which has now had ample time, under practical application, to reveal its defects.

The Federation of Citizens Associations has a membership which has been reliably estimated at over 15,000 in 47 member bodies, almost all of them neighborhood associations.

Certainly in such things as urban renewal and home rule, and, perhaps, in other matters, the Federation of Citizens Associations and the Federation of Civic Associations are closer to their members than the Democratic Central Committee of the District of Columbia.

I include items which are relevant to the matters I have been discussing:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 7, 1963]

District of Columbia Democrats Oppose Redevelopment Land Agency Bill

The District of Columbia Democratic Central Committee threw its support yesterday behind those opposing a proposed plan to reorganize the District Redevelopment Land Agency.

The committee voted without dissent "to support the views of Redevelopment Land Agency Chairman Neville Miller and National Capital Planning Commission Chairman Mrs. James H. Rowe, Jr., and oppose the proposed reorganization plan."

Under the plan, the agency would lose its autonomous status and become a part of the District's government and the planning commission relegated to an advisory role.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 5, 1963]

Adams-Morgan Disunity

The letter which appeared on April 25 purporting to represent the Adams-Morgan businessmen or the 18th and Columbia Road Businessmen's Association is strange indeed. It was not signed by the current president of the association, nor by its immediate past president.

The economic damage to the service commercial businesses, to be displaced under the planning commission's plan, employing approximately 1,000 people with an annual payroll of $5½ million should be self-apparent. The total annual sales volume of these businesses is approximately $35 million.

According to the Redevelopment Agency's own and other Government agency figures, in excess of 40 percent of such displaced businesses never reopen and are permanently removed from the business scene.

The businessmen's association, while not disapproving the plan, did insist on the retention of service commercial businesses in the area.

Alphons J. Hackl.

Washington.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, May 3, 1963]

End to National Capitol Planning Commission Veto on Renewal Urged—Commissioners Tobriner, Clarke, Would Make Group Advisory

(By Charles D. Pierce)

In the face of strong opposition from the National Capital Planning Commission, a majority of the District Commissioners said today that this planning agency's veto power over urban renewal projects should be eliminated.

In his first public discussion of a proposed executive reorganization order which would make the role of the Planning Commission merely advisory, Commissioner Walter N. Tobriner said he firmly believes this change is desirable.

Engineer Commissioner Frederick J. Clarke said he also is convinced that the NCPC's veto power on individual urban renewal projects should be lifted.

Both Commissioners, however, agreed that they might go along with a modification of the proposed reorganization order to make the Redevelopment Land Agency Board directly responsible to the District Commissioners instead of abolishing it.

DISCUSSES ROLE

Discussing the NCPC's role in urban renewal, Mr. Tobriner said:

"Any divided authority slows the urban renewal program. It's like having an army with two generals."

Brigadier General Clarke said that in his opinion "if you have two people who can say 'No,' this is not desirable.

"We have pretty good control of all other municipal functions, where the NCPC has only an advisory role now."

Mrs. James H. Rowe, NCPC Chairman, said in a letter approved by the NCPC yesterday that "it is difficult to understand" how the Planning Commission can do its job "if its role in the urban renewal program, which will reshape the face of the National Capital for many years to come, is reduced to a mere advisory relationship" to the Commissioners.

OBJECTIONS ARE SEEN

The RLA, itself, today opposed lodging all urban renewal powers with the city heads, saying the Commissioners already control renewal activities. Transfer of administration under the proposed scheme has "features which are objectionable," RLA said.

The Agency's opposition was based on its belief that "development and execution of an effective local urban renewal program can never be achieved in the context of ordinary day-to-day city administration."

The views of both RLA and the planning commission were submitted to the Budget Bureau, which had circulated a draft of the reorganization plan for comment.

In its present form the proposed reorganization order would, in addition to abolishing the NCPC veto, eliminate the RLA board of directors and make this agency a department of the District government.

The reorganization order was proposed by the District government's administrative and urban renewal staff, given general approval by the Commissioners and sent to the Bureau of the Budget.

TWO DRAFTS SENT

Actually, it was learned today, two alternative drafts were sent to the Budget Bureau from the District Building. One is the version now being circulated by the Bureau of the Budget to the affected agencies and is the one the Commissioners preferred at that time.

The second draft was based on a plan proposed by the Federal City Council, which would have given the Commissioners more authority over urban renewal, but would have kept the RLA board.

Mr. Tobriner said today that "I am not convinced it would be desirable to abolish the RLA board.

"However, I do believe that the RLA board should be wholly appointed by the District Commissioners and responsible to the Commissioners."

At present, three of the appointments to the 5-man RLA board are made by the Commissioners. The other two appointments are made by the President.

Brigadier General Clarke said that he believes that "in the long run, it would be better not to have the RLA in the chain of command. I supported the reorganization order because it has administrative simplicity."

WOULD BACK TOBRINER

However, the general indicated that he would be willing to support Mr. Tobriner's position on the RLA board.

The third District Commissioner, John B. Duncan, was testifying today before a congressional committee and was not immediately available for comment.

The District Commissioners are expected to take a formal position on the reorganization order soon, after considering objections which have been made by the NCPC and the RLA to the Budget Bureau.

The reorganization order must be submitted by President Kennedy to Congress before June 1, the expiration date of the Reorganization Act of 1949.

If a reorganization plan is submitted by the deadline, it would go into effect automatically unless a simple majority of either the House or the Senate disapproved it.

Chairman Neville Miller of RLA gave his agency's position in a letter to Harold Seidman, the Budget Bureau's assistant director for management and organization. Mr. Seidman last Friday circulated the draft plan after it was prepared, reportedly at the request of the District government.

RESOLUTION OF FEDERATION OF CITIZENS ASSOCIATIONS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Whereas several bills have been introduced in the 88th Congress to provide the citizens of the District of Columbia with a form of self-government commonly referred to as home rule, all of which bills are essentially the same, varying only in details such as numbers, designations, and salaries; and

Whereas none of these bills provide full voting representation for the citizens of the District of Columbia in both Houses of Congress, which privilege is enjoyed by the citizens of every other city of the United States, large or small, and which we believe to be an essential element of any form of self-government; and

Whereas confusion and uncertainty could and undoubtedly would result from the fact that the Congress in all of the bills introduced reserves to itself, without limitation, the very power to legislate for the District of Columbia that it delegates to the proposed city council or assembly: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Federation of Citizens Associations in meeting assembled this 28th day of March 1963, That it is opposed to the principle of so-called home rule for the citizens of the District of Columbia without full voting representation in both Houses of the Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Members of the Senate and House Committees on the District of Columbia, and to the President of the United States.

ROBERT A. KENNEDY,
Chairman, Committee on Suffrage.
MRS. HERMAN M. FRAZIER,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Local Suffrage.

Approved by the Federation: March 28, 1963.

MABEL E. MORRIS,
MRS. EDWARD B. MORRIS,
Secretary, Federation of Citizens Associations.

RESOLUTION IN APPRECIATION

Resolved, That the Federation of Citizens Associations of the District of Columbia, in regular meeting assembled on April 25, 1963, express appreciation to Congressmen WIDNALL, MCDOWELL, MULTER, and KYL for their efforts to improve the residential qualities of this city and to encourage citizen initiative in the conservation of its residential assets with the obvious aim of establishing a favorable climate for steady evolutionary progress in the city's development in the place of the chaos to which we have been subjected through urban renewal operations; and be it

Resolved, That the Federation of Citizens Associations of the District of Columbia express appreciation to Congressman MCMILLAN, chairman of the Committee on District Affairs, and to Congressman DOWDY, subcommittee chairman, for the businesslike investigation of urban renewal operations in the District of Columbia which have brought to light the gross inequities and the destructive powers of urban renewal as practiced in this city; and be it further

Resolved, That the Federation of Citizens States be urged to examine the records of these hearings as indicative of the imperative need for overhauling urban renewal legislation which has now had ample time, under practical application, to reveal its defects; and be it

Resolved, That the Federation of Citizens Associations assure these Congressmen of our desire to cooperate in this effort toward the attainment of mutual goals, to study proposed legislation, participate in public hearings, and engage in other supporting action to correct the defects which have been revealed in urban renewal laws through their practical application, to exert particular effort toward the elimination of the dangerous powers of expropriation vested in administrators of this program which threaten the rights of private property ownership.

Proposed by the City Planning and Zoning Committee.

MRS. JOHN F. SNYDER,
PETER GLICKERT,
Cochairmen.

Approved unanimously by the federation, April 25, 1963.

Mabel E. Morris,
MRS. EDWARD B. MORRIS,
Secretary.

FISH PROTEIN CONCENTRATE

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, the number of people who go hungry in the world is increasing daily. This appalling situation could be alleviated substantially by maximum production of inexpensive and nutritional food. Fish protein concentrate is such a product; but its distribution is inhibited in this country by an administrative ruling which is, in my opinion, not supported by the facts of the case. The following article from the Wall Street Journal is an excellent explanation of the problem and I sincerely recommend it to the attention of my colleagues:

FISH FLOUR FRACAS

The Interior Department has asked Congress for more than $500,000 to improve a fish food product the Food and Drug Administration has, in effect, ruled "filthy."

At the same time, leading nutritionists claim that a satisfactory process for preparing the product already exists and, in fact, is in full-scale operation.

At the center of this confusing controversy is fish protein concentrate (FPC), also known as fish flour. Praised by diet experts, Congressmen and its promoters, even the Food and Drug people, agree it's an excellent source of protein.

Although the fracas has a certain Alice-in-Wonderland quality, the product at issue could be a strategic weapon in the struggle to feed burgeoning populations—particularly in underdeveloped countries. Two-thirds of the planet's human population suffers from malnutrition, specifically a deficiency or almost complete lack of animal protein. Every second at least one person dies of starvation somewhere in the world.

POLITICAL ASPECTS

Involved in the fish flour controversy are not only humane but important political considerations. At least it's argued that food could play a more significant role in the battle to win the support of uncommitted countries where a substandard diet is the rule rather than the exception.

Food and Drug Administration insists its stand against whole fish flour does not prevent Government agencies or others from shipping FPC to undernourished people abroad whose countries have no rule against it. Nevertheless the State Department, the food for peace program and other food donors are reluctant to run the risk of a violent propaganda attack on the United States which would likely be forthcoming if they should try to feed foreigners something not regarded as suitable for Americans.

To see why protein is so important, consider a few facts on nutrition. Aside from water and minerals, foods consist of proteins, fats and carbohydrates. If a diet is low on fats and carbohydrates, there is little problem, since the organism can manufacture both out of proteins. But it cannot manufacture proteins out of fats or carbohydrates.

Animal proteins contain more of the essential amino acids than do plant proteins. The best animal proteins are in milk and eggs which generally are in short supply in underdeveloped countries. It's estimated that just the presently unharvested fish in U.S. coastal waters translated into fish protein concentrate would supply sufficient quantities of animal protein to supplement the deficient diets of about 1 billion people for 300 days at the cost of less than a half cent per person per day.

For some time it's been obvious to food technicians that an easy and obvious method of getting bulk protein concentrate would be to take whole fish, clean and defat them, remove the fishy taste and odor and grind them into flourlike substances. Scientists claim there are proven processes for doing this.

VIOBIN'S PLANTS

A Midwest producer of pharmaceutical preparations, Ezra Levin, president of the VioBin Corp. in Monticello, Ill., says he has a plant in New Bedford, Mass., that turns out 14 tons of fish flour daily and a second built in conjunction with other interests on Long Island which will have a 20-ton-a-day capacity.

There have been significant efforts abroad in FPC manufacture. A Swedish firm has invested $1 million in research efforts, technical breakthroughs in techniques have been scored in Uruguay and Germany, and Russian-manufactured FPC has been tested in this country. Also, fish protein plants have been operated in Peru and South Africa.

And every year both here and abroad tons of fish meal are fed to cattle, poultry and even ranch-raised mink to get maximum growth in the shortest period of time. So in a world where people die for lack of protein and the technical methods to make FPC exist, what is the stumbling block to its widespread production here?

It's section 402(a)(3) of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, the Food and Drug Administration says, which bars the interstate shipment in this country of a product that is "filthy, putrid, decomposed or otherwise unfit for food." The agency's reasoning is that the complete fish—fins, tail, bones, viscera and all—is unclean and, regardless of what is done with it, it is not fit for human consumption under the law.

The fish flour fight prompted by this point of view got underway at the Washington level in 1961 when fishing interests petitioned the Food and Drug Administration to establish a definition and standard of identity for fish protein concentrate and whole fish flour. At that time the agency informally expressed an opinion that it has doggedly held to ever since, that whole fish flour should be regarded as an "adulterated product."

They formalized this view when the Food and Drug Administration issued a standard of identity the following year. It said fish flour would be illegal unless it was made from cleaned fish after discarding heads, tails, fins, viscera and intestinal contents. Bureau of Fishery experts estimate fish flour could be made for as little as 9 cents a pound from whole fish and that using eviscerated fish would increase the price fivefold.

This impasse caused fish flour exponents to redouble their efforts and attracted supporters to their cause. Senator Paul Douglas, Democrat, of Illinois, even went so far as to serve fellow Congressmen a fish flour and rice curry in his office while newsmen looked on.

With a public hearing on the Food and Drug Administration's ruling slated, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall entered the picture. He asked the National Academy of Sciences to have a special panel find out whether fish flour could be safely made, whether such a product now exists and also whether there is a need for inexpensive animal-protein food supplement among low-income groups in the United States. Pending the committee report the public hearings were postponed.

To Mr. Udall's first two questions the special panel answered in the affirmative. To the third query it said that although no one has demonstrated a need for animal protein in the United States, there's the possibility such a product would be of great value both in emergency situations and in meeting worldwide expanding food requirements. And the committee cautioned: "The lack of demonstrable and existing evidence of present need should not interfere with development of new food products."

Although this report was issued 6 months ago, the Food and Drug Administration has adamantly stood on its original evaluation of fish flour.

The agency's attitude in this matter draws a strong response from fish flour proponents. Says one, "It's like telling you that because your hands are dirty, they'll always be dirty no matter how well you wash them."

PERFECTLY GOOD FOOD

Dr. Frederick J. Stare, professor of nutrition at Harvard School of Public Health and one of the world's leading nutritionists, declares simply, "If you grind up the whole fish and if it is cleaned chemically and bacteriologically the resulting fish flour is perfectly good food."

Reports by the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations indicate hundreds of tons of fish flour have been produced and consumed by humans in Sweden, Morocco and South Africa.

The Bulletin of Atomic Scientists comments: "The Food and Drug Administration maintains that its composition makes fish flour unesthetic and that it will be repugnant to consumers, overlooking the fact products such as gelatin are known to come from raw materials equally unesthetic * * * that fish flour is pure and clean chemically and biologically is not in question."

And it has been noted that the Food and Drug Administration allows the sale of many imported food oddities—canned worms, insects and reptiles—which are esthetically disturbing as diet items to many Americans.

Should the Food and Drug Administration change its mind on fish flour, of course, it would mean a lot to the fish industry, and Mr. Levin's VioBin company in particular, as well as to other fish processors.

But as long as the Food and Drug Administration holds to its present stand, it is unlikely domestically produced fish flour, whether made by the VioBin method or some improved technique the Interior Department may come up with, will have any kind of market here except as livestock food.

Regardless of what Government agencies do or say about this product, however, there are powerful forces working on behalf of it and other new foods. The world's skyrocketing population is expected to double by the end of the century. And to score even moderate improvements in the substandard nutritional state of the foorly fed portion of the population, food production must be doubled by 1980 and trebled by the year 2000.

WHY AID INDONESIA?

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MacGregor] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, on May 7, the Kennedy administration told the Congress of recent "emergency" aid to Indonesia in the total amount of $19,700,000. We learned that a $17 million loan was granted 2 months ago by our Agency for International Development. We are told that on top of this figure, an additional $2,700,000 has been given to Indonesia to equip and train a special unit of Indonesian police.

Mr. Frank Coffin, Deputy Administrator of the AID, tells us that this money came out of President Kennedy's emergency foreign aid funds. We are advised that the administration has taken these highly dubious steps in an effort to woo President Sukarno's regime away from Communist bloc influence.

For several years many of us have cited the need for a more effective policy of selectivity in the administration of our programs of foreign economic and military assistance. We recognize that although our aid has made significant contributions to the welfare and strength of free world nations, and, therefore, to our own national interest, we have in some cases made serious mistakes. We have too often expected that American gifts throughout the world would make us popular; quite obviously it is respect, not popularity, which we should be seeking.

This truism is reflected in the report of the Clay Committee on Foreign Aid issued last March 22. The Clay report correctly emphasizes the need of continued support for properly administered mutual defense and development programs overseas. But it also adds:

> We cannot believe that our national interest is served by indefinitely continuing commitments at the present rate to the 95 countries and territories which are now receiving our economic and/or military assistance. Substantial tightening up and sharpened objectives in terms of our national interests are necessary, based on a realistic look at past experience, present needs, and future probabilities.

The Clay report also states:

> If our assistance strengthens the will and capacity of a country to remain independent and helps it move toward political and economic stability, our money will have been wisely spent. If our aid simply postpones the inevitable day of financial and national reckoning, then we have wasted our substance and helped the country not at all.

In reference to Indonesia, the distinguished committee headed by General Clay says:

> We do not see how external assistance can be granted to this nation by free world countries unless it puts its internal house in order, provides fair treatment to foreign creditors and enterprises, and refrains from international adventures.

Mr. Speaker, President Liu Shao-chi of Communist China has just concluded a visit to Jakarta, Indonesia. The effect of this event has been to confirm the close association of these two countries. President Sukarno referred to the two countries as "the pillars of the new emerging forces" and he predicted that together they will see the collapse of the "old established forces" by which he means the leadership of the non-Communist world.

Mr. Sukarno is quoted as saying that the colonialist and the neocolonialist countries are trying to undermine Indonesia and Communist China. And Mr. Liu referred to the two countries as "comrades in arms."

Let us not think of these comments in terms of the "friendliness" which some may think would be due the United States. Affection for the United States is not a requirement for the world stability we need, and we should not be sensitive on this point. But let us measure the significance of this event by the yardstick of the Clay report and of others who would have us be very realistic about our national interest.

Between 1945 and 1962 this country has given to Indonesia almost $700 million worth of various kinds of assistance. The time is here for us to ask ourselves what the result has been. According to the best standards our Government has been able to establish the result has been negative, and no further aid commitments to Indonesia are justified.

The Clay report speaks of the "inevitable day of financial and national reckoning." It is a fact that Indonesia, despite the substantial assistance provided by Communist and non-Communist nations, is now in the midst of its worst economic crisis in its 14 years of independence. Foreign exchange reserves are very low, inflation is running free, and consumer goods are very scarce.

Government mismanagement is everywhere, with no evidence that our efforts to strengthen the agricultural and industrial base of the country have been helpful. Though the government gives assurances of putting its house in order, all indications point to a dominant government effort to undermine the formation of the new Federation of Malaysia. This forthcoming exercise in "international adventure" comes hard on the heels of Sukarno's aggressive expansionism into West New Guinea.

Realistically, perhaps the biggest single result of our aid to Indonesia has been to shore up the position of the Sukarno regime. In view of the evident partnership now built to bind Sukarno to Communist China, it is obviously not in our interest to support Sukarno. Elimination of our aid programs may be the only hope we have of aiding the people of Indonesia in fending off the Communist attachment. We must give more support to non-Communist elements in Indonesia and throughout southeast Asia, and less aid to those who would undermine free peoples living under free governments. Continued intertia, carrying us along the hopeless path of the past several years, can only prolong the agony in just the way we have seen it prolonged elsewhere.

Continued aid to the Sukarno regime would be another sad chapter in the American capacity to confuse charity with true assistance.

Our foreign aid efforts in Indonesia have been well-motivated but fruitless, and have even worked against our objectives. It is time we recognize this, and act accordingly. There is no emergency which justifies the Kennedy administration in helping Sukarno. It is incumbent upon the Congress to put a stop to this ill-conceived application of foreign assistance.

GROWING PAINS: THE 16TH McGRAW-HILL SURVEY OF BUSINESS PLANS FOR NEW PLANTS AND EQUIPMENT

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the 16th annual McGraw-Hill "Survey of Business Plans for New Plants and Equipment—1963–66," which was released on April 26, 1963, contains a wealth of important information, much of which bears upon the current debate of our Nation's economic health.

The survey points up several factors which are of particular interest since they relate to the administration's contention that our rate of economic growth is seriously lagging and that the proper course to follow is deficit financing to increase aggregate demand.

The McGraw-Hill survey shows, for example, that American business plans to spend a record $40 billion on new plants and equipment this year and that the average amount planned for 1964–65 is slightly higher than the amount spent in 1962. Beside the need to modernize facilities, business is increasing its investment in response to an anticipated increase in unit sales of 18 percent between 1963 and 1966. While additions to capacity in recent years have been small, the survey shows that manufacturers are planning to add 12 percent to their capacity during the next 3 years.

Since investment has failed to advance significantly in recent years, the favorable outlook in this area is cheerful news. It is also convincing evidence of the dynamic nature of our economy.

While the new depreciation guidelines and the investment tax credit passed last year are helping to stimulate this higher level of investment activity, the primary reason lies in the increase in sales which business foresees in the future as a result of changes in population and other factors in our economy. The point I am making is that when Government removes impediments to growth—as it did when it revised the depreciation guidelines—the private sector of the economy will react vigorously. It will react as well to changes in the economy, such as innovations, increases in family formation, and changes in the age-sex mix of the population, which can be expected to sharply increase future sales. Besides being unneeded, Government props and stimulation in the form of large budget deficits can be positively harmful.

Another factor brought out by the survey—which developed this information for the first time this year—is the large proportion of their facilities which companies report to be technologically out of date. All industry reported to McGraw-Hill that at the end of 1962, 20 percent of its stock of plant and equipment was technologically outmoded, while manufacturing alone reported that 22 percent was obsolete. As a result, American business is continuing to emphasize modernization rather than expansion of its facilities.

The administration's constant emphasis on the amount of idle plant in our economy loses much of its significance when we recognize that over a fifth of our manufacturing plant and equipment is technologically outmoded. With 22 percent of our plant technologically outmoded and with manufacturing operating at 83 percent of capacity, some of this high cost and admittedly outmoded capacity is now being used.

In terms of technologically up-to-date capacity, it is clear there is little, if any, idle plant and equipment which can be used to supply the increase in aggregate demand which the administration hopes to achieve through a tax cut, higher Government spending, and bigger Government deficits.

If this is so, what happens to the administration's theory that because of idle plant an increase in aggregate demand can take place without creating inflation? And what happens to the administration's position that investment incentives can be minimized and that the major share of any tax adjustment should go to increase consumer demand?

Another area emphasized in the McGraw-Hill survey is the amount of new products on the market. The administration claims that our economic growth has been lagging in recent years. Certainly one indication of real growth is the amount of new and improved goods and services on the market, a factor which is only imperfectly measured by dollars alone as in the gross national product computations.

The McGraw-Hill survey shows that as a result of new discoveries in the laboratories, manufacturers expect that by 1966, 13 percent of their sales will be in new products not now known. The survey also points out that manufacturers as a whole said that 25 percent of their 1962 sales were in new products not made 10 years ago. Here, Mr. Speaker, is proof of the real and significant economic growth which is taking place in our society.

Unfortunately, research and development—which the survey shows makes this kind of new product development possible—is expected to level off over the next few years. When asked why they were planning to slow down their spending on research and development—a prime source of economic growth—the major reason given by the largest proportion of the companies was the pressures of the profit squeeze. With many companies dissatisfied about profit margins, there has been some belt-tightening in their research and development budgets.

The McGraw-Hill survey is highly respected, and I believe that the relevance of many of its findings to the crucial economic subjects now being discussed in the Congress requires that we give the survey and its findings our serious thought and attention. While the entire survey is rather lengthy, I wish to highlight several portions of it which relate to the subjects I have discussed in these remarks. Mr. Speaker, I include excerpts from the survey, as well as a number of interesting tables relating to the subjects which I have discussed, in the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

EXCERPTS FROM McGRAW-HILL SURVEY

SALES EXPECTATIONS

The fact that companies are expecting increased demand in the future is revealed by their sales expectations. The sales targets, particularly beyond this year, indicate confidence in a growing economy. Manufacturers expect their sales, in physical volume, to rise only 4 percent this year. This is the same percentage increase indicated in the McGraw-Hill fall survey. Although the increase itself is small, it comes on top of a very good sales year. But between 1963 and 1966 manufacturers expect unit sales to rise 18 percent.

The auto industry had its second best sales year on record last year and expects to do just as well in 1963. And all other industries expect some increase in unit sales this year. They range from a low of 2 percent in both transportation equipment and textiles to a high of 7 percent in the electrical machinery industry.

But for the period 1963–66 most industries expect to do considerably better. And the expected additions to capacity over the period will provide adequate capacity to meet these sales objectives. The steel industry expects the physical volume of sales to rise only 3 percent this year, but for the 3 years beyond, it expects sales to rise 13 percent. The auto industry anticipates a sales increase of 15 percent between 1963 and 1966. The transportation equipment industry and textiles which expect only a small increase this year hope to see sales rise another 14 percent during the next 3 years.

Last year, McGraw-Hill asked companies about the age of their stock of plants and equipment. But age does not of itself necessarily reveal the quality of facilities. So this year for the first time McGraw-Hill asked companies to provide some indication of how technologically out of date they thought their facilities are. When asked what percent of its stock of plant and equipment at the end of last year it considered technologically outmoded, business as a whole reported that 20 percent was out of date. But many of the older industries, industries which have not concentrated on modernization, have a significantly higher proportion of technologically outmoded facilities. The railroads reported more than half of their facilities are obsolete. A year ago railroads reported that 39 percent of all their facilities had been installed prior to 1945. Those industries engaged in making railroad equipment and in shipbuilding also have a high percent of outmoded facilities—39 percent. Even the machinery industry which has devoted well over two-thirds of its investment in the past 5 years to moderization has a large amount of out-of-date plant and equipment—26 percent.

Industries like electrical machinery in which the fast growing electronics industry is becoming a significant part and autos which have spent vast sums on automation have the lowest proportion of outmoded facilities. In transportation, the airlines which are now nearly all converted to jet aircraft indicate that they consider only 4 percent of their facilities out of date.

That American business is endeavoring to make some headway in putting these facilities in first-class shape is revealed by their continuing emphasis on modernization rather than expansion, an intensive drive which began in 1958. This year, manufacturers as a whole plan to devote 68 percent of their total investment to modernization, 32 percent for expansion. This is roughly the same proportion they have been spending since 1958. And their current planning is to continue to divide their investment in the same proportion during the period 1964-66.

Only fabricated metals and instruments and chemicals plan to spend more for expansion than modernization this year. But both these industries have consistently devoted more than half of their investment dollar to expansion for the past 2 years. And they plan to do the same thing during the next 3 years. Since both these industries are more oriented to new product development than many others, undoubtedly much of the expansion will be to make new products.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT AND NEW PRODUCTS

In its quest for new horizons American industry continues to look to research and development for new products, for new processes and for improving current products. To this end industry as a whole worked on research and development projects to the tune of $12 billion last year, 10 percent more than 1961. The amount of research and development being performed by industry has risen spectacularly over the decade; research and development expenditures are now three and one-half times greater than 10 years ago. But the rate of increase planned for the years ahead appears to be tapering off. After a 10-percent increase, between 1961 and 1962, industry expects the amount of research and development it will perform this year will rise only 4 percent. And companies now indicate that between 1963 and 1966 they expect their research and development to go up slightly more than $1 billion for the 3-year period.

Companies also indicated some of the reasons for this apparent slowdown. When asked, if the rate of increase in research and development expenditures is slowing down in your firm, what is the major reason, the largest proportion of companies cited the profit squeeze. Salaries which account for the bulk of research and development expenditures have been rising steadily and with many companies unhappy about profit margins there apparently has been some belt tightening in research and development budgets.

Of the companies answering 41 percent stated that the profit squeeze was responsible for the slowdown in research and development. Another 18 percent indicated that major projects had been completed, and they were not currently contemplating any new ones. And 17 percent said that research and development was being performed more efficiently which presumably could also be related to the profit picture. While these firms indicated that they were taking a closer look at their research and development budgets, many others said that there was no slowdown in their programs; they were going ahead and increasing their budgets at about the same rate as they had in the past.

And furthermore, they expect these programs to pay off in the near future. Manufacturers expect that as a result of new discoveries in the laboratories, 13 percent of their 1966 sales will be in new products, either products not produced last year or products so completely changed as to be reasonably considered new products.

Those industries currently spending the most for research are the ones expecting the largest sales volume in new products. For example, the electrical machinery and communications industry which is spending $2.6 billion on research and development this year expects 22 percent of 1966 sales to be in new products. The transportation equipment industry, mostly aircraft, which is doing nearly twice as much research as any other industry, also expects the largest growth in new products. This industry anticipates that by 1966 fully 36 percent of its sales will be in completely new products. The machinery industry, another large research and development performer, also expects a large proportion of its 1966 sales will be in new products.

And it is those same industries that have spent large amounts for research and development that have benefited from new product sales in the past 10 years. While manufacturers as a whole revealed that 25 percent of their 1962 sales were in new products, products not made 10 years ago, those industries which have spent the most on research and development had a much higher percent of sales in new products than the average. Machinery manufacturers indicated 38 percent of their 1962 sales were in products not produced 10 years ago. Transportation equipment firms revealed that 60 percent of their 1962 sales were in new products, while electrical machinery manufacturers indicated nearly half of their 1962 sales were in products which did not exist 10 years ago.

Those industries which have spent relatively little on research and development, food and beverages, textiles, petroleum, and primary metals were the same industries indicating that new products accounted for a smaller proportion of last year's sales than the overall average.

The inference appears obvious—those industries that spend money on research and development will be assured of a continuing flow of new products and processes in the future. There can be little doubt that new products and new cost-saving processes will take on added importance in the years ahead, as foreign competition threatens to continue. And new products will create new sales potential. The combination of large research and development expenditures, new products and development of new techniques will in turn mean high capital expenditures to take advantage of these new developments.

How much of our stock of plant and equipment is technologically outmoded [1]

Industry:	*Percent outmoded*
Iron and steel	27
Nonferrous metals	14
Machinery	26
Electrical machinery	11
Autos, trucks, and parts	12
Transportation equipment	22
Aircraft	17
Shipbuilding, railroad equipment and other	39
Fabricated metals and instruments	22
Chemicals	10
Paper and pulp	18
Rubber	20
Stone, clay, and glass	15
Petroleum and coal products	10
Food and beverages	24
Textiles	29
Miscellaneous manufacturing	27
All manufacturing	22
Mining	21
Railroads	51
Other transportation and communications	15
Electric utilities	12
Commercial	18
All industry	20

[1] As of December 1962.

How manufacturers are expanding capacity [1]

[Index of industrial capacity (December 1950=100)]

Industry	1962	Planned		Percent increase		
		1963	1966	1961-62	1962-63	1963-66
Iron and steel	147	151	162	1	3	7
Nonferrous metals	207	211	238	2	2	13
Machinery	205	215	239	5	5	11
Electrical machinery	243	250	275	4	3	10
Autos, trucks, and parts	179	181	199	1	1	10
Transportation equipment (aircraft, ships, railroad equipment)	291	308	336	7	6	9
Fabricated metals and instruments	187	197	230	5	6	16
Chemicals	230	242	281	5	5	16
Paper and pulp	186	192	204	3	3	6
Rubber	179	190	209	4	6	10
Stone, clay, and glass	176	183	201	3	4	10
Petroleum and coal products	147	150	159	0	2	5
Food and beverages	159	167	187	5	5	12
Textiles	129	134	149	2	4	11
Miscellaneous manufacturing	177	186	214	7	5	15
All manufacturing	189	197	221	4	4	12

[1] Weighted by 1957 value; added weights used by Federal Reserve Board in its calculation of the industrial production index.

NOTE.—All data as of end of year.

Capacity—Rates of operation

[In percent]

Industry	Actual operating rate [1]					Preferred rate, 1962
	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	
Iron and steel	73	96	50	83	(1)	(1)
Nonferrous metals	77	77	72	79	79	95
Machinery	70	76	70	75	79	91
Electrical machinery	80	79	74	79	79	93
Autos, trucks, and parts	78	88	80	86	88	96
Transportation equipment (aircraft, ships, railroad equipment)	70	75	71	71	78	88
Fabricated metals and instruments	80	84	76	76	76	92
Chemicals	80	82	75	79	78	90
Paper and pulp	87	91	88	90	89	97
Rubber	78	84	76	93	95	94
Stone, clay, and glass	79	78	70	71	74	88
Petroleum and coal products	87	86	81	90	91	95
Food and beverages	82	83	81	82	81	86
Textiles	87	92	82	91	92	96
Miscellaneous manufacturing	84	89	83	89	87	94
All manufacturing	80	85	77	83	83	92

[1] Not available.

NOTE.—All rates as of end of year.

Modernization versus expansion

Industry	Percent of capital spending planned for—			
	1963		1964–66	
	Replacement and modernization	Expansion	Replacement and modernization	Expansion
Iron and steel	70	30	68	32
Nonferrous metals	76	24	57	43
Machinery	73	27	74	26
Electrical machinery	69	31	73	27
Autos, trucks, and parts	89	11	87	13
Transportation equipment (aircraft, ships, railroad equipment)	60	40	63	37
Fabricated metals and instruments	45	55	40	60
Chemicals	46	54	45	55
Paper and pulp	84	16	79	21
Rubber	64	36	62	38
Stone, clay, and glass	59	41	60	40
Petroleum and coal products	81	19	95	5
Food and beverages	73	27	58	42
Textiles	67	33	68	32
Miscellaneous manufacturing	62	38	58	42
All manufacturing	68	32	68	32

The growth of research and development expenditures

[In millions of dollars]

Industry	1960	1961	1962	Planned	
				1963	1966
Primary metals	164	157	166	169	191
Machinery	993	1,013	1,124	1,180	1,369
Electrical machinery and communications	2,405	2,501	2,601	2,731	3,168
Aircraft and parts	3,482	3,795	4,364	4,539	4,539
Autos and other transportation equipment	849	866	909	918	1,056
Fabricated metals and ordnance	126	140	144	154	180
Professional and scientific instruments	416	466	522	574	689
Chemicals and allied products	1,047	1,016	1,077	1,121	1,278
Paper and allied products	66	67	77	82	93
Rubber products	115	124	135	134	150
Stone, clay, and glass	82	84	92	98	121
Petroleum products	289	312	315	331	364
Food and kindred products	106	110	120	132	141
Textile mill products and apparel	37	39	38	39	43
Other industries [1]	320	336	349	363	410
All industries	10,497	11,026	12,033	12,565	13,792

[1] Includes tobacco, lumber and wood products, furniture, printing and publishing, and miscellaneous manufacturing industries, mining, utilities, and railroads.

New products and sales

Industry	New products [1] percent of 1966 expected sales	Percent of 1962 sales in products not produced in 1952
Iron and steel	8	18
Nonferrous metals	9	18
Machinery	22	38
Electrical machinery	22	49
Autos, trucks, and parts	14	38
Transportation equipment (aircraft, ships, railroad equipment)	36	60
Fabricated metals and instruments	22	30
Chemicals	16	31
Paper and pulp	8	31
Rubber	8	4
Stone, clay, and glass	12	19
Petroleum and coal products	4	4
Food and beverages	7	11
Textiles	14	22
Miscellaneous manufacturing	12	22
All manufacturing	13	25

[1] Products not produced in 1962.

What is the major reason for the slowdown in the rate of increase in research and development expenditures?

Industry	Percent of companies answering					
	Profit squeeze	Major projects completed	Unsatisfactory profit on past R. & D.	R. & D. being performed more efficiently	Lack of profitable new projects	Other
Iron and steel	80	0	0	20	0	0
Nonferrous metals	56	22	11	0	11	0
Machinery	45	18	8	16	12	1
Electrical machinery	44	17	11	11	11	6
Autos, trucks, and parts	29	43	14	14	0	0
Transportation equipment (aircraft, ships, railroad equipment)	40	20	20	0	20	0
Fabricated metals and instruments	46	8	0	8	30	8
Chemicals	45	5	5	15	20	10
Paper and pulp	63	0	13	12	0	12
Rubber	25	25	0	50	0	0
Stone, clay, and glass	23	23	8	23	23	0
Petroleum and coal products	17	17	17	33	16	0
Food and beverages	36	14	0	36	5	9
Textiles	36	36	0	9	19	0
Miscellaneous manufacturing	43	21	11	21	4	0
All manufacturing	42	17	8	17	12	4
All other	32	26	3	13	23	3
All industry	41	18	7	17	13	4

PROJECT MOHOLE IS NO HOLE

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of public concern over space lags and missile gaps. But there is an area of scientific investigation right here on earth in which the United States seems to be falling behind without any good excuse at all. Although this matter has attracted relatively little attention or congressional inquiry, it deserves it.

I refer to Project Mohole, which has been described by Dr. Alan T. Waterman, Director of the National Science Foundation, as "man's greatest single geological project." Despite this lofty description, it is Dr. Waterman's own agency of Government which is responsible for the unreasonable and unexplained delay in pushing it to completion.

Project Mohole is the program for drilling through the earth's crust and determining the structure and composition of the first, second, third, and, hopefully, the fourth layer—the latter being the earth's mantle. Phase 1 was carried out off Guadalupe Island by a small group of scientist-engineers who managed to prove the feasibility of reaching the Mohorovic Discontinuity—a sharp break in seismic velocities thought to mark the start of the mantle—by drilling test holes in the deep ocean floor. Deepest drilling was 601 feet below the ocean floor in 11,672 feet of water—where the holes passed out of Miocene foraminiferal sediments at about 557 feet into basalt. The total cost of this operation was $1.5 million. Full advantage was taken of the petroleum industry's interest in deep ocean drilling to enlist its cost-free assistance, specifically donation of the ocean-drilling barge *Cuss-1*.

For some as yet completely unexplained reason, the second phase of the program—which will entail drilling 3 miles, more or less, into the ocean floor in an ocean depth of 3 miles—was turned over to a prime systems contractor, after the fashion of a major weapons systems project. And "because we don't want to give any one company a major competitive advantage in deep sea drilling know-how," the decision was made to exclude oil companies as possible contractors. This served neatly to assure that the best engineering know-how available for the project would not be permitted to participate. Not only that, but there was every indication that much of such participation might have been arranged on a cost-free basis.

Now 2 years after placing the contract, nothing—save studies and evaluations—has been accomplished. The prime contractor, Brown & Root, has little to show for its time and efforts except for four voluminous reports. The customer—the National Science Foundation—is still sitting on its hands, unwilling and/or unable to decide how to start, much less proceed.

So, at the moment, Project Mohole is "no hole."

Two advisory groups, the American Miscellaneous Society, known as Amsoc, which is a committee of the National Academy of Sciences, and Ocean Science & Engineering, Inc., consisting of certain key members of the original Mohole team—both agree on how to proceed and have repeatedly passed their recommendations on to National Science Foundation. Essentially these recommendations are as follows: Take a World War II tanker and convert it into an interim drilling ship capable of handling 20,000 feet of drill pipe. Cost of conversion, equipping, and operating the ship for a year is estimated at $7 million. If the mantle is closer than the scientists think the mantle would be hit with no further expense to the taxpayer. If not, much valuable scientific information and expensive engineering know-how would be gained—at a very low cost. In contrast, Brown & Root wants to build a massive craft 275-feet-square right from the start at a cost of $15 million. The main argument against this route is the heavy commitment of funds without first determining if it is necessary.

This week in Houston, Tex., Amsoc, Brown & Root, and the National Science Foundation are conducting 3 days of meetings in which Brown & Root's massive studies and Amsoc's recommendations will be examined and discussed. There is hope, but no guarantee, that agreement will be reached.

We are all indebted to Ocean Science News, a business letter published here in Washington, for its suggestion in the issue of April 30, that Congress should look into Project Mohole. I am in complete agreement with that recommendation. We should endeavor to ascertain why the National Science Foundation has done virtually nothing in the way of providing management of the project. We should, in fact, as Ocean Science News suggests, determine if National Science Foundation is the proper agency to handle projects of this size and scientific and national importance. National Science Foundation has proved its capabilities in the management of research grants and fellowships but it has fallen flat on its face in the administration of Project Mohole.

Meanwhile, the Russians have scheduled an excellent program of deep-earth scientific drilling consisting of a pattern of holes all across the Soviet Union, culminating—they hope—in the piercing of the mantle in the Kuriles. And, they are going ahead. They have reached just over 17,000 feet in their first hole in the Caucasus.

In contrast the only Mohole accomplishment in the last 2 years is a 1,000-foot core drilling in Puerto Rico last fall. It was drilled by Western Geophysical under a subcontract from Brown & Root, at Amsoc's insistence, into the central part of an anticline—a dome or arch of rock. The continuous core was entirely of serpentine, a rock that may represent the earth's crust under ocean basins.

The Amsoc group is a highly individualistic committee of scientists who are determined that the project be carried out on an accelerated, high priority basis. It is no secret that its members are impatient over the bureaucratic slowdown treatment the project has been given by the National Science Foundation. As one of these highly knowledgeable scientists has said, there is no drilling ship, there are no new cores and, so far, no program has been approved to proceed with. Yet in the interim, the estimate for completing the project has risen from $40 to $60 million.

It is high time for the Congress to build a bonfire under the National Science Foundation, which apparently is the only stimulus at hand for making them get their show on the road.

ADDRESS BEFORE FLORIDA DIVISION OF THE INVESTORS LEAGUE, INC., BY LESTER O. SCHRIVER OF THE AMERICAN HERITAGE FOUNDATION

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the privilege of addressing the Florida division of the Investors League, Inc., a nationwide organization dedicated to the preservation and strengthening of the private enterprise system and individual freedom, at its fifth annual forum held in Orlando, Fla., on April 15.

On this occasion I also had the privilege of sharing the platform with Mr. Lester O. Schriver, executive vice president of the American Heritage Foundation, whose address, "Who Pays Your Fare?" will be of interest to everyone who shares his belief in the American ideals and principles of a strong competitive free enterprise system and of individual freedom, responsibility and self-reliance.

I commend Mr. Schriver's address to the attention of my colleagues:

WHO PAYS YOUR FARE?

There is but one fundamental issue before the citizens of America today and that is the preservation of our traditional way of life. For the past 30 years that way of life has been under attack by enemies from within and from without. Essential socialism is rapidly supplanting our free enterprise, capitalistic, competitive way of life. That way of life has given us a keener sense of responsibility, more human dignity, and greater material prosperity than has ever been enjoyed by any generation of human beings on the face of the earth.

Thomas Jefferson once said, "The price of liberty is eternal vigilance." That means that human liberty isn't something that can be put away in mothballs or kept as a museum piece. If it is to live and flourish and continue to serve us and those who come after us, it must be fought for by every generation or it will be forever lost. "That which thy fathers bequeathed to thee—earn it anew if thou wouldst possess it."

Our way of life is built on the theory that the supreme power and authority and the responsibility for its exercise rests with the people. It implies that the responsibility for our institutions, our business enterprises and the Government itself rests upon the character and the judgment of all the people. But theory and practice have drifted miles apart. In theory we are self-reliant and responsible, and every man is master of his own fate. In practice, our moral fiber has been weakened, and our sense of responsibility badly eroded.

In the past 30 years we have become lulled by the sweet music of the siren called Security, who offers freedom from responsibility from the cradle to the grave. Our morals have become eroded to the point that we are willing to be bribed by our own money. We seem to have been forgetting that government produces nothing and that it can provide for all the needs of its citizens only by depriving them of these essentials of their liberty. Liberty and security are not synonymous. As a matter of fact, they could be wholly incompatible. When Patrick Henry declared, "Give me liberty or give me death," he did not ask for security. When the signers of the Declaration of Independence signed that historic document, they demanded only liberty.

If security is our greatest urge, we have no need or right to be free. A benevolent dictatorship is probably the most efficient vehicle of security, and if that is all the heart desires then liberty is wholly unnecessary. But if you want liberty, and responsibility, and opportunity, then our traditional way of life, with all its imperfections, is the best hope of earth—for Americans.

A few days ago a friend gave me a bit of lyric prose which belongs right here. I don't know the author. If I did, I would thank him for a very great contribution. Here it is:

"EMBLEM OF AMERICA

"When God made the oyster, He guaranteed him absolute economic and social security. He built the oyster a house, a shell to protect him from other animals and other oysters. When hungry, the oyster opens up his shell and food rushes in.

"But when God made the eagle, what did He do? He said, 'The blue sky is the limit. Get out and build your own house.' And the eagle goes out and builds his house on the highest mountain crag, where danger and disaster threaten him everyday. For food, he flies through a thousand miles of rain and snow and wind.

"But please remember, the eagle and not the oyster is the emblem of America."

Is our way of life passing into the limbo of aborted dreams? Sometimes I think I see the signs of a complete surrender to the welfare state. And what are those signs? When people prefer to draw unemployment insurance rather than earn a living (and they often do), then all self-respect has vanished and moral responsibility is dead.

When racketeers can invade our labor unions and remain beyond the law (and they do). When dope peddlers and sex perverts can debauch our schools and colleges (and they do). When youth gangs rove the streets to rob and rape and kill in ever-increasing numbers (and they do). Then public apathy and official impotency has put the skids on the ideals and principles that have identified us as a decent, moral and God-fearing Nation.

When we become so soft, or timid, or indifferent, or lethargic that racketeers and criminals (at home and abroad) get away with murder—

When gamblers and thugs run many of our cities—

When labor goons intimidate decent labor and industry—

It is time to rise up in our righteous wrath and cast out the power of this human sewage from our public life before it pollutes every decent thing we possess.

Can our country permanently survive the selfishness and stupidity of its own citizens? I don't know. We still have to demonstrate that we can preserve that which the founders of our Republic bequeathed us.

But how and where did we lose our way? How and where did we lose our ideals, our sense of responsibility, our high regard for honest toil, our desire to achieve? I just don't know when or where the virus attacked our whole body politic, our body economic, and our body social.

But like a cancer it has been eating at the very vitals of our national life and has left us sick and confused. It was Plato who once said, "The penalty that good men pay for indifference to public affairs is to be ruled by evil men."

Of course, indifference has taken its toll, and in addition our moral fiber has been eroded by our lust for a fast buck and our desire for ease. Furthermore, we have been going through a 30-year program of brainwashing which has seemed so plausible, so utopian, so sweet and ideal that we have been cunningly seduced by Delilah, and, without realizing it, made the victims of the Philistines. The process has been so gradual that we haven't realized that our basic socio-political philosophy has gone through a complete metamorphosis. A symptom of the change is the general sloughing off of a sense of responsibility, and now most of us are inclined to look to government for the fulfillment of all our needs.

If you don't believe that the concept of an all-encompassing, all-knowing, benevolent, public welfare government has engulfed our entire way of life, just look at tomorrow's newspapers or listen to tomorrow's TV. Almost every headline has to do with government. A government that would provide for our retirement, prescribe the hours you may work, the minimum price you may accept for your services. It prescribes the age you must attain before you can work and the age when you must quit. The quasi-governmental welfare agencies would provide a playpen and toys after retirement, and before long it will be "medicare" for everyone, furnished by a welfare state.

In addition, government insists on imposing rules and regulations for people of other lands, who might prefer to be left alone to pursue their own way of life. And there is much subtle propaganda, which would seem to extol the virtues of internationalism or togetherness and to discredit national consciousness. As a matter of fact, nationalism is only the desire of a people to be themselves. A little of it wouldn't hurt Americans a bit. The greatest antidote to communism would be to demonstrate here in America that the free enterprise, capitalistic, competitive system will really work. That demonstration would do more to discourage Khrushchev than all the missile demonstrations of which we are capable.

Instead of giving government all the newspaper space and all the radio time, why not spend some time telling our people what free enterprise is doing for the country? Incidentally, free enterprise is paying all the bills for the attractive facade of our welfare government.

How long has it been since you have seen or heard a kind word about the fact that our legal reserve life insurance companies furnish the money to manufacture airplanes, to build highways, apartments, business blocks, and private housing, running into many billions of dollars? How about our great industrial establishments that provide work for millions and products for ten thousand uses? And how about our private, our truly great citizens, who provide funds to build colleges, churches, hospitals, and philanthropies by the thousands at the local, State, and National levels?

As a rule, whenever you hear a private citizen mentioned it is when he has murdered someone, or has committed a crime, or has been a fool. The same is true of our business enterprises. If an officer of a bank has stolen a quarter of a million of the bank's assets, his exploits get top billing. But let 10,000 bankers do their work well and honorably and thereby contribute much to the stability of our economy and they remain anonymous forever.

But let the Government make the slightest move in any direction and the whole world is reminded again that the welfare of the people is being safeguarded by a rich, all-knowing, benevolent, thoughtful Government.

Yes, we have been brainwashed. We now present a new and different national personality. We have been so lulled by the excess of adulation for the new political philosophy that we accept it as a new and better way of life. Our sense of responsibility has been drugged almost to the point of stupor, and we really believe we are being carried to heaven on flowery beds of ease. And Khrushchev is laughing in the Kremlin as he tells us, "We will bury you." Well, he will, too, if we don't stop playing scared or dead and demonstrate to the world that we have had "a new birth of freedom and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

And now you ask, "What can we do about it?" Well, the first thing we can do is to again assert our right of franchise and move in to clean up politics at the local level. Whether we like it or not, politics is the science of government in America. It's the only system we know. Too long the average good citizen has left a vacuum by remaining aloof to dirty politics, and the self-seekers, the racketeers, and petty politicians, and the incompetents have moved in and are intrenched.

Did you ever attend a meeting at the precinct or ward level? I will bet that not 10 percent of you have ever attended such a meeting. But the ward heelers, the racketeers, and the handout boys are always there. They may decide to run someone for mayor who has some standing in the community, but if a good man is elected under those conditions his hands are tied because he is beholden to those from whom he obtained his empty title.

We have no right to complain about the fitness of those who govern us, unless and until we have made every reasonable effort to elect and support men and women of stature, character, and competence. When the day comes that every decent citizen will do his utmost to provide for himself and his neighbor good, honest, and responsible government, on that day will we be on our way back to our traditional concept—of free enterprise, decency, and general responsibility. The decent people in any community can have good government if they will really work for it.

But there is a first step before we can actively and intelligently participate in government at any level. And that step is to learn the techniques of its operation from the precinct to the statehouse.

Our present system is entirely adequate and democratic. In fact, it is part and parcel of our concept of representative government. The only difference between good government and bad government is the quality of men who run its operation.

At the precinct and ward level we should replace the ward heeler with the merchant, the doctor, and the banker. Instead of the racketeer, who in some form is always there, let us have the active participation of the teacher, the farmer, the honest representative of labor, yes, and even the minister, the priest, and the rabbi. And then let us become interested enough to actually run for office ourselves. Politics is not a dirty business or a petty business unless its citizens make it dirty and petty.

This is a call to arms, directed to every citizen who would like to preserve for himself and for posterity our free enterprise, capitalistic, competitive system, which has demonstrated its efficacy for more than 150 years and which still is our best hope of survival as a Nation.

The challenge is as great as the call to arms in the hour of our Nation's peril. Indeed, this is an hour when our Nation is in dire peril. You may not be called upon to carry a gun or throw a hand grenade, but the need of your service is just as great as it would be in time of war. And so to arms. Go to the next meeting in your precinct. Learn the ropes. Influence the thinking and the actions. Help to select candidates and help to elect them. And after you have elected them make them realize that the decent, honest, self-respecting people back home are back of them in the performance of their duty.

A few years ago Josiah Holland produced a great poem entitled "Give Us Men." I give it to you as he gave it:

"God give us men, a time like this demands
Great hearts, strong minds, true faith and ready hands,
Men whom the lust of office cannot kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions and will;
Men who love honor; men who will not lie;
Men who can stand before a demagog,
And damn his treacherous flatteries without winking;
Tall men, suncrowned, who live above the fog;
In public duty, and in private thinking;
For while the rabble, with its thumb-worn creeds,
Its large professions, and its little deeds,
Mingle in selfish strife, lo. Freedom weeps,
Wrong rules the land and waiting justice sleeps."

And now, I give you my perversion of Holland's poem:

"God give us men,
Men of character and high ability to lead our Government,
Men of vision and courage to head our colleges,
Men of integrity and high purpose to be prophets and preachers.
Men with keen minds and great hearts to work night and day to keep America morally and financially solvent.
Men who will serve and sacrifice to keep bright and clean the ideal for which men have died that we might live.
Men who will lead with humility and magnanimity, and follow with loyalty and dignity.
Yes, God give us men!
Out of the bounty of earth and the labor of men.
Out of the longing of hearts and the prayer of souls,
Out of the memory of ages and the hopes of the world,
God fashioned a nation in Love, and we call it America."

"GO GO"

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I now have what purports to be a reply to a letter I addressed to Secretary of Defense McNamara on April 23 on the subject of participation by American servicemen in a moving picture, "Go Go," made in Iceland.

My complaint was, and still is, that these men appeared in the roles of "souses and girl corrupters," according to a review of the picture by Variety.

Instead of an answer from Mr. McNamara, who is responsible for overall policies of the Department of Defense, I have a letter signed by Mr. Arthur Sylvester, the Department's publicity director.

It is an entirely unsatisfactory answer and again, under date of May 7, 1963, I have written to Mr. McNamara asking some questions to which, this time, I hope I will get the answers.

So that the record may be complete, I include Mr. Sylvester's letter to me and my letter to Secretary McNamara of May 7 at this point in my remarks.

The only encouraging thing in Mr. Sylvester's letter is his statement that the Department's policies with reference to standards of conduct are being strengthened. I hope so.

The letters follow:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., May 3, 1963.

Hon. FRANK J. BECKER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKER: This is in reply to your communication relative to participation of U.S. servicemen in a commercial film entitled "Go Go," produced in Iceland.

Following Jim Lucas' story last week in the Washington News, we were obligated to answer many press queries on the subject before getting more complete information from the Navy on which to base this letter. Although the resulting news stories contained substantially the same information, the following is in answer to your specific questions.

Two Navy men attached to the Iceland Defense Force did appear in the film in question. They were Lt. (jg.) (then ensign) Lawrence William Schnepf, U.S. Naval Reserve, and AT1c. John Daniel Tacy, U.S. Navy. Ensign Schnepf portrayed a junior officer in three brief scenes. Aviation Technician Tacy portrayed the part of a master sergeant, also in a minor supporting role.

An informal investigation of the circumstances was conducted by the Navy in November of last year. Schnepf and Tacy stated that they had volunteered for the parts and performed them during off-duty hours, without remuneration. They admitted, however, that neither of them had seen the script nor were they later shown the completed picture or scenes in which they appeared. The command information officer had advised the men to check on the parts they were to play to avoid anything that would "bring discredit upon the military services or cause embarrassment to the command," which is in keeping with the provisions of the Department of Defense Standards of Conduct. The producer, however, scheduled the filming of the scenes before the men had an opportunity to read the script. Subsequently, the command information officer was transferred to another duty.

The present commander, Iceland Defense Force, has told us that the completed picture caused no ill feeling for the military base in Iceland, thus no disciplinary action was taken against Schnepf and Tacy. He agreed, however, that the incident resulted from bad judgment on the part of all concerned, particularly the command information officer who should have followed up to assure review and evaluation of the script.

We have no information on the producer's distribution plans other than the April 17 Variety item indicating the film had been reviewed in Sweden.

The present policy of the Department of Defense regarding standards of conduct is being supplemented and strengthened by our revised instruction for assistance in production of commercial films. The new directive will require review of all screenplays when service personnel seek outside employment in motion pictures. I am sure that this will provide a substantial safeguard against recurrences of this type.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR SYLVESTER.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 7, 1963.

Hon. ROBERT S. MCNAMARA,
Secretary of Defense, The Pentagon, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On April 23 I addressed a letter to you with reference to two military personnel participating in the foreign film "Go Go," portraying "souses and girl corrupters." I subsequently received a telephone call to the effect that an admiral was going to make a full-scale report of this matter.

I have now received a letter not from you, but from Mr. Arthur Sylvester of your public relations staff. I am sure if you read a copy of this letter, you would not be satisfied and neither am I.

We read that there are many restrictions placed upon men of our military services in making speeches or writing articles or books, and that they must submit these to higher echelons for approval. We also read about the steps or action being taken against any military service personnel violating these rules. However, in this instance, I believe an officer and a technician degraded the uniform of the U.S. Navy in portraying characters of such a nature in a motion picture to be shown in foreign countries. From the letter I received, I am given to understand that the command information officer was transferred to another duty. However, from sources at my command, I am informed he is now on a better assignment than before.

I feel sure you will agree that I am entitled to answers to the following specific questions:

1. Did these U.S. military personnel play the roles of "souses and girl corrupters" in U.S. military uniform in the motion picture "Go Go"?

2. (a) Who was the command information officer, and what punishment was meted out to him for having permitted military personnel to play these parts without having investigated the script himself?

(b) Why are military personnel permitted to wear uniforms in commercial productions when playing character parts? I have enjoyed many motion pictures portraying our Military Establishment, but always the characters were played by actors, and invariably the pictures were shown in the United States where people would understand our way of life.

3. How long after this incident was Ensign Schnepf promoted to lieutenant?

4. Since our military personnel are restricted, as stated in the first part of this letter, why do not the same restrictions cover those involved in the production of motion pictures?

I know you are a busy man, but somehow I feel my letter should have come to your attention, and the reply thereto should have been based on policies which affect our Military Establishment.

The answers to the above questions would be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK J. BECKER,
Member of Congress.

THE WASHINGTON SCENE AND THE INVESTORS' PROBLEMS AHEAD

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of the House an address made by William Jackman, the president of the Investors League, Inc., before the fifth annual investors forum of the league's Florida division in Orlando, Fla., on April 15, 1963:

THE WASHINGTON SCENE AND THE INVESTORS' PROBLEMS AHEAD

The 88th Congress convened at high noon on Wednesday, January 9. The new Senate is made up of 100 Members: 67 Democrats and 33 Republicans. The House has a membership of 435: 176 Republicans and 258 Democrats, with 1 vacancy. Senator CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona, was chosen as President pro tempore of the Senate. Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, is again majority leader; Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, majority whip; Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, of Illinois, minority leader; and Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, of California, minority whip. In the new House of Representatives, JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, was elected Speaker; CARL ALBERT, of Oklahoma, majority leader; HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana, majority whip; CHARLES A. HALLECK, of Indiana, minority leader; and Representative LESLIE C. ARENDS, of Illinois, minority whip.

THE HOUSE RULES COMMITTEE

On the first day of the new session—January 9—the administration was able to ram through the House, under forced draft, and after much political maneuvering, a resolution to again pack the House Rules Committee by adding three members thereto so that the administration, and the liberal element in the House, may more easily decide which legislation is to be considered by the House, itself.

The House of Representatives by a vote of 235 to 196, voted to again increase the House Rules Committee to 15 members. According to proponents of the administration's packing efforts, the move was supposedly designed to secure the right of every Congressman to vote on legislation approved by other committees.

THE SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE

The Senate's Democratic steering committee dealt a severe blow to President Kennedy's Federal income tax and medicare proposals.

The steering group, policymaking panel for Senate Democrats, soundly defeated a plan to enlarge the Senate Finance Committee from 17 to 19 members. The two additions according to the plan, would look favorably on the President's tax proposals, as well as his plan to finance health care for the aged, through social security.

But as things stand now, the Finance Committee will remain at 17 members—11 Democrats and 6 Republicans—and remain under the control of gentlemen of fiscal integrity led by Chairman HARRY BYRD, of Virginia. In addition, the Minority Leader EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois, a foe of most Kennedy fiscal measures, will fill the Republican vacancy on the Finance Committee.

The steering group did, however, vote to enlarge seven committees, including the Appropriations Committee. Two Kennedy backers, Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, and Senator E. L. BARTLETT, of Alaska, were appointed to that committee. Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, of Connecticut, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare under Mr. Kennedy and a Senator but for a few weeks, was named to the Finance Committee, regardless of the fact that other Senators had vastly greater seniority and fiscal experience.

Senator BYRD predicted President Kennedy's top-priority tax cut proposal won't clear his tax-writing Finance Committee until after Labor Day. The Virginia Democrat, leader of the Senate opposition to the plan, said his own misgivings have been confirmed by a flood of mail from all over the country.

COMMITTEE STAFFS

Recognizing the need for an efficient and effective minority party within a democracy, the Republican Party has intensified efforts this year to build an adequate minority staff on congressional committees in the House. At present, 461 committee staffers are picked by the majority party, and only 43 by the Republican Members. On the 8 joint Senate and House committees, the Democrats have chosen 70 staff members, the Republicans only 2.

To correct this situation, Republicans on all committees have raised their voices in protest. Congressman FRED SCHWENGEL, of Iowa, has introduced a bill which would adjust the imbalance. Equality is not the goal, since the majority party will always have the right to choose a majority of the staff members. It is extremely important that the minority have staff employees with a priority on time and availability. Otherwise there can be no effective minority views.

CONGRESSIONAL LEADERSHIP

Worry grows among Kennedy men over the effectiveness of Congress leadership. Some hold the majority chiefs lack needed alertness, maneuverability, farsightedness. They charge MANSFIELD almost abdicates as Senate Democratic leader, leaving too much to Majority Whip HUMPHREY and committee chairmen. Critics see bumbling on the mass transit bill passed by the Senate; labor's objections, Senate economy sentiment stirred unexpected trouble.

SENATE OUTLOOK

Democrats turn jittery about threatened Senate losses in 1964's voting. Sizable shifts could give the GOP a base for recapturing Senate control in 1966 or 1968. Democratic victors in the 1958 sweep face serious trouble in normally Republican States. Party strategists write off Moss, of Utah, YOUNG, of Ohio; Indiana's HARTKE is in for an uphill race. The rising Texas GOP could snatch Senator YARBOROUGH's seat.

Greatest threats confront liberal Democrats; New Jersey's WILLIAMS, MUSKIE, of Maine, California's ENGLE all look vulnerable. Even veterans MANSFIELD, of Montana, JACKSON, of Washington aren't shoo-ins. Potential effect: Increasing Senate trouble for liberal legislation.

Republican BEALL, of Maryland, MECHEM, of New Mexico, are underdogs for reelection. But odds favor other GOP Senators facing voters: Pennsylvania's SCOTT, WILLIAMS, of Delaware, Arizona's GOLDWATER.

THE SEC REPORTS

SEC's report on stock market problems evokes undercover resentment in the securities industry. Some executives privately charge the Commission grabs credit for all reforms already made. There's fear that recommendations still to come could weaken investor confidence. The industry will fight some SEC ideas for legislation.

THE NEW FRONTIER ADVANCES AGAIN

For the second time in 6 months the New Frontier has set a record, a record high in the Consumer Price Index. The only trouble with this kind of progress is that it costs us all as consumers more money to buy our necessities. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the Index returned in February to its record high of September. In fact, in the past year, food prices alone have gone up 1.8 percent. While the administration makes a big play for the votes of the elderly, the pensioners and the like, the Kennedy spending and deficit policies have cost these people, the ones who can least afford it, more of the purchasing power of their available dollars. This is a new kind of persuasion technique for getting people to accept Government handouts and Government controls—don't leave them any choice.

Surprisingly enough, while the index has climbed steadily since 1961, prices for durable goods, upon which our great job-producing industries rely for profits in order to invest and expand, have been subject to several severe drops and are barely above the 1960 level. As a result, spending for plant and equipment is down 2 percent over the last 5 years. Yet the Kennedy tax program ignores the need to invest, and instead is dedicated to increasing consumer spending, which has risen 17 percent in the same period. Of course, once the reforms are put into the suggested new tax law, most middle income consumers will find little if any break or tax relief. The only record the New Frontier seems sure of breaking is—the most promises with the least performance.

SPEAKING OF BUDGETS AND DEFICITS

Economic planners of the New Frontier blame increased defense spending for the annual huge deficits they roll up. This is simply not true. In the past 10 years, spending for defense has risen a total of 26 percent while at the same time, nondefense spending has risen 104 percent. Included in the nondefense portion of our spending hikes have been a myriad of pump-priming, socialistic schemes. They all hold out the promise of something for nothing but in truth, they erode our freedoms as well as our material worth.

Speaking of budgets and deficits—and somehow one word demands use of the other along the New Frontier—the Treasury's official budget estimate of the deficit for this fiscal year has been stated as $8.8 billion. Figures show, however, that during the first 8 months of this fiscal year the actual deficit has already passed $10 billion, and we still have 4 more months to go.

Based on the accuracy of this year's estimates, we can look for a staggering $20 billion deficit in the next fiscal year unless some of the wild spending plans of the New Frontier are halted.

FOREIGN AID SPENDING

The report of the President's Clay Committee, named to study foreign aid spending, has startled the Nation. The Committee recommends further sharp cuts in foreign aid appropriations. Foreign aid funds for this fiscal year of 1963 total $3.9 billion. In his budget the President requested $4.9 billion for foreign aid in fiscal 1964, starting July 1. Congress seems certain to reduce these appropriations to around $3.4 billion, and Chairman PASSMAN of the House Foreign Aid Appropriations Subcommittee, will fight to cut them to $2.5 billion. The Clay Committee's findings of foreign aid waste and extravagance fit in with a previous report of a special committee headed by Democratic Senate Leader MANSFIELD that some $5 billion of American money has been wasted in southeast Asia in recent years.

MORE CONGRESSIONAL INTIMIDATION

Two weeks ago, in a surprise economy move, the House Appropriations Committee voted 22 to 19 to chop $450 million off the administration's request for continuing the job-creating public works program started last fall. This was a clear slap in the face for the proponents of big spending schemes. Last Wednesday this issue came up for a floor vote. The cut advocated by the committee was restored by a rollcall vote of 228 to 184. This followed 3 days of the most vicious lobbying by the administration we have ever witnessed. Their tactics bordered on blackmail. Congressmen voting against the administration were threatened with withdrawal of Government spending programs within their districts. We will publish the individual voting records of our Congressmen on this issue. There is still a chance to defeat the bill in the U.S. Senate.

YOUR LEAGUE'S TARGETS AHEAD

The legislative issues pending in this Congress which most specifically affect the interests of investors and businessmen seem to lie in the general fields of taxation, labor union abuses, and extension of needless public works and welfare schemes, especially in the field of extension of Federal socialized electric power schemes. The league's efforts will be concentrated in these fields.

Federal taxation

The hearings before the Ways and Means Committee on the administration's tax reduction and tax reform proposals were concluded 2 weeks ago. This was the President's prime legislative objective for this session of Congress. The proposals were thoroughly blasted by the Nation's press and by businessmen and investors everywhere. Also by many Members of the House and Senate including Democratic Senator HARRY F. BYRD, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee.

The final tax bill that will emerge from the Ways and Means Committee, probably in late May at the earliest, will not bear the slightest resemblance to the administration's proposals. With Senator BYRD's opposition, such proposals would never clear the Senate Finance Committee. Whatever bill is passed by the House, it will probably not reach the Senate floor before September and we will have a crack at it before the Senate Finance Committee.

In testimony before the Ways and Means Committee, your president specifically urged the committee to reject the administration's proposals and recommended that consideration should instead be given to enactment of the Herlong-Baker bill that would reduce personal and corporate income taxes over a 5-year period to a maximum rate of 42 percent and to enactment of the Wilson bill (H.R. 257) to reduce the tax on long-term capital gains gradually over a 5-year period provided such gains were invested in 5-year 2-percent U.S. Government bonds redeemable at the option of the holder on sliding scale of from 75 percent of par value during the first year and advancing on a sliding scale to 100 percent of par value at death or maturity. This latter proposal should be considered apart from the omnibus tax bill. It is the only proposal that would immediately increase the Treasury's tax take.

Your league vigorously opposed the proposals to impose a new capital gains tax on gifts and estates payable at the time a gift is made, or upon death, on the value of the property so bequeathed over and above the original cost. We also opposed the proposal to repeal the $50 and 4 percent dividend credit and recommended that such credit be increased to $100 and 10 percent. Your league's basic tax objectives are to gradually get rid of the progressive feature of the income tax and the so-called tax on long-term capital gains and to get completely rid of the double taxation of corporate earnings. To hasten this day we have urged that all Government owned or financed enterprises, especially electric projects and co-ops, pay their fair share of Federal taxes.

Remember, ladies and gentlemen, it was primarily the organized investor-owners of the Nation who, "hunting as a pack," put the biggest crimp in the administration's tax proposals—but it is obvious that we should remain continuously alert. The advocates of planned socialism and the welfare State are well aware that their objectives can most readily be attained by taxing away the capital and incomes of owners of private property.

Labor unions

The east coast maritime strike, the Philadelphia transit strike, the New York and Cleveland newspaper strikes, the various strikes at missile bases, and now the threat of a national railroad strike over work rules, bring into sharp focus the necessity of remedial legislative remedies. So far, the administration recipients of the union labor overlords' political aid have been remotely mute, except to appoint factfinding boards to recommend settlement by nonbinding arbitration. The administration has appointed as chairmen of these boards such "impartial" chairmen as Senator WAYNE MORSE and New Deal Judge Sam Rosenman. This is as near to compulsory arbitration as we can possibly get. There is nothing impartial about their recommendations. Labor's unholy alliance with Government should be destroyed. The czarist dictators' power over a free people should be destroyed in the name of human freedom. There are dedicated statesmen in Congress who are cognizant of the evils involved, not only to free enterprise, but the rank and file members' right to human freedom, who have introduced legislation in Congress to nullify the power of the Hitlers and Khrushchevs in labor to conduct an all-powerful invisible government in defiance of the public interest. Here are the proposed bills:

S. 87: A bill by Senator GOLDWATER for himself and Senators CURTIS and TOWER, essentially designed to amend our labor laws to create a national, right-to-work law except where the separate States can deny it. This would reverse our present procedures whereby any State can create its own right-to-work law. This bill has been referred to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. It deserves our wholehearted support. In the meantime, however, we should lend our complete support to enacting State right-to-work laws.

S. 287: A bill by Senator MCCLELLAN of Arkansas (for himself, Senators BYRD of Virginia, GOLDWATER, BENNETT of Utah, EASTLAND, ROBERTSON, THURMOND, CURTIS, STENNIS, and TOWER). This bill would put transportation unions under the antitrust laws. Your league should go all out for this legislation, especially when a national railroad strike is threatened. We should also strive to extend the scope of these proposals in an effort to put all unions under antitrust. This legislation has been referred to the Senate Judiciary Committee and should get far more consideration than bills referred to the Labor Committees.

There have also been introduced by Congressmen LENNON of North Carolina and SCOTT of North Carolina identical bills (H.R. 2415 and H.R. 2426) to prohibit strikes by employees in certain strategic defense facilities, especially our missile manufacturing sites.

All of these legislative proposals will receive your league's vigorous attention.

PHONY UNEMPLOYMENT STATISTICS?

On March 13, we had the delightful experience of listening to the tax testimony of President George Meany of the AFL–CIO. It was one of the most amusing and disillusioning spectacles we have ever been privileged to observe. Mr. Meany's prepared testimony is on the record. It constituted a rejection of President Kennedy's tax proposals as aiding the rich plutocrats.

This prepared "on the record" testimony was nothing compared to "after testimony" questions, which have not yet been made public, led by Congressman BRUCE ALGER, of Texas. When asked how much investment was required to create a job for each worker in industry, Mr. Meany suggested that it might take $7,000 or $8,000. Under cross-questioning, he finally admitted that it might take an average of $18,000. The truth is, that in the 20 leading industrial corporations employing nearly 2,500,000 workers, the average is over $28,000. The top electrical manufacturers' figure is $18,000, the top petroleum companies is $50,000, and the top steel industry is $90,000.

During the same cross-examination by Congressman Alger, Meany was asked how our unemployment statistics were arrived at. Mr. Meany didn't know. Neither did any of the Congressmen present know. We've been fed statistics of unemployment at 4 percent three months ago, 6 percent a few weeks ago—7 percent soon, if the administration's tax proposals are not approved.

Your president sent a letter to the Ways and Means Committee the next day stating that 3 years ago the Department of Labor used the following yardstick for ascertaining "unemployment" statistics:

"A person is unemployed, according to the Department of Labor, if during the week of investigation he is laid off temporarily because of bad weather, seasonal changes, illness; also, if he is on strike or otherwise chooses not to work. Any boy or girl over fourteen, and not in school, is unemployed, if so reported, because at that age one automatically becomes a member of the 'labor force', according to the Department; for that reason the number of unemployable increases during the summer vacation and diminishes when school opens. The unit of computation is derived from the data brought in by interviewers who visit 35,000 selected households and rooming houses, covering 330 sampling areas, distributed among 636 counties and independent cities. Every month the sample areas are changed."

It is obvious that this technique of "sampling" is subject to serious political intrigue.

Here's what is happening: Before they went on strike early last December, New York City's printers averaged about $145 a week. At present, those who didn't take other jobs are averaging $120 a week—$70 in union strike benefits and $50 in State unemployment benefits.

It is one thing to provide jobless benefits with the idea of tiding a man over until he can get a job. It is quite another to pervert that charitable principle by making the benefits so high and so protracted that they reduce or destroy the incentive to find a job. Another effect is to falsely inflate the Government's unemployment statistics.

Your league will find the current answer. We are also preparing a special study on labor abuses and recommended legislation to correct them of which we have been promised the widest possible national distribution.

Socialized power

Our New Frontier is planning the squandering of billions of your tax dollars on further needlessly and squandermaniacally programs to socialize our energy resource industries. Your league will fight every one of these welfare-state proposals.

We have urged enactment of legislation to tax all federally owned or financed electric companies at the identical rates that investor owned power companies are taxed by levying upon them an excise tax on their gross equivalent in amount to the corporate income tax imposed on the taxpaying investor-owned companies bears to their gross revenue. We have also been able to have introduced in Congress a bill to stop "handouts" in the form of "giveaway" interest rates to the REA's. The following excerpt we received from Congressman CHARLES M. TEAGUE, of California, is self-explanatory:

"Once the Federal Government subsidizes anything, it is difficult to get it to abandon the practice. Many years ago, Congress provided that the Rural Electrification Administration could loan money to local REA cooperatives throughout the country at an interest rate of only 2 percent. The purpose was to make it easier for these cooperatives to bring electricity to farmers in remote areas. That purpose has been substantially accomplished, inasmuch as 98 percent of all farms is now electrified. Present-day loans to these cooperatives (if needed at all) should be at the same rate of interest the Government itself must pay on its own borrowings—which, at the present time, is approximately 3½ percent. I have introduced a bill (H.R. 5065) to accomplish this. However, I must report frankly that there is no immediate likelihood that it will be enacted into law. The REA cooperatives have developed a terrific pressure organization directed by the REA bureaucrats here in Washington, and I am afraid it will be a long process to persuade a majority of the Members of Congress that the existing subsidy is unfair to taxpayers as a whole. Nevertheless, I am encouraged by the public's increasing awareness of this situation and by the support that has been offered so far."

INVESTORS MUST ORGANIZE

The one indispensable ally that our Government has in the war against communism is the system of private profit and private property. It is against this ally my friends that our Government has declared war. It is an established policy of our Government today to make war against the institution of private property and especially the stockholder owners of our large corporations. My friends, we are going hellbent for socialism and no one seems to worry about it.

The people who are responsible for our gigantic pulsating, life-giving enterprise are the savers, the investors, the stockholders in American industry. And where are they? Everywhere and nowhere. They are dispersed, dissembled, voiceless and, for practical purposes, helpless. And what is the result of this dissembly, this lack of organization, this voicelessness? These owners are the target of every political move that comes out of Washington. Every single thing that is suggested in Congress has about it the appearance, at least, and certainly the effect of clamping and clipping, of cramping and restricting the interest of these people in American enterprise. All over in and throughout the great structure of American private enterprise there now crawls an army of inquisitorial bureaucrats as thick and as annoying as the ancient lice of Egypt. Ten thousand governmental commandments hedge and hamper the operations of American private business.

Someone, or some dedicated group, must spearhead a drive to arrest this Marxist inspired attempt to destroy our capitalist, free enterprise system based on the political-economic theory of the right to individual ownership of property. Someone must enlist the 17 million scattered owners, the "forgotten men," in a battle to preserve what they own in America. These people do not yet realize their latent political power.

Basically, this is what the investors league seeks to accomplish. In our opinion the purpose of political-economic education is political action. This is the field in which the investors league effectively operates. Our thousands of members across the Nation are dedicated patriots. We need thousands, yes, millions, of new members. We need contributions, all we can get, to expand our new membership drives through newspaper advertising, radio, and TV.

You ladies and gentlemen before us today well know this. We expect you to help carry this torch. Help get us new members. Help us raise new funds to further our membership drives and to engage in the programs so needed to further our cause.

We have available today some rather eminent panelists who will discuss many of the issues of the day. You have available copies of our bulletins and other literature explaining our views on taxation, labor, and other issues for which we will battle.

You members, officers, and directors of the league's Florida division, your zeal, your dedication and your legislative effectiveness at both the State and national level are setting a pattern for the effectiveness of local investors league chapters across the Nation.

DANGER OF RUSSIAN COMMUNISM IN CUBA

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, no Member of the House of Representatives has been more diligent in bringing to the attention of the House and the public in general the grave danger of Russian communism in Cuba than our colleague, the gentleman from Florida, WILLIAM C. CRAMER.

On April 15, 1963, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] made an address on the subject of "Communism in Cuba," as well as some of the domestic issues here before the Congress, that is worthy of the attention of every Member of Congress.

This address, which was given before the annual meeting of the Investors League of Florida, is printed hereafter:

ADDRESS BY HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, BEFORE THE INVESTORS LEAGUE OF FLORIDA, CHERRY PLAZA HOTEL, ORLANDO, FLA., APRIL 15, 1963

There's probably no State in the Union in which more people, because they are on fixed incomes, have a proportionately greater interest in sound fiscal policies as they affect investments, savings, and the value of the dollar than in the Sunshine State.

Likewise, there's not any organization with a larger number of responsible thinking people than the Investors League—people who think of the future of their children, the security of their country, and the imperativeness of winning this cold war with atheistic communism.

For these reasons, and many more, it's a privilege and a pleasure to appear before the Investors League of Florida.

Your convention could be held at no greater moment in the history of our country; for at no time has our Nation been faced with more serious challenges. The challenge is not only from overseas as has traditionally been the case. Rather, the challenge is merely over the Florida Straits—90 miles from Florida's shores.

And what's equally as serious as the Communists having a foothold at our doorstep, is the apparent lack of willingness, desire, or just plain ability on the part of this administration to do anything effective about removing this threat—or even exhibiting a firm intent to implement the Monroe Doctrine.

The result of accepting and coexisting with a Communist Cuba has been an invitation to the Communists to infiltrate other areas of the Western Hemisphere unchecked. Today, we are faced with the possible Communist takeovers of the governments of Haiti, the Dominican Republic, Venezuela, and Guatemala. The Communists are swiftly populating other lesser known but strategically important smaller islands in the West Indies, including Barbados, Antigua, Curaçao, and others where the ratio in the major cities is already 1 Russian to 10 other people. These islands are doing business with Russia so the door is open to move in.

Vacillation, indecision and a lack of the determination necessary to rid this hemisphere of Castro's Cuba has resulted in a threat to our way of life unparalleled in the history of our great country. If America is to be preserved rather than regarded as a short-lived experiment in individual freedom and human dignity, a reaffirmation of basic U.S. policies, such as the Monroe Doctrine, must be stated and fully implemented. To abandon the Monroe Doctrine during this crucial period is to sacrifice America's self-interests and security. We'd better start putting America's security first * * * if we want American freedoms to last.

This is the anniversary of the abortive Bay of Pigs invasion, attempted 2 years ago. It is, therefore, an apropos time to reflect on the results of the vacillating and timid policy America has adopted toward Communist Cuba, a tiptoeing policy that has resulted in a fully armed and established Communist war machine located at the solar-plexis of the Western Hemisphere.

Two years ago, with adequate air support, the now abortive invasion would have been a glorious victory for freedom. Instead, we withdrew this vital support and in so doing, doomed the invasion to failure and disgrace. We've been withdrawing ever since—with the all too brief and ineffective quarantine as the only show of determination.

Why did we withdraw this promised air support? Because some in the U.S. State Department and some of our representatives at the United Nations feared our participation would result in adverse worldwide opinion, in an adverse image.

Ladies and gentlemen, can any nation afford to sacrifice its long-range security on the altar of public opinion? We did—at least momentarily.

When the Soviets put down the Hungarian revolt with guns and tanks, did they concern themselves with their image? Not on your life. It's about time we stopped applying Madison Avenue image-creating techniques based on timidity in solving world crises and in meeting the clear and present danger to the freedom of this hemisphere posed by Communist Cuba.

Imagine, if you will, an American policy so vacillating that while taking responsibility for the failure of a refugee invasion of Cuba 2 years ago, we are today arraying every deterrent at the command of the United States and British Governments to stop Cuba's freedom fighters—a 360-degree Kennedy twist. While in October and November we imposed a partial quarantine to keep certain Russian ships from entering Cuba, we have today put into effect a complete quarantine to prevent Cuban freedom fighters from entering Cuba, to keep Cubans from regaining the freedom of their homeland. Khrushchev's assertion which he announced before the Supreme Soviet recently that he had received assurances from this country that Cuba wouldn't be invaded seems to be affirmed more and more by our actions and inactions.

Meanwhile, the Caribbean smolders with Communist revolt. The Guatamalan anti-Communist group, was, fortunately, successful; a similar but unsuccessful coup in Argentina followed; and, as I mentioned earlier, Venezuela, Haiti, and the Dominican Republic are within months of turning Communist unless we are determined to prevent it.

Infiltration and subversion literally flourish throughout the Americas with Cuba as the spawning ground. The New Frontier "rocks" while Latin America burns with subversion and Communist revolution.

CIA Director McCone, in testimony before the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, recently admitted that: "At least 1,000 to 1,500 persons came to Cuba in 1962 from all other Latin American countries with the possible exception of Uruguay, to receive ideological indoctrination or guerrilla warfare training or both. More have gone in 1963 despite the limited facilities for reaching Cuba at present."

What Mr. McCone failed to tell the subcommittee was that U.S. citizens are venturing to Cuba as well and last month, I turned over to the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, the names of some 97 U.S. citizens who made this illegal journey within a 6-month period in 1962. On the list were many notorious Communists. Going and coming through the Cuban Embassy in Mexico City, many of these U.S. citizens, upon returning to this country, actually advertised the fact they've been to Cuba in Communist newspapers published in the United States. They give lectures and show films in this country propagandizing Castro's Communist revolution and at the same time raise money for Communist front organizations such as the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. Although traveling to Cuba is in violation of the law, neither our State Department nor our Justice Department have pressed for or prosecuted these known violators, many of whom are Communist sympathizers. I have introduced a bill, H.R. 5320, tightening travel restrictions so that prosecutions of persons using this open door to subversion can be more easily accomplished.

As can be seen, even the United States is not free from the direct efforts of Castro's and Khrushchev's insatiable Communist appetites.

So devoid of purposeful leadership is the State Department that we commit ourselves to a $640 million loan to Brazil without even a commitment from President Goulart that this money will not be used to tool up Brazil's trade with Russia. The fact of the matter is that stepping up trade with Russia is the stated aim of this money, and the Rio press was the first to admit it.

Brazil, incidentally, is one of only five Latin American nations still recognizing Castro and the U.S. Ambassador to Brazil, Lincoln Gordon, in testimony before the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Relations, made the unequivocal statement that Brazil's Government, student groups, and labor groups are heavily infiltrated with Communists.

On Goulart's Cabinet sit three avowed Marxists, his press secretary is an admitted Communist—and still, we loan that Government $640 million of your hard-earned tax dollars without commitments that efforts to oust the Communists will be made.

This is not an isolated example. We lavish foreign aid on Chedi Jagan in British Guiana who, for all intents and purposes, is a leftist dictator and, until it served his purposes to denounce him, a good friend of Castro. But, we refuse to provide meaningful aid to the anti-Communist government of Haiti which is across the Windward Pass, gateway to the Panama Canal, in order to protect that vital passage. How absurd can we get?

And, because of our refusal to strengthen anti-Communist Haitians, it is only within months of being taken over by the Communists. Many Haitians who work the Cuban sugarcane fields are being trained by Communists in the arts of sabotage and subversion. These workers return to Haiti and join forces with Communist trained and paid French-speaking Ghanaians who can't be told apart from the natives. A subversive, well-trained Communist corps practicing sabotage and poised to take over the Haitian Government is presently in existence.

As further evidence of our lack of purpose in Latin America, President Kennedy before he went to Costa Rica, doomed the conference to mediocrity by announcing in advance that discussions of ways to dissipate the Communist menace through a hard line policy toward Cuba were not to be topics of discussion. This position was contrary to the expressed wishes of the Central American countries present, particularly Guatemala and Nicaragua, two countries that had already felt the sharp sting of Castro invasions.

Despite the laudatory press releases on the success of the conference, less than two weeks later, the Communist threat became so serious that Guatemala was taken over by a military coup and its President deposed.

It's high time for a thorough housecleaning in the State Department and for a shakeup of the bureaucratic stagnation that has settled into the minds of Washington's policymakers. And it's about time for a meaningful statement of purpose based on ridding the Americas of communism and keeping it free from alien systems. It's time for the announcement of a plan of action for freedom led by the United States.

It's time we threw the Khrushchev doctrine of "coexistence with Castro and communism in this hemisphere" into the ashcan and retrieved the Monroe Doctrine therefrom. Along these lines, I have introduced a resolution (H.J. Res. 227), calling for the restatement and full implementation of Monroe Doctrine.

I have proposed the following steps to weaken communism's grip in this hemisphere, none of which have been taken by this administration:

First, we should recognize a free, non-Communist Cuban government-in-exile. Once a Cuban government-in-exile is recognized, it could legally receive our assistance as well as the assistance of other hemispheric nations. It would fall under the provisions of the treaties of Rio and Caracas. It could become a member of the Organization of American States. It would provide a rallying force for all Cuban refugees, give encouragement and help to the Cuban underground, give courage and hope to the oppressed anti-Castro Cubans who are in the majority in Cuba, and provide the means for the Cubans to win back their own freedom.

Instead of uniting the Cuban refugees, however, the administration is doing everything in its power to divide them and make them as ineffective a group as possible.

Secondly, we should impose an effective trade ban and call upon those nations still doing business with Castro, including Italy and Great Britain, to stop trading with Castro.

Thirdly, we should demand that all Latin American nations withdraw recognition of Castro and stop doing business with him and we should withhold Alliance for Progress Funds from nations who refuse to comply.

Fourth, to halt the spread of subversion throughout this hemisphere, we should insist that Mexico close its open door of subversion through which people from all Latin American countries gain entrance to and return from Cuba. As I mentioned earlier, even U.S. citizens are taking this subversive route.

Fifth, we should, if it becomes necessary, and if the Communists refuse to remove troops and heavy war materiel and keep shooting at Americans on the high seas, impose another quarantine to halt the inshipment of further defensive weapons and oil.

What has happened to the spirit of America that bred such patriots as Nathan Hale, a man hardly out of his teens, who prior to his execution said: "I regret that I have but one life to give to my country."

What's happened to the Patrick Henrys, George Washingtons, Thomas Jeffersons, and Teddy Roosevelts? Patriots all who, under today's so-called modern liberalism would be considered radicals and reactionaries.

On the home front this is a tax-cut year. It started out as a tax cut and revision year, but most of the revisions were so ill-considered, they were sidetracked temporarily almost as soon as they were submitted.

Shining brightly from the lantern of New Frontierism, however, are proposals which would result in stifling private enterprise, equalizing income, discouraging individual investment, emasculating incentive and penalizing investors.

Although the withholding on dividends and interest proposal of the last Congress met its proper demise, this duck-billed platypus is back in another form this year. It seems the Hellers and Schlesingers are insistent on wanting to repeal the 5-year-old $50 credit and 4 percent deduction provision. Although it's dead for this year, you can bet your bottom dollar—if you still have one left by then, that it will be back again next year and the battle will be resumed.

I don't follow the reasoning of those who want to repeal this effort to encourage frugal Americans to invest in free enterprise. Investment in private enterprise creates more jobs, tools up industry, keeps us in a competitive position with foreign imports and provides self-respecting people with needed self-earned incomes. Of course, I can understand why this existing incentive program is repulsive to the "concentration of power in Washington boys," most of whom seem to think that the profit motive is somehow outmoded, a "cliche," and maybe a little "immoral."

They would much rather resort to the bureaucrat's dream world of the thirties and to the alphabetical agencies such as the YCC, CCC, WPA.

Of course, none of these programs were able to solve the Nation's No. 1 problem of the thirties—unemployment; and even Socialist Henry Wallace finally admitted this fact on a television broadcast 2 weeks ago.

Only private enterprise, with its profit motive, has made the United States first in production, in standard of living, in military preparedness, and in the eyes of the world. And only unincumbered and unintimidated free enterprise can solve the pressing problems of unemployment. Why change a proven formula of success for egghead experimentalism and New Deal economic failures?

In addition, the President's tax reforms would penalize the homeowner, by disallowing as deductions the interest paid on mortgages and real estate taxes; the senior citizens, by a reduction of present tax exemptions from the present $1,200 to $600; the working family head, who would lose his tax-free sick pay; the widow, who would be required to pay a tax on the value the home had appreciated during its ownership in addition to inheritance tax; and the generous, by disallowing deductions to churches, charities and educational institutions.

And to compound this planned penalizing of the frugal taxpayer, we've been presented with a $98.9 billion budget containing a built-in deficit—a planned deficit—of $12 billion which, through deficits, would further penalize the frugal with the shrinking dollar value, caused by inflation. I personally believe that this extravagant and substantial deficit is cause for grave concern. Increased Federal expenditures without any indication as to where the funds will come from is totally lacking in fiscal responsibility.

This budget can and must be cut and this can be accomplished without weakening our national defense, outerspace exploration programs or needed services. And it seems to me the place to start is by cutting out foreign aid dollars that we are presently giving to Communist countries or spending lavishly and foolishly without any direction of purpose. We should require other member nations to pay their fair share of the assessments to the United Nations and we should cut off Alliance for Progress funds from Latin American countries doing business with Castro.

Domestically, dollars could be cut from the Federal civilian payroll, and millions more could be cut from the President's leaf-raking programs such as the Domestic Peace Corps, the Youth Conservation Corps, the $5 billion catchall education proposal, the $450 million for pork barrel public works.

On Wednesday of last week, the Democrats in the House went on record as being against any sort of fiscal responsibility by voting to restore $450 million to the public works acceleration bill—the same $450 million which was removed from the bill in the Appropriations Committee.

This money—your tax dollars—is now being spent for 70-percent Federal cost sharing on constructing swimming pools, rodent control, exotic plants, beautifying the TVA, and building fishponds, as examples. Talk about boondoggles. Here are some specific examples of how your tax dollars are being spent under the guise of aiding unemployment:

A recreational facility at Lexington City, Mo., will cost $881,000 and employ 9 people. This is $90,000 per man per year.

A municipal stadium in Bridgeport, Conn., $475,000.

A lagoon in Choctaw, Ala., $292,000.

Fish ponds in Oklahoma, $121,000.

A recreational facility in San Juan, P.R., $400,000.

This list goes on and on, but what's significant is that the entire $450 million will employ only 50,000 people, less than 2 percent of the present unemployed. If make-work leaf-raking projects are to be the answer to the unemployment problem, then the cost of employing 1 million of the nearly 5 million unemployed would be $10 billion or $10,000 per man employed per year.

It's obvious that this is not the answer to meeting this pressing problem. Encouragement of private enterprise, instead of discouragement, is the way to bring a permanent end to serious unemployment.

Thus, I have discussed briefly what I believe will be the two major issues facing this session of Congress—fiscal sanity and the Cuban-Communist threat.

Actually, they are both interrelated, because the Communist threat throughout the world is a challenge to our freedom * * * to our very constitutional government. In order to continue to support the necessary efforts at home and abroad to meet these challenges to our way of life, we must retain our economic solvency and financial stability.

Khrushchev has said that he'll bury us and said that he'd do it without a war by first turning America toward socialism and bankruptcy, thus making it ripe for a Communist takeover for which the Communists will be poised and ready.

If communism is permitted to continue its expansion in this hemisphere, already only 90 miles from our borders, Khrushchev's prophecy can come true.

PANAMA CANAL QUESTIONS: IMMEDIATE ACTION REQUIRED

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, since the nationalization in 1956 by Egypt of the Suez Canal and the precedent-making recognition and support by our Government of that action, the Panama Canal has been the victim of a series of diplomatic aggressions on the part of the Republic of Panama against the sovereignty and jurisdiction of the United States over the Canal Zone. Immeasurably complicated by the ratification in 1955 of the secretly contrived Eisenhower-Remon Treaty, our Government, both the Congress and the Executive, has failed to meet these assaults with forthright declaration of policy. Instead, through mistaken acts of generosity and timid attempts at placation, it has aggravated the situation in the Canal Zone, with conditions there verging on chaos.

Underlying the present sovereignty agitation, and related to it in many ways, is the transcendant question of increased transit capacity, a subject that has been under congressional consideration since the advent in 1945 of the atomic bomb. In that year, the Congress, on recommendations of administrative authorities, enacted Public Law 280, 79th Congress, authorizing the Governor of the Panama Canal—now Canal Zone—to study the means for increasing the capacity and security of the Panama Canal to meet the future needs of interoceanic commerce and national defense, including consideration of canals at other locations, and a restudy of the Third Locks project authorized by act approved August 11, 1939.

This construction project, hurriedly started in 1940 without adequate study, was suspended in May 1942 by the Secretary of War—Stimson—after an expenditure of some $75 million of the taxpayers' money, mainly on lock-site excavations for parallel acts of larger locks at Gatun and Miraflores, most of which can be used in the future. Fortunately, the suspension of that project occurred before excavation was started at Pedro Miguel.

The wording of the 1945 statute, which was drafted in the Panama Canal organization that would later supervise its execution, is most significant in that this law was the first basic canal statute to include the terms, "security" and "national defense," along with the usual terms, "capacity" and "interoceanic commerce" for such laws.

Under a far more extreme interpretation of this conveniently worded enactment, those who directed the inquiry emphasized the "security" and "national defense" factors as paramount and controlling, and even as a "mandate" from the Congress for a recommendation of a new canal of sea-level design at Panama. Later developments revealed that this design had been one of the undisclosed and unauthorized objectives of the 1939 Third Locks project.

The report of the Governor, heedless of the diplomatic consequences and costs involved, recommended only a sea-level project at Panama for a major increase of transit capacity, on the basis of its alleged greater "security" primarily against atomic attack and the needs of "national defense." This action served to obscure the plan for the major improvement of the existing canal which, when evaluated from all significant angles, may be the best solution.

Forwarded to Congress by the President on December 1, 1947, and significantly without approval, comment or recommendation, the Congress took no action and the report was not published as is usual in such cases.

In the ensuing discussions of the 1947 sea-level recommendation in the Congress, distinguished members described its significant features and exposed the fallacies upon which it was founded. Notable among those discussions were statements by such leaders as Chairman Fred Bradley and Schuler Otis Bland of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and Representatives Thomas E. Martin and Willis W. Bradley, all of whom strongly opposed the sea-level proposal.

The special attention of the Congress is invited to two addresses by Representative Willis W. Bradley, which admirably clarified the issues and made strong appeals for an independent inquiry: "What of the Panama Canal?" Congressional Record, volume 94, part 10, page A2449; and "The Why's of the Panama Canal," Congressional Record, volume 95, part 12, page A1303. With minor revision, the arguments presented in these two addresses apply with equal force today.

Unfortunately, nothing specific was done is this regard until 1957, when the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, pursuant to House Resolution 149, 85th Congress, appointed a part-time board of consultants to investigate the short-range plans for improving the Panama Canal.

This board made no new field engineering studies and based its report on data and studies made by others for the Panama Canal Company, or by the staff of the Company. Its report, House Report No. 1960, 86th Congress, signed on June 1, 1960, recommended no action toward a major increase of canal capacity, but that the entire situation be reviewed in 1970, or at an appropriately earlier date if traffic estimates are exceeded.

The time, Mr. Speaker, has now come for our Government to undertake the important task of deciding upon the matter of increased transit capacity for the Panama Canal.

For this purpose, there are a number of bills now before the Congress, which I wish to discuss briefly.

One group, illustrated by H.R. 863, introduced by my colleague from Ohio [Mr. Bow], and H.R. 3858, by myself, would create the Interoceanic Canals Commission. This independent body would be directed to study, first the question of increasing the capacity and operational efficiency of the present canal through adaptation of the suspended third lock project to provide a summit level terminal lake anchorage in the Pacific end of the canal to correspond with that in the Atlantic end; second, the construction of new canal of sea-level design at Panamá, and third, the question of a second canal. Consideration of the treaty and territorial rights involved, which so far have been ignored, would be one of the main features of this inquiry.

An entirely different approach, however, is represented by H.R. 80, introduced by my colleague from North Carolina [Mr. Bonner]. This bill would authorize the Panama Canal Company to study the means for increasing the security and capacity of the Panama Canal or construction of a new canal to meet the future needs of interoceanic commerce and national defense. The key terms of this bill are identical with those of Public Law 280, 79th Congress, and equally ambiguous. Nor do they provide for consideration of the treaty or territorial questions involved. Moreover, it would keep the inquiry under the control of the same advocates who have long had the predetermined objective of a sea level canal at Panama for reasons other than navigation.

These advocates, Mr. Speaker, have unjustifiably opposed any major improvement of the existing waterway on the ground that such improvement would delay "conversion" to sea level. This is no reason at all, but a challenge to which the Congress should be alert. Every factor in the situation demands that the question of the future increase of transit capacity should not be undertaken by administrative agencies but by an independent body under congressional authorization, which should be composed only of those of the highest qualifications.

In anticipation of the present situation, I requested Mr. Edward Sydney Randolph, of Baton Rouge, La., a former member of the 1957 board of consultants, to review the 1960 report of that body which he has done in a letter to me dated April 5, 1963. The fact that he was not a member of this board during its consideration of the long-range program left him free to comment upon its report objectively.

His long service in the Canal Zone in responsible engineering capacity, familiarity with the problems involved, independence and vision, enabled him to prepare specific comments of rare merit that reflect a lifetime of observation and study. Not only that, his knowledge has enabled him to present a most constructive engineering program that should be considered only by an independent commission, with powers as set forth in H.R. 863 and H.R. 3858.

Every consideration in the overall subject demands that our Government energetically strive to create the Interoceanic Canals Commission at the earliest date, for too much time has already passed.

In these general connections, we must not overlook the facts that the well-known and tested Terminal Lake-third locks solution for the Panama Canal would not require the negotiation of a new treaty with Panama, but that the sea-level proposal would so require. The first is covered by existing treaties but the latter is not so covered. These features in themselves ought to be sufficient to determine the matter; but, in any event, the proposed commission would consider this important treaty question.

An indispensable prerequisite before undertaking any plan for the increase of capacity of the Panama Canal or for a second canal at another site is the clarification and reaffirmation of U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone, which is constantly being contested by Panama. Such results are contemplated in House Concurrent Resolution 105, introduced by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Cannon], and House Concurrent Resolution 113, introduced by myself.

Mr. Speaker, delay and confusion have, for too long, plagued the situation on the isthmus as regards the sovereignty of the United States over the Canal Zone and also the determination of an adequate plan for increased transit capacity and operational improvement of the Panama Canal. The time has come for action, for which the 1960 report of the Board of Consultants was a constructive first step.

In order to make Mr. Randolph's statesmanlike engineering analysis of this 1960 report easily available not only to the Congress and the Executive, but as well to all interests concerned with interoceanic commerce and have to bear the costs of tolls as well as to the nations at large, I quote it as a part of my remarks:

Baton Rouge, La.,
April 5, 1963.

To: The Honorable Daniel J. Flood, House of Representatives, Old House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

From: Edward Sydney Randolph, registered professional engineer, Life Fellow, American Society of Civil Engineers.

Subject: Panama Isthmian Canal—Bill to create an Interoceanic Canals Commission.

Reference: Letter of Congressman Flood to E. S. Randolph dated October 4, 1962, and later matter.

Dear Mr. Flood: This is in response to your request for comments on the above subjects.

A list of references is at the end of this letter. For brevity references will be to year and page number. Most references are to the 1960 consulting board report. Although I served on the Board while it produce the short-range program, July 15, 1958, published as a committee print, I did not contribute to the long-range program, nor did I know what the contents were, until after its publication. The short-range program has long ago been implemented.

To reduce confusing details, this letter will deal chiefly with the locked-in parts of the Panama Canal from Gatun locks at the north to Miraflores locks at the south end. The 1960 board report states at page 8, "The sea-level sections may take traffic in both directions simultaneously." The sea-level section from Gatun to sea is nominally 6.43, and at Pacific end, from Miraflores locks to sea is nominally 7.41 nautical miles. (Pilot's Handbook, revised 1956, p. 17.14.)

If in the remote future, there will be a need for some improvements to the sea-level sections of the lock-canal, it might be economical to perform these operations when needed and not associate them with any program for new locks. The sea-level sections do not seem to be limiting factors to the capacity of the canal.

The several very distinguished members of the board which produced the long-range program, signed June 1, 1960, were engaged for almost 3 years on the short- and long-range programs. Significant is the statement (1960 p. 1) "No new field engineering was done for the purpose of this report. It is based on data and studies made by others for the Panama Canal, or by the company's staff." Under the circumstances, I do not know how they could have produced a better report at that time. I do not question their findings. At the time of signing, the board possessed far more late information than I. In this letter, I hope to show reasons why the inquiry should be energetically continued at an early date. Any discussions in this letter are to point up the need for inquiries, not with the intention of deciding any other issues.

The board was provided with several plans and estimates for lock-type and sea-level canals at the Canal Zone. The board made some comments on them but did not recommend any for construction.

Several names have been used to differentiate the several lock-canal plans, but obviously any third lane of new locks will, in fact, be a third set of locks. There are wide differences in estimated costs, times required for construction, dimensions of lock chambers, and conveniences of operation in the lock plans offered to the board and shown in the 1960 board report. There might be more and different plans for locks developed, perhaps leading to something superior, if further investigations were vigorously and objectively pushed, by a representative group of able men, empowered to act. The proposed bill, H.R. 3858, to create an Interoceanic Canals Commission, now before Congress, would be the best agency for securing the best plan for the future Panama Canal—or a canal in any other place.

The 1939 report (H.D. 210, 76th) led to the authorization by Congress of a third set of locks. Construction was started July 1, 1940, but was suspended by the Secretary of War in May 1942, due to shortage of ships and materials more urgently needed in wartime. (Encyclopedia Britannica, 1961, p. 173.) Construction was not resumed. Other plans were put forward—for a sea-level canal, and a third lock canal which would elevate the Miraflores Lake to summit level (the Terminal Lake Canal). These two were widely publicized and discussed. (See 1949 Transactions of the Am. Soc. C.E., vol. 114, pp. 558–906.) Accordingly, it appears that the lock canal plan is still the one approved and favored by Congress. But events since the board report dated June 1960 would justify a new look at all lock canal plans heretofore published and others to be devised.

In the 1960 report, I found no recommendations for the resumption of the lock construction program. However, at page 7, recommendation 7, is stated: "The entire situation should be reviewed in 1970, or if the present traffic estimates are appreciably exceeded, at an appropriately earlier date." At the time of signing the report, it was doubtless quite clear that a new examination of the matter should be based solely on traffic density. But the situation will be different after year 1967, when it is expected that the enlargements recommended in the 1960 report will be accomplished. Also, the investigations recommended by the board are yielding data, which should be evaluated by the proposed commission.

In the 1960 report, at page 38, is shown "Plan 1: Interim Improvements to Present Canal (cost $61 million)." The interim program is all that was recommended for construction. Other recommendations included various investigations, one concerning the construction of a sea-level canal and another concerning water supply for lockages.

What will happen after the year 1967? Should the United States be ready with the best plan for construction of new locks, in case of need? Even those lock plans revised in 1958 (1960, p. 319, app. 3) are not on a comparable basis. How can the best plan be found? It is probably true that a third flight of new locks can be constructed in much less time than any sea-level canal, and for a fraction of the first cost.

After the year 1967, there will be an ample waterway from lock to lock. So deep that the full increase in depth will not be required for a long time. The original locks will have some perfections added but will limit the size of the maximum ship to 102 feet wide, 800 feet long and 38 feet fresh water draft (1960, p. 38). When only one lock lane is available the maximum traffic will be 38 lockages in 24 hours (p. 19). It was estimated that the outage time of one chamber could be reduced to 72 or 96 hours, for repairs (p. 19). That is 3 or 4 days. If during one of those 3-day periods transits happened to be at a peak rate there could be a piling-up of ships. The maximum peak day rate in 1959 was 39.2 transits (1960, table at p. 24). Estimated peak day traffic for 1976 was 47.1, and for year 2000 was 61.9. While these possibilities of delays to ships during several days do not seem alarming now, the situation needs consideration together with the overall planning of the future canal. At page 19, is the statement: "If these outage times can be selected for minimum traffic interference, the maximum capacity could be achieved."

(1960, p. 17): "Basically, the absolute measure of the canal capacity is the maximum number of lockages that can be processed in 24 hours." And at page 21: "It is generally predicted that the capacity of a single lock lane would be insufficient at times to meet the needs of expected traffic beyond the year 1960."

It is time for a hard new look at the several problems as they will be influenced by the passage of time, interim improvements, the yield from the investigations recommended in the 1960 report, and by other scientific advances. Congress must decide all major questions based on sufficient information. A commission can present data, to Congress, based on the commission's massive investigations. Engineers, and other experts, employed by the commission, can provide answers to lesser questions and information for consideration by the commission.

In the press there have been statements to the effect that some improvements in capacity of the American Isthmian Canal will be required by year 1980. If true, the lead time is running out. Such statements are subject to question by a representative body such as a commission. For each proposed plan in the 1960 report is shown a construction schedule. The minimum is 8½ years for lock construction including 2 for engineering and administration (1960, p. 373). At pages 382 and 386 are shown construction schedules for Plan III—Consolidated Third Locks (Terminal Lake) and Plan IV—Zone Sea Level Canal, both 12 years for completion after authorization. These schedules are for necessary work after authorization (1960, p. 324). To be added to the above time periods are the time for Congressional action and before that time for commission actions. There is so vast a field for investigation that several years might be required by a commission alone.

Crash programs are costly and likely to be far from the best. The only possible means for the full accomplishment of all the interlocking inquiries concerning an enlarged waterway would be by means of the proposed commission.

Each basic fact relating to the problem has a number of variations and different advocates.

The interim improvements recommended by the 1960 board included the deepening of the summit level by 5 feet, from nominal fresh water depth of 45 feet to 50 feet, or 11 percent, and for the widening from 300 to 500 feet minimum, or 67 percent, and this is expected to be accomplished by year 1967. In the meantime all commercial tonnage applying for passage is accommodated by the original channel while in the process of widening and deepening. The installation of lights and signals along the canal, already implemented, will enable vessels to pass in both directions simultaneously during night or day (1960, p. 302). "Lighting both Gaillard Cut and the locks would * * * increase the capacity * * * by permitting 2-way traffic in Gaillard Cut during darkness, thus making 24-hour operations possible."

It is implied that the widened and deepened canal will (except for the locks) have ability to handle the traffic, in tons, until the year 2000 (1960, p. 3, conclusion 8). "Comparison of capacity and demand also shows that even the present canal, after completion of the short-range program and plan I, will have fully adequate capacity to meet the demands of traffic beyond the year 2000 * * * except * * * when repairs or overhauls are being made to the locks." And at page 26: "The life of the dredged channel can be perpetuated by periodic dredging."

From the above, it might be construed that there need be no more massive deepening or widening programs for the waterway as far as man can foresee. (Even the 37-foot salt water draft of the carrier U.S.S. *Constellation* would be comfortably accommodated.)

The added depth, particularly in the restricted Gaillard Cut, will permit some extra drawdown of Gatun Lake level in dry seasons, which will permit some added electric power generation at the Gatun Station. At first this will permit a certain amount of fuel saving. But as ships increase in size it is probable that the minimum lake level will again be increased. The water level must provide sufficient depth above the lock sills at Gatun and Pedro Miguel to float ships conveniently.

At page 25 of 1960 report is stated:

"(d) Water supply: The usable water supply in Gatun Lake is increased under this plan * * * by deepening the channel 3 feet more than required for ship maneuverability. With this increase the water supply is considered adequate for the operation of the canal as reconstructed under this plan."

The authors of the report seem to have taken a long look ahead—to the time when the third flight of locks is a reality. Then the 3 feet added depth will be very welcome for larger ships.

The minimum depth of 47 feet (occurring only at ends of long dry seasons) should suffice for many years, if new and deeper locks are provided. If deeper water will ever be a necessity, at that date consideration might be given to adoption to a higher minimum level which would lend itself to a gradual increase in depth; or to lowering the bottom of the canal, which would need to be done in a larger step, to be economically performed. It must, at some time, be decided which expedient will be adopted, how much increase in depth at one time, and when the deepening will be imperative, if ever.

A full inquiry by the commission might show that the channel, harbor, and aids to navigation will not require large improvements above those accomplished and now in progress within the predictable future. Also that the dates of the needs for larger locks, deeper channels, and added water supply may be based on different factors.

In the cost estimates, provided for consideration by the consulting board, starting at page 389 of 1960 report, for additional locks, are shown items which might not be appropriate after the current program of widening, deepening, lighting, etc., of the channels is completed. Assume the waterway will then be adequate until sometime like year 2000 (too far ahead for any accurate forecast). In that case a third lane of new and larger locks will accommodate practically all traffic, even very large ships.

Under the above assumption, there would fall from the cost estimates those items already accomplished, in whole or in part, such as channel deepening and widening, lighting, signals, harbor improvements and ship salvage facilities; none of which would need attention merely because there were larger locks and probably would need only maintenance for a very long time.

If these items are deducted from the cost estimates, as shown on table 1 (following), the costs (1939) would be reduced to—

	Million
For plan II, Third Locks, reduced amount	$468
For plan III, Terminal Lake—third locks	875

The published estimates, in 1960 report are not in so much detail that I can determine exactly how much of each item should be excluded as unnecessary to the functioning of any of the locks.

TABLE I

(Part or all of the following items in estimated costs might be found unnecessary or inappropriate for any new cost estimates for a new flight of locks in the Panama Canal)

	Plan II, 3d locks	Plan III, consolidated 3d locks (Terminal Lake), 3 lifts
Page references, 1960 Board report	389, 390	393–395
Items 3 and 4. Channel excavation	$197,770,000	$204,010,000
Item 5. Harbor improvements	3,300,000	12,950,000
Item 6a. Excavation, unclassified	17,180,930	
Item 6b. Excavation, unclassified		
Item 6c. Excavation, unclassified	15,321,250	
Item 12. Aids to navigation	11,500,000	
Item 11. Aids to navigation		11,498,000
Item 11. Ship salvage facilities		8,240,000
Total	245,072,180	236,698,000
Engineering design and supervision, exploratory work, and inspection of materials (at 8 percent)	19,606,000	18,936,000
Total (assumed deductible)	264,678,000	255,634,000
Original total estimated cost	733,080,000	1,130,310,000
Balance, original total less deductibles	468,402,000	874,676,000

NOTE.—It is possible that for plan III an additional item of $23,000,000 would be deductible, it being "Excavation unclassified" at Gatun.

I have not seen costs, on a comparable basis, for the plan III, the Terminal Lake plan, and plan II, the third locks plan. Those presented in 1960 are based on plans so different in size and other respects that a cost comparison cannot be found. In plan III, the construction of the two upper chambers, in Miraflores Lake, to make the Miraflores locks a continuous 3-lift affairs to summit level, would be terribly difficult, long drawn out, would make navigation during construction very inconvenient. The cost for the two parallel chambers, about $178 million (1960, p. 394) would go far toward building another 3-lift lock at Miraflores, if of reasonable size. The construction time would be shortened from 12 to 8½ years (p. 381) and would not interfere with traffic during construction. Each of these items would materially reduce the cost of the project.

The chamber size of 200 by 1,500 feet for plan III, new locks, is a carryover from 1947 studies. The horizontal area is 78 percent greater than for locks 140 by 1,200 feet. The U.S.S. *Constellation* is 252 feet wide. Any lock large enough to accommodate such craft as the *Constellation* would have no commercial value. However, the enlarged waterway (except locks) would carry the *Constellation*. If it were found necessary to accommodate such vessels, a special lock at each end of the canal might be built and operated for the account of the Navy Department. Due to probable infrequent use, there might be possible some economics of construction. Obviously, if such a lock system were ever to be built, the cost and inconvenience would be much less if the locks were built in only two, rather than three locations.

Water control: Most essential for floating and locking vessels. This tremendously involved subject is too time consuming for direct consideration by Congress. Better that engineers work up the data, then a commission draw conclusion for submission to Congress.

It is axiomatic that the Gatun Lake was developed as an integral part of the waterway. The lake is wholly within the Canal Zone but most of the watershed is in the Republic of Panama. Thus the Republic of Panama is free to build reservoirs on the upper watershed for their own purposes, such as municipal uses and possibly for power. However, any spillage from such reservoirs would almost inevitably flow into the Gatun Lake. This use of water by the Panama Republic will become the subject of news items, I feel sure.

"Water supply appears to be adequate for lock operation and for municipal uses" (1960, p. 24). And on page 723: "In the present canal, therefore, the available water supply will be ample for anticipated traffic beyond the year 2000."

Probably, by the year 2000, considerable pumping into Gatun Lake will be required, of sea water (or brackish water) from one of the sea-level approaches to the locks. The cost was estimated at $250 per lockage, year 1931 (report, 1931, p. 31). Now the costs will be more. The procedure for operating pumps is subject to variations in order to meet varying needs. To limit the cost in plant and in power demand (in kilowatts), a program wherein the pumps would be operated for a longer period than for the period of actual need of extra water for depth and for lockages might be worked out if scientific forecasting is somewhat improved by the end of this century. In any case, if too much water were pumped, it could be later used to generate part of the power consumed in the pumping. The subject is very complicated. It is one for consideration of a commission with the advice of engineers.

Pumping water into reservoirs is not new. At the newly finished Robert Moses Niagara Power Plant (National Geographic, April 1963, p. 581): "At night when power demand is low, Niagara-powered electric pumps store water in reservoirs. During the day's peak demand, the stored water flows out through the same pumps, which become turbogenerators producing more electricity."

For a long time the Gatun Lake has been mildly saline, at the upper ends of the terminal locks, due to the mixing action caused by the filling jets in the lock floors. The heavier saline water lies at the bottom of the lake or cut. With heavy pumping the salinity might become objectionable when water is intended for municipal uses. By the time pumping in large amounts becomes necessary, great advances in the desalting of water will have been made. In Barron's magazine, April 1, 1963, at page 3, is stated: "A plastic-like membrane * * * filters dissolved salt out of water."

Electric power: Traditionally water has been drawn from Gatun Lake to generate at Gatun Station. As lockages increase, water for power must decrease (1960, p. 24). "There is not enough water for hydroelectric units to generate all the power required for the Canal Zone in the dry season and in some subnormal rainy seasons." And at page 22, is stated: "There is insufficient diesel power generating equipment on the isthmus to handle all power requirements."

In the 1960 report, page 25, at bottom, reference is made to "* * * deepening the channel 3 feet more than required for improvement of ship maneuverability." It is implied that the lake level can be lowered by all or part of this 3 feet, and so provide added water during dry seasons. That is, only 2 feet of the 5-foot deeping in plan 1, was for maneuverability. In early years this would permit saving in fuel for power generation. The proposed lowering of lake bottom to elevation 30, for plan III (1960, p. 29) would permit more drawdown, but would deprive the old locks at Gatun of much useful depth. The cost of deepening to elevation 30 would be tremendous. I cannot make an exact determination of it from the estimates in the report.

FINANCIAL MATTERS

The financial policy of the Panama Canal has not been quite like that of a commercial enterprise. One test might be: Could a new flight of locks be financed by a bond issue sold to the public? The answer is obvious, because experience shows that the original investment would not be recovered.

From report, 1960, page 2: "Unless improvements are made for security reasons alone, the carrying charges of all capital expenditures, including appropriate amortization, as well as cost of operation of the canal, should be borne by canal tolls."

Any new cost analyses might very well include amortization as favored by the 1960 board.

There is talk of constructing another canal, away from the present one. Should we so multiply our financial losses?

A new canal, at some other location, would, besides the construction cost, involve the duplication of many plant items, now on the Canal Zone, and at modern prices. Some items are: accommodations to foreign countries, land rental, harbors and harbor facilities (including drydocks and repair shops), dams and reservoirs, waterworks, power system, fuel stores, industrial plant for operations, storehouses, dwellings, community buildings, roads, and streets, sanitation and hospitals, telephone system, possibly a railway. (There is also the installation system for national defense.)

It seems overoptimistic to assume that a better treaty, or perhaps one as good as we still have with the Republic of Panama, could be negotiated.

All of the plant items, now in operation on the Panama Canal would serve as well with a third flight of locks as they do at present. Any needed additions would serve to increase the volume of business and should reduce the overhead and other operating costs, per vessel in transit.

It would be impossible, of course, to make an offhand cost estimate of the ancillary items above listed. I would not be surprised if it exceeded half a billion dollars.

A businessman's viewpoint might indicate that the plan requiring the smallest outlay of money, over the years, would be most likely to succeed.

Other lock plans suggested for study: It would be interesting and possibly very valuable to have at least two lock canal plans investigated by a commission. One to be a variation of the plan II, Third Locks Canal which would bypass Pedro Miguel locks on the west side, and have a duplicate of the Gatun new locks at the Miraflores site, and a channel on west side of Miraflores Lake.

The other would be a variation of plan III, consolidated Third Locks Canal (in the 1960 report), better known as the Terminal Lake plan, which would naturally follow the completion of the plan II variation having the bypass channel ready, the second Miraflores flight of locks would be simple to accomplish, relatively inexpensive. Then with two new locks at Miraflores, the completion of the Terminal Lake would be the final step.

Both plans could make use of the enlarged waterway between locks as well as the sea-level sections, without change. Both would be designed to the same dimensions, having locks, probably 140 by 1,200 feet in plan and about 50 feet deep, or any more appropriate size selected by the commission. Both would include, in construction cost, only the new locks, approaches, and such essential appurtenances required to make locks workable.

By omitting the new Pedro Miguel west lock there would be saved costs of 4,500 feet of lock and approach walls, 260 linear feet of lock floor, two caisson seats and a pair of gates. Also the bottom of the excavated bypass channel would be about 27 feet higher than in case of plan II. There would be savings in cost due to working in only one location at the Pacific end of canal. There would be savings in operating and maintenance costs.

There need be no change in the Gatun locks as now planned, unless the dimensions are changed. Both, of course, being at the same dimensions, as adopted for the Pacific end.

In the first plan (bypass Pedro Miguel locks), the cost of the bypass channel would be involved. The channel would pass along the west side of Miraflores Lake. The present canal channel and the new would require separation by a substantial dike, which would later be removed when the Terminal Lake permanent structures were completed. The difference in water levels would be nominally from 54 feet to 85 feet. But the summit level could possibly rise, during a great flood to 92 feet. About 38 feet would be the difference in water levels to be provided for.

In the first plan, the completed arrangement on the Pacific end would match that at the Atlantic end of the canal. One flight of locks at each end, from summit level to the sea in three steps. It appears that the variation of plan II, above described would be less costly to construct than plan II with locks at three locations.

The greater saving resulting from the suggested plan above would be realized when a second lock were placed at Miraflores beside the first new lock—then both would be served by the same bypass channel. (If a special lock for aircraft carriers were added, the saving would again be realized.)

For the Terminal Lake plan, here suggested, the elimination of the two upper chambers at the old Miraflores Locks would make available a saving in cost of about $178 million (1960, p. 394). That would go far toward the construction of a second lock for the new twin locks at the west Miraflores site, required for the Terminal Lake plan. Shortening the construction period would make a material saving in first cost. Avoiding any interference with traffic during construction would make a large saving. The old locks need not be altered at all until it was time to abandon them and complete the closure of the terminal lake at Miraflores.

After construction of a pair of twin locks at Miraflores west site, the final step in the completion of the Terminal Lake plan would include the enclosing of the Miraflores Lake to permit its surface elevation to be at summit level, the relocation of facilities involved, and the removal of part or all of the old Pedro Miguel locks.

It might be prudent to try for the single lock at Miraflores with the Pedro Miguel bypass channel first because of the relatively small outlay in money. Later, at the appropriate date, develop the second lock at Miraflores. (If this date is not too remote, it might be possible to get along with only one new lock at Gatun while using the old Gatun locks. This expedient would greatly reduce the second outlay of money, and permit some of the money to be used to elevate the Miraflores Lake.)

My personal feeling is that the step-at-the-time construction program would be easier to finance. Any of the items of construction is large enough to avoid the objections to small contracts.

The following steps can be financed singly, or in combination:

1. Build a flight of new locks at Gatun and one at Miraflores, with bypass channel west of Pedro Miguel locks and in west side of Miraflores Lake.
2. Build second west Miraflores lock, use same bypass channel.
3. Raise Miraflores Lake.
4. Add second lock at Gatun, east.

Sincerely yours,

E. S. RANDOLPH.

REFERENCES

1. The 1931 report, House Document No. 139, 72d Congress, 1st session, by U.S. Army Interoceanic Canal Board.

2. The 1939 report, House Document No. 210, 76th Congress, 1st session, by the Governor of the Panama Canal, "Report on the Panama Canal for the Future Needs of Interoceanic Shipping."

3. The 1947 report, "Report of the Governor of the Panama Canal," under Public Law 280, 79th Congress, 1st session, Isthmian Canal Studies, 1947.

4. The 1958 report, "Improvements to the Panama Canal—Short-Range Program," July 15, 1958, by Board of Consultants, Isthmian Canal Studies, committee report, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

5. The 1960 report, House Report No. 1960, 86th Congress, 2d session, by Board of Consultants, Isthmian Canal Studies, "Report on a Long-Range Program for Isthmian Canal Transits," signed June 1, 1960.

6. The 1949 volume of transactions of the American Society of Civil Engineers, volume 114, pages 558 to 906. Contains a paper by Capt. Miles P. DuVal, "The Marine Operating Problems of the Panama Canal and their Solution." Describes at length the Terminal Lake plan and has been widely read by engineers. Also are many papers relating to the sea-level subject. This is the only reference containing discussions from both sides.

7. Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1961 edition, pages 172 to 174.

8. U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings, March 1963, at page 152, shows overall dimensions and draft of the aircraft carrier *Constellation* (1047 feet long by 252 feet wide by 37-foot draft. Completed December 1961.

9. Panama Canal Company, Pilots Handbook, revised 1956.

DAVID HALL: HANDICAPPED AMERICAN OF THE YEAR

Mr. **MARTIN** of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. **BYRNES** of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a signal honor will be given tomorrow, May 9, to an outstanding citizen of my congressional district.

David Hall of Allouez, Wis., will be awarded the President's trophy signifying his selection as Handicapped American of the Year by the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped. The ceremony will take place at 9:30 a.m. at the Departmental Auditorium in Washington.

This national award is the climax of a remarkable comeback against tremendous odds. It is a tribute to the courage and perseverance which lifted this young man from a bed of almost complete paralysis to a life full of meaning and of devotion to his fellow citizens.

I congratulate David Hall for the recognition which has justly come to him. I commend his parents for the great contribution they made to his comeback, and his many friends in the Green Bay area who have played their part in helping David to help himself. It is indeed an honor to represent a district which has produced such a fine American.

The David Hall story should prove an inspiration to every American who suffers a physical handicap and indeed to every American as an example of courage in the face of adversity.

As part of my remarks, I include the announcement of the award by the President's Committee and a story of David Hall's victory over fate as told by Bob Knaus in the Green Bay Press-Gazette.

WISCONSIN MAN NAMED HANDICAPPED AMERICAN OF THE YEAR BY PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE

David Hall, who was in an auto accident in 1955 which paralyzed him from the neck down, which caused him to devote his life to working with the handicapped and to promote traffic and highway safety, was named Handicapped American of the Year today by the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

Hall, 27, of 151 Hoffman Road, Allouez, Wis., was nominated by the Wisconsin Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

He will receive the President's Trophy in recognition of this honor at the annual meeting of the President's Committee on the morning of May 9 in the departmental auditorium in Washington, D.C.

The trophy is awarded annually as a special honor to the handicapped individual who has surmounted his or her own handicap to become a useful citizen and a person who helped encourage, inspire, or facilitate the employment of the handicapped. The trophy, a sterling silver plaque mounted on a mahogany base, is made by students of the Institute for the Crippled and Disabled in New York City.

Hall, who received neck and back injuries in the accident and who works from a wheelchair, is supervisor of the sheltered workshop of the Curative Workshop in Green Bay. Among those under Hall's supervision are controlled epileptics, mental patients, and other handicapped individuals. His duties include supervision, observing of progress, and evaluating of performance.

William B. Nystrom, executive director of the workshop, pointed out in a letter supporting Hall's nomination: "He has done an outstanding job. The shop has grown from 4 people to over 20 with 4 firms now sending us subcontract work. The people are now working 5 days a week. Most of these accomplishments have been directly due to the efforts of Dave Hall."

Hall, whose safety message is known throughout Wisconsin and Michigan, has actively promoted traffic and highway safety before a number of organizations and high schools. By last summer he had spoken to more than 80 different groups with a combined audience of more than 50,000 persons.

He dedicated his life to this phase of safety—including promotion of the use of seat belts—as a result of his own experience and "when I read some of the unbelievable traffic statistics * * * I couldn't help but think how each victim must wish, as I do, for just one more chance."

"There is no second chance for us but I thought of all the drivers who still have a chance to live a normal life, and enjoy all the wonderful things the world has to offer."

The accident occured on July 22, 1955, as Hall was riding as a passenger in his friend's new convertible. They were on a trip to Michigan traveling at a high rate of speed when another auto pulled onto the highway from a side road and collided with their vehicle. The convertible went off the road, through a field and slammed into a tree. Hall's friend and the driver of the other car were not injured but the door on Hall's side flew open and he was thrown out and landed on his back.

After intensive rehabilitation, and four operations that enabled Hall to regain some grasping power in one hand, he gradually learned to do a great deal for himself. He has even obtained a car specially equipped with hand controls and has learned to drive again.

Hall was named the Handicapped Person of the Year in Wisconsin by the State's Governor's Committee. In addition, he was one of two recipients of the Distinguished Service Award presented annually by the Green Bay Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Hall lives with his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Robert D. Hall at the Hoffman Road address.

[From the Green Bay Press-Gazette]

(By Bob Knaus)

Seven years ago, life couldn't have been any worse for David Hall. Fate had just thrown him a terrible curve ball, one that would put him in a wheelchair for life, unable to move a single muscle in his body below the neck.

He had been a typically active teenager before his neck was snapped in a violent 100-mile-an-hour traffic accident in upper Michigan.

The prospect of having to spend the rest of his life in a wheelchair must have frightened him terribly. The thought that he would be unable to lead a normal life must have depressed him unmercifully, particularly in those first days after the accident as he lay in a hospital bed pondering his future.

Gradually, however, as the days went by and Hall thought the situation out more clearly, he became determined to overcome his handicap and attempt to regain as normal a life as possible under the circumstances.

His determination has succeeded far beyond his wildest imaginations. It has carried him before thousands of people in hundreds of cities in the Midwest. It has won him numerous awards.

But his determination has carried him even further. It has won him statewide acclaim, for which he will be recognized at a banquet Monday, honoring him with the Wisconsin Handicapped Person of the Year Award. Even this isn't the climax.

On May 9, Hall will travel to Washington, D.C., where he will receive the President's Trophy in recognition of being named Handicapped American of the Year. The award will be presented by the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

Hall, 26, received this latest award for his work in traffic safety and operations of the sheltered workshop in Green Bay.

To thousands of attentive audiences, the David Hall story has brought new and tragic meaning to automobile accidents.

The David Hall story began in the spring of 1961 as plans got underway for an annual safety conference to be held in Green Bay. Hall was approached to speak on his accident.

More than 1,000 persons listened in hushed and shocked silence that day as Hall, seated in his wheelchair on stage at the arena, related details of his accident in a dramatic, yet matter-of-fact manner.

They rose to a standing ovation at the conclusion of the talk.

This was the start for the Allouez resident. A foundation was formed to schedule Hall's appearances. He started on a small scale, speaking before local high school audiences.

Soon, however, he began traveling—first around the Green Bay area, then throughout the State, and finally outside the State. Audiences in upper and lower Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, and Minnesota began to hear the David Hall story.

Back at home, however, Hall also turned to another project. The curative workshop was trying out a sheltered workshop program, aimed at providing work for the handicapped.

Starting out with four handicapped persons, the sheltered workshop began modestly in 1961 by stringing business forms. Hall was put in charge of the program which, by now, has expanded until 20 persons take part in the program. The workshop is an agency of the United Fund of Brown County.

Recognition of Hall's efforts began in earnest. In October of 1961 he was nominated for the State Handicapped Person of the Year Award. In 1 year, he won the award. Gov. John Reynolds will make the formal award presentation Monday night.

Last month Hall won another coveted award—the Distinguished Service Award presented by the junior chamber of commerce. This award, for outstanding community achievement, was shared jointly with Bart Starr, Packer quarterback.

Two weeks ago, Hall was accorded the highest honor—the Presidential Trophy naming him the top handicapped person in the United States.

Life for David Hall has certainly been contradictory—reaching an unbelievable low 7 years ago, then skyrocketing unbelievably high. For a man of his determination, it was inevitable.

TAX REDUCTION

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Betts] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer has editorially commented on the difficulty of following the President's logic in pleading for reduction of Federal income taxes. The Plain Dealer is one of the outstanding and respected newspapers in the country and I think its comments deserve consideration.

The editorial follows:

Tax-Cut Logic

We cannot follow the logic in the reasons the Kennedy administration has given for its proposal to reduce Federal income taxes.

A few months ago the President was saying that a tax reduction was necessary in order to avoid a recession. Now Treasury Secretary Dillon is saying that because of the business pickup, it is more imperative than ever that taxes be reduced because it would do more good when the economy is fairly buoyant than when it is merely limping along.

The only conclusion we can draw from these conflicting reasons is that the administration wants a tax cut, period, and is justifying it by cutting the sail to fit the cloth. And, of course, it has occurred to us that a tax reduction could be good medicine in an election year.

The Plain Dealer favors a reduction in income taxes, believing the economy would be stimulated if people were allowed to spend more of their own money on the things they want, not what some Government bureaucrat believes they ought to have.

But the Plain Dealer also believes that any reduction in income taxes should be accompanied by a corresponding reduction in Government spending. Unfortunately, neither Congress nor the administration has shown much inclination to do this.

FEDERAL GRANTS-IN-AID PROGRAMS

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Goodell] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill calling for the periodic review of the numerous grants-in-aid programs of the Federal Government and the automatic expiration of these programs every 5 years unless specifically renewed by Congress.

It is the purpose of this proposal to establish a uniform policy and procedure whereby all programs for grant-in-aid assistance to the States or to their political subdivisions shall be made the subject of sufficient subsequent review by the Congress to insure their effectiveness and that they are revised and updated to meet new conditions. It is important, too, that grant programs be terminated when they have achieved their purpose.

There is growing support for a proposal of this nature, Mr. Speaker. A report by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, dated June 1961, recommends this action. In a resolution adopted by the Governors' conference in Hershey, Pa., in July 1962, it was stated that "the efficiency and public support of grants-in-aid would be enhanced if their systematic congressional review and reassessment at prescribed intervals were assured."

Similar, but not identical, legislation has been introduced previously by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Fountain] and by Senator Muskie in the other Chamber. My bill goes further than these measures. I support these earlier proposals in principle and would support them should they come to the floor of the House in that form. I think we should go further than those proposals, much further.

Mr. Speaker, according to the very extensive and worthwhile studies conducted by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, there are 45 general categories of grants now in effect. Ten were established prior to 1930, 14 during the period 1931–45—with all but 1 of these enacted during the depression years—and 21 since the end of World War II.

The Commission's report points out that highway construction and public assistance account for over 70 percent of total grants-in-aid for the fiscal year 1961, under a program initiated in 1911.

The easiest way to present the impact of my bill is in the form of a chart which follows:

Effect of Goodell bill on grants-in-aid programs

Length of program	Effect of Goodell bill	Section of Goodell bill
	ENACTED PRIOR TO 88TH CONG.	
Permanent	Expires 5th year after Goodell bill enacted.	3(b).
	Reviewed in 88th or 89th Cong.	4(b).
5 years or more	Expires 5th year after Goodell bill enacted.	3(b).
	Reviewed in 88th or 89th Cong.	4(b).
4 years or more	Reviewed 1 year before expiration.	4(a).
	ENACTED AFTER 88TH CONG.	
Permanent	Expires 5th year after its enactment.	3(a).
5 years or more	Reviewed once every 5 years.	4(a).
4 years or more	Reviewed 1 year before expiration.	4(b).

Mr. Speaker, grants-in-aid constitute at least 10 percent of the national budget—more when defense expenditures are excluded. They deserve careful and continuing scrutiny by the Congress and especially by the committees of the House. These programs serve many useful purposes. The intent of my bill is to increase their effectiveness.

I invite the careful study of my colleagues to this proposal and urge that action be taken by the Congress this year.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Skubitz (at the request of Mr. Halleck), for the remainder of the week, on account of death in family.

Mr. Fallon (at the request of Mr. Lankford), for today, May 8, on account of official business.

Mr. Healey (at the request of Mr. Murphy of New York), for Wednesday, May 8, 1963, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Kyl (at the request of Mr. Martin of Nebraska), for 20 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Purcell, for 60 minutes, on Thursday, May 9, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Smith of Virginia (at the request of Mr. Albert) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Jennings and to include a speech.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Martin of Nebraska) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Lipscomb.

Mr. Curtis.

Mr. Martin of Nebraska.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. Gonzalez) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Giaimo.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 394. An act to validate the homestead entries of Leo F. Reeves.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 9, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

776. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the annual report of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, for the fiscal year 1962; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

777. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report covering personal property received by State surplus property agencies for distribution to public health and educational institutions and civil defense organizations, covering the calendar quarter January 1 through March 31, 1963, pursuant to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

778. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

779. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Tariff Commission, transmitting the third supplemental report on the tariff classification study, pursuant to the Tariff Classification Act of 1962; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

780. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of the orders entered in the cases of certain aliens who have been found admissible to the United States, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

781. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases where the authority was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Report on Television Network Program Procurement (Rept. No. 281). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TRIMBLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 337. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 6009. A bill to provide, for the periods ending June 30, 1963, and August 31, 1963, temporary increases in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 282). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 6138. A bill to amend section 753(b) of title 28, United States Code, to provide for the recording of proceedings in the U.S. district courts by means of electronic sound recording as well as by shorthand or mechanical means; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENTON:

H.R. 6139. A bill to provide for the establishment and administration of the Lincoln Trail Memorial Parkway in the States of Kentucky, Indiana, and Illinois, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 6140. A bill to amend section 109 of title 23 of the United States Code relating to construction standards on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 6141. A bill to amend section 104(b) (5) of title 23, United States Code, to provide for the submission of certain cost estimates for the completion of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 6142. A bill to amend section 2401 of title 28 of the United States Code to toll the running of statute of limitations against tort claims of persons under legal disability or beyond the seas at the time their claims accrue; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 6143. A bill to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities in undergraduate institutions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 6144. A bill to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities in undergraduate and graduate institutions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. HANSEN:

H.R. 6145. A bill to provide for extension of State jurisdiction over the Quinault Indian Reservation, Wash., only with the consent of the Quinault Tribe, and to authorize the tribe to terminate any State jurisdiction heretofore extended under Public Law 280, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 6146. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require the marking of lumber and wood products to indicate to the ultimate purchaser in the United States the name of the country of origin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 6147. A bill to amend section 6323 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the relationship of certain liens for taxes to the rights of mortgagees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 6148. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code relating to highways, in order to permit States having toll and free roads, bridges, and tunnels designated as part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways to designate other routes for inclusion in the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska:

H.R. 6149. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Agate Fossil Beds National Monument in the State of Nebraska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 6150. A bill to amend section 503 of title 38, United States Code, to provide an exclusion from annual income for amounts paid by a veteran for the last illness, burial, and just debts of the veteran's deceased spouse or child; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 6151. A bill to increase the appropriation authorization for the completion of the construction of the irrigation and power systems of the Flathead Indian irrigation project, Montana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 6152. A bill to amend section 4554 of title 39, United States Code, to extend the fourth-class educational and library materials rate to playscripts; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 6153. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAKER:

H.R. 6154. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that gross income does not include gain from the sale or exchange of a principal residence; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 6155. A bill to extend for 3 years the provisions of the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 6156. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual may qualify for disability insurance benefits and the disability freeze with only four quarters of coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 6157. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of natural resources and recreational areas; and to authorize State and community youth employment programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GILL:

H.R. 6158. A bill to provide for the registration of contractors of migrant agricultural workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 6159. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act relating to the lawful admission for permanent residence of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.R. 6160. A bill to provide for the right of persons to be represented by attorneys in matters before Federal agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 6161. A bill to require an annual report to Congress comparing the salary of the uniformed services and those of private industry; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 6162. A bill to retrocede to the State of Wisconsin concurrent jurisdiction over the rights-of-way for U.S. Highway No. 16 and Wisconsin State Highway No. 21 within Camp McCoy, Wis., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 6163. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act relating to the lawful admission for permanent residence of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BASS:

H.R. 6164. A bill to amend sections 162 and 274 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the deductibility of certain business entertainment, etc., expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 6165. A bill to amend sections 162 and 274 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the deductibility of certain business entertainment, etc., expenses; to the Committe on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 6166. A bill to amend sections 162 and 274 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the deductibility of certain business entertainment, etc., expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 6167. A bill to amend sections 162 and 274 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the deductibility of certain business entertainment, etc., expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 6168. A bill to amend sections 162 and 274 of The Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the deductibility of certain business entertainment, etc., expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 6169. A bill to amend sections 162 and 274 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the deductibility of certain business entertainment, etc., expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 6170. A bill to amend sections 162 and 274 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the deductibility of certain business entertainment, etc., expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H.R. 6171. A bill to amend sections 162 and 274 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the deductibility of certain business entertainment, etc., expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 6172. A bill to amend sections 162 and 274 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the deductibility of certain business entertainment, etc., expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.R. 6173. A bill to amend sections 162 and 274 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the deductibility of certain business entertainment, etc., expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 6174. A bill to amend sections 162 and 274 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the deductibility of certain business entertainment, etc., expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 6175. A bill to amend sections 162 and 274 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the deductibility of certain business entertainment, etc., expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 6176. A bill to provide for regular congressional review of all laws providing for grants-in-aid to States and to local units of government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 6177. A bill to amend section 2(a) of article VI of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1947 relating to the annual payment to the District of Columbia by the United States; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.R. 6178. A bill to amend section 1034 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that where the taxpayer or his spouse has attained the age of 65 no gain on the sale or exchange of the taxpayer's home will be taxed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.J. Res. 401. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.J. Res. 402. Joint resolution establishing a national shrine commission to select and procure a site and formulate plans for the construction of a permanent memorial building in memory of the veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WALLHAUSER:

H. Con. Res. 150. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress concerning the establishment of a Cuban National Council; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H. Res. 338. Resolution concerning collective defensive agreements with Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. Res. 339. Resolution to urge the President to invite cooperation to prevent aggression in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 6179. A bill for the relief of Jacqueline Edwine Pascall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 6180. A bill for the relief of Maj. Warren G. Ward, Capt. Paul H. Beck, and 1st Lt. Russell K. Hansen, U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AVERY:

H.R. 6181. A bill for the relief of Mr. Rudolph Sanderson, of Meriden, Kans.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 6182. A bill for the relief of Bryce A. Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6183. A bill for the relief of Maxie L. Stevent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6184. A bill for the relief of Louis St. Laurent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.R. 6185. A bill to authorize the National Rifle Association of America to complete the construction and occupancy of its headquarters building in Washington, D.C.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 6186. A bill for the relief of Wing Kwang Moy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 6187. A bill for the relief of Pietro D'Onofrio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 6188. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna Benes-Szoverffy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 6189. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Stella T. Pittman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6190. A bill for the relief of Mr. Robert Cermin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.R. 6191. A bill for the relief of John W. Elliott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H.R. 6192. A bill for the relief of Sister Enrica (Pasqualina Filippo) and Sister Antonia (Ida Conforto); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 6193. A bill for the relief of Guiseppa Sicurella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHADEBERG:

H.R. 6194. A bill for the relief of Calliope Res; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

115. By Mr. GURNEY: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Winter Park, Fla., requesting the Congress of the United States to recognize the increasing threat of the monopolistic power of labor unions which is a deterrent to our constitutional republican form of government and to enact remedial legislation immediately; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

116. By the SPEAKER: Petition of John J. Shaughnessy, Brooklyn, N.Y., relative to his redress of grievance for being fired from Government service, because he suggested affixing the name "United States of America" on all American goods in containers being shipped abroad, and "the controversial Oppenheimer case" whose main figure is being given a $50,000 cash award although he was a security risk; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

May 10: Rumanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, May 10 marks a day of special importance to the people of the subjugated country of Rumania and the Rumanians throughout the world who look with hope to the day when their homeland will once again be free.

Rumania, as we all know, is one of the countries which lies behind the Iron Curtain of Soviet colonialism. Ironically, as the world experiences the birth of many new nations only recently emerging from colonial status, forces are at work through the international Communist conspiracy to impose a new colonialism, upon these new nations and upon others long within the community of free nations.

Each year that passes for these subjugated people can only increase their desire to see freedom once more return to their dominated homelands. I have no doubt that given the chance to choose, the Rumanians and the others now suffering under the yoke of Communist colonialism would choose freedom; this is evident from the continuing flow of those who, despite the danger and despite the fact that they must leave everything behind them, vote with their feet and flee from the Iron Curtain.

I think we must make the free choice of a form of government a keystone of our policy in regard to Rumania, whose Independence Day we celebrate today, and the other nations suffering under Soviet colonialism. The people in these unhappy countries must, to achieve real freedom, be given the opportunity to determine for themselves how they shall be governed. Free elections must be our goal for the Soviet colonies; given the chance, they will choose freedom.

Ninth Pan American Highway Congress Meets in Nation's Capital—Delegates Seek International Roadbuilding Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, from May 6 to 18, 1963, the Ninth Pan American Highway Congress will be holding its important meetings in Washington, D.C. Four hundred and twenty-five delegates from 21 countries of this hemisphere, including Canada, are gathered here in a useful conference designed to promote international coordination and cooperation in matters of highway transportation.

Transportation being a major tool of economic development, the Ninth Pan American Highway Congress is particularly meaningful at this time of emphasis and effort in enhancing the economic base of the entire hemisphere. An integrated program of highway construction on a regional, national and international basis can do much to advance commerce and industry, and can be of significant value in raising living standards.

En route to the Congress, many delegates took part in an official road tour through Central America, utilizing that portion of the Inter-American Highway from Panama to Mexico City. They were thus able to witness firsthand the benefits brought to that sector of the world through successful programs of international roadbuilding.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Roads of the Senate Committee on Public Works, it was my privilege to participate in the first plenary session of the Ninth Pan American Highway Congress. After the introduction by Federal Highway Administrator, Hon. Rex Whitton, it was my responsibility to bring to the assembled delegates and official observers the greetings and welcome from the Congress of the United States. I also conveyed the respects of the committees of both the House and Senate which have jurisdiction over matters of highway construction in the United States and in other lands. Likewise, I expressed the best wishes of the chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Works, the Honorable Pat McNamara, senior Senator from Michigan.

Mr. President, I request that my remarks before the Ninth Pan American Highway Congress, May 7, 1963, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE INTER-AMERICAN HIGHWAY AND REGIONAL TRADE

(Remarks by Senator Jennings Randolph, Democrat, of West Virginia, chairman, Subcommittee on Public Roads, Senate Public Works Committee, before the Ninth Pan American Highway Congress, Department of State Auditorium, May 7, 1963)

To many of our citizens in the United States, the Inter-American Highway is visualized as some of you saw it on your recent caravan, a long and pleasant trip through scenic country and historic cities.

But to a large extent this great investment of funds, engineering talent, and construction effort is giving its benefits locally to the people who live along its route and in the regions it traverses.

Years ago the Inter-American Highway was called the road that food built. In essence this phrase implied that laborers on the construction of the highway earned respectable wages; they were thus able to buy food for an adequate diet, both in quantity and nutritional value; thus fortified, their work became more productive.

This simple story exemplifies the value of any road and its effect on the economy of the area it serves. The Inter-American Highway is a grand, large-scale example of what has happened since time immemorial, whenever an improved highway penetrates into an area hitherto served only by a dry season road, or none at all.

Our own country has experienced the same process of development. The so-called "Whisky Rebellion" in 1794 came about for lack of a decent road across the mountains from western to eastern Pennsylvania. Wagon freight cost $5 to $10 per hundred pounds, so farmers converted their grain to whisky, but refused to pay the Federal liquor tax.

That we did not do much about roads, for a long time, is indicated by the cry 100 years later, at the beginning of this century, to "get the farmer out of the mud."

The cost of transportation is among the most important factors in any economy, local or international. In cash value, it can be measured by this comparison: it costs about 4 cents to transport a ton of goods 1 mile, over good roads; moving the same quantity by pack animal over a poor road or trail costs about 20 cents, or five times as much.

The farmer who laboriously packs his produce to the village market on his donkey's back, or on his own, or maybe his wife's, has little incentive to increase production. But with good roads available, a truck can carry his crops farther and faster, and they arrive unspoiled. He has a choice of markets. He has ample reason to grow more; his income is better so he has means to improve his crops. He can also buy the products of the city he could not previously afford.

At the same time, people in urban and metropolitan areas now have more food available and it is better and in greater variety. With lower transportation costs, the food costs less. And the farmer is buying what the city folk produce. Thus we have an interacting economic growth, a lifting by the bootstraps of both country and city.

This is not a new development to any of you, I am sure. Though it does not offer an immediate and dramatic transformation, it is the forerunner of regional and international commerce. It does insure the general elevation of the living standards of all our people. Good transportation, as typified by the Inter-American Highway, is the necessary catalyst for economic expansion, and thus toward the building of a better world.

One aspect of this thought is eloquently expressed in a poem by Ethelyn Miller Hartwich, of South Dakota, which was quoted to me by my colleague from that State, Senator KARL E. MUNDT:

"Great roads the Romans built that men
might meet, and walls to keep strong
men apart—secure.
Now, centuries have gone, and in defeat
the walls are fallen, but the roads endure."

Taxes, Spending, and Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. PAT JENNINGS

OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, 1 week ago today the Honorable Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury, spoke before the chamber of commerce here in Washington, D.C., on the importance of a tax reduction this year.

His remarks explain succinctly the causes of our economy's lack of growth. They set forth the President's tax program as the best means of overcoming this chronic problem. It may serve as an example to those who endeavor to find common grounds for supporting this legislation.

Secretary Dillon's address merits the attention of this body, and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including his address.

The address follows:

TAXES, SPENDING, AND FREEDOM

(Remarks by the Honorable Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury, Before the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, at the Statler Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C., April 30, 1963)

For the second general session of your annual meeting, you have chosen the theme, "Taxes, Spending, and Freedom." It is a theme both timely and significant. Timely, because in a relatively few weeks the House Ways and Means Committee will report out the tax bill it is now working on in executive session. And significant, because there is no more urgent task confronting the Nation today than the adoption of a program of tax reduction and reform, a program that is at once fair, substantial, and fiscally responsible.

There is no doubt in my mind that such a program will be enacted into law this year. The public testimony on the tax proposals has strengthened my earlier belief that tax reduction is essential. It is no surprise that, on an issue so complex, so farreaching and that so deeply affects so many people, there is no unanimity of agreement. What is genuinely remarkable is that the understandable and sometimes sharp disagreement on details has in no way weakened the strong and widespread consensus that only a thorough overhaul of our tax system can provide the lasting impetus our economy needs.

More than 200 witnesses have testified before the House Ways and Means Committee on the President's tax proposals. While their views have differed widely on specifics, only two of these witnesses have disagreed with the central thesis of the President's program, the need for a substantial tax reduction to encourage economic growth. While your organization, for example, has questioned certain details in the President's proposals, it has not questioned its aim.

In fact, you have made it very clear that you strongly support the principle of tax reduction as vital to the continuation of a healthy free economy. The practical question is: What can you actively do to make that goal a reality when you do not agree with all the means proposed to reach it? An excellent answer to that question has just been given by the group of distinguished business leaders who, last week, here in Washington, formed the Business Committee for Tax Reduction in 1963 and who drew up a statement of principles upon which businessmen can unite in support of meaningful tax reduction in 1963.

Certainly, the time is ripe. Four or five months ago, few of us could have realistically expected that the economic conditions for a tax cut would be as favorable as they now seem. For, based upon the performance of our economy in the last few months, our prospects for the year are relatively better than most observers had expected. If the improvement continues, our estimated revenues for fiscal 1964 may well be more than we estimated in January perhaps by as much as a billion dollars, thus reducing the deficit.

Even more important, a tax cut when the economy is reasonably buoyant would be far more effective in carrying us toward full employment than a tax cut when the economy is merely limping along. For the tax program that the President has proposed is designed as a long-range program, a program not merely to shield us from an economic downturn, but to accelerate our economic growth well into the future. The present state of our economy is ideal for the inauguration of that kind of program.

As you are well aware, the aim of the President's tax proposals is to break the iron grip upon our economy of a tax system which helped control inflation during the Second World War and its aftermath, but which now throttles growth. It is a program to promote economic growth by promoting economic freedom. And by economic freedom I mean not only the freedom of the market place, of investment, and of enterprise, but the freedom that is the right of every American, to have the opportunity to work, to grow, and to prosper in accordance with his talents.

Far too many Americans have not had that opportunity for far to long a time. Not for a single month in the past 5 years has unemployment fallen below 5 percent. Yet for the greater part of the preceding 5 years, unemployment was either below or only slightly above the 4-percent level that many regard as reasonably full employment. Last month, 4½ million of our citizens could not find the jobs they sought.

Unless we do something now, the prospects are that many more millions will be unable to find jobs in the future. Next year, those young people who were born in 1946, the first year of the postwar baby boom, will turn 18 and begin to enter our labor force in large numbers. During the mid-sixties our labor force will have to absorb an average annual inflow of around 2,700,000 young people, compared to 1,800,000 during the mid-fifties, an increase of 50 percent. We must be able to provide jobs for all of these young men and women. And we must do it in a time of ever-increasing automation. For the impact of automation that has long been felt among our bluecollar factory workers is now spreading rapidly in the white-collar and service areas.

We welcome the progress of automation. But we cannot accept the unemployment that too often accompanies it. We can, and we must, take steps to meet, with a many-sided response, the twin challenge of automation and a rapidly growing labor force. The Government has a clear and direct responsibility in this area. But it will act only to the extent that the private economy cannot, or does not, meet this challenge.

The President's tax program is evidence of his belief that a free and vigorous private economy can provide our citizens with abundant job opportunities. Should we fail to achieve this kind of economy, let no one imagine that the result would be anything but catastrophic. For instance, Mr. W. P. Gullander, president of the National Association of Manufacturers, recently estimated that, if our economy continues to create jobs no faster than it has during the past 5 years, then, by 1970, our unemployment rate would soar to a shocking 12.7 percent.

The American people could never tolerate such a result. It would inevitably call forth massive governmental action to provide the jobs that our private economy had not provided. The President's tax program is proof enough that such a prospect is as unwelcome to us in Washington as it must be to you.

High unemployment is at once the most enduring and the most unendurable result of our slow growth over the past 5 years, but it is only one of the many ills which flow from an inadequate economic performance. The likelihood is that without a program of substantial tax reduction, our plants will continue to operate below the levels that businessmen themselves feel they need for most efficient production; that there will be no letup in the pressure upon profit margins; that new investment which, in real terms, is just equally the levels reached 6 years ago, will continue to lag, that we will, in short continue to suffer from the many ills that accompany an economy whose resources and incentives for growth are hampered by an overly restrictive tax system.

As long as our economy is so hampered, we are likely to continue to suffer as well from the chronic budgetary deficits that grow because our economy fails to grow. The record is clear that the deficit we now face is the result of an economy which produces too little, rather than of a government which spends too much. Let us briefly review that record:

We are all well aware that within the past 2 years the Soviet rulers felt enough confidence in their power to confront us with a military challenge on a scale we have not seen since the Berlin blockade, 15 years ago. Fortunately, President Kennedy had, in one of the very first moves of his administration, ordered a rapid and substantial buildup of our military power. It was this increased military strength and the steadfastness of our citizens that enabled us to withstand both the Berlin crisis of 1961 and the Cuban crisis of last fall. That military buildup was vital to preserve our freedoms. It was also expensive. Our annual defense budget grew by some $10 billion.

In addition to their military threat, the Soviets have also challenged us in the vast new arena of space. Thanks to a considerable headstart and rockets far larger than ours, they have been able, up to now, to outperform us in manned space flight and to capture the imagination of the world by their feats. But, in the spring of 1961, our Congress agreed with President Kennedy, that we were no longer willing to continue second best in space. It approved a program designed to put an American on the moon before the end of the decade, and hopefully before the arrival of any Soviet space explorer. That decision was extremely costly, but it involved far more than a symbolic race to the moon. It represented our clear determination as a nation that we will not permit the Soviet Union to preempt world leadership in a new and unknown environment whose potential we have scarcely begun to foresee.

These two decisions in defense and space, along with relatively normal increases in other programs vital to the needs of our growing population, have combined to push our expenditures substantially higher than the revenues we collect from our underemployed economy. I mean exactly what I say when I characterize these other increases as relatively normal. Because, for all programs except defense, space, and interest on the public debt, President Kennedy's current 1964 budget recommendations exceed actual 1961 expenditures by only $4.5 billion, as compared to an increase of $4.9 billion in these same programs during 3 preceding years, 1958–61. There can be no question that, if our economy were operating at reasonably full capacity, our tax system would today be producing more than enough revenue to finance our current national needs within a balanced budget. Instead of worrying about deficits we would be enjoying budgetary surpluses.

But the harsh truth is, that unless we release the drag which our tax system now exerts on our economy, we cannot hope to move significantly closer to a balanced budget. In fact, the experience of recent years has shown that exactly the opposite will take place.

Thus, we are faced with what might seem at first to be a paradox: while our present tax rates are so high that they would produce a substantial budget surplus at reasonably full employment, we have little hope of ever achieving that surplus unless we first reduce our tax rates.

Actually, this should not be very mysterious. The explanation is that the major factor in our economic progress, and, indeed, in the progress of any free market economy such as ours, is the vitality of the private sector, both the business community and the consuming public. The across-the-board reduction in our tax rates recommended by the President will stimulate both. We can expect more economic activity, and higher tax revenues, to result. This has been the record in the past, and there is no reason to expect that it will not prove to be the case again. We are not alone in this analysis of the results of tax reduction. One of the clearest statements of this thesis that I have ever seen reads as follows:

"Any appreciable downward revision in tax rates will, of course, cause an immediate reduction in revenues. But there is substantial evidence from the history of tax relief measures, particularly with respect to income taxes, that the initial revenue loss is soon made up by an increase in the tax base against which the lower rates are charged. There is evidence of this not only in our own experience but also in the experience of such countries as Canada, West Germany, and Austria, each of which has enacted several tax relief measures in the post-World War II period."

That statement was made by the National Council of State Chambers of Commerce in its bulletin on Federal Tax Facts, June 4, 1958.

Last year, we took our first important steps in tax relief. They were the enactment of the investment credit and the complete revision and extensive liberalization, for the first time in 20 years, of the tax rules dealing with depreciation. The combined effect of these two actions was to reduce the taxload on business by some $2.5 billion a year, the equivalent of a five-point reduction in corporate taxes.

Today, business is reacting to these two measures as we had anticipated. The enlarged flow of new orders for machinery and equipment that marked the opening months of the year, and the recent striking increase in business appropriations for modernization and expansion, can be traced largely to these two actions. Most of you, I am sure, have seen the report in the magazine, Iron Age, of the effect of these measures on the steel industry, an increase of 32 percent in depreciation writeoffs.

The investment credit and new depreciation guidelines were a preliminary part of the tax program now under consideration by the House Ways and Means Committee. That program, as you know, offers a broad, top-to-bottom reduction in tax rates, both corporate and personal, accompanied by a number of structural reforms. The overall result would be a reduction of $10.3 billion in taxes, designed to unleash our economy and allow it to reach its full potential.

The President's program is not weighted in favor of any one sector of the economy at the expense of any other. It recognizes the simple fact that a free-market economy requires both supply and demand. It also recognizes the fact that our economy consists of a complex and interdependent network of forces, and that we cannot lift the entire economy onto a new and higher plane of activity by lifting merely one sector of it.

Consider for a moment how the tax reductions are distributed in the President's program: Virtually one-half of the $10.3 billion in net tax reduction would go to taxpayers with incomes of $10,000 and under, and the other half to individuals with incomes higher than $10,000 and to corporations. When you include last year's investment credit and depreciation reform, the corporate share amounts to 40 percent of the administration's long-range tax reduction program. And roughly one-third, or nearly 32 percent, of the net tax reduction goes to middle-income taxpayers, those in the $10,000-to-$50,000 brackets.

The substantial rate reductions in the middle and upper income brackets offer a genuine spur to incentives for effort, initiative, and investment. Yet the rate reductions could not be as large as they are, and remain within the limits of fiscal responsibility, in the absence of the revenue-raising reforms. Without this additional revenue, tax-rate reduction would have to be more modest.

The question of fiscal responsibility has given our people the greatest concern in their consideration of the tax program, a concern implicit in the theme you have chosen today. That is a concern we in the administration fully share. Indeed, it is clearly spelled out in the President's budget message, as well as in his tax message.

As I have said, it is our belief that the tax reduction we have proposed will so invigorate the economy that, in a few years, our revenues under the new, lower rate structure will be larger than if we were to continue with our present rate structure, which stifles economic growth. Nevertheless, the first and immediate fiscal impact of tax reduction will be lower revenues and a somewhat larger deficit. This calls for the most careful expenditure control. And that is just what the President has pledged.

Since increases in defense, space and interest on the public debt are unavoidable, he has held fiscal 1964 expenditure levels below those of the current year in the overall civilian programs of the Government. He has specifically stated on more than one occasion that a substantial part of the increased revenues from our expanding economy will be set aside to reduce the deficit until such time as it is eliminated. The significance of this pledge has apparently not been fully understood. As the President stated in his budget message, "The prospect of expanding economic activity and rising Federal revenues in the years ahead does not mean that Federal outlays should rise in proportion to such revenue increases. As the tax cut becomes fully effective and the economy climbs toward full employment, a substantial part of the revenue increases must go toward eliminating the transitional deficit." This means that as revenues increase through the stimulus of the tax program and the normal growth of our economy, expenditures will not be permitted to rise as rapidly, leaving a substantial portion of each year's increase available to reduce our present budgetary deficit. The President has already begun to translate his pledges into action. Since January, he has cut expenditure requests by over $750 million, including the recent cut of $400 million in his foreign aid request. This is sure proof of the effectiveness of the program of expenditure control that is such an important and integral part of the President's tax reduction program.

I recognize that there are some who believe that the administration favors budget deficits as being good in and of themselves. This is simply not so. We dislike deficits as much as anyone. But, we are prepared to accept them if necessary to preserve our national security. And we are not prepared to sacrifice effective job-producing programs such as the emergency public works bill, during a period when unemployment remains at unacceptably high levels. We are solidly against waste in Government and welcome efforts to reduce it. But we do not accept the claims of those who would make meat-ax cuts in the budget but are not prepared to justify the details. For instance, it is downright irresponsible to claim, as some have done, that defense expenditures can be cut 5 percent merely because they amount to over $50 billion a year. Secretary McNamara has given us the most efficient operation of the Defense Department that our Nation has ever known, yet, because of the economies he is effecting, he is under attack from many directions. No man has the right to claim that additional defense economies are possible unless he is willing to spell out exactly where and how they can be made. We welcome the advice and help of all our citizens in assuring the most frugal conduct of the Nation's business, but we reject the counsel of those who would sacrifice major national interests and even endanger our national security, merely because our economy has not operated near enough to capacity to produce the needed revenues.

In a further effort to minimize the effect of tax reduction on the budget, its impact has been spread over 3 fiscal years. This does not mean, however, that we have to wait 3 years to feel the economic impact of tax reduction. Quite the contrary. The President's tax program would release a very large amount of money throughout the economy in a very short period of time. If the tax program, for example, became effective in October, then within 9 months the economy would benefit from roughly $6 billion in tax relief, and within 15 months the entire $10 billion reduction would be in effect.

The President's tax program offers strong encouragement to both consumption and investment, to every income group and to every sector of our economy. It meets the need for prompt and effective action to lower rates, to foster incentives and effort, at the same time that it meets the need to keep the budgetary deficit within a tolerable limit. It offers our private economy the freedom it needs to draw upon its own inherent resources for growth, to create the job opportunities we will need in the years ahead, and to provide the revenues necessary to preserve our national security and answer our critical national needs.

It is a program designed to meet our needs today, and to lay the foundation for a better tomorrow. It responds to the challenge of our time in a responsible manner. Some of us may disagree with parts of the program, and with the details of the separate provisions, but all of us will recognize that effective action is vital if we are to meet today's economic realities. I am sure the bill that will come out of the Ways and Means Committee will provide that action, and I am sure that the overwhelming majority of our people will support it wholeheartedly.

Agate Springs Fossil Quarries, Sioux County, Nebr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I wish to insert a statement in the Record in connection with a bill I have introduced today, as a companion bill to one being introduced in the Senate by Senator Roman L. Hruska, of Nebraska, to preserve and designate the Agate Springs Fossil Quarries, located in Sioux County, Nebr., as a national monument in the National Park Service System.

These unique fossil beds are known around the world, and this fame rests principally on the wealth of geologic information and paleontologic information gained from them since their discovery. This may well be the world's largest deposit of prehistoric animal remains, and it is estimated that only about 25 percent have been explored after some 60 years of digging by scientists.

The superintendent of nearby Scottsbluff National Monument estimates that his site now has 96,000 visitors a year and that the Agate Monument could conceivably attract 50,000 per year. The proposed project would include almost 3,000 acres of land, construction of a visitor's center, an Indian artifacts museum, and development of a museum at the fossil quarries. Three stories could be told at the site: First, paleontology of of the area dating back 21 million years; second, pioneer ranching; and third, the Indian experiences of Capt. James Cook—Government Indian scout, cattleman, author, and amateur bone collector, who purchased Agate Springs in 1887. It was Captain Cook who earlier discovered the first fossil material in an area now recognized to be one of the world's richest finds.

The Regional Director of the National Park Service, Omaha, Nebr., is now preparing a final report of the Advisory Board of National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings and Monuments, and both Federal and State officials feel that these fossil beds should be preserved for research and future generations. The area could be developed into a prime tourist attraction in addition to neighboring Scottsbluff National Monument, Chimney Rock, the Black Hills, and so forth.

As presently proposed, the cost of the project would run an estimated $1,750,000—including the acquisition of the land, construction of a visitor center, an Indian artifacts museum, development of a museum at the quarries, and the paving of roads to the fossil sites.

I believe this is a worthwhile project, and I feel it is our duty to protect these fossil quarries for additional research and posterity.

Seventy-fifth Anniversary of the Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, on May 7 and 8, the Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station at New Haven marks the 75th anniversary of work in two important fields of science that have contributed greatly to this Nation's eminence in farm technology and its steadily advancing standards of living. The areas of scientific work to be commemorated are botany and plant pathology.

Scientists from numerous States, Canada, Great Britain, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture have gathered at New Haven to present papers and take part in discussions on topics such as the history of plant pathology, biochemical resistance, and plant chemotherapy.

They were welcomed on May 7 by Director James G. Horsfall, himself an internationally recognized plant pathologist.

I am pleased to represent the district which includes this pioneer station. Its accomplishments are legion, and I would like to take this opportunity to mention briefly a few of its many notable achievements.

The Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station is the oldest such station in the United States. Since 1875, its business has been and continues to be the scientific investigation of agriculture's problems and related ones. Its product has been and continues to be discovery in the biological sciences.

The Connecticut station's first director was Dr. Samuel W. Johnson. He fathered the idea on which the American experiment station movement was founded and succeeded. This was "that an experiment station should be near to but not a part of an academy." Johnson had a unique combination of scholarship, ability as a writer and speaker, and missionary zeal for the principle that knowledge needs to be sought before it can be taught. He was one of the active leaders in bringing about establishment of the State agricultural experiment stations under the Federal Hatch Act of 1887, 13 years after Connecticut's "first station in the Nation" was founded.

In 1868, he published "How Crops Grow," a book described at the time of his death in 1909 as more widely read and studied than any other work on agricultural chemistry ever issued. It was translated into German, Russian, Swedish, and Italian, and used as a textbook in those languages. It was followed in 1870 by a second book, "How Crops Feed."

It was, therefore, a fitting tribute when the Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station on March 29 announced a series of annual lectures named for its first director, Samuel W. Johnson. The first lecture in the series will be given by an internationally known speaker as the principal address at the annual "Science at Work" meeting, to be held at Lockwood Farm, Mount Carmel, on Wednesday, August 14.

A leaflet issued last year, "The Connecticut Station Story," tells of outstanding accomplishments at the station during its first 75 years. Among them was the corn seed production technique first used by Donald F. Jones in 1917. He invented the four-way cross that made hybrid corn practical. Protein investigations by Thomas B. Osborne led to the discovery of the significance of amino acids in the diet. The Morgan universal extractant, simulating the action of plant roots in removing minerals from the soil solution, made possible the widely used Morgan method for quick-testing soils. The zineb fungicides had their origin in research at the Connecticut station, and organic fungicides generally are originally tested by methods or modifications of methods the station developed. Station research made the tobacco shade tent practical in 1900, thereby creating a new agricultural industry in the Connecticut Valley.

In his report to Gov. John N. Dempsey in 1961, Director James G. Horsfall most ably defined the purpose and nature of the work done by the Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station—and by those established subsequently in all the other States—in the following words:

> This station was established as a unique venture of government in 1875. It was to discover knowledge and put it to work. The station is unique today among agencies of government whose reports are included in this digest.
>
> It is true that the statutes assign to the station specific duties, duties that in themselves have little to do with scientific investigations. In this respect the station is like other departments of State government. The station has been given these assignments, however, because they call for the skills and knowledge the station has in putting science to work.
>
> The general mandate, however, the responsibility for science, does not involve execution of manmade laws. It asks rather for discovery of natural laws and meanings of laws, and for information on their application now and in the future. We do not know why these laws came into being, or where, or when, and we are unlikely to find answers to these questions. We do know that natural laws cannot be evaded or repealed. Through organized research, men have made a bold beginning at the gigantic task of understanding how some of these laws work and how the knowledge gained can be used.

I congratulate the station on the occasion of its 75th anniversary, and I am sure that my colleagues in this House will join me in thanking the station and its most able director for its outstanding record of accomplishment and scientific contribution.

Tribute on 50th Anniversary of Southern California Flower Growers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, beautiful, fresh cut flowers decorated the tables at the annual joint dinner of the California State Society and of the California representatives to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce meeting, which was held at the International Inn April 30, 1963. These special touches of living color, which remind so many of us of our native California, were contributed this year, as they have been for the past decade, by the Southern California Flower Growers, Inc., of Los Angeles.

The members of this association are Americans of Japanese ancestry, many of whom served with honor in the Armed Forces of our country during World War II and in Korea. They contribute fresh cut flowers for table decorations and corsages for the ladies every year to remind us that those of Japanese ancestry in this country, as those of similar ancestry in their native Japan, are specialists in the art of growing flowers and in imparting a sense of beauty to the contemporary scene. Moreover, they and their parents before them have contributed much to the development of flower growing as one of California's major industries.

The Japanese flower growers in southern California, some 36 in number, first organized their flower market at Fourth and Los Angeles Streets in Los Angeles in 1913. Their first market space comprised 20 by 60 feet.

This year they celebrate their 50th year of continuous service, except for the war years when persons of Japanese ancestry were evacuated from their west coast homes and associations, by dedicating in September the largest flower market in the United States where producers can gather and sell their products. It will be the only flower market in the Nation built solely for the floral industry. It will be on the spot where for the past 40 years the flower market has flourished—in the center of the wholesale flower district.

This three-story concrete building, which will have a floor area of some 190,000 square feet, costing more than $2 million, and completely air conditioned, will be a living memorial to the American sense of living beauty as expressed in natural flowers and a tribute to the Japanese-Americans who have contributed so much to the development of California and to the flower industry.

Initially grossing only $5 a day, in the past half-century the flower market has grown to the point where it now grosses more than $25 million per year. From some 36 growers in 1913, it grew to accommodate 124 growers in a single year, when the market was incorporated and moved to Fourth and Wall Streets in 1914. In 10 years, by 1923, the market had expanded to serve some 159 members and the market moved to its present location, at 755 Wall Street, in the heart of Los Angeles' wholesale flower market district.

After World War II, when Japanese-Americans were allowed to return to their former homes in California and elsewhere on the west coast, only about a hundred of its former members returned to the flower market. Others returned but did not go back into the flower business because their former properties were no longer available to them, because of their inability to purchase needed land, because of their failure to find qualified help. These moved into other fields, some more lucrative or more appropriate to their talents than horticulture.

In any event, today the flower market services some 100 members, who have nurseries in an area extending from just south of San Francisco to San Diego County. These members produce approximately 65 percent of all the flowers sold in southern California. These 100 members, incidentally, now produce with modern and improved technology and mechanization more than the 159 members produced just prior to World War II.

The cut flower and ornamental plants industry of California, whose products are shipped not only to all parts of the United States but to many other countries of the free world is now an $85 million a year operation. There has been a steady growth in production over the years, although the number of producers has decreased. The industry has seen the transition from the family-type nurseries to modern corporations, complete with staffs for research, production, and sales. The so-called small producers today tend to grow the miscellaneous products, with their great and endless variety, while the large producers tend to specialize in the regular sales items, such as stocks, roses, gladiolus, and carnations. As with other American industries, the marginal growers have been dropping out and the industry faces new challenges from plastic flowers and flower substitutes. But the California industry continues to believe that one can say it better with flowers.

In any event, the growth and expansion of the southern California flower growers and its market have paralleled the remarkable and spectacular growth and expansion of all of California, and especially the Los Angeles area.

The development of the market is a commentary on the dedication and conscientious effort of its officers and members over the years not only in trying to grow the most beautiful flowers in the world most efficiently but also in cooperative effort to better serve the flower-buying public at both the wholesale and retail levels. Their success story is another example of combining industry with integrity in the finest tradition of the American frontier.

The present officers of the flower market are Gongoro Endo, president; Kazuo Minami, vice president; George Kobata, secretary; Tom Endow, treasurer; and Frank Kuwahara, general manager.

So, as this unique group of Californians celebrate their 50th anniversary of service to its members and the people of the State and Nation, I know that Members will join with me in congratulating them on their success and achievements in the past half century and express the hope that the next 50 years will see them enjoy continued growth and prosperity.

Law Day Address by the Honorable Harry F. Byrd, of Virginia, University of Virginia, May 3, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. SMITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a scholarly and eloquent address delivered by the senior Senator from Virginia, the Honorable HARRY F. BYRD, at the University of Virginia on Law Day, May 3, in which he discusses the basic and fundamental principles upon which our Government is founded.

The discussion is so thorough and so unanswerable that it is a document that should be read and studied by every Member of Congress who believes in adherence to the constitutional principles upon which our Nation is founded.

Senator BYRD's long experience in government; first as a leader in the State Senate of Virginia, next as Governor of Virginia, and for the past 30 years in the U.S. Senate and presently chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, should command the respect and attention of every thoughtful American.

The address follows:

SPEECH DELIVERED BY SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD, DEMOCRAT OF VIRGINIA, AS LAW DAY DOHERTY LECTURE, UNIVERSITY, AT CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA., FRIDAY, MAY 3

It is a high privilege and a great honor to deliver the Doherty lecture on the occasion of Law Day at the University of Virginia Law School. I am deeply grateful for the courtesy of your invitation.

As State senator, as Governor, and as a Member of the U.S. Senate I have been interested in the development of the system of education in Virginia for more than 40 years, and the University of Virginia Law School has always been a source of great pride. It is recognized as one of the best, and worthy of the traditions of Jefferson.

Mixed with the pleasure of being back at the university there is a note of regret in the fact that Dean F. D. G. Ribble is retiring. He has been associated with the law school as student, professor and dean, almost constantly for some 40 years.

He has been dean and acting dean since 1937. He is a friend of long standing. I respect him as do the students who have had the privilege of his tutelage. I am pleased to be among his host of friends who salute him this evening.

What does one say—on Law Day at the University of Virginia—to so many old and cherished friends like Dean Ribble; and to so many newer friends, like Dr. Edgar F. Shannon, president of this great university, who has already distinguished himself in his service here?

I am not a lawyer, but my father was; and he was a graduate of the University of Virginia Law School. He was always a great admirer of Thomas Jefferson, the founder of the University of Virginia, and he never failed to let me know it.

It was from my father that I first learned the sources of sovereign power, the reasons to respect the law under which we govern ourselves, and the principles of our system which Jefferson stated so clearly.

Jefferson sent the model of Virginia's Capitol Building from France. And under Jefferson's dome at the Capitol in Richmond I spent some of the most rewarding years of my life in the service of our great Commonwealth.

It is natural on this occasion that my thoughts turn to Jefferson; and thinking of him, I am reminded of his great and continuing concern about the division of powers in government which he regarded as fundamental to our system.

Largely at his insistence government in this Nation was federally centralized to protect our freedom from foreign aggression, and decentralized in the States for preservation of our individual liberties and freedom of action at home.

This division of power was fundamental to our system of government in the beginning, and it is fundamental now. And throughout our national existence it has remained all-important, but always difficult to keep secure.

As early as 1825, the year before he died, Jefferson, in a letter to William B. Giles, found reason to think his concern over centralization of power in the Federal Government had been justified.

With the development of communication, increase in population, industrialization, and so forth, there is an inevitable tendency toward centralization. If we are to maintain the source of national strength at home which is inherent in decentralized government, there is need for constant vigilance.

It is in the interest of vigilance against excessive centralization of power in the Federal Government that I am speaking this evening. The subject assigned to me is: Massive Federal Spending and Concentration of National Power. And, as we have learned from experience, massive Federal spending and centralization of power feed on each other.

It is time, I think, to examine the extent to which our fundamental principles have been eroded, and the need to reverse the trend by recurrence to them.

On this subject my thoughts are directed to the fundamentals involved. It is natural that I should draw on the experience of my lifetime, and my own knowledge of local, State, and Federal Government. It is not my intention to implicate any Federal administration more than any other, or to be partisan in any degree.

When I am asked what kind of Democrat I am, I reply that I am a Jeffersonian Democrat. I wear that label with pride because I think it marks me as one who fights for the fundamentals on which the finest system of government in history was built. I fight for these fundamentals because I believe in them.

I believe sound progress is the primary purpose in every man's life. Sound progress is the source of strength. But progress is not sound unless it is based on sound financing; this is another application of the checks and balances which have been so useful in our Government and way of life.

I believe in the basic principles of our governmental system which, by written constitution, contemplated State sovereignty, local autonomy, and Federal Government. Three coordinate branches of Government were contemplated at each level. The effort was to avoid encroachment as among the levels, and among the branches. I believe enterprise and strength is stimulated by such a system. It must be preserved and defended wherever it is attacked.

I believe it is the sound productivity and strength developed under this concept that have brought us to world power in relatively few generations. Historically, lives of nations are measured in hundreds of years. I want the life of this Nation to be the longest and the best.

I believe our people generally want our system perpetuated and strengthened. Basically the requirements are: simple honesty and individual initiative, a self-reliance and willing work, constructive production and free competition, and progressive development and sound financing.

Our position as a free world leader, as well as our domestic welfare, depend upon the preservation of the basic sources of strength in our system. It has been our strength, almost alone, which for 15 years has held back the iron curtain around the world.

This country is abundantly blessed with the elements of national strength. We have geographical location, climate, size, resources, population, and form of government designed for freedom and initiative in productive enterprise.

We are leaders in a new era of atomic energy, rockets, and space. Our productive know-how and capacity are unsurpassed. We have the basic requirements for sound progress, economic, social, and in international relations.

I believe with responsible citizenship, with good government, and with fiscal soundness there would be no fear for the future.

But without responsible citizenship, good government, and fiscal soundness there will be neither solid progress nor security with military preparedness. These are the alternatives we face in this Nation today. We are capable of meeting these requirements, but this is not achieved without discipline.

The greatness of this Nation is without parallel. Our capacity for constructive leadership in the world is immeasurable. But I have a feeling of anxiety, and I suspect most of you know it too. Our Government is being challenged from abroad and undermined at home. The Nation is showing signs of weakness when it should be strongest.

We seem to be running deficits everywhere. Take four of them as examples:

First, there is the United Nations deficit. U.N. peace operations in the Congo and the Near East this year are financed entirely from bond issue proceeds, and whether this indebtedness will ever be repaid remains to be seen. All U.N. arrearages on December 31, 1962, totaled $121.6 million.

Second, there is the NATO deficit. Of all 15 NATO nations, only the United States and Canada have met NATO "goals" qualitatively and quantitatively with respect to furnishing troops.

Third, there is the balance-of-payments deficit. We spent $2.2 billion more in foreign countries in calendar year 1962 than we took in from transactions abroad. Our money went out in foreign aid, maintenance of troops around the world, migration of U.S. business, tourist expenditures, purchase of imports, etc. We have run deficits in these accounts for 12 of the past 13 years. This has resulted in the loss of two-thirds of our free gold. Gold backs the dollar.

Fourth, there is the domestic budget deficit. Federal economists are confusing the public by talking in terms of three budgets; there is a deficit in each of them. The deficit in the regular budget is estimated at $8.8 billion this year and $11.9 billion next year—a 2-year deficit of $20.7 billion—and this would be the highest 2-year deficit combination in peace-time history.

In short, we are surrounded by deficits. And with them we have: debt and inflation; we have balance-of-payments trouble; we have dwindling gold reserves; and we have Communists within 90 miles of our shore.

With respect to the domestic budget deficit, there has been reason before now to think we were on a permanent deficit financing basis; now it is proposed to enter an era of planned deficits.

Planned deficits are contemplated under the pending proposal to increase spending and reduce taxes at the same time. The Secretary of the Treasury testified recently that the current tax cut recommendations would create deficits until fiscal year 1966 or 1967.

He said this week that revising the deficit estimate for the coming fiscal year from $12 billion down to $11 billion provided more reason for cutting taxes. He was saying 3 months ago that the tax cut was necessary to prevent depression. Now he is saying taxes should be cut because business is booming.

But any way he slices his reasoning, he still plans deficits for years in the future, and Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Stanley Surrey said it is not possible to cut expenditures.

Our strength is being sapped by paternalism of Federal bureaucracy grown too big; usurpation of power by the Federal Supreme Court grown too mighty; and force of pressure groups grown too arrogant. They are undermining our system, changing our attitudes, and hobbling our will for freedom.

Hope for the future built on confidence is the stimulating force for sound progress. But confidence is not stimulated by expanding Federal paternalism, or Federal usurpation of authority and power, or excessive Federal spending; and we are experiencing all three.

In my judgment lack of confidence in Federal policies, and the fiscal position of the Central Government are a real and serious drag on our progress in all respects. There is a deadening lack of confidence arising from Federal attitudes with respect to huge deficits in our balance of international payments; integrity of the dollar, and loss in our gold reserves; usurpation of power by Federal agencies and courts, with dangerous centralization of authority; lack of a square deal between business and labor; and deficit financing for nonessential Federal expenditures.

The Federal Government's record on these matters does not stimulate confidence. New and enlightened Federal policies, with disciplined positions, are needed with respect to each item I have listed, and with respect to the combination.

For 17 years, since World War II, the United States has been banker, policeman and Santa Claus for the free world. We have spent more than $100 billion in foreign aid, including some $4.5 billion which went to Iron Curtain countries, and foreign aid has contributed to our deficit in foreign transactions.

Promises to eliminate the international payments deficits have not been fulfilled to date; these deficits are continuing despite our generally favorable balance in foreign commercial trade.

Confidence would be stimulated by elimination of nonessential foreign aid in a complete reorganization of the program. This would be a good place to start more effective discipline over all Federal expenditures abroad in the effort to balance our income from foreign countries with our expenditures in them.

The law does not require it, but for years we have given foreign governments and their central banks the option of taking payments for these overseas deficits in dollars, or in gold at the statutory rate of $35 an ounce.

They take gold instead of dollars if their confidence in our money is impaired. They are aware of our domestic deficits, our increasing Federal debt, and the decline in the value of our dollar. They have taken two-thirds of our free gold since 1949.

Gold backs our money and some $12 billion in gold is required for this purpose. We had more than $24 billion in gold in 1949. Now we have less than $16 billion. We are within $4 billion of the amount required to back the dollar, and the gold is still going out.

I regard this as our most serious fiscal and monetary problem. If the time comes when we cannot offer dollars-or-gold convertibility in our foreign transactions, we shall be faced with a catastrophic situation.

It would be dangerous to remove gold as the base for the dollar or renege on the gold-or-dollar option in foreign settlements while the dollar is under the fire of chronic domestic deficits and declining value.

Either or both of these courses would be regarded around the world as a sign of weakness; and other free world currencies tied to the dollar would be jeopardized as well as our own. It is imperative that we stop the drain on our gold. This will not be done without return to sound fiscal principles in the Federal Government.

Meanwhile, the value of the dollar at home is steadily going down. As compared with dollars worth 100 cents in 1939, American dollars were worth 47.3 cents each in March 1960, they were worth 46.6 cents in March 1961, they were worth 46.1 cents in March 1962, and they were worth 45.6 cents in March of this year.

Confidence does not rise with falling gold reserves, or with declining purchasing power of the dollar. The drop in both must be stopped in the interest of restoring confidence among our people at home and among free world governments abroad.

This requires removal of the fear of inflation; and neither domestic nor foreign fears of inflation in this country will be removed so long as the Federal Government continues to embrace huge and nonessential deficit financing. Talk of more inflation is increasing at this time.

Fear of inflation forever lurks in a continuing deficit situation. Bernard Baruch, one of this Nation's wisest counselors and most respected financiers, has testified before the Senate Finance Committee that deficit spending is always to be feared as a dangerous contributor to inflation.

The Federal Government of the United States has been on a deficit financing basis in 27 of the last 33 years, and the value of the dollar has dropped 54.4 cents since 1939. And there is no sign of relief from deficits in the future. On the contrary, they are being planned for years to come.

It is easy to blame war and military costs for this record of deficits, and the tremendous $305 billion debt piled up in their wake. But the combined duration of World War II and the Korean war was about 8 years. There have been 20 deficits in the other 25 years.

In the 10 years since the end of the Korean war we have had seven deficits; the Federal debt has gone up nearly $40 billion, and the annual cost of the Federal Government has been increased by approximately $20 billion, or more than 25 percent.

And within these past 10 years we experienced the greatest peacetime deficit in history. This occurred in 1959, when the deficit reached $12.4 billion. Unfortunately, it appears that this record may not stand unbroken much longer.

Government economists are now telling us that a balanced budget would lead to increased unemployment and general economic decline. They say this would happen whether we reduced Federal expenditures to meet tax collections, or increased taxes to meet expenditures.

The same Government economists say balancing the budget is still a goal, but to balance it any time soon would make us poor because there would be no Federal deficit to make us rich. And to make us richer faster, they think the Government should create bigger deficits by spending more and cutting taxes at the same time.

These ideas don't sound like men looking for new frontiers. They sound like Rip Van Winkle. These economists must have been taking a long nap. If their theory were valid, we have already had enough deficits to make us all rich and employed before now.

The hard fact is that of the $20 billion increase in the cost of the Federal Government since the end of the Korean war in 1953, $17 billion has been for strictly domestic-civilian programs, projects, and purposes, and interest.

This $17 billion increase excludes the cost of military functions, foreign aid and trust fund programs such as those for social security, highways and Federal National Mortgage Association. Federal spending for domestic-civilian purposes and interest in the coming year is estimated at $38.4 billion.

In this country we achieved our liberty, our freedoms, and our greatness by adherence to fundamental principles. They are still the wellspring of our strength; but we are allowing departures from them to accumulate.

All around us there are signs indicating the need for recurrence to our national doctrines as they were laid down in the wisdom of our Founding Fathers. It is becoming urgent that we should take heed.

Thomas Jefferson, in an 1816 letter to Samuel Kerchival, said: "A departure from principle in one instance becomes a precedent for a second; the second for the third; and so on til the bulk of society is reduced to misery without sensibilities, except for sin and suffering.

"The forehorse of this frightful situation," Jefferson said, "is public debt, and in its train there is wretchedness and oppression."

Here at the University of Virginia, almost in sight of Monticello, and not far from Mount Vernon, I think you will agree that Jefferson and Washington were the greatest men this Nation has produced. Jefferson formulated our purposes and our system of government; and Washington put them into operation.

No Nation ever had higher purposes; and no better system of government has ever been devised. It is not a pure democracy; but it is a brilliant and practical approach to it. Its underlying principles must not be chipped away.

They represent fundamentals conceived in revolution against oppression and autocratic power exercised by a remote central government. I cannot imagine that the people of this country want them abandoned.

Our forefathers were willing to fight and die for our national objectives which were liberty, the conditions of freedom, and a system of government designed forever to guarantee these blessings for our people.

We know from the experience of our history that this guarantee requires division of authority in a manner to avoid the evils of centralized power within the Nation, and to utilize the strength of national power outside, in our foreign relations.

Minimum central government for purposes at home, and use of Federal power abroad have been keys to our great domestic progress and the development of our prestige in world affairs. This country was founded on the principle that we were to be a union of sovereign States, federalized for specified purposes.

The purposes of the Federal Government are clearly stated in the national Constitution which the States adopted. And under the Bill of Rights, powers not specified as Federal are retained by the States and the people.

This is in accordance with the wise counsel of Jefferson. As Minister Plenipotentiary to France, he saw at firsthand the reactionary oppression of concentrated power in the nations of Europe.

From Paris he wrote home urging us to "make the States one as to everything connected with foreign relations, and keep them the several States as to everything purely domestic."

Fundamentally, the principles underlying our system hold that people in their local environment are entitled to maximum freedom in the pursuit of happiness with minimum subordination to central authority.

No American has ever been more constructively liberal than Thomas Jefferson, and no one has been more eager for sound progress in furthering the general welfare of the people and the Nation.

But his was a sound liberalism, developed from a conservative base: strong Federal, State and local government in their respective areas, sound financing, republican form of government, informed electorate, et cetera.

These are not deterrents to progress. They contemplate growth in the Nation's size, resources and population. They are capable of providing the freedom necessary for varied approach to worthy objectives.

One of the great fundamentals of our system was the freedom for individual initiative through which our people could start at the bottom and raise themselves to the top unrestricted by stifling paternalism.

Another was its promotion of the competitive enterprise system under which the Nation grew great in sound progress and free competition at the marketplace. This is impossible in a bureaucratic straitjacket.

We are founded on the capitalism of competitive enterprise. Under our form of government this provides the means for our pursuit of liberty, freedom, and independence. How else could we achieve material prosperity with cultural accomplishment?

We do not necessarily defend the status quo; neither do we assume that change is necessarily progress. Basically, I think we wish to solve our problems by methods conforming to our fundamental principles.

There can be no doubt that this Nation was founded in a deeply rooted mistrust of central government. Paternalistic government undermines our principles, limits our freedom, deprives us of the fruits of our labor, and curbs our initiative.

The evils and potential evils of centralized government were clearly seen by both Jefferson and Washington; and Jefferson in particular, warned against them throughout most of his adult lifetime.

He expressed concern over the possibilities of excessive centralization in a letter to Giddeon Granger in August 1800. Twenty-one years later, in his autobiography (1821) Jefferson was still cautioning against centralized government in the United States, and he left this statement for our guidance:

"It is not by consolidation, or concentration of powers, but by their distribution that good government is effected."

It is appropriate to recall these views of Thomas Jefferson on this occasion. It is even more appropriate to recall his views with respect to the Federal judiciary. His apprehensions over the Federal judiciary were second only to his fear generally of centralizing too much power in the Federal Government. And these fears were related.

Let me quote what he said in this respect. In 1823, he told William Johnson that:

"There is no danger I apprehend so much as the consolidation of our Government by the noiseless and, therefore, unalarming instrumentality of the Supreme Court."

Washington also warned us against usurpation of power which he said was the "customary weapon by which free nations are destroyed." And then the First President went one step further when he said our Government "* * * will become despotic only when the people have been so corrupted as to need despotic government, being incapable of any other."

Times and circumstances change, but principles do not. We have abused our freedoms, our form of government, and our system of competitive enterprise which are our national heritage. Under the Constitution, as it was written, ours is still a government originating in the sovereignty of the States.

It is one thing to be free from foreign domination. It is another thing to be free among ourselves, free from domination by a remote central government of our own creation. We will fight foreign aggression without question; but we take our freedoms at home for granted.

Washington is as far from Honolulu as it is from Moscow. Centralize in Washington the power, the Government, and the authority over a Nation so vast in size, and so diversified in interests as ours, and you impair the wisdom of enlightened government and invite destruction of our cherished freedoms.

This is what is happening. We are changing our system of government; not by amendment to the Constitution as provided in our basic law, but by means more subtle which are equally as effective. They are in the form of all kinds of so-called Federal aids, subsidies, decrees, and other tools of power and force.

We are being enticed into centralization by Federal paternalism, forced into centralization by Federal usurpation of power, and driven to centralization under the burden of public debt. I wish it could be said that this trend is abating. It is not. It is continuing with increasing boldness.

Test these tendencies of today, and we find them in violation of our fundamental principles; they lack practical and frugal approach; they are unproductive of sound progress; and they erode our character and confidence.

Consider two of the proposals sent by the President to Congress for consideration during the past year. Under one he could spend public funds without appropriation. Under the other he could cut taxes by executive order. No other President in our history ever asked for such Executive power.

Both proposals would undermine the Constitution which prohibits expenditures except in "consequence of appropriations made by law" and fixes the taxing power of the Government in the legislative branch. Fortunately, Congress had the courage to reject both proposals. But they will be made again.

The very fact that they were so openly made disturbs the confidence of people who would adhere to fundamental principles and believe that concentration of spending and taxing powers in the hands of one man would do violence to the foundation of our system of government.

Consider the Executive crackdown on the steel industry last spring. In that case the Central Government made unprecedented use of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Federal grand jury, and the threat to withdraw and withhold Federal contracts from companies which dared not to conform.

Consider the increasing dominance by the Federal executive branch together with the everwidening usurpation of power, in a continuing line of decisions, by the Federal Supreme Court. Now it is undertaking to dictate and influence formation of political districts within States from which members of State legislatures are elected.

Nothing is further outside of Federal jurisdiction. Gerrymander by the Federal judiciary is something new and dangerous in our form of government. It could be used to destroy the effectiveness of our two-party system, as well as the fundamental safeguards of dual governments under the Constitution.

Consider the fact that the Government of the United States has asked a Federal court to enjoin the State of Virginia from spending its own money in support of all public schools in the Commonwealth for both white children and Negroes, unless one county in the State submits to Federal demands.

The Attorney General of the United States on April 26, 1961, filed a petition in the Federal District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond, asking for Federal injunction to restrain the State of Virginia from: "* * * approving, paying, or issuing warrants for the payment of any funds of the State for the maintenance or operation of public schools anywhere in Virginia for so long and during such period as the public schools of Prince Edward County are closed and a system of public free schools is not maintained within the county."

The Prince Edward school case is still in the Federal courts; but the fact remains that public schools are still operating in Virginia, and the State's money appropriated for this purpose is still being used. But such intemperate Federal action cannot be taken lightly.

It is true that this move for Federal injunctive control over public schools in Virginia involves the Federal effort to force integration of school children, but I would remind citizens in all States that their own school interests also are in jeopardy if such a precedent were set.

In the area of public education, consider the fact that the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on Monday, April 29, started hearings on Senate bill 580 which sets forth 24 Federal programs for higher education as well as public education at the lower levels, each with Federal standards to be complied with.

This is an authorization bill; and if it is passed it would be practically useless without subsequent appropriations which would be made in other bills. And provisions in this bill could not control restrictive amendments which might be added to the appropriation bills over the years to come.

Such amendments might reach to matters like textbooks, curricula, teachers' salaries, and so forth. Federal subsidy money could be limited to States with teacher merit systems, or vice versa, or to States with a single pay scale for members of the teaching profession, or vice versa, and so on.

When Federal funds are involved, in the form of subsidies, grants or otherwise, Federal control is inherent. It may be through Federal court injunctions, in substantive legislation, through appropriation bill riders, through Executive orders, or otherwise; but it will be there.

Consider Executive Order 11063 of November 20, 1962, in which the President decreed racial integration in all Federal and federally assisted housing programs. I commend the Virginia Law Weekly, published here at the university, for its editorial of last December 6, entitled "A Regrettable Order."

Consider Executive Order 10925 of March 6, 1961, which, with respect to Federal contracts, in part says: "* * * All Government contracting agencies shall include in every Government contract hereafter entered into the following provisions: in connection with performance of work under this contract the contractor agrees as follows: (1) the contractor will not discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, creed, color or national origin * * *."

Here again, it is true that the two examples I have cited involve integration. But consider the increasing Federal requirement that so-called Davis-Bacon wage rates be applied for construction in which Federal subsidy money is used—examples are schools, hospitals, highways, and so forth.

Davis-Bacon wage rates, as applied by the Federal Government, almost without exception are metropolitan rates. To apply them elsewhere means spending more money for fewer classrooms, fewer hospital beds, fewer miles of highway, and so on. Nonessential expenditures are made mandatory, and local wage schedules are drastically disturbed.

Farmers who participate in the Federal agricultural price support program are subjected to Federal restrictions on their crops. The restrictions are in the form of quotas, acreage allotment or production control, and so forth. There are Federal standards, restrictions or controls, or the combination, in all of these subsidy programs.

Make no mistake; the Federal Government does not become party to expensive projects and programs involving expenditure of so-called Federal funds without, at some time or another, assuming its share, and usually more than its share, of control.

I often wonder whether people, institutions, localities and States, when they apply for these Federal subsidies, stop to realize that the principal source of the Central Government's income is its taxes and other levies on all of us.

It collects the taxes, deducts a high administrative cost, and, in the case of these subsidies, it passes the money back with strings attached; and generally it requires States to match the so-called Federal payments.

I wonder how much people, institutions, localities and States, think about the fact that when they ask for Federal subsidies, they are asking the Federal Government to limit their freedom of action for which the Nation was founded.

Every Federal payment takes its toll in centralized restraint and control. If, as the administration says, the rate of progress in this country has been slowed down in recent years, the cause is too much centralization, not a lack of Government programs.

Thirty years ago when I went to the Senate there was only a handful of programs for grants to States and localities, including those for highways and land-grant colleges. Federal expenditures through these programs at that time totaled about $100 million.

Now Federal payments in the form of grants are going out to States and localities through 60-odd programs, and Federal expenditures for this purpose are totaling $8 billion a year. In addition, there are some 50 programs for payments and grants to individuals totaling $2.5 billion.

Add to these the Federal civilian and military payrolls, and other recipients of Federal largesse, and we find more than 50 million people receiving Federal payments each year totaling more than $50 billion. These recipients, with their families, could total half our population.

In addition, millions of people are benefiting from Federal insurance programs covering housing mortgages and so on. And wherever a mortgage is insured, so is a bank. Think of the businesses benefiting from junk mail which the Government delivers through the Post Office which operates at a loss.

The fact is that we find Federal subsidies flowing to business, industry, private finance, agriculture, transportation, power, housing, health, education, States, localities, private and public institutions, and individuals. Name an area of endeavor, and the chances are there is a Federal subsidy program to go with it.

We know that we cannot suddenly rip all of these Federal programs out of our way of living. Some of them, such as some aspects of the veterans' programs, Federal payrolls, and retirement, and so forth, are legitimately within the Federal province. Others, such as social security and unemployment insurance, are in the nature of contributory trust funds.

But from experience we have learned that the more government is centralized, the more easily it is influenced by leaders of organized pressure groups. Political target areas, the source of authority, and the ruling officials are more centralized and therefore more susceptible to concentrated pressure.

Let me use a few more figures, just to fix in your memory the magnitude of what is going on in Federal domestic civilian programs.

Let me compare budget estimates for next fiscal year, beginning July 1, with actual figures for the year after the Korean war ended 10 years ago. Assuming the budget requests for the coming fiscal year 1964, as compared with actual expenditures in fiscal year 1954:

Federal payments for agriculture and agricultural resources would have more than doubled from $2.6 billion to $5.7 billion; Federal payments for commerce and transportation would have far more than doubled from $1.2 billion to $3.4 billion; Federal payments for health, labor, and welfare would have risen from $2.1 billion to $5.6 billion; and Federal payments for education would have gone from $326 million to $1.5 billion.

Since the first of January the President has recommended at least 12 new grant programs and for them he has asked for $200 million in the first year for expenditures simply to get them organized and ready for the big business which would come later.

I regard this steady increase in reliance on Central Government as evidence of weakness, not of strength. I regard it as departure from vigorous initiative and enterprise which have made us great. I regard it as a tendency toward state socialism which is not in the character of the American system.

I would be remiss on the occasion of Law Day at the university founded by Thomas Jefferson, if I did not say that judicial usurpation of power has reached a peak with the Warren Supreme Court. I dislike saying it, but the record of this Court is one of the principal reasons for my feeling of anxiety at this time, when the best of our strength is needed.

Its decisions have invaded homes, handicapped police protection, disregarded State sovereignty, interfered with the authority of the executive branch of the Federal Government, and usurped the powers of Congress.

Some of the best legal minds of the Nation are here this evening. You are familiar with the case documentation. I shall not burden you with the roll call, but it can be supplied.

For the purposes of this occasion, I shall rely on the chief justices of State supreme courts throughout the Nation. In their 1958 conference at Pasadena, they found reason to urge the Warren Court to restrain itself in the exercise of vast power. Recent decisions have not eased that anxiety.

The action was taken in a 38 to 6 adoption of a report based on the study and findings of 10 eminent jurists. The study was of recent decisions indicating general trends in the area of Federal-State relationships. I shall quote only two brief excerpts. The report said: "Second only to the increasing dominance of the National Government has been the development of the immense power of the Supreme Court in both State and National affairs. It is not merely the final arbiter of the law; it is the maker of policy in many social and economic fields."

And then the report said further: "It has long been the American boast that we have a government of laws and not of men. We believe that any study of recent decisions of the Supreme Court will raise at least considerable doubt as to the validity of that boast."

It seems to me that there can be no doubt that the Federal Supreme Court has been a participant in undermining our system of Government, contributing to centralization of power and authority; and thereby sapping our national strength. This makes us more vulnerable to destructive forces both at home and abroad.

But I do not want to leave the impression that more recent administrations and courts have been totally responsible for the dangerous degree of centralization we have reached. For instance, in consideration of the character and quality of the Supreme Court over recent decades, we cannot overlook the packing of the Court which was the issue of the 1930's.

This was about the time that the more recent trend toward centralization of power in the Federal Government started. And it was in 1932 that we Democrats held such high hopes for the strengthening of our system of government as a means of bringing us out of the depression. I shall never forget the 1932 Democratic platform.

I embraced it with great enthusiasm, and in the course of my efforts in its behalf, I became identified as a New Dealer. And to this day I am the most loyal of the original New Dealers in the Democratic Party. Let me quote a few passages from that 1932 New Deal platform to back me up:

"We believe that a party platform is a covenant with the people to be faithfully kept by the party when entrusted with power and the people are entitled to know in plain words the terms of the contract to which they are asked to subscribe."

Now I quote some of the plain words of that contract between the New Deal and the people who entrusted them with power.

"We advocate an immediate and drastic reduction of governmental expenditures by abolishing useless commissions and offices, consolidating departments and bureaus, and eliminating extravagance, to accomplish a saving of not less than 25 percent in the cost of the Government."

There we old New Dealers still stand, admittedly there is not much left to stand on; but then, there are not many of us left standing. Just let me quote again from what that platform said:

"We favor maintenance of the national credit by a Federal budget annually balanced and sound currency to be preserved at all hazards."

And to conclude the quotes from the original New Deal platform of 1932, it said we stood for "The removal of Government from all fields of private enterprise except where necessary to develop public works and natural resources in the common interest."

I cast the Virginia delegation's vote for nomination of Franklin D. Roosevelt on that platform. President Roosevelt and I took the oath of office on the same snowy day, March 4, 1933. My first vote in the Senate was on the bill advocated by Mr. Roosevelt "to preserve the credit of the U.S. Government."

It was enacted. It provided for a 15-percent cut in all appropriations. I thought that was a pretty good performance on a campaign promise to cut the budget 25 percent. You know what happened after 6 months of the Roosevelt administration. He reversed himself, went on an orgy of spending, and we have been centralizing authority in Washington ever since.

But here I stand this evening as a veteran of the original New Deal. I have experienced combat fatigue at times; I have taken some shell shock; and I am a battle-scarred veteran from fighting for the promised New Deal. But somehow I have survived, and I am still here defending fundamentals of our great system.

In summary, let me say that since the departure from the pledges of that platform, our system has been increasingly subjected to three subverting trends which must be stopped. These trends are (1) increasing centralization with fiscal deterioration; (2) increasing usurpation of power by the Federal judiciary; and (3) increasing influence of pressure group leaders over Federal authorities.

Reverse these, and I have no doubt about our strength to meet any foreseeable foreign or domestic challenge. It is up to all of us who believe in our system of government to fight for the kind of progress we know to be sound; the kind of progress that is built on the faith in the future that only a nation blessed with our fundamental freedoms can have. That is my purpose, and I am sure it is yours.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 9, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Luke 18: 1: *And He spake a parable unto them to this end, that men ought always to pray.*

Almighty God, Thou knowest how much we need wisdom and strength for our daily tasks and divine insight to lead us along ways which are frequently so very dark.

Grant that by entering the secret retreat of prayer we may find our worship and our work, our creed and conduct brought together in cordial agreement and kept in balance.

Inspire us to believe and understand more firmly and fully that, if we are to see our duties and responsibilities in their right perspective and perform them faithfully, then we must cultivate the prayer life more devoutly.

For Christ's sake we offer our petitions and dedicate our lives. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2842. An act to amend section 3238 of title 18, United States Code.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 5366. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. McGEE, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. CASE, Mr. ALLOTT, and Mr. COTTON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 138. An act to redesignate the Big Hole Battlefield National Monument, to revise the boundaries thereof, and for other purposes.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, this morning I appeared before the Judiciary Committee and urged the committee to hold further civil rights investigations and hearings in Birmingham and in other places around the country, both north and south. These hearings would provide an orderly forum for the consideration of civil rights transgressions and would provide the Congress with an excellent record on the need for vital legislation. How can the committee hold hearings here, when the best evidence is available right now in Birmingham?

The Birmingham blunder of police dogs, water pressure, and massive child jailing is almost sufficient proof that rational minds are not in control. These are the hallmarks of government by hate and hysteria.

There is a very urgent need for legislation, as well as Executive action. The peaceful march which was initiated in Birmingham by the Reverend Martin Luther King and his associates was a right of assembly guaranteed by the first amendment to the Constitution. In the famous case of the United States against Cruickshank, Chief Justice Waite declared:

> The right of the people peaceably to assemble for the purpose of petitioning Congress for a redress of grievances, or for anything else connected with the powers or the duties of the National Government, is an attribute of national citizenship, and, as such, under the protection of, and guaranteed by, the United States.

The committee and those petitioning the committee would be under the clear protection of the U.S. Government.

The use of cruel police methods to obstruct the right of peaceful assembly by the civil rights marchers provides full legal authority for Federal intervention. Under our doctrine of dual citizenship, both State and National, there are rights of national citizenship which must be protected and preserved.

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS: POLITICS—POWER

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, although the White House and various executive departments deny the awarding of Government contracts as a part of administration strategy to build political power and extend Government influence, the facts belie the denials.

We have only to cite several incidents to show that President Kennedy's administration has unashamedly used contract awards to get votes and to enforce Kennedy sponsored programs and philosophy.

All of us recall that last year when the President used the power of his high office to control steel prices, that the Defense Department directed that steel orders be shifted to mills which did not raise prices. The Secretary of Defense openly threatened Lockheed Aircraft with a loss of defense business if it refused a union's demand for a union shop and a strike resulted.

Candidate Kennedy stumped this country from one end to the other promising contract awards to States he considered depressed areas and unashamedly sought votes in West Virginia and Pennsylvania on the promise of Federal contracts.

The President's young brother was elected to the Senate on the basis of a platform that he could bring more Federal business to Massachusetts.

What will be the end result of the juggling of the 100,000 contracts awarded annually by the Federal Government? First, it is going to cost the people more in taxes because contract costs will rise; second, it will penalize honest businessmen who refuse to support the Kennedy approved candidates for Congress and the White House, and third, it will place the survival of industry in the hands of Federal bureaucrats who will dictate terms, labor policies, location of work performed, approved subcontractors—in short, private enterprise will be wrecked and another long step toward dictatorship in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, Congress must reassert its authority and insist that Government contracts be awarded on a competitive basis to companies offering the best products at the most reasonable prices. We must stop the current policy by which the White House exerts dictatorial power in contract awards.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY AND THE BIRMINGHAM, ALA., SITUATION

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I was amazed to read this morning that the President at his press conference yesterday suggested that the Federal Government has no legal power to act in respect of the shocking episodes of police brutality in Birmingham, Ala.

The President ought to start looking for new legal advice. The 1st and 14th amendments, which mean the right to petition and the right to speak freely, go hand in hand. There is a Federal power there, and by suggesting that the power does not exist, the President is losing his bargaining power. If the President wishes to solve this problem peacefully, which he should, he must hold his bargaining position. That bargaining position only exists because of the power of the Federal Government under the 1st and 14th amendments.

It is high time, it seems to me, that the administration stop trying to be all things to all people and should serve notice that the right to petition will not be subverted. The 1st and 14th amendments have some meaning, Mr. Speaker, and they should not be downgraded.

Mr. Speaker, last Saturday morning—5 days ago—I sent the following wire to the President:

> I respectfully urge you to take immediate action to stop the continued use of police brutality in Alabama against the legitimate goals of U.S. citizens. Negroes in our country have already waited too long for full citizenship. It is too late to counsel patience when police dogs are turned loose and human freedom and human dignity are being trampled in the streets.

Mr. Speaker, our country could well be headed for a national emergency on the subject of equal rights for Negroes. The President should not deny his powers in the face of it.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may have until midnight tonight to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

THE LATE MRS. NINA KAY GORE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply grieved to learn from the press this morning of the death of Mrs. Nina Kay Gore, widow of the late Senator Thomas Pryor Gore. Her illustrious husband was one of the two first Senators from the State of Oklahoma, and the first blind person ever to serve in the U.S. Senate.

Mrs. Gore was often referred to by the late Senator as "my eyes." Senator Gore was perhaps the most eloquent man ever to serve the State of Oklahoma in any capacity, and it was due in large measure to the great devotion of his wonderful wife for a period of more than half a century that he was able to serve with such distinction in the U.S. Senate for three terms. I knew the Senator and Mrs. Gore many years during their lifetime. I knew them as close, personal friends, and as political friends.

I extend to the children and the grandchildren of Mrs. Gore my deepest personal sympathy.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point an article on the late Senator Gore's widow.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 9, 1963]

SENATOR GORE'S WIDOW IS DEAD

(By Stephen C. Rogers)

Many women just stand behind their men, but Nina Kay Gore had to do more than that.

Her late husband was Senator Thomas Pryor Gore of Oklahoma, and he was America's first blind Senator. For more than 50 years, until his death in 1949, Mrs. Gore was his eyesight, his chief link with the printed page and the world around him.

Mrs. Gore died yesterday, at her home at 2311 Connecticut Avenue NW. She was 85.

Born on a ranch in eastern Texas, she met her husband at a political rally on her father's plantation.

He was 25 at the time and though blinded since childhood was already a rising star in local politics. The couple was married in 1898 and moved to Oklahoma 3 years later.

ACTED AS ADVISER

From the date of their marriage, Mrs. Gore not only "saw" for both of them but she was her husband's closest adviser.

Frequently referred to by her husband as "my eyes," she would read newspapers, books, and technical papers to him for as many as 10 hours a day. He had learned braille, but spurned it because of the limited amount of knowledge he felt it contained.

Once, while in the Senate, the couple made a trip to the Panama Canal. On his return, the Senator amazed his colleagues with his detailed physical description of the waterway.

Mr. Gore was elected one of Oklahoma's first two U.S. Senators in 1907, and the couple came here virtually to stay.

Her husband served in the Senate from 1907 to 1921 and again from 1931 to 1937. His political career was often stormy and throughout it his wife was his firmest supporter.

PARTY CONFLICT

Nominally a Democrat, he was often at odds with the party line. Once, Mrs. Gore recounted, Woodrow Wilson's Vice President Thomas R. Marshall begged her to dissuade her husband from an unpopular political stand.

"He's doing and saying what he believes is right," she replied, "and I wouldn't try to keep him from doing that if I knew it meant the end of his political career."

Mr. Gore lost his Senate seat when he refused to support the New Deal.

During her long residence here Mrs. Gore was a member of the Washington Club and the Congressional Club.

Surviving are a daughter, Mrs. Robert Olds of Southampton, Long Island, and a son, Thomas N. of El Paso, Tex. Among her grandchildren are playwright Gore Vidal and Mrs. Newton Steers, stepsister of Jacqueline Kennedy and wife of last year's unsuccessful Republican candidate for Maryland Congressman at large.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 42]

Anderson
Aspinall
Ayres
Blatnik
Bolling
Buckley
Casey
Celler
Conte
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Dent
Diggs
Edmondson
Fino
Forrester
Gary
Gray
Hagan, Ga.
Hall
Healey
Joelson
Jones, Ala.
Kee
Lloyd
McDade
MacGregor
Miller, Calif.
Pepper
Powell
Rains
Reid, N.Y.
Scott
Shelley
Sheppard
Siler
Skubitz
Steed
Stubblefield
Taft
Walter
Weaver

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 389 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made on the life and character of Mrs. Nina Kay Gore, and include an article, and that any Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks immediately following my remarks, and that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the life and character of Mrs. Gore.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DAVIDSONVILLE, MD., NIKE SITE

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I, with four of our colleagues, recently traveled by helicopter to the nearby U.S. Army Nike site at Davidsonville, Md. This visit proved interesting, informative, and reassuring.

We were met at the site by Brig. Gen. Stephen M. Mellnik, commanding general of 1st Region, Army Air Defense Command, and Brig. Gen. John D. Stevens, commanding general of the 35th Artillery Brigade. In their concise briefings these gentlemen explained how Army air defense units, composed primarily of a multitude of Nike-Hercules missile sites nationwide, combine with elements of the U.S. Air Force, the U.S. Navy, and the Canadian Armed Forces to form a virtually impregnable shield against enemy aerial attack on the United States. I wonder how many of our citizens understand the true magnitude of this great system which extends from the Arctic Circle to the Gulf of Mexico. I wonder, too, how many comprehend the depth with which our long-range radars penetrate, and the number of layers of smaller radars which are capable of triggering into action hundreds of interceptor aircraft, area type antiaircraft missiles, and pinpoint type missiles, of which the Nike-Hercules is the principal one.

A demonstration of the Nike-Hercules in action by members of Battery B, 71st Artillery Regiment, commanded by Capt. Charles Nash, impressed upon us the great efficiency of the system, and particularly the high caliber of personnel who operate it 24 hours a day. The American people have every reason to be proud of the dedication, alertness, and proficiency of these men who man our air defense installations. It is comforting to see first hand the validity of their boast that the odds for blasting an enemy aircraft from the skies are "closer to 100 percent than a certain brand of soap is to purity."

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

PERSONNEL SECURITY IN THE NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 334 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

> *Resolved,* That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 950) to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Un-American Activities, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the usual 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Smith] and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution providing for an open rule and 1 hour of general debate on the bill, H.R. 950.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill briefly is to establish a legislative base for enforcing a strict security standard for the employment and retention in employment of persons of the National Security Agency and to achieve maximum security for the activities of the Agency, to strengthen the capability of the Secretary of Defense and the Director of the Agency and to provide for such by authorizing the Secretary of Defense summarily to terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Agency wherever he considers that action to be in the interest of the United States, and by expressly excepting appointments to the Agency positions from the Civil Service Act of 1883 and from provisions of the Performance Rating Act of 1950.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that in brief is the purpose of the proposed legislation. I might add that this bill was passed by the House late in the last session of the Congress by a vote of 351 for and 24 against.

Mr. Speaker, I should also like to add further that this bill is sponsored by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. Walter], the chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House. Unfortunately, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Walter] is unable to be here because of certain physical handicaps at this time to present the bill and explain it at the proper time. But I understand that my distinguished and also very capable friend, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Willis], will handle the matter at the proper time.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that we all deeply regret the infirmities that have beset our great leader, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Walter], as chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee, who has served in this House for now in excess of 30 years, and who is one of the highly respected Members of this House.

I am sure that I express the wish and fervent hope of the membership of the House, the entire membership, that our friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Walter], may soon recover and be back with us to continue rendering yeoman service for the welfare of his country, to which he is so devoted.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I am happy to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi in his remarks. I visited "Tad" Walter in the hospital last week. I would like to report that he was in fine spirits. He had all of that courage and determination that has always characterized that great and fighting American. He had confidence that he would soon be back with us. I assured him that every Member of the House was praying for his speedy recovery.

Mr. COLMER. I am sure the House appreciates this message from the majority leader.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. We in Pennsylvania, regardless of party, are proud of "Tad" Walter who has been a wonderful servant of the people and a fine Congressman. We are glad to hear that he is getting along well and will soon be back.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Mississippi for yielding to me. I realize that this subject will come up in debate and be discussed thoroughly, but during the debate on the rule, I wonder if the gentleman can tell us if attention was directed to this bill as it relates to the termination of employment and the protection that is accorded a person who is summarily dismissed. Last year, since I was one of those who, surprisingly enough to my colleagues, opposed the passage of the bill, I raised this question, because of mistaken identity or other problems, could not the Secretary of Defense, as a dictator in this instance, summarily fire anyone, never give the reason for it, never give an accounting of it. There is no board of appeal, as I understand, unless the bill has been changed, to consider these matters. I see on page 5 of the report, this statement:

> Such a determination of the Secretary shall be final and the basis for the determination will not be subject to review in any administrative or judicial proceeding. This authority is to be exercised circumspectly, and only when removals should not, because of the paramount national security interests, be carried out under Public Law 733 of the 81st Congress with respect to security ground cases, or under section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act with respect to suitability ground cases.

In directing this inquiry I want to make it perfectly plain that I, like every Member of this body, do not believe we should help fellow travelers or Communists, but I am struck with the thought, what about mistaken identity and a Secretary of Defense, who being a man of action summarily dismisses somebody in error; this person could not be heard nor his good name cleared. I wonder if the gentleman took this matter up in consideration of granting a rule?

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana, from the committee that reported the bill.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question of my good friend from Texas I would say this. The bill does establish boards of appraisal to assist the Secretary of Defense in the discharge of his personnel responsibilities. I think possibly I should preliminarily mention the basic provision in the first part of the bill. The bill requires a full field investigation of all employees of the National Security Agency in whatever capacity employed. It requires a more careful screening than has been the practice up until a year or so ago when we were faced with the defection of Martin and Mitchell from that Agency. It will compel a thorough examination of a person's background before he is hired.

Now, that procedure would certainly reduce the possibility of someone facing an exercise of the ultimate power of discharge under this bill.

In addition, any charge against an employee is so thoroughly checked out that the possibility of mistaken identity is, for all practical purposes, nil.

I have never heard of a single case in which an employee of any U.S. security agency has ever been discharged because he was mistakenly identified as someone else, or vice versa.

So actually very few persons, if any, may be involved. I understand that for the purposes of due process of law, when applicable, one would be too many. I am talking about the practicality of this bill. When an employee undergoes investigation, with the assistance of our security people, the FBI and others, and reports are made with reference to the particular activities of that person, there is little likelihood that an exercise of the summary power will be necessary. Moreover, of course the bill does not bar departmental hearings. The Secretary of Defense will under the bill promulgate rules and regulations, and there will be departmental proceedings, including, in most cases, testimony and statements of the persons involved. But ultimately there may and can be exceptional cases when, upon the certificate of the Secretary of Defense, in person, and because of the national interest and security, normal procedure cannot be followed. Then it is possible summarily to dismiss. But to assume that the Secretary of Defense will capriciously and arbitrarily exercise this power is, I think, to assume a course of action that no person in that high station in life will take.

Finally, talking in terms of due process, let me advise the gentleman that there are other statutes on the books similar to the provisions of the bill—particularly the statute granting similar power to the CIA. They have been on the books for many, many years. These specific provisions of the bill have been tested by the courts. Let me suggest to the gentleman that he read a passage in a decision by the Circuit Court of Appeals in the case of Bailey vs. Richardson, affirmed by the Supreme Court, involving a situation exactly along the lines of this bill on the issue of due process. The Court said this:

> In the absence of statute or ancient custom to the contrary, executive offices are held at the will of the appointing authority, not for life or for fixed terms. If removal be at will, of what purpose would due process be? To hold office at the will of a superior and to be removable therefrom only by constitutional due process of law are opposite and inherently conflicting ideas. Due process of law is not applicable unless one is being deprived of something to which he has a right.

No person has a right to be hired in the National Security Agency. Despite all the precautions we have taken to see to it that there will be investigations, boards of appraisal, or a careful screening, the Secretary of Defense may be required to exercise that power ultimately, to fire someone without court tests or litigation.

Mr. ALGER. I appreciate the statement of the gentleman from Louisiana. I understand the problem involved. Without developing that further at this time, let me ask another thing. Is the reason that there cannot be a review of this decision by the Secretary, whose decision is final, because of the security nature of the material? My next question would be of the gentleman, Would a man who is fired or summarily dismissed for good reason, but whose name is Bill Jones or Jack Smith, as a case of mistaken identity, then he appeals, the Secretary does not have to give an accounting because of the security nature? I think that was the answer last year.

Mr. WILLIS. Not only because of the security nature, but the Secretary of Defense must make a specific determination before he can act. He must certify that those procedures and laws authorizing termination of employment normally applicable cannot be followed, because it is against the national interest and security so to do.

So far as the termination of employment is concerned, the bill does provide that termination of employment under the bill shall not affect the right of the officer or the employee involved to seek or to accept employment with any other department or agency of the United States, if he is declared eligible for such employment by the U.S. Civil Service Commission.

Mr. ALGER. If I understand the gentleman, it means, therefore, and I am certainly not arguing the point because I see the problem, the Secretary when he terminates such employment must say so in writing but he does not need to say anything except that it is in the interest of the U.S. security; is that correct?

Mr. WILLIS. Exactly.

Mr. ALGER. And he does not have to give the grounds for such removal?

Mr. WILLIS. Exactly, because to do so would be to make disclosures not in the national interest. This authority resides in the Secretary alone. For him to say more would be for him to disclose things that some people would like to know but are not entitled to know.

Mr. ALGER. One final question then. We are up against the hard fact that we are in a free country with self-imposed security measures and there could be the case where the Secretary on the one hand could be an arbitrary dictator and on the other hand a person could be summarily dismissed who is innocent, yet we are up against the hard fact that there is an irreducibile minimum in security matters. But that clearly is the situation we are in. A dictatorship is possible on the one hand and dismissal without recourse or reevaluation of the grounds of dismissal on the other hand; is that not correct?

Mr. WILLIS. Well, I do not assume the possibility of a dictatorship. It is inconceivable to me that the Secretary of Defense would be capricious or arbitrary and would exercise that power simply to be a dictator and to do harm to anybody.

Mr. ALGER. If I may ask my colleague one further question. Does the gentleman know if there is any other procedure without violating security measures, discussed in your committee deliberations, that could be imposed after the decision in the bill which is called final and from which no appeal is possible, is there any further protection to American citizens against the case of mistaken identity. For example, where the Secretary knowing that a man's record is subversive accidentally transfers that file to another man with the same name. Does the gentleman see any possibility of that?

Mr. WILLIS. Of course, if the gentleman insists on that narrow possibility, that a person who is an employee, whose life has been checked and is in the records of the Department, who has been under surveillance, where they see him every day, and he is in fact the person involved—if despite that, the gentleman feels there can be a case of mistaken identity, then we must reach a point which I cannot conceive happening.

I would say to the gentleman, this is a situation, which to me is inconceivable. Should it arise, I feel certain that somehow redress could be found for this wrong. I believe the Secretary, of course, on his own motion would redress this wrong and on his own motion he could say, "I made a mistake." But I do not think such a mistake as that could happen.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana and the gentleman from Mississippi for yielding. I wanted to develop this situation. I know that the gentleman in his own mind believes that such a comedy of errors is impossible.

I am inclined to share his view, but I think this is the time and place to thrash it out, because no man here intends that any harm be done anyone, and this gentleman does not in this instance.

Mr. WILLIS. I know very well that the gentleman addressing the question to me feels as I do about what would happen.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. WATSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished colleague from Mississippi in giving my wholehearted support for this amendment to strengthen the Internal Security Act. This measure meets a long overdue need in the security posture of America, and I commend the Un-American Activities Committee and its able charman for its introduction.

Too long we have coddled those who are wittingly and unwittingly seeking to subvert the security interests of our Nation. It is fitting that Congress face squarely up to this matter with the summary discharge method as proposed in this bill. We can no longer rely upon the courts for during recent years they have demonstrated a dangerous propensity for ignoring the best interests of national security in favor of the protection of Communists and their fellow travelers.

Some of the opponents of this measure are critical because it provides for the immediate removal of any employee of the National Security Agency when that employee is deemed by the Secretary of Defense to be a security risk. I submit that we cannot move too quickly in removing a traitor from accessibility to top secret information involving our national security. There can be no tolerance for the Communists.

When the national security or our very survival is at stake we cannot afford to take a chance with any security risk. Not only should we ferret out subversive agents who are conspiring with the Godless Communists but it is unconscionable to think that we would tolerate for one moment any Communist sympathizer within the ranks of our Federal employees.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, this bill could very well be strengthened by the additional mandatory forfeiture of all salaries which may be due the discharged security risk as well as a permanent prohibition against future employment in the Federal service. In this measure we have the opportunity to choose between the best interests of America and that of a Communist sympathizer. As for me and other loyal Americans the choice should not be a difficult one.

Finally, as drastic as the provisions of this measure may be in the discharge of any security risk I must reiterate that we have too long coddled and overly protected those who are seeking to undermine our democratic way of life.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman from Texas that while he and I have not agreed on too many things that have come up in the House, I want to congratulate him on his interest in the preservation of the rights of individual American citizens, whether they are in Government by appointment or by right or by whatever it may be. I grant the fact no one has the right to be employed by the Federal Government, but if you are employed by the Federal Government and you lose that employment under some kind of a cloud, I am sure the gentleman will agree that could be detrimental if not fatal to the entire career of that individual.

I would like to ask the gentleman whether he will reserve his opinion, his final opinion, until he has listened to the debate on the floor. There is a very good part of the bill, the part that requires more careful screening of people to be hired by the agency. There is no question but what that part of the bill is well written and well conceived. But before we come to final action, I hope the gentleman will reserve his opinion, because I think we have an answer to the arguments made by the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Springer].

Mr. SPRINGER. I direct this question to the chairman of the committee handling the bill, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Willis].

Does this bill cover only the Department of Defense?

Mr. WILLIS. It does not cover all of the Department of Defense. It covers the National Security Agency in that Department.

Mr. SPRINGER. Over what does the National Security Agency have jurisdiction for security purposes?

Mr. WILLIS. I will come to that in general debate right soon.

Mr. SPRINGER. The reason I ask that question is this: Some of our security problems in the past 20 years have come not from the Department of Defense but from the State Department.

The reason I raise this question is that just before I came to the Congress I went down to talk to the Chief Counsel for the State Department, and I found out they did not make a full home and background investigation. Will the gentleman tell the House whether or not the State Department now makes such an investigation?

Mr. WILLIS. To be perfectly frank about that, I am not completely familiar with the practices in the State Department. We did not look into that. This bill has to do only with the National Security Agency.

Mr. SPRINGER. This last question: Who drew up this bill, the Department of Justice, the gentleman's committee, or some individual on the committee?

Mr. WILLIS. This is the handiwork of our committee and committee counsel after hearings. This is not a downtown bill. Of course the Department of Defense has collaborated. This bill, by the way, has the recommendation of the Department of Defense, it has the approval of the Department of Justice and the Civil Service Administration, and appropriate agencies to which we normally refer legislation of this kind.

Mr. SPRINGER. At the present time, is a field investigation, including home and background, required by the National Security Agency?

Mr. WILLIS. By the National Security Agency?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes.

Mr. WILLIS. I know improvements have been made since the hearings, and I will come to that in general debate. Reforms have been made. The type of full field investigation that this bill contemplates is now fully made by the Agency.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Springer].

Mr. SPRINGER. I do not want to take up any more time than is absolutely necessary, but so that you will understand what I mean, in the case of William T. Martin, who attended the University of Illinois, from my own knowledge of the background of the case, may I say that had a full investigation, including home and background investigation, been made of William Martin before he was employed by the Defense Department or the NSA, all of the weaknesses which this man had would have been revealed, and I think that any security check made by the judgment of any qualified officer would have shown that he could not be employed for either classified or security information of this kind.

Mr. WILLIS. May I say this, that I agree with the gentleman, and that is the purpose of the bill. A while ago the gentleman asked me whether a full field investigation was now required by NSA. Counsel now reminds me that since our hearings, yes, a full field investigation is now being conducted and required and has been for the last 2 years. We have not heard of any adverse results from it. But, this bill would give a legislative sanction and mandate for thorough investigations.

Mr. SPRINGER. If this is so true of this agency, may I say to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana why is not the same thing required of every other service agency having jurisdiction over matters which vitally affect us in the world? Has this committee gone into what is being done in the State Department or the other agencies? In fact, there are other agencies that need it even worse than this one.

Mr. WILLIS. I will say to the gentleman that the comparable agency to this one is the CIA. The statute established for that agency, is the pattern of this bill. As to other agencies, we will have to take them one at a time.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Johansen].

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, if I may have the attention of the gentleman from Illinois, in response to one comment that he made—I forget whether it was Martin or Mitchell.

Mr. SPRINGER. Martin.

Mr. JOHANSEN. The very information that the gentleman referred to was developed fully in the hearings. I associate myself with the gentleman from Louisiana, and I am in agreement with him, and I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that one of the reasons for this requirement and provision of this bill is the outgrowth of the information developed in the hearings.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Wyman].

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Louisiana whether or not this bill is something the Department of Defense wants to have and says it needs to have for the security of the country?

Mr. WILLIS. The answer is "Yes."

Mr. WYMAN. Has the Department taken the position that as to those people about whom the gentleman from California spoke, that were already in the agency, and to whom this formula will apply, that as to those people it is necessary that in the public interest and for the national security they should be able to be removed without notice and hearing?

Mr. WILLIS. Yes, definitely.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 334 provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate on H.R. 950. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Colmer] has described the purpose of this bill and, in my opinion, absolutely correctly.

I concur in the statement he has made and I associate myself with his remarks, particularly do I associate myself with his remarks regarding the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Walter], a fine friend of mine, and one of the most distinguished Members of this body, and I certainly wish him well and hope he will return very shortly. We have covered this rule quite thoroughly here in the discussion.

Mr. Speaker, I do have a request for time, but I know of no objection to the rule. However, there will be opposition to certain parts of the bill, I understand.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would like to say that I wish to join in the comments of the gentleman from California [Mr. Smith], and the gentleman from Mississippi concerning our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Walter], and join in the hope that he may have a very speedy recovery and rejoin us soon.

Mr. Speaker, may I also say one word to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Wyman], who asked whether or not this had been requested and was considered necessary by the Department of Defense, implying that any time the Department of Defense requested something that that automatically would make it desirable. I believe that there will be some gentlemen on the other side of the aisle who will think at times the Department makes decisions, whether they are in the national interest or otherwise, which may not be completely 100-percent correct just because they make them.

Mr. Speaker, I think we should not, therefore, take the position that the Department of Defense and particularly the Secretary of Defense, as one man, can always be infallible. I think that will be well brought out in the debate.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, much of the discussion of the bill has already taken place here on the rule, which is very well. But I just wanted to say, supplementing my remarks, that I am very strong for this bill. The fact of the business is that it is one of the few bills that has been reported out by my committee, the Committee on Rules, which I felt any interest in handling at this session of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I think this bill should pass. I think it will pass. I would like to express my agreement with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] that we should have somewhat similar legislation—or that was the implication, at least, of the gentleman's remarks—covering other departments. I think the security of this Nation should be foremost in all of our deliberations.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 950) to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 950, with Mr. DAVIS of Georgia in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I would like the great privilege of reading to you a short statement of our colleague from Pennsylvania, the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER, distinguished and capable chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities:

> Mr. Chairman, I deeply regret that I cannot be on the floor today to speak in behalf of H.R. 950, a bill which I consider so vital to our national security, and to personally cast my vote for it.
>
> Our security rests primarily and essentially on the loyalty to this country which resides in the hearts of the overwhelming majority of our citizens. But it does not rest on that alone. It also rests on the procedures, methods and techniques we devise to prevent employment by our Government—particularly in those agencies dealing with highly classified information—of persons who are knowingly disloyal, or who, for a variety of other reasons, constitute a threat to the security of all.
>
> Effective security, insofar as it depends upon such procedures rather than on loyalty, must begin with and be most highly developed in the intelligence agencies of our country.
>
> We know that NSA is one of the most sensitive of our intelligence agencies. We know that effective security has not prevailed in that agency in the past. We know that it is our duty to see that it prevails in the future.
>
> I trust that the House, most of whose Members have previously weighed the merits of this bill, will vote overwhelmingly for it, as it did for an identical bill in the last Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to address myself to three questions relating to H.R. 950.

First. What are we dealing with in this bill?

Second. Why are we concerned with the subject matter of the bill?

Third. What will we do through this bill?

First. What are we dealing with?

We are dealing with the National Security Agency, successor to the Armed Forces Security Agency, an element of the Department of Defense which ranks with the Central Intelligence Agency in the sensitivity of its operations. The National Security Agency plays so highly specialized a role in the defense and security of the United States and its operations are so highly sensitive that no outsider can actually describe its activities. They are guarded not only from the public but from other Government agencies as well. The Civil Service Commission, which audits all Government positions, is not allowed to know what NSA employees do. By section 6, Public Law 36, of the 86th Congress, no law is to be construed to require the disclosure of any NSA functions or activities.

This is what the Department of Defense, which administers the NSA, says of that Agency:

> The Agency is faced with enormous security responsibilities. The missions assigned to the Agency seek to fulfill basic requirements of our national security. All activities conducted by NSA to carry out these missions are highly classified. Disclosure of the nature of these activities or portions of them could seriously impair the success of the Agency's efforts. Despite separation of tasks into work compartments and other precautions, the large majority of personnel of the Agency by virtue of their duties are exposed to, or have access to, uniquely sensitive information. The improper use, handling, or disclosure of this information could have adverse effects upon the national security.

These facts speak for themselves, Mr. Chairman. There can be no doubt in anyone's mind that the National Security Agency, which is dealt with in H.R. 950, carries out the most delicate type intelligence operations of our Government. This being so, there is unqualified need for the best possible security in that Agency.

The second question: Why are we concerned with NSA security procedures?

On August 1, 1960, the news broke that two NSA mathematicians had disappeared. They had not returned from a supposed vacation trip they were taking together. A few days later, the Department of Defense reluctantly admitted in a press release that "it must be assumed that there is a likelihood that they have gone behind the Iron Curtain."

On September 6, 1960, these two men appeared at a carefully staged press conference in Moscow. In the course of this conference, they reviled their country and gave full support to a Soviet propaganda attempt to discredit this Nation in all parts of the world.

These two men, Bernon F. Mitchell and William H. Martin, had access to highly classified information. There could be little doubt in anyone's mind, in view of their behavior, that they had told everything they knew to intelligence officials of the Soviet Union.

The Committee on Un-American Activities undertook an investigation to determine what was wrong at the National Security Agency—why and how these two men, who never should have been given access to any classified information, were employed by so sensitive an intelligence arm of the U.S. Government.

The committee's investigators spent 2,000 man-hours and covered 15 States and the committee held 16 separate executive session hearings in getting at the facts of NSA security procedures.

When the committee's report was published in August of 1962, the Director of Personnel for NSA had been dismissed, the Director of Security and two others in its Office of Security Services had "resigned," and 26 other employees had been dropped for reasons of sex deviation.

In issuing its report, the committee stated that it was "amazed and shocked" by the results of its investigation which revealed that extremely lax security measures were in effect when Mitchell and Martin were hired and even at the time the investigation was undertaken.

The most important part of the investigation, however, was the aftereffects of it—the fact that 22 reforms were instituted by the NSA to correct the weaknesses and failures uncovered by the committee's investigation.

This, Mr. Chairman, is why we are dealing with the National Security Agency today, why we have before us H.R. 950. We are considering this bill because, beyond all question, the committee's investigation revealed that there was a need to do something to permanently correct the deplorable security conditions that had existed in the Agency, to see that such conditions will never develop again.

The third question: What does H.R. 950 do?

Its major purpose is to provide a legislative base for continuing permanent enforcement of strict personnel security standards in the National Security Agency.

The bill has five main provisions:

First. It provides that no one shall be employed in, or detailed or assigned to NSA and given access to classified information unless such employment, detail, or access is "clearly consistent with the national security."

Second. It prohibits the employment of any person in the Agency unless he has been cleared for access to classified information after a full field investigation.

Third. It establishes boards of appraisal to be appointed by the Director of the Agency to assist him in discharging his personnel security responsibilities. The Director will refer to such boards doubtful cases which, in his opinion, warrant further inquiry as to the suitability of the employee's appointment to, or retention in, employment.

No one at NSA may be given access to classified information, contrary to the recommendations of these boards, unless the Secretary of Defense or his designee states in writing that such access is "in the national interest."

Fourth. It gives to the Secretary of Defense the summary power, when needed, to terminate the employment of any employee of the Agency. However, he will exercise this summary power only "in the interests of the United States" and after determining that procedures prescribed in other laws governing termination of Government service cannot be invoked "consistently with the national security."

Fifth. It excepts appointments to the Agency from the provisions of the Civil Service Act of 1883 and from provisions of the Performance Rating Act of 1950. These exceptions are now administratively executed but it is deemed necessary to give statutory exemption to preclude the withdrawal of the authority. Other sensitive agencies are already excepted by statute from the requirement of similar disclosures.

Before concluding my remarks, there is one other important point about this bill that I want to stress. It is this: From the practical viewpoint, all these provisions speak for themselves. It is apparent to every reasonable person that they are desirable elements in establishing effective security for any highly sensitive agency.

The only question then is that of whether or not these provisions are constitutional. On this most important point, I wish to stress the fact, Mr. Chairman, that there is nothing new or untried in this bill from the constitutional angle. Every one of its provisions exists in legislation previously adopted by the Congress and tested in the courts of this land. This bill does not give the Secretary of Defense, the ultimate boss of the National Security Agency, any power that has not already been given to other officials of the Government and which, as I indicated a moment ago, has not been tested and upheld by the courts.

An identical bill, H.R. 12082, passed the House in the 87th Congress, under suspension of the rules, by the overwhelming vote of 351 to 24. In the course of the debate on the bill on that occasion, every single objection to it centered on the provision granting summary dismissal power to the Secretary of Defense. It has been publicly announced that an amendment will be offered to strike this provision, contained in section 303, from the present bill. For that reason, I will address myself now to the constitutional issues contained in this section. Because we are dealing with a sensitive intelligence agency, there can be no question, I believe, of the practical value and desirability of summary dismissal power.

In the National Security Act of 1947, Public Law 253 of the 80th Congress, in section 102(c), the Congress gave the same summary dismissal power to the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. We have checked the House and Senate debates on that bill, and the House and Senate reports on it. Nowhere did we find a single objection or a single question raised about the grant of summary dismissal power. Both the House and the Senate apparently were in unanimous agreement that such power was not only desirable in an intelligence agency, but also that it would meet the test of constitutionality. I might add that to the best of my knowledge, since that time, repeal of this summary dismissal power granted to the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency has never been recommended by a single Member of Congress.

The CIA Director has since exercised his summary dismissal power on a variety of occasions. That power has been challenged. Last year, in the case of Torpats against McCone, the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia upheld this summary dismissal power, and the Supreme Court subsequently denied certiorari in the case.

More important, in the case of Bailey against Richardson, the courts of our land went directly to the question of due process in the dismissal of Federal employees—the question of whether a hearing, confrontation, or cross-examination of witnesses were necessary before a Government employee could be dismissed.

In this case, the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, in 1950, after giving full and comprehensive consideration to the principle of due process, held that a hearing, confrontation, or cross-examination of witnesses were not required by due process and that a Federal employee could be dismissed without them. On April 30, 1951, the Supreme Court affirmed this decision.

That decision stands today as the law of this land. It has not since been reversed. For this reason, we can only conclude that claims that the summary dismissal power is a violation of due process are completely lacking in judicial support and are no more than a new and novel interpretation of due process.

In this respect, it is interesting to note what the Commission on Government Security found in 1957 after the most thorough review of U.S. security procedures ever undertaken in the history of our Nation. Its report, issued in pursuance to Public Law 304 of the 84th Congress, as amended, states:

> Proceedings for screening out, transferring, or discharging employees necessary in the maintenance of national security are not judicial, or adversary in character. They do not establish guilt or mete out punishment. They merely determine suitability from a security viewpoint.
>
> In the interests of justice and fairness, however, the proceedings must be such as will secure, as far as it is humanly possible, that decisions are reached which are in accord with the facts and that these be no arbitrary, ill founded, or capricious denials of employment, transfers, or discharges in the name of security.

I know of no court holding which contradicts this statement.

The issue before us, Mr. Chairman, is very clear. Do we want to provide security procedures in the National Security Agency or do we not? By our votes, we will each give our answer to this question.

Mr. Chairman, the following are synopses and discussions of four or five court decisions dealing with the kind of cases covered by this bill:

First. Torpats against McCone, decided March 23, 1962, in the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia; certiorari denied by the U.S. Supreme Court, November 5, 1962—this case applicable.

Torpats was employed by the Central Intelligence Agency from 1949 to 1958. He was in conflict with his superiors. The decision does not give further facts. On January 30, 1961, Torpats received notice that his employment was "terminated pursuant to authority contained in section 102(c), National Security Act of 1947. This termination does not affect your right to seek or accept employment in any other department or agency of the U.S. Government if you are declared eligible for such employment by the U.S. Civil Service Commission."

The National Security Act of 1947 gives a summary power of dismissal similar to that provided in section 303 of the bill, H.R. 950. Pursuant to this statute the CIA adopted regulations calling for an impartial review by the Director of all pertinent information upon which he relies in terminating "to the extent that is consistent with the interests of the United States." The court held that the termination of employment was within the authority of the Director conferred upon him by Congress and in accordance with his own regulations. The court said that this termination was to be distinguished from a so-called security discharge such as was involved in *Service* v. *Dulles*, 354 U.S. 363 (1957), and related cases. The Supreme Court denied certiorari.

Second, *Greene* v. *McElroy*, 360 U.S. 474 (1949), not applicable.

This case related to a security program in connection with classified Government contracts in private industry. A security program was established by the Secretary of Defense, regulating access to classified information by employees in private industry who were engaged in working on Government contracts. The decision was limited to the holding that such regulations were invalid because they had not been authorized either by Congress or the President.

In H.R. 950, we are seeking to establish congressional authorization for procedures relating to employment in a highly sensitive agency of the U.S. Government.

Third, *Service* v. *Dulles*, 354 U.S. 363 (1957), not applicable.

The statute, commonly referred to as the McCarran Rider provided:

> Notwithstanding the provisions of * * * any other law, the Secretary of State may, in his absolute discretion * * * terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Department of State or of the Foreign Service of the United States whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States.

Under the authority of this rider, the State Department issued regulations for dismissal from employment relating to first, loyalty and second, security cases. The regulations set up a hearing and review procedure. Under the regulations the Secretary of State had no right to dismiss an employee unless and until the Deputy Undersecretary, acting upon findings of the Department's Loyalty-Security Board, had recommended dismissal.

The Secretary dismissed Service without compliance with the requirements of his own regulations. The holding of the court was limited to the single point that the discharge of Service was invalid because it violated the regulations of the Department of State which were binding upon the Secretary. The court expressly stated that its holding was limited to this single conclusion.

Fourth. *Bailey* v. *Richardson*, 182 F. 2d 46, decided in the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, March 22, 1950; affirmed by the Supreme Court on certiorari by an equally divided court, Justice Clark not participating—applicable.

Miss Bailey was employed in the Federal Security Agency, now abolished, which was a grouping of agencies whose major purposes related to promotion of social and economic security, educational opportunity, and health. The Government notified her that it had received information to the effect that she was a member of the Communist Party and affiliated with subversive organizations. She was given a hearing and the procedures before the Loyalty Boards conformed with the requirements of the Executive Order 9835, which required that the names of confidential informants be kept confidential. As a result of the hearing, the Loyalty Board found that on all the evidence reasonable grounds existed for the belief that Miss Bailey was disloyal to the Government of the United States, and she was discharged from employment. While Miss Bailey was given a general statement of the charges, she claims that this information did not include the names of informants against her or the dates or places of her alleged activities, and that her constitutional rights had been violated. The court said:

> In the absence of statute or ancient custom to the contrary, executive offices are held at the will of the appointing authority, not for life or for fixed terms. If removal be at will, of what purpose would process be? To hold office at the will of a superior and to be removable therefrom only by constitutional due process of law are opposite and inherently conflicting ideas. Due process of law is not applicable unless one is being deprived of something to which he has a right.
>
> Constitutionally, the criterion for retention or removal of subordinate employees is the confidence of superior executive officials. Confidence is not controllable by process. What may be required by acts of the Congress is another matter, but there is no requirement in the Constitution that the executive branch rely upon the services of persons in whom it lacks confidence.

To the argument of Miss Bailey that even if the executive had power to dismiss her without a judicial hearing, they had no power to call her disloyal while doing so, the court said:

> If Miss Bailey had no constitutional right to her office and the executive officers had power to dismiss her, the fact that she was injured in the process of dismissal neither invalidates her dismissal nor gives her right to redress; this under a rule of law established long ago.

The court quoted from Judge Learned Hand and pointed out that, as is so often the case, the answer must be found in a balance between the evils inevitable in either alternative. The reason for the rule is the same as that which permits a person to be publicly stigmatized by utterances on the floor of the Congress without any opportunity in any established forum to deny or to refute. The court said that these harsh rules "have always been held necessary as a matter of public policy, public interest, and the unimpeded performance of the public business."

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we are on notice that an amendment will be offered to strike section 303 from the bill, H.R. 950.

This is the section which grants to the Secretary of Defense the power of summary dismissal of a National Security Agency employee "whenever he"—the Secretary—"considers that action to be in the interest of the United States, and he determines that the procedures prescribed in other provisions of law that authorize the termination of the employment of that officer or employee cannot be invoked consistently with the national security."

The issue of the retention or elimination of this section is the principal, if not sole, matter in controversy here this afternoon—as it was last September when a similar bill passed the House by a vote of 351 to 24.

I might add that this provision is also one of the most vital features of H.R. 950 from the standpoint of safeguarding both the security of this Agency and the security of the United States. Make no mistake about that.

Let us see, first of all, precisely what H.R. 950 and section 303 does not do:

It does not bar or ban hearings, confrontation, and cross-examination for NSA employees generally.

It does not alter the fact that NSA, as a part of the Department of Defense, is generally subject to overall Defense Department regulations controlling dismissal of employees and is also generally subject to Executive Order 10450, the security directive issued by President Eisenhower which provides for notification, hearing, right of counsel, and so forth, for an accused employee. This is, and under H.R. 950 will continue to be, the procedure normally followed by NSA in terminating employment of personnel judged to be security risks.

The truth is that, broadly speaking, H.R. 950 provides a legislative basis for administrative regulations which improve and strengthen these normal procedures in terminating employment of personnel judged to be security risks.

It provides a legislative basis for promulgation of regulations granting hearings and related rights to NSA employees insofar as such procedures are consistent with the Agency's security responsibilities.

Indeed, the boards of appraisal provided for in section 302(b) represent an additional protection of the interests and rights of NSA employees as well as an additional protection of the security of our country. The fact that all doubtful cases will be referred to these boards of appraisal is, itself, a guarantee against hasty, ill considered, or arbitrary dismissals based on unsubstantiated, derogatory information.

The truth is that, in view of the court decisions referred to by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS], this bill gives NSA employees more protection than the law requires.

To allege that H.R. 950 or section 303 gives the Secretary of Defense power, willy-nilly, to fire any NSA employee at all on the basis of gossip, hearsay, suspicion, or anonymous accusations, is to grossly distort the meaning and import of this bill.

Now as to precisely what section 303 does do. It provides only that in exceptional cases, when hearings cannot be granted without injury to our country, the Secretary will have power to deny such hearings and to exercise summary dismissal.

It provides that this power is to be exercised only when the Secretary "determines that the procedures prescribed in other provisions of law that authorize the termination of the employment of an officer or employee cannot be invoked consistently with the national security."

Without this minimum reservation of discretionary authority on the part of the Secretary of Defense, he could, and would be, confronted with a choice of disclosure of confidential sources or even exposure and destruction of our own vital espionage activities, on the one hand, or the retention by NSA of an employee known to be a security risk and the continuation of access on the part of that known security risk to the most highly classified information of the U.S. Government.

This, of course, is an intolerable dilemma. It is unthinkable that in one of the two or three most sensitive intelligence agencies of our Government, the top official of that agency—the Secretary of Defense—should be denied the means of avoiding and resolving such a dilemma.

I know of no other way of so resolving the dilemma than is provided in section 303. The Members of this House who oppose section 303 propose no alternative means of resolving this dilemma. By proposing to eliminate this section they underwrite and insure the perpetuation of the possibility of such a dilemma.

I cannot believe that this House will go along with such a proposal as this.

Now let me address myself to the main argument and claim of opponents of section 303. In substance it is that this section "vests the Secretary of Defense with the summary and unreviewable power to discharge any employee of the National Security Agency with no hearing whatever." In other words it is charged that this is a violation of the due process rights of the employee.

I would point out that due process is no more an absolute right than are the first amendment rights to free speech, assembly, and religion. Repeatedly the courts have held that no right is absolute and unlimited.

Recently Dean Griswold of Harvard Law School, lecturing at the University of Utah Law School, offered some penetrating criticism of the absolutist approach in the field of law. In this lecture Dean Griswold said:

> The absolutist approach involves, I submit, a failure to exercise the responsibilities—and indeed the pains—of judging. By ignoring factors relevant to sound decision it inevitably leads to wrong results.

Mr. Chairman, we must avoid the absolutist approach to the question of due process because we must avoid the wrong results which, as Dean Griswold pointed out, flow from such an approach.

The absolutist approach is a species of fanaticism as opposed to the approach of reason. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes once observed that a man is correct in extending his private property rights to the air above his plot of ground to build, for example, a house 100 feet high. But it is an absolutist absurdity to argue that his property rights to the air reach all the way to outer space.

In this present argument it is an absolutist excess to argue that a valid principle such as the confrontation or cross-examination elements of due process extends to the preposterous length of claiming that there can never be any limitation on those rights.

The question then becomes, When and to what extent is it proper to limit this right or these elements of due process?

In my humble judgment the answer is when and to the extent that such limitation is dictated by considerations of the basic security and, indeed, survival of the Government and of the freedom of 188 million people.

Freedom cannot survive if it is to include the freedom of enemies of freedom to destroy freedom.

One final and extremely important point:

As I remarked during the debate on this bill last year it seems to me the gentlemen who are opposing section 303 of this bill are attempting to refight a 16-year-old battle and issue.

Section 102(c) of the National Security Act of 1947 provided that notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, "the Director of Central Intelligence (Agency) may, at his discretion, terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Agency whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the interest of the United States."

As with section 303 of this bill, the 1947 act provided that such termination shall not affect the right of the person involved to seek or accept employment with any other department or agency of the United States if he is declared eligible for such employment by the U.S. Civil Service Commission.

The summary dismissal authority granted in the 1947 act was sustained by the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia in Torpats against McCone March 23 of last year, and certiorari was denied by the U.S. Supreme Court November 5 of last year.

I do not believe it can be claimed with any validity that the National Security Agency is any less sensitive than the CIA.

Unless the opponents of section 303 are disposed to argue this point, I must conclude that the logic of their opposition to section 303 is that they advocate the repeal of section 102(c) of the National Security Act of 1947.

I do not see how they can have it any other way.

I do not see how they can deny that they are, in effect, asking that we turn the clock back with respect to the personnel security of CIA by repealing the 1947 provision for summary dismissal.

And to do this would be to enthrone an interpretation of the constitutional guarantees of due process which the court of appeals and the U.S. Supreme Court refused to acknowledge or enthrone by virtue of the decision in Torpats against McCone.

I am sure that this House will not commit itself to such a course of action. I am confident the House will retain section 303 and overwhelmingly approve H.R. 950.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. I would like to associate myself with the remarks which have been made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN].

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I yield myself 2 additional minutes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. If the gentleman will yield, I would like to ask a few questions of the gentleman from Michigan.

Is it true that an applicant for a job in any agency of the U.S. Government does not have a right to know why he was not hired by the Government agency in which he sought employment? In other words, there is no opportunity for him to have a hearing to give him the right to request information as to why he was not hired?

Mr. JOHANSEN. To my knowledge there is no provision which guarantees such an alleged right. Certainly there is no provision which guarantees that right, if in compliance with the request for that information a violation of the security or the national interest of the country is involved.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. If the gentleman will yield further, the second question is this: This holds true, does it not, with reference to the National Security Agency?

Mr. JOHANSEN. Certainly.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. And if a person applies for a position with this Agency and investigation reveals there is reasonable doubt as to his loyalty or his character or his ability or whatever might cause him to be a security risk, and after having been given a job with this Agency, he has no recourse, has he, but to accept the fact that he was not given employment?

Mr. JOHANSEN. Precisely.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Permit me to propound a hypothetical question to the gentleman:

Suppose that John Doe is hired by this very sensitive security agency, the NSA, on, say, May 1, 1963, and he has successfully concealed information about himself which if it had been revealed would be sufficient for him not to be hired, and this information which he withheld comes into the possession of NSA on the 10th of May, 10 days later, is there any legitimate reason that the Agency should not have the right to discharge him because he is a security risk if it has a right not to hire him?

Mr. JOHANSEN. That question could not be answered in my judgment with a simple yes or no, because of the rights or privileges or however you wish to define them, which have been spelled out. There are restrictions, very definite restrictions, as to arbitrary dismissal.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

The facts of the matter are that not only rights but the procedures are established by law which must be complied with and are complied with in the overwhelming instances of termination of employment. The thing that this proposed legislation does is to spell out that in one situation, to wit: where it is determined that the exercise of those normal procedures would be violative or potentially violative of the national security, then the right of the responsible official of the Department of Defense to dismiss summarily is underscored and affirmed.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan for his comments and to add this observation. In an agency so vitally important to the security of our Nation as is the NSA, it seems to me that employees should, like Caesar's wife, be beyond reproach. Should we by mere technicalities deny this Nation the right, the opportunity, and the responsibility to adequately defend itself from those who would destroy freedom, we, who represent the people, would be derelict in our duty.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I thank my colleague on the Un-American Activities Committee.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COHELAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I should like to get right at the heart of the dilemma that he describes and which may separate us on one portion of this bill. I ask the gentleman to tell me what happens if the Secretary of Defense makes a finding under the provision that is in the law and then subsequently the person who has been separated as a security risk—remember, we have used this term "security risk"—the individual separated, and properly under this bill, as a security risk, seeks remedy in the courts of this land and is found not to be a security risk. Where do we stand then?

Mr. JOHANSEN. Let me say first of all that I think we stand as was pointed out in the colloquy during the debate on the rule, that the effect is to find that a miscarriage of justice or a wrong was done. I would assume, therefore, that it would be the responsibility of the Secretary of Defense and he would respond to that responsibility by correcting that wrong.

Mr. COHELAN. But I would ask the gentleman, would it not be better if we could incorporate these procedures into this bill? The gentleman has a good bill. I think the committee is to be commended, particularly in the terms of the field investigation. But the question of working out administrative due process procedures—and at the appropriate time I shall argue this—it seems to me we would avoid this business of the possibility of separating a person who claims to be innocent and who might subsequently prove himself to be innocent.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I shall respond very briefly to that, because there will be the opportunity to pursue this further. This procedure, this right of recourse, some kind of right of review, has got to terminate somewhere. The action of the Secretary of Defense is the termination point, not the beginning, of the procedures under this bill.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further out of fairness to other gentleman who are on their feet.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ALGER. The good sense of the gentleman's remarks is quite apparent. In order to get away from the possibility of dictatorship on the one hand and making an error on the other, what would the gentleman think of an amendment of this nature to section 303? I would also ask for better language than this. Under section 303, subparagraph (a), at the end of that paragraph it says:

> Such a determination is final.

Suppose we said something like this, "reviewable only by a three-man appeals board should the person dismissed appeal the decision, such appeals board designated by the President"?

Does the gentleman not feel that this would clear the Secretary of Defense possibly of being a dictator on the one hand and making an error on the other, and throw this into an appeal level, in this case a board? It does not have to be public. It can be secret and the man would have a chance to be heard. What does the gentleman think of such an amendment?

Mr. JOHANSEN. The gentleman thinks he would have to think about that amendment a few moments before responding to the suggestion. I will say to the gentleman from Texas I will proceed to do same.

Mr. ALGER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I yield to my colleague on the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I would ask the ranking member of our Committee on Un-American Activities two questions. First, is it not true that the two NSA employees, Bernon F. Mitchell and William H. Martin, who defected to the Soviet Union with valuable secrets, had a questionable record of conduct up to the time of their defection but, while they had this record which merited their discharge in the national interest, this could not be accomplished because the law protected their right, in effect, to engage in traitorous activity against their own Government, because of the proceedings that would be necessary?

Mr. JOHANSEN. Yes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Secondly, is it not true that had legislation of the type which is contained in H.R. 950 been on the statute books at that time, Mitchell and Martin could have been summarily fired by the appropriate officials, and there would not have resulted the loss of secrets in this sensitive area?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I think that is true, but I think more my point in connection with this legislation is that they would not have gotten on in the first place because of the provisions for investigation under section 302.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I certainly associate myself with the ranking minority member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities in his remarks. I only want to add that the National Security Agency is supersecret in its operations. It is not inconsistent that hiring and firing practices should be covered with the same cloak of secrecy to protect our national interest. This is an awesome grant of power, I agree, and should be granted only with evidence that indicates an overpowering need. I suggest that the evidence so indicates, and I support H.R. 950. I supported H.R. 12082 last fall when it passed this body by a vote of 351 to 24, and I trust it will get the same resounding support today.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. I want to commend my friend for his sincere interest in protecting the United States, but I should like to have him tell me very briefly where there is any limitation in this bill on the absolutely untrammeled and unrestricted absolute discretion of the Agency and the Agency head to discharge any individual without hearing or the right of review, and without any superintendence or supervision over that course.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Certainly there is a limitation, No. 1, in the establishment of the boards of appraisal.

Mr. DINGELL. I am talking about discharges, now. Because our time is scarce, and I know the time of the gentleman is limited, I would like to ask him not to state that on the floor but put it in the record of the debate, to tell this House where in this bill there is language or anything which would authorize any individual in construing this legislation to say there is a limitation on the discharge authority. I do not think there is any limitation on the absolute discretion of the agency head to discharge.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I cannot yield further to the gentleman. I will say this, there is very specifically stated the express limitation that there must be a finding and certification by the Secretary of Defense. There is a specific requirement provided that the Secretary must certify with respect to the requirements of national security.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Roosevelt].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, in 2 minutes it is rather obvious I cannot be too specific.

I want to get back to the argument of my good friend from Michigan, which is fundamental in what we are talking about. I want to emphasize that so far as I know there is nobody opposing the sections of this bill that deal with trying to make sure that we hire the proper personnel in the first instance. What we are talking about is, after they are hired, after they have gone through the screening process, then, as my friend from Michigan [Mr. Dingell] says, I can find nothing in section 303 that requires that anywhere there be a written decision, anywhere there is anything said that there be a determination that the Secretary shall not suspend every other kind of normal procedure and fire the individual.

Now this individual has been carefully screened—remember. I will say to my friend, the gentleman from Louisiana

[Mr. WILLIS] the very reason that he gave, that this will not happen often, is the very reason I want to be sure about this. We have already done all we can to see that the right kind of people are hired. Then here we would turn around and give to the Secretary, without any provision for notifying the individual, the right to fire that individual and to say that somewhere they have found something that makes that employee a security risk and that then the employee can be fired without ever knowing what kind of charges were made against him.

I want to say to my friends in all honesty, do you really believe, even if it is a privilege to work for the Government, that you should hire somebody in this kind of sensitive position and then put one person in the position to fire that employee without letting the employee know what he is charged with, and to just simply state that the employee is fired without having to explain why—all the Secretary has to do is say that this is a man who is dangerous to the security of the country.

Suppose that happens to an individual? Where is that individual ever again going to get a job in our United States?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. WILLIS. May I say to my colleague, the gentleman from California, on checking my schedule here I find that I can yield him 1 more minute.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am very grateful to my colleague.

Mr. Chairman, there is a provision in this bill in section 302(a) which provides that persons can be employed by the agency prior to their full field investigation so long as they do not have access to sensitive or cryptological information or material. Then why can you not just take this person away from any sensitive information if he is already there? You cannot remove from him what he already knows. That is already in his mind, and when you fire him you are not going to be able to blank out his mind. He has that information. But if you want to protect yourself in the future, then take him away from any kind of work having to do with that kind of sensitive information and give him a fair chance to know what he is accused of and give him a fair opportunity then to present his case at least.

In section 303 you do not even make any attempt to do that.

Lastly, Mr. Chairman, because the time is so limited, let me point out that in 5 U.S.C. 22 the Secretary now has the authority to fire somebody out of the National Security Agency. We are not taking away his right to fire people who he finds are disloyal to the United States. It seems to me all we are asking for is a reasonable opportunity not to do an injustice to somebody unreasonably. We must ask where can that employee who is discharged go? How can he possibly rectify the record when there is no record to rectify?

Mr. Chairman, I do not think that is the way we operate in the United States.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 950. On September 4, 1962, I objected to an identical bill when it appeared on the Consent Calendar, and on September 19, 1962, I voted against the measure when it passed the House under suspension of the rules. My opposition to the bill on those occasions and at present is based on the fundamental denial of constitutional rights involved in any procedure which would give the power of summary dismissal to the Secretary of Defense.

Under section 303(a) of H.R. 950 the Secretary of Defense would have the authority to terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the National Security Agency whenever he considers "that action to be in the interest of the United States, and he determines that the procedures prescribed in other provisions of law that authorize the termination of employment of that officer or employee cannot be invoked consistently with national security." Under the provisions of the bill, such action by the Secretary of Defense would be final.

This bill violates basic constitutional concepts and is totally inconsistent with the principles of Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence. It gives the Secretary of Defense the authority to fire any employee of the National Security Agency without a hearing, without the right of cross-examination, without the right to have any information against him, without the right of appeal, and without even the right to know why he is being fired.

An employee who is fired under the provisions of the bill has the right to go to the Civil Service Commission and present himself for other Federal employment. This provision is ludicrous. It is inconceivable that the drafters of this bill seriously thought that a person fired for unknown "security reasons" would have a chance of getting other Federal employment. In fact, a person whose employment was terminated under the provisions of this bill would hardly have a chance to obtain private employment. Because he is denied his basic right to know why he is fired, it would be impossible to explain the loss of employment to a prospective employer.

Mr. Chairman, Andrew J. Biemiller, director of the Department of Legislation of the AFL–CIO, has sent the following telegram to our colleague, Congressman ROOSEVELT, of California, who will offer an amendment to strike section 303(a):

> Urge you vote in favor of the Roosevelt amendment to H.R. 950 to strike the authorization for summary dismissal of Government employees. Experience shows no need for this drastic denial of fair procedure.

Mr. Chairman, the provisions of this measure are inconsistent with the due process provisions of the Constitution. The measure is a product of cold war hysteria and should be rejected. In our fight for liberty, let us not lose our liberty.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER].

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct some questions, if I may, to the gentleman from Louisiana and other members of the committee to help my understanding, recognizing that we have the double problem of maintaining security and not giving aid and comfort to the enemy, and at the same time not defame the character of any person without appeal.

I submit this amendment to the gentleman from Louisiana for his comment, his counsel, or such other advice as he may choose to give me.

If you will look at the bill on page 5, after the word "final," I suggest the following:

> Except any employee whose employment is so terminated, shall have the right of appeal to an Appeal Board, such Appeal Board shall consist of three persons, appointed by the President, and who are cleared by the Director of the National Security Agency for access to classified information.

My intention in this language is that the President may designate the man with the highest security clearance. It would be perfectly all right if the Secretary of Defense appointed these men. It would not be public. They would go into it if the person demands an appeal. It would not violate security, but it would give the man a chance to be heard and remove from the Secretary the onus of the charge of being a dictator or of making an error singlehandedly.

What does the gentleman think of such an amendment?

Mr. WILLIS. I think it bad, for this reason:

As the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN] has said, you must have finality at some point. A Review Board of three is designated by the amendment proposed. Conceivably, that Board can also make a mistake if the Secretary can make a mistake. Then shall the discharged employee have the right to go to court? The court may make a mistake. Do you go to the next highest court? The question is, What is to be final?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [M. COHELAN].

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, obviously in 2 minutes one cannot begin to argue this very, very difficult question. I am very pleased that our colleagues, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN], have drawn the issue as well as they have; and, if I may have the attention of the gentleman from Texas, I am delighted to hear this gesture in terms of an amendment, because what I will talk about when I have a chance to speak more extensively is that some type of administrative due process must be provided.

Those of you who were here last year will remember that I argued the question, and I want to refer you to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 108, part 14, beginning on page 19622, where I discussed this point. You will recall I pointed out at that time that this argument was not made lightly; that it was made in consultation with some of the most distinguished lawyers in my State, and the University of California. I inserted an article in the RECORD by Prof.

Frank Newman, the very learned dean of the Boalt Hall Law School at the University of California, which goes into the question of due process and the question of rights and privileges in this specific kind of problem.

One of the things I want to say, if I have time, is this: The distinguished chairman of the committee has pointed out and made a great fuss about the two NSA employees who defected. The simple fact of the matter is and the record has proven the point, that these men should not have been hired in the first place.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Mathias].

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, I have a special interest in this legislation. I doubt if any Member of this House represents more Federal employees than I do. I know these employees to be dedicated public servants. They deserve better of the Congress than this bill.

Now, I am particularly interested by two of the supporting letters which appear in the report on this legislation. One of these letters is from the Justice Department. In that letter the Deputy Attorney General, Mr. Katzenbach, gives his full approval to the bill. He approves its passage, but in his letter he does not mention in any way the unusual summary termination procedures provided in the bill. He apparently has no concern whatever about the fact that employees can be summarily dismissed without an iota of information of the reason for their dismissal. Likewise, the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission devotes his attention in his letter to other parts of the bill, and there is no mention whatever of the summary termination provisions.

The Congress must consider carefully the unusual and drastic provision in this bill for summary termination of employment which can work untold injustice to Federal employees. I think the fact that the Justice Department has chosen not to deal with the termination provision is in itself an indication of the unsavory nature of the provision. I think the fact that the Justice Department does not want to talk about it indicates that it is something that it feels ought to be swept under the rug, and I do hope we sweep it under the rug by defeating this bill, unless it is amended to provide some reasonable form of due process prior to summary termination of employment by the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Bray].

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to speak on this bill because I am not on that committee, and the knowledge I have of the bill is what I heard in debate last year and the debate today and information I received by reading the report and the bill. But, I did have some experience in the study of the Martin-Mitchell case of the two defectors from the National Security Agency to Russia which has been mentioned here earlier.

Matters coming before the National Security Agency are very supersecret, about as secret as you can get. A high degree of security is demanded, and there should not be the slightest suspicion on anyone connected with the Agency. No one is forced to go into it. They know the background when they go in.

The very slightest suspicion, or any grounds for such suspicion, should certainly preclude that person from handling supersecret matters, so secret we do not want to discuss them here.

In studying the Martin case, evidence developed before his disappearance that would have justified his dismissal but, frankly, there was not sufficient evidence developed to have been able to make a good case before a board. I do not know whether there was any consideration of dismissing Martin but there was enough evidence to have justified such consideration. In the Army, as many of you know, an officer can remove from command anyone under him summarily at any time. He makes no excuse. Later he may have to defend his action, but that authority in the commander must exist. The same reasons exist for having such authority in such a secret organization as the National Security Agency.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe there is a Member in this body who has shown any more interest in defending the rights of civil service employees from being unfairly dismissed than I have. Time after time I have taken a personal interest in specific cases. But let us realize first that this is a very secret—I want to repeat again—supersecret organization on which the very security of America may depend. Many times the person in charge can become aware of a deterioration in a subordinate. There isn't enough evidence to make a case but in a supersensitive organization as the National Security Agency we cannot always safely set up the same safeguards to job retention that we do in the regular civil service. There are many people in America, honest people, who have traits in their character or background who should never be employed in the National Security Agency or in the CIA.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Waggonner].

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, I rise in support of this legislation much the same as I did last year.

Mr. Chairman, there seems to be two or three points of discussion here. First of all there seems to be a point of view that we can no longer delegate authority to any of our Secretaries because they cannot be trusted. However, it seems the least we could possibly do in this particular case would be to be consistent, because I do not assume to begin with that our Secretaries are a bunch of scoundrels and are not going to give anyone fair and equitable treatment.

Mr. Chairman, the other is that people are going to be dismissed without being informed of what their crimes might possibly be. It is my firm opinion that a man guilty of subversion need not be told because he knows full well to begin with for what he is being dismissed.

Again, Mr. Chairman, there is the idea and I will ask the chairman of the committee, my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Willis], about this—that there is a constitutional right which is inherent and guarantees the right to work for the Government or for some such agency as this for all individuals, and that due process is involved. I would like to ask the gentleman from Louisiana if he would clarify this particular point.

Mr. WILLIS. I am delighted that the gentleman has made the inquiry. That very issue was decided by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Bailey* v. *Richardson,* 182 F. 2d 46, first decided in the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, March 22, 1950; and affirmed by the Supreme Court on certiorari by an equally divided court, Justice Clark not participating.

Miss Bailey was employed in the Federal Security Agency, now abolished, which was a grouping of agencies whose major purpose related to promotion of social and economic security, educational opportunity, and health. The Government notified her that it had received information to the effect that she was a member of the Communist Party and affiliated with subversive organizations. She was given a hearing and the procedures before the loyalty boards conformed with the requirements of the Executive Order 9835, which required that the names of confidential informants be kept confidential. As a result of the hearing, the loyalty board found that on all the evidence reasonable grounds existed for the belief that Miss Bailey was disloyal to the Government of the United States, and she was discharged from employment. While Miss Bailey was given a general statement of the charges, she claims that this information did not include the names of informants against her or the dates or places of her alleged activities, and that her constitutional rights had been violated. The court said:

> In the absence of statute or ancient custom to the contrary, executive offices are held at the will of the appointing authority, not for life or for fixed terms. If removal be at will, of what purpose would process be? To hold office at the will of a superior and to be removable therefrom only by constitutional due process of law are opposite and inherently conflicting ideas. Due process of law is not applicable unless one is being deprived of something to which he has a right.
>
> Constitutionally, the criterion for retention or removal of subordinate employees is the confidence of superior executive officials. Confidence is not controllable, by process. What may be required by acts of the Congress is another matter, but there is no requirement in the Constitution that the executive branch rely upon the services of persons in whom it lacks confidence.

To the argument of Miss Bailey that even if the executive had power to dismiss her without a judicial hearing, they had no power to call her disloyal while doing so, the court said:

> If Miss Bailey had no constitutional right to her office and the executive officers had power to dismiss her, the fact that she was injured in the process of dismissal neither

invalidates her dismissal nor gives her right to redress; this under a rule of law established long ago.

The court quoted from Judge Learned Hand and pointed out that, as is so often the case, the answer must be found in a balance between the evils inevitable in either alternative. The reason for the rule is the same as that which permits a person to be publicly stigmatized by utterances on the floor of the Congress without any opportunity in any established forum to deny or to refute. The court said that these harsh rules "have always been held necessary as a matter of public policy, public interest, and the unimpeded performance of the public business."

Mr. WAGGONNER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remaining time on this side of the aisle, just to point out and to underscore what seems to me is the very much overlooked provision of this legislation and the provision of the law governing CIA, that termination under this summary dismissal procedure does not affect the individual's right to seek or accept employment in any other department or agency of the U.S. Government.

This is a major safeguard against stigmatizing a person unfairly or depriving him unfairly or improperly of Government employment. But at the same time it provides that flexibility which in certain cases is essential if the Secretary of Defense and the head of the CIA are to meet their very heavy responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, I offer one other observation. As the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Willis] has pointed out, of course there is possibility of error. There is possibility of error in judicial process. Does that argue therefore that trial by jury, judicial process, and the courts are to be abolished because the power inherent in them has a potential of human fallibility?

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Tuck], a member of this committee, 5 minutes.

At this time I ask unanimous consent that, following the presentation of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Tuck], all Members who so desire may extend their remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Louisiana, for yielding to me at this time. I want to say, too, that I am in wholehearted accord with the statements the gentleman has made relative to this bill. I favor the passage of the bill as reported to the House from the Committee on Un-American Activities. This bill passed the House of Representatives in the last Congress, during the latter part of the session, but was not acted upon on the other side, supposedly because they did not have time in which to act.

Mr. Chairman, security and freedom are the bedrock upon which our liberty is based. Our Government was established for the purpose of guaranteeing to our citizens both freedom and security. They constitute what we call our American way of life. Each is dependent upon the other and without both we have neither.

Among the most important weapons we have to protect our security and freedom are those laws designed to prevent infiltration of our Government by enemies of the Nation. Exiles from Czechoslovakia tell us that their country lacked both effective security laws and the will to employ them. That is the one reason why there was a takeover of the Czech Government in 1948 by these despicable Communists.

The jugular vein of every nation is the government. The bureaus and the agencies of the government constitute the principal target of Communist infiltration. We have a great democratic Government here. We must preserve it. In order to do so, top priority must be given to securing that Government from infiltration by the enemy.

Mr. Chairman, I have always contended that it is a privilege for a citizen to be employed by the U.S. Government. It is not a right. A person so occupied and employed is indeed a servant of the people. The least that can be demanded of that person is that he will not betray the trust of his fellow citizens.

It is the right and the duty of the Government to take firm and resolute action to assure that it employs only individuals who are loyal and who continue to be loyal to the form of government which we enjoy here in America today.

Despite all its imperfections, our system of Government under which we are privileged to live has provided more genuine freedom to a greater number of people over a longer period of time than any other system in the history of the world. We in this House have a bounden duty today to keep it that way. This may sound like flag waving, but if it is, I would rather wave the flag of my country than to be guilty of contributing to a wavering of that flag. Our flag, the Stars and Stripes, has never trailed in the dust of defeat and it never will, as long as we produce men and women who are determined to protect the best interest of this country. Not only in civil life and in our Government, but on the battlefields and battle seas of the world.

Let me remind you that, in the name of the people, the House of Representatives helped to create the National Security Agency as a vital and necessary part of a $50-billion-a-year defense program to preserve this Nation. It is our duty to take such further action now as may be necessary to assure the people that the National Security Agency will be used in their behalf and will not be infiltrated and utilized against them by the enemies of the United States, such as was done not long ago by Martin and Mitchell.

The issue before us is a clear one. If there is a conflict between the Government of the United States and the individual, then I say it is more important to preserve the freedom and the security of America than it is to guarantee a job to some faithless, perfidious person employed by that Goverment and who cannot be trusted as a security risk.

I have no concern for the protection of the so-called rights of such persons as Martin and Mitchell. They have no rights other than to be punished as criminals and traitors.

I am reminded, in conclusion, of the story that was one of the favorite stories of the late distinguished Senator from Kentucky, Senator Barkley. He said that out in one of the legislative districts of Kentucky a young man was a candidate for the Democratic nomination for the House of Representatives of Kentucky. He was down in one of the counties where they were raising sheep, where the dogs had killed almost all the sheep there were in that county. Of course, the dogs were quite unpopular there. This young man was making his speech before his constituents there in that county and he said, "Gentlemen, I favor a strong dog law. I am in favor of a dog law so strong it will exterminate dogs and thus save the sheep."

The farmers liked that.

The next day he went on to the adjoining county, which was the fox hunting country where they rode behind the dogs and where they had no sheep but plenty of beautiful and expensive dogs. So he was getting along pretty well, until finally one of the men over there got up and said: "Let me ask you a question, sir? Will you tell the people here what sort of dog law it is that you favor? What are you going to do to the dogs to protect the sheep?"

He said, "Oh, my friends, I am glad you asked me that question. I am in favor of a dog law. I am in favor of a strong dog law. But I am in favor of a dog law that will protect the sheep and not hurt the dogs."

Mr. Chairman, if in this case it is necessary to hurt a few persons of questionable security risk in order to protect the people of the United States of America, I am in favor of America first.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. The bill offered by the distinguished chairman is the result of extensive hearings and examination by the House Un-American Activities Committee.

The legislation under consideration has the support of the Department of Defense, the Civil Service Commission, the National Security Agency, and the Department of Justice, all of which presented their views to the committee during formulation of this legislation.

One of the purposes of this bill is to allow the Secretary of Defense to recruit and terminate employment of NSA personnel, with the counsel of an advisory board. Such machinery is necessary in governmental agencies which have been exempted from normal civil service procedures because of the classified nature of their functions.

Careful note has been made in the committee report to state that the advisory board is not established for the purpose of protecting the employees of this particular agency as much as to provide mature disposition of doubtful security cases.

I am advised that similar personnel procedures are prescribed for the Central Intelligence Agency, an agency charged with even more critical and sensitive functions than NSA.

The defection of NSA employees, Bernon F. Mitchell and William H. Martin, both of whom had been employed in highly sensitive areas, in 1960 gave rise to the investigation which produced the bill before us now. What precautions have been taken to prevent future occurrences involving CIA personnel?

Mr. Chairman, when Congress established the Central Intelligence Agency in 1947 it exempted that agency from virtually all normal controls applied to other governmental operations. As we see here today, Congress is providing for procedural changes in the NSA some 11 years after this agency was established in 1952. Time has run its course on the CIA, and the Congress would improve the role of that agency through the establishment of a joint House-Senate watchdog committee on CIA.

Such a committee is proposed in House Joint Resolution 211, and would be similar to the present Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, which was established in 1946 to give congressional review to the highly sensitive operation of the Atomic Energy Commission. A watchdog committee as proposed in House Joint Resolution 211 would also improve communications between Congress and CIA, lessening the possibilities of misunderstanding and undue criticism of that agency.

I commend the efforts of this committee, and am pleased to support its work.

Mr. GILL. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that most of us who will vote against this bill do so without any particular disagreement with those provisions requiring full field investigation and appraisal of persons to be assigned to or employed by the National Security Agency.

However, I emphatically join my colleagues who oppose that portion of the bill which would eliminate any and all rights of appeal or hearing for an employee whose employment is terminated. The failure of the Committee on Un-American Activities, and this House, to accept the various amendments offered which would have in some degree preserved the constitutional right to due process of law for terminated employees, makes the total bill defective and unacceptable.

The processes established under existing law (5 U.S.C. 22-1 and 863) make ample provision for the protection of the security interests of the United States; to eliminate even these restricted rights of due process, as H.R. 950 would do, goes far beyond the limits of reason. It opens the door, as even some of our conservative Republican colleagues have pointed out, to arbitrary and capricious action on the part of Government administrators.

There has been much said about danger to the national security. Democracy itself is a dangerous form of government and in its very danger lies its strength. The protection of individual rights by the requirement of due process of law, which has long endured in this Nation of ours, is a radical and dangerous idea in most of the world today. This dangerous concept is outlawed in the Soviet Union, in Red China, in Castro's Cuba, indeed, in all of the Communist bloc and many of those countries alined with it.

I think we might well ask: How does one destroy his enemy by becoming like him?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, from the experiences of mankind in many unhappy centuries have come lessons that guided the thinking of our forefathers when they gave to the world the Constitution of the United States as the most perfect political doctrine within the power of man to create.

It recognizes the frailty of the wisest and the best of human kind. Even the most prudent and the most dedicated of men can go astray in the exercise of power unlimited and unchecked. So under our Constitution we have a government of checks, a check by one branch of government upon another branch and as well a check upon each individual citizen by other citizens. Unless there be that check men of the warmest hearts and of the best of intentions may trespass upon the rights of other men.

The principle that no man shall be deprived of his reputation, his goods, his job, or of any possession that gives sustenance, substance, some measure of contentment and of dignity to his existence, shall be taken from him without the opportunity of facing his accusers is deeply rooted in our law and in the American concept.

No man is infallible. All men have their friends and their acquaintenances, and all men at times find themselves influenced by things that have been whispered into their ears and on which they have had no opportunity of making their own investigations. This is true of men on all levels of intelligence and of position and men of the highest moral motivation as well as those of the lowest. All of this our forefathers envisioned when they referred to the frailties of human nature, and sought by words that they placed into the Constitution of the United States to guard against by constitutional guarantees and by laws.

The bill we have under discussion is a good bill in intention. No one should have access to secrets vital to the security of this Nation that is not entirely trustworthy. Certainly no one should have access to secrets the divulgence of which could do harm to the security of our Nation unless in every sense he had the same loyalty to and love of country that fills the very being of a man willing to give his life for his country.

I think we all agree that the Secretary of Defense and the Director of the Security Agency, responsible for the safekeeping of the Nation's secrets, should have every reasonable means of replacing persons of questionable loyalty, of questionable dependability, of questionable discretion.

I think it is possible to obtain the objective sought by this bill if it were amended to preserve the principle, so precious to our American concept of the right of the accused always to face his accusers. I do not think it is possible to do that by amendments offered from the floor. I do not think that ever a bill, reasonably acceptable to everyone seeking the same objective but by conflicting means, can be written on the floor of the House.

I read on page 5 of H.R. 950, subsection b of section 301, and I find here a meritorious effort to protect one discharged from the sensitive National Security Agency from prejudice in search for employment in other departments of the Federal Government. It provides that termination of employment by the Security Agency shall not affect the right of the officer or employee involved to seek or accept employment with other department or agency of the United United States if he is declared eligible for such employment by the U.S. Civil Service Commission. I take it that the intention of this subsection is to protect the person discharged, without a trial or a hearing or the opportunity of confronting his accusers, when he seeks employment elsewhere in the Federal Government. But the fact is that the person so discharged would find himself fatally handicapped. He might have been discharged without there being in anyone's mind the slightest suspicion of his loyalty. He may have been discharged for what would have seemed a good and sufficient reason to his superiors because he did not have the temperament of one entrusted with confidential matters. Yet the fact that he had been discharged by the Security Agency without any explanation of the reason, without any record on which one could check, would naturally raise a serious doubt with other governmental agencies or departments to which he might apply.

I think it is possible to write a bill that will attain in full the objectives of H.R. 950, the right of a sensitive agency to transfer an employee who is not fitted temperamentally or otherwise for service in the sensitive area. I think this can be done without violation of the American concept of justice that every man shall be protected from divestment of his life or possessions without having the opportunity of facing his accusers. But, Mr. Chairman, I repeat I do not think it can be done by rewriting the bill here on the floor of the House.

I am in full sympathy with the objectives of the bill, but I shall be one of a minority voting against it with the hope that when the measure reaches the other body, it will receive further study to the end that the National Security Agency will have the fullest means of protection and at the same time there will be the fullest possible protection against the possibility of a good and loyal American citizen becoming the victim of gossip, whispers, and charges from an unnamed and unidentified source.

When in the expediency of the moment and in our reaching out for the easy means of attaining desired objectives we wander from the spirit, and as well, the letter of the Constitution, we are entering the uncharted wilderness from which our forefathers sought to protect us.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of H.R. 950 is to establish a legislative base for enforcing a strict security standard for the employment and retention in employment of persons in the National Security Agency, to achieve maximum security for the activities of the Agency, and to strengthen the capability of the Secretary of Defense and the Director of the Agency to provide for such by authorizing the Secretary of Defense to terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Agency whenever he considers such action to be in the best interests of the United States. This purpose, I believe, will not in any way be jeopardized by the amendments proposed by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD], and by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER]. The proposed amendments would have merely given an employee, once he has been hired, the right of appeal and the right to be heard in his own defense upon being discharged for alleged misconduct.

I have no objection to any other provision of the bill, but I do believe that without the proposed amendments the bill violates a fundamental American right of fair play. One of the most cherished rights in our great democracy has been the right of due process of law. We have long believed in and practiced the principle that no one shall be found guilty of any misconduct without being given "a day in court." Without the proposed amendments, the bill denies an officer or employee of the Agency this fundamental American right.

The amendments would not have effected any lowering of the standard of security because the Secretary would still have retained the right to discharge an employee for good cause. The amendments would have merely extended to such employee the right to defend his reputation and future livelihood. Through capriciousness and arbitrary action, a faithful and loyal employee could be summarily discharged under the provisions of the bill as it now stands and have his whole life ruined.

In all good conscience, therefore, I cannot support the measure in its present form.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Chairman, in the present earnest debate as to the merits of legislation before us, I think it is worthy of note that the bill comes to us from the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Understandably, this committee receives most of its public notice through its investigative activity. Less well known is its function of legislative recommendation.

I need not review the unfortunate circumstances, revealed in detail in congressional hearings, which gave evidence of inadequate personnel security controls in the National Security Agency, a highly sensitive establishment. The revelations of individual cases made headlines, but little public attention attached to the subsequent painstaking analysis of the personnel selection and management problems which culminated in the drafting of the pending bill. The membership and staff of the Committee on Un-American Activities merit the approbation and thanks of this House, I believe, in addressing themselves to the problem in a dispassionate way and arriving at legislative recommendations which give promise of greater protection for the sensitive functions of the National Security Agency without doing violence to basic principles of fairness which all can agree should be applied in the Federal service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Internal Security Act of 1950 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE III—PERSONNEL SECURITY PROCEDURES IN NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY

"Regulations for employment security

"SEC. 301. Subject to the provisions of this title, the Secretary of Defense (hereafter in this title referred to as the 'Secretary') shall prescribe such regulations relating to continuing security procedures as he considers necessary to assure—

"(1) that no person shall be employed in, or detailed or assigned to, the National Security Agency (hereafter in this title referred to as the 'Agency'), or continue to be so employed, detailed, or assigned; and

"(2) that no person so employed, detailed, or assigned shall have access to any classified information; unless such employment, detail, assignment, or access to classified information is clearly consistent with the national security.

"Full field investigation and appraisal

"SEC. 302. (a) No person shall be employed in, or detailed or assigned to, the Agency unless he has been the subject of a full field investigation in connection with such employment, detail, or assignment, and is cleared for access to classified information in accordance with the provisions of this title; excepting that conditional employment without access to sensitive cryptologic information or material may be tendered any applicant, under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, pending the completion of such full field investigation: *And provided further,* That such full field investigation at the discretion of the Secretary need not be required in the case of persons assigned or detailed to the Agency who have a current security clearance for access to sensitive cryptologic information under equivalent standards of investigation and clearance. During any period of war declared by the Congress, or during any period when the Secretary determines that a national disaster exists, or in exceptional cases in which the Secretary (or his designee for such purpose) makes a determination in writing that his action is necessary or advisable in the national interest, he may authorize the employment of any person in, or the detail or assignment of any person to, the Agency, and may grant to any such person access to classified information, on a temporary basis, pending the completion of the full field investigation and the clearance for access to classified information required by this subsection, if the Secretary determines that such action is clearly consistent with the national security.

"(b) To assist the Secretary and the Director of the Agency in carrying out their personnel security responsibilities, one or more boards of appraisal of three members each, to be appointed by the Director of the Agency, shall be established in the Agency. Such a board shall appraise the loyalty and suitability of persons for access to classified information, in those cases in which the Director of the Agency determines that there is a doubt whether their access to that information would be clearly consistent with the national security, and shall submit a report and recommendation on each such a case. However, appraisal by such a board is not required before action may be taken under section 14 of the Act of June 27, 1944, chapter 287, as amended (5 U.S.C. 863), section 1 of the Act of August 26, 1950, chapter 803, as amended (5 U.S.C. 22–1), or any other similar provision of law. Each member of such a board shall be specially qualified and trained for his duties as such a member, shall have been the subject of a full field investigation in connection with his appointment as such a member, and shall have been cleared by the Director for access to classified information at the time of his appointment as such a member. No person shall be cleared for access to classified information, contrary to the recommendations of any such board, unless the Secretary (or his designee for such purpose) shall make a determination in writing that such employment, detail, assignment, or access to classified information is in the national interest.

"Termination of employment

"SEC. 303. (a) Notwithstanding section 14 of the Act of June 27, 1944, chapter 287, as amended (5 U.S.C. 863), section 1 of the Act of August 26, 1950, chapter 803, as amended (5 U.S.C. 22–1), or any other provision of law, the Secretary may terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Agency whenever he considers that action to be in the interest of the United States, and he determines that the procedures prescribed in other provisions of law that authorize the termination of the employment of that officer or employee cannot be invoked consistently with the national security. Such a determination is final.

"(b) Termination of employment under this section shall not affect the right of the officer or employee involved to seek or accept employment with any other department or agency of the United States if he is declared eligible for such employment by the United States Civil Service Commission.

"Definition of classified information

"SEC. 304. For the purposes of this section, the term 'classified information' means information which, for reasons of national security, is specifically designated by a United States Government agency for limited or restricted disemination or distribution.

"Nonapplicability of Administrative Procedure Act

"SEC. 305. The Administrative Procedure Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.), shall not apply to the use or exercise of any authority granted by this title.

"Amendments

"SEC. 306. (a) The first sentence of section 2 of the Act of May 29, 1959 (50 U.S.C. 402 note), is amended by inserting ', without regard to the civil service laws,' immediately after 'and to appoint thereto'.

"(b) Subsection (b) of section 2 of the Performance Rating Act of 1950 (5 U.S.C. 2001(b)) is amended—

"(1) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (13) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon; and

"(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

" '(14) The National Security Agency.'."

Mr. WILLIS (during the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill may be dispensed with, and that the bill be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. Roosevelt: On page 4, strike out line 18 and all that follows down through page 5, line 4 and renumber the sections as necessary.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be amended to include on page 5, line 5, the words "under this section" be eliminated in order to make that subsection (b) conform to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be so modified.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. Roosevelt: On page 4, strike out line 18 and all that follows down through page 5, line 4, and the words "under this section" on page 5, line 5, and renumber the following sections as necessary.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I think we have debated this basic subject rather fully this afternoon. I do not intend to take the full 5 minutes but I would like to make a few remarks, if I may, to my good friend, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Willis].

The gentleman has pointed out it is possible even when we have judicial review that sometimes we send someone to the electric chair who later proves to be not guilty. The gentleman uses that possibility as a reason that we should abolish any kind of review in these cases. I admire my colleague as a lawyer as well as a wonderful friend, but I cannot see any logical sequitur in that line of argument because we know that the reasons we have our judicial procedures set up is to try to mete out justice to all. Here we do not even take the elemental step—we do not even take the first step to mete out justice. It is true that even if we did give some kind of review that we still might make mistakes, but certainly I can see no reason why that should be used as an argument for giving no judicial review at all. Of course, the fact might be that in the end there is still finally a chance for mistake. In this agency today there can be no case which is not covered by appropriate law which gives all power to the Secretary to remove any individual that he is afraid of away from a sensitive area and to give that individual a hearing and give it to him in secret? That is done over and over again. There can be absolutely no question of security violation. I cannot see any reason why in this instance we would be endangering the security of our country when we are trying to do something to preserve the rights of an individual—even if he is a dog. Now, I do not like to call people dogs, but I do not think we should assume that he is a dog. He might be a pretty good person who for some reason or another has incurred the wrath of somebody through a personality conflict—and in this kind of work personality conflicts arise, perhaps, more quickly than in any other kind of work. It seems to me, all we are saying and all we are asking of the committee is—let us be sure that we hire the right kind of people.

Let us be sure we can remove them, but at least give the person who is accused the right to know what he is accused of, even if you do it in secret, and give him the right to enable him to process an appeal.

Incidentally, if the gentleman from Texas will look on page 3, section 302(b), he will find there are boards of competent people set up. I would even go so far as to suggest one of those boards should be given the responsibility for some kind of appeal. But there is no appeal. How can you in the times in which we exist do this to an American citizen, who was carefully picked to serve his Government, after all kinds of rigidity tests were given to him, and then blacken him without giving some assurance he will get his fair day in court?

I leave it on that basis. I hope my friends will believe that we as everybody else are as strong for the security of our country as anyone can be. You cannot accuse us of less loyalty to our country because we want to stand for the rights of individuals. We believe we are trying to strengthen and maintain basic American ideals and principles.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to agree with my colleague from California, but since I do not feel we should strike that section, I ask the gentleman to consider an amendment which I shall propose at the proper time that would give the protection he seeks. I ask him to consider an amendment I proposed earlier relative to the Appeal Board. I do not want to water the gentleman's amendment at the moment, but should it not prevail I have an amendment.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I will have to say there are always more ways than one to do a job. It seemed to me this was the best and simplest way. If it is turned down and the gentleman has an amendment, perhaps I shall support his amendment. But the gentleman from Louisiana is not going to accept that either.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have not much time, and I hope you will listen very closely to what I have to say, and particularly you lawyers in the House who may not have followed the argument last year.

I am going to put this article in the Record again, and you may refer to it later. But I want to refer to the pertinent sections here, because it deals with everything we have been talking about.

Professor Newman, dean of the California Law School, states:

> Our presumption is that modest reforms may be practicable, that the process of prescribing due process could be bettered.

He goes on to say:

> Yet without soaring into semantics or political theory, could we not shun one view of life, liberty, or property that has caused much chaos? I refer to the hundreds, maybe thousands, of cases that protect rights but not privileges, declaring that due process of law is not applicable with respect to Government employment, for instance, unless one is being deprived of something to which he has a right.

He goes on to say:

> The due-process clauses say nothing of right versus privilege. The chief vice of the privilege doctrine is that it has insulated us from a body of law, highly reputable, that seems designedly apt for protecting the freedoms that life, liberty, or property seem to imply.

Finally, he goes on to say:

> To pronounce that "liberty or property" includes, say, reputational and emotional interests would not mean that governments no longer could deprive people of those interests, or that deprivations could be effected only by judicial trial. The requirement would merely be that due process be accorded.

That is what I have been referring to, and we are not talking strictly about criminal due process.

We are talking about administrative due process, and we can develop procedures which will protect the so-called informer, and the security requirements can be met.

Again, as Professor Newman so clearly points out:

> The kind of precise portrayal of harm that may crucially affect a lawsuit is exemplified by petitioner's brief in *Peters* v. *Hobby*. "We, of course, concede," said counsel, "that the Constitution does not limit the power of the Executive summarily to terminate employment on secret information or for any other reason. The question before this Court is only whether the Government has the right to accompany a discharge with a finding of disloyalty which ruins the reputation and career of the accused, without a full hearing. In other words, the protested harm was not to job security but to one's repute as a prospective jobholder."

Now, where the present bill before us goes astray, in my judgment, is in jumping from the proven necessity of tightening up security measures in the preemployment stage to the unproven assumption that national security demands giving authority to the Secretary of Defense to terminate summarily without any hearing whatsoever.

As Justice Tom Clark said in the Supreme Court's unanimous opinion in *Wieman* v. *Updegraff* (344 U.S. 183 (1952)):

> There can be no dispute about the consequences visited upon a person excluded from public employment on disloyalty grounds. In the view of the community, the stain is a deep one; indeed, it has become a badge of infamy.

When we realize the tremendous damage which is visited on any Government employee who is dismissed on loyalty or security grounds, we want to be sure that the dismissal is not done unjustly. This bill would permit possible unjust summary dismissal based on the word of nameless accusers.

It denies to Government employees the most elementary features of due process—namely, the notice of charges and the right to confront and cross-examine the accusers.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT]. I think it has to be made clear exactly what the amendment does.

First of all, it has to be stated once again that this bill before us abolishes hearings; it abolishes the normal right of an employee to have stated to him the reason he is being fired. The bill abolishes an employee's normal right to submit a statement on his own behalf, whether it be in secret or whether it be in public hearings. The bill before us waives all of the existing provisions of law contained in the United States Code designed to give an employee minimum safeguards in the Government service.

Further, the bill abolishes any right of court review. And there is another deficiency which has not been mentioned in the debate. There is power to the Secretary to delegate this vast power to any subordinate employee of the entire Federal apparatus that happens to be under his jurisdiction. I hope Members are aware of the trouble that this can cause. Lesser bureaucrats very often take the safe course.

I think Members should be conscious of what we are doing here today. We must view this unusual procedure in the context of the great power that is lodged today in the Central Government. The Central Government is given total arbitrary power to willy-nilly fire a person, with all of the problems of stigma and stain and reputation that go with it. There has been some discussion about past laxity in the National Security Agency. This has nothing to do with questions of laxity. This has to do, as the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] said, with due process. You do not have an absence of firm control, or the presence of laxity, because you have provided a minimum measure of due process.

Mr. Chairman, it has to be understood that procedure is just as important as substance when you are dealing with the central power of the Government. My friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] has put his finger on it when the gentleman talks about central power and the dangers of central power. When you collect this amount of arbitrary power with no review, no hearing, no check, no appeal, then you have got something to be afraid of. I would urge the gentleman from Texas, however, to support this amendment that is now pending. That amendment seeks only to reinstate the hearing procedures contained in title 5 of the United States Code. These procedures do not require direct confrontation. The Government does not have to give up any secrets. Title V of the Code provides that when an employee receives notice of dismissal, he has a right to a written statement summarizing the charge. He has an opportunity to reply in writing within 30 days and he is given a hearing. He has a right to appeal to the head of the Agency.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] asks that there be a review board. There is already a provision in title V that there be a review by the Agency head. This is all that we ask. Is it too much to ask for minimum due process in this regard? I think in order to save the bill which is now pending before the House and which has been brought forth by the gentleman from Louisiana—because I feel sure it will be struck down by the courts as being unconstitutional under the fifth amendment otherwise—this amendment should be adopted.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York has stated the case well. The gentleman is a distinguished lawyer, and I wish the gentleman would explain to the members of the committee—particularly for the benefit of us nonlawyers—just what the difference is between criminal due process and administrative due process. I would ask the gentleman to tell us how it will affect the security of the agency.

Mr. LINDSAY. Within the limited time I have left I will state to the gentleman from California that the gentleman has already alluded to that body of law known as administrative due process. It is something substantially less than the process in a criminal trial. It is a body of law, largely built up by the courts, which states that people who work for or deal with the Federal Government cannot be treated arbitrarily and summarily. They have to be accorded fair and decent treatment.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. If I understood the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] correctly—and I know the gentleman will correct me if I am misstating him—he expressed the belief that this provision might be struck down by the courts.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHANSEN. Surely.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that after the time which has been allotted to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN] has expired debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The **CHAIRMAN.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, do I understand that would apply also to other amendments to this section, or just to this amendment?

Mr. WILLIS. All debate on this amendment and amendments to this amendment.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation.

The **CHAIRMAN.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I should like to ask the distinguished Chairman if he would request sufficient time to give each of us at least 3 minutes. I think there were six Members standing; that would be 18 minutes.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The Chair observes eight Members standing at this time.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The **CHAIRMAN.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, if I understood the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] correctly he expressed the view that it would be desirable to delete section 303 in order to save the bill which otherwise the gentleman regards as excellent because, if I understood him correctly, he believed this provision would be struck down by the courts.

Mr. Chairman, let us start facing the facts. Let us not be led down some primrose path by a statement of that kind. The truth of the matter is that a provision almost word for word identical to this one in section 303 is included in the National Security Act of 1947 with respect to the CIA. The facts of the matter are that it has been before the courts. The facts of the matter are that when the case, as I mentioned in general debate, of Torpats against McCone was brought before the Court of Appeals in the District of Columbia a year ago last March the court sustained this type of provision. And again I say it was almost word for word—identical. The court held that the National Security Act of 1947 gives summary power of dismissal, similar to that, I will add, provided in section 303 of this bill, which the amendment of the gentleman from California would delete; and that pursuant to this statute the CIA adopted regulations calling—and I invite particular attention to this phrase "for an impartial review by the Director."

Now, about all this talk about review. The review under section 303 would be vested in the Secretary of Defense and the authority that is vested in him is the review of the recommendations or findings of these boards of appraisal.

Not only did the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals sustain this similar legislation that relates to CIA, but the attempt was made to secure a review of the decision by the U.S. Supreme Court and certiorari was denied.

I just cannot let stand unchallenged the kind of an argument evidently advanced by my very good friend from New York, that in order to save this bill you have to gut it and you have to gut it to save it because of what the courts are going to do to it, when the courts have not done anything of the kind in a totally parallel situation.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment. I urge my colleagues not to be misled as to its necessity or its import.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I asked for this time to ask a question of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. I am concerned about section 304 of the bill. I notice that it states:

> For the purposes of this section, the term "classified information" means information which, for reasons of national security, is specifically designated by a United States Government agency for limited or restricted dissemination or distribution.

There are a number of documents that cross my desk almost every day, as vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Some of those are marked "Confidential," some "Secret," some "Top Secret," and some, "For Official Use Only." The question I want to ask is, Would these "For Official Use Only" documents, for limited distribution, be characterized as classified information?

Mr. WILLIS. There may be other usage of the words in the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. No. It happens in the defense committees and other committees, too. "For Official Use Only" documents frequently come across our desks. These are restricted in distribution, but they are not necessarily classified information.

Mr. WILLIS. Let me read to the gentleman a letter which contains the information he is seeking.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am afraid my time will not allow that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I think the committee has brought out a good bill, except the one section that is under dispute in this particular amendment. I do not believe I would like to see us go as far as the Roosevelt amendment, because I think that in this area there is need for a great deal more power in the Secretary of Defense. Actually, if we get the power of dismissal too far removed from the Secretary, there is doubt that he would use this power as he should.

On the other hand, I am deeply concerned about the committee's failure to put in an intermediate kind of power of review to replace the normal procedures of review. I do not like to have amendments on the floor of this type without committee study. However, the amendment the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] is going to propose seems reasonable. Certainly it could be worked out in detail. In this way this item that concerns me, and I think many people, of giving all power to any one man, I do not care who he is, would be corrected. I am really more concerned about the effect on the individual who has that power. If I were Secretary of Defense, I am sure I would establish some sort of review board in this kind of case.

Therefore, I hope this amendment will be defeated, and that an amendment such as the one proposed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] will be accepted, and that the Committee will think a little more deeply on this subject that concerns us.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY].

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me may be granted to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY].

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Roosevelt amendment. I would like especially to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] for making it clear that under existing law a security risk can be dismissed but still have appeal and review rights which in no way jeopardize national security. What section 303 does in the bill under consideration is to strip those rights of appeal and review. The question has been raised, and I think very interestingly, as to whether or not due process in fact applies to a situation of this kind. The chairman has suggested that a Supreme Court decision, Bailey against Richardson, is relevant, particularly the statement:

> Due process of law is not applicable unless one is being deprived of something to which he has a right.

Perhaps so, Mr. Chairman, but I am reminded of a case which although not on all fours or completely analogous, perhaps, has significance.

A former constituent of mine applied some 7 or 8 years ago for prisoner-of-war compensation under a Federal law which granted $3 a day for each day in prison to Korean prisoners of war who did not collaborate with the enemy.

This man's application, Mr. Chairman, was denied. It was denied by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission without an adequate hearing and without the veteran—who had received the Bronze Star for gallantry and the Purple Heart for wounds—having the opportunity to confront his accusers or the right to cross-examine them. Eight years later—after the authority of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission had run out, this man's reputation was salvaged. It was salvaged by the Congress and by the President, not by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. The reputation of an American citizen was restored because this legislative body exercised its right of review, because the House Committee on the Judiciary held a hearing—two, really—the first of which determined that this man had been denied a hearing within the meaning of the law and the second finding that as a matter of substance he did not collaborate with the enemy. Only at this point—only at this point after 7 long years—was his reputation saved. It was not done by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. That Commission's finding made the man a traitor. There was no right of review under the law. The administrative procedures act did not apply. There was no due process because the benefits involved were not a matter of right, they were a matter of grace. But what about his reputation? What about his reputation? If it had not been for a body other than and higher than the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, that man would be a traitor today to everyone in the United States—except himself.

Mr. Chairman, this is what we are concerned with when we consider a bill such as the one before us. When we put the authority in the hands of one man to determine with finality whether a man is loyal or not, without proper opportunity for defense or review, that is going too far.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the committee for what I consider generally to be a good bill. I do not join my colleague from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] in his amendment to strike out section 303, although I believe the bill as it stands is not a proper protection to the citizens of the United States on the one hand, and on the other hand puts the Secretary of Defense, no matter how well intentioned a man he may be—and we have had good Secretaries of Defense in the past—in the position of being a dictator.

In order to correct the situation, I shall submit to the membership of the House an amendment, which I will present at the right time; and because I oppose the amendment of the gentleman from California, I should like to read the language of the amendment, which is as follows:

> On page 5, line 4, after the word "final" insert "except that any employee whose employment is so terminated shall have the right of appeal to an appeal board, such appeal board shall consist of three persons, appointed by the President, and who are cleared by the Director of the National Security Agency for access to classified information.

I must say to the chairman of the committee, who has done a fine job in this area, this would not divulge the sensitive material that we are all aware we must protect in this Nation, if we are to have security. Yet it would give the man the right of appeal so he is not summarily dismissed by another human being who can make a mistake, as can the Secretary of Defense, in summarily dismissing a man who has not such appeal.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. NEDZI].

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the debate this afternoon, and have the feeling that the membership is not fully advised of what the law is as it stands now with reference to the area about which we are talking.

I would like to take a moment to read as has been presented to me, chapter 803, Public Law 33. This law incidentally was extended in 1953 to all agencies of the Federal Government.

The law is as follows:

> Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, Secretaries of State, Commerce; Attorney General, Secretary of Defense; Secretaries of Army, Navy and Air Force; Secretary of Treasury; Atomic Energy Commission; Chairman, National Security Resources Board; or Director of National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, may, in his absolute discretion and when deemed necessary in the interest of national security, suspend, without pay, any civilian officer or employee in the mentioned Departments: *Provided*, That to the extent that such agency head

determines that the interests of the national security permit, the employee concerned shall be notified of the reasons for his suspension and within thirty days after such notification any person shall have an opportunity to submit any statements or affidavits to the official designated by the head of the agency concerned to show why he should be reinstated or restored to duty. The agency head concerned may, following such investigation and review as he deems necessary, terminate the employment of the suspended employee whenever he shall determine such termination necessary or advisable in the interest of the national security of the United States, and such determination by the agency head concerned shall be conclusive and final: *Provided further*, That any employee having a permanent or indefinite appointment, and having completed his probationary or trial period, who is a citizen of the United States whose employment is suspended under the authority of this Act, shall be given after his suspension and before his employment is terminated under the authority of this Act (1) a written statement within thirty days after his suspension of the charges against him, which shall be subject to amendment within thirty days thereafter and which shall be stated as specifically as security considerations permit; (2) an opportunity within thirty days thereafter (plus an additional thirty days if the charges are amended) to answer such charges and submit affidavits; (3) a hearing, at the employee's request, by a duly constituted agency authority for this purpose; (4) a review of his case by the agency head, or some official designated by him, before a decision adverse to the employee is made final; and (5) a written statement of the decision of the agency head: *Provided further*, That any person whose employment is so suspended or terminated under the authority of this Act may, in the discretion of the agency head concerned, be reinstated or restored to duty with compensation.

Approved August 26, 1950.

(5 U.S.C.A. 652; 42 U.S.C.A. 1801 et seq.; 42 U.S.C.A. 1812; 5 U.S.C.A. 652 note, U.S.C.C.S. 1949, p. 451, U.S.C.C.S. 1949, p. 1032; E.O. 10450, Apr. 27, 1953; 18 F.R. 3183, extends coverage of Public Law 733 to all agencies of the Federal Government and all departments.)

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am greatly concerned over section 304. I believe it widens the scope of documents which can be classified, such as "For Official Use Only." We know that many hundreds of people are given the authority to classify in the different departments, something like over 593 in the Department of Commerce and several thousand in the Department of Defense. Now, we also know that many times news releases are marked "Confidential" to hold them until a certain time. I fear that we are really broadening the field of classification of documents to the point where it will, under this bill, become a menace to the rights of the individual.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Wyman].

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment, and would like to say one or two things that may be helpful in this regard.

The gentleman from California has offered an amendment here in which he raises the point that it is unfair to the people who work in this Agency to have summary dismissal procedures apply to them. It seems to me that we are looking aside from the real issue. The security of the country is involved here, and the Secretary of Defense has deemed it necessary to ask the Congress for relief. Now, the committee report says that the Secretary shall be authorized summarily to terminate the services of employees of the National Security Agency when such action is deemed necessary in the interests of the United States. In the security interest of the Nation the Defense Department does not want this record. They do not want the written record that is implicit in the appellate process that would expose the procedures, activities, and goings on within this highly classified Government Agency. Under the amendment an employee given notice of termination could go to the Circuit Court of Appeals, or to the Supreme Court itself. Surely there can be no quarrel for summary dismissal for those who come into the Agency after the effective date of the legislation, because they will be forewarned of the situation prevailing in this Agency.

But, that is not the argument of the gentleman from California. His amendment would strike out the entire power of termination itself. As to the constitutional requirements of due process either civil or criminal due process, all I can say is that the matter of Government employment as a privilege has been settled at this point by the courts. It is not a right, and to this point in our jurisprudence being a privilege only, it lacks the status or the sanctuary the judiciary has conferred on rights. I will agree, though, with the gentleman that what is going to happen if this question should go to the Supreme Court is problematical. This we have seen from its decisions over the last 6 or 8 years.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Willis].

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the arguments made in favor of this amendment. They all proceed on the assumption that the Secretary of Defense is a man who is inclined to be arbitrary and capricious and insists on having czarist and dictatorial powers, and further, that nothing has been done about the employee's case prior to the time that the papers reached the desk of the Secretary of Defense. As a matter of fact, if you read every part of this bill you will see that the action of the Secretary of Defense is itself in the nature of a review action. The bill provides for boards of appraisal whose duties will be to look into all aspects of these cases, gather all the facts, evaluate all the evidence, and submit a report in writing along with a recommendation as to what action should be taken in each case.

Then after that evaluation is made, the matter goes to the Secretary of Defense for final action.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired. All time on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. Roosevelt].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Roosevelt) there were—ayes 39, noes 132.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ALGER. Mr Chairman I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Alger: On page 5, line 4, strike the period after the word "final", insert a semicolon, add as follows: "except that any employee whose employment is so terminated, shall have the right of appeal to an appeal board. Such appeal board shall consist of three persons, appointed by the President, and who are cleared by the Director of the National Security Agency for access to classified information."

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, I know of no reason to explain this amendment further. I have had the privilege of presenting it to my colleagues earlier during the debate. It has just been read by the Clerk. Unless there are some questions of me, I will let the amendment stand for a vote.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would like to ask the gentleman, if this board should be established would the individual who was concerned have some information so that he could come prepared before the board under the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. ALGER. That would certainly be my understanding. But I have kept the amendment as simple as possible. I think we know what needs to be done to protect the individual on the one hand and to remove this dictatorial power from one man in our Government on the other hand. I think that is the nature of an appeal board. I do not believe that by having such an appeal board there would be released security information or vital information that we do not intend to divulge under the security processes of this country with which I know the gentleman agrees.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. If the gentleman will yield further, as long as it is understood that there is implicit in the gentleman's amendment the right of the individual to prepare a case to defend himself, I certainly agree with the latter part of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. ALGER. That would be my understanding.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. I think implicit in the use of the word "appeal" would be something along that line, and I agree with the gentleman from Texas. The whole purpose is not to have the usual formality in this kind of a record which would be in the nature of a reasonable appeal.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Pool].

Mr. POOL. In the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Alger], does the gentleman have anything in the amendment about what happens to the employee while his case is on appeal? Does the appellee have access to this secret information in this very secret branch of the Government?

Mr. ALGER. No. You see, I do not intend to throw out this bill. I repeat, I believe this is a good bill, but this would provide a little bit of additional protection, however, and remove this decision from one man's dictatorial policy.

Mr. POOL. You have not answered my question.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. May I say to the gentleman from Texas that the amendment says, "except that any employee whose employment is so terminated, has the right of appeal to this board, or the appeal board is created."

Mr. POOL. What happens to the man during appeal?

Mr. GROSS. What happens to him? He is out.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LINDSAY. I think the gentleman's amendment is worthy of support. It does exactly what the Roosevelt amendment was trying to do. They are very close together. I do not understand why the opposition came to the other amendment, but I am perfectly delighted to accept this amendment.

Mr. ALGER. I thank the gentleman. I, myself, feel it is a better bill if we do not delete the entire section.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman can tell me whether he is able to define by this simple, hastily conceived on-the-floor amendment, precisely what right of appeal means with reference to this board of three.

Mr. ALGER. If the gentleman thinks that I know what it may mean in the minds of some of the people who are administering our law today, he is wrong. I can assure the gentleman I do not know. But I think this does tighten it a little bit.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Does not the gentleman feel that if our friends on the other side whose amendment was defeated see in this the possibility of accomplishing precisely what the committee voted down, that it is a dangerous proposition?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I look with favor on the gentleman's amendment and I shall probably vote for it. But there is one thing that does concern me and that is, will the accused individual or the discharged individual have enough information furnished him to allow him to prepare his appeal and to make his case or is this just a reference to a board to review the action already taken?

Mr. ALGER. I would say to the gentleman that any appeal that did not go to the heart of what the gentleman has suggested would be no appeal at all.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Then I shall support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. ALGER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask this. In the earlier debate the gentleman suggested that his amendment would not involve publicity, that the appellate proceedings would be secret; is that correct?

Mr. ALGER. That is my understanding, because the people designated by the President would have the highest security classification. It is my intention that the security information of this country be not divulged.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I observed only a few Members standing. I ask unanimous consent that all time on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I so move.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a clarification of the motion just voted on. The time was limited to 15 minutes, but was the last 5 minutes reserved to the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not understand that the motion included the reservation of the last 5 minutes to the committee. The Chair therefore rules that the motion agreed to by the Committee simply limits the time to 15 minutes without that reservation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. WYMAN].

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, I address my remarks to the question I asked the gentleman from Texas, who said that the three persons appointed to the board were to be cleared by the Director of the National Security Agency for classified information, and that the report of the appellate proceeding, if there were an appeal, would be secret. I submit in addressing these remarks in opposition to this amendment that, although he says it will be secret, if this amendment is adopted, then we are going to have a situation applied to the National Security Agency of this country which will be the same as applies to any other agency. We do not need that and do not want it. This is contrary to the policy of this bill itself. It is against the best interest of this country to have such a required public record. So I suggest, if it is in order to have appellate decisions at all here, that at some point along the road there might be an amendment offered that will make it very clear that the proceedings shall be secret and shall apply only to persons employed after the applicable effective date of this act. Otherwise, the House should vote down this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman I should like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the author of the amendment, some questions to ascertain just how much review he contemplates by reason of the amendment. Does the gentleman contemplate that a confidential transcript from the agency head shall be available to the receiving board of three members?

Mr. ALGER. The gentleman does not, but at least there is an element of discretion at the direction of the Secretary of Defense and the Director of the National Security Agency.

Mr. DINGELL. I am speaking to the gentleman, I say, of the review that will be held by the appellate board, the three men who will serve as a review board. Does the gentleman contemplate they will have a transcript for their information from the Secretary in order for him to make their determination?

Mr. ALGER. I cannot imagine an appellate board doing anything unless they knew the facts.

Mr. DINGELL. Does the gentleman expect the appeal board to confer on the employee the right to produce documents and cross-examine witnesses as fully as possible, while protecting the Secretary of Defense and the security of the United States?

Mr. ALGER. I do not feel that the gentleman and I have the same feeling about an appellate board. This would not be an appellate board in the sense that the term is ordinarily used.

Mr. DINGELL. Does the gentleman feel there would be opportunity to have the production of documents and the examination of evidence as fully as possible in connection with the security of the United States?

Mr. ALGER. I feel the gentleman is forgetting what the original bill is. He must realize he will have more in the bill than he has now.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman will concede that in the bill an employee of NSA has only the right to be summarily discharged without appeal. This is precisely what the bill does. It authorizes the employee concerned to be discharged by the Secretary without information as to why.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I, along with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER], am concerned that the committee did not provide some type of review board. This is the reason for this amendment. We must recognize that mistakes can be made, there might be an error. It would be my feeling that this board would hold these reviews in complete secrecy in order to uphold the national security of our country.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ALGER. I should like to compliment the gentleman, if I may, for his help and the language that he provided for this amendment, because I really believe it does go to the heart of the problem. We are talking about two things, on the one hand, the dictatorial power that is placed in the hands of one man, no matter how fine a man he may be.

Secondly, denial of review for a person whose character may indeed be defamed where he cannot have any review whatsoever, this may not be as far as we ought to go, but certainly it is better than what we would have under the bill. Yet, I think the bill goes to the heart of the problem with which we are concerned and that is the security of essential and vital information. At the same time, we must not defame character without recourse for the accused. That is the reason I am for the amendment and I thank the gentleman for his help.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I compliment the committee on bringing out this bill and I say the bill has my complete support, but do urge the adoption of this amendment so that employees who are discharged will have some protection and still preserve our national security.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WYMAN. I would just like to ask the gentleman if he has made reference here to the fact that these proceedings would be secret and there would be no transcript and no publicity. I am sure the gentleman knows what happens when defense counsel get into these things even though the matter may not involve actual criminal charges, when defense counsel asks to have this held in public, and there is nothing in the legislation that requires it to be secret, that may be reversible error and it is going to throw a monkey wrench into the whole proceedings. This amendment does not require secrecy and this amendment is fatally defective in this respect alone.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK].

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. WYMAN] put his finger exactly on the point I want to raise. We have one of the leading attorneys in this body, the chairman of the jurisprudence committee of the American Bar Association and his observations are very timely. In addition, in my 2 years in this body, I do not believe I have ever heard of a case of a legislative record being more muddled on a point than it has been on this particular issue. I say that with no reflection either on the gentleman from Texas or anyone else. I think if we look at the legislative record as we have established it here, it would be very interesting for anyone to try to interpret just what we mean. The gentleman's amendment in the first instance is a laudable effort at limiting this absolute delegation of power. It is recognized on one hand the necessity of having rigid laws and regulation because of the supersecret nature of the agency. He is, in effect, saying that there should be a board of three looking over the shoulders, so to speak, of the Secretary of Defense to review what was accomplished. I think the legislative record, as it is being developed, shows that much more than this has been read into the RECORD and for that reason I would suggest that it be turned down. Chaos might well result from the passage of this amendment although the gentleman from Texas clearly had a very admirable idea in mind.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALGER. I would suggest to the gentleman, without really disagreeing with what he has just said, that he makes my point. It may be that this does not go far enough, but it does give the discretion both to the Secretary of Defense and the President, if you please. If they do not take action or do not feel an appeal should be put in, then what the gentleman is suggesting is right. It would be helpful. But, on the other hand, it does give the individual protection that he does not have now under the bill. I think it is a good bill going to the heart of the problem of protecting classified material in the National Security Agency.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN].

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to say I am delighted with the amendment of the gentleman from Texas, but not because I believe it is sufficient. On the contrary, I think it is insufficient in many particulars, but it does strike at the problem we are trying to solve. I know there will be another amendment forthcoming. However, I am going to vote for the gentleman's amendment because I think at least it is a modifying amendment. But, as I say, I think it is insufficient.

Like every other Member of this House, I have a deep concern that effective security standards are provided and maintained at NSA, as well as at all other sensitive agencies. At the same time we must be certain that in this process we do not forget that there are other important values to be considered—that a proper adjustment has to be made between the rights of American citizens and the National Security. As the distinguished attorney, Eleanor Bontecou, stated in her book "The Federal Loyalty-Security Program."

> They (speaking of U.S. courts) may then decide that the maintenance of our traditional freedoms and our traditional respect for fairness is as necessary to our safety as a free nation as are the forging of secret weapons and the raising of armies.

My concern is not only that innocent people may be unjustly accused and dismissed, but that the Agency itself may not be able to make an intelligent decision without some form of hearing.

Due process does not have meaning and value alone to the unjustly accused. It is also essential to the institution or the individual that makes the determination.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN].

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge the defeat of this very dangerous amendment. I regret finding myself in opposition to my very esteemed friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER].

There is nothing in this amendment—this effort to write an appellate provision into the bill—that defines the basis of an appeal, that defines the scope of the appeal, or that defines the appellate procedures.

The legislative intent of this amendment is, as one of my colleagues on the committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK], observed, completely muddied and completely obscured.

I would suggest, in all frankness, to my good friend from Texas that he ought to take caution from the eagerness of those who offered the amendment to gut the bill, deleting section 303—by the eagerness they displayed to adopt his child, and he should in consequence disown the child, because if this is adopted you are going to throw into jeopardy the basic purpose and intent of this section 303. You are going to not only do that but you are going to jeopardize this procedure as it relates to the CIA, a procedure which has been established for 18 years.

If the gentleman from Texas feels this is so fundamental, and I respect his sincerity completely, there is a course to be followed, and that is to introduce corrective legislation with respect not only to this bill, this agency, but with respect to the CIA, and permit hearings to be held on the matter, and act on it in proper fashion.

I plead with the Members not to accept this type of amendatory process.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS].

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I completely agree with the gentleman who just spoke and the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. WYMAN], who made a very brilliant explanation of the situation we are in.

This amendment starts out by recognizing the power given to the Secretary of Defense in the bill. The amendment says "except that any employee whose employment is so terminated." So the amendment recognizes the power of the Secretary of Defense to terminate employment. We do not know what kind of procedure the appeal board will follow, whether there is to be confrontation or cross-examination; we do not know what kind of record will be made. The right of appeal is given, but it does not say whether after the appeal the man is to be reinstated and under what conditions. That is what comes out of presenting an amendment of this type in this sensitive area on the floor without hearings.

I respectfully urge its defeat.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER].

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. ALGER) there were—ayes 46, noes 111.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to direct a question to the distinguished chairman of the committee regarding the intent of the committee on section 304 of the bill.

As I read it, it defines "classified information" as information which, for reasons of national security, is specifically designated by a U.S. Government agency for limited or restricted dissemination or distribution.

Now, for 8 years I have studied the field of classified information. Much information is classified strictly in accordance with law. Much is classified really on a claim, I guess one of privilege within an agency, having no sanction in law, statutory, or through any Executive order of the President.

Is it, therefore, Mr. Chairman, the intention that these different three categories of information, top secret, secret, and confidential, authorized under Executive Order 10501, which became effective on December 15, 1953, with the additional category, "Used only in this agency" of "sensitive cryptologic information," will apply? Is that the intention and that alone?

Mr. WILLIS. I would say to the gentleman that is the intention, as is evidenced by a letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense addressed to the chairman of our committee on August 8, 1962. In it he gives a very short definition of "cryptologic information." He says:

> Sensitive cryptologic information is a special type of classified information which requires special clearances,

And so on.

> It consists of any classified information—
>
> A. Concerning the nature, preparation, or use of any code, cipher, or cryptographic system; or
>
> B. Concerning the design, construction, use, maintenance, or repair of any device, apparatus, or appliance used or prepared or planned for use for cryptographic or communication intelligence purposes; or
>
> C. Concerning communications intelligence activities.

Mr. MOSS. I thank the gentleman again for clarification. In addition to the one classification of cryptologic information, the other three are only those authorized under Executive Order 10501 and the guidelines and definitions of that Executive order are applicable in this instance.

Mr. WILLIS. Although the Executive order is not mentioned in the letter, a sentence agreeing with what the gentleman says reads as follows:

> It includes three categories of information depending upon the degree of protection required—confidential, secret, and top secret.

Mr. MOSS. And that is the intention of the committee?

Mr. WILLIS. That is the intention of the committee.

Mr. MOSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. MOORHEAD:
>
> On page 4, line 24, immediately after "Agency" insert the following: "in accordance with the provisions of this subsection".
>
> Page 5, strike out all of line 4 after "security." and insert in lieu thereof the following:
>
> "Any officer or employee of the Agency shall, before his employment is terminated under the authority of this subsection, be given a 30-day suspension without pay and during that time he shall be given—
>
> "(1) a written statement of the charges against him, which shall be stated as specifically as security considerations permit;
>
> "(2) an opportunity within 10 days after receipt of the statement of charges against him to answer such charges and to submit affidavits; and
>
> "(3) a written statement of the final decision of the Secretary.
>
> "Any action taken by the Secretary under authority of this subsection shall be final, however, the Secretary shall submit to the chairmen of the Committees on the Judiciary of the Senate and the House of Representatives a written report with respect to any such action."

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD] yield?

Mr. MOORHEAD. I would be glad to yield to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that following the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD], on his amendment, that debate on this amendment and all amendments to this bill close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. DINGELL, Mr. COHELAN, and Mr. O'HARA of Michigan objected.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I move that following the presentation under the usual 5-minute rule all debate on the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD], and all debate on all amendments to the bill close in 15 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, in the various amendments that we have been considering this afternoon we are trying to hit a middle ground between protecting absolutely the security of the United States and at the same time giving the maximum degree of protection to the individual.

This amendment which I propose is an adaptation of the basic law regarding the discharge of employees from the Department of State, Department of Commerce, and so forth.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the amendment does the fundamental job of protecting the national security of the United States. It does so, because what does it require? It requires a written statement of the charge against the employee discharged. But it carefully points out only as specifically as security considerations permit. Therefore, if there is a question of security involved in the written charge the security takes precedence over the individual.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, it gives the employee a chance to state his own case so that we can be as sure as we can that the final deciding officer has both sides of the question.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the amendment requires a written decision on the part of the Secretary. It provides specifically that the action of the Secretary under this subsection shall be final. Thus it cannot be tied up in litigation in the courts. However, it does this: It says that the Secretary must submit reports of what he has done under this section to the chairmen of the Judiciary Committees of the House and the Senate. What is the purpose of this provision? If the Secretary finds himself reporting five or more cases in a year, he is going to be concerned that the chairmen of these committees will check on whether he has been arbitrarily using this section in cases when he should properly use the general law. This will be a brake on the Secretary. I submit that it is consistent entirely with our primary concern, which is the national security.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN].

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment as I opposed the previous amendment. First of all it is an effort to write a fundamental change into this legislation on the floor in the closing minutes of debate and under a sharp limitation of time.

I oppose it also because the very purpose of section 303 is to provide, and it does provide, that where security prevents the disclosure of the reasons, prevents even acquainting the employee with the reasons for termination, then it shall rest with the Secretary to act summarily.

In other words, this amendment is either on the one hand meaningful, and if it is meaningful then it is dangerous, because it reverses the very purpose of section 303, or else it is meaningless, because it is essentially self-defeating by reason of this security provision.

There are circumstances, Mr. Chairman, under which the Justice Department will not prosecute a known spy or agent or Communist because the national interest and security are better served by preserving the security of the espionage system by which that information was secured. Here we are trying to deal with a situation in which, as I pointed out in general debate, the choice is between exposing those sources of information and that espionage operation or on the other hand tolerating the continued employment of the individual in a sensitive area.

This again is a dangerous amendment and I strongly urge its defeat.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, like all of my colleagues in the House I am intensely interested in seeing the strongest possible security measures erected for the protection of the National Security Agency. I am keenly aware of the importance of this agency to the United States and to our struggle against the Communist conspiracy.

I feel, however, that we can have security consistent with a real measure of protection of the individual liberties of our people and that unnecessary sacrifice of individual liberties of American citizens at the altar of national defense is not only unwise but will lead to tyranny and dictatorship. I support the first two sections to H.R. 950 which are as follows:

SEC. 301. Subject to the provisions of this title, the Secretary of Defense (hereafter in this title referred to as the "Secretary") shall prescribe such regulations relating to continuing security procedures as he considers necessary to assure—

(1) that no person shall be employed in, or detailed or assigned to, the National Security Agency (hereafter in this title referred to as the "Agency"), or continue to be so employed, detailed, or assigned; and

(2) that no person so employed, detailed, or assigned shall have access to any classified information; unless such employment, detail, assignment, or access to classified information is clearly consistent with the national security.

SEC. 302. (a) No person shall be employed in, or detailed or assigned to, the Agency unless he has been the subject of a full field investigation in connection with such employment, detail, or assignment, and is cleared for access to classified information in accordance with the provisions of this title; excepting that conditional employment without access to sensitive cryptologic information or material may be tendered any applicant, under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, pending the completion of such full field investigation: *And provided further,* That such full field investigation at the discretion of the Secretary need not be required in the case of persons assigned or detailed to the Agency who have a current security clearance for access to sensitive cryptologic information under equivalent standards of investigation and clearance. During any period of war declared by the Congress, or during any period when the Secretary determines that a national disaster exists, or in exceptional cases in which the Secretary (or his designee for such purpose) makes a determination in writing that his action is necessary or advisable in the national interest, he may authorize the employment of any person in, or the detail or assignment of any person to, the Agency, and may grant to any such person access to classified information, on a temporary basis, pending the completion of the full field investigation and the clearance for access to classified information required by this subsection, if the Secretary determines that such action is clearly consistent with the national security.

(b) To assist the Secretary and the Director of the Agency in carrying out their personal security responsibilities, one or more boards of appraisal of three members each, to be appointed by the Director of the Agency, shall be established in the Agency. Such a board shall appraise the loyalty and suitability of persons for access to classified information, in those cases in which the Director of the Agency determines that there is a doubt whether their access to that information would be clearly consistent with the national security, and shall submit a report and recommendation on each such a case. However, appraisal by such a board is not required before action may be taken under section 14 of the Act of June 27, 1944, chapter 287, as amended (5 U.S.C. 863), section 1 of the Act of August 26, 1950, chapter 803, as amended (5 U.S.C. 22-1), or any other similar provision of law. Each member of such a board shall be specially qualified and trained for his duties as such a member, shall have been the subject of a full field investigation in connection with his appointment as such a member, and shall have been cleared by the Director for access to classified information at the time of his appointment as such a member. No person shall be cleared for access to classified information, contrary to the recommendations of any such board, unless the Secretary (or his designee for such purpose) shall make a determination in writing that such employment, detail assignment, or access to classified information is in the national interest.

I oppose, however, the unwise provisions of section 303(a) dealing with termination of employment. The House has witnessed a curious spectacle today. We have a strong statute on the books dealing with termination of employment of individuals for security reasons within the Department of Defense and a number of other Government agencies which is as follows:

SEC. 303. (a) Notwithstanding section 14 of the Act of June 27, 1944, chapter 287, as amended (5 U.S.C. 863), section 1 of the Act of August 26, 1950, chapter 803, as amended (5 U.S.C. 22-1), or any other provision of law, the Secretary may terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Agency whenever he considers that action to be in the interest of the United States, and he determines that the procedures prescribed in other provisions of law that authorize the termination of the employment of that officer or employee cannot be invoked consistently with the national security. Such a determination is final.

Note that the statute specifically provides:

That to the extent that such agency head determines that the interests of the national security permit, the employee concerned shall be notified of the reasons for his suspension and within 30 days after such notification any person shall have an opportunity to submit any statements or affidavits to the official designated by the head of the agency concerned to show why he should be reinstated or restored to duty. The agency head concerned may, following such investigation and review as he deems necessary, terminate the employment of the suspended employee whenever he shall determine such termination necessary or advisable in the interest of the national security of the United States, and such determination by the agency head concerned shall be conclusive and final.

This morning I had my office call the Un-American Activities Committee for a copy of the transcript of the hearings on this legislation. At first I was advised it was available and would be forthcoming. Subsequently my office was advised that copies of the transcript were not available. We are faced today with the problem of considering a piece of legislation on which hearings held, if any, were conducted behind closed doors. Information which would normally and which should normally flow to Members of Congress is denied to all of us in our vote except for a list of witnesses who testified indicating generally that all concurred in the necessity for this legislation. It is indeed strange that in the light of existing statutes and so slight a record before the Congress, that we should feel such a pressing, desperate, and crying need for this legislation. There is, moreover, an abundantly clear Executive order on the subject of discharge of Federal employees where there is question as to either the security of the United States in continuing the employment, or in the loyalty of the employee in question. I refer to Executive Order 10450 dated April 27, 1953—18 Federal Register 2489.

How are we to determine that the committee has legislated well in this matter since the grist of the legislative mill, the printed report of the hearings, is unavailable to us?

The alleged ground for stampeding this legislation through the Congress is supposedly the case involving the defection of the National Security Agency employees, Vernon F. Mitchell and William H. Martin. It is highly questionable whether legislation of this kind would have prevented defection of these individuals. It appears abundantly plain that the evil of their defection and their ability to betray their trust to the United States lay in failure to apply adequate and sufficient clearance procedures to their hiring and not in any absence of authority to discharge these defectors.

Indeed under the existing statute cited above it is plain that the Agency head could have discharged them without revealing any information which he felt involved the national security or the public interest by reason of discretion already vested in him.

There is no language in this bill requiring the Secretary of Defense to afford any information to an employee whatsoever before his discharge as to the nature of the charges against him. The language of section 303 authorizes absolute discretion to terminate the employment of any officer, or employee of the National Security Agency, whenever he considers that action to be in the interest of the United States and where the Secretary in his absolute and untrammeled discretion determines the waiver of other provisions of law to be in the interest of national security. The bill says "such termination is final."

I, for one, do not propose to be stampeded into enactment of legislation so destructive of individual rights and so inconsistent with our traditional constitutional practices without a more real showing than the flimsy record upon which we act today and upon the abundant misinterpretation of the existing strong security measures to protect the interest of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN].

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I think it is pretty clear that all of the objectives that we have been seeking in terms of maximizing protection, both for the individual and for the Government, are inherent in the amendment advanced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD]. I urge its adoption. However, if it is not adopted I would think that the bill by itself is insufficient because I do not think that there is adequate protection in it.

Mr. Chairman, I want to complete the statement I was making when I left the floor previously, because I think it is terribly important, as we close.

You will all remember, and particularly those of you familiar with the law, that Mr. Justice Jackson had quite a reputation for being tough on these questions. But in a paper he wrote before he died, entitled "The Task of Maintaining Our Liberties—The Role of the Judiciary," which was published in the American Bar Journal of November 1953, this great American protested:

> We cannot approve any use of official powers or position to prejudice or condemn a person in liberty, property or good name which does not inform him of the source and substance of the charge and give it timely and open-minded hearing as to its truth—safeguards without which no judgment can have a sound foundation.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this statement of Mr. Justice Jackson speaks eloquently to this point, to the danger inherent in section 303 without amendment. I trust that we will all bear this firmly in mind as we vote on this provision, and if it is not amended appropriately, that it will be defeated as a dangerous and unwarranted infringement on the basic constitutional rights of American citizens.

Mr. Chairman, I have referred extensively in my remarks to the thoughtful and pertinent article by Dean Frank Newman. I believe this full article deserves the careful consideration of the entire House for it goes to the heart of this very difficult and important issue we have been discussing.

THE PROCESS OF PRESCRIBING DUE PROCESS

(By Frank C. Newman, professor of law, University of California School of Law, Berkeley)

Recently we were told that the dueness of government procedure is not tested by "doctrinaire conception" or "loose generalities or sentiments abstractly appealing." Instead, "Whether the scheme satisfies those strivings for justice which due process guarantees, must be judged in the light of reason drawn from the considerations of fairness that reflect our traditions of legal and political thought, duly related to the public interest Congress sought to meet * * * as against the hazards of hardship to the individual that the * * * [attacked] procedure would entail."[1]

That is quite a mouthful. And no sooner were the words pronounced than a dissenting Justice retorted, "When we turn to the cases, personal preference, not reason, seems, however, to be controlling." Further, "Due process under the prevailing doctrine is what the judges say it is; and it differs from judge to judge, from court to court * * *. [It is] a tool of activitists who respond to their own visceral reactions in deciding what is fair, decent, or reasonable."[2]

Sanford Kadish has dissected the viewpoints those excerpts reflect,[3] and we will not refurbish his findings here. The intent of this article is to examine method rather than theory or result. We do not survey the rules of due process or query their correctness.[4] We do look at the process of prescribing those rules. We assess the prescribers' procedure, testing it for capacity to help insure correct rules. Our presumption is that modest reforms may be practicable, that the process of prescribing due process could be bettered.

Many of the ideas discussed here relate to *Hannah* v. *Larche*, decided by the Supreme Court in June 1960.[5] It deals with the due process rights of subpenaed witnesses. The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, having received accusations that certain Louisiana registrars had deprived citizens of the right to vote, subpenaed those registrars to appear at a hearing and testify regarding the accusations. The registrars learned that the Commission would deny rights of apprisal, confrontation, and cross-examination; so their lawyers obtained a court order enjoining the Commission "from conducting the proposed hearing in Shreveport, La., whereby plaintiff registrars, accused of depriving others of the right to vote, would be denied the rights of appraisal, confrontation, and cross-examination."[6] The Supreme Court then vacated the injunction, ruling that in this kind of proceeding due process does not require that subpenaed witnesses be given those rights.

The opinions in *Hannah* v. *Larche* are a mine of information on the theory and practice of due process. They concern not merely an injunction in Louisiana and the subpenaed registrars whom it protected. Subpenaed witnesses generally are discussed—not only civil rights witnesses, but those called by all other executive and administrative officials, by grand juries, by legislative investigating committees, Federal and State. Specifically, the opinions have helped inspire these questions as to the process of prescribing due process.[7]

I. Should not the words of the due process clauses be reexamined for plain meaning?

II. Should not due process rights more consistently be classified and distinguished from other constitutional rights?

III. Would not an analytical checklist aid the deciding of cases?

IV. Who could spearhead reform, how?

I. THE WORDS OF THE DUE PROCESS CLAUSES SHOULD BE REEXAMINED FOR PLAIN MEANING

The fifth amendment declares, "No person shall * * * be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law." The 14th amendment (for our purposes here) is the same: "No State shall * * * deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law." Those words are spongy and by themselves solve no problems. Quite a few problems might be eased, though, if the words were given full content. We pose two illustrations: (1) the privilege doctrine; (2) the too-pervasive criminal trial analogy.

A. The privilege doctrine

How should we read "life, liberty, or property"? "Liberty" has attracted probably the most attention, and no doubt needs more.[8] We are not even near the brave new world that might inhere in "life." (Does it mean only freedom from death? How about "the good life," or what for some people "begins at 40"?) Yet without soaring into semantics or political theory could we not shun one view of "life, liberty or property" that has caused much chaos? I refer to the hundreds, maybe thousands, of cases that protect "rights" but not "privileges," declaring that "due process of law is not applicable [with respect to government employment, for instance] unless one is being deprived of something to which he has a right."[9] I refer also to *Hannah* v. *Larche*, where the Court stated that the Civil Rights Commission "does not make determinations depriving anyone of his life, liberty, or property * * * and cannot take any affirmative action which will affect an individual's legal rights."[10] When the facts that were before the Court are examined, when we see that the Commission—pursuant to congressional command—can and does sponsor publicity that may defame, degrade, and incriminate people, what the Court seems to have said is that governments, by derogatory publicity, do not affect "liberty, or property."

The due process clauses say nothing of right versus privilege. The chief vice of the privilege doctrine is that it has insulated us from a body of law, highly reputable, that seems designedly apt for protecting the freedoms that "life, liberty, or property" appears to imply. I refer now to the law of torts, and the successful handling there of all legal interests. The torts cases teach us that "property" means more than land and chattels and choses-in-action; "liberty," more than freedom from physical harm and imprisonment. Why should those cases have outpaced due process cases? Why in private suits for damages or an injunction should legal interests be protected that due process leaves helpless? Examples are the interest in freedom from interference with reasonable economic expectancies, the interest in personal reputation and in freedom from disparagement, and the interest in freedom from emotional upset.[11]

---

[1] Frankfurter J., concurring in *Hannah* v. *Larche*, 363 U.S. 420, 487 (1960).

[2] Douglas, J., id. 505–506.

[3] Kadish, "Methodology and Criteria in Due Process Adjudication—A Survey and Criticism," 66 Yale L. J. 319 (1957).

[4] "While Justice Cardozo in 1937 felt able to find the 'rationalizing principle' which gave 'proper order and coherence' to the determination made up to that time, the array of apparently disordered determinations since that date would no doubt give pause to one contemplating a similar effort today." Kadish, "A Case Study in the Signification of Procedural Due Process—Institutionalizing the Mentally Ill," 9 W. Pol., Q. 93 (1956).

[5] 363 U.S. 420 (1960); 74 Harv. L. Rev. 120 (1960).

[6] 363 U.S. at 429 n. 11.

[7] The opinions are criticized in Newman, "Due Process, Investigations, and Civil Rights."

[8] E.g., see Nutting, "The Fifth Amendment and Privacy," 18 U. Pitt L. Rev. 533 (1957); Shattuck, "The True Meaning of the Term 'Liberty' in Those Clauses in the Federal and State Constitutions Which Protect Life, Liberty, and Property," 4 Harv L. Rev. 365 (1891); Hand "The Bill of Rights" 51 (1958) ("Liberty not only includes freedom from personal restraint, but enough economic security to allow its possessor the enjoyment of a satisfactory life."); *Palko* v. *Connecticut*, 302 U.S. 319, 327 (1937) ("liberty of the mind as well as liberty of action").

[9] *Bailey* v. *Richardson*, 182 F. 2d 46, 58 (D.C. Cir. 1950), affirmed, 341 U.S. 918 (1961).

[10] 363 U.S. at 441; and note the Commission's use of the quotation in press release No. 133 (1961).

[11] The technical terms are from Harper & James, "Torts," xxi-xv (1956); cf. Prosser, "Insult and Outrage," 44 Calif. L. Rev. 40 (1956); Prosser, Privacy, 48 Calif. L. Rev. 383 (1960). See also *Greene* v. *McElroy*, 360 U.S. 474, 493 n. 22 (1959); *Anti-Facist Comm.* v. *McGrath*, 341 U.S. 123, 139 (1951); Rothbard, "Human Rights Are Property Rights," The Freeman, April 1960, p. 23; note, 65 Harv. L. Rev. 156 (1951); cf. Parker,

The privilege doctrine should be junked, and "life, liberty, or property" should be treated as a description of all legal interests. To the question, "Won't you still have to define that last phrase?" the answer is, "Of course." But definitions can be guided by a bulk of precedents that makes far more sense than have judge's travails as to the rights of saloon keepers, dancehall operators, Government employees, and aliens.

To pronounce that "liberty, or property" includes, say, reputational and emotional interests would not mean that governments no longer could deprive people of those interests, or that deprivations could be effected only by judicial trial. The requirement would merely be that due process be accorded. With no trial and without a chance sometimes even to argue, people are often deprived of their property and liberty and even their lives; but in emergency cases, for example, due process is not necessarily violated.

Recognition of a due process freedom from disparagement or emotional upset would not require procedures the same as those which now protect a man's employment security, say, or his land. The nature of the interest must be taken into account. That is why we demand special strictness for criminal proceedings, forfeiture proceedings, proceedings involving citizenship. That "life" and "liberty" and "property" are constitutionally conjoined does not mean that all interests therein merit identical protection.

In *Hannah* v. *Larche* the Court may wisely have decided that a certain civil rights hearing should not be proscribed, even though appraisal, confrontation, and cross-examination were to be denied. The Court's analysis would have been sounder, though, had it discussed differences between (1) a hearing that injures a witness by publicity which defames, degrades, or incriminates him and (2) a hearing that avoids those effects. In private law most courts have proved their fitness boldly to protect liberty and property interests. The Supreme Court is not honored by an implication that "Whatever procedure is authorized by Congress, it is due process as far as a witness who is merely defamed, degraded, or incriminated at a hearing is concerned."[13]

B. The too pervasive criminal trial analogy

The majority Justices in Hannah are to be commended for the breadth of their inquiry. Though the Louisiana registrars had been accused of crime, the Court in seeking analogies did not limit itself to criminal proceedings. It considered also the investigatory traditions of administrative agencies and of legislative committees.

Generally, judges (and scholars) assume too often that the criminal process is a model for other processes. We say, "Due process of course must be observed in civil as in criminal trials, but since civil defendants are not alleged criminals some guarantees (e.g., proof beyond a reasonable doubt) do not apply." Similarly, licensees merit still lesser protection; and even less than that need be granted to prospective licensees, conscientious objectors, people who are mentally ill, Government contractors, and parolees—all because they are not the accused in a criminal trial.

Consider the dictum that we test for due process by seeing whether procedures "offend those canons of decency and fairness which express the notions of justice of English-speaking peoples even toward those charged with the most heinous offenses."[13] Consider the recent cataloging of the values involved in procedural due process as (1) "insuring the reliability of the guilt-determining process," and (2) "insuring respect for the dignity of the individual."[14] The isolation of that second value is a major contribution to our understanding of due process, and may bring us great profit (see below). The first value, however, never should have been characterized as one circumscribed by "guilt-determining." What due process aims for is reliable truth-determining or, broadly, the reliability of the determining-making process. (We cannot use "decisionmaking" because it may imply adjudication, broader than "criminal" but still too narrow.)

The due process clauses do not restrict all determination-making by Government. They do apply whenever determination-making deprives a person of life, liberty, or property. The word "deprive" needs emphasis. It has no kinship to guilt. It does not imply, "No person shall be deprived [in the way alleged criminals in medieval England often were deprived] of life, liberty, or property without due process." It rather must be read, "No person shall be deprived [in any manner whatsoever] of life, liberty, or property without due process."

One gain might be that we no longer would measure public utilities, TV networks, social security beneficiaries, schoolteachers, and juvenile delinquents on the scale of procedural rights that gives 100 points to alleged murderers and zero points to an unwanted Cabinet official.[15] A related gain might be an awareness that due process sometimes should give people more rights than criminal proceedings insure. The fact that pretrial discovery may be narrow in criminal cases, for example, hardly means that it should be no broader in hearings on license applications. Subpenaed civil rights witnesses should not be estopped from making a case for limited cross-examination merely because suspects before a grand jury may be denied that right.[16]

II. DUE PROCESS RIGHTS SHOULD BE CLASSIFIED AND DISTINGUISHED FROM OTHER CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

It is difficult to justify a brief filed in the Supreme Court that begins, "The question presented is * * * the right of Congress or the [Civil Rights] Commission to violate under the 14th amendment the rules of fairplay and the traditional forms of fair procedure without explicit action by the Nation's lawmakers even if it is possible that the Constitution presents no inhibition."[17] Literate lawyers at least ought not suggest that Federal officials are ruled by the 14th amendment rather than the 5th.

It is also difficult, though, to censure illiteracies that could well be the result of the courts' 5th and 14th amendment confusions. Due process of the 14th amendment includes some Bill of Rights, non-5th amendment procedure rules and some 1st amendment substantive rules, but not all of them. Fifth amendment due process includes some but perhaps not all of "equal protection of the law." Both cover void-for-vagueness; but that doctrine has a unique role regarding the "preferred" freedoms, and we never have decided whether it is really procedural or substantive.[18]

Overlaps are inevitable. But would it not help if rights claimed as constitutional were always, to the extent practicable, wrapped in the words that are most apt? Thus, if we seek a right not to be exposed by Congress or a right to be silent or to be let alone, we need very sophisticated analyses of article I and the first amendment and the privilege against self-incrimination, as well as of residual due process. Relations between due process and the sixth and seventh amendments ("criminal prosecutions" and "suits at common law") need clarification too, as does the impact of the fourth amendment as well as due process on "compulsory extortion of a man's own testimony,"[19] Even within the fifth, what is due for grand jury proceedings may differ from the implications of "No person shall be held * * * unless on a presentment or indictment." And have we not learned enough about the privilege against self-incrimination to enable us to concede that we need not force a man to forfeit other protections (e.g., procedural protections) merely because he is about to

---

"Administrative Law," 36 n. 36 (1952) ("The meagerness with which our problem—viz. what rights are protected by due process?—has been dealt is astounding"). The best and most complete discussion of the privilege doctrine is 1 Davis, "Administrative Law Treatise," secs. 7.11–7.20 (1958). Professor Davis concludes, "Instead of 2 categories [right and privilege] we could have 6 or 20, for the weakest privilege or absence of privilege to the strongest constitutional right." Id. at 508. I prefer three categories: life, liberty, and property. Many interests are not legal interests and thus are not life, liberty, or property interests. Those that are, however (and I suggest the torts cases as guides), merit due process protection. That does not mean that the processes fit for allegedly subversive employees or allegedly knowledgeable witnesses must be the same as those for allegedly immora aliens or the defendant in a criminal case. Cf. id. at 462.

[13] I have thus paraphrased a dictum in *United States ex. rel. Knauff* v. *Shaughnessy*, 338 U.S. 537, 544 (1950). For criticism of the analysis in the Hannah case see Newman, supra, note 7.

[13] *Malinski* v. *New York*, 324 U.S. 401, 417 (1945).

[14] See Kadish, supra, note 3, at 346–347; supra, note 4, at 99. My criticism of Professor Kadish's ideas are meant to be tributes, not complaints. The process of prescribing due process might be aided immensely if scholars were more conscientious in building on the foundations occasionally laid by outstanding writings such as the articles of his I have cited.

[15] "The discharged Cabinet officer may have a property interest in his job and in his reputation, but we want the President to have an unrestricted power to discharge him." 1 Davis, "Administrative Law Treatise," 454 n. 7 (1958). Do Premier Ben-Gurion's recent struggles re Israeli Defense Minister Lavon suggest that Professor Davis may go too far? Should a Cabinet officer be defenseless against findings of bribery or sexual immorality? If he could show there was no evidence against him, or no evidence other than the charges of a confessed liar, relief by way of declaratory judgment might well be appropriate. Cf. Gardner, "The Great Charter and the Case of *Angilly* v. *United States*," 67 Harv. L. Rev. 1 (1953).

[16] There are many reasons why grand jury hearings are more protective than civil rights hearings. Cf. note, 74 Harv. L. Rev. 590 (1961). On the pretrial point, the Government argued in Hannah that "prehearing notice of the contents and sources of allegations made against them—which plaintiffs claim is their constitutional right—is not even provided on the issue of guilt or innocence in Federal criminal prosecutions." Brief for appellants, p. 40. Civil rights witnesses, however, do not benefit from pleading and trial traditions that protect alleged criminals. Also, they have not been indicted; and would it be wrong to assume that there would be less risk of their fabricating false evidence than of an indictee's?

[17] Appellee's brief in *Hannah* v. *Larche*, pp. 1–22; and see p. 85 of the transcript of oral argument ("the 14th amendment because they are denying them due process of law").

[18] See Hand, "The Bill of Rights" (1958); cf. McWhinney, "The Power Value and Its Public Law Graduations: A Preliminary Excursus," 9 J. Pub. L. 43 (1960).

[19] *Boyd* v. *United States*, 116 U.S. 616, 630 (1886).

be incriminated and thus may claim the privilege?[20]

To suggest that doctrine and arguments should be solidly based is far from startling, and I hope readers will not infer that next on the agenda is to be a criticism of the West Digest outlines. Are we not startlingly ignorant, though, as to the panoply of rules of due process? Have reasonably adequate summaries ever been constructed? Has any judge, scholar, or practitioner ever mastered those rules in the way that other law has been mastered (evidence, contracts, torts, and tax, for example)? Mere wishing for a summary or a Wigmore or Williston gains us little, but more imaginative building of large and small blocks of due process law could indeed be useful.

A distinction noted above illustrates the point. Some due process rules aim to insure the reliability of the determination-making process (e.g., rules requiring cross-examination and an unprejudiced tribunal). Others aim at respect for the dignity of the individual (e.g., rules against stomach pumping and cruel punishment). That classification could vitally affect due process semantics. "Fairness," for instance, must have an ingredient of efficiency when we test the first kind of rule (reliability) that normally could be absent in rules aimed at personal dignity. And judicial standards such as "hardship so acute and shocking that our policy will not endure it"[21] and "protection of ultimate decency in a civilized society"[22] seem to fit the second value better than the first.

The recent Davis "Administrative Law Treatise" supplies a more than ample base for classification. If its teachings as to the administrative process could now be integrated with comparable studies of court processes (including analyses of contempt procedure, for example, as well as police, mental health, and family court procedures, etc.) the prescribers of due process would gain immensely.

III. AN ANALYTICAL CHECKLIST MIGHT AID THE DECIDING OF CASES

Appellate courts are not an audience of law students. Yet their handling of due process cases might benefit from the kind of issue-finding checklist that has helped many law students analyze difficult examinations. For when the procedure of government officials is measured for compliance with due process, are not these questions relevant?

A. Apart from alleged procedural error, exactly how did officials harm (or threaten to harm) complainant in this case?

We have seen that much may hinge on "deprive" and "life, liberty, or property." However interpreted, though, those words must be tailored to proved facts. Assume that courts do construe "liberty, or property" to include freedom from reputational harm. The precise interests jeopardized still must be identified in each case, as must the official conduct that caused the jeopardy.

In *Hannah* v. *Larche* the phrase "defame, degrade, or incriminate" was critical. Yet whether the registrars truly did risk defamation or degradation was pretty much left to inference, and the attorneys never did dramatize the ways in which the Commission threatened to deprive the registrars of the interests that inhere in freedom from defamation and degradation. Similarly, though the registrars had been subpenaed and thus risked injury required to be self-inflicted,[23] language of the Court implies that subpenaed witnesses are no different from other people whom the Commission's activities might harm.[24]

The kind of precise portrayal of harm that may crucially affect a lawsuit is exemplified by petitioner's brief in *Peters* v. *Hobby*.[25] "We of course concede," said counsel, "that the Constitution does not limit the power of the executive summarily to terminate employment on secret information or for any other reason. The question before this Court is only whether the Government has the right to accompany a discharge with a finding of disloyalty which ruins the reputation and career of the accused, without a full hearing."[26] In other words, the protested harm was not to job security but to one's repute as a prospective jobholder.[27]

B. Exactly what procedural rights were granted, available, denied?

Phrases like "notice," "summary procedure," and right to be heard" are of decreasing value in due process litigation. Sometimes because of their fuzziness they are provably misleading. Procedural rights are bands on a spectrum, and courts are led astray if they have to hazard a guess or examine the record microscopically to ascertain which bands merit attention. Too many briefs and opinions never tell us exactly what rights were granted the complainant, to offset those denied, or what rights might have been available had he made a timely request.

Hannah v. *Larche* is disturbingly illustrative. Appraisal, confrontation, and cross-examination are rights the Court held may be denied to witnesses. But with respect to cross-examination was it relevant that complainants could have submitted to the Commission questions to be put to their accusers? With respect to confrontation was it relevant that all accusers who were scheduled to testify could have been confronted? And with respect to appraisal what really do we learn from the Court's language: Were the subpenas sufficient? Was their vagueness illuminated by "315 written interrogatories"? Is a chairman's "opening statement [of] the subject of the hearing" enough? Could complainants have been denied the right to hear or read what their accusers who testified had to say?[28]

All conceivable rights need not be separately arrayed in each case, for red penciling or blue penciling as to grant, availability, and denial. A general arraying is useful, however, and for border zones helps compel the tougher analyses that too often are shunned. With an array, judges might even be able to unravel some three-dimensional complications. In Hannah, for instance, what should the Court have pronounced as to secret hearings (which in fact were prescribed by Congress)? If freedom from defamation and degradation is "liberty, or property," should due process for secret hearings require less severe rules than those for public hearings (as to appraisal, confrontation, cross-examination, and right to counsel, for example)? We are miles from solving that problem,[29] and by overlooking the complainants' right to a secret hearing the Court in Hannah probably has made the solution more difficult.

Finally, an accurate charting of rights granted, available, and denied would assure cognizance of some worthy ideas that relate to the timing of judicial redress. In Hannah all the judges chose to avoid a holding as to ripeness and exhaustion of administrative remedies. But the fact that some issues may have been ripe[30] does not mean that all procedural rulings were fixed. Secrecy versus publicity; the Commission's use of nontestifying accusers; the value of submitting questions for the Commission to put to testifying accusers; those are sample issues the Court never faced. Yet its opinion will encourage too many readers to infer that due process requires none of the rights that proper analysis of those issues might ensure.

C. To decide the case is it necessary to apply the Constitution?

A settled doctrine requires that judges look critically at all statutes and regulations which allegedly permit a process that allegedly violates due process. "Traditional forms of fair procedure [must] not be restricted by implication or without the most explicit action by the Nation's lawmakers, even in areas where it is possible that the Constitution presents no inhibition."[31] There are some traps for the unwary, but we shall not discuss them here because the matter involves statutory interpretation rather than due process.

Other doctrines that seem to be less used in due process cases could have a like impact. Do they merit more use? The doctrine of prejudicial error, for example, has a respectable history that Congress honored in the Administrative Procedure Act.[32] It can be twisted by compelling a complainant to prove too much, and a concern for decent governing may require that it not affect certain cases (death penalty cases, say). But would not due process law generally profit from the kind of precise identification and measurement of procedural harm that we recommended above for substantive harm? Little damage can result from "Whatever the bounds of due process, complaint here has not been prejudiced."[33]

---

[20] See the discussion on pp. 112–113 of the transcript of oral argument in the Hannah case ("There might not be the necessity for pleading the fifth amendment if we were given the opportunity of presenting witnesses."). But cf. *In re Groban,* 352 U.S. 330 (1957).

[21] *Palko* v. *Connecticut,* 302 U.S. 319, 328 (1937).

[22] *Adamson* v. *California,* 332 U.S. 46, 61 (1947).

[23] For an example of Commission-sponsored harm to reputation that had its origins in compulsorily self-inflicted injury see p. 5 of the Commission's NPR–44 (Dec. 12, 1958): "The election officials recited their excuse for not testifying in a halting manner, requiring coaching and prompting from their attorneys every four or five words."

[24] 363 U.S. at 443. I think this explains why the Court misconstrued the words of the injunction. Id. at 429 n. 11 and 444 n. 20.

[25] 349 U.S. 331 (1955).

[26] Brief for petitioner, p. 10, *Peters* v. *Hobby,* 349 U.S. 331 (1955). Approval of counsel's concession should not be inferred from its quotation here.

[27] Cf. Gardner, "The Great Charter and the Case of *Angilly* v. *United States,*" 67 Harv. L. Rev. 1, 21 (1953) ("the circulation of adverse opinions about Angilly's character was no part of the duty of the collector's job").

[28] For discussion, see Newman supra, note 7.

[29] Cf. the dissenting opinion in *Hannah* v. *Larche,* 363 U.S. 420, 496 (1960).

[30] There are not many cases where, for threatened procedural irregularities, an agency hearing has been enjoined. 3 Davis "Administrative Law Treatise," chs. 20 and 21 (1958). The attack in the Hannah case was directed at procedural rules. They were "final agency action" within sec. 10(c) of the APA, 60 Stat. 243 (1946), 5 U.S.C. sec. 1009 (1958); but query whether there was "no adequate remedy in any court." Cf. sec. 105(g) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957, 71 Stat. 636 (1957), 42 U.S.C., sec. 1975d(g) (1958). The Solicitor General did not discuss this issue even though the Department of Justice had pressed it at the trial level.

[31] *Greene* v. *McElroy,* 360 U.S. 474, 508 (1959); *Clancy* v. *United States,* 81 S. Ct. 645 (1961).

[32] Supra, note 30, § 10(e).

[33] Cf. *Market St. Ry.* v. *Railroad Comm'n,* 324 U.S. 548, 562 (1945). A prejudicial error doctrine would not be contrary to the Karl Llewellyn rule that "once there is a clearish light, a court should make effort to state an ever broader line for guidance." Llewellyn, "The Common Law Tradition: Deciding Ap-

Another set of nonconstitutional inquiries pertains to cases where courts are not the aggressors against government (as when they enjoin hearings), but are rather the dispensers of power (as when their aid is sought to enforce subpenas or other agency commands). In Hannah it was held that due process did not authorize the enjoining of a civil rights hearing. Might the court have been more solicitous of witnesses' rights had the appeal resulted from a lower court's refusal to enforce a civil rights subpena, rather than an order which made the lower court an aggressor? [34]

D. If it is necessary to test for due process [and again note the need for checking, too, other clauses of the Constitution], what authorities have approved, disapproved, or proscribed the questioned procedure?

We need not fret here about stare decisis. Locating all the precedents may be troublesome (because of the stunted progress on classification we mentioned above), but the course of due process precedent does not vary from what seems set for most constitutional litigation.

What may distinguish due process cases is the density of nonjudicial precedent. At times, the quest for what courts have done seems almost incidental. That quest is now complemented by the inquiry, "What procedures have governments actually used in matters like this?" The Brandeis brief has a noble history, and its utility for subjects other than economic regulation is established.[35] When it is launched full blown into the fray of due process, however, it sometimes seems more akin to Stephen Potter and his gamesmanship than to a distinguished jurist and his drive for social reform.

The main trouble with noncourt precedents in procedure cases is that they approach infinity. An important argument can begin, "In the FTC, CAB, NLRB, and Department of Interior, for example." Or, "In 23 States public utilities commissions." Or, "In the juvenile delinquency proceedings surveyed by the editors of the Indiana Law Review." Or, "In Queensland, Northern Ireland, and Pakistan." Or, "Compare [or contrast] the long-established practices as to allegedly insane criminals in France, Norway, Nazi Germany, and/or Soviet Russia." And historical inquiry adds a vast dimension of time to that of geography.

The Court in *Hannah* v. *Larche* thought it "highly significant that the Commission's procedures are not historically foreign to other forms of investigation under our system." [36] We are then invited to consider:

1. "The first full-fledged congressional investigating committee. * * * The development and use of legislative investigation by the colonial governments. * * * The English origin of legislative investigations in this country. * * * The English practice [now]."
2. A "vast majority of instances * * * [where] congressional committees have not given witnesses detailed notice or an opportunity to confront, cross-examine and call other witnesses."
3. "The history of investigations conducted by the executive branch of the Government."
4. Processes of the FTC, SEC, AEC, FCC, NLRB, OPS, OPA, FDA, Department of Agriculture, Tariff Commission, and "many of the most famous Presidential Commissions."
5. "The oldest and perhaps, the best known of all investigative bodies, the grand jury."

That is an impressive list—though more agencies could have been added, of course, as well as State and Commonwealth precedents.

What causes pause is that the research required to document that kind of survey can be quite taxing. And there is evidence that the lawyers and clerks who aided the Court in Hannah did not tax themselves sufficiently.[37] Public administration research and historical and comparative research demand a scientific method; and findings that are accurate, complete, valid, and reliable are not easily assured.

The decade of the 1960's is hardly a time for arguing that tough due process cases should be decided without reference to the practice of other tribunals, other governments, other eras. We must recognize, nevertheless, that the data collected will tend to be anecdotal even if they are trustworthy. "[T]he considerations of fairness that reflect our traditions of legal and political thought." [38] are often elusive, and the amassing of citations which purport to illumine those traditions sometimes adds little light indeed.[39]

E. Exactly how would efficiency be affected, in this and similar proceedings, if complainant's request were allowed? (herein of deference)

Even if "traditions of legal and political thought" have been revealed, they need be "duly related to the public interest Congress sought to meet ** * as against the hazards or hardship to the individual that the * * * [attacked]procedure would entail." [40] Gospel truths are that due process shields us from other public interests and that the other interests give way whenever "the hazards or hardship to the individual" loom too large.

This article will not explore the issues of deference and balancing that perplex judges when they apply first amendment due process, or aim to ensure "respect for the dignity of the individual." [41] Instead, we ask if those issues demand the same articulation when judges seek to preserve what we labeled above "the reliability of the determination-making process." If the public interest, for example, is to keep movies clean and to imprison dope addicts, prior censorship and stomach pumping may or may not be constitutional, given a court's view of fundamental rights and individual dignity. But prior censorship and stomach pumping, per se, are not unreliable. They can be efficient truth-determining techniques, whether or not lawful.

When we permit censorship and testing of the human body, however, the procedures often must be checked for reliability. Thus, each exhibitor ought to be allowed to argue that his movie should not be censored, and the questioning of physiologists' techniques (e.g., on blood tests) should be permitted, because we know that arguing and questioning may well expose error arising out of those procedures.[42]

What truly is the public interest in procedure itself (or more precisely, in the procedures that may lead to depriving people of their life, liberty, or property)? Is it not to insure that correct determinations will be made (and thus only the deserving deprivations be effected), except where some margin of error seems essential to avoid ills that inhere in procedure (e.g., cost and delay)?

To illustrate: The public interest in censoring dirty movies might be jeopardized if the only available procedure were trial by jury; and too few drunk drivers might be punished if every government breath-tester could be subpenaed and cross-examined as to the conditions surrounding his breath-test. Yet censors and testers err, as do all government officials; and centuries of revolution and war warn us that too much error is intolerable. The problem is to set the margin of tolerable error, given the ills of too much procedure. (That margin is usually minimized, of course, by the inventiveness of lawmen who demonstrate that devices such as preliminary injunctions can avoid the harm of dirty movies, pending a truth-seeking trial, and that allowing a man's own doctor to repeat a health official's test is a check on accuracy that raises hardly any of the questions which trouble us as to cross-examination of health officials.)

In due process cases there are these critical questions: (1) Exactly how would "efficiency" be affected, in this and similar proceedings, were complainant's request for procedural rights allowed? (2) Should courts make that determination or should other officials?

---

peals," 398 (1960). Does his rule, prescribed for appellate work generally, apply to all due process cases? I submit that the potential harm to government of cases that say "This and like procedures are bad" is much less than the potential harm to citizens of "This and like procedures are permissible." (Cf. the *Hannah* case.) The reason is that officials tend to push the borderlines to the citizen's disadvantages in both situations.

[34] Cf. *United States* v. *Kleinman,* 107 F. Supp. 407, 408 (D.D.C. 1952).

[35] See 2 Davis, "Administrative Law Treatise," 354 (1958); cf. Doro, "The Brandeis Brief," 11 Vand L. Rev. 783 (1958).

[36] 363 U.S. at 444.

[37] See Newman, supra, note 7.

[38] Frankfurter, J., concurring in *Hannah* v. *Larche,* 363 U.S. 420, 487 (1960).

[39] Professor Kadish perceptively describes and evaluates the "criteria for interpreting a flexible due process." Kadish "Methodology and Criteria in Due Process Adjudication—A Survey and Criticism," 66 Yale L.J. 319, 327, 344 (1957). He concludes, "the Court has [regarded] * * * its function as one of passively applying moral judgments already made, rather than as one of actively making new moral decision." Id. at 344. He does not fully explore "whether the Supreme Court is institutionally equipped to ascertain and evaluate the complex factual data necessary for rational decisionmaking." Id. at 359. But his inquiries into "the data of comparative legal systems" (p. 354) and "the use of knowledge outside the record" (p. 359) lead me to wonder, Are mountains of data ever likely to be truly as enlightening as an insistent focus on good sense? He searches for "the effect of an added risk of misdeterminations if certain procedures are sanctioned, and * * * the effect of not permitting an attenuation of those procedures." (p. 353). That is a scholarly definition of what I have loosely labeled "efficiency." In the Hannah case, I believe, the Court was so bogged in data that its members never did exploit their own good sense on how complainants' requested rights might have affected the efficiency of the Civil Rights Commission. Another example is *Anonymous* v. *Baker,* 360 U.S. 287 (1959). Since the investigator there "expressed his readiness to suspend the course of questioning whenever appellants wished to consult with counsel" (id. at 28), exactly how would efficiency have been hurt if counsel had been allowed to observe the proceedings?

[40] Frankfurter, J., concurring in *Hannah* v. *Larche,* 363 U.S. 420, 487 (1960).

[41] See Hand, "The Bill of Rights" (1958).

[42] On blood tests, compare the court of appeals opinion in *United States ex rel, Lee Kum Hoy* v. *Shaugnessy,* 237 F.2d 307, 308 (2d cir. 1956) ("the data * * * established conclusively that Lee Ha could not be the father"), with the Supreme Court's per curiam notation that remand was necessary because "the blood grouping tests made herein were in some respects inaccurate and the reports thereof partly erroneous and conflicting," 355 U.S. 169, 170 (1957). Cf. In re Newbern, 175 Cal. App. 2d 862, 1 Cal. Rptr. 80 (1959); and see Littel and Sturgeon, "Defects in Discovery and Testing Procedures: Two Problems in the Medicolegal Application of Blood Grouping Tests," 5 U.C.L.A.L. Rev. 629 (1958).

The Civil Rights Commission's assignment is to submit reports to the President and the Congress. Those reports are to "appraise the laws and policies of the Federal Government with respect to equal protection of the laws," and the Commission is directed to "study and collect information concerning legal developments constituting a denial of equal protection of the laws." The public interest is manifest; and efficiency would suffer if the Commission, after it had studied sociological and statistical reports and law review articles, say, were required to notify interested citizens of a grand hearing to be convened at which the authors of those reports and articles could be cross-examined. The band of Commission error that thus might be exposed is far less significant than the obvious ills of that procedure; and the right to petition the Government (as well as advising one's legislators, participating in congressional hearings, etc.) seems sufficient for keeping the margin of error low.

The Commission is further directed, however, to "investigate allegations in writing * * * that certain citizens of the United States are being deprived of their right to vote and to have that vote counted by reason of their color, race, religion, or national origin; which writing, under oath or affirmation, shall set forth the facts." The public interest implied in that directive relates to evildoing—the kind of evildoing that may first, persuade Congress to enact law; and second, persuade the President that he should either (A) encourage Congress to enact law, or (B) advise his Attorney General or other subordinates of a possible need for appropriate action. Quite clearly, Congress no longer was satisfied with the type of informal accusations that normally are adequate for legislating. Apparently too, Congress was not satisfied that the Attorney General and other policemen knew enough about existing violations of law. So sworn accusations were called for, setting forth "the facts"; and the Commission was directed to investigate them. As LYNDON JOHNSON said on the floor of the Senate, "It can gather facts instead of charges; it can sift out the truth from the fancies."[43]

What of efficiency? During the year ending in August 1959, the Commission received approximately 240 accusations involving 29 counties in 8 states.[44] By February 1960, at least 86 more had been filed, involving 4 additional counties.[45] The Commission favors "full investigations,"[46] which apparently means careful study, field interviews, and—on rare occasions—hearings. This seems clear: To advise every accused evildoer that he has been accused, to tell him who accused him, and/or to permit him to cross-examine his accusers might be too complicating, too delaying, too costly.

What if the accused is subpenaed, however, to testify regarding an accuser's testimony at a public hearing? Would it be inefficient to let him know generally what the Commission was after, what kind of examination he would be expected to face, what evidence he should be ready to produce? Would it be inefficient before he testifies to let him sit with the public as a spectator? Would it be inefficient to allow him a limited right of cross-examination, or to submit questions for the Commission to put to his accusers?

Those are questions *Hannah* v. *Larche* did not answer, and they illustrate a variety of questions that ought to have been answered. They relate to the reliability of the determination-making process. One can ask whether the margin of error that might have been minimized by the rights postulated, for that kind of civil rights hearing, would truly have been offset by the ills that sometimes might accompany such rights.

That weighing of procedures' efficiency leads to the question, Who decides? When should courts defer to the judgment of the legislature? Of the Chief Executive? Of Cabinet officials? Of policemen, prosecutors, prison wardens, psychiatrists? If we sought only "the considerations of fairness that reflect our traditions of legal and political thought, duly related to * * * the hazards or hardship to the individual that the * * * [attacked] procedure would entail," judges ought to be paramount.[47] When we also seek "the public interest," however, so that it too can be balanced with the traditions and the individual's interest, efficiency is the new ingredient. The play between procedure and the goals of government becomes crucial, and the epic of administrative law—in New Deal years especially—resounds with reminders that courts' views of efficiency are often believed to be heedlessly frustrating. Even so, the case for deference by judges is weakest when procedural due process is at stake; and these observations seem noteworthy:

First, the legislature is often the antagonist in litigation that involves economic controls, equal protection, censorship, and other substantive questions. In procedural due process cases, contrastingly, courts hardly ever have to declare a statute unconstitutional. For legislatures rarely say, "This is the procedure we want used." Instead they broadly delegate procedure-making authority, and the result is that courts then war with lesser bodies than the legislature itself. Even when a statute is voided that says to an agency, "You may if you wish deny the right to cross-examine," the effect is different from the voiding of a statute providing, "Cross-examination must not be allowed, for the public interest then would suffer." That latter statute is atypical.

Second, administrators (and investigating committees, grand juries, and in fact all lesser officials with jobs to do) have demonstrated, I think, that they are less trustworthy with respect to procedure than are judges. I refer not merely to the abuses of loyalty-security, the pillorying of peoples' reputations, illegal police practices, or other histories of arbitrary action. Nor would I add only the reminder of Justice Douglas in Hannah that "Men of good will, not evil ones only, invent, under feelings of urgency, new and different procedures that have an awful effect on the citizen."[48] I am more influenced by the fact that administrators too often have cried, "Wolf, wolf." Too often, for example, have government attorneys pleaded that to grant rights requested by the complainants would wreck their agency's program—when, following defeat in court, it becomes obvious that the threats were posh. Even in the Supreme Court, where governments have such great resources for winnowing out their borderline cases, is it not astonishing that the Solicitors General (and their State counterparts) so frighteningly often have been wrong on what fundamental fairness requires? And how inadequate, empirically, have been their hundreds of awful-consequence predictions regarding the efficiency and effectiveness of government business.

Judges are sometimes wrong, too. And it may be that a few decisions are making a few criminals' lot a happy one, or that appellate judges as a group still are too eager to impose court rules on agencies whose tasks call for a modified process and a freedom to experiment. In bulk, though, the sins of judges who aimed to insure due process surely have been overbalanced by the sins of bureaucrats who—conscientiously, vigorously, in good faith we assume—seek means that at first glance appear the least disruptive to their immediate ends. Too few administrators have acknowledged that "due process of law is not for the sole benefit of an accused * * * [and] is the best insurance for the Government itself against those blunders which leave lasting stains on a system of justice.[49]

IV. WHO COULD SPEARHEAD REFORM, HOW?

The people who prescribe due process are nearly always adjudicators—administrative or judicial. In their adjudications they examine procedure to see if it is constitutional. On occasion, agencies and trial judges set the law of due process (e.g., when a body like the NLRB declares, "No less than this does due process require."). But appellate courts are paramount, of course; the Supreme Court, preeminent. Inevitably this article treats of that Court's problems. Its process for prescribing due process is emulated by other prescribers, and the target of reform is there if the process be deficient.

Whether legal writings point the way to reform is not always a test of their utility. Some of the best do not aid reformers but rather contribute to knowledge, understanding, or their readers' enjoyment. Yet aid to reform is a valued goal, and provides an interesting test for what Erwin Griswold has called "the current chapter in the long history of criticism of the Court."[50]

The message in most of the newer criticism is that the nine Justices who comprise the Court themselves bear responsibility for its ills. If we imagine, for instance, a conscientious, newly appointed Justice who is eager to fashion the image toward which he should strive, he would learn from careful study of the recent critiques that he and his colleagues should be wiser, more lawyerlike, more statesmanlike, more perceptive, more efficient, less dilettante, less opinionated, more or less worldly, more or less consistent, more or less unanimous, etc. (He would also learn that the mere reading of all those books and articles probably fouled up his time chart.)

---

[43] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 103, pt. 10, p. 13897.

[44] 1959 Report of the Commission on Civil Rights, 55.

[45] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 106, pt. 3, p. 3692.

[46] 1959 Report of the Commission on Civil Rights, 55.

[47] But cf. *Norwegian Nitrogen Prod. Co.* v. *United States,* 288 U.S. 294, 321 (1933): "Since a hearing is required, there is a command by implication to do whatever may be necessary to make the hearing fair. A duty so interdeterminate must vary in form and shape with all the changing circumstances whereby fairness is conditioned. The appeal is to the sense of justice of administrative officers, clothed by the statute with discretionary powers. Their resolve is not subject to impeachment for unwisdom without more. It must be shown to be arbitrary."

[48] 363 U.S. at 507.

[49] *Shaughnessy* v. *Mezei,* 345 U.S. 206, 224-225 (1953) (dissenting opinion); cf. Gellhorn, "Changing Attitudes Toward the Administrative Process," in "Individual Freedom and Governmental Restraints," ch. 1 (1956). For further comment on deference and due process see Kadish, "Methodology and Criteria in Due Process Adjudication—A Survey and Criticism," 66 Yale L.J. 319, 358-359 (1957; cf. id. at 337 n. 114 ("In the area of procedural due process * * * [Justice Frankfurter] seems to be asserting a doctrine that increases, rather than decreases, the latitude of discretion open to the Court in adjudicating constitutional issues."). Learned Hand, who recently admonished that the court's duty of deference must not be denigrated, seems to categorize procedural due process separately. Hand, "The Bill of Rights," 44-45 (1958). It is significant that the widely distributed prefact to Davis, "Administrative Law Treatise" (1958), which documents Supreme Court misfeasances by citing chapter and verse, complains of no procedure cases? Cf. 2 id., sec. 16.10; 1 id. 471 (discusses efficiency without mention of deference).

[50] Griswold, foreword, "Of Time and Attitudes—Professor Hart and Judge Arnold," 74 Harv. L. Rev. 81, 82 (1960).

Here we deal only with procedural due process, and that topic is not how the Court should manage its business or how the Court should handle constitutional law. But we have considered reforms, and an identifying of possible reformers seems fitting. What is clear is that we will delude ourselves if we assume the Court alone has the burden of improvement.

Questions this article has posed relate, for example, to "good lawyering." Is not that attribute one which in the Court is far more institutional than personal? Are not craftsmanship and understanding far less dependent on the conscience and will of nine Justices than on the presented product of counsel, trial courts, law clerks, other participants? In Hannah, for instance, though the case was terrifically complex, the opinions and the Justices' comments in oral argument show an awareness of issues and of law that was nowhere near matched by counsels' briefs or arguments. Who, then, is to blame for missing some of the subtle points discussed above (particularly when we see that Hannah was announced the same day as *Aquilino, Durham, Locomotive Engineers, Annheuser-Busch, Metlakatla,* three *Steelworkers* cases, *Flemming* v. *Nestor, Miner* v. *Atlas, Schilling, American-Foreign Steamship, Hudson,* and *Cory Corp.* v. *Sauber*[51])?

Thruman Arnold's comment that the Supreme Court opinions "rank higher than the articles which appear in the Harvard Law Review" is worth pondering.[52] Do not current attacks on the Court, even when "based on understanding and respect and designed to assist the Court with its great and difficult task in our constitutional system,"[53] tend to reach for a perfection that no nine Justices, law professors, Wall Street lawyers, or men or angels could ever attain? Improved lawyering and sounder analyses and new lines of inquiry and efficient procedures must be institutional goals. Our worst sin as critics has been an unscholarly premise that some outstanding men named Warren, Frankfurter, Black, et al., somehow should take on an assignment that in fact must largely be ours and many others'.

The problem of court reform is reminiscent of problems of influence peddling. There the initial cry was for improved ethics in the regulatory agencies. Then it became clear that the issues were really quite complex and that some of the boldest critics—Congressmen and lawyers—were themselves deeply involved. Influence peddling problems still are mostly unsolved; but we have learned that agencies' codes of ethics are only piecemeal solutions, and that self-reform within Congress and the bar may be much more critical.

Consider similarly the aches of investigating committees. We first pitted the good guys against the bad and hoped that sensible middlemen (Senators George and MCCLELLAN say) would restore law and order. Then we discovered that voters and newspapermen and thus politics were involved, and that fair committee procedure called for sophistications which only members of the bar could supply. The response of lawyer-planners and lawyer-draftsmen was excellent; and if more lawyer-statesmen had responded comparably (with the kind of lobbying campaign that is now being waged for professional men's tax benefits, say), we might have achieved for investigating committees a more impressive code than the House of Representatives' fair play rules.[54] (And who knows what impact that victory might have had on *Hannah* v. *Larche*?[55])

The influence peddling and investigating committee analogies show what can be done when less attention is given to "Here is what you the commissioners (or you the Congressmen) should do" than to "Here is what we the lawyers must do." The procedures of Congress provide a model too where critics finally realized that "Here is what we the professors must do." The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 is in large part a product of political scientists, after years of learned but unheeded scholarship as to legislatures' organizational deficiencies.[56]

Institutionally what might be done to improve the process of due process? As noted above we need a superior literature, which presses for precise definitions and what Karl Llewellyn calls "the structuring of whole fields and * * * the sweating of clarity out of tangled lumps of 5 or 15 or 50 or a hundred and fifty cases. * * * [For] it is the scholar who must carry the load first of stumppulling and then of dreaming of sweating up intelligible tentative drafts of sound design."[57] The need for that literature (and for efficient guides to its use, instead of our self-deceiving "Index to Legal Periodicals") should help keep us humble. No one can pretend, however, that the need is likely to inspire any foundation-sponsored or other project that in the foreseeable future could bring us closer to a better due-process process.

For measurable gain we must seek less remote proposals, such as Dean Griswold's suggestion that "the bar should take the lead in developing legislation which will reduce the burden on the Supreme Court."[58] The proposal I discuss now relates to the bar, particularly to traditions of advocacy that seem fixed for due process litigation (and, I suppose, most Court litigation).

If we must identify the mortal sinners in the due-process prescribing process, I nominate the lawyers for plaintiff and defendant. Their time chart is less compulsive than the Justices'; and they surely are most at fault when items on the checklist are unchecked, when exact harms, exact procedures, exact precedents are unidentified. A choice excerpt from one of the Hannah briefs (confusing 5th and 14th amendment due process) was quoted above. A score or more other excerpts would be equally damning. At oral argument why was the Court misled, for instance, as to the practices of congressional committees, the understanding of the Commission as to its duties re executive sessions, the Commission's interpretation of "defame, degrade, or incriminate"?[59]

The plain truth is that the Court does not benefit from what excellent advocacy could insure, just as it does not benefit from what excellent scholarship could insure. The temptation, therefore, is to conclude that lawyers must study the facts and law more carefully, write better briefs, prepare more painstakingly for oral argument. Unhappily, that has the same unreality as does telling scholars that the quality of texts and articles ought to be improved. Of course we need superior advocacy, but recognizing the need does not make the prospects of improvement less remote.

So, again, are we reduced to pontification that the true call is for a better bench, a better bar, better law schools—just as some critics argue that to control influence peddling and investigating committees we must elect better legislators and hire better men in Government? One hopes that less radical cures might be developed; and it is with respect to advocacy that one cure might be practicable, I believe.

When due process is prescribed, law is made—procedure law. Facts and arguments which influence that lawmaking are in part the same facts and arguments which would have influenced noncourt lawmakers—legislatures, agencies, judicial conferences, other groups that reform procedure law. The techniques for presenting facts and arguments, however, are phenomenally dissimilar. For in the process of prescribing due process we rely almost entirely on the talents and resources of two parties' lawyers.

To the comment, "Isn't that true for all judicial lawmaking?" I must reply, "Yes." And perhaps the process of all judicial lawmaking needs reforming, so we could bring to judges the wisdom and insights that are the product of procedures in statute making and rule making. I stress, though, three facts that may call for accelerated action on due-process process.

First. In due-process cases most private lawyers do not enjoy the competence that may mark their presentation of other cases. As a result, courts do not benefit from the high-quality lawyering that can aid tax law, labor law, criminal law, the law of the press, other subjects. Even civil liberties lawyers tend to be better informed on first amendment rights than on most due-process rights.

Second. Government lawyers, on the other hand, are able to acquire due-process experience; and the fee and expense limits that in many cases confine private lawyering are not paralleled in Government. The two teams of lawyers, therefore, are not evenly matched; and the courts suffer. If Government advocates were statesmen, fit to guide judges wisely through labyrinths of righteousness, their competence would be a blessing. The facts, sadly, show that solicitors general and their counterparts are not permitted such a role. For their counsel is sought not when other officials wish to design a procedure, so that the lessons of "the very essence of a scheme of ordered liberty" may be put to good use. Rather they answer calls of alarm. They are shock troops to be rushed in when a lawsuit impends. Their job, with awful consistence, is to demonstrate that a procedure already set is really legitimate, though they and other lawyers (and people who designed the procedure, even) might now concede that de novo a more fair procedure should have been designed.[60] One shudders at the thought of the arbitrary governing that now might be our heritage if judges, year after year, decade after decade, had been overly impressed by the due-process expertness of Governments' advocates.

Third. Procedure (the kind of procedure that is used to deprive people of life, liberty, and property) is peculiarly a lawyer's topic. In other fields there are businessmen and churchmen and doctors and engineers for whom lawyers speak. Those people can be concerned with procedure, but even when substance is deeply affected (as in the commitment of juvenile delinquents or the mentally ill, say) the legal profession does not forfeit its eminence.

---

[51] See 363 U.S. 509–721 (1960).

[52] Arnold, "Professor Hart's Theology," 73 Harv. L. Rev. 1298 (1960).

[53] Griswold, "Foreword: Of Tome and Attitudes—Professor Hart and Judge Arnold," 74 Harv. L. Rev., 81 (1960).

[54] See, Newman, "Some Facts on Fact-Finding by an Investigatory Commission," 13 Admin. L. Rev.—(1961).

[55] Cf. Newman, supra, note 7.

[56] See Galloway, "The Operation of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946," 45 Am. Pol. Sci. Rev. 41 (1951).

[57] Llewellyn, "The Common Law: Deciding Appeals," 346 (1960).

[58] Griswold, "Foreward: Of Time and Attitudes—Professor Hart and Judge Arnold," 74 Harv. L. Rev. 81, 85 (1960); cf. Arnold, "Professor Hart's Theology," 73 Harv. L. Rev. 1298, 1300 (1960) ("How Professor Hart proposes to reform the bar he does not say.").

[59] See pp. 43–45, 50–58, and 93 of the transcript.

[60] I have been advised that the Government lawyers responsible for arguing the Hannah case were so set on victory that they sought out potential amici (who were contemplating the filing of a brief possibly like the Douglas-Black dissent) and persuaded them not to file.

In typical cases, however, lawyers for the man deprived of life, liberty, or property may share too little of their whole profession's lore; lawyers for the Government, too much. Should not courts insure a better balance by seeking from the profession aids to wisdom that the bar as a whole (lawyers and professors) could provide?

The best discussion of extra manpower that I know is Karl Llewellyn's; and his comments on the lower courts and counsel, the judge's law clerk, and outside experts merit attention.[61] I wish he himself had given more attention to the amicus brief. "[R]equesting or inviting, on occasion, an amicus brief * * * has been little institutionalized," he says, "and if institutionalized unwisely it could turn into an abuse; but the idea has much merit, for occasional use, especially when light is needed on situations technical and relatively unfamiliar to the court." [62]

He wrote mostly of private law. With regard to due-process law, for which the bar has a unique bent, should we be so cautious? A flood of amicus briefs might rub rawly too many sensitive issues in commercial law, perhaps, or all constitutional law. But one of these days we will have to face up to the arbitrariness and need for a right to petition and right to be heard in judicial lawmaking,[63] and is not due process a fertile first field for experiment and expansion?

Why should not lawyers and law professors—individually, for clients, for ABA, AALS, ACLU, and other groups, for governments—articulate via amicus briefs a concern with due process procedure law that matches their variously demonstrated concerns with all other forms of procedure law? We have taught ourselves that committee reports and scholarly writings, alone, do not sufficiently influence lawmakers and that reform activity, to be fruitful, has to be packaged efficiently. For courts is not the best package—comparable to appearance at a legislative or rulemaking hearing or an office conference with legislators or administrators—the amicus brief?

What would such briefs add? The writers could be lawyers whose interest was not confined to (1) this particular case, or (2) ensuring victory for the Government in this and similar cases. Their contribution could reflect some of that maturing of collective thought which perhaps cannot be assured by the Bench itself.[64] They could test counsels' arguments for compliance with the checklist (which thereby would become sharper, more complete, more useful). They could supply the breadth of view we need to expose privilege doctrines, too pervasive criminal trial analogies, and other doctrinal dead ends. Their ideas would not be molded to victory or defeat,[65] and their grand strategy less likely would involve aims extraneous to due process.[66] They could also focus for courts' attention some rather good ideas in legal writings that now, too often, are entombed. (In Hannah the opinions cite none of the leading texts or articles on cross-examination, and only one of the scores of recent articles that discuss investigating committee procedures.)

Those are potential gains, speculative but not insignificant. They might call for some management planning, though by no means do I recommend any souped-up, centrally controled, amicus brief filing body.[67] Free enterprise and sometimes even brashness are to be encouraged (which, incidentally, may require for academic life a vigilance to be sure that young teachers do not write articles instead of briefs merely to get their publish-or-perish credits).

CONCLUSION

In short, the due-process process calls for altertness as to the deficiences of both doctrine and mechanics. It calls for awareness that the job of whittling away at those deficiencies is too vast for nine Justices. Reforms that a thousand others of us must effect are needed, and an expanded amicus tradition might be one useful reform.

The Justices bear some responsibility. When parties' briefs are insufficient postponements can be ordered; and there are many precedents where the attorneys have been directed to discuss Court-framed questions, where agencies have been asked to interpret documents or describe their practices, where comments of independent counsel have been sought. The Court might even impose some minimum standards for due process advocacy, to insure that lawyers do not ignore items on a checklist or that they detail their quarrels regarding fact (adjudicative and legislative) as well as the law theories they espouse. Especially, the Court should not jeopardize its own due process by restrictive application of its amicus rules.[68] It is not a committee of Congress, and it owes no duty of graciousness to all advocates who may wish to file or read statements. It is part of "the Government," nonetheless, and "to petition the Government" for better due process (whether or not a first amendment right) is a right the Court surely should encourage when its own work might profit.

A final word relates to social significance. With respect to procedure law in general, it can be argued that appellate courts are not the best forum for reform and that reformers' limited energies, therefore, should be aimed at revised statutes, revised regulations, revised court rules. That is certainly true as to civil procedure and a great deal of criminal and administrative procedure. The big regulatory agencies, for example, rarely have any due process troubles; and a whole new Administrative Procedure Act can be drafted with only minor reference to the rules of due process.

There are immense areas of government, however, where much law is due process law—where crucial statutes, regulations, and rules are either nonexistent or unconstitutional. Many criminal proceedings, loyalty-security proceedings, mental health proceedings, traffic court, juvenile court, and family court proceedings illustrate the point. The officials engaged in those activities are not constantly perturbed by due process opinions, but there is ample evidence that those opinions do have an enormous impact.[69]

Yet even more critical than an impact on administration is the impact on reform itself. We tend to regard due process opinions mostly as warnings to policemen or trial judges or agency officials—telling them what appellate courts won't let them do. Those warnings themselves effect many reforms. (E.g., "We'd better change the rules, because Olympus says we're not supposed to do that anymore.") The greater effect, though, pertains to statutes, regulations, and rules that are new and more comprehensive.[69] Reformers of those less explored proceedings I just mentioned (loyalty-security, traffic court, juvenile court, etc.) do not only inquire "What must we avoid to keep the new procedures constitutional?" They also ask, "For ideas as to procedure why don't we consider the due process precedents?" And often they add, "Why as a matter of policy should we require more than due process requires? For the cases tell us what is 'fair,' and who are we to seek more than fairness?" [70]

Hannah v. *Larche*, for example, reminds us that "due process embodies the differing rules of fairplay, which through the years, have become associated with differing types of proceedings." The proposals there rejected, we are told, "would make a shambles of the investigation and stifle the * * * gathering of facts." "[T]he investigative process could be completely disrupted. * * * Factfinding agencies * * * would be diverted from their legitimate duties and would be plagued by the injection of collateral issues that would make the investigation interminable." [71] Should reformers disregard those prestigious predictions? Or is it possible that the Court's inquiry in this single case may have greater effect on the whole course of investigatory reform than will a vigorous decade of scholarly research and writing?

---

[61] Llewellyn, "The Common Law: Deciding Appeals," 317–332 (1960). Some of the most objectionable language in the Court's Hannah opinion was inspired by pp. 18 and 35 of the Government's brief. See text preceding note 10, supra.

[62] Llewellyn, "The Common Law: Deciding Appeals," 323 (1960).

[63] See Weintraub, "Judicial Legislation," N.Y.L.J., Mar. 19, 1959; cf. *Mitchell* v. *Trawler Racer, Inc.*, 362 U.S. 539, 571–572 (1960) (dissenting opinion); *Wyatt* v. *United States*, 362 U.S. 525, 535 (1960) (dissenting opinion); *NLRB* v. *E. & B. Brewing Co.*, 276 F. 2d 594 (6th Cir. 1960); George R. Currie, "Appellate Courts Use of Facts Outside of the Record by Resort to Judicial Notice and Independent Investigation," 1960 Wis. L. Rev. 39.

[64] Cf. Hart, foreword, "The Time Chart of the Justices," 73 Harv. L. Rev. 84 (1959).

[65] While preparing a mock petition for rehearing in the Hannah case I discovered that my avowed "concern for rationality in the law of due process" was consistent with neither appellants' nor respondents' aims. Both sides would have opposed my suggested conclusion. See Newman, supra, note 7.

[66] In the cold war now being waged on desegregation and other racial issues, what really are the stakes in a dispute regarding technicalities of the procedure of one not very powerful Federal investigatory agency?

[67] Cf. Freedman, "Promoting the Public Welfare: A Proposal for Establishing a People's Advocate," 43 A.B.A.J. 211 (1957); Kadish, "Methodology and Criteria in Due Process Adjudication—A Survey and Criticism," 66 Yale L. J. 319, 363 n. 198 (1957) (references to "a research body which would make determination of constitutional facts").

[68] Cf. *Knetsch* v. *United States*, 81 S. Ct. 132, 137 (1960) ("Some point is made in an amicus curiae brief of the fact that * * * [petitioner] in entering into these annuity agreements relied on individual ruling letters issued by the Commissioner to other taxpayers. This argument has never been advanced by petitioners in this case. Accordingly, we have no reason to pass upon it."). Would more flexibility on rehearings be desiderable? Cf. Louisell and Degnan, "Rehearing in American Appellate Courts," 44 Calif., L. Rev. 627 (1956). Generally, see Swisher, "The Supreme Court and the 'Moment of truth,' " 54 Am. Pol. Sci. Rev. 879, 884 (1960).

[69] Two years ago, reviewing the Davis "Administrative Law Treatise," I stated that "Agency rulemakers and adjudicators do pay considerable attention to statutes, but if Professor Davis believes they are regularly influenced by Supreme Court opinions I believe he is mistaken." Newman, "The Literature of Administrative Law and the New Davis Treatise," 43 Minn. L. Rev. 637, 642 (1959). I now believe that I was mistaken, assuming that (1) we do not overly stress the word "regularly," and (2) administrative law includes the whole sweep of government and not merely those proceedings that are the focus of most law practice before agencies.

[70] For a suggestion that officials sometimes are afraid to recognize more rights than due process demands see Rourke, "Law Enforcement Through Publicity," 24 U. Ch. L. Rev. 225, 253 n. 108 (1957).

[71] 363 U.S. at 442–444.

The process of prescribing due process thus may even dominate reform. Efforts to improve its effectiveness could be widely rewarding indeed.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. Roosevelt].

Mr. **ROOSEVELT**. Mr. Chairman, if the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania is not adopted it will become very obvious that we have been unable to improve this bill on the floor this afternoon. In that case, I think it becomes imperative that all those who feel deeply about this American principle vote against the bill, because if the bill has a strong negative vote in the House today and still passes, we have a hope that it may be improved in the other body. I hope we may have a substantial vote to show how important we believe the improvement of this bill is as far as section 303 is concerned.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'Hara].

Mr. **O'HARA** of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the parliamentary situation is such that I cannot offer my amendment at this time. However, after the Moorhead amendment is disposed of, I will offer an amendment which will have to be voted upon without explanation or debate. I have therefore taken this time to explain my amendment.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. Roosevelt], the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Alger], and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moorhead], have all been directed to the right to a hearing and to the right of appeal. Whatever might be said in favor of such provisions, I doubt that the Committee will prove to be willing to consider the right of appeal and hearing in these cases.

My amendment is directed, not to the right of hearing and appeal, but to another aspect of section 303, the absolute authority of the Secretary to terminate the employment of any employee under certain prescribed circumstances. Under the bill he could delegate that authority to any employee of the Department of Defense. He probably will delegate that authority if he follows precedent. I am very much afraid we will end up with some obscure employee of the Department of Defense actually making these decisions. Since it is always a lot easier, simpler, neater, and cleaner to avoid the time-consuming and cumbersome procedures of a formal hearing the tendency will be to use the summary procedure whenever it can possibly be justified.

My amendment attempts to limit the use of such procedure to cases involving the gravest consequences to the national security. It requires that the Secretary of Defense personally make the decision to terminate an employee's employment on security grounds without hearing, and that in this personal decision he obtain the personal concurrence of the highest legal officer of the United States, the Attorney General of the United States. The adoption of my amendment will give us at least some assurance that this authority granted in section 303 will not be used arbitrarily or capriciously. I think that is the least we can do.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Willis].

Mr. **WILLIS**. Mr. Chairman, I regard this amendment as the most devastating of all those offered heretofore, because it would require giving to the employee—

> (1) a written statement of the charges against him, which shall be stated as specifically as security considerations permit—

Whatever that may mean—

> (2) an opportunity within 10 days after receipt of the statement of charges against him to answer such charges and to submit affidavits; and
>
> (3) a written statement of the final decision of the Secretary.

In other words, everything would be in writing. The charge against him would have to be in writing, and it would violate all security measures. I know the gentleman is highly motivated about this amendment. I told him I could not go along for the reason I have stated. This actually goes far beyond anything that has been proposed. It would require giving everything in writing, written charges and countercharges, and a copy of the written decision, so that everything would be in the open. It would violate all our security measures.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of the amendment.

Mr. **MOORHEAD**. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **WILLIS**. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and may I say I have great respect for my friend.

Mr. **MOORHEAD**. The gentleman refers to the phrase, "as specifically as security considerations permit." That means so long as you are not endangering the security of the United States. A mere statement to that effect would be sufficient if giving anything more would be a danger to the national security.

Mr. **WILLIS**. Of course, I do not know what the result would be, but let me repeat what I said earlier, under this bill you have three steps. First, the board of appraisal passes on the evidence. That is step No. 1. Step No. 2, the conclusion of the board goes to the Director of the National Security Agency. Step No. 3, the final papers go to the Secretary of Defense, who has the power to discharge an employee.

So you do have a 3-step review procedure here, but you must have finality to the procedure. The final authority is the Secretary of Defense.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The time of the gentleman has expired.

All time for debate has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moorhead].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. **O'HARA** of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, and ask that it be voted on.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. O'Hara of Michigan: On page 5, after line 4, insert the following:
>
> "(b) The authority to terminate employment under this section may be exercised by the Secretary only after he obtains the concurrence of the Attorney General. Neither the authority of the Secretary to terminate employment, nor the functions of the Attorney General with respect to concurrence, under this section may be delegated."
>
> On page 5, line 5, strike out "(b)" and insert in lieu thereof "(c)".

The **CHAIRMAN**. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'Hara].

The amendment was rejected.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Davis of Georgia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 950) to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950, pursuant to House Resolution 334, he reported the bill back to the House.

The **SPEAKER**. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The **SPEAKER**. For what purpose does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Alger] rise?

Mr. **ALGER**. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The **SPEAKER**. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. **ALGER**. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The **SPEAKER**. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. Alger moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 950, to the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. **ALGER**. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion was rejected.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. **WILLIS**. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken and there were—yeas 340, nays 40, answered "present" 1, not voting 54, as follows:

[Roll No. 43]

YEAS—340

Abbitt
Abele
Abernethy
Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Andrews
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Avery
Baker
Baldwin
Barry
Bass
Bates
Battin
Becker
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Berry
Betts
Boland
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonner
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Brock
Bromwell
Brooks
Broomfield

Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke
Burkhalter
Burleson
Burton
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cannon
Carey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clark
Clausen
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Delaney
Denton
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Diggs
Dole
Donohue
Dowdy
Downing
Dwyer
Elliott
Ellsworth
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Flood
Flynt
Ford
Foreman
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Gavin
Giaimo
Gibbons
Glenn
Goodell
Goodling
Gray
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Halleck
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hays
Healey
Hébert
Hechler
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Hoeven
Hoffman
Holland

Horan
Horton
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Jensen
Johansen
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karth
Keith
Kelly
Kilburn
Kilgore
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Knox
Kornegay
Kunkel
Kyl
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lesinski
Libonati
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McIntire
McLoskey
McMillan
Macdonald
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Matthews
May
Meader
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Milliken
Mills
Minish
Minshall
Montoya
Moore
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nelsen
Nix
Norblad
Nygaard
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pillion
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Price
Pucinski
Purcell

Quie
Quillen
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rich
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Rumsfeld
Ryan, Mich.
St. George
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shipley
Short
Shriver
Sibal
Sikes
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stephens
Stinson
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Thornberry
Toll
Tollefson
Trimble
Tuck
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Van Pelt
Vinson
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watson
Watts
Weaver
Weltner
Westland
Whalley
Wharton
White
Whitener
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wright
Wydler
Wyman
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—40

Alger
Ashley
Brown, Calif.

Cameron
Celler
Cohelan

Corman
Curtis
Dingell

Dulski
Duncan
Edwards
Farbstein
Fraser
Gilbert
Gill
Gonzalez
Green, Oreg.
Hawkins
Holifield

Karsten
Kastenmeier
King, Calif.
Lindsay
Long, Md.
Matsunaga
Moorhead
Moss
Nedzi
O'Hara, Ill.
Olson, Minn.

Reuss
Robison
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Roybal
Ryan, N.Y.
Sickles
Sisk
Staebler

PRESENT—1

Mathias

NOT VOTING—54

Anderson
Ayres
Baring
Barrett
Beermann
Bennett, Mich.
Blatnik
Boggs
Bolling
Bruce
Buckley
Casey
Conte
Cooley
Dent
Dorn
Edmondson
Finnegan

Fino
Fisher
Fogarty
Forrester
Gary
Grabowski
Grant
Hagan, Ga.
Hall
Joelson
Kee
Keogh
Lankford
Leggett
MacGregor
Miller, N.Y.
Monagan
Mosher

Multer
Pilcher
Powell
Rains
Reid, N.Y.
Schenck
Scott
Shelley
Sheppard
Siler
Skubitz
Slack
Steed
Taft
Thompson, N.J.
Walter

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Walter for, with Mr. Multer against.
Mr. Hall for, with Mr. Mosher against.
Mr. Bruce for, with Mr. Mathias against.
Mr. Siler for, with Mr. MacGregor against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Anderson.
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Casey with Mr. Conte.
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Schenck.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Fisher with Mr. Skubitz.
Mr. Monagan with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Grabowski with Mr. Beermann.
Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Reid of New York.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Steed with Mr. Taft.
Mr. Blatnik with Mrs. Kee.
Mr. Shelley with Mr. Baring.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Joelson with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Dent.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Finnegan.
Mr. Gary with Mr. Lankford.
Mr. Scott with Mr. Cooley.
Mr. Slack with Mr. Pilcher.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Forrester.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Grant.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRUCE]. If he were present, he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF MAY 13

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire of the majority leader as to the program, if any, for the balance of the week, and the program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. If the gentleman will yield, the legislative program for this week has been completed. It will be my intention following the announcement of the program to ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The program for next week is as follows:

Monday is District Day. There are four bills to be considered:

H.R. 3191, to exempt life insurance companies from the act of February 4, 1913, regulating loaning of money on securities in the District of Columbia.

H.R. 4273, authorizing suspension or dismissal of students in District of Columbia public schools.

H.R. 4274, authorizing the reasonable use of force by principals and teachers to maintain order in District of Columbia public schools.

H.R. 4276, Horizontal Property Act of the District of Columbia.

Tuesday, House Resolution 314, to grant additional travel authority to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Wednesday and the balance of the week, H.R. 6009, to provide, for the periods ending June 30, 1963, and August 31, 1963, temporary increases in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act. This bill will be considered under a closed rule, with 4 hours of general debate.

This announcement, of course, is subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program or any change in the program may be announced later.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank the gentleman.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, MAY 13

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule on Wednesday next be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the 10th of May is the traditional national holiday of the Rumanian people. Unfortunately it cannot be openly celebrated in their land, which is currently under Soviet domination.

This date is celebrated because it is the anniversary of three great events in the history of Rumania.

First was the proclamation in 1866 that Charles would be Prince of Rumania. Fifteen years later Charles I was crowned King of Rumania. On this date in 1877 Rumania proclaimed her independence and freedom from the outmoded Ottoman Empire.

Now, however, the Rumanian people are living again under the repression of a foreign ruler. The Soviets have changed the traditional celebration from the 10th of May to the 9th of May, which is the anniversary of the Soviet victory. But although the official celebration takes place on the 9th of May, it is the traditional allegiance to independence celebrated on the 10th of May which warms the hearts of many Rumanians and keeps alive the hopes for restored freedom in the future.

All real Americans are looking to the day when Rumania and the Rumanian people will again be free.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, Rumanians are the largest ethnic group in the Balkan Peninsula, and these 17 million productive and courageous peasants occupy one of the largest and most fertile lands in the whole region. They have lived in their historic homeland since time immemorial, and they have had to defend their homes for centuries against invaders and conquerors. They had also to struggle hard and constantly for their freedom and independence. Since the end of the Middle Ages they had faced some formidable and fearless adversaries, and, considering the forbidding, unfavorable conditions under which they faced these adversaries, they did very well. Then early in modern times the invincible steamroller of the Ottoman Turks overran their country. Thus conquered, they were subjected to the oppressive Turkish rule which they endured for 400 years. But they never lost sight of their national goal, their freedom and independence. In the first part of the 1800's they staged several uprisings and revolts, but each time they fell short of their goal, and were ruthlessly punished for their attempts to free themselves. But in the middle of the century the Crimean War provided them with a welcome opportunity.

At the conclusion of that war in 1856 European powers pressed the Sultan of Turkey to allow the Rumanians autonomy by setting up two autonomous principalities there. Later these two principalities were united under the rule of a prince. But mere autonomy was not the goal of the Rumanian people; they wanted independence. So even under autonomy they continued their struggle, and on May 10, 1877, they again raised the banner of revolt against the Turks by proclaiming their independence. In the Russo-Turkish War of 1877–78 of course they fought on the side of Russia, and the successful conclusion of that war assured their independence.

Since those days Rumanians have had their ups and downs. Their country became prosperous at times, and at other times it was poverty-stricken. In the course of the two World Wars it was invaded by enemy forces and ravaged beyond recognition. All these the Rumanians endured, hoping that at the end of World War II they would have their rewards in freedom. Even before the end of the last war, however, they experienced the terrible misfortune of losing not only part of their country, but also their freedom and independence. The Soviet Union robbed them of these inalienable rights. Today Rumanians have become the Soviet Union's captive subjects, a helpless satellite nation behind the Iron Curtain. On the 86th anniversary of their Independence Day I am glad to echo their genuine patriotic sentiments and speak for their undying love for freedom and for an early emancipation from Soviet and Communist domination.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, each year it is a distinct pleasure for me to extend my best wishes and hopes to the many Americans of Rumanian descent who are this day celebrating the Rumanian traditional Independence Day. Our continued devotion to the cause of freedom for Rumania also serves to strengthen the cause of freedom at home and everywhere in the world.

In the Royal Proclamation of August 23, 1944, King Michael I, stated, "the new government marks the beginning of an era in which the rights and liberties of all citizens will be respected." Such promising beginnings were soon halted by the Soviet Communist government when, on March 6, 1945, in violation of its solemn undertakings, it intervened in Rumanian affairs and installed the first of a series of puppet governments which have existed in that nation until today.

The travesty which the Communist regime seeks to perpetuate cannot deceive the people of Rumania nor blind the free world to the true meaning of this day or prevent our paying tribute to the fortitude and deep love of liberty of the Rumanian people. I join with all freedom-loving Americans in keeping alive the aspirations and dreams of a free Rumania under God.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, May 10 is a day of great importance to the Rumanian people and her friends throughout the world because it is Rumanian Independence Day. After the First World War a great French statesman called Rumania a bulwark against the Bolshevik poison, and for more than 20 years thereafter Rumania's mission as a Christian outpost against the atheistic Communists won her widespread respect throughout the Western World. But 18 years ago last March 6 the people of Rumania were robbed of their national independence by the Russian imperialists. In March 1945, the Soviet representative, Andrei Vishinsky, forced the young Rumanian monarch to commission a cabinet led by a Communist sympathizer and dominated by Communists, and not long thereafter the Communists consolidated their power grab.

Thus the Russians destroyed the free government of an old and honored nation and imposed upon the Rumanian people a form of government which is completely foreign to their ideas, culture, and traditions. Yet the Rumanian people have not lost their love of human freedom, their faith in the destiny of their nation. They remain dedicated to the cause of the free world—the belief that justice will prevail among nations and that Rumania will once again resume her rightful place in the family of nations, free to return to the beauty of her ancient civilization. It is this unshakeable faith which holds the people of Rumania in an alliance of the heart with the people of the United States—an alliance which someday will be strengthened by the passing of Soviet imperialism.

The observation of a French statesman 45 years ago remains true today: Rumanians refuse to accept the slavery of communism. The people of Rumania will be prohibited from celebrating this anniversary by the alien government which has been imposed on them by the masters of the Communist imperialism. The Russians are dedicated to destroying all hope for a return to national independence. But we know that the days of all dictators are numbered, that the strongest empires crumble with the passing years, and that the captive nations look forward to their day of freedom with unwavering faith. I salute the Rumanian people on their independence day and reaffirm our commitment to the freedom of all peoples.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, it is paradoxical but true that while many anniversaries of national independence days are being celebrated in many parts of the free world, it often happens that the very peoples whose independence days we celebrate are not free today. This is certainly true in the case of Rumanian people, who had regained their independence 86 years ago with the aid of the fighting forces of czarist Russia, but today they are enslaved by the Soviet regime of Communist Russia. The last war brought national tragedy to these people. Rumanians were among the first peoples to be involved in that war, and they were also among the first to be caught in the claws of the Soviet Union's unrelenting Communist totalitarianism.

Mr. Speaker, as we well know, Rumania's modern history has had its sad and tragic side. Centuries ago, when the country was overrun by the Ottoman Turks, helpless Rumanians were not in a position to resist effectively their conquerors, and so had to submit to their oppressive rule. But they were never reconciled with their lot, and they did not want to submit willingly to the Ottoman regime. Instead, they tried to maintain their spirit of freedom and love of independence. They fought their oppressors endlessly and with all the means at their disposal. Then in the course of the last century the Ottoman regime showed signs of weakening, while Rumania's cause of freedom gained friends and enlisted forces in and out of Rumania. Soon after the Crimean War in 1856 Rumanians gained autonomous status, and in 1877 they regained their freedom and independence. May 10 of that year, the date on which Rumanians proclaimed their independence and vowed to attain it, marked a veritable turning point in their national history. From that day on they became masters of their destiny, and took their fate into their own hands. It is of course true that since then there have been ups and downs in their forward march as a sovereign and independent nation, but through it all these sturdy and stout-hearted Rumanians have clung to their right to freedom. Even though today they are not free, let us all hope on the 86th anniversary celebration of their independence day that they regain their freedom and live in peace.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the Rumanians make up one of the most numerous ethnic groups in the Balkan Peninsula, and their fertile land is perhaps the most bountiful in natural resources. Today more than 18 million Rumanians live in a territory of about 100,000 square miles. Nature has been generous in enriching the soil of the land in a way to make it the most productive in the whole region, while its subsoil is enormously rich in natural resources, including vast petroleum deposits.

These rugged peasants in the vast range of eastern Balkans have lived in this land from time immemorial. When their peace was threatened by their numerous foes, they always gave a good account of themselves and succeeded in maintaining their freedom. Then early in modern times came the Ottoman Turks, who, carrying everything before them in their victory march, swept over the entire Balkan Peninsula, and overran Rumania.

Thenceforth for some 400 years Rumanians lived under the oppressive rule of Ottoman sultans' callous agents. They were never reconciled to their lot as subjects of their hated foes, so they rose and staged open revolt against the Turks. Until mid-19th century they had no success. Instead, they were severely and inhumanly punished by their oppressors for attempting to free themselves. Then in the middle of the last century an international event, the Crimean War, worked in their favor. At the end of that war the Turkish Government was persuaded by the great European powers to grant autonomy to the Rumanian people. Rumanians were grateful for what they received then, but were not quite satisfied and contented; what they wanted was full freedom and independence. This they attained in 1877.

During the Russo-Turkish War of 1877–78 Rumanians rose almost to a man, rebelled against the Turks, proclaimed their independence on May 10 of 1877, and fought on the side of the Russians to the victorious end of that war. In the peace treaty signed in 1878, Rumania's independence was guaranteed by the great powers, and thus they were assured of their national independence. Since 1877 May 10 has become a Rumanian national holiday and its anniversary is being observed in all Rumanian communities, in and out of Rumania. I am indeed happy to join Rumanian-Americans in the celebration of the 86th anniversary of Rumanian Independence Day.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, flags were hoisted all over Rumania on the occasion of Rumania's official national holiday. But ironically Rumania's official national holiday commemorates, not some great event in the life of the Rumanian people, but the triumph of Soviet arms at the end of World War II. Thus is a conquered people forced to pay homage to its conquerors.

But on Thursday Rumanians did not page homage in their hearts. It was on the following day, May 10, that Rumanians—quietly and without the hoisting of flags—recalled the freedom and independence that once were theirs and looked forward to the day when their country may again be delivered from foreign domination. For it was on May 10, 1866, that Prince Charles I was inaugurated sovereign of a united people, and on May 10, 1877, that Rumania finally threw off the Ottoman yoke.

The peoples of Eastern Europe differ from one another in history, language, and customs, Mr. Speaker, but they are at one in their love of liberty and in their passionate desire for national independence. We in America share fully their hopes and ideals. On the occasion of the Rumanian national holiday it is a great honor to salute the people of Rumania and to assure them that they have not been forgotten, and will not be forgotten, by freedom-loving peoples everywhere.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Balkan Peninsula has been the powder keg of Europe in modern times, and the peoples there have always been caught in some conflagration. Such events have been rather common in the long history of these peoples, and the people there have taken these in their stride. Neither as independent and unruly nations, nor as subjects to conquering and powerful oppressors, have they enjoyed peace for any length of time; that gift has been denied to them. The Rumanian people, as one of the larger ethnic groups in the eastern part of the peninsula, form no exception. Their national history has been eventful and turbulent, but through it all they have managed to maintain their individuality and at times even the territorial integrity of their country.

Early in modern times the peninsula was overrun by the then invincible Ottoman Turks, and Rumania became an Ottoman province. So it remained for 400 years, and the Rumanians endured during that time the oppressive yoke of their conquerors. The country was in constant turmoil and unrest, and the people always ready to rebel against the Turks. But all efforts to that end failed, because Rumanians by themselves alone were never in a position to cope with their powerful and ruthless adversaries. Each attempt ended in bloody reprisals, sometimes in wholesale massacres of innocent people. In the middle of the last century an international event favored them. The Crimean War between Russia and the Turks, with Britain and France also involved, brought in its wake a certain measure of freedom to the Balkan peoples. The Rumanians secured autonomy, guaranteed by the great powers of Europe. That was in 1856, the first step toward their eventual and complete independence, which only came about some 20 years later.

During the Russo-Turkish War of 1877–78 the Rumanians again rose in rebellion against the Turks, proclaimed their independence on May 10 of 1877, and carried on their fight with the effective aid of the Russians. At the conclusion of that war the Sultan of Turkey granted the Rumanian people freedom and recognized their independence. Thus was achieved Rumanian freedom 86 years ago, and since then May 10 has been a Rumanian national holiday. As such its anniversary has been observed throughout the world in all Rumanian communities. Today Rumanians are not free, and of course they cannot properly celebrate their independence day in their homeland, but we in the free world gladly do so, and I am happy to join all Americans of Rumanian descent to celebrate the Rumanian Independence Day.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I am continuously concerned with the plight of the captive European nations. The unfortunate people of these nations, who were enslaved by the Russians into the Communist empire and forced under the yoke of the international Communist conspiracy, must not be forgotten. I believe it is important to show these people that we are concerned with their problems and have not written them off for all time.

Today, May 10, is a very special day for the people of Rumania. It marks the anniversary of the three most significant dates in their original struggle for independence—an independence which was won, only to be lost.

During the middle of the 19th century, Rumania consisted of two provinces, Wallachia and Moldavia. The provinces were ruled by local princes but were controlled by the Turks. As a result of the Treaty of Paris in 1856, local assemblies were called for the purpose of unifying the country. While Alexander Cuza, a Moldavian, became Prince of both provinces, factionalism continued.

On May 10, 1866, with the aid of Napolean III, in the city of Bucharest, Charles of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen was proclaimed Prince of all Rumania. The new union was finally recognized by Turkey and the European states. The independence of the Rumanian people was, however, not complete.

All ties with Turkey were broken when, in 1877, Rumania declared its complete independence and entered the Russo-Turkish War as Russia's ally. Despite its efforts on behalf of Russia during the war, upon its conclusion Russia attempted to take control of Rumania.

The final steps toward independence were taken in 1881. The Congress of Berlin recognized an independent Rumania after Russia had usurped Bessarabia with its predominantly Rumanian populace. On May 10, 1881, by national election, Charles was crowned King of Rumania. Thereafter, in an atmosphere of economic and political stability and with a united people, Rumania took its place among the nations of the world.

Rumania's independence was, as we all know, short lived. First came the Germans and then the Soviet Union which was not content with driving out and destroying the Nazi invader. Instead the Soviet Union, by preconceived plan, displaced the Germans and started its eastern European empire.

Today, Rumania and the other captive European nations are under the domination and control of the Soviet Union. Religious freedom does not exist, nor do the other individual rights which all people cherish.

Last year, after conducting lengthy hearings on the captive European nations, the Subcommittee on Europe reported that it was unlikely· that there would be any major changes within the Soviet bloc in the near future. Puppet Communist governments continue to exercise effective control in the captive nations. We must, however, continue to give careful study to developments in these nations so that we may be in a position to help their peoples regain their freedom when the ever-moving pendulum of world history presents an opportune moment.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of Rumanian independence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

MR. BECKER'S BLACKOUT

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an editorial and a news item.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I referred to an article in the Washington Evening Star of that date. The editorial was entitled "Mr. Becker's Blackout."

I have read many editorials and newspaper articles, but this editorial was written after I talked with Mr. Epstein, who called me on the phone. He is an editorial writer. I would call this "editorial asininity."

The editorial states:

> It is interesting to note that Representative Becker of New York cited nothing in his House speech to support his charge that "there seems to be a complete blackout of crime news" in the District.

Then he winds up the editorial by saying:

> In the exercise of its editorial judgment, however, the Star has never deliberately withheld legitimate crime news. It is not doing it now. It will not do so in the future.

I never said they deliberately did, but I believe this editorial writer should read his own newspaper for the past month—only last night I saw two items of crime in the paper, one on page A24, the other on B3—or any paper in Washington within the last month.

I am inserting an article entitled "Serious Crime in District of Columbia Rises 1.1 Percent in April." Major crimes were 1,808. That is only a small part of crimes committed.

The public ought to know from day to day about these things, and that is what I am fighting for. I think this editorial writer might take the time to read his own newspaper, and he will find there has been no crime news published in the Washington papers during the past month, and I am trying to find out the reason why.

The articles referred to are as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star,
May 8, 1963]

Mr. Becker's Blackout

It is interesting to note that Representative Becker, of New York, cited nothing in his House speech to support his charge that "there seems to be a complete blackout of crime news" in the District. But it is not surprising that he failed to do so, for we do not believe that any such supporting evidence exists.

As far as the availability of crime news is concerned, the facts are substantially as Chief Murray has stated them: Police radios are monitored constantly by newspaper reporters. A police teletype is located in the police headquarters pressroom. And the officers actually working on cases are no less available to newsmen now than they have ever been.

As for the press, newspapers have never printed every item that is available to them on every subject—crime included. It would be impossible for them to do so. In the exercise of its editorial judgment, however, the Star has never deliberately withheld legitimate crime news. It is not doing so now. It will not do so in the future.

[From the Washington Evening Star,
May 8, 1963]

Serious Crime in District of Columbia Rises 1.1 Percent in April

Serious crime in the District was still on the rise in April, according to an official report issued today. But the rate of increase was the lowest recorded in the past 11 months.

In an announcement released by Police Chief Robert V. Murray, the number of part I (serious) offenses reported last month was 1,808—1.1 percent higher than the number of similar offenses reported in April 1962.

The period covered by the department's crime report is the first full month since the District Commissioners ordered a ban on investigative arrests. The ban went into effect March 15.

Of the eight part I offenses listed, increases (in relation to April 1962) were reported in five categories: Criminal homicide, rape, aggravated assault, housebreaking, and auto theft.

Totals in each category, together with the number reported in April 1962, and the percentage increase, follow:

Criminal homicide—11(April last year, 10, up 10 percent); rape—13 (8, up 62.5 percent); aggravated assault—221 (215, up 2.8 percent); housebreaking—460 (359, up 28.1 percent); auto theft—219 (216, up 1.4 percent).

The April report shows decreases in three crime categories—robbery, grand larceny and petty larceny—as follows:

Robbery—137 (1 year ago: 154; down 11 percent); grand larceny—84 (100, down 16 percent); petty larceny—663 (727, down 8.8 percent).

The report also gave the number of part I offenses reported in the 12-month period that ended on April 30 as a total of 23,317. Police said the figure is 2.9 percent higher than the total number of offenses reported during the calendar year of 1962.

THE FAIR NAME OF MAHOGANY

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill designed to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act so as to prohibit use in interstate commerce of the word "mahogany" to describe woods which are not in fact mahogany. This is not a labeling act and should not be confused with the various wood labeling measures now pending in the Congress. Its primary direction is toward false advertising in any form.

My colleague, the Honorable Hastings Keith, Republican Congressman from Massachusetts, has introduced an identical bill under the number H.R. 5669. And it is entirely appropriate that this matter should be introduced by both parties—this is not a partisan political issue.

This short bill is for the purpose of protecting the age-old name of a fine cabinet wood against use by nonmahogany woods. Mahogany has been known and used for fine furniture in this country since the earliest colonial times. It was used by European cabinetmakers from about 1500. At first the wood came from tropical American sources, but later as Africa was explored, mahogany flowed into trade from that continent. For many years the South American and African mahogany was classified botanically under the same name, but later these two members of the Meliceae tree family were reclassified as Swietenia, which is the tropical American variety; and Khaya, which comes from Africa. These two woods of the mahogany family are almost indistinguishable in the form of lumber, and they are the only woods which ethically are entitled to use the name mahogany.

In the early 1900's began the importation of hardwoods from the Philippines, such as lauan and tanguile. These are excellent hardwoods and highly desirable for many purposes. But they are not mahogany in any sense and are not entitled to use the name. Nevertheless, for competitive purposes the honorable title of mahogany—"Philippine mahogany" was attached to them.

Starting in 1925, a bitter fight has been waged in the Federal Trade Commission to suppress this unethical use. In 1927, the Commission ruled that the term "mahogany" could not be applied to these nonmahogany woods. Later, after a series of motions and proceedings the FTC acquiesced to the use by the Philippine woods so long as the geographical prefix was also used. This is hardly the issue since the wood so described is not mahogany no matter where it originated. Both FTC actions were affirmed by the Federal courts on the procedural ground of administrative discretion.

The fight has continued in FTC down to today, but it now seems quite clear the relief through Federal Trade Commission is not available, and legislation is the only appropriate course of action. The case of mahogany is completely unique—the names of all other woods are carefully protected. Federal Trade Commission has taken successful action to protect walnut against terms such as "African walnut," "Oriental walnut," and "Canadian walnut" to describe woods not of the genuine walnut family. Quite recently, eucalyptus imported from Australia was prevented from being described as "Tasmanian oak" or "Australian oak."

It has been argued by some that since the term "Philippine mahogany" has been used for many years its use should be allowed to continue. Such an argument cannot withstand analysis. This is to say that the robber may keep his spoils if he eludes capture for sufficient time. Equity requires that the fruits of wrongdoing be returned. Others say that the consumer is no longer deceived and knows that Philippine mahogany is not genuine mahogany. Studies show this is not accurate and that consumers believe Philippine mahogany is genuine mahogany grown in the Philippines. Lauan and the other Philippine hardwoods are known in all other parts of the world by their native names and not as mahogany. In fact within the United States for purposes of customs duties and freight rates they are described by their true names.

I do not mean to imply that lauan is not a good wood for many purposes. Indeed, it is so good and so inexpensive that there is little doubt that it will continue its very high sales volume under its true name. It does not need to ride on the coattails of any other wood. Within the past 10 or more years millions of dollars worth of lauan has been sold to American consumers in the form of plywood wall paneling, flush doors, and kitchen cabinets all under the misleading name of "Philippine mahogany" and often even the qualifying word "Philippine" has been omitted. On the other hand, the importers and sellers of genuine mahogany, several of which are from my own State of Louisiana, have not fared so well. Sales volumes have fallen to an extremely low point and many well-known mahogany firms have been liquidated, such as Friberg Co. of New Orleans—once the world's largest manufacturer of mahogany.

Of course, all of this harm cannot be directly traced to the unfair use of the term "mahogany." But it must be admitted that a housewife who has purchased cabinets for her kitchen known as "mahogany" does not purchase furniture, which in her mind is made of the same wood, for her living room.

Nor is the harm limited to the importers and millers of mahogany, furniture manufacturers, retailers, and, indeed, every furniture buyer has a valid interest in this measure. This Congress should take action to correct this wrong. I shall do my best to assure that it does.

THE WORK MEASUREMENT SYSTEM—DEMORALIZING TO THE POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today which would prohibit the Post Office Department from using impersonal measuring devices to determine the work output of an individual employee. In essence, my bill would insure the restoration of individual dignity to the loyal workers in our country's postal service.

For some time, I have been concerned over a growing tendency to regard postal employees as mere machines. This apparently has resulted from overzealous management in the Post Office Department.

In Government, as in private industry, I feel there is every reason to adopt sound practices which promote greater economy and efficiency. However, when the practices chosen impair service to the public by unjustly penalizing the vast majority of loyal and dedicated postal workers, then it becomes necessary to impose a congressional checkrein.

The Department contends the objective of its work measurement system is to improve efficiency and reduce operating costs. If these objectives were being met by the system, without adverse side effects, then I would be the first to endorse it. However, such is not the case.

The operation of this work measurement system has become destructive of employee morale and actually works against a more efficient and economical post office operation. During inspection visits of post offices in my own home community of Rochester, N.Y., I have seen first hand how this system is impairing postal service by destroying the personal dedication of career workers.

Postal workers report that this system sacrifices accuracy for speed. The workers in the Rochester post office are subjected to constant tension on the job. Morale has been damaged by postal clerks being pitted against one another in a race with the clock.

I am also opposed to this work measurement system because of the arbitrary measurement system which is used to determine postal worker output. Clerks are judged on the length of time it takes them to process the mail in a tray. In a single tray, there can be as much variation as 250 pieces of mail, depending on envelope or package thickness and how tightly the trays are packed.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the postal workers themselves want the Department to operate with the greatest efficiency and provide the best possible service to the mail-using public. They are conscientious men and women, many of whom have been in the postal service all of their working lives.

Yet, they reason—and, I agree—that improved postal service will result from improved employee working conditions rather than harsh and discriminatory rules laid down in Washington with little concern for their effect on these public servants.

TEXAS LIBERALISM APPLAUDED

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker and fellow Members, I cannot avoid the temptation to get up and express my heartfelt appreciation for our distinguished colleague from Texas, the Congressman from Dallas. It warms the cockles of my heart to know that at least some of us, of the embattled Texas liberals, have found a new champion from our State.

Mr. Speaker, I compliment the gentleman from Texas for his magnificent display of pure and unadulterated liberalism here today.

H.R. 6160: AUTHORIZING LAWYERS TO PRACTICE BEFORE FEDERAL AGENCIES WITHOUT SPECIAL ADMISSION

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we introduced H.R. 6160 which would authorize lawyers to practice before Federal agencies without special admission to agency bars. It is my hope that comment upon this bill may be informative to all Members of the House, whether or not they are lawyers by profession.

This bill is companion to an effort that is going forward in the other body of the Congress, sponsored by the junior Senator from Missouri and others in that body as S. 1466. Our bill, H.R. 6160, provides for the right of persons to be represented before Federal administrative agencies of the United States by attorneys of their own choice and the purpose of our bill is to permit members of the bar in good standing of the highest court of any State to practice before any Federal agency of the United States.

The analysis of our bill is as follows:

Section 1(a) gives recognition to the basic principle that we mentioned; that any person who is a member of the bar of the highest court of his State may represent others before any Federal agency.

Section (b) goes about to determine—what up to this point has been left unresolved—who is a member in good standing in the various jurisdictions. This section provides that when an attorney puts his personal signature to a paper in practice before the agency he represents that he is authorized and qualified and is thereafter subject to appropriate penalty for misrepresentation.

Section (c) provides that this legislation is not to change in any way the existing statutes which permit practice before certain agencies by nonlawyers and leaves exactly where they were before this bill all of the provisions for discipline of those appearing in a professional capacity before an agency.

Section 2 is a provision which we think is needed to make the legislation effective in that it requires that the agency recognize and deal with the attorney who is qualified to appear in a representative capacity before it. This section simply provides that wheh once the agency has made known to it in writing that a participant is represented by an attorney at law any notice or other written communication required or permitted to be given to or by such participant shall be given to or by such attorney. If there are other or former methods or service specifically provided by statute such service may continue as so provided but if the participant is represented by an attorney then additional service shall be given to, by, or through such attorney.

Section 3 leaves the law exactly as it is or was if it continued any prohibition against former officers or employees of an agency representing others before that agency. If presently prohibited by statute or regulation, the status remains the same.

Mr. Speaker, may I take a moment to review some recent legal history which I think will show very plainly the need for a measure like H.R. 6160. A brief look at the situation a few years ago will show there was a bewildering array of regulations restricting attorneys from practicing before our Federal regulatory agencies.

In a report from the Office of Administrative Procedure of the Department of Justice in 1957 it pointed out that as late as 1938 a lawyer who chose to qualify himself for general practice in the District of Columbia would be required to file 14 applications and obtain 10 clerk certificates, 1 personal certification of a judge, submit to 7 investigations as to character, take 1 examination, take 14 oaths, enter his name on 14 rolls and be subject to discipline by 23 or more agencies.

All of us can be thankful that in more recent years there has been an increasing acceptance of the proposition that every lawyer in good standing at the bar of his State court is entitled to practice before Federal agencies without the necessity of complying with formal admission requirements. Most administrative agencies do not now have formal procedures for admission but there remains some exceptions and this is the purpose of our bill; namely, that any remaining cumbersome admission requirements for attorneys will be pushed aside by this legislation, returning to the general practitioner his role as a recognized officer of the forum where he appears.

As we suggested, considerable progress has already been made. At the beginning of the year 1957, 10 Federal administrative agencies still had rules for formal admission of attorneys. In that year, the office of Legal Counsel, Department of Justice, distributed to these agencies an analysis of the admission problem and a recommendation that they dispense with formal admission procedures and adopt in lieu thereof a proposed formal rule which will make eligible to practice any person who is a member in good standing of the bar of the highest court of any State.

At that time, four agencies, to wit, General Accounting Office, Federal Communications Commission, Civil Service Commission, and the Post Office Department, adopted the proposal of the Department of Justice. At that time, only one agency, the Patent Office, declined to adopt the proposal. Five other agencies took the proposal under consideration, but in 1958 the Subversive Activities Control Board adopted the proposed rule.

All along there have not been simply one but two paramount problems for attorneys practicing before Federal regulatory agencies: First, admission of attorneys; second, recognition of attorneys. There was a wide lack of uniformity in the field of recognition. By recognition is meant the practice with respect to service of notices, pleadings, or other written communications upon lawyers. In the past, much valuable time needed to prepare for a hearing has been lost by service going to the principal or the client when direct service upon an attorney would have given counsel full knowledge of what to expect and an additional amount of time for preparation. This bill provides for such recognition and calls for service of any written papers or any notification in writing to be upon the lawyer. In connection with the problem of admission, let me hasten to point out that it is my opinion that while attorneys in good standing should be fully recognized by Government agencies it by no means should follow that these attorneys should be free from regulations by the agencies and this is why we believe there should be a provision for a simple, uniform, and sufficient agency rule for discipline of attorneys who are guilty of misconduct or who might fail to maintain a high standard of professional conduct.

Mr. Speaker, this bill simply implements the right of a person to be represented by counsel of his own choice. This is universally recognized, in every State of our Union. We believe this legislation will contribute to the orderly process of government and will expedite and make more convenient the handling of matters before Federal agencies.

The principles of this bill have been approved by the American Bar Association and by that organization's committee on the Federal Administrative Practices Act. It is my hope this bill and companion measures will receive wide general support of lawyers throughout the country.

In the final analysis, the ultimate benefit of this legislation will go to the client because if this legislation is passed his legal problems with the various Federal agencies here in Washington can then be handled by his own local attorney.

PENTAGON BILLION-DOLLAR-A-WEEK CLUB WASTE

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, death and taxes are the two most certain facts of life, even as they are among the least desirable. Therefore, it is no news to my colleagues when I remind them that our tax bill is an ever-increasing burden. It is just as much a fact that we can no longer meet our tax obligations. We are passing on our debts to posterity. Our grandchildren must pay for our folly.

I know of no one who complains of paying necessary taxes. The rub comes when we see our hard-earned tax dollars thrown away, squandered and wasted by chairborne bureaucrats in the countless cubbyholes and rabbit warrens that bear an alphabet-soup agency name on the front door.

We are asked to lay out over $100 billion for the next fiscal year. That is over $2,222 in taxes for every family head in this Nation—$42 per week. There is so much waste and inefficiency in that fantastic figure that it would take a lifetime to ferret it all out, but it is my duty, as a Representative in Congress, to find and eliminate as much of it as is humanly possible.

Mr. Speaker, I am only 1 of 535 Members of Congress. There are others working in other areas just as hard as I to cut out the fat, eliminate the waste and expose the wasters.

You would think that the President of this United States would show some concern for this ever-increasing tax burden and indebtedness, but the clever and witty television quip has replaced a sober and intensive approach to that job. You would think the President's right-hand secretary in charge of Defense would show some concern. But that is not the case and I can prove it.

While lip service is given to economy in Defense, the waste goes on unchecked at subordinate levels. While the Secretary of Defense spouts pious statistics and tries to cover the administration's muddy tracks on matters such as TFX, people at the real working level in our "Alice-in-Wonderland" Defense Department continue to throw money away like it was water.

In the past, I have called so many cases of waste, abuse of regulations, inefficiency and dishonesty to the attention of the taxpayers that it has become embarrassing to the Secretary of Defense and the various services involved.

To escape this embarrassment, the Secretary of Defense has attempted, under all kinds of excuses and subterfuges, to withhold this information from me. Apparently, the shiny-seat generals in the Pentagon, plus some egghead bureaucrat civilian officials, thought withholding this information would silence my attack.

Evidently they prefer to let the waste run wild. At any rate, they have violently opposed, in a behind-the-scenes manner, my pinpointing waste and means of eliminating it, which would stretch the taxpayers' dollar.

Mr. Speaker, I do not relish making these disclosures month after month, but an aroused public opinion is the only way to bring about changes in the wasteful policies of the military. They are still operating on a world war basis over there and they have a "to hell with the taxpayers" attitude that must be halted.

I have no other recourse than to go to the public with my story, to use the press, television and radio to get the facts to the public. I don't expect the Defense Department to agree with me, but the taxpayers will and do when they know the real facts, unsweetened by Pentagon sugar coating.

A year ago, the Secretary of Defense instructed that bid information of an unclassified nature no longer be made available to my office. That didn't stop me. I kept right on, bombarding the various services with questions and using informal ways of gathering information to prove the waste of tax dollars.

I could be popular with the Defense Department. So can any other Congressman who follows the principle of the three monkeys. Hear no evil, see no evil, speak no evil, and you will get the red carpet treatment from the military. You will get boat rides, free excursion trips, all the trimmings. You will be a big man with the military brass—but you have to close your eyes and your ears and still your tongue about what is going on. That was not what the people of my district sent me to Congress for and I am here to see that their interests and the interests of all taxpayers, are protected.

With the aid of Representative Moss, of California, chairman of the House Government Operations Freedom of Information Subcommittee, and with the help of my colleague, Representative MAHON, chairman of the Appropriations Defense Subcommittee, this information has again been made available to me. It was not an easy fight—for me or for my colleagues, and I thank them and their committees for the valuable help.

Both these men recognize the right of a Congressman to inquire into expenditure of tax dollars, and recognized the contribution that can be made by an alert and inquiring Congressman. They assisted my study by going to bat for me. In effect they also went to bat for every other Member of Congress.

What transpired was fine—up to a point. The information is again available and my study can proceed. But what has happened to the arrangement since it was made? Let us take a look and see how this is handled. I must warn you at this point that what you are about to hear would be unbelievable if it were not being done under the sacred cow disguise of national defense and "hurrah for the flag."

Defense Department officials told Members of this Congress it took $10,000 a year to supply this information to me—a pittance compared to the savings that have been achieved. They, therefore, suggested a substitue—less costly method.

They said they would send the information to the Procurement Advisory Center of the Small Business Administration where I could have it picked up. I must go—or dispatch a representative of my office—each day to pick it up—a drive of several miles. This I do not mind. I intend to get this information, to study it, and to make use of it to bring the runaway cost of National Defense into line.

While I or my staff is making a daily run to Small Business Administration, we are not alone.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Defense is dispatching—daily—a GS–16 Pentagon chair flyer named Robert C. Owens to the SBA to hand these bid sets to me. This man's salary is as high as $18,000 a year. He goes to SBA daily and stands around, waiting for me to pick up these bid sets. It takes less than 1 minute of his time to get them and hand them to me. I could pick them up myself in 10 seconds. They could be sent to the armed services liaison offices on the Hill.

But no. An $18,000 a year bureaucrat takes a taxicab at taxpayers' expense and hangs around all day. He was there Monday, he was there Tuesday, he was there yesterday, and he is there today. Believe it or not, today he has a female assistant with him. It's costing the taxpayers this man's salary plus his transportation and I say it is criminal waste and completely unnecessary.

Mr. Speaker, That is the way the Defense Department utilizes its manpower. This is living testimony to the terrible overstaffing and rampant bureaucracy in the Pentagon.

The material I pick up could be handled by an SBA employee as a part of his regular work with no extra expense to the taxpayers. But I am told, the Pentagon plans to continue to staff this office in the future. This House should demand that this be stopped—and at once.

Mr. Speaker, is there any doubt in your mind or in the minds of my colleagues at this stage of the game but that we can have just as much defense and security as we now have—and for much less money?

We are spending $58 billion for defense and in my opinion we could do the same job for $40 billion. Our shining, glittering Defense Department, headed by a slide-rule executive, is rotten to the core. It is infected with a malignancy just as deadly as cancer. The symptoms are gross inefficiency, incredible incompetency, profligate waste of money, and rampant bureaucracy. All are eating away at the vitals of the taxpayers of the United States and the day is fast approaching when this Nation will not be able to tolerate such a pressing burden and survive.

Mr. Speaker, I call on my colleagues in both Houses of Congress to join in a sincere and dedicated effort to reverse this trend of runaway spending and the best place to start is where over 50 percent of our tax money is being spent—in the Defense Department. The time to start is now.

J. EDGAR HOOVER: 39TH ANNIVERSARY AS DIRECTOR, FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the House will not be in session tomorrow, I thought I would take this occasion to advise the House that tomorrow marks the 39th anniversary of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

I know many Members of the Congress admire this great patriotic American.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD in commemoration of the 39th anniversary of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE MANMADE FIBERS PROBLEM IS NOT RESOLVED

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, we are on the eve of the second anniversary of the President's announcement of a seven-point program of assistance to the textile industry. Few problems affecting the welfare of the United States have received as much attention by as many Members of the Congress as the textile import problem. Because of the fundamental importance of the relationship between the Congress and the President in our Government of checks and balances and divided powers, it should be of interest to all Members of the Congress and to the public to consider the record of Executive and congressional attention to the textile import problem.

If it should prove to be impossible for the Congress to secure significant action by the Executive in the correction of a problem, where the means for correction lies within the Executive's power, a decent respect by the Congress for its own prerogatives requires that this fact be known. We ought not to suffer our powers to be weakened or dissipated by inattention or default.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I wish to set forth a résumé of the significant actions of the President and the Congress during the past 2 years on the textile import problem. This is an especially appropriate time to remind the Congress of these matters for not only is this the eve of the second anniversary of the President's seven-point program, but it may also be the beginning of a new era in the program. A speech delivered by Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges recently in Atlantic City could be so interpreted. In a moment I shall refer to the Secretary's speech and its possible implications for the President's program. First, however, Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the following important dates and actions concerning the problem:

March 14, 1961: Pastore subcommittee issued a report reviewing developments in the textile import problem and recommending that "quotas on textile mill products and on garments and apparel, and on man-made fiber staple, filaments, and filament yarn, be established by country and by category of product."

March 27, 1961: 16 members, representing more than 100 Congressmen from 43 States, conferred with the President, urging him to exercise his authority under the national security provision of the Trade Agreements Act to establish textile import quotas by country and by category. At this meeting, the gentleman from Georgia, Congressman CARL VINSON, chairman of the House textile delegation, appealed to the President to invoke the national security provision and stated:

> A strong textile industry in the United States is essential to our national security.

And he appealed to the President under the national security provision to impose quotas on imports of textiles by country and by category.

March 27, 1961: The gentleman from North Carolina, Representative HAROLD D. COOLEY, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the House, and a member of the textile delegation, stated that "a reasonable system of import quotas" on textiles was "the fairest and most logical" solution to the textile import problem and that "the practical way to apply import quotas at this time is through the national security amendment to the Trade Agreements Act."

April 18, 1961: 71 Congressmen participated in a floor discussion in the House of Representatives urging the President to use the authority provided in the national security provision of the Trade Agreements Act to impose quotas on textile imports by category and by country of origin.

May 2, 1961: The President announced his seven-point program of assistance to the textile industry, stating:

> An application by the textile industry for action under existing statutes, such as the escape clause or the national security provision of the Trade Agreements Extension Act, will be carefully considered on its merits.

The President's announcement referred to the testimony of the Office of Defense Mobilization that the textile industry "was one of the industries essential to our national security" and stated:

> It is of vital importance in peacetime and it has a direct effect upon our total economy.

May 15, 1961: The textile industry requested the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization—now the Office of Emergency Planning—to make an investigation of textile imports under the national security provision of the Trade Agreements Act.

June 9, 1961: Secretary Hodges wrote the president, ACMI, that the Geneva negotiations for an international arrangement on cotton textiles were "being undertaken as one part of the President's seven-point program and are independent of the petition filed by the textile industry with the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization."

June 9, 1961: Myer Feldman wrote the gentleman from Georgia, Congressman CARL VINSON:

> Although the first negotiations may deal principally with cotton textiles, we intend to also deal with manmade fibers and wool. * * * We have the whole textile industry in mind.

June 10, 1961: Under Secretary of State Ball wrote the gentleman from Georgia, Congressman VINSON, that the Geneva negotiations "are independent of the petition filed by the industry with the OCDM."

June 14, 1961: Secretary Hodges wrote the president, Man-Made Fiber Producers Association, Inc., that he had been given "the assurance of the White House that the administration plans to deal with manmade fibers and other types of textiles" and that the Geneva negotiations "are being undertaken as one part of the President's seven-point program and are independent of the petition filed by the textile industry with the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization."

June 19, 1961: OCDM ordered an investigation of textile imports under the national security provision of the Trade Agreements Act.

June 19, 1961: Under Secretary of State George Ball, in a conference with textile industry representatives, stated:

> Point 6 of the President's program, the directive under which the State Department is acting in the calling of an international conference to consider a multinational approach to this problem, is by no means exclusive. It is not by any means exclusively an approach even to the problem of imports, which is one of the troublesome problems that is facing your industry, as you know. The OCDM petition has been filed, which you gentlemen have all filed now. Studies are going to be made on that petition in a very objective way. There will be a recommendation by the OCDM to the President. That is all going forward.

June 21, 1961: Assistant Secretary of State Brooks Hays wrote Senator GEORGE A. SMATHERS that the Geneva negotiations "are independent of the petition filed by the industry with the OCDM."

June 22, 1961: 36 Senators and 121 Congressmen signed a letter to the President stating:

> The considered opinion of all [that] Mr. Ball's program will insure the continued deterioration of the U.S. industry [because it] excludes wool, silk, and manmade fiber textiles and apparel [and would] assure every country an automatic annual increase in export potential of all textiles and apparel to the United States.

June 29, 1961: J. M. Cheatham, speaking for the combined textile industry, wrote the President stating that the State Department's proposed negotiations were fundamentally defective because "limited to cotton textiles and apparel; wool cloth, apparel, and other products, silk fabric and apparel, and manmade fiber and its products in all forms are excluded." The letter stated the industry's "fear that the outcome of the negotiations will inevitably prejudice our chances for more meaningful action as a result of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization investigation, which is now pending."

June 30, 1961: The President wrote to Senator PASTORE and the gentleman from Georgia, Congressman VINSON, responding to the letter of June 22 and stating:

> The contemplated negotiations are designed as one of a series of efforts to assist the textile industry [and that the State Department was] being instructed to get the best possible relief, not only for cotton but for other fibers.

July 10, 1961: Assistant Secretary of State Brooks Hays wrote Congressman BURR P. Harrison:

> It is not the President's intention that the proposed international arrangement shall serve as the only measure of relief for the domestic textile industry [and that] the multilateral discussions which have been undertaken will not prejudice the consideration of the application filed by the various domestic textile industries with the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

October 15, 1961: The public record in the textile import case officially closed by the Office of Emergency Planning.

January 23, 1962: Speaking for the House textile delegation, the gentleman from Georgia, Congressman CARL VINSON, wrote to the President stating, in part, that the lack of current plans or intentions by the administration to implement the President's program for wool, manmade, or silk manufacturers seriously impaired the effectiveness of the program. This letter stated:

> A favorable finding by the Office of Emergency Planning in the pending textile case, which in my judgment the facts merit, will cloak the office of the Presidency with additional authority to take appropriate action to protect the economic and military security of our Nation from damage inflicted or threatened by unrestrained imports [and strengthen the negotiating position of the United States] in the forthcoming cotton textile negotiations, but also in negotiations affecting other fibers which we sincerely hope will be immediately forthcoming.

January 27, 1962: Laurence F. O'Brien, special assistant to the President, replied for the President to Congressman VINSON's letter of January 23. Mr. O'Brien's letter stated:

> After the conclusion of the permanent textile agreement, the problems of the wool and manmade fibers industries will certainly be attacked.

February 15, 1962: Members of the House textile delegation, speaking through the gentleman from Georgia, Congressman CARL VINSON, sent a letter to the President stating that understanding "that the United States will hold the level of imports of cotton texile products for a 5-year term at virtually the present level" and expressing the hope "that the administration would now promptly move on wool, manmade fiber, silk, and other textile fibers." This letter stated the hope of the delegation "that the operation of the long-term arrangement will be carried out in such a way that its force is not modified or diluted by administrative judgment or action."

February 26, 1962: The President responded to the letter from the congressional delegation by a letter to the gentleman from Georgia, Congressman Vinson, stating:

> The long-term agreement, which was just negotiated, will continue the same level of imports, with minor adjustments, for an additional 5 years. It provides the tools with which we can prevent adverse effects upon the cotton textile industry from imports, and the tools will be used.

The President referred to the explanation which had been given to the congressional delegation by representatives of the executive department and stated:

> The industry can plan production with complete confidence that its markets will not be disrupted by imports.

Finally, the President referred to the textile industry's application pending before the Office of Emergency Planning and said:

> Consideration of this case upon its merits is being expedited and I am requesting the Office of Emergency Planning to make a recommendation to me without any unnecessary delay.

The President said that he had requested the Departments involved to implement his program for the wool, manmade fiber, and silk divisions of the industry.

June 13, 1962: the gentleman from Georgia, Congressman Vinson, speaking for Members of Congress representing textile interests, wrote the President referring to remarks of Assistant Secretary of State Johnson that he knew of no commitment by the administration to take any action on imports of wool and synthetic fabrics. Mr. Vinson's letter urged approval of the pending textile industry Office of Emergency Planning case, stating that as a result of such action "countries trading with the United States in woolen, silk, and manmade fiber products would find it expedient to negotiate appropriate arrangements with the United States."

July 11, 1962: Secretary of Commerce Hodges, in press release G-62-129, commented on his testimony before the House Appropriations Committee, to the effect that it would not be necessary for the Government to invoke the national security provision of the Tariff Act for textiles "if we get the long-term agreement." Secretary Hodges stated in his press release that the short-term and long-term cotton textile arrangements are "exclusively restricted to cotton textile products." He conceded that the OEP case "is still alive" and said that it might be needed if the long-term cotton textile arrangement is not adhered to by the participating countries "and if suitable arrangements are not devised to cope with the import problems of textiles manufactured from fibers other than cotton."

August 7, 1962: Myer Feldman, deputy special counsel to President Kennedy, in letter to the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, stated:

> The President, under his seven-point program for textiles * * * has expressed his concern about the importation of all textiles, including those made of wool and manmade fibers, and indicated his determination to take steps to deal effectively with these imports.

October 1, 1962: The long-term cotton textile arrangement took effect.

October 11, 1962: The President signed into law the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. It is held probable that this legislation passed the House and the Senate because of its support by the so-called textile delegations in the House and the Senate, many of whom, in supporting the administration's trade bill, voted contrary to the convictions which they had previously expressed on the subject of freer trade legislation.

Mr. Speaker, as matters stood prior to Secretary Hodges' recent speech, the administration—from the President on down—was committed to taking action to solve the import problem affecting textiles of fibers other than cotton, notably wool, silk, and manmade fibers, and the investigation by the Office of Emergency Planning of the impact of textile imports on the national security was conceded to be the chosen instrument for effecting such a solution.

Some of us who are as much interested in the damaging effect of textile imports on the production of fibers, fabrics, and apparel other than cotton, gave our unstinting support and cooperation to the cotton textile interests in securing attention to their problem, though we had considerable misgivings about the suitability of the long-term cotton textile arrangement for this purpose. Of late we have found ourselves standing disappointingly alone in our efforts to secure forthright attention by the administration to the problem of imports of textiles of wool, silk, and manmade fibers. This feeling that the legislative warriors, once united in the common cause of the entire textile industry, have silently left the scene in large numbers is brought into sharp focus by Secretary Hodges' speech on April 29, 1963, delivered before the Underwear Institute in Atlantic City. The Secretary made a brief review of the President's seven-point program.

In referring to the seventh point, which the Members will recall consisted of a promise by the President that an application by the textile industry for action under existing statutes, such as the national security provision of the Trade Agreements Act, would be carefully considered on its merits, the Secretary stated:

> The seventh point in the President's program, concerning possible action under the escape clause of the national security provision of our trade legislation, has largely lost its significance in view of subsequent developments, and assuming we can follow through on all our plans.

I have great respect and personal regard for Secretary Hodges, but his language quite frankly disturbs me greatly.

I hope this statement is not an indication by the administration that the investigation by the Office of Emergency Planning of the effect of textile imports on the national security is going to be swept under the rug. I sincerely hope the Secretary, in stating that the textile industry's national security case has lost its significance, is not speaking for the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, who under the law is charged with determining the significance of imports as affecting the national security.

I hope too that the Secretary of Commerce did not intend to convey the meaning which his words express and that he did not in fact say for the administration that the textile industry's national security case is lost without it ever having been decided.

It will be interesting to see if those Members of Congress who have manmade fiber plants, woolen and worsted, silk, or manmade fiber textile mills or apparel plants utilizing chiefly wool, silk, or manmade fiber fabrics in their districts will accept the Secretary's reference to the lack of significance in the OEP case as measuring up to the kind of action needed and promised.

I do not think it necessary at this point to set forth detailed statistics on the import trends in manmade fiber, woolen and worsted, and silk textiles. It is sufficient to say that the conditions which led to the initiation of an investigation of the threat of textile imports to the national security have continued and worsened in the noncotton areas of the industry.

It may be that this body is powerless to secure governmental attention to this fundamental problem affecting the welfare of our citizens in their national security interest, and particularly of the large segment of our citizenry actually dependent upon the textile industry for employment.

But the truth of the matter is that the U.S. Government needs a favorable decision in the textile industry national security case for the following reasons:

First. A finding by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning that textile imports are threatening to impair the national security would, under the language of the national security provision, cloak the President with authority to take such action as he deems necessary to adjust imports of textiles to remove such impairment.

Second. Public Law 87-488, amending section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 so as to authorize the President to regulate imports of textiles from countries not parties to the long-term cotton textile arrangement, does not supply authority to the President to negotiate or enforce an international agreement pertaining to manmade fibers, fabrics, or apparel, or textile products containing blends of cotton or wool and manmade fiber—an important part of textile and apparel trade. Section 204 of the Agricultural Act, which Public Law 87-488 amended, is limited in scope to agricultural commodities and textiles made therefrom.

Third. A favorable finding in the OEP case would (a) strengthen the President's hand in enforcing the cotton textile arrangements; (b) give the President plenary power to work out a comprehensive solution to the textile import problem as it affects manmade fibers, and textile products of such fibers, and of silk and wool, thereby giving our trading partners a special incentive to negotiate international agreements with respect to trade in such articles in order to avoid the consequences of unilateral action by the President; and (c) give the President an alternate means for acting to equalize raw cotton costs for domestic versus foreign producers of cotton textiles.

Fourth. The Government has recognized that the textile import problem is an interdependent one necessarily involving the consideration of products of all of the textile fibers. The President and his associates have given assurances to the Congress that a solution would be promptly effected for manmade fiber, silk, and wool textiles; however, no effective action has been taken on such products. At this juncture a favorable decision in the OEP case can provide the means for the President and his advisers to work out a total solution to the whole interdependent textile import problem, and thereby keep faith with their assurances to the Congress and the industry that such action would be taken.

Fifth. Above all, a favorable finding in the OEP case would be appropriate because the textile industry is essential to the national security; textile imports are causing distress in all sectors of the industry, and have now resumed the sharply increasing trend which characterized the period 1958–60; and effective regulation of the import volume is a must if the industry is to have sufficient strength, capacity, and manpower to fulfill its vital role in peace and war. Finally, action to regulate imports in the name of national defense is the most defensible of all import adjustments. Other nations must respect such action.

PROPOSED COTTON LEGISLATION

The **SPEAKER**. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. Morris] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a cotton bill which will perhaps contain some unique features. Some of these unique features are: It will reduce the cost of the cotton program instead of increasing it. It will reduce the price supports on Midland 1-inch staple cotton from its present approximately 32.5 cents per pound support price to approximately 30 cents per pound for the 1964 crop. The support price for the 1965 crop will be 29 cents per pound and for the 1966 crop, 28 cents per pound, and 27 cents per pound for the 1967 crop. My bill will allow a farmer, who cannot produce under the price support schedules as outlined in the bill, to sell his cotton allotments to other farmers or to the Secretary of Agriculture. The Secretary of Agriculture will be authorized to purchase any cotton allotment not purchased by other farmers for a minimum price of $100 per acre.

At the present time there is approximately a $42.50-per-bale subsidy which is paid on the export of American cotton. By lowering the price support 2½ cents per pound the first year, this subsidy will automatically be lowered to $32 per bale the first year and $5 per bale for the next 3 years, making a total reduction of better than 50 percent per bale for the present subsidy on export cotton.

Of course, the cost to the Commodity Credit Corporation, where a farmer fails to redeem his cotton from the loan and the Government is forced to assume title to the cotton, will be reduced by $10 a bale in the first year and by a total of $25 per bale when the price support scale is completely in effect.

By authorizing the purchase and sale of cotton allotments, I am facing up to the problem in this program which cannot be ignored: Cotton must be produced in areas where it can be grown most efficiently. In doing so, I am also compensating a farmer who does not feel he can produce cotton under the provisions of this legislation.

I will be the first to admit this is a new policy with regard to agricultural allotments but it is not a new policy of this Government for other industries. At the end of World War II, we authorized tax writeoffs in the amount of over $34 billion to allow American industries to convert from the production of war materials to the production of consumer goods. I do not know whether any farm organizations or the cotton industry will support my bill. Of course, I would hope that not only farm organizations and the cotton industry will support the legislation but also all who are interested in a sensible and less costly farm program.

It is difficult to accurately forecast the exact saving under this legislation but I think conservatively it will reduce the cost of the cotton program by $75 million the first year with a possible reduction of $700 million to a billion dollars overall in a 4-year period. It is my understanding a new cotton bill, prepared by the House Agriculture Committee in conjunction with the Department and various segments of the cotton industry including producers, will shortly be offered to the Congress. I think the Congress should be offered an alternative and believe my bill will represent at least a step in the right direction toward the solution of some of the problems which are facing both the producers and the cotton industry.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to give some estimate of what the farm program has cost.

In 1961, the cotton program cost approximately $545 million. The export subsidy cost $208 million on cotton lint. The export subsidy on cotton products cost $18 million. Cotton exported under Public Law 480 cost $153 million. Carrying charges and interest cost $26.8 million.

The difference between the support price of the cotton and the export price paid to the Government—this is for cotton owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation—was $137.9 million. The 1962 program cost approximately $654 million. The export subsidy in 1962 was $191 million on cotton lint. The export subsidy on cotton products was $17 million. The cost of the exports under Public Law 480 was $204 million. The carrying charges in 1962 was approximately $46 million.

The difference between the support price which the Commodity Credit Corporation purchased cotton and which it sold on the open market overseas was $195 million.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will carefully consider this new legislation.

PEACE IN THE NEAR EAST MUST BE PRESERVED

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. Libonati). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ryan] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I view with grave concern recent events in the Middle East. It has become increasingly evident that President Nasser of Egypt is intensifying his efforts to create a military bloc dedicated to the destruction of the only true democracy and friend of the United States in that area—Israel. Egypt has stepped up its political efforts against Israel. With the assistance of the Soviet Union and West German scientists, Nasser has embarked upon a deadly arms race in the Middle East. The controlled radio broadcasts from Egypt, Iraq, and Syria have called for the destruction of Israel and the violent overthrow of Jordan and Saudi Arabia. These broadcasts, which are beamed to many parts of Africa, have directly attacked the United States.

There should be little need to remind the House that these events in the Middle East threaten not only Israel but also world peace. It is inconceivable that a major war in that area would not embroil the great powers. The possibility of the introduction of nuclear weapons in that area makes the situation even more ominous. Because of the threat to the peace and because of the deep commitment of the United States to the survival of Israel, I join with Senators Humphrey, Gruening, Hart, McCarthy, Clark, and Morse—who have introduced a similar resolution in the other body—and submit the following concurrent resolution:

> Whereas tensions in the Near East are steadily mounting; and
>
> Whereas the stability and peace of the Near East are vital to the well being of the peoples of the Near East and to the world at large; and
>
> Whereas the continuing arms race in the Near East threatens to enter a new stage of development of nuclear weapons and offensive missiles; and
>
> Whereas the policy of the United States is to discourage an arms race in the Near East; and
>
> Whereas the United States has contributed generously and impartially to promote the economic development of the states of the Near East and to raise the standard of living of their peoples; and
>
> Whereas several of the states are wasting precious resources in order to acquire ever

greater quantities and ever more sophisticated types of weapons, thus partially offsetting the effects and aims of United States foreign economic and technical assistance programs; and

Whereas the acquisition of such arms serves further to heighten the tensions in the Near East and to enhance the risk of hostilities, and

Whereas the interests of the states and peoples of the area, of the United States, and of the world in general would be served by a reduction of tensions, by an end to belligerency and by a termination of the arms race: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States use his good offices with the states of the area to negotiate with them either through the United Nations, or directly, an agreement that nuclear weapons will neither be produced in the area nor be introduced into the area; that missiles of a mass-destruction nature will neither be produced nor be introduced into the area; that an international policing system will be adopted to enforce such agreement; and that the United States continue, in accordance with the tripartite declaration of May 1950, to take all necessary and appropriate actions both within and outside the United Nations to prevent any violation of existing frontiers or armistice lines in the Near East; and that the United States, either through the United Nations, or directly with other nations in the area, devise means to bring to an end the recriminations and incitements to violence which are contributing to tension and instability in the Near East.

This resolution reaffirms the Tripartite Declaration of May 1950 in which the United States, Britain, and France are committed to take action "both within and outside the United Nations" if any state in the area should use force or threaten the use of force in violation of the Arab-Israel armistice agreement. The declaration also proclaims our opposition to an arms race in the Middle East. The resolution also urges, that the United States use its good offices to negotiate with the Middle Eastern states an agreement banning nuclear weapons in that area under an international policing system.

In addition to the proposed resolution, which I believe is vitally important for the safety of Israel and the world, I urge the President and the Secretary of State carefully to review the foreign aid program to insure that U.S. aid does not make it possible for any state to divert its own funds from being used for the benefit of its people to the acquisition of armaments aimed at the destruction of another state.

Mr. Speaker, our commitment to the democracy of Israel and our commitment to world peace requires us to approve this resolution as quickly as possible.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HALPERN. I wish to commend the gentleman for his perceptive analysis of the crucial Middle East situation. I strongly support the resolution to which he refers, and I hope that the respective committees in both bodies of this Congress will give the resolution and similar resolutions on this subject very careful consideration and evaluation. I wish again to compliment the gentleman for his fine work in this field.

Mr. RYAN of New York. I thank the gentleman. I know we are all aware of the great contribution made by the gentleman from New York in his efforts to see to it that the situation does not explode.

FEDERAL-AID PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SYSTEMS

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, as you and my colleagues know, Federal funds are made available to the States on a matching basis to assist in highway construction. The States generally are required to match the Federal funds on a 50 to 50 basis on projects on the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems—commonly referred to as the ABC system—and 90 to 10 on the projects on the Interstate System. However, the law provides that in any State containing more than 5 percent of nontaxable Indian lands and public domain lands, the Federal share of the cost of a given road project will be increased, and the State matching decreased, based on the percentage that these lands bear to the total area of the State. In other words, the public lands States are given credit, so to speak, for Federal lands which lie beyond the reach of the taxing powers of the States.

FAIR AND EQUITABLE

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, this so-called "sliding scale" provision of the law, which dates from 1921, is fair and equitable. However, under the present law, the area of national forests and national parks and monuments is not included in determining the matching requirements of the individual States. Under the existing law, only 13 States receive the benefit of the lowered matching requirements. But there are 154 national forests comprising over 181 million acres located in 39 States and Puerto Rico. With growing interest in outdoor recreation and wilderness areas, this acreage may well increase substantially. It seems to me that in all fairness, States having large areas of national forests should be granted the same benefits with respect to Federal-aid highway matching requirements as have been extended to those States with large areas of public domain and Indian lands. I have today introduced a bill which would provide for this.

NEW HAMPSHIRE—EXAMPLE

Let me illustrate the effect of this bill, using my own State of New Hampshire as an example. Under existing law, the State of New Hampshire is required to match Federal funds made available for projects on the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems on a 50 to 50 basis—the State must match each dollar of Federal funds with $1 of State funds. The State of New Hampshire has Federally owned national forest lands totaling 677,600 acres—this means that more than 11 percent of our land area has been placed beyond the reach of our taxing power. Most of this land is in the matchless White Mountain National Forest, enjoyed by people from all over our great Nation for its scenic splendor and spiritually refreshing wilderness areas.

FOR ABC—$826,770 PER YEAR

If my bill is enacted, the Federal share of the cost of Federal-aid primary and secondary projects in New Hampshire would be 55.69 percent and the State's share 44.31 percent, instead of the present ratio of 50 to 50. For the fiscal year 1962, Federal-aid funds apportioned to the State of New Hampshire for the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems totaled $4,045,939. In order to receive this sum, the State was required to match it with an equivalent amount, $4,045,939. If my bill is enacted, the State of New Hampshire would be required to provide only $3,219,169 in order to obtain the full Federal apportionment. The difference of $826,770 could be used to great advantage by the State, particularly in our rural areas and to improve our recreational access roads which are used by people from all over the country.

It should be pointed out that reducing the State's matching requirements in the Federal-aid primary and secondary program would neither increase nor decrease the amount of Federal aid allotted to any State nor would it require the expenditure of additional Federal funds. It would simply reduce the amount of funds which a particular State might have to provide in order to receive the full benefit of Federal aid, and give the State greater flexibility in expenditure of available State highway funds.

FOR INTERSTATE—$1,313,390

The situation is somewhat different in the case of projects on the Interstate System, where apportionments to the States are based on the estimated cost of completing the Interstate System, and the Federal Government bears 90 percent of the cost of interstate projects except in those 13 States where the Federal share is greater because of substantial areas of public lands. Under the existing law, the Federal share of interstate projects in New Hampshire is 90 percent. If my bill is enacted, the Federal share in New Hampshire would be 91.14 percent. The attached schedule will show how the other States will fare if my bill is enacted. The estimated cost of completing the Interstate System which was submitted to the Congress in 1961 showed that the estimated remaining cost of completing the system in New Hampshire was $115,257,000. Computed at 90 percent, the Federal share of this estimated cost is $103,731,300; computed at the proposed 91.14 percent, the Federal share would be $105,045,230, or an increase of $1,313,930 in the amount of Federal-aid interstate funds paid to New Hampshire for completion of the system.

OTHER BILLS

If the Federal share of the cost of completing the Interstate System is increased in States having large areas of national forests, parks, and monuments, it follows that there would be necessarily a greater outlay of Federal funds, and, on the basis of the latest cost estimates, additional funds would have to be provided for the highway trust fund. However, as I pointed out at the time I introduced H.R. 5601, the proceeds of several Federal automotive taxes are now being diverted to the general fund instead of being used for highway purposes. H.R. 5601 would transfer the proceeds of these taxes to the highway trust fund, and these additional revenues could be used to defray the costs of the modest increase in the Federal share of the Interstate System which I now propose.

In addition, under H.R. 6015, which I introduced last week and which provides for advance purchase of rights-of-way by States, savings in excess of this added Federal share may well be realized.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned earlier, I feel that the sliding scale provision which benefits those States having large areas of nontaxable Indian lands and public domain lands is fair and equitable and I believe that the same benefit should be extended to those States having large areas of national forests, national parks, and monuments. My bill would so provide, and I sincerely hope the Congress will take early and favorable action.

Sliding scale rates of Federal-aid participation in public lands States based on inclusion of entire areas of national forests, parks, and monuments

[Dollars in thousands]

State	Percentage of project cost payable from Federal-aid funds		Additional interstate Federal funds required under proposed ratio
	50 percent Federal, 50 percent State	90 percent Federal, 10 percent State	
Alabama	51.02	90.20	$1,063
Alaska	98.13	----------	----------
Arizona	85.56	[1] 97.11	2,167
Arkansas	53.61	90.72	1,937
California	71.42	94.28	66,871
Colorado	67.65	93.53	7,535
Florida	53.53	90.71	3,788
Georgia	51.05	90.21	995
Hawaii	52.77	90.55	1,111
Idaho	82.53	[1] 96.51	3,226
Illinois	50.30	90.06	805
Indiana	50.26	90.05	318
Iowa	50.02	[2] 90.00	----------
Kansas	50.05	90.01	19
Kentucky	51.01	90.20	1,049
Louisiana	51.00	90.20	1,486
Maine	50.18	90.04	49
Maryland	50.13	90.03	128
Michigan	54.19	90.84	8,415
Minnesota	53.56	90.71	4,722
Mississippi	51.93	90.39	1,219
Missouri	51.53	90.31	2,039
Montana	66.22	93.24	4,811
Nebraska	50.37	90.07	105
Nevada	93.32	[1] 98.66	----------
New Hampshire	55.69	91.14	1,314
New Jersey	50.01	[2] 90.00	----------
New Mexico	70.47	91.09	3,953
New York	50.01	[2] 90.00	----------
North Carolina	52.24	90.45	947
North Dakota	51.14	90.23	261
Ohio	50.21	90.04	702
Oklahoma	52.34	90.47	1,454
Oregon	75.45	[1] 95.09	12,415
Pennsylvania	50.82	90.16	1,840
South Carolina	51.49	90.30	666
South Dakota	56.52	91.30	439
Tennessee	51.56	90.31	2,008
Texas	50.40	90.08	930
Utah	85.09	[1] 97.02	596
Vermont	51.89	90.38	$674
Virginia	53.27	90.65	5,079
Washington	66.03	93.21	13,719
West Virginia	52.92	90.58	2,245
Wisconsin	52.27	90.45	1,023
Wyoming	75.32	[1] 95.06	5,135
District of Columbia	58.70	91.74	6,434
Puerto Rico	50.76	----------	----------
Total	----------	----------	175,692

See footnotes at end of table.

Sliding scale rates of Federal-aid participation in public lands States based on inclusion of entire areas of national forests, parks, and monuments—Continued

[1] Maximum amount of 95 percent as prescribed by title 23, U.S.C., sec. 120(c) used in determining additional Federal funds required.

[2] Increase in Federal percentage less than 0.005.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the Rural Electrification Administration needs a complete shakeup and overhauling. This agency is using the taxpayer's money to do things and go off in directions never contemplated by law. The appointed officials running the agency seem to think that Congress will not take any action to require compliance with the law because REA still claims to operate under the phony cloak of being primarily a program to help the farmer. In reality, it is only using the good name of the American farmer to spread Federal bureaucratic control over more of our citizens and the Nation's economy.

Almost a year has passed since the Appropriations Committee instructed the REA Administrator to set his house in order by conforming to congressional intentions when the Rural Electrification Act was passed. But the Administrator has so far failed to take constructive action. Since REA has not taken advantage of the friendly advice of the committee to straighten itself out, the time has come for us in Congress to do the job ourselves.

Congress needs to consider and come to some decision about the following matters: The fact that REA is granting loans to finance the construction of steam electric generating facilities to supplement Federal hydroelectric power systems despite the continued refusal of Congress to authorize direct Federal construction of such steamplants. The question of whether the Federal power marketing agencies should have supplementary steamplants is a policy decision for Congress to make—not the REA Administrator.

Under present appropriation procedures REA is able to amend existing congressional power policy by expanding Federal power systems through generation and transmission loans. This has been done recently in loans to the Colorado Ute Electric Association of Colorado, the Basin Electric Power Cooperative of South Dakota and the Upshur Rural Electric Cooperative Corp. at Gilmer, Tex. If the Appropriations Committee would establish the specific purpose on projects to which funds are to be applied agencies could not change congressional policy by administrative action.

The iron curtain of secrecy still surrounds the REA actions on large-scale generation and transmission facilities. Not even members of committees of Congress are given information as to the economic and engineering feasibility of such plants even though the cost of some may run as high as $60 million.

Since REA refuses to specify to Congress the exact purpose for which its funds are to be spent, how can Congress determine the need each year for the REA program? How can the public know its tax money is being used properly? The REA Administrator told the Senate Appropriations Committee last year that he could not sit down in advance and prejudge loan applications, but he still expects Congress, without any information whatsoever, to prejudge the accuracy of his loan authorization requests.

The hearings clearly indicate that that the recent revision of REA's generation and transmission policy to include a "third criterion" under which the Administrator can justify loans for large powerplants to protect the so-called effectiveness and security of its borrowers completely nullifies the two congressionally approved criteria under which the Administrator was previously authorized to make loans. These criteria required that generating plants should be built only when it can be conclusively shown that energy is not available from any existing source or that the plant can produce energy at lower cost than can be obtained from any other source. This new third criterion has no basis in law and it was put into effect by the Administrator without any prior consultation with duly authorized committees of Congress.

The REA is still using loans authorized under section 5 of the act to finance the purchase and installation of electrical and plumbing equipment for industrial and commercial enterprises. The House Agricultural Committee last year warned the Administrator that the use of section 5 loans for industrial purposes was contrary to congressional intent, but REA has ignored this congressional warning.

For too many years now Congress has been appropriating blindly for this rural electrification program in the belief that it could do no wrong. It is quite evident, however, that Congress is now becoming increasingly aware of the change of direction in REA policy. There is also clear indication of growing public concern throughout the Nation over this costly program.

It is time for Congress to recognize its responsibility to the Nation's taxpayers by asserting its control over the REA's activities through the appropriations process.

INTERNATIONAL HOME LOAN BANK

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the greatest contribution our country can make in foreign aid is to help other countries, those who wish to emulate the success of America, understand the ideas which have guided us on our way to greatness and adapt them for their own use. With this thought in mind, I have today introduced legislation, identical to bills which were offered in the last Congress and which have been introduced in both the House of Representatives and the Senate in this session, to establish an International Home Loan Bank.

This proposal, which has the backing of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and the U.S. Savings and Loan League, among other groups, has as its purpose the development in other countries, especially the underdeveloped nations of the world, of a savings and loan system to promote thrift, encourage homeownership, and aid in the rise of middle class among these people. The mechanism of this bill, by which it would accomplish its goals, would be an International Home Loan Bank through which financial backing could be given to the developing savings and loan industry abroad.

Clearly, the goals which are set for the International Home Loan Bank would be important in helping homeownership in the underdeveloped countries. This form of development is meaningful apart from any Communist threat. It is a real step forward in the entire social structure of the nation establishing these lending institutions. It meets problems which exist independent of the cold war, and it envisions the involvement of the people of the recipient nation, indeed their involvement as the primary force in this matter, in the effort to overcome these problems.

Late last year, the New York Times published an article on housing needs in Latin America. This article, which appeared in the Sunday, October 21, edition of the Times, points up the importance of this problem and I ask unanimous consent that it be made a part of my remarks to help give a clearer understanding of the bill I have introduced and its goals.

Spurs Are Sought in Latin Housing

(By Philip Shabecoff)

In much of Latin America, a penny saved is a rare coin—and therein lies one of the chief reasons for Latin America's acute shortage of housing.

"There are 18 million Latin American families now living in urban slums who can afford some kind of decent housing," Rodman C. Rockefeller said recently.

The problem, he explained, is that in most areas of Latin America, a lack of individual savings means that mortgages simply are not available for middle and lower class housing.

Mr. Rockefeller, eldest son of Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, is vice president in charge of housing for the International Basic Economy Corp. (IBEC). The company, a financing development and investment concern controlled by Rockefeller interests, soon will build its 10,000th home in Puerto Rico and South America.

Although most Latin American governments have set up housing programs, often with grants from U.S. agencies such as the Agency for International Development, millions of people continue to live in tin shacks and apartment house slums. The answer to this blight, Mr. Rockefeller believes, lies in private rather than Government housing.

Some 50 percent of South America's urban population earns enough money to amortize mortgages, he asserted. But mortgages generally are available only for luxury housing, and on exorbitant terms.

FEW INDIVIDUALS SAVE

The reason for this, Mr. Rockefeller explained is that there is little individual saving in Latin America. Inflation and low income levels discourage savings in most of the countries there, and virtually no savings institutions exist in an effective form. And lack of individual savings means a dearth of capital for mortgages.

What is needed in Latin America, Mr. Rockefeller said, is a system of insured savings and loan associations similar to that in this country. But except for recently organized projects in Chile and Peru, these institutions are rare in Latin America.

Help may be on the way, however, as a result of a bill introduced in the Senate on October 2 by Senator George Smathers, Democrat, of Florida.

The legislation, which was designed to help Latin Americans save their own money for private housing, was a casualty of the recent congressional scramble for adjournment and never got out of the Committee on Banking and Currency. However, Senator Smathers plans to reintroduce it when the Senate next convenes.

The bill, an amendment to previously proposed legislation to alter the Federal Home Loan Bank Act and the Home Owners Land Act, called for the establishment of an "International Home Loan Bank."

FOREIGN INVESTMENT PERMITTED

Through this bank U.S. savings and loan companies will have the privilege of investing up to 1 percent of their assets in similar institutions in Latin America and elsewhere overseas, laying the groundwork for the establishment of savings and loan systems in those areas.

The bill, which also was sponsored by Senator John Sparkman, Democrat, of Alabama, is reported to have a good chance of passing in the next session of Congress.

The U.S. savings and loan organizations which might invest in counterpart institutions in South America are regarding the Chilean experiment with keen interest. A little more than a year ago, at the advice of American economic experts, 18 associations were started there under the supervision of a central bank, with American capital serving as seed money.

The associations pay 6 percent interest on savings and charge 10 percent on mortgages, Mr. Rockefeller said. They also operate under an unusual inflation-protection mechanism which adjusts interest and principal on both savings and mortgages on the basis of an index of wages and prices.

By the end of the first year, 23,000 people were participating in the program, and 1,780 mortgages had been approved or were in the process of approval.

DEMAND EXCEEDS BUILDING

Because of the associations, many new houses are being built in Chile. However, there is evidence that the mortgage system has grown faster than the construction business. Demand for houses is far exceeding actual production, Mr. Rockefeller said.

In most cases, he explained, builders are short of sufficient working capital. It is also difficult to convince them that the new system is here to stay and that their profits for building homes will not be wiped out by inflation.

This is where IBEC steps in. The company has built most of its houses in Puerto Rico, but it believes the establishment of savings and loan companies will provide opportunity in South America.

IBEC already has under construction 750 houses in Santiago, Chile, and plans to build more. Most of the houses are three-bedroom dwellings that sell for $7,000 to $8,000. The company also is building in Peru, where two associations have been established, one by a Roman Catholic priest.

One of IBEC's basic functions, Mr. Rockefeller said, is to demonstrate that U.S. industrial methods and techniques are applicable abroad.

"It is not an original idea, but we try to concentrate on businesses, such as housing, that directly affect people. We also make a profit by doing so," he said.

One of these techniques is the IBEC method of home construction. This makes use of a house-sized steel form to mold reinforced concrete on a previously prepared floor slab. Once a site is prepared, the company can produce six houses a day on that site.

PRECAST PANELS HELPFUL

IBEC also uses precast concrete wall panel and roof systems in its housing projects.

Recently, however, IBEC has recognized that its methods are not always applicable in South America. Often, the absence of materials and large-scale demand makes the mass construction method too expensive. Construction also is slowed by government inspection methods and equipment breakdowns. The company, therefore, is beginning to turn to local manual labor as the cheapest method of building in some areas.

As soon as the new bill is passed, Mr. Rockefeller predicted, at least five U.S. savings and loan companies will invest in South American countries. IBEC will be prepared to construct about 2,500 housing units a year to meet the expected demand for homes.

Mr. Rockefeller believes that the middle class housing shortage in Latin America must be alleviated for the security of this country as well as for the needs of the Latin Americans.

"The middle class in Latin America, which certainly has the ability to revolt, has been denied the normal material rewards that the middle class expects in the United States," he said. "While the Latin middle class is loyal to the Western concept of government, this denial puts a tremendous strain on its loyalty."

SOCIAL SECURITY DISABILITY AND WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION: CURING THE OVERLAP

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, Congress enacted the social security law in 1935 and 21 years later, in 1956, amended the law to provide for the payment of social security disability benefits. This was the beginning of the social security disability program.

Since that date important changes have taken place in the program. Originally, disability benefits were restricted to persons 50 years of age and over. Provision was made to offset against social security disability benefits, all benefits received under workmen's compensation laws.

In 1958, the provision for deduction of workmen's compensation benefits was eliminated. Also in that year, benefits for the dependents of a beneficiary under the program were made available.

In 1960, the age 50 limitation was eliminated so that all qualified persons totally and permanently disabled became entitled to benefits.

From these facts, it is apparent that there has been a considerable expansion of the social security disability program. There is demand for still further extension.

In 1961, H.R. 4571 proposed to extend disability benefits to persons temporarily disabled. Under such a provision, which received the support of President Kennedy and very serious consideration by the Ways and Means Committee, more people would have been placed upon the social security disability rolls. Many of these already would have been receiving workmen's compensation benefits. This provision was eliminated from the bill which was enacted.

In 1962, bills to broaden even further the disability provision of the Social Security Act at even higher costs were pending at the adjournment of the 87th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, factually speaking, there has been considerable change from the original disability program as enacted by Congress. Some of the results flowing from this expanded program are surprising indeed and not the results which, in my opinion, were envisioned by Congress.

For instance, with the elimination of the offset provision in 1958, it is now possible for a beneficiary to draw both State workmen's compensation and social security disability benefits for a single injury. Consider the results of this particular change in the law.

A disabled employee with a wife and two dependents who earns $400 per month would be entitled to receive $254 in social security disability benefits. In addition, if he were a workmen's compensation covered employee in the State of Massachusetts, he would be entitled to receive $294.67 per month under workmen's compensation. He would thus receive $548.67 per month tax-free while disabled, as compared with his former earnings of $400 per month which would be subject to Federal income tax of more than $400 per year.

Mr. Speaker, workers in 47 jurisdictions receive through this duplication of benefits more than their take-home pay. I am firmly of the opinion that Congress did not intend this result.

From this result, also the program for the rehabilitation of these injured persons will suffer. No longer will there be any incentive for the injured person to return to a productive livelihood. Reports have reached me that the drop in the number of rehabilitated persons has reached alarming proportions.

Mr. Speaker, the tired story of Federal encroachment is having its impact upon the individual State compensation programs. Some States already are resisting this dual Federal-State plan. In Minnesota, a partial "reverse offset" law has been enacted which provides that State compensation benefits will be reduced by social security disability benefits. Legislation has been introduced this year in the States of Colorado and Maryland to enact the "reverse offset."

The handwriting is clear, Mr. Speaker, that the demise of the State programs is a matter-of-fact under such laws. I do not believe the Congress intended to bring about the destruction of the State workmen's compensation programs through enactment of the Social Security Disability Act.

Mr. Speaker, any detriment done to the State workmen's compensation program by the Federal social security program would be irreparable injury. The State programs for 50 years have been the basic disability programs in this country for work-connected disabilities. The Federal program under social security cannot compare favorably at all with the benefits under the State program, that is, payments and unlimited medical benefits. Thus, destroying the State programs, in effect, is only hurting our disabled people.

Enough has been said here to reveal some problem areas in the social security disability program. Informed persons acquainted with these areas have suggested two approaches as solutions. One approach would be to limit the amount of dual benefits to a certain percentage of disabled worker's average weekly wage, not to exceed a maximum sum.

The other approach would be to reinstate the offset provision in the Federal act which was repealed in 1958. This would reduce social security disability benefits by the amount of benefits received under the State compensation programs. Under both of these approaches, persons receiving benefits under the present laws would not be affected. The purpose here is not to take away benefits from disabled people but to make sound and workable the disability programs of the States and the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON] have introduced bills which will encompass the solution mentioned here. I am happy to join my colleagues in the introduction of these bills in order to have a thorough review and study of this matter.

DUE PROCESS FOR STATES IN APPEALING ADMINISTRATIVE DECISIONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a resolution, which is set out at the close of my remarks, from the National Conference of State Legislative Leaders regarding certain problems which have arisen in the area of Federal-State cooperation in the field of welfare. In effect, there is a limitation of due process in that certain interested parties—the States—cannot now appeal administrative decisions of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare under the public assistance titles of the Social Security Act.

I have today introduced a bill which would provide for this right of appeal in these sections of the Social Security Act, titles I, IV, X, XIV, and XVI. The appeal which is contemplated is first administrative and, if necessary, through the Federal court system.

The cooperation of our Federal and State welfare agencies is vital if we are to make our efforts in this important field effective. I believe this cooperation would be improved if we could provide the States with the opportunity of raising their objections to administrative decisions by the Federal Government in a forum where these objections could be properly evaluated. This is the purpose of my bill.

The resolution calling attention to the problem in this field, upon which my proposal is based, follows:

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF STATE LEGISLATIVE LEADERS

RESOLUTION

Whereas in the several States segments of the public and their elected representatives are manifesting increasing concern with policies, administration, effect, and skyrocketing cost of federally aided public assistance programs; and

Whereas this conference is concerned with the many problems that, irrespective of the political complexion of the executive branch of the Government of the United States, have stemmed over the year from Federal-State relationships in public welfare, such as:

(a) The steadily increasing delegation of power by the Congress to Federal administrators, or the assumption of such power by such administrators as, for example, the requirement that each State by administrative mandate or by law prescribe a State plan of administration including "uniform statewide standards of assistance." Such uniformity, in practice, makes it unnecessarily difficult to aid and rehabilitate each needy person as an individual, differing in characteristics and requirements from other individuals; and

(b) The promulgation of policy and procedure by appointive Federal and State officials and personnel unguided by sufficient legislative standards which should be prescribed by Congress and by the State legislatures subject to limitations set forth by Congress; and

Whereas this conference has no disagreement with the fundamental aims of practical modern public welfare, namely, to aid people who have insufficient resources and to provide such aid promptly, objectively, effectively, and economically. Administration of assistance in accordance with the best self-help and rehabilitation practices, however, should not be hampered by the needless burden of the present network of administrative regulations, reporting, bulletins, State letters, interpretations, minute conformity reviews, and a mass of other administrative requirements unnecessary to insure compliance with congressional policy or to safeguard Federal funds: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That in its consideration of public assistance legislation and the Social Security Act, the Congress adhere to the following principles:

1. That Congress limit the present broad delegation of power under the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act by setting forth more definitive standards with which a State must comply to qualify for Federal public assistance grants and at the same time leave sufficient latitude for appropriate administrative action in implementing the policy of Congress.

2. That such compliance shall be determined according to the provisions of a State's law insofar as they conform to such Federal statutory conditions and insofar as such conforming State laws are substantially executed in good faith; and

3. That no Federal agency shall deny or withhold Federal funds available for public assistance grants to the States without the approval of an impartial administrative tribunal after notice and opportunity to be heard shall have been afforded the State adversely affected, and further that a State shall have the right to appeal the determination of such tribunal to an appropriate U.S. court.

4. That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Clerk of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of the Senate, and to each member of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House and of the Committee on Finance of the Senate of the United States.

TO STIMULATE INVESTMENT INTO NEW ENTERPRISE

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, at the present time, under section 212 of the Internal Revenue Code a loss is deductible for amounts spent in searching out and investigating a potential business or investment only where the taxpayer has entered into the transaction under contemplation and the loss has resulted from the abandonment of the project. This interpretation of the section came into prominence in 1957 in the Internal Revenue Service's Revenue Ruling 57–418.

Prior to 1957, the expenditures for preliminary investigations of business or investment opportunities were allowed as deductions even though the taxpayer did not, eventually, enter the transaction. I have today offered a bill which would in effect overrule Revenue Ruling 57–418 and reinstate the earlier rule as set out above.

The basis of this amendment is to encourage taxpayers to investigate new ventures and investments. Requiring that a taxpayer materially commit himself to the development of a particular undertaking before the expenses of investigating it in order to weigh its possibilities are allowed as a tax deduction limits the scope of ventures into which careful and responsible taxpayers will look for possible development and this, in turn, limits the development potential of our economy.

Living as we do in a period of rapid technological change and innovation, I feel it is wiser for us to stimulate the activities of those who would move us into new fields by exploring their economic possibilities than to hobble their efforts to help America move forward.

MAY 10: RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, May 10, is the traditional national holiday of Rumania, commemorating that nation's independence and the founding of the Kingdom of Rumania.

Unfortunately, this holiday cannot be celebrated in Rumania, since the Soviet-imposed government there attempts to eradicate all traces of Rumania's great and glorious past.

However, the Rumanian people throughout the free world continue to observe their nation's national holiday with persistent devotion and continue their active efforts and cooperation with organizations representing other captive lands to the ultimate goal of restoring freedom to all their homelands.

It has been most heartening to me, Mr. Speaker, to notice a growing national interest here in the United States in the plight of the captive peoples of communism, and the further realization that the forces of legitimate nationalism constitute the basic weakness of the Soviet colonial empire.

We maintain as a cornerstone of our foreign policy, support of one of the key points of President Wilson's famous 14 points—namely, self-determination of peoples.

The government now in power in Rumania is illegitimate. It clearly does not consider the wishes of the Rumanian people. A quiet, persistent opposition to the regime continues. Certainly, as we commemorate Rumania's independence day we can give to its leaders in the free world and its quiet, persistent people in the land itself, hope and inspiration that will enable them to maintain their efforts and join the great free world crusade for the end of the Communist threat to the world and the restoration of true freedom to others and their lands.

PUBLISHERS WHO CHEAT: CHEATERS WHO WRITE

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. OSMERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, on May 5, 1963, an outrageous smear of my character based on a series of lies appeared in Parade, a newspaper magazine, which is independently published for distribution by a large number of Sunday newspapers throughout the United States.

This attempted character assassination of me was included in an article by Jack Anderson, which bore the title "Is Congress Protecting Its Members Who Cheat?" This article was a followup on an earlier one in Parade which appeared on March 24, 1963, also by Jack Anderson, titled "Congressmen Who Cheat."

In these articles, the totally untrue charge is made that I made a quick $4,000 profit in 60 days by obtaining inside information at a committee hearing at which condemnation of land on Capitol Hill was being considered. It is stated that I slipped out of my chair, phoned a real estate broker, ordered him to buy property in the area to be condemned, then returned to the hearing in time to vote.

If true, such a charge would certainly be a serious reflection on my character. However, it is so ridiculous and contrary to the facts that it is completely beyond intelligent comprehension that Parade, with its great resources, would not, at the very least, have asked one of Washington's many competent reporters to check the facts because they are so quickly and easily available to anyone.

Here are the facts from official records:

First question: Did I get inside information at a committee meeting where the purchase of land on Capitol Hill was being considered, leave the meeting, call a broker to purchase property and return to the meeting in time to vote? Answer: Absolutely not.

As our legislative directories will show, I do not now, nor have I ever, served on any committee or commission dealing in any way whatsoever with the acquisition of land on Capitol Hill, nor have I ever attended any meeting of any such group.

Second question: To completely clear the air of any suspicion, could I have obtained inside information from other sources prior to my buying a house on Capitol Hill in 1957? Answer: Absolutely not.

The Architect of the Capitol informs me that the House Office Building Commission made the decision to buy the land for the new House Office Building—location specified in the March 24 article—in May of 1955, more than 2 years before my purchase, while the decision to acquire the 2 blocks east of the Old House Office Building—location in May 5 article—was made in June of 1960 almost 3 years after my purchase.

Third question: Did I ever make a quick $4,000 profit in 60 days on any Capitol Hill property? Answer: Absolutely not.

In July of 1957 I bought a dilapidated house in Washington, D.C., at 125 C Street, SE., for $15,500, without using a broker, intending to renovate and occupy part of it myself. I paid $3,500 in cash and took out a $12,000 mortgage. After learning from several contractors how high the cost of its renovation would be, I placed it on the market and was unable to find a buyer. After some months without any offers, a real estate broker found a buyer in March of 1958, 9 months after my purchase, who could make only a $1,000 downpayment with the balance of the sale price of $19,000, due me covered by a second mortgage payable 3 years after the sale. I received just $50 in cash at the time of sale while the real estate broker received a 5-percent commission of $950 out of the $1,000 downpayment. Considering legal fees, taxes during my ownership, and incidental expenses, when the second mortgage was finally paid off 3 years later, the result was a long, long way from a "quick $4,000 profit in 60 days." This same house changed hands again a few years ago. It still stands there on C Street, vacant, unimproved and for sale.

Obviously from these facts, any charge that I used inside information for my own gain is a vicious smear based on fabricated falsehoods. Anyone at any time could have learned the truth from the official records of Congress and the Recorder of Deeds for the District of Columbia without difficulty or delay.

In his May 5 Parade article, Anderson again repeated one of his 1962 falsehoods about me. This year, however, it appears in the form of a question rather than as a statement of fact. It is the accusation that the pay of one of my clerks is used to pay my printing bills. The repetition of this lie has caused great anguish to the valuable part-time member of my staff whom he mentions, Mrs. Laura Sellner. She has now resigned, I regret to report. She has performed faithful service for my constituents. She simply refused to take this unfounded abuse any longer. I cannot blame her.

Mr. Speaker, it will always be my purpose to defend and preserve our great free press, not to destroy it. The few publishers who permit their columns to be used to degrade a man's character and integrity without check or restraint by the lazy, the incompetent, or by malicious scandalmongers, do great harm to the reputation of every decent publisher and to the principle of a free press. Let us be thankful, Mr. Speaker, that the overwhelming majority of our news media owners, editors, and reporters are decent, honest, hard-working, and truthful people.

ANTIDUMPING LEGISLATION

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Utah [Mr. BURTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, it is a well-known fact that we are faced with a high level of unemployment in America, and it is equally well known that many foreign-made products are capturing the markets of American-made goods, and thereby adding to our unemployment problem. I am not criticizing a fair trade policy or arrangement. I am critical of unfair trade practices. In 1962, we adopted the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, and it was the declared purpose of the act, and I quote:

> (1) to stimulate the economic growth of the United States and maintain and enlarge foreign markets for the products of United States agriculture, industry, mining, and commerce; and (2) to strengthen economic relations with foreign countries through the development of open and nondiscriminatory trading in the free world.

Yet in recent years we have seen American industry nearly destroyed by unfair trade practices and discrimination of American products. I cite as examples, turkeys and poultry products generally, coal, steel, cattle, sheep, lead-zinc, copper, and many others. During the past few months I have written to the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman, and even to the President, requesting utilization of section 252 of the Trade Expansion Act to eliminate unfair and discriminatory practices, but the problems have not yet been resolved. It may well be that the Congress should assume this responsibility, and that we will have to define these unfair practices with great clarity.

It is my impression that the problems cited are directly tied up with the practice of foreign manufacturers dumping their products in this country and selling them at prices below what they are sold for in their own countries. Many Members of this House and the Senate have drawn the same conclusion, and hence have introduced antidumping legislation. This afternoon I have taken that same opportunity. This bill is almost identical to many already introduced, but it includes the further provision designed to protect the product as well as the industry. This is important since many of the products dumped upon our markets may not substantially injure the industry but will injure or even eliminate various products within the industry.

PREVENTING THE SPREAD OF COMMUNISM

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. TUPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that I speak for all of my colleagues when I express the hope that the administration will resolve to take whatever steps are necessary to prevent communism from spreading another tenacle in this hemisphere.

Haiti has been ripe for revolution from within for several years; the squalor and miserable poverty of the great majority of Haitians has created this explosive situation. We in the United States hope that Haitians will oust the oppressive Duvalier upon the expiration of his elected term of office this May 15. The Organization of American States could then assist Haiti in establishing a stable and humane government and provide for free elections as soon as possible.

We should not discount the possibility of Duvalier bidding for Communist support in a last minute attempt to prop up his regime by force, in return for accepting Communist control. We must be extremely alert for any evidence of an attempt at a Communist takeover of Haiti, whether through intrigue or revolution, and be prepared to act swiftly to prevent it.

There may be value in hindsight in reviewing the Haitian problem. We have given the Duvalier government nearly $50 million in U.S. aid.

In the future instead of being in the position far too often of choosing the lesser of two evils by strengthening the government of a dictator, it seems to me that we should look harder for a better choice. Without assurances that democratic processes will be strictly adhered to, it is highly questionable whether our aid does more than postpone eventual chaos and add to the unhappy plight of many citizens of that particular country.

An editorial appearing in a Maine daily newspaper, the Portland Press Herald, on May 8, contains some salient points on the Haitian situation which I think the House should be aware of.

The editorial follows:

OAS OFFERS LITTLE HOPE TO HAITI BY BLOCKING DUVALIER'S OVERTHROW

The quarrel between Haiti and the Dominican Republic, which the Organization of American States has been trying to keep from erupting into hostilities, differs in major respects from the customary Latin American dispute, and the more or less traditional Latin American internal revolt.

The Dominicans have massed troops on the Haitian border as a means of protecting their own property and people within Haiti. They realize that President Duvalier of Haiti, who uses torture, murder, and imprisonment to suppress his real and imagined enemies, is capable of launching a bloodbath indiscriminately if the plotters among his own people threaten to topple him.

And so far as the simmering rebellion within Haiti goes, it is not accompanied by the hope that overturn of the existing despot will bring into power a more enlightened leader. The ignorance and poverty of the people and the country's bloody history, offer little optimism.

Where the Kennedy administration and the OAS appear weak is their failure to offer a better alternative than keeping the tyrant Duvalier in power. If the OAS wants to improve matters in Latin America, here is a situation in which it might encourage a successful revolt by Haitians, and then establish an OAS trusteeship, with American economic aid. Yet in any decision between intervention and jealous adherence to the principle of sovereign rights, the latter will win.

THE INEQUITIES OF SOCIAL SECURITY—WHAT YOU MAY NOT KNOW

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, a friend of mine by the name of Mr. Alvin L. Levine has made an analysis of our social security system and entitled it "The Inequities of Social Security—What You May Not Know."

Mr. Levine put this article out as a service to the industry by Perfect Fit Industries, Inc., of New York City.

This is not only an analysis of the inequities but has bona fide suggestions for amendments to the social security law. I concur with most of these suggestions.

I am today sending a copy of this to the distinguished chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Arkansas, the Honorable WILBUR MILLS, for consideration by his committee. I sincerely hope some of these suggestions will be recognized and in the not too far distant future proposed as amendments to the social security law.

The article follows:

THE INEQUITIES OF SOCIAL SECURITY—WHAT YOU MAY NOT KNOW

In its original concept, when introduced in the year 1937, social security was an excellent idea. The purpose of it was to take care of man's fear of tomorrow and to give him some semblance of security in his old age (in those days, supposedly the children were to support the parents when they got older—now it is just the opposite). It would also take care of total disability.

However, as social security now stands, being that it is absolutely compulsory, it can work a grave injustice on a strong percentage of the wage earners in the United States.

Listed below are some of these inequities:

1. If you are 21 years old today, between your employer and yourself, you pay $360 a year in social security taxes; $400 in 1966, $450 in 1968. By the time you are 65, you will have put away over $18,000, providing there is not a raise in social security taxes. If that same money was put in a bank at 4¼ percent interest, compounded quarterly, you would have approximately $50,000 when you are 65, which would give you an income of $2,250 a year without touching the principal.

Now under social security, supposing you die at the age of 65 and your wife predeceases you and you don't have any dependent children, which is most likely at that age, all that your estate gets is $255 in funeral expenses. What happened to the $50,000?

2. Supposing when you are 65 years old, you feel that you can't live on social security, plus what you saved, and you keep on working and paying the tax, knowing that at the age of 72 the social security benefit will then become obligatory. But, you die at the age of 70 or 71 and your wife predeceases you, the same thing holds true.

3. Supposing you do retire at the age of 65 and your wife is alive and you get over $200 a month, which is $2,500 a year, and you live 12 years. You will only have collected $30,000, which is a $20,000 loss to begin with.

4. If you are a woman and you pay full social security benefits all your life and your husband is employed and you both retire at the age of 65, then all he collects is $127 a month maximum, and you can collect $127 a month maximum. Your working loses him the 50 percent additional benefit that he would have gotten for a wife that had never worked. The working wife is also being discriminated against. This gives both you and your husband an extra compulsory burden.

5. If a man dies at the age of 55 or 60 or thereabouts and leaves a widow 50 years old or thereabouts and she doesn't have any dependent children (under 18), then she collects nothing until she is 62 years old. Why shouldn't she be able to collect during the intervening years?

Also, if the same woman wants to go to work because she doesn't have enough on which to live and she doesn't remarry in the future, she is forced to pay social security out of her weekly salary in spite of the fact that it is an absolute impossibility for her to receive any additional benefits.

6. If you are a bachelor, you pay the same tax as a married man, and you can only collect one benefit, instead of one and a half. The same goes for a bachelorette.

7. Originally, in the first 13 years of social security, the tax was 3 percent of $3,000 or $90 a year, for which you could receive upon retirement between your wife and yourself $80 a month. Now you pay $360 and will soon pay $450 a year, and the maximum upon retirement will be $204 a month. In other words, you will pay five times the premium for 2½ times the benefit.

8. If a man wants to retire at the age of 65 and his wife is 55, which is not an uncommon thing, he only receives social security for himself, and she has to wait until she is 62. The only solution to this is for men to marry older women. This means that the Government, in addition to everything else, will have to get into the marriage business.

9. A widow without dependent children of a man who has paid social security cannot be paid anything for disability until she is 62. She may not be able to wait that long.

10. If a woman works all her life and retires at the age of 65 and she is married to a man who is not eligible for social security, she can only receive a benefit for him if she contributes more than 50 percent of his support. In other words, in spite of the fact that she pays the same amount while working as any man, she has less rights.

Now who does benefit by social security?

(a) A man who retires at the age of 65, who is satisfied to get $204 a month; who probably has some kind of a pension and who can pick up a few dollars a year in earnings; and who lives until the age of 85 with his wife.

(b) A person who becomes disabled at a moderate age in life and collects the full benefits of social security.

(c) A widow with dependent children.

(d) A widow of a recent marriage who is at least 62 years old.

But the great majority of people, particularly in the merchandising field, which is the field that we are concerned with, can well give away far more than they receive.

What are some of the solutions?

1. A woman or man who works and pays the full benefits should be able to receive the full benefits without considering whether or not there is a husband or wife who is collecting on their own.

2. The social security payment should be compulsory after the age of 65, no matter what the earnings, or even if it was settled for half, it would be better than it is now—and no further deductions for taxes after 65 years of age if still employed.

3. A widow should be entitled to her rights at any age, or until she at least remarries.

4. There should be a lump-sum payment with some degree of equity for families or estates of people who die, who have never received social security benefits and yet have paid in many thousands of dollars.

5. A man when he retires at 65, providing he is married, should be able to receive the full benefit for himself and his wife, no matter what his wife's age is.

6. A widow eligible for social security, but not receiving it because she is under 62 and hasn't any dependent children, should receive a benefit if she becomes permanently disabled.

7. A woman under social security married to a man ineligible for social security should receive the same benefits when she retires as any husband would receive, in spite of the fact that his wife may never have worked a day in her life.

Therefore, as you can see, the social security laws need revision, and you can do your part by writing your Congressman and Senator.

OUTDOOR ADVERTISING AND TRAFFIC SAFETY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the subject of traffic safety concerns one of the most serious problems in the United States. Any attempt to attribute traffic accidents to spurious causes, while at the same time ignoring available data of various road and roadside features, known to be major factors contributing to accidents, is a distinct disservice to the cause of traffic safety. Likewise, any improper or inadequate analyses of data which might tend to arrive at statistically unsound conclusions should not be permitted to inferentially attribute a cause and effect relationship where no such relationship exists.

About February 19, 1963, the New York Thruway Authority released a report by Madigan-Hyland, Inc., a firm of consulting engineers, which purported to be "an analysis of accident statistics and records of the New York State Thruway for the years 1961–62, to determine the relationship, if any, between the number of accidents and the existence of advertising devices along the route of the expressway." This report appears on pages 4839–4840 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 25, 1963.

This report has been challenged by outstanding leaders in the field of investigation of accident causation. It is the consensus of their opinions that the analysis of data made by Madigan-Hyland was inadequate; that the conclusions were invalid, statistically unsound, completely without foundation and unsupportable under any professionally statistical standards.

It is also noted that while the New York Thruway report attempts to include outdoor advertising with all "inattention" accidents that the term "inattention" is frequently used as a "catchall" and not one which can be confined, or perhaps even used, in connection with advertising devices visible along the New York Thruway.

Analyses of the New York Thruway report appear by the following authorities in the order in which they are listed: Exhibit A, by Dr. Ernest E. Blanche, Ernest E. Blanche & Associates; exhibit B, by Dr. Leon Brody, New York University; exhibit C, by Dr. Bruce Greenshields, University of Michigan; exhibit D, by Prof. J. Carl McMonagle, Michigan State University.

Mr. Speaker, I am in possession of the biographies of each of the authorities and will be glad to make them available to any Member upon request:

COMMENTS AND CONDENSED ANALYSIS BY DR. ERNEST E. BLANCHE, REGARDING THE REPORT MADE BY MADIGAN-HYLAND, INC., TO THE NEW YORK STATE THRUWAY AUTHORITY, CONCERNING THE RELATIONSHIP OF OUTDOOR ADVERTISING AND TRAFFIC ACCIDENTS

The conclusion of the Madigan-Hyland report to the chairman of the New York State Thruway Authority (that in 1961 and 1962 there were three times as many "driver inattention" accidents per mile on the thruway where signs were visible as against the thruway where signs were not visible) is erroneous, misleading, and statistically unsound.

The reason Madigan-Hyland obtained this false result is that Madigan-Hyland limited itself to relating the driver inattention accidents to only one variable (advertising signs) and ignored many other variables which were available.

Madigan-Hyland did not consider such other variables as traffic volume, either in the form of number of vehicles traveling past specific points or number of vehicle miles, road characteristics such as "on" and "off" ramps, bridges over water or depressions, overhead bridges supporting roads crossing the thruway, usually at right angles, service areas, parking areas, and many other road features which are known to be major factors contributing to accidents.

Madigan-Hyland simply divided the New York Thruway into two classifications of roadway based on some arbitrary unit of measure which Madigan-Hyland has not indicated, namely: (1) Sections of roadway from which signs were visible without regard to the size, shape, or type of sign, location, or the distance from the thruway right-of-way; (2) sections of roadway from which signs were not visible. Without indicating whether they were using sections of length of one mile or half-a-mile or one-tenth of a mile, Madigan-Hyland then added all these sections to obtain a total of road miles for each of the two classes. Then Madigan-Hyland tallied the number of driver inattention accidents for each of the two types of roadway and then divided the number of accidents for each type by the number of miles in that type, thereby obtaining results which are entirely false and without statistical validity of any kind.

It was as though Madigan-Hyland had picked 200 men—100 with light hair and 100 with dark hair, then weighed all the men and discovered the 100 men with light hair weighed 17,500 pounds, while the 100 men with dark hair weighed 18,000 pounds—as though they next averaged the weights per man (175 pounds for the light haired men and 180 pounds for the dark haired men) and published the statement that the average dark haired man weighs 180 pounds while the average light haired man weighs 175 pounds. The mathematics involved are correct, but the conclusion is wrong. We know from many scientific studies, made previously, that weight is related to height, waist measurement, chest measurement, bone structure, etc., but it is not related to the color of hair. In the above example the study was limited to one variable (hair) which has no relationship to weight, and ignored other variables which previous studies have shown do have a relationship.

To evaluate the true relationship between accidents and the many variables involved, the following activities were undertaken: Inattention accident records were obtained, with their exact locations on the thruway, as used by Madigan-Hyland, for the year 1961; however, it was not possible to obtain similar records for 1962. (Authorities agree that records for one entire year are a very adequate sample.)

Limited to the driver inattention accidents occurring in 1961, a preliminary analysis showed that more than half of all driver inattention accidents occurred within 45 miles of the beginning of the thruway at Yonkers and on the 21 miles of thruway going through Buffalo up to Niagara Falls. Because more than half of these accidents occurred on only 66 miles of high traffic segments of the 559-mile thruway, a detailed study was made of all road features, road characteristics, and advertising signs on these two portions. An inventory was made of these, locating them by the tenths-of-a-mile markers which are the official highway distance indicators during an auto trip north and south on the first 45 miles of the thruway beginning at Yonkers and ending at Harriman, N.Y. (a total of 90 road miles). A similar inventory of these items was made on the 21 miles of thruway beginning just east of the city line of Buffalo, traveling through the city to the downtown area and then turning north along the river to Niagara Falls (42 miles).

These locations were then plotted to a tenth-of-a-mile on chart paper on which the 1961 driver inattention accidents had previously been indicated. Without going into any mathematical analysis, it was apparent from the chart that there were some unusual road characteristics at which accidents were clustered, namely: (1) Approximately one out of every seven accidents on the Yonkers-Harriman portion occurred on the 3-mile-long Tappan Zee Bridge crossing the Hudson River, where no advertising devices were visible; (2) in the 90 miles of roadway from Yonkers to Harriman and return, there were 62 ramps of exit or entry, an average of one ramp every mile and a half; (3) for the 42 miles of thruway in Buffalo and north of Buffalo, there was an on or off ramp occurring on the average of every two-thirds of a mile; (4) for the remainder of the thruway, totaling over a thousand road miles, the on or off ramps averaged one every 6 miles; (5) approximately 72 percent of the accidents occurring on the first 45 miles of thruway (Yonkers to Harriman) occurred at locations which were within two-tenths of a mile (about 1,050 feet) of an on ramp, an off ramp, a bridge, an overhead bridge, a service area, or a toll area; (6) there was a peaking of accident locations where on and off ramps were close together, introducing traffic friction as cars entered and left the main stream of traffic.

Because the detailed motor vehicle reports filled out by the investigating officers were not available to us, the driver inattention accidents could not be classified as to whether they were two-vehicle collisions, a car running into a bridge rail, a car running into the support of an overhead bridge, a car failing to stay on the roadway, accidents occurring on roadway covered with ice, snow, or rain, and other conditions which would have been noted by the investigating officer.

Since more than half of the 1961 driver inattention accidents occurred on less than 12 percent of the road miles on the entire New York Thruway, a detailed correlation analysis was conducted for the 90 road miles from Yonkers to Harriman and return, and separately for the 42 miles of roadway from Buffalo to Niagara Falls and return.

The results of the correlation analysis showed that the partial correlation coefficient between accidents and advertising signs on the Yonkers-Harriman portion was approximately zero while that between accidents and road features as identified above was 0.45, indicating a direct positive relationship between accidents and road characteristics but absolutely no relationship between accidents and advertising signs.

For the Buffalo-Niagara Falls section, the partial correlation coefficient between accidents and advertising signs was also approximately zero, while that between accidents and road characteristics was 0.42.

This means that there is a direct positive relationship between accidents and road characteristics, and that if these road characteristics are not considered in any study (such as the Madigan-Hyland report), then any cause-and-effect relationship between accidents and road characteristics would be erroneously attributed to advertising signs seen from the roadway, even though such signs might not actually be located near the road right-of-way.

It is important to report that the partial correlation coefficients obtained separately for the two metropolitan segments of the New York Thruway are very close to the results obtained by the State Highway Department of Michigan for accidents occurring on 120 miles of highway for the 3-year period from 1947 to 1949. The Michigan Highway Department study included a correlation analysis of about 10 variables and determined that the partial correlation coefficient between accidents and advertising signs was approximately zero while the partial correlations between accidents and road and roadside features were high.

As far as I know, this correlation analysis with the limited data indicated for the New York Thruway is the first indication that the results for a limited access highway approximate those for a conventional type highway with intersections.

In conclusion, I would like to point out that the Madigan-Hyland report, in my opinion, is an immature attempt to support a general conclusion that was indicated or desired. The Madigan-Hyland results are invalid, completely without foundation, and unsupportable under any professional statistical standards.

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY,
DIVISION OF GENERAL EDUCATION,
CENTER FOR SAFETY EDUCATION,
New York, N.Y., April 29, 1963.

MR. FRANK BLAKE,
Director of Public Relations,
Outdoor Advertising Association of America,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. BLAKE: With reference to your letter of April 16, asking me to comment on a report concerning the New York Thruway, made by Madigan-Hyland, Inc., the following remarks are based entirely on the information contained in the copy you sent me. Moreover, I have not referred to the comments of other reviewers, so that I might be free of any "halo effect."

The Madigan-Hyland report presents the findings of an investigation "to determine the relationships, if any, between the number of accidents and the existence of advertising devices along the route of the expressway." This statement appears in the opening paragraph. A little further in the introductory remarks (paragraph 4), the statement is made "that advertising devices are a factor in accidents principally because they distract the motorists' attention." This tends to nullify the reasonably scientific qualification in the phase, "if any," previously mentioned. Indeed a cause-and-effect explanation is suggested (paragraph four) even before a relationship (if any) has been ascertained. It is on this questionable basis that the design of the study is formulated and carried out. Such procedure is not ordinarily regarded as compatible with valid scientific research.

Review of the entire report prompts questions and remarks such as the following:

1. What is meant by "visible"? Does visibility refer to advertising message details, to the sign as a whole? In either case, what evidence is there regarding driver perception—the essential criterion of visibility for the purposes of this study?

2. How is driver "inattention" defined? It is recognized by many experts that this term, or its positive counterpart, attention, is a broad and elusive psychological phenomenon. Thus, inattention may be internally or externally occasioned for many possible reasons. If externally derived, this might be the result of advertising signs or of countless other distractions (or attractions), natural or manmade, to be found in any area of travel. These may range from scenic qualities to homes along the highway, and even to traffic density or the behavior of other drivers. The prevalence of these possibilities is undetermined in the subject study. Moreover, as is well known by traffic safety experts, accident reports freely use such categories as inattention and careless driving to cover many different things—i.e., as a catchall.

3. The statements and data relating to traffic density are cause for concern. To begin with, the criteria of "heavy density" and "medium density," for the purposes of this study, are not specified. Therefore, the reader cannot be sure of the coverage. More important, however, is this fact: Since traffic volume may reasonably be hypothesized to contribute to driver attractions or distractions, study of a "light density" area might well provide a "purer" test of the distractive effect, if any, of external stimuli such as advertising messages. The report provides no data on a "light density" area. Indeed, the given accident rates drop drastically from 2.9 and 2 per mile in the heavy density area to 0.40 and 0.26 for the medium density area, suggesting that traffic density may be the principal variable responsible for the obtained results.

4. If advertising devices contribute to the latter at all, one would expect the obtained data to be subjected to statistical tests of significance. No such tests are reported. Consequently we may in any case have data that lack any significance.

5. Apart from traffic density and the presence or absence of advertising devices, other variables need to be controlled for a definitive study. These range from destination psychology factors in the areas studied to the geography and topography of the roadway segments involved. To put this point in positive terms, a definitive study of roadway risk potential in relation to X would necessarily include a controlled experiment in which a given stretch of roadway were studied when advertising devices are present and when they are absent. This would tend to keep many influential factors constant except, primarily, the one "under the microscope"—i.e., advertising messages. (Of course, the experiment would have to be repeated at different locations to permit any generalizations.)

We consider it a professional responsibility to call attention to both valid and questionable research relating to traffic safety. Consequently there is no fee for my evaluation of the subject study which, as reported, appears to me to fall in a highly questionable category.

Sincerely,

LEON BRODY,
Director of Research.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN,
Ann Arbor, March 25, 1963.

Mr. FRANK BLAKE,
Outdoor Advertising Association of America, Inc., Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. BLAKE: In accordance with your request at our conference on Friday, March 22, I am glad to give you my evaluation of the Madigan-Hyland report to the New York State Thruway Authority on the "Relationship Between Accidents and the Presence of Advertising Signs."

I think this report is misleading. That it is statistically unsound is shown by the analysis of the report by Dr. Ernest E. Blanche, Ernest E. Blanche & Associates, Inc., and by comparison with a study of road signs and accidents by Dr. A. R. Lauer and J. Carl McMonagle, ("Do Road Signs Affect Accidents?" A. R. Lauer and J. Carl McMonagle, Traffic Quarterly, July 1955, pp. 322–329).

There are several assumptions in the Madigan-Hyland report that are open to question. For example, the statement: "* * * it was recognized that advertising devices are a factor in accidents principally because they distract the motorists attention."

The implication seems to be that the motorists attention is distracted to the advertising sign and away from the driving task. It is perhaps more logical to assume that a certain amount of distraction is necessary to keep the motorist awake and alert. In fact, the study by Lauer and McMonagle mentions that "designers of the New York Thruway recognized the need for variety of roadside stimuli by designing otherwise unnecessary curves in that highway."

The difficulty of getting unbiased opinions and of pinning down visual attention is illustrated by an incident related in "Statistics with Applications to Highway Traffic Analysis," Bruce D. Greenshields and Frank M. Weida, published by the Eno Foundation, 1952. On page 8 of this 238-page monograph, there is related in part a study of no-passing zones. I quote:

"It was decided to try road signs worded to warn drivers that they were entering a no-passing zone. It was doubted that a large percentage of the motorists would see the signs, but surprisingly enough, over 98 percent of them stated they had seen the signs. This was so unexpected that it was questionable, and a way of checking these answers was sought.

"The means of checking was revealed through consideration of the purpose of the sign. Signs aside from those whose shape conveys a message, must be read. A sign much larger than the no-passing sign was prominently displayed to warn the drivers that they were entering a test zone. This might have been guessed from the fact that they had seen three or four different types of marking within a mile or so, but, over one-third when questioned said they did not know they were in a test zone. The conclusion reached was that at least one-third and probably more did not see the no-passing signs in spite of the fact that 98 percent said they had."

The Madigan-Hyland report establishes a correlation between the presence of advertising signs and the occurrence of traffic accidents judged by the State trooper reporting, to be due to inattention. In evaluating the finding of the Madigan-Hyland report it must be remembered that a correlation coefficient does not necessarily show the existence of a cause-and-effect relationship. There could be other causes for the accidents.

The highway factors that lead to accidents are numerous and fall into three general categories: (1) those relating to the geometry of the highway; (2) those relating to the appearance of the highway and environment; and, (3) those relating to the flow of traffic. If these many variables that can cause accidents are omitted from the accident analysis, the analysis is statistically unsound.

This fact is shown by Dr. Ernest E. Blanche's analysis of the Madigan-Hyland report. Dr. Blanche makes an inventory of all road features for the pertinent part of the thruway and then analyzes the data to obtain a proper evaluation of the effect of the advertising signs which obviously constitute a small part of the visual highway environment.

Dr. Blanche obtains a simple correlation coefficient between accidents and road features of 0.46. (It may be noted the "determining coefficient" is the square of the correlation coefficient. Thus, the roadside features could be expected to account for only about 21 percent of the accidents.)

Dr. Blanche then computed a multiple correlation coefficient between accidents and road features and advertising signs and found it to be 0.47 which is almost identical to the simple correlation (0.46) between accidents and road features.

A partial correlation coefficient between accidents and advertising (removing the influence of road features) computed by Dr. Blanche, was found to be 0.05.

The analysis by Dr. Blanche is the same as that followed in the Lauer and McMonagle study conducted in Michigan. This indicates the correctness of the method.

The Michigan study included nine variables: vehicle miles, private drives, restaurants, taverns, gas stations, stores, other establishments, design features, and advertising.

It is significant that in the Michigan study the partial correlation (eliminating the effects of other variables) between accidents and roadside signs of—0.066 for roadways with no intersections and 0.002 for roadways with intersections shows practically no relationship between roadside advertising and accidents.

The Michigan study included a laboratory study in which factors could be controlled. The conclusion of the authors of the Michigan study, as stated: "The studies (laboratory and field) each confirm that there is no significant relationship shown between outdoor advertising signs and highway accidents. The evidence, if any, is slightly in favor of having something along the highway to arouse the motorists and keep him alerted as far as efficient driving is concerned."

It is my opinion that the Madigan-Hyland report is erroneous in that it fails to take into consideration the many highway variables other than outdoor advertising signs that can cause accidents. This opinion is confirmed by the findings and statistical procedures followed by Dr. Blanche and by Dr. Lauer and Professor McMonagle.

Sincerely yours,

BRUCE D. GREENSHIELDS,
Assistant Director.

STATEMENT OF J. CARL MCMONAGLE ON REPORTS MADE BY MADIGAN-HYLAND, INC., CONSULTING ENGINEERS, NEW YORK CITY, AND BY DR. ERNEST E. BLANCHE, ERNEST E. BLANCHE & ASSOCIATES, INC., KENSINGTON, MD., ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ACCIDENTS AND OUTDOOR ADVERTISING DEVICES ON THE NEW YORK STATE THRUWAY

I have very carefully examined the reports made by Madigan-Hyland, Inc., and Dr. Ernest E. Blanche to determine the statistical soundness of each report. I cannot agree with the report made by Madigan-Hyland, Inc., because of several factors. First, they did not consider any of the other roadside features on the highway and confined their report entirely to outdoor advertising signs. I believe it is a well-established fact that in order to get a sound statistical analysis of accidents on any highway that all roadside features should be considered and correlation made between them. Second, the accident reports they studied only covered those accidents on which the investigating officers indicated driver inattention. I believe all traffic safety experts agree that driver inattention can be caused by many things, and not just outdoor advertising signs or any one individual roadside feature. The soundness of this item on the accident report can be questioned because it is the investigating officer's opinion. I believe that if Madigan-Hyland, Inc., had made a complete study of roadside features and made a correlating analysis of these features, both simple and multiple, that they would have come up with quite a different answer.

In my review of Dr. Ernest E. Blanche's report, the condition is quite different. Dr. Blanche considered all roadside features and other factors along the highway in making his correlation analysis, as was done in the Michigan study conducted some years ago. I have carefully studied his analysis and am in complete concurrence with his findings.

It is not my intention in any way to discredit or criticize the integrity or ability of the Madigan-Hyland firm in their study because I firmly believe that if their assignment from the New York State Thruway Authority had been broad enough that they would have come up with the same answer as the Michigan study, the study conducted by Dr. Ernest E. Blanche and the laboratory study by Dr. A. R. Lauer, of Iowa State College, all three of which quite emphatically indicated that outdoor advertising signs had no relationship to accidents on any highway.

MARCH 27, 1963.

COORDINATION OF FEDERAL AND STATE INHERITANCE AND ESTATE TAXES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill for the purpose of implementing recommendations of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations which seeks to coordinate Federal and State inheritance and estate taxes and to increase the States' share of revenues produced by these taxes. This bill is identical to H.R. 5155 which I introduced in the 87th Congress and to H.R. 5039 which was introduced recently by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH]. I have the honor to represent the House on the Advisory Commission, together with the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH], and the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER], who is joining us in the sponsorship of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation was unanimously recommended by the Advisory Commission. Under Public Law 86-380 the Commission has the responsibility of recommending methods of coordinating and simplifying tax laws and administrative practices in order to achieve a more orderly and less competitive fiscal relationship between the level of government and to reduce the burden of compliance for taxpayers.

The Commission selected this tax area for intensive study in 1960, shortly after its organization, because legislative developments since the mid-1930's have impaired the effectiveness of the Federal credit for inheritance and estate taxes paid to States. The credit provision was enacted by the Congress 37 years ago to safeguard the States' share of these revenues and to facilitate interstate tax uniformity. These objectives have not been realized, and a legislative remedy has been urged upon the Congress from all sides for more than two decades.

The inheritance and estate tax area is now characterized by tax overlapping and complexity, by heavy tax compliance burdens for taxpayers, and by relatively high administrative costs, out of all proportion to the small contribution these taxes make to most States' revenues. Inheritances and estates are now taxed by the Federal Government and also by 49 States—Nevada is the only exception. Gifts are taxed by the Federal Government and 12 States. All these taxes provide annually only about $400 million to the States and $1.6 billion to the Federal Government.

My bill provides for a new two-bracket Federal tax credit for taxes paid to States to reserve for the States a relatively large proportion of these taxes in the low tax brackets and a small proportion in the middle and higher brackets. This will stabilize State collections from these taxes and improve their distribution among the States. The new credit will be available to taxpayers only after their respective States have simplified their tax laws and adjusted their tax rates to avail themselves of the revenue being relinquished by the Federal Government. The bill requires all States to adopt estate tax laws to reduce tax complexity, ease the compliance burdens of taxpayers, and improve tax administration.

This program will ultimately result in relinquishing several hundred million dollars of annual Federal revenue to the States. The loss of Federal revenue, however, will not begin for several years because the States will need time to bring their laws into conformity. It will take place only as tax simplification is actually achieved.

The Advisory Commission's recommendations, which this bill seeks to implement, have been endorsed by important national organizations, including the Governors' Conference, the National Tax Association, the National Association of Counties, the National Legislative Conference of the Council of State Governments, the National Association of Attorneys General, the Executive Committee of the National Conference of State Legislative Leaders, and the National Association of State Auditors, Comptrollers, and Treasurers.

SIMPLIFICATION OF FEDERAL GRANTS-IN-AID TO STATES FOR PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today, for appropriate reference, H.R. 6195, to implement recommendations made by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations for the purpose of simplifying and improving the administration of Federal grants-in-aid for public health services.

Except for minor technical changes, this bill is the same as H.R. 5706 which I introduced in the 87th Congress. An identical bill (S. 1051) has been introduced in the other body by Senator MUSKIE with the bipartisan support of 12 additional Members.

This bill is designed to accomplish two objectives. First, it would amend the Public Health Service Act of 1944 to permit States, at the discretion of the Governor concerned, to transfer up to one-third of the Federal funds granted in any one category to one or more of four other disease control categories. It is proposed that this flexibility apply to the following five categorical grants: general health assistance, cancer control, heart disease control, tuberculosis control, and venereal disease control. The bill would not affect the remaining health categories of mental health, maternal and child health, and crippled children's services.

It is believed that the transfer provision would allow the States sufficient flexibility to apply the Federal funds to the categories of the greatest need within the particular State, while at the same time providing assurance to the Congress that in terms of the Nation as a whole the categorical areas would receive the relative emphasis placed upon them by the Congress in annual appropriations.

Second, the bill would establish a uniform allotment and matching formula for Federal grants to States in the special categories listed above. A number of differing formulas are now applicable to these five categories. The Advisory Commission believes this diversity is of doubtful value and causes unnecessary complexity at both the National and State levels. It is the Commission's view that a combination of population, as a general indicator of relative program need among the States, and per capita income, as an indicator of financial ability, would be fair to all the States. Accordingly, the bill incorporates the Hill-Burton formula used in other Public Health Service programs, such as the hospital construction program for this purpose.

Formal resolutions urging enactment of this legislation have been adopted by the Governor's Conference, the Executive Committee of the National Conference of State Legislative Leaders, the National Legislative Conference of the Council of State Governments, the National Association of State Budget Officers, the National Association of Attorneys General, the Midwestern Regional Conference of the Council of State Governments, the American Municipal Association, and the National Association of County Officials.

AMERICAN POLICY WITH RESPECT TO GERMAN ARMAMENT ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, on April 14 of this year I had the honor to bring to the attention of my colleagues a very disturbing newspaper report to the effect that some 300 German aviation technicians, including some former active Nazis, were presently working in the United Arab Republic, on the banks of the Nile, working to build a mach 2.0 jet fighter aircraft for the Egyptians. The report also indicated that this group was headed by Willy Messerschmitt, top German aviation scientist under Hitler and currently a German industrialist.

As I reported at that time, Mr. Speaker, I had wired the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense requesting that they advise me of the truth or falsity of these charges, together with their recommendations as to what course the United States might follow in the event the reports were substantially correct, to put an end to this serious threat to peace and stability in the Middle East.

Mr. Speaker, these replies have now been received, and I thereby take this opportunity to make them available to my colleagues in the Congress.

The letters follow:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., April 25, 1963.

Hon. SAMUEL S. STRATTON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STRATTON: Thank you for your telegram of April 4 concerning the buildup of military capability in the United Arab Republic and the presence of German technicians and scientists there.

The question of the activities of German scientists in the United Arab Republic was discussed by the President in his press conference of April 3. The President noted that "the German Government itself has indicated its displeasure and there is some question of whether it may be a breach of the law, the German scientists who are working on missiles, air engines, and air frames. There are not a great number of them, but there are some of them, and, of course, they do affect the tensions in the Middle East." We are discussing the issue with the parties concerned and are engaged in gathering all available information.

In respect to the United Arab Republic's hope to produce jet trainers and jet fighters, it is by no means clear that the security situation in the Near East would be seriously affected in view of the availability of such aircraft from elsewhere. In addition, there now exist increasingly effective defenses against manned aircraft. One of these, the Hawk missile, is being sold to Israel by the United States and will be in place next year. The United Arab Republic, in seeking to create its own source of fighter aircraft using Western resources, is trying to reduce its current commitments to the Soviets for military equipment.

With regard to missiles, the complications are greater. The United States is deeply concerned for the future. Both the United Arab Republic and Israel have missile programs, and there are other aspects which must be given consideration. As the President stated on April 3, "This matter has been very strongly brought to attention by the Israeli Government and by other interested parties who are seeking to diminish rather than increase the arms race in the Middle East."

Historically, the United States has played a key role in maintaining relative stability in the Near East. This continues to be the case. The United States has strongly supported the peacekeeping machinery of the United Nations in the Near East and has through quiet but persistent diplomacy brought its influence to bear in favor of restraint and moderation. In addition, the United States has supplied Israel a great deal of economic assistance. Since attaining statehood, Israel has been able not only to provide adequately for its own powerful armed forces, but has been able also to achieve a rapid economic development and one of the highest living standards in the world.

Not only is the arms race in the Near East a matter of deep concern to the United States but also one of great complexity. Quoting the President again from his comments to the press on April 3:

"We would be reluctant to see a military balance of power in the Middle East which was such as to encourage aggression rather than discouraging it. So this is a matter which we will have to continue to observe. We have expressed our strong opposition to the introduction or manufacture of nuclear weapons in the Middle East, and we have indicated that strongly to all of the countries. So we have to wait and see as time goes on. At the present time, there is a balance which I think would discourage military action on either side. I would hope it will continue."

While watching the situation closely, the Department also is exploring carefully every possible solution to the problem.

If I may be of any further assistance to you, please do not hesitate to call on me.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
Assistant Secretary.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., April 26, 1963.

Hon. SAMUEL S. STRATTON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. STRATTON: Your telegram of April 4, 1963, addressed to Secretary McNamara regarding West German scientific activity in the United Arab Republic has been referred to this office for reply.

We have evaluated the points set forth in your message and find them essentially correct. West German activity in Egypt has been well publicized for several years. On the aircraft side, the Egyptian Government began efforts in the late 1950's to establish its own aircraft industry. As stated in your letter, there are German technicians and mechanics engaged in the production of a jet trainer and a light fighter reconnaissance aircraft. To the best of our knowledge Mr. Willy Messerschmitt has not been identified with this program in Egypt.

Insofar as the United Arab Republic's rocket project is concerned, we estimate that there are some West Germans engaged in this program. There is no evidence that any West Germans are working on nuclear, radiological or biological weapons. Parenthetically, we have not been able to identify any prominent Nazis involved in any of the foregoing activities.

I am sure you will appreciate that your query as to the steps the U.S. Government can take to terminate German scientific activity presents policy considerations which fall within the proper competence of the Department of State. I understand the Department of State is writing you separately on this point. However, I can assure you that both the Department of State and the Department of Defense are conscious of the need to stabilize conditions in the Middle East area, particularly with reference to Israel and its neighboring Arab States. As you know, the United States has long held to the view that the introduction of weapons of mass destruction and sophisticated offensive weapons into the Middle East was inimical to our interests as well as to those of countries immediately concerned. I believe our recent decision to make the Hawk missile available to Israel to broaden Israel's capability for defense against manned aircraft demonstrates our Government's resolve to maintain a power equilibrium in the area.

I trust that the foregoing is responsive to the military points raised in your communication to Secretary McNamara. If I can be of further service to you on this matter please do not hesitate to call me.

Sincerely,

FRANK K. SLOAN,
Deputy Assistant Secretary.

STATEMENT ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following is a statement I presented today to the Judiciary Subcommittee presently holding hearings on civil rights bills:

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER BEFORE HOUSE JUDICIARY SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5, MAY 9, 1963

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to testify in support of the bills before the committee, including my own bills, H.R. 543 and H.R. 548. H.R. 543 is designed to prevent discrimination in public places and public transportation against members of the Armed Forces; H.R. 548, to protect the right to vote in Federal elections.

A modern-day De Toqueville or Lord Byrce, Mr. Chairman, might well conclude that civil rights is a triennial bloom in the congressional garden. In 1957 after years of agonizing frustration—frustration within as well as without the Congress—we enacted a Civil Rights Act. In that act the Congress took a significant step toward fulfillment of the promise of the 15th amendment which guarantees to every American citizen the right to vote regardless of race or color. By that act Congress authorized the Federal Government to bring civil actions for injunctive relief where discrimination denied or threatened the right to vote. The act further prohibited intimidation, threats, and coercion for the purpose of interfering with the right to vote in Federal primary and general elections.

Three years later, in the wake of some obvious disappointments in connection with its earlier efforts, Congress sought to strengthen the 1957 act by enacting the Civil Rights Act of 1960. It provided that States, as well as voting registrars, may be sued for discriminatory practices. Title III of the 1960 act required the preservation of voting records, and empowered the Attorney General to inspect them. Under title IV, Congress provided for Federal voting referees to facilitate the registration of persons improperly denied the right to vote.

Another 3 years have passed. We are now seized of the opportunity which, if I may continue with my horticultural analogy, will permit us to convert this delicate bud into a hardy perennial. The means for accomplishing this are embodied in proposals before this committee.

The right to vote is a constitutional right. As everyone familiar with Federal elections knows, many qualified Americans are systematically denied the right to vote. This is accomplished by the so-called literacy test. These tests, fair and nondiscriminatory on their face, are administered so as to prevent certain of our citizens from voting. They make a mockery of the 15th amendment. They eat at the vitals of the democratic process. They are, in short, an intolerable evil in a representative system of government.

H.R. 548, if enacted, will remedy this unwholesome situation. This is not a new proposal, indeed some of the members of this committee have introduced identical or similar legislation in this as well as the 87th Congress. It is, in truth, a modest proposal. It does not attempt to eliminate literacy as a proper and reasonable qualification for voting. I do not think the requirement of literacy for voter qualification should be abandoned completely. It is important that the voter have an understanding of the issues which he is called upon to decide. But, as frequently used, these tests bear absolutely no relationship to a person's qualification to vote.

This bill, moreover, is applicable only with respect to voting in Federal elections, a matter of some concern to the Nation and Congress as well as to the States.

Lastly, the bill does not propose any oppression or arbitrary governmental action against individuals. On the contrary, it is designed to facilitate a person's constitutional right to vote only in the face of State discriminatory action.

The bill requires the States which use literacy tests, to use an objective standard. The maximum uniform standard set forth in the bill is the completion of the sixth grade in any public school or accredited private school. This includes such institutions in the several States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. This is a reasonable standard; it is much like the standard which my own State of New York has used for many years.

When this proposal was before the last Congress, some Members expressed doubts as to its constitutionality. The power to determine the qualifications of voters, they argued, was left to the States. That power—the power to set the qualifications for voters in Federal as well as State elections—is not, however, unlimited.

The 15th amendment provides that neither the Federal Government nor the States can deny or abridge the right of citizens to vote on account of race or color. And, Congress is empowered to enforce this prohibition by appropriate legislation.

The clear import of this 15th amendment is that Congress has the power to enact laws to prevent the States from abridging the right of citizens to vote on racial grounds. The Commission on Civil Rights has found that certain States are in fact using their voter qualification laws to deny citizens the right to vote on racial grounds. If Congress endorses these findings—which are incorporated in H.R. 548—it clearly has the power by appropriate legislation to prevent the States from abridging the right of citizens to vote on racial grounds.

Is the enactment of an objective standard—the sixth grade test in this case—beyond the power of Congress? This test does not alter the State requirement that persons be literate in order to vote. The sixth grade test is simply a means by which Congress may insure that an otherwise legitimate State voter qualification—literacy—is not used as a means of excluding voters on racial grounds.

Under the Constitution the qualifications prescribed by the States for elections to the most numerous branch of their legislature apply in Federal elections. The right to vote in Federal elections is not however a right derived from the State. State-established voter qualifications are, of course, subject to the Constitution, particularly to the 14th and 15th amendments which prohibit certain types of discriminatory action.

The Supreme Court, in a number of cases, has upheld the validity of literacy tests. But these cases, and I refer specifically to *Lassiter* v. *Northampton County Board of Elections*, 360 U.S. 45 (1959), hold only that a State may adopt a fair literacy test for voting provided that such a test applies alike to all citizens of the State without regard to race or color. The Lassiter decision suggests, what commonsense tells us, that a State may not establish qualifications that abridge the right to vote on racial grounds.

The 14th amendment provides that no State shall "deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws." That amendment also provides that Congress "shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation" the provisions of the amendment. In providing that persons who have completed the sixth grade shall be regarded as literate under any State literacy law, the Congress would be enforcing the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment.

Under article I, section 4, clause 1 of the Constitution the States may prescribe the "times, places, and manner of holding elections" except that "Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations." There are a number of decisions under this section, but none to my knowledge, has ever held unconstitutional an act of Congress regulating the manner in which elections are held. In *Smiley* v. *Holm*, 285 U.S. 355, 366–367 (1932), the Supreme Court indicated that Congress "has a general supervisory power over the whole subject" of congressional elections. Chief Justice Hughes speaking for the Court said:

"Consideration of the subject matter and of the terms of the provision requires affirmative answer. The subject matter is the times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives. It cannot be doubted that these comprehensive words embrace authority to provide a complete code for congressional elections, not only as to times and places, but in relation to notices, registration, supervision of voting, protection of voters, prevention of fraud and corrupt practices, counting of votes, duties of inspectors and canvassers, and making and publication of election returns; in short, to enact the numerous requirements as to procedure and safeguards which experience shows are necessary in order to enforce the fundamental right involved. These requirements would be nugatory if they did not have appropriate sanctions in the definition of offenses and punishments. All this is comprised in the subject of 'times, places, and manner of holding elections' and involves lawmaking in its essential features and most important aspect.

"This view is confirmed by the second clause of article I, section 4, which provides that 'the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations,' with the single exception stated. The phrase 'such regulations' plainly refers to regulations of the same general character that the legislature of the State is authorized to prescribe with respect to congressional elections. In exercising this power, the Congress may supplement these State regulations or may substitute its own. It may impose additional penalties for the violation of the State laws or provide independent sanctions. It has a general supervisory power over the whole subject."

In enacting a sixth-grade standard for literacy as regards Federal elections, Congress would simply be exercising its "general supervisory power" to assure that State officials in the performance of their duties under State law also did their duty as regards the United States.

These provisions—the power of Congress to enforce the 15th and 14th amendments and the power of Congress to provide for the manner in which elections are held, plus the "necessary and proper" powers—provide an adequate legal basis for enactment of H.R. 548.

I also commend to the committee for its prompt consideration, H.R. 543. This bill would make it unlawful for hotels, restaurants, theaters, parks, or other public or semi-public places as well as public transportation facilities to discriminate against any member of the Armed Forces of the United States because of race, color, or creed. It subjects proprietors, managers, and employees of such facilities to criminal penalties for discrimination directed against members of the uniformed services.

We have an obligation to protect our service men and women from the insults of racial bias. The necessity for Federal action in this regard does not have to be labored, it is obvious to all.

Mr. Chairman, I am told that 1963 is a vintage year. The 88th Congress has it within its power to make it a vintage year for constitutional rights. Let us pour some new legislative wine into these old bottles.

WATER POLLUTION: A SERIOUS NATIONAL PROBLEM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDowell] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, water pollution has become a serious national problem. It is bad enough when people have to resort to buying bottled water in order to get a drink of water free of industrial waste and sediment. But now, we are told by the official West German Institute for Water, Soil, and Air Hygiene, that it has found indications of cancer-producing detergents in the water supply.

Scientists in the Taft Sanitary Engineering Center in Cincinnati have reported on the consequences arising out of the use of such contaminated water.

Senator Gaylord Nelson, of Wisconsin, is to be congratulated for introducing a bill to set standards that detergents must meet including solubility. His bill takes advantage of the fact that new processes have been developed which would produce soluble detergents. These processes have been pioneered in West Germany where the Parliament had to outlaw insoluble detergents because that nation's principal rivers, including the Rhine, had become piled high with foam.

I include as part of my remarks an article by Marquis Childs on this subject:

SENATOR NELSON OPENS WAR ON DETERGENTS

(By Marquis Childs)

When they returned recently from their recess within a recess a number of Members of Congress reported they found people back home interested not in Laos or Cuba or even in the Rockefeller marriage and how it may affect the presidential race next year but in something much more immediate. That is how they can be sure of getting a drink of relatively unpolluted water when they turn on the tap.

Pollution of the water supply is becoming a serious problem in area after area. In many communities those who can afford it are buying bottled water. They are becoming accustomed to seeing a deposit of sediment from water out of the tap run into bathtubs and dishpans.

This has a direct bearing on conservation and the survival of fish and game. But as hundreds of newly developed chemical compounds are dumped into streams in industrial waste and used with a heavy hand in insect sprays it is a factor of still undetermined significance in the health of human beings. And as compared to the thousands of scientists at work developing new chemicals and pesticides very little is being done about this wholesale pollution of the environment.

A principal source that has been building up during the past 15 years is the chemical detergents used by millions of housewives in automatic dishwashers. Today 4 billion pounds of detergent a year are used. This chemical dissolves in water only very gradually and so, as it is dumped into sewage systems that in turn pour into streams and rivers, it is a more or less permanent cause of pollution.

Senator GAYLORD NELSON, Democrat, of Wisconsin, has put in a bill which would set standards that detergent manufacturers must meet after 1965. New processes are available which at little additional cost would produce soluble detergents. This has been proved out in West Germany which pioneered the chemical detergents. There the Parliament outlawed insoluble detergents after a certain date when it was shown that even principal rivers, such as the Rhine, were piled high with detergent foam.

NELSON, who as Governor pushed through a $50 million conservation program to preserve the great recreation resources of his State, told the Senate that chemical detergents had been found to have polluted the underground water in 64 of Wisconsin's 72 counties. He punctured the idea that this was a State problem which could be handled by the State, pointing out that underground water supplies following mysterious underground routes lead for hundreds of miles in all directions from Wisconsin rivers.

He called attention to the effect of detergent foam in clogging sewage plants. This foam becomes impregnated with a high bacteria count and carried by the wind it becomes an immediate health hazard. As early as 1950 the Wisconsin State Board of Health reported a wall of foam on the Mississippi River in western Wisconsin 15 feet high, 35 feet wide, and 300 feet long. Some years later helicopters had to be used to blow away foam on the Baraboo River in searching for a lost boy.

The official West German institute for water, soil and air hygiene reported last year finding indications of cancer-producing effects of detergents in the water supply. This is, of course only a tentative finding. But it suggests the unknowns in the release of a vast new volume of chemicals in man's environment.

A few scientists in the Taft Sanitary Engineering Center in Cincinnati have been studying the effects of detergent pollution. In a recent report they pointed out how dire the consequences can be as virtually all of this material finds its way into surface and ground water. Since with the population explosion water supplies must be used over and over, the cumulative volume of detergents can be an ever-increasing menace unless it is checked.

Only the more dramatic instances get into the news. In Suffolk County, N.Y., the tap water came out foaming like beer. At one point the Federal Housing Administration refused to insure mortgages because the quality of well water showed the long-term effects of detergents from septic tank effluent.

NELSON, a freshman Senator, is convinced there is a large body of public opinion deeply concerned about pollution of the air and water and ready to respond to leadership seeking to save what is left of the American heritage and to protect defenseless individuals from poisons discharged at random into the environment. In introducing his detergent bill, he spoke of a battle to preserve the simplest basic elements necessary to human survival. This is a line that may have far more political appeal than is realized here.

HANFORD ELECTRIC GENERATION BONDS: CONFIDENCE IN PROJECT SHOWN BY LOW INTEREST BID ON BONDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, last year Congress authorized the Washington Public Power Supply System to build the Hanford project to put waste heat to work producing electricity at the Atomic Energy Commission's new plutonium production reactor in the State of Washington.

This congressional action came only after extended debate on the merits of the proposal of public agencies in the Pacific Northwest to create the world's largest atomic powerplant. Even after legislation was passed permitting implementation of the plan, opponents hinted darkly that its financial feasibility made doubtful eventual construction of the generating facilities.

Yesterday bids were opened on $122 million of Hanford project revenue bonds. Four bids were received. Bidders and net interest costs included: William S. Morris & Co., 3.2601 percent; Halsey, Stuart & Co., 3.31 percent; Smith, Barney & Co., First Boston Corp., Blyth & Co., White, Weld & Co., and associates, 3.333 percent; and John Nuveen & Co., B. J. Van Ingren & Co. and associates, 3.344 percent.

Mr. Speaker, these bids are significant on several counts.

First, this was the largest strictly municipal revenue bond issue ever put up for sale at competitive bidding. Involved were $59,590,000 of serial bonds with a variety of coupons, and $62,410,000 of term bonds with a 3.25-percent coupon.

Second, interest rates by all four bidders were far below those utilized in original economic feasibility studies of the Hanford project. A net interest cost of 4 percent was assumed in initial studies which found the plant fully feasible and a self-liquidating investment on this basis. Later investigations employed a more realistic 3⅝ interest figure. But events have proved even this lower estimate too cautious. Actual low bid on the Hanford bonds was 3.2601 percent. Even the high bid of 3.344 percent was considerably beneath the latest prebid estimate.

Third, four major firms or syndicates bid for the Hanford bonds, indicating the attractive nature of the offering. Each of the four bidders at the sale was required to post a "good faith" check equal to 1 percent of the $122 million issue, or $1,220,000—another indication of the high interest created by the Hanford bonds.

The low-interest costs associated with the Hanford revenue bond issue were perhaps foreshadowed by the financial community's response to revenue notes offered by Washington Public Power Supply System in November 1962, for interim funding of the project. Seattle Trust & Savings Bank obtained those notes on a bid of 1.895 percent—an amazingly low figure.

Feasibility of the Hanford plant was further enhanced by a 35-percent saving over estimates on the cost of turbine generators. General Electric Co. was awarded an $18,200,000 contract to build the two steam-turbine generators for the 800,000-kilowatt plant—almost $10 million less than the sum of $28 million which had been allocated to cover this expense. A byproduct was reduction of the bond issue from $130 million to $122 million.

When the Hanford power was offered to prospective power purchasers, a total of 76 public agencies, rural electric cooperatives, and private power companies oversubscribed the project output by requesting more than 168 percent of the plant's output.

Consumer-owned systems numbering 71 in 4 States asked for 118.01 percent of the power. However, under the statute authorizing non-Federal development of the project by the Washington Public Power Supply System, 50 percent of the power was offered to "private organizations." Five private power companies each requested 10 percent of the output, equivalent to their full 50-percent share, and the share of consumer-owned systems was reduced proportionately.

Mr. Speaker, this was a good project to begin with, and it is getting better all the time. As Under Secretary of the Interior James K. Carr said recently:

> It is my opinion that the Hanford project power bonds represent one of the finest

financial opportunities ever offered to private capital through the bond market. My judgment is based on the belief that the Hanford power bonds are backed by the criteria that make for a high-quality security. More to the point, there is a ready market for the power; there is a highly diversified sharing of risk; and the project has had the advantage of the best engineering and technical brainpower in America.

Yesterday hardheaded financiers—men prepared to back their opinions with cold cash—gave the ultimate judgment on the financial feasibility of the Hanford project. The institutions represented in the bidding are not in business to back good causes. They seek to invest money in ideas which will return a profit—and they backed Hanford. They recognized a sound proposal, and sought to participate in its implementation.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at the end of these remarks for the information of the House a copy of a news story in the Wall Street Journal of May 9, 1963, headed "W. S. Morris Wins Washington State Power Unit Bonds" together with the text of an address of April 19, 1963, by Under Secretary of the Interior James K. Carr.

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 9, 1963]

W. S. MORRIS WINS WASHINGTON STATE POWER UNIT BONDS

William S. Morris & Co., bidding alone, again surprised the financial community by winning Washington Public Power Supply System's $122 million of Hanford project electric revenue bonds.

An annual net interest cost of 3.2601 percent was produced for the Washington State agency by the relatively small New York municipal bond concern's bid of 98 for $59,590,000 of serial bonds with a variety of coupons and $62,410,000 of term bonds with a 3¼ percent coupon.

FEDERAL UNIT APPROVES

Net interest costs bid by the three rival syndicates include: Halsey, Stuart & Co. and associates, 3.31 percent; Smith, Barney & Co., First Boston Corp., Blyth & Co., White, Weld & Co. and associates, 3.333 percent and John Nuveen & Co., B. J. Van Ingen & Co. and associates, 3.344 percent.

The Bonneville Power Administration joined with the Washington State agency in accepting the Morris bid. Approval of the award by Bonneville was necessary since Bonneville, a Federal power marketing agency, will be a prime distributor of electricity produced at the Hanford project of the WPPSS.

Dillon, Read & Co., consultants to Bonneville Power, recommended acceptance of the Morris bid. Each of the four bidders at the sale was required to post a "good faith" check equal to 1 percent of the $122 million offering, or $1,220,000.

The offering ranks as the largest municipal issue to reach the market since March 12, when Illinois sold $150 million of general obligation bonds. It was the largest strictly municipal revenue issue ever put up for sale at competitive bidding.

Proceeds from the sale will finance an 800,000-kilowatt atomic electric plant at Hanford, Wash. The project, planned for completion in October 1965, will operate on steam from a new Atomic Energy Commission reactor being built to make plutonium, which is used in atomic weapons.

The issue represents by far the biggest bond purchase on record for the Morris firm. The New York concern and its principal partner, Morris, first came into prominence in August 1961 by winning $100 million California school bonds in competition with a Bank of America syndicate.

WON VETERANS' BONDS

Mr. Morris, who bids alone, repeated a month later by winning $100 million California veterans' bonds, also in competition with Bank of America and associates. Subsequent Morris bids for major California State issues have been topped by rival bidders, mostly Bank of America groups.

A "surprise" Morris bid for the $150 million Illinois offering of March 12 was topped by a bid from a "Chicago bank" group headed by Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago.

The Morris firm scaled the $59,590,000 of Hanford project serial bonds on the public reoffering at prices to yield from 2.25 percent for bonds maturing September 1, 1967, to 3.25 percent for those due September 1, 1986. The $62,410,000 of 3¼ percent term bonds were priced at 98, to yield 3.35 percent to maturity on September 1, 1996.

A SLUGGISH START

But unlike the two $100 million California offerings purchased by the Morris organization in 1961, both of which were quickly grabbed up by investors, yesterday's offering made a sluggish start in the retail market. "We still have an unsold balance of about $107 million left," Mr. Morris said late in the day.

He estimated his gross profit at $1,440,000 if all the bonds can be sold at list prices and his possible net profit at $600,000. He also conceded the possibility of heavy losses in the event sale of the bonds remains sluggish and it is necessary to sell them at reduced prices later.

The Morris firm was estimated to have netted a profit of about $1 million from its first California bond venture and about $700,000 from its second. A factor said to have been important in Mr. Morris' decision to bid for the first $100 million California offering was the small $100,000 "good faith" check required by the State.

COMPLETELY ASTONISHED

Commenting on yesterday's surprise maneuver, Mr. Morris said: "We didn't have any occasion to go around Wall Street telling everybody we were bidding, so naturally it was a surprise. We did tell some officials of the Washington Power System, though. I figure the municipal market is rising and I thought I'd go out and get the bonds."

"We raised our eyebrows when we heard Morris had bid and we were completely astonished minutes later when it turned out he was best bidder," a member of one of the rival syndicates said. "All I can say is that it was a hectic morning and we're disappointed."

A member of another syndicate said, "Bill Morris is gambling heavily on the possibility the municipal bond market will rise over the next few weeks."

WPPSS, a group of Washington State public power agencies, accepted as paying agents for the bonds Franklin National Bank of Long Island, New York, the principal paying agent; Harris Trust & Savings Bank, Chicago, and Seattle First National Bank, Seattle.

Five private utilities and 71 public power agencies will purchase power from the Hanford project at a rate sufficient to pay operational costs and debt service.

ADDRESS BY JAMES K. CARR, UNDER SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR, PORTLAND, OREG., APRIL 19, 1963

Not many months ago if someone had predicted we would be here this evening at such a meeting, considering the sale of Hanford power project bonds, he would have been dismissed with a shrug as a chimerical dreamer. Less than a year ago the proposal was so snarled in bitter, political controversy that to expect any ready, reasonable solution bordered on indulgence in sheer fantasy. For some of you to be here it should be exciting like coming into the last act of the play just before the curtain falls. It isn't a tragedy. This story ends well.

One thing sure, it is to the great credit of many Members of the Congress, President Kennedy and his administration, representatives of privately owned and publicly owned power suppliers, several individuals, and particularly Owen Hurd and Charles F. Luce, that we are meeting tonight. For ours is the purpose of moving forward toward an outstanding national conservation achievement.

Production of power with Hanford stream is now a real, live, program to utilize valuable energy and prevent inexcusable waste. You are being given an attractive opportunity to participate in this tremendously worthwhile effort.

You will recall that the Congress rejected the Hanford steam electric plant when it was first proposed as an all-Federal project. The Washington Public Power Supply System, under the able leadership of Owen Hurd, stepped forward with the proposal, now written into law, for harnessing the byproduct steam from the new Hanford production reactor, and prevented what would have been a shameful waste of the Nation's energy resources. It will add more than 900,000 kilowatts of firm capacity to the Pacific Northwest Power System.

Devoted and dogged, Owen Hurd, his associates, many citizens from all walks in the Pacific Northwest and particularly Member's of its Congressional delegation on both sides of the aisle—Senator JACKSON, first and foremost, Senator MAGNUSON, Congresswoman HANSEN, Congresswoman MAY, and Congressman WESTLAND—deserve a full measure of gratitude from the people of the Pacific Northwest and the Nation for conserving and putting this extremely valuable resource to work in the public interest. Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, of California, then chairman, Congressman CRAIG HOSMER, and others on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, also merit a considerable share of the credit. The dedication of these men and women and their final victory is an inspiration to those of us in the public service.

All requirements of the authorizing legislation have been met. In a little over 6 months since the Hanford steam electric plant was authorized, the Washington Public Power Supply System, the Bonneville Power Administration, the Atomic Energy Commission, and their consultants have been working virtually around the clock to bring us to this point where, in a short 3 weeks, revenue bonds in the amount of $122 million will be offered for sale. This is where you as financiers come in.

In making your own decisions on the bond proposal, you will consider a number of factors. Although engineering and financial analyses are far more important, one factor in analyzing a proposal which involves the Federal Government so heavily is the attitude or guiding philosophy of the incumbent administration.

Let me speak briefly regarding the objectives and general guidelines of the Kennedy administration's power marketing program and its national electric energy goals as set forth by Secretary Udall based on policy established by the Congress.

Together with the Federal Power Commission and the other independent agencies involved, we in the Department under President Kennedy's leadership wish to encourage and assure construction of the most efficient electrical generating and transmission system that modern technology can help us achieve. The achievement of this highly efficient and necessary electric system requires the construction of larger and larger thermal electric plants serving, where feasible, the needs of one or more or several utilities. There must also be full development of the Nation's remaining, renewable hydro resources wherever practicable. The administration's goal requires the interconnection of systems between various areas and regions to take advantage of time changes, weather differences, resulting in diversity of peak loads. The program demands the use of extra-high-voltage transmission systems, including the use of extra-high-voltage direct current lines where feasible to reduce transmission costs and save land with smaller right-of-way requirements. The full and final spirit in which we should turn to our task is to strive for the utmost efficiency in design and operation of existing and future facilities, bringing scientific and technical advances to bear in the fundamental effort to drive down the cost of electric power to the consumer. Isolated power systems with "tea kettle" size generation have no place in the new era where electric energy so vitally affects our way of life.

In the next 20 years privately owned and publicly owned agencies will have to invest an estimated $125 to $130 billion in new generating and transmission facilities. This will include primarily investment by the privately owned utility industry of the Nation, which accounts for 80 percent of the power suppliers. In addition, it will involve the publicly owned system—Federal and non-Federal. Any saving we can make by greater efficiency as we face this tremendous investment means possible savings to the power users of billions of dollars. The ultimate goal is lower cost power to the power user. This is a prerequisite for an expanding economy in the United States and will assist us in competing successfully in the markets of the world.

Secretary Udall has repeatedly said that the job should be tackled by publicly owned and privately owned utility systems in the spirit of "competitive cooperation." This will require a lot of patience, a great deal of understanding, but basically a realization that all utilities exist because of the service they render to the public. There is not room for venomous controversy over philosophy. That is a luxury paid for by the power users which we cannot afford. Toward that desirable goal of low-cost power through cooperation, although the system suffers some imperfections, we in the Department of the Interior intend to use our energies to preserve the diversity of ownership of utilities which is the traditional American system. This pattern of private and public utility ownership has served successfully in building the greatest power generation and distribution system in the world.

It has produced the necessary power to meet the Nation's growing needs. It provides competition in a service that is of its nature, monopolistic. We firmly believe that although the trend in many parts of the world is toward greater government ownership of power generation and transmission facilities, there is no necessity for significantly changing the pattern of utility ownership in the United States. And that means public power agencies have and will continue to serve a very useful purpose in the national interest.

The Pacific Northwest's history is a good example of why we think this way. In the Pacific Northwest, publicly owned and privately owned suppliers are learning to pool their resources, and to interconnect the systems. It's just good engineering. In this way, they live together, prosper together, and build their region economically together.

All utilities in the region are interconnected hydraulically and electrically through the Northwest power pool. A Federal agency, the Bonneville Power Administration provides the backbone grid for the Northwest power pool. The power grid is interconnected at nearly 500 points with the non-Federal utilities. Bonneville "wheels" non-Federal power over its lines, and the non-Federal utilities, both public and private, "wheel" Federal power over their lines. Through an unparalleled and high degree of coordination and cooperation, the electric utilities of this region, by taking advantage of diversity of loads, are able to squeeze more than 1 million additional kilowatts out of existing hydroplants.

The region to date has been almost totally dependent on hydroelectric power, largely for two reasons. First, it is blessed with the greatest power producing river in America—the Columbia. Second, it has no proven reserves of oil or gas, and only limited deposits of high-grade coal. Because a river must be developed not only for power, but for flood control, irrigation, navigation, recreation, and other purposes for which there is no return for private investment, the bulk of the job of developing the Columbia has been done by the Federal Government. Power pays its full share and much of irrigation's share, about 80 percent of the total cost.

Federal power is sold through the Bonneville Power Administration—about 40 percent to publicly owned utilities, about 15 percent to privately owned utilities, about 30 percent to the aluminum industry and about 15 percent to other industries and Federal agencies. The Bonneville Power Administration markets about 60 percent of the power in the region. Except for one State—Washington—the majority of the customers in the Bonneville Power Administration marketing area are served by private utilities.

And here in the region, family use of electric power is among the highest in the Nation—over 10,000 kilowatt-hours per residence compared to the national average of about 4,000 kilowatt-hours. Rates, both public and private, are among the lowest.

The Federal Government has 6½ million kilowatts of installed capacity in the Northwest, with another 3½ million kilowatts under construction or authorized. When fully installed, this 10 million kilowatt capacity will represent a Federal investment of about $2.6 billion in generation, plus $800 million in transmission. The non-Federal utilities, public and private, have nearly 5 million kilowatts of installed capacity in the same region, and more than 2½ million kilowatts under construction or licensed, exclusive of the Hanford steamplant. This represents an investment of more than $2 billion for non-Federal generation in the region. Much of the power output of the local public utilities has been contracted for by the private utilities of the Pacific Northwest.

Without question, one of the finest examples of cooperation between public and private power, here in the Northwest or in the Nation, involves the Hanford steamplant. It is a non-Federal project, to be financed through the sale of revenue bonds, constructed and operated by the Washington Public Power Supply System. Its output is being purchased 50 percent by 5 private utilities and 50 percent by 71 public agencies. Through a unique exchange agreement among the Washington Public Power Supply System, each of the participants and the Bonneville Power Administration, the output of the reactor is to be turned over to the Bonneville Power Administration and marketed through the Bonneville Power Administration channels.

Getting back to the specific subject of the bonds that will be offered for sale: It is my opinion that the Hanford project power bonds represent one of the finest financial opportunities ever offered to private capital through the bond market. My judgment is based on the belief that the Hanford power bonds are backed by the criteria that make for a high-quality security. More to the point, there is a ready market for the power; there is a highly diversified sharing of risk; and the project has had the advantage of the best engineering and technical brainpower in America.

I should like to elaborate:

First, there is a ready market in the region for this power. The output of the reactor was oversubscribed by the public agencies, alone, and when the private utilities contracted for their 50-percent share, the public agencies' subscriptions had to be cut back more than half. Regional load growth now is on the order of 400,000 kilowatts a year—equivalent to a new Bonneville Dam every year—and soon it will be 600,000 kilowatts annually. Without the Hanford steamplant, the region would have faced a power shortage in late 1965 and 1966, because no major source of new hydropower is scheduled to come on the line until mid-1967. Hanford power, during the dual-purpose stage, will cost less than power from alternative sources and, during the single-purpose stage, the cost will be comparable to that of the modern steam-electric plants.

Second, it is a worthy security because of the highly diversified risk-sharing among responsible utilities. Seventy-six participants with total assets of $2.4 billion, including five privately-owned utilities, have pledged to pay all costs of the project in return for receiving its entire output. The contractual arrangements underlying this security are much the same as those for the Priest Rapids, Rocky Reach, Wanapum and Wells Dams, where the power was sold on a "slice-of-the-cake" basis, and the price paid by each purchaser was based on an equivalent share of the total costs of the project.

There is, however, this important difference in the case of the Hanford project. In my judgment it makes the Hanford project securities even more attractive. Each purchaser of Hanford power has been given and has accepted, the opportunity to exchange its share of Hanford's electrical output for a quantity of Bonneville-generated electricity delivered at its load centers. The exchange account is settled by applying standard Bonneville rates to the billing which the party to the exchange has received for its share of Hanford power. Stated another way, the exchange contract between Bonneville and each purchaser of Hanford power guarantees the purchaser that for the sum it pays each month to the Washington Public Power Supply System for Hanford power it will receive from Bonneville, at its load centers, the amount of firm power that sum would purchase under Bonneville standard rates. Bonneville is obligated to supply the power and energy to the participant regardless of whether the Hanford project is actually generating energy. The exchange agreement remains in effect until the bonds are retired.

The participating utilities are presently buying about 40 percent of their power from Bonneville. Hanford power, in turn, represents less than 40 percent of the kilowatt-hours they purchase from Bonneville, and only about 15 percent of the total kilowatt-hours they use.

Third, this project has had the best engineering and technical brainpower in America behind it from its conception 10 years ago by General Electric engineers. The whole complex of General Electric engineering know-how has been and is being applied to this project—the reactor, itself, and the steamplant—through design, production, and construction stages. Two outstanding consultant firms, Burns & Roe, for powerplant and reactor design, and R. W. Beck & Associates, utility analysts, have been advising the Washington Public Power Supply System. Bonneville engineers have reviewed all stages of design, and the Atomic Energy Commission's experts have stayed on top of this project from the beginning.

The Hanford power project of the Washington Public Power Supply System will become a reality because, despite powerful opposition, it is a project so undeniably sound, so urgently needed, so sensible that when the true facts became known it received the approval of the Congress of the United States. The battle for conservation at Hanford will live as a symbol of the people's defiantly determined effort to conserve and prevent the waste of energy resources. To the world it is a symbol of this Nation's ability to use nuclear power for peaceful purposes. The Hanford plant will be the world's largest nuclear steam-electric plant. The investor, as I said at the outset, is being given an attractive opportunity to participate in this conservation achievement in an investment for the future of the Pacific Northwest and for the future of America.

In closing, I should like to say this. In terms of larger generating plants, pooling of power, interconnection of regional power systems, use of direct-current transmission lines, where feasible, the Nation has a magnificent opportunity to demonstrate true conservation and exhibit its determination to make a more efficient use of its abundant, yet limited energy resources.

People are becoming increasingly aware what is being accomplished in the Pacific Northwest and specifically at Hanford. In the light of that enlightenment, I hope we are at the break of day when agreement will soon be reached on the manner of providing extra high-voltage transmission lines to link the Pacific Northwest and the Pacific Southwest. These will help assure that the cost of electric power to the ultimate consumer will be as low as possible, consistent with sound business principles. And this is in accord with the national power policy as it has been repeatedly set forth by the Congress of the United States.

We are striving to carry out that policy in the national interest. You and your business associates are being given an opportunity to participate.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BEERMANN (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), for the remainder of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for the remainder of the week, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. MORRIS, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. RYAN of New York, for 5 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. BROOMFIELD (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska), for 45 minutes, on Monday, May 13.

Mr. HOLIFIELD (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 30 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SIKES (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 15 minutes, Monday, May 13, 1963, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HAWKINS.

Mr. COOLEY.

Mr. TOLLEFSON.

Mr. TAFT.

Mr. LINDSAY.

Mr. COHELAN to revise and extend his remarks and to include an article in remarks made by him in Committee of the Whole today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania.

Mr. MULTER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MORSE.

Mr. CURTIS.

Mr. WESTLAND.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 138. An act to redesignate the Big Hole Battlefield National Monument, to revise the boundaries thereof, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 199. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans having the service-connected disability of deafness of both ears;

H.R. 211. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide increases in rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to children and parents of deceased veterans; and

H.R. 214. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans suffering the loss or loss of use of both vocal cords, with resulting complete aphonia.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 13, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

782. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize additional Assistant Secretaries in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to assist the Secretary in the efficient administration of the Department"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

783. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the rehabilitation of Guam, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

784. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to improve the financing of the civil service retirement system"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

785. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the voluntary election by employees of annual premium compensation instead of the saved pay rate"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 340. Resolution granting additional travel authority to the Committee on Education and Labor; without amendment (Rept. No. 283). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 3191. A bill to exempt life insurance companies from the act of February 4, 1913, regulating loaning of money on securities in the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 285). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 4273. A bill to amend section 207, title 31, of the District of Columbia Code of 1961, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 286). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 4274. A bill to amend section 103, title 31, of the District of Columbia Code of 1961, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 287). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 5860. A bill to amend section 407 of the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 284). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 4276. A bill to provide for the creation of horizontal property regimes in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 288). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FOUNTAIN:

H.R. 6195. A bill to amend section 314 of the Public Health Service Act, by providing greater flexibility to States in the use of certain public health grants-in-aid, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 6196. A bill to encourage increased consumption of cotton, to maintain the income of cotton producers, to provide a special research program designed to lower costs of production, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROMWELL:

H.R. 6197. A bill to revive and reenact as amended the act entitled "An act creating the City of Clinton Bridge Commission and authorizing said commission and its successors to acquire by purchase or condemnation and to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at or near Clinton, Iowa, and at or near

Fulton, Ill", approved December 21, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 6198. A bill creating the Dubuque Bridge Commission and authorizing said commission and its successors to acquire by purchase or condemnation and to construct, maintain and operate a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Dubuque, Iowa, Grant County, Wis., and Jo Daviess County, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H.R. 6199. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact of agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 6200. A bill to amend section 212 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the deduction of certain expenses paid or incurred in a search for a business or investment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6201. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to prevent duplication of benefits based on disability in cases where the disabled individual receives workmen's compensation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6202. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to give the States the right of appeal from administrative decisions of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in connection with State plans under the public assistance titles of such act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6203. A bill to authorize the establishment of an International Home Loan Bank to assist in the development of savings associations and building societies in countries where they do not now exist in order to accomplish improved living standards, to increase employment, and to better social and political conditions through facilities for savings and homeownership for the millions of people of modest but stable earning capacity; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 6204. A bill to authorize the establishment of an International Home Loan Bank to assist in the development of savings associations and building societies in countries where they do not now exist in order to provide improved living standards and housing conditions in the form of individual ownership, to increase employment and to better social and political conditions and develop free enterprise in place of socialism through facilities for savings and homeownership for the millions of people of modest but stable earning capacity, in order that these countries and their people might benefit from the blessings of our form of economic opportunity; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 6205. A bill to amend section 312 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that leukemia developing a 10-percent degree of disability after separation from the service shall be considered to be service connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FOUNTAIN:

H.R. 6206. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an increase in the amount for which a credit may be allowed against the Federal estate tax for estate taxes paid to States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 6207. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an increase in the amount for which a credit may be allowed against the Federal estate tax for estate taxes paid to States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 6208. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 6209. A bill to prohibit the use of measuring devices to measure the work of an individual employee in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

H.R. 6210. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to prohibit the use of the term "mahogany" in connection with woods and other products which are not in fact mahogany; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 6211. A bill to extend for 2 years the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, which relate to Federal assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.R. 6212. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 6213. A bill to establish the Fire Island National Seashore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BURTON:

H.R. 6214. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 6215. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to provide that only lumber and other wood products which have been produced in the United States may be used in construction or rehabilitation covered by Federal Housing Administration insured mortgages; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 6216. A bill to amend section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to provide for the carriage of lumber by U.S.-flag commercial vessels or by vessels of the country of origin of lumber; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 6217. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require certain new packages of imported articles to be marked to indicate the country of origin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTIN of California:

H.R. 6218. A bill to amend the act of June 29, 1960, to authorize additional extensions of time for final proof by certain entrymen under the desert land laws and to make such additional extensions available to the successors of such entrymen; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 6219. A bill to continue for 2 years the existing reduction of the exemption from duty enjoyed by returning residents, and to limit the exemption to articles accompanying such residents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 6220. A bill to amend the Clayton Act to prohibit restraints of trade carried into effect through the use of unfair and deceptive methods of packaging or labeling certain consumer commodities distributed in commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 6221. A bill to amend the Area Redevelopment Act to clarify the areas which may be designated as redevelopment areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 6222. A bill relating to the Federal share of the cost of certain Federal-aid highway projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 6223. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a program in five areas of the United States to increase usable precipitation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 6224. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to permit the sale of cotton acreage allotments under specified circumstances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H.R. 6225. A bill to provide for the rehabilitation of Guam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 6226. A bill to protect consumers and others against misbranding, false invoicing, and false advertising of decorative wood and simulated wood products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.J. Res. 403. Joint resolution to amend section 316 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to extend the time by which a lease transferring tobacco acreage allotment may be filed; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CLAUSEN:

H.J. Res. 404. Joint resolution requesting and authorizing the President to impose an immediate 10 percent emergency quota on all imports of softwood lumber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H. Con. Res. 151. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to present before the United Nations the question of the enslavement of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia with a view to obtaining their independence and the return of their peoples; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H. Con. Res. 152. Concurrent resolution favoring an agreement among states of the Near East prohibiting the production of nuclear weapons and offensive missiles; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TOLL:

H. Res. 341. Resolution for Arab-Israel peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 342. Resolution for Arab-Israel peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 343. Resolution authorizing the printing of eulogies delivered in the House of Representatives as a tribute to Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt as a House document, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting Congress to continue and increase support of the East-West Center, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 6227. A bill for the relief of Aldo Casole; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H.R. 6228. A bill for the relief of Casimiro Giurici; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 6229. A bill for the relief of Phillip Mazzella, his wife, Anna Buono Mazzella, and their minor children, Michele Mazzella and Libera Maria Mazzella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 6230. A bill for the relief of Romuald Chmura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 6231. A bill for the relief of David Hiestand; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 6232. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Katharina Raffaelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 6233. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain land of the United States to the Pascua Yaqui Association, Inc.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

117. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Boniface Espinda, deputy county clerk, Wailuku, Maui, Hawaii, requesting the Department of Defense to seriously consider relocating certain military installations and personnel from the Island of Oahu to the Island of Maui, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE

Thursday, May 9, 1963

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of grace and glory, in hours of commotion and confusion we are sure of no light but Thine, no refuge from the stormy blasts but in Thee.

To Thee who knowest the secrets of our hearts, we commit ourselves and our Nation; we lift to Thee the moral chaos of our divided world, its spiritual fatigue, its restlessness of heart, its dark forebodings.

We acknowledge our share in all that is wrong in human relationships; our love of ease, our pride of race and place and possessions. Yet with all our falling short of the mark of our high calling, we thank Thee for the disturbing vision of the agonizing needs of Thy children who share with us the good earth, and for the increasing determination of our dear land not to be disobedient to that vision splendid of a redeemed and emancipated race.

Guide us, O Thou Great Jehovah, as we fashion our policies and our actions on Thy truth that humanity is one and that Thou dost hold the whole world in Thy hands.

In the dear Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 8, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 39) designating the week of May 20–26, 1963, as National Actors' Equity Week, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2268. An act for the relief of Mrs. Geneva H. Trisler; and

H.R. 4811. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marjorie Curtis.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

H.R. 2268. An act for the relief of Mrs. Geneva H. Trisler; and

H.R. 4811. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marjorie Curtis.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS IN MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in view of the unusual circumstances, and inasmuch as it seems that at the moment the Democratic Party is in complete control, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded. [Laughter.]

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the following subcommittees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Minerals, Materials, and Fuel Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations.

The Business and Commerce Subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The Small Business Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore, laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Supplemental Report of U.S. Tariff Commission on Tariff Classification Study

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Tariff Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the third supplemental report of that Commission on the Tariff Classification Study, dated May 7, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

Report on Personal and Real Property Disposed of to Public Health and Educational Institutions

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering personal property received by State surplus property agencies for distribution to public health and educational institutions and civil defense organizations, and real property disposed of to public health and educational institutions, for the quarter ended March 31, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Admission Into the United States of Certain Defector Aliens

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting admission into the United States of certain defector aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Temporary Admission Into the United States of Certain Aliens

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report of U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report, for the fiscal year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Additional Assistant Secretaries in Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize additional Assistant Secretaries in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to assist the Secretary in the efficient administration of the Department (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Amendment of Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By Mrs. NEUBERGER:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Joint Memorial 15

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the 52d Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

"Whereas the livestock and poultry feeding industries are a vital and integral part of the economy of the State of Oregon and of the United States of America; and

"Whereas the ability of these grain-feeding livestock and poultry industries to survive and prosper in any area is heavily dependent upon the prices of grains in each and every other major grain-producing and grain-feeding area of the country; and

"Whereas through the years Federal grain programs have failed to stabilize grain price levels and relationships and have penalized some grain-feeding areas while benefiting others; and

"Whereas grain price levels and relationships are subject to moderation and are largely manageable by the programs authorized by the Congress and administered by Federal agencies; and

"Whereas grain feeders for many years have been unable to use wheat as a feed due to the relatively low prices of corn and milo: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:

"(1) The Congress of the United States is urged to:

"(a) Keep under constant scrutiny the grain price levels and relationships resulting from administrative regulations and practices of Federal agencies operating grain programs authorized by the Congress; and

"(b) Retain or enact legislative provisions necessary to establish and maintain stable and equitable price relationships among the various grains and among the major grain-producing and grain-feeding areas of the Nation.

"(2) The secretary of state shall send a copy of this memorial to the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to each member of the Oregon congressional delegation, and to the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

"Adopted by house April 9, 1963.

"Cecil L. Edwards,
"Chief Clerk of House.
"Clarence Barten,
"Speaker of House.

"Adopted by senate April 25, 1963.

"Ben Musa,
"President of Senate."

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.)

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, without amendment:

H.R. 4997. An act to extend the feed grain program (Rept. No. 172).

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that minority views on House bill 4997, the feed grains bill, may be received and printed together with the majority report. This bill was reported earlier today by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Kennedy in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment:

H.R. 4655. An act to amend title IX of the Social Security Act with respect to the amount authorized to be made available to the States out of the employment security administration account for certain administrative expenses, to reduce the rate of the Federal unemployment tax for the calendar year 1963, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 174).

By Mr. DOUGLAS, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

S. 1359. A bill to provide for an additional Assistant Secretary in the Treasury Department (Rept. No. 173).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance:

Frank H. Tuohy, of New Jersey, to be Comptroller of Customs, with headquarters at New York, N.Y.

By Mr. McNAMARA, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Arnold Ordman, of Maryland, to be General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board.

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Leland J. Haworth, of New York, to be Director of the National Science Foundation; and

Eugene A. Arnold, Jr., and sundry other candidates, for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JACKSON (by request):

S. 1495. A bill to provide for the rehabilitation of Guam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Jackson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr. Gruening):

S. 1496. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to produce and sell crude oil from the Umiat field, naval petroleum reserve No. 4, for the purpose of making local fuel available for use in connection with the drilling, mechanical and heating operations of those involved in oil and gas exploration and development work in the nearby areas outside naval petroleum reserve No. 4, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. Bartlett when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 1497. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921, so as to provide protection thereunder for industries of friendly nations with which the United States has entered into trade agreements and to provide additional bases for determining the foreign market value of merchandise imported from Communist countries; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1498. A bill to amend section 304 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 1499. A bill to amend section 5(b)(1) of the Trading With the Enemy Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1500. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to impose a limitation upon the time for the institution of deportation proceedings, and a limitation upon the time for the loss of U.S. nationality; to the Committee on Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Morse when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. Hart):

S. 1501. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to make the deportation provisions thereof inapplicable to any alien admitted for permanent residence prior to his 14th birthday or to any alien who has continuously resided in the United States for 10 years immediately following his admission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Morse when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 1502. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exempt from tax musical instruments sold to students for school use; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1503. A bill to amend section 203(a) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, with respect to the filing of schedules of charges by connecting carriers; and

S. 1504. A bill to amend section 4(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, with respect to the applicability of the conflict-of-interest provisions to persons serving in the Federal Communications Commission unit of the National Defense Executive Reserve; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. Yarborough, Mr. Javits, Mr. Clark, and Mr. Prouty):

S. 1505. A bill to amend section 33 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act so as to provide a system of safety rules, regulations, and safety inspection and training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Humphrey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mrs. NEUBERGER (for herself and Mr. Muskie):

S. 1506. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. McGEE (for himself and Mr. Simpson):

S. 1507. A bill to authorize the conveyance of a certain tract of land to the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Armed Services.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

EXPRESSION OF SENSE OF CONGRESS RELATING TO LEWIS AND CLARK TRAIL

Mr. BURDICK submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res.

40); which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the route traversed by Captains Meriwether Lewis and William Clark on their expedition of 1804–1806 from Saint Louis, Missouri, to the Pacific Northwest should, to the greatest extent feasible, be identified, marked, and kept available for the inspiration and enjoyment of the American people and that, to this end (a) all agencies of the United States which administer lands along the route of the expedition, including particularly the Departments of the Interior, Agriculture, and the Army, should act in concert to preserve and mark in an appropriate fashion the route wherever it crosses lands which they administer and to assure public access to the lands so crossed, and (b) that all States, counties, municipalities, and private parties who own land along the route or are otherwise interested in the success of this project should be invited, and they are hereby invited, to join in memorializing, preserving and marking the route of the expedition.

REHABILITATION OF GUAM

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the rehabilitation of Guam.

Mr. President, this proposed legislation has been submitted to the Congress by Executive communication, and I am happy to introduce it by request. As Senators know, Guam was struck by a devastating typhoon in November 1962, and it is the purpose of this bill to provide Federal aid in the rebuilding of the territory. The Territories Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has scheduled a hearing on the bill for Thursday, May 16, in room 3110 New Senate Office Building.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the communication from the Department of the Interior explaining in detail the purpose of the proposal may be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1495) to provide for the rehabilitation of Guam, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JACKSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The letter presented by Mr. JACKSON is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., May 7, 1963.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: Enclosed is a draft of a proposed bill "To provide for the rehabilitation of Guam, and for other purposes."

We recommend that the bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and we recommend that it be enacted.

It is the purpose of this proposed bill to provide $56 million upon which the government of Guam may draw in order to finance needed public works and community development projects. The program which is envisioned is one which is considered appropriate for a community which has just gone through a major disaster.

Twenty years ago the island of Guam became the only American community, except for the Philippine Islands, to be ravaged by war during World War II. The postwar Guam which was built on the ruins of the prewar community was a community of makeshift homes, quonset huts, and generally substandard facilities. Villages and the community grew and developed without adequate planning or provision for the utilities and sanitary facilities which we in the mainland have come to consider essential to a decent standard of living.

The weakness inherent in such development was vividly evidenced when on November 11 and 12, 1962, the island of Guam was devastated by a typhoon of unprecedented severity which inflicted extensive property damage upon the military, civilian and governmental sectors of the Guam community. Through great good fortune there was a minimum loss of life and the people of Guam are now engaged in the early stages of the tremendous task of rebuilding which lies ahead. It is our hope that this proposed bill will be enacted in order to provide them with the assistance which they require if their efforts and the efforts of the government of Guam are to be meaningful. Fortunately, the Federal Disaster Act was applicable to Guam at the time of the typhoon and the Office of Emergency Planning was quick to act to meet the immediate needs of the people immediately after the storm, and from that source there are available certain funds which will permit emergency repairs to and temporary replacement of essential public facilities damaged or destroyed in the major disaster. This is not, however, what is needed. We will have gained little if the 40,000 American citizens of the civilian community on the island of Guam are required to replace substandard homes and facilities destroyed by Typhoon Karen with new substandard homes and facilities, which will last only until the next typhoon.

The government of Guam has surveyed the needs of the civilian and governmental community of Guam and has proposed a public works and community development program which can be completed in 5 to 10 years at a cost of approximately $56 million. This program would provide modern schools, hospital, power, water, and sewer facilities, governmental buildings, and planned community development.

The government of Guam cannot finance this program itself over the proposed 5- to 10-year period. While Guam has been able in recent years to finance itself with local revenues and the proceeds of the Federal internal revenue taxes collected in Guam and retained by Guam pursuant to the provisions of the Guam Organic Act, it has not acquired a surplus which could now be utilized, nor are its annual revenues sufficient to finance the program. It is for this reason that the enclosed bill is proposed.

Section 1 of the proposed bill states the general purposes of the legislation.

Section 2 authorizes the appropriation of up to $56 million. Payments would be made to the government of Guam on the basis of requests from the Governor, and approval by the Secretary of the Interior. It is anticipated that the Secretary of the Interior will require that the Governor's request have the approval of the Guam Legislature. The section further enumerates some of the purposes for which the government of Guam may spend the money obtained.

Section 3 provides for repayment by means of withholding by the Secretary of the Treasury, from tax collections that would otherwise be paid to the government of Guam by the Secretary. In general, repayments by Guam would be at the rate of 50 percent of its advances, except that the rate of 100 percent would apply with respect to advances for power, water, or telephone projects, because they are by nature self-liquidating, and 100 percent would also apply with respect to sums advanced to Guam for purposes of permitting it to qualify under Federal grant-in-aid programs. Guam would be expressly permitted under section 2 of the bill to obtain funds under the act so that it could match, by whatever formula is pertinent, Federal funds available for particular programs in Guam, and these amounts would be required by section 3 to be repaid at the 100 percent rate.

The 100-percent repayment provision is not intended to apply to funds advanced to Guam under section of the bill merely because they finance activities that supplement or expand activities financed pursuant to the Federal disaster relief program (64 Stat. 1109, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 1855).

Repayment would be effected over a 30-year period beginning July 1, 1968, with the rate of repayment determined by the Secretary of the Interior. Interest would be required to be paid on the unpaid balance starting July 1, 1968, at a rate computed by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the average yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities as of the last day of the month preceding the advance, adjusted to the nearest one-eighth percent.

Section 4 permits the Government of Guam, on a reimbursable basis, to obtain services and facilities from Federal agencies. In the event that an agency is permitted by law to make services and facilities available to the Government of Guam without reimbursement, it would continue to be authorized to do so.

Section 5 provides that borrowings by the Government of Guam under the proposed bill would not be regarded as public indebtedness, for purposes of the Organic Act provision which limits Guam's public indebtedness to 10 percent of the aggregate tax valuation of property in Guam.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that the enactment of this legislation would be consistent with the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN A. CARVER,
Acting Secretary of the Interior.

ARCTIC OIL DEVELOPMENT VITAL TO ALASKA AND THE NATION

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, in behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and myself, I introduce a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to produce and sell crude oil from the Umiat field, naval petroleum reserve No. 4, with the purpose of making local fuel available for limited use in oil and gas exploration now being carried on in neighboring areas.

The Navy's oil reserves at Umiat are deep within the Arctic Circle literally hundreds of miles from a town or city.

In recent years, geologists have come to believe that the Arctic slopes may be rich in great resources of oil and natural gas. Oil companies are exploring and developing these Federal lands, and hopes are expressed that before too many years a producing field will be a reality in the Arctic.

The potential is extraordinary but unfortunately the costs of exploration in the Arctic are extraordinary too. All equipment, men, and fuel must be flown in. The temperatures may be low but the prices are sky high. A barrel of oil selling for $3 in Anchorage will cost in excess of $35 at Umiat. This oil is vital for drilling and heating purposes. Without it, to drive the diesel-powered drilling equipment and to heat the machines and the men who run them exploration work would be impossible.

At the present time, today, at Umiat there are two unused Navy wells in operating condition. These wells could produce quantities of crude oil tomorrow. The drilling rig, the pumping unit, and the diesel engine are installed at the wellhead. The only thing missing is the fuel pump which has been removed to prevent unauthorized borrowing of the oil. A new fuel pump costs $32.

The oil is there, but the Navy is not authorized to sell it. At the present time law provides that the Navy may sell oil from its petroleum reserves only if the Secretary of the Navy recommends to the President and the President finds that such sale is in the interest of national defense and the Congress by joint resolution so approves the sale. It is true that law provides for the production of oil for reasons of conservation, maintenance, and testing of the reserves. None of the reasons, however, would cover the sale of oil to companies engaged in oil exploration activities.

The bill which I am introducing today would allow the Navy to do so.

The availability of reasonably priced crude oil in the Umiat area would go a long way to encourage the development of a producing commercial oil field in the region. I cannot underestimate, Mr. President, the importance which such a producing field would have to the economy and development of the State of Alaska.

The sale of Umiat oil would be made at no cost to the Government. So that the Government may receive a profit on the operation, it is contemplated that the oil would be sold in the ground with the purchaser being obliged to produce it from existing productive wells for limited use and only for companies exploring in the area. The sale would be through competitive bids and all proceeds would be deposited directly in the Treasury. All proceeds would be clear profit to the Government.

There would be a sliding price scale written into the contract in order that there would be no excessive profits, and the sales contract, of course, would be made only after consultation with the Armed Services Committees of both Houses of Congress.

There is no intention of putting the Navy in the selling business, in competition with private enterprise. First, disposition of the oil is to be made only in the immediate area of Umiat and only for the purpose of supporting oil exploration operations. Second, the authority to make such sales is to expire January 1, 1969. It is not contemplated in this bill that the Navy should have any but temporary authority to sell oil. The bill would, in fact, be of major benefit to the Navy. It now holds title to the vast oil reserves of the Umiat field in naval petroleum reserve No. 4. It is, however, unable to make use of the field because there are no means or methods of transporting the oil from Umiat to a place of use. Should a major commercial oil field develop in the area—and that is what this bill looks for—the producing oil companies would no doubt construct a pipeline and pumping equipment to get their product to market. This equipment and pipeline would be available to the Navy in time of emergency or perhaps even on a regular basis. This would substantially increase the value of the Umiat oil reserves to the Navy.

Mr. President, no opposition to the proposal has been expressed from any direction. It is my earnest hope that this legislation will be approved in this session of Congress.

I ask that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1496) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to produce and sell crude oil from the Umiat field, naval petroleum reserve No. 4, for the purpose of making local fuel available for use in connection with the drilling, mechanical and heating operations of those involved in oil and gas exploration and development work in the nearby areas outside naval petroleum reserve No. 4, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr. GRUENING), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, until January 1, 1969, the Secretary of the Navy may, under subsection (a) of section 7422 of title 10, United States Code, produce and sell petroleum from the Umiat field, naval petroleum reserve numbered 4, for the purpose of aiding petroleum exploration and development in the nearby areas outside naval petroleum reserve numbered 4.

LEGISLATION RELATING TO EAST-WEST TRADE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, three bills to implement my report on East-West trade, which I made after returning from the Soviet Union in 1961 on a mission for the Joint Economic Committee.

As part of these overall proposals to deal with the problem of East-West trade, last year I introduced a measure to amend the Export Control Act of 1949, as amended, which has been adopted during the 2d session, 87th Congress. Through that amendment, Congress declared it to be "the policy of the United States to formulate, reformulate, and apply such controls to the maximum extent possible in cooperation with all nations with which the United States had defense treaty commitments, and to formulate a unified commercial and trading policy to be observed by the non-Communist-dominated nations or areas in their dealings with the Communist-dominated nations."

The first bill I am introducing at this time would amend the Antidumping Act of 1921, to make it more effective in preventing Soviet bloc exports from disrupting free world markets.

The second bill would amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, to provide alternative agricultural marketing and purchasing opportunities, on a cooperative basis, for free world nations which are imperiled by an overdependence on trade with the Soviet bloc.

The third bill would amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, to stress maximum cooperation with our allies in the application of emergency provisions of the act.

This proposed legislation is designed to unify trading policies, by encouraging treaties or executive agreements, among the United States and those nations with which we have defense treaty commitments, such as the NATO countries, now the principal world exporters of industrial products to the U.S.S.R., and later with other free world nations.

These treaties would deal with the extension of export credits to any or all Communist-dominated nations; alternative marketing and purchasing opportunities—including preemptive buying and stockpiling—for non-Communist-dominated nations or areas threatened by or experiencing serious economic injury as the result of the economic policies of Communist-dominated nations; contingency plans and measures to place additional restraints on, or to eliminate or increase trade with, Communist-dominated nations; and common proposals for, and means to enforce, a unified agreement with Communist-dominated nations governing the basic and specific rules of commercial and trading relations between free world nations and the Communist-dominated nations.

Mr. President, the report to which I have referred is entitled "The Political States in East-West Trade." It revealed that trade between Western Europe and the Soviet bloc nations is growing and that the Communists are taking advantage of our competitive system to bid off one individual free world businessman against the other with the result of alarming Soviet acquisitions of technological know-how and advanced equipment of all sorts.

Mr. President, I am alarmed by the widening rift in free world trade policies with the Soviet bloc. It is vitally important that whatever the nations of the free world do, we do together in East-West trade. Today Western European nations sell a great deal to the Communist bloc countries while we do not. It is time to end this contradiction in the critically important trade policy of the free world. My report was designed to try to deal with that and to offer specific proposals for legislation to try to perfect our cooperation, which is so essential in respect to the free world's relations with the Soviet bloc and for world peace.

In the measures I am introducing today, one of the amendments to the Antidumping Act would broaden the present definition of parties injured by such "dumping" in order to include industries of friendly nations—not U.S. industries alone. Therefore, sanctions of the Antidumping Act could be invoked if cutrate sales by Communist bloc countries threatened to destroy the U.S. market for the products of free world nations, in the expectation that similar measures would be enacted by other free world nations.

Section 2 of the bill would redefine the term "dumping" in such a way that this practice could be determined independently of cost and price factors prevailing in the exporting country whose commerce and internal economy is state-controlled. This is necessary, because the state-controlled economies of the Soviet bloc make it impossible to assign true costs and prices to their exports. Actually, all of their goods carry a political price tag and costs are judged by the Communists in terms of political gain. Therefore, the selling price of Soviet bloc exports must be judged in terms of free world prices for similar goods or Soviet prices to the buyers most dependent on them—whichever is the higher. This bill would focus on the politically-motivated pricing policies of the Communist bloc. Redefinition of "dumping" would set some realistic standards by which the free world could judge the pricing of Communist bloc exports and at the same time would highlight the overcharging engaged in by the Soviet Union in its exports to its satellite nations.

It should be noted that the bill goes beyond S. 1318, introduced by the distinguished Senators from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] and others on April 11. My bill would introduce the concept of reciprocity into antidumping law by protecting the markets of friendly countries in the United States and protecting our oversea markets from the threat of disruptive Soviet bloc trade practices. It places antidumping law within the framework of East-West trade policy and will add another element of strength to interallied unity.

In this connection I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention the excellent statement made by Professor Strausz-Hupé before the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary on October 26, 1962, with regard to the problem of the export of strategic materials to the U.S.S.R. and other bloc countries—see hearings pages 415-424. His statement supports my contention that the United States as well as our Western allies must develop an effective policy to meet the bloc's economic offensive. Such a policy requires a variety of tools. The three bills I am introducing today offer a variety of such tools.

There is another aspect of U.S. policy in East-West trade which requires the most careful consideration: the effect of our antitrust laws on the formation of consortia of United States business cooperating with other free world business enterprises in order to face in the markets of the world the monolithic state trading organizations of the Soviet bloc. On April 2, I introduced S. 1255, which is cosponsored by Senators COOPER, HARTKE and BREWSTER, for the establishment of a Commission on Revision of the Antitrust Laws of the United States, which would undertake a comprehensive review of the impact of our laws on this problem, among others, and of what amendments may be needed.

I emphasize to all Senators the urgency of a coordinated policy on East-West trade, which is what I seek to bring about with this series of measures. I very much hope that these bills will receive favorable attention by the Senate, as did my amendment to the Export Control Act in the last session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

S. 1497. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921, so as to provide protection thereunder for industries of friendly nations with which the United States has entered into trade agreements and to provide additional bases for determining the foreign market value of merchandise imported from Communist countries; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1498. A bill to amend section 304 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 1499. A bill to amend section 5(b)(1) of the Trading With the Enemy Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION ACT OF 1952

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, two bills amending the Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1952 by placing time limits upon the Federal Government in bringing proceedings for deportation of aliens or revocation of the citizenship of naturalized citizens.

The bills are not mutually exclusive. The enactment of both of them would mark an important advance in the procedural protection that we demand for native-born Americans, but which have not extended to persons who have long lived in the United States but who were born elsewhere.

One is a statute of limitation upon the initiation of proceedings to deport or to revoke citizenship. It is a 5-year statute of limitations. It requires the Federal Government to institute such proceedings within 5 years of the deportable act in the case of an alien, and within 5 years of the granting of final citizenship in the case of a naturalized citizen.

We have statutes of limitation for nearly all Federal crimes. It is almost uniformly a 5-year limitation. Yet in deportation proceedings, we have seen the U.S. Government go back 10, 20, or more years into a person's past to find an act for which that person can be deported. This practice works the same injustice upon the alien from which we insist native-born Americans be protected. It is the difficulty of contracting witnesses, producing evidence, recalling important events, and in general, preparing a case.

In my opinion, both aliens and naturalized citizens are entitled to this protection. An analysis prepared by the Association of the Bar of the City of New York of S. 551 of the 87th Congress summarizes the legal desirability of such a limitation. S. 551 was introduced by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. I was pleased to cosponsor it with him. It contained a 10-year limitation upon the institution of deportation proceedings, requiring that the proceedings be instituted within 10 years of the deportable act.

Said this analysis:

> Almost all civil remedies and criminal sanctions in our legal system are subject to time limitations precluding adverse consequences for conduct more than a certain number of years past. The law imposes such limitations, not in order to encourage the tortfeasor, the cheat, the burglar, the extortioner, or the corrupt official, to name a few examples of those who may benefit thereby, but because of the harmful social consequences of disrupting human affairs by reason of events in the far distant past.
>
> In *Wood* v. *Carpenter*, 101 U.S. 135, 193 (1879) the Court explained: "Statutes of limitation are vital to the welfare of society and are favored in the law. They are found and approved in all systems of enlightened jurisprudence. They promote repose by giving security and stability to human affairs."
>
> The draftsmen of the 1952 act recognized that a statute of limitations was desirable in the field of deportation, but apparently considered that it should apply only to certain special grounds for deportation. In reporting the McCarran-Walter Act, the conference committee stated "The conferees have provided for a statute of limitations * * * in accord with humanitarian principles, particularly in the case of aliens whose deportation would be based on mental disease or on economic distress."
>
> Nevertheless, while the 1952 act limits deportation for certain grounds, including those based on mental disease and economic distress, to acts occurring within 5 years after entry, the act contains no general statute of limitations. Even the 5-year limitation on certain grounds for deportation is undermined to a considerable extent by the reentry doctrine, which computes the 5 years not from the original entry, but from the last entry made by the alien at any time.
>
> The operation of the deportation law in the absence of any limitations period is illustrated by *Niukkanen* v. *McAlexander*, 362 U.S. 390 (1960). In that case, a 52-year-old man, employed as a house painter in Oregon, who had lived in this country since before his first birthday, and who had served honorably in our Army, was ordered deported on the grounds of parol evidence of conduct more than 20 years previous. We do not believe that the hardship to the individual in that case—and the hardship to his native-born American wife—was justified by benefits to society as a result of his deportation.
>
> The chief purposes of deportation are similar to two of the aims of the criminal law: to deter specified conduct, and to prevent its repetition (in this country). In our Federal criminal law a 5-year statute of limitations is provided for practically all crimes (18 U.S.C. 3282). The exceptions to this general rule are crimes so heinous as to be punishable by death, such as murder, kidnaping, or treason (18 U.S.C. 3281).
>
> A commentator has discussed the purposes served by statutes of limitations in criminal laws as follows: "The primary consideration underlying such legislation is undoubtedly one of fairness to the defendant. There comes a time when he ought to be secure in his reasonable expectation that the slate has been wiped clean of ancient obligations.
>
> "Where the legislature puts a limit on criminal prosecutions, it recognizes the defendant's special interest in not being compelled to put his freedom and his reputation at the hazard of what is likely to be parol evidence of imperfectly remembered events, while at the same time it denies the social

utility of punishing crimes long past" (63 Harvard Law Review 1177, 1185–86, 1950).

The primary reasons underlying statutes of limitations in criminal cases seem to us equally applicable to deportation proceedings. We believe that society does not gain when persons are deported on the basis of long past events, and that considerations of fairness to the individual common to all systems of enlightened jurisprudence call for the adoption of a statute of limitations applicable to deportation.

Mr. President, the New York Bar Association endorsed the 10-year limit of S. 551, but I believe that it makes an even better case for a 5-year limitation.

In addition, the same factors apply to proceedings brought to revoke citizenship from a naturalized citizen. Therefore, my bill provides that if the Government finds evidence that the individual misrepresented or falsified his record or otherwise was disqualified for citizenship, the proceedings to revoke that citizenship must be brought within 5 years after final naturalization.

TIME LIMITATION ON DEPORTATIONS AS SUCH

My second bill provides for a time period after which an alien admitted for permanent residence may no longer be deported for any reason. It extends this protection to individuals who were admitted to this country for permanent residence prior to age 14, and to persons who have resided in this country for 10 or more consecutive years after admission for permanent residence.

I offer it because I believe there should come a time when a person admitted for permanent residence really becomes a permanent resident. This measure in no way makes the aliens it covers immune to prosecution for any crime. It does remove the use of deportation as a means of punishment.

It will be noted that my bill does not cover persons admitted for any other reason than permanent residence, no matter how long they have resided here. It does not seek to change a temporary admission to a permanent admission merely through length of stay. It does not affect the status of individuals or groups admitted under special parole for political reasons, such as the Cuban exiles.

There will undoubtedly be meritorious cases brought up that would not be covered by either of these two bills. But either of them alone and certainly both of them together would mark a useful advance in procedures governing foreign-born residents of the United States. Either alone would prevent a repetition of the horrendous miscarriage of justice that sent 52-year-old William Mackie of Portland, Oreg., back to a native Finland he left at the age of 8 months. It was Mackie, whose Finnish name was Niukkanen, who was referred to in the article of the New York City Bar Association.

Both are needed to give noncitizens a similar protection against the bringing up of long-past events that citizens are entitled to, and to confine the punishment for crimes committed by long-time residents to statutory penalties rather than deportation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. MORSE, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1500. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to impose a limitation upon the time for the institution of deportation proceedings, and a limitation upon the time for the loss of U.S. nationality.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. HART):

S. 1501. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to make the deportation provisions thereof inapplicable to any alien admitted for permanent residence prior to his 14th birthday or to any alien who has continuously resided in the United States for 10 years immediately following his admission.

AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, RELATING TO FILING OF CERTAIN SCHEDULES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 203(a) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, with respect to the filing of schedules of charges by connecting carriers. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, requesting the proposed legislation, together with an explanation of the proposed amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1503) to amend section 203(a) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, with respect to the filing of schedules of charges by connecting carriers, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and explanation presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS
COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., April 11, 1963.

THE VICE PRESIDENT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: The Commission has adopted as a part of its legislative program for the 88th Congress a proposal to amend section 203(a) of the Communications Act so that connecting carriers would be required to file a tariff covering communications subject to the Commission's jurisdiction where there is no fully subject common carrier obligated under section 203(a) of the act to file a tariff. Thus, whenever a connecting carrier provides interstate or foreign communication service which is subject to the Commission's jurisdiction, there would be a tariff on file with the Commission setting forth the charges and practices relating to the rendition of that service.

The Commission's explanation and draft bill to accomplish the foregoing objective were submitted to the Bureau of the Budget for its consideration. We are now advised by that Bureau that from the standpoint of the administration's program there would be no objection to the presentation of the draft bill to the Congress for its consideration. Accordingly, there are enclosed six copies of our draft bill on this subject and six copies of an explanatory statement with reference thereto.

The consideration by the Senate of the proposed amendment would be greatly appreciated. The Commission would be happy to furnish any additional information that may be desired by the Senate or by the committee to which this proposal is referred.

Sincerely yours,

NEWTON N. MINOW,
Chairman.

EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SECTION 203 OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934 TO REQUIRE FILING OF TARIFFS BY CONNECTING CARRIERS (47 U.S.C. 203(a))

This proposal would amend section 203(a) of the Communications Act so that connecting carriers would be required to file a tariff covering communications subject to the Commission's jurisdiction where there is no fully subject common carrier obligated under section 203(a) of the act to file a tariff.[1] Thus, whenever a connecting carrier provides interstate or foreign communication service which is subject to the Commission's jurisdiction, there would be a tariff on file with the Commission setting forth the charges and practices relating to the rendition of that service.

At present, even though the Commission is required to regulate the charges and practices of connecting carriers under sections 201 through 205 of the Communications Act, there are instances where these carriers, by virtue of section 203(a), are not required to file a tariff on which the Commission may base its regulation. As a result, the only method available to the Commission for obtaining necessary information is by request or order to the carrier. Furthermore, unless a tariff is filed the Commission may not even be aware that interstate service is being provided.

Section 203(a) of the Communications Act expressly exempts connecting carriers from the requirement of filing a tariff. Thus, for example, a connecting carrier located in a State bordering Mexico or Canada may interconnect by wire or radio with a foreign carrier. The foreign carrier, not being subject to our jurisdiction, does not file a tariff, and the connecting carrier, because of section 203(a), is not required to file one.

---

[1] Section 3(u) of the Communications Act defines a "connecting carrier" as "* * * a carrier described in clause (2), (3), or (4) of section 2(b)."

The pertinent parts of section 2(b) of the Communications Act provide:

"(b) Subject to the provisions of section 301, nothing in this act shall be construed to apply or to give the Commission jurisdiction with respect to * * *. (2) any carrier engaged in interstate or foreign communication solely through physical connection with the facilities of another carrier not directly or indirectly controlling or controlled by, or under direct or indirect common control with such carrier, or (3) any carrier engaged in interstate or foreign communication solely through connection by radio, or by wire and radio, with facilities, located in an adjoining State or in Canada or Mexico (where they adjoin the State in which the carrier is doing business), of another carrier not directly or indirectly controlling or controlled by, or under direct or indirect common control with such carrier, or (4) any carrier to which clause (2) or clause (3) would be applicable except for furnishing interstate mobile radio communication service or radio communication service to mobile stations on land vehicles in Canada or Mexico; except that sections 201 through 205 of this act, both inclusive, shall, except as otherwise provided therein, apply to carriers described in clauses (2), (3), and (4)."

Similarly, where a connecting carrier in one State interconnects with a connecting carrier in an adjoining State by wire or radio, they both may retain their exempt status as connecting carriers, notwithstanding the fact that the communication service they are rendering is interstate in character and subject to the Commission's jurisdiction.

Another example of where, despite the interstate character of the communication service involved, there is no tariff required to be filed, is in those instances where a connecting carrier provides services in connection with chain broadcasting or incidental radio communication. In such cases the Commission has held that, although the provision of such service is subject to its jurisdiction, a carrier does not lose its connecting carrier status by providing it. *Capital City Telephone Company*, 3 F.C.C. 189 (1936).

Rate regulation envisions the publishing of rates through filed tariffs so that the public may be advised of the rates to be charged, and the Commission, having jurisdiction over the rates, may have the opportunity to review and, if necessary, investigate them.

AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, RELATING TO APPLICABILITY OF CONFLICT-OF-INTEREST PROVISIONS TO CERTAIN PERSONS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 4(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, with respect to the applicability of the conflict-of-interest provisions to persons serving in the Federal Communications Commission unit of the National Defense Executive Reserve. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, requesting the proposed legislation, together with an explanation of the proposed amendment.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1504) to amend section 4(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, with respect to the applicability of the conflict-of-interest provisions to persons serving in the Federal Communications Commission unit of the National Defense Executive Reserve, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and explanation presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., April 11, 1963.
THE VICE PRESIDENT,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: The Commission has adopted as a part of its legislative program for the 88th Congress a proposal to amend section 4(b) of the Communications Act to provide an exemption from the conflict of interest provision for persons acting as executive reservists pursuant to subsection (e) of section 710 of the Defense Production Act of 1950; and it further provides that this exemption is further extended to such executive reservists when employed full-time in time of war or during periods of national emergency declared by the President.

The Commission's explanation and draft bill to accomplish the foregoing objective were submitted to the Bureau of the Budget for its consideration. We are now advised by that Bureau that from the standpoint of the administration's program there would be no objection to the presentation of the draft bill to the Congress for its consideration. Accordingly, there are enclosed six copies of our draft bill on this subject and six copies of an explanatory statement with reference thereto.

The consideration by the Senate of the proposed amendment would be greatly appreciated. The Commission would be happy to furnish any additional information that may be desired by the Senate or by the committee to which this proposal is referred.

Sincerely yours,
NEWTON N. MINOW,
Chairman.

EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SECTION 4(b) OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, AS AMENDED (47 U.S.C. 154 (b)), WITH RESPECT TO TRAINING OF PERSONS IN THE EXECUTIVE RESERVE UNIT OF THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION FOR FULL-TIME EMPLOYMENT IN TIME OF WAR OR PERIODS OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY DECLARED BY THE PRESIDENT

The proposed amendment would amend the Communications Act by adding at the end of the second sentence of section 4(b) new language to provide that persons acting as executive reservists pursuant to subsection (e) of section 710 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended (69 Stat. 583, 50 U.S.C. app. 2160(e)), and not otherwise employed by the Government in a full-time capacity shall, except for the requirement of citizenship, be exempt from the foregoing provisions of this subsection, and this exemption is extended to executive reservists when employed full time in time of war or during periods of national emergency declared by the President.

The Executive Reserve program, approved in Congress in 1955 as an amendment to section 710 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. app. 2160(e)), authorized the President to provide for the establishment and training of a nucleus executive reserve for employment in executive positions in Government during periods of emergency. It further authorized the President to provide by regulation for the exemption of members of such Reserve from the operation of the conflict-of-interest provisions in sections 281, 283, 284, 434, and 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (section 99 of title 5).[1] The President exercised the authority thus granted him and promulgated on February 15, 1956, Executive Order No. 10660 establishing the National Defense Executive Reserve. That Executive order has since been amended in minor respects.

A number of departments and agencies of the Federal Government, including the Federal Communications Commission, have established units of the National Defense Executive Reserve, pursuant to the foregoing authority. In the case of the Federal Communications Commission, its reservists would be given training for employment in executive positions equivalent to bureau chiefs involving the administration of the Communications Act of 1934. Thus, upon mobilization in an emergency, such reservists would have had the necessary training to assume the duties and responsibilities of a bureau head and to perform such other duties and responsibilities as may be delegated in such emergency to the Commission under the wartime powers of the President or other appropriate authority.

The conflict-of-interest provisions of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (47 U.S.C. 154(b)), prohibit any "member of the Commission or person in its employ" from having, for example, a financial interest in the manufacture or sale of radio apparatus for wire or radio communication; in communication by wire or radio or in radio transmission of energy; or financial interest in any company owning stocks, bonds, or other securities of any company furnishing services or apparatus to any company engaged in manufacturing or selling apparatus used for communication by wire or radio; or ownership of stocks, bonds, or other securities of any corporation subject to the Communications Act.

For the purpose of recruitment for the Executive Reserve training program of the Commission, the foregoing provisions of section 4(b) of the Communications Act have been found to be unduly restrictive and have deterred well-qualified persons from accepting appointment for training as executive reservists in the Commission's unit of the National Defense Executive Reserve. It is those people who, by reason of their past employment in the Commission or employment in executive positions in the communications industry, are the best qualified and most valuable to serve the Government as full-time Commission employees in periods of national emergency or time of war.

In the case of the Federal Communications Commission its reservists have been given broad training at periodic intervals in the work of the various bureaus and offices to which they have been designated. Such training is designed with the objective of providing these reservists with the capability of fulfilling the executive position in such bureaus and offices involving the administration of the Communications Act. Thus in the event of their mobilization in a national emergency such reservists will have had the necessary training to assume the duties and responsibilities of such bureaus and offices and to perform such other duties and responsibilities as may be duly delegated to the Commission in a national emergency.

FEDERAL SAFETY STANDARDS AMENDMENTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], and the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 33 of the Federal mployees' Compensation Act so as to provide for a system of Federal safety rules, regulations, and safety inspection and training.

---

[1] Public Law 87-849, approved Oct. 23, 1962, and effective 90 days after the date of its enactment, provides in sec. 2 thereof that "* * * All exemptions from the provisions of sections 281, 282, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code heretofore created or authorized by statute which are in force on the effective date of this act shall, on and after that date, be deemed to be exemptions from sections 203, 204, 205, 207, 208, or 209, respectively, of title 18 of the United States Code except to the extent that they affect officers or employees of the executive branch of the United States Government, of any independent agency of the United States, or of the District of Columbia, as to whom they are no longer applicable." Further, sec. 3 of said Public Law 87-849 reads as follows: "Section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99) is repealed."

In 1961, the latest year for which figures are available, work injuries of Federal employees cost slightly in excess of $62 million. This represented an increase of almost 23 percent during this past 5 years. Moreover, the number of injuries increased slightly between 1960 and 1961.

There are presently no existing minimum safety standards to be met by all Federal agencies. With approximately 54 different Federal agencies responsible under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to take some measures to provide for the safety of the Federal employee at the workplace, there are approximately 54 different types of safety programs. These facts indicate a pressing need for many Federal administrators to accept their responsibilities in the field of safety and to stimulate active participation by those under their supervision.

There presently exists much duplication of effort in the way of publications, training, inspections, and requests for financial support for safety personnel. There is no common objective, but a multiplicity of interests among administrators.

There is no agency or coordinating body which has the authority to see that overall objectives are set, that minimum safety standards are developed and put into effect on a Government-wide basis. Although the Department of Labor promotes cooperation and coordination of the Federal safety effort, it does not have recognized authority to develop and coordinate an effective Federal safety program.

JUSTIFICATION FOR FEDERAL SAFETY LEGISLATION

Since the cost of on-the-job injuries to Federal workers has risen significantly, and the number of accidents has increased, it seems imperative that some action be taken to improve the situation.

By amending section 33(c) of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act it will be possible to do this. The amendments would accomplish the following things:

First. They would require the head of each Federal agency to establish a safety program in conformity with the standards program and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Labor.

Second. They would give the Secretary of Labor authority to develop, promulgate, and promote minimum safety standards for Federal employees.

Third. They would provide for surveys and investigations of injury cases which would provide useful data for individual agencies to use in controlling injuries to their employees.

Fourth. They would provide a means for coordinating and collecting the information and data developed by each Federal agency and making it available for all to use in helping prevent duplication of effort.

Fifth. They would provide an advisory staff of technicians for those agencies wishing to initiate or improve their safety efforts.

Sixth. They would provide a Federal safety advisory committee which would include representatives from both labor and management and thus insure a more closely knitted joint labor and management effort toward improving the safety record.

Seventh. They would provide resources for training and education of Federal advisory personnel in order to upgrade the safety know-how of those in positions of safety responsiiblity of all Federal employees.

It is imperative that action be taken to coordinate in a more effective fashion the Federal efforts in accident prevention and to advise and consult on the objectives to be set and achieved. It is imperative that minimum Federal safety standards be developed and that every Federal agency be required to meet them. Amending section 33(c) of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act will establish the coordination and direction needed.

The purpose of this legislation is to attain these objectives by reducing the suffering experienced by Federal employees exposed to various hazards and thus some badly needed tax dollars.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1505) to amend section 33 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act so as to provide a system of safety rules, regulations, and safety inspection and training, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

EXTENSION OF FEED GRAIN PROGRAM—AMENDMENTS

Mr. ALLOTT submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 4997) to extend the feed-grain program, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICE OF CANCELLATION OF HEARINGS ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 45

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], I wish to announce that the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments had scheduled hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 45 for May 13 and 14. However, a conflict has developed with other Judiciary Committee business, which has made it necessary to cancel these hearings.

I wish to notify all interested persons that these hearings will not be held as scheduled on the 13th and 14th of May, and that they have been postponed until further notice.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 9, 1963, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 133. An act to redesignate the Big Hole Battlefield National Monument, to revise the boundaries thereof, and for other purposes; and

S. 394. An act to validate the homestead entries of Leo F. Reeves.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the measures on the calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 149, Senate Resolution 128, and that the following measures on the calendar be considered in sequence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will proceed to call these calendar measures.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS PROVIDED FOR THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

The resolution (S. Res. 128) to provide additional funds for the Committee on Appropriations was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eighty-eighth Congress, $25,000, in addition to the amounts, and for the same purposes, specified in section 134(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act, approved August 2, 1946.

REPRINTING OF COPIES OF COMMITTEE PRINT, 87TH CONGRESS, ENTITLED "PART 1 OF CONCENTRATION RATIOS IN MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY, 1958"

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 30) to reprint copies of the committee print, 87th Congress, entitled "Part 1 of Concentration Ratios in Manufacturing Industry, 1958," was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary two thousand additional copies of part 1 of its committee print of the Eighty-seventh Congress entitled "Concentration Ratios in Manufacturing Industry, 1958", a report prepared by the Bureau of the Census for the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly.

PRINTING FOR USE OF SENATE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORT AND HEARINGS ON "STATE DEPARTMENT SECURITY"

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 37) authorizing the printing for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary of additional copies of a report and hearings on "State Department Security" issued by its Internal Security Subcommittee during the 87th Congress was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary eight thousand additional copies of the report (committee print) of its Internal Security Subcommittee of the Eighty-seventh Congress, second session, entitled "State Department Security"; five thousand copies each of part 1 (the William Wieland case), part 2 (the Office of Security), part 3 (the new passport regulations), part 4 (testimony of Elmer Hipsley, Otto Otepka, John Leahy, Roger Jones, Scott McLeod, Andreas Lowenfeld), and part 5 (testimony of William Wieland), of the subcommittee's hearings of the Eighty-seventh Congress on State Department security; and five thousand additional copies of part 13 of the subcommittee's hearings of the Eighty-seventh Congress on Communist threat to the United States through the Caribbean.

PRINTING AS SENATE DOCUMENT OF "DOCUMENTS ON INTERNATIONAL ASPECTS OF EXPLORATION AND USE OF OUTER SPACE"

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 131) to provide for "Documents on International Aspects of Exploration and Use of Outer Space" to be printed as Senate document, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "printed", to strike out "three thousand" and insert "two thousand five hundred"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the study entitled "Documents on International Aspects of the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, 1954–1962" prepared for the use of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, United States Senate, by the Historical Office, Bureau of Public Affairs, Department of State, shall be printed with illustrations as a Senate document. There shall be printed two thousand five hundred additional copies of such Senate document which shall be for the use of the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

RETTA P. REYNOLDS

The resolution (S. Res. 139) to pay a gratuity to Retta P. Reynolds was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Retta P. Reynolds, widow of Clifford P. Reynolds, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to one year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, last night the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] asked unanimous consent to have an intern employee given the privileges of the floor on the ground that his presence would be extremely helpful insofar as consideration by the Senate of appropriations is concerned. In the course of that discussion the Senator stated:

> He is a full-time employee of an agency downtown.

By lifting that statement out of context I believe I did not do injustice to anything that the distinguished Senator said. But his request was that the intern be permitted the privilege of the floor during the remainder of the present legislative session.

When he became aware of the request, the majority leader felt that the request might well be withdrawn until it could be further discussed.

I should point out that it would be an extraordinary circumstance for one who is on the executive payroll to be given the privileges of the Senate floor, and, in fact, it would be extraordinary for someone on the executive payroll to be employed in a legislative capacity in the office of a Member of the Senate or the House.

One can easily spell out the implications. It would be easy indeed to get a dozen people—or as many as the clerical allowance would permit—to work in a Senator's office, and there would be an impingement on legislative prerogatives which would become, in a sense, an admixture of the executive and legislative branches.

I could foresee, I think, quite a number of difficulties that might arise which would be a clear departure from the constitutional separation of the executive and the legislative branches. I felt that I ought to allude to the question now. If that should become a practice, I believe the Senate ought to cause an investigation to be made, because it could harden into a practice that would proliferate and cause no end of difficulty.

I desired to raise the question when the Senator from Wisconsin was present in the Chamber for any comment that he might wish to make.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, yesterday the positions taken by the majority leader and the minority leader were correct. I considered the precedents. I had not realized that anything other than the parliamentary necessity for obtaining unanimous consent was necessary. I had checked with the Assistant Parliamentarian.

But I am withdrawing the request. I certainly will not press it. In fact, I have written a letter to the Sergeant at Arms removing the names of all other members of my staff from the list of those having the privilege of access to the floor, including my personal secretary and one or two other staff members. On reconsideration I thought there was no reason why they should be in the Chamber.

There is a reason why the man in question should be present in the Chamber. He is a highly competent assistant on legislative questions. However, I understand the situation well. Senators are correct, and I am happy to withdraw the request.

I should like to explain the procedure. The man in question is an intern in my office. He worked in the office of Congressman PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, a distinguished Republican Representative from New Jersey, for 4 months, until he came to my office. He had a choice of senatorial offices, and I am flattered and happy that he chose mine. He is doing excellent work. He is one of a few interns from downtown who are given an opportunity to work on the Hill to give them an understanding of the legislative process. I think it is a constructive program. I am all for it. I think it is very fine from every standpoint, and it really does not handicap me significantly for him not to have access to the floor. I thought his presence would be convenient occasionally, and I thought the question could be cleared up by asking unanimous consent.

I withdraw the request without any feeling of offense, and recognizing that Senators are absolutely correct. I have been one of those who have complained about the fact that often too many individuals are in the Chamber. In removing the privilege of my staff, who are on the Senate payroll, to be present in the Chamber—they do not have to be here—I am trying to comply with the position taken by the majority leader and the minority leader yesterday.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the question goes a little further than that. Whenever a committee wishes to conduct an investigation and use executive personnel, it is common practice to include a phrase or a clause of some kind that the committee shall have the right to use executive personnel from the agencies. It can be on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis. But in every case there must be statutory authority for it before a committee or a subcommittee of the House or Senate can avail itself of that privilege. It occurs to me, in logical consistency, that there should be a special request that would have to be authorized by legislation or by resolution of the Senate to transfer to the Senate staff anyone who is on the executive payroll.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The man in question is not being transferred. He is still on the executive payroll. He is really working here for the benefit of the executive branch. It is very wholesome and constructive for those who are making a career in the executive branch—and this is a career man with tenure—to have some solid and practical experience working in the House and Senate. That is what the man is doing. He is here acquiring a kind of on-the-job training that would be available to him so that he could better serve the executive branch and the interests of our Government in the legislative branch in future years. He will be with me until August 15. Whether he is with me, the Senator from Illinois, or the Senator from Montana, I think his experience here would be a service to the executive branch. He is handling his experience as a training program. He is not really working for the Senate, although he is of great value to me. He is a very intelligent man, who has done excellent work on legislative subjects. I would like him to continue in that capacity, if there is no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. First, I commend the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin, who, in making his request, acted in good faith and on the basis of information given to him. As we all know, almost anything can be done by unanimous consent in this body.

I repeat that on the basis of the information furnished the Senator from

Wisconsin his request was perfectly in order. However, since last evening, I have been looking back into the precedents. I recalled that the question had been considered in the Committee on Rules and Administration. At present I am having a memorandum prepared which will set forth explicitly what the situation is relative to interns and attachés in the offices of Senators.

If I recall correctly, the only stipulation made with respect to interns is that they are given the privilege of the secretaries' gallery, to enable them to observe. But, to the best of my knowledge, they are not and have not been allowed on the floor of the Senate.

So I wish the RECORD to show that the Senator from Wisconsin was perfectly within his rights and was acting in good faith. I commend him for his statement today.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Do I understand correctly that the Senate is still in the morning hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

RETIREMENT OF JAMES MILNE, ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT OF REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to say a word in behalf of Jim Milne, who has been the administrative assistant of Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., for 39 years. During that period Mr. MARTIN has been the Speaker of the House and its minority leader over a considerable period of years. Through all the 39 years that Representative MARTIN has served in the Congress of the United States, he has had the loyal assistance of James Milne. Milne has been a helpful, loyal, and hard working assistant. He has great knowledge of the departments of Government. He has great knowledge of the affairs of Congress and how congressional activity is carried forward.

Yesterday Mr. Milne announced his retirement after 39 years of service. Mr. MARTIN had a reception in his honor. I was privileged to attend. I want the RECORD to show that Members of the Senate, as well as Members of the House, appreciate the services and assistance Jim Milne has given us through the years during which we have been Members of Congress. I congratulate him upon his long period of faithful service. I think it is the longest in history for any administrative assistant. I wish for him and Mrs. Milne many happy future years.

RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, it is instructive to note the official holidays sanctioned by the Rumanian People's Republic: May Day, a traditional Communist holiday; August 23, the so-called Liberation Day commemorating the fall of the pro-German government of Premier Antonescu in 1944, an event which opened the way for the Soviet occupation and takeover; and November 7, the anniversary of the Russian Revolution in 1917.

Two of these holidays have no roots in Rumanian history, and the third is a hollow commemoration of Soviet aggression dressed up as "the start of the people's revolution." The real Rumanian national holiday—May 10—is not celebrated in the Communist satellite.

The repression of a holiday would seem to be a small thing beside the enormity of Soviet atrocities in Eastern Europe since World War II. But it is not unimportant, for holidays are part of the national life of a people. It is this sense of national integrity which the Communist system is dedicated to crushing. They are particularly unwilling to permit national independence days, which would annually remind the people of their present lack of freedom and independence.

So it falls to us in the free world to commemorate the steps in Rumania's struggle for independence which occurred on May 10 in not 1 but 3 years—1866, 1877, and 1881. In this way we bear witness to the fact that we have not forgotten the plight of the Rumanians and other captive peoples, that we hope that they will again be able to celebrate May 10 as we here in the United States celebrate the Fourth of July.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, tomorrow, May 10, has long been the traditional national holiday for the Rumanian people. On that day, in 1881, modern Rumania was born through the union of two provinces, Moldavia and Wallachia. Soon after, the national independence and sovereignty of the Rumanian state were recognized officially by the other countries of the world.

It is tragic that today this momentous holiday can be observed with festivities only by those Rumanians outside that country's borders. The present Communist regime of Rumania, dominated by Moscow, will not permit the Rumanians to celebrate the times when they were free and independent. If these unfortunate people can celebrate this holiday at all, they must do so silently and in their hearts.

At this time, Mr. President, I would like to join the other distinguished Senators in sending our warmest greetings to the Rumanian people on their national holiday. I hope that the time will come when Rumania will once again enjoy the blessings of self-determination and freedom.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, tomorrow is the anniversary of Rumania's independence from the Ottoman Empire. On May 10, 1877, Rumania proclaimed independence from Turkey and soon became a constitutional monarchy. Sadly those still living in Rumania can no longer openly celebrate this traditional national holiday. On December 30, 1947, the Communist Party displaced the National Peasant Party, King Michael I abdicated under Soviet pressure and the so-called People's Republic was proclaimed. As the free world knows, this republic was of the people in name only. Red tyranny replaced free thought and the national aspirations of the Rumanian people were twisted under the cruel authority of a monolithic totalitarianism.

Rumania has long been one of the most industrialized Balkan States. Industry now represents 57.6 percent of her economy. Her mineral wealth is great, with oil production exceeding 11 million tons annually. However, this natural wealth has been exploited by the Soviet Union and was put under state control on June 12, 1948. State farms, collectives, and cooperatives embraced 82 percent of Rumania's land by 1961. The Rumanians have lost more than their land, moreover. Freedom of worship in Rumania has also fallen victim to state control. Orthodox clergy are paid by the state and Roman Catholic orders have been abolished despite many protests by the United States and Great Britain against such suppression.

It is fitting on this anniversary day, then, to urge those Rumanians behind the Iron Curtain, whose rejoicing cannot be openly displayed, to take heart and look to the day when their land will again truly be their land. All Americans of Rumanian descent, indeed all freedom-loving Americans, support wholeheartedly the democratic aspirations of the Rumanian people. Let them be assured that the United States will never be satisfied with a world in which the Baltic nations lie under the heel of their Communist oppressors.

HENRY J. KAISER

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, today is the 81st birthday anniversary of a man whose name has become synonymous with dynamic leadership—Henry J. Kaiser.

Hawaii is proud to claim him as one of her own. We are proud that he has chosen Hawaii as his home.

From Hawaii, Mr. Kaiser is continuing his amazing career as a master builder, a practical visionary, an imaginative, civic-minded developer. His life symbolizes the American dream come true. From humble beginnings, he has achieved preeminence as the builder of an industrial complex spread around the globe.

On the occasion of his 81st birthday today, I have the pleasure of calling attention to an excellent article which appeared in the April 28, 1963, issue of the Sunday Star-Bulletin & Advertiser titled "Henry J. Kaiser, Hawaii-Based Industrialist, Directs Worldwide Empire With Speed and Dedication."

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HENRY J. KAISER, HAWAII-BASED INDUSTRIALIST, DIRECTS WORLDWIDE EMPIRE WITH SPEED AND DEDICATION

(By John Cook)

Fortune magazine once called him the boldest industrialist since Henry Ford.

Then it went even further and said: "Not in all history has any industrial figure successfully got into so many and various projects."

The man the magazine was talking about is Henry John Kaiser, who will be 81 years old on May 9.

It did not overstate the case.

Any one of a dozen projects this man has started would be enough to keep a lesser man busy for a lifetime.

His shipbuilding activities during World War II have become almost legendary.

During that period 1,490 ships slid down the ways of Kaiser shipyards—an average of one a day and nearly one-third of the entire American production of wartime merchant shipping.

At one time one of his yards put together a prefabricated Liberty ship in just 4½ days.

Even before the war, he and his associated companies had built more than 1,000 projects costing $383 million.

These included Hoover, Grand Coulee, Bonneville, and Shasta Dams, the piers for the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge, and 200 miles of highway and 500 bridges in Cuba.

Companies of which he is founder-chairman include Willys Motors, Inc., creators of the world-famous Jeep and the world's largest manufacturer of 4-wheel-drive commercial vehicles; Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp., which produces one-fourth of the Nation's primary aluminum; Kaiser Steel Corp., which produces almost half of all steel made on the west coast and has the eighth largest plant in the Nation, and Permanente Cement Co., the largest supplier of building materials in the West.

As founder-chairman of Kaiser Industries Corp., he shares in the direction of all 51 active affiliated companies and subsidiaries—a worldwide industrial complex with assets of approximately $2 billion.

And these are just his industrial ventures. They do not include his hotel building or his $350-million residential-resort city called Hawaii Kai, or his television station.

They do not include the Kaiser Foundation, a nonprofit, charitable trust with 1 million members and 60 medical offices and hospitals—the result of 20 years of pioneering in the health-plan field.

Despite his years, anyone who expects to keep up with him has to get up early in the morning.

Take a typical day last week: At 5 o'clock in the morning he is on the phone talking to his son, Edgar Kaiser, president of Kaiser Industries with headquarters in Oakland, Calif. He is discussing an $88 million construction project which the company is bidding on and expects to get.

He is not concerned about the early call. He wears three watches—one with east coast time, one with west coast time, and one with Hawaii time—and he knows his son will be in the office.

A short time later he is in his own office and the day has started not only for him but also for everyone else within summoning distance.

It is not a fancy office, but it is neat, comfortable and functional. It is housed in a low, inconspicuous building just off the highway in the center of Hawaii Kai. Only one small sign announces its presence.

Kaiser uses a long walnut desk with six phones hung around its edge. These phones keep him in touch with Kaiser operations all over the world.

On the desk is a small sign with the legend "Don't bring me anything but trouble. Good news weakens me."

There is a bronze hand holding a torch, an award given to Kaiser at the International Broadcasting Award Dinner and naming him the outstanding proponent of the free enterprise system.

On the walls are beautifully rendered paintings of residential projects present and future, a couple of poems with a moral, and an admonition that starts out: "You pile enough tomorrows and you have collected nothing but a lot of empty yesterdays."

Soon he is reviewing plans for two more projects connected with Hawaii Kai—expensive new single-family residences designed in the Venetian style to fit into the many rugged ravines that plunge down to the ocean, and a wholly new multiple-family project of five 32-unit and three 16-unit apartment houses surrounding a nine-hole golf course.

These unique apartments will be built almost like steps that fit against the slope of the hill in back.

The project will include a restaurant, a night-lighted driving range, a reconstruction of an ancient Hawaiian fishing village, parking lots and possibly an aerial tramway up the side of the steep mountain.

These projects are presently Kaiser's enthusiasms and soon his desk is covered with drawings and plans.

Then the subject of interisland ferries comes up and out come more drawings. The problem of ferries has long been a challenge and Kaiser is a man who can't resist challenges.

Entirely on his own he hired top-flight designing marine engineers and had them work up plans for a huge catamaran that would travel 22 knots and carry 50 automobiles as well as passengers from island to island.

He has presented these plans to Dr. Fujio Matsuda, head of the State department of transportation and is awaiting developments.

Then he discusses a pet project of Mrs. Kaiser's—a drive to get more help at the State animal quarantine station.

"They have only 1 man for 70 dogs," he says, "and that's not enough. They should have a maximum of 50 dogs per man in order to make sure that rabies doesn't get loose in the islands.

"Mrs. Kaiser has 50 dogs of her own and she knows how much time it takes to give them proper care.

"If rabies ever got loose here it would be a terrible thing."

Presently Mrs. Kaiser herself comes in. She is younger than her husband and is his second wife. She had supervised a crew of nurses for Kaiser's first wife just before she died and now she is looking after Kaiser himself.

She wants to know what he is drinking.

It is a soft drink and she reminds him that his doctor wants him to keep his weight down.

She arranges a time for her husband to come home for his massage and wants to know if he still plans to go to the ball game that night.

"I don't think so," he says. "I'm pretty tired."

She reminds him that it is the last game before the home team goes on the road and he agrees to go. She gives him an affectionate peck and heads for home.

He heads for Kaiser Hospital to look at a new machine that takes motion picture X-rays, the first of its kind in Hawaii.

Still the pace does not slacken.

From the hospital he goes to the office of Architect Arthur Y. Mori to go over the working drawings of the new Venetian-villa type single-family residence.

From there he goes down to Kewalo Basin to check on the operation of his cruise vessel, the catamaran *Ale Ale Kai V*.

On the way back to his office he dozes briefly sitting up in the back seat of his limousine.

Already it has been a full day, but he will return to the office to tackle more work, go home for his massage, take in the ball game in the evening and then spend much of the night dreaming up new ideas.

He is a driving man. But he is also a driven man.

An associate who has been close to him for many years says he couldn't stop if he wanted to.

On first meeting Henry J. Kaiser one is struck by his direct gaze. You get the feeling he is taking your measure.

He is getting along in years and he moves slowly. His speech, too, is careful and precise. But you do not doubt for a moment that he is the boss.

He has that indefinable aura of authority about him. When he is a member of a group his personality dominates even when he is simply listening to the discussion.

So alert are the people who work for him that when he wants something it just seems to materialize.

When he goes to the hospital, the head man meets him as he gets out of the car. Not just any nurse, but a supervising nurse, takes his hand and even fusses over him a bit.

When he goes to see an architect the architect is there, even though he happens to have been taking a day off. If someone is not on the spot whenever he is needed, Kaiser wants to know where he is.

He may even back-seat-drive a bit.

When he finishes his business at a given place he says "let's go," and there is no delay about it.

Driving around the Magic Island project he will say: "I started this project, spent every day for 6 weeks at the legislature pushing it through and then completed the first increment. Now somebody else has taken over the job and I'm finished with it."

The comment is typical of the man. He does not look back. When he is done with a thing he is done with it. There are too many new projects to be dreamed up.

Or he will look across at the Hawaiian Village and say with simple pride: "I built that."

Or he will notice some project that seems to be a long time in the making and say: "Too slow. The attitude seems to be that we'll do it tomorrow, but there's only one time to do anything and that's today."

Then he will tell you about his first highway job in California—how he took it under a 2-year contract and finished it in 6 months. Or the incredibly vast job in Cuba, a 5-year job that he finished in 2.

"They don't know what speed is over here," he will say, and then add: "I'm not satisfied with the way Hawaii Kai is going, but of course you have to wait for the market."

He practically never talks about himself except in terms of his projects—his 100 industrial plants around the country and his operations in 27 foreign countries.

He will talk of the problems in building a 200-mile canal in Pakistan or an $80 million addition to an aluminum plant in India, or a method of producing better quality steel at a lower cost using compressed oxygen, a method now being used at his plant in Fontana, Calif.

"We weren't supposed to know enough about it to do it, but we went ahead and did it anyway."

Then he recalls that he went against the advice of the experts more than once. There wouldn't be a big enough market for aluminum after the war, the experts said.

Kaiser went ahead anyway.

The west coast couldn't support a steel mill, the experts said.

Again he went ahead.

Even when he is talking about his philosophy he is really talking about his business.

"The key to a successful life," he says, "is service. We have a motto in our organization: Find the need and fill it."

And he is fond of quoting simple verse that has a moral:

"To be alive in such an age—
To live in it,
To give in it!

Give thanks with all thy flaming heart—
Crave but to have in it a part."

He does not readily admit that he has made many mistakes but he does say that a man who is afraid to fail will never succeed.

"If you're filled with fear you can't accomplish anything. Most failures are due to lack of proper preparation," he says.

In the course of a long conversation the closest he came to an introspective remark was when he commented on religion.

"I don't wear my religion on my sleeve," he said. That closed the subject.

He did mention an address he once gave in Marble Collegiate Church in New York at the invitation of Norman Vincent Peale.

It was on "Philosophy of a Happy and Successful Life." It was printed in Reader's Digest and he still receives letters about it from different parts of the world.

One of the points he expounded was the necessity of loving and serving people.

Yet he seems to have few warm personal friends. He is closest to his associates, the men who accomplish things. One of his associates remarked that he doesn't make many friends simply for the sake of friendship.

This same man said: "He doesn't have much recreation and very few completely extraneous activities. His work is his recreation."

Henry J. Kaiser was born May 9, 1882, at Sprout Brook, N.Y. His father, Francis J. Kaiser, was a mechanic in a shoe factory and his mother was a practical nurse. Both were immigrants from Germany.

At 13 he quit school to take a job at $1.50 a week as cashboy for a Utica, N.Y., dry goods store. At 22 he became a partner in a photographic firm.

Today he says he didn't find this work very interesting because "I wasn't building anything."

So he went west and joined a construction company. When he was 32 he formed the Henry J. Kaiser Co., Ltd., and was soon building things in a big way.

He moved his headquarters to Oakland in 1921 and there they have remained.

The rest is history.

Honor upon honor has come to him. Just a week ago he received the Robins Award of America after being voted the most admired industrialist by students in 125 universities.

He went to Utah to receive the award then swung down to Hollywood to go over plans for a Kaiser-sponsored television show being produced by Lucille Ball's Desilu Productions.

Then he consulted with an architectural artist on plans for new projects.

He will travel thousands of miles a week—to Oakland to review his world-wide operations, to New York to discuss finances, to Europe to talk about plans for a tunnel under the English Channel.

He never stops.

Yet he does not take exclusive credit for his tremendous success.

"I surround myself with men who know more than I do," he says.

But he is the one who has the dreams, and he pushes and prods and drives until those dreams are realized. Then he has more dreams.

He does not hesitate to ask for opinions and he likes men around him who do not hesitate to give theirs. Occasionally he will ask for a comment on some subject and then give a faint, disconcerting smile as though he knows what you are talking about better than you do.

He wears bifocals, has lost most of his hair and has trouble controlling the weight around his middle, but when he looks at you, you know that his is a tough, sharp mind.

He has no plans for retiring. His head is too full of ideas.

During his address at the church in New York he quoted Henry James: "Men habitually use only a small part of the powers which they possess and which they might use under appropriate circumstances."

Henry J. Kaiser is one of those fortunate men who have discovered how to use their powers to the fullest.

In November of 1960 when he addressed the 30th World Travel Conference here in Hawaii, he told the delegates: "I wish you both great accomplishment and great pleasure here."

Perhaps this expresses better than any other single remark the essence of the man.

To him, great accomplishment and great pleasure are one and the same.

'THE DIALOG ON GROWTH CONTINUED"—LECTURE BY DR. RAYMOND J. SAULNIER

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD what is referred to as "The Dialog on Growth Continued," a lecture delivered at Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, Monday, April 29, 1963, by Dr. Raymond J. Saulnier, professor of economics, one-time chairman of the Board of Economic Advisers for President Eisenhower.

There being no objection, the lecture was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DIALOG ON GROWTH CONTINUED

(By Dr. Raymond J. Saulnier)

Speaking a little less than a year ago at Yale University, President Kennedy invited discussion—a "serious dialog" he termed it—on ways and means for promoting a higher rate of growth. He called in particular for a "cleaning up" of the area of discourse having to do with the impact of Federal expenditures on the growth performance of our economy and for discussion of budgetary questions in general.

It is hard for me to believe that the President could be greatly disappointed in the results of his Yale initiative. The dialog he wisely called for has gone forward at a fair pace. And it has been no mere academic discussion, to use an expression about which, as a long-time academician myself, I have personal reservations. On the contrary, public debate on the matters in which he expressed special interest has taken a very practical turn as a result of his having put forward a highly controversial budget plan for the fiscal year 1964.

The administration's fiscal plan may be summarized as follows: With official estimates as of January 1963 stating that the administrative budget will show a deficit of close to $9 billion in fiscal 1963, the plan calls for (1) an increase in Federal spending of $4.5 billion in fiscal 1964, following a $6.5 billion increase the year before and bringing the total to $98.8 billion; (2) an increase in spending authority (new obligational authority) of $4.7 billion in fiscal 1964. Following a $10.3 billion increase the year before and bringing the total to $107.9 billion; (3) a reduction of taxes which, over a period of 3 years, and net of the direct revenue effects of asked-for structural reforms, would come to $10.3 billion; and (4) a planned deficit of $11.9 billion in fiscal 1964.

Few budgets in recent years, perhaps in the entire history of our country, have been of a nature more likely to raise controversy and it is not surprising that public discussion of it has been spirited. And I think it is correct to say that the discussion has been conducted on a fairly respectable level of sophistication. There has been recourse to a certain amount of what has been called mythology but it would be a mistake to believe that this has been exclusively on one side of the argument. We were warned at Yale last June against "traditional labels" "wornout slogans" "ancient cliches" and "myths." These are things to be avoided, to be sure, but we must remember that the expression "ancient cliche" for example, can become a cliche, too. And the amount of mischief that such a cliche can do as an obstacle to our being able to discuss policy problems logically and objectively and to our ability to learn what there is to learn from experience is not one bit less for the fact that it is a modern rather than an ancient substitute for thought.

Indeed, we must be careful that the debate doesn't result in the construction of a new mythology. But I think there is precisely such a danger. The new mythology would run something like this: It would be a grave mistake and a threat to our economic security to cut Federal expenditures, or even to prevent their increase, because this would be followed inevitably by a reduction in employment, by a rise in unemployment and by an assortment of other economic ills. Conversely, the new mythology would tell us that an increase in Federal expenditures will increase employment as nothing else will, and has a capability that is absolutely unique for the promotion of the Nation's prosperity.

The launching of a new mythology of this type is no fancied danger. Indeed, I must say, most respectfully, that I believe President Kennedy came very close to doing so when, in speaking on April 19 last to the American Society of Newspaper Editors in Washington, D.C., he asserted that "a cut of $5 billion now from the proposed Federal budget * * * would cause 1 million fewer jobs by the end of the fiscal year." In the same address, and by way of illustrating this same fiscal point of view, the President assigned a great part of the responsibility for the 1957–58 recession to what he described as the "tremendous drop" in 1957 in Federal purchases, in the defense area particularly, and credited it with having added to the miseries caused by what he apparently believes to have been a generally mistaken fiscal and monetary policy; namely, "a $12.5 billion deficit in 1959, the largest outflow in a period of 3 years of gold and dollars amounting to nearly $12 billion and a recession in 1960."

These are important questions. We want to be quite sure that we have a balanced picture in mind of what happened in 1957. In particular, we want to be sure that we don't attribute an undue role in the 1957–58 recession to changes in the level of Federal expenditures. This is not just a question of keeping our history straight. It is also a question of drawing the right conclusions from history. And right conclusions in these matters are important not only for guidance in current policy matters but for our understanding of the proper and most constructive role of government in our economic life.

We may begin by asking what actually did happen to Federal expenditures in 1957. There was a small and short-lived decline that can be seen in quarterly data only but the fact is that on an annual basis Federal spending did not decline at all. On the contrary, Federal spending went up by several billion dollars in 1957. And it went up again in 1958. This is true whether we measure spending by the administrative (conventional) budget, by the consolidated cash statement of the Federal Government, or by the national income accounts. And it is true whether we speak of calendar years or fiscal years.

It would burden these remarks unduly to cite the figures for each of these accounts but to use the administrative budget as an example, spending was $4.4 billion higher in 1957 (calendar) than in 1956. It went up by another $4.1 billion in 1958, and by another $4.5 billion in 1959. There was a drop in 1960, but only in the administrative and cash budgets; in the national income accounts, a style of budget accounting which the President singled out at Yale for special commendation, there was an increase in Federal spending in 1960, also.

The same is true of Federal purchases of goods and services, as registered in the gross national product accounts, a measure of Federal spending activity to which special attention was given in the President's address to the editors. Total Federal purchases (in current prices) rose by $4 billion in 1957 and by another $2.9 billion in 1958. In constant (1954) prices the year-to-year increases were $1.5 and $1.3 billion, respectively.

What about Federal purchases of goods and services for national defense, on which the President's major interest was concentrated? These rose by $4 billion in 1957, after having risen by $1.3 billion in 1956, and then went up by another $400 million in 1958.

In short, the expenditure declines to which the President refers were so short-lived they can't be found in annual figures. They can be found only in quarterly data. And when you find them, as you will see, they are small in amount.

Let us look at these quarterly data first in terms of the amounts spent by the Federal Government in the purchase of goods and services. The expenditure reduction is greatest when purchases are expressed in constant prices, so let me cite these figures first. What we find is that the 1957 expenditure decline lasted for only two quarters and involved a drop from an annual rate of $44 billion (1954 prices) in the second quarter of 1957 to $42.3 billion in the fourth quarter. Purchases rose again, by nearly a billion dollars on an annual rate base, in the first quarter of 1958.

In current prices the decline in Federal purchases was smaller and shorter lived, lasting only 3 months. There was a drop from an annual rate of $50 billion in the third quarter of 1957 (the amount had held steady between the second and third quarters) to $49.4 billion in the fourth quarter.

What about expenditures on defense goods? Again, one has to use quarterly data to find a decline. And again, it was short lived and was small in amount. On a current price basis, which is the only basis for which data are readily available for quarterly analysis, there was a decline from a seasonally adjusted annual rate of $45 billion in the third quarter of 1957 to $44 billion in the fourth quarter. The figure was back to $44.4 billion in the first quarter of 1958.

Now, purchases of goods and services constitute a large part of the Federal Government's spending activity, but not all of it. In fact, figures on purchases miss about one-third of the budget total in the period we are discussing. In order to get a complete picture of the Federal Government's spending in 1957 we should, therefore, look not just at purchases of goods and services but at all Federal Government expenditures. If we do this, again using the income and product accounts, we see that the decline lasted for 3 months only, in this case from the second to the third quarter of 1957, that the drop was from an annual rate of $80.3 billion (current prices) to $79.9 billion, only $400 million on a seasonally adjusted annual rate basis, and that there was an increase to $80.6 billion in the fourth quarter.

The President's argument was concisely summarized in the label of the chart used on the occasion of his talk to the newspaper editors. It read: "Growing Unemployment Followed Budget Cuts in 1957." Now if this is read to mean that unemployment in 1958 and subsequently was caused by budget cuts in 1957—which is not an unlikely reading—then we must load onto small, short-lived declines in Federal expenditures or in Federal purchases of goods and services a responsibility that is far heavier than I believe we have any ground for expecting them to carry. And I believe it would be a great mistake to conclude from this experience that any effort at expenditure control in 1963 should be ruled out of bounds. All the more so, incidentally, when the 1963 question is not whether expenditures should be cut or not over the previous year, but whether expenditures should go up by $4.5 billion or not.

Let us pursue this matter a bit further. As we have seen, Federal expenditure reductions in 1957 were not large and did not last long. Indeed, the more closely you look at them the smaller they become. Clearly, one must take a good many other factors into consideration to reach a correct understanding of the 1957–58 recession. Accordingly, let me enumerate, with a minimum of comment, some major factors antecedent to the 1957–58 downturn that, in my judgment, had an important bearing on it.

First, 1955 and 1956 were years of very rapid increase in the production and sale of consumer goods, especially consumer durable goods, reflecting in good part the release of demands that had been built up, and pent up, in the Korean conflict period. These were unusually heavy and urgent demands, and it is very unlikely that they could have been extended without diminution much beyond 1956 or mid-1957. Specifically, there was an exceptionally heavy surge of automobile production and sales in 1955; and high levels of auto sales continued in 1956 and 1957.

By and large, these increases in demand reflected economic considerations such as employment income and price. But it would be a mistake to ignore for one thing the effect of changes in automobile styling in this period. For reasons you must not ask me to explain, the American people rushed to the dealers' showrooms to buy the multicolored cars with wraparound windshields and modest tail fins that became available in the fall of 1954. Their enthusiasm reached an unprecedented pitch in 1955. It continued in 1956 and in 1957, too, but by that time the cars had evolved in design to an unbelievable length, width and weight. And the modest little tail fins of the 1955 model had become very large, indeed, and to me, and I believe to a great many others, were by this time not very attractive at all. To some people they were the sign of an irretrievable national decadence, though happily this was mainly a case of some people's ability to write getting the better of them. In any case, auto dealers' showrooms in 1958 were shunned by vast numbers of Americans and sales of domestically-produced cars dropped in 1958 by nearly 2 million or to very little more than 50 percent of what they had been in 1955. If you are looking for shocks to our economy in this period, this was certainly a leading one. And the rate of Federal spending had very little to do with it. The drop in sales could not have been due entirely to a disenchantment with automobiles per se or to consumer income because at the same time that the demand for domestically-produced cars was collapsing we were importing more and more of the smaller, more compact and less expensive, cars produced abroad. To remind ourselves of the extent of this shift in demand, let me recall that new passenger car imports rose from a value of $69 million in 1955 to a value of $735 million in 1959.

Another factor contributed to the essentially unsustainable increase in car sales that began in 1955 and for which we paid heavily in 1958. Consumer installment credit terms were greatly liberalized, both as regards the minimum downpayments required and the number of months allowed for repayment. Indeed, the liberalization of terms was so notorious that there was widespread advocacy in 1956 and in 1957 for the enactment of standby authority which would permit the Federal Government—presumably acting through the Federal Reserve System—to reimpose controls on the use of consumer installment credit. To all intents and purposes this expansionary factor had spent its force by 1957.

Second, we reached by mid-1957 the climax of a boom in business fixed investment expenditures that had lifted spending by American business on plant and equipment from a seasonally adjusted annual rate of about $26 billion in early 1955 to a rate of about $37 billion in mid-1957, an increase of 50 percent in 2½ years. Obviously, this was too sharp a rate of increase to be continued for very long, and it wasn't. A sharp decline in plant and equipment expenditures began in mid-1957 and continued for a year; at its low point, in mid-1958, it had reduced activity in the investment goods sector of our economy by about 25 percent.

Third, home building had spurted in 1954 to levels that, unless some future revision of housing statistics tells us otherwise, have never since been exceeded. Then, in 1955, long before the short-lived and small 1957 reduction in the rate of Federal expenditures occurred, a decline in housing starts began which lasted for about 2 years, exerting a more or less continuously deflationary effect on the economy.

Fourth, and on a point to which I will refer again in a moment, the years immediately preceding 1957 were marked by sharp increases in labor compensation rates, far in excess of the productivity improvements achieved in those years. The facts on this point are by now reasonably well known and acknowledged. As was pointed out in the President's Economic Report for January 1962, average hourly compensation in manufacturing industries rose by 6 percent or more in 1955 and again in 1956, very much in excess of normal productivity gains. And over the period 1953–57 as a whole, average hourly compensation rates in all private nonagricultural industries rose twice as fast as output per manhour.

As reflected in data on manufacturing industries, the result of this inflation of labor costs, along with other cost factors having a similar effect, was a decline in the ratio of profits per dollar of sales in 1956 and 1957. And in data covering all corporate enterprise in the United States we see that there was a parallel decline in the volume of corporate profits after taxes. I am sure there is no need at this point in the dialog to say that this steady attrition of corporate profits had a deflationary effect on the investment expenditures of business and that this, in turn, had a deflationary effect on economic activity generally.

Fifth, inventories were being accumulated in 1955 at rates that were exceeded in the immediately preceding years only during the Korean conflict period, and the buildup was almost as high in 1956 as in 1955. This, also, was an invitation to downturn at a later date, and come it did. The buildup dropped from a rate of $4.7 billion in 1956 to $1.6 billion in 1957, starting well before and far exceeding in size the drop in Federal expenditures to which such a long list of mischievous results has been attributed.

Sixth, our merchandise trade balance, which reflects the balance between goods exported to the rest of the world and goods imported from other countries, and which then as now showed an excess of exports over imports, rose sharply in 1956 and experienced an exceptional spurt in the winter of 1956–57 when the Suez crisis disrupted world trade.

The effect of this unfortunate international incident on the foreign trade of the United States was greatly to increase the demand for our exports, notably oil, and thus to give a powerfully accelerating impulse to our economy. But the stimulus did not last, and no one would have wanted it to. When the letdown came, as it did in the second quarter of 1957, it inevitably exerted a deflationary pressure on our economy. Indeed, the drop in net exports between the first quarter of 1957 and the first quarter of 1958, measured in current prices, came to $4.3 billion, on an annual rate basis. As an influence on the economy, therefore, net exports antedated and far outweighed changes in Federal expenditures or purchases. Indeed, even between the second and fourth quarters of 1957, which is the particular period to which the President has referred, the decline in net exports was actually greater than the decline in Federal purchases of goods and services.

So, you see, there were many factors conspiring together in 1957 to complicate the task of holding our economy stable and achieving the measure of sustainable growth of which our economy was capable. What a setback to our understanding of the business cycle it would be if we were to fall into the error of thinking that the whole experience was due to a cut in expenditures by the Federal Government. Even more serious, what a misfortune it would be if, based on an analysis of the 1957–58 recession that is oversimplified to say the least, any resistance to the continuous rise of Federal spending were to be discredited as ancient thinking and rooted in mythology.

While I am on this subject of the 1957–58 recession I should like to comment on the interpretation of this event, and of the period 1957–62 as a whole, expounded by the Council of Economic Advisers in its January 1963 Economic Report to the President.

The Council's interpretation may be summarized as follows. In its view, the U.S. economy has lagged continuously since 1957 and this lag, which by exerting itself again in the second-half of 1962 seriously upset the Council's forecasts for that year, has been due to a "suspicion," to the Council's word, on the part of American businessmen that "underutilization was to be the normal state of the American economy." In an interesting venture in lay psychoanalysis, the Council concludes that the downcast spirits of businessmen derive from "[the] unemployment of manpower and machines [that has] persisted for nearly 5 years." Not unexpectedly, the Council finds this unhappy state of affairs to be due to the needlessly restrictive monetary and fiscal policy pursued by the Eisenhower administration in the years 1957–60.

There is by no means enough time at my disposal tonight to address myself as fully as I should like to this interpretation of the 1957–61 period, which I believe to be mistaken. But that opportunity may present itself at some other time. Let me say only that the Council's interpretation ignores major forces that were at work in the economy in 1957–60 in favor of a fascination with fiscal and monetary policy. It gives no attention at all to the 1957 and pre-1957 developments which I have just sketched. And among the post-1957 developments which it ignores is the steel strike of 1959, which completely blocked the normal course of recovery and growth in that year and in 1960 and had the impact on our economy of a minor recession.

And I reject the Council's criticism of fiscal and monetary policy in the 1957–60 episode as having been needlessly restrictive. I believe that their point of view is based on an underestimation of the inflationary developments, actual as well as threatened, that featured that period. We must not forget that those were years of considerable price and cost inflation. I have already commented on the cost and particularly on the wage inflation that was occurring especially in 1955 and 1956. Beginning in 1956, after 4 years of comparative stability, the index of consumer prices began a rise which lasted for about 2½ years and which averaged about 3¼ percent a year. This is a rate of price increase sufficient to cut the purchasing power of the dollar by over 25 percent in just about one decade. There was a sharp rise, also, in common stock prices and in land values. Is there anyone who would seriously maintain that this was a situation that a responsible government should have ignored?

It was no accident that this was the age, fortunately not a long one, of articles on "The Age of Inflation." I would maintain that it is a serious deficiency in any interpretation of the period, and certainly of any interpretation that is intended to clarify policy problems, to overlook the inflation psychology which these writings commented on month after month and which did indeed take hold in those years and spread through the economy and through financial markets especially. The spread of this psychology would have been all the greater and would have left marks on the economy all the deeper if it had not been resisted by fiscal and monetary policy. Under the circumstances, any deviation from monetary and fiscal restraint would have aggravated the inflationary psychology which already existed and would have given encouragement to every inflationary force, whether from the side of cost or of demand, that was then active in our economy. And it would have complicated today's problems of achieving growth and stability and of holding prices reasonably steady. If you will forgive a semifacetious remark, let me say that although I would not claim that the monetary and fiscal policies pursued in the years prior to 1961 were intended to ease the path of my friends on the present Council of Economic Advisers, I hope that some day these policies will receive at least part of the credit due them for having had some such effect.

As I have said in talking about these matters on another occasion, we are not speaking here of an imaginary inflation problem but a very real one with which we had a major encounter. Currently, it is fashionable to disparage the policies which were adopted to meet it, but I assure that if we ever encounter it again we will find ourselves in the position of having to do precisely the same thing over again. And let us not think that this is a total impossibility. Indeed, it was envisaged by the President in his remarks to the Society of Newspaper Editors on April 19 when he said, "If we get again in this country strong inflationary pressure there are obvious monetary restraints which * * * would prevent us from going into an abnormal period."

So much for the business cycle theory implied in the caption "Unemployment Followed Budget Cuts in 1957" that topped the President's statistical exhibit when he spoke to the news editors and for the more elaborate excursion into business cycle history by the Council of Economic Advisers. Let me invite you to consider from another angle the relationship between budget cuts and budget increases, on the one hand, and employment and unemployment, on the other. We can throw some light, I think, on this relationship by comparing what happened to jobs in 1953–55, when Federal spending was reduced sharply, with a roughly comparable reduction in taxes, with what happened in 1960–62, when Federal expenditures were increased by an even larger amount, with no significant change in taxes. Both periods were marked by recession: 1953–54, when the Korean conflict was being ended; and 1960–61, which was much less severe and which can be accounted for entirely by inventory adjustment. But for purposes of testing relationships between budget changes and changes in employment and unemployment it is changes between the terminal years of the two periods which we should compare.

The salient facts are these: Between 1953 and 1955, incident to the liquidation of the Korean conflict, Federal administrative budget expenditures were reduced by $6.9 billion and Federal purchases of national defense goods and services in the gross national product accounts, on which the President places particular emphasis was reduced by $10.2 billion. These figures are in current prices and refer to calendar years. Between 1960 and 1962, on the other hand, Federal budget expenditures rose by $14.3 billion and defense purchases increased by $7.7 billion. One could hardly ask for two more sharply contrasting periods on the basis of which to test a theory that employment will fall if the budget is cut, with or without a reduction in taxes.

What does the comparison show? The fact is that employment increased between 1953 and 1955 while the budget and taxes were being reduced by almost as much as it increased between 1960 and 1962 when expenditures were being raised. The civilian employment increase in the first period was 1 million; in the second period it was 1,318,000.

If one examines the employment figures, however, it will be seen that the increase that took place between 1960 and 1962 consisted in the main of a rise in government jobs—Federal, State, and local. Government employment increased by 665,000 and accounted for more than 50 percent of the total employment increase. There was an increase in government jobs between 1953 and 1955, too, again counting Federal, State, and local employment, but it was much smaller, amounting to 269,000 or only about 25 percent of the total gain.

And what about unemployment in these two periods? The fact is that it increased in both periods: just over 1 million between 1953 and 1955 and 76,000 between 1960 and 1962. But two factors were at work in the economy in these years that together more than account for this difference.

In the first place, our Armed Forces were reduced by 500,000 between 1953 and 1955, as we demobilized following the Korean conflict, whereas they were increased by 314,000 between 1960 and 1962 as our military commitments and involvements around the world tended to become more numerous and to deepen.

Second, labor force participation rates were rising between 1953 and 1955 (from 58.5 to 58.7 percent), which made the task of preventing a rise in unemployment in that period more difficult; they were declining between 1960 and 1962 (from 58.3 to 57.4 percent), which simplified the task of holding unemployment down. We may ask what would have been the result as regards changes in unemployment if these rates had remained unchanged over the two periods. Interestingly enough, if this had been the case unemployment would have increased by half again as much in 1960–62, when Federal expenditures were being increased by nearly $15 billion, as it did in 1953–55, when Federal expenditures were being reduced by around $7 billion. In short, the apparently better unemployment record of 1960–62 was due not to a difference in Federal expenditure policy, but to the simple fact that in those years there was an appreciable drop in the percentage of American people going into the labor market in search of work.

I am sure you understand that the dialog on the relation of budget cuts to employment and to unemployment and on the causes and consequences of the 1957–58 recession are inspired by more than an academic interest in clarifying a few points in business cycle theory or annals, though we may hope for some byproducts of this character.

On the contrary, the dialog is inspired by a very practical policy question. But if I may say so, quite respectfully, the question is not, as the President suggested in his speech to the newspaper editors, whether we shall at this time have wholesale budget cuts of $5, $10, or $15 billion. The question is whether, with the economy rising at a good rate, and I would judge at a good bit faster rate than was officially expected when the budget was put together, but with a large budgetary deficit in prospect, it is sound fiscal policy to increase Federal spending by $5 billion at the same time that we are reducing taxes—over a 3-year period—by some $10 billion. The question is whether in this context of economic conditions and with our long-term interests prominently in mind we would not be better advised to exercise a closer control over Federal spending increases and possibly to hold spending levels unchanged as between fiscal 1963 and fiscal 1964.

This is the practical question, and the purpose of this paper is to show that as we seek an answer to it, efforts at expenditure control should not be blocked by a general proposition to the effect that unemployment follows budget cuts or by assertions that there is a necessary connection between budget cuts (if we were in fact talking about budget cuts) and unemployment such that a $5-billion cut, which the President has cited, would necessarily produce a loss of 1 million jobs. Nor should we be dissuaded from a sensible program of expenditure containment and control—and by this I do not mean just turning down preliminary agency and department requests from the inflated figures which they normally put forward, but by holding actual budget expenditures to a level which, consistent with our wish to reduce taxes, is within our fiscal capability—by a theory to the effect that a reduction in the rate of Federal purchases of defense goods and services in 1957 which occurred within the limits of a single quarter, and which came to $1 billion on a seasonally adjusted annual rate basis but followed an annual rate increase of $1.3 billion in the first 6 months of the year and was followed by a $400-million increase in the first quarter of 1958, should be assigned major responsibility for two recessions, a $12½ billion budget deficit, and a very large outflow of gold.

If we accept this version of history and this line of argument we will have committed ourselves to a policy that is not only inflationary in its direct effects, even if we have to wait a bit for the inflationary effects to show themselves, but which will support and amplify all independent inflationary forces at work in our economy.

What is more, we will have committed ourselves to a fiscal policy which implies the steady growth of government, and in particular of the Federal Government, relative to the private sector of the economy. And we will have invited a basic restructuring of our traditional institutions.

The fact is, however, that there are checks and balances in our economy and in our political system that can prevent such processes from getting out of hand. As a practical matter, you can't cut taxes and raise expenditures simultaneously without at some point getting into a frightful fiscal mess and I expect this fact of life to be recognized before too long. Rightly or wrongly we are going to cut taxes and cut them substantially.

All the best people are for it, though there must be at least a dozen different formulas on how it should be done. Even those who not so long ago were complaining of "public squalor and private affluence" are now vying with one another to reduce our revenue-gathering capability. You can be assured that this frame of mind will not last long because it supports a strategy which is essentially nonviable.

I like to say that I do not make many forecasts, and actually I do not. But I am prepared to make one for you tonight. My forecast is that you will hear a lot more about Federal expenditure control before you hear less. And there is more than an even chance that the idea, ancient as it is, will win a new respectability when it is adopted, as I expect it will be, by the President's own administration, an event to which I look forward eagerly.

And when this piece of ancient thinking has been lifted, as the saying goes, into the 20th century, and put into practical effect, I do not expect it to be followed by unemployment. Nor do I expect it to cause a recession, let alone two recessions. And I do not expect it to promote an accelerated outflow of gold. On the contrary, I would expect it to bring benefits not just to us but to all our friends around the world who look to us, more than to anyone else, to maintain a sturdy, unimpeachable fiscal position and a free society.

REPORT OF MISSISSIPPI LEGISLATURE ON EVENTS AT UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIPPI

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, it is not surprising that the Legislature of the State of Mississippi concluded its recent investigation of the tragic events which surrounded the admission of James Meredith to the University of Mississippi by placing the entire blame on the Attorney General and a courageous group of U.S. marshals who carried out their duty to enforce the lawful orders of the Federal court. It is quite obvious the investigation was designed to support conclusions determined before the investigation began. The unfairness of the investigation is demonstrated by the fact that not a single U.S. marshal was invited to testify about the facts which led up to the riot of the University of Mississippi last September 30.

I do not believe the people of this country will be fooled by the findings of the Mississippi Legislature, but will instead prefer to believe the eyewitness accounts of the riot quoted in a statement issued by officials of the Department of Justice in response to the report of the Mississippi Legislature.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this statement issued May 8, 1963, be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, MAY 8, 1963

Like its predecessor, this report is based on selected testimony from selected witnesses. It is characterized by bias, factual errors, and misstatements.

The major criticism seems to be the charge that the Attorney General sent the marshals to the University of Mississippi as a political move. This does not make much sense. What the report fails to point out and what the members of the committee are aware of is that the arrangement to put Mr. Meredith on the campus was made by Governor Barnett. Not only was the presence of the marshals at the University of Mississippi arranged for by Governor Barnett, but the number of marshals also was approved by Governor Barnett.

It was Governor Barnett also who said that he and the State of Mississippi would maintain law and order.

The marshals went to the university to uphold final Federal court orders for Mr. Meredith's immediate admission to the university. The necessity of Federal intervention to enforce those orders is not questioned by the report.

As for what touched off the riot, the eyewitness accounts of the many newsmen who were present but not called to testify by the committee—provide an objective evaluation. Mr. Sterling Slappey wrote, in U.S. News & World Report:

"Gradually, as the hours passed, the crowd began to grow meaner. People spat at the marshals. They flipped lighted cigarettes atop the canvas covers of the big convoy trucks. Somebody tossed a burning newspaper onto one of the trucks, but it was quickly snuffed out. Somebody else grabbed a fire extinguisher and squirted it in the face of a Negro truckdriver.

"This was the mood when President Kennedy's voice started coming over the radio—at 8 p.m., Oxford time. The President was calling for order and calm. But as he spoke, the campus exploded in violence.

"A length of heavy pipe came hurtling through the air. It struck a marshal's helmeted head. As though on signal, there erupted a rain of rocks, bricks, bottles—anything that could be thrown. The calm turned to chaos.

"The marshals stood their ground. Somebody ordered us newsmen to get out of the line of fire, and the marshals opened up with tear gas—the first round of a barrage that was to go on repeatedly for hours."

Another reporter, Mr. Tom Lankford, of the Birmingham News, described the scene in these words:

"It was obvious to us that this was no pep rally, no demonstration that would break up soon. The shrieks were getting louder, more intense. Students and persons in the crowd were armed. There were rocks, Molotov cocktails, bottles, bricks, and weapons."

NEW YORK TIMES URGES ENACTMENT OF BILL FOR NEEDED FOREIGN AFFAIRS ACADEMY

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, our country now has 32,000 key Government people looking after our interests in foreign countries, not including military personnel. They are from the State Department, Agency for International Development, U.S. Information Agency, Commerce, Agriculture, Labor, and other departments. They are diplomats, attachés, technical advisors, teachers and conferees on foreign policy.

They are among the top group of people responsible for our national security. Our cold war against communism is dependent to a large degree on their capability.

That is why I am cosponsor with the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Senator SYMINGTON] of a bill to set up a National Academy of Foreign Affairs, for the specialized training of our American people on missions overseas.

This academy would be a university-like school to handle up to 1,500 trainees for foreign service work with a faculty of about 600 full-time and part-time professors. Besides specialized training for the jobs our key people are doing in 127 foreign countries and states, the Academy would provide research on foreign service and foreign policy programs looking into the future.

Foreign language instruction would be a major task for the academy. Training in language and other fields of learning in foreign affairs would be provided not only for the Government employees, but for his family as well in certain cases. Now while this would be a graduate school, it would have specialized classes for the whole family of a Government employee who is going to live among the people, so that his entire family would learn the language and learn the way of life in order that every member of that family would, in a sense, be a diplomat for the American people.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial "Foreign Affairs Academy" from the New York Times of May 9, 1963, supporting this legislation be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN AFFAIRS ACADEMY

The old idea that governmental interest in foreign affairs was limited to the State Department and to the Armed Forces has long been obsolete.

The Department of Agriculture, for example, is today concerned with the impact of the European Common Market on the chicken industry of Delaware and Virginia. The Department of Commerce must be alert now to the changing climate for American investment in and trade with all areas of the world. The Agency for International Development has the entire underdeveloped area of this planet as the domain of its activities, and the U.S. Information Agency seeks to bring the American point of view to the attention of peoples in every land. Such examples could be multiplied many times.

Against this background, it is puzzling that the U.S. Government has up to now had no central institution for advanced inservice training of its personnel concerned with foreign affairs, and for research related to such training as well as to foreign policy generally. Efforts are now underway to correct this anomaly through establishment of an Academy of Foreign Affairs. A bill to this end is now before Congress.

The proposed Academy would be a central foreign affairs training and research institute for the Government, performing for the civilian agencies work somewhat analogous to that now done for the Armed Forces by the National War College. The bill ought to be approved at this session of Congress so that the Academy could go into operation as soon as possible.

RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY, 10TH OF MAY, OCCASION TO RENEW HOPE FOR THE OPPRESSED

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, it is with a feeling of sadness that I speak today on what is regretfully becoming an annual duty—the duty to commemorate a Rumanian independence that no longer exists. Each year as Members of this deliberative body comment on the 10th of May, the national holiday of the Rumanian people since they won their independence on that date in 1877, there is the hope another year will bring new hope to an oppressed people.

Each year we note with sadness that a nation that has known the dignity of freedom, now groans under the yoke of oppression. Today, the people of Rumania are not free to observe their own national holiday. But there are Rumanians around the world who have found a measure of freedom, and who remember the loved ones they left behind, sealed behind the Iron Curtain that reached out and engulfed them when they were weakened by the effects of World War II.

The Rumanians, before they fell to the Communists, had carried forward the industrious spirit that had brought prosperity to ancient Rome and later to their own country. The sons of the Romans have the endurance and will to independence of their forebears.

I wish to assure the Rumanian people that our interest in their plight as an enslaved nation under the Communist guns, has not dimmed with time, nor will it ever. I express the hope that the spirit of independence will remain vibrant in the hearts of those who treasure freedom, and that Rumania will arise free from the shackles that now bind them. Long live the Rumanian people.

MRS. ANITA BREWER, NIECE OF TEXAS' STANLEY WALKER, WINS HONOR IN JOURNALISM

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the life of one of this country's great writers, Stanley Walker, of Texas, came to a tragic end on Sunday, November 25, 1962.

Stanley Walker gained fame as city editor of the Herald-Tribune in New York and as a writer of books which enjoyed wide popularity. He became a legend in his own lifetime and commanded tremendous respect within his profession and from his readers.

One of the persons deeply touched by the death of Stanley Walker was his niece, Mrs. Anita Brewer, an able reporter on the staff of the American Statesman in Austin, one of the outstanding news reporters of Texas. Mrs. Brewer was assigned to the story. Her article is a moving tribute to a man who held the affection of legions of readers. As a consequence, she won the first Excellence in Journalism Award ever presented by the Texas Institute of Letters, an award established by the Houston Post in honor of Stanley Walker. It was a worthy bestowal on a worthy person.

I ask unanimous consent that the story of the award entitled "Anita Brewer Given Award" from the American Statesman of February 17, 1963, and the story of Stanley Walker's death from the Austin American of November 26, 1963, be placed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Austin (Tex.) American-Statesman, Feb. 17, 1963]

EXCELLENCE AGAIN: ANITA BREWER GIVEN AWARD

Anita Brewer, American-Statesman reporter who is no stranger to prizes, has won the first excellence in journalism award presented by the Texas Institute of Letters.

Frederic Will, also of Austin and a member of the University of Texas classical languages faculty, won the best book of poetry $100 prize for his "A Wedge of Words" published as part of the university's tower series.

Another Austinite, Miss Jo Alys Downs, was cited for her work as typographical designer for John Biggers' book, "Ananse," which won the $50 prize given by the Dallas Museum of Fine Arts for best book design. It was published by the University of Texas Press. Biggers is art department chairman on the Texas Southern University faculty in Houston. He won the award for his African drawings.

The institute presented $3,050 in literary prizes at its annual dinner Saturday night at the Menger Hotel in San Antonio.

Three of the authors—Katherine Anne Porter, who won the $1,000 best work of fiction prize, Will and Biggers—were honored at Austin's own Writers Roundup in October.

Mrs. Brewer's prize-winning story, "Death Takes Noted Author," won the Headliners' Award for writing under pressure of a deadline February 2.

The $250 Institute of Letters award for excellence in journalism was presented by the Houston Post and establishes a new category of prizes.

It honors the late Stanley Walker, Texas newspaperman who became a legend in New York City as city editor of the Herald Tribune.

Mrs. Brewer, winner of the first Stanley Walker Memorial Award, wrote the story within minutes after she learned of her uncle's death at his ranch home near Lampasas.

"The story was well written though done under pressure, moving yet detached" the selections committee said in its report to the Institute of Letters.

Miss Porter, a native of central Texas, was named the year's best fiction writer for her "Ship of Fools" published by Atlantic-Little, Brown.

Other winners include:

Best nonfiction—"Mary Austin Holley" by Rebecca Smith Lee, published by the University of Texas Press, the $1,000 Carr P. Collins Award.

Most significant contribution to knowledge—"Footlights on the Border" by Joseph Stephen Gallegly, the $500 Friends of the Dallas Public Library Award.

Best juvenile—"Room To Grow" by Loula Grace Erdman, published by Dodd, Mead, the $100 Cokesbury Book Store Award.

Runner-up in fiction—"The Bible Salesman" by Alma Stone, published by Doubleday, the $50 special award given by Rosengren's Book Store of San Antonio. Miss Stone, who now lives in New York, is a sister of Miss Mary Stone of the University of Texas library staff.

[From the Austin (Tex.) American, Nov. 26, 1962]

DEATH TAKES NOTED AUTHOR

(By Anita Brewer)

Stanley Walker, who loved life but on his own terms, ended his life Sunday at his ranch home near Lampasas, just over the hill and across the creek from the place where he was born 64 years ago.

Justice of the Peace Casbeer Snell, Police Chief Henry J. Sharp, and Dr. Alton A. Bishop, of the Rollins-Brook Hospital, Lampasas, were called to the Walker home shortly before noon.

After conferring with Dr. Bishop, Justice of the Peace Snell returned a coroner's verdict of "death by self-inflicted shotgun wounds."

Walker, who shaped newspaper history and a personal legend as city editor of the New York Herald Tribune, was found dead with a shotgun by his side on the porch of a little house he called the museum.

This was the place where he wrote books and articles on his typewriter and where he read from the hundreds of books in his library. He kept there many items he prized, like a singletree his grandfather had made, a still life painted by his mother, and the gun.

The plan for Sunday had been different. He was to go to Temple and there catch a train for Houston, where Tuesday morning he would have undergone surgery. He had cancer of the throat.

The terms of Stanley Walker's life began to change last week, when he learned that surgery would be necessary and that his vocal cords would be removed.

He tried to joke about it, telling his friends Harry Benge Crozier and Edmonds Travis, of Austin, "People talk too much anyway. Now maybe I'll be able to get some work done."

But he also told Crozier and Travis, "I love life, but on my own terms."

Walker's death recalls that of his boyhood idol, his Uncle Ernest Walker.

It was Stanley Walker who said the few words of farewell over his uncle's grave, and it was Stanley Walker who explained in his book, "Home to Texas," why he thought Uncle Ernest had taken his own life:

"His letters contained apologies for embarrassing people and explained that he could not bear the prospect of becoming bedridden and being a burden."

Walker wrote about his uncle's funeral: "Some of the pallbearers, as well as others present, no doubt had scruples about suicide, but none of them presumed to criticize the manner of his ending. One, a realist, went so far as to say: 'He had a sort of code about misfits. When an animal was hopelessly crippled, or diseased, he always destroyed it, usually with a mercy shot. I am not here to judge him.'

"Another, a grizzled old gentleman, trying to be philosophical, put it this way: 'He has gone on an unfamiliar trail. Millions have ridden that trail, but no scout has ever come back to tell us what it is like. Ernest was always careful about the horse he picked for a journey into new country. This is probably his toughest ride. Surely we must grant him the privilege of choosing his mount.' "

Stanley Walker wrote in a magazine article once that when he died he wanted his body cremated and the ashes scattered on the side of a hill, the place he loved. These wishes will be followed.

Walker first became nationally known as city editor of the New York Herald Tribune.

He began his newspaper career as a reporter for the Austin American. He was assistant city editor of the Dallas Morning News from 1918 to 1919. He left the News to go to New York.

Walker was a typical Texan and loved to dress the part. In Dallas, he carried out his city editor's duties at his desk with his five-gallon hat pushed back on his head.

After going to New York, Walker was rewrite man for the New York Herald—now the New York Herald Tribune—until 1926. From that year to 1928, he was night city editor. He served as city editor from 1928 to 1935. In 1935, he left the Herald Tribune to become managing editor of the New York Mirror, which he left after 1 year.

Walker then went to the old New York American as news editor, but after several months he resigned the post, saying, "I couldn't see how I could be of any value to them."

After stints with the New Yorker magazine and the now defunct New York Woman, Walker went back to the Herald Tribune as editor and writer from 1937–39.

He left to become editor of the old Philadelphia Evening Public Ledger from 1939 to 1940.

Besides his fabulous newspaper career during which he made the New York Herald Tribune the liveliest, newsiest paper in the world by hiring a team of bright young writers, Walker's pungent comments and memorable escapades, his adeptness at the "match game" and his warmth and wit are still main topics of conversation when men gather at Bleeck's Restaurant in New York.

Small, wiry, with tremendous energy, piercing hazel eyes and the ability to get a tremendous amount of work done, he continued his writing after leaving New York. In Texas, he wrote "Journey Toward the Sunlight," "Home to Texas," and the new book, published this month by Viking, "Texas."

Recently, he went to Los Alamos, N. Mex., on a reporting job to write the story of that new city of the atomic bomb. In telling about this trip, he said:

"Before asking any questions, I walked around Los Alamos for awhile, just looking, trying to get the feel of the place. I like to do that before getting a story. I noticed that something seemed strange. There was something missing. Then I realized what it was * * * there weren't any old people. No old men whittling, nor chewing tobacco, nor playing dominoes, nor standing around in doorways. There weren't any old people at all."

Walker was a close associate, confidante, and biographer of two Republican presidential candidates—Wendell Willkie and Thomas E. Dewey. He was the author of "Dewey, an American of This Century" and "This Is Wendell Willkie."

In a way, too, he was the official biographer of the 1920's, and wrote about them in his first two books, "The Night Club Era" and "Mrs. Astor's Horse." His book, "City Editor," has been almost a bible for aspiring young newspapermen for three decades.

He made newspaper work seem a wonderful, almost magic, kind of occupation, and somehow lent this enthusiasm to others.

In 1923 he married Mary Louise Sandefer of Abilene. She died in 1944. They had two children, Joan (Mrs. Tom Wenning of New York City) and James Stanley Walker of Abilene.

In 1946, he married Ruth Alden Howell, a Washington newspaperwoman. She is now librarian of the Lampasas Public Library, and brought to the rustic house on Stanley Walker's hillside in Lampasas County good music, candlelight, gourmet food, and a great helping of good humor.

He came home to Texas in 1946. Since then, his typewriter and his mind were very busy, writing and thinking. He was proudly a conservative in politics, but he turned down an invitation to join a rightwing group with this:

"Sure, I'm a Grover Cleveland man, and I believe in working for a living * * * but I believe also in progress."

In the current New Yorker magazine, Walker's latest book, "Texas," is reviewed. The writer says this: "He grumbles about the awful food, the bad schools, the decline of character, and although he does so most entertainingly, he is so obviously in earnest that one wonders why he doesn't make another getaway."

Stanley Walker has gotten away but that doesn't mean he didn't love his Texas hillside and the people who loved him.

Survivors include the widow, Mrs. Ruth Walker; a daughter, Mrs. Tom H. Wenning, of New York; a son, James Stanley Walker, of Abilene, Tex.; two brothers, Lewis Walker and Thurman Walker, both of Lampasas; and four grandchildren.

DEDICATION OF THE PADEREWSKI MEMORIAL MARKER

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, this morning I had the privilege and honor to attend the ceremonies dedicating the memorial marker to Ignace Jan Paderewski at the Arlington National Cemetery. This dedication had a special significance for me, for the final resting place of the great Polish pianist, composer, patriot, and statesman is beneath the mast of the U.S.S. *Maine*, symbol of American patriotism and love of freedom, and namesake of the State to which my father came from Poland in search of freedom.

Ignace Jan Paderewski was already renowned as a musician when in December 1919 he went to Warsaw to help organize a provisional government for free Poland. He later served as Premier and Foreign Minister, participating in negotiations for the Versailles Treaty. He later served as President of the Polish Government in Exile after the Nazi conquest of World War II. He died in New York City, June 29, 1941.

At the order of Franklin D. Roosevelt, the body of Paderewski was temporarily placed in a repository beneath the mast of the U.S.S. *Maine*. No sign or symbol has identified this resting place because it was understood that it was to be temporary. Over the years, however, numerous requests had been made for identification of some kind.

Senator WILLIAMS of New Jersey, in a Senate speech last year, asked that some memorial be provided. As a result of meetings and White House action since that time, the Army has fashioned a marker to designate the site. Senator WILLIAMS worked with the Army, the State Department, and Polish-American groups to arrange today's ceremony. Congressmen who have participated in meetings with the Senator are Representatives JOHN BRADEMAS, ROBERT N. GIAIMO, HARRIS B. MCDOWELL, and CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI.

I was moved by the ceremonies, this morning. They honored a hero of Poland, the United States and the free world. President Kennedy's presence and inspiring comments emphasized the importance of Paderewski to our own heritage and devotion to liberty.

I want to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Senator WILLIAMS of New Jersey, whose efforts made this suitable tribute possible. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the remarks by Charles Rozmarek of Chicago, president of the Polish American Congress and the Polish National Alliance, the remarks by Senator WILLIAMS and the remarks by the President be printed in the RECORD at this point.

In addition, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks made at the 10th anniversary of Paderewski's interment by the then Chargé d'Affairs of the Polish Embassy, Michael Kwapiszewski, be printed in the RECORD at this point. It is a thoughtful appreciation of Paderewski's contributions which should be remembered today.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF MR. CHARLES ROZMAREK, PRESIDENT OF THE POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS AND THE POLISH NATIONAL ALLIANCE, DELIVERED AT THE DEDICATION OF PADEREWSKI MEMORIAL TABLET IN ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY, WASHINGTON, D.C., MAY 9, 1963

Americans of Polish heritage are grateful to the President of the United States, to Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, of New Jersey, to the Army, and to the State Department for this ceremony.

This is not merely a dedication of a plaque identifying the temporary resting place of the remains of Ignace Jan Paderewski. This is, rather, a continuation and renewal of the tributes that are being paid to the memory of one of the greatest artists and statesmen of our troubled times.

All Americans understand our pride in Paderewski, as the son of the land of our ancestry. We are the first, however, to recognize the fact, that Paderewski belongs to more countries than Poland. Through his genius, he also belongs to America and to all mankind.

Paderewski, one of the great geniuses in the world of music, dedicated his spiritual riches to the highest ideals of freedom in world statesmanship.

Once asked who was the greater—the statesman or the artist—Paderewski replied without hesitation, "The statesman." And he gave this definition of the term, which applies so precisely to himself:

"I speak of that man of state whose courage, morality, and wisdom open for humanity a greater path of destiny; of those rare spirits which, voicing the innermost hopes and visions of the race, mold the future and hold up the torch of life."

It was the tragedy of this man, that in the darkening shadows of his life, he saw his beloved Poland once more the victim of Russo-German conspiracy, which subjected the Poles to unspeakable atrocities of war and wasted their homeland.

After the superhuman effort on behalf of Poland during and after World War I, he was blessed with a vision of his native land—free and independent. His joy, however, was short.

For in 1939, when barbarian conquerors from the West and East devastated Poland, Paderewski again gave himself fully to the cause of freedom. Almost 80 years old at that time, he accepted the presidency of the Polish National Council in Exile, and once again fulfilled his destiny to unify and lead his people in their valiant fight for freedom.

It was not given to him to see his beloved Poland a free and independent state and to see international peace based on justice and Christian ethics. He died in New York, on June 29, 1941, among his steadfast friends and admirers—the Americans. He died in the country for which his affections were second only to those of Poland. And the Americans decided that his remains will rest on the free soil of America until such time, when Polish soil will be free.

Some day, Paderewski will return to Poland in the blazing glory of his spiritual greatness. These remains, now reposed in Maine Memorial, will be enshrined in the Polish National Pantheon—the Royal Castle of Wawel in Kraków, and will join in eternal peace and glory the kings of Poland and such noble and inspiring spirits as those of Kosciuszko, Mickiewicz, Sienkiewicz, and other lights of Polish heritage.

It is for us, the living, to hasten the day of the liberation of Poland and to work for a just peace and international justice among nations.

Paderewski has shown us the path of devotion and courage in a deeply patriotic living, and in the service of the only cause worth living for and dying for—the cause of freedom for all the people, everywhere.

Remarks by Senator Harrison A. Williams

Thank you, Mr. Rozmarek. As you have indicated, Ignace Jan Paderewski gave the world much to admire during his lifetime. Since his death in 1941, his memory has continued to inspire those who yearn for freedom. That memory we honor today. And, in doing so, we are honored as trustees of the great spirit of Paderewski. Our trusteeship dates from the beginning of the most difficult times for our Nation, and Paderewski's spirit—the spirit of liberty—today motivates all freemen. The warm affection that we have for the people of Poland is expressed here, too. It is a friendship that will endure as long as justice and liberty are revered.

Remarks of President Kennedy at the Ceremony Honoring Ignace Jan Paderewski, Arlington National Cemetery, May 9, 1963

We gather here today to pay tribute to one of the overwhelming figures of our century. Ignace Jan Paderewski was a great Pole, a great musician, a great statesman and, above all, a brave and compassionate human being.

His life exhibits some of the extraordinary contrasts of our age. Little could seem more antagonistic among human activities than music and statesmanship. Yet Paderewski was a virtuoso of both. This was no accident; for he knew that both were rooted in the idea of liberty—that both depended on the freedom of man to respond to his own vision of life. For Paderewski, the world of art was the completion of the world of politics. As he once put it, "La patrie avant tout: ensuite l'art."

He was, of course, one of the supreme artists of our time. I shall always count it a great sorrow never to have heard him play. The purity of his genius moved millions around the world—and the fulfillment of this towering talent as pianist and composer would have been enough for most men. But Paderewski was, above all, a patriot who could not rest comfortably while his countrymen suffered or lived in bondage. He saw Polish independence as a means of liberating the Polish creative spirit. He gave freely of his energy and resources throughout his life in an unceasing effort to win and protect the freedom of his native land.

No one contributed more generously to the relief of the victims of the First World War in Poland than Paderewski. In Allied capitals he was the eloquent champion of Polish independence, and his personal influence helped persuade Woodrow Wilson to include a free Polish state as one of his 14 points. For a time, Paderewski even assumed the leadership of the new Poland, serving as Prime Minister and arguing the Polish case in the council chambers of Versailles.

When a Second World War exposed Poland to new threats, Paderewski, now 80 years old, once again pleaded the Polish cause. He died on these shores in 1941, and President Roosevelt gave his body this temporary resting place here at the Arlington National Cemetery until the time would come for final burial in a free Poland.

The United States is everlastingly in debt to those Polish patriots, like Pulaski and Kosciuszko, who fought for our own independence 180 years ago. We are therefore glad to recall that the reestablishment of Poland after the First World War was in no small measure the consequence of American representations on Poland's behalf. Within a few months of Paderewski's death, the United States was again committed in a great struggle to assure independence to all nations. That struggle has not been concluded. The pursuit of that goal remains a keystone of our foreign policy.

To Americans, Paderewski stands for national independence, for national dignity, for humanity and for art. It is fitting that the mortal remains of this Polish patriot, whose life and work for half a century were so closely bound to the United States, should rest in our national cemetery until the moment comes for reinterment in his homeland. His music may at last be silent, but the cause for which he lived and died is immortal.

Remarks by Michael Kwapiszewski, May 26, 1951

It is not possible to approach today's ceremony without humility and reverence. The more years separate us from the fateful hour a decade ago when Ignace Jan Paderewski closed his eyes in final sleep, greater and greater looms his figure on the darkened horizon of our world. And the greater the figure, the more difficult is my undertaking to evaluate him as a human being, as a statesman, a humanitarian, and a patriot.

There are those who have rendered such great service to humanity and have achieved such rare distinction that they, in a sense, lose their identity as nationals and become the pride of many nations. Such a one is Paderewski—a beloved son of Poland, the adopted child of all the nations—a citizen of the world.

It does not rest within the present capacity of any man to appreciate accurately the contributions of Ignace Paderewski to mankind. They are so many and so diverse as to make such appraisal impossible.

His genius knew no bounds, covering every area of the human struggle and human aspiration.

His earthly remains have been given resting place in this shrine of American heroes—only temporarily, however, for the American Nation and American leaders realize what was his desire. To return alive or dead to his beloved Poland, whose banner he so proudly carried throughout his life.

Our vigil over his earthly remains must be the expression of our own and his undying hope, that in glory he will return where he wished to rest, in the soil of free Poland.

The great Frenchman, J. J. Rousseau, gave to the Poles the advice so well applicable to the present day: "If you Poles cannot prevent your neighbors from swallowing you, you can at least make certain that they will not digest you."

This the Polish nation is doing today.

Let us be worthy of this struggle, let us close our ranks and conduct ourselves as the immortal Paderewski would wish.

In closing, permit me to quote from the eminent American statesman, the late Charles Evans Hughes, when he paid a touching tribute to Ignace Paderewski on the 10th anniversary of the independence of Poland in 1928: "He has given the world the extraordinary spectacle of the combination of the genius of the artist, the ardor of the patriot, the zeal of the philanthropist, and the wisdom of the statesman. In the period of unparalleled strife and most severe distress, he brought to the crisis the inestimable benefit of constructive leadership. He has known how to inspire, how to rescue, how to conserve. Creative power has rarely had such an opportunity, and rarely has opportunity been so nobly used. He has served his country well, and he has thus added luster to his broad service to humanity."

ANNUAL MEETING OF THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OF THE HANDICAPPED HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C.—RITA MARIE ZANDRON HONORED AS WINNER OF WEST VIRGINIA STATE WRITING CONTEST

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, today and tomorrow, May 9 and 10, mark the 1963 annual meeting of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, being held in Washington, D.C.

As a member of the President's Committee, and the Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped in West Virginia, and a member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I am particularly sensitive to the problems which confront handicapped citizens in the complex world of today. Accordingly, it was a pleasure to attend a portion of the opening ceremonies of the 1963 annual meeting, and to have an opportunity to discuss with responsible officials issues and problems as they relate to the handicapped.

The 2-day session, being observed for the 15th year, is attended by community leaders, employers, members of Governors' and community committees, persons representing many professional areas, officials of Federal and State rehabilitation agencies and many foreign countries interested in reclaiming the talents of afflicted workers.

The objective of this meeting is to focus national and international attention on the importance and value of rehabilitating and employing the handicapped. Programs deal with the effects of automation, workmen's compensation, the role of Federal, State and local governments, and the importance of sheltered workshops in the employment of the handicapped. Employment of the mentally restored and mentally retarded will also receive careful attention.

A highlight of activities is the presentation by President Kennedy of the Handicapped American of the Year Award to David Hall, of Green Bay, Wis. Mr. Hall is a 27-year-old supervisor of the Sheltered Workshop of the Curative Workshop of Green Bay. Paralyzed from the neck down as a result of an automobile accident in 1955, David Hall has since dedicated his life to working with the handicapped and the promotion of highway safety. His life is an inspiration.

Yet another significant moment of this meeting is the presentation of the national awards in the 1963 State writing contests. High school students throughout the United States entered this essay competition, writing on the subject "Ability Counts." Forty-four State winners were then selected, and from their number, five national winners were named. Recipient of the $1,000 first prize was Judith Keith Sikes, of Murfreesboro, Tenn.

Among the State winners present was Miss Rita Marie Zandron, whose essay was selected as the most outstanding among hundreds of entries from high school students in West Virginia. Rita is enrolled at Central Catholic High School, in Wheeling, and resides at 90 Kenney Street in that city. Her sentiments in behalf of the handicapped have brought deserved credit to herself, and honor to her native State. We are proud of Rita Marie Zandron.

Also present on this notable occasion were energetic and capable citizens of the Mountain State who are intensely active in the worthy drive for more equitable employment opportunity for the handicapped. Among these were: Dr. N. H. Dyer, State director of health; E. L. James, Jr., member of the board of directors of Goodwill Industries; and Jack W. Trammell, of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. of West Virginia. All of these civic-minded gentlemen reside in Charleston.

Mr. President, it is my belief that worldwide attention should be focused on the activities and helpful discussions being carried on at the 1963 annual meeting of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped. Only then will we be able to convince all men that it is, as Miss Zandron wrote, "the abilities of the handicapped that matter—not their disabilities."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 5555) to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 138) to redesignate the Big Hole Battlefield National Monument, to revise the boundaries thereof, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 5555) to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

BUILDINGS FOR THE BUREAU OF THE MINT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of Calendar No. 146, S. 874.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 874) to authorize the construction and equipping of buildings required in connection with the operations of the Bureau of the Mint.

Mr. CLARK obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me with the understanding that he will not lose his right to the floor, so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill, S. 874, is to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire sites for, and to construct and equip, such buildings as may be required in connection with the operations of the Bureau of the Mint. The bill authorizes appropriations for this purpose.

The bill itself contains general authority for construction, within the limits of applicable statutes, leaving the nature and location of the work to be done under it to be specified in subsequent appropriations acts.

The proposed legislation would authorize the Secretary to erect a new coinage mint at Philadelphia, Pa., to replace the existing mint at that location. The present mint, which is working practically around the clock and producing a substantial amount of the coinage of the country, is operating with very obsolete equipment and necessarily, for that reason, in an inefficient manner. With the expenditure of this new money the efficiency of the new operation can be very much improved.

The horrid word "automation" creeps into this picture, but it is highly desirable that the U.S. Government should mint its coins at the least possible cost and with the greatest possible efficiency, in a manner which will make it possible to have the work done promptly.

I point out, however, that the proposed legislation is phrased in general terms, and provides authority for future contingencies in connection with the operations of the mint.

The demand for coins has increased considerably during recent years, and the mint has been hard pressed to produce enough coins with its present facilities. The rate at which coin demand has increased is illustrated by a table which appears on page 2 of the committee report, and I ask unanimous consent that the table may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Domestic coins produced by the U.S. mints

Fiscal year:	*Total pieces*
1950	497, 271, 759
1951	1, 157, 820, 778
1952	1, 551, 096, 448
1953	1, 619, 562, 894
1954	1, 451, 654, 402
1955	936, 871, 253
1956	1, 413, 745, 542
1957	1, 899, 739, 340
1958	2, 009, 949, 962
1959	1, 570, 768, 816
1960	2, 566, 946, 842
1961	3, 058, 791, 188
1962	3, 460, 524, 142

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in view of the recent substantial increase in the demand for coins, and the limited minting facilities, arrangements were made early last year for a study of this problem by a private management consulting firm. This firm concluded that the coin demand will continue to increase steadily each year, along with the growing population, our increased gross national product, and related economic factors.

There are attached to the report of the committee the recommendations and conclusions of Arthur D. Little, Inc., the consultants who were retained by the Treasury Department to make the study to which I have just referred.

These major recommendations are:

First, that 200,000 square feet of new manufacturing space be provided as soon as possible.

Second, that semi-continuous casting techniques be used.

Third, that the mint operate with a larger inventory of finished coin or greater financial flexibility.

The hearings were conducted by the Committee on Banking and Currency, in which the case for this bill was convincingly made. There were no opposition witnesses. There was no substantial objection within the committee as to the desirability of the bill, although I believe the able Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], who is a member of the committee, desires to offer an amendment later.

The committee did not consider it necessary to reach any conclusions as to the location of the expanded facilities, because the bill provides general authority to construct and equip buildings, within the limitations of Public Law 87-534 as to the location of the mints in Philadelphia and Denver and assay offices in New York and San Francisco. However, the committee took note of the fact that the Director of the Mint and the Assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury testified that it was the Treasury's intention to continue to maintain mints both in Philadelphia and in Denver. The witnesses further stated that it was their intention, subject to obtaining appropriations, to provide new space to replace the manufacturing space in Philadelphia, as recommended in the Arthur D. Little report, by building a new mint in Philadelphia.

It has been tentatively agreed that the location of the new Philadelphia mint will be in the Independence Hall area, where a new Federal building replacing property to be removed under urban redevelopment laws will add greatly to the beauty and architectural splendor in that part of the city from which I come. We are proud that it is being rehabilitated. I refer to the area around Independence Hall, Carpenter's Hall, and other great historic monuments of William Penn's and Benjamin Franklin's Philadelphia. This particular project will aid substantially in this endeavor.

It has been made clear that no effort will be made to close the Denver mint. On the other hand, officials have said they intend to improve and expand the mint at Denver as needed to take care of the demands of the Mountain and Western States. Improvements may also be necessary from time to time at the assay offices in New York and San Francisco.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I would not want to diminish the efforts of the Senator from Pennsylvania to add to the glories and beauties of Philadelphia. My only concern is that we do not add to the glories and beauties of Philadelphia at the expense of the State of Colorado.

The report states what the Senator from Pennsylvania has said. However, a most unusual situation is involved. My colleague, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], is coming to the Chamber. He is also interested in this subject. Perhaps we can straighten out a part of the legislative history. I have read the report, but we have before us a very unusual bill.

The bill provides that the General Services Administration, or the Secretary of the Treasury, through the GSA, may design and construct such buildings as may be required in connection with the operations of the Bureau of the Mint; furnish and equip such buildings; and acquire suitable sites for such buildings by purchase, condemnation, donation, exchange, and so forth.

The second paragraph provides that all functions with respect to the operation, maintenance, and custody of any building are vested in the Secretary of the Treasury, and all functions with respect to the repair and improvement of any such building are vested in the Administrator of General Services.

The bill also provides that nothing in this act shall be construed as authorizing the construction of any public building as defined in the Public Buildings Act of 1959.

The last section carries a provision for an open-end appropriation.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I have a constitutional objection to any open-end appropriation act. When we consider the construction of a building, we ought to have a reasonable idea of what the building is to cost. Even though it be stated in the hearings or in the report that there is no such intention, if there is an open-end appropriation provision, there is not much of a limitation. That is what we have here.

In addition, there is no limitation on time. I understand the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] has an objection to that provision.

I see that my colleague [Mr. DOMINICK] has reached the Chamber from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which he has been attending. I want to yield the floor to him, but before doing so, I would like to make the record perfectly clear that, in the first place, we are contemplating and discussing only two locations in the bill. Is that correct?

Mr. CLARK. That is certainly my understanding of the situation, and that was what was testified to at the hearing. The Senator's colleague [Mr. DOMINICK] was at the hearing. He asked some very pertinent questions of the administration witnesses. My recollection is in accord with what the Senator from Colorado has stated.

Mr. ALLOTT. Second, there is no intention to supplant the Denver Mint, which has produced coin at a cost much lower than that in any other mint in this country.

Mr. CLARK. There was a feeling, which I think was widespread, among the witnesses and the members of the committee, of great affection for that mint. I am sure the two Senators from Colorado will have no reason to regret their support of the bill, because I am confident that, in due course, the needs and requirements for minting coin in the western section of the country will be met by the Denver Mint.

Mr. ALLOTT. I will desist from asking further questions, because my colleague who is a member of the committee, is present in the Chamber, and I want to give him an opportunity to make a record.

Mr. CLARK. I am prepared to yield the floor, unless the Senator from Colorado wishes to ask me some questions.

Mr. DOMINICK. I would like to speak on my own time.

Mr. CLARK. I yield the floor.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Pennsylvania and my colleague the Senator from Colorado. There was little, if any, doubt during the process of the hearings that a new facility for coining coins—to coin a bad pun—is necessary. The use of coins has increased so much, with the use of vending machines, imposition of taxes, and so forth, that we must have new facilities to meet the demand during the next 6 or 7 years—in fact, probably during the next 15 years. The problem we face is where to put the new facilities.

The evidence showed that, under existing conditions, the Denver Mint is producing coins more cheaply and efficiently than any other mint in the country. It is also self-evident that the mint which is now in Philadelphia and which serves very well the eastern part of the country, with a large population, is an outmoded mint at present, so far as its facilities and equipment are concerned. A great increase can be produced by having a new mint in Philadelphia.

Obviously, there is a good deal of concern in our particular area of the country about what would happen to the Denver Mint in the event a new Philadelphia facility were built. At the hearings I asked Miss Adams, the Director of the Mint, what the programs and plans were in connection with the Denver Mint. She indicated at that time that there was absolutely no intention on her part or on the part of the administration to close the Denver Mint; and that plans had been developed for the expansion of the Denver Mint, which has the necessary room for its expansion, by virtue of farsighted planning, in which the mint itself had acquired additional land around it in order to make available additional space for mintage purposes. I was glad to find that rumors we had heard were unfounded.

It seems to me, if we put too short a time limit in the bill before us—and I do not know what time limit the Senator from Wisconsin has in mind—we may find ourselves in a position where, after the construction of the Philadelphia Mint has been completed, we would be unable to proceed with the necessary programing of the expansion of the Denver Mint, which at the present time is serving almost two-thirds of the country in geographical area.

I ask the Senator from Wisconsin to try to reply to some of these questions that I have in mind during the presentation of his amendment, which I understand will follow shortly.

There was before the committee, in the consideration of the pending bill, an analysis of the Arthur D. Little report. I personally did not have an opportunity to analyze this report all the way through, but I believe there was a fairly adequate presentation of it. This report, which is an independent report, made very clear the fact that the Denver Mint was efficient and economical, and was producing to the best extent possible by any existing mint.

I believe that there should be no doubt in the Record that it is the position of the committee, as I understand it is also the position of the administration, that if the pending bill is passed, it is the intention of the administration not only to build the Philadelphia Mint, but also to program for the future expansion of the Denver Mint.

I ask my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] whether that is his understanding as well.

Mr. CLARK. It is.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I see no figure of any kind, either in the report or in the bill. This is an open-end authorization. Does not anyone have any information as to what the estimated cost would be?

Mr. CLARK. In response to the inquiry of my friend from Illinois, the Treasury Department and those watchdogs of the Treasury, the Bureau of the Budget, did not believe it desirable to ask for an authorization in terms of dollar value. The Banking and Currency Committee was unanimously of the view that it was not desirable to have any figure in the bill but, rather, to leave this to the appropriating process at the appropriate time.

The figure of $17 million has been suggested as more or less within the range of the cost for the Philadelphia Mint. I ask my friends from Colorado whether they have received any information as to the cost of refurbishing the Denver Mint.

Mr. DOMINICK. We did. We computed that the construction on the adjacent property already owned by the Government, and including equipment, would cost about $4½ million. That is substantially below what a new mint would cost. The Arthur D. Little report indicates that a new mint at Philadelphia would cost about $22 a square foot, without including land acquisition costs. The estimate was in the neighborhood of $14 million for the type of mint that was being discussed, and perhaps a little more than that without the land acquisition cost being included. That is my understanding of the Little report.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. This is a rather singular state of affairs. As referred to by my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania, the Treasury, and the watchdogs, the Bureau of the Budget, and the committee itself have not seen fit to put in the bill some kind of estimate. Obviously new obligational authority is involved. If there is no estimate, it does not show up in the budget. I do not think this is any way "to run a railroad." I believe that before the bill came to the Senate there should have been included some estimate, so that the Senate and the House, both in due time, might know how much of a charge there would be, not only on this year's budget but next year's budget, and also in the following year.

The figure of $17 million has been mentioned. If my capacity for arithmetic is any good at all, $14 million plus $4 million amounts to $18 million for the Denver Mint, including the acquisition of land. In addition, it would be necessary to take into account what the cost would be in Philadelphia.

Mr. DOMINICK. I should like to make one correction. The total cost of expanding the Denver Mint is estimated at $4½ million. That is all. The Philadelphia Mint is a wholly different situation.

We estimate that it would cost in the neighborhood of $14 million, without including land acquisition costs. There is under discussion a proposal to put the mint in an urban renewal area. What the land acquisition cost there would be, I do not know. It is not necessary to acquire land in Denver, because the Government already owns the land around the mint.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That would be a total of about $20 million.

Mr. DOMINICK. For the two facilities.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We ought to know more about it.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record, in connection with my remarks, a resolution of the City Council of the City and County of Denver, concerning the mint situation.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

RESOLUTION 10

Resolution acknowledging the importance of the Denver Mint to the Denver area and the entire Nation, and urging that existing facilities of the Denver Mint be expanded

Whereas the Denver Mint has constituted for many years a source of sincere pride to the Denver community; and

Whereas the Denver Mint has for many years been an important attraction to tourists and visitors in the Denver area; and

Whereas the Denver Mint now employs over 300 workers with an annual payroll of some $2,000,000, thus making the mint a highly significant factor in the economy of the Denver metropolitan area; and

Whereas the high productivity and central location of the Denver Mint enables coin to be shipped cheaply, rapidly, and efficiently to banking facilities throughout the United States; and

Whereas various studies have shown that the Denver Mint compares favorably in both efficiency and costs of operation with other minting facilities in the United States; and

Whereas officials of the Denver Mint have urged for at least 12 years that the facilities of the mint be enlarged and improved in order to achieve even greater efficiency of operation; and

Whereas the U.S. Government now owns a substantial parcel of property immediately adjacent to the mint which could accommodate the enlargement of the present facilities; and

Whereas enlargement of the Denver Mint would benefit not only the immediate Denver area, but the entire Nation as well: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Council of the City and County of Denver:

Section 1. That it is the sense of the Council that the facilities of the U.S. Mint in Denver can and should be substantially enlarged and that said expansion should be undertaken as soon as possible in order to better meet present and future needs of the United States for coin.

Sec. 2. That a certified copy of this resolution be directed to the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate of the United States, the same having the matter of mint requirements presently under consideration.

Mr. CLARK. The Public Buildings Act, passed by the Eisenhower administration in 1959, contains no authorization. It is left entirely to the appropriating process. We are only following the precedent set by the Eisenhower administration.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There may be an isolated precedent of that kind, but certainly that does not prove the case. Congress is in charge of the public purse. It ought to know not only what goes into the purse, but also what comes out of it. Here we have an open-end authorization with a rather offhand estimate of perhaps $18 million or $20 million. That could easily balloon into $40 million or $50 million. This may be something like our new Dulles Airport, which is costing twice as much as the original estimate.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I point out to the Senator that not one cent will be spent until that great watchdog over the Treasury, the Senate Committee on Appropriations, approves whatever request is made by the administration.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I know; but under this language, $100 million could be spent. Even if the members of the Committee on Appropriations could be left out of the picture and approval could be obtained on the floor of the Senate and the floor of the House, that would prove exactly nothing. I make the point that this is a very careless authorizing procedure. It should not be done by either branch of the National Legislature, which is charged with the responsibility for the public purse. The Department should be required to submit to Congress figures to sustain an authorization which will be, at the same time, a guideline for the Committee on Appropriations so that when questions are asked, there will be direction to a figure in the proposal into which one can put his teeth. I do not believe anyone can gainsay the fact that fiscally this proposal is a very irresponsible way of authorizing.

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. Mr. President, I offer an amendment and ask that it be read.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 13, before the comma, it is proposed to insert the following: "for any fiscal year commencing after June 30, 1963, and ending prior to July 1, 1970."

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. Mr. President, this amendment would place a 7 year time limit on the bill. The bill provides an authorization for an unlimited period of time to construct and equip buildings within the limitations of Public Law 87-534 as to the locations of mints and assay offices.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] was exactly correct in saying that $100 million or more could be spent. The bill provides no limitation in that respect. The authorization would last forever—in perpetuity. I think it would be wise to provide an actual figure as a limitation. I believe a figure of $25 million or $30 million for an authorization would make sense.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] who is an expert on the Philadelphia situation, has said that the cost of the building will be $14 million to $15 million; the cost of the land, $2,500,000; so the total Philadelphia cost would be $17,500,000.

The junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] has said that $4,500,000 is the maximum amount which is expected to be spent on the Denver mint. That adds up to a $22 million Federal expenditure.

At the same time, I am very sympathetic to the views of the Senator from Pennsylvania. I recognize that it would be fine to have an architectural triumph, as he put it, of beauty and splendor; but when we talk about beauty and splendor, it seems to me we ought also to consider the cost of such beauty and splendor.

I should be happy to support any amendment which any Senator wishes to offer which would place a dollar limitation in the bill. However, once again I say that there are practical objections to doing so. Certainly, we should not open up the situation so as to say that forever, from now on, the Committee on Banking and Currency, which is charged by the Senate with the responsibility of fixing authorizations, shall have nothing to say about establishing limits or guidelines within which mints, assay offices, and so forth, will be built. That is exactly what we are saying in the bill. There is no time limit, and there is no dollar limit.

This means that the Committee on Appropriations could act without any limit at all. But the function of the Committee on Appropriations is exactly what its name implies. Its function is to appropriate within limitations of authorizations. The Committee on Appropriations always looks to the authorization limitations. The members of that committee are harried, harassed, and extremely busy men—undoubtedly the busiest Members of the Senate. It seems to me that we would not be doing them any favor by saying that whatever amount they wish to appropriate is all right. The sky is the limit.

Mr. **ALLOTT**. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. I yield.

Mr. **ALLOTT**. As I understand the effect of the Senator's amendment, it is to place a time limitation in the bill.

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. The Senator from Colorado is correct.

Mr. **ALLOTT**. In a discussion with the Senator in the Chamber a half hour or so ago, I told him I was disposed to support his amendment. I have since learned, although I cannot put my finger on the exact testimony, that Miss Adams testified that this expenditure would involve a 10-year program. I do not believe it would be possible to finish it in less time.

What would the Senator from Wisconsin think of changing the period of time to 10 years? We know that it is planned to build a mint in Philadelphia. We, in Colorado, do not wish to be left out on a time basis, because the expansion of the Denver mint will take place subsequent to the expansion in Philadelphia. Neither do we in Colorado wish to be left out of appropriation bills.

The history of the Denver Mint, as the Senator knows, is a very fine one. It is the best in the country. For this reason, we desire to make certain that we shall not be "included out."

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. The Senator from Colorado makes an excellent point. It is my understanding that the Philadelphia project might well be a 10-year project, and that the Denver project may take longer.

In view of the solid sense of the Senator from Colorado in recognizing that there is merit in providing a time limit, I am willing to modify my amendment. Would the Senator say that 15 years would be adequate, or would he suggest 10 years?

Mr. **CLARK**. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. I yield.

Mr. **CLARK**. Will the Senator yield for the purpose of my suggesting the absence of a quorum? I think that we might briefly confer to see if some satisfactory language may be drafted.

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, without losing my right to the floor.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **CLARK**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. Mr. President, I desire to modify my amendment. I shall read the modification, because it is short.

On page 2 line 13 before the comma, it is proposed to insert the following: "for any fiscal year commencing after June 30, 1963, and ending prior to July 1, 1973."

That would provide a 10-year limitation.

The second amendment is: On page 2, line 15, strike out "such sums as may be necessary" and insert in lieu thereof "$30 million."

That means that there will be a time limitation of 10 years and an authorization amount limitation of $30 million.

Mr. **CLARK**. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. **CLARK**. For the purpose of having the record quite clear, will the Senator from Wisconsin read into the record section 4 as it would be amended by his amendment, should it be adopted?

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. Yes, indeed:

> There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year commencing after June 30, 1963, and ending prior to July 1, 1973, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $30,000,000 to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Mr. **CLARK**. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. I yield.

Mr. **CLARK**. It occurs to me that it should read a little differently, in order to have the intent clear; and I suggest the following:

> There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, sums not in excess of $30,000,000 to carry out the purposes of this Act.

And then with the 10-year limitation which the Senator from Wisconsin has already read into the record.

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania; and I am happy to accept that modification of my amendment. I believe this amendment provides exactly what the Senators from Colorado, the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and I have been asking for. It provides, first, an appropriate and practical time limitation; and, second, a dollar limitation which it seems to me is sufficiently generous to provide for what is needed, on the basis of what the Senator from Pennsylvania has spelled out—but at the same time it limits the amount which can be spent under the circumstances to the amount which we hope will be spent.

Mr. **CLARK**. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. I yield.

Mr. **CLARK**. Mr. President, as the Senator in charge of the bill, and with the concurrence of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, and the concurrence of the two Senators from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT and Mr. DOMINICK], and in light of the debate which has occurred, I am prepared to accept this amendment, as modified.

Mr. **ROBERTSON**. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. **CLARK**. I yield.

Mr. **ROBERTSON**. Of course the chairman of the committee is interested in this proposed legislation—first, because, of course, there is no doubt about the need for new mint equipment and a new building in Philadelphia; and second, because we consider that ultimately a new one will be needed in Denver. I am glad that Senators who are interested in those localities have been able to reach an agreement with the Senator from Wisconsin, whose amendment I approve. It provides leeway of about $8 million, if there is inflation.

We hope there will not be inflation; but it is wise to provide that much leeway above the President's request of $22 million. So I approve of the amendment.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

The amendment, as modified was agreed to.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. **CLARK**. Mr. President, I ask for the third reading of the bill.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 874) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question now is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 874) was passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized, acting through the Administrator of General Services, (1) to design and construct such buildings as may be required in connection with the operations of the Bureau of the Mint; (2) to furnish and equip such buildings with all necessary building equipment, facilities, and utilities; and (3) to acquire suitable sites for such buildings by purchase, condemnation, donation, exchange, or otherwise. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to furnish and equip such buildings with all necessary coinage and other special equipment and facilities.

SEC. 2. All functions with respect to the operation, maintenance, and custody of any building constructed pursuant to this Act are hereby vested in the Secretary of the Treasury, and all functions with respect to the repair and improvement of any such building are hereby vested in the Administrator of General Services.

SEC. 3. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed as authorizing the construction of any public building as defined in the Public Buildings Act of 1959.

SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year commencing after June 30, 1963, and ending prior to July 1, 1973, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums not in excess of $30,000,000 to carry out the purposes of this Act. Sums appropriated to the Department of the Treasury for the purposes of this Act may be available for transfer to the Administrator of General Services to remain available until expended.

Mr. **CLARK**. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. **ALLOTT**. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. **CLARK**. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DESIGNATION OF NATIONAL ACTORS' EQUITY WEEK

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate Joint Resolution 39.

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 39) designating the week of May 20–26, 1963, as National Actors' Equity Week, which was, on pages 1 and 2, strike out the preamble.

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of Calendar No. 127, Senate bill 537.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 537) to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **KEATING**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IRVING M. IVES AND EDMUND EZRA DAY: PARTNERS IN PIONEERING

Mr. **KEATING**. Mr. President, my predecessor in this body, the late Irving M. Ives, was properly recognized as a trailblazer in the struggle for civil rights because of his authorship of the first State Fair Employment Practices Act in America. By his leadership in this field, Irving Ives "altered forever the whole horizon of civil rights"—it has been said.

But this man had other great accomplishments to his credit, and one of them was formulation of plans leading to the founding of the School of Industrial and Labor Relations at Cornell University. This creative and forward-looking development grew out of Irving Ives' work in the State legislature and it has served as a model for many other States to undertake serious study of this vital and challenging field.

Mr. President, Prof. Milton R. Konvitz, a distinguished author and teacher at the School of Industrial and Labor Relations, delivered last fall an erudite and inspiring address on the occasion of the dedication ceremonies of Ives Quadrangle at Cornell University. In his remarks he dealt with Irving Ives' remarkable pioneering achievements and his partnership with Edmund Ezra Day in helping to build Cornell University into the great educational institution it is today.

I ask unanimous consent that Professor Konvitz' address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FOUNDING OF THE NEW YORK STATE SCHOOL OF INDUSTRIAL AND LABOR RELATIONS—A TRIBUTE TO IRVING M. IVES AND EDMUND EZRA DAY

(Address by Milton R. Konvitz)

Soon after Horace Mann died, a public subscription for a statue of him was undertaken, and Thoreau was asked for a contribution. Although a friend of the Horace Mann family, Thoreau declined because he thought that "a man ought not any more to take up room in the world after he was dead."

But some men do take up room in the world after they have died; indeed, some men, like Thoreau himself, take up more room after their death than they did while they were alive.

The room that men take up is much more than physical space. In paying tribute to Irving M. Ives and Edmund Ezra Day, at the dedication of this complex of buildings, we could appropriately recall the epitaph to Christopher Wren, written by his son and inscribed over the interior of a door in St. Paul's: Si monumentum requiris, circumspice—"If you would see his monument, look around." But as we look around, we see a great deal more than what is apparent to the outer eye. For the inner eye sees a school, an institution; and an institution is always, and above all else, an idea; and an idea has its original home and its most congenial habitat in the mind, heart and spirit of a man. Emerson was, of course, right in stressing the truth that an institution is the lengthened shadow of a man.

It sometimes providentially happens that several men are brought together in such a way that their ideas, purposes and wills coalesce into an institution which absorbs their diverse talents, so that they are made to move in one direction, toward an identical goal. Cornell University has been singularly fortunate in such fruitful partnerships. There was the original union of Ezra Cornell and Andrew Dickson White, a pattern that was repeated some 80 years later in the partnership of Irving Ives and Edmund Ezra Day. I find these partnerships full of tantalizing antinomies. White and Day were the scholars, the philosophers, the highbrows, the eggheads. Cornell and Ives were men from the marketplace, the kings, the practical men. One might naturally have looked to White and Day for the ideas, and to Cornell and Ives for the practical implementation. But we know that precisely the opposite happened. The grand ideas, the far-reaching designs, the lofty and splendid dreams came to Cornell and Ives. It was they who were the philosophers, who spoke as if they had fed on locusts and wild honey. It was the so-called practical men who brought their dreams to the so-called scholars and philosophers; and in the partnerships that were formed, the conventional roles of these men lost their significance: the practical men had their heads in the heaven of Platonic ideas, and the philosophers lived and worked in the cave.

The truth is that each pair made up a single philosopher-king; and it was perhaps for this reason that in the process of realization the grand designs were not mutilated or trivialized. In the precarious and tedious business of execution in detail, the ideas, surviving the hard discipline of reality, remained free and brave.

Now, what was the high and pure idea that has become the institution which is the lengthened shadow of Ives and Day?

As the leading member of the New York State Legislature, Irving Ives discovered that, especially in our complex, industrialized civilization, it is through work that a man becomes and gets to know himself as a human being. For only through work can a man rise above the exigencies of nature. Work, as Emil Brunner has said, "is the great and dangerous privilege of man." And yet, when Ives looked about him in his own great State, he saw that millions of men were discriminated against when they sought to exercise this great and dangerous privilege, which was their birthright as men, because of their race, color, religion, or national origin. This abuse and misuse of men made work an ethical problem, and led Irving Ives to become the proponent of the Ives-Quinn Law, the first State fair employment practices act in the United States. For the first time in the history of civilization, opportunity for employment without discrimination became a civil right. Today there are such enforceable laws in 20 States, and their reach has in some States been extended to encompass education, housing, and places of public accommodation. By making employment a civil right, and by establishing a special agency charged with the duty to vindicate this right, Irving Ives altered forever the whole horizon of civil rights.

At the same time Irving Ives saw that almost the entire field of industrial and labor relations was excluded from scholarship and teaching, and was, more often than not, subject to imposture, dogma, ignorance, or lazy conjecture. This was a paradoxical and indefensible situation, for industrial and labor relations are of prime importance in our culture and civilization, and if scholarship is truth—truth about things that matter—then this situation could not be allowed to continue. Ives and his legislative Committee on Industrial and Labor Conditions—the so-called Ives committee—went before the legislature with a bill to set up a school that would fill this vacuum. It was a daringly creative idea, and one that was eminently appropriate to what E. H. Carr has called the 20th century revolution: the expansion of reason. The primary function of reason or the intelligence, as applied to man in society, is no longer merely to investigate, but also to transform. This heightened consciousness of the power of man to improve the organization and management of his social, economic and political affairs by the application of rational processes could not be stopped at the point where man achieves or affirms his "great and dangerous privilege" as a worker.

Men with horse-and-buggy notions must have laughed at this idea of Irving Ives; for there is always a cult of irrationalism, there are always those who would not permit the extension of the role of reason in society. But the legislature accepted the Ives plan; and Edmund Ezra Day and the trustees and faculty of Cornell University gave the New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations "a local habitation and a name." And thus, industrial and labor relations, from an object of fear, revulsion, or indifference, became a subject of serious study.

I would like to think that Irving Ives shared the spiritual values of Thomas Jefferson, who, you will recall, when the time came for him to draft his own epitaph, disregarded all the great offices he had filled in Virginia and in the National Government, and wrote simply: "Here was buried Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of Independence, of the statute of Virginia for religious freedom, and father of the University of Virginia." Irving Ives, too, filled great offices in his State and Nation, and even one of international reach, yet, I think, he would want to be remembered as the author of the first statute guaranteeing freedom from discrimination in employment, and as the father of the School of Industrial and Labor Relations. That is greatness enough for any man.

I venture to think, too, that Dr. Day, in taking steps to bring this school into the Cornell University family of colleges, acted not only in response to the demands of the twentieth century revolution, but also consistently with the best in the classical tradition of education.

Aristotle's disdainful attitude toward work or practical activity led him to the conclusion that subjects of instruction are "partly of a liberal and partly of an illiberal character." All paid employments, he said, belong to the vulgar arts, "for they absorb and degrade the mind." The first principle of all action, he said, was leisure. Even in the pursuit of liberal subjects, the freeman or gentleman must preserve an amateur or dilettantish character. Leisure is always higher than occupation: the power to use leisure rightly is the basis of the freeman's life.

These views of Aristotle dominated education through the medieval period. The main stream of thought held to the belief that practical activity is to be shunned by the pious man, who replaced the Aristotelian freeman, for practical activity was likely to attach a man to the world which he should desire to leave. All practical activity, all work, belonged to the world that followed the fall of Adam and was part of the curse visited on mankind. The best that might be said for practical activity was that it might be a means of discipline against a sinful life.

But the classical tradition had another current of educational philosophy. Plato contended, quite simply, that if theory is a product of mind, so is practice. There can be no reasonable distinction between them, and so education and the life of reason ought not to be confined exclusively to the theoretical. To know a thing or an act is to know it as part of an embracing order. There ought to be, therefore, no sharp line between subjects of study that are "liberal" and those that are "illiberal." A liberal subject may be studied illiberally, and a so-called illiberal subject may be studied liberally. The difference is to be found in the teaching and not in the subject. Thus, Plato's highest type of man, as soon as he attains contemplation, was bound to return to action. Theory must be turned to practical account.

Cicero's thought was in the spirit of Plato when in his speech for Archias he stressed the inner connection among all branches of learning, among all arts which aim at human culture and humaneness. "All arts which have anything to do with man," he contended, "have a common bond and, as it were, contain within themselves a certain affinity."

It was this Platonic attitude that, displacing Aristotelian scholasticism, came to dominate the spirit of the Renaissance, of the Reformation, and of the intellectual, scientific, and industrial revolutions of modern history. Erasmus, by applying to the New Testament the principles of humanism and scholarship, broke down the barriers between sacred and profane learning, and made the Bible itself the subject of serious scholarship. In the same way and spirit, modern scholarship broke down the barriers between theoretical and practical studies, between the traditional "liberal" and "illiberal" subjects. And so, gradually, and often painfully, it came to be generally recognized that scholarship is truth, whether the inquiry is secular or sacred, literary or scientific, theoretical or practical. There is truth in the hitting in of a nail, or in thinking of the problem of evil, or in finding a remedy for malaria, or in dating a Dead Sea scroll, or in the conduct of a union meeting, or in the solution of a mathematical problem.

This was an inevitable development, as we look back upon the process now, for once the Bible and classical literature ceased to be regarded as depositories of knowledge of facts, once men ceased to go to Genesis or to Aristotle for the fact of natural or social history, scholarship, or the search for truth became boundless in reach. Liberty of thought became inextricably attached to the ideal of the unity of knowledge. And so it is natural that today theologians, giving the Bible a fresh reading, see that work or practical activity was not said to be a curse on man, but rather a fulfillment of God's order to man to subdue the earth, so that it may serve his needs and ideals; and intellectual history now traces Western civilization back to this very will to work, to be practical, to create—a will that, as a contemporary theologian puts it, "asserted itself in history by breaking down the barriers which separated the 'merely industrial' or 'merely useful' kinds of work from the 'higher' kinds."

Now, this complex development of ideas and of civilization was, I feel sure, written on the tables of Ezra Cornell's mind, which he summarized in the phrase that is on the seal of the University: "I would found an institution where any person can find instruction in any study.

When Edmund Ezra Day asked Irving Ives to place his School of Industrial and Labor Relations on the campus at Ithaca and to make it an integral part of the university, he acted in the spirit of Cornell and White, and in the spirit of Plato and the humanities, and of all those elements of our religion and culture that are alive and significant for life. Day and Ives, knowing that work is a primary concern of man and of society, and that a substantial aspect of civilization is the system of relations among men who work, and between workers, employers, government, and society, founded a school of industrial and labor relations within a university that does not recognize a classification of subjects into liberal and illiberal, or theoretical and practical, or sacred and profane—a school within a university conducted on the principle that narrow subjects must be studied broadly and deeply, that theories must be tested by practice, and that practical activities must be investigated for valid empirical generalizations, for the one in the many that they may contain.

The establishment of the school broke new ground in American education. We who are intimately connected with the school know that only men who have no responsibility have the right to leave ideas vague. We have the responsibility to turn ideals into practicalities, and to seek near—and even immediate—means to distant ends. We are, however, not gods but men. We do not expect to complete that which is by its nature an infinite task, or to find perfections where only approximations are possible. And so, while we are proud of our functions and purposes, we are humble in the awareness of our imperfections and limitations; yet we hope that, young or old, we shall never want to take in sail, and that it will ever be our determination, as it is our destiny, to strive and to seek to fulfill the ideals of Ives and Day, for whom—with apologies to Thoreau—there will ever be ample room in the world of living men.

A TRACTOR FOR DAMPAU

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, to those of us who are so involved with the formulation of U.S. foreign policy and the execution of the foreign aid program, it is gratifying and refreshing to hear of the activities of private individuals in parallel fields.

I was pleased to learn recently of the fine job one of my New York constituents is doing with the International Voluntary Services in Vietnam. Dan Leaty of Ontario, N.Y., has been with International Voluntary Service a little less than a year and has been carrying out his duties primarily in the village of Dampau. His dedication to his work and to the people of Vietnam has inspired the people of his own hometown to see what they could do to help this village.

Many of the men and women in Dampau have been driven from their homes in the mountains by Chinese Communist guerrillas. They are starting anew to build a home out of the jungle.

Through Dan Leaty came a plea from a missionary in Dampau for a tractor to help turn barren earth into fertile land. Immediately, Dan's fellow citizens in Ontario rallied behind the missionary request. Through funds provided by church and civic organizations as well as through personal donations, a tractor complete with plow and tools will soon be presented to the people of Dampau.

Mr. President, the enthusiasm Dan Leaty and his community of good neighbors have put into this project has my highest commendation. America needs more men like Dan Leaty with his pioneering spirit and more towns like Ontario, N.Y., whose citizens are willing to share what they have with the less privileged people of the world. Their efforts have contributed immeasurably to a better and more productive Dampau and, in turn, have contributed toward a better understanding of America in this tiny village. The tractor they have donated will stand as a lasting symbol of friendship between American and Vietnam.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT FROM TODAY UNTIL 11 O'CLOCK ON MONDAY, MAY 13, 1963

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock on Monday morning next.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE DAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of Senators, in view of the fact that one of our distinguished colleagues, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], will be honored this evening by a dinner being given him in recognition of his services as the former chairman of the Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee, I should notify the Senate, with the concurrence of the distinguished minority leader, that the Senate will not be in session too late today, so that all interested Republicans can attend the dinner in honor of our colleague. I understand that it is a $1-plus a plate dinner. [Laughter.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if my distinguished friend will yield, he is invited also, if he can scare up $1,000.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The minority leader is talking to a Democrat.

INTERIM REPORT BY PREPAREDNESS INVESTIGATING SUBCOMMITTEE WITH RESPECT TO CUBA

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services has filed a report with the full committee on the first phases of the hearings it has been conducting with reference to the military buildup in Cuba and with particular reference to our intelligence activities and operations in connection with Cuba during the year 1962 and to date.

In addition to the report we filed with the committee, which is a secret report and necessarily so because it involves the security of the Nation, we have released to the press and to the public a so-called "sanitized" version of that report which carries all the information and comment thereon which is permitted under the rules for release of security matters of this nature.

I shall present today a fairly brief statement with reference to the activities of the subcommittee so far on this subject and some brief comment upon some major phases of the report.

First, I invite attention to the fact that, so far as the Senator from Mississippi knows, this is the first extensive hearing ever held on a major activity of the CIA and related intelligence activities, and the first report made thereon. Some hearings held of a major nature might have been held, but I have not been able to run across any report which was filed.

This was not an investigation of the CIA at all, but was considered to be a starting point for a better understanding of the problem with references to Cuba and what developed there, and some of the reasons why.

The members of the subcommittee who followed the testimony now have a better understanding of the problem of detection and analysis of information from human sources or other sources. The Government has had to carry on intelligence checks not only with reference to Cuba, but also with reference to many other places in the world. We have a better understanding of, and some sympathy with respect to the problems presented in connection with this matter.

At the conclusion of this phase of the testimony, there was some difference of opinion among the members of the subcommittee as to what should be in the report, as to what should be said and how it should be said. Without anyone yielding one bit in principle, as a result of an exchange of thought and suggestions, which was very thorough and certainly very helpful to me—and I think to the other members of the subcommittee—we now are filing a unanimous report, agreed to by all the members. I think that within itself it is a contribution with reference to this problem.

The subcommittee now consists of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and myself; and I have the privilege of being the present chairman.

I invite attention of Senators to the secret report. It will be kept on file and accessible to any Member of the Senate or any Member of the House, so far as that is concerned, at the Committee on Armed Services and at the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, each of which is located on the second floor of the Old Senate Office Building. I commend the reading of the report to each Member of Congress. There are deletions, necessarily, of facts as well as comment thereon, from the report which went out to the press, but I think there is much solid matter in the report, so far as the material it proposes to cover is concerned.

Mr. President, while our investigation is not yet complete and will continue, the subcommittee has now filed with the Committee on Armed Services an interim report which is directed primarily to the military developments in that unhappy island and our intelligence activities and operations in connection with them.

The interim report filed with our parent committee was necessarily classified as "Secret" since it contains information which, if publicly released, would have affected our national security adversely. However, consistent with our pledge to make all the facts public to the extent permitted by national security considerations, all of the facts and information contained in the report which can be made public under security regulations are now being released to the press and the public.

The subcommittee endeavored to make its interim report as factual as possible. When the evidence thus far presented to us was inadequate to enable us to arrive at definitive conclusions—as was true with respect to the number of Soviet troops now in Cuba and with respect to the question of whether concealed strategic missiles remain there—we have frankly said so. When deficiencies or inadequacies in our intelligence operations appeared, we have candidly pointed them out. In those cases where credit was due to our intelligence people, we have been equally candid.

I would like to discuss briefly some of the major findings of the interim report. As I have stated, it is directed primarily to our intelligence operations prior to, during and after the crisis last fall.

Mr. President, last October we escaped being confronted with operational strategic missiles on our very doorstep by a very narrow margin. We may be thankful indeed that our photographic reconnaissance last fall was able to identify all strategic weapon systems in

Cuba before they became fully operational and to spell out their locations and performance characteristics—all in a limited period of time and despite adverse weather and an almost completely closed society. At the same time, it is important to note that photographic reconnaissance has certain inherent limitations and that the absence of photographic confirmation of a report or reports does not necessarily mean that such reports are untrue. It is to be hoped that useful lessons have been learned from these facts.

From the testimony thus far presented, it appears to the subcommittee that a reasonably competent job was done by the intelligence community in acquiring and collecting intelligence information and data. We found also, however, that faulty intelligence evaluation of the data, coupled with the philosophical conviction of the intelligence officials that it would be contrary to Soviet policy to introduce strategic missiles into Cuba, resulted in some intelligence judgments and evaluations which later proved to be erroneous. A factor which contributed to the faulty evaluations was the tendency of the intelligence community to downgrade and discount the reports of Cuban refugees and exiles.

(At this point Mr. INOUYE took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I do not mean to suggest they should accept everything which is said, but perhaps there has been a tendency to overdowngrade the reports of Cuban refugees. Perhaps that would be a more accurate way to state it.

A few of the instances of faulty intelligence judgment and evaluation deserve specific comment.

The evidence was undisputed that it was not until after a confirming picture was obtained on October 25, 1962—3 days after the President spoke to the Nation—that it was established by the intelligence community that organized Soviet ground combat units were indeed present in Cuba. While I will not comment on this fact at length, its importance should be obvious to all.

In addition, as the subcommittee report points out, the number of Soviet troops in Cuba was substantially underestimated by the intelligence community throughout the crisis. On October 22, 1962—the day the President spoke—our intelligence people estimated that there were 8,000 to 10,000 Soviets in Cuba, including civilian technicians. They now say that, at the height of the buildup last October, there were at least 22,000 Soviet troops on the island.

Despite numerous reports of their presence, it was not until photographic evidence was obtained on October 14, 1962, that the intelligence community concluded that strategic missiles had, in fact, been introduced into Cuba. On this point it is clear to the subcommittee the intelligence evaluation was strongly influenced by the community's conviction that the introduction of such missiles would be contrary to Soviet policy and that, as a result, indicators that such missiles were being installed were not given proper weight.

On the other hand, the subcommittee found no evidence that there was a photography gap between September 5 and October 15, and no factual support for the charge that prior to October 14 a conflict or deadlock existed between Central Intelligence Agency and the Strategic Air Command which resulted in the transfer of the U-2 flights from CIA to SAC.

I emphasize that finding because there was a great deal of confusion and misleading information from various sources about a terrible gap due to some conflict or difference between the CIA and SAC. There was not a scintilla of evidence to support that charge. To the contrary, all the evidence—positive strong, emphatic evidence—was to the effect that there was the closest coordination, cooperation, and working together between them all the way through. There was no evidence of a conflict or a so-called gap.

We inquired closely into the many reports that strategic missiles and other offensive weapons are now concealed in Cuba in caves and elsewhere. All of the intelligence chiefs expressed the opinion that all such weapons have been removed, but each readily admitted that, in terms of absolutes, it is quite possible that some remain. Since absolute assurance on this question can come only from thorough on-site inspection by reliable observers, which we have not had, there is reason for grave concern about this matter.

In this connection, the evidence disclosed that there are literally thousands of caves and underground caverns in Cuba and that many of these are suitable for the storage and concealment of strategic missiles and other offensive weapons. Military activity has, in fact, been observed in connection with a number of these caves, but it is the view of our intelligence people that they are being utilized for the storage of military supplies and gear associated with the weapons we know to be in Cuba, and not for the storage of strategic offensive weapons. Admittedly, this judgment is based substantially on the negative evidence that there is no affirmative proof to the contrary.

Strategic missiles and weapons may or may not be in Cuba at this time. The absence of conclusive evidence one way or the other at this point prevents the subcommittee from reaching a definite conclusion. However, the importance of ascertaining the truth about this matter cannot be overemphasized. The testimony established that if all missiles and associated equipment and the necesasry personnel are readily available in Cuba in a state of maximum readiness, the Soviet medium range—1,100 miles—ballistic missile could be made operational in a matter of hours. Thus, if it should be true that these missiles and their associated equipment remain in Cuba, the danger and peril is clear and obvious.

The evidence upon the number of Soviet troops now in Cuba was similarly inconclusive. Our intelligence people estimate that about 5,000 Soviets were withdrawn following the October confrontation, leaving, according to intelligence estimates, about 17,500 Soviets in Cuba. Another 4,000 to 5,000 Soviets have been withdrawn since the first of the year, our intelligence people say. However, despite this, they have not changed their estimate of 17,500. This indicates to the subcommittee, at the least, a low level of confidence in the original estimate. There is also some doubt in our minds as to the adequacy of information on the number of newly arriving Soviets. The intelligence chiefs agree that there is no evidence that any of the combat ground troops associated with the four mobile armored groups have been withdrawn.

I wish to make one comment about the figure of 17,500 Soviet troops in Cuba and the intelligence that 4,000 or 5,000 have been withdrawn since the first of this calendar year, when in the same sentence it is said that they have not changed their estimate of the figure of 17,500. That statement is difficult to understand on the surface, but I think it is partly explained by the fact, as I understand, that the figure 17,500 is not a firm figure, whereas the figure of 4,000 to 5,000 believed to have been withdrawn is a firm figure.

Bearing in mind the lack of hard evidence on the question and the substantial underestimation of last fall, we conclude that no one in official U.S. sources can tell, with any real degree of confidence, how many Russians are now in Cuba. We feel that the official 17,500 estimate is perhaps a minimum figure. Other sources—primarily refugee and exile groups—estimate that as many as 40,000 Soviets are now in Cuba.

In any event, it is conceded that the combined Soviet and Cuban forces now in the island are quite powerful defensively and could offer severe opposition to any attack. These Communist forces have an extensive and quite numerous array of modern weapons, including some of the latest types in the Soviet arsenal. They are admittedly capable of suppressing any internal rebellion or revolt mounted without external support. It is clear that an invasion from without, to have a fair chance of success, would require large forces, extensive seaborne landing efforts, and adequate air cover.

I think it is fair to say, too, that these Soviet soldiers there, particularly the hard, armored units, could control Castro, too.

Thus, as the interim report points out, aside from the threat which Cuba presents militarily and as a base for subversive activities, the continued presence of the Soviet forces in Cuba is a most effective shield against either internal revolt or invasion by external forces. The ringing of the island by the Soviet air defense and missile systems, and the islandwide evidence of impressive, powerful, armored Russia troop units, all apparently immune from attack, is a psychological damper to the fires of revolt. We can only expect, under existing conditions, that whatever capacity and will to resist communism which now exists among the people of Cuba will further wither and shrink at time goes by.

I would like to emphasize, Mr. President, that in preparing its interim report the subcommittee was fully conscious of its obligation to make the pertinent facts available to the public to the maximum extent possible. No facts have been withheld except those which might compromise or jeopardize our intelligence operations and activities or otherwise give aid and comfort to our enemies.

We have set forth the facts in as concise, orderly, and logical manner as possible. We hope that this report, and any subsequent reports on this subject which the subcommittee may issue, will be useful and valuable both in spotlighting the activities with respect to Cuba and in meeting the basic right of the people of the United States to be fully informed.

I have only a few personal remarks to make before I yield the floor, but first I wish to say a special word about my very strong and deep feeling, official and personally, for the members of the subcommittee, and the very fine way in which they worked on this subject, and their interest and zeal and firm purpose in having a worthwhile report submitted, as far as it could go, and that it be accurate and to the point.

Not the slightest element of partisanship or political consideration has entered into the treatment of this subject.

The Senator from Washington has asked me to yield to him, because he has a pressing matter to attend to. I will yield to him first, and make my personal remarks later.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I wished to call attention to a matter that I believe—and I am sure the chairman of the subcommittee will agree—is a very important part of the inquiry made by the subcommittee.

I refer, of course, to the deep concern of the subcommittee in its inquiry with respect to the placing in Cuba of offensive ballistic missiles. I believe the record should disclose, so that the American people will fully understand, that the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, Mr. John McCone, had predicted, as early as August, that the unusual activity then underway by the Soviets in relation to Cuba indicated to him that one thing they could be up to was the placement of ballistic missiles in Cuba. This information was brought to the attention of the committee on March 12, 1963, when Mr. McCone testified. Am I correct?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. Mr. McCone said he based that tentative conclusion on intuition.

Mr. JACKSON. I will read from the censored part of the testimony. It is also my understanding that he was the only one in the intelligence community who had come to this conclusion early in August. The record, I believe, will so disclose.

Mr. STENNIS. The chairman, of course, could not be certain about it. So far as he knows, that is correct.

Mr. JACKSON. I should like to read a part of the censored testimony, taken on March 12, 1963. It has been cleared for release. It is a very brief excerpt, and I will not detain the Senator for long. It reads:

> Senator JACKSON. As a matter of fact, Mr. McCone, as I recall, either in the previous meeting or someplace else, it was my recollection that you were one of the first to suspect, based on judgment on your part, that the Soviets might put in missiles, MRBM's or IRBM's, in Cuba.
>
> Mr. MCCONE. That is correct; that is correct.
>
> Senator JACKSON. Would you just elaborate on that a little.
>
> Mr. MCCONE. Yes.
>
> We detected the movement of, unusual movement——
>
> Senator JACKSON. What was that date?
>
> Mr. MCCONE. Well, I am speaking now of late July and early August—we detected an unusual movement of men and materiel of an unidentified nature in the direction of Cuba in late July, and it started to arrive in August. I came to the conclusion that the only explanation was, let us say one of the explanations of this unusual movement would be, that they were preparing to place offensive missiles in Cuba, and I so reported my views on August 10.
>
> I had no hard intelligence.
>
> Senator JACKSON. This was a matter of your intuitive judgment.
>
> Mr. MCCONE. This was a matter of judgment. I had no hard intelligence.
>
> I left on August 23, and I was gone until the 24th of September.
>
> I instructed CIA to put out a daily special report on intelligence findings, and they started it on August 24, and continued it until September 19, at which they thought it was duplicative of other information carried in our regular bulletin. I emphasize that there was no hard intelligence to support my position.
>
> Intuitive, I could reach no other conclusion, I couldn't understand why these surface-to-air missile sites were there, so useless for protecting the island against invasion.
>
> They must be there, in my opinion, to shield the island against observation from aerial reconnaissance.

That is a quotation from the censored testimony of March 12.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I now wish to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts, who has a pressing engagement elsewhere.

Mr. JACKSON. I wish the RECORD to show that Mr. McCone foresaw what was later to be developed. I believe he deserves great credit for making this information known.

Mr. STENNIS. We can come back to this point later. I wish to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts now, because he has a pressing engagement elsewhere.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's yielding to me. I agree with what the Senator from Washington has said about Mr. McCone. I have a very high regard for him. If the Senator from Missouri, who is on his feet, will permit me to do so, I should like to make only a brief statement, because I really must keep an engagement elsewhere, but at the same time I do not want to disconcert him.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Of course I am glad to defer to my distinguished friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I appreciate the Senator's courtesy.

With reference to the report the Senator from Mississippi has presented, it is very important to emphasize that the subcommittee has made no recommendations. It has reached certain conclusions, but it has made no recommendations, because this is an interim report; it is not a final report. The subcommittee intends to keep its eyes on this problem for a long time to come.

Secondly, it is very clear that one of the conclusions is, as the Senator from Mississippi has pointed out, that this operation gives the Soviets a foothold in the Western Hemisphere—that it is a problem that we must consider. We must keep it actively in our minds, and be alive to it.

Thirdly, I point out that by unanimous agreement, the subcommittee did not go into the question of the past. It determined that it was a matter for the Preparedness Subcommittee to consider, that the subcommittee had to look forward; that what was past was past; and that we had to start with the facts we now find and that we had to work forward to the best possible advantage.

I point out those three things, because I know the subcommittee was unanimous in reaching the conclusion that it should not make any recommendations, and also that it should not at this time go into the questions of the past.

I congratulate the Senator from Mississippi on the effort that he put into the report, and the great energy he used in persuading the subcommittee to be unanimous on the subject. I thank the Senator from Mississippi, and I appreciate the fact that the Senator from Missouri gave me this opportunity to make these remarks.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator, and again express my great appreciation for his very fine work and cooperation.

The Senator has made reference to the past. Does he refer to the Bay of Pigs operation?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. I should now like to yield to the Senator from Missouri, who had previously asked me to yield to him.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I wish to join the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Washington in commending the able chairman of the Preparedness Subcommittee. He has done excellent work in the preparation of the report. I commend also his staff. The American people will be very glad to receive these facts with respect to what actually transpired in those critical days last fall.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Missouri for the fine contribution in connection with the report and his wise counsel.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator, and join in commending the very able Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, Mr. McCone. As Senators know, I was eager to see him confirmed for this position, because of his extraordinary management capacity, as so well demonstrated in private business and in Government in the past.

Unfortunately, Mr. McCone's intuition, was not reflected in the actions of the Air Force and the other departments which have to do with our intelligence, because, again unfortunately, although Mr. McCone also wisely told his own organization about his apprehensions, that information was not passed on to the intelligence apparatus. Therefore, there could be no criticism of the President or the intelligence apparatus for not having acted on such information. I have been assured that will not occur again.

We know Mr. McCone was whipping together a new organization, and from this time forward I am sure that the people in his agency will be very desirous of promptly transferring his thoughts, not only to the Department of Defense and the Department of State, but also to the Joint Intelligence Board and to the President of the United States.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JACKSON. We must conform to the rules of propriety. I should like to comment on to whom and on what dates in August Mr. McCone passed on his apprehensions.

In response to the Senator's statement, if he will refer to the hearing transcript, he will find an answer to this matter.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am sure we understand each other. I believe it is fair to say that my information was confirmed by what Mr. McCone said to me. I discussed this subject with Mr. McCone; and I have already mentioned it on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. JACKSON. If the Senator from Missouri will refer to the transcript of the testimony on March 12, he will find the answer to this matter he has raised. I do not believe it is proper for me to discuss this question on the floor of the Senate; therefore, I shall let the record stand in that regard.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. Had the Senator from Missouri finished?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Again, I express my appreciation for the fine report submitted by the very able Senator from Mississippi with respect to this most important subject. I now ask him this question: Regardless of what we have done in the past, does he not agree that the presence of large Soviet forces in Cuba, at least from the standpoint of the development of subversion in Central and South America, constitutes a menace to the security of the United States?

Mr. STENNIS. I heartily agree. The report in effect so states, even though we did not spell out the details on that point to as great an extent as we could have done. Before I yield the floor I shall have some personal remarks to make, which partly cover that point.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. I neglected in my remarks to say what is obvious, although I do not believe it needs to be said on the floor of the Senate, because it has been said so many times. As usual, the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], has performed a conscientious duty in accordance with his customary judicial sense of fairness. He has done so with great effort and much diligence. I associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] and other Senators concerning the outstanding work which the Senator from Mississippi has done and is doing in connection with this all-important investigation.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Washington for his fine cooperation.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Arizona, who is a relatively new member of the subcommittee and is making a fine contribution to its work.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator from Mississippi. I merely wished to pay my respects to the chairman for the careful work he has done and is doing as chairman of the subcommittee. I wish also to pay my respects and offer my thanks to the competent staff, who make it so easy to serve on the subcommittee.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Arizona on behalf of the staff and myself.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The subcommittee has submitted a good report. It is factual and truthful. It will give the American people confidence in the Central Intelligence Agency, although all of us must admit that none of us is perfect. I believe that in this particular case the package developed by the Central Intelligence Agency was a good intelligence package. Anyone who reads the report will have to agree with that statement. Also, anyone who reads the report will have to agree that there was an error in judgment somewhere. We cannot point the finger, nor can we select the spot.

I emphasize what the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] said about Mr. McCone. Mr. McCone is competent in judgment. I believe he did a good job. He was constantly aware of what was occurring after about July of last year. If my memory serves me correctly, he was in touch with his office, even though he was in Europe while the disturbances were taking place in Cuba. So there was no lack of interest on the part of Mr. McCone. He kept on top of the situation, as I have earlier related, because the report shows that the situation was well understood. But somewhere along the line, in my estimation, there was a breakdown.

Again, I thank the chairman for yielding to me and for the privilege I have to serve with him on this important committee.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Arizona for his remarks and for his very fine cooperation throughout the hearings and in the preparation of the report.

Mr. President, I now yield to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], who is a new member of the committee this year. He was of great assistance during the hearings and cooperated in a splendid way. He has made a distinct contribution to the report.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I congratulate the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee for his fine work on the interim report. I also compliment the members of the committee and the staff who have worked hard on the report. I feel that the report is a good one. It is objective. It will be helpful to the people of the country to know exactly what the report contains.

It is my judgment that we cannot permit the Communists to remain in Cuba, only 90 miles off our shores. We should demand of Mr. Khrushchev, who is really in control of Cuba, rather than Mr. Castro, that he remove the Soviet forces, including personnel, armaments, and equipment, by a fixed date. If he refuses to remove the Soviet forces by a fixed date, it is my suggestion that the United States should sever diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union and that the Organization of American States should do likewise. If that should be done, I feel that Mr. Khrushchev might change his mind. It is my thought that Mr. Khrushchev would not want the biggest spy headquarters in the world closed; namely, the Russian Embassy in Washington; and that he would not want his other spy headquarters closed; namely, the Russian Embassies in Central and South America. However, if such demands failed to get results, then we should apply a naval and air blockade to Cuba in order to bring the Soviets to their knees.

It has been said that such action might be regarded as an act of war. Possibly it could be considered as such. But, Mr. President, it is my feeling that we cannot permit the Soviets to remain so close to our shores, because that jeopardizes the safety of this country, as well as that of the countries of Central America, of the countries of South America, and of the remainder of the free world. Furthermore, Soviet presence in Cuba provides for the Soviets a base for subversion.

If either of the suggestions I have made does not bring results, then we should not delay longer, but should turn this matter over to the military, in order that the Soviets can be forced out of Cuba.

It is my feeling that we have not been as strong on this matter as we should.

Last fall, when the President demanded that Khrushchev remove the Russian missiles from Cuba, I took occasion to praise the President of the United States; and I was pleased to praise the President for that action. I may say that at the time I was in Brazil, and that action by the President of the United States brought a favorable reaction on the part of the delegates from various free countries of the world who were attending the Interparliamentary Union meeting there.

However, since then, the situation has worsened, in my opinion; and we are now in a position where we cannot permit the present situation to continue. I feel that we must take action; and the quicker we take it, the better for the United States and for the entire free world.

Again, Mr. President, as I have stated, I believe we have here an excellent report; and again I commend the chairman of the subcommittee for his splendid work in connection with this interim report.

In closing, I would like to associate myself with the distinguished Senator from Washington in his laudatory remarks about Mr. McCone.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from South Carolina, and I also thank him for his fine work.

Mr. President, in reference to Mr. McCone, the Director of the CIA, in my opinion he is very capable, very able, and, of course, highly dedicated and alert. He gave us the fullest cooperation, and he was fully frank to the committee. I could not find anything lacking.

I also wish to emphasize that the holding of a hearing on a major intelligence problem is a very delicate matter which should be handled with the utmost caution. I do not think representatives of this agency should be called in for an accounting every few days, or that any small so-called error should be magnified. Of course errors are made. One of the most revealing matters about which we were informed was the difficulty of properly evaluating intelligence. It comes from thousands of places all over the world, and is mostly chaff. That is a very, very difficult and highly important undertaking.

Mr. President, before I conclude, I should like to express briefly my personal views and convictions about the tragic Cuban situation. In doing so, I wish to make clear that I speak only for myself, not for the other subcommittee members, who, of course, will speak for themselves.

I have long said that the invasion of the Western Hemisphere by the forces of godless communism is the gravest and most serious of all the challenges and threats now confronting the United States. Our very survival may depend upon the prompt and proper solution of this problem.

Aside from the military threat—much as we may debate the size and quality of the military power which is currently maintained by the Soviets in Cuba—one conclusion is sure, certain, and inescapable: It is that Fidel Castro—aided, supported, and bolstered by his Soviet masters and their military might—is in every way possible spurring, supporting, and abetting the efforts of the Communists and other revolutionary elements to subvert, overthrow, and seize control of the governments of Latin America. It is with this in mind that we must assess the value to Khrushchev of his Cuban vassalage.

We know that it is Soviet Russia and world communism which is the real enemy in Cuba and elsewhere in Latin America. We know that it is the Kremlin which is calling the shots in this grim and unhappy drama and which is using Cuba for the furtherance and exploitation of its own sinister aims and ambitions.

Therefore, I am convinced that the number one priority of our national and foreign policy should and must be the complete removal of all Russians from Cuba and the adoption of a firm and hard plan which once and for all will rid our hemisphere of this threat.

To those who say that this involves risks and the danger of a nuclear war, I reply that there comes a time—as there did last October—when risks must be taken in order to protect and preserve our vital national interests. The risks of doing nothing—of allowing this Communist threat to fester and grow and perhaps to subvert nation after nation—are infinitely greater.

We must make it crystal clear over and over again to all the world that the principles of our historic Monroe Doctrine are still part and parcel of our national policy, and that, regardless of the risks, we are not prepared to abandon it now. We must continue to demonstrate, by deed as well as by word, that we are determined to prevent, either in Cuba or elsewhere in the Americas, the creation or use of any externally supported military capability which endangers our security or that of the Western Hemisphere.

I close by pointing out again that this is an interim report. The subcommittee will continue its surveillance with reference to this problem, and will try to develop further facts in connection with it.

Mr. President, the Senator from Montana has asked that I yield to him.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am sorry that I did not have an opportunity to read all the details of the speech of the Senator from Mississippi; but I was especially interested in the summary of major findings, 14 in number. If the Senator from Mississippi is willing to permit me to do so, I should like to make some comments and to ask some questions.

Mr. STENNIS. I shall be glad to have the Senator from Montana do so.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am delighted to know, for example, that the inquiry has not yet been completed; also, that many of the recommendations which are made at this time are based on information which has been furnished in large part by the intelligence community headed by John McCone, the head of the CIA. I should like to join the other members of the committee who have expressed their great admiration for Mr. McCone and for the devotion to duty which he has displayed, not only in the position he now holds, but also in the positions of trust and confidence he has previously held in the Government of the United States.

I note that the first of the major findings, as summarized, is as follows:

> 1. While hindsight shows that the performance of the Central Intelligence Agency and the military intelligence agencies can be criticized in some areas, in other areas they performed creditably. Offensive weapons systems were identified before becoming operational and their locations and performance characteristics spelled out in a limited period of time despite adverse weather and an almost completely closed society.

I believe that is a fair statement, although I point out that so far as even intelligence agencies are concerned, we must allow a margin for error.

Furthermore, if my information is correct, what Mr. McCone has to deal with is an accumulation of intelligence estimates from other intelligence agencies, which he, because of his office, has to consolidate, synthesize, and make available to the National Security Council, and, most especially, to the President.

No. 2 is:

> 2. Although photographic reconnaissance has limitations, it was this capability which ultimately produced incontrovertible proof of the presence of strategic missiles and offensive weapons in Cuba. Credit is due to those involved in this mission.

I am glad to know this point has been raised, because questions have been raised about photographic reconnaissance. So the committee has performed a definite service in clearing up this matter.

No. 3 is:

> 3. While a reasonably competent job was done in acquiring and collecting intelligence information and data, in retrospect it appears that several substantial errors were made by the intelligence agencies in the evaluation of the information and data which was accumulated.

Again let me say that this is to be expected. It is too bad that the errors were substantial; but we must allow a margin.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the Senator from Montana is certainly correct in his statement in regard to allowing a margin for error. That is very clear when we see the mass of conflicting reports from human sources with which they have to deal, and in regard to which they have to allow for so much self-interest. In addition, sometimes they receive contradictions from photographic sources.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. STENNIS. That makes it almost impossible to know with certainty the exact location; or perhaps in checking, it is found that cloudy weather had intervened.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Or that the photographs were made from a wrong angle.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In paragraph 4, the chairman of the committee and his committee have brought out the fact that on occasion the intelligence community has predisposition to evaluate opinion on the basis of what they think will happen rather that what the facts are.

I note that in subsection (b) of paragraph 4, the statement is made:

> (b) The number of Soviet troops in Cuba was substantially underestimated throughout the crisis. On October 22, our intelligence people estimated that there were 8,000 to 10,000 Soviets in Cuba. They now say that, at the height of the buildup, there were at least 22,000 Soviet personnel on the island.

That statement can be related to one made several days ago by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], in which he mentioned the fact that there were various figures, going up to 40,000, as shown in the report, and going down to 12,000, with 17,000, 22,000, and other figures in between. He referred to the situations as a sort of numbers game.

That is about the best way it could be stated. The chairman of the committee knows that, so far as the number enunciated by the President is concerned, that number was furnished to him, I would assume, by Mr. John McCone, based upon the intelligence of all the intelligence communities, and was stated as an estimate and not an actual figure. Heads going back and forth cannot be counted, and an accurate figure, under any circumstances, could not be arrived at.

Mr. STENNIS. It is necessarily a "soft" figure, as that term is used in intelligence work. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The chairman has cleared up that point.

In subsection (c) of paragraph 4 the following statement is made:

> In reaching their pre-October 14 negative judgment the intelligence analysts were strongly influenced by their judgment as to Soviet policy and indications that strategic missiles were being installed were not given proper weight by the intelligence community. A contributing factor to this was the tendency on the part of the intelligence people to discredit and downgrade the reports of Cuban refugees and exiles.

I have two comments to make at this time:

First, I recall several meetings which the leadership attended with the President, the Chiefs of Staff, Mr. McCone, and other members of the administration.

When asked, Mr. McCone stated that every single bit of evidence which came to the attention of his committee, no matter from what source it had come—Cuban exiles or others—was looked into, and no bit of evidence was turned aside.

I repeat a statement in subsection (c):

> In reaching their pre-October 14 negative judgment—

If I remember correctly, the President was in Chicago. I see the Senator from Illinois is present in the Chamber. Perhaps he could state the date.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The speech in Chicago was on the night of Friday, October 19.

Mr. STENNIS. The President spoke to the Nation on the 22d.

Mr. MANSFIELD. On October 14 the first pictures were shown. They were the first pictures which indicated what was taking place. They got into Washington on the 15th.

As soon as the President got the initial information on October 14 he ordered increased photographic reconnaissance, so he was absolutely sure of the information which Mr. McCone then presented to him on October 21 and 22. He then called the leadership back from different parts of the country, and the next day showed the pictures, blown up, which proved beyond a shadow of a doubt that missiles had been implanted in Cuba.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct.

To make the point clear, October 14 was the date that the picture which revealed so much was taken. It was flown in here on the 15th. Evaluation was started that night, which was Monday night. Certain evaluations, which are a very minute process, of course, require some time. Then, as the Senator from Mississippi recalls, the President was called back. He was notified, of course, before then, but he turned back on Thursday or Friday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the chairman will yield further, in paragraph 5, the committee states:

> 5. The subcommittee has uncovered no evidence to substantiate charges and speculation about a photography gap having existed from September 5 to October 14.

I am glad that the statement was made, because it answers various charges which have been made.

In subsection 6, the committee also sets at rest the report which has come to our attention from time to time about a conflict between the Central Intelligence Agency and the Strategic Air Command.

Then in subsection 7 the committee states:

> 7. To a man the intelligence chiefs stated that it is their opinion that all strategic missiles and bombers have been removed from Cuba. However, they readily admit that, in terms of absolutes—

I repeat that word "absolutes"—

> it is quite possible that offensive weapons remain on the island concealed in caves or otherwise.

That is a fair statement, if it is not misrepresented. No one can make a statement in a matter of this kind and be absolutely sure, as testimony given by Secretary McNamara and John McCone before various committees has proved. But that has been distorted by individuals from time to time to indicate that an absolute finding was made that there were strategic missiles and bombers yet in Cuba. I would only hope that the differentiation which the committee has brought out would be kept in mind.

Paragraph 8 refers to the fact that there are literally thousands of caves and underground caverns on the island of Cuba. That is known.

No. 9 raises a question but does not state a fact when it brings out the following:

> 9. Even though the intelligence community believes that all have been withdrawn, it is of the greatest urgency to determine whether or not strategic missiles are now concealed in Cuba. The criticality of this is illustrated by the fact that, assuming maximum readiness at preselected sites, with all equipment prelocated, the Soviet mobile medium range (1,100 miles) missiles could be made operational in a matter of hours.

I repeat that only a question is raised at that point. It is not a statement of fact.

Mr. STENNIS. That is very clear. No. 9 is a way of saying that eternal vigilance is required and is absolutely necessary.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Exactly. Point 10 again gets back to what the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] referred to several days ago as a "numbers game," concerning the number of Soviet troops and technicians in Cuba. As I have said before, and cannot repeat too often—and I do this only to indicate the honesty of the President—when the President has given out figures time and time again he has depended on the estimates furnished him by Mr. McCone and others.

I was interested in the opinion expressed in point 11 relative to how high or how low the number of Soviet technicians and troops in Cuba are.

Point 12 is very interesting because in that paragraph appears the statement:

> They—

Meaning the Soviet-Cuban forces—

> are admittedly capable of suppressing any internal rebellion or revolt mounted without external support, and it is clear that an invasion from without, to have a fair chance of success, would require large forces, extensive seaborne landing efforts, and adequate air cover.

It is clear that an invasion from without, to have a fair chance of success, would require, first, large forces; second, extensive seaborne landing efforts; third, adequate airpower.

I would add one further stipulation:

Fourth, time, because those situations cannot be mounted overnight. It takes time.

I am impressed with what the committee said in points 13 and 14.

I think the committee has done a meritorious job. The committee has done an honest job. It has done a straightforward job. The thanks of the Senate are due to the committee for the fairness, integrity, and understanding it has shown.

Mr. STENNIS. We thank the Senator from Montana very much for his fine and generous remarks on the work of the subcommittee, as well as his analysis of the points that were raised.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Since I am not a member of the committee, I have not engaged in this debate. As the Senator from Mississippi knows, I have had an interest in this subject.

I wish to express to the Senator from Mississippi and to the other members of his fine committee my gratification over the report. I commend them for the very careful way they have approached the task which was entrusted to them. I have just seen the report. It seems to be well and carefully prepared, which is typical of the work we have come to know the distinguished Senator from Mississippi engages in. The same is true with respect to the other members of the committee.

I wish to express my gratification particularly, as the Senator from Mississippi has, because of the fact that this is a unanimous report. There has been no tinge of partisanship or special interest entering into the preparation of it. Perhaps I can be pardoned for saying I am greatly heartened by the findings of the committee.

I join in the expressions of praise for Mr. McCone. It has been my observation that he has performed a fine service, and that there were times during this difficult period when the man on the street was often saying, "This is the fault of the CIA." This report clearly demonstrates that that was not an accurate assessment, and I am happy that the committee so found.

I wish to add one word about the so-called numbers game, since my name was brought in by the distinguished majority leader. In that connection, as I am sure the distinguished majority leader realizes, I said there was no merit in engaging in a "numbers game," which is exactly the same thing the President of the United States said.

As to the troops in Cuba, if there are 12,000 or 13,000, which is the lowest estimate anybody has given, that is 12,000 or 13,000 too many. The committee has said so in the report. I believe that most people are agreed on that point.

I think the committee has performed a great service for our Nation, and is entitled to the highest praise.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator very much on behalf of the subcommittee. I thank him especially for myself, too. The Senator from New York has made a real contribution in this difficult field. I consulted with the Senator about the hearings at the beginning, and he made some helpful suggestions.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with the Senator from New York that the Senator from Mississippi and other members of the committee—helping him, I hope—have done their best to bring out the facts, so far as they could find them up to the present time.

As I said before to the Senator from Mississippi, we have very clearly not made any recommendations, because we did not think it was the time to make recommendations.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think the most important fact which is brought out in the report and the conclusions to be derived from it is the fact that the Russians have established a foothold in the Western Hemisphere, and that is something which has to be constantly in our minds, to make sure that the proper steps are taken to get them out of the hemisphere, if we can, and, in any event, to make sure that every step we take is a step in the interest of our own security.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, has the report now been officially released?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes. There is a "Secret" copy of the report with the Committee on Armed Services and of course with the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee. It is classified as "Secret," and necessarily so. It is open to any Member of the Senate or of the House at those places. We think it is better not to take it out.

There is an edited copy which has now gone to the public and to the press. It went to the press this morning at about 9:30. That will be printed. It is now mimeographed, but it will be printed as soon as the Printing Office can take care of that job.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The copy I have, styled an "interim report" by the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, is "for release"?

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is what the Senator refers to as the presently released copy, rather than the report itself?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. That is the so-called sanitized version of the report. In other words, it has been cleared by the CIA itself and by the Department of Defense as being permissible for publication.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is fair to assume that, if this is an interim report, there will be a subsequent report.

Mr. STENNIS. That is the expectation of the committee. We expect to continue a surveillance over this subject for any possible developments. This does complete the intelligence part, up until now.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The report itself—not the interim press release, but the report itself—still has the imprint of classification on it?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And is available only to Members of the Senate?

Mr. STENNIS. Or to Members of the House. It will be in the committee rooms, as I said, available at any time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That clarifies the situation.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. President, I shall complete my remarks in about 2 more minutes.

I wish to thank, as well as commend, the members of the staff of the subcommittee who have worked so hard, both day and night, as well as on some holidays, preparing for the hearings and conducting them, and preparing the report.

I wish to single out two—James T. Kendall, chief counsel, and Samuel R. Shaw, a U.S. Marine Corps general, who has been with us—for their especially fine and highly valuable work.

In the talk I made, I frequently used the term "intelligence community." I read now briefly a definition of that term, as carried in the report itself. I think it should be reflected in the RECORD:

> Broadly speaking, the term "intelligence community" includes the Central Intelligence Agency, the Defense Intelligence Agency, the intelligence sections of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Department of State, the National Security Agency, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. It is used in this report, however, in a somewhat more limited sense. Where the term appears in this report it primarily refers to and includes the Central Intelligence Agency, the Defense Intelligence Agency, and the intelligence sections of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. Other agencies are, of course, impliedly included in our use of the term to the extent that they participated in or contributed to any of the activities or operations discussed.

That definition refers to the term "intelligence community" which I used.

In addition to what has been said about Mr. McCone, we had full cooperation from the intelligence chiefs of different Department of Defense and different services. We found that they, too, had rendered very fine service.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Mississippi a question. If he has already answered it, I apologize, because I was unable to be present during the delivery of his previous remarks.

I, for one, was hopeful that the committee would be able to fix responsibility in the so-called Cuba buildup and indicate to us whether this was due to a slip-up in our intelligence systems or a slip at the policy- or decision-making level. I wonder if the Senator could tell me whether the interim report of the committee attempts to go into that question.

Mr. STENNIS. The report will speak for itself on that point. I do not mean to give the Senator a short answer, but that matter is covered, so far as the report goes into it, as clearly as possible. As the Senator from Massachusetts said, we did not go into final conclusions or recommendations. It is largely a factual report, with some observations indicated therewith.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senate will indulge me briefly, I wish to bring up some nominations. They have been cleared with the committees and the minority leadership. The time taken will be short.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business to consider executive reports of committees submitted today.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE EXCHANGE OF OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS AND GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the majority leader has asked me to ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from Executive G, 88th Congress, 1st session, a Convention Concerning the Exchange of Official Publications and Government Documents, together with a certified copy of a procès-verbal relating thereto, and a certified copy of the Convention Concerning the International Exchange of Publications, signed at Paris on October 18, 1960, transmitted to the Senate today by the President of the United States, and that the conventions and message from the President be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a certified copy of the Convention Concerning the Exchange of Official Publications and Government Documents Between States, together with a certified copy of a procès-verbal relating thereto, and a certified copy of the Convention Concerning the International Exchange of Publications. Both of the conventions were adopted by the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization at Paris on December 3, 1958, and the procès-verbal was signed at Paris on October 18, 1960.

I transmit also the report made to me by the Secretary of State regarding the aforesaid conventions and procès-verbal.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 9, 1963*.

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Secretary of State; (2) certified copy of Convention Concerning the Exchange of Official Publications and Government Documents Between States; (3) certified copy of procès-verbal; (4) certified copy of Convention Concerning the International Exchange of Publications.)

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS TO FILE REPORT ON INTERNATIONAL COFFEE AGREEMENT, WITH INDIVIDUAL VIEWS, DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I ask unanimous consent that the committee be allowed to file a report on the International Coffee Agreement, 1962, with individual views, during the adjournment of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMPTROLLER OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frank H. Tuohy, of New Jersey, to be Comptroller of Customs, with headquarters at New York, N.Y.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Leland J. Hayworth, of New York, to be Director of the National Science Foundation for a term of 6 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Arnold Ordman, of Maryland, to be General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board for a term of 4 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Health Service.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that those nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified immediately of the nominations confirmed this day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

A NATIONAL EMERGENCY ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, first I wish to express my gratitude to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] who, with his customary courtesy, has allowed me to proceed him in recognition. I shall not take very long.

I wish to address the Senate on the question of what has been occurring in Birmingham, Ala. Whether or not there has been a momentary suspension of the situation there, the Nation is facing a mounting crisis over racial relations, equality of opportunity, and the safeguarding of civil rights. It is critically important that this time be utilized to the full before something else happens which could give us even worse difficulties and complicate further the effort to remove the causes of these shattering events.

While I respect the President fully in everything he is trying to do about the very difficult situation which he faces in Birmingham, I most respectfully dissent from the administration's view, expressed by the President yesterday, that situations such as have occurred at Birmingham, Ala., cannot be reached by Federal law. I believe they can be reached through the courts with general power in the Attorney General to sue to enforce the rights of U.S. citizens under the 14th amendment.

I believe another way to reach them, or to try to reach them, is through the present criminal laws. It can be done in the Federal courts under sections 241 and 242 of the United States Criminal Code, which make it an offense to deprive any citizen of his constitutional rights.

The civil right under the first amendment to peaceably assemble and petition for redress of grievances has just been again restated by the Supreme Court of the United States in a case decided February 25, 1963, Edwards against South Carolina, in which the Court made that right clear in freeing 187 U.S. citizens who had been arrested in South Carolina for breach of the peace under State law. The Court said it would free those citizens, convicted under State law, because the conviction infringed the petitioners' freedom to petition for redress of their grievances. It has been long established that the first amendment freedoms are protected, by the 14th amendment, from infringement by the States.

Mr. President, the security of the Nation is at stake.

Let us remember that we are not dealing with a local issue, but, rather, with a local manifestation of a grave national issue. The plain fact is that Birmingham follows Little Rock, Ark.; Albany, Ga.; Oxford, Miss.; Greenwood, Miss., and other clashes. It is another in a long series of warnings to our Nation that we are close to a national emergency on civil rights. The Negro community—10 percent of the Nation and 18 million people—is reacting to a spreading belief that real progress will come in civil rights only when Negroes move directly against segregation and discrimination.

What are we to do under these circumstances? We believe the Negro community is impatient with the pace accorded its demands for compliance with the Constitution; it is frustrated at the constant watering down of measures to meet those demands; it is tired of seeing the Constitution and the laws outraged and defied, even by officials of local and State governments; and it is embittered by so-called progress which they deem hardly measurable within their lifetimes.

First. I think the President should commit openly and fully all our national resources in the fight for civil rights and equal opportunity for all citizens. That would include the determination to lead Congress in the fight. Presidents have done it before. This President should do so. It is the only way the fight can be meaningfully won. I am convinced that proceeding only with Executive authority, without being grounded in legislation, will not be adequate.

Second. The Federal presence, through identifiable officers of the U.S. Government, should be established to bring evidence of Federal protection into every community where civil rights are seriously jeopardized. We sent U.S. marshals to Oxford, Miss. I think we have to do it everywhere this kind of situation is involved.

Third. Where the techniques are manifestly inadequate, the Constitution must be implemented by legislation and the President must himself lead the drive, as I said, in the Congress to implement it.

The President proposed seven measures in his 1963 civil rights message. The administration's four-part voting rights package is good as far as it goes; and so, too, are proposals for technical aid to desegregating school districts and for extending the U.S. Civil Rights Commission. Those seven measures, commendable as they are, do not meet the issue. I believe we ought to be looking, rather, to the 27 legislative recommendations of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission in its comprehensive 1961 reports.

In that respect, I give the following order of priority. I believe that these six measures are needed to alleviate the tremendous pressure which exists in the Negro community for direct action:

First. The required filing within 180 days of school desegregation plans for at least first-step compliance commencing in the next school year.

Second. A sixth-grade standard qualification for voting as a substitute for discriminatory literacy tests.

Third. A Federal Fair Employment Practices Commission covering interstate commerce generally, as well as covering government contractors, Federal employment, and the District of Columbia.

Fourth. Permanent extension of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission.

Fifth. Prohibition of discrimination in hotels and motels in interstate commerce and the elimination of the separate-but-equal clauses in the Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Act and the Morrill Land Grant College Act.

Sixth. A broadened and effective authority for the Attorney General to bring suit in representative cases for denial of all rights under the 14th amendment, which, as I said a moment ago, would include the 1st amendment right of assembly and petition.

I believe that all this is as fully as important as any major policy legislation that Congres has to consider, such as the proposed tax cut. We must fight it out on the floor of the Senate. With the rulings we have had, we may have to fight out an amendment to the filibuster rule.

The hour is very late. The danger is very great. We can afford many mistakes, Mr. President, but one mistake we cannot afford, and that is the failure to take account of the legitimate grievances of a great number of our citizens which go to the very heart of their status as citizens.

I point out that we are going through the third and most dangerous phase.

The first phase centered on the 1954 school desegregation decision. That was the court phase.

In 1961 there were the sit-ins. That was the phase directed to specific examples of discrimination, such as segregation at lunch counters.

Now we are seeing in Birmingham a complete revulsion against the whole social order and every form of discrimination. That makes the hour very late in terms of tranquillity and order in our country, not only in Birmingham, but everywhere else.

All of us are well aware of the propaganda value to Communists throughout the world of our civil rights struggle, especially with such manifestations as the arrest of children and the use of police dogs and firemen's hoses. That should give additional incentive to our insistence upon immediate action.

The remedies are within our hands, in both the executive and legislative departments. We in Congress have failed signally in meeting our responsibilities to the Nation and its destiny in civil rights, and the country is beginning to reap the bitter fruits of our failure. The times and our people will not let us wait. If we would not fail our country, we must act now.

FORTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF TIME, INC.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, Time magazine celebrated its 40th anniversary on May 6 with a most auspicious dinner in New York City. A highly distinguished group of 1,800 people attended this event in the Grand Ballroom of the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel. Three hundred men and women had been subjects of Time's famous cover stories.

It was my great privilege to be present at this gala affair at which Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON and the Rev. Dr. Paul J. Tillich, the famed philosopher and theologist, made distinguished speeches. Also among the highlights of the evening was a brilliant speech by Secretary of State Dean Rusk.

I should like to call their remarks to the attention of the Senate at this time, and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speeches were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE LYNDON B. JOHNSON, VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, HOTEL WALDORF-ASTORIA, NEW YORK CITY, MAY 6, 1963, 10:30 P.M.

Vice President JOHNSON. Mr. Luce, distinguished Americans, as I have looked around the room tonight, I have realized that many of us owe Harry Luce a very great debt for being the first publisher to select magazine cover models on a basis other than beauty.

The 40 years of Time magazine have been crucial years in our national history, and this history has been recorded and reflected in the cover pages of this great magazine.

So this means that we have here in the room tonight the conglomeration of viewpoints that could only be assembled in a free land.

A good many of us would have been shot or sent to remote exile if we lived in other parts of the globe, so it seems to me that those who have been brought together here tonight owe a great debt of gratitude to our Nation and its determination to preserve freedom for us all.

So I should like to ask you to join me in a toast to our host and to our country, America, the land of the free.

Mr. LUCE. Thank you, Vice President JOHNSON, for the inspiration of your words.

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE DEAN RUSK, SECRETARY OF STATE OF THE UNITED STATES, HOTEL WALDORF-ASTORIA, NEW YORK CITY, MAY 6, 1963

Mr. LUCE. The next speaker did not propose on this occasion to make what is ordinarily called a speech. We are very happy to have him here on any terms, and it is understood that it will be some informal remarks that we will receive tonight from the Secretary of State.

Before he rises, permit me to make a few remarks about him and the office he holds.

A great many books have been written and are being always written about the Presidency and our Presidents. If someone should sometime write a short history of Secretaries of State, it might well show that succession is no less remarkable for the talents of the men who have occupied that post than those who have occupied the White House—and a few of them, of course, have been in both lines of succession: Jefferson, Madison, Monroe. Following them were such great names as John C. Calhoun, Daniel Webster, William Seward, John Hay, Elihu Root, Charles Evans Hughes, Dean Acheson, John Foster Dulles.

The muse of history has had her eye on Dean Rusk for quite a while; but the big chapter is only now being written. We do not know how it will come out. But we do know that Dean Rusk has the qualities of mind and heart that will rank him high in this great succession of Secretaries of State of the United States.

It is a great honor for me tonight to present to you the Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Rusk.

The Honorable DEAN RUSK. Mr. Luce, your Excellencies, distinguished, gallant, and lovely company: The clock is running; there are other guests to meet, and I would gladly yield my time for contemplation of what Dr. Tillich has just said, but I am very happy indeed to be here.

My admission ticket was a cover story written just before I became Secretary of State, and in those good old days, Time said some very nice things about me.

Indeed, the man who wrote the article is now working for me in the Department of State.

We are members, I suppose, of a special order of cover story victims here this evening, and all of us share the experience of having been fully exposed; but we have our knight commanders, the men of the year; we have our grand knight commander, the man of the century—the incomparable Winston Churchill. So this is a proud order.

It is a great privilege for me to join the Vice President to bring our congratulations to Harry Luce and to his associates on this 40th occasion of the birth of Time.

An idea has become a vital and throbbing institution, with a special relationship to its readers. Time has always informed them. It has on occasion inspired them. It has frequently amused them. It has sometimes irritated and angered them. But it has never bored them.

They set out 40 years ago to talk about what the news means—not in some disembodied spirit, not claiming to have some special revelation, but stepping forth frankly and boldly to tell its readers what the publishers and the editors of this great publication themselves believed.

Hiding behind no one else, taking their own responsibility, living with the results.

It has become a rather important international institution.

I suppose Time holds the record—I have not made a detailed count—but I suppose Time holds the alltime record for having been banned from more countries than any other publication of general circulation.

I would suppose that in these past 40 years that is something of a medal of merit.

Of course, the thin skin of the U.S. Government, toughened by the first amendment, has never allowed that question to arise in this country.

But on more than one occasion, we in the Department of State have been asked by diplomats from this or that country, "Was he speaking for the Government of the United States?" And we regularly say, "No, brother, shake hands; he was only speaking to you, just as he speaks to us."

Forty years is a long time. A world transformed, this world of Harry Luce and Time, the world of every citizen.

In 1923 relations with only 50 countries. In 1923 still possible for a Secretary of State to say goodby to an ambassador in full confidence he would not hear from him for at least 6 months.

Forty years in which great explosions have taken place. The explosion of states, now 112 of them, 33 of whom have planned elections and changes in government in this calendar year, and 5 of whom have already enjoyed unscheduled changes in government in this calendar year.

An explosion of aspiration, a rather recent discovery on the part of ordinary men and women in all parts of the earth that disease and ignorance and misery are not there by the hand of providence, but something which men can do something about.

An explosion of communications, communications themselves which have transformed modern life.

Just shortly before Time was organized, I remember down in Georgia that we had a homemade telephone system which connected the farms in a particular region—no outside connection. We had a system of rings which called everyone to the phone on purpose, as on certain occasions three long rings meant come to the phone, and it was either a fire which you should come to help fight, or a mad dog which you should chase from one farm to the other, or a Federal officer coming into the area.

And now everything that happens all over the world goes into those same homes—radio and television—and those same homes are intimately involved with every aspect of our foreign policy.

The communications which puts a special emphasis on what happens next for an able and sophisticated and competitive press today finds that what happens today is no longer news—it is what is going to happen tomorrow that is the object of interest and concern.

Although this is the cause for concern and anxiety to those of us who are called upon to be prophets, nevertheless there is something realistic about it, because the pace of events is moving so fast that unless we can find some way to keep our sights on tomorrow, we cannot expect to be in touch with today.

Since 1923 the human race has been posed with an entirely new question, derived from $E=m_0c^2$.

The 40th aniversary—will there be another 40th and a 40th beyond that? A question still for the human spirit to resolve.

I have known Harry Luce in many different ways, as an individual, as a publisher. There are two ideas to which I know he is deeply attached, which seem to me to be central in our relations with other countries. I shall not elaborate either one of them here.

The first is the notion of law. The law which does not enslave but liberates; the law which makes it possible to predict how we shall act—the law which makes it possible for us to pursue our eccentric orbits with a minimum of collision.

Secondly, this underlying and fundamental difference between a world of coercion and a world of freedom.

American foreign policy—you go home, think deeply about what this country is all about, and you have the essence of it in your hand.

A simple notion that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed—simple and to me, Dr. Tillich, relatively unambiguous aspirations of the ordinary man.

Health, rather than sickness; knowledge, rather than ignorance.

Relief from the terror that strikes at midnight.

Ability to move with family and friends in confidence.

The simple notions which can be generously shared because what one has need not be taken away from the other.

These simple ideas are what foreign policy is all about, what the thousand cables a day coming into and going out of the Department of State all mean—what the million Americans in uniform outside the continental United States are concerned about; what the 15 international meetings were working at today, meetings somewhere in the world at which we were represented—what is meant in the preamble and articles I and II of the United Nations Charter to which we subscribed at a time when we had been purged in the fires of a great war.

These are the simple notions which move us forward, and these are the notions that are deeply rooted in the very nature of man, and these are the notions which link us with people in all parts of the earth, and these are the notions which mean that the world of freemen is the world of tomorrow.

This great course of history is moving toward freedom today as it has been before, and when we consult America at its best and our democratic allies at their best, and discover what we are really all about, we can walk the world in confidence and in courage, because that is the world which will surely prevail.

Thank you very much.

The Human Condition

(Address by the Reverend Dr. Paul J. Tillich, University of Chicago Divinity School)

May I express first my feeling of thanks for the honor to be a speaker at this great occasion, a feeling which is increased by my awareness that only the astonishing lack of prejudice in the American tradition made it possible to choose someone who is not a born American and who shows this fact irrefutably by his accent.

When accepting the invitation, I was asked to speak about "The Human Condition in Relation to the Anniversary Celebration of Time Magazine." While the human condition is a subject of general philosophical significance, our interest tonight is focused on the late past and the near future. Nevertheless, one cannot say anything about the present human situation without having an image of the universal condition of man. It is my conviction that the character of the human condition, like the character of all life, is ambiguity: the inseparable mixture of good and evil, of true and false, of creative and destructive forces—both individual and social. Of course, there are degrees to which the one or the other side prevails, but there is nothing unambiguously creative and nothing unambiguously destructive. They accompany each other inseparably.

Sometimes I have the feeling that the American irony, including the style of Time magazine, shows some awareness of the ambiguity of life—as long as it does not degenerate into mere cynicism. The awareness of the ambiguity of one's own highest achievements (as well as one's own deepest failures) is a definite symptom of maturity. Therefore, in an assembly in which so great achievements in so many realms of life are represented, it may be justified to speak of something I suggest to call the ambiguity of perfection. He who is not aware of the ambiguity of his perfection as a person and in his work is not yet mature; and a nation which is not aware of the ambiguity of its greatness also lacks maturity. Are we mature as a nation, are we aware of the ambiguity even of the best in us?

There are signs of such awareness in many places. The very fact that I was asked to speak about the "human condition" points to a lack of certainty about the excellence of this condition. An awareness of the ambiguity of our achievements is alive in those who know that the American form of democracy, though preferable to most other present political methods, is not the end of the ways of historical providence. It is alive in those who realize that our methods of education-in-breadth, though desirable, are full of dangers for the future of our culture. It is alive in those who realize that the immense success of our economic system, though justified by this success, is not unambiguous criterion for all other systems. It is alive in churches insofar as they recognize that they are not the unambiguous and exclusive vehicle of the manifestation of the mystery of being.

These are symptoms of growing maturity. Against them stand the forces for whom everything human is divided into one part which is unambiguously right—to which they themselves belong and those who go with them—and the other part which is unambiguously right—even if it were one-half of all mankind. This is immaturity, nourished by ignorance, indoctrination, and propaganda of fear and hate. It seems to me that it is the duty of all those whose voices can be heard—governments, parties, media of communication including the great magazines—to become more aware of this situation. These forces which claim unambiguous perfection damage the finest in American spirit, that which once has created a constitution based on the awareness of the ambiguity of perfection in all bearers of power.

While the ambiguity of perfection is true of the human condition under all circumstances, there is an ambiguity which is particularly true of our present condition. It is based on the fact that our culture is one-dimensional, determined by the drive toward expansion in the horizontal line: be it the push into outer space, be it the production of ever new and improved tools, be it the increase in means and materials of communication, be it the growing number of human beings to whom cultural goods are available—all this is one-dimensional horizontal expansion. Therefore, it is subject to the ambiguity of expansion.

Ambiguity does not mean evil. The merely negative critics of our condition confuse the two concepts and are not able to name the positive sources from which even their own criticism derives: if everything were negative it could not even be recognized as negative. Life is not like that—its problem is deeper. It is profoundly ambiguous.

I want to exemplify this through the concept of cultural goods as they are available to more and more people. It is certainly significant that the creations of all centuries now lie in the grasp of a large proportion of the people through wide-open education and through public communication, but the ambiguity appears if the creations of past and present become cultural goods to be sold and bought. This is hardly avoidable but it can be fought; and it is one of my finest experiences that in many places in this country, small groups, centered around one serious book, interpreting it week by week, do this uphill fight, perhaps without knowing it.

For it is an uphill fight. The negative forces of our one-dimensional culture are extremely strong: if cultural goods can be sold and bought it is an almost irresistible temptation for contemporary creative minds to produce in order to sell. Often they resist this temptation and are in danger of being ignored by society but who can prevent the consumers from taking the greatest creations of the past as goods for their entertainment or their social standing or as objects of conversation? Nobody can, and the consumers then miss tragically the experience of these works as expressions of ultimate human possibilities, profoundly significant for their own existence and the meaning of their own lives. In the line of this thought, I would sum up my philosophy of education in the demand that education through all cultural creations must lead to initiation; namely, to initiation into the depth of life and the meaning of human existence. But we ask: Is this possible in a one-dimensional culture? For the mystery of life belongs to the dimension of depths.

Every great cultural creation has in itself an inexhaustible depth of meaning. Much self-denial was needed to produce it and much self-denial is needed to receive it. We must stop running in the one dimension. We must come to a rest, we must enter the creation and unite with its inner power. This is true of works of art, literature, of philosophy, of symbols of religion, and of relations to other human beings. But it is hard to find such rest in a one-dimensional culture. The endless variety of possibility, the fascination of the new, the demand to be ahead of the development make waiting and contemplating almost impossible. The market of cultural goods requires always more production and more exchange: this is what ambiguity of expansion means.

It is the role of the creative critic to show the ambiguity of perfection in every culture. And we had great critics in the late past and we hope to have them in the future.

However, they also have to fight a continuous struggle in the one-dimensional culture. Their fight is not that of the critic in former cultures where it could lead to martyrdom; but it is the fight against being taken into the culture as another cultural good. Then the Socratic gadfly is imprisoned though not in order to be killed. He is fed even with food for his criticism but he is not free to give a judgment from the vertical dimension which may shake the culture that feeds him in its foundations.

You may think that these are words of a theologian who wants to sell the oldest cultural good, namely religion. He does not. Even if one calls the experience in the vertical dimension religious it is not what this word usually connotes. It is not what I sometimes have called the magazine-concept of religion, namely, religion as one of the cultural functions of man's spirit reported for instance between economy and sports, considered as the job of the "religionist"—the most antireligious word in the English language. Religion as the experience of the vertical line is effective in every creative work, in artistic as well as scientific, in ethical as well as in political, in technical as well as in economic creations, and even the power of playing, this great symbol of human freedom. Religion in this sense is the state in which we are grasped by the infinite seriousness of the question of the meaning of our life and our readiness to receive answers and to act according to them. These questions and answers are ordinarily expressed in systems of religious thought and life. But they are not exclusively bound to such expression. The vertical dimension, the dimension of depths is present in the secular as well as in the religious realm. It is present, too, in our own one-dimensional culture though obscured and suppressed by the forces of the horizontal and their restless drives.

It is my hope for the future that they will be uncovered and liberated far more and for far more people than they are under the human condition in the present period. And I believe that it is the duty of all those who speak for our times—including Time magazine—to help with passion and wisdom so that the ultimate question becomes powerful again in our Western culture and in our Nation.

Mr. JAVITS. I add my tribute to Time magazine and to its renowned founder and editor in chief, Henry R. Luce, and his principal associates, Roy E. Larsen, Andrew Heiskell, James A. Linen, Wedley Donovan, and to the staff of Time, Inc. They have brought new and bold concepts into the magazine publishing business; they have added refreshing innovations to the communications media; they have enriched the journalism profession and have become a great and influential force in American society.

SHIPPING CONFERENCE FREIGHT RATES MUCH HIGHER FOR AMERICAN STEEL EXPORTS THAN FOR FOREIGN STEEL IMPORTS IN SHIPS GOING TO AND FROM THE SAME PORTS CARRYING IDENTICAL ITEMS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on May 2, the final day of the Joint Economic Committee hearings on steel, the committee went into the question of the effect of international competitive factors on the domestic steel industry. Mr. Walter Lederer, Chief, Balance of Payments Division of the Department of Commerce, was our chief witness for this final day's hearing. Near the end of his testimony, he produced a table on the comparison of ocean freight rates on iron and steel products for three U.S. foreign trade routes. This table showed that ocean freight rates established by the international shipping conferences—the steamship cartels—are very much higher from a given port in the United States to North Atlantic-Western Germany and French ports, and Pacific coast and Japanese ports than are tonnage conference rates on identical products shipped from the same ports to a given American port.

What this table indicated was that the same ships traveling to and from the same American and foreign ports have, in almost every case, higher conference rates for steel exports from the United States than for the same steel imports from abroad. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this table be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—*Comparison of conference ocean freight rates effective March 1962 on iron and steel products for 3 U.S. foreign trade routes*

[Amount in dollars]

Commodity	U.S. North Atlantic ports and West Germany [1]		U.S. gulf ports and North Atlantic French ports [2]		U.S. Pacific ports and Japan [3]	
	Freight rate on U.S. exports	Freight rate on U.S. imports	Freight rate on U.S. exports	Freight rate on U.S. imports	Freight rate on U.S. exports	Freight rate on U.S. imports
Angles, beams, girders (structurals)	31.25	19.75	28.50	17.00	28.10	15.50
Bolts	31.25	24.00	28.50	20.50	(4)	(4)
Castings and forgings	44.25	29.25	40.25	34.00	(4)	(4)
Billets and blooms	(4)	(4)	13.25	17.00	30.35	15.50
Rails	36.75	19.75	33.50	17.00	(5)	(5)
Rods, wire, plain	29.50	18.25	(5)	(5)	28.25	15.50
Screws	46.00	24.00	(5)	(5)	(5)	(5)
Pipes, iron and steel 6-inch diameter	(4)	(1)	(4)	(4)	30.35	21.00
Wire, barbed	28.50	23.00	28.50	19.00	(4)	(4)
Bars, reinforcing up to 40 feet	(4)	19.75	(4)	(4)	28.10	(4)
Oil well casings	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	33.60	21.00
Shapes, plain, not fabricated	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	28.10	(4)
Rods	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	28.25	15.50

[1] North Atlantic Continental Freight Conference tariffs.

[2] Gulf-French Atlantic Hamburg Range Conference-Continental United States Gulf Westbound Conference.

[3] Pacific Westbound Conference and Trans Pacific Freight Conference of Japan.

[4] Freight rate is either not available or the commodities are included in another class.

[5] Not available.

NOTE.—Freight on exports on ton basis, 2,240 pounds; freight on imports on ton basis, 1,000 kilos=2,204.6 pounds (except Japan where import freight is on the long-ton basis, 2,240 pounds).

Source: U.S. Federal Maritime Commission, Division of Foreign Tariffs.

HIGHER RATES FOR EXPORTS THAN IMPORTS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, columns 1 and 2 of this table show, for example, that the freight rates on traffic between U.S. North Atlantic ports and West Germany were considerably higher on our exports than on the imports from the same ports and in the same ships. For example, the conference rates on angles, beams, and girders, as of March 1962, were $31.25 per ton on U.S. exports, but only $19.75 on U.S. imports, or a difference of $11.50 per ton.

On bolts the rates were $31.25 per ton on our exports but only $24 on imports, or a difference of $7.25 per ton. On castings and forgings the conference rates were $44.25 on our exports but only $29.25 on imports, or a difference of $15.

On screws the rates were $46 for our exports, but only $24 on our imports, or a difference of $22, or over 90 percent higher.

The same general facts were true for rates between U.S. gulf ports and North Atlantic-French ports, and between U.S. Pacific ports and Japanese ports.

If we take the simple arithmetic average for the three routes on the table, we find in the case of ingots, blooms, billots, and slabs the excess of conference export rates over import conference rates, effective in March 1962, was 86 percent; in the case of wire rods, 71 percent; in the case of structural shapes and piling, 69 percent; in the case of rails and accessories, 91 percent; in the case of wire nails, 34 percent; in the case of pipe and tubing, 45 percent; and in the case of barbed wire, 37 percent.

The committee heard additional testimony from Mr. Lederer that, even when tramp steamers were carrying the trade, while the general level of rates might be lower, the percentage differential in rates between our exports and imports were often in the same general ratio.

While there were often some differences in price between our steel products and foreign steel products, Mr. Lederer testified that our prices, in many cases, were not so much higher as to compensate for the freight costs and tariffs on them—transcript, page 411. For example, the price of merchant bars produced f.o.b. mills in the United States was $113.50, but $110.58 in Belgium, $112.35 in France, and $106.46 in the United Kingdom, all of which are just slightly lower than the U.S. price, but $119.42 in the Netherlands and $113.86 in West Germany, both of which are slightly higher.

To take a more specific example, the price of a certain German wire rod, f.o.b. West Germany, is approximately $116 a short ton. The U.S. price is $132.60. The inbound rate from Germany to an Atlantic port is $18.25. With this rate, the German import can compete with wire rods made in the United States. However, if the outbound rate of $29.50 applied to the German inbound product, it could not compete, for the price would be at least $145.50—more than the American price. So in this case the differential permits German goods to come into the United States and compete with our goods; whereas if the American rate were to be applied, German wire rods could not come in.

I wish to pay tribute to Mr. Lederer for the testimony which he produced. It was honest, scientific testimony. I am sure that great pressure will be exerted in certain quarters against Mr. Lederer. In my judgment, he deserves full support from the Department of Commerce. I know he will have support from the membership of the Senate and the House.

BALANCE OF PAYMENTS—LOSS OF STEEL EXPORTS

In view of the balance-of-payments problem of the United States, with respect to which we have an unfavorable balance of approximately $3 billion a year, although a favorable balance of trade, and in view of the decline in American steel exports and the increase in steel imports, which were shown very clearly in the testimony, members of the committee thought that this table and the facts given by Mr. Lederer were of great importance.

For example, in 1955, the United States exported about 4.2 million short tons of steel and imported 1.1 million short tons, but by 1962 we were exporting only 2.1 million short tons and importing 4.3 million short tons. In other words, while our exports fell by half our imports multiplied fourfold. Instead of our exports exceeding our imports in quantity by four times, they were only one-half the volume of imports.

In view of this very large decline in our exports and large increase in our imports, and in view of the serious balance-of-payments problem which this country faces, the committee felt that we should make further inquiries into this matter.

On the surface it had every appearance of being a scandalous situation and we sought to find out the facts about it.

If, as it appeared, the freight rates on our exports were often almost as much as twice the freight rates on our imports, and if the differential in rates in many cases was as much as 10 percent, or more, of the price of a ton of steel, this discrimination in freight rates could play a major part in the decline in our steel exports and the increase in imports in the last few years.

Furthermore, if this condition were generally true for other products as well as steel, it might account for a considerable part of our balance-of-payments problem, and therefore was of the highest national interest to the committee and to the country.

GROSSLY INADEQUATE TESTIMONY OF MARITIME COMMISSION

Mr. President, as a result of this striking testimony which we received in the hearings on the morning of May 2, 1963, we decided to hold an additional hearing on the afternoon of that day and to seek an explanation from the Federal Maritime Commission, which has direct jurisdiction over these matters. Before I report in detail on the testimony of the Federal Maritime Commission, I want to characterize the testimony which we received from their representatives as inadequate, shocking, disgraceful, and giving every indication that the Commission and the Commission's predecessor, the Federal Maritime Board, have been grossly negligent and gravely derelict in their duty to protect American industry, the public interest, and the U.S. national interest.

The Federal Maritime Board and the present Federal Maritime Commission, which was created in the fall of 1960, both come within the jurisdiction of the so-called Jones Act of 1916. Section 15 of that act has not been changed. It gave to the Maritime Board, as it now gives to the Maritime Commission, full jurisdiction and authority over the subject of rates and services. I read from page 15 of the Celler committee report, and from section 15, which has been in effect for 47 years:

> Section 15, which, from the point of view of this subcommittee, is the heart of the Shipping Act, requires the filing with the Commission of every written agreement and of written memorandums reflecting every oral agreement, or modification, or cancellation thereof, which, in whole or in part, fixes or regulates rates or accommodations; controls, regulates, prevents, or destroys competition; pools or apportions earnings or traffic; allots or restricts ports or sailings; limits or regulates volume or character of traffic; or in any manner provides for exclusive, preferential or cooperative working arrangements: Such agreements can be made effective and lawful only upon approval by the Commission. The Commission may disapprove, cancel or modify any agreement that it finds to be unjustly discriminatory or unfair, to operate to the detriment of the commerce of the United States, to be contrary to the public interest, or to be in violation of the act.

A transcript of the Joint Economic Committee hearing for May 2, 1963, is located in the office of the Joint Economic Committee. I have a copy of the hearings in my hand. I wish to speak about the unresponsive nature of the replies of the representatives of the Maritime Commission to questions which were addressed to them.

They testified, first of all, as appears in the transcript at page 499, that this situation of differential rates has been "a matter of general knowledge." In addition, they testified, as appears at pages 521 and 522 of the transcript of hearings, that they had known about this situation for at least 16 years. We took them back year by year until 1947.

Third, they testified that they had the right and the authority to initiate studies and action about these matters and that they had the power to disapprove of these conference rates, but that they had not done so. They testified further that they did not have representatives at the negotiations of the international steamship conferences, that they had no observers at these conferences, and that they had never brought this matter to the attention either of the Commerce Department or of the President. They further testified, as appears at page 493 of the transcript, that they had not taken any steps to get American shipping to move independently of the cartels.

At one point in the hearings, when they pleaded ignorance of the table that Mr. Lederer had produced at the hearings, it was pointed out to them that the source of the table was the Federal Maritime Commission itself. In other words, the material that Mr. Lederer produced was taken from their own data, about which they pleaded ignorance. This testimony appears at page 491 of the hearings.

They finally put forward the excuse that they did not have adequate staff to carry out studies. However, the testimony brought out that they had no memory of ever asking for additional staff for this purpose—transcript, page 507. They further testified that they had "less than 60 people" dealing with the agreements, tariffs, and complaints of the conferences.

In view of the fact that the Joint Economic Committee, which raised this issue, has a staff of only 5 professional experts, who are busy with all kinds of subjects, and that Mr. Lederer, who brought this situation to our attention, has only a very small staff, and in view of the fact that the Celler committee, which previously had raised this issue, has only a comparatively small staff, I characterized the excuse of the Maritime Commission of having less than 60 people by saying that "that is an army."

Finally, Mr. President, in attempted mitigation of their neglect, they pointed out that at one time, when the baby carriage industry itself made a complaint to them, they studied the question of freight rates on baby carriages, and the costs of loading and unloading baby carriages. I regard the fact that they excused their lack of action by citing the fact that they had gone into the matter of baby carriage rates as a poor excuse and as an "infantile" argument.

Mr. President, there may be some explanation for this matter, but the Maritime Commission which has known of this situation for 16 years, which has the power to initiate studies, which has the power to disapprove rates, which has at least a staff of 60 to inquire into it, and which has never drawn this matter to the attention of anyone else, certainly gave no explanation whatsoever of this situation which may be of tremendous importance in the whole question of American imports and exports and the balance of payments.

Again let me say that, from the testimony we heard, I can only characterize the lack of action on the part of the Maritime Commission, even to make studies, as shocking, as a grave dereliction of duty, and as grossly negligent.

LETTER TO PRESIDENT

Mr. President, the facts brought out at our hearings and the complete lack of explanation about them by the Maritime Commission led to a motion by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] which was approved by the committee without a dissenting vote, that the chairman write to the President a letter drawing to his attention this testimony and the lack of action and explanation by the Maritime Commission.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the letter I sent to the President, by the unanimous vote of the committee, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 3, 1963.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As you know, the Joint Economic Committee has been holding hearings on the steel industry. On May 2, the committee received testimony concerning international competitive factors affecting the U.S. steel industry and our balance of payments.

The committee was seriously disturbed to learn of the existence of substantial discrimination against American exporters in ocean freight rates. For example, the record shows that freight rates on identical steel products are significantly higher—sometimes nearly twice as high—when they are exported than when imported. On some classes of steel products this differential appears to be 10 percent or more of the prices of the products concerned. I invite your attention to annex A, which contains the table documenting this discrimination and relevant descriptive remarks submitted to the committee by Walther Lederer of the Commerce Department's Balance of Payments Division.

Seeking a better understanding of this unfavorable situation, the committee invited the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission or his representatives to testify. Testimony by the Commission's representatives revealed what I called in the record "a grave dereliction of duty on the part of the Federal Maritime Commission" in protecting the national interest. The testimony showed that the Maritime Commission has long been aware of the existence of discrimination against American exporters (see tab A of the record, p. 499), but that no study had ever been made by the Commission to determine the extent of this discrimination and its consequences for American trade. Examination of the witnesses established that the Maritime Commission has the authority to disapprove ocean rates set by steamship conferences, but that this authority has not been exercised. The only specific instance which the witnesses were able to cite was an informal inquiry into rates concerning baby carriages. (The Commission has informed us today that the first formal investigation into discriminatory rate levels is currently underway, involving rates between U.S. Pacific and Far Eastern ports.)

It became evident that the Maritime Commission views its role in protecting American exporters against discrimination in freight rates as purely passive, leaving the initiative for instigating action to private parties or to other Government agencies. The witnesses justified their failure to take action by stating that they lacked staff. However, they were unable to say whether the Commission had ever asked for more staff for the purpose of making rate comparisons.

In a matter so vital to the national interest, Mr. President, it is shocking to find the Maritime Commission's lack of initiative justified, as it was yesterday, in the words: "Just the old adage of the squeaking wheel getting the grease, Senator, there is so little grease to go around" (table B, p. 511).

When the serious nature of this situation became clear, the committee members who were present unanimously adopted Senator PROXMIRE's motion that the chairman "write a letter to the President of the United States pointing to the testimony that we had this morning, which provoked this hearing this afternoon, and the testimony this afternoon, and the lack of any action on the part of the Maritime Commission in this situation, because I think it should be called to his attention, and I think it is the duty and the function of this committee to do so" (table C, p. 530).

The committee believes that you may wish to investigate the problem of discrimination in ocean freight rates. Such an investigation should include a review of the functioning of the public agencies responsible for assuring the protection of U.S. industry and labor and the American balance of payments.

This appears to be a general problem in American international trade. It involves not only commerce between the United States and foreign countries, but the American competitive position in third markets. Mr. Lederer stated: "This is a common situation, that the rates on ships going out from the United States are higher than those for ships coming back" (tab D, p. 436). He further said that he had the impression "that the rates from the United States, for instance, to the north coast of South America, an area relatively close to our shores, are considerably higher than the rates from Europe to the same place" (loc. cit.).

The Maritime Commission appears to have been grossly negligent. The committee learned of this freight discrimination from the International Payments Division of the Commerce Department, but the question was raised as to whether other sections of that Department more responsible for protecting American export interests have done all that is reasonably possible to bring instances of freight discrimination to the attention of the Maritime Commission.

Mr. President, I know the seriousness with which you regard our balance-of-payments problem. We have here an area which bears importantly on our international competitive position and where substantial improvement appears possible.

Faithfully yours,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
Chairman.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this letter summarizes much of what I have said today. I have since received from Mr. Myer Feldman, the Deputy Special Counsel to the President, a reply in which he says the President agrees that this situation requires considerably more attention than the testimony indicates it has been receiving, and that the administration is going to investigate the question. He said that, on behalf of the President, he is asking both the Council of Economic Advisers and the Department of Commerce to report promptly both as to the reasons for the discrimination and how it could be eliminated. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this letter appear in my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 16, 1963.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: The President asked me to thank you for sending him the transcript of testimony before the Joint Economic Committee showing the discrimination against American exporters in ocean freight rates. We agree that this requires considerably more attention than the testimony would indicate it has been receiving. We are going to investigate the question.

I am asking both the Council of Economic Advisers and the Department of Commerce to report promptly on the reason for the discrimination and how it could be eliminated. We are also conducting a review of the steps that all Government agencies can take to assure protection of U.S. industry and labor and the American balance of payments.

We appreciate your calling this matter to our attention.

Sincerely,

MYER FELDMAN,
Deputy Special Counsel to the President.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, there is one further development on this matter which is most interesting: I understand that the day after our hearings on May 3, the Federal Maritime Commission decided that it, too, should look into this matter. I may say that they are doing this now even though they testified at the hearings that they had never done it in the past because no industry representative had ever made a complaint. We may have jarred them from their lethargy.

CELLER COMMITTEE'S PREVIOUS WORK

Mr. President, I also want to give credit where credit is due. In March of 1961, the Celler Antitrust Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee held hearings on monopoly problems in regulated industries. One of the key issues they went into was the question of the shocking discriminations in ocean shipping rates. The fact that these hearings had been held and that the Maritime Commission was aware of them made their feeble excuses before our committee even worse, because it is clear that another committee of the Congress had previously brought to their attention many of the same matters.

The Celler committee brought out that there had been discriminatory conference rates on such items as automotive equipment, industrial chemicals—about which I shall say a few words in a minute or two—major appliances, jewelry, electronics, rubber and rubber products, farm machinery, textile machinery, fertilizers, and air conditioners and refrigeration equipment. Consequently, while our committee has received testimony mainly concerning iron and steel products, it appears to be true, from the hearings and report of the Celler committee, that the same situation existed for a variety of other American exports. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD excerpts from the Celler committee hearings from pages 824 to 829, giving the details about these matters.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the hearings was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN STEAMSHIP COMMITTEE
ON CONFERENCE STUDIES,
New York, N.Y., November 18, 1960.

To All Members of the Steering Committee:

NOTICE OF MEETING

GENTLEMEN: You will recall that at the meeting of the steering committee held in New York on November 4 it was decided that another meeting of the committee should be held in New Orleans in the early part of December. Mr. A. C. Cocke has called my attention to the fact that he, like many other members of our committee, will be spending a great deal of time in Washington in the early part of December, and he suggests that the meeting be held in Washington. A spot check by telephone has indicated that this would probably be more convenient for many members.

Accordingly, I am calling a meeting of the steering committee to be held in Washington, D.C., at a place to be designated later, on Wednesday, December 7, 1960. The meeting will commence at 10 a.m.

I now enclose for your records (1) a copy of the draft minutes of the November 4 meeting, and (2) a copy of a document prepared by the Department of Commerce and distributed to those present at a meeting held in Washington, D.C., on November 3, the purpose of which meeting was to discuss the promotion of export trade. The enclosed document was distributed at the close of the meeting and was not discussed.

Very truly yours,

WALTER E. MALONEY,
Chairman.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE HELD ON NOVEMBER 4, 1960, IN THE BOARD ROOM OF THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE INSTITUTE, INC., 11 BROADWAY, NEW YORK, N.Y.

The chairman called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. The following were in attendance:

Members: Joseph H. Ball, Frank N. Bowers, A. C. Cocke, and W. L. Hamm.

Ex officio members: Charles R. Andrews, Ramond F. Burley, Ralph E. Casey, James A. Dennean, Ralph B. Dewey, W. C. Galloway, A. J. Pasch, Alvin Shapiro, and J. Monroe Sullivan.

Others: Robert Adams, William B. Ewers, John C. Gorman, Elmer C. Maddy, John R. Mahoney, E. R. Senn, Elkan Turk, Jr., Charles F. Warren, and Burton H. White.

The chairman stated that the draft minutes of the meeting of the steering committee held on September 14, 1960, had been distributed to all members. On motion duly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, said minutes were approved.

The members were given a report on the financial status of the committee, and there was discussion as to whether the funds on hand would be sufficient to carry the committee through December 31, 1960. It was the sense of the meeting that no further assessment should be made until January at the earliest, and the chairman was authorized, should the need arise, to seek advance contributions from members to carry the committee's activities until such assessment could be made.

The chairman called attention to the fact that the committee had not filled the vacancy in the office of secretary-treasurer. After full discussion of various suggestions relative to personnel in Washington, it was decided that the vacancy in the office of secretary-treasurer should not be filled at this time, and the chairman was authorized and instructed to endeavor to work out some satisfactory arrangement, subject to the approval of the executive committee.

The committee was given reports on the status of the pending studies by congressional committees.

With the agenda for the meeting members had been given a draft of a revised bill to legalize existing and future tying arrangements. The chairman explained that this bill is practically identical to the first section of the earlier draft approved by this committee, and that the subject matter of the second and third sections of the earlier bill would now be incorporated in a second piece of legislation to be sponsored by the committee. After full discussion, and on motion duly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the committee approved the draft bill on tying arrangements and urged that everything be done to promote its enactment. The chairman announced that the draft of the second bill covering matters other than tying arrangements was not ready as yet but will be submitted for consideration by the committee in the very near future.

The committee was informed that the special subcommittee established to study the f.o.b./f.a.s. problem had met and discussed various possible approaches to the matter. It will be necessary for the subcommittee to have further discussions before it can submit a report.

The committee discussed at some length the status of efforts within the several conferences to adopt a neutral body setup. Mention was made of several difficulties which had been encountered, and suggestions were made as to ways and means of expediting the effectuation of such systems. On motion duly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the committee went on record in favor of the establishment of self-policing systems designed to carry out effectively the provisions of conference agreements. In order to ascertain methods by which the policy might be effectuated, the chairman was authorized and instructed to appoint a small subcommittee to study the matter. To facilitate the work of this subcommittee the chairman was instructed to communicate with the conference chairman to get full information with regard to the status of neutral body agreements within their conferences.

The members of the committee expressed a desire to have another committee meeting in the early part of December, and it was tentatively decided that such a meeting should be held in New Orleans.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned.

WALTER E. MALONEY.

OCEAN FREIGHT RATES AS A DETERRENT TO THE EXPANSION OF U.S. EXPORT SALES

Since the early part of this year, the Department of Commerce has been holding weekly meetings with representatives of various industries to discuss ways and means of increasing export sales in connection with our current export sales expansion program.

During several of these meetings industry spokesmen have pointed out that one of the principal deterrents to increased export sales is the high level of outbound ocean freight rates as compared with the inbound rates for the same commodity on the same trade route. Complaints have also been registered regarding the discrepancy between rates from U.S. ports to foreign destinations and from foreign ports to these same foreign destinations for the same commodity. Specifically, the following industries have provided the Department with statements regarding this matter: automotive equipment, industrial chemicals, major appliances, jewelry industry, electronics, rubber and rubber products, farm machinery, textile machinery, fertilizers, air conditioners and refrigeration equipment.

Following is a synopsis of the statements presented by these industries:

AUTOMOTIVE EQUIPMENT

The eastbound automobile rate level particularly to the continental/United Kingdom ports has been higher than the inward or westbound rate to U.S. ports, since 1945. After extended discussion with the AMA Ocean Rate Committee, the conference lines made a rate deduction in 1958 and another in 1959.

The impression exists that these concessions were prompted, however, by the then impending congressional investigation. Concern exists that as soon as the conference lines decide to boost the eastbound rates once again, this will be done, regardless of protest.

United Kingdom trade

	Boxed	Unboxed
Present eastbound conference rate,[1] per 40-cubic-foot ton	$23.00	$26.00
Reported westbound rate,[2] per 40 cubic feet	11.55	[3] 16.45

[1] Rate applies to 8,960 pounds.
[2] Rate applies to 4,481 pounds.
[3] 240 cubic feet or greater; $12.60 per 40-cubic-foot units under 240 cubic feet.

Continental trade

	Present eastbound conference rate [1]		Reported westbound rate [2] from Antwerp (per cubic meter, 45 feet)
	French-Belgium-Dutch ports (per 40-cubic-foot ton)	German ports (per 40-cubic-foot ton)	
Boxed	$15	$16.50	[3] $22.00
Unboxed	18	20.00	14.30

[1] Rate applies to 8,960 pounds.
[2] Rate applies to 3,000 kilos (6,615 pounds).
[3] To a value of $2,000; $33 per cubic meter if value over $2,000.

INDUSTRIAL CHEMICALS

There is such great disparity between eastbound and westbound transatlantic freight costs as to make it impossible, in many cases, to effect eastward sales at all. A typical chemical commodity, which is sufficiently universal in application to make it worth using as an example, is sodium cyanide. To the best of our knowledge, this material comes to the United States from Germany, France, and the United Kingdom to the extent of some 18 million pounds valued at about $3 million per year. Movement eastward is, to all intents and purposes, nil despite the fact the published going prices in the home market in all producing countries are roughly the same.

This one-way movement is explained more by the discrepancy in freights than by tariff differentials:

	Per hundredweight
Hamburg to New York	$0.82
Rotterdam to New York	.82
Liverpool to New York	.873
New York to Hamburg	6.61
New York to Rotterdam/Antwerp	5.85
New York to Liverpool	(1)
New Orleans to Antwerp	6.44

[1] Not yet available.

MAJOR APPLIANCES

At the August 17, 1960, meeting of the ocean rate committee, consumer products division, various members reported that they had been informed of your interest in the level of ocean rates of freight insofar as they affect unfavorably the exports of American products to world markets.

This committee holds that the disparity between American and European—and in some instances Asian—ocean rates of freight is one of various important factors which have an adverse influence on the flow of a considerable number of American products to foreign markets. Electrical household appliances such as refrigerators, freezers, ranges, washing machines, dryers, and others are in this category.

The objectives of this ocean rate committee include continued negotiations with steamship conferences concerning rate levels which are detrimental to U.S. exports and, incidentally, harmful to the lines themselves, in the firm conviction that thereby a contribution will be made toward a rising volume of exports.

JEWELRY

Recently we made two simultaneous shipments of our men's jewelry to England via a member line of the North Atlantic and United Kingdom Freight Conference. They consisted of a total of 21 cartons: cube, 35 feet; weight, 1,128 pounds; value, $7,273.81. We declared the merchandise as "articles of men's wear," as we do in the case of all other ocean freight shipments, and all air express and parcel post shipments.

The company ignored our declared classification and without consideration of any nature slapped the "imitation jewelry" rate of $18.50 per carton minimum, or a total freight bill of $388.50 on the shipment (parcel post would have been only $275). Had we known this was going to take place, we would have increased the size of the cartons. But even had we done this, we would still have come under the "imitation jewelry" cubic-foot rate of $3.25 per foot and our total freight bill would have been $43.75 for this small shipment. To soak us $388.50, where the rate charged by any other steamship line save those of the North Atlantic conferences would be $43.75, is unjust, discriminatory, and outrageous. Obviously, what should be the most economical transportation, ocean freight, is anything but that under existing conference rates.

ELECTRONICS

Thank you for your recent telephone call, advising that your office plans to call to the attention of the Federal Maritime Board, complaints of American industry that ocean freight rates discriminate against U.S. export shippers and favor our foreign competition.

The Electronic Industries Association, through its international department traffic committee, has worked for several years to alleviate this situation through direct negotiations with steamship conference representatives. In general, we have found the conference willing to cooperate and a number of rate adjustments have been put into effect covering products of the electronics industry.

The freight rate is, of course, a factor in establishing the price at which a product is sold in a foreign country. Many countries also base their tariff rates on the cost, insurance, and freight value of the product. This tends to multiply the already existing rate discrimination.

It is our recommendation that your office urge the Federal Maritime Board to investigate thoroughly all rate proposals presented to it and require that conferences justify all rates which discriminate against American shippers. American steamship companies are highly subsidized to insure that American export products can reach foreign ports at a shipping cost comparable with our foreign competition. Steamship conferences, which traditionally are dominated by foreign lines, should be required to justify all rate proposals which do not provide parity for American exports. The Federal Maritime Board should be encouraged to think in terms of rate parity for American exporters so they can enjoy the benefits which should be provided with the tax dollars spent to subsidize American shipping interests.

RUBBER

In many cases, ocean freight rates are the deciding factor as to whether U.S. producers can obtain the business. An industry representative stated that both United States and West German producers quoted prices on a substantial order for surgeons gloves in Ecuador. U.S. prices were lower but ocean freight rates were so much higher that the landed cost from Germany was less than that for U.S. products, so that the business was placed with a German company.

FARM MACHINERY

Ocean freight rates handicap American exports. Some rates from the United States to Europe are considerably higher than rates from Europe to the United States. Some rates from Europe to a third country are lower than rates for the same distances on voyages originating in the United States.

TEXTILE MACHINERY

Marine freight rates are higher from U.S. ports to Europe than rates from Europe to the United States.

FERTILIZERS

Last week I was asked by one of our executives what single thing was the greatest deterrent to increasing our chemical export sales. I imagine that by asking this loaded question he expected I might say—a bigger budget, more people, etc. My prompt answer to this question was noncompetitive U.S. ocean freight rates.

Reflecting on this subject, I knew that it was not specifically listed in the agenda and probably the committee does not desire to dwell on it at length at this time, but I do feel that this roadblock to expansion is so basic that if it is not recognized, then all of the help and assistance that the Government desires to give to aid exports may become academic, for I know in our case we must produce competitively and then deliver abroad competitively, and if we cannot complete both of these two stages there is no use windmilling about anything else.

Please be mindful that I am expressing my personal opinion on a key deterrent to export sales of chemicals which Food Machinery & Chemical Corp. has to offer for export, and if the chemical industry were canvassed, I believe you will find that for tonnage chemicals a considerable amount of business is lost because U.S. rates cannot compete with foreign-flag lines, many of which are subsidized by their governments to the extent it reflects substantially in their rate structure.

I would be the first to admit that I do not know how U.S. lines can lower their rates when I hear that the master of foreign vessels gets from $4,000 to $5,000 per year, and on U.S. vessels captains are paid $10,000 to $15,000, along with comparable differences in the pay of foreign versus U.S. crews. I have also heard that costs to load a vessel vary from $1.50 to $4 per ton abroad, whereas in the United States it is estimated at $7 to $8 per ton.

My point being, that if Food Machinery & Chemical Corp. can produce a product competitively for export but cannot deliver competitively, then the tariff rates, trade restrictions, or any help the Bureau can lend to promotion of trade, become academic.

From my point of view, in the strengthening of the U.S. position in world trade, ocean freight rates play a most vital integral part, and for Food Machinery & Chemical Corp. chemicals to take advantage of the assistance to its fullest degree we must first, somehow, equalize the primary problem of noncompetitive freight rates either by lowering our rates or increasing foreign rates. (Food Machinery & Chemical Corp.)

Potash fertilizer is a bulk commodity valued at only about $20 (muriate of potash) or $30 (sulfate of potash) per ton at U.S. mine. Because of its Carlsbad location, the major part of the domestic industry is burdened with a costly rail haul just to reach a port. Before the foreign destination is reached, a costly ocean freight must be added to arrive at the landed cost. This freight burden is onerous not only in its relation to the basic value of the potash fertilizer shipped but even more so in its relation to the much lower freight costs from the foreign producing countries to most of their export markets. Whereas ocean freight costs on potash to the Far East or Oceania are approximately the same from the United States as they are from Western Europe, it is a well-known fact that it costs twice as much to ship potash across the ocean from the United States to Europe as it costs to ship the same product and quality in the opposite direction. For this reason European potash producers have long been able to secure a substantial part of our domestic market in the coastal strip from Maine to Florida. The opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway may for the first time give European potash suppliers access to the important Midwest market. In general, a rail haul may add $10 to $15 per ton and an ocean freight another $10 to $15 per ton on U.S. potash exports. The significance of a freight advantage to a European supplier of, say $5 per ton, is obviously very important for a product which sells for $20 per ton free on board plant. (Southwest Potash Corp.)

AIR CONDITIONING AND REFRIGERATION

A general statement was made by several industry representatives that ocean freight rates on shipments from the United States to foreign destinations are not competitive with similar rates for shipments to these same destinations from foreign points of origin.

In reply to these complaints the Department is pointing out first of all that the Government does not exercise any direct control over the level of ocean freight rates. Secondly, shippers are being advised to follow the procedure outlined in the attached pamphlet "Ocean Freight Rates" whenever it is felt that certain rates are either excessively high or of a discriminatory nature.

Copies of all of the industry statements listed in this memorandum have been transmitted to the Regulation Office of the Federal Maritime Board for whatever action is deemed appropriate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to call particular attention to the material of the Celler committee report on industrial chemicals and automobiles. When the Celler committee took up this matter, it found great disparity between the rates on exports and the rates on imports. One example it chose was sodium cyanide. The rate from Hamburg to New York was 82 cents; but the rate from New York to Hamburg was $6.61—or a rate on exports eight times greater than the rate on imports. The rate from Rotterdam to New York was 82 cents; but the rate from New York to Rotterdam was $5.85—or seven times as much.

In the case of automobiles, the rate on exports of automobiles was 77½ cents per cubic foot, as compared to an import rate of from 31.5 to 36 cents per cubic foot; and the difference in the tonnage rates in the case of automobiles was $6 to $7 a ton.

Mr. President, there is a very interesting story in this connection. After the Celler committee brought out these facts—and the American Automobile Manufacturers Association assisted in bringing them out—the association sought a readjustment of the rates. It did not apply to the Maritime Commission, because it thought there was too much redtape involved in connection with that procedure; but the association dealt directly with the shipping conferences, and it obtained an approximate equalization of the rates.

Subsequently, the shippers of sodium cyanide sought a readjustment of rates. However, they took up that matter, not with the Maritime Commission, but directly with the shipping conferences. They obtained a readjustment.

I emphasize the fact that in both cases that action was taken only after the Celler committee brought out the facts and thus provided material which enabled the private parties to do something which the Maritime Commission should have done on its own initiative.

DECREASING EXPORTS—INCREASING IMPORTS

However, we believe that differential rates still continue for a great mass of commodities which are exported and imported. We have a rather clear indication that this situation is effective in diminishing exports and in increasing imports. We have that clear indication from the record in connection with the steel industry. For example, on ingots, blooms, billets, slabs, and so forth, our exports diminished 58 percent from 1955 to 1962; and those items were of importance.

The decrease was from 602,000 short tons to 253,000 short tons. The average value per ton was $81. At the same time, the imports were increasing by 17 percent, or from 146,000 to 171,000 tons.

In the case of wire rods—to which I have previously referred—the exports between 1955 and 1962 decreased by 45 percent; but the imports increased by 1,244 percent—or from 48,000 tons to 645,000 tons. The value was $96 per ton. So estimating the increases at 600,000 tons, there was an increase in imports of just short of $60 million worth.

In the case of pipe and tubing, our exports fell from 350,000 to 192,000 tons. Our imports increased from 77,000 to 655,000 tons, at an average value of $148 a ton. That would be an increase of approximately 580,000 tons at $148 a ton, or very close to $85 million.

I ask unanimous consent that the table on the composition of U.S. exports and imports of steel by major product groupings be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 7.—*Composition of U.S. exports and imports of steel, by major product groupings*

EXPORTS

Product grouping	1955		1957		1959		1961		1962		1962 average value per ton
	Thousand short tons	Percent of total	Thousand short tons	Percent of total	Thousand short tons	Percent of total	Thousand short tons	Percent of total	Thousand short tons	Percent of total	
Ingots, blooms, billets, slabs, etc	602	16	510	10	14	1	138	7	253	[1]13	$81
Skelp	88	2	197	4	16	1	42	2	12	(1)	94
Wire rods	31	1	14	(1)	4	(1)	5	(1)	17	1	226
Structural shapes and piling	289	7	471	9	240	16	223	11	159	8	145
Plates	216	6	604	11	66	5	97	5	120	6	218
Rails and accessories	74	2	235	4	94	6	108	6	117	6	152
Concrete reinforcing bars	74	2	85	2	14	1	16	1	22	1	134
Other bars and tool steel	132	3	130	2	53	4	76	4	80	4	272
Pipe and tubing	350	9	1,185	22	266	18	211	11	192	9	448
Wire nails	3	(1)	4	(1)	3	(1)	3	(1)	4	(1)	764
Barbed wire	45	1	1	(1)	1	(1)	1	(1)	13	1	206
Wire fencing			3	(1)	1	(1)	2	(1)	2	(1)	288
Other wire and wire products			31	1	21	1	20	1	28	1	356
Sheet and strip	1,194	31	1,075	20	442	29	566	28	600	30	240
Tin mill products	773	20	803	15	273	18	481	24	394	20	153
Total	3,871	100	5,348	100	1,508	100	1,989	100	2,013	100	211

IMPORTS

Product grouping	1955		1957		1959		1961		1962		1962 average value per ton
	Thousand short tons	Percent of total	Thousand short tons	Percent of total	Thousand short tons	Percent of total	Thousand short tons	Percent of total	Thousand short tons	Percent of total	
Ingots, blooms, billets, and slabs, etc	146	15	8	1	92	2	179	6	171	4	$78
Skelp					(1)	(1)	1	(1)	4	(1)	89
Wire rods	48	5	55	5	448	10	451	14	645	16	96
Structural shapes and piling	110	11	269	23	506	12	293	9	374	9	98
Plates	2	(1)	22	2	291	7	37	1	150	4	93
Rails and accessories	7	1	5	(1)	10	(1)	23	1	12	(1)	95
Concrete reinforcing bars	159	16	160	14	852	19	583	18	607	15	73
Other bars and tool steel	130	13	103	9	487	11	324	10	388	9	112
Pipe and tubing	77	8	191	16	553	12	521	16	655	16	148
Wire nails	131	14	135	12	305	7	245	8	271	7	139
Barbed wire	113	12	63	5	78	2	82	3	67	2	131
Wire fencing			30	3	79	2	60	2	73	2	130
Other wire and wire products			71	6	239	5	175	6	244	6	185
Sheet and strip	47	5	41	4	385	9	171	5	383	9	163
Tin mill products	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	67	2	19	1	56	1	160
Total	970	100	1,153	100	4,392	100	3,164	100	4,100	100	118

[1] Less than ½ of 1 percent or less than 500 short tons.

Source: American Iron & Steel Institute and basic data of Bureau of the Census.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In the case of barbed wire, our exports fell from 45,000 tons to 2,000 tons, or virtually disappeared, while imports were increasing from 113,000 to 374,000—a large increase.

THIRD COUNTRY RATES

Another factor needs to be probed. That is the question of rates to third countries. This may be the most important of all. We were able to cover it only in a glancing way. Mr. Lederer testified that it is his general impression that rates from Europe to the northern ports of South America, which would be Venezuela, Colombia and Panama, were very much lower than our ocean freight rates from Galveston, despite the fact that the distances from Galveston to these North and South American ports are very much less. We desire to go into this subject more thoroughly, but this may be the most serious obstacle of all under which we are operating, because it will penalize our trade with third countries and not merely with the continent of Europe or with Japan.

SHOCKING SITUATION

Mr. President, this is a shocking matter and one for which we have every right for both an explanation and action. It is amazing that the Maritime Commission came before us and pleaded ignorance about an industry which they are supposed to regulate. What efforts and zeal they expended on this matter seem to have been in the single area of the comparative costs of loading and unloading baby carriages. They felt no obligation apparently even to inquire into these matters and to protect the interests of American industry and of the United States. Apparently they have sat back in their handsome building merely waiting for complaints and litigants to come to them. They pleaded lack of staff when they had what those of us in the legislative branch would consider to be an army to help them. But they had no memory even of requesting additional staff for this purpose.

A serious question arises why this Commission, which has primary jurisdiction over these matters, had apparently never raised its voice to protect the American exporter, American industry, and the American public. They apparently have never disapproved a conference rate on their own initiative—although they have that power—and have really not acted to protect our interests even in the face of a great loss of steel exports and a great increase in imports. This is true even though the testimony we received was that the differentials in the conference rates between the charges for our exports and the charges on imports in the same ships going to the same places was, in some cases, almost double, and in many cases, represented absolute amounts which were more than 10 percent of the price of the product. These facts, in and of themselves, could explain why some of our products are unable to compete abroad.

NATURE OF SHIPPING CONFERENCES

Mr. President, we should go more thoroughly into the nature of international shipping conferences. I am told that the record seems to show that as of the end of August 1961, a total of 105 active steamship conferences were operating over trade routes directly involving U.S. commerce. In at least 13 of those conferences there are no American-flag lines, and in another 30 only 1 American-flag line is an active participant. In about 93 of those conferences Americans are outnumbered. We are not certain yet exactly to what extent. The voting powers are distributed inside the conferences, possibly on the basis of the number of ships, possibly on the tonnage. But that subject needs to be probed. We are hopelessly outnumbered in the conferences.

The conferences are divided into two groups. First, there are the outbound conferences, which deal with commerce from the United States to other ports. There are only three of those. They are between the United States and Europe, and between the Pacific coast and Japan, and between the gulf and Europe. Perhaps I should refer to the first, the North Atlantic Trade Conference.

The inbound trade from Europe to the United States has 21 conferences, and their headquarters are entirely in European countries, Brussels being 1 of the major centers. The outbound conference fixes rates going out, the inbound conference fixes rates coming in. But the inbound rates are nearly always lower than the outbound rates. We should watch both sets of rates. We should reduce the outbound rates and probably there should be an increase in the inbound rates.

Mr. President, I hope we can find an explanation for this problem and act to rectify it.

One question is, Why have not the shippers complained? That is a mystery. I do not happen to have a definite answer. Perhaps they have despaired from getting action from the Commission, as two of the groups apparently did. I do not wish to insinuate, but it may be that some of the shippers have their private arrangements with the shipping lines.

It may be that shippers have their private deals with the shipping lines. It may be that industries are afraid to complain for fear that shipping will not be available to them when it is needed. It may be that there are some gentlemen's international agreements on markets and who is to be dominant in the trade of particular items. No doubt such excuses will be made, but it certainly appears that American goods over a wide range of products are being discriminated against by the official rates set by these international cartels, which our Maritime Commission has the power to break up, but which it has refused to deal with.

These facts throw some light on the question as to why our exports of steel have diminished and why imports have increased. Some spokesmen for the steel industry have laid the blame on wage rates. The record indicates that increased wage rates in the United States since 1957–58 have been approximately matched by increases in productivity, so that the labor cost per unit of output has not risen. It has risen about 1 percent in 5 years, if we include white-collar workers as well as blue-collar workers. It has risen about four-tenths of 1 percent if wage workers alone are considered

The evidence we have produced also seems to indicate that the prices of raw materials in the steel industry—coal, limestone, and iron ore—fell from 6 to 9 percent during this time. It is a well-known fact that the cost of raw materials in our country is very much lower than the cost of raw materials in Europe. These two factors, labor costs and material costs make up over 80 percent of the costs of producing steel. As we have seen, they have not gone up but have actually fallen when taken together.

Thus we have not lost our markets in steel due to increased costs.

I suggest that we may find that the steel industry has been barking up the wrong tree, or trying to hang the wrong culprit. A large part of the difficulty may very well lie in the differential freight rates.

ACTION NEEDED

I think the American Government must act to make certain that our goods are not discriminated against. We should make certain that these international cartels do not act in their own interests without considering our national interest. In the complete absence of action by the one agency of the Government which has jurisdiction over this matter, then some other agency must make certain that our interests are protected.

We cannot depend upon the deathbed repentance of the Maritime Administration, after they made such a terrible showing, to think that they would say, the next day, "We are already acting on this matter." If we relax our vigilance, they are likely to do what they did after the Celler committee produced its report 2 years ago. We need constant, unceasing vigilance, scrutiny, and pressure.

Mr. President, this is a shocking and disgraceful situation and the President, the Congress, and the country deserve an explanation of it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE FEED GRAIN ACT OF 1963

Mr. **ALLOTT**. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has just ordered reported the Feed Grain Act of 1963. Earlier this week I addressed a letter to the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], calling his attention to a particular situation existing in Colorado with respect to Moravian Malting barley. This particular barley is grown almost exclusively in the State, and does not contribute to the surplus. In fact, almost the entire production is under contract to a brewery and is used by it for its manufacturing purposes.

In order to indicate how limited is the production of this variety I would call attention to the fact that in the year 1960, according to figures furnished me by the Department of Agriculture, the only States other than Colorado growing any Moravian barley were Montana, with eight-tenths of 1 percent of the total acreage of barley planted, and Wyoming, with 3.6 percent of the total acreage of barley planted. Even more current and significant is the conference report of the Malting Barley Improvement Association held at Milwaukee on January 17, 1963, which shows only Colorado reporting any figures on Moravian Malting barley.

During the year 1962, the Coors Brewery purchased all but 43,000 of the 2,243,000 bushels produced, and the expectations are that the demands will continue and probably increase in each ensuing year.

Under present law, the Secretary of Agriculture has authority to exempt varieties of barley, Moravian included, from the operation of the feed grain program. He has done so in the past but did not in the year 1963, based upon a determination that there were more than normal yields. I submit, however, that Moravian is in a category apart—and does not contribute to a surplus.

This situation was further described in my letter to the distinguished chairman [Mr. ELLENDER] and I ask unanimous consent that my letter may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 7, 1963.

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: During your considerations of H.R. 4997, the Feed Grain Act of 1963, I should like to call to your attention and to the members of the committee a problem with respect to Moravian barley being encountered by constituents in Colorado.

As you know, the present law permits the Secretary of Agriculture to exempt varieties of barley from the operation of the feed grain program. However, the Secretary did not elect to do so for the 1963 crop.

Moravian barley is a good cash crop for growers in Colorado, most of which is purchased by the Coors Brewery of Golden, Colo. Figures furnished to me indicate that in 1962, 2,243,000 bushels of Moravian were grown. Of this amount all save 43,000 bushels was purchased by the brewery. This miniscule remainder was not accepted because of frost damage, growers asking to keep

> some for special feed use and some that was not within standards.
>
> Under all circumstances, it would appear that Moravian should properly be considered for an exemption from the bill. I would appreciate your reviewing this situation with that in mind. I know that the growers in Colorado would most appreciate favorable consideration being given this request.
>
> Best regards.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> GORDON ALLOTT.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I shall offer an amendment to H.R. 4997, the effect of which is to exempt this particular barley, Moravian, from the operation of the feed grain program. I send it to the desk, and ask that it be printed and lie on the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO J. EDGAR HOOVER

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the brief remarks I intend to make at the moment I had planned to make tomorrow, as the most appropriate day, but in view of the fact that the Senate plans to adjourn until Monday I should like to make them at this time. They refer to the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, J. Edgar Hoover.

First I wish to quote a philosophical statement with regard to responsibility, from a very great American, as follows:

> If I were to try to read, much less answer, all the attacks made on me, this shop might as well be closed for any other business. I do the very best I know how—the very best I can, and I mean to keep doing so until the end. If the end brings me out all right, what is said against me won't amount to anything. If the end brings me out wrong, 10 angels swearing I was right would make no difference.

Those words were spoken by Abraham Lincoln. They described his philosophy of duty.

Thirty-nine years ago tomorrow a young man was appointed to a big job. Through the years this man has followed Mr. Lincoln's philosophy. He has done and continues to do his very best. None can justly refute this statement.

The man I speak of is John Edgar Hoover.

J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

His name is as famous as any other in this Nation. He is as much a part of Americana as John Glenn, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, Gen. John "Black Jack" Pershing, and John Hancock.

Each of these men and the other thousands of American heroes from colonial days to the present have been and are endowed with a special spirit. It is the spirit which has set them apart from the crowd—the spirit which has given them courage to stand in the face of formidable adversaries—the spirit which has enabled them to lead the United States of America through the greatest of perils to the heights of eminence we enjoy today.

It is the spirit which possessed John Hancock when he so boldly penned his name to the Declaration of Independence.

It is the spirit which passed from "Black Jack" Pershing to his men and gave them the courage and determination to pour out of the trenches and charge to victory over the German Armies in World War I.

It is the spirit which drove General MacArthur back to the Philippines and on across the Pacific to Japan.

It is the spirit which lifted John Glenn into space even before his historic flight of February 20, 1962.

It is the spirit which caused J. Edgar Hoover on May 10, 1924, to set certain conditions on his acceptance of the job of Acting Director of the Bureau of Investigation.

Thank God for this spirit. Thank God for men like J. Edgar Hoover.

My mind, although unencumbered by the restrictions imposed on the thinking of men in so many parts of the world today, cannot imagine this Nation without this spirit or men like J. Edgar Hoover.

> The Bureau must be divorced from politics and not be a catchall for political hacks. Appointments must be based on merit. Second, promotions will be made on proved ability and the Bureau will be responsible only to the Attorney General.

These are the conditions set by J. Edgar Hoover 39 years ago today when Harlan Fiske Stone offered him the position of Acting Director of the Bureau of Investigation. The wisdom of these conditions, set by a man only 29 years of age, is evident to each of us today. They are conditions which have remained unchanged for 39 years. They are conditions which have elevated the Federal Bureau of Investigation to the pinnacle of respect and efficiency. They are conditions which have raised the standards of law enforcement in this country to the highest level ever attained.

Harlan Fiske Stone was a stern New Englander. He had been named Attorney General at a time when the Department of Justice was at a low ebb. He was determined to clean up the mess he inherited. Already he had deposed William J. Burns as Director of the Bureau of Investigation. He was not a man to stand for backtalk. J. Edgar Hoover knew this, yet he had the courage to set conditions on his acceptance of the job offered him.

This courage, this determination to do his duty as he sees it, has been a trait of J. Edgar Hoover throughout his life. This is the spirit which J. Edgar Hoover has imparted to the men and women of the FBI. It is the spirit which has made the FBI a symbol of justice, law, and order throughout the land.

The Bureau of Investigation in 1924 was a small organization. The job of directing it, however, if performed properly, was a big task. Many of the men in the Bureau were of no value whatever. They had to be replaced with men of integrity, determination, and dedication. It took a great deal of these ingredients back in the twenties to be a worthy public servant.

J. Edgar Hoover chose his men carefully and intelligently. He saw to their training and rewarded ability with promotion. Hence it was that when the Nation was overrun with marauding gangs of the early thirties, the FBI was ready, willing, and able to answer the call.

One by one the gangs were eliminated as FBI agents, armed with new laws giving them the power to carry firearms, make arrests, and investigate such things as kidnaping, bank robbery and fleeing felons, pressed the fight. Mr. Hoover personally apprehended Alvin Karpis, one of the most vicious of the gang leaders of the thirties.

The thirties also marked the FBI's entry into the field of protecting the Nation from internal subversion. The data which Mr. Hoover and his agents began to collect as early as 1936 on the Communists, Fascists, and Nazis proved invaluable a few years later when we became involved in a shooting war with the Nazis and Fascists and subsequently in a cold war with the Communists. It is a historical fact that not one act of foreign-directed sabotage occurred in the United States during World War II. The FBI also kept tight control over espionage operations of the Axis powers.

Thus by the midforties, Mr. Hoover had led his small band of dedicated men and women in the FBI in successful fights against criminal and Fascist gangs. There was, however, no time to take bows. The Communists were stronger than ever and, feeling their new strength, were looking around for new lands to conquer. The full forces of their propaganda, espionage, and subversive networks were directed against the United States. Time after time Mr. Hoover warned the Nation of this evil but it took a few shocks—shocks like the Rosenberg and Abel cases—to awaken many Americans.

Even shocked, many Americans remained apathetic about the Communist menace. They showed little interest in or concern about learning of the enemy of freedom. In March 1958 a new book appeared which was to jolt untold numbers of Americans into an acute awareness of communism. It was "Masters of Deceit" by J. Edgar Hoover. In this book, Mr. Hoover unfolded for the first time for the public the unscrupulous nature of communism. Without sensationalism, he presented in a carefully organized form the basic facts about communism, free of the lies and distortions which the Communists themselves always have used to conceal their true meaning. Last year Mr. Hoover gave us another book, "A Study of Communism," to further enhance the knowledge which free men possess about their sworn enemy.

The apathy with which so many Americans have viewed the internal Communist threat perhaps is in large measure a tribute to Mr. Hoover and the FBI. Without doubt, the FBI has been most effective in carrying out its responsibilities of protecting the internal security of the United States.

There is another large and sinister evil looming over our Nation—the organized underworld. With the steady decline of moral standards in recent years there has been a steady growth of organized crime. Smalltime hoodlums and common thieves have amassed tremendous wealth in recent years through organized gambling and other vices. At the same time, crimes of robbery, murder, rape, assault, burglary, major larceny, and automobile theft have been going up year after year. Just last week Mr. Hoover had this to say about the crime situation:

> It is my firm belief that the public attitude toward law enforcement is a major and basic cause of the current crime increase. Too many people today are concerning themselves only with rights. They are ignoring responsibilities. Too many citizens have adopted a don't-get-involved attitude about matters of crime. They close their eyes to unlawful acts.

Americans should heed well these words of a great leader. For 39 years he has protected us from the forces of crime and subversion. His knowledge of these evils is second to none; hence, he speaks with proven authority.

Where would law enforcement in America be today if it were not for the spirit of J. Edgar Hoover?

Would there be an FBI Laboratory second to none in the world in the field of scientific crime detection? Would there be an Identification Division of the FBI so efficient that a single set of fingerprints can be found among the almost 167 million sets on file in a matter of minutes? Would there be an FBI National Academy which has provided excellent training to over 4,300 local, State, Federal, and foreign law enforcement officers? Would there be the very close cooperation which exists today among law-enforcement agencies at all levels?

Without J. Edgar Hoover, I am certain none of these conditions which are so vital to good law enforcement could exist as we know them today.

In spite of the many outstanding contributions, Mr. Hoover and his beloved FBI have not been beyond attack. Naturally, he and the organization have been, and will continue to be the main target of the criminal and the subversive. Mr. Hoover has said many times that when these elements stop attacking him he will feel he is failing to do a good job.

But there have been attacks from other sources. Some have been made for purely selfish reasons. Some have resulted from a misunderstanding of Mr. Hoover's actions and motives. The names of these attackers are unimportant. Their vicious remarks are even less important in the end when they are proved untrue. It behooves all of us, however, to stay alert to such attacks and refute them before they can cause any damage.

J. Edgar Hoover is a man dedicated to the law. I commend to one and all the following statement from an article he wrote for the February 1962 issue of the American Bar Association Journal:

> The majesty of the law, in today's world, is not just a figure of speech or a rhetorical flourish. It is the diadem of American freedom, the reality which distinguishes us from tyranny. It is our heritage, our refuge, our glory.

Such are the words of a great American. I congratulate Mr. Hoover on his 39th anniversary. Moreover, I congratulate the American people, the American system, and American security for having the benefit of his services during more than three decades.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, as has already been stated, tomorrow will mark the 39th anniversary of the entering into Federal service of Hon. J. Edgar Hoover, the head of the FBI.

I wish to add, to what has already been said, my appreciation of Mr. Hoover's outstanding service. I can think of no individual who has contributed more to the security and well-being of this Republic than Mr. Hoover.

I can think of no one who has served with greater distinction and greater intelligence or has accomplished his mission better than Mr. Hoover, at the same time accomplishing it in keeping with the highest principles of ethics.

His task has not been an easy one. He has dealt with stupendous problems involving Communist and Nazi infiltration, as well as with the worst criminal element in our country, and many other elements of our land.

Perhaps sometimes, in our enthusiasm, Congress has overloaded the FBI with activities that might well have been performed by someone else. Perhaps sometimes those in the executive department have, in their enthusiasm, made requests and demands upon the Federal Bureau of Investigation which perhaps should not have been made.

Through it all J. Edgar Hoover has conducted a law enforcement agency with outstanding success. He has been the great defender of what we refer to as the American way of life and our system of government.

I pay tribute to him and congratulate him; and as a citizen I thank him for the great service he has rendered.

RATIFICATION BY THE STATE OF MISSOURI OF ANTI-POLL-TAX AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am most happy to inform the Senate that the State of Missouri today ratified the anti-poll-tax amendment to the Constitution. Missouri thus becomes the 34th State to have done so.

I was notified just a few minutes ago that the House of the Missouri Legislature this morning approved ratification of the amendment by a vote of 150 to 7. The Missouri Senate on March 18, 1963, approved ratification of the amendment by a vote of 31 to 1. The house action this morning, when reaffirmed by the senate, completed ratification by the legislature of that great State.

I wish to express my great appreciation for the fine work that the two distinguished Senators from Missouri—the senior Senator [Mr. SYMINGTON], and his colleague [Mr. LONG]—have done in connection with this important matter. Each cosponsored and supported my resolution proposing this amendment to passage in the Senate and each has contributed greatly to the commendable action that the legislature of their great Midwestern State has taken.

With ratification by 34 of the 38 States required to make this amendment to the Constitution valid, I am hopeful that we may have good news before too long a time from the remaining States whose legislatures are presently in session, but which have not acted.

I again wish to express my heartfelt thanks to my distinguished friends who have worked so hard on this matter with me.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Missouri.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. The Senator from Florida, as usual, is most generous. My colleague [Mr SYMINGTON] is not able to be present on the floor, but he desires to join with me in expressing congratulations to the Senator from Florida for the great job he has done, not only in sponsoring this proposal and getting it through this Congress, but in continuing his efforts with the various States.

I am happy and proud to have had a part in this great project with the Senator from Florida in erasing from the basic law of our land this section, which we feel is not in keeping with the great traditions of America.

I am sure the distinguished Senator from Florida and my colleague from Missouri will wish to join in expressing our appreciation to Senator Albert Spradling, President pro tempore of the Missouri Senate, Senator John Joynt, the majority leader of the senate, Hon. Tom Graham, speaker of the house, and Hon. Jim Trimble, the majority leader of the House of Representatives of Missouri; as well as all the members of those two bodies, who in a little less than an hour passed this measure through the legislature.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am most appreciative of the gracious statement made by the distinguished Senator for himself and his colleague. I wish the RECORD to show that the junior Senator from Missouri, who has such close familiarity with the proceedings of the State of Missouri, serving as a member of its senate, as its president pro tempore, as chairman of its judiciary committee and as Lieutenant Governor of his State, before he came to the Senate, has rendered incalculable service in contacting all of the gentlemen whom he has named. I certainly wish to join with him in expressing to them my appreciation, but making it very clear for the record that the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri is entitled to the credit for contacting them, because I could not have even attempted to do so except through his good offices.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. I thank the Senator. I am happy to have worked with him. I am happy that my colleagues in Missouri have not forgotten it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I join in commending the Senator from Florida for his splendid leadership in connection with this very important constitutional amendment to eliminate the poll-tax requirement for voting. This is an endeavor which he has undertaken over the years. If ever we have seen an example of patient perseverance and dedication to public duty yielding their own reward, it is in this instance. I salute the Senator from Florida for what he has done, and thank him, belatedly, for the kind comments he made several weeks ago with reference to our own State legislature, when it was impossible for me to be present in the Senate to join in an extended comment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the kind comment of the Senator from Minnesota. If my recollection serves me, the great State of Minnesota, represented so ably by the distinguished majority whip, was the 15th or 16th State to ratify the amendment, ratifying the same day as Ohio, February 27, 1963. I believe I took occasion at that time to say that, except for the very strong support of the two Senators from Minnesota and their continued effort in contacting their Governor, the leaders of both houses of their legislature, and the members of the legislature, no such happy result would have been achieved.

I thank him and his colleague from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Florida very much.

TESTIMONY OF THE HONORABLE ANTHONY J. CELEBREZZE AND THE HONORABLE W. WILLARD WIRTZ BEFORE THE EDUCATION SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on the opening day of our hearings on S. 580 and related bills, it was the pleasure of my subcommittee to hear the Honorable Anthony J. Celebrezze, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. On the following day the subcommittee was privileged to take testimony from the Honorable W. Willard Wirtz, Secretary of Labor.

Because of the widespread interest which has been expressed by Senators, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the testimony of each of these Cabinet officials be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY ANTHONY J. CELEBREZZE, SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE, U.S. SENATE, APRIL 29, 1963

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I deem it a real privilege to appear before this distinguished committee this morning to testify on behalf of S. 580, the National Education Improvement Act of 1963.

As President Kennedy indicated in his 1963 message to the Congress on education, "increasing the quality and availability of education is vital to both our national security and our domestic well-being. A free nation can rise no higher than the standard of excellence set in its schools and colleges."

We are here today because our efforts to strengthen American education, repeatedly launched, have repeatedly failed.

We are here today to start afresh to sort and analyze education's vast problems and to renew our efforts to resolve them.

S. 580 is designed to meet the Federal Government's responsibilities in this vital area of our national life. It features a comprehensive, yet selective approach to the needs of American education. It would assist in the improvement of education on all levels from elementary to graduate school, would promote educational quality, would expand individual opportunity for achieving educational self-fulfillment, would help our educational institutions to absorb the oncoming enrollment increases of millions of students, and would enable the Nation to better meet its critical needs for skilled manpower, accelerated economic growth, and strengthened national security.

For a nation now accustomed to living with the threat of thermonuclear war, it is perhaps difficult to think of crisis in terms of education. A well-stocked arsenal and a thriving economy—these would seem to be the primary objects of public concern in this era of global uncertainty. Problems related to classrooms and teachers, textbooks and laboratories are less likely to arouse widespread national anxieties.

Yet there is a direct connection between the strength of our schools and the strength of the Nation. Education is essential both to our national defense and to our national growth. It is the guardian of freedom and the mainspring of progress, and, when education is weakened, both freedom and economic progress are seriously imperiled.

It is no secret that the condition of education in the United States calls for action and calls for action now—throughout the land—in the cities and suburbs, on the farms, and in the towns.

Lack of adequate education and lack of opportunity for education are major contributing factors to our present high rates of unemployment, dependency, delinquency, and crime. They lie at the root of our inability to meet urgent needs for skilled and highly trained manpower. In science and medicine, engineering and agriculture, in education itself, and a host of other occupations requiring special or advanced training, these manpower shortages are major barriers to social and economic progress.

We must ask ourselves how this situation has been allowed to develop in a great nation which has long recognized the close bond between education and freedom—a nation in which education is a requirement for all its youngsters and whose singular contribution to the history of democracy has been the establishment of a system of free public schools unequaled by any other nation.

One reason undoubtedly stems from our past achievements. Because education as a whole has been more available than anywhere else, there is a tendency to be complacent about its present and its future. It is inconceivable to most Americans that this Nation should fail—or indeed be second best.

It took a Russian sputnik in 1957 to jolt the country out of its tranquilized state of indifference toward education. But our efforts to upgrade American education—given a big boost by the Soviet feat—have not yet caught up with our massive needs.

At the beginning of this school year we were still short of classrooms despite a stepped-up rate of construction. As a result of these shortages, more than 1 million children are attending school in overcrowded classrooms and almost 2 million are forced to study in outmoded, unhealthy, and even hazardous school buildings. We need more classrooms at the elementary, secondary, and higher education levels.

There are still not enough well-qualified teachers in our schools although many localities have made strenuous efforts to raise teachers' salaries and improve their professional standing. In the fall of 1962, the States reported that 83,000 teachers failed to meet full State certification requirements. Few teachers have the opportunity to refresh and update their knowledge although major advances in learning are continuously being made in most fields of study. Unless teachers are given access to this abundant new knowledge, the knowledge they impart to their students will already be obsolete.

The school dropout problem persistently plagues us. In this decade alone, an estimated 7½ million youngsters will leave high school without a diploma. Set adrift in a competitive world of work which requires more, not less, education and training, these youngsters constitute a tragic waste of our human resources. Their hopelessness and disillusion are a matter of great concern not only in the big cities but also in the smaller towns and rural areas.

We have not yet given adequate attention to the educational needs of more than 22 million American adults over the age of 25 who have had less than 8 years of schooling and to several million who completely lack the ability to read and write.

We have not yet met the educational needs of an estimated 5 million handicapped children who require specially trained teachers and specially tailored programs.

Between 25 and 40 percent of our able high school graduates still fail to go to college—some because they are not sufficiently motivated and others because they cannot afford it.

Opportunities for higher education, already narrowed by financial considerations, will soon be even further restricted by space limitations if college facilities are not immediately expanded.

The pressures of our growing population are being increasingly felt at all levels of education. More than one-fourth of our population—more than 50 million individuals—is currently enrolled in our schools and colleges. By 1970 there will be 10 million more.

College enrollments alone will almost double in this decade. The first sharp increases are only 2 years away. Without new buildings, begun immediately, our institutions of higher education will not be prepared to receive them.

These are some of the disquieting realities in education today. They are facts which will yield only to a massive cooperative national effort on behalf of education at all levels.

These educational deficiencies have become so serious that they limit the productive capacity, economic growth, and security of the Nation, restrict the scope and progress of scientific investigation, and hamper the building of our national defense. They have made education a matter of national concern.

The dilemma presented to the Nation by the inadequacy of local resources to support education and the urgent need for strengthened education must be met and resolved.

The dependence of many communities on property taxes alone to provide revenues for the schools is not realistic. The burden of the regressive property tax is becoming too heavy on the homeowner and small businessman. Supplemental financial aid from other sources is essential to meet our burgeoning school costs at all levels of education.

Where a community is fortunate enough to have adequate resources—usually industrial property or residential property of high value—its schools are usually excellent. But local school revenues vary considerably from district to district and from State to State with the result that the quality of education throughout our land is very uneven.

The migration from farm to city and from city to suburb that has been going on for some decades has compounded even further the problems of the schools and has made the uneven quality of education among our States a matter of national concern.

Residents of high-income States with better-than-average schools must often move and enroll their children in less-than-average schools in low-income States. And children from impoverished schools, moving to other communities, carry their educational handicaps with them. The burden of repairing these handicaps falls heavily on a relatively small proportion of the Nation—especially on our largest cities.

Education is an investment in human capital and a primary factor in economic growth. Economists have estimated that in recent years our investment in education has been responsible for up to 40 percent of the Nation's growth and productivity. A college education is calculated to be worth approximately $400,000 in lifetime earnings. This return benefits not only the individual but the entire economy.

We cannot continue to allow the high cost of education to close the door of opportunity to able and talented youth. As we become increasingly dependent on skilled and highly trained manpower to meet the needs of national growth and national security and to meet the needs of individuals in a free but complex society, we must provide increased opportunity for students of limited financial means to advance their education to the highest level they are able and willing to attain.

There is nothing new about Federal aid to education. The earmarking by the National Government, under the Survey Ordinance of 1785, of a parcel of land in each township for schools set a precedent for the recognition of education as a national concern which has persisted throughout our history.

Certainly last year's centennial observance of the passage of the Morrill Act—the Land-Grant College Act of 1862—clearly accorded to Federal aid to education the hallmark of a national tradition. When the Congress in that act aided in the creation of colleges to provide instruction in agriculture and the mechanic arts, it responded to a crucial educational need and to the national interest of that time.

When the Congress passed the Vocational Education Act of 1917, the GI bills of World War II, and the National Defense Education Act of 1958, in each instance it responded in a timely and direct way to the recognized needs of the American people and to the requirements of the national interest.

The assistance to education which we propose in this bill would carry on this well-established tradition of Federal support in education.

It does not seek to preempt the rights of the States and communities to control the education of our youth. Neither would it lessen the responsibility of the States to meet this important obligation to its citizens. Rather, it would enable the States and our institutions of higher education to meet those responsibilities and fulfill those obligations which, for a number of reasons, they are now unable to meet. It would shore up the structure of education until the States and private institutions of higher education are able to support it alone.

The legislation we are proposing would not give the Federal Government a dominant role in education. Rather, it would enable the States and local communities to carry out their own responsibilities for education. This margin of expenditure would spell the difference between mediocrity and excellence and would help to even out the wide differences in educational quality and opportunity that now exist among the States.

In every case, Federal support would be designed to stimulate local action. It would enable the States to improve the quality of their schools, while at the same time giving them an opportunity to adjust their financial systems to meet their requirements for support of education when the period of Federal assistance is completed.

The Federal Government cannot and should not attempt to solve all education's many complex problems. It cannot and should not take over responsibility for education. But the Federal Government can and should step forward to shoulder those responsibilities which lie clearly within the scope of its constitutional limitations and which it is already carrying to a lesser degree.

This bill is designed to enable the Federal Government to make its proper contribution.

It is a comprehensive bill which addresses itself to the entire range of needs in American education. Each part, though, must be considered in its relationship to the whole. The structure of education is such that every level depends upon the preceding level, and each, in turn, is depended upon by those which follow.

What we do or do not do to assist higher education, to expand the capacity of our institutions of higher education, to improve the quality of teacher education, to develop strength in specialized fields will have a direct and forceful impact on the quality of education at the elementary and secondary levels. And what we do or do not do to aid our public elementary and secondary schools to meet their problems of crowded classrooms, underpaid teachers, and changing curriculum needs is of direct consequence to the continued growth and strengthening of higher education.

Just as the different but complementary parts of education cannot be separated one from the other, the total well-being of our society cannot be measured apart from education. President Kennedy has said that "education is the keystone in the arch of freedom and progress." It is an essential condition of a living and growing democracy. It is the citizen's opportunity for personal fulfillment and happiness. It is the country's greatest resource for achieving national strength and prosperity.

Let me now turn to the specific proposals of the bill itself. They are addressed to six major categories of educational needs: First, to the expansion of opportunities for individuals in higher education; second, to the expansion and improvement of higher education facilities; third, to the improvement of the quality of education at all levels; fourth, to strengthening elementary and secondary education; fifth, to improving vocational and special education; and, finally, to the expansion of opportunities for continuing education beyond the formal school years.

TITLE I—EXPANSION OF OPPORTUNITIES FOR INDIVIDUALS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

To help realize our national goal that each individual shall have the opportunity for education at the highest level of which he is capable, the bill provides in title I for expansion of the successful National Defense Education Act student loan and graduate fellowship programs and for additional opportunities to finance a college education through the initiation of a program of work-study campus employment and a program of Federal insurance for commercial loans to students.

Steeply rising costs of higher education accompanied by an upward climb in the college-age population pose for many American families today the vexing and expensive problem of providing their children with the education necessary for tomorrow's demands on their knowledge and productive capability.

One factor limiting attendance at college that must be overcome is the cost. Intelligence is not related to family income or ability to pay the costs of going to college, but actual enrollment is. Estimates indicate that between 25 and 40 percent of our most capable students—those with IQ's of 120 and above who want to go to college—do not now go beyond high school, largely because of financial need. Further evidence that higher education is largely dependent upon the ability of the student to pay the price is indicated by the fact that private education continues to draw 50 percent of its students and public education 25 percent from the top 10 percent of the Nation's income groups.

A program of Federal financial assistance through student loans began in 1958. Since that time, more than 350,000 students in 1,500 institutions have received NDEA loans exceeding $230 million. This year an estimated 220,000 will borrow $110 million—an average of $500 each. Yet the demand for loan funds is not being met. More than 100 institutions have requested greater Federal contributions than the maximum to which they are now limited.

The requirements of the present national defense student loan program are such that many students from middle-upper income families are unable to obtain loans. Yet 6 million families in this category face a heavy financial burden as a result of the spiraling costs of a college education which are especially severe if the family is large. To assist such families, we are recommending the establishment of a Federal loan insurance program that would provide them easier access to commercial loans and enable them to spread the payments for college costs over a considerable period of time.

More students help finance their college education from their part-time earnings than from any other source of outside aid, such as scholarships and loans. Although many students find jobs off the campus, most of the earnings are from work-study programs administered by and, for the most part, financed by the colleges and universities. College-paid undergraduate employment now totals about $100 million a year and provides average earnings of about $285 for 350,000 students. The Federal Government can help these additional thousands of students who work their way through college by undertaking partial support of educationally related oncampus student employment.

Graduate education is the most expensive level of education, and its high cost is the primary cause of attrition from study for advanced degrees. Of the total number of graduate students currently enrolled, only about 40 percent are full-time students. The others pursue studies on a part-time basis because they need to earn money to support themselves and their families.

The many years necessary for part-time students to earn doctorates aggravate this problem. In the natural sciences, where fellowships and assistantships are relatively abundant, students generally earn their doctorates in 4 or 5 years. In the social sciences and the humanities, however, an average of 8 years is required. Thus, it is essential to increase fellowship aid so as to attract thousands of additional graduate students and in order to reduce the high attrition rate among our present graduate students.

TITLE II—EXPANSION AND IMPROVEMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION

To strengthen higher education, S. 580 would assist the Nation's colleges and universities to construct urgently needed classrooms, laboratories, libraries, and technical facilities, would promote the establishment and strengthening of educational centers of excellence in graduate and technical education, and would expand Federal support for modern foreign language and area studies under the National Defense Education Act.

College enrollments in 1970 are expected to be double those of 1960. Approximately 7 million students will be in attendance by 1970, with the greatest increase in entering enrollments coming in the next 2 years. To provide for additional students, replace obsolete structures, and modernize usable buildings, institutions of higher education should invest an average of $2.3 billion annually. Expenditures currently fall short of this by $1 billion annually.

General instructional programs and facilities are especially difficult to finance. The college housing loan program, now authorized at $300 million annually, enables institutions to construct only such income-producing facilities as dormitories, dining halls, and student centers. Needs for academic facilities are even more acute.

Additional public community colleges would provide higher education opportunities to thousands of students who would continue their schooling if they had access to colleges close to their homes. To meet the Nation's needs for general-purpose junior colleges with degree transfer programs, we should open 25 to 30 new community colleges annually during the next 10 years.

The need for expanded college-level technical education is also acute. Because of the present shortage of subprofessional technicians, many highly trained scientists and engineers are forced to serve as draftsmen or laboratory aids. Whereas the satisfactory ratio is considered to be 2 or 3 technicians to 1 professional engineer, the present ratio ranges from 7 to 11.5 technicians to every 10 engineers. Nor is there any indication that the situation is righting itself. The Nation's institutions of higher education are turning out approximately 2 technicians for every 5 engineers—only 15,000 a year against an estimated annual need of 80,000.

With regard to college libraries, when measured against the minimum standards of the American Library Association, 52 percent of all libraries in 4-year institutions now have substandard collections, 49 percent are inadequately staffed, and 58 percent receive less than 5 percent of total institutional expenditures.

TITLE III—IMPROVEMENT OF EDUCATIONAL QUALITY

To strengthen and improve educational quality at every level of our expanding educational enterprise, S. 580 proposes, in title III, Federal assistance for the improvement of teacher-preparation programs, for the upgrading of teacher competence through expanded operation of teacher-training institutes, for specialized training of teachers in selected educational areas, for broad and accelerated educational research and demonstration efforts, and for the strengthening of State statistical services in the field of education.

The most significant factor in the learning process, next to the aptitude of the learner, is the quality of instruction. Concern about the quality of teaching in the Nation's schools has already led to Federal assistance programs which are producing substantial improvement in the teaching of mathematics, science, and foreign languages. The Nation's need for maximum development of human resources requires that this wave of improvement be expanded and extended to other vital fields. Title III attacks this problem at five significant points: Improving the teaching of those already in service, strengthening the preparation of future teachers' training, expanding training programs for personnel who deal with specialized needs of children, educational research and the demonstration of tested techniques, and improving educational statistics essential to the maintenance of effective schools.

In the fall of 1962 about 83,000 full-time teachers failed to meet full State certification standards. They represent about 5.5 percent of the total teaching staff.

Additional thousands of teachers have not had an opportunity to refresh and update their knowledge of the subject matter they teach. They have not been able to bring into the classrooms important new knowledge resulting from recent broad advances in all fields of study. Shortages of teachers and trained personnel in auxiliary and specialized fields have also handicapped efforts to expand and strengthen school and college curriculum.

TITLE IV—STRENGTHENING ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

To insure that the entire educational effort is founded upon quality instruction in the elementary and secondary schools, S. 580 authorizes selective assistance for the improvement of inadequate teachers' salaries, for the elimination of critical classroom construction deficiencies, and for the support of special research and demonstration projects designed to bolster educational quality and opportunity. Existing programs of the National Defense Education Act for the acquisition of science, mathematics, and modern foreign language instructional equipment and for guidance, counseling, and testing, as well as the programs of school assistance in federally affected areas, would be extended in a continuation of the helpful Federal educational role already authorized by the Congress.

In just 1 year, from the fall of 1961 to the fall of 1962, public school enrollment increased by 1.4 million students. This brought enrollment to a new peak of 38.8 million. Effects of the high postwar birth rate are being felt increasingly in high schools, where enrollment is increasing more rapidly than in elementary schools.

According to reports of the States, approximately 1,667,000 pupils were in excess of the normal classroom capacity last fall—attending school in overcrowded classrooms, makeshift quarters, and rented facilities, and under similar emergency arrangements. An estimated additional 1.7 million children were attending school last fall in obsolete and unsatisfactory facilities.

It is estimated that, in the decade of the 1960's, there will be 7½ million youngsters who will drop out of high school before graduation. Twenty-six million youngsters will be added to the working force in the decade ahead. Out of every 10 children now in grade school, only 7 will earn a high school diploma, only 4 will continue their education, and only 2 will finish 4 years of college. We know that unemployment and welfare cases are going to be concentrated in the dropout group. Not only are dropouts going to be competing with great numbers of youngsters who are better prepared to face the job world, but they are going to be seeking work in an economy in which the kinds of jobs they are limited to undertake are disappearing. The school dropout problem constitutes a tragic waste of human resources. It adversely influences the social and economic values necessary for a healthy society. The only way we can minimize social costs over the long run is to invest more in education and training.

The Federal Government must act swiftly to insure that the States have the resources and are provided the incentives to meet this tragic problem.

TITLE V—EXPANSION AND IMPROVEMENT OF VOCATIONAL AND SPECIAL EDUCATION

To meet the challenges of new technology and a dynamic economy, title V of this legislation would authorize the expansion and modernization of the Federal-State Vocational Education Acts and a program to eliminate the educational deficiencies of a significant portion of our adult population. An additional investment in the education of our handicapped children would enable them to lead more productive and satisfying lives in the years ahead.

The dramatic breakthrough in scientific knowledge, the evolution of new means for production, and the greater demands for skilled manpower are matters that concern us as a nation.

Right now only about 4 million people a year are being served by vocational education programs, about half of whom are adults. Opportunities are obviously far too limited. In the large cities, where education is very much affected by socioeconomic changes, vocational education offerings are often inadequate. Only one-fifth of present vocational enrollments are in our largest cities.

The panel of consultants who this year studied our national vocational education needs and offerings has stated that, in this changing world of work, vocational education must provide up-to-date training opportunities for the more than 20 million youngsters expected to enter the labor market in the 1960's without a college degree.

It must serve the training and retraining needs of millions of workers whose skills and knowledge need updating or whose jobs disappear in the wake of automation and economic change.

It must provide education beyond the high school level so that the ever-increasing demand for highly skilled craftsmen will be met.

It must be capable of constant expansion and revision to reflect changing employment possibilities and national economic needs.

We are concerned also about the 5 million handicapped school-age children in this country who are in need of special education. These include children who are blind or partially blind, or deaf, or have speech impairments, or who are crippled or have other special health problems, or who are emotionally disturbed or mentally retarded.

Almost all these children can be helped to live normal lives. But they can be helped only if they have very special teachers—teachers with the kind of professional preparation that will enable them to understand the effects of the child's deviation upon his learning and to know how to help him.

Of the 5 million handicapped children, about 1½ million are mentally retarded and another 1½ million have very serious social or emotional problems which interfere with their learning. Their talents, which in some cases are unusual, are hidden away, their abilities submerged, their promise blighted.

For these children, about 200,000 special teachers are needed, but only 50,000 to 60,000 are now available. Only 2,000 degrees in special education were granted during 1959-60. By 1968, only about one-third of the Nation's handicapped children will have access to needed special educational training opportunities.

TITLE VI—EXPANSION OF CONTINUING EDUCATION

This legislation, finally, would extend the incalculable benefits of education to all our population who wish to use them: To the millions of adult Americans who require additional educational opportunities to remedy the lack of formal education in childhood, to all those who need to keep abreast of the revolutionary changes in knowledge in order to perform their jobs well in today's highly specialized and professionalized job market, and to all our population who do not now enjoy the numerous benefits of good library services.

Eight million Americans 25 years of age and older have less than 5 years of schooling; almost 23 million have less than an eighth grade education. Without a foundation in basic education—without the ability to read, write, and do simple arithmetic—these millions of Americans are committed to a future of minimum earnings, recurrent joblessness, dependency, and personal deprivation.

The cost to the Nation of this lack of basic education among so large a group is staggering. Here is the hard core of unemployed, supported by public welfare funds and unable to benefit from major vocational training programs because of the lack of basic education skills.

The problem of limited educational attainment is not limited to any particular area or population group. It is nationwide. In New York State the number of adults with less than 8 years of schooling is nearly 2 million; in Illinois, California, Pennsylvania, and Texas it ranges from 1 to 1½ million. Thirteen other States—Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, New Jersey, North Carolina, Ohio, Tennessee, and Virginia—each have more than half a million such adults.

Our increasingly complex society demands a continuous process of lifelong learning and relearning. An insistent need and demand from the general public have caused many of our State universities and colleges to offer certain courses or kinds of instruction in extension. These offerings have of necessity been limited in number and in scope. The educational opportunities of great numbers of people who are above the usual school age have been limited. Many of these people, because of remoteness from a university campus, cannot attend regular courses or programs. Increasingly, extension courses are becoming an important means for technical workers in an ever-widening range of occupations to upgrade their skills and keep abreast of new developments. Such educational opportunities will obviously have a far-reaching effect on industrial efficiency and the national economy. The fact that it has been necessary for these broad extension programs in general to be self-supporting has seriously limited the extent as well as the adequacy of their service.

For the vast majority of Americans, the basic source of continuing cultural and learning opportunities is the public library. Yet, 18 million Americans have no readily available library services. Some 110 million persons, 60 million in urban areas, have inadequate library services.

The proposed legislation follows in its concepts the provisions of the successful Library Services Act, which has materially assisted the development of public library service in rural areas in the United States.

We recommend that this assistance now be extended to meet the needs for improved library services, including construction, in urban areas as well.

This education bill focuses on the very heart and substance of our Nation's security, our economic growth, and the promise America will hold for individual aspiration and fulfillment in generations to come.

I urge your most careful consideration of the components of this bill in relation to each other and, above all, in relation to the larger purposes of the long-range national interest. Those purposes call for the kind of broad and balanced action which this bill embodies. They call for our joint effort in resolving the difficulties, the differences, and dilemmas that are implicit in any proposal for a major move forward in a sensitive area of human relationships.

The program that we are proposing is an educational program, realistic in terms of cost and clearly in line with both the limitations of Federal activity in the sphere of education and the Federal obligation to promote our domestic well-being and our national security.

President Kennedy has said that the proposed program for education "neither includes nor rejects all of the features which have long been sought by the various educational groups and organizations." He has characterized it as "a prudent and balanced program drawing upon the efforts of many past Congresses and the proposals of many Members of both Houses and both political parties." The President has stated also that this "is solely an educational program" and is not an attempt "to solve all other difficult domestic problems."

Social and economic problems that this Nation now faces extend far beyond the realm of education, and they cannot be solved by education legislation alone. They can be helped by broadening educational opportunities, by improving the quality of education, by stimulating economic growth.

These problems need our sympathy, our tolerance, and understanding. They require long and steadfast efforts in many fields and on many fronts. But let us not place on education the full burden of all our difficult and complex social tasks when education is already faltering under the weight of its own heavy responsibilities.

Let us join together in a cooperative, concerted effort to strengthen education.

Let us focus our attention on its critical needs—not the fragmented needs of this field or that or the needs of one level as opposed to another, but the needs of the whole house of education, from kindergarten through college and beyond.

Let us concentrate our efforts on meeting these needs. To do this will require not only expanded Federal support to education but increased support from business and industry and a new look by the States and local communities at the resources that they may be able to command.

The challenge in education is now. We must meet it. And I am sure that working together we will meet it. To that end, I strongly recommend your favorable consideration of S. 580.

STATEMENT OF W. WILLARD WIRTZ, SECRETARY OF LABOR, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE, ON S. 580, NATIONAL EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1963, APRIL 30, 1963

My testimony, as Secretary of Labor, in support of the National Education Improvement Act of 1963, S. 580, reflects the realization that full employment in this country depends on full education.

These are actually comparative terms, and there has always been something of this relationship between learning and making a living. I refer, however, to the effect of what we loosely call "automation" upon the interdependence of education and employment.

Unless and until the educational system in this country is significantly strengthened, two danger spots that have already shown up in our manpower situation are going to continue to get worse. One is the concentration of unemployment among unskilled workers. The other is the imminent shortage of personnel in a good many skilled, professional, semiprofessional, and technical occupations.

The basic necessity, if there is to be full employment, is to increase the demand for manpower by stepping up the rate of the whole national enterprise. But this will not in itself meet the whole unemployment problem, for it will not sufficiently increase the number of unskilled jobs. And this necessary stepping up of the economic growth rate will itself be retarded unless people with the skills and training which the new jobs require are available.

The reason for the increasing concentration of unemployment among unskilled workers is that machines are taking over the unskilled jobs. These are the jobs which have, up to this time, absorbed the casualties of the educational system: Those who for one reason or another have left school without having added to the strength which is in their arms and backs the skill it takes to do something more than "common labor." This wasn't too bad when there were enough common labor jobs around. Now there aren't.

Today, unskilled workers make up 5 percent of the work force. But almost 15 percent of all the unemployed are in this group. Unemployment is over twice as high among the younger worker group and among nonwhite workers—the two groups in which there are the largest percentages of unskilled workers—than it is in the work force as a whole.

What this means in terms of educational needs is obvious. We simply cannot any longer afford to let boys and girls leave the educational system unprepared to use their minds as well as their muscles. We must, in one way or another, see to it that they have what today's—and tomorrow's—labor market requires. The margin for educational error or failure, which is what the unskilled jobs in the old work force constituted, has been taken up by machine.

Our educational system has to date been too largely college oriented. It has worked out that most of those who do not go on to college, especially those who finished high school, picked up in the course of this education enough training or skills to somehow or other get a job. However, it is becoming increasingly apparent that inadequate training and education contribute to unemployment and dislocation. We can no longer depend on the haphazard methods used in the past to prepare our labor force.

The Department is issuing today a special research report called Young Workers: Their Special Training Needs, which for the first time contains the facts and figures which give the full dimensions of the problems facing our noncollege bound young people. I should like to refer to some of the highlights from this report because they put into broad perspective the magnitude and complexity of the problem that we as a people face in educating and training youngsters who are going directly to work rather than toward college. Many of these youngsters will be leaving an educational system oriented to a college education instead of the world of work.

First, let me say that this report underscores the urgency of our problem and emphasizes the need for immediate action. The facts are there; it is up to us as responsible citizens to act.

Our report sends up a warning signal that says to all Americans that the postwar population explosion, which first hit the schools, is now making itself felt on the side and makeup of the labor force in this year and in 1964 and 1965. During the 1963–65 period, about 7.5 million new young workers will be looking for work. Again, let me emphasize, I am not discussing forecasts in the wild blue yonder, I am speaking about something which is occurring at this very moment. In fact, the leadtime for adequately preparing many of the youngsters before they enter the labor force has already disappeared.

Because of the changing job requirements of our economy and the increasing employment opportunities in those jobs requiring higher levels of education and skills, the group which will cause us the most concern will be the 5½ million non-college-bound new young workers who will be looking for work in the next 3 years. About 3½ million of these young men and women will have a high school education and approximately another 2 million youngsters will not have completed their high school education.

The number of young persons in the 14-to-19 age category expected to be working at or seeking full or part-time jobs (for the most part they will be 18- and 19-year-olds) will probably rise from 6.2 million in 1960 to 7.7 million in 1965 and 8.4 million by 1970.

This 24-percent increase of 1.5 million 14- to 19-year-olds in the labor force between 1960 and 1965 dramatically points up the immediacy of the youth employment problem. Between 1965 and 1970 the number of young persons ages 14 through 19 in the labor force will increase by about 736,000—or nearly 10 percent. Thus, of the total increase in the 1960 decade, two-thirds of the increase will have occurred by 1965.

The youth employment problem will be especially acute in some States in the next few years because the great upsurge in the number of youthful jobseekers will not occur at a uniform rate. In 11 States the expected growth between 1960 and 1965 in the number of teenagers in the workforce will exceed the total increase in nonagricultural employment which occurred between 1957 and 1962 in each of these States.[1] In a 12th State, West Virginia, the number of teenagers in the labor force is expected to decline slightly between 1960 and 1965; the number of nonagricultural jobs dropped by 69,000 between 1957 and 1962. During this period, these 12 States had a total loss of 358,000 nonagricultural jobs. In these same States, the total number of 14–19-year-olds working or seeking work between 1960 and 1965 is expected to grow by 552,000. The States where the greatest difficulty in providing jobs for young workers may occur are: New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, and West Virginia.

In some large industrial States such as New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois and Massachusetts, approximately one-fifth or more of the labor force growth between 1960 and 1965 is expected to consist of non-college-bound teenagers.

Our report indicates that many of our youngsters have special training needs. If we are to avoid the "social dynamite" which will be generated by frustrated unemployed youngsters, we must have an omnibus educational and training approach which will encompass all of our young citizens. We must, for example, reach out to the 150,000 young men in the 14 to 19 age group who were not attending any school and were not in our labor force in October 1962.

Our educational and training programs must also give special attention to the approximately 12 million youngsters under the age of 18 who were growing up in families whose total money income was less than $3,000 in 1961. This income is considerably below the minimum family budget considered as modest but adequate by the Department of Labor. If our programs do not reach these young persons then they will, in all probability, repeat the experience of their fathers and end up as low-income family heads with little education and meager income. It is up to us to break the circle of poverty encompassing so many of our citizens who lack a proper education.

The report also shows that about one out of every four nonwhite teenagers in the labor force was unemployed compared with about one out of every eight white teenagers. Both the high school graduate and the dropout among the nonwhite youngsters are primarily employed in low-paying service occupations and in farm labor jobs.

The special training needs of young workers resulting from the profound change occurring in the agricultural sector of our economy are also pointed up in our report. Many of the teenagers now growing up in rural-farm areas may not find farm jobs when they are ready to enter the labor market because of the continuing technological revolution on our farms. They will be looking for jobs in urban areas and many of them will not be prepared for the increasingly complex jobs developing in our factories and offices.

We cannot ignore the 415,000 children under age 14 who are growing up in migrant families. Approximately one-half of the children under 18 in migratory families move about the country as their families follow the crops. Generally, migratory youths enter school later, attend classes fewer days, achieve the least progress, drop out of school earliest, and constitute the Nation's largest single reservoir of illiterates. We must have educational and training programs which are flexible so that they adjust to the special needs of the children of migratory workers.

We cannot afford to ignore the large number of youths with physical and mental handicaps. They represent a special challenge to the Nation's training resources. The Office of the Surgeon General of the U.S. Department of the Army has estimated that almost a third of the country's youths subject to examination for military service are unable to meet acceptable standards for medical and mental fitness.

A considerable number of young persons with all types of handicaps are not attending school, mainly because most school systems lack the specially trained teachers, and to some extent the facilities necessary to make school a meaningful experience for these young people. In passing let me note that only about a quarter of a million of the Nation's 1¼ million school age retardees are enrolled in special education programs in public schools.

Another problem which our report highlights is that we have a large number of young married men who have incomes inadequate for subsistence living. Many young breadwinners are forced by circumstances to concern themselves more with immediate economic needs than with developing their future careers. It is unlikely that many of the more than 700,000 family heads below the age of 25 with total annual money incomes of less than $3,000 are able to devote their efforts to develop their full potential through training. The special difficulty facing these young married workers is expected to affect an increasing number of our youths as long as they continue to marry and have children at an earlier age than did their parents. A fresh and different approach to many of our training and educational programs is needed to meet their problems.

Our report concludes that the millions of young persons who will be jobseekers in the next few years are essentially a heterogenous group with differing educational and training needs. The education bill under consideration today represents a major step forward in that it recognizes the complexity of the problem and proposes a many-sided approach to a difficult problem. In its recommendation for vocational education the bill makes the same point that our report makes; namely that training must be realistic in the light of actual or anticipated opportunities for employment.

Last week, as Chairman of the President's Committee on Youth Employment, I had the honor of transmitting the Committee's report and recommendations on "The Challenge of Jobless Youth" to the President. S. 580 would take decisive steps to implement many of the Committee's recommendations for action programs to resolve both immediate and long-run problems of youth employment. There is little doubt that many of the problems faced by the Nation in areas such as unemployment, juvenile delinquency, and the wasteful practice of under-utilized manpower are rooted in inadequacies in our educational system.

Almost every recommendation made by the President's Committee on Youth Employment to resolve future problems of jobless youth has some counterpart for educational action in S. 580. One broad-gaged recommendation urges that necessary steps be taken by local school systems to improve teaching methods and strengthen curricula for those young people going directly to work from secondary schools. A related recommendation stipulates that additional funds must be provided to enable the schools to extend and improve their current educational programs. Within the context of these recommendations such educational imperatives are stressed as the need for remedial teaching, curricula for students who are not academically oriented, educational programs for out-of-school youth who want further training, expanded and improved guidance and counseling programs, and an additional 2 years of post-high school education for all youth capable of benefiting from this program. The Congress is urged to recognize the Federal responsibility by helping to supply the resources required to initiate these programs.

The Congress is called upon in one recommendation to reexamine existing vocational education laws and practices. Where necessary, the President's Youth Employment Committee recommends that vocational and technical education be strengthened by offering Federal reimbursement for training in more and different occupations. A companion recommendation asks that area skill centers or technical or vocational schools should be established for youth and adults in many new central locations. For these, the curriculum should provide training for any occupation in which a job may be reasonably expected and for which youth may be qualified.

The President's Youth Employment Committee calls for immediate crash programs to bring inadequately educated out-of-school youth up to at least minimum standards of employability. Key recognition is given to the inability of out-of-school youth to get jobs because they lack basic skills in reading, writing, speaking, and the use of numbers. Such programs, the Committee notes, will require funds for adequate classrooms and skilled teachers.

Educational preparation for the world of work is a recurrent theme in the Youth Committee's recommendations to meet the challenge of jobless youth. The proposed National Education Improvement Act offers much to facilitate the difficult transition faced by youth seeking to take their place as productive members of the Nation's labor force.

It is among our high hopes for the future that a much larger number of America's youth can go on to college. We will not accept any dilution of the disciplines of the school system which are necessary to prepare boys and girls for meaningful use of their college opportunity. Today's circumstances demand, and S. 580 recognizes, that a great deal must be done to enlarge that opportunity and to strengthen the preparatory work for it. We must at the same time recognize that today the training demands of the work force require full recognition of the need for educational programs which prepare not only for college but for work to be performed without benefit of a college education.

Title V–A of S. 580 will permit modernization and expansion of the present permanent program of Federal grants to the States for vocational education. The proposal is broadly conceived, with provisions covering high school students, high school graduates and dropouts, experienced workers in need of further training or retraining, and persons who are socially disadvantaged. It provides financial assistance for the construction of area vocational education schools, and for a wide range of ancillary services, including most notably teacher training and the development of new teaching techniques and materials. Improving the quality of teacher training, particularly in keeping the teacher up-to-date and abreast of modern techniques, is of the utmost importance.

Another significant provision of the bill is the requirement that State plans for vocational education must include consultation with and use of the services of the public employment service offices to help assure that training will be related to occupational demand in the labor market.

These important provisions take into account the need for assuring that the vocational education system can meet the requirements of economic growth and the constantly shifting occupational demands of modern technological developments. They recognize the need for expanding and updating the system, and for introducing flexibility in the programing of vocational education.

---

[1] These States are: Connecticut, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Kansas, Delaware, Louisiana, and Montana.

Representatives of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have already discussed, in some detail, the Nation's vocational education system and the effect of the proposed new program. It has seemed to me that I might be most helpful to the subcommittee by suggesting to you some of what we have learned about the present vocational education program in connection with the administration of the Area Redevelopment Act and the Manpower Development and Training Act.

These are, in a sense, remedial programs. Perhaps their broadest lesson is that a great deal more must, in the long run, be done as part of a broad program of preparing people in advance for the demands which will be placed upon them in the modern and future world of work.

But there are some more specific lessons from this Area Redevelopment Act and Manpower Development and Training Act experience.

There is, first, the cumulative evidence of an urgent need for additional vocational education facilities, equipment, and personnel.

We are finding, for example, that in many areas as much as 75 percent of the training provided under these two legislative programs must be carried on at night. This is not because the unemployed prefer to train at night, but because the facilities are only available then. In addition, the vocational education equipment at hand is all too often obsolete.

These inadequacies have a direct bearing on the Nation's unemployment problem. We have sometimes been unable to start training where definite job openings exist. In some instances, training has been delayed for months waiting for adequate facilities, equipment, and personnel to become available. The efforts of all involved are frustrated when we find job opportunities and potential trainees, but no facilities.

With the authority under Manpower Development and Training Act to purchase equipment, we have been able to overcome to a limited extent the problems of obsolete and insufficient equipment for training unemployed persons. But this effort to update training equipment has permitted taking only a step toward the modernization of our total vocational education system.

To some extent, we have been able to offset the lack of available local facilities, equipment, and personnel for training under the Manpower Development and Training Act by arranging to send trainees out of their home communities to other areas where there are adequate facilities to undertake the necessary job training.

In this connection, I particularly commend to your favorable consideration the provision to permit use of funds for the construction of area vocational schools. This provision recognizes the realities of the present labor market situation. We are less and less dealing with small isolated labor markets. A central area school is an appropriate way of bringing up-to-date training to larger geographic areas, pulling together resources to purchase and install the evermore expensive equipment necessary for today's job training.

Industry, too, has an important role to play in skill development. The Department of Labor encourages labor and management to accept an appropriate share of the responsibility for training employed workers. Many such programs exist. But they cannot do the total job that needs to be done. Many employers do not have the facilities or the instructional staff to provide training. Passage of title V–A would be a significant step in closing the gap between industry's need for training and the Nation's present capacity to provide training. Also, the training provided by this bill will give individuals an opportunity to increase their employability and to build a good foundation of basic skill and knowledge that can be supplemented by any training that may become available to them in industry.

I would like to emphasize that although passage of this bill will strengthen formal education it will not eliminate the need for the training programs that are provided under the Manpower Development and Training Act and the Area Redevelopment Act. Such training is designed primarily to meet and is focused upon the job needs of individual long-term unemployed workers, with what Congress determined to be essential provision for the payment of a training allowance to a worker participating in such a program.

In order to restore these hard-core unemployed to full productive capacity, we must tailor-make training courses to their needs in the context of the job market they face. This makes mandatory a determinative role of the manpower agency—the local public employment office.

The purpose of part B of title VI, which deals with "Adult basic education," is to provide instruction for adults who are unable to read and write English or who have not completed the equivalent of the eighth grade of school, with a view to increasing their opportunities for productive and profitable employment. Here again, our experience under the Manpower Development and Training Act illuminates the need for such a program.

Recent data indicate that more than 300,000 people looking for jobs had less than a fifth-grade education and almost 1½ million of those unemployed had less than an eighth grade education. People so ill-prepared are at a competitive disadvantage in today's highly skilled labor market, and will become progressively more disadvantaged as the Nation pushes its way toward greater technological achievement.

The close correlation between unemployment, experience and level of educational attainment is known to all of us who study our monthly reports on the labor force. In March 1962 the overall unemployment rate was 6.2 percent. Workers with less than a high school education had an unemployment rate of about 8 percent while about 5 percent of the high school graduates and about 2.6 percent of workers wtih some college education were jobless in that month.

The lifetime earnings of workers are relative to their educational attainment. A recent study by the Bureau of the Census revealed that additional schooling is clearly associated with a very substantial increase in lifetime income. Over a lifetime, the total earnings of men with 1 to 3 years of high school and those of a high school graduate is better than $46,000. The difference in lifetime earnings between a high school graduate and a college graduate is close to $180,000. Urban males with 4 years or more of college education had annual incomes of $6,780 in 1958 as compared with the income of $2,504 for urban men with less than 8 years of schooling.

About three-fourths of the family heads with less than a high school education had family incomes under $3,000 a year. Approximately 58 percent of the family heads with some college education had incomes of $15,000 and over. Only 21 percent of those with less than a high school education had incomes of $15,000 or more.

What is happening in the work force is exactly like what is happening in the Armed Forces: the minimum competence and training qualifications have gone up sharply in the past 5 years. The place for the foot soldier and the common laborer is diminishing rapidly.

So, in the Armed Forces, the poorly qualified boy is being rejected. Five years ago, the military was taking boys who could function at a fifth-grade training level. Today the minimum has been raised to a ninth-grade level. The others are rejected. And they are being rejected in the work force in precisely the same way.

There is a direct correlation between a person's education and his earnings. A study of the income of men 25 years of age and older shows that those with less than 8 years of education have a median income of $2,100 a year; those with 8 years of education show a median income of $3,800 a year; the median for high school graduates is $5,500; and for college graduates it is $7,950.

These figures unquestionably reflect elements other than the formal education of the individuals involved. But it is certain that the differences in educational attainment represent a prime reason for these income differentials.

I would also like to emphasize that in considering the cost of adequate education and training, we ought to realize that the salvage cost of retraining an individual who has been assigned to the economic slag heap is less than what will be the public expense of supporting such an individual each year of his nonworking life if he is not retrained. We hear a great deal these days about the undesirability of passing on costs to the next generation. Even if we were forced to borrow the funds for training the unemployed worker, the cost to the taxpayer would approximate only 2 percent of what would otherwise be required for the support of the unemployed worker during the 40 years of his adult life. Even if dollars were the only consideration, we would realize that our lack of action may impose years of enforced unemployment on the would-be worker, thus passing on a far heavier debt than that contemplated by a constructive program of job training.

We are finding that all too many of the hard-core unemployed group are functionally illiterate—unable to take the initial screening tests or even to fill out an application for training or a job. An extremely large percentage of applicants have had to be rejected because they have only a fourth- or fifth-grade education, or less.

Recently, a new training course was initiated to train people for semiskilled jobs as maintenance and service workers. Many of the applicants, however, were unable to read the labels on cans of cleaning materials, detergents, insecticides, rat poisons, and the like. In this case, it has been decided to begin at the beginning and teach the trainees to read, along with the duties of the job. This means that one-half of the 6-hour training day will be devoted to remedial basic education and only one-half to occupational training.

A demonstration project is now underway at the Norfolk Division of Virginia State College, to train 100 unskilled, chronically unemployed workers. Many of these workers who have had little opportunity for formal schooling are being taught the 3 R's along with specific occupational skills.

There are, too, literally millions of adults who are not unemployed who also need the benefits of the adult education section of this proposed legislation. The 1960 census disclosed that 8⅓ million Americans 25 years of age and over had completed fewer than 5 years of schooling. Their ability to hold the job, or to find a new one when they become unemployed, would in most cases be greatly improved if they could learn to read and write.

There remains, however, the other, perhaps even larger, new demand which the developing economy, viewed from the standpoint of manpower considerations, places on the educational system.

Many of the manpower problems which confront us are related to the unavailability of an adequate supply of trained workers to fill job openings that exist today and that are anticipated in the years ahead. The nature of many jobs is changing and new occupations and specialties are constantly emerging. Today, this country is faced with the paradox of having a high rate of unemployment at the same time that many jobs remain vacant because of the unavailability of properly trained workers.

There has been, in the past 5 years, a speedup in the long-term shift away from the output of goods toward the supplying of services, and from blue-collar to white-collar occupations. The past decade and a half has seen an acceleration in the long-term trend of increase in the professional, managerial, clerical, and sales occupations at the expense of the manual occupations. We expect a continuation of this trend in the years ahead.

Among the blue- and white-collar occupations, rapid technological change has resulted in a shift away from unskilled jobs to occupations requiring more education and intensive training.

Special significance attaches, in this connection, to the provision in S. 580 for the construction of academic facilities for public community colleges. This will enable many more young people with limited finances to obtain 2 years of additional education beyond high school and will help to eliminate the economic barrier which may be keeping qualified young men and women from going to college. Many junior colleges provide training in technical and other semiprofessional occupations which are in great demand today and for which a continuing demand is anticipated. Although the shortages of engineers and scientists—and the consequent need to relieve the professional workers of tasks which can be performed by less highly trained persons—have helped to increase the employment of technicians in the past two decades, the growth of these occupations has a more fundamental cause. It is due basically to the increasing complexity of modern technology, which has created a need for workers who have some basic scientific and mathematical knowledge and also specialized training in some aspect of technology.

In 1960 the number of technicians working with engineers and scientists was about 775,000, according to a rough estimate. It is anticipated that, during the next 10 to 15 years, demand will increase at least as fast in these occupations as in engineering and the sciences, leading possibly to a doubling in requirements by 1975.

Our manpower research studies indicate that there is a general shortage of people with graduate degrees, especially in college teaching and research, and this situation is growing more serious each year in view of rising college enrollments and the increasing proportion of young people attending college. The increase in the number of graduate fellowships that is provided in this Act will go a long way toward increasing the supply of college teachers.

The payment of higher salaries to teachers will go a long way toward attracting qualified personnel into the profession and retaining them. Many of our school systems are still issuing short-term emergency certificates to teachers not meeting regular requirements; increasing the size of classes; and employing other expedients to staff their schools.

The forces at work in the economy today are reshaping our manpower requirements. Automation, space exploration, new advances in science and technology, require that the Nation's work force be better educated and more highly skilled than ever before in its history. It is necessary to create an educational climate in which there is a reconciliation of the needs of jobs and the potential of people to fill these jobs.

It is the central tradition of Western civilization to be concerned with man as an individual, and to recognize science and technology only as instruments of human advancement. S. 580 properly reflects our demand for teachers, counselors, social scientists of all kinds, health workers, librarians, social and welfare workers, clergymen, and a great variety of other occupations, as well as our great need for scientists, engineers, and technicians.

The ultimate goal of education must be to enable and motivate every individual to realize his maximum potential in knowledge and skills, and thus to benefit himself, his country, and the world.

The growth in our educational system has gone hand in hand with the expansion of the Nation's economy. Neither would have been possible without the other.

The highest education this country can give its people will be all too little to prepare them for citizenship in today's world. An intelligent citizenry is the basis of a free democratic society.

THE AMERICAN LUMBER INDUSTRY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, since early last year there has been considerable concern expressed by spokesmen for the American lumber industry over the rise in imports from Canada. It has been their position that if we were to restrict imports from Canada, all would be well with our domestic lumber industry. There is mounting evidence, however, which has lead me to believe that the solution is not arrived at so easily. The problems which face our domestic lumber industry are large and they may grow. There is now evidence which suggests that instead of constantly flailing away at the Canadian lumber industry, the domestic industry of the United States should join hands with its Canadian counterpart to determine a course of action which will protect and develop markets for lumber.

Within the last few months two large lumber companies in Oregon have allegedly reduced their operations. One of these, the Guistina Brothers Lumber Co., closed its sawmill in Eugene, but they are continuing—and I make particular note of this—their plywood and stud mill. The Georgia Pacific Co. has cut back its lumber operations but it too is continuing to produce plywood and other forest products. Both cases involve firms which, in my judgment, have moved their capital to a part of the industry which is more profitable.

Today there came across my desk an excellent letter from a Mr. Corydon Wagner. I ask unanimous consent that his letter and enclosure be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter and enclosure were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TACOMA, WASH.,
May 7, 1963.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have not had the pleasure of meeting you. By way of introduction, I am Tacoma-born and have been in the lumber business since 1919, and now have interests in both Washington State and British Columbia. A statement of mine against tariff restrictions on Canadian lumber imports received some publicity a year ago, which statement I will attach as I consider it expresses my views quite adequately. Last October I attended the Tariff Commission hearing in Washington, D.C., and presented testimony.

I am prompted to write you since a Portland friend of mine recently sent me excerpts from the Congressional Record of April 22 wherein is reported your comments on the Yakima Conference April 7–8 of the Pacific Northwest Trade Association. You drew attention to constructive suggestions on improving relations between Western Canada and the United States, with particular reference to imports of softwood lumber, which had been made by two principal spokesmen at the Conference. The speeches of Mr. Robert B. Pamplin, president of the Georgia-Pacific Corp., and Gen. B. M. Hoffmeister, president of the Council of the Forest Industries of British Columbia, were given in full.

I attended the conference and share your views on the valuable contribution made by these two gentlemen toward a sensible solution of the problem. The conference heartily endorsed these statements as well, as evidenced by the following resolution which was adopted at its conclusion:

"Whereas it has been the consistent view of various authoritative Canadian and American speakers, and of the delegates assembled at the 49th General Conference of Pacific Northwest Trade Association that a relaxation of trade barriers between United States and Canada would promote optimum development of the internal economies of the two countries and strengthen them in the competition for trade with the rest of the world;

"Therefore be it recommended to the Governments of Canada and the United States, in order to expedite the process and minimize the short-term readjustments which will nevertheless result therefrom, that an appropriate international commission be charged with responsibility for investigation of and reporting on the means for the accomplishment of these ends."

I was particularly interested in Mr. Pamplin's statement, since previously his company had been reported as being a member of the Lumbermen's Economic Survival Committee, which is the organization that sought the hearing before the U.S. Tariff Commission.

A few days later, I believe about April 19, the Georgia-Pacific Corp., in a lumber association release, was stated to have found it necessary to shut down permanently their sawmill at Springfield, Oreg. which, as the former Booth Kelly mill, was known to be one of the oldest and stablest of west coast sawmills. The reason for this shutdown was directly attributed, according to the lumber association report, "to depressed market conditions brought about by excessive imports of Canadian softwood lumber." Under the circumstances, I felt constrained to ask for verification from Mr. Pamplin.

Up until its purchase by the Georgia-Pacific Corp. I had been, for 10 years, familiar with the Booth Kelly Lumber Co. as a member of its board of directors. I knew, of course, that following acquisition Georgia-Pacific had divested itself of a great deal of the timber acquired—by resale to others. I am told Georgia-Pacific has continued to sell quantities of logs to other neighboring firms, and further, has recently opened a new and second plywood operation adjoining, which about doubles the capacity of Georgia-Pacific's plywood manufacturing activities in the Springfield area. Since it probably took 2 years to complete this new plant, it would seem obvious that the decision to shut down the ex-Booth Kelly sawmill on May 1, 1963, was in actuality a decision made some years ago and must have been based on Georgia-Pacific's judgment at that time as to the best use of timber and logs retained by them.

I made inquiry of Mr. Pamplin and he wrote me as follows:

"We shut down our Booth Kelly mill because we could take our timber and put it in the plywood mill and make a lot more money. After building a new plywood mill at Springfield, we started utilizing more and more of the fir logs in plywood. The logs that were left were not of a type suitable for manufacturing in the sawmill; the mill was built to take pretty much a woods-run log. That is, we would have to put in the upper grades along with the lower grades in order to run the mill profitably. We are not in position to do this, and, in view of the very low price level of lumber today, we simply had no other alternative but to shut down the mill.

"After closing the mill, we will still have as many employees at Springfield as we had at the time of taking over the Booth Kelly Lumber Co. However, practically all of them will be working in plywood. We will be maintaining a small sawmill to cut the very small logs. This is a new mill that was built approximately 6 months ago."

With your interest in seeking a fair and statesmanlike solution for a complicated international economic problem, I thought these observations might be of value to you.

Unless judgments in this matter are based on facts and an eventual wise decision as to where the ultimate best interest lies, there can be no solution worthy of the name.

Yours truly,

CORYDON WAGNER.

URGES COOPERATION WITH BRITISH COLUMBIA MILLS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Mr. Wagner for 40 years has been identified with the U.S. lumber industry, both as an operating executive and officer in regional and national lumber associations.)

To the POST INTELLIGENCER:

The daily press has had many reports and statements on the unhappy plight of one of the Pacific Northwest's basic industries—lumber. The problem is a complicated one, combining loss of markets through drastic changes in construction practices and lumber uses and higher costs forced by competition within the industry itself in many cases, but aided and abetted by the philosophy and policies of our Government with respect to labor and timber sales.

That the British Columbia Government may be more sympathetic or more aware of the needs of its lumber industry in respect to these same matters is generally believed. However, frustration and envy hardly seem valid reasons to clamor now for a higher duty, or an embargo, or any other campaign against the importation of Canadian lumber.

Such agitation is a distraction from the main difficulty, and merely provides a convenient hobgoblin to chastise. Even if British Columbia shipments were completely eliminated from the U.S. market, it would still be doubtful whether the U.S. mills of the Pacific Northwest would find consequential improvement. Lumber must continue to be offered at relatively low prices or the aggressive competition of alternate materials will be further stimulated.

Lumber production in British Columbia has increased, certainly, but so has the production from virtually all of the Western States outside of Washington and Oregon. The mills of the latter two States are the ones most seriously disturbed in this period of extreme competition for a reduced overall volume of business.

They suffer from relatively high costs of both labor and stumpage, costs which did not seem excessive in the boom period between 1946 and 1956. These mills no longer have the trade which formerly brought premium prices for quality stock particularly suited to their equipment and timber supply. The greatest inroads on lumber markets have probably been made by plywood from this very same timber supply. And by the various new products of paper, paperboard, and synthetic boards, also from the same supply. Today's volume markets pay no premiums, and are open to most species and producing areas with little regard for special values once held in high esteem.

The need, surely, is for more efficient mills, designed for present day trade and more sales. It seems faulty psychology to accept present shrunken markets as fixed. Rather than pursuing the defensive moves that have been discussed, wouldn't it be better to first explore the possibilities of getting cooperation of the Canadian mills in an expanded joint promotional program to increase markets in all of the potential trading areas worldwide?

The establishing of such contact would serve to explore and eventually resolve the petty annoyances of manipulated exchange and differing customs duties and railroad traffic rules.

CORYDON WAGNER.

TACOMA.

Mr. MORSE. We are not acquainted but it is my recollection that he was president of the National Lumber Manufacturers Association a few years ago.

His letter points out that the Pacific Northwest Trade Association resolved that there should be created an International Commission to work out trade matters between the United States and Canada.

I think this is an excellent idea and it is my hope that the President and Prime Minister Pearson will explore this possibility when they meet at Hyannisport.

I take particular note of the fact that Mr. Wagner explodes the myth some have been attempting to create that the recent Georgia Pacific closing of the Booth Kelly sawmill at Springfield, Oreg., was due either directly or indirectly to Canadian lumber imports. Georgia Pacific's president, Mr. Pamplin says, "it was done because plywood is more profitable than lumber."

We can make much greater progress if a course of action is selected based upon facts and a reasonable accommodation of divergent views as Mr. Wagner so well suggests.

Today I shall discuss some of the facts which have come to my attention.

Within the last few days evidence has appeared that the lumber market is not, just now, falling to pieces. Lumber prices are up $4 according to the Wall Street Journal of April 30. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIR LUMBER PRICES IN WEST RISE ABOUT $4 A THOUSAND BOARD FEET

PORTLAND, OREG.—Green fir lumber prices have risen about $4 a thousand board feet in the past 2 weeks.

Key grade 2 by 4's, used in home building, now sell for about $67 a thousand board feet, up from $63 in mid-April and $64 a year ago. Prices are f.o.b. Northwest mills for rail shipment East.

Improved weather for homebuilding in the East has caused a pickup in demand, while wet spring weather in producing areas has slowed production. The annual spring thaw also has bogged down production in Canada. This is a reversal of the situation a month ago, when mills lost most of an earlier $3 price rise. "Now demand is good and production is off," commented one lumberman.

Douglas-fir lumber orders are the highest since early March, while production is the lowest since the first of the year, according to West Coast Lumbermen's Association figures for 141 mills representing 59 percent of the fir lumber production of western Oregon and Washington. Orders are above production, by 3.8 percent, for the first time since early March.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, what is happening to our domestic lumber industry is that those firms which produce plywood are able to convert a log into a more valuable product.

But "one swallow does not make a summer" and there is a new development to which I wish to call particular attention. The Washington Post for April 27 describes a new home which was built by the National Association of Home Builders Research Institute in cooperation with the United States Steel. The home has a foundation system which can be constructed by a four-man crew in one-half day. Steel will replace the joists, the stringers, and the sills normally used in home construction. Steel may replace the 2 by 6, 2 by 8 and 2 by 10 pieces of lumber which form the backbone of the western lumber industry both in the United States and in Canada. In addition, the house has plywood laminated floors and the exterior walls and roof are made of plywood.

I ask unanimous consent that the article in the Washington Post and the United States Steel's quarterly report for 1963, describing this house, be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article and report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRIAL HOME HAS LATEST INNOVATIONS

Over at 2987 West Ritchie Parkway, Rockville, is a house the Joneses would have trouble keeping up with.

At first glance it is probably the least imposing house in W. Evans Buchanan's Colony North subdivision. But it is the most impressive inside—and on close inspection outside, above, and underneath.

For Buchanan, who is president of the National Association of Home Builders (NAHB), was selected to build the latest of the NAHB Research Institute's experimental houses.

Inside, the house contains the latest innovations in factory-finished building materials—from acoustical luminous bathroom ceilings to the lowly baseboard, which in this house is made of plastic, snaps on and off and incorporates the electrical outlet system.

FILM ON PLYWOOD

The outside of the gray and green house, though it appears to the casual observer to offer nothing unusual, proves to be far from ordinary. The walls and roof are of exterior plywood, prefinished with film—not paint—that has been laminated to the wood panels.

The ground the basementless house sits on was covered with polyethylene; next came styrofoam for insulation. The foundation was especially designed of steel, and the subfloor and finished hardwood floor are one laminated piece.

The house was officially opened last week by Robert C. Weaver, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. It is now open to the public and will remain so for 3 or 4 months, Buchanan says, before he sells it.

PLASTIC POWDER ROOM

The up-to-date builder and the curious homeowner each will find the house offers a number of innovations that stimulate his interest. If he finds the one-piece molded plastic powder room too far out for his use, he may get a few practical ideas from such developments as vinyl-covered wall panels or louvered doors that are used to provide undereave closet space.

STEEL FOUNDATION SYSTEM FOR HOUSING CONSTRUCTION MOCKS FREEZING WEATHER

In little over a half year's span of time, United States Steel developed a new all-weather steel foundation system designed to permit home builders to schedule year-round construction, even in regions where in winter the earth freezes.

The new system, the result of 7 months of research and development carried out in cooperation with the National Association of Home Builders, was introduced in mid-December at the NAHB exposition in Chicago. It will be tested by builders in various sections of the country prior to commercial introduction.

Described as deceptively simple, the all-steel foundation is essentially an adaptation of the post and beam concept. The only excavation required is the boring of holes 2 feet in diameter down through the frost line—a job easily accomplished even in frozen ground.

The entire foundation consists of four cold-formed C-shaped steel perimeter beams, supporting legs, four diagonal corner braces, and a dozen interior steel joists. Wood flooring is nailed directly to the steel joists. The system does the same work as highly complicated poured or built-up foundations that require extensive site preparation and time-consuming onsite work, and that are almost completely at the mercy of the weather.

The development work, which created assurance that the new system is cost-competitive with other kinds of foundations, began last May with a request from an NAHB member-builder for a foundation he could install in cold weather without worrying about frozen ground, freezing concrete, and idle, weather-bound crews. The foundation system was approved by the NAHB Research Institute and installed last November under its 1962 Research House, at Rockville, Md.

Along with the foundation system, United States Steel displayed numerous other steel building components at the home builders' exposition. One of these is a modular interior partition panel utilizing light steel vertical studs, which was developed in conjunction with the gypsum board industry.

Steel studs are bonded to the gypsum board faces by adhesives in a specially developed production process. Top and bottom members of the panel are wood, to facilitate nailing.

This product, developed for the homebuilding industry as a non-weight-bearing interior partition panel, is now being used in all homes produced by United States Steel Homes Division.

That division announced in December that franchised dealers in United States Steel homes are developing townhouse projects in Louisville, Pittsburgh, and Atlanta; Huron, S. Dak.; and Binghamton, N.Y. Similar projects are under consideration in Kansas City, Cleveland, Washington, Chicago, Dayton, St. Louis, and Minneapolis.

All townhouse units manufactured by the homes division utilize the steel structural system that is an exclusive feature of all the products it manufactures. This system in all interior and exterior walls makes available a strong, dimensionally stable building system, and uniform high quality that is inherent in steel. Precision engineering and quality control, made possible by in-plant manufacture of components of the system, is another attribute.

All of the units in the Louisville townhouse community, which was opened recently, embrace one and one-half baths, full basements, central air conditioning, built-in oven and range, outside storage area, and patio. Soundproof walls between units abutting upon one another assure complete privacy. In addition, the rear yard for each dwelling is completely fenced.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in my judgment, this development carries far greater impact on our domestic lumber industry than any lumber imports from Canada, and in addition, it can have a far greater impact on the Canadian lumber industry.

The December 1962 issue of Business Review contains an article by Prof. Wesley C. Ballaine, of the Bureau of Business Research at the University of Oregon, in Eugene; this is the 16th consecutive business outlook for Oregon and Professor Ballaine emphasizes the general problems facing the domestic lumber industry.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON

(By Wesley C. Ballaine)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Wesley C. Ballaine is professor and director, Bureau of Business Research, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oreg. This is Professor Ballaine's 16th consecutive business outlook article for Oregon.)

It appears that in 1963 the Oregon economy will continue to improve gradually, but at a rate less rapid than that for the country as a whole. Should there be a nationwide slackening of economic expansion in 1963, Oregon will be adversely affected. Without going into the reasons why a leveling off of our national economic improvement seems a reasonable expectation during the first half of 1963, the writer believes this will occur but that its reaction in Oregon will not be particularly severe.

CURRENT TRENDS

The year 1963 will be much like 1962; therefore, it is worthwhile reviewing 1962 briefly. During 1962, the level of Oregon business rose consistently, but the percentage of improvement was less than that experienced by the entire Nation. Characteristics of the year just closing are many, but one which is particularly eye catching is that although most indexes of Oregon economic activity went up considerably during the year, the State's economic expansion was insufficient to attract a net in-migration. The Oregon Census Board estimates that the population increase in 1962 was no more than the excess of births over deaths.

I. DETERMINANTS OF BUSINESS ACTIVITY IN OREGON

In order to forecast probable trends in the level of business activity in Oregon during 1963, it is necessary to describe briefly the structure of the Oregon economy. By knowing its nature and how its works, it will be easier to analyze the effect of the forces which will play upon it next year. The first step in this analysis is to simplify the task by eliminating from consideration all those activities which have little or nothing to do with determining the general level of business activity. This means that at the very start those activities which provide the bulk of employment in the State can be eliminated from consideration—retailing; finance, real estate, and insurance; services generally; residential and other construction in which both the decision of whether or not to build and the required funds are local to Oregon; most wholesaling; and much manufacturing other than lumber, plywood, pulp, and paper.

The determinants of a change in the level of business activity and its extent and direction are relatively few in number because of the specialized nature of the Oregon economy.

1. Foremost in the list of determinants is the processing of wood. The principal divisions of the industry, ranked by employment, are lumber, plywood, pulp, and paper. Hardboard and certain other products are too small to require separate analysis, although a few years from now their importance may have grown to the point where this will no longer be true.

2. Agricultural products, both raw and processed, are next in importance to products based on wood. Although many raw and processed agricultural products are consumed in the State, the great majority are sold outside. Agricultural products, processed foods, and lumber and wood products probably comprise by value more than one-half of the sales of Oregon products outside of the State.

3. A third determinant is out-of-State tourism.

4. Major construction activity such as highways, dams, and large factories where the funds come from out of State is another determinant.

5. Direct Federal Government investment is the final determinant which will be discussed.

II. HOW THESE DETERMINANTS WILL AFFECT 1963

Manufactures based on wood

The outlook for firms making products based on wood is of a mixed nature. The major segment of this group of firms is lumber manufacturers, whose future appears rather discouraging from both a short-run and a longrun point of view. The outlook for pulp and paper and plywood is much better, although 1963 will certainly not be a year of unusual prosperity for any of them.

Lumber manufacturing is suffering from inadequate profit margins for a large number of mills, and there appears to be little hope of a fundamental improvement until the production capacity of the industry is reduced considerably.

The only readily available indicator of the monthly activity of Oregon mills is employment. However, employment is unstable because of the seasonal and cyclical sensitivity of the industry and its increasing efficiency. The highest annual rate of employment since World War II was 86,400 in 1951; the figure in late 1962 was 72,000. The existence of the present difficulties facing the lumber industry is shown not in employment figures but in profit figures, which are not generally available. Neither of the two unions to which workers in the industry who are organized belong requested wage increases in 1962—an indication of the extent of the appreciation of the inadequacy of profits.

Although the lumber industry has been undergoing a period of rather noisy travail, there have been very few objective economic analyses of the troubles of the Douglas fir and western pine sections of the industry. In 1961, the managements blamed their troubles, on the purchase of logs (rather than lumber) by the Japanese; in 1962, they blamed Canadian producers, because they had increased their share of sales in the American market.

Industry leaders and trade associations have advocated their own therapy and have done little to evaluate the social and political implications of their proposals, which have consisted of requests for various sorts of rule changes by the Federal Government to improve the competitive situation of the industry in the American market. These proposals have included requests for modification of our navigation laws, tariffs, and quotas on imports of lumber and prohibition on export of logs from federally owned lands. A reaction to approaching a social problem by means of helping individual mills is given in the following excerpt from an Associated Press dispatch regarding the hearing before the U.S. Tariff Commission on the industry's appeal for a tariff or quota relief from Canadian imports of softwood: "Walter R. Schreiber, a member of the Commission, said he was surprised that during the entire hearing none of the parties had called in witnesses from universities and colleges in Washington, Oregon, and California which maintain forestry schools."[1]

Despite the lack of economic studies of the industry, a few comments on its situation can be made. On the demand side, home construction materials consist of progressively lower percentages of lumber. To the extent that this shift in construction materials affects areas in which Douglas fir and western pine are sold, the Oregon producers are experiencing a gradually contracting market. From a shorter run point of view, the probability is that residential construction in 1963 will be slightly below (say 5 percent below) the level of 1962, with no cessation in business expansion. Should there be a slackening of business activity, a still greater decrease might occur. Thus, the Oregon lumber producers are faced with both a long-term and a short-term declining domestic market plus growing competition from Canada.

A word about raw materials of the lumber industry will explain further difficulties faced by the industry. Since a large portion of the timber used by manufacturers is bid at auction from the Federal Government, it would seem that at present the mills would not bid the price of timber as high as if the demand situation were better. However, this has not been the case to the extent that one would think. One of the reasons is that other users of timber—especially plywood producers—can operate successfully on higher stumpage costs and therefore bid up the price in order to get the timber. A shift in the end-use of timber from lumber to plywood is taking place; a shift in end-use of raw materials in a free enterprise economy is normally effected through the price system by the raw material becoming too expensive for the declining use because it is bid up by demand for the expanding use. All such shifts are painful.

The growth of plywood production in Oregon has been truly phenomenal. In 1947, 4,700 workers were employed, in 1960 the figure was 21,900, and it is nearly 24,500 now. Continued expansion has taken place the last few years in the face of much lower prices than those which prevailed only a few years ago. In view of the fact that plywood plants involve relatively large expenditures of capital, it appears that plywood production is still profitable because new plants are constantly being constructed. It seems reasonable to assume that plywood production will continue to increase slightly during 1963 unless the country experiences a much more severe downturn than now seems probable.

The 1963 outlook for pulp and paper production in Oregon is for another year much like 1962. The chances are that employment and output in 1963 will be relatively high but that profit levels will be only moderate. This group of manufacturers employs approximately 7,200 workers and there is little expectation of much increase in 1963. A new $35 million International Paper Co. plant at Gardiner will begin production early in 1964, but it will not add to the number of workers in 1963. Basically, pulp and paper production facilities in the United States have been so great in recent years that the industry has been plagued with oversupply, so that the expansion of plants for this purpose will be retarded as long as this situation continues. The longer run outlook is for considerable expansion; this is another illustration of the changing end-use of timber.

Construction

The type of construction that will actively determine the level of business activity in 1963 will remain high, but probably will not rise above the 1962 level. Many large construction projects are underway, the largest of which is the John Day Dam, but there are few new ones in a backlog to take the place of those completed or to add to the ones now in process. Highway work will continue to be significant and so will new commercial building, but there is a national trend to reduce the number of starts of new large apartment houses and office buildings.

The rate of construction of new residences in Oregon will remain high, as will most kinds of small engineering work.

Tourism

A commonly made statement is that the expenditures made by out-of-State tourists constitutes Oregon's third largest industry. There is little solid information about the cash value of out-of-State tourists, except for an unscientific sample of motorists' expenditures, obtained by the highway department. Tourists passing through Oregon by car spend their money at service stations (much of this goes directly out of State to the oil company whose products are purchased), motels, and restaurants. It is impossible to tell from census data the contribution that out-of-State motorists make to the receipts of these business firms. Careful investigation in other States indicates that tourism produces much less income than is popularly supposed. Another factor about income from tourists is that since Oregonians spend considerable sums touring in other States, the increase in these expenditures must be subtracted from increases in the expenditures of out-of-State tourists in order to obtain the net increase in Oregon income. A minor problem in dealing with tourist expenditures is the great difficulty in defining a "tourist."

Tourism will not bring as much into the State in 1963 as in 1962 because the Seattle World's Fair was an attraction to the Pacific Northwest in 1962. However, the long-term income from tourism will continue to rise, with 1963 being a better year than 1961, although not as good as the unusual year of 1962.

Closely allied to tourism is what is coming to be called the "convention industry." Facilities for handling conventions have greatly expanded in Portland, Eugene, and Salem, and they will continue to expand. The amount of income brought into Oregon by conventions will be greater in 1963 than in 1962. However, conventions are one of the minor determinants of business activity.

Agriculture and food processing

The forecast that 1963 should be a comparatively good year for agriculture is based on the assumption that the increase in agricultural marketing receipts which has been characteristic of 1962 will continue through 1963. The improvement in 1962 agricultural marketing receipts as compared to those of 1961 has been accounted for principally by crops, rather than by livestock. The outlook for crop income appears good, and livestock adjustments should enable that branch of agricultural activity to improve somewhat its contribution to agricultural marketing receipts in 1963.

Processing of food products is the second most important source of manufacturing employment in the State, employing an average of 21,000 persons annually. Its longrun growth trend is both toward a gradual total increase and toward operating for more months a year. It seems that food processing will have at least as good a year in 1963 as in 1962, and perhaps somewhat better.

Direct Government investment

Government investment is made for many purposes. At the present time, Government investment is most commonly thought of in relation to defense installations or factories built to handle prime Government contracts. New direct investments of these kinds in Oregon were rare indeed during 1962, and it is doubtful that they will be any greater during 1963. Total defense plant investment in Oregon is very low compared to that in either Washington or California. A potentially important exception is the Boardman project, which is to be used for missile testing and other defense-related industry. This is expected to create a considerable number of jobs when it is completed, but the project has not yet progressed beyond the stage of appraising private properties which must be acquired. It is most unlikely that any substantial increase in employment will result from the Boardman project in 1963.

Oregon firms hold very few prime defense contracts, so they have made little plant investment to undertake the specified work. However, many Oregon firms hold secondary defense contracts; in most cases the prime contractor is the Boeing Co. of Seattle. The exact number and value of these secondary contracts is unknown, but they have led to the construction of specialized facilities to house the necessary equipment. Because of the new trend of placing Government defense contracts in the Southwest, prime contracts will probably not increase in Washington in 1963. This means secondary contracts in Oregon are unlikely to increase in 1963.

Government investment in nondefense facilities is heavy in Oregon and may well increase somewhat next year. Bonneville Power Administration, forest lands, and rivers and harbors are the principal areas in which this investment may be made.

III. INTERACTION

The interaction of all these determinants of business activity will result in Oregon's business activity being high, by historical standards, but it will not be as ebullient as that of many other States. In 1963, Oregon may well attract a small net balance of migration of people from other States, which will be more than was done in 1962. On the other hand, the possibility of a severe downturn in Oregon business is extremely unlikely.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, he points out that Oregon lumber producers are faced with both a long-term and a short-term declining domestic market plus growing competition from Canada. His view is that the raw material problems faced by this industry are severe because of the pressure being placed on the supply by wood producers who can operate successfully on higher stumpage cost and therefore bid up the price in order to get the timber. He points out that a shift in the use of timber from lumber to plywood is taking place and that such shifts are usually marked by the raw material—in this case lumber—becoming too expensive for the declining use because it is bid up by demand for the expanding use, such as plywood.

Professor Ballaine also points out that Oregon's present outlook for expansion of the pulp and paper industry is limited because the entire industry has been plagued by an oversupply for the last few years. However, the long run outlook he sees is for considerable expansion in pulp and this is another illustration of the changing use of timber.

---

[1] Eugene Register-Guard, Oct. 14, 1962, p. 16B.

I also ask unanimous consent that there be placed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks lumber data prepared for me by the Bureau of the Census in the Department of Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the data were ordered to be printed in the Record.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. This shows that for Oregon there has been a continual contraction in the number of sawmills in the State since 1947. In that year there were 1,466 sawmills in Oregon which produced 7.1 billion board feet of lumber. By 1954, the number had dropped to 1,201 sawmills and the production had risen to 8.8 billion board feet of lumber. Four years later the number of sawmills had declined by more than 50 percent to 645 and production was down slightly to 7.5 billion board feet of lumber. It is interesting to note in the figures, however, that the number of very large and medium mills had risen and the big decline was in the number of small mills.

The April 14 Oregonian contains a story quoting Prof. Walter J. Mead on the lumber situation which I ask to be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Professor Opposes Hike of Tariffs on Lumber

Increase of tariffs is not the solution to problems of the lumber industry, Dr. Walter J. Mead, professor of economics at the University of California, told members of the American Institute of Industrial Engineers Friday.

At the sixth annual conference of the Oregon chapter, held at the Sheraton Hotel, Dr. Mead said.

"In fact, one of the important solutions would be to eliminate all import restrictions. Tariffs don't act as restraints on import trade anyway. They are only a nuisance."

Dr. Mead explained that average tariffs here are about 1 percent of dollar volume. This contrasts to 12 percent in England and about 7.5 percent in Common Market countries.

ACT'S REPEAL URGED

"Actually, if we cut our tariffs to zero, on a reciprocal basis we would have much more to gain," Dr. Mead said. He added that if the Common Market was expanded, then President Kennedy's tariff cutting powers would become important to the Nation's economy. Few products produced in the Northwest would be affected, he said.

Farm products, lumber, pulp and paper, have the highest tariffs in other countries but are among the lowest on imports to the United States.

"An increase in tariffs only brings retaliation," he said, "while a reciprocal reduction, especially to zero, would open up foreign markets so American industry could compete more equitably."

Dr. Mead said another important solution to the lumber industry's problems would be the outright repeal of the Jones Act. This would only aid in stimulating coastal trade but would help, he said.

SOLUTION OFFERED

However, he said the most important solution would be for the Government to change its method of selling timber. At present, a patch of timber sold to the highest bidder, includes large and small trees and many species.

The solution proposed by Dr. Mead would be for the Government to operate a wholesale log market where each sawmill could purchase the timber best suited to the individual mill's operation. The timber would be debarked at the log market thereby saving each mill the purchase price of a $250,000 barking machine. All timber would be sorted into grades, sizes and species.

Dr. Mead said this form of selling timber would enable each sawmill to operate much more efficiently and thereby reduce costs and increase profits.

According to Dr. Mead, who has made a special study of the Northwest lumber industry, the problems facing lumbermen are the direct result of a completely free enterprise system, at work, with the exception of the restrictions imposed by the Government.

He said there are 450 small and medium sawmills still operating in the Douglas fir area; which includes the western third of Oregon and Washington. Since 1948, according to Dr. Mead's figures, about 1,000 mills have gone out of business. But this is almost exactly the number of mills which went into operation in the preceding 20 years.

"This is a direct result of the operation of the free enterprise system," he said. "In 1925, there were 631 mills in the Douglas fir area and in 1960, 614, almost the same number."

FIGURE SAID FALSE

Dr. Mead said the usual quotation that more than 200 mills have gone under in the past 2 years is "quite an exaggeration."

He said the reason so many mills came into being before 1948 is that the profit margin was high and reached a peak in 1951 when the basic price was $75 per thousand board feet. "Although the price has remained fairly high, above $55, the profit margin has shrunk."

The reason for this, Dr. Mead maintained is that the buying market has become almost monopolistic but the selling market is highly competitive.

Mr. MORSE. Professor Mead points out that in 1925 there were 631 mills in the Douglas-fir region compared to 614 in 1960.

The changing complexion of our domestic lumber industry certainly indicates that it may be desirable to provide some measure of relief through modest import arrangements with Canada. Such efforts, however, would be meaningless unless the industry itself were to first chart a course which would alleviate many of the problems that confront it.

I am concerned that while United States Steel, which too has felt the sting of steel imports from abroad, is launching an aggressive campaign striking at the very foundation of the western lumber industry its dimensions and standard market, the American lumber industry, in turn, has been channeling most of its visible efforts into devising means for restricting trade with Canada. The lumber industry faces a very, very serious problem. In a large part, this is due to its own unwillingness to recognize the trend in events.

Unless the domestic lumber industry can do a better job of merchandising its product in competition with such new products as steel, the market for construction types of lumber will disappear in the same way that the market for boards has declined. No amount of restriction on Canadian imports of lumber would change the picture. The lumber industries of our two nations cannot continue to quarrel, to knock each others products and expect lumber to gain ground. It does lumber no good for some in our industry to knock Canadian lumber as inferior in quality or manufacture. It does no good for the dry and green producers to row about which product is superior.

I think it is time for the leaders in our industry to sit down and chart a course for themselves. I think then they should sit down with their Canadian counterparts to chart a course which will operate within the framework of the free enterprise system while strengthening the use of lumber.

I ask unanimous consent that my letters dated April 29 to Secretary Hodges and May 2 to Mr. M. B. Doyle, of the National Lumber Manufacturers Association, be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

April 29, 1963.

Hon. Luther Hodges,
Secretary of Commerce,
Department of Commerce,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: A great deal of concern has been expressed to me over proposals to change the standard dimensions for lumber through the American Lumber Standards Committee.

Some producers in my State are urging such action, others are urging further review and study. I have had extensive consultations with a number of people who are well informed and I am of the opinion that this entire matter is one in need of further review.

The subject breaks down into three parts: First is the question of the consumer requirements for which lumber is manufactured; second is the question of policy as it relates to the operation of the American Lumber Standards Committee; and third is the question of procedure under which lumber standards should be formulated.

I do not propose in this letter to discuss the merits of the case, but rather to deal with what I believe are the basic policy issues which deserve most serious consideration by both your Department and the Department of Justice. As you know, the concept of voluntary standards for commodities has a long history. It was in the early 1920's, when Herbert Hoover was Secretary of Commerce, that these standards were developed. The one significant difference between the American Lumber Standards Committee and other industry standard committees is the relation to an antitrust consent decree brought by the United States against the National Lumber Manufacturers Association (Civil No. 11262, D. Dist. Columbia, May 6, 1941, and Dec. 22, 1953).

It is my understanding as a result of that decree and subsequent modifications approved by the court, the present committee structure was established with all members appointed for an indeterminate tenure by the Secretary of Commerce.

I believe there should be a careful review made to determine whether this committee, as presently constituted, meets the criteria set forth by the President in his conflict of interest instructions on the composition, procedure and tenure for members of advisory committees. Also for consideration is the question whether, as presently composed, this committee is fully representative both of the lumber industry and the lumber consuming segment of our Nation.

A lumber standard, while voluntary in theory, carries with it a great deal of Government support. The standard is published by the Government. In the words of your own department, it is included in the Federal catalog system and is utilized widely in any situation where a Government purchase or contract is involved.

Therefore, I believe that a broad responsibility reposes in you to make certain that this committee is so composed and operated that the industry and public interest are harmoniously recognized. It would seem to me to be most important that arrangements be made to have representative groups such as homebuilders on this committee. I believe it would be consistent with the President's general directive that there be a review of the present procedure which gives indeterminate tenure to those now serving on the committee.

I am further advised that a meeting scheduled by this committee in San Francisco for May 2–3 will not be open to the public, although the matter before this group has broad public interest aspects and involves nothing which would call for secrecy.

The basic issue now before this group is the proposal to standardize the dimensions of nominal 2-inch lumber to a thickness of 1½ inches compared to the present 1⅝-inch used for both green and dry lumber. I need not describe in detail to you the difficulties that have been faced by the American lumber industry and the deep concern that exists over this proposal which would have far-reaching economic effects within the industry.

There have been charges made over the alleged use of political influence on the question before you. No matter what executive agency is involved, it has always been my view that I, as a Member of the Senate, have a political responsibility. In this case I feel compelled to call upon you to take the following steps: (1) review the composition and tenure of the American Lumber Standards Committee to determine whether it meets broad public interest requirement; (2) ascertain whether the procedures being used to arrive at lumber standards are based on sound technical views fully supported by sufficient research conducted under standards approved and prescribed by the National Bureau of Standards, and (3) determine whether the standards being promulgated will be of material assistance in enlarging and improving the market for lumber.

With appreciation and best regards.

Sincerely,

WAYNE MORSE.

MAY 2, 1963.

Mr. MORTIMER B. DOYLE,
National Lumber Manufacturers Association, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DOYLE: Thank you very much for your good letter of April 1. I did not reply immediately because I wanted to give most serious consideration to the important points you raised.

There is no doubt in my mind that our domestic lumber industry continues to face real problems, the solutions to which are not easy.

In addition to the seven items you list on the legislative front, there are other bills, some directed toward the specific problem of lumber imports, such as Mrs. NEUBERGER's bill on the Jones Act, and some which would have a more indirect effect on the industry generally, such as the land conservation fund and the wilderness bill.

No doubt you have seen the printed hearings on H.R. 2513. The executive agencies unanimously expressed opposition to S. 957, the amendment proposed thereto on marking imported lumber. You are also aware, I am sure, that the homebuilders, representatives of lumber dealers and those generally interested in trade expressed strong opposition. In addition, the Canadian Government's aid memoire was presented through our Department of State.

In fairness to you I should point out that the bills numbered 1, 3, 4, and 5 mentioned in your letter, would appear to have very little chance of obtaining congressional approval.

Senator MAGNUSON is scheduling additional lumber hearings in the South. Whether these will bring to light new facts remains to be seen.

Enclosed is a tearsheet from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in which I inserted three speeches, two by Americans and one by a Canadian. What is said in these speeches leads me to believe that it should be possible for the lumber industries in our two countries to work toward a solution which would produce mutual benefits.

The increase in Canadian imports of lumber certainly presents difficult problems to segments of our lumber industry, but I believe that a very significant problem is the relation of the use of wood in the form of lumber to wood in other forms such as plywood, as well as to substitutes for wood.

On the subject of the American Lumber Standards Committee, I would like to see the Secretary of Commerce reconstitute the committee by broadening its representation. In this connection, it might be useful to provide for some type of Canadian participation. I think it would be useful, using the vehicle of this committee, to explore ways to increase lumber use. I believe that instead of the pending revision in construction of lumber thickness, there should be a full review designed to demonstrate whether and how wood can be used in increased quantities and that a strenuous effort should be made, using Government assistance if necessary, to better orient lumber production to consumer requirements.

The elections in Canada will, no doubt, result in the formation of a Government which we all hope will effectively meet Canada's needs and thereby enable her to enjoy a period of stability and progress. There is reason to believe that the Canadians will be desirous of restoring the value of their currency. Even if this should be done, Canada's balance of trade would require her to continue her efforts to export. There is every reason to believe that the restoration of Canadian currency values would not appreciably diminish her ability to ship substantial quantities of lumber into the United States.

This Congress has approximately 18 months more to run. I would like to see substantial efforts made by Canadian and American lumber groups, and those interested in lumber, to achieve agreement on constructive steps and to work actively and cooperatively to achieve these goals within the private sector of our respective economies. If this can be done by mid-winter, I would be most willing to join in a suggestion to the chairman of the Finance Committee that consideration be given to an early hearing in 1964 on legislation along the lines of Senate Joint Resolution 50 to determine whether legislation of the type contemplated by that resolution is still needed. Therefore, this subject, too, should be included in industrial discussions with the understanding that the proposal might be reintroduced in a modified form prior to the holding of hearings.

On a personal note, I wish to express the view that we in the free world must draw more closely together to fashion a social, economical and political phalanx which exposes communism's flaws by demonstrating freedom's strengths. This will require, for example, that we and Canada work closely together on mutual interests matters such as defense as well as on trade matters such as lumber. We need a strong and expanding lumber industry and I believe we can meet our obligations here while at the same time aiding Canada in her legitimate economic interests. Canada too, must recognize our needs and I am optimistic that her new Government will move to strengthen the historic bonds which have been so beneficial to both the Canadian and American people.

Your letter to me was marked personal and confidential and I have so treated it. However, you need not treat my reply as confidential and you are at liberty to make it available to your associates, to your counterparts in the Canadian lumber industry, and to other groups, such as the lumber dealers and homebuilders, who are substantial users of lumber.

With kindest regards.

Sincerely,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. MORSE. On the lumber import question, I add this observation: People who have been in Canada recently tell me that they have seen ships from Europe being loaded with lumber made in Canada, destined for the United States, stamped with the trademark of at least one of the major lumber producing firms in the United States. I shall ask the Secretary of Commerce to advise me as to what the facts may be, but I think that this is an interesting facet of the situation—particularly in view of the fact that this company is a major participant in the National Lumber Manufacturers Association which so strongly urged import controls.

At my request, the Department of Commerce has supplied certain data on log and lumber exports to Japan from Oregon and Washington as well as from Canada. The Department has promised to furnish other information dealing with this subject when compiled. At this time, however, I wish to make this information available for study by those who are concerned about this question. I ask unanimous consent that the memorandum entitled, "Quantities of Log and Lumber Exports to Japan From Oregon, Washington, and Canada, 1962 and First Quarter 1963," be inserted at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Quantities of log and lumber exports to Japan from Oregon-Washington and Canada, 1962 and 1st quarter 1963

[Thousand board feet]

	1962	1st quarter 1963
OREGON-WASHINGTON		
Softwood logs exports to Japan (except Port Orford cedar)	251, 197	[1] 78, 871
Proportion of 1961 log production in western Oregon and Washington (9,587,904—latest data available) (percent)	2. 62	[1] . 92
Softwood lumber exports to Japan from Oregon-Washington	37, 975	[1] 10, 964
Proportion of total softwood production in WCLA region (7,865,000,000 in 1962; 1,940,000,000 in 1963, 1st quarter) (percent)	. 48	. 57
CANADA (MOSTLY FROM WESTERN BRITISH COLUMBIA)		
Softwood log exports to Japan	31, 910	[1] 11, 660
Proportion of 1961 log production in Western British Columbia (3,952,275,000 board feet—latest data available) (percent)	. 81	[1] . 29
Softwood lumber exports to Japan	116, 499	[1] 35, 223
Proportion of 1962 lumber production in western British Columbia (3,061,314,000 board feet—latest data available) (percent)	3. 81	[1] 1. 15

[1] Should be multiplied by 6 to get annual rate.

EXHIBIT 1

TABLE 1.—*Selected statistics for industry 2411, logging camps and logging contractors; industry 2421, sawmills and planing mills; and industry 2432, veneer and plywood plants, classified by employment size, for selected States, 1958 and 1954*

Industrial code	State, industry, and item	All establishments, total		Establishments with an average of— 1 to 49 employees		50 to 99 employees		100 to 249 employees		250 to 499 employees		500 to 999 employees		1,000 to 2,499 employees		2,500 employees and over	
		1958	1954	1958	1954	1958	1954	1958	1954	1958	1954	1958	1954	1958	1954	1958	1954
	MONTANA																
2411	Logging camps and logging contractors:																
	Number of establishments	153	139	153	136	------	3	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
	All employees:																
	Number [1]	1,000	1,085	1,000	923	------	162	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
	Payroll [2] (thousand dollars)	4,354	3,754	4,354	3,151	------	603	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
2421	Sawmills and planing mills:																
	Number of establishments	208	230	188	215	12	6	5	7	1	------	2	2	------	------	------	------
	All employees:																
	Number [1]	(D)	(D)	1,495	1,792	867	355	810	901	(D)	------	(D)	(D)	------	------	------	------
	Payroll [2] (thousand dollars)	(D)	(D)	5,493	5,955	3,781	1,588	3,878	3,729	(D)	------	(D)	(D)	------	------	------	------
2432	Veneer and plywood plants: [3]																
	Number of establishments	2	------	1	------	1	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
	All employees:																
	Number [1]	(D)	------	(D)	------	(D)	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
	Payroll [2] (thousand dollars)	(D)	------	(D)	------	(D)	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
	IDAHO																
2411	Logging camps and logging contractors:																
	Number of establishments	239	234	231	226	4	3	3	3	1	2	------	------	------	------	------	------
	All employees:																
	Number [1]	2,424	(D)	1,339	1,303	275	197	*810*	356	(D)	(D)	------	------	------	------	------	------
	Payroll [2] (thousand dollars)	12,418	(D)	6,295	4,207	1,773	1,053	*4,350*	1,821	(D)	(D)	------	------	------	------	------	------
2421	Sawmills and planing mills:																
	Number of establishments	201	224	172	189	12	16	11	11	4	7	1	------	1	1	------	------
	All employees:																
	Number [1]	7,537	8,616	1,877	1,868	798	1,109	1,680	1,689	*3,182*	*3,950*	(D)	------	(D)	(D)	------	------
	Payroll [2] (thousand dollars)	33,654	34,657	7,186	6,337	3,425	4,623	7,826	7,097	*15,217*	*16,600*	(D)	------	(D)	(D)	------	------
2432	Veneer and plywood plants: [3]																
	Number of establishments	1	1	------	1	1	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
	All employees:																
	Number [1]	(D)	(D)	------	(D)	(D)	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
	Payroll [2] (thousand dollars)	(D)	(D)	------	(D)	(D)	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
	WASHINGTON																
2411	Logging camps and logging contractors:																
	Number of establishments	1,026	1,119	1,005	1,097	12	12	4	6	3	3	2	1	------	------	------	------
	All employees:																
	Number [1]	7,867	9,116	3,898	5,402	862	829	652	994	*2,455*	*1,891*	(D)	(D)	------	------	------	------
	Payroll [2] (thousand dollars)	36,454	35,308	16,650	19,418	4,571	3,717	2,961	3,759	*12,272*	*8,414*	(D)	(D)	------	------	------	------
2421	Sawmills and planing mills:																
	Number of establishments	488	607	411	520	40	45	23	26	9	9	3	4	1	2	1	1
	All employees:																
	Number [1]	18,318	21,875	3,411	4,545	2,712	3,264	3,529	3,903	3,242	3,061	*5,424*	2,376	(D)	*4,726*	(D)	(D)
	Payroll [2] (thousand dollars)	82,672	86,736	13,458	15,593	11,920	13,960	16,653	15,885	14,834	13,012	*25,807*	10,269	(D)	*18,017*	(D)	(D)
2432	Veneer and plywood plants: [3]																
	Number of establishments	46	49	14	16	7	5	9	12	15	12	1	4	------	------	------	------
	All employees:																
	Number [1]	8,759	(D)	(D)	(D)	551	411	1,739	2,112	5,536	4,051	(D)	2,290	------	------	------	------
	Payroll [2] (thousand dollars)	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	2,729	2,376	8,329	10,309	26,894	19,691	(D)	8,716	------	------	------	------
	OREGON																
2411	Logging camps and logging contractors:																
	Number of establishments	1,652	2,225	1,619	2,183	22	30	10	11	------	1	1	------	------	------	------	------
	All employees:																
	Number [1]	11,278	14,021	7,820	9,824	1,442	2,026	*2,016*	*2,171*	------	(D)	(D)	------	------	------	------	------
	Payroll [2] (thousand dollars)	55,494	56,261	36,254	36,623	8,060	9,859	*11,180*	*9,779*	------	(D)	(D)	------	------	------	------	------
2421	Sawmills and planing mills:																
	Number of establishments	721	1,326	568	1,116	85	111	44	69	18	20	5	9	1	1	------	------
	All employees:																
	Number [1]	31,727	44,296	6,822	11,894	6,179	7,397	6,693	11,033	6,525	6,503	*5,508*	*7,469*	(D)	(D)	------	------
	Payroll [2] (thousand dollars)	153,063	187,771	28,262	43,118	29,344	33,169	43,432	49,145	32,948	28,799	*28,077*	*33,540*	(D)	(D)	------	------
2432	Veneer and plywood plants: [3]																
	Number of establishments	108	66	31	17	16	7	36	27	17	12	8	3	------	------	------	------
	All employees:																
	Number [1]	18,910	11,735	699	518	1,103	507	6,466	4,607	5,480	4,067	5,162	2,036	------	------	------	------
	Payroll [2] (thousand dollars)	94,073	55,253	2,855	2,294	5,204	2,494	33,187	22,121	27,398	19,164	25,429	9,180	------	------	------	------
	CALIFORNIA																
2411	Logging camps and logging contractors:																
	Number of establishments	773	702	759	686	11	13	2	2	1	1	------	------	------	------	------	------
	All employees:																
	Number [1]	5,500	5,912	4,162	4,476	654	846	*684*	*590*	(D)	(D)	------	------	------	------	------	------
	Payroll (thousand dollars) [2]	28,311	24,721	19,576	17,535	3,984	4,222	*4,751*	*2964*	(D)	(D)	------	------	------	------	------	------
2421	Sawmills and planing mills:																
	Number of establishments	613	776	485	628	62	82	51	43	10	18	4	5	1	------	------	------
	All employees:																
	Number [1]	26,079	30,806	6,524	8,385	4,137	5,704	8,104	6,692	3,348	6,087	*3,966*	3,938	(D)	------	------	------
	Payroll (thousand dollars) [2]	123,424	138,208	28,469	33,814	20,138	26,920	29,139	30,365	17,136	28,910	*18,542*	18,199	(D)	------	------	------
2432	Veneer and plywood plants: [3]																
	Number of establishments	49	36	22	18	11	7	12	6	3	4	1	1	------	------	------	------
	All employees:																
	Number [1]	4,457	4,000	(D)	410	806	521	1,845	959	902	*2,110*	(D)	(D)	------	------	------	------
	Payroll (thousand dollars) [2]	(D)	19,803	(D)	1,701	4,060	2,458	9,477	4,721	5,031	*10,923*	(D)	(D)	------	------	------	------

---

[1] Based upon an annual average of the number of production workers composed of an average of production-worker midmonth employment in March, May, August, and November, and a March figure for all other employees.

[2] Includes the gross earnings paid in the calendar years 1958 and 1954 to all employees on the payroll of operating establishments classified in the specified industry.

[3] In 1954 data for industry 2422, veneer mills, and industry 2432, plywood plants, were reported separately. The 1957 standard industrial classification system combined these industries to form the new industry 2432, veneer and plywood plants, as shown in the 1958 Census of Manufactures. The 1954 data shown here include a combination of the 2 separately classified industries.

NOTE.—A (D) appears in the column where the figure has been omitted to avoid disclosing figures for individual companies. In most cases where the figure has been omitted the combined figure is italicized and shown in the size class to the left.

TABLE 2.—*Lumber: Production and number of establishments, by production size class, for selected States, 1958, 1954, and 1947*

Production size class (thousand board feet) and year	Montana		Idaho		Washington		Oregon		California [2]	
	Establishments (number) [1]	Total production (thousand board feet)	Establishments (number) [1]	Total production (thousand board feet)	Establishments (number) [1]	Total production (thousand board feet)	Establishments (number) [1]	Total production (thousand board feet)	Establishments (number) [1]	Total production (thousand board feet)
Total:										
1958	195	924, 014	184	1, 437, 000	469	3, 454, 668	645	7, 544, 530	501	5, 320, 774
1954	214	738, 000	206	1, 399, 000	552	3, 028, 000	1, 201	8, 851, 000	604	5, 113, 000
1947	407	499, 959	388	950, 791	808	3, 705, 401	1, 466	7, 102, 410	884	3, 408, 522
0 to 999:										
1958	118	41, 170	68	26, 426	233	81, 408	193	72, 501	138	51, 594
1954	136	72, 000	95	58, 000	282	146, 000	526	319, 000	187	181, 000
1947	326	70, 943	288	66, 400	485	183, 537	750	295, 729	521	157, 566
1,000 to 2,999:										
1958	31	54, 224	39	68, 819	77	133, 865	108	185, 458	103	169, 937
1954	30	58, 000	44	70, 000	101	155, 000	198	341, 000	103	201, 000
1947	48	85, 453	44	80, 545	147	274, 297	289	532, 323	145	266, 958
3,000 to 4,999:										
1958	4	15, 362	14	53, 642	35	135, 357	46	179, 720	39	150, 585
1954	16	58, 000	11	44, 000	44	155, 000	100	388, 000	64	251, 000
1947	18	67, 845	17	61, 840	54	211, 344	125	481, 506	61	227, 016
5,000 to 9,999:										
1958	16	123, 128	28	204, 770	50	326, 634	82	591, 075	49	349, 084
1954	16	114, 000	21	149, 000	48	313, 000	124	895, 000	90	658, 000
1947	11	73, 655	22	148, 498	51	357, 882	131	907, 297	73	499, 261
10,000 to 14,999:										
1958	7	78, 781	12	145, 950	22	263, 805	67	828, 704	48	600, 688
1954	6	74, 000	12	144, 000	25	285, 000	76	927, 000	57	689, 000
1947	1	202, 063	3	199, 275	12	139, 040	55	649, 866	31	385, 308
15,000 to 24,999:										
1958	12	230, 200	11	196, 696	20	393, 568	53	1, 016, 637	60	1, 167, 229
1954	6	105, 000	8	145, 000	22	386, 000	87	1, 686, 000	57	1, 082, 000
1947	------	------	8	(D)	21	394, 742	48	896, 213	21	414, 083
25,000 to 49,999:										
1958	4	133, 266	7	231, 216	17	638, 161	73	2, 534, 327	49	1, 708, 324
1954	2	(D)	9	272, 000	17	513, 000	66	2, 259, 000	34	1, 142, 000
1947	1	(D)	3	*394, 238*	26	921, 720	51	1, 788, 769	25	889, 777
50,000 and over:										
1958	3	247, 883	5	509, 481	15	1, 481, 870	23	2, 136, 108	15	1, 123, 333
1954	2	(D)	6	517, 000	13	1, 075, 000	24	2, 036, 000	12	909, 000
1947	2	(D)	3	(D)	12	1, 222, 839	17	1, 550, 707	7	568, 553

---

[1] Number of mills will be slightly higher due to establishments reporting multiple mills.

[2] In 1947 figures for California were combined with those for Nevada to avoid disclosing figures for individual companies.

NOTE.—Data which cannot be shown without disclosing information for individual companies have been combined with figures for other size classes. A (D) appears in the column where the figure has been omitted and the combined figure is italicized and shown in the size class above.

Source: Census of Manufactures, 1958 and 1947; "Facts for Industry Series M13G-04 (Revised)," Lumber Production, 1954.

TABLE 3.—*Selected statistics for pulp, paper, and board mills, classified by employment size, for selected States, 1958 and 1954*

Industrial code	State, industry, and item	All establishments, total		Establishments with an average of—													
				1 to 49 employees		50 to 99 employees		100 to 249 employees		250 to 499 employees		500 to 999 employees		1,000 to 2,499 employees		2,500 employees and over	
		1958	1954	1958	1954	1958	1954	1958	1954	1958	1954	1958	1954	1958	1954	1958	1954
	WASHINGTON																
2611	Pulp mills: [1]																
	Number of establishments	11	23	------	2	1	4	3	5	7	6	------	6	------	------	------	------
	All employees: [2]																
	Number	3, 348	7, 090	------	*342*	*3, 349*	(D)	(D)	945	(D)	2, 181	------	3, 622	------	------	------	------
	Payroll (thousand dollars)	18, 412	34, 408	------	*1, 491*	*18, 412*	(D)	(D)	3, 449	(D)	11, 773	------	17, 695	------	------	------	------
2621 2631	Paper and board mills: [3] Number of establishments	18	17	1	2	2	1	4	7	6	5	4	1	1	1	------	------
2661	Building paper and board mills:																
	Number of establishments	4	3	3	2	------	------	------	1	1	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
	All employees: [2]																
	Number	(D)	222	(D)	*222*	------	------	------	(D)	(D)	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
	Payroll (thousand dollars)	(D)	783	(D)	*783*	------	------	------	(D)	(D)	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
	OREGON																
2611	Pulpmills: [1]																
	Number of establishments	2	11	------	1	------	4	2	5	------	1	------	------	------	------	------	------
	All employees: [2]																
	Number	(D)	1, 625	------	*263*	------	(D)	(D)	*1, 362*	------	(D)	------	------	------	------	------	------
	Payroll (thousand dollars)	(D)	7, 840	------	*1, 136*	------	(D)	(D)	*6, 704*	------	(D)	------	------	------	------	------	------
2621 2631	Paper and board mills:																
	Number of establishments	8	6	------	1	------	------	3	2	1	3	3	------	1	------	------	------
	All employees: [2]																
	Number	3, 785	1, 465	------	*1, 465*	------	------	*3, 785*	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	------	(D)	------	------	------
	Payroll (thousand dollars)	21, 997	6, 816	------	*6, 816*	------	------	*21, 997*	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	------	(D)	------	------	------
2661	Building paper and board mills:																
	Number of establishments	11	6	4	3	3	1	3	1	1	1	------	------	------	------	------	------
	All employees: [2]																
	Number	1, 027	590	118	111	197	*479*	*712*	(D)	(D)	(D)	------	------	------	------	------	------
	Payroll (thousand dollars)	5, 346	2, 440	588	528	1, 030	*1, 912*	*3, 728*	(D)	(D)	(D)	------	------	------	------	------	------

See footnotes at end of table.

Table 3.—*Selected statistics for pulp, paper, and board mills, classified by employment size, for selected States, 1958 and 1954*—Con.

Industrial code	State, industry, and item	All establishments, total		Establishments with an average of—													
				1 to 49 employees		50 to 99 employees		100 to 249 employees		250 to 499 employees		500 to 999 employees		1,000 to 2,499 employees		2,500 employees and over	
		1958	1954	1958	1954	1958	1954	1958	1954	1958	1954	1958	1954	1958	1954	1958	1954
	CALIFORNIA																
2621 2631	Paper and board mills:																
	Number of establishments	23	13	7	4	4	3	8	3	4	3	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
	All employees:[2]																
	Number	3,097	1,871	*391*	64	(D)	266	1,386	*1,541*	1,320	(D)	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
	Payroll (thousand dollars)	17,853	8,881	*2,427*	364	(D)	1,178	8,086	*7,339*	7,340	(D)	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
2661	Building paper and board mills:																
	Number of establishments	16	8	12	3	3	3	-------	1	-------	1	1	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
	All employees:[2]																
	Number	946	817	182	*817*	*764*	(D)	-------	(D)	-------	(D)	(D)	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
	Payroll (thousand dollars)	5,243	3,900	879	*3,900*	*4,364*	(D)	-------	(D)	-------	(D)	(D)	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
	IDAHO AND MONTANA[4]																

Note.—A (D) appears in the column where the figure has been omitted, and the combined figure is italicized and shown in the size-class to the left.

[1] In 1958 companies operating pulpmills at the same physical location as primary paper and board mills were permitted to submit a single report for the Census of Manufactures combining the activities of such integrated operations. Such companies were, however, requested to report in a special inquiry the number of production workers and the amount of their wages engaged in the pulpmill department at such integrated operations. This departmental information is shown below.

	Total	1 to 49 employees	50 to 99 employees	100 to 249 employees	250 to 499 employees	500 to 999 employees
WASHINGTON						
Number of pulpmill departments	17	4	5	3	4	1
Number of production workers	2,925	126	*860*	(D)	*1,939*	(D)
Wages paid (thousand dollars)	15,277	666	*4,129*	(D)	*10,482*	(D)
OREGON						
Number of pulpmill departments	8	2	1	3	1	1
Number of production workers	1,421	*1,421*	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Wages paid (thousand dollars)	7,988	*7,988*	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)

[2] All employees represent the average of the number of production workers for the payroll period ended nearest the 15th of March, May, August, and November, plus all other employees for the payroll period ended nearest the 15th of March.

[3] In the case of Washington, the exact figures from the 1958 Census of Manufactures are withheld to avoid disclosing individual company information. In 1958, there were 18 paper and paperboard mills (industries 2621 and 2631) in Washington, with a combined employment amounting to between 7,500 and 10,000 employees, and a total payroll exceeding $40,000,000.

[4] The exact figures for operations in Idaho and Montana are withheld to avoid disclosing individual company information. In 1958, Idaho had 1 separately reported pulpmill (industry 2611) with total employment in the 250-to-499 employee size range; also a paperboard mill (industry 2631) in the 500-to-999 employment size range. At the latter operation the pulpmill department reported production workers in the 250-to-499 employment size class. In Montana a separately reported pulpmill (industry 2611) was included in the 1958 Census of Manufactures with total employment in the 50-to-99 employment size class; also a building board mill in the 1-to-49 employment size class.

"NATIONAL FOREST ACCESS"

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, several days ago I received a very interesting letter from Mr. Spencer M. Smith, Jr., secretary of the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Smith's excellent letter of May 2 be printed at this point in my remarks, and that the list of members of the executive committee and board of directors of this organization be included on Mr. Smith's letter as it is printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter and list were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Citizens Committee on
Natural Resources,
Washington, D.C., May 2, 1963.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I have delayed this letter to you partly because of a very heated reaction I had to the lumber companies presentation of their case on April 23 against the Forest Service regulations which seek to implement the Attorney General's decision of February 1962. As you are aware, the hearing on April 23 was before Assistant Secretary John Baker.

I tried to convey to the Assistant Secretary in my oral presentation, that we thought the procedures followed in obtaining reactions to the regulations prior to their promulgation was abundantly fair and offered the opportunity at several stages for discussions and analysis. The first draft was submitted to us with an ample opportunity for comment. This courtesy was extended to everyone interested in national forest policy. The Service received the criticisms and issued another draft on which the hearing of April 23 was based. Upon the conclusion of these hearings, we understand Assistant Secretary Baker, as the presiding officer at the hearings, will present the matter to the Secretary of Agriculture with recommendations.

Again, the conduct of the hearings were completely fair to all concerned. The timber industry required 3½ hours to present their case, in a hearing that began at 10 o'clock in the morning, recessed about 1 hour for lunch, and concluded shortly after 5 o'clock. At no time did the presiding officer or any members representing the Department and the Forest Service make any rebuttal, but instead allowed the industry complete freedom in presenting their case.

The case of the industry was so intemperate with attacks made on the Attorney General's decision, the administration by the Forest Service, and the proposed regulations that serious questions were raised in many minds as to the ultimate objectives of this group of timber operators.

Senator, more than any one else you have labored for over a decade for access roads in national forest areas. By and large, conservation groups have supported this effort, even though we are fully aware that occasionally the building of such roads will be in conflict with some of the objectives we hope to accomplish in the national forests. Basically, however, the need for access roads clearly benefits the interest of the public, to which we feel a strong responsibility. We recognize that only full utilization of that part of the national forest being managed, under multiple use provided for by a statute of Congress, can best be achieved if the necessary access roads are constructed.

There is an additional problem that we hope we were farseeing enough to realize. A comparable case was that of Hells Canyon. We felt we were acting responsibly when we urged a full utilization be made of the resources at Hells Canyon, for in so doing many of the values with which which we were concerned were in no jeopardy as a result of this full development. Contrarywise, we determined that if these resources at Hells Canyon were not fully utilized the burden of meeting the deficits of such underdevelopment would place many of the scenic and wildlife values in jeopardy at other sites. We feel the record vindicated our judgment—unfortunately—in failing to use full utilization of Hells Canyon, the dam at Bruces Eddy became necessary. As a consequence this dam will destroy many of the scenic and fish and wildlife values. Proper planning could have prevented this situation.

We feel the access road problem is most comparable to the case we cited above. If adequate multiple-use access roads cannot be constructed to allow proper recreation and proper timber management in areas of the national forests so designed for this activity, then the pressures will be so great as to place the wilderness areas in constant jeopardy. Indeed, with the growing population and its attendant problems should provide a mandate for careful planning and full utilization. If timber companies preach the need for access roads but concomitantly do everything in their power to prevent access roads, their policy is inimical to the public interest and is basically inimical to the overall commercial timber users. If the timber companies, who are of significant size, are able, when their land completely surrounds an area of national forest land, to prevent multiple-purpose access roads to this national forest land all interests suffer save the particular monopolistic firms. Recreational uses are foreclosed, competitive bidding, as well as a source of supply of timber open to all companies is not possible. The only benefactor is the timber company withholding access.

The burden of the testimony of the timber companies therefore shocked me, as well as many of my conservation colleagues. We simply were not prepared for the expressions of what we had thought to be a responsible industry. There have been times in the past where we have been genuinely concerned about the difficulty that all of the timber industry was having due to the importation of Canadian timber, the problem of utilization up to allowable cut and a number of related problems. I say to you, Senator, quite consideredly, that whatever good will and sympathy these firms were beneficiaries of was dissipated to a great extent as a consequence of their expressed attitudes at the hearings.

Our reason for writing you this letter is not just to explain our frustrations, but to inform you of the attitude of the timber industry as represented at the hearing and our reactions to it. We feel you are entitled to know this information. We know of the many and concerted efforts that you have made, not only for the recreational users of the national forests but in behalf of the timber industry in general. We are also aware that you may well feel as deeply disappointed as do we.

Cordially,

SPENCER M. SMITH, Jr.

Mr. MORSE. It is not my intention to discuss the subject of Mr. Smith's letter in detail. However, I have sought to help the lumber industry on the many problems that confront it in its relations with the Federal Government, and I intend to continue to help it in the future on the many problems, including those relating to lumber imports and taxation.

I would be remiss in my duty to the lumber industry if I were not to advise the industry that it is running the danger of dissipating the good will and sympathy of leading conservationists if it continues to proceed as it has been proceeding on the subject of access to our national forests.

I have looked into the industry contentions and find that industry spokesmen made remarks such as these about the proposed forest access regulations now before the Secretary of Agriculture:

First. Private timber firms will be "one by one forced to capitulate to the Forest Service on terms that are harmful to both the public interest and the interest of the forest industry."

Second. "It was a sad day for land owners in the national forests when the Attorney General's opinion on the law of 1897 was issued."

Third. The Forest Service "has no mills dependent upon its timber supply."

Fourth. "I stress that my client firmly believes that the theorem of the greatest good for the greatest number is an evil facing the United States today, and if left unchanged, to our way of thinking the individual could be stripped of his rights."

Fifth. The regulations "implicitly authorize Forest Service Administrators to wield to the fullest the very substantial economic power which resides in the Forest Service, and they deny reciprocity to the private landowner."

Sixth. "The Federal Government has the freedom in that it has no plant to supply, no orders to fill, no payrolls to meet, and no employees to retain that are dependent upon harvesting or any particular tract of timber."

In addition, I ask unanimous consent that two of the National Lumber Manufacturers Association press releases, and a Western Pine Association newsletter be printed at this point.

There being no objection, the releases and newsletter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

J.F.K.'s 50-Mile Hike Plan May Be Hobbled by New Federal Rules

The former head of the President's Council on Youth Fitness said today that one of the administration's own agencies has thrown "a partial roadblock" into President Kennedy's suggestion that America hike itself into physical fitness.

Shane MacCarthy, Youth Fitness Director under President Eisenhower and now an official of the National Lumber Manufacturers Association, said this is one effect of proposed new Forest Service regulations governing rights-of-way across Government and private timberlands.

"Because of the one-sidedness of the proposed new rules," MacCarthy commented, "it will be impossible for the Government and private industry to enter into the kind of rights-of-way exchange agreements that both parties have been accustomed to for more than 60 years. The new regulations make unreasonable demands on private timber growers, virtually eliminating their rights to control traffic over their own roads on their own lands.

"As a result, it appears likely that access will be blocked, or at least delayed, to some 40 million acres of Government and private timberland suitable for such outdoor recreational activities as hunting, fishing, and hiking. It is unfortunate that one effect of the new rules will be to throw a partial roadblock into President Kennedy's suggestion that Americans hike themselves into physical fitness."

Forest Service Regulations May Block Access to 40 Million Acres of Potential Recreation Land

Outdoor recreationists, as a result of new regulations proposed by the Forest Service, may be denied access to at least 40 million acres of Government and private forest land suitable for a variety of fresh-air sports, according to the National Lumber Manufacturers Association.

The regulations, which have attracted little attention to date outside of the timber industry and recreation circles, would change the rules under which private timber growers and the Forest Service have swapped rights-of-way across each other's lands for the past 65 years.

At a recent hearing in Washington, D.C., industry representatives objected to the regulations on the grounds they are discriminatory and unfair. Basically, their complaint was that the rules would make unreasonable demands on private timber growers, virtually eliminating their rights to control traffic over their own roads on their own lands and providing no assurance that private owners would be fairly compensated for the loss of these rights and related investments.

Following are specific examples of how the proposed new regulations would provide—in the words of industry spokesmen—"one-way reciprocity" in connection with the exchange of road rights:

1. The Forest Service could prohibit a private owner from crossing public lands to his own timber unless he surrenders rights, title, and interest in his own roads.
2. The Forest Service would be the sole judge of the value of rights taken.
3. The Forest Service would require permanent road rights across private land in exchange for temporary, revocable permits across national forest lands.
4. Even where the Forest Service paid for only a partial interest in a private road, it would demand full control over use of the road.
5. The Forest Service can gain immediate access by condemnation but could delay access to the timber grower indefinitely unless he agreed to sacrifice his road investments.
6. Private timber growers would be charged with paying the road costs of multiple use on national forest lands.
7. The Forest Service insists on free use of timber growers' roads crossing national forest land but refuses free use by the timber grower of Forest Service roads on private lands.
8. The Forest Service could take over hundreds of miles of costly roads built by a private timber grower and give nothing in return but the right to cross less than a mile of inexpensive bare land.

Under the proposed new rules, timber spokesmen point out, a company would be powerless to close its roads to public traffic when the hazard of fire was especially great, as following a prolonged dry spell, or when heavy logging traffic made public travel on roads particularly dangerous.

Such prospective difficulties could cause private timber growers to balk at entering into road-exchange agreements with the Forest Service, say industry officials. This would be in marked contrast to the close cooperation and easily negotiated exchanges of the past.

The result then might be a stalemate in Government-industry negotiations—an impasse that could block or delay access by recreation users to millions of acres of Government and private forest land.

Exchange of rights-of-way is essential to the orderly development of both Government and private timberlands because these lands are intermingled in a crisscross, checkerboard pattern that dates back to the days Congress made vast land grants to the railroads, homesteaders, and others to encourage settlement and development of the West.

The timber industry has made great expanses of its forests available to recreationists. Latest figures indicate that some 61 million acres of private timber-growing land are open to recreation users at one time or another during the year.

However, industry spokesmen emphasize, the Forest Service proposals cloud the prospect of new forest areas being opened up to recreation users—because of what the industry describes as the "one-sidedness" of the new regulations.

Hunting and fishing are the principal outdoor recreation uses of private commercial forest land. Well over 90 percent of the lands available to recreationists by private industry are used for one or both of these purposes.

Other popular outdoor recreational activities include picnicking, hiking, camping, berry picking, bird watching, horseback riding, and (in northern climes) skiing.

WESTERN PINE ASSOCIATION,
Portland, Oreg., April 24, 1963.

To: Members.

Subject: Proposed Forest Service road regulations damaging to private property.

GENTLEMEN: Report from National Lumber Manufacturers Association on Washington, D.C., hearing held April 23, indicates the importance that at the Portland hearing next Monday, April 29, industry people make it clear the following could happen if the regulations as now written are adopted:

1. The Forest Service could take over a timber grower's costly road system in exchange for the right to cross inexpensive bare land with no assurance that the timber grower will ultimately receive fair value.

2. The Forest Service requires permanent road rights in exchange for temporary, revocable permits.

3. The Forest Service takes over all control of roads while paying a fractional share of costs (rather than sharing control proportionately or on a mutual basis).

4. The Forest Service can get immediate access by condemnation, but can delay access to the timber grower indefinitely unless he agrees to sacrifice his investment.

5. The Forest Service insists on free use of private roads on national forest lands but refuses free use of national forest roads on private lands.

6. Multiple-use traffic rides without an assigned cost-share, while timber growers must pay.

Hugh Lamoreaux, chairman of the Oregon Forest Practice Committee and member of our truck transportation committee will present a statement for the association. All member-companies having roads will want to appear or send statements to protect their interests.

Sincerely,

E. L. KOLBE.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I add two other remarks from this record—a statement by C. R. Gutermuth of the Wildlife Management Institute:

> I do not think that the reputation of the Forest Service warrants this kind of continued attack by those members of industry.

Then there is a statement by Joe Penfold speaking for the Izaak Walton League:

> If there are modifications in these proposed regulations that should be made in the interest of fairness to the owners, the public, we have full confidence in you, Mr. Secretary (John Baker) and Secretary Freeman, that such modifications will be made.

Mr. President, over the last several years I have battled with Secretaries of Agriculture and Chiefs of the Forest Service over conservation policy. Often I have been joined by my colleagues from the Pacific Northwest in efforts to raise the allowable cuts, improve the sale of timber, add road funds and improve access, and establish a high mountain policy.

In every instance I have tried to find the course that serves the public interest. At times in the past conservation spokesmen have been critical of my efforts to see more forest roads built, more timber placed on the market, and allowable cuts raised. To their credit they have come to me later and said they recognize the course I have urged was the proper course.

Conservationists supported the effort by Senator JACKSON and myself to have the Secretary set forth a high mountain policy and they have backed up my effort to preserve the great scenic resource of Waldo Lake.

I ask unanimous consent that two statements from the 1962 report of the regional forester of the Pacific Northwest region of the Forest Service be printed at this point.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Although a soft lumber market prevailed in 1962, the region's timber harvest for the year reached the alltime high of 4.4 billion board feet. The previous high was 4.3 billion board feet in 1959. The 1962 harvest was valued at $80.5 million, compared to $85.9 million in 1959, and illustrates a downward trend in prices.

Timber sold during the same two periods reveals the same downward price trend. In 1962, 4.2 billion board feet sold for $69 million, while in 1959, 4 billion board feet was valued at $99 million. A record volume of 7.85 billion is now under contract of sale.

The region's annual allowable cut was increased in 1962 about 125 million board feet, bringing the total annual allowable cut to 4.266 billion board feet. Since 1950, the allowable cut has been increased 74 percent.

The catastrophic October 12 windstorm leveled an estimated 1.145 billion board feet of timber in the national forests of the region. Timber sale plans are giving priority to early salvage of the damaged timber. In the 2½ months following the storm, 175 million board feet of blowdown timber was sold in approximately 300 sales. An estimated 70 percent of the down timber is salvable.

HIGH MOUNTAIN AREAS

Management of all resources in the high mountain area will be planned to keep soil in place and to maintain or improve its productivity. Watershed values will be given primary consideration. The land will be managed to maintain or enhance opportunities for both conventional outdoor recreation and wilderness experience with minimum modification of the landscape. Fish and wildlife management will be emphasized because of its recreational importance.

Mr. MORSE. One shows how the results of the work I have done, along with other Members of Congress, to improve forest timber sales, allowable cuts, and roads. This effort has brought economic dividends to the Pacific Northwest.

Timber allowable cuts in the Northwest national forests are up 74 percent since 1950. Record volumes are being sold. In 1950 the Northwest national forests sold only 1.4 billion board feet. In 1962, 4.2 billion board feet were sold. This is a 300-percent increase in sales.

In two and a half months the Forest Service sold 175 million board feet of the timber blown down in the storm of last October 12.

Balancing this, the Forest Service has put into operation its high mountain policy directed toward protecting our precious heritage of natural resources.

In my judgment, those in the timber industry who are responsible people should weigh most carefully the efforts some are making to limit the application of the multiple-use concept to sound forest management.

THE SUCCESS OF THE FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this administration took office in the midst of an abundance and variety in agricultural production which the world had never previously seen. At the same time, thousands of American families were unable to fully participate in this abundance for lack of food purchasing power. An immediate attack was launched to meet this situation. President Kennedy ordered a major effort to make more effective use of commodities acquired under price support and surplus removal programs to more adequately meet the food requirements of needy families, schools, and welfare institutions. He also requested that a food stamp program be initiated on a pilot, or experimental, basis to test the impact and feasibility of this approach to improving the diets of low-income families.

It has been a great privilege to work for and support this type of food stamp program ever since I first came to the Senate. I well recall the many efforts that were made in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry during the decade of the 1950's to reestablish the food stamp program on a permanent basis. I recall the efforts made by the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and I also recall the efforts of my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY]. It was my privilege in 1958 to offer an amendment on the floor of the Senate to establish the food stamp program on a pilot project basis.

Fortunately, that amendment was sustained in conference and became a part of the law of the land. It authorized the President of the United States, through the Secretary of Agriculture, to establish a food stamp program on a pilot basis, so as to review the feasibility of such a program with a view to making it more permanent and widespread.

The Department of Agriculture, in its earlier experience with the food stamp plan of 1939-43 and in subsequent extensive surveys of food purchase and consumption patterns by family size and income, had learned that those in the lowest income groups readily stepped up their food purchases as their incomes increased. They bought not only more, but better food from a nutritional standpoint with particular emphasis on high-resource-using products such as meats, poultry, dairy products, and fruits and vegetables.

The first of the original eight pilot projects opened May 29, 1961, in McDowell County, W. Va. Included in the first group of pilot areas were parts of St. Louis and Itasca Counties, Minn.

With only a few months' experience, both Minnesota counties strongly urged extension of the food stamp program to all of St. Louis and Itasca Counties. Those two counties were the victims of severe unemployment due to a loss of jobs in the Minnesota iron mines and subsequently on the docks in the great port city of Duluth.

The recommendation of St. Louis and Itasca Counties was made in November 1962, and in March 1963, a third county, Carlton, was added to the list of Minnesota food stamp program areas.

In all three Minnesota counties through March 1963, a total of $3,073,443 in food coupons has been issued. Of these, over $2 million worth were purchased and almost $1 million were bonus coupons issued free of charge. This has meant almost $1 million in net additional food purchasing power for participating families in the three counties and a substantial boost to the local economy.

In March of this year, 14,625 people in the three counties participated in the program. This figure can be expected to increase since the program in Carlton County has just begun operating and it takes about 3 months or so for the program to become fully effective in new areas.

Accompanying the pilot programs was an intensive research effort to measure and survey every phase of the operation: the effect on food consumption patterns in a sample of matched households in the city of Detroit and in rural Fayette County, Pa.; the impact of the program on retail food store sales in all eight areas; the acceptability of the program to participating families, nonparticipating families, retailers, welfare officials, and the general public in the pilot areas.

It was found that families participating in the food stamp program made significant increases in their food purchases. Animal products—such as meat, poultry, fish, milk, and eggs—and fruits and vegetables, accounted for more than 80 percent of the gains in the value of food used.

Money value of meats, poultry, fish, milk, and eggs, as a group, increased 40 percent in Detroit and 9 percent in rural Fayette County after the program went into effect. In Detroit, red meats alone accounted for over one-third of the net increase in the dollar value of foods consumed by participating families. This increase resulted from a rise of about 1 pound per capita in weekly meat consumption rather than from a shift to higher value meats. Fresh vegetable consumption in Detroit rose 46 percent by value while the volume of fresh vegetables consumed by participating families increased by 124 percent. Thus Senators can see what an impact this program would have upon the agricultural economy and upon the producers of agricultural products.

Dollar sales of retail stores in the pilot food stamp program were up 8 percent, after adjustment for seasonal variation, from sales reported prior to the initiation of the program. The volume of food coupon redemptions reported by sample stores indicated that size of store was not a decisive factor in attracting food coupon business. Small stores reported an average gain of 7 percent compared to 8 percent for large stores after the introduction of food coupons. Medium and very small stores showed considerably larger percentage gains.

Nutritional evaluation of matched households in Detroit and rural Fayette County showed that over one-third to almost one-half of the participating families had good diets in September–October, 1961, as compared with slightly more than one-fourth of the low-income, nonparticipating families in those months. A "good diet" is defined as one which supplies the family with 100 percent or more of the allowances of the eight nutrients for which recommendations have been made by the National Research Council.

Over 90 percent of the participating families reported that they liked the food stamp program better than the direct donation of surplus foods—primarily because it offered a wider variety of food.

After a thorough evaluation of the pilot operation, the program was offered to additional areas throughout the country on a continuing experimental basis to test its feasibility under a still wider variety of geographic and economic conditions.

At the end of the first week in May, the program was operating in 35 counties and three major cities—St. Louis, Detroit, and Pittsburgh. Secretary Freeman has said:

> Acceptance of this program is universally good. Those buying stamps like it because they pay part of their own way, and can shop in stores rather than wait in food lines. Retailers like it because it increases their sales about 8 percent. We like it because it provides a much better diet and increases the use of food * * * and also means we can use an established, efficient distribution system rather than create a second parallel concessional system as has been done in the direct distribution program. The President has recommended to the Congress that the food stamp program be made permanent. Such legislation is now pending. I feel confident it will become law and represent a historical step forward in making better use of America's food abundance.

The essential features of the food stamp program are as follows:

The food stamp program operates through normal channels of trade.

Food coupons are issued to families determined by State public welfare agencies to be in economic need of food assistance. Families receiving some type of public or general assistance under a State's welfare program are considered to be in economic need. Other families may also receive food coupons provided their family income does not exceed certain stated amounts. The amount of income permitted to such families is worked out by the Department of Agriculture with the State and must bear a relationship to the standards used by the State to determine eligibility for its own welfare programs.

Participating families exchange the amount of money they could normally be expected to spend for food, based on family size and income, for coupons of a higher monetary value. The difference between what each family pays and the total value of its coupon allotment represents the Government's contribution to the program. For example, on the average, participating families are spending 63 cents for each dollar in coupons they receive. This purchase requirement is intended to assure that the bonus coupons represent net additional food purchasing power.

Families use the coupons to buy food in retail stores at prevailing prices. Retailers are authorized to accept coupons by the Department of Agriculture and they agree to abide by the rules of the program in accepting and redeeming coupons. They redeem the coupons through banks or through authorized food wholesalers. Banks, in turn, process the coupons through the Federal Reserve System.

Every effort has been made to keep the program simple, flexible, and adaptable to State and local welfare practices, and to the practices of the normal commercial marketing and banking systems.

Mr. President, on April 26, the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], by request, introduced S. 1387, which would implement President Kennedy's recommendations by putting the food stamp program on a permanent basis. I strongly support this legislation now, as I have in the past, and urge Senators to join with me in helping to bring about the passage of this important bill during this session of Congress. The food stamp program now is ready to move out of the pilot stage and from under the legislative authority on which the experimental phase was based. Only a gradual and orderly extension of program operations is contemplated since it requires virtually communitywide understanding and cooperation to be fully effective.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a status report on food coupon issuance in each of the pilot areas in operation through March of this year, and a list of food stamp program areas. It should be noted that the bonus coupons represent net additional food purchasing power to the economy of each area.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

Cumulative issuances to date by area

[Includes March 1963]

State and county or city	Number of months in operation	Bonus (Federal contribution)	Cash (recipient payment)	Total value of coupons issued
Alabama: Jefferson County	1	$59, 240	$36, 268	$95, 508
California: Humboldt County	1	4, 157	8, 710	12, 867
Illinois: Franklin County	21	680, 251	1, 286, 597	1, 966, 848
Kentucky:				
Floyd County	22	1, 583, 527	510, 929	2, 094, 456
Knott County	4	158, 624	71, 686	230, 310
Perry County	1	50, 620	19, 732	70, 352
Subtotal		1, 792, 771	602, 347	2, 395, 118
Louisiana:				
Avoyelles Parish	1	219, 948	150, 598	370, 546
Evangeline Parish	3	49, 805	28, 200	78, 005
Subtotal		269, 753	178, 798	448, 551
Michigan: Detroit	21	12, 690, 000	25, 012, 346	37, 702, 346
Minnesota:				
Carlton County	1	4, 610	11, 568	16, 178
Itasca County [1]	22	138, 647	246, 431	385, 078
St. Louis County [1]	22	845, 872	1, 826, 315	2, 672, 187
Subtotal		989, 129	2, 084, 314	3, 073, 443
Missouri: St. Louis	3	111, 485	152, 702	264, 187
Montana: Silver Bow County	22	246, 543	538, 378	784, 921
New Mexico: San Miguel County	22	658, 624	678, 722	1, 337, 346
North Carolina: Nash County	5	155, 258	146, 862	302, 120
Ohio: Lucas County	4	307, 674	639, 047	946, 721
Oregon: Multnomah County	4	162, 284	404, 138	566, 422
Pennsylvania:				
Cambria County	1	94, 046	178, 703	272, 749
Fayette County	22	3, 739, 891	6, 116, 365	9, 856, 256
Luzerne County	6	469, 657	918, 113	1, 387, 770
Pittsburgh	1	289, 602	563, 808	853, 410
Subtotal		4, 593, 196	7, 776, 989	12, 370, 185
Virginia:				
Dickenson County	1	16, 888	8, 886	25, 774
Lee County	1	13, 734	8, 974	22, 708
Wise County	2	59, 893	24, 308	84, 201
Subtotal		90, 515	42, 168	132, 683
West Virginia:				
Logan County	5	234, 073	333, 010	567, 083
McDowell County	22	2, 251, 477	2, 615, 199	4, 866, 676
Mingo County	5	211, 073	297, 245	508, 318
Wayne County	5	138, 511	197, 659	336, 170
Subtotal		2, 835, 134	3, 443, 113	6, 278, 247
Wisconsin:				
Douglas County	5	40, 193	95, 209	135, 402
Iron County	1	2, 532	5, 968	8, 500
Subtotal		42, 725	101, 177	143, 902
Grand total		25, 688, 739	43, 132, 676	68, 821, 415

---

[1] Initial project in operation since June 1961 included parts of these 2 counties; expanded to 2 separate countywide operations in November 1962.

DATE OF OPENING, FOOD STAMP PROGRAM AREAS

ORIGINAL PILOT AREAS

Franklin County, Ill., July 10, 1961.
Floyd County, Ky., June 1, 1961.
City of Detroit, Mich., July 5, 1961.
Parts of St. Louis and Itasca Counties, Minn., June 5, 1961, June 7, 1961.
Silver Bow County, Mont., June 1, 1961.
San Miguel County, N. Mex., June 5, 1961.
Fayette County, Pa., June 1, 1961.
McDowell County, W. Va., May 29, 1961.

ADDITIONAL AREAS DESIGNATED AND NOW OPERATING

Jefferson County, Ala., March 11, 1963.
Walker County, Ala., May 6, 1963.
Independence County, Ark., April 2, 1963.
Humboldt County, Calif., March 1, 1963.
Vanderburgh County, Ind., April 1, 1963.
Knott County, Ky., December 3, 1962.
Perry County, Ky., March 4, 1963.
Avoyelles Parish, La., March 1, 1963.
Evangeline Parish, La., January 7, 1963.
Carlton County, Minn., March 4, 1963.
Remainder of St. Louis and Itasca Counties, Minn., November 1962.
City of St. Louis, Mo., January 2, 1963.
Nash County, N.C., November 1962.
Cuyahoga County, Ohio, May 1, 1963.
Lucas County, Ohio, December 3, 1962.
Multnomah County, Oreg., December 3, 1962.
City of Pittsburgh, Pa., March 1, 1963.
Cambria County, Pa., March 1, 1963.
Luzerne County, Pa., October 1, 1962.
Dickenson County, Va., March 4, 1963.
Lee County, Va., March 5, 1963.
Wise County, Va., February 1, 1963.
Logan County, W. Va., November 1962.
Mingo County, W. Va., November 1962.
Wayne County, W. Va., November 1962.
Douglas County, Wis., November 1962.
Iron County, Wis., March 1, 1963.

ADDITIONAL AREAS DESIGNATED BUT NOT YET OPEN AND PROBABLE STARTING DATE

Rice County, Kans., June 2, 1963.
Mora County, N. Mex., June 2, 1963.
Santa Fe County, N. Mex., June 2, 1963.
Grundy County, Tenn., June 3, 1963.
Hamilton County, Tenn., June 3, 1963.
Marion County, Tenn., June 3, 1963.
Sequatchie County, Tenn., June 3, 1963.
Grays Harbor County, Wash., June 1 or later.
Pacific County, Wash., June 1 or later.
Yakima County, Wash., June 1 or later.

DUAL DISTRIBUTION, WIRE RODS, AND THE SQUEEZE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, on March 15, I introduced two bills for consideration by the Senate: S. 1107, a bill to amend the Clayton Act to prohibit vertically integrated companies from engaging in discriminatory practices against independent producers and distributors; and S. 1108, a bill to require certain companies engaged in dual distribution to disclose separate annual operating data on each of their establishments which compete with independent customers of such companies in the sale and industrial use of their products.

In proposing this legislation, I stated that I was more concerned with providing a focus for an enlarged and enlightened discussion of the general problem of dual distribution and vertical integration than with pressing for the enactment of these bills in their present form. At the same time, I challenged the small business supporters of this proposed legislation to produce evidence that the problem is, indeed, as severe as they aver, and that these bills will help solve it, not only in their own interest, but also in the national interest.

One day after the introduction of S. 1107 and S. 1108, on March 16, there appeared in the Washington Post an article entitled "Steel Firms Complaint Could Lead to New Probe of Pricing." Subsequently, on March 19, the Wall Street Journal printed an item entitled "Treasury Rules Belgium Dumped Wire Rods in United States; Users Fear a Tariff Rise Could Ruin Their Business," and the American Metal Market carried a story entitled "Wire Rod Dumping Charge Upheld." These articles dealt with the antidumping complaint recently filed by six major, integrated, American steel companies against the importation of wire rods from Belgium, Luxembourg, France, West Germany, and Japan.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these articles be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 16, 1963]

STEEL FIRMS COMPLAINT COULD LEAD TO NEW PROBE OF PRICING

(By Frank C. Porter)

A steel price dispute that could lead to open controversy between the United States and the European Common Market is expected to come before the Tariff Commission next week.

It is being watched closely on Capitol Hill, where the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, has long had steel pricing policies under surveillance.

At issue is an antidumping complaint filed by six major American steel firms last September. The complaint charges that five nations—West Germany, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, all in the Common Market, and Japan—have been selling wire rods in the United States at prices less than they sell for in oversea markets.

The complaint is bitterly opposed, not only by oversea producers, but by American importers and independent fabricators who depend on cheaper foreign wire rods. In substance, they charge that the domestic producers have suffered no injury because they can well afford to cut prices to the import level and still make a profit.

DISCUSSED IN EUROPE

If opponents can convince the Tariff Commission that production costs of American steel are competitive with those in Europe, it will be grist to the Kefauver mill. The Tennessee Senator last fall sought to prove just that, in his unsuccessful effort to pry cost data from four major steelmakers. KEFAUVER wanted the information to determine whether steel pricing policy required tougher antitrust laws.

Although the complaint has received little publicity on this side of the Atlantic, it has been widely discussed in the European press. If the dumping charges stick, the Common Market might be tempted to take retaliatory measures against American exports, as it did last year when the United States slapped added restrictions on carpets and glass. Furthermore, Uncle Sam's bargaining position would suffer at the very time he's seeking a reduction of EEC barriers under the Trade Expansion Act.

Antidumping procedure is split in two parts. First the Treasury Department must determine whether the foreign firms are indeed selling in the United States at less than fair value—that is, at less than the price at which they sell in oversea markets.

Then the Tariff Commission must decide whether the domestic industry has suffered injury. If it so decides, a special dumping duty equal to the difference between the price offered in the United States and that charged overseas is imposed.

In the present case, the Treasury last December found reason to suspect that foreign wire rods were being dumped here. Pending its final determination, it ordered appraisement withheld. This meant that imported wire rods were free to enter the country but would be subject to an antidumping duty, retroactive to December, if the Tariff Commission should subsequently rule in favor of the domestic firms.

BUSINESS INJURY CLAIMED

Importers and the domestic fabricators claim their business has been hurt badly by this tariff uncertainty. Some charge there have been unnecessary delays in the Treasury, which has had the complaint nearly 6 months, and that the domestic producers are in no hurry to have the issue settled since imports already have been hurt.

A Treasury spokesman said yesterday its decision should be forthcoming next week. The Tariff Commission must then decide the injury question within 3 months.

The Treasury is expected to rule that dumping exists. European firms concede they have sold wire rods here for less than on the Continent but only in order to meet competition from the Japanese, whose price in the United States is understood to be no less than their domestic price.

At the time of the complaint, the going price for imported wire rods was about $114 a ton against the fair value price of $122.50 which the domestic producers say prevailed in Europe. The Japanese reportedly charge $90 a ton in their home market.

But the price charged by American steel mills ranges between $140 and $150.

Kurt Orban, the largest American mill agent for imported rods, claims research has convinced him wire rods can be made for $82 a ton in this country. One southern fabricator says that he and several other consumers considered setting up their own rodmill in Texas to dodge the high domestic price. They figured they could turn out rods for $90 a ton the first year, $85 thereafter. (The plan was abandoned because of world overcapacity, the fabricator said.)

CAPTIVE MILLS

The 200 small independent fabricators, which draw wire from rods to make bagging ties, fencing, nails, paper clip and staple wire, building mesh and the like, compete with "captive" mills owned by the big primary steel producers.

The captive mills buy rods from the parent mills at $140–$150 a ton but are competitive with the independents on prices of finished products, say $158 a ton for building mesh. The independents claim the primary producers care little if their fabricating subsidiaries lose money since the profit margin is so high on the rods sold to them.

The independents, which purchase some rods from the domestic mills, claim they must buy some cheaper foreign steel to make any profit. The primary producers, they say, make more by selling at high prices than they would by dropping their prices to the import level and increasing their volume. Furthermore, the independents argue, any slash in domestic rod prices might weaken the price structure for other products as well as the producers' argument that they can't compete with foreign steel.

Most importers and small fabricators feel that the six steel firms—Armco, Bethlehem, Colorado Fuel & Iron, Detroit Steel, Jones & Laughlin, and Republic—brought the antidumping action for political reasons: to convince the administration that no concessions on steel should be given in forthcoming trade talks with the foreign market; to persuade unions to keep their demands low to protect their jobs against foreign competition.

[From American Metal Market, Mar. 19, 1963]

WIRE ROD DUMPING CHARGE UPHELD—CASE GOES TO TARIFF COMMISSION; IT MAY BE A PYRRHIC VICTORY FOR PRODUCERS

(By Ed Taishoff)

WASHINGTON.—The Customs Bureau ruled that Belgian steel producers are selling wire rod in this country at dumping prices.

The ruling has been passed on to the Tariff Commission—which now will conduct its own investigation to determine if these sales are injuring domestic producers.

Sales below fair value as well as injury must be proved, before the Tariff Commission will uphold a dumping charge.

The customs determination yesterday is the first major ruling in any of the approximately half dozen major steel dumping charges filed within the past few months.

Specifically, the Bureau determined that Belgian wire rod was being sold in the United States at less than fair value—a term which means that the basic American price for this commodity is less than its basic home price.

But the ruling applies only to Belgian rod. No less than fair value determination has yet been made on rod coming from the other countries accused of dumping this product. These countries are: Luxembourg, Germany, France, and Japan.

The wire rod complaint was made by a Washington law firm on behalf of five major steel producers.

In addition, customs is studying dumping charges against Luxembourg, Belgian, German, French, and Japanese steel pipe, Japanese plate, Belgian wire mesh, rebars from an as yet unnamed country.

This last charge apparently was not filed by a major steel producer. As a matter of policy, customs discreetly treats all information pertaining to dumping cases as confidential.

It will only confirm or deny information obtained from other sources. Therefore, the only way to identify a particular charge—and against whom it was made—is for the complainant to announce his action himself. Since this was not done in the rebar case, it is difficult to learn more than the fact that a rebar complaint has been filed.

There are indications that customs will soon make a determination in the wire mesh case. This case has been under study for several months. Nongovernmental sources think the mesh charge may be thrown out—although this remains to be seen.

Imports of wire rods last year were nearly 645,000 net tons, up from 451,000 in 1961. Of this total nearly 300,000 tons came from Japan, 39,000 tons from Belgium, about 113,000 from West Germany, 46,000 from Australia and the rest scattered among a number of countries. A shade over half of the increase came from Japan.

Shipments of rods by domestic mills last year were 1,017,239 net tons versus 935,111 in 1961.

[From American Metal Market, Mar. 19, 1963]

WIRE ROD DUMPING CHARGE UPHELD; BUT IS IT A PYRRHIC VICTORY?

(By Freeman Bishop)

WASHINGTON.—The dumping case of six steel firms against imports of Belgian steel rods may give Senator Estes Kefauver's Antitrust Subcommittee much of the information sought last year when the full Judiciary Committee refused to uphold a contempt citation against most of the steel industry.

Forwarded yesterday from the Treasury were findings of that agency in the donnybrook heating up between the U.S. steel industry and the European Common Market nations.

Procedure on antidumping cases is for Treasury to forward its findings to the Tariff Commission. The tariff experts then have 3 months to make their determination of whether to uphold antidumping charges.

The entire steel industry may be embroiled in this "case" before it's over, with Senator Kefauver pushing hard to get out of this altercation the price data he sought unsuccessfully to subpena from the steel companies last year.

Nothing new to the steel industry is surveillance by the Kefauver Antitrust Subcommittee. Special investigations of the industry have been underway for 10 years and will continue to exist, Senate antitrusters promise.

Senator KEFAUVER believes steel prices are artificially high and he claims prices could be lowered to meet import competition and still return a profit to the industry.

U.S. producers may be working into a real bind. They may be forced to prove their price structure in order to uphold the dumping charges. This could require disclosure of price data the industry doesn't want to disclose.

Dumping charges against foreign producers of steel in U.S. markets are expected to be upheld by Treasury; that is, that foreign sellers are operating in U.S. markets at prices lower than those at which they sell the same product at home.

Bethlehem, Armco, Colorado Fuel & Iron, Detroit Steel, Jones & Laughlin, and Republic Steel are the producers whose complaint will be considered by the Tariff Commission.

Charges to be expected on Capitol Hill against the steel firms will include:

That the complainants brought the charges to forestall wage increases in the wage contract negotiations.

That charges were to warn the Kennedy administration against making steel concessions in current Common Market trade negotiations.

It is expected some smaller firms will claim the steel dumping case was based on unrealistic figures and they will charge that larger producers sell rods to "captive" firms at high prices, making their profit on this transaction while absorbing the loss by the subsidiary.

Steel producers will contend their wage scales and production costs are so high they cannot meet this competition from abroad.

[From The Wall Street Journal, Mar. 19, 1963]

U.S. Steelmakers Win a Round—Treasury Rules Belgium Dumped Wire Rods in United States; Users Fear a Tariff Rise Could Ruin Their Business

The Treasury Department upheld the complaint of U.S. steel mills that hot-rolled carbon steel wire rods are being imported from Belgium at cut-rate prices in violation of the U.S. antidumping law.

The Treasury referred the case to the Tariff Commission, which must decide whether the imports are injuring U.S. steelmakers. If it decides they are, the Tariff Commission is empowered to boost customs levies to bring the imports in line with domestic goods.

A controversy has long been simmering between U.S. producers of wire rods and domestic users who have been buying the product from foreign mills. These users insist the steel industry's effort to reduce the wire rod imports, if successful, could put some of the fabricators out of business.

TO CONSIDER OTHER COMPLAINTS

Under the antidumping law, the Tariff Commission has 3 months to decide the Belgian rod case. Treasury officials said they hope to use the time to rule on other sections of the complaint involving steel rods imported from West Germany, France, Luxembourg, and Japan.

Six U.S. steel mills participated in the original charge against wire rod imports. They were Bethlehem Steel Corp., Colorado Fuel & Iron Corp., Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., Republic Steel Corp., Armco Steel Corp., and Detroit Steel Corp. Youngstown Sheet & Tube Corp. joined later.

In their complaint, filed last September, the companies alleged that Belgian rods were being sold in the United States, at from $24.95 to $25.85 a ton below the indicated value in the Belgian market.

The Treasury, in ruling that the Belgian prices had violated the antidumping law, computed a weighted average price for steel rods sold in Belgium and made a similar computation for the price paid by importers in the United States.

The average import price, a Treasury official said, was well below the European level. The official added, however, that Department rules forbid publication of the price figures used in the comparison.

An official of one of the U.S. mills that participated in the complaint said of the Treasury ruling, "We're glad to have some results, but we had hopes that the European countries would be considered together rather than separately." He said the Common Market mills operate as a single entity, through the European Coal and Steel Community, and joint consideration would have eased the investigation. Members of the Common Market, in additon to Belgium, are West Germany, France, Italy, the Netherlands, and Luxemburg.

IMPORTS IMPACT

Other sources, however, observed that U.S. mills had pushed for joint treatment by the Tariff Commission because it would have been easier for the mills to prove injury from the combined imports of all foreign nations, instead of one by one.

The impact of wire rod imports has been significant. According to industry data, foreign producers sold 645,000 tons of the product in this country last year, up from 451,000 tons in 1961 and only 54,000 tons in 1957. The imported volume in 1962 accounted for 39 percent of the U.S. wire rod market.

The Treasury estimated the value of wire rods imported from Belgium last year at $1.8 million.

Imported rods have sold for as little as $95 a ton in recent months. Prices, however, have moved to $105 to $115 a ton, still well below the U.S.-made price of generally $140 to $145 a ton.

Despite the price differential, U.S. importers of the foreign-made goods insist there is no violation of the antidumping law. Declared Ernest Wimpfheimer, president of the American Institute for Imported Steel, a New York trade group representing importers:

"We think that the dumping charge has no merit and the sooner we have a chance to present the evidence the sooner we can get a determination and dismiss the complaint. There is every reason to assume that this case will be dismissed by the Tariff Commission with a finding of no injury to the American steel industry."

U.S. fabricators said they have been buying the imported rods because they can't afford the higher priced domestic goods. Many contend that even if U.S. mills are able to force higher prices on imports, this won't mean more business for domestic steel makers. The fabricators said they still won't be able to afford the U.S. rods.

Nearly 300 small companies process wire rods into such products as wire staples, chain link fence, and nuts and bolts, and a large percentage of them use imported steel. Some said they would try to pass higher import prices along to customers, but most insisted the market wouldn't stand this and that it would mean a sharp pinch on profit.

Some users of wire rods and drawn wire have even charged that U.S. mills have refused to cut the price of rods or wire, but have slashed prices on some finished wire products in recent years to put a squeeze on these smaller companies with which they compete for wire product business. One Texas maker of wire mesh used to reinforce concrete said it has filed complaints with the Federal Trade Commission and the Texas attorney general that U.S. mills charge more for wire used to make the mesh than they do for the finished mesh itself.

An attorney for makers and importers of European steel said some wire-rod users plan to testify at any Tariff Commission hearing that U.S. mills are squeezing these customers by selling wire products at a relatively small markup over the rod prices, or even at the same prices. The counsel also said he plans to offer evidence aimed at showing U.S. mills are pricing their wire rods more than $50 a ton above the cost of making them.

A Midwest maker of chain-link fence and wire mesh used to reinforce concrete for such uses as garage floors, delivers the mesh to customers at Grand Island, Nebr., for a price equal to 8 cents a pound. The company currently pays about 6 cents a pound for Japanese wire rods, giving it a 2-cent spread to prepare the rods, draw the wire, fabricate the mesh and ship it to Grand Island.

A $10-PER-TON RISE COULD BE FATAL

But this concern said it would have to pay 7½ cents a pound for domestic rods, and freight charges to Grand Island alone would be more than that half-cent spread. If imported rods climbed another $10 a ton, or a half-cent a pound, "we'd just have to throw reinforcing mesh in mothballs," a company official said.

An eastern rod user said it would have to pay nearly $145 a ton for domestic rods, but sells its wire product for an average of only $150 a ton and has operating and overhead costs of more than $30 a ton. The company currently pays about $105 a ton for foreign wire rods and said that if the price got up to around $115, "we'd have a difficult time keeping our head above water."

U.S. steel mills in the past 6 months also have filed antidumping complaints against European and Japanese producers of standard pipe, Japanese makers of hot-rolled sheet and Canadian producers of reinforcing bars.

Many wire-rod customers insist higher foreign rod prices wouldn't swing them to domestic rods, which would still be too high in price unless U.S. mills abandon their policy of not cutting rod prices to meet import competition.

The eastern company that buys 30 percent of its rods from abroad said that as foreign rod prices rise, "the saving on the 30 percent we buy is less effective. We couldn't afford to do other than buy a larger percentage from abroad to keep our average cost of supply down." Many rod users contend the antidumping drive seems so pointless that U.S. mills must be waging it for some reason such as attempting to create a general hostility toward imported steel.

OUTCOME IN DOUBT

Domestic steel mills that make wire rods say they don't know what the final outcome of their antidumping drive will be. But some feel that if import prices are boosted a bit, and they can count on these prices staying there, then the U.S. mills will be able to trim their own prices enough to win back some business. "Until the antidumping law is enforced, it's impossible for the domestic mills to know what we're going to do to get this business back. We've got to decide where we stand first," one major producer said.

Steel mills deny any effort to put a squeeze on their wire rod customers. A few insist they have at times offered price concessions on rods. And while most mills concede they haven't tried to bring the price of rods down to meet import prices, they insist these prices are far too low to attempt to compete with them and they have no assurance they wouldn't go still lower if they did make the try.

PRICE-STRUCTURE DAMAGE?

Some steel sales officials said they have met price reductions on many fabricated wire products but not on wire rods because there seemed more justification for adjustment on fabricated wire products. Less drastic cuts were needed on the fabricated products and a greater profit margin was available to play with, they said. "Unlike rods," said one official, "you have a chance to be competitive with the going price on mesh."

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I do not express an opinion on the factual issue raised by the dumping charges. That is for the Treasury to determine. Neither do I venture a conclusion on the question of injury or potential injury. That is for the Tariff Commission to decide. However, as a member of the Senate Committee on Small Business, and as author of S. 1107 and S. 1108, I am deeply concerned with the implications of this controversy for small, independent, nonintegrated wire rod fabricators.

The six major steel companies which have filed the dumping complaint—Bethlehem, Republic, Jones & Laughlin, Armco, Colorado Fuel & Iron, and Detroit Steel—are all vertically integrated steel producers. They make both wire rods—an intermediate raw material—and such finished products as bale ties, wire mesh, chain link fence, nails and staples, and so forth. All of these companies rank among the 15 largest steel companies in the United States. All appear on Fortune magazine's list of the 500 largest industrial corporations in the country. All claim that they have been injured by the importation of wire rods from abroad. All of them ostensibly want the volume of such imports reduced and/or the price of imported wire rods raised, or both.

The users of wire rods, however, take a diametrically opposite view. They are the small, nonintegrated fabricators who must normally buy their raw material from the integrated giants, and must then compete with these giants in the sale of finished products. These small businessmen are peculiarly vulnerable to sharpshooting tactics by their integrated supplier-competitors. They have to live under a regime of administered prices, dominated by the integrated steel producers who face their customers with a solid phalanx of identical prices. They have to live in constant fear of discriminatory denials of supply and predatory price squeezes which the steel giants apply with periodic regularity. These practices, say the independents, have been used against them recently for the express purpose of driving them out of business and leaving the production of wire products in the hands of a vertically integrated oligopoly. Therefore, with rod prices increasing faster than product prices, the independents have felt compelled to turn, at least in part, to imported rods, for competitive survival. They now fear that small business might be injured seriously—and perhaps fatally—if the Tariff Commission were to uphold the dumping charges, and if, as a consequence, wire rod imports were either to be curtailed or to be subjected to unwarranted price hikes.

Mr. President, I reiterate that my primary concern is, not with a particular product or a particular case, but with the problem of vertical integration as it impinges on the small business community. I am concerned with the wire rod matter only because it affects the fate of some 300 independent fabricators, and only because it illustrates how the vertical price squeeze may strangle the small-business component of an entire industry. Therefore, in an effort to determine whether there has indeed been a squeeze on the small wire rod fabricators, I have asked my staff to assemble for me some authoritative data on the behavior of various steel prices in recent years. These data, based on the Bureau of Labor Statistics price indexes, are summarized in a table which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Wholesale price index for selected steel products, 1955–62

[1955=100]

	Semi-finished steel products (10–13)	Billets, rerolling carbon (10–13–01)	Wire rods (10–13–11)	Finished steel products (10–14)	Drawn wire, carbon (10–14–76)	Bale ties, carbon (10–14–82)	Nails, wire 8d common (10–14–86)	Barbed wire, galvanized (10–14–91)	Woven wire fence, galvanized (10–14–96)	Welded wire fabric (10–82–51) [1]	Chain link fence (10–82–61)
1955	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
1956	107.00	106.00	111.80	108.40	106.50	110.30	108.80	108.00	109.40	(2)	106.60
1957	118.50	118.50	122.60	118.70	119.70	129.90	117.10	114.30	119.10	126.20	116.20
1958	122.90	122.70	128.90	122.90	125.10	129.20	119.90	116.50	122.50	130.60	121.60
1959	124.80	124.60	131.60	124.90	127.50	129.20	119.90	116.70	122.60	130.60	121.60
1960	124.50	124.60	131.60	124.70	127.50	126.20	117.10	114.40	120.00	130.60	121.60
1961	124.20	124.60	131.60	124.30	127.50	124.00	115.10	111.90	117.60	130.60	121.60
1962	124.20	124.60	131.60	123.90	127.50	124.00	115.10	112.00	117.70	125.50	121.60

[1] January 1955=100.
[2] Not available.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Wholesale Prices and Price Indexes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the foregoing table shows that, since 1955, the price of wire rods has increased far more than the price of the billets out of which wire rods are made, and also more than the price of various finished products into which wire rods are transformed. This would indicate that the wire rod prices are clearly out of line with related steel prices, and that the users of wire rods—especially the small, independent fabricators—have been caught in a price squeeze. More important, it indicates that, starting in 1959, the squeeze in the case of some products has become a double squeeze, because in that year the price of several finished products was actually reduced.

Mr. President, here certainly is concrete evidence of the problem of vertical integration and the need for possible action along the lines of S. 1107 and S. 1108. Certainly, there is need for a thorough exploration of the impact of vertical integration—not only on wire rod fabricators, or steel fabricators generally, but also on other independent businessmen caught in a system of dual distribution. I note that the Roosevelt subcommittee in the House has already begun hearings. It is my hope that the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, which has been assigned legislative responsibility on the Senate side, for S. 1107 and S. 1108, will conduct parallel hearings in the near future.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BREWSTER in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HOBGOBLINS ON THE RIGHT

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, our colleague the senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] delivered a magnificent address in the Senate last week in which he exposed the hysterical, phoney, and sometimes ridiculously ludicrous campaign being stirred up by groups he aptly categorized as "fright peddlers."

He pointed out that those who instigate charges of treason and worse against every Government decision with which they disagree "defile the honorable philosophy of conservatism—as thoroughly as the Communists defile the honorable philosophy of liberalism." Like the Communists, the extreme right has its dupes and front organizations. Obviously there are many cases in which well-intentioned but misguided persons have been deceived by the propaganda, the outright lies, and the excessive zeal of the leaders of such efforts.

The speech of the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] deserves and has already received the highest praise from Republicans and Democrats alike, and from many of our leading newspapers. The New York Herald Tribune, in an editorial entitled "Hobgoblins on the Right," commended him for doing "a good, and a needed job." The courageous and constructive speech is typical of the outstanding service of the Senator from California. It is one more milestone in a career which has made him one of the most effective and respected Members of this body.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorial in the New York Herald Tribune be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOBGOBLINS ON THE RIGHT

There are quite a number of John Birchers and others of the extreme right in Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL's California backyard. To take them on in open battle as he has done repeatedly calls for political courage of no mean order. But the Republican Senate whip is performing a service not only to his party but to his State and his country by exposing those who, as he put it, "defile the honorable philosophy of conservatism."

The far right, like the far left, generally finds no respectable voices, among the press or public men, to speak for it. As a result, many canards originate in their little hate sheets and their little hate speeches and circulate unchecked. It is amazing with what credulity the wildest stories are accepted by those predisposed to believe them; the tale of cannibal Africans being trained by the United Nations in Georgia to take over the United States could, one would imagine, deceive no one, yet Senator Kuchel says it is mentioned in many of the "fright letters" he receives.

There is a philosophy of conservatism, and, as Mr. Kuchel says, it is an honorable one. But it certainly cannot be advanced by stories which sound like a mixture of the late and unlamented Julius Streicher's outpourings with the tales of the Brothers Grimm. Nor will American security be promoted by keeping a wary eye on imaginary Mongol hordes clustering just across the Mexican border. Above all, the wrong that is done to patriotic Americans by such right-wing calumnies represents a threat to the public service and the public order.

This country needs to have its best minds, and all good citizens, trading thoughts openly in the marketplace of ideas. What is damaging are under-the-counter deals, secret connivings, faked goods and counterfeit intellectual currency. By acting as a kind of better business bureau to police the phony "ideas" of the right, Senator Kuchel is doing a good, and a needed, job. As he says, the United States has enough dangerous enemies without inventing any hobgoblins.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, obviously I am grateful to the Senator from New York for his very generous comments, and I thank him. I am also grateful that the Senator from New York, has once again made comments on a very grave national problem, so that they may be spread on the Record.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR KEATING

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the present occupant of the chair [Mr. Brewster] represents one great American political party. The Senator from New York [Mr. Keating] and I represent another.

It is an American tragedy that those on the extreme left, and those on the extreme right, have almost precisely the same ends in mind; perhaps for different purposes, but nevertheless clearly the same goals to reach. Therefore, Mr. President, we need to be on guard.

I take this occasion to salute the junior Senator from New York. Kenneth Keating has served his State and his Nation for many years. He has served America in war and in peace. Over his years of service in the U.S. Senate his has been a magnificent record of true liberalism. He is a Republican who has stood foursquare for that eternal American gospel, equal treatment under law.

I have been glad in the Senate, along with my Republican colleagues and my Democratic colleagues, to follow his leadership in the never-ending fight for equal treatment for all Americans—rich and poor, black and white, Christian and Jew, big and little—in this great, free Republic of ours.

I remember something that General Eisenhower said when he was in the White House. He said he wanted to describe his philosophy as liberal with respect to the people's wants and as conservative with respect to the people's money.

Ken Keating is a liberal, and the record will demonstrate it. Again and again in controversies in the Senate involving human freedom and human liberty at home or in mankind's struggles all around this globe, he has been in the vanguard of the true liberals. With respect to fiscal policy—with respect to the intricate problems of American Government in the fields of finance, taxation, and the proper expenditure of public moneys as distinguished from improper expenditures—I salute my colleague from New York as a true conservative. That is not a non sequitur, because the record which the Senator from New York [Mr. Keating] has made in this Chamber shows that he has followed the kind of political philosophy laid down by a great, dedicated American patriot.

I am glad to recall the sincere courage and the constructive criticism which have motivated his comments with respect to those important segments of our foreign policy which have riveted the eyes of the Nation upon them—Cuba, for example. Sound and solid have been the discourses which have come from the mouth of Senator Keating in this Chamber and in this country.

So on this occasion I simply want to repeat my thanks to a friend of years, and in doing so to say that the people of the country are grateful that the people of New York have sent him here to bring his experience, his courage, and his high principles to bear upon the manifold problems which continue to plague our people.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I express my deep gratitude to my friend from California for these kind expressions. I know of no one from whom I would treasure more such statements of commendation. I shall always remember them. I am more grateful than I can express.

SITUS PICKETING

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, just a few days ago the distinguished majority whip [Mr. Humphrey] and I joined in sponsoring situs picketing legislation—legislation recommended by President Eisenhower in his state of the Union messages on at least three occasions; legislation designed to provide that there shall be one labor policy in America, rather than two, as is the case, regrettably, at the moment.

In a word, we seek to give to men in the building and construction trades precisely the same rights that their fellow Americans in industrial unions have had under the law—no more and no less.

The other day the Washington Post contained a very excellent editorial discussing the reasons why our proposed legislation ought to be enacted into law. I ask unanimous consent that the text of that editorial, entitled "Neglected Injustice," which appeared in the May 6 edition of that great newspaper, be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Neglected Injustice

Senators Kuchel and Humphrey have introduced a minor bill that long ago should have been enacted. Its purpose is simply to put workmen in the building trades on an equal footing with other employees in exercising the right of peaceful picketing. At present the law is grossly discriminatory, as Senator Kuchel has pointed out. It permits employees of a factory to engage in peaceful picketing in a labor dispute, but construction workers may not.

This inconsistency arises from the fact that a manufacturing plant is usually operated by a single employer and a construction project involves many different employers. The Supreme Court ruled more than a decade ago that if striking electricians picket a jobsite and bricklayers, carpenters, and other craftsmen refuse to cross the picket line, the electricians are guilty of causing a secondary boycott in violation of the Taft-Hartley Act. The reasoning is that the bricklayers, carpenters, and so forth have been induced to strike with the object of bringing pressure upon the prime contractor to stop doing business with the electrical contractor.

Actually, the secondary boycott provision was designed to protect innocent third parties from being injured by labor disputes with which they have no connection. It was not intended to apply to construction jobs where members of many different unions are working together, under separate employers, on a single project. But in the light of the Supreme Court's ruling an amendment exempting the building trades from this provision will be necessary to end the present discrimination. Incidentally, former President Eisenhower asked Congress to correct this injustice back in 1954. How long will it take Congress to make an adjustment in the law on which there appears to be widespread agreement?

UNITED JEWISH APPEAL ANNIVERSARY WEEK IN NEW YORK STATE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, during the week of May 6–12, the people of New York State are making United Jewish Appeal Anniversary Week. By proclamation of Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, my State is paying tribute to the untiring efforts of the United Jewish Appeal, which has aided over 3 million people whose lives have been touched by adversity.

The appeal has played an instrumental role in keeping alive the traditions and heritage of Jewish life at a time when it was threatened by brutal oppressors dedicated to its extinction. Today, its vital programs are bringing happiness and a better life to people in 28 nations.

Mr. President, I am pleased that Governor Rockefeller has set aside this week in honor of the United Jewish Appeal, and ask unanimous consent that his proclamation be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

State of New York,
Executive Chamber,
Albany, N.Y.

Proclamation

Since its establishment in 1939, United Jewish Appeal has dedicated itself to sustaining Jewish life wherever it is threatened, and to resettling the uprooted in Israel, the United States and other free lands. During this historic quarter century, the United Jewish Appeal has aided 3 million persons whose lives have been shadowed by homelessness and oppression.

In its 1963 campaign, the United Jewish Appeal must go forward with its urgent program of redeeming the lives and strengthening the hopes of those who are still caught in the currents of a tempestuous world. Hundreds of thousands of human beings must be helped in 28 nations around the world.

Now, therefore, I, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim May 6–12, 1963, as United Jewish Appeal Anniversary Week in New York State.

Given under my hand and the privy seal of the State at the capitol in the city of Albany this 15th day of April in the year of our Lord 1963.

[SEAL] NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER.

By the Governor:

WILLIAM A. RONAN,
Secretary to the Governor.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

A REBIRTH OF THE PERFORMING ARTS AT THE GRASSROOTS, THE TWIN CITIES' GUTHRIE REPERTORY THEATER, INSPIRES THE NATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Tuesday night, May 7, was an important landmark in the history of the legitimate theater of the United States. That night, Minnesota and the Nation greeted the new Guthrie Repertory Theater, in its opening performance.

The occasion was a gala event in the long cultural history of my State. It was also one of the most remarkable events in the artistic life of this country in the past decade.

As one who has been privileged to sponsor legislation for the performing—as well as for the visual—arts in every Congress in which I have served, it is a particular pleasure to invite the Congress' attention to this great milestone.

For here, art and the people have united at the grassroots to serve art and the people.

The entire communities of Minneapolis and St. Paul have made this cultural landmark possible, along with citizens from all over my State, joining with the best of Broadway's talent.

Literally, for decades, observers have said, "the living theater is actually dying in America." Year after year, more and more of the legitimate stage has become concentrated on Broadway; and, year after year, the amount of living theater on Broadway, itself, has declined.

Fewer theaters—fewer productions, more unemployed actors, actresses, stage crews and musicians, rising costs, few "big hits," infinitely fewer small "hits," many deficit productions—this has been the distressing pattern.

Recognizing the situation, leaders of the legitimate stage have not been inactive; they have tried every type of remedy.

For a number of years, for example, some leaders of the American National Theater and Academy—ANTA—chartered by the Congress, envisioned a "40 theater plan" throughout the country. And there have been other plans as well, in which Broadway hoped to "hatch" theaters under its wing in other States. All of these plans have floundered, usually on the hard rock of finances.

Now, however, leadership at the grassroots has asserted itself. Dynamic, civic-minded individuals and organizations have welded community pride, professional artistry and strong financial backing into an unbeatable combination.

I congratulate the people of Minneapolis and St. Paul, Tyrone Guthrie, the Walker Foundation, the Ford Foundation, John Cowles, Jr., editor of the Minneapolis Star and Tribune, and all the other trailblazers who have made this event possible.

This was truly an inspiring occasion for the people of the upper Midwest, particularly the people of the Twin Cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul.

I had hoped to be able to attend the opening of the Guthrie Theater, because it marks a new point in the history of the arts and cultural development. It was impossible for me to be present on this occasion. However I am happy to say that on Sunday night of this week Mrs. Humphrey and I will be at that theater to see one of the great plays and to enjoy the exciting experience of being a part of a great development in the field of the arts and cultural life.

The play's the thing. Some of the greatest plays in the stage's great tradition will now be re-created by means of the noble tradition of repertory theater.

The sparks will, we hope, ignite similar enterprises across the Nation. The road ahead will not be easy, but it is now better illuminated before us, thanks to the Guthrie Theater's inspiring example.

"There's no business like show business," and no way of reviving the theater like fusing the best of the past with the best of the present.

The Guthrie Theater is exciting in its ideas, in its architecture, in its personnel. It stirs the Nation and the Nation rejoices to be stirred.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD, the following materials:

First, an article in the Sunday, May 2, issue of the New York Times with regard to the Guthrie Repertory Theater; second, an editorial from the Minneapolis Tribune of May 7, praising the opening of the Guthrie Theater; and third, an article in the Sunday, May 2, issue of the Washington Post describing the conception of this historic theatrical venture in the Twin Cities.

There being no objection, the materials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 5, 1963]

A DREAM COMING TRUE

(By Richard L. Coe)

The years's most exciting theatrical event occurs this week not in little, dirty, old New York but in, of all places, Minneapolis, Minn.

This afternoon will bring the dedication of the new Tyrone Guthrie Theater in the Twin Cities. Tuesday, a company formed by Dr Guthrie, one of the most admired directors of our times, will inaugurate a theater built by Minnesotans in his honor with a production of "Hamlet." In the title role will be George Grizzard, the Arena Stage favorite who went on to the New York stage, the Hollywood screen, TV, and to this most striking of assignments.

The Minnesota venture marks one more step in the stimulating world of today's theater to its decentralization from the hit-or-miss world of Gotham. One cannot overemphasize what this can mean to the American theater's future. We in Washington, rejoicing in Arena Stage's magnificent achievement in a world which superficially is making less room for the exultation of living theater, can further rejoice, with the Twin Cities, that this new step is being achieved.

Dr. Guthrie is one of the world's theater leaders, respected not simply in Europe and America where his productions have been seen, but elsewhere where his work has been recorded and his writings admired. Six-feet-five, Dr. Guthrie is an extraordinary man. With his wife he travels the world, eschewing the fashionable luxury hotels, living in modest hostels with their portable (sometimes verboten) Bunsen burner, passing up the posh restaurants to dream, quietly, of the sort of theater they love.

These loves have included long remembered productions of London's Old Vic, Broadway's "The Matchmaker" and the creation of Ontario's famed Stratford Shakespeare Festival.

The new Minnesota stage is a close kin to the one Guthrie created in Ontario's Stratford, for this too has a multilevel open stage, surrounded on 3 sides by 1,400 seats. Already Minnesotans are gasping that some $330,000 worth of tickets have been sold before the season even opens.

Two plays will start what in time will be a true repertory system this week, "Hamlet" opening Tuesday night, Moliere's "The Miser" opening Wednesday. "The Three Sisters" will enter the repertory June 17 and "Death of a Salesman" on July 16. The season will run through September 22, with 'Hamlet" the final bill. Individual seats will cost from $1.50 to $5, with group tickets available. Further factual details may be had from the Tyrone Guthrie Theater, 725 Vineland Place, Minneapolis 3, Minn.

One of the theater's purposes was to give actors an opportunity to work outside of tense Manhattan and they have flocked to do so. Grizzard left his starring role in the year's top play, "Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?" to have his crack at Hamlet. Hume Cronyn, finished with his long "Cleopatra" assignment, and his wife Jessica Tandy, will, between them, have roles in all four plays. Rita Gam accepted an "as cast" contract for "Hamlet" in order to have leads in "The Three Sisters" and the Moliere.

Washington knows many of the other players, Nicolas Coster, Clayton Corzatte, Ed Preble, Paul Ballantyne, Ellen Geer, John Cromwell, Lee Richardson, Ruth Nelson, and Robert Pastene. Tanya Moisewitsch, who created so many of the Ontario costumes for Dr. Guthrie, is the principal designer and another Canadian who has scored both at Stratford and on Broadway, Douglas Campbell, is Dr. Guthrie's second in command.

When it was learned four autumns ago that Dr. Guthrie was considering creation of a theater removed from New York, several farflung cities scrambled to attract the noted director, Minneapolis only one of them.

"There are too few chances for people to experience and enjoy the entertainment the classic plays can provide," Sir Tyrone told all comers, "yet theater is as important to the life of a community as an orchestra or museums or libraries."

Quick to get cracking were a handful of Minnesotans, among them the university's Frank Whiting, Publisher John Cowles, Jr., General Mills Board Chairman Harry Bullis, Critic John K. Sherman, the T. B. Walker Art Center and, as the new theater's first program is forced to say, "others too numerous to mention."

Anyway, Minneapolis rolled up its sleeves, found land, raised a million and a half dollars, went even further than Producer Oliver Rae and Production Manager Peter Zeisler had been promised.

The players have been rehearsing for 2 months and their phone calls and letters reflect precisely the enthusiasm Dr. Guthrie dreamed of: "The stage is magnificent, tricky at first, but wonderful." The costumes, wait till you see 'em. And the people, these wonderful, open-hearted, generous people of Minnesota. What a relief from New York. We're going to give 'em some great performances."

The birth of a theater is an exciting portent. This is why Minnesota's Tyrone Guthrie Theater is one of the few major events of the American theater's year.

[From the Minneapolis Morning Tribune, May 7, 1963]

The Guthrie Theater

The opening of the Tyrone Guthrie Theater tonight with the production of "Hamlet" is a historic occasion in the intellectual and cultural life of the Twin Cities and the Upper Midwest.

It represents a very real triumph for thousands of men and women who have given generously of time, money, and talents to make this artistic and cultural ideal a living actuality.

It has been said that good theater, that is the art theater, represents a kind of cutting edge into the world of tomorrow. In all kinds of ways, in literature and the use of language, in costume and design, in philosophy and art, the theater influences men and has since its beginning. The Guthrie Theater undoubtedly will have profound effects on the life of this region.

The new theater, which is breathtaking architecturally, will of course, be used for more than the production of Shakespeare, Moliere, Chekhov, and Arthur Miller plays. Next week, for example, the Walker Art Center will inaugurate its series of "The Poet Reads" with appearances by Allen Tate and Isabella Gardner reading their own poetry. They are to be followed later by John Hall Wheelock and John Crowe Ransom.

Later this month, a series of jazz concerts will open at the Guthrie Theater with the Modern Jazz Quartet playing, to be followed by the Sonny Rollins Quartet in June. Thus at the very moment of its opening, the city and the region can see some of the many cultural uses to which the new theater will be put.

The Guthrie Theater needs, of course, continuing support and patronage. Nothing at this high level is ever easily achieved. There are always a few who care passionately and these will have to carry the main burden as they have in the past. But it is worth it. As one Minneapolitan, looking over the Guthrie a few days before it opened, remarked: Say, this really puts us out in front."

Another Test for Decentralization

(By Austin C. Wehrwein)

The professional American theater, caged by commercialism on Manhattan Island, neurotic with self-doubt and guilt complexes, loathed and loved by those who live in it, is about to experience an experiment that could help liberate it.

This experiment begins here on Tuesday when Tyrone Guthrie opens a 20-week repertory season with a "modified modern" dress production of "Hamlet" in which he dismisses the concept that Hamlet "is a constipated young man in long black tights."

Here, 1,000 miles from Broadway as the jets fly, in a gleaming $2,500,000 glass-walled, 1,437-seat open-stage theater bearing Mr. Guthrie's name, the people of the Twin Cities (population 1,400,000) will launch a full-scale, truly professional regional repertory organization. Indeed, the theater will be supported on a scale and in the style that symphony orchestras have come to expect and enjoy.

REPERTORY TRADITION

This is not little theater; not stock; not straw hat; not road show; and it is definitely not show biz.

It is a happy marriage of community chest-type of impulse that raised contributions of $1,800,000 and the highest degree of professionalism innocent of profit motive. It is a long-awaited step toward the repertory tradition of Europe, Britain and Russia but without Government support or direction.

If it works here, interest already smoldering in places like Milwaukee, Detroit and Cleveland is very likely to burst into flame, the cultural course of this country may well be changed.

"I don't think a theatre should be any more self-supporting than the public library," Peter Zeisler, production director, who with Oliver Rea, the administrator, makes up the troika that created the enterprise out of shared disgust for Broadway show biz.

For the Upper Midwest the four-play season is the most important cultural event since the first concert by the Minneapolis Symphony 60 years ago. For the world of drama it is one more test of the long dream that decentralization spells salvation.

"A dream itself is but a shadow," Hamlet tells Guildenstern. No shadow at the box office, the season is already a smash. Long before opening, advance subscription ticket sales ($18 top, down to $5.40) exceeded $221,000.

And total advance sales (single top $5, down to $1.50) exceeded $325,000. Optimism abounds that it will be a cinch to reach the 75 percent capacity needed to meet the $660,000 operating budget, which for comparable New York productions would be at least double.

Mail orders have come from as far off as New York, San Diego and Biloxi. But much credit is given to 1,000 tireless women volunteers who have worked over an area in a 100-mile radius from the Twin Cities pushing the project at teas, cocktail parties and dinners. Rita Gam and jovial Douglas Campbell, Mr. Guthrie's assistant, talked to a labor meeting and the AFL–CIO bought out an entire performance.

Dayton's department store sold about 40 percent of the season subscription tickets on its credit card and permitted the use of its 400,000-name mailing list for direct-mail advertising. A $377,000 Ford Foundation grant that came as a bit of a windfall will go a long way towards insuring financial help during the 3 years picked as the tryout run. The troika is cautious, however. The project's real success will be measurable, they warn, 3 years hence when the novelty has worn off.

By artistic standards this is also a season of high promise. Besides "Hamlet," Mr. Guthrie—Tony to his close friends, Dr. Guthrie to a revering cast and Middlewesterners too shy to use his title, Sir—will direct Chekhov's "The Three Sisters."

Mr. Campbell, like Mr. Guthrie, a veteran of the Old Vic, will stage Molière's "The Miser" and Arthur Miller's "Death of a Salesman." The acting company includes Hume Cronyn, his wife Jessica Tandy, George Grizzard, late of "Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf," and now the lead in "Hamlet," Rita Gam and Zoe Caldwell. Some supporting roles will be taken by University of Minnesota graduate students on leave under grants from the McKnight Foundation.

THEATER DESIGN

The theater, the acoustics of which are still doubtful and yet to get the acid test, was designed by Ralph Rapson, head of the university architectural department. The auditorium is horseshoe shaped. The seats, which are upholstered in subdued colors, sweep around the deep brown wooden open-platform asymetrical stage in a 200-degree arc. Ramps to the area below the stage allow startling entrances and exits through the audience areas.

In off season the theater will be used for chamber music and jazz concerts, lectures, and other plays but probably never for standard road shows.

All this began 4 years ago when Oliver Rea and Peter Zeisler were working on the musical "Juno," which had a short run on Broadway. They agreed they were disenchanted and shared a hunch that the country might be right for decentralization. They joined forces with Mr. Guthrie, a kindred spirit whose successes at the Stratford, Ontario, Shakespeare Festival and the Old Vic made him a natural for this project. Along the line a luncheon with Brooks Atkinson, to whom they went for advice as a veteran champion of the far-off Broadway drama, resulted in a story about their dream in the New York Times. Response from around the country resulted in a Rea-Guthrie coast-to-coast "shopping trip."

The turning point was reached after Mr. Rea happened to meet John Cowles, Jr., editor of the Minneapolis Star & Tribune. at a football game in Iowa City. Mr. Cowles, hearing that the shopping team was coming to Minneapolis to see Dr. Frank Whiting, director of the University Theater, promised to swing into action. He set up a meeting for Mr. Rea and Mr. Guthrie and it made no great difference that the individualistic Mr. Guthrie showed up in sneakers without socks. He is nothing if not eloquent.

Mr. Cowles lined up the keen, energetic young men that make the next-in-line group in the Twin City power structure and, as Mr. Guthrie put it, "Minn will come through."

Mr. Cowles quietly laid the groundwork for getting a $400,000 grant and a tract of land adjacent to the Walker Art Center from the Walker Foundation. Contributions began to flow in; they came from all the usual sources touched in community service drives and from 3,500 families, the junior league, the women's club and even 37 cents from a Sunday school class in a small town called Mankato.

Mr. Rea and Mr. Zeisler are now émigres from Broadway by choice and Mr. Guthrie, who will commute off season to his home in Ireland, has the rank of professor at the

28,000-student university which, in the words of Dr. Whiting, has a love affair with the theater without messy entanglements.

PAY SCALE

A chance to take part in a new theater enterprise and the promise of steady work in classic plays has made it possible to pay a scale well below that of the commercial theater and thereby draw on talent that normally would not be available outside of big show-biz centers. Mr. Rea, for his part, was willing to take a $14,000-a-year salary, and the top actor's remuneration is $400 a week, easily one-fifth of what a Broadway play might be worth to a good actor.

Here a theater can have roots, Mr. Guthrie says. No actors chasing too few jobs, or managers chasing too few theaters, or plays produced by people from somewhere else for buyers from Indianapolis. Not just show business and shopkeeping. Not one actor in 10,000 gets a chance to appear in four plays in one season, he added, not to mention the startlingly few jobs available at all.

To Mr. Cronyn this engagement is like a doctor's taking a year off from his routine daily practice to do basic research.

"It is so much healthier and worth while. It's clean."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I hope Senators will permit me a degree of parochial, sectional, and local pride when I say that we are greatly privileged in our area of America to have a truly great cultural center in the State of Minnesota, with our university, our many colleges, Walker Art Center, Minneapolis Institute of Fine Arts, our great Minneapolis Symphony Orchestra, the Guthrie Theater, many other theaters and motion picture centers, and many other fine cultural activities, including some of the finest choral groups and finest orchestras and bands to be found anywhere in the United States.

We in the Midwest feel very much a part and very much of belonging to and very much within the cultural development of the United States and, indeed of Western civilization.

I invite all my colleagues in the Senate and their families and friends to pay us a visit and to share with us the exciting and, I am sure, rewarding experience of an evening at the Guthrie Theater, where the best of the past and the best of the present are always available.

INTERIM REPORT ON CUBAN MILITARY BUILDUP

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services of the U.S. Senate today made public its interim report on the Cuban military buildup. I think that it is a good report, and I certainly commend most highly the chairman of the subcommittee for the outstanding and truly great job he has done on this matter.

He has provided inspiring leadership on this matter. He has been forceful and firm, but he has displayed his truly magnificent judicial temperament in the fairness that he has extended to every member of the subcommittee and all parties concerned in the preparation of this report.

As would be expected in a unanimous report on such a serious matter as the Cuban military buildup, compromise is inevitable; and to the extent that it affects areas in which unanimous agreement can be arrived, this is constructive and desirable in the representative context of a democratic society. It is in that spirit that I signed and joined in the unanimous report.

But I wish to elaborate with an expression of individual observations that I have on this matter.

In the late summer and early fall of last year, treachery of the most reckless sort yet to be experienced in the nuclear age was taking place in this hemisphere virtually in our own backyard. The Soviet Union, despite its public and diplomatic protestations to the contrary, had embarked on a series of surreptitious activities in its Communist-dominated satellite of Cuba which were calculated to upset the world's delicate power balance. This grandiose plot of the Kremlin, if successfully executed, would mortally imperil the lives of 188 million citizens of these United States and millions more of their neighboring friends throughout Latin America.

Quite apart from the fact that these secretive activities compounded a previous flagrant violation of an internationally recognized cornerstone of U.S. policy—the Monroe Doctrine—they also constituted a brazen breach of the tacit understanding between the principal nuclear powers in the waging of the cold war, in that no nuclear power would undertake a provocative course of action so inimical to the vital national interests of another that the latter was given no option except recourse to the use of weapons from its nuclear arsenal.

Although we were aware that something rather extraordinary was going on in Cuba last summer, the exact nature of the activities was not actually known. Our elected officials sought from time to time to press high-ranking representatives of the Soviet Union for an answer. They were invariably told that any military activity taking place in Cuba was all directed toward achieving a defensive military posture for the Soviet Union's Communist puppet, Fidel Castro, who had purportedly developed a psychosis from the fear of another invasion attempt following the Bay of Pigs fiasco in April of the previous year. These bland assurances to our officials that all activity in Cuba was defensively oriented created the exercise in semantics in the public debate over whether or not a particular weapon was deemed to be offensive or defensive—at best, a rather tenuous distinction even conceding that in some rare instances it may have some validity. Even if one could accept the premise that all weapons being introduced into Cuba were defensive, the fact that the United States took no action to halt the defensive buildup leads inevitably to the inference that we were prepared then, as we seemingly are now, to condone the presence of a foreign system in this hemisphere.

In any event, the argument over offensive versus defensive weapons collapsed when the duplicitous treachery of the Soviet Union was finally exposed by conclusive proof that it had, in fact, introduced strategic weapons into Cuba and thereby outflanked our ability to detect a surprise attack which it had previously been assumed would arrive over our northern approaches. Yet, even assuming that we possessed the capability along our southern flank to detect attacking aircraft and missiles, their launching from an enemy base merely 90 miles from our southernmost shore would reduce the 15-minute warning time to which our strategic retaliatory force is now geared, to something on the order of 6 minutes in some cases and virtually to zero in others—a situation clearly unacceptable to both the deterrent effect of our strategic force and our national survival. This was a real serious threat and one which had to result in a nuclear confrontation—we were given no option.

The Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee held hearings in secret session on the Cuban military buildup and took testimony from representatives of the intelligence branches of the Government—generically known as the intelligence community. The interim committee report concentrates primarily on the numbers, types, and deployment of weapons and Soviet personnel believed to have been introduced into Cuba during the buildup and the belief of the intelligence community as to which and how many were withdrawn. While I may have agreed that the information contained within the interim report should be made available to the public, I have personally felt that the report should have included at least a recitation of the overriding issues presented by a Communist base in this hemisphere along with the data acquired by committee staff personnel in interviewing Cuban refugees and exile organizations in the Greater Miami area. Moreover, I would have preferred to have seen incorporated in any report of the committee, the lessons to be learned and remembered from the crisis over Cuba in October 1962.

Up to the time of the Cuban crisis, the United States had credited the Soviet Union with the ability of rather precisely determining the risks involved in its various adventures to impose their Communist tyranny upon the free world. Cuba, however, has demonstrated that the Communists, as was true with so many others who have sought to do us harm in times past, are simply incapable of evaluating that intangible something in our national character by which we suddenly resolve to stand firm, at whatever the risk in life or treasure, and will brook no further retreat or concession. We, ourselves, cannot predict in advance the point at which we will conclude that we have had enough so that this national resolve is evoked and if we cannot certainly the Communists cannot. King George III, the Kaiser, Hitler, and now Khrushchev have found that they could not properly gage this national trait of ours. The nuclear showdown of October 1962 will stand in history as another instance to corroborate the fact that those who seek to toy with our survival as a nation should realize that it just will not be countenanced. This is one lesson.

The crisis over Cuba also demonstrated that it is patently ridiculous for any foreign power to conclude that the United States is too liberal to fight; that our patience and restraint is indicative of democratic decadence; that we are prone to harbor thoughts of abject capitulation whenever nuclear rockets are rattled or that we stand in such trembling fear of the thought of a nuclear war that we insist on peace at any price and will paralyze the initiative of our Government, be it Democratic or Republican, in coping with the many and varied Communist-inspired threats against us. The staunch support overwhelmingly given by U.S. citizens and the governments of Latin America to the President during the crisis over Cuba should well serve as another lesson to any foreign power bent on destroying us and the principles of liberty and freedom for which we stand.

Another lesson to be learned from the Cuban crisis is that governments, as with people, have a tendency to discount or ignore altogether certain indicators which, if they were to be accepted and believed, would necessarily override preconceived philosophical convictions. The public debate over the military buildup in Cuba really evolved into an issue of whether or not those in official positions of government were giving sufficient credence to information available to them which, although lacking the dignity of conclusive proof, nevertheless, certainly suggested a high probability that strategic weapons were being introduced by the Soviet Union into Cuba contrary to a preconceived philosophical conviction that the Soviet Union would not risk a nuclear showdown with the United States despite the tremendous military advantage to be gained by such a bold adventure in Cuba.

Finally, of course, is the lesson which we should have learned long ago but apparently have a tendency to forget. The Soviet Union, under its peculiar Communist standards and never recognizing a moral obligation, has left a trail of broken treaties and agreements in the wake of its international affairs. Having lied blatantly about introducing strategic weapons into Cuba, are we to accept at face value the Communist assurances that they have all been withdrawn or that they will not be reintroduced?

For several months prior to the crisis in October, thousands of Cubans were fleeing the Communist tyranny imposed by Fidel Castro. Those who were interviewed upon their arrival in the United States by representatives of our intelligence agencies were reporting that Soviet ships in Cuban ports of call were being unloaded at night behind hastily erected barricades to obscure all dock activities from inquisitive Cuban passersby, and that, suddenly, Cuban stevedores, who had previously unloaded Soviet cargoes, were no longer permitted to do so. They were also reporting that the routes taken by the military convoys in departing from the docks were not in a direction toward any known military installation, but, rather, seemed to be headed out toward the countryside, and that in the outlying towns and villages through which the convoys passed in the night, curfews were imposed, requiring all Cubans to remain in their homes, and all municipally generated electricity was shut off at the source.

Refugees who had fled from such towns and villages told of the unmistakable rumblings of the convoys as they passed through, and that those who dared peer out could see, by light reflected from the headlights of the vehicles, trailers transporting large cylindrical objects draped with canvas. Obviously, they were not able to pass judgment on the offensive or defensive nature of these objects, but they know they were missiles—and big ones, at that.

Refugees who had fled from the countryside reported that the Russians were summarily evicting farmers from their lands, around which fences were erected immediately. Shortly thereafter, blasting was heard, and large quantities of construction materials were seen to enter these restricted areas, from which even the Cuban military personnel were excluded.

Other refugees from the seaport areas were describing the newly arriving Russians as being young, physically fit, well disciplined, and possessing an unmistakable military bearing. Upon debarking from the ships, they were seen forming in ranks, and either marching off in step or moving out in military personnel carriers.

With the possible exception of construction activity in the restricted areas, our high-altitude U–2 aerial photographic reconnaissance flights could detect none of this clandestine activity. Consequently, the intelligence community, claiming the absence of evidence, continued to adhere to the view that the activity, whatever it was, could only be defensive in nature; and the American public was so informed. With respect to the Russian personnel, all of whom arrived in Cuba garbed in civilian sports clothing, the intelligence community continued to assert that these were merely military instructors and advisers or civilian technicians concerned with improving the Cuban economy, which, under the great promises of communism, had deteriorated to the point where important commodities were rationed. On the basis of information coming to them from the underground in Cuba, the Cuban exile organizations in Miami were asserting that these new arrivals were Soviet combat troops, despite their civilian sports apparel, and that they were present in Cuba in numbers ranging from 20,000 to 50,000. In Havana alone, Soviet troops were seen on the streets in greater numbers than American tourists were at the height of the tourist season in the days before Castro. Yet, the intelligence community apparently discounted these reports, because it was not until October 25 that the technicians became combat troops. Months later, the intelligence community reevaluated its data on Soviet troop strength in Cuba, and agreed with the refugee reports that there were 22,000 Soviet combat troops in Cuba during the crisis. Early this year the intelligence community adhered to an estimate of 17,500 Russian troops in Cuba, while exile organizations were stating that there were 35,000.

Obviously, a head count throughout the entire island is impossible, and high-altitude reconnaissance is least effective in determining numbers and nationalities of persons on the ground. Yet, there have been some in high office who have dismissed the argument over how many Soviet troops were or are now in Cuba, on the ground that it is immaterial. I believe it is very important to arrive at a sound judgment on this point, despite the difficulty of conformation, because it is a critical factor for the military in judging the probable success of a campaign in the light of the strength of the probable opposition to be engaged and overcome. Its proper evaluation cannot be lightly dismissed, for it determines the enemy's probable order of battle. Had the United States been required to invade Cuba during the crisis, to insure the destruction of the strategic missile sites, there might well have been a serious element of surprise awaiting our forces.

The quantities and types of the various weapons which the Soviet Union attempted to deploy in Cuba are fully set forth in the subcommittee's interim report. There are one or two, however, which should receive further attention.

The flight of a U–2 on the 29th of August confirmed the existence of a number of surface-to-air missile sites employing the SA–2 missile similar in many respects to our Nike-Hercules. There are 24 of these sites, having 6 launchers each, deployed in a tightly knit air defense around the entire perimeter of Cuba. This particular weapon is credited with three successful intercepts of high-flying U–2's—that of Gary Powers over the Soviet Union, a few years ago; a Nationalist Chinese U–2 over Red China, the month before the Cuban crisis; and Major Anderson's U–2 on October 27, during the crisis.

It does not appear that any official analysis was made of the probable reasons behind the Soviet Union's move to give Cuba the type of air defense capability represented by this sophisticated weapon system. Those within the intelligence community who gave the matter any thought at all reasoned that since the SA–2 missile is relatively ineffective against low-flying aircraft, which would normally provide close ground support to an invading force, these sites were surely not meant for repelling any possible future invasion attempts. Therefore, they must be for the purpose of denying to us further aerial reconnaissance by U–2's, in order to hide something of real significance—strategic missiles, perhaps? No official recognition, so far as we know, was given to this reasoning and intuitive judgment.

While these surface-to-air missile sites, at the time when they were spotted, were in varying stages of completion and were not yet considered to be operational, it was quite evident that some of them soon would be. This would necessarily inject a new element of risk to future U–2 flights. The repercussions flowing from the loss of the U–2 over Soviet territory remain too vividly etched in memory to warrant the risk of repetition. Consequently, the operation of U–2 flights was transferred from the Central Intelligence Agency to the Strategic Air Command.

The date on which the entire surface-to-air missile complex became operational was not conclusively established. Apparently, the sites were not ready by October 14, when the Soviets displayed their medium-range ballistic missile sites, or, if they were ready, they withheld their fire. Differing reasons have been advanced for this anomaly. On the one hand, if they were not ready, then the Soviets were premature in revealing their medium-range ballistic missiles on October 14, thereby indicating perhaps a construction slippage or poor phasing between completion of the surface-to-air missile sites and the ballistic missile sites.

Conversely, if they were operational, but withheld their fire, then it is surmised that the Russians displayed only the ballistic missile sites which they purposely wanted us to see, keeping in reserve, through deployment in caves or by camouflage, the genuine strategic weapons capability they sought to retain. One thing, however, is certain: These sites achieved a sufficient capability to take the life of Air Force Major Anderson, who piloted a U–2 over Cuba on October 27.

High-altitude photographic reconnaissance of Cuba continues on a regular basis, without interference. It is reasonable to believe that because the Soviet Union could not deliver on its guarantee of on-site inspection, due to Castro's adamant attitude, it is permitting aerial reconnaissance to continue without hindrance, in lieu of on-site inspection. While it is hardly an adequate substitute, we must not overlook the very significant fact that aerial reconnaissance, upon which we place so much reliance—perhaps even too much, can be denied to us at any time the Soviet Union tires of its permissive suffrance of these overflights. Moreover, there are indications that Cubans are being trained in the maintenance and operation of these surface-to-air missiles. Just how lenient or long-suffering Castro may be should his men take over these sites, remains to be seen. However, I cannot for a moment subscribe to the view, as some would have us do, that the presence of Soviet troops in Cuba is a mixed blessing, because they can control Castro's emotional and irrational actions. On the contrary, the Soviet presence in Cuba is simply intolerable to all patriotic Americans, all of whom are gradually coming to the realization that the threat of the Soviet presence in Cuba is so grave that, one way or another, sooner or later, it will have to be eradicated. The Cuban refugees and exiles share similar views.

Mr. President, I am personally distressed to hear the repeated accusations of obvious self-interest directed against the Cuban refugee and the continuing maligning of his character. Despite the fact that more than 168,000 Cuban refugees have either fled to or have settled in the greater Miami area, it is reported that there has been no increase in the crime rate there, nor has there been any recorded court case of juvenile delinquency or illegitimacy attributable to the Cuban exile. This, I think, is a commendable reflection upon the good morals, high standards, and sterling character of the Cuban refugee. Yet, whenever he expresses his opinion upon the necessity, for the good of the hemisphere, of getting rid of communism in Cuba, his motives are immediately impugned, because, as it is claimed, his only interest is to reacquire his wealth and possessions which have been confiscated or expropriated by the Cuban Communist regime.

While I am realistic enough to know that some of the Cuban refugees may be motivated by economic or political gain by the overthrow of Castro and the eradication of communism from Cuba, nevertheless, the overwhelming majority are interested in returning to a free and democratic Cuba. How can we condemn the Cuban patriotic fervor when our own independence was achieved by men of similar patriotism? Isn't it really the unlawful presence of Russians in this hemisphere that is the root of the problem when the claim is made that the Cuban exile is trying to dictate the foreign policy of the United States, that is, another United States-Soviet Union confrontation, coming about through raids and forays of Cuban exile organizations against Castro?

Having himself been a victim of a Communist takeover of his government, with its attendant repressions and tyranny, he is more keenly aware of the patterns and drift of events in Latin America, which reveal to him the subversions taking place in other governments. Moreover, his experience has awakened him to the fact that if democratic government is to survive, responsible citizens must take an active interest in it.

Having been far more accurate in his estimates of the situation during the military buildup in Cuba than was our own intelligence community, it may be well to listen more attentively to what he has to say today. He claims as follows:

First. Cuba is being used as the advanced Communist base for the subversion of Central America and South America in a scheme to isolate the United States.

Second, Castro's stature alone as one who has successfully defied the Colossus of the North is an unstabilizing factor in other Latin American governments.

Third. Because of the instability of governments caused by the influence of Castro on Latin America, people are transferring their wealth to the world capitals of governments outside Latin America at a rate faster than the Alliance for Progress can fill the vacuum from this flight of capital wealth. Consequently, the Alliance for Progress is doomed to failure so long as Castro and communism reign in Cuba.

Fourth. Strategic missiles are still in Cuba, either hidden in caves or adequately camouflaged against detection by U–2 aircraft; and Castro, therefore, still constitutes a definite military threat to the United States and the hemisphere.

Fifth. Russian combat troops in Cuba number about 35,000. Token numbers are withdrawn now and again, but thousands more are introduced surreptitiously.

Sixth. Castro cannot trust the reliability of his old rebel army of the Sierra Maestra or of his militia, but must rely on Russian troops to control and repress the Cuban populace.

Seventh. So long as Russian troops remain in Cuba, an uprising by the Cuban people could not possibly succeed; and a great fear of the Cuban exile is a repetition of the slaughter of Budapest.

Eighth. Executions are occurring at a rate conservatively estimated at 500 a month throughout the island. Most are killed right on the spot without benefit of trial even by the Communist kangaroo court system.

Ninth. The underground in Cuba is losing its effectiveness because of infiltration by Castro sympathizers and it is not receiving any support by the United States despite official hints and inferences to the contrary.

Tenth. The block informer or neighborhood vigilante holds the power of life and death over those persons living within his neighborhood. He has an unlimited franchise to murder.

Eleventh. Persons who make applications—after being encouraged to do so—for exit visas are immediately marked as enemies of the regime. Some are permitted to leave on extremely short notice provided they have sufficient assets to buy their way out. Permission is most frequently given if the refugee owns a house or an apartment to leave behind for Russians to occupy. The refugee is permitted to take with him merely the clothes he wears.

Twelfth. The Communists have encouraged the degeneration of moral standards particularly among the teenagers.

Thirteenth. Cuban exiles are very worried over the Communist indoctrination of Cuban youths and the problem they will present should Cuba ever be free again.

Fourteenth. "Each individual Cuban is himself a republic" so that the political factions and organizational rivalries among the exiles mean nothing to anyone who understands the Cuban temperament. They will unquestionably unite for the common goal of freeing Cuba upon the showing of strong, able leadership.

The recommendations of the Cuban refugees over how Cuba is to be freed are as varied as opinions held by Americans. They are confident that the Russian troops will never leave through diplomatic means. Their removal is of the first priority in freeing Cuba. Some, of course, advocate a complete blockade because by depriving Castro of oil, his country will grind to a halt in 6 weeks. Others recommend an invasion either by the United States in its own self-interest or invasion by a Latin army supported by the United States to avoid a direct United States soldier-Russian soldier confrontation.

All, however, are agreed, that paramilitary actions within Cuba and raids and excursions by Cuban exiles are a tremendous morale factor for the oppressed people of Cuba even though these raids, undertaken at tremendous personal risk, do not result in any massive destruction.

By those who seek justification for cracking down on the Cuban exile raids, it is claimed that legally they are in violation of our neutrality laws if they originate from U.S. soil. It is known among Cubans in Miami that prior to the crackdown, our Central Intelligence Agency was supporting these exile raids by furnishing money and equipment to exile organizations for that purpose. What was the attitude then of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the Immigration Service or the Coast Guard toward violations of neutrality laws condoned and supported by another Government agency?

There are many questions which have yet to be explained and answered to a concerned and much confused citizenry. Ultimately, the full story surrounding our actions and inactions concerning Cuba will be told. The invasion at the Bay of Pigs, the question of news management during the crisis, the guarantee of onsite inspection apparently given in exchange for our pledge not to invade or to permit anyone else to invade, the relationship, if any, between Cuba and withdrawing our missiles from Turkey and Italy and the recent crackdown and betrayal of Cuban exiles whom we actively supported previously—even worse the utterly malicious attacks and aspersions cast upon the character of these courageous people.

The American people are generally frustrated and ashamed over the vacillation and inaction of our Nation toward the criminals and murderers ensconced in Cuba who daily flaunt their audacity at the mightiest Nation on this earth. That the Latin will follow a strong and forceful leader is not open to debate particularly since the unanimous support given by all Latin American governments to the President's firm stand. However, their despair in witnessing this Nation seemingly gravitating toward coexistence and acceptance of communism in this hemisphere will shortly, and inevitably lead to feelings of simple disgust.

How can these United States of America ever again claim to be the leader of the free world or ever hope to achieve the respect of other peoples so long as we tolerate—whether willingly or begrudgingly—the presence of this festering infection so very close to home?

We have been told that Cuba has another mixed blessing in that it is "a showcase of Communist failure" and that the Russians will find it much too costly to retain at a price of a million dollars a day, a mere pittance to the Soviets in the light of what is to be gained by subverting all of Latin America. Make no mistake about it, we are not containing Castro communism within the island of Cuba.

I maintain that Cuba today is more nearly a showcase of U.S. failures than a showcase of Russian failure—failure to insure the success of the Bay of Pigs invasion; failure to oust a foreign system from this hemisphere in accordance with any number of treaties, pacts, and agreements including, if you will, the Monroe Doctrine; failure to exert the dynamic leadership demanded of it by all Latin America and failure to realize the threat that is posed—not only to Cubans but to ourselves and this hemisphere—by the continuing presence of this alien system of treachery. It must and it will be eradicated else we shall all fall victims to it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mrs. SMITH. I am pleased to yield.

Mr. KEATING. I commend the distinguished Senator from Maine both for her constructive work on the committee—which in my judgment has performed a magnificent service for our Nation—and also for her forceful and forthright address in the Senate today. The Senator from Maine is well known as one who has studied our Nation's defenses for many years. She is as well informed on the subject as any other Member of this body. I believe the lessons which she has drawn and delineated in her address are some which we, those in the executive branch, and the American people can well take to heart.

When the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] was present, I said I was very gratified that the report was a unanimous report and that all members of the subcommittee were in agreement on the findings. That is very much in the national interest. It is very constructive.

The distinguished Senator has added helpful comments here today and has put the report in proper perspective. I congratulate her wholeheartedly on her address.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I thank the very distinguished Senator from New York. No one has had a better understanding of the Cuban crisis and the needs of our country with respect to clarifying the problems and bringing about assurance to the people of the United States so that there will be less confusion. I appreciate very much the comment of the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING]. He has made a very great contribution. When some people were doubting his word last fall, he was found to be right. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Senator from Maine.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the role.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, MAY 13, AT 11 A.M.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 4 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Monday, May 13, 1963, at 11 o'clock a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 9, 1963:

Comptroller of Customs

Frank H. Tuohy, of New Jersey, to be Comptroller of Customs, with headquarters at New York, N.Y.

National Science Foundation

Leland J. Haworth, of New York, to be Director of the National Science Foundation for a term of 6 years.

National Labor Relations Board

Arnold Ordman, of Maryland, to be General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board for a term of 4 years.

Public Health Service

The following candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations:

To be senior assistant surgeons

Eugene A. Arnold, Jr.
Jo Anne F. Holzman
Joseph T. English

To be assistant surgeons

David L. Child
John R. Furman
Allan L. Brakensiek
Robert K. Heide
George A. Reich

To be senior assistant dental surgeons

Raymond E. Goepfrich
Richard D. Lowe
Terrance W. Baker

To be assistant dental surgeons

Richard P. Frank
Richard F. Rappl
Robert F. Williams
Sheppard M. Levine
Charles A. Borgman
Paul J. Carr
James C. Dunkel
John A. Matis
Jack L. Cox
Paul J. Heins
Bruce R. Thorburn
Louis S. Vodzak
William S. Driscoll
Stephen J. Christensen
Joseph Schwartz
Fred D. Greenblatt
Robert H. Dumbaugh

To be assistant sanitary engineer

Vincent P. Barnaba

To be junior assistant sanitary engineers

Donald S. Baker
Robert L. Thoem
Joseph R. Tynsky

To be senior assistant sanitarian

William P. Wollschlager

To be assistant sanitarian

Edwin J. Heidig

To be senior assistant veterinary officers

Arnold F. Kaufmann
Melvin J. Worth, Jr.
Donald D. Smith.

To be assistant veterinary officers

Albert S. Ricker
John G. Orthoefer
Larry T. Grubbs

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Israel Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, and as an American who has descended from forebearers who migrated to this land which has enjoyed independence for almost 200 years, I welcome the opportunity to hail the approaching 15th year of Israel independence, a sovereign state of progressive people.

In many ways, the State of Israel may be considered as a diminutive United States. Within its 7,882.6 square miles, are found mountains and deserts, lakes and rivers, gorges, coastal plains and inland valleys. There are copper mines, steel mills, oil refineries, and phosphate plants. Its Government is democratic and is pledged to the principles of liberty, justice, and peace. Furthermore, the citizens of Israel have political equality, regardless of religion, race, or sex, and freedom of religion and education.

The greatest similarity between this new nation, which is celebrating its 15th year of independence, and the United States, is the people. Both nations were built by immigrants who traveled to a new land of promise from all parts of the globe. One hundred and two countries are now represented in the development of this modern State of the Middle East, one which is regarded as progressive, dynamic, and stable.

The rapid increase of immigrants, however, since the founding of the State, resulted in continuous hardships for the Government, which, if the country were to survive, had to be solved. Unemployment, housing shortages, and insufficient food caused the Israeli leaders to call upon the United States for succor. The request was readily complied with and continues today in the form of development loans. Since the inception of the American aid programs, Israel has received approximately $880 million. With these funds, the Government has built roads, schools, health facilities, factories, and towns. It has fed the hungry, supported the unemployed, and settled the immigrant.

It was money well spent by us and wisely used by the recipients for the greatest benefit to the most people in this new promised land. The most appropriate use of foreign aid money by Israel could well have served as a model for other recipient nations to follow.

Although assistance is still received from the United States, Israel has begun a technical assistance program of its own. With a minimum of expenditures, its development programs to other underdeveloped countries of the world has gained for this Nation many friends and allies. Schools are playing the greatest part in these projects since, from Israeli institutions venture experts and instructors to requesting nations, to help solve development problems arising from independence. Furthermore, to these institutions come the promising young people of these underdeveloped nations, who desire to acquire learning and methods which have proved so successful in the rapid modernization of Israel.

The adaptation to the problems of Israel and the desire for learning to keep pace with the modern growth of the new nation, as demonstrated by immigrants to Israel from all over the world, is but paralleled by our own immigrants of Jewish faith since the early days of the founding of this Nation. They, and those who have followed in posterity, as well as more recent immigrants who fled or survived persecution in other lands, have contributed immensely to the growth, welfare, and tremendous progress of these great United States.

They have distinguished themselves in the professions, the sciences and arts, in the fields of government and commerce, and last but not least in the welfare movements for the benefit of fellowmen. Blessed with an unquenchable thirst for knowledge, the benefits derived therefrom has flown forth in the interest of all mankind.

My own city of Philadelphia represents a typical example where the people of Jewish faith, immigrant and nativeborn, have taken their rightful place in the ranks of good citizens, with a zeal for active participation in the building and strengthening of the community life in a great metropolitan area. It is in this fulfillment of civic pride and civic duty, and a genuine desire to help their fellow citizens enjoy a full life that is repeated all over this land, and has been reflected in the progress of Israel for the past 15 years.

Israel's declaration of independence on May 14, 1948, under our calendar, was the result of years of hard work, of disappointments and unfulfilled promises, of politics and campaigns. Yet, when promulgated, it was the fulfillment of the dreams of world Jewry for a national homeland, a place with which to be identified, a refuge from centuries of persecution and tyranny. And so it is with pride that we salute the citizens of Israel as they celebrate their most treasured remembrance, the anniversary of their independence.

Rumanian Holiday Observance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, for many decades May 10 has been a traditional holiday for the people of Rumania. Because their homeland is now occupied, the holiday can only be observed openly by Rumanians outside the country's borders and in the hearts of those still in their native land.

Even though another official holiday has been declared by the occupying forces the importance of the May 10 date cannot be overshadowed. Rumania's independence of the past is a proud memory in the hearts and minds of all Rumanians and this day is a symbol which encourages these people to retain the faith and hope that freedom will once again return to their homeland.

I am proud to join with freedom-loving people everywhere in saluting these courageous people and to assure them that their cause has not been forgotten.

Writing to Your Congressman: The Way and the Wherefore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE]. The article is full of excellent advice. I commend it to every Member of the House—and to our constituents:

WRITING TO YOUR CONGRESSMAN: THE WAY AND THE WHEREFORE

Any newspaper reporter—whether he be a potential Walter Lippmann still admiring his framed journalism degree or an experienced political analyst in Washington—is familiar with the famous five "W's." Answers to the five questions—who, why, what, when, and where—are the ingredients of a good news story.

Curiously enough, the five "W's" can also be applied to the important business of writing to your Congressman.

The answers to the first two, "who" and "why," nibble at the very roots of American democracy. Every citizen has a right to representation, and his Congressman in Washington is elected to preserve and extend those rights. It is perfectly clear, then, that every citizen has (to coin a phrase) a right to write.

The best reason for writing to your Congressman is to make sure that he is, in fact, representing you and will continue to work diligently for the best interests of both his district and the Nation. Don't forget either that your Congressman represents all the people of his district regardless of their political party. Though your views on some issues might differ, he will still be interested in hearing from you.

"What" should you write your Congressman about? This is a difficult question, and the obvious answer may be the best one. You should write when you are deeply affected by an issue or a bill before the Congress. Chances are—if you actually take the time and trouble to write—you believe deeply in a particular viewpoint or bill. You are expressing the innate desire of man to be understood, to communicate, and to have a voice in all decisions affecting his future.

This said, it is best to write your Congressman as though you were talking to him in person. You should be straightforward, sincere, and brief. A good crisp letter which explains your position in four or five solid paragraphs is more effective than a rambling, three- or four-page speech which exhausts both you and the Congressman. In deciding what to write, individuality should be the first consideration. Your Representative wants to know what you feel as a voter and a citizen.

Your Congressman, naturally, is interested in those local problems which relate to the Federal Government. While he always wants to hear about specific bills before the Congress, he also wants to know how you feel about such important matters as civil rights, foreign affairs, and domestic issues that are not voted on daily, except indirectly. Another thing to remember is that a vast number of issues involve State and local governments and have no relation to the Federal Government. Make certain that the man to whom you write is the one who can be of help to you. Your Congressman can be of little real assistance, for example, in improving the effectiveness of local police. This is strictly a municipal or county matter.

The question of "when" is also vital, as timing always is. A quarterback calls his signals on Saturday and not on Monday. After one game is over, he must begin preparing for the next. Similarly, the time to write is during the strategic preparation stages before a vote of the full House is taken. Obviously, it doesn't mean much to "Monday morning quarterback" a measure after it has been voted on.

Finally, everyone knows "where" to write his Congressman, but often people fail to realize that many have offices in their districts. Find out where his office is and try to meet him. I, for instance, hold office hours in the larger cities and towns as often as possible and maintain a congressional office in my hometown.

A few hints may be in order now that general answers have been suggested for the five "W's." Four basic essentials to keep in mind are: (1) Know what you are talking about; (2) tell your Congressman how the proposed legislation will affect you and your business; (3) believe in the value of a personal letter rather than a form or petition; and (4) don't forget to write legibly and always include your address, even on petitions. This can save both time and temper and assures an answer. Above all, remember that more meaning will be placed on the sincere, individual approach. It is possible that one forthright letter will be more valuable than 10 signatures scribbled on a petition or 20 form letters.

A Congressman receives up to 275 letters a day when pressing issues confront the Nation, with a daily average of 150 letters. Since January 9 of this year, my office has answered 125 pieces of mail each day, in spite of the fact that no major legislation is pending as yet. So you can see how important every minute becomes. More than ever before, a Congressman spends his time helping you—his constituents—bridge the growing gap between the individual and ever-increasing big Government.

To conclude on a personal note, I encourage the closest possible ties with the people of my district. I want to see them when they are in Washington and talk with them at home. When this is not possible, I ask them to write whenever they wish. I am happy to report that the response has been enthusiastic.

In this way, I feel that I am discharging a portion of my responsibilities in the proper manner. I think that I can sensibly judge the thinking and sometimes actually feel the pulse of my district. Only in this way can a Congressman truly represent his people as their agent and deputy before the highest legislative tribunal in the land.

Civil Rights, United States of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, the Nation has great reason to be troubled and concerned about what is happening in certain areas of the United States over the denial of constitutional rights.

Open warfare between peaceful demonstrators for basic and simple constitutional rights and officials whose duty it is to uphold these same rights is an incident we cannot ignore.

It is unnecessary to enumerate the acts of violence and denials that daily occur. They have become common knowledge to every schoolchild and every man and woman in our country. Unfortunately, this evening's newspaper will add additional stories; more of us will become emotional, some sadder, and a few will calmly question their civic responsibilities and moral duties.

Aside from the purely human suffering and costly waste of resources in areas that can ill afford more disabilities, the threat to our national leadership and our moral and legal codes poses an even greater challenge.

Well may we recall the words of Mr. Justice Brandeis:

> In a government of laws, existence of the government will be imperiled if it fails to observe the law scrupulously. Our government is the potent, omnipresent teacher. For good or for ill, it teaches the whole people by its example. Crime is contagious. If the government becomes a lawbreaker, it breeds contempt for law; it invites every man to become a law unto himself; it invites anarchy.

Strangely enough, the issue is really not whether we have the basic power to act, or the need. Never before in our national existence have we been more fortified for this moment in history.

Our great judiciary has given new meaning to long cherished ideas of constitutional law, the concept of law both as a shield to protect the innocent and as a dynamic force in modern industrial societies to move us forward.

In recent years we have moved on many fronts to gain acceptance of equality of opportunity as a basic part of the American way of life. In some 20 States, we have passed fair employment practices laws covering over 112 million Americans. In State after State we have moved to desegregate schools and other public facilities.

These and other examples of progress and civil rights, however, must be viewed as the belated accomplishment of what we concluded to be part of our goals over a hundred years ago. Viewed in this light we must learn to understand the impatience to be free, the practical necessity to engage in a gainful occupation, and the urgency to live in human dignity. Little children want education now, men must have jobs to maintain their families now, citizens want to vote in elections now. Human dignity calls for respect now.

Also, whether we like it or not, we have reached a stage in Government responsibility when we must question our own legislative intent and fiscal integrity.

Does the constitutional prohibition against discrimination run throughout the text of every statute which we enact?

If it does—and who will contend we can enact laws otherwise—then our intent is being flouted, with our indulgence, by those who use the law to discriminate in schools, vocational education, libraries, and other Government facilities and services.

We might well recall the words so well spoken that those who dip their hands in the public treasury should not object if a little democracy sticks to their fingers.

If we can spend taxpayers' money to support violations of constitutional provisions and in the face of open defiance of Federal court orders, do we not harm our own fiscal integrity, and allow room in our conduct for other abuses of public funds?

These are but a few of the serious questions raised by events now occurring in our land. Responsible men, both North and South, must give the answers. We have in this Congress many such men. Let us hope that these leaders, not the demagogues, bigots and the extremists, provide the leadership for our great country by proceeding to counsel with each other, and acting on the many measures already introduced in this Congress to uphold our concepts of justice expressed in the Declaration of Independence, the Bill of Rights, the Federal and most State constitutions.

Results of Poll Taken in the Sixth Congressional District of Washington State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I recently mailed questionnaires to 45,000 residents of my congressional district, which includes all of Pierce County and all of Kitsap County with the exception of Bainbridge Island. It contained 10 questions dealing with issues pending before Congress.

The names of the individuals receiving the questionnaires were selected at random from lists which gave no indication of the political leanings of those people. The number of recipients and the number of returns were sufficiently large to give assurance that a good cross-section opinion of my constituency would be obtained.

To date there has been a much better than average response, indicating an increased interest on the part of my people in the affairs of government. I have received thus far responses from 17 percent of the people who received questionnaires. More returns are expected, of course, but a sufficient number have now been received to determine the general views of the people of my area. I am sure that their opinions will be of interest to the other Members of the House.

A few people have asked why I have sent out questionnaires. The English statesman, Edmund Burke, in 1774 perhaps supplied one answer. He said in a speech to his people:

> It ought to be the happiness and glory of a representative to live in the strictest union, the closest correspondence, and the most unreserved communication with his constituents. Their wishes ought to have great weight with him; their opinion high respect; their business unremitted attention. It is his duty to sacrifice his repose, his pleasures, his satisfaction to theirs; and above all, ever, and in all cases, to prefer their interests to his own.

The results of the poll expressed in terms of percentages are as follows:

Results of poll taken in the 6th Congressional District of Washington State

[In percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion
1. The estimated Federal deficit for fiscal year 1963 is $8,800,000,000. The estimated deficit for fiscal 1964 is $11,900,000,000. In view of these figures do you believe there should be a general tax cut this year?	34	60	6
2. If a general tax cut is made, do you believe it should be accompanied by a reduction in Federal expenditures?	83	10	7
3. Do you favor medical care for people over 65 by—			
(a) Increasing the social security taxes upon employees and employers?	34	40	4
(b) Promoting a Blue Cross type plan whereby the Federal Government would assume full financial responsibility only for persons below a certain income level?	35	35	6
(c) Expanding the present Federal-State (Kerr-Mills) legislation	23	23	16
4. Do you favor continuance of our foreign assistance program at its present level of about $4,000,000,000 annually?	21	69	10
5. Do you believe that the Cuban situation has been adequately dealt with by our Government?	24	64	12
6. Should the United States continue its membership in the United Nations?	71	19	10
7. Should the House Committee on Un-American Activities be continued?	73	14	13
8. Do you favor the establishment of a Domestic Peace Corps?	40	40	20
9. Do you favor Federal financial aid for—			
(a) Elementary and secondary school construction	44	48	8
(b) Elementary and secondary teachers' salaries	23	66	11
(c) Construction of university facilities	40	41	19
10. Would you favor legislation giving the President more flexibility in handling national emergency strikes by providing back-to-work injunctions and compulsory arbitration machinery?	60	30	10

James N. Milne

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute, to one of the most devoted and dedicated employees this House of Representatives has ever had, James N. Milne, of Fall River, Mass.

Jim is retiring after 38 years of service as administrative assistant to our beloved former Speaker, Joseph W. Martin, Jr., of Massachusetts. This may well be the longest continuous relationship between a Congressman and his assistant in the long history of this body. Certainly, it is a record that reflects favorably upon Jim Milne, upon Congressman Martin, and upon this House.

Jim Milne was a young Fall River newspaperman back in 1924 when Joe Martin first ran for Congress. He believed in this young politician, and he worked for him. He went to Washington with him when Congress convened in March of 1925 and he has been here, working with Congressman Martin, ever since.

He was at his side when our beloved former leader rose to the high honor of being elected Speaker of this House, and he was with him at several national conventions of the Republican Party when Joe Martin presided as chairman of the convention. He not only sat by the side of history; he has helped to make it.

Jim's retirement is now official, but I would like the Congressional Record to show this tribute to him, for his lifetime of public service, for his help to many of us, for all that he has added to the good name of this honorable body.

Cotton Bill Introduced

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a new cotton bill. It proposes to remove the inequity of the two-price cotton system and to protect the income of cotton producers. Moreover, it would mean great savings on prices paid by consumers for cotton goods.

I emphasize especially the provision for small farms. The bill provides that each farmer will get a price support of up to 10 percent above the general support level. This will cover the total production of approximately 75 percent of all cotton producers. In some States where there are numerous small farms, more than 90 percent of the producers grow 15 bales or less. In my own State of North Carolina, which has more small farms than any other State, the income of 95 percent or more of our cotton farmers will be fully protected under the small farm provision.

Mr. Speaker, with the consent of the House, I am publishing in the Congressional Record a press statement I issued today upon the introduction of the cotton bill.

The statement follows:

> COOLEY INTRODUCES NEW COTTON BILL
>
> Chairman Harold D. Cooley, of the House Committee on Agriculture, introduced in the House today a new cotton bill, aimed at enabling cotton to compete fairly with synthetic fibers and improving the competitive position of domestic mills against imports of cheap foreign cotton goods.
>
> The legislation would make American cotton available to domestic mills at world cotton prices, provide a special price protection for small cotton farms, and launch a crash research program to reduce the cost of producing cotton.
>
> Upon introducing the bill, Mr. Cooley stated:
>
> "Agriculture is the biggest business in America in dollar value involved and people employed, and the cotton industry is the biggest part of American agriculture. Perhaps more than 10 million persons, almost one-sixth of the Nation's labor force, is engaged in the production of cotton, in ginning, marketing, transporting, milling, and in the manufacture and merchandising of cotton goods.
>
> "Cotton now is in a life and death struggle.
>
> "A flood of cheap textiles is flowing in from abroad, displacing the goods produced by our own workers and demoralizing the domestic markets for our textile industry.
>
> "Synthetic fibers make devastating inroads into markets where cotton never before has been seriously challenged.
>
> "I am sure that the cotton industry recognizes the amount of work the Committee on Agriculture has done and the time spent in attempting to arrive at a solution to the cotton problem. Our Cotton Subcommittee, headed by the Honorable E. C. Gathings, of Arkansas, started hearings early in December and we have continued meetings with all segments of the cotton industry, up to this very moment.
>
> "Early in this session of the Congress I introduced a very simple bill to remove the two-price cotton system—wherein foreign mills obtain our cotton at a much cheaper price than our own domestic mills—and thus

enable cotton to compete more fairly with synthetic fibers and improve the competitive position of American mills against imports of foreign cotton goods.

"Controversy developed around this legislation, and around other bills which would have permitted the overplanting of allotted acres where a producer was willing to take the world price for cotton produced on the acreage planted in addition to his allotment.

"I then personally sought to bring all elements of the industry, and the administration, into agreement.

"Based on my conversations with producers, the trade and the mills, legislative language was drawn together. This language, in bill draft form, was submitted to the Department of Agriculture for comment, and it was discussed among all elements of the industry, and was considered at a meeting of cotton producers at Memphis on last Monday.

"The bill I introduced today represents the broadest area of possible agreement I have been able to find. This is not exclusively my bill, but it simply represents my best effort to present the thinking developed in my search for a basis of unity among the producers, the trade and the mills, behind legislation which will deal effectively with the very serious problem that confronts cotton and the millions of people associated with cotton.

"There appears to be unanimity of opinion that the payment-in-kind section is the best approach to removing the two-price system, with all its inequities. The mills and the administration are in agreement on this.

"Moreover, there seems to be unanimous support for the crash research on the reduction of cotton production costs.

"I believe that the provision for protection of the smaller farms will receive very general support.

"However, differences developed among producers on a provision in an earlier draft of the bill that would have permitted producers to plant up to 30 percent above their acreage allotments, at world prices for the cotton produced on the extra acres, if such would not increase the stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation. This provision has been omitted from the bill I have introduced.

"I reemphasize to all people associated with cotton the urgency of our situation. Cotton is losing its markets, and once lost they may never be regained. This is hurting everyone concerned with cotton. I am hopeful that the industry—producers, the mills and the trade—will develop solidarity behind this legislation to deal with the crisis we confront."

A concise summary of the bill follows:

PAYMENTS-IN-KIND

The Commodity Credit Corporation, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, would be authorized:

(1) From the date of enactment, until August 1, 1964, to make payments through the issuance of payment-in-kind certificates to persons other than producers in such amounts and subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines will eliminate inequities due to the differences in the cost of raw cotton between domestic and foreign users of cotton;

(2) For the period beginning August 1, 1964, and ending July 31, 1967, such payments-in-kind shall be made to persons other than producers in an amount as will make such cotton available for domestic use at a price which is not in excess of the price at which such cotton is made available for export; and

(3) Payments-in-kind also would be provided to make raw cotton in inventory on the date of enactment available for consumption at prices consistent with the purposes of the legislation.

Thus the Secretary of Agriculture would be given discretion in determining the level of payments-in-kind prior to August 1, 1964, but after that date and until July 31, 1967, he would be directed to make such payments in the amount necessary to make cotton available to American mills at the same price American cotton is offered for export. Under the current cotton export program, American cotton is offered for export at 8½ cents per pound lower than the price domestic mills must pay.

SMALL FARM PROVISION

For the 1964, 1965, and 1966 crops of cotton, the Secretary may on up to the first 15 bales of each farmer's production increase the price support up to a level 10 percent in excess of the basic level of price support not in excess of the level of price support in effect for the remainder of the crop, but for the 1963 crop. This would be carried out through simultaneous purchase and sale or similar operations in order to keep such cotton to the maximum extent practicable in the normal commercial channels of trade. This will not involve any direct payments to farmers.

RESEARCH

The Secretary is authorized and directed to conduct a special cotton research program designed to reduce the cost of producing upland cotton at the earliest practicable date, using up to $10 million annually for this purpose. The Secretary then would make such reductions in the level of price support as will reflect reductions in the costs of producing cotton.

UNRESTRICTED SALES

Beginning August 1, 1964, the Commodity Credit Corporation would be authorized to sell upland cotton for unrestricted use at not less than 105 percent of the current loan rate plus reasonable carrying charge. Such sales from CCC stocks for unrestricted use now can be made at not less than 115 percent of the current loan rate.

Rumanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, among the national holidays of the world, Rumania's must surely be considered one of the most remarkable, for on May 10 in 1866, 1877, and 1881 three milestones were passed in the country's drive for independence.

On May 10, 1866, the Rumanian dynasty was founded when Charles of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen, a member of the Prussian royal family, was proclaimed Prince of Rumania. This event marked the successful outcome of the nation's long fight for the right to elect a prince from one of the nonneighboring royal families as its sovereign. Such a disinterested ruler was needed in order to end the strife and rivalry among Rumanian candidates to the throne and thereby insure a greater degree of unity.

In 1859 the two Provinces of Moldavia and Wallachia had been able to unite under the Rumanian Prince Alexander Cuza as a result of Russia's defeat in the Crimean War and the support of France. It was not until 1866 that the inauguration of a foreign prince was made possible through the intercession of Napoleon III. A nearly unanimous referendum held in the two Provinces elected Charles Hohenzollern, and on the tenth of May he took the oath to a liberal constitution which had recently been adopted. He was also formally invested by the Turkish sultan, who still held suzerainty over the two Provinces. The European powers now joined Turkey in recognizing the union of Wallachia and Moldavia as the Principality of Rumania.

On May 10, 1877, Rumania took advantage of the Russo-Turkish War to break away from the Ottoman Empire. She declared her independence, entered the war on Russia's side, and made a substantial contribution to the defeat of Turkey.

In 1878 the Congress of Berlin recognized Rumania's independence, but the European powers ignored her claim to the predominantly Rumanian Province of Bessarabia. This area, which Russia had been forced to return to Rumania after the Crimean War, was now restored to Russia.

Another landmark in Rumania's history was reached on May 10, 1881, when she was recognized as a sovereign kingdom and Charles was crowned the first King of Rumania. Finally, the events of World War I enabled Rumania to complete her national unification with the addition of Bessarabia and the remainder of Dobruja, Bukovina, and Transylvania.

Rumania has unfortunately lost the sovereign independence for which she struggled for more than half a century. A victim of Russia's historic drive to dominate the Balkans, Rumania is now a satellite in the Communist bloc.

Yet the great national tradition which the events of May 10 symbolize renews our hopes each year that the Rumanian people will once again be able to take the helm of their ship of state.

The Wilderness Which Will Endure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, once again the Congress will consider wilderness legislation. I, along with many others, support the principle of setting aside such areas. There is, however, a matter that concerns me. That is the method which would be used to designate our wilderness areas.

It is my belief Congress should have this responsibility. There are others who agree, including Mr. H. R. Glascock, Jr., who is associated with the Western Forestry and Conservation Association.

Mr. Speaker, in a speech before the National Wool Growers Association early this year, Mr. Glascock presented some of the dangers involved in allowing the executive branch to have free reign to determine what should and what should not be designated wilderness. Also, he presented many strong arguments for restoring to the Congress its constitutional responsibilities with respect to public lands.

His speech, Mr. Speaker, should interest each Member of Congress. Therefore, under leave to extend my remarks, I include it in the Record.

The speech follows:

The Wilderness Which Will Endure

(By H. R. Glascock, Jr.)

I count it a real honor and privilege to address the members of the National Wool Growers Association who play such an important part in clothing and feeding the Nation. You, like other resources industries, are a service industry providing basic needs of people. Your products enhance our standard of living. Your profits, if any, contribute to building up the land and supporting schools and Government. By use of soil and toil you have helped keep America strong and free. Your part in conservation, like that of other practical conservationists, is to demonstrate that man can use the land and its renewable resources without using them up.

I have been asked to speak to you on the outlook for wilderness legislation. It no longer is meaningful to refer to the wilderness bill. There are two completely different bills and there may well be more before this matter is settled. Furthermore, the subject of wilderness withdrawals is a part of the larger legislative problem of public land withdrawals in general. Of special interest to this convention is the fact that most withdrawals involve grazing in one form or another. When a Secretary of Agriculture or Interior can sign away at the stroke of a pen millions of acres of public lands for exclusive-use reservations, it is something for Congress to worry about; to ask itself if it has overdelegated authority invested in it by the Constitution.

PROBLEM OF ADMINISTRATIVE WITHDRAWALS

Such large administrative assignments of Federal lands to limited use are not engaged in by secretaries from only one political party. Outgoing Secretary of the Interior Seaton 2 years ago penned the proclamation of a 9-million-acre national game range in the Brooks Range of Alaska over the protests of the State's Governor and congressional delegation. And just the other day Secretary of Agriculture Freeman inked the order creating the largest national forest wilderness area in the United States—the 1¼-million-acre Selway-Bitterroot. This dedication is half again as large as that recommended by the local Inland Empire multiple use committee and exceeds the Forest Service's own proposal by some 77,000 acres.

National monuments and many other types of withdrawals can also be created by Executive proclamation. Even Congress has difficulty getting one "unproclamated." Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture have a fondness for this authority and have opposed its discontinuance by Congress. They can be expected to continue to do so.

FIRST THINGS FIRST

Congressman Wayne Aspinall, chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, put the whole problem into focus in a letter to President Kennedy of October 15. He wrote:

"Dear Mr. President: Because of your frequently expressed interest in extension of conservation measures to our public lands and passage of legislation to provide for preservation of wilderness areas, it is suggested that your Office may be able to facilitate action on these matters during the 88th Congress after it convenes in January 1963.

"The core of the controversy surrounding these problems is the degree of responsibility and authority to be exercised by the legislative and executive branches. This has been the main issue in legislation that has been proposed relative to withdrawal, restriction, and use of public lands as well as in the approach to designating areas to be preserved as wilderness.

"Last year, after receiving conflicting reports from the executive agencies involved, we asked the Bureau of the Budget for the administration's viewpoint. The Committee was advised that the Bureau of the Budget had no objection to legislation that would require an act of Congress for each withdrawal, reservation, or restriction of public lands as embodied in certain bills then pending before Congress. However, we have continued to receive unfavorable comments from other agencies on each of several bills that have been submitted suggesting alternative approaches to the problem.

"I think that any student of the public lands situation will recognize that we have reached a point where it is essential to establish clear-cut legislative guidelines concerning the management, use, and disposition of our public lands. This has come about because of past inaction of Congress, coupled with the growing scarcity of land in the United States and the parallel need to preserve some of our undisturbed areas in their natural setting. While all these matters are intertwined, I have come to the realization that first things should come first. Accordingly, I think that we should, in the interest of orderliness, take up the matter of congressional-executive relationships first; when that question has been settled through the enactment of legislation setting up a pattern for future guidelines we can then immediately turn our attention to wilderness preservation.

"Since we have failed to come up with a formula that can be accepted among all the administrative agencies, we earnestly invite you to submit to the 88th Congress your views as to legislation that would permit Congress to fulfill its constitutional responsibility to make rules governing the use and disposition of Federal property and at the same time not hamper the effective administration of that property in accordance with the time honored conservation principle of effecting the maximum good for the maximum number.

"For my part, I assure you that I shall cooperate to every extent possible to arrive at a mutually satisfactory procedure at an early date, after which I will, within that concept, work earnestly and diligently for the establishment of wilderness preservation areas as a part of our natural heritage.

"Sincerely yours,

"Wayne Aspinall."

UNIFORM PROCEDURES FOR WITHDRAWALS

Now in this letter, Chairman Aspinall was being quite modest. For he and his committee have already come a long way toward a reasonable solution to the problem of public land withdrawals for limited use, including wilderness. After lengthy and objective hearings and intensive study, they drafted and approved a bill late in the last Congress which would, for the first time, establish uniform procedures for withdrawals of public lands for any purpose, specifying acts of Congress for those over 5,000 acres. It is well to recall that national parks have always been created by acts of Congress. Wilderness reservations are singled out for special treatment in the second part of the bill, which students of public lands may feel is unnecessary or superfluous. This was done to give immediate statutory designation to 6.8 million acres of administratively dedicated wilderness, wild, and canoe lands on the national forests.

This House measure, then, can be called a wilderness bill, though it is a much more far-reaching piece of legislation. It is sure to be reintroduced in the 88th Congress. It will pose an embarrassment for many preservation leaders, since it constitutes an extension of the Engle Act which they persuasively supported in the 84th and 85th Congresses. Engaged in promoting the old wilderness system bill now, they have already labeled the new House bill as scuttling tactics.

PRESERVATION LEADERS SUPPORTED PRINCIPLE

Let us see how the testimony of preservation and wildlife leaders before the House Interior Committee in 1955, 1956, and 1957 supports enactment of the new wilderness bill developed by that committee. Mr. Howard Zahniser, executive secretary of the Wilderness Society, who is usually credited with authorship of the original wilderness system bill, told the committee at its hearings on March 16, 1956, relative to withdrawal and utilization of the public lands:

"Now, as I understand your concern here, you are going further along that same line of trying to establish a firm policy with regard to our public lands. I do not think there is anything that you can devote your attention to that is more timely and that is more likely to be of permanent benefit to the public. * * * We are at the place where we need to take a good look at our public land policies and determine what we are going to have for the future for some of these uses that will not be available if we do not exercise the foresight. * * * I anticipate being in a position of supporting the proposals that I understand the committee is going to make."

Mr. J. W. Penfold, conservation director of the Izaak Walton League of America, who has been discrediting the new wilderness bill which extends the Engle Act, wrote House Interior Committee Chairman Engle on March 14, 1956 for the hearing record as follows:

"The military seems to have shown a bland disregard of the multiple natural resource values pertaining to the lands they seek for their own single purposes. The military has already had withdrawn vast areas. Is the fullest utilization being made of them? Is there coordination among the various services in the use of these lands jointly? The record doesn't show this to be the case. Shouldn't this kind of multiple use be a firm part of policy?

"We earnestly and respectfully urge your committee, Mr. Engle, to seek, formulate, and adopt a policy applicable to military withdrawals which will protect resources, preserve, insofar as possible, the opportunity for their proper utilization and which guarantee that no withdrawal or extension of a withdrawal will be granted prior to full consideration of all elements and interests and precise evaluation of the resources and uses affected. And further, a policy which will insure that every other possibility is thoroughly explored before additional lands are withdrawn."

Mr. Fred M. Packard, executive secretary of the National Parks Association, was asked by Chairman Engle at the hearings on March 16, 1956:

"The legislation currently being drafted would * * * provide that major withdrawal must be submitted to the Congress. * * * Do you feel without seeing the legislation and committing yourself to the terminology of it, that the general principles of that sort of legislation are sound?"

Mr. Packard replied:

"Would that legislation have an effect on the application of the Antiquities Act to the establishment of national monuments? * * * That is not a withdrawal in the usual sense of the word. That is one factor we would have to consider. Other than that, I would say emphatically we would support such legislation."

On May 24, 1956 Mr. Packard wrote Chairman ENGLE:

"By formal resolution, the board of trustees stated the support of the National Parks Association for your bill H.R. 10371 and other similar bills, which would return to the Congress the control over withdrawals and reservations made for military purposes, at its annual meeting on May 10."

Again at the March 16, 1956, hearing, Congressman METCALF obtained similar approval from Mr. Charles Callison, then conservation director of the National Wildlife Federation, when he said:

"Pending before another committee is H.R. 5306 and related bills which would require congressional approval for the disposition of wildlife refuge land. This would be only a limited part of the land with which you are concerned in the legislation you are drafting. Mr. Callison and the organizations which he represents, as well as other conservation organizations, have declared themselves in favor of that legislation. I am sure they would be in favor of the broader legislation which would require congressional approval for all withdrawals."

Mr. Callison responded:

"Mr. Chairman, I should like to confirm what Congressman METCALF has said, and also to say in reply to your remarks a moment ago that the challenge which you have laid down to us is certainly a good one and we accept it.

"We have been intensely interested and have been greatly concerned for a number of years with the growing demands or requests of various agencies of the Government and especially the military departments for larger and larger withdrawals of the public lands. * * * We think there are several principles involved. We are pleased to see this committee and Congress going into this matter. One is the matter of the possibility of multiple use of these areas, including the opportunity of the growing army of sportsmen to utilize the game and fishery resources, and including also the important necessity for management of those resources by the proper State game-management agencies. * * * We think that certainly there should be an opportunity and the means for working out a multiple-use program with the military department.

"We have been pleased by discussions that we have heard about proposed legislation which may result from these hearings. * * * That would give Congress greater control over withdrawals of the public lands, and would set up a system for working out multiple-use possibilities on these lands and correct some of the other faults and, what seems to us, apparent abuses of the system of public land withdrawals.

"Just in principle and without having seen the proposed legislation, the National Wildlife Federation is for it and we hope it does come out of this committee. We certainly give it our enthusiastic support because we think it is greatly needed."

The March 16, 1956 hearing of the House Interior Committee also heard Mr. C. R. Gutermuth, vice president of the Wildlife Management Institute, testify:

"Several bills have been introduced in recent Congresses to overcome the inequity that follows the withdrawal of public lands for military purposes. These military reservations, with their vast size, oftentimes have become private hunting and fishing grounds for the military. * * * That protective legislation is needed is borne out by the thinking of several of the larger national conservation groups.

"In view of the tremendous number of acres of public lands that already have been withdrawn and reserved for military use, the Institute questions the necessity and advisability of the many additional requests that are being made. * * * Congress should be insisting that all of the services should be making greater combined and coordinated use of the lands already under military control."

And Mr. Gutermuth wrote Chairman ENGLE on April 16, 1956:

"It is hoped that prompt action can be given to H.R. 10371, and the other identical bills that call for congressional action on the withdrawal of public lands for defense purposes. The conservation forces feel that legislation is necessary to curb the continuing demand of the armed services for additional large blocks of Federal land, and you may be sure that the other urgently needed provisions in these bills will have widespread public support."

Chairman ENGLE questioned Mr. George Difani, executive secretary of the California Wildlife Federation, in this vein during the March 16, 1956, hearing:

"Would you say, Mr. Difani, that the California sportsmen and your organization in particular, would favor the general principle of restoring to the Congress control over the public land areas, with particular reference to these huge military reservations?"

Mr. Difani replied without equivocation:

"Yes. I am sure we favor that proposal."

On June 4, 1956, Mr. David R. Brower, executive director of the Sierra Club, wrote Congressman ASPINALL:

"This is to let you know that the Sierra Club approves in principle the bill you introduced which would require congressional action on withdrawals for defense purposes of more than 5,000 acres of land and water, and to require that hunting, fishing, and trapping on such areas be done in conformity with State laws."

GOVERNMENT OFFICERS SUPPORTED PRINCIPLE

In this and subsequent hearings on public land withdrawals during 1956 and 1957, which culminated in enactment of the legislation under consideration, the House Interior Committee recorded numerous supporting statements and letters from State and local outdoor and wildlife groups and State natural resource agencies. Nor was the proposal to put the brakes on administrative withdrawals of public lands without some support from Federal land administrators. At the February 20, 1956, hearing Chairman ENGLE asked Assistant Secretary of Interior Wesley A. D'Ewart, "It boils down to this, does it not? That the Congress through a failure to legislate and through establishment of precedents has for all practical purposes delegated the disposition of huge areas of the public domain to the executive branch?"

Mr. D'Ewart replied, "And I might also add, by action of the Supreme Court in upholding that action."

Chairman ENGLE asked, "In upholding what is regarded as congressional failure to challenge the precedents which have been established for public land withdrawals?"

Mr. D'Ewart replied, "That is correct."

And Congressman Stewart L. Udall of Arizona testified before the House Interior Committee hearing on June 11, 1956, regarding the military withdrawal bill, "I think this legislation is very definitely needed in our area, and I urge the Committee to act favorably with regard to it."

But on August 23, 1962, Secretary of Interior Stewart L. Udall told a news conference with respect to the new House wilderness bill employing the principle of the Engle Act for all public land withdrawals:

"It would greatly restrict and practically eliminate the power in the President which has really achieved great advances in conservation this century. This power has enabled the President to designate Federal lands as wildlife refuges and national monuments to preserve them for the public."

WIDE CONGRESSIONAL SUPPORT FOR PRINCIPLE

Now, all of these statements are a matter of public record contained in the records of the House Interior Committee hearings on the so-called Engle Act. They played a major role in the enactment of the legislation. They argue eloquently for a principle on public land withdrawals which cannot logically stop at defense withdrawals. They point up the inconsistency of many critics of the House Interior Committee approach. Succeeding Congresses have seen numerous bills with wide sponsorship in both Houses amending the Engle Act to require acts of Congress for public land withdrawals over 5,000 acres for any purpose. The concern over undue delegation of congressional responsibilities has been growing.

Last year the Fund for the Republic's Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions at Santa Barbara, Calif., published a paper by Charles A. Reich, associate professor of law at Yale, entitled "Bureaucracy and the Forests." Among other things, but illustrative of his thesis, Professor Reich states:

"In a democracy, laws and policies, including laws governing publicly owned resources, must theoretically be made in public by the people's elected representatives. But in today's overcomplicated world an overwhelmed Congress has been forced to delegate a large measure of legislative power to specialized executive and administrative agencies the officials of which are not elected or directly controlled by the people.

"When congressional relinquishment of the lawmaking function first assumed major proportions, in the early days of the New Deal, the Supreme Court tried to halt the trend. The Justices declared that legislative power cannot be delegated and that Congress can permit the executive agencies to make 'regulations' only within the boundaries of carefully prescribed standards. But growing Government soon broke through this retaining wall, and eventually the courts ceased to demand strict standards for delegation.

"The standards Congress has used to delegate authority over the forests are so general, so sweeping, and so vague as to represent a turnover of virtually all responsibility. 'Multiple use' does establish that the forests cannot be used exclusively for one purpose, but beyond this it is little more than a phrase expressing the hope that all competing interests can somehow be satisfied and leaving the real decisions to others. The 'relative values' of various resources are to be given 'due consideration,' but Congress has not indicated what those values are or what action shall be deemed 'due consideration'."

ENDURING WILDERNESS AREAS ARE DEFENSIBLE ONES

You may have noted that I have given as the title for these remarks, "The Wilderness Which Will Endure." If you interpret this that I am a wilderness lover and user, you are correct. It is my contention that the only roadless wilderness which will permanently endure is that which is carefully selected as being primarily valuable for this purpose; that which does not project out into productive areas needed by an expanding population struggling to maintain and increase its standard of living, from the land.

I am convinced that this kind of selectivity is not being achieved in wilderness establishment today any more than it was for military withdrawals before the Engle Act. No one argues convincingly that national parks have not been, and are not being, well protected under their separate acts of Congress and the generalized National Park Act. If the need then is for Congress, to have more say on wilderness, let us do it in this proven way and really require congressional scrutiny in the selection and guidance in administration.

THE NEED: A MAGNA CARTA FOR PUBLIC LANDS

The Aspinall bill would do this and restore to Congress its constitutional responsibilities with respect to public lands. The old wilderness system bill would merely give lipservice to congressional prerogatives by statutory endorsement of administrative selections as they are made. Congress could but tacitly approve or arduously veto executive branch withdrawals. These points are clarified in the authoritative chart prepared by the House Interior Committee entitled, "Background, Analysis, and Comparison of Major Provisions, Wilderness Preservation."

Now is the time and the opportunity to assist the evolution of wilderness legislation into a Magna Carta for the withdrawal and utilization of the public lands of the United States, using the principle so properly advanced by Clair Engle a few years ago.

Republican Women Hear Representative Ford Discuss Staffing, Managed News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, late last month, Republican women from throughout the country came to Washington to attend the annual Republican Women's Conference. One of the highlights of this year's conference was the speech by the gentleman from Michigan, the chairman of the House Republican conference, Mr. Ford. In his speech, the gentleman directed attention to two items of special importance to the group: the inadequacy of minority staffing in Congress and the management of news by the administration.

Gerry Ford made it quite clear that it is the American people who suffer when the Congressional minority is handicapped by inadequate staff help. He called attention to the excellent work of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Schwengel] in leading the effort to bring fair staffing to the Congress.

This speech makes some excellent points and I am taking this opportunity to expand its audience by placing it in the Congressional Record:

Address by Representative Gerald R. Ford, Republican Women's Conference, Sheraton Park Hotel, April 26, 1963.

Today I want to discuss two important issues being faced by the Republicans in the House of Representatives. One has to do with minority staffing of committees and the other with the withholding of vital information from the Congress by the executive branch of the Government.

Republicans in the House have moved ahead on several fronts in the early months of this Congress. The Republican conference has been put to new and potentially significant uses. We have appointed a Special Subcommittee on Nuclear Test Ban Negotiations under Congressman Craig Hosmer of California, the ranking Republican on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. The test-ban committee has received position papers from such distinguished experts as Edward Teller, former AEC Chairman Lewis Strauss, and Chief U.S. Disarmament Negotiator William C. Foster—and its reports have been given wide press coverage. We have also set up a Subcommittee on Increased Minority Staffing under Congressman Fred Schwengel, of Iowa.

At the opening of the Congress the conference adopted a package of fairplay amendments including a demand for equal time for the minority in debating conference committee reports. We didn't win that fight but we did put the Democratic leadership on notice that the minority was going to play a more active role in the future.

The Republicans on the House Appropriation Committee under a special committee headed by Congressman Bow, of Ohio, have reviewed the President's budget in detail with the assistance of former Budget Director Maurice Stans. The Republicans on Education and Labor and Judiciary have developed alternative Republican proposals in important legislative fields. The House Republican Policy Committee under the able leadership of Congressman John Byrnes of Wisconsin, has been doing an excellent job on the vital issues before us.

Yes, this has been a period of new Republican activity—of hard work in reviewing the Kennedy administration's proposals and in developing Republican alternatives. Our batting average has not been 100 percent but we expect to improve our percentage of success in the months ahead.

One of the most important problems we have tackled is the issue of minority staffing. All the rest of the work we are attempting to accomplish presupposes adequate professionally competent committee staff. There is a limit—a real limit—to how much an individual Congressman or group of Congressmen working in cooperation can accomplish in a given 24-hour period. Each of us has his constituency and its interests to serve. Just keeping abreast of our committee work—preparing for hearings, interrogating witnesses, drafting legislation and reports, handling bills on the floor is a full-time job. And then there are the inevitable social and political obligations of life in the Nation's Capital as well as in the home district. Time is a Congressman's precious commodity. Staff assistance is essential to us if we are to function effectively.

One of the most serious limitations the Republican minority in Congress has been faced with has been inadequate staff. Last year Roscoe Drummond wrote a series of columns which you may have read dramatizing our position to the Nation. Drummond estimated that we Republicans in the House were being shortchanged 12 to 1 on committee staff although the Democratic-Republican ratio in House membership was closer to 3 to 2. Some readers misunderstood him to mean that there were 12 Democrats on committee staffs to every Republican. This is not the case—most of our committees have professional staff that have served for many years. Some are Republicans that were hired during the early years of the Eisenhower administration. The point that Drummond was making was that the great bulk of the professional staff on our committees were under the control and responsible to the Democratic majority. This has meant that in too many instances minority views were not being written when bills were reported, that committee investigations were being carried out almost exclusively from the majority point of view. I might add that the worst partisan abuse of the concept of professional nonpartisan staff—as set out in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946—has come on a few committees with large budgets for investigatory staff, such as the Education and Labor Committee. Without minority staff we have not been in a position on certain committees to draft Republican alternatives or to initiate legislation where the administration has faltered.

Because of the central importance of staffing, the Republican Conference unanimously endorsed a proposal by Congressman Fred Schwengel of Iowa which would have given the minority 40 percent of the committee staff on committees where the majority of the Republicans were dissatisfied with the staff assistance they were getting. Congressman Schwengel is now chairing our Conference Subcommittee on Increased Minority Staffing. He and his committee have been performing yeomen's service in gathering data on the staffing problem, in pressing for more staff at the committee level, in arguing our case before the House Administration Committee which approves all committee budgets, and in planning future strategy in the staffing fight.

Congressman Schwengel estimates that we shall have 30 more minority staff members this year than we had in the last Congress, largely as a result of his committee's work. Furthermore the majority leader, Carl Albert, as a result of the fight for more minority staff has pledged his party to eliminate partisan abuse in staffing and to abide by the spirit of the Reorganization Act. We intend to hold him to his word.

On the Senate side our big guns have begun to swing into action although I might add after our foot soldiers launched the offensive. We welcome their assistance. You may have seen Senator Goldwater's column a few Sundays ago. Senator Goldwater said that:

"Insufficient minority staffing makes legislation more dependent than ever upon the statistics, the witnesses, the proposals of the Democratic administration as transmitted through the majority. I would make this point just as emphatically if the situation were reversed and the proper committee staffing denied to the Democrats. The need is for proper policies, properly researched, properly arrived at and understood above and beyond the desires of the particular administration running the executive branch."

Senator Dirksen has recently urged all ranking minority members on the standing committees of the Senate to press for more staff assistance to service the needs of the minority.

I have been discussing the problem of minority staff but this is only a part of a much larger problem that the staffing fight has dramatically illustrated. The Congress at large just does not have the staff resources it needs if it is to perform its proper role in our constitutional system. We have seen the gradual and continuing erosion of power from the legislative to the executive in the past 30 years. One of the major intents of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 was to reestablish balance to provide Congress with professional staff for its legislative committees. This was a real gain for effective congressional government but we have not kept pace with the times. There are numerous specific examples in both the House and Senate right today and the country is the loser because of this deficiency.

Most Members of Congress would agree on how crucial the staffing issue is not only to a vigorous and constructive opposition but also for the survival of Congress as a meaningful participant in our processes of government.

A good part of the minority staffing problem would be solved with the correction of this broader problem. There is a clear need for a selective increase in the professional nonpartisan staff of the committees in areas of deficiency such as I have just noted. Ultimately we may be moving toward the kind of staffing arrangement that Congressman Tom Curtis has suggested—a "three-part staff" with the bulk of the staff professional and nonpartisan (i.e., available to all Members regardless of party affiliation) with a few staff members, also professional qualified, under the direct control of the majority and minority respectively—for the purpose of drafting majority and minority reports and assisting the Members on issues of a more immediate party political nature.

What, you ask, can I or my club do to help solve these problems? You can help by writing your Congressmen and Senators be they Democrat or Republican and asking them how they stand on the staffing issue. Congressmen don't vote by weighing their mail but they will certainly sit up and take notice of an issue on which they receive intelligent letters. Particularly in a case such as this where we are discussing a problem peculiar to Congress, its methods of operation, and its public image. Congressmen are especially sensitive to the views and judgments of their constituents. Write and ask your Congressman if he feels that Congress is meeting its responsibilities in reviewing and considering executive proposals for new spending and legislation. Is Congress adequately overseeing the executive agencies? The Billie Sol Estes case is only one example—albeit an extreme one—of how the system can get out of order. Is Congress showing the leadership that the times demand? And within this broader context can Congress function at all without a mature responsible opposition that has the staff resources to perform its role as critic and to assume that more than one side of the issue is considered? These are mighty important questions. We are not dealing in petty partisan politics but in issues that affect the course of our democracy.

I want to move now to another issue affecting the basic principles of our democratic way of life and our constitutional system of government.

One of the least dramatic, but most serious, problems which has come up during the last 2 years concerns the very foundation of our ideals of representative government. It affects me personally, and through me it affects the 462,000 residents of Michigan I represent. But as a matter of fact the principle involved affects all Members of Congress and all their constituents. I am speaking of a little publicized idea called "executive privilege." This is how I came up against it several weeks ago:

Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, was testifying before our defense appropriations subcommittee about the Cuban situation. We were asking him some important and searching questions about the Bay of Pigs invasion—which I might say will be looked on as one of the darkest pages in the history of American foreign policy and a page written exclusively by the Kennedy administration. Our committee had a right and a need to know how our Government handled that mess, for we pass on all the money spent by the Defense Department and, if they don't use it properly, we have the right and responsibility to know so any corrective action can be taken.

I had been disturbed by some news stories which had been appearing just before our meeting with General Taylor which you may remember—these had to do with what went wrong at the time of the invasion and whether or not the United States ever promised any air cover for the Cuban refugee invaders. I wanted to clear that matter up and to get into some other obvious problems connected with that fiasco which would help our committee decide how to vote when it came time to appropriate money for the Department of Defense and related agencies.

General Taylor was one of the best men in the country to answer these important questions. He had been appointed by President Kennedy to head a four-man board to investigate the ill-fated Bay-of-Pigs invasion and find out what went wrong. The investigation was made and the board informed the President what it found out. Then, according to testimony to us and other public statements, the four were told by the President to say nothing about the investigation.

So what happened? Three of the members of the board did follow instructions. Adm. Arleigh Burke, former Chief of Naval Operations did, Allen Dulles, former CIA Chief did, and General Taylor did. But Bobby Kennedy, the fourth member didn't. In one of the classic examples of news management we have seen in this country, Bobby told his version of the invasion to reporters from U.S. News and World Report and the Knight newspapers. He was in Palm Beach at the time.

Now like all good elephants, we Republicans have long memories. I would like you to recall with me here today some of Mr. Kennedy's own words and compare them with his performance in this very important incident.

First of all, let me read you a section out of the Democratic platform which bears directly on this subject. (Not that the platform makes any difference, you understand, to the Democrats. Its greatest value over the years have been to Republicans who are constantly able to show how hypocritical they are about saying one thing and doing another.) The 1960 platform said: "We reject the Republican contention that the workings of the Government are the special private preserve of the Executive. The massive wall of secrecy erected between the executive branch and the Congress as well as the citizen, must be torn down. Information must flow freely, save in those areas in which the national security is involved." So on the basis of this strongly worded platform, Senator Kennedy campaigned. As a candidate he gave us lots of words about how under his administration the public would be well informed and how their Representatives in Congress would never be denied information they needed to pass the laws of the land.

At one point he said—very eloquently, I think: "The President—who himself bears much of the responsibility for the preservation of American democracy—has the affirmative duty to see to it that the American people are kept fully informed. It is true that in today's world of peril some Government information must be kept secret—information whose publication would endanger the national security. The people of the United States are entitled to the fullest possible information about their Government and the President must see that they receive it.

Also on the campaign he referred specifically to Executive privilege. He said that whenever information is not restricted by specific statute, security needs, or the Constitution, "there is no justification for using the doctrine of Executive privilege to keep information from the Congress and the public." I hurry to add that, in the case of General Taylor's refusal, no specific statute would prohibit him from testifying, no security is involved, and the Constitution gives no justification for his position at all. Continuing down "memory lane," I recall that in his first state of the Union message Mr. Kennedy made every Congressman's and newspaperman's heart warm with this statement:

"For my part, I shall withhold from neither the Congress nor the people any fact, or report—past, present, or future—which is necessary for any informed judgment of our conduct and hazards."

The fact of the matter, from my own personal experience with General Taylor and the Bay of Pigs, is that the President is keeping the Congress and the public in the dark; he is preventing the lawfully elected representatives of the people from making informed judgments of the past conduct of our Government and therefore the future hazards which we face. This, I submit, is contrary to everything representative government stands for, to everything we Republicans stand for and, if we can believe their platform, everything the Democrats themselves stand for.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 13, 1963

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Very Rev. F. M. Galdau, rector, St. Dumitru Romanian Orthodox Church, New York City, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, amen.

O, Heavenly Father, the source of wisdom and of all goodness, we thank Thee for all the blessings Thou hast shown to us in these times of uncertainty and difficulty. We beseech Thee, O Lord, to strengthen us in Thy holy faith; to always warm our hearts with love of God and our neighbor and to remove from us all enmities and bad thoughts which may rebel against Thy will and our salvation.

Give, O Lord, to the honorable Members of this Congress and to all leaders of good faith throughout the world the spirit of wisdom and love of mankind which strengthens and elevates nations. Renew in our hearts the spirit of righteousness, of good will and peace with justice, which enlightens and teaches the truth. Fill us with the spirit of self-denial and courage, and give us the vigor and the vision, which you gave to Thy holy apostles when you sent them into the world to spread Thy holy Gospel.

Hear us, O Lord, as you heard our forefathers when they asked for Thy help and guidance. Pour upon us, O, Lord, Thy heavenly gifts, so that we can fulfill our mission in the present world and be of help to those who are enslaved by the godless ones, and who suffer for their faith in Thee and for their freedom and independence, which are from Thee. We beseech Thee to show Thy mercy especially toward the Rumanian people, who today are celebrating their day of independence. Instill in them and in all the enslaved nations of the world Thy holy faith, love and hope, so that they may be able to continue to praise Thy name and do Thy will. May they be Thy instruments, in spite of their sufferings and hardships, to free their country of oppression and return it to independence and freedom, which are born of Thee.

Help us, O Lord, to help all those who suffer the yoke of the godless ones, and enlighten and guide us, so that we may be able to rejoice in the freedom and independence of all those who believe in Thee and who are placing all their present and future hopes in Thy mighty power and salvation.

We ask this in Jesus' name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 9, 1963, was dispensed with.

FEED GRAIN ACT OF 1963—MINORITY VIEWS SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 9, 1963,

Mr. HOLLAND, on May 11, 1963, submitted the minority views of himself and Senators Eastland, Aiken, Hickenlooper, Boggs, and Mechem on the bill (H.R. 4997) to extend the feed grain program, which were printed with the majority report, No. 172.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 950) to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 950) to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950 was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the call of the Legislative Calendar was dispensed with.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS IN MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the joint meeting of the Senate and House Public Works Committees for the Ninth Pan-American Highway Congress was authorized to continue during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the Judiciary and the Fiscal Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

ROBERT L. NOLAN

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the General Counsel of the Department of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Robert L. Nolan, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Legislative Resolution 37

"Whereas the Nebraska Legislature, in 1947, unanimously approved the Nebraska Reclamation Act which permitted the formation and organization of the 550,000-acre Nebraska Mid-State Reclamation District in Buffalo, Hall, and Merrick Counties, to further develop proposals of the multipurpose mid-State project to utilize a portion of the water of the Platte River, now flowing unused to the Gulf of Mexico; and

"Whereas there is now pending before the 88th Congress, Senate file 388 and House roll 64, which provide for authorization of construction of the mid-State project by the Secretary of Interior, under Federal reclamation law, as a unit of Missouri River Basin project; and

"Whereas legislation for this purpose has been introduced in the Congress of the United States for several sessions: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in 73d session assembled:*

"1. That the legislature memorializes the 88th Congress and the respective Interior Committees thereof to support the proposals of the Bureau of Reclamation for the $81 million mid-State project and approve the above legislation for its authorization and construction.

"2. That copies of this resolution, suitably engrossed, be transmitted by the clerk of the legislature to the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives of the 88th Congress, to Hon. Henry Jackson, chairman of the Senate Interior Committee, and Hon. Wayne Aspinall, chairman of the House Interior Committee, and to each Member from Nebraska in the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States.

"Dwight W. Burney,
"*President of the Legislature.*

"Attest:

"Hugo F. Srb,
"*Clerk of the Legislature.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 31

"Joint resolution relative to equal rights for women

"Whereas since 1920, women of the United States have had only one right under the Federal Government: suffrage—the right to vote; and

"Whereas in all other civil and legal respects women live under State laws which contain more than 1,000 legal discriminations including, but not limited to, property and inheritance rights, guardianship rights, and management of earnings; and

"Whereas these discriminations against women contrast surprisingly with the rights of men under Federal and State laws; and

"Whereas in this Nation 'conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal,' legal discrimination on the basis of sex constitutes an intolerable burden upon women solely dependent upon their own efforts for a livelihood, and is a source of irritation to thousands of others who recognize in this discrimination a flat contradiction of the American principle of equality, wholly out of accord with the status of American women reached by achievement in various fields of human endeavor; and

"Whereas before women may achieve full civil rights, an equal rights amendment to the Constitution is necessary, such as that now pending before Congress reading 'Equality of Rights Under the Law Shall Not Be Denied or Abridged by the United States or by Any State on Account of Sex'; and

"Whereas among the many women's organizations on record in support of this amendment are the National Association of Women Lawyers, National Association of Women Doctors, California Federation of Women's Clubs, Business and Professional Women's Clubs, American Federation of Soroptimists, and hundreds of local groups; and

"Whereas nine States have memorialized Congress to pass the equal rights amendment which was a plank in both political party platforms at the last national election: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly,* That the members now join with these legislators of sister States in respectfully urging Congress to pass the equal rights amendment to the U.S. Constitution; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the U.S. Senate, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress elected from the State of California."

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE—AMENDMENT TO SENATE BILL 1321

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Johnston] and myself, I send to the desk a concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of South Carolina requesting the Senators and the Members of the House of Representatives from South Carolina in the Congress of the United States to strongly oppose the enactment of a statute creating a Domestic Peace Corps, and I ask that this resolution be referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Whereas the General Assembly of South Carolina has been informed that an effort will be made to enact a statute by the Congress of the United States creating a Domestic Peace Corps; and

Whereas the members of the general assembly believe that a Peace Corps for domestic purposes is wholly unnecessary and may involve the expenditure of large sums from the Public Treasury which will be sorely needed to balance the national budget; and

Whereas the general assembly believes that if the passage of some type of legislation on this subject becomes inevitable, then the congressional delegation from South Carolina should make every effort to amend the statute to prohibit the Federal Government from sending any members of the Corps into any State except upon the invitation of the Governor of the State concerned: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), that the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives from South Carolina in the Congress of the United States are hereby requested to vigorously oppose the enactment of any legislation creating a Domestic Peace Corps; and be it further

Resolved, That the delegation from South Carolina in the Congress is further requested that if the enactment of such legislation becomes inevitable, then the delegation is requested to make every effort to amend the bill to prohibit the Federal Government from sending any member of the Domestic Peace Corps into any State except upon express invitation from the Governor of the State concerned; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives from South Carolina in the Congress of the United States.

Attest:

INEZ WATSON,
Clerk of the House.

Mr. THURMOND. In this resolution, Mr. President, the South Carolina General Assembly states, and I quote:

> The members of the general assembly believe that a Peace Corps for domestic purposes is wholly unnecessary and may involve the expenditure of large sums from the Public Treasury which will be sorely needed to balance the national budget.

The general assembly, however, realizing that quite often the Congress passes legislation which is not in accord with the sentiments of the General Assembly of South Carolina recognizes that S. 1321, to create a National Service Corps, might well pass the Congress, despite their opposition and even despite the fact that their Representatives in Congress honor their entreaty to oppose the bill. The general assembly in its resolution, therefore, went further and requested of the South Carolina delegation, and I quote:

> The general assembly believes that if the passage of some type of legislation on this subject becomes inevitable, then the congressional delegation from South Carolina should make every effort to amend the statute to prohibit the Federal Government from sending any members of the corps into any State except upon the invitation of the Governor of the State concerned.

Mr. President, I agree with the South Carolina General Assembly, and it is my intention to vote against S. 1321 should that bill be brought before the Senate for consideration. I further agree with the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina, that should the bill appear likely of passage, however, it certainly should be amended so that the National Service Corps cannot become operational in any State except upon the invitation of the Governor of that State.

I, therefore, have prepared an amendment to S. 1321 which would prohibit use of the National Service Corps in any State except upon the Governor's invitation. I now send this amendment to the desk and ask that it lie on the table for 1 week, during which period Senators, who desire to do so may join in cosponsoring the amendment by adding their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from South Carolina.

The amendment was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, without amendment:

H.R. 5389. An act to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 175).

By Mr. McNAMARA, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with amendments:

S. 1409. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce and to provide for the restitution of wages lost by employees by reason of any such discrimination (Rept. No. 176).

By Mr. HARTKE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments:

S. 1227. A bill authorizing the Association of Universalist Women (a nonprofit corporation in the District of Columbia) to consolidate with the Alliance of Unitarian Women (a nonprofit corporation in the State of Massachusetts) (Rept. No. 177).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Manuel Frederick Cohen, of Maryland, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

By Mr. DOUGLAS, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

John Prior Lewis, of Indiana, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois, to be a representative of the United States of America to the fourth special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations;

Francis T. P. Plimpton, of New York, to be a representative of the United States of America to the fourth special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations;

Charles W. Yost, of New York, to be a representative of the United States of America to the fourth special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations;

Jonathan B. Bingham, of New York, to be a representative of the United States of America to the fourth special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations;

Sidney R. Yates, of Illinois, to be a representative of the United States of America to the fourth special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations; and

Executive H, 87th Congress, 2d session; the International Coffee Agreement, 1962; without reservation (Executive Rept. No. 1).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McCLELLAN (by request):

S. 1508. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to improve the administration of transfers and conveyances of certain real property for various public uses, and for other purposes; and

S. 1509. A bill to authorize reimbursement to owners and tenants of certain lands or interests therein acquired by the United States for certain moving expenses, losses, and damages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCLELLAN when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself and Mr. FULBRIGHT):

S. 1510. A bill authorizing modification of the Dardanelle lock and dam project, Arkansas, with particular reference to sewer facilities for the city of Russellville, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request) (for himself and Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina):

S. 1511. A bill to encourage increased consumption of cotton, to maintain the income of cotton producers, to provide a special research program designed to lower costs of production, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. ELLENDER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S. 1512. A bill to authorize one additional Assistant Secretary of State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. FULBRIGHT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 1513. A bill to preserve and make available in a volume or volumes certain historical and background material relating to American Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. GOLDWATER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1514. A bill for the relief of Gudrun Luise Antje Martin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FONG:

S. 1515. A bill to amend section 328 of the Immigration and Nationality Act relating to naturalization through service in the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. FONG when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

S. 1516. A bill for the relief of Ana Murgelj; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. NEUBERGER:

S. 1517. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special U.S. postage stamp in commemoration of the crusade against cancer; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mrs. NEUBERGER when she introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1518. A bill for the relief of Mary G. Eastlake; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 1519. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require use of articles, materials, and products of the United States in performing contracts for the construction, conversion, alteration, or repair of vessels; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 1520. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exempt from tax musical instruments sold to students for school use; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. HARTKE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER (for himself and Mr. MILLER):

S. 1521. A bill to revive and reenact as amended the act entitled "An act creating the City of Clinton Bridge Commission and authorizing said commission and its successors to acquire by purchase or condemnation and to construct, maintain and operate a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at or near Clinton, Iowa, and at or near Fulton, Ill.," approved December 21, 1944; and

S. 1522. A bill creating the Dubuque Bridge Commission and authorizing said commission and its successors to acquire by purchase or condemnation and to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Dubuque, Iowa, Grant County, Wis., and Jo Daviess County, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McNAMARA (by request):

S. 1523. A bill to make certain changes in the functions of the Beach Erosion Board and the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER (for himself and Mr. MILLER):

S. 1524. A bill for the relief of Hai Yung Jung and Johnny Jung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGEE:

S. 1525. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kayo Fujimoto Howard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 1526. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exempt musical instruments sold to students for school use from the manufacturers excise tax; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 1527. A bill to amend the act of May 29, 1958, with respect to payment of moving expenses of owners and tenants of land acquired for the national park system; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S.J. Res. 78. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate the week beginning October 27, 1963, through November 2, 1963, as Country Music Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT TO IMPROVE ADMINISTRATION OF CERTAIN TRANSFERS AND CONVEYANCES OF REAL PROPERTY

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to improve the administration of transfers and conveyances of certain real property for various public uses, and for other purposes.

This bill is being introduced at the request of the Administrator of General Services, as a part of the GSA legislative program for 1963. A similar draft bill was submitted by the President in the 87th Congress and referred to the Committee on Government Operations. The staff, with the cooperation of the legislative counsel of the Senate, made a detailed study of the proposed legislation, but the bill was not given consideration by the committee during the last Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter addressed to the President of the Senate, dated March 1, 1963, an explanation of the objectives of the bill as submitted, and a section-by-section analysis thereof, be printed in the RECORD following this statement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter, explanation, and analysis, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1508) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to improve the administration of transfers and conveyances of certain real property for various public uses, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter, explanation, and analysis, presented by Mr. McCLELLAN, are as follows:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., March 1, 1963.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is enclosed for your consideration a draft of a bill "To amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to improve the administration of transfers and conveyances of certain real property for various public uses, and for other purposes."

This proposal is a part of the legislative program of the General Services Administration for 1963.

The Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, insofar as it relates to conveyances of surplus real property for public purposes, continued in effect the provisions of the former Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, pertaining to conveyances of surplus property for airport, public park, public recreational areas, and historic monument uses. The 1949 act and subsequent amendments, however, provided new legislation governing conveyances of surplus real property for health and educational purposes and authorized the negotiated sale of surplus real property to public bodies at fair market value. In addition, the special disposal authority for conveyances of real property for wildlife conservation purposes contained in Public Law 537, 80th Congress (62 Stat. 240, 16 U.S.C. 667 b–d), remained in the Administrator of General Services.

Since enactment of the 1949 act and subsequent amendments it has become increasingly apparent as GSA continues to administer these laws that inconsistencies exist in the substantive, as well as the administrative aspects of the various provisions dealing with the disposal of surplus real property for non-Federal public uses.

Accordingly, when the President created an Ad Hoc Interdepartmental Committee to study this matter we welcomed the opportunity to submit recommendations for legislative proposals concerning the public use aspects of the surplus real property disposal program. As a result of the deliberations of the Committee, on which I served as Chairman, we submitted a report to the President on May 9, 1962, including draft legislation which the Committee concluded to be necessary and desirable, and which the President on May 16, 1962, transmitted to the Congress. The proposed legislation was referred to the Committees on Government Operations of the Senate and House of Representatives. However, it was not introduced in the 87th Congress. The draft bill enclosed herewith embodies the proposed legislation.

The proposed legislation does not expand the scope of existing laws to include additional categories and purposes for which surplus real property can be conveyed without consideration or at a substantial monetary discount. During every session of Congress since the enactment of the 1949 act, a number of bills have been introduced which, if enacted, would have expanded on a general or piecemeal basis the purposes for which surplus real property could be conveyed. Although many of the organizations and purposes which would benefit by the enactment of such legislation are meritorious and embrace varying aspects of public benefit, we have consistently opposed such legislation on the basis that enactment would increase the difficulties in administering the laws, create undue delay in disposing of properties, and increase the cost of managing and disposing of surplus properties. We believe that property which has been purchased with funds provided by taxpayers throughout the country should be donated or conveyed at a substantial monetary discount only for purposes that are compelling in the national interest. With increasing demands on available financial resources of the Federal Government to support and maintain urgent Federal Government activities, any action which would result in any deduction from this source of revenue should not be favored.

The draft bill therefore deals with those provisions of the present law authorizing the disposal of surplus real properties to qualified applicants for airport, health, education, park and recreation, historic monuments and wildlife conservation uses. In addition, as discussed in the enclosure, it would supplement the authority contained in the 1949 act, as amended, to permit the negotiated sale of surplus real property to public bodies at 75 percent of the estimated fair market value of the property for worthwhile non-Federal public uses. Existing authority permitting the negotiated sale of surplus real property to public bodies at the estimated fair market value would be retained, however, where in the discretion of the Administrator a 25-percent discount is not justified.

Attached hereto is an analysis dealing with the policy and substantive amendments proposed by the bill in existing law. We are preparing a complete section-by-section analysis explaining, for the use of the Congress in its consideration of the bill, the many technical and administrative changes which are either required to effectuate the major changes or otherwise desirable to facilitate administration of the act.

We believe that enactment of this measure will expedite and facilitate the disposal of surplus real property, stimulate local public programs for the intensive use of property for such programs, improve the administration of the surplus real property disposal program, and at the same time assure that the interest of the entire citizenry in the public resources is adequately evaluated and compensated. We therefore strongly urge enactment of the draft bill.

The financial effect of the enactment of this measure cannot be estimated at this time.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there would be no objection to the submission of the draft bill to the Congress and that its enactment would be consistent with the administration's objectives.

BERNARD L. BOUTIN,
Administrator.

General Services Administration's Analysis of a Bill "To Amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as Amended, To Improve the Administration of Transfers and Conveyances of Certain Real Property for Various Public Uses, and for Other Purposes"

The ad hoc committee was particularly concerned with inconsistencies in statutory requirements for payment of a consideration as among the various public uses. Thus the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in administering provisions of the act pertaining to conveyances of surplus real property for health and educational purposes applied percentage discounts based on criteria promulgated by the Department in accordance with the health and educational provisions of the act, which increase the amount of the public benefit discount in proportion to the degree of public benefit accruing from the proposed use and the extent of such use. On the other hand, present law authorizing conveyances for public park and recreational purposes requires a payment of 50 percent of the current fair value of the property while conveyances of surplus property for wildlife conservation, historic monuments, and airports are made without monetary consideration under existing law.

We believe all of the non-Federal public uses for which surplus real property may be conveyed involve a public benefit which should be recognized in the price at which such property should be made available therefor. The extent of the benefit accruing to the public from the various authorized uses is not necessarily uniform. Therefore, a method should be established under which the degree of public interest and extent of use for public benefit may be appropriately recognized in determining the price at which the property is made available.

The draft bill would authorize the establishment of a sliding scale pricing formula which would reflect the proper public benefit for all such conveyances. This would have two beneficial effects: First, it would compensate the general public for the conveyance of publicly owned property either monetarily or through a greater public use of such property. Secondly, it would stimulate the applicant to develop more comprehensive plans for the use and enjoyment of the facilities in order to obtain a higher public benefit discount. Under the draft bill, the amount of the public benefit discounts will be prescribed the various sponsoring agencies based on criteria and guides promulgated by them under such policies as the President may prescribe. This would enable the sponsoring agency to constantly reevaluate and adjust the public benefit discounts as changing circumstances justify or require.

The draft bill also includes a new provision which would permit the negotiated sale of surplus real and related personal property to public bodies at 75 percent of the estimated fair market value of the property. This provision would be in addition to the present authority contained in subsection 203(e)(3)(H) of the 1949 act, as amended, authorizing negotiated sales at the estimated fair market value. Under existing law, the General Services Administration has negotiated the sale of a number of properties to eligible public bodies desiring to acquire real property for purposes that do not come within the scope of the existing law authorizing conveyances for non-Federal specified categories of public uses. Such purposes include municipal buildings, municipal parking lots, storage, and maintenance areas, and others. In addition, public bodies often desire to acquire surplus real property by negotiated sale where they are not in a position to proceed immediately with the program or qualify under existing provisions of law for public use conveyances. Also, public bodies desire to purchase surplus real property as part of their long-range plans to develop industrial areas. Although the present law, by its terms, contains no restrictions or limitations on the purposes for which eligible bodies can acquire surplus property by negotiation, some question exists as to whether the negotiating authority should be exercised only where the public bodies intend to possess and utilize property for direct public purposes.

We believe that many uses of real property by non-Federal public bodies not now recognized in the law as meriting a public benefit discount are meritorious, possess some aspects of national significance, and are deserving of some public benefit allowance. Such purposes include commercial or industrial development to be accomplished under well conceived, active, and properly approved plans which demonstrate that such uses have at least reasonable probability of realization. The proposed bill therefore would create authority in addition to the existing subsection to provide for a discount of 25 percent on negotiated sales to public bodies, and we would interpret and administer this subsection to permit negotiated conveyances for these worthwhile non-Federal uses. We wish to emphasize, however, that subsection 203(e)(3)(H) as presently contained in the 1949 act, would remain in effect, thus permitting the Administrator to require the full estimated fair market value in payment for the property where the use to which the public body proposes to put the property does not, in accordance with criteria to be prescribed by the Administrator, warrant a 25-percent discount.

It is not believed that legislative use restrictions are necessary or appropriate in conveyances for non-Federal public purposes at a 25-percent discount; however, it is believed that GSA should in exercising discretion as to whether surplus property should be sold to non-Federal public bodies at such discount, adopt adequate administrative safeguards to assure that the property is being acquired for legitimate public purposes. Although we have no precise basis on which to place the public benefit accruing from such conveyances at 25 percent of the fair value of the property, we believe that a public benefit discount at approximately this figure will recognize and stimulate such worthwhile local public uses. Also, the 25-percent discount will stimulate early sales of surplus real property to public bodies, reducing the cost of property protection and maintenance. In addition, the costs of publicly advertising such properties for sale through the normal competitive bid procedures will be eliminated. Inasmuch as such conveyances would be made without restrictions on use, the Government would be relieved of a substantial cost of determining and enforcing compliance with and reforming, correcting, amending or granting releases from such use restrictions.

Consistent with the proposed amendment permitting negotiated sales of surplus real property to public bodies at 25-percent discount is the provision in the draft bill which would permit public bodies eligible initially to purchase surplus real property under that amendment to subsequently acquire in fee properties initially conveyed to them for any of the recognized public uses. The conveyance in fee would be made upon payment by the grantee of 75 percent of the then current estimated fair market value of the property (exclusive of improvements and changes made by the grantee), or 75 percent of the estimated fair market value of the property at the time the conveyance was made to the grantee, whichever is higher, less the amount paid by the grantee at the time the property was conveyed.

A further significant amendment to the existing law is a provision in the proposed bill which would permit grantees to utilize properties conveyed for one of the authorized public uses for an alternate authorized public use subject to the required use restrictions for such alternate use.

It is believed that all disposals of surplus real property for the various non-Federal public uses should require generally that the grantee undertake to devote the property to such public use in perpetuity, and the draft bill so provides. Recognizing, however, that under some circumstances perpetual use restrictions might operate to preclude or impair use of the property for the purposes for which it is desired, an exception has been provided in the proposed bill whereby the head of the agency to which the property has been assigned for conveyance is authorized to limit the period during which use requirements and restrictions shall remain effective to a specified term of years of not less than 20 where he determines that to do so would better achieve the public purpose for which the property is to be conveyed. A provision is included, however, which would authorize the President to provide longer minimum use periods applicable to particular types of uses as changing circumstances warrant.

Other amendments generally applicable to all of the various public uses are intended to (1) clearly define the findings and determinations required to be made by the several agencies involved; (2) provide a more uniform approach to administering the various programs; (3) provide uniform provisions for enforcement, amendment or release of restrictions and conditions on the use of the property by the grantee; and (4) provide for the Government's use of the properties in times of emergency.

Consistent with the recommendation contained in the President's conservation message to the Congress on March 1, 1962, conveyance of Federal surplus property for park and recreational use may be made under the draft bill on more liberal terms than the present 50-percent payment requirement where justified in a particular case by the public interest to be served. On the other hand, the payment requirement could be greater where the public interest is limited. This should assure development of park and recreational plans by local communities incorporating broad public benefit aspects.

The present statutory requirement that conveyances of property for historical monuments be made without consideration will be eliminated by enactment of this amendatory legislation. However, a 100-percent public benefit discount can be authorized where, in the evaluation by the Secretary of the Interior, such discount is justified by the public interest.

The proposed bill also would make a sliding scale price applicable to conveyances for conservation of wildlife as distinguished from the present no consideration authorization. It should be noted, however, that while the legislative history of the Wildlife Conservation Act indicates that the Congress intended that conveyances of property for wildlife conservation were to be limited to marginal lands, we would interpret the proposed amendment to authorize the conveyance of nonmarginal lands for wildlife conservation purposes. The draft bill would also incorporate the Wildlife Conservation Act into the 1949 act.

The draft bill contains two major substantive changes from the present law relating to the disposal of surplus property for airport purposes. First, the proposed amendatory language will eliminate the priority provided by existing law under which surplus real property is first available for airport purposes. This is the only priority in existing law among the authorizations for conveyance of Federal surplus real property for various non-Federal public uses. Although, in the majority of instances, the continued use of airport property as a public airport would constitute the highest and best use of the property in the national interest, we believe that proposals to convey surplus property for airport use should be evaluated in the same manner as other public uses and that General Services Administration should have responsibility for determining whether the proposed airport use is consistent with the highest and best use of the property, constitutes a use consistent with good property management practice, and is more in the overall national interest than other possible uses or disposals of the property.

Secondly, the existing statutory authority which provides for conveyances of airport property without consideration would be amended to conform with other public use conveyances to provide for a public benefit discount based on evaluation by the Federal Aviation Agency of the public benefit to be derived from the proposed use of the facility. The amendatory legislation in the draft bill dealing with transfers of personal property for airport use is a technical rather than substantive change necessitated by the fact that existing legislation treats real and personal property together in authorizing disposals for airport use.

Section-by-Section Analysis of the Draft Bill To Amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as Amended, To Improve the Administration of Transfers and Conveyances of Certain Real Property for Various Public Uses, and for Other Purposes

Section 1 is the enacting clause.

Section 2 would add a new subsection (i) to section 202 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949. The proposed new subsection 202(i) incorporates into the 1949 act that part of the act of May 19, 1948 (Public Law 537, 80th Cong., approved May 19, 1948, 62 Stat. 240, 16 U.S.C. 667 b-d) which authorizes transfers to the Secretary of the Interior for wildlife conservation purposes of real property no longer required by a Federal agency, when the property has particular value in carrying out the national migratory bird management program. General Services Administration has construed Public Law 537 as pertaining to real property reported excess under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949. New subsection 202(i) is limited to excess real property and expressly provides that transfers of such property having particular value in carrying out the national migratory bird management program shall be without reimbursement or transfer of funds. The other part of Public Law 537, authorizing transfers to States for wildlife conservation purposes other than the migratory bird program of real property no longer required by Federal agencies, would be incorporated into the 1949 act, as subsection 203(k)(3) thereof, by section 10 of the draft bill.

Section 3 would amend paragraph (1) of subsection (e) of section 203 of the 1949 act to include, as an additional exception to the general requirement for advertising disposals of surplus property, the authorization contained in the new paragraph (1) which would be added by section 8(c) of the draft bill to subsection (k) of section 203 of the act. This authorization would permit the negotiated sale of surplus real property and related personal property to public bodies at 75 percent of the estimated fair market value of the property.

Section 4 would incorporate in paragraph (1) of section 203(j) of the 1949 act (which authorizes donation of surplus personal property for use in any State for purposes of education, public health, or civil defense) authority for donation of surplus personal property for public airport use in the States.

Section 13(g) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 (50 U.S.C. App. 1622(g)), as amended, which was excepted from repeal in the 1949 act, authorizes disposals of both real and personal surplus property, without monetary consideration to the United States, for public airport purposes. By the proposed amendment set forth in section 4 of the draft bill donations of surplus personal property for public airports are brought under the provisions of subsection 203(j)(1) of the 1949 act restricting donations of surplus personal property to transfers to State agencies designated under State law for the purpose of distributing all donable property allocated under the subsection for use within the States. The authority to dispose of surplus real property for airport use is set forth in section 10 of the draft bill as new subsection (k)(4) of the 1949 act. Section 13(g) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 would be repealed by section 14 of the bill, the repealer section.

Section 5 would amend paragraph (2) of subsection (j) of section 203 of the 1949 act merely to make it consistent with the amendment proposed to paragraph (1) of subsection (j) of section 203 by section 4 of the draft bill, and to insert an appropriate cross-reference to the new paragraph (5) which would be added to subsection (j) of section 203 of the 1949 act by section 7 of the draft bill.

Section 6(a) would repeal paragraph (6) of subsection (j) of section 203, which defines the term "State" as used in subsection (j). The definition of that term, applicable to both subsections (j) and (k) of section 203, is provided by section 13 of the draft bill.

Section 6(b) would renumber present paragraph (5) of subsection (j) as paragraph (6), and would amend the paragraph by adding the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency as one of the officials authorized to impose reasonable terms, conditions, reservations, and restrictions upon the use of donated personal property. The paragraph would thus be made consistent with the other amendments to subsection (j) pertaining to the donation of surplus personal property for public airport use.

Section 7 would insert a new paragraph (5) in subsection (j) of section 203 of the act, which would incorporate provisions pertaining to the donation of surplus personal property for public airport use which are analogous to the provisions of subsection (j) for the donation of surplus personal property for purposes of education, public health, and civil defense.

Section 8(a) would renumber paragraph 2 of subsection (k) of section 203 of the act as paragraph (9). The paragraph relates to compliance with restrictions contained in transfer instruments, reformation of such instruments, and granting of releases from such restrictions. By section 11 of the draft bill the renumbered paragraph (9) would be amended in various respects, as explained in the analysis of section 11.

Section 8(b) would renumber paragraph (1) of subsection (k) as paragraph (2). The renumbered paragraph (2) would be amended by section 9 of the draft bill, as explained in the analysis of section 9.

Section 8(c) would add a new paragraph (1) to subsection (k) of section 203, authorizing negotiated sale of surplus real property to States, other public bodies, and tax-supported agencies, at a price equal to 75 percent of the estimated fair market value of the property. The new subsection (k)(1) would supplement the authority presently contained in the act in section 203(e)(3)(H) permitting the negotiated sale of surplus property to States and other public bodies at the estimated fair market value. The Administrator in his discretion could negotiate the sale of property at the estimated fair market value if he determined that the purpose for which the public body proposed to use the property did not justify a 25-percent discount.

Section 9 would amend renumbered paragraph (2) of subsection (k), so as to continue the authority of the Administrator presently contained in subsection (k)(1) of the act, to transfer surplus real property for educational or public health purposes, including research. The proposed amendment would not broaden or restrict the types of surplus real property presently authorized for conveyance for educational or public health purposes, or the scope of those purposes. The amendment would give the Administrator authority to withhold surplus real property from disposal to afford applicants a reasonable period of time to complete plans for proposed uses of it, and to apply for conveyances of surplus real property for such purposes. Consistent with the other donation provisions of amended subsection (k), paragraph (2) prescribes definite procedures and specifies the justification required for assignment of surplus real property for disposal. The procedures and justification required are comparable to and consistent with those required for all assignments of surplus real property for disposal for the various non-Federal public uses authorized under section 203(k) as it would be amended by the bill. Paragraph (2) would eliminate what is, in effect, a requirement in the existing law for dual approval by the Administrator: first, to the assignment for disposal, and then to the actual disposal for health and educational purposes.

Section 10 would incorporate in one subsection of the Property Act, as section 203(k)(3) thereof, authority presently contained in the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, and in the act of May 19, 1948 (62 Stat. 240, 16 U.S.C. 667 b-d) authorizing the disposal of surplus real property for public park, public recreational areas, historic monuments, and fish and wildlife conservation. It would provide a uniform procedure under which the Administrator will receive from the appropriate agency a recommendation for assignment, and also the agency's request for the property, together with appropriate justification that property applied for is needed, suitable, and desirable for a proposed use. If the Administrator in his discretion assigns the property to the appropriate agency for such use, that agency may then proceed to convey the property without further reference to the Administrator. The proposed subsection does not change existing requirements and determinations for the transfer of property for historic monument uses.

Proposed subsection 203(k)(4) of the act, set forth in section 10 of the draft bill, would incorporate in the act authority presently contained in section (13)(g) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, authorizing the conveyance of surplus real property for public airport purposes. That act was exempted from repeal, and thus continued in effect, by subsection 602(a)(1) of the 1949 act.

Paragraphs (A) and (B) of the proposed subsection 203(k)(4) would provide for uniform procedures and determinations comparable to those applicable to the assignment and conveyance of surplus real property for other public purposes under proposed subsections 203(k)(2) and 203(k)(3) of the act.

The proposed amended authority for the assignment and conveyance of surplus real property for airport use would eliminate the priority given conveyances of property for airport use contained in section 13(g) (6) of the 1944 act whereby the disposal of surplus property is given priority immediately following transfers to other Government agencies.

Proposed section 203(k) (4) (C) of the act, also set forth in section 10 of the draft bill, would provide for five kinds of terms, conditions, reservations, and restrictions applicable to conveyances of surplus real property for airport purposes. Except for some modifications, these five requirements, peculiar to airport use of property, are presently contained in section 13(g) of the 1944 act. The first three, dealing with unjust discrimination, nonexclusive right to use, and the elimination and prevention of airport hazards, respectively, are identical with provisions contained in section 13(g) (2) (B), (C), and (D) of the 1944 act, except that the provision in section 13(g) (2) (C) (2) of the 1944 act permitting an exclusive right to engage in the sale of gas and oil has been eliminated in the bill. Only minor changes of an editorial and clarifying nature are made in the fourth condition giving nonexclusive use of the landing area to the Federal Government. The fifth condition, which requires the acquiring public agency to release the United States from certain liability for restoration or other damages, is similar to the language contained in section 13(g) (2) (G) of the 1944 act, except for the elimination of a provision preserving reimbursement rights of the acquiring public agency under section 17 of the Federal Airport Act for repair for damage by Federal agencies.

Proposed section 203(k) (4) (D) would authorize the Administrator of Federal Aviation Agency, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, to omit certain specified restrictive provisions from disposal instruments if said Administrator determines that such omission is necessary to protect or advance the interest of the United States in civil aviation or national defense. Specifically, the following restrictions may be waived: (1) the aforementioned requirement in proposed section 203(k) (4) (C) that a public agency, accepting surplus property for airport purposes, release the United States from any and all responsibility for restoration or other damages under any lease or agreement covering the use by the United States of the airport; (2) the right of the United States to have exclusive or nonexclusive use, control, and possession of the airport facilities during a national emergency as required by proposed section 203 (k) (7) (A) of the act; and (3) the requirement that the grantee use the property for the purposes for which conveyance is made as required in proposed section 203(k) (7) (B) of the act.

The proposed section 203(k) (5) sets forth the factors the Administrator must take into consideration in determining whether property should be made available for the various public purposes covered by preceding provisions of proposed subsection 203(k) of the act. These factors are the highest and best use of the property, good property management practices, and whether the proposed use is more in the overall national interest than other possible uses of the property.

Proposed section 203(k) (6) of the act would provide for the establishment of a sliding scale pricing formula which will reflect the proper public benefit discount in the price a grantee will pay for all surplus real property acquired for the non-Federal public uses authorized by the draft bill. Such a public benefit allowance is presently required in subsection 203(k) of the Property Act for the conveyances of surplus real property for educational and public health purposes. The amount of the public benefit discount would be determined by the various concerned agencies based on standards and guides promulgated by them under such policies as the President may prescribe. The present law requires conveyances for park and recreational use to be made at 50 percent of fair value, but contains no requirement for consideration for conveyances of surplus real property for wildlife conservation, historic monuments, or airport use. The proposed legislation would provide a sliding scale for the latter three uses as well. Conveyances at a 100 percent discount could, however, be authorized if warranted by the proposed use of the property.

Proposed section 203(k) (7) of the act would require that, with certain exceptions in connection with conveyances for airport purposes, all conveyances of surplus real property for the various non-Federal public uses authorized under proposed subsection 203(k) of the act shall contain appropriate clauses which will—

(a) Grant the United States without charge the right to exclusive or nonexclusive use, control and possession of real properties conveyed for the educational, public health, public park, public recreation, historic monument, and fish and wildlife conservation uses during any national emergency declared by the President or the Congress, and the right to exclusive or nonexclusive use, control and possession without charge, of airports at which surplus properties conveyed for airport use are located; with provisos, however, that the United States shall be responsible for maintaining such part of the property as it may use exclusively, and contribute a reasonable part of the cost of maintenance of any such property used nonexclusively, and that the United States shall pay a fair rental for its use of any improvements to the property made without U.S. aid.

(b) Require that the grantee use the property for the purposes for which the conveyance is being made, and restrict such use to such purposes in perpetuity, with the provisos, however, that in any instances where the head of the agency to which the property has been assigned for conveyance determines that to reduce the period of such restricted use to a term of not less than 20 years would better achieve the public purposes for which the property is to be conveyed, the instrument of conveyance can so provide, and that grantees may be permitted to grant rights-of-way and easements to others on conditions as specified.

(c) Impose such additional provisions as may be determined necessary to safeguard the interests of the United States.

(d) Provide for the reversion of the property to the United States where there has been failure to comply with the terms of the conveyance, subject, however, to outstanding mortgages and liens resulting from the grantee's improvement of the property (such latter provision to facilitate the grantee's making financing arrangements more effectively to carry out the public purpose for which the property was conveyed).

(e) Permit, subject to the approval of the Administrator of General Services, and, in the case of property conveyed for airport purposes, subject to the additional approval of the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency and the Secretary of Defense, the subsequent sale in fee, and free and clear of all conditions, of property initially conveyed to States, territories, possessions, political subdivisions thereof, tax-supported agencies therein, and instrumentalities thereof for any of the authorized public uses, upon payment by the grantee of 75 percent of the current estimated fair market value of the property at the time of subsequent sale, or 75 percent of the estimated fair market value at the time the conveyance was originally made to the grantee, whichever is higher, less the amount paid by the grantee at the time the property was originally conveyed (such new authority being consistent with proposed section 203(k) (1) of the act which permits the negotiated sale of surplus property initially to States and public bodies, without restriction on use, at 75 percent of the estimated fair market value).

Proposed section 203(k) (8) of the Property Act, which is the last provision contained in section 10 of the draft bill, would permit grantees to reacquire property which has reverted to the Government for noncompliance pursuant to the reversionary provisions of proposed section 203(k) (7) (D) of the bill, by negotiated sale at 75 percent of the estimated fair market value, when such grantees are eligible under proposed section 203(k) (1), and also makes it possible for original grantees to reacquire reverted property for other non-Federal public uses authorized in proposed subsection 203(k).

Section 11 of the draft bill sets forth the proposed amended provisions of section 203 (k) (9) of the Property Act, relative to compliance with restrictions contained in transfer instruments, reformation of such instruments, and granting of releases from such restrictions.

The officials who would act, and the area within which each one may act are as follows:

(a) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in the case of property transferred for educational uses or for public health uses;

(b) The Secretary of the Interior, in the case of property conveyed for public park, public recreational area, and historic monument uses, and for use for the conservation of fish or wildlife other than migratory birds;

(c) The Secretary of Defense, in case of property transferred for use in the training and maintenance of civilian components of the Armed Forces, or in the case of personal property transferred for civil defense purposes; and

(d) The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency in the case of property transferred for public airport purposes.

Each official is directed to determine and enforce compliance with restrictions contained in transfer instruments, and is also authorized to:

(1) Reform, correct, or amend any such instrument where necessary to correct or conform such transfers to the requirements of applicable laws;

(2) To grant releases from the requirements that the United States have exclusive or nonexclusive use of the property during a national emergency as required in proposed section 203(k) (7) (A) where such releases would promote the accomplishment of the purposes for which the property was transferred and would be in the best interest of the United States (subject to approval of the Secretary of Defense in the case of airport property);

(3) Subject to the disapproval of the Administrator of General Services within 30 days after notice to him—

(A) Grant releases from restrictions on the use of the property where the appropriate official determines that a compelling public need requires the use of the property for another public purpose for which conveyance of surplus real property is authorized by the bill—such alternative public use, however, to be subject to the same terms and conditions as would apply if the property were initially conveyed for such alternate public purpose;

(B) Grant releases (on terms protecting or advancing the interests of the United States, including payment of a fair consideration) from any other restrictions if he determines that the release will not prevent, or will promote the accomplishment of the purpose for which the property was conveyed and will be in the best interest of the United States—except from the requirements that the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency approve use or disposal for other than airport purposes of property transferred for such purposes, and that any property conveyed under the bill be used by the grantee for the purposes for which the conveyance was made; and

(C) Grant releases from the requirement that the property be used perpetually and exclusively by the grantee for the purposes for which the conveyance was made upon a determination by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of the Interior, or the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, as the case may be, that such release is necessary to the accomplishment of the purpose for which the property was conveyed, and subject to agreement by the grantee: (aa) to continue to devote the property to the purposes for which it was conveyed, or (bb) that if the property is used or disposed of by the grantee for other than the purposes for which it was conveyed, it will be used or disposed of at the fair market value and the proceeds either will be devoted to the same purposes for which the property was conveyed to the grantee or will be paid to the United States. Such releases from the perpetual-use requirement may be necessary in order that grantees can obtain financing for improvements to properties so as to make them useful for the public purposes intended.

Section 12 would amend subsection 203(o) of the Property Act which now requires the submission of quarterly reports to the Senate and House of Representatives by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, showing the acquisition cost of all personal property donated and real property disposed of under the provisions of section 203 of the act. Under the proposed amendment subsection 203(o) the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of Defense, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, and the Secretary of the Interior, as the case may be, would be required to submit annual reports to the Senate and the House of Representatives showing the acquisition cost, respectively, of all personal property donated under subsection 203(j) of the act for education, public health, civil defense, or public airport purposes, and of all real property disposed of under subsection 203(k) of the act to educational or public health institutions, or for public airport purposes, or for public park, public recreational area, historic monument, or fish and wildlife conservation use.

Section 13 would add new subsections (p) and (q) to section 203 of the Property Act. Subsection (p) would provide a definition of the terms "State" and "States" as used in subsections (j) and (k) of section 203. This definition is of like tenor with, and in lieu of the definitions set forth separately in the present subsections (j) and (k) of the act. Subsection (q) would substitute "Secretary of Defense" for "Federal Civil Defense Administrator" or Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization" whatever those designations are used in subsections (j) and (k) of section 203 of the act, the purpose being to reflect the assignment of civil defense responsibilities to the Secretary of Defense made by Executive Order 10952 of July 20, 1961 (26 F.R. 6577).

Section 14 of the draft bill is the repealer section. It would repeal the act of May 19, 1948, relative to transfers of real property for wildlife conservation purposes, section 13(h) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, relative to transfers of surplus real property for parks, recreation, and historic monuments, and section 13(g) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, together with sections 2, 3, and 4 of the act of October 1, 1949, relative to transfers of surplus property for public airport purposes. The substance of these laws which are proposed for repeal would be incorporated in the Property Act by the preceding provisions of the draft bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I wish to emphasize that, although this proposed legislation has been pending before the committee for some time, no opportunity has been afforded members of the committee to familiarize themselves with its provisions, which, according to the General Services Administration, would authorize the establishment of a sliding scale pricing formula which would reflect the proper public benefit allowances for all conveyances of surplus real property for public purposes.

At the last executive session of the committee, held on April 26, 1963, action was deferred on a motion made by Senator **Karl E. Mundt**, that a study should be conducted into the general problems involved in connection with the surplus property disposal program. The subject bill should provide the basis for hearings before the committee on all aspects of the disposition of surplus property under the public benefit provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act, and permit the committee to evaluate the present operations of the law, and to recommend proper amendments based on information developed at such hearings.

REIMBURSEMENT TO OWNERS AND TENANTS OF CERTAIN LANDS OR INTERESTS THEREIN

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize reimbursement to owners and tenants of certain lands or interests therein acquired by the United States for certain moving expenses and losses and damages, and for other purposes.

This bill is introduced at the request of the Administrator of General Services as a part of the legislative program of the General Services Administration for 1963.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter addressed to the President of the Senate from the Administrator of General Services dated April 15, 1963, which sets forth additional justification and background on this proposed legislation, be printed in the Record at this point as part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1509) to authorize reimbursement to owners and tenants of certain lands or interests therein acquired by the United States for certain moving expenses, losses, and damages, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McClellan, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter presented by Mr. McClellan is as follows:

General Services Administration,
Washington, D.C., April 15, 1963.
Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: There is transmitted herewith for referral to the appropriate committee a draft bill prepared by the General Services Administration to authorize reimbursement to owners and tenants of certain lands or interests therein acquired by the United States for certain moving expenses and losses and damages, and for other purposes.

This proposal is a part of the legislative program of the General Services Administration for 1963.

Except for acquisitions by the military departments and the Department of Interior, owners or tenants of land or interests in land acquired by GSA and other executive agencies may be paid only the fair market value of the property acquired. Expenses, losses, and damages incurred by the owners or tenants as a direct result of moving themselves, their families and possessions, are not compensable.

The proposed legislation would provide to other executive agencies authority similar to that now applicable to the military departments and the Department of Interior. There would thus be eliminated the present inequitable situation where the question as to whether owners or tenants may be reimbursed for moving expenses depends on the agency acquiring the property rather than the merits of the case.

The bill would apply only to real property acquired, after the date of enactment, for Federal use by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise. Reimbursement to owners and tenants would be limited to such fair and reasonable expenses, losses, and damages as are incurred by them as a direct result of moving, and could not in any event exceed 25 percent of the fair value of the property acquired.

In order to promote uniformity, the bill would authorize the Administrator of General Services to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the legislation.

Further discussion of the proposed bill is contained in the enclosed statement.

We are informed by the military departments and the Department of the Interior that, in terms of their overall acquisitions, average payments are substantially less than the maximum 25 percent. It is anticipated that under the proposed legislation the average amounts to be paid for moving expenses may be greater than in the case of acquisitions by the military departments or the Department of the Interior, because most of GSA's land acquisitions are in urban areas and involve lands on which there are buildings with many tenants, and that such payments may average as much as 10 percent of the fair market value of the real property acquired by GSA after enactment of the bill. On this assumption and based on GSA's current building program, it is estimated that the proposed legislation would require an increase in the GSA appropriation of $2,300,000 in the first year. Because of the different types of land acquired by the various executive agencies in both urban and rural areas, coming within the authority of this proposed legislation, it is not possible to estimate the effect its enactment would have on the total budgetary requirements of the Federal Government.

Prompt and favorable consideration of the enclosed draft bill is recommended.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,
Bernard L. Boutin,
Administrator.

Statement Concerning Proposed Bill

Prior to September 28, 1951, the cost of moving owners and tenants from lands acquired by the Federal Government was not reimbursable because such moving was determined to be a consequential cost and not compensable under existing law.

Section 501(b) of the act of September 28, 1951 (65 Stat. 364) authorized the Secretaries of the military departments to reimburse landowners and tenants for moving expenses in connection with lands acquired for specific military projects. Section 401(b) of the act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 624–625) broadened the authority of the military departments to make such reimbursement for all of their public works projects.

These acts provide for reimbursement to owners and tenants of land acquired for such projects for expenses and other losses and damages incurred in the process and as a direct result of moving themselves and their families and possessions because of such acquisition of land. Such reimbursement is in addition to, but not in duplication of, any payments in respect of such acquisitions as may be otherwise authorized by law and may not exceed 25 percent of the fair value of the parcel of land being acquired. Applications for such reimbursement must be filed within a period of 1 year following the date of the acquisition.

The act of September 21, 1959 (73 Stat. 589) amended the foregoing 1952 act to provide that applications may be filed either 1 year from the date of acquisition or within 1 year following the date that the property is vacated by the applicant, whichever date is later.

An act of May 29, 1958 (72 Stat. 152), granted the Secretary of the Interior authority similar to that granted the Secretaries of the military departments in connection with the acquisition of lands for developments under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, including water conservation, other water developments, and other public works projects of the Bureau of Reclamation.

The legislation described above is indicative of the growing concern of Congress that owners and tenants of land and interests therein be adequately compensated when their property is acquired for public use, by establishing a new category of compensable expenses and damages.

The text of the legislation proposed by GSA is similar to the authority granted to the military departments and to the Secretary of the Interior in the foregoing statutes. The reimbursement of moving expenses under the proposed legislation is limited to acquisitions of land or interests therein for Federal use. It would not apply to former owners or tenants of property acquired by the Government as the result of the foreclosure of a mortgage held by the Government or to such owners or tenants where the property is subject to a mortgage held by the Government and the owner-mortgagor conveys title to the property to the Government in lieu of a foreclosure.

While it is impossible to foresee every item that may be compensable under the proposed legislation, the following are examples considered by the Office of the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, to be typical items of reimbursable expenses, losses, and damages (par. 12(a), Engineering Manual 405–1–699, dated June 13, 1960):

"Expenses: Transportation costs; costs of removing and crating possessions; cost of advertising for transportation or crating; costs of storage pending moving; insurance premiums for protection of possessions while in storage or being moved; labor performed by owner or tenant in accomplishing move; costs of reinstalling machinery, equipment, etc.; costs of inoculation of livestock, if required, prior to entrance of livestock into a country or State; short-term loan charges to defray moving expenses only; and out-of-pocket expenses in obtaining new site or land, such as expenditure for title search, appraisal, survey, or settlement (not including any part of the purchase price for the new site or any expenditure for the purpose of adding to the value or utility of the new site); taxes incident to expenses incurred in moving;

"Losses: Time lost from employment by owner or tenant because of moving (not including labor performed to accomplish move); property lost or stolen in the process of moving; death of or injury to livestock;

"Damages: Uninsured injuries to furniture or equipment."

The Office of the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, lists the following as typical nonreimbursable expenses, losses, and damages (par. 12(b), Engineering Manual 405–1–699, dated June 13, 1960):

"Expenses: Costs of conveying land to Government, additional expenses incurred because of living in a new location, costs of removing salvage material reserved, capital improvement to the replacement site;

"Losses: Difference between amount received from Government for property and amount paid for replacement property; interest on loan for purchase of replacement property; loss due to duplication of interest, taxes, etc.; loss of goodwill, loss of profits, loss of trained employees, expenses of sales and losses because of such sales;

"Damages: Personal injury while moving or preparing to move."

It was found advisable in drafting the proposed legislation to depart from the provisions of the acts applicable to the military departments and to the Secretary of the Interior with respect to the period of time within which application for moving expenses can be made. It was decided to propose that a 1-year period for applications should begin on (a) the date the parcel of land or interest in land is to be vacated under an agreement with the Government or pursuant to law, including an order of a court, or (b) the date the parcel is actually vacated, whichever first occurs. GSA's experience is that, in many instances, some time may elapse after the date on which title is acquired to a parcel of land for the construction thereon of a public building and the date on which construction commences. During this period the property may be leased to the former owner or tenant of the owner to provide interim income to the Government to offset the costs to the Government of maintenance and protection of the property. There are other instances where lands have been acquired by purchase and the landowner or tenant has been notified of the Government's requirement for immediate possession, but the occupant has held over without color of right. In condemnation proceedings, although the court orders the landowner to surrender possession of the premises on a particular date, the landowner may refuse to surrender possession of the premises on the date fixed. In such situations the holdover-occupant should not be permitted to take advantage of his own delinquency in vacating the premises by having the 1-year period begin on the date he actually vacates the property. On the other hand, if the occupant elects to vacate the premises at some time prior to the date he is required to do so, there is no reason why he cannot furnish an itemized statement of his expenses, losses and damages within 1 year from the date he actually moves from the premises.

GSA is aware, of course, of the studies being conducted by the Select Subcommittee on Real Property Acquisition of the House Committee on Public Works. GSA urges, however, that the proposed bill be enacted now so that a reasonable degree of uniformity in the matter of reimbursement for moving expenses can be achieved pending the results of the subcommittee's studies. The present situation fosters inequities for which there can be no reasonable justification, resulting in poor relationships between the public and those agencies which lack authority to make payments of the type being made by the military departments and the Department of the Interior.

In order that landowners and tenants may receive equal treatment, the proposed legislation provides for the issuance of uniform rules and regulations. The Administrator of General Services has the responsibility for acquiring real property for public buildings, and, except for the land acquisitions of the military departments and the Department of the Interior which are not affected by the proposed legislation, GSA's land acquisitions are probably greater than those of other executive agencies. The proposed legislation therefore vests in the Administrator of General Services the authority to make such uniform rules and regulations as he finds necessary and proper for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the proposed legislation.

PROPOSED COTTON LEGISLATION—NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON SENATE BILL 1511

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, a few days ago the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry agreed to hold hearings on proposed cotton legislation beginning on May 20. The hearings were to be held as to all bills before the committee.

A few weeks ago the House of Representatives was presented with a bill by Mr. COOLEY, which is H.R. 6196.

On behalf of myself, and the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], I introduce, for appropriate reference, by request, a copy of this bill, so that it may be considered by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry beginning on May 20.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1511) to encourage increased consumption of cotton, to maintain the income of cotton producers, to provide a special research program designed to lower costs of production, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ELLENDER (for himself and Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize one additional Assistant Secretary of State and for other purposes.

The proposed legislation has been requested by the Department of State, and I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific bill to which Members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this bill, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD at this point, together with the letter from Secretary of State Dean Rusk and a section-by-section analysis and statement of costs furnished by the Department of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, letter, section-by-section analysis, and statement of costs will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1512) to authorize an additional Assistant Secretary of State, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) Section 1 of the Act of May 26, 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 151a), is amended by striking out "eleven" and inserting in lieu thereof "twelve".

(b) Section 106(a)(17) of the Federal Executive Pay Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 738) is amended by striking out "(11)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(12)".

SEC. 2. Section 1002 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 804), is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end of the first sentence and inserting a colon and the following: "*Provided,* That a retired officer of the Service may, with the authorization of the Secretary, accept an offer of employment made by a foreign government".

SEC. 3. The first section of the Act of July 12, 1960, (74 Stat. 371) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) The benefits provided in subsection (a) of this section are hereby extended to not to exceed three participants who retire and become entitled to receive an annuity from the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund subsequent to June 30, 1962, and prior to June 30, 1963, whenever the Secretary of State determines it to be in the public interest to extend said benefits to any such participant."

The letter, section-by-section analysis, and statement of costs, presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT, are as follows:

APRIL 18, 1963.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: There is transmitted herewith for consideration by the Congress a proposed bill designed to achieve the following objectives:

1. To authorize, subject to Senate confirmation, one additional Assistant Secretary of State;
2. To authorize retired Foreign Service officers to act as advisers to foreign governments pursuant to approval of the Secretary of State;
3. To provide for increased retirement benefits for a maximum of three Foreign Service officers to which they would have otherwise been entitled had they retired prior to June 1, 1962.

Section 1 would authorize an additional Assistant Secretary of State position in the Department of State which, it is contemplated, will be used for the Director of the Bureau of Intelligence and Research. The importance and scope of the position fully justifies this action.

The Bureau of Intelligence and Research has the dual function of meeting the requirements of the coordinated intelligence community under intelligence directives issued by the National Security Council, and also meeting the Department's own research and intelligence needs. In a rapidly changing world it is essential for sound policymaking that adequate information be available regarding the current situation and the probable future consequences of potential alternatives decisions. It is important to look ahead, to seek to anticipate problems or opportunities for American foreign policy, and to apply specialized skills to the task of improving the basic assumptions on which policy rests.

For these reasons, the functions of the Bureau of Intelligence and Research are equivalent in importance to those of the geographic and functional bureaus, each of which is currently headed by an Assistant Secretary. The enactment of the proposed bill would also enable the Department to recognize more fully the importance of the Department's intelligence and intelligence research activities.

Section 2 would authorize retired Foreign Service officers to accept, with the specific authorization in each case of the Secretary of State, employment as advisers or consultants to foreign governments. This section is designed primarily to enable certain newly independent countries to obtain advice and counsel in establishing embassies and setting up foreign service systems, and becoming familiar with the international practices of protocol. Recently several nations, especially newly independent African nations, have approached the Department requesting the services of retired Foreign Service officers to act as advisers in establishing embassies in the United States and throughout the world, and to provide assistance in training personnel in protocol and formalities of diplomatic relations. At the present time, the Department has been unable to comply with such requests due to the provision of the Constitution prohibiting persons holding offices of profit or trust of the United States from accepting without the consent of Congress, any office of any foreign state. Because retired Foreign Service officers are subject to recall by the Secretary of State whenever he determines such recall is in the public interest, they have been considered as subject to this prohibition.

The administration believes that it would be in the interest of the United States if the Secretary of State were given the discretionary power here sought to authorize certain retired Foreign Service officers to act as advisers to foreign governments.

Section 3 would provide authority for the Secretary of State to extend the benefits provided in the subsection (a) of section 1 of Public Law 86-612, approved July 12, 1960. The benefits conferred by this section expired on June 30, 1962. The provision of this proposed section would extend those benefits to not to exceed three officers of the Foreign Service to June 30, 1963, when it is determined by the Secretary of State such action is in the public interest.

The voluntary retirement of participants in the Foreign Service retirement and disability system is dependent upon the approval of the Secretary of State. In most instances such approval is granted when requested by those Foreign Service officers who, have reached 50 years of age and have rendered 20 years of service. There are presently in the Foreign Service a few high ranking career officers who are nearing mandatory retirement age but who have remained in the service at the request of the Secretary of State because of their unique qualifications and background of experience. By doing so, they have forfeited the additional retirement benefits for which they were eligible prior to June 30, 1962. This section is believed to be in the interest of the equitable treatment for those Foreign Service officers not to exceed three in number, who have remained on duty at the request of the Secretary of State. Under this section the Secretary could, in his discretion, extend for a period not to exceed 12 months, benefits of Public Law 86-612 to not more than three Foreign Service officers.

The Department has been informed by the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection, from the standpoint of the administration's program, to the presentation of this draft legislation to the Congress for its consideration.

I trust that this proposed bill will receive such consideration as the Congress may deem appropriate.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN RUSK.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS AND EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Section 1 would add an Assistant Secretary position in the Department of State which it is contemplated will be used for the Director of the Bureau of Intelligence and Research. The importance and scope of the job and the need to maintain the Department's position in the intelligence community fully justifies this action.

The Bureau of Intelligence and Research has the dual function of meeting the requirements of the coordinated intelligence community under intelligence directives issued by the National Security Council, and also meeting the Department's own research and intelligence needs. In a rapidly changing world, it is essential for sound policymaking that adequate information be available regarding the current situation and the probable future consequence of potential alternative decisions. It is important to attempt to look ahead, to try to anticipate problems or opportunities for American foreign policy and it is also necessary to apply specialized skills to the task of improving the basic assumption on which policy rests.

For these reasons the functions of the Bureau of Intelligence and Research are equivalent in importance to those of the geographic and functional bureaus currently headed by an Assistant Secretary. The enactment of the proposed bill would enable the Department to give more adequate attention to the quality of research activities and would insure consideration of research information at a high level.

Section 2 would authorize retired Foreign Service officers to accept, with the prior authorization of the Secretary of State, employment as advisers or consultants to foreign governments. The Department believes this provision is desirable. It will enable certain newly independent countries to secure advice and counsel in establishing embassies and foreign service systems, and becoming familiar with practices of protocol. Several nations, especially in Africa, have approached the Department requesting the services of retired Foreign Service officers to act as advisers in establishing embassies in the United States and throughout the world, and to provide assistance in training personnel in protocol and the formalities of diplomatic relations. At the present time, the Department has been unable to comply with such requests due to the provision of the Constitution prohibiting persons holding offices of profit or trust of the United States from accepting, without the consent of Congress, any office of any foreign state. Because retired Foreign Service officers are subject to recall by the Secretary of State whenever he determines such recall is in the public interest, they have been considered as subject to this prohibition.

Section 3 would provide authority for the Secretary of State to extend the benefits provided in subsection (a) of section 1 of Public Law 86-612, approved July 12, 1960, to June 30, 1963, to not exceed three officers of the Foreign Service, when he determines it to be in the public interest to do so. Public Law 86-612 provided that the annuity of any participant in the Foreign Service retirement and disability system entitled to receive an annuity on or before June 30, 1962, should be increased by 10 percent.

Section 636 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, provides that any participant in the Foreign Service retirement and disability system who is at least 50 years of age and has rendered 20 years of service may, on his own application with the consent of the Secretary of State, be retired from the Service and receive an immediate annuity. A number of participants in the Foreign Service retirement and disability system have taken advantage of this benefit which provided them with a substantial increase in annuity if their annuity began before June 30, 1962. The voluntary retirement of these participants was dependent upon the approval of the Secretary. In most instances such approval was granted. There are, however, in the service a few high-ranking career officers who, nearing mandatory retirement age, elected to apply for voluntary retirement because of the benefits accruing to them under the provisions of Public Law 86–612 whose services were needed beyond June 30, 1962. The Secretary was reluctant to disapprove their applications for voluntary retirement in view of the financial hardship this would impose upon them by denying them the annuity benefits of Public Law 86–612. However, their continued service in the key positions to which they are assigned (Chief of Mission and other high-level positions) was in the public interest. This proposed amendment will enable the Secretary to extend, in his discretion, the benefits of Public Law 86–612 to not to exceed three officers, if they retire before June 30, 1963.

ESTIMATED COST OF PROPOSED DRAFT BILL

1. Additional Assistant Secretary for I & R, first year cost, none. (Comment: Appointment of the Director of Intelligence and Research as an Assistant Secretary will involve no cost since his salary is already the same as that of an Assistant Secretary.)

2. Foreign employment of retired Foreign Service officers, first year cost, none. (Comment: This proposal does not involve any cost.)

3. Adjustments and annuities under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system, first year cost, $116,400. (Comment: This estimate is based on the annuity increase each of three officers would receive under the bill, projected for 20 years:

$145×240 months	$34, 800
$164×240 months	39, 360
$176×240 months	42, 240
Net cost	$116, 400)

PRESERVATION OF CERTAIN HISTORICAL AND BACKGROUND MATERIAL RELATING TO AMERICAN INDIANS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, there has been presented to me what I feel is a very sound proposal to increase the present fund of resource material of Indian culture and history available to students and scholars in this field.

Today there is a wealth of research material being filed with the Indian Claims Commission on behalf of Indian tribes and the Government. The purpose of the bill I now introduce would be to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to select from this material that part which the Secretary determines to be of historical and background significance. The material selected would then be edited and published and made available to interested groups, public or private, as an aid to their studies.

Such a project will make a very real contribution in that it will make this material readily available whereas otherwise it is likely to again be buried away in the National Archives.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the table for 3 days so that any of my colleagues who wish to join as a cosponsor may have the opportunity to do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Arizona.

The bill (S. 1513) to preserve and make available in a volume or volumes certain historical and background material relating to American Indians, introduced by Mr. GOLDWATER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION ACT, RELATING TO REENLISTMENT OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1952, allowing any alien who has been inducted into the U.S. Army to reenlist in the U.S. Regular Army.

Under provisions of the Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1952, foreign-born persons without permanent U.S. residence status who are inducted into the U.S. military forces are prohibited from reenlisting or extending service.

My bill would render alien inductees now in the U.S. military service eligible for reenlistment by waiving this requirement of permanent residence. It will also give such persons the privilege to be naturalized.

In addition, my proposal leaves intact the provisions of the Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1952 that give naturalization rights to persons who satisfy three requirements: First, have served for 3 years in the U.S. Armed Forces; second, were honorably discharged; and third, filed naturalization papers within 6 months of separation from the service.

Alien GI's under my proposal may qualify for naturalization only if they reenlist in the Regular Army of the United States.

All the other requirements to citizenship, such as good moral character, are, of course, retained under this proposal.

My bill would take care of requests such as those I have received from six citizens of the Philippine Republic who entered the United States as contract laborers for the U.S. Navy at Guam, and one who entered on a visitor's permit at Washington, D.C.

All had been inducted into the U.S. Army and are now serving at Schofield Barracks, Hawaii.

All have expressed a deep loyalty to America and see a continuance of their service in our Armed Forces as their patriotic duty to their newly adopted country.

Mr. President, I feel that this is a meritorious bill, in that the commendable impulses of persons who are of proven worth to serve the Nation should be encouraged. I believe, to paraphrase Thomas Paine, that "Those who expect to reap the blessings of freedom" should be given the opportunity to "undergo the fatigue of supporting it."

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1515) to amend section 328 of the Immigration and Nationality Act relating to naturalization through service in the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. FONG, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 328(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1439) is hereby amended (1) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon, and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(4) the petitioner may be naturalized without having been lawfully admitted for permanent residence, if (A) at any time subsequent to enlistment or induction, the petitioner shall have entered the United States pursuant to official orders of the Armed Forces of the United States, and (B) the petitioner, unless ineligible, shall have reenlisted in the Armed Forces of the United States within five years after the date of expiration of the original term of service for which the petitioner had enlisted or was inducted."

SEC. 2. Section 3253(c) of title 10, United States Code, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) In time of peace, no person may be accepted for original enlistment in the Army unless—

"(1) he is a citizen of the United States, or

"(2) he has been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence under the applicable provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, or

"(3) he has been inducted into the Army and enlists on or before the date of the expiration of the term of service for which he was inducted, or within any period of five years immediately succeeding such date if he has resided continuously in the United States during such period."

POSTAGE STAMP URGED COMMEMORATING CRUSADE AGAINST CANCER

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, today cancer is second only to heart disease as the leading cause of death. The American Cancer Society predicts 280,000 Americans will die this year of previously diagnosed or recently detected cases. Another 815,000 will be under medical care, and 530,000 new cases will be diagnosed in 1963.

In 1913 the American Society for the Control of Cancer, forerunner of the American Cancer Society, was founded. In 1937 the National Cancer Institute was established by act of Congress, with every United States Senator joining as a sponsor, and it is located in nearby Bethesda, Md., served by a branch of the Washington post office. At that time only one out of every seven victims of cancer could be saved. Today modern medicine and early detection could save one cancer patient in two.

By congressional action the President of the United States is authorized to issue annually a proclamation setting apart the month of April of each year as Cancer Control Month. The congressional resolution invites the medical profession, the press, and all agencies, and individuals interested in the control of the disease of cancer by education and other cooperative means to unite during this month in a public dedication to such a program and in a concerted effort to impress upon the people of the Nation the necessity for such a program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in my remarks the proclamation issued by President Kennedy designating April 1963 as Cancer Control Month.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CANCER CONTROL MONTH, 1963—A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Whereas the conquest of cancer, which has annually claimed the lives of 280,000 Americans and threatens the lives of millions more in the future, depends upon vigorous programs of medical research and public education; and

Whereas progress in research has already significantly increased the rate of survival of cancer patients and holds promise of further improvement through studies dealing with the cause, prevention, and treatment of malignant disease; and

Whereas the continued efforts of medical scientists, physicians, public health workers, and volunteers depend upon continued public support, encouragement, and cooperation; and

Whereas the Congress, by a joint resolution approved March 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 148), requested the President to issue annually a proclamation setting apart the month of April as Cancer Control Month:

Now, therefore, I, John F. Kennedy, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim the month of April 1963 as Cancer Control Month; and I invite the Governors of the States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and other areas subject to the jurisdiction of the United States to issue similar proclamations.

I also ask the medical and allied health professions, the communications industries, and all other interested persons and groups to unite during the appointed month in public reaffirmation of this Nation's efforts to control cancer.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 7th day of March in the year of our Lord 1963, and of the Independence of the United States of America the 187th.

[SEAL]

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

By the President:

DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent to include at this point in my remarks the President's statement before the Eleanor Roosevelt Cancer Foundation, delivered February 15, 1962, in the Cabinet Room of the White House and broadcast to the Nation.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESIDENT'S REMARKS BEFORE THE ELEANOR ROOSEVELT CANCER FOUNDATION IN THE CABINET ROOM OF THE WHITE HOUSE, FEBRUARY 15, 1962.

Thank you, Burt Lancaster.

The struggle for better health for the people of this country rests upon the effort of us all. Participation of our people in any one issue—and this is true of the fight against disease as well as the struggle against our other national challenges—depends upon the individual effort that each of us will put into it. In this spirit I designate 1962 as Cancer Progress Year—a year which will dramatize the advances mades in the fight against cancer during the past 25 years. In 1937 only one out of every seven victims of cancer could be saved. Today one out of every two can be saved. And we look forward to the—we hope not too distant—day when this disease will be wiped out, when our fellow citizens and the members of our family will be free from this dread prospect of a disease which has caused so much pain and suffering.

In 1937 the National Cancer Institute was established by an act of Congress, and every U.S. Senator joined as a sponsor. In that same year the American Cancer Society began its nationwide education program. Partnerships like this between the people and the National Government are indeed the heartbeat of our Nation in this kind of great effort. I am happy to be part of this salute to the volunteers who have made this possible—to the doctors, the nurses, the people who work in our research laboratories, to our fellow Americans whose generous gifts have made this fight possible. I am proud to be able to pay tribute to one special volunteer, who has made this cause very much her own, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt. The cancer foundation which bears her name is now affiliated with the American Cancer Society in a great national effort. I hope that all of us will be part of it. This deserves our most earnest and sympathetic consideration, and I therefore hope that you will open your doors and your hearts to the 2 million volunteers in this great drive who will be calling upon you.

Thank you very much.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I have had extended correspondence, over a period of several years with the Post Office Department, urging the issuance of a special U.S. stamp commemorating the crusade against cancer. Anticancer postage stamps are not new by any means. Since 1928 some 110 postal postage stamps have been issued by 46 countries in the effort to help conquer cancer.

The Post Office Department in the past has issued special commemorative stamps on the fight against disease. For example, on February 15, 1957, during the 20th anniversary year of the Association for Infantile Paralysis and the March of Dimes, a special commemorative stamp was issued honoring those who had helped fight polio. More recently a malaria eradication stamp was issued on March 30, 1962.

Mr. President, I introduce proposed legislation authorizing and directing the Postmaster General to issue a special commemorative postage stamp on April 1, 1964, commemorating the crusade against cancer. The bill provides that the stamp shall be first offered for sale to the public in Washington, D.C.

Mr. President, because many Members of the Senate have expressed interest in and support for the issuance of such a stamp, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks, and that it be held at the desk for a period of 10 days so that others might join in its sponsorship.

Mr. President, a crusade-against-cancer commemorative stamp will be a means of fostering public awareness of this dread disease, so that many of the 88,000 American lives which are lost needlessly to cancer every year might be saved by helping stimulate visits to doctors in time for early diagnosis and treatment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD and lie on the desk as requested.

The bill (S. 1517) to provide for the issuance of a special U.S. postage stamp in commemoration of the crusade against cancer, introduced by Mrs. NEUBERGER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to issue a special postage stamp commemorating the crusade against cancer. The stamps shall first be offered for sale to the public at Washington, D.C. on April 1, 1964.

Such postage stamps shall be issued in such denomination and design, and for such a period, as the Postmaster General may determine.

EXCISE TAX ON MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS BOUGHT PRIVATELY FOR SCHOOL USE

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exempt from tax musical instruments sold to students for school use.

It seems paradoxical to me that school bands and orchestras have two kinds of instruments being played side by side. There are those purchased by schools for student use which are not subject to excise tax, and those purchased by parents for their children to use in school on which the tax must be paid. The tax on instruments purchased by parents is, in effect, a tax on musical textbooks. I believe this tax to be wholly without justification.

In order to eliminate this inequity in the law, I propose with the introduction of this bill, to provide for the extension of the excise tax exemption to all musical instruments used by students in educational institutions.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the bill itself be printed at the close of my remarks. I further ask unanimous consent that the bill be permitted to lie on the table for 5 days so that those of my colleagues who wish to cosponsor this bill may have the opportunity to do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record, and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Indiana.

The bill (S. 1520) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exempt from tax musical instruments sold to students for school use, introduced by Mr. Hartke, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a)(1) the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, is amended by adding after section 4151 (relating to the imposition of tax on musical instruments) the following new section:

"Sec. 4152. Exemption for Educational Use.

"The tax imposed by section 4151 shall not apply to any musical instrument sold to an individual who is a student in an educational institution if such instrument is to be used by such student in an orchestra, band, or similar organization sponsored by, or a course of instruction offered by, such institution. For purposes of this section, the term 'educational institution' means an educational institution (1) which is a nonprofit educational organization (as defined in section 4221 (d) (5)) or (2) which is an agency or instrumentality of any government or any political subdivision thereof, or is owned or operated by a government or any political subdivision thereof or by any agency or instrumentality of one or more governments or political subdivisions. The right to exemption under this section shall be evidenced in such manner as the Secretary or his delegate may prescribe by regulations."

(2) The table of sections for part II of subchapter C of chapter 32 of such Code is amended by striking out—

"Sec. 4151. Imposition of tax."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"Sec. 4151. Imposition of tax.

"Sec. 4152. Exemption for educational use."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a)(1) shall apply to sales of musical instruments made after the date of enactment of this Act to students of an educational institution (as defined in section 4152 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended by this Act).

CONSOLIDATION OF ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSALIST WOMEN WITH ALLIANCE OF UNITARIAN WOMEN—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, there is at the desk a bill reported unanimously this morning from the Committee on the District of Columbia by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke].

The Universalist Church and the Unitarian Church, which combined a year ago, have women's organizations. The Universalist Association of Women wishes to be able to join legally with the Alliance of Unitarian Women, which is a nonprofit corporation in Massachusetts.

Both the majority leader and the minority leader have been consulted, and both of them approve; and the District of Columbia Committee is unanimous. There is no opposition to the bill.

Therefore, Mr. President, I request suspension of the rule, so that this measure may be considered at this time; and I hope the bill will be enacted promptly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 1227) to authorize the Association of Universalist Women to consolidate with the Alliance of Unitarian Women, a nonprofit corporation in the State of Massachusetts.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1227) authorizing the Association of Universalist Women (a nonprofit corporation in the District of Columbia) to consolidate with the Alliance of Unitarian Women (a nonprofit corporation in the State of Massachusetts) which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments on page 3, line 10, after the word "the," where it appears the first time, to strike out "Superintendent of Corporations" and insert "Commissioners"; after line 12, to insert "As used in this Act, the term 'Commissioners of the District of Columbia' means the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or their designated agent."; and on page 4, line 12, after the word "the," where it appears the second time, to strike out "Superintendent of Corporations" and insert "Commissioners", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Association of Universalist Women, a corporation established and existing under the laws of the District of Columbia by virtue of title 29, chapter 6, of the District of Columbia Code, 1961 edition, is hereby authorized to enter into a consolidation with the Alliance of Unitarian Women (formerly named National Alliance of Unitarian and Other Liberal Christian Women), a corporation established and existing under public statutes, chapter 115, of the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and Acts in amendment thereto, under which consolidation said corporation shall thereafter become and be one corporation under a name to be adopted at the organizational meeting of the consolidated corporation, which consolidated corporation shall be a corporation existing under the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, only, and shall in all respects be a continuation of each of said existing corporations.

Sec. 2. Upon such consolidation becoming effective, all property of the Association of Universalist Women, including all bequests, devises, gifts, and transfers of any kind heretofore and hereafter made to or for its benefit, shall be transferred to and vest in the consolidated corporation without further act or deed. Said consolidated corporation shall have the same powers, rights, and privileges with respect to such property and with respect to such bequests, devises, gifts, and transfers as would have been possessed by said consolidated corporation had such bequests, devises, gifts, and transfers been made directly to it and for its purposes, so far as such powers, rights, and privileges can be legally conferred by this Act, and otherwise shall have with respect to such property and such bequests, devises, gifts, and transfers the same powers, rights, and privileges as would have been possessed by the Association of Universalist Women had such consolidation not been effected.

Sec. 3. The consolidated corporation shall be deemed to have assumed and shall be liable for all the liabilities and obligations of the Association of Universalist Women.

Sec. 4. The consolidated corporation shall be deemed to have agreed that it may be sued in the District of Columbia for any obligation or liability of the Association of Universalist Women and shall be deemed to have irrevocably appointed the Commissioners of the District of Columbia as its agent to accept service of process in any action for the enforcement of any such obligation or liability. As used in this Act, the term "Commissioners of the District of Columbia" means the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or their designated agent.

Sec. 5. The consolidation shall not be completed—

(a) unless the same shall have been authorized by appropriate legislation enacted by the Commonwealth;

(b) unless at meetings called for the purpose, each of said existing corporations, by not less than a majority vote of those present and voting, shall have accepted this Act and any act of the legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts relating to the consolidation; and

(c) unless after the aforesaid authorization and acceptance said existing corporations shall have called and held an organization meeting of the consolidated corporation to be held at such time and place anywhere in the United States of America or Canada as said existing corporations may by separate vote designate at such meeting of acceptance, and each of the existing corporations shall at said meeting of acceptance designate its delegates to such organization meeting of the consolidated corporation for the purpose of adopting bylaws for the consolidated corporation and of electing initial officers, directors, and other officers thereof.

Sec. 6. The consolidation shall be complete and effective upon the filing with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia of a certificate signed by the secretaries of said existing corporations who shall make affidavit setting forth detailed compliance with the provisions of section 5 and stating the names and addresses of the administrative board or board of directors and other officers initially elected by said organizing meeting. Said certificate shall be filed not later than sixty days after the date of said organizing meeting.

Sec. 7. This Act shall take effect immediately.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill (S. 1227) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader and the acting minority leader.

NATIONAL SERVICE CORPS—AMENDMENT

Mr. THURMOND submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1321) to provide for a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and ordered to be printed.

EXTENSION OF FEED GRAIN PROGRAM—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MILLER submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 4997) to extend the feed grain program, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 4997, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 4997, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. AIKEN submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 4997, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATION BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the nomination of Robert C. Strong, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Iraq.

In accordance with the committee rule, this pending nomination may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of its receipt in the Senate.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF J. LINDSAY ALMOND, JR., TO BE ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, May 28, 1963, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of J. Lindsay Almond, Jr., of Virginia, to be associate judge of the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Johnston], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska], and myself, as chairman.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 20) to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. Aspinall, Mr. O'Brien of New York, Mr. Morris, Mr. Saylor, and Mr. Chenoweth were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H.R. 2842. An act to amend section 3238 of title 18, United States Code; and

S.J. Res. 39. Joint resolution designating the week of May 20–26, 1963, as National Actors' Equity Week.

SMOG AND LUNG CANCER

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, recently in Pasadena, Calif., a group of scientists found evidence that lung cancer can result from smog—that is to say, from polluted air. The Federal Government is interested in the elimination of air pollutants, exactly as it is interested in the elimination of pollutants from the water we drink. That is the reason we have passed Federal air pollution laws these past few years.

On April 18, the Los Angeles Times published a most interesting article on this general subject. Because the Senate will before too long, I hope, be dealing, once again, with air pollution legislation, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, Apr. 18, 1963]

Science Finds Support for Theory Smog Can Cause Lung Cancer

(By Harry Nelson)

The first scientific evidence that human lung cells exposed to smoggy air undergo changes characteristic of the early stages of cancer has been reported by a group of Pasadena researchers.

The work, which supports what previously has been intuition that smog can cause lung cancer, was done by Dr. Donald E. Rounds and Dr. C. M. Pomerat and coworkers at the Pasadena Foundation for Medical Research.

Using human lung tissue growing in laboratory dishes, the scientists first exposed the tissue to a chemical used routinely by laboratories for causing cancer.

Then they recorded on motion picture film the changes in the cells which were triggered by the cancer-causing chemical.

The photographs, taken at regular intervals through a microscope, showed that the growth rate was increased and that the cell chromosomes—the carriers of hereditary information—underwent abnormal changes.

Having established the nature of the changes caused by a chemical known to cause cancer, the researchers repeated the experiment with fresh cells but this time exposing them to Pasadena air on smoggy days.

According to Dr. Rounds, the growth rate and the chromosomal abnormalities were nearly identical to those appearing in the first experiment.

"The experiments show there are sufficient carcinogens (cancer-causing chemicals) in the atmosphere to trigger the initial steps toward malignancy," Dr. Rounds said in an interview.

"We can't say that we caused malignancy, but we can say that the changes in the cells were nearly identical to changes appearing when carcinogens are used."

The scientist, who is associate director of the foundation's Division of Cellular Biology, said that a person who breathes smoggy air for 3 minutes will undergo similar changes in his lung tissue.

Why then does not everybody get lung cancer?

Presumably, he said, because most persons have body defense systems efficient enough to clear away the abnormal cells before they have the chance to advance to a malignant state.

LETHAL TO CELLS

In addition, many of the abnormal cells die because the damage to the chromosomes is severe enough to be lethal to the cells.

Dr. Rounds believes that the cancer-causing capacity of smog resides in the particulate matter to which various hydrocarbons become attached.

The gas components of smog—sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxide, for example—probably are responsible for the congestion, bronchitis and emphysema which are aggravated by smog.

Dr. Pomerat is an internationally recognized tissue culture expert. Tissue culture is the name for the technique of growing tissue in laboratory dishes. It is known that certain kinds of chromosomal abnormalities occur in tissue culture even when the cells are not exposed to toxic or noxious agents.

CONTROLS STUDIED

But Dr. Rounds said that the changes occurring in the chemical and smog experiments were significantly more common, sufficient indication for him to conclude that they were due to the materials the cells were exposed to.

The scientists also are using their technique to study the efficiency of various smog control devices for automobiles. They expose tissue cultures to exhaust gases before they pass through a device and compare the effects on cells with those produced by gases after they have been passed through the device.

This phase of their work is being done in conjunction with the State air pollution control board.

COTTON IS IN TROUBLE

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the predicament in which cotton finds itself today grows more and more acute. The grower, the textile manufacturer, the consumer, the taxpayer, and the economy of the Nation suffer from the hodge-podge of existing cotton law.

A new and objective and long-range look at cotton and its future is long overdue. An atmosphere of defeatism now pervading the question of new cotton legislation must be cast aside, and there must be a concerted effort on the part of all interests to revitalize the industry.

Charles S. Murphy, Under Secretary of Agriculture, when speaking in New Orleans on Friday, correctly stated "that a problem does exist, and cotton is in trouble." Referring to a number of cotton legislative proposals now pending before the Congress, Mr. Murphy especially noted the merits of the cotton bill which I have introduced in the Senate, on which hearings will be held May 20 before the Agriculture and Forestry Committee.

I appreciated his remarks, and call them to the attention of everyone interested in a solution to the cotton problem.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this speech be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ADDRESS BY UNDER SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE CHARLES S. MURPHY BEFORE THE AMERICAN COTTON SHIPPERS ASSOCIATION, ROOSEVELT HOTEL, NEW ORLEANS, LA., MAY 10, 1963, 11 A.M.

I have spent a lot of time during the past 2 years working on proposed cotton legislation. This has been a most interesting experience. However, at this time it appears that the degree of success which is likely to be achieved is a matter of conjecture.

I said last December that I thought the prospects for new cotton legislation were excellent because there were so many people who needed cotton legislation so badly they would simply have to get together—submerge their differences—and work to get a bill passed. It now seems that I may well have been wrong in my estimate of the situation. Differences have not been submerged.

I spoke again on this subject in January. At that time, I said "the hope for enactment of new cotton legislation remains alive. Whether this hope is in fact realized will depend to a great extent on whether the different groups in the cotton industry can and will submerge their respective viewpoints sufficiently to provide the essential degree of accommodation to the viewpoints of others. No one is going to be able to have his first choice as to what the new legislation will contain. It is possible, however, to have new legislation under which everyone would be better off than with no new legislation at all. That is the real choice.

"Even if the cotton industry is united in its efforts to obtain prompt passage of a new bill, there are many pitfalls along the way and many difficulties ahead in obtaining the necessary concurrence and support from noncotton groups. Substantial opposition or dissension within the cotton industry itself can and almost certainly will prevent passage in time for the planting of the 1963 crop.

"I believe the recommendations of the Secretary's Cotton Advisory Committee of January 14, 1963, offer the best—and perhaps the only—basis on which there is a reasonable hope of agreement. These recommendations were arrived at by the Advisory Committee after deliberations extending over many months and after thorough discussion of many alternative proposals. They represent a degree of agreement which was reached only after much give and take. Anyone who might wish to upset them now should recognize (1) the difficulty of finding any other basis of agreement, and (2) the necessity for agreement if legislation is to be passed."

* * * * *

"No one is entirely satisfied or happy with proposals recommended by the Advisory Committee. I expect I have heard more objections to them than anyone elese. Nevertheless, they still seem to me to be the only basis on which there is a reasonable hope of achieving an early agreement."

There were evidently a lot of people who didn't believe what I said in January, because they went off in a good many other directions. This, of course, they had a perfect right to do. But I might point out that we have no cotton legislation and the prospects do not look as good now as they did in January.

Instead of differences being submerged they have been emphasized more and more.

There is general agreement on one phase of the matter, namely, that a problem does exist and cotton is in trouble. Even here, there are differences of opinion as to how serious the trouble is. It sometimes seems to me that various spokesmen are competing with each other to see who can make the most extreme statement about the seriousness of the situation. I would not for one moment wish to minimize the gravity of this problem, but I don't believe I can add much to what has already been said on the subject.

The problem in the cotton industry has existed for a number of years. As we worked with our Cotton Advisory Committee in the fall of 1961 and the spring of 1962 on proposed legislation, we saw only limited opportunities for improvement. We were searching for a formula which would maintain or increase the income of cotton farmers, which would make cotton more competitive, and would at the same time reduce Government costs for the cotton program. This was a formula which made the task extremely difficult.

A major new element was introduced into the picture last fall when President Kennedy indicated that additional Government funds might be used to help solve the problems of the cotton industry and to eliminate the inequity of the two-price cotton system. It was his judgment that the general welfare might be best served by the expenditure of these additional funds. It seemed to me that this decision of the President's was the key to the solution of our problem—the magic ingredient that would solve the dilemma of cotton with which we had been wrestling so earnestly. However, this has not been the case—at least not yet. Too many people—too many interests—are still insisting upon maintaining conflicting positions.

I think it should be understood that the administration in its desire to help find a solution of the problems of the cotton industry has agreed to a plan which would add many millions of dollars to the estimated cost of the cotton program. Let me hasten to add that we believe this expenditure would be fully justified in the resulting benefits to the entire Nation. Consumer savings alone would largely justify the expenditures—since prices to consumers would, it is estimated, be reduced the equivalent of twice as much as the increased Government costs. In addition, the stimulating effects on the entire economy through greater prosperity and activity in the very important cotton industry would be most beneficial to everyone.

However, the added Government costs present a very practical problem of great magnitude in budgetary terms. Government expenditures have to be paid with tax money that is actually collected by the Government. I want the record to be perfectly clear that the President has gone very far indeed, and has more than made good on his commitment to recommend legislation which would eliminate the inequity of the two-price system for cotton.

Indeed, I think the President has gone as far as he should be expected to go. His responsibility to manage the Federal budget is a very heavy one, and no one can rightly contend that the share he is willing to allocate to cotton is less than its fair share.

The administration has not taken, and is not taking, a dogmatic attitude about this matter. It recognizes the problem. It has suggested solutions—it has accepted modifications and counterproposals—it has been and is willing to agree to almost any reasonable solution that other people will agree to.

Nevertheless, there are limits beyond which we cannot go.

I believe the solution to the problem, if it is to be found at all, must be found within the limit of Federal expenditures which the President has already indicated he is willing to accept. There is no assurance that the Congress will agree even to expenditures of this magnitude—there is very little chance the Congress would agree to more.

Where then is the solution to be found? Should we raise the export price of American cotton so as to reduce the cost of the export program? Few knowledgeable people with whom I have discussed the subject would advocate this course. If American cotton is to be exported at all, it can only be exported at world prices. Otherwise, no one will buy it. The exports must be maintained. They are too important—not only to the cotton industry—but to our balance of payments—to the entire national economy—to even think of letting them stop.

Is the answer to reduce the support price for cotton? Many people are saying yes. They say they know American farmers cannot produce cotton at the world price of around 24 cents a pound, but that 30 cents a pound would be about right. That would be a reduction of 2½ cents a pound. Before you settle on this as a painless and easy answer, do a little bit of simple arithmetic with me. See what would happen to cotton farmers' income. Suppose the cotton farmers' total cost of production is only 24 cents a pound—and surely that is not a high estimate. His present support price is 32½ cents—leaving a margin of profit of 8½ cents. If we simply reduce his price 2½ cents, he loses more than one-fourth of his profit—his net income. But you say, his volume will be increased—and in due time it may. Our economists estimate that for each 1 cent reduction in price, mill consumption could increase by as much as 200,000 bales. So a 2½-cent cut would mean 500,000 bales more cotton. This would mean that the American cotton farmer instead of losing 29 percent of his net income loses only 27 percent—instead of losing $175 million, he only loses $160 million.

This is not a consequence to be accepted lightly. In the Department of Agriculture, we have found it a very painful prospect.

We are committed to helping maintain farm income—not reducing it. Nevertheless, there have been many spokesmen for cotton producers who have advocated or acquiesced in a reduction of the support price to 30 cents. If this is really what producers want, what are we to say?

I will say this. We feel a special obligation to the small farmer—one whose voice is heard least in the corridors of Washington—but one whose need is greatest. We are willing to accept his proxy in this matter, and we don't propose to vote it in favor of a price support cut for the little man as a part of a legislative package.

Is it necessary to a solution that a payment be made on cotton consumed domestically which is equal to the entire difference between the export price and the domestic price of cotton? If so, the squeeze is going to be awfully tight somewhere else.

I have identified some of the questions about the cotton problem. Finding answers is more difficult.

We have conducted a diligent search for answers. From time to time, we have thought we were finding some.

I referred earlier to the program recommended by our Advisory Committee last January 14. We thought that was a satisfactory answer and still think so. But somewhere along the line, it failed to provide what some people thought they had to have—so it was derailed. Various modifications were proposed. We have considered them one after another and agreed to them whenever we could. Most of the administration's difficulties in considering these proposals have revolved around budgetary considerations. In that area we feel that we have gone about as far as we can go.

As you all know, we recently sent to Congressman Cooley, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, our views on a draft bill he had sent to us for comment. We agreed to the main points in the draft he sent to us, subject to the minimum changes necessary to bring it within our budgetary limits and provide a measure of protection for small producers.

This draft bill would provide for payments with respect to cotton consumed in the United States to eliminate the inequity of the two-price system. These payments would be in an amount determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, subject to the proviso that on and after August 1, 1964, the payments would have to be sufficient to make cotton available for domestic consumption at the same price it is available for export. These payments would be made to "someone other than the producer," but there is not one word about whether they should be made to the "first buyer" or "last handler."

The draft bill also provides for the planting of cotton on export acres outside the national allotment and at the world price. It also would authorize a lower price level for that part of the production from each farm which exceeded 30 bales. Finally, it would authorize a stepped up program of research aimed at reducing the cost of producing cotton, and would provide for a reduction in support price commensurate with such reductions in costs of production as might be achieved.

A number of persons interested in cotton promptly said they would oppose this proposal. They probably will be able to defeat it if they persist in this attitude. I understand that various producer groups are still considering this proposal and more may be heard from them later.

Hearings on cotton legislation are scheduled to begin before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on May 20. The bills before that committee will include one introduced by Senator Sparkman of Alabama which embodies the recommendations of our Advisory Committee to which I referred earlier. The Department of Agriculture will, of course, indicate to the Senate committee that it believes this proposal to be a suitable way of dealing with the problem.

The Senate committee will also have before it another bill proposed by Senator Talmadge of Georgia. This bill has some very constructive possibilities. Briefly, it would provide for each grower a domestic allotment—his fair share of the domestic market—expressed in bales. Each grower could produce and market as much cotton as he pleased at world prices. Then, in addition to what he received in the marketplace, the Government would make payments to him on his domestic allotment to achieve specified levels of total returns per pound for this share of his production.

This proposal would permit cotton to move freely through private trade channels at price levels approximating world prices. It would be possible under this proposal to increase the net income of cotton farmers and, at the same time, lower Government costs in comparison with other programs. It would be the lowest cost way of achieving a one-price system for cotton. It would be simpler to administer than the present program. We believe that this bill deserves the most careful and objective consideration.

There is, in some quarters, strong opposition to one of the features of the Talmadge bill—namely, the direct payments to cotton producers. One of the reasons for this opposition is the fear that limitations might be put upon the size of payments so as to ruin large producers. However, the bill has a safeguard against this. It requires that price support be provided in one form or another no matter how large the producer. Thus, if funds were not made available for paying part of the support price in the form of direct payments, the Secretary would be required by the law to provide the total support price by loans or purchases just as he does now. This has been referred to as the "snap back" provision. We regard it as very wise. We regard it as essential that large producers as well as small shall receive a fair return for their cotton.

There is one curious phenomenon related to the Talmadge bill and similar proposals involving direct payments to cotton producers. Many, many people—many of them in high places—say "We know this kind of proposal makes sense—it would be best for everybody—and I'm for it," they say, "but the trouble is we can't get it passed—the Farm Bureau leadership is against it."

This leads me to a question which I wish to pose to your group here today. I think I know how you feel about the Talmadge bill and other like proposals. But my question to you is: What are you going to do about it? How long are you going to continue to listen to people who say they agree with you that this is the best kind of proposal but it can't be passed?

I want the record to be perfectly clear from this point on that the Department of Agriculture is not responsible for the ills which beset the cotton industry. You ought to know who your friends are; and, if you are going to aim your fire anywhere, you ought to aim it at the right places.

We, in the Department, are going to keep right on doing the best we can to get cotton legislation passed. But the fate of this matter does not rest in our hands. It rests in yours, and in the hands of cotton producers, and textile mills—and all the groups interested in the welfare of people in the cotton industry. We will do our part. But we cannot do your part. The outcome rests in your hands just as much as it does in ours.

It will take the best efforts of all of us to get the job done.

AMERICAN LEGION SPEECH BY CASPER, WYO., YOUTH

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, in a speech that won the regional American Legion Oratorical contest at Albuquerque, N. Mex., a Casper, Wyo., youth recently warned of the danger of communism to the United States Constitution.

In his remarks John Vorhies, Jr., observes that America is now the strongest fortress of freedom left in the world, and that we have an unprecedented moral obligation to spread the ideas of our Founding Fathers and to fight the forces of communism.

John states that we are charged with the never ending task of defending and preserving this Nation and its ideals for the world of tomorrow.

In the hope that it will be of interest to my colleagues and to Americans who read of our proceedings, I request unanimous consent to have this speech by John Vorhies, Jr., of Casper, Wyo., printed in the Congressional Record following my remarks.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Our Constitution—Hope for Mankind

(By John R. Vorhies, Jr., 1234 South Wolcott Street, Casper, Wyo.)

Existence—that is a magnificent word, for existence is the miracle that God brought about in a dead universe. And, God made man—to exist. The miracle of life alone is more than enough, for no one would trade existence for nothingness. Yet, some of us have been given a special existence far above that of the rest of mankind—for we exist in a free society. What we have done and what we will do with this gift has a profound effect on the rest of the world.

I believe that to save mankind and to help the oppressed people of the United States of America, the fate of mankind has, in a sense, been placed in our hands. For the inexorable force of Communism is rolling across the countries of the world—picking them up and transforming them into police states. America is now the strongest fortress of freedom left in the world. For that reason we have an unprecedented moral obligation to spread the ideas of our Founding Fathers and to fight the forces of communism.

We have, in the United States, the prize for which mankind has always fought. That prize is freedom. For the citizens of the United States freedom, insured by our Constitution, has meant the greatest material wealth in the world. It has meant the evolution of the best economic system imaginable. For our ideas of free and natural competition have made our industries the most efficient in the world. On top of that, our workers receive higher wages than any other labor force on earth. Our institutions, our ideals, our people and even our buildings all reflect the free society in which we live.

Look around at the beautiful, freely functional architecture of our country and compare it with the dull, drab buildings in the Soviet Union. Some of the structures found in this country are truly inspired creations. The Federal Science Pavilion at the Seattle World's Fair and Dulles International Airport in Washington, D.C., are two creations in concrete which will thrill people with their beautifully functional design for years to come. In every city of the United States there are many buildings and parks and works of pure art which wonderfully evidence the free spirit which abounds here. Architects, writers, painters, and all creative people wish to express their feeling for beauty through their work. In the United States they may do so without interference.

Think of the many charitable institutions in this country: the Ford Foundation, the United Fund, CARE, and the many church-supported programs in foreign countries. Of their own free will the people of the United States choose to help the handicapped and poverty stricken people of the world.

Consider our ideals which were formed with a feeling for the worth of every individual human being and which are overshadowed with deepest respect for the ultimate supremacy of the human soul. These beliefs are the result of life in a free society.

The people of this country brilliantly reflect the type of society in which they live. We Americans are a happy, intelligent people who love our country. Our minds are free to think creatively, to plan our lives, to learn. Utilizing their leisure time Americans have become the most informed people in the world. Every day they turn to art and to literature in ever-increasing numbers. Even the lowliest factory worker lives on an intellectual plane far above that of a large majority of the world's population. We in the United States have truly achieved a wonderful existence.

To fulfill the opportunity of today and the promise of the future is the duty of every single citizen of this great country. We are charged with the never-ending task of defending and preserving this Nation and its ideals for the world of tomorrow. We must never forget that our Constitution is a shining beacon for the oppressed peoples of all the earth. We must not let that beacon go out. We must not forsake mankind and cheat our children. We must never forget that if we lose our freedom then all of the material wealth in the world will be as nothing.

The ancient Romans were blessed with the beginnings of an intellectual climate similar to ours. They had the most advanced society in the world for their time. But the people became complacent. They stopped fighting for their rights. They stopped exercising their legislative privileges to obtain more freedom. They became physically soft. Their minds began to deteriorate along with their bodies. Thousands upon thousands of people quit fighting for life and accepted the government dole. They became drones in a society that depended upon slaves. The story is the same in many countries of the world. Spain and Italy and Germany and the South American countries all were taken over by dictators because the people failed to wake up and take action against the waves of tyranny. There is a very real example of the price of apathy just 90 miles off our gulf coast.

If we fail to exercise our privileges and think for ourselves we will be lulled into that same complacency. We must be ever aware of our obligation to our country and to mankind. We must realize that we are the last hope for the world. For if we fail to preserve and spread the ideas of our Constitution then communism will take over and reign supreme, perhaps forever.

The Constitution is very much like an insurance policy, to keep the freedoms it gives us we must make regular payments. We pay with intelligent voting and eternal vigilance. If we fail to make the first payment we will lose our freedoms. If we fail to make the second payment we will lose our country.

Our society is like a tower with the Constitution as its base. Every American citizen is an integral part of that tower. Every citizen must support part of the load or the structure will be weakened. We must have unity of spirit, and strength of purpose with common goals or the Constitution will not be able to support our tower.

Beyond these national considerations we still have an all-important task to perform for mankind. That task is to spread peace and freedom and love of God all over the world.

LAW DEGREE EARNED BY SENATOR BYRD OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, each year, from spring until summer, it is not unusual for Members of this body to attend university commencements. Neither is it unusual on these occasions for Senators to receive honorary degrees of one kind or another, frequently in law. I must confess that I have always felt somewhat reticent, although deeply honored, when I have been the recipient of such a degree, as though it were an unearned distinction.

There is one Member of this body who has no cause for such feelings. On June 10 he will receive from American University a degree in law which he will have earned the hard way. Throughout the years that he has been in the Senate, he has taken the requisite courses in law at American University. He has been a student, as any other student, and has had to carry the same load of studies. Indeed, he has had to work harder than most, for circumstances had previously denied him the opportunity of attending college.

But this grueling effort is now over, or is almost over. Senator BYRD of West Virginia will graduate with honors, and will receive his degree in law.

Mr. President, there has been no more faithful or hardworking Member of this body in discharging his constitutional responsibilities as a Senator than ROBERT BYRD. He has carried his share, and more than his share, of the burdens of the Senate, even while working for his law degree. It has been a great effort, a great strain, and a great personal sacrifice. It adds up to a remarkable feat of the intellect and personal determination which deserves the highest recognition and commendation. I know that all Members join with me in congratulating our colleague, Senator BYRD, on his outstanding achievement.

I ask unanimous consent that an article which appeared in the Sunday Star of May 12, 1963, referring to the Senator, be included at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star of May 12, 1963]

PERSEVERANCE PAYS OFF: SENATOR ROBERT BYRD, 45, EARNS BELATED LAW DEGREE

(By Harriet Griffiths)

Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, kept first by hard times and then by busy times from going through undergraduate college, has managed to earn himself a law degree at 45.

It will be a prized moment for the West Virginia Democrat when he is made a bachelor of laws at American University's June 10 commencement exercises with President Kennedy as speaker.

Behind it are formal law studies begun and completed under what he admits was "terrific pressure" during the 10-year span of his service in the House and Senate, with exceptional scholarship requirements because of his lack of a AB.

RUGGED SCHEDULE

Counting out his election years and one other year when he toured the world as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, he attended classes like any other part-time student during about 6 years.

"For those several years, I was practically a prisoner in my own den at night and on weekends," he recalls. He often ate his supper as his wife drove him from Capitol Hill to the law school at 20th and G Streets NW.

On trips to West Virginia, Mrs. Byrd drove and the Senator studied. Off for Las Vegas to observe an atomic explosion, he carried along his law books.

If the Washington party circuit missed him during his self-imposed stewardship, Senator BYRD didn't reciprocate.

"I have absolutely no interest whatever in cocktail parties," he says. "They are extremely boring as far as I am concerned."

However much a stranger to the social scene, he was a good deal in evidence during the workday at the Capitol. District affairs, particularly the welfare program, have been a memorable area of his thoroughgoing attention as chairman of the Senate District Appropriations Subcommittee.

HAD JOB CONSCIENCE

"I did not let my work suffer as a result of my going to school," the Senator says. "I took my study hours out of those in which one would normally expect to rest from his work."

An intense man who calls himself a workhorse he says there has been no difference in the busy schedule he maintains at the office—his staff estimates he goes out to lunch about four times a month—since last August when he actually finished his law studies.

And despite the frank marveling of those who have heard him explain the District budget to the Senate without any notes, he claims no such ally as a photographic memory.

UTILIZES SPARE TIME

"I'm not able to memorize easily," he avers. Nevertheless, he has committed a large volume of poetry and other literary passages to memory. As one way of making use of spare minutes, he has a dictionary in his bathroom so he can add a new word to his vocabulary while shaving.

In his free time, "I am now able to be with my family more," he says. The family includes his daughters, Mona, a teacher at Henry Thoreau Intermediate School in Vienna, Va., and Marjorie, a George Washington University student.

Senator BYRD thinks he was more sensitive than his professors or his fellow students about the presence of a U.S. Senator in the law school classroom.

PREFERRED ANONYMITY

He made some effort to keep his identity from being known, but eventually the other students would learn who he was. He preferred that his professors call him "Mr. BYRD," but at least one continued to call on him in class as "Senator."

He thinks very few of his fellow Senators, aside from Majority Leader MANSFIELD, with whom he would check to see if any votes were coming up before going off to class at 5:30 p.m., knew he was attending law school.

"I was under terrific pressure," he says of the long haul. "When one attempts to do this while engaged in one of the most important jobs in the world, it becomes almost impossible to stand up under the strain. There were times when I wondered whether I had the strength and determination to go on."

ENCOURAGED BY INSTRUCTORS

The Senator says he had a good deal of encouragement from Dean John S. Myers, of the law school and Associate Dean B. J. Tennery, who was one of his professors; "They would urge me to keep pressing on."

He took part of his law work at George Washington University and the rest at American University. American, under a provision in effect at the time he started, agreed to accept him as a law degree candidate despite lack of a bachelor's degree on grounds of his past record and with the provision that he maintain a B average.

Senator BYRD not only did that, but won the Mooers trophy as the outstanding student in trial practice court and awards for the best examination showings in corporation law, security transactions, and administrative law.

HAD MENIAL JOBS

Graduating from high school as class valedictorian in 1934, he couldn't go on to college. He looked for work for almost a year, and then got a job in a service station. Later he worked in a produce market and meat market. He married young and kept busy making a living.

He took a correspondence course in English from the University of Wisconsin and started college work in West Virginia 16 years after leaving high school, attending classes while serving in the State house and senate.

Now he expects to rest on his educational laurels, except for a possible refresher course next fall and a try at the District bar examination.

"If it were a tangible thing and I could sell it, I wouldn't take $100,000 for my law degree," he asserts.

But on the other hand, "I wouldn't attempt to go through law school again under the circumstances for $100,000 either."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from California withhold that suggestion?

Mr. KUCHEL. I do.

IS PEACE A RELIGIOUS OBJECTIVE?—RULING BY INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I want to call to the attention of the Senate a ruling by the Internal Revenue Service which should astonish thinking people everywhere.

The Internal Revenue Service has ruled that the pursuit of peace is not a religious objective. For this precise reason, it has revoked the tax-exempt status of an old, established Christian peace group, the Fellowship of Reconciliation.

The Internal Revenue Service told this organization:

> Your principal purpose is the prevention of war and the abolition of armaments, particularly nuclear weapons. We do not conclude that your purposes are religious.

I do not pretend to be qualified to decide which organizations should be tax exempt and which should not. It may be that the Internal Revenue Service can cite reasons for justifying the revocation of a tax exemption which has stood unchallenged since 1926.

All I can say is that the reasons the Internal Revenue Service has cited so far are absolute nonsense. More than that, they pose a serious threat to religious organizations in America, and they undermine the entire philosophy of this Nation's quest for peace.

The Internal Revenue Service ruling made the fantastic assertion that peace is not a religious objective, because peace can be achieved only through legislation, and that therefore an organization which works for peace is not a religious organization, but is an action organization.

This ruling obviously was written by someone who knew nothing about religion and also knew nothing about peace.

It seems to me that this ruling must not be allowed to stand as the stated policy of the U.S. Government. It should be repudiated by religious persons of every persuasion, and it should be repudiated by officials of the United States.

I have been following this case since February 27 of this year, when I received from a constituent, a distinguished professor at a Wisconsin college, a letter notifying me of this unprecedented decision. He asked whether American churches could accept the dictum that religion has no voice in political decisions, that the church must stick to its worship and sacraments.

My first inclination was to assume that my friend was misinformed. I could not believe that an agency of the U.S. Government would ever formally rule that the quest for peace is not a religious activity. So I proceeded very slowly.

I wrote to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Mortimer Caplin, asking him if these facts were correct. To this date, I have received no reply, except confirmation from a subordinate that these facts were indeed correct. What I wanted the Internal Revenue Service to do was to explain what follows as a result of this decision.

I asked this question:

> Exactly how did the Internal Revenue Service determine that world peace could be secured only through legislation, and could you give me an example of the legislation needed to bring this about?

I received no answer. It seemed to me a good question. If the Internal Revenue Service has a bill which can be passed that will legislate world peace, I would like to see it and to be a cosponsor. I would guess that every Senator would want to be a cosponsor.

As I said, I proceeded slowly in the assumption that the Internal Revenue Service could not have made such a ruling. But there is no question any longer. Here are some exact quotes from the Internal Revenue Service letter to the Fellowship of Reconciliation, dated Jan. 10, 1963:

> You are operated for a purpose that is political in character, and not within the scope of section 501(e)(3). We believe it is clear that your principal purpose is the prevention of war and the abolition of armaments, particularly nuclear weapons. * * *
>
> It is our position that a purpose of "antimilitarism, peace, and international reconciliation," is a political purpose and not within the orbit of section 501(e)(3). * * *
>
> Resolving international controversies is a political purpose, not a charitable or religious purpose. * * *
>
> We do not conclude that your purposes are religious. * * *
>
> Your main objective is the attainment of international peace by the abolition of armaments and by other revisions in our program of national defense. This is an objective that can only be obtained by legislation.

What a shocking contrast this bureaucratic dialogue makes with the great new peace encyclical of Pope John XXIII—a document which reaffirms for all the world the essentially religious nature of mankind's everlasting quest for peace.

Does the Internal Revenue Service intend to take a new look at the tax exempt status of Catholic churches now that it realizes they are working for peace under the leadership of one of the greatest Popes in history?

As I have emphasized, I do not attempt to substitute my judgment for that of the Internal Revenue Service in deciding tax cases. But the fact remains that no valid reasons have been presented in this case.

I feel no necessity to make a case for the Fellowship of Reconciliation. There are probably many issues on which the organization and I would disagree. But the public should know that this is an old and established peace group. Its national advisory council includes some of the great names of American religion: Dr. George Buttrick of Union Theological Seminary; Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick of Riverside Church, New York City; Dr. Martin Luther King, of Atlanta, Ga., and Prof. Kenneth Scott Latourette of Yale University Divinity School.

The **VICE PRESIDENT**. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Wisconsin may be permitted to proceed for an additional 3 minutes.

The **VICE PRESIDENT**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **NELSON**. The only encouraging sign in this whole baffling incident is the report that the Internal Revenue Service is taking a second look at its unusual decision. But this does not offer much hope. From what little I can learn, the Internal Revenue Service is not actually reconsidering its decision on the "nonreligious" nature of peace. Instead, it is inviting the fellowship to submit new evidence which would enable it to qualify for tax exempt status under this strange ruling.

This appears to me to be equally dangerous. In effect, the Internal Revenue Service is suggesting that the fellowship change or at least redefine its activities from the pursuit of peace to something "more religious."

Without making any attempt to judge the merit of other cases of tax exemption, it is interesting to note that tax exempt status remains in effect for many groups whose principal activity is to campaign for more militant and aggressive actions by the United States in foreign affairs. Tax-exempt status presently is accorded to many militant right-wing organizations. There seems to be no question in the mind of the U.S. Government that such organizations are truly religious.

Mr. President, I just learned this morning that 26 prominent church leaders, including two former presidents of the National Council of Churches and the president of Notre Dame university, are making a protest today on this same decision.

The statement of this distinguished group of Protestants, Catholics and Jews points up the seriousness of this decision. I want to congratulate these distinguished churchmen for rallying to the side of this small, interdenominational organization. They obviously see the serious implications of this Internal Revenue Service ruling.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a statement by the authors of a folder entitled "Why We Belong to the Fellowship of Reconciliation," by Dr. Fosdick and seven other church leaders; a statement of Dr. Edwin T. Dahlberg, minister emeritus, Delmar Baptist Church, St. Louis, Mo.; and a statement concerning the ruling of the Internal Revenue Service on the tax exempt status of the Fellowship of Reconciliation.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Why We Belong to the Fellowship of Reconciliation

"I joined the FOR in its early days. Having seen at first hand what war means, in the first world conflict, my conscience could no longer dodge the issue: That war, in its causes, processes and results, is the complete denial of everything that Jesus Christ stands for. I welcomed then, as I do still, a fellowship which takes Christ's ways of life seriously—not simply as an ideal dream for tomorrow but as a practical program today.

"The FOR is not the only organization to which in my desire to serve the cause of peace I give allegiance, but it has distinctive functions. It represents the advance guard of those who distrust brutal force, however patriotically camouflaged, as a means of solving mankind's problems; who practice positive, constructive, nonviolent resistance against injustice; who, sharing with all intelligent people the conviction that the abolition of war is now a necessity if mankind is to survive, propose in every field which they can influence to substitute undiscourageable good will for coercive violence.

"Within the FOR one finds differing opinions about details of policy and strategy. I find no attempt to achieve unanimity. But the organization's basic convictions and endeavors have gathered around them a company of men and women with whom I am glad to be associated. I think that the future belongs to what the FOR stands for.

"HARRY EMERSON FOSDICK."

John Haynes Holmes: "As a founder of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, I am proud of its record, in stormy times, on the great issues of brotherhood and peace.

"I like the fellowship because it is a quiet, steadfast, resolute group of men and women, who refuse longer to make compromise with sin. It finds war between nations to be the greatest of all evils, and acts accordingly. Its ordeals have been many, its risks more frightening than can be imagined. But it carries on, and will carry on, until peace has come to heal and bless this troubled world."

Allan A. Hunter: "The real struggle is not East versus West. It is between two wills within us. One is the will to annihilate, to dominate and despise, coming to a climax in the disintegrating force of the hydrogen bomb. The other is the will to save, to share, to appreciate: what we see in Jesus. This vitality is our center of reference. When we forget that, the evil we are trying to overcome hypnotizes us into relying on the devil's own skills. So, as members of the FOR, we have to say 'No' to war—each in terms of his own integrity. But the 'no' is incidental. What is ultimate is the positive, reconciling power of God that would go to the cross rather than give up loving 'enemies.' This alternative to the threat of retaliation is what the FOR emphasizes. Until a more certain trumpet sounds throughout the church, for Christ's new and living way, the FOR is needed in our world, desperately needed."

Paul Scherer: "I belong to the Fellowship of Reconciliation because I can find no better means of registering my conviction that in our time, with our instruments of mass suicide, war and the threat of war, are the surest and quickest way not to safeguard but to destroy everything that the free world holds dear. Without drawing any too facile conclusions from the Christian gospel in the direction of pacifism, I yet believe that the witness, both negative and positive, borne by the fellowship is more significant than any other in the so-called secular field with which I can identify myself."

Henry Hitt Crane: "Of all the peace organizations in this country the most authentic, unambiguous and effective seems to me to be the Fellowship of Reconciliation. Under leadership that is courageous, uncompromising and creative it has maintained an unequivocal witness to its sovereign allegiance to Jesus Christ, His way, His truth, and His life, thus moving far beyond the area of mere negative protest into the realm of positive affirmation and example. I know of no more effective way for a sincere Christian to declare his vital concern for world peace than to join the FOR."

Roland H. Bainton: "I belong to the Fellowship of Reconciliation because it has made a consistent stand against war and has worked persistently and constructively for peace. I belong also because there is a certain latitude within the fellowship for diversity of opinion. We are not all of one mind as to the Christian limits of constraint nor as to the strategies of peace. I find myself less radically pacifist than some and more disposed to work with and exert influence upon peace-minded nonpacifists. Our fellowship has not thus far excluded such an approach, and because some divergence is conceded I am glad that I am able to be a member of the fellowship. The witness of the society is particularly needed at this time when the great powers talk of peace and go on bleeding the nations in preparations for war."

Howard Thurman: "I joined the Fellowship of Reconciliation when I was a sophomore in college in 1922. At that time I was not wrestling with the problems of peace and war in any large national or international context. I was trying to find a way to live in the social climate of Georgia, without giving myself over to the hostility and the evil in my environment. For me, it was not a question of deciding not to bear arms, but it was a question of confirming my faith in the creative possibilities of reconciliation at the grim level of my context in my immediate environment. I discovered that there were men like Shorty Collins and John Nevin Sayre who, notwithstanding the fact that they were white, were able to share a quality of understanding and love which said to me that this is not only the right way, but also a better way than was in evidence around me.

"During all the years since, I have maintained my sense of belonging to the fellowship because of the strength which it has given to a lifelong conviction that meaningful experiences of unity and fellowship between people are more compelling than the concepts, the ideologies, the fears or the prejudices that may separate them. The multiplication of these experiences, over a time interval of sufficient duration, can undermine any barrier that separates one man from the other."

Culbert G. Rutenber: "When World War II came, I had already been a pacifist for several years. But I was an isolated one belonging to no organization. When the war broke, I felt the need of the undergirding of others who shared the same convictions. So I joined the Fellowship of Reconciliation.

"In the FOR I found unity in diversity. The kinds of pacifism represented there covered a wide range of beliefs. I received the stimulus of divergent viewpoints, the correction of differing minds, within a fellowship broad enough for all.

"The FOR is the conscience of America on the issues of war and peace. It sounds the alarm even when no one is listening. Moreover it is an active and frequently pioneering agency for reconciliation. I feel it merits my support."

STATEMENT OF DR. EDWIN T. DAHLBERG

Twenty-six prominent churchmen today assailed the recent revocation by the Internal Revenue Service of the tax-exempt status of the country's largest interfaith and interdenominational religious pacifist organization. They described the reasons given by the Internal Revenue Service for the action revoking the status held for 37 years by the Fellowship of Reconciliation as "a challenge to the right of the religious community in America to address itself to peace." Signers of the statement included two former presidents of the National Council of Churches, the President of Notre Dame University, several prominent rabbis and four Protestant bishops. They called on the "religious community" of the country to "unite against the encroachment of governmental bodies into its right to bring the prophetic voice of religion to bear on problems that so desperately need its spiritual insights for lasting solution."

The Fellowship of Reconciliation was organized in 1915. It has 13,000 members including more than 1,500 clergymen, who joined on the basis of a statement of purpose that declares their belief that "love, such as that seen preeminently in Jesus, must serve as the true guide of personal conduct under all circumstances; and they seek to demonstrate this love as the effective force for overcoming evil and transforming society into a creative fellowship." Throughout its history it has been active in attempts to apply nonviolent and reconciling tactics to conflict situations between groups and races as well as in war. In recent years the organization has played a considerable part in the application of nonviolent methods and philosophy to the struggle for racial equality, and leading figures in that movement, including the Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., are among its members.

The Internal Revenue Service in revoking the fellowship's tax-exempt standing, asserted that the organization's work for peace is not religious but political, and that its objectives can be attained only by the passage or defeat of legislation, thus placing it in a newly created IRS category of "action organizations". Several church bodies and periodicals have joined in support of the Fellowship in contesting both of these assertions.

STATEMENT ON THE REVOCATION BY THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE OF THE FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION'S STATUS AS A TAX-EXEMPT ORGANIZATION

The full statement released today and the list of signers is attached.

The Internal Revenue Service has revoked the tax-exempt status of the Fellowship of Reconciliation. As a religious pacifist organization, to which many ministers and laymen belong, the FOR for 37 years has enjoyed the same tax-exempt status granted to other religious and secular agencies engaged in not-for-profit educational activities. Now, suddenly without a formal hearing, Internal Revenue Service revokes this status for a small but important peace educational group. We believe this ruling has implications that extend far beyond the immediate predicament of the FOR. It deserves the attention of the churches engaged in social education and action even though they appear for the moment to be exempt from the Internal Revenue Service ruling.

First of all it should be noted that the FOR in its statement of purpose says that it is "composed of men and women of many nations and races who recognize the unity of the worldwide human family and wish to explore the possibilities of love for discovering truth. They believe that love, such as that seen preeminently in Jesus, must serve as the true guide of personal conduct under all circumstances; and they seek to demonstrate this love as the effective force for overcoming evil and transforming society into a creative fellowship." Formed in England in 1914 and extended to the United States in 1915, the FOR is a "movement of Christian protest against war. Most of its members have joined because of their desire to follow unswervingly the way of life exemplified by Jesus."

Considering this background and with the knowledge of the FOR's activities over the years we find the Internal Revenue Service reasons for revocation somewhat surprising and altogether unconvincing. As we understand it IRS bases its ruling on two reasons: (1) The pursuit of peace, disarmament, and the reconciliation of nations is not religious but political activity. (2) The FOR's objective—world peace—can be secured only by passage of legislation and as a result the organization falls into a recently created category of "action organizations" excluded from the right to tax deductibility.

In regard to the first reason for revocation we believe the FOR has asked the right questions: "Is the American church willing to accept the dictum that religion has no voice in political decisions, that the church must stick to its worship and sacraments, with no word of judgment for the state?" We believe that the church must always retain the right to judge the state and that this is not only a religious activity but a religious duty. It is therefore disconcerting to see this misinterpretation of religious activity accepted as a basis for denying tax exemption.

Undoubtedly legislation will be a part of the movement to attain world peace or for that matter to pursue any other desirable social objective. But the concept that these desirable objectives can be attained only through legislation is fatuous. Changes in attitudes of individual human beings through a process of education normally precede legislation or changes in interpretation of laws. Whether it is race relations, alcoholism, juvenile delinquency or world peace, the church is involved directly and substantially in this process and could not divorce itself from this process without divorcing itself from the Gospel itself.

The record of the FOR over the years bears out its recent statement that "Peace will not be made only through legislation, or indeed through legislation at all. Peace will be made as reconciliation and brotherhood become operative in international relationships as in personal. To acomplish that is the major purpose of the fellowship." In this respect it is like other church bodies who are only incidentally involved in the legislative process and whose major work deals with the changing of attitudes which eventually lead to reform in the social order.

We believe the Internal Revenue Service was in error in revoking the tax-exempt status of the FOR and express the hope that an immediate public hearing will be granted in which this wrong will be righted.

The grounds given by the Internal Revenue Service for its recent revocation of the tax-exempt status held by the Fellowship of Reconciliation for 37 years constitute a challenge to the right of the religious community in America to address itself to peace or indeed to any social issue where some governmental or legislative action may be implied.

It is not just the fellowship that is under attack here; the implications are very broad and even fearsome for the state of religion in America. We believe the religious community should unite against the encroachment of governmental bodies into its right to bring the prophetic voice of religion to bear on problems that so desperately need its spiritual insights for lasting solution.

Prof. Roland Bainton, Yale University; Dr. John C. Bennett, vice president, Union Theological Seminary; the Reverend Daniel Berrigan, S.J., Le Moyne University; Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, stated clerk of the United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., past president of the National Council of Churches; Prof. Henry J. Cadbury, Harvard Divinity School, honorary chairman of the AFSC; Dr. Henry Hitt Crane, minister emeritus of the Central Methodist Church of Detroit, Mich.; Dr. Edwin T. Dahlberg, immediate past president of the National Council of Churches; the Reverend George H. Dunne, S.J., Georgetown University; Rabbi Maurice N. Eisendrath, president, Union of American Hebrew Congregations; Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, minister emeritus, Riverside Church, New York; Rabbi Arthur Gilbert, staff consultant on Religious Freedom and Public Affairs, National Conference of Christians and Jews; Bishop A. Raymond Grant, Portland (Oreg.) Area Methodist Church; Dr. Georgia Harkness, Pacific School of Religion; the Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, president, Notre Dame University; Rabbi Isidor B. Hoffman, Columbia University; Bishop Gerald Kennedy, Los Angeles Area Methodist Church; the Reverend John LaFarge, S.J., associate editor, America; the Right Reverend W. Appleton Lawrence, retired bishop, Episcopal Church of Western Massachusetts; the Reverend Thomas Merton, author, Abbey of Gethsemenee, Trappist, Ky.; Dr. Walter G. Muelder, dean, Boston University School of Theology; Prof. Reinhold Niebuhr, Union Theological Seminary; Mr. Clarence Pickett, secretary emeritus, American Friends Service Committee; Dr. Howard Schomer, president, Chicago Theological Seminary; Rabbi Steven Schwarzschild, Temple Beth El, Lynn, Mass., managing editor, Judaism; Mr. Herman Will, Jr., associate general secretary, Board of Christian Social Concerns of the Methodist Church; and Prof. Gordon Zahn, Loyola University.

(The above-named persons have signed in their individual capacities. Titles and organizations are for purposes of identification only.)

MAINTAINING CONSTITUTIONAL CHECKS AND BALANCES

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, my senior colleague from the State of Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] has recently addressed a Law Day gathering at the Marshall Wythe School of Law, William and Mary College in Williamsburg, Va. In his remarks, my colleague has touched once again with true insight and great sincerity upon the problem of maintaining our traditional system of constitutional checks and balances within the Federal Government.

I believe this to be a serious enough problem to warrant the careful consideration of every Member of the Congress, and I therefore request unanimous consent that the remarks of my colleague be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(On Saturday afternoon, May 4, Senator GORDON ALLOTT, Republican, of Colorado, addressed a Law Day gathering of students, faculty, and alumni of the Marshall Wythe School of Law, William and Mary College, Williamsburg, Va.)

I want to begin today, in more ways than one, with fundamentals. All the documents of this Nation relating to the concepts of law and order are based on these fundamentals, which must remain sound and inviolate, or else the entire complicated and magnificent superstructure of our society will be endangered.

Just as you, I am proud of those documents, hammered out and tempered by the men of our Republic, which established these fundamental principles under the actual stress of a struggle for their homes, their lives, their fortunes, and their freedoms. To some of these we will turn our attention.

The date of Law Day is most significant, in our discussion of these principles, because it gives those of us who live by these fundamental concepts of freedom an opportunity to refute those antihuman doctrines of the dogmatists of Marxism on the very same day that they have set aside to reaffirm their inflexible resolve to destroy our constitutional order and still the voice of freedom.

But principles are not enough. And where better than here—in this State, this city, and this ancient and honorable citadel of learning—to remind ourselves that the idea of freedom needs the fulfillment of practical institutions, that a Virginia-born Declaration of Independence is just so much rhetoric without a Virginia-bred constitutional order, and that a free people quickly falls into impotence or anarchy without the foundations of sound judgment and true knowledge. Virginia has endowed this Nation with stirring documents, with rich experience, and with wise leaders—and I can attest, from my own experience in the Nation's Capitol, that in such a patriot as your revered senior Senator, the old tradition flourishes still.

I am honored today to acknowledge personally my obligation to him for his friendship, courage, and counsel.

In your junior Senator, of course, you have an even more direct connection of school and capitol, William and Mary having awarded him a doctorate in law just 7 years ago.

That this is the second oldest college in America is a calendar fact. The events you have infused into our history are more stirring than the dates, however. Jefferson, Monroe, and Tyler studied here. And we, if well advised, study them still.

There is a practical, everyday incident that attaches our history to your school as well. As you may recall, George Washington, the practical workaday Washington, received his first surveyors' license from this school.

Yet traditions that live in memory alone can be choked in the rank weeds of actual disuse. Your State knows that and tends its fields of contemporary law carefully and wisely. You have, uniquely, a Commission on Constitutional Government in the Commonwealth of Virginia. Its work is widely known and widely respected. In the area of Federal-State relationships, I would say, its work is preeminent. Its work also is very much to the point of what I will discuss today.

From your Commission on Constitutional Government, I recall very vividly, came a recent reminder of some wise words spoken by the late Justice Arthur Vanderbilt. Commenting on the development of the Federal system in America, he concluded that the colonists "had enough of completely centralized government with no distribution of powers and they were intent on seeing to it that they should never suffer such grievances from a government of their own construction."

Some of us are still intent upon that objective. I would say, in fact, that beyond all of our partisan squabbles, there is really only one issue which is fateful, for our form of government, in the fullest sense of that word—fateful. That issue is whether we will preserve a system of distributed governmental powers—distributed to the States, to the Federal legislature, the executive, and to the judiciary—or whether we will, by a government of our own construction, centralize power and retreat from liberty.

One forceful goad for such a retreat from liberty is impatience. Progress, we find, often is defined merely as velocity. Motion, not order, has become obsessive to some of us. And action, not wisdom, has become a status symbol.

Elihu Root warned us of this impatience long before it became a national hobby. He wrote that: "If the people of our country yield to impatience which would destroy the system that alone makes effective these great impersonal rules and preserves our constitutional government, rather than endure the temporary inconvenience of pursuing regulated methods of changing the law, we shall not be reforming. We shall not be making progress, but we shall be exhibiting that lack of self-control which enables great bodies of men to abide the slow process of orderly government rather than break down the barriers of order when they are struck by the impulse of the moment."

This occasion is exactly right for a restatement of that warning.

Law Day has a level of meaning far beyond the mere celebration of impartial rules and regulations, or even the independence of our judicial system. It is an invitation to dig down to the essence and principles of the law. And when we do this, I suggest that we will get very close indeed, to the heart of American constitutional system and to the secret strength embedded in the sweep of our national experience. One principle to be found is that of order. And this is an order beyond mere obedience to sound law: it is an order that emerges out of the very spirit of the law, and thus is man's best approximation of the principle of universal order and the laws of nature. For, the force, the integrity, the ultimate justice of all laws, comes eventually not only from the words written on paper, but from the hearts and minds of the judges, the prosecutors, the lawyers, and, finally, of the citizens who sit as jurors on judgment of the disputes between their fellow men. If the devotion of any of these falters, there is no law. These are not just pious sentiments. They are, in effect, the marching orders of free men everywhere and the preamble to the constitution of every free society.

Let me suggest to you today that we can most profoundly restate the meaning of the American Revolution and the lessons of all subsequent American political history as the progressive working out, in political action, and political institutions, of the ideal of an ordered freedom. This history, from the first, has been caught up in the tension between ideals and practicalities. Our institutions have sought that subtle balance between liberty and authority that avoids the extremes, alike, despotism and anarchy. And if America has bequeathed one overriding lesson to men who cherish freedom, it is this: a self-governing people must be a self-controlled people, each individual responding as best he can to that universal principle of order and justice which his human reason apprehends.

Freedom cannot be bought cheaply. Conscience purchases freedom with eternal vigilance. It must be continually earned and amortized over a complete lifetime of responsible citizenship.

The American constitutional system is part and parcel of this same process. It is a system of balanced order, and of ordered freedom. One aspect is the Federal principle. The other is the balance of the powers between the three branches of our Government. It is my purpose today to point out the dangers to our free society from the assault on our Federal system by the executive establishment. The Federal principle is a balance of power and of sovereignty between States and Nation and, within each unit, between the duties of obedient citizenship and the liberties of each individual person. Also within each unit, the principle of balance extends to the separation of governmental powers among the executive and legislative and the judiciary.

This is unquestionably fundamental constitutional law, but particularly on this day, Law Day, and especially in these perilous times, a reexamination of fundamentals is imperative. The balance of power has been described and expressed on many occasions by the U.S. Supreme Court and the language of the Court in the case of *J. W. Hampton, Jr. and Co.* v. *the United States* (276 U.S. 394) is as meaningful as any. At page 406, the Court has this to say:

"In the actual administration of the Government, Congress or the legislature should exercise the legislative power, the President or the State executive, the executive, and the courts the judicial power, and in carrying out that constitutional division into three branches it is a breach of the national fundamental law if Congress gives up its legislative power and transfers it to the President, or to the judicial branch, or if by law it attempts to invest itself or its Members with either executive power or judicial power."

Always at the fulcrum of this delicate yet enduring balance is the responsible and informed citizen whose central position in the American system has nowhere been better summed up than by the late Justice, Robert Jackson, in these words:

"It is not the function of our Government to keep the citizens from falling into error. It is the function of the citizen to keep the Government from falling into error.

What is my point in returning to first principles? Is it simply the tradition of such occasions as Law Day to haul out and refurbish a reminder or two of the sources of our national heritage—and then tuck them away again for another year and another patriotic celebration? I almost wish that this were true—that all these principles that "go without saying" were, indeed, still going. But I fear that the truth is far different. It is dangerously different. I fear that these principles of balance and of order in the Federal system may become museum pieces in a democracy that has lost its dynamic impulse.

The attack comes in two major forms: from an ever-mounting bureaucratic centralism which threatens to destroy the Federal system itself, and, secondly, from within this monster State, a self-serving executive establishment. This executive establishment, is not just the President alone, but that monstrosity that has grown under the executive, theoretically under his direction. It is as arrogant, as it is power hungry. It is as self-confident as it is contemptuous of the good sense of the American people. I believe that "attack" is the right word here, because we deal here with a truly revolutionary assault on the traditional practices of the American constitutional system. If the assault succeeds, then government by law disappears to be supplanted by government by threat, intimidation, by executive fiat—and at the very best, by benevolent paternalism. It must not be permitted to succeed. We have powerful resources with which to counterattack: First, the great documents of our American heritage itself, no matter how cynically they may be regarded by the new breed. And a mightly legion is also at hand—the great overwhelming majority of the American people. I am convinced that most of them are on the side of bold and responsible State and local leaders and of their representatives, the Congress of the United States.

This is a mighty legion. But the job is a tough one. What is involved is the courage to live in freedom. And that must mean, within the framework of impartial law, freedom for everyone, everywhere in the Nation, who is prepared to accept the burdens of citizenship. It means equal rights and equal opportunities not at the point of a gun, nor by executive decree, but out of the hearts and minds of free men and women. It means a refusal on the part of State and local officials to be bribed by the lure of Federal handouts into the full-scale rout of State sovereignty. It means a parallel willingness to meet real needs and to provide essential public services—as both stimulus and support to private initiative and individual enterprise. It means, in brief, State and local leadership of such quality as will arouse the people to the vigorous defense of their threatened liberties. There is no lesson, on this score, that I would presume to teach the people of this Commonwealth.

My own theater of battle lies in the halls of the U.S. Capitol where the same fight is being waged, and the same stakes are at issue: the balanced order of the American constitutional system, and the liberties of the American people. Here, the fight is shrouded in my mystique of something called "the national interest"—which, allegedly, only the Executive is able to translate into public policy—and by the half-truth that only the President represents all the people. Of course, he represents all of the people. But, taken one by one, and as an institution, so, too, does the Congress of the United States. And precisely the genius of the American political system is that it strikes a balance between these two equal governmental partners, just as it must also strike a balance with the third of these equal partners, the judiciary. Its dynamic principle is to subject all matters of public policy to the interplay of wisdom and judgment and experience of each. This is not a system that presumes to have a hot wire to the absolute truth—but only the confidence that we can approach it closest by filtering the accumulated wisdom of the whole people through responsible and representative institutions. Our model is not that of a throne room—but rather that of a free and public assembly, a forum of deliberation and decision.

And this is a working model, too, backed by nearly two centuries of hard testing and of effective experience. It has worked, first of all, because the American community is marked not only by those differences which make government necessary but also by those more basic agreements which alone make democratic government possible. It has worked because the American people cherish both freedom and order—and have succeeded, to a great degree, in enjoying both. And it has worked because the essential principle of balance has been respected—as between State and Nation, and as among executive, legislative, and judicial. It has worked as well, because the balance among the three branches has until recently, been maintained.

It is this principle that is now under the gun. An executive establishment that evidently regards humility as the eighth capital sin—with limitless arrogance to offset its lack of tempered judgment—puffed up with self-importance rather than held in the checkreins of self-discipline—this, in my view, is the source of the menace.

Let me be more specific about my meaning. Let me give examples of the contribution this makes to the breakdown of our American order. The current debate over "managed" and distorted news is a prime case in point. And the passions aroused by Mr. Sylvester's all too candid statement of right ends justifying false means have tended to obscure the central issue. This administration seems to be saying to the American people, in effect, we will tell you what we think you ought to know—at our discretion, and our convenience, and as a lever to generate popular support for our policies. I do not question the sincerity of the executive spokesmen, misguided as it may be. But I do question their lack of adherence to a principle of free government that was self-evident in Jefferson's Day and to which long history has added greater urgency still. That is, a free people can be truly self-governing only if it possesses the impartial information on which to base its judgment of policy alternatives. Managed news, which, by design, misinforms—makes a mockery of this democratic process.

Another case in point, this is the confirmed habit of the executive to present all its programs as be-alls and end-alls, and to brand congressional opposition as sheer and selfish obstruction to "the national interest." Once more, sincerity is not the issue; what is at issue is the attempt thus to cut off meaningful debate even before it can get started. When the executive dusts off a pump-priming public-works program—outside the traditional framework of congressional control—and claims that it will forthwith "solve" the unemployment problem—well, that's it. Any and all further questions are just so many roadblocks to progress. And the Congressman who dares to doubt that this program will be either efficient or effective is labeled inhuman and insensitive to the plight of the poor and the downtrodden. Nonsense this may well be. But on the record, devilishly effective nonsense is cutting off realistic debate and is reducing Congress to a rubber stamp.

A third illustration of what I mean by this menace. More and more with the passing of each debt-ridden year, there is a growing presumption and acceptance that if anything needs to be done anywhere in the American community, the only agent of progress is the central Government. The usurpation of the tax dollar, not just in modes of taxation, but in total amounts, has left the municipality, the county, and the State with inadequate resources to play their rightful roles. The ability to deal, at home, with the local problems and responsibilities is thus diminished, and with each diminishment comes a renewed clamor for the Federal Government to do something. Thus the Federal grows larger feeding upon itself, while the local government is forced to yield more.

Thus the omnipotent bureaucracy of the executive establishment serves to break down the order of our day established by the great documents of our heritage. The list of priorities of the establishments is endless. It includes "emergency" public works; operating rules and standards in that vast area of public welfare; arbitrary regulation of power transmission over Federal lands; and production controls on agricultural commodities. If it continues to grow, it will encompass everything from school dropouts and juvenile delinquents to * * * as recently released from the Department of Agriculture * * * the type of shoes you should wear—all without benefit of Congress. The new battle cry is for "standby" authority. And thus the erosion of congressional power continues, and with it the sequence that leads to a diminishment of State government.

This, as I see it, is the situation in which we find ourselves, those of us who really believe in the institution and retention of a republic. I can sense the question forming in your minds: Why doesn't Congress do something, and why do they yield? Fortunately, your State and mine both have Members who do want to stop this. But our numbers are pitifully few. Watch the rollcalls of the Senate, for example, and see how many of these basic decisions are made toward a more centralized, all-powerful government by a vote of almost 2 to 1. It comes with deadening regularity.

The battle can be won. It cannot be won by citizen responsibility in one-third of the States, it must be won with a good majority.

The usurpation of our right to have the truth, disguising additional central powers as being in the "national interest," the relegation of local governments to a lesser importance with each new day—all of these can be stopped by a citizenry conscious of and concerned with the moral factors of law. In this, we lawyers have an added responsibility because we each began our practice with an oath of support to our Constitution. We can, in this form of society, choose to surrender our freedoms. Our freedom gives us even that ultimate choice * * * to renounce freedom. We can do it dramatically and with painful pointedness, by constitutional amendment. Or ironically, we can do it by simply allowing a series of painless defaults, which, in turn, create an insidious erosion of the principles of freedom.

To all of us, law students and members of the bar alike, it is upon us, because of our training, that the special responsibility falls for the prevention of this insidious erosion. It is for us to restore, in American public affairs, that lawful order from which freemen derive their standards of judgment and within whose framework they seek their individual fulfillment.

PROPOSED REAL ESTATE TAX INCREASE FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA RESIDENTS

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, recently in my committee work in connection with the District of Columbia Committee I have observed considerable discussion in relation to possible means of raising revenue for the District of Columbia. The questions discussed included types of taxes within the District and whether there should be additional property taxes.

On May 6, 1963, Mr. Carl Shipley spoke to the Forest Hill Citizens Association and on May 2, 1963, he spoke to the Mt. Olivet Heights Citizens Association. Both of those speeches state facts and figures as to what would happen in relation to the tax structure on real property within the District of Columbia in the event the proposals of this administration should be adopted as a revenue-raising measure. Because I think the speeches are of extreme interest to the people within the District and to many other people who will be coming here in the future, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Shipley's remarks be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

President Kennedy and his special adviser on the District of Columbia affairs, Charles Horsky of Maryland, have recommended a substantial real estate tax increase for District of Columbia residents—from $2.50 to $2.70 per $100 of assessed value. Only 46.2 percent of the District's land is taxable (14,164 acres)—the rest is tax exempt because it is owned by the Government, foreign nations, schools, and churches. The taxable real estate already bears an unfair tax burden in order to supply municipal services to suburban nonresidents who work here. We will pay $60.6 million in real estate taxes in 1963. We paid only $51 million in 1960—just 3 years ago.

District of Columbia real estate taxes were increased from $1.75 in 1947 to $2 in 1948, $2.15 in 1950, $2.20 in 1955, $2.30 in 1957, and up to $2.50 in 1962. Since 1957 assessed value of real estate has increased about 25 percent—9 percent represents the general reassessment in 1960, and much of the rest additional reassessments in various sections of the city. Today some residential property, without additional improvements, pays twice the tax it paid in 1957.

A real estate tax increase will drive more business enterprises to the suburbs, and discourage new business from locating here. We need more businesses so our young people can get jobs. Half of the District of Columbia revenues are paid by or collected through commercial activities.

We have 76,000 owner-occupied residential properties out of a total of 262,000 homes. This is one of the lowest ratios (1 in 3) in the Nation. The proposed 20-cent real estate tax increase will make home ownership more expensive, and home acquisition more difficult. It will aggravate the "flight to the suburbs" of upper-class residential owners, and discourage new residents from locating in the District. Rents on apartments and rooms must go up, to the disadvantage of those with fixed or retired income.

The Kennedy administration's proposed District of Columbia real estate tax increase will squeeze another $5 million a year out of District of Columbia taxpayers. It will make District of Columbia real estate taxes higher than Alexandria, Arlington, Fairfax County and City, and Falls Church. Only blue-chip Montgomery and Prince George counties will be higher—35½ cents and 7½ cents respectively, a small differential.

Why do not President Kennedy and Mr. Horsky fight for an adequate Federal payment, measured by need above taxes comparable to adjacent jurisdictions? Congressional committees and the District of Columbia Commissioners have recommended this for years. Why do they not advocate a 1-percent withholding tax on nonresidents' income at the source, as is exacted by hundreds of cities which have a large commuter working population? The District of Columbia Commissioners have recommended this. It would raise twice as much ($10 million) as the proposed real estate tax increase.

The District of Columbia budget and tax policies should encourage an inflow of new businesses and residents, to stimulate economic activity—not drive what we have left over the District line.

President Kennedy's District of Columbia adviser, Charles A. Horsky, a Maryland resident, is trying to "panic" Congress into action on the Kennedy proposed tax increase for District residents by a phony cry of "crisis." District residents in 1961 paid about $225 per person in taxes—well above the U.S. average. We are already paying more than our local share of a national obligation—upkeep of the Nation's Capital. Any budget increase should be met by an increased Federal payment. It is fiscal duplicity for Mr. Kennedy to recommend a tax cut for the rest of the Nation, but a tax increase for the District of Columbia residents. It is somewhat ridiculous to find President Kennedy urging an increase in sales, income, and real estate taxes for the District of Columbia residents, when the Federal Government occupies 43 percent of our land tax free, but pays only 12 percent of the budget. Mr. Kennedy recommends that Congress pay only 16 percent next year, when in all fairness he should be fighting for at least 43 percent of the budget—a Federal payment of $138 million. Up until 1921 the Federal payment was 50 percent of our budget. Since then it has fluctuated from a high of 39½ percent in 1924 to a low of 8½ percent in 1954. Land area would be a fairer standard for the Federal payment than a real estate tax equivalent. The National Government throws a cost burden on the District far in excess of its share of the real estate tax.

Mr. Kennedy has large Democratic majorities in the Senate and House. How about some Presidential leadership where it counts—not in bold speeches, but in Congress?

There is no "crisis" or impending "deficits" in the District of Columbia finances. To the extent Mr. Horsky implies otherwise, he is misrepresenting the facts. The District of Columbia staff officials have advised the Commissioners that the District of Columbia budget for fiscal 1964 "can be financed from available revenue sources." This is an increase of over $3 million above 1963 appropriations. Why drive everyone but welfare clients to the suburbs by tax increases? Budget and tax policies should encourage an "inflow" of new residents, and a "non-outflow" of existing residents. The District should offer an advantageous tax differential.

Instead of a tax increase recommendation, District taxpayers are entitled to some assurances from Mr. Horsky:

1. That all waste and inefficiency have been cut from the District government. Why should we have the largest and highest paid municipal work force in the United States?

2. That cheating and fraud are eliminated from the Welfare Department. Why should we have the worst administered welfare program in the United States?

3. That municipal employees will be required to reside and pay taxes in the District. Why should District residents pay nearly $60 million in taxes each year for salaries of nonresident city employees—one-third of the 30,000 who work for District of Columbia taxpayers?

4. That our police procedures are geared to our public safety needs. Why should we

have one of the worst crime records in the Nation, when we have the second largest police force?

When Mr. Horsky and the White House meet their responsibilities for providing the Nation's Capital with honest and efficient government, we will have no difficulty getting an adequate Federal payment, and Mr. Kennedy's proposed tax increases will be unnecessary.

MANNED LUNAR LANDING PROGRAM

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, last week in a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences—and in my capacity as the ranking Republican on that committee—I proposed that the committee put the manned lunar program in greater perspective by calling witnesses who represent a broad spectrum of opinion in official and unofficial circles noted for their ability to relate the formulation of Government policy to scientific programs.

I expressed the belief that this was particularly necessary since President Kennedy implied that Congress is responsible for identifying those areas in the space budget where there may be waste when he said on April 3, 1963—

> It may be that there's waste in the space budget. If there's waste, then I think it ought to be cut out by the Congress and I'm sure it will be.

While we all look forward to, and pray fervently for, a successful and safe mission by Major Cooper tomorrow or later, I think that it is well in these times of emotional exhilaration to retain our perspective and objectivity. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that my letter be placed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U. S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., May 10, 1963.

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On April 3, President Kennedy said "it may be that there's waste in the space budget. If there's waste, then I think it ought to be cut out by the Congress and I'm sure it will be." In this connection, I have been considering the responsibility of the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, of which I am ranking minority member, for authorizing the fiscal 1964 budget of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Clearly our committee has a special obligation at the present time to investigate thoroughly the objectives, programs, and budget represented by NASA's request for $5,712 million, an increase of $2 billion over the fiscal 1963 budget which had only last year been raised $2 billion over the 1962 figure. When an agency's budget grows at the rate of $4 billion in 2 years, the situation demands the closest scrutiny by the Congress.

Having served for many years on the Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations, I am familiar with examples of waste which have been discovered after unnecessary expenditures have already been incurred. In such cases, there is not much that can be done except to regret that essential facts were not marshaled in time for the committees and the Congress to use with foresight in preventing needless expense.

Since the space budgets are fairly near the beginning of a period of rising costs, and the manned lunar landing alone is estimated variously from $20 to $40 billion during this decade, I should prefer to take advance action to forestall any expenditure of funds and any development of inefficient practices which might result in waste.

To furnish the basis for wisdom in congressional judgment, I hope our committee will call witnesses who represent a broad spectrum of opinion in official and unofficial circles noted for their ability to relate the formulation of Government policy to scientific programs. This seems to me to be particularly necessary since the President has implied that Congress is responsible for identifying those areas in the space budget where there may be waste.

I realize that the recent objectives of our space program were sent by President Kennedy to the Congress on May 25, 1961, when he defined "urgent national needs," and that since then Congress has twice voted in favor of annual appropriations for the space goals of accelerating worldwide space communications, a satellite weather system, a nuclear rocket; and "before this decade is out, of landing a man on the moon and returning him safely to earth."

I recall, too, that at that time the President asked Congress for a judgment in accepting a "firm commitment" to the manned lunar program which was estimated after 1962 to be between $7 to $9 billion additional over the next 5 years.

As we know, one Congress cannot legally commit succeeding Congresses to long-range future courses of action, although it is usual for programs in the public interest, strongly supported by public opinion, to be consistently continued.

It is not, however, for this legal reason that I think our committee should study the objectives of our space activities, the allocation of our resources, and the benefits we hope to derive from the uses and exploration of outer space. Rather, it is because I think the priority given the manned lunar program is more of an issue now than it was 2 years ago. At least the criticisms have crystallized more, and now is the time to study the types of objections which are being raised and to find answers which people will understand.

Our committee members are not in a position to balance expenditures with taxation for this purpose, nor are we in a position to choose between competing national objectives. But we are in a position to study the allocation of money, resources, personnel, and facilities in our space activities. We are in a position to obtain the facts which will enable us to establish criteria for the effective coordination and efficient administration of our space program.

We have all strongly favored U.S. preeminence in the space age, and space legislation has received not only bipartisan but, almost always, unanimous support during the past 5 years.

It is interesting to note that criticisms expressed concerning the allocation of funds within the space budget, and the amount of the total budget, are coming from members of both political parties as well as from some scientists and engineers who are not identified with either party.

I do not, therefore, regard NASA's budget for fiscal 1964 as a partisan matter. The authorization and appropriation of our space funds is an area where public understanding is needed to resolve any doubts about our course of action.

Sincerely yours,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
U.S. Senator.

RETIRED MILITARY PAY EQUALIZATION

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, the action of the House of Representatives in adopting the proposal of retired pay equalization, often called recomputation, is most gratifying and encouraging to me. It makes me feel as though my unsuccessful effort last year to get this proposal adopted by the Senate Armed Services Committee was not in vain and may have indirectly contributed to the action taken this year by the House. I shall continue to fight for the recomputation proposal within the Senate Armed Services Committee and for its retention in the military pay bill—and hope that the Senate will take the same action as the House has to correct this long overdue justice to those of the military who retired prior to 1958.

FACT OF CHANGE

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, the central fact of American life today is that we live in a time of accelerated change, brought about through the scientific and technological advances.

These rapid changes influence almost all forms of human endeavor and directly have a relationship to problems of importance.

In the field, Government has recognized the problems and has taken remedial steps. Yet there has been—and this is perhaps the genius of our system—a recognition of the practical and human problems involved.

An editorial in the Southwest Daily Times of Liberal, Kans., entitled, "Fact of Change" clearly develops this concept and is, I think, a brief and accurate statement of the problem involved.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be placed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACT OF CHANGE

No one, needless to say, likes to see his job disappear. And society at large feels a wrench when progress makes certain jobs obsolete. Secretary of Labor Wirtz recognized this situation when he said: "The presiding fact in our time * * * is the fact of change. A job used to be something that a man expected to have all his life, and our trouble today is that is what he still expects * * * (yet) a job is no longer something which most people can reasonably expect to have or to perform the rest of their lives. There is going to be a change."

The change lies in technological advances, and in the forces of competition. A primary current example lies in the obsolete railroad work rules—the source of "featherbedding" which cost this hard-pressed industry something like $600 million a year. A distinguished Presidential Commission recommended sweeping changes. The Federal courts, including the Supreme Court, have held that the railroads have the legal right to make adjustments.

But human values have not been abandoned. The Commission also recommended protective provisions for workers which have been termed unprecedented in cost and magnitude—and which the railroads accepted. No displaced worker would be summarily dismissed. To provide one illustration, the Commission agreed that 27,000 firemen now in road freight or yard service with 10 or more years' seniority should be kept on with full job rights until retirement, death or other attrition ends their jobs. Those with lesser seniority will also get substantial benefits, retraining for other work among them.

The clock ticks on, and no one can stop it. In railroading, one hour must follow the next—the happy part is that the human element has been considered as seriously as the economic element.

TO CURB THE JUNKETEERS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, last Tuesday, May 7, the House by a vote of 384 to 2 passed the Burleson resolution—the resolution which proposes to put a curb on unnecessary junketing by Members of Congress. This resolution would still allow adequate funds to pay the necessary expenses of bona fide official trips by Members of Congress, but it would require a strict accounting of such expenditures.

On March 19, 1963, I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 63, which is a companion bill to the Burleson bill. Both of these have been referred to the Senate Rules Committee, and I am urging that prompt hearings be held and that it be reported to the Senate for our action.

In this connection I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of Thursday, May 9, 1963.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO CURB THE JUNKETEERS

The Senate may not follow suit, but the House has done a fine day's work in its overwhelming vote—384 to 2—to put a curb on junketing Members of Congress. The action has been long overdue. It lays down rules that are at once simple and sensible. Under them, Senators and Representatives would no longer be outrageously favored on their travels abroad. They would still enjoy certain advantages, of course, but they would have to give an accounting of them, and that would be an excellent thing.

Thus, if the House bill becomes law, Congressmen on foreign trips will henceforth have the same per diem expense account—from $12 to $30—as employees of the executive branch. Further, they will have to report their expenditures in detail and support them with receipts and other documentation whenever they exceed the per diem rate. As a further check the State Department will be required to file an exact accounting of counterpart money (the currencies of the countries visited) handed out to each congressional visitor in Paris, London, Copenhagen, Stockholm and ever so many other places that our national legislators find delightful on "investigating" tours.

The reform envisioned here seems self-evidently wholesome. But the Senate may balk at it. After all, in the world's greatest deliberative body, there is an historically ingrained reluctance to give up special privileges of any kind. Even so, abuses have their limits, and the American people have good reason to demand that an end be put to the scandalous junketeering of some of our Congressmen. The House has shown the way for the Senate.

TRIBUTE TO ARTHUR HERBERT GREENWOOD

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, it was with great sadness that I learned of the death April 26, of Arthur Herbert Greenwood, a distinguished son of Indiana and a dedicated servant of the American people.

I was a child in 1923 when the people of Indiana's Seventh Congressional District first sent Arthur Greenwood to Washington to serve them in the House of Representatives. In the 19 years that followed our country encountered many crises. But none, to men like Arthur Greenwood, was insurmountable. Crises were only challenges and challenges were met with solutions.

During the turbulent first 100 days of Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal, it was Arthur Greenwood who was chosen by fellow Democratic colleagues to serve as majority whip in the House. His able leadership helped steer this Nation on a great new course, and his contributions to the welfare of the American people will not soon be forgotten.

In his passing we have lost a valued acquaintance and noble spirit.

LEGISLATIVE ADVOCACY AND THE GOVERNMENT LAWYER

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the March issue of the American Bar Association Journal contains an article entitled "Legislative Advocacy and the Government Lawyer," by Dr. Ross D. Netherton, counsel for legal research of the Highway Research Board, National Academy of Sciences, National Research Council.

In this article, Dr. Netherton deals with the dilemma which most Government lawyers face when they must compete with the army of lobbyists representing private interest groups. His suggestions as to how lawyers representing the public can function effectively without resorting to the tactics that have called forth condemnation and regulation of lobbying are commendable and deserve wide notice among those who are part of the legislative process on both the national and local levels.

Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEGISLATIVE ADVOCACY AND THE GOVERNMENT LAWYER

(By Ross D. Netherton)

(NOTE.—From time to time various aspects of fact finding for legislation have been discussed in this department. The present contribution emphasizing the influence of the Government lawyer in this process. The author is counsel for legal research for the Highway Research Board of the National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council.)

It has been customary to think of the government lawyer's role in the legislative process as either that of a draftsman of statutes or that of a technical specialist working in the background of a legislative investigation. Seldom has counsel for a public agency thought of himself as an advocate in the same way as a trial counsel who represents his client in the courtroom. Advocacy in the legislative arena is, however, just as real and as significant in its results as advocacy in the courts, although its precepts and practices have only recently begun to be studied by lawyers.[1] This rise of interest in legislative advocacy has, to a great extent, been the result of curiosity about how a governmental agency should conduct itself and its business before legislative bodies.[2] To appreciate the type of advocacy that has been developed in connection with the legislative process one should first recall the setting in which the legislative advocate carries on his work.

ETHICS AND ADVOCACY

The Anglo-American tradition in law relies predominantly on what may be called "adversary inquiry" to determine the facts upon which legal decisions are based. In this process it is expected that counsel, by vigorously presenting all facts and arguments favorable to their clients' position, will build a factual record and a balanced perspective for the decision-makers to do their work. And as we rely on adverse examination of witnesses and partisan argument to disclose fully and interpret the facts of a lawsuit, so we also expect our legislatures to discover and interpret the facts and various other considerations upon which statutes are based. From time to time criticism has been leveled at this form of fact finding but as yet no other or better system appears ready to replace it.

But how can counsel for a public agency effectively participate in this partisan process? How can he be as vigorously partisan for his client's position as lobbyists for other interest groups who do not have the public official's obligation of service to the legislature? A public agency may strongly oppose a piece of proposed legislation, but it cannot ethically adopt the attitude that it will do everything possible to defeat this bill in the legislature and, if it fails in this, will continue its opposition for the avowed purpose of scuttling its administration. With respect to the legislation it does not like, the public opposition of a public agency must be: We respectfully believe that the proposed bill is bad for the following reasons, but if in its collective wisdom the legislature sees fit to enact it we urge that the following changes or additions be made in order to make the legislative intent crystal clear and the provisions of the law capable of effective enforcement.

By comparison with the positions that outright lobbyists sometimes take, this may seem greatly restrained. But it is by no means a powerless position. The obligation of commitment to and service of whatever is duly enacted as law can become the key element of an extremely effective legislative advocacy based on the image of candor and accuracy of advice.

THE VALUE OF CONFIDENCE

A moment's reflection will reveal two sources of strength in this approach. What makes a legislative advocate successful in his work? Clearly it is not overstatements, threats of reprisal at the pools, cajolery and bribery that were the stock in trade of some of the notorious unbridled lobbyists of the 19th century. Procedural reforms in Congress and the State legislature commencing in the 1910's have completely changed the atmosphere of legislative business. Equally important, the degree to which interest groups have become organized—statewide, regionally and nationally—has meant that on any major sensitive or controversial issue the balance of outside pressures bearing on the legislature will be more even than it was in the 19th century when only a relatively small group of interests enjoyed direct access to the attention of the lawmakers and the media of public information.[3] In this setting of competing claims and statements, the busy legislator must and does place a high premium on the candor of the advice he receives. His respect goes to the counselor who he knows will tell him the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. And conversely, the counselor who has a legislator's respect and credence holds the key to influence with that legislator.

---

[1] Of this fact it has been said: "The bar seems to have been less aggressive in this field than in its more familiar background of the courts. Lawyers in our system by training and tradition long regarded the legislative process as alien to the true body of the law; they seem, therefore, not to have been alert to the possibilities of practice before legislative committees, and not as vigilant there as in court to assert the claims of clients. Moreover, legislative inquiry often was armored against successful legal attack; the committee commanded publicity, the adverse effects of which might overweigh even a successful legal challenge to the committee's probing; events also might move too fast in a legislative inquiry to permit practical relief by court action against unauthorized or unfair tactics," Hurst, J. W., "The Growth of American Law: The Law Makers" (Boston, 1950), p. 341.

[2] See e.g.: Weeks, O. D., "Initiation of Legislation by Administrative Agencies," 9 Brooklyn Law Review, 117 (1940); Moneypenny, P., "A Code of Ethics for Public Administration," 21 George Washington Law Review 423 (1953).

Some years ago, the official in charge of legislative liaison for a major department of the Federal Government spoke to a group of Washington lobbyists about their work. He reminded them that what made them valuable to their clients was the confidence that Congress and the Federal executive agencies reposed in them. This confidence was not an attribute acquired en masse or conferred by reason of the prestige of their clients. To the extent that it existed, it was individually bestowed by reason of demonstrated reliability over long periods of contact. Momentarily it might seem otherwise; the influence peddler and the high-pressure campaigner might occasionally have his day. But in the long run, confidence in the candor and thoroughness of the lobbyist's advice—be it pleasant or not—was the strongest basis of influence with the legislature.[4]

THE IMPORTANCE OF INFORMATION

Confidence is thus one source of the legislative advocate's strength. Information is another; and with respect to this source, counsel for public agencies enjoy real advantages. This may be illustrated by reference to legislative problems involved in the current national program of highway building.

Through his own agency the State highway department counsel has access to technical information regarding all phases of highway programs and their impact on the community. By drawing upon research which has been and is being done by his State highway department, by universities, by the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads, by the Congress and by others, counsel can provide comprehensive, analyzed information on literally every controversial issue involved in modern highway programs.

The potential advantage of access to these sources of knowledge should not be underestimated. Today research on the scale that is necessary to discover and interpret the facts regarding highway transportation problems is too expensive, too time consuming and too complex to be within the reach of any but the major organized groups. This has been recognized by many special interest groups throughout the country and has led them to organize and finance research on matters of common interest and then, most important, to make this information available to their members for use in their operations.

Anyone who has watched the legislative activities of the States recently can cite examples of this phenomenon. One might be the activity of the utility industry in connection with legislation to liberalize State laws relating to reimbursement for the cost of relocating utility facilities due to highway construction. The coincidence of the language of the bills that were introduced and the arguments and factual data presented in support of these bills is too striking for one not to see in their background a single central source of research and inspiration.

With respect to almost any major highway policy issue of the present or foreseeable future, one may detect signs that affected interest groups are organizing for the purpose of making their interest known to legislatures and that one of the principal aspects of their organized activity will be research.

More and more, also, legislatures are turning to interim study committees and other public agencies to make studies of the facts regarding important questions, and to recommend the best manner of proceeding. On a national scale the studies called for by Congress under section 210 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 stand as a classic example.[5] These studies, when completed in 1962, represented almost 5 years of painstaking collection and analysis of engineering and economic data. They were called for by Congress to provide the factual basis for revision of the legislative policy and law relating to financing the national highway program. They will also have applications in connection with State and Federal vehicle size and weight laws and statutory standards for highway design.

The value of research to legislative advocacy should not have to be documented further. We ask our elected representatives at all levels of government to determine public policy on questions which are beyond the capabilities of even a Solomon. We ask them to work under pressures of cruel proportions as part of the price of continuing to operate the republican form of government guaranteed in our Constitution. Is it any wonder, then, that the two things our legislators want most of all are advisers who are candid and thoughtful in their consultation and who can give them accurate and complete knowledge of the facts as they exist?

This brings up the matter of technique. How does counsel for a public agency establish and make use of his sources of strength as an advocate?

THE TECHNIQUE OF LIAISON

There are, of course, occasions when formal statements or written communications may be addressed to legislative bodies. Recently, however, an experienced legislative lawyer has observed that for counsel representing a public agency this sort of communication is never enough. Liaison must be a day-to-day matter. Speaking to a group of State highway department counsel, he said: "The day-to-day coordination which I have in mind consists of having a representative of the State highway department constantly in contact with the appropriate committees of the State legislatures so as to keep fully informed as to legislative proposals being considered by the committee, plans they may have for hearings and other actions with respect to such proposals, and to be available at all times to offer technical assistance upon request in the preparation of draft bills, furnishing needed information and related matters."[6]

The details of organization within an agency's legal staff and the precise methods established to carry on liaison will of course vary. But it need not be a massive or complicated system, designed to penetrate subtleties and massive walls of resistance. It is surprising how often the obstacles to legislation are simply and easily overcome.

Recently an experienced State highway counsel told a story that illustrates this. At a meeting with this staff he asked why a certain highway bill which the department needed appeared to be buried in a legislative committee. No one could say. The counsel knew the chairman of this committee well enough to call him and ask him bluntly just what was troubling the committee about the bill. The chairman was just as blunt in his answer. "None of us understand this bill," he said, "and nobody has explained it to us." Counsel then asked if the chairman would arrange an executive session of the committee so that counsel and some of the highway department staff might go over the bill to explain its background, its basis, and its terms. The chairman was glad to oblige. The meeting was held and the bill was reported favorably out of the committee.

Not all bills can be moved through the legislative process this easily, but many problems with the legislature can be avoided or eased if day-to-day liaison, backed up by sound legislative research is practiced. Possibly the little day-to-day victories over fuzzy language, incomplete expressions of legislative intent, inconsistency of stautory construction, and legislative oversight will not seem like very much of an accomplishment to the lawyer who performs this liaison. If so he should reflect on the time, the frustration, and the effort that are called for to correct the consequences of these oversights once they have passed unnoticed into an enacted bill. Let him also be reassured that there is no better or firmer way of building up the legislative advocate's sources of strength—confidence and knowledge—than in this type of day-to-day liaison with legislative leaders.

ALL AMERICA CITIES

Mr. **KEFAUVER**. Mr. President, a distinguished jury recently selected 11 cities of our Nation as winning All America Cities. I am happy to note that among these 11, announced in the April 23d issue of Look magazine, are two in Tennessee—Chattanooga and Knoxville; no other State had as many in the winners' category.

For those of us who know the people of Knoxville and Chattanooga and their leaders, the selection of these cities comes as no surprise. The enterprise they have shown in recent years—in improving their institutions, their neighborhoods and their social relationships—has been outstanding, and I am proud to join the National Municipal League and Look magazine in saluting them.

---

[3] Insight into the changes that have occurred in the techniques of legislative advocacy during the 20th century may be gathered from Hurst, J. W., "The Growth of American Law; the Law Makers" (Boston, 1950), Schriftgiesser, K., "The Lobbyists" (Boston 1951), and Horack, F. E., Jr., "Cases and Materials on Legislation" (Chicago 1954), c. 5.

[4] Documentation of such a sensitive proposition is naturally difficult. The writer can, however, cite a personal experience to illustrate. In the course of a decade of legislative counseling he had many dealings with Members of Congress, and particularly the Members' legislative assistants. On one occasion, when a Senator's assistant was about to leave his position for other employment, he introduced his successor to the writer, and said to the successor: "You can always rely on what this fellow tells you. He will never throw you a curve." The writer regards this as one of the highest compliments he ever received as a lobbyist.

[5] Public Law 627 (84th Cong.), June 29, 1956 (70 Stat. 374, sec. 210). See also the following reports on the study of highway cost allocation: 1st progress report 1957 H. Doc. 106 (85th Cong., 1st sess.); 2d progress report, 1958, H. Doc. 344 (85th Cong., 2d sess.); 3d progress report, 1959, H. Doc. 191 (86th Cong., 1st sess.); 4th progress report, 1960, H. Doc. 355 (86th Cong., 2d sess.); final report, 1961, H. Docs. 54 (Jan. 16, 1961) and 72 (Jan. 23, 1961) (87th Cong., 1st sess.).

[6] May, R. L., "The Importance of Legislative Liasion," a paper presented at the meeting of the Legal Affairs Committee, American Association of State Highway Officials, Denver, October 1961.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed at this point in the RECORD the general remarks in the Look article about the All America Cities as well as those relating specifically to Chattanooga and Knoxville.

There being no objection, the material referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

THE NATIONAL MUNICIPAL LEAGUE AND LOOK SALUTE THIS YEAR'S FINALISTS—ALL AMERICA CITIES

Winners: Allentown, Pa.; Bartlesville, Okla.; Boston, Mass.; Chattanooga, Tenn.; Dade County, Fla.; Grafton, W. Va.; Grand Junction, Colo.; High Point, N.C.; Knoxville, Tenn.; Quincy, Ill.; San Diego, Calif.

Runners-Up: Boulder, Colo.; Columbia, S.C.; Dayton, Ohio; Florissant, Mo.; Fort Lauderdale, Fla.; Medford, Mass.; Muncie, Ind.; Pocatello, Idaho; Pomona, Calif.; Salisbury, Md.; Utica, N.Y.

The All America Cities jury, which selected the winners for 1962: Dr. George H. Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion, former president, National Municipal League; Mrs. Hazel Blanchard, president, National Education Association; Albert C. Boyd, president, American Chamber of Commerce Executives; William T. Gossett, former vice president, the Ford Motor Co.; Mrs. Herbert E. Hawkes, president, American Association of University Women; Leo Kramer, assistant to the president, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL–CIO; Roy B. Martin, Jr., mayor of Norfolk, Va.; Williard V. Merrihue, board chairman, Effective Citizens Organization; Vernon C. Myers, publisher, Look; James M. Osborn, research associate, Yale University; Mrs. Robert J. Phillips, president, League of Women Voters of the United States; Dr. Donald H. Webster, director of Bureau of Governmental Research and Services, University of Washington.

EVERY 11½ SECONDS, OUR CITIES MUST MEET THE NEEDS OF A NEW AMERICAN

A baby is born, and an American city has a new citizen—and a new problem. As this child matures, he will require schools, hospitals, police protection and a host of other community services. His city government is nominally responsible for providing these services, but the final responsibility for maintaining a "good" city rests with his parents and other private citizens like them. As novelist and poet Jan Struther put it, "A city's as great as the little people that live there." Effective citizen action, not merely good government, is the basic criterion for the All America City citations, which are awarded annually by Look and the National Municipal League. The size and wealth of a city do not matter. For instance, this year's smallest winner, Grafton, W. Va. (5,700), won because of its citizens' efforts to remedy a staggering unemployment problem.

In the years since the All America Cities contest began, over a hundred communities have received awards for such diverse achievements as getting rid of a corrupt city administration or building a school. Some problems are common to many cities: providing services for a rapidly expanding population, renewal and rehabilitation of blighted areas, changing the machinery of government as adjacent municipalities grow together to become one city, and, always a danger, citizen apathy. Cities learn from each other in solving these, and other, problems. Falls Church, Va., a 1961 winner, learned about citizen political activity from Rockville, Md., a winner in 1954 and 1961. This year's 22 finalists were selected from almost 70 applicants by a committee of experts. Last November, the finalists presented their cases to the All America Cities jury during the National Conference on Government at Washington, D.C. This year's jury hearings will take place on November 17–20 in Detroit. Entry forms for this year's contest can be obtained from: National Municipal League, 47 East 68th Street, New York 21, N.Y. The exciting stories of two of 1962's award winners are told on the following paragraphs:

KNOXVILLE, TENN.

Before May 1961, Knoxville was the largest "dry" city in the world. The sale of alcoholic beverages was handled entirely by bootleggers. Knoxville businessmen and civic leaders, tired of the lawlessness caused by Knox County's unworkable prohibition laws, organized a committee of 1,000 for legal control. After an intensive campaign by more than 2,600 volunteers, Knox County voters approved legal control of liquor. Now, alcoholic beverages are sold through rigidly regulated stores, and dollars that formerly enriched bootleggers help defray the city's expenses.

Knoxville has changed in other ways. A $1 million promenade has provided the city with an attractive downtown shopping center. Market Square, a historic but unsightly farmers' market, was replaced by a modern mall—fine for pedestrians—at a cost of $313,000. Plans are now underway for a major rehabilitation of Gay Street, Knoxville's main thoroughfare. Perhaps the greatest source of pride to Knoxville is its new auditorium-coliseum, which can seat 10,000.

CHATTANOOGA, TENN.

New forces are at work in the shadow of Lookout Mountain, a famous Civil War battleground. The Golden Gateway Citizens Advisory Committee, composed of 93 Chattanooga residents, planned and won voter approval of a $15 million urban renewal project. Backed by 4,000 citizens, a commission is at work on plans for beautification of the entire metropolitan area. Mounting governmental costs and duplication of services among Chattanooga and neighboring communities led to the formation, last year, of a 30-member Metro Advisory Committee to study the advantages of metropolitan government. A metropolitan charter is now being readied for submission to the voters. The new Chattanooga Technical Institute is turning out badly needed technicians for local industry. In the touchy area of school desegregation, Chattanooga is making more than token progress.

HOW MY COMMUNITY BENEFITS FROM THE ABILITIES OF HANDICAPPED WORKERS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I am pleased and proud to announce to the Senate that Miss Judith Keith Sikes of Murfreesboro, Tenn., is the national winner of the 1963 "Ability Counts" contest sponsored by the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

Judith, who is 16 and attends Murfreesboro Central High School, will receive $1,000 first prize in ceremonies at the Departmental Auditorium in Washington on May 9. Her theme, titled "How My Community Benefits From the Abilities of Handicapped Workers," was judged the best among those submitted by juniors and seniors from public, parochial, and private schools in 43 States and the District of Columbia.

I have read Judith's winning paper, and I am particularly impressed by her profound perception of her fellow human beings. As she observes, "Actually the handicapped differs little from the mentally and physically able-bodied worker because the whole world in all her 'physical manifestations' is a collection of the handicapped. The man who possesses the physically unimpaired body has a handicap of some type, somewhere. It may be a fear of failure, an ungovernable temper, an inferiority complex, or a feeling of frustration. Whatever it is, this disability very likely handicaps him as much as the loss of legs does the paralytic."

Mr. President, I think that Judith's entire paper should be widely read and for that reason I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the paper was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

HOW MY COMMUNITY BENEFITS FROM THE ABILITIES OF HANDICAPPED WORKERS

(By Judith Keith Sikes, Murfreesboro Central High School, Murfreesboro, Tenn.)

This is my community, and the community of my handicapped brothers.

Come with us to the square. Stand at the entrance of the majestic old courthouse where many great men have stood. Around us within a radius of several miles are the banks and office buildings, stores and cafes, post office and city hall and jail.

Woven in among these are the churches and schools, some new, some old. In and beyond all this lie the people and their homes—homes of influence, homes of the average, and homes of the poor and underprivileged. A fairly average community, it seems. But it isn't.

Ours differs from the average community in that we are blessed in having a group of handicapped people who play leading roles in the development of our community.

To take part fully in a democracy or in a democratic community such as ours, the handicapped must be economically independent; he must be employed.[1] When such is the case, the handicapped ceases to be a problem and becomes, instead, a benefit.

The word "handicapped," in past generations, often implied to the employer lack of ability or capacity to perform useful work competitively. People chose to ignore the fact that Bach, Sara Bernhardt, John Milton, and Paul of Tarsus, like many other great people, also had handicaps; but how much they contributed to so many.

Within the last few years, however, people have begun to realize what an asset the handicapped worker can be to the development of a community. The so-called handicapped workers have proven successful in thousands of jobs where their skills and abilities have been matched with work requirements.

Actually the handicapped differs little from the mentally and physically able-bodied worker because the whole world in all her "physical manifestations" is a collection of the handicapped. The man who possesses the physically unimpaired body has a handicap of some type, somewhere. It may be a fear of failure, an ungovernable temper, an inferiority complex or a feeling of frustration. Whatever it is, this disability very likely handicaps him as much as the loss of legs does the paralytic.

---

[1] Maj. Gen. Melvin J. Maas, USMCR, Ret., Jobs for the Handicapped Pamphlet," 1962–63, p. V (the First Word).

According to leading men who specialize in work with the handicapped, there are four different groups of handicapped people.

First there are the slightly handicapped who are generally found in the schools and social activities because their parents usually refuse to notice any disability in their child for fear of losing social position. Instead, they insist on his being a part of the so-called normal group. When given a proper chance to excel in some type of vocational work, these prove to be very capable.

For example, there was a young boy in our community who was a slow learner. However, because a friend insisted, he tried out for the football team; and today he is remembered as one of the best athletes in his school. He has a good job, has self-respect, and is a contributing citizen.

Next are the moderately handicapped or those who can be helped in special education. A few are found in the schools, but most are trained in special classrooms to excel in something they are interested in. An unusual fact to be kept in mind is that the moderately handicapped along with the more severely handicapped are interested in only a part of a thing at a time. In riding through an industrial town full of new construction he might see just a post and be particularly interested it in.

Such was the case of a young man who was unable to learn in classroom work. While driving a friend's car, they passed a field of trees, cattle, sheep, and a horse. Immediately the young man noticed the horse and soon developed a strong love of horses. Today, with the help of teachers and friends, he is a horse trainer in our community making $3,000 a year. He also pays income tax. It is evident that he is doing his part in building a better America.

Then we come to the physically handicapped who are limited in their abilities. They, too, can contribute a great deal.

Mr. N is in his last year of college and is a practice teacher in one of our schools. Because of his ability as a teacher, one would hardly notice, that he, having lost one leg, is physically handicapped.

Then, too, there is Mr. G who was injured by shrapnel on an observation post in World War II. Today he is giving of himself and his time to numerous projects, and has served efficiently for many years in a responsible position in our county. As President Kennedy said:

"Utilization of physically handicapped persons in productive employment is sound and necessary, both for the contribution handicapped citizens can make to our national productivity and for the sense of independence and well-being which they can derive from doing a job." [2]

In our final group are those who are severely handicapped and must have help in their activities. However, through work-shelters which our community provides and special supervised training which competent members of our community are giving plus self-determination, these people, too are becoming assets to the community.

So it is that each of us in his own way in keeping with his own talents contributes his share.[3]

The handicapped does not want pity. We must guard against this as the mother of a handicapped child must guard against self-pity. To all of us the handicapped says:

It is my heritage to stand erect, proud, and unafraid; to think and act for myself, enjoy the benefit of my creations and to face the world boldly and say, this I have done.[4]

In this way the handicapped takes his place in, and contributes to, the community in which he lives. We feel that our community is making determined strides in this direction so that we can truly say,

We are not our brother's keeper,
We are our brother's brother.[5]

DEATH OF LEON PEARSON

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the recent passing of Leon Pearson, a most distinguished American journalist, was saddening to his many friends throughout the Nation and to the many friends of his brother, Drew Pearson.

The death of Leon Pearson means a loss not only to the profession of which he was so proud and to which he gave so much of his life but also to the fields of education and the arts, to which he also devoted much of his energy and intellect.

One of the finest tributes that have been paid Leon Pearson, in my opinion, came from his brother. This tribute was made on the Drew Pearson radio broadcast in Washington on May 4. Drew's colleague, Jack Anderson, substituted for Drew and read the tribute.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this portion of the script of the Drew Pearson broadcast of May 4 be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURCHASE, N.Y.—Drew Pearson had the sad duty this past week to attend the funeral of his brother Leon, a quietly gentle man, who died suddenly and unexpectedly of a heart attack. From Purchase, Drew telephoned me and asked me to read you this about his brother:

"For many years my radio program and column were backstopped and enlightened by a man who did not take the public bows. He was my brother. Leon Pearson, 2 years younger than I, had much of the milk of human kindness in his soul, and sometimes he winced at the acid in the column and the radio program.

"I think I can best describe him as an educator as well as a reporter. He had taught at the University of Pennsylvania, and he kept on teaching as a newspaperman and broadcaster. He taught good government, better understanding of foreign affairs, better appreciation of good literature and the theater.

"My brother was crippled with polio when he was very small, but that handicap never got him down. I think it increased his courage and his understanding of other people's problems. Despite his crippled body, he covered the news with the same zest and determination—whether it was the founding of the United Nations in San Francisco, where he worked alongside a young reporter named John F. Kennedy, or reporting a new rose named for Mrs. Henry Wallace, at the Agriculture Department; or covering the Algerian revolution where he was arrested by the French for phoning the news back to Paris.

"He was a newspaperman in the old tradition: indefatigable, courageous but kindly. In his pursuit of the news he never forgot his consideration for others; never lost his sense of fairplay.

"While I shall miss him and his family will miss him—more important, I think, the newspaper and broadcasting world will miss him. That was my little brother Leon."

Those are Drew's sad and heartfelt words about his brother.

THE AMERICAN FISHERIES INDUSTRIES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in remarks on the Senate floor on September 14 and again on September 18 of last year, I expressed the hope that the voluntary retirement of the Honorable Benjamin A. Smith, of Massachusetts, from the Senate would not terminate his services to the Nation and its first and oldest industry—the American fisheries.

This was a hope which I know all Senators shared, and which they indicated by the approval of Senate Resolution 392, recommending an International Conference on Fisheries Conservation and by their unanimous agreement to amendment of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 which gave the President power, following convocation of such a Conference, to take at his discretion certain actions with relation to imports of fish from those nations declining to participate or to agree to sound conservation principles.

Senator Smith, I am happy to say, was a cosponsor of both the resolution and the amendment. Later in my remarks I shall request unanimous consent that both the resolution and the amendment be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. President, it is in keeping with the spirit of these legislative determinations and the considerations of the Senate which preceded them that our esteemed recent colleague has now been designated by President Kennedy to be chairman of the U.S. delegation at the Conference of the International North Pacific Fisheries Commission to be held here in Washington next month.

This will be the most significant and important International Fisheries Conference in which our Government has participated in many years, and my colleagues will be gratified as I am to know that at this Conference Senator Smith will hold the rank of Ambassador, thus facilitating direct contact with the White House and the State Department.

Too often, as I have pointed out on the Senate floor many times, at international meetings or in international negotiations relating to fisheries problems, our U.S. delegations and heads of delegations have been far outranked by those representing the other participating parties, one reason, perhaps, why we have frequently given ground.

We can be sure that former Senator Smith will never let our fisheries industry down.

As I stated on the Senate floor on last September 14, Senator Smith has a practical knowledge of fisheries and the problems of the fishery industry that is unique in Congress.

I continue:

Prior to coming to the Senate, Ben Smith served as mayor of the principal fishing port on the Atlantic coast, perhaps our oldest and most historic fishing port on either coast, Gloucester, Mass. Both in his public and private career he has endeavored with honor and distinction to advance the fisheries industries, not only of his native city and his State, but also of the Nation.

---

[2] The President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, Jobs for the Handicapped pamphlet, 1962–63, p. 12 (the last word) direct quote from the message of President Kennedy.

[3] The President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, Jobs for the Handicapped pamphlet, 1962–63, p. 1.

[4] Henry Viscardi, Jr., "The Sweet Dignity of A Productive Life," June 17, 1953, p. 3.

[5] Stuart Currie, "The Presbyterian Survey," December 1962, p. 22.

No Member of Congress, I might add, during the 26 years I have served in the legislative branch of our Government, has had such wide and direct knowledge of the many tribulations and problems which beset our fisheries industry, and which have become more complex and burdensome with each passing year.

Many of us will recall Senator Smith's great address of May 24, 1962—not quite a year ago—here on the Senate floor on the plight of the American fishing industry, or the program which he recommended to restore that industry to its rightful place in the Nation's economy. Some of the proposals which he made then are embodied now in bills pending before the Senate committee of which I am chairman.

Members of the Committee on Commerce, I am sure, will carry forward Ben Smith's legislative objectives while he directs attention to a new field, the field of international fisheries negotiations.

These could get rough at the forthcoming conference which will determine the pattern of fisheries in the North Pacific for years to come, either to the advantage or the disadvantage of the contracting parties, depending on the conference decisions and determinations.

The international North Pacific fisheries pattern could, in turn, affect high-sea fisheries in other parts of the world as the need mounts for more and more conservation of food species. Vast as are the oceans the world supply of preferred species within areas available to fishing vessels is not inexhaustible.

Since World War II the world catch has more than doubled—from 20 million tons in 1947 to 41.2 million tons in 1961 the last year for which world totals are available.

Most of the nations which have historically fished the high seas have, with improved vessels and gear, increased their catches. Nations which a few years ago barely supplied the needs of their population in coastal areas have become major producers.

For example, in 1955 Peru's catch was less than half a billion pounds; 6 years later it had increased to 11.6 billion pounds. Soviet Russia's catch in 1950 was 1.7 million metric tons; last year it totaled 4.1 million metric tons.

Both Peru and Soviet Russia have passed the United States, which has been reduced to fifth rank among the countries fishing the high seas. In 1956 we ranked second only to Japan which still retains world leadership with 16.3 percent of the total world catch. Peru is second, Communist China third, Soviet Russia fourth, and the United States fifth, followed by Norway, Canada, Spain, India, the United Kingdom, Indonesia, Iceland, the Union of South Africa, Denmark, Western Germany, and Portugal in that order. France, the Philippines, and Chile also are taking more than a billion pounds of fish annually.

The major fishing areas of the Northern Hemisphere with which the United States is concerned is that in the Northwest Atlantic off the New England coast and Newfoundland and that in the North Pacific east of 175° west longitude. Less than 5 percent of the world's fishery catch is south of the Equator.

Slightly less than half of the total U.S. catch—49 percent—is along the Atlantic coast. Twenty-seven percent is along the gulf coast, while the water off our Pacific Coast States supplies 22 percent of our fishery products.

The greatest percentage increases since World War II have been in the gulf area; there has been a slight increase on the Atlantic coast, while the catch off our Pacific Coast States has dropped percentagewise from 41 percent of the U.S. total in 1950 to 21 percent in 1962 or almost half.

The latter statistic, in my opinion, points up the need for greater conservation in the North Pacific, not less. Yet it is this year that Japan has indicated it wishes to review the fisheries convention or agreement under which certain fishery stocks in the North Pacific have been conserved for almost 10 years.

Briefly, the North Pacific High Seas Fisheries Convention was signed in Tokyo, May 8, 1952, by delegated representatives of the United States, Canada and Japan. It was ratified by the Senate and by the President in July of that same year, by Canada in May, 1953, and by Japan in June 1953. Ratifications were exchanged and the convention entered into force on June 12, 1953.

Under the convention the three participant nations joined in setting up an international North Pacific Fisheries Commission, the Commission to be composed of three national sections and each section to have one vote.

These nations through their commissioners assumed an obligation to encourage the conservation of fishery resources in the North Pacific Ocean with a view to insuring maximum sustained productivity.

To sustain productivity and conserve fisheries threatened with depletion the principle of abstention was adopted when evidence based on scientific research indicates that more extensive exploitation would not be conducive to conservation of the resource.

In other words, abstention means that when a nation is able to show that a stock of fish is being fully utilized, is under intensive scientific research, and is subject to regulations based upon this research, then other nations which have not previously fished the stocks in the convention area must abstain from fishing them, the stocks covered being salmon, halibut, and herring.

The effect is that Japan abstains from fishing for salmon east of 175° west longitude in the Pacific Ocean. This protects most of the salmon originating in North American streams. Halibut stocks south of the Aleutians are similarly protected. The above abstention line is, however, only provisional. Japan has indicated that it wishes to move the line further east, thus enabling them to fish a greater area of the ocean for the protected stocks. American fishermen would like to see the line moved further west.

American fishermen, organizations as well as individuals, contend that many of the salmon west of the provisional line are of American origin, spawned in fresh water streams of our western coast, and they offer considerable scientific evidence to support this position.

One of the issues, therefore, to be threshed out at the coming conference, is where this line should be.

Another, and perhaps graver issue, is whether the convention shall continue in force.

Article XI of the convention states:

> This convention—shall continue in force for a period of 10 years and thereafter until 1 year from the day on which a contracting party shall give notice to the other contracting parties of an intention of terminating the convention, whereupon it shall terminate as to all contracting parties.

During the past 9¾ years the convention has contributed greatly to maintenance of orderly fishing activities of the three participating countries in the North Pacific and the scientific activities of the three countries have provided valuable data on the fisheries resources within the convention area. Even the spokesman for the Japanese delegation at the ninth annual meeting of the North Pacific Fisheries Commission agreed to that.

But the Japanese spokesman at the same time called for a reexamination of the convention with a view to modifications which he considered would be to the advantage of Japan, one of the grounds being that a fourth nation, not a signatory to the convention, recently has greatly expanded its trawl fisheries in the North Pacific. This, of course, is Soviet Russia.

The American delegation to the coming conference, it is obvious, will be facing problems both critical and delicate. The United States is fortunate that this delegation will be chaired by our able and esteemed recent colleague, Ben Smith, and that Chairman Smith at this conference will have the rank of ambassador.

That the Pacific Coast States all have a very deep interest in the outcome of this conference is indicated by the resolution adopted by the Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission at its annual meeting held last October in Seattle and before, in fact, the Japanese delegation to the international meeting of last year had indicated its position. The resolution reads as follows:

> Whereas in June of 1963, the International North Pacific Fisheries Treaty will have been in effect for 10 years; and
>
> Whereas, under the terms of the treaty, one of the parties signatory to it may at that time serve notice of modification or termination; and
>
> Whereas such modification or termination could lead to conditions which would result in virtual destruction of North Pacific fishery resources, and
>
> Whereas foreign fishing fleets, outside the terms of the treaty, are operating in offshore North American waters; and
>
> Whereas these developments pose a threat not only to fishery resources maintained by extreme sacrifice of Canadian and American fishermen, but to resources not now used by Canada and the United States but which may be of utmost importance to these countries in the future: Be it therefore
>
> *Resolved*, That the Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission urge adoption by the United

States and Canadian Governments of a policy in all fishery negotiations of (1) resisting all attempts by fishermen other than those of Canada and the United States to engage in the harvest of the fisheries of the eastern North Pacific which are now fully utilized and under severe management restrictions, and (2) insisting that all fishing operations contiguous to the coasts of Canada and the United States be conducted with sufficient restraint as to permit the stocks of fish in the area to be harvested on a maximum sustained yield basis from year to year in the future.

Mr. President, I vision the forthcoming conference as a forerunner of future international conferences between nations exploiting the fisheries resources in waters off other coasts of the United States.

I foresee the eventual necessity of an international world conference on conservation of the living resources of the high seas throughout the world ocean, and as contemplated in Senate Resolution 392 of the 87th Congress and the fisheries amendment to the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

When these conferences take place it is my hope that the United States will have the good fortune to have our distinguished recent colleague, Benjamin A. Smith, as chairman of the U.S. delegation with the same rank he is to have at the forthcoming North Pacific conference.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Senate Resolution 392 of the 87th Congress, 2d session, and an amendment to the Trade Expansion Act passed by Congress, both of which were discussed earlier in my remarks, and both of which bore the name of Senator Smith as cosponsor.

There being no objection, the resolution and amendment were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the increasing world population and the consequent growing demand for animal protein, together with industrial and economic development in all parts of the world have resulted in remarkable expansion of world fishing effort; and

Whereas technological developments have vastly improved man's ability to harvest the living resources of the sea; and

Whereas estuarine fishery resources, to which little attention has been devoted on a worldwide basis in spite of their increasing importance as a source of human food, present unique scientific and technical problems; and

Whereas these developments raise new technical and scientific conservation problems the solution of which would best be approached on a worldwide basis: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the President should propose an International Conference on the Conservation of Fishery Resources to consider the technical, economic, and scientific problems relating to the conservation, utilization, and regulation of living marine resources in the high seas and estuarine waters of the world, and that government, industrial, scientific, and technical participation in such Conference on as wide a basis as may be practicable should be encouraged.

"SEC. —. CONSERVATION OF FISHERY RESOURCES.

"Upon the convocation of a conference on the use or conservation of international fishery resources, the President shall, by all appropriate means at his disposal, seek to persuade countries whose domestic fishing practices or policies affect such resource, to engage in negotiation in good faith relating to the use or conservation of such resources. If, after such efforts by the President and by other countries which have agreed to engage in such negotiations, any other country whose conservation practices or policies affect the interests of the United States and such other countries has, in the judgment of the President, failed or refused to engage in such negotiations in good faith, the President may, if he is satisfied that such action is likely to be effective in inducing such country to engage in such negotiations in good faith, increase the rate of duty on any fish in any form imported from such country into the United States, for such time as he deems necessary, to a rate not more than 50 per centum above the rate existing on July 1, 1934."

RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on May 10, the free Rumanians of the world observed their national holiday. It was not a day of great celebration; rather, it was a day spent in somber reflection upon the history of a country which once enjoyed the liberties of a free society, but now is closeted within the confines of Communist tyranny.

Since May 10 of 1881, when King Carol was crowned King of United Rumania, this day has been traditionally observed as Rumanian Independence Day. Indeed, Rumania has been independent for all but 18 years of this stretch of time. It was not until 1945, in flagrant violation of the Yalta agreement, that freedom of expression was silenced, the dignity of the individual was destroyed, and Rumania became subjugated to the unbearable yoke of communism.

Mr. President, this is not the only time in the long and magnificent history of Rumania that she has been subjugated to an alien tyrant. In the 15th century, Rumania was overrun and conquered by the Ottoman Turks, and for a number of centuries the Rumanians were forced to endure their rule of oppression. Yet the spirit of freedom was burning; and when the opportunity came, the Rumanians cast aside the chains of bondage, and in 1881, declared their independence.

Today, however, freedom has once again been silenced in this Balkan country. The Soviet occupation has brought exploitation of the land, coupled with ruthless repression of all those who oppose the dictates of the Kremlin.

Mr. President, on this occasion, as we pay tribute to Rumanian people throughout the world, let us hold out our hand of friendship. Let us assure the Rumanian people that we have not forgotten their plight, and that we are working and praying for their liberation.

FISCAL PLIGHT OF LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excellent article by Frank C. Porter which appeared in yesterday's Washington Post. In his column entitled "It's the Rising State-Local Levies That Make U.S. Taxpayers Cry Uncle," Mr. Porter presents authoritative statistics which explode two basic myths concerning recent efforts of both the States and the National Government to strengthen our Federal system.

This article contains graphic evidence proving that the Federal Government over the past decade has not experienced a disproportionate growth in its debt, expenditures, or civilian employees. On the contrary, Federal spending rose only 35 percent over the past 10 years, compared to 130 percent for the State and local levels of government, and the national debt increased 15 percent during this period, as against 250 percent for the States and local governmental units. Further, over the past 5 years, the hiring of new personnel on the State and local levels has amounted to 13 times the number added to the Federal civil employees' lists. These figures provide ample proof that Federal growth in these three areas has been modest and even conservative by State and local standards.

In addition, they clearly demonstrate the inaccuracy of the widely shared belief that State and local governments are unwilling or unable to assume their proper share of the financial responsibility for the expanding governmental services that the American public has demanded since World War II. These statistics, along with the fact that State and local taxes are now two-thirds as large as Federal revenue, indicate that these levels of government are working strenuously to make themselves viable instruments of 20th century democracy.

When related to each other, these developments highlight the overwhelming need for continuing the pattern of intergovernmental collaboration that has emerged over the past 15 years. No level of government alone has been able to bear the cost of these expanding domestic services. Instead, each of the three planes has joined in the spirit of traditional American cooperation to share this staggering financial burden. This collaborative relationship must be continued and strengthened if the future of our Federal system is to be secure.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT'S THE RISING STATE-LOCAL LEVIES THAT MAKE U.S. TAXPAYERS CRY "UNCLE"

(By Frank C. Porter)

The economy bloc, venting its full fury on an administration that seeks simultaneously to boost Federal spending and slash taxes, may be trying to put out a brush fire in the front yard while the barn burns down out back.

For while the harsh glare of publicity focuses on Uncle Sam's fiscal troubles, taxes and spending in the cities, counties and State across the land are climbing at a dizzying rate.

Federal expenditures have risen about 35 percent in the past decade, but spending by State and local governments has shot up 130 percent in the same period. The Federal debt has increased 15 percent in the decade; State and local debt is 2½ times what it was at the end of 1952. In the past 5 years alone, State and local governments have hired more than 13 times the number of new civilian employees added to Federal payrolls.

While the White House, Treasury, and Capitol Hill bear the brunt of squandermania charges—particularly from powerful business groups such as the Chamber of Commerce and National Association of Manufacturers—evidence points to a growing grassroots rebellion against high taxation and spending by the smaller political jurisdictions.

In New York City, more than 1,300 citizens converged on city hall one day last month to protest Mayor Robert F. Wagner's proposal to boost the city sales tax from 3 to 4 percent (it passed).

In Detroit, voters turned down decisively a $90 million school bond issue and a proposal to raise school taxes.

Voters, in fact, have rejected 32 percent of the $1.2 billion in new bond issues submitted to them in the first 4 months of 1963. Five years ago, the rejection rate was 25 percent; in 1953, it was only 17 percent.

The political death toll of State governors of both parties in last fall's elections has been widely attributed to their advocacy of unpopular tax increases.

Economist Eliot Janeway links "a dramatic breakout" of support for Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona, to "a taxpayers' revolt, still largely unsung but gathering strength every day, not only in liberal-Democratic New York City itself, in GOLDWATER'S Arizona, but also in most every place in between."

"But if the opponents of local government spending are becoming more vocal, so are the advocates—those who earnestly cite the Nation's great unmet needs for more schools, highways, hospitals, sewers, parks, playgrounds, libraries, welfare payments, better correctional institutions, job retraining, police and fire protection.

Since they involve money, the most emotionally supercharged commodity known to man, taxes are seldom the dreary, dull subject they are often represented. Almost anyone with an adding machine and an ax to grind can convert them into a fiscal horror story, on the one hand, or the image of a fount from which all good things flow, on the other.

For example, all taxes—Federal, State and local—rose from a piddling $1.4 billion in 1902 to more than $124 billion last year, nearly a 100-fold increase in 60 years. Or again, the total of all kinds of governmental debt amounted to an average $41 for every man, woman and child in 1902; now it is more than $2,000.

But defenders of public spending consider such comparisons inept. They involve two totally different worlds, they argue, and ignore war, depression, inflation, a fantastic increase in the Nation's wealth, changes in mores and political philosophy and the population explosion.

Total taxes rose from $46 billion at the end of World War II to $116 billion in 1961, a jump of more than 150 percent. But taking population growth into account, these same taxes on a per capita basis show an increase of slightly more than 100 percent. And the rise is further reduced to only 30 percent if the per capita figures are adjusted for price changes over the years.

Except in wartime, State and local spending and taxation traditionally outpaced Federal operations until a quarter century ago. Then the New Deal sought to pull the United States out of the worst depression in history through forced-draft spending, Federal expenditures inched above State and local spending in the mid-1930's. Much of this was done through deficit financing and it was not until 1942, with the Nation already at war, that Federal taxes rose above the State-local level.

Federal taxation and spending, which had extremely steep rises in both World War II and the Korean war, failed to fall back below the State-local level after the hostilities. But the proportionate gap is closing rapidly; State and local taxes are now two-thirds as large as the Federal take; they were only a fourth in 1944 and a third as recently as 1954.

The narrowing gap is even more graphically represented, which shows Federal taxes as a percentage of the country's total output of goods and services in an irregular but substantial decline while State and local taxes in terms of gross national product have been rising steadily since 1944.

Federal operations have continued at an abnormally high level largely because of the United States' role as leader in the cold war. Eliminating defense and foreign spending, interest on the national debt (most of which is the result of prior wars) and payments to State and local governments, Federal spending totals less than half that of the smaller jurisdictions.

State and local debt still is only about 27 percent as large as the Federal. But since World War II, the Federal debt his risen moderately, from $270 billion to about $300 billion, while State and local indebtedness has grown fivefold, from $16 billion to $80 billion. Note that total public debt, in per capita and constant dollar terms, has declined since World War II.

Total public debt also has declined since the war relative to the Nation's total output, or gross national product. There has been a massive shift of debt from the public to the private sector of the Nation's economy, a trend which is still continuing.

Here are some of the reasons behind the spectacular growth in State and local operations:

Communities have had an extremely heavy backlog of pent-up capital needs accumulated not only during the austerity of wartime but during the paralyzing poverty of the great depression.

The postwar baby boom has put an unprecedented strain on educational facilities. Beyond this, society is much more demanding of its schools than it was a generation ago, particularly since it is increasingly harder to find a place for the untutored, unskilled worker. Education now takes 31 cents out of every State-local revenue dollar, the biggest slice of the expenditure pie.

To meet these still-growing needs, officeholders are sometimes forced to desperate measures such as the semiannual State lottery passed last month by the New Hampshire Legislature. A Colorado political leader has suggested that his State should begin thinking about a lottery, too, and predicts that "you're going to find a lot of States going into it."

Just last week, Indiana became the 37th State to adopt a sales tax, and four others have boosted their rates this year. Nearly 2,000 cities, towns and counties also have a sales tax.

Thirty-two States now have income taxes, of which 26 collect it through withholding. These levies now account for nearly $3 billion a year against only $422 million in 1946. The big mainstay, however, is still the real estate tax, local and State revenues from which jumped from less than $5 billion in 1956 to a current rate of about $20 billion.

Does the continued rapid growth of local taxing and spending mean that Federal power is diminishing and the communities are doing more for themselves?

Tax experts say they don't think so. They point out that the expansion has been in areas traditionally reserved to the States, counties and towns, such as education. One points out that this expansion is largely the effect of expansion of the economy as a whole.

Many of the goods and services provided by State and local governments are what economists call "complementary commodities." The growth in privately produced automobiles, for example, necessitates a parallel growth in publicly built highways.

The big expansion in State-local spending and taxation may be a major factor contributing to the growing Federal deficit. President Kennedy has observed that without "intergovernmental payments"—funds paid by the U.S. Government to States and local governments—the budget would be in balance.

PROTECTION OF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF CITIZENS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, last week I spoke to the Senate on the subject of the tragic events in Birmingham, Ala. At that time I introduced a bill which would give the Attorney General a new legal procedure to protect the constitutional rights of our citizens and to prevent future incidents from building up to the explosion of human violence which has occurred in Birmingham.

The need for such a bill has now been made even more bitterly apparent. The juggernaut of human passion once set in motion is not easily stopped. There seems to be an almost fatal progress from peaceable demonstration, to mass arrests, to street violence and then finally to the ultimate act of senseless terrorism, nighttime bombings. At this point it is open to question whether the actions of men of good will, in which we placed such hope, can stop this bloody progression. The agreement between the two races in Birmingham is seriously threatened. The terrorists who planted those bombs knew what they were doing: they knew that the explosions they ignited, whether or not they killed their intended victims, would wreck the delicately balanced agreement reached after much strenuous effort. The bomb throwers might as well have poured gasoline in the streets and set a match to it.

And so we have reached the final stage: Federal troops are standing by, ready to enter the city of Birmingham. I support the action of the President; he cannot let an American city be torn apart by violence piled upon violence. Peace which cannot be attained by reason must be imposed by force. But all of us, as Americans, must feel a terrible shame that armed troops must fill the vacuum left by the breakdown of law and order. Although the rule of law is basic to the life of this Nation, martial law is, as it should be, anathema to every American citizen. But, however repugnant the use of troops may be to our ideals, the Government must preserve peace and order, and the rights of its citizens. And yet soldiers can only control violence. They cannot provide a solution to its causes. Force can maintain order but cannot replace the lawful and orderly process of government which alone will enable every man, black or white, to live at peace with his neighbor.

But now we must ask ourselves why this terrible juggernaut was allowed to roll on unchecked until it could not be halted except by force. The troops outside of Birmingham are living symbols of our failure as citizens of a great democracy to maintain and preserve our ideals through lawful means. We must take steps now to prevent this failure from ever happening again or we must admit that our system of government is weakest where it should be strongest, in the protection of the rights of its citizens. We cannot see Little Rock, Jackson and Birmingham repeated again and again in the years ahead.

Mr. President, I have introduced one bill which would help prevent such a repetition. I know my colleagues have other proposals which are both useful and necessary. This body has a duty and a great obligation to consider these proposals now; to see what should be done; and to act promptly to take whatever steps we feel necessary to end once and for all opportunities for mob rule in this country.

DANGER IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, new tensions in the Middle East stirred up by renewed Egyptian efforts to unite with Syria and Iraq have also given rise to concern over U.S. policy in that region. The arms buildup in Egypt, with the encouragement and support of the Soviet Union, the United Arab Republic proposal to drive Israel into the sea, and the violent propaganda attempts by Cairo radio and pro-Nasser agitators to stir up a revolt against Jordan constitute a grave danger to peace, and threaten to involve the great powers, if open hostilities should break out. The resolution which I and a bipartisan group of my colleagues introduced last week calls for a mutual defense agreement, on the Philippines model, between the United States, the United Kingdom, France, and other nations, with Israel and any other Middle East State. It would go a long way toward stabilizing the region by making clear to all our firm determination to join to protect the territorial integrity and political independence of any signatory Middle East nation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an editorial by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., entitled "U.S. Foreign Policy," which appeared in the May 5 issue of Hearst newspapers; and an analysis by S. L. A. Marshall, entitled "Mideast Peril," which appeared in the Washington Post on May 11.

There being no objection, the editorial and the article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Hearst newspapers, May 5, 1963]

U.S. Foreign Policy

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

From the eastern end of the Mediterranean the sound has again come of renewed gnashing of teeth and sharpening of knives. Egypt's President Nasser, unquestionably considering himself a 20th century Pharaoh, has precariously alined Syria and Iraq into his allegedly United Arab Republic. This dubious trio has, of course, fondly reassured itself that Israel, outnumbered 20 to 1, faces doom.

But, as Israel's Prime Minister Ben-Gurion informed our correspondent Leo Monsky last week, his small nation is confident it can repulse any Arab attack. This view is shared by most military experts; it's a consensus that Israel today can inflict savage defeat on her attackers, as she has demonstrated in the past.

Yet the possibility exists that she might face tougher sledding in the future if Nasser continues to receive enormous Soviet military shipments—and enormous U.S. foreign aid.

A U.S. policy that contributes to such a portent of bloodshed for the Middle East, including peril for the only democratic nation in the area, is surely inimical to American principles; it is, in fact, plain un-American.

It is little wonder, therefore, that an influential group of Senators have during the past week demanded a searching reappraisal of our Middle East foreign policy, and I heartily endorse that request.

The United States should act before a Middle East fire breaks out. We should notify the Arabs that unless they desist from their announced policy of exterminating Israel we shall be forced to begin decisive shipments of arms to that beleaguered state. We organized an immediate arms airlift to India when she was under attack by Red China; there is no reason why we should not do the same for Israel before she is attacked.

Any other course is tantamount to informing the Israelis they are strictly on their own, regardless of massive shipments of Soviet arms to the Arabs. And even this would be false, for there is little doubt that the United States would be drawn into a major conflagration if it erupts in the Middle East. Thus the sensible and moral course is to act so decisively now—by forcing the Arabs to cease warlike intentions—that the area becomes stabilized.

The situation as it stands now has caused my good friend Senator Ernest Gruening, Democrat, of Alaska, to comment caustically on the Senate floor that Soviet arms, Nazi scientists and U.S. money make a wonderful combination in the United Arab Republic.

"Unless the U.S. policy of building up Nasser is reversed," Senator Gruening added, "it is going to produce a bloody war in the Middle East for which we will bear a certain responsibility and into which we may well be drawn."

He is emphatically correct and so are Senators Wayne Morse, Democrat, of Oregon; Sherman Cooper, Republican, of Kentucky; Kenneth Keating, Republican, of New York; Jacob Javits, Republican, of New York; Paul Douglas, Democrat, of Illinois; John Pastore, Democrat, of Rhode Island; Hugh Scott, Republican, of Pennsylvania; Clifford Case, Republican, of New Jersey; Leverett Saltonstall, Republican, of Massachusetts; and Hubert Humphrey, Democrat, of Minnesota. This impressive, bipartisan and cross-country lineup joined in calling for a policy that will check Nasser's bloodthirsty design.

Senator Javits has proposed a United States-British-French peace treaty guaranteeing Israel's frontiers and this is an avenue certainly worth exploring. There is no doubt that the administration should, in addition, heed the words of Senator Keating, who said, "It is high time for Government officials to get tough and pull the fuse out of the Middle East powder keg (and to) view the plight of Israel with the same alarm that they apparently regard the situation in Laos and Berlin."

It is high time indeed to pursue a course of honor and justice in the Middle East, not one of cheap and useless expediency.

[From the Washington Post, May 11, 1963]

Mideast Peril—Nasser, Hussein, and Israel

(By S. L. A. Marshall)

The recent rumble in the Congress, highlighted by the demand of a group of liberals that the United States cut off all aid to President Gamal Abdel Nasser's Egypt because of his overt aggressions against the kingdom of Jordan, prompts the comment: "Better late than never."

All along, the idea of buying any Nasser good will through this frivolous bounty has been perfectly ridiculous; it can't even be rented for a day.

The danger of his malevolent meddling in King Hussein's domain is nigh limitless. Nasser isn't playing with dynamite; he's cooking with nuclear fission. When Washington admonishes him to be a good boy, it's wasting breath.

Why he plays a forcing hand is plain enough. The new United Arab Republic is thus far a house of cards. When governments are as unstable as those in Damascus and Baghdad, pledges of federation are still a long way from becoming solidly collectible. Nasser's feelings that he has won nothing for certain in this parley and must continue plunging is a well-warranted conclusion which no one would deny him.

But when, prodded by his fears, he risks provoking a Middle East war which could evolve into world conflict, when he stages deliberate aggressions intended to bag the whole fertile crescent for himself—then that should become everybody's business. Otherwise there is no more peace-keeping power on earth today than in the time of Nebuchadnezzar.

It is simply impossible to imagine a Nasser-inspired revolution toppling Hussein and taking over Jordan without the fire spreading swiftly and dramatically. Such an encirclement would mean slow death to Israel, as every official in Jerusalem well knows.

Should Hussein go down from a Nasserite coup, Israel would feel compelled to go to war. We would probably see an immediate total mobilization, which would mean more than 250,000 trained men and women springing to arms within 72 hours.

To anyone who knows that military terrain, what would happen is fairly predictable. Places the prophets knew, such as Jericho, Sodom and Bethlehem, would swiftly reappear on modern war maps.

Sodom is at water's edge at the south end of the Dead Sea. Gaze across the lifeless gray-blue waters from Sodom and one notes a patch of bright green on the Jordan side made vivid by the contrast with the otherwise unbroken monotony of bleached flats and tawny cliffs around the Dead Sea rim. This is Safi, or Safia, an oasis with an abundant artesian spring. One Jordan battalion bases on Safi because of the water.

Elsewhere around this great salt lake Jordan troops cannot live or move, except in small patrols. Let Safi be snuffed out by an airdrop, and any threat to Jerusalem dies. That is, provided that Jericho can be handled quickly in the same way. T. E. Lawrence became a real threat to the Turks in World War I once he became firmly based in this remote region.

From the Jezreel Valley south of Galilee, hard by Megidoo (or Armageddon) Israel's armed forces striking south along the River Jordan, and quickly linking up with an airdrop at the Jericho bridgehead, would seal off all Jordanian forces west of the river. As to terrain features, it is a feasible and not too complex operation. The fact that the Jordan army holds both mountain ranges bounding the Jordan Valley by no means forbids it.

West Jordan cannot be used by its garrisons as a springboard against Israel. The mountain area southward from the ridges of Gilboa is a powder keg of treason and malice which could explode against itself. Most of the good farmland of Jordan is there. Of the 700,000 civilians populating it, two-thirds are rootless refugees who hate Israel and Hussein equally, but cannot unite to strike against either. The two Jordanian brigades deployed west of the river between Nablus and Hebron are barely sufficient to exercise police control over the moblike population. If encircled, instead of uniting to resist, these people would probably sift back across the river.

Jericho is therefore a weak link between the western bulge of Jordan, which could hardly be held if Israel moved, and the main body of Transjordan, which must be the locus of viable revolution against Hussein.

The Amman government sees the military problem but can't do much about it because troop distribution must be equated according to the rise of the interior threat against the throne. The largest Jordan army camp west of the river is next to Jericho. Jordan's only tank battalion in the west usually encamps there. Other tank formations base on Amman and Mafrak. North of the capital, there is a triangle of Jordan measuring approximately 40 miles on each side, with the points resting on the cities of Irbid, Mafrak and Amman. This triangle is the backbone of the kingdom's security. Within it surges Hussein's fight for an independent Jordan and the plotting of his enemies.

By these moves, Israel could take all of Jordan west of the river and could then decide whether to stand on the high ground both ways from Jerusalem and await the Arabs, or take the offensive against Amman. There should be no doubt in anybody's mind that her army and air force are equal to that first task.

But that couldn't end it, since Nasser, taking a heavy initial defeat, would either have to rebound or suffer humiliation. With the alinement which now constitutes that amorphous entity, the United Arab Republic, that could mean a general war between sides no longer armed weakly as in 1948 involving the whole Arabian Peninsula. Big power interests being as we know them, it couldn't be fought in a vacuum.

CONGRESS MUST PLAY ROLE IN CIVIL RIGHTS CRISIS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to make a few observations about the untoward and very tragic events which occurred over the last weekend at Birmingham. I shall do my utmost to keep my statement very severely to what we can do in the Congress, as I realize the delicacy of the situation which is involved in that area right now.

Last week I testified before the House Judiciary Committee on the pending civil rights measures there and pointed out that the Nation is facing a mounting crisis over civil rights. Events in Birmingham over the weekend have given tragic point to this statement. Under these circumstances the role of responsibility requires that the President be supported in the utilization of the resources of our Federal Government to maintain the peace and protect the rights of U.S. citizens, whoever may be breaching the peace or jeopardizing these rights.

But the Congress, too, must play its role and cannot sit silent in the face of such portentous events. I expressed last week my disagreement with the administration's view, stressed by the President, that "there isn't any Federal statute that was involved" in Birmingham, Ala. I pointed out that situations such as those which are occurring at Birmingham can be reached through the courts, if the Attorney General is given authority to bring civil actions to enforce the rights of U.S. citizens under the 14th amendment, as well as through existing criminal law statutes.

The Congress must play its role in such a crisis as we face, and we cannot be deterred or frustrated in this by the threat of filibuster. Indeed, the failure to have this showdown in the Congress before now must be put down as at least one cause—I believe an important one—for the events we have seen unfolding.

In my testimony last week in a committee of the other body, I specified six priority items in the legislative program which can meet the issue and come measurably near to satisfying the justifiable complaints of the Negro community—proposals which draw largely on the U.S. Civil Rights Commission's 27 recommendations for legislation:

These six items are as follows:

First. The required filing within 180 days of school desegregation plans for at least first step compliance commencing the next school year.

Second. A sixth grade standard qualification for voting as a substitute for discriminatory literacy tests.

Third. A Federal Fair Employment Practices Commission covering interstate commerce, Government contractors, and the District of Columbia.

Fourth. Permanent extension of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission.

Fifth. Prohibition of discrimination in hotels and motels in interstate commerce and the elimination of the separate-but-equal clauses in the Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Act and the Morrill Land Grant College Acts, which are completely anachronistic since the decision of the Supreme Court in 1954.

Sixth. A broadened and effective authority to the Attorney General to bring suit in representative cases for denial of all rights under the 14th amendment, which would include the 1st amendment right of assembly and petition—which has been the very right in issue in Birmingham.

We are already getting a reaction from abroad of the events in Birmingham, and while there is considerable understanding of the problem as being very difficult, the propaganda value of what has happened can only help those who are opposed to our free institutions, and is unfortunately a forceful incentive to them in propagating communism in Africa, Asia and Latin America.

I believe the role of Congress is as vital as the role of the executive department and that we have failed signally in the Congress to meet our responsibilities to the Nation in this field. The national interest will not let us wait; we had better get at it now.

I ask unanimous consent that there may be included in the RECORD as a part of my remarks editorials from the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune, of New York, substantially to the effect of the statement I have made, as well as articles from the New York Herald Tribune and the New York Times of yesterday showing what the foreign press is stating about this very trying issue.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 13, 1963]

BOMBINGS IN BIRMINGHAM

The white and Negro moderates who so courageously and wisely reached an accord in Birmingham must not lose heart or lose their heads. The bombings of a Negro leader's home and the motel where the negotiations had taken place were the work of hoodlums and fanatical segregationists who will have to be caught and given exemplary punishment.

It would be tragic and ironical if criminals of this type should be allowed to succeed in their aim of destroying the agreement reached by the moderate elements. It would also be tragic if it should prove necessary for the President to take more drastic action than he did last night in ordering the movement of Army troops to the vicinity of Birmingham and the alerting of the Alabama National Guard. He may still be forced to employ the full military power of the Federal Government, but this is a step that he would obviously take with only the greatest reluctance and, literally, as a last resort.

The stakes involved in the Birmingham conflict are too great to be lost to gangsters masquerading as defenders of the white race whom, in reality, they are disgracing. At the same time, the gravity of the issues at stake has to be faced if a national setback is to be avoided. Birmingham is not the only city having racial violence. In some way, the rigidity of the social structure in Alabama, Mississippi, and even in States where some or much progress has already been made, must be modified.

It takes courage and wisdom to recognize historical necessities and to accept them. When an accommodation is reached, as it was in Birmingham, the extremists—those who take a stand-pat position on the one hand, and those who resort to violence on the other—are defeated.

The Negroes who rose in their fury after the Birmingham bombings can be understood, but they were wrong and unwise because they played straight into the hands of the die-hard segregationists and also of the Black Muslim lunatic fringe. Dr. Martin Luther King was right to announce immediately that the accord reached in Birmingham would still stand, and Mayor-elect Boutwell deserves credit for his condemnation of the outrages. It is now up to the authorities to see to it that justice is done.

This is a serious crisis partly because the human factors are unpredictable and irrational. The Negro community is reacting against laws it considers unjust and power it considers to be tyrannical. But violence is not the answer, even to such white violence as the cruel bombings of yesterday morning. American stability has been built on grass roots, on local initiative, on States rights. The conflict in Birmingham must be resolved in Birmingham.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, May 13, 1963]

TRAGIC SUNDAY IN BIRMINGHAM

There is much reason for sadness but little for surprise in the violence that racked Birmingham after the conclusion of the truce in that harried city. For weeks, tension had been building up under the pressure of Negro demonstrations and the arrests, the firehoses and the police dogs that were employed to curb them. And when agreement had at last been reached on the very modest program of desegregation put forward by the Negro leadership, holdover city officials were prompt to denounce the white businessmen who had taken part in the unofficial accord. This kept the atmosphere explosive; hoodlum bombs touched it off.

Under the best of circumstances, the threat of violence is implicit in such a situation as obtains in Birmingham today, where the codes of the past are reluctantly yielding to the future. There are always anarchical fringes, whose insensate acts make the task of the reasonable groups on both sides 10 times more difficult. The shame of Birmingham lies less in the secret evildoers who threw the bombs, or in the mobs, who responded with rocks, than in the men who used their dubious hold on public office—Public Safety Commissioner Connor and Mayor Arthur Hanes—to condemn the responsible white community leaders.

It is to be noted that the newly elected mayor, Albert Boutwell, who clearly represents majority opinion in Birmingham, was prompt and vigorous in condemning the dastardly hit-and-run bombers who precipitated the storm in the city. Hope for Birmingham rests with men like Mr. Boutwell, and Sidney W. Smyer, who headed the white committee that negotiated the settlement of Negro grievances. The threat lies in the mentality represented by Connor and Hanes.

As for Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., he was not only the central figure in the demonstrations and negotiations in the Alabama city. He emerged from the ruins of his brother's bombed house, where he and his family had escaped death only, as he put it, by "a miracle from the hand of God." And he called repeatedly to the crowd of excited and angry Negroes outside: "Please refrain from violence. You are defeating our cause."

Dr. King certainly does not have to prove his sincerity or his moral courage. But he displayed these qualities preeminently on Birmingham's tragic Sabbath morning. If he is met in anything approaching his own spirit, Birmingham will resolve its dilemma, and the whole Nation can benefit.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, May 13, 1963]

U.S. Image Abroad

(By Robert J. Donovan)

These are some of the headlines from around the world gathered by the Herald Tribune bureaus: "Race Clash—1,000 Children Jailed" (Daily Mirror (London)); "Explosive Situation in Alabama" (Unita (Rome)); "Monstrous Crimes of the Racists in the United States" (Pravda (Moscow)); "Is This America the Beautiful?" (Times (Ghana)); "Arrests of Schoolchildren Do Not Make a Pretty Picture" (The Mail (Kuala Lumpur)); "Brutes of Alabama" (Morning Post (Lagos)); "Savages in Alabama" (Liberation (Paris)).

This summary of world opinion illustrates what President Kennedy meant at his press conference last Wednesday when he called the racial disorders "a spectacle which was seriously damaging the reputation of both Birmingham and the country."

For two reasons in particular the troubles in Birmingham have been more difficult than even Oxford, Miss., and Little Rock, Ark., were for American officials overseas to explain away.

One reason is that the news photographs from Birmingham—with the dogs, firehoses and arrested Negro children—have been more gripping than the photographs of the Oxford and Little Rock incidents.

The other reason is that in these two previous situations the Federal Government was able to move in with troops to restore order, whereas in Birmingham, Federal activity, though intensive and effective, has been hidden and subtle.

In the eyes of other peoples, particularly in Africa, the overt, dramatic Federal intervention in Arkansas and Mississippi compensated for local discrimination against Negroes. The resentment toward the United States that black peoples felt everywhere was assauged when they beheld the military as well as the moral and legal power of the Federal Government applied to the redress of Negro rights.

In Birmingham, on the other hand, they saw Negroes being checkmated day after day with dogs and firehoses while the Federal Government took no overt action.

The explanation, of course, is that the legal grounds on which the Federal Government intervened in Oxford and Little Rock were absent in Birmingham.

"There isn't any Federal statute that was involved in the last few days in Birmingham," the President told his press conference. "I indicated the areas where the Federal Government had intervened in Birmingham—the matter of voting, the matters of dealing with education and other matters. On the specific issues of the parades, that did not involve a Federal issue."

Even in the United States, where the Federal-State relationship is familiar, this point was widely misunderstood. Mr. Kennedy was receiving stinging criticism from certain Negroes, liberals and others for not going overtly to the assistance of Negroes in Birmingham. Indeed it was a very uncomfortable week for him.

If many Americans failed to grasp the legal distinction, how much more difficult it was for Africans and Asians. Vast numbers of them had no way of knowing that the local disturbances in Birmingham did not thwart the orders of Federal courts as was the case at the University of Mississippi last year and at Central High School in Little Rock in 1957. From their great distances away all that they could see was the sight of Negro masses scuffling with the police in Birmingham.

Press reaction in Ghana and Nigeria, especially, to the supposed lack of Government action was sharply critical.

And the Moscow newspaper Pravda, which doubtless knew better, taunted the United States for lack of Federal efforts to settle the troubles. Like certain other papers around the world it linked the Birmingham disorders with the recent fatal shooting of William L. Moore, Baltimore postman, in Alabama while he was hiking across the State to deliver a letter to Gov. Ross R. Barnett, of Mississippi, protesting racial discrimination.

Pravda juxtaposed an account of Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy's recent courtesy visit to racist Governor Wallace in Alabama and the slaying of Mr. Moore. Though known to Mr. Kennedy, the paper said, the murderer was not in jail. More than a week before this article appeared Floyd L. Simpson, a rural store operator in Alabama, was arrested on a charge of first degree murder in the case.

A roundup of world opinion as compiled by the U.S. Information Agency shows that up to now, at least, the severest criticism of Birmingham centered in Africa. This was not unexpected. What is more surprising is that so far comment in Western Europe and the Soviet Union has been relatively moderate both in tone and in quantity.

Editorial comment in Western Europe, of which there was little last week, contained less moralizing than heretofore and displayed an understanding of the difficulty of the Negro problem in the United States.

Thus the Daily Telegraph, a conservative London paper, noted that the problem is not exclusively an American one but part of a widespread and potentially dangerous condition. "Such scandals of intolerance as these," the papers said, "are not of local but international danger. For more and more the dark races are conscious of common interests and will support one another's struggles for emancipation."

La Stampa, a Liberal paper in Turin, Italy, while deploring the tactics of the Birmingham police, said that the spectacle was not "representative of the true face of the United States."

Remarkably, even Pravda said that "to the honor of the American people it must be mentioned that they do not share the view of Alabama's Governor and are deeply disturbed by events in America's South."

Peking news media confined themselves to reporting the Birmingham story and stressing police brutality and the fact that the President had not ordered troops to Alabama.

Cairo papers also singled out police brutality and headlines in Egypt's leading papers called attention to the use of police dogs against Negro demonstrators.

The insidious effect of Birmingham on Africa, in particular, it seems, was to cast doubt on the sincerity of American friendship for the new nations.

Still, while making allowances for the damage done to American prestige last week, USIA reports show that there is now considerably more understanding abroad of the American racial problem than there was when the world was shocked by Little Rock 6 years ago.

Last week, as it had done at the time of Little Rock and of Oxford, the Voice of America broadcast to the world the straight news of the Birmingham disorders. There was no attempt to deny the facts, but drawing on experiences in the two earlier incidents, the Voice and other USIA organs did try to put the facts in perspective.

This effort took the form of broadcasts and distribution of commentaries aimed at showing, for example, that:

1. The disorders were greatly deplored by the overwhelming mass of the American people.
2. The problem was primarily regional.
3. Extensive progress in race relations is being made throughout the United States.

The USIA also was making a special effort to make clear to peoples abroad the legal reasons that inhibited the President from intervening in Birmingham. USIA broadcasts have played up the fact that the President and Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy sent Burke Marshall to the troubled city as their personal representative. And attention of foreign audiences has been called to the fact that Mr. Marshall, who is Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department, was the man who engineered the settlement that brought the truce Wednesday.

As USIA officials are the first to point out, however, the long-term endeavors to inform public opinion abroad about the progress of race relations in America, is at least as important as efforts made abruptly in the midst of a crisis like last week's.

These longer range efforts take such form as circulation of pamphlets and books by Negroes through oversea American libraries, broadcasts by leading Negroes, and trips abroad by authorities on race relations, of whom Ralph McGill, editor of the Atlanta Constitution, was one of the most recent.

One pamphlet that USIA has distributed around the world is called "Success Stories From America." It contains photographs and biographical sketches of such Negroes as Leontyne Price, Metropolitan Opera singer; Lena Horne, actress and singer; Paul Williams, architect; Willie Mays, of the San Francisco Giants; Representative WILLIAM L. DAWSON, Democrat, of Illinois; Robert Weaver, Director of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and Maj. Gen. Benjamin O. Davis, Air Force Deputy Chief of Staff in Europe.

Among the books distributed recently are "The Negro Revolt" by Louis E. Lomax, "Negro Leadership in a Southern City" by Margaret E. Burgess, and "Victory Over Myself" by Floyd Patterson.

In hammering away at the theme of Negro progress in America the Voice of America, in its oversea broadcasts in 38 languages, has featured such discussions as "The Negro in America," by Dr. George Simpson, of Oberlin College; "Negro Voting Rights in the South," by Harold C. Fleming, of the Potomac Institute, and "Tensions and Change in Negro-White Relations," by Harry Ashmore, editor-in-chief of the Encyclopedia Britannica and former editor of the Little Rock Gazette.

Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, also has done broadcasts for the Voice.

Moving pictures are an important part of the USIA effort to portray the Negro in American life. The agency recently has circulated throughout the world three films on Marian Anderson as well as such films as "The Rafer Johnson Story," "Althea Gibson, Tennis Champion," "Toward Tomorrow," featuring Ralph J. Bunche, U.N. Under Secretary for Special Political Affairs, and "Wilma Rudolph, Olympic Champion."

Despite all their best efforts, however, USIA officials admit that all their pamphlets, all their words and books and motion pictures have not half the impact—or one-tenth—of the reports of the actual events that took place in Birmingham.

And if, as was the case in Birmingham, the problem lay outside the powers of the Federal Government, the only answer is that the responsible people of the community come to the realization of their responsibilities as citizens of the United States, and solve these problems before they explode.

[From the New York Times, May 12, 1963]

OPINION OF THE WEEK: AT HOME AND ABROAD

(Birmingham to foreigners: How the racial strife that has beset Birmingham, Ala., is viewed through differing lenses in several foreign countries, including Soviet Russia, is indicated in the following editorial excerpts.)

"The administration may not have done enough to satisfy the more impatient of the Negro voters—and, 9 years after the Supreme Court's call for deliberate speed toward integration, the patience of a good many seems to be wearing thin. But its reasons for caution have much more to do with a genuine regard for legal process and gradual evolution than with a dread of losing white votes in the South" (the Guardian, Manchester).

"The Alabama race incidents point up a Negro solidarity, almost nonexistent during the past 10 years, which has developed into important proportions. It is noticeable also that the Federal Government, despite its obvious sympathy toward colored peoples, is not always in a position to impose its will on the local authorities. Time is pressing President Kennedy, whose policy with regard to the underdeveloped countries is being attacked by a racial problem which has particular repercussions in Africa" (les Echos, Paris).

"In Birmingham an uninhibited police commissioner—ironically one with very dubious claim to present office—has been setting Alsatians on peaceful male demonstrators, turning firehoses on women and children, and confining prisoners in what seem unspeakable conditions. There may have been some faults on the other side. * * * Yet it is difficult to advance counsel of moderation when, for instance, a postman who entered the State as a lone 'freedom marcher' was promptly murdered" (the Press, Delhi).

"The United States will no doubt experience race conflicts at least as bitter as at present. In the international field, however, it is a fact that the U.S. political and ideological opponents have not succeeded in making as much profit out of race problems as Americans themselves have often feared. It has been too evident that responsible authorities in the United States have worked purposefully and earnestly for equality of the colored" (Svenska Dagbladet, Stockholm).

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

AMENDMENT OF LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate and made the pending business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 537) to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I notify the attachés of the Senate that this will be a live quorum.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I withhold the suggestion.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, S. 537, the unfinished business, has been made the pending business. Do I correctly understand that it will not be considered today?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct. It will not be considered until after the Senate disposes of the feed grains bill one way or the other.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Then why make it the pending business, if it will not be considered?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Because of an agreement reached with certain Senators interested in the bill who have asked for that consideration.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I believe I am interested in the bill. I did not know about this. To which bill does the distinguished majority leader refer?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The feed grains bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish merely to get my bearings as to S. 537. I had understood it was to be considered today. I am here, prepared for that. Of course, I am perfectly agreeable to whatever is necessary to accommodate the work of the Senate, as the Senator knows, but I do not wish to have consideration of the bill deferred merely because some one Senator may wish to have it deferred.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If the Senator who has proposed amendments to the bill is seeking deferment, I wish to be heard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is not seeking deferment. This is a decision of the leadership, which should have been discussed with the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas. Unfortunately, the fault is mine; I did not do so. I hope the Senator will allow us to proceed in this manner.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I will not object. I say to my distinguished friend the majority leader that I try always to cooperate to the end that the proceedings of the Senate may be expedited, to serve the purposes of the leadership. This is a turn of events I had not anticipated or been warned about.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The majority leader is at fault in that respect.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I notify the Senate that it will be a live quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 71 Leg.]

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Beall
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Edmondson
Ellender
Engle
Fong
Fulbright
Goldwater
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kefauver
Kennedy
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, La.
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Mechem
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Williams, Del.
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin] are absent on official business.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is not present.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. Beall, Mr. Bible, Mr. Byrd of Virginia, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Case, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Eastland, Mr. Engle, Mr. Fong, Mr. Fulbright, Mr. Goldwater, Mr. Gore, Mr. Hart, Mr. Hickenlooper, Mr. Hill, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Javits, Mr. Johnston, Mr. Kefauver, Mr. Lausche, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Long of Louisiana, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McGee, Mr. Monroney, Mr. Mundt, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Pell, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Russell, Mr. Saltonstall, Mr. Smathers, Mrs. Smith, Mr. Sparkman, Mr. Talmadge, Mr. Thurmond, and Mr. Williams of New Jersey entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 154, House bill 4997, to extend the feed-grain program.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 4997) to extend the feed-grain program.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is in the Chamber; and, as the next ranking member of the Committee on Agriculture, I defer to him.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I can only say that the requested procedure is, to say the least, interesting. It is quite important that the legislative budget be acted on by the Senate, for time is passing, and there is a deadline, at least, under the law—although, of course, it can be avoided—for the appropriations, whereas certainly the feed-grain bill cannot possibly take effect until sometime next year, and a feed-grain act is now in operation.

I see no particular reason or urgency at the moment, from the standpoint of the application of the law, for setting aside the legislative budget, in order to take up this feed-grain bill—to which, of course, I am opposed, anyway.

Of course I have respect for the leadership; and if the leadership is reasonably satisfied about this matter, I am realistic enough to believe that there is quite a bit of power behind this bill and in favor of forcing it through at this time. I do not agree with the reason for that or with the purposes behind that activity.

However, so far as I, personally, am concerned, if the leadership desires to have this measure taken up now, I shall not enter any particular objection at the moment. Of course, if I do not enter objection now, I presume that moment will pass, and the bill will be taken up.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, further reserving the right to object, and speaking for myself, of course I certainly do not wish to obfuscate the legislative process and enter into any kind of arrangement to put this measure into the future. I am fully aware of the fact that there has been a hope that perhaps action on this bill could be delayed until after the wheat referendum on May 21—which, I believe, is a week from tomorrow.

Under the reservation of objection, perhaps I should inquire of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry whether there is real urgency about this bill or whether some impact is to be gained as a result of having speedy action taken on it in a form under which all amendments may be voted down, so that the bill can be rushed for Executive signature at the earliest possible date.

I am trying to be very candid about this matter, Mr. President, because I know all the discussions which have been in the air, and I have been on the receiving end of a great quantity of mail on this subject; and I know there is an expressed hope—and an organized hope, as a matter of fact—that action on the bill could be deferred, so that it could have no influence or impact on the question of how the farmers will vote a week from Tuesday.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, that question was brought before the committee; and the committee voted out the bill, in the hope that it would be enacted before May 21. I hope to develop that point in my speech explaining the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then, Mr. President, according to the distinguished chairman of the committee, there is no question that a majority of the committee favors action on this bill prior to the wheat referendum a week from Tuesday.

Mr. ELLENDER. I would say that that is correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, further reserving the right to object, I am not so certain that I fully agree with the distinguished chairman of the Agriculture and Forestry Committee that a majority of the committee necessarily favored action on this bill prior to May 21 of this month. A majority of the committee voted the bill out of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I think there were mixed emotions in the committee—if we are to speculate as to what went on in the minds of the members of the committee. There were many members who thought that certain amendments to the bill should be considered and should be adopted. There was discussion that the bill should be voted out of the committee and brought to the floor of the Senate and passed, as an influence, if you please, in attempting to secure a "yes" vote in the wheat referendum; and for a considerable period of time there was in the committee a great deal of discussion as to whether that would be proper legislative procedure; namely, to disregard what seemed to be a rather evident necessity for the adoption of amendments to this measure, which is substantially different from the legislation now on the statute books.

But I must say that philosophy was speedily, expeditiously, and effectively overridden by a majority of the committee; and the bill was ordered to be reported to the Senate.

Again I say I can see no real justification for having the Senate consider this bill at this time, and certainly no necessity for speedy action on it. But be that as it may, apparently it is the order of business which is about to be adopted.

I have said that at this time—and when I say "at this time," I mean prior to the giving of unanimous consent; and between now and the time when such consent is given, I might have a change of mind—but at this time I am not disposed to necessarily object to the immediate taking up of this measure, although I am bound to register my disapproval of such precipitate methods, and especially the precipitous method by which, really, in my judgment, needed amendments to this bill, in the interests of agriculture in the feed grain area, were so vigorously voted down by really what might be considered a rather bare majority of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Many members of the committee know that certain amendments ought to be added to the bill in order, at least, to make the bill conform to or correct certain questions which will have to be corrected in one way or another very shortly. In considering a bill of that kind, which would have such a vital effect upon the feed grain areas of our country, I see no reason why the committee should not have given the subject extensive attention in order that the bill might be better than the law now on the books. In my judgment the bill is worse than the act now on the books. I merely mention the vast, unlimited, and unprecedented discretion which would be given the Secretary of Agriculture under the measure that we are proposing to put on the books in relation to feed-grain farmers for next year. I think the bill should have been given considerably more study than it was given. But because of my great regard for the leadership, knowing their desire to get along with the business, and their determination, I am not disposed to enter an objection at this moment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, further reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee when the report accompanying the bill actually became available to Senators.

Mr. ELLENDER. This morning.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I recall that permission to file the report by midnight on Saturday night was granted, so that actually the report was not available to Senators until this morning—meaning actually this noon. Since Senators were attending to the business of their various committees, they had no time to examine the bill. So under the circumstances it seems to me that Senators have had scant time to go through the report and make a determination of what they would like to do. It seems to me that it would be a little precipitate to move forward quite so fast. I would be very reluctant to object. I prefer always to leave such action in the hands of the members of the appropriate committees. I do not see the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] in the Chamber at the moment. I conferred with him earlier.

Still under the reservation of objection, I should like to inquire of the distinguished majority leader what he sees by way of a timetable leading to final passage of the bill.

I am informed, though I do not know how reliable my information is, that tomorrow a substantial contingent of Senators may go to Florida to observe the Cooper launching. Of course, if they should go, it would be impossible for them to be present and to discuss the bill. They should have an opportunity to do so. Probably still others could not get ready by today for adequate discussion of the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if any Senator wishes to go to Florida tomorrow to see the launching of Major Cooper, he can be assured of a live pair. I have discussed with the distinguished minority leader the time of convening tomorrow. Tentatively we have mentioned 11 a.m. I would hope that those who may be absent tomorrow would be able to deliver their speeches on the floor of the Senate this afternoon. I am quite sure that all members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry would know what to say without the benefit of the report, and should be prepared to make their views known.

Mr. President, when I arrived at my office today, I received in excess of 50 telegrams from Montana asking me to delay bringing up the feed grain bill.

In reply, I dictated a letter in which I stated that on Thursday last I had announced to the Senate that the feed grain bill would become the pending order of business today, that it was my understanding that that was the understanding of the Senate, and I would do my best to bring it up at this time. So I would hope that the leniency, the understanding, and the tolerance shown by the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] would still hold so that we could at least get the bill laid down and debate started in earnest.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, still speaking under my reservation of objection, I wonder if the majority leader has considered the possibility of a day certain when we might vote on final passage of the bill. I have no desire to obstruct. I desire only that there be an adequate opportunity to discuss the bill in every detail before the vote is taken. It occurred to me that probably sometime on Thursday afternoon next would be perhaps an appropriate time, and would take account of those who will be gone on various missions each of the first day of the week. A vote on Thursday would satisfy nearly every requirement that I could think of.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would the Senator be agreeable to a vote on Tuesday?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I doubt it very much.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Does the Senator mean a week from tomorrow?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is the important date, but that is not what I meant.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator from Montana meant tomorrow, I am sure. But even if live pairs could be procured for those who will be gone, still the desire to be heard on the bill would not be satisfied. Perhaps Senators are not ready today, since the report was not received until this morning.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that the bill under consideration was passed by the House of Representatives on April 25, 1963, and a report was attached to that bill. That bill has been before us during all the time intervening. No change has been made in the bill by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. We are now considering the same bill that was voted upon and passed by the House on April 25, 1963.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, still speaking under my reservation of objection, I do not know that Senators are required to take judicial notice of what happens in the House 30 days or 60 days ago. Each Senator has his own committees and his own workload to take care of. It cannot be anticipated that Senators would go on a fishing expedition to find out what the House did on a given date. Moreover, a Senator is entitled to the views expressed in the report, the bill, or in an amended bill reported by the body of which he is a part. So I can assign no validity to the argument that my distinguished friend from Louisiana makes on that point.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the time of a possible vote on the bill may be a little premature to discuss. May we discuss it a little later today?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am quite agreeable to the suggestion made by one of the distinguished Senators that Thursday be set as the date for the vote. I am not in accord with the view that the vote be taken tomorrow for the simple reason that I do not think Senators have had sufficient opportunity to determine what is in the bill. The only opportunity those of us who serve on the committee, and who have strong convictions on the bill one way or another, will have to communicate the facts which control our convictions to our colleagues will be in argument and in debate. It occurs to me that if we could set final vote for Thursday afternoon, ample discussion today, tomorrow, and Thursday would be allowed.

A sizable number of Senators will be going to Cape Canaveral tomorrow. I am a member of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences. I should like to join my colleagues there tomorrow. But I have canceled my plans to go with my committee, and to my home State, because it seems extremely important to some that this bill be considered at this particular time.

I am not in favor of any prolonged opposition to the measure. I am perfectly willing to vote, let us say, on Thursday. But I want Senators to have an opportunity to discuss the bill. I think this is the worst agricultural bill which has been before the Senate during my service in this body. It not only would adopt, as to feed grains, the Brannan program, but would do a much worse thing. It would not even limit the application of compensatory payments as they were limited under the Brannan program.

I want Senators to realize what they are being asked to do. Therefore, I hope the vote may be set at not earlier than Thursday. I am quite agreeable to give consent to a vote Thursday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think the Senator has made a very reasonable request. As always, he is most gracious in his consideration of the problems of the leadership. I know he will understand when I say that I mentioned Tuesday only for bargaining purposes.

I hope to meet later in the afternoon with the distinguished minority leader and other Senators from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and perhaps reach a reasonable agreement which will give every Senator an opportunity to make his views known.

Mr. HOLLAND. I express my appreciation. I shall not object to present consideration of the measure. There will be ample opportunity to discuss it. As I say, I am strongly opposed to it. I wish to state my opposition and the reasons for it, but I understand I shall have an opportunity to do that between now and Thursday. That is why I suggest a vote on Thursday.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, further reserving the right to object, I say to the majority leader very frankly that if an objection to considering the bill would postpone action on it for an indefinite time or for a substantial period of time, I would have no hesitancy about objecting. I am merely trying to be realistic when I say that an objection at the moment, at least, will not be lodged by me.

The Senator from Florida has again mentioned one very important thing. There are at least three, and perhaps four, Senators who are not on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry who are vitally interested in this bill and who wish to participate in the discussion of the bill from their standpoint, who, so far as I know, have not yet had an opportunity to see the hearings or the report. On last Friday two of these Senators asked me specifically about the timing of the bill and were very much concerned about it not being acted upon finally in the early part of this week. They were concerned to the point that they did not want it acted upon at that time.

I hope that before Senators agree to any specific time—to which I would have to object at this moment—we can be given a little time to discuss it with interested Members of the Senate who are not members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, in order to get some views and try to harmonize any final agreement which the leadership may wish to propose to the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator has that assurance.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator from Montana.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana?

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader what is to happen with respect to S. 537 after the feed grain bill is disposed of.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That will be the pending business. I would hope that we would be able to consider it. There will, of course, be the conference reports on the supplemental appropriation bill and the military procurement bill in between.

Mr. MILLER. But it is the intention of the leadership to consider S. 537 and to dispose of it within a reasonable time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have only one further observation to make. The majority leader is in a position to move to set aside S. 537 and to consider the feed grain bill if he so desires. He preferred, however, to ask unanimous consent. I am quite sure that we can agree upon a timetable agreeable to all Senators, so that every Senator will have an opportunity to be heard.

FEED GRAIN ACT OF 1963

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 4997) to extend the feed grain program.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The feed grain bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I am in favor of the bill. I went along with 10 other Senators in the committee. The vote was 11 to 6 in the committee. It was not a partisan vote. At that time both Democrats and Republicans voted on both sides of the question.

It was felt in the committee that some legislation should be enacted at this time.

There is a movement on foot, of which I think Senators should be aware, that one group is trying to postpone action until after the referendum vote upon the wheat program, which is before the farmers. I believe that vote will be on the 21st of this month.

So, if a time to vote could be arranged either Wednesday or Thursday that would be satisfactory to me, and I think it would suit most of the members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

I hope some agreement can be reached whereby this legislation can be expedited rather than to prolong consideration and take up time of the Senate. Every day spent on this subject will mean keeping other legislation from being considered.

For that reason I hope Senators can agree to a reasonable date on which to consider the bill and dispose of it, after Senators have had an opportunity to speak and express themselves in respect to what the bill would do for agriculture.

FREE WORLD TRADE WITH CUBA

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, from time to time I have been placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the number of ships from the free world which have been discharging cargoes to Communist Cuba. I have kept the RECORD up to date. I have today another list of ships for the period April 5 through May 8, 1963.

During the period April 5 through May 8, 1963, 20 free world freighters and tankers totaling 152,953 gross tons discharged their cargoes in Cuba. Great Britain maintained its lead in supplying Castro by providing 77,953 gross tons of the before-mentioned total. During the past 2 weeks alone five vessels flying the Lebanese flag, totaling 35,678 gross tons called in Cuba. A significant first is a Swedish freighter, the *Dagmar*, of 6,490 gross tons.

In the course of the past month through May 8, 1963 the following ships, of the free world arrived in Cuba and unloaded their cargoes. Their flag of registry and gross tonnage is as indicated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the list of ships may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Athelmonarch (tanker), British, 11,192.
Avisfaith, British, 7,868.
Hazelmoor, British, 7,907.
Ho Fung, British, 7,121.
Wendover, British, 9,098.
Ardrowan, British, 7,300.
Fir Hill, British, 7,119.
Maratha Enterprise, British, 7,166.
Vercharmian, British, 7,265.
Yungfutuary, British, 5,388.
Aldebaran (tanker), Greek, 12,897.
Americana, Greek, 7,104.
Galini, Greek, 7,266.
Ilena, Lebanese, 5,925.
Akamas, Lebanese, 7,285.
Aiolos II, Lebanese, 7,256.
Noelle, Lebanese, 7,251.
Parmarina, Lebanese, 6,721.
St. Nicholas, Lebanese, 7,165.
Dagmar, Swedish, 6,490.

EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION—REMARKS BY DR. FRANK STANTON

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, ever since the Federal Communications Commission reserved 242 television channels for educational purposes in 1952, this program has slowly but determinedly moved ahead. Last year, after 8 years of effort, my educational bill which would help put the many unused educational television channels on the air was enacted. A great deal still must be done and will be done before the benefits of this miraculous medium and the creation of the educational television network becomes a fact.

I was, therefore, pleased to read the remarks of Dr. Frank Stanton, president of the Columbia Broadcasting System, delivered to the CBS network affiliates on March 9, 1963, in which he devoted his entire talk to educational television. I must say that this is one of the most enlightened analyses made by a commercial broadcaster that I have had the opportunity to read. Its forthrightness as well as its farsightedness displays the type of leadership that Dr. Stanton has exercised in the field of broadcasting for so many years.

I congratulate him for this excellent presentation and commend it to my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in full at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NINTH GENERAL CONFERENCE OF CBS TELEVISION NETWORK AFFILIATES

(By Frank Stanton, president, Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc.)

Once more I am very happy to welcome all of you. It is now 15 years since we first met together to discuss our common opportunities and our common problems. The mutual approach we have taken—the friendly atmosphere of openness and informality—has, I think, been extremely useful in establishing and maintaining the CBS Television Network's No. 1 position.

In 1955, when we began to refer to this annual session as a "general conference," I emphasized that our calling this gathering a conference was no accident. "Our purpose," I said at that time, "is not to invite you here for lectures; rather, the purpose is to provide means for the exchange of ideas with the central focus on perplexing problems that affect us all deeply and equally."

We have had, in the intervening years, many such discussions, and out of them have come reasoned, consistent, supportable views that have frequently been the basis for much of the progress not only we but the whole field of television have made.

It is in this spirit of friendly and frank mutual counsel that I come again to you this year, to discuss a subject that is, I believe, of deep concern to the future of all television and, perhaps, of our whole society—educational television.

At the outset, let me put unmistakably the propositions that I see as the points of departure—the minimum essentials—for our discussion:

First, educational television must not fail.

Second, we in commercial television have a very real stake in its survival and success.

Third, it must succeed in its broadest, not its narrowest, concept.

Fourth, it must be independent—independent alike of subsidy by Government or subsidy by commercial television.

Although the concept of educational television is as old as television itself, as an operating branch of broadcasting it is still in its early youth, going through agonizing growing pains more frequently than not, uncertain of itself in most ways, and attempting to solve practical problems of a very special nature that have no counterparts either in broadcasting or in education.

In 1948, when we held our first affiliates' clinic, the predecessor of these annual conferences, there were no educational television stations on the air. And it was to be 5 years—1953—before the first started operations. Today there are 79 educational stations in operation, and over 300 channels, both VHF and UHF, are reserved for educational purposes. But even this number, according to a report of the National Association of Educational Broadcasters, is inadequate to meet the need if television is to be fully utilized to help solve the immense educational task facing this country for the predictable future. No less than 600 additional channels, the report stated, will be necessary.

We in commercial television know something of the problems these educational stations have, because some problems are implicit in the medium—however it is used or financed. To name a few—all too familiar to you: the enormous need for material, the great costs of production, the competent manpower required, the necessity to serve a community as a whole and not just one area of interest or just one level of education. In addition, educational television must find a means—better than improvisations—to pay its way in a society that can offer no foolproof method borrowed from a similar situation.

And the fundamental challenge to educational television is the same as the fundamental challenge to us in commercial television: to interest an audience and to hold it. We broadcasters ought not to take any satisfaction in educational television as a weak adjunct of commercial television, however true that may be today. We ought not to be content merely to support it with conscience money. We have a very real stake in its success—its success on a broad, varied scale. For what diminishes it diminishes us, in that it diminishes all television. And what strengthens it strengthens us, because it strengthens all television.

If this seems to you idle theory, think for a minute of what our society would be if we had the printing press but no textbooks, no learned quarterlies, no magazines appealing to the few, no specialized cultural publications—if the role of the printing press were limited only to the production of mass circulation magazines, however excellent. Would not all of us sense that something was wrong and feel an obligation to see that something was done about it? And would we not feel that those already using print with spectacular success had a particular concern that something be done? That it not be bucked over to the Government?

I am not just preaching benevolence here. To prove itself in our age—to advance its freedom as a mature medium—television is going to have to do, with distinction and effectiveness, all the jobs of which it is capable—not just those that we in commercial television have taken on. And the measure of the medium's total achievement will be the measure of our own freedom to do our part of the job.

If educational television is to realize its fullest potentialities, it is important that we encourage it to take the broadest and not the narrowest view of its mission, to make the most and not the least of its opportunities.

This means that, if we honestly believe in free competition, we should welcome educational television into the free competition for the viewer's attention. I discussed with you last year our conviction that the surest path to television's growth was not more Government supervision, not more industry policing, not more private pressure groups, but more competition. I suggested to you, and I testified before the FCC, that the most sensible approach to more competition was a fuller utilization of the spectrum—UHF as well as VHF—using both bands for more stations and better, more varied service.

I remind you of this now, because it is to me overwhelmingly clear that educational television is one additional competitive factor that can give us the kind of prodding anyone needs in order to improve constantly. As you know, CBS has not arrived at this judgment lately. Over 2 years ago, on January 13, 1961, I disagreed with the president of the National Educational Television and Radio Center, in a panel discussion at the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, that educational television should be only supplementary to rather than competitive with commercial television. On that occasion, I said, "I think that in the long run educational television will be a competitive service, and I think that this is desirable." In that same year, 1961, the CBS annual report included the following statement in the letter of the chairman and the president: "CBS has always had a special interest in educational television, has supported its growth, and has directly contributed to the widening of its range of activities. CBS welcomes educational television not only as supplementary to, but as competitive with, commercial television service. We believe this competition will benefit both types of service."

We did not come to that conclusion only for the good of educational television. We did not even come to it only for the good of the public that television, in order to survive, must serve. We came to it primarily for the good of all television—commercial and educational.

I am sure that you know as well as I do that the price of growth—the price, in fact, of survival—in any mass medium is change—constant, never-ceasing change. I do not know that it is always change for the better or even that it is always progressive. But change itself is the thing—never resting on your oars, never sure you have the right mix, never completely satisfied, being as willing to change when you are not entirely sure you are right as when you think it is perfectly safe. The only deadly thing for us—for any mass medium—is to stand still while the inexorable law of change is going to work all about us.

Yet we must have some sense of what we are doing, some sense of pace, some sense of direction. We are like the mass circulation magazine whose economics, audience, and fundamental editorial and advertising roles do not permit it the same freedom as the book publisher, who can survive with a much smaller audience, who has no advertising function and who needs to meet no huge economic commitments. Yet does anyone doubt that the mass printed media are much the better off because there are book publishers and publishers of little magazines, from whom flow a continuous stream of new ideas, new knowledge, new theories appealing to every size of audience, reflecting every kind of interest, representing every kind of creative approach? A great testing ground is provided by all this activity—where the unfamiliar and the unproved can be tried out in an arena in which the stakes are low enough to make such trial possible on a broad scale.

Ultimately not just the vitality of our total cultural life is quickened by this but the mass media find themselves with a twofold gain—an audience somehow aware of new things going on and an indication of what those things are and how they can be handled.

This medium of ours is not immune, and cannot be, from all the laws of survival and growth and the pressures that affect the older media. Nor are we immune from the economic facts that rule out for us today many of the things that we are going to be doing tomorrow—the experimenting that must precede the innovations that will command popular attention at some future time. We must look to educational television stations to pave the way for us in some of these fields.

It is, therefore, of direct concern to all of us that these stations thrive, that they find a satisfactory solution to their financial problems.

I hope that there is no disagreement that it is fundamentally bad for any medium—or any important sector of a medium—to be dependent for its survival on Government handouts. The critical role an educational television station can play in the national and local community, its daring in attempting to treat new ideas in new ways, its independent, freewheeling approach to broadcasting, all can be compromised by the need to withstand political scrutiny to get next year's funds.

Nor does subsidy by commercial television offer an any more desirable permanent solution. As you know, we at CBS are keenly aware that, during the initial stages of their development, educational stations need our help. CBS has, in fact, contributed well over $1 million to educational television stations, in funds, material, equipment, and technical assistance. But over the long haul it would be a bad business for educational stations to develop habits of finance that made them dependent upon us or any other networks or stations. The educational television station ought not to be trying to please us any more than the Government. It ought to be trying to please the public it serves—and ideally should be beholden only to that public.

For this reason it seems to me wholly desirable—and I also believe it to be wholly feasible—that educational television derive its support from multiple sources and that the great bulk of that support come directly from the public.

Television is commonly recognized as the most powerful and persuasive medium the world has ever known. Its effectiveness in moving people to action has been clearly and impressively demonstrated over and over again. Its ability to enlist and hold the attention of audiences is unmatched. Surely by putting this enormous capacity to work intelligently, imaginatively, educational television can tap the resources of its great and growing audiences to build up its capital and operating funds. Individual educational institutions in this country, during the past decade, have attracted hundreds of millions of dollars to bolster their position. A single college has raised as much as a hundred million dollars in 3 years.

I have had enough experience in nonprofit organizations—and so have all of you—to know that it isn't easy. But the important thing is that it is possible and that, given the drive and the imagination, success is probable. Stronger, more meaningful and more appealing membership plans can be conceived and launched. New, more realistic and relevant matching gift arrangements can be explored. Campaigns and public appeals can be more persuasive, more provocative, more moving.

In all this, we in commercial television should, I think, take a more active and concerned role. Making a donation is the simplest and easiest thing to do. We ought to do more. We ought to use our experience and ingenuity to help the educational stations plan and launch a mighty annual campaign. It ought to be communitywide, and it ought to be saturating. It is important, and it ought to involve not just the educational and television worlds, but the churches, the civic organizations, the business community—the people.

The service provided by educational television—whether it is called educational, cultural, noncommercial or any other name—ought to be a commonplace in this country and in this age. Its support ought to cut right across the board. It ought to stimulate not only the interest but the pride of all our people. But none of this will happen automatically. And again I remind you that the easiest way in the short run will be the hardest in the long run. We ought to tackle it the hard way now—enlarging the base of support until it is as natural for people to support their educational channels as it is to support their colleges and universities, their hospitals and all their other community services.

There is, as far as I know, no specific program of action that you as a group can undertake, and I doubt very much that you could find a universal formula equally applicable to all communities. But each of you has an expert knowledge of his own community. Many of you have been leading forces in the support of educational stations in your areas, and have given generously, both materially and of your time and abilities. I hope very much that, individually and on your own initiative, you can share with one another your experiences and the knowledge you have acquired, so that you can think more about permanent solutions and broadening support and discuss your thoughts with other community leaders, and, finally, that you can help make the true dimensions and nature of the problem more apparent to more people.

Educational television has a giant mission—one of the greatest opportunities for constructive good in this century. We have got to see it off to a sound start and to a lasting future.

THE TFX DISPUTE

Mr. **MUSKIE.** Mr. President, the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations for several weeks has been conducting hearings on the award of a contract by the Defense Department to the General Dynamics Corp., for the development of a tactical experimental fighter plane, better known as TFX. As a member of that subcommittee, I have been closely involved in this matter.

The issues involved are of great importance. At the same time, many of the considerations involved are highly technical, and exceedingly difficult to comprehend.

An article in this morning's Washington Post & Times Herald by John G. Norris, provides, in my opinion, a good, factual and objective summary of the proceedings to date. I think it will be of value to the Members of the Senate and to the public who may be interested in keeping abreast of this matter. I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUESTIONS OF JUDGMENT—TFX DISPUTE CENTERS ON CONTRACT PIONEERING

(By John G. Norris)

After 10 weeks of bitter and far-reaching Senate hearings, the TFX controversy has reached a point where a good look at the basic issues is in order.

Those issues—largely obscured in the welter of charges—can best be understood by looking at the evidence on less than a dozen key questions. Some judgments then may be possible.

Underlying the many-faceted affair is one vital point: Did Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara use judgment in ordering an all-purpose fighter—a plane that the military unanimously considered "satisfactory" but inferior to the alternatives—because he concluded it would save money and time?

Here are the major elements that must be borne in mind while approaching the key questions in the controversy:

Last fall, McNamara awarded a contract to General Dynamics Corp. for a new tactical fighter for the Air Force and Navy, although its bid was $100 million higher than that of the rival Boeing Co.

The Secretary said Boeing's estimates were unrealistically low. He also said General Dynamics came much closer to a major new approach to weapons procurement that he was instituting to provide simpler arms more quickly and cheaply.

A fundamental requirement under the new approach was that the Air Force and Navy versions of the plane be as similar as possible in order to cut costs. McNamara decided against Boeing on grounds that General Dynamics better met this objective. Earlier, he had overruled Air Force and Navy insistence on a third possible course—development by each service of its own fighter in order to achieve maximum combat efficiency.

After 22 months and many attempts, both companies produced designs that all military echelons agreed were "acceptable" with changes; designs that would "markedly improve" air combat effectiveness. Boeing, however, was recommended by the military as promising the better plane at the lower price.

McNamara overruled them. The Senate Investigations Subcommittee launched an inquiry, which developed into an indictment of the Secretary. Angry infighting between the Pentagon and subcommittee—often over technicalities—has confused the picture, and McNamara has not yet presented his case in detail, nor has he been questioned. Neither have Air Force Secretary Eugene M. Zuckert nor Navy Secretary Fred Korth, who support McNamara.

But these major questions raised during the investigation are noteworthy:

Is McNamara right in insisting that the Armed Forces work out a radically different system of procuring complex new weapons?

The old system was to choose a reliable contractor, who offered the best design and price, and work with him in developing the best weapon possible.

Where unforeseen problems arose, the Government paid the added cost. Often the price soared, operational readiness deadlines were not met and necessary design changes in one component cut unexpected performance in other respects.

McNamara thinks this is archaic and wasteful. His new system, being pioneered with the TFX, involves:

Detailed program definition planning at the Pentagon.

Insistence on more realistic cost estimates from contractors.

Better Pentagon standards for judging whether bidders are underestimating either the cost or the difficulty of the job in order to get the award.

Greater use of the fixed-price incentive contracts rather than cost-plus awards.

Putting greater weight, in picking contractors, on the experience of companies in developing similar weapons.

Not insisting that new weapons "meet performance standards that go far beyond essential military requirements."

PROS AND CONS

McNamara says the new system can save billions and prevent such past mistakes as the canceled nuclear airplane and P6-M jet seaplane as well as weapons that ultimately cost three, four, or more times the original estimate.

Critics see merit in some of the new procedures, but declare that overall it is more suited to producing new automobiles than very advanced and complex planes and missiles.

Boeing officials—and Senate Investigations Subcommittee Chairman JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, Democrat of Arkansas, jumped on McNamara's insistence on realistic bidding. They said it would discourage cost competition and lead companies to put in bids based on what they thought the Pentagon expected rather than undercutting competitors.

Fears also have been voiced that the new emphasis on experience will promote monopoly and freeze out new companies.

But the chief objections have come over McNamara's comments that the services and bidders should not seek far higher performance standards in new weapons than demanded by essential military requirements. This key point bears on the next question.

Is McNamara right in insisting, where the services have need for the same general type of weapon, that they adopt a common or nearly common design even though this means some compromise in combat performance?

This commonalty issue goes to the heart of the TFX dispute. When McNamara took office, both the Air Force and Navy had separate proposals for new tactical fighters for use from advance bases and from aircraft carriers in conventional war.

Each would have replaced several planes which have different characteristics for various tactical missions. A new development in aerodynamics—the retractable wing—made this possible. Essentially, this involves hinging of the wings so they can be swept back for high supersonic flight or be extended for slow landings and takeoffs, loitering over the target or ferrying to oversea bases.

Experts agreed that this important—though yet unperfected and untested—technique was a big step toward an all-purpose fighter. But both Air Force and Navy military chiefs maintained that it would not bridge their differing needs.

Weight was the principal obstacle. The Air Force could let the plane grow heavy to achieve the desired supersonic dash, hovering ability for close ground support and range for flying to oversea targets. The Navy had to keep its version lighter for landing on carriers.

McNamara insisted that it could be done. The services set forth their performance requirements and bids were asked for a bi-service TFX (tactical fighter, experimental). On the first round none of six bidders came up with a satisfactory design. But Boeing led. The joint evaluation teams and their military superiors wanted to pick Boeing and work with it to devise two acceptable and probably widely varying Air Force and Navy versions of the plane.

McNamara, however, insisted on further competition and new design by Boeing and General Dynamics. Four attempts were made in all. On the last try, after some trimming of requirements, both designs were adjudged acceptable with further changes. Boeing, in the lead all along, was recommended.

For one thing, Boeing had provided for bonus performance in several characteristics, offering higher than minimum requirements. McNamara concluded, however, that the Air Force and Navy versions of the Boeing design were two separate planes structurally, whereas the General Dynamics design largely met his goal of commonalty.

Principally because of his conclusion that the cost of the Boeing plane would run far higher than estimated, and because of his feeling that Boeing's edge in performance was marginal, the Secretary gave the award to General Dynamics.

McNamara argues that the United States cannot afford to spend heavy additional sums for bonus performance beyond stated military requirements, or to build two different planes where one will do the job.

Adm. George W. Anderson, who recently did not receive reappointment as Chief of Naval Operations, put the case for the other side when called to testify in the Senate investigation. He had wanted a separate Navy fighter and favored Boeing because it promised more for the fleet.

Anderson said the Boeing superiority in performance might seem marginal to some, but that such an edge could be very important in war—as Japanese Zeros and bombers demonstrated early in World War II in terms of U.S. planes and ships destroyed. Russia now has an edge over some American planes, he said, adding:

"Those of us who have learned the hard way of the importance of this edge attach great significance to what might otherwise appear inconsequential differences between two competing pieces of military hardware."

In answering such criticism, McNamara has said that a billion dollars can be saved by building one common fighter plane instead of separate ones for the Air Force and Navy—not an unimportant goal.

Does General Dynamics really provide one basically all-purpose Air Force and Navy plane, and Boeing two?

Basically, it was shown that General Dynamics had about 85 percent commonalty of parts, while Boeing had 60 percent common parts.

This General Dynamics advantage was disputed by testimony that many of its common parts were those not normally requiring replacement and hence not requiring additional cost in spare-parts stocking.

But this was offset by the fact that the joint evaluation group reported that Boeing's Air Force and Navy versions were structurally separate planes—and hence requiring extensive separate testing—while General Dynamic's design was structurally one plane.

Is the General Dynamics design inferior in performance to the Boeing? How much of a compromise would result from such a finding and from McNamara's earlier ruling that the Air Force and Navy could not build separate fighters?

The testimony clearly shows that ranking military men regarded the Boeing design as superior to General Dynamics'.

Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Air Force Chief of Staff, testified that the "operational advantage of Boeing outweighed the other factors involved."

He said there was no doubt but that a separate plane designed for Air Force requirements would have had higher performance than the common design approved.

But he also declared that the compromise was acceptable because of the money savings involved, which might permit ordering more planes than the approximately 1,500 Air Force and 230 Navy TFXs contemplated.

Gen. William F. McKee, Air Force Vice Chief of Staff, and Gen. Walter C. Sweeney, commander of the U.S. Air Force Tactical Air Command, also testified that they regarded the Boeing design as superior. Even stronger objections were voiced by Navy witnesses, who felt that carrier aviation suffered even more than the Air Force under the McNamara decisions first against separate airplanes and then against Boeing.

Security prevented any precise definition of the merits of one plane over the other, but there was official testimony indicating that a Senate subcommittee chart showing that Boeing had 1,100 miles greater ferry range and 50 percent greater bomb carrying capacity was exaggerated.

And General Dynamics officials testified that their plane would have a definite advantage in supersonic combat range. They said the General Dynamics plane could cover 19 percent more targets in Europe and 14.5 percent more in Asia, calling this the "guts of the whole design problem for the Air Force airplane."

Was the Boeing design technically more "risky," as McNamara said?

The Boeing plane does provide for "thrust-reversers" to slow down the fighter in flight or in landing by deflecting the jet streams from the engines, thus permitting greater air maneuverability and safer landings on short fields. General Dynamics plans conventional speed brakes for slowing down in the air, and normal wheel brakes on the ground.

Boeing has used thrust-reversers on subsonic transports for ground braking, but they never had been tried in supersonic flight. There is an admitted risk of possible delay in perfecting them, although the chances of ultimate success and greater performance are good.

Boeing also has proposed use of titanium instead of steel in some structural parts, involving both possible weight savings and risks of delay. And it proposed putting the engine air scoops on top instead of on the side of the plane to avoid intake of rocks on rough airfields. General Dynamics uses steel and conventional air scoops.

Again, advantages had to be weighed against risks of delays, added cost and possible performance downgrading if the entire plane had to be redesigned because the innovation would not work.

McNamara argued that these "unnecessary" new features not only increased the chances of costly delays in development, but could result in failure of the F-111 (the operational name of the TFX) to meet its operational deadline. This has happened before to planes where designers pushed for risky performance goals.

The testimony showed that all three Boeing innovations involved some risk but not as much of a problem as perfecting the retractable wing.

Which of the two TFX proposals is less costly? Is McNamara's claim of a billion-dollar saving sound or simply "propaganda," as Senator McCLELLAN charges?

General Dynamic's bid for developing the TFX and building 23 prototypes was $630 million—$148 million more than Boeing's.

Its estimate for the entire development and production job was $91 million higher than Boeing's figure of $5,364,300,000.

An Air Force evaluation of the estimates concluded that both companies were 'way low and that General Dynamics' overall job would run $100 million to $416 million higher than Boeing's. Total cost may run to $6.5 billion.

McNamara said he picked General Dynamics partly because Boeing's figures were "unrealistically optimistic" and the U.S. Air Force evaluations of it were "unreliable." He said the latter were based on a hypothetical TFX plane, not the two competitors, and that the whole system needs major reform. This is easier said than done, say critics.

McCLELLAN has made much of General Accounting Office official's statements that McNamara has no solid figures of his own to justify his award to General Dynamics, but relied on "rough judgments" of both estimates, based partly on his experience at Ford Motor Co. It is difficult, however, to see how he could have gotten new and better cost figures.

The Secretary's doubts about the Boeing bid deal not only with the prospects of costly changes in design if the risky features of its plane run into trouble, but also stem from his belief that the company had grossly underestimated some of the difficulties and cost of its development work.

DESIGN HELD SIMPLER

He said the General Dynamics design was simpler and less risky and would lead to less cost over the entire life of the airplane. Some Senators insisted that the Boeing bid was a fixed one, but Pentagon officials declared that when a contractor on a long, complex weapons order runs into financial difficulties because of an underbid, the Government must bail him out if it wants the product.

The only really firm contract negotiated last fall, they insisted, was for the development phase, with the much bigger production order left for final settlement later.

As for McNamara's claim of a billion-dollar saving, Pentagon officials say this was based on the difference of cost between building one Air Force-Navy TFX and the abandoned attempt to build two separate aircraft—not the difference between the General Dynamics and Boeing bids. His statement, however, has been interpreted as meaning the latter. Defense officials say there is no way of estimating the actual potential saving.

Is General Dynamics and its key Navy subcontractor, Grumman Aircraft, more experienced and qualified than its rival defense industry giant, Boeing, as McNamara says?

General Dynamics has built two supersonic fighters, the Air Force F-102 and F-106. Grumman is a veteran builder of Navy carrier fighter planes, and developed and tested an earlier retractable-wing airplane which, while not accepted by the Government, gave them experience in the field.

Boeing has been a successful builder of Air Force subsonic bombers, but has not developed a fighter since the 1930's. There is some difference between the two types of planes, but both companies are viewed as qualified to develop the TFX.

Did political or other influence enter into the big contract award? And, on the other side of the coin, are there other motives behind the Senate investigation than meet the eye?

To date, there has been not a scintilla of evidence that politics entered into McNamara's mind, despite the suggestion that the General Dynamics-Grumman plane would be built in Texas and New York, and the Boeing in Kansas.

The Senate investigators have noted that Deputy Defense Secretary Roswell Gilpatric's old law firm was counsel for General Dynamics in some matters before he came to the Pentagon. Gilpatric's friends scoff at the implication of any conflict of interest on his part and call this a red herring.

It has been suggested that the Senate subcommittee's fervent attacks on McNamara are aimed at discrediting his judgment and forcing him to resign. This is denied, but there is little doubt but that many on Capitol Hill and in the military and defense industry would like to see the confident, dynamic Secretary taken down a peg.

It is too early to say what action the Senate subcommittee may recommend regarding the TFX contract and highly doubtful that it could influence McNamara's action in any practical way.

Senators' suggestions that Boeing and General Dynamics both build prototypes and that a choice between them be delayed until after flight tests are discounted. It would cost hundreds of millions of dollars and delay combat-ready planes by a year.

As for McNamara's reputation, there is no evidence that the confusing evidence on the TFX as yet has had any impact on his popular image as the man who took on the generals and admirals and firmly asserted civilian rule.

Some may conclude from the airing of the controversy that he was wrong. But this comes down to a matter of judgment, and he is the man charged with making such judgments.

WISHES OF SUCCESS FOR ASTRONAUT LEROY GORDON COOPER, JR.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, the people of Hawaii join with people everywhere who are waiting with high hopes for the successful blastoff of Astronaut Leroy Gordon Cooper, Jr., tomorrow. We in the 50th State have a particular reason for fervently wishing every success to Astronaut Cooper, for he is a former student at the University of Hawaii. He knows Hawaii and Hawaii regards him as one of her own. We are proud that Hawaii will be the first American community to which Major Cooper will be taken after he has completed his 22 orbits around the earth.

It is my pleasure to announce that a special aloha welcome is being planned in Hawaii after his scheduled arrival there Friday afternoon. Both civilian and military communities are joining in the public tribute during the 7½ hours Major Cooper is expected to spend in Hawaii.

According to information I have received from Honolulu, Major Cooper's wife will be on hand to welcome the astronaut when he lands at Hickam Air Force Base by helicopter from the recovery carrier U.S.S. *Kearsarge*. Adm. Harry D. Felt, Commander in Chief of the Pacific, and civilian leaders will be there to greet him.

A motorcade will take Major Cooper through Honolulu streets, to the University of Hawaii campus, where he studied for 3 years.

The motorcade will then go to Iolani Palace, the capitol, where a program of tribute is planned and a medal will be presented him by the University of Hawaii. An official reception at Washington Place, the executive mansion, will follow.

Everything is being done to make his arrival in Hawaii a truly heartwarming occasion. It will be an aloha homecoming for a hero in the true spirit of Hawaiian hospitality.

DR. HAROLD F. DORN

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, there have been many distinguished physicians and scientists who have pierced the veil of ignorance surrounding the mechanism and causes of cancer. But none I think was more entitled to our profound gratitude than Dr. Harold F. Dorn, Chief of the Biometrics Branch of the National Institutes of Health, whose untimely death last Thursday prompted Washington Post reporter Stephen C. Rogers to comment: "Cancer struck down one of its most diligent enemies."

Dr. Dorn's landmark survey of the health histories of 249,000 World War I veterans served to establish the overwhelming relationship between cigarette smoking and lung cancer. This was but one achievement of a remarkably creative and productive career. His untimely loss is indeed a very tragic one both for his family, to whom I extend my deepest sympathies, and for the Nation to whom he had dedicated his services.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Harold Dorn, NIH Specialist," by Stephen C. Rogers, which appeared in the May 10 edition of the Washington Post, be printed at the close of these remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Harold Dorn, NIH Specialist

(By Stephen C. Rogers)

Cancer struck down one of its most diligent enemies yesterday when Harold F. Dorn, 56, died of the disease at the National Institutes of Health.

As NIH's chief statistician, Mr. Dorn prepared the 1958 survey which led the Public Health Service to search for links between lung cancer and smoking.

In a study which spanned years, Mr. Dorn kept tabs on more than 200,000 veterans of World War I, seeking out their tobacco habits and the causes of their deaths.

He concluded, among other things, that the death rate for general smokers was 32 percent higher than for nonsmokers and that the lung cancer death rate for cigarette smokers was about 10 times the death rate as for nonsmokers.

In 1959, a year after Mr. Dorn's study was released, the then Surg. Gen. Leroy E. Burney declared for the first time that the weight of evidence implicates smoking as a main cause of rising lung cancer.

NOTED FOR BIOMETRICS

Mr. Dorn was internationally recognized in the field of biometrics, which applies statistical methods to biological facts. At the time of his death, he had been a demographer, statistician, and biometrician for the Public Health Service since 1936.

In 1961 the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare cited him as "the Federal Government's outstanding leader in the field of biometric theory and practice."

Since 1953 he had been general secretary of the International Union Against Cancer.

Born in Tompkins County, N.Y., Mr. Dorn received his bachelor's and master's degrees from Cornell University. In 1933 he earned a doctorate in sociology from the University of Wisconsin.

He came to Washington in 1934 to work for the Works Progress Administration and 2 years later joined the Health Service.

WAR WORK HONORS

He won the Legion of Merit for his work during World War II as chief of the medical statistics division in the War Department's Office of the Surgeon General.

He was chief of the biometrics branch of NIH's Research Services for 10 years until 1960. In that year he became chief of the biometrics branch of the National Heart Institute.

Mr. Dorn was also known for his work in epidemiology, the science which seeks statistically to isolate the causes of diseases.

Mr. Dorn lived at 15 Burning Tree Court, Bethesda.

He is survived by his wife, Celia, and two daughters, Patricia Adams, of East Lansing, Mich., and Eleanor Phillips, of Ann Arbor, Mich.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FEED GRAIN ACT OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4997) to extend the feed grain program.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the pending measure extends for a period of 2 years, the same type of feed grain program that the Senate twice approved in 1961 and extended again in 1962.

The bill provides for: Price support for corn and other feed grains based on 65 to 90 percent of parity for corn, with authority to make part of the support available through payments in kind; and diversion of feed-grain acreage to conserving uses in return for payment in kind.

As in the case of the 1963 program law, price support would be conditioned on participation in the acreage diversion program to the extent prescribed by the Secretary; the maximum diversion which could be permitted for any farm would be 50 percent of its base acreage, or 25 acres, whichever is greater; the maximum payment rate per acre diverted would be 50 percent of the support price multiplied by the average yield; and an exemption from diversion requirements for price support could be made for malting barley. The Secretary has advised the committee by correspondence that the program would be administered in about the same manner as the 1963 program. His letters in this regard are set out in the report.

At this point I ask unanimous consent that these letters may be made a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Department of Agriculture,
Office of the Secretary,
Washington, May 8, 1963.

Hon. Allen J. Ellender,
Chairman, Agriculture and Forestry Committee, U.S. Senate.

Dear Mr. Chairman: During my appearance before your committee last Friday, and I understand in subsequent hearings this week, questions have been raised concerning the administration of the 1964 and 1965 programs under the authority contained in H.R. 4997. As I stated before your committee, we face a different situation in 1964 and 1965 from that which we faced in the past 3 years when the maximum amount of participation and stock reduction was needed. In future years our problem will be to maintain a security reserve or carryover of feed grains in the range of 45 to 50 million tons. This will require careful study and judgment on the mix of various program provisions so as to obtain the desired degree of participation without allocation or rationing. Obviously, in view of uncertainties of weather and the possibilities of changes in production, utilization, and exports, the judgment and decisions on detailed program provisions must be made on the basis of the best available information at the time the decisions are made. It is for these reasons that I would sincerely hope the committee would not limit the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture in carrying out his responsibility under this proposed legislation.

However, in view of the questions which have been raised concerning this matter, perhaps it would be helpful to members of the committee and of the Senate to reiterate what has previously been stated by Department officials. We have indicated that based on present information and estimates (1) the price-support level for feed grains in 1964 will not be materially different from the levels in effect for the 1963 crops; (2) the portion of the price support to be made in payment-in-kind under the 1964 program is expected to be somewhat less than the 18 cents required under the 1963 program; (3) the required minimum diversion for eligibility of price support under the 1964 program would in no case be greater than that required in the 1961, 1962, and 1963 programs (20 percent of the 1959–60 base acreage), and could possibly be slightly lower; and (4) final decisions will be made on the basis of the best estimates available at the time the final announcements are to be made, and in making such decisions, thorough consideration will be given to the effects on producers' income in the very important feed grain-livestock sector of our agricultural economy, and also to the cost aspects on an overall, as well as a per-unit basis.

Furthermore, we would seek the recommendations, advice, and counsel of organizations and individuals who are involved in the production of both feed grains and livestock before making such decisions.

I trust the above will be helpful to your committee in its deliberations. May I again urge the prompt passage of this bill in the form approved by the House of Representatives. I assure you that my administration of this bill will be in accord with the highest level of public responsibility.

Sincerely,

Orville L. Freeman,
Secretary.

Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C., May 9, 1963.

Hon. Allen J. Ellender,
Chairman, Agriculture and Forestry Committee, U.S. Senate.

Dear Mr. Chairman: In my letter of yesterday, May 8, I indicated to your committee the administrative actions which, based on present information and estimates, would be taken under the feed-grain program authorized by H.R. 4997. While these comments were made with respect to the 1964 program, they will also apply, in general, to the 1965 program. However, as I indicated in my letter yesterday, it is very difficult to make precise estimates so far in advance in view of the uncertainties of weather and the possibilities of changes in production, utilization, and exports. Obviously, it is even more difficult to make such estimates for the 1965 program than it is for the 1964 program. Especially is this true in determining the price-support level and the minimum percentage of diversion which will be required for eligibility for price support.

With regard to the portion of price support to be made available in the form of payment-in-kind, however, we can foresee no conditions which would require this payment under either the 1964 program or the 1965 program to be in excess of the 18 cents provided by law for corn under the 1963 program.

I trust this will supplement and clarify my previous assurances concerning the administration of the feed grain program.

Sincerely,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the new feed grain program has been very effective in curtailing production, in reducing the supply of feed grains and, more importantly, in lessening the cost to the Government. In addition, this voluntary feed grain program has also contributed substantially to the improvement in farm income in 1961 and 1962.

Senators will recall that the feed grain program in effect prior to 1961 guaranteed Government price supports at 65 percent of parity or 90 percent of the 3-year average, whichever was higher, with absolutely no limit on production. Under programs in effect prior to 1961 the production, utilization, and carryover stocks of all feed grains had been increasing for a number of years, and the accumulation of stocks by the Government, which had been produced in excess of our needs in previous years, was not only becoming unmanageable, but was also extremely costly.

I want to review in detail some of the facts regarding production, utilization, and the accumulation of stocks, in order to show that the program adopted in 1961 has been effective. Later in my statement I will show that the arguments and charges against this voluntary feed grain program are completely unfounded.

In my opinion, a study of these facts would convince any reasonable person that a continuation of the program is in the best interest of agriculture and of the country as a whole.

Production of feed grains in 1954 amounted to 114.1 million tons, and by 1960 had increased to 155.6 million tons. During the same period utilization of feed grains had increased from 107.6 million tons to 145.9 million tons. Notwithstanding the very substantial increase in utilization as indicated, Government stocks of surplus feeds increased from 22.6 million tons to 74.6 million tons, and the Commodity Credit Corporation investment in feed grains increased from $1.3 billion in 1954 to $3.3 billion by 1961.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the Senator has pointed out—and I assume he is reading from the table on page 9—that the production of feed grains increased from 114.1 million tons to 140.6 million tons.

Mr. ELLENDER. To 155.6 million tons.

Mr. AIKEN. To 155.6?

Mr. ELLENDER. In 1960.

Mr. AIKEN. In 1960?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. That is 41 million tons. Of course, the Senator is using more favorable figures than the table shows as a whole, using the years 1953 to 1961. Since 1954 we find an increase in production of 26.5 million tons, but the disappearance increased from 107.6 to 154 million tons.

Mr. ELLENDER. From 107.6 million tons in 1954, disappearance increased to 145.9 million tons in 1960.

Mr. AIKEN. If the Senator wishes to use the years 1954 to 1960, which suit his arguments better, I agree that there is an increase of 41 million tons in production and 38.3 million tons in disappearance. Of course, if we go back to the previous year, the situation is much more favorable to the other side of the argument.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator will have an opportunity to give his side of the argument.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. Let us put it this way. If the increase in production is virtually equal to the increase in disappearance, where did the increase in the carryover come from?

Mr. ELLENDER. There was a greater increase in production than in disappearance.

Mr. AIKEN. Depending on what years are used.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have been listening to the arguments of the opponents of the feed grain bill. That argument is that 85 percent of the grain is consumed on the farm and that only 15 percent is not consumed on the farm. If that is true, why should there be, over a period of 7 or 8 years, such a large carryover, exceeding that in previous years? For instance, the total carryover of feed grains in 1954 was 31.7 million tons. By 1961, before the 1961 program went into effect, that carryover had increased to 84.7 million tons. I would like to know why that is. The answer is so evident that I would expect my good friend from Vermont to state that it was due to greater production. If there had been an increase in utilization, to keep up with production, it would go without saying that one would have canceled out the other. That did not happen. That is not the fact. That is where Mr. Charles Shuman, the president of the American Farm Bureau Federation went off the track, as I will indicate as I go along. I invite Senators to read the statements of Mr. Shuman as he presented them to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I would rather refer to the table on page 9 of the hearings, which shows that over a 10-year period production increased from 108.3 million to 140.6 million tons, and disappearance increased from 105.8 million to 154 million tons. In other words, the disappearance increased 48.2 million tons a year, and production increased 32.3 million tons a year. I was wondering how the big increase in carryover came about. I agree with the Senator that one can take pencil and paper and prove anything he wishes.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what Mr. Shuman did. The Senator from Vermont was present last Tuesday and heard Mr. Shuman testify that an 11.9-million-ton reduction in production only affected the size of the carryover by about 1.7 million tons.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not swear by Mr. Shuman's figures.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am glad the Senator does not.

Mr. AIKEN. I am referring to the figures of the Department of Agriculture, which appear on page 9 of the hearings.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, there is no doubt that the upward trend in production and Government stocks and costs would have continued had not remedial legislation been enacted.

However, the Congress did take action and as a result, the production of all feed grains in 1961 was reduced 15 million tons below the previous year and production in 1962 was reduced 12½ million tons below 1960. Similarly, there was a reduction both in the total carryover of feed grains and the Government stocks of these commodities.

In the first year of the program, Government stocks were reduced by 12.2 million tons. It is expected that Government stocks will be further decreased because of the 1962 program by about 11.4 million tons, for a total reduction in the 2-year operation of the new voluntary feed grain program of about 23.6 million tons. In addition, it is expected that this year's program will result in another substantial reduction in stocks.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table showing the production, utilization, and carryover of feed grains.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Feed grains

[All figures in millions]

Year	Production	Utilization	Total	Carryover		
				Other	Government	
					Quantity	Value
	Tons	*Tons*	*Tons*	*Tons*	*Tons*	*Dollars*
1954	114.1	107.6	31.7	9.1	22.6	1,268.0
1955	120.8	117.4	39.1	9.4	29.7	1,643.4
1956	119.3	114.6	43.2	8.5	34.7	2,004.8
1957	132.4	123.2	48.8	8.0	40.8	2,180.0
1958	144.1	135.9	59.0	9.3	49.7	2,574.0
1959	149.6	143.1	67.5	9.5	58.0	2,847.1
1960	155.6	145.9	74.6	8.9	65.7	3,085.5
1961	140.6	154.0	84.7	10.1	74.6	3,270.7
1962	143.1	154.2	71.8	9.4	62.4	2,558.1
1963 [1]			61.0	10.0	51.0	2,189.1

[1] Estimate.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, in the 2 years that the new feed grain program has been in effect the Commodity Credit Corporation investment in feed grains will have been reduced by about $1 billion below the $3.3 billion that the Government had invested as of June 30, 1961, before the new program became fully effective.

The Department of Agriculture estimates that after deducting the cost of the new program the ultimate net savings to taxpayers resulting from the acreage diversion program in 1961 and 1962 will amount to about $1.2 billion.

The argument is made that the decrease in stocks that have occurred is principally the result of increases in the utilization of feed grains. This argument is advanced because utilization of corn and other feed grains increased in 1961 and 1962. But, Mr. President, the fact is that the utilization of feed grains has been increasing steadily in past years and, in spite of this, until the 1961 program went into effect, Government stocks also increased. I will show that this is the case.

The production of corn for grain increased from 2.7 billion bushels in 1954 to 3.9 billion bushels in 1960. This amounts to an increase of 44 percent.

I would like to emphasize at this point that there was a very significant upward trend in production that would have continued into the future. The upward production trend is not the result of increased acreage devoted to the production of corn, for acreage increased only by 2.9 million acres. Rather, the principal reason lies in the fact that yields increased from 39.4 bushels per acre to 54.5 bushels. This is an increase of 38 percent. Studies made by responsible authorities both in the Department of Agriculture and at land-grant universities indicate that yields will continue to increase.

While the production of corn was increasing, the utilization of corn was also increasing. In 1954 domestic utilization amounted to 2.5 billion bushels. By 1960 domestic utilization amounted to 3.4 billion bushels, an increase of only 36 percent, as compared with an increase of 44 percent in the production of corn.

Exports of corn also were increasing. In 1954, 92 million bushels were exported and in 1960, 276 million bushels.

Senators will note that while the utilization of corn increased very substantially the fact is that the production of corn increased even faster, thereby adding to surplus stocks. The carryover stocks at the end of each marketing year from 1954 through 1960 also showed a very substantial increase. As a matter of fact, carryover stocks in 1954 amounted to only about 1 billion bushels. By 1960 the carryover stocks had increased by about a billion bushels and amounted to 2 billion, 8 million bushels.

I might add that during the period from 1954 to 1960, when the production of corn was increasing, when the domestic disappearance of corn was increasing, when the exports of corn were increasing, and when the carryover stocks were increasing, the only thing to show a decrease was the price of corn. Price supports in 1954 were set at $1.62 per bushel but in 1960 price supports had been lowered to $1.06 per bushel.

In 1961 the first feed grain program went into effect. As a result, the production of corn in 1961 decreased from 3.9 billion bushels to 3.6 billion bushels, a reduction of about 300 million bushels. In the second year of the program corn production was 264 million bushels less than it was in 1960.

Carryover stocks of corn are declining substantially under the program. Stocks decreased from 2 billion bushels in 1960 to 1.6 billion bushels in 1961 and at the end of this marketing year will amount to only 1.3 billion bushels for a total decrease of about 700 million bushels during the 2-year period in which the feed grain program was in effect.

On the other hand, if the program had not gone into effect, the production of corn in 1962, instead of being 264 million bushels less than in 1960, would have been 522 million bushels more; and the production and carryover would consequently have been 786 million bushels greater than it was. These projections were determined by the technicians in the Department of Agriculture utilizing trend data developed for technical publications.

Furthermore, instead of carryover stocks of corn being reduced in 1961 and 1962 by 700 million bushels to the 1.3 billion bushels estimated for the end of the marketing year for the 1962 crop, the Department technicians have estimated that the stocks would have increased by 542 million bushels in those 2 years to all-time high of 2.5 billion bushels, or 1.2 billion bushels greater than under the program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). The morning hour having ended, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 537) to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate continue with the consideration of House bill 4997, to extend the feed grain program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection——

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the feed grain bill has been the pending business?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I assure Senators that while the program costs were high in 1960, the costs would have been fantastic in 1962, had we not changed the program in 1961.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table showing the production, utilization, and carryover stocks of corn.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CORN

Production, utilization, and carryover stocks of corn, 1954–60 with 1961–63 estimates without feed grain program

[All figures represent millions except support price]

Crop	Production for grain	Utilization		Carryover stocks at end of crop marketing year	Support price
		Domestic	Exports		
	Bushels	*Bushels*	*Bushels*	*Bushels*	*Per bushel*
1954	2,708	2,502	92	1,035	$1.62
1955	2,873	2,636	108	1,165	1.58
1956	3,075	2,657	165	1,419	1.50
1957	3,045	2,814	183	1,469	1.40
1958	3,356	3,088	214	1,524	1.36
1959	3,825	3,351	212	1,787	1.12
1960	3,908	3,412	276	2,008	1.06
1961—With program	3,626	3,580	415	1,640	1.20
Without program	4,275	3,641	433	2,210	1.05
1962—With program	3,644	3,610	375	1,300	1.20
Without program	4,430	3,716	375	2,550	1.05
1963—With program	3,800	3,651	355	1,095	1.25
Without program	4,430	3,801	355	2,825	1.05

NOTE.—Carryover stocks without program assume continuation of 1960-type program in 1961, 1962, and 1963.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the same story can be told about grain sorghums. Production increased from 236 million bushels in 1954 to 620 million bushels in 1960, an increase of 162 percent. Stocks of this commodity increased at an even greater rate. From 75 million bushels in 1954, stocks had increased to 702 million bushels in 1960.

Had the program not been in effect in 1961 and 1962, the production of grain sorghum would have increased to 670 million bushels, and stocks to 875 million bushels. Most of this tremendous increase in stocks would have been taken over by the Government, thereby adding to the cost of the program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table showing the production, utilization, and carryover stocks of grain sorghums.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRAIN SORGHUMS

Production, utilization, and carryover stocks of grain sorghums, 1954–60, with 1961–63 estimates without feed grain program

[All figures represent millions except support price]

Crop	Production for grain	Utilization		Carryover stocks at end of marketing year for crops	Support price
		Domestic	Exports		
	Bushels	*Bushels*	*Bushels*	*Bushels*	*Per bushel*
1954	236	135	48	75	$1.28
1955	243	170	66	81	1.00
1956	205	185	22	79	1.10
1957	568	281	57	309	1.04
1958	581	280	100	510	1.02
1959	555	384	100	581	.85
1960	620	428	71	702	.85
1961—Actual	480	422	99	661	1.08
Estimated with 1960-type program	665	473	99	795	.85
1962—Actual	509	445	100	625	1.08
Estimated with 1960-type program	670	490	100	875	.85
1963—Estimate	565	515	100	575	1.12
Estimated with 1960-type program	700	500	100	975	.85

NOTE.—Carryover stocks without program assume continuation of 1960-type program in 1961, 1962, and 1963.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, without a doubt the feed-grain program which was enacted in 1961 has caused both production and stocks, to say nothing of cost, to decrease. The gains to agriculture, as well as to the taxpayers, have been substantial. It would therefore be harmful if we were to allow this program to expire. We must consolidate and maintain the gains and savings to the Government which have accrued under the program in effect the past 3 years.

I may say at this point that, in my opinion, a mandatory feed-grain program would have been much preferable to a voluntary feed-grain program. It would, in my opinion, have been less costly and more effective. However, Congress refused to enact such a program, although I must admit that early in 1962 the Senate did pass a mandatory feed-grain program.

Be that as it may, the fact remains that the voluntary program is much better than the program in effect prior to 1961. As I have previously indicated to Senators, a program of unlimited production with guaranteed high price supports will result only in increased Government costs.

Mr. President in order that we may have the issues squarely before us, let us take a look at the opposition to extension of this program.

The committee held hearings to determine what the objections might be; and I should like to examine those objections in the order in which they were presented by the American Farm Bureau Federation, represented by its president, Mr. Charles B. Shuman. I would regard this organization as the principal opponent of the bill.

The first objection was one of timing—namely, that the bill should not be considered before May 21, because it might be interpreted as an effort to influence the vote in the wheat referendum. Mr. President, the only reason why this bill can be so interpreted is that it establishes some of the ground rules upon which the referendum is based. Clearly, the time to establish those rules is before the referendum, so that the farmer may know what he is voting on. We should not wait until after the referendum, and then change the rules.

Last year, when Congress enacted the wheat law, it provided in section 328 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, that "Effective with the 1964 crop, during any year in which an acreage diversion program is in effect for feed grains," the Secretary may permit feed-grain and wheat acreage to be interchanged. That is an essential part of the wheat program. It is not new. It was passed last year. The farmers know about it. But until Congress acts, they can only guess as to whether there will be a feed-grain program which will make this provision operative. They have a right to know before they vote. The type of "influencing" which I would condemn would be that of keeping the farmers in the dark on this point until after they have voted.

Other reasons advanced for delaying the action on the bill until after May 21 were that we could not act objectively in the heat of a referendum, that result of the referendum might require reanalysis, that there would still be time after May 21, and that we should know more about the actual results of the 1963 program. Of course, all these are just reasons for delaying action so that the producers will be forced to go to the polls without being fully informed on the issues. We can act objectively, and we can do so today on the basis of the present situation. Both wheat producers and feed-grain producers should know what the program will be, as soon as that is possible. We have had 2 years of experience with this program, and we shall not gain much more knowledge about the results of the 1963 program by waiting until May 21.

The farmers will vote on May 21. Whether there is a feed grain diversion program is one of the facts they should know. In all fairness, Congress should act before May 21 on this bill.

The first substantive objection to the bill, as raised by the American Farm Bureau Federation, was that the cost of the program could not be justified since—and now I quote from the testimony give by Mr. Shuman—

> Over 90 percent of the reduction in feed grain carryover was due to factors other than reduced production of the grains covered by the program.

Let us look at the facts. From 1954 to 1960, feed grain production increased from 114.1 million tons, as I previously stated, to 155.6 million tons. At the same time, utilization increased from 107.6 million tons to 145.9 million tons. Because production increased faster than utilization, the carryover increased from 31.7 million tons in 1954 to 84.7 million tons at the end of the 1960 crop marketing year. In 1961, the first year of the feed grain program, production decreased by 15.0 million tons. Not only did the program keep production from increasing at the rate at which it had been increasing in the past, but production was actually reduced below 1960 production by 15.0 million tons. If Senators will look at table 1 on page 6 of the report, in the column headed "Production," the picture should appear very clearly. Utilization in 1961 increased at about the same rate at which it had been increasing. As a result of this cut in production and the usual increase in utilization, the carryover, instead of increasing, as it had been doing every year since 1951, was reduced by 13 million tons. Now with this very clear picture of the effectiveness of the feed grain program in reversing the buildup of stocks, how can anyone contend that over 90 percent of the reduction in feed grain carryover was due to factors other than reduced production of the grains covered by the program.

The witness who made that statement is Mr. Shuman. He reached his conclusion in this way, and I will use his own figures to show his fallacy. He started with the reduction in carryover during 1961 of 12.9 million tons of all feed grains. Of this, he says 8.1 million tons is due to increased utilization and 3.1 million tons is due to reductions in barley and oats, leaving only 1.7 million tons of the reduction in carryover which can be attributed to the program. And this in spite of the fact that he recognizes that corn and sorghum production was reduced by 11.9 million tons. What he fails to take into account is that the 1960 production exceeded 1960 utilization by 9.7 million tons, and this gap had to be closed before we could start reducing the carryover.

The truth is that if we did not have the 11.9 million ton reduction in corn and sorghums, the 3.1 million ton reduction in barley and oats, and the 8.1 million ton increase in utilization, the carryover would have been exactly 23.1 million tons higher than it was.

We would have had a tremendous increase in the carryover, instead of a decrease, just as we did every year before the program went into effect. The only trend that changed in 1961 was corn and sorghum production. Utilization continued going up, oat production continued going down, and barley production continued about even. If we had not reduced corn and sorghum production by 11.9 million tons, the carryover would have been 11.9 million tons greater than it was. If we had not had a 1961 program, corn and sorghum production would have continued to increase as they had in the past and the carryover would have continued to increase as in the past.

The witness' methods of computation is similar to the way we used to prove we had eleven fingers, by counting backwards. On one hand we have 10, 9, 8, 7, 6, and on the other hand we have 5, which makes 11.

It would be as sensible to argue in that manner as Mr. Shuman argues the question as I have indicated.

In the same manner the witness analyzes the 1962 feed grain program, and comes to the conclusion that a reduction of 10.5 million tons in the production of corn, sorghum, and barley affected the size of the carryover by only half a million tons. Imagine that. The witness contends that we reduced production by 10.5 million tons and the carryover is smaller by half a million tons because of that.

For the 2 years, the witness says we reduced production of crops covered by the program by 22.4 million tons, and that resulted in a reduction in the carryover of only 2.2 million tons. Senators will find that table in the printed hearings. An earlier witness opposing the bill, Representative FINDLEY, of Illinois, had given the Committee a most surprising figure as to the cost per bushel of the program, $30.

Perhaps I could increase that amount to $40 if I were to add into the cost the amount paid to all Government employees, the salaries of the Secretary of Agriculture and the members of his force, Senators, the President, and everyone else. We might have made it $40 a bushel. How ridiculous can people get?

The method of computation used by Mr. Shuman explains how that figure was reached. In fact, I believe the merits of the bill are so obvious, that even the distortion of the facts engaged in by the opponents cannot detract from it.

So that is the first substantive objection to the bill in the principal opponent's opinion. I think that pretty well sums up the opposition to the bill. They do not want it now, because they do not think the farmers should know the details of the wheat program until after they have voted.

They do not want the measure now because the Farm Bureau has always been opposed to it. The Farm Bureau has not only been against the feed grain program but it has been opposed to the wheat program. In the States in which wheat is produced, it is now trying to get a "no" vote in the referendum that will take place on May 21.

The American Farm Bureau on that issue never seems to see the light, nor does it in any manner slacken its opposition. It did all it could to prevent the Congress from enacting the wheat program. It is now in the States trying to defeat the referendum on May 21. With an actual reduction—without any allowance being made for normal increases in yields—of 22.4 million tons—I repeat—with an actual reduction of 22.4 million tons in corn and sorghum production in 1961 and 1962, they contend that only 2.2 million tons of the reduction in carryover can be attributed to the feed grain program.

Oh, of course, they do have other arguments. They have discovered what they describe as a little known fact: Feed grain production actually went up—not down—in 1962 as compared to 1961. Imagine that. Of course 1961 and 1962 were both program years, and no effort was made to reduce 1962 production below 1961. But when we compare a program year, such as 1962 with a nonprogram year such as 1960, we certainly see how effective the program is. Using the witnesses' figures, as set out in his table, the 1962 production of corn and sorghum was 10.5 million tons below 1960 production.

Do not forget that those 2 years were years in which there was a program. But when we compare it to 1960, the year before the program started, we find the differences that I have heretofore outlined.

The next argument in opposition to the bill is that the 1963 program will be less effective and more costly than the 1962 program. That is their opinion, and certainly the program will always be more effective or more costly in one year than another, so long as years are not identical. Congress developed the 1963 program as an improvement over the 1962 program, and I think Congress succeeded. But the fact that one program year may be better than another is no argument for having no program at all.

The next objection is that the Secretary would be given what they call "wide open discretionary authority to make compensatory payments;" and they contend this would force consumers to pay part of their food costs through taxes. Of course, it would not do this any more than the programs we had before 1961. The purpose of the bill is to reduce the cost of the program, so that consumers will pay less of their food costs through taxes. The purpose of providing for paying a portion of the support price through payments in kind is the same as in the current program, and it is clearly set out in the bill on page 3, beginning on line 7. The Secretary is given authority to use payments in kind to make available such portion of the support price as he determines desirable "to assure that the benefits of the price support and diversion programs inure primarily to those producers who cooperate in reducing their acreage of feed grains." That is all there is to it.

The committee went into this matter thoroughly with the Secretary, and his letters to the committee on the subject are set out at page 2 of the committee report. The bill provides only for a 2-year program, and the committee could foresee no possibility that the price support payment rate would exceed that for the 1963 program, which is 18 cents a bushel in the case of corn. The Secretary's letters provide assurance that the rate will not exceed 18 cents, and the testimony indicates that it will probably be less. It was stated by the Department that it might be between 10 and 15 cents per bushel.

But I have not covered all of the objections to the bill yet. The rest of them are the usual feeble type of objections that are always made by anyone who is opposed to anything. To wit: The Secretary's authority is too broad. They say it is too broad because it authorizes him to determine whether a feed-grain diversion program is in effect. This is very broad authority all right, about as broad as he has been exercising on marketing quotas since 1938, and on conservation programs before that, and on other programs even before that.

The authority of the Secretary is also said to be too broad because he is authorized to support prices between 65 and 90 percent of parity. For years he determined the support for oats, rye, barley, and sorghums between 0 and 90 percent of parity, and he still has that authority under the present law for most commodities. The Secretary says the support level will be about the same under the bill as it is this year.

The bill is said to provide too broad authority because the Secretary could determine the percentage of the base acreage—up to a maximum of 50 percent—a producer must divert to participate. Well, that is exactly like it is under the 1963 program. The Secretary had a little more authority under the 1963 program, though. He could make diversion payments in cash on up to 20 percent of the base acreage. He did not do that in 1963 and he will not have the authority in 1964 and 1965, because we have taken it away from him. It does not make much difference. The Secretary has promised to administer this provision about as he is doing this year.

And finally, the opponents object to the authority provided by the bill for the Secretary to set the diversion payment rate. It is the same authority as Congress approved in the case of the 1963 program and a little more limited than Congress provided for the 1961 and 1962 programs.

Now let us look at a few of the other objections raised by opponents of the bill at the hearings.

The Secretary of Agriculture testified that the feed grain program resulted in a greater stability of feed grain prices than would have occurred in the absence of a program.

However, some witnesses testified against the feed grain program because they felt that it had resulted in lower feed grain prices. That was the testimony of Mr. Shuman. Furthermore, they attributed the recent break in cattle prices to this fact.

On the other hand, other witnesses who testified against the extension of the feed grain program complained that the result had been to increase feed grain prices.

This puzzles me, because I cannot understand how feed grain prices can be both lowered and increased under the same programs.

Under normal conditions I understand, as well as the next, that feed grain prices in some areas will differ from feed grain prices in other areas. For example, there is little doubt that the price of corn in both North Carolina and Florida is normally higher than the price of corn in Iowa. The reason for this is, of course, that North Carolina and Florida are both deficit-producing States. Both must import corn. But, if the price of corn goes down in Iowa then the price of corn must also decrease in North Carolina and Florida in about the same proportion.

It is difficult for me to understand why two people from the same organization will oppose the bill for entirely opposite reasons.

In addition, I think it is important to understand that the feed grain program that has been in effect for the past 3 years, and that is extended by this bill for another 2 years, is a voluntary program. There is no compulsion about it. Producers are not compelled in any way to participate. Farmers, of their own choice, can choose whether or not they want to participate in the program. If they participate, they receive price supports and diversion payments. If they do not wish to participate, they can plant as much as they wish without any penalty. However, these producers are not entitled to price supports, nor can they receive diversion payments.

Last year when the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry held hearings a number of witnesses testified against a mandatory feed grain program. This year these same witnesses are testifying against a voluntary feed grain program. Apparently they want the feed grain producers to have no program at all, or perhaps the old program.

There were some witnesses who testified that cheap feed makes cheap livestock. As a matter of fact, many of them blame the recent livestock drop on cheap feed caused by the feed grain program. If we do not pass this bill, feed grain producers will return to a program of unlimited production with price supports at such level between 50 and 90 percent of parity as will not result in increasing Commodity Credit Corporation stocks. Best indications are that this price would be approximately 80 cents per bushel. If the prices which prevailed under the feed grain program in 1961 and 1962 caused cheap feed and lower livestock prices, certainly unlimited production with prices at 80 cents per bushel would do even greater harm. Therefore, I cannot understand the logic of their arguments.

I feel that the objections made to the bill at the hearings were without foundation. There is little doubt that this program will benefit not only the feed grain producers, but also the livestock producers as well, in that an adequate supply of feed grains will be available at fair prices to livestock producers.

Mr. President, that about wraps up the arguments regarding the feed grain program.

Of course, I know that the opposition will make impassioned speeches about "freedom to farms," and "discretionary authority" and a whole host of other strawmen.

But the plain, unvarnished truth is that the new feed grain program has been successful in achieving all of the objectives for which it has been designed.

It has reduced Government stocks and costs. It has saved the taxpayers of the country millions of dollars. It has improved farm income. There is no doubt about it.

So, Senators, remember this during the speeches of the opposition, for, by and large, most opposition is not directed against the bill itself, but is designed only to delay passage until after the wheat referendum.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield first to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, I compliment the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for this fine presentation on this agricultural problem. I compliment him for the leadership he has shown in the committee and his architectural ability and draftsmanship in preparing bills for Senate consideration. I wish to ask the Senator a few questions, however.

I understand the principal change between this program and the 1961, 1962, and 1963 programs is the flexibility that is permitted to allow wheat producers to interchange wheat acres for feed grain acres, and vice versa. Is that true?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is one change. This bill makes operative the wheat provision passed last year, which permits such substitution. It was not applicable to the 1961, 1962, or 1963 program.

Mr. BURDICK. If, for example, a farmer had 50 acres as the feed grain base, and 50 acres as a wheat base, that farmer would have the privilege of planting all those acres to feed grains or all to wheat. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; subject to such conditions as the Secretary might prescribe, farmers could plant feed grains on wheat acreage and vice versa. Of course the farmer planting wheat on fee grain acreage would get only the feed wheat price for it. He would not get certificate for that wheat.

Mr. BURDICK. I understand. In other words, if the wheat could be grown on the feed grain acreage, it would be subject to the price of $1.30, and not the certificate price.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. BURDICK. What other essential differences are there between the 1963 and 1964 programs?

Mr. ELLENDER. I cannot see any, except that the Secretary of Agriculture is given more discretionary power. The reason for that is that when a crash program was in effect in 1961, he had to use every measure at his disposal in order to invite farmers to enter into the program. He had to make the program attractive; so much so that in the first year cash payments were provided if farmers diverted 20 percent, or payments in kind, and for the rest of the program there were provided payments in kind; that is, on an additional 20 percent.

An entirely different situation exists today, in that, as I pointed out previously, the reduction in the carryover has been considerable. Instead of having the 84.7 million tons of carryover that existed in 1961, at the end of this year there will be a carryover of 61 million tons. Therefore, not as many acres will be needed for diversion in order to attain the goal the Secretary seeks. What that goal is, I do not know. It may be 45 million tons. It may be 55 million tons. It depends on many factors that are not at hand now.

It may be that there will be a greater consumption of feed grains. Perhaps there will be more exports of corn.

Therefore, the Secretary cannot make his determination now. We are giving him leeway so he can make a determination as to the exact amount of production he hopes to curtail at the time he makes that determination. In order to carry out that objective, we do not want to put the Secretary in a straitjacket, prescribing how much he shall be put out for cash, how much for this, and how much for that. We say to the Secretary, "You can enter into agreements with farmers and have a program whereby they may take out 50 percent of their base acreage." Instead of having to pay the farmer half of the support price on his production, the figure may be made 25 or 40 percent.

I am sure many farmers would gladly be in favor of a program in which they would be paid in kind at 30, 35, or 40 percent of the support price. The Secretary would be given that authority so as to get into the program the amount of acres he felt would be necessary in order to attain his goal of the cut in production.

Mr. BURDICK. Based on the facts, the Senator has developed, the goal is reduction in production and at the same time the maintenance of income for the farmers. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. That was one of the reasons that prompted the establishment of these programs.

Mr. BURDICK. The Senator has made a very powerful case for the legislation. I will support him.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield now to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I join in what our distinguished colleague from North Dakota has said to the chairman. I think his speech is a devastating response to the critics of the program. As the Senator knows, I was one of those who criticized the feed grain program last year. I did so, first, because the administration proposed a mandatory program; second, the voluntary alternative proposed last year seemed a preliminary to a compulsory program. I want to emphasize the point the Senator from Louisiana has made so well; namely, that it is a completely voluntary program.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is not a mandatory program.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is not.

Mr. PROXMIRE. And it is a 2-year program.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator has made clear on the basis of the record, that this program has meant a reduction of 15 million tons in production in 1961 as compared with what it was in 1960. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is true that that was the first time since 1951 that there had been a substantial reduction in production?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. The carryover rose every year from 1951 until the 1961 program became effective.

Mr. PROXMIRE. In other words, there had not been a reduction before. Those who say the reduction was not the result of the program could hardly base that statement on experience. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. The facts bear out that statement, because the facts indicate that there was no reduction until the 1961 program became effective. Any fairminded man who would read the facts would certainly come to the conclusion that I have stated in my presentation.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Does it not follow, then, that the reduction in carryover was the result of reduction in production?

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no doubt about it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not a fact that the saving to the taxpayers is clear and the evidence is based on experience?

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not also true that this has resulted in an increase and in a stabilization of farm income, on the basis of the statement of the Secretary of Agriculture and the facts?

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course, the program was put into effect in order to assist the farmers in their farm income. There is no doubt about that.

As the Senator will remember, when the present administration came into office, one of its first concerns was to try to increase farm income. I think the administration has succeeded in doing it. This program has certainly gone far to do something about it. As the Senator pointed out before, a person must be blind or biased or prejudiced not to conclude that this program has decreased the costs. This program has lessened to a great extent the cost to the taxpayer. I made reference to that fact in my presentation.

The figures I have presented were given to me by our economists, and were considered by the Department of Agriculture, and was ascertained on the same basis as other figures used in arriving at crop figures. In fact, they used the same method they have used for years.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not also true that although the opponents of the bill complain—and I believe they have some basis for their complaint—that the Secretary of Agriculture will be given substantial discretion, he did write to the chairman of the committee and made it explicit and clear that he would limit his discretion and would not pay more than 18 cents per bushel, and would probably, as the Senator has pointed out, pay between 10 and 15 cents, but that he would be limited to 18 cents.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. I emphasize again that the reason for the payment of 18 cents is written into the law. In other words, the purpose is to give the full price support to those who cooperate. The Senator well knows that if the support price of $1.25 had been made available through loan without the special payment being made, the feed grain market price would have been just under the $1.25 support price that was fixed.

The noncooperators would have received the benefits from this higher price support in the market. In other words, although this in not on all fours, and the Senator will remember that in 1956, under the previous administration, there was on the statute books a corn program in connection with which it was decided that the cooperators would get $1.50 a bushel. A few weeks after the program was announced, the Secretary of Agriculture, under the law, provided for $1.25 in support for those who did not cooperate. That had the effect of causing a large number of growers to abandon their promise to go into the program, because if they planted all they desired on their farm—in other words, planted from fence to fence and from the doorstep to the front gate—they could make more money at $1.25 per bushel than if they planted restricted acres at $1.50 a bushel. When we placed that law on the statute books for the 1961, 1962, and 1963 crops—as we are trying to do again now—for the 1964 and 1965 crops it contained provisions to prevent the noncooperators from getting the benefit of the higher price support that the Secretary of Agriculture could pay. That is why we provide for a method by which the Secretary can pay a part of the support price in kind, and the rest in direct payments.

Mr. PROXMIRE. At the same time, are not the discretion and flexibility provided in the bill sensible, in view of the fact that this program is beginning to solve the problem, and therefore there should be a transition, and the Secretary should have an opportunity to use his discretion? There has been higher favorable weather in the feed grain production areas in the last few years. There may be a change in the weather. There are some indications already that there may be a change. If that happens, the Secretary will have the discretion to protect against a shortage. At the same time, the discretion given him will enable the Secretary to keep the cost down if there is a bumper crop. In other words, he should be able to move in that direction, to the point where perhaps we can hope the program will cost an insignificant amount to the taxpayer and eventually where we can achieve a balance between production and consumption. Is that not correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. Instead of requiring 25 to 26 million acres, he may require only 10 million acres or 7½ million acres. This discretion will make the program less attractive so as to reduce some of the participation.

Mr. PROXMIRE. So we hope that by 1966 we may arrive at a situation in which a program of this dimension, or at least of this cost, may not be necessary.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not true that the program actually represents a limitation on the Secretary of Agriculture in two important respects? First, he cannot make payments in cash, but must make payments in kind. Secondly, for the first time since 1961 he is limited in the price support to 90 percent of parity.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. He cannot make diversion payments in cash under the bill. All diversion payments are to be in kind. And the support level required for 1961, 1962, and 1963 was not less than 65 percent of parity, with no upper limit on the Secretary's authority. This year the Secretary is limited to a level from 65 to 90 percent of parity, so his authority is certainly more limited in this respect.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator very much. I believe it is important to emphasize and stress the fact that this is an area in which Congress has not given the Secretary of Agriculture sky-is-the-limit discretion. He is now definitely limited.

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no doubt about it. Under the bill, the support level is not less than 65 percent nor more than 90 percent of parity. He could not go above 90 percent under the bill.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator very much. I wish to underline once more the fact that this is a voluntary program; that it is a program which, based on experience, will save money; that it has stabilized farm income and, in my opinion, has increased farm income; that the program provides only necessary discretion for the Secretary, in view of the fact that it is a transition program. Finally this bill delimits some of the Secretary's discretion for the first time. I thank the Senator for an excellent presentation.

Mr. ELLENDER. His discretion is no greater than it has been under laws on the statute books since 1938, as I pointed out earlier.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I would like to ask the Senator if he can give us the reason why the base acreage for the 3 leading feed grains increased from 113 million acres in 1960, to 123,300,000 in 1962, and this year went up to 132,300,000. What is the reason for that increase in base acreage over the 3-year period?

Is the Senator sure that these acres existed? I hope that this base acreage was not raised by more than 19 million acres merely to pay the owners for not planting on nonexistent acres. It is very puzzling why the increase took place over that 3-year period.

I hope that before the debate ends, there will be an explanation of that. Possibly the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] will explain it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Where does the Senator find a reference to that statement?

Mr. AIKEN. On page 24 of the report, in the minority views. I did not help to write the report; in fact, I was absent from the city at the time it was prepared.

Mr. ELLENDER. I suppose the report will be thoroughly explained by someone else.

Mr. AIKEN. Very well; but I thought there should be an explanation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. Of course, as the Senator will note on page 6, there has been a steady increase in the number of harvested acres until 1961. When the program became effective, the number of harvested acres decreased substantially. As I said, that was due to the program. I thought the Senator from Vermont was referring to the past 3 years. I know that there has been a difference in the number of acres that have been diverted in the past 3 or 4 years under the program.

Mr. AIKEN. Apparently the signup this year is less than it was last year. The indications are that 100,100,000 acres will be planted to the three feed grains this year compared with about 92.2 million acres last year. To these acreages we have to add the acreages diverted each year to get the total acreage accounted for by these commodities.

I am not being critical of the chairman; I merely happened to run across these figures, and they were new to me. At least, if I had known of them before, they had slipped my mind.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have before me the current number of harvested acres. The planted acres in 1962 were 125.9 million, and the harvested acres would be——

Mr. AIKEN. I do not ask the Senator from Louisiana to supply the figures now, but perhaps they should be placed in the RECORD before the debate is concluded.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Vermont will concede, will he not, that since the advent of the program, the number of harvested acres has decreased considerably?

Mr. AIKEN. I should hope so. I should hope that after an expenditure of $1.7 billion for 2 years there would be some decrease; and I am sure there was.

Mr. ELLENDER. Certainly. Of course, that meant less production. As the Senator knows, Mr. Shuman said that instead of acreage decreasing, acreage increased. I have before me table 1, on page 6 of the report which indicates what the number of planted acres were from 1950 through 1962. I presume they are accurate figures because they are taken from the Department. If they differ from the ones contained in the minority views, I am not familiar with how the figuring was done. It may be that some of the data that were presented for the minority views came from the American Farm Bureau Federation; I do not know. However, the figures of the American Farm Bureau Federation differ from those the committee presented, particularly in respect to the carryover and the amount of grain that was consumed, and other factors.

Mr. AIKEN. I am not vouching for the accuracy of the figures in the minority views, but I assume they were acquired from the Department. As the Senator knows, one can get figures from the same Department to prove almost anything.

Mr. ELLENDER. No, no. We can get the same figures from the Department; but after they have been obtained, they can be manipulated somewhat. That is true in almost any case.

The figures I am giving to the Senate have been taken from the Department records, and they are given in good faith. As I said previously, the figures concerning the carryover and the amount of feed grains consumed during a certain period, which show the trend, have also been taken from the Department. Those figures and conclusions have been reached in the same manner as the Department has been applying them for many years past.

Mr. AIKEN. However, I do not seem to find in the report that the basic acreage is submitted anywhere; merely the acreage that was planted and the acreage that was diverted. Probably we should have the base acreage for the various years accurately supplied before the debate is concluded.

Mr. ELLENDER. We have supplied the number of acres planted from 1950 through 1962.

Mr. AIKEN. That is different.

Mr. ELLENDER. We have shown the number of acres harvested from 1950 through 1962.

Mr. AIKEN. That is true; but what is lacking is the base acreage, which, according to the minority views, has increased from a planted acreage of 113 million acres in 1960 to 132,300,000 for 1963. I think we should know how that came about, if it came about.

Mr. ELLENDER. I shall ask the committee's economists to supply those figures.

Mr. AIKEN. That is all I ask.

Mr. ELLENDER. I did not see any necessity for those figures at the time; in fact, no member of the committee asked for them. However, I am sure the figures can be supplied.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. I should like to ask the Senator from Louisiana a few questions. First, do I correctly understand him to say that if the law that is at present on the books should remain in effect, without any modification by the bill, 80-cents-a-bushel grain may be expected?

Mr. ELLENDER. The price support will be at a level from 50 to 90 percent of parity that will not result in increasing the surpluses of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I am told that the corn support price would amount to about 80 cents a bushel under this formula.

Mr. MILLER. I remind the Senator from Louisiana that I was one of several Senators who last year sounded that very warning at the time the feed grains bill of 1962 was passed. I am gratified to know that the Senator from Louisiana now recognizes that danger.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. Do I correctly understand that that danger is one reason for the consideration of the particular bill that is now before the Senate?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is one of the reasons. The Senator from Iowa well knows that when feed grains were considered, I was one of those who, for some time, led the fight in the Senate for a compulsory feed grains program. I believe the Senator from Iowa opposed that program. My reasons were very simple.

It is my judgment that if feed grain prices are stable, so that the farmer who feeds his livestock will know a year in advance what he will have to pay for his grain, the farmer can adopt a program according to whatever the figures show. But to have a situation in which the cost of feed would fluctuate or would go even as low as 80 cents a bushel would have a damaging effect, in my opinion, on the price of any kind of livestock that utilizes feed grains.

Mr. MILLER. I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Louisiana that such action could have a disastrous effect. That is one reason why many of us sounded a warning last year at the time 50 percent of parity was placed in the bill. Now that it is in the bill, we are faced with the argument that if we do not do something about it, possibly we shall have 50 percent of parity and 80-cent corn.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not believe the situation goes that far. It is the judgment of some persons that if this program can be continued for another 2 years, at most, and if the carryover can be reduced to normalcy, which, I understand, is around 45 and 50 million tons, the farmers will then be able to take care of the situation on their own, and will produce in keeping with the requirements.

Mr. MILLER. In the meantime, the Senator from Louisiana certainly recognizes the tragedy that could flow from 80-cent corn and 50 percent of parity, as they exist under present law.

Mr. ELLENDER. The tragedy came about because the Senate would not agree with the chairman of the committee. If the chairman of the committee had been able to obtain enactment of the program he advocated, the so-called tragedy, to which the Senator from Iowa refers, would not have occurred. But I was licked, and that was it.

Mr. MILLER. If I were in favor of a controlled program, a nonvoluntary program, I would be more than happy to adopt the Senator's argument, because he presents an argument for that kind of program very well. But the point I am making is that if we are in danger, perhaps, under the present law of having corn drop to 80 cents a bushel and of having 50 percent of parity visited upon the farmers, it seems to me this is one of the underlying reasons why a bill has come before Congress now to alleviate that possibility. Am I correct in my understanding?

Mr. ELLENDER. Not entirely so, on that basis. Perhaps the Senator was present when I began my remarks. At that time I said that the reason why we want the bill enacted is to get to the farmers who will vote on May 21 full knowledge of the program which can be envisioned in the event the referendum is successful, because, as the Senator knows, there is in the wheat law a provision which gives the farmers the right to transfer acreage from wheat to corn, or vice versa, provided there is an acreage diversion program in effect for feed grains.

Mr. MILLER. I am familiar with that. But does the Senator from Louisiana still make the point about 80 cents a bushel corn?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do.

Mr. MILLER. Then, if we are concerned about the possibility of 80 cents a bushel corn and 50 percent parity for feed grains, and if, therefore, this bill is being rushed through in order to alleviate that problem, why is it that the wheat farmers are being told that if they do not vote for the program on May 21, Congress will do nothing about the situation—which will put them in the same position, next year, that the feed grain farmers are faced with now; namely, 50 percent of parity.

Mr. ELLENDER. So far as I can determine, that is a fact, because I do not believe Congress will enact any wheat legislation this year.

Mr. MILLER. Yet we are willing to enact legislation for the feed-grain farmers.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is only one of the reasons. But in my speech I gave many reasons for the enactment of this measure, and it is not related only to the argument the Senator has stated.

Mr. MILLER. But the Senator from Louisiana recognizes, does he not, that this is a very important argument?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; but it is only one of the many.

Mr. MILLER. But the Senator from Louisiana still does not think it is important enough to warrant having Congress take the same action in the case of wheat, does he?

Mr. ELLENDER. No, for the reason that the wheat producers have their chance now. Under the law, if the referendum fails, compliers would receive price supports of 50 percent of parity. I shall not go into the reasons why we changed the wheat bill last year, because all that is history now. In the bill we included the clause to which I referred a moment ago. But in order that the wheat farmers may have full opportunity to know what they can do or what they can expect, I believe this feed-grain bill should be passed, because the wheat farmers could not make the substitution of wheat for feed grains unless the feed-grain program were enacted.

Mr. MILLER. On the basis of the Senator's colloquy with the Senator from Wisconsin, I think perhaps before we are too hasty about emphasizing some of the virtues of the program under which we have been operating, it would be well to develop several points.

First, a question was asked—and the Senator from Louisiana answered it in the affirmative—about the reduction of production. Also, a question was asked—and again the Senator from Louisiana answered it in the affirmative—regarding the carryover stocks of feed grains.

Does the Senator from Louisiana have any figures which show the relationship between the reduction of carryover stocks, on the one hand, and the increase in domestic consumption, the increase in exports under Public Law 480, the increase in distribution under the food-for-peace program, and the increase in distribution under the stamp program?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; and if the Senator from Iowa will read my speech, he will see them. As I recall, the increase in production was 44 percent, and the increase in domestic utilization was 36 percent.

Mr. MILLER. Will the Senator from Louisiana relate those increases to the reduction of carryover stocks?

Mr. ELLENDER. Now the Senator from Iowa is arguing in the way Mr. Shuman did.

Mr. MILLER. I am not arguing; I am asking questions.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the Senator will examine the tables I placed in the RECORD, I am sure his question will be answered. If he will look at table 1, he will note that production increased from 114.1 million tons in 1954 to 155.6 million tons in 1960; and if he will look at the column headed "Utilization," he will find that the utilization in 1954 was 107.6 million tons, and in 1960 it was 145.9 million tons.

Mr. MILLER. I do not believe the Senator is being responsive—although I know he is trying to be—to my question in regard to comparing the years 1960, 1961, and 1962 as regards the carryover stocks of feed grains and the increased consumption domestically and the increased exports and other uses. That is the information I am trying to obtain.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that; and I am trying to answer as best I can. The Senator from Iowa has the tables before him. He will find that in 1961, production was reduced—below that in 1960—to 140.6 million tons—the table shows 140.1 million tons, but that is a typographical error, it should be 140.6; and utilization increased, from 145.9 million tons in 1960 to 154 million tons in 1961. Is that the information the Senator from Iowa wishes to have? If so, there it is.

Mr. MILLER. Are the figures for utilization those for domestic utilization only?

Mr. ELLENDER. No, for all utilization, covering everything.

Mr. MILLER. For what years?

Mr. ELLENDER. For 1961—the first year of the program.

Mr. MILLER. Let me ask the Senator about the year 1962.

Mr. ELLENDER. In 1962, the utilization was only two-tenths of a million tons more.

Mr. MILLER. How much was the reduction in the carryover stocks?

Mr. ELLENDER. The carryover was reduced from 84.7 million tons in 1961 to 71.8 million tons in 1962; and the estimate is that by 1963 it will be reduced to 61 million tons.

Mr. MILLER. Then do I correctly understand the Senator from Louisiana to say that the reduction of the carryover stocks from 1961 to 1962 was from 84.7 million tons to what?

Mr. ELLENDER. To 71.8 million tons.

Mr. MILLER. Or a reduction of approximately 13 million tons?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, 12.9 million tons.

Mr. MILLER. How much was the increase in consumption?

Mr. ELLENDER. Utilization in 1961 was 154 million tons; in 1962, 154.2 million tons. There was less exported in 1962 and more consumed domestically.

Mr. MILLER. Then of the 12.9 million tons of reduction in carryover, it appears that about 7 million tons resulted from increase in consumption. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. I believe my good friend ignores the fact that there was a reduction in production. Production fell from 155.6 million tons to 143 million in 1962.

Mr. MILLER. In what year was that 155 million production?

Mr. ELLENDER. That was 1960—155.6 million tons.

Mr. MILLER. We are trying to get a comparison between 1961 and 1962.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish the Senator would read my speech and look at the tables which I submitted for the RECORD. He would find the answer to his question there.

Mr. MILLER. If the Senator from Louisiana will forget 1960 and go into 1961, I believe he can give me the answer I seek and which I think should be in the RECORD. What is the difference between 1961 and 1962?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator can figure for himself with pencil and paper. Production in 1960 was 155.6 million tons. In 1961, it was 140.6 million tons; in 1962, it was 143.1 million tons.

Utilization for the same years, beginning with 1960, was 145.9 million tons; for 1961, 154.0 million tons; for 1962, 154.2 million tons.

The total carryover in 1960 was 74.6 million tons; in 1961 it was 84.7 million tons; and in 1962 it was 71.6 million tons. The estimate for 1963 is 61 million tons.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator for bringing out those figures. That is the point I am making. When we talk about 1962, it seems to me that we cannot go to a reduction in production for that year as a source for reduction in carrover stocks, because actually production went up a little. It went up some 3 million.

Mr. ELLENDER. I ask the Senator not to forget that those were 2 program years. We could not expect the difference between 1961 and 1962 to be great because those were the years in which we had a program. But the Senator should figure on what the production was in 1960, the last year of no program, and 1961 and 1962, when there was a program.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator from Iowa is not overlooking the fact that there is a difference between 1960 and 1961. What the Senator is interested in looking at is the continuation of the program and whether or not it is doing what some of the proponents claim it is doing. From the Senator's figures it appears to me that he cannot say that the reduction in carryover stocks from 1961 to 1962 has been due to a reduction in production, because actually it appears that production went up a little. Therefore, we must look to increased consumption or increased utilization.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator ought to figure that if we had not had a program, the same trend as appears in the table of increased production would have carried through 1960, 1961, and 1962. For example, in 1958 production was 144.1 million tons. In 1959 it went to 149.6 million tons. In 1960 it went to 155.6 million tons.

During the first year of the program, production went down to 140.6 million tons. The second year under the program production was at 143.1 million, up a little from 1961 but well below 1960. If we had had no program, there is no doubt that the same tendency would have existed as in the past, which would have resulted in an increase in production.

For the information of my good friend, who is from a State in which the corn grows tall, I have a table numbered 2, which indicates the trend in the production of corn. Production of corn in 1960 was 3.908 billion bushels. With the program, production went down to 3.626 billion bushels. Without the program it would have been 4.275 billion for 1961.

In 1962, with the program, production was 3.644 billion bushels. Without the program the estimate is that it would have been 4.430 billion bushels.

For the current year, with the program, production is expected to be 3.8 billion, and without the program production would have been 4.430 billion. Of course, that would be reflected in the carryover, as the Senator well knows.

Mr. MILLER. I thank my colleague for bringing out that point. But I should like to point out to him that I had no part of the previous program. It was not my privilege to serve in the Senate with him at that time. I am not particularly interested in ancient history right now. I am interested in where we are going from here. I am not so much concerned about comparisons between no program and this program, because the Senator well knows that many programs could be used. I do not think some people who write to me and profess concern about the present program would be satisfied if I should write back and tell them, "Look how much better it is now than if we did not have anything at all."

If I did so, the people would come right back, as I have come back to the Senator from Louisiana, and would say, "That is not the choice. The choice is between programs and not between no program and the proposed program."

I should like to ask another question. Something was said about the reduction in the cost of the program. Yet, if I recall correctly, the appropriations for the Department of Agriculture from the fiscal year 1961 to the fiscal year 1962 went up approximately $1 billion or more. How can we say that the program has cut down the cost to the taxpayers when the appropriation for the USDA has gone up $1 billion a year?

Mr. ELLENDER. That covered all expenses and included a consolidation of losses for the previous years. The Senator knows that. The increase did not pertain particularly to the corn or other feed grain programs solely.

Mr. MILLER. Is the Senator saying that the cost of the USDA appropriations will not go up another $1 billion?

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish the Senator would relate his costs to the program itself and not to the overall cost of the Department of Agriculture. I believe the Senator is trying to elicit from me, for the record, the cost of the present program. I have so stated in my address. I have given it in a table. The report also shows the cost.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator knows that I am not merely trying to elicit that cost. The Senator knows I am trying to put in perspective the little colloquy between him and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] with regard to the cost savings to taxpayers. I find it very difficult to go back home, to face taxpayers in my State, and tell them the cost of the present program is not as great as it was. In reply they can point to the increased costs every year of the USDA appropriations.

My final question relates to the increase in income of farmers, which is the point that the Senator stressed in his statement. It is also a point that the Senator from Wisconsin stressed. Yet, as I understand, the net income for farming for last year was about the same as it was for 1961, and it is forecast that the net income for 1963 will be about the same as for the calendar year 1962.

Mr. ELLENDER. The net income for 1960 was $11.692 billion. The net income for 1961 was $12.803 billion. The net income for 1962 was $12.900 billion.

Mr. MILLER. It was about the same as between 1961 and 1962, then?

Mr. ELLENDER. It was a little higher in 1962.

Mr. MILLER. Yes. Will the Senator yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGOVERN in the chair). Does the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Getting back to the difference in income as between 1960 and 1961, as I understand the situation, the difference was almost entirely the same amount as the land retirement payments.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the argument of the Farm Bureau, and probably of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Is it corrrect? I do not care who makes the argument. I am merely asking the queston.

Mr. ELLENDER. It may be that the figures jibe, yes, but it was not due to that circumstance. I suppose the Senator is arguing that income was not increasing at the marketplace.

Mr. MILLER. What is the Senator's question?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is endeavoring to argue that there was no increased income at the marketplace, but that it was due almost exclusively to benefit payments, I suppose.

Mr. MILLER. Not quite.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is that not the Senator's argument?

Mr. MILLER. Not quite.

Let me state my point. My point is that if there had not been the land retirements paid for in 1961, the farmers would have raised their crops of feed grains and sold them in 1962, so there really was an acceleration of 1962 income in 1961 in the amount of the land retirement payments. I would not call that quite the same as a difference in the marketplace. I would call it a shift of or an acceleration of income.

That is why I do not think there was much difference in income as between 1961 and 1962, nor is it anticipated that there will be much difference as between 1963 and 1962. The farmers got a 1-year jump on some income.

On the question of net income for farming, I have heard all kinds of claims made about how farmers are doing so much better. The Senator is aware of the fact that during the past 2-year period, while the emergency feed grain program has been in operation, 367,000 farmers and farm operators have gone off the farms. If I read the reports of the Department of Commerce correctly, it is stated that the only reason why there has been an increase—not a large one—in income per farmer is because there are fewer farmers. Does the Senator agree with that conclusion?

Mr. ELLENDER. It has always been the case—and I am positive of this—that if it were not for the fact that we have had and do have these farm programs there is no telling what might happen to the principal segment of our economy, which is farming. The Senator well knows what would happen to our economy if, overnight, we were to remove all the payments of which he is complaining.

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. And price supports.

Mr. MILLER. One of the universities in my State conducted a survey on that question in 1960, and pointed out how disastrous it would be.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. I think a study of the subject was made by the Extension Service at Iowa University.

Mr. MILLER. Iowa State University.

Mr. ELLENDER. By the Extension Service, or whatever branch it was.

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. The committee distributed thousands of copies of the study.

Personally I do not wish to see us get into that difficulty. It would seem to me that these programs might taper down gradually. If we can reduce the enormous surpluses of corn and other feed grains to normal figures, that will help a good deal. That is the effort which is being put forth now by those of us who want to accomplish that end, and by the Department.

Mr. MILLER. I know that is the purpose of my friend from Louisiana; and he knows that is my purpose. I do not want the Senator to think that I am being unduly critical, but I feel that we ought to have the Record show certain things.

My bone of contention is the colloquy between the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Wisconsin, in which leading questions were asked about the saving of income to taxpayers and the increasing of income to the farmers. I think it is all right for the Senator to answer those questions as he did, if he so desires, but at the same time the Record ought to show some other factors which are involved, which I have been trying to bring out during our colloquy.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator will have an opportunity to do that on his own time. I contend that if we had had no program whatever as to feed grains, as we have had since 1961, we would have had an unlimited production of corn. I do not know of any reason why the trend upward of surpluses and cost to the Government would not have been as I indicated was the case from 1958 through 1960. The trend was present.

Mr. MILLER. I fail to see why.

Mr. ELLENDER. If I recall the figure correctly, at one time the cost for corn, other feed grains, and wheat was almost a billion dollars a year on a carrying charge basis. We have reduced that. I do not recall the exact figure. We hope to continue that trend by reducing the carryover, as has been indicated by the tables which I placed in the Record.

Mr. MILLER. I fail to understand why the Senator persists in talking about the difference between having this program and having nothing. I do not think that is the choice which ought to be given to the farmers of our country—"Take this program or take nothing." If they take the program, it is pointed out to them how much better off things are than they would be if they had nothing.

I do not think the problem is that simple. I think the farmers have a choice as among programs. Of course, the Senator knows this is one of the underlying arguments behind the wheat referendum.

I do not wish to take any more of the Senator's time, and I thank the Senator for his gracious attention to my questions.

Mr. ELLENDER. I was glad to answer the Senator's questions.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not wish to detain the Senator from Louisiana unduly. I understand he has not had his lunch. I would like to ask him about four questions.

If the Senator from Louisiana will advert to page 240 of the printed hearings, he will find a statement there filed by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, which may or may not be correct in whole or in part. It is about that statement that I wanted to ask the Senator from Louisiana some questions, and about that particular paragraph in the statement headed "Costs, Results, and Income Effects."

The first figure I ask the Senator from Louisiana about is in the second paragraph of that section of the statement which reads:

> On the basis of 2 crop years of operation, 1961 and 1962, the net reduction in the output for 1962 from 1960 for corn, barley, and grain sorghums was 379 million bushels. The cost of the diversion program for 1961 and 1962 has been $1,695 million. Measured in this way, it could be said that each bushel of feed grain reduction cost $4.48.

I note that apparently the figures are taken from the tables to which the Senator from Louisiana has referred, on page 7 of the printed hearings.

I ask the Senator if he will comment on that particular measurement of the high cost of the program as made in that particular statement?

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course, I did not ascertain the amount of $4.48 a bushel. That is the figure; is it not?

Mr. HOLLAND. Four dollars and forty-eight cents a bushel, figured only as presented by that statement in the printed hearings.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand. The Senator from Florida will remember that one witness from Illinois said the cost was $30 a bushel. So it depends on what figures one uses. If one used the figure of 1.7 million tons as being the correct figure for the reduction in the carryover in 1961 attributable to the program, as one witness did, one could say that the cost was $25 or $30 a bushel. But the U.S. Chamber of Commerce fails to take into consideration the fact that, without the programs, production would have continued to increase at rates similar to previous years. As I pointed out, in corn alone the increase in 1961 would have been from 3.6 billion bushels actually produced to 4.2 estimated, and in 1962 from 3.6 billion bushels actually produced to 4.4 billion bushels which would have been produced had there been no diversion program.

If the Senator takes into consideration the huge amount of corn and other feed grains that would have been produced if the program had not gone into effect, and the enormous costs that would have resulted because of the increase in surpluses, I say those figures are absolutely wrong. They are misleading.

Mr. HOLLAND. What the Senator means, I am sure, and I am inclined to agree with him, is that this is not the only way to measure the value of the program.

What the Senator means is that the way it was stated by this witness in the statement to which I have referred, is not, in the Senator's opinion, a sound way to measure the value of the program.

Mr. ELLENDER. Exactly.

Mr. HOLLAND. I agree with the Senator that this is not the only way, but it is one way. According to this method of measurement, which is that 379 million bushels was the net reduction of the 1962 crop from the 1960 crop, the cost of the program was $4.48 a bushel.

I come now to the second standard applied. The witness who filed the statement with the committee presents two different standards, and I think it is the second standard that I am sure the Senator from Louisiana would say, or I would say, is nearer a correct standard than the first, and I think it shows a very high cost. I read that second standard:

> But taking into consideration the reduction of 415 million bushels of the three grains in Commodity Credit Corporation stocks and loans between February 28, 1961, and February 28, 1963, a total reduction of production and Government stocks for the 2-year period totals 794 million bushels.

That compares with the 379 million bushels stated in the earlier paragraph.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I continue to read:

> Measured against the cost of the programs for the 2 years, the cost per bushel of total reduction of both is $2.13. This is, in our judgment, an inordinately high cost operation.

Does the Senator agree with that?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; if one takes the figures as the Senator has read them and makes the computations the witness made, I imagine one would reach the figure the witness reached. But I do not think that is any way to figure the cost of the program, and when one considers the additional amount of grains that would have been produced without a program and the enormous amount of carrying charges and storing charges, one arrives at a different answer. As the Senator knows, and as is shown in the Record, this Government has had some grain in storage for 7 years. The cost of accumulated storage charges amounted to about $1.50 when the cost to the Government of buying that grain was about $1.20, or a little over a dollar.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think the Senator from Louisiana has made it clear that he does not agree with the second measure or standard of the value of the program, which seems to me, however, to be a much fairer one than the first one. I come now to the third standard:

> Moreover, the costs of the program equaled more than 34 percent of the total cash receipts from the sale of the three grains by farmers in 1961. In 1962, the figure was more than 36 percent.

I ask the distinguished Senator from Louisiana if he thinks it is a sound program to have the total of the cash receipts from the sale of the three grains by farmers so little more than the cost of the program.

Mr. ELLENDER. It depends on how one uses the figures. If these were accurate figures, based on a fair evaluation of the program, I would say the cost is excessive, but I point out that we must take the overall picture of what the cost would have been if we had not had these programs. Furthermore, the Senator must take into consideration the fact that cash receipts represents only grain sold, while about 70 percent of the grain produced is not marketed but is fed on the farms where it is reduced. A fairer way to figure this would be to use value of production rather than cash receipts from marketings.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question on that point?

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator will allow me to complete my questions, I shall be glad to desist.

Mr. ELLENDER. I think the Senator from North Dakota wanted to ask a question based on the question the Senator from Florida asked.

Mr. HOLLAND. Very well.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. The table on page 7 of the hearings gives the number of acres diverted from corn, sorghum grain, and barley, for 3 years. The first year, 1961, it was 25.2 million acres. The second year, 1962, it was 28.6 million acres. The third year, 1963, it was 25.7 million acres. If those acres had been in production, our surpluses would have been far greater than they are now.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator, of course, has a point, but the fact is that the acres diverted were the acres least productive. The Secretary of Agriculture so stated, and it is a matter of common knowledge, besides. The reduction in production may well be what would have been produced on that poorer acreage.

The witness, however, in bringing out by his statement the fact that such a large proportion of the total sums received by the producers for the price of grain was by way of price support moneys paid to producers by the Federal Government, objects to that because it shows the Federal Government supporting in large part the cost of production. That is the purpose of the question of the Senator from Florida, because he does not believe the Senator from North Dakota wants the Government paying 36 percent of the sale price of the grain to farmers to produce it.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. But the cost to the Federal Government would have been far greater if the acreage had not been diverted and had been putting additional grain in Government storage.

Mr. HOLLAND. If I understand the Senator correctly, he is not claiming the program is so effective, but that we would have been in worse shape if we had not had such a program.

That, of course, is a question for debate. The Senator from Florida has no intention of debating that subject, because it is not a subject that is being considered now, and because he did not support the programs under which these huge surpluses were created.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to suggest to the Senator how the $4.48 per bushel was used in the second paragraph to which he has referred, on page 240. Let us read that paragraph. It reads:

> On the basis of 2 crop years of operation, 1961 and 1962, the net reduction in the output for 1962 from 1960 for corn, barley, and grain sorghums was 379 million bushels. The cost of the diversion program for 1961 and 1962 has been $1,695 million. Measured in this way, it could be said that each bushel of feed grain reduction cost $4.48.

In other words, what has been done was to take the cost for 2 years and divide by the reduction in output for 1 year.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida called attention to that, in his statement, and he also stated that he thought that was not a sound way to evaluate a program, but that it is one way of evaluating it.

Mr. ELLENDER. I agree with the Senator that that is not a sound way to evaluate the program.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator has so stated, and the RECORD shows.

The second paragraph would fix the cost at $2.13. I asked the distinguished Senator to comment, and I believe he has done so.

The third question was——

Mr. ELLENDER. Is that based on the cost in both years?

Mr. HOLLAND. They took the reduction in production and added it to the reduction in CCC stocks.

Mr. ELLENDER. In that case, as in the first case, they did not take into consideration the amounts that would have been saved had we not had a program.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is a bit of casuistry in which the Senator from Florida did not want to indulge, because he has heard so many statements made as to what would have been saved if the poorer acres had been included. The third question was with respect to the next paragraph which I shall read again:

> Moreover, the costs of the program equaled more than 34 percent of the total cash receipts from the sale of the three grains by farmers in 1961. In 1962, the figure was more than 36 percent.

I ask the distinguished Senator if he feels it was sound for the Government to pay that large proportion of the total cash receipts of the farmers for reducing grain production.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the figures are correct, in order to obtain this reduction—as I have said, I do not know the basis for the 36 percent, or the basis for the 34 percent—I would say those figures appear to be very high. Of course, I doubt that I would have advocated a program that was so costly, unless we figured the savings that could be attained by other programs not having been put into effect. But, I say again, that about 70 percent of the feed grains are fed on farms where produced, and only about 30 percent sold in the market. Therefore, cash receipts are only a small part of the value of production of all feed grains.

The fact that all these figures that were presented by the chambers of commerce and by Mr. Shuman—and I believe the Senator was present when Mr. Shuman testified——

Mr. HOLLAND. No; I was not present.

Mr. ELLENDER. I hope the Senator will read the record, because Mr. Shuman's argument was that the program had caused the price of feed grain to go down and thereby had had a serious effect on decreasing the price of livestock. Another witness from the same organization said that the effect of the program was to increase the price of the grain.

I believe that my good friend from Florida presided when a number of members of the organization from his State appeared. As I remember, the point of their contention was that the program had increased feed costs. That is not in accordance with the testimony of the president of the same organization, the American Farm Bureau Federation.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am not pleading for or against anyone's statement. I am merely asking the distinguished chairman of our committee, for whom I have great respect, as he knows, to give his opinion. The last paragraph in this particular section of this witness' statement, who was Mr. Theron J. Rice, is, I think, particularly appealing to me and, I hope it will be to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. That statement is as follows:

> The magnitude of income effects of the diversion payments is shown by the fact that in 1960 Government payments were 9 percent of net operator cash income from farming. For 1961, this rose to 18 percent—

That is the first year of this crash program.

> and for 1962, Government payments constituted 25 percent.

I ask my distinguished friend if he thinks this is a sound trend, to allow the Government to raise and continue to raise its subsidization of feed grain producers.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course not. I am wondering if the figures taken by the Senator are figures that apply solely to the feed grain program. Do they take into consideration conservation payments and various other payments made to the farmer?

Mr. HOLLAND. My understanding is that we are talking now about the overall effect of the feed grain program on Government payments to farmers.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am wondering about these payments. The witness said:

> The magnitude of income effects of the diversion payments is shown by the fact that in 1960 Government payments were 9 percent of net operator cash income from farming. For 1961, this rose to 18 percent, and for 1962, Government payments constituted 25 percent.

I am wondering whether that statement took into consideration the payments other than that made to the farmers for taking acres out of cultivation.

Mr. HOLLAND. In answer I would say that the figures include the feed grain diversion payments, which helped greatly to increase Government payments to 25 percent of net cash income.

I should like to say one thing further before pausing for such reply as the Senator may wish to make. It seems to me that we have gotten into a very unhealthy situation in respect to these emergency programs from year to year, for the past 3 years. It is now proposed to do the same thing for 2 years ahead, and to do it within a few days in order to affect a vote in a referendum on another commodity, wheat. We propose to buy over the support and confidence of millions of producers of grains by raising the Government's contribution to their income to the high figures stated in the testimony.

Does the Senator think it is sound for the Government to make such high payments to the grain and other producers?

Mr. ELLENDER. If the Senator's figures are correct; yes. However, I doubt the correctness of them, for the reason that the chamber of commerce states that in 1960 payments were 9 percent of net operator cash income. We had no feed grain program in 1960 which provided for direct payments for diversion. Therefore, the statement quoted by the Senator takes into consideration other than feed-grain payments.

Mr. HOLLAND. The figures show in the years 1961 and 1962 the Government has raised very greatly its subsidies to the producers of feed grains.

Mr. ELLENDER. Any amounts paid under the feed grain program were to take acres out of cultivation, so as to reduce surpluses, which did occur. That is true.

When the feed grain program was considered in 1961 and 1962, and the renewal in 1963, the Farm Bureau opposed those programs as vigorously as it opposed the wheat program. When asked what program it would offer, the Farm Bureau proposed a program along the same line as the one now under consideration, except that they said that the payments would not be so high for land retirement as they are in the case of corn and other feed grains. But, as I remember, the program envisioned payments on from 65 million to 80 million acres of land which would be taken out of cultivation; and on the rest of it, the farmers would be able to plant whatever they desired.

I say that whether we take the program as it was enacted by Congress or the program which was suggested by the chief opponent of the program—when I say "chief opponent," I mean the principal opponent among the many organizations—both of them are costly. In my judgment, if the figures were tallied at the end, there would not be too much difference between the program which Congress enacted and the one which was submitted by the present chief opponent of the program.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Louisiana for yielding so courteously to me.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. Before yielding, I should like to repeat that I do not know where the chamber of commerce obtained those figures or how it compiled them. They say that the 1960 Government payments were 9 percent of the net operation cash income. As I stated, there was no feed grain program providing for payments for retired acres in corn or feed grains during that year. Evidently other income must have been included in order to reach that figure. I have had a computation made by the chief economist of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. For 1961, realized net farm income was $12,803 million. The payments aggregated $824 million. So of the net income of 1961, the feed grain payments would have been 6.4 percent instead of 29 percent, 18 percent, or 25 percent, as recited by the chamber of commerce.

I now yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. A moment ago I understood the Senator from Louisiana to say that when the feed grain bill was being proposed, the American Farm Bureau Federation opposed it; and that the only thing it proposed was a substitute based upon the retirement of X million acres of land. I understood the Senator from Louisiana to say that this would be approximately as costly as this program, or perhaps not any more costly than the program now in effect.

I understood the Senator from Louisiana to say that from that standpoint there was not much difference.

I merely call the attention of the Senator from Louisiana to the one fundamental difference between the program in effect, the program of the present Department of Agriculture, and the program proposed by the American Farm Bureau Federation. The program proposed by the Farm Bureau, while it would be no more expensive, would have kept and maintained the farmers' freedom of action, without their being supervised by bureaucrats and the horde of personnel in the Department of Agriculture. There is a great difference between bureaucratic control of the farmer, on the one hand, and freedom of action of the farmer, on the other. I think that is a very significant difference.

Mr. ELLENDER. I grant that; but the Senator from Iowa knows that the corn and other feed grains program is a voluntary program. The farmer does not have to participate if he does not wish to. He can plant all the corn he wishes to plant; he can plant all the oats he wishes to plant. But if he does not cooperate, he does not get price supports. The farmer is free to do whatever he pleases: to plant all he wishes to plant, or to comply with the acreage allotments and get price supports.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. But there is a vast difference between the two programs.

Mr. ELLENDER. No; I do not see how the Senator can say that.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. On the one hand, the Federal Government steps in and, on the basis of fair compensation, on a bid basis or otherwise, retires X number of acres throughout the country. That does not require mandatory legal cooperation in order for the farmer to get the benefit. The determination of acreage is based upon a mandatory consideration for the retirement of acres. The farmer is free to plant what he wishes to plant on the acres that remain.

Mr. ELLENDER. But it depends on price support, also. Price support is attached to that program. If the Senator will examine the program submitted by the American Farm Bureau Federation, he will see that price supports were offered to the compliers, because that would be the way to proceed. It would not be possible to persuade farmers to act or to comply with the program unless there were some inducement.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The inducement is a reasonable price for the retired acres.

Mr. ELLENDER. I know; but price supports enter into the consideration, too.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. But the price supports were not at an attractive rate.

Mr. ELLENDER. They were only $1.06 at the time for the growers of corn and other feed.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Ninety percent of a 3-year average.

Mr. ELLENDER. But I reiterate that this is a voluntary program, one without compulsion on any farmer to plant or not to plant. He can plant all the feed grains he desires. The only penalty, if he does not comply, is that he will not receive price supports.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, Washington and the Pacific Northwest are surplus producers of feed grain. Barley, primarily, is used as a feed grain in Washington because it is the least expensive. In recent years we have been producing about 1½ million tons of barley each year and have been feeding only about one-third of what we produce. Probably about 10 percent of it goes to the malting industry and the remainder or over one-half of our output is exported, mostly with the aid of Federal programs.

H.R. 4997, now under consideration, would extend the currently successful feed grain program for the 1964–65 crop years and complement the 1964 wheat certificate plan. Unless Congress enacts such legislation prior to the wheat referendum on May 21, it in effect will be asking the wheatgrowers of America to make a decision without all of the facts. Postponement of passage of the bill after May 21 will make the feed grain plan more difficult to accept and serve no useful purpose. If the referendum carries both our wheat and feed grain producers will have need of this legislation. The wheatgrowers will require a land retirement feed grain program under the substitution clause of the wheat certificate plan, and the feed grain growers will want to continue the reduction of the burdensome feed grain carryover and thus insure a fair return on their labor. If the wheat referendum fails, the feed producers will have reasonable legislation, and the wheat producers will have made their choice.

I have received innumerable indications of support in my State for the timely passage of H.R. 4997. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD representative letters in this connection. The first is a letter from Mr. Robert Tanke, president of the North Pacific Grain Growers, a regional cooperative grain marketing association.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTH PACIFIC GRAIN GROWERS, INC.,
Mohler, Wash., April 29, 1963.

Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: In a regular meeting of our board of directors held in Lewiston, Idaho, on April 25, 1963, a resolution was passed to support a favorable vote for the 1964 wheat referendum.

As a farmer owned and controlled grain marketing cooperative we feel it is our responsibility to our members to support any legislation affecting our members' welfare.

The passage of the feed grain bill is the key to making the wheat program the workable program we need to give the farmer in the Pacific Northwest the flexibility necessary for the economical operation of his farm.

We request your support on the passage of the feed grain bill, and we urge final passage before May 21, 1963.

Sincerely,

ROBERT W. TANKE,
President.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, among the many other resolute organizations representing both the wheat and feed grain growers supporting the immediate passage of H.R. 4997 is the National Association of Wheat Growers. That organization's president, Mr. Glen Bayne, from Washington State, has indicated to me that this measure will best meet the needs of the Pacific Northwest. This morning I received from him a letter in connection with H.R. 4997. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF WHEAT GROWERS,
Washington, D.C., May 10, 1963.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: We respectfully urge you to support H.R. 4997, a bill to extend the feed grain program for the years 1964 and 1965.

This legislation covering the 1964 and 1965 crop years extends the currently successful feed grain legislation for these years. The present feed grain legislation has, to our best knowledge, reduced the burdensome feed grains carryover, reduced the cost to the taxpayer, and maintained the feed producers' income at a reasonable level.

The need for passage of this legislation prior to the May 21 wheat referendum is very apparent when we realize that the 1964 wheat certificate plan needs a land retirement feed grain program to round out and complete the wheat plan. The substitution clause of the wheat certificate plan requires the existence of a land retirement feed grain program for its implementation.

With a "Yes" vote in the referendum and with this feed grain legislation, we especially want to point out the freedom of choice by the farmer after he has made his required land retirement, to plant and harvest any combination of wheat and feed grains he might desire. Of course, if he wishes to comply for wheat certificates, under the law, he must plant the 80 percent of his allotment acres to wheat.

With a "No" vote, if he wishes price support and to avoid all penalties he must plant wheat within his allotment the balance of his land or 60 acres in feed grains other than wheat.

Delay of passage of this legislation beyond the May 21 referendum will, we believe, make its acceptance more difficult and will serve no good purpose. We understand that there is much support for this program from both parties of the Congress but that the major debate is in the timing of its passage. We recommend passage of this legislation without amendment so that it may become law prior to May 21.

Respectfully,

GLEN L. BAYNE,
President.

Mr. AIKEN obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield, if it is understood that in yielding for this purpose, he will not lose the floor? I wish to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. AIKEN. Very well; I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I had planned to review the efforts of the New Frontier in the field of agriculture over the past 2½ years and also to estimate the results which have been attained. I have decided to condense that review into one sentence, to the effect that the efforts of the New Frontier have been misguided and the results are not good. It may be that later in the debate I shall review what has happened to dairying, cotton, and other agricultural commodities.

The emergency feed grain bill which we are considering today, or an extension of it, as it is called, would not by itself be disastrous. It might inconvenience many of us, but it would not wreck the country if the bill were enacted into law and put into effect.

However, we have no surplus feed grain. We have not over 3 to 5 months' supply of feed grains above that which we absolutely must have to feed our livestock and poultry. I do not call that a surplus.

Furthermore, Secretary Freeman has indicated that he may not use the authority at all even if it is granted by the Congress, but he would love to have it.

As I understand, the purport of the bill is primarily to increase prices of feed grains and to pay the feed grain grower for not planting as much as he otherwise might plant. That, of course, might enable the feed grain grower to break even. It would not be so good for the dairyman, the poultry raiser, the beef producer or the hog feeder.

We are already feeling the effects of the Secretary's misguided efforts in the soybean area, in that today dairymen must pay about $15 a ton more for soybean meal to make up the loss which the processors must take on soybean oil. That is not very satisfactory.

If we should reduce the supply and raise the cost of production, the natural effect would be to raise consumer prices. Someone must pay the cost. If the natural effect should ensue, the prices of milk and all animal and poultry products—eggs, pork, and so forth—would be increased and inevitably would be passed on to the consumers.

We have been very good to the consumers. Perhaps the time has come when we should carry out the Department's programs and increase the cost to the consumers.

For example, in the Eastern States today, about 75 percent of our extension calls are made on nonfarm people. I am advised that 75 percent of the requests made of the Department of Agriculture for bulletins come from nonfarm people. We farmers pay all the costs of food inspections. It is possible that the time has come when the consumer should expect to pay a higher percentage of his or her income for food. However, the administration states it does not intend to let the natural effect take place, and plans to use tax money, as it would be authorized to do, to hold up prices to the producer, and possibly to hold down consumer costs.

Tax money is not picked out of the air—not yet, anyway. We may come to that, if the national debt continues to rise and prices keep going up. We may have to pick it out of the air, off the printing presses, or obtain it somewhere else. But that time has not yet arrived, thank heaven. The result of using tax money to hold up farm prices or hold down consumer costs would inevitably mean higher taxes, a higher debt, and smaller dollars.

The feed grain extension bill should be considered for what it really is. It is one phase of the general, worldwide plan which has far-reaching implications in world affairs. The administration is very insistent that we enact the proposed legislation this week. On the face of it that does not make sense, because in other years we have enacted feed grain legislation very much later in the year and without any criticism on the part of the administration. But now the administration states that it must have it now. Of course, we know that it desires to increase the power of Government which would be granted under the bill. It wishes to control the food supply of the country, because if the food supply were controlled, many more people and farmers would be controlled. The administration desires to control production. That is the ostensible purpose of the bill. It also desires to control marketing, both domestic and export.

It now comes forward with another reason for wanting the legislation enacted this week. That is the impending vote on the wheat referendum which is scheduled to take place on the 21st of this month. That sounds all right, but the passage of the bill would not affect 300 votes in the whole country on the wheat referendum.

A great many of the votes cast will be cast on an emotional basis. Mixed in those emotions will be everything from Laos to Cuba, including everything else that may come to mind. So I do not believe the impending vote on the wheat program is the real reason why the administration desires the passage of the bill right now. It is true that the bill would permit the planting of wheat on feed grain acres, which is contemplated as bait to influence farmers to vote favorably on the wheat program. But I think most farmers know that if they plant the wheat on the feed grain acres, they will only get the feed grain price for it. It can only come into competition with the other feed grains.

In my opinion, the primary reason why the administration desires the legislation passed and signed this week is to indicate our intention to promote the Common Market policy and the purpose of getting the United Kingdom into the Common Market. Despite Secretary Freeman's protestations objecting to the exclusion of American poultry from German markets and high tariffs being imposed on American farm commodities by other European countries, it is now apparent that we are going to give up the agricultural market in Europe in respect to many commodities. Europe wants us to give up not only the European market itself, but they desire us to give up other markets in the world so that countries other than the United States can take over those markets. The United States can produce many farm commodities at a much lower cost than can the European countries. We can produce wheat at not over a third of the cost of producing it in Belgium, Germany, or France. But when we sell that commodity at a fair world market price, it is called dumping. They call it dumping, because while we can make a profit on the sales price, they cannot do so. For that reason they have support prices running up to $3 or more per bushel for wheat in other countries.

They want us to get out of their market, to let them have it, so that they can put the price up to $3 a bushel for the European consumers; and they cannot do that until they get us out of the market.

Why is all this monkey-shining going on to get the United Kingdom into the Common Market? I think it would be a good idea to have the United Kingdom in the Common Market. Eventually, if there is to be a Common Market of value, there must be many more countries than the United Kingdom and six countries of Western Europe in it.

The answer to this question is that the administration and certain classes of international investors are insisting upon Britain's entry into the Common Market. As an example, I point out that, of the Common Market countries, I think there are six or more—France would have control over most of the petroleum produced in all the countries. This fact was brought out in a colloquy which I had with Christian Herter when he came before the Committee on Foreign Relations for approval of his nomination on January 22 of this year.

The following colloquy occurred:

Senator AIKEN. Which is the principal power or potential power of petroleum among the Western European countries?

Mr. HERTER. I am not sure that I can answer that question offhand. The British, of course, have had an interest in the Middle East for a great many years.

Senator AIKEN. But they are not in the Common Market.

Mr. HERTER. They are not in the Common Market at the present time.

The development of the Sahara oil—and the Libyan oil, the Sahara oil is essentially French, Algerian.

Senator AIKEN. That is right. Now to go ahead.

If the Common Market countries of Western Europe have their own trade alliance there, France would be the principal supplier of petroleum, which would have a decided advantage to her; isn't that so?

Mr. HERTER. She would have an advantage there if there were restrictions placed on other imports.

Senator AIKEN. But if the United Kingdom became a member of the Common Market then, France would lose that advantage; is that correct?

Mr. HERTER. I think quite possibly.

Senator AIKEN. Aren't American petroleum interests considerably interested in the Middle East oil production along with Great Britain?

Mr. HERTER. I think they are, very much so.

After he said that, I asked the Department of Commerce to tell me to what extent American petroleum interests are interested in the Middle East. They gave me the answer that the direct American investment in the Near East petroleum industry, at the end of 1961, according to the latest officially published figures, was $1,191 million. Net capital outflow in 1961 on the investment was $104 million. American earnings during 1961 were $745 million. American income during 1961—earnings, plus dividends, plus interest, minus undistributed profits, minus withheld taxes on dividends—was $755 million.

I agree that that amount of income is worth looking after. But so long as France would have the inside track on Common Market sales of petroleum, the Middle East would not stand a very good chance of coming in, materially. Therefore it would appear necessary to have some deal or arrangement made with France before the Middle East oil, which is about half owned by American companies, could share in the Western European market.

France also is the principal agricultural producer of Western Europe. France also wants to get her ex-African colonies into the Common Market. If a deal could be made with France whereby in return for giving the agricultural markets to France and her ex-African colonies there could be a United Kingdom entrance into the Common Market, then that would be very profitable for some segments of our economy. However, if Britain comes into the Common Market and Western Europe—primarily France—takes over the agricultural market, the Commonwealth countries which now have a preference in the United Kingdom market would lose such preference. Among these would be New Zealand, Australia, and Canada. Those countries then would have to look for other markets for their wheat, meat, and dairy products. The United States and the U.S.-supplied markets are logical places to look for a market in the event they are virtually excluded from the British market. I believe that they have already made overtures to U.S. officials, looking to the increased shipment of livestock products into the United States. In fact, we are already seeing some evidences that administratively this Government has permitted greatly increased imports of meats—40 percent more than a year ago—and a 100-percent increase in cream shipments from New Zealand to the United States in the past year. This would indicate that the administration might be getting into a position so that it would not be such a shock to transfer the markets, or to admit the Commonwealth products into this country all at one time.

Why is there such a hurry to have the proposed legislation passed? Mr. Herter is in France or Switzerland today. He is meeting with representatives of the Common Market this week.

If American agriculture is to be used for bargaining purposes, then the passage of the bill and a favorable vote on the wheat referendum are essential to his success in using American agricultural exports for bargaining purposes. The Common Market countries, as we read in the press, are already suspicious of us. They seem to feel that the President or his appointees may not have the authority to trade off American agricultural markets. They are already threatening, as I read in the papers yesterday, exclusion of imports from the United States unless there is a "yes" vote on the wheat referendum, which will take place on May 21.

The administration wants the bill passed and a "yes" vote on the wheat referendum to show the European countries that it can deliver U.S. agricultural markets in the event that any trade requiring such delivery is made.

If Western Europe gets the agricultural markets, and France gets her ex-African colonies included, one way or the other, in the Common Market, we will lose not only our wheat market but also our tobacco market. Our poultry market is almost gone now. We have lost over half of the cotton in export trade in the past 2 years.

The question is, in voting on the bill, Shall we give up our agricultural export business in order to maintain and expand the market for other commodities in the world trading orbit?

Mr. President, as I said before, I may desire to speak later as to the failure of the New Frontier to tell what it has done to dairying, what it has done to the soybean industry, what it has done to the cotton industry, what it has done to the meat industry, and other things.

The fact is that, as I said in the first place, these efforts have been misguided. The results have been almost disastrous.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I commend the distinguished Senator from Vermont for his timely warning to agriculture in this Nation of the threat which is confronting it as we deal with the Common Market agreement. I think there is grave danger of American agriculture's being traded down the river. If our representatives and leaders do not insist that agriculture be protected, and that preference not be given to industrial trade, I am confident that we shall be in difficulty in future years. So I commend the Senator from Vermont for calling this problem to the attention of the Senate.

I was interested in his comment about France and her agriculture production. I think everyone realizes that, from the standpoint of agriculture, France is the most important country in Europe. I was advised that production in France is only about 25 percent of what it could be if France used mechanization and more fertilizer. So we are confronted with a very serious situation in agriculture by threats from the Common Market.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator. There is no question that Western European countries, particularly France, are not only anxious to get our agricultural export business for Western Europe which would be bad enough, but when they want to get our export business to the rest of the world, that is going too far. We must stand up and fight. I would be just as happy if Mr. Herter did not have satisfactory assurance that he could use American agriculture as a pawn in dealing with other countries.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, as the Senate considers H.R. 4997, the Feed Grain Act of 1963, we are again reminded that agriculture's performance in recent postwar years is most impressive.

We are fortunate in this Nation to have a farm efficiency that has increased more rapidly even than industrial efficiency.

In the past 10 years the average annual increase in output per man-hour on farms was three times the rate of increase in nonfarm activities. Also in 1948–53, the most recent 5-year period for which data are available, total factor productivity was increasing at a rate more than 50 percent faster in the farm than in the nonfarm sector.

Employment in the agricultural labor force has declined by one-third—or about 2.8 million during this period—releasing sufficient workers to account for one-fourth of the growth in civilian nonagricultural employment. Only Sweden has equaled the United States in the rate of decrease in the farm labor force in recent years.

Farm output per unit of all resources used in production increased by more than 30 percent in the postwar period.

Farm tenancy declined moderately during this period, and farm consolidations led to a decrease of more than 2 million—or 35 percent—in the number of farms between 1947 and 1961.

About 80 percent of all farms, averaging a third larger than in 1947, are operated by owners or part owners today. Owner-operated farms, as a percentage of all farms enumerated, are now at a record high.

Not only did farm output increase by one-third in the 1947–61 period, but meat animal and other livestock products increased by a similar percentage. Per capita consumption of red and poultry meats increased by 29 pounds, or 17 percent.

Per capita production and consumption of frozen fruits and vegetables tripled during this period. In addition to supplying domestic consumers with increasing per capita supplies of meats, poultry, and fresh frozen fruits and vegetables, both commercial and noncommercial exports of food and fibers also were increased.

That is truly a performance that agriculture can well be proud of and is most important in our Nation's economy.

Even with this record of achievement in agriculture, we must continue an expansion of our programs of science and research.

On April 11 of this year, Dr. C. Peairs Wilson, director, Kansas Agricultural Experiment Station, speaking to the Farm Equipment Institute Conference at Manhattan, Kans., discussed the need for changes in our agricultural research.

It seems to me that this is a most appropriate topic for consideration as we debate the 1963 feed grain bill.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Wilson's speech be made a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHANGING NEEDS IN AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH [1]

(By C. Peairs Wilson, Director, Kansas Agricultural Experiment Station)

When one looks at the facts about the productivity of American agriculture over the past century, he cannot deny that it is one of the most outstanding, if not miraculous, achievements of all time.

Since 1920 man-hours in farming have decreased 54 percent but total output has increased 52 percent. Output per man-hour has increased 250 percent. Man-hours per acre of wheat have decreased 66 percent and, since yields per acre have increased, man-hours per 100 bushels of wheat have decreased 80 percent. Man-hours per acre of corn have decreased 70 percent, but man-hours per 100 bushels of corn have decreased 82 percent. At no other stage in history has agriculture made so rapid a change; in no other nation in the world has agriculture made such progress; no other major industry in America has made so great an increase in efficiency.

Nearly all competent analysts conclude that this has been brought about principally by a combination of excellent natural resources, a stable political system, a free enterprise economy and a long period of application of science and technology to the problems of agriculture of which your industry has been a very important part.

Dr. T. W. Shultz of the University of Chicago points out that the lower limit of return on public and private investment in agricultural research is 35 percent and the upper limit is 171 percent. Pick any point in that range and the yield on investment is amazing.

Jesse W. Tapp, chairman of the Board of the Bank of America, says: "Although in actual dollars it doesn't bulk very large, relative to the cost of other factors, the most significant inputs that were made in American agriculture, I believe, are those spent in the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the land-grant college system, and their subsequent programs of research and education. In few, if any, other ventures has the marginal productivity been so great."

In spite of this record, of which we can all be justly proud, agricultural research is not expanding to any marked degree. Increases in funds for agricultural research have come at so slow a rate in recent years as to barely keep ahead of the increasing costs of doing research. But research budgets for other types of research are increasing by leaps and bounds. The National Science Foundation, strongly supporting the basic sciences and engineering but with only a pittance for biological sciences and virtually nothing for projects identified with agriculture, expanded rapidly during the 1950's. The National Institutes of Health, with heavy emphasis on medical research, annually receive more from Congress than they request and have difficulty in using all their funds wisely. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration now counts its research and development funds in billions instead of millions. This is not to belittle research in other fields but to raise the question of why agricultural research is not expanding.

Why haven't our budgets in agricultural research grown as rapidly as in other areas? I can assure you it is not because we have run out of problems to research upon. It is perhaps in part because we have done a very good job. We have made it possible to produce a superabundance of food. A casual observer would wonder why we should learn how to produce more food when we already have surpluses. He would wonder why we should reduce manpower needs on farms when we already have unemployment and there appears to be no place for that released manpower to go.

We need to break a logjam in agriculture. Farmers readily accept the results of research which shows how to produce two bushels of wheat or corn where only one grew before. Farmers readily accept the possibility of using 1 man and a machine to handle 640 acres when it took 2 men and 2 machines to handle 640 acres before. But when you add up all the two bushels where one grew before, or add up all the jobs lost because we have developed new technology, we run into real problems: Surpluses of farm products and reduced employment of farm people. What I am saying is that we have too long ignored the impact of technology on people.

Dr. H. C. Knoblauch of the Cooperative State Experiment Stations Service, says it in a more sophisticated fashion: "The technological advances have put tremendous stress on social and political institutions and organizations in the country. More and more the need for social scientists and their results of research has become apparent. This is because it has been necessary to modify the social institutions and their functioning in domestic relationships so that the product of the dynamic technological advances in agriculture could continue to reward adequately those in agriculture for their endeavor and provide all society with the abundance of products which flow from them."

I would say that one of the changing needs in agricultural research is for much greater emphasis on the application of social sciences to agriculture. This includes marketing, foreign trade, economic policy, land economics, farm management, political science, and sociology. We need to know more about the economic, social, and political relationships within agriculture. We need to know much more about the relationships between agriculture and the urban-industrial society. We need to know much more about relationships involved in interregional and international trade. This is not easy and the road is well booby-trapped. Research and education on things in agriculture—soils, plants, animals, machines—is noncontroversial. Research on people and their institutions and organizations is another matter. Protected markets, prices, property rights, trade territories, organizations, offices, positions, beliefs, values and the like are controversial. But let's face it. We can't have our cake and eat it too. We can't take the advantages of science and technology and ignore the disadvantages. We can't embrace the benefits and hope the problems will go away because they won't. Perhaps we should ask ourselves not, "Where is science and technology taking us," but, "Where are we going to take science and technology." Science and technology are the tools of man—not the masters. How can we use science and technology for the benefit of mankind?

The Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, president of Notre Dame University and a member of the National Science Board which is responsible to the President of the United States for operation of the National Science Foundation said in an article in the Saturday Review entitled "Science Is Amoral; Need Scientists Be Amoral, Too?"

---

[1] Address, Farm Equipment Institute Conference, Kansas State University, Manhattan, April 11, 1963.

"No one can deny that science and technology are the greatest and most impelling forces in 20th century culture. Just look at what they have accomplished for this Nation which has totally espoused them. We are better fed, better housed, better clothed, better medicated, longer lived than any people in the history of mankind. We have better communications, better transportation, and more electrical energy than any nation on earth. We are indeed the affluent society, almost overwhelmed by every convenience and gadget, envied and emulated by every other society that may condemn us at one moment and imitate us the next.

"How well are science and technology being used by man and for man? Page through any newspaper or magazine, listen to our radio and look at our television programs. What image do these give of the production of the white coated scientists and engineers?

"To a hungry world we give the image of stored surpluses, better dog food, more esoteric dishes, how to eat more and still lose weight, how to have more appetite and then alleviate the effects of overeating, how to stimulate and then sedate. Better soap, better deodorants, better beer, better cigarettes, better heating and cooling, better barbiturates, better cars, better chewing gums: these seem to be the ultimate blessings that science and technology have afforded us, the highly visible trappings of our American society, the most widely advertised contributions of science and technology to modern day Americans and to the world.

"What really has impact on the earth's peoples outside of America is that thanks to science and technology—we are wealthy while they are poor, we are healthy while they are diseased, we live in palaces compared to their shacks, we are well fed while they are hungry, we are educated while they are ignorant, we have the good life while they have only frustrated hopes. We may think to win them by the dazzling performance of putting men in space, but this is meager inspiration to people living in the swamps of poverty, ignorance, and disease, below the arching orbits.

"But, we can, if we really believe in freedom and human dignity, help create in our day a new condition of mankind, a situation in which human freedom and dignity are at least possible. Never before in history has this been possible. The vast majority of mankind has ever been hungry, diseased, ignorant, poor and badly housed. The great glory of science and technology in our day is that it provides the means of relieving this ancient human bondage, these cruel forms of universal human slavery.

"Will science and technology in our day be dedicated to this great and noble work of human liberation?

"We all admit the impact of the scientific and technological revolution. But we have yet to witness the revolution of scientists and engineers.

"Suppose that our scientists and engineers really decided to make an assault on hunger: by developing both good and arid lands abroad and organizing large scale agriculture around the world as we have in this country where 5 to 10 percent of the population feed all the rest of the people and develop huge surpluses. We have proved that it can be done, but we have been satisfied to do it mainly for ourselves. If scientists and engineers put their talents to work do you believe that there would be 900 million illiterates in this world, with all the riches of human culture closed to them?

"Someone may remark at this point: 'But we are spending billions for foreign aid.' Yes, about $4 billion annually, to be exact. But again, about half of this is military aid, and the $2 billion that are left seem hardly sacrificial when you compare it to the $6 billion we spend annually for tobacco, the $12 billion for alcohol, the $20 billion for that ancient pastime called gambling.

"We cannot overlook that there are only 80 engineers backing up our multibillion Agency for International Development, as against 8,000 or 9,000 in our Space Agency. We cannot overlook that the total 78-nation budget for the International Atomic Energy Agency—the atoms for peace program—is less than the cost of a single rocket shot at the Moon last October. To produce one nuclear submarine we spend more than our total annual budget for agricultural research and this, in a world of hunger.

"Science and engineering, in our times are anything but mediocre. Why then should the scientist and engineer allow them to be used for mediocre ends and to hide himself in the mass?

"Why should we pioneer in space and be timid on earth? Why should we break the bonds of earth and leave men in bondage below?

"Unless a true revolution occurs, future generations of historians may ask why our scientists and engineers did not really join the human race in our times when the opportunities were so great, the means at hand so magnificent."

This is certainly a strong endorsement for agricultural research from a nonagriculturist. Certainly agricultural research has contributed greatly to human welfare and has much more to contribute if we can overcome the impediments to making use of the products of agricultural technology. It does little good to grow an abundance of agricultural produce then storing it instead of using it or to release manpower from the farm if the released manpower cannot be used constructively in producing other goods and services. We must break through the barriers between the abundance of food and the hungry people of the world; between manpower released from farming and gainful employment in other vocations and locations. These problems should be amenable to the research of social scientists if we will give them the resources and accept the results of the research as readily as we do the results of the research of the physical and biological scientists. It is my opinion that once these barriers are broken, agricultural research in the physical, biological and engineering sciences will receive increased support and will grow and develop.

In the meantime we may well be operating within rather limited resources. This will call for very careful evaluation of research programs, reducing or eliminating low priority work and reallocating limited research resources among high priority problems. It is my opinion that we must maintain and even increase the potential for increased production even though we may not use all that potential immediately. We must conserve our natural resources. Among our natural resources, I include soil, water, forest, grass, and wildlife resources. High on the priority list is water resources which, as a Nation, we have too long considered of low priority. Water is primarily an agricultural resource. True, cities and factories need water. They also need food but that does not make food an urban resource. Most of the water of the Nation falls as precipitation on agricultural land or is subsurface water under agricultural land. Two-thirds of the precipitation in Kansas is lost through evaporation from the soil. One-fourth is used through plant transpiration. Less than one-tenth runs off by streams. Yet, when we speak of water resources most people think of stream water either flowing or impounded behind dams. If we were to reduce evaporation from soil and transpiration by plants by 10 percent, we would conserve for beneficial use more water than the entire current stream outflow from the State. Any effort to separate water conservation from soil conservation will be detrimental to both soil and water conservation. Wildlife, forest, and grass conservation are all closely interrelated and in turn are related to soil and water conservation. Major attention needs to be given to conservation research.

Someone has said that the three major concerns to mankind are (or ought to be) bombs, bulldozers, and babies. These three words are symbols of broader problems. Bombs, in addition to the direct threat to man's existence, represent the threat of contamination—contamination from fallout, contamination from chemicals, contamination from wastes. Bulldozers, or rather the way in which they are used, represent a threat to the natural beauty of the landscape as they lay waste to trees, grass, flowers, wildlife, and the natural contours of the countryside in making way for highways, airports, building sites, and the like. Babies suggest the population explosion, not only within the United States but throughout the world. The pressure of population against resources, if the population grows too fast, could mean lower standards of living for all. A world with too large a proportion of the population now undernourished, illiterate, swamped in poverty, disease ridden and frustrated, must prepare for a very rapid population growth, particularly in those areas of the globe that already have the problems.

No, we have not run out of problems to solve and agricultural research has much to contribute. The record will show that agricultural research can solve problems. It will take the best thinking of all of us to delineate the high priority problems and go to work on them.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall be opposed to the pending bill. I have heard with the deepest interest the views expressed by my learned and distinguished colleague in the Senate in the field of agriculture, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. President, we must constantly test these farm programs, in view of the fact that the money is being spent to the tune of billions of dollars a year, in the light of whether they really are helping our farm community. Let us remember that New York State is one of the Nation's leading producers of milk and cheese. Therefore, I represent a State which has a burning interest in agriculture.

First, we must consider the farmer. Then we must consider the consumer, and mainly the city consumer, because 70 percent of our consumers now reside in urban areas. Then, we must consider, though not in this order of priority, because they are all entitled to equal consideration, the taxpayer, who is underwriting all our efforts to stabilize the farm situation. We must consider the advancing technology in the field of agriculture which has stimulated greater production. Finally, we must consider the progress of research and development in the agricultural field, with the object of developing new techniques and outlets for the distribution of our farm surpluses.

Tested by all these standards, it is my belief that the pending bill is not going in the right direction, but in the wrong direction. Laying aside the charge of coercion that has been made with respect to the Secretary of Agriculture and the statements made that if no legislation is passed prior to the May 21 wheat referendum and the farmers vote "no" on the referendum, they will get no legislation passed this year, and speaking solely about the present bill, it seems to me that if we were going in the right direction I would not care about the influence of passage of this legislation on the wheat referendum. But I deeply feel that we are still attempting to go in the wrong direction, running against the current, and, instead of dealing with surpluses, with the efficiency of the farmer, with obsolescence and advances in technology in farm production, we have approached the problem by attempting to impose limitations on production, which have the effect, in my view, of raising prices materially for the consumer. Such increased prices further adversely affect our ability to compete in the rest of the world. And the present policy also contributes to a reduction of the total output of food which we could utilize with effectiveness in the food for peace program and similar programs.

I have always been greatly impressed by the position of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and of others, that although we have large surpluses, when we consider the mutability of nature and the vast responsibilities we have in the world and our existing capacity to meet these responsibilities, one cannot come to the conclusion that we have inordinate surpluses.

I have always said, and I say again—and I deeply feel that this represents the prevailing view in my State—that we would pay even the enormous bill which is involved in aid to American agriculture, if we had our feet moving in the right direction. The present plan does not assist us in movement in the right direction. It merely provides for a limitation of supplies, and at the same time places a very high cost on the development and maintenance of the surpluses which are created. Such a policy imposes a double tax on American consumers.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator feel the same way about the dairy program? New York dairy producers get a price support of 75 to 90 percent. The cost to the taxpayer last year was around $500 million, and the year before that it was $630 million.

Mr. JAVITS. I say to my friend from Louisiana that with respect to the dairy farmers in my State, certainly they would be glad to do without any high fixed price support dairy program provided that the milk marketing orders were adequately and properly maintained.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from New York will have an opportunity to vote on that question, because our committee is considering the dairy bill with the view of trying to save the taxpayers from the enormous subsidy paid to maintain support for the milk producers.

Mr. JAVITS. I have voted on it before exactly in accordance with the principle that I have been stating.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Whenever we have had a war, we have encouraged overproduction of food, to be on the safe side. We did it with respect to dairy products as well as other products.

At the end of the Korean war we found ourselves with surpluses of about 1 billion pounds of butter and cheese owned by the Federal Government. We started to work that off. A good deal of it went into relief. On April 1, 1961, the Commodity Credit Corporation did not own 1 pound of butter or 1 pound of cheese.

I believe I am literally correct. At least I am approximately correct.

The Secretary of Agriculture then came forward with a new program. He could not let well enough alone. We had got ourselves in a position where production and consumption were in balance, with the exception of powdered skim milk. We will always have surpluses of powdered skim milk if we produce enough fresh milk and cream to supply the regular market. The production is not always at the same level. On April 1, 1961, the Secretary of Agriculture raised the support price for manufacturing milk to $3.40 a 100 pounds. It was about $3.23 at that time. This encouraged overproduction in manufacturing areas.

That was one thing that happened to us.

Then the Secretary and the President asked for controls over dairy production, even though production was in balance with consumption at the time. This naturally worried every first-grade producer in the country. They milked their cows a little longer, and they fed them more grain, and they overproduced; so if the New Frontier got its way and they were cut down 20 percent in the amount they were permitted to produce, they would still have production at a level which would enable them to live and support their families.

There was another factor responsible for the increase in production that year—and the Secretary was not to blame for this one: That was the perfect producing weather from the Atlantic to the Pacific. The upshot was that with all these things happening, the Department of Agriculture, in accordance with the laws enacted by Congress, had to buy large quantities of cheese and butter. The Department continued to buy cheese and butter until it acquired almost 400 million pounds of butter. In May of 1962, Congress said, "Absolutely nothing doing, so far as Government controls and allocations of production to dairymen are concerned." Then the situation began to improve. In about 2 months, production began to drop below what it had been in the previous year.

But the Department still hangs on to its 360 million pounds of butter. There are two reasons for this. First, the 360 million pounds of butter hangs like a cloud or a sword over the head of the dairyman. It certainly hangs as a depressant over the price which the dairyman receives. The Department apparently is so wedded to that 360 million pounds of butter that it will do almost anything rather than to part with any of it.

But there is another reason for the Department's hanging onto the butter. It should be noted that at the time the Secretary raised the support price for manufacturing milk, he also raised the support price for soybeans from $1.85 a bushel to $2.30 a bushel, and then encouraged farmers to raise soybeans. The grain acreage was cut, and farmers were encouraged to put into soybeans the land they had taken out of grain production. As a result, in the last 2 years there has been a production of approximately 700 million bushels of soybeans.

As I mentioned earlier today, soybeans have to be processed. We export a reasonable amount of soybeans, and the export market is a good one. More soybeans could have been produced to good advantage. But the result was that there was a little overproduction.

The price of soybean oil dropped from about 13 cents a pound to a little more than 8 cents a pound. The price is now up to about 9 or 9¼ cents a pound. Soybean oil is running out of our ears. Soybean oil is running into the Mississippi River. I understand that thousands of ducks tried to swim on the oil but sank; they could not swim.

But the Secretary did not miss any opportunity to dispose of soybean oil anywhere on earth that soybean oil would be taken. Even the maple sirup producers of New York and Vermont complained about the soybean oil business. In Brooklyn, where a company was manufacturing maple sirup cans, the soybean oil producers bought all the sirup cans and shipped soybean oil in them to be given away. The upshot was that the Department of Agriculture disposed of about 500 million pounds of oil last year by giving it to welfare organizations like Catholic charities, CARE, and others. Those organizations did a good job with their distribution.

Unfortunately, this action made it a little more difficult for 58-cents-a-pound butter to compete with 8-cents-a-pound soybean oil. That action did not help the dairyman in any way.

Unfortunately, too, the soybean producers, finding that they were not doing so well on oil, jumped the price of soy meal to $15 a ton. That action did not help the dairymen or the beef producers, either. So the trouble in which the dairyman finds himself is largely due to the unfortunate experiment which the Secretary of Agriculture made in soybeans. It ties into the feed grain program. All these activities tie together.

I believe that in March or April the parity price of all farm commodities—I do not think much of parity as a yardstick, but so long as the Department insists on using it, we shall have to use it—hit a new low for the last 26 years. I ask the Senator from Iowa if that is not a correct statement.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. A new low since 1931, I believe.

Mr. AIKEN. This is the trouble: The Secretary still insists that he will control the milk production of this country. I am afraid that he will increase production again, so long as he holds to that view. I know that milk production has not dropped in Vermont; and production has risen in New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey. A dairyman came into my office 6 weeks ago and gave the real reason. He is a dairyman who milks perhaps 100 cows. He said, "We are milking 25 cows more than we ought to milk. We do not want to milk them; we cannot afford to milk them; but we cannot afford not to milk them so long as we are constantly threatened with the quota program that the administration is so insistent upon."

So if the Department would only forget its inordinate desire to control the dairyman and let him operate his own business, we would find that it would not be more than 1 year before the milk situation in this country would be infinitely better than it is today.

I do not know what the Secretary will do with 360 million pounds of butter. He must sleep with it at night, he thinks so much of it. The butter could be sent to Cuba; but the trouble is that a month ago, when we could have sent 20 million pounds of butter to Cuba, the Government sent more soybean oil to Cuba to keep the Russians happy. I understand the Russians brought their own caviar and vodka; but, otherwise, I think we are treating them pretty well.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield that I may comment on the statement of the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I suggest that the Secretary is probably using a lot of butter to grease the skids for the passage of the bill—which may be a far-fetched situation.

So far as the soybean situation is concerned, the Senator from Vermont probably recalls that soybeans were taking care of themselves, not only in the world market but in the domestic market as well, until this administration, through the philosophy of Dr. Cochrane, followed by Mr. Freeman, started to monkey with the situation and increased support prices. As they were told at that time, we now have soybean troubles. If they did it, they did it in spite of what they were told, and now we have soybean troubles, with soy oil running out of our ears.

Mr. AIKEN. Soybeans were selling for $2.60 a bushel at the time support prices were raised from $1.85 to $2.80; and that price is somewhat less than it was before the noble experiment began.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It is my impression that the price was $2.34.

Mr. AIKEN. I know the price was $2.60 at the time, and no time was lost in sending the prices down.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. We have a huge surplus of soybeans and soy oil as a result of bureaucratic manipulation.

Mr. AIKEN. We have so much soybean oil that it is necessary to maintain the flow of the Mississippi River with it. I think there should not be so much mixing of oil with water; the ducks ought to be given a chance to swim on the water.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Vermont for his very informed judgment about the dairy situation. May I ask him a question with respect to dairymen? Does the Senator feet that if the bill passes, it will result in increased costs of feed grain to the dairymen?

Mr. AIKEN. That is the purpose of the bill; there is no question about it.

Mr. JAVITS. In 1962, Congress passed the wheat program. As the Senator will remember, the wheat program allowed a diversion of a certain number of wheat acres to feed grain acreage. Is the practical effect of the pending measure to add to that program price protection and compensatory payments for feed grains which were not actually included in the wheat program?

Mr. AIKEN. That is my understanding. The bill provides authority for the wheat grower to plant in feed grains his acres which are taken out of wheat. In fact, the Secretary gave the committee a couple of examples, showing that the proposed legislation would not necessarily reduce the acreage applicable to wheat at all, except that only a certain percentage of it could be sold for the export market or for milling; the rest would have to be sold as feed. I think that program lends itself to a little "getting around," if the Senator from New York understands what I mean.

Mr. JAVITS. Yes.

As I understand the views of those who live in the cities—and I also emphasize that I likewise represent the views of many farmers who are engaged in dairying—the people are perfectly willing to have funds spent for such programs, but they want to have us proceed in such a way that a rational supply and demand situation will be developed in connection with agricultural matters. So I do not believe the city dwellers will object to such a program.

The Senator from Vermont spoke of the possibility of a price increase. However, I do not think the city dwellers would object to that, either. I think they would recognize that the price of this commodity, as in the case of any other commodity they purchase, would be responsive to the operation of the laws of economics, and that the farmers must be responsive to the adjustments which occur in the world—as the farmers were during the war, when they increased agricultural production in the national interest.

But it seems to me that now, 18 years after the end of World War II, it is up to the people of States which have large urban populations, as well as the people of States in which there are distributors in addition to farmers and city dwellers, to oppose these programs, in the hope that the opposition will mount and will increase to the point where we can end essentially governmental operation of the agricultural system, as well as the agricultural price system.

It is for that reason that I have consistently taken the attitude which I have taken in regard to these matters, and which I take today.

Mr. AIKEN. I understand the position of the Senator from New York; but I do not think the city people yet understand what is happening to them and what will happen to them. These bills, when added together, amount to an attempt to control the food supply of the Nation. I do not think any government which has succeeded in obtaining absolute control of food production and distribution has had to worry thereafter about surpluses. So I think it well to have some surplus available.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's position and his leadership. He has always been my leader in connection with agricultural matters; and in addressing myself to this matter today, I want him to understand how I feel about his leadership in connection with agricultural problems.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am about to propound a unanimous-consent request. I have discussed this matter with the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]; with the very able chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]; with the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]; with the ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]; and with other Senators. It seems to me to meet with their general approval.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the morning hour on Wednesday next, 1 hour be allotted for each amendment—in other words, 30 minutes to a side—and that the final vote on the pending legislation be taken at 4 p.m. on Thursday afternoon, next.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** First, does the Senator from Montana ask unanimous consent to dispense with the rule requirement for a quorum call prior to the entering of a unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection? Without objection, the requirement for a quorum call will be dispensed with.

The question now is whether there is objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to refer to a matter which I did not mention a moment ago when I was discussing this subject with the minority leader. It is completely my fault that I did not mention it to him then. I point out that there are about three amendments which I regard as very important and essential; and, in particular, there is one amendment which I would not like to have made subject to a limitation of 1 hour, or 30 minutes to a side. I should like to have 45 minutes to a side allowed in connection with that amendment. It is the one which refers to the maintenance of the 18-cent production payment ceiling, as contained in the present bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would an allowance of 2 hours be sufficient for that amendment?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes. In fact, I doubt that 2 hours would be used on it. But if 2 hours can be allowed for that one amendment—inasmuch as it is proposed that the limitation commence on Wednesday, following the morning hour—I believe that would be well, for that amendment might require more than 30 minutes to a side.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I modify my request in order to make a special stipulation that 2 hours—or 1 hour to each side—be allowed for the debate on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request, as modified? Without objection——

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I understand that will not interfere with having the vote taken not later than 4 o'clock on Thursday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me ask whether the proposed agreement will apply to any amendments at the desk after the morning hour on Wednesday, regardless of whether the amendments are ruled to be germane?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from New York will not raise that question in connection with a bill of this nature. I hope all amendments will be germane. This is a very important bill, and we went to a great deal of trouble to try to arrive at an arrangement in connection with it. So I hope the Senator from New York will consider this matter in view of the seriousness involved in the question at hand.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I add my request to that of the majority leader to the Senator from New York. I have canceled the trip which I was scheduled to take tomorrow, when I should be present as a host for Senators who attend the Cooper launching; and I have also agreed to the Thursday date—all upon the understanding, of course, that there be the usual requirement that the amendments be germane. So I am trying to be very cooperative, despite the fact that I am very much opposed to the bill.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope the distinguished Senator from New York will agree not to submit amendments of the sort referred to, and will agree that there be the normal requirement that all amendments be germane, and that nongermane amendments will not be included under the agreement.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have no objection to the proposed limitation of time or to the proposed requirement that the vote be taken on Thursday, at 4 o'clock. But I do not wish to be hamstrung as regards the kind of amendments to be offered. All I want is to have the unanimous-consent agreement include a provision—aside from the provisions in regard to the time, which are perfectly acceptable to me—that amendments which are at the desk at the end of the morning hour on Wednesday will be the ones covered by the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I must object, unless the proposed unanimous-consent agreement includes the usual provision that only amendments which are germane may be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. HOLLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President——

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield to the minority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to the majority leader.

OUR NATIONAL PROBLEMS CAN BE SOLVED

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, one of the unanswered questions of physics is that of determining how much effort is expended in trying to solve the major problems facing America, and how much is expended in proving that those problems cannot be solved at all. Sometimes it seems that far more time and talent is devoted to the negative side of that question. The "nay-sayers" seem to outnumber the "yea-sayers," or at least to outtalk them. The result of this is to make many Americans feel that the problems besetting them can never be remedied, or even ameliorated.

A clear and compelling voice for the affirmative was heard last Saturday evening when the Vice President of the United States spoke to the Political Cartoonists of America. This was the voice of one who believes that our major problems can and should be attacked, and that they may yield to a determined and courageous national effort to solve them. It is a voice that should be heard by all Americans and I therefore ask unanimous consent that his speech may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON BEFORE THE DINNER OF POLITICAL CARTOONISTS OF AMERICA, WASHINGTON, D.C., MAY 11, 1963

I suppose you may think I am appearing here in some kind of disguise—no chaps, no boots, no 10-gallon hat, none of the wardrobe I seem to wear in your works of art.

But I was told this dinner was informal—so I just dressed the way folks do every night at Johnson City.

Your invitation didn't say whether I would be here as an honoree—or as a target. But it is a pleasure to welcome you to Washington, where the pen is mightier than the sword—and the political cartoonist's pen is often the mightiest of all.

Herblock and Jim Berryman and Gib Crockett remind us every day that if a photograph is worth a thousand words, a pointed cartoon is worth ten thousand. So, on the basis of fair exchange, I suppose I should honor you with ten thousand words. But I believe that about a thousand will be sufficient.

Back in college days, one of my favorite writers was Thoreau. One of his injunctions which made a lasting impression on me consisted of two words: "Simplify, simplify."

That could well be your motto. That is your genius.

It ought to be the motto—and the work—of our political leadership, too.

Our times are complex.

Details of many issues are nearly incomprehensible.

But the 4 billion human beings who inhabit this earth want and need—and will respond to—leadership able and willing to do just that: "Simplify, simplify."

The enemies of freedom understand this.

They never forget it.

Communists have their dogmas and dialectics. But when they talk to the masses of humankind they simplify—to terms of milk for the babies, food for the families, shoes for the feet, roofs for the nighttime, jobs for the daytime.

Here at home, in our own country, we don't hear much any more in the way of outright, head-on, old-fashioned opposition to social reform and human progress. Nobody defends child labor as character building. Nobody defends the 72-hour week as a mandate of natural law.

Nobody comes right out and quotes Scripture to tell us the poor we have with us always, so why be bothered?

The words of 1913 and 1933 are gone. But the opposition is not gone.

Today Americans are being told that we cannot meet our human problems at home; that we cannot be masters of our destiny in the world, because we are captives of the complexities of this age.

Eighteen percent of our unemployed are boys and girls under the age of 21; 100,000 of our brightest high-school graduates each year can't afford the cost of continuing on to college; 4 out of 10 of our fifth graders today will never finish high school if present rates of dropouts continue.

But we are told nothing can be done; no cures can even be attempted, because the complexities of international high finance do not permit domestic initiative to conserve the talents and even the lives of our young.

This is only one example.

Go down the list of America's needs, and the answer is always the same: nothing can be done, because we are captives of unseeing, unfeeling, unsympathetic complexities.

We are told the moon is too far away from us, and the Negro is too close to us, for us to do what we can and what we should about either.

We are told small business is too small to save, and big business is too big to bother even when the public interest is at stake.

We are told schoolchildren under 21 are too young to be exposed to Federal aid, and we are told citizens over 65 are too old for the same.

We are told there are no issues.

We are told that if there are problems, we cannot afford to undertake their solution because of the great complexities of our age.

I reject the doctrine of a fragile America. I reject the doctrine of a delicate dollar. I reject the doctrine of a corruptible character among Americans which cannot withstand the responsible service of their Government.

The words we hear today are the words of a new and sophisticated age—but the voice that speaks them is the voice of an age gone by: the voice of those who would have America stand pat and stand still rather than respond to the human needs of our society.

In saying this, my purpose is not partisan. It is exactly the contrary.

In these last 30 to 50 years, the social conscience of America has crossed and crisscrossed party lines. There are few among us—if any at all—who seriously want to undo the gains we have made toward the greater dignity of the individual or the welfare of the whole society.

But my point is this:

Agreed as we are on the kind of life we want all Americans to enjoy, we are failing to serve our own unanimous purpose because some believe we have become captives of the complexities of our age.

We are agreed that we must avoid waste.

We are agreed that we must avoid excesses in our public programs.

We are agreed that we must protect the integrity of the dollar.

We are agreed that we must defend the national security.

The American consensus is strong.

But the domestic American purpose is uncertain.

An oversupply of thumbtacks makes a national scandal.

But our $30 billion annual loss from underused manpower, our $15 billion annual loss from discrimination, our $11 billion annual loss from air pollution run on and on because we are told the solutions would be wasteful—and the costs excessive.

We are told space exploration will undermine the dollar. But we are not told what would happen to the dollar—or to America—if space were defaulted to the Communists.

I do not believe that this generation of Americans is willing to resign itself to going to bed each night by the light of a Communist moon.

We are not captives of complexity.

Freedom is not complicated. Freedom is what every man has when he is born—and spends the rest of his life trying to keep or get back. That is the simplified issue of these times—for as freedom is not complicated, the choices of this age are the most simplified of history.

Mankind has the choice of freedom or slavery, of peace or destruction, of arms control or devastation, of prosperity for all or poverty for all, of cooperation or catastrophe.

Here at home—among Americans themselves—the choices of our times have also been simplified for us.

This time tomorrow there will be 1,000 more 65-year olds than there are today. There are 1 million more 16-years olds tonight than this time last year. The needs of young and old have acquired new dimensions. We cannot in this year of 1963 stand pat on the answers conceived in 1933.

We need—as never before—the fullest use and the highest use of all our resources, material and human.

But plant capacity stands idle; 13 million acres of Dust Bowl lands need to be revegetated; 200 million acres of rangeland need to be cleared and planted.

Our rivers still run red, carrying away topsoil, if not detergents.

Twenty-five thousand tons of air pollution settle down upon one city alone—and public health is endangered by this in 6,000 other cities.

There is work to do—great works for a great Nation.

As never before, we need a commitment to education.

We think of ourselves as an educated Nation—and we are. But 63 percent of us haven't completed high school and 92 percent of our adults haven't completed college.

We are producing fewer—not more—engineers and scientists today than in 1950.

On and on we could go. The list is long and growing.

But this is not a list of new commitments. It is a listing of America's oldest commitments which we are obliged to honor if we would keep America as America.

The complexities of our times are many—whether in outer space or international finance or budgetmaking or tax collecting.

But those complexities do not control us.

We are masters of our fate—and the fate of freedom.

We must trust our system.

We must trust our institutions.

We must trust ourselves—to the fullest.

We have caricatured our Congress, our Supreme Court, our Presidency, our parties, our public leadership. The caricature must not undermine our confidence or infect us with cynicism—or else we shall become a caricature of the strong, free peoples that we are.

All who are privileged to lead American opinion are, I believe, obliged to use their forums and their energies to persuade Americans that we are captives of no complexity but are free men who are masters of great new capabilities.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BREWSTER in the chair). The Senator from Florida has the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have the floor. I agreed to yield briefly to the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN]. I shall perhaps require an hour for my statement. Each of the Senators has told me that he desires to speak 3 minutes and 5 minutes respectively. I yield first to the Senator from New York.

CRISIS IN BIRMINGHAM

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, we are all deeply concerned about the outbreak of violence in Birmingham. None of us, of course, wishes to say or do anything which would exacerbate the situation there.

We have learned once again, however, that the more timid and hesitant the Federal Government is to enforce civil rights, the more drastic will be the measures to which it must ultimately resort.

At a meeting with Deputy Attorney General Katzenbach last week, it was urged by a number of Senators that the Department of Justice seek the legislative authority it needs to intervene in these situations when conciliation and mediation break down. In an exchange of correspondence with Mr. Marshall in April, I asked the Department to give its views on legislation which would empower the Attorney General to seek civil injunctions in cases involving denials of civil rights, but the Department has not yet responded to this letter.

I do not mean to be critical, because I recognize the problems with which they are faced, and I am sure that my letter will be responded to in due course.

Today, Attorney General Kennedy appeared before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary and made a strong case for the enactment of a public defender bill—a bill designed to provide paid counsel for defendants in criminal cases.

This is a good cause. It is a cause which I have supported over a number of years. But a public defender for law-abiding citizens seeking to vindicate their constitutional rights is an even more urgent requirement.

I hope—and we all do—that not only peace but justice will be achieved in Birmingham. The efforts of Assistant Attorney General Burke Marshall certainly deserves the highest praise, and I do not condone violence on either side of this dispute. But we must be able to back up the Federal Government's responsibility with legal means.

The alternative to mediation under the present gap in our legal arsenal appears to be the use of Federal troops. Certainly there should be something in between these two steps which the Federal Government can do to confront these challenges to equal rights. If the Federal Government is ready to send troops to Alabama, it ought to be willing to give its full backing to the legislation needed to authorize civil injunctive suits in these cases.

The battle of Birmingham—no matter what its outcome—must be viewed as a symptom of a much broader problem with menacing implications. The impatience of American Negroes with second-class citizenship is obvious and understandable. We must anticipate the possibility of many more Birminghams and recognize the responsibility of the Federal Government to make certain that the Constitution is respected and enforced throughout America.

I thank the Senator from Florida for yielding to me.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE RULES THAT PEACE IS NOT A RELIGIOUS CONCERN

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida for yielding to me. Later in the debate I intend to speak on the proposed feed grain legislation, but today I wish to comment very briefly on another subject.

I was shocked to read in a current periodical this past weekend of a ruling by the Internal Revenue Service which has deprived one of the Nation's established religious groups of its tax exempt status because that group has been working primarily for peace.

I could scarcely believe my eyes as I read the explanation of the Internal Revenue Service that they had revoked the tax exemption of the Fellowship of Reconciliation because that organization is devoted primarily to "the prevention of war."

"We do not conclude that your purposes are religious," the IRS told this respected Christian organization which includes among its members some of the most honored clergymen and religious leaders in America.

Mr. President, it is absolutely fantastic that an agency of the U.S. Government should presume that working for world peace and the prevention of war is not a religious purpose.

There have been many rebukes to the Prince of Peace over the centuries, but this must be the first time that the U.S. Government has officially declared that His message of peace and reconciliation is not religious.

The person who concocted the ruling that working for peace is not a religious concern may be an expert on taxation but he is an ignoramus in the field of religion and especially in the area of Christian social action.

I take this opportunity to ask publicly on the floor of the U.S. Senate that the Internal Revenue Service come to its senses on this issue and restore to the Fellowship of Reconciliation the same tax exempt status that is enjoyed by other religious groups.

I make this request not primarily for this one organization, but because as a churchman, as a former soldier, and as a citizen dedicated to the cause of peace, I cannot accept a ruling by my Government that the search for world peace is not a religious purpose.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am very happy to do so.

FEED GRAIN ACT OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4997) to extend the feed grain program.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish to speak in opposition to the pending measure because, if enacted, it would be very, very hurtful to many agricultural industries in our Nation, particularly to those who produce meat, livestock—especially cattle—and to those who produce poultry or eggs and those who operate dairies.

I think, in addition, that what is proposed is a long step toward total regimentation of the agriculture of this Nation. Since I feel so, I would not be justified in doing other than calling to the attention of the Senate the fact that I feel it is that kind of a bill and that it is a bill which we should certainly turn down.

First, Mr. President, I wish to refer to the testimony of the Florida witnesses; not because I think they testified more accurately than other witnesses nor because I think that their experience differs from that of others elsewhere, but because I think on account of our geographic location we do have a certain situation which is perhaps more applicable to them, because of our great distance from the centers of production of feed grains, than to others whom I can now recall. It is perhaps true that there are some in New England, and there may be some in other parts of the Nation, who are equally or at least similarly affected, but I believe Florida probably is more adversely affected than any other area concerning which I have heard.

Mr. President, I call attention of the Senate, therefore, to the fact that the three industries of my State which I have mentioned, which are the livestock industry, the dairy industry and the poultry industry, all large, substantial and reputable industries—have sent highly representative members and officials of their industry to testify before the committee, to voice their extreme objection to this particular legislation.

I want the RECORD to show that I objected to the feed grain portion of the first bill passed last year, and voted against it. However, after serving on the conference committee on the second bill and helping to moderate its provisions—for instance, so that they would not apply to a person raising only food for his own stock or dairy or poultry farm—and after obtaining in conference a very important provision affecting wheat; namely, that which cut down the minimum acreage from 55 million to a lesser figure, as is known to all Senators, or to an uncertain figure which can be below that, I did vote for that bill on the question of passage, stating at the time that I was reluctant to vote for the feed grain portion but that the good accomplished as to the wheat industry was sufficiently great and that we had been working for it sufficiently long to justify my voting for it.

Mr. President, I have no regrets or apologies about that, but I wish to make it very clear that I have never voted for anything which even approaches the terms of this bill, even though it has been stated on the floor by Senators who I am sure believe it that the bill is a simple extension of earlier acts, which this year are applying for the third year, though in somewhat different form. This bill has such great variations from the law under which we have been operating that I could never agree to support such a measure.

With reference to the Florida witnesses, the first witness was Mr. Cushman S. Radebaugh, president of the American National Cattlemen's Association, who happens to live in our State. He made a very strong statement representing the American National Cattlemen's Association and also representing the livestock industry of our State.

Mr. President, I also have received a telegram from Mr. Ralph Cellon, the president of the cattlemen's association of Florida, stating his strong objection and that of the association to the bill, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be incorporated in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KISSIMMEE, FLA.,
May 11, 1963.

Senator SPESSARD HOLLAND,
Washington, D.C.:

Florida Cattlemen's Association urge you not to vote for same feed grain bill which passed House. We believe this feed grain bill should not be considered before May 21 wheat referendum and our association feels too much authority is given to Secretary of Agriculture in the bill.

Respectfully,
RALPH W. CELLON,
President, Florida Cattlemen's Association.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the next witness was Mr. T. K. McClane, Jr., executive vice president of the Florida Farm Bureau Federation. He spoke for an organization which he advises has 33,000 farm family members in our State. I am sure he could not speak for all those 33,000, but I know perfectly well that the principles for which he spoke have been repeatedly approved, and enacted from year to year, by our State Farm Bureau Federation conventions and by the directors of the Florida Federation.

Both Mr. McClane and Mr. Ed Finlayson, the president of the Florida Farm Bureau Federation, who wrote me about the measure, expressed the strong opposition of the Florida Farm Bureau Federation to this measure.

The third of the witnesses was Mr. John J. Johnston, of Kissimmee, Fla., who is a member of the board of directors of the Central Florida Milk Producers Association and who also is a member of the board of directors of the Farmers Cooperative Exchange, which he explained was an organization consisting of 22 dairy farmers who, through a cooperative plant and distributing agency, were trying to lessen the cost of feed, among other things, for their dairy production.

The fourth of the witnesses was Mr. Herman Jones of Jacksonville, Fla., who is a poultryman, president of the Florida Hatchery & Breeders Association, a member of the board of directors of the Florida Poultry Industry Federation, and a member of other poultry groups in Florida. He is certainly one of the most active and highly representative poultrymen in our State. He testified as to the extreme objection of the poultry producers, egg producers, hatchers and the like in his industry, which in our State is quite a large segment of the national poultry industry.

I am glad to observe that the present Presiding Officer is the junior Senator from Maryland (Mr. BREWSTER in the chair). I am sure one of his greatest concerns is the poultry industry of his State. That is also true with reference to the dairy industry.

Mr. President, I am not going to impose upon other Senators by reading into the RECORD long portions of testimony by these witnesses. My purpose is to state that representative people, on behalf of their organizations, have come here to make it clear that they oppose—and why they opposed—enactment of this proposed legislation.

Mr. President, I am not quoting from their testimony. I am simply stating what is to be found among their statements. Any Senator may read the testimony if he wishes. The witnesses make it clear that Florida's situation in the matter of obtaining feed for its various industries of this kind is difficult.

When the first of these programs was started in 1961, we produced at that time only about 40 percent of the total feed requirements of these industries in our State.

Since that time the acreage has been brought down by the operation of these feed grain programs.

Mr. McClane stated the acreage was reduced some 30,000 or 40,000 acres last year from the year before, and that similar acreage reductions have also resulted in a 12-cent rise in prices of feed grains over the Nation. Likewise, our State has to pay, on the average, 20 cents per bushel more for its grain requirements as a transportation differential when the grain comes from the central grain producing States, than is the case with many other States which are closer.

When these factors are all added up, it should be clear that the various industries which I have mentioned feel they are being adversely affected by this type of agricultural legislation.

They have already been adversely affected by the existing programs. They think they will be more adversely affected by the proposed legislation, because they feel that the provision which makes discretionary with the Secretary of Agriculture the fixing of the amount of compensatory payments—payments in kind, really the bonus which the Secretary is allowed to pay to the producers of feed grains—is unlimited under this bill, whereas under the act now operating, 18 cents per bushel for corn is the limit.

They feel that the fact that such power is not limited is a precedent which they would not want to see enacted, by any means.

I know perfectly well that the Secretary of Agriculture, after this question arose, and not before—after this question became very vigorously debated in our committee—sent to our distinguished chairman first one letter, and then a second letter, which stated in so many words, that he will not fix the amount of these payments in kind at more than 18 cents a bushel, which is the amount provided under the existing law.

When the question came up as to why that could not be placed in the bill by amendment, the only reason advanced was that it was necessary to pass the bill before the 21st of this month, because of the wheat referendum on that date.

I do not want to see the Senate ever pass a bill which leaves unlimited authority in a Secretary of Agriculture to fix, at his own discretion, any part of the support price which will be carried out through production payments, which can be paid as a bonus for diversion of acreage, and for limiting supplies, and for control, in an important field such as this.

Mr. President, it is an important question, not merely to those who are in the livestock, poultry, and dairy business, but it is an important question to the entire Nation, as to whether we should ever give to any one man, no matter how fine he may be—and I question neither the integrity nor goodness nor the many other likeable and commendable characteristics of the Secretary of Agriculture; I am fond of him; but I would not ever want to be proposed a law which would give to any one man—any such extraordinary power over such an important segment of agriculture in this country.

To do so would be to set a precedent and to start off on a path which, in my humble judgment, could lead only to one place, and that is to the complete regimentation and control of agriculture from one end of the country to the other.

Mr. President, to me it is lamentable when we find, despite the fact that the farming section is among the most conservative sections of the country, a section which has supplied great leadership, the people of whom have contributed so much to good, clean government, that there are those who now propose such unbridled control over an industry which has always prided itself on independence of judgment. Our country has been proud of the fact that the farmers know how to meet their own problems probably better than any other group in our Nation. Yet here it is proposed to start, for the first time, the regimentation of this important segment of our agricultural economy.

Mr. President, it is not merely for the purposes of this bill that these provisions are offered. These provisions are quite similar to ones advanced by another Secretary of Agriculture some years ago, Mr. Brannan. I have no doubt he was honest in the advancement of that program. I have no brickbats to throw at him. He testified before our committee and stated very clearly what his views were and what he wanted us to do. I well remember that the whole committee, with the exception of a single member, threw his program out the window and reported an entirely different approach to the agricultural problems of our Nation, an approach which an earlier Secretary of Agriculture, now the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CLINTON ANDERSON], and our distinguished friend, the acting minority leader, and ranking Republican member of the Agriculture Committee, Mr. AIKEN, of Vermont, got together on formulating a program that to me was not only full of commonsense, but which also advocated most clearly the kind of independent aspirations which the American people generally ascribe to agricultural people. We gave the farmers some guidelines and some help, and set up some machinery, but did not attempt to tell them what their decision should be, and how much they should plant, and how much they should reap, and, in effect, control and regiment their every action, as the Brannan plan did.

Mr. President, I felt it might be useful to recall for the RECORD the testimony of former Secretary Brannan when he appeared before our committee a few years ago. I am prepared to do so as briefly as I can because I think the RECORD should show clearly that this program comes partly out of the Brannan plan, except that it is worse—worse in that the Brannan plan at least tried to limit the application of the program to what the former Secretary called family units, which he defined, as I shall quote him to have defined them, before our committee, at that time.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I hold no brief for the Brannan plan, but I do say, in behalf of Mr. Brannan, that when he was approached to see if he would put all the employees of the Department of Agriculture to work promoting that plan, he declined to do so, saying it was neither proper nor legal. I want to give Mr. Brannan credit for it. There were one or two instances where Federal employees got overly enthusiastic and did exceed the bounds of propriety, but, I am sure, not with the Secretary's consent.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to have had the statement made by the Senator from Vermont, who was very fair to Mr. Brannan on that occasion, and always has been since. I am trying to be equally so. For that reason, I am going to place in the RECORD the exact words of the Secretary describing his program.

I shall not read all of them, but I ask, first, that the items on page 35 of the hearings on the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1949 which I have marked be included at this point as a part of my statement.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Application of support: Loans, purchase agreements, production payments, and direct purchases should be available for use. These several methods would be used singly or in combination as experience and prevailing circumstances warrant.
>
> Commodity loans and purchase agreements are probably the most effective and efficient methods for the commodities which do not appreciably deteriorate in storage and for those which should be held in reserve in appreciable quantities for production stability or against national emergencies.
>
> Production payments, on the other hand, seem more adaptable as a method for supporting highly perishable commodities and those for which storage is too costly.
>
> In the case of both perishables and storables, it may sometimes be desirable to remove surpluses or to obtain supplies for storage or collateral programs by purchasing directly from producers or intermediate processors.
>
> Conditions of support: The availability of price support cannot be separated from the acceptance by farmers of reasonable undertakings to advance or accomplish the overall objectives of a sound farm program in the interests of the public and of their fellow farmers, such as:
>
> (a) The observance of minimum and sound soil conservation practices;
>
> (b) Compliance with or adoption of whatever programs are found necessary to curtail wasteful production or disorderly marketing (such measures as acreage allotments, marketing quotas and marketing agreements which may be adopted from time to time through referendums or by the authority of the Secretary under terms of specific legislation such as is now on the statute books);
>
> (c) The limitation of eligibility for price support to a defined volume of production on each farm—a volume high enough to benefit most farms but one which will not encourage the development of extremely large industrialized farming.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on page 37, I ask unanimous consent that similar treatment be given to the portion of Mr. Brannan's testimony printed on that page, as I have marked it.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Price-support methods: Commodity loans and purchase agreements are methods well adapted to the support of storable commodities which can be carried over without processing for a number of marketing years if necessary. Storables account for roughly 25 percent of our annual cash receipts from farm marketings and include cotton, corn, wheat, and other grains, tobacco, the oil-seed crops, dry beans and peas, wool, and peanuts. These are not all equally storable, but experience has shown that loans and purchase agreements are effective for all the commodities on this list. Nevertheless, it would be

desirable to have available, as a supplementary method, the authority to make production payments under certain circumstances.

The nonstorables—products which are either highly perishable or which can be stored only at heavy expense—include fruits, vegetables, meat animals, milk, butterfat, poultry and eggs, and account for roughly 75 percent of cash farm receipts. Production of these commodities is geared largely to domestic demand, and this demand fluctuates with employment, wages, and other factors which change mass purchasing power. We can hope to increase per capita consumption of all or most of these products in a healthy economic climate.

When it is necessary to apply supports to any of these nonstorable commodities I recommend that we rely mainly upon production payments.

Mr. HOLLAND. On the next page, I read this portion of Mr. Brannan's statement:

Under this system the farmer would be paid in cash the difference between the support standard for commodities which he produced and the average selling price for those commodities in the marketplace. Because the payments would go directly to the farmer it would be an efficient support operation.

In another place on that same page Mr. Brannan stated:

It is obvious, of course, that the use of production payments must be qualified in such a manner as to avoid extremely depressed prices in the marketplace or a wasteful use of soil resources.

I ask unanimous consent that the portion of Mr. Brannan's statement on page 39 that I have marked be included in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Failure to provide for adjustments in production may result in burdensome surpluses as well as continued unwise use of much of our soil resources.

In view of the significant changes that have taken place in the total volume and in the pattern of agricultural production, there is a need to reexamine our adjustment policies and programs in order to insure that they realistically meet the problems that lie ahead. In making this reexamination, careful consideration must be given to providing a combination of production and marketing adjustment measures to balance supplies with demand, giving producers an opportunity to contribute to farm income stabilization, and providing reasonable limits to the Government's financial assistance. My suggestions regarding these, by commodity groups, are outlined below:

Marketing quotas and acreage allotments should continue to be available or be provided for commodities such as tobacco, cotton, wheat, rice, corn, and peanuts with improvements based on experience.

Whenever acreage allotments or marketing quotas are in effect on corn, acreage allotments and marketing quotas should be available for use on other feed grains and possibly rye. Such authorities are needed for additional commodities, such as soybeans, flaxseed, and dry edible beans.

The legislation should provide for acreage allotments, marketing quotas and marketing agreements and orders for fruits, vegetables, and tree nuts. Producers of any one of these commodities should be provided with adequate tools to develop a program which would maintain or establish balance between supplies and demand, thereby providing a basis for price and income stabilization.

The time may come when marketing quotas or similar feasible devices may be desirable for meat animals, dairy products, poultry and eggs, although the need for improving the diets of consumers and for encouraging conservation farming would not so dictate at this time. For fluid milk, marketing agreements and orders should be continued.

Eligibility of a producer for participation in the benefits of any price support program should be conditioned upon compliance with or adoption of applicable programs of production adjustment, marketing quotas or agreements, and the carrying out of reasonable conservation practice requirements.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Brannan then made it clear that he wanted a limitation proposed. He said:

A further limit on the extent of support is necessary if the public is not to provide financial encouragement for the continued development of extremely large-scale, industrialized farming.

The program I have presented is designed to raise the efficiency with which resources are used in agriculture. But our emphasis upon efficiency must not be followed in disregard of maintaining a strong and self-reliant rural population in America. In my opinion, we would be wrong to allow our programs to operate in such a way as to encourage the concentration of our farmland into fewer and fewer hands.

Mr. President, I wonder if those who drafted the pending bill originally, and before the Secretary of Agriculture had written his two self-limiting letters, realized that they were not recognizing the need for a limitation of discretion and authority of the Secretary of Agriculture.

I quote from page 40, as follows:

As one means of implementing this conclusion, I suggest that the production of a farm in excess of a predetermined amount be not eligible for price support.

To determine the amount of commodities per farm eligible for support, it is suggested that we establish a common unit of measurement applicable to all agricultural commodities on which price supports may reasonably be expected at some time. I am suggesting a "comparative unit," which would be equal to 10 bushels of corn, almost 8 bushels of wheat, or a little more than 50 pounds of cotton. The equivalent in other crops or commodities may be quickly computed by relating their value to the value of corn according to prices used in the price-support standard. This is elaborated upon in the attached table, exhibit D.

It is then suggested that not more than 1,800 comparative units per farm be eligible for support. The effect would be about as follows: The operators of all farms, no matter how large, would receive benefits of the price-support program to the extent of 1,800 units of the commodities grown on that farm. Farms which produce in excess of 1,800 units would not enjoy support on the excess. This would exclude part of the production on approximately 2 percent of the farms of the Nation.

There are other statements of the same sort. However, I believe that perhaps the best résumé of Mr. Brannan's testimony may be found in his exhibit D, which appears at page 44 of the hearing record. I ask unanimous consent that his exhibit D, on page 44, be included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the exhibit was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT D

Selected list of commodities showing quantity equivalent to 1 unit (10 bushels of corn) valued at income support standard prices

Commodity:	*Quantity equivalent to 1 unit*
Wheat, bushels	7.77
Corn, bushels	10.00
Cotton, pounds	52.16
Rice, bushels	6.46
Peanuts, pounds	154.97
Tobacco:	
Flue-cured, pounds	29.68
Burley, pounds	29.44
Butterfat, pounds	21.82
Milk, whole, hundredweight	3.46
Hogs, hundredweight	0.76
Eggs, dozen	31.88
Chickens, pounds	50.34
Flaxseed, bushels	3.40
Soybeans, bushels	5.75
Beans, dry, edible, hundredweight	1.73
Potatoes, bushels	9.18
Beef cattle, hundredweight	0.86
Lambs, hundredweight	0.79
Oats, bushels	17.70
Barley, bushels	11.97
Apples, bushels	5.59
Wool, pounds	29.32
Oranges, boxes	7.45

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the only reason I have gone to this length is to have Senators realize that as to these commodities, they are treading the same path that Mr. Brannan trod, but that they are not observing the principal limitation which he stated time and time again in his testimony to be a necessary ingredient of such a program in order to make it at all fair, unless the farm program of this Nation was to encourage the growth of large-scale, industrialized farming to the detriment of the family farm.

It is true that the advocates of the bill, after this question was raised, secured from the present Secretary of Agriculture the statements in his two letters, which appear in the RECORD and which have been mentioned by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, the chairman of the committee.

That does not change the vice of the proposed legislation at all in this regard, because this is an open invitation for other groups, who may be adversely affected from time to time, to come in and request of us the same kind of authorization that we will have given, if we pass the pending bill, to a large segment of the agricultural production in our Nation.

It is inconceivable to me that the Senate, which has turned down repeatedly and by huge margins in committee and on the floor any real approach to the Brannan plan, would approve the pending bill in the form in which it is now, because of the fact that it so gravely violates a very clear principle of payment limitation which even Mr. Brannan admitted must be placed on his program if it were to be at all fair to the agricultural producers who are affected by it.

Let us see what Secretary Freeman had to say on this same subject matter. I shall quote from the record with reference to his discussion of this subject when it came up.

First I shall read a provision found in section 2, subsection (d), on page 3 of the printed bill, which reads as follows:

> Such portion of the support price for any feed grain included in the acreage diversion program as the Secretary determines desirable to assure that the benefits of the price support and diversion programs inure primarily to those producers who cooperate in reducing their acreage of feed grains shall be made available to producers through payments in kind.

I noted that the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, the able chairman of the committee, in making his fine presentation of this subject matter, read this same portion of the bill and said that it declares what the purpose of the action is. It does disclose it. He was correct. Enough was to be paid by way of compensatory payments or bonuses, and subtracted from the support price fixed by the Secretary, to persuade whatever number of people he had determined in his discretion it was necessary to persuade, to enter into the program. That is the purpose of its being there. That is the reason it is unlimited. Remembering now that he was being examined on this subject before he wrote these two letters, it might be well to quote from the questions propounded to him and from his own comment as to what his observations were on this subject.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] asked the Secretary a question. Disregarding the early part of it, I read the pertinent part, as follows:

> Do you as Secretary have complete discretion to decide how much of the payments will be compensatory or, let us say, Brannan type payments? Would you agree that the bill, as passed by the House, would for instance permit you to set the loan rate at 50 cents a bushel and the compensatory rate at 75 cents a bushel if you wanted to?
>
> I am not asking you whether you would or not, but I say, would it permit you to do so?

The Secretary said: "I believe so."

Then the second question was:

> Would it permit you to set the loan rate at zero a bushel and the compensatory payment at 25 cents a bushel or a dollar or something else?
>
> Secretary FREEMAN. I think so.
>
> Senator HICKENLOOPER. You would have that discretion from zero to basically whatever you wanted to put it? So you could go to zero if you were so minded?"

This is the complete answer of the Secretary on that point:

> The mix between the acreage diversion payments and the price support payments is intentionally left rather broad for reasons that I related in response to the question from the Senator from Delaware this morning.

I continue to quote:

> Senator HICKENLOOPER. Yes. Now, do you think that that complete discretion, from zero on up, is the kind of a discretion that really Congress ought to lodge in a Secretary?

This is the answer of Secretary Freeman:

> I think it is a modest discretion when it is considered in terms of the four corners of the law, the development of this program, the new dimension to which it will move when we have eliminated surpluses.

I merely wish to have the RECORD show very clearly that the Secretary of Agriculture—and I respect him; he is frank; he came right out with what he was talking about—said:

> I think it is a modest discretion when it is considered in terms of the four corners of the law, the development of this program, the new dimension to which it will move when we have eliminated surpluses.

We are dealing with a very deliberate and frankly stated effort to give the Secretary of Agriculture, by the terms of the bill, complete discretion to divide the support price which is fixed by the bill at anywhere from 65 to 90 percent of parity, in any two kinds of moieties that he wishes, so long as they total the price support which was announced. But those two moieties are completely different. One is the loan value from which the CCC resale price would be computed; the other is the fixed so-called compensatory payment, which is included as a persuader. I remember that in World War I—and I know the Senator from Louisiana will remember this—there were certain devices in the Armed Forces which were called persuaders. Here is a persuader which is being given to the Secretary of Agriculture, so that he could set as much of this total price support as a come along persuader to get all of the acreage into the diversion program as he feels should be there. I think it is so unlimited as not to require any further discussion.

I read further from the testimony of Secretary of Agriculture Freeman:

> Actually, the support price in this bill is between 65 and 90. And then the payment adjustment, in connection with that support price, is left to the discretion of the Secretary, which is the only change, where previously it was 18 cents.

It was not only a change; but I agree with the Secretary that it was the principal change. I think we will all agree that that is the case. But the Secretary continued:

> So this is actually not a very significant change.

I disagree. It was a very great change.

Any person, no matter how splendid his objective, how fine his character, how genial his disposition, who thinks this was not a substantial change or a significant change, when he was asking that Congress give him, instead of the 18-cent limitation for the fixing of the so-called bonus payment, an absolute, unlimited discretion and authority, as he has already stated, must understand where we are going if we pass this kind of legislation.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] upon that exchange having been completed, asked the Secretary this question:

> Well, would you object to them retaining it as it was originally?

That is, the 18 cents.

Secretary Freeman replied:

> I think I would feel very strongly that it is important that the amount of discretion, which was the product of some very, very careful thought and review and hearings should remain as it is on——
>
> Senator HICKENLOOPER. You mean as it is in the bill we are considering?
>
> Secretary FREEMAN. As it now stands in the bill before you; yes.
>
> Senator HICKENLOOPER. Well, then, it must be a significant change from the other bill?
>
> Secretary FREEMAN. Well, that is a question of definition, I suppose. I would say it is important.
>
> And I do not think that the increased discretion, in and of itself, is a great delegation of authority, by no means.

The Secretary of Agriculture, who did not regard that as a very great delegation of authority or a very great departure from anything Congress has ever done before, could not have been thinking very carefully before he made that reply.

Then the Secretary ended with this statement:

> I think it is well within the normal congressional delegation of discretion.

I do not believe it is within the normal scope of delegation of discretion. I know that we in the Senate have never delegated such discretion to anyone in this field. I do not believe it is appropriate for us even to consider it now, particularly when, by these letters, it has become clear at last that the Secretary does not intend to go higher than the 18 cents now fixed by existing law. There is no Member of the Senate who does not realize that the bill should not have been drawn in the way it is presented to us. But it is stated—and I am sure Secretary Freeman would meet his commitment—that the Secretary is committed to not go above 18 cents in 1964 and 1965. I believe there are Senators who would not agree that the Secretary of Agriculture is likely to be functioning in 1965. We all hope that he will be well and happy; and so far as I am concerned, I hope that he will still be functioning as Secretary of Agriculture. But there will be an election between now and then. I think it ought to be very clear that the Secretary of Agriculture cannot give a commitment binding upon anyone else than himself. I believe this commitment is completely binding on him. I hope that not only will he serve out his present term, but also that he will have another 4-year term; and if he wants others beyond that, I should be glad to see him have those terms. But I certainly think that anyone who regarded a commitment made by the existing Secretary of Agriculture as conclusive on all of 1964, a year to which we have not yet attained, and then the year 1965, which will come in the next administration, would realize that we were taking a lot on faith if we approved the proposed legislation in this form.

Senators have come to me and asked, "Why not let the bill pass without your opposition? You know the Secretary will not exceed 18 cents. He has told us that now. We have gained that point."

We have gained that point, Mr. President. But that point would not have been gained, in my humble judgment, but for the fight put up in committee. Nevertheless, I do not believe in loose methods of enacting important legislation affecting the livelihood of hundreds of thousands of people in businesses throughout the country.

Mr. President, tomorrow I shall probably have further remarks to make in regard to this matter. However, I see present at this time certain Senators who wish to speak. So I should like to bring to a conclusion my remarks of today by asking that certain excerpts from the minority views on the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks. In fact, I shall read for the RECORD items 1 and 2, which I believe to be of particular importance. In letters written by the Secretary of Agriculture it is claimed that these points have been met. In fact, such letters constitute an admission that this measure is unsound; that is shown by the fact that the letters were written in an attempt to justify the passage of this unseemly measure in the form in which it now exists.

I now read from the minority views:

CHANGES IN H.R. 4997 FROM THE 1963 FEED GRAIN PROGRAM

H.R. 4997 is basically a 2-year extension of the 1963 feed grain program with the following major changes:

(1) The Secretary is given discretion to set the direct payment and the loan at any combination that will result in a level of support from 65 to 90 percent of parity. This would permit the Secretary wide-open discretion to substantially lower the loan rate and dramatically raise the compensatory payment rate. This action would automatically lower the resale price of surplus grains held by CCC, and thus add a new confusing factor to artificially depress market prices.

I call particular attention to the latter portion of paragraph (1). At this time I shall not expand on that point; but I read that part again:

This action would automatically lower the resale price of surplus grains held by CCC, and thus add a new confusing factor to artificially depress market prices.

(2) The Secretary is given discretion to set the percentage of diversion required in order for the producer to qualify for price support (up to 50 percent).

Mr. President, from remarks which have been made today by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], I understand that another letter from the Secretary of Agriculture gives us assurance that in connection with that matter, he will not require more than a 20 percent diversion for compliance with the program? Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. I have both letters in the RECORD.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. I appreciate his placing them in the RECORD, and I also appreciate the fact that both he and the Secretary of Agriculture have seen the soundness of the objections to this measure by those of us who have objected to it, at least to the degree that they seek to correct—insofar as the Secretary's letters could correct—matters in connection with such legislation which are so wrong that I think that despite all the good intentions, they would place us on the road to complete governmental domination and control of agriculture.

Mr. President, I close by adverting to my own State. I believe Florida is ninth in population in the Nation, and our agricultural production is somewhat in excess of $800 million, as compared with an agricultural income of several billion dollars in other States. Nevertheless, Florida is a large agricultural State, and this proposed legislation would have a very adverse effect in 3 respects on some of our largest agricultural industries.

First, we are so far removed from the average place of production that we have to add an average of 20 cents a bushel in order to obtain sufficient grain to supply our needs. We used to import 60 percent of our feed and that percentage now has become more, since these diversion programs have been under way.

Second, we have to pay the added cost of 12 cents a bushel which has applied to this whole industry, by reason of the programs of 1961 and 1962.

Third—and this is something which Senators may lose sight of—we have lost a great deal of the acreage for local production, and that acreage must be replaced by grain coming in at the full market price, with our freight differential added to it, and it adds greatly to the cost which has resulted from these programs.

Mr. President, there can be no doubt that such legislation is regional legislation and is class legislation, and reflects unnecessary losses and hardships, in varying degrees, upon our State and other States similarly situated.

Mr. President, the Senate should not attempt to have proposed legislation of this kind enacted, and more particularly when it would seek to establish—for the first time in our agricultural program—a precedent of unlimited authority granted to the Secretary of Agriculture in connection with the fixing of compensatory payments or bonus payments.

Mr. President, I hope we shall not take this proposed step. For that reason, I object strongly to the proposed passage of this measure.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

MILITARY PROCUREMENT ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2440) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1964 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missile, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2440) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1964 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated during fiscal year 1964 for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, as authorized by law, in amounts as follows:

"PROCUREMENT

"Aircraft

"For aircraft: For the Army, $503,600,000; for the Navy and the Marine Corps, $1,938,700,000; for the Air Force, $3,448,600,000.

"Missiles

"For missiles: For the Army, $565,700,000; for the Navy, $1,107,300,000; for the Marine Corps, $14,700,000; for the Air Force, $2,177,000,000.

"Naval vessels

"For naval vessels: For the Navy, $2,159,600,000.

"RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

"Aircraft

"For aircraft: For the Army, $79,748,000; for the Navy (including the Marine Corps), $198,083,000; for the Air Force, $676,986,000, of which amount $363,700,000 is authorized only for research, development, and test of the RS–70.

"Missiles

"For missiles: For the Army, $559,301,000; for the Navy (including the Marine Corps), $572,433,000; for the Air Force $1,028,332,000.

"Naval vessels

"For naval vessels: For the Navy, $284,208,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
JOHN C. STENNIS,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CARL VINSON,
L. MENDEL RIVERS,
PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
F. EDWARD HÉBERT,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
LEON H. GAVIN,
WALTER NORBLAD,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the report relates to the authorization bill for military procurement and research and development. The representatives of the two bodies came to an agreement on Friday on the bill.

The conferees have agreed on a bill that totals $15,314,291,000. This is $362,800,000 more than the Senate version of the bill and $542,100,000 less than the House version. The amount requested by the Department of Defense was $15,358,691,000, so the conference recommendation is $44,400,000 less than the amount sought by the Department.

It must be borne in mind that both the Senate and the House bills provided $363,700,000 in authorization for the further development of the RS-70 aircraft that the Department did not request. The congressional reduction in the programs proposed by the Department, therefore, amounts to $408,100,000.

I have a tabulation that compares the amounts sought by the Department with amounts approved by the House and the Senate bills and the amounts agreed upon by the conferees. This tabulation shows separately the amounts involved for procurement and for research and development on aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels.

I ask unanimous consent that the tabulation be printed at the conclusion of my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, of the $362.8 million in restoration of Senate cuts agreed by the Senate conferees, $8.3 million is for Iroquois helicopters; $23.8 million is for Chinook helicopters; and $15 million is a partial restoration of the $30 million reduction the Senate had made in the Pershing missile authorization.

On naval aircraft types, the Senate had made reductions of $117.3 million on seven types of aircraft. The conferees restored these reductions except for the $13 million reduction in the F4B program and a $7 million reduction for the TC4B. The Senate also receded from a reduction of $10.5 million in naval aircraft modifications and spares and a reduction of $12.2 million in the SUBROC missile procurement program.

On the Air Force program the conferees made a partial restoration of Senate reductions in the F4C and the RF4C procurement program. The amount restored is $42 million for F4C procurement and $42.3 million for the RF4C procurement. Also restored were Senate reductions of $35.3 million in "below the line" items of procurement, such as modifications and spares.

In the Air Force missile program the Senate receded from a reduction of $67.6 million in the procurement of Minuteman missiles and $8.2 million for modifications and spares.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I believe the procurement and research authorization agreed to by the conferees is a sound one. While it provides less than the Department had requested, I am convinced that the reductions will not adversely affect our defense. I urge that the report be approved.

Exhibit 1

[Thousands of dollars]

	Requested, fiscal year 1964	House	Senate	Conference
Procurement:				
Aircraft:				
Army	522, 100	522, 100	471, 200	503, 600
Navy and Marine Corps	1, 958, 700	1, 958, 700	1, 830, 900	1, 938, 700
Air Force	3, 559, 000	3, 559, 000	3, 329, 000	3, 448, 600
Missiles:				
Army	580, 700	580, 700	550, 700	565, 700
Navy	1, 107, 300	1, 107, 300	1, 095, 100	1, 107, 300
Marine Corps	14, 700	14, 700	14, 700	14, 700
Air Force	2, 177, 000	2, 177, 000	2, 101, 200	2, 177, 000
Naval vessels: Navy	2, 310, 000	2, 444, 000	2, 159, 600	2, 159, 600
Subtotal	12, 229, 500	12, 363, 500	11, 552, 400	11, 915, 200
Research, development, test, and evaluation:				
Aircraft:				
Army	82, 148	82, 148	79, 748	79, 748
Navy and Marine Corps	204, 183	204, 183	198, 083	198, 083
Air Force	322, 986	686, 686	676, 986	676, 986
Missiles:				
Army	576, 601	576, 601	559, 301	559, 301
Navy and Marine Corps	590, 133	590, 133	572, 433	572, 433
Air Force	1, 060, 132	1, 060, 132	1, 028, 332	1, 028, 332
Naval vessels: Navy	293, 008	293, 008	284, 208	284, 208
Subtotal	3, 129, 191	3, 492, 891	3, 399, 091	3, 399, 091
Total	15, 358, 691	15, 856, 391	14, 951, 491	15, 314, 291

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What was the manner in which the RS-70 was finally treated?

Mr. RUSSELL. It was retained in the bill. Both bodies had agreed to the sum of $363.7 million to be earmarked for the RS-70's. That item was not in conference.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So both Houses have agreed to it?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is in the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Agricultural Production, Marketing, and Stabilization of Prices of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow, to consider dairy legislation.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 13, 1963, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled joint resolution (S.J. Res. 39) designating the week of May 20–26, 1963, as National Actors' Equity Week.

RECESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 14, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 13, 1963:

Robert C. Strong, of Pennsylvania, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Iraq.

In the Navy

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be permanent ensigns in the line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Bruce W. Gunkle
Gerard G. Johnson
Roy L. Welch

Traian Benchea (midshipmen, Naval Academy) to be a permanent ensign in the line of the Navy (special duty communications) subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps candidates to be permanent ensigns in the line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Louis J. Boos
Alvin L. Franson
Jerry D. Gilbert

The following-named Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps candidates to be permanent ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Charles L. Actis
Richard D. Arendt
James J. Bell
Thomas M. Bettridge
James T. Black
Paul R. Boone
Gene S. Brown
Thomas E. Brown

Joseph R. Bunch, Jr.
David E. Butler
William P. Carter
David L. Cutter
Bruce E. Douglas
James E. Foust III
Richard E. Garabedian
William W. Hankins
Charles A. Hart
Joseph F. Hering
Frederick E. Hopper
George R. Hundelt
Thomas M. Kanaley
James D. Kaufman
Gary J. Kunkle
James R. Larson
Clarence M. Lawyer
Paul M. Lehner
Harold G. Lutz, Jr.
Charles R. McCall
Thomas M. McGinnis, Jr.
Jerry L. McIntyre
James M. McMonagle
Walter J. Maurer
Charles E. Meador
Gerald B. Mundy
Charles G. Murphy
James J. O'Donnell
Bruce A. Phillips
Richard W. Rew
William J. Roberts
Edward L. Romig
David O. Rutherford
Christopher C. Schuller
Robert A. Severance
John E. Sockwell III
Rheuble A. Spring
Robert M. Strickland, Jr.
Joel K. Swint
James F. Tonjum
John J. Tracy
William T. Wilkens
Joe R. Stafford
Raymond H. Schudder

The following-named Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps candidates to be permanent ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Edwin R. Barnes
Kenneth P. Battaile
Garnett F. Bedenbaugh
Gary E. Bremer
Lee W. Buckwalter
Eugene J. Clancy
Robert L. Davis
Kenneth E. Hendrickson
Peter G. Juliano
Kenneth C. Kelley
John C. McKenna
Thomas C. McKee
Richard L. Myers
Evangelos C. Orfanedes
David H. Ross
Terry V. Rankin
James Y. Robinson, Jr.
Roger G. Schroeder
Dennis R. Slaughter
Robert L. Snyder
John F. Thimes
Wilfred J. Vaudreuil, Jr.

Philip M. Young (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps candidate) to be a permanent ensign in the line of the Navy (engineering duty), subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named graduates from Navy enlisted scientific education program to be permanent ensigns in the line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Louis N. Anclaux
David J. Coker
Bobby V. Hassler
Rex E. Hunt
Robert F. Ward

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants and temporary lieutenant commanders in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Joseph P. Kerwin
Philip I. Wagner
Herman P. Wintrich

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Raymond F. Austin, Jr.
Richard J. Cavallaro
Robert B. Faust
Arthur D. Hagan
Boyd L. Harris
Larry A. Huntsinger
Camille J. Maravalli
John B. Webster

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Norman J. Cowen
Frederick D. Lewis
David J. McMahon

Marcus McHenry, limited duty officer, to be reverted to a permanent chief warrant officer, W-4, in the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade indicated:

To be commanders, line

John W. Barden
Richard F. Schumaker
John B. Griffin
Harold B. Boaz
Peter Della Rocca
Eudore A. Forcier
Rollin F. Heassler
Laurence D. Egan
Homer A. Giddens
John R. Shannon
Robert P. Javins
Howard A. Westphal
Emile R. Gemoets, Jr.
Gordon E. Kaufman
Frederick S. Butz
Raymond A. Kulig
Robert L. Moore
Elwood Vaughan
Theodore F. Drag
Kenneth Richardson
James E. Plowden, Jr.
George Wilder, Jr.
Champ C. Mulligan
Daniel B. Delly
Lester D. Carter
Edward O. Crosby
Royal D. Berg
Carl B. Kole
David L. Miller
John E. Nichols
Hugh A. Cleveland
Clayton F. Johnson
Willie W. Harris
Nathan H. King
Laurence G. Brooks
Warren "L" Clary
Clayton W. Merrill
Kenneth L. Shurtleff
Kenneth W. Scott
Adolph J. Furtek
John F. Rule
Frank W. Warrick
Paul St. Jerne
Edwin R. Jenks
Harvey B. Jones
Robert F. Jones
Anthony S. Creider
Robert Gilmour, Jr.
Fred R. Crumbaugh, Jr.
Elmer H. Earnhardt
Joseph E. Sullivan
Robert G. Langland
Robert B. Stickles
James D. Dodge
Alfred V. Boutin
Howard W. Carr
David E. Hilton
James D. Moore
John L. Murphy
Howard W. Masterman
Lewis J. Polansky
Donnie W. Huckaby
Edward G. Jones
Charles R. Sullenger
Llewellyn E. Jalbert
John S. Tuttle
Louis C. Hambley
Woodson P. Bremer
Chesley W. Richey
James D. March
Kenneth S. Dick
Charles E. Johnson, Jr.
Theodore C. Gavett
James M. Parnell
Lawrence O. Nasset
William F. Harris
Benjamin G. Sailors
Reid E. Coble
Ray W. Seiwert
George S. Schlemmer
Leonard W. Cushing
Donald Gaither
Paul H. Williams
Hubert D. Gano
Leonard F. Bathel

To be commanders, Supply Corps

Eugene G. Greene
Martti O. Mattila
Byron Uskievich
James F. Armlin
William S. Wright
Andrew F. Bevill
Emlin N. Brown, Jr.

To be commanders, Civil Engineer Corps

Herron Oldham
Johnnie C. Dennis

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named (Army Reserve Officer Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

James R. Harper

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent promotion to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Thomas R. Baisley
Francis J. Basso, Jr.
Gordon D. Batcheller
Richard P. Carlisle
John J. Carr
William A. Coti
Robert A. Courtemanche
Oliver J. Crews, Jr.
Douglas A. Crowe
John E. Dickins
Thomas P Donnelly
William R. Dudman
Richard W. Ellison
Floyd S. Giordani
Thomas E. Gnibus
George W. Gore
Peter Graebner
Terry E. Harris
Charles B. Hartzell
James A. Hatchett
Donnal E. Hiltbrunner
Paul J. Hockersmith
Howard L. Joselane
Richard S. Kaye
Alan B. Kehn
Ted Lopuszynski
Eugene A. Lynch
William D. Major
John T. Marshall
Paul Morigeau, Jr.
Barry J. Murphy
Bernal J. Nichol, Jr.
William W. Ogle
Whilden S. Parker
Bruce G. Pearson
Thomas H. Perkins
Albert H. Phillips
James E. Quill
Henry J. M. Radcliffe
Robert J. Regan, Jr.
Owen B. Renfro
Patrick S. Rogers
Donald E. Santo
Richard J. Sasek
Robert W. Schussler
Adolfo P. Sgambelluri
Ronald M. Shea
Jerry L. Shelton
Frank M. Slovik
Billy J. Spights
Andrew P. Taylor
Nat H. Vincent
Robert E. Williamson
David J. Willis
David A. Wyrick
Roger Zensen

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary promotion to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

John F. Abele
Gilbert A. Bartlett
William C. Bednar, Jr.
Dennis C. Beyma
Robert W. Byrd
Bruce J. Campbell
John J. Carroll
William F. Farrell III
Walter J. Fleming
Ronald O. Gibson
Paul G. Grummon
Glenn C. Lawty
Raymond A. List
Brian M. Mathews
Gerald L. McKay
Paul D. McLaughlin
Edward H. Menzer
Carroll W. Morris
John E. Reardon
Robert E. Setser
John J. Sheehan
Philip H. Torrey III
Michael H. Vidos

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 13, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Colossians 3: 14: *Above all these things put on love which binds everything together in perfect harmony.*

Almighty God, we fervently and earnestly beseech Thee that we may constantly covet and cultivate that finer spirit which can transform the intractable heart of humanity, changing it from hatred to love and from ill will to brotherhood.

We penitently confess that we are frequently very selfish and supercilious in our demands and try to gain so much from life for ourselves and have little concern about giving help and happiness and hope to others.

Grant that in character and conduct we may manifest a hallowed respect for the sanctity of human personality, whatever our differences and distinctions may be in color and in creed.

Inspire us to discover and emphasize our oneness and bear in mind that we have all been created in Thine image and with a capacity to be like Thee in spirit.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 9, 1963, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill and concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 874. An act to authorize the construction and equipping of buildings required in connection with the operations of the Bureau of the Mint;

S. Con. Res. 30. Concurrent resolution to reprint copies of the committee print, 87th Congress, entitled "Part 1 of Concentration Ratios in Manufacturing Industry, 1958"; and

S. Con. Res. 37. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary of additional copies of a report and hearings on "State Department Security" issued by its

Internal Security Subcommittee during the 87th Congress.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S.J. Res. 39. Joint resolution designating the week of May 20–26, 1963, as National Actors' Equity Week.

AUTHORIZATIONS FOR AIRCRAFT, MISSILES, AND NAVAL VESSELS FOR THE ARMED FORCES, FISCAL YEAR 1964

Mr. VINSON submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 2440) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1964 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

FEDERAL AND STATE PROGRAMS RELATING TO OUTDOOR RECREATION

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 20) to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes, with House amendments thereto, insist on the House amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. Aspinall, O'Brien of New York, Morris, Saylor, and Chenoweth.

THE LATE HONORABLE JED J. JOHNSON

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Wickersham].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, when Judge Jed J. Johnson passed away May 8, 1963, it could well be said that Oklahoma lost one of its greatest public servants. Jed Johnson was a very close personal friend of mine. It was my privilege to serve in Congress with him. The Johnson's were intimate friends of Mrs. Wickersham and myself.

Jed Johnson was a representative of the people in every sense of the word. He served in the House of Representatives through perhaps two of the most perilous times this country has ever seen—1927 to 1947—through a great depression and a world war.

The people of his district came first with Jed Johnson. He once got into a squabble with the late Harold Ickes, the former Secretary of Interior, concerning the wishes of his constituents. I should like to quote from an article appearing in the Washington, D.C., Evening Star, of September 4, 1946, by Harold L. Ickes, with the permission of the copyright holder, Hall Syndicates, Inc., New York.

> With the coming of the war, Interior sought to operate on as little money as possible. We thought we could dispense with the various Indian fairs that were being held every summer. Jed Johnson agreed, except as to the Anadarko Fair held in his congressional district. Despite a reduction of over $100,000 in the appropriation that financed Indian fairs, in July of 1943 he wired to the Indian Service: "Have assured Indians they will receive at least $2,000 and probably $2,500. Please bear in mind there will be another day." Without advising me, the Indian Service yielded and Anadarko held the only Indian fair in the country.

Jed Johnson not only served his constituents well while in Congress, but he served his fellow Washington residents by teaching a men's Bible class for more than 17 years. One of his former Bible class students said in 1944:

> Representative Johnson always impresses the class with his deep knowledge of the Bible and the splendid style in which he presents his material. He speaks without notes, but his lectures are obviously well prepared. He is a man's man in all he does.

Until his death last week, Jed Johnson had served ably since 1947 as a judge in the U.S. Customs Court, upon appointment by former President Harry S. Truman. Jed Johnson served his profession, his State, and his God in the most able manner. I wish to express my sympathies to the members of his beloved family at this time.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. Wickersham] in this tribute to a great Oklahoman and a former distinguished Member of the House, the late Jed Joseph Johnson. Jed Johnson was my friend for many years. I knew him when he was a member of the Oklahoma State Senate more than 35 years ago. He served the old Oklahoma Sixth Congressional District in the House for more than 20 years. At the time of his defeat in 1946 he was a ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations and chairman of the Subcommittee on the Interior. In my State and elsewhere he has left many monuments to his service. He was devoted to the job of building up our Indian schools and in advancing the cause of Indian health and education. He was a devoted Member of the House. Since 1947 he has served with distinction as a U.S. judge on the customs court. He has been eligible for retirement for several years, but he refused to quit working until the end.

Jed Johnson has been my friend over the years. Mrs. Albert and I lived in his house when we were first married.

He has left a fine family. His son, Jed Johnson, Jr., used to work as a page in the House after his father had left the House. Many Members may also remember him.

To Mrs. Johnson and the children and grandchildren of Jed Johnson, Mrs. Albert and I extend our heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Jarman] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the life, service, and memory of Jed Joseph Johnson. Born in Ellis County, Tex., Ed Johnson moved to Oklahoma in 1888, attended its public schools, and graduated in 1915 with a degree in law from the University of Oklahoma. After postgraduate work in France, he was admitted to the bar and commenced the practice of law in Walters, Okla. Seven years as a member of the Oklahoma State Senate prepared him for a congressional career which began in March of 1927 and did not end until he accepted a judgeship on the U.S. custom court in 1947.

Mr. Speaker, we all admire courage. We all respect patriotism. We all pay homage to integrity and loyalty. Jed Johnson had all of these qualities in great abundance. He displayed them as he sought, strove and tried to represent the State he so greatly loved. As the inspired record speaks of the disciple Barnabas, Jed Johson was a "good" man. He was a good man because his life as a public servant was one in which he preformed good works and kind deeds. He was a great Oklahoman. The inspiration of the Great Plains was in his being. The promise of the soil was in his character. The very directness of nature was in all his thoughts and all his utterances. A great Oklahoman and a good person; but most of all Jed Johnson was a great American.

His life was dedicated to America. He was devoted to the causes that have made our Nation the unchallenged leader of the free world. He was devoted to progress and thus did not fear new fields and new programs. His service in this House speaks for itself and the record he made is worthy of imitation by all men. Truly, Jed Johnson was a giant among Americans.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, to his wife and fine family I extend my deepest sympathy. I am sure, however, they draw consolation in knowing that his was a life well lived, that his was a life well spent. They know that Jed Johnson would say with the poet:

Today the journey is ended,
  I have worked out the mandates of fate;
Naked, alone, undefended,
  I knock at the uttermost gate.

Behind is life and its longing,
  Its trial, its trouble, its sorrow;
Beyond is the infinite morning
  Of a day without a tomorrow.

Lo, the gate swings wide at my knocking,
  Across endless reaches I see
Lost friends with laughter come flocking
  To give a glad welcome to me.

Farewell, the maze has been threaded,
  This is the ending of strife;
Say not that death should be dreaded—
  'Tis but the beginning of life.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all other members of the Oklahoma delegation be permitted to revise and extend their remarks immediately following those of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Jarman].

The **SPEAKER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. **BELCHER.** Mr. Speaker, there are frequently times when one yearns for soft words and tender phrases that could convey cherished memories, warmed by the sunlight of friendship stored in long years of association, hard work, and daily deeds and kindnesses. Such a time is now; for my dear friend, the Honorable Jed Joseph Johnson, of Chickasha, Okla, has passed from our sight, bequeathing me a rich legacy of fond memories, wise counsel, and hearty laughter.

When I first came to Washington in 1941, as executive secretary to Ross Rizley, I had the wonderful opportunity of becoming well acquainted with Jed, who gave so freely of his time, his friendship, and his help.

Jed had that rare combination of honesty, sincerity, love, and humility to make a friend of everyone he came in contact with, regardless of party affiliation or personality. And these were well-nourished qualities which he daily tended and cultivated.

They sprouted forth as he grew from a boy's farm life and public schooling and progressed to law school at the University of Oklahoma. They waxed strong and tall as he served his country in World War I. Healthy leaves sprang forth when his experience broadened later as an editor, a State senator, and a delegate to the annual Peace Conference of the Interparliamentary Union at Paris in 1927 and 1937, and at Geneva in 1929.

And then Jed's budding life blossomed into that magnificent flower of human love and understanding which inevitably was picked for high public service. Jed was elected to Congress. As a Democrat from our State of Oklahoma, he came to Washington as a Member of the 70th Congress, and then was reelected for the nine succeeding Congresses, serving 18 years in all.

But Jed's work was not finished, and the blossom was still fresh and fragrant; for Jed was called to serve at another pillar of our American society. In 1947, he was appointed by President Harry S. Truman to the U.S. customs court. There he diligently labored until his passing.

I will never forget Jed, for his ideas, his counsel, and his contributions will ever be alive in my thoughts; and both Mrs. Belcher and I extend our most heartfelt sympathy to his wonderful wife, Mrs. Beatrice L. Johnson, now of New York City, and to his son and his three daughters.

I could dwell for hours on the Jed I knew, from whose affluent life I gleaned so much of the sunlight of warm friendship; but in his case there is no need, for he shared it freely with all.

Mr. **WICKERSHAM.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the subject of the late Honorable Jed Johnson.

The **SPEAKER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. **FISHER.** Mr. Speaker, the memory of the late Jed J. Johnson, who passed away in New York on May 7, has been eulogized by his former colleagues in the House. I wish to associate myself with the many expressions of admiration for that distinguished American. Jed Johnson served in the House for many years and was one of the most respected Members of this body. He was known for his courage, his devotion to the office he filled, and his untiring efforts in behalf of good government. The country has suffered a heavy loss.

Judge Johnson will be remembered by those who knew him as a friendly, affable, courteous gentleman of the old school. He will also be remembered for his statesmanship and his fight for economy and fiscal responsibility during the time he served so ably on the Committee on Appropriations. I feel that I have lost a valuable friend in his passing. I extend to the family my deepest sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. **ROONEY.** Mr. Speaker, it is with a sad heart that I join my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of one of the finest and most capable members I have ever known, the Honorable Jed J. Johnson, of Oklahoma. I considered Jed one of my best friends, and was indeed shocked when I first learned of his passing on May 8, 1963, by telephone from the Honorable Webster J. Oliver, Chief Judge of the U.S. Customs Court.

Jed Johnson was my first chairman of a subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations. When I was elected to the House Committee on Appropriations in January 1945, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], then, as now, chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations, assigned me to the Interior subcommittee of which Jed was chairman. I learned quite a bit about appropriations procedure from him. He was a highly respected gentleman who represented the people of his beloved State of Oklahoma with dignity and honor; first as a State senator in Oklahoma and then for 20 years as a member of this House from the Sixth District of Oklahoma. His public service did not stop there, however, for he was appointed by President Harry S. Truman judge of the U.S. Customs Court where he diligently labored until his passing.

His good deeds and his many fine qualities will long be remembered by all who were privileged to have known Jed Johnson. His beloved wife, his son, and his daughters have my deepest sympathy in their great loss.

Mr. **GATHINGS.** Mr. Speaker, it was with real regret that I learned of the passing of Judge Jed J. Johnson. I was associated with him in this House closely for a number of years. He was my benefactor at the time I started my work in the House. He was ever ready to give me information that was most valuable and helpful to me as a fledgling Member of this body. One of the first appearances I ever made before a committee of the Congress was on the occasion of my appealing to the Subcommittee on Interior of the House Committee on Appropriations headed by Jed Johnson, of Oklahoma. This was in behalf of the allocation of funds for the building of a fish hatchery at Corning, Ark. It was a real inspiration and joy to me when, by and through the assistance and efforts of Chairman Johnson, the subcommittee approved the request. The fish hatchery was built, and as a result, hundreds upon hundreds of people from a wide area have enjoyed good fishing in nearby streams due solely to the generosity and influence of the subcommittee chairman in providing the money for this project.

Jed Johnson's family and my family have been close friends throughout these years. His son, Jed, Jr., and my daughter, Tolise, are the same age.

It was a genuine delight for him to help others. I believe his happiest moments were when he was being of service to his constituents or to his colleagues or friends. I do not recall who it was that composed these words: "Strow gladness on the paths of men, you cannot pass this way again."

During his service in the House of Representatives, Jed Johnson brought happiness to untold members, including myself. He was a Representative in the truest sense of the word. That is to say, he typified the type of person that our Founding Fathers had in mind when the legislative branch, as well as our Government, was established under the Constitution. He served his district with zeal and determination during his long tenure in the House.

Mrs. Gathings and I extend sympathy to Mrs. Johnson and her fine family in the passing of this great and good man.

Mr. **PATMAN.** Mr. Speaker, it was with regret that I noted the passing of a former Member of the House of Representatives, the Honorable Jed J. Johnson, a Representative from the State of Oklahoma from 1927 to 1947.

I had the privilege of serving with Jed Johnson for a number of years. He was one of the sincerest, most able Members of Congress that I have ever known. He was highly respected by all his colleagues and was a dedicated, patriotic American.

Jed Johnson, his wonderful wife and fine children were very popular with Members of Congress and their families. In other words, the Jed Johnson family was one the entire Congress was very proud of.

Jed Johnson served his country well and was properly referred to as a great American.

DO BRITISH AIR FARES MATCH BRITISH OCEAN RATES TO CUBA?

Mr. **ROGERS** of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. **ROGERS** of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the British Government has warned two U.S. airlines to increase their transatlantic fares or risk action by the British to detain their aircraft.

As a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, which has jurisdiction over commercial air fares, I find this news very disturbing. It comes at a time when Anglo-American relations must be preserved and strengthened, and the United States is making every attempt to do so.

Just recently the Congress approved honorary citizenship for Sir Winston Churchill, an unprecedented move by the American people to honor a great British figure.

And the U.S. Government has done little to actively discourage the regular stream of British merchant vessels calling in the ports of Communist Cuba, despite my regular protests of this situation. In the past two weeks, 5 British ships have aided the Moscow to Havana pipeline by calling in Cuba, and total British ocean traffic to Castro's island numbers 26 ships since the start of this year. Nearly half of these ships were tankers.

The U.S. and British Governments will conduct negotiations shortly in an effort to settle differences in transatlantic air fares. I strongly urge that these discussions include firm U.S. demands that British shipping to Cuba be suspended. A settlement of this kind would do much to preserve the close ties between England and America.

THE 12TH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this time to bring to the attention of the House, the 12th Annual Report of the National Science Foundation. As a newcomer this report is most interesting, particularly, appendix C, pages 176 to 230, which enumerates the research grants. As I understand it, this Foundation spends $261 million of which $88½ million is for the research grants.

I do not want my statement today to be an indictment of this work, but a momentary note of question. You see, Mr. Speaker, I come from a basically industrial district and I would like to be able to explain to my factory workers the necessity of spending $48,300 of their hard-earned money for a study of "Genetics of Sex Expression in Plants." I am inclined to think that my people will feel that the plants have successfully expressed themselves in this area with the help of nature and without Government intervention for 2000 years—and they may expect me to have some answers for them. Mr. Speaker, they may also question spending $5,500 to study "Hybridization and Evolutionary Divergence in Tree Frogs" or they may wonder about spending $12,900 to study "Gene Action in Cytoplasmic Sterility of Sorghum." My people are fond of tree frogs and they like sorghum very much, but I doubt that a one of them is very concerned about whether their molasses is sterile or fertile.

So, Mr. Speaker, if some of the Members who have been around for awhile would tell me how I could explain some of these studies, I would appreciate it. They might include explanations for such studies as $8,300 for a study of "Comparative Genetics of the Deer Mouse and the Laboratory Mouse," and $29,700 for a study of "Incompatibility Factors in Schizophyllum"—whatever that is—and many others that appear on the 50-odd pages mentioned.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963

Mr. THOMAS submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 5517) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

RUMANIAN NATIONAL HOLIDAY

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, the history of the Rumanian people during the last two decades has been full of calamities and tragedies. They were among the first to be involved in the last World War, and they were also among the first to be caught in the claws of the Soviet Union's aggressive totalitarianism. It is true that their earlier history does not present an easygoing and happy existence, but since 1940 their lot has been unenviably and invariably sad.

Centuries ago their country was overrun and the people subjected to the rule of the Ottoman Turks for some 400 years, but these doughty and dauntless peasants were not easily reconciled with the oppressive rule of an alien regime, and they fought back their oppressors with all the means at their disposal. They always looked forward to the day when they could cast off the alien yoke weighing heavily upon them. More than 100 years ago the Crimean War offered them this chance. At the end of that war they first attained autonomous status. Then in 1877 they seized upon another opportunity during the Russo-Turkish War of 1877–78, and proclaimed their independence on May 10 of that year. For 86 years that day has become a Rumanian national holiday.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS

The **SPEAKER.** This is District of Columbia Day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMillan], chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

EXEMPT LIFE INSURANCE COMPANIES, ACT OF FEBRUARY 4, 1913

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 3191) to exempt life insurance companies from the act of Februrary 4, 1913, regulating loaning of money on securities in the District of Columbia.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 10 of the Act entitled "An Act to regulate the business of loaning money on security of any kind by persons, firms, and corporations other than national banks, licensed bankers, trust companies, savings banks, building and loan associations, and real estate brokers in the District of Columbia", approved February 4, 1913. (D.C. Code, sec. 26–610), is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "or to life insurance companies."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, after "amended" strike out "by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'or to life insurance companies' " and insert:

"(a) by inserting the subsection designation '(a)' immediately before the first word of such section; (2) by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: 'or to life insurance companies. As used in this section the term "life insurance companies" means and includes any life insurance company authorized to do business in the District of Columbia pursuant to the Life Insurance Act (48 Stat. 1127. et seq.) and any other life insurance company which has a valid, current license to do business as such in any State of the United States'; and (3) by adding thereto the following new subsection:

" '(b) Any person or any legal entity exempted from the provisions of this Act by such subsection (a) of this section making loans secured on real or personal property in the District of Columbia who or which does not maintain an office for doing business in the District of Columbia or a residence in said District where such person or legal entity may be served with process in any suit arising out of any such transaction or in connection with such property shall appoint and maintain at all times in the District of Columbia a resident agent upon whom process may be served in any such suit, and shall register with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or with their designee the name and address of such resident agent. Any such person or legal entity which fails to appoint and maintain at all times in the District of Columbia such resident agent shall not, while such failure continues, be entitled to the exemption provided in this section. Whenever any such person or entity does not have in the District of Columbia an agent for services of process or such agent cannot with reasonable diligence be found at his registered address, then the said Commissioners or their designee shall be the agent for the service of process for such person or entity. Service of process on the Commissioners or their designee shall be made by delivering to, and leaving with them, or with any person having charge of their office, or with their designee, duplicate copies of the process accompanied by a fee in the amount of $2.00 and such service shall be sufficient service upon such person or entity. In the event of such service, the Commissioners, or their designee, shall immediately cause one of such copies to be forwarded by registered or certified mail, addressed to such person or entity at his or its address, as such address appears on the records of the Commissioners or their designee. Any such service shall be returnable in not less than thirty days unless the rules of the court issuing such process prescribe another period, in which case such prescribed period shall govern. Nothing contained in this section shall limit or affect the right to serve any process, notice, or demand required or permitted by law to be served on any such person or entity in any other manner now or hereafter permitted by law.' "

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3191 would exempt life insurance companies from the act of February 4, 1913, regulating loaning of money on securities in the District of Columbia.

The amendment of section 26-610 of the District of Columbia Code would add life insurance companies to the list of institutional lenders already exempted under that section from the provisions of chapter 6, title 26 of the District of Columbia Code, generally called the loan shark law. The amendment would not add any new category of investment authority for life insurance companies.

The present language of section 26-610 excludes from the purview of that law just about all types of institutional lenders except insurance companies. Historically, this omission is probably accounted for by the fact that insurance companies, particularly life insurance companies, were not as significant in the mortgage lending market in 1913, when the legislation in question was enacted, as they have since become.

The legislative record shows clearly that the 1913 act was aimed at driving out the unlicensed makers of small loans charging an exorbitant rate of interest to the borrowers. As late as 1930, it was considered that the act applied only to small loans of $200 or less and did not apply to normal real estate mortgage transactions (see *Von Rosen* v. *Dean*, 41 F. (2d) 982). More recent decisions of the local court of appeals, however, appear to hedge on the Von Rosen case with the result that substantial doubt has been raised as to whether an institutional lender not included in the exemption of 26-610 is restricted by the provisions of the Loan Shark Act in its regular mortgage loan operations.

The problem and the questions relative to life insurance companies arise because section 26-601 of the District of Columbia Code establishes a 6-percent interest limit on loans for more than $200 if made by a lender other than those exempted in section 26-610.

On the other hand, the usury statute, section 28-2703 of the District of Columbia Code, allows for a maximum interest rate up to 8 percent provided the loan contract is in writing. There is no question that banks and building and loan associations, exempted by 26-610 of the code, are governed in their maximum interest rate only by the usury statute. As indicated, however, there is a question in the case of insurance companies as a consequence of which the conservative position has been taken by many such companies that they will not entertain requests for loans in the District of Columbia which in normal circumstances will justify at a given time an interest rate in excess of 6 percent. Such loans in general are those for larger amounts desired by sophisticated investors in the development of commercial and apartment projects. While it seems clear that the 1913 act was not intended to cover a lender such as an insurance company, the fact is that for all practical purposes many insurance companies will not make available in the District of Columbia funds which otherwise might be loaned for enterprises and under conditions justifying an interest rate in excess of 6 percent. Naturally, the companies prefer to take that portion of their investment funds to a jurisdiction in which there is no question about the authorized interest rate.

The enactment of H.R. 3191 has the support of some foreign companies licensed to do business here and which are now lending money on real estate mortgages in the District of Columbia. It also has the support of the domestic life insurance companies of the District and many other interested groups.

The bill, as amended and reported, has the approval of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Subsection (b) would be inserted into the act to make sure that a foreign lender making real estate or personal property loans in the District can be served with process in suits arising out of any such loan transaction or in connection with the property securing the loan. The section requires the nonresident company or person to appoint a resident agent. It further provides that in the event that such an agent is not appointed, the Commissioners of the District or their designee shall be the agent for the service of process for such company or person, for a fee of $2, and the exemption provided by the statute as amended is lost.

This same legislation passed the House on June 25, 1962.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I introduced H.R. 3191 in order to provide needed exemption to life insurance companies from the 1913 regulatory act addressed to the loaning of money on securities in the District of Columbia. Most institutional lenders are already exempted from the purview of that act and the legislative record shows clearly that the 1913 act was aimed not at the closely regulated institutional lender, but rather at the makers of small loans charging an exorbitant rate of interest to the borrower. Recent court decisions, however, have cast some ambiguity on the purview of the 1913 law. Consequently, it is indeed gratifying to note House passage today of H.R. 3191. Enactment of this measure into law will considerably clear the air and dispel existing uncertainties surrounding security loan transactions carried on by District of Columbia life insurance companies.

LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to submit for the Record information explaining the bill just passed, and I also ask unanimous consent that the chairman of the subcommittee calling up the remainder of the bills have the opportunity to submit his remarks in the Record following the passage of each bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. At this time I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Whitener] to call up bills.

SUSPENSION OF UNRULY PUPILS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 4273) to amend section 207, title 31, of the District of Columbia Code of 1961, as amended, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the gentleman would give the Members of the House an explanation of this bill?

Mr. WHITENER. I shall be happy to explain the bill. This is a bill to amend section 207 of title 31 of the District of Columbia Code.

Simply stated, the bill would confer upon the school authorities of the District of Columbia the right to suspend or dismiss students who do not conduct themselves in accordance with the standards of good behavior and the rules promulgated by the Board of Education.

Mr. KYL. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is there anything in this particular bill concerning corporal punishment of students in school?

Mr. WHITENER. Not in my opinion. There are some people who take the position that to make a child leave the schoolroom is corporal punishment. But this is merely a bill to give the school authorities the privilege of suspending or expelling school students who do not behave.

I might say further to the gentleman from Iowa that some doubt has been expressed by the school authorities as to whether under the compulsory school attendance law in the District of Columbia the school authorities have the power to suspend or expel. This bill would remove any doubt as to that power or authority.

Mr. KYL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section

207, title 31, of the District of Columbia Code of 1961, as amended (43 Stat. 87, chapter 141, Art. I, section 7) is amended by adding a new paragraph, as follows:

"Notwithstanding the provisions of this section, or any other provision of law, a school principal in the District of Columbia shall have authority to suspend or dismiss any pupil who willfully and persistently violates the rules of the school or who may be guilty of immoral or disreputable conduct, or who may be a menace to the school: *Provided*, That any suspension or dismissal in excess of ten school days or any suspension or dismissal denying a pupil the right to attend school during the last ten school days of the school year shall be subject to the approval of the Superintendent of Schools for the District of Columbia. Every suspension or dismissal for cause shall be reported at once to the Superintendent, who shall investigate the cause and approve or disapprove the action of such principal."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out lines 3, 4, 5, and 6 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That section 7 of article I of the Act of February 24, 1925 (43 Stat. 807; D.C. Code, 31–207), is amended by adding a new paragraph as follows:"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time and passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend section 7 of article I of the act of February 24, 1925."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill H.R. 4273, is to amend the present District of Columbia compulsory school attendance law (D.C. Code, 31–207) so as to permit the suspension or dismissal of unruly pupils within the age limits of compulsory attendance.

In view of the fact that the above-cited section of the District of Columbia Code presently provides no latitude whatever for any child in the District between the ages of 7 and 16 years being prevented from regular attendance at school, the school authorities have expressed doubt as to their legal right to suspend or expel pupils within those age limits.

One aspect of the disciplinary crisis in the District of Columbia public schools, so graphically developed in the MacCarthy committee's report on the stadium riots of last Thanksgiving Day, is the demoralizing effect of the presence of a relatively small number of pupils who are utterly uncontrollable, and yet cannot be removed from the schools under present legal limitations. This problem led Dr. Carl F. Hansen, District of Columbia Superintendent of Schools, to write to the District of Columbia Board of Education on February 20, 1963, as follows:

"The Superintendent recommends that the following rule of the Board of Education governing suspension and dismissal be amended by the deletion of the portion in black brackets.

" 'Chapter XIII, section 18, paragraph 1: The following offenses furnish sufficient cause for suspension or expulsion [in cases to which the Compulsory School Attendance Act does not apply:]

" '1. Immoral conduct.

" '2. Indecent language.

" '3. Violent or pointed opposition to authority.

" '4. Persistent disobedience or disorder.

" '5. Habitual tardiness.

" '6. Unauthorized absence.

" '7. Poor personal hygiene.

" '8. Continuing academic failure.

'2. Such suspension or expulsion shall be made only with the approval of the assistant superintendent concerned and shall be immediately reported in writing to the Superintendent of Schools.' "

The justifications are:

1. It is inevitable in any school system that some children will be so uncontrollable as to receive no benefit from school attendance.

2. In such cases the presence of the uncontrollable pupil interferes with the right to learn of others in the class and school.

3. The solution to the pupil's problem is often of such depth and character that ordinary school facilities cannot be successful.

4. Keeping the pupil who cannot respond to schooling in school often covers up the problem and prevents broader constructive action to correct it.

5. Where the school cannot provide necessary services the responsibility for doing so must be accepted by the parents and the community at large such as is represented by the Board of Directors of the juvenile delinquency project.

6. The right to dismiss should have a beneficial effect upon pupil behavior because it is apparent that under current regulations some pupils and their parents take advantage of the current immunity against dismissal.

7. The Compulsory School Attendance Act requires parents to provide schooling for children under 16 years of age but it does not require the public schools to do so.

8. The Board of Education has before it a proposal to provide extended school services to pupils who are dismissed from the regular day school program. It is hoped that special help can be given most pupils.

The superintendent recommends that the Board of Education refer this proposal to the Committee on Rules for study and recommendation to the Board of Education.

On March 14, 1963, Dr. Hansen wrote to the Committee on Rules of the Board of Education, expanding upon the problem further, as follows:

SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS,
Washington, D.C., March 14, 1963.

To the Committee on Rules of the Board of Education:

On Wednesday, February 20, 1963, the Superintendent submitted a report to the Board of Education concerning changes in the rule on suspension and expulsion. At that time it was stated that administrative guidelines would be developed by a committee of officers and teachers appointed for this purpose. The committee agrees with the Superintendent that in order to guarantee an atmosphere conducive to learning and to protect persons and property, the policies concerning suspension and expulsion must be modified.

In every instance before dismissing or suspending the uncontrollable pupil the principal should exhaust all available resources in his behalf. These include the use of school psychologists to recommend school placement, the Department of Public Health to consider physical health problems, family agencies to assess and to aid in improvement of home conditions, and church and neighborhood resources.

Before acting to dismiss a pupil the principal should give the uncontrollable pupil favorable placement in a school classroom, in a social adjustment class, or on visiting instruction in the home, unless the prognosis as to the value of such placement is negative.

The teacher should report any pupil that is beyond control without fear of loss of status or criticism. She should be a part of the school team to determine whether school or community resources are available for the child. She must have the sympathetic understanding of the administrative staff in the recommendations she makes.

SUSPENSION

1. The power of suspension is vested in the principal, or in his absence, the acting principal.

2. An indefinite suspension shall be made in the event of a continuing pattern of antisocial behavior or for an initial offense of an aggravated nature. In all cases the principal must inform the pupil of his suspension and the reason for it. The principal does not at this point set a period of suspension, but informs the pupil that his parents will be advised of the period of suspension at a later date.

3. The principal should report the suspension to the parents and the assistant superintendent by phone, personal contact, or letter.

4. The principal will arrange a conference at which the parents, a representative from the Department of Pupil Personnel Services, and the teacher, if one is involved in the suspension, must be present. At this conference the conditions under which the pupil will be reinstated will be defined.

5. With the fulfillment of the conditions of the agreement arrived at in the conference the pupil may be readmitted to school.

DISMISSAL

1. When the student's behavior leaves no hope of satisfactory adjustment, this action may be taken with or without previous suspension.

2. Dismissal will be accomplished on the recommendation of the principal with the approval of the Superintendent of Schools.

3. Where a pupil has been dismissed, the Department of Pupil Personnel Services will endeavor to find a community service for the child or will assist the parents, if they desire, in finding suitable private or tutorial education for their child.

In addition, the Superintendent and the school officers concerned are of the opinion that a special school, similar in part to that of the Boys' Junior-Senior High School, should be established.

This proposed new school facility will be given early and careful attention and a report thereon will be submitted to the committee as soon as possible.

4. The school departments will work in closest cooperation with the juvenile delinquency project and the juvenile court to find help for the uncontrollable child.

5. An appeal for the readmission of a dismissed pupil may be made by the parent, guardian, or an appropriate agency which has assumed responsibility for the pupil's education. The appeal shall be made through the principal to the Assistant Superintendent in charge of Pupil Personnel Services and must be supported by evidence that the pupil has been sufficiently rehabilitated to justify a retrial in school.

This report is submitted for the information of the committee.

At a public hearing held on March 26, 1963, a spokesman for the Classroom Teachers Council of the District of Columbia, comprising some 3,500 District of Columbia teachers, expressed that body's overwhelming approval of this measure, testifying in part, as follows:

Because there is apparently some question as to the present legality of the proposal regarding the expulsion or dismissal from school of those pupils under the age

> of 16, we recommend that the Congress pass H.R. 4273. We believe that when a child has willfully and persistently violated the rules and all reasonable means of correction has failed, the public schools should not be forced to take complete responsibility for that child if other individuals or agencies can contribute more effectively to his development.

A representative of the District of Columbia Education Association, in testimony expressing that organization's support of this bill, said in part:

> Concerning H.R. 4273, which would amend the District of Columbia Code to permit the suspension or dismissal of any pupil for certain stated reasons, again I would like to see this cared for by a change in the rule of the Board of Education. However, should it be substantiated that the Board of Education does not have the legal right to do so, then I think legislation would be justified.
>
> The executive board of the DCEA recommended to the Board of Education that it delete that part of the rule on dismissal which makes it inapplicable to pupils between 7 and 16 years of age:
>
> (A) To allow suspension until the Department of Pupil Personnel Services makes a recommendation as to school placement; or,
>
> (B) If proper public school placement is not available, until placement can be made by the parent or the community in a special school or one supported by the community where the pupil may be in residence.
>
> This recommendation was made by the DCEA executive board in the firm belief that it is not the intention of the Superintendent to permit, and that it will not cause, the dumping of children into the streets; but rather that it will be the means for impressing upon parents and all other parties concerned the necessity to seek whatever therapeutic helps are available to develop the recalcitrant child into a good member of society. It is important to note that additional facilities must be provided to care for these children.

Support for this legislation was expressed also by a number of civic organizations and individual citizens at full public hearings on March 13 and 26, 1963.

On April 17, 1963, the Board of Education approved in principle Dr. Hansen's recommendation, amended so as to provide only for suspension of unruly students within compulsory attendance age limits. Inasmuch as the Board doubts its legal authority under present law to go further and sanction the expulsion of such pupils, this committee feels that H.R. 4273, which will remove that legal impediment, is vital to the realistic treatment of this problem.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, these two bills, designed to improve the present deplorable disciplinary situation in the public schools of the District of Columbia, have my heartiest support. In fact, I introduced identical legislation in two companion bills, H.R. 4713 and H.R. 4714.

Specifically, one of these bills would amend the Compulsory School Attendance Act by providing legal authority for the suspension or expulsion of chronically unruly pupils regardless of their age, and the other would permit teachers and principals to exert reasonable force in exercising their lawful authority to maintain order in the classrooms.

At present, incorrigible students in the District of Columbia public schools apparently cannot be suspended or expelled from school if they are between the ages of 7 and 16 years, and they cannot be punished effectively because of a District of Columbia Board of Education rule forbidding corporal punishment. Furthermore, the term "corporal punishment" in this connection has been ridiculously distorted by administrative interpretation so that District of Columbia teachers today fear to detain unruly pupils after school hours or during recess periods, to separate them in any way from the rest of the class, or even to assign them extra written work as punishment lest they, the teachers, be held guilty of using corporal punishment and thus exposed to censure.

The result of these two barriers to discipline is that today a relatively small percentage of the District of Columbia school population, utterly incorrigible and openly insolent and defiant to their teachers and principals, are completely disrupting the normal learning process of the majority of their classmates who are trying earnestly but vainly to acquire an education.

Many complaints have come to me, and undoubtedly to many of my colleagues as well, from harassed teachers and parents in this city faced with the frustration of this problem and the present restrictions against resolving it. Further, I submit that no reasonable person could read the report of the Citizens Committee on the disgraceful rioting at District of Columbia Stadium last Thanksgiving Day without realizing the extent to which discipline has deteriorated in at least some of the District of Columbia public schools and the degree to which this situation is militating so unfairly against the teachers and other school personnel as they try valiantly to maintain some semblance of order, and against the conscientious students who are being cheated out of the educational opportunity to which they are entitled.

The Superintendent of Schools of the District of Columbia, who formerly has felt that neither of these proposed remedies was necessary, has been aroused by these recent developments to the point that on February 20, 1963, he formally requested the District of Columbia Board of Education to adopt both of these measures by administrative action. The Board agreed in principle with Dr. Hansen's position regarding suspension and expulsion of pupils. However, they apparently felt some misgivings as to their legal authority in this direction, in view of the present Compulsory School Attendance Act, and endorsed only a halfway measure. Therefore, I strongly urge the passage of H.R. 4273, which will remove any legal barrier to the full acceptance of Dr. Hansen's proposal.

As for the Superintendent's request for removal of the ban on corporal punishment, the Board split on this issue and voted it down by a narrow margin. Some of the members of this Board, including its president, testified at our hearings on H.R. 4274 that they are opposed to any form of corporal punishment and are convinced that other means of maintaining order can be just as effective, or more so. In my opinion, this unrealistic attitude is a major contributing factor toward the present critical situation. If disciplinary measures short of properly controlled and administered corporal punishment can indeed be effective against the hoodlum element in the District of Columbia public schools, then why have such measures not been successfully applied? Since the Board of Education, apprised of the facts and with public sentiment expressed at a hearing last April 8 heavily in favor of the judicious use of corporal punishment in the schools, has declined to take this realistic and constructive step, I urge the Congress to approve H.R. 4274 and thus provide a sorely needed weapon against this disgraceful condition which is impeding the proper functioning of the school system of the District of Columbia.

DISCIPLINE IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 4274) to amend section 103, title 31, of the District of Columbia Code of 1961, as amended, with amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from North Carolina to explain this piece of legislation?

Mr. WHITENER. I shall be happy to explain this bill. This bill is the one which has been referred to in some quarters as corporal punishment legislation. The language of the bill I think is self-explanatory. It merely would enact into law the proposition that principals and teachers in the public schools of the District of Columbia may use reasonable force in the exercise of lawful authority to restrain or correct pupils and maintain order. Neither the Board of Education nor any other governmental authority in the District of Columbia shall promulgate or continue in effect a rule, regulation, or bylaw which prohibits the use of such force as is specified in this section.

Mr. Speaker, I may say to the gentleman that the language of this bill is identical to the language of the statute in my State. I can say further to the gentleman that only in the State of New Jersey and the District of Columbia is there any prohibition with reference to the type of provisions which are contained in this bill.

I might further say to the gentleman that in the testimony before the committee the Superintendent of Schools of the District of Columbia, Dr. Carl Hansen, commends this legislation to the Congress. Also it is commended in the testimony of a representative of the Classroom Teacher's Council. We were told that this council represented or has a membership of 3,000 to 3,500 teachers in the District of Columbia.

The witness, Miss Helen Courtney, testified that the elementary schoolteachers were polled and were in agreement to the extent of 95 percent. The junior high teachers and the high school teachers were spot checked with approximately the same result. I might say further to the gentleman that according to the testimony before our subcommittee the National Educational Association conducted a similar poll. Of the men teachers who were polled, 78 percent of them favored such a proposal and 69.2 percent of the women teachers in the Nation favored such a proposal.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I have asked the gentleman if it is possible for us to legislate in this fashion in the schools of the District of Columbia because Congress in effect has the authority to regulate the business of the District and because Congress provides the funds for the operation of the schools; is this correct?

Mr. WHITENER. I would say to the gentleman that in the view of this Member the Congress not only has the authority but we have the duty.

Mr. KYL. Would it follow then that if the Federal Government provides funds for the operation of schools in North Carolina or Iowa or Wyoming they would also have the right to promulgate such rules and regulations?

Mr. WHITENER. I think the gentleman knows what my answer would be to that. In the first place, I do not think the Federal Government has any business providing funds for education in North Carolina, and if they did, they would not have the right to promulgate such rules and regulations.

Mr. KYL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, do I understand correctly that by this legislation we are simply repealing a ruling of the Board of Education in the District? Does not the Board of Education have the authority to bring about this result whether or not we legislate?

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman that that is correct; and we had hoped that the Board would bring about that result. The Board was divided on the question. On April 13, I believe, at a meeting, a majority of the Board of Education voted against doing away with their regulations. We felt that the Superintendent of Schools and 95 percent of the schoolteachers who were in favor of this proposal, and who are in the classrooms, were entitled to support from the Board, and if not from the Board, from the Congress. I might say to the gentleman that we had hearings before the Board of Education finally got around to a formal discussion of the matter and it was not until after the discussion that the bills were reported out by the subcommittee and full committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. BROMWELL. But the Board of Education has not changed its position by reason of the hearings and the reporting of this bill; is that correct?

Mr. WHITENER. I will say to the gentleman that the Board of Education and the Washington Post have not agreed; the Evening Star and the District of Columbia Committee have.

Mr. BROMWELL. Is this House going to put itself in the position of second guessing the Board of Education on its decisions?

Mr. WHITENER. I might say to the gentleman that I do not believe there is any second guessing involved. We have on the statute books title 31 of the District of Columbia Code, in which is found many, many regulations with reference to the schools of this District which deal with a much less important phase of the operation of the schools than this. Also, if we followed the gentleman's inference we would say that the State legislatures in these various States, as in my State of North Carolina, were overriding their school boards. But in my State, the response we have had from the interested school leaders has been that they do not feel that the Legislature was improvidently wandering into the field of school administration, and they thought it was a proper legislative act. And that is the feeling of the subcommittee and the committee.

Mr. BROMWELL. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 103, title 31, of the District of Columbia Code of 1961, as amended (34 Stat. 317, ch. 3446, sec. 2), is amended by adding a new paragraph, as follows:

"Principals and teachers in the public schools of the District of Columbia may use reasonable force in the exercise of lawful authority to restrain or correct pupils and maintain order. Neither the Board of Education nor any other governmental authority in the District of Columbia shall promulgate or continue in effect a rule, regulation, or bylaw which prohibits the use of such force as is specified in this section."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out lines 3, 4, and 5 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That subsection (a) of section 2 of the Act of June 20, 1906, as amended (34 Stat. 317; D.C. Code, secs. 31-101—104), is amended by inserting immediately after the third paragraph thereof (D.C. Code, sec. 31-103) the following:"

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the proposed legislation is a glaring example of why Congress should not be legislating for the District of Columbia and why there should be home rule for the District and why Congress should act now on home rule.

It seems to me incredible that in this day and age there should be a bill before Congress designed to cope with the disciplinary problems in the District schools by resorting to corporal punishment.

To suggest that corporal punishment is the answer, or even a partial answer, to the grave problems in Washington's schools, it seems to me, is extremely dangerous and appallingly naive. It is dangerous because it focuses attention on a supposed cure-all where there is no cure-all. Instead of directing our attention to finding effective solutions for the deep and complicated problems of the District of Columbia, the idea of corporal punishment seems an easy way out. It suggests that this is some kind of a new wonder drug to heal the wounds which have been created by years and years, yes, centuries of segregation, poverty and neglect.

Instead of thinking about corporal punishment as an answer to the problems in the District, we should be concentrating, and concentrating hard, to eliminate the conditions which caused the social and economic ills in the first place, for no school's children can be expected to be healthy and happy students when they come from overcrowded slums, broken homes, and strife-ridden neighborhoods, a situation which results from segregated housing in the first place.

No amount of beating, and that is exactly what this bill intends, is going to transform culturally deprived and emotionally charged young people into model pupils.

The thinking reflected in this bill is naive because it assumes that physical punishment can mold youngsters and force a rebellious youngster to submit to required standards of conduct.

The truth of the matter is that students who would be subjected to this discipline would become worse by the application of corporal punishment. It would just build up their resentments and frustrations. Public humiliation by beatings in front of their classmates would make them more resentful and frustrated and do nothing to solve the problem. What these young people need is psychiatric help and counseling and the concern of a concerned Congress.

We are not going to solve the problem by passing the buck to the schoolteacher saying, "You go ahead and beat these children, and all the problems will be solved."

Rather, these youngsters need to be shown, by example and guidance, that there are other ways of learning to control oneself and that there are other methods of coping with one's rebellious feelings. They need skillful guidance counselors, school psychiatrists, and well trained and knowledgeable teachers to help them to learn better ways of living. And that is what this Congress should be concerned about providing for these youngsters, helpers and teachers, not whips.

Mr. Speaker, a classroom, and a school, is a place for learning—learning about the world and learning the skills with which to live and work in the world. Surprisingly, and this does startle many of those who advocate corporal punishment, most students, even the unruly ones, do respect this aim of a school. They want to succeed in the world, and so they want to learn in school. For they realize that in school they have an opportunity to equip themselves with the knowledge and techniques that are needed for jobs and occupations in the larger community.

If these young people are provided with skillful instruction in meaningful studies and in a healthy classroom atmosphere, many of their so-called behavior problems disappear. But, how can all this be accomplished in a school system which is understaffed, underequipped, and sadly demoralized? We should be concentrating now on how to provide teachers and equipment and support for Washington's schools.

Of course, there are deeply disturbed children who become grave discipline problems. But for them, as for the others, application of the ruler is of no help. They need the counsel of skilled professionals, doctors, guidance counselors, and psychiatrists, and they need special facilities to aid them. We should be concentrating now on how to give these troubled children this badly needed help.

Let us start now to provide these children with help and guidance and proper schools and enact a home rule measure to give the authority to the District of Columbia to deal with problems both in the schools and other areas, so that Congress is no longer called upon to pass this kind of foolish nonsense. Constructive programs to help the District's schools, yes. Corporal punishment, no.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not take the 5 minutes, but I will say to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from New York, I think the answer to his argument is the language of the court of his State in the case of *People ex rel. Hogan* v. *Newton* (56 N.Y.S. (2d) 779) City Court of White Plains, July 12, 1945, and I quote from the court:

> A school or a school system is entitled to maintain discipline. * * * If a schoolteacher cannot maintain respect for or obedience of a school rule or instruction, the teacher is entitled to and should maintain such respect or obedience with force, if necessary, and under the proper conditions.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

So what the gentleman is saying is that the State of New York provides for corporal punishment; is that not true, in their school system?

Mr. WHITENER. Without question.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RYAN of New York. I would like to say to the gentleman that the State of New York does not provide by law for corporal punishment in schools. This question was before the Legislature of the State of New York, and a bill very similar to the bill before the House today was not enacted.

Mr. GROSS. It permits corporal punishment; is that not true?

Mr. RYAN of New York. The case which the gentleman from North Carolina cited was perfectly sound common law. Any teacher in any school system may use whatever force is necessary to defend himself and deal with violence and force. It is an entirely different thing to urge the House to pass a law in effect telling teachers in the school system of the District of Columbia to use corporal punishment and force and to abrogate an existing rule of the Board of Education.

Mr. GROSS. So the State of New York does permit corporal punishment in its schools?

Mr. RYAN of New York. Absolutely not. I refer the gentleman to section 90, subdivision 15, of the bylaws of the New York City Board of Education which provides:

> No corporal punishment shall be inflicted in any of the public schools nor punishment of any kind tending to cause excessive fear or physical or mental distress.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. I only cited one case that is to be found in the record of the hearings, but you will find other cases as well.

There is the case of *People* v. *Mummert* (50 N.Y.S. (2d) 699) which is a 1944 case.

There is the case of *People ex rel Ebert* v. *Baldini* (159 N.Y.S. (2d) 802). That is a 1957 case.

There is the case of People against Newton which I read from previously which is a 1945 case in the State of New York.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill, H.R. 4274, is to amend existing law so as to permit principals and teachers in the public schools of the District of Columbia to use reasonable force in exercising their lawful authority to maintain order in the schools, and to forbid tne Board of Education to abrogate this authority.

At present, the District of Columbia statutes are silent on this point. However, chapter V, section 1, paragraph 20 of the Rules of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, states "Corporal punishment is not permitted." Thus, the District stands alone with New Jersey as the only jurisdictions with such a restriction. Furthermore, the situation in the District of Columbia has been considerably worsened by administrative interpretations of the term "corporal punishment," examples of which are cited in the following excerpts from a statement addressed to the District of Columbia Board of Education by one of its members, under date of April 17, 1963:

> If you have read the 1,300-plus letters from our teachers, you will find over and over again such comments as "I'd like to keep my pupils after 3 o'clock, but I can't * * * that's corporal punishment;" "I'd like to assign written compositions for punishment, but I can't * * * that's corporal punishment;" "I'd like to keep a student in class for part of his recess period, but I can't * * * that's corporal punishment;" "I'd like to separate him from the rest of the class, but I can't * * * that's corporal punishment."
>
> And so forth.

The deterioration of discipline in the public schools of the District of Columbia, highlighted in the report of the Citizens' Committee appointed to investigate the stadium riots of last Thanksgiving Day, finally reached such a point that on February 20, 1963, Dr. Carl F. Hansen, District of Columbia Superintendent of Schools, who on previous occasions has declared himself as opposed to corporal punishment in the schools, felt impelled to write to the District of Columbia Board of Education as follows:

> The Superintendent recommends the deletion of the rule prohibiting corporal punishment stated as follows in chapter V, section 1, paragraph 20, of the Rules of the Board of Education:
>
> "Corporal punishment is not permitted."
>
> The justifications are:
>
> 1. The rule places teachers in fear of censure in case they take any action against a pupil that may be alleged to be corporal punishment.
>
> 2. Some pupils and possibly their parents have the incorrect impression that a teacher may not touch them in any way as a result of the existence of the rule.
>
> 3. The trend in the country is toward a judicious use of corporal punishment. Only New Jersey and the District of Columbia still have rules prohibiting its use.
>
> 4. Teachers and school officers sometimes feel that the rule against corporal punishment is an expression of distrust of their competence to handle their responsibilities.
>
> Administrative guidelines for the use of corporal punishment and the conditions for its use will be developed by a committee of teachers and officers.
>
> The Superintendent recommends that the proposal be referred to the Committee on Rules for study and recommendation to the Board of Education.

In a subsequent letter to the Board of Education, dated April 17, 1963, Dr. Hansen expounded more fully on this subject. Pertinent passages are as follows:

> The rule against corporal punishment is a reduction in teacher authority. It has proved to be more than that: it has produced insolence among some pupils and parents and insecurity among teachers.
>
> If teachers are trusted with the power to influence the moral and intellectual development of children, anxiety about a possible misuse of authority to use physical punishment seems unjustified.
>
> * * * * *
>
> If this is to be a society governed by law then that society must use sanctions upon those who violate those laws. Otherwise, each man makes his own rules and the result is government by individual will.
>
> The same principle applies to classroom management. The government must be one of rule rather than individual preferences and wishes. Methods to enforce observance of the rules must be available to the teacher or the whole class suffers from the curtailment of their rights. Rather than being repressive, the enforcement of rules preserves the rights of the members of the class.
>
> When the reasonable use of corporal punishment establishes observance of the rules this makes for freedom and is anything but repressive. Self-discipline is the objective, but until this is achieved external discipline must be applied. To charge that to do this is repressive is to question the principle of government by law rather than by personal whims.
>
> * * * * *
>
> There is nothing to indicate that teachers will use corporal punishment on a wide scale. They have made it clear that they mainly want to be relieved of the rule against it.
>
> Where corporal punishment is permitted, the use of it seems infrequent. There is no indication of widespread misuse of this authority where it is permitted.
>
> Moreover, the proposed guidelines for the use of corporal punishment limit the act to

> specific measures. The striking about the face, beating or shaking are not acceptable forms of corporal punishment.
>
> The teacher is responsible for classroom discipline. She will not employ corporal punishment except when she believes to do so will be salutary. In many instances, she will not elect to use this form of control, particularly if the pupil is not likely to respond in a positive way, where the size of the pupils or the condition of behavior makes the use of corporal punishment impractical, or where other means of disciplining pupils are more promising. These may include suspension of privileges, isolation, detention after school, a consultation with parents, suspension or dismissal.
>
> The anxiety about mischief being done to children by possible application of a paddle should be outweighed by anxiety about undisciplined, uncontrolled, or unchecked behavior which may be effectively corrected in the classroom to the real advantage of the pupil. The worst treatment we can give a child in the classroom is to fail to define for him the limits of his rights and privileges. The most insecure child is one who is given complete license to act as he will.
>
> The most security comes from telling the child what to expect if he gets out of bounds.
>
> If there are parents who do not use corporal punishment in their own families and do not want teachers to do so, such parents may notify the principal in writing of their wishes on this matter. In so doing, they must assume responsibility for seeing to it that their children behave well in class and, where this does not take place, will themselves supply the necessary sanctions to bring about an improvement in behavior.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The Superintendent has repeatedly explained his position: the authority of the teacher must be clear and unequivocal. The rule against corporal punishment seriously erodes this authority. This conclusion is the result of recent widespread inquiry among teachers substantiated by subsequent polls by teacher organizations.
>
> * * * * *
>
> What is most needed at this time is a firm commitment by the Board of Education to support their teachers in maintaining discipline. The time for action is now, and this should be practical and usable. Extended remarks upon the philosophy of education, the sanctity of childhood, the exclusive use of reason as the way to get children to behave satisfactorily will not satisfy the school staff.

More than 95 percent of the members of the Classroom Teachers Council of the District of Columbia, comprising some 3,500 elementary, junior high, and senior high school teachers, expressed approval of Dr. Hansen's position in this matter. Their spokesman testified at a public hearing on H.R. 4274, held March 26, 1963, in part as follows:

> We deplore the numerous misinterpretations which have obscured for some citizens the purpose and proposed administration of these proposals. We reiterate that the sole purpose of the proposed changes is to insure a more positive, constructive school climate which will work to the advantage of all students who are attending school to learn. It is understood that disciplinary problems arise among a very small minority, but these problems can seriously obstruct procedures designed to benefit the many.
>
> We believe that children need and will respect a firm administrative policy which gives them a sense of security, an awareness of adult leadership and authority, and the knowledge that schools are established basically to build good citizens who obey laws and respect the rights of others.
>
> Inasmuch as the Board of Education has within its jurisdiction the power to permit the use of corporal punishment, we believe that this power should remain vested in that body. However, if no such constructive action is taken by the Board of Education, it is imperative that H.R. 4274 be passed by the Congress.

This same sentiment was expressed by a representative of the District of Columbia Education Association, who stated:

> The executive board recommended deletion of the rule of the Board of Education prohibiting corporal punishment. We believe with the Superintendent of Schools that teachers are not desirous of employing corporal punishment, but that they do desire to be relieved of the effect of the rule against it, since the rule causes some children to be unresponsive to authority.
>
> As Dr. Hansen has stated, students and parents must understand that touching a child, leading him forcibly from the room, and subduing him because he has become uncontrollable are examples of disciplinary control which are permissible. Successful disciplinary control, whether it be in the classrooms, corridors, or other places where greater freedom is permitted should always be considered a cooperative endeavor of the entire staff in a school building, the children and the parents. Parents must be made to realize that they have a tremendous part to play in creating respect on the part of their children for the authority of teachers and school officers.

Strong support for this removal of the ban on corporal punishment was expressed also by numerous citizens and civic organizations, both to this committee at hearings on March 13 and 26, 1963, and at a public hearing held by the Committee on Rules of the District of Columbia Board of Education on April 8, 1963.

On April 17, 1963, however, despite the strong and widespread support for this measure, both local and from other jurisdictions, a divided District of Columbia Board of Education voted against any modification of their present ban on the use of reasonable force. Inasmuch as the Board of Education has thus declined to take this realistic and salutary step to grant to the teaching personnel of the District of Columbia public schools a disciplinary authority which exists in 49 States, this committee feels that this legislation is essential to the restoration of discipline and order in the public schools of the Nation's Capital.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. McFALL), there were—ayes 60, noes 7.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, and the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 278, nays 53, not voting 102, as follows:

[Roll No. 44]

YEAS—278

Abbitt
Abele
Abernethy
Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Alger
Anderson
Andrews
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Avery
Ayres
Baker
Baldwin
Barry
Bass
Battin
Becker
Beckworth
Beermann
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Boggs
Boland
Bolton,
  Frances P.
Bonner
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Brock
Bromwell
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Bruce
Burkhalter
Burleson
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cameron
Cannon
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clark
Clausen
Collier
Colmer
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Denton
Derwinski
Devine
Dingell
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Dwyer
Elliott
Everett
Evins
Feighan
Findley
Fisher
Flood
Foreman
Fountain
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gathings
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Goodell
Goodling
Grant
Gray
Griffin
Griffiths
Gross
Gubser
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hébert
Hechler
Hemphill
Herlong
Hoeven
Hoffman
Holland
Horan
Horton
Huddleston
Hull
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jensen
Johansen
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Keith
Kelly
Kilburn
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Knox
Kornegay
Kunkel
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
McClory
McIntire
McLoskey
McMillan
Macdonald
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Nebr.
Matthews
May
Meader
Michel
Milliken
Mills
Minshall
Monagan
Montoya
Moore
Morgan
Morris
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Multer
Murray
Natcher
Nelsen
Norblad
Nygaard
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Perkins
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Rhodes, Pa.
Rich
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Ala.
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney
Rostenkowski
Roush
Rumsfeld
St. George
St Germain
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Sheppard
Short
Shriver
Sibal
Sikes
Siler
Sisk
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Stephens
Stinson
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taft
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Thornberry
Tollefson
Trimble
Tuck
Tupper
Tuten
Utt
Van Pelt
Vinson
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watson
Watts
Weaver
Weltner
Wharton
White
Whitener
Wickersham
Widnall
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson,
  Charles H.
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wright
Wydler
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—53

Ashley
Brown, Calif.
Burke
Byrne, Pa.
Cohelan
Corman
Daddario
Daniels
Dent
Duncan
Edwards
Fallon
Finnegan
Fraser
Friedel
Gallagher
Gill
Green, Oreg.
Hanna
Hansen
Hawkins
Joelson
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kyl
Leggett
Libonati
Lindsay
Long, Md.
McDowell
McFall
Matsunaga
Minish
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olson, Minn.
Price
Reuss
Rodino
Roybal
Ryan, N.Y.
Schwengel
Shipley
Sickles
Smith, Iowa
Toll
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin

NOT VOTING—102

Arends
Baring
Barrett
Bates
Belcher
Blatnik
Bolling
Bolton, Oliver P.
Buckley
Burton
Carey
Celler
Clancy
Cleveland
Conte
Cooley
Davis, Tenn.
Delaney
Derounian
Diggs
Donohue
Edmondson
Ellsworth
Farbstein
Fascell
Fino
Flynt
Fogarty
Ford
Forrester
Frelinghuysen
Garmatz
Gary
Gavin
Giaimo
Gilbert
Glenn
Grabowski
Green, Pa.
Grover
Gurney
Halpern
Harding
Harris
Hays
Healey
Henderson
Holifield
Hosmer
Jarman
Jennings
Johnson, Calif.
Kee
Keogh
Kluczynski
Lankford
Lesinski
McCulloch
McDade
MacGregor
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Miller, Calif.
Miller, N.Y.
Moorhead
Morrison
Murphy, N.Y.
Nedzi
Nix
O'Neill
Osmers
Pepper
Philbin
Pilcher
Pillion
Powell
Rains
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rogers, Tex.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Roudebush
Ryan, Mich.
St. Onge
Schenck
Shelley
Slack
Staebler
Staggers
Steed
Taylor
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Vanik
Walter
Westland
Whalley
Whitten
Wyman

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Walter with Mr. Conte.

Mr. Taylor with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. Donohue with Mr. Wyman.

Mr. Philbin with Mr. Ford.

Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Arends.

Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Grover.

Mr. Fascell with Mr. McCulloch.

Mr. Nix with Mr. Glenn.

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Pillion.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Oliver P. Bolton.

Mr. Henderson with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.

Mr. Harding with Mr. Osmers.

Mr. Staggers with Mr. Derounian.

Mr. Steed with Mr. Clancy.

Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Bates.

Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. MacGregor.

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Halpern.

Mr. Giaimo with Mr. Westland.

Mr. Grabowski with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Roudebush.

Mr. Shelley with Mr. Miller of New York.

Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Burton.

Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Gavin.

Mr. Johnson of California with Mr. Whalley.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. McDade.

Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Belcher.

Mr. Forrester with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. Hays with Mr. Schenck.

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Mathias.

Mr. Jennings with Mr. Gurney.

Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Robison.

Mr. Rains with Mr. Cleveland.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Hosmer.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Baring.

Mr. Cooley with Mr. Keogh.

Mr. Diggs with Mr. Farbstein.

Mr. Vanik with Mr. Powell.

Mr. Lankford with Mr. Celler.

Mr. Gary with Mr. Gilbert.

Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Delaney.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Buckley.

Mr. Jarman with Mr. Carey.

Mr. Slack with Mr. Murphy of New York.

Mr. Whitten with Mr. Healey.

Mr. Flynt with Mr. Nedzi.

Mr. Harris with Mr. Ryan of Michigan.

Mr. Pilcher with Mr. Rosenthal.

Mr. Roberts of Texas with Mr. Staebler.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. BURKE changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend section 2 of the act of June 20, 1906, as amended."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HORIZONTAL PROPERTY ACT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMillan].

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Huddleston] to call up the next bill.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 4276) to provide for the creation of horizontal property regimes in the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Horizontal Property Act of the District of Columbia".

Sec. 2. Definitions.—Unless it is plainly evident from the context that a different meaning is intended, as used herein—

(a) "Unit" or "condominium unit" means an enclosed space, consisting of one or more rooms, occupying all or part of a floor in buildings of one or more floors or stories regardless of whether it be designed for residence, for office, for the operation of any industry or business, or for any other type or independent use, and shall include such accessory units as may be appended thereto, such as garage space, storage space, balcony, terrace or patio: *Provided,* That said unit has a direct exit to a thoroughfare or to a given common space leading to a thoroughfare.

(b) "Condominium" means the ownership of single units in a multiunit structure with common elements.

(c) "Condominium project" means a real estate condominium project; a plan or project whereby five or more apartments, rooms, office spaces, or other units in existing or proposed buildings or structures are offered or proposed to be offered for sale.

(d) "Coowner" means a person, persons, corporation, trust, or other legal entity, or any combination thereof, that owns a condominium unit within the building.

(e) "Council of coowners" means the coowners as defined in subsection (d) of this section, acting as a group in accordance with the provisions of this Act and the bylaws and declaration established thereunder; and a majority, as defined in subsection (h) of this section, shall, except as otherwise provided in this Act, constitute a quorum for the adoption of decisions.

(f) "General common elements" except as otherwise provided in the plat of condominium subdivision, means and includes—

(1) the land on which the building stands in fee simple or leased provided that leasehold interest of each unit is separable from the leasehold interests of the other units;

(2) the foundations, main walls, roofs, halls, columns, girders, beams, supports, corridors, fire escapes, lobbies, stairways, and entrance and exit or communication ways;

(3) the basements, flat roofs, yards, and gardens, except as otherwise provided or stipulated;

(4) the premises for lodging of janitors or persons in charge of the building, except as otherwise provided or stipulated;

(5) the compartments or installations of central services such as power, light, gas, cold and hot water, heating, central air conditioning or central refrigeration, swimming pools, reservoirs, water tanks and pumps, and the like;

(6) the elevators, garbage incinerators and, in general, all devices or installations existing for common use; and

(7) all other elements of the building rationally of common use or necessary to its existence, upkeep, and safety.

(g) "Limited common elements" means and includes those common elements which are agreed upon by all the coowners to be reserved for the use of a certain number of condominium units, such as special corridors, stairways, and elevators, sanitary services common to the apartments of a particular floor, and the like.

(h) "Majority of coowners," "two-thirds of the coowners," and "three-fourths of the coowners" means, respectively, 51, 66⅔ and 75 per centum or more of the votes of the coowners computed in accordance with their percentage interests as established under section 6 of this Act.

(i) "Plat of condominium subdivision" means the plat of the surveyor of the District of Columbia establishing the condominium units, accessory units, general common elements, and limited common elements.

(j) "Person" means a natural individual, corporation, trustee, or other legal entity or any combination thereof.

(k) "Developer" means a person that undertakes to develop a real estate condominium project.

(l) "Property" means and includes the lands whether leasehold, if separable as defined in (f)(1) of this section, or in fee simple, the building, all improvements and structures thereon, and all easements, rights, and appurtenances thereunto belonging.

(m) "To record" means to record in accordance with the provisions of section 499 of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia", approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1189, 1268).

(n) "Common expenses" means and includes—

(1) all sums lawfully assessed against the unit owners by the council of coowners;

(2) expenses of administration, maintenance, repair, or replacement of the common areas and facilities, including repair and replacement funds as may be established;

(3) expenses agreed upon as common expenses by the council of coowners;

(4) expenses declared common expenses by the provisions of this Act or by the bylaws.

(o) "Common profits" means the balance of all income, rents, profits, and revenues from the common areas and facilities remaining after deduction of the common expenses.

(p) All words used herein include the male, female, and neuter genders and include the singular or plural numbers, as the case may be.

SEC. 3. HORIZONTAL PROPERTY REGIMES.—Whenever the owners or the coowners of any square or lot shall subdivide the same into a condominium project in conformity with section 9 of this Act with a plat of condominium subdivision there shall be established a horizontal property regime.

SEC. 4. STATUS OF CONDOMINIUM UNITS WITHIN A HORIZONTAL PROPERTY REGIME.—Once the property is subdivided into the horizontal property regime, a condominium unit in the building may be individually conveyed, leased, and encumbered and may be inherited or devised by will, as if it were sole and entirely independent of the other condominium units in the building of which it forms a part; the said separate units shall have the same incidents as real property and the corresponding individual titles and interests therein shall be recordable.

SEC. 5. JOINT TENANCIES, TENANCIES IN COMMON, TENANCIES BY THE ENTIRETY.—Any condominium unit may be held and owned by more than one person as joint tenants, as tenants in common, as tenants by the entirety (in the case of husband and wife), or in any other real property tenancy relationship recognized under the laws of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 6. OWNERSHIP OF CONDOMINIUM UNITS, OF COMMON ELEMENTS; DECLARATION; VOTING; INDIVIDUAL UNIT DEEDS.—A condominium unit owner shall have the exclusive fee simple ownership of his unit and shall have a common right to a share, with the other coowners, of an undivided fee simple interest in the common elements of the property, equivalent to the percentage representing the value of the unit to the value of whole property.

Said percentage interest shall not be separated from the unit to which it appertains.

The individual percentages shall be established at the time the horizontal property regime is constituted by the recording among the land records of the District of Columbia, of a declaration setting forth said percentages, shall have a permanent character, and shall not be changed without the acquiescence of the coowners representing all the condominium units in the building, which said change shall be evidenced by an appropriate amendatory declaration to such effect recorded among the land records of the District of Columbia. Said share interest shall be set forth of record, in the initial individual condominium unit deeds. Said share interests in the common elements shall, nevertheless, be subject to mutual rights of ingress, egress, and regress of use and enjoyment of the other coowners.

The said basic value of said undivided common interest shall be fixed for the purposes of this Act and shall not fix the market value of the individual condominium units and undivided share interests and shall not prevent each coowner from fixing a different circumstantial value to his condominium unit and undivided share interest in the common elements, in all types of acts and contracts.

In addition to the foregoing provisions, the declaration may contain other provisions and attachments relating to the condominium and to the units which are not inconsistent with this Act.

Voting at all meetings of the coowners shall be on a percentage basis, and the percentage of the vote to which each coowner is entitled shall be the individual percentage assigned to his unit in the declaration.

Individual condominium unit deeds may make reference to this Act, the condominium subdivision and land subdivision plats referred to in section 10 hereof, the declaration provided for in this section, the bylaws of the council of coowners, and the deeds may include any further details which the grantor and grantee may deem desirable to set forth consistent with the declaration and this Act.

SEC. 7. INDIVISIBILITY OF COMMON ELEMENTS; LIMITATION UPON PARTITION.—The common elements, both general and limited, shall remain undivided. No unit owner, or any other person, shall bring any action for partition or division of the coownership permitted under section 93 and related provisions of the Act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stats. 1203), as amended by Act of June 30, 1902 (32 Stats. 523, ch. 1329), against any other owner or owners of any interest or interests in the same horizontal property regime so as to terminate the regime.

Nothing contained in this section shall be construed as a limitation on partition by the owners of one or more units in a regime as to the individual ownership of such unit or units without terminating the regime or as to the ownership of property outside the regime: *Provided*, That upon partition of any such individual unit the same shall be sold as an entity and shall not be partitioned in kind.

SEC. 8. USE OF ELEMENTS HELD IN COMMON, RIGHT TO REPAIR COMMON ELEMENTS.—Each coowner may use the elements held in common in accordance with the purposes for which they are intended, without hindering or encroaching upon the lawful rights of the other coowners.

The manager, board of directors or of administration, as the case may be shall have an irrevocable right and an easement to enter units to make repairs to common elements or when repairs reasonably appear to be necessary for public safety or to prevent damage to property other than the unit.

SEC. 9. CONDOMINIUM SUBDIVISION.—Whenever the owner or the coowners of any square or lot duly subdivided in confirmity with section 1581 of the Act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1425), or other applicable laws of the District of Columbia, shall deem it necessary to subdivide the same into a condominium project of convenient condominium units for sale and occupancy and means of access for their accommodation, he may cause a plat or plats to be made by the surveyor of the District of Columbia, on which said plats, together, shall be expressed—

(a) the ground dimensions as set forth under such section 1581 and the exterior lengths of all lines of the building;

(b) for each floor of the condominium subdivision, the number of letter, dimensions, and lengths of finished interior surfaces of unit dividing walls of the individual condominium units; the elevations (or average elevation, in the case of slight variance) from a fixed known point, of finished floors and of finished ceilings of such condominium units situate upon the same floor, and further expressing the area, the relationship of each unit to the other upon the same floor and their relationship to the common elements upon said floor.

(c) the dimensions and lengths of the interior finished surface of walls, elevations, from said same fixed known point, of the finished floors and of the finished ceilings of the general common elements of the building, and, in proper case, of the limited common elements restricted to a given number of condominium units, expressing which are those units.

(d) any other data necessary for the identification of the individual condominium units and the general and limited common elements.

And said owners or coowners may certify such condominium subdivisions under their hands and seals in the presence of two credible witnesses, upon the same plat or on a paper or a parchment attached thereto. And the same shall thereupon be put up, labeled, indexed, and preserved for record and deposit with the office of the surveyor for the District of Columbia in like manner as land subdivisions have been heretofore recorded or in such other books as the said surveyor may prescribe.

SEC. 10. REFERENCE TO PLAT.—When a plat of a condominium project and subdivision shall be so certified, examined, and recorded, the purchaser of any condominium unit thereof or any person interested therein, may refer to the plat and record for description in the same manner as to squares and lots divided between the Commissioners and the original proprietors and in the same manner as has been heretofore the practice for land subdivisions: *Provided*, That said purchaser or other person interested therein shall also make reference to the plat of land subdivision appearing prior to the establishment of the condominium subdivision thereupon. Any such conveyance of an individual condominium unit shall be deemed to also convey the undivided interest of the owner in the common elements, both general and limited and of any accessory units, if any, appertaining to said condominium unit without specifically or particularly referring to the same.

SEC. 11. TERMINATION AND WAIVER OF REGIME.—All the coowners or the sole owner of a building constituted unto a horizontal property regime may terminate and waive this regime and regroup or merge the individual and several condominium units with the principal property; such termination and waiver shall be by certification to such effect upon the plat of condominium subdivision establishing the particular horizontal property regime under the hands and seals of the said sole owner or coowners, in the presence of two credible witnesses, upon the same plat or upon a paper or parchment attached thereto: *Provided*, That the said individual condominium units are unencumbered, or if encumbered, that the creditors in whose behalf the encumbrances are recorded agree to accept as security the undivided interest in the property of the debtor coowner and said creditors or trustees under duly recorded deeds of trust, shall signify their assent to such termination and waiver upon the aforesaid plat, paper, or parchment: *Provided further*, That should the buildings or other improvements in a condominium project be more than two-thirds destroyed by fire or other disaster, the coowners of three-fourths of the condominium project may waive and terminate the horizontal property regime and may certify to such termination and waiver: *And provided further*, That if within ninety days of the date of such damage or destruction:

(a) the council of coowners does not determine to repair, reconstruct or rebuild as provided in sections 21 and 22 of this Act, or,

(b) the insurance indemnity is delivered pro rata to the coowners in conformity with the provisions of section 21 of this Act and if the coowners do not terminate and waive the regime in conformity with this section of this Act, then any unit owner or any other person aggrieved thereby may file a petition in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, setting forth under oath such facts as may be necessary to entitle the petitioner to the relief prayed and praying judicial termination of the horizontal property regime. Said petition may be served as provided in section 14(g) of this Act. The court may thereupon lay a rule upon the council of coowners, unless they shall voluntarily appear and admit the allegations of the petition, to show cause, under oath, on or before the tenth day, exclusive of Sundays and legal holidays, after service of such rule, why the prayers of said petition should not be granted. If no cause be shown against the prayer of the petition by the council of coowners, or by any one of the coowners, the court may determine in a summary way whether the facts warrant termination and thereupon the court may decree the particular horizontal property regime terminated.

In the event a horizontal property regime is terminated or waived, the property shall be deemed to be owned in common by the coowners, and the undivided interest in the property owned in common which shall appertain to each coowner shall be the percentage of undivided interest previously owned by such coowner in the common elements in the property as set forth in the declaration under section 6 hereof.

Upon such termination and waiver the provisions of section 10 of this Act shall no longer be applicable and reference to the principal property thereupon, shall be to the plat and record of the prior land subdivision and thereupon the restraint against partition or division of the coownership imposed by section 7 of this Act shall no longer apply. In the event of such partition suit the net proceeds shall be divided among all the unit owners, in porportion to their respective undivided ownership of the common elements, after first paying off, out of the respective shares of the unit owners, all liens on the unit of each unit owner.

Sec. 12. Merger No Bar to Reconstitution.—The merger provided for in the preceding section shall in no way bar the subsequent constitution of the property into another horizontal property regime whenever so desired and upon observance of the provisions of this Act.

Sec. 13. Bylaws, Availability for Examination.—The administration of every building constituted into a horizontal property regime shall be governed by the bylaws as the council of coowners may from time to time adopt, which said bylaws together with the declaration, including recorded attachments thereto, referred to in section 6 of this Act shall be available for examination by all the coowners, their duly authorized attorneys or agents, at convenient hours on working days that shall be set and announced for general knowledge.

A true copy of said bylaws shall be annexed to the declaration referred to in section 6 of this Act and made a part thereof. No modification of or amendment to the bylaws shall be valid unless set forth in an amendment to the declaration and such amendment is duly recorded.

Each unit owner shall comply strictly with the bylaws and with the administrative rules and regulations adopted pursuant thereto, as either of the same may be lawfully amended from time to time. Failure to comply with any of the same shall be ground for an action to recover sums due, for damages or injunctive relief or both, maintainable by the manager, the administrator, board of directors or of administration, or as specified in the bylaws or in proper case, by an aggrieved unit owner.

Sec. 14. Necessary Contents of Bylaws; Modification of System.—The bylaws must necessarily provide for at least the following:

(a) Form of administration, indicating whether this shall be in charge of an administrator, manager, or of a board of directors, or of administration, or otherwise, and specifying the powers, manner of removal, and, where proper, the compensation thereof.

(b) Method of calling or summoning the coowners to assemble; that a majority of coowners is required to adopt decisions, except as otherwise provided in this Act; who is to preside over the meeting and who will keep the minute book wherein the resolutions shall be recorded.

(c) Care, upkeep, and surveillance of the building and its general or limited common elements and services.

(d) Manner of collecting from the coowners for the payment of common expenses.

(e) Designation, hiring, and dismissal of the personnel necessary for the good working order of the building and for the proper care of the general or limited common elements and to provide services for the building.

(f) Such restrictions on or requirements respecting the use and maintenance of the units and the use of the common elements as are designed to prevent unreasonable interference with the use of the respective units and of the common elements by the several unit owners.

(g) Designation of person authorized to accept service of process in any action relating to two or more units or to the common elements as authorized under section 24 of this Act. Such person must be a resident of and maintain an office in the District of Columbia.

(h) Notice as to the existence or nonexistence of a declaration in trust for the enforcement of the lien for common expenses permitted under section 19 of this Act.

The sole owner of the building, or if there be more than one, the coowners representing two-thirds of the votes provided for in section 6 of this Act may at any time modify the system of administration, but each one of the particulars set forth in this section shall always be embodied in the bylaws.

Sec. 15. Books of Receipts and Expenditures; Availability for Examination.—The manager, administrator, or the board of directors, or of administration, or other form of administration specified in the bylaws, shall keep books with detailed accounts in chronological order, of the receipts and of the expenditures affecting the building and its administration and specifying the maintenance and repair expenses of the common elements and any other expenses incurred. Both said books and the vouchers accrediting the entries made thereupon shall be available for examination by the coowners, their duly authorized agents or attorneys, at convenient hours on working days that shall be set and announced for general knowledge. All books and records shall be kept in accordance with good accounting practice and shall be audited at least once a year by an auditor outside the organization.

Sec. 16. Common Profits, Contributions for Payment of Common Expenses of Administration and Maintenance.—The common profits of the property shall be distributed among and the common expenses shall be charged to the unit owners according to the percentages establishsed by section 6 of this Act.

All coowners are bound to contribute in accordance with the said percentages toward the expenses of administration and of maintenance and repairs of the general common elements, and, in proper case, of the limited common elements of the building and toward any other expenses lawfully agreed upon by the council of coowners.

No owner shall be exempt from contributing toward such common expenses by waiver of the use or enjoyment of the common elements both general and limited, or by the abandonment of the condominium unit belonging to him.

Said contribution may be determined, levied, and assessed as a lien on the beginning of each calendar or fiscal year, and may become and be due and payable in such installments as the bylaws may provide, and said bylaws may further provide that upon default in the payment of any one or more of such installments, the balance of said lien may be accelerated at the option of the manager, board of directors, or of management and be declared due and payable in full.

Sec. 17. Priority of Liens.—The lien established by section 16 of this Act shall have preference over any other assessments, liens, judgments, or charges of whatever nature, except the following:

(a) General and special assessments for real estate taxes on the condominium unit and,

(b) The liens of any deeds of trust, mortgage instruments, or encumbrances duly recorded on the condominium unit prior to the assessment of the lien thereon or duly recorded on said unit after receipt of a written statement from the manager, board of directors, or of management reflecting that payments on said lien were current as of the date of recordation of said deed of trust, mortgage instrument, or encumbrance.

Upon a voluntary sale or conveyance of a condominium unit all unpaid assessments against a grantor coowner for his pro rata share of the expenses to which section 16 of this act refers shall first be paid out of the sales price or by the grantee in the order of preference set forth above. Upon an involuntary sale through foreclosure of a deed of trust, mortgage, or encumbrance having preference as set forth in subparagraph (b) of this section a purchaser thereunder shall not be liable for any installments of such lien as became due prior to his acquisition of title. Such arrears shall be deemed common expenses, collectible from all coowners, including such purchaser.

Sec. 18. Joint and Several Liability of Purchaser and Seller for Amounts Owing Under Section 16; Purchasers' Recovery, Purchasers' or Lenders' Right to a Statement Setting Forth Amount Due.—The purchaser of a condominium unit in a voluntary sale shall be jointly and severally liable with the seller for the amounts owing by the latter under section 16 of this Act upon his interest in the condominium unit up to the time of conveyance; without prejudice to the purchasers' right to recover from the other party the amounts paid by him as such joint debtor: *Provided*, That any such purchaser, or a lender under a deed of trust, mortgage, or encumbrance, or parties designated by them, shall be entitled to a statement from the manager, board of directors, or of administration, as the case may be, setting forth the amount of unpaid assessments against the seller or borrower, and the unit conveyed or encumbered shall not be subject to a lien for any unpaid assessment in excess of the amount set forth.

Sec. 19. Supplementary Method of Enforcement of Lien.—In addition to proceedings available at law or equity for the enforcement of the lien established by section 16 of this Act, all the owners of property constituted into a horizontal property regime may execute bonds conditioned upon the faithful performance and payment of the installments of the lien permitted by section 16 of this Act and may secure the payment of such obligations by a declaration in trust recorded among the land records of the District of Columbia, granting unto a trustee or trustees appropriate powers to the end that upon default in the performance of such bond, said declaration in trust may be foreclosed by said trustee or trustees, acting at the direction of the manager, board of directors, or of management, as is proper practice in the District of Columbia in foreclosing a deed of trust.

And the bylaws may require in the event such bonds have been executed and such declaration in trust is recorded that any subsequent purchaser of a condominium unit in said horizontal property regime shall take title subject thereto and shall assume such obligations: *Provided*, That the said lien, bond, and declaration in trust shall be subordinate to and a junior lien to liens of general or special assessments for real estate taxes, then or thereafter accruing against the unit and to the lien of any duly recorded deeds of trust, mortgages, or encumbrances previously placed upon the unit and said lien, bond, and declaration in trust shall be and become subordinate to any subsequently recorded deeds of trust, mortgages, or encumbrances: *Provided*, That the lender thereunder shall first obtain from the manager, board of directors, or of administration a written statement as provided in section 18, of this Act reflecting that payments due under this lien are current as of the date of recordation of such subsequent deed of trust, mortgage, or encumbrance.

SEC. 20. INSURING BUILDING AGAINST RISKS; INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS OF COOWNERS.—The manager or the board of directors, if required by the bylaws or by a majority of the coowners, or at the request of a mortgagee having a first mortgage of record covering a unit, shall have the authority to, and shall, obtain insurance for the property against loss or damage by fire and such other hazards under such terms and for such amounts as shall be required or requested. Such insurance coverage shall be written on the property in the name of such manager or of the board of directors of the council of coowners, as trustee for each of the unit owners in the percentages established in the declaration. Premiums shall be common expenses. Provision for such insurance shall be without prejudice to the right of each unit owner to insure his own unit for his benefit.

SEC. 21. APPLICATION OF INSURANCE PROCEEDS TO RECONSTRUCTION; PRO RATA DISTRIBUTION IN CERTAIN CASES; RULES GOVERNING.—In case of fire or other disaster the insurance indemnity shall, except as provided in the next succeeding paragraph of this section, be applied to reconstruct the building.

Reconstruction shall not be compulsory where destruction comprises the whole or more than two-thirds of the buildings and other improvements in a condominium project. In such cases, and unless otherwise unanimously agreed upon by the coowners, the indemnity shall be delivered pro rata to the coowners entitled to it in accordance with provisions made by the bylaws or in accordance with a decision of three-fourths of the coowners, if there be no bylaws provision, after first paying off, out of the respective shares of the unit owners, to the extent sufficient for the purpose, all liens on the unit of each coowner. Should it be proper to proceed with the reconstruction, the provision for such eventuality made in the bylaws shall be observed, or, in lieu thereof, the decision of the council of coowners shall prevail.

SEC. 22. SHARING OF RECONSTRUCTION COST WHERE BUILDING IS NOT INSURED OR INSURANCE INDEMNITY IS INSUFFICIENT; MODIFICATION OF SECTION OF RESOLUTION.—Where the building is not insured or where the insurance indemnity is insufficient to cover the cost of reconstruction the new building costs shall be paid by all the coowners in the same proportion as their proportionate ownership of the common elements of the condominium project, and if any one or more of those composing the minority shall refuse to make such payments, the majority may proceed with the reconstruction at the expense of all the coowners and the share of the resulting common expense may be assessed against all the coowners and such assessment for this expense shall have the same priority as provided under section 17 of this Act.

SEC. 23. SEPARATE TAXATION.—For the purposes of assessment and taxation of property constituted into a horizontal property regime and to conform to the system of numbering squares, lots, blocks, and parcels for taxation purposes in effect in the District of Columbia, each condominium unit duly situate upon a subdivided lot and square shall bear a number or letter that will distinguish it from every other condominium unit situate in said lot and square.

Each of said condominium units shall be carried on the records of the assessor as a separate and distinct entity and all real estate taxes, including general and special assessments, shall be assessed, levied, and collected against each of said several, separate, and distinct units in conformity with the percentages of coownership established by section 6 of this Act. Said individual assessments shall include the value of the percentage interest in the common elements and of the unit itself.

No forfeiture or sale of the improvements or the real estate as a whole for delinquent real estate taxes, special assessments, or charges shall ever divest or in anywise affect the title to an individual condominium unit so long as the real estate taxes or duly levied share of special assessments and charges on said individual condominium unit are currently paid.

SEC. 24. ACTIONS; RIGHT TO SEPARATE RELEASE OF JUDGMENT.—Without limiting the right of any coowner, actions may be brought on behalf of two or more of the unit owners, as their respective interests may appear, by the manager, or board of directors, or of administration with respect to any cause of action relating to the common elements or more than one unit.

Service of process on two or more unit owners in any action relating to the common elements may be made on the person designated in the bylaws in conformity with section 14(g) of this Act.

In the event of entry of a final judgment as a lien against two or more unit owners, the unit owners of the separate units may remove their unit and their percentage interest in the common elements from the lien thereof by payment of the fractional proportional amounts attributable to each of the units affected. Said individual payment shall be computed by reference to the percentage established pursuant to section 6 of this Act. After such partial payment, partial discharge, or release or other satisfaction, the unit and its percentage interest in the common elements shall thereafter be free and clear of the lien of such judgment.

Such partial payment, satisfaction, or discharge shall not prevent such a judgment creditor from proceeding to enforce his rights against any unit and its percentage interest in the common elements not so paid, satisfied or discharged.

SEC. 25. MECHANICS' AND MATERIALMEN'S LIENS, ENFORCEMENT THEREOF; REMOVAL FROM LIEN; EFFECT OF PART PAYMENT.—Subsequent to establishment of a horizontal property regime as provided in this Act, and while the property remains subject to this Act, no lien shall thereafter arise or be effective against the property. During such period liens or encumbrances shall arise or be created and enforced only against each unit and the percentage of undivided interest in the common areas and facilities appurtenant to such unit in the same manner and under the same conditions in every respect as liens or encumbrances may arise or be created upon or against any other separate parcel or real property subject to individual ownership: *Provided*, That no labor perfomed or materials furnished with the consent or at the request of a unit owner or his agent or his contractor or subcontractor, shall be the basis for the filing of a lien pursuant to the provisions of section 1237 of the Act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1384), against the unit or any other property of any other unit owner not expressly consenting to or requesting the same, except that such express consent shall be deemed to be given by the owner of any unit in the case of emergency repairs thereto. Labor performed or materials furnished for the common areas and facilities, if duly authorized by the council of coowners, the manager, or board of directors in accordance with this Act, the declaration or bylaws, shall be deemed to be performed or furnished with the expres consent of each unit owner and shall be the basis for the filing of a lien pursuant to the provisions of section 1237 of the Act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1384), against each of the units and shall be subject to the provisions of subparagraph (b) hereunder. Notice of said lien may be served on the person designated in conformity with section 14(g) of this Act.

(b) In the event of filing of a lien against two or more units and their respective percentage interest in the common elements, the unit owners of the separate units may remove their unit and their percentage interest in the common elements appurtenant thereto from the said lien by payment, or may file a written undertaking with surety approved by the court as provided in section 1254 of the Act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1387), of the fractional or proportional amounts attributable to each of the units affected. Said individual payment, or amount of bond, shall be computed by reference to the percentage established pursuant to section 6 of this Act. After such partial payment, filing of bond, partial discharge, or release, or other satisfaction, the unit and its percentage interest in the common elements shall thereafter be free and clear of such lien. Such partial payment, indemnity, satisfaction, or discharge shall not prevent the lienor from proceeding to enforce his rights against any unit and its percentage interest in the common elements not so paid, indemnified, satisfied, or discharged.

SEC. 26. ZONING.—The provisions of the zoning regulations of the District of Columbia, as may be in effect as of the date of enactment of this Act, shall not apply to the condominium subdivision as herein established: *Provided*, That whenever they deem it proper, the Zoning Commission of the District of Columbia may adopt rules and regulations, not inconsistent with general law, governing a horizontal property regime in order to implement this program: *And provided further*, That this section of this Act shall not be construed so as to create an exception, not otherwise authorized, as to the conformity of use or of structure in whatever district the lot of the land subdivision or the building thereon may be situate within the zoning plan of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 27. SUPPLEMENT OF EXISTING CODE PROVISIONS.—The provisions of this Act shall be in addition to and supplemental to all other provisions of law of the District of Columbia and wheresoever there appears in the provisions the words "square", "lot", "land", "ground", "parcel", "property", "block", or other designation denoting a unit of land, where appropriate to implement this Act, after such descriptive terms, there shall be deemed inserted reference to a condominium unit, condominium subdivision, or horizontal property regime, whichever shall be appropriate to effect the ends and purposes of this Act: *Provided*, That wherever the application of the provisions of this Act conflict with the application of such other provisions, this Act shall prevail.

SEC. 28. SEVERABILITY.—If any provisions of this Act, or any section, sentence, clause, phrase, or word or the application thereof, in any circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this Act, and of the application of any such provision, section, sentence, clause, phrase, or word in any other circumstances shall not be affected thereby and to this end, the provisions of this Act are declared severable.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill, H.R. 4276, is to establish within the District of Columbia a new estate in property, known as condominium, which is defined in the bill as "the ownership of single units in a multiunit structure with common elements."

The bill permits fee simple ownership of a unit in a multiunit structure which may be designed for residence, office, the operation of any industry or business, or any other type of use, with its accessory units—all of which is known as the horizontal property regime or condominium project. Not only does the person own in fee simple the space referred to, but he has an undivided interest in the public portions of the building, which include the roof, the walls, the ceiling, corridors, stairways, basement, heating and air-conditioning plants, and all other elements of common use.

Under the bill, persons would be enabled, not only to purchase and convey, but to lease and encumber, units in a building in the same manner as other real property, and purchasers would be entitled to deeds conveying said units to them along with an undivided share in the common elements referred to.

The bill provides for the creation of condominium projects which consist of five or more apartments, rooms, office spaces, or other units in existing or proposed buildings, so that they may be offered for sale. Units thereof may consist of one or more rooms of any closed space, occupying all or part of a floor or one or more floors, regardless of whether the building is designed for residency, office, industry or business, or any other type of independent use.

The bill is essential to provide for separate real estate taxation of the individual units and to permit the creation of horizontal subdivision plats. While these primary purposes are being accomplished, the bill also contains detailed authority for the creation of a quasi-corporation to manage the building; to restrain partition; to provide means to levy, collect, and enforce the lien for common expenses; to provide for separate release of the individual units from the liens of judgments or mechanics' liens—all to the end that the ownership of an individual unit will be as similar as possible to the incidents of ownership of an individual home, or business property.

The concept of ownership of real estate by condominium was recognized as early as the Code Napoleon of 1812. Legislation similar to the reported bill has been approved in the following 19 jurisdictions: Alaska, Arkansas, Arizona, Georgia, Hawaii, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Utah, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. Such legislation is also pending in 22 other States.

Testimony at the public hearing held on May 6, 1963, established that condominium has a flexibility which permits individual financing, and an individual purchaser can either pay cash for his unit, obtain a conventional loan, or an FHA-insured loan, and he will have freedom in repaying the loan or in making whatever financial arrangements he desires.

Condominium has advantages over cooperative projects which impose restrictions on resale, whereas there is no such restriction on the resale of a condominium unit. Cooperative projects usually require a downpayment of at least one-third of the cost, whereas under FHA and other financing, the downpayment for condominiums is much less. Cooperatives involve a stock or membership transaction, whereas condominium involves a real estate transaction, and the member of the condominium, when transferring ownership, has freedom in setting the selling price, and so forth.

The Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia endorse the principle and purpose of condominium legislation for the District. The bill was fully supported at the hearing by the District of Columbia Bar Association, the Federal Housing Administration of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, Lawyer's Title Insurance Corp., Washington Board of Realtors, Home Builders Association of Metropolitan Washington, Mortgage Bankers Association of Metropolitan Washington, and Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade.

The committee feels this to be meritorious legislation that will enable the District of Columbia to keep apace the surrounding jurisdictions in this recent development in property ownership.

Section 2: Definitions.

> (a) "Unit" or "condominium unit" means an enclosed space, consisting of one or more rooms, occupying all or part of a floor in buildings of one or more floors or stories regardless of whether it be designed for residence, for office, for the operation of any industry or business, or for any other type of independent use, and shall include such accessory units as may be appended thereto, such as garage, storage space, balcony, terrace or patio: *Provided*, That said unit has a direct exit to a thoroughfare or to a given common space leading to a thoroughfare.
>
> * * * * *
>
> (c) "Condominium project" means a real estate condominium project: a plan or project whereby five or more apartments, rooms, office spaces, or other units in existing or proposed buildings or structures are offered or proposed to be offered for sale.

Section 3: Horizontal property regimes. Conforms this new concept of ownership to the prevailing District of Columbia custom of subdivision by plat rather than the use of filed floor plans. The legislation recently enacted in Utah and Maryland also follows this form.

Section 4: Status of condominium units within a horizontal property regime. This provides that once the regime is established, the individual units may be conveyed, leased, or encumbered, may be inherited and devised by will, the same as any other real estate.

Section 5: Joint tenancies, tenancies in common, tenancies by the entirety. This section provides that title can be held like any other real estate, by joint tenancy, tenancy in common, tenancy by the entirety, or individually.

Section 6: Ownership of condominium units, of common elements; declaration; voting; individual unit deeds. Provides for the exclusive fee simple ownership of a condominium unit with the owner having a common right to share, with other coowners, an individual fee simple interest in the common elements of the property, equivalent to the percentage representing the value of the unit to the value of whole property.

Section 7: Indivisibility of common elements, limitation upon partition. Restrains judicial partition of the project while the same is subject to a horizontal property regime. This is an essential element to assure purchasers or lenders of the continued existence of the particular project in condominium form. In case the building is destroyed two-thirds or more by fire or other disaster, 75 percent of the coowners of the condominium project can decide whether to have the building rebuilt or the insurance money divided proratably among the coowners.

Section 8: Use of elements held in common, right to repair common elements. Is common to the legislation enacted in other States and designed to prevent one unit from becoming a hazard to other owners or to the public.

Section 9: Condominium subdivision. Details the form to be used in the creation of a plat of condominium subdivision. It parallels existing District of Columbia Code provisions for land subdivisions, permits condominiums only upon duly subdivided lots in order that the units dividing lines may be definitely fixed by the surveyor to established lot lines.

Section 10: Reference to plat. Provides for a short form of description of individual units to avoid metes and bounds descriptions of a cube to the end that the present short code form of deed may also be used in conveyance of condominium units.

Section 11: Termination and waiver of regime. Provides for termination of the horizontal property regime. A method of judicial termination has been added to permit termination where the coowners neglect or refuse to act in a situation where a partially damaged or destroyed building may become a hazard to the public. The regime cannot be terminated without the consent of all the coowners or the sole owner of the building. It is felt that it would be difficult to finance the individual condominium units if the regime could be destroyed without the consent of all the owners.

Section 12: Merger no bar to reconstitution. Provides for reconstitution and is common to the legislation of the other States.

Section 13: Bylaws, availability for examination.

Section 14: Necessary contents of bylaws; modification of system. Sections 13 and 14 authorize the adoption of bylaws, a copy of which must be annexed to the declaration under which the condominium regime is established and recorded among the land records. Thus each condominium owner will have public notice of the provisions of the bylaws and his rights and obligations thereunder and the results of noncompliance with the bylaws. The bylaws should also spell out whether in the event the owner of a unit desires to sell it the other coowners should have the first refusal.

In some jurisdictions this matter is covered by statute and the usual proviso is that the remaining owners of units have the right to meet any offered purchase price within 10 days. This is a protection to the other owners and in this fashion they have some control over the ownership of particular units.

Section 15: Books of receipts and expenditures; availability for examination. This provides for the keeping of accurate books of accounts which are open to all coowners during reasonable business hours. Books are to be kept according to standard accounting practice.

Section 16: Common profits, contributions for payment of common expenses of administration and maintenance. This section spells out the responsibilities of coowners to contribute toward the maintenance of the common elements and the nature and extent thereof and the responsibility for making repairs. No owner may escape contributing toward the upkeep of common elements by giving up the use or enjoyment of the individual unit belonging to him or her.

Section 17: Priority of liens. This spells out the creation of liens and the enforcement of liens for nonpayment toward the expenses of the common elements.

Section 18: Joint and several liability of purchaser and seller for amounts owing under section 16; purchasers' recovery, purchasers' or lenders' right to a statement setting forth amount due. This section sets out the right of a purchaser or lender to receive a statement from the management setting forth the unpaid assessments against the seller or borrower.

Section 19: Supplementary method of enforcement of lien. This is a supplementary method to enforce the lien for common expenses, to provide for a quick method of enforcement in a form parallel to the District of Columbia method of foreclosures under deeds of trust.

Section 20: Insuring building against risks; individual rights of coowners. Provides for insurance and follows the FHA model act.

Section 21: Application of insurance proceeds to reconstruction; pro rata distribution in certain cases; rules governing. This follows previously enacted legislation.

Section 22: Sharing of reconstruction cost where building is not insured or insurance indemnity is insufficient; modification of section of resolution. This has been revised to conform to HHFA technical comments.

Section 23: Separate taxation. Parallels existing District of Columbia Code provisions for assessment and taxation of real property and provides for separate taxation of the individual units. This fulfills an essential need.

Section 24: Actions; right to separate release of judgment.

Section 25: Mechanics' and materialmen's liens, enforcement thereof; removal from lien; effect of part payment. These two sections provide for an orderly manner of litigation and enables individual owners to obtain separate releases of judgments or mechanics' liens. Section 25 now conforms to HHFA's technical comments following the FHA model act.

Section 26: Zoning. This is intended to prevent zoning regulations being used to thwart establishment of condominium subdivision, yet permit regulation by the Zoning Commission of the project when considered as an entity.

Section 27: Supplement of existing code provisions. Is to supplement the existing code to the end that section-by-section revision will not be necessary to adapt the present code to this new concept and to give the horizontal property regime exemption, where necessary, from existing code provisions such as the rule against perpetuities.

Section 28: Severability. Is a standard severability provision.

WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACT

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

MAY, 8, 1963.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Speaker,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, the Committee on Agriculture on May 6, 1963, considered the work plans transmitted to you by Executive Communication No. 641 and referred to this committee and unanimously approved each of such plans. The work plans involved are:

New Mexico: Apache Brazito-Mesquite watershed.
Missouri: Callahan Creek watershed.
North Carolina: Conetoe Creek watershed.
Iowa: Held watershed.

Sincerely yours,
HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman.

GRANTS FOR COLLECTION OF HISTORICAL DOCUMENTS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, in a time such as ours when men are striving toward new horizons of freedom, knowledge of the intimate history of the formation of our Nation is of singular significance.

If we may assume that all men seek freedom, we must recognize the responsibility this Nation's political leaders and scholars have toward making available the broadest possible understanding of the beginning and the development of our own political institutions.

Every jot and tittle of our history can be important. It is difficult enough for free people to chart their own course wisely, but without knowing and understanding how we began or how we got this far the task is doubly difficult.

The most respected national leaders in our history have been earnest students of history as Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, and Alexander Hamilton were before them. We must not overlook any opportunity to encourage new leadership, informed in the priceless heritage of our history, to prepare themselves to meet new challenges, firm in the knowledge that to secure our unalienable rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

Mr. Speaker, the essential work of collecting, preserving, and publishing, when appropriate, documents which are important for an understanding of the history of the United States is not progressing as we would like it. Reports from the National Historical Publications Commission—first established by the Congress in 1934—indicate that not one of the major projects now underway is securely financed and that there are grave questions about the continuity of these significant projects.

The President has announced his enthusiastic support of a proposal by the Commission that the Federal Government make available funds to assure the continuation of this vital program.

Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which, I believe, will assure the Congress and our people of an orderly and efficient continuation of this critical research. It provides for a balanced program of Government and private participation and funding as suggested by the President under the direction of the National Historical Publications Commission. I believe every Member of the House of Representatives is keenly interested in the preservation and publication of appropriate key documents of American history and I insert the provisions of this legislative proposal at this point in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

A bill to amend section 503 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize grants for the collection, reproduction and publication of documentary source material significant to the history of the United States, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 503 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (44 U.S.C. 393) be amended as follows:

Subsection 503(d) is amended by inserting after the words "United States." the second time it appears the following language: "The Administrator is authorized, within the limits of appropriated and donated funds available therefor, to make allocations to Federal agencies, and grants to State and local agencies and to nonprofit organizations and institutions, for the collecting, describing, editing, and publishing (including microfilming and other forms of reproduction) of documentary sources significant to the history of the United States. Prior to making such allocations and grants, the Administrator should seek the advice and recommendations of the National Historical Publications Commission."

Section 503 is further amended by the addition of two new subsections as follows:

"503(e) The Commission is authorized to establish special advisory committees to consult with and make recommendations to it.

The members of such special advisory committees shall be chosen from among the leading historians, political scientists, archives, librarians, and other specialists of the Nation. Members of such special advisory committees shall be reimbursed for transportation and other expenses on the same basis as members of the Commission."

"503(f) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the General Services Administration an amount not to exceed $500,000 each year for the purposes specified in (d) above; *Provided:* That such appropriations shall be available until expended when so provided in appropriation acts."

DOMESTIC PEACE CORPS

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the following concurrent resolution was adopted by the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina.

I commend this timely and forthright resolution to the Members of Congress and to the people of this country:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OPPOSING A DOMESTIC PEACE CORPS

Whereas the General Assembly of South Carolina has been informed that an effort will be made to enact a statute by the Congress of the United States creating a Domestic Peace Corps; and

Whereas the members of the general assembly believe that a Peace Corps for domestic purposes is wholly unnecessary and may involve the expenditure of large sums from the Public Treasury which will be sorely needed to balance the national budget; and

Whereas the general assembly believes that if the passage of some type of legislation on this subject becomes inevitable, then the congressional delegation from South Carolina should make every effort to amend the statute to prohibit the Federal Government from sending any members of the Corps into any State except upon the invitation of the Governor of the State concerned: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of represenatives (the senate concurring), That the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives from South Carolina in the Congress of the United States are hereby requested to vigorously oppose the enactment of any legislation creating a Domestic Peace Corps; and be it further

Resolved, That the delegation from South Carolina in the Congress is further requested that if the enactment of such legislation becomes inevitable, then the delegation is requested to make every effort to amend the bill to prohibit the Federal Government from sending any member of the Domestic Peace Corps into any State except upon express invitation from the Governor of the State concerned; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives from South Carolina in the Congress of the United States.

AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE REPORTS SEGREGATION IN NEW YORK NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, the first item on the agenda of unfinished business before the Nation is civil rights, an issue which gets practically no service in the South and all too often more lipservice than action in the North. The American Veterans' Committee, which has been in the forefront of the fight for full equality for all our citizens, has brought to light a shocking pattern of segregation in the New York National Guard. I want to bring to the attention of the House a letter addressed to me from Murray Gross, the national chairman of the American Veterans Committee, which shows the extent of segregation in the New York National Guard.

Over a year ago, in April 1962, this segregation was called to the attention of Governor Rockefeller by the American Veterans Committee, yet no effective action has been taken to remedy the situation.

Murray Gross points out:

> Governor Rockefeller has, in the past, expressed criticism of the President because of alleged weakness in the civil rights area. It seems to AVC that the Governor should be encouraged to clean his own house first. The Governor is in a position to achieve full integration in the National Guard of his State by a stroke of the pen; AVC hopes that he may soon make the stroke effective.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon the Governor of New York to take immediate steps to eliminate segregation in the New York National Guard. I include the full text of the American Veterans Committee letter at this point in the RECORD:

AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE,
Washington, D.C., April 23, 1963.

The Honorable WILLIAM FITTS RYAN,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RYAN: The American Veterans Committee has long been concerned with the extent to which segregation persists in the New York National Guard.

When AVC learned that whole Infantry battle groups, located in New York County, had no Negro personnel whatever assigned to them, whereas other units, principally transportation and Artillery were virtually all-Negro as to officers and warrant officers, and contained large concentrations of Negro enlisted personnel, correspondence was initiated with Maj. Gen. A. C. O'Hara, commanding general of the New York National Guard.

General O'Hara's replies indicate that he thinks of the issue of segregation entirely in terms of whether new enlistments into existing units are considered without regard to race; General O'Hara apparently does not feel that the New York National Guard has any obligation to carry out the public policy of the State in terms of reshuffling personnel now assigned to all-white or substantially all-Negro units.

The American Veterans Committee communicated with Governor Rockefeller in April 1962, calling his attention to the state of the National Guard, and asking for his intervention. A conference was finally set up, which took place in June 1962, between General O'Hara and several senior officers of the New York National Guard, and an AVC delegation, in the presence of Mr. Charles Palmer, assistant secretary to the Governor. While the conference produced some minor results, so as to strengthen the process of keeping records as to applicants for enlistment, the National Guard reiterated its views that it had no policy requiring affirmative action looking toward the integration of existing units, and that it would not even take the lead in asking for volunteers to transfer to other units across racial lines.

The American Veterans Committee is now in possession of detailed figures, as of December 31, 1962, which show the racial makeup of the various units of the National Guard. The following are some examples from these figures:

(a) Not a single Negro is serving in any of the military police units of the State (102d MP Battalion, 27th, 105th and 107th MP Companies and 42d Division MP Detachment, comprising 23 officers, 3 warrant officers, and 326 enlisted men).

(b) Not a single Negro is serving in any of the ordnance units in the State (106th, 727th, and 742d Ordnance Battalions, together with their attached companies, comprising 52 officers, 34 warrant officers, and 1,108 enlisted men).

(c) Among all of the medical units in the State (102d and 134 Battalions), comprising 56 officers and 393 enlisted men, there are exactly 2 Negro enlisted men, a percentage of about 0.5 percent.

(d) Among all of the signal units in the State (104th Signal Group, 101st, 227th, and 242d Signal Battalions) comprising 53 officers, 15 warrant officers and 887 enlisted men, there is exactly 1 Negro enlisted man, a percentage of about 0.11 percent.

(e) Not a single Negro is serving in the 71st, 107th, and 165th Infantry Battle Groups, all located in Manhattan (which according to the 1960 census is over 25 percent nonwhite), and including 139 officers, 9 warrant officers, and 2,753 enlisted men.

(f) The 141st Transportation Battalion, with its attached companies has 18 out of 18 Negro officers, 6 out of 6 Negro warrant officers, and 238 out of 465 Negro enlisted men, or percentages of 100 percent, 100 percent and 51.1 percent respectively.

(g) The 369th Artillery, with its assigned batteries, has 21 out of 22 Negro officers, 3 out of 3 Negro warrant officers, and 240 out of 397 Negro enlisted men, or percentages of 95.5 percent, 100 percent, and 60.5 percent, respectilvely.

If these figures were reported from a State located in the South, or in which a legal policy requiring segregation had recently been abolished, such as North Carolina, they would be perfectly understandable.

Coming from New York, however, which State has a firm public policy dedicated to complete integration, at least of the public sector, they demonstrate a lamentable lack of leadership. Governor Rockefeller has, in the past, expressed criticism of the President because of alleged weakness in the civil rights area. It seems to AVC that the Governor should be encouraged to clean his own house first. The Governor is in a position to achieve full integration in the National Guard of his State by a stroke of the pen; AVC hopes that he may soon make the stroke effective.

Yours very truly,

MURRAY GROSS,
National Chairman,
American Veterans' Committee.

FPC HAS NO JURISDICTION OVER ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, information has come to me that the Federal Power Commission is, by administrative decision, extending its jurisdiction to regulate rural electric cooperatives.

Members will recollect that the 1935 amendments to the Federal Water Power Act, which give FPC its regulatory powers, were contained in the same bill as the Public Utility Holding Company Act. The purpose of the combined bill was to preclude repetition of certain undesirable financing and ratemaking practices in the electric utility business which was then dominated by a few big holding companies. The Federal Power Act must thus be viewed as remedial legislation and so interpreted.

The purpose of the Federal Power Act is to protect utility investors and to balance the conflicts inherent in investor-owned type business where there is substantial diversity of interest between owner and consumer. It is to protect the public interest that FPC is charged with responsibility to regulate interstate rates for the wholesale sale of energy for ultimate distribution to the public and to regulate the sale of utility company securities. The Congress did not intend to confer on FPC carte blanche authority to control the operation of electric cooperatives which were almost unknown in 1935 when Congress delegated regulatory power to FPC, and which are consumer-owned membership organizations.

In a cooperative there is no basic conflict of interest between owner and consumer. Consumers and owners have a unity of interest and control. If rates are too high the surplus which accumulates is returned to the member-consumers. And since the only security interest in an REA cooperative is held by the members and by the Federal Government, there is obviously no need to protect the general public against unsound securities. In addition to the self-regulating nature of electric cooperatives, the REA Administrator has complete authority and legal responsibility, under the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, to exercise, and does exercise, whatever control is necessary to assure that the systems for which he loans funds, operate in the public interest. And, if all this were not enough assurance, the Congress itself, by its power to amend the REA Act, and by its control over REA loan authorizations has absolute power of decision over electric cooperatives. FPC regulation is, therefore, wholly superfluous.

The FPC staff is already laboring against a backlog of 23 area gas rate proceedings, involving major suppliers, the disposition of each of which could take from 4 to 14 years, by the Commission's own estimates. In addition, proceedings concerned with the rate schedules, accounting practices and licensed hydroelectric project applications of major electric utility companies are under scrutiny by FPC.

By comparison with these problems involving a large segment of the public, REA-financed electric systems are so small that all of them together own less than 1 percent of the installed generating capacity of the United States and serve less than 8 percent of all electric consumers. The public interest to be served by FPC control of REA-financed systems is, therefore, small; even conceding such control to be in the public interest.

The Federal Power Act nowhere expresses or implies authority for FPC to regulate membership associations. The legislative history is just the opposite. The Rural Electrification Act, which came after the Federal Power Act, does not mention FPC. And during debate on the Rural Electrification Act, Congress expressly rejected participation by FPC in the rural electrification program. In fact, the concept of Congress conferring full authority on the REA Administrator to supervise loans under the act, and simultaneously requiring the borrowers, after they had obtained a loan from the Administrator, to seek FPC approval to issue a note and mortgage to the same Administrator, just does not make sense.

For 26 years, under Democratic and Republican administrations, the FPC did not assert jurisdiction over electric cooperatives. And during that time, in 1946 in fact, Congress rejected, by a record vote in the Senate, a proposal to subject electric cooperatives to FPC jurisdiction. Separate bills to give FPC such authority over cooperatives have been repeatedly introduced and have repeatedly died. Apparently, therefore, even those who favor FPC jurisdiction over electric cooperatives have been and are of the opinion that such jurisdiction does not now exist.

REA financed systems do not hold themselves out to serve the public, nor are they generally required to serve the public. They are, therefore, not public utilities in the generally accepted legal sense. And, a private business cannot be converted into a public utility by merely designating it as such.

To subject REA loans and REA regulated rates to FPC review is to impose an unnecessary and superfluous layer of governmental control on one of the most efficiently operated programs this Congress has ever sponsored.

I commend the Chairman of FPC for his decision to revitalize the role of his agency in regulating the electric utility industry. But, I question, as a matter of law and as a matter of policy, his effort to apply the influence of his agency to the rural electrification program; an area in which it is decidedly not needed and not authorized by law to be.

FEED GRAIN PROGRAMS

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, many people have assumed to speak for farmers relative to their preference of feed grain programs, but few scientifically based surveys have been taken. One was recently completed by the Wallaces farmer poll, showing that 73 percent of the Iowa farmers prefer the 1961–62–63 programs compared to only 6 percent that would prefer the program in effect in 1959–60. This also corresponds with private surveys that I have previously taken and reported to this body. This is a margin of 12 to 1, and indicates that farmers really want what will work and in the long run be the best for both the farmers and the taxpayers.

Although farmers were permitted unlimited production under the 1959–60 program, they know that supports without any limitation on production results in accumulated surpluses and higher storage costs. This poll conclusively indicates that the producers themselves want a program that will work in the long run, to the interest of our entire United States.

The poll also showed that the margin among Republicans was 67 percent for the new programs compared to 11 percent for the 1959–60 program. This is a margin of 6 to 1 among Republican farmers. The Democratic margin was about 40 to 1.

If those who oppose the feed grains programs of the past 2 years and still want to go back to the old approach do not represent farmers generally, Republican farmers, Democratic farmers, and certainly not taxpayers, they can only represent a few people who want burdensome surpluses upon which the Government must pay storage, unstable and erratic supplies, and greater fluctuation in supply and prices—even though it would cost both the farmers and the taxpayers a lot more.

Following is the full text of the report on the survey which I commend for study by each Member of this body:

WALLACES FARMER POLL: FARMERS LIKE PRESENT FEED GRAIN PROGRAM

Iowa farmers think highly of the voluntary feed grain programs in operation the last 3 years, according to a recent Wallaces farmer poll. Of those interviewed in a scientifically based survey, 73 percent preferred the recent programs over the other two choices—low level supports for all, and no Government program of any kind.

Congress is now considering legislation that will extend the feed grain program for 2 more years. Neither the administration nor Republican farm leaders have given the program their full support.

Its effectiveness in halting the buildup of feed grains in Government bins, however, is attracting an increasing amount of bipartisan support. Washington observers expect the voluntary plan to be extended.

Here is the question asked Iowa farmers: "Congress will consider a feed grain program for 1964 and beyond this year. Which of the following do you prefer?"

1. A voluntary program similar to the 1963 program with support price at $1.25, direct payments on corn produced, and payment for acres taken out of production for those who stay within their allotment.

2. A voluntary program similar to the 1961 and 1962 program with support price at $1.25 for those who stay within their allotment, higher payments for acres taken out of production than in choice No. 1, but no direct payments on corn grown.

3. A program with no planting restrictions and price supports for all producers at 81 cents per bushel, or 90 percent of the average price of the preceding 3 years, whichever is higher.

4. No Government program at all—no planting restrictions—and no support price.

Here is the way Iowa farmers voted:

	Percent
1. 1963 program	48
2. 1961–62 program	25
3. No allotments, low supports	6
4. No program	21

This indicates that farmers prefer the 1963 plan to the 1961–62 versions of the feed grain program about two to one. The direct payment idea, under which participators are paid 18 cents per bushel of normal yield of corn on allotted acres, was introduced this year. Payments for retired land were reduced. But the direct payments made the program more enticing for livestock producers who feed most or all of the grain they produce.

Proposal No. 3 is the corn program pushed by the American Farm Bureau Federation for several years. The conservatives in Iowa, who are influential in molding Farm Bureau policy, apparently prefer no Government intervention of any kind to the AFBF plan.

The voluntary program got its strongest backing from the larger farmers. They are in the best position to restrict corn acreage and retire some land. Of farmers with more than 300 acres of crops harvested last year, 92 percent voted for No. 1 or No. 2. Those with 200 to 299 acres gave the voluntary programs a 79-percent vote of approval.

Votes by political party preferences were as follows (percent):

	Republican	Democrat
No. 1	49	52
No. 2	27	29
No. 3	11	2
No. 4	23	17

Some of those interviewed said they didn't like them, but felt that agriculture is in such a fix that we can't get along without Government programs now. Many felt that present corn bases—the average of 1959 and 1960 plantings—were not fair. Those who were rotating their crops and carrying out a good conservation program were hurt.

"We need a program and No. 1 would be OK if the base was figured according to the number of crop acres," commented a young Clinton County farmer.

"I'm really not for controls at all, but I can see we have to do something about the surplus," said a Linn County farm owner. "So I have to choose one of the programs."

"We've tried all kinds of programs, none too successful," said an older Bremer County farmer. "Now let's try no Government program, no restrictions, no support price. It's worth a try."

SOCIALIZED JOB PLACEMENT

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an article.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the social planners in the Kennedy administration are becoming more and more brazen in forcing the Federal Government into fields far outside the jurisdiction conferred by the Constitution. The President has clearly shown his antipathy to business and private enterprise in his crackdown on the steel industry, his uncomplimentary remarks about businessmen in general and his consistent support of big labor in its demands upon business, however unreasonable.

Now we come to the U.S. Employment Service which is openly competing with private business and making every effort to encourage technical people to leave private industry in order to work for the Government.

Mr. Speaker, every time we permit the Federal Government to expand its control or influence in any area of our national life we move one step closer to dictatorship.

The private employment agencies represent a legitimate and sometimes highly technical business in job placement and in counseling and in putting qualified people in key positions. The bureaucrats have evidently marked this industry for nationalization if recent activities of the USES are interpreted correctly. Giving credence to such an interpretation is a statement by an official of the USES in which he frankly admits the Government is knowingly and purposely in competition with private employment agencies for the sole purpose of making the Government the sole source in this field.

The USES and Labor Department position is spelled out by Holmes Alexander in a recent article and I would like to include it as a part of my remarks. Mr. Speaker, I hope Congress will put a stop to such activities by taking action on a bill I introduced in the House and the companion bill introduced by a number of Members of the other body to get the Government out of business in competition with its citizens. My bill is H.R. 4926. Mr. Alexander's article follows:

SOCIALIZED JOB PLACEMENT

(By Holmes Alexander)

In Toledo, an Ohio spokesman for the U.S. Employment Service (USES) gave the following television comment to the question of whether his government bureau was in competition with the private enterprise employment agencies:

"I have no compunction about competing with private employment agencies," said this public servant, one Milton Davidson. "I want to make it very uncomfortable for those fee-charging agencies."

You could hardly find the bust-business policy of Federal bureaucracy more ruthlessly expressed. Here is the profit system frankly denounced. Here is the implicit socialistic philosophy which says that Government enterprise can do things better than private enterprise. Here is the diametric reversal of Lincoln's celebrated statement of governmental purpose:

"The object of Government is to do for a community of people, whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot so well do for themselves."

Today, there are 4.1 million unemployed persons in the United States of America, and a good many of them evidently cannot find work. It goes without saying that the purpose of the tax-supported Employment Service is to guide such hapless persons into jobs. But there are 68.1 million people who do have gainful positions, proving that they are not hapless.

And what do we find USES doing? We find at the latest report that, during 1962 USES got three new jobs for employed persons as against two jobs for the jobless. Some of the positions which the USES was brokering ran upward of $20,000 a year. It seems obvious that a man in that bracket hardly needs or deserves socialized job placement. So here is the government helping people who didn't need help more than it was helping people who did.

What else? The Government was actively threatening the jobs and incomes of persons who make a living in the employment agencies. It is a small American industry, but a socially useful one. I learn that there are roughly 4,500 firms which specialize in job-finding, that these firms engage 25,000 workers whose average income is a modest $5,000 a year.

These agents find themselves competing with a Federal bureau that charges no fee for job placement but which spends $160 million a year out of tax-supplied revenue.

Wondering if Mr. Davidson's TV statement represented official thinking, I contacted the Labor Department and got a startling viewpoint. I was told:

"There is a moral question of whether a man should have to pay to find a job."

The implication is plain that profit-seekers in the field of job placement, often a very specialized form of counseling and aptitude testing, are the equivalent of social bloodsuckers.

You could walk all over the New Frontier and not come up with a better example of why businessmen continue to regard this administration as antibusiness.

PROPAGANDA PARADE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, this accumulation of mail which I call to the attention of my colleagues has been received by one western Kansas farm family since January 1 of this year. It is all from the county agricultural stabilization and conservation service and consists of a mixture of propaganda for various Freeman farm programs, along with some material of an informational nature. Much of it might be categorized as "junk mail." It is all unsolicited.

There are 20 separate envelopes here—all mailed at Government expense to the same farmer since January 1. In some cases he received numerous copies of the same release. His wife, who mailed this material to me, notes that she has retained a stack of correspondence from the ASCS committee almost as large as the one she sent me. Her letter reads:

DEAR MR. DOLE: My husband and I think you will be interested in some of the information our local and national ASC office gives out. We have been impressed, unfavorably, with the amount of duplication.

My husband and father-in-law farm together, so to speak, and we live on the farm together. Yet each receives up to five copies of the same material, each copy in a different envelope.

We have received the enclosed material since January 1 of this year. We have kept everything of importance—loan papers, copies of the information, etc. That stack is almost as large as the one we sent you.

A lot of farmers around here are getting a little tired of sorting through all of these things to find out what's important.

We are concerned especially about the wheat referendum leaflet—its effect on the small grower, thus the effect on the general vote.

If each ASC office had to account for its postage (a postage meter would be fine), wouldn't that take care of some of the post office's problems? I mean five letters in 1 day, with five copies of the same thing. Really.

It is not my purpose to cause this Kansas farm family trouble so the names are omitted, however, I have the letter here if anyone wishes to examine it, and also the ASCS material forwarded.

Included in this inventory are four copies of an official USDA pamphlet apparently designed to influence farmers to vote "Yes" in the May 21 wheat referendum. The document tells this Kansas farm family—in quadruplicate—that—

> Reliable economists, both within and outside the Department of Agriculture, predict that the market price of wheat would drop to about $1 per bushel and that wheat income would decline about $700 million (if quotas are not approved). They also point out that this would have a serious adverse impact on prices for feed grain, livestock, and livestock products.

I would appreciate an opportunity to question these anonymous economists on this point, for any economist worth his salt would not say a 60-pound bushel of wheat would bring only $1 a bushel at the same time the Government was supporting a 56-pound bushel of corn at $1.25 as in 1963. Such a contention is ridiculous on its face, but it is nevertheless made and presumably has been sent—perhaps in quadruplicate—to every wheatgrower in the United States.

Among other items in the inventory of ASCS material sent to the Kansas farm family I have mentioned are:

Four copies of a USDA pamphlet soliciting farmers to sign up for the 1963 feed-grain program.

Four releases relating to the barley program, along with three others in different form, also relating to the barley program.

Six identical notices of "acreages, yields, payment rates for the 1963 feed-grain program."

Numerous other mimeographed letters and releases to farmers—in duplicate and triplicate—relating to various farm programs.

The collection is all here for anyone who wishes to examine it.

Clearly the most unmanageable surplus which confronts the Department of Agriculture is not cotton, corn, or wheat, but its own proliferation of printed and mimeographed propaganda. Perhaps the postal deficit would be eliminated, or at least substantially reduced, if Secretary of Agriculture Freeman would send just one—and not half a dozen—of each of his farm program sales brochures to every farm family.

With 5.5 million producers of wheat, barley, corn, and other feed grains, not to mention voluminous mailings to thousands of other farmers, the cost must run well into millions of dollars.

Since Postmaster General J. Edward Day is crying loud and long about the recent House cut in his postal budget, I suggest he contact Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman, and outline his views on a "supply-management" program for all governmental agencies using the U.S. mails. Freeman should be willing to adopt a "supply-management" program for USDA mailings, similar to the one he constantly advocates for the American farmer, for certainly here is an example of oversupply and little or no demand.

THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I take this time today to talk, as I have heretofore, about the problems of the textile industry which are continuing problems.

Someone has asked why we talk so often about these problems. It is because the seriousness continues; the dangers inherent in continuation of the present policies and the need for legislation continue night and day. No only are we losing textile jobs, but some of the textile plants are going out of business. Others are having to curtail their operation. Others find their profit margin is going down to such an extent they can no longer hope to stay in business.

I have particularly in mind an industry run by a friend of mine which is losing money this very day on account of Japanese imports, and because of the two-price cotton situation. This plant may go out of business on June 1 if something is not done.

At the same time all this is going on, we find that the textile industry, in keeping with its policy of being all for America, in keeping with a policy of industry and cooperation which during World War II brought forth E Certificates for efficiency of production for our Armed Forces and for our country, in keeping with its patriotism which sent the boys and girls of parents who worked in those mills overseas to fight for their country, today in keeping with their continuing desire to help the United States of America today are selling savings bonds to help the financing of our country. This is typical of this great American industry, a patriotic American industry, and for many, many reasons the textile industry deserves consideration of the Congress and relief from whoever is in position to give relief.

We have heard a lot here about the two-price cotton system. Simply stated, it is a situation in which foreign textile manufacturers, using the best machinery that money can buy, purchase our cotton at $42.50 a bale less, take it overseas, use labor which is paid about one-seventh of what our labor is paid, send goods back here and sell the processed materials for 25 percent less than we can produce them. It has disrupted our economy, it has taken jobs away from us, and it is ultimately going to cause the death of a great American industry if something is not done, and done soon.

On May 9 of this year, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture introduced H.R. 6196, entitled "A bill to encourage increased consumption of cotton, to maintain the income of cotton producers, to provide a special research program designed to lower costs of production, and for other purposes."

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding the following new section:

"SEC. 348. In order to maintain and expand domestic consumption of upland cotton produced in the United States and to prevent discrimination against the domestic users of such cotton, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commodity Credit Corporation, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, is authorized and directed for the period beginning with the date of enactment of this section and ending July 31, 1967, to make payments through the issuance of payment-in-kind certificates to persons other than producers in such amounts and subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines will eliminate inequities due to differences in the cost of raw cotton between domestic and foreign users of such cotton, including such payments as may be necessary to make raw cotton in inventory on the date of enactment of this section available for consumption at prices consistent with the purposes of this section: *Provided,* That beginning August 1, 1964, payments shall be made to persons other than producers in an amount as will make upland cotton produced in the United States available for domestic use at a price which is not in excess of the price at which such cotton is made available for export."

SEC. 2. Section 385 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended, by adding at the end thereof the following: "This section also shall be applicable to payments provided for under section 348 of this title."

SEC. 3. Section 104 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to conduct a special cotton research program designed to reduce the cost of producing upland cotton in the United States at the earliest practicable date. In carrying out this special research program, the Secretary is authorized to utilize not to exceed $10,000,000 annually of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Secretary shall report annually to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate with respect to the results of such research.

"(b) In establishing the level of price support to cooperators for each crop of upland cotton beginning with the 1965 crop of such cotton, the Secretary, notwithstanding the provisions of section 103, shall make such reductions in the price support level as will reflect reductions in the costs of producing cotton."

SEC. 4. Section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by inserting after the first proviso in the third sentence thereof the following: "*Provided further,* That beginning August 1, 1964, the Commodity Credit Corporation may sell upland cotton for unrestricted use at not less than 105 per centum of the current loan rate for such cotton under section 103(a) plus reasonable carrying charges:"

SEC. 5. Section 103 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by inserting "(a)" before the first sentence thereof and by adding at the end of such section the following new subsections:

"(b) For the 1964, 1965, and 1966 crops of cotton, the Secretary, notwithstanding any other provision of law, may provide to cooperators price support on not to exceed fifteen bales (standard five hundred pounds gross weight) of the production from their allotments at a level up to 10 per centum in excess of the basic level of price support established under subsection (a) hereof but not in excess of the level of price support for the 1963 crop.

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in order to keep cotton to the maximum extent practicable in the normal channels of trade, if the level of price support to cooperators for the 1964, 1965, or 1966 crop is increased under subsection (b), price support for cotton at the level established under subsection (b) shall be carried out through the simultaneous purchase of cotton at the support price therefor under subsection (b) and sale of such cotton at the support price therefor under subsection (a) or similar operations, including loans under which the cotton would be redeemable by payment of the amount for which the cotton would be redeemable if the loan thereon had been made at the support price for such cotton under subsection (a)."

Let me say to the Congress of the United States that while I do not think this legislation is all that is to be desired, nevertheless I commend the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture for introducing legislation, and I join many members of the textile industry in saluting and hailing this particular effort on the part of this distinguished gentleman. I know he is trying, and I salute him for trying to find a solution to this grave problem.

After the bill was introduced on May 10 of this year, the papers of the country carried many stories on this effort, and the major spokesmen for the cotton industry applauded the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY]. This bill would end the two-price cotton system, and in connection with the introduction of that particular bill, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, through the Committee on Agriculture, released a press release, and because I think it is proper to insert it at this point, I do so. It is as follows:

COOLEY INTRODUCES NEW COTTON BILL

Chairman HAROLD D. COOLEY, of the House Committee on Agriculture, introduced in the House today a new cotton bill, aimed at enabling cotton to compete fairly with synthetic fibers and improving the competitive position of domestic mills against imports of cheap foreign cotton goods.

The legislation would make American cotton available to domestic mills at world cotton prices, provide a special price protection for small cotton farms, and launch a crash research program to reduce the cost of producing cotton.

Upon introducing the bill, Mr. COOLEY stated:

"Agriculture is the biggest business in America in dollar value involved and people employed, and the cotton industry is the biggest part of American agriculture. Perhaps more than 10 million persons—almost one-sixth of the Nation's labor force—is engaged in the production of cotton, in ginning, marketing, transporting, milling, and in the manufacture and merchandising of cotton goods.

"Cotton now is in a life or death struggle.

"A flood of cheap textiles is flowing in from abroad, displacing the goods produced by our own workers and demoralizing the domestic markets for our textile industry.

"Synthetic fibers make devastating inroads into markets where cotton never before has been seriously challenged.

"I am sure that the cotton industry recognizes the amount of work the Committee on Agriculture has done at the time spent in attempting to arrive at a solution to the cotton problem. Our Cotton Subcommittee, headed by Hon. E. C. GATHINGS, of Arkansas, started hearings early in December and we have continued meetings with all segments of the cotton industry, up to this very moment.

"Early in this session of the Congress I introduced a very simple bill to remove the two-price cotton system (wherein foreign mills obtain our cotton at a much cheaper price than our own domestic mills) and thus enable cotton to compete more fairly with synthetic fibers and improve the competitive position of American mills against imports of foreign cotton goods.

"Controversy developed around this legislation, and around other bills which would have permitted the overplanting of allotted acres where a producer was willing to take the world price for cotton produced on the acreage planted in addition to his allotment.

"I then personally sought to bring all elements of the industry, and the administration, into agreement.

"Based on my conversations with producers, the trade and the mills, legislative language was drawn together. This language, in bill draft form, was submitted to the Department of Agriculture for comment, and it was discussed among all elements of the industry, and was considered at a meeting of cotton producers at Memphis on last Monday.

"The bill I introduced today represents the broadest area of possible agreement I have been able to find. This is not exclusively my bill, but it simply represents my best effort to present the thinking developed in my search for a basis of unity among the producers, the trade and the mills, behind legislation which will deal effectively with the very serious problem that confronts cotton and the millions of people associated with cotton.

"There appears to be unanimity of opinion that the payment-in-kind section is the best approach to removing the 2-price system, with all its inequities. The mills and the administration are in agreement on this.

"Moreover, there seems to be unanimous support for the crash research on the reduction of cotton production costs.

"I believe that the provision for protection of the smaller farms will receive very general support.

"However, differences developed among producers on a provision in an earlier draft of the bill that would have permitted producers to plant up to 30-percent above their acreage allotments, at world prices for the cotton produced on the extra acres, if such would not increase the stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation. This provision has been omitted from the bill I have introduced.

"I reemphasize to all people associated with cotton the urgency of our situation. Cotton is losing its markets, and once lost they may never be regained. This is hurting everyone concerned with cotton. I am hopeful that the industry—producers, the mills and the trade—will develop solidarity behind this legislation to deal with the crisis we confront."

A concise summary of the bill follows:

Payments in kind: The Commodity Credit Corporation, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, would be authorized:

1. From the date of enactment, until August 1, 1964, to make payments through the issuance of payment-in-kind certificates to persons other than producers in such amounts and subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines will eliminate inequities due to the differences in the cost of raw cotton between domestic and foreign users of cotton; and

2. For the period beginning August 1, 1964, and ending July 31, 1967, such payments in kind shall be made to persons other than producers in an amount as will make such cotton available for domestic use at a price which is not in excess of the price at which such cotton is made available for export.

3. Payments in kind also would be provided to make new raw cotton in inventory on the date of enactment available for consumption at prices consistent with the purposes of the legislation.

Thus the Secretary of Agriculture would be given discretion in determining the level of payments in kind prior to August 1, 1964, but after that date and until July 31, 1967 he would be directed to make such payments in the amount necessary to make cotton available to American mills at the same price American cotton is offered for export. Under the current cotton export program, American cotton is offered for export at 8½ cents per pound lower than the price domestic mills must pay.

Small farm provision: For the 1964, 1965, and 1966 crops of cotton, the Secretary may on up to the first 15 bales of each farmer's production increase the price support up to a level 10 percent in excess of the basic level of price support in effect for the remainder of the crop, but not in excess of the level of price support for the 1963 crop. This would be carried out through simultaneous purchase and sale or similar operations in order to keep such cotton to the maximum extent practicable in the normal commercial channels of trade. This will not involve any direct payments to farmers.

Research: The Secretary is authorized and directed to conduct a special cotton research program designed to reduce the cost of producing upland cotton at the earliest practicable date, using up to $10 million annually for this purpose. The Secretary then would make such reductions in the level of price support as will reflect reductions in the costs of producing cotton.

Unrestricted sales: Beginning August 1, 1964, the Commodity Credit Corporation would be authorized to sell upland cotton for unrestricted use at not less than 105 percent of the current loan rate plus reasonable carrying charge. Such sales from CCC stocks for unrestricted use now can be made at not less than 115 percent of the current loan rate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, while I stand here in praise and gratitude for this legislation, I would have preferred that we end the two-price cotton system simply. I would have preferred that we either impose import fees, which would in effect end it, or that we discontinue export subsidies on cotton, which would effectively have done the same thing.

I include at this point in my remarks the two bills I introduced, H.R. 4644 and H.R. 4645:

H.R. 4644

A bill to discontinue export subsidies on cotton

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That after one hundred and twenty days after the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Commodity Credit Corporation shall not carry out any program designed to subsidize the exportation of cotton from the United States.

SEC. 2. Section 203 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1853) and section 110 of the Agricultural Act of 1958 are each repealed, effective one hundred and twenty days after the enactment of this Act.

H.R. 4645

A bill to impose import fees on cotton and cotton goods equal to the export subsidy paid on cotton exports by the United States

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President shall, by proclamation, impose import fees on cotton products which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption in the United States in an amount equal to the difference, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, between the United States domestic price for the quantity of cotton used in the production of that article and the export price of that quantity of cotton of like quality.

Not long ago the retiring president of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute told a responsible audience that employment in the U.S. textile industry was sharply down, and so were earnings, and that competition with foreign textile manufacturers was becoming very rugged. It was significant that he only prescribed one particular cure which he thought was possible, and that particular cure may be realized by reading one sentence of his statement, in which he said this:

> All that this industry wants is a chance to buy American grown cotton at the same price it is sold to foreign competition.

We have had many people tell us that this is what the industry wants. The President of the United States said that the two-price cotton system is an inequity and a burden. The Secretary of Agriculture has from time to time made statements saying that the two-price cotton system is an inequity. The Secretary of Commerce has made the statement that we need to do something about the cotton price situation, and he himself, as Chairman of the Interagency Textile Committee—and I salute his work in connection with that particular Committee—has worked toward relief, and I believe that all in the industry itself, those producing cotton, those who use cotton, and those dependent upon cotton, find themselves, as it were, in the same boat.

I was somewhat amazed some time ago to receive a letter from one of the great cotton merchants in the world saying that the two-price cotton system had to be done away with. And, I wondered what motivated him. He realized that unless the two-price cotton system was done away with, the people who grow cotton are going to find themselves in difficulty in the years to come. Then I looked with a great deal of pleasure at the statement given by the president of the New York Cotton Exchange before the Committee on Agriculture and the Cotton Subcommittee, which I include at this point in my remarks:

Statement of F. Marion Rhodes, President, New York Cotton Exchange, New York, N.Y., in Support of a One-Price Cotton Program Operated Through Normal Trade Channels Before the Cotton Subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture, U.S. House of Representatives

My name is F. Marion Rhodes. I am President of the New York Cotton Exchange, located in New York City. I am also interested in the production and ginning of cotton in New Madrid County, Mo. I spent over 25 years as an employee of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. During a large part of that time I was responsible for the administration of the cotton programs of the Department.

The membership of our exchange includes representatives of all major segments of the industry—producers, merchants, and textile manufacturers. The exchange is vitally interested in the well-being of the entire cotton economy since we believe that no one segment can prosper for long unless the entire industry is healthy. I am also vitally interested personally since I have been connected with the cotton industry in one way or another for more than 40 years.

The need for new cotton legislation has become so apparent it hardly seems necessary to discuss it in detail. Nearly all, if not all, cotton organizations now recognize the need for new legislation and have agreed that it is imperative that it be passed in time to apply to the 1963 crop of cotton.

It is even more noteworthy that most cotton organizations now recognize that in order to compete in world markets, the price of U.S. cotton must be reduced below a level that would be fair and reasonable to most U.S. growers and that a satisfactory way must be found to bridge this gap. There appears to be rather general agreement that this can best be accomplished by means of PIK certificates. Only a few months ago there were many cotton leaders who still contended all of cotton's problems could be solved by merely reducing the level of price support a few points each year. They apparently thought that if prices were moving in the right direction, it was not necessary to actually be competitive. Fortunately, this type of thinking has largely been dissipated.

Cotton is at the crossroads. We are now suffering the most serious competitive losses in the domestic market we have ever experienced. I am certain you are aware that cotton's share of the domestic market dropped by about 850,000 bales during the past 2 years. It is almost a certainty that cotton's competitive losses will not only continue but will likely increase during the next few years unless Congress takes action to remedy the situation. President Kennedy recognized the necessity for action back in May 1961 when he issued his 7-point textile statement. Point 4 of this program directed the Department of Agriculture to explore and make recommendations to eliminate or offset the raw cotton price advantage to foreign mills.

The President issued a second statement on September 6, 1962 requesting the Department of Agriculture to give immediate attention to the formulation of a domestic program that would eliminate the inequity between the cost of raw cotton to foreign mills and the cost of raw cotton to our domestic mills.

It is the considered judgment of the members of the New York Cotton Exchange that the President's recommendation is sound and can only be accomplished by the adoption of a one-price competitive program operated through normal trade channels and implemented by PIK certificates paid to the "first buyer" of the cotton. The New York Cotton Exchange as well as other exchanges throughout the world have been advocating a one-price program for many years.

Even though there was universal agreement that the payment approach is the only proper solution to our current situation, it would still be essential that the greatest care be used in developing a program that not only makes cotton competitive in both the domestic and foreign markets, but also permits cotton to move through normal channels of trade.

I would like to emphasize two factors which we believe absolutely essential to a sound program:

1. ONE-PRICE PROGRAM

By this we mean a program which permits American textile mills to buy cotton at the same equivalent price paid by foreign mills. Although the initial cost of this approach to the problem may be higher, it is certain to cost the taxpayer far less in the final analysis when consideration is given to the fact that cotton textiles and cotton clothing would be priced materially lower in the domestic market and greatly benefit all consumers of cotton goods in the United States. Last month when Mr. C. A. Cannon, chairman of the board of Cannon Mills Co., of Kannapolis, N.C., testified before this committee, he stated:

"A complete return to a one-price system for cotton in the United States could mean an annual cost saving to the consuming public of a probable $600 to $800 million when the initial cotton cost reduction is carried all the way through the textile pipeline to the retail counter."

Assuming Mr. Cannon's figures are approximately correct, a switch from the present cotton program to a PIK payment program, even though it were somewhat more costly, would still save the taxpayers more than $500 million per year.

With minor exceptions, textile mills in the United States have access to only American grown upland cotton. Foreign textile mills have access to approximately 35 million bales of foreign produced cotton before they are required to even discuss cotton prices with their residual supplier, the United States. Foreign produced cotton of comparable quality to American cotton normally sells for less. Therefore, the present difference between the price American mills pay for their raw cotton and the price the foreign mills pay is more than the 8½ cents per pound export subsidy.

2. PIK CERTIFICATE MUST BE MADE TO THE FIRST BUYER

The payment of the PIK certificate to the last seller would nullify completely the major goal of new cotton legislation, namely, a one-price cotton program. If the PIK payment is made to the last seller, a two-price cotton program would continue to exist as there would be a domestic interior price and a domestic mill and export price. In the event the domestic mill price is higher than the export price, a definite possibility, we would have a three-price cotton program.

Under the last-seller approach, the futures market would, of necessity, reflect either the interior price or the domestic mill price, depending upon the use of PIK certificates in connection with certificated stocks If they reflected the domestic interior price, this would preclude their use by foreign importers and domestic mills. If, on the other hand, the market reflected the domestic mill and export price, this would preclude their use by merchants.

If the PIK certificates are issued to the last handler of cotton, it will force that substantial part of each cotton crop, not in immediate demand, which might well be the greater part of it, into the loan and the Government would carry the cotton until it is needed for export or for domestic mill consumption. This would result from the fact that merchants could not afford and would refuse to invest in cotton at the higher price knowing that such investment could not be recovered until the cotton is sold to the ultimate consumer.

The last-seller approach is being advocated by those who favor continuing the current practice of marketing the cotton crop through Government programs. There can be little doubt that if the PIK certificates are paid to the last seller of cotton, free stocks will be reduced to a bare minimum and the Government loan program will further displace the mechanism of the free market in the merchandising of cotton. Under such a system independent cotton merchants would be at a serious competitive disadvantage since they could not compete with those organizations which can carry cotton at no expense to themselves.

The advocates of the last-seller approach have been quite successful in making some producer representatives believe this approach eliminates all danger of Congress putting a limitation on the amount of assistance a producer may receive from the cotton program. It should be clear to everyone that should Congress decide to put limitations on the benefits a cotton producer may receive, the Congress could make it effective irrespective of who receives the PIK payment. In my opinion, there is no more danger of a limitation being placed on the benefits a producer may receive under a PIK program operated through the first buyer than if it were operated through the last seller. In neither case would there be a payment being made to the farmer.

If there is to be a limitation on PIK payments, it will doubtless take the form of a limit on the number of cents per pound that may be paid, regardless of whom receives the payment. In my opinion, if there is to be a limitation of any kind, it is far more likely to be a limitation on the amount of money a producer may obtain under the loan program. Such limitations have always been completely ineffective since the market price stays at or slightly below the loan level. The discounts, if any, the large producers take have been insignificant.

This question of limitations has been discussed so much it has been blown completely out of perspective. I want to make it clear, however, that the members of the New York Cotton Exchange are unalterably opposed to any limitation being placed on the benefits a producer may receive under the cotton program. On the other hand, however, we submit that the question of limitations is frequently used to cloud the real issue under discussion.

In looking over the testimony presented to this subcommittee last month, I was surprised to see that at least one witness strongly inferred that there was a connection between the $50,000 limitation applicable to 1960 loans and purchases made by CCC on any agricultural commodity declared to be in surplus supply and the 1960 choice (A) purchase program. I think a quick look at the facts will show clearly that any analogy between these two programs and the PIK certificate program that is being proposed is imaginary rather than real.

The choice (A) purchase program was a part of the Agricultural Act of 1958. The $50,000 limitation was a part of the Agricultural Appropriation Act of 1960–61. The two bills were originated by different committees of Congress. The $50,000 limitation applied to all commodities that the Secretary declared to be in surplus supply, not just to cotton. I can see no analogy whatever between the 1960 choice (A) purchase program and the $50,000 limitation that was in effect for 1 year and the proposed PIK certificate program operated through the first buyer of the cotton.

Advocates of the last-seller approach have also attempted to make it appear this is the only way cotton could be made available to our domestic mills at the export price immediately upon passage of new legislation. The problems to be confronted in administering a new program, including the granting of immediate relief to the domestic mills, will largely depend upon whether the new legislation applies to cotton produced in 1963 or to all carryover cotton as well. In any event these administrative problems will be relatively simple since the bulk of all carryover stocks will be held by CCC.

A one-price competitive program could be achieved in many ways. It is generally recognized that the most simple and direct method would be to make the equalization payment directly to the producer. Many producers object to direct payments with ample justification. The next most simple and direct method would be to pay a domestic consumption subsidy to the mills. Mills object to receiving direct subsidies, also with justification. I would submit, however, that a PIK certificate paid to the last seller would, in fact, be a slightly disguised domestic consumption subsidy. On the other hand, the merchants of the country, through their national organization, the American Cotton Shippers Association, have indicated a willingness to accept the onus of receiving the subsidy as a service to the entire industry. They have repeatedly stated, however, that it is their considered judgment the program could work successfully only if the PIK certificates were issued to the first buyer. It would seem reasonable, therefore, to give serious consideration to the recommendations of these qualified and experienced merchants who have volunteered to perform this important function for the well-being of the entire industry.

Based on many years of experience in administering the cotton programs of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, I can unqualifiedly assure you a PIK payment program operated through the first buyer would be far more simple to administer than the one operated through the last seller. The major part of the machinery needed and the qualified personnel are already available in the county offices throughout the Cotton Belt and in the New Orleans commodity office. It would merely mean assigning these additional functions to an existing organization. Relatively few, if any, additional personnel would be required.

We should not overlook the fact that the cost (interest) of financing a cotton crop of 15 million bales under the last-seller approach would be about $15 to $18 million more than it would be under the first-buyer approach. This calculation is based on a payment of $30 per bale on 15 million bales with interest at 5 percent with crop carried for an average of 8 months.

Despite the many conflicting interests, it appears the prospects are better today than they have been since 1958 for the industry to obtain a sound one-price cotton program. It would be a tragedy if the few dissident elements in the cotton industry are again successful in defeating the passage of a sound cotton program or if the program were established in a manner that prevented cotton from moving through normal trade channels to both the domestic and foreign markets.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank you and the members of the committee for the privilege of appearing before you and presenting our views on the need for new cotton legislation.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. MORRIS. First I want to compliment the gentleman from South Carolina on his consistent efforts to not only assist the cotton industry but to assist all the people in this country. By helping the cotton industry he helps all the people in this country, because the cotton industry is a large segment of our economy in this country. Now, if I understand the situation correctly, a textile owner in South Carolina or in the United States has to pay about $8.50 a hundred more for cotton than a textile manufacturer in Hong Kong.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I thank the gentleman, and he is eminently correct. It amounts to about $42.50 a bale.

Mr. MORRIS. I wanted to take this opportunity also to tell the gentleman from South Carolina and the House that I have been concerned about the cotton industry. I have introduced a bill which in my opinion will be a step in the right direction. Admittedly, it will not do everything that the textile manufacturers want done. But it will reduce the cost of American cotton to the textile industry by $2.50 a hundred the first year, the next year $1 per hundred, the next year another dollar, the next year a dollar, and in all it will reduce the price within a period of 4 years $5.50 per hundred on American cotton to the domestic industry.

Mr. Speaker, this will not exactly put it on the same basis as foreign competitors but I think it will help them. Also, in lowering this price support, the bill which I have introduced would provide that if a farmer cannot produce under these conditions, he can sell his cotton allotment to some other farmer who can produce under these conditions. And, if he cannot find a buyer from another farmer under the bill which I have introduced authority is given to the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase his allotment at $100 per acre.

I do not claim that this cotton bill is the answer to all the problems. However, I think it is a step in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, I know and hope that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL] and the other Members of the House will give this bill careful consideration.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from South Carolina for the effort that he is putting forth in this field.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I want to thank the gentleman from New Mexico. I recall with a great deal of pleasure and gratitude that the gentleman sits on the Committee on Interior of which he is a distinguished member. The gentleman is interested in the cotton program and he has been interested not only in the problems of the cotton producer, but as a great American he has been interested in the problems which we have as consumers of cotton and production of cotton textiles. I certainly say to the gentleman that I endorse his idea and I hope I will be able to be of some assistance to the gentleman.

Mr. MORRIS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I shall be delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. ASHMORE. I want to endorse what my friend has stated on this most important subject. It is vital in my opinion to more people than just the manufacturer of the textiles in this country, because if the manufacturer cannot make a profit then the cotton producer, as many people are now learning, is also facing a tremendous problem and many difficulties.

I have not read the bill which has been introduced by our colleague, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MORRIS], who just spoke about it a few moments ago. But I certainly have a great deal of interest in it and I am going to study it and also study the new legislation which the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], the distinguished Chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, has introduced. I hope that one of these bills will make it possible for us to arrive at a solution to this problem.

Mr. Speaker, the textile industry is one of the largest in the country—the largest in the Southeast, and certainly in many other areas. It is the largest in my State. It means employment to thousands and thousands of people and it also means a livelihood for many people who earn their living from the farm, because the cotton side of the picture is simply this: With this two-price system the textile manufacturer is being forced to use manmade fibers now; whereas, he should and must prefer to use cotton. It is a better fabric. It is a better product, and not only helps the consumer but helps the cotton producer. Therefore, with the two-price system now in existence every time the manufacturer is compelled for financial reasons to use manmade fibers he is hurting the cotton producer. If this trend continues we will be led down the road ultimately to a situation where most of the fabrics of this nature will come from manmade fiber and cotton will be left out in the cold. That means, of course, that the farmer will be hurt as badly or worse than the manufacturer.

Mr. Speaker, it is for the best interests of all of us, the cotton grower, the cotton manufacturer, the textile manufacturer and the consuming public, as well as the entire economy of this country that this two-price system be removed without further delay.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that it can be done within the immediate future.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I want to thank the gentleman. I know the people of his great textile area are grateful for his constant and continuing alertness to this problem. I thank him for his contribution today.

Mr. Speaker, a short distance from the northeastern edge of the congressional district that I am privileged to represent is the little town of Rockingham, N.C. Some of the people whom I represent live in South Carolina and commute daily to Rockingham to work. It is their means of livelihood. Recently the Ledbetter Manufacturing Co. which is at Rockingham had to switch to synthetics. I read an article from the Textile Reporter, which is a trade magazine and which says this:

> Cotton market conditions caused by the two-price system are blamed for Ledbetter Manufacturing Co.'s switch to synthetic yarns after 80 years in the cotton yarn business. The firm, heretofore producing cotton yarns exclusively, is moving altogether into synthetic yarns. Some 100 are employed at the Rockingham, N.C., plant where equipment includes 50 cards, 4 pickers and 6,864 ring and 4,288 twister spindles.

That is just one of the signs of the times. And if we continue our policies we are going to take America out of the cotton textile business just as we have taken America out of so many businesses; taken American jobs away from people who are patriotic and taxpaying, by policies which have decimated the watchmaking industry, the bicycle industry, the leather goods industry, and other industries in this great Nation. Go, if you will, into the soft coal areas of this country in West Virginia and Pennsylvania and see what oil imports have done. They have caused unemployment, want, and unhappiness. I can think of nothing that is more foreign to the American way of life or to the civilization we claim we are proud of than want and despair and hunger and unemployment. It is not American. It is the product of a wrong ideology. It is the product of poor policy and planning. I condemn the State Department for it, as I have time and time again. But it continues; it does not seem to make any difference which party is in power, because the State Department continues in power. It is very unfortunate. Some day I hope with all the hope at my command, because I have faith in this great Nation and in its people, that these policies will be changed.

In my district we have a chain, I suppose you would call it—although there are not that many plants—at least a group of mills which employ from ten to fifteen thousand people. Those people are the finest people in the world. I represent them here. I know two-thirds of them by their name. They have the finest in equipment. They are efficient in operation. These people are dedicated workers. We give the best work for the dollar down in my part of the country of any laboring people on earth, I believe. They have a profit-sharing system which is second to none. If a fellow works in that plant for a number of years and retires he has a nest egg in addition to his ordinary retirement. They have a recreation program which is second to none. They have golf courses on which the people who work in those mills are allowed to play, and those who are dependent upon them are able to join. I might give you some idea of this recreational program. It costs my family and me $3.60 a month to enjoy the privilege of the golf course and the bowling alley.

That is unheard of in any country club in America. We have a camaraderie there. We have swimming pools, and in the summertime they sponsor swimming contests in which all the children try to beat each other and get on the team. Then the best team is taken to a State contest. They have parks there where the best entertainment is given. All of this is free, free because we have this great recreation program.

I just noticed in the paper of April 24 that this particular company had a profit drop. This does not mean just the stockholders have a drop.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Do they push each other in that pool fully clothed, that pool you are talking about?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I do not know what the gentleman means by that remark. I had not considered that. Those people usually come in with bathing suits. I would be glad to have the gentleman come down and see this pool for himself.

Mr. GROSS. I would be delighted to come down there and see it.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I hope the gentleman would be enlightened, because those facetious remarks I am certain add nothing to this discussion.

As I was starting to say before I was, I might say, facetiously interrupted, this particular profit drop affects not only the people who are stockholders but it affects every man and woman who works in the plant, because he is on a profit-sharing system. There are more than 15,000 homes being affected.

I have here an article from a State newspaper of April 24 stating they had a profit drop, and the headline is " 'Two-Price' Blamed." There is concrete evidence, solid evidence, that the system is injuring the people whom we say and whom so many people say they want to protect. The article is as follows:

TWO-PRICE BLAMED—SPRINGS HAS PROFIT DROP

(By Ron Wenzell)

> FORT LAWN.—The president of the Springs Cotton Mills reported a slight drop in profits for 1962 in his annual address to the stockholders Tuesday.
>
> H. W. Close blamed the retreat in profits from a high of $15,004,648 in 1961 to $14,456,286 last year on:
>
> "A wage increase for employes, higher cost for cotton, competition of low-cost textile imports from other countries, stagnant markets, cautious customers in an unsettled economic world and the utter failure of the administration to ease the immoral and unreasonable burden of two-price cotton."
>
> Close also reported a drop in total sales from $197,977,914 in 1961 to $197,616,789 last year.
>
> Notwithstanding the losses, Close said sales were the second highest in the company's history and net income was the highest in the textile industry per dollar of sales.
>
> Close announced total assets of $196,480,839 compared with $183,974,866 a year ago.
>
> "The Springs Cotton Mills is not crying," he told the assembled stockholders at a luncheon meeting in the warehouse complex at Fort Lawn. "We continue to be healthy in an ailing industry. We are determined to remain efficient and profitable."
>
> The president of Springs called for an all out drive to eliminate the two-price cotton program.
>
> "We face a serious obstacle," he said. "We must move forward despite what President Kennedy has called a 'unique burden'—The burden of two-price cotton. Make no mistake, the penalty of two-price cotton takes its toll among even the leaders of the American Textile Industry.
>
> "We can produce efficiently. We can spend heavily on modernization. We can merchandise aggressively. We can seek new products and new markets. But, we cannot pay one-third more than our foreign competitors pay for our basic raw material and hope to meet the competition on even ground," Close said.
>
> "We ask only this of Congress," he concluded. "Let us buy U.S. cotton at the same

price it is offering to our oversea competitors. Could any request be more fair?"

Reviewing the expansion of its facilities Springs undertook in 1962, Close called attention to:

1. The company's recent entry into the synthetic blend field.
2. Current construction of two 40,000 spindle plants at Fort Lawn.
3. Construction of a new office building in New York City.
4. Construction by the affiliated Lancaster and Chester Railway of a 100,000 bale cotton warehouse complex at Fort Lawn.
5. A current expansion of the company's Grace Finishing Plant near Lancaster.

Figures were released Tuesday showing that Springs now pays more than 11 percent of the entire corporate income tax paid in South Carolina, employs 12,500 persons and operates 850,000 spindles, 18,500 looms and 350 sewing machines.

In 1962, Springs employees turned out more than 500 million linear yards of finished cloth, including more than 36 million sheets and pillowcases. Wages paid during the year totaled nearly $45 million.

In connection with that profit drop, the president of that company made a statement in his annual message to the stockholders, and I am including that at this point in the RECORD because it brings out exactly what I have tried to point out here:

FREEDOM TO FIGHT WITH BOTH HANDS

(By H. W. Close)

For the Springs Cotton Mills, 1962 was a year of intensive preparation for significant and far-reaching changes.

It was a year of multi-million-dollar expansions. It was a year of continued modernization. It was a year of careful planning for greater diversification and greater flexibility. It was a year of good progress.

Our sales totaled $197,616,789, down a fraction from the previous year's $197,977,914, but still the second highest in our history.

Our profits dipped to $14,456,286, compared with $15,004,648 in the previous year, but our net income per dollar of sales still remains the highest in the textile industry.

A wage increase for our employees, a higher cost for the cotton we buy, the competition of low-cost textile imports from other countries, stagnant markets and cautious customers in an unsettled economic world combined to push our profits downward.

This pressure on profits was aggravated by the other failure of the administration to ease the immoral and unreasonable burden of two-price cotton.

Yet the Springs Cotton Mills is not crying. We continue to be healthy in an ailing industry. We are determined to remain efficient and profitable.

As a measure of our vitality, we point to the record of our first 75 years, for we have reached a milestone in our history—our 75th anniversary year. We observe that anniversary this year with deep pride, for our growth has made a significant impact upon the economic development of South Carolina and our record of efficiency has contributed to the development of American textiles.

Our story began in the days after the War Between the States. That war and the vindictive postwar days of Reconstruction had left the South destitute. Cotton, long the white gold of the southland, could not be sold for enough to buy food. The South was forced to seek a means of pulling itself up by its own bootstraps. It turned to manufacturing. This was the beginning of a trend away from the soil that continues to this day.

For the Springs organization, the story began in 1888. In that year, in the little town of Fort Mill, S.C., Fort Mill Manufacturing Co. went into production—with 200 looms, no spinning, and little capital.

From this small beginning, the Springs Cotton Mills developed, guided successively by the vision of Capt. Samuel E. White, the financial ability of Col. Leroy Springs, and the organizational and promotional genius of Col. Elliott White Springs. Despite wars, depressions, and adversity, the Springs organization grew. Cotton mills started independently in the neighboring towns of Lancaster, Chester, and Kershaw gradually were consolidated into a single, smooth-working company.

Today, Springs stands as one of the leaders of the textile industry. It is the world's largest producer of cottons. It pays more than 11 percent of the entire corporate income tax paid in the State of South Carolina. It employs 12,500 persons, who operate 850,000 spindles, 18,500 looms, and 350 sewing machines.

Last year, Springs employees turned out more than 500 million linear yards of finished cloth, including more than 36 million sheets and pillowcases. Wages paid during the year totaled nearly $49 million. Our employees' share of 1962 profits, over and above their regular pay, totaled $4,250,485—the highest amount in the company's history.

In the last 10 years alone, Springs has spent nearly $60 million for new facilities and new machinery.

A look at the activities of 1962 gives some idea of the forward movement at Springs, made possible by loyal employees, efficient work, skill, imagination, and the investment of capital for new plants and equipment.

As part of our longstanding policy of constant modernization, we installed $2 million worth of new, high-speed looms, including a quantity of shuttleless looms.

We arranged for the construction and lease of a vast, all-concrete cotton warehouse complex capable of holding more than 100,000 bales of cotton at one time.

We began construction of two 40,000 spindle cotton mills, the Elliott plant and the Frances plant. These almost identical plants, costing more than $7 million each, will be completed this year. They will be showcases for the entire textile industry, refrigerated and incorporating the most advanced methods of efficient, high-quality production.

Recently, in New York, there was completed the 21-story Springs Building in mid-Manhattan, the center of the new textile district. It will serve as headquarters for our selling house, Springs Mills, Inc.

We are currently in the process of entering the field of synthetics with a blend of cotton and Kodel IV, a new and superior polyester with lasting whiteness, developed by Eastman Chemical Products, Inc., a subsidiary of Eastman Kodak Co.

We are now building $3 million worth of additions to our Grace finishing plant, which already is the largest and most modern in the world. At the same time, we will install $4 million worth of new finishing equipment in the plant.

We have under serious consideration still other areas of diversification, both in this country and abroad. We look to the future with confidence. We have the ability and the determination to move with the times and to maintain our dominant position. We shall win our share of the steadily expanding world markets for textiles.

But we face a serious obstacle. We must move forward despite what President Kennedy has called a "unique burden"—the burden of two-price cotton. Make no mistake. The penalty of two-price cotton takes its toll among even the leaders of the American textile industry. And so we raise the same questions that we raised a year ago. "Why shouldn't we go all out to eliminate the two-price cotton program? Why shouldn't the farmer also operate in a free market and sell under the law of supply and demand?"

In the world of buying and selling, nothing is free. This includes the subsidy to the cotton farmer, which has produced two-price cotton. And so, it is inescapable that the American textile industry will pay a fearful price as long as the iniquitous two-price cotton system is permitted to exist. So, too, it is inescapable that the American cotton farmer in the long run will pay a similar price, for cotton is being priced out of the market. The farmer will lose a market for his crop.

We can produce efficiently. We can spend heavily on modernization. We can merchandise aggressively. We can seek new products and new markets. But we cannot pay one-third more than our foreign competitors pay for our basic raw material and hope to meet the competition on even ground.

The cotton textile industry is being squeezed on two sides. On one hand, it is losing ground to foreign producers of cottons. On the other hand, with the price of its product forced to an unnaturally high level by Government action, it is losing ground to makers of synthetic textiles both in this country and abroad.

The U.S. Government cannot deny or evade the responsibility for this grossly unfair position. President Kennedy, himself, has conceded that the inequity of two-price cotton must be abolished. But despite all the talk, two-price cotton remains.

There now seems to be some recognition of the punishing toll of the two-price cotton system. Various political compromises are being discussed in the Congress, but they all add up to additional subsidies and the plain fact is that we do not want a subsidy for the textile industry, to offset a subsidy paid to the U.S. cotton farmer. That would impose a double burden upon the U.S. taxpayer.

One recent compromise proposal would spread Government action over a 2-year period. This could dislocate textile markets for 2 years—and some U.S. mills possibly would not survive. We need positive action and we need it now.

We ask only this of the Congress: Let us buy U.S. cotton at the same price it is offered to our oversea competitors. Could any request be more fair?

We in the Springs organization are willing to take on any competition in the world on even terms. We seek no favors. As we have said before, all we ask is the freedom to fight with both hands.

Some time ago, not this year but some time ago, one of the great textile leaders of North Carolina, who happens not to live in my district but who has a plant in my district, made a statement, back in 1958, and I think it is significant now. He was talking about the fact that a cotton shortage was imminent, and it is going to be imminent unless we do something about it. I include this article at this point in the RECORD:

COTTON SHORTAGE IS FORESEEN BY TEXTILE LEADER

Textile leader C. A. Cannon of Kannapolis, N.C., urging immediate action to remedy an impending cotton shortage, has told Secretary of Agriculture Benson that "the situation, for farmers and mills, is one of crisis. Another year of inaction will mean catastrophe."

Mr. Cannon, president of Cannon Mills Co. and chairman of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute's Special Cotton Policy Committee, told Secretary Benson in a letter that adverse weather conditions have seriously impaired the quality and quantity of the 1957 crop.

"Something must be done without delay," Mr. Cannon declared. "I trust your Department will act without delay."

The manufacturer also said that "any emergency requirements by the Federal Government for military supplies would create a panic in the cotton market. In our judgment, cotton for such an emergency is not available in this country." He told Secretary Benson that cotton legislation is needed to:

1. Increase acreage.
2. Assure competitive pricing.
3. Produce in 1958 quality cotton for nearby consumption and reasonable carryover.

"Anything short of this program," Mr. Cannon asserted, "will result in unemployment in the cotton textile industry from Maine to Texas. The present reduced production of cotton is creating and will create havoc for the cotton farmer from North Carolina to California.

Mr. Cannon said that a foreign agricultural report issued by the U.S. Department of Agriculture "clearly indicates that the present cotton policy is building up foreign production of cotton, is building up foreign production of textiles, all at the expense of the American cotton farmer and the American textile worker."

Mr. Cannon, citing the increase of rayon consumption as compared to the decline of cotton consumption, said, "It had become quite evident to everyone connected with the cotton industry, from producer to manufacturer, that the high support price was making cotton noncompetitive and was curtailing consumption in American mills, thereby promoting the use of substantial amounts of manmade fibers. The decline in domestic consumption during the August–November period of 1957 indicates that only about 8 million bales will be used by our domestic mills this year.

"The cotton producer, possibly for the first time, realized that the shrinking acreage was creating an intolerable situation for the future of cotton production for American consumption and the export market.

"The cotton manufacturer realized that with the small acreage being planted during the year 1957 and with the export program going forward at the world price level we were fast moving into a supply situation that would seriously curtail domestic consumption and exports unless immediate steps were taken to increase production in 1958.

"We, of course, did not realize in the early summer of 1957 just how serious the situation would become, since we could not anticipate the drastic failure, both in quality and quantity, of the 1957 crop of cotton.

"Information is now available and on examination by your department we feel sure you will realize that before the cotton crop comes to market in the fall of 1958 we will be tragically short of the types of cotton needed for quality goods in the United States and abroad. There is but one conclusion: the foreign buyers will depend more and more on foreign cotton-producing countries, who will increase their production as much as possible. Foreign cotton purchasers have made it emphatically clear that competitive and stable prices and continuity of supply are essential to holding our markets."

Mr. Cannon said that his committee has had no response from repeated presentations of the textile industry's cotton problems to the Department of Commerce, the White House and the USDA. Mr. Cannon added:

"We see that Senator Ellender, chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, says that there can be no relief for individual commodities as such but that an overall farm bill is the only way to approach this problem.

"If the effect of such an unwise policy could be confined to 1 year and we were able to recoup the cotton production and market for cotton goods, it would be one question, but it seems quite evident to us that under this approach we will have permanently lost the demand for a great amount of cotton in this country and abroad.

"The cotton farmer should be encouraged to increase his acreage with the planting which will begin in February of this year to produce a minimum of 16 million bales. This production is needed to restore our normal stock of spinnable cotton for home consumption and for export.

"I think you will find that whatever cotton you have in the loan on July 30, 1958, will be the lowest grade of undesirable junk that has ever been accumulated in any one place in the history of the world."

Someone may say that is the whole trouble. No, I do not think that is the whole trouble. I think we have other troubles, too. I plagiarize a good deal here because I do not have time to do all the research I should like to do. We have problems in the Congress, things we have to tend to in connection with what our constituents ask us to do.

I have here an article from the Textile Reporter of April 25 which I think should be brought to the attention of the Congress at this time. The title of it is, "Foreign Markets for U.S. Textiles Blocked by Our Ever-Loving Allies." This tells about the diplomacy of this country. I do not call it diplomacy. I have never heard diplomacy and stupidity as synonymous with each other, until we consider some of the things going on today. But apparently that is the order of the day.

Mr. Speaker, I include this article at this point in the Record:

Foreign Markets for U.S. Textiles Blocked by Our Ever-Loving Allies—William Singer Suggests Knuckle-Headed U.S. Diplomats Must Share Much of Blame for the Decay of Our Once Prosperous Export Trade

The once receptive and profitable export markets for textile products manufactured in the United States have dwindled to a point where we now sell about one-fiftieth as much yardage as 12 foreign textile industries ship to us, according to William Singer, president of the Textile Export Association of the United States.

In a speech delivered at the recent annual meeting of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Mr. Singer pointed out that a principal reason for this wide discrepancy is that the very countries which have virtually free access to the lucrative American market, at the insistence of the U.S. State Department, have erected insurmountable barriers against such U.S. products as are competitive in price.

At the outset of his remarks, Mr. Singer reminded his audience that "World trade, that is the international movement of basic commodities, manufactured goods and services, and also gold and monetary reserves is undergoing a profound change.

"The outward manifestations of this," he continued, "must be apparent to even those who run as they read. To cite a few examples of happenings over the last 6 months that have deeply altered the foundations of global commerce: (1) Adoption of the so-called Trade Expansion Act by the United States; (2) the exclusion of Great Britain from the European Economic Community; (3) international agreements governing the movement of cotton products; (4) the widening economic rift between the highly industrialized and so-called underdeveloped nations; (5) the pressure for worldwide agreements on basic commodities such as wheat, coffee, sugar, cocoa, etc., which could very well lead to conferences on cotton, jute, wool, silk, and other basic textile commodities; (6) continued loss of gold and dollar reserves by the United States and by contrast, the strengthening of currencies abroad, especially in Western Europe; (7) rampant nationalism in South America, Africa, Asia, and the Middle East, and acceleration of the tendency toward the formation of regional trade blocs; (8) resurgence of competition from politically priced textiles from Iron Curtain countries—Red China, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Hungary."

Mr. Singer continued in part, as follows:

Faced with these developments, it is obvious that the chief task of the American textile industry in the months or years ahead is to adapt itself to a rapidly changing world and not be led astray by misleading slogans or tear-drenched propaganda.

The differences between the American textile industry and those of the rest of the world are many and varied. We take great pride in the fact that we pay the highest wages, that our population is far and away the best dressed and that our profit margins, compared with those of our competitors overseas, are extremely modest. As an exporter who is familiar with 70 foreign markets, what impresses me most is this: When most foreign textile manufacturers get together as we are doing now, the No. 1 item on the agenda is not imports, one-price cotton, onerous taxes, burdensome freight rates, or the attitude of the public they are supposed to serve. They are concerned solely with the exclusion of all textiles from their home markets and the development of profitable export outlets, especially in the United States of America.

Our industry, and rightly so, is involved in the main with imports and the price of cotton. In this connection, it may be interesting to compare their shipments to our markets and their purchasers from us:

In 1962 twelve foreign industries shipped a total of 436,787,600 square yards to the American markets and would have shipped much more if enforcement of the international agreement had not stiffened. In return, these same countries purchased from use the tremendous total of 8,517,073 square yards.

All of us are familiar with the steady decline of our export trade and its effect on American mills and markets. Less known and less appreciated is the effect on raw cotton producers of the growing imbalance in cotton goods trade. The normal excess of exports over imports in terms of raw cotton was reversed in 1960 when imports exceeded exports by 39,500 bales. Last year the deficit amounted to 176,300 bales equivalent. In 1951 the excess of exports over imports totaled 739,000 bales.

But, in all fairness, it should be pointed out that nearly all of our exports would have been obliterated if the so-called two-price system had not been extended to cotton products at the very inception of the program. The basic rate on exports has always been the spread in prices between domestically consumed and exported cotton. These so-called equalization payments have been administered efficiently but even so our exports have deteriorated. I need not emphasize any rate smaller than that on raw cotton would be disastrous.

In the current debate over cotton prices, there have been frequent allusions to freight rates. Every American exporter is familiar with the fact that inland freight rates are a burdensome handicap and something we can do nothing about. Most of the overseas mills that compete against us are located within a stone's throw of big ports and their expenses in moving textiles to the pier are negligible.

PINPOINTING THE REASONS

In order to pinpoint the reasons behind this sad reversal in our international trade position, I would like to cite some of the difficulties that are now plaguing us.

To start at our very doorstep or less than a hundred miles away, we have completely lost the Cuban market where a textile famine has compelled the government to ration garments, an action not attempted in the United States even in the grimmest days of World War II. Our sales to this tortured nation used to average 65 million yards of cotton per year. American owners of mills there have lost everything. In addition, the Cuban government owes this industry $7 million for goods paid for by importers but whose assets were seized by the Castro regime. Haiti is in the midst of a period of economic and political turmoil. Since the overthrow of the Trujillo faction we have recaptured, with government aid, of course, our rightful share of the Dominican market. Puerto Rico is not officially regarded as an export market although its purchases are handled by the foreign trade divisions of mill selling agencies because of documentation and language problems as are shipments to other territories such as the Virgin Islands and Guam and even the State of Hawaii. Takings by Jamaica have been running on an average of 5 million yards per year and shipments to Trinidad and Tobago have been climbing. There is room for improvement in business with the Leeward & Windward Islands and Barbados. Trade with the Netherlands Antilles, better known as Curacao, remains fairly steady.

Across the Gulf of Mexico, the situation, insofar as exports of our textiles is concerned, is rather depressing. In order to protect an industry that is far from flourishing and cannot be regarded as efficient in the light of modern technology, Mexico for some years past has sternly controlled the flow of imports through a rigid licensing system. Its purchases from us last year were about 400,000 square yards or considerably less than those of the average small converter here in the United States of America.

In Central America, we are faced with the formation of a trade bloc that could lead to a sharp drop in sales. Although these countries are small, they have long been reliable customers and their per capita consumption of textiles is considerably above that of larger and supposedly more prosperous countries. Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua and Costa Rica are organizing a miniature common market and, judging by developments of the last year, this is likely to produce a rash of restrictions on imported textiles.

To complete our survey of this continent, I would like to direct your attention to a land of ice and snow and far and away our most important foreign market. Canada last year bought from us 189,690,076 square yards of cottons and close to 30 million yards of manmade fiber fabrics. Faced with a financial crisis and slumping currency, Canada last June imposed surtaxes on imports and this was followed by a drop in our sales of cotton goods alone of close to 27 million yards. Several months ago the Canadian Trade Minister promised a removal of these surcharges but he resigned shortly thereafter, refused to run for reelection and the country is now (March) in the throes of a national election scheduled for April 8 with no one in a position to make binding decisions on foreign matters.

Across the shining seas to the south of us lies the continent of South America, for more than a century the locale of our traditional markets for textiles. In compiling our monthly figures, we classify as a major market any country whose monthly takings average a million yards of cottons, and a half million yards of synthetics. It may astound you that there is no longer a single market in this category from Panama to Patagonia. Shipments to Brazil, the largest and richest, have been running close to zero for years. Offhand, I would say that the smallest East Side jobber buys more from my own company each year than Brazil does from our entire industry. The next largest, Argentina, bought from us last year 167,000 square yards. Takings by Uruguay, Falkland Islands and French Guiana are so trivial that we don't bother to list them. If it were not for Government aid, trade with Bolivia would be nonexistent. Colombia, Peru, Chile have built almost insurmountable tariff walls around their industries. Even oil-rich, ore-rich Venezuela over the last year upped import duties and is no longer a principal market. Just to cite some of the obstacles, in addition to licensing, hidden taxes, and fees, that confront us in South America: Venezuelan tariff on cotton goods average $5.50 per pound; in Argentina and Paraguay the rate is 200 percent ad valorem, and in Uruguay 150 percent.

POSSIBLE CAUSES OF POVERTY

No one has ever determined or has even sought to find out how much exorbitant textile prices in so undeveloped countries are responsible for the poverty which eventually leads to political unrest. On the surface, establishment of a textile industry seems to be a solution to certain economic difficulties but in many cases it only serves to compound them. Efficient operation of a modern textile industry requires technical, managerial and scientific skills which undeveloped countries do not possess and which requires decades of industrial experience to develop.

Insofar as merchandising our textiles is concerned, most of Asia is a lost continent. Japan and India rigidly protect their textile industries from outside competition. In the Middle East markets have been taken over by Red China, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Japan, India and Egypt. Indonesia gets its goods from Red China, Hong Kong and circuitously from Japan through the Public Law 480 program. Hong Kong, of course, has no restrictions but its purchases from us are one fifty-fifth of its shipments to this market. Changes in the AID program have served to divert Vietnam purchases to Japan. Other markets in southeast Asia are being flooded by Red Chinese goods at prices no industry in the world can match.

The Philippines as of now present the most vivid illustration of the problems that beset us in more than 50 other markets. Mills recently established there can hardly supply one-third of the normal requirements. Yet these handful of producers last July succeeded in inducing the Manila government to quadruple tariff rates on American cotton fabrics, thus reducing our sales to a trickle. This action was taken shortly after the Congress generously voted to grant to Philippine citizens about $68 million in payment of war damage claims.

Of the 25 African countries which have become members of the United Nations, only four, South Africa, Rhodesia, Liberia and Morocco can be listed as dependable outlets for us. Egypt, Sudan and Nigeria are building up industries of their own. Recent increases in shipments to Congo are financed through our AID programs.

Congressional approval of the Trade Expansion Act and its objectives which are to remove unreasonable obstacles to international trade plus the formation of regional economic and political blocs and their effect on commercial alliances and treaties has served to emphasize the necessity for a reappraisal of the industry's foreign trade policies and activities.

Foreign trade embraces both imports and exports and includes such subsidiary factors as foreign aid, agricultural disposal programs, disruptive customs and trade practices and all other elements affecting the international flow of goods, capital and services.

UNITED STATES OVERLY GENEROUS

In solving or stabilizing its import problems, the industry has been just and reasonable and overly generous in comparison with the restrictive policies followed by most foreign textile suppliers safeguarding their home markets.

The time is at hand for more consideration of the export status of the industry which has deteriorated sadly over the last decade. Recapture of ground lost is imperative if the Government is to succeed in its announced program of stanching the outflow of gold.

American textile exporters have been vigorous, intelligent and imaginative in their attempts to expand oversea sales but have been hampered by circumstances over which they are unable to exercise direct control.

In order to be effective, and industrywide export policy should embody these basic principles:

Trade treaties and international agreements should accord textiles the same consideration as other commodities and manufactures. Negotiations with the Common Market and other regional trade blocs should be based on equitable and reciprocal treatment of textiles. Hard bargaining with friendly nations should be Government policy from now on. If necessary, retaliatory measures should be used to counteract unreasonable barriers against American textiles in oversea markets. Incidentally, we as exporters would welcome reasonable quota arrangements with the many countries that have unilaterally placed a virtual embargo on our products.

Only American spun, woven, and finished fabrics or products made in the United States of America of American cotton should be purchased by AID funds. None of these funds or those of any other tax-supported agency should be allocated for the establishment of textile facilities abroad.

Competition from Iron Curtain countries should be countered by Government aid where deemed necessary or by diplomatic approaches to friendly nations.

Also, efforts should be made through diplomatic and other official channels to reduce and eventually eliminate illegal and evil trade practices, condoned in many countries, which make it impossible for reputable American firms to transact business. The same pressure should be used to relieve American exporters traveling abroad of cumbersome visa and other entrance requirements, foreign taxes or fees, undue delays in clearing samples, unnecessary documentation and other harassments.

Of great help to the export trade would be repeal of Federal taxes on foreign cables, which add substantially to the cost of soliciting business, and adoption of special rates by airlines on excess baggage consisting of samples and customary trade impedimenta.

THE PIRACY PROBLEM

Badly in need of international control is the piracy of American styles which has become a menace in a number of markets in the last several years.

These, of course, represent only the readily visible handicaps to a prosperous export trade. Given the enthusiastic and unremitting support of Government and industry, there is every reason to expect a recovery of a goodly share of the ground lost overseas in the last 5 years.

The task of restoring our traditional position in world trade is tremendous but not insuperable.

Burdened as we are with the highest labor and fiber costs in the world, we are equipped well enough from the standpoint of styling, efficiency and service to compete in those types of textiles where price is not the sole factor. Achievement of its export goals is every bit as important to the industry as amelioration of its import difficulties. But our objectives cannot be attained without the cooperation of the Government. Only the Government and its envoys abroad have the authority and the power to level what have become known as "unreasonable obstacles." This requires day-by-day grappling with a host of difficulties arising out of Government ukases overseas. In order to redress our balance of trade and arrest the alarming depletion of reserves, Washington has been constantly prodding industry and agriculture to increase exports. The only way this can be done is for Government to pry open the doors that have been slammed shut against us.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I am happy to yield to my colleague from Ohio.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I would say to the gentleman from South Carolina, although we do not have any cotton industry, so to speak, in my district in Ohio, nevertheless anything that damages American industry anywhere in the country is of vital interest to me as well as to other Representatives from the State of Ohio. I might point out we had basically the same trouble in the glass industry. Years went by before we received some small amount of relief. I certainly hope the gentleman from South Carolina will be successful in his efforts. I commend the gentleman for bringing this information to the attention of the Members of the House.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio. I might say when we considered the reciprocal trade legislation extension which, I believe, was in 1958, among the problems we had was not only the textile problem but we had the problems of the glass people, the tuna fishing people, the leather goods people, bicycles, watchmakers, and various other industries. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his contribution.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to commend our colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina, for his usual very forceful and able presentation of one of the greatest problems confronting our country and the industries of this country today.

Mr. Speaker, I have followed, of course, this problem very closely since coming to the Congress. I have been very interested in the progress that any bill is making that will rectify and correct the inequitable two-price cotton system. I understand that last week another herculean effort was made here in Washington to get together on some type of bill that could be presented to the Congress which would have the possibility of passage.

I noted also in the public press Mr. Charles Cannon, one of the great leaders in the textile industry of the country today, who comes from my State of North Carolina, making the statement, and I think it is a very prophetic statement, and it certainly bears directly on the point that our able colleagues are making here today:

> I say quite frankly that if positive action is not taken, the cotton program is lost and American mills will turn more and more to synthetic fibers.

Now what will that mean, Mr. Speaker, not only to the textile industry of America but to the cotton producers, the growers, and those who work in the mills? Of course, the whole country has and should have a vital interest in this business of cotton. It has been with us for a long time. One of the columns, you might say, of this great empire is that of the cotton industry. We have been the world's cotton producers down through the years. When cotton goes, a lot of things American go. I say that the two-price cotton system, Mr. Speaker, is on the verge of wrecking a very important and indispensable segment of our industry and source of employment for our people.

What happens if, as Mr. Cannon says, we go to synthetics and we quit growing cotton? Then the growers will be out of business. It is quite apparent, as I understand it, from the scientific standpoint for mill owners today to make synthetics with some degree of ease and satisfaction. That is, that they can weave synthetics into garments as a reasonable substitute for cotton. The industry would much prefer, as I understand it, to have cotton but if they cannot compete they have no alternative. They must turn to synthetics and to things that will put them in a competitive position.

If I could direct one question to my good friend from South Carolina, I would ask him this. Why is it that we have here a problem that everybody who speaks on it recognizes? The President recognizes it, the Department of Agriculture recognizes it, many Members of the Congress recognize it as an inequitable and unjust system that is doing great damage to one of the large segments of our industry.

Why is it, then, that something cannot be done about it?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I thank the gentleman, and I wish I had the answer. Certainly there are many of us trying to do something about that, including my distinguished friend from North Carolina, who addressed the question to me, and I want to thank him for the question.

We are at the crossroads now, and to get this bill passed that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] has introduced is going to have to have the backing of the administration, and it is going to have to have bipartisan backing.

As the gentleman said a while ago, this is an American problem, because any time you have serious unemployment, either in reality or threatened, it is an American problem and a very serious American problem.

I thank the gentleman for his question.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Let me say in conclusion, I want to thank the gentleman. That question was put to indicate we have a situation that everybody agrees is wrong, yet for one reason or another the various interested and affected elements are unable to get together and come up with a solution. It would appear to me that the problem is so grave certainly the best thinking on the part of the producers, the industry, and the Government could come up with something that would salvage this great industry and this great system.

I want to congratulate the gentleman from South Carolina for his usual magnificent job and for the very fine continuing war he is waging in this area.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I thank the gentleman. It is a real privilege to be associated with him in working on this problem and many others.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the gentleman from South Carolina that I agree with what my friend, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY] has said, with one exception. He has stated that the textile industry could easily convert to synthetics. This is certainly true in many cases, but there are many, many instances of one-mill operations that are completely set up to run cotton only, and they are experiencing difficulty in converting. In many cases these mills will have to close, and in other cases it might be necessary for them to sell to other operators at deflated values. I get letters in my office every day stating they are having difficulty in converting over to synthetics.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KORNEGAY. The gentleman is correct in his statement. By my statement with reference to the industry converting to synthetics I did not mean to say you could do so by a snap of the finger. There is an old adage that necessity is the mother of invention. If under the two-price cotton system it becomes impossible for our textile industry to compete, then it will be necessary for them to move to other phases at a great loss to many, many elements of the business.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. I agree with the gentleman. I just wanted to clarify the situation for the Members of the House, that these mills are not going to be able to convert easily. A lot of them will have to go out of business.

May I say to the gentleman from South Carolina, that he is making a very important statement in reference to a very important segment of our economy, not only to the area which we represent but to the country as a whole.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the fact is that American cotton is fast losing markets in this country and abroad. It is a fair statement to make that the principal reason for this is that cotton is not competitive in price.

Today U.S. cotton faces many tough competitors—including foreign-grown cotton, manmade fibers, and such materials as paper, plastics, and fiber glass. American cotton must meet price competition if it is to remain a source of livelihood for millions and a bulwark of the Nation's economy.

Another disturbing situation is that cotton which is held under the Commodity Credit Corp., under loans or otherwise, is increasing rapidly. It appears now that our cotton stocks are headed back up to an estimated 10.6 million bales by next August 1. This will mean even larger carrying charges for maintaining this inventory, not to speak of the amount of funds tied up in idle cotton inventories.

In conducting research on two-price cotton, I ran across the following editorial in the Kannapolis Daily Independent on May 1, 1963, entitled "Cotton Industry Fading." It appeared originally in the Los Angeles Times. I urge every Member of the House to read this editorial, as it gives a very short and concise picture of the situation facing the cotton textile industry today.

[From the Kannapolis (N.C.) Daily Independent, May 1, 1963]

COTTON INDUSTRY FADING

Federal price supports have destroyed the normal market for U.S. butter to a point where families on relief consume more butter from Federal surplus, distributed free than all the rest of the U.S. population.

The same disruptive forces are apparently at work in the cotton textile industry.

The U.S. cotton subsidy program costs the taxpayers $500 million a year. It has resulted in huge Government-held stockpiles.

The official price of cotton is pegged at 32.5 cents a pound, which U.S. textile firms must pay for their raw material. But the Government is selling cotton abroad from stockpile at 24 cents a pound.

So foreign textile makers, competing with U.S. textile operators, buy the raw material for fabric 8.5 cents a pound cheaper than U.S. weavers. As labor costs are also lower everywhere abroad, U.S. textile makers are put in an impossible competitive position by their own Government. They are losing their overseas markets.

The textile industry had a steady $300 million annual export surplus before World War II, helping the U.S. balance of trade by that much.

Last year we had a $400-million adverse trade balance in cotton textiles. The loss in 15 years is a net $700 million annually—with a consequent drain on our gold reserves. With the trade tide running against us, this hurts.

It also hurts to know that the industry work force has been reduced from 1.24 million employees to 880,000, a loss of 360,000 jobs. To the cost of U.S. taxpayers of $500 million a year in subsidies must be added the higher prices they must pay for cotton goods.

What have taxpayers "bought" with their $10 to $12 billion in cotton price supports over the past 30 years? (1) Loss of our overseas textile market and a $400 million adverse trade balance; (2) loss of 360,000 jobs, increased unemployment and relief costs for the jobless; (3) probably permanent loss of a large domestic market for cotton, as mills convert to synthetics.

But this does not give the entire picture. The fact is that the large integrated mills, consisting of numerous plants, are able to better withstand this present situation than are the small mills which lack the flexibility or financial resources to meet the threat. As an example, I include at this point a copy of a letter that I received from the operator of a small mill in Taylorsville, N.C., which gives a picture of the financial plight of the small cotton spinning mill:

TAYLORSVILLE, N.C.,
May 8, 1963.

Hon. JAMES T. BROYHILL,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JIM: I know you have been swamped with mail with regard to the two-price cotton program now in effect. This is not to add to your burden but merely to clarify the position of a little manufacturer. At this writing, it is impossible for me to ship any yarn to the northern market because of prices that are from 3 to 5 cents a pound lower than my manufacturing cost (and I have an efficient operation). The only business that I am able to secure is in extremely coarse counts from local knitters and only then because of freight and selling commission savings.

When the congressional delegation made their investigation of the southern mills, they went to the big mills that have a diversified line and have financial strength to withstand the present situation and in addition to this position, they are not wholly cotton manufacturers, but bib manufacturers, of synthetic products. A true picture of the cotton manufacturer's position would have been a tour through the small mills from 5,000 to 25,000 spindles, who do not have the resources to spend half a million dollars up for the latest manufacturing machinery. I have tried, unsuccessfully for over 6 weeks, to obtain some synthetic fibers for processing and am unable to obtain any from any producer and have frankly been told that they are not taking on any additional plants. Now JIM, with this position, in less than 18 months time, every single cotton mill my size and smaller will either be out of business or sold at a sacrifice price to one of the big chains. You and I both know that this is an unhealthy prospect. Why are we being sacrificed and what can be done to help?

We do not want subsidies; we only want a fair and reasonable chance to compete. If you have any information or can help us in any way, I would appreciate an expression from you.

Sincerely yours,
HOWARD R. WHITENER.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, has introduced a bill with the purpose of correcting the two-price cotton system and bringing it to an end. This proposal has admitted weaknesses and I would hope that the committee gives careful study to the proposal and makes needed corrections so that this House can have a sound program to support. I include at this point an editorial which appeared in the Charlotte, N.C., News on Saturday, May 11, 1963.

ANOTHER "TWO-BY-FOUR" IS NEEDED TO PROP UP THE COTTON INDUSTRY

Representative HAROLD COOLEY's proposal for ending the two-price cotton system is an expedient compromise. But it has the advantage of being attainable, a feature not shared by other suggestions. And the ailing domestic textile industry needs immediate relief if the cost-imposed shift from cotton to synthetics is to be slowed.

In the narrow view, Representative COOLEY's bill will reduce the competitive advantage enjoyed by foreign textile plants over American mills—an advantage stemming from U.S. subsidization of domestic cotton sold on the world market. But the broad effect will be to shore up again the entire U.S. cotton industry, which more and more resembles a sagging barn propped up by two-by-fours.

Nothing short of a complete overhaul can make the barn a truly stable structure. Unfortunately, neither the cotton producers nor the U.S. textile industry can wait for reconstruction. That's why Representative COOLEY's bill has merit.

The efforts of the Government to ward off distress in the cotton industry stem from the establishment in 1933 of acreage controls and price supports to aid farmers during the depression. This end was accomplished, but higher-priced U.S. cotton encouraged greater production by other countries. And the supports also encouraged the production of synthetics, which have been able to compete with cotton at the level of supported prices. Since 1930, the percentage of world cotton produced in the U.S. has declined from a high of 60 percent to a low, in the mid-fifties, of 39 percent.

The bind was further tightened when the United States found it necessary, in order to make domestic cotton competitive in the world market, to establish an 8½-cent-per-pound subsidy on exported cotton. This permits foreign mills to buy U.S. cotton at a price lower than that paid by American mills. Further gilding this advantage are lower wage scales abroad. The net result: Foreign mills buy U.S. cotton at "cut-rate" prices, transform it into cotton goods, ship them into the United States and undersell domestic products.

U.S. mills have sought relief, but without success. An earlier proposal—one we believe would have sufficed and one which did not entail further subsidy—called for an equalization fee on the cotton content of imported goods. But the Tariff Commission vetoed this recommendation. Meanwhile, U.S. mills have been looking more and more to synthetics.

Representative COOLEY's bill will provide payment-in-kind to U.S. mills. That is, they will receive cotton rather than cash subsidies. This will ease the two-price inequity, help safeguard the jobs of those who work in apparel and textile industries, and protect the income of cotton farmers.

However, it does not get at the inherent difficulties of a program which has as its basic function the provision of a guaranteed market at a specified price for a predetermined amount of cotton. No producer of any product could ask more.

Representative COOLEY's bill is designed to strengthen a weak spot in this artificial economic structure. Artificial or not, however, the cotton program is the only bulwark between stability and collapse for a major southern industry—the major industry in some States. Consideration of Representative COOLEY's measure, then, has to begin with the question: If not this bill, what? Even more to the point, for the South at least, is another question; if not cotton, what?

This editorial admittedly states that this bill does not get at the inherent difficulties of the overall cotton program and that nothing short of a complete overhaul of the program will be beneficial in the long run. I will certainly concur with the conclusions.

However, it is important that we have full study and consideration of this bill in the hope that workable legislation can be brought to the floor of this House and a cotton program enacted this year. We cannot afford to wait any longer.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. COLLIER. I am indeed sympathetic to the sad plight of the cotton growers of this country, as well as the textile industry of this country; but, as the gentleman knows, this is not a situation that is unique to either the cotton growers or the textile industry. I refer to ceramics, glass, and other industries. In the last session of Congress we passed what was known as the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. I hasten to say I do not know what the significance of the word "expansion" is in there, because I doubt seriously whether it will expand trade, but be that as it may, I want to point out the gentleman's colleague stated that while we recognize these problems, nothing is ever done about them.

Will the gentleman agree with me that one of the reasons nothing has been done about it is because repeatedly in the industry where they have been able to prove the peril point there has been no administrative relief; in fact, there has been complete indifference on the part of the Tariff Commission and the executive in recent years to provide the relief even after there has been a finding that an industry has reached the peril point as the result of foreign competition.

Mr. HEMPHILL. The gentleman is correct: I might say that the gentleman has been here long enough to know, and my understanding is that the reason by which the original bill of sale by which they sold the reciprocal trade legislation to the Congress—and I was suspicious of it—was the escape clause, and under the escape clause provisions the textile industry has never received any relief, nor has any other industry, except in rare instances. Not only has the textile industry received no relief from the escape clause, but recently we had the import fee up before the Tariff Commission, and by a 3-to-2 decision they turned it down.

And, I think it is significant for me to read a sentence here, which I would like to again emphasize, with the Japanese sitting there smiling and laughing at us. I was possessed of a great deal of emotion because I felt that the people back home should have had relief.

Here is a little article from a textile leader of this Nation, a former Secretary of the Army and a distinguished, great American.

> The Japanese should not be allowed to appear at textile hearings in this country "as if they own the United States," a textile leader declares. J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc., president Robert T. Stevens points out that their case should be presented through diplomatic channels rather than at hearings such as those held during recent negotiations on import limits.

I went back home and I made a couple of talks, and my heart bled, because I felt that the climate was wrong in an American hearing room, with American judges. It was wrong yesterday and it is wrong today, and unless something is done, it will be wrong tomorrow.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I just want to make one further observation, that this is indeed, in my humble opinion, the result of Congress once again abdicating its constitutional power and authority in giving to the executive branch of Government this power. And, I say that with no special animosity, because I care not whether it is a Republican or a Democrat in the White House, but the fact remains that Congress has delegated to the executive branch of the Government its responsibility under the Constitution notwithstanding, the right to establish duties and tariffs when it was, in fact, and is the prerogative and the responsibility of the Congress to handle this matter of duties and tariffs in the interest of protecting American industry, and we will forever, as long as we have turned this authority over to the executive branch of the Government, regardless of who is sitting in the White House, come begging for administrative relief because we have given to the Executive that responsibility that we should be exercising ourselves as the Congress of the United States.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I thank the gentleman for his participation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I agree with the gentleman that the textile industry is being punished and that something ought to be done about it. Let me say to the gentleman again, as I have said before, that this does not end with the textile industry. The gentleman says this is a bipartisan issue, and it is a bipartisan issue, but when we consider the price differential in cotton and the repeal of this differential as it presently exists, let us go beyond that and let us at the same time inquire into the punishment that is being dealt out to other industries in this country. This is the point I want to make. I agree that it is bipartisan. I am willing to support the gentleman, but I am not willing to support the elimination of the punishment of the textile industry standing alone. I want to go on at the same time and do something for the other industries that are being punished.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I thank the gentleman, and I would hasten to join the gentleman in doing something for everyone who is affected. That is the reason why 2 or 3 years ago—maybe not that long—someone asked me why I was going to vote for a depressed areas bill. I said, "It is pretty simple to me. The people in West Virginia and Pennsylvania are Americans, and they are my kind of Americans. I served with some of them in war, and for this reason I am going to help them." However, I did not beg the point at that time that my textile people would not be given relief, because I said that it was a pretty poor neighbor—and I have said it before—who will not lend his neighbor a hoe with which to kill a snake. That is what I was doing then, and I intend to do it tomorrow. I will help the gentleman with any industry. But I say do not saddle this effort on the part of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], and his great committee, to do something about a matter that everyone admits is wrong by saying, "If you are not going to include everything we do not plan to support you." We do not vote that way in South Carolina. We vote for the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, while I might have been criticized for my vote on that occasion I am happy to be criticized because any time I am criticized for doing what I think is American, that means I have stirred up something. It is like the preacher who said, "I am glad you did not agree with me on Sunday because if you did agree with me you might stay away." Maybe that is the way it is with people who criticize on occasion. Perhaps we need to stir up a little bit more criticism and interest.

Mr. Speaker, in keeping with what the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina said a while ago, I have an article which shows that cotton consumption dropped about 3,000 bales a day in a certain part of February as compared with last year. At the same time that that was going on and the troubles were increasing here, we find out that Hong Kong cotton exports increased, and I have the figures here from the Textile Reporter, which carries these statistics.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include this article at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The article referred to follows:

> Cotton consumption dropped to 32,956 bales a day in February from an average of 35,852 bales daily a year earlier. This pulled the seasonally adjusted consumption index down to 98 percent of the 1957–59 average compared with 106 percent in February 1962. Total U.S. consumption amounted to 659,128 running bales compared with 717,044 a year earlier. But synthetic staple consumption rose to 62,015,000 pounds from 48,196,000, the Census Bureau reports.
>
> Hong Kong's cotton shirt exports to the United States increased by 510,188 dozen to 1,942,390 dozen last year. Shipments in the first quarter of the 5-year international cotton textile agreement (October-December) amounted to 538,970 dozen. December exports showed a gain of 24,952 over the year-earlier figure, indicating a rising trend which went counter to purposes of the agreement. In addition, shipments of shirts made from other fibers rose to 71,744 dozen in 1962 from 66,868 dozen in 1961.

Mr. HEMPHILL. What is the answer? We do not have all of the answers. However, my purpose in getting up here today is to say that the textile people and the people who are in the know and who are dependent upon the industry have their livelihoods and employment at stake.

Mr. Speaker, I think the legislation which has been introduced by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], is good legislation. Therefore, I intend to support it. I publicly announce my support here and now. I say, with no reservation, that while I would prefer some other method, certainly legislation is somewhat of a compromise oftentimes, but not in this case too much of a compromise. However, I salute the gentleman for his efforts. I know it has been a hard problem and the gentleman has had a hard time. I have talked with the gentleman about it, and he has worked hard with it.

If we do not have some relief in this and other areas, I do not know what we are going to do.

I desire to include at this point in the RECORD a letter from Mr. A. C. Cannon, previously referred to here, who has a mill located in the congressional district which it is my privilege to represent. It just so happens that it is located up at York, S.C. I know those folk up there pretty well. They call me by my first name. I think it is one of the most complimentary things that can happen to a young man to be known and called by his first name and be known that well.

I ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks at this point in the RECORD the letter which I have just referred to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The article referred to follows:

CANNON MILLS CO.,
Kannapolis, N.C., April 12, 1963.

Hon. R. W. HEMPHILL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HEMPHILL: I have just finished reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 3, and I want to express to you again my appreciation of your continued interest in our problems.

You have certainly put enough in the RECORD to convince any fair-minded person that not only the textile plants, but their employees, their suppliers, and the cotton farmers are in jeopardy.

If the administration does not crack down on the Department of Agriculture and force it to carry out the President's statement of September that the inequity should be removed and support his program as expressed in his farm message of January 1963, we will be forced to the conclusion that the Humphrey-Freeman-Duncan combination is willing to defy the President's program.

I have just read a speech made by Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND in the Senate. It had no bearing on the domestic consumption, but was aimed entirely to export problems. It seems to me many of our cotton producers, cotton shippers, and possibly some of the public are magnifying the export importance to the American cotton farmer, when the truth of the matter is that their only dependable source of outlet is the American textile mills. We are a captive customer.

I am just as much in favor of maintaining our exports and helping our balance of trade as anyone, but it should not be allowed to deteriorate into a problem where it is export or American consumption. Our policy should include our part of the world market for raw cotton and an increased American consumption in our American mills and increased employment in our American mills.

Sincerely yours,

C. A. CANNON.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I have previously mentioned the Stephens interests, which has mills located in my district. A significant statement was made by the distinguished president of that company.

I read here on April 2 an article in which the J. P. Stephens Co. has announced the closing of a woolen mill at Andover, Mass. When you read something like that and you are located in a textile area as I am—primarily textile—you realize that article could have been about Chester, S.C., or York, S.C., or Gaffney, S.C., or any other place in my congressional district.

If that headline had come out in my district I would have to recognize the fact that a lot of people were put out of work. On the American scene today if you lose a job after 45 years of age, you have had it. You have had it especially in the textile plants because not only are they stressing efficiency but because of competition they have to stress efficiency. No only do they have to stress efficiency but on occasion we have been threatened with automation.

I have here a news story from Atlanta of April 10, 1963, and I ask unanimous consent that I may include it with my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The article referred to follows:

[From the Charlotte Observer, Apr. 10, 1963]

TEXTILISTS GET "AUTOMATE OR LIQUIDATE" WARNING

ATLANTA.—A textile industry observer told key National Cotton Council members Tuesday that spinning mills must explore possibilities of automation if they are to survive.

President L. H. Hance of the Institute of Textile Technology of Charlottesville, Va., sounded this keynote before a panel on automation at the council's research and marketing conference here.

A watchword of the conference was "automate or liquidate." Not all agreed that a pushbutton era of total automation will ever become technically possible in the textile industry.

Discussions of latest automation machinery were given by Robert M. Jones, of Easley, S.C.; Edward S. Rudnick, of New Bedford, Mass., and Zoltan Szaloki, of Whitinsville, Mass.

Hance, who presided over the discussions, said that increasing productivity through automation is one way to meet many forms of competition that face the American textile mills.

This competition stems not only from cheaper labor for foreign mills and a publicized price differential that enables foreign mills to buy American cotton cheaper than American mills can, Hance said.

Pressure to install automated machinery also comes from the glamor of automation in space-age industries and from the fact that automation is now in style, Hance said. He added:

"If you consider what we are faced with in raw material costs, labor States, competition within, competition without, Government action and prices in the market you arrive at the conclusion that the textile industry must become interested in improved methods to survive."

Hance said that he believed the industry in America could cushion the impact of automation on labor by using increased productivity as an opportunity to raise workers' prestige rather than mass layoffs.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, this article shows the threat of automation which is another threat we have facing us which takes the jobs of these people.

Mr. Speaker, here is what this news article I referred to a minute ago said:

> All of the workers will be dismissed when the plant is closed. The company is cooperating with other textile plants in the area in placing the workers.

As much as they cooperate—and I am sure it is sincere; I read that in no sense of criticism—I know what is going to happen. About 50 percent of those people are going to be turned out to graze, put on the unemployment rolls. They will lose their dignity, they will lose their jobs, they will lose their position as consumers in the Nation. Here are Americans who are made ineffectual. One of the privileges of citizenship is the privilege of working in this great Nation. That person is out of work.

I have said this time and time again because it is in my heart, that this is a very sad thing. What is going to be done about it I do not know, but I do believe that elimination of the two-price cotton system is the first step in the right direction; not only the first, but it is the only hope, because in negotiations we are outnegotiated every time; in diplomacy we are outbargained every time.

Why do I speak so often on this? I have something here from the Department of Commerce showing what textiles mean in my beloved and native State. It tells how much it means to our economy and how we are dependent on that economy. We used to grow a lot of cotton, but the kind of upland cotton we can produce has no great appeal on the market today. The people in other sections of the country can get water and have the advantage of their topography which lends itself to mechanization and easy cultivation.

I close here by calling attention to a statement which shows what our people are concerned with; the operation of textile plants in South Carolina in 1962, as sent to me by the U.S. Department of Commerce. I insert it in the RECORD at this point.

The matter referred to follows:

South Carolina's textile plants operated in high gear in 1962, leading all States in production of textile yardgoods. The total yardage produced amounted to a whopping total of almost 5 billion yards of cloth.

Of a grand total of 12,265,434,000 yards produced in the major producing sections of the United States, 10,974,258,000 came from mills in the Southern States, the Charleston field office of the U.S. Department of Commerce said.

Included in the South's output were 8,685,594,000 yards of cotton broadwoven goods, 94 percent of the national total, 2,149,058,000 of manmade fiber broadwoven goods, 80 percent of the U.S. supply, and 139,606,000 yards of woolen and worsted goods, 46 percent.

In most Southern States, especially the major producers, the 1962 production outstripped that of 1961, the nearly 11 billion

yards of last year topping that of the previous year, 10,514,844,000 yards, by slightly more than 4 percent. This compared with an increase of 3.6 percent in production of the three types of goods in the Nation as a whole.

Several Southern States continued high on the list of major producers in output of the three goods.

Paul Quattlebaum, Jr., Commerce Department field director, said this was especially true in the production of cotton broadwoven and manmade fiber broadwoven goods.

If you buy a cotton dress or shirt this summer, chances are almost 50–50 that the material was made in South Carolina. South Carolina's 3,989,921,000 yards of cotton broadwovens not only remained safely in first place and far ahead of all other States, but constituted 46 percent of that of the entire South, and 43 percent of the national trade.

In first place in production of manmade fibers was North Carolina, with an output of 879,790,000 yards, but the margin was narrow, because South Carolina closely followed with 817,262,000.

In second position in the output of woolen and worsted was South Carolina, with 39,246,000, an increase over 1961 of 8.3 percent. Massachusetts was the leader with 44,998,000.

Production was up in 1962 over 1961 in nearly all of the Southern States in each of the three types of goods. In woolen and worsteds, in addition to South Carolina's output, North Carolina produced 28,453,000 yards for a 16-percent gain, and Virginia, 15,175,000 for an advance of 37.7 percent. Incomplete data for Georgia in 1962, another major producer in the South, prevented measuring the rate of change in that State. Georgia, in 1961, was fourth in the Nation in output, with 30,946,000 yards, and in the first quarter of 1962 turned out 9,526,000, second largest quantity in the South and third greatest in the Nation.

Six Southern States, South Carolina, North Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Tennessee, and Texas, in that order, occupied the six topmost rankings in the United States in production last year of cotton broadwoven goods. In addition to South Carolina's nearly 4 billion yards, which was a 1-percent gain over 1961, North Carolina turned out 1,733,050,000 for a 3.2-percent rise; Georgia, 1,540,339,000, 5.2 percent; Alabama, 772,770,000, 1.7 percent; Tennessee, 159,521,000, 8.8 percent; and Texas, 129,186,000 up 3.8 percent over 1961.

Production of woolen and worsted goods in major producing States in United States and by regions in 1962 and 1961 with rates of change and ranking

[In thousand linear yards]

States and regions	1962	Rank	1961	Rank	Rates of change, 1962–61
					Percent
Massachusetts	44,998	1	43,115	1	+4.4
South Carolina	39,246	2	36,238	2	+8.3
New Hampshire	35,171	3	33,468	3	+5.1
Maine	35,157	4	30,750	5	+14.3
North Carolina	28,453	5	24,516	6	+16.0
Rhode Island	18,111	6	15,144	7	+19.6
Virginia	15,175	7	11,018	8	+37.7
Pennsylvania	12,566	8	10,668	9	+17.8
Connecticut	7,069	9	6,664	10	+6.1
Vermont	3,056	10	3,587	11	−14.8
Georgia [1]	------	------	30,946	4	------
New York [1]	------	------	2,309	12	------
New Jersey [1]	------	------	715	13	------
Southern region [2]	139,606	------	129,607	------	+7.7
New England region [3]	143,562	------	132,629	------	+8.2
Middle Atlantic region [4]	14,146	------	13,692	------	+3.3
North central region [5]	5,721	------	5,684	------	+.6
Western region [6]	3,238	------	2,950	------	+9.8
United States	306,273	------	284,562	------	+7.6

[1] Data for 1962 incomplete for fear of divulging confidential information.

[2] Southern region also includes Maryland, West Virginia, Tennessee, Alabama, and Texas.

[3] Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut.

[4] New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania.

[5] Ohio, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, and Missouri.

[6] Utah, Washington, Oregon, and California.

Production of cotton broadwoven goods in major producing States in United States and by regions in 1962 and 1961 with rates of change and ranking

[In thousand linear yards]

States and regions	1962	Rank	1961	Rank	Rates of change, 1962–61
					Percent
South Carolina	3,989,921	1	3,963,388	1	+0.7
North Carolina	1,733,050	2	1,678,821	2	+3.2
Georgia	1,540,339	3	1,463,838	3	+5.2
Alabama	772,770	4	759,464	4	+1.7
Tennessee	159,521	5	146,622	6	+8.8
Texas	129,186	6	124,483	7	+3.8
Pennsylvania	27,065	7	31,332	9	−13.6
New Jersey	5,310	8	7,740	10	−31.4
New York	409	9	1,209	11	−66.2
Maine [1]	------	------	116,394	8	------
Massachusetts [1]	------	------	259,869	5	------
New England region [2]	549,424	------	612,656	------	−10.3
Middle Atlantic region [3]	32,784	------	40,279	------	−18.6
Southern region [4]	8,685,594	------	8,496,434	------	+2.2
North central and west [5]	6,065	------	5,518	------	+9.9
United States	9,273,884	------	9,154,789	------	+1.3

[1] Data incomplete for 1962.

[2] Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut.

[3] New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania.

[4] Also includes Maryland, Virginia, Florida, Kentucky, Mississippi, Arkansas, and Louisiana.

[5] Ohio, Illinois, Wisconsin, Missouri, and California.

Source: Current Industrial Reports M22T.1(62) Quarterly, Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce.

Production of manmade fiber broadwoven goods in major producing States in United States and by regions in 1962 and 1961 with rates of change and ranking

[In thousand linear yards]

States and regions	1962	Rank	1961	Rank	Rates of change, 1962–61
					Percent
North Carolina	879,790	1	761,595	1	+15.5
South Carolina	817,262	2	698,618	2	+17.0
Massachusetts	175,141	3	170,249	3	+2.9
Virginia	160,740	4	160,757	4	−.01
Georgia	158,023	5	147,222	5	+7.3
Pennsylvania	148,623	6	134,575	6	+10.4
Rhode Island	85,567	7	82,675	7	+3.5
New Hampshire	51,584	8	48,323	8	+6.7
Maine	22,346	9	20,037	10	+11.5
New Jersey	20,324	10	21,669	9	−6.2
Connecticut	13,168	11	12,425	12	+6.0
New York	12,176	12	15,404	11	−20.9
New England region [1]	347,806	------	333,709	------	+4.2
Middle Atlantic region [2]	181,123	------	171,648	------	+5.5
Southern region [3]	2,149,058	------	1,888,803	------	+13.8
North central and west [4]	7,290	------	------	------	------
United States	2,685,277	------	2,399,273	------	+11.9

[1] Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut.

[2] New York New Jersey, and Pennsylvania.

[3] Also includes Maryland, Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, and Texas.

[4] Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Washington, and California.

Source: Current Industrial Reports M22T.2(62), Quarterly Summary, Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I am glad to yield to my distinguished colleague from North Carolina.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my distinguished colleague, Congressman Hemphill, in again raising my voice in behalf of the urgency to bring relief to our cotton textile industry by remedial action to offset the two-price cotton differential, which has been of such devastating disadvantage to our domestic industry.

The chairman of the great House Agriculture Committee has introduced a new cotton bill, May 9, H.R. 6196, which it is devoutly hoped can be shortly reported to the House and which contains a remedy for effective application to this problem. Chairman Cooley has labored long and diligently to produce a measure which meets the approval of the whole cotton complex and which has the blessing of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. I want to commend our colleague on his patience and perseverance in this regard, and I hope very much that it can be rewarded by the favorable consideration of this body to the bill which we trust his committee can shortly report to us.

Too long, oh, too long, Mr. Speaker, have we delayed this action, while our textile mills and our textile employees have suffered this unjust discrimination. My voice has been only one of many to be raised in protest of this long-standing injustice, but as I have demonstrated here on the floor so often that I may well earn the nickname of "Tex" Kornegay, I will continue to voice my protests until some definitive action can be taken. Chairman Cooley has truly said, in introducing the bill, that cotton is in a life-and-death struggle and that the bill he has introduced represents the broadest area of possible agreement which he has been able to negotiate.

Mr. Speaker, let me voice here the hope that when this legislation comes to us for action, regional differences will be forgotten in the overall benefits of the bill and that every spectrum of the cotton industry will rally to the support of this measure before our cotton industry has declined to the point where there can be no effective restoration of it.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished colleague from California.

Mr. SISK. Let me say in the first instance that I did not hear all of the gentleman's speech, but I wish to congratulate him on the statements he has made since I came into the Chamber. I agree with him completely with reference to the problems of the textile industry, and at this time I particularly wish to express my deep appreciation to my good friend from South Carolina for his fairness and his willingness to view America as a whole and the problems of all America when these programs come before us.

Again I express my appreciation of his help on water projects in my great State of California and of his assistance in other ways, because he recognizes that what is good for California is good for all America just as what is good for South Carolina is good for America as a whole. I agree with him.

But I would like to ask him a question or two with reference to the pending legislation introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture [Mr. Cooley]. I agree with the need for changes in the situation regarding pricing policies, where the textile mills are confronted with the situation that is leading to the very conditions which the gentleman has cited in his statement and in these articles from which he has read.

I would like to indicate that we in the West have some problems in connection with this having to do, very frankly, basically, with the desire for additional acreage. I am sure, as the gentleman knows, that there have been many, many meetings of the cotton industry across the Nation, the whole Cotton Belt, in an attempt to work out a compromise agreement.

Very frankly, I would have to indicate that at the present time there seems to be considerable feeling in the areas of the belt, and particularly the western growers, that in the pending proposal which the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Cooley] has introduced they have been pretty much left out of the picture. I have told the gentleman of his fairness, and I am asking if he would be willing if some amendment could be reached which would assist us in reference to our acreage, not to take it from his area, but which would grant us the opportunity even at a lower price support to gain some additional acreage or overplant. Would the gentleman be inclined to consider that?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I certainly would be inclined to consider it. Let me say to the gentleman, I have had proposed to me on various occasions programs which would increase the acreage of those able to produce cotton, but not at the same time kill off the people in areas that are now producing cotton and do not seek additional acreage, and that would provide that cotton be sold on the world market. Certainly I think that is worthy of consideration. I might say one of the biggest cotton growers in California happens to be from a neighboring congressional district. He has made a study of cotton conditions. I have had the privilege of knowing him out there in California as a producer. I do not know whether or not he is in my friend's district.

Mr. SISK. I do, of course, know Mr. Camp very well, although he does not live in my district but in an adjoining district. Very frankly, I might say to my friend, a substantial amount of the cotton produced in California today is produced by individuals who came either from the gentleman's State or the great States of North Carolina, Tennessee, Georgia, or other areas in the South and Southeast. We certainly do not desire to eliminate cotton as an industry in the gentleman's area. This is not of course what we would seek in any instance. We are concerned with being permitted to grow cotton in an efficient manner where at the present time limitations on acreage make it very difficult to know what actually would be the rock-bottom price for which we could produce cotton. This is a situation, very frankly, where our growers have indicated a desire to see a substantial drop in support prices on cotton in our area. We realize the problem with respect to many of the growers in the Southeast and the South. We are perfectly willing to support legislation which will do what the gentleman I know would feel must be done to sustain that industry there and at the same time give us an opportunity to produce cotton efficiently. This is the only reason I asked the gentleman to yield, so that we might possibly bring out some of these problems here, because I can see already in the past few days a hardening of the lines on the controversy here. Yet at the same time I am wholly in favor of the objective.

The gentleman's explanation refers to the textile industry. I would not want to be placed in the position of having to vote against him, because I am very grateful for what the gentleman from South Carolina speaking today has done in supporting us in many of the problems we have had. That is one of my reasons for asking this question and indicating to him my desire to cooperate, but at the same time realizing that apparently with the legislation which the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Cooley] has introduced we do have some differences.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I thank the gentleman for his remarks. I am sure the gentleman understands about the California cotton and the textile mills. When they start converting, like this Rockingham plant which is just across the line in North Carolina, the textile industry today is hurt because everybody cannot go into synthetics. If everybody goes to synthetics, it will eliminate half the plants in our country. Our diplomats will then say we have to import cotton textiles from overseas.

It means that there is going to be a decimation of the cotton producing industry which is one of the problems that the distinguished gentleman from California has always had at heart. I have talked many times with him about this problem and I salute the fact that the President was diligent in protecting their interests when he could do so. So we are in the same boat. We have to keep the producer alive and keep the consumer alive. That is about the size of it.

Mr. SISK. I would like to conclude my remarks by again expressing my appreciation to my distinguished friend for yielding and saying that I agree with him completely in his last remark because I had proposed to touch on the dangers inherent in synthetics not only with respect to the gentleman's area but for my area as well because we are very cognizant of the threat of synthetics, and of course this is the reason why it is absolutely imperative that we make domestic cotton available to domestic mills at a price that can compete with synthetics. Unless we do that, we are both going to be hurt. I join the gentleman completely in the hope that through the legislative processes we may be able to do something that will not only sustain a healthy and good textile industry in the gentleman's area but at the same time will maintain cotton as a producing item for the farmers of America and as a good economic benefit to the American economy.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I again thank my colleague and those who have participated in the discussion of this very serious problem. Again I say this is the best way to answer the problem. I hope both sides of the aisle support the elimination of the two-price cotton system.

INDONESIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ASHLEY). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, when a man has been warned a number of times for disturbing the peace and threatening his neighbors, when he has shown he is more interested in collecting guns than in providing food for his family, when he stubbornly refuses to go about the job of earning a living, he is considered less than a good risk for a loan from his local bank.

By the same token, if a nation repeatedly makes threats against its neighbors, arms itself to the teeth in the face of near chaos in its economy, stubbornly refuses to go about the business of improving living standards, I do not think such a nation is a good risk in which to invest our taxpayers' money.

Yet, this is the situation we find in Indonesia.

When this new nation was formed after its long struggle for independence, I was one of those who held out high hopes for its future. Indonesia is a potentially rich nation, populated by intelligent and cultured people. Its natural resources are enormous and virtually untapped. There is plenty of natural wealth in and under the earth in Indonesia to adequately feed its people, provide them with a rapidly improving standard of living, and it could become one of the richest industrial and trading nations in southeast Asia.

All the ingredients for stability, for economic growth are available in abundant amount. But, instead of prosperity, we find poverty. Instead of wealth, we find war and the constant threat of war. Instead of stability we find senseless speeches, designed to divide and create hatred and unrest.

At the risk of offending two lifelong friends, the Netherlands and Australia, our Government sided with Indonesia in its nebulous claims to West New Guinea, a stone age remnant which might be important from a prestige point of view, but which certainly did nothing to increase Indonesia's ability to provide its citizens with a better life.

Now that President Sukarno has pulled off this Asian "anschluss" with our help, in a manner reminiscent of European history in the late 1930's, he is turning his attentions to his neighbors to the north, threatening them with border raids and inflammatory statements, in order to draw the attention of Indonesia's people away from the economic chaos at home.

The Indonesian constitution has been turned off and on like a faucet whenever it happens to suit those in power.

Its economy is going downhill at express train speed.

Where Indonesia formerly was one of the major rice-producing areas in the world, and rice was actually exported, this nation now has to import more than a million tons of rice a year and, in the words of her own officials, has become the largest rice importer in the world.

Where Indonesia formerly was the world's major producer of rubber, this nation now has taken a back seat to Malaya, despite the fact that Malaya does not have nearly as much rubber plantation acreage.

Where Indonesia formerly was a major producer of tin, production has dropped from 44,000 tons in 1939 to only 16,000 tons. One-third of Indonesia's tin dredges are idle, and it has not even been able to meet its quotas granted under the International Tin Agreement.

Where Indonesian cane sugar previously dominated the southeast Asian market and was second only to Cuba in world production, Indonesian sugar is now a million tons less a year than prewar production. Taiwan has overtaken Indonesia in production of this important commodity.

The tobacco industry in Sumatra—once internationally famous for the quality of its cigar wrapper leaf—has gone rapidly downhill since the industry was nationalized in 1958.

Where Indonesia had a bank balance of $337 million in 1960, the Indonesian Government now has a sizable deficit, mostly because of a military budget which takes 1 out of every 2 rupiah received in revenue.

Deficit spending at a fantastic rate and a general lack of confidence in the ability of Indonesia to start working toward solving its pressing problems has dropped the value of the rupiah from the official rate of 45 for each dollar to 1,300 for the dollar at the free rate.

Retail prices of food in Indonesia have increased almost eight times in the past 8 years.

The Indonesians themselves are certainly aware of what is happening to their new nation. Prof. Oteng Kosasih, president of the Bandung Technical Institute, said:

> Before World War II, the country was prosperous and covered with green * * * but now it is dry everywhere.

What has caused this drying up of the resources, of the production, of the very hopes of the people of Indonesia?

One of the reasons, most certainly, is the belief of the current ruler of Indonesia that a nation's economy can be made to dance like a puppet on a string.

Another important reason is the vast arms buildup which has drained Indonesia and which will continue to drain Indonesia of its raw materials in the foreseeable future.

During the past 2 years, about 80 percent of the Indonesian military hardware has been supplied by the Soviet Union—for a price.

Today, Indonesia has an army of 330,000 regulars, well equipped with amphibious tanks and artillery.

Indonesia has 100 jet fighters and bombers, including at least 20 delta-wing Mig–21 supersonic fighters and 20 Ilyushin bombers.

Indonesia has a battery of ground-to-air missiles.

For its navy, Indonesia has 4 *Skoryi* class Russian destroyers, 4 *Kronstadt* class submarine chasers, 12 Soviet W class oceangoing submarines, 2 fleet tankers, 2 *Riga* class frigates with ship-to-ship missiles, and a 19,000-ton *Sverdlov* class cruiser.

In addition, the navy possesses 8 patrol boats, and anticipates 4 more submarines and 15 more torpedo boats from the Soviets.

At the present time, Indonesia has the largest submarine fleet of any Far Eastern country outside of the Soviet's own Pacific fleet.

This arms buildup has saddled Indonesia with a $1 billion debt to the Soviet Union, and the Russians have a habit of demanding payment in full and on time.

Both Russian and Red Chinese officials are welcomed in Indonesia with open arms. Indonesia now has the largest single Communist Party in the world outside the Iron or Bamboo Curtains, and the P. K. I.—Indonesia-Communist Party—has been demanding—and getting—an ever-increasing role in the Indonesian Government.

Recent headlines in our newspapers have shown us where this considerable military force, supplied by the Soviets, would be used. We have already noted President Sukarno's statements in opposition to the formation of a new nation—the Federation of Malaysia.

The independent Federation of Malaya, the autonomous state of Singapore and the three British Borneo territories—Sarawak, Brunei, and North Borneo—are scheduled to come into being as a single nation this coming August 31.

Indonesia does not like the idea. Russian-built aircraft have violated the Borneo border on a number of occasions. Indonesian gunboats have menaced the Straits of Malacca and have set fire to rubber-laden barges on the Johore Coast of Malaya. Malayan fishermen have been attacked and killed on the high seas. In the past month, Indonesians have raided the Sarawak border three times, within 40 miles of the Sarawak capital.

Why does Indonesia resent the new Federation of Malaysia? One reason most certainly is that Malaysia is expected to progress rapidly through democratic means, and the contrast between this progress and Indonesian failure to cope with its economic problems will dull the influence of President Sukarno as a leader in the so-called neutral bloc.

Another is that the formation of the new independent nation of Malaysia will deprive President Sukarno of an excuse for attempting to take over these former colonies in the same manner his threats against West New Guinea delivered him a colony with hardly a shot being fired.

For some time, the United States has stuck by its original intention of attempting to bring about a rapid increase in the standard of living in Indonesia. We have poured massive amounts of economic aid into this country, totaling some $682 million, through June 1962, with the hope that Indonesia would find a way out of its financial difficulties and somehow set its own house in order.

But instead of using this vast sum of money for the purpose for which it was intended, Indonesia has instead used it as a bargaining point to force more military supplies from the Russians.

Instead of living standards rising, they are actually falling, and this in a country where natural resources are among the best in the world.

In return for our assistance, we find that American consulates have been attacked, that our embassy buildings have been stoned and that the favorite pastime of Indonesia officials seems to be to hurl verbal brickbats in our direction.

Under the circumstances, I think the Clay report's statement in regard to further assistance to Indonesia was a masterpiece of understatement. The report recommended that "unless it—Indonesia—puts its internal house in order, provides fair treatment to foreign creditors and enterprises, and refrains from international adventures" it does not deserve the support of our economic aid.

Let us hope that Indonesia will realize that making threatening gestures at its neighbors is not going to solve its problem of putting enough food in the stomachs of its citizens who have suffered famine, who have been forced to riot for enough food to eat, in the midst of a land which should be supplying all their earthly needs.

In the past, I have been a strong supporter of foreign aid. I believe in its basic objectives. I believe in its principles. I am in agreement with the need for doing all we can to assist in bringing freedom, opportunity, and rising living standards to those countries which need such help.

But I cannot support programs in which governments refuse to help themselves and which are using funds, not for the benefit of their people, but for their own personal glory.

If Indonesia seeks a challenge, it certainly has that challenge in supplying the considerable needs of its own people. I do not see why our taxpayers' dollars should pay the fare for a one-way trip to oblivion for Indonesia and its leaders.

I think it is in the best interests of our Nation that we immediately suspend all further economic and military assistance to Indonesia.

We should continue this embargo on further financial assistance to Indonesia until such time as we have positive indications that Indonesia has started on the road to economic recovery and has ended its present intrusions on the territories of its neighbors.

To continue our present policy of assistance to Indonesia is senseless and useless. It simply helps to forestall the day when Indonesia must make a decision to solve its internal economic troubles.

I have every confidence that Indonesia has the ability to solve these problems. All that is lacking is the will and the positive leadership to tackle an admittedly unpleasant task.

We cannot—and we should not—tell Indonesia which particular path it should take to economic recovery and stability.

This must be decided by the Indonesians themselves.

But we cannot—and we should not—invest funds from our Federal Treasury in a nation which has shown so little interest in solving its own problems.

Our foreign aid dollars are not an end in themselves. They are simply a vehicle to progress. We should not permit anyone to use this vehicle until he has passed his driver's test.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOMFIELD. I would be delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Now, despite this tremendous Russian buildup of armaments in Indonesia and despite Dictator Sukarno's known affinity of the rulers in the Kremlin, in the last few weeks we have given to them—the United States reached into the pockets of its taxpayers and dished out almost $20 million to take care of their immediate credit needs.

Does not the gentleman think this is incredible that this Government, in the light of what is going on in Indonesia, would give them another thin dime—give this blackmailer Sukarno another thin dime?

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Yes, I do, very definitely, and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOMFIELD. I would be delighted to yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MATHIAS. The gentleman is producing some very interesting figures with regard to Indonesia and with respect to our relationships with Indonesia. It has not been very long ago that the Indonesians were making territorial demands against the Dutch in the area of Hollandia, an area which is familiar to many Americans who served in the South Pacific in World War II.

Is the gentleman able to advise the House as to how much investigation was done by the State Department in this aggressive action of Indonesia before we took a position in support of their territorial demands?

Mr. BROOMFIELD. I am afraid I could not answer the gentleman.

Mr. MATHIAS. If the gentleman will yield further, I think this is an area on which very few people have any knowledge, and I think it would be very interesting for the State Department to let us know—not from the point of view of fixing responsibility for past actions, but as an index of what we may expect in the future and just how much investigation was done of Indonesian demands and of the situation in Indonesia before we jumped into that situation and used our influence to persuade our allies, the Netherlands particularly, to surrender their claim on a very important part of the world.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOMFIELD. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Michigan for making this statement. The gentleman is one of the outstanding members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I would hope that the committee will see fit to put sufficiently strong strings on foreign aid this year in order to prevent the spectacle recurring of us shoveling out tax dollars to aid a Communist-leaning socialist government in Indonesia.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. I thank the gentleman.

LIVESTOCK INDUSTRY MARKET PROMOTION

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOMFIELD. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. Some time ago the House Committee on Agriculture reported out the bill, H.R. 5860, which would provide authority for the livestock industry to make deductions for expenses incurred in connection with market promotion. This provision has been in effect for some 40 years. The bill was well received in committee. In fact, on the motion to report the bill favorably, I voted "yea" and I do not believe there was any negative vote sounded at all. I certainly am hopeful that the leadership of the House will find it possible at a very early date to call this bill up since the livestock industry is approaching the deadline date of June 30 in regard to this legislation. Perhaps, someone in the House could inform me if there is any substantial opposition to this bill and why there might be any need for delay.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOMFIELD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] with respect to the bill, H.R. 5860. I might point out there are two very significant differences in the bill this year, at least in the presentation of the bill because this year we had both the national livestock meat board and the beef council joined together in support of this measure.

Secondly, this is something that benefits both the farmer and the consumer. It is an entirely voluntary program on the part of everyone involved from top to bottom. It removes any question as to legality of meat promotion by this method. As our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] pointed out, it is very urgent that this bill be passed because June 30 is the deadline. I am certainly for it. I supported it and voted for it in committee, and I certainly shall support it on the floor of the House.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOMFIELD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SHORT. I would like to clarify one point in relation to the remarks made by the gentleman from Illinois. I am a member of the Committee on Agriculture as is the gentleman from Illinois and also the gentleman from Kansas who just spoke, but I was one of the cosponsors of this bill in the first place and the gentleman from Illinois, I believe, said something to the effect that there may have been some opposition.

There was no opposition expressed in the committee or before the committee. This was a real unique piece of legislation, and quite a departure from the usual representation that comes up before the Committee on Agriculture when we have agricultural bills up for consideration. There was unanimous support for this legislation, and I have received literally hundreds of communications from all over the United States supporting the legislation and urging its adoption.

I just wanted to make this statement to indicate how universal the support for this legislation is. I have not had any communication raising any question or any opposition to the bill.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, in response to what the gentleman has just said, I had not intended to convey the idea there was any opposition. I do not know of any opposition at any point. I believe next Monday is Consent Calendar day, and this would be a proper time to consider and pass this legislation. In any event, I hope there will be prompt action on the bill which is identical to the bill the gentleman has introduced.

Mr. SHORT. I hope it will be considered and passed as quickly as possible.

UNNEEDED RACIAL PROBLEMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] for 15 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I dislike to see my country toady to any nation or to any individual. But this great Nation is toadying to Martin Luther King. The Government should tell Martin Luther King that he is on his own when he goes meddling. The best thing that could happen would be for all groups to ignore him, and then if he persists in getting himself sent to jail, leave him there. This demagog has made himself rich and a hero by playing up racial prejudice, and to this Nation's shame its Government has supported him in what he is doing. He is no friend to the Negro, but he is a disgrace to the United States.

It is common knowledge that a moderate city government has been elected in Birmingham; that the new city government intends to seek to bring an end to the discord between the races and that the concessions which have been granted there after strife and rioting would have been forthcoming with neither strife nor rioting under the new city government. This would not have served the purpose of Martin Luther King. His reputation must have racial crisis on which to feed; otherwise, he will fade from view. Phony that he is, he has no stature on which to stand in a constructive atmosphere.

The United States does itself and the world an injustice when it allows itself to be used in this fashion. Americans who travel abroad or who work for this country in foreign posts have told me repeatedly that one of the principal issues they encounter abroad is agitation about civil rights within the United States. Amazingly, however, they state that the agitation seems to stem primarily from constant emphasis on the problem by the U.S. Government itself. Whether through a defense mechanism or an effort for political gain, the result is equally unfortunate. The foreign press and foreign nationals assume that the civil rights question is a much greater problem than it actually is, and play it up accordingly. Other more mature nations, like the British, have handled this problem with seemingly little trouble, and I note that they never refer to it. We show ineptness abroad as well as at home in our handling of racial problems. Nobody gains.

AID TO THE BLIND BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. KING] for 15 minutes.

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill containing several proposals to amend title X and XVI of the Social Security Act.

The purpose of this bill is to bring about much needed improvements and increased opportunities to blind persons who must depend upon the federally supported blind-aid programs, maintained under these titles, and established by Congress to meet the needs of sightless men and women unable to provide for themselves.

This bill is a continuation of my efforts, since becoming a Member of the House of Representatives, to change blind-aid programs—to make of them, not programs offering mere marginal subsistence and static survival, but making of them programs designed and directed toward encouraging and assisting blind-aid recipients to achieve rehabilitation and restoration to a normal, full, and fruitful life.

In his message to Congress on February 1, 1962, President Kennedy declared that the federally-supported State programs of public assistance should have as their objective the elimination of prolonged dependency upon public welfare in our society; they should offer rehabilitation, not just relief. He stated that they should not only adequately satisfy the basic needs of our citizens who are in want, but they should also offer a means whereby these people, dependent and defeated, may rebuild their shattered lives, may achieve independence, restored self-pride, and economic self-sufficiency.

My bill would incorporate this high purpose into State programs of blind aid. It would help blind people who are in need to work toward rehabilitation, to achieve, ultimately for many, I believe, complete liberation from any dependence at all upon public relief.

Previous Congresses have adopted proposals I have offered to make programs of blind aid a rehabilitative force in the lives of needy blind persons, and they are now Federal law. And, because of this, blind people in need have been given increased opportunities to live with decency and dignity, to attain rehabilitation and restoration to regular and contributory lives in the community. But much still remains to be done, many more changes must be made if the Federal-State programs of aid to the blind are truly to provide the chance for rehabilitation to more than 100,000 blind Americans, if these programs are to offer more than relief from want to these people.

Although the public welfare amendments, adopted by Congress in 1962, contain provisions to give implementation to self-care, self-support, and the strengthening of family life public assistance goals included by the 1956 amendments to the Social Security Act, these very same public welfare amendments adopted by Congress last year include the new title XVI, making it possible for States to consolidate their programs of aid to the blind, the aged, and the disabled into one welfare category, into one single public assistance program.

It is my belief that this single category approach will not help blind people to realize the goals of self-care and self-support, that the social and economic problems of the blind, the aged, and the permanently and totally disabled are so different and distinctive that they must be solved and satisfied by solutions based upon the separate categorical approach—an approach, long established in public welfare, where these group differences are determined and solved by solutions based upon needs and problems which are commonly shared within each group.

The separate and distinctive needs and problems of each of these groups cannot, and will not, be met if the same standards of need are applied to all, if the same budgetary standards are applied to all, in utter disregard of the well-known categorical differences existing among these several groups.

I believe that many blind persons who are now aid recipients possess a potential for the attainment of full self-support, but few of these, I think, will realize this potential if they are to be lumped together, if their needs are to be considered and administratively treated as identical to those whose potential for achieving self-support is very slight in today's competitive world.

Therefore, several of the provisions of the bill I am introducing are intended to preserve, protect, and reinforce the categorical approach in the federally assisted State blind-aid programs.

Mr. Speaker, enactment of my bill into law would help substantial numbers of blind people in their courageous struggle to help themselves; it would help them in their determination that, in spite of the severity of their disability, they can and will live independent lives, dependent, not upon public welfare throughout their lives, but dependent upon their own talents and resources, contributing by their talents and taxes to the strength of the Nation.

Section 1 would remove the 12-month limitation on the exemption of additional income and resources for blind-aid recipients having a State-approved rehabilitation plan for achieving self-support.

Whether a person is sighted or sightless, certainly it takes more than 1 year to get a firm foothold in a new economic venture. It certainly takes longer than 12 months for a lawyer or an insurance agent, a salesman or newsstand operator to establish himself in a new business endeavor.

I believe that, when a blind person enters into the practice of a profession or establishes a new business, all of the income from such activity should be available to strengthen the person's position in the new business—to buy inventory and equipment, to purchase law books, to hire readers. I believe that none of the income should be used to reduce the blind person's aid grant until self-support has been achieved from the business activity.

Nor is the 12-months limitation on the exemption of additional income and resources needed as a control, as a means of preventing abuses. This exemption is only available to blind-aid recipients working under a State-approved rehabilitation plan for attaining self-support therefore, when the goal of the plan has been realized, when full self-support has been reached, then, of course, the exemption will terminate, for it will have served its purpose—the aid grant will no longer be needed—the blind person will have become independent, economically self-sufficient.

I am particularly proud, as a Californian, Mr. Speaker, to be able to cite the experience of my own State in support of this proposal.

In 1941, our legislature, recognizing the employability potential of blind persons, established a solely State-financed program now called aid to the potentially self-supporting blind. This program, intended to encourage and assist in the attainment of rehabilitation, intended to serve as a bridge from dependence to independence, provides liberal exemptions of real and personal property, of income and resources, as incentives to employment—so that blind persons receiving aid under the program may have the use of money they earn, the use of property they possess, to help them to achieve, the objective of their State-approved rehabilitation plan—the achievement of full self-support.

Since this program was established in California, a considerable number of blind participants in the program have attained full economic self-sufficiency. And in the overwhelming majority of these cases, many months in excess of a year were required to gain this most desirable end.

Let me give some figures from the records of California's Department of Social Welfare: During the past fiscal year—ending June 30, 1962—there were 111 discontinuances in the aid to the potentially self-supporting blind program—more than one-third of the entire statewide caseload.

A total of 62 discontinuances were due to various causes—the largest number resulting from a determination by the administering counties that an adequate plan for self-support no longer existed, and these cases were transferred over to the aid to the needy blind program.

However, 49 discontinuances were made because the recipients had achieved self-support.

Of these 49 persons who successfully reached their rehabilitation goal of full self-support, 36.7 percent entered the trades and professions, 24.5 percent entered business enterprises, 20.4 percent became vending stand operators and workers, 14.3 percent entered miscellaneous kinds of employment, and the plan of self-support was not known in 4.1 percent of the cases.

Of the 49 cases discontinued because self-support had been achieved, 20.4 percent were recipients under aid to the potentially self-supporting blind program for less than 1 year; 28.6 percent for 1 to 2 years; 20.4 percent from 2 to 3 years; 10.2 percent from 3 to 4 years; 8.1 percent from 4 to 5 years; and 12.3 percent for over 5 years.

You will see from the foregoing recital of California's experience that, of the cases discontinued because self-support had been achieved, almost 80 percent of the recipients required more than 1 year of assistance under the rehabilitatively directed program of blind aid before self-support was achieved.

It is most significant, I think, that for each year self-support is maintained, by the 49 recipients of aid, there is a saving in public funds of more than $92,000.

Mr. Speaker, if the Federal requirement, which limits the exemption of additional income and resources to 12 months, had been applied to the 49 now self-supporting blind persons, 40 of them would still be on the welfare roles, perhaps to remain there all of their lives.

I urge, therefore, that California's experience be used to benefit the Nation's blind, that Federal law be changed, that this restrictive 12-month's limitation be removed, and that blind persons in the other 49 States be stimulated and encouraged in their efforts to support themselves.

Not only will this action by Congress save many thousands of welfare dollars, it will also help blind men and women as they try to rebuild their lives.

Section 2 provides that the ability of relatives to contribute to the support of applicants for and recipients of aid to the blind be disregarded entirely in determining eligibility or the amount of the aid grant; and that only such contributions as are voluntarily made and actually received be considered as income.

In support of this proposal, I would remind you that the purpose declaration of the 1956 amendments to the Social Security Act includes this statement:

> [To] promote the well-being of the Nation by encouraging the States to place greater emphasis in helping to strengthen family life and helping needy families and individuals attain the maximum economic and personal independence of which they are capable.

Thus, alongside the goals of self-care and self-support, the aim of helping to strengthen family life is made a specific purpose of the public assistance programs.

And the 1962 public welfare amendments had as one of their primary objectives the preservation and protection of family unity, the strengthening of family integrity.

In contrast to this objective—yes, even in derogation of it—the effect of the enforcement of relatives' responsibility laws—a concept which is itself a holdover from the medieval poor laws—has been to humiliate and to demoralize blind-aid recipients and their families alike.

While the returns from such enforcement have never been financially significant in reducing expenditures under the program of blind aid, such enforcement has plainly worked injustice and hardship both upon the aging parents, passing out of the productive years of life, and upon their blind sons and daughters, still in the productive years of life.

Enforcement of relatives' responsibility laws has served only to spread poverty, not diminish it, to disrupt, and destroy family ties, not strengthen them. It results in replacing mutual affection with bitterness—above all, it retards or completely prevents the development of the healthy family relationships which are asserted to be a major purpose of the public welfare programs—of the blind-aid programs—under the Social Security Act.

Section 3 would prohibit any State agency administering federally supported blind-aid programs, from requiring needy blind recipients to subject their property to liens or transfers to such agencies as a condition of receiving aid.

To permit States to require the encumbering of the small amounts of property held by some blind-aid recipients deprives these individuals of an ability to use their own possessions for self-care and rehabilitation.

It is not possible to help the blind person to return to productive and useful living if his very future is to be mortgaged or his property is to be taken from him because he receives assistance from the public at a time of need.

Section 4 would specifically provide that the individual needs of each person claiming aid to the blind be presumed to be not less than a fixed amount—an amount to be set by each State in accordance with its own circumstances and conditions; and further, it provides that, if the actual need of an individual recipient exceeds the prescribed figure, he shall be entitled to a payment to meet his particular needs, unless he possesses nonexempt income sufficient to meet his actual needs.

The basic needs for the very necessities of life of blind-aid recipients are not being fully met in most States, let alone any special needs incident to blindness.

The unusually low amount of the average grant in the Nation means that even a subsistence compatible with decency and health is not being provided under the State programs of blind aid.

In order to further the purpose of self-support and self-care, aid to the blind should be granted on the basis of equal minimum payments to all blind recipients, to serve as a floor of protection against physical deprivation.

Thus, the minimum amount of aid would be derived from the demonstrated needs of the group of recipients, rather than the demonstrated needs of the blind individuals.

The special circumstances of the blind individual would be taken into consideration for aid grants above the minimum amount.

I believe that through the device of the fixed minimum grant of aid, the dignity and integrity of the aid recipient, as well as his right to privacy, are safeguarded; he is no longer subjected to the individualized investigation and discretionary judgement of the social worker, but is regarded as a member of a group, entitled to be treated in a manner prescribed by law.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the principle of equal minimum payments to all blind-aid recipients, with its provision of a floor of security and a positive stimulus to self-help and independence, tends to counteract the harshest features of the individualized means test; reduces administrative costs and simplifies procedures; and, most vital of all, preserves and promotes the moral and psychological well-being of the blind recipients, and stimulates and encourages them toward greater efforts in the direction of self-care and self-support.

Section 5 would specifically provide that nothing in title XVI of the Social Security Act shall be construed to prevent any State from having different standards of assistance and different eligibility provisions for any of the categories included in the combined plan under the title.

When representatives of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare appeared before congressional committees in support of the proposed public welfare amendments of 1962, we were assured that the new title XVI, which would allow States to consolidate their programs of assistance to the blind, the aged, and the disabled into one category, would serve only as a bookkeeping arrangement, that it was intended to simplify the administration of public assistance by furnishing a convenient package plan for Federal financial participation for all three adult categories.

However, in an official bulletin purporting to interpret the 1962 public welfare amendments, the Health, Education, and Welfare Department has made it abundantly clear that the new public assistance title was really not intended merely to make procedural changes in the administration of programs of aid to the blind, aged, and disabled, but it was the Department's intention to make substantive changes in existing programs—changes so far-reaching that, I believe, they would have disastrous consequences for the Nation's needy blind citizens.

Despite its own earlier protestations to the contrary, and despite the absence of any wording in the law to support it, the department has ruled that the combined State plan filed under title XVI must lay down a common standard for determining need and payments for all three adult categories of aid.

Furthermore, there must be identical provisions governing property holdings as well as lien and recovery provisions.

It is notable that the HEW officials in their interpretative State Letter 582 recognize an exception to their common standard requirement with respect to the five States which have separate State agencies or commissions for the blind—Delaware, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Virginia and North Carolina.

> In States which have a separate agency for the blind—

The Federal letter reads—

> the standard for the blind can be different from the standard for the aged and disabled.

If these 5 States can have different standards for the blind—if the differing objectives and characteristics of the blind program are recognized as valid for these 5 States—why is this principle not extended to the remaining 45 States as well?

I believe that it should be. I believe that it must be.

In short, Mr. Speaker, except in the five States mentioned above and except as otherwise provided in the Federal law concerning conditions of eligibility, standards of determining need and payments, the HEW administrators now insist that aid for the blind, aged, and disabled under the new title must be exactly the same.

The Federal ruling, contained in the Department's State letter 582, if allowed to stand, would serve, I am convinced, to result in the complete scrambling of blind aid with aid to the aged and the disabled, in terms of budgetary procedures, rule and regulatory materials, as well as actual administration of the program.

Mr. Speaker, blindness can and does occur any time during a person's life. It can and does often occur when a man is in his twenties or thirties, when he is still in his working years; and though he may have to seek public assistance to live, he need not remain a public charge, a burden for his remaining years upon the taxes of others.

Such a person can resume his former life and activities, can work again, perhaps in his old job and provide for himself and his family again—but he requires help.

The man now blind and an aid recipient, oftentimes with a potential for restoration to constructive, gainful work, has needs different from the aged person whose working life is past, from the disabled person who has no work potential at all.

But whether a blind person is young or old, whether he has an employability potential or not, he has needs which are unique, which are peculiar to the nature of his disability.

These needs must be considered separately from those of others, they must be met and satisfied on a categorical basis.

To scramble the blind, aged, and disabled into the one category of assistance, to judge the needs of all according to common standards, is to repudiate the self-care and self-support purposes of the Social Security Act—and it is to reject and repudiate the declared high purposes of rehabilitation and restoration asserted by President Kennedy as the goals to be served by the 1962 public welfare amendments.

I believe that if blind-aid recipients are to be indiscriminately lumped together with the aged and the disabled, if the needs of all are to be ascertained in accordance with common budgetary standards, then the terms self-care and self-support, rehabilitation, and restoration will become a mockery in the lives of thousands of blind persons—and thousands of blind persons may remain needlessly on public welfare all of their lives.

Section 6 would permit any State to claim Federal matching money for aid-to-the-blind cases under a separate or second plan for aid to the blind which meets the Federal requirements.

If the disastrous effects of title XVI on the lives of blind people are to be minimized and counteracted, if rehabilitation and restoration are to have real meaning in the lives of blind-aid recipients, then it is not enough to provide for the separate consideration of the needs of blind persons.

States should be permitted, as are the States of Delaware, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Virginia, and North Carolina, to file a separate plan for their blind-aid program.

They should be allowed to have separate administration of their blind-aid program.

And certainly the benefits from the Federal Government which are made available to States which consolidate their blind, aged, and disabled aid programs under title XVI, should be available to States which prefer to establish, on a separate basis, and under a second plan, their programs of blind aid.

Since these benefits have been statutorily assured to the 5 States, they should likewise be assured and available to any of the other 45 States which believe their blind-aid programs will better serve the needs of their needy blind citizens by separate administration of the public assistance programs created and maintained for the sole purpose of meeting the needs of these people.

The States should, I think, also be permitted to locate the administration of such separate blind-aid programs in an agency of State government other than the department of public welfare—a privilege already granted to the five select States—the division of the blind in Massachusetts, for example, I understand, is located and is allowed to remain located in that State's department of education.

Section 7 provides, just as title I and title XVI now do, for Federal financial participation up to one-half of a total of $15 monthly expenditure for medical care for blind-aid recipients.

States which prefer to continue administration of their blind-aid programs under title X of the Social Security Act, States which refuse to lump their needy blind into a common welfare pot with the aged and disabled in order to qualify for the inducements offered to them to consolidate their programs under title XVI, should have the advantage, for their needy blind, of these same inducements, and very same benefits provided by the Federal Government and paid for in part by Federal funds.

If Federal matching money up to $15 is to be provided to meet the medical needs of blind persons under the consolidated category title, then similar Federal matching should be provided for the same purpose to States which do not consolidate their adult aid categories.

If the medical requirements of needy blind persons are to be borne in part by the Federal Government's help, then these needs should be met, this help should be given, whatever the administrative structure of the program may be, whether under title X or under title XVI.

Congress has already provided such Federal help for participation in medical care programs for the blind to the five States already named above. Such Federal help should be available to all of the other States for the same purpose and for the same reasons.

Section 8 amends section 141(b) of Public Law 87-543, by striking out the words "or any period thereafter" at the conclusion thereof.

Section 141(b) of the Public Welfare Amendments adopted by Congress in 1962 now reads:

> No payment may be made to a State under title I, X, or XIV of the Social Security Act for any period for which such State receives any payments under title XVI of such Act or any period thereafter.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has issued State Letter No. 616, setting forth in question and answer form, the Department's interpretations of the various provisions of the new title XVI.

In part B of that document, question 4 reads:

> May a State, which has received payments under title XVI with respect to a period of operation of its title XVI plan, subsequently terminate that plan and resume operation of a plan under title I, X, or XIV?

"No," emphatically "no," is the answer given:

> Section 141(b) of Public Law 87-543 makes it clear that the State's decision to use the combined title (XVI) is irrevocable since it precludes Federal grants to the States under any of the assistance titles (other than title XIV) for any period after a period for which the State was paid under title XVI.

Mr. Speaker, the word "irrevocable" is a very strong word. It is a very final word. It means there can be no turning back once a choice has been made—no matter how good the reasons might be for turning back.

"Irrevocable" means that, even if state welfare authorities determine, after consolidating their programs for the aged, blind, and disabled into one single category under title XVI, that their needy citizens served by the State's aid program would be better served by returning to separate, categorical programs under title I, X, and XIV, they would not be permitted to do so—and still receive Federal participating funds for their aid programs.

No, Mr. Speaker, a State can never change back from title XVI once an election has been made.

However dissatisfied the State welfare people might be with their consolidated category of aid under title XVI—however much they might be convinced, after experience under title XVI, that they are unable to meet the needs of their needy citizens under such a program of aid—in spite of all this, Mr. Speaker, they must continue to administer their aid program under it. They can never renounce it and administer public assistance to the aged, blind, and disabled as they once did, under the categorical titles—I, X, and XIV.

Last year, when the Public Welfare Amending bill was being considered by the Ways and Means Committee—throughout the time this measure was before Congress—the new title XVI was described by its proponents from HEW, and in all printed explanatory material, as the "optional" plan.

Mr. Speaker, I fail utterly to see anything "optional" about a State plan which makes a choice to accept it, an unchangeable, an irrevocable choice.

Mr. Speaker, Federal money is provided to the States under the public assistance titles of the Social Security Act to assist the States in meeting the needs of their people who are unable to care for themselves and need help.

I believe we in Congress should always be aware of this purpose as we consider welfare legislation—and, I firmly believe, officials of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should likewise never lose sight of this purpose as they interpret the welfare legislation which we make into Federal law.

I believe that the present provision of irrevocability in section 141(b) is a derogation of this purpose, and should be struck from the law.

Section 9 would specifically provide that the services provided for in the public welfare amendments enacted last year be given only to those blind-aid recipients who voluntarily request them, that the amount of aid to such persons in no wise shall be contingent upon the acceptance of any service, and that services for the blind shall be defined and administered to the blind, aged, and disabled, on a categorical basis, and in accordance with their separate and categorical problems and needs.

Mr. Speaker, during all my years in Congress, I have worked to increase the opportunities of blind-aid recipients to work their way from dependence upon public welfare to independence and economic self-sufficiency.

I have introduced measures in Congress after Congress and I have supported these measures vigorously, that State blind-aid programs might be made into a rehabilitative force and a restorative process in the lives of needy blind Americans.

Therefore, I endorsed and supported the "services" provisions of the 1962 public welfare amendments to the Social Security Act when they were before us for consideration.

Designed to reduce or eliminate prolonged dependency upon public welfare, intended as implementation of the self-care and self-support purposes of the public assistance titles of the act, these "services," I believe, adequately provided, by persons properly oriented philosophically and proficiently trained—would prove of increasing benefit to needy blind persons as they so determinedly strive to offset the social and economic disadvantages of their disability, as they strive to live without sight in our sighted world.

I believe that services which will assist needy blind persons to achieve self-care and self-support are fine—I endorse them, I have worked for them—but, I believe they must never be a substitute or an alternative for the immediate, day-by-day reason for the every existence for public assistance programs—to help people in want to live, to meet their basic needs which they are unable to meet themselves.

Rehabilitative services should be made available to the blind-aid recipient, but he must never be coerced into accepting such services.

The desire for rehabilitation comes, not from threats, but from encouragement and stimulation; it comes from reawakened hope, from rebuilt dreams.

Rehabilitation services in public welfare will only be of value to blind-aid recipients, I think, when such people have been aroused to want them, when they have been stimulated to voluntarily request them. And it is for the personnel of the State administering agencies to provoke this desire, to so revitalize and stimulate their sightless clients that they do voluntarily request such services.

Nor must rehabilitative services in welfare programs to blind persons ever be offered on the basis that, if refused, aid grants will be cut off, applications for aid will be denied.

An aid grant must continue to be given to meet a needy person's unmet wants for food and shelter, for clothing and other necessities of life—it must continue whether or not a blind client is interested in rehabilitation, it must be given to him because he is in want and so long as he remains in want, with needs he cannot satisfy from his own labors.

Whatever the social or economic differences among blind persons, all share certain common problems because of their loss of sight.

If the rehabilitation and restoration services provided under public welfare programs are to be of any value, there must first be a recognition that needy blind persons share common problems and have similar needs because they are blind—and these problems must be met, and these needs must be satisfied by administering these services on a categorical basis.

To scramble blind people in with the aged and the disabled, and then to offer rehabilitative services to such an indiscriminately, intermixed group could, I believe, serve only to raise hopes, and then to destroy them at the very inception.

The needs of blind people, their difficulties and problems, are different from those of the aged and the disabled. In fact, the needs and the problems of each group of adult aid recipients are distinctive and different, each from the other group.

Rehabilitative and restorative services under welfare should and must be provided to each group separately and categorically—for, to do differently, it seems to me, will not promote the objectives of rehabilitation and restoration—they will not help to eliminate or reduce prolonged dependency upon public welfare—they can only result in chaos and confusion in the aid programs, and disillusionment to the recipients—and a lost opportunity to help people in grave need of help.

Section 10 would provide for an increase in the matching of State funds by the Federal Government whereby the Federal Government would pay six-sevenths of the first $50 of the average payment of aid to the blind, and from 50 percent to 75 percent—in accordance with the variable grant formula—of the difference between $50 and $100.

The proposed increase in the matching formula alone will assure that aid-to-the-blind payments in the State programs will more adequately meet the actual financial needs of recipients when they are in distress.

The consequence of the present low Federal ceiling on matching has been that many of the States have been unable to keep pace with rising prices, with constantly soaring living costs, thus imposing even greater poverty and distress upon the needy blind men and women of our land who must depend upon public assistance for their every want, for their very survival.

Section 11 would provide that any increase in Federal funds provided to improve blind aid grants of needy blind persons be given to the States only upon the condition that the States will pass on the additional funds to blind recipients without diminishing the States' share in such payments.

Although the reports of the Ways and Means Committee and the Finance Committee, issued with reference to the public welfare amendments adopted last year by Congress, were most explicit and most emphatic in declaring that the additional Federal funds provided for the aid programs were intended to increase the woefully inadequate monthly aid grants of recipients, few States have actually carried out this very clear and unequivocal congressional intent, few States have actually passed on the additional $5 per month per recipient to needy recipients of aid.

Nor is this a novel occurrence, but it has happened often over the years. Time after time, Congress has recognized that aid grants of needy recipients were not sufficient to permit the maintenance of even the barest standard of existence, and have endeavored to increase the aid grants by increasing the share of Federal money in such grants.

But too often some of the States have used the additional money so provided for other purposes, or they have passed on the additional Federal funds but then have reduced their own share, their own contribution, in such payments by a proportionate amount, leaving aid recipients as bad off as before.

This situation should be prevented from happening again. It can be prevented by adoption of this particular provision of my bill.

Section 12 would prohibit the imposition of any residence requirement as a condition for receiving aid to the blind.

If the goal of self-support in Federal-State programs of blind aid is to have meaning for many blind persons, then they must be free to move from State to State in search of greater opportunities of employment.

They must be free to go to a State where they believe they might obtain work, where their talents and training are needed, where they can realize the full value of training received through their vocational rehabilitation State program. They must be free to search for work throughout the Nation for it is not easy nor simple for blind persons to obtain jobs, however qualified they may be, however well trained and talented.

Since as aid recipients they cannot save enough to tide them over in a new State until a job is found, they must be able to apply for aid in the new State that they may live while they look for employment.

They must also be certain, if they do leave their home State in search of work and do not find it, that they can, if necessary, return to their home State and again qualify for blind-aid payments to live on. They must not be penalized in their search to improve themselves by forfeiture of their residence eligibility in their home State—a forfeiture which could occur and which, I believe, should not occur—and the remedy for this possibility is to prohibit residence as a requirement in federally supported State blind-aid programs.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, each of the proposals contained in the bill I have introduced today is intended to assist blind men and women as they aspire and work toward the goal of normal living.

Each proposal is directed toward improving conditions and equalizing opportunities for more than 100,000 sightless Americans.

Each proposal, enacted into law, would help to reduce the disadvantages encountered by these people, living as they do without sight, trying as they do to participate fully in our Nation's life without sight.

Therefore, I urge that each of these proposals be considered very carefully by Congress, and then because each as law would help blind people to be better able to help themselves, that each will be adopted and made law.

Our blind fellow citizens have already accomplished wonders beyond belief in their tireless efforts to help themselves; they will accomplish even more with the kind of help my bill as law would give them.

DETERGENT INDUSTRY FIGHTS ANTIPOLLUTION LAW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss] for 30 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, since I introduced legislation to end detergent pollution in this country on January 17, I have received expressions of strong support from countless citizens, academicians and scientists, sporting and conservation groups, municipalities, and State officials.

My bill, H.R. 4571, would ban after June 30, 1965, synthetic detergents that did not meet standards of decomposability to be set by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Secretary would be required to set standards to assure that synthetic detergents would decompose reasonably quickly and completely. The failure of the present detergents to decompose quickly or completely is the root of the detergent pollution problem that is causing increasing concern throughout the Nation.

I am deeply concerned about this problem. My concern appears in the Congressional Record for January 17, pages 558–562; February 11, pages 2215–2216; February 21, daily Record, page A815; February 25, daily Record, page A946; February 26, daily Record, page A978; February 27, daily Record, page A1020; February 28, daily Record, page A1060; March 7, page 2861; March 11, daily Record, page A1300; and March 25, daily Record, page A1701.

Members of the other body have also taken action to deal with the detergent problem. Legislation similar to mine was introduced by Senator Metcalf, of Montana, on March 19 (S. 1118), and by Senator Neuberger, of Oregon, with Senators McIntyre, of New Hampshire, and Nelson, of Wisconsin as cosponsors, on March 25 (S. 1183).

STRONG SUPPORT FOR H.R. 4571

Many of the citizens who have taken the time to write letters of thanks and to offer their aid have experienced one of the problems that H.R. 4571 will meet, a foaming head on their glass of drinking water. Alkyl benzene sulfonate—ABS—the basic ingredient of most of today's so-called hard detergents, travels for remarkable distances in the ground, polluting wells as it goes.

Many other citizens, I am sure, were motivated by the distress that they and all of us feel when we see a beautiful pond or stream made ugly by foam.

Scientists and physicians have written about their concern over the possible long-term effects of continued ingestion of ABS. In addition, the presence of ABS has other undesirable effects on our drinking water supply. Research by two scientists, Beverly White Miller and Sister Mary Raphael, both professors of chemistry and biology at Mary Manse College, Toledo, has led them to conclude that detergents in concentrations between 0.25 and 10 parts per million actually support the growth of harmful bacteria. Unfortunately, concentrations in that range are not uncommon in ground waters and streams in this country.

There is also some evidence that the presence of detergents in ground water facilitates the entry of intestinal viruses into drinking water supplies. This drives another nail in the coffin for the "detergent foam is good for you" campaign which tried to portray detergents as a useful indicator of the presence of other pollution. We should as readily be thankful for lipstick on our cup in a restaurant.

DETERGENTS ARE HARMFUL TO WATERLIFE

Support from sportsmen and conservation groups stems not only from the esthetic outrage at finding a favorite fishing stream buried in billows of suds but from concern over the effect of the detergents on waterlife. ABS is certainly toxic to some species of fish at levels of 3.5 parts per million or more. At times of low stream flow, at the outflow pipes of sewage treatment plants and at the discharge points for waste water from commercial laundries and other facilities using large quantities of detergents, such concentrations are now occurring. The result may not be fish kills but rather the departure of the fish from the threatening, polluted waters.

Detergent pollution levels of 0.6 parts per million—far lower than the level known to be necessary to harm fish—are toxic to eggs and larvae of bivalves. This was an important consideration in the decision of the Maryland Water Pollution Control Commission to impose antidetergent pollution regulations that would help protect the important shellfish industry in that State.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, a layer of detergent foam on the water's surface interferes with the natural purification of the stream to the detriment of acquatic life as well as human users of the water.

Municipalities have backed H.R. 4571 as a means of dealing with the costly and vexing problems "hard" detergents are causing in sewage treatment plants and water works. ABS interferes seriously with the treatment of sewage. It puts added burdens on local taxpayers by requiring extra efforts to beat down mountains of foam and to clean off the slippery slime that covers the plant when grease-laden foam is blown about.

DETERGENT INDUSTRY BEGINS CAMPAIGN OF PRESS AGENTRY AGAINST H.R. 4571

However, all this support has stirred the oligarchs of the detergent industry. They have sent forth teams of press agents in a campaign against legislation to eliminate detergent pollution.

According to newspaper accounts, the anti-anti-detergent pollution campaign came into my own State of Wisconsin at least twice last month. And on the second occasion, there were two teams in the State at once, according to a report in the Wisconsin State Journal.

The purveyors of soft soap about "hard" detergents have been representatives of Procter & Gamble, Lever Bros. and the Soap & Detergent Association. The third giant of the industry, Colgate Palmolive, has indicated to me their general support for H.R. 4571. Mr. Speaker, I want now to hail them for their public spirited position.

But the other leaders of the detergent industry have taken a quite different position and I think the people of the United States are entitled to an answer to their press agent's allegations.

First. Legislation is needed. The industry claims that banning "hard" synthetic detergents is unwarranted and unnecessary because the industry itself is voluntarily bending every effort to produce a more degradable detergent.

This is fine and if it is true, the ban should not bother the companies in the least; but if it is not true, the law will be there to serve the public need.

The industry has objected that the legislation would be "premature." But E. Scott Pattison, technical division manager of the Soap & Detergent Association, told a Wisconsin State Senate committee last month that the industry would have a degradable detergent ready for mass distribution by the end of 1965. This is a mere 6 months later than the effective date of H.R. 4571.

But significantly, no one has pledged that the industry will switch entirely to the superior detergent when it becomes available, especially if it is initially somewhat more expensive than the ABS-based product. The economics of the situation may be such that H.R. 4571 will be needed to assure the prompt and complete elimination of detergent pollution even after a decomposable detergent is perfected. Imposition of a deadline would spur the industry's alleged efforts to get a decomposable product on the market.

Second. The industry spending for research is nothing to brag about. The detergent industry spokesmen campaigning against regulatory legislation have made much of the claim that the industry is spending $5 million yearly for research to develop a decomposable detergent.

This is praiseworthy, as far as it goes. But the industry is far more notable for its efforts to convince people how fine their present products are than for its efforts to develop new ones in the public interest. The $5 million spent by the entire industry for research may be compared with the $138 million which, according to an estimate in the Forbes magazine of February 15, 1963, Procter & Gamble alone is spending on advertising. I would estimate that the spending for research is less than 2 percent of the industry's spending for advertising. In the light of the industry's grave responsibility in this matter, its press agents should stop crowing about the relatively paltry amount that it is devoting to research.

Third. The industry should emulate, not belittle, the West German decomposable detergents. While German industry is readying its production facilities to comply by October 1964, with a law similar to H.R. 4571, the detergent industry in America is sneering at the decomposable detergents developed by the Germans. J. P. Weaver of Procter & Gamble told the Milwaukee Journal last month that the German detergents are "dusty, harsh to the skin, and costly."

Pattison was quoted as "warning" that tremendous problems remain to be solved before a decomposable detergent can be produced in this country.

While Procter & Gamble was busy belittling the German accomplishment, it was equally busy in Germany building a large detergent plant at Worms. The problem of biodegradability should not bother Procter & Gamble G.m.b.H. from a technical standpoint, the reporter for Chemical Week observed in his March 30 article on Procter & Gamble's new oversea plants. Procter & Gamble G.m.b.H. will presumably use the detergent raw material of which Procter & Gamble, U.S.A., spoke so harshly.

I suppose, however, that Procter & Gamble G.m.b.H. will conduct a massive advertising campaign to convince consumers that their German product is "99 and 44/100 percent pure" and "oh, so mild."

The industry pretends that the detergent pollution problem has been exaggerated. But what has been exaggerated is the difficulty of doing something about "hard" detergents. The West German activity at Condea Petrochemie G.m.b.H. at Chemische Werke Huels and at Rheinpreussen G.m.b.H. shows that it is possible to market within a reasonable period of time, a detergent that will meet a higher standard of decomposability and clean equally well.

Fourth. The industry stifles criticism with money. Although there is considerable criticism of the effects of detergents, the outcry has been muffled by the diligence of the industry in passing out study grants. The pattern seems to be this: Step one, a significant group becomes actively concerned with the detergent pollution problem and nears the point of recommending remedial action. Step two, the industry sends in paid obscurantists who confuse the issue as much as possible. Step three, the industry offers a grant for a long, thorough study to clarify the issue. Result: The group is silenced for a good long while and the industry goes its way. Wisconsin papers recently reported the grant of $15,000 by the Soap & Detergent Association to share in a $32,000 study in my own State. I understand that there have been a number of other "study grants" by the association or individual companies.

THE INDUSTRY STAND IS DISAPPOINTING

Mr. Speaker, I have been disappointed by the attitude of the companies opposing H.R. 4571. That bill provides a means of protecting the public without putting the industry in a straitjacket or imposing unfair burdens. The setting of standards is left to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare who can take into account the status of technical and scientific developments in his decision. I believe ample time is allowed for conversion to the decomposable product.

H.R. 4571, of course, will not solve the entire water pollution problem or even end all the foaming in our waterways. But it will deal with one source of pollution and reduce the total by that much. It provides a definite step toward the clean, pure water that we need in this country, now and in the future.

COLONIALIST EXPLOITERS

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert into the Record at this point an editorial which appeared in the May 6 issue of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat that briefly and accurately tells a story that has worldwide implications.

I especially direct this editorial to the attention of State Department officials and our officials of the United Nations. May I also at this time remind the Members of Congress of House Resolutions 14 and 15 which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] and I have offered for the creation of a bipartisan special House Committee on the Captive Nations that could effectively develop and reveal to the world information such as is briefly touched on in this editorial.

Colonialist Exploiters

For every exploitation of a colony that took place decades ago, the West has been damned tenfold by enemy and friend alike.

But any Western sins against backward people blanch into obscurity at a glimpse of the magnitude of modern Soviet exploitation of its huge colonial empire in Eastern Europe.

One method the Soviet plunderers employ is to overcharge their satellites for the goods they get from Russia and to underpay the satellites for the products they sell the Soviets.

Through this practice in 1961, Russia cheated its six European satellites out of more than $1,300 million. The total from 1955 to 1961 exceeds $6,300 million.

These figures were arrived at by an analysis of statistics released by the Soviets themselves. Alexander Kutt, an Estonian economist, put this price tag on the massive Soviet exploitation. He simply compared the prices which the Soviet Union received and paid for exports and imports in its trade with Western Europe with those in its trade with Eastern Europe.

The countries, Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania and Poland, were overcharged $929 million for their imports in 1961 and underpaid $394 million for their exports to Russia. A net take for the Russians of more than $1,300 million.

This plundering of the once free states of Eastern Europe is a crime that ought not to go unnoticed among the Western-baiting regimes, whose shrill cries of colonialism have long bored the reasonable delegates in U.N. chambers.

CHOICE BECOMING CLEAR: GOLDWATER IN 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashbrook] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming more apparent each day that the Republican nominee for President will be Senator Barry Goldwater. The spontaneous support which he has received throughout the country is a modern political phenomenon. Operating without the usual buildup accorded the liberal candidates, the Senator from Arizona has nonetheless become more and more the favorite of Republicans throughout the country.

Editorial comments from papers throughout the Nation indicate the demand for a conservative candidate to oppose the reckless policies of the Kennedy administration and draw the issues into close focus. I include three typical editorials which point out the feeling which is becoming more manifest each day:

[From the Cut Bank Pioneer Press, May 2, 1963]

The Man From the West

There is a political miracle daily developing in this country that can have far-reaching effects on our national future. The emergence of Senator Barry Goldwater, of Arizona as a distinct presidential possibility and as a menace to the future power plans of the Kennedy dynasty is an event whose political importance cannot be overestimated.

The Goldwater boom, if such it can be called, is really a phenomenon. Behind it are no groups of wealthy easterners the like of whom scattered greenbacks with a lavish hand in Chicago in 1952, to defeat Taft. There is logical reason why a Senator from a small Western State should be a candidate; no reason at all save the personality of Barry Goldwater.

The Kennedy drive for the Democratic nomination 3 years ago was no spontaneous eruption of popular will; it was cold-blooded, carefully planned, cannily executed political maneuvering, well oiled with unlimited cash. Not so the current Goldwater movement. No one can place a finger on just where it started or who is behind it. For the past several years the Nation as a whole has admired the junior Arizona Senator. They have flocked to hear him, watched him on TV, read his syndicated column. There has been more or less wishful thinking regarding a desire to vote "for a man like that" for President; thinking dismissed because there has never been a President come from a frontier Western State, far from the centers of population.

Spontaneously, in different parts of the country, these thoughts seem to have crystalized into action: "This is our country." "We elect the President." "Why can't we vote for the man we want?" "Are we always going to be a nation of sheep?" "To hell with the odds, we're going to elect the man we need." Thus, the Goldwater boom was born. Makes we older people think back to 1912 when Teddy Roosevelt was forced out of the GOP nomination by President Taft; makes one remember that day when "Teddy" announced "My hat is in the ring"—and set the country afire.

What is the source of the Goldwater strength? Why, it is simply this, he stands at the opposite pole from Jack Kennedy. He alone offers that clear contrast of conservatism as opposed to liberalism. Goldwater put into commonsense language the things conservatives believe: States rights, limited government, private enterprise, and America first, last, and always. Bluntly stated, he has nothing in common with Kennedy.

There is more to the Goldwater strength than these few items, of course. The man from Arizona is critical of the U.N.; he is skeptical of foreign aid; he is in favor of placing reasonable restraints on the power of organized labor. These are issues on which grassroots America agree. He opposes deficit spending, demands sound currency, wants more power to go to State and local governments.

All these sound views on public issues would go for little were if not for the personality of the man: He is a soldier and a patriot; he has charm, grace, and good manners and, as Kilpatrick of the Richmond New Courier puts it, "These characteristics are contained, moreover, in a Rhett Butler maleness that men find attractive and the girls find divine."

The 1964 election is a year away, yet because the entire country is uneasy and worried, people are thinking ahead. The dreary prospect of a Kennedy-Rockefeller campaign appeals to no one; colossal in expenditures, otherwise devoid of interest. Last week in another column we used a short Tom Anderson quotation that applies here so aptly we repeat it: "Switching from Kennedy to Rockefeller would be like leaving the soiled diapers on the baby and only changing the pins."

Goldwater, if given the Republican nomination, can be elected. He is the only Republican who can be elected. And it will be a campaign to remember.

Given a chance, grassroots America would go joyously for Goldwater in 1964. It would be a case of average rural and small town Americans against the machine and bloc votes of the big cities; of the South and the West against the concentrated and controlled minority groups of the populous centers; of hundreds of thousands of small donations against the power of intrenched wealth; of amateur workers by the thousand competing with the paid professionals of the most powerful political machine in U.S. history.

You can more or less forget the partisan party labels. They are merely the vehicles in which the candidates ride. No longer is it Republican versus Democrats. The Democratic Party has been swallowed up by the New Frontier. With Goldwater as the nominee, the traditionally Democratic South would give him at least 100 electoral votes and millions of Jeffersonian Democrats the country over would take this opportunity to oust the dynasty bent on national surrender.

It would be a campaign. Not Republican versus Democrat, but at long last, conservative versus liberal. Courage versus appeasement. Economy versus waste. Sovereignty versus surrender. Grassroots Americans versus machine-controlled votes. A joyous, enthusiastic, ripsnorting campaign with America first, last, and always.

[From the Tulsa Tribune, May 1, 1963]

Let's Go With Goldwater

Come on, Barry, quit being coy.

Why don't you toss your Arizona Stetson right into the middle of the Republican ring and run for President? Win or lose you can help the country.

The country needs an alternative to the devouring moloch of ever-bigger Government. It needs a clear-cut choice between a high degree of individual freedom and the progressive loss of that freedom. It needs an option of destinations, not merely parallel highways to the police state.

The misnamed Liberals are quick to assure Republicans that if they adopt any course except "me-tooism" they will lose. And by following this advice too often the Republicans have slipped into a chronic minority party.

They now control only a third of the seats in the U.S. Congress and the governorships of only 17 of the 50 States. They have compromised and amended their principles until no one knows just what they stand for. In many cases they have merely offered to do as amateurs what the professionals are already doing to the country. No wonder that party is in trouble.

But the very weakness of the Republican Party presents its great opportunity. If you are desperate enough you can afford to be bold. There comes a time when there's no profit in timidity. As Marshal Foch said at the Battle of the Marne: "My right is driven in. My left has vanished. My center is hard pressed. The situation is excellent. I will attack at once."

If the Republican Party hopes to preserve the Nation from being trussed in a straightjacket by power-hungry rulers it had better quit trying to outpromise the promisers. You can't lick at giveaways the boys who seem to think that most of the national wealth should be funneled into Washington to be redistributed at their pleasure.

The Republican Party can only stand on broad principles. But these principles, properly stated, can make sense to a lot of Americans who are now hopelessly confused.

We don't know whether a party standing on those principles can win in '64. But we're pretty darned sure that if the Republican Party doesn't stand boldly against the bureaucratic bearhugs which are crushing us with love, it won't win in '64, '68 or ever.

Republicans should examine their early history. Because a man named Lincoln stood on principle he was defeated for the Senate in 1858. And because he still stood on principle he was elected President in 1860. The party rose because it presented a clear alternative to the confusion of the Democrats a century ago. When have the Democrats been more confused than now?

We like BARRY GOLDWATER because he represents an alternative. He has been too smart to take advice from people who never vote Republican anyway. He denies the progressiveness of progressive tyranny. He is, as he titled his book, a Conservative with a conscience.

Whether such a candidate would win or lose, he would draw together the forces that fear and hate Big Brotherism, and in that new unity there would be power to slow or halt this menace. These forces are now scattered and leaderless. It's time to give them a banner they can follow.

Come on, BARRY, get into the race with both feet—and fists.

[From the Miami Herald, May 5, 1963]

GOP Can Make Its Taste Test With an Undiluted Goldwater

VIEWS ON THE NEWS

Some distinguished but poorly advised Republicans are quietly putting forward Gov. George Romney, of Michigan, as their 1964 presidential candidate.

The group is said to include General Eisenhower, Leonard W. Hall, a former GOP national chairman, and J. Clifford Folger, the party's principal money raiser in 1960.

According to an Associated Press story, "Republican sources report that Romney is hopeful of winning the nomination * * * but is unwilling to appear to be seeking it."

And some cynics say that Hall and Folger are really committed to Dick Nixon, but hope Romney will gain enough national attention to subtract support from both Governor Rockefeller and BARRY GOLDWATER.

There may be some basis for this reported strategy, since the ways of politics are devious when the stakes are high. But I really don't know. Certainly, Eisenhower would not knowingly be a party to any such artifice.

MICHIGAN CAN LOSE

However, it seems to me that whether the Romney-for-President backing is sincere or is only a device to have the GOP turn again to Dick Nixon in 1964, the movement does a distinct disservice to Michigan's able Governor and the people of his State.

Romney was elected in 1962. He took office in the wake of more than a decade of misrule, complicated by labor's domination of former Gov. G. Mennen Williams and a stubborn, unprogressive Republican majority in the State legislature.

Michigan's financial woes made national headlines. Industry began to look upon the Wolverine State as "a bad place to do business." In some instances, the State's plight was exaggerated but there was enough substance in the charges to make them stick.

As the leading figure in the fight to give Michigan a new constitution, George Romney was effective and persuasive.

Since his election, the Governor has shown unusual administrative talents. The chaotic condition of the State's finances is being corrected. Romney works well with the legislature.

Citizens of Michigan trust Governor Romney. He is articulate, energetic and a crusader for good government.

He could be Presidential timber.

A START, BUT

Having said this, I pray that George Romney will not be persuaded or conned into believing that he is the man to take on J.F.K. in 1964.

First things usually come first, and there is a job to be done in Michigan. Romney has made a splendid start but it is, nevertheless, only a start.

The national attention that Romney is getting could turn a lesser man's head. Flattery—mixed with sincere and well deserved tributes—is a powerful potion.

Still, Governor Romney has a contract with the people of Michigan to change the State's image. This, he is doing. But the task is far from completion.

If Michigan gets the notion that Romney is being carried away by higher political ambitions, his motives will be questioned and his programs are certain to be seriously damaged.

As one who admires Romney and also has a vital interest in Michigan's growth and development, I suggest that George can do much more for his State and his own political future by staying on the job he said he wanted, and to which he was elected.

MORE ON POLITICS

Governor Nelson Rockefeller is discovering that being the front runner for the Republican presidential nomination has its disadvantages.

When 1,200 newspaper publishers and their guests gathered in the Waldorf-Astoria ballroom to hear "Rocky" at the Bureau of Advertising banquet, they were prepared for a topflight performance.

Unhappily, the Governor laid a large-sized egg. Though his speech did not lack substance, Rocky's delivery was dreary and uninspired.

As the lady sitting next to me said with a wink, "He must have his mind on other matters."

A CINCINNATI DUD

Last Monday, Rockefeller addressed a $100-a-plate Republican dinner in Cincinnati. One of my trusted spies in the Queen City reports that "Rockefeller came to Cincinnati with one apparent purpose: to sell himself to the Taft Republicans."

And then he added: "The general conclusion of politicians and reporters present was that the Taft Republicans didn't buy.

"He had a big turnout, the crowd was cordial but by no standards was it enthusiastic. Former President Eisenhower was here 2 years ago and got a rousing welcome. Last year, Senator GOLDWATER came and shook the rafters.

"Against those two sparkling performances, Rockefeller's was flat.

"He told the crowd what they wanted to hear—fiscal responsibility, Kennedy bungling, individual liberty, expansion of private enterprise, and more jobs—but the telling of it was dull.

"The Taft Republicans felt that this was especially designed for them. One said, after the speech, 'He's all things to all men. This is not the way he talks in New York.'

"Rockefeller was interrupted by polite applause half a dozen times in his speech, but it was not sustained or wild applause. This was in sharp contrast to the receptions given GOLDWATER and Eisenhower.

HE'S NO MATCH

What's happened to Rocky?

I have heard him talk on three or four occasions when he was quite good.

Perhaps the combination of liquor license scandals in New York, an unpopular tax program, the charges which forced the GOP State chairman to resign, and his personal affairs are getting him down.

In any event, Rocky's usual bounce is lacking, and, on the basis of his last two speeches, he would be no match for Kennedy in a hard-hitting campaign.

BARRY'S BACKING

Which, once again, brings up the subject of BARRY GOLDWATER.

Last Wednesday evening, on "CBS Reports," Columnist Walter Lippmann confirmed the views expressed earlier in "The Publisher's Notebook"; namely, that a Kennedy-Rockefeller race would give the voters little real choice because no real philosophical differences exist between them.

Lippmann thought, as I do, that if the Republicans really want to test the issues, they should nominate the Senator from Arizona.

As I said last week, "It would be stimulating, for a change, to have some real issues in a Presidential campaign and most beneficial to the country to hear them discussed."

In a poll of Ohio Republican county chairmen, taken by the Akron Beacon Journal, 37 percent were for GOLDWATER as against 30 percent for Rockefeller. Significantly, some of the chairmen favoring GOLDWATER are from the State's most populous counties.

One poll does not constitute a trend, but GOLDWATER's stock is rising rapidly among the conservatively oriented voters.

WELL, WHY NOT?

Could GOLDWATER win? Could any Republican beat Kennedy?

This I doubt, providing the country is still prosperous in 1964, and Kennedy isn't taking the worst of it from Comrade Khrushchev.

But until someone such as GOLDWATER heads the Republican ticket, the conservative strength in this country will never be tested.

Why should the Republicans, basically the conservative party, fear to try it?

CANYONLANDS NATIONAL PARK

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Utah [Mr. LLOYD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced into the record of the Subcommittee on Public Lands of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States Senate a statement pertaining to the proposed Canyonlands National Park, surrounding the confluence of the Colorado and Green Rivers in Utah which together constitute the wildest river in the United States and some of the most fantastic wonders of nature to be found anywhere in the world.

Because of the importance of this pending legislation to the people of all

America, I feel it appropriate to present the statement to the whole House at this time.

I give wholehearted support to the principle of S. 27, establishing the Canyonlands National Park. The areas of agreement among informed persons regarding conditions of the proposed park are now so dominating that action on the bill should proceed forthwith. The few remaining areas of disagreement, including the drawing of the precise boundaries should not be beyond the power of reasonable men to resolve, and at an early date. Upon the responsible accommodation of these remaining areas of disagreement depends my complete and final endorsement of S. 27.

Within the proposed boundaries of the bill, the Federal ownership is 231,532 acres, with an additional 27,000-plus acres of State land. There is no private land within the area. Consequently, the cost of acquisition to the Federal Government will be nothing, except for the amount required to pay for State lands which cannot be acquired by exchange.

In the words of Max N. Edwards, Assistant Secretary and Legislative Counsel to the Department of Interior, as presented for this record:

> So when you look at it, it is a real bargain in comparison to other authorizations with which this committee and the Congress have been faced. I think it is also important to point out to this committee that in considering this bill no private residences or employment will be disturbed because there are none.

But my purpose in introducing this statement into the record is not to emphasize the singular lack of expense to the Federal Government, important as this is, but rather to give voice to the incomparable opportunity now afforded to the Congress of the United States to add to the national park system, a land without comparison anywhere in the world.

On April 6, 1963, the author of the bill, Senator FRANK E. MOSS, of Utah, Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT, the senior Senator from Utah, and LAURENCE J. BURTON, Utah First District Congressman, met with Gov. George D. Clyde, of Utah, in Salt Lake City at a meeting suggested by Governor Clyde to which I was also invited as the fourth and final member of the Utah congressional delegation and which invitation I accepted wholeheartedly.

Subsequent to my acceptance, the House Banking and Currency Committee upon which I serve, acted upon legislation pertaining directly to the use and supply of silver, a matter if important economic interest to my State, and this bill was called up for action in the House at a time which conflicted with my planned visit to the Salt Lake City meeting on Canyonlands. I therefore canceled the Salt Lake trip in the conviction that the three congressional delegates in attendance with the Governor could make progress to agreement which I could support.

While the Salt Lake meeting did result in progress, there remained and still remain final steps toward full agreement. This involves, in addition to matters to be hereinafter noted, the precise language which will give to the United States and to Utah as national park area the incomparably beautiful and rare country of the Canyonlands, at the same time reserving for reasonable and proper development, the more obvious areas of oil and mineral wealth for beneficial use and orderly development. The successful culmination of this final agreement is our present challenge.

I will not add to the RECORD duplicate testimony which has been submitted in detail and depth in this and previous RECORD'S.

I endorse the descriptions of the beauty and inspiration of the geologic fantasies created by nature in the weird and colorful world which surrounds the confluence of the Green and Colorado Rivers in Utah. The uranium boom of the 1950's helped raise this fantastic land to public notice. Before those years, I traveled in this and adjoining areas of my State as a scoutmaster, and saw the wonder and inspiration which these magic lands brought to young eyes, and believe these unbelievable beauties should be protected and supervised with the respect and talent which the National Park Service contributes to the preservation of the supreme wealths of nature.

As a Utahan, I will be proud to have the searchers of beauty by the millions, in this and future generations, draw on the inspiration of these temples of rock and spirit.

Canyonlands in an area of untold oil and mineral wealth. As the result of new discoveries, the assessed value of property in San Juan County, in which most of Canyonlands is located, jumped from $3.4 million in 1953 to $132 million in 1960. The school district became self-sustaining and contributed a surplus to other school districts of Utah under the State's uniform school fund. The announced termination of Government purchases of uranium resulted in a decline in this valuation, but oil, potash and other mineral reserves make the area unique in national park regions and require open minds to prevent unwise and excessive lockups of economic resources.

There has been great impetus to creation of Canyonlands by the present Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Stewart L. Udall. As a Utahan, I should like to add my voice to the others who have expressed public appreciation to him. Secretary Udall would prefer a larger acreage in the park, as is well known, but it is my very sincere hope that he will recognize the validity of the arguments of those whom I support, which is that benefits to education and other vital needs, support the recognition of boundaries and uses which will allow reasonable utilization of mineral as well as esthetic resources.

There now remain three principal areas in which more precise agreement is necessary. They are:

First. Boundaries, particularly those in the northeast portion where there must be an accommodation with appropriate development of minerals, oil, and other private uses. It is my hope there may be agreement among all four members of the Utah congressional delegation which will represent the consensus of informed opinion and the needs of the National Park Service.

Second. Language of the so-called phaseout provisions. This should be sufficiently clear to discourage future litigation, at the same time giving proper weight to public and private rights.

Third. Improvement of language pertaining to exchange of Utah school lands within the proposed park area for similar sections outside the proposed park boundaries. This language should accurately and equitably represent the interests of both the Federal Government and the State of Utah.

I pledge my efforts to encourage and achieve these final decisions upon which a united effort toward the establishment of the Canyonlands National Park can be launched and which will be evidence of the intelligence of the civilization of our day.

NATIONAL DEBT LIMIT INCREASE LOOMS ONCE MORE

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. SHORT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, before the end of this week we will have before the House of Representatives the bill to once again increase the debt limit ceiling—to a record $309 billion. It is my understanding that the new limit is to apply during July and August, and that a further increase will be needed later on so the Government can finance a big deficit in prospect for the year beginning July 1. It has been further indicated by Treasury Secretary Dillon that the debt limit ceiling may have to be boosted still higher—to between $315 billion and $325 billion.

Some news items about this pending legislation, by means of their wording, might easily mislead my constituents and the general public into believing that this proposal meets with the approval of all the House membership, as well as the entire Ways and Means Committee membership. Therefore, I would like to point out some very pertinent objections I personally have, and am sure the minority members of the House and Ways and Means Committee also have, judging from their minority report on H.R. 6009.

First, I want to remind the public that Congress took action last year providing for a temporary statutory debt limitation for the period from July 1, 1963, to March 31, 1963, of $308 billion. During the period April 1 to June 24, this ceiling was to drop down to $305 billion. Then from June 25 to June 30, 1963, it was to drop still further to $300 billion. And finally, on July 1, the debt limitation would automatically revert to the permanent limitation of $285 billion.

This series of actions supposedly was taken to allow proper provision to be made for expected seasonal variations in expenditures and receipts of the Government in fiscal 1963—but was not intended to allow flexibility to cover deficit financing for 1963.

This administration misled the Congress and the public by presenting a fictitious budget—which balanced on paper only—and carried forth the fiction in the debt ceiling increase last year by providing the peak of $308 billion, to supposedly drop to a low of $300 billion after June 25, 1963.

We Republicans, and all those who do not believe in planned deficit financing as a Government policy, have been described as suffering from basic Puritan ethics by President Kennedy's chief economic adviser, Walter W. Heller. Just recently we were called "naggers" by one of the administration's legislative leaders. All because we oppose continued reckless spending, unbalanced budgets, and continued increased national debt limits.

According to Webster's dictionary, a "nagger" is one who irritates by persistent scolding or urging. It is unfortunate that the present administration appears to be so irresponsible in handling our national economy that we are forced to take the position of being "naggers"—although I must admit the term "Puritan ethics"—instead of having an unpleasant connotation—is looked upon by most people as something to be proud of.

I was under the impression, during the period of time President Kennedy was running for the Presidency, that he more or less suffered from "basic Puritan ethics." At any rate, a brief quotation from one of his speeches would indicate this to most people:

> I want to be a President who is concerned, not only about the Government balancing its budget, but about the housewife balancing hers.

Evidently someone helped cure President Kennedy from this dread disease once he took office. Let me say that the housewife would have far less difficulty in balancing her budget if the Federal Government would take the lead in establishing this as a virtue instead of Puritanism, and also take less from her budget in the way of taxes by the obvious means of lessening Federal Government expenditures.

The New Frontier has continued to flood Congress with more and more plans or programs for increased spending, not for balancing the budget. They want to "get the country moving again" by providing everything for the citizens, such as more public works, more medical care, more recreational facilities, a domestic Peace Corps, youth camps for school dropouts—thereby increasing the desire of many youths to go ahead and drop out of school, since they will be provided for by the Government anyhow. At the same time this New Frontier is going to reduce taxes, and at the same time increase Federal spending for all these services. Truly a monumental task. Actually an impossible task. Even for talented New Frontiersmen.

We Republican Members also love our country. We also have the welfare of its citizens at heart. We would like to help the President achieve his expressed desire to balance the Federal budget and help the housewife balance her household budget as well, if he would just permit us to help. We will even cheerfully accept the title of "Puritan naggers" if he will allow us the privilege of helping.

This year the Republican members of the House Ways and Means Committee have proposed an extension of the existing debt ceiling of $305 billion. The members feel, and rightly so, that if the Kennedy administration is truly sincere in its protestations of desiring efficiency and economy in Government, this proposed ceiling will be adequate for the foreseeable future.

The Republicans feel—and again let me say I wholeheartedly agree—that this ceiling would bring about closer control on Government spending. They have not just taken a puritanical stance and stated their objections, but have offered constructively three ways by which such a reduction of expenditures could be brought about, and I will outline them at this time.

First, the Secretary of the Treasury can increase sales of disposal of Government financial assets and strategic materials. According to a table listing loans, presented in a hearing before the House Ways and Means Committee this session, the Government has about $30 billion in loans, many of which are readily marketable to private lenders.

Second, there has been a substantial improvement in business and employment, which will increase revenues for the balance of fiscal 1963 and fiscal 1964. This statement was made by the Secretary of the Treasury in a speech before the U.S. Chamber of Commerce when he forecast an increase of at least $1 billion for 1964, of revenues to the Treasury.

Third, the Defense Department—according to the administration's own Director of the Budget in a speech before the American Society of Newspaper Editors on April 19, 1963—is supposed to produce nearly $2 billion of identifiable savings in this fiscal year.

Statistics are admittedly dull, but let me point the following out anyhow:

On June 30, 1961, the debt ceiling was $293 billion. Accumulated deficits projected to June 30, 1964, amount to $27.1 billion. Add these deficits to the debt ceiling of June 30, 1961, and during fiscal 1964 the debt ceiling will have to be raised to at least $320 billion.

Apparently the administration feels if they feed this "medicine" to cure our "basic Puritan ethics" in small doses, it will not taste so bad.

However, even that increase to $320 billion will not be enough unless the New Frontier spending is checked. President Kennedy has requested new obligational authority for fiscal 1964 of almost $108 billion. This New Frontier administration has, since it took office, increased the 1962 budget of $80.9 billion to the 1964 budget of $107.9 billion—an increase of $27 billion. This means a $1 billion per month rate increase.

This leaves we "nagging Puritans" with some pretty basic questions for the New Frontier planned deficit financing proponents.

First, do the Members of Congress now support a policy of unlimited debt?

Second, are we to "rubberstamp" every request of the administration to extend its borrowing authority every time its expenditures exceed its revenues? If so, perhaps the housewife would like this privilege extended to her as well.

Third, if the above situation is to be fact, why not instead simply remove a national debt ceiling limitation and stop being hypocritical about it?

We all realize austerity is never popular. But we also realize that bankruptcy is demoralizing—to say the least—and national bankruptcy would demoralize not only our own citizens, but the entire world, with the exception of the Communist bloc countries who look forward with glee to that happening anyhow.

While I hesitate to do so, I feel I must offer some more statistics. While a candidate for the Presidency, Senator Kennedy made a speech before the Associated Business Publications Conference in New York on October 12, 1960. At that time he castigated the party—meaning the Republican Party—which he asserted had expanded the Federal payroll to an all-time high, increased the debt limit five times, and spent two-thirds as much money as all the previous administrations put together.

In this speech, Candidate Kennedy had a lot to say about national economy, and finally stated "we would use the budget as an instrument of economic stabilization."

How did he plan to do this? By what means? Let me finish the quote:

> In boom times we should run a surplus and retire the debt. We should seek a balanced budget over the course of the business cycle with surpluses during good times more than offsetting the deficits which may be incurred during slumps.

So, let us analyze his statement. First, how does the Federal payroll now compare with the payroll existing at the time President Kennedy took office? Two million three hundred and fifty-two thousand seven hundred and ninety-nine were on the Federal payroll when he took office. As of June 30, 1962, the actual total was 2,484,654, meaning an increase of 131,855 Federal employees.

President Kennedy's estimate in the 1963 budget showed a figure of 2,534,041 for the Federal payroll; and as of June 30, 1964, the estimate is raised to 2,570,533.

Simple mathematics will show that the Kennedy administration first increased the payroll by 181,242 employees—and next increased it by 217,734 employees—over that which existed at the time he took office.

As an interesting, and somewhat aggravating sidelight, let me add that not only is he increasing the regular Federal payroll but the White House staff, through a Mrs. Dorothy Davies, is now taking direct control of the more than 10,000 student summer jobs in Government by means of directing that all applicants must be cleared through the staff, including political references. It will be interesting to find out later how many of the students hired offered Republican political references.

The five-time debt limit increase during Eisenhower's 8-year term—which Candidate Kennedy castigated—has been more than matched now by his fourth request for a raise in the debt limit before the end of his 4-year term. I shudder to even think of what will happen if the New Frontier administration holds sway for 4 more years.

I have a tabulation which shows the Eisenhower spending by fiscal years—July 1, 1952, through June 30, 1960—which indicates the following:

	Million
1953	$74, 120
1954	67, 537
1955	64, 389
1956	66, 224
1957	68, 966
1958	71, 369
1959	80, 342
1960	76, 539
Total	569, 486

However, the same tabulation shows Kennedy spending—also by fiscal years—July 1, 1960, through June 30, 1964, which indicates the following—even allowing for use of his own "estimates" for 1963 and 1964.

	Million
1961	81, 515
1962	87, 787
1963 (estimated)	94, 311
1964 (estimated)	98, 802

This totals, for 4 years, to $362,415 million.

When the final figures are in for actual spending, instead of the "estimated" figures for 1963 and 1964 it will be much, much more.

Not bad for an administration dedicated to "moving ahead."

My same tabulation shows that in 35 Republican administrations, there has been a net increase in the national debt of $16,086 million. Whereas, in 26 Democratic years, there was a net increase of the national debt of $271,832 million.

This same tally shows the percentage for Republicans for the national debt to be 5.6 percent, and that for the Democrats to be 94.4 percent.

It also shows the interest burden for Republicans to be $502 million, whereas the interest burden for the Democrats was $8.46 billion.

To close, I would like to quote Thomas Jefferson—claimed as the mentor of the Democratic Party—who had this to say about criticism:

> He who fears criticism is hopeless. If our cause is right, be not afraid of criticism, advocate it, expound it, and if need be, fight for it. Critics always have been and always will be, but to the strong minded they are a help rather than a hindrance. Take your part in life's stage and play your part to the end.

So perhaps instead of "naggers" we should more properly be called "helpers." But whatever we are called—we do not propose to cast aside our convictions or our integrity to help push the United States further down the road to national bankruptcy for the convenience of economic theorists.

A STUDY BY THE AMERICAN LAW DIVISION OF THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS SUPPORTS THE VIEW THAT A CONGRESSIONAL ACT IS REQUIRED TO AUTHORIZE CONVERSION OF THE CAPITOL THEATER TO OFFICE SPACE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] for 10 minutes.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, a new study by the American Law Division of the Library of Congress supports the view that a congressional act is required to authorize a conversion of the Capitol Theater in Washington, D.C., to office space. The National Press Building Corp., owner of the Capitol Theater in the District of Columbia, has announced that rising costs and taxes make it necessary to convert the theater to store and office space.

Last fall, to its great credit, the Committee on the District of Columbia of the House of Representatives shepherded through the House without a dissenting vote a bill to save the Capitol Theater which I cosponsored. I have now introduced a revised measure, H.R. 5613, which has broad citizen support.

Faced with a similar crisis regarding Carnegie Hall in New York City the citizens there acted in time and successfully saved that great cultural facility for themselves and their children. Leadership in the drive to save Carnegie Hall was undertaken by Isaac Stern and other leading artists, and Mayor Robert Wagner, Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, and Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt.

At the opening of the exhibition of the Mona Lisa in the National Gallery of Art President Kennedy said:

> I want to make clear that grateful as we are for this painting, we will continue to press ahead with the effort to develop an independent artistic force and power of our own.

There are, of course, many things such an independent artistic force of our own could do, but certainly there is nothing which would pay quicker and richer cultural dividends than saving the Capitol Theater in Washington, D.C. I hope that President Kennedy will add his own great leadership in the drive to save the Capitol Theater for the benefit of the people of this Nation. The interest in the arts of the theater was never higher than it is today, for we are in the midst of a national cultural explosion, and his leadership in this matter would have great national support.

Here in the District of Columbia many of our theaters have been destroyed for parking lot and other purposes—the Shubert, and the Columbia—and even now this administration is moving to destroy the Belasco Theater and replace it with a pseudo early American entrance to a wholly modern building. It is also moving to destroy the Washington Civic Auditorium in order to straighten a minor roadway.

Surely the arts which, as President Eisenhower once said, "make our civilization endure and flourish" deserve more than lip service from this administration.

I include the Library of Congress study, an article from the Sunday Star of May 12, 1963, and a copy of my bill, H.R. 5613, which seeks to preserve the Capitol Theater:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., May 10, 1963.

To: Hon. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL.
From: American Law Division.
Subject: National Press Club Building, District of Columbia, proposed elimination of theater in, jurisdiction to grant authority for.

Reference is made to your request of April 15, 1963, inquiring whether, in view of Public Law 127 (69th Cong., 44 Stat. 298), authorizing construction of the Press Club Building to a height of 140 feet, the District of Columbia Board of Zoning Adjustment now has authority to permit the proposed conversion of the Capitol Theater into office space or would this require an act of Congress. You enclosed a letter from Saul E. Rogers, attorney at law, 580 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y., which states his opinion that an act of Congress is required and in addition a newspaper clipping stating that the Board had deferred action because of its desire to explore its authority to grant the variance requested. Both the letter and the clipping are returned herewith. You particularly desire to be informed of the arguments which might be made supporting the proposition that a congressional act is required.

The proposition that a congressional act is required to authorize conversion of the Capitol Theater to office space would seem to be reasonably arguable along the following lines:

In 1910 the Congress of the United States passed the act of June 1, 1910 (36 Stat. 452) an act to regulate the height of buildings in the District of Columbia, (D.C. Code 5-401 through 5-409). The act, however, was more than a mere height regulation, although it dealt mainly in terms of height. That is to say it required various amounts of fire-proof construction for certain types of buildings, not only because of their height but because of the use, i.e., business buildings (sec. 2); hotels, apartment houses, and tenement houses, halls with a seating capacity of more than 300 and even theaters (sec. 3); business and commercial streets and residence streets, (sec. 5), etc. In other words they were actually dealing with fire safety and use in terms of height (see also H. Rept. No. 720, 61st Cong. on H.R. 19070; S. Rept. No. 581 and H. Rept. No. 1382 (the conference report)). In doing this the Congress placed an overall height limitation on buildings on business streets or avenues as follows (sec. 5):

"No building shall be erected, altered or raised in any manner as to exceed the height of one hundred and thirty feet on a business street or avenue as the same is now or hereafter may be lawfully designated except (north side of Pennsylvania Avenue from 1st to 15th Streets—160 feet).

In 1920 by the act of March 1, 1920 (41 Stat. 500), an act to regulate the height, area, and use of buildings in the District of Columbia and to create a Zoning Commission and for other purposes (D.C. Code 5-412), et seq., a zoning system was instituted in the District "to protect the public health, secure the public safety and to protect property." This act authorized the Zoning Commission to divide the District up into districts and to issue zoning regulations therefor. It did not, however, authorize the commission either, to permit buildings to be constructed in excess of the height limitations of the 1910 act, supra, or to issue regulations governing buildings to be erected in excess of that height (see text, 41 Stat. 500, also H.R. No. 108, 66th Cong. on H.R. 6863; S. Rept. No. 226, and H. Rept. No. 653 (conference report), CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 58, pp. 5044–5050, 6555–6558, vol. 59, pp. 1032–1033). In fact the act in section 2 made this specifically clear as follows:

"That within six months after the passage of this Act and after public notice and hearing as hereinafter provided, the said commission shall divide the District of Columbia into certain districts, to be known, respectively, as height, area, and use districts, and shall adopt regulations specifying the height and area of buildings thereafter to be erected or altered therein and the purposes for which buildings and premises therein may be used: *Provided*, That such regulations may differ in the various districts: *Provided further*, That the permissible height of buildings in any district shall not exceed the maximum height of building now authorized upon any street in any part of that district by the Act of Congress approved June 1, 1910, and amendments thereto, regulating the height of buildings in the District of Columbia."

Not only was such power not given to the Zoning Commission but the act of 1910, supra, was not repealed. Its limiting provisions were left in force, even down to the present time (see D.C. Code 5-401 through 5-409).

Subsequent to the enactment of the 1920 act, supra, i.e., in 1926, the Congress made a special exception to the 1910 act by enacting the act of April 16, 1926 (44 Stat. 298, ch. 150), an act to amend an act regulating the height of buildings in the District of Columbia, approved June 1, 1910, in the following terms:

"That an act entitled 'An Act to regulate the height of buildings in the District of Columbia', approved June 1, 1910, be, and it is hereby, amended by adding at the end of paragraph 5 of said Act the following proviso:

"*And further provided*, That the building to be erected on lots 813, 814, and 820, in square 254, located on the southeast corner of Fourteenth and F Streets northwest, be permitted to be erected to a height not to exceed one hundred and forty feet above the F Street curb."

The Congress, as is evident, did not amend the 1920 Zoning Commission Act to give the Commission authority to make exceptions to the construction of specific kinds of buildings above the height limitations of the 1910 act. In fact, as noted, supra in the 1920 act, those limitations were specifically imposed upon the Commission, and remained so. The Congress, having reserved to itself in the 1910 act decisions with respect the types, kinds, locations and other matters relating to buildings to be constructed above those height limitations, was in legal effect, here, making such a decision with reference to the specific building, the National Press Club Building, to be erected on the corner of 14th and F Streets NW. Even with respect to this particular building, Congress was not merely making a height decision. It considered the effect of light or air on surrounding property, stating in part (H. Rept. No. 591, 69th Cong., p. 1):

And we do not believe that this is in any way contrary to the spirit of the act of June 1, 1910, providing for a zoning commission, as the additional height will in no way shut off light or air from the surrounding property.

Although the committee's statement respecting the Zoning Commission Act was in error, since the Commission was established by the Act of 1920, the Congress, here, was making its own zoning decision respecting light and air with respect to that specific building.

The Senate committee's Report No. 505, on H.R. 9398, was extremely brief, because it had already considered the matter in connection with its own bill, S. 3495. If favorably reported H.R. 9398 for the reason, as it stated, set forth in the report on S. 3495, i.e., Senate Report No. 395. That use and density were considered by the Congress is evident from the Senate committee's Report, No. 395. The report states that an auditorium and appurtenances suitable for club, quasi-public and public functions is to be superimposed upon an 11-story structure and that the building would be the largest privately owned building in Washington. It noted architectural aspects of the building, its relationship to the "sky line" and the surrounding buildings, light, and air, and even the width of the surrounding streets. It stated that the "plans" provided for the auditorium, etc., and thus, it is evident that the committee was aware of the content of the proposed building, i.e., stores, theater, offices and club. Nothing appears, in either the act, the reports of the committees, or elsewhere, of an intention on the part of Congress to share its jurisdiction, over buildings, exceeding the limitations of the 1910 act, with the Zoning Commission or anyone else.

Finally, the act of June 20, 1938, 52 Statute 797, providing for the zoning of the District of Columbia and the regulation of the location, height, bulk and uses of buildings and other structures and of the uses of land in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes. (D.C. Code 5-420 et seq.) which created the Board of Zoning Adjustment and increased zoning powers, did not confer upon the Zoning Commission or the Board of Zoning Adjustment any additional powers respecting situations covered by the 1910 act. Here too, the matters covered by the earlier act were placed beyond their reach. Section 6 of the 1938 act specifically provides (see also D.C. Code 5-418):

"The permissible height of buildings in any district shall not exceed the maximum height of buildings now authorized upon any street in any part of the District of Columbia by the act of Congress approved June 1, 1910, and amendments thereto, regulating the height of buildings in the District of Columbia."

Nor did the repeals section of the act (sec. 15) reach the 1910 act. It repealed the Zoning Act of 1920, supra, in part and any laws in conflict with the provisions of the 1938 act. Further, nothing appears in the act, the Committee Reports (H. Rept. No. 2418, 75th Cong.; S. Rept. No. 1962) as elsewhere that Congress intended by the 1938 act to part with or share its jurisdiction in matters exceeding the limitations imposed by it in the 1910 act.

[From the Sunday Star, Washington, D.C., May 12, 1963]

END OF A MOVIE PALACE?

(By T. W. Tirana)

"Standing room only inside," the stentorian doorman with the resplendent blue and gold-braid uniform used to declare outside the Capitol Theater. The faithful, in a line often extending from F Street around the corner to 14th Street, would wait their turn patiently, rain or shine. Eventually they would be admitted to a sanctuary of marble pillars, cut-glass chandeliers, mirrors, polished brass, tasseled velvet curtains, plush carpets, fancy powder room with attendants, a platoon of deferential ushers and, of course, the show. For a few hours, they could live in splendor, unmindful of the dirty dishes left undone at home or the dreary job awaiting them the next morning.

Those were the old days. The Capitol doorman, now somewhat bedraggled, rarely announces these days that the show is sold out. Last to be sold out were the Bolshoi Ballet last November, "Gone With the Wind" in 1961, "Some Like It Hot," in 1959, and "Carousel" in 1956. The theater has tried 3-D, wiring the seats to vibrate with a horror show called "The Tingler," Vista-Vision and CinemaScope. Nothing seemed to help. Fewer and fewer people came until, now, the theater on the average has fewer than half its seats filled. In 1953, the four-act vaudeville show which preceded each movie was killed. The house staff was cut gradually from 70 to 30. The days of the old movie palaces had come to an end.

The National Press Building Corp., owner of the theater which takes up one-third of the building, announced recently that it planned to convert the theater into store and office space. There was a loud outcry. Two local groups offered to take over the lease the Loew's movie chain was ready to drop, a Citizen's Committee To Save the Capitol Theater was formed to remind the corporation of its duties to the public, and bills were introduced in Congress to allow the District Commissioners to run the theater. In the midst of the furor, Loew's lease was extended to July 31.

Although the Capitol is in bad need of repair, without it there would be no stage large enough for major ballet, opera and drama productions for several seasons. The National Culture Center, still on the drawing boards and far from its fund-raising goal, could not be built for at least 3 to 6 years. Constitution Hall is suitable only for concerts and the two remaining stages, at Lisner Auditorium and the National Theater, are small. The Washington Coliseum, built for circuses and hockey games, might serve in a pinch.

"Imagine Russia sending the Bolshoi Ballet here and our having to say that Washington can't play it—that Washington has no theater large enough," says Sam Jack Kaufman, president of Musician's Union Local 161, who used to conduct in the pit of the Capitol.

The Press Building actually was made possible by the theater. Desperate to get a theater downtown, movie magnate William Fox offered the Press Club, now majority stockholder in the Press Building Corp., $500,000 cash for the first and 25th years' rent if the club would build a theater in its proposed building. With its finances taken care of, the Press Club proceeded with the building. During the depression, when Mr. Fox ran into trouble, Loew's took over the lease.

The Capitol, called the Fox until 1933, was designed by C. W. and George L. Rapp of Chicago, noted movie palace architects. Although not as gaudy or grotesque as some of the other movie palaces built in the 1920's, the Capitol, with its imitation Moorish-Hispanic theme, was considered the best theater south of New York. It has a stage 100 by 32 feet, a Wurlitzer organ, an orchestra pit which rises to stage level, and seats for 3,342 fans.

Despite our nostalgic memories of the roaring twenties, public entertainments then were few. Only 1 family in 10 had a car, and there was no Little League, mass bowling or television. For lack of things to do and places to go, people went to the movies—religiously. They usually set aside 1 day a week for the picture show, caring more about going to the movies than watching a particular film; going to the movies was an adventure.

Class lines were more rigid in those days than these, and the great moviegoing public was fascinated with the lives of the rich. Hollywood, having discovered this early, played the rags to riches theme for all it was worth. The movie palaces helped, providing the setting for a total escape from reality.

The grand opening of the Fox, on September 19, 1927, was attended by President and Mrs. Coolidge and much of the Cabinet and diplomatic corps. A 50-piece orchestra played "The Star-Spangled Banner." Then the curtains opened, and there on the screen was Fort McHenry, lit by flashes of artillery fire, and Francis Scott Key, watching the flag that was still there. There were choruses, ballet, a newsreel and finally the movie, "Paid To Love," in which the crown prince of a small European country falls in love with a cabaret entertainer, marries her and, as a reward, obtains a large loan for his kingdom from an American banker.

All the stars who made the circuit stopped at the Capitol at one time or another. They included Judy Garland, Betty Hutton, Mickey Rooney, Red Skelton, Arthur Godfrey, Danny Kaye, and Frank Sinatra. There were also the big name band leaders—Vincent Lopez, Ted Lewis, Glenn Miller, Ben Bernie, Tommy Dorsey, Benny Goodman, and Spike Jones, who holds the theater attendance record of 55,000 for 1 week. Toward the end, though, entertainers began asking the theater management for the same pay they were getting from television and that did it.

The small movie theaters with low overheads came into their own after World War II. The movie palaces began collapsing, making way for office buildings and parking lots. Gone are the Roxy in New York, the plushest of the palaces, with 6,214 seats; the Fox in San Francisco; the Paramount in Los Angeles, and the Mastbaum in Philadelphia. One exception is the Metropolitan in Boston, which has been restored.

Were the Capitol to follow the trend, says Sol Hurok, international theatrical entrepreneur and a prejudiced observer, it would be one of "the greatest catastrophes Washington could face." Mr. Hurok says the demand for theater is such that practically every show he brings here is a sellout. He adds that he could guarantee keeping the Capitol going 26 weeks of the year all by himself.

The English Royal Ballet was the first fatality. Scheduled to play here May 24 through 26, it had to be rerouted to Boston because the Loew's management was not sure last winter how long it would have the theater. The last live performance was put on March 1, by Allan Sherman, the comedian.

Albert F. Adams, manager of the National Press Building and secretary of the corporation, says, "Certainly we have no fight with culture. It doesn't make sense to call upon this one corporation to subsidize the fine arts in Washington."

Knox Banner, executive director of Downtown Progress, a nonprofit group formed by businessmen, adds, "We regret losing any kind of theater downtown, but the owners shouldn't be required to continue to operate at a loss for the public good."

The Press Building corporation is heavily in debt. At the expiration of its yearly lease last September 30, Loew's asked for a reduction in its rent, which had been about $172,000. The corporation replied that this was not feasible. Two Washington groups were interested in picking up Loew's lease when the corporation, with preliminary bids on converting the theater, raised its asking price to about $265,000 with a graranteed 20-year lease. It indicated it would prefer having stores and offices in the space.

Hopes for keeping the theater going lie mainly in a bill introduced before Congress by Representative WIDNALL, Republican, of New Jersey, and Senator BEALL, Republican, of Maryland. The bill would allow the District Commissioners, advised by a citizens' committee on the arts, to lease the theater for 20 years. Arrangements to pay for the lease have been left flexible, but a grant from the proposed increased Federal payment to the District and a local tax of not more than one mill on each dollar have been mentioned. Hearings on the bill are imminent.

Commissioner Walter N. Tobriner says that although the theater should be saved if at all possible, a separate Federal grant rather any local funds should be used. "There are too many other priorities," he says. Washington is presently spending $24,100, not including Recreation Department staff salaries, on the arts—the National Symphony, the Watergate concerts, opera and ballet. Hagerstown, Md., is spending practically the same amount, $23,120, on the arts, and Baltimore spends more than $4 million a year.

Two local groups have offered to take over the Capitol lease, starting at the figure Loew's was paying. Both groups believe that by rebuilding much of the theater, by bringing in a combination of top movies and theater, and by cutting the overhead, which they think would be easy with a local management, they could fill more seats and make the Capitol pay.

Don King, owner of the new Town Theater, who is one of the bidders, notes that more than 9 million people visited the Smithsonian Institution last year. Many of these people could be added to the Capitol's regular patrons, he thinks. Patrick Hayes, who with Fred Burke and Marvin Goldman, operators of the K–B Theaters, forms the second group, believes he would have no trouble bringing in foreign productions like the Bolshoi, musicals from the New York City Center, Stratford Shakespearean shows and stars like Victor Borge, Maurice Chevalier, Bob Hope and Harry Belafonte.

Some observers believe that if the Press Building corporation starts converting the theater into stores and offices, it will find the cost much higher than it anticipates. Six stories would have to be cleared out, without disturbing seven stories above them and all this on one of the busiest streets in Washington.

On the other hand, the cost involved in taking over the theater and running it at a profit is incalculable. A new management would have no way of telling, for instance, whether it could get Loew's seats at a reasonable price or whether it would have to buy new seats at $40 each. Meanwhile, the fate of the Capitol, and whether for several seasons there will be any large theater productions in Washington, hangs in the balance.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Board") is hereby authorized and directed to enter into an agreement with the owner of the Capitol Theater, at 1326 F Street Northwest, in the District of Columbia, in order to assure that the Capitol Theater shall continue to be available for a period of at least twenty years for such purposes as the presentation of outstanding programs including motion pictures. This agreement shall include an option on the part of the Board to renew for a like period of time. Subject to the agreement entered into between the Board and the owner of the Capitol Theater, the Board is authorized to rent such theater for such purposes as the presentation of outstanding programs including motion pictures upon such terms as the Board may deem appropriate.

SEC. 2. There is hereby established a committee which shall be known as the "Citizens Committee on the Arts" to be composed of twenty-five members as follows:

(1) the President of the Board, who shall serve as chairman of the Citizens Committee on the Arts;

(2) the Superintendent of the Recreation Department of the District of Columbia, who shall be executive secretary coordinator; and

(3) twenty-three well-qualified judges of the arts to be appointed by the Board.

The Citizens Committee on the Arts shall advise and assist the Board in carrying out the provisions of this Act, and advise and assist the Board in carrying out any other art activities which the Board may undertake or assist. In making appointments to the Citizens Committee on the Arts under clause (3) of this section, the Board shall give special consideration to individuals recommended for such appointment by art organizations and associations, and educational institutions, or other institutions, with art programs, in the District of Columbia.

SEC. 3. (a) (1) The Board is authorized to and shall solicit such contributions as it may deem necessary for a special fund to be known as the Commissioners' Art Fund to carry out the provisions of this Act as well as any other art activities or programs which the Board may undertake or assist.

(2) Beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, the Board shall set aside annually, from the general fund of the District of Columbia, for contribution to the Commissioners' Art Fund an amount, not less than $100,000, from the annual payment by the United States toward defraying the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, not more than an amount equal to the product of 0.001 and the amount of tax revenue collected by the District of Columbia government in the preceding fiscal year which, together with such contributions as may be accepted, and such funds as may be set aside from the general fund of the District of Columbia, under the authority of this section, shall be known as the Commissioners' Art Fund and shall be used by the Board to carry out the provisions of this Act as well as any other art activities or programs which the Board may undertake or assist.

(c) Of the funds made available to the Board each fiscal year under this section, not less than $75,000 shall be used by the Board to assist the National Symphony Orchestra in producing additional concerts in the District of Columbia, such as art festivals for the purpose of discovering and encouraging young artists, summer concerts, and children's concerts, at such facilities as the Carter Barron Amphitheater, the Capitol Theater, and Constitution Hall, which additional concerts shall be presented free of charge, or at such admission fees as the Board may determine, for the benefit of the residents of the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia and its environs and the millions of tourists who visit the District of Columbia annually.

(d) Of the funds made available to the Board each fiscal year under this section, not less than $50,000 shall be used by the Board to assist the art activities and programs of the Recreation Department of the District of Columbia, authorized by section 3 of article II of the Act entitled "An Act to create a Recreation Board for the District of Columbia, to define its duties, and for other purposes", approved April 29, 1942, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 8–210), in the presentation of programs for children, young people, and others, and to provide other creative art programs which shall be made available in cooperation with the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, as well as those programs which may be provided in cooperation with the Corcoran Gallery of Art.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on the Judiciary have permission to sit during general debate on May 15, 16, and 17.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

MATSON NAVIGATION CO. STATES POLICY POSITION ON THE ISSUE OF SUBSIDY IN THE HAWAII FREIGHT TRADE

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to your attention and to the attention of our colleagues the position of the Matson Navigation Co. on the issue of subsidy in the Hawaii freight trade.

I bring this statement to the attention of the House of Representatives in that I am chairman of the California delegation's subcommittee on ships and shipbuilding. As of this time, Mr. Speaker, I have not determined in my own mind the merit or possibility of a subsidy for the domestic shipping trade. However, I feel the position of this pioneering company in the western trade merits our serious evaluation.

Matson Navigation Co., the biggest U.S. domestic nonsubsidized steamship line, has taken a neutral stand on the issue of subsidy in the Hawaii freight trade.

The question of subsidy for Hawaii's ocean freight was discussed today by the trade's dominant carrier in the first of a series of informational memos on various subjects which materially affect Matson and the public interest.

Matson's "memo on public affairs" says the company's position regarding the issue of subsidy, both construction and operating, Federal or State, in the Hawaii freight trade is one of neutrality—neither pro nor con.

The memo adds: As the principal carrier in the trade, it is Matson's fundamental responsibility to keep the total cost of moving Hawaii's commerce at the lowest possible level consistent with the maintenance of adequate service and a fair return to the stockholders on their investment in Matson. This responsibility does not include the determination of who is to pay this cost.

Under the present system, the users of the service pay directly for it through freight charges. This is the normal way of doing business. Under a subsidy arrangement, part of the cost would be shifted, either to the taxpayers of the State or the Nation. Whether or not the cost burden should be shifted is a matter of public policy, to be decided by the public and those appointed or elected to serve the public interest.

If a subsidy were ever granted in the Hawaii trade, it is anticipated that Matson would be a participant on an equal basis with other carriers.

Subsidy, of course, is appealing to ratepayers because it would offer a measure of rate relief at other than the ratepayers' full expense. Ratepayers know that subsidies are paid to many U.S. shipping companies to move goods in foreign commerce. It is not illogical for them to wonder why it should not be extended to include Hawaii.

The basic question raised by the Hawaiian interest in a Federal subsidy is this: What, if any, economic consideration should the Federal Government accord to Hawaii because its mid-Pacific geographical location eliminated the use of two modern forms of transportation—rail and truck—as a connecting link between Hawaii and the mainland coastlines of the first 48 States? It should be pointed out that most of these States do not benefit from ocean transportation, the cheapest carrier of freight per ton-mile known to man.

The framers of the U.S. Constitution did not envision the question of noncontiguity, and the authors of the statehood bill were not able to examine all the possible new State-Federal relationships that would emerge from the fact of noncontiguity. So this basic question could be restated as follows: Is Hawaii's sea-girted economy burdened because it is not served directly by the rail and truck network of the Nation; and, if so, is this a Federal responsibility for which the tax moneys of all the States should be spent?

AN OBJECTIVE VIEW

An expert employed by the State of Hawaii to study the subsidy question points out in his 1962 report that most proposals suggesting an operating differential subsidy have appealed to the so-called national maritime policy.

"But," said Dr. John L. Hazard, professor of transportation at Michigan State University, "the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 was not written with a view to support of the noncontiguous domestic trades.[1] In fact, it would seem to forbid it.

The policy objectives are general:

"It is necessary for the national defense and development of its foreign commerce and domestic commerce that the United States shall have a merchant marine (a) sufficient to carry its domestic water-borne commerce and a substantial portion of the water-borne export and import foreign commerce of the United States, and to provide shipping service on all routes essential for maintaining the flow of such domestic and foreign water-borne commerce at all times; (b) capable of serving as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency; (c) owned and operated under the U.S. flag by citizens of the United States insofar as may be practicable; and (d) composed of the best equipped, safest, and most suitable types of vessels, constructed in the United States and manned with a trained and efficient citizen personnel. It is thereby declared to be the policy of the United States to foster the development and encourage the maintenance of such a merchant marine.[2]

"The exclusion of domestic contiguous trades from subsidy is specific: 'No operating-differential subsidy shall be paid for the operation of any vessel on a voyage on which it engages in coastal or intercoastal trade.'

"The status of noncontiguous States is less certain * * *" said Dr. Hazard.

Another facet concerning subsidy and domestic noncontiguous shipping is the cost of handling cargo, which is no small consideration in the overall high operating costs of the Hawaii trade. There is no subsidy for handling cargo in the foreign or domestic trade at present. If cargo handling were to be subsidized in the domestic trade, this would be a new concept not present in any statute or trade of our country. Only certain vessel costs are now subsidized in the foreign trade, crew wages and subsistence, vessel insurance, and certain maintenance and repairs.

According to Dr. Hazard: "Matson's cargo handling costs in the Pacific service (about two-thirds of all costs), for instance, are 2½ times per ton what they were in 1951."

For 1960, the year Dr. Hazard used for his subsidy calculations, he noted that "only a third (34 percent) of the cost increases (incurred by Matson in 1959) occurred afloat, an area accessible to subsidy, while two-thirds (66 percent) occurred in operations beyond the reach of subsidy, primarily in cargo handling ashore."

Dr. Hazard noted in his study,[3] that the foreign trade shipping line recipients of subsidy determine how much of the subsidy, if any, will be converted into lower rates. "They do not do this arbitrarily," said Dr. Hazard. "They have worked under intense cost pressures since the end of World War II."

In a major effort to reduce overall operating costs, including the high cargo-handling cost burden, Matson has been the first U.S. line to effect a containerization system, the first to modify freighters for specialized automotive and sugar hauls, and the first to undertake computer programing of vessel scheduling.

"Matson," declared Dr. Hazard, "is definitely the low-cost operator in both Hawaiian-mainland (Pacific coast and Gulf-Atlantic coast) trades, and her agent-owners have not been making substantial returns from either ownership or agency operations."

While Matson has had to raise its general merchandise rates several times in recent years, Dr. Hazard noted:

"Hawaii's ocean freight bill (mainland and interisland) amounted to about 6 percent of island personal income in 1960, while the mainland spent over 9.6 percent of its personal income for commercial freight services in 1956, according to one authority, and 5.3 percent according to another authority."

Opponents of subsidy for the domestic offshore trades may argue that Hawaii's ocean freight bill is less than the mainland transportation freight bill of other American communities which are a similar distance from source of supply. For example, freight carried between Chicago and San Francisco, between Seattle and Memphis, between New Orleans and Philadelphia, costs relatively more than between San Francisco and Hawaii. Many U.S. communities, in fact, have higher transportation costs than Hawaii's. These mainland communities may argue that subsidy for Hawaii is discriminatory against their own interests; that Hawaii does not subsidize any portion of mainland transportation; and that mainland taxpayers are not willing to subsidize any of Hawaii's.

Supporters of subsidy for the domestic offshore trades may argue that regardless of land and ocean transportation cost comparisons, many sources of supply are so located that both land and ocean transportation costs must be paid.

These opposing viewpoints present a question of public policy which the people must decide.

MANY MONUMENTS TO SAM G. SPAL

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I join the chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in expressing sorrow for the death of Mr. Sam G. Spal, who was one of the outstanding employees of Congress in the handling of technical legislation.

---

[1] A contrary view, however, was expressed in "Interlocking Relationships in Hawaii and Public Regulation of Ocean Transportation" by Dr. Vernon A. Mund, that: "A policy of subsidizing protected carriers is in keeping with present national merchant marine policy."

[2] Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

[3] Subsidy, "A Step Toward Definition of a Hawaiian Shipping and Commercial Policy," Bureau of Business Research, University of Hawaii.

Whenever I had to know what was in the law or in pending legislation on many of the issues to come before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I found that a talk with Sam Spal was certain to give me the information I needed. He was not only a dedicated researcher into the facts connected with technical provisions of legislation, but he considered it his responsibility to make sure any Member of Congress seeking information on any point with which he was familiar received all of the facts which would be helpful to that Member. In other words, Sam Spal was not a proponent of a point of view when helping us on legislation but an objective researcher in the highest traditions of congressional staff service.

As a result, many monuments to his memory can be found in the Statutes at Large of the United States, in the United States Code, in the legislative reports filed with the House, and in the documentation and research material which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in connection with major legislative issues handled for the committee by Mr. Spal.

Mr. Speaker, as the sponsor of numerous bills referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce during the past 10 years, particularly in connection with changes in the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, I was deeply indebted to Mr. Spal for the technical help he often provided me, and his courtesy and graciousness when I needed some specific information. It is therefore a source of great satisfaction to me right now that he knew personally of my high regard and my appreciation for his efforts and ability, and also that I had expressed my regard publicly, here on the House floor, last September, during consideration of the drug control bill we enacted last year.

I did not mention Mr. Spal by name at that time. I wish I had done so. But he knew I was referring particularly to Sam Spal, and so did the members of the committee which he served, and so did most Members of the House, when I referred, during my remarks on the drug bill, to the outstanding staff work done on that legislation in the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The American people are fortunate to have had the services of Sam Spal—and of others like him, who work behind the scenes in the Congress and do the hardest part of the work on legislation, and carry a tremendous burden of responsibility in drafting and shaping the laws which affect the American people in so many ways. Every beneficiary of railroad retirement benefits, for instance, owes Sam Spal many debts of gratitude; so does every American concerned about the safety and efficacy of the medicines used in treating the sick; so does every American who believes in good government and in laws intended to improve the health and safety and well-being of the people of this Nation.

TARIFF ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation to amend section 526 of the Tariff Act to include protection for the valid design and copyright patents of American producers against piracy by imported competition.

The problem of design piracy in domestic industry has been a cause of great concern, and legislation is pending to amend the patent laws to help take care of this matter. But, legislation dealing with piracy by foreign producers is greatly needed. The proposal which I bring to my colleagues' attention here today offers a solution to this problem.

Fortunately, outright and complete piracy does not occur often; the greatest difficulty is caused by simulated designs or close copies of domestic products. Because of the time consumed by patent litigation and because of its great expense, American producers, and in particular small businesses, find it difficult to protect themselves from the competitive infringement of copied designs from abroad. Usually the entrance of such copied products into the country is not noticed by the U.S. producer until they are on the open market, after the damage is already being done. Under the Tariff Act, section 526 already provides the necessary protection for registered trademarks; my amendment, which would prohibit the importation of these simulated designs, asks only the same, rightful protection for design patents and copyrights.

I feel that this proposal will in no way impinge upon the administration's trade expansion program, nor upon the interests of ethical foreign producers and importers. It does not touch on trade between other nations, and it is in line with the provisions of article XX-I-(d) of GATT giving protection to patents, trademarks, and copyrights.

In summary, this amendment concerns only articles covered by a registered valid design patent or copyright, and should have no adverse effect on fair and ethical import trade; at the same time, it would guard the interests of the American producer's patent and copyright privileges.

TAX REVISIONS TO BENEFIT SMALL BUSINESS AND PROMOTE OUR NATION'S ECONOMY

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Small Business Committee, the effect of the President's proposed tax revisions on small business has been of much interest and importance. On March 15, I addressed letters to the chairman of the Federal Trade Commission and the Attorney General requesting their opinions concerning certain aspects of the proposed tax revisions.

I have recently received replies from Mr. Paul Rand Dixon, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission and Mr. Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, Deputy Attorney General, presenting their official views on the proposed tax program. Both of these gentlemen pointed out that the proposed tax revisions which would do away with the multiple corporation exemptions on corporation taxes would be of significant benefit to small business and would put them in a better competitive position.

It is felt that the proposed tax revisions will give more immediate relief to small business than any other segment of our economy. Because of the importance of this matter now pending before Congress, I think it proper that I bring to the attention of my colleagues the opinions of these very authoritative sources concerning this aspect of tax revisions.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert the copies of the letters representing the views of the Federal Trade Commission and the Justice Department in the body of the RECORD at this point:

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., April 5, 1963.

HON. JOE L. EVINS,
Chairman, Select Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN EVINS: I received your letter of March 15, 1963, requesting my views regarding: (1) The effect on competition of the present law concerning surtax exemptions; and (2) the effect on competition of the President's proposal if it is enacted.

Questions relating to corporate tax rates are complex. There is no doubt, however, that any given corporate tax rate structure is related closely to competition and economic growth. Any corporate tax policy which encourages the entrance into economic activity of new firms and the rational growth of existing small business will, in the first instance, strengthen the competitive forces in our economy. Competitive forces, in turn, stimulate economic growth and insure that its fruits will be fairly distributed.

Economic growth, in turn, creates a more favorable environment for the entrance of new firms and the sound growth of existing small business. The unhappy experience of past recessions teaches the importance of economic growth. Recessionary forces cause extremely difficult conditions for small business: not only is entrance into economic activity by new firms impeded, but the mortality rate of small business is high. A corporate tax structure which encourages both competitive forces and growth, creates a more favorable climate for additional competitive stimulants.

The proposed tax program of the President which calls for a reversal of the normal and surtax rates on the first $25,000 of taxable income and couples this reversal with a single surtax exemption for multiple corporate organizations is a policy consistent with the competitive philosophy. It must be stressed that any reversal of these rates without this provision of a single surtax exemption could provide an unwholesome tax inducement toward proliferation of multiple corporation organizations.

The basis for support of the proposed tax program rests, in large measure, on its design to eliminate three shortcomings or inequities in existing corporate tax legislation. Secretary of the Treasury Dillon, in his statement to the House Committee on Ways and Means, spelled out clearly the following three shortcomings: (1) that existing legislation misdirects benefits intended for small business; (2) that existing legislation may be providing incentives for the creation of uneconomic corporate structures and for the continuing proliferation of such corporate structures and; (3) that existing legislation may affect adversely competitive conditions within an industry in that a single corporate entity of equal income may carry a heavier tax burden than a competing wholly owned subsidiary of a large corporation. I am in full agreement with the proposed tax revisions designed to overcome these shortcomings.

With reference to the first of these shortcomings, it is clear that the mischanneling of tax benefits intended for small business into bonuses for intermediate and large business runs counter to both the philosophy underlying a competitive economy and to equitable treatment in corporate tax rates. According to the Treasury Department's calculations this "bonus" resulting from existing multiple surtax exemptions may be as large as an effective 42-percent tax reduction or savings in some cases. The proposed legislation, on the other hand, will reverse this by conferring a "bonus" on small business in the form of a proportionally larger overall reduction in corporate tax rates. In addition, the estimated tax savings of over $200 million by the almost 500,000 small corporations (with taxable incomes of $25,000 or less) should prove beneficial.

The necessity for eliminating the second shortcoming is very clear, especially in view of the record which shows that although the great majority of American corporations do not follow this practice, it is used quite extensively by large businesses in certain fields. Proliferation of uneconomic corporate structures is unhealthy and unsound. Provision for a single surtax exemption for multiple-corporate organizations should prevent any tendency for establishing or maintaining such organizations except when they are dictated by sound economic reasons.

With reference to the third shortcoming, unequal treatment of tax burdens of any magnitude on firms of equal income within the same industry distorts the competitive process. An essential rationale of our competitive system is that economic efficiency rather than special advantage determines the outcome of the competitive race. Clearly, large multiestablishment corporations are not simply a collection of small businesses. Their large size confers upon them substantial advantages; e.g., they already may enjoy the economies of large-scale operations, they may have abundant retained earnings or have ready access to capital markets, and they may engage in nationwide advertising and promotion campaigns. Hence, to permit some large businesses to enjoy the same tax treatment as bona fide small ones circumvents the intent of tax legislation designed to promote new entry and growth by small businesses and, thereby, to promote economic growth and a healthy, competitive economy.

In sum, I feel (1) that the present corporate tax provision allowing unlimited surtax exemptions for multiple corporation organizations is harmful to competition and (2) that the proposed tax revision, by correcting these inequities, should stimulate further the competitive forces in the American economy.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL R. DIXON,
Chairman.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY
ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., April 16, 1963.

Hon. JOE L. EVINS,
Chairman, Select Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN EVINS: This is in response to your letter of March 15, 1963, requesting the views of the Department of Justice regarding the proposal in the President's tax program for 1963 to limit to one the number of surtax exemptions allowed an affiliated corporate group.

The $25,000 surtax exemption was intended to help equalize the competitive position of small business and to provide a tax benefit to small business in order to foster its preservation and growth. In his message to Congress of June 19, 1935, first recommending this tax provision, President Roosevelt said:

"It seems only equitable, therefore, to adjust our tax system in accordance with economic capacity, advantage, and fact. The smaller corporations should not carry burdens beyond their powers; the vast concentrations of capital should be ready to carry burdens commensurate with their powers and their advantages.

* * * * *

"Without such small enterprise our competitive economic society would cease. Size begets monopoly. Moreover, in the aggregate these little businesses furnish the indispensable local basis for those nationwide markets which alone can insure the success of our mass-production industries. Today our smaller corporations are fighting not only for their own local well-being but for that fairly distributed national prosperity which makes large-scale enterprise possible."

As the Secretary of the Treasury has pointed out, under the provisions of existing law multicorporate groups have been able to obtain susbtantial reduction in their effective tax rate by qualifying for multiple surtax exemptions. This gives such affiliated multicorporate groups a substantial advantage as compared with enterprises having equal income but organized as single corporate entities and also gives certain relatively large businesses the advantages of both size and large income and the tax benefits intended solely for small business.

The data gathered by the Treasury Department show that the types of business in which the device of multiple incorporation has been used for this purpose are principally those engaged in various aspects of retailing, consumer services, personal finance, and real estate. These are the fields in which small business is principally engaged and in which it has its greatest opportunities generally. Therefore, competition is impaired and handicapped by the abuse which has grown up under the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code intended to aid small business in achieving competitive equality.

The availability of the surtax exemption to relatively large businesses operating through a large number of affiliated and controlled corporations has impaired the effectiveness of the surtax exemption and tended to lessen competition in two respects. First, it has tended to frustrate the effect of the surtax exemption in equalizing the position of small business in competition with chain stores and other large enterprises. Second, it has tended to give those enterprises which were willing or able to take advantage of this loophole a more advantageous tax rate than other business enterprises of similar size and income.

This tends to distort the allocation of capital resources by attracting capital to those enterprises which have the more favorable tax rate. This in turn gives such enterprises a greater access to capital on more favorable terms which increases their competitive advantage. Thus, the effect of the present law concerning surtax exemptions is to distort and lessen competition both between small business and relatively large business and between various types of middle-sized and big business.

The enactment of the President's proposal with respect to surtax exemptions would avoid the abuses referred to here and would tend to achieve the original purposes of the surtax exemption. Thus the President's proposal would tend to foster small business and strengthen its competitive position and would also help to restore the competitive balance among various enterprises of a larger size. This Department, therefore, favors this proposal, which (over a 5-year transitional period) would limit commonly controlled affiliated corporate groups to one surtax exemption, and believes that this proposal would aid in securing the objectives of the antitrust laws by promoting a competitive economy.

Sincerely,

NICHOLAS DEB. KATZENBACH,
Deputy Attorney General.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HEALEY (at the request of Mr. ROONEY), for May 13, 1963, today, on account of illness.

Mr. GURNEY (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), for Monday, May 13, and Tuesday, May 14, on account of Committee on Science and Astronautics trip to Atlantic Missile Range for Mercury MA–9 shot.

Mr. GARMATZ (at the request of Mr. FRIEDEL), for the remainder of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. FORRESTER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for the remainder of the week, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. KING of California (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REUSS (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PILLION (at the request of Mr. MATHIAS), for 1 hour, on May 14.

Mr. WIDNALL (at the request of Mr. MATHIAS), for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. GROSS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SHELLEY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MATHIAS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WIDNALL.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia.

Mr. AYRES.

Mr. LAIRD.

Mr. **Berry.**

Mr. **Alger.**

Mr. **Schwengel.**

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. **Kornegay**) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. **Finnegan.**

Mr. **Lankford** in two instances.

Mr. **Rodino.**

SENATE BILL AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

A bill and concurrent resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 874. An act to authorize the construction and equipping of buildings required in connection with the operations of the Bureau of the Mint; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. Con. Res. 30. Concurrent resolution to reprint copies of the committee print, 87th Congress, entitled "Part 1 of Concentration Ratios in Manufacturing Industry, 1958"; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 37. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary of additional copies of a report and hearings on "State Department Security" issued by its Internal Security Subcommittee during the 87th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2842. An act to amend section 3238 of title 18, United States Code.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S.J. Res. 39. Joint resolution designating the week of May 20–26, 1963, as National Actors' Equity Week.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 14, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

786. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report on title I, Public Law 480, agreements concluded during April 1963, pursuant to Public Law 85–128; to the Committee on Agriculture.

787. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the final report relating to the establishment or development of installations and facilities required for advanced research projects, pursuant to section 403, Public Law 85–685; to the Committee on Armed Services.

788. A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the semiannual report on the strategic and critical materials stockpiling program for the period July 1 to December 31, 1962, pursuant to Public Law 520, 79th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

789. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report on the progress of the liquidation activities of the national defense, war and reconversion activities of Reconstruction Finance Corporation, pursuant to Public Law 163, 83d Congress, as amended, and with Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1957; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

790. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States; transmitting a report on uneconomical practices in the administration of the employment service and unemployment compensation programs of the Bureau of Employment Security, Department of Labor; to the Committee on Government Operations.

791. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on a review of the policies and practices of the Department of Labor regarding treatment of terminal leave in determining unemployment compensation for former Federal civilian employees and ex-servicemen; to the Committee on Government Operations.

792. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a master contract, together with a form of proposed supplemental agreement to be executed thereunder, relating to proposed drainage and minor construction work exceeding a total cost of $200,000 on the Wellton-Mohawk Division, Gila project, Arizona, pursuant to the act of June 13, 1956 (70 Stat. 274); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

793. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, relative to the receipt of a project proposal relating to the Jackson Valley Irrigation District at Ione, Calif., having applied for an increase in its loan from $1,327,000 to $2,378,000, pursuant to section 10 of the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

794. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed amendment to the concession contract with Crater Lake Lodge, Inc., Crater Lake National Park, Oreg., pursuant to 67 Stat. 271, as amended by 70 Stat. 543; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

795. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "a bill for the relief of Robert L. Nolan"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

796. A letter from the Clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, transmitting certified copies of the court's opinion and findings in the case of *Henry J. Krueger, et al.* v. *The United States*, congressional No. 11–54, pursuant to House Resolution 562; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

797. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to include certain officers and employees of the General Services Administration within the provisions of the United States Code relating to assaults upon, and homicides of, certain officers and employees of the United States as constituting a crime"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

798. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to implement the Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials, opened for signature at Lake Success on November 22, 1950"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

799. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Tariff Commission, transmitting the fourth supplemental report on the tariff classification study, pursuant to the Tariff Classification Act of 1962; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

800. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 1504 of the Social Security Act regarding the assignment of wages for Federal employees"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

801. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated March 26, 1963, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Devil River, Mich., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted July 31, 1957; to the Committee on Public Works.

802. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated March 20, 1963, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of the reports on Monhegan Harbor, Maine, requested by resolutions of the Committees on Public Works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted April 28, 1958, and July 16, 1958; to the Committee on Public Works.

803. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated April 3, 1963, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Popes Creek, Westmoreland County, Va., authorized by the River and Harbor Act, approved May 17, 1950; to the Committee on Public Works.

804. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated March 28, 1963, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on the small-boat channel from Panacea to Apalachee Bay, Fla., authorized by the River and Harbor Act, approved July 3, 1958. No authorization by Congress is recommended as the desired improvement has been adopted for accomplishment by the Chief of Engineers under the provisions of section 107 of the 1960 River and Harbor Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. VINSON: Committee of conference. H.R. 2440. A bill to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1964 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 289). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. THOMAS: Committee of conference. H.R. 5517. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 290). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 18. An act to change the name of Harpers Ferry National Monument to Harpers Ferry National Historical Park; without amendment (Rept. No. 291). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 1162. A bill to consolidate Vicksburg National Military Park and to provide for certain adjustments necessitated by the installation of a park tour road, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 292). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. House Concurrent Resolution 61. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress in respect to the Lewis and Clark Trail from St. Louis, Mo., to the Pacific Northwest; with amendment (Rept. No. 293). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHLEY (by request):

H.R. 6234. A bill to amend section 526 of the Tariff Act of 1930 to prohibit the importation of merchandise covered by an American copyright or design patent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 6235. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code so as to allow compensation to counsel assigned by the court in criminal cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 6236. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exempt from tax musical instruments sold to students for school use; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H.R. 6237. A bill to amend section 503 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize grants for the collection, reproduction, and publication of documentary source material significant to the history of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 6238. A bill to grant nonquota status to any immigrant born in an independent country of the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 6239. A bill to help maintain the financial solvency of the Federal Government by reducing nonessential expenditures through reduction in personnel in various agencies of the Federal Government by attrition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DOLE:

H.R. 6240. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an individual, over a 5-year period, a credit for social security taxes paid by him; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DORN (by request):

H.R. 6241. A bill to terminate all acreage controls, loans, and export subsidies for cotton, and to make certain transitional payments to cotton producers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GILL:

H.R. 6242. A bill to provide for the registration of contractors of migrant agricultural workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H.R. 6243. A bill to authorize the conveyance of a certain tract of land to the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H.R. 6244. A bill to amend sections 162 and 274 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the deductibility of certain business entertainment, etc., expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 6245. A bill to amend titles X and XVI of the Social Security Act to improve the programs of aid to the blind so that they will more effectively encourage and assist blind individuals to achieve rehabilitation and restoration to a normal, full, and fruitful life; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 6246. A bill relating to the deductibility of accrued vacation pay; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 6247. A bill relating to the deductibility of accrued vacation pay; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 6248. A bill to provide assistance to certain States bordering the Mississippi River in the construction of the Great River Road; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 6249. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exempt from tax musical instruments sold to students for school use; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POFF:

H.R. 6250. A bill to provide legal assistance for indigent defendants in criminal cases in U.S. courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 6251. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for expenses incurred for the higher education of himself, his spouse, and his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H.R. 6252. A bill authorizing modification of the Dardanelle lock and dam project, Arkansas, with particular reference to sewer facilities for the city of Russellville, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H.R. 6253. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease certain deposits of minerals in the bed of the Red River in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 6254. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain real property of the United States heretofore granted to the city of Grand Prairie, Tex., for public airport purposes, contingent upon acceptance and approval by the Director of Airports, Federal Aviation Agency, as protector of the interests of the United States, and to convey to the United States certain real property now used for public airport purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H. Con. Res. 153. Concurrent resolution that the President of the United States be requested to bring up the Baltic States question before the United Nations and that the United Nations conduct free elections in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, under its supervision; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H. Con. Res. 154. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress in respect to the Lewis and Clark Trail from St. Louis, Mo., to the Pacific Northwest; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. Con. Res. 155. Concurrent resolution favoring an agreement among states of the Near East prohibiting the production of nuclear weapons and offensive missiles; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MINISH:

H. Res. 344. Resolution favoring an agreement among states of the Near East prohibiting the production of nuclear weapons and offensive missiles; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. LIBONATI: House Resolution No. 106 as adopted in the 73d General Assembly of the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to establishment of a Federal water pollution control research facility in California; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting that favorable consideration be given to the bill H.R. 2332; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Tennessee, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America relating to the qualifications of electors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 6255. A bill for the relief of Justi Bevc; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6256. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Inga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6257. A bill for the relief of Constantine Sotos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6258. A bill for the relief of Steve and Panagiota Tsipas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H.R. 6259. A bill for the relief of David Hiestand; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 6260. A bill for the relief of Wai Chan Cheng Liu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6261. A bill for the relief of Miss Yersapetouhi Darmanian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H.R. 6262. A bill for the relief of Dirk Rugebregt, his wife Jane Esther Rugebregt, and their minor son, Eduard George Rugebregt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6263. A bill for the relief of Velia Tonioni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIBAL:

H.R. 6264. A bill for the relief of Antonio Palmieri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6265. A bill for the relief of Fernando Palmieri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 6266. A bill for the relief of Bettie J. Miller and Herman Floyd Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H.R. 6267. A bill for the relief of Lee R. Smith and Lee R. Smith III, his son; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Remarks of Robert Taft, Jr., to University of Akron College of Law Student Bar Association on the Occasion of Law Day, U.S.A., 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, it is with much pleasure that I submit the remarks of the Honorable ROBERT TAFT, JR., to University of Akron College of Law Student Bar Association on the occasion of Law Day, U.S.A., 1963:

President Auburn, Dean Samad, faculty, and members of the Student Bar Association of the University of Akron Law School; this is the sixth annual observance of Law Day in the United States. Giving formal recognition to this custom, the 87th Congress in 1961 designated May 1 of each year "* * * as a special day of celebration by the American people in appreciation of their liberties and reaffirmation of their loyalty to the United States of America; of their rededication to the ideals of equality and justice under law in their relations with each other, as well as with other nations; and for the cultivation of that respect for law that is so vital to the democratic way of life."

There has been chosen for this year's celebration here the theme, "Law: Rule of Right, Not Might." In accordance with this theme, I would like to talk briefly on the rule of law here in the United States and some threats that I see to it here at home, as serious as those that we all know exist throughout the world.

First, we should note that even though we may be members of the legal profession, we recognize that this is not a lawyers' day or any attempt to glamorize those engaged in the legal profession, even though we may have some special charges and responsibilities on that account. Rather, we celebrate the particularly crucial place in law of the past and present in our country and realize that it is essential to our continued enjoyment of liberty and progress. It is crucial because our own progress and the progress of mankind have been and continue to be linked inextricably to a recognition of the individual human being as the important unit of society. This is a unique concept within the Judaeo-Christian heritage, but one which may well be the ultimate key to success or failure in the 20th century battle for man's mind.

Our Declaration of Independence states: "All men are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these rights Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Then followed the 5th and 14th amendments prohibiting the deprivation of liberty by government without due process of law. Commenting on these rights, Justice Peckham in *Allgeyer* v. *Louisiana*, 165 U.S. 578, said:

"The liberty mentioned in that amendment means not only the right of the citizen to be free from mere physical restraint of his person, as by incarceration, but the term is deemed to embrace the right of the citizen to be free in the enjoyment of all his faculties; to be free to use them in all lawful ways; to live and work where he will; to earn his livelihood by any lawful calling; to pursue any livelihood or avocation, and for that purpose to enter into all contracts which may be proper, necessary and essential to the carrying out of a successful conclusion the purposes above mentioned."

Yet, we recognize that the concept of human liberty does not mean any totally unbridled freedom of individuals to act as their whims may dictate. Without the bounds of law, religion, and personal discipline, chaos would result. Without rules, regulations, or laws governing conduct, the freedom of each person or group to do what he or it chooses, soon impinges upon the freedom of others. Conflicts result that can lead to loss of liberty by both.

Immense changes in human life, which have occurred during the last century and continue, have precipitated individuals into such close, complicated and interlocked relationships that existing and established rules of law and behavior sometimes prove inadequate. Various reactions have resulted, but one of the broadest and most threatening to freedom has been an inclination to abandon and forget the touchstone of the individual as the primary unit of society with which the law should concern itself. We tend, rather, to create authorities and codes which tend to become autonomous, self-perpetuating forces in themselves in derogation of human liberty. They tend to lead us to accept as inevitable requirements of conformity. For peoples and nations who never enjoyed liberty, this attitude might be excused. For ourselves, through whom the driving force of freedom created a way of life and of unparalleled progress, to abandon it now would be incredible folly. Our solution must lie in the preservation of individual rights under law. If we fail to preserve those rights, even the most perfect rule of law would be sterile and worthless.

One of the areas in which we see serious threats of individual freedom and the rule of law most clearly is the international scene. By definition and theory communism is the antithesis of individualism. Moreover, the mere military threat which exists, in itself puts demands and restrictions upon individual rights and upon the rule of law that are imposed by high military spending, the application of large portions of industrial capacity to military production, and the demand for military manpower. It is hard to conceive of being more completely and directly deprived of liberty than being drafted into the Armed Forces. Yet, such restrictions most of us recognize to be permissible, and we consent to protect ourselves from total deprivation of our liberty by force from aboard. For this reason we must accept them, but also for this reason it becomes even more vital to turn our attention to areas where threats to our liberty under a rule of law can and should be held in check and repelled.

One area of these threats lies in the constantly increasing size and power of Government and in the breakdown of procedures in the judicial, administrative, and legislative functions of Government. Perhaps because of frustrations with the complicated problems we must deal with and our failure to establish adequate methods of dealing with these complications.

This Law Day, for instance, we are still debating the issues of constitutional law and of executive, legislative, and judicial power and responsibility. Perhaps these debates try our patience. At times we become eager to do things and to move things, and the law and structure of government seem to be stumbling blocks. What we must recognize is that they never really are in the fundamental sense. Rather, they represent proper tests of our actions and restraints upon change merely for the sake of change, a reminder that in a society such as ours the way in which we do things is often as important as what we do.

The failures which we have experienced in attempts to check the trend toward conformity and regulation cannot be put solely at the door of advocates of executive power. President Truman used to have a sign in his office at the White House that read, "The buck stops here."

We in Congress should feel the same way. It is easy enough to pass all responsibility for important decisions that should be spelled out in legislation to the executive who is to administer a particular program, but to do so is to be derelict in our constitutional duties. We are elected to pass judgments and not pass bucks. We are not elected to scramble after easy solutions and quick cures. We are the jury appointed by the people to decide the course of freedom itself. Congress is not merely a funnel to pour money into one project or another. It is not an auction hall in which we should try to outbid one another for special favors. It is a forum in which our laws are formed.

The law which in this land begins with the Constitution is the very essence of what we call the American way, just as the consent of the governed is the essence of our political structure. We must always remember that in this country we consent to be governed. We do not elect to be ruled.

A part of the trend against which we must guard is related to the constant increase of Federal power at the expense of State and local powers and even problems previously handled by private institutions or individuals. Much has been said in this respect. But I think we must also recognize that the same dangers to freedom may well exist at the local level and have just as detrimental effect as they may have at the Federal level. Certainly it is clear that the Federal courts will not any longer interfere with the local and State regulation of individual activities except in the most extreme cases. For instance, recently the Kansas debt-adjustment case in the Supreme Court should be interpreted as a reiteration and strengthening of the expressed disinterest of the court with local and State regulation of business activities except, perhaps, in areas where the civil rights of individual citizens are found to be involved.

At the same time it is true that the failure of State and local governments to face up to new problems and to try to handle them in a manner consistent with our traditional concepts has led to further Federal Government activity under the excuse that the States and local governments are unable to handle them. Such arguments must always be carefully weighed because it certainly appears that in many cases the fact of the matter is that the State and local governments appear to and, presumably, the electorate behind those voters in fact has no interest in the program or solution proposed.

But it often is true that the blame for excessive interference with private, local, and State activity is based on economic considerations relating to the more available Federal tax funds. When this happens, the Congress does have a special responsibility which it should fulfill, not to make excessive delegations of power unrelated to standards. Yet, many bills proposed and some that are passed continue to advocate broad regulatory power with few, if any checks upon it, investigations, and the right to demand information without notice and complaints filed or court hearings, and similar proposals for raw power without proper concern for procedures and a hearing for those to be affected.

Even where standards have been prescribed in many situations the growing habits of the administrative bureaus and agencies carry on in spite of the provisions of law. Here it clearly should be up to the courts to protect the rights of those affected, but, unfortunately, there has been a tendency in the opposite direction. For instance, recently as has been mentioned by Governor Romney, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in administering a law which clearly left up to the States the right to determine standards for qualification for payments under a welfare program for the children of the unemployed, refused to make such payments on the basis of standards set by the State of Michigan and tried to require other standards.

In the field of labor relations, the same attitude of disregard for legal limitations has been shown by the President and his labor Secretaries in their interference and dictation of terms of settlement and prices as shown in the steel price crisis of 1962 and, more recently, in the dock strike interference in New York. Under the guise that the public has an interest in important economic decisions of the type involved, the Government is more and more interjecting itself as the third party of the bargaining table, not merely from the point of view of voicing public opinion but, perhaps, for bringing about compulsory arbitration of such disputes with the determination being made by the Government. Compulsory arbitration with labor and management alone involved, in itself constitutes a serious threat to the collective bargaining process that has by-and-large worked so well in our country. To impose compulsory arbitration with the Government also sitting as a party in the dispute would amount to wage and price control whether it is so recognized and sanctified by legislation or not.

The whole field of agriculture, of course, is slipping rapidly toward such complete economic control with little or no voice for those being affected. The wheat referendum of May 21, if it passes, will put another nail in the coffin of any freedom of choice for the farmer who wishes to raise this crop. The medicare and Federal-aid-to-education proposals, while aimed at problems and needs with which most Americans are sympathetic, would contain many elements of compulsion and, in spite of lipservice to the concept of no Federal control, would in fact through powers to prescribe regulations and to administer such programs constitute serious further incursions upon such individual freedoms.

Even in the judicial process, trend has been away from precedent and uniform application of rules of law to factual situations which are generally similar. The primary concept of the rule of law is that Government should be a rule of laws, not of men. Yet, in many cases before it recently the court seems to adopt an ad hoc approach that seems likely to do little for the administration of justice in general. By way of example, such a case as *Fay* v. *Noia* has been accurately described by one of the dissenting justices as a staggering blow to the effective administration of criminal justice in State courts. With almost no limitations, habeas corpus actions can now be brought at any time to review criminal cases even though the time for appeal is passed and the State for all practical purposes may have no basis on which to provide up-to-date proof as to events happening many years previously. Commenting on this recently, Senator STENNIS on the floor of the Senate stated as follows:

"This is another illustration of a departure from what we have always known as constitutional Government and constitutional procedures. * * * What gave the Court the power to render its decision today if it did not have the power yesterday? Was a constitutional amendment adopted overnight? Did Congress meet and hurriedly enact a statute? Neither of these things happened. I submit, Mr. President, that there is only one explanation. A majority of the court reached a certain result because of special facts and proceeded accordingly in spite of longstanding precedent."

The threat, then, of our liberty being deprived from us by governmental action here at home is a threefold one. It lies within the three branches of our government at Federal, State, and local levels. To check it will require our devoted and continued attention as legislators and as administrators, judges, and as lawyers. But more than that, it will call for an attitude of concern by the people generally in this country, and such an attitude can be fostered only if the lawyers themselves continue to reemphasize to all of our citizens the importance of law and legal procedures as safeguards to liberty. This is the threat with which we should concern ourselves on this Law Day, for might can be embodied too well in the regimentation of government as in armed force. It is greater perhaps, but just as effective against right. What we must understand and convey to others is that government and every other form of public control is a means to human well-being, not an end in itself. Man was not made for the state, but the state for man, and it derives its just powers from the consent of the governed. No sort of rule can justly rest on power alone. Here is the eternal answer to all forms of tyranny over the person, the property, and the minds of men.

Newark Observes Hundredth Anniversary of Emancipation Proclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, in September 1862, the newspapers in our Nation carried the text of a communication from the President of the United States. This communication became the great, historic Emancipation Proclamation on the following January 1.

With this document, the guarantee of civil rights assured our citizens by the spirit of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution with its first 10 amendments should have become effective for all our citizens, regardless of their race or color. That this guarantee has not become so effective we know all too well. But the Emancipation Proclamation was the milestone for us in future generations to mark our progress.

I am proud that my home city, Newark, N.J., has given the recognition due to President Lincoln's brave inspired proclamation. Under the leadership of our distinguished former colleague and present mayor of Newark, the Honorable Hugh J. Addonizio, the Emanicipation Centennial Committee yesterday observed a public prayer for peace and sponsored a great community parade.

Important though they are in themselves, these events achieve even greater importance when they are properly recognized as manifestations of the healthy outlook of Newark toward the question of civil rights. In Newark, civil rights is not a question. It is a fact—a living example of the ability of people of all creeds and colors and ethnic backgrounds to live and work together. And it is wise that the city should show by such observances that it is a fact.

It is perhaps significant that the Emancipation Centennial should have taken place just 4 days after the Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary of which I am a member began hearings on my bill, H.R. 4575, and other similar bills which I hope will become the Civil Rights Act of 1963. With such legislation, we shall be able to offset the widespread effort to deny our citizens their civil rights because of race, color or religion. The right to vote will not be denied, the rights to employment opportunity and housing availability will not be curtailed.

I sincerely pray and shall do all in my power to assist enactment of the civil rights bills now in committee. With the example of my native city, the work of its Emancipation Centennial Committee and its entire government under Mayor Addonizio, I am optimistic that civil rights will become a fact, not a question, for all American citizens.

Wisconsin Paper Week Marks Wisconsin Paper Industry as First in Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the week of May 12 to May 18 has been proclaimed Wisconsin Paper Week by the Governor of Wisconsin. This is the first year that paper week will be celebrated in my own State of Wisconsin. It is a fitting tribute to the State's second largest industry because this paper industry is first in the Nation. Of the 47 paper-producing States in this country, Wisconsin leads all the others in sales, tonnage, investments, taxes paid and other categories. I am proud of the many outstanding accomplishments that have marked the history of Wisconsin, and especially proud of the notable record established by the paper industry, not only as regards economics, but also in the development of natural resources, in the areas of paper-related research, and in the many recreational facilities that have been a welcome byproduct of the industry's endeavors.

Mr. Speaker, as a portion of my remarks I include a transcript of my Washington television report to the people of Wisconsin in which I joined with them in honoring one of Wisconsin's great and dynamic industries.

The report follows:

> Today I would like to join all Wisconsin citizens in paying a special tribute to one of the State's outstanding industries. As we all know, Wisconsin has been a leader in many areas of State and national life. This year for the first time we have set aside the entire week of May 12 to May 18 to celebrate the significant contributions of the paper industry.
>
> Our paper industry has demonstrated that it is the best in the country. Of the 47 paper-producing States, Wisconsin ranks first. It leads all other States in sales, tonnage, investments, taxes paid, and other categories. Annual sales for example total almost a billion dollars and State taxes alone amount to some $218 million.
>
> The Wisconsin paper industry has grown with the State from the very beginning. The first mill, which made newsprint from rags, was built in 1848 in Milwaukee. Today, on the Fox River alone, the 35 miles between Lake Winnebago and Green Bay has the highest concentration of paper mills of any area in the world. Our own seventh district contains 11 of the 34 Wisconsin communities in which paper mills are located.
>
> In all, there are 197 pulp, paper, paperboard and paper products establishments in Wisconsin. Forty-nine of these are pulp and paper mills. The size and diversity of Wisconsin's paper industry constitutes a vital and significant contribution to the State's economy. In employment, for example, the paper industry supplies jobs to one-tenth of the manufacturing personnel in our State. Their average annual salary is $6,100.
>
> At the same time, there are many byproducts that contribute greatly to other areas of the economy. One of these is the creation of new markets for the State's natural resources. Take pulpwood, for example. A few years ago, the paper industry was unable to utilize large amounts of Wisconsin's hardwoods such as aspen, birch, maple and oak. As a result, they had to rely heavily on the long-fibered pine and spruce trees. These softwoods are now in short supply in our State so the industry had to rely on importing the pulp it needed from other States. Today, new markets for Wisconsin's hardwoods have been opened up in the State thanks to the new uses our scientists have discovered for the paper industry.
>
> In 1962 alone, Wisconsin pulp and paper mills paid more than $18 million for Wisconsin-grown pulpwood. This figure represents about half of all wood used by Wisconsin's 49 pulp and paper mills.
>
> Of course, the benefits to our State derived from the paper industry are not confined to economics alone. Recreation for all of our citizens has been greatly aided by the paper industry's activities. They own, for example, 920,000 acres of Wisconsin timberland. And on these lands, the companies have a total of 710 miles of road. Virtually all of Wisconsin's industrial forests are open to hunters, fishermen, and other recreation seekers. The Wisconsin and Fox Rivers provide another example. The many paper industry-financed dams and reservoirs assure even, controlled flow of the river and year-round utilization of the once-precipitous Wisconsin River for power, production, conservation, and recreation.
>
> All Wisconsin citizens should be proud of the outstanding achievements that have characterized the Wisconsin paper industry throughout its history.

Congressman James Cleveland Sees Lack of Minority Staffing as One of the Problems Facing an Effective Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed encouraging to note how many of the newer Members of the Congress have discussed the need for adequate minority staffs for congressional committees whenever the opportunity presents itself.

These minority Members, who do not have a great deal of seniority, find themselves under a great handicap because they have the least access to one or two minority staff members that might exist on certain committees.

It is, therefore, with a great sense of satisfaction and pride that I noticed in the Monday, April 22, issue of the Dartmouth a report on a vigorous speech delivered by Congressman JAMES C. CLEVELAND, of New Hampshire, on the minority staffing problem. The complete text of the article in his speech follows:

CLEVELAND OUTLINES THE ISSUES CONFRONTING THE 88TH CONGRESS

(By Terence A. Lowe)

> "The central issue before the 88th Congress is the issue of war and peace—no issue is more important than this," said New Hampshire Congressman JAMES CLEVELAND before a meeting of the Young Republicans Friday evening.
>
> "On this, there are no easy solutions—I will make no pontification," he said.
>
> The Republican Congressman turned to "the problem of the state of the national economy." "Of course, everyone would like to see a strong growing national economy. But there is a deep split of opinion as to how we will realize this objective, on this there is a real division between the two parties."
>
> "The Republicans feel that the way to create this condition is to unleash business and to encourage the private sector of the economy.
>
> "I am against the approach of Government finding people jobs in Government initiated programs," he said.
>
> The third problem he considered was the effectiveness of the Congress. "Is it equipped to transmit the will of the people into action?" Mr. CLEVELAND asked. "There is a strong feeling that it is not," was his answer.
>
> "One of the problems is this: Tools of the Congress have not been developed, and this is mainly due to the staffing problem."
>
> "This has been called a do-nothing Congress," observed Mr. CLEVELAND. "But sometimes it is a very intelligent thing to do nothing—especially in cases of wild presidential schemes."
>
> "If Congress is not coming up with constructive alternatives to presidential proposals, it is because of the need for tremendous staffs. For the Congress to come up with constructive alternatives, there must also be staff people responsible to Republicans.
>
> "If the Republican Party is going to perform the historic function of the minority party, it has got to have the staff to do it. In opposition to President Kennedy's organization of over 10,000 men, such a staff is necessary if we are to maintain a government of checks and balances," concluded Congressman CLEVELAND.

SENATOR MONAHAN: NEW HAMPSHIRE SWEEPSTAKES

> In a preliminary speech, State Senator Robert S. Monahan spoke out against the New Hampshire sweepstakes bill which has passed both the house and the senate. This, Senator Monahan noted, occurred "despite the fact that the majority and minority leaders of both bodies opposed it."
>
> "Governor King will have 5 days to act upon the bill when it reaches his desk. He has voted for it twice as a house member. He has not taken a position on the present bill, but the general feeling is that he will allow the bill to become law without his signature," said Senator Monahan.
>
> "My own feeling is that it won't be long before Federal marshals will check on transportation of tickets across State lines. The State of New Hampshire will be guilty of encouraging people to violate Federal law which prohibits the transportation of these tickets across State lines," stated Senator Monahan.

Imports From Communist Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a news release on a speech made by Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON in Chicago, on May 6, 1963, which in my judgment, is absolutely asinine.

In his speech, he condemned what he called misguided critics of trade with Communist countries, and called for increased trade with Poland and other Iron Curtain countries to "encourage freedom and carefully pressure tyranny."

Among other things, Vice President JOHNSON said:

> We believe that people punished enough by their Communist captors should not be—and must not be—punished still more by free men merely because they are involuntary victims of Communist tyranny.

Mr. Speaker, it is unbelievable that the Vice President of the United States should publicly condemn organized campaigns to boycott businessmen selling Polish goods in this country, but this is what Mr. JOHNSON is reported by the press to have said in his Chicago speech a week ago last Sunday.

The State Department is reported to have recently circulated within that Department a draft policy paper which suggested among other things that "should a national Communist regime be established, we should make a maximum effort short of military action to permit its survival."

Must we use our military strength to prevent armed uprisings against Communist regimes such as exist today in Cuba, and force our industries and labor out of business in order to make room for imports from Communist countries? What kind of business is this?

This May Is Better Hearing Month

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, there are 15 million Americans whose hearing or speech is defective, according to the American Hearing Society. At least 1 out of 10 persons suffers a hearing loss, often unknowingly.

That is why the American Hearing Society, a national nonprofit agency with 170 member organizations throughout the United States, is sponsoring, during May, Better Hearing Month. Every effort is being made by the society and its affiliates to publicize services which are available to the deaf and the hard of hearing.

As Miss Mary E. Switzer, president of the American Hearing Society and U.S. Commissioner of Vocational Rehabilitation, points out:

> A fine example of service is the society's campaign for a program in the Nation's schools to detect loss of hearing among the more than 3 million children with this handicap. The corrective followup to this program will spare many of these children a lifelong hearing disability.

To emphasize the importance of a hearing checkup for the elderly and middle-aged, as well as the young, Crayton Walker, executive director of the American Hearing Society, and his associates decided upon a slogan for Better Hearing Month: "You'd best invest in a hearing test." All over America this slogan is being communicated to our people, with the support of President Kennedy, Governors, mayors, civic groups, and the Advertising Council through press, radio, television, posters and other media.

In expressing his best wishes for the success of Better Hearing Month, President Kennedy informed Miss Switzer:

> I am happy to wish the American Hearing Society and its member agencies in all parts of the country every success in their efforts during Better Hearing Month, May 1963, to inform all Americans of steps they may take to preserve their hearing or to minimize the effects of impaired hearing. Every conscientious effort in this direction strengthens the health of the people, and merits the serious attention of all who are concerned with the Nation's well-being.

To date 28 Governors have notified the American Hearing Society at its Washington headquarters, 919 18th Street NW., that they have issued Better Hearing Month proclamations or statements.

Honorary national chairman of Better Hearing Month is Miss Nanette Fabray, currently starring on Broadway as the First Lady in the musical, "Mr. President."

Miss Fabray, who has herself overcome the hardship of a hearing loss, has declared:

> A hearing problem is not now a hopeless problem, and certainly no longer one to cause embarrassment or shame. It was acceptable, and a trial to all concerned, when there was nothing that could be done about it. But that was in the era of the ear trumpet. This is the jet age. Advancement in the prevention of deafness, and the aid of deafness, has thankfully kept pace with the age.

Sertoma Club of Washington, D.C., is typical of many civic clubs supporting Better Hearing Month, having contributed $500 for an exhibit of services available to the hard of hearing, which will be routed throughout the country for display.

Another international organization actively participating this year in Better Hearing Month is the well-known barbershop quartet society, SPEBSQSA, with 30,000 members. Barbershop quartets are offering their services in 675 cities where there are chapters to sing a special theme song for Better Hearing Month gatherings, as well as on radio and TV.

Even telephone companies are providing hearing checkups through a method called Dial-a-Test. Hearing aid dealers are exhibiting 25,000 posters all over the country in addition to the many thousands of posters distributed by the 170 member agencies of American Hearing Society.

I wish to add my personal support of Better Hearing Month, and pass along to my colleagues for their repetition at every opportunity: "Hearing is priceless—protect it."

Congratulations to Magazine Publishers Association and Charles D. Ablard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the Magazine Publishers Association has just announced the appointment of Mr. Charles D. Ablard to be its vice president. I should like to congratulate Magazine Publishers Association, and its distinguished president, Mr. John K. Herbert, on their fine choice.

Mr. Ablard is a constituent of mine and lives in Alexandria, Va. He is a former judicial officer and Post Office Department Board of Contract Appeals Chairman. With another constituent Mr. Marion Edwyn Harrison, Mr. Ablard has been a partner in the firm of Ablard & Harrison. Mr. Harrison is also an authority on postal matters and is a former Associate General Counsel of the Post Office Department and member of its Board of Contract Appeals.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of May 11, 1963:

> WASHINGTON REPORT
>
> (By Congressman BRUCE ALGER)
>
> SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL
>
> A good example of how the people are sometimes fooled into believing that Congress is making great savings in Federal spending was passage this week of the conference report on the supplemental appropriation bill. When this bill was before the House last month, we cut it 12.4 percent under the budget estimates. It then went to the Senate which upped it. (The Senate is sometimes referred to facetiously as the "upper" body because it always ups appropriations passed by the House.) In Conference agreement was reached on 11.2 percent below the budget requests and that is the way the bill came back to the House and was passed. The people are now being told that Congress has saved 11.2 percent, but the joker is that the House increased the amount over last year's appropriation so that even with the 11.2 percent cut in budget figures we will still spend more than we did in the last budget. And there are other examples far worse because there was an effort to cut this bill.
>
> MILITARY PAY BOOST
>
> A bill (H.R. 5555), to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the armed services, passed the House on Wednesday. I voted for the increase because I believe our military personnel are entitled to it. We need to attract and keep the best possible manpower in our military forces. Normally, I oppose Federal spending bills when the Federal Government is deficit financing. That is, borrowing to spend, instead of making both ends meet. My support of the military pay boost was a worthy exception to the rule. It is far more costly to our taxpayers to pay for turnover of military personnel than to pay this pay increase. Furthermore, as I pointed out in debate, a $52 billion defense budget has enough waste, duplication, and uneconomic practices in it, such as occur in sole-source procurement and surplus disposal, that more than enough can be saved to pay for this pay boost.

AMENDING INTERNAL SECURITY ACT

Conservative and liberal Members of the House found amusement in the vote on H.R. 950 to amend the Internal Security Act which saw Alger voting with some of the more liberal Members. I was glad to share in the lighthearted moment this caused even during a debate on a very serious subject. The bill would grant to the Secretary of Defense power to remove from the National Security Agency, at his discretion, anyone he believed to be a security risk. Of course, I am for protecting the Nation against subversives and I am for removing security risks from their jobs. I am for the objective of the bill. I opposed it because I am against the means.

The most basic principle for which I stand is the freedom of the individual. It is my firm conviction that in order to preserve the freedom of all our people we must jealously guard individual freedom. This bill gave the sole power to take away a man's job to the Secretary of Defense from whose decision there is no appeal and the accused has no right to even know the charges brought against him. I do not believe any single human being is without error and to grant the dictatorial powers of this bill to the Secretary of Defense could mean tragedy to an individual wrongly accused. During debate on the bill I introduced an amendment to create a three-man board to which decisions of the Secretary of Defense could be appealed. It just seems logical that four heads are better than one in guaranteeing the full protection of the Constitution to every single citizen of this land. Of course my amendment was defeated as I expected it would be because I realize, and so stated, that this is not a good way to legislate. I introduced it to make it appear in the Record and in the hope that the amendment can be properly drawn by the Senate in committee and remove the objectionable parts of the bill as passed by the House. I know that my position regarding this legislation will be misinterpreted by some, but I made it abundantly clear in the debate that I do not believe we should help Communists or fellow travelers. But I hold most precious individual liberty. It has been said that in order to get a single traitor or subversive it may be necessary to sacrifice some innocent people. I hold the future freedom of all our people is better served if we guard with all our power the liberty of the individual, even if it means that we may miss uncovering a few subversives. We cannot compromise with the principle of liberty and we cannot justify any means to obtain a good end. The safety of all, in a free country, demands the protection of the individual.

TRIBUTE TO BARRY GOLDWATER

The Barry Goldwater testimonial dinner was a great occasion. All Republicans joined to honor the 4-year leader of the Senate Congressional Committee. Senator Goldwater was eulogized as a vigorous leader and outspoken champion of a particular philosophy, the limited role of the Government in our lives, and a team worker and supporter of those with whom he occasionally differs. His beliefs and conduct characterize a politician-statesman worthy of emulation by all in public service. Barry and Peggy modestly accepted the accolades and ovations. Many present agreed that the standing ovations mirror the feelings of the confidence and respect of the American people. There was no questioning the affection of those present.

THE TAXATION OF NATURAL RESOURCES

The taxation of natural resources received the attention of the Ways and Means Committee this week, particularly oil depletion. In recapitulation of industry witnesses views which contradict the President's and Secretary Dillon's recommendations as they impose an additional $280 million in taxes. I challenged Secretary Dillon with this bill of particulars. The tax recommendations: (1) Contradict and defeat the President's announced goals, (a) economic growth, (b) relieve unemployment, (c) free up investment capital, (d) increase consumer purchasing power. (2) Treat oil depletion as tax matter rather than resource policy. (3) Result in higher prices for gasoline and other petroleum products. (4) Result in less exploration, and smaller oil reserves, further damaging the oil industry, and indeed our national security, oil being vital to national defense. (5) More inequitable to smaller companies. (6) Add administrative complexity. (7) Lowers oil earnings further which now average 9.1 percent of invested capital as against 10.4 percent of all industry. (8) Further burdens industry which bears 6.7 percent of all taxes—Federal, State, local now totaling $7.8 billion. (9) Weaken our international competitive position. (10) Contradict 1963 aim of oversea investment credit. (11) Places oil industry abroad in separate tax position from all other industry.

It is my hope and effort that before basic tax changes are made "knowledge should go before" and a complete study should be made. Specifically, I have called on the administration to answer the many contradictory criticisms leveled by the industry against the President's recommendation.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE

(One-minute speech from the Congressional Record, May 8, 1963)

Mr. Alger. Mr. Speaker, Khrushchev is notifying the world that Cuba is branded, packaged, and delivered to Russia as a full-fledged Communist satellite—and he does not expect the United States to do anything about it. That is the meaning of Castro's mission to Moscow. It is a real victory for Khrushchev, even though he is paying quite a price for it.

"Of course, the United States, the leader of the free world, is paying the highest price of all. We are assisting Khrushchev in his announced goal of burying us. Mr. President, do we have a foreign policy, and if so what is it? What is wrong with reimposing the Monroe Doctrine?"

Maryland School Yearbook, Newspaper, and Magazine Awards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to announce that three schools located in the Fifth Congressional District of Maryland, won top awards at the 17th annual convention of the Maryland Scholastic Press Advisers Association on May 11, 1963.

Andover Junior-Senior High of Linthicum, Md., was awarded a plaque and trophy for being rated the best junior-senior high school paper in Maryland. This, I believe, is quite an accomplishment since their publication, "The Arrow," is not yet 2 years old.

Glen Burnie High School took two first place awards, which included the best yearbook in the State for their publication, "Le Souvenir," and the "Glen Burnian" was rated the best newspaper in the State. Among magazines, their "Impressions" placed fifth in the State. Annapolis Senior High won third place for its newspaper, "Tally Ho."

My sincere congratulations for a job well done goes to these fine schools in Maryland.

Golden Anniversary Honors of the Fraternal Order of Eagles Are Bestowed Upon Past State President Thomas E. Gosland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, today, May 13, I would like to bring to your attention and to our colleagues' attention the golden anniversary testimonial dinner recently given honoring California past president of the Eagles, Thomas E. Gosland. I wish very much to review some of the work of the Eagles and relate the devoted work of "Mr. Eagle" of California, who has been an Eagle for 50 years.

An Indiana Congressman once observed:

> There is something about the Fraternal Order of Eagles that is different and distinctive, something not to be found in any other order.

With this statement, I wholeheartedly agree. Other fraternal orders promote good fellowship, do good deeds, and do them well. Other fraternal orders provide death payments or other benefits for their members. But the Eagles go further than that. They reach outside their own ranks to assist in the welfare of all mankind.

Since February of 1898, when the order was founded by six theater owners in a waterfront shipyard in Seattle, the Eagles not only welcomed the average man as a member, but fought for his right to a life of dignity and self-respect.

In 1963 more than 800,000 members of our brotherhood attest to the principles of "liberty, truth, justice, and equality" upon which it was founded. Since the founding date, thousands of communities in our Nation, in Canada, in the Philippines, and in Guam have learned of brotherhood, friendship, and helpfulness from the work of the Eagles.

Fraternal orders have, in many instances, come into existence to provide remedies for some kind of grievance, or because those starting the new organizations were not in accord with the principles or methods of conducting some order already in operation.

Strictly speaking, the Fraternal Order of Eagles originated from this latter method. The records tell us that the founders met for the adjustment of a common grievance. From the second or third of these gatherings evolved the great brotherhood of which we are now so proud.

The name, the Fraternal Order of Eagles, was a happy selection, indeed, and very appropriate for an order having liberty as first among its principles, and the flag of our country as its standard. The great bird is indissolubly allied with both and has always typified the virtue of liberty.

It was on a Sunday, February 6, 1898, that Messrs. John Cort, John W. Considine, H. L. Leavitt, T. J. Considine, and M. Goldsmith laid the foundation stone and began their work.

The word "aerie" came into use at this time, and simultaneously the order was given its present name. It then became obvious to the membership that the operations of the order could be extended beyond the city of Seattle, which had given it birth, and that such extension could be brought about by the creation of a supreme or grand aerie.

With this objective in view, a meeting was held in Seattle on April 20, 1898, which resulted in a grand aerie constitution and the incorporation of the body under the laws of the State of Washington. A charter was secured, the constitution, as prepared, was adopted. Thus the grand aerie came into being and the first charter fee was paid by Seattle No. 1, which was also the first aerie installed under the ritual of the grand body.

The order was now in a position to reach out for new territory, and it was not long before the cities of Spokane, Tacoma, and Portland came under the wing of Eagledom. Organizers were sent to California, Montana, Oregon, and British Columbia.

The interest in Eagledom prospered in California, and the aerie at San Francisco was the fifth to come into existence; San Jose, the eighth; Sacramento, the ninth.

Like every new movement, the early days of the Fraternal Order of Eagles were hampered for want of cash. But from the outset it reached out to assist in the welfare of others. I am aware what the late Congressman Louis Ludlow of Indiana had in mind when he said of the order, "It reaches out and tries to help in solving the distressing and difficult problems of human relief."

The motto of "liberty, truth, justice, and equality" has been applied to every phase of endeavor.

The Fraternal Order of Eagles was a pioneer in calling for programs in discharge of governmental obligations to our people. A substantial factor in the enactment and strengthening of our social security system was the enlightened leadership of the Eagles. Through the persistent calling of the Eagles much needed legislation was enacted to provide for orphan children.

California has not been least among the "doers" in the program of the order. I am reminded of the Memorial Foundation for aiding the children of Eagle fathers who lost their lives in military service. I am reminded of our contributions to the Crusade for Freedom, a role in which Eagles translated their services into balloon launchings to combat communism.

I recall the Eagles' efforts in behalf of the Damon Runyon Cancer Fund; local crusades for safety, which have alerted hundreds of communities to traffic dangers; the presentation of Ten Commandment scrolls to local aeries, to reawaken spiritual and moral values.

It is right and proper that we look upon these accomplishments—and many more—as the helping hand of Eagledom which has built for the future.

But, Mr. Speaker, it has taken individual effort to build the order, and to dispense the good things of life to others. Such an individual is Thomas E. Gosland. He has given 50 years of unselfish service to the Fraternal Order of Eagles.

I have reminded you that the superstructure of Eagledom rests upon the foundation of our four cardinal principles, "liberty, truth, justice, and equality." May I further remind you that Tom Gosland has devoted his time, his head, and his heart to the duties of the high offices he has held as State president, local aerie president, and grand outside guard. He early learned the lessons of the Eagles' principles and acquired the characteristics of one who is imbued with brotherly love.

Tom Gosland possesses the abilities of leadership; he has accepted responsibility; he has a deep recognition of the needs of others. He knows that the individual who thinks only of self spreads gloom and doubt. Those who bring the greatest joy, as well as those who render the greatest service to mankind, are those who are oblivious to self, forgetful of personal gain, dedicated in thought and action to the welfare of others. Tom has engendered the love of all Eagledom.

It is with deep admiration and pride that I relate this to our colleagues on the occasion of the recent anniversary testimonial given in honor of Tom Gosland.

School Patrols Awarded Gold Lifesaver Medals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. FINNEGAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, May 9, it was my great pleasure to be present at a ceremony in the rose garden of the White House where the President honored eight young schoolchildren for acts of outstanding courage in the line of duty. The seven boys and one girl are all members of school safety patrols.

President Kennedy addressed a short speech of praise to the young people and pinned their medals on them. The awards are gold lifesaver medals provided by the American Automobile Association as part of a general safety program organized and conducted by the American Automobile Association.

Of the eight youngsters, two are from the Ninth District of Illinois which I have the honor to represent. Alvin Cynova, 13, is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Warren Cynova of 5111 North Glenwood, and Randy Newnum is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Clyde Jenkins of 1305 West Carmen.

The two boys are members of the safety patrol at Trumbull School, Chicago, were cited for pulling an adult school-crossing guard and three small girls out of the path of a speeding car. I would like to take this opportunity to offer my sincere congratulations to Alvin and Randy for their courage and their outstanding response to duty.

Philippine War Damage Claims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the House should concur in the Senate amendment to the Philippine War Damage Claims Act of 1962. It provides that any further payments by the United States would go to the Philippine Government instead of to private claimants.

Recent revelations before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee of improper activities on behalf of the Philippine war damage claims legislation indicates the need for this amendment as the best way of correcting the situation. It was passed by the Senate on May 1, 1963, by a rollcall vote of 58 to 26, being title IV of the supplemental appropriations bill (H.R. 5517).

This Senate amendment—No. 76—has been reported in disagreement by the conference committee, and a motion will be made for the House to recede and concur when the report of the conference committee comes back to the House.

Believing that the full facts should be before the House at that time, I include as part of these remarks a joint statement by Members of the House:

STATEMENT ON PHILIPPINE WAR DAMAGE CLAIMS

Recent hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee during its investigation of the Foreign Agents Registration Act (hearing of Apr. 18, 1963, entitled "Activities of Nondiplomatic Representatives of Foreign Principals in the United States") disclosed improper activities on behalf of the legislation. This led important members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, including the chairman and Senators SPARKMAN, SYMINGTON, and HICKENLOOPER to state that if the Senate had known the facts disclosed, it would not have passed the 1962 act in the form in which it was passed (hearing, pp. 262–263).

Senator SPARKMAN stated:

"You will recall that I presided over the committee during practically all of the hearings on this Philippine War Damage Claims Act of 1962. We had two bills before us at that time. One was the bill * * * which would have paid the amount directly to the Philippine Government, the full amount. The other was the bill * * * to make the payments to individual claimants.

"I want to say that in my opinion, had the committee been fully advised as to the facts that are before us now, the bill that was passed would not have been approved."

He later stated during the debate on the Senate amendment (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 7581):

"Had I known that the former Commissioners were taking advantage of the position they held and the information they had obtained as Commissioners, together with the other officials, I certainly would not have voted for that bill. I would have voted for the bill which would have provided payment directly to the Philippine Government."

The Senate decided that the proper way to correct the situation was to change the 1962 act by amendment into the other form providing for payment directly to the Philippine Government, and proceeded to pass such an amendment by a vote of 58 to 26.

I

The improper activities which led the Senate to change the form of the 1962 act.

1. The testimony before the Senate investigation showed that over a period of years lobbyists had been stirring up a demand for further payments on war claims.

The Congress had been led to believe that there had long been an insistent public demand in the Philippines for further payments. But the testimony before the Senate investigation showed that this demand had in part been stirred up by lobbyists: Mr. O'Donnell, a former member of the Philippine War Damage Commission; Mr. Delgado, the former Filipino member of the Commission (as required by the 1946 act); and Mr. Schein, former chief examiner of the Commission; that Mr. Delgado wrote to Mr. O'Donnell on January 13, 1952 (hearing, p. 178):

"Your letter of December 23, 1952, was duly received and have noted its contents with great interest. I believe you are quite right in your appraisal of the situation there but I am afraid that enthusiasm on the part of the interested parties and the Government here have cooled off. Nothing has been done and no one seems to be interested enough to take the initiative in having some action by the Government on the matter of additional war damage compensation. However, I am writing today to Mr. Lino Gutierrez, president of the Private Claimants Association, and other interested parties on the subject. In addition, in the broadcast which I am scheduled to make on the 18th of this month over the station DEBB, I will discuss the subject in an effort to arouse enthusiasm and start the ball rolling.

"I am of the considered opinion that even if the chances of obtaining the $200 million are not rosy this year, something must be done there to keep up the interest of the administration on the same, as otherwise our probabilities of obtaining additional money next year would be much less."

Addressing the Senate on April 26, 1963, Senator FULBRIGHT said (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 7198):

"The evidence taken from Mr. O'Donnell's own files indicates that he and Mr. Delgado promoted the so-called moral obligation to pay further claims, and kept the issue of further payments alive after 'enthusiasm on the part of the interested parties and the—Philippine—Government had cooled off'. * * * That letter is merely indicative of, and an example of, many other letters which indicate the beginning and the pursuance of an activity on the part of these gentlemen to create in the Philippines, and eventually in the Congress, the belief that there was a moral obligation to pay further claims."

2. The testimony before the Senate investigation showed that Mr. O'Donnell and Mr. Delgado started to promote legislation for further payments on war claims shortly after leaving the Commission in 1951.

Senator FULBRIGHT said:

"Very soon after his leaving office as a member of the Commission, Mr. O'Donnell made arrangements on his own to represent one group of claimants and his fellow Commissioner, Mr. Delgado, conceived the purpose of obtaining enactment of further legislation which would and did result in great financial benefit to Mr. O'Donnell. As I have indicated, he and his associates have already received in excess of $1 million, and more would come to them if the existing law should be allowed to stand (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 7198).

"It is significant that the further payments to be made were upon claims which they themselves had adjudicated as members of the Commission." (hearing, p. 261).

The testimony showed that Mr. O'Donnell sought to procure in Washington a list of the claimants, and wrote Mr. Delgado on February 9, 1952 (hearing, p. 179):

"It is regrettable that we did not make up this list before we left the Commission, but this is little solace now."

3. The testimony before the Senate investigation showed that Mr. O'Donnell, Mr. Delgado, and Mr. Schein spearheaded the testimony before the Foreign Affairs Committee in support of the claims legislation without disclosing their strong private interest in it.

The testimony showed that a crucial issue in the consideration of this legislation was as to the meaning and intent of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946; that the testimony of these three men was accepted as coming from men who were experts on that subject due to their work with the Commission; that they had already received large legal fees as a result of other Philippine war damage legislation, and would receive additional large fees if the 1962 act were passed in the form which they desired; namely, with provision for payments to private claimants; that the Foreign Affairs Committee reported favorably a bill in that form on June 27, 1960, despite the fact that the then administration had recommended settlement of Philippine war damage claims with the Philippine Government by a lump-sum payment to that Government.

That bill, H.R. 12078, 86th Congress, 2d session, died in the Rules Committee. In the 87th Congress a similar bill, H.R. 8617, was reported favorably in August 1961, and was defeated in the House May 9, 1962, on a rollcall vote of 201 to 171. Another similar bill, H.R. 11721, was immediately filed, was passed by the House on August 1, 1962, by the Senate on August 24, 1962, and became Public Law 87–616.

During the debate in the Senate on May 1, 1963, Senator HICKENLOOPER suggested an explanation as to why the House chose to support a bill for payment to claimants rather than to the Philippine Government, saying (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 7583):

"A bill providing payment to the Philippine Government was ruled out in the other body. No one knew quite why.

"The information that I am about to mention is not yet in the RECORD, but I assure Senators that there is ample reason to know that word went from powerful Members of the other body that unless the State Department and the administration accepted the bill as it was altered to make the $73 million payments to individual claimants rather than to the Philippine Government, there would be no bill at all, and the international complications that had arisen as the result of the failure to pass the original bill in the House would continue."

Comments by Senator FULBRIGHT were (hearing, p. 261):

"Mr. O'Donnell testified before this committee that he did not disclose, in previous testimony before the Congress, that he was acting in fact, if not in law, as the agent of foreign principals, and for his own interests. He spoke as a former official of the Federal Government whose interest was in having that Government pay purportedly legitimate claims. In fact, he was bound to be at least partially motivated by his own financial interest.

"The primary purpose of this investigation, of which today's hearing was a part, is to examine into the terms and the administration of the Foreign Agents Registration Act. Today's hearing I think has disclosed significant weaknesses, to the extent that Congress, the State Department, and the Justice Department did not know that a powerful moving force behind the passage of the Philippine War Damage Claims Legislation Act of 1962 was private gain rather than public welfare or national security.

"That they (Mr. O'Donnell and Mr. Delgado) have been unduly enriched is of less importance than that the legislative process has been subverted. Both Congress and the Executive were, I believe, deceived."

During the debate in the Senate on May 1, 1963, Senator HICKENLOOPER said (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 7584):

"This is a flagrant case. It is a flagrant case of * * * deliberate withholding of personal interest by witnesses before committees of the Congress, which amounts to complete deception.

"They were out drumming up business by international cable, letter, and other contacts to solicit the claims of these people. Then they got busy and stirred up the idea that the United States might be induced to put up $73 million for rehabilitation purposes, but their purpose was to pay it to individuals on individual claims, because they were developing contracts with the individual claimants, and those contracts have been listed in the RECORD. They used a substantial amount of money * * * One of these men came before the committees of the House and Senate, presenting himself as a former member of the Philippine War Damage Commission, and therefore connoting that he was in a special position of sympathy for and knowledge of the poor people in the Philippines—and many of them did suffer—but he never once disclosed that he was a lobbyist who had solicited business for revenue, based upon his service in the Government. * * * He never disclosed his own personal interest in this subject or his own pecuniary interest, or that of his fellow member on the Commission who was equally busy in the Philippines soliciting these claims.

"This was a racket, and a concealed racket. The administration did not know it. It was not revealed until almost collaterally and incidentally to a broader investigation by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations."

II

The House should concur with the Senate amendment

The House was subjected to the same pressures and deceptions as the Senate. The

House should conclude, as did Members of the Senate, that, had it known the facts which have since been disclosed, it would not have passed the 1962 act in the form in which it was passed. It should decide that the best way to correct the situation is to change the 1962 act by amendment into the form providing for payment directly to the Philippine Government.

The House has had grave doubts as to making further payments to private claimants. It defeated one bill for that purpose May 9, 1962, by a record vote of 201 to 171. It certainly would not have subsequently passed another similar bill had it known the facts which have since been disclosed.

If it did not pass that form of bill, it would have passed a bill providing for payment to the Philippine Government, as the previous administration had virtually promised such a settlement, and had recommended it to the Congress.

In 1959 the United States negotiated settlement of 19 outstanding Philippine claims, one of which was for additional war damages. In a note of August 4, 1959, to the Philippine Government, under the salutation, "Excellency," it said (Foreign Relations Committee hearing, June 12, 1962, p. 20):

"With respect to the Philippine claim for payment of additional war damage compensation in accordance with the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 (Public Law 370, 79th Cong.) the executive branch of the U.S. Government will at the next regular session of the Congress, and in connection with the legislative program for fiscal year 1961, request appropriate legislation enabling the settlement of this matter on the basis of $73 million, which amount reflects the statutory maximum of unpaid private claims according to the reports of the War Damage Commission. By a settlement, made directly with the Philippine Government, the U.S. Government will consider itself completely divested of all responsibility for payment of individual private claims. A memorandum showing the computation of the amount unpaid under the Philippine Rehabilitation Act is enclosed. No further request of the U.S. Government relating to war damage compensation will be entertained other than to supply any records which might be appropriate and be needed by the Philippine Government."

The House should now concur in the Senate amendment which would bring about settlement in that manner—by payment to the Philippine Government.

1. It is not enough merely to attempt to cut off further fees to the lobbyists.

That probably cannot be done effectively, anyway. The right objective is to undo the effect of the improper practices and deceptions which led to passage of a bill for payment to claimants which would not have been passed had the deceptions been known.

Senator Sparkman, who presided at the Senate hearings on the legislation said:

"I would not have voted for that bill. I would have voted for the bill which would have provided payments directly to the Philippine Government."

The proper corrective measure is to amend the 1962 act so that it will provide for payment directly to the Philippine Government.

2. Settlement by payment to the Philippine Government is acceptable to that Government.

Under Secretary Harriman told the Foreign Relations Committee, with reference to two bills, one for payment to the Philippine Government, and one for payment to private claimants (hearing, June 12, 1962, p. 14):

"The (Philippine) Government itself has stated that it will accept either bill with good will."

3. Settlement by payment to the Philippine Government would carry out the purposes of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 better than would further payments at this late date to private claimants.

The main purpose of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 was to rehabilitate the war-torn economy of the Philippines. Payment of private claims for war damages (whether caused by the United States or not) was chosen as a means to get the money quickly into the stream of the Philippine economy. The money had to be spent, or have been spent, for replacement and repair of the damages.

The 1962 act contains a similar requirement, but over $30 million will go to 287 claimants who have large claims of $25,000 and over (hearings, Foreign Relations Committee, June 12, 1962, p. 4). It is clear that most of them will long ago have made the replacements and repairs, so that the new payments will be windfalls.

Payment to the Philippine Government on the other hand would be a direct help to the Philippine economy, and so more in keeping with the purpose of the 1946 act.

4. The claimed saving to the United States as a result of paying private claimants is far outweighed by other considerations.

The 1962 act appropriated about $73 million for payment of private claims, with a provision that any amounts left over after such payments would revert to the U.S. Treasury. If settlement of the war damage claims issue were made by payment to the Philippine Government, the money would all be used for such payment.

Those who favor payment to private claimants make much of the possible saving resulting from lost claims caused by disappearance of claimants, etc.

But even if a few more million dollars might go to the Philippine Government, if payment were made to it, than would go to private claimants, that fact assumes slight importance when it is recalled that since 1946 the United States has furnished over a billion dollars of aid to the Philippines and is still furnishing aid in large amounts.

That fact is far outweighed by the consideration that payments now to private claimants would in many cases be windfalls, whereas payments to the Philippine Government would carry out the purpose of the 1946 act of aiding the Philippine economy. Under the Senate amendment providing for payment to the Philippine Government, that Government would be free to use the money for rehabilitation or in such manner as it saw fit.

Fifth. If the House would not have passed the 1962 act had it known the facts recently disclosed, it should now change the form of that act to provide payment to the Philippine Government rather than to private claimants.

Those who oppose the Senate amendment argue that the 1962 act should not be changed merely because of some wrongful lobbying. Other lobbyists, they say, have made campaign contributions and been active in sponsoring legislation. The newspapers have made much of campaign contributions, which make good stories, but it is clear that what moved the Senate to conclude that it would not have passed the 1962 act had it known the facts recently disclosed was mainly based on other considerations: with Mr. O'Donnell's and Mr. Delgado's activities in promoting a demand for war claims legislation, both here and in the Philippines; with their employment on claims legislation shortly after leaving the Commission; with their spearheading of testimony before the Congress favorable to that legislation without disclosing their private interest; and with their efforts to shape the legislation in such a way that it went to individual claimants, resulting in the lobbyists' private gain, rather than to the Philippine Government—in short, with improper pressures and deceptions which led Senator Hickenlooper to say, "The situation stinks" (Congressional Record, p. 7584).

III

Background facts as to opposition to further payments of private claims

The previous administration strongly opposed further payments to private claimants at this late date, and the House defeated one bill for that purpose.

The crucial issue was as to the alleged moral obligation to make such further payments. The disclosures in the Senate investigation have cast doubt on previous testimony on this issue, much of which came from the three lobbyists mentioned above. They even claimed that a "promise" had been made for further payments, and that such payments were a "debt."

In other respects, arguments previously made against further payments to private claimants have been strengthened and justified by the recent disclosures.

Those arguments were—

1. The private claims being brought forward were not "war damage claims" in the generally accepted sense of those words (which refer to claims based on legal liability) but were based on voluntary gifts made by the United States to rehabilitate the Philippine economy.

2. The real purpose of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 was rehabilitation, and payment to private claimants was a vehicle to accomplish that purpose. The report of the House Foreign Affairs Committee on that act stated:

"The bill is not a private claims measure to reimburse individuals or organizations for damage incurred in war. The primary function of the payments is to assist and encourage rehabilitation and rebuilding of the economy and social structure of the nation."

3. Further payment of private claims would not accomplish the main purpose of the 1946 act. The Bell Mission to the Philippines of 1950 reported (Foreign Affairs Committee Supplemental hearings on June 9, 1960, p. 21):

"That further war damage payments to individuals would not contribute materially to economic development in the Philippines, and that continuing assistance by the United States should be for development projects in agriculture and industry related to the specific needs of the Philippine economy rather than as additional war damage payments to individuals."

Since then over $1 billion of U.S. aid has gone to the Philippines.

On March 3, 1960, Mr. Douglas Dillon, Acting Secretary of State, wrote to the Speaker of the House:

"The executive branch believes that rebuilding, replacement, or repair of war-damaged private property in the Philippines is no longer practicable. Moreover, in view of the time which has elapsed since the original claims were approved, and since the U.S. Philippine War Damage Commission went out of existence on March 31, 1951, it is not considered practicable for the U.S. Government to assume any responsibility for the payment of the balance of approved individual private property claims."

4. The Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 did not create an obligation for further payments of private claims beyond the $400 million then provided.

This was the crucial issue. The 1946 act provided $400 million for payment of private claims. It contained a provision that the balance of the money left after the payment of small claims in full should be used toward payment of certain other claims up to a maximum of 75 percent. The $400 million was insufficient to pay that maximum.

Proponents of the 1962 act claimed that these provisions indicated an obligation to pay up to 75 percent. Opponents maintained that the intent of the 1946 act was to set up a method of disbursing $400 million, and not a method of paying claims up to 75 percent.

The record of hearings, reports, and debates relative to the 1946 act can fairly be said to show that a majority of the members of the committees in both branches did not intend to create a further obligation beyond the $400 million authorized although a few committee members insisted that the intent was to pay up to 75 percent.

CONCLUSION

The only record House vote on this legislation was against further payments to private claimants, a vote of 201 to 171 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 108, pt. 6, pp. 8007–8008). Since the recent disclosures in the Senate investigation, there are strong additional reasons for standing back of that vote, and for voting to concur in the Senate amendment.

H. R. GROSS.
WAYNE L. HAYS.
ROBERT R. BARRY.

Newspaper Awards, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, the Maryland-Delaware Press Association recently made its awards for excellence in journalism during 1962. In reading the results of this contest, I was greatly pleased to see that so many of the newspapers published in the Fifth Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent, were singled out for their outstanding work during the past year.

It was particularly gratifying to me to learn that the paper published in my hometown of Annapolis, the Evening Capital, was recognized for its high-caliber work; in the class of dailies it was awarded second place for general excellence and third place for excellence in typography.

It was also a great pleasure to learn that the Maryland Gazette, of Glen Burnie, was awarded third place for excellence in typography for weeklies with circulation over 5,000 and that the News Leader, of Laurel, was awarded first place for general excellence for weeklies with circulation under 5,000 with the Maryland Independent, of La Plata, receiving third place in the same class.

Other recognition received by newspapers, and their reporters, published in the Fifth District included third place for the Maryland Independent for community service; third place to Jack O'Brien of the Evening Capital for spot news writing; third place to Helen de Zayas of the Evening Capital for social news writing; second place to Sue Miller of the Maryland Gazette for spot news writing; first place to Gertrude L. Poe of the News Leader for feature writing; and first place to Robert Grauel of the News Leader for news photography on a weekly.